UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 107—PART 2

JANUARY 30, 1961, TO FEBRUARY 24, 1961

(PAGES 1357 TO 2730)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1961

J
11
.R
v.107
pt.2

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, through all the travail of a free people determining its leaders in a time fraught with danger and world turbulence, our hope, O God, is in Thee, as this dear land of our hope and prayer turns to a new chapter in the Nation's life.

We are grateful for the patriotism and fidelity of those honored by the Nation, who have stood as watchmen on the ramparts of our Republic in the perilous years through which we have been called to pass; statesmen who have given of their best and now, in the procession of history, step aside as the tumult and the shouting dies, and the captains and the kings depart.

We pray for a special portion of Thine enabling might, a holy ordination upon the President and the Vice President of the United States and the coadjutors who have been chosen, the few out of the many, to counsel with them, as in cooperation with the Congress they chart the course and determine the direction of our America in the momentous years that loom ahead.

Forbid that for any partisan advantage the precious oil of national unity should be spilled upon the ground, to ignite selfish fires. May it, rather, still feed the flame of liberty's torch as it enlightens the awakening world, where freedom and slavery struggle in mortal combat.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 26, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, I wish to announce that it had been the intention of the leadership to bring up today the resolutions which provide funds for the activities of various special committees and subcommittees of the Senate. We are prepared now to go ahead with those measures; but, at the request of a Senator, action on them will be delayed until tomorrow.

Today, after the Senate returns from the Hall of the House of Representatives, it will take up sundry nominations.

There will be no morning hour until after the Senate returns.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether it is proposed to bring up, today, the so-called money resolutions for the subcommittees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In reply to the distinguished minority leader, let me say that had been our intention, as he will recall. But due to the fact that one Senator wishes to go over the reports a little more carefully, those measures will not be brought up until tomorrow.

Today, following our return from the Hall of the House of Representatives, we shall dispose of as many nominations as possible; but, to the best of my knowledge, that is the only business which will be conducted today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader for that information.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 73)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear the annual message of the President of the United States.

(The annual message of the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Upon the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CANNON in the chair).

ORDER OF BUSINESS AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership that when consideration of the pending nominations is concluded, and whatever speeches are to be made, to adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that will be the order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose is to consider money resolutions and whatever additional nominations there may be at the time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. What does the majority leader plan to do with regard to miscellaneous items not connected with nominations? For example, I wish to ask that a certain document be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That request may be made today.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the majority leader restate his intention with regard to the consideration of money resolutions? Will that be done today or tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow. I had intended to ask that such resolutions be

considered today, but because of a request from a Senator, they will be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it the intention of the majority leader to consider nominations first and then the routine business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I believe there should be a morning hour preceding consideration of the nominations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF REVIEW OF APPROPRIATION ENTITLED "MEDICAL CARE, NAVY, 1958"

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on a review of an overobligation on an appropriation entitled "Medical Care, Navy, 1958"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war, and reconversion activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarter ended December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF COST OF EXCESS PROFICIENCY FLYING IN U.S. AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the cost of excess proficiency flying in the U.S. Air Force, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS' CANTEEN SERVICE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Farm Credit Administration, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICES NEGOTIATED UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH BURROUGHS CORP., DETROIT, MICH.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of prices negotiated for coordinate date transmitting sets under Department of the Air Force contracts AF 30 (635)-9324 and AF 30 (635)-11490 with Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich., dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, on the disposal of foreign excess property by that Commission during fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO PARTICIPATION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN WEST VIRGINIA CENTENNIAL OF 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the study and recommendations as to the appropriate participation by the Federal Government in the West Virginia Centennial of 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 21-23, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide 12-year terms for fulltime referees, increase the maximum salary limitations of referees, increase the salary of the Chief of Bankruptcy, authorize compensation for service of a retired referee and to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for a more liberal retirement annuity for referees in bankruptcy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAROLE OF CERTAIN REFUGEES

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders relating to the parole of certain refugees (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949 in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949 in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949 in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, during calendar year 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN CERTAIN GRADE OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on certain positions in the grade of GS-17 within that office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

UNIFORM COST-SHARING STANDARDS FOR LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION OR FLOOD PREVENTION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide uniform cost-sharing standards for non-Federal entities cooperating with the Federal Government in local flood protection or flood prevention projects, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, RELATING TO ACCESS TO RESTRICTED DATA BY COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to grant access to restricted data to Coast Guard personnel on the same basis as such access is granted to certain personnel of agencies of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORT OF U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas thousands of acres of rich farmland are annually endangered by floodwaters of the Kootenai River which completely inundate said lands or subject them to great percolation and seepage; and

"Whereas public buildings of Boundary County in the State of Idaho, and of the village of Bonners Ferry, and of the United States, and of School District No. 101 of Boundary County, and major highways U.S. No. 95 and U.S. No. 2 and bridges thereon, having great economic and military importance to the people of the State of Idaho and of the United States, are each year endan-

gered and damaged by floodwaters of the Kootenai River; and

"Whereas places of commerce and service to the people of Boundary County and the State of Idaho are each spring endangered, damaged and interrupted by the rise of the Kootenai River; and

"Whereas all of the above has caused, and unless corrected, will continue to cause, damage to public and private property, loss of tax revenues and expenditures of public funds in battling against these floodwaters amounting to millions of dollars; and

"Whereas this great loss can and would be averted by an upstream dam for flood control, which dam would also provide great electrical power generation both at site and downstream upon both the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers; and

"Whereas such a multipurpose dam, commonly called Libby Dam has heretofore been recommended by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army and authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the construction thereof has been long delayed pending agreement of the United States and Canada concerning management and regulation of the waters of the Kootenai and Columbia Rivers, which are international streams; and

"Whereas the international Joint Commission has announced that agreement upon these matters has been reached and which will require ratification of a treaty thereon between the United States and Canada: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to conclude and ratify a treaty between the United States and Canada providing for construction of Libby Dam upon the Kootenai River; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas American firms shipping lumber and wood products to Canada for sale must pay approximately seven times as much duty as Canadian firms exporting lumber and wood products to the United States, it is evident that there is a great and pressing need for an equalization of U.S. import duties with Canadian import duties on lumber and wood products; and

"Whereas U.S. producers are further hurt because Canadian mills (British Columbia for example) obtain stumpage at savings of $10 to $12 per thousand less than Idaho mills and their wage rates will average about 50 cents per hour less than ours in Idaho; and

"Whereas we currently pay 20 percent customs shipping flake and particle board into Canada and charge on Canadian products of a similar nature is understood to be much less; a large particle board plant is now under construction in Manitoba and news reports state that it plans to market most of its products in the Midwestern United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to the problem of raising U.S. import duties on lumber and wood products with those of Canada for the same items to the end that U.S. producers may not be put to disadvantage and loss by reason of the above mentioned conditions and that such action as may be appropriate be taken immediately to protect U.S. producers of lumber and wood products; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the freight rate situation is one of the two greatest contributions to the depressed lumbering industry in the Northwest—the other being Forest Service timber sales policies; and

"Whereas it is desirable that Congress take cognizance of the present freight rate situation, because of its inequities and adverse effects on the forest products from Idaho and the entire Northwest, and

"Whereas there is a pressing need for uniform motor freight rate regulations among the States, instead of the present hodgepodge of varying regulations, licensing, etc., to the end that lumber producers could turn to trucking their products to market if unable to obtain satisfactory and reasonable rail freight rates: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to take cognizance of the present hodgepodge of varying regulations, licensing, etc., because of their inequities and adverse effects on the forest products and forest industries of Idaho and the entire Northwest; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress give attention to the present need for uniform motor freight rate regulations among the several States in the Northwest so that lumber producers could turn to trucking their products to market if unable to obtain satisfactory and reasonable rail freight rates; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4 (UNDERHILL AND MOODY OF WHITE)

"Whereas several million persons are unemployed in the United States, and the unemployment situation has become a perplexing problem; and

"Whereas it is always vitally important to the stability of our Nation to hold unemployment to the lowest possible minimum; and

"Whereas one of the most certain methods of removing millions of employees permanently from regular employment is to provide for voluntary retirement at the age of 60; and

"Whereas many persons establish social security protection before they reach the age of 65, and then live only a comparatively brief time after attaining retirement age; and

"Whereas the actual period of enjoying social security benefits is often short for many persons over the age of 65; and

"Whereas we believe that the social security law should be amended to provide for voluntary retirement at the age of 60 and thus remove millions of persons from employment competition: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 63d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas does hereby respectfully request the Congress of the United States to amend the social security law to provide for voluntary retirement at the age of 60; and be it further

"Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution, a copy of the same shall be mailed by the secretary of state to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States, and one to each Member of the congressional delegation from the State of Arkansas."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2 BY FLETCHER OF SALINE

"A concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing the electoral college system and establishing a system of popular elections for the elections of the President and the Vice President of the United States.

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. The General Assembly of the State of Arkansas respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing the electoral college system and establishing a system of popular elections for the election of the President and the Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The General Assembly of the State of Arkansas further respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States that it provide that such amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be effective when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"SEC. 3. The secretary of state of the State of Arkansas is hereby directed to send certified copies of this concurrent resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress of the United States from

the State of Arkansas, and the chief executive and presiding officers of the legislative bodies of each of the several States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

"*To the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas there was held on November 8, 1960, a national election for the purpose of electing officers to various National and State offices; and

"Whereas as the outcome of said national election, a new administration in the National Government of the United States is assuming office under the leadership of the Honorable John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Legislature of the State of Washington does hereby congratulate the Honorable John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States, and extend to the new national administration, under his leadership, felicitations and sincere best wishes from this legislature. We are confident that the new administration will meet with wisdom and foresight the numerous and momentous matters which are now, and will in the ensuing years, be placed before it for consideration; be it hereby further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate and of the House, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Washington congressional delegation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States to approve the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado and to appropriate funds for initiation of the construction of the project at the earliest possible time

"Whereas the Fryingpan-Arkansas project is a multiple-purpose development designed as a major step in the maximum utilization of water and resources in the Arkansas and Colorado River Basins in Colorado; and

"Whereas the completion of this project will mean a substantially increased domestic and irrigation water supply, reservoirs of power for industrial development, flood and sediment control, antipollution, fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation in both the Arkansas and Colorado River Basins; and

"Whereas the people of Colorado have already spent more than $500,000 in preparing the necessary plans and agreements to make this project become a reality, and the Federal Government has spent more than $1 million for the same purpose; and

"Whereas the project is designed as an independent, self-sustaining unit; and

"Whereas the construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project is of vital benefit to the entire economy of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein),* That this general assembly, as a matter of official policy, urges and recommends the approval of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, and memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the initiation of construction thereon at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Members of Congress from the State of Colorado, and the Secretary of Interior of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 22

"Whereas the United Nations Charter was approved in the U.S. Senate on July 28, 1945, and thus began the 'honeymoon period of the charter' during which time the one-worlders, both in and out of the United Nations, seeking ways and means to circumvent, or alter its intendments, proceeded, and are still proceeding, by a variety of devious maneuvers and clever resorts to semantics, to transform the United Nations into a 'world government' or to give it many of the incidents thereof; and

"Whereas on August 3, 1946, while the Senate of the United States was considering the Morse resolution (S. Res. 196), authorizing unconditional acceptance by the United States of compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, Senator Connally, of Texas, introduced a reservation or condition thereto, which provided that this country's acceptance of the jurisdiction of the World Court, as it is popularly known, 'shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of the United States, as determined by the United States,' which was adopted by a very substantial majority of the Senate; and

"Whereas with the deep disappointment of the one-worlders and international do-gooders at this action, the movement to bring about the repeal of the Connally reservation was begun, resulting in the introduction of Senate Resolution 94, by HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on March 24, 1959, which lay dormant until President Eisenhower, speaking in New Delhi, India, in December 1959, was reported to have stated that he was 'willing to lose a point now and then to an international tribunal in order to obtain a world at peace under rule of law' whereupon, with this Presidential shot in the arm hearings were held on Senate Resolution 94, January 27, 1960, and on February 17, 1960, following which, on March 29, 1960, further action was wisely postponed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and

"Whereas the internationalists, doubtless, will revive the issue at the current session of the Congress and press for the repeal of this safeguard of the preservation of the integrity and sovereignty of the United States, from any arrogated jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice or of the United Nations, either of which, by its own ipse dixit, could internationalize a purely domestic matter so that it lost its character as a domestic issue and lost the benefit, if any, of the protection and immunities provided in the United Nations Charter with respect to such matters; and

"Whereas pleasing, but empty, platitudes as 'world law' or 'world peace through law,' wholly without substance, are stock phrases of world government enthusiasts whose technique is to 'sell' world government by attractive labels, since rule of law presupposes a supreme lawgiver and a tribunal capable of enforcing it and coercing transgressors; and

"Whereas there is no statutory international law or law of nations, but such consists of certain rules and principles of law customarily recognized by civilized nations, supplemented, from time to time, by formal conventions, treaties, and pacts and other vague, nonstatutory media dealing with undefined 'international obligations'; and

"Whereas the so-called World Court is neither a court nor a judicial body, but a commission, modeled almost exactly upon the pattern of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which had no hesitation in promulgating pacts, covenants, and treaties encroaching upon the domestic affairs of the United States, challenging the sovereignty and independence thereof, and abridging the rights of the people under their own laws and Constitution, for which its only protection, from such prostitution, was found in the Connally reservation; and

"Whereas it is apparent that, with the repeal of the Connally reservation, our country would be subjected to the direction of the so-called World Court composed of 15 members, many of whom hold views inimical to the interests of the United States, chosen by the General Assembly of the United Nations, determining its own jurisdiction; and

"Whereas a number of other nations have only accepted jurisdiction of the World Court with reservations, including but not limited to, Mexico, France, Russia, Liberia, Union of South Africa, Pakistan, Sudan, India, Australia, United Arab Republic, even though some of these, including Russia, the United Arab Republic, and Australia, have representatives on the International Court of Justice; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the United States to settle international disputes by arbitration and peaceful means, rather than by force, nevertheless, it is surely not in the best interests of the United States to surrender its sovereignty and integrity to a World Court, established without either constitutional or statutory authority and existing solely by virtue of its own arrogated power; and

"Whereas by such surrender the United States will have been legally disarmed which is as dangerous as military disarmament; and

"Whereas only by maintaining a strong America internally will America be strong externally; and

"Whereas Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH having heretofore expressed his opposition to the repeal of the Connally reservation, it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to commend his position thereon and to urge the other members of the Texas delegation in the Congress to support the Connally reservation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Texas,* That it is the sense of this body that the Connally reservation, preserving the integrity, sovereignty and independence of the United States, be retained for the foregoing and other reasons; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded, under the seal of the Senate of Texas, by the secretary, to the President; and to the Vice President of the United States; to the U.S. Senators from Texas; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Members of the House of Representatives from Texas; to the Secretary of State of the United States; to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and to the chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee."

The petition of Robert O. Wilbur, of Flemington, N.J., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Tommy Cook Post 122, the American Legion, Rayville, La., relating to certain decisions of the Supreme Court and certain acts of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Trinidad, Colo., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the construction of needed public works and improvement; to the Committee on Public Works.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF COLORADO LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the concern of President Kennedy and of the Congress with the severe hardships endured by the citizens of the chronically and persistently depressed area of our economy is well known. I welcome the quick action of President Kennedy, in his Executive Order No. 1, extending and expanding the program of surplus food distribution to the needy and I congratulate Secretary Freeman for his swift implementation of the order.

I also applaud the prompt hearings held by Senator DOUGLAS and his subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, on S. 1, the area redevelopment bill. I have testified on this measure in the past and I intend to do all that I can in the future to insure its favorable consideration.

My own State of Colorado—with a fine record of economic wealth—has, within it areas of chronic unemployment and hardship.

Trinidad and Walsenburg are examples of two towns whose depressions have been severe, persistent and of long term. Dependent primarily upon coal mining for their livelihood, these two towns have been particularly hard hit by the gradual decline of the coal industry since the war.

As a sign of the great concern of the people of Colorado with the hardship and suffering in the Trinidad-Walsenburg area, the Colorado Legislature has passed a memorial on this grave matter, requesting the Congress to include, in its legislation on area redevelopment, clear provision for assistance to such depressed localities as these.

In conformity with its wishes I have testified on behalf of area redevelopment at every opportunity in my Senate career, most recently speaking in favor of S. 1 of the 87th Congress. I have prepared for Senator DOUGLAS' committee an amendment which has specific reference to the plight of Trinidad and Walsenburg. I am confident the committee, in marking up the bill, will give my amendment its careful consideration.

At this time, Mr. President, I should like to present to the Senate the joint memorial recently passed by the Colorado Legislature and I would ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to include Huerfano County and Las Animas County of the State of Colorado in any provisions to be made by Congress or the President for aid to depressed areas of the United States

Whereas the President of the United States and Members of the Congress of the United States have indicated a desire to assist areas of the United States which are experiencing a decline in their business growth as compared to other areas of the United States; and

Whereas the presence of a depressed area in any section of the United States represents a source of danger to the continued growth of the United States in an historical period of competition with other great powers of the world; and

Whereas the counties of Huerfano and Las Animas in the State of Colorado have in recent years experienced a serious decline in their business growth and must be considered as depressed areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That it respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to include Huerfano County and Las Animas County of the State of Colorado in any provisions to be made by Congress or the President for aid to depressed areas of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States; and to the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado who are urgently requested to introduce and sponsor such legislation as is necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

SAM T. TAYLOR,
President of the Senate.
LUCILE L. SHUSTER,
Secretary of the Senate.
ALBERT J. TOMSIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
GENE MANZANASER,
Chief clerk of the House of Representatives.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, certified by Idaho's secretary of state, the Honorable Arnold Williams, did on January 24, 1961, approve Senate Joint Memorial No. 8, petitioning the Congress and the President of the United States to give early consideration to the construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir on the Teton River in Idaho.

This is an outstanding project in southeastern Idaho, and I recently discussed it with Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy. The Bureau intends to study the acceleration of plans for the project, and I have high hopes that this may be accomplished.

The Lower Teton development would be a multiple-purpose project to provide the full potential for flood control, irrigation, power, and recreation on the Teton River. It is badly needed in the area, and the Interior Department's initial reconnaissance report will be completed this year.

Mr. President, concurring in the expressed sentiments of the resolution, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas what is known as the Lower Teton project, situated in the county of Fremont, State of Idaho, and included in the recent comprehensive study of the Snake River by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers is highly essential to the uninterrupted growth and stability of Idaho agriculture: the economic benefits thereby accumulating to this great State particularly and the United States generally being many times greater than the cost of this project; and

Whereas the waters of the Teton River constitute a significant portion of the irrigation supplies available to eastern Idaho and, indeed, all of the Snake River area and are, therefore an important part of the water resource which is the foundation of our economic and industrial strength; and

Whereas if the irrigated farms of Idaho are to be maintained as secure units and survive in this technological age of specialized agriculture and its associated high operating costs, it is imperative that our present storage reservoirs be supplemented with new facilities to store the high water near its source, thereby further eliminating the danger of drought and its attendant hardships in all of the irrigated areas of the Snake River; and

Whereas each succeeding board of county commissioners has, since the creation of Madison and Fremont Counties, been confronted with the serious annual problem of the wild, ravaging Teton River, all of which conditions would be eliminated through the construction of said project; and

Whereas even in years of mild snowfall in the watershed, the Teton River can be depended upon to provide at least several weeks of round-the-clock effort to protect private and public property from the floodwater of the Teton. Madison County maintains 11 bridges across the Teton, 2 with steel spans, 3 reinforced concrete, and 6 lumber bridges. Many times, serious damage to these structures has resulted from the uncontrollable destructive force of the flooding Teton. The bridges blocked by ice jams and the normal debris of high water become dams—forcing the floodwaters out onto surrounding farming land destroying its productive capacity for 1, 2, or 3 years. The Idaho State Highway Department maintains four bridges across the Teton within the boundaries of Freemont and Madison Counties and the Union Pacific Railroad system has three. Each of these bridges has, in the past, been the source of serious trouble and great maintenance expense because of the uncontrolled flooding Teton; and

Whereas each year, almost without exception, many square miles south and west

of Teton City lie under water as a result of the Teton flooding, and frequently private homes and storage facilities are jeopardized. Because of the slow and meandering course of the Teton it is impossible to predict where it will strike next, and

Whereas eastern Idaho counties maintain hundreds of miles of oil road—not including State or Federal highways—the foundations become spongelike under the saturation of flood waters so that even light loads break the mat into thousands of pieces making complete resurfacing necessary; and

Whereas the benefits of flood control, irrigation, and associated economic expansion have justified consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Army Engineers of our recommendation for construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir without delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir with the least possible delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Army Engineers, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

EXCLUSION OF RED CHINA FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I present a petition which was sent to me from the Holy Name Society of St. Adalbert's Roman Catholic Church in Elmhurst, N.Y. I am in full agreement with the position taken by the members of this society that Red China must be excluded from membership in the United Nations. As a member of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations, I intend to leave no stone unturned in preventing this Communist menace to peace from taking a seat in the United Nations.

The resolution of St. Adalbert's Holy Name Society reads:

It is requested that you do everything within your power to continue the stand of the United States of America and many other friendly nations that Communist China be excluded from membership in the United Nations. We beseech you to use every possible means through the State Department and our United Nations representative to continue the task of preventing this menace to peace on earth from using the United Nations as their propaganda medium for the spread of communism and vilification of the United States.

Mr. President, this petition was forwarded to me by Mr. Edward V. Perchase, president of the St. Adalbert's Holy Name Society. I regret that I cannot have printed the full list of several hundred names which accompany this petition.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF TRINIDAD, COLO.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Trinidad, Colo., relating to Federal assistance to States in public works projects.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States is contemplating the enactment of legislation to check the growth of unemployment by providing Federal assistance to State and local governmental agencies for the construction of needed public works and improvements; and

Whereas the city of Trinidad, Colo., should be designated a labor surplus area with a substantial unemployment problem; and

Whereas the city of Trinidad, Colo., sorely needs such public works and improvements as the expansion of domestic water, sewer disposal plant, recreational facilities, etc.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Trinidad, Colo., memorializes the Congress to enact legislation to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the construction of needed public works and improvements; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives, to all area Congressmen, and to the U.S. Senators representing the State of Colorado.

JAMES E. GRIFFIN,
Mayor.

Attest:

FRANK HOCH,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 153. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963 (Rept. No. 28).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of December 1960. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER 1960 and NOVEMBER 1960, AND PAY, NOVEMBER 1960 AND OCTOBER 1960

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for December 1960 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In December numbered—	In November numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In November was—	In October was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,356,720	2,360,667	−3,947	$1,135,908	$1,091,960	+$43,948
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,324,586	1,327,154	−2,568	632,432	606,946	+25,486
Department of Defense	1,032,134	1,033,513	−1,379	503,476	485,014	+18,462
Inside the United States	2,197,041	2,200,583	−3,542			
Outside the United States	159,679	160,084	−405			
Industrial employment	561,815	563,128	−1,313			
Foreign nationals	174,279	175,348	−1,069	23,720	[2] 22,948	+772

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I, breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II, breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III, breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV, breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V, shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1960, and comparison with November 1960, and pay for November 1960, and comparison with October 1960*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	December	November	Increase	Decrease	November	October	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	87,887	89,689		1,802	$43,101	$41,587	$1,514	
Commerce [1]	31,372	31,763		391	16,890	16,254	636	
Health, Education, and Welfare	64,847	63,654	1,193		32,519	30,056	2,463	
Interior	50,975	51,557		582	27,385	[2] 26,699	686	
Justice	30,842	30,932		90	19,161	18,123	1,038	
Labor	6,957	7,063		106	4,031	3,875	156	
Post Office	[3] 573,160	573,056	104		251,962	242,277	9,685	
State [4]	37,826	38,070		244	17,875	18,308		$433
Treasury	76,736	76,998		262	42,433	40,432	2,001	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	416	421		5	254	240	14	
Bureau of the Budget	439	438	1		376	358	18	
Council of Economic Advisers	32	31	1		27	24	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	71		1	33	34		1
National Security Council	63	64		1	50	48	2	
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,793	1,805		12	1,232	1,182	50	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	1	2		1	1	1		
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	5	5			3	3		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	12	12			6	8		2
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3			2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	444	445		1	80	79	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,824	6,859		35	4,713	4,472	241	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	598	599		1	374	357	17	
Civil Aeronautics Board	755	757		2	530	501	29	
Civil Service Commission	3,605	3,607		2	2,147	2,044	103	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7			4	5		1
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			4	4		
Commission on Civil Rights	78	78			50	46	4	
Development Loan Fund	145	147		2	111	100	11	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	234	236		2	167	157	10	
Farm Credit Administration	241	242		1	165	157	8	
Federal Aviation Agency	39,722	39,526	196		24,442	22,764	1,678	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	6	1		4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,360	1,359	1		869	832	37	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,234	1,240		6	805	698	107	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,053	1,048	5		653	636	17	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	339	341		2	291	271	20	
Federal Power Commission	853	842	11		560	530	30	
Federal Trade Commission	801	799	2		558	531	27	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	49	48	1		37	35	2	
General Accounting Office	4,885	4,918		33	2,974	2,820	154	
General Services Administration [5]	29,195	29,132	63		13,350	12,494	856	
Government Contract Committee	26	28		2	18	18		
Government Printing Office	6,573	6,557	16		3,219	3,142	77	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,244	11,295		51	6,648	6,387	261	
Indian Claims Commission	17	17			16	16		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,357	2,370		13	1,506	1,443	63	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,042	15,929	113		10,817	10,268	549	
National Capital Housing Authority	338	339		1	135	138		3
National Capital Planning Commission	45	45			31	30	1	
National Capital Transportation Agency	10	13		3	4	2	2	
National Gallery of Art	314	319		5	132	127	5	
National Labor Relations Board	1,774	1,766	8		1,142	1,084	58	
National Mediation Board	115	122		7	104	85	19	
National Science Foundation	687	[2] 657	30		369	388		19
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	50	41	9		27	25	2	
Panama Canal	14,333	14,320	13		4,740	6,634		1,894
Railroad Retirement Board	2,177	2,207		30	1,128	1,100	28	
Renegotiation Board	279	281		2	221	210	11	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	162	161	1		104	97	7	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,031	1,016	15		667	627	40	
Selective Service System	6,460	6,423	37		1,975	1,874	101	
Small Business Administration	2,325	2,312	13		1,424	1,359	65	
Smithsonian Institution	1,106	1,114		8	526	503	23	
Soldiers' Home	1,025	1,022	3		327	320	7	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	48	48			35	34	1	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27			23	22	1	
Tariff Commission	267	266	1		184	175	9	
Tax Court of the United States	150	151		1	112	109	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,855	15,249		394	8,315	8,192	123	
Texas Water Study Commission	49	50		1	34	32	2	
U.S. Information Agency	10,807	10,841		34	4,361	4,076	285	
Veterans' Administration	173,475	173,701		226	73,764	69,268	4,496	
Virgin Islands Corporation	547	591		44	95	113		18
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,324,586	1,327,154	1,838	4,406	632,432	606,946	27,857	2,371
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			2,568				25,486	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,856	[2] 1,860		4	1,377	1,322	55	
Department of the Army	[6] 380,681	381,984		1,303	179,764	175,751	4,013	
Department of the Navy	342,980	[2] 343,421		441	175,289	167,785	7,504	
Department of the Air Force	306,617	306,248	369		147,046	140,156	6,890	
Total, Department of Defense	1,032,134	1,033,513	369	1,748	503,476	485,014	18,462	
Net change, Department of Defense			1,379				18,462	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [7]	2,356,720	2,360,667	2,207	6,154	1,135,908	1,091,960	46,319	2,371
Net change, including Department of Defense			3,947				43,948	

[1] December figure includes 207 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] Excludes 293,020 temporary Christmas employees.
[4] December figure includes 14,406 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 14,497 in November and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 3,881 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 3,892.
[5] Includes 1 employee of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[6] Subject to revision.
[7] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1960, and comparison with November 1960*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	86,862	88,675		1,813
Commerce [1]	30,781	31,170		389
Health, Education, and Welfare	64,389	63,207	1,182	
Interior	50,519	51,101		582
Justice	30,515	30,607		92
Labor	6,881	6,975		94
Post Office	[2] 571,921	571,805	116	
State [3]	9,107	9,193		86
Treasury	76,169	76,432		263
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	416	421		5
Bureau of the Budget	439	438	1	
Council of Economic Advisers	32	31	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	71		1
National Security Council	63	64		1
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,793	1,805		12
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	1	2		1
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	5	5		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	12	12		
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3		
American Battle Monuments Commission	12	12		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,784	6,819		35
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	598	599		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	755	757		2
Civil Service Commission	3,602	3,604		2
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	78	78		
Development Loan Fund	145	147		2
Export-Import Bank of Washington	234	236		2
Farm Credit Administration	241	242		1
Federal Aviation Agency	38,815	38,627	188	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	6	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,358	1,357	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,232	1,238		6
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,053	1,048	5	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	339	341		2
Federal Power Commission	853	842	11	
Federal Trade Commission	801	799	2	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	49	48	1	
General Accounting Office	4,812	4,844		32
General Services Administration [4]	29,193	29,130	63	
Government Contract Committee	26	28		2
Independent agencies—Continued				
Government Printing Office	6,573	6,557	16	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,099	11,150		51
Indian Claims Commission	17	17		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,357	2,370		13
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,036	15,924	112	
National Capital Housing Authority	338	339		1
National Capital Planning Commission	45	45		
National Capital Transportation Agency	10	13		3
National Gallery of Art	314	319		5
National Labor Relations Board	1,746	1,738	8	
National Mediation Board	115	122		7
National Science Foundation	682	[5] 653	29	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	50	41	9	
Panama Canal	389	402		13
Railroad Retirement Board	2,177	2,207		30
Renegotiation Board	279	281		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	162	161	1	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,031	1,016	15	
Selective Service System	6,306	6,270	36	
Small Business Administration	2,300	2,286	14	
Smithsonian Institution	1,097	1,104		7
Soldiers' Home	1,025	1,022	3	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	48	48		
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27		
Tariff Commission	267	266	1	
Tax Court of the United States	150	151		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,853	15,247		394
Texas Water Study Commission	49	50		1
U.S. Information Agency	2,783	2,779	4	
Veterans' Administration	172,398	172,615		217
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,265,701	1,268,052	1,820	4,171
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			2,351	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,818	[5] 1,820		2
Department of the Army	330,242	331,478		1,236
Department of the Navy	320,926	[5] 321,295		369
Department of the Air Force	278,354	277,938	416	
Total, Department of Defense	931,340	932,531	416	1,607
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,191	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,197,041	2,200,583	2,236	5,778
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			3,542	

[1] December figure includes 207 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] Excludes 292,838 temporary Christmas employees.
[3] December figure includes 1,942 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 1,946 in November.
[4] Includes 1 employee of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[5] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1960, and comparison with November 1960*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,025	1,014	11	
Commerce	591	593		2
Health, Education, and Welfare	458	447	11	
Interior	456	456		
Justice	327	325	2	
Labor	76	88		12
Post Office	[1] 1,239	1,251		12
State [2]	28,719	28,877		158
Treasury	567	566	1	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	432	433		1
Atomic Energy Commission	40	40		
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	907	899	8	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	73	74		1
General Services Administration	2	2		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	145	145		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	6	5	1	
National Labor Relations Board	28	28		
National Science Foundation	5	[3] 4	1	
Panama Canal	13,944	13,918	26	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	154	153	1	
Small Business Administration	25	26		1
Smithsonian Institution	9	10		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,024	8,062		38
Veterans' Administration	1,077	1,086		9
Virgin Islands Corporation	547	591		44
Total, excluding Department of Defense	58,885	59,102	62	279
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			217	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	38	40		2
Department of the Army	[4] 50,439	50,506		67
Department of the Navy	22,054	22,126		72
Department of the Air Force	28,263	28,310		47
Total, Department of Defense	100,794	100,982		188
Net decrease, Department of Defense			188	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	159,679	160,084	62	467
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			405	

[1] Excludes 182 temporary Christmas employees.
[2] December figure includes 12,464 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 12,551 in November. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The December figure includes 3,881 of these trust fund employees and the November figure includes 3,892.
[3] Revised on basis of later information.
[4] Subject to revision.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1960, and comparison with November 1960*

Department or agency	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,427	3,407	20	
Commerce	5,662	5,671		9
Interior	7,798	7,774	24	
Post Office	236	234	2	
Treasury	5,048	5,122		74
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	228	226	2	
Federal Aviation Agency	1,695	1,684	11	
General Services Administration	1,360	1,347	13	
Government Printing Office	6,573	6,557	16	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,042	15,929	113	
Panama Canal	7,372	7,358	14	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	126	129		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,061	12,447		386
Virgin Islands Corporation	547	591		44
Total, excluding Department of Defense	68,175	68,476	215	516
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			301	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 135,000	[2] 135,594		594
Outside the United States	[1] 4,500	[2] 4,547		47
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	199,235	199,493		258
Outside the United States	483	487		4
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	152,707	152,805		98
Outside the United States	1,715	1,726		11
Total, Department of Defense	493,640	494,652		1,012
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,012	
Grant total, including Department of Defense	561,815	563,128	215	1,528
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,313	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of December 1960 and comparison with November 1960*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November	December	November
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	31	30					31	30		
Crete	46	46					46	46		
England	3,336	3,305			16	14	3,320	3,291		
France	22,145	22,499	17,985	17,972	4	4	4,156	4,523		
Germany	80,861	81,066	67,746	67,996	52	[1] 52	13,063	13,018		
Greece	272	273					272	273		
Japan	57,673	58,140	20,051	20,384	15,501	[1] 15,634	22,121	22,122		
Korea	6,226	6,186	6,226	6,186						
Morocco	2,998	3,120			857	854	2,141	2,266		
Netherlands	42	42					42	42		
Norway	24	24					24	24		
Saudi Arabia	2	1					2	1		
Trinidad	622	615			622	615				
Total	174,279	175,348	112,008	112,538	17,052	17,173	45,218	45,636	1	1

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,356,720. This was a net decrease of 3,947 compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1961, which began July 1, 1960, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1960	2,382,549		125
August	2,384,933	2,384	
September	2,364,636		20,297
October	2,360,534		4,102
November	2,360,667	133	
December	2,356,720		3,947
Net decrease for 1st 6 months of fiscal year 1961			25,954

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of December was 1,324,586, a decrease of 2,568 as compared with the November total of 1,327,154. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,032,134, a decrease of 1,379 as compared with 1,033,513 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 1,802 and the Interior Department with 582. The largest increase was reported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 1,193.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 1,303, and the Department of the Navy with 441. The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 369.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 3,542 and outside the United States civilian employment decreased 405. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December totaled 561,815, a decrease of 1,313.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,346,720 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 174,279 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during December who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in November was 175,348. A breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Australia	1				1
Canada	31			31	
Crete	46			46	
England	3,336		16	3,320	
France	22,145	17,985	4	4,156	
Germany	81,861	67,746	52	13,063	
Greece	272			272	
Japan	57,673	20,051	15,501	22,121	
Korea	6,226	6,226			
Morocco	2,998		857	2,141	
Netherlands	42			42	
Norway	24			24	
Saudi Arabia	2			2	
Trinidad	622		622		
Total	174,279	112,008	17,052	45,218	1

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of November 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, NOVEMBER 1960

INVENTORIES

This is the 12th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is for the month of November 1960.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The four agencies reported that as of November 1, 1960, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $16,176,103,000 and as of November 30, 1960, they totaled $16,183,501,000, a net increase of $7,398,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program in the table that follows.

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1960	End of month, Nov. 30, 1960	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture:			
Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$7,442,100	$7,441,730	−$370
Exchange commodities—Strategic and critical materials	107,327	72,125	−35,202
Total, Department of Agriculture	7,549,427	7,513,855	−35,572
General Services Administration:			
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,139,825	6,132,492	−7,333
Federal Facilities Corporation: Tin inventory	9,519	9,519	
Defense Production Act program	1,462,619	1,464,171	+1,552
Supplemental stockpile	836,539	838,128	+1,589
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit		44,974	+44,974
Total, General Services Administration	8,448,503	8,489,285	+40,782
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:			
Civil defense stockpile	15,193	16,413	+1,220
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:			
Civil defense medical stockpile	162,980	163,948	+968
Grand total	16,176,103	16,183,501	+7,398

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detail is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, November 1960: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, November 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, November 1960.

Table 4: Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, November 1960, including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists when extended support, and in some instances in a form to which the supported commodity is processed or converted to increase marketability. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: All inventories are recorded in the accounts at cost. "Cost value" is comprised of the initial cost of the commodity plus storage, handling, transportation, and accessorial expenses paid or accrued up to the date of reporting. The initial cost of inventories acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans is the unpaid balance of the notes plus storage and other charges advanced, any equities due or paid to producers on warehouse-stored collateral (by Public Law 85-835, and beginning with 1959 crop production, the Corporation will not make equity payments to borrowers on unredeemed price support loan collateral, title to which it acquires on or after maturity of the loans), and the net value of any quantity or quality differences determined upon delivery of farm-stored collateral. Amounts paid to lending agencies participating in the loan program for crop years prior to 1958 were recorded as a part of inventory cost.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition: Total costs of storage, handling, transportation, and other accessorial expenses incurred during the month.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition value plus applicable amount of carrying charges. The amount of cost allocated to commodities removed from inventory is determined with the view of retaining in the inventory accounts the cost of commodities remaining on hand. The cost allocated to commodities removed from price support inventory is generally computed on the basis of average unit cost of the commodity reflected in the inventory accounts for the applicable crop year and general storage location. In the case of commodities generally stored commingled (e.g., bulk grains and bulk oils) the crop year is determined on the first-in, first-out basis. In the case of commodities stored in identified lots, the crop year is determined by lot identification.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, November 1960, including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month								Inventory, end of the month, Nov. 30, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities:													
Basic commodities:													
Corn	Bushel	1,428,420	$2,389,536	−292	−$317	53,917	$61,827	$13,541	$1,054	10,006	$22,102	1,472,089	$2,443,539
Cornmeal	Pound					41,874	1,694		1	41,874	1,695		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	64	18,235					16	1	3	967	61	17,285
Cotton, upland	do	5,509	952,982			2,219	344,487	1,480	44	2,291	374,925	5,437	924,068
Peanut butter	Pound			+14	+4					14	4		
Peanuts, farmers' stock	do					106	11	2			2	106	11
Peanuts, shelled	do	88,477	14,708	−14	−4	2,068	283	57	2	4,627	699	85,904	14,347
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	1,406	13,464			147	1,180	69	75	130	1,422	1,423	13,366
Rice, rough	do	2,453	13,193	+1	+4		(1)	124	1	1,061	5,776	1,393	7,546
Tobacco	Pound					3,841	2,135			3,841	2,135		
Wheat	Bushel	1,154,121	2,982,572	−119	−376	35	74	13,420	7,127	8,260	29,319	1,145,777	2,973,498
Wheat flour	Pound					197,148	9,766		(1)	197,148	9,766		
Total, basic commodities			6,384,690		−689		421,457	28,709	8,305		448,812		6,393,600
Designated nonbasic commodities:													
Barley	Bushel	61,962	75,633	−104	−81	12	21	725	328	2,224	3,385	59,646	73,241
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	313,693	846,456	−62	−280	35	56	6,575	2,339	1,222	3,600	312,444	851,546
Milk and butterfat:													
Butter	Pound	85,635	50,850			200	121	110	148	12,706	7,716	73,129	43,513
Cheese	do	134	46					(1)	−1	35	10	99	35
Milk, dried	do	333,445	46,895			36,621	5,535	133	263	63,541	9,468	307,525	43,358
Milk, fluid	do					17,770	729			17,770	729		
Oats	Bushel	11,697	9,352	−12	−6	12	8	96	12	187	170	11,510	9,292
Rye	do	4,430	6,378	−4	−3	1	1	44	8	110	180	4,317	6,248
Tung oil	Pound	13,277	2,884			16,001	3,354	10	−10	4,952	1,055	24,326	5,183
Total designated nonbasic commodities			1,038,494		−370		9,825	7,693	3,087		26,313		1,032,416
Other nonbasic commodities:													
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	12	71	(1)	−1			1	13	6	50	6	34
Flaxseed	Bushel	3	8	(1)	−1			(1)	(1)	3	6	(1)	1
Soybeans	do	8,456	18,735	−7	−15	14	27	84	2	1,446	3,269	7,017	15,564
Turpentine	Gallon	191	102					1		89	48	102	55
Total, other nonbasic commodities			18,916		−17		27	86	15		3,373		15,654
Total, agricultural commodities			7,442,100		−1,076		431,309	36,488	11,407		478,498		7,441,730
Exchange commodities:													
Strategic and critical materials: [2]													
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, crude	Pound	56,295	3,300			5,987	327	(1)	46	24,792	1,565	37,490	2,108
Antimony, metal	do	1,993	500			1,061	265	1	3	823	196	2,231	573
Asbestos, amosite	do	6,446	737			461	49	2	20	3,294	415	3,613	393
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	3,443	544			1,001	126	44	7	499	115	3,945	606
Bauxite	do	3,998,622	25,604			178,671	1,270	14	73	1,332,580	9,213	2,844,713	17,748
Beryl ore	do	1,895	403					1	(1)			1,895	404
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	1,245	2,539			123	244	(1)	−1	799	1,619	569	1,163
Bismuth	do	350	736					(1)	(1)	350	736		
Boart	Carat	2,399	6,325							450	1,240	1,949	5,085
Cadmium	Pound	277	351					(1)	(1)	277	351		
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	295,484	2,807			46,309	453	92	8	182,590	1,786	159,203	1,574
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do	8,020	102					(1)	(1)	8,020	102		
Chrome ore, Turkish, metallurgical	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Chromium metal	do	252	242			33	30	(1)	(1)	161	152	124	120
Colemanite, Turkish boron minerals	do	28,944	787					3	(1)	28,944	790		
Columbite	do	67	51			56	42	1	(1)	123	94		
Diamonds	Carat	325	4,370							325	4,370		
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Pound	17,154	2,884			2,027	349	5	30	10,416	1,758	8,765	1,511
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	3,364	724					3	1	3,364	728		
Ferromanganese	do	87,242	8,564			36,902	3,412	30	350	67,332	6,785	56,812	5,571
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	43,033	802					7	(1)	24,942	469	18,091	340
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	83,628	1,273					1	(1)	83,628	1,274		
Lead	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	80,341	3,353					(1)	1	47,487	1,988	32,854	1,366
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	1,170,410	25,768			51,048	1,057	24	123	262,271	5,827	959,187	21,145
Manganese ore, natural, battery grade	do	76,390	3,884					1	4			76,390	3,889
Mica	do	168	567			31	110	1	1	21	14	178	665
Quartz crystals	do	119	1,818			4	29	(1)	(1)			123	1,847
Rutile	do	13,349	1,316					6	20			13,349	1,342
Silicon carbide	do	27,356	2,575			4,791	451	6	25	20,450	1,902	11,697	1,155
Thorium nitrate	do	50	115					(1)	(1)			50	115
Tin	do	1,488	1,483					(1)	(1)	1,488	1,483		
Titanium sponge	do	2,100	2,803			500	600	1	1			2,600	3,405
Zinc	do							(1)	1		1		
Total, strategic and critical materials			107,327				8,814	243	713		44,972		72,125
Total, Department of Agriculture			7,549,427		−1,076		440,123	36,731	12,120		523,470		7,513,855

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, November 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers, and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisition; include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental tansfers at markes or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage locationt and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and, sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile: Total (classified detail omitted).			$6,139,825		+$6		$1,054		$8,393		$6,132,492
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	4	9,519							4	9,519
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	746	378,400			4	1,940			750	380,340
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica	Long dry ton	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	1,070			(1)	11			2	1,081
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	871	31,617			11	396			882	32,013
Cobalt	Pound	24,847	51,499			340	564			25,187	52,063
Columbite	do	10,618	51,736	(1)	−1					10,618	51,736
Copper	Short ton	134	74,227					1	713	132	73,514
Cryolite	do	39	10,676					(1)	69	38	10,607
Fluorspar	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Graphite, lubricating	Short ton	(1)	99					(1)	10	(1)	89
Lead	do	8	3,036							8	3,036
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3,022	174,892			8	514			3,031	175,407
Mica, Wuscovite block and film	Pound	6,091	34,217			45	455			6,136	34,672
Nickel	do	133,613	116,403			3,833	2,673	3,798	3,731	133,649	115,345
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,108	660					22	2	6,086	658
Rutile	Short dry ton	10	1,927					1	202	9	1,725
Thorium	Pound	849	42							849	42
Tantalite	do	1,529	9,734							1,529	9,734
Tin	Long ton	(1)	372							(1)	372
Titanium	Short ton	22	167,648							22	167,648
Tungsten	Pound	79,810	325,461	−1	−2					79,809	325,459
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,458,135		−3		6,552		4,727		1,459,957
Machine tools inventory:											
In storage	Tool	(1)	116			(1)	123	(1)	19	(1)	219
On lease	do	(1)	4,339					(1)	373	(1)	3,966
On loan	do	(1)	29							(1)	29
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			4,485				123		383		4,214
Total, Defense Production Act			1,462,619		−3		6,675		5,120		1,464,171
Supplemental stockpile: [2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	131	16,699							131	16,699
Antimony, metal	do	9	4,888		+4					9	4,892
Asbestos, amosite	do	3	759							3	759
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,499							5	3,499
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton	2	847							2	847
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	2,139	33,111		−255					2,139	32,886
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	683	10,577		−72					683	10,505
Beryl	Short ton	8	17,894		+36					8	17,930
Bismuth	Pound	1,146	2,579							1,146	2,579
Cadmium	do	6,332	10,582		+5					6,332	10,586
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	47	9,698		+53					47	9,750
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,295	202,649	(1)	+349					1,295	202,998
Chromite, refractory grade	do	165	4,680		(1)					165	4,680
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	51	2,267		−102					51	2,165
Columbite	Pound	153	400		+2					153	402
Copper	Short ton	10	6,598		(1)					10	6,598
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	111	258							111	258
Diamond, industrial, stones	do	10,199	130,708		+933					10,199	131,641
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	492	26,431		+36					492	26,468
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	2	67							2	67
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	222	58,424		+223					4214	58,647
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	35	3,334							35	3,334
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	do	18	1,436							18	1,436
Manganese, metallurgical	do	1,071	101,695		10					1,071	101,705
Mercury	Flask	16	3,446							16	3,446
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	263	698							263	698
Mica, muscovite film	do	27	212							27	212
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,826	6,226		(1)					4,826	6,226
Mica, phlogopite splittings	do	231	227		+$1					231	228
Palladium	Troy ounce	548	9,826		+46					548	9,872

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, November 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Supplemental stockpile [2]—Continued											
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	$1,099							82	$1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	560							15	560
Selenium	Pound	157	1,037		+34					157	1,071
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	77	14,891		+120					77	15,011
Tantalite	Pound	8	21		(1)					8	21
Thorium	do	4,030	9,344		+200					4,030	9,544
Tin	Long ton	7	15,486	(1)	−221					7	15,265
Titanium	Short ton	6	23,149		+3					6	23,152
Tungsten	Pound	4,485	15,627							4,485	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	324	79,447		+153					324	79,600
Total, supplemental stockpile			836,539		+1,589						838,128
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit: [2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton					12	$1,565			12	1,565
Antimony, metal	do					(1)	196			(1)	196
Asbestos, amosite	do					2	415			2	415
Asbestos, crocidolite	do					(1)	115			(1)	115
Bauxite	Long ton					551	9,213			551	9,213
Beryllium copper master alloy	Pound					799	1,620			799	1,620
Bismuth	do					350	736			350	736
Cadmium	do					277	352			277	352
Chromite, chemical grade	Short ton					(1)	1,786			(1)	1,786
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do					(1)	153			(1)	153
Chromite, refractory grade	do					4	103			4	103
Colemanite	Long ton					12	791			12	791
Columbite	Pound					85	94			85	94
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat					450	1,240			450	1,240
Diamond, industrial, stones	do					326	4,370			326	4,370
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short ton					4	1,757			4	1,757
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do					1	729			1	729
Ferromanganese	do					34	6,785			34	6,785
Fluorspar, acid grade	do					11	469			11	469
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do					41	1,274			41	1,274
Manganese, chemical grade	do					23	1,988			23	1,988
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do					3	5,826			3	5,826
Mica	Pound					21	14			21	14
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton					10	1,902			10	1,902
Tin	Long ton					1	1,483			1	1,483
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit.							44,974				44,974
Total, General Services Administration			8,448,503		+1,591		52,703		$13,513		8,489,285

[1] Less than 500.
[2] See appendix for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, November 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity.—Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure.—Shown only for engineering supply units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity.—Shown only for one item, namely, engineering supply units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list numerous different items.

Inventory-cost value.—Dollar value figures on commodities in the stockpile inventory essentially reflect their actual cost. The stockpile inventory is generally augmented by acquisition of Government excess property without reimbursement to the several holding agencies. The value assigned to these materials is (1) original acquisition cost if known, (2) estimated current market value of items in similar condition, or (3) average unit cost of identical or similar items purchased in the open market for stockpiling. Government excess property acquired by reimbursement is assigned a value equal to the amount of the fair-value reimbursement required.

Adjustments.—Represent inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions.—Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals.—Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Values shown are based on average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month.—Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpile (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings).	10 mile units	(1)	$7,357		[3] −$12		$901			(1)	$8,247
Chemical and biological equipment			778						[3] $2		776
Radiological equipment			7,057		(1)		438		[4] 105		7,391
Total, civil defense stockpile, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.			15,193		−11		1,339		107		16,413

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Accounting adjustments.
[3] Inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).
[4] Consists of $103,528 granted to other Federal agencies and to States, and $1,081 inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, November 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare defines content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for hospital functional units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory cost value: The dollar value figures in the civil defense medical stockpile inventory reflect essentially the average acquisition costs per unit of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in commodity groups other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Normally these transactions result from inventory pricing adjustments due to recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, removal of material for sampling during testing or reworking, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during month, including new procurement and acquisition of Government excess property.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month. Costs of disposals are calculated on a basis of the average unit price of items in inventory at the time of removal. Disposals consist principally of items no longer suitable for stockpiling due to deterioration and of samples consumed through testing.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Nov. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Nov. 30, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses			$104,758		(1)		[2] $968		(1)		$105,726
Medical bulk stocks at manufacturer locations			4,117								4,117
Civil defense emergency hospitals	Each	2	38,504							2	38,504
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals)			15,601								15,601
Total, civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare			162,980				968				163,948

[1] Less than 500.

[2] Serum albumin returned from manufacturer resulting from reworking blood plasma.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

The Price-Support Program

Price-support operations are carried out under the corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 71), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales to livestock feed in emergency areas.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Strategic and critical materials stockpiling and related programs

1. National Stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OCDM. In addition, GSA is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OCDM determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin Received From Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

4. Supplemental Stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OCDM (32 A.C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958,

have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Civil defense stockpile program

This stockpiling program, conducted pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended, is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Civil defense medical stockpile program

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OCDM stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OCDM warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriations reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Agriculture Department, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on November 30, 1960, totaled $16,183,501,000. November activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net increase of $7,398,000.

Net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. November activity and end-of-the-month totals are summarized:

[In thousands of dollars]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, November 1960	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture:		
Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−370	7,441,730
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	−35,202	72,125
Total, Department of Agriculture	−35,572	7,513,855
General Services Administration:		
Strategic and critical materials:		
3. National stockpile	−7,333	6,132,492
4. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory		9,519
5. Defense Production Act program	+1,552	1,464,171
6. Supplemental stockpile	+1,590	838,128
7. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	+44,974	44,974
Total, General Services Administration	+40,782	8,489,285
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
8. Civil defense stockpile	+1,220	16,413
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
9. Civil defense medical stockpile	+968	163,948
Grand total	+7,398	16,183,501

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

STORAGE AND HANDLING

The report shows storage and handling costs for Commodity Credit's price-support inventory totaled $36,731,000 for the month of November. It should be noted these storage costs are for only two of the nine stockpiles covered by the report.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

The major net increases in cost value during November were $54 million in corn, and $6 million in manganese. This was partially offset by major net decreases including $30 million in cotton, $11 million in milk and butterfat, and $9 million in wheat.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 20 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $7.5 billion price-support inventory on November 30, 1960, those leading in cost value include: Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $3 billion; corn, with 1.5 billion bushels at a cost of $2.4 billion; and cotton, with 5.5 million bales at a cost of $941 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.6 billion, including the $6.1 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows: Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 7.1 million tons at a cost of $489 million; tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million; and manganese (and ores), with 4.8 million tons at a cost of $331 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Supplies and equipment in two civil defense stockpile inventories total $180 million. More than 90 percent is in the medical stockpile valued at $164 million.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 638. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include New Mexico among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 639. A bill to change the name of the Thomaston Dam and Reservoir on the Naugatuck River at Thomaston, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 640. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 641. A bill for the relief of Maryellen Boone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wen Jung Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 643. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Clemente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 644. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, concerning reemployment of officers or employees; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 645. A bill to authorize grants to assist the States in strengthening professional nurse education, in order to relieve the shortage of well-trained professional nurses and to meet the requirements of Federal, State, and local government hospitals and health agencies, as well as of nongovernmental hospitals and other employers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 646. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) to be paid to men at age 62; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 647. A bill to restrict the purposes for which certain real property to be disposed of by the United States may be sold; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 648. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to certain educational institutions; and

S. 649. A bill to amend sections 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. CHURCH):

S. 650. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 651. A bill for the relief of Howard B. Schmutz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 652. A bill to create an additional judicial district in the State of California, to create an additional division for the northern district of California, and to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 653. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 654. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 655. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 656. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States, or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof, for the establishment of institutions of a minimum security type for treating and rehabilitating juvenile delinquents; and

S. 657. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an after-care post-hospital treatment program for drug addiction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 659. A bill to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 660. A bill to eliminate block voting for marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 661. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 662. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 requiring certain adjustments of apportionments depending upon the amount of funds available in the Highway Trust Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 663. A bill for the relief of Andreas Rakintzis (Rakajes); and

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Ling Chang Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 665. A bill to authorize user charges for certain services performed by the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 666. A bill to amend sections 4(2), 4(4), 7(e), and 15 of the Natural Gas Act, relating to rates and contracts of natural gas companies and the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity to such companies, and relating to hearings and procedure in proceedings before the Federal Power Commission involving natural gas matters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 667. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the State of Washington for the purpose of purchasing Indian lands;

S. 668. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1954;

S. 669. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes," approved July 28, 1955; and

S. 670. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish, in the State of Washington, an institution for the care, custody, and education of certain juvenile dependents and delinquents; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 671. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study of compensation to persons affected by the acquisition of property under Federal or federally assisted programs, through condemnation proceedings or otherwise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed or established in economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 673. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Mr. Roman Dackow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 675. A bill to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 676. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders;

S. 677. A bill to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating differential subsidy for cruises;

S. 678. A bill to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands;

S. 679. A bill to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

S. 680. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services;

S. 681. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences;

S. 682. A bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases;

S. 683. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission;

S. 684. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers; and

S. 685. A bill to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Juan Perez Varella and Manuel Prieto Alba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 687. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include New Mexico among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 688. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the New Mexico Boys' Ranch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 689. A bill for the relief of Karl Heinz Agar;

S. 690. A bill for the relief of Ernestina Uranga Salas de Frederick;

S. 691. A bill for the relief of Andreas Rakintzis (Rakajes);

S. 692. A bill for the relief of John A. Lynn;

S. 693. A bill for the relief of Joana Krasnauskiene;

S. 694. A bill for the relief of Jubencio Lucero, Sr., and his wife, Adela R. Lucero;

S. 695. A bill for the relief of Thomas Peter Villa;

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Angel Ardaiz Martinez; and

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Maria Luisa Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 698. A bill to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 699. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Fung Wan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 701. A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 702. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands in the State of Wyoming with the town of Afton, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 703. A bill to validate the homestead entries of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 704. A bill for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin; and

S. 705. A bill for the relief of Norman T. Burgett, Lawrence S. Foote, Richard E. Forsgren, James R. Hart, Ordeen A. Jallen, James M. Lane, David E. Smith, Jack K. Warren, and Anne W. Welsh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 706. A bill to provide that credit may be allowed under the Civil Service Retirement Act for service performed by certain persons in American Samoa; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 707. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 708. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain payments for the relief and rehabilitation of needy victims of Nazi persecution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S.J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to develop a plan for a system of highways to be known as the Lewis and Clark National Tourway which shall extend from St. Louis, Mo., along the general route of the Lewis and Clark Expedition; to the Committee on Public Works.

CHANGE OF NAME OF THOMASTON DAM AND RESERVOIR, CONN.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to name the Thomaston Dam and Reservoir in memory of the late Charles L. Eyanson, first chairman of the Naugatuck Valley River Control Commission.

Mr. Eyanson was a public-spirited citizen with a record of distinguished service in the State of Connecticut and in the highly industrialized Naugatuck Valley. His death on November 20, 1959, was a severe loss to our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a citation, accompanying the award of the Department of the Army's Certificate of Appreciation for Patriotic Civilian Service to Mr. Eyanson, may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the citation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 639) to change the name of the Thomaston Dam and Reservoir on the Naugatuck River at Thomaston, Conn., introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. DODD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The citation presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

The Department of the Army Certificate of Appreciation for Patriotic Civilian Service is awarded to Charles Louis Eyanson for his outstanding service to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in his capacity as the first chairman of the Naugatuck Valley River Control Commission from its inception in 1955 until November 1959. His conspicuous record of achievement in assisting the Corps of Engineers in the planning and construction of a comprehensive flood-control system for protection of the Naugatuck River Valley, in acquainting the public with the need for a flood-control program, and sound zoning laws, and in aiding Federal, State, and municipal agencies in developing and expediting this program, has resulted in significant protection to all communities throughout the Naugatuck River Valley. Through his inspired leadership and his devoted efforts, he greatly enhanced the well-being and security of all who live within the Naugatuck Valley and has helped to gain for the Army and the Corps of Engineers great prestige and public support.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO REEMPLOYMENT OF OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which, if enacted, would make a technical change in the accounting and administrative arrangements pertaining to the reemployment by a Federal Government agency of a retired Foreign Service officer or employee.

Under section 872 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, which was enacted last September a retired Foreign Service employee may be reemployed by the Federal Government and may receive his salary plus such portion of his retirement annuity as will make his total pay equal to the pay which he was receiving at the time of his retirement from the Foreign Service. This means that if a retired officer is employed by an agency other than the Department of State two agencies are involved in making payments to him. The solution to this problem which was provided by the new section 872 is that the agency of the Federal Government reemploying the Foreign Service annuitant shall pay to the Department of State the funds necessary to cover salary, employer contribution, and leave payments, and that the Department of State shall in turn pay to the annuitant the portion of his salary that he is entitled to and the portion of his annuity that he is entitled to, making such withholdings and deductions as are authorized and required by law.

This system is unnecessarily cumbersome in some cases. It is simpler in some instances for the employing agency to pay the salary of the annuitant directly to him, making the necessary withholdings and deductions, and allowing the Department of State to pay any additional amount from the retired officer's annuity to which he may be entitled. This bill would allow these fiscal arrangements to be handled either entirely by the Department of State as the law now provides or to be shared between the Department of State and the agency which employs the retired officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 644) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, concerning reemployment of officers or employees, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN PROFESSIONAL NURSE EDUCATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize grants to assist the States in

strengthening professional nurse education. An identical bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by my colleague from Alabama, Mr. KENNETH A. ROBERTS. We will be happy to have any suggestions which might in any way help to make the proposed legislation more effective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 645) to authorize grants to assist the States in strengthening professional nurse education, in order to relieve the shortage of well-trained professional nurses and to meet the requirements of Federal, State, and local government hospitals and health agencies, as well as of nongovernmental hospitals and other employers, introduced by Mr. HILL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DONATIONS OF SURPLUS PROPERTY TO CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to certain educational institutions. This bill would clarify and end the anomaly under the surplus property donation program whereby schools, colleges and universities are eligible to receive personal property donated for purposes of education, while libraries not operated by these institutions but open to the public are not eligible. A similar bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations during the 86th Congress, and passed the Senate on September 5, 1959.

I ask that a letter addressed to me from the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated January 19, 1961, which recommends favorable action on this bill and contains additional background and justification, be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 648) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to permit donations of surplus property to certain educational institutions, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
January 19, 1961.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As I complete my tenure as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I should like to extend, through you, my personal thanks to every member of your Committee with whom my staff and I have had the opportunity of working in the last Congress.

I should also like to take this opportunity to urge the committee to approve legislation to end the anomaly, under the surplus personal property donation program, whereby schools, colleges, and universities are eligible to receive personal property donated for purposes of education, while libraries not operated by these institutions but open to the public are not eligible. Public and other nonprofit libraries are in a very real sense an adjunct to and resource for the schools whose students they serve, as well as highly useful instrumentalities for adult education generally. Moreover, the eligibility of certain special schools, such as those for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped, should be clarified, in order to leave no doubt that such schools are eligible to receive surplus property even though they cannot meet the same academic standards now applied to normal schools. In addition, educational television facilities should be made eligible regardless of whether, as now required, they are directly owned and operated by a school or college. Legislation to accomplish these objectives was passed by the Senate as S. 155, in the last Congress, and was introduced in the House as H.R. 11394. I again recommend the enactment of this legislation.

I hope that this proposal will receive your favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

SETTLEMENT OF NATIONAL GUARD MEMBERS' FINAL ACCOUNT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Comptroller General, a bill to amend section 714(c) of title 32, United States Code, to provide that settlement of National Guard members' final accounts shall be settled in the same manner as accounts of deceased members of the Armed Forces.

Public Law 86-641 amended the act with respect to members of the Armed Forces to provide for payments without necessity of settlement by the General Accounting Office, but did not similarly amend the act with respect to members of the National Guard.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 86-641, the law governing the settlement of such accounts of members of the Armed Forces and for members of the National Guard required settlement by the General Accounting Office where no beneficiary had been designated by the member prior to his death. This bill proposes to settle such accounts for members of the National Guard in the same manner as accounts are settled for members of the Armed Forces.

I ask unanimous consent to include a letter from the Comptroller General on this subject as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 649) to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to recommend the enactment of legislation authorizing settlement of deceased National Guard members' final accounts in the same manner as accounts of deceased members of the Armed Forces.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 86-641, the law governing settlement of such accounts, as codified in title 10, United States Code, section 2771, for deceased members of the Armed Forces and, by substantially identical language, in title 32, United States Code, section 714, for deceased members of the National Guard, required settlement by the General Accounting Office in cases where no beneficiary had been designated by the member prior to his death. Public Law 86-641, approved July 12, 1960, amended section 2771 of title 10 with respect to members of the Armed Forces to provide for payment without necessity of settlement by the General Accounting Office, but title 32, United States Code, section 714, was not similarly amended with respect to members of the National Guard.

We believe that the accounts of deceased National Guard members should be settled in the same manner as those of members of the Armed Forces and, therefore, we recommend the enactment of legislation to amend section 714 of title 32 to accomplish this purpose.

There is enclosed a draft of a bill "to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office." A communication on this subject is also being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

OMNIBUS CALIFORNIA JUDGESHIP BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], a bill to create an additional judicial district in the State of California, to create an additional division for the northern district of California, and to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the State of California.

This omnibus California judgeship bill authorizes the addition of four Federal district judges for my State—two in the north and two in the south. This is in accordance with the recommendation of the State Bar of California. This bill also provides for a new southern district, to include Imperial and San Diego Counties, as well as an eastern division in the present northern district of California, to include Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. With the exception of San Diego and Imperial, the present southern district of California would become the central district.

Mr. President, it is a maxim, and a very true one, that "justice delayed is justice denied." In our Nation, dedicated to equal justice under law, justice

is being denied to many Americans every day. American rights are not being violated in the streets or public squares, but they are just as surely being violated behind closed doors. And, ironically, the doors that are closed belong to our Federal courtrooms. In many instances, by delaying trials we are figuratively throwing open jail doors. In many instances, by delaying trials we are literally performing miscarriages of justice.

We must have more judges. Our Nation grows. The 1960 census tells a dramatic story. The State of California has had a 40 percent population growth in the last decade. Justice must keep pace.

Here are some statistics on current justice. They are shocking:

In 1960, northern district of California, 134 civil cases pending 5 years and over.

In 1960, northern district of California, 1,658 civil cases pending, compared to 428 in 1941.

In 1960, northern district of California, 19.4 months the median interval from the filing of cases to their disposition—higher than the national median.

In 1960, northern district of California, 12.3 months the median interval from issue to trial—higher than national median.

In 1959, northern district of California, 10 judges from other districts contributed a total of 363 days' work to this district.

This is a mere sampling of the situation as it now exists in California. In order that more of this unhappy story of delayed justice may be brought before the American people, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following important documents:

Letter from the president of the State Bar of California.

Resolution of the Oakland City Council.

Editorial from the Oakland Tribune.

Resolution of the Mendocino County Bar Association.

The 1960 supplemental report of the San Diego Bar Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the matters referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 652) to create an additional judicial district in the State of California, to create an additional division for the northern district of California, and to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the State of California, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The matters presented by Mr. KUCHEL are as follows:

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA,
November 25, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: At its November meeting, the board of governors of the State Bar of California adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the board of governors of the State Bar of California earnestly recommends for favorable consideration by the Congress of the United States the proposal to add two additional judges to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California and to add two additional judges to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California; and it is further

"*Resolved,* That copies of the herein resolutions be sent to Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL and CLAIR ENGLE and all local bar associations."

The resolution recognizes the need for such judges in order to enable the Federal courts of California to function efficiently with an adequate staff of Federal judges.

You are certainly familiar with the problems of our courts in California due to the State's rapidly expanding population. The California Legislature recognized the need for additional judges in our State courts by adopting legislation increasing the number of judges in our State courts. This bill was approved by Governor Brown.

Congress has failed to recognize thus far that such additional Federal judges are needed. The resolution represents the sense of the State Bar of California, and we earnestly hope that you will do your utmost to see that appropriate legislation is passed enabling the Federal courts of California to have four additional judges.

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, I shall be happy to discuss them with you, either personally or by telephone.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. SHEPPARD,
President.

RESOLUTION 40258 C.M.S. OF THE OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL

Resolution recommending the establishment of an eastern division for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, with court to be held at the county seat of Alameda County, and for the creation of an additional judgeship for such division, and endorsing House Joint Resolutions 160 and 165 establishing same

Resolved, That Resolution 37907 C.M.S. of this council adopted on the 13th day of February 1959 be and the same is hereby reaffirmed, said resolution reading as follows:

"Whereas it has been estimated that the residents of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties are the litigants in approximately one-third of the Federal cases now pending and being filed in San Francisco; that it is essential to adequately serve the people of the area that an eastern division for the U.S. district court be established for said counties; and that a Federal district judge should be assigned to such eastern division; and

"Whereas the creation of such a court is a matter of considerable community concern for the reason that it will bring the Federal judiciary into direct daily contact with the people of said counties, an element essential to the effective and just operation of a trial court; and

"Whereas Alameda and Contra Costa Counties have a combined population in excess of 1,200,000 persons, and do not have a U.S. district court division for their people because of the practical inaccessibility of present Federal courts; and

"Whereas it is believed that the establishment of another division for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, is extremely desirable, necessary, and inevitable, and that such division will be established in northern California and in an area other than in the city and county of San Francisco, State of California; and

"Whereas the county seat of Alameda County is the logical place for the holding of court for such eastern division, the conducting of Federal litigation and the transaction of all Federal Government business in which are involved the residents of our East Bay counties; and

"Whereas it is believed imperative that immediate and constructive action be taken in the interest of our community in view of the fact that the location for such court is not assured to the East Bay, and that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States an omnibus bill for the judiciary in which the location of such court should be determined; and

"Whereas there have been introduced and are now pending before the Congress of the United States House Joint Resolution 165 introduced by Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, and House Joint Resolution 160, introduced by Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN, providing for the establishment of said district court: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Council of the City of Oakland as follows:*

"1. That there be established an eastern division for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

"2. That the court for said eastern division be held in a city of the East Bay, preferably the county seat of Alameda County.

"3. That House Joint Resolutions 160 and 165 be, and the same hereby are, endorsed.

"4. That an additional judgeship be created for such eastern division; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to U.S. Senators CLAIR ENGLE and THOMAS H. KUCHEL, the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and Congressmen GEORGE P. MILLER and JEFFERY COHELAN.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Mar. 28, 1960]

FEDERAL JUDGE NEEDED

For more than 10 years a Federal district court has been sought to care for the needs of rapidly growing Alameda and Contra Costa Counties.

As the population has steadily climbed, the burdens of the courts have mounted also. Now, John D. Randall, president of the American Bar Association, points out that in this area there is an average time-lag of 9½ months between the filing and the trial of Federal cases.

This is a disgraceful situation and one that ought to be remedied immediately. In some instances, it might even amount to a denial of justice. It has been so recognized by the Alameda and Contra Costa Bar Associations, the board of supervisors, and other civic groups.

Emphasizing the need was another statement by Mr. Randall to the effect that the six Federal judges in northern California handle two-thirds more cases than the national average. Some relief is offered by a measure in the House of Representatives that would provide one more judge for northern California. A Senate bill would authorize none for this area. Here, then, is a matter on which the California delegation should take action, and at the present session.

RESOLUTION OF THE MENDOCINO BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the Mendocino County Bar Association of Mendocino County, Calif., recognizes the difficulty encountered in getting cases seasonably set for trial in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, northern division, at Sacramento, Calif., because of the large caseload which has built up in that court, and which the able judge presiding is unable to dispose of by himself; and

Whereas this bar association is cognizant of the fact that the population of the territory served by said court is growing at a rapid rate and that the quantity of litigation is increasing accordingly; and

Whereas this bar association is cognizant of the fact that the business of said court

cannot be successfully and efficiently dispatched by one judge; and

Whereas this bar association recognizes and determines the urgent need for a second full-time permanent resident district judge for said court; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Mendocino County Bar Association, That the Congress of the United States be urged to adopt legislation providing for an additional full-time resident district judge in Sacramento for the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, northern division; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be delivered to Senators Engle and Kuchel and to Congressmen Clem W. Miller, Harold T. Johnson, John E. Moss, John F. Baldwin, Jr., and John J. McFall and to the Honorable Richard H. Chambers, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, and to the Honorable Louis E. Goodman, chief judge, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

THE 1960 SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION TO ESTABLISH A SEPARATE FEDERAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT FOR SAN DIEGO AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES

INTRODUCTION

In 1953, at the request of the San Diego Bar Association, Congress authorized an additional U.S. district judge for the southern district of California, and the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee recommended his assignment to the southern division of the district (San Diego and Imperial Counties.) This recommendation was ignored by the then presiding judge of the district, and a committee of the San Diego County Bar was appointed to investigate the Federal court situation in San Diego. As a result of careful study, the bar association recommended the establishment of a Federal judicial district for San Diego and Imperial Counties with two judges in 1955.

On August 30, 1957, Senate bill 2840, introduced by Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL, authorizing the new district, unanimously passed the Senate.

In 1958 the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee, after a hearing before Subcommittee No. 5 and the study of reports of the San Diego County Bar Committee submitted in 1955, 1956 and 1958, included the recommended district in the omnibus judgeship bill H.R. 13672, which was not voted on at that session.

In the 86th Congress, 1st session, bills were introduced by U.S. Senators CLAIR ENGLE and THOMAS H. KUCHEL of California (S.J. Res. 92 and S. 1747) and Representative ROBERT C. WILSON (H.R. 2811) to provide for the new district with two U.S. district judges.

Advocates of the district

The Federal judicial district for San Diego and Imperial Counties has been endorsed by the Honorable Edmund C. Brown, Governor of California, both houses of the California Legislature unanimously, the Honorable Stanley Mosk, attorney general of California, the State Bar of California, the Bar Associations of San Diego and Imperial Counties, Mr. Loyd Wright, when he was president of the American Bar Association, and the following organizations:

The City Council of San Diego.

The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego.

San Diego County Central Democratic Committee.

San Diego County Central Republican Committee.

San Diego County Republican Men's Club.

San Diego County Women's Republican Committee.

California Young Republicans.

San Diego County Republican Assembly.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, first district, department of California.

San Diego Chamber of Commerce.

The Attorney General, the Honorable William R. Rogers, on January 20, 1958, announced that if Congress passed a bill creating the district that the Department of Justice would recommend to the President that the bill be signed.

Recent increase in judicial business, personnel, and facilities

Since approval by the House Judiciary Committee in 1958 of the proposed legislation, San Diego County has continued its phenomenal economic, military, and population growth as pointed out later in this report. This has resulted in increased Federal business and the need for additional facilities.

As a result, on January 15, 1960, Judge James M. Carter and Fred Kunzel and senior retired Judge Jacob L. Weinberger were assigned to the southern division of San Diego. Judges Kunzel and Carter are working full time and retired judge Weinberger is able to work half the time to keep up with the calendar.

A few weeks ago, on January 20, 1960, Chief Judge Richard H. Chambers of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, as a result of a survey made by him and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, recommended to the General Services Administration the immediate erection of a third courtroom in the present Federal building, since the three judges have to alternate between two courtrooms. It is hoped these facilities will be sufficient for 5 years.

In addition to this, Judge Chambers has assigned Judge John Bowen of Seattle to assist in San Diego during February, and has promised another judge in March. In December, Judge Picard helped out in San Diego for 3 weeks.

The San Diego division has a criminal calendar almost as large as that of Los Angeles, as shown by exhibit A, although Los Angeles has seven resident judges. The reason for it is, of course, the location of San Diego and Imperial Counties on the Mexican border, the enormous concentration of military and defense personnel and facilities, and the presence of the port, as well as the more rapidly growing population in this area.

Some of these same factors contribute to a civil calendar which has more than its share of important and protracted civil cases—the big cases. Judge Carter's present calendar, for example, includes *U.S.* v. *Falbrook,* a water case involving 6,000 defendants, which has been in trial since 1958 and is expected to last another year, *U.S.* v. *Texaco,* an antitrust case, 6 months' estimated trial time, a recently filed Government condemnation case for 3,200 acres in the city of San Diego, adjoining Miramar air base, against a number of defendants, *U.S.* v. *San Diego Grocers,* an antitrust case, 4 months, *Campus Theater,* a private antitrust case, 3 weeks, and the recent case of *A. L. Wirin* v. *Hildeon,* challenging the entire immigration search and arrest procedures, several months.

The regular civil cases include Government tort claims, arising from the heavy concentration of Government military vehicles here, patents, because of the large defense and electronic industry, admiralty, with diversity of citizenship, and miscellaneous.

The task of the local judges is made more difficult by the fact that they are required to leave their crowded calendars and take over one-ninth of the Los Angeles civil cases each month. This seems foolish when the chief judge of the circuit must continuously assign extra judges to San Diego. This procedure is very disrupting to the San Diego calendars and litigants, and causes delays and postponements.

Need for U.S. attorney

A separate district would provide a U.S. attorney here, with full authority and prestige to deal directly wth the complex law-enforcement problems in the two southern counties. Since the United States has no jurisdiction in Mexico, close and delicate liaison must be maintained with Mexican officials and State and city narcotic law enforcement officials. Also, San Diego and Imperial Counties have huge military establishments, which are not present in Los Angeles, with which close contact must be maintained. The 25th Customs Collection District, charged with narcotic border smuggling offenses, and the regional FBI office here have the same boundaries, San Diego and Imperial Counties, as the proposed district.

At present the San Diego U.S. attorney's office is only a branch office. Many important decisions must clear through Los Angeles.

The pay of the local assistant U.S. attorneys is quite low and the turnover has been extremely high despite the importance of the positions.

All the civil litigation is handled from the head Los Angeles office although tried here, making it extremely inconvenient and expensive for local litigants and adding greatly to Government travel, per diem, telephone expense, and travel time lost in the many important civil cases.

In fact, both in the courts and the U.S. attorney's office here centralization has reached a point with the great increase in judicial business here and growth of the community where it is uneconomical and inefficient.

Economic and population factors

As pointed out in previous reports to the Congress, San Diego is the second most populous county in the State of California and San Diego city the third largest metropolitan area, just behind Los Angeles and the combined San Francisco-Oakland area. It is one of the fastest growing areas in the State. In 1950 the county had a population of 556,803, and as of June 30, 1959, it was 1,006,800. Other population figures and economic data are given in exhibit C, "1959 Annual Business Survey." Imperial County, June 30, 1959, was 71,400.

Construction continues at a very fast clip. The business economics department of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., construction for 1959 lists the city of San Diego at $195,200,000 behind only New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Houston and ahead of Dallas, Philadelphia, Seattle, Atlanta, San Francisco, Milwaukee, Detroit, Boston, and Washington, D.C. Last figures available for 1958 show San Diego County construction at $322,770,000.

In 1958 in the county 22,559 new residential units were built.

San Diego and Imperial Counties have the largest military concentration on the west coast. The largest naval district in the world is the 11th Naval District. Miramar Airbase, soon to be enlarged again by 3,200 acres, is the Navy's largest airbase, Camp Pendleton is the world's biggest marine base. Hospitals, electronics laboratories, the training station, and other military activities form a vast complex.

The Atlas missile has its home here, as well as General Atomics. Convair, Ryan, Solar, and Rohr pour out missiles and planes and a host of electronic companies and military subcontractors round out the picture.

January 30, 1960, signalized San Diego's future as a shipbuilding center when *Export Agent,* the first of six 10,000-ton freighters, was launched. Logging operations have commenced and timber is moving from the port to the Far East.

The port is of increasing economic importance.

Already authorized is a major branch of the University of California at La Jolla, con-

tiguous to General Atomics, to meet the demand for scientists here.

The new district would embrace Imperial County, one of the richest and most intensely cultivated agricultural areas in the world, now studied by arid eastern counties as a guide to their development programs. In 1958 the value of its agricultural production was $130,837,000. San Diego's 1958 agricultural products were worth $100,455,635.

As discussed in previous reports, the economy of San Diego and Imperial Counties is closely allied to that of Baja California, Mexico. Its growth has paralleled that of San Diego and Imperial Counties. In 1950 the Mexican metropolitan areas on the San Diego-Imperial County border was 226,965 and in 1957, 470,089. Border crossings from Mexico increased from 6,787,148 in 1950 to 15,935,325 in 1959. The Immigration Service is now increasing the present 8 lanes of entry at San Ysidro to 19 lanes.

It has been recognized by industry as well as the Government that San Diego is the natural headquarters for the southern counties. The headquarters for Pacific Telephone Co. for San Diego, Imperial, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino and parts of Los Angeles County is San Diego. It was previously pointed out that the regional FBI and 25th Customs Collection District headquarters covering San Diego and Imperial Counties are in San Diego.

Particular law enforcement problems

San Diego, because of its location, has many immigration cases. However, the big problem is narcotic smuggling. In 1952 there were 68 narcotics arrests by customs agents in San Diego and Imperial Counties, which increased to 306 in 1959. In fact, the 25th Customs Collection District reports more narcotic arrests and seizures than any other district. The narcotic border problem here was recently studied by a committee headed by U.S. Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr.

Comparison with other districts

California, the second largest State in population and third in area, has but two districts, the northern and southern. By comparison, New York and Texas each have four districts. Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Illinois, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania each have three districts.

San Diego and Imperial Counties are each about the size of Connecticut. Both in population and area the new district would be larger than several States and a number of districts.

CONCLUSION

The San Diego County Bar Association urges passage of the Senate and House of Representatives bills providing for a new district for San Diego and Imperial Counties for the following reasons:

1. Population and economic importance of the area.
2. Increase in Federal court litigation.
3. Problems peculiar to this area due to its border location, military and defense establishments, and port.
4. More efficient court and Justice Department administration due to decentralization.
5. Better law enforcement through coordination by a U.S. attorney, with authority, pay, and prestige and tenure with military commanders, Mexican authorities, and local law enforcement officials.
6. The district boundaries should correspond with the law enforcement boundaries of such agencies as the FBI and customs agents.
7. Representation of the United States locally in the important and growing Federal civil field.
8. Savings of travel, per diem, telephone, and other expenses, particularly in civil cases, to Government and litigants.

A MONUMENT TO MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, again, as 1 year ago, I am privileged to introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], a bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico.

This bill has been approved by both the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget.

I have been informed that the Mexican Government would be pleased to accept a statue of our great President Abraham Lincoln. This is especially fitting because of the high regard in which Lincoln is held by the Mexican people and because of Lincoln's crucial support of Benito Juarez, the outstanding Mexican patriot.

You will recall, Mr. President, that in the spring of 1864, Napoleon III, of France, was preparing to establish a Mexican empire under Archduke Maximilian, of Austria. The struggling young Mexican Republic faced an uncertain future. Yet, in that hour of crisis, disregarding European hostility, Lincoln and his Secretary of State, William Seward, provided encouragement and, later, active support for the brave new Government of Mexico.

The Mexican Minister to the United States in gratitude proclaimed:

Our common interest, political as well as commercial, will give us a common continental policy which no European nation would dare disregard.

It is fitting, then, that we present Mexico with a statue of Lincoln, to remind ourselves, as well as the Mexican people, of the common ideals of the two statesmen, Lincoln and Juarez, and of the continuing Mexican-United States bonds of history, geography, commerce, and love of freedom.

As I stated when I introduced this bill last year:

Today, we share with Mexico a great deal more than our 1,935 miles of a common border. We have entered upon a new era of mutual cooperation and respect. The visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico and the official visit of Mexico's distinguished President, Lopez-Mateos, to the United States are indicative of this era. The forms of our cooperation may take many guises. It may involve a joint commission to wipe out a destructive hoof-and-mouth disease or any other hindrance which distresses both peoples. It may take the form of that unique and enduring monument to Mexican-United States cooperation, the mighty Falcon Dam, constructed and built by the two Governments on the Rio Grande, 75 miles downstream from Laredo. Or it may take the form of a cultural exchange program. But whatever the nature of cooperation between our two countries, we labor toward a common goal: To advance the cause of peace with honor among all peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be set forth in full at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill be held at the desk until tomorrow, before being printed, in the event that any other of my colleagues desire to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 653) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is authorized and requested to procure a statue of Lincoln to commemorate appropriately the independence of Mexico, and present the same, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico in commemoration of the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the independence of Mexico and the one hundredth anniversary of the triumph of Benito Juarez. Such monument shall be prepared only after the design, plans, and specifications therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including payment of the cost of such statue, the design and construction of a suitable pedestal therefor, transportation, including insurance, erection of the statue in Mexico, and traveling expenses of persons delegated by the Secretary of State to present such statue, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico.

TO MAKE UNLAWFUL CERTAIN PRACTICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE PLACING OF MINOR CHILDREN FOR PERMANENT FREE CARE OR FOR ADOPTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption.

The bill has been framed wholly and solely to eliminate that insidious trafficking in human beings, more commonly known as the black market in babies.

If enacted, it in no way should be construed or misconstrued to have any effect on the operations of authorized, licensed, and accepted agencies, nor would it interfere with the rights of attorneys for services rendered directly in connection with the obtaining of an adoption decree nor with the rights of doctors to obtain reasonable fees for necessary medical services rendered in connection with prenatal care of the natural mother

and delivery of the child or with a physical examination of the child involved.

The bill is a refinement of legislation introduced in previous Congresses. It is designed entirely and exclusively for the purpose of protecting the 160,000 illegitimate children born each year, to protect the mothers of those children, and to protect the prospective adoptive parents. In practice, it will place Federal criminal sanctions against the transportation of these children across State lines by black market operators whose only concern is the profit to be wrung from eager prospective parents, unhappy unwed mothers, and a completely helpless newborn infant. These scheming brokers profit from human tragedy by compounding it—humanitarian considerations have no part in the transaction.

More than 500 public and private agencies concerned with child adoption practices nationally were polled by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency on the merits of this proposed legislation. That poll showed that those agencies uniformly urged its enactment into law. This bill will simply give the same measure of regulation to interstate traffic in human beings as is accorded by the law to commerce in stolen cars.

Professional and unscrupulous baby brokers have been uncovered who induce natural mothers to go to metropolitan areas to have their children placed out for adoption in exchange for dollar considerations that range as high as $5,000 per child. Testimony before the Delinquency Subcommittee revealed brokers who bragged that they have placed children for adoption in all the States in the Nation. The subcommittee has estimated that in the interstate sale of babies at least $15 million a year changes hands. Thirty-three States do not make intrastate baby selling a crime. Those States which do have statutes prohibiting baby selling have been unable due to the interstate nature of the activity, to arrest or control the nefarious traffic. There is at present no Federal statute making interstate baby selling a crime.

A California grand jury investigating the black market baby racket during 1960 heard it described as a supermarket operation that operated from coast to coast.

It is abundantly clear that this unwholesome commerce in human infants will continue to grow until effective Federal legislation is enacted. The bill will in no way proscribe the rights of States or municipalities in the adoptive practices that are currently—or will be in the future—statutory. It will have no effect on current adoption laws and practices within the several States, subdivisions thereof, territories, or possessions.

I submit that the measure is necessary to protect the more than 160,000 children who are born out of wedlock each year, their unfortunate mothers, and the prospective adoptive parents. I submit that the measure will give added protection to the lawyer, the doctor, the responsible adoptive agencies, and the professional social worker who are normally and legally involved in the wholesome and humanitarian task of placing unwanted children in homes in which they are wanted and will be loved.

Mr. President, I commend the bill to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INSTITUTIONS OF A MINIMUM SECURITY TYPE FOR TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and myself I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States for the establishment of institutions of a minimum security type for treating and rehabilitating juvenile delinquents.

This measure, if enacted, would in effect aid States to assist themselves in coping with their delinquency problems. This would be accomplished in two ways: First, by broadening the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so that surplus Federal property could be used for the treatment of juvenile delinquents as well as for health, educational, and civil defense purposes; and second, by providing funds in the form of grants to the States for the purpose of helping to establish, maintain, or operate institutions of a minimum security type for the treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents.

Since I last introduced the bill, the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has held 11 hearings in major cities in all sections of the United States. Everywhere we went, the story was the same. There are more and more delinquents on the one hand, and not enough of the type of facilities we need to handle them on the other. In fact, in one major eastern State there were 600 fewer beds for delinquents in the State in 1959 than in 1945. This in spite of the fact that there were hundreds more delinquents. In 1970 that State expects to need 1,800 more beds for court-committed delinquents than are presently available.

In most States the juvenile court judge has only two choices for offenders. Either he can send an offender to a State training school—the admitted end of the line for hardened offenders, or he can put him on probation. Yet we know that large numbers of boys and girls cannot benefit from either recourse and, in most cases, are actually pushed further into a life of crime by inadequate placement.

What is needed are intermediate facilities that can handle children who are too disturbed to remain on probation—usually at home, which is the seat of their difficulty—yet not at the point where they should be placed with hardened, experienced older youths who exploit them and lead them irretrievably into a life of crime. I say "irretrievably" because we know that recidivism at the training school level is exceedingly high—sometimes as high as 70 to 80 percent.

The provisions of the bill would help State groups establish such needed facilities. For example, one of the most successful programs in this area is the so-called forestry camp. With the proper selection of inmates and a good staff, these institutions have recorded remarkable success in the rehabilitation of delinquents. Some States, however, do not have the land or buildings necessary to begin such a program. The bill would provide the necessary beginning equipment, which is surplus Federal property, in addition to funds for the staffing of such an institution, provided that the program meets the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Testimony before the subcommittee has substantiated the relatively low cost of treating delinquents in such a program compared to a training school; and in terms of the number of youths who are diverted from further criminal activities, the saving of these young lives is inestimable.

This is only one of the possibilities under the proposed legislation. Admittedly, different States have different problems—different needs. Another possibility for large urban areas with severe delinquency problems is an intermediate facility, popularly called the "halfway house." Housed in these institutions would be the more seriously delinquent boys released from State training schools. These centers would gradually integrate the boys back into the community while still maintaining a degree of supervision during the most critical period in the rehabilitative process. I speak of the first weeks of freedom when boys are susceptible to reentering the delinquent-criminal groups which spawned them. This type of facility should be considered of highest priority and yet, at the present time, they are practically nonexistent.

These are only two of the types of programs we need if we are to reduce the yearly toll of youngsters that turn to a life of crime. The bill is flexible enough to satisfy the individual needs of particular States. By this time—after 11 years of steadily increasing juvenile crime—it should be obvious that Federal action is necessary. I feel that the bill is of primary importance to our country.

Mr. President, I commend the bill to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 656) to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States, or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof, for the establishment of institutions of a minimum security type for treating and rehabilitating juvenile delinquents, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER

(for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AFTERCARE POSTHOSPITALIZATION TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR DRUG ADDICTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the establishment by the Federal Government of an aftercare treatment program for narcotic addicts who have been released from hospitals operated by the U.S. Public Health Service that treat drug addiction.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency for the past 7 years and as a past chairman of this subcommittee, I have seen a continued increase in the use of narcotic drugs by both adults and juveniles in certain areas of the country.

Time and time again there has been testimony before this subcommittee from qualified expert witnesses on narcotic drug addiction who have requested Federal assistance in providing followup aftercare service for addicts released from the Federal Public Health hospitals. One of the White House conference recommendations relating to juvenile delinquency reads as follows:

> That Federal facilities, followup treatment, and parole services for narcotic addicts be improved.

The high percentage of recidivism of narcotic addicts is a well-known statistic. Experts attribute these repeated failures to the lack of parole and aftercare facilities for the addict who is released from hospitalization to return to his old environment without any control or assistance.

The rehabilitation of the drug addict presents problems which I do not believe can be resolved without methods that take into consideration psychological as well as physical addiction. The effort and money used to treat narcotic addiction is partly wasted, due, in some measure at least, to the fact that there is no followup of hospital treatment. An example of the type of aftercare control that might be provided by the passage of the bill would be a Federal nalline testing program that has been used successfully for several years by the State of California and has recently been adopted by several other States. The nalline test was developed by Public Health doctors with Federal funds, yet to date has not been utilized by the Federal Government because of the lack of proper legislation which would provide for its use. An advantage of a nalline testing program is its relatively small cost, the fact that it does not require highly trained personnel in its administration, and its efficacy in keeping larger numbers of addicts from falling back to the use of drugs than heretofore possible.

I submit, Mr. President, that the measures provided for in the bill are a part of the Federal responsibility in the continuous war against the insidious traffic of narcotic drugs and the fight against drug addiction.

Mr. President, I commend this bill to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 657) to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare posthospital treatment program for drug addiction, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CARROLL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO CERTAIN TAX RELIEF MEASURES BY RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which I introduce on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], which is designed to broaden for the commuter railroads the benefit of tax relief measures granted to them by State and local governments, to enable them to operate.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 658) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

I am today introducing legislation to permit the railroads to receive the full benefit of tax relief measures granted them by States, counties, and localities for the continuance of commuter and other essential rail services. Senators KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, are cosponsors of the bill.

This Federal legislation is necessary to give the commuter railroads the planned benefits of tax reductions made available to them by States to enable them to continue commuter services. Right now we are heading full throttle toward a national crisis in railroad passenger services. Rising costs, slumping earnings, obsolete equipment and inadequate or nonexistent Government help—these factors are contributing to the serious deterioration of commuter facilities and services affecting New York and many other metropolitan areas in our Nation. Neither the public interest in adequate rail transportation facilities nor the requirements of national security can be met indefinitely unless Government recognizes its duty to cooperate with the railroads in seeking means to help them avert financial collapse.

The legislation I am proposing would directly stimulate State and local efforts to help railroads continue unprofitable but necessary passenger train service, by seeing to it that tax relief extended to railroads operating at a loss is not absorbed by Federal taxes. It would be of immediate benefit to railroads operating in New York State and in any other area where such tax exemptions or abatement has been granted since under present Federal law, a locality may forego tax revenue in order to help a railroad maintain commuter services only to watch up to 52 percent of the revenue revert to the U.S. Treasury.

Under Governor Rockefeller's leadership, New York launched a major program of railroad assistance in 1959 when the State legislature set ceilings on the assessment of railroad properties by communities. Thus far, the plan has resulted in local tax relief to railroads amounting to $5.5 million. Under this law and new legislation which Governor Rockefeller is recommending now to exempt properties devoted to commuter passenger service from real property taxes, local tax relief to railroads in New York State can increase to $20 million annually by 1963. Unless the Federal Government recognizes its responsibility to take a similar course of action, as much as $10.4 million of that amount could become Federal revenue, thus diverted from the original goal of helping rehabilitate essential rail services in New York.

The depressed earnings of New York railroads in recent years has often been traced to the requirement that they continue to operate unprofitable passenger services. This financial burden which they must carry in the public interest has prevented them in many cases from buying new equipment and modernizing their facilities. The tax relief which my legislation encourages should enable railroads to make such improvements when it is most economical. For instance, older cars of the New Haven railroad now cost between $52,000 and $66,000 each to overhaul—had they been renovated on schedule which means every 6 years, the cost could have been kept down to $10,000 per car.

The necessity for coordinated tax relief by the Federal, State, and local government, is becoming more urgent every year as the number of commuters continues to increase while the commuter facilities decrease. The accelerating population expansion into suburban areas across the country means that by 1975 an additional 30 million people will require either regular or intermittent travel facilities—car, bus, or rail—into the center of our big cities. There is presently no feasible substitute for passenger train services, as New York's some 200,000 rail commuters can testify. During the two temporary commuter service stoppages within the past year, no emergency plan could prevent major traffic tieups on highways to and from the city as thousands of rail commuters tried to get to their jobs.

If passenger train discontinuances in the future should affect only 15 percent, or 30,000, of our present commuters, we would have to construct a 12-lane thruway to accommodate the increased auto traffic and turn more than 50 acres of land in the city into parking lots. The same problem would confront a city like Boston or any other metropolitan area which now welcomes a daily transfusion of thousands of rail commuters into the mainstream of metropolitan activity.

The following commuter railroads in New York State have been discontinued in recent years: the Putnam Division and the West Shore Branch of the New York Central and

the Central's lines in and around Auburn, N.Y. Presently pending with the New York State Public Service Commission are discontinuance petitions filed by the New York Central to end passenger services between Niagara Falls and Buffalo, Utica and Watertown and Massena-Malone, and between Syracuse and Watertown and Massena-Malone.

APPOINTMENT BY POSTMASTER GENERAL OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill that is intended to relieve the Senate from a burden which it should not have to perform and which it cannot possibly do properly.

The bill would relieve the Senate of the requirement of considering and confirming the more than 1,500 nominations for postmasters of first-, second-, and third-class post offices that are placed before us each year. Under the proposed legislation, the Postmaster General of the United States would make these appointments in the same manner in which he now appoints clerks and rural carriers as well as postmasters at fourth-class offices.

This legislation would make no changes in the civil service system of selection and would not in any way alter the requirements for the office or affect veterans' preference rights in such appointments. In approving this bill, we would only be doing what we did several years ago when the Congress rightly recognized that no constructive purpose was served by having the Senate confirm district directors of the Internal Revenue Service. We adopted legislation that permitted the Director of the Internal Revenue Service to make those appointments, and so far as I can determine, that system is working quite well. As evidence that this latter step was in the right direction, no one now proposes that we should go back to the old system of requiring senatorial approval for these positions.

There are over 23,000 first-, second-, and third-class post offices in the United States, and under present law the Senate must confirm each of those postmasters. The average turnover through normal replacements, death, or retirement is over 1,500 per year.

Every Senator recognizes that it is simply impossible for us to make any semblance of a check as to the background or qualifications of these individual nominees. Certainly, I could not possibly have time to check postmaster nominees in Alaska, California, or Texas; nor could the Senators from those States possibly investigate the qualifications of nominees in Vermont, Pennsylvania, or Delaware.

I do not think it is at all necessary to belabor the Senate with these details. However, I am sure that the Post Office Department could operate more efficiently if they could simply select postmasters from the eligible list in the same manner in which rural carriers and other clerks are appointed.

The record of Senate confirmation of postmasters over the past 10 years—since the beginning of the 82d Congress—would seem to show conclusively that Senate consideration of these appointments is completely unnecessary. In that 10-year period, the Senate has approved 10,556 postmaster nominations and rejected only 3.

I hope the Senate will agree with me that it is time to remove the requirement of Senate confirmation of these appointments and act favorably on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 659) to provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ELIMINATION OF BLOCK VOTING FOR MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate block voting for marketing orders. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 660) to eliminate block voting for marketing orders, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The explanation presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO ELIMINATE BLOCK VOTING FOR MARKETING ORDERS

This bill requires that any producer approval or disapproval required in connection with the issuance or termination of any marketing order shall be determined by the individual votes of the producers. This would eliminate block voting of their members by cooperative associations.

Paragraphs (8) and (9) of section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provide that a marketing order may be issued only if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that it is approved by at least two-thirds of the producers by number or volume (three-fourths of the producers in the case of certain citrus fruits). Other paragraphs provide for producer approval of particular provisions of orders and of the termination of orders.

Paragraph (12) of section 8c at present provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may consider the approval or disapproval of a cooperative association of producers as the approval or disapproval of its members. The attached bill would amend paragraph (12) to eliminate such representation by cooperatives of their members and to require instead that the approval or disapproval of producers shall be determined by their individual votes.

Paragraph (19) of section 8c authorizes the Secretary to conduct referendums to determine producer approval or disapproval of the issuance of an order. Section 2 of the bill would amend paragraph (19) so as to require the Secretary to conduct referendums in such cases and so as to eliminate a reference in paragraph (19) to representation by cooperatives of their members.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing 15 Basques who are presently stateless in my State the opportunity to seek American citizenship.

These men are all working in Idaho. They are vital there as professional herdsmen and caretakers in the sheep-raising industry. They have been allowed to remain in this country on a limited basis under a law passed by the Congress in 1955.

The bill I introduce is similar to one I previously introduced, and which was approved by the Senate in 1959, but which lacked action in the House of Representatives.

There is adequate precedent to allow these men permanent residence in the United States. Many of them have been in our country for 12 years, and very responsible residents of Idaho inform me they have been industrious, capable, and law-abiding individuals.

We in Idaho are proud to have one of the largest Basque colonies in the New World. The Basques have played a prominent role in Idaho extending back to territorial days. They are a remarkably self-sufficient, proud, and loyal people, and have contributed much to our society and its economy.

The status of these 15 people is particularly unfortunate in that they wish to become citizens of the United States. However, under the restrictive provisions of the existing law, they cannot make application. I am most hopeful this bill will receive early and favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 661) for the relief of certain aliens, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS OF HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1956, REQUIRING CERTAIN ADJUSTMENTS OF APPORTIONMENTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to bring construction of the interstate highway program up to date with the original schedule.

The original Highway Act of 1956 contemplated a completely self-financing highway program which would be paid from the highway trust fund during the period of construction. It was contemplated that the program would be finished in 15 years. The program is now behind schedule. Just as important is the fact that each year's delay means that the cost of construction is getting higher and higher.

The Highway Act recognized that during the early years of planning and construction the revenues available from the trust fund might fall behind expenditures. However, during the final years the available revenues were expected to exceed expenditures. In the end, there-

fore, when the highway system is completed, the gasoline and other highway taxes would have paid for it.

However, Congress in 1956 slowed down progress when it added an additional provision which provided that annual expenditures for the highway program could not exceed the amount in the highway trust fund. This provision is in conflict with the original purpose of the act.

The bill which I am introducing will restore the original intent of the Highway Act—that is, to build the highway in 15 years on a sound monetary basis. This will make the highway program one that is being paid for while it is being used. With the enactment of this bill it will be possible for full apportionments to be made each year for construction of the highway program. In the end, the highway system will have been completely self-financing as originally contemplated by Congress.

In effect, the Federal Government broke faith with the States when the Bureau of Public Roads refused to release funds made available by Congress for the highway program. The States had relied on the apportionments which the Congress had made and proceeded with plans accordingly.

There is another distinct reason why this bill should be passed immediately. Passage of this bill will help the economy and provide more jobs for the growing number of unemployed. It is generally recognized that we are now in another recession. Over 5 million Americans are unemployed. Many of these Americans can be removed from the unemployment rolls and put back to work if we bring the highway program up to date. We can do this by a program which will be self-financing. The additional jobs will provide more tax revenue and will help generate additional purchasing power which will help business. It will provide a modern highway system with more safety and better transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 662) to repeal the provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 requiring certain adjustments of apportionments depending upon the amount of funds available in the highway trust fund, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 4, 7, AND 15 OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners and of the public service commission of my State, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 15 of the Natural Gas Act.

I am advised that commissioners from 29 States voted for these amendments, while those from 13 States were against them. Commissions from the other States were either evenly divided, did not vote, or were absent.

I ask unanimous consent that their analysis of the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 666) to amend sections 4(2), 4(4), 7(e), and 15 of the Natural Gas Act, relating to rates and contracts of natural gas companies and the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity to such companies, and relating to hearings and procedure in proceedings before the Federal Power Commission involving natural gas matters, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE NATURAL GAS ACT

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4 (A) OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WHICH SEEKS TO OUTLAW THESE INDEFINITE PRICING CLAUSES IN NATURAL GAS CONTRACTS

Little need be said in justification of this proposed amendment. The Federal Power Commission has long advocated an amendment to the Natural Gas Act outlawing these inflationary pricing clauses in natural gas contracts. I know of no substantial support for them, except the support by the very parties who unjustly profit by their operation.

These indefinite pricing clauses absolutely guarantee inflation in natural gas prices without any relation whatsoever to cost or value of the product. Such a situation is indefensible and immoral. To illustrate: The two-party favored-nation clause provides that the price of natural gas may be increased in the event the purchaser shall pay or offer a higher price for natural gas in the same field or in any area specified in the contract. The third-party favored-nation clause provides that the price of natural gas may be increased in the event some person not a party to the contract shall pay or offer a higher price for natural gas in the same field or in any area specified in the contract. The better market clause or price redetermination clause provides that the price of natural gas may be increased in the event the average of two or more prices which are paid by purchasers in a specified area is greater. The spiral escalation clause provides that the price of natural gas may be increased in the event the resale rates of the purchaser under the contract are increased. The mere statement of the nature of these indefinite pricing clauses is sufficient to condemn them, particularly when it is realized that they affect a most important natural resource of this Nation.

The contention is made that these indefinite pricing clauses in natural gas contracts are void as a matter of law. Without undertaking to argue the merits of this position, surely it would be beneficial and desirable to have the Natural Gas Act categorically prohibit them so that no further possible legal argument could be made in their behalf.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4 (E) OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WHICH STRIKES THE PROHIBITION AGAINST SUSPENSION OF RATE CHANGES APPLICABLE TO NATURAL GAS SOLD FOR INDUSTRIAL USE FOR RESALE

The Federal Power Commission has sought this legislative remedy for a number of years. This proposed amendment would close the loophole now existing in the Natural Gas Act which prohibits the Federal Power Commission from suspending rate changes affecting natural gas which is sold for resale for industrial use. Experience has shown that this prohibition frustrates to a great extent efficient regulation of natural gas companies.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4 (E) OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WHICH SEEKS TO PROHIBIT CONSECUTIVE RATE INCREASES RESULTING FROM THE AUTOMATIC OPERATION OF SAID SECTION 4 (E)

This proposed amendment would restrict the operation of section 4(e) to permit only one rate increase, as applied to a particular customer, by operation of law, all other such rate increases by operation of law being barred until the Federal Power Commission had passed upon the reasonableness of the one increase in question. This amendment would not prohibit the Federal Power Commission from placing in effect a filed rate increase, even though it did not pass upon the reasonableness of such increase. The amendment would only restrict the automatic operation of the statute as is now the case. Should some emergency arise, the Federal Power Commission would still have authority to place in effect, by specific order, any filed rate increase it saw fit to so place in effect, even though such rate increase had been suspended. (*Re Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp.*, 31 P.U.R. (3d) 84.) The proposed amendment contains a proviso specifically spelling out the authority of the Federal Power Commission to permit to go into effect or to place into effect rate changes where it deems such necessary.

Some question has been raised as to the constitutionality of this proposed amendment. This objection on constitutional grounds is in the same category as the historical objection to any and all regulation upon constitutional grounds. Surely, the amendment is not unconstitutional upon its face. We must keep in mind the general rules applicable to testing the constitutionality of a statute. All presumptions of validity are indulged in support of the statute, and the law creates a presumption of a set of facts which will support the constitutionality of the statute. (*Pacific States, etc., Co.* v. *White*, 296 U.S. 176, 185–186, 80 L. ed. 138, 146; *Alabama State Federation of Labor* v. *McAdory*, 325 U.S. 450, 465–466, 89 L. ed. 1725, 1737.) The burden rests strongly upon the person charging unconstitutionality to prove the charge.

It is contended that this proposed amendment would be unconstitutional because the Federal Power Commission cannot get around to passing upon the reasonableness of this backlog of rate increase filings and, therefore, unconstitutionality would arise from that fact. The legal presumption is that the Federal Power Commission will discharge its duty in a lawful manner and that it will dispose of proceedings before it so as to comply with constitutional requirements. This is elementary constitutional law. This backlog of cases situation might be used as an argument if the amendment was an absolute bar to placing into effect more than one rate increase. I doubt the validity of such argument, even in such context. However, the proposed amendment is not an absolute bar because the Federal Power Commission, notwithstanding this proposed amendment, could place in effect any filed rate increase it desired to.

In the State of California, there has existed, since 1912, a statute which prohibits a public utility from placing in effect any rate increase until a showing has been made before the public utilities commission and a finding has been made by the commission that such increase is justified. This statute reads as follows:

"No public utility shall raise any rate or so alter any classification, contract, practice,

or rule as to result in any increase in any rate except upon a showing before the commission and a finding by the commission that such increase is justified." (Sec. 454, Public Utilities Code of California.)

This statute prohibits even the commission from authorizing the increasing of a rate, unless the mandate of this statute is complied with. Not even one increase may go into effect without the proof and finding of justification. This statute has been assailed many times but its validity has been upheld.

If it be admitted that this backlog of rate increase proceedings constitutes a bar to relief from the present evil which exists, then, it must be conceded that we have become victims of an unwholesome situation; that it is our master.

Should this amendment be enacted into law, I am convinced that events thereafter would prove, as has been the case in the past, that these arguments in terrorem will prove groundless. At all events, the public interest demands that we attempt to redress the existing evil.

This amendment would cause both the natural gas companies and the Federal Power Commission to expedite hearings in rate proceedings as nothing else would.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 7(E) OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT SEEKING TO MAKE IT JURISDICTIONAL TO THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY THAT THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION MAKE A SPECIFIC FINDING UPON THE CONSISTENCY WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST OF THE PRICE AT WHICH NATURAL GAS IS SOLD IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE PURSUANT TO A CERTIFICATE OR CERTIFICATES OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY

This proposed amendment would write into the statute the spirit of the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Catco case. Some thought is expressed that this amendment is not necessary, but I disagree. The Supreme Court of the United States may change its interpretation of this particular provision of the Natural Gas Act when new members should come upon that Court, or present members might entertain changed views. Our history is all too full of such regrettable changes of heart by the Supreme Court of the United States. In my judgment, this is a subject far too important to be left to the insecurity of judicial quicksands. The public interest has a right to be safeguarded by specific statutory prescription. This proposed amendment would do exactly that.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 15 OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT WHICH WOULD PRESCRIBE PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS IN THE HEARING AND THE DISPOSITION OF MATTERS BEFORE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

This proposed amendment to section 15 of the Natural Gas Act seeks to set up uniform requirements with regard to the hearing of matters before the Federal Power Commission and the disposition thereof. However, this proposed amendment contains a safeguarding provision which clearly provides that these procedural requirements are not to be construed as jurisdictional. In other words, the failure of the Federal Power Commission or of its examiners to comply with these requirements would not, ipso facto, render void the action of the Commission or of its examiners. The main purpose of this proposed amendment is to admonish the Commission and its examiners and the interested parties to exercise all reasonable diligence to bring matters to a speedy hearing and to dispose of such matters thereafter with dispatch. Said proposed amendment attempts to do away as much as possible with the so-called regulatory lag.

COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN PERSONS AFFECTED BY ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would establish a bipartisan commission to make a study of the acquisition of property under Federal and federally assisted programs, in order to review the present methods and procedures, and the awards and the amounts of awards.

In recent years the Federal Government has instituted programs under which millions of acres of land and innumerable buildings have been acquired from private owners. While much of this property has been acquired by purchase, a great deal has been acquired through condemnation proceedings, and in those cases where voluntary sales were effected the threat of condemnation proceedings was in the background.

These Federal and federally assisted programs include some in which Federal agencies acquire and use the land directly, for example, in many military programs; in other cases the land is acquired and owned by State or local agencies, for example, in most road programs; and in other cases the land may be resold for private use, for example, in the urban renewal program.

Probably the biggest acquisition program has been that of the military. I am advised that in 1940, the War and Navy Departments used about 2½ million acres of land. By the close of the war, these two Departments had the use of 52 million acres, about equal in size to Kansas or Utah. By June 30, 1960, the land held by the Army, Navy, and Air Force came to more than 29 million acres, about the size of Louisiana or Pennsylvania, and almost as large an area as Mississippi or New York.

Other Federal programs have acquired or are acquiring substantial amounts of land. In the urban renewal program under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the first 400 projects called for the clearance of about 15,000 acres, not including streets and alleys. And, unlike much of the land used for military programs, these 15,000 acres are located in urban areas and consist mostly of developed land. The Federal highway programs also call for the acquisition of large areas, including both expensive developed land in cities and farmland and wasteland outside cities. Something like 730,000 parcels of real property, or about 1½ million acres, are required for the routes of the Interstate System alone, and these at an estimated cost of about $5½ billion. About twice this amount will be required for all Federal-aid highway rights-of-way during the next 12 to 15 years.

Acquisition of land in this volume is a very different thing from Federal acquisition of property during the 19th century, or even during the 1st quarter of the 20th century. The problems created when land is acquired under Federal or federally assisted programs by thousands of acres in rural areas or by scores of acres in developed urban areas are different, both in kind and in degree, from the problems created in earlier days, when Federal acquisitions of land amounted merely to taking enough land for a post office, or an arsenal, or even an Army post, and when there was always more space, either nearby or out on the frontier, for the dispossessed people and businesses.

The problem becomes particularly acute when an urban renewal project cleans out an entire section of town, or a dam floods an entire town—houses, stores, office buildings, movie theaters, banks, churches, and everything else. The Banking and Currency Committee has in the past heard testimony setting forth in dramatic detail the problems facing businesses, large and small, which have been wiped out by urban renewal projects or by Federal highway projects. Three bills were introduced on this subject in the last Congress, S. 1340, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], S. 1351, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and S. 1777, by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. These bills would have provided loans to small business concerns affected by the highway and urban renewal programs.

The problem, of course, is not limited to small businesses or to these two Federal programs. The problem affects all sizes of business and it affects all Federal programs under which land is acquired, particularly, of course, where the land acquisitions are very extensive. It was, I think, for this reason that the Banking and Currency Committee did not take action on any of these three bills either in connection with the small business legislation or the housing legislation.

It seems to me the question is a matter of much broader concern and one which basically goes back to the requirements of the 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation and that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

These constitutional requirements have been spelled out in judicial decisions and in statutes over many years, for the most part, before acquisitions of land were substantial or had a drastic effect upon a wide area. As I have said, there is a difference of kind, as well as a difference of degree, between acquiring enough land for a Federal office building, even acquiring the Federal Triangle, and acquiring square miles in a city for an urban renewal project or acquiring a whole valley for the purpose of flooding it for a dam.

It is because of this change in the nature and effect of land acquisition under Federal programs, either by condemnation or under threat of condemnation, that I think it is desirable to have a thorough and impartial study of land acquisitions under Federal and federally assisted programs. This study should be broad enough to cover all land acquisitions under Federal and federally assisted programs, such as highway programs, public works programs, urban renewal programs, and military programs.

It should be broad enough to cover all land acquisition, no matter how the property is acquired or by whom. It should be broad enough also to cover all the widespread effects of these land acquisitions—their effects on owners, on tenants, on nearby property and businesses, and on others affected by the acquisition. It should be broad enough to cover the benefits and burdens of these land acquisitions, in relation to the persons and businesses involved and to the Federal programs under which the properties are acquired. For example, the study should include the extent to which the costs of Federal programs are borne by individuals or firms whose property is taken or whose property or business is either destroyed or reduced in value by the taking of neighboring property, and the extent to which these costs are borne by the general public which underwrites these programs. It should also include consideration of the benefits which these programs may provide for persons and businesses in affected areas.

The study should be made in the broad spirit of the just compensation provision of the 5th amendment and the due process clauses of the 5th and 14th amendments. It should not be limited to a determination of the legal bounds of those provisions or of any particular statute.

The bill which I am introducing would establish a bipartisan commission, the Federal Commission on Property Acquisition Compensation, consisting of 15 members, 7 appointed by the President, 4 appointed by the Vice President, and 4 appointed by the Speaker. Three of the members appointed by the President must come from private life, and two of those appointed by the Vice President and two of those appointed by the Speaker could come from private life. These might be lawyers or appraisers active in the field, they might be retired judges who had handled condemnation cases, or they might have some other experience which would make their services valuable. This Commission would make a comprehensive study of the acquisition of property by the Federal Government or others, under Federal or federally assisted programs. The Commission would be required to file a report by December 31, 1963, and it would be required to make specific recommendations.

This bill is based upon S. 2802 of the last Congress, which I introduced a year ago. Favorable comments on S. 2802 were received from the Defense Department and the Housing and Home Finance Agency, along with some suggested changes. I have revised the bill to take into account these suggestions and several suggestions made by others interested in the field.

In introducing this bill, I do not, of course, wish to take the position that any particular judicial awards have been too high or too low, and I do not wish to take the position that any condemnation statute now on the books needs to be amended. That would be to prejudge the work of the Commission. But the testimony which has been presented to the Banking and Currency Committee on the effects on individuals and businesses of the widespread land acquisitions under Federal programs within the jurisdiction of that court convinces me that this matter should be thoroughly and promptly revised, and specific recommendations should be made to the Congress, so that we may be satisfied—as the bill says—

That all persons affected by the acquisition of property by the United States or under Federal or federally assisted programs shall receive fair, just and equal treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 671) to provide for a comprehensive study of compensation to persons affected by the acquisition of property under Federal or federally assisted programs, through condemnation proceedings or otherwise, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEX., TO BE UTILIZED AS PART OF SAN JACINTO BATTLEGROUND PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas so the historically valuable property may be utilized as part of my State's consecrated San Jacinto Battleground Park.

The land in question—a portion of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot that has been declared surplus by the General Services Administration—surrounds the 10-acre DeZavala homestead and cemetery, which is a portion of the San Jacinto Battleground Park area. The GSA plans to sell the propery owned by the Government to the high bidder, which could mean that the centrally located DeZavala land would be fenced off from public entry. This would for all practical purposes cause this historic site to lose its identity and its inspirational value to citizens of Texas and the Nation.

Mr. President, Lorenzo DeZavala was a great liberal political leader of Mexico and had been a member of the Cortez of Spain prior to Mexico's independence from Spain. He had held high office in the Mexican Government in Mexico City. When Santa Anna became a dictator and seized the powers of government, Lorenzo DeZavala opposed the dictator's usurpations and fled to Texas, joining the liberty-loving Texans in their battle for freedom. Lorenzo DeZavala was elected first Vice President of the Republic of Texas and was a signer of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

As the Texan Army under Sam Houston retreated before Santa Anna's vast Army, they neared the site of the home of Lorenzo DeZavala, who lived on the east bank of Buffalo Bayou, just opposite the battleground of San Jacinto. Lorenzo DeZavala's home was a place of refuge for the lovers of liberty, fighting tyranny and oppression.

This historic cemetery includes the graves of Lorenzo DeZavala and his family, and also the grave of General Castrillion, the ablest officer under Santa Anna, and a brave professional Spanish soldier who lost his life when he refused to run at San Jacinto.

Other important acts in the life of the Republic of Texas took place in the DeZavala homestead. This ground is hallowed ground from the days of the Republic of Texas. I strongly urge the General Services Administration to accede to the unanimous request of the commissioners court of Harris County, and that lot 26, containing 152 acres of this land, adjacent to the DeZavala Cemetery and homestead, be set apart and reserved from the impending sale, and that title be passed to the State of Texas, so that this land can be maintained with the State park at San Jacinto battleground, where all future generations of America can relive the thrilling history of the creation of a republic within less than 6 months' time.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 673) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Texas all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands adjacent to the San Jacinto Battleground Park located in Harris County, Texas, containing approximately one hundred and fifty-two acres, and more specifically described as lot numbered 26 on scheme III of the land planning map of the General Services Administration showing the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property, Harris County, Texas.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act (1) shall provide that the lands so conveyed shall be for public park purposes, and that in the event they ever cease to be used for such purposes the title to such lands shall revert to the United States, which shall have the immediate right of reentry thereon, and (2) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands so conveyed.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS TRADE ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish more effective procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas. Under this bill, appeals would be submitted to the Secretary of Labor, who can, if he chooses,

call upon the Tariff Commission for relevant trade and international economic data. In much the same manner as under the escape clause—section 7—of the Trade Agreements Act, the Secretary shall then make an investigation and shall recommend to the President what action should be taken in those cases in which he finds that, because of the wage-cost differential, some measure of tariff, quota, or tariff-quota relief is warranted.

I am happy to announce that this bill is cosponsored by Senators BEALL, BRIDGES, COTTON, DODD, PASTORE, PROUTY, and WILEY, all of whom were cosponsors of this measure last year.

Mr. President, the problems now faced by a number of key American industries due to increased imports from low-wage areas are most serious and deserve our earnest attention. Above all, we must concern ourselves about the fact that a significant number of American workers have been thereby displaced and their families have been greatly inconvenienced and harmed.

It is abundantly clear that a number of American industries today find it extremely difficult to compete with areas in which wages are only a fraction of those in the United States. There is little that can be done by these industries to maintain and increase their sales. This is especially true of domestic industries throughout the entire Nation in which wages represent a considerable proportion of total production costs. It is generally these industries which have been most seriously injured by increased imports. For example: Textiles, all types of apparel, kitchen utensils and various kinds of handtools, small appliances, novelty items and toys, rugs, bicycles, umbrellas, light machinery, footwear, tile, china and ceramic products, athletic equipment, plumbing fixtures, steel, copper and brass, optical equipment, gloves and other leather goods, certain chemicals, hats, lace, and various papers and paper products.

Mr. President, I have always made it clear that I do not call for, nor do I want to see, a full-scale and sweeping reversal of America's trade policies. In this day and age, protectionism, or the trade policy which has come to be known by this name, is as outdated as the "model T." As a Member of Congress for 14 years, I have always supported the principle of reciprocal trade. I do not in any way intend to abandon this position. In introducing my bill today, I am only interested in seeing to it that we give injured domestic industries and workers a better and fairer break.

There are several shades of opinion on this very difficult and complex issue. There are those who vociferously represent extreme points of view at both ends of the spectrum. I firmly believe my bill represents a sensible, middle ground position. In effect it says that, while we must not repudiate our present policies, there is no reason why we should not provide a realistic way in which to help seriously affected domestic industries, their employees, and their families.

Our present trade agreements legislation clearly states that the interests of affected American industries should be guarded. Every nation of the world watches over its own interests. So should we. In doing so, however, we certainly must not violate or abrogate existing agreements or understandings with our allies and trade partners throughout the world.

Mr. President, there are a few minor changes in language, all of a perfecting nature, that distinguish this bill from the bill on this same subject which I introduced last year. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of the new bill appear at the end of my remarks.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that my bill lie on the table until Wednesday, February 8, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 675) to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Trade Act of 1961."

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The rapid expansion of American foreign trade in recent years permits foreign industries in which wages and working conditions are below American standards to compete with domestic industries in which wages are significantly higher and in which minimum wages and working conditions are set by law by the United States and the several States. Many American industries, especially those in which labor costs constitute a high proportion of the total production cost, have been injured or are threatened with serious injury as a result of such competition. The following procedures are established to provide relief for such American industries.

PROCEDURES

SEC. 3. (a) Upon the request of the President, or upon resolution of either House of Congress, or upon application of the representative of any domestic industry or employee organization in a domestic industry, or upon application of any interested party, or upon his own motion, the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") or his designee shall make an investigation of any situation in which it is alleged that the differential in costs, due to the existence of wage rates and working conditions significantly below U.S. standards, gives foreign manufacturers or producers a competitive advantage over U.S. manufacturers or producers.

(b) In carrying out an investigation and hearings under the foregoing procedure, the Secretary shall to the extent practicable consider (among other factors): wages and all other forms of remuneration for work performed, labor productivity, production costs and the components thereof, working conditions, legislation or regulations pertaining to working conditions, and overall standards of living in the United States and in the country or countries of origin of the imported article or articles under investigation.

(c) The Secretary shall request the views of the Tariff Commission in writing on relevant trade and international factors in all cases in which he deems such information necessary to the investigatory process under this Act. He may also request the views of any other interested agency or agencies of the Federal Government.

(d) Should the Secretary find that a domestic industry is being or is likely to be injured by imports of goods which are produced in foreign countries under wages and working conditions below United States standards, he shall recommend to the President such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies as he shall deem necessary or proper in each case, but in no event shall such new or additional duties exceed existing rates of duty by more than 100 per centum or by more than the amount of 50 per centum ad valorem, whichever is higher, nor shall such new or additional quotas reduce the volume of imports permitted by existing quotas by more than 50 per centum.

(e) Upon receipt of the Secretary's report and recommendations, the President may by order impose such new or additional duties, import quotas, or other remedies (1) as recommended by the Secretary to be necessary to afford relief to the domestic industry, or (2) as are determined by the President to be necessary for such purpose.

(f) The Secretary shall make and publish, with dispatch and in no event more than six months after the request, application, or resolution is made, a report on each request, application, or resolution under this Act.

(g) Any order issued pursuant to this Act may be modified, suspended, or terminated under the procedures herein established.

(h) The new or additional duties or import quotas imposed by the President or other action taken by him under this Act and any modification, suspension, or termination thereof, shall become effective on such date as he shall specify in his order and shall be treated for administrative purposes as a part of the Tariff Act of 1930.

(i) The Secretary shall, within ninety days after the enactment of this Act, promulgate procedural regulations to give effect to the authority conferred upon him hereunder.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury, following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligations of the United States with which this Act might conflict, but in any event not later than ninety days after the date of enactment.

CIVIL LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS BY COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLE AND FREIGHT FORWARDERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 676) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for your consideration a draft of a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders.

This legislative proposal is designed to correct an existing situation which adversely affects the shipper interests of the Federal Government as well as the interests of private shippers. Because of its responsibilities under section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with regard to transportation and traffic management on behalf of the executive agencies of the Government, General Services Administration recommends that the proposal have the early consideration of the Congress.

Under the provisions of parts I and III of the Interstate Commerce Act relating, respectively, to rail and water carriers, the shipper may litigate as to the reasonableness of past transportation charges. Parts II and IV of the act relating to motor carriers and freight forwarders do not contain comparable provisions. However, since the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935 (pt. II), the Interstate Commerce Commission had interpreted the act as leaving shippers the right to sue in the courts for damages resulting from unlawful rates on a determination by ICC that the rates sued on were unreasonable or otherwise unlawful; thus, providing essentially the same rights to shippers as was specified in parts I and III of that act.

In an opinion handed down May 18, 1959, the Supreme Court of the United States, in *T.I.M.E., Inc.* v. *United States of America* and *Davidson Transfer and Storage Company, Inc.* v. *United States of America*, Nos. 68 and 96, ruled, however, that under the statute, the recovery of reparations or damages arising from the application of unreasonable rates on past motor carrier shipments is precluded.

The effect of this ruling is to deprive shippers, including the U.S. Government, of a right to damages resulting from unreasonable or unlawful rates on past shipments. The Comptroller General of the United States has estimated, on the basis of the limited experience since the Court's ruling that the U.S. Government will suffer a loss of about $16,000 a week because of inability to recover charges in excess of those based on reasonable rates in connection with shipments by motor carriers subject to part II of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The enactment of this amendment will establish procedure for reparation awards and limitations of actions with respect to motor carrier and freight forwarder operations subject to parts II and IV of the Interstate Commerce Act comparable to that now provided in parts I and III of the act for rail and water transportation.

Congress has on previous occasions considered legislative proposals to amend the act along lines similar to those now proposed. Legislative history seems to indicate that the principal reason for failure of enactment was reliance on the then existing Interstate Commerce Commission interpretation of the Motor Carrier Act that shippers could sue for damages resulting from unreasonable rates.

Under the present interpretation of the statute, a tariff rate filed by a motor carrier or freight forwarder, regardless how unreasonable or unlawful, is required by law to be charged by the carrier and paid by the shipper until that rate is ordered changed by the ICC. Shippers are now, by reason of the ruling of the Supreme Court, deprived of their right to a determination as to just and reasonable rates on shipments already made or to recover reparation for the excess paid over the reasonable rates.

This situation does not exist in rail and water charges. The Interstate Commerce Act gives shippers a legal right to reparation for unreasonable rail and water charges collected by the carrier. Enactment of the proposed amendment would, in this respect, place on a uniform footing all four classes of carriers under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

For these reasons, GSA recommends early enactment of the proposed bill.

The Bureau of the Budget by letter dated December 28, 1960, advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY FOR CRUISES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purposes of the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 677) to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a draft bill, with an accompanying statement of purposes and provisions, which is designed to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay operating-differential subsidy under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, for the operation of passenger vessels on cruises not on the essential trade routes during the slack season on the essential service to which the vessel is assigned.

The draft bill would not increase the amount of operating-differential subsidy that would be paid with respect to the vessel. The draft bill would authorize removal of the vessel from its essential service during the slack season for the purpose of cruising, and would authorize the continuation of payment of operating-differential subsidy for the period of such cruises.

The draft bill contains a special recapture provision which provides for recapture of operating-differential subsidy from 75 percent of profits earned on such cruises in excess of 10 percent of capital necessarily employed. This recapture is in lieu of the provision of the act which provides, with respect to other vessel operations, for recapture of subsidy from 50 percent of profits in excess of 10 percent of capital necessarily employed.

The purpose of the draft bill is to improve the earnings of passenger vessels without increasing the amount of subsidy.

On January 9, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF THE PURPOSES AND PROVISIONS OF THE DRAFT BILL TO AMEND TITLE VI OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE THE PAYMENT OF OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY FOR CRUISES

Under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, the Federal Maritime Board is authorized to contract to pay operating-differential subsidy for the operation of vessels on trade routes determined to be essential by the Secretary of Commerce under section 211 of that act.

The Federal Maritime Board has contracted under that act with a number of operators for the operation of both cargo and passenger vessels on such essential trade routes. Under the provisions of that act, such contracts provide that if the earnings, over a 10-year period, of the combined fleet of cargo and passenger vessels operated by any contractor exceed 10 percent of capital necessarily employed in the operation of such vessels, such contractor shall repay to the United States one-half of such excess profits but not exceeding the amount of operating-differential subsidy paid during such 10-year period.

Passenger vessels operated under such contracts have a slow season during which they earn little profit or even operate at a loss. This reduces the annual profits made by the contractor on his fleet of vessels and thus tends to reduce the fleet profits which are subject to the foregoing recapture provision for the United States.

The purpose of the draft bill is to authorize the removal of passenger vessels from the essential trade routes during their slow season, to authorize such vessels to cruise during such slow season off the essential trade routes, and to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy during such cruises. This would not increase the amount of operating-differential subsidy that would be paid with respect to such passenger vessels because under existing contracts such subsidy is payable for the entire year. The effect of the bill would be merely to authorize removal of such passenger vessels from the essential trade routes during their slow season and to authorize continuation of payment of such subsidy while they are cruising off the essential trade routes. To the extent that such cruising off the essential trade routes would increase the earnings, or reduce the losses, made with these passenger vessels during their slow season, the fleet profits of the contractors will be increased and thus the profits of the operators that are subject to recapture also will be increased. The amount of operating-differential subsidy that

is paid with respect to such vessels will remain the same because the draft bill provides that for the period of such cruising the operating-differential subsidy shall be computed in the same way as though the vessel for such period had been operated on the essential service to which it is assigned.

Analysis of passenger travel on passenger ships shows definite seasonal peaks. The high season for United States North Atlantic/Mediterranean outbound travel ranges from March to October reaching a peak in June or July; on the homebound leg the peak is August or September. This same pattern exists in the entire United States/European passenger trade. As a rule the slack period of passenger travel both outbound and inbound occurs in January and February. Similar seasonal fluctuations in the volume of passenger traffic are evident in the South American and transpacific trades.

On outbound voyages in the slow season, utilization may range from 50 to 60 percent of available space with a corresponding reduction in revenue. Examination of voyage results of one operator of large passenger vessels shows a profit from the passenger ship operation before subsidy in the peak season (second and third quarters) and a considerable loss in the slow seasons (the first and last quarters of the year).

To help offset the dimunition of traffic in the off season many foreign operators schedule repairs, inspection and drydocking of their passenger ships in the winter months and at the same time schedule attractive short cruises to warmer climates to accomodate this ever-growing type of business. The importance and extent of cruise business is evident by the number of cruises scheduled with foreign-flag vessels to the Caribbean and other South and Central American areas from New York. More than 80 cruise voyages were advertised in a leading trade publication for each of the months of January and February 1960 ranging from a few days to a month or more, with an average of about 2 weeks by passenger ships normally assigned to other services including such large ships as the *Nieuw Amsterdam* of Holland-America Line, *Bremen* of North German Lloyd Line, and the *Mauretania* of Cunard Line. Some foreign-flag vessels also make cruises to other areas during the winter; the Italian Line usually transfer one or two passenger ships from its normal United States Atlantic/Mediterranean Service to the Mediterranean/East Coast South American Service. Paid advertisements and press dispatches indicate a growing number of cruises by foreign-flag passenger vessels commencing their cruises at U.S. ports, primarily New York, and such cruises exceed by far the number of the cruises advertised by U.S.-flag vessels as a part of the regularly scheduled services.

Most U.S. subsidized operators of passenger vessels employ at least two passenger vessels on a service and the withdrawal of one vessel with a consequent reduction in the frequency of sailings on its regular service during the slack season should not adversely affect its overall service. The scheduling of cruises offers the added advantage of permitting an operator to schedule a short cruise or cruises during a period when a vessel might normally be idle awaiting its next scheduled sailing date after annual repairs or drydocking.

Review of space utilization on cruises indicates that on well-known vessels, passenger demand ranges from good to excellent. Since the U.S.-flag passenger vessel fleet is well known they should meet with favorable acceptance by the growing number of tourists who take off-season cruises.

There is no doubt that with favorable acceptance, the cruises would provide revenue in excess of that which would be realized if the vessels were retained in the regular service at a low utilization level.

Cruises made under the proposed legislation would not have a seriously adverse effect on other U.S.-flag operators since under the draft bill competitive factors with respect to other American-flag operators would be minimized by limiting the passengers to round-trip passengers, prohibiting the carriage of mail or cargo, requiring that cruises begin and end at a domestic port on the operator's essential service to which the vessel is assigned, permitting the embarkation of passengers only at domestic ports on the operators' essential service to which the vessel is assigned, and permitting the vessel to stop at other domestic ports only for the time and the same purposes as is permitted with respect to foreign-flag vessels carrying passengers who embarked at domestic ports. The proposed legislation is an effort to place the operator of U.S. passenger vessels on a more favorable competitive basis with his foreign-flag competitors by permitting him to compete with them for available off-route cruise passengers during the slack season on the regular service of the vessels. Through anticipated improved financial results these operators will be able to further strengthen the future of the U.S. passenger fleet.

The draft bill would add a new section 613 to title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which would authorize the Federal Maritime Board to subsidize cruises, subject to the foregoing conditions, if the Federal Maritime Board determines that for the period of such cruises, operation of the vessel is not required in order to furnish adequate service on the service, route, or line to which the vessel is assigned or for which application is made. Operation of the vessel on cruises would be restricted by the new section to not exceeding one-third of each year.

The new section 613 would also provide that if at the end of a 10-year recapture period, the contractor has earned an average return of more than 10 percent per annum on his capital necessarily employed, he shall pay to the United States 75 percent of such excess but not exceeding the amount of operating-differential subsidy paid with respect to such cruises. This is in lieu of the 50-percent recapture provision of section 606(5) of the act. If the operator has earned less than an average return of 10 percent per annum, his recapture accounting would be under section 606(5) of the act.

The draft bill would amend section 601 of the act (which requires, as a prerequisite to the granting of operating differential subsidy, a finding that operation of the vessel in a service, route or line is required to meet foreign-flag competition and to promote the foreign commerce of the United States) to require a finding that operation of the vessel in a service, route or line is required to meet foreign-flag competition except to the extent the vessel is operated on cruises authorized under the new section 613. Conforming changes would also be made in sections 602, 603, and 607(b). The amendment to section 603(b) would provide that for the period during which the vessel is operated on cruises authorized by the new section 613, operating-differential subsidy shall be computed as though the vessel were being operated on the essential service to which it is assigned. The reason for this provision is that it would not be practical to make the computation on the basis of direct competition.

Attached is a comparative text showing the changes the draft bill would make in existing law.

EXTENSION OF AUTOMOBILE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT TO GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 678) to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands.

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

As its title indicates, the purpose of the proposed bill is to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act, Public Law 85–506 (15 U.S.C., 1231–1233), to the territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands in order that the inhabitants of those territories of the United States may have the benefit of a statute which is now applicable to all of the States and the District of Columbia.

When enacted in 1958, the act applied to the States and to the then incorporated territories of Hawaii and Alaska, but not to the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands. The primary purpose of the act is to require the disclosure of the manufacturer's suggested retail price of new automobiles by requiring every manufacturer or importer of new automobiles distributed in interstate commerce to affix a label to the windshield or window of each new automobile, prior to delivery to any dealer, which will contain information as to the make, model, serial, or identification number, final assembly point, the name and location of the dealer and the city or town to which it is to be delivered to him, and the manufacturer's suggested retail price, specifying separately the suggested price of the car and the suggested price of each item of optional equipment physically attached to the automobile at the time of delivery. Such information is presently not required to be available to purchasers in Guam and the Virgin Islands, but would be upon enactment of this proposed bill.

Inasmuch as the legislative history of the act is silent in regard to the application of the statute to Guam and the Virgin Islands, it is assumed that they were not included within the purview of the act through inadvertence or oversight. We are of the opinion that the act would be beneficial to the inhabitants of Guam and the Virgin Islands for the same reason that it is presently beneficial to the inhabitants of the United States and the District of Columbia.

When used without further definition in a statute, the term "territory" is generally regarded as denoting an incorporated territory only. It was so used, for example, in section 3797 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It was apparently intended to have the same meaning when the Automobile Information Disclosure Act was passed and approved in 1958, at which time

both Alaska and Hawaii had the status of incorporated territories. Since Alaska and Hawaii's admission to the Union, however, the inclusion in the act of references to "territories" is without meaning, for no incorporated territories remain. Because the term "territory" does not usually, without further definition, include unincorporated territories, i.e., such areas as Guam and the Virgin Islands, to which the provisions of the U.S. Constitution have not been expressly extended, Guam and the Virgin Islands are not now included in the application of the act. By defining the term "territory" to include Guam and the Virgin Islands, the proposed bill would have the effect of extending the statute to those unincorporated territories on the same terms as now apply to the States.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS TO LAND CATCHES OF FISH IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 679) to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 3, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

This bill will further amend section 4311 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 251) to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land fish in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands. At present this section, among other things, prohibits the landing of fish or fish products by a foreign-flag vessel in a port of the United States, with certain exceptions not now pertinent, when the fish or fish products are the catch of the transporting vessel taken on board on the high seas or when they have been transshipped on the high seas.

It has been the custom for many years to permit small British fishing vessels from Tortola, British Virgin Islands, to bring into the Virgin Islands of the United States their catches of fish taken in adjacent waters. This supply of fish has formed a source of cheap food, which in the opinion of officials of this Department is believed necessary to the continued economic welfare of the people of the islands. The imports have ranged from about 900 pounds to 4,000 pounds of fish a month and constitute a vital source of food for the people of these islands.

Information has been given this Department by the Treasury Department that the collector of customs has been approached by certain large fishing and packing interests inquiring as to the possibility of their landing fresh tuna in the Virgin Islands taken by Japanese fishing vessels, canning the catch in canneries to be established in the Virgin Islands, and thereafter shipping the fish to ports or places in the continental United States. Fish so taken, canned, and forwarded could arrive in the continental United States without payment of any duty, subject to compliance with section 301, Tariff Act of 1930.

Actually, the Bureau of Customs has been overlooking this small importation of fresh fish in small boats from nearby places to St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, since the supply was directed for immediate local consumption in the islands. Unless the exception is granted through enactment of the enclosed draft bill, it will be necessary for the collector of customs at St. Thomas to prohibit further landings of fish from the small boats operating out of Tortola. The exception to be granted through amendment of section 4311 of the Revised Statutes is limited to foreign-flag vessels of not more than 50 feet overall length. It is further stipulated that the fish so landed in a port of the Virgin Islands of the United States shall be for immediate consumption in such islands. The sale of the imported fresh fish to any agent, representative, or employee of a freezer or cannery is prohibited in the absence of satisfactory evidence that such sale or transfer is for immediate consumption.

The necessity for preparation of the permissive legislation was brought to the attention of officials of this Department by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable A. Gilmore Flues, and the draft proposal has the approval of officials of the Treasury Department.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need in support thereof, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 680) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special meteorological services.

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

On January 6, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE FUNDS RECEIVED FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

The Weather Bureau has often been requested by various State and local governments as well as private organizations and individuals to provide or undertake special meteorological investigations, tests, services, development projects, technical evaluations and other similar activities which the personnel and facilities of the Weather Bureau are specially capable of carrying out. It has become increasingly difficult for the Weather Bureau to perform such functions, which ordinarily cannot be effectively undertaken by any other organizations, because of the lack of adequate statutory authorization to utilize funds for these purposes which the requesting public or private agency would be willing to provide. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to enable the Weather Bureau to accept and use funds provided by State and local governments and private organizations and individuals for special services required by them which cannot be financed from available Weather Bureau resources.

Some instances in which the authorization herein proposed could be utilized for the benefit of local needs are as follows:

1. The State of California is embarking on a large-scale water resources program (headed by its new department of water resources) for which it requires a large increase in precipitation stations, in reporting, in maintenance, and inspection of stations, and in processing of data. The Weather Bureau's responsibility is national, with its available funds actually insufficient to cover the local needs of California. The State is willing to pay for the increase required to meet its needs. The necessary funds cannot be accepted and utilized by the Bureau unless the proposed legislation is enacted.

2. In 1955 the Kansas Water Resources Factfinding and Research Committee recommended to the Governor and legislature a cooperative program with the U.S. Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Weather Bureau, and U.S. Soil Conservation Service for comprehensive research in hydrology of small watersheds, requiring detailed data on all aspects of the water cycle and effects of man's operation. Estimated State funds, $150,000 per year for 20 years, to be matched by Federal funds.

But of the four Federal agencies mentioned, only the Weather Bureau cannot now accept and utilize the State funds.

3. Many thousands of communities on lesser tributaries and in headwater areas suffer devastating flash floods. With the support of the Weather Bureau's national main stem and tributary flood forecasting system and its developing radar network, these communities could be warned effectively in many cases after establishment of special local observational and reporting networks and communications, development of localized forecast and warning procedures, and educational liaison in planning actions based on warnings. The costs may average only a few thousand dollars per community per year. There are thousands of such communities, and the Bureau is able to serve only a token few with its available funds. The job could be done wherever the community felt it was sufficiently needed to pay for it—if the Bureau could accept and use funds made available by the community.

4. Fire-Weather Service of the Weather Bureau is another service which operates on a cost-sharing basis in many instances and which is handicapped in its operation by lack of adequate legislative authority. The service provides day-to-day forecasts and advices during the fire season and issues detailed localized operational forecasts for going fires. The Bureau is subject to a heavy demand from forest protection agencies for an expansion of this service to new areas. In most cases it is unable to provide the needed assistance. Enactment of the proposed legislation would greatly facilitate arrangements to provide additional badly needed services of this nature where Federal funds are not available but State or local governments are willing to help.

5. Agricultural weather services, particularly those requiring highly localized and detailed forecasts and special instrumentation, would be greatly benefited by enactment of the proposed legislation. This type of service cannot be adequately handled through the general forecast service and as a rule it is of direct benefit to a relatively small segment of the population. Accordingly, such services are often arranged on a cost-sharing basis where the recipients of the service assume a share of the costs involved. The Horticultural Protection Service which operates in Florida, California, Washington, Oregon, and a few other States is a good example of a specialized weather service that often uses cost-sharing procedures. Under present law the cooperating agency is limited to furnishing such items as communication expenses and office quarters while the full salary of the employee must be paid by the Federal Government. This seriously limits the number of points where such service can be provided since the major expense must continue to be handled by the Federal Government. The Bureau has had many requests from all parts of the country for more agricultural weather service of the above-mentioned type. Although cost sharing is one good way of furnishing more service of this kind, the Bureau is seriously handicapped by the present inability to utilize funds which the localities would be willing to furnish.

6. The Weather Bureau has, in the past few years, received several requests for special observations and assistance in the field of air pollution. Two specific examples of recent origin are the request from the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District for the reinstitution of intermediate upper air soundings at Santa Monica, Calif., and the request from the San Diego County Air Pollution District for additional wind installations and additional upper air soundings in the vicinity of San Diego. There have been other similar requests in the past. The Bureau has generally met such requests either by declining on the basis of inadequate funds or, where consultation work and a minimum of observations would suffice, arranging for support through other agencies such as the Public Health Service or the Atomic Energy Commission. In light of the increased interest in air pollution, it can be expected that the number of these requests will increase, particularly for specialized observational data such as low-level radiosondes and additional wind measurements. The Bureau will be unable to accommodate most of these requests unless it can accept reimbursement.

On December 22, 1955, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy recommended:

"Continued cooperation with States and municipalities should be encouraged. Such cooperation serves to supplement the basic data programs of the Federal Government in fields in which there is substantial joint interest. State and local participation contributes to the fundamental programs for interpretation, analysis, and research which are primarily national in character, and extend beyond the interests of any single geographical area. Federal matching of State financial support for data programs on a 50–50 basis has been mutually satisfactory and should continue to be a sound basis for such cooperation. * * * Authorization for cooperative participation should be provided if necessary authorization is lacking."

The Bureau cannot provide the cooperation proposed unless legislation is enacted authorizing it to utilize State funds.

Harvey O. Banks, Director of Water Resources, State of California, in supporting legislation such as here proposed, said:

"In many areas, there is need to supplement the basic information now gathered in order that more detailed evaluation may be made of the nature and occurrence of water supplies. California is most vitally interested in the most efficient and complete control and utilization of its water resources to meet the needs of all beneficial uses.

"Therefore, it is the recommendation of the State of California that legislation be enacted by the Congress which would permit agreements permitting cooperative financing between the Weather Bureau and non-Federal agencies under which the trained personnel of the Weather Bureau might be assigned to these cooperative endeavors to obtain and develop information and to make analyses thereof, in addition to that gathered under the Bureau's present basic responsibilities. If this legislation is enacted, we expect to take advantage of it, by entering into such a cooperative agreement at an early date."

Enactment of the bill transmitted herewith will make it possible for the Weather Bureau to provide more effective service to our localities and industry. We urge its prompt favorable consideration by Congress.

CONTRACTS FOR CONDUCT OF RESEARCH IN FIELD OF METEOROLOGY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need in support thereof, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 681) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

On January 6, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS FOR THE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF METEOROLOGY AND TO AUTHORIZE INSTALLATION OF GOVERNMENT TELEPHONES IN CERTAIN PRIVATE RESIDENCES

Section 1 of this proposed legislation would clarify the authority of the Department to enter into research contracts in the various meteorological fields. At present the only specific authority for entering into such projects is contained in section 803 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 783), which authorizes the Department to enter into research contracts with public and private agencies for the purpose of increasing the safety and efficiency of air navigation.

As a result, the Department, rather than relying upon inherent authority to enter into research contracts, places the contracts on the basis that they relate to civil aviation. It would appear to be preferable to recognize the value of research programs in the entire field of meteorology by removing this artificial limitation on such contracts.

In many cases the most efficient method of accomplishing desired research in a particular area of meteorological science is to have all or part of the project contracted out to private agencies, such as universities, in order that their highly specialized research facilities can be utilized. If the Department were to attempt to perform all such research at its own facilities with its own personnel, substantial temporary increases in both facilities and personnel would be required. Research contracts make available the desired facilities and experienced personnel at far less cost to the Government. Enactment of the proposed legislation would constitute recognition of the value of the use of research contracts in all fields of meteorology.

Moreover, it is believed that the enactment of specific legislation authorizing such

contracts would eliminate possible reluctance on the part of contractors to undertake projects not obviously related to aviation meteorology and would stimulate the interest of private organizations in securing such contracts.

Section 2 of this proposed legislation would authorize the expenditure of public money for telephone services installed in private residences for use as the Chief of Bureau may direct in carrying into effect the basic enabling laws authorizing collection and distribution of information on weather conditions throughout the United States, its territories, and possessions. The telephone installations will be made in cases where frequent need can be shown to exist, or isolated location prevents use of public utility communication facilities to contact meteorological personnel for reports of severe storms, floods, etc., and the dissemination of emergency weather warnings, etc.

At many semi-isolated or isolated locations, Weather Bureau field facilities are not open 24 hours daily, and at these locations field employees have little or no requirements for private telephones in their residences which are often Government owned In cases where special weather observations are urgently needed from these stations after normal office hours, or it is urgent that storm warnings or advice be disseminated, there are no telephone facilities now available by which field personnel can be contacted and required reports obtained, or warnings issued. The installation of telephone services in private residences in these instances will insure that emergency meteorological services are available at all locations.

Section 1 of this legislation is merely clarifying in nature and no increase in expenditures would be involved.

Section 2 would involve an estimated expenditure of $8,000 per annum from base appropriation.

PROVISION FOR EXCEPTIONS TO RULES OF NAVIGATION IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 682) to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1961.

The Honorable PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce has prepared and submits herewith, as a part of the legislative program for the 87th Congress, 1st session, a draft of proposed bill to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases.

The proposed legislation is intended to permit the relatively few vessels having lights and day signals which extend vertically above the understructure of a bridge to depart from the rules of navigation that are ordinarily applicable on the particular waterway. It is proposed that the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating be authorized to prescribe such special rules, to be observed by vessels navigating under or near certain bridges, as in his judgment the public safety may require for the prevention of collisions.

The need for legislation along the lines of the proposed bill is established in the Department of Commerce report on Navigational Clearance Requirements for Highway and Railroad Bridges, published in February 1955. The Bureau of Public Roads of this Department has been striving during recent years to obtain reasonable reductions in the navigational clearances required for highway bridges constructed with Federal-aid highway funds, with the objective of reducing the cost of the navigational increment of highway bridges whenever and wherever it is feasible without unduly affecting the reasonable requirements of waterway transportation. One of the problems involved is the need for relatively high navigational clearances to permit vessels engaged in coastal trade to operate on inland waters with navigational lights that conform to the "international rules of the road." The international rules necessitate the carrying of navigational lights at an elevation substantially higher than that required under the rules applicable on inland waters and navigational lights which conform to the International Rules are in some cases permissible and in some cases required on seagoing vessels operating on inland waterways. On the other hand, navigational lights which conform to the rules generally applicable to inland waterways, do not meet the requirements of the international rules.

Studies of bridge costs indicate that substantial amounts of additional funds are required to construct bridges with vertical clearances sufficient to pass vessels equipped with the navigational lights required under international rules over that which is required to pass vessels equipped with the navigational lights required under the rules applicable on inland waters. The matter is also pertinent with respect to movable bridges. In many instances, vessels operating with navigational lights required under the rules applicable on inland waters can pass under existing movable bridges in closed position, but it is necessary to open these bridges for the same or similar vessels if they are equipped with navigational lights required under the international rules. This is particularly important in urban areas where the large volume of highway traffic delayed by the bridge opening results in a substantial economic loss to the community.

It is believed that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in savings in bridge construction and operation costs which would benefit principally the Federal-aid, State, and local highway programs. The proposed legislation, and the special rules that would be issued pursuant thereto, would provide official recognition for effective treatment of a rapidly growing problem in surface transportation relationships.

The enclosed draft bill is identical to a draft bill submitted to the 86th Congress, 2d session, on May 5, 1960, and introduced as S. 3540.

The Department of Commerce recommends this proposed legislation for favorable consideration of the Congress.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget by letter of January 5, 1961, that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this letter to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT OF OATH ON CERTAIN DOCUMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD, together with its enclosure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, with its enclosure, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 683) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter, with enclosure, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress a proposal to eliminate the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Commission as provided in sections 219, 308, and 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219, 308, and 319).

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objectives was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau by its letter dated January 16, 1961, that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the Committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK W. FORD,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, ELIMINATING THE REQUIREMENT OF AN OATH OR AFFIRMATION ON CERTAIN REPORTS AND APPLICATION FORMS SUBMITTED TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (47 U.S.C. 219, 308 AND 319)

The Federal Communications Commission recommends to the Congress the consideration of legislation to amend sections 219, 308, and 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted

to the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to said sections. Affected would be annual and other reports of common carriers required under section 219, and applications for construction permits, station licenses, or modifications or renewals thereof under sections 308 and 319.

The requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Commission imposes a burden on the public, and also on the Commission in those instances where the applicant omits the required oath or affirmation. In such cases the workload of the Commission is increased to the extent necessary to return reports or application forms for the required verification. This slows up the consideration by the Commission of the matters involved and the processing of applications. Inconvenience and delay to the public result.

As a substitute for the oath or affirmation on Commission forms, where presently required, it is proposed to provide thereon a warning similar to the following:

"Willful false statements on this form can be punished by fine or imprisonment" (United States Code, title 18, sec. 1001).

Title 18, section 1001, United States Code, provides that whoever makes any false or fraudulent statements or representations concerning any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. In addition, the Communications Act provides in section 312(a) that a station license or construction permit may be revoked for false statements knowingly made in an application or in any statement of fact which may be required under section 308.

The Commission feels, therefore, that the elimination of the oath or affirmation requirements would not adversely affect its interests in view of the aforementioned provisions of the United States Code and the Communications Act, and accordingly urges the enactment of the proposed legislation.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO PAINTING AND ILLUMINATION OF RADIO TOWERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, together with an explanation of the proposed legislation, in which he requests this measure, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, together with the explanation, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 684) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington D.C., January 19, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress a proposal to amend section 303(q) of the Communications Act to further authorize the Commission to require the prescribed painting and/or illumination of a radio tower until it is dismantled (47 U.S.C. 303(q)).

The Commission's explanation and draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau, by its letter dated January 16, 1961, that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft to the Congress for its consideration.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK W. FORD,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 303 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 (TO REQUIRE THAT ABANDONED RADIO TOWERS CONTINUE TO MEET THE PAINTING AND LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS THAT WOULD BE APPLICABLE IF USED PURSUANT TO LICENSE), 47 UNITED STATES CODE 303(q)

The Commission wishes to recommend at this time for the consideration of the Congress the enactment of legislation amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used pursuant to license issued by the Federal Communications Commission, title 47, United States Code, section 303(q).

Concern has been expresed by aviation interests, both Government and non-Government, and by the general public, over the steadily increasing number of tall antenna towers, particularly those over 1,000 feet, which if left unmarked and standing at any future time, would present a serious hazard to safety in the field of aviation. The current trend toward many high radio antenna towers presents a much more acute problem than that which has existed in the past, due to the much greater speeds attained by modern aircraft and due to the fact that towers built in the past are as a general rule of much less height than those currently being constructed. Furthermore, radio towers, being of latticed construction, are inherently less visible than solid structures such as buildings, water towers, smokestacks, and the like.

This concern about the present potential hazard to aviation safety prompted the Air Coordinating Committee to establish a Joint Industry/Government Tall Structures Committee (JIGTSC) to investigate the problems raised in the joint use of airspace by the aviation and broadcast industries, and to recommend appropriate action establishing the position of the Federal Government in this matter. One of JIGTSC's recommendations was that "the FCC requires the removal or appropriate lighting and marking of unused or abandoned towers if it has such authority, and if such authority does not exist that the FCC seek appropriate legislation to obtain this objective."

This Commission, after study and consideration of this JIGTSC recommendation concluded that it would be of public benefit to require the removal or appropriate lighting and marking of radio towers, both during and subsequent to their use for radio transmitting purposes.

Section 303(q) of the Communications Act currently provides:

"SEC. 303. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the Commission from time to time, as public convenience, interest, or necessity requires shall—

(q) Have authority to require the painting and/or illumination of radio towers if and when in its judgment such towers constitute, or there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute, a menace to air navigation.

The criteria which have been adopted pursuant to this authority against which aeronautical hazard is gaged in particular cases, are set forth in part 17 of the rules of this Commission, concerning the construction, marking, and lighting of antenna towers and supporting structures. In general, these criteria provide that radio towers exceeding 170 feet in height require obstruction marking irrespective of location and under these criteria, the number of radio towers that can be approved without obstruction marking greatly exceeds those requiring such marking. The painting and lighting specifications imposed under part 17, as amended from time to time, provide an adequate vehicle for the protection of aviation interests and otherwise meet the Commission's responsibilities under present law; however, these criteria are applicable at this point only to towers used in connection with authorized radio station operation. Accordingly, these criteria would not be applicable under present law and regulations to towers which have at one time been licensed for use in connection with the transmission of radio communications but which become no longer licensed for that purpose. These towers in this sense become abandoned towers, and create the particular problem now sought to be remedied.

Abandonment can occur by voluntary act of the licensee, as when the licensee is permitted to expire or is submitted for cancellation, or when the licensee fails to contest an order to show cause, in consequence of which the license is revoked. Involuntary abandonment normally results from bankruptcy, death, or other legal disability affecting the licensee. Since the events leading to abandonment normally coincide with expiration, cancellation, or revocation of the station license, the Commission is at that juncture powerless to compel continued obstruction marking by invoking the administrative sanctions normally available to it except those cases where other radio licenses are outstanding in the name of the same person.

Further, the FCC is the Federal agency which has final authority to authorize the construction of towers to be used as part of a licensed radio station operation and has the authority to require the painting and/or illumination of such towers. In addition, the Federal Aviation Agency, which is the Federal agency having primary responsibility over the navigable airspace recognizes the FCC's authority in the field of antenna towers. On page 12 of the FAA and Airspace, issued by the Federal Aviation Agency, August 1959, it states:

"Airspace matters in which FAA has an interest but does not make the final decision.

"The types of airspace cases which fall into this category are:

"1. Applications to the Federal Communications Commission for construction of radio or TV transmitting towers which may involve or create an aeronautical hazard. The final action on these cases is taken by the Federal Communications Commission."

This same legislative proposal was introduced into the 2d session of the 86th Congress as S. 2812 and H.R. 10259. The Senate bill was passed in the Senate on March 28, 1960, and no action was taken in the House on either proposed bill. In a letter dated February 24, 1960, to Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Interstate and For-

eign Commerce Committee, the Federal Aviation Agency commented on this proposal in part stating "the Federal Aviation Agency strongly recommends enactment of S. 2812" and "the Bureau of the Budget has advised that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this report to your committee."

Therefore, it is logical, and orderly administration would appear to dictate, that the FCC deal with the problem of assuring to the greatest extent possible, that radio antenna towers be properly lighted and painted at all times, i.e., both during and subsequent to their use for radio transmitting purposes.

The Commission considers the enactment of this legislation, which has been coordinated with the Air Coordinating Committee and its member agencies, of the utmost importance for facilitating a solution to the problems raised by the joint use of airspace by the aviation and broadcast industries so as to minimize the hazards to aviation safety.

AMENDMENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ACT OF 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 685) to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and analysis presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

There are also enclosed four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

On January 18, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS AND STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION AMENDING COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ACT OF 1948

Section 1(a) amends the act to provide that the number of officers on active duty as authorized in the annual appropriation acts shall be an average number rather than a maximum number.

This is a restatement into substantive law of a provision included in the annual appropriation act for the past 2 years.

Section 1(b) would delete the proviso that authorizes permanent promotions to lieutenant (junior grade) after 2 years' service when there are vacancies in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade). The reason for this section will be discussed under section 1(d).

Section 1(c) merely changes the numbering of sections.

Section 1(d) would add a new section 12 to the act. Subsection (a) of the new section would authorize temporary appointment by the President alone in the grade of ensign. At the present time there is no authority for appointment in the grade of ensign until the appointment is confirmed by the Senate. At times the names are not known sufficiently in advance to obtain this confirmation before the reporting date and it is necessary to appoint candidates temporarily in the noncommissioned rating of deck officer. Additional paperwork is involved in separating them from that rating and appointing them as ensigns when confirmed by the Senate. Temporary appointments as ensign would avoid this difficulty and would also permit the temporary appointment as ensign of officers recruited and appointed at times when the Congress is not in session. Another important factor is that military obligation under the Universal Military Training Act may be met by service as a commissioned officer in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, but not by service as a deck officer. Hence we may recruit, appoint an officer as deck officer, send him to his new assignment, complete a large part of his early training and then have him called by Selective Service before he can be commissioned.

Subsection (b) of the new section would permit the temporary promotion of officers in the permanent grade of ensign to lieutenant (junior grade) when vacancies exist in the higher grades. The present restriction of 2 years' service as ensign when there are vacancies in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) places the Coast and Geodetic Survey at a disadvantage with the other services and the Civil Service in recruiting personnel as their regulations permit an earlier promotion. Adoption of this subsection would make subsection (b) of this bill desirable. Permanent promotion to lieutenant (junior grade) would be made upon completion of 3 years' service which is comparable to the other services.

Subsection (c) of the new section would authorize a one-grade temporary promotion of any officer when deemed desirable or necessary by the Secretary of Commerce. At times officers with special qualifications are assigned to duty with other services or to special projects where it would be desirable that they hold a rank higher than their permanent grade in order to carry out their assigned duties properly and to give them rank commensurate with their responsibilities. Such a promotion would be terminated upon change of assignment.

Section 1(e) of the bill would renumber section 12 of the act and would amend the section to authorize discretionary 20-year retirement in lieu of the discretionary 30-year retirement now authorized. In spite of the fact that this provision would authorize retirements 10 years earlier than now authorized, we believe it would result in retaining capable officers in the service for longer periods of service. During the 5-year period 1953 through 1957 56 officers resigned from the service. Thirty-seven of these officers resigned with less than 3 years service. This group would include those who were obviously misfits or definitely dissatisfied with a service life. The other 19, or one-third of the officers resigning during this period, remained in the service from 3 to 8 years. Promotion opportunities because of limited room at the top discourages these officers from remaining in the service for at least 30 years in order to obtain retirement benefits; whereas, if 20-year retirement were available, we believe a large number of these officers would remain on duty and provide us with the bulwark of younger experienced officers, the lack of which is now hampering the operations of the Bureau.

Subsection (f) is a redesignation of numbers without change.

Subsection (g) would authorize shipment at Government expense of a personally owned vehicle when an officer is ordered to make a permanent change of station. At the present time, when our officers are ordered to duty outside the continental United States it is necessary for them to ship their automobiles at personal expense. At this time, in most places, an automobile is a necessity rather than a luxury and the requirement that shipment be made at personal expense imposes an undue burden on the personnel involved. In a recent decision, the Comptroller General held that authority for shipment at Government expense which is applicable to members of the Armed Forces is not applicable to officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Our officers are paid on the same compensation plan and subject to the same moves as members of the Armed Forces and we believe, as a matter of justice, they should not be forced to bear this additional expense personally. Public Law 86-707, approved September 6, 1960, authorizes the shipment of an automobile for civilian officers and employees of the Government and to the best of our knowledge the only Federal employees who are not authorized to ship a personally owned automobile at Government expense on an oversea permanent change of station are commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service.

Section 2 would authorize credit for service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for purposes of civil service retirement the same as now credited members of the Armed Forces. This subsection would place service as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey within the meaning of the term "military service" for the purposes of that act as it is now credited for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Section 3 would authorize the payment of a special money allowance to the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. At the present time this special allowance is payable to the chiefs of all the other uniformed services to cover special and exceptional expenses incurred because of their position. The Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey is frequently required to entertain visiting foreign officials who visit the Bureau for consultation purposes and having no allowance for this purpose is either put to considerable personal expense or placed in the embarrassing position of being forced to shirk obvious social obligations.

Section 4 would authorize the settlement of claims for loss or damage to the personal property of an officer incident to his service. Under present authority when an officer moves on a permanent change of station and personal property is damaged in the move, his only relief is action against the mover. In most cases the effects go into temporary storage resulting in such a division of responsibility that all parties deny liability for the damage generally resulting in the individual being forced to take the loss. Adoption of this section would permit the Government to settle such claims and not force the individual to absorb them the same as is now authorized for members of the Armed Forces.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR RETURN OF HEIRLESS PROPERTY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to authorize a $500,000 lump-sum settlement of all claims of so-called successor organizations for return of heirless property which was vested during World War II. The bill is cosponsored by Senator JAVITS and Senator KEFAUVER.

A brief explanation of the provisions of the present Trading With the Enemy Act will, I believe, make clear the meritorious purpose of the bill. Originally, the Trading With the Enemy Act provided for the vesting of all property of German nationals in this country. Immediately after the war, provision was made for return of property to German nationals who had been subject to persecution on grounds of race, religion or political belief. Since in many cases the beneficiaries of this legislation had been exterminated by the Nazis, a large amount of this property remained unclaimed. In 1954 an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act was enacted with bipartisan sponsorship and support to provide for the return of such heirless property up to a maximum of $3 million to so-called successor organizations which were to use the proceeds for the relief and rehabilitation of needy surviving persecutees in the United States. The purpose of the bill we are today introducing is to provide for a lump-sum settlement of all such claims in the amount of $500,000.

The bill has obvious merit. On the basis of the best governmental and nongovernmental information available when the Trading With the Enemy Act was amended in 1954 a ceiling of $3 million was placed on payments for heirless property. This sum is now being reduced to only $500,000. During the hearings last session before our Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee it was indicated that one claim alone, if it were subject to proof in the normal course, might amount to $1 million. It is almost certain that the actual amount of heirless property is far in excess of the $500,000 provided for in this bill.

It should be made clear that none of the money involved in this measure would come out of the U.S. Treasury. It will all come from assets vested from persecuted German and other nationals which would have been returned to the victims of persecution under the provisions of existing law if they were still alive or if any living heirs could be traced. It should be noted also that all of the money involved under this measure would go to help needy victims of persecution now in the United States, and that no part of the proceeds could be used for legal or similar expenses.

Legislation identical to this bill was approved by the House of Representatives and was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in the last session of Congress. In our haste to adjourn in September the bill was never motioned up for consideration in the Senate and was allowed to die on the calendar.

Mr. President, I hope we will give this bill prompt approval and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 708) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to provide for certain payments for relief and rehabilitation of needy victims of Nazi persecution, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEATING for himself, Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 32(h) of the Trading With the Enemy Act is amended by striking out all that follows the first sentence in the first paragraph down through the third paragraph, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of any organization not so designated before the date of enactment of this amendment, such organization may be so designated only if it applies for such designation within three months after such date of enactment.

"The President, or such officer as he may designate, shall, before the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this amendment, pay out of the War Claims Fund to organizations designated before or after the date of enactment of this amendment pursuant to this subsection the sum of $500,000. If there is more than one such designated organization, such sum shall be allocated among such organizations in the proportions in which the proceeds of heirless property were distributed, pursuant to agreements to which the United States was a party, by the Intergovernmental Committee for Refugees and successor organizations thereto. Acceptance of payment pursuant to this subsection by any such organization shall constitute a full and complete discharge of all claims filed by such organization pursuant to this section, as it existed before the date of enactment of this amendment.

"No payment may be made to any organization designated under this section unless it has given firm and responsible assurances approved by the President that (1) the payment will be used on the basis of need in the rehabilitation and settlement of persons in the United States who suffered substantial deprivation of liberty or failed to enjoy the full rights of citizenship within the meaning of subdivisions (C) and (D) of subsection (a)(2) of this section; (2) it will make to the President, with a copy to be furnished to the Congress, such reports (including a detailed annual report on the use of the payment made to it) and permit such examination of its books as the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, may from time to time require; and (3) it will not use any part of such payment for legal fees, salaries, or other administrative expenses connected with the filing of claims for such payment or for the recovery of any property or interest under this section."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 33 of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows "whichever is later" and inserting a period.

SEC. 3. Section 39 of such Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new sentence: "Immediately upon the enactment of this sentence, the Attorney General shall cover into the Treasury of the United States, for deposit into the War Claims Fund, from property vested in or transferred to him under this Act, the sum of $500,000 to make payments authorized under section 32 (h) of this Act."

U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 13 and 20, 1961, the names of Senators ANDERSON, BEALL, BIBLE, BOGGS, BYRD of West Virginia, CARROLL, CLARK, CHAVEZ, FONG, GRUENING, HARTKE, HICKEY, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, KEFAUVER, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, McGEE, MONRONEY, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, PASTORE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, SCOTT, STENNIS, YARBOROUGH, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 407) to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. ENGLE) on January 13, 1961.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 17, 1961, the names of Senators ALLOTT, BIBLE, BLAKLEY, CANNON, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, COOPER, CURTIS, DWORSHAK, ENGLE, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, McCARTHY, MORSE, MOSS, MUNDT, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, SCHOEPPEL, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 454) to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, until March 31, 1965, introduced by Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. McGEE) on January 17, 1961.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, when S. 454, the bill to extend the National Wool Act, was printed, the name of the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] were inadvertently not printed. I ask that at the next printing of this bill the names of the Senators from California and Colorado be added to the cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 469) to establish a Commission on Country Life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STRENGTHENING OF LAWS AGAINST ORGANIZED CRIME—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 23, 1961, the names of Senators FONG, BUSH, BUTLER, and KEATING, were added as additional co-

sponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. WILEY, on January 23, 1961:

S. 523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow criminal expenditures;

S. 524. A bill to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 525. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act;

S. 526. A bill to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith;

S. 527. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia; and

S. 528. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last week I introduced S. 587, to amend the Internal Revenue Code. I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, S. 80, introduced by my colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill provides increases in compensation of food-service workers and laundry workers under the Veterans' Administration. An identical bill, S. 2973, introduced during the last Congress, was sent to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the consideration of S. 80 and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing of the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, called for by Senate Resolution 267, 86th Congress, 2d session, be extended from January 31, 1961, to February 21, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS (S. DOC. NO. 10)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in order to maintain a continuity of the official record of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects authorized by the Congress in 1956—Public Law 485, 84th Congress, 70 Stat. 105—I have requested unanimous consent each following year that the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior be printed as a Senate document together with pertinent comments, and I so request for the fourth annual report with illustrations.

In connection with the fourth annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, subsequent developments of an official character are pertinent to the record of this vast multiple-purpose development in addition to the historical construction and related phases of the most extensive project ever authorized under the reclamation law in 1902. I also request that this material be included as a part of the document.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the approval of former Secretary Seaton be printed in the RECORD, as well as in the document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in addition to the inclusion of the fourth annual report in the document, I also request unanimous consent that there be included with my remarks the following:

First. A copy of a news release dated January 17, 1961, issued by the then Secretary of the Interior relating to the establishment of average power rates on the Colorado River storage project together with my introduction. This action includes the establishment of power rates for the Colorado River storage project and for all Federal construction of a transmission system for this project.

Second. The complete text of the recommendations of Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy to the then Secretary Fred A. Seaton relating to recommendations approved by Mr. Seaton in connection with the transmission system and the rates to be assessed thereon. The material referred to in paragraph second to be printed in document only.

Unanimous consent is also requested for inclusion for printing in the attachments a copy of a map showing the proposed transmission system of the Colorado River storage project linking points in the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming.

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS MADE AND PENDING

The total investment in the Colorado River storage project as of June 30, 1960, as shown by the fourth annual report of the Secretary was $136,791,193.

Appropriations for fiscal year 1961 totaled $58,700,000, and for fiscal year 1962, the Bureau of the Budget recommendation is for $60,700,000 net for the Colorado River storage project. Thus, subject to the action in the first session of the 87th Congress, the total investment in the Colorado River storage project at the conclusion of the current session of Congress will be $256,291,930.

HIGHLIGHTS OF FORMER INTERIOR SECRETARY SEATON'S APPROVAL ON JANUARY 17, 1961, OF FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF BACKBONE TRANSMISSION SYSTEM OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

1. Approves recommendation of Reclamation Commissioner Dominy for construction of all Federal transmission systems linking Grand Canyon (Arizona), Flaming Gorge (Utah), and Curecanti (Colorado) hydroelectric plants.

2. The power marketing area to be linked by the Colorado system would extend from Pilot Butte Dam in Wyoming southward to Heber and Vernal, Utah, southeasterly linking with Green Mountain Dam, thence to the Gunnison and Montrose area of Colorado to link with the Curecanti project in Colorado, thence southwesterly to Four Corners, thence westerly to Glen Canyon Dam and powerplant in Arizona and southerly to the Phoenix substation in Arizona. Lesser voltage lines would link the system with Sigurd, Utah, and Fredonia on the border between Arizona and Utah. Another 230-kilowatt line would extend from Four Corners southeasterly to Albuquerque, N. Mex.

3. An average rate of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour for firm energy is proposed; 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour for nonfirm energy and $15 per kilowatt-year for peaking capacity. The estimated construction of the Federal system approximates $186 million.

4. The statement rejects the proposal of the privately owned utilities of the area for the construction of the greater part of the transmission system saying that "an analysis would more heavily favor all Federal construction in that the power allocation and irrigation allocation would be repaid in less time and the irrigation assistance would be available at an earlier date and in larger quantities" under the proposal of the private utilities.

5. The reclamation proposal approved by former Secretary Seaton provides for selling power at 6 mills under Federal construction of the transmission system as compared with 6.57 mills under the utility proposal.

Appropriations proposed in budget for Colorado River storage project and participating projects for fiscal year 1962

Project:	*Fiscal year 1962*
Curecanti unit, Colorado	$4,557,000
Flaming Gorge unit, Utah-Wyoming	11,741,000
Glen Canyon unit, Arizona-Utah	39,825,740
Navajo unit, New Mexico	4,980,000
Transmission division	8,673,000
Participating projects:	
Central Utah, Vernal unit, Utah	1,083,000
Florida, Colo	2,777,000
Hammond, N. Mex	1,334,000
Paonia, Colo	330,000
Seedskadee, Wyo	5,711,000
Smith Fork, Colo	2,027,000
Advance planning	1,179,000
Total (including carryover)	84,217,740

ESTIMATED COST OF OVERALL PROJECT

The estimated construction cost of the Colorado River storage project including participating projects as set forth in the report on S. 500, 84th Congress, 1st session, $1,658,460,100. The construction and operation and maintenance authorized by Public Law 485, 84th Congress, 2d session, is $760 million.

This authorized total includes Glen Canyon Dam and powerplant, Flaming Gorge

Dam and powerplant, Curecanti dams and powerplant, and the Navajo storage reservoir. Participating projects authorized include Central Utah (initial phase), Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including Minnesota unit, etc., and other necessary works), Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork. Other participating projects and additional features which are included in the estimated overall costs of $1,658,460,100 are subject to further authorization by the Congress before construction begins.

The construction contemplated in the $760 million authorized limitation includes the three power projects—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Curecanti—the Navajo Dam storage project, and certain participating units. The estimated cost of the transmission system approximates $180 million which with related transmission facilities may run the total cost of the transmission to more than $200 million.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LOUIS FALK OBERDORFER, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, February 6, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on the nomination of Louis Falk Oberdorfer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on January 23 I addressed the Senate on the subject of our budgetary problems, stressing the seriousness of our unfavorable balance of payments and stating that those monetary problems precluded the free and uninhibited resort to deficit spending to relieve current and, we hope, temporary unemployment. Naturally, it highly gratified me to find in the report of the President's task force, which is composed of Gov. Allan Sproul, chairman, Professor McCracken, of the University of Michigan, and Professor Blough, of Columbia University, entitled "The Economic Situation in the Balance of Payments," released by the President on January 26, that the views I had previously expressed concerning the grave danger of inflationary spending were fully endorsed by that distinguished group of monetary experts.

In order that all Members of Congress who have not had an opportunity to read that 22-page report may have a better understanding of the findings and recommendations of the Sproul Committee, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some of its pertinent paragraphs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our suggestions relate primarily to fiscal policy, monetary policy, price and cost policy, and foreign economic policy, all of which have to bear some of the burden of improving economic conditions at home and supporting the prestige and power of the United States around the world.

It is in preparation for an understanding of our welding together of the national and international aspects of problems and policies, that it may be helpful to specify certain broad general opinions which have conditioned our approach.

Economic growth

Whatever the longer future may hold in terms of the rate of growth of real product of our economy per capita, and we would hope that it can gradually be accelerated, this is not the answer to our clear and present problems at home and abroad.

Fiscal policy

We think that fiscal policy, despite certain elements of inflexibility, must play an enlarged role in modifying swings and trends in our economy, and that in seeking to have it play this role the Federal budget should move around balance, not always remain in balance. If the compensatory character of the budget is to be maintained, however, it should be in surplus during times of maximum employment and production as well as in deficit during times of recession; this requires control of expenditures when revenue is coming in strongly even more than when revenues are declining, if we are to avoid an alternation of poorly timed slim surpluses and poorly timed excessive deficits.

Monetary policy

We believe that monetary policy may have been asked to play too large a role in combating cyclical variations in economic activity and secular trends which have had some of their roots in structural defects and structural developments, and in fiscal deficiencies. We also believe, however, that monetary policy is of key importance in the present situation which involves compatibility of domestic programs and international financial relations.

Balance of payments

We do not think that the limits now imposed on our domestic freedom of action by our balance of payments position is a factor which involves countenancing continued high unemployment or which prevents constructive action to promote domestic economic recovery. The restraints of our balance of payments position, presently accentuated by temporary influences, are such as should help to keep undesirable domestic trends from developing to or beyond the point of no return.

THE DOMESTIC ECONOMIC SITUATION

The year 1961 opened against the backdrop of a slow decline in production and disappointing developments in employment that had begun about mid-1960. The total output of goods and services is estimated to have been at an annual rate of $503.5 billion in the fourth quarter of 1960, or 0.3 percent below the second quarter peak.

* * * * *

Sources of current economic strength

In spite of sharp declines during December, the recession thus far has been a relatively mild one. The declines in measures of business conditions generally have been less than during periods of comparable length in the two preceding recessions. Usually the magnitude of a decline at this stage in a recession is a good clue to its ultimate severity. We must be on the alert for unexpected developments, but so far the current recession has not developed in a way suggesting a cumulative, further severe decline in business activity.

Government units at all levels will be increasing their expenditures through the year. State and local governments have been quite responsive to the pressing need for the facilities and services for which they are primarily responsible, increasing their outlays recently at the annual rate of 8 to 10 percent. Something like this increase seems evident for the year ahead. And it seems probable that the rise in Federal outlays will be somewhat more than the increase during the last year.

If our appraisal up to this point is realistic, purchases of goods and services by consumers should continue at about current levels, with the probability of some increases after the early part of the year. Employment will continue high, though there will be slack in the labor force. Consumers' incomes after taxes have been well maintained even during the recession. The moderate extent of the rise in consumer borrowing last year, and present credit conditions, mean that financing will be readily available for the purchase of houses and other items of consumer capital goods. While empirical evidence bearing on the buying intentions and attitudes of consumers does not suggest bullish sentiment, neither is there evidence of such a plunge in consumer confidence as had already occurred at this stage of the last recession. Intentions to buy have dropped somewhat below year-earlier levels, but attitudes generally (as measured by surveys) indicate that basic confidence has not deteriorated significantly from that of last summer.

* * * * *

The outlook for 1961

What does this analysis indicate for the probable course of economic developments during the year ahead? The evidence available to us in January suggests two conclusions as bases for economic policy in the months ahead. First, the current contraction still appears to be in the family of the relatively mild recessions that have characterized the postwar period. It does not yet look like a cumulative, severe recession. Second, we must assume that the decline in business activity has further to run, though the bottom of the recession could turn out to be not very far below the current level of business activity.

Even if we are not too far from the low point, are we probably going to have a delayed or weak upturn and recovery? This is a question that understandably is of considerable concern, though one that cannot and need not be given a conclusive answer at this point.

Clearly there are no obvious things that guarantee a strong upsurge, such as deferred demands for automobiles, a heavy expansion in housing, or quite large increases in Government spending. Experience, however, teaches us to be cautious about assuming that elements of strength will not be present during the next upturn just because they were not clearly visible during the preceding recession. Three years ago there was also considerable pessimism engendered by the absence of obvious sources of major strength; yet the economic situation turned around fairly early in the year and moved upward vigorously for a time.

It may be useful, in attempting to gage the probable vigor of the next upturn, to examine the course the economy has traced out in these other similar periods. In the year following the low quarters in 1954 and again in 1958 gross national product increased somewhat over 9 percent. Even if the force of the upturn, this time, should turn out to be somewhat less than in these earlier periods, and there is as yet no cer-

tainty about this, our output of goods and services by the end of this year should be measurably above that of the final quarter of 1960.

Would this be a good performance for the economy in 1961? In a very real sense, this question must be answered in the affirmative. It would mean that the contraction in business activity would have been small, and that business conditions during much of the current year would be improving. On the other hand it would also mean that the year would be one of continued slack in the labor force, with employment even by the end of 1961 still short of what would be needed to provide reasonably full utilization of our productive resources. This would be true because the labor force will expand by perhaps 1 to 1½ percent, productivity should rise, and we begin with some slack in employment. Unemployment would be declining, but it would still be above normal minimum levels, and it would still pose an important problem of economic growth and human welfare.

The present domestic economic situation and an assessment of its immediate prospects, then, seem to call quite simply for expansionist economic policies. At this point, however, we confront another and for this country a new problem in the consideration of policies to expand the domestic economy, namely, the disequilibrium in our balance of payments. Can we afford to adopt policies that would have the effect of enlarging the demand for output? Would a policy of economic expansion further aggravate the substantial excess of payments to the rest of the world over our receipts—with possibly a loss of gold at an increasing rate? These are the questions we have been asking ourselves as a Nation. And in making suggestions about the structure of an appropriate economic policy for this country in 1961, clearly we must take into account this disequilibrium of recent years in our balance of payments. It is to this matter that we now turn.

THE DISEQUILIBRIUM IN THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

In the present system of international trade and finance, the United States plays the dual role of trader and banker. Because it is the world's most powerful trading nation, it has consistently taken the lead in establishing conditions for the vigorous expansion of international trade throughout the free world. In its role as banker for the world, the United States has made billions of dollars freely available to serve as monetary reserves for other countries. In both these roles, as trader and as banker, the United States has a commitment to the promotion of liberal trading practices, and to a strong and stable international financial structure.

With the remarkable recovery and expansion of the rest of the industrialized world, during the past decade, the United States can no longer take for granted, however, the automatic fitting together of its trading position and its banking responsibilities. This means it must be concerned with the size and frequency of whatever deficits occur in its balance of payments. The cumulative force of developments has now clearly brought into view a new position, and the need for new decisions in the formulation of public policy—the recognition that, in general, our performance as a trader and our performance as a banker must be reconciled with a balance of payments position that will support both roles. We have not reached a crisis. We have reached a turning point in our world economic position, one that calls for fresh analysis and determined action. The objective, of course, is to play our proper part in the preservation of a growing system of free trade and payments in the world at large. Our pivotal place in that system calls for more exacting choices, but it also provides the prospect of greater opportunity, in helping to strengthen economic and financial ties among the countries of the free world.

Here then, are the facts which must be faced.

With the exception of the year 1957 the United States has had a deficit in its balance of international payments in every year since 1949. For the whole 11-year period, 1950–60, the cumulative net deficit was $21 billion, an average of nearly $2 billion a year. The present concern with the balance of payments is related particularly to the fact that half of the total deficit was experienced in the most recent 3 years, 1958–60, and that during this period there was an outflow of gold of nearly $5 billion.

The recent general pattern of the U.S. balance of payments includes a large surplus in the current account (goods, services, and investment income), while both the private capital account and the Government account usually show deficits which, together, have exceeded the current account surplus, resulting in a final net deficit. The combination of conditions has changed from year to year, and although the final size of the deficit was nearly the same for 1958, 1959, and 1960, the particular classes of transactions giving rise to the deficits were markedly different, as is seen when the balance of payments statement is examined in detail.

Current account

In 1960, the trade balance (merchandise exports minus merchandise imports) showed an estimated surplus of $4.5 billion, compared with $0.9 billion in 1959, and $3.3 billion in 1958. These wide fluctuations in trade surplus were the consequence of changes in both exports and imports. In 1960, merchandise exports (excluding Government transfers of military materiel, since these do not affect the balance of payments) were an estimated $19.5 billion, a new all-time peak, compared with $16.2 billion in 1959 and $16.3 billion in 1958.

Shifts in the amounts of U.S. exports and in its export position, especially in 1959 and 1960, were greatly influenced by the comparative business conditions prevailing in the United States and in other countries. The good showing of 1960 was due at least in part to rapid economic expansion in much of Europe and Japan, while the U.S. economy was moving into a recession. There was also a diminution in the discriminatory restrictions imposed abroad against goods from the United States.

Merchandise imported by the United States (excluding military spending abroad by the Government) totaled an estimated $15 billion in 1960, compared with $15.3 billion in 1959, and $13 billion in 1958. During the course of 1960 the rate of imports decreased somewhat as business activity in the United States leveled off and declined. The receipts and payments on service transactions showed a net surplus for the United States over the 3 years, amounting to $1.1 billion in 1960, $1.3 billion in 1959, and $1.7 billion in 1958.

Private capital account

The private capital account includes the changes in U.S. private investments (direct business investment, stocks and bonds, loans, and deposits) that affect the balance of payments, as well as changes in foreign long-term investment here. Income of foreign business subsidiaries that is not declared as dividends does not enter into the U.S. international balance of payments.

The recorded net outflow of private capital was an estimated $3.1 billion in 1960, $1.8 billion in 1959, and $2.8 billion in 1958. There is reason to believe that the actual net outflow in 1960 was larger than this recorded amount of $3.1 billion. There are many transactions which the system of collecting information on international private capital movements does not reach; it is believed that changes from year to year in the amount of errors and omissions in the balance of payments statement are largely a reflection of such transactions. The estimated $1.6 billion change in errors and omissions, from plus $0.8 billion in 1959 to minus $0.8 billion in 1960, for example, may well represent, mostly if not entirely, capital outflow which should be added to the recorded net outflow for 1960, thereby possibly raising the figure for net private capital outflow to nearly $5 billion.

* * * * *

Government account

A major element in the balance of payments of the United States since the war has been governmental loans and grants to foreign countries, together with U.S. military expenditures overseas. The total of grants, net loans (loans minus repayments), and military spending abroad amounted to an estimated $5.2 billion in 1960, $5.1 billion in 1959, and $6 billion in 1958. While the relative shares of different kinds of transactions have changed over the years, the total figure has remained fairly stable; compared with 1960 it was a little higher in 1949, lower from 1950 to 1955, and somewhat higher from 1956 through 1958. These governmental transactions, accordingly, have not contributed to the enlargements, in recent years, of the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, but they remain a continuing heavy charge on our international accounts in an increasingly competitive world economy.

Under present policy, a considerable part of the governmental grants and loans are spent directly for goods in the United States; the military expenditures abroad, however, result in placing unrestricted dollars in the hands of foreign holders.

The balance of payments outlook for 1961

The forces affecting the balance of payments are worldwide in character and include not only economic factors but also shifts in governmental policies of this and other countries. Moreover, since the balance of payments represents the residual settlement of offsetting transactions, its fluctuations show much greater amplitude than do the fluctuations in the transactions themselves. Accordingly, the balance of payments deficit or surplus that will be realized in any particular year is impossible to forecast with any degree of reliability.

We do believe, however, that with favorable circumstances a substantial improvement in the U.S. balance of payments may be realized in 1961. Even so, the problem of the basic deficit will remain. According to the best available evidence this basic or average expected deficit, with no change in our policies, would be about $2 billion.

The concern over the balance of payments

It was not until 1958 and thereafter that the deficit in the balance of payments came to be looked on as a matter for concern. In 1957 there had been a small surplus and an inflow of gold. The deficits of the earlier years had been welcomed as easing the dollar shortage and supplying other countries with badly needed monetary and foreign exchange reserves. The three large deficits of 1958, 1959, and 1960, accompanied by an outflow of gold totaling $4.7 billion for the 3 years, and amounting to $1.2 billion (excluding a special gold transaction) in the last 3 months of 1960, demonstrated that what had earlier been a source of benefit and strength to the rest of the world had now become, in the minds of many, a cause for questions and even of misgivings about the financial future of the United States.

One of the questions which recent experience has raised is whether the United States will be able to achieve viable equilibrium in its international payments position, without taking drastic steps such as increasing restrictions on imports, sharply reducing its worldwide military and economic programs, imposing exchange controls, or devaluing the dollar.

The special position of the United States in the world, which has resulted in the United States supporting large overseas military expenditures and grants for mutual defense, and loans and grants to promote economic stability and development in other countries, and in encouraging a substantial flow of private foreign investment, places a heavy load on the U.S. balance of payments. To carry this load, and at the same time maintain equilibrium in its balance of payments, the United States is obliged to develop a current account surplus of proportionately greater dimensions than do most other countries and greater than the United States enjoyed in the prewar years.

The second question is whether the volume of liquid dollar liabilities of the United States is already so great that, in some period of low confidence and fiscal stress, the gold reserves of the United States might be insufficient to meet the demand for gold, necessitating exchange controls or even devaluation.

The fact that the United States is on balance a creditor nation, with a net international investment position that improved substantially during the 1950's, is no answer to the problem. The great bulk of U.S. assets abroad are privately owned, and are long-term investments, and some are payable in inconvertible currencies. They are not available to offset or repay short-term liabilities.

Both of these questions carry the implied misgiving that the United States might not continue indefinitely to honor its commitment to allow foreign governments and central banks to buy gold from the U.S. Treasury without limit or restraint at the present price of $35 an ounce—a cornerstone of our banking responsibility.

There is general agreement that the basic deficit in the U.S. balance of payments needs to be substantially reduced, because it would be risky to let our short term or liquid dollar liabilities rise indefinitely at the recent rate. Since we believe there will be no early need to increase international liquidity further, the goal of U.S. policy, at least for the near future, should be to demonstrate that the country can achieve balance-of-payments equilibrium on the average, although, of course, not in every year. This means that the United States needs to find ways of increasing its international receipts or decreasing its international payments, or some combination of the two, so that our international financial position will not continue to be clouded by the persistence of annual deficits of the magnitude of those experienced during the past decade.

This is not likely to be an easy task, in view of the increases in productivity in other industrial countries and the growing international competition for markets; but for a country with annual international transactions totaling more than $60 billion it ought to be well within our capacity to accomplish if each type of transaction makes a contribution.

* * * * *

The gold outflow

The most visible and publicly disturbing problem of recent months has been that various official foreign holders of dollars have come to prefer gold to increased dollar balances or, quite starkly, to prefer gold to dollars. An outflow of gold in the amounts and at the rate of recent movements could impair or destroy the ability of the U.S. dollar to serve as a principal world currency and thus break down the international monetary system which has been slowly and laboriously built up during the past 15 years, and which it is in the interest of all countries in the free world to maintain and strengthen.

Yet, paradoxically, it is the fear that such a breakdown might happen which has caused some central banks to seek to safeguard their reserve position and reduce the possibility of loss to their governments, and of criticism of themselves, if the dollar should be devalued, by increasing the ratio of their gold reserves to their dollar holdings.

The sense of uncertainty which this outflow created has also stimulated speculative private hoarding of gold and has resulted in gyrations in the price of gold on the London gold market, which strengthened speculative fevers and fears. U.S. gold has moved into private hoards abroad, through legal gold markets, when central banks have sold gold in these markets and replenished their holdings by buying gold from the U.S. Treasury.

At the end of 1960 free gold held by the United States was $6.2 billion, and its outstanding liquid dollar liabilities were an estimated $19.1 billion, not including dollar deposits and U.S. Government securities held by international financial institutions. The gold required by law to be held as a reserve against Federal Reserve currency and deposits was $11.6 billion and, if this requirement should be repealed, free gold holdings and total gold holdings would be the same. The usable gold stock would then be 93 percent of foreign short-term liabilities. This is a relatively large reserve and should be adequate to meet all demands as long as there is confidence in the dollar, since dollar balances have the advantage of earning a return while gold holdings are a charge on the holder. The fundamental interest of government and private citizens alike, in this country and abroad, in the proper working of an international monetary system, make it a first task of economic statesmanship to dispel present fears about the value of the dollar.

1. Psychologically, what is needed is a strong affirmation by the President-in-office that we are going to maintain the present gold value of the dollar, and that we shall use whatever resources are necessary to this end; that we are not going to tinker with the dollar and that we are not going to interfere with the movement of funds between this country and foreign countries by way of exchange controls.

2. To support this declaration of intent we should remind our own nationals, and those of other countries, that we still have a large amount of free gold reserves (approximately $6.2 billion), that these reserves can be substantially increased by exercising our rights and privileges at the International Monetary Fund (up to possibly $4 billion), and that we have a "hidden reserve" in the form of the gold stock which is being held as backing for the note and deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks (approximately $11.6 billion). The logic of the suggestion that these legal reserve requirements might now be revoked so that our reserves would be able to serve, unreservedly, in meeting temporary swings in foreign preferences for gold or dollars when our balance of payments is in "deficit," is impressive. We do not think that a reduction or the elimination of these legal reserve requirements has become necessary, but we would support the action if the Government should decide that now is the "appropriate time."

3. Actions which we think should clearly be taken now are:

(a) Pursue effectively the things which the previous administration has already ordered to conserve dollar expenditures abroad in behalf of our Armed Forces and in connection with our foreign economic aid programs. Since much of our foreign economic aid now takes the form of "tied loans" the principal benefit here should be found in our military expenditures.

(b) Pursue effectively removal of continued discriminatory practices of whatever kind which help to keep dollar goods out of foreign markets and foreign capital out of the United States. It is particularly important to try to prevent the common-market concept, now taking form among various countries, from becoming a focus of trade discrimination unfavorable to us.

(c) Accelerate efforts to devise public action and induce private action which will create an export climate in this country and a competitive urge to profit by it, along with a recognition that increasingly intense competition from foreign producers in both domestic and foreign markets places a high priority on rising productivity, stable costs and prices, and the development of new and improved products. A critical factor in our balance of payments, in the years ahead, will be our trade surplus.

(d) Demand a larger participation of other advanced countries in the financial requirements of our common defense. The mission of Mr. Anderson and Mr. Dillon to West Germany in December was necessary and in pursuance of previous negotiation, and it is regrettable that it was misrepresented as an unsuccessful begging mission.

(e) Take steps to remove the tax incentives which are promoting private capital investment abroad in the industrially developed countries many of which, with our help, have regained their economic strength. Movements of private capital to and retention of earnings in such countries should now be left to the attractions of direct market advantage.

(f) Reduce the amount of foreign goods which returning tourists may bring into the United States free of duty, for reasons of equity if not for substantial savings.

(g) Continue the prohibition against the holding of gold abroad by nationals of the United States, recently announced by our Government and, perhaps, advance the effective date. The disruptive nature of whatever outflow of funds results from such purchases, and the patent inequities of prohibiting domestic gold hoards while permitting them abroad, warrants attempting to place all of our citizens on an even footing in this regard.

* * * * *

Domestic economic policy

The task of domestic economic policy for the year ahead will be unusually complex. It must contribute to a vigorous, sustainable domestic recovery and expansion, but it must be carried out at a time when actions will also be needed to strengthen our balance of payments position. Both are essential. We cannot rest content if equilibrium in our balance of payments is achieved only by maintaining excessive unemployment. On the other hand, actions designed to force domestic expansion without regard to our external transactions would be equally unwise. They would almost certainly seriously weaken international confidence in the dollar, and they would create inflationary pressures and inflationary fears, even though the process would start with unemployed resources. It is within this framework that we make our specific suggestions.

1. Fiscal policy: The current disequilibrium in our balance of payments highlights the need for more reliance on fiscal or budget policy and less on monetary policy. If more stimulus is needed, it should come heavily from the budget side instead of through such measures of credit policy as would activate another outflow of short term funds to other countries. It is, however, important

that this shift in emphasis be undertaken in a way which demonstrates that the Government intends to pursue a firm budget policy.

(a) Accordingly, even in a recession the Government should continue to make its decisions about expenditure programs on the basis of the on-going needs of the Nation for public services and facilities. It should not try to step up Federal spending, which does not meet this test, in order to counter the recession. Countering a mild and short recession by emergency public spending does not work well in practice. With even minimal lags most of the actual increase in spending will come after it is no longer appropriate. Moreover, such emergency spending programs would, in practice, establish a needlessly higher expenditure plateau from which the next increase would occur.

* * * * *

4. Price and cost policies: There are substantial differences of opinion about the extent of probable inflationary pressures, or the extent of the damage to our economy that would occur if we did have some chronic inflation. We believe that the capacity of the economy to tolerate inflation is at least considerably reduced now, both for domestic and international reasons. Accordingly, the time is ripe, in addition to the basic requirements of good monetary and fiscal policy, to take some other steps that would be helpful in preventing inflation.

First, as a Government and as a Nation we need to give more explicit attention to the subject of improving productivity. If the rate of gain in productivity could be stepped up, we could lift levels of living more rapidly at home; and lower pressures on costs would improve our competitive position abroad. Stepping up the rate of gain in productivity will be difficult; and some developments will make for lower rate of gain in the years ahead. More younger workers will be in the work force. We have about exhausted the rapid increase made possible in our earlier history by a shift from agricultural to industrial work. And, the demand for services is apt to continue to grow more rapidly than the demand for industrial products.

We believe, therefore, that the objective of enhancing the capacity of the economy to improve productivity should be high on the national agenda both at the research and at the operational level. Ways of accelerating the use of better and more productive machinery and equipment must be sought. We shall need to upgrade the skill level of the labor force. Research has shown that new and complex management systems, eliciting the strong cooperation and involvement of employees in finding and implementing ways of doing things better, have established the basis for achieving significant gains in productivity. This country's heritage of a democratic, classless society puts it in a peculiarly strong position to tap the full creative powers of all our people.

Second, we must strengthen the conditions essential for vigorous price and product competition. It is the relentless pressure of competition that fuels the drive for new and better things, and gets these fruits of progress promptly disseminated to the whole people. Moreover, few things do more to encourage price flexibility and product innovation than knowledge that an aggressive competitor would otherwise take over. There is clear evidence that consumers respond actively to the price factor and to products that are new and better as well as different.

Third, we believe that a part of our difficulty in maintaining a stable price level has arisen because our wagemaking arrangements have tended to produce wage settlements averaging, for the whole economy, more than the general increase in productivity, even in the absence of an inflationary volume of demand. There are now some hopeful signs. A wider understanding exists of the simple fact that persistent increases in unit production costs mean a rising price level, or enlarged unemployment, or some combination of the two. The recedence of inflation-mindedness has created a more favorable environment within which wage negotiations can take place. Greater awareness of foreign competition, actual and potential, has had a restraining influence. Something more might be gained from quiet explorations by management and labor of the interrelated subjects of productivity, costs, and prices without the publicity and pressure of a wage contract deadline. Perhaps more collective consideration would improve the results of collective bargaining.

Whether these trends toward moderation will prove to be adequate remains to be seen. Formalized proposals calling for governmental machinery to pass upon wage and price decisions in major industries impress us as creating more problems than they would solve, and could well exert an upward bias on price decisions. At this juncture we believe the administration would be wise to avoid a doctrinaire approach, to watch developments closely as the next expansion unfolds, and to rely on the considerable power of restraint inherent in public opinion.

Fourth, section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 should be amended to include reasonable stability of the general price level as one objective of national economic policy. Clearly, it is one of our objectives, and our declaration of national economic policy should include it. This would stiffen our own national will to achieve the greater stability of our price-cost level that would make possible a more orderly, vigorous, and sustained pace of economic growth. And it would be an explicit declaration to the free world that the dollar is to be maintained as a strong currency of stable value.

ALLAN SPROUL,
Chairman.
PAUL W. MCCRACKEN.
ROY BLOUGH.

PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President's state of the Union message was a sober appraisal of the situation in which we find ourselves both at home and abroad. The President has given us the truth, without the embellishment of either panicky alarm or vacuous optimism. The state of the Union, as the new President finds it, calls neither for dancing in the streets nor for the despair of futility.

It calls most of all for honesty in facing the Nation's problems and for deliberate constructive action on these problems. At home, we have got to recognize that there is suffering or the serious threat of suffering to the well-being of millions of citizens, because of unemployment or inadequate employment or underpaid employment. There is a threat to the stability and the vitality of the Nation's economy in the persistent sluggishness of its key industries, in the farm situation and in a progressive stagnation in certain key manufacturing and mining centers. We have got to deal with these problems. In this modern era no rug is large enough to sweep them under. The gold outflow to which the President alluded, in part at least, is a reflection of these inner weaknesses and a spur to act to correct them.

In short, our economy must begin to move again. Our farms must provide a better livelihood to our farmers. Our educational plant must yield better opportunities to young people to train to the maximum of their individual capacities. Our faith in our great medical facilities must be cleansed of its present idle boast, insofar as these facilities fail to serve with decency and dignity, millions of our older citizens. In these matters, the President has promised to point the way.

As for the job of Government housekeeping, let no one underestimate the sweeping significance of the President's intentions with regard to reorganization of the Defense Department and its programs and his implied promise to replace "Parkinson's law" with "Kennedy's law" as regards the civil service. In the latter case, the President has performed a great public service by announcing that—

> A man's rank and reputation in this administration will be determined by the size of the job he does and not by the size of his staff, his office, or his budget.

It was to these and other domestic matters that the President initially addressed himself before turning to the even more complex problems which face us abroad. And may I say, that in so doing he put the situation in the proper order. For it is the inner condition of the house of the Nation which will largely determine how the Nation shall tower in the neighborhood of the world, not the coat of paint on the outside.

But let no one underestimate, either, the power of the new ideas which he has advanced in all aspects of foreign policy. He has offered a new promise of cooperation in matters of vital importance to all mankind, to friend and foe alike—in nuclear survival and in the common exploration of outer space. He offers a new approach to the spread of freedom in Latin America and in the newly burgeoning nations and even to those areas, such as Eastern Europe, where it has long been but a dim and receding hope. He is building upon the policies of the previous administration in this respect but it is clear that he intends to build anew, to build strong, to build purposefully.

This Congress—Republicans no less than Democrats and both no less than the executive branch—has a deep responsibility to work with the President to see to it that the house is put promptly in order. We must help him to close the inner cracks in the walls if the paint of foreign policy is to adhere properly. Our basic task in the Senate is to give prompt and careful consideration to the legislation and other measures which he may propose. Let this be done with a high sense of national purpose and dedication and I am confident that the Nation will begin to move again and that the outlines of a new and constructive foreign policy which his message contained will be filled in steadily with tangible achievements for the peace and common progress of mankind.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to our President, who has just delivered a great state of the Union message. It was as bracing as a cold shower after 8 years in a tepid bath.

The future will be brighter if Congress will respond, in full measure, to the challenge the President has laid upon us.

HOW TO BRING WORLD PEACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from time to time Members of Congress, including myself, have been critical of certain aspects of our foreign-aid program. Attention is often directed to waste, maladministration, and general ineffectiveness in certain areas of the world. Many feel that there is a great need for a new approach to these problems, in light of changing conditions. One of the most imaginative proposals to come forward in recent years is the one for the Youth Peace Corps. I am especially pleased to know that the new administration is planning to get this program started soon. This program will send young people abroad, to work with and assist our friends in foreign countries, helping them help themselves.

A program similar to the Youth Peace Corps proposal, but smaller in magnitude, has been in operation since 1948. I refer to the international farm youth exchange program, through which young Americans go to other lands and foreign youths come here. This program, which operates under the philosophy that "understanding is the foundation of world peace" has been most successful.

A number of Montana youths have participated in this exchange program; and the editor of the Hungry Horse News, of Columbia Falls, Mont., has recently printed an interview with Gary Glantz, an international farm youth exchange delegate from Carbon County, in the State. Gary spent 7 months in Venezuela, and on his return he has been speaking throughout the State, in behalf of this exchange program which has done so much to promote a better relationship between our friends and neighbors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mel Ruder's feature article, which appeared in the January 20, 1961, issue of the Hungry Horse News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA FARM YOUTH SHOWS HOW TO BRING WORLD PEACE

(By Mel Ruder)

Americans are particularly alert to the failure of some foreign aid programs. Most horrible example is the $300 million spent in Laos, a country of 3 million residents where the average annual family income is $50 a year. Despite the flood of American dollars, the average Laotian's living standard hasn't changed. Graft has been widespread and the country threatens to be another Korea.

Much in contrast to the flood of foreign aid dollars has been the international farm youth exchange program where young Americans go to other lands, and foreign youths come here.

IFYE STARTED IN 1948

Started in 1948, the IFYE program has spread to 60 countries, and has over 1,000 participants. No Federal or State governmental funds are used to finance the actual exchanges. Objective is that understanding is the foundation of world peace. The Hungry Horse News believes this, and Tuesday we had the opportunity of a long chat with Gary Glantz, 25-year-old Carbon County rancher. He spent April through November as an international farm youth exchange delegate in Venezuela.

BUSY SCHEDULE

Glantz' schedule included 12 talks to schools, service clubs, 4-H, and other farm groups here in the Flathead. He is a handsome, sincere young man. We'd pick him to do a job.

Last week he was speaking in his home area about Red Lodge. Next week he'll be in Lincoln County, and these talks are to continue through March. Meanwhile in Venezuela, there are young men and women telling of their stay in the United States.

Venezuela is something over twice the size of the State of Montana with a population of 6,320,000. The name means "Little Venice" and resulted from early Spanish explorers finding natives living in houses on stilts along the coast.

We asked Gary about Venezuela. He replied that the country on the northernmost part of South America has excellent natural resources including oil, iron, other minerals and gems. He continued: "It's a land of contrast. There's the tropical coastal area including Maracaibo, the principal port on the Caribbean. Then Caracas, the capital, is a city of more than 1 million located in the Andes at 3,000 feet elevation."

Gary continued that the year-round climate in Caracas is comfortable. The seasons are wet for 8 months and dry for 4 months.

Gary, who with his father raises shorthorn cattle in Montana, spent 7 months with 12 host families.

He told us of spending 4 weeks with Senor and Senora Rode, who have a 250-acre coffee farm in the Andes. Senor Rode was born in Germany; she in Switzerland. Both are naturalized Venezuelans, and proud of their country. Around the table five languages were spoken, and Spanish was the only tongue understood by all.

HARVESTING COFFEE

Coffee harvest takes place in October and November. It reminded Gary of the wheat harvest back in Montana. "Everybody talks about yields and quality."

Gary felt that the best coffee went to European markets since they saw and bought coffee beans. Americans see their coffee as ground and in cans or jars.

Gary next went south across the Andes to the lowlands and the rice, milk cow, coconut, and sugarcane farm of Senor and Senora Morales. It was mid-July and the rice and sugarcane harvest was getting underway.

He continued: "The harvest actually takes place at no specific time of year since there is year-round crop-growing seasons there. As a result their cows also calve year round."

In progress is crossing native cattle with Brown Swiss with resultant higher milk production.

The Morales family live in a home of concrete with a tile roof and concrete floor. There were five rooms and three young children.

LEARNING SPANISH

We asked: "Can you talk Spanish?"

Gary replied: "Now, yes. It took about 2 months to know what they were saying and about 3 months to reply fluently. In 7 months if you live with them you can speak Spanish fluently."

He told of being in Colombia briefly. Citizens there knew from his Spanish that he came from Venezuela. He also told of passing as a Venezuelan. At the Morales home, as a joke, Reinaldo introduced Gary as a Venezuelan who had been studying in the United States. It took the guests 4 hours to learn differently.

While most Venezuelans are of Spanish and Indian descent, Gary noted that there is a considerable influx of Italians, Germans, French, and other Europeans who have emigrated since World War II.

He felt that these newcomers were especially alert to democracy. They knew what it had been to live under dictatorships in Europe and be thrown in jail for a traffic ticket.

Gary also lived with the Romero family, whose home had sod walls and a galvanized metal roof. There were three rooms. The Romeros raised coconuts, had a small milk herd, some corn, yuca, and a cooked banana called platino.

FARM PROBLEMS

The Romero problem, Gary commented, was essentially too small a farm and lacked modern equipment.

We asked about meals. Gary replied that he shared with the families and ate what they ate. Especially where there were lower incomes the portions were not as large as people in the United States are accustomed to.

A day in Venezuela starts with a cup of coffee. Breakfast at the Romeros was about 6:30 a.m., and then the cows were milked.

Typical menu included arepa, which is cornbread with butter, and rice is also served at every meal as is coffee. It is strong, black, and served in a small cup.

The noon meal with more arepa, rice, often had black beans, meat often pork, lettuce and tomato salad, and for dessert, a plum-like fruit with syrup.

Gary told how the noon meal is served anytime from 10 a.m. until 1 p.m. varying from day to day.

Especially if the day was hot, there is an hour to hour and a half siesta after dinner. If it was a busy day there wouldn't be any siesta.

The evening meal is always after dark about 8 or 9 p.m. Typical menu includes arepa, coffee, beef but in small portion, and often no dessert. On the other hand "dulce" which meant a banana or orange was served.

MORE ABOUT FOOD

Gary commented that the middle class families ate much as do most of the rural population, but as the income increases there are more foods known to U.S. citizens.

We laughed when Gary told us how he cooked meals for his host families to show them what our food tasted like. He made a lemon meringue pie and was disappointed. The crust and filing were good, but the meringue shrunk. Senor Morales liked the pie.

He also made U.S. style pancakes, and had brought some cans of popcorn. Gary popped the corn. The South Americans thought of it as a dessert, put sugar on the popped corn and ate it.

Our conversation turned to recreation.

Some of the host families had cars. Others used bicycles, mules, or walked. There were often barbecues on Sundays.

DATING IN VENEZUELA

We talked of dating in Venezuela, where in the rural areas the chaperone system is in effect. When you go out on a date, mother and often an aunt comes along. You pay for mother and the aunt's entertainment as well.

Gary laughed: "You know, I found that we had more fun when the parents went along."

He liked the fiestas, and told of the whole population liking music. They have their own instruments such as the quarto, which is like the ukulele, the more familiar gourds, and a big harp. Gary liked their dancing. "There's a lot of hip action."

Then we talked of Venezuelan problems. A part of the IFYE objective is to avoid political discussion, but Gary felt that the

present Betancourt government in office since December 7, 1958, was an effective democracy, with religious freedom and a desire for education.

The country's immense oil revenues are being used to build excellent surfaced highways, and provide schools. A Venezuelan problem is that much of the food producing area is on the other side of the Andes from the cities.

There is a high illiteracy rate where virtually three out of four people cannot read nor write. A result is that they vote by colors. However education is compulsory and there is decided emphasis on getting children to school.

KNOW ABOUT US

Gary felt that the Venezuelans like the Canadians know much more about the United States than we do about them. They were interested in the world series and in the presidential election. The Venezuelan votes directly for his president, and doesn't have an electoral system.

Gary commented that foreign aid dollars from the United States didn't mean much to the average Venezuelan. If he didn't get the dollars, he couldn't see how they helped him.

Venezuela imports food, and is a market for beef, powdered milk, eggs, as well as manufactured goods.

Gary believes that U.S. exports of dried milk selling for about 12½ cents a quart was effective.

We asked how the Venezuelans looked at us. Gary replied: "They think of the U.S. citizens having it awful easy because we have so many machines. They see our movies, and think we have kitchens and homes like the movies." They were surprised to find that Gary worked with his hands.

Gary continued: "The rural citizen there works longer hours than we do. It's a tougher life, and more exposed to the elements."

We formed mental pictures of this young Montanan living with the Venezuelans, working side by side with them in the fields.

FRIENDLY FEELING

He told us of the sad farewells. "Within a week of coming to a host family, they accepted me as part of the family. There was my host father, host mother and host brothers and sisters. I was part of the family."

Gary told of weaving rope halters for the Llaneros on the ranch of Senor and Senora Prodger. The ranch was about half the size of Flathead County. The Llaneros lived in small homes across the land.

The cattle resembled the old Texas longhorns without the long horns, and were resistant to disease and heat. Crossing this animal with Brahma, Santa Gertrudis and shorthorn was creating a better beef animal.

Both Senor and Senora Prodger had been born in England.

Ranching on the cattle plains of Venezuela is quite different from Montana. The two seasons are wet when a cowboy often takes to a boat. Gary told of roping a cow from a boat and almost upsetting. Then there is the dry season, really hot and dry.

We asked Gary about seeing other citizens of the United States. He replied: "You do in the cities, especially where there is oil activity, but not in the rural areas."

One of the results of Gary's 7 months in Venezuela, there are three American 4–H Clubs pen pals with three 5–V Clubs in South America.

For our part, we like the idea of citizens in the heartland of Venezuela judging the United States by what they saw in Gary Glantz of Roberts, Mont. He's clean cut, knows farm life, worked by their side and avoided any comparisons of "things better in the United States."

Gary has one more year at Montana State College before he gets his mechanical engineering degree. He intends to remain in Montana except that he plans to visit his friends in Venezuela.

The international farm youth exchange program makes sense to us.

OPTIMISM REPORTED IN EQUADOR ON THE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, Clayton Willis writing in the Albuquerque Tribune of January 14, details at length the feelings of American businessmen doing business in Latin America and particularly in Ecuador. It is interesting to note the optimism in that country since the election of President Kennedy, and the feeling that our relations with Latin America are headed for new and better horizons. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL MAN PART OWNER OF ECUADOR BUSINESS

(By Clayton Willis)

At least one American doing business in Latin America has a good word for the practice.

William C. Marchiondo, Albuquerque attorney, has this to say about his business experience in Ecuador where he is part owner of CASADA, an airplane spraying company which sprays bananas:

"So far our business experience in Ecuador has been very favorable. We haven't had the problem of graft that you frequently hear about in Latin America."

Mr. Marchiondo, a partner of the Albuquerque law firm of McAtee, Toulouse, Marchiondo, Ruud, and Gallagher, has been interested in the enterprise since January 1960.

HAS 16 PLANES

He said the company is one of the largest airline fumigation companies in Ecuador. CASADA has 16 planes, its own airstrip. It is not connected with United Fruit Co. which has extensive banana operations in the South American country which borders Peru and Colombia.

The attorney said Latin America as a whole offers a tremendous opportunity for investment of private American capital "as long as we treat them on an equal basis with us."

He added that there are advantages to Americans who invest in Ecuador from the tax standpoint. "The tax structure is much less than it is in the United States," Marchiondo noted.

Ecuador, whose 4 million population is more than half illiterate, desperately needs economic development according to Marchiondo. "The people need help, are willing to help themselves. All they need is the financial and technical assistance, medicine and professional people to show them how to develop the country," the Albuquerquean added.

HOUSING SHORTAGE

Marchiondo, who spent 42 days in Ecuador last year, cited the tremendous housing shortage and the poor standard of living in Ecuador's largest city of Guayaquil (population 410,000). "And the standard of living could very definitely be improved in Guayaquil," he observed.

He said that housing, living and sanitation conditions in the mountain city of Quito (population 280,000) are much better. Marchiondo described the 9,348 foot-high capital city as a "beautiful, colonial city."

Marchiondo, who plans a return trip to Ecuador in May or June, remarked that the Ecuadorian highway system is bad. He noted that he could only go between 20 and 40 m.p.h. on the section of the Pan American Highway between Quito and Guayaquil.

The attorney said that "since the election of Kennedy, the Ecuadorians feel optimistic about encouraging better relationships with the United States. They now feel the United States will try to encourage more investment of American private capital, and will extend more foreign aid to help develop them economically, culturally, and healthwise."

Asked about Ecuadorian sentiment toward Cuban Premier Castro, Marchiondo said Ecuadorians are pro-American and anti-Castro.

MORE MEASURES ARE NEEDED TO HALT INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, of the many grave problems which President Kennedy has inherited, at home and abroad, and which he summarized so eloquently in his inspiring message to Congress today, none is more pressing than that of our mounting unemployment. Despite the optimistic allegations of President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon during the recent campaign and thereafter, we know that the number of Americans now out of work has reached its highest peak in 21 years; but instead of leveling off or improving, that tragic condition is steadily deteriorating.

As the New York Times declared in a recent editorial entitled "The Shadow of Unemployment":

No informed person had expected the December statistics on employment and unemployment to make pleasant reading. The reality, however, has proved to be even worse than was expected. The number of unemployed last month was more than 4,500,000, the highest for any December since 1940.

That figure has increased to over 5 million in the month ending tomorrow, January 1961.

Under the able sponsorship of Senator DOUGLAS, S. 1, a bill for area redevelopment, has been introduced in this Congress. I am a cosponsor thereof and testified before the Banking and Currency Committee in its behalf because the situation in my own State of Alaska has become steadily more crucial. This aggravation of the plight of Alaska's unemployed is in very large measure due to the Federal mismanagement, for the 69 years preceding statehood, of the greatest Alaska natural resource—the salmon fisheries. In the last year of Federal control—1959—the salmon pack dropped to the lowest point since 1900, a decline from a high in the middle 1930's of over 8 million cases to 1,600,000. The result in Alaska's coastal communities, which have always been dependent on the fisheries for their livelihood, has been disastrous.

While I hope that S. 1, the area redevelopment bill, will be speedily enacted, I wish to assert, without qualification, that I feel that additional constructive measures to give reemployment to the millions of Americans who, through no fault of their own, find themselves without work, should be enacted.

I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR GRUENING

This measure is most needed legislation to bring relief to those people across the country who are unemployed now, all too many of whom are chronically unemployed because of a change in industrial activity in the area in which they find themselves, or for other circumstances beyond their control. Indeed, if we are to see increased productivity in the industrial field in this country, if we are to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, by making available opportunities for a livelihood for peoples and communities, we cannot afford not to enact this legislation. Some of the provisions of the proposed measure, S. 1, should apply to my State, Alaska, if the last frontier is to fit well into the New Frontier as far as economic growth is concerned.

According to a recent report on income in Alaska, published by the Office of Business Economics of the U.S. Department of Commerce, approximately one-tenth of the State's population consists of native Alaskans in rural areas, in the more than 200 villages scattered throughout the State. The report suggests that this portion of the population is engaged to a considerable degree in a subsistence-type economy for at least part of the year. Indeed, the subsistence level of income in many of the villages is due to reliance on the now gravely depleted fisheries in the coastal areas. Villagers may fair well for a few weeks when the fishing season is at its peak—or rather they did fare well years ago before the tragic depletion of the fisheries—but empty stomachs and empty purses for a major portion of the year and now in many communities during the entire year, do not contribute to the economic or physical well-being of the people nor to the overall economic well-being of the State.

The commissioner of the Department of Labor of the State of Alaska, Mr. B. G. Johnson, has wired me certain statistics regarding the vast areas and serious degrees of unemployment in my State. For example, in Angoon there are 360 unemployed; in Kake, 500; in Metlakatla, 944; in the village of Hydaburg, 316 are out of work; in Hoonah, 590 are unemployed; in Kasaan, 50; in Klawock, 260; and at Klukwan, 118 are unemployed. That is the situation in some of the villages in southeastern Alaska, where the village populations are comprised of Haida, Tlingit and Tsimpsian Indians.

The same picture can be painted of villages in the northern and western parts of Alaska, where a few of the statistics are as follows: Akiak, 189; Holikachuk, 104; Kaltag, 157; Kotzebue, the largest Eskimo village in the world, 1,100; and at Kwigillingok, 327 are unemployed.

These statistics may sound like mere figures—and they are. They are virtually the entire employable populations of the villages named. I use those figures because, in a telephone call to my office just yesterday, Mr. Johnson, the labor commissioner for the State of Alaska, assured me: "We just don't have any employed people in those villages at all, for the most part, with the exception of the village schoolteacher, the storekeeper and the missionary." He assured me that the situation in Alaska is considerably worse than it was just 1 year ago. I could go on indefinitely, naming village after village, community after community. However, let it suffice to say that in round numbers, according to the State labor department's figures, there are right now approximately 22,000 native Alaskans unemployed, well over half the total native population of my State.

These people, by and large—unless they have other jobs to which they can go when the fishing season ends, and Mr. Johnson assures me there are very few such jobs for the native peoples—are not covered by either the State or Federal unemployment insurance program.

The coastal villages in southeastern Alaska and in the south central and western regions, as I have previously had occasion to comment on the floor of the Senate, depend heavily on the salmon fisheries of Alaska, once the greatest fishery resource in the Nation. Due to Federal governmental neglect, mismanagement, and allowance of abuses during the years of Alaska's territorial status, this once great salmon fishery resource declined steadily. In 1936 the salmon pack of Alaska was 8,454,948 cases. By 1941 it had slacked off to only 6,906,503 cases. In 1943, it was 5,396,509 cases, and 4,341,120 cases in 1945. By 1953 it was only 2,925,570 cases and 2,441,894 cases in 1957. In 1959, the last year of Federal control, the salmon pack had fallen off to only 1,600,000 cases. Fortunately, in the Bristol Bay, in our western area of Alaska, the 1960 season saw a return of the salmon and the picture brightened for once. But that was not so in southeastern Alaska and in other areas where the salmon pack has continued its steady decline. Through the various successive agencies of the Federal Government entrusted with the regulatory responsibility and the safeguarding of the salmon fisheries, mismanagement and gross neglect was the general practice. There is a clear Federal responsibility, therefore, to come to the aid of the people in those areas who have been deprived of their livelihoods through Federal mismanagement and nonfeasance.

The picture of unemployment in Alaska is alarming in the light of the fact that in recent years the unemployment insurance program of the State has covered, on the average, 12 percent of the total work force, more than three times the national average.

Moreover, such figures include only those persons currently receiving unemployment compensation payments under the program administered by the State; they do not include those who have exhausted their eligibility but who remain unemployed. I have been informed that while the State will pay unemployment compensation for a maximum of 26 weeks, the vast majority of persons making claims under the State program are eligible for only 12 to 16 weeks of such compensation.

For the State as a whole the unemployment rate for the week ending January 14, 1961, was 18.7 percent, based on the average covered employment making claims for compensation on that date. Again, I remind you that the figure would be considerably higher if those unemployed persons were included who were not covered by any unemployment compensation program. For the week ending January 7 of this year, the unemployment rate was 15.8 percent, compared with only 14.1 percent for the same period a year ago. Thus, it can be observed that the situation has worsened in a period of 1 year, with a substantial increase in the unemployment rate, and the prospects are for further deterioration of the situation.

That condition is further substantiated by figures, also provided by the labor commissioner for the State, that while the latest number of persons claiming benefits under the State unemployment insurance program for the week ending January 7, 1961, was 5,837, the comparable figure for 1 year year ago was 4,842, or nearly 1,000 fewer unemployed persons in 1960 than in 1961.

Permit me to add one additional set of statistics. For the week ending December 31, 1960, the average unemployment rate for the State was 15.1 percent. The five major cities were hard hit. Their percentages of unemployed are as follows: Juneau, 12 percent; Anchorage, 13.4 percent; Ketchikan, 17.5 percent; Fairbanks, 18.1 percent, and in Petersburg, an alarming 35.3 percent of the area's labor force was listed as unemployed.

The Federal Government would be sorely remiss in its obligations to its citizens if it stood idly by while such a situation as I have described continues—a situation which exists in many other parts of our Nation.

We are a union of interdependent States. Poverty and unemployment in one State can spread with the rapidity of a plague to infect the other States of the Union. That is the lesson we should have learned from the bleak days of the depression of the early thirties.

The Federal Government must act with speed—and should act with vigor, intelligence, and foresight. S. 1, the Area Redevelopment Act, is only one action which should be taken promptly to turn back the blight which has struck so many areas of our Nation. In fact, though I heartily approve this legislation for what it can do, it will not begin to meet the Nation's needs, and certainly not those of Alaska.

WIRETAPPING LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a report which has been issued by the Federal legislation committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. This report on proposed Federal legislation to legalize wiretapping permitted by State laws should be of interest to every Member of the Senate. It represents the careful and scholarly thought of leading members of the bar on a topic which has been the subject of much debate among lawyers and legislators, and which is pending at present before the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report and its appendix be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and appendix were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, 42 WEST 44TH STREET

COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Report on proposed Federal legislation to legalize wiretapping permitted by State laws

Under date of June 24, 1960, the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate reported out S. 3340, which bill had been introduced under date of April 6, 1960, by Senator KEATING. Accompanying the bill, the committee issued a brief supporting report by Senator KEATING.[1] It does not appear that hearings were held with respect to S. 3340, although a subcommittee had held hearings during 1959 with respect to certain other bills which sought to legalize wiretapping by Federal officials in specified circumstances, and which also included provisions similar to S. 3340.[2]

[1] 86th Cong., 2d sess., Senate Rept. No. 1720, to accompany S. 3340.

A bill similar to S. 3340 had previously been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman CELLER as H.R. 11589.

[2] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (These hearings will hereinafter be cited as "Hearings, Constitutional Rights

S. 3340 proposes to amend chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code by adding the following provision:

"§ 3501. Evidence of Intercepted Communication.

"No law of the United States shall be construed to prohibit the interception, by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State (or any political subdivision thereof) in compliance with the provisions of any statute of such State, of any wire or radio communication, and the divulgence, in any proceeding in any court of such State, of the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of any communication so intercepted, if such interception was made after determination by a court of such State that reasonable grounds existed for belief that such interception might disclose evidence of the commission of a crime."

STATED JUSTIFICATION FOR S. 3340

The brief report accompanying the bill indicates: (1) That the primary purpose of the bill is to overcome the effects of the recent decision of the court of appeals in *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* and *O'Rourke* v. *Levine*, 277 F. 2d 739 (2d Cir., Apr. 14, 1960), and the earlier decision of the Supreme Court in *Benanti* v. *U.S.*, 355 U.S. 96 (1957); and (2) that the provisions of New York law [3] authorizing wiretapping to procure evidence of any crime, were assumed to represent an appropriate and desirable standard for the relaxation of present Federal restrictions on wiretapping by State officials.

In *Benanti* v. *U.S.*, cited above, the Supreme Court reversed a conviction in a Federal court based in part on evidence obtained as a result of wiretapping by New York State law-enforcement officers pursuant to a State-court warrant authorized by New York law, which evidence was subsequently turned over to the Federal authorities by the New York State officers. Interpreting the prohibitions on wiretapping contained in the Federal Communications Act (F.C.A.), the Court stated:

"The Federal Communications Act is a comprehensive scheme for the regulation of interstate communication. In order to safeguard those interests protected under section 605, that portion of the statute pertinent to this case applies both to intrastate and to interstate communications. * * * In light of the above considerations, and keeping in mind this comprehensive scheme of interstate regulation and the public policy underlying section 605 as part of that scheme, we find that Congress, setting out a prohibition in plain terms, did not mean to allow State legislation which would contradict that section and that policy * * *." (*Benanti* v. *U.S.*, 335 U.S. 96, 105.)

In *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* and *O'Rourke* v. *Levine*, cited above, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reasserted the Benanti principle that the FCA prohibits State wiretapping. The actual holding affirmed the district court's refusal to enjoin the introduction in evidence during trials pending in New York State courts of wiretap evidence obtained pursuant to the New York statute, the introduction of which the defendants contended would constitute a divulgence in violation of section 605 F.C.A. The denial of the injunction was predicated on grounds of comity and other equitable considerations; however, the Court pointed to the criminal and civil penalties applicable to violations of section 605 FCA. One of the judges further underlined the point by expressly calling upon the local U.S. attorney "to follow the proceedings (in the State court trial) with the closest attention," presumably for the purpose of initiating a prosecution against the State prosecutor if he divulged the wiretap evidence in the course of the State court trial.[4]

On June 27, 1960, the Supreme Court granted certiorari in *Pugach* v. *Dollinger*, and it appears the case will be reached for argument during January 1961.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

There is undoubtedly need for an end to the chaotic situation resulting from the clash between the Federal prohibition of all interception and divulgence of telephone communications, and the conflicting State statutes and practices. Due to the legal posture of the case, the Supreme Court's decision in *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* is not likely to provide the remedy.[5] Accordingly, consideration of possible statutory revisions is appropriate and timely.

Implicit in S. 3340 and the accompanying report is the premise that S. 3340 deals essentially with problems of local law enforcement which are primarily the concern of the several States, and the principles and standards formulated by the respective States should accordingly be given predominant if not conclusive weight. This premise is not wholly valid. In the area covered by S. 3340, considerations of local law enforcement are interwoven with those relating to the regulation of a nationwide system of telephonic communication, which is indisputably a matter of primary national interest and responsibility. Whether and in what circumstances State agents should be permitted to tamper with telephonic communications, a substantial and indistinguishable portion of which are interstate,[6] are problems of paramount Federal concern, not essentially different from those which would arise if the proposals sought to empower State agents to open the mails incident to their local law-enforcement activities. We do not think it would seriously be contended that Congress should grant authority to State agents to open mail in transit in aid of local law enforcement, without at the very least laying down precise limitations and standards as conditions precedent to the exercise of any such authority.

At the present time, it has been settled by authoritative rulings of the Supreme Court that section 605 of the Federal Communications Act prohibits interception and divulgence of any telephone communication by anyone, whether such communication be intrastate or interstate, and whether such interception be by a private individual, or by an agent of a State government acting under purported authority of a State statute.[7]

The Federal policy has been part of the law of the land since enactment of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, even though not uniformly understood or applied. Indeed, 6 years prior to the enactment of the statute, in *Olmstead* v. *U.S.*, 277 U.S. 438, four justices of the Supreme Court (Holmes, Brandeis, Stone, and Butler) not only characterized wiretapping as "dirty business" (Justice Holmes' words) but were of the view that evidence thus obtained violated the Federal Constitution's prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. At least several members of the present Supreme Court have asserted their adherence to this view.[8]

The national policy against wiretapping expressed in section 605 F.C.A. is buttressed by similar prohibitions contained in statutes enacted by 33 states.[9] Only six States have statutes purporting to authorize law-enforcement officials to engage in wiretapping, upon compliance with specified procedures.[10]

Since the enactment of S. 3340 would constitute a first and far-reaching relaxation in the quarter-century Federal prohibition against wiretapping, it may be anticipated that the enactment will ultimately have a broad impact on present wiretapping restrictions throughout all areas, Federal as well as State. At the State level, it may be expected that in many of the 33 States which now prohibit wiretapping, enactment of S. 3340 will be urged as an example and invitation for parallel State enactments. At the Federal level, it will inevitably and forcefully be urged that there is no logical justification to deny wiretapping authorization to Federal agencies alone, once S. 3340 has relaxed and reversed the present national policy against wiretapping.

To mention these considerations, however, is not necessarily to oppose any modifications of the present national policy.

Rather, the purpose is to suggest that S. 3340 has a disarming simplicity which may serve to obscure the far-reaching policy changes which this measure will effectuate throughout the Nation, at Federal and State levels. In sum, it may be said to shift the national policy from one flatly prohibiting wiretapping at any level, to one favoring "controlled" wiretapping at all levels.

Viewed in this light, it is evident that a threshold and basic policy decision must be reached as the first step in evaluating S. 3340. Should this significant shift in national policy be effected? If so, does S. 3340 embody controls and standards requisite and appropriate for the revised national policy?

Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary.") The last reported hearings in this series, published in part 5 thereof, were held Dec. 15 and 16, 1959.

The principal pending bills with respect to wiretapping during this period were S. 1292 (introduced by Senator KEATING) and H.R. 70 (introduced by Congressman CELLER). Our committee accorded preliminary study to S. 1292 and H.R. 70, but this report does not attempt to cover them in view of our understanding that only S. 3340, or a similar bill, is likely to be the subject of congressional consideration early in the current session.

[3] New York constitution, art. I, sec. 12; New York Code of Criminal Procedure, sec. 813–a.

[4] 277 F. 2d at 746.

[5] If the Supreme Court affirms the decision of the court of appeals, the present situation will remain unchanged; a reversal would seem to require a holding that the district court should have issued the requested injunction. The effect of such a ruling would seem to definitely nullify all wiretapping under State statutes.

[6] *Weiss* v. *U.S.*, 308 U.S. 321, 327; *Benanti* v. *U.S.*, 335 U.S. 96, 104.

[7] In Benanti the Court pointed out that it has not yet been decided whether both an interception and a divulgence are necessary for a violation of sec. 605 F.C.A. (355 U.S. at 100n). This ambiguity furnishes the rationale on which Federal investigative agents, such as the staff of the FBI, presently base their wiretapping activities. It is contended that since such interceptions are performed only for investigative purposes, and are not divulged by being offered in evidence in any court, the statute is not violated. (Hearings, C.R. Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary; Communications from Attorney General William P. Rogers, pt. 5, pp. 1481–1482.)

[8] See *On Lee* v. *U.S.*, 343 U.S. 747 (1952), dissenting opinions of Justices Douglas, Frankfurter, Burton. See also dissenting opinions in *Schwartz* v. *Texas*, 344 U.S. 199 (1952).

[9] Communication from Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress (hearings, C.R. Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary, pt. 5, p. 1527). The communication lists 39 States as prohibiting wiretapping, but this list includes the 6 which permit limited wiretapping by law-enforcement officials.

[10] Id. at p. 1528. The six States are Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, and Oregon.

COMMITTEE CONCLUSIONS AS TO S. 3340

Our committee has concluded: (1) that it is prepared to accept and recommend the basic change in national policy discussed above; (2) that S. 3340, in its present form, is deficient in the controls and standards requisite and appropriate for the revised national policy.

(a) Basic policy conclusion: The considerations which entered into the basic policy conclusion of the committee were various, as was the weight accorded to one or another of these considerations by the respective committee members. There was general recognition that we are confronted in this area, as in so many others, with the search for that most elusive formulae, in which a proper balance is struck between the respective needs of society and the rights of the individual. To some, the advantages of wiretapping in aid of law-enforcement officials in combatting crime seemed entitled to greater weight in the formula.[11] To others, it appeared that the rights of the individual require zealous protection in respect of police wiretapping for, as has been authoritatively asserted, "a telephone interception is a far more devastating measure than any search warrant." [12]

In the final analysis, however, even those members of the committee philosophically opposed to all wiretappings were induced by essentially pragmatic considerations to join in the committee's conclusion that the national policy should officially shift from absolute prohibition of wiretapping to controlled wiretapping. For it is clear from a number of authoritative studies that, in the face of the present national policy, wiretapping by law-enforcement officials and others is now so widespread and entrenched a practice throughout the Nation that it would be illusory to believe any complete prohibition could be made effectual, or that it would comport with public opinion.[13] These studies, moreover, indicate that the trend of both public and expert opinion is now in the direction of controlled wiretapping by law-enforcement officials, under continuous and close supervision.

Our committee believes this trend may be salutary, and that a desirable solution may be achieved if—but only if—the controls under which the law-enforcement officials are permitted to engage in wiretapping are meaningful and adequate. Incorporation of such meaningful and adequate controls should be absolute condition to the shift in national policy sought by such measures as S. 3340. Discussed below are the important deficiencies of S. 3440 in this regard.

(b) Deficiencies of S. 3340. The deficiencies of S. 3340 may be grouped in four categories, as follows: (1) Lack of limitation in respect of type of crime; (2) lack of specification of requirements for obtaining court orders and maintaining records; (3) lack of prohibition of use of evidence obtained in violation of the statute; (4) lack of provision for Federal surveillance.

(1) Lack of limitation in respect of type of crime. If a State court order is obtained the bill would legalize State wiretapping in the investigation of any crime, even the pettiest misdemeanor. The sweep of the New York statute which it follows in this regard has been the subject of severe criticism;[14] we do not believe it should be permitted to set the standard for revised Federal policy in the regulation of our nationwide system of telephone communication.

A Nevada statute, enacted in 1957, authorizes court wiretap orders only where "there are reasonable grounds to believe that the crime of murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery or crime of endangering the national defense or a violation of the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act has been committed or is about to be committed."[15] Limitation of wiretaps to more serious crimes of this type accords with a substantial body of expert opinion.[16]

Our committee believes that such limitation to more serious crimes is highly desirable in order to curtail invasion of the right of privacy, but we do not favor limitation based on specific crimes. To avoid the gaps which may result from such specific enumeration, and to allow for some latitude in the various State criminal concepts, it is our recommendation that wiretap orders be limited to crimes punishable by maximum sentences of 5 years or longer. While we do not profess certitude that such a limitation would draw the line at precisely the optimum point, we feel it would be an appropriate starting point for the revised national policy, subject to revision in the light of the experience data which would be assembled pursuant to our fourth proposal discussed below.

(2) Lack of specification of requirements for obtaining court order and maintaining records. Authoritative studies of day-to-day practices in States which have statutes authorizing wiretapping emphasize the importance of spelling out in the statute the procedural and substantive requirements for obtaining the court order, in order to guard against perfunctory issuance of such orders on the basis of an inadequate showing; and also the requirement for the proper maintenance of records.[17]

We believe, therefore, that any Federal legislation authorizing wiretapping pursuant to court order under State statute, should require that such an order be issued only upon an application which states the grounds therefor with a high degree of particularity. The Federal legislation should include provisions to the effect that an ex parte order of a State court for the interception of a communication can be issued only upon an application of a designated responsible official setting forth fully the facts and circumstances upon which the application is based, showing that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such interception may disclose evidence of the commission of the crime punishable under the laws of that State by a maximum sentence of 5 years or longer. Compare subdivision 1 of section 7 of the Nevada wiretapping statute (ch. 242,

---

[11] See, e.g., Brown, The Great Wiretapping Debate and the Crisis in Law Enforcement. 6 N.Y. Law Forum, 265–282.

[12] Hofstadter, J., *In the Matter of the Interception of Telephone Communications of Anonymous*, 207 Misc. 69, 74–75 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., 1955):

"A telephone interception is a far more devastating measure than any search warrant. A search warrant is confined to a definite place and to specific items or, at least, to items of a stated class or description. Those in possession of the searched premises know the search is going on and, when the officer has completed this search, whether successfully or not, he departs. Not so, in the case of a telephone interception. The interception order is obtained ex parte and the person whose line is to be tapped is, of course, in ignorance of the fact. The tap is maintained continuously, day and night. Everything said over the line is heard, however foreign to the stated objective of the law-enforcement officers. The most intimate conversations, personal, social, professional, business, or even confidential of an unlimited number of persons may be laid bare. In effect, the line of everyone who is called from or makes a call to the tapped line at any time is being tapped during the maintenance of the tap. When a line in a public telephone booth is tapped, as has on occasion been done, the conversations of people having no relation of any kind to the operator of the place in which the booth is situated or the person whose line is tapped, are overheard. It is little wonder that Justice Brandeis was moved to say in the Olmstead case: 'As a means of espionage, writs of assistance and general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared with wiretapping.' (277 U.S. 438, 476.)"

[13] See, for example: Dash, Schwartz, Knowlton, The Eavesdroppers (1959); Westin, Wiretapping: The Quiet Revolution, Commentary magazine, April 1960 (reprinted in hearings, C.R. Senate Judiciary, pt. 5, pp. 1957–64); Westin, The Wiretapping Problem, 52 Col. L. Rev. 165; Rozenzweig, The Law of Wiretapping, 32 Cornell L.Q. 514, 33 Cornell L.Q. 73.

[14] See authorities cited on the preceding page. See also the critical pronouncement of an incumbent justice of the New York Supreme Court, based on his extensive first-hand experience with wiretapping under the New York statute. In the Matter of the Interception of Telephone Communications of Anonymous (supra).

"New York Special Sessions Justice Frank Oliver testified that the court order had proved ineffective as a means of protecting the citizen, and that delegates to the constitutional convention never imagined that such orders 'would be issued on trivial grounds or in cases involving only suspicion of a misdemeanor or offense.'" (Westin, The Wiretapping Problem, 52 Col. L. Rev. 165, 195.)

[15] Nev. Stat. ch. 242 (1957); see Appendix.

[16] For example, limitation to crimes "directly and immediately affecting the safety of human life" (Westin, The Wiretapping Problem, 52 Col. L. Rev. at 203); limitation to cases involving national security, treason, sabotage, espionage and related offenses (Mr. Edward B. Williams, Hearings, C.R. Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary, pt. 5, p. 1485). At the Federal level, H.R. 70, introduced by Congressman CELLER during the preceding congressional session would limit wiretapping by Federal officials, pursuant to court order, to the crimes of espionage, kidnaping, sabotage, treason, sedition, and defined subversive activities. In connection with Federal wiretapping, the Attorney General and the Director of the FBI have asserted that wiretaps are authorized by the Attorney General "only in cases involving the internal security of the Nation or where a human life may be imperiled such as kidnaping." (Hearings, C.R. Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary, pt. 5, pp. 1481–2).

[17] See, for example, Dash, Schwartz, Knowlton, The Eavesdroppers (1959), pp. 44–70; Westin, The Wiretapping Problem, 52 Col. L, Rev. 165, 203. See also id. at p. 196, in which a former assistant district attorney in New York is quoted as having stated in a report filed in connection with a grand jury investigation:

"* * * no records were kept of the telephone conversations intercepted so that officers procured information which they were able to sell without suspicion of their superiors in the police department. On the basis of testimony given by high-ranking police officials called before the grand jury * * * [the report] asserted that authority to tap telephones was being obtained on false affidavits. 'Dishonest statements' were used by policemen to obtain warrants; applications for wiretapping warrants were often made without any information to support the requests. * * * This was an admitted practice in many parts of the police department. Without facts and without any information members of the department supported their applications with such statements as a matter of convenience and as an expedient to obtain an order."

In 1957 and 1958 various safeguards were added to the New York law designed in part to eliminate abuses such as those mentioned above; New York Penal Law, secs. 739–745.

Nevada Statutes, 1957).[18] Without necessarily endorsing every detail, we also believe that provisions along the line of those contained in section 7, subdivisions 2 through 6, and sections 8 and 9 of the Nevada statute should be required by S. 3340 or by any other Federal legislation which proposes to give Federal sanction to wiretapping under State statutes. Excerpts from the Nevada statute are set forth in the appendix of this report.

(3) Lack of prohibition of use of evidence obtained in violation of the statute: Some States which have statutes authorizing wiretapping pursuant to court order, nevertheless permit evidence obtained in violation of the statute to be received in evidence upon the trial.[19] In our Federal courts, a firm line of decisions prohibits the admission of evidence obtained directly or indirectly as the result of wiretapping in violation of section 605 F.C.A.[20] However, the Supreme Court has declined to reverse convictions in State courts on the basis of such illegally obtained wiretap evidence, on the ground that section 605 F.C.A. does not contain a clear manifestation of the intention of Congress to render inadmissible in State courts evidence obtained in violation of the statute.[21] It is in an effort to circumvent this result that the situations discussed in the Pugach and O'Rourke decisions (discussed above) have arisen.

We believe that if Congress now enacts legislation authorizing wiretapping by State officials in compliance with specified conditions, it should clearly provide that wiretap evidence (and the fruits thereof) obtained otherwise than in compliance with the statute, shall be inadmissible in any trial or proceeding, whether State or Federal. It cannot be doubted that the exclusionary rule is an important, if not indispensable, aid in effectuating the statutory purpose.[22]

The power of Congress to restrict all wiretapping in order to protect the integrity of interstate communication, now exercised in section 605 F.C.A., derives from the Commerce clause (art. 1, sec. 8) of the Constitution. Under the necessary and proper clause of article 1, section 8, and the supremacy clause of article VI, measures to effectuate the granted power are valid and paramount, even though they subordinate State law and rules of practice.[23] Perhaps the closest analogy to a Federal statute barring admission of evidence in State courts is to be found in the immunity statutes.

In *Adams* v. *Maryland*, 347 U.S. 179, 183, the Court held that a Federal statute prohibiting the use of testimony given by a congressional witness as evidence "in any criminal proceeding in any court," was fully applicable and controlling in State courts as well as Federal. Reversing a State court conviction in which the federally prohibited evidence was used, the Court stated: "Since Congress in the legitimate exercise of its powers enacts 'the supreme law of the land' State courts are bound by section 3486 (of title 18, U.S.C.), even though it affects their rules of practice." To the same effect, *Reina* v. *United States* (U.S., Dec. 19, 1960, and *Ullmann* v. *U.S.*, 350 U.S. 422).

While not without some distinctions, these decisions clearly show that the Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld the right of Congress to control the use of evidence and practice in State courts when necessary to effectuate a Federal power.

(4) Lack of provision for Federal surveillance. A statute providing for controlled wiretapping cannot properly be self-executing. If the congressional policies and limitations are to be observed, there must be adequate supervision and enforcement.

Although assistance in supervision and enforcement at the State level should be welcomed and encouraged, the Federal Government cannot ignore its own responsibilities to exercise an informed surveillance over the operation of its new Federal policy authorizing controlled wiretapping by law-enforcement officials. Accordingly, any legislation along the lines of S. 3340 should require each State, through specifically designated officials, to transmit to an agency of the Federal Government monthly and other periodic reports as to the number of wiretapping applications applied for, granted or denied, the nature of the crimes involved, and other relevant information. This Federal agency, possibly the Federal Communications Commission or the Attorney General,[24] should be empowered to assure itself of the completeness and accuracy of the information filed with it, and should be required to file with Congress quarterly and other periodic reports with respect to the information thus compiled.

It is believed that this system of reporting will not only provide Congress with an informed review of the workings of the system on the basis of which it may determine whether amendments are needed, but will of its own force exercise a salutary restraining influence on the issuance of wiretapping warrants where the necessity for them is doubtful, and will help expose illegal wiretap activity.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin L. Gasperini, Chairman; M. Bernard Adinoff, Howard J. Aibel, Alfred Berman, William G. F. Botzow, Victor Brudney, Edward Q. Carr, Jr., William G. Fennell, Marvin G. Frankel, Richard A. Givens, Cecilia H. Goetz, Lawrence W. Keepnews, Robert A. Kirtland, Robert A. Koch, Herbert Prashker, William J. Rennert, Leonard B. Sand, William J. Shrenk, Jr., Hayden N. Smith, Telford Taylor, Everett I. Willis, Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.

JANUARY 10, 1961.

APPENDIX—EXCERPTS FROM CHAPTER 242—NEVADA STATUTES (1957)

Section 6 (p. 335): "Except as otherwise provided in sections 7, 8 and 9, no person shall intrude upon the privacy of other persons by surreptitiously listening to, monitoring or recording, or attempting to listen to, monitor or record, by means of any mechanical, electronic or other listening device, any private conversation engaged in by such other persons, or disclose the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect or meaning of any such conversation so listened to, monitored or recorded, unless authorized to do so by one of the persons engaging in the conversation."

Section 7 (pp. 335–336):

"1. An ex parte order for the interception of wire or radio communications or private conversations may be issued by the judge of a district court or of the Supreme Court upon application of a district attorney or of the Attorney General setting forth fully the facts and circumstances upon which the application is based and stating that:

"(a) There are reasonable grounds to believe that the crime of murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery or crime of endangering the national defense or a violation of the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act has been committed or is about to be committed; and

"(b) There are reasonable grounds to believe that evidence will be obtained essential to the solution of such crime or which may enable the prevention of such crime; and

"(c) No other means are readily available for obtaining such evidence.

"2. Where statements in the application are solely upon the information or belief of the applicant, the precise source of the information and the grounds for the belief must be given.

"3. The applicant must state whether any prior application has been made to intercept private conversations or wire or radio communications on the same communication facilities or of, from or to the same person, and, if such prior application exists, the applicant shall disclose the current status thereof.

"4. The application and any order issued under this section shall identify fully the particular communication facilities on which the applicant proposes to make the interception and the purpose of such interception.

"5. The court may examine, upon oath or affirmation, the applicant and any witness the applicant desires to produce or the court requires to be produced.

"6. Orders issued under this section shall not be effective for a period longer than 60 days, after which period the court which issued the order may, upon application of the officer who secured the original order, in its discretion, renew, or continue the order for an additional period not to exceed 60 days. All further renewals thereafter shall be for a period not to exceed 30 days."

Section 8 (p. 336):

"1. During the effective period of any order issued pursuant to section 7, or any extension thereof, the application for any order under section 7 and any supporting documents, testimony, or proceedings in connection therewith shall remain confidential and in the custody of the court, and such materials shall not be released nor shall any information concerning them be disclosed in any manner except upon written order of the court.

"2. No person shall disclose any information obtained by reason of an order issued under section 7, except for the purpose of obtaining evidence for the solution or prevention of a crime enumerated in section 7, or for the prosecution of persons accused thereof, unless such information has become

---

[18] As has previously been pointed out, our committee does not recommend the Nevada statute's enumeration of specific crimes for which wiretapping may be permitted, but rather the establishment of a standard for limitation to the more serious crimes.

[19] In New York this has long been the rule; *Matter of Davis*, 252 App. Div. 591, 598; *Peo.* v. *McDonald*, 177 App. Div. 806, 809; *Peo.* v. *Katz*, 201 Misc. 414. In recent years, the New York Legislature has acted to exclude illegally obtained wiretap evidence. In 1957 receipt of illegally obtained wiretap evidence was prohibited in civil trials; sec. 345a, Civil Practice Act. In 1959 the legislature sought to amend this provision to extend the exclusionary rule to criminal trials, but the legislation was vetoed by the Governor (Hearings, C.R. Subcommittee, Senate Judiciary, pt. 5, pp. 1877–1879).

[20] *Nardone* v. *U.S.*, 302 U.S. 379, 308 U.S. 338; *Weiss* v. *U .S.*, 308 U.S. 321; *Goldman* v. *U.S.*, 316 U.S. 129; *Benanti* v. *U.S.*, 355 U.S. 96.

[21] *Schwartz* v. *Texas*, 344 U.S. 199, 202–203, the Court stated (p. 203), "Since we do not believe that Congress intended to impose a rule of evidence on the State courts, we do not decide whether it has the power to do so."

[22] See, for example, the data presented by Mr. Justice Murphy in *Wolf* v. *Colorado*, 338 U.S. 25, 44–47 (dissenting opinion).

[23] See, e.g., *Maryland* v. *Soper*, 270 U.S. 9; *Ohio* v. *Thomas*, 173 U.S. 276, 283; *Boske* v. *Comingore*, 177 U.S. 459, 468. The situation is, of course, a fortiori where Congress has preempted the field, *Garner* v. *Teamsters*, 346 U.S. 485, *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, *San Diego Bldg. Trades* v. *Garmon*, 359 U.S. 236.

[24] It has been suggested that in view of the Federal investigatory activities over which the Attorney General exercises authority, there may be some question of possible conflicting interests if he were designated to exercise surveillance over the operation of the wiretapping legislation. From this point of view, vesting the duty in an independent agency such as the FCC might be preferable.

a matter of public record in a criminal action as provided in section 9."

Section 9 (p. 336):

"1. Any information obtained, either directly or indirectly, as a result of a violation of section 3, 4, 5, or 6 shall not be admissible as evidence in any action.

"2. Any information obtained, either directly or indirectly, pursuant to an effective order issued under section 7 shall not be admissible as evidence in any action.

"3. Any information obtained, either directly or indirectly, pursuant to an effective order issued under section 7 shall not be admissible in any action except:

"(a) It shall be admissible in criminal actions involving crimes enumerated in section 7 in accordance with rules of evidence in criminal cases; and

"(b) In proceedings before a grand jury involving crimes enumerated in section 7."

ISSUANCE OF NONQUOTA VISAS TO REFUGEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a misunderstanding has arisen regarding the major provision of proposed refugee legislation (S. 552) which my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I introduced last week along with Senators MORSE, SALTONSTALL, CASE of New Jersey, and SCOTT.

According to a story by the Associated Press, Representative FRANCIS WALTER, the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration, believes my colleagues and I have overestimated the desire of refugees to come to the United States. He is quoted as saying:

> They couldn't get 40,000 refugees if they advertised in every newspaper in Europe.

To make the record perfectly clear, our bill would provide nonquota visas available for up to 40,000 refugee escapees who are defined in section 6 of the act as follows:

> (a) the term "refugee-escapee" means any alien who, because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, has fled or shall flee (1) from any Communist, Communist-dominated, or Communist-occupied area, (2) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, or (3) from other countries or areas in which forces opposed to the free world and free institutions are at work, and who cannot return to such area, or to such country, on account of race, religion, or political opinion.

Obviously we have not limited the 40,000 visas to European refugees for the simple reason that the refugee problem cannot be limited to Europe. It is unfortunately true that there are an estimated 61,000 refugees living outside and 12,000 living inside refugee camps in Europe. Many have been stateless and homeless for 5 years, while most of those still in camps have been there anywhere from 10 to 15 years. In addition, 110,000 Chinese are seeking temporary refuge in Hong Kong, and several thousand non-Asiatic refugees are on the Chinese mainland. Despite the uncertain future confronting escapees from Communist countries, still they come. In 1961, 200,000 East Germans fled into West Germany, and an additional 10,000 non-German refugees escaped from Iron Curtain countries. Some 50,000 Cubans have fled their homeland, many coming to the United States where present law does not make them eligible to apply for citizenship should they so desire. It is impossible to predict from where the next wave of refugees may come. All we know is that our present immigration laws leave us hopelessly unprepared to cope with any reasonable number. Emergency legislation was required in 1956 to admit almost 40,000 Hungarian freedom fighters and their families, and it would be needed again if a similar crisis developed.

Last year we passed a very limited bill which would permit the United States to take up to 25 percent of the total number of refugees from Europe admitted by other nations. While it is a step in the right direction, the bill does not discharge our national obligation as leader of the free world toward the thousands of men, women, and children, many with relatives and friends in the United States, who want to live and work in freedom and become useful members of a free society.

The admission of 40,000 people provided in our bill, S. 552, seems to be a most modest number when compared with the magnitude of the world refugee problem. Of course, we do not know exactly how many refugees would want to come to the United States this week or next year, if they could, but in the name of humanity let us make provision to welcome our fair share; let us give them the opportunity to immigrate here. Let us start now to establish a national policy toward refugee-escapees which will rescue them from the terrible discouragements, repeated defeats, and human misery which some have endured for more than a decade. The people who have had the courage and the will to flee from tyranny should know that we are mindful of their sacrifice and their need and that the American people stand ready to help. This we can do by passing major refugee and immigration legislation during this session. The bill my colleagues and I have introduced would not provide visas which would go begging. I do not believe we would have to advertise for applicants, because the United States still stands as the unparalleled land of opportunity for freedom-loving people wherever they may be. Once Congress acts favorably on such a bill and the word goes out, we will not have to advertise. The news itself will be of major importance in newspapers throughout the world, and it will, in fact, constitute one of the best advertisements for the American way of life that has ever appeared.

Mr. President, the proposed revision is eminently deserving of enactment. It is a subject upon which Congress urgently needs to take action. I was disappointed that the President did not even mention immigration in his message to Congress today.

REPORTS OF CENSORSHIP BY KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am very much disturbed over reports appearing in the public print about Kennedy administration censorship of speeches and statements prepared by the Nation's military leaders. I want to know what it means in terms of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of the American people to know what our leaders think about the Soviet menace.

Are we entering into a new period of secret diplomacy in which our Government's dealings with the Russians are to be kept under wraps and displayed to the people only after they are accomplished facts? Is this new regime to be a dictaphone type of "gag rule" government, bent on its own prestige, or is it to be a government of free speech which holds the people's interest paramount?

Who is Pierre Salinger that the people should know what Arleigh Burke and men of his stature think about the Russians only after Salinger has blue penciled the text? And what happened to the so-called "open door" administration that we were led to expect after a campaign in which the Eisenhower administration was accused of all manner of infringement on freedom of information?

Mr. President, the developments over the weekend have served to shake the confidence and the faith of the American people in the new administration. The White House has moved with a disconcerting and frightening speed to establish its control over any and all information emanating from the U.S. Government and its agencies. I wonder how far it will go. Will the Democratic Members of the U.S. Senate be permitted to speak their minds on the subject of communism and the Soviet menace, or will they have to submit to the approval of the White House? Does this extreme caution extending to outright censorship of remarks pertaining to the Soviet Union presage an era of capitulation to the Kremlin's wishes? Are we to go back to those infamous years of the Truman administration when not even Red spies could be arrested for fear of disrupting what was termed a delicate international situation?

I say that the danger signal has been hoisted by the White House, and must be recognized by us as something repugnant to the American way of life and dangerous to the best interests of our people.

PROPOSED PROVISION OF LIFETIME OFFICE FOR DR. HOWARD McCRUM SNYDER, FORMERLY PERSONAL PHYSICIAN TO EX-PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, reading in a Washington newspaper, I was surprised to observe that Congress has now been asked to provide a lifetime office for Dr. Howard McCrum Snyder, until recently the personal physician in the White House to former President Eisenhower.

A distinguished colleague, according to this news story, has introduced a private bill which would give Dr. Snyder—who is a retired major general, U.S. Army Medical Corps, and is therefore the recipient of full retirement pay, an office at Walter Reed Army Hospital. This at a time when hospital space is at a premium and thousands of additional hos-

pital rooms are needed in practically every city of our country.

The bill would also confer upon this eminent physician the title of consultant in medicine. I make no objection to that.

Furthermore, had President Eisenhower and those associated with him conferred a distinguished service decoration or any other decoration upon Dr. Snyder for his services as personal physician to the President of the United States, I would have voiced no objection whatever.

Frankly, Mr. President, I feel that the time is here to put an end to adding additional pensions on retirement pay, and in this particular instance taking an additional room at an Army hospital for this particular retired major general.

Additional costs and expense would be involved to our Government, and what seems to me to be important is that a hospital room—no doubt sorely needed in the care of men in the Armed Forces and their dependents who come and go in this particular hospital—would be withdrawn from that service.

Mr. President, Dr. Howard McCrum Snyder has had a long and distinguished service in the U.S. Army and as personal physician to General Eisenhower in Europe and personal physician for him in the White House. In fact, General Eisenhower returned him to the active list of the Army in 1950 while serving as commander of the North American Treaty Organization Forces. Then from 1953 to 1961 he served the President as his personal physician.

Personally, Mr. President, I object to establishing any precedent of this sort or continuing any such precedent.

I will vote against this private bill should it be brought before the Senate at a time when I am on the floor. Furthermore I expect to object to any unanimous consent request to have this private bill considered.

It is my view that bills of this nature, involving expense to our taxpayers, when merged together amount to a considerable sum. We should put an end to this sort of practice.

Had Dr. Snyder been decorated at the same time Lt. Col. John Eisenhower was decorated for his distinguished service as aide to his father, the President, I would have voiced no objection.

I am firm in my objection to segregating and allocating a much needed hospital room to this distinguished retired major general.

MULTIPLE SPONSORSHIP OF BILLS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have noted with interest that a number of my colleagues—in recent days—have expressed opinions against the practice of multiple sponsorship of bills.

In general I agree with these views and I would support steps that may be taken in the Senate to curtail the practice.

When I first came to the Senate I had the honor of sitting at the desk next to a very distinguished American the late Vice President and Senator Barkley.

The abolishment of multiple sponsorship was a project that was very close to him, and with the passage of time, I have been able to see more clearly the evils of the practice that had disturbed him.

As has been pointed out in brief colloquies on the subject in the past few days, requests to cosponsor legislation frequently can be a source of embarrassment.

First, a Senator dislikes to turn down such a request from a colleague especially if he is in full agreement with the described aims of the bill.

However, he may find out to his sorrow later that the bill is imperfect or that it has ramifications that were not apparent or desired.

Further, there is the chance that committee action might so amend a bill from its original intent that a Senator may ultimately be forced to vote against a measure of which he—theoretically—is a sponsor.

It is disturbing too, that wide sponsorship of a bill seems to create a public impression that the measure is certain of enactment when in fact it is not.

I recall a celebrated instance when a bill with 85 Senators as cosponsors was introduced in the Senate.

Now if a bill ever looked like a sure thing it is one with 85 sponsors. But this bill not only did not pass, it never even got out of committee.

I can conceive of situations where by virtue of its being a State matter or because of the joint effort involved in drafting the bill more than one sponsor may be proper.

But, in general, it seems to be a practice that has gotten badly out of hand and should be curbed.

ROBERT C. HILL, FORMER AMBASSADOR TO MEXICO

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, former Ambassador Robert C. Hill is well known to Members of the Senate for his ability and competence, and for his extensive knowledge of Latin America. His service as an Assistant Secretary of State and as our Ambassador to Mexico have given him almost unrivaled experience and background with respect to this vital part of the world.

Ambassador Hill, now a member of the New Hampshire Legislature, last week gave an interesting and impressive talk to the annual meeting of the New Hampshire Women's Republican Club, and his remarks were commented on editorially in the Manchester Union Leader for January 27, 1961.

The editorial by William Loeb, publisher of the Union Leader, highlights some key aspects of Mr. Hill's remarks which I believe merit the attention and the consideration of all Members of the Senate. Ambassador Hill's revelations in connection with Dr. Milton Eisenhower's visit to Mexico, in the early days of the rise of Castro, are extremely interesting, coming as they do from such a source.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the editorial from the Manchester Union Leader entitled "Not Mañana, Action Now."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT MAÑANA, ACTION NOW!

Representative Robert C. Hill, of Littleton, addressing the annual meeting of the State Women's Republican Club last Tuesday, revealed shocking facts about the Cuban situation.

It seems that in 1959 when Representative Hill was U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, former President Eisenhower's brother, went to Mexico in the course of an inspection of conditions in Latin America which he was making for the President.

At that time, officials of the U.S. Embassy in Mexico gave Dr. Eisenhower a detailed account of Castro's Communist connections and the fact that Castro was obviously under Communist control, if not actually a Communist.

What is significant about that interview is that the State Department official who accompanied Dr. Eisenhower from Washington, on hearing this statement from Mexican officials who had had a chance to observe Castro during his residence in Mexico, said: "That's a lie, Dr. Eisenhower."

While Representative Hill did not mention the name of the State Department official who accused those (who exposed Castro) of lying, we understand that he is currently the subject of an important Washington investigation.

Equally shocking was Representative Hill's revelation that as late as May 28, 1960, just a little more than 6 months ago, official dispatches were coming from our Embassy in Havana saying that it could handle Castro and that we could still make a deal with him.

These two instances, by themselves, reveal that there is either fantastic stupidity in the Central and South American divisions of our State Department or something much worse—treason.

It is surely to be hoped that the Kennedy administration will clean house in this area of the State Department as soon as possible.

A very distinguished figure in the field of American medicine, Dr. Louis C. Diamond, associate chief physician in the Children's Hospital in Boston, has just returned from a tour of South America and has confirmed to this newspaper the reports that have been frequently reaching American ears of late—that our entire handling of our aid program in South America is extremely incompetent.

If we are not to lose all our support in South America, the Kennedy administration must appoint the ablest possible man to Assistant Secretary in charge of South American affairs.

In the meantime, Representative HILL's suggestion is well taken that the United States should take the leadership in insisting that the Organization of American States live up to its constitution, which would require it to take appropriate action against Cuba.

Wise, too, is Hill's further suggestion that, because Russian ships are carrying arms to Communist supporters in Cuba and other Latin American nations, all Russian shipping be barred from the shores of the Caribbean countries and of South America.

The crisis in Latin America will not stand for delay. It is too deadly.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an extension of the morning hour, under the regular 3-minute limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last week there died a man who contributed more to the mutual understanding of peoples in a human way, at the village level, than did any other man we have sent abroad. I feel particularly saddened at his death, because I was vice president of the International Rescue Committee under which he worked and under which he got started. The president of that organization, Angier Biddle Duke, is presently with us, today, in the gallery.

All those with whom Thomas Dooley worked acquired from him a keener and better understanding of his idea that by the use of village medicine, America can spread its message throughout the world. Dr. Thomas Dooley has done more in that respect, in my opinion, than any other man in recent years.

I rise now to pay this tribute to him; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Few Aided So Many So Quickly," which was published on January 21 in the Providence Evening Bulletin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin, Jan. 21, 1961]

FEW AIDED SO MANY SO QUICKLY

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, in his book "Deliver Us From Evil," described the great job it was feeding and providing sanitary facilities for 2,000 Vietnam refugees from the Communist Viet Minh aboard the U.S.S. *Montague*, on which he was medical officer in 1954. But an even bigger job on board was dispelling prejudices toward Americans held by the frightened natives who had been brushed by Communist propaganda.

The voyage to Saigon, which turned into a victory in ideological warfare for Dr. Dooley, probably influenced the young doctor's future a great deal. Later that year, he transferred to the port city of Haiphong where he commanded a task force which organized, built and maintained huge refugee camps through which passed some 600,000 Vietnamese after the fall of Dienbienphu. Dr. Dooley cared for their medical needs, and made friends with the frightened people in flight.

He resigned his Navy commission in the spring of 1956, organized a small private medical mobile unit which he took to Laos because, he said, "right now Laos is the ripest plum for communism." He administered, in about equal dosages, medicine and humanity, doing much for the good name of the United States among the natives.

Dr. Dooley died of cancer in New York's Memorial Hospital Wednesday night, a few days after his 34th birthday, leaving behind an organization known as Medico which, a year ago, had 17 projects in operation in 12 countries, including 7 hospitals in southeast Asia. Dr. Dooley, even while wearing a brace for support during his terminal illness, toured the country giving lectures to help support Medico.

Others have worked in the vineyard with less publicity than Dr. Dooley, but few men have done so much in so little time for their fellows as he did. Few have done so well in projecting the real image of Americans to foreign people who have not understood us. His death is a genuine loss.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, today, in his native St. Louis, beneath a fresh mound in Calvary Cemetery, Dr. Thomas Dooley, aged 34, is at rest. It is far from the teeming jungles of Laos, where men battle one another with the deepest of fears and most deadly of hates. It is far from the same jungles where the young doctor found his lifework, battling loathesome disease, the pain, the hunger, and the ignorance in this rarely touched area of the earth.

As a Navy doctor in 1954, Dr. Dooley was witness to the plight of refugees fleeing from Communist North Vietnam. He was to find his cross and crown in that place of danger and disease, of utter poverty and oppression, of hopeless pain and perpetual hopelessness.

"These are the things," Dr. Dooley declared, "which Americans are so well armed to fight against, and gentleness, intelligence, and will can conquer." These are the qualities the young doctor took with him to help the hopeless. He said:

> We had seen tender, simple, loving care—the crudest kind of medicine practiced by mere boys—change a people's fear and hatred into friendship and understanding. We had witnessed the power of medical aid to reach the hearts and souls of a nation. We had seen it transform the brotherhood of man from an ideal into a reality that plain people could understand.

In the jungle Dr. Dooley did find his own Calvary. His own battle with cancer was shared in prayer, if not in pain, by an entire world that understood compassion, appraised character, and appreciated courage.

On the very day after his 34th birthday the end came for him, despite the devoted care of his friends at New York's Memorial Hospital. The whole world is friend to such a man who was such a friend to the helpless. It was a privilege for us to have lived in his heroic era. It was a special honor for those who like my colleague, Senator PELL, had closer acquaintance and service near him. There is a vicarious link for me, for at Notre Dame my son follows the premedical course that gave Dr. Dooley the beginnings of his skill. There Dr. Dooley is already a campus tradition. He honors Notre Dame—as Notre Dame honored him. He honors St. Louis University and every teacher out of whose guidance he could steer his own steps toward service to humanity. In student dreams is born the character of the true physician. And in all too few years from the campus came the fulfillment of his fervor—his supreme service, his supreme sacrifice.

Dr. Dooley suffered much, that mankind might suffer less. Who shall say he died too young? He lived so briefly, yet so richly. In his living, he lived to give life to others; and in his dying, he has inspired others who accept the pledge that his memory shall be an enduring mission.

He was cofounder of Medico—the Medical International Cooperation Organization. He gave to it the proceeds from his compelling writings. Now with widespread public support Medico flourishes in at least 10 countries, with 17 programs, with its own staff of able doctors, and a small legion of local assistants and trainees.

In the simple story of Dr. Dooley there must be an accent on heroics. But unless we accept the heroics along with the humility and the humanity of this dedicated being, we shall have lost the lesson of Dr. Dooley's life.

Against the pain, hunger, and ignorance that fashion the common denominator of man's fear and hatred of man, Dr. Dooley taught us that the deadliest weapons are the kindliest gifts—intelligence, gentleness, good will.

May that lesson live with us, and may Dr. Dooley's memory linger forever.

MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we were fortunate today to listen to the remarks of the President of the United States. It was a masterly diagnosis of the world situation and the domestic situation. I use the word "diagnosis" because physicians differ in their diagnosis of the ills of the human body. Nevertheless, it was a masterly diagnosis by a great American of our domestic and foreign problems and the challenges that lie ahead.

I remember other occasions when this country was privileged to listen to great addresses about situations which confronted it. The other day I called attention to the time when, in 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt took office he made a great speech in which he said that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself. I thrilled to that statement, and I am sure all America did. But we waited and waited for the panaceas. They did not come.

We are talking now about 4 to 5 million unemployed. Back in the 1930's, the number of unemployed was as high as 10 million, with only 30 million employed. What we are all hoping and praying for is that the panaceas which will be forthcoming now will not be attempts to find solutions as were attempted to be found then. It took a war to solve those problems, and the war did not really solve them; it merely multiplied them. We are all hoping and praying that, under the new administration, the light that is necessary—and by "light" I mean understanding—will be forthcoming so that solutions will be found. I say again the address was a masterly diagnosis by a great American.

PROPOSALS OF SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the report which has been made by the Southern Regional Council. This is a very distinguished council, composed of both Negroes and whites, leading southerners, generally considered moderate southerners.

I ask unanimous consent that a sketch of the principal executive of the council, Mr. Harold Fleming, may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 30, 1961]

A FIGHTER WITH HUMOR—HAROLD CURTIS FLEMING

ATLANTA, January 29.—Behind the Southern Regional Council's blueprint for Presidential action on civil rights, made public today, stands an unassuming Georgian whose name is a legend in the race relations field.

Harold Curtis Fleming took a temporary job with the council more than 13 years ago and never left. He first became information chief and later executive director of white and Negro leaders in 14 Southern States.

The advice to "see Fleming" has become commonplace for those with more than passing interest in the region's most pressing problem. Sociologists, Government officials, foundation executives, visitors from abroad, and writers have listened for hours to his calm, reasoned interpretation of the complexities of the racial crisis.

The 38-year-old executive's telephone rings frequently with calls for advice from officials of some State or city caught in an explosion touched off by racial change. On many occasions, respect for his opinion among both whites and Negroes has enabled him to help bring about a solution.

PUBLIC OPINION INFLUENCED

He has directed a staff of 16 specialists in its efforts to advance the cause of equal opportunity for "all the South's people." This has been achieved primarily through a program of research, information, and education, which has influenced public opinion and legislation by making it impossible to ignore the facts.

Ralph McGill, noted liberal spokesman for the South, publisher of the Atlanta Constitution and a founder of the Southern Regional Council, advised Mr. Fleming to join the organization. He says of him today:

"I've never known a man who has so met the needs of the times. He is a dedicated, intelligent person with all of the necessary courage—one of the great figures of the new South."

Hal Fleming, as he is known, was born in Atlanta on July 27, 1922. He spent his early years here and on a farm in Elbert County in the red clay hills of northeast Georgia. He attended Atlanta's now defunct Boy's High School some years after Dean Rusk, the new Secretary of State.

WON HARVARD SCHOLARSHIP

He accepted a scholarship from Harvard University, worked on the college newspaper, the Crimson, and the literary magazine, the Advocate, and was elected to membership in the Signet Society.

His college education was interrupted by World War II. Mr. Fleming, who is white, served as captain of a Negro quartermaster company on Okinawa. After the war he returned to Harvard.

He and his wife, Jane, a Vassar graduate from St. Paul, Minn., live with their two small sons in a Dutch Colonial home in Atlanta's Ansley Park. Indicative of his favorite pastime is her complaint that they have "too many books and not enough bookshelves."

The slim, blond, and somewhat bald executive also is something of a ragtime virtuoso on the ukulele. He can and does switch to hill-billy tunes when friends insist.

AVOIDS THE DOCTRINAIRE

One characteristic sets Mr. Fleming apart from many others in his field. This is his refusal to adopt a doctrinaire stance on racial questions or to lose his sense of humor. This attitude has caused some hotheads to consider him at first as irreverent.

"Those who know him well," says one friend, "are aware that he is seething inside over the injustice done to Negroes. They also know that he can be counted upon for the intelligent answer, the fine assessment of the facts, the sound judgment, the knowledgeable insight."

While Mr. Fleming's analysis may be profound, according to one who has known him for years, "he laces it with a mild, delightful humor like that of the classic British soldier in 'Journey's End.'"

Neither his personality nor his views are typically southern. But his associates contend that he is deeply concerned about the region's problems and that he has shown a greater sense of dedication than most in the search for a solution.

Mr. JAVITS. The significance of this report is that it calls for major areas of Executive action by the President. I have noted six such areas. I think the report emphasizes the fact that the implementation of great words will be what will count, rather than the brave words alone, admirable as they are.

I agree thoroughly with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], which has just been uttered concerning the President. I was sorry to see that civil rights was "kissed off" in the message to Congress by one sentence, and not a very powerful one. The President's message related not only to foreign policies of this country, but domestic policies. I am deeply disquieted that we have been hearing only about legislative action, and not executive action as well, because I am completely convinced that school desegregation cannot be successfully carried through except with executive action as well as legislative action.

Executive action is called for in the report in six areas. I shall conclude my statement by mentioning them:

First, the President is urged to publicly affirm his full support of the Supreme Court's 1954 decision and his intention to employ his executive powers as needed to assure orderly compliance with it.

Second, it is urged that an announcement be made that, at a date certain, no research funds will be granted by the Federal Government to any institution of higher learning, or its faculty, public or private, which refuses admission to anyone because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Third, a national registration drive, under the personal sponsorship of the President, should be launched and supported by publications describing registration and voting qualifications and procedures in each State.

Fourth, desegregation of the National Guard in Southern States is urged.

Fifth, there is a need for certification by Government contractors in advance that no one will be denied employment because of race. This can be done by executive action.

Sixth, a declaration by the President that Federal housing programs will be guided by integration rather than by segregation policies.

These are the specifications set forth by a distinguished group. Here are policies that can be implemented, to the credit of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the specific proposals of the Southern Regional Council may be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We urge upon the President that he publicly affirm his full support of the Supreme Court's 1954 decision and his intention to employ his Executive powers as needed to assure orderly compliance with it;

* * * * *

An announcement ought to be made that, at a date certain, no research funds will be granted by the Federal Government to any institution of higher learning (or its faculty), public or private, which refuses admission to anyone because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

* * * * *

A national registration drive, under the personal sponsorship of the President, should be launched, and supported by publications describing registration and voting qualifications and procedures in each State.

The National Guard in Southern States is the remnant of segregation in the armed services; segregation in southern colleges and universities, and the mode of selection of academy cadets and midshipmen, restrict the opportunities for Negroes to become military officers. All of these situations are within the power of the President to remedy or ameliorate.

* * * * *

There needs to be more effective enforcement of the bar against discriminatory employment by Government contractors. Large contractors can be appropriately charged with a special responsibility for positive recruitment of Negroes; an appropriate means of requiring this would be prior certification as a condition for award of contract.

* * * * *

A declaration by the President that Federal housing programs will be guided by a belief in the values of integration would be the soundest basis for an Executive order prohibiting discrimination.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. Since the middle of the 17th century these hard-working and courageous people had been living under Russian regimes. Unhappily, their experience as a free people was brief. In 1920 the Red army attacked the new republic and the Ukraine was made part of the Soviet Union.

The freedom-loving people of Ukraine, who number 42 million in Europe, have maintained their national unity through great adversity, and they still do so. They represent a force for freedom in the struggle against Russian Communist imperialism.

Americans of Ukrainian descent, many of whom live in Minnesota, celebrated Ukrainian Independence Day last January 22. I wish to acknowledge the efforts of the Minnesota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and that of Mr. Wasil Dombrowsky, its president, and Mr. Mykola Derbush,

secretary, in calling attention to the plight of the Ukrainian people and their continuing fight for freedom.

Ukrainian Independence Day presents the Congress with an opportunity to recall our position made officially in the enactment on July 17, 1959, of the joint resolution designating "Captive Nations Week." On that occasion the Ukraine was listed as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the motion, to ask the Senator whether he feels we should have a quorum call.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum as soon as the Senate proceeds to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Charles H. King, of Michigan, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, Walter C. Wallace, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, and Theodore F. Stevens, of Alaska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, transmitted to the Senate on January 10, 1961; which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of nominations of flag and general officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

The nominations are as follows:

Rear Adm. Edward C. Kenney, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, and sundry other officers of the Navy, for appointment and promotion;

Lt. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, and sundry other officers, for appointment and promotion in the U.S. Army;

Lt. Gen. Joseph H. Atkinson (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Brig. Gen. Joe C. Moffitt, and sundry other officers, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force; and

Richard A. Evans and Robert B. Bell, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, Marine Corps Reserve.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably a total of 12,095 nominations in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force in the grade of colonel and captain and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Department of State be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the nomination of Mr. George W. Ball to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, by way of emphasizing to the Senate the critically important nature of this office and the great expectations which many people hold, that George Ball may carry on in the very distinguished tradition of Douglas Dillon, whom he is succeeding in this critically important office, and to highlight the fact that what will be before us and what Mr. Ball will be called upon to deal with immediately is the ratification by the Senate of the treaty for the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development. In that regard I point out that notwithstanding all the talk about initiative in terms of foreign policy in the Eisenhower administration and the administration that preceded it, the OECD represents one of the most distinguished of our foreign policy initiatives ever taken in this country, with the purpose and the form of the organization far greater than the size and aggregate economic power of the whole Atlantic Community, aggregating almost $1 billion in productive power, infinitely outshining the Communist bloc. This initiative was the initiative of the previous administration, carried through by Secretary of State Herter and Under Secretary of State Dillon.

Mr. Ball will now have, I think, the great privilege and honor of carrying that program through to completion.

I make these remarks only to emphasize the critical nature of the mission, and the fact that the baton is being passed from one administration to the next on so important a matter as this, and it is being passed in terms of the country, regardless of party, from one very outstanding man to another very outstanding man.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in choosing persons to fill positions of high responsibility in his new administration, President Kennedy has made many excellent selections.

To my mind one of his finest is the appointment of G. Mennen Williams as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

As my colleagues know, Mennen Williams was Governor of the State of Michigan for six terms covering a period of 12 years.

As Governor he demonstrated his capacity for leadership, his ability for administration, and his grasp of the need for progress and new ideas.

Furthermore, his integrity has never been challenged.

I believe our country is very fortunate that all these attributes will be concentrated in one of the most important positions in this administration.

In assuming his role in the guidance of American relations with the African nations, Governor Williams will, I know, devote his talents and energies completely to the ultimate advantage of the people of both our continents.

I am pleased to support and endorse his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the State Department nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate pass over for the time being the nominations in the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward Gudeman, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Labor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the nominations will be considered en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have no objection to either the consideration of the nominations en bloc or their confirmation, but I wish to say a word about the nomination of Mrs. Esther Peterson, who is one of the nominees, to be Director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. When she came before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, I was unfortunately engaged before another committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, a not unusual situation in which Senators sometimes find themselves. Therefore I did not have the opportunity to pay to Mrs. Peterson the tribute which she deserves. I have dealt with her for many years in respect to labor matters. She has been on Capitol Hill for a long time. I have always found her to be not only an outstanding humanitarian, but perhaps, what is more important, a person of objective judgment in terms of balancing the urgent needs of the country with the urgent needs she felt she was serving in the matters she was urging on the part of labor.

I think Mrs. Peterson was an excellent choice to head this critically important Bureau. I hope that her concept of statesmanship will have an even greater opportunity for displaying its virtues and talents in the days ahead, and I wish to congratulate Mrs. Peterson on the floor of the Senate on being named to this very high office.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to express my gratification at the appointment of Mrs. Esther Peterson to be Director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor. I, too, have had the opportunity to know her since I first came to the Senate in 1947. I know that I express the judgment of all who know her when I say that she is a woman of great ability and intelligence. She is certainly humane in every approach to her duty and her work, and all Senators have found her extremely fair. I am glad that she has been named to this very important post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Labor Department nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it will come as no surprise to Senators on the majority side that the distinguished American, Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, a lady from California, who is about to become Treasurer of the United States, is not of the same partisan persuasion as I; but I trust it will come as no surprise either that this Californian is happy and proud to rise in the Senate today to pay tribute to one of his fellow Californians. I do not have the pleasure of knowing Mrs. Smith personally though I hope to rectify this error before too long. I do know her by her excellent and fine reputation. She has ever been a good citizen of our country. She has been an honorable member of the Democratic Party. She has been recognized by her neighbors and by those who know her as an extremely able and dedicated woman.

I wish for her all happiness and all success as she becomes the Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to know Mrs. Elizabeth Smith for some time. The words of the distinguished Senator from California on this nomination have further endeared him to me and have increased my great respect for him, because what he has said about Mrs. Smith is certainly merited. She is not only an able and brilliant woman, but also a very charming woman. The distinguished minority whip has brought great credit not only to himself but to his great State of California and to the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Treasury Department nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John S. Gleason, Jr., to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Gleason and of the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Department of the Interior, exclusive of that of Kenneth Holum, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JAMES K. CARR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am happy to vote for the confirmation of the nomination by President Kennedy of Mr. James K. Carr, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Interior. I have had the pleasure of knowing Jim Carr as a friend for a long, long time. I have known him as an efficient and distinguished public servant. He performed many important functions in the Congress of the United States as a valued and valiant staff member for the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He has been a very able executive of the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. In the past several years he has been chairman of the Water Resources Board of California. Mr. Carr will add considerable luster to the Department of the Interior. He is highly experienced in handling the problems of our area, particularly the semiarid West. On the occasion of his nomination, I am glad to wish him Godspeed on the great labors which he is about to perform.

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in saying a few words in behalf of Mr. John A. Carver, whom President Kennedy has nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Lands, National Parks, Territories, and the Indian Bureau.

Mr. Carver is an old friend and associate of mine. We both come from Boise, Idaho, where he and I separately engaged in the private practice of law before I entered public life. Mr. Carver served with distinction then as assistant attorney general of Idaho, and went on

to become the senior member of the very successful law firm of Carver, Greenfield, & McClenahan. In that practice he had the opportunity to represent clients who were stockmen and sheepmen, with problems relating to their grazing privileges on the public domain, and also lumber companies which dealt with the purchase of federally owned timber.

Following my election to the Senate, Mr. Carver honored me by volunteering his services, and I engaged him as my administrative assistant.

In that capacity, during the past 4 years, he has given special attention to my service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the many western matters relating to the jurisdiction of that committee. He has served me with exceptional industry, great ability, and unswerving high principle. On the basis of my long acquaintance with him, I am certain that he will serve in his new position with great competence, and in a manner which will reflect much credit upon him and upon the new administration.

I therefore, with considerable pride, urge the Senate to confirm the nomination of Mr. Carver to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Department of the Interior, with the exception of the nomination of Kenneth Holum, are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of the Interior Department nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there is one nomination remaining in the Department of the Interior, that of Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota. Because one Senator has had to send to his office for additional information on this nomination, I move that the Senate return to legislative session, with the assurance that later in the afternoon the nomination of Mr. Holum will be brought up.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader state that when the nomination is brought up he will notify the junior Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FINAL REPORT ON COORDINATION OF FEDERAL BIOMEDICAL AND OTHER SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations, through its Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations has now completed its studies pursuant to two special resolutions which the Senate had approved in 1959 and 1960.

These were, first, Senate Resolution 347, 85th Congress, as extended by Senate Resolution 42, 86th Congress, for a survey of international medical research assistance and rehabilitation; and second, Senate Resolution 255, sections 1–4, 86th Congress, for a study of interagency coordination in scientific research.

The final report, pursuant to these studies, is exceedingly comprehensive and consists of several parts.

PART I—BUDGET, FISCAL SURVEY

Part I, now in committee print form, comprises a fiscal and personnel survey of health activities of the U.S. Government. It depicts the agency-by-agency expenditures of $4.1 billion for medical and health-related programs. This represents 1 out of every 20 U.S. budget dollars. The report describes, in text and chart, some $649 million in Federal biomedical research. It shows the distribution by agencies of some 6,000 professional research personnel.

Part I, like the succeeding parts, brings together Government-wide information never previously available to the public or the legislative and executive branches.

It provides for the Congress a new tool of analysis which supplements the guides developed by other expert committees.

OTHER PARTS OF REPORT

Parts II, III, IV, and V of the final report are similarly comprehensive. They include detailed staff analyses of the U.S. Government's programs in international medical research and international health assistance; coordination of domestic biomedical research and coordination of information on physical sciences research.

So voluminous are the various parts of the final report that we will be presenting them in the form of several volumes.

These will be issued as fast as they are processed from the Government Printing Office. In anticipation of their publication, we have received literally hundreds of requests for copies of the various parts. We have been endeavoring to make them available as rapidly as possible.

Since we have, however, but a single professional employee, the project director of the studies, aided by a small editing, clerical, stenographic force, we are necessarily limited in how fast we can process the voluminous publications.

REQUEST FOR FILING OF REPORT BY MARCH 31

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the time within which the Committee on Government Operations may file the final report, pursuant to Senate Resolution 255, sections 1–4, 86th Congress, be extended until March 31, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 25, 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am glad to say that the Committee on Government Operations on January 26 approved Senate Resolution 26, 87th Congress, for a new study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency. This resolution is now pending before the Senate Committee on Rules. Adoption of the new resolution by the Senate will enable us to follow up on many helpful leads which we have developed during the initial studies, now completed. The new resolution will, we believe, enable us to make further contributions to Federal efficiency, supplementing those which we have reported to the Committee on Rules.

FILING OF STATEMENT ON PUBLICATION SERIES

I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared, describing a series of additional committee prints now in process by the subcommittee, pursuant to our previous authority. Information on these publications will, I believe, be of value to the hundreds of individuals who have inquired by phone and by letter, concerning our on-going work. I believe that the publications which are described, together with those issued by the Committee on Government Operations, as a whole, notably its study, "Documentation, Storage, and Retrieval of Scientific Information" are among the most popular and best received items issued by the Congress in recent years.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLICATIONS RESULTING FROM TWO STUDIES

(By Senator HUMPHREY)

As a result of our two studies, there has already been issued a broad series of publications.

Thus, pursuant to the international health study, we have issued 10 committee prints and a 310-page hearing volume. Now in process at the Government Printing Office are four additional committee prints and two appendix volumes. The latter volumes consist of many informative exhibits compiled by the subcommittee as part of our international health review. This includes correspondence with leading scientists such as winners of the Nobel award, deans of medical schools, executives of pharmaceutical companies, foreign ministers of health, leaders of the American Medical Association, and other health authorities.

As part of our study of the "Coordination of Domestic Scientific Research," there has been issued a 251-page hearing volume. This volume consists of the transcript of our hearing on "Coordination of Domestic Biomedical Research." It includes as well, 69 exhibits. Two of these exhibits consist of new charts which were compiled, showing a breakdown of the major classifications of biomedical research projects being conducted under Federal auspices in the 1960 fiscal year. These charts show 22,924 projects, representing a total expenditure of $455 million for the projects themselves. (In addition, there was over 200 million additional dollars of research-type expenditures which are described in pt. I of our final report.)

ENTHUSIASTIC REACTIONS TO TWO STUDIES

As we have reported to the Committee on Rules, the reaction to our studies has been enthusiastically favorable. It would be difficult to recall a Senate study in recent years which has met with a warmer or more gratifying response.

The subcommittee has received hundreds upon hundreds of letters from leaders in the life sciences and the physical sciences, commending our efforts.

CORPORATIONS URGE MORE INFORMATION

In our review of problems of coordination of information on physical sciences research, we have been in contact with hundreds of leading American corporations. We have

asked them for their reactions on the manner in which the Federal Government is discharging its responsibility to keep American free enterprise informed on current federally supported research and development. Here again, we have received literally hundreds of favorable reactions to our efforts.

PUBLICATIONS ON INTERAGENCY SCIENTIFIC COORDINATION

Our study of interagency coordination of research in the physical sciences has resulted in a series of publications now in committee print form.

One of the most voluminous of these publications is "Coordination of Information on Current Scientific Research and Development in Science and Engineering, Supported by Agencies of the U.S. Government."

This publication brings together for the first time information regarding the critical problem of management of information on current physical sciences research in the U.S. Government.

It shows the enormity of the problem. At the present time, the Federal Government is spending over $8 billion for research, development, testing, and evaluation. In the physical sciences this involves an estimated 160,000 research projects which are now being performed in over 7,000 research installations. From a manpower standpoint it involves 240,000 engineers and over 120,000 scientists in research and development work.

To assure prompt and effective exchange of information, as appropriate, on this vast number of research projects and among this vast number of individuals is a formidable problem. It is a problem which the Federal Government has only begun to meet. One of the ways by which it can do so is through the Science Information Exchange. An announcement was made in September 1960 concerning the future registration of current projects in the mathematical, physical, engineering, and social sciences on the part of the exchange, but the announcement is a long way from being implemented.

A second committee print is entitled "A Study of Information on Electronic Research and Development." This is a comprehensive study on the subject of management of information on the estimated $1.75 billion in electronic research, development, testing, and evaluation now underway under Federal Government auspices. It is estimated that one-third or more of the cost of each major U.S. missile system consists of electronics parts. The management of information on this subject alone is an important executive branch responsibility.

IMPORTANCE OF PROBLEM

I want to emphasize that circulation of information is a key to scientific progress. Research is not really completed until the results are made known to those who must utilize such information.

Unless there is effective circulation of information, unintended duplication of effort may occur. This can result in grave wastage of men, money, facilities, and time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ASSISTANCE

For these and earlier mentioned publications, we have had very helpful cooperation from Federal agencies, including the Library of Congress.

I should like in particular to acknowledge the assistance of three experts. They are—

(a) For the print on information on research—in all of the sciences—we are appreciative of the assistance of Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., senior science specialist, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

(b) For the print on information on electronic research—Mr. Joshua Stern, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

(c) For part I of the final report—the Federal fiscal, personnel survey on $4.1 billion in health programs—Mr. I. M. Labovitz, senior specialist in social welfare, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

For our publications on biomedical research, we are glad to acknowledge the cooperation of the National Institutes of Health and, in particular, its Office of Program Planning.

We appreciate, too, the cooperation with our subcommittee staff on the part of the Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation, the Office of the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, as well as other Federal organizations.

OBTAINING PUBLICATIONS FROM SUBCOMMITTEE

The various publications which have been mentioned can be obtained, when available, from the subcommittee's office, room 162, Old Senate Office Building, Capital 4-3121, extension 2308.

I believe that the entire series of publications represents the most comprehensive assembly of data on problems of prepublication and postpublication scientific information which has ever been made available either within the executive or the legislative branches. The subject of information retrieval was described in an article in the September 1960 issue of Fortune as one of the crucial elements in the scientific revolution of our times. The contributions by the parent Committee on Government Operations and by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am privileged to be chairman, will, we trust, exert a continued constructive impact on America's ability to realize the fullest potentialities from this revolution.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATIVE TO AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 45, to investigate matters relative to aeronautical and space activities of the Federal departments and agencies be laid down and made the pending business. It is Calendar No. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 45), to investigate matters relative to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the resolution will not be considered today. However, it will be the first order of business after the morning hour tomorrow.

ACCELERATED AMORTIZATION DEDUCTIONS FOR INDUSTRIAL OR COMMERCIAL PLANTS AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTED IN ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to provide accelerated amortization deductions for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed in economically depressed areas.

The purpose of this proposal is to encourage capital investments which will provide new employment opportunities in areas suffering from high and prolonged unemployment.

It is estimated that 10 to 20 percent of the people wanting work in the depressed areas are unable to find jobs.

The suffering of hundreds of thousands of American workers and their families living in depressed areas and unable to find gainful employment demands our immediate concern.

I was very much pleased to hear President Kennedy, in his message today, place high priority on dealing with the problems of depressed areas. I am confident that Congress will give the President the backing he needs and deserves in his efforts to assist in improving the economies of such areas.

I point out that the task force on problems of depressed areas, appointed by President Kennedy in December, and headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in its report to the President recommended consideration of the proposal which I am offering today. I am hopeful that this measure will be given careful and sympathetic consideration by the Committee on Finance and by the House Committee on Ways and Means, to which a companion measure offered by Representative JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, has been referred.

It should be emphasized that the bill I am offering specifically states that accelerated amortization deductions will be allowed only on those capital investments made in a depressed area—as defined in the bill—and "which will provide new employment opportunities all or substantially all of which will be filled by individuals residing in such area."

The basic purpose of the proposal is to bring new job opportunities to the workers in areas of substantial unemployment.

I have in mind particularly the northeastern part of Minnesota, as well as other parts of our Nation. In the past few years in northeastern Minnesota we have had very severe conditions of economic distress and unemployment. I regret to have to inform the Senate that that unemployment has been rising. Industrial investment has been diminishing. With the exception of investment in our fine taconite plants, which process taconite ore, which in a sense is a manufacturing process, Minnesota has been suffering severely from the lack of capital investment.

Capital investments which will not provide new job opportunities to workers of the area will not, under the terms of my bill, qualify for a fast tax writeoff. I am aware of the difference of opinion which exists in Congress over the advisability of fast tax writeoffs, but I believe that fast tax writeoffs for accelerated depreciation can be justified when there is a great need for encouraging capital investment. We must have capital investment in this area, otherwise the area will not only become distressed; it will become an economically

barren area so far as job opportunities are concerned.

I know, Mr. President, that the proposed legislation would definitely encourage new capital investment in economically depressed areas, including northeastern Minnesota which, as I have indicated, is experiencing serious economic problems and high and sustained unemployment.

The passage of this measure, coupled with the enactment of the area redevelopment bill and my Youth Conservation Corps proposal, would without a doubt stimulate the economy in northeastern Minnesota and in scores of areas throughout our country which face similar economic problems.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Minnesota knows of my own interest in the whole problem of areas of economic unemployment. First, will the Senator from Minnesota tell me if the measure which he proposes would be applicable to similar areas in my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed. It would apply to all those areas which are defined in the area redevelopment bill as being areas in which there has been continued or sustained unemployment, and in which there seems to be difficulty in affording new job opportunities. The only rule of thumb which is applied is that the new investment shall provide new job opportunities for persons residing within those areas.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Minnesota tell me how he deals with a matter which arises in the consideration of the several distressed area proposals? I read in the newspapers that the President has indicated that he favors the administration of this program within the Department of Commerce. I spoke with the Secretary of Commerce this morning. He told me he favors the administration of the program within that Department. That is also provided in bills which I introduced in the previous session and in this one.

Does the Senator from Minnesota have an opinion on the question? Does he agree with me that it would be well to keep the proposal within a department which already employs a number of persons—I think about 40—in related areas similar to that which is involved in this proposal, and which, I believe, administers some appropriated funds within the same general objective as is proposed in the various depressed area measures?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I had been of the mind that this program might well stand on its own in a separate agency, but I recognize that when that is done, frequently we do not provide for the full utilization of the expert personnel already employed in the existing departments, and the administration of the program then becomes a little cumbersome at times.

Mr. SCOTT. I was thinking of the timesaving element, as well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Department of Commerce and the Secretary of Commerce will put a high priority on the administration of the proposed act. It may very well fit into the activities of the Department of Commerce. I know that the Senator from Pennsylvania has felt as he does.

I think the answer depends primarily on the zeal, the purpose, and the sense of direction which the administrator or the director of this particular program would give it. I feel that the Department of Commerce has one asset that cannot be overlooked, namely, that it is fully acquainted with the business community. What is more, it has available the statistical information and technical services which will be needed to administer an area redevelopment program. I may say that the Department of Labor is similarly equipped.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So whoever directs the program within a department—and I have the feeling that it will be administered within the Department of Commerce—I hope he will establish some kind of interdepartmental or interagency committee which will work with the Department of Agriculture—because there are distressed areas in the field of agriculture—the Department of Labor, possibly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of the Interior. I include the Department of the Interior because the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has reminded me of mining. I am very much aware of mining because of the existence of the great iron mines in northern Minnesota. All we are asking is that the facilities in the departments be utilized and that job opportunities be made available.

Mr. SCOTT. As a matter of fact, one never knows what the distinguished junior Senator from New York is mining for.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 672) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an accelerated amortization deduction for industrial or commercial plants and facilities constructed or established in economically depressed areas, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL WATER RESOURCES — SUPPLEMENTAL AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 29)

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on April 20, 1959, the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 48, establishing a Select Committee on National Water Resources to make exhaustive studies of the extent to which water resources activities in the United States are related to the national interest, and studies of the extent and character of water resources activities required to provide for water needs of population, agriculture, and industry, between the present time and 1980. The committee was directed to transmit to the Senate not later than January 31, 1961, the results of the studies authorized, together with such recommendations as the committee felt to be desirable.

Mr. President, I believe that history will record this day—January 30, 1961—as a milestone in the great effort for conservation and better use of our great natural resources.

For this distinguished committee, I am proud today to present its final report. After 2 years of thorough investigation and study, this committee has come up with the most complete document on this subject that has ever been produced.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 48, 86th Congress, 1st session, relating to national water resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the report carries a message of deep urgency, and it is completely documented by the facts and estimates of the leading authorities in this field. It comes at a most appropriate and significant time. A new administration has moved in and is gearing for action, ready to tackle these critical problems which are challenging the present and threatening the future.

In the words of my favorite phrase, the "land, wood and water" are the basic elements of economic strength, and these elements must be diligently conserved and wisely used if we are to maintain our security and reinforce our world position. President Kennedy has said we must negotiate with the Russians from a position of strength, and this report verifies the fact that the basic foundation of our enduring strength consists of our natural resources.

This report today is concerned with general recommendations as to how we can best meet our water needs for farm, home and factory in an expanding economy as we move into 1980 and the end of the century. These recommendations will be furnished to the appropriate committees and it is my hope that appropriate legislation will be introduced, in addition to that already before Congress.

Mr. President, our committee closes shop tomorrow. Its job is done. But we hope that its recommendations will bring bold and vigorous response. This alone can produce a stronger, sounder, safer, and enduring America.

Mr. President, I am very happy to report that for once a committee has been formed, has accomplished its assigned objective, with a minimum of expenditure of public funds, and is now terminating its activities within the time set, without recommending that its life be extended or that its work be continued. The filing of the report of the Select Committee on National Water Resources is the last official action to be taken by the committee, and at midnight tomorrow the existence of the committee will terminate.

Water conservation and utilization are becoming recognized more and more as the No. 1 economic problem in the Nation. I think the work of this committee will go down in history as one of the most outstanding studies of water resources ever carried out in the United States. And yet, how could it have failed? The original concept of the study was thought up and it was introduced into the Senate by the distinguished majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, with the aid of his great colleague from the State of Montana, now retired, Senator Murray. When the committee was formed, many of the most able Members of the Senate were appointed to membership. All the Members were selected from the four great standing committees of the Senate that have primary responsibilities for substantive legislation in the field of water resources. In addition to Senator Murray, who was then chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, membership of the Select Committee from that committee included Senator ANDERSON, the new chairman; Senator KUCHEL, the distinguished assistant minority leader; and Senator JACKSON. From the Committee on Public Works there were included Senator CHAVEZ our great chairman; Senator CASE, the ranking minority member; Senator Moss; and, in addition to myself, Senator Martin, who retired at the end of the last session.

For the first time, I believe, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were brought in with the Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees on a water study. From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we had Senator ELLENDER, the eminent chairman of that committee; Senator HART; and Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. And from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we had its distinguished chairman, Senator MAGNUSON; its ranking minority member, Senator SCHOEPPEL; and Senator ENGLE, Senator MCGEE and Senator SCOTT. I repeat, with this membership, how could this committee have failed to do one of the finest jobs of any committee ever assembled by the Senate of the United States? I consider it a very great privilege indeed, to have served as chairman of this group. Senator KUCHEL was the vice chairman, and the committee work has been carried out in a bipartisan manner at all times.

The report which I am today filing with the Senate is the latest in a long line of reports on national water resources. Since the Inland Waterways Commission filed its report with President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1907, there have been no less than 20 major studies and reviews of the Nation's water resources problems.

Since the end of the Second World War, we have had the First Hoover Commission, the Second Hoover Commission, President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission, the Missouri Basin Survey Commission, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. Naturally with all of this work having been done in the field of water resources, someone might think that we would be ploughing the same ground. Well, Mr. President, I want to tell you that this committee has done one thing that none of the other committees really did. This committee has looked forward instead of backward. Instead of looking backward, trying to find mistakes of the past years, this committee has looked ahead at the great challenge faced by the United States in the decades to come.

One of the first things we found was that to consider the projects and proposals that would be needed by 1980, we would have to set our sights ahead to the year 2000, because some of the required projects are so vast and tremendous in scope that we will need more than 20 years to take them from the beginning of construction stage to the time when they will actually deliver the water we must have. There have been projections of needs 20 years in the future before, and there will be many more. Without emphasizing the figures, I just want to say that the estimates put together by our technicians and used as the basis for the committee's report show a need for the withdrawal of 559 billion gallons of water a day by the year 1980, and 888 billion gallons a day by the year 2000.

I think the future will show that these projections are low, but they are soundly and conservatively based and I think the best justified set of projections that have ever been made, because for the first time they have considered the overall needs for such purposes as fish and wildlife conservation, pollution abatement, and the effect on water supply of agricultural watershed programs.

The work of the committee has assured me of one thing—that the United States has enough water for continued national advancement. However, we must have foresight and planning. We must construct ample works to conserve water and keep it pure. We must greatly expand our scientific research programs to develop ways to make better use of its available water. With the exception of certain areas, the underdeveloped potential supply will be sufficient, and the techniques of making it available for use are at hand or can be developed. But it will be necessary to begin now, without further delay, to take concerted national action to open up, protect, and keep available, the potential resources of water that a munificent providence has given us. For a multitude of actions affecting the uses and sources of water, that are constantly taken, day by day, in our changing, growing, society, are having far-reaching, and as a practical matter, permanent effects on the cost and future availability of water.

The job of correcting our past mistakes and acting to provide for the future needs is a tremendous one. It is a task for cooperative effort by all segments of society. Federal, State, and local governmental action, and the efforts of private industry, will have to be combined. The investments necessary will be large, and many of the problems difficult and time consuming to solve. The longer we delay a major frontal attack upon our growing water resources problems, the greater will be the cost of their solution and the lesser will become our opportunities for full realization of the benefits from the limited potential supply.

The first and most important step toward getting the job done is the development of increased public awareness and understanding of the Nation's water resources problems, of their effect on the Nation's economy, and of the possible ways of solving them. Facilitating this step has been one of the primary objectives of the Select Committee on National Water Resources.

Our national water resources situation is dynamic. It changes constantly as scientific advancement reshapes our way of life, creating new water requirements and problems. At the same time, scientific progress is opening up prospects of better technical means for solving the problems.

The task confronting the Nation calls for the establishment of a planned sufficiency of good water for essential uses to replace the natural abundance which no longer exists. It entails the anticipation of long-range water demands and requires timely efforts to assure that they can be met in the most efficient manner consistent with accepted aims. Action to avoid water difficulties, rather than efforts to correct them after they have occurred, must be taken if economic decline is to be avoided in many areas.

Government, of necessity, has assumed major water responsibilities, and the public looks to it for leadership and assistance in this field of common necessity. Thus, government must equip itself to the adoption of far-sighted preventive programs and policies to deal with our now seriously declining water resources situation.

The facts ascertained by this committee show that 5 major categories of combined Federal, State, and local action, together with private effort, are required. These are: First, regulating streamflow through the construction of surplus reservoirs and through watershed management programs; second, improving the quality of our streams through more adequate pollution abatement programs; third, making better use of underground storage; fourth, increasing the efficiency with which water is used through elimination of wasteful practices, improved sewage treatment methods, recirculation, increased irrigation efficiency, and substitution where possible of air for water cooling; and fifth, increasing the natural yield of good water by desalting of ocean water, purification of brackish water, weather modification, and other means.

Under the conservative projections used by the committee staff and the technicians who assembled the water supply-demand studies for the committee, it was found that there will be a need for an additional 315 million acre-feet of reservoir capacity for river regulation between 1954, base year for the studies, and 1980. This is over and above the existing reservoir capacity which amounts to

almost 300 million acre-feet. The additional capacity is estimated to cost about $12 billion. However, this is only a part of the job, for the major task remaining to be done is the adoption of and the putting into effect of adequate pollution abatement programs in order to maintain the relatively high quality of water that will be needed if future requirements are to be met. New investments for this purpose are estimated at about $42 billion to be required between 1954 and 1980. Substantial increases in our rates of expenditures for these purposes will be required.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma for the great public service he has rendered in making the study, and for his work as chairman of the committee in compiling these facts and presenting these recommendations to the Congress.

It is interesting that today in his state of the Union message President Kennedy called attention to the need for fresh water in the future and the need to conserve water. The report which the able Senator is now rendering gives point and meaning to this reference, which of necessity was brief, in the state of the Union message.

This is a very able report. A great study has been made. I find it unique that, the study having been made and the report having been rendered, the committee is to be abolished. This is unique in the annals of the Congress.

Mr. KERR. I thank my good friend from Tennessee for each of the kind things he has said.

In connection with the reference to the requirements in our country for fresh water, I refer to a fact with which the Senator is very familiar, that eminent industrial, economic, and social authorities, as well as governmental authorities in our country, tell us that by 1975—which, Mr. President, in the passage of time is but a little while from today—not only will the Nation have an increased population, in excess of 65 million above the present number, but also the natural resource in general use which will be the shortest of supply in this Nation will be fresh water.

This is a challenge, which calls for a response from all of us, and especially from a national government cognizant of the needs of its people. We must provide opportunities for growth, for expansion and for development, inspired by the determination to be equal to the responsibilities which rest upon us as members of this Government.

Mr. President, the investments to which I referred, totaling $42 billion by 1980, are for municipal water supply and pollution abatement, but these will not all be Federal investments. Certainly these will not be all the investments to be required in the field of water resources development. They do not include the additional requirements for flood control, navigation, or power development. They are listed as the requirements in the limited field of municipal water supply and pollution abatement.

These are the combined totals of all local, State, and Federal Governments and private interests. As large as these sums are, they seem modest when related to the expected growth of the gross national product. Why, even under the conservative estimates of rate of growth assumed by the staff, the gross national product is expected to exceed $1,060 billion per year by 1980. The growth of the national economy may very well increase at a faster rate, in which case larger amounts of water and even larger investments will be required. But as the Nation grows, our financial capability to make these investments grows. Clearly, here is a task which must be done if we are to avoid permitting the lack of water to deter our economic growth.

Mr. President, we do not need a Chief Executive who dreams dreams, as did Pharaohs of old, nor do we need an inspired prophet, such as Joseph was, to interpret such dreams. The picture of our growing needs is before all of us. He who runs may read.

We can take a leaf from that ancient story of how an inspired prime minister for a thoughtful monarch moved in the days of plenty to provide the means to insure the survival of the nation through the years of lack and drought ahead.

If there is one thing which I as chairman of this committee have been impressed with in all the hearings we have had it is the fact that there is a pattern of rainfall and drought by periods and eras, as well as by seasons of the year, apparent in the records of our Nation's rainfall and moisture precipitation. It is to be found in the records of local observation stations which cover more than a century. It is to be read in the rings which nature provides in the trees of our forests, where there is the definite and absolute story of the years and periods of abundant rainfall followed inevitably by the periods of less rainfall and drought.

We would be more than negligent and far less than prudent if we ignored this story which nature has unfolded, and with reference to which both natural records and manmade records advise that if we do not move in the immediate years ahead to provide this Nation with the means of guaranteeing an adequate supply of water in the decade of the 1970's, at which time we have a abundance of evidence that we can expect a period of drought of a severity equal to or greater than that of the drought either of the 1930's or the 1950's.

So in the preparation of this report and in making of these statements the Senator from Oklahoma is not only inspired by the abundance of evidence across the Nation of the opportunity for growth and development through conservation of soil and water, but also the purpose on the part of the people in every area of our country to move to develop their areas in order that they might have their rightful share in the growth and national development. There is also the stimulant of the definite knowledge that we move not only to take advantage of the opportunities for growth and development, but also to avoid the awful penalties which negligence on our part to provide storage facilities will cause to be brought upon us, penalties we can neither afford to bear nor would we be willing to bear.

What are the next steps to be taken? The magnitude of water needs is such that we will eventually need full development of all our available water resources for them to be met. First step which the committee recommends is for the preparation of up-to-date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins in the United States.

That statement does not echo the language used by our Chief Executive in the state of the Union message, nor did he echo the thoughts and findings of this committee. But the statement made by him, as the statement in this report, is but a recognition by alert governmental authorities and personalities of the realities of the hour and day in which we live.

Such plans should take into account prospective plans for all purposes served through water development, giving full recognition to purposes such as streamflow regulation, outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife conservation, and all others. The committee believes that a program to complete such studies for all river basins in the Nation by 1970, at the very latest, should be adopted. It would be wonderful if we could do it more rapidly than that. But the facts are that a program of this magnitude cannot be handled any quicker than that because of the scarcity of trained engineers and technicians that are able to do the necessary work, because of the tremendous proportion of the job itself. The comprehensive basin plans should be kept up to date and used as guides for our Federal, State, and local water resources development programs.

The comprehensive plans must be developed with the full participation of the State governmental units involved, and some of the States are not equipped to do the job. Therefore, the second recommendation of the committee is for a Federal program of grants to the States to assist them to more actively participate in the planning and undertaking of water resources development activities. The committee recommends establishment of a 10-year program of grants of about $5 million annually of Federal funds to be made available to and matched by the States for this purpose. These funds should be used solely for the States to participate in the preparation of comprehensive, long-range river basin development plans along the lines I previously mentioned. The funds would be used primarily for hiring competent engineers and technicians so that the States would be on an equal footing with the Federal agencies which are usually well staffed for carrying out this kind of work. A precedent for this type of matching fund program exists in section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which authorized grants to States and interstate agencies for the formulation of water pollution control programs. This program, in effect only

since 1956, has stimulated State expenditures in this field, and the States are now spending more of their own money on this type of work than is required by the terms of the act.

The committee's third recommendation is for more research. The committee believes that the Federal Government should coordinate and reemphasize the Federal research programs on water. A great deal has been done in this direction in recent years, but a lot more needs to be done. The committee recommends expanding the programs of basic research in fields such as atmospheric physics, solar activity, hydrology of ground-water movement and recharge, physical chemistry and molecular structure of water, photosynthesis, climatic cycles, and other natural phenomena associated with water in all its forms.

The committee also recommends stepping up the applied research programs for increasing water supplies through such programs as desalting, weather modification, and evaporation and evapotranspiration reduction. Likewise an expansion of applied research in fields of water conservation is needed with emphasis on putting improved waste treatment methods into use, increasing efficiency in the agricultural use of water, finding ways to take better care of fish and wildlife needs, and developing advanced techniques for system planning for optimum development of the water resources of river basins.

The committee also believes there is much to be gained by studying and evaluating the effect of existing water resources development projects toward the end of modifying them where necessary to meet changing needs, and developing better guidelines for future projects.

The committee asks that the executive branch of the Government review present research programs in the field of water and formulate a coordinated program of research along the suggested lines for submission to Congress next year for consideration along with the budget estimates for the 1963 fiscal year.

The committee's fourth recommendation is that the Federal Government continue to look ahead and assess the water supply-demand outlook in all regions as a means of helping the Congress and the public to judge current and prospective public action needed to meet future demands for water.

Several other recommendations are made by the committee for action which would yield important results. The committee suggests that steps be taken to regulate flood plain use as a means of reducing flood damages whenever such regulations provide greater net benefits to the national economy than would be provided through other methods of preventing flood losses. A step in this direction was taken by the Public Works Committee last year, when it reported legislation directing the Chief of Engineers to make information and advice on flood hazards available to local interests on request. Further steps should be taken as practicable.

Next, the committee suggests that further study should be given to the emerging water problems of the areas in which water shortages will be most acute by 1980, with a view to finding ways that these water shortages can be dealt with in such manner as to minimize adverse effects on the economy of the area.

There should also be a study of the future needs for major storage reservoirs for river regulation for all purposes, with a report to the Congress. Our limited remaining reservoir sites are being preempted rapidly for other purposes. We need to have the facts so that the Congress can take appropriate action as necessary to preserve those reservoir sites that will be needed to provide the river regulation for future needs so that the reservoir sites will be available at a minimum cost for use when needed.

The final recommendation of the committee is that public hearings should be held in the vicinity of federally sponsored water resources facilities whenever such facilities are proposed to be developed or whenever any major change in works or policies is to be made. This is an essential step if the public is to be adequately and fully informed and so that the necessary support will be provided for the needed facilities.

Mr. President, I commend this report to all of the Members of the Senate as a guide to our immediate needs for action in the water resources field. Individual members of the committee—and I hope that we will be joined by many of the other Members of the Senate—plan to introduce the legislation needed to carry out these recommendations. The bills, as introduced, will be referred to the appropriate committees of the Senate for consideration. I have already been joined by many Senators in introducing several bills covering some of the subjects dealt with by this report, and they have been referred to the Public Works Committee. Other bills will be forthcoming as they are made ready.

Mr. President, one of the reasons this committee will be remembered is the example it has set in the economical use of public funds. When the committee was set up in April 1959, $175,000 was provided to carry on its activities through January 1960. When the committee found out that much of the needed expert knowledge was available in the Federal agencies, full use was made of the service of those agencies. As a result, the first year's work of the committee was carried on with an expenditure of only $44,370, and almost $131,000 was returned to the Treasury. For the full year ending tomorrow, the committee obtained $150,000, and I am very happy to report that we are winding up, completing the work of the committee, with an expenditure of only about $54,000 of these funds, and returning about $95,000 to the Treasury. This is a record which has seldom been equaled by any governmental agency. In view of this record I want to tell a little bit of just how the committee operated.

When the committee was formed we immediately looked around to find the ablest staff available. Fortunately, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress was able to furnish us with a staff director in the person of Ted Schad. It was a great boon to the committee when it secured the services of Ted Schad. Through training and experience he was preeminently qualified to do our job. He has carried out his work with the greatest distinction.

Under his direction, a staff of expert consultants was retained, on a when actually employed basis. The consultants were Dr. Abel Wolman, professor of sanitary engineering at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, one of the Nation's leading sanitary engineers; Dr. Gilbert F. White, head of the Department of Geography, University of Chicago, an expert on floods; W. G. Hoyt, a retired hydrologic engineer with over 40 years' service with the Department of the Interior in the field of water resources; Col. H. C. Gee, formerly of the Corps of Engineers, and now a consulting engineer in West Palm Beach, Fla., and Dr. Edward A. Ackerman, executive officer of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, a geographer who has had a long career in the field of water resources including service as Assistant General manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The committee also had the advice and counsel of a staff advisory committee made up of some of the top staff members of the existing standing committees; John L. Mutz from the staff of the Public Works Committee; Goodrich W. Lineweaver and Eugene D. Eaton from the Interior Committee staff; Cotys Mouser from the Agriculture and Forestry Committee staff; and Harry Huse from the staff of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Don McBride from my staff also served as a member of this group. I have never known a staff group to work together more harmoniously and efficiently, and in my opinion its work is second to none that has been done on any previous reports made on national water policy.

The professional staff has had the able assistance of a small but excellent administrative and clerical staff. Paul McBride was detailed to serve this committee from the Public Works Committee staff, as its chief clerk. Secretarial and clerical duties of the committee have been most recently handled by Maggie Duckett and Ann Lown. Earlier Victor Jackson and Sue Allen assisted with this work. For public relations we had the part-time assistance of Leonard Mosby, who handled the press releases for the committee, along with his duties with the Corps of Army Engineers. The Government Printing Office assigned Jim Olsen to work with the committee in connection with the printing of the committee's studies, and the Library of Congress assigned Barbara Jibrin to serve as editor of the committee's hearings.

The committee also had the assistance of Miss Malvina Stephenson, of my staff, in the preparation of the report which the committee made to the Senate.

The committee has assembled a series of studies covering all aspects of water resources activities in the United States. Our 32 committee prints contain over 90 reports and they have already been acclaimed by many as one of the most

comprehensive reviews and forecasts of water resources development ever assembled in the United States. The 32 committee prints comprise over 2,000 pages.

These studies, which are filed with the Senate along with the report of the committee, consist of three general types of reports. First the general background studies covering such matters as available water supplies, population projections, and economic assumptions; second, projections of future demands for water and water-related activities; and third, reports on new techniques and means for meeting demands. The final report in the series consists of a water supply-demand study made for the Committee by Resources for the Future, Inc., based on the projections furnished in the earlier studies. This water supply-demand study summarizes data pertaining to water resources needs in 1980 and 2000, in each of 22 water resources regions into which the United States was divided for the purpose of the studies.

In addition to the studies undertaken under the sponsorship of the committee, public hearings were held in all parts of the Nation to seek the views of water resources leaders. Twenty-four hearings were held in 21 States, with over 900 witnesses presenting 3,920 pages of testimony. These hearings have been printed and are available to the Members of the Senate and others interested in the water resources. They provide a mine of information on the water resources problems faced by the Nation.

It would take me the rest of the afternoon to tell of the wonderful cooperation and assistance that has been provided the committee by the Federal agencies, by State officials, and by all others who have been called on to participate in the committee's work. I want to mention just a few who are worthy of the highest commendation for the help they have given us. First, Resources for the Future, Inc., a privately endowed research foundation, as a public service, at no cost to the committee, made available the services of Dr. Nathaniel Wollman to the committee, to prepare the water-supply-demand study which I mentioned previously. In the study for the first time an attempt was made to lay out some basic relationships between water supply and demand in the United States, which give an indication of the overall magnitude of the water resources job to be done.

The U.S. Public Health Service did a magnificent job for the committee in furnishing information on municipal water use and pollution abatement. Four studies were undertaken for the committee by that Service, covering respectively, future water requirements for municipal use, pollution abatement, water quality management, and water requirements for pollution abatement. The latter report was prepared for the Public Health Service by one of its part-time consultants, Prof. George Reid, head of the Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Oklahoma.

The Department of the Interior also contributed a great deal toward the committee's work by undertaking certain difficult studies for the committee. From the Geological Survey of that Department, we had two general reports on water resources and problems, a compilation of maps and tables showing all the surface water resources in the United States, and a technical report on phreatophytes. The Bureau of Reclamation made an excellent study for the committee on future needs for reclamation in the Western States, and a technical report on evaporation reduction and seepage control. The Department's Office of Saline Water reported to us on saline water conversion. Separate reports on water recreation needs in the United States and fish and wildlife resources were made for us by the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service. The Department of the Interior also gave us reports on the water resources of Alaska and Hawaii, and of the territorial and island possessions of the United States.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It occurs to me that the scope of the study which the Senator's committee has made and the committee's findings might be of great usefulness to countries other than the United States, even though the study is directed to the United States and is for the benefit of the United States. However, in its broadness and depth, I think it might be useful to many other people.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his statement. I think the study is not only useful to other nations; it is especially valuable to us in developing our own resources, so that we may be better neighbors with the other countries of the world.

The Bureau of Mines prepared a report forecasting the needs of the mineral industry for water. Altogether there were 13 major reports made for the committee by the Department of the Interior and its agencies, and in addition a great deal of technical data was furnished the committee staff.

The Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army likewise made a great contribution to the work of the select committee by preparing excellent studies on future needs for navigation and on floods and flood control, in which projections were made of future requirements in those fields. In addition to these two formal reports, staff members of the Corps of Engineers assisted the committee staff by compiling data on reservoirs and furnishing other technical material pertaining to water resource development that was needed for the water supply-demand studies.

The Department of Agriculture and its agencies and staff also made a very important contribution to the work of the committee. Four major reports were prepared, covering land and water potentials and future requirements for water, estimated water requirements for agricultural purposes and their effects on water supplies, evapotranspiration reduction, and water resources research needs. Staff of the Department of Agriculture also assisted with preparation of the necessary statistical data and furnished other technical information and advice needed for the water supply-demand studies. The Rural Electrification Administration advised the committee on projected needs for power for the REA cooperatives.

Agencies of the Department of Commerce also assisted mightily. The Census Bureau made projections of the Nation's population to the years 1980 and 2000, with breakdowns by States and river basins. This work was superimposed on the Bureau's already heavy workload in connection with the preparations for and taking of the 1960 census. Unfortunately the data from the 1960 census was not available in time to be useful for the committee's work. Business and Defense Services Administration of the Commerce Department estimated future water requirements of principal water-using industries and prepared a report on this subject for the committee.

The Weather Bureau made two special studies for the committee, on weather modification, and on river forecasting and hydrometeorological analysis. Staff members also gave us projections of needed investments in water resources facilities to 1980, and assisted with the compilation of other statistical data for the committee.

Many other agencies of the Federal Government also made contributions. The Federal Power Commission reported to us on electric power in relation to the Nation's water resources. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in addition to furnishing some of our staff, made a special report on previous reviews of national water resources during the past 50 years. The Tennessee Valley Authority prepared a report on flood problems and management in the Tennessee River basin. A report on application and effects of nuclear energy was made for the committee by the Atomic Energy Commission.

So far as I know, no additional appropriations for carrying out all of this work for the committee were made, and I am humble and grateful, indeed, when I think of the countless hours of overtime that have been put into the studies for the committee by the dedicated civil service employees of the water resource agencies of the Government.

In addition to all of this help given to the committee by the Federal agencies, and the reports, previously mentioned, by each of the 50 States, there have been outstanding contributions to the work made by various segments of industry. A special report for the electric power industry was furnished the committee by Edison Electric Institute. Public power made its contribution through a report to the committee by the American Public Power Association.

All these reports are published in the committee prints which I mentioned earlier, along with the special technical reports which the committee contracted for from Abel Wolman and his associates; and by Dr. Ackerman and his associates; and the water-supply-demand study prepared for the committee by Dr. Nathaniel Wollman of Resources for the Future, Inc.

The committee prints have been given wide circulation as they have been released over the past 15 months or so, and copies have been made available on request to libraries, Government agencies, engineers, and water resources officials. I commend them to the appropriate Senate committees as background material for the consideration of water resources policies for the future.

The committee's report, which I am filing with the Senate today, contains a summary of the committee prints and a description of the activities of the committee. The committee recommends that its report be printed as a Senate document so that it will be widely available to all concerned with water resources policy in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have listened with great interest to the report presented by our distinguished chairman. Before I comment on the report itself, I should first like to pay tribute to the leadership—and I use the word "leadership" with a capital "L"—that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has given to the Select Committee on National Water Resources. He has achieved a remarkable result, not only in bringing the report in by the first fixed date on which the committee's report was due—he has not had to ask for any extension of time—but, under his leadership, the committee also has accomplished its work and will return to the Senate unexpended a large portion of the funds which were made available to it. Those two accomplishments speak for themselves. But, beyond that, and going on to the work of the committee, I think the outstanding thing the committee has done for the country is the presentation of the problem of water to the country in a way in which the country has come to realize that water today is a national problem, and not a local, sectional, or regional problem.

The committee held hearings in some 25-odd cities throughout the country, and demonstrated that the future needs in water constitute truly a national problem.

If the chairman will permit me to briefly comment on one or two matters to which I think the report directs attention:

Very properly, the report emphasizes that we must learn how to reuse and make maximum use of our water. That is to be accomplished partly by conventional antipollution control measures, but it must also be accomplished by demineralization of water. That is a broad term. It means the desalting of ocean waters. It means taking minerals and salts out of brackish inland waters in those areas where such water supplies must be tapped in order to meet the demand and need which the report demonstrates.

The second area of augmentation for fresh water supplies can be in the modification of clouds. I recall that when we first started talking about cloud modification, in 1949 and 1950, there were a good many Members of Congress, as well as people generally, who were inclined to wink about it and think that some of us perhaps were a little "touched." But times have changed and the greater awareness that weather is a product of complex conditions and the reports of weather in the making coming from satellites in space has created a new climate of opinion in this field.

Hearings in 1952 on a bill introduced by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, a bill introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and a third bill which I introduced, produced a joint bill which I had the honor to present on the floor. It authorized the President to name an Advisory National Committee on Weather Control. That committee made its report which, in turn formed the foundation for a followup program that was authorized in a bill which, with several cosponsors, I introduced in 1958. It was considered in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, of that committee, held very productive hearings.

As a result, Congress authorized a field research program in cloud modification, which was placed with the National Science Foundation.

I hope the report which the Water Resources Committee is now presenting will give impetus to the program in which the National Science Foundation is authorized to carry on through contracts with agencies and institutions throughout the country. Developments in rocketry suggest a new approach to cloud seeding which may be very productive.

I wish to pay tribute to the cooperation of the Members of the Senate, as well as the members of the select committee who have worked in these fields—desalination of salty waters and modification of clouds to increase our supplies of fresh water. The Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE] have taken great interest in the desalination programs, as have Senators from Massachusetts and New Jersey because of the availability of the huge supplies of ocean water for their cities. But if I were to name all the Senators who have been interested, it would be too long a list to recite at this time.

I close by saying that the report of the select committee is one that deserves wide circulation and it is hoped that it will awaken the national conscience and evoke the support necessary to implement the recommendations offered.

Again, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his leadership of the committee and for his courtesy in yielding to me for these observations.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota, and I wish to say there is no way for the Senator from Oklahoma to adequately pay his respects to each member of the committee, which has worked now for 2 years in developing this report. In my statement, I have made reference to the work of our fine staff; but among the members of the committee, none did a greater job, was more devoted, or gave more information than did the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. He has long been recognized as one of the outstanding leaders and authorities in every field of water problems and soil conservation, and that leadership was of tremendous value to the committee in the hearings and in the preparation of the report. It was not only my privilege to serve with him on this committee, but on the Public Works Committee, where I found his ability and cooperation of tremendous value, not only to his State and area, but to the Nation in general, and, I may say, to Oklahoma in particular. I am happy to have had this association with him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I say that it is always a pleasure to cooperate with the Senator from Oklahoma on Oklahoma projects, because the Senator from Oklahoma has so many times demonstrated his interest and understanding of water problems in all parts of the country.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that along with the report are contained the supplemental views of several distinguished Senators, who in a very able, learned, and effective manner have set forth very convincingly their thoughts and recommendations with reference to the problems considered by the committee. They are the supplemental views, added to the report provided by the committee, and printed in the report, of Senators ENGLE, HART, MCGEE, and Moss, together with the individual extended views of Senator MCGEE. I commend these views also to the attention of the Senate and the agencies of Congress. I do not regard them as being at all in conflict with the views of the entire committee.

In the work of the committee, we naturally had to base our estimates upon the best forecasts we could obtain. We obtained forecasts from various technical authorities, including the Bureau of the Census, Resources for the Future, Inc., and certain institutions and foundations, so as to estimate what the future growth of the country might be. They indicated what they believed to be what are called a high forecast, a low forecast, and a median forecast. Senators might use their own judgment in deciding which of those forecasts they might accept as being the most authoritative and best balanced.

The committee chose the average and based its recommendations and findings on those forecasts, realizing full well that only the unfolding of time will disclose which of the several forecasts before the committee was the accurate one, if any. However, all agreed that urgency must be the watchword; that a more dynamic program must be our mission; that all people everywhere must be alerted, informed, inspired, and mobilized in order that this mighty Nation might build for its future generations an even better foundation of national resources than we of our day and generation have enjoyed and used to such great advantage.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in the 8 years during which I have had the honor to serve in the Senate, no single chore has been so satisfying or so rewarding as the one presented to me by my membership on the Select Committee on Water Resources. Under the able chairmanship of my friend the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for a number of weeks he and I and other members of the committee traveled across the Nation on a non-political whistle-stop tour. We came into your State, Mr. President. We were enriched by a frank and exceedingly helpful discussion of the water problems of the various States through which we were privileged to pass and in which we held our hearings. That discussion was received from representatives of those States. It found the basis for our report. I think that experience showed the members of the committee that the problem of water is not local or regional; in fact, perhaps it is not even national. Instead, it is global in character.

At any rate, from the standpoint of the people of the United States it is a national problem; and it faces us and plagues us, and will continue to do so in the future.

I think the members of the committee were also enriched, during those long weeks, by the wit and charm and friendship of my friend the Senator from Oklahoma.

One of the phrases he used at one point in our peregrinations across the land comes now to my mind; when he was speaking of the able and the gallant people of Oklahoma, whose able Senator he is, he said, on one occasion, "The people of Oklahoma are against any combine they ain't in on."

Mr. President, this report on water resources is a combine in which all of us participate and all of us play a part; and I wish to say to the senior Senator from Oklahoma that he ably performed a public chore. He did it with not the slightest implication of politics. So did we.

The Members on his side of the aisle and the Members on this side of the aisle sat around the table again and again, after our long days of hearings, to prepare, with the assistance of the fine staff he assembled, and to whom he has paid his tribute here, today, a document with which I am proud to be associated in some small way.

Mr. President, a little later I shall, in my own right, make some comments on part of the report which I think particularly important to my section of the country.

But at this time I rise simply to salute my friend and to tell him that his is a job well done.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my friend the Senator from California for his kind words. I wish to say to him that today I am inspired by his presence and his remarks, as I was both inspired and encouraged, through the long months of our work together on this committee, by his able, effective, unselfish, untiring contributions to the work of the committee. None served it better than did the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join in paying tribute to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma, for the report he has submitted to the Senate.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], has already stated that the work was both satisfying and rewarding. In addition, I found it exciting; and, Mr. President, when one can find water exciting, that takes some doing.

The magnitude of the task was such that it turned into an almost awe-inspiring undertaking. The confusion which prevailed in some parts of the country and the conflicting points of view which everywhere appeared had to be translated, through the committee, into a meaningful document. I think the greatest tribute to the chairman of the committee is that he was above it all and was able to take the contrasting strains of thought and petitions and feelings and weave them together into what I am confident wil be found to be one of the great, rich documents for the guidance of the country.

By his efforts he has shown the country how our lack of concern for water, thus far, has actually curtailed the economic growth of America, and how our indifference to water has even kept us from reaching the standard of living which we might otherwise have expected to attain. He has shown how it endangered the health of the people and—above all else—how it eroded the total national effort in our pursuit of security. I think these are the elements which add up to the extreme sense of urgency which underlies all that he has said today and all that has been included in the report.

The Senator from Oklahoma has not been afraid to ask the right questions in connection with a problem from which no American will be able any longer to ecape if our Nation is to remain successful. Elements of cost, conflict, and embarrassment were thrown out the window, in his determined effort to find answers; and then his great judgment prevailed as he tried to bring all these factors into balance and to arrive at the recommendations which, under his leadership, have been incorporated in the report.

I also pay tribute to him for the role in which our section of the country—his and mine, the West—has been cast. It is not a role of aggrandizement. It is simply a stage which has been reached now in the history of the development of our country. The eastern sections of America have made great sacrifices which have enriched us. They have made contributions which helped the Western States to grow. We think now of the President's message of today and the exciting prospect it unfolds for the new development of our land, and the realization it emphasizes that through the development of our water capabilities, most of which, in their unused potential, are concentrated in the West, it will be possible to broaden the base of the Nation's economic underpinning. Mr. President, I believe that in the long pull one of the great consequences coming from the chairmanship by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and his great contributions in connection with the committee's report will be the great economic expansion which will be available to us through the untapped God-given wealth of the West. It will be found that water, almost alone, will make it possible to utilize and develop this wealth to the fullest.

In my own State of Wyoming we have long had a very keen and alert awareness of the shortage of water—the more so, Mr. President, also because a significant portion of the Nation's watershed happens to lie within the boundaries of our State.

The waters of the Snake River that pour into the Columbia River reach up high into the mountains of the western part of our State. The headwaters of the Missouri basin are in our State. The headwaters of the Colorado River basin are in our State. So we are more than a little water conscious. We are glad to contribute more than our share in making our water resources available to the country as a whole.

Finally, I would say that perhaps as meaningful as anything in the report of the committee, headed by the Senator from Oklahoma, to the Nation has been its focusing on the importance of getting this message to the people; not merely to Senators, not merely to the Congress, or to the administrative branch of the Government, but to the man in the street. The Senator from Oklahoma has done more than anyone I know to take the problem of water out of the professional conference rooms of the water experts, and to promote it as a problem for every American instead of just the water specialists. For all too long, water specialists have been talking too much with each other, and not enough with the rest of the country. I think he has asserted, through our civic groups, as well as our governmental agencies, the complete urgency of everyone's participation in attacking the problem posed by our water needs. The Senator from Oklahoma knows better than I that we cannot pass an act of Congress and create water; that once we discover our difficulty in water supply in 1972 or 1980, not even the finest deliberations of this, the greatest deliberative body in the world, can change the aspects of that urgency. But he is attacking the problem long enough in advance and is attaching to it a sense of urgency soon enough so that we can meet our responsibilities adequately; before the rest of our remaining supply of water runs out.

I would suggest, Mr. President, very humbly, that even though the committee is going out of existence with the submission of this report, the impact of the chairman's contribution and his leadership in the committee are going to go forward, to the reward of the country as a whole. I thank him for his leadership, and for having indulged patiently

my own small contribution in the discussion now underway.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his generous and kind remarks. He made a fine contribution to the work of the committee. He brought us something which is incapable of evaluation, Mr. President. He brought a freshness and a vigor of viewpoint that were wholesome, stimulating, and inspiring. If I may be permitted to be a trifle poetic, I would say that his personality and ability remind me of the vigor of the mountain air of his native State; his steadfastness reminds me of the rugged grandeur of its great mountains; and his mental brilliance of the magnificent glitter of the sunshine of the Wyoming streams to which he referred. He did a great job as a member of the committee, and as chairman of the committee I am grateful for it and also for what he has said here today.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I, too, join in the tribute being paid the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, chairman of the committee, for a thorough, factual, and definitive study of the water needs of this country. He did it with a dedication which did justice to the very newest member in his greatest enthusiasm. He personally conducted hearings from one end of the United States to the other, hearings which, to the surprise of some, were standing-room-only affairs, so widespread is the public concern with our water problem. The hearings themselves, for their thoroughness and sharpness, and sometimes even for their humor, contributed by the chairman, served to further and advance the public interest in this subject.

I was a member of the committee by reason of the kindness of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who appointed me to it as a representative of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It was my very good fortune to serve on the committee, and I am grateful to him.

The committee report and the accompanying studies constitute a monumental contribution to our knowledge of our water requirements.

Three of my colleagues, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], who has spoken, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], have joined me in submitting supplemental views to the committee report. We do this not in dissent, but, rather, we hope, to stress more sharply four fundamental points.

First, we wish to emphasize the urgency which the facts uncovered by the committee clearly warrant. Second, we believe it imperative and within the committee's mandate to spell out programs to meet the demonstrated need. Third, we suggest a method of providing the governmental coordination essential to efficient and effective water resource development. Fourth, and basic to the thinking of those of us who present the supplemental views, is the belief that this Nation is on the edge of a new forward surge; that this forward surge will bring with it a greater economic growth than that used as a basis for the committee's statistics. This greater anticipated growth means greater water use, but it also means larger revenues with which to tackle the Nation's public needs, of which water resource development is a priority item.

As one of the two members of the water committee from east of the Mississippi, I have a special word to my colleagues who represent this one-half of the United States. I quote from the supplemental views, which expresses this point well:

> There long has been recognition of the special requirements and special problems of the Western States arising out of their critical dependence on extremely limited water supplies. Now, in addition, there is growing recognition of the special water resource problems of the Eastern and Midwestern States. The special problems of the humid regions are a compound of several factors: supply-requirements problems stemming from the enormous growth of municipal and industrial uses; extreme pollution loads; concentrated recreation pressures; and the difficulty in providing essention storage reservoirs at sites that are increasingly preempted by intensive residential and industrial developments.

That is a quotation which I think makes clear the characteristics of the problems which affect the eastern region of the country.

History teaches us that a tragic fate awaits a people who fail to meet their water needs. It is my strong impression that in this water problem, the American people are eager for action, and in many cases are ahead of us in their willingness to undertake the burdens. They want us—all of us, in Federal, State, and local government, and in private industry—to get on the job. I think one of the reasons why there are footnotes in the history of civilizations which once thrived and now are dead is that they failed to meet their water needs. The resources were those in some cases, but the courage and energy of the people were lacking, and their green and verdant valleys became a collection of sand, and the countries took their places in the history of the funeral of nations.

With the leave of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I should like to make a request. On Saturday last I received from John Welborn, its board chairman, the excellent 1960 annual report of the Kalamazoo Soil Conservation District.

One article strikes me as so pertinent to the report we are filing today that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

It was written by Randel Burson, who is vice chairman of the Kalamazoo district. In simplicity which reaches eloquence, this working farmer sums up in a few words the concern which all Americans must develop if we are to meet our soil-and-water needs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER

(By Randel Burson)

Water makes news. Too much water or not enough. Water in the wrong places, water out of control. Critical shortages of water, etc. Day by day our national water problem grows more acute, more costly and for the most part we do not realize what is happening and the terrible threat it poses for our future existence.

Water is our most wasted resource. The very abundance of water around us is proof of how this precious resource is wasted. For most of the water we do see is water we do not use. Water experts tell us that 90 and 95 percent of the water that falls on the land escapes our water systems.

Only 10 percent or less is put to use expanding economy, which in 1950 the water demand was 190 billions of gallons per day, 1960 was 250 billions of gallons and they estimate by 1970 we will be using over 400 billions of gallons per day.

Now I ask you what have you done to help in conserving water. You know there is help available through your local soil conservation district. The landowner and the technician work out a system for the farm which will help prevent loss of soil and water and keep the land productive, some of the ways are improved rotations, strip cropping, terracing leaving stubble and straw on the surface, or any of dozens of practices. Which are used depends on slope of land, kind of soil and many other conditions. This kind of farming maintains or improves the soil and passes it to our children in good condition.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have enjoyed every moment of the days I have spent "on the road" with the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Before I became a Member of the Senate I heard many favorable comments about the Senator. They are all true, and do not tell half the story.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, nobody brought a greater contribution to our committee than did the Senator from Michigan. Most of us were from west of the river. He helped dramatize both the fact of and the necessity for a great need for water conservation in every State in the Union. He did so in a manner which was brilliant. I have never seen a member of the committee do a more effective job and at the same time be more quiet or more humble about it. He was most persuasive and effective, both by reason of his ability and because of his wonderful personality.

Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Does the RECORD show that the report of the committee will be printed as a Senate document?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be printed as a Senate report, not as a Senate document.

Mr. KERR. I should like to verify that in the printing of the report the supplemental views of the Senators appearing at the end will be printed also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma make that request?

Mr. KERR. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, it is ordered that the supplemental views be printed as a part of the report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, of the myriad of problems connected with national water resources into which the select committee inquired, none is more vexing or more important than that which surrounds the jurisdictional controversy between the Federal Government and the governments of the several States respecting water and water rights.

This is a unique type of republic which the Founding Fathers fashioned with its system of dual sovereignty. In a very real sense, progress in America is never advanced by strife, bitterness, or discord between the two sovereigns. It is made by amity, good will, and cooperation, which, I regret to say, have all too often been absent in the relationships between the Federal Government and the governments of the States in water development.

I was highly gratified that the Select Committee on National Water Resources unanimously approved a section on this subject in the report, all of which, in the committee's opinion, indicates the indispensable need, as soon as possible, to bring this jurisdictional strife under control.

I wish to read, beginning at page 65 of the report, some comments concerning the State from which I come:

California, with its nearly 16 million citizens—to whom a half million more are being added each year—has a far-reaching State water resource development plan, estimated to cost 11 or more billions of dollars within the next 25 years. Last November the voters of the State adopted a proposal to bond themselves in the amount of $1,750 million to bring the waters of the Feather River from the northern to the southern part of the State over a transmission system hundreds of miles long.

At the very time this project was under consideration by the people of the State, the Federal Government asserted in a California court action that when the United States acquired the area that is now California, and five other States, under the 1848 Peace Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo which ended the war with Mexico, the Federal Government—

I now quote from the position of the Government of the United States—

became the owner of all lands and all rights to use water within the area. This ownership is still retained unless it has been divested pursuant to act of Congress. There has been no such divestment (*City of Fresno v. State Water Rights Board*, California Superior Court, Fresno County, No. 105245).

I continue to read from the report:

This claim by the Federal Government, based on a 112-year-old peace treaty, of outright ownership over all unappropriated water in the State, is described by California officials as "casting a dark and ugly cloud over California's water development program." If this situation is to deter the development of California water resources or the development of the resources of any other State, this conflict must be cleared up and the Congress should take leadership in doing it.

Examples of the conflicts of Federal-State jurisdiction in the field of water abound. One arose in Iowa where a State law sought to prevent diversion of water from one river to another within the State but where a private utility, licensed by a Federal agency, contended it did not need to comply with the State law. The Supreme Court agreed with the utility's contention. The Hawthorne case in Nevada represents a controversy between the Navy, occupying property in that State, and the State of Nevada over the applicability of a State law controlling underground water to a Federal military reservation. We make no comment on the validity of the Federal and State contentions. We point to them simply to indicate our belief that what can be done to compose the conflicts in this field ought to be done by both the Federal Government and by the several States.

These cases mentioned briefly above are but a few specific examples of the ever-increasing conflict between the Federal Government and the States over water rights. As stated, such conflicts operate to the disadvantage of both, retarding the maximum development of water resources by the States.

Senate Resolution 48 directs the committee to "make exhaustive studies of the extent to which water resources activities in the United States are related to the national interests." Clearly, Federal-State conflicts, if they retard water resource development, are "water resource activities related to the national interest."

The broadening pattern of these conflicts is conclusive proof of the urgent need for clear-cut, definitive action on the part of Congress to work out with the States a redefining of Federal-State powers and responsibilities for control, use, and development of water resources. The Federal Government should not hamstring the States in the States' efforts to develop their water resources to meet the needs of their people. Neither should the States hamstring the Federal Government in its efforts to fulfill its functions within the Constitution.

Among clearly Federal responsibilities are flood control and maintenance of navigability where navigability is an economic fact and not merely a convenient legal fiction for assertion of the doctrine of "paramount rights" for other purposes. In the creation of great multipurpose dams on interstate rivers, such as the Hoover, Parker, Garrison, and Fort Peck Dams, the Federal Government must continue to take the lead. Clearly, too, in the case of international rivers, such as the St. Lawrence, the Columbia or the Rio Grande, only the Federal Government can negotiate treaties with foreign powers respecting the apportionment and use of their waters.

In such spheres the National Government is and must continue to be sovereign.

However, in our 184 years as a Nation, the citizens of the individual States philosophically and historically have had recognized powers and responsibilities for the control, use, and development of the water resources within their State boundaries in accordance with local needs and conditions.

Precedents for Federal-State relationships in water resource development have been set in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 388, 399) and in the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887). These far-sighted Federal laws have stood the test of time and experience. Patently, however, they are not the final answer.

The U.S. Department of Justice clearly recognized the problem when in 1956 it cited, with approval, the following statement:

"It follows that the preservation of the integrity of State water laws cannot be accomplished if efforts for that purpose are confined to the insertion in various acts of Congress of a provision requiring that Federal agencies constructing and operating Federal projects shall observe the State laws respecting appropriation, use, and distribution of water. It is evident that the solution lies largely in the integration of the operation of physical facilities and the coordination in an appropriate manner of jurisdictions in a dual form of government."

The problem of Federal-State water rights is one that calls for broad objective inquiry, and for statesmanship of the highest caliber on the part of both the Congress and the States in its solution. A solution must be worked out, and worked out promptly, for the preservation of the historic pattern under which our people have grown great.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the shocking character of the allegation by the Federal Government in the lawsuit to which I have referred. As I have indicated, the Federal Department of Justice under the last administration took the position that the United States of America owns all the waters in the State from which I come, which are not presently appropriated. That is an almost unbelievable assertion, and it is geared, unbelievably, to a treaty of peace between Mexico and the United States which was entered into in 1848, far more than a century ago.

As a U.S. Senator, I completely recognize that the Government of the United States has responsibilities, has duties, and has rights; but the States also have responsibilities, and the States also have duties, and the States also have rights.

The people of California last November wrote out an I O U of $1¾ billion—one thousand seven hundred millions of dollars—as a downpayment on a prodigious and unbelievable State water undertaking, in order to care for the millions of people who are coming to my State, who through the years have come to my State, and who I have no doubt will continue to do so. In the absence of an abundance of water—indeed, in the absence simply of an adequate water supply—it will not be possible to continue to maintain the economy which generally prevails in my State now.

This is not alone a California problem. This is a problem which affects the good people of Arizona and the good people of all other States in the West which trace their origin in the United States to this same treaty of peace. Indeed, Mr. President, the Department of Justice has made somewhat similar contentions in other parts of the country.

It is my hope that the new American Government—your President and mine, and his administration—may take another look at what I believe to be an outrageous and wrong position which the Federal Government has previously taken with respect to the waters of one sovereign American State.

I am gratified that the committee saw fit to include the comments that it did in this field. Mr. President, before too many weeks have elapsed, I hope that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on which both our Presiding Officer [Mr. METCALF] and I have the honor to sit, will hold hearings in which Federal and State representatives and other interested people can give us the benefit of their conflicting views so that all members of that committee may be able to bring to the floor of the Senate honest and constructive legislation which will remove a roadblock and will permit the Federal Government and the State governments in every instance, or at any rate in many of them, to go forward in

harmony and cooperation and not in legalistic animosities to solve the problem of water, and to bring water in abundance to all sections of our country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I, as the junior Senator from Arizona, a neighboring State of California, merely wish to take this occasion to rise, and thank the senior Senator from California for the outstanding work that he has done in this field. As he well knows, the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo affects five of our Western States, and the decision to which he refers likewise affects five of our Western States. He is well aware of the fact that landownership in the West without ownership of water rights means absolutely nothing. I believe the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has performed an outstanding service for all of us who live in the West. I wish to take the opportunity that presents itself at this time to thank him on behalf of the people of my State, and I am sure thanks could be extended from the people of the other affected States also.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am most grateful to my good friend from Arizona. I believe that all members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, coming as we do from the semiarid West, can perform a high public service in rejecting the extreme positions that regrettably have been taken.

I wish to say also that we are going to see the dawn of a new day in which the people of Arizona, California, and other fine States who trace their membership in the Union to a common origin—the treaty of peace with Mexico—will be able to get together and act constructively for our country.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF KENNETH HOLUM TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the nomination of Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in regard to the confirmation of Mr. Kenneth Holum as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power.

This nominee comes from the Midwest, the Missouri River basin, to be more specific. This fact would normally elicit interest in his appointment insofar as the State which I represent is concerned.

Over and above this, however, when he is designated for the Assistant Secretaryship for Water and Power, the index of interest rises sharply because of the importance to the Missouri River basin of the jurisdiction encompassed in that post.

By way of background, Mr. President, I should like to recall that the present development of the Missouri River and its basin has been attained basically through and by reason of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

That act in reality contains a reconciliation of two plans for the development of the Missouri River basin. One of these plans was proposed by the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, and dealt primarily with flood control and navigation. The other plan was from the Bureau of Reclamation and provided primarily for irrigation and reclamation.

There were apprehensions that one of these plans might gain control over activities within the scope of the other; that is, that one would become dominant, and the other inferior.

At the same time there was generally shared in the Congress the view that a concept of well-balanced, multipurpose development was practicable and that it could and should be reduced to statutory form. In other words, it was felt that a plan could be evolved by which the waters of the valley could be used to conserve the interests of everybody living in the valley. This meant that it could be developed so as to protect and advance irrigation and reclamation, to provide and advance the development of hydroelectric power as well as for all feasible and desirable navigation, all in addition to provision for complete flood control.

This all goes to describe a combined plan for a balancer of the several purposes to be served in the river development which was being authorized. It meant that a proper and suitable proportion be observed as to each of those water uses.

This is what was done within the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944 as finally acted into law. It resulted in what is commonly referred to as the Pick-Sloan plan.

RECENT DISCUSSIONS AS TO CHANGES IN WATER USES

Mr. President, all this is pertinent to the pending confirmation of a nominee for Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Power and Water because recently there has been talk about proposals to emphasize water uses for power generation outside of the context and balance originally conceived by the Pick-Sloan plan and as actually applied for several years last passed. If such talk should materialize and be converted into policy, then to the extent that power generation would be favored or exclusively served, other of the multiple uses originally envisioned and provided for would be damaged and shortchanged. Such violence to these other uses was not intended nor approved by Congress and should not be allowed to happen.

The nominee, Mr. President, no doubt has views of his own on the details of any such efforts to change the present status and application of the law. No doubt he has expressed and advocated views regarding them in representing various organizations in which he has been active as an officer or otherwise.

However, it is fair to expect that in accepting the post to which he has been nominated, he will shed any feeling or action of advocacy or partisanship as to such previous views, and that he will assume the office of assistant secretaryship as a Government official representing the public interest as a whole, rather than any small segment or isolated view thereof. I should like to accord Mr. Holum the benefit of that kind of attitude and intent in keeping with his statements of his hearing in which he gave assurance that he would approach responsibilities with objectivity and an open mind.

That one is justified in doing so, is fortified by the testimony which he gave last week on the occasion of his confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There, inquiry was made along lines of interest which I have already indicated.

AS TO POSSIBLE CONFLICT BETWEEN POWER AND NAVIGATION

The nominee made it clear in his testimony that he favors "full multipurpose development of all our water resources" and in such a fashion as to make "sure that we make maximum beneficial use of those water resources."

He also testified that it was his experience that the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army is competent in representing those interests for which it has responsibility, namely, the operation of the main stem dams and also the navigational projects on the Missouri River. Mr. Holum's testimony on these particular points at pages 3 and 4 of the printed hearings reads as follows:

Senator DWORSHAK. The second question is: Do you favor emphasizing power development over navigation development of the Missouri River?

Mr. HOLUM. Senator, this of course, is a question very closely related to questions that have been discussed with my two superiors. It becomes a question involving the interests of the upper basin States against the lower basin States, in this case of the Missouri Basin.

I favor full multipurpose development of all of our water resources. I think it is absolutely essential for the future welfare of our country that we do. I think we must be careful as we develop these water resources to make sure that we make the maximum beneficial use of those water resources.

As I serve in the Department of the Interior, I shall be representing certain water users of the Missouri Valley.

The U.S. Corps of Army Engineers has other duties, of course. I shall, of course, vigorously represent the interest of the Department of the Interior.

Senator DWORSHAK. The third question is: If priority for power development of the Missouri River over, for example, navigation development, is to be given, do you think that this can be done without changing the Flood Control Act of 1944?

Senator MILLER has indicated that there is no mention of power development in this act.

Mr. HOLUM. I think that Senator MILLER is asking me a legal question. As a representative of the Department of the Interior, I am not completely competent to answer at this moment. I think I can refer back to what I said previously: that I believe in the full multipurpose, comprehensive development of our water resources, and that that involves a maximum amount of conservation in all areas.

What the legal status would be, whether or not this situation exists or could exist, without an act of Congress, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Holum, I have two questions that were sent to me by Senator LONG of Louisiana. I think it is appropriate that they be asked.

The first one is: Do you advocate operation of the reservoir systems of the United States in a manner such that navigation may be jeopardized?

Mr. HOLUM. These questions are all very closely related. I can assure the Senator that while I have been extremely busy in the last days that I have been in Washington, I have devoted as much time as I could to studying the proposed filling criteria for the Colorado River projects, because I think the problem of reservoir filling in the Missouri Basin is a critical problem.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not familiar with what Senator LONG is alluding to, but we have heard stories about the program for slack water navigation in the Missouri River below Sioux City and so forth.

I assume that, since his State is on the Missouri River, he wonders whether the primary emphasis is going to be such that navigation will be jeopardized.

Mr. HOLUM. The U.S. Corps of Army Engineers has the responsibility for operating not only the main stem dams but also the navigational projects on the Missouri River.

It has been my experience as a citizen of South Dakota that the Corps of Army Engineers is competent in representing those interests.

From this and other testimony, it would appear that Mr. Holum's views are clearly in full understanding and support of the original concept of balance among the several water uses as set out and provided for in the Pick-Sloan plan—Flood Control Act of 1944.

CONTROL OF WATER UTILIZATION

In the preamble of the 1944 Flood Control Act, Congress declared that its policy was:

To recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control as herein authorized to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent established and potential uses, for all purposes of the waters of the Nation's rivers.

Pursuant to this declaration of policy, there was created some years ago a coordinating committee composed of representatives of eight Federal agencies and each of the basin States. The State representatives are appointed by the respective State Governors.

This coordinating committee meets twice annually to review operating schedules of the main stem dams and to formulate an operating plan for the year ahead. When it comes to agreement, the annual operating plan is then presented to the full Missouri Basin Interagency Committee for its approval. Upon such approval being indicated, the Corps of Engineers then proceeds to operate the reservoir system so as to equitably serve all authorized functions.

Mr. President, recently and from time to time there has been some talk about replacing the present system of operating control with a single agency of Federal authority. Usually this is talked of in terms of creating a Missouri Valley Authority.

Opposition to such MVA idea is not new in this Senate. In fact, such an authority has been rejected in this body very decisively in past sessions.

I firmly believe that the prevailing view among the States in the Missouri River Basin is still overwhelmingly against a Missouri Valley Authority; against the centralization of control in a Federal entity at the price of sacrificing the interests and rights now enjoyed and exercised by the several States through their agencies and their elected officials.

It is heartening to read from the printed testimony of Mr. Holum that he does not favor a Missouri Valley Authority and that he expresses faith in the States and their officials in regard to the subject activities.

At page 4 of the hearings, the chairman of the committee, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, was questioning Mr. Holum.

The CHAIRMAN. I will read you the next question.

Do you agree that the Senators, Representatives, Governors, and other officials elected under a statewide basis, from the States which have a conflict between fish and wildlife regulations and the needs of navigation and other purposes are best able to speak for the overall requirements of their State, and, if not, who is?

Mr. HOLUM. Well, certainly I would recognize that the Governors and the elected officials of any State should be in a position to be highly competent to speak for the interests in their States.

More specifically, the witness answered questions pertaining to a Missouri Valley Authority. At page 3, for example:

Senator DWORSHAK. The question is: Are you in favor of a Missouri Valley Authority or some similar single agency having control over development and uses of the Missouri River?

Mr. HOLUM. If you want a yes or no answer under the existing circumstances, the answer would be "No."

At page 9 of the hearings, the witness spoke out flatly and without reservation on the same point as follows:

Senator BIBLE. But suppose legislation were put before the Congress to create a TVA-type of project in the Missouri Valley. Would you favor that?

Mr. HOLUM. I previously answered that question negatively.

At still another point in his testimony, Mr. Holum spoke out on another subject which has been frequently discussed. This was at page 7:

Senator BIBLE. Do you feel that the Federal Government is under an obligation to meet all the power requirements of preference customers in the Missouri Basin?

Mr. HOLUM. No, sir.

Mr. President, it is my intention to address the Senate in greater detail at a future time on the points to which I have referred in these remarks. At that time I propose to do so not as a propower or antipower advocate; nor as a pronavigation or antinavigation advocate; nor as a proreclamation or antireclamation advocate. At that time I propose rather to address myself to a reaffirmation of those legislative principles, history, and provisions which made possible the splendid development and progress which we behold in the Missouri River Basin as of today. It will be my purpose to speak out for a retention of that balance and proportion which must be observed among the several water uses and purposes, so as to assure the continued success and progress of the entire basin.

At that time I intend to speak in opposition to any proposal to have any single Federal agency or entity assume jurisdiction and control over this subject matter, to the exclusion of the rights and against the best interests of the several States, their elected officials, their agencies, and their citizens.

But that is for another day.

For now, I should like to say that members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are to be commended for having inquired into the subjects covered on the occasion of the hearing on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holum.

The points raised are vital to the future of water and power everywhere; but, of course, more immediately and more particularly to the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys.

They are important as a basis for confirming the nomination of a man to a post having much jurisdiction and great influence over the administration of the laws and the affairs of the subject involved.

It is on these considerations that I speak to the pending nomination.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I rise not to speak specifically against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holum, but to call the attention of the Senate to the pattern which this administration seems to be following in the appointment of men who will occupy positions of control and influence in the power field. It is becoming quite clear that the appointees are men who have been selected because of their interest in public power as against men who have had experience in private power. I think we would expect a similar protest or an expression of concern were those men all from the field of private power.

Like the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who just spoke, I feel and hope that these men will be able to dissociate themselves from their background and will render unbiased decisions when those decisions confront them.

Mr. President, I cannot help wondering what the new administration has in mind so far as our electric utility industry is concerned. It is no secret that for a good many years there has been quite a bit of controversy in both the House and the Senate as to the role that private and governmental development of electricity should play in our national economy. I naturally tend toward letting private industry take on all of the burden or responsibility, whichever it is desired to call it, of providing our future power needs as it is willing to assume them. This is because I believe that Government should do for the people only those things that need to be done but which private industry is unwilling or refuses to do. I think the private electric industry of the United States has performed outstanding service in providing for our electric needs. From all I can gather, it has plans well into the future for providing our needs both during peacetimes and during a period of war emergency. From what I know, its plans even now extend into the year 1980, and in some instances even into the year 2000. Even during World War II, when we had much less of everything than we do today, Mr. Krug, who headed the Utility Division of the War Production Board, and later became Chairman of that Board, said:

> The electric industry had never been too little or too late.

Mr. Krug, who had been head of electric power for the TVA, could in no sense of the word be considered a champion of the electric utility companies.

The point I am making is that the electric companies have expanded their facilities for supplying electricity for the growing needs of our people—expanded it with a spirit of daring unsurpassed by any industry in America. Maybe they have been forced to it—I do not know—but the fact is that they have done it. We now have about 40 percent of the world's supply of electricity. We have far more electricity per capita, use more electricity per capita, and have more reserve per capita than any other major nation in the world. If there is anything of which we are not short, it is electricity. In fact, it has been developed to such an extent in this country that if an emergency came along, if we used up our extensive reserves by curtailment of domestic use without hurting our people, we could pick up more than enough electric power to carry on any war effort that might confront us.

Mr. President, I do not want what I have to say to be construed as an effort on my part to champion the interests of the electric power companies; that is not my purpose at all. I have no monetary interest in them. My own interest in them is their position as a segment of our free enterprise system that has never failed us in time of emergency and which not only stands ready to provide our future needs in either war or peace, but whose entire future plans contemplate just that. During these trying times when our Federal, State, and local budgets are stretched to their very limit to meet our needs for defense, education, roads, streets and the like, why should we spend tax money on things that our citizens can and will do through the free enterprise system?

Mr. President, in this opening statement I may have seemed to stray from the point at issue; namely, the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holum to become the Assistant Secretary of Interior. I started out with the question, What is this new administration's motive as regards our electric power industry? I think the appointment of Mr. Holum has a direct bearing on the answer to that question.

There are three administrative branches of the Government which are the focal points of most of our controversies on the question of electric companies versus the various forms of government power and power systems financed by the Federal Government. Those branches of the executive comprise the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Power Commission. Let us see what the new administration has done toward staffing those Departments.

First, let us start with the Department of the Interior because that is the Department that is under consideration at this time. Stewart Udall was named as Secretary of Interior. I have known Stewart for many years. When he came before the committee of which I am a member, I had no opposition to his appointment. But there is one thing I want to say right now: If we go by his voting record during his service in the House of Representatives, the electric companies can take no comfort in his appointment.

The new administration has appointed Mr. James K. Carr as Under Secretary of Interior. I am not personally acquainted with Mr. Carr, but I know that his background in the electric power field is that of Government power. He has been assistant general manager of the Sacramento, Calif., Municipal Utility District, which is a form of Government ownership and operation.

Mr. Kenneth Holum, whose nomination to the position of Assistant Secretary of Interior for Water and Power is before us, has a longtime record as an advocate of Government ownership of electric power. He has been active in several rural electric cooperative organizations which have advocated more and more Federal power, even to the detriment of other uses, such as inland navigation. More recently he has been chairman of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association, which has strongly advocated a giant electric power system in the upper Missouri River Basin States. This proposed system would be comprised of steam and hydroelectric generating stations and an extensive high-voltage transmission grid serving electric cooperatives and municipally operated systems in the area. Of course, the Government, through the Interior Department, would contribute materially toward providing this system, and what it did not build itself it would finance with below-cost-to-Government money obtained through the REA.

The Mid-West Electric Consumers Association, in which Mr. Holum has been an active executive, recently passed a series of resolutions. I call attention to the fact that in its first resolution it sets up a priority of use for water in which navigation is in the last place on the totem pole. Use for navigation is relegated below fish, wildlife, and recreation, although we are authorizing and constructing some of our water projects with navigation as a primary objective.

I shall not try to discuss all of their resolutions, but I shall call attention to No. 5, in which it is resolved that the Secretary of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation be requested not to enter into any long-term interconnections, integration, coordination, or other wheeling contracts covering supplemental thermal power until uniform power marketing policies concerning these matters be developed and published by the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation after discussion with the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association Power Supply Committee. Now with their ex-leader, Mr. Holum, as Assistant Secretary for Water and Power, of the Department of Interior, and with the Bureau of Reclamation directly under him, I am sure the association's resolution No. 5 will be carried out. But other American citizens and American industries have a vital interest in these questions. Are they going to be consulted in these matters; and, if consulted, will their advice or recommendations, regardless of how sound they may be, receive fair and unbiased consideration? That is the question that worries me.

Now let us look for a moment at appointments made in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. John A. Baker, ex-director of legislative services of the National Farmers Union, has been appointed as Director of Agricultural Services. What has that to do with electric power? Why, Mr. President, he will be sitting right over the Rural Electrification Administration. He will be consulted on policies and loans made by the REA, if not directing them. We remember that several years ago there was quite a difference in the House and in the Senate about whether to override a Presidential veto on taking the REA out from under the Department of Agriculture. The Presidential veto on this very question was upheld in the House, but not in the Senate. It was decided to leave the REA under the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Ellis, Executive Director of the NRECA, was carrying the fight to get the REA out from under the Department of Agriculture. Why? Well, he wanted to get it out from Mr. Scott, whom Mr. Baker will replace. With Mr. Baker now in Mr. Scott's place, I am sure there will be no effort to get the REA out from the Department of Agriculture.

All one has to do is go back and look over the record of the National Farmers Union, to know why Mr. Baker would be perfectly acceptable to the NRECA. The National Farmers Union has been crusading not only for public power, but also for every other type of leftwing philosophy there has been in this country for the past many years.

Now considering the appointments in the Department of Agriculture under which the REA operates, let me state that we hear mentioned prominently as appointees to be the Administrator of REA such persons as Clyde Ellis and Norman Clapp. I think all of us know a little something about Mr. Ellis; but probably few of us have ever heard the name of Mr. Clapp. I do not know much about him, either, except that he is the brother of Gordon Clapp, who for a long time was general manager of the TVA, and whose philosophy on Government power is no secret. He believes in bigger and better TVA's spread all over this country. To judge from all of his actions that I have noticed, he believes that the private electric companies have no place in our national economy.

If Mr. Ellis is appointed to the REA post, there is no question in the minds of most of us about the position he would take on the subject of electric companies versus Government power. His record on this subject has been well established. He thinks the electric companies are an unholy alliance or monopoly that should be done away with.

Now let us consider the third branch of Government that deals with the electric power industry—the Federal Power Commission. The White House has already announced that it plans to appoint Mr. Joseph Swidler as Chairman of FPC and Mr. Howard Morgan as a member of the Commission. Remember, Mr. President, that the FPC is a quasi-judicial branch of the Government, set up by the Congress to regulate the electric utility industry. It is supposed to be a fair and impartial branch of the Government.

Mr. Swidler's background is well known to all of us who have had an interest in the many controversies that have arisen in the electric utility industry. He started out in 1933 as a lawyer in the Department of Interior. After a short stay in that position, he went to TVA, as a lawyer. He later became Assistant General Counsel, and, in 1945, became General Counsel of the TVA. Any of us who followed his career in that position well know that he was in favor of all-out Federal development of electric power, both steam and hydroelectric in the TVA area. I doubt that one could find a more ardent supporter of Federal power in this country than Mr. Swidler. After he got out of TVA, in 1958, he entered private law practice. I understand he has been very active in the Citizens for TVA group, which spends its time dangling the bait of cheap federally subsidized electric power as an incentive for enticing industries from other areas to the Tennessee Valley. In addition, he has been active in the group in Kentucky for low-cost power which has been working very hard to get certain municipalities to take over the Kentucky Utilities Co. properties and to bring TVA power into communities far outside the present TVA territory. Besides that I understand he has been representing certain electric cooperatives in Georgia and Alabama, and has been the influence which has prevented the electric cooperatives in those areas from entering into reasonable and equitable contracts with existing electric companies there.

In other words, what I am trying to tell the Senate, Mr. President, is that the new administration has designated as the new Chairman of the Federal Power Commission—a supposedly quasi-judicial body of the Government, an agency set up to regulate the electric-utility industry—a man whose entire background is that of an advocate of Government power.

I do not have to tell this body, Mr. President, the powers that the FPC has over the electric industry. Neither do I have to tell the Senate the power the Chairman of the FPC has over the Commission. I think this industry, which is such an important segment of our national industry, has a right to expect of its Government unbiased and unprejudiced regulation; and I think there is an obligation on the part of the Senate to see that it gets this type of regulation.

Let us consider the next appointment; another Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission has been nominated—Mr. Howard Morgan, of Oregon. Mr. Morgan was a public utilities commissioner in the State of Oregon from 1957 to 1959. I am told that during his term of office he showed a very distinct prejudice against segments of the industry under his jurisdiction, in particular, the railroads and the electric companies. One of the Oregon newspapers which was not averse to his appointment said that he could be a good commissioner if he could rid himself of some of his built-in opinions and prejudices. Frankly, I do not think there should be appointed to regulatory commissions of the Government or any other executive agency persons about whom there is any question of bias. Our Government is a government of the people, and it should look in an unbiased manner after the interests of all of the people. We cannot expect that to be done if the persons assigned to top positions in the various agencies of the Government have long histories of one-sided activities in promoting one side of a very controversial issue.

Mr. President, I see a very definite pattern developing in the appointments to the various administrative agencies and commissions that handle our electric industry problems. These positions are being filled by persons who not only have shown a strong bias in favor of Government power, but some are doctrinaire public-power advocates—in fact, crusaders for Government power.

Mr. President, I do not oppose the appointment of Mr. Holum for personal reasons or because I object to him as an individual. But I do know that his background in the electric industry has been that of a crusader for public power. I do know that he is being considered for the high position of Assistant Secretary for Water and Power of the Department of Interior. I do know that the Department over which he would have charge will be called upon to make decisions that will be of the utmost importance to the electric power industry, both public and private. And I do know that during the hearing before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, I very carefully asked Mr. Holum questions that would develop his viewpoint on matters of concern to the electric industry. And I do know that I got what I consider very evasive answers.

His answers to my questions at the hearing, which were proposed in an attempt to determine whether he is capable of rendering fair and unbiased judgment on decisions he will be required to make, gave me no assurance. In fact, the evasiveness of his answers, and also his indecision in answering, which may not be reflected in the record, but could be fully appreciated by one who was present, left on me a strong impression that he would not be capable of rendering a fair and unbiased decision.

Mr. President, to point out why I feel strongly about this matter—not only about the pattern that has been developed, but also about the question of whether a person will be able to brainwash himself of years of association with any one part of the national life, I go back to questions asked at the joint hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Senate Committee on Public Works, on May 1, 2, and 3, 1957, to be found in part 1, pages 156 and 157, of the hearings on Missouri Basin water problems. In replying to a question about the agency which my good friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] talked about today, Mr. Holum said:

> I am sure you recall, Mr. Chairman, that when we conducted our hearings in all 10 of the basin States and listened to representatives of every walk of life from each of those 10 States, we found almost unanimous agreement among the people in the basin that they wanted their resources developed by 1 agency, so they could go to 1 place and get responsible answers.

Then, skipping a few paragraphs, we find that he gave the following concluding answer to that question; I read now from page 157:

> I could say as far as I am concerned that that just strengthened my own conviction that we need that kind of an agency in the Missouri Basin if we are going to get good development and good use of our water.

A relatively short time later, this past week, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] submitted a question to Mr. Holum. This appears at page 3 of the hearings on his confirmation. I should like to read this into the RECORD because it rather goes opposite to what Mr. Holum felt was a proper answer just a little over a year ago:

> First, Mr. Holum, are you in favor of a Missouri Valley Authority, or some similar single agency having control over development and uses of the Missouri River?
>
> Mr. HOLUM. Senator, if I have the pleasure to serve in the Department of the Interior, I shall hope that the Department of the Interior will be able to execute its responsibilities in such a way that the Congress of the United States is confident that the resources of the Missouri Valley are being properly managed.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is not really an answer, is it?
>
> Mr. HOLUM. Senator, would you read the question again?
>
> Perhaps I missed the question.

Senator DWORSHAK. The question is: Are you in favor of a Missouri Valley Authority or some similar single agency having control over development and uses of the Missouri River?

Mr. HOLUM. If you want a yes or no answer under the existing circumstances, the answer would be "no."

The gentleman in question changed his mind rather quickly. One does not expect that kind of a change of mind in a few months over a year.

Before I complete my remarks, there is one point that I want to bring out. It was in answer to a question I put to Mr. Holum during the course of the hearings. Part of this question I asked Mr. Holum:

My question on that is: Do you believe that the Federal Government should build or finance steamplants to supplement power produced from Federal hydroprojects that preference customers will not have to get any of their power from privately owned electrical companies.

I never could get a definite answer to that question. I pursued it for quite some time. I was led around the bush many times. It became quite obvious that I was not going to get an answer, so I gave up.

But again referring to some hearings held in February and March 1959, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Federal power marketing problems, Mr. Holum had this to say, and I read from page 18 of the hearings:

If we save and put to beneficial and productive use the water that is currently dedicated to the uneconomic free flowing navigation channel and if the Government will firm the hydropower to the point of the maximum economic return either by constructing thermal or nuclear generating capacity or by leasing such capacity from others, I am confident that the Bureau of Reclamation can meet the total power requests of the preference customers.

Mr. President, I do not want to indicate, by reference to hearings past and present, any personal feeling about the honesty of this gentleman. I have no reason to doubt his honesty. I have no reason to suspect that he will not try to be fair and impartial. I hope that is true. My purpose was to point out the dedication this man has held over the years to the idea that public power is better than private power. I think we have a place in our scheme of things for both. I would dislike wholeheartedly to see the Kennedy administration start off with a program that would, by the nature of the appointees, be against free enterprise participation in the development of power. I would feel just as strongly about it if the appointees all came from the private power fields. I think we have to divide this development up. While we must recognize that slightly over 16 percent of our power is generated and distributed by public power projects, a few years ago that percentage was below 10. If we continue with the idea that there is something wrong with private power in the whole field of power generation, it will not be long before we are beholden to the Federal Government for our power sources.

Mr. President, I have no intention of asking for a yea-and-nay vote on the confirmation of Mr. Holum's appointment. I registered my vote in committee. I am very happy to let it go as it is.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Arizona that he does not wish to delay action on the confirmation. As the Senator said, he was in committee and he asked questions. Perhaps some of the answers were not all that some would like them to have been. I thought the nominee made forthright statements and answers. Others were of the view that he answered the questions very satisfactorily when they were put to him.

We are all deeply interested in the question of waterpower, and I am perfectly willing to trust Mr. Holum, and believe he will work honestly and uprightly in this field.

I appreciate the sentiments expressed. I thought it was fine that the Senator from Nebraska made his statement in the beginning. Again, I express appreciation for not delaying action on the nomination, and I express the hope that Mr. Holum's nomination will be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have known Mr. Holum for a number of years. He is a friend of our family. I have high regard for him as an individual. He is a fine citizen. He was from the State of South Dakota, whence my family came. I believe he will be a very splendid and dedicated public servant. I am pleased the committee reported the nomination favorably.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I rise in support of this nomination. I, too, have known Mr. Holum for a number of years. I believe him to be a man of integrity and honesty. He is a member of an old pioneer family which lived long in South Dakota. North Dakota, as you know, Mr. President, is one of the 17 western reclamation States. We are concerned with water development and power development and the development of the Missouri River.

This nomination is made to succeed a man who also came from our Missouri River Valley, Hon. Mr. Fred G. Aandahl. We feel that we are fortunate to have a man from the valley who knows our immediate problems.

Since I am a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and heard the testimony, I, too, would like to reiterate what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said, that Mr. Holum was very forthright and honest in his answers.

So I shall be pleased to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Holum.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Mr. Holum was a neighbor of mine in South Dakota. During the interrogation before the committee, I became a little concerned about the same matters discussed by the Senator from Arizona, because in my area, more than in any other part of the United States, we have a system of development of power which has resulted in a happy marriage between public power, non-Federal public power, and private power.

I should like to have that continue. I wish to be sure that the private power interests, as well as the public power interests, have a spokesman in the Department of the Interior and in the Bureau of Reclamation who will continue this development of our country.

There is now pending before the Bureau of Reclamation a contract providing a reciprocal wheeling agreement, under which the Montana Power Co. is permitted to wheel some of its non-Federal private power over the Bureau of Reclamation lines, and at the same time the Bureau of Reclamation is permitted to wheel some power over the Montana Power Co. lines.

As Mr. Holum said, that is a matter of economics. There is a reserve capacity in each of those lines.

One of the things which we shall try to urge upon the new administration is approval of the extension of that contract with a reciprocal agreement. I especially wished to have Mr. Holum give us assurance that he would continue this happy relationship, and would permit private power development down the Columbia River, down the Missouri River, and in other parts of the United States.

During my interrogation, I found Mr. Holum's answers to be frank and forthright. I believe that neither the public power interests nor the private power interests need have any concern in regard to the confirmation of his nomination. I believe that we, in the upstream State of Montana, do not have to worry about navigation. I feel that he can resolve the sometimes conflicting interests in regard to the domestic, industrial, reclamation, power, and other uses of water, so that the public interest will be best served by the development of our great rivers.

I shall enthusiastically vote to confirm the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate—and I assume there is not—I move, as in legislative session, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 31, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30, 1961:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1964. (Reappointment.)

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Herschel C. Loveless, of Iowa, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Ivan A. Nestingen, of Wisconsin, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY COMMISSION

Rex Marion Whitton, of Missouri, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mortimer M. Caplin, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Abram Chayes, of Massachusetts, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Robert J. Burkhardt, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954.

Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1961.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

UNITED NATIONS

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be Representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Louis Falk Oberdorfer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Roger W. Jones, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Under Secretary of State.

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

James K. Carr, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

Kenneth Holum, of South Dakota, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

John A. Carver, Jr., of Idaho, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Frank Barry, of Arizona, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Edward Gudeman, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

William Willard Wirtz, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of Labor.

Jerry R. Holleman, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, of Virginia, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, of California, to be Treasurer of the United States.

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Robert V. Roosa, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

John S. Gleason, Jr., of Illinois, to be Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be lieutenant commander, effective October 7, 1960, with date of rank June 15, 1960

Donald L. Campbell

To be lieutenant commander

Kenneth A. MacDonald

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

K. William Jeffers
Donald W. Moncevicz
Raymond L. Speer
Jack W. Kinney, Jr.

To be ensigns

Victor R. Smith
Ralph J. Land
Thomas M. Monaghan
Francis D. Moran
Robert A. Zimmer
Guy H. Fisher, Jr.
John W. Bricker
Marvin G. Lane
Robert C. McGuffee, Jr.
Robert E. Lushene

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be senior surgeons

Clyde O. Brindley
Arthur R. Dahlgren
Lynn L. Fulkerson
Edwin M. Lerner II
Glen W. McDonald
Thomas E. O'Brien
Lucy D. Ozarin
Paul S. Parrino
Carl I. Pirkle
Celia W. Tabor
Joseph F. Wilson

To be surgeons

Marquerite L. Candler
Jane G. Elchlepp
Samuel M. Fox III
D. Wells Goodrich
Kehl Markley III
Warren A. Rasmussen
Franz W. Rosa
Sam Silbergeld
Martha R. Wilson

To be senior assistant surgeons

W. King Engel
John R. Gill, Jr.
W. Paul Glezen

To be senior dental surgeons

William J. Pennoyer
Francis W. Pomije
Stewart H. Rowberry
James F. Scott
Sidney J. Winter

To be senior sanitary engineers

Aleck Alexander
John H. Burgess
Daniel W. Evans
Clyde F. Fehn
Archie B. Freeman
Murray A. Getz
Arthur H. Johnson
Carl A. Lindstrom
Paul P. Maier
Bernard E. Saltzman
James D. William

To be sanitary engineers

Albert G. Friend
Guy L. Hubbs
William N. Long
Everett L. MacLeman
Gordon G. Robeck

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Gerald L. Eugene

To be senior scientists

Floyd O. Atchley
Morris Goldman
Melvin E. Griffith
Charles R. Joyce
George W. Lones
Charles S. Richards
Harry A. Saroff
John C. Wagner

To be scientist

Byron L. Harriman

To be senior assistant scientist

Joseph M. Butler, Jr.

To be sanitarians

George A. Amundson
C. Bradley Bridges
Robert B. Carson
Warren S. Dobson
Leroy S. Houser
Wilfred H. Johnson
Harvey B. Morlan
Donald K. Summers
Harold E. Thompson, Jr.

To be nurse officers

Eileen M. Coviello
Mary A. Ivanko
Margaret E. Lamson
Maud J. Larssen
Mary F. Luvisi
E. Josephine Strachan
Elizabeth Walker

To be dietitians

Genevieve L. Casalaspro
Geraldine M. Piper
Jean M. Pope
Eileen M. Reid
Anna O. Reimer
Jeanne L. Tillotson

To be therapist

Vida J. Niebuhr

To be health services officers

John R. Barry
Jason N. Calhoun
Marjorie E. Cantoni
Jessie P. Dowling
Margaret E. Heap
Dorothy A. Huskey
George Landsman
Barbara A. Murphy
Shirley H. Owen
Philip P. Simon
Evelyn Walker
Ellen J. Walsh
Emma M. Wiest
Jeanne E. Wright

To be senior assistant health services officer

Gloria M. Russo

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Lawrence I. Carnes

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

John A. Eckert

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

George R. McGuire
George N. Newton

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Robert L. Elder
John A. Eure
Paul J. Traina

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Joseph F. Toomey

To be senior scientist

Herbert T. Dalmat

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate January 30, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Walter C. Wallace, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Charles H. King, of Michigan, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Theodore F. Stevens, of Alaska, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 30, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

1 Samuel 10: 26: *There went with Saul a band of men, whose hearts God had touched.*

O Thou who art the guiding intelligence in the life of men and of nations, we earnestly beseech Thee that our

President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress may be Thy honored servants and the pioneers of a new era whose minds and hearts Thou hast touched with the spirit of wisdom and understanding as they seek to build a world in which there is mutual trust and good will among men.

Grant that they may be endowed with a faith that fulfills itself in faithfulness, a hope that carries on patiently in the confidence that Thy divine purposes for mankind, though delayed, will never be defeated, and above all gird them with a love which casts out fear and is ready to make any sacrifice in the struggle for freedom and righteousness.

We are not asking Thee to deal with us in any preferential manner but show us how we, as citizens of this beloved country, may be partners with our chosen representatives and freemen everywhere in leading and lifting confused and groping humanity out of the tensions of time into the sanctuary of that peace which is eternal.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 26, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a concurrent resolution of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12:30 postmeridian.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]; the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure, the highest privilege, and the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 73)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, and Members of the Congress, it is a pleasure to return from whence I came. [Applause.] You are among my oldest friends in Washington, and the House is my oldest home. It was here, more than 14 years ago, that I first took the oath of Federal office. It was here, for 14 years, that I gained both knowledge and inspiration from members of both parties in both Houses—from your wise and generous leaders—and from the pronouncements which I can vividly recall, sitting then where you sit now—including the programs of two great Presidents, the undimmed eloquence of Churchill, the soaring idealism of Nehru, the steadfast words of General de Gaulle. To speak from this same historic rostrum is a sobering experience; to be back among so many friends is a happy one.

I am confident that friendship will continue. Our Constitution wisely assigns both joint and separate roles to each branch of the Government; and a President and a Congress who hold each other in mutual respect will neither permit nor attempt any trespass. For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact or report, past, present or future, which is necessary for an informed judgment of our conduct and hazards. [Applause.] I shall neither shift the burden of executive decisions to the Congress, nor avoid responsibility for the outcome of those decisions. [Applause.]

I speak today in an hour of national peril and national opportunity. Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain. The answers are by no means clear. All of us together—this administration, this Congress, this Nation—must forge those answers.

But today, were I to offer—after little more than a week in office—detailed legislation to remedy every national ill, the Congress would rightly wonder whether the desire for speed had replaced the duty of responsibility.

My remarks, therefore, will be limited. But they will also be candid. To state the facts frankly is not to despair the future nor indict the past. The prudent heir takes careful inventory of his legacies, and gives a faithful accounting to those whom he owes an obligation of trust. And, while the occasion does not call for another recital of our blessings and assets, we do have no greater asset than the willingness of a free and determined people, through its elected officials, to face all problems frankly and meet all dangers free from panic or fear.

I

The present state of our economy is disturbing. We take office in the wake of 7 months of recession, 3½ years of slack, 7 years of diminished economic growth, and 9 years of falling farm income.

Business bankruptcies have reached their highest level since the great depression. Since 1951 farm income has been squeezed down by 25 percent. Save for a brief period in 1958, insured unemployment is at the highest peak in our history. Of some 5½ million Americans who are without jobs, more than 1 million have been searching for work for more than 4 months. And during each month some 150,000 workers are exhausting their already meager jobless benefit rights.

Nearly one-eighth of those who are without jobs live almost without hope in nearly 100 especially depressed and troubled areas. The rest include new school graduates unable to use their talents, farmers forced to give up their part-time jobs that had balanced their budgets, skilled and unskilled workers laid off in such important industries as metals, machinery, automobiles, and apparel.

Our recovery from the 1958 recession, moreover, was anemic and incomplete. Our gross national product never regained its full potential. Unemployment never returned to normal levels. Maximum use of our national industrial capacity was never restored.

In short, the American economy is in trouble. The most resourceful industrialized country on earth ranks among the last in economic growth. Since last spring our economic growth rate actually receded. Business investment is in a decline. Profits have fallen below predicted levels. Construction is off. A million unsold automobiles are in inventory. Fewer people are working—and the average workweek has shrunk well below 40 hours. Yet prices have continued to rise—so that now too many Americans have less to spend for items that cost them more to buy.

Economic prophecy is at best an uncertain art—as demonstrated by the prediction 1 year ago from this same podium that 1960 would be "the most prosperous year in our history." Nevertheless, forecasts of continued slack and only slightly reduced unemployment throughout 1961 and 1962 have been made with alarming unanimity—and this administration does not intend to stand helplessly by. [Applause.]

We cannot afford to waste idle hours and empty plants while awaiting the end of a recession. We must show the world what a free economy can do—to reduce unemployment, to put unused capacity to work, to spur new productivity, and to foster higher economic growth within a range of sound fiscal policies and relative price stability.

I will propose to the Congress within the next 14 days measures to improve unemployment compensation through temporary increases in duration on a self-supporting basis—to provide more food to the families of the unemployed, and aid to their needy children—to redevelop our areas of chronic labor surplus—to expand the services of the U.S. Employment Offices—to stimulate housing and construction—to secure more purchasing power for our lowest paid workers by raising and expanding the minimum wage—to offer tax incentives for sound plant investment—to increase the development of our natural resources—to encourage price stability—and to take other steps aimed at insuring a prompt recovery and paving the way for increased long-range growth. This is not a partisan program concentrating on our weaknesses—it is, I hope, a national program to realize our strength. [Applause.]

II

Efficient expansion at home, stimulating the new plant and technology that can make our goods more competitive, is also the key to the international balance of payments problem. Laying aside all alarmist talk and panicky solutions, let us put that knotty problem in its proper perspective.

It is true that, since 1958, the gap between the dollars we spend or invest abroad and the dollars returned to us here has substantially widened. This overall deficit in our balance of payments increased by nearly $11 billion in the last 3 years—and holders of dollars abroad converted them to gold in such quantity as to cause a total outflow of nearly $5 billion of gold from our gold reserve. The 1959 deficit was caused in large part by the failure of our exports to penetrate foreign markets—the result both of restrictions on our goods and our own uncompetitive prices. The 1960 deficit, on the other hand, was more the result of an increase in private capital outflow seeking new opportunity, higher return or speculative advantage abroad.

Meanwhile this country has continued to bear more than its share of the West's military and foreign aid obligations. Under existing policies, another deficit of $2 billion it predicted for 1961—and individuals in those countries whose dollar position once depended on these deficits for improvement now wonder aloud whether our gold reserves will remain sufficient to meet our gold obligations.

All this is cause for concern—but it is not cause for panic, for our monetary and financial position remains exceedingly strong. Including our drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund and the gold reserve held as backing for our currency and Federal Reserve deposits, we have some $22 billion in total gold stocks and other international monetary reserves available—and I now pledge that their full strength stands behind the value of the dollar for use if needed. [Applause.]

Moreover, we hold large assets abroad—the total owed this Nation far exceeds the claims upon our reserves—and our exports once again substantially exceed our imports.

In short, we need not, and we shall not, take any action to increase the dollar price of gold from $35 an ounce [applause]—to impose exchange controls—to reduce our antirecession efforts—to fall back on restrictive trade policies—or to weaken our commitments around the world.

This administration will not distort the value of the dollar in any fashion—and this is a commitment. [Applause.]

Prudence and good sense do require, however, that new steps be taken to ease the payments deficit and prevent any gold crisis. Our success in world affairs has long depended in part upon foreign confidence in our ability to pay. A series of Executive orders, legislative remedies, and cooperative efforts with our allies will get underway immediately, aimed at attracting foreign investment and travel to this country, promoting American exports, at stable prices and with more liberal governmental guarantees and financing—curbing tax and customs loopholes that encourage undue spending of private dollars abroad—and—through OECD, NATO, and otherwise—sharing with our allies all efforts to provide for the common defense of the free world and the hopes for growth of the less developed lands. While the current deficit lasts, ways will be found to ease our dollar outlays abroad without placing the full burden on the families of men whom we have asked to serve our flag overseas. [Applause.] In short, whatever is required will be done to back up all our efforts abroad, and to make certain that, in the future as in the past, the dollar is as "sound as a dollar." [Applause.]

III

But more than our exchange of international payments is out of balance. The current Federal budget for fiscal 1961 is almost certain to show a net deficit. The budget already submitted for fiscal 1962 will remain in balance only if the Congress enacts all the revenue measures requested—and only if an earlier and sharper upturn in the economy than my economic advisers now think likely produces the tax revenues estimated. Nevertheless, a new administration must of necessity build on the spending and revenue estimates already submitted. Within that framework, barring the development of urgent national defense needs or a worsening of the economy, it is my current intention to advocate a program of expenditures which, including revenues from a stimulation of the economy, will not of and by themselves unbalance the earlier budget.

However, we will do what must be done, for our national household is cluttered with unfinished and neglected tasks. Our cities are being engulfed in squalor. Twelve long years after Congress declared our goal to be a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family, we still have 25 million Americans living in substandard homes. A new housing program under a new Housing and Urban Affairs Department will be needed this year.

Our classrooms contain 2 million more children than they properly have room for, taught by 90,000 teachers not properly qualified to teach. One-third of our most promising high school graduates are financially unable to continue the development of their talents. The war babies of the 1940's, who overcrowded our schools in the 1950's, are now descending in the 1960's upon our colleges—with two college students for every one 10 years from now—and our colleges are ill prepared. We lack the scientists, the engineers, and the teachers our world obligations require. We have neglected oceanography, saline water conversion, and the basic research that lies at the root of all progress. Federal grants for both higher and public school education can no longer be delayed. [Applause.]

Medical research has achieved new wonders—but these wonders are too often beyond the reach of too many people, owing to a lack of income—particularly among the aged—a lack of hospital beds, a lack of nursing homes, and a lack of doctors and dentists. Measures to provide health care for the aged under social security, and to increase the supply of both facilities and personnel, must be undertaken this year. [Applause.]

Our supply of clean water is dwindling. Organized and juvenile crimes cost the taxpayers millions of dollars each year, making it essential that we have improved enforcement and new legislative safeguards. The denial of constitutional rights to some of our fellow Amer-

icans on account of race—at the ballot box and elsewhere—disturbs the national conscience, and subjects us to the charge of world opinion that our democracy is not equal to the high promise of our heritage. Morality in private business has not been sufficiently spurred by morality in public business. A host of problems and projects in all 50 States, though not possible to include in this message, deserves—and will receive—the attention of both the Congress and the executive branch. On most of these matters, messages will be sent to the Congress within the next 2 weeks.

IV

But all these problems pale when placed beside those which confront us around the world. No man entering upon this office, regardless of his party, regardless of his previous service in Washington, could fail to be staggered upon learning—even in this brief 10-day period—the harsh enormity of the trials through which we must pass in the next 4 years. Each day the crises multiply. Each day their solution grows more difficult. Each day we draw nearer the hour of maximum danger, as weapons spread and hostile forces grow stronger. I feel I must inform the Congress that our analyses over the last 10 days make it clear that—in each of these principal areas of crisis—the tide of events has been running out and time has not been our friend.

In Asia, the relentless pressures of the Chinese Communists menace the security of the entire area—from the borders of India and South Vietnam to the jungles of Laos, struggling to protect its newly won independence. We seek in Laos what we seek in all Asia, and, indeed, in all the world—freedom for the people and independence for their government. This Nation shall persevere in our pursuit of these objectives. [Applause.]

In Africa, the Congo has been brutally torn by civil strife, political unrest, and public disorder. We shall continue to support the heroic efforts of the United Nations to restore peace and order—efforts which are now endangered by mounting tensions, unsolved problems, and decreasing support from many member states.

In Latin America, Communist agents seeking to exploit that region's peaceful revolution of hope have established a base on Cuba, only 90 miles from our shores. Our objection with Cuba is not over the people's drive for a better life. Our objection is to their domination by foreign and domestic tyrannies. [Applause.] Cuban social and economic reform should be encouraged. Questions of economic and trade policy can always be negotiated. But Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated. [Applause.]

We are pledged to work with our sister republics to free the Americas of all such foreign domination and all tyranny, working toward the goal of a free hemisphere of free governments, extending from Cape Horn to the Arctic Circle. [Applause.]

In Europe our alliances are unfulfilled and in some disarray. The unity of NATO has been weakened by economic rivalry and partially eroded by national interest. It has not yet fully mobilized its resources nor fully achieved a common outlook. Yet no Atlantic power can meet on its own the mutual problems now facing us in defense, foreign aid, monetary reserves, and a host of other areas; and our close ties with those whose hopes and interests we share are among this Nation's most powerful assets.

Our greatest challenge is still the world that lies beyond the cold war—but the first great obstacle is still our relations with the Soviet Union and Communist China. We must never be lulled into believing that either power has yielded its ambitions for world domination—ambitions which they forcefully restated only a short time ago. On the contrary, our task is to convince them that aggression and subversion will not be profitable routes to pursue those ends. Open and peaceful competition—for prestige, for markets, for scientific achievement, even for men's minds—is something else again. For if freedom and communism were to compete for man's allegiance in a world at peace, I would look to the future with ever increasing confidence. [Applause.]

To meet this array of challenges—to fulfill the role we cannot avoid on the world scene—we must reexamine and revise our whole arsenal of tools.

One must not overshadow the other. On the Presidential coat of arms, the American eagle holds in his right talon the olive branch, while in his left is held a bundle of arrows. We intend to give equal attention to both. [Applause.]

First. We must strengthen our military tools. We are moving into a period of uncertain risk and great commitment in which both the military and diplomatic possibilities require a free world force so powerful as to make any aggression clearly futile. Yet in the past, lack of a consistent, coherent military strategy, the absence of basic assumptions about our national requirements and the faulty estimates and duplication arising from interservice rivalries have all made it difficult to assess accurately how adequate—or inadequate—our defenses really are.

I have, therefore, instructed the Secretary of Defense to reappraise our entire defense strategy—our ability to fulfill our commitments—the effectiveness, vulnerability, and dispersal of our strategic bases, forces and warning systems—the efficiency and economy of our operation and organization—the elimination of obsolete bases and installations—and the adequacy, modernization, and mobility of our present conventional and nuclear forces and weapons systems in the light of present and future dangers. I have asked for preliminary conclusions by the end of February—and I shall then recommend whatever legislative, budgetary or Executive action is needed in the light of these conclusions.

In the meantime, I have asked the Defense Secretary to initiate immediately three new steps clearly needed now:

(a) I have directed prompt action to increase our airlift capacity. Obtaining additional air transport mobility—and obtaining it now—will better assure the ability of our conventional forces to respond, with discrimination and speed, to any problem at any spot on the globe at any moment's notice. [Applause.] In particular it will enable us to meet any deliberate effort to avoid or divert our forces by starting limited wars in widely scattered parts of the globe.

(b) I have directed prompt action to step up our Polaris submarine program. [Applause.] Using unobligated shipbuilding funds now—to let contracts originally scheduled for the next fiscal year—will build and place on station—at least 9 months earlier than planned—substantially more units of a crucial deterrent—a fleet that will never attack first, but possess sufficient powers of retaliation, concealed beneath the seas, to discourage any aggressor from launching an attack on our security. [Applause.]

(c) I have directed prompt action to accelerate our entire missile program. Until the Secretary of Defense's reappraisal is completed, and emphasis here will be largely on improved organization and decisionmaking—on cutting down the wasteful duplications and timelag that have handicapped our whole family of missiles. If we are to keep the peace, we need an invulnerable missile force powerful enough to deter any aggressor from even threatening an attack he would know could not destroy enough of our own force to prevent his own destruction. For as I said upon taking the oath of office: "Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed." [Applause.]

Secondly, we must improve our economic tools. Our role is essential and unavoidable in the construction of a sound and expanding economy for the entire non-Communist world, helping other nations build the strength to meet their own problems, to satisfy their own aspirations, and to surmount their own dangers. The problems in achieving this goal are towering and unprecedented—the response must be towering and unprecedented as well, much as lend-lease and the Marshall plan were in earlier years, which brought such fruitful results.

(a) I intend to ask the Congress for authority to establish a new and more effective program for assisting the economic, educational, and social development of other countries and continents. That program must stimulate and take more effectively into account the contributions of our allies, and provide central policy direction for all our own programs that now so often overlap, conflict, or diffuse our energies and resources. Such a program, compared to past programs, will require more flexibility for short run emergencies; more commitment to long term development; new attention to education at all levels; greater emphasis on the recipient nations' role, their effort and their purpose, with greater social justice for their own people, with broader distribution and participation of their people, and more efficient public administration and more efficient tax systems of their own [applause] and orderly

planning for national and regional development instead of a piecemeal approach.

(b) I hope the Senate will take early action approving the Convention establishing the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. This will be an important instrument in sharing with our allies this development effort—working toward the time when each nation will contribute in proportion to its own ability to pay. For, while we are prepared to assume our full share of these huge burdens, we cannot and must not be expected to bear them alone. [Applause.]

(c) To our sister republics to the south, we have pledged a new alliance for progress—alianza para progreso. [Applause.] Our goal is a free and prosperous Latin America, realizing for all its states and their citizens a degree of economic and social progress that matches their historic contributions of culture, intellect, and liberty. To start this Nation's role at this time in that alliance of neighbors, I am recommending the following:

That the Congress appropriate in full the $500 million fund pledged by the act of Bogotá, to be used not as an instrument of the cold war, but as a first step in the sound development of the Americas;

That a new interdepartmental task force be established under the leadership of the Department of State, to coordinate at the highest level all policies and programs of concern to the Americas;

That our delegates to the OAS, working with those of other members, strengthen that body as an instrument to preserve the peace and to prevent foreign domination anywhere in the hemisphere;

That, in cooperation with other nations, we launch a new hemispheric attack on illiteracy and inadequate educational opportunities at all levels; and, finally,

That a food-for-peace mission be sent immediately to Latin America to explore ways in which our vast food abundance can be used to help end hunger and malnutrition in certain areas of suffering in our own hemisphere. [Applause.]

(d) This administration is expanding its new food-for-peace program in every possible way. The product of our abundance must be more effectively used to relieve hunger and help economic growth in all corners of the globe. I have asked the Director of this program to recommend additional ways in which these surpluses can advance the interests of world peace—including the establishment of world food reserves.

(e) An even more valuable national asset is our reservoir of dedicated men and women—not only on our college campuses but in every age group—who have indicated their desire to contribute their skills, their efforts, and a part of their lives to the fight for world order. We can mobilize this talent through the formation of a National Peace Corps, enlisting the services of all those with the desire and capacity to help foreign lands meet their urgent needs for trained personnel.

(f) Finally, while our attention is centered on the development of the non-Communist world, we must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the eastern European peoples. [Applause.] In order to be prepared to help reestablish historic ties of friendship, I am asking the Congress for increased discretion to use economic tools in this area whenever this is found to be clearly in the national interest. This will require amendment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act along the lines I proposed as a Member of the Senate, and upon which the Senate voted last summer. Meanwhile, I hope to explore with the Polish Government the possibility of using our frozen Polish funds on projects of peace that will demonstrate our abiding friendship and interest in the people of Poland. [Applause.]

Third, we must sharpen our political and diplomatic tools—the means of cooperation and agreement on which an enforcible world order must ultimately rest.

(a) I have already taken steps to coordinate and expand our disarmament effort—to increase our programs of research and study—and to make arms control a central goal of our national policy under my personal direction. The deadly arms race, and the huge resources it absorbs, have too long overshadowed all else we must do. We must prevent that arms race from spreading to new nations, to new nuclear powers, and to the reaches of outer space. We must make certain that our negotiators are better informed and better prepared—to formulate workable proposals of our own and to make sound judgments about the proposals of others.

I have asked the other governments concerned to agree to a reasonable delay in the talks on a nuclear test ban—and it is our intention to resume negotiations prepared to reach a final agreement with any nation that is equally willing to agree to an effective and enforcible treaty. [Applause.]

(b) We must increase our support of the United Nations as an instrument to end the cold war instead of an arena in which to fight it. In recognition of its increasing importance and the doubling of its membership, we are enlarging and strengthening our own mission to the U.N., we shall help insure that it is properly financed, we shall work to see that the integrity of the office of the Secretary-General is maintained. [Applause.] And I would address a special plea to the smaller nations of the world—to join with us in strengthening this organization, which is far more essential to their security than it is to ours—the only body in the world today where no nation need be powerful to be secure, where every nation has an equal voice, and where any nation can exert influence not according to the strength of its armies but according to the strength of its ideas. [Applause.] It deserves the support of all.

(c) Finally, this administration intends to explore promptly all possible areas of cooperation with the Soviet Union and other nations "to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors." Specifically, I now invite all nations—including the Soviet Union—to join with us in developing a weather prediction program, in a new communications satellite program and in preparation for probing the distant planets of Mars and Venus, probes which may someday unlock the deepest secrets of the universe.

Today this country is ahead in the science and technology of space [applause], while the Soviet Union is ahead in the capacity to lift large vehicles into orbit. Both nations would help themselves as well as other nations by removing these endeavors from the bitter and wasteful competition of the cold war. [Applause.] The United States would be willing to join with the Soviet Union and the scientists of all nations in a greater effort to make the fruits of this new knowledge available to all—and, beyond that, in an effort to extend farm technology to hungry nations, to wipe out disease, to increase exchanges of scientists and their knowledge, and to make our own laboratories available to technicians of other lands who lack the facilities to pursue their own work. Where nature makes natural allies of us all, we can demonstrate that beneficial relations are possible even with those with whom we most deeply disagree—and this must someday be the basis of world peace and world law. [Applause.]

V

I have commented on the state of the domestic economy, our balance of payments, our Federal and social budget, and the state of the world. I would like to conclude with a few remarks about the state of the executive branch. We have found it full of honest and useful public servants—but their capacity to act decisively at the exact time action is needed has too often been muffled in the morass of committees, timidities, and fictitious theories which have created a growing gap between decision and execution, between planning and reality. In a time of rapidly deteriorating situations at home and abroad, this is bad for the public service and particularly bad for the country; and we mean to make a change. [Applause.]

I here pledge myself and my colleagues in the Cabinet to a continuous encouragement of initiative, responsibility, and energy in serving the public interest. Let every public servant know, whether his post is high or low, that a man's rank and reputation in this administration will be determined by the size of the job he does, and not by the size of his staff, his office, or his budget. [Applause.] Let it be clear that this administration recognizes the value of daring and dissent—that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change. Let the public service be a proud and lively career. And let every man and woman who work in any area of our National Government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and honor in the future years:

"I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need." [Applause.]

For only through complete dedication by us all to the national interest can we bring our country through the troubled years that lie ahead. Our problems are critical. The tide is unfavorable. The news will be worse before it is better. And while hoping and working for the best, we should prepare ourselves for the worst.

We cannot escape our dangers—neither must we let them drive us to panic or narrow isolation. In many areas of the world where the balance of power already rests with our adversary, the forces of freedom are sharply divided. It is one of the ironies of our time that the techniques of a harsh and repressive system should be able to instill discipline and ardor in its servants—while the blessings of liberty have too often stood for privilege, materialism, and a life of ease.

But I have a different view of liberty. [Applause.]

Life in 1961 will not be easy. Wishing it, predicting it, even asking for it, will not make it so. There will be further setbacks before the tide is turned. But turn it we must. The hopes of all mankind rest upon us—not simply upon those of us in this Chamber, but upon the peasant in Laos, the fisherman in Nigeria, the exile from Cuba, the spirit that moves every man and nation who shares our hopes for freedom and the future. And in the final analysis, they rest most of all upon the pride and perseverance of our fellow American citizens.

In the words of the great President whose birthday we honor today, closing his final state of the Union message 16 years ago: "We pray that we may be worthy of the unlimited opportunities that God has given us." [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

(The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.)

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1961.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I have taken this up with my colleagues on the other side. This is extending the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the chartering of the Massachusetts General Hospital, which takes place tomorrow and within the next few days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because the gentleman from Massachusetts has spoken to me about the resolution, he informed me he had also taken the matter up with our ranking people on the Committee on the Judiciary. As far as I am concerned, I can see no objection to the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 132

Extending the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the chartering of the Massachusetts General Hospital.

Whereas the year 1961 marks the 150th anniversary of the chartering of the Massachusetts General Hospital by the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts; and

Whereas over a million patients have been cared for, and many thousands of doctors and nurses have been trained, in the Massachusetts General Hospital; and

Whereas countless contributions to the progress of medicine have been made at the Massachusetts General Hospital, including the first public demonstration of ether anesthesia in 1846, the discovery of the nature of appendicitis and its cure in 1886, the early development in America of aseptic surgery and the use of the X-ray, and the introduction of medical social service to the world in 1905; and

Whereas McLean Hospital, the psychiatric division of the Massachusetts General Hospital, was the fourth hospital in America established for the care of the mentally ill; and

Whereas today the Massachusetts General Hospital has nine hundred and twenty-five beds, treats about twenty-four thousand patients every year, serves as a training hospital for students of the Harvard Medical School, and devotes over one-fifth of its annual budget to medical research; and

Whereas, as a part of the observance of its sesquicentennial, the Massachusetts General Hospital is holding from January 31 through February 2, 1961, an international convocation of persons distinguished in the field of medicine and related fields to participate in scientific symposia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the trustees, officers, staff, and personnel of the Massachusetts General Hospital on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the chartering of the Massachusetts General Hospital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL, 1811–1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly great hospitals of the world is the Massachusetts General Hospital, located in Boston, Mass. On January 31, February 1, and February 2, this truly great hospital will celebrate its 150th anniversary with a convocation, the theme of which will be "To heighten the hope of man."

While 150 years old, the hospital is still young, because the trustees, all doctors and nurses, and everyone else associated with the hospital, are looking to the future, with plans for improving the hospital in the years ahead in the service of and bringing hope of suffering mankind. This great hospital, throughout the generations, has not only brought hope to many hundreds of thousands who have entered it as patients, but through its medical research has brought blessings to countless of millions throughout the world. While 150 years old, this great hospital is still young because those who guide it are dedicated men and women, proud of the past but looking to the future. I quote from a letter recently received from Francis C. Gray of Boston, chairman of the board of trustees, in which he said:

We have many plans for improving the hospital in the years ahead. The building, which has the highest priority is a new clinics building to replace the old, outmoded outpatient building which has long

since outlived its usefulness. When this building is completed, it will provide important new facilities for improving the community services of this great institution.

It is only fitting that a hospital of this kind should be recognized by appropriate action by the House of Representatives, and it is with this view that I have introduced the House resolution "extending the greetings and felicitations of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the chartering of the Massachusetts General Hospital" and which the House, by unanimous consent, has so graciously adopted today, which action is particularly significant because the House of Representatives took such action without my House resolution being referred to committee. I appreciate the cooperation of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. CELLER of New York; and the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. MCCULLOCH of Ohio; and the other members of the committee, and particularly Speaker RAYBURN and Minority Leader HALLECK, for their splendid cooperation in permitting this resolution to be brought up today.

I include in my remarks an article appearing in the magazine section of the Boston Sunday Globe of January 22, 1961, entitled "International Convocation" and also an article written by Dr. Dean A. Clark, general director of the Massachusetts General Hospital entitled, "The Massachusetts General Hospital in the Next 150 Years."

Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts General Hospital was the first in New England, third in the United States. It was founded on the initiative of the Reverend John Bartlett, who as chaplain was appalled by the filth and chaos of the Boston Almshouse, where the indigent, sick, and mentally ill were thrown together under nightmarish conditions. Drs. James Jackson and John Collins Warren of the faculty of the Harvard Medical School were the driving force behind the establishment and early development of the Massachusetts General Hospital, where they were the first physician and surgeon, respectively. In 1810, they wrote a circular letter which said in part:

> It has appeared very desirable to a number of respectable gentlemen, that a hospital for the reception of lunatics and other sick persons should be established in this town. It is unnecessary to urge the propriety and even obligation of succoring the poor in sickness. When in distress, every man becomes our neighbor, not only if he be of the household of faith, but even though his misfortunes have been induced by transgressing the rules both of reason and religion. There are a number of collateral advantages that would attend the establishment of a hospital in this place. These are the facilities for acquiring knowledge, which it would give to the students in the medical school established in this town. The means of medical education in New England are at present very limited, and totally inadequate to so important a purpose. Everyone is liable to suffer from the want of such a school; everyone may derive, directly or indirectly, the greatest benefits from its establishment.
>
> A hospital is an institution absolutely essential to a medical school, and one which would afford relief and comfort to thousands of the sick and miserable. On what other objects can the superfluities of the rich be so well bestowed?
>
> The amount required for the institution proposed may, at first sight, appear large. But it will cease to appear so, when we consider that it is to afford relief, not only to those who may require assistance during the present or the present age, but that it is to erect a most honorable monument of the munificence of the present times, which will insure to its founders the blessings of thousands in ages to come; and when we add that this amount may be raised at once, if a few opulent men will contribute only their superfluous income from 1 year. Compared with the benefits which such an establishment would afford of what value is the pleasure of accumulating riches in those stores which are already groaning under their weight?

It is interesting to note that in this letter the two doctors pointed out that equally as important as the care of the sick in their minds was the medical school's need for a hospital in which to teach students the practical art of medicine. The Massachusetts General Hospital has remained the chief teaching hospital of the Harvard Medical School ever since.

The hospital was chartered by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1811 and admitted its first patient 10 years later, a delay due in large part to the War of 1812 with England. The McLean Hospital, its psychiatric division, actually opened sooner—in Somerville in 1818—moving to its present site in Belmont in 1895. It was the fourth hospital for the mentally ill in America.

In addition to having cared for more than a million patients and trained many thousands of doctors and nurses in its long history, the Massachusetts General Hospital has made countless contributions to medicine. These include the first public demonstration of ether anesthesia in 1846, discovery of the real nature of appendicitis and its cure in 1886, early exploitation in America of aseptic surgery and the X-rays, the introduction of medical social service to the world in 1905, the clinical pathological conference, and hundreds of surgical techniques, innovations in medical diagnosis and treatment, laboratory methods and basic scientific observations.

The treatment of the mentally ill at the McLean Hospital from the outset was progressive even by modern standards and continued so for decades before enlightened attitudes began to pervade mental institutions generally. The first training school in the world for nurses connected with a mental hospital was opened at McLean in 1882. Less than a decade later it was beginning a scientific investigation of mental disease in the laboratory which has evolved into one of the most extensive programs of research into the basic chemical and physiological nature of the brain and mental processes in existence.

The Massachusetts General Hospital today has 925 beds, treats about 24,000 patients every year with an active staff of more than 400 assisted by 3,000 personnel. Approximately a thousand students are enrolled in its numerous educational programs, and 160 residents and house officers continue their medical training there, as well as the students of the Harvard Medical School.

The MGH spends more than $4 million out of its $20 million annual budget on about 350 research projects which are carried on in 35 departments by 150 investigators and nearly 200 clinical and research fellows.

Its high quality of care, attributable in large part to its traditional atmosphere of teaching and research, has attracted patients from all over the world. Likewise students, doctors, and scientists from every corner of the globe have come to learn and teach at the Massachusetts General Hospital and Harvard Medical School; upon their return they have invigorated the standards of medicine in their homelands with the contagious spirit of dedication to human welfare and scientific curiosity.

Within the lifespan of the Massachusetts General Hospital, most of the science and practice of medicine as we know it has come into being.

When this venerable institution was opened, no one took a patient's temperature; the clinical thermometer had not been invented. Use of the microscope was still decades ahead. Anesthesia was yet to have its first demonstration, and, with the germ theory yet to be enunciated, antiseptics were used only to counteract bad odors; surgeons operated on kitchen tables with ungloved hands in their second-best frock coats. The general use of X-rays was a hundred years hence. "Bleed and purge" were the classic treatments.

And yet, in the year 1811, while Europe was absorbed with Napoleon's march toward Moscow, some of Boston's brilliant minds were trying to combat disease and alleviate the lot of the insane. To thoughtful men it was clear that a community general hospital could save lives and, at the same time, advance the effectiveness of the medical lectures sponsored by Harvard. So, leading citizens—John Quincy Adams, James Bowdoin, George Cabot, Benjamin Crowninshield, John Lowell, Thomas H. Perkins, William Phillips, Josiah Quincy, Richard Sullivan, John Warren, and others—banded together to organize a charitable institution to be known as the Massachusetts General Hospital. Letters of appeal were sent out containing a concise statement of purpose which is as valid today as when written:

> It is the great object of this institution to enable persons in all parts of the Commonwealth to avail themselves of the best medical and surgical aid which our country affords, under the most advantageous circumstances.

On October 16, 1846, in the amphitheater under the dome of the original building there occurred an event that changed the course of medicine. In the presence of a number of attending physicians, a patient was rendered unconscious by the inhalation of ether and a neck tumor was removed by Dr. John C. Warren. When the operation had been completed and the patient returned to consciousness with no memory of what

he had undergone, Dr. Warren uttered his famous verdict on anesthesia: "Gentlemen, this is no humbug."

This first demonstration to the profession that ether could safely be applied to produce insensibility during surgical operations has been hailed by subsequent generations. Oliver Wendell Holmes referred to this as the moment "when the fiercest extremity of suffering was steeped in the waters of forgetfulness, and the deepest furrow in the knotted brow of agony was smoothed away forever."

A less rhetorical, but none the less moving appraisal of this event by the famous Dr. William H. Welch, of Johns Hopkins stated that "the boon of painless surgery is the greatest gift of American medicine to mankind."

Certain milestones may be ticked off: 1873, the school of nursing was established; 1877, carbolic spray to promote surgical healing without infection was introduced; 1886, Dr. Reginald H. Fitz, first to recognize the true nature of appendicitis, opened the door to the whole field of emergency operations in the abdominal cavity which today save thousands of lives each year; 1896, a dim picture of the bones of the human hand was obtained on a photographic plate just a few weeks after Roentgen's announcement of the X-ray.

With the turn of the 20th century, Massachusetts General, along with other hospitals, turned another corner: the growing understanding of the techniques of asepsis had, for the first time, made the hospital a safer place for surgery and the care of illness than the home. With this came a need to augment the wards with accommodations for private patients. In due time, the Phillips House was built and, later, the Baker Memorial—cited as "the first hospital for people of moderate means."

Thus, the service of Massachusetts General Hospital was extended not only to thousands of families in the Boston area, but also to people from all over the world—including many patients from foreign lands—attracted to Boston by the skill of the professional staff of the hospital.

This special skill can be attributed to the hospital's affiliation with the Harvard Medical School. Under this arrangement, the medical profession is combed for leading men in each specialty. They conduct clinical instruction and treat patients, and with such a galaxy of gifted medical talent, it is not surprising that important medical history has been made here. A steady drumfire of significant additions to knowledge has issued from the Massachusetts General Hospital in recent decades.

Out of the famous Mallinckrodt "Ward 4," designed expressly for research purposes, have come the first systematic understanding of lead poisoning, new understanding of various metabolic diseases particularly hyperthyroidism and new knowledge of arthritis. The hospital's operating rooms have seen surgical innovations bringing new hope for sufferers from lung diseases previously fatal, from brain tumors, fractured hips, and certain heart diseases. In collaboration with physicists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, radioactive "tracers" were put to work years before the birth of the atomic age.

Thus, in seeking to provide the best possible hospital care, the trustees have been rewarded by the knowledge that the byproducts have included a worldwide reputation in medical teaching and in medical research.

The articles referred to follow:

INTERNATIONAL CONVOCATION

The Massachusetts General Hospital will open its sesquicentennial with a convocation January 31 through February 2—3 days of scientific symposia; panels on nursing and the hospital's role in the community; paying for medical care; international health; a look at the medicine of the future.

Taking part will be some of the most distinguished men and women in their field. The proceedings will make copy for newspapers, radio and TV. For they are dealing with questions that concern everyone today and tomorrow, against a background of the past—the M.G.H. has had experience for a long time in meeting them and seeking solutions.

On ballots returned from all over the world outstanding living alumni of the hospital's house staff and graduates of the nursing school have been nominated and will be announced at the convocation. Citations, the equivalent of honorory degrees, are to be given representatives from some of the major hospitals of the world.

Ever since the General opened its doors it has had an international flavor. Its first physician and surgeon both had had training in England and on the Continent Early in this century, to reinvigorate the Harvard Medical School and the hospital, promising young members of the house staff were sent to work in London and Paris, Munich and Vienna and Copenhagen. In recent years many of these same men have been summoned abroad to teach or advise and have gone in the role of good will ambassadors with the blessing and assistance of the State Department. They in turn have brought doctors from away to share their knowledge in research and care of patients with doctors and nurses in the hospital on the Charles, and young men and women to study and work here. There is a constant going and coming—one world concerned with the sick and the alleviation of suffering in Boston and elsewhere.

As an adjunct to care of the sick the hospital is one of the foremost educational institutions in Boston. More than 400 of the physicians on its active staff teach in the hospital and the Harvard Medical School. There are 162 interns and residents, continuing their education, and nearly 200 clinical and research fellows. The school of nursing has 450 student nurses alone.

All told, 1,000 young people are in 20 educational programs, including medical students, medical social workers, medical record librarians, students in pastoral care, dietetic interns, medical illustrators, medical and laboratory technicians, occupational and physical therapists. Practical nurses and aids also are in training.

Some 600 volunteers last year contributed 50,000 hours. Among them were the hard-working ladies' visiting committee, 92 years old, first in the country; the staff wives' association; the distaff club, made up of wives of the house staff.

Thus there has been a many faceted development undreamed of when the hospital opened its doors for the first patients in 1821. Then simple attempts were made to treat typhoid fever with ice-cold bottles, for example. Now a staff seeking to understand as well as treat disease, will listen knowledgeably at the convocation to such disquisitions as that of Dr. Jerome Lejeune of the University of Paris on "Chromosomal Abnormalities" and of Dr. Harry Bostrom of Sweden's Karolinska Institute on "The Mucopolysaccharides." Dr. Bostrom, like a group working at the Massachusetts General Hospital, is trying through these high molecular weight compounds to find the biochemical abnormalities in the body which may bring on arthritis, a disease which was troubling men and women when the pyramids were built.

For a century and a half this all has been the Massachusetts General Hospital.

THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL HOSPITAL IN THE NEXT 150 YEARS

(By Dean A. Clark, M.D., general director)

The future of the Massachusetts General Hospital will, in the long run, depend upon the public's decision about the general fate of voluntary teaching hospitals in the United States. There are but a few of these—certainly fewer than 100 out of our 6,000 hospitals—and they are all beset with professional, financial, and administrative problems.

All our voluntary, teaching hospitals have in common a three-sided goal: care of patients, teaching, and research. Many, if not most of these hospitals function almost exclusively as referral centers to which complicated and difficult cases are sent. Only a handful, like the Massachusetts General, also function as community hospitals for the general care of patients from their neighborhoods.

This dual function of being a referral center and a community hospital offers many advantages, we believe, for both teaching and research, but it also brings special difficulties. The future will bring many changes in the form of these activities, even though the hospital's basic mission of healing the sick will not change.

For one thing, the hospital will undoubtedly care for an even larger proportion of chronic, as opposed to acute, illness, since chronic illness is increasing in our population. Care of such illnesses requires long-term supervision rather than short-term episodic treatment and requires generous community support even more than care of acute illness, since so few people can pay the full cost of care for a long-term illness.

Secondly, our staff probably will become much more highly organized along the lines of group practice so that the various special skills of staff members and their professional and technical associates, such as nurses, technicians, dietitians, therapists, social workers, can be brought to bear most effectively on each patient's and family's problems.

In the third place, the community will almost surely demand and be ready to support comprehensive health services, through the hospital for those who are ill at home, in nursing homes, in the ambulatory clinic, and in chronic disease hospitals, as well as in the hospital's own beds.

The hospital's care will include preventive, diagnostic, therapeutic, and rehabilitative services in all these various locations for patients of any type of financial status, rich or poor. All of these services will, in general, be provided as a part of an overall community, possibly a regional program.

Finally, the public will insist before long on paying for most, if not all, of these services (as well as for the full direct and indirect expenses of research) through voluntary health insurance or government or some combination of them.

Few patients, in the future, will be paying for their medical and hospital care directly out of their own pockets.

Whatever changes in staff organization or in financing may come about, I am confident, as I am sure we all are, that the essential spirit of Massachusetts General Hospital will

endure—the spirit that sees the patient as the central focus of whatever we do, that shows not only top-flight skills and techniques but attention to each individual patient's needs, and compassion for all who suffer.

THE 154TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1961, the Nation observed the 154th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

In this year 1961, the Nation is also commemorating the centennial anniversary of the commencement of the Civil War. In company with Lincoln, Grant, and Davis, General Lee was among the outstanding figures of that great conflict of men, ideas, and ideals.

On June 13, 1866, General Lee made application for a Presidential pardon. All circumstances considered, it seems singularly fitting and appropriate that the Congress, even at this late date, should move to restore to that great American his full and unabridged rights of citizenship retroactive to the date of his application.

For that purpose, I have introduced a bill patterned after legislation which has several times previously been introduced in this House but which has not yet cleared the obstacle course of the legislative process.

I earnestly trust that the Committee on the Judiciary will find time early in the session to consider the matter as a part of the contribution of Congress to the Civil War Centennial which is now in progress.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California, has brought to my attention the appalling fact that there are currently 350,000 Californians unemployed. San Diego has 7.2 percent unemployed; San Bernardino-Riverside has in excess of 7 percent unemployed; Ukiah-Fort Bragg has 16 percent unemployed; and Eureka has almost 14 percent unemployed. Therefore, I anxiously join my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in cosponsoring H.R. 5 to promote redevelopment for distressed areas.

U.S. SECRETS FOR SALE AT BARGAIN PRICES

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently, disturbed with the ease military secrets of the United States can be obtained by foreign powers, I sought to alert our country to this danger by cooperating with Argosy magazine in an exposé of the loose manner in which we guard vital defense information.

I invite my colleagues in the House to read the article which resulted from this interest and which appeared in the December 1960 issue of Argosy.

It follows:

U.S. SECRETS FOR SALE—50 CENTS APIECE

(By Congressman MELVIN PRICE, as told to Edward Hymoff)

"WASHINGTON.—Red spies are granted red-carpet treatment in their quest for U.S. secrets. Information worth thousands of dollars to the Reds if secretly purchased in any other country is openly obtained in the Nation's Capital for as little as $2.

"Any members of an Iron Curtain diplomatic mission stationed here can pick up vital information from a number of sources and—"

This headline and news story has yet to be printed. It came close to being published last May when a group of Pentagon security officers blew their collective brass hats upon learning that a Soviet Embassy official quietly paid $2 for a copy of a legitimate publication, allegedly jampacked with classified data.

The furor began when Vladimir D. Pavlov, third secretary of the Russian Embassy in Washington, D.C., strode through the 14th Street entrance of the National Press Building, took the elevator to the 12th floor, turned left as he stepped off and headed straight for room 1226. Without hesitation, Pavlov walked into the tiny office of Kendall K. Hoyt, director of the Association of Missile and Rocket Industries, asked for the "1960 Missile Handbook" and paid $2 for this slim volume of facts, figures and drawings of the Nation's latest missiles. Then, without further hesitation, the husky Russian paid an additional $2 which put him on a mailing list for the latest facts and figures based on updating of the original handbook at least two more times this year.

The original issue of the 1960 roundup of missile and space facts and its two updated supplements, contain a wealth of information. Thoroughly covered are 295 U.S. missile and space projects in a keyed index; photos and data on 58 leading missiles; data on 123 research and development projects; facts about the $14,700 million aerospace budget for the 1961 fiscal year and, finally, a contractors' directory including missile work being done by 586 companies at 718 plants, their locations, name of key personnel, and phone numbers. This, mind you, is just a sample of what's available in our Nation's Capital to Red spies—all at bargain rates.

U.S. intelligence agencies are spending untold millions of dollars in an effort to obtain just a fraction of the information Communist diplomats and military attachés openly obtain in this country without resorting to the cloak-and-dagger methods usually associated with some foreign missions that are known to seek out national secrets by foul as well as fair means. Comrade Pavlov undoubtedly collected a fund of invaluable intelligence material which soon found its way back to Moscow. Moreover, he made no secret of his movements; everything he did was absolutely legal and aboveboard.

Whatever Pavlov's real job is as third secretary of the Soviet Embassy, he and other members of Communist diplomatic missions also constantly and regularly visit the U.S. Government Printing Office where they openly purchase military manuals covering a variety of subjects and technical data important to our national defense effort today. These facts have since come to light during and after the hearings held last spring and summer by the Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Originally, this special subcommittee uncovered a parade of downright stupid publications called, for want of a better name, technical manuals, which painstakingly instructed the serviceman how to care for household pets (while assigned to orderly duty in a general officer's home); how to purchase liquor for a party ("larger groups consume less per person than small parties"); or the one on how to choose a wife ("do we realize the seriousness of the marriage vows?"). There was also one on the best way to fill a paper sack with groceries ("place heavy items on the bottom of the sack and fragile or perishable items on top") and another volume in the planning stage regarding baby tending.

While members of the committee were reading a U.S. Air Force manual on the "Care and Control of Pets," the Soviets were secretly interrogating U–2 Pilot Francis Gary Powers. When Comrade Pavlov purchased his encyclopedia of missile and space data for a total of $4, the Soviets announced the capture of Powers. This hapless pilot was trying to obtain information along similar lines but in a difficult and dangerous project that cost tens of millions of dollars.

So far as the military services were concerned, the information contained in the "1960 Missile Handbook" purchased by the Russian third secretary was classified. None of this data, however, was obtained by the editor from the Pentagon. According to the director of the Association of Missile and Rocket Industries, every bit of information in AMRI's annual publication was taken from trade magazines and technical papers. He added that extreme care was used to compile the data from information previously made public. Much of this information, often labeled "Secret" or "Classified" by the military services, is usually data that has been downgraded for public dissemination by the higher echelon Defense Department security review censors. Their decisions take time to filter down to their counterparts in the Army, Navy, or Air Force. Behind this release of information: The desire of manufacturers to publicize the latest hardware they've sold to the military services.

What all this adds up to is a tremendous flow of information into enemy hands. Actual secrets are no longer needed by the Soviet intelligence apparatus. Bits and pieces of information acquired from various sources, when pieced together, tell the Reds what they want to know. The prime example of an intelligence-gathering project, one in which all the work was done for the Russians in a great saving of time, effort and money, is the "1960 Missile Handbook." J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, summed this up last July in a warning to the Senate Judiciary Committee. He declared that Soviet intelligence officers are aware of our freedoms and take advantage of them.

"It is no secret," he added, "that one of the results of that freedom in our democratic society is the availability of voluminous information to members of the public merely for the asking."

According to Hoover—and he bases his contention on estimates—some 90 percent of an intelligence agent's time, in any country but ours, is spent in securing information

secretly. Much of this information is easily obtainable in the United States and especially in Washington by—incredulous as it may seem—purchasing it from the U.S. Government.

Any member of the Russian Embassy, any military attaché from an Iron Curtain diplomatic mission can walk into the U.S. Government Printing Office and purchase cartons of vital facts, statistics, and even current military information. Even when the so-called "spirit of Camp David" prevailed last year, during Premier Khrushchev's visit to Washington, any member of his entourage could have made a number of quick purchases to be transported back to Moscow in Khrushchev's personal plane. And right now, as a matter of fact, Russian Embassy clerks and military attachés are probably preparing a package of official U.S. Government data purchased this very day from our Government. In the Government Printing Office salesroom, they will usually find and select any number of military technical and field manuals containing information by which our Armed Forces presently function. You, too, can purchase these manuals. There's no difference in price for Russians or Americans.

Perhaps you don't know how the U.S. Army will guard some supply depots, factories, bridges, and railroad centers in time of war. But you can bet the lives of the GI's who will patrol or hold down sentry posts at these installations that the Red Army intelligence service knows. A member of the Soviet Embassy in Washington purchased this vital information for 55 cents when FM 19–30 went on sale in the U.S. Government Printing Office several months ago. The title of this manual, dated February 1959, is "Physical Security." Its chapters cover everything from "Physical Security Planning" and "The Threat of Sabotage" right through a section on alarm and communications systems, and an appendix on a "Suggested Guard Training Schedule." With this information, a group of saboteurs can easily wreak havoc, since they would know how physical security is handled in the U.S. Army and how our GI's assigned to guarding vital installations would think and react in time of emergency.

Name it, and it's probably for sale by the U.S. Government. There's no need even to personally visit the Government Printing Office salesroom. Available to any interested parties are price lists and title pamphlets with order blanks attached. A spy can even mail in a check with his order blank and receive information the easy way; like the 284-page U.S. Navy manual, "Principles of Guided Missiles and Nuclear Weapons," issued just last year. Two dollars will buy this informative book. For $3.50 anyone can purchase U.S. Air Force Manual 52–31 which was issued 3 years ago, and within its 573 pages contains, according to its title, "Guided Missiles Fundamentals." For another $1.15 a Soviet military attaché has undoubtedly purchased five Department of the Army pamphlets published as recently as June 1958 and containing a do-it-yourself bibliography about "Missiles, Rockets, and Satellites." Within the five thin volumes are listings of books, technical and general articles and research papers which describe how to launch, deploy, fight with and strategically place tactical missiles and rockets.

Where does responsibility lie? Certainly not with the U.S. Government Printing Office.

"Sure, we sell to a lot of Russians from the Embassy," the clerk behind the salesroom counter admits freely. "We also sell to Poles, Czechs, and Hungarians. We have to. There's no law against it. Somebody decides that this material is out of date—somebody at the Pentagon, not in this building—and we get it to sell. They really buy it, too. Twice a week, sometimes more, somebody from the Soviet Embassy is in here browsing around.

"Each of these visitors picks up what he wants, orders what he doesn't see on the shelves but what is listed in the latest price pamphlet. He pays cash. That's all we need to sell it."

This is the Nation's problem today. How is the United States to retain freedom of information, but still make it difficult for the Reds to find the vital facts they presently so easily acquire? No matter how old the information, or how obsolete, American industrial and scientific know-how today is based upon building blocks—developments arrived at from broad-based research. Many military, technical, and training manuals considered outdated now and on sale at the Government Printing Office are acknowledged by many prominent military authorities to contain a wealth of information from which current equipment and tactics have been developed. And if this official source of intelligence data isn't enough to make a spy's mouth water, there are open to his prying eyes the various military and industrial exhibits at public conventions and meetings. Here's a typical example:

Dressed in civilian clothing, Lt. Cols. Viktor F. Lobanov and Vzevolod S. Tovma, assistant military attachés from the Soviet Embassy, registered at the Army Association's annual meeting at Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel early last August.

Shortly afterward, two Russian air attachés drove up to the hotel and entered the display room. An hour later, the two air attachés, Vsevolod N. Generalov and Avgust A. Yashin, appeared at the hotel taxi ramp with armloads of documents. They hailed a cab and drove off to the Russian Embassy. Before the day was out, Capt. Edward Gordon, the stylish army attaché from the Polish Embassy, known throughout Washington for his Ivy League appearance, sauntered among the displays along with his big-brother colleagues from Moscow.

For 3 days, the Reds wandered among the 144 displays collecting material, taking notes and talking technical talk with industry experts manning the exhibit booths. Unaware that they were being observed by a reporter from the Washington Star, the Reds collected every brochure they could lay their hands on. This is what they did during the 3-day meeting:

Monday, August 8, 11 a.m.: Colonels Lobadnov and Tovma arrived at the Sheraton-Park in a taxi and registered at the meeting. Each man paid the $1 registration fee and an additional $4.50 for the reception that night. At the registration desk, they accepted free plastic briefcases, attached identification cards to their lapels—denoting name and rank—and began their grand tour through 21,000 square feet of floorspace jammed with military exhibits.

Their briefcases began to bulge with brochures and pamphlets on planes, weapons, electronics and vehicles as the day wore on. Returning to the Embassy early in the afternoon, they arrived back at the hotel shortly after 3 p.m. and picked up where they left off in the exhibit area.

During the day, Captain Gordon followed the Russian routine but kept pretty much to himself.

Tuesday, August 9, 11 a.m.: Russian air attachés Generalov and Yashin arrived, proceeding straight to the exhibits without registering. Shortly before noon, Colonels Lobadnov and Tovma appeared, joined their two air force colleagues and an hour later, the four of them departed in a taxi. Each man entered the cab carrying an armload of printed material.

At 3:10 p.m., Colonels Lobadnov and Tovma returned and proceeded to a conference where they sat through a lengthy speech by Lieut. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, U.S. Army Research and Development Chief, who warned of an era "darkened by the sinister shadows of the hammer and sickle."

The Washington Star reporter wrote that at each burst of applause, as General Trudeau discussed the Communist menace, the two Russian colonels applauded politely along with the rest of the audience. They occasionally made notes as General Trudeau spoke of how the Reds can "steal information 2 years after we have it and still beat us to the punch."

Later they sat through additional discussions which covered subjects concerning the development of weapons, communications equipment, air and ground vehicles, surveillance and even problems concerning the Red army.

From 3 p.m. until 5 o'clock, Captain Gordon studied the missile display and collected additional printed data from the industry representatives in the booths.

Wednesday, August 10, 11 a.m., Captain Gordon, still wearing his badge identifying him as a representative of the Polish People's Republic, continues his collection-of-information tour.

Soviet air attaché Generalov is observed at noon on a meticulous note-taking tour of the Redstone, Mercury, and Jupiter exhibits. At 1:30 p.m. Colonel Lobadonov arrives and goes straight to a lecture on the training of the modern American soldier. He is joined 50 minutes later by Colonel Tovma, and they both sit through a detailed discussion of U.S. Army leadership training.

There are no laws which prohibited these Red officers from attending the Army Association meeting as long as it was held within 25 miles of the center of Washington. Nor did the organization holding the convention rule out the attendance of military attachés from behind the Iron Curtain. Therefore, these men were free to participate as they did. It's also interesting to note that seven items of defense equipment never seen by the general public were exhibited for the first time. They included the T–114 tracked reconnaissance vehicle, which is expected to replace armored cars and light tanks, a detailed drawing of the Mauler, the new mobile air-defense automatic firing system, new features of the still-under-wraps Nike-Zeus anti-missile missile; jet-propelled target drone; a model of a 200-mm. warhead which reportedly can pack an atomic punch, a new one-man antiaircraft weapon called Red Eye and a small portable computer.

The Soviets, of course, are taking full advantage of our unique way of life and its many liberties including the freedom of information. Indicative of this is a statement, made 4 months ago by Soviet space scientist Leonid Sedov, summing up America's greatest security problem. We have a nuclear-powered aircraft program going on. The Soviets have one, too. But they have not yet developed an atomic rocket engine. They will, however, pay out a fortune to buy our secrets surreptitiously if they can't buy them openly—and cheaply.

"We will wait," Sedov declared. Perhaps he was studying a technical manual forwarded to him by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. "We will wait until the Americans finish theirs. * * * Thus we will get information whether it is possible to build such engines, and get it without having to waste a lot of money ourselves."

Perhaps it would cost Russia a tremendous fortune if we can find a way to make intelligence gathering in the United States much more difficult. It might slow up the swift rate of Soviet scientific and industrial development if manuals and technical data could no longer be easily purchased at any price, anywhere, any time.

A TAX MEASURE TO RESTORE AMERICA'S LEAD IN PRODUCTIVITY AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT AND WIPE OUT THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENT DEFICIT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Masachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a tax measure which I believe warrants the Members' most serious attention.

This bill would speed up substantially the rate at which business firms and farmers may write off, for Federal income tax purposes, the cost of newly acquired machinery and equipment used in trade and commerce. Specifically, the bill will permit the taxpayer to write off within the present tax year 100 percent of the cost of capital equipment which he acquires within the year, up to a maximum of one-half million dollars; and it will likewise permit a similar writeoff in the coming tax year, 1962, for such equipment newly acquired within that year. After 1962 the depreciation allowances would be the same as they are now. In other words, this is a temporary measure. It is something in the nature of an emergency measure, intended to help relieve the extreme stresses under which we now find both the private economy and the Federal Government.

PURPOSE TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY

The purpose of the bill is to give the domestic economy a shot in the arm; help put the unemployed back to work producing good and useful things; and, above all, to restore America's lead in productivity and business efficiency among the world's nations, so as to regain our competitive position in world markets and combat the inroads of foreign-made goods in our domestic markets. It is only in this way that we can wipe out the humiliating deficit in our balance of payments with other nations which is not only threatening our gold reserve but paralyzing the Federal Government's ability to adopt policies needed to cope with our domestic problems.

Certainly the state of the economy is not good. Furthermore, the mounting unemployment, the recent fall in personal income, the large decline in investment and predictions for a still further decline in the rate at which the Nation's productive facilities will be modernized and expanded in the coming year, are all clear signs that we are drifting into deeper trouble.

Most of us have learned enough to know that the time to deal with economic disease is when the fever first strikes—not after a crippling disease has run its course and paralysis has set in.

And to those among us who hold to economic faith-healing and opposed any form of economic "doctoring" I might point out that the kind of medicine this bill contains would be good medicine at any time, even if the economy were healthy. It is like drinking orange juice and including fresh vegetables in the daily diet.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

How does this bill fit in with other programs which seem to be in the offing?

First, there is a question of adopting flexible tax rates, particularly as to individual incomes. Many think that consumer purchasing power should be increased, by lowering taxes, in periods of recession such as now. I fully agree that flexible taxes ought to be one of the permanent weapons for fighting both deflation and inflation. In my judgment, we should have flexible tax rates, not only to permit reductions in recessions, but to permit increases in boom periods, as a means of combating inflation and reducing the Federal debt. In fact, I am now making refinements to a bill I introduced last May (H.R. 12360) providing for such taxes, and I expect to reintroduce that bill shortly.

Second, much has been said about the deficit in our "public economy." Presumably the new administration will shortly make recommendations for increased public spending in such fields as education, housing, roads, and so on, but public spending is not the whole solution. Indeed such increased spending as is being publicly discussed by President Kennedy's advisers is not of a magnitude that would pull us out of the recession. Nor will spending of this kind do much toward modernizing the Nation's productive equipment, and that is what must be done if we are to be able to spend the amounts on public services that these services really require.

There is only one way to keep the American standard of living increasing, provide more jobs and at higher pay. That is to keep pushing ahead the frontiers of modern technology—continuously replace the old and inefficient machines with the new and more productive.

THREAT TO OUR GOLD RESERVES

We know that America enjoys the highest standard of living in the world, enjoys the highest wage rates, and has the greatest output per man-hour of work only because American farms and business firms provide more and better machinery per worker.

We also know that in recent years America's leadership in productivity has badly slipped. It is not necessary for me to review the humiliating scoreboard on our comparative rate of economic growth. Our lag is well known. It has come about because of our failure to increase productivity as rapidly as we should have.

We need not even consider Russia. The price of our drift is being driven home every day by the low-cost Japanese and European-made goods coming into our markets, and by the appearance of more and more distressed industries and more and more unemployment.

Many of these Japanese and European industries are operating with the newest plants and the most modern tools—to a large extent acquired with U.S. aid—while our own capital equipment has grown obsolete. A survey conducted by the American Machinist in 1958 showed that 66 percent of all our machine tools were then more than 10 years of age. Today the average age is more than 13 years, while substantially all of the German industry has been built since 1950. One would have to be out of touch with the world to imagine that tools built 13 years ago could even begin to compete with the cost-cutting advances that have been made even within the past 2 years. As compared to 13 years ago, the equipment of modern plants in many types of production makes possible cost savings of 90 percent and more.

Much of the obsolescence with which we are faced today is as a direct result of the monetary policies of the Eisenhower administration and British bankers' thinking of 1810. The tight-money and high-interest policies have retarded investment, as indeed they were intended to do.

MONETARY POLICIES PARALYZED

But monetary policies have not been the whole cause. Rather, the conclusion of business people and independent experts alike is that the real obsolescence period of most capital equipment today is a great deal shorter than the depreciation periods generally allowed under the tax laws. Some experts have estimated that if U.S. industry were actually replacing equipment as fast as it is becoming obsolete, the cost would be from $5 to $8 billion a year more than its present depreciation allowance.

Plainly, no change in monetary policies likely to be made will be enough to correct the deficit which has accumulated over the long years of economic slumber. In truth, there are some disturbing signs that the new administration will itself be enmeshed in the Eisenhower monetary policies—at least for some time to come. All policies I have heard suggested to date revolve around the notion that our first objective must be to preserve the gold. Thus the monetary policies which seem to be shaping up are modified by those of the past only by the notion that while short-term rates must continue to be held up—as a means of checking the flow of "hot funds" and easing the drain of our gold—long-term rates can nevertheless be brought down and thus investment in new capital equipment can be allowed to resume.

Over the past 6 years I have been, not the most effective critic, but very probably the most persistent critic, of the Federal Reserve's bills only policy. No one would be happier than I to see an end to that policy. But even if the bills only policy were completely eliminated, and the Federal Reserve officials became fully cooperative in the idea of trading in the long-term market, they could not make anything like the reduction in long-term rates that the economy calls for without also reducing short-term rates.

So, in context of the policies that seem to be shaping up, it is not too much to say that our balance of payments prob-

lem must be solved before any real solution to our domestic problems can be reached. Such a reduction in interest rates as the domestic economy clearly calls for does not seem to be in prospect.

INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY ONLY SOLUTION

The point has been made, of course, that we still have a favorable balance of trade if we count only the dollar value of the goods and services actually imported and exported. But we cannot reasonably count these dollars alone. It leaves unanswered the question of why the dollars going abroad in loans, in aid, and in private investment are being used to buy the Treasury's gold, rather than to buy U.S. goods and services.

We might ask why dollars lent to a Latin American country, say, are not used to buy from the United States the tools and machines for which the dollars are lent. The answer is, all too frequently, that these goods can be brought more cheaply in Europe, and the dollars are used to buy the goods from Europe.

Why then, we might ask, don't the European nationals who acquire these dollars use them to buy goods from the United States? The answer is again the same. They can buy the items cheaper in Europe, and the result is that the dollars end up as surplus in the central banks of Europe and are then used to buy our gold.

The only way out, as I see it, is to modernize our capital equipment and get production costs down. It is unrealistic to hope that costs can be brought down by reducing wages, or that U.S. wages can be held down while European and Japanese wages catch up. Such a policy would be bad even if it were possible.

It is my hope that if the bill I propose is adopted, the resulting productivity increases will be shared all around—in higher profits, in higher wages, and in lower prices to consumers, both here and abroad—and that we will all benefit from a restoration of our capital goods industries.

There is good reason to think, furthermore, that defense costs would come down. The bill would be extremely helpful to the metalworking industries, which account for about half of our industrial output. These are supplying the so-called military hardware—at higher and higher prices, incidentally—and according to many estimates there is no greater potential for cost reductions anywhere.

Now, let us be more specific about the provisions of the bill.

ALL KINDS OF BUSINESS AND FARM EQUIPMENT ELIGIBLE

What kinds of machinery and equipment would be eligible for a speedup writeoff under the bill? Answer: All kinds of tangible personal property used in business or farming having a usable life of 3 years or more. In short, almost all kinds of business investment would be eligible except, of course, investments in inventories, financial paper—such as stocks, bonds, mortgages, and so on—and real estate.

In other words, the bill would apply to all kinds of machinery, tools, and equipment, including office machines, automobiles, trucks, and so on, as well as to all kinds of farm machinery and equipment.

American agriculture is, of course, the most efficient in the world. Even so, American farmers are using a great deal of old, obsolete, and broken-down equipment. Getting farm costs down is one way to increase farm incomes and to dispose of more farm products in foreign markets. I would like to see, too, a drastic modernization of the farm equipment producers so that these producers can again offer farmers tractors and other machinery at prices they can afford to pay.

The building industry is, of course, in the doldrums. But buildings constitute a problem of a different kind. It would hardly be feasible to allow a builder of a one-half-million-dollar apartment house, say, to write off the entire cost in 1 year. Furthermore, the Government already has other means of stimulating building activity.

THE BILL HELPS ALL BUSINESS BUT HELPS SMALLER FIRMS MOST

How much new investment can be written off under the bill? Answer: The cost of any property—including used property—acquired in the tax year 1961 can be written off in that year, up to a maximum of one-half million dollars. In addition, any such property acquired in the tax year 1962 can be written off in that year, up to a maximum of one-half million dollars.

Previously I suggested that I would introduce a bill allowing a writeoff of up to $1 million in the present year. Some of the experts have told me, however, that such an allowance, limited to 1 year, would be of limited effectiveness because it frequently takes more than 1 year to acquire and install new equipment. Furthermore, modernizing a plant these days often requires much more than the addition of a new tool; it may require a whole new assembly line. The same kind of thing frequently occurs in modernizing a retail store.

On these considerations, it has seemed to me better to offer a writeoff of one-half million dollars in each of 2 years. At the end of 2 years, the speedup amortization arrangements would automatically expire and the present law concerning depreciation would remain in effect.

Another point bearing on the effectiveness of the bill is that the new provision it offers would be good for only 2 years. At the end of 2 years the law reverts to exactly the same provisions as now prevail. Thus, to take advantage of this, everybody would have to act promptly.

The bill is not intended to help just small business. It is intended to help all business—although, in its direct effects, the bill obviously offers the most help to the smaller firms. The acquisition of another one-half million dollars or $1 million of new equipment would perhaps not mean too much to the multi-billion-dollar corporations.

But there are several good reasons why the most help should go to the smaller firms and why, also, even the biggest corporations will benefit indirectly.

In the first place, giving the most help to the smaller firms would be justified if for no other reason than that the immense weight of the Government has for so long now, through so many different policies, been pushing productive resources and know-how into the top corporations. Let me illustrate. The Federal Government is now making grants to business for research and technological developments in an aggregate amount greater than the total Federal budget before World War II. The Department of Defense is handing out something like $6 billion a year for such purposes, and this money is being used to develop new products and new production technologies of all kinds. Yet more than 90 percent of this $6 billion is going to only 100 companies. Furthermore, the Department of Defense allows the company which makes patentable inventions at Government expense to acquire and control the patents. It is time to throw the weight of the Government around a little more evenly.

In truth, however, the bill would be of immense indirect benefit to such top corporations as United States Steel and General Motors. At least 18,000 of the some 25,000 metalworking firms in the country are small firms having sales of less than $1 million a year. If these firms can be modernized so as to increase the sales of steel products both at home and abroad, the result will be a vast expansion of the market for the raw materials which the United States Steel Corp. has to sell. Similarly, if we can modernize the parts producers and increase their productivity, General Motors should benefit from cost reductions in the many parts it has to buy.

REMOVES UNCERTAINTY—DOES NOT PROVIDE A TAX "FORGIVENESS"

The principal reason for limiting the writeoff to one-half million dollars a year is, however, that the offer of a writeoff of a relatively small size is the kind most likely to be used and to be effective. The feature of the bill which makes it most attractive is not that it forgives any taxes—it does not. It provides only a tax postponement. Rather, the attractive feature is that it removes uncertainties which stand in the way of investment in new equipment where these uncertainties are most pronounced.

The point is that the small firm is much less able to plan its future than the big corporation. The small man is reluctant to purchase machinery which he can write off only over a span of, say, 5 or 10 years, because he has little basis for being confident that he will have any profits over these years; he is uncertain whether the other members of his management team will still be around, or whether he himself will still be alive.

On the other hand, the great corporations can and do plan ahead. They regard themselves, correctly, as continuing institutions, and they are able to plan their expansion rates, their obsolescence rates, and even to some extent their profit rates. Thus it is not too important for, say, General Motors, to be able to take an extra deduction from its profits this year, when it knows that whatever it takes this year will have

to be made up next year or the year following. But this is important to the small firm.

Another uncertainty which plagues the small firm more than it does the big firm is the uncertainty as to what depreciation period the Internal Revenue Service is going to insist upon, after equipment is acquired, and how the tax examiners may change their minds about a depreciation schedule once it is established.

Another reason why a 1-year writeoff will be attractive to the smaller firms is that they can obtain bank loans to finance purchases of equipment for such a period. It is much more difficult for a small firm to get financing for periods of 5, 7, or 10 years. The big corporations are plagued with no such handicap.

WILL INCREASE LONGRUN TAX REVENUES

Now, the question is, what will the bill "cost"—what will it do to the Federal budget? In the long run, obviously, the bill will not "cost" anything. To repeat, the bill does not provide a tax "forgiveness"—it only provides a tax postponement. Consequently, any cost reductions it brings about in industry and commerce will, in the long run, increase profits and wages and thus bring in more tax revenues, not less tax revenues.

In this connection, I call particular attention to the fact that the bill contains a feature which would prevent the more generous depreciation provisions being used either as a tax dodge, or as a means of speculating in tools and equipment. If, at any time in the future, the taxpayer sells property which has been depreciated under the provisions of this bill, the income from such sales must be treated as ordinary income and taxed accordingly. The bill does not, however, change the capital gains treatment now accorded property depreciated under already existing provisions of law. In other words, the bill plugs a loophole which the bill itself would otherwise create; but it does not attempt to cure any problems arising under existing law.

Now, what will the shortrun cost of the bill be? What effect will the bill have on the Federal budget this year and next year, when the increased allowances will be principally felt? Manifestly, this kind of program does not lend itself to confident estimates. There are two unknowns.

There is the question of what extent the advantages offered by the bill will actually be used. Of course, to the extent that the advantages are not used, they will not cost anything. On the other hand, to the extent that the bill does stimulate the purchase of new equipment, it will to some extent generate immediate increases in taxable incomes. What the multiplier effect will be, however, is another unknown.

I do not believe that the bill would be inflationary, if enacted promptly. Considering the slack in the economy generally and the slack in the capital goods industries particularly, there should be no reason why production of all kinds of business equipment could not be stepped up without price increases.

On the other hand, if we assume that by the end of this year, or perhaps next year, the economy may be operating in high gear again, then by that time much of the new equipment will be in place and making itself felt in lower costs. Another point to consider, also, is that the present technological revolution is making profound changes in materials-handling and inventory practices. Some of the most spectacular cost reductions made possible by new techniques in both manufacturing and distribution are those which result from reduced requirements of inventories, both raw materials and work-in-process, and reduced requirements for handling these inventories. So, to a large extent, raw materials requirements for the new modernization will be cushioned by the modernization itself.

All of this is not to minimize the uncertain effects of the bill on the Federal budget this year and next. I am somewhat aware of the great intellectual investment which goes into the budget-making, as I am of the fact that questions of bookkeeping convenience sometimes dictate the choice of policies. I do not believe, however, that we should be led into the habit of rejecting a good policy, merely because its effects cannot be precisely quantified in advance, in favor of some less desirable policy which happens to be more predictable. If precision of predictability were to be the controlling test of whether a policy should be adopted, the first ballistics missile would never have been fired. Obviously, the trajectory of that missile could not have been predicted as reliably as the trajectory of a World War II cannon.

Let us get moving in what we know to be the right direction, even though we cannot know in advance at what rate we may accelerate, once we start moving. I am convinced that this bill goes in the right direction.

SOME PROGRESS ON THE YOUTH CORPS PROPOSAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's proposal of a Youth Corps of young Americans who volunteer to serve their country in technical assistance missions has aroused great public interest. In order to further a discussion of the proposal, I include my article on the subject in the February 1961 Progressive:

A dozen recent conferences on our foreign aid program have agreed that we must discover ways of sharpening its impact abroad and obtaining better understanding at home. At the point of destination, so the criticism runs, our aid program relies too much upon military hardware, or upon grandiose steel-and-concrete projects that have little meaning to native peoples. Too often it is administered by the aloof, enclave-living, redtape-bound types caricatured in "The Ugly American." Too often our aid is short-stopped by corrupt or reactionary rulers before it "trickles down" to the people.

At the point of origin, much of the idealism which animated the Marshall plan and the original Point Four concept has worn thin. As every Congressman knows, voters who once thrilled to the vision of West Europeans striving to restore their economies, of primitive peoples making the desert bloom, now ask embarrassing questions about Laos and Korea and Iraq.

This spring, the Kennedy Administration and the 87th Congress will be overhauling the foreign-aid program. In this overhaul, there will figure prominently the idea of using a corps of young Americans overseas to try to rekindle the flickering flame of idealism.

During the campaign last fall, Candidate Kennedy asked that some appropriate way be found to take advantage of the skills, the talents, the devotion, and the idealism which are inherent in America's young people; and to utilize the services of those properly trained, on the new frontiers of humanity—to aid in building dams, teaching schools, operating hospitals, establishing irrigation projects, and generally to help other people to help themselves.

Within a few weeks Congress will receive the authoritative Colorado State University study of the proposal for a Point 4 Youth Corps. For some months Colorado State has been making an on-the-spot study of the feasibility of the project in eight underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The study was authorized in an amendment to last year's Mutual Security Act sponsored by the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, and myself.

The idea of a Point 4 Youth Corps first came to me on a congressional mission to southeast Asia in the fall of 1957. There I saw something that in a flash could cancel out, in its potential, many of the mistakes we had made. In the jungles of Cambodia, I saw a team of four young American schoolteachers who were going from village to village setting up the elementary schools that the French had neglected to provide in a hundred years of colonialism. The villagers and the young Americans loved each other, and I could only regret that there were 4, rather than 40, or 400, Americans working on the project.

A few months later, in a talk at Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y., I suggested the idea of a Point 4 Selective Service for young Americans, neither busybodies nor misfits, with some degree of expertness, and a willingness to serve their country for a few years in far-off places, at a soldier's pay, in the greatest adventure of the age.

The response there—and wherever else I have discussed it—was electric. So I made it my business to discuss and refine the proposal, through meetings and conversations with Government officials, religious and welfare leaders, and university teachers and administrators. By the end of 1959, the legislation calling for an official congressional study was ready. The authorization for the study became law in June 1960, and the appropriation was made in September 1960. Meanwhile, in June, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota introduced a bill providing for the immediate establishment of a U.S. Peace Corps, setting forth the legal status of such a corps in detail.

From these essentially similar proposals, will, I hope, emerge legislation sufficient to bring the corps into being before the end of 1961. The exact bill on which Congress will be asked to act will undoubtedly be hammered out within the next few weeks. And Congress can be relied on to make some modifications. But, based on the quick acceptance by Congress last year of the study, I am highly optimistic that the corps will be established by law.

A whole series of knotty questions needs to be resolved before the corps can become a reality. At the end of 1960, I sponsored a meeting in Washington of representatives of more than 60 interested organizations—business, labor, religious, welfare, university. Here are the main questions we asked ourselves:

1. What is the corps' purpose?

Four main purposes appear:

To add a human element to our programs of economic and social development.

To furnish a constructive outlet for the great reservoir of youthful idealism in this country.

To make available a much larger pool of U.S. oversea technicians.

To educate some of our young people both for eventual service overseas as a life work, and to lend their future home communities in America a sense of world understanding.

2. What types of jobs should the corps do?

Almost everything useful under the sun, the answer seems to be, but teaching comes first. Representative BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's African subcommittee, reports that dozens of newly independent African states are desperately anxious for American technicians of all kinds, particularly teachers. Even before the beginnings of a formal program, many young Americans are teaching abroad on their own. Sam Bowles, son of Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, just out of Yale, and his wife, are now having the time of their lives teaching in Nigeria, for example.

At a very simple level, there is a tremendous demand for teachers of English. One of the happiest memories of my Army career was teaching readin' and ritin' to a group of Navajos and Cajuns at Camp Joseph T. Robinson, Ark., for several months in 1943. All I had for a text or a teacher's guide was an army "poopsheet," but the iridescent smiles of the Navajos and the joy of the Cajuns at establishing contact with home through the parish priest showed how easy it is to be a success at this.

Young Americans with some engineering training can help plan and build schools clinics, irrigation projects, roads, and community centers. Home economists can demonstrate soapmaking, food handling, child care. Farmers can demonstrate crop and livestock improvement, irrigation, conservation. There is great need for people trained in medicine, nursing, and public administration.

3. How big should the corps be?

Here, there is a great variety of opinion. Some labor representatives talk about a vast foreign legion like a Civilian Conservation Corps, an army of 100,000 or so doing manual labor. But this approach overlooks the fact that unskilled labor is something of which most underdeveloped countries have a considerable surplus.

At the other extreme is the view presented to President Kennedy by Professor Max Millikan of Massachusetts Institute of Technology: "The program should be launched on a limited pilot basis with no more than a few hundred members," and the Government content itself with coordinating the programs of nongovernmental agencies. The trouble with such a program is that it is really no program at all. To have esprit de corps, you must first have a corps. A few hundred participants are now being furnished by such organizations as International Voluntary Services, which carries on excellent programs in agriculture and community development in such places as Viet Nam, Jordan, and Ghana; Operation Cross-Roads Africa, conducted by that remarkable Harlem minister, James H. Robinson, which brings 150 students a year to Africa; and the American Friends Service Committee, an old hand at person-to-person diplomacy. Agencies such as these are the first to say that their resources are wholly inadequate for the size of the task presented.

A program on the order of 1,000 to 2,000, consisting of both voluntary organizations and a Government-sponsored component, sounds to most observers like the most sensible way to begin. An ultimate expansion to perhaps 10,000 could be envisaged.

4. What should be the qualifications for membership in the corps?

All are agreed that members should be "carefully selected." In practice, most members should have a college bachelor's degree or better. But there is no reason why a young farmer without a degree, for example, could not give invaluable service overseas. It would therefore seem wisest not to require a college degree.

Much more difficult will be the more subjective type of screening. The corps certainly does not want members who are suspicious of foreigners. Equally, it seems to me, it does not want those who are so caught up with the rest of the world that they are out of touch with their own society.

5. Should the corps be public or private?

Here again, there are those who advocate that the corps should depend entirely upon voluntary organizations, and those who advocate that it should be entirely governmental. The problem is too big for the voluntary organizations alone. Still, encouraging a pluralistic approach requires that the voluntary organizations be considered as part of the total American program. Perhaps the best solution would be to lodge the corps at least initially, in the agency which has been handling our technical assistance programs, the International Cooperation Administration. Top coordination could perhaps be handed to an Under Secretary of State. The major nucleus of the corps would be sponsored and financed directly by the Government. Voluntary agencies would be able to expand their programs as they were given aid by the Government, such as for oversea travel.

The Youth Corps idea should not be limited to U.S. participation. Recently, Karl Blessing, president of the West German Central Bank, urged a device for enabling German young people to work abroad in the underdeveloped areas, both for the good of their souls and as a recognition of Germany's favorable balance of payments position. Similar moves are afoot in the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and elsewhere. While the United States should not wait on others for launching its own program, joint activities with other contributing countries, and perhaps some day with the United Nations, are well worth exploring.

6. Should Point 4 Youth Corps members be draft exempt?

It is argued by some that service in the Youth Corps would be considerably more arduous in most cases than peacetime service in the armed forces—it probably would be—and therefore, the Youth Corps service should provide exemption from the draft. Total draft exemption, however, would run into domestic political opposition. In the last campaign, for example, Vice President Richard Nixon called the concept "a haven for draft dodgers." A more sensitive objection to the complete draft exemption idea was advanced by the Reverend James H. Robinson, of Operation Cross-Roads Africa, who pointed out that Youth Corps members might be suspect abroad if it were known that draft exemption was a possible motive for their signing up.

A sensible way of handling the problem has been worked out in practice by International Voluntary Services. While the young person is serving overseas, he is deferred from the draft just as is a university student. On his return from his 3 or 4 years' stint abroad, he more than likely will be 25 years old, or married, or otherwise beyond the reach of the draft. In practice, IVS reports that so far not one member has been drafted upon his return. Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey has indicated he would go along with this kind of approach to the Youth Corps.

7. How should Youth Corps members be trained?

Everyone seems agreed that a well-developed orientation course of at least 6 months is necessary, divided between this country and the general area where the member will work. The three areas of concentration would be a refresher course in American culture and government; studies of the culture of the underdeveloped area; and language training.

8. How much would the program cost?

It is envisaged that members sign up for at least 3 years. Pay and allowances should be comparable to those of a soldier, something like expenses, plus $80 a month, which is the amount the rifle-toting counterpart of Youth Corps members would get in the Army. The annual cost for each member of the corps, including transportation and living facilities, is estimated at around $5,000. On that basis, it would cost $10 million a year to send 2,000 young Americans abroad—less than one one-hundred-fiftieth of the sum we are now spending on our current foreign economic aid program. If we can afford to send many thousands of U.S. Army officers to Turkey and Iran and Vietnam and Pakistan to train soldiers, surely we can afford to send a small number of young Americans to train farmers and teachers.

President Kennedy received more letters on the Youth Corps, according to Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, than on any subject he raised during the campaign. Letters from young Americans volunteering for the Corps, with an apparent full awareness of the sacrifice it entails, already fill several drawers of my filing cabinet. The letters prove that young Americans want to participate in the war against poverty and ignorance and disease. They want to involve themselves in the affirmative evolution of the have-nots. Surely the administration and the Congress can fashion a bridge to assist their idealism to become reality.

OZARK HILLS

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, back in the Ozark hills that are the trademark of my district, youngsters grow up with the understanding that their parents are anxious to give counsel and guidance as they develop toward manhood.

But we also try to teach our youngsters that there comes a time when each must assume his own independence and can no longer rely on his father or mother to recommend solutions to his problems, when he must stand on his own two feet.

Much of the so-called liberal philosophy of today is a direct contradiction to the lessons we learned. We are urged on every occasion, and from every direction, to lean on Uncle Sam, to toss our every problem in his lap for the past 28 years—one entire generation—just as we used to toss them in our parents' laps when we were children.

My district has problems similar to those that confront other districts in the Nation. We, too, have our areas of high unemployment and so-called depressed areas though perhaps not to the extent of districts with a higher degree of industrialization.

But I do not believe in the paternalistic approach. I do not believe that the Federal Government has the answer to these problems in its "hip pocket." If this were so, then we are in effect admitting that the Communists are on the right track because they turn all their problems over to the top echelon of government.

We are still a free enterprise Nation, thank God. And this system which has provided us with such a high standard of living deserves the chance to correct its own deficiencies before we "kill the goose that lays the golden egg."

It is with this purpose in mind that I have today submitted a major tax reform bill. Its provisions are essentially those contained in the Herlong-Baker bill which failed to gain enactment in the 86th Congress. A similar bill has been submitted by several of my colleagues.

The bill is designed to release the present tax brakes on our economic growth. It would do this by making available, through tax rate reform, sufficient risk capital after taxes to encourage the start of substantial new businesses and for the development of established business, both large and small, and thus create more job opportunities.

It will improve incentives, both individual and corporate, by restoring the rewards for merit.

It will allow persons in lower income brackets more take-home pay for basic needs.

It will spread reductions over a period of years so as not to impair essential revenue needs.

Enactment of major tax reform legislation would add strength and greater meaning to efforts to reduce and control the Federal spending level since it would offer a clear choice for the public between greater spending or a more moderate tax rate structure.

We cannot, in all sincerity, expect local and State governments to assume more responsibilities for State and local problems unless we alleviate the death grip now held by the Federal Government on all potential sources of tax revenue.

I believe this one piece of legislation will do more to curb our disturbing unemployment picture than all the so-called depressed area bills combined, because it attacks the heart of the problem which is the slowdown in capital investment whereas the depressed area bills offer little more than the creation of new Federal bureaus and more Federal employees.

One approach seeks to lessen taxes and stop inflation. The other can only increase them. One approach represents a plea to our Government to free private capital for expansion and the creation of new jobs. The other will further restrict its availability. I urge the House to choose the right approach.

Although President Kennedy has not yet indicated his position on general tax reform, he stated in his inaugural address that Americans should ask, "Not what can my country do for me, but what can I do for my country?"

This legislation is dedicated to that philosophy by seeking to make it possible for more Americans to do for themselves what too many must now ask government to do for them.

FOR THE RELIEF OF THE JEFFERSON LOAN CO.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced for the consideration of the Subcommittee on Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary a private bill for the relief of the Jefferson Loan Co. and its corporate successor, the Jefferson Mortgage Co.

This corporation incurred tax liability and paid taxes in the business years ending January 31, 1947, and January 31, 1948, on amounts reported in profits by certain of the corporation officers. In reality, there were no profits in those years and the profits reported were so reported as part of a plan by the officers involved to accomplish a fraud.

The corporations in question having removed the faithless officers now seek to have refunded to them the amount of the tax overpayments in the 2 years mentioned. Attempts to seek remedy in the courts have pointed to the necessity of having relief given by the Congress. It is my hope that the Congress will be able to study and decide upon these claims in the near future, with reference to the policy Congress wishes to establish in encouraging or discouraging efforts of stockholders to clean up and keep clean the management entrusted to carry on the operation of the companies.

TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the national issues which has received wide discussion and has been the subject of general interest in recent months is that of education. There is no question of the importance of education to the future of our country; progress in the sciences, the social sciences, in culture and in economics all must rest in large part upon the continued increase in the level of education of the American people. The importance of education to America's future brings immediately to mind the questions of what is America doing in the field of education, what more can be done, by whom should it be done.

Education in this country is a cooperative venture; important work is being done in education by Federal, State, and local governments, by foundations and industries and by private citizens. There is a real contribution to be made by each of the aforementioned groups and it is only through their constructive cooperation and through the recognition and respect of each of the role of the other that we can continue to progress in the fields of education.

I have today introduced a bill which I feel will strengthen the educational position of America. This bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education. This would lighten the financial burden which is a major barrier to the enjoyment of many of our young people of the benefits of a higher education; and as education is necessary to our future progress, the lessening of this financial burden will benefit the country as a whole. It is my hope that passage of this legislation would encourage parents to reappraise their financial ability to send their children to college.

The basic features of the bill, which would assure fairness in its operation and service to the country are:

First. The bill would encourage higher education by making it more feasible financially for parents to send their children or for students to support themselves in college.

Second. Its provisions would apply only to those institutions of higher education which meet present tests for special tax treatment under present income tax laws.

Third. By operating as a tax credit, the cost to the Government would be approximately the same as if the fees were deductible and there would be no favoritism, no greater advantage to the higher bracket taxpayer than to the low income taxpayer.

Fourth. An outside limit of $450 credit, or a $1,500 tuition charge per year, is set; this would, it is hoped, be of substantial assistance to work in higher education on the graduate and professional level as well as the undergraduate level.

Fifth. This provision would apply not only to parents of the student and the student himself, but to any individual taxpayer who wishes to assist a promising young man or women by financing his or her higher education.

Sixth. No tax credit would be allowed on amounts for tuition and fees supplied in the form of scholarships, fellowships, or grants from sources other than the taxpayer himself.

I believe that this proposal offers a sound step forward in the encouragement of private expenditures in the field of education. The choice of how one will spend his money remains with the individual, but the expenditure of it in support of education is given favored tax treatment. This encouragement would result in wider use of the full range of institutions which provide the training and the skills which are so necessary for America.

I want to make one other point. This bill is limited to costs of higher education. However, the principle upon which the bill rests, is applicable to the costs of secondary and primary education. Once the principle has been adopted and proven to be sound in one area of education I trust that it will be extended to all areas of education.

PERMISSIBLE WRITING AND PRINTING ON THIRD- AND FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the present postal rate law, medicine with handwritten or typed instruction labels which is sent through the mails is subject to first-class postage rates. At the same time, the printed, gummed labels which give the same information for patent medicines are subject to third- and fourth-class postage rates. This distinction appears capricious.

Today, many medicines other than the patent medicines are sent through the mails. The increased cost of first-class postage is a real item of increased expense in purchasing these medicines, especially burdensome to older persons whose long illnesses require continuous purchase of medicines, often by mail.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill which would permit these handwritten and typed instructions to enjoy the same postal advantages as the printed material accompanying patent medicine.

RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks this House has been locked in a serious struggle behind the scenes over the Rules Committee. On the one hand, it is feared that the present Rules Committee will block consideration of scme important Presidential proposals. On the other hand, it is feared that an expanded Rules Committee would be merely a rubberstamp and an instrument for ramming through legislative proposals under a closed or so-called gag rule.

I do not believe that the Rules Committee should, in all fairness, be permitted to block proposed legislation from reaching the floor where the House may work its majority will. It is my opinion that, when a real and avowed majority exists, under present circumstances, it can always get its proposals to the floor of the House. Nonetheless, it is claimed by men more versed in parliamentary strategy than I, that the present Rules Committee will be able to use its power to exact unfair concessions before legislation reaches the floor.

I need not repeat my strenuous opposition to much of the so-called Kennedy program, but I want to beat that program fairly, on the merits of the issues and by open vote. I am therefore willing to support expansion of the Rules Committee and eliminate this small but unfair stumbling block to the Kennedy program, provided that our loyal opposition can be guaranteed protection against steamroller tactics and gag rules.

The Rules Committee's greatest power is its control over the debate and amendment procedures. By granting a closed rule the committee can deny every Member's right to offer amendments. A closed rule can be granted by a simple majority vote of the Rules Committee, affirmed by the House.

If the Speaker and the President have a disciplined majority on the Rules Committee, they can run roughshod over all opposition and deny any meaningful right of debate and amendment on the floor of the House. Such a power would seriously undermine our deliberative process in this, the greatest legislative body in the world. I cannot bring myself to vote such authority into the hands of a temporary majority, without adequate guarantee against its abuse.

Some may ask, "Is it better to have such authority wielded by a minority than by a majority?" My answer is that such authority should only be exercised by a two-thirds vote of the Rules Committee, affirmed by a two-thirds vote of those voting in the House. That alternative is open to us as a compromise. When a temporary majority group is given the power to close off the opposition entirely, the dagger is placed at the very heart of our democratic system.

My offer to those who wish to expand the Rules Committee is simple. I will help you eliminate this minor, but admittedly unfair, stumbling block to the Kennedy program, if you will adopt a two-thirds requirement or some other adequate protection in the Rules Committee against the gag rule. I am presently one of the 20 or 25 Members on the Republican side who has indicated willingness to be completely open-minded on this issue. I cannot conscientiously help you expand the Rules Committee, however, if the price you insist upon is my submission to possible gag rule by the majority in the House of Representatives. Unless you offer me a reliable guarantee that this will not happen, I must regretfully inform you that you have gone too far and in doing so you have just lost one of your Republican supporters.

ISRAEL HONORED

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller on the occasion of the Chanukah festival for Israel at Madison Square Garden, December 19, 1960, delivered a stirring address paying tribute to the State of Israel and its accomplishments. I would like to include in the RECORD at this point some excerpts from his remarks which I think will be of interest to my colleagues:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE CHANUKAH FESTIVAL FOR ISRAEL, SPONSORED BY THE STATE OF ISRAEL BOND ORGANIZATION, MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, NEW YORK CITY, MONDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 19, 1960, 8:15 P.M.

It is indeed most appropriate that an occasion of spiritual significance and joy should mark the 13th birthday—the Bar Mitzvah—of Israel.

The coming of age of Israel as a leading member of the world family of nations is of great significance to all free men.

Chanukah, one of the most joyous holidays in the Hebrew calendar, relates that significance to the past, the present, the future.

As Chanukah commemorates the triumph over tyranny of the people of ancient Israel, so does this Chanukah festival celebrate modern Israel's role as an instrument of deliverance from new tyrannies in the 20th century.

As the religious significance of Chanukah derives from the "miracle of the lights," so may we find in the lights that shine from modern Israel a new symbol—a new assurance—of the living reality of our common spiritual heritage.

This heritage—dedicated to the supreme worth of the individual human being, to the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God—reminds us of the light that has ever shone for humanity amid whatever darkness men have created, that shines today, that will shine into the limitless future.

Those of you who are gathered here tonight have helped mightily to make Israel's light shine as a beacon of democracy amid the storms that beset the world.

The Israel bond campaign has become the most powerful single instrument in the economic development of Israel.

Your purchases of Israel bonds—and worldwide sales now total more than $465 million—have helped to underwrite Israel's phenomenal growth in agriculture, in industry, in transportation, in the exploitation of mineral resources, and in the construction of housing.

You and thousands upon thousands throughout our land have thus not only helped to provide better lives for hundreds of thousands of your fellow men, but have also assisted in strengthening a new nation whose growth, whose role as a haven for the homeless, whose aid to other new nations helps to build the forces of world freedom and to restrain the advance of totalitarianism.

May Israel continue to grow and prosper, may America's close ties with Israel remain unbroken, may the joy and the love that is yours tonight at this Chanukah festival for Israel live with you always.

GEN. WILLIAM BLAKE

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1961, Gen. William Blake will retire as manager of the Veterans' Administration, Boston regional office, after 43 years of outstanding service in many capacities for his State and Nation. It is my privilege and honor to pay tribute to this great American citizen before this distinguished House.

In the many positions of trust which have been his, he has always demonstrated the highest integrity of character and has been motivated by the best of principles.

His qualities of leadership have been reflected in the efficiency and exemplary manner in which he and those under his direction have discharged their responsibilities and tasks.

But above all, it is his unselfish devotion to labors on behalf of his fellow men which has merited the gratitude of all those who have benefited from them. Indeed, the countless veterans, for whom he has done so much, are indebted to him. I know that the veterans of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts are grateful.

After 43 years of such unselfish work in the cause of others he will enter into well-deserved retirement. As he begins a new life, he will take with him the profound and sincere gratitude of myself, my fellow veterans, and all his fellow citizens for the noble service he has given to his fellow men, his State, and Nation. This is the fitting tribute and memorial for his accomplishments which shall be carried in the hearts and minds of men always.

I know that you will join with me in wishing him continued success and good health in the years ahead which are his to enjoy.

U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE AGENCY

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in introducing today a bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy, I have undertaken to meet a situation which has become increasingly serious for our country, and have proposed a step which many will agree is long overdue.

For almost as long as the United States of America has existed as a nation, the people of this country, through their Government, have recognized the necessity of providing trained officers for the Army and the Navy, and at the earliest opportunity established the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis, which in all their long history never have ceased to bring cause for pride to every American. As our Military Establishment has changed, we have established an Air Force Academy, and to fill the need of services no less vital, we have the Coast Guard Academy and the Merchant Marine Academy.

The purposes for which these academies were established are being fulfilled every day. Truthfully, we could not efficiently or satisfactorily operate these branches of our Government without them.

In these years of the cold war, and, indeed at the other times in our history when the international climate is relatively milder, there are as many battles to be won or lost at the diplomacy table as in a shooting war, and it is obvious that in the days and months and years to come we must depend upon a better trained Foreign Service to be our "shock troops" and to win battles at the conference table for us, so there will be no shooting war.

Yet, ironically, the department of the Federal Government which ranks first, in any procedure of protocol and priority, has no assured reservoir of trained and dedicated, competent personnel, to help the Foreign Service keep up with its burgeoning problems and responsibilities.

Long ago, the State Department outgrew its quarters as a White House neighbor in the building which has been called "the magnificent monstrosity," but which I sincerely hope will be preserved and not demolished. During the period before the beautiful marble palace in Foggy Bottom was completed, the Department burst its seams and at one time had branches and offices in as many as 25 different buildings in Washington.

Now, in the new State Department Building, they have everything—they say: Everything, that is, except the facilities such as those which have proven their worth to the military services, to provide the men and women who are trained for foreign service as a vocation, more than as a mere livelihood.

If we ever are to banish "the Ugly American;" if we ever are to meet the sound criticisms of thoughtful observers who say not enough of our Foreign Service people are proficient in the language of the country in which they serve, and not enough of them get along well with the people among whom they serve because they really are not interested in the country, then, assuredly, we need what I have sought to provide in the bill which I have introduced today.

My bill establishes in the Department of State a U.S. Foreign Service Academy to train selected men and women between the ages of 17 and 22, to be known as Foreign Service cadets. Upon satisfactory completion of 4 years of work and study at the Academy, the cadet would be appointed as an officer or employee of the Foreign Service in a position for which he is qualified, or in any other branch of the Government in a position for which he is qualified by reason of his special training. The cadet would agree to serve at least 3 years after graduation from the Academy.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of State to appoint a commission of five members to advise him in connection with the selection of a permanent location for the Academy, and to buy land, prepare plans and construct the facilities needed, and temporary or existing buildings at any location desired will be used until the Academy is completed at its permanent location.

The authorized number of Foreign Service cadets will be four from each State, two of whom are to be nominated by each Senator; two from each congressional district, to be nominated by the representative from that district, and also two from Puerto Rico, four from the District of Columbia, and two from the Canal Zone.

The methods of appointment correspond generally in my bill, to the methods adopted by the military service academies, which differ from one another in some details, as every Member knows.

There never was a time in our history when a Foreign Service Academy was more sorely needed by our country. I hope that this bill will receive prompt and careful consideration of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and that it may be pushed through for adoption at this session.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once more this great legislative body meets to pay tribute to the memory of our 32d President, the greatly beloved, highly regarded, and late lamented Franklin Delano Roosevelt—the world's greatest humanitarian.

It has been the custom of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, to set aside a day for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of Presidents who have died. This day, January the 30th—his natal day—has, therefore, been set aside in memory of this great American, who took office at the gravest moment of an economic crisis which threatened the security of the Republic—a man who twice preserved his country, was three times reelected to its Presidency and died in office in his country's greatest war, having lived to see the victory assured but not to share it.

This service, coming as it does, immediately following the state of the Union address by President Kennedy, we are forcibly reminded that this generation, too, faced with grave domestic and foreign problems, has a rendezvous with destiny.

The great Civil War President, Abraham Lincoln, in his message to Congress in 1862, said:

> We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation.

The final assessment of Franklin Roosevelt's achievements will not be made by us or on this floor. It will be made elsewhere and though we cannot pay the final tribute which time reserves to others, we can speak of Franklin Roosevelt as a living man.

Many of us in this room are men and women who knew him, men, for the most part who served with him in Government during the country's greatest war. Many

in this room bore responsibility at his request; sat in council with him. There is not one of us here who did not watch him near or at a distance, privately, or publicly, in the great trial which was his life.

Greatness in a man, as in a mountain, requires distance to be seen. In the long range, it is the things by which we live that are important. This was true in the life of Franklin Roosevelt. He might have been speaking of himself, as well as of the country, when he said:

> To some generations much is given; of some generations much is expected. This generation has a rendezvous with destiny.

He played a great part in great events. He was his country's President and undisputed leader at a great and decisive moment in history.

In Franklin Roosevelt the qualities we knew were these—he loved mankind. He had their confidence not only because he believed in them as men and women, but because he expected much of them as men and women. The decisions he made, whether in war or in peace, were decisions that affected the lives of individuals.

And finally, and most important of all perhaps for us who have outlived him, he dared to hope. There was never a time in the dark years of the depression, of the black years of the war, when he lost hope. And as the end of the war drew near, and the end of his life with it, his hope grew greater, grew beyond the war, beyond the victory to peace. He dared to hope for peace, to believe in peace, and to act for peace. Young in heart himself, he always thought of his country as young, also, as the new world, as the builder of new worlds of peace. Believer in man, and believer, therefore, in men, he thought this Republic of ours as part of that greater republic of mankind on which alone a true peace can be rested. He never thought the labor would be easy. He never questioned—he least of all men—that differences and difficulties would arise. But neither did he cease to hope. Nor would he now.

These then were his qualities as President and foremost citizen of the United States. Brave, steadfast, one who dared to see the facts, to face them, and to act; one who believed, who hoped. Whatever verdict history writes down; this much we know who knew him—that he was a man. God give us heart and will to take this Nation as he left it—not only powerful, not only rich, but young and hopeful and confident and believing and strong—God give us heart and will to take this Nation forward as he meant to take it to a new, more daring future, a new world of peace.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia on taking this time today to bring to the attention of the House the name of a great American, a great President, who in his own right made many firsts in the field of legislation and the field of responsibility of Government to the people of America.

I remember quite well the depression of 1932, as a young businessman, when the banks of this country were closed and when mortgages were being foreclosed by the hundreds of thousands; when people were losing their homes and their farms; when men were out of work—some 16 million men were out of work in the United States; and when hope was at its lowest ebb.

In my own little town, where I lived at that time, the businessmen were all operating at a loss. Many of them had gone into bankruptcy. In my own case, I had been unable to pay rent on a store, in which I was operating a business, for 3 years. I had a type of rent moratorium arrangement with the owner of the property, because they could not rent it to anyone else, anyway. I am happy to say that in later years, after President Roosevelt took office and put in certain reform measures, I was able to pay up the back rent and make a living for myself and my family.

At that time I was secretary of a family farm corporation that had some 28 farms in the State of Missouri. Those farms were 3 and 4 years behind in their taxes. The State of Missouri was bankrupt. They were paying their State employees with tax warrants—their schoolteachers and policemen and their other State employees were paid with State warrants of indebtedness because they did not have cash income.

This situation was duplicated throughout America in many, many of the States of America which were unable to float their bonds, and they were paying their obligations temporarily with tax warrants.

As a young businessman, a young married man with small children, I saw this good man come into power and grasp firmly the rudder of the ship of state and start guiding the ship of state toward the safe harbor of solvency.

I saw him do the things which others who were more timid or more fearful said could not be done. I saw the banks reestablished, I saw insurance put behind the banks so the average depositor's savings were guaranteed by Government credit, I saw the moratorium on mortgages through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, I saw other measures of relief for the people on the farms of America, crop support and loans, to get the people back into the area of production again.

As a young man who had never been interested in politics, this action on the part of a Chief Executive who had the courage and the will to take the reins of government and to hold them firmly and guide properly gave me an interest in politics and the science of government which I had never had before. I began to take notice of the tremendous things which government could do and which the people could do if given the opportunity, if they were properly led. It became an inspiration to me and from that day on, 1932 or 1933, I became interested in the politics of my community, of my State, and of my Nation, and worked hard for people I thought would support a strong hand and a helpful hand in government. I have never been sorry.

I think the Chief Executive of our Nation should take hold of the reins strongly. I think he should bring hope and inspiration and guidance and leadership to the people of the Nation. I have confidence if the people of America are given the proper guidance, the proper leadership, they will rise to any challenges that are placed before them. Throughout our history where challenges have been made, whether in the domestic field or on the international front, when we have had strong men rise the people have put their shoulders to the wheel, put their money into the effort and their spiritual strength into the effort, then America has met every challenge. I trust and hope that under this new President who spoke so forcefully to us today the people of America again will respond to the strong leadership, to the spiritual guidance of a man who is not afraid to take hold of the rudder of the ship of state and guide it properly.

I want to compliment the gentleman for taking this time and allowing us to say a few of the things which have long been in our minds and which we are proud to have the opportunity to state publicly.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in this observance of the birthday of a great American, a great and beloved world leader, and one of the truly great Presidents of this Nation. The lasting monument to his memory will not be one of marble or of stone. Franklin Delano Roosevelt is enshrined in the hearts and minds of freemen everywhere. The love and consideration which he had for people and which people will forever have for him shall continue as a part of the immortality of our world. The good that he did lives after him in this Nation's continuing march toward a world where men shall live in peace and where want and fear shall be banished. This was the essence of our late leader's greatness, that he lighted a road of hope for millions throughout the world who had lived always in the shadow of death and grinding poverty. We have but started toward the goals he envisioned, but we are on the way. It is most fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we should pause in the hurry of today in observance of the anniversary of the birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He shall be a giant among men always. May our love and affection for him remain sincere and bright in a world that lives in a world possessed of too much strife and darkness.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for getting this time to commemorate the birthday of President Roosevelt. I was a mere boy growing up when he was President. I grew up in a very conservative area, but

I can well remember going to town when little groups of farmers and townsmen would gather around and their conversation would be to the effect that democracy will not work. This great President gave us the leadership that saved this country for democracy and showed us that democracy will work. Our generation is especially, I think, indebted to his great leadership. I also recall, because I lived in the heart of isolationist America, his leadership before World War II. He knew the danger that existed across the sea and took executive action that saved Britain in time for Britain to help save us in World War II. Even in this House of Representatives, his defense policies were being vigorously opposed and bills that passed were passed by the very slimmest of margins. Even in the House of Representatives people were saying that we should not try to help to save the world, that we should not be concerned with Axis activities, and that President Roosevelt was a warmonger. I think our generation is even more indebted, perhaps, than some of the older generations to this great man.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for commemorating the birthday of a great President.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to join in expressing appreciation to our colleague for taking the initiative in affording us the opportunity to pay our respects to a great President. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was more than just a President. His was the vision that foresaw that with technological change there came the necessity for world communion. He knew what that meant and he initiated brave steps in that direction. His basic philosophy was the basic philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and the great people who founded this country. It was based squarely and firmly on the highest and noblest concepts of the dignity of man. Until we come to realize that all men are created equal and until we treat them as such and until the world accepts this philosophy, peace will not come. But it will come and it can come in our time because the world marches forward. Franklin Delano Roosevelt has the distinction of being the navigator who calculated the course and started mankind in that new direction to meet the conditions of a new era.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate also the gentleman from West Virginia for arranging this tribute to our 32d President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I am reminded of the two inscriptions on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the National Archives Building. One proclaims: "What is past is prologue" and the other admonishes us to "Study the past."

Today, as we listened to our 35th President deliver his state of the Union message, we can again, indeed, look to the past and gain inspiration and guidance from Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was his very spirit here today, the bold, firm, and determined policies laid down by our President, following so closely the work that President Roosevelt began.

Mr. Roosevelt had his critics. He had the courage to have critics. He had a bold program. He had given America concept. Simply because he declared a program that in a very improved system, under the benefits of capitalism the common workingman must have an opportunity to share in the wealth of his Nation. As he worked his program through the legislative processes of our democracy, he, of course, met setbacks and defeats, but today we can look back upon the great program that he had proclaimed; his great concern for the workingman; his great concern for the aged; his great concern for all Americans; the fact that he had the courage to propose programs like social security, banking insurance, unemployment compensation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to protect people from losing their homes. I recall the minimum wage. Those are the foundations which strengthened America. Those were the principles which proved to the whole world that democracy can and indeed does work. Those were the principles that saved America at a time when we were on the very precipice of going under.

We know that, as of today, 30 years ago the Communist doctrine was that communism thrives on poverty, and wherever there is poverty there is progress for communism.

This great President stands before the people and offers a foreign program which is going to put this country back on the wheels again. And it did. Even though his critics today, even as today when our President says we must care for the old people, even as today when the underprivileged must have an improved minimum wage, just as today our President said we must face the problem of giving this Nation an educational program second to none.

Thirty years ago there was a critic who issued all sorts of epithets of criticism. Yet this very program has endured during the years, and democracy is stronger because of his guidance and wisdom. If this country had the courage to follow his wise counsel in 1937, when as a young man I watched this great President in Chicago, when he proclaimed that these attacks must be contained before they would bring about war, his message fell on deaf ears. Yet I wonder if those Gold Star Mothers who lost their sons in the great World War feel that way today. Had we followed his counsel World War II could have been avoided.

So that it is proper that we study the hopes, that we study the great courage and bold leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and that we approach this new session of Congress with a new President with the hope that all of us in Congress on both sides will weigh this program not in terms of partisanship but today as great Americans we share in these great principles which he laid down if we are to make America the kind of country that Franklin Delano Roosevelt worked so hard to bring about.

I congratulate the gentleman for having taken this time to pay tribute to one of our great Americans, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the history of our country and the great Presidents that our country has had if they possessed one trait in common with each other, that is political courage.

There is no man in the history of our country who occupied the Office of Chief Executive of our country who displayed greater political courage than did Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Franklin D. Roosevelt was not only a great humanitarian, as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has referred to, not only a great leader in time of peace, but he was a great leader in time of danger and war.

I remember well the measures that have been referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] and other Members, such as the Social Security Act, the Minimum Wage Act, the recovery actions of the great depression, because I was one of those who sat on and was a member of the subcommittee which drafted the Social Security Act. I presided over the House when we were considering the first minimum wage bill, starting out at 25 cents an hour. I remember that I presided for 11 days and when the bill came out of the Committee of the Whole it was riddled so badly that those of us who supported the bill under the leadership of a great legislator and a great lady, Mary G. Norton, who was chairman of the Committee on Labor at that time, voted to recommit it. It was so badly butchered by the forces of the opposition whom we will see floating around here tomorrow. I have seen them so often through the years.

That bill was so riddled by the forces of the opposition that those of us who favored the proposal originally sent it back to the committee so that 2 or 3 months later another bill might come out, better in form, better in effect. That did occur and we finally staggeringly got through a bill of some respectability. Nevertheless, it got on the statute books, and from there we started to improve upon it, so that the law now provides for $1 an hour. It should go to $1.25 an hour.

The same happened in connection with social security legislation. We had to give, give, and give to keep a skeleton bill in order to get the votes on the floor of the House. But we got it on the statute books, and once on the statute books it was easier from there to start it on the road of progress.

I remember the other humane legislation of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was well termed the "great humanitarian."

I can remember Franklin D. Roosevelt as our President in time of war. I was with him one day, highly honored by enjoying his confidence and respect, something that will always be a treasured memory of mine, when Rommel was galloping across North Africa, winning victory after victory. The word had come that Hitler was going to take over Spain and Gibraltar, which would

mean control of the Mediterranean. That would have been a bad blow to us in those days. We were retreating in battles everywhere, not only in Europe but in the Far East. I can remember Franklin D. Roosevelt saying to me, "JOHN"—he had his hand clenched—"Hitler can win every battle, but until he wins the battle of the Atlantic he will not have won the war."

That showed a man of grim determination.

Today we saw another type of Franklin D. Roosevelt, younger in years, a different name, a different personality, but with that same political courage. We listened to a speech of courage; we listened to a message of courage today following his inaugural message of several days ago. His message today on the state of the Union was not only statesmanlike but we saw one who was determined to carry out his message and, above all, I read into that mind of his the great political courage he possesses, that he was not only thinking of you and I of this generation and other Americans of this generation but he was thinking about the youngsters that we meet in the corridors of this Capitol Building, the youngsters we meet in Washington, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, the little towns of our country, those on the farms, those with youngsters, your children and your children's children whose life is still ahead of them.

He was determined to give them the leadership that would assure them the kind of a world that they want to live in, a world where they will live under a government of laws and not a government of men as represented by the vicious, evil minds of those who are in the Kremlin. When I saw President Kennedy speaking, I saw Franklin D. Roosevelt looking ahead. He was thinking of us, not only of today but the youngsters of America, the citizens of tomorrow. Their lives are being determined today, and he knows that under our constitutional setup, as Franklin D. Roosevelt did, that leadership has got to come from the White House because under our Constitution the President is the sole repository in the field of foreign affairs and is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. One thing is certain. President Kennedy is determined that atheistic and internationdal communism is not going to engulf any more of the world and is not going to engulf America. Franklin D. Roosevelt was that type, with great political courage. As I said, we have had other Presidents that I could name, but we are honoring the memory today of Franklin D. Roosevelt. To me it is one of the great treasures of my life that I knew him, that I lived to know Franklin D. Roosevelt, and particularly to be in the close association with him that I was in my position of leadership for so many years prior to his death. So, it is well that we pause today and pay respects to this great man as we did the other day to pay respect to another President who was elected as a Republican. But, over and above politics, they were Presidents of the United States to represent all the people. As we paused the other day to show our respects to the memory of William McKinley, so it is well that we pause today to show our respects to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt and to rededicate our lives to America along the lines that he did during his lifetime and which President Kennedy so clearly showed today that he intends to do.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] on the wonderfully inspiring speech.

Anyone who attempts to describe the greatness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and what he has done to give direction, hope, and inspiration to the human society undertakes a very difficult task. Words are inadequate to say what is in our hearts, because Franklin Roosevelt was the rarest of mortal men.

It has seemed to me that Franklin Roosevelt's greatest contributions—the ones that will live through the course of history—were not the particular economic and social programs of his time, though these were great indeed. Rather, what he has done to mold the hopes and ideals of people everywhere in the world has been to give a new dignity to the human being. Not since the Declaration of Independence has any man, or group of men, elevated by word and deed the dignity of the individual man and the aspirations of all men to attain a good society of men.

It is sometimes said today that the United States is under a handicap in the world competition for the minds and hearts of men because, it is said, we do not have any clear and appealing purpose. The truth is that we are not lacking in a clear and appealing purpose, but we do too much neglect to articulate our purpose. Franklin Delano Roosevelt articulated our purpose in clear and ringing words when he spoke of the four freedoms. This is our purpose—the attainment of these four freedoms. They bear repeating again and again.

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peaceful life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the very distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. BAILEY, the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, and my other colleagues who have spoken today. May I say on my own behalf that certainly the days in which we live and the problems which we face are comparable, indeed, to the times and the great issues which my father faced during the terms of his Presidency. I could only hope, speaking as an individual, that the solutions to the great problems which face our country will be met with the same fortitude as the people of our country showed in those times of trial. If my father left any message, I believe it was that he believed that with the help of God's guidance our country and our cause would win, for they were just.

I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, political courage is still rare enough to attract and hold the public attention. Moreover, it is one of the few traits that can earn the admiration of the political opposition.

Take the case of John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, the great defender of "southern rights" in the decades preceding the Civil War. Opposed at every turn by the antislavery forces, Calhoun was nonetheless recognized for his political courage, and was therefore respected, even by his bitterest opponents.

A similar case was that of Congressman Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania, a leader of the Radical antislavery forces in the Civil War and Reconstruction periods. Denounced for his views by proslavery leaders for virtually every act of his public career, Stevens, at the time of death, drew the compliments of the opposition who termed him, "The best Radical of them all." Opposed on grounds of principle, he was nonetheless hailed for political courage.

The same was the view of Senator Robert M. La Follette, of Wisconsin, an enemy of monopoly—and those to admire him included many of the monopolists themselves. Again, his opponents respected the political courage of the man, while opposing his views on practically every major issue.

In politics, courage is measured in the light of popular trends and the extent to which the politician dares to oppose them in behalf of his own philosophy.

Geared to conservative principles, the American people are hesitant to accept rapid change, and rightly so. But sometimes rapid change is necessary, and when that is the case, the Nation relies upon the men of courage to forge new trails for others to follow. At such a time, those who take up the torch in the name of principle, notwithstanding the threat to their own political careers, are the men we admire, even if we disagree with their views. The phrase, "They fought for what they believed," is one of honor and compels the multitude, regardless of faction, to pay homage to those so designated.

Never was this more evident than in 1945, at the death of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Criticized beyond measure by his opponents during his lifetime, President Roosevelt nonetheless was respected, even by those who led the chorus of opposition. For never had a man in American political life held so fast to his cause in the face of conservative criticism, and never was liberal change effected to such a remarkable extent. Even those who opposed the reforms were compelled to hail the courage and ability of the reformer.

Yes, Franklin D. Roosevelt was respected by his opponents. But to those who admired him, the emotion invoked by his death was far more than admiration, far more than respect.

To them, it was one of love and a sense of deep loss over the departure of a friend. For to the admirers of Franklin D. Roosevelt, his courage was only one of his many startling attributes; the most important, perhaps; yet only one of a multitude.

I was one of those to so regard the record and accomplishments of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and it is indeed an honor, to me, to hail them today, on the 79th anniversary of his birth.

Born to wealth, which in no way required his interest in the common people, he developed a love for them that brought him into politics to work in their behalf.

Afflicted with a disease that crippled his physical being, he overcame infirmity to pour more energy into his work than generally is demonstrated by even the most active men in public life.

Reared in an atmosphere of conservative tastes, he nonetheless responded to crisis with a willingness to inaugurate liberal reform.

And, in the face of possible political destruction, he hewed to his chosen course as a man of courage.

Entering politics as a State senator in upstate New York, Roosevelt was soon at war with the opposition and with the largest city machine in his own party. An early admirer of Woodrow Wilson, he rose to prominence by supporting Wilson in the election of 1912, and was rewarded with the position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy. So well did he handle the job that many believed he was already on the way to political heights.

But sickness intervened and for several years Roosevelt was removed from the political field by an attack of poliomyelitis, which deprived him of the use of his lower limbs. Undaunted, he returned to the political wars in 1924, to place the name of Gov. Al Smith before the Democratic National Convention. Smith, in turn, supported Roosevelt for Governor of New York in 1928, and he was elected.

The reappearance of Roosevelt in office in 1929 coincided with the greatest economic crash ever experienced in American history, and, as Governor, he demonstrated a progressive outlook that caught the national attention. To contend with widespread suffering, he proposed a program of economic reform, and the New York Legislature enacted the program into law, to the general applause of the New York population.

No wonder, then, that the Democratic party turned to Roosevelt for leadership in 1932, and the American people endorsed the move by electing him to the White House. Events were to bear out the confidence of both the party and the people.

In the face of national crisis, Roosevelt proposed reform on a national scale. Critics protested; the timid held back; conservative newspapers cried alarm. But Roosevelt moved forward, with plans to feed the hungry, house the homeless, and give work to the unemployed—all at Federal expense.

National bankruptcy was prophesied by many economists. Yet it did not take place. Socialism was prophesied by many supposed political experts. Yet it did not take place. Tyranny was prophesied by many unaccustomed to the presence of a strong leader at the national helm. Yet neither did tyranny take place.

Instead, the Great Depression was struck down, and the Nation restored to a sound economic base.

When foreign war threatened, toward the close of Roosevelt's second term, Americans feared our entrance into it, and Roosevelt did all in his power to prevent that from happening. Yet when war came, he rose to the position of war leader, comparable only to his already-established position as a peacetime administrator.

Harkening to the voice of leadership which had cut down the gods of hunger in 1933, Americans rose to follow its lead again, against the gods of tyranny—and again the result was victory.

Seldom must a political leader prove himself in more than one world-shaking crisis—but such was Roosevelt's task, which he carried out with a courage unexampled in American political history.

To him, we pay our respects today, in honor of a principle—political courage—without which our Nation would merely be one of many, instead of what it is: the outstanding Republic of the world today.

His courage saw us through the perils of poverty and the honors of war. Today there are literally millions of Americans who voice the silent prayer:

"God grant that similar courage may grace our national leadership in the days ahead."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the life and memory of one of our greatest Presidents, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

From the tragic days of the depression, when farms were being foreclosed on every hand and business bankruptcies were at an alltime high, through victory in time of the greatest threat our Nation has known—in World War II—and into a period of unprecedented prosperity—the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt shines as one of the bright lights that has guided our Nation.

It is fitting that on this anniversary of his birthday we should pay our respects to this great American who served so gallantly in the time of domestic crisis and period of war in which our Nation emerged victorious.

President Roosevelt's place in history is assured among the greatest men who have ever served as the Chief Executive of our country. Yet as time passes the monumental deeds of this great American stand even higher and are more prominent on the horizon of history.

Today when we as a Nation again face many crises the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt serves as an example of what can be done to revitalize the Nation and again set us on the high-road of achievement.

It is significant that our new President, President Kennedy, in his first state of the Union address today closed his remarks by quoting one of President Roosevelt's great statements. This is very fitting and is a birthday tribute to the late President Roosevelt which I am sure he would approve as President Kennedy follows in his footsteps and in the democratic traditions of our country.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Franklin D. Roosevelt's leadership has inspired and moved us all. Some of us have the gift of recording our thoughts in a poetic vein. I should like to bring to my colleagues' attention a few lines prepared in honor of President Roosevelt's birthday, by Jacob Landy, a constituent of mine, who was moved to write:

FRANKLIN DELANO ROSSEVELT—IN MEMORIAM

Gone is another of the breed of noble men,
Dimmed is the light of a shining star.
We mourn thy untimely passing, thou Knight
Battling 'gainst darkness and armed might.

Not in vain thy glorious deeds; thy life
An inspiration to gain the distant heights
Of man's great destiny, a better world
With liberty, justice and light for all.

Thou didst labor to assure us
Freedom of speech and freedom of worship,
And freedom from want. Thou didst teach us
'Fore all, to fear naught but fear itself.

E'en as Moses led the children of Israel
From bondage in Egypt to the Promised Land
He could not enter, so thou, showing us the way
Hast left us heavy of heart to travel the road alone.

But thy spirit, a pillar of fire by night
And a trailing cloud by day, doth inspire us.
Forward, upward, onward we march
To attain our goal of a better day.

That better day, when lands shall never
Know the scourge of War. When the parliament
Of nations shall preserve to each people
Its rights to freedom, peace and bread.

SUPPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Washington [Mr. PELLY], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has continued the existence of the Committee on Un-American Activities without a single dissenting vote, the next decision to be made by the House is the making of an adequate appropriation so that this committee may effectively continue its work for the Congress. Although a limited number of individuals and groups—largely outside the Congress—have attacked this committee since its establishment as a standing committee in 1945, the evidence points to the fact that the overwhelming number of clear-thinking and right-thinking people in America have approved the work of this committee and desire to see its work supported. I have talked to many Congressmen who are receiving a tremendous amount of mail from their constituents urging full support for the needs of this committee.

I hasten to say that everyone who has opposed the continuation of the committee or has criticized some of its operations is not a Communist or sympathetic to the Communist conspiracy which aims to overthrow our free institutions by force and violence. In this category there are some intelligent and sincere persons. I believe that many who oppose this committee do not fully understand its procedures.

On the other hand, there are those who actively seek the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee who have different motives. The committee has alerted Congress and the people of this Nation to the Communist conspiracy and that is exactly why a campaign has been organized to destroy the committee and its effectiveness by one means or another. The latest movements in this direction have been the inspiring and organizing of youth student group protests.

The Smith Act prosecutions did great damage to the Communist Party and shattered its organization in the United States. When the 11 top Communist Party leaders were convicted of violating the Smith Act in 1950, their organization fell apart. Communism in this country declined to the lowest ebb in more than half a century. Three years ago, however, the Supreme Court in the case of *Yates* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 298 (1957)) practically destroyed the Smith Act in a decision involving the second-string Communist Party leaders; and, as a result, those convicted were released. Since that time the party has been operating with only minor restrictions placed upon it, with the result that at the national convention of the Communist Party held December 10, 1959, in New York City, Gus Hall was able to proclaim the revival and reorganization of the Communist movement. Moreover, the Communists were able to extend their operation and have now dedicated themselves to the capture of youth which was announced at the Communist Party National Conference on Youth, held in December 1960 at Chicago. As a result of the Supreme Court decision, the Communist Party is once again in business and has available to it the experienced disciplined leadership which is making itself felt as an instrument of Soviet propaganda and for the conduct of subversive activities, including espionage and sabotage, designed to weaken our way of life and eventually to secure the destruction and overthrow of our Government.

Therefore, it has seemed to me that the House Un-American Activities Committee is essential. In spite of the organized effort to belittle its work and cloud the issue, I am convinced its studies and investigations have resulted not only in important legislation but especially I am of the opinion right now that further legislation is needed to restore the effectiveness of the Smith Act to protect our free way of life.

The latest misguided attack on the effectiveness of this committee, I understand, will be an effort to effect a cut in the committee's appropriated funds.

The work of the House Un-American Activities Committee has been the primary source of the factual information that demonstrates the existence of forces attempting to undermine individual and constitutional freedom.

In the past, a certain few newspapers have had a running attack on the way the committee hearings were conducted. In particular, a documentary film of the student demonstrations last May in San Francisco during 2 days of the hearings has been described as slanted propaganda. I got into the controversy when I took exception to an editorial attack on the committee by the Washington Post. This newspaper published my letter of protest and some publicity resulted.

Almost without exception the resulting flood of mail I received on the subject from all over the country strongly supported the Un-American Activities Committee.

Meanwhile, news of the threat to its existence and effectiveness spread. From all over my State, letters, and postcards reached me urging me to support it—which, of course, I will continue to do.

Some of the communications received follow. Certain people who wrote asked me not to use their letters for various reasons—some out of fear of business reprisals; some out of just plain fear; and others for personal reasons. But when I wrote acknowledging letters saying I might use them as testimony in support of continuation of the committee I was told by the overwhelming majority if it would serve the purpose I was free to use their names.

So, hereinafter is a sample of letters, with irrelevant material deleted, which reached me, each of which between the lines or directly is an eloquent appeal for adequate funds to be voted to the Un-American Activities Committee to carry on its vital work.

It has been most gratifying for me to receive such widespread support for my defense of the committee and its dedicated members in the necessary continuation of investigating subversive activities.

The letters follow:

TOLOVANA PARK, OREG.,
January 1961.

Hon. THOMAS PELLY.

DEAR MR. PELLY: First to thank you for your letter to Washington Post. Am very happy to say I voted for you when living in Washington and hope to return to cast many more.

MRS. FRANK CALLAWAY.

WEBSTER GROVES, MO.

Congressman PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: About 2 weeks ago I had the good fortune to tune my car radio on to a newscast by Fulton Lewis that spoke high praise of you. The gist of Lewis' newscast was that you had addressed a scathing letter to the Washington Post condemning them for their inimical stand with regard to "Operation Abolition."

This letter is written for two reasons: First, to thank you sincerely for your strong and effective effort; second, to ask for a copy of your blast at the Washington Post.

GEORGE HIXON.

ALVIN TEX.,
January 11, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: We have meant to get this letter off sooner to congratulate you on your fine letter to the Washington Post concerning their editorial on the film "Operation Abolition." We heard Fulton Lewis, Jr., read it and were very favorably impressed. Our views in the matter certainly coincide with yours.

NITA N. MITCHELL.

OLYMPIA, WASH.,
January 7, 1961.

Congressman THOMAS M. PELLY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: You will have noted from the heading that we are not residents of your congressional district. Had we been able to do so, we surely would have voted for you. We are proud that you represent our State in the Congress.

The primary reason for this letter to you, however, is to commend you as highly as we know how for your letter to the editor of the Washington Post, which Fulton Lewis, Jr., read in full on a broadcast last week. We approve very strongly of your stand in favor of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the efforts of Chairman WALTER. We hope you will continue to do everything in your power to thwart the attempts of JAMES ROOSEVELT, or anyone else, to discredit or abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

MRS. HOWARD A. BARNER.

BREMERTON, WASH.,
December 31, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
U.S. Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I believe we should support strongly the House Un-American Activities Committee and the fine work they are doing. They are taking such a beating in the press and elsewhere. This committee and a smear campaign against J. Edgar Hoover is definitely on the Communist agenda for 1961. The film "Operation Abolition" is tremendous and because of its impact its authenticity is being challenged.

It is just that I so want this great country of ours preserved and freedom for the rest of the world. But we won't be able to do one thing if we don't first look after our own.

Mrs. J. M. JOHNSON.

WOODHAVEN, N.Y.,
December 28, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Mr. Lewis read the entire contents of your letter to the Washington Post. Your courageous stand is to be commended.

C. S. THOMAS.

TACOMA, WASH.,
January 5, 1961.

Hon. TOM PELLY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is not often we find men in public life, especially political, who are courageous enough to go on public record and make such a firm stand for the welfare of his country. Being a patriot these days is a bigot of the worst kind, so the majority of the press believe.

I personally purchased the subject film and there have been over 100 private and public showings. The reaction in most instances has been good.

It is requested that I be sent a copy of subject letter and it is further requested permission to reproduce in its entirety to help us to alert the people in our area of the danger we face.

Capt. JOHN K. ALGEO,
U.S. Navy.

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.,
December 28, 1960.

I was impressed with your letter.

JO ARRIEA.

LOMBARD, ILL.,
December 27, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the Chicago Tribune of December 25 of your reply to the Washington Post, and I heartily approve of your forthright challenge of their attack on the committees investigating communism. That paper is doing an untold amount of harm to American interests by its promotion of Communist enterprises, of which this abolition campaign is one. Their every lie and distortion ought to be refuted in the strongest possible terms, as you have so ably done in this case.

PAUL STOUT,
Secretary, Committee to Defend Congressional Committees Investigating Communism.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
January 2, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. PELLY: In the Cincinnati Enquirer of December 26 we read with very great pleasure your forthright comments vis-a-vis the smear campaign which goes on constantly in an effort to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

This is a group of dedicated Americans, if ever we heard of one, which is more than can be said about the fuzzy ones who never lose a chance to plug for the enemies of our beloved country. It's hard for the average citizen to imagine what they hope to achieve by their tactics unless it be the downfall of this country. God forbid.

Thank you for the lift you gave that wonderful but belabored group and please let me know if ever I can be of service in that connection or in any other way.

Sincerely and gratefully,

AL. B. GARTNER.

OAK PARK, ILL.,
December 31, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We sincerely commend you on your forthright and courageous denunciation of the Washington Post for its very apparent publication of falsehoods and misrepresentations regarding the film "Operation Abolition" in its editorials of December 5 and 20. Mr. Philip Warden of the Chicago Tribune Press Service prepared a very fine article thereon, which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune on December 25.

For the past 18 months we have been devoting much of our time and efforts to alerting our friends and acquaintances to the serious internal menace to our Nation arising out of the widespread Communist infiltration, subversion and vicious propagandizing thereof. We firmly believe that you and your colleagues in the House of Representatives and in the Senate must initiate immediate, drastic and resolute action in order to end this very grave internal Communist threat to our Nation's security.

Most of the American people do not seem to realize that the Communists are engaged in a total all-out war to destroy our Nation, which is the biggest obstacle in their path to world conquest. They are deadly in earnest in their determination to conquer and to destroy us; their weapons of war are not the conventional weapons, but rather the weapons of infiltration, subversion, propaganda, agitation of racial groups and social classes, and similar psychological tactics. They cannot be trusted in any way as they are masters of deceit. All efforts of our Government to coexist and have peace with the Communists will be futile and will only lead to our own self-destruction, for coexistence and peace to the Communists means nothing less than total world conquest. Any and all summit meetings and agreements on our part with the Communists are likewise suicidal, for they merely advance Communist world conquest.

We hope and pray that you and your colleagues in the House and Senate will realize the true nature and deadly determination of this enemy of ours and will have the courage to pursue a course of action designed to achieve total victory for our country in this undeclared war of the Communists against our Nation. Ordinary and half-hearted measures such as have been passed by the House and Senate over the past 12 years will not suffice. The exigency of our Nation's present deplorable situation calls for very drastic measures such as those hereinafter set forth. We trust that you will give them your consideration.

Unless you and your colleagues in the House and the Senate have the wisdom, the sagacity and the courage * * * we must confess that we will be compelled to hold very grave fear and doubt as to the survival of our beloved Republic.

Yours sincerely,

EDGAR A. SCHEUBERT.
HELEN SCHEUBERT.

GREENBELT, MD.,
December 24, 1960.

Representative THOMAS M. PELLY.

DEAR SIR: With pleasure and pride I read your letter published in the Washington Post regards the Committee on Un-American Activities. I am glad to see you know what the score is.

JOE BRADY.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 28, 1960.

SIR: I wish to thank you for your splendid letter to that vile Washington Post. It is very necessary for that committee to be active.

A. R. RIDER.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.

We know that the liberals plan to move against the House Rules Committee on January 3, 1961. It is our hope that patriots in Washington will join the coalition of conservatives and block their plan of conspiracy.

Thank God for patriots like yourself and many others. We urge you to carry on our fight for freedom.

Very respectfully,

GERALDINE M. GIFFORD.

MORRISTOWN, N.J.,
December 29, 1960.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PELLY: As a native-born, fully alerted citizen of our country—will you please accept my grateful appreciation re your letter to Washington (D.C.) Post as heard via Mutual Radio via Fulton Lewis, Jr., last evening, December 28, 1960.

MRS. D. A. HORSTMANN.

CARMEL, CALIF.,
December 25, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Under UPI dateline December 24 in the San Francisco Examiner, appears a report on your splendid letter to the editor of the Washington Post. You could not have been surprised at the position taken by the Post, but it is well that you wrote as you did.

K. H. DONAVIN.

PAMPA, TEX.,
December 31, 1960.

Mr. TOM PELLY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Fulton Lewis, Jr., gave us such a good account of your actions on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that I must thank you for it. We will see in a few days whether those vermin can get away with it again.

ROBERT W. ORR,
Member VFW and Legion.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
December 17, 1960.

Hon. Representative PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As you know, the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a legal, duly constituted standing committee of the U.S. Congress (Public Law 601, sec. 121). The business of carrying out and fulfilling the needs for Federal legislation as permitted by the U.S. Constitution is done through the use of committees. These committees provide the means of investigation and study which is needed before laws can be made. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is no exception to this rule and all rules governing committees. One of these regulations is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is authorized to make, from time to time, investigations and shall study pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government, one of these agencies being the FBI.

On January 3, 1961, the Communist "Operation Abolition" is holding a meeting in Washington, D.C., and on January 4, 1961, JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat of California, is scheduled to introduce a bill into Congress to rescind the mandate under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates. It is interesting to note that the House Committee on Un-American Activities seems to be the only committee under attack by Soviet forces within our Nation, some in places high in Government.

The strong arm of the FBI and the House Committee on Un-American Activities are

responsible for apprehending and exposing thousands of Communists that are carrying on espionage work for Communist Russia in our beloved country. Without the fine work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the FBI, America's freedom would soon be under a Communist dictatorship. It is certainly the patriotic duty of every American to guard this precious freedom by supporting the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the FBI.

Thank you for your services to our beloved America.

Sincerely,

Herbert Zaulati, Mark Dillon, Mrs. Eva F. Gifford, Buna Kuan, Mary M. Boone, San Mateo; Mrs. F. M. Beckstrom, Menlo Park; Mary Ellen Marskey, San Mateo; Generose O'Leary, Ruth Raise, Fred D. Hattoon, Menlo Park; Mr. and Mrs. P. E. Myers, Audrey G. Olmo, Mrs. E. J. Zejdlik, San Mateo; Betty Swan, Marie R. Sangmaster, Kathryn Tanner, San Mateo.

WEST PLAINS, MO.,
December 29, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Please accept my sincere congratulations for the fine letter you wrote to the Washington Post about their editorial attempting to discredit the film showing up the San Francisco riots for what they were.

You are so right, and one might wonder if news sources seeking to distort the facts of this case are indeed under the evil star of Moscow.

It is a sad commentary on branches of our armed services that they seem to run for cover and (according to Fulton Lewis), discontinue showing this film, just as they did in the now famous, "Manual," episode. What sinister force is at work in the armed services, and who makes such strange decisions? The criterion should surely be "Is it true?" not "Will it offend the pro-Red agitators who would like to destroy our basic freedoms?"

I lived in Washington for many years, near Seattle, and still have relatives there. I have followed your career in the Congress with interest.

Happy New Year to you, sir, and thanks for your good letter in freedom's cause. Don't let them abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Yours sincerely,

CARL T. RICHARDSON.

WILMETTE, ILL.,
December 30, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I am glad someone is interested and courageous enough to take notice of the treatment being given to HUAC by the Washington Post.

Thank you for your efforts.

WINIFRED WALLACE.

BERWYN, PA.,
December 28, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR OUTSPOKEN PATRIOT: God bless you and "all your house" for your excoriation of the Washington Post. The editor had it coming.

FREDERIC R. WOOD.

COLLEGE PARK, MD.,
December 26, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Congratulations on your most direct and appropriate letter to the Washington Post as printed on December 24, 1960. I hope that it receives wide circulation.

Enclosed you will find a letter I have written to the Reporter magazine in response to a request that I continue my subscription. It is my recollection that the Washington Post editorials were inspired by the article by Paul Jacobs to which I refer in my letter.

Your tribute to Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, is richly deserved for he is brilliant and dedicated. I hope that you will not only support the House Committee on Un-American Activities but that you will also get as many other Members of Congress to do likewise as you can. Perhaps copies of your letter to each Member of the House would help.

I am mailing my copy of your letter (as printed) to the American Security Council in Chicago with the suggestion that it be reprinted and mailed to their membership.

With expressions of my highest esteem, I am,

Sincerely,

STANLEY J. TRACY.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
December 27, 1960.

Representative THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended for your strong stand against the Washington Post editorials of December 5 and December 20. It is obvious that these editorials are slanted and are giving aid to the Communist program. This type of reporting has to be attacked and more people alerted to this menace which has made such deep inroads in our country.

VIRGINIA HANSEN.

MERIDEN, N.H.,
December 28, 1960.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Please accept my congratulations on your recent letter to the Washington Post concerning that newspaper's attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee. Your remarks on the Post's editorial policy are well taken, as I know from 7 years in the Pentagon which included service on the Army General Staff, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

I should appreciate having a few copies of your letter, if these are available, for circulation here in New Hampshire where some local newspapers seem to model themselves on the Post, complete with the cartoons of Mr. Herbert Block.

Faithfully yours,

BERNARD THIELEN,
Colonel, U.S. Army (retired).

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
December 29, 1960.

The House Un-American Activities Committee and Senate Internal Security must never go any more than should Hoover's FBI.

(Unsigned).

NEW YORK CITY,
December 29, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I listened with great interest when Fulton Lewis read your letter to the Washington Post on his broadcast last evening, and was delighted with the way you went after that newspaper.

Congratulations for your patriotism and for your willingness to hit back at a wretched newspaper like the Washington Post.

It was noteworthy, too, that you, as a Republican, were praising FRANCIS WALTER, a Democrat. WALTER deserves all that you said.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 28, 1960.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I remember your delegation of Pacific coast mayors in Tokyo in 1951. I saw your letter addressed to the Washington Post, perennial and indefatigable brainwasher.

The enclosed is in complete accord with your own views.

Maj. Gen. C. A. WILLOUGHBY,
U.S. Army (retired).

AMARILLO, TEX.,
December 26, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: Mrs. Lee and I are spending Christmas with our son and his family in Dayton, Ohio. While reading the paper yesterday I read the enclosed article in the Dayton Daily News.

I am writing you this short personal note to congratulate you on the stand you have taken to fight the nefarious stupid dupes of communism. I want you to know that I and many more Texans are behind you and all our other Senators and Congressmen who are fighting for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

WILLIAM L. LEE,
Brigadier General,
U.S. Air Force (retired).

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
December 26, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Every true American will honor you for your statement re the unwarranted attack on House Committee on Un-American Activities.

MILES F. STEEL.

SHREVEPORT, LA.
December 28, 1960.

Hon. TOM PELLY,
Representative, State of Washington,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: Please accept my congratulations for your rebuke to the Washington Post, mentioned on radio tonight by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr. Millions of patriotic Americans appreciate the fine work of the Un-American Activities Committee and others exposing and fighting communism—aided and abetted by a big socialistic government.

E. R. PECK.

MADISON, WIS.,
December 30, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: May I congratulate you on the excellent letter you sent to the Washington Post denouncing their editorial on the subject of "Operation Abolition." I did not see this letter but heard Fulton Lewis, Jr.'s broadcast on this subject.

Unfortunately there are millions of Americans so naive they fail to understand how "liberalism" of the Washington Post type is softening up our people to accept full-fledged socialist communism.

I wish we had more men like you in Washington. I wish you many years of success and happiness in your work.

Sincerely,

L. K. POLLARD.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.,
January 3, 1961.

Representative THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: On December 28, 1960 broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr. I was thrilled to hear him read a letter you had written to a well-known Washington newspaper, in answer to their editorial concerning the film "Operation Abolition."

It certainly is most reassuring to know we still have men who are willing to stand up

and be counted, so to speak, and I want to thank you for taking the time to write such a letter. How we do need others, willing to take issue with any and all, people or publications, who are obviously giving aid and comfort to the very forces that would destroy this Republic.

There is no doubt in my mind that you are opposed to the movement trying to discredit and abolish our House Committee on Un-American Activities, but please put forth a special effort to quickly defeat this movement. I am enclosing a copy of the letter I wrote my Congressman.

Thank you again for having the courage of your convictions.

Yours very truly,

MRS. T. R. BROOKE.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I include one or two more sample letters which are representative of the hundreds of letters and postcards I have received in support of the House Un-American Activities Committee. These are letters which by the hundreds have expressed general support of the committee:

SPOKANE, WASH.

DEAR SIR: It is my opinion that the Un-American Activities Committee should be retained. I hope you will work for this and also for the continuation of FRANCIS WALTER as chairman.

Very truly yours,

MADEL R. FREDERICK.

SEATTLE, WASH.

I understand there is some agitation to discontinue the Committee on Un-American Activities, which is very disturbing. I do hope that you agree with me that this would be a most unfortunate thing and that you may see your way clear to head off such a measure.

MRS. P. E. JENSEN.

BELLEVUE, WASH.

DEAR MR. PELLY: We are glad you support the House Un-American Activities Committee. Please do all possible to see they have an adequate budget.

EDITH M. PHILLIPS.

SEATTLE, WASH.

DEAR SIR: To my knowledge there is a House Committee on Un-American Activities in the U.S. Congress since 1938. Its task is to gather information for the safety of United States.

The activities of this committee are despised by the Communists and therefore they strongly agitate against it.

Considering all this the board of the Latvian Relief Association of State of Washington Chapter of Seattle and I ask you kindly to do everything possible so that the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities could be continued and even expanded.

Truly yours,

EDGARS Z. ELFERTS,
Membership Secretary.

CENTRALIA, WASH.

DEAR SIR: I wish to protest the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We believe it is very necessary to the good of our country.

We also believe it very necessary that this committee be furnished with funds to carry on this work.

MRS. GRACE BOOHER.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Please record my vote and that of my associates against the disbanding of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I think it serves a real purpose and is a protection to the citizenry of this country.

E. A. COOK.

BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WASH.

DEAR MR. PELLY: I would like to express my appreciation to you for your television program which I viewed yesterday, when you had as your guest Mr. FRANCIS E. WALTER of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We would like you and Mr. WALTER to know that we are behind him 100 percent in the fine work he is doing, and it would be a tragedy indeed if his committee were discontinued.

It has come to my attention that the film, "Communism on the Map," which heretofore has been made available by the Navy to civilians, has now been withdrawn from civilian use. As you know, this third world war is being fought by many of us not in uniform, and it is necessary that we be given all the information necessary to recognize the enemy.

Therefore, I would like to know if the above is true, and if so, why this order was given and on whose authority.

Thanking you,

Very truly yours,

MRS. T. A. BATEMAN.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago from Benton Harbor, Mich., which is in the Fourth Congressional District, came this wire:

Hon. CLAIRE HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

A vote next Tuesday to enlarge the Rules Committee will be a vote for democracy. No stubborn minority should have the power to prevent debate and to curtail the right of Members of the House to vote on legislation. Our country suffers in the eyes of the world by this denial democratic processes.

BERRIEN COUNTY COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Rev. DOLAD STROHL,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee.
Attorney LESTER E. PAGE,
Chairman, Division of Christian Life and Work.
Rev. FRANKS A. VICTORSON,
President.
Rev. WALTER B. PRICE,
Executive Director.

Now, that would be all right, if there were a little more knowledge in the minds of the people who sent it. Since it was my privilege to come here in 1935 I have never seen quite so much propaganda in favor of any single proposition, unless it was the packing of the Court, and so much ignorance about the issues involved as has come to us on the so-called rules issue.

For example, this group is an intelligent and patriotic group, made up of people who are usually up-to-date. They should know what they are wiring me about. It is obvious that they do not understand the situation. In the beginning of their wire they say, "No stubborn minority should have the power to prevent debate," and so forth. There never has been a minority that has been able to prevent debate or the power to prevent legislation. I assume—and I may be corrected if I am wrong—that for the last 7 years the majority of this House—and I notice that the majority leader of that party is here——

Mr. McCORMACK. Smiling, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And smiling, too, which is certainly an ordeal for him to go through when I am talking; and I congratulate him upon his willpower and his success.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At your feet, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was not smiling while you were talking. I was smiling at how truthful was the telegram and how much they should be admired and respected for knowing what is going on.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let us read the telegram again and see. I would not venture to question the knowledge, the information or the statesmanship of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. But apparently he does not know what he is talking about. And that is something that is unusual, I will say. But this idea that a minority of the House has shut off debate, when the Democrats have had a two-thirds majority of the membership of the House for something like 7 years; they not only have had the power to pass legislation, but they could had they wished pass it over a veto of the President. I do not know what is the matter with them. I think they lack conviction of the merit of their proposals.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman read the whole telegram; did he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, except the signatures; and those will go in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman indicated it came from a council of churches; that the signers were a church group?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes; surely. It came from a church group.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are very intelligent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly and sincere and patriotic but grievously uninformed in this particular case. The trouble is that the propaganda that some folks have been putting out for the last 8 or 10 years has deceived them. That is the trouble; it has been put out in such a nice, pleasant, palatable deceptive way, they have gone astray.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do they come from the gentleman's district?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Surely.

Mr. McCORMACK. They reflect credit upon the gentleman's district.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Beyond question they are good, the best of citizens. They did not even vote for me. There was a minority in that district, who for reasons that were sufficient to them, did not vote for me. They belong to that group. No one can find any fault with that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is disowning them, is he?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not at all. I just do not agree with their views on this matter. Some from other parts

of the district say now they are not going to support me any more—some of them; but they never did support me. In any event, I do not expect to run again. I am in that delightful state that if we do not reduce the purchasing power of the dollar I will be able to get along on retirement. I am worried somewhat. What I am afraid of is that we will cut the value of the dollar so it will not buy 5 cents worth of goods.

Let us go back to the issue that comes tomorrow. What is going on now is a drive by a small minority of the gentleman's own party and a few on this side, maybe 15 or 20 on this side, a drive for that minority to secure control of the Rules Committee and put on it some "yes" boys—Members, the Speaker, or the administration can call and who will answer as directed. I am not reflecting in any way on any Member of the House—but that is the purpose of the move—to put some gentlemen on there who will dance when the Speaker, without his gun, and the Vice President from Texas may have one—I do not know what they do down there—will make them dance and bring in a rule limiting debate, preventing amendments, or barring amendments. I do wish the gentleman would have someone, but I cannot ask him to do it, take a look at it—at the real issue.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was looking at the signers of the gentleman's telegram. I thought they were a very fine group of Americans.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, they are. There can be no doubt as to that. They are just mistaken; that is all. By false statements, by half truths, as carried in the press, over radio and TV, they and many others have been led to believe the Rules Committee can and has prevented consideration by the House of legislation a majority desired to debate and perhaps adopt. That is not true.

The House created a Committee on Rules in 1789. It was made a regular standing committee in 1880 and that is its status today. There never has been a time—there is not now a time—when a majority of the House cannot consider, debate, and pass any legislation a majority desires.

The only exception is when a President interposes a veto. Then a two-thirds majority is required.

The purpose of the present drive is to give to a minority in both parties a minority in the House control of the Committee on Rules so that it will report out to the House proposed legislation which they desire under a rule limiting or denying debate, preventing amendments waiving all points of order.

A minority of so-called misnamed liberals now desires the powers of a dictator.

Some demanding the change say the world will be watching our vote tomorrow. Nonsense. The world—especially the newly created republics in Africa—are interested in what and how much we will help and give them. They do not even know there is a Rules Committee. Read what the Washington Star has said on the present issue. One editorial you will find in the daily RECORD of January 26, inserted by Mr. GROSS, of Iowa.

The other reads:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 27, 1961]

WHO'S SHOOTING WHOM?

There are times when our heart goes out to Judge HOWARD SMITH and his embattled Rules Committee. Only from the right do these gentlemen enjoy a respite from the withering fire. In front, from the rear, and above all from the left the cannon are volleying and thundering.

What is this all about? Who is shooting at whom, and why? We have read from time to time that Speaker SAM RAYBURN is shooting at Judge SMITH and the Rules Committee because he thinks the Kennedy legislative program will be doomed unless this committee is mowed down, or at least packed with two new Democratic members who will roll over and play dead when the Speaker snaps his fingers.

All of this is a little hard to understand. And it is especially hard to understand if one looks at the RECORD and reads the words of Mr. SAM. Shortly before the last, the 86th, Congress adjourned on September 1, 1960, Speaker RAYBURN made a little speech to the assembled Representatives. "We have come," he said, "to the close of one of the busiest and, in my opinion, one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress it has ever been my privilege to serve in. And I am winding up my 24th term."

If this is the case, what has happened since the 1st of last September? Judge SMITH and the Rules Committee were right there, Johnny-on-the-spot, so to speak, throughout all of the 86th Congress. And yet, according to Speaker RAYBURN, that was one of the busiest and most fruitful sessions in all of his experience in Congress. What has happened since to change the Speaker's mind? Certainly the Rules Committee has not blocked or frustrated or bottled up any legislation in the 87th Congress, which has barely begun to function. So what is the shooting all about? Is it possible (we most certainly think so) that there is more than meets the eye in this unwarranted and unreasonable drive to pack the Rules Committee?

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS—STATEMENT OF POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many months in connection with my studies of the operations of the so-called international Communist conspiracy for conquest of the Caribbean Basin, I have pondered the Monroe Doctrine and repeatedly urged its positive reaffirmation by our Government.

Thus it was most gratifying to hear in the inaugural address by President Kennedy on January 20, 1961, what was a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine in words as strong as those used by President Monroe in 1823.

It has been even more satisfying to read subsequently that the significance of that and other parts of the inaugural address is appreciated by our most scholarly publicists, among whom is Mr. George E. Sokolsky.

In his well-known column in the Washington Post of January 26, Mr. Sokolsky emphasizes the great issues so eloquently presented to the people of our country by the new President.

The article follows:

THE STATEMENT OF POLICY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

In his inaugural address President Kennedy laid down his policy. Kennedy said:

"Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty.

"This much we pledge—and more."

Then he restated the Monroe Doctrine in his own words:

"To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new alliance for progress—to assist freemen and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."

In many respects this statement is as strong, if not stronger than the original Monroe Doctrine. In fact, Kennedy issued a threat—clearly a threat—to those nations "who would make themselves our adversary."

"Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

"We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed."

If these statements are put together, they become a guiding policy, namely, that the United States will prepare vigorously for war, if it should come; that the United States has no program of appeasement but does have a program of the defense of liberty and territorial independence, for all peoples, particularly for those of the Americas.

The United States seeks peace and is willing to negotiate for peace, but it will not negotiate from fear. He said:

"So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

Khrushchev understands precisely what all this means. He will excerpt these paragraphs as they are excerpted here; he will tear the thought out of the verbiage and recognize that he is dealing with a tough hombre, who does not speak soft or act soft. All this will be clear to the Russian. He is warned that good manners are "not a sign of weakness," but their lack can engender disgust. If Khrushchev believes that Kennedy is a sissy and that he can hurl a shoe at him, he is mistaken.

On the other hand, President Kennedy must recognize that Soviet Russia cannot relinquish its main objective which is to reduce the entire world to an acceptance of Marxist sociology and economics. Whereas Khrushchev masks his intentions behind such generous phrases as competitive coexistence, Mao Tze-tung is more honest and frank. Mao, as an orthodox Communist, desires a war upon the United States immediately. In the recent great conference in Moscow, Mao's insistence upon war was voted down, but every statement out of Peking establishes his moral rejection of the Kremlin decision. Mao has a famine to look after; otherwise he would not have retreated.

President Kennedy in his inaugural says he will not make Harry Truman's mistake about "good, old Joe." He said: "Sincerity

is always subject to proof." Also Kennedy is in no hurry.

"All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet."

Surely, the course toward understanding did not begin with this inaugural address. It began when Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill rescued Stalin from defeat and were rewarded by treachery. It began when the United States gave Soviet Russia $11 billion to found the industry which is now being used against us. It began at Teheran and Yalta. It was continued at Camp David and before that at the first summit conference. "Let us begin" is not historically correct. "Let us try again after many failures and disappointments," would have been more accurate.

THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. This is a day of great historical importance to millions of people behind the Russian Iron Curtain, and to millions of others in the free world who trace their birth or heritage to the Ukraine. It is also a day of special meaning to all who cherish freedom and seek justice for and among the nations of the world. To us Americans it should be, and is, a day to remember, because our country is the birthplace of the national independence movement and source of the ideals and ideas which move people to seek their national independence.

For all too long our national leadership has failed to recognize the true nature of the revolutionary age in which we live. On too many occasions our national leadership has failed to identify the aspirations of the American people with those of the people in long submerged nations who are striving to throw off the chains of colonialism and imperialism. Revolutions have taken place in areas under the old colonialism as well as in nations under the new imperialism, revolutions which have for their objective the attainment or the rewinning of national independence. These rapidly moving human events on both sides of the Russian Iron Curtain have neither enjoyed our support or suffered from our opposition. We have assumed the posture of neutrals in a long series of international events which are shaping the future of the world and for which our political heritage bears a heavy responsibility.

For us to be neutrals in this revolutionary age is as ridiculous as the Russians posing as the leaders of this revolutionary era or supporters of the national independence movements. Our Nation is a child of the revolutionary spirit and our political ideals supply the driving force for the revolutionary age. The Russians on the other hand are the historic champions of imperialism, and their counterrevolutionary ideals and tactics seek to harness the revolutionary spirit to their dreams of world empire. The year 1960 brought home to us the full harvest of our posture of neutralism in the revolutionary age. In that year the Russian imperialists laid bold claim on the leadership of the national independence movements, charged the United States with leadership of the imperialist camp, and deceived millions of unsuspecting people the world over that there was validity to their claims. The neutral attitude of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, during the course of these Khrushchev claims and charges before the General Assembly, was a major factor in causing respect for us to be reduced to a dangerous low among the nations of the earth.

As a nation, we are emerging from a long sleep, from a Disneyland world and a Rip van Winkle repast. The trumpet call of a new and vigorous generation of Americans has been sounded. President Kennedy has called upon Americans of all ages to awaken to the dangers which confront us and to seize the opportunities which are ours to abolish tyranny, poverty, and disease from the affairs of men. He has warned all who would hear to stop thinking about what our country can do for us and to start thinking about what we can do for our country. This is an open invitation to the electorate to take an active part in shaping the future of our country in both domestic and international affairs. It is now up to the people to raise their voices so that they may be heard, and to put their shoulders to the wheel so that we can move ahead.

Those who observe this 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence, and all those who will pay public tribute to the independence anniversary dates of the other captive nations in the months ahead can do much to help remove the posture of neutralism from our foreign affairs and to launch us upon a course consistent with our political heritage. Those who have seen the land of their birth or the land of their forebears fall victim to the new Russian imperialism, know well the threat this scourge holds for our free society. More important, they know the revolutionary spirit strikes fear in the heart of the Red tyrant and lifts up the hopes of the oppressed nations. It is time to speak out with the boldness of freemen, and it is time to act with the courage befitting our station as a free people.

It was a burning belief in the political ideals of liberty which brought national independence to Ukraine 43 years ago. Those same beliefs can remove the hand of the tyrant from all the captive nations if they are rekindled in the hearts of our people.

U.S. CURRENCY USED FOR ANTI-U.S. PROPAGANDA IN PANAMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the stamping of anti-American propaganda on U.S. $1 bills in Panama is a clever and vicious attempt by the Panamanian radicals to spread ill feeling toward our country throughout not only the Caribbean, but throughout the world, for U.S. currency travels far.

One-dollar bills have been received by me from various U.S. citizens residing on the isthmus who have protested the misuse of currency which carries inked stampings of "Exploitacion Yankee—No," meaning, "Exploitation by the Yankee—No," and "Exploitacion Cleric—No," translated "Exploitation by the Church—No."

In a recent letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, I suggested that a diplomatic protest be made by the State Department to the Republic of Panama concerning the misuse of U.S. currency. This letter in turn was forwarded to the State Department which issued a memorandum to the Republic of Panama along the following lines:

> While the Government of the United States is not aware whether the practice of defacing U.S. currency continues to exist in Panama, my Government brings this matter to the attention of the authorities of the Republic of Panama in the hope that the practice, should it continue to exist, may be halted by such action on the part of the Panamanian authorities as may be practicable and available.

Mr. Speaker, this is just another example of the extent to which the Communist elements will go to degrade, deride, and belittle the United States, but in such a manner that only diplomatic protests may be made. The State Department can only protest for it has no jurisdiction in Panama itself. This emphasizes further the importance of our retaining complete sovereignty in the Canal Zone, the territory which has been granted in perpetuity to the United States by a binding treaty.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), until February 6, 1961, on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 10 minutes in two instances, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MASON on the subject "Tax Equality."

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ALGER.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. RODINO.

(At the request of Mr. DEVINE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT).

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 31, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

490. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to urging prompt consideration and enactment of an area redevelopment bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

492. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) for the fiscal year 1960 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

493. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

494. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

495. A letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D.C., September 21–23, 1960, pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 331 (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

496. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, relative to a review of the appropriation accounts of the Department of the Navy, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), disclosing certain improper obligations and expenditures of funds which constituted violations of sections 3678 and 3679, Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 628 and 31 U.S.C. 665(1)(2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

497. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, relative to the Department of the Air Force requesting approval to proceed with the immediate erection of three large aircraft maintenance docks for the Air Force Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 86–500; to the Committee on Armed Services.

498. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corp., pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress, and with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

499. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the annual reports and financial statements of the District of Columbia Armory Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 605, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

500. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report relating to the Atomic Energy Commission disposal of foreign excess property during fiscal year 1960, pursuant to section 404 (63 Stat. 398; 40 U.S.C. 514); to the Committee on Government Operations.

501. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the prices negotiated for coordinate data transmitting sets under Department of the Air Force fixed-price incentive contracts AF 30(635)–9324 and AF 30(635)–11490 with Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

502. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the cost of excess proficiency flying in the U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

503. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Annual Report for 1960 of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

504. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide 12-year terms for full-time referees, increase the maximum salary limitations of referees, increase the salary of the Chief of Bankruptcy, authorize compensation for service of a retired referee and to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for a more liberal retirement annuity for Referees of Bankruptcy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

505. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report with respect to positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

506. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the report of positions in grades GS–18, 17, and 16 in the Federal Aviation Agency on December 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

507. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report covering positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18 by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

508. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5, pursuant to Public Law 566, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

509. A letter from the vice president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1960, pursuant to chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 3507. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Departments of the Air Force and the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Yuma, Ariz., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 3508. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3509. A bill to establish a program of grants for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3510. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 3511. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3512. A bill to amend title VII of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain former Reconstructiton Finance Corporation property for the year 1954; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3513. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3514. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3516. A bill to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3517. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 3518. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in the State of Indiana to Clark County, Ind.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 3519. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 3520. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 3522. A bill to create a Susquehanna Watershed Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 3523. A bill to encourage needed evaluation of rehabilitation potentials of, and the provision of rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who may engage in gainful work or achieve substantial ability of independent living, thereby eliminating or reducing their burden on others and contributing to their dignity and self-respect; to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit evaluation and rehabilitation facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 3524. A bill to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3525. A bill to authorize the enlargement of the Arlington National Cemetery and to provide that certain land heretofore reserved for other purposes shall be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army as a part of the Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 3526. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3527. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 3528. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3529. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857, 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3530. A bill to amend the law relating to mining leases on tribal Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3531. A bill to supplement and amend the act of June 30, 1948, relating to the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, and to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior issued under the act of June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3532. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian owned lands under the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3533. A bill to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3534. A bill to donate to certain Indian tribes some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservations involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 3535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3536. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3537. A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3538. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to threats or injury to Federal officers in the discharge of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3539. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3540. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 3541. A bill to stabilize cotton price support for the 1961 crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 3543. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 3544. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 3545. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime to tamper with a ballot cast for any candidate for Federal office; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3546. A bill to permit the city of Stockton, Calif., to have the entire cost of its proposed transient labor center included as a local noncash grant-in-aid under the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and to amend the House Act of 1949 to remove the present ceiling on relocation payments for displaced individuals, families, and business concerns under that program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 3547. A bill to permit the use from June 1 through September 30, 1961, of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in the Mount Desert, Maine, post office to assist the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the establishment of the first settlement on Mount Desert Island; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 3548. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 3549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 3550. A bill to equalize taxation and provide revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3551. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3553. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 3554. A bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73 million for that purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3555. A bill to change the name of the Thomaston Dam and Reservoir on the Naugatuck River at Thomaston, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3556. A bill to provide for humane treatment of animals used in experiment and research by recipients of grants from the United States, and by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3557. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of Panama Canal ship pilots; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 3558. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to authorize for teachers in private nonprofit schools certain benefits under the provisions of title II, V, and VI of such act providing for teachers in public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 3559. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3560. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty on iron ore; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion rate for iron ore from deposits in the United States to 27½ percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3562. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 3563. A bill to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3564. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase for a 2-year period the additional first-year depreciation allowance in respect of tangible personal property used in a trade or business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 3565. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3566. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3567. A bill to authorize the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to approve a financial contribution for civil defense purposes to the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 3568. A bill to commemorate the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 3569. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3570. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase one of the limitations on grants for construction from $250,000 to $500,000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3571. A bill to establish permanent firing squads for national cemeteries in which burials are conducted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 3572. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation in South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3573. A bill to provide for the establishment, under the National Science Foundation, of a National Science Academy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3574. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 3575. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation and the Seminole Reservations in Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3576. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3577. A bill to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3578. A bill to reduce the maximum workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to 35 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 3579. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 3580. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3581. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3582. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 3583. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3584. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 3585. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 3586. A bill to reduce to $200 the exemption provided for returning residents by paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3587. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide outpatient medical and dental treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as such treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 3588. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 3589. A bill to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish and spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 3591. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a proper relationship between wheat, corn, grain sorghum and other feeds on a proper feed unit basis, to bring supply and demand into balance, and to assist American agriculture in essential adjustment during the years 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963, and to provide for a permanent farm program thereafter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 3592. A bill granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operations of library facilities and services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 177. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution creating the Roanoke Island Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution designating President's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to residence requirements under State laws for voters for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 133. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. Res. 134. Resolution stating that the House of Representatives oppose the Presidential directive reducing the number of dependents of military personnel overseas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: Memorials of the House of Representatives of Missouri, memorializing the Congress to establish a national recreational area on the Current and Eleven Point Rivers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting an amendment to the social security law to provide for voluntary retirement at the age of 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution relating to the granting of representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to approve the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado and to appropriate funds for initiation of the construction of the project at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to avoid any lapse in the effectiveness of the provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation extending the effectiveness of the act to and including the 31st day of December 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to conclude and ratify a treaty between the United States and Canada providing for construction of Libby Dam upon the Kootenai River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the present hodgepodge of varying regulations, licensing, etc., because of their inequities and adverse effects on the forest products and forest industries of Idaho and the entire Northwest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give immediate attention to the problem of raising U.S. import duties on lumber and wood products with those of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish uniform marketing practices in the several States as part of the tobacco loan program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to commending and congratulating those Members who oppose the packing of the Rules Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to congratulating the Honorable John F. Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States and the new national administration under his leadership; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3593. A bill for the relief of Antonio Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3594. A bill for the relief of Antonino Ceci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3595. A bill for the relief of Anna Isernia Alloca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 3596. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to Purvis C. Vickers, Robert I. Vickers, and Joseph M. Vickers, a copartnership doing business as Vickers Bros.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 3597. A bill for the relief of George Franklin Sawyer; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 3598. A bill for the relief of Aurelio Di Meo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3599. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodora Psilekaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 3600. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Au; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3602. A bill for the relief of Chang Ho Nien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 3603. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Soultanian and Hilda Soultanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 3604. A bill for the relief of Anthony Harry Giazikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 3605. A bill for the relief of Jefferson Loan Co., Inc., and Jefferson Mortgage Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 3606. A bill for the relief of William C. Winter, Jr., lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force (Medical Corps); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3607. A bill for the relief of Janet Giritliyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 3608. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Fuchs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 3609. A bill for the relief of Jovan and Vesa Ilijevski-Ilic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 3610. A bill for the relief of Luigi Antonelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 3611. A bill for the relief of citizens of the State of Illinois and of the State of New Jersey, organizers and owners of First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 3612. A bill for the relief of Kwong Kai Shim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 3613. A bill for the relief of Willard L. Gleeson-Broadcasting Corp. of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3614. A bill for the relief of James Joseph Shaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3615. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jacqueline Shaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3616. A bill for the relief of Antonio Joaquim da Silva Aresta, Luiza De Jesus Gomes Moreira Aresta and Antonio Luiz Moreira Aresta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 3617. A bill for the relief of Irene Trebacz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 3618. A bill for the relief of Tin Yuk Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Prudente, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REECE:

H.R. 3620. A bill for the relief of T. L. Cable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3621. A bill for the relief of David H. Forman and Julia Forman; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3622. A bill for the relief of Bernarsi Dass and wife, Gyano Peganyee Dass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 3623. A bill for the relief of G. C. Muckenthaler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Saverio Lacertosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3626. A bill for the relief of Gianni Mender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Zappone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Paolo Lazzaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Maj. Katherine F. Bradspies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Peter Tsivis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3631. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Giuseppe Agrusa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 3632. A bill for the relief of Antoni Zolkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3633. A bill for the relief of Angelina Rainone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3634. A bill for the relief of Miss Hedwig Dora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H. Res. 135. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 3613) for the relief of Willard L. Gleeson-Broadcasting Corp. of America, with accompanying papers, to the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

45. The Speaker presented a petition of the mayor, Trinidad, Colo., relative to enacting legislation to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the construction of needed public works and improvement, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 28, 1961.

The Rules Committee change (see newsletter January 7, 1961) or packing of the membership (from present 8 Democrats, 4 Republicans to proposed 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans) is a tremendous power struggle with features easily misunderstood or unknown to some. (1) The Democrat leadership wants more liberal control of the programing of legislation to strengthen the northern liberals and weaken the southerners who are less liberal, (2) despite the generally publicized view, the Rules Committee cannot block legislation, it can only delay it pending study, (3) some Members approve of the delay or attempted blocking of legislation they don't want before the House for consideration and a recorded vote; meanwhile, the Rules Committee can be blamed, (4) changing committee membership is properly within the majority party's jurisdiction since the ratio of Republican-Democrat Members changes each Congress. Further, the Rules Committee must be able to program the legislation the majority party wants to consider since as the majority party, it is their responsibility. Hence, the 2-to-1 ratio of Democrats to Republicans, even though the House ratio is 5 to 3.

Few dispute the reasonableness of this arrangement. Then why the fuss in adding two Democrats and one Republican, inasmuch as the same ratio is maintained? Because this move will be a liberal victory and a conservative loss. However, at this point like-thinking Members disagree. Some feel the change will clarify the basic liberalism of the Democratic leadership for the benefit of all better to recognize and understand the legislative forces at work in Congress. Some, like myself, recognize a far more sinister danger; namely, the changing of the ground rules of debate.

Each bill comes to the House with an accompanying rule from the Rules Committee governing its consideration, debate, amendment, and recommittal. This proposed change can easily result in rules which waive points of order, limit the time for free debate, prevent amendments from being offered, and generally throttle the normal democratic legislative procedure. Therefore, we face not only more radical legislation but different ground rules limiting or preventing legitimate disagreement. Some may quickly recognize there an apparent contradiction—liberals stifling freedom of debate rather than championing it. This recognition could easily lead to a further thought that many liberals today are radicals, not really liberals at all in the true sense. For my part, I shall oppose the Rules Committee change as I shall any disruption of the democratic and orderly process.

President Kennedy's first Executive order directed the Secretary of Agriculture to buy eggs, pork, and beans for distribution to people in so-called depressed areas. The Secretary is given authority to make such purchases under what is known as section 32 funds in the Agriculture Act of 1935. Under the broad power of this legislation and the interpretations which have grown up around it since 1935, the Secretary has almost unlimited power to declare any agriculture commodity in surplus. The act empowers him to declare surplus any farm commodity which, in his opinion, is not being sold for a fair market price, at the present time considered to be 90 percent of parity. Under section 32, he may then use these commodities to feed people in need. The President's order of last Saturday goes even further, it not only proposes to feed those in need, but to insure a nutritious diet. We are now treading on the dangerous ground of bringing about a pure socialistic program wherein the Government will not only feed the people but decide for them what is a balanced diet. There are other inherent dangers in this action: (1) Government buying creates a false demand for these commodities and may jeopardize the market causing higher prices to consumers; (2) temptation of those not actually in need to participate in the program because of added foods; (3) it's an open-end program; an estimated 3½ million people could be eligible now but this figure could be doubled under the loose interpretation of who is needy; (4) cost—once the program starts and present funds are expended, Congress will have to appropriate more because you can't stop feeding people once you have started. One other point to remember, section 32 deals only with surplus foods; it does not authorize welfare programs. The President and Secretary of Agriculture refer to the Executive order as a "welfare measure," but the lawyers in the Agriculture Department very carefully avoid this and insist on calling it a surplus disposal program. Once again it might be well to consider whether the Federal Government is intended and so constituted as to be able to feed, clothe, or house people. I don't think so.

The task forces reporting to President Kennedy have one thing in common. Each directs its attention to a particular field of study. It is easy to see how recommendations for increased spending and Government participation in each can, when combined, make a staggering total, far beyond our purse. Even justifiable additions to Federal jurisdiction are unwarranted when Federal income is exceeded. Perhaps a task force of fiscal responsibility to correlate spending recommendations is needed, dedicated to a stable currency, a sound dollar. It appears certain that the 220 campaign promises of President Kennedy, paralleled by the task forces recommendations, must be wholly or partially abandoned.

Federal Power Commission Chairman-designate Joseph C. Swidler Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, America has watched with great interest and much approval President Kennedy's selection of Cabinet members to serve with him in the new administration and more recently our attention has been focused on the selection of subcabinet appointments and appointments of chairmen and members of regulatory agencies and commissions.

In this connection, the President is to be particularly commended in the selection of Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, of Tennessee, nominated to become Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. It is most important that this Commission have a capable, competent Chairman and in Mr. Swidler, the President has made a most excellent choice.

Mr. Swidler is a very able lawyer, a fine administrator and thoroughly knowledgable in the power field. Moreover, he is a dedicated public servant. The FPC possesses great powers affecting the consumers of this Nation, and in his many years of public service Mr. Swidler has proven his dedication and obligation is to the public interest.

Mr. Swidler, a native of Chicago, is a graduate of the University of Illinois. As General Counsel of the Tennessee Valley Authority, where he served for a score of years, Mr. Swidler had a most outstanding record. Following his resignation from the TVA, Swidler has engaged in the practice of private law in Nashville, in my State of Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that President Kennedy appointed Mr. Swidler as Chairman of this important Commission and I predict a record of dedicated service and a performance of which the President and the people of the Nation will be proud. The important programs of the Federal Power Commission should be greatly improved in the public interest.

Back-Door Appropriation Bills—Scope and Extent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that not more than a handful of Members of the House are aware of the amounts of money involved in the back-door appropriation bills or the scope and variety of Government programs which they finance. These are the types of bills which now secure their financing outside our traditional annual appropriations process. They are the types House Resolution 115, which I introduced, along with identical resolutions by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SMITH] and the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] would, if adopted, require annual review and appropriation through the regular established congressional appropriations process as are all the hundreds of other programs of Government.

The House, which has the constitutional responsibility to originate the appropriation bills, surely cannot consider the bills intelligently when it permits, as it now does, several committees to write checks against one checkbook and no one keeping the checkbook stub up to date. Under that kind of slipshod procedure, no wonder we wind up the session not knowing what we have done to the budget and to the Treasury. No wonder we spend money we do not have for things we could get along without or defer until we could afford them.

In order to show the dimensions of these backdoor bypasses of the traditional appropriations procedure, I include tables listing the backdoor bills of the last 3 years. They are striking—both as to totals involved and the diversity of programs encompassed. I hope every Member will note especially how many of these bills originated in the other body—although this House, under the constitutional interpretation and practice, has the exclusive responsibility for originating bills withdrawing money from the Treasury:

Authority to obligate the Government carried in legislative bills, 85th Cong., 2d sess., public debt transactions and contract authorities

Bill	Subject	Budget request	Senate	House	Enacted	Enacted compared with request
S. 3418 (Public Law 85-364)	Emergency Housing Act	$90,000,000	$1,900,000,000	$1,900,000,000	$1,900,000,000	+$1,810,000,000
S. 3149 (Public Law 85-424)	Export-Import Bank lending authority.	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	
S. 3651 (Public Law 85-699)	Small-business investments		250,000,000	[1]		
S. 3497 (failed to pass)	Community facilities		900,000,000	[2]		
S. 3683 (pocket veto)	Depressed areas		300,000,000	[3]		
S. 4036 (failed to pass)	Minerals subsidy		350,000,000	[4]		
S. 3502 (pocket veto)	Airport grants		512,000,000	437,000,000	[5] (437,000,000)	
S. 4035 (failed to pass)	Housing Act of 1958	1,500,000,000	2,475,000,000	[6]		−1,500,000,000
S. 3468 (Public Law 85-740)	Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation		20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000
H.R. 9821 (Public Law 85-381)	Highway Act of 1958		269,000,000	209,000,000	235,000,000	+235,000,000
H.R. 13247 (Public Law 85-864)	Education bill (sec. 307)			[7]		
S. 4102	Writeoff of losses under Defense Production Act, borrowing authority.	300,000,000	[8]			−300,000,000
H.R. 13014	Direct veterans' loans			[9]		
S. 1869	TVA borrowing authority	125,000,000	125,000,000	[8]		−125,000,000
H.R. 12883 (Public Law 85-895)	Capitol Power Plant construction		6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	+6,500,000
S. 1728 (Public Law 85-672)	Maritime Academy Act of 1958		[10] 2,696,000	2,696,000	2,696,000	+2,696,000
Total		4,015,000,000	9,110,196,000	4,575,196,000	4,164,196,000	+149,196,000

[1] House committee changed to regular appropriation authorization.
[2] Reported at $1,900,000,000, including $400,000,000 revolving fund feature. Bill failed of passage.
[3] Reported at $200,000,000, plus $200,000,000 revolving fund; changed on floor to regular appropriation authorization.
[4] House committee changed to regular appropriation authorization (of $650,000,000, however).
[5] Contract authority prevailed on passage but bill was pocket-vetoed.
[6] Reported at $2,050,000,000, but bill failed of passage.
[7] As reported bill included a public-debt transaction but this was deleted by committee floor amendment.
[8] Reported but no floor action.
[9] Reported at $150,000,000, but no floor action; same program was duplicated in title IX of S. 4035 listed above.
[10] Estimated.

Authority to obligate the Government carried in legislative bills, 86th Cong., 1st sess., public debt transactions and contract authorities

Bill and subject	Executive requests		Senate	House	Final	Final compared with requests	
	Full basis	Basis comparable to final				Full basis	Comparable basis
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
S. 1094 (H.R. 4452): Bretton Woods Agreement Act (public debt) [1]	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	[1] $4,550,000,000		
H.R. 2256: Direct veterans loans (public debt)			100,000,000	300,000,000	100,000,000	+$100,000,000	+$100,000,000
S. 1 (H.R. 1011): Airport grants (contract authority)	200,000,000	120,000,000	465,000,000	297,000,000	126,000,000	−74,000,000	+6,000,000
S. 57: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority) (vetoed)	(1,650,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(2,675,000,000)	(1,975,000,000)	[2] (1,300,000,000)	(−350,000,000)	(+500,000,000)
S. 2539: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority) (vetoed)	(1,650,000,000)	(550,000,000)	(825,000,000)	(825,000,000)	[3] (825,000,000) [4]	(−825,000,000)	(+275,000,000)
H.R. 8678: Highway Act of 1959							
S. 2654: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority)	1,650,000,000	800,000,000	925,000,000	925,000,000	[5] 925,000,000	−725,000,000	+125,000,000
Grand total	6,400,000,000	5,470,000,000	6,040,000,000	6,072,000,000	5,701,000,000	−699,000,000	+231,000,000

[1] $1,375,000,000 for immediate expenditure; $3,175,000,000 in nature of guarantee for World Bank bonds.
[2] In addition, provided for 45,000 public housing units (contract authority) estimated at $874,500,000 and, in addition, carried language permitting an additional number of about 145,000 at an estimated cost of some $2,825,000,000.
[3] In addition, provided for 37,000 public housing units (contract authority) estimated at $719,000,000.
[4] Increased gas tax by 1 cent from Oct. 1, 1959, until July 1961 at which time, for the 3 fiscal years 1962-64, bill actually appropriates to the highway trust fund, from the general fund, certain excise taxes estimated to total approximately $2.5 billion.

New authority to obligate the Government carried in legislative bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess., public debt transactions and contract authorities

Bill and subject	Executive request	Senate	House	Enacted	Enacted compared with request
H.J. Res. 784 (Housing Act amendments): [1]					
College housing loans (public debt)		$500,000,000	$500,000,000	$500,000,000	+$500,000,000
Public facilities loans (public debt)	[2] $20,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+30,000,000
H.R. 7903 (direct veterans loans; public debt)		300,000,000	300,000,000	[3] 300,000,000	+300,000,000
H.R. 10495 (Highway Act of 1960): Park, Indian, and forest roads and trails (contract authority)	[4]	167,000,000	167,000,000	167,000,000	+167,000,000
Total	20,000,000	1,017,000,000	1,017,000,000	1,017,000,000	+997,000,000

[1] Attached by the Senate (on next to last day of session) to a House joint resolution having nothing to do with housing.
[2] The fiscal 1961 portion of a total of $100,000,000 which, under the executive proposal, was to be subject to annual appropriation review and control.
[3] For 2-year period. In addition, bill as passed permits use of repayments and balances through use of a revolving fund.
[4] Budget proposed to finance through appropriations process—no amount requested for 1961. Bill as passed provided contract authority for 1961 and 1962.

Mr. Speaker, one of the principal appropriation techniques used in these backdoor bills is the so-called public debt transactions. It has interesting parliamentary and constitutional characteristics as a mechanism for raising and appropriating funds for governmental purposes.

There has come to my attention authoritative correspondence on the subject between the Secretary of the Treasury, as the custodian of all public moneys, and the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] which is enlightening, persuasive, and pertinent to the backdoor device of public debt transactions. I include that correspondence at this point:

AUGUST 6, 1958.

Hon. ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, Congress has from time to time authorized expenditures from public debt receipts to conduct specified programs of Government. The increasing frequency with which this devise is being used, particularly in the present Congress, has been a matter of considerable concern. On more than one occasion it has been the subject of debate on its merits as a means of raising and appropriating public funds as well as on its parliamentary and constitutional characteristics.

It has been suggested that, when under such authority you cause Government securities to be sold, the proceeds of such issues are not "in the Treasury." It has been suggested further that, when such proceeds are used to purchase notes or other evidence of indebtedness from the administrative agency authorized to issue such notes, the subsequent expenditure of such proceeds by the agency does not constitute the use of public funds for the support of the general functions of Government.

It appears to me that both of these suggestions are in error, and I would first refer to the Constitution of the United States, article I, section 9, paragraph 7, which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

This language makes no distinction as to the source of the money in the Treasury. It clearly provides that money in the Treasury can lawfully get out in only one way—by appropriation made by law. It must necessarily follow that a legislative enactment permitting money to be drawn from the Treasury is an appropriation, the form, method, or the words used being immaterial.

Next, I would expect that in the ordinary course of events, the proceeds of public debt issues are commingled in the general fund balance of the Treasury with other receipts, such as tax receipts, customs, and miscellaneous income. I take it to be the fact that, in periods of deficit financing, when current tax collections fail to meet daily expenditure needs, the whole range of Government functions is financed from public debt proceeds at least in part. In short, the day-to-day operation of Government has been met to some extent by borrowed funds, else we would not have a public debt. This debt represents money borrowed, placed in the Treasury, and subsequently expended for functions of Government pursuant to appropriations made by law—mostly, I might add, pursuant to appropriations carried in the regular appropriation bills over the years. I cannot but conclude that public debt receipts have been used, and are being used, to support all manner of Government activities.

Since you are the one official having authoritative knowledge as to the public moneys, I would appreciate from you a statement of the facts as they pertain to my conclusions just cited. I would like to have your response to the following specific questions:

1. Are the proceeds of public debt issues placed in the Treasury?

2. If in the Treasury, are they commingled in the general fund balance with other receipts such as tax and miscellaneous income?

3. In the Treasury statements of receipts and expenditures, are not the expenditures made under authority of the public debt transaction device reflected as expenditures just as are expenditures under other forms of appropriations? That is, are they not shown as withdrawals from the Treasury in the same sense as are withdrawals pursuant to the more common form of appropriating language?

4. Is it not a fact, particularly in periods of deficit financing, that the general fund balance on any given day is a mixture of funds in the Treasury derived from many sources, including the proceeds of public debt issues, and that such balance is impossible of differentiation or distinction as to its derivation?

I would appreciate your early advice and comment on the matter.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1958.

Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. GARY: This is in reply to your letter of August 6, 1958, which contains a number of specific questions and observations regarding authorizations made by Congress to expend from public debt receipts to conduct specified programs of the Government.

The answers to your questions, which follow, are presented in the same order as in your letter:

1. The proceeds of public debt issues are placed "in the Treasury." In other words, receipts from public debt issues are covered into the Treasury the same as all other receipts of the Federal Government.

2. Public debt receipts are commingled in the general fund balance with other receipts such as taxes and miscellaneous income. The Treasury maintains one general cash account to which all receipts of the Federal Government are credited and from which all expenditures of the Federal Government are made.

3. In Treasury statements of receipts and expenditures, the expenditures made under authority of the public debt transaction device are reflected as expenditures just as expenditures under other forms of appropriations. They are shown as withdrawals from the Treasury in the same sense as withdrawals pursuant to the more common form of appropriation language.

4. The general fund balance on any given day is a mixture of funds in the Treasury derived from many sources, including the proceeds of public debt issues. Such balance is impossible of differentiation or distinction as to its derivation. This is true regardless of whether there is a budgetary surplus or a deficit.

In conclusion, I agree with your opinion that a legislative enactment permitting money to be drawn from the Treasury is an appropriation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

How To Register Birth of U.S. Citizens Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an amendment to part 22, chapter I, title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations which provides for the registration of births abroad of children who are citizens of the United States.

I trust that this information will assist my colleagues in answering the increasing number of inquiries from U.S. citizens whose children were born abroad.

The ever increasing travel of American citizens for business and personal reasons, and the widespread military obligations of the United States which requires residence for extended periods overseas, the number of American citizens born outside of the United States is now estimated at approximately 50,000 persons per year. Physical conditions in some foreign countries, the lack of procedural knowledge on the part of American parents and the lack of cooperation in some foreign areas has provoked a mounting number of situations in which U.S. citizens born abroad have been unable to secure proper or recognized documents reflecting proof of birth.

The reluctance on the part of various persons, organizations, and agencies to fully and promptly recognize the validity of birth documents of citizens born abroad, prompted me to recommend to the Departments of State and Justice that this matter of registration of children born abroad be resolved by administrative regulations.

My recommendation was accepted and a regulation was promulgated on October 23, 1959, and published in the Federal Register of November 3, 1959. Pursuant to this regulation, our consular officers abroad are now instructed to assist the parents of children born abroad who are, under the law, citizens of the United States at birth, to establish a record of their birth. The regulation specifies that consular officers are required to record the birth of such children upon the application of a parent or a person in interest. The proof of birth may consist of, but is not limited to, authorized copies of registration of the birth with local authorities, a baptismal certificate, an affidavit of the doctor or other person attending at the

birth, or other similar evidence. Even if no such documentary proof can be obtained, the applicant for registration of birth may obtain registration upon the submission of an affidavit explaining satisfactorily why such proof is not available. Facts relating to the birth of the child should be set forth in such affidavit.

The consular officer will, at the time of the registration of birth, issue to the parent or person in interest a copy of the registration record when requested and upon payment of a fee of $1.50. Additional copies of the registration of birth record shall be issued by the authentication officer of the Department of State when requested by the parent or person in interest and upon the payment of the required fees. At the time of registration of birth, the consular officer shall furnish to the parent or person in interest a formal certification of birth record without fee. This certification shall include the name, sex, place and date of birth, and date of filing of the birth registration record. The certification form shall bear the signature of the consular officer, the date of issuance and the seal of the issuing officer. At any time subsequent to the registration of birth, when requested and upon payment of the required fee of $2.50, the authentication officer of the Department of State and on behalf of the Secretary of State shall issue to the parent or person in interest a certification of birth form which shall be similar to the contents to that described in this paragraph.

Rehabilitation Act of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill entitled "The Rehabilitation Act of 1961." This is similar to H.R. 1119, which I introduced in the 86th Congress. The provisions of the bill are briefly as follows:

Title I amends the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Rehabilitation, with a Commissioner of Rehabilitation, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate. The Commissioner is to perform such functions respecting rehabilitation and related matters as the Secretary may prescribe and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for Assistant Secretaries of the Department. This title also calls for the appointment by the Secretary of an advisory committee broadly representative of public and professional interest in rehabilitation, including the interest of labor, business, medicine, welfare, psychology, and education, to review and advise the Secretary with respect to rehabilitation policies, and other matters relating to the rehabilitation program as he may from time to time request. The Secretary or his designate is to be chairman of this committee. It is believed that having a statutory Office of Rehabilitation with its Commissioner appointed by the President will result in improved status for the rehabilitation movement and direct additional attention to the significance of rehabilitation in the total program of health, education, and welfare in this country.

Title II of the bill amends the present Vocational Rehabilitation Act to set up a program of independent living rehabilitation through which may be served seriously handicapped individuals who may not be feasible for vocational rehabilitation but who can achieve a substantial degree of self-care and independence. Such individuals are excluded from services under the present act. We firmly believe that this broader concept of rehabilitation is necessary for the period in which we are living.

We further believe that many of the individuals accepted for independent living rehabilitation services will ultimately progress to the point where they will be candidates for vocational rehabilitation.

Title III of the bill establishes in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation a program to assist States and local communities in developing workshops and other rehabilitation facilities for the seriously handicapped. At the present time, there is a dearth of such facilities, particularly workshops to provide a transitional experience for handicapped individuals before they can assume competitive employment. This is a serious gap in existing legislation, which permits the construction of comprehensive rehabilitation centers but cannot be used to establish workshops and more limited rehabilitation facilities.

Title IV of the bill is designed to strengthen the existing program for the evaluation of the nature and extent of disability and rehabilitation potential of the individual. The Federal Government would pay three-quarters of the cost of such services on an open-end basis to encourage the States to provide adequate and comprehensive evaluation services, which are a prime requisite for any successful rehabilitation program. It is assumed that evaluation work will actually be done in existing or expanded community evaluation centers.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this body know that I have always been a strong supporter of rehabilitation. In my position as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee which considers appropriations for all health, education, and welfare programs, I have been in a position to observe at first hand what is being accomplished as a result of the funds appropriated by this body for the purpose of rehabilitating our handicapped citizens. In addition, it has been my privilege to visit many rehabilitation facilities throughout the country and to talk with hundreds of individuals who are giving their lives professionally to the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals. I still believe that the Federal Government does not spend any money more wisely than what it spends on rehabilitation. In fact, it is far more than a slogan to be able to say that rehabilitation actually does not cost anything, that it is an investment which returns ample dividends both socially and economically. I am proud to be associated with efforts to bring about a further expansion of rehabilitation activity. I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will conduct early hearings on this legislation, and that a bill will be reported to the House before the end of this session.

Good Neighbor Policy: Junior Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of greater understanding between the United States and our sister countries in the Western Hemisphere to the south has never been more accentuated than at the present time. Longtime friends of ours in Latin America are viewing with considerable doubt our longtime policy of good neighborliness.

I am proud to report that, in a small way, the 10th District of Virginia is contributing to a better understanding between the Republics of the United States and Costa Rica.

Last summer, the daughter of a constituent of mine, an enthusiastic Spanish student at St. Agnes School in Alexandria, spent 2 months in San Jose, Costa Rica, as the guest of Senor and Senora Jose Maria Macaya and their daughter Gloria. This young lady was afforded an opportunity to live with a Costa Rican family, learn and appreciate their customs, and improve on her use of the Spanish language. From this experience there developed a great friendship between the parents and their children, with the result that a reciprocal visit was arranged whereby Gloria came to Virginia as the guest of my constituents.

Today, Gloria Macaya, accompanied by her hostess, is visiting the Halls of Congress, watching democracy in action.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly significant to me that one of the parents of the North American girl is an official of Pan American World Airways. No single corporation in the United States has contributed more to greater understanding between ourselves and the nations of the world than Pan American. This airline has often been referred to as an unofficial instrument of our State Department and those of us who have traveled abroad on Pan American have long recognized the impact of this reference.

Mr. Speaker, I have known this constituent of mine and his lovely wife for many years. Coincidentally, their daughter and mine serve on the editorial staff of Shearings, the student publication at St. Agnes School.

There are many things to be done to convince our neighbors to the south that

the United States seeks to be friendly, not colonial. Reproductions of this informal and modest exchange of young people, exchanges of philosophies and ideas, on a large scale, could be infinitely more effective in reaching a better understanding between the United States and our Central and South American neighbors than huge and unrestricted monetary grants that picture us as the benevolent despot.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a brief article from the Alexandria Gazette of January 23 as a part of the RECORD:

JUNEL DOULENS HAS COSTA RICAN VISITOR

The second stage of an informal, unofficial person-to-person program is being enacted these days at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Roger B. Doulens, 906 Andover Drive, in the Westgrove section of Fairfax County.

Last summer, Miss Junel Doulens, 16-year-old daughter of the Doulens, visited the Republic of Costa Rica in Central America, as the 2-month guest of Senor and Senora Jose Maria Macaya.

Junel, a Spanish major at St. Agnes School in Alexandria, sought a desirable environment in the Western Hemisphere in which Castilian Spanish is spoken in order to improve on her usage of the traditional Latin tongue.

Today, as her houseguest, Junel has Senorita Gloria Macaya, youngest daughter of the Macaya family. Gloria, who arrived last Sunday on a Pan American-Panagra-National flight from Panama, will remain with the Doulens family for several weeks and will attend, periodically, classes at St. Agnes as a guest of the faculty.

Meanwhile, Gloria, in the company of Mrs. Doulens and Junel, attended the inaugural ceremony and the inaugural parade.

The Rules Committee Should Not Be Packed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is now apparent to even the most naive that the proposed vote on packing the Rules Committee was postponed because it was evident, at that time, that the proposal would be defeated.

Alarmed at the probable failure to accomplish the proposed packing, it is evident that extreme pressure has been exerted by the Democratic leadership and the administration to bring opponents of the measure into line.

If it were possible to have a secret ballot on the matter, there can be no doubt that the proposed packing plan would be overwhelmingly defeated. It is to be hoped that those Members of Congress who are against this unwarranted packing of the Rules Committee will have the courage of their convictions to vote "nay" regardless of the pressure being applied.

The record is quite clear that the Rules Committee has not thwarted and cannot thwart the will of the majority of the House. What, then, is the real reason for wanting to pack the Rules Committee? Undoubtedly, one of the real reasons is to make it easier to bring out a lot of highly questionable bills that would otherwise require and cannot get the backing of a majority of the House to bring them to the House floor. Another reason might well be the desire to be able to bring highly questionable and controversial bills to the House floor under closed rules that will prohibit or limit any change by the House, thus preventing any action by a majority—the very action the packing of the Rules Committee is supposed to assure.

An editorial in the Washington Evening Star on January 27, 1961, quotes the Speaker as having stated on September 1, 1960, that:

We have come to the close of one of the busiest and, in my opinion, one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress it has ever been my privilege to serve in. And I am winding up my 24th term.

The editorial then goes on to question what all the shooting is about. We who know the Rules Committee has not been thwarting the will of the majority also wonder why.

The left-wing Washington Post often referred to as Washington's Pravda, in this morning's edition, has a headline over a front-page editorial saying the "President Fears World Reaction If Test Is Lost." It seems every means is being employed to change the vote of those House Members opposed to the packing of the Rules Committee. The Post mentions three Cabinet members who have been active in this respect.

Under the Constitution, there are supposed to be three separate branches of Government. Yet we find here a desperate effort by the executive department to influence or dictate how the legislative body shall operate. The Star editorial follows:

WHO'S SHOOTING WHOM?

There are times when our heart goes out to Judge HOWARD SMITH and his embattled Rules Committee. Only from the right do these gentlemen enjoy a respite from the withering fire. In front, from the rear, and above all from the left the cannon are volleying and thundering.

What is this all about? Who is shooting at whom, and why? We have read from time to time that Speaker SAM RAYBURN is shooting at Judge SMITH and the Rules Committee because he thinks the Kennedy legislative program will be doomed unless this committee is mowed down, or at least packed with two new Democratic members who will roll over and play dead when the Speaker snaps his fingers.

All of this is a little hard to understand. And it is especially hard to understand if one looks at the record and reads the words of Mr. SAM. Shortly before the last, the 86th, Congress adjourned on September 1, 1960, Speaker RAYBURN made a little speech to the assembled Representatives. "We have come," he said, "to the close of one of the busiest and, in my opinion, one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress it has ever been my privilege to serve in. And I am winding up my 24th term."

If this is the case, what has happened since the first of last September? Judge SMITH and the Rules Committee were right there, Johnny-on-the-spot so to speak, throughout all of the 86th Congress. And yet, according to Speaker RAYBURN, that was one of the busiest and most fruitful sessions in all of his experience in Congress. What has happened since to change the Speaker's mind? Certainly the Rules Committee has not blocked or frustrated or bottled up any legislation in the 87th Congress, which has barely begun to function. So what is the shooting all about? Is it possible (we most certainly think so) that there is more than meets the eye in this unwarranted and unreasonable drive to pack the Rules Committee?

A New Frontier for the House Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night several members of the House Committee on Education and Labor had the pleasure of attending a testimonial banquet in honor of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. This tribute, held in New York, was arranged to honor him upon his becoming chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

It gives me great pleasure today to introduce into the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues here in Congress, Mr. POWELL's penetrating speech, in which he outlined some of his hopes and some of his plans for the future actions of the committee he heads and of which I have the honor of being a member. I believe Mr. POWELL's remarks can best be described as a new frontier for the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. POWELL's remarks follow:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE ADAM C. POWELL AT THE HOTEL COMMODORE, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1961, AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HIS HONOR, GIVEN BY THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE OF ONE THOUSAND, THE HONORABLE ANGIER BIDDLE DUKE, CHAIRMAN

Former President Woodrow Wilson once said, "I would rather lose in a cause that one day will win, than win in a cause that someday will lose."

For years, I have viewed with bitter frustration, our Nation standing still while other nations moved ahead. And when our voices were raised in protest, the sole answers were only the dwindling echoes. My colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor have, through the years, tried to insist on legislation that would keep America in its rightful place as a first-class nation.

Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, of West Virginia, has been urging, for years, some kind of restrictions against those cheap imports that have helped to cause us unemployment.

The gentlewoman from Oregon, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, has urged, without success, investigations of juvenile delinquency and migratory labor.

Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT has been urging that we pass some kind of permanent Fair Employment Practices Act to guarantee full employment for all American citizens.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRANK THOMPSON, has urged, for years, the establishment of intercultural exchanges with other nations.

From Pennsylvania, the voice of Congressman ELMER HOLLAND has been raised for 3 years on the problems of unemployment.

The new Congressman from Chicago, Mr. ROMAN PUCINSKI, has stated, without any response, that the administration of the National Labor Relations Board needed a thorough airing.

And I, for 5 years, have been urging that we have a crash program in the field of the sciences, so that our technicians and engineers would be available for this new space age.

All of these, plus the protests and the legislative ideas of many other colleagues in the fields of education and labor, met with no response whatsoever.

Because of massive bigotry, we, as a nation, have reaped massive mediocrity in the fields of education and labor.

Today, our land is reeling from the repercussions of this self-made miasma of the fifties—the decadent decade.

We have been humiliated, in recent months, by our going to Germany begging for financial help. The flow of gold is now a major problem. In 5 years, we have been reduced to second place in the fields of science and engineering education. Artificial unemployment is now probably our national No. 1 problem. Artificial, because it is due, to a great extent, to the bitter paradox of a rising flood of cheap imports and, on the other hand, increasing automation. Automation could be our answer to this total problem, but we have let this become almost a Frankenstein. The problems of unemployment have gone unheeded, automation has stalked unbridled, and today we are in serious trouble.

The Soviet Union has recently opened the Friendship House in Moscow, with full scholarships for the young minds of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Since 1955, I have been pleading for this in our own country.

The dropouts and the potential dropouts increase, and juvenile delinquency is on the upswing, and the U.S. Congress has sat with its hands tied because of the lack of vision on the part of those who were in positions of control in our committee.

Federal agencies have been interpreting Federal law on the side of the status quo of decadence.

The Federal Government has refused to uphold the Supreme Court decision of 1954, thus aiding the defiance of Federal law.

Today, we face the highest number of workers ever in the history of our country to receive unemployment insurance.

Our universities and colleges must spend more in the next 9 years than they have spent since the founding of this Nation or, in other words, in the past 184 years.

Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the keys to our international and diplomatic future, are wondering what kind of doubletalking, doubledealing democracy we are preaching abroad and yet refusing to practice at home. We find this type of shoddy democracy even holding sway in some of our labor unions.

I, personally, come to this moment of a new era—of a new administration—totally free to do that which I feel is best for our land. During the past years, I have personally been exposed to all types of purges, persecutions, prosecutions, and promises. I come with a record in the field of labor that is one of the best in Congress, and yet I come with my hands free, because labor has not been the force that has made me what I am today—the force has been the people.

For 31 years I have lived in the eyes of the public as one of those trying to lead the people. For 20 years I have been in politics. And now I stand at this precise moment—needing nothing, with no desires, no wants, except to serve our land to the best of my ability. I therefore take this occasion as an opportunity to state that I am determined, with the help of God and my colleagues, to do my best to get our Committee on Education and Labor back into the mainstream of human progress.

I am particularly glad that we now have in the administration, two of the most able minds in our country—Mr. Goldberg and Mr. Ribicoff—as the two men with whom I will deal in the coming years, and to whom I publicly pledge my wholehearted cooperation.

I believe in a first-class education for all Americans. I believe in teamwork by management and labor, working harmoniously for the good of the United States. And I believe that there should be no second-class category in labor.

One of the executives of General Motors once said, "What's good for General Motors is good for America." Some labor leaders have said, "What's good for labor is good for America." I reject these statements and all others. I say, "What's good for America is good for Americans."

In the first place, we shall bring out of our committee all legislation which has been approved by our committee in the past session, and we intend to do this as quickly as possible.

In the second place, we believe that the problem of unemployment must be faced now. Automation should be encouraged, migratory labor studied, and imports that damage our labor market should be curtailed. I believe that, if necessary, we should push for a 32-hour, 4-day week; that this is a time for dramatic and salutary movements for the good of our country's economy.

In the third place, labor and management should cease their buckpassing, and one man's misdeeds should no longer be allowed to give all of labor a black eye. I believe that the time has come to repeat Franklin Roosevelt's statement, "A plague on both your houses." The National Labor Relations Board should be thoroughly investigated to see that it is interpreting present labor legislation with fairness and not with the seeming injustices of recent years. A careful examination of some type of fair employment practices legislation should be made so that the cry will go all over the earth that America is practicing at home what it is preaching abroad. In this respect, the apprenticeship training program must be carefully thought through to see whether it is a program of training for democracy or for discrimination.

In the fourth place, this Nation, under God, has the greatest political idea that man has ever conceived—the idea of democracy. We intend to sell this idea through a two-way program. At home—through full scholarships for the young men and women of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—and abroad, through our new missionaries of the peace corps, properly briefed and trained in those places that can serve as bridges: a bridge to Latin America, namely, Puerto Rico; a bridge to Asia, namely, Hawaii; a bridge to Africa, namely, the British West Indies. We believe that the program of science education in Soviet Russia must be studied objectively by our committee and consultants to see if the Soviets do have anything that we do not have, and if so, what can we do to match their accomplishments. We shall encourage our youths, however, so that we shall use that which the Communists will never be able to have—freedom of the human mind.

In the fifth place, I believe that special attention should be paid to the South. I do not believe that the South is doing what it should in the field of education. School Management magazine reports that the best efforts now being made in the United States school districts are being made in New England, and the worst efforts are being made on the prosperous west coast, with the South running very close to the bottom. Therefore, this aspect of the problem should be studied.

We should also study, very carefully, the fact that the South needs more funds, especially in the field of higher education; and yet, at the same time, according to President Eisenhower's Civil Rights Commission report on January 15, the South is still a place that refuses to use even Federal funds for equal education for Negroes and whites. Federal funds now cover about 15 percent of all State budgets for higher education in the Deep South. These include grants for scientific research, loans for college housing construction, funds for agricultural research and extension activities.

I agree with the dean of the University of North Carolina Graduate School who, in Biloxi, Miss., on January 19, said that the South needs money badly for higher education; but I also agree with the Civil Rights Commission's report on almost the same day, which stated, "No Federal funds should be granted for higher education in those institutions that discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion or national origin."

It is highly significant that President Eisenhower's Civil Rights Commission has come to this conclusion now. For 5 years I have been fighting, through the Powell amendment, to see that such funds should be denied, and the Eisenhower administration has consistently refused to agree with my point of view. Now that they're finished—now that it's all over—the President's personal Commission agrees with the Powell amendment. More important than that, and more interesting, is the fact that the former Attorney General of the United States, William Rogers, on January 17, endorsed the Powell amendment by saying that he believes that Federal funds should be withheld from those colleges that discriminate against Negroes. I cannot help but point out, however, that all during the years of Mr. Rogers' administration, he refused to make such a statement and refused to answer affirmatively, inquiries and correspondence from me to the executive branch of Government. I believe that the Powell amendment must, in this Congress, be enacted, either through legislation by the Congress or by Executive order of the White House, because the time is long overdue when the law of the land, the Supreme Court decision, should be undergirded by the executive and the legislative branches.

When I see what God has done in the past, I have no worries about the future—and what God will do.

Four Men of God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 18, 1961, the four chaplains were posthumously awarded Medals of Honor at a memorial ceremony at Fort Myer. Thus culminated many years of effort by myself and other Members of Congress, to pay tribute to four of the greatest men in American history.

These four men of God who died in the sinking of the troopship *Dorchester* in the North Atlantic in 1943 have already become an American legend. America will never forget the stirring story of their selfless sacrifice in the name of God, fellow man and country. Nor will we

forget their poignant demonstration of true brotherhood as Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, they clasped hands in prayer and went down with the ship to the depths of the sea together.

It is a source of immense personal gratification to me that the tribute for which we worked so long has now at last been paid. The medals of honor, however, constitute not repayment, but only a reminder of the debt which we owe and shall always continue to owe to these four American heroes.

The Tax Equalization Act of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1961

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to eliminate from the Internal Revenue Code the income tax advantages now accorded to cooperative corporations and to require these cooperative corporations to pay Federal income tax on all earnings before distribution, on the same basis and at the same rates as proprietary corporations. The act may be cited as the "Tax Equalization Act of 1961."

I have read in the past few days, Mr. Speaker, that a new administration will play no favorites in the taxation of income; that the President and his economic advisers believe that income is income, regardless of where it comes from and who receives it.

I hope that is a fact. Cooperatives certainly have income and just as certainly they have enjoyed highly favored treatment in the matter of taxation for nearly half a century while most other businesses have been burdened with increasingly heavy taxes.

For several years I have urged that all corporations, cooperative and otherwise, be taxed on the basis of absolute equality—not only to alleviate the unfair hardship that is now imposed upon taxpaying businesses, but also to bring into the Treasury a very considerable amount of brand new revenue. It appears that a good many converts have been made to my idea since I first introduced a bill along this line some 15 years ago; in fact, almost everybody, except the cooperatives themselves, now seems to be in favor of doing something to remedy the situation.

Two years ago the Treasury Department, after a good deal of study and soul searching, produced a bill proposing that a measure of taxation should be levied against co-op patronage dividends. It was a small step in the right direction; that was about all.

Thereafter, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], held a long series of panel discussions covering many phases of taxation, the cooperative situation among them. And in February of last year, the full committee devoted 5 full days to hearings on the subject. Fifty witnesses testified during these hearings.

For the Treasury Department, Mr. Jay W. Glasmann, Assistant to the Secretary, said:

> The Treasury Department believes that the full deduction now allowed to cooperatives for all forms of noncash patronage refunds affords them an unwarranted tax advantage over many competing businesses.

For the Department of Commerce, Mr. Carl F. Oechsle, Assistant Secretary, said:

> We believe that cooperatives produce economic income and that that income should be taxed when created or recognized.

Mr. Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, said:

> The exemption (of cooperatives) deprives the Treasury of some hundreds of million of dollars of needed revenue, and gives one form of business organization a wholly unfair competitive advantage over other forms of business organization. In the interests of greater equality of taxation in this country, the exemption from the income tax of the income of cooperatives should be abolished.

William C. Warren, dean of the Columbia University Law School, said:

> It is essential that the situation with respect to cooperatives be acted upon immediately. Delay in this matter will cause irreparable harm to many business corporations now competing with cooperatives; it will also result in substantial revenue loss. It is urged that this committee * * * take immediate action toward remedying the situation.

Samuel J. Lanahan, editor of the Tax Executives Journal, said:

> Taxation of these (cooperative) earnings is fully justified, since it is evident that such a return is as much a dividend as in the case of any other joint stock enterprise under centralized management.

H. L. Thompson, Jr., chairman of the committee on equal taxation of the National Wholesale Hardware Association, said:

> The present inequities of tax laws between the two segments of our industry, namely, the full-taxpaying distributors and their co-op competitors, has created a kind of Gresham's tax law—the corporations that don't pay taxes drive out of business the companies that do.

Otis H. Ellis, general counsel of the National Oil Jobbers Council, said:

> If the Congress intends to do anything about tax loopholes, the field of cooperative taxation affords plenty of opportunity for equitable action. The plugging of a loophole, however, was never accomplished merely by making a slight decrease in the diameter of the hole.

Harold F. Garner, president of Local 644 of the International Chemical Workers' Union, AFL–CIO, said:

> We feel that the Government is making our jobs less secure with this tax law discrimination, and don't think this is the spirit of fairplay or free enterprise.

There were many other statements in a similar vein. The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Charles B. Shuman, said:

> We believe that no one should be expected to pay a tax with respect to something which is without value. It is the purport and intent of our position to cause the written instruments issued by cooperative associations reflecting net savings and income not paid in cash to have taxable value if they are to be deducted by the cooperative.

I offer you these statements, Mr. Speaker, to refresh your mind and the minds of my colleagues. There is a serious demand on the part of businessmen, tax experts, and many Government officials that the time has come when cooperative corporations must finally be looked upon as moneymaking organizations of big business—and that they must be taxed on that basis and no other.

In the budget which President Eisenhower sent to the Congress only 2 weeks ago, he said, as he has said before:

> It is again recommended that the Congress promptly consider amending the laws on the taxation of cooperatives to provide for more equitable taxation.

And President Kennedy in a letter written during the campaign said unequivocally:

> I am certainly opposed to unfair inequalities in our tax system. Although generally I am in favor of cooperatives for the legitimate and constructive role which they play in our economy, there is undoubtedly room for a reexamination of the tax status which many of them enjoy. I have pledged myself to a general reexamination of our existing tax structure.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one proper way to tax cooperatives. That is to tax them on all earnings before distribution in exactly the same way that all other corporations are now taxed. In 1951, an effort was made to impose tax on patronage dividends after their receipt by individual members. The courts threw it out when they found that the individual members were expected to pay income tax on paper—perhaps utterly worthless paper—which they had received in lieu of cash. I have no doubt that a similar attempt will be made when the matter of cooperative corporation taxation again comes to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means at this session—and I give fair warning that I shall fight such a proposal with all my strength. If a sufficient number of the members of the committee will join with me in such a fight, I know we shall have the economic and political backing of the entire taxpaying business community.

It is not enough to say that "either the cooperative corporation or the cooperative member shall be taxed." The proprietary, joint-stock corporation is taxed first on all of its earnings and the recipients of its dividends are then taxed on their receipts. This is double taxation. I grant that it is an inequity, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if General Motors and United States Steel and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and their stockholders are so taxed, then there is no reason why the great Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association and the Consumers Cooperative Association and the big southern cooperatives should not be taxed in exactly the same way. They too are corporations; they too make great sums of money—and to let them escape payment of income tax is to close

our eyes to a loophole that is bigger than a barn door.

Already it begins to be evident, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasury will need a great deal of money in the next 4 years. I offer you a place to get several hundred millions—without adding to the national debt and without starting the printing presses.

Let me close, if you please, with a few statistics: gross business volume of all farm cooperatives amounted to $14 billion in 1957–58, according to the most recent tabulation of the Department of Agriculture's Farmer Cooperative Service. Farm products marketed by cooperatives accounted for $10.5 billion. Farm supplies sold to co-op members amounted to almost $3.3 billion. Receipts from service operations, such as trucking, cotton ginning, locker plant operation, accounted for the balance.

Although cooperatives claim that they are small business, another survey by the Farmer Cooperative Service shows that nearly 40 percent of them conduct annual business in excess of $500,000 and nearly 10 percent exceed $1 million. The report shows further than 83 marketing co-ops and 18 farm supply co-ops boast annual business volume of more than $20 million.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are hunting for new sources of revenue to protect our country, both at home and abroad, this highly important source of new tax money cannot and must not be ignored. I urge action on my new bill before the summer recess.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we turn unfilled to Thee, grant to our anxious, groping hearts the assurance that behind the shadows and in them standeth One who slumbers not nor sleeps.

With our human limitations we are beset by perplexities. Our needs are many as we turn from problem to problem; but our greatest need is of Thee. Unless we find Thee and are found of Thee, the laws of Thy physical universe will break our mortal life and the laws of Thy moral realm will make mockery of our futile rebellions.

Only in Thy will is our peace. And so, Eternal Father, whose mercy is like the wideness of the sea, breathe anew on hearts that pray for the peace that comes only when our jarring discords are tuned to the music of Thy will. Then, as radiant heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts around the whole, wide world, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of sacrificial service. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 30, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1961.*

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ecuador;

W. Wendell Blancke, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Congo, and to serve concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Chad, the Central African Republic, and the Gabon Republic;

Joseph Palmer 2d, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Nigeria;

R. Borden Reams, of Nevada, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Ivory Coast, and to serve concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Dahomey, and the Republic of Niger;

Francis H. Russell, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Ghana;

Henry S. Villard, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania;

Thomas K. Wright, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Mali;

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large;

Abram Chayes, of Massachusetts, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State;

Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund;

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; and

Byron E. Blankinship, of Oregon, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the executive calendar will be stated.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD C. MANGRUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am sure all the marines are very much pleased with all the Marine Corps nominations on the Executive Calendar, and particularly with that of Richard C. Mangrum to be major general of the Marine Corps. General Mangrum had one of the outstanding records in World War II, for which he received the Distinguished Flying Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster. His record certainly entitled him to every consideration, which I am sure he is receiving. He will be a great credit, as he has been in the past, to the defenses of our country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations in the Marine Corps en bloc?

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES R. RODERICK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about Brig. Gen. Charles R. Roderick, whose nomination came up during the congressional recess, and for that reason action by the Senate on it was delayed. I am delighted to see his nomination on the list today. I note that he will serve as deputy assistant for legislative affairs to the Secretary of Defense, in a liaison capacity.

I think very highly of General Roderick; and I am delighted, indeed, that we shall have the benefit of his service and also his advice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished minority leader in what he has stated just now.

It is a matter of great personal satisfaction that I note, among the nominations submitted to the Senate for confirmation, the name of Brig. Gen. Charles R. Roderick, U.S. Air Force. General Roderick received an interim appointment as brigadier general, and his name is among those being submitted for confirmation in that grade. General Roderick is serving, as other Members of the Senate are aware, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In the interim between the retirement of the former assistant to the Secretary of Defense for legislative affairs, Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, and the recent appointment of Mr. Norman Paul to that position, General Roderick was acting assistant to the Secretary of Defense for legislative affairs.

Since I first came to know General Roderick personally, I have been continually impressed by his rare abilities, sincerity, honesty, and his deep understanding of legislative-executive relationships. I am happy to have the information that General Roderick will continue to serve in the Office of Secretary of Defense, as deputy assistant to the Secretary for legislative affairs. I know I express the feelings of other Members of the Senate in extending warmest congratulations to General Roderick for his well-deserved promotion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations in the Air Force en bloc?

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Army will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS, THE NAVY, AND THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the Air Force which had been received by the Senate on January 17 and January 10, 1961, and had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN CORDAGE FIBERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 17,500,000 pounds of cordage fibers now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM

A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports, and financial statements on the District of Columbia National Guard Armory and the District of Columbia Stadium, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN UNITS OF FORT BELKNAP INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to the landowners within the project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

USE OF FUNDS ARISING FROM A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE NEZ PERCE TRIBE OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROGRESS REPORT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a progress report of that Commission, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, what is known as the lower Teton project, situated in the county of Fremont, State of Idaho, and included in the recent comprehensive study of the Snake River by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers is highly essential to the uninterrupted growth and stability of Idaho agriculture; the economic benefits thereby accumulating to this

great State particularly and the United States generally being many times greater than the cost of this project; and

"Whereas the waters of the Teton River constitute a significant portion of the irrigation supplies available to eastern Idaho and, indeed, all of the Snake River area and are, therefore an important part of the water resource which is the foundation of our economic and industrial strength; and

"Whereas if the irrigated farms of Idaho are to be maintained as secure units and survive in this technological age of specialized agriculture and its associated high operating costs, it is imperative that our present storage reservoirs be supplemented with new facilities to store the high water near its source, thereby further eliminating the danger of drought and its attendant hardships in all of the irrigated areas of the Snake River; and

"Whereas each succeeding board of county commissioners has, since the creation of Madison and Fremont Counties, been confronted with the serious annual problem of the wild, ravaging Teton River, all of which conditions would be eliminated through the construction of said project; and

"Whereas even in years of mild snowfall in the watershed, the Teton River can be depended upon to provide at least several weeks of round-the-clock effort to protect private and public property from the floodwater of the Teton. Madison County maintains 11 bridges across the Teton, 2 with steel spans, 3 reinforced concrete, and 6 lumber bridges. Many times, serious damage to these structures has resulted from the uncontrollable destructive force of the flooding Teton. The bridges blocked by ice jams and the normal debris of high water become dams—forcing the floodwaters out onto surrounding farming lands destroying its productive capacity for 1, 2 or 3 years. The Idaho State Highway Department maintains four bridges across the Teton within the boundaries of Fremont and Madison Counties and the Union Pacific Railroad System has three. Each of these bridges has, in the past, been the source of serious trouble and great maintenance expense because of the uncontrolled flooding Teton; and

"Whereas each year, almost without exception, many square miles south and west of Teton City lie under water as a result of the Teton flooding, and frequently private homes and storage facilities are jeopardized. Because of the slow and meandering course of the Teton it is impossible to predict where it will strike next; and

"Whereas Eastern Idaho counties maintain hundreds of miles of oil road—not including State or Federal highways—the foundations become spongelike under the saturation of floodwaters so that even light loads break the mat into thousands of pieces making complete resurfacing necessary; and

"Whereas the benefits of flood control, irrigation, and associated economic expansion has justified consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Army Engineers and our recommendation for construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir without delay: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to and construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir with the least possible delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Army Engineers and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION BY THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

"Whereas the mighty U.S.S. *Missouri* is now stationed at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash.; and

"Whereas the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has excellent berthing facilities; and

"Whereas the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard is within a highly populated area and is served by excellent ferry, highway, and other transportation facilities; and

"Whereas the mighty battleship U.S.S. *Missouri* is highly attractive to tourists because of its glorious history in battle and as the place of the surrender terminating the Second World War; and

"Whereas the holding of the Century 21 Exposition in Seattle, Wash. in the near future will attract millions of tourists to the Pacific Northwest, thousands of whom will be eager to view this historic battleship: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the U.S.S. *Missouri* continue to be berthed at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash.; and that it be further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of Washington in Congress.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

"We, the members of the Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your Excellency as follows:

"Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, pursuant to resolutions adopted January 4, 1960, by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate and June 9, 1960, by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, the District Engineer has been directed to review the reports of the Chief of Engineers on Snohomish River and Tributaries, transmitted to the Congress on December 23, 1955; and

"Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has scheduled a hearing at Snohomish, Wash., January 25, 1961, with a view to determining whether any modification of the recommendations contained therein is desirable at the present with respect to provision of flood control improvements in the watershed; and this watershed is considered to include the Snohomish, Snoqualmie, Skykomish Rivers, and all their tributaries; and

"Whereas said review has been made more necessary due to disastrous floods of November and December, 1959, and in previous years which caused damages in the millions of dollars; and

"Whereas a similar disastrous flood seems imminent at this moment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the Senate of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully petition the President of the United States and the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to act favorably on said review and for Congress to enact and approve at the earliest moment legislation and appropriations to provide necessary flood control improvements on the Snohomish River and tributaries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, The President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Chief of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Washington.

"WARD BOWDEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas; ordered to lie on the table:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 25

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the State of Texas wishes to pay tribute to a magnificent Texan who brings international recognition to this beloved State on January 20, 1961, when he is inaugurated as Vice President of these United States, the Honorable Senator LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON; and

"Whereas this distinguished son of Texas, born in Stonewall on August 27, 1908, began his illustrious career with the greatest of all assets, the desire for knowledge and the willingness to earn it. His achievements correspond to this philosophy with which he relates to his fellow man. His willingness to give something in return for the knowledge desired has resulted in his tremendous usefulness to the world and has compelled the world to reward him in terms of his own choice; and

"Whereas after he graduated from the Blanco public schools and the Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos, Tex., and after he served the young people as a schoolteacher in Houston, he served in the 75th and 76th Congress and then as a U.S. Senator from 1949 until this historic date when he becomes Vice President; and

"Whereas Senator JOHNSON was named chairman of a very important Special Senate Space and Astronautics Committee whose purpose was to review and make recommendations on the internationally important space program; and

"Whereas LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON has given to his country all of his heart and soul. His success in this personal goal began with a definiteness of purpose. His great understanding and respect for the fundamentals of Americanism have been the forces that have given him the opportunity for success; and

"Whereas as a Congressman and as minority and majority leader of the Senate, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON has fought for the American form of government which was originally written into the Constitution of the United States and which provides the fullest measure of the right to individual liberty, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of worship; and

"Whereas LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON'S giant efforts in the Senate have insured above all the freedom of individual initiative that gives every citizen the privilege of choosing his own occupation and setting his own price upon his knowledge, skill, and experience. No other man and no other country offer the people such an abundant choice of opportunities for marketing of their services; and

"Whereas, this Texan, whose home is Johnson City in the beautiful hill country of the Lone Star State, is a pillar of Americanism in his national spirit of love for liberty and his demand for the privilege of self-determination, as expressed by our pioneers in industry and Government. His national love of freedom of speech, thought, and action is a distinguishing feature of his great leadership; and

"Whereas this great statesman's national sense of justice inspires him to fight for the protection of the weak as well as of the strong, and has never tolerated territorial annexation by conquest without adequate compensation; and

"Whereas LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON's fight for these rights proves his belief that it is the duty of every loyal American to defend all these fundamentals of freedom in Americanism against all who endeavor to weaken or destroy this country. He seeks to protect the strong as well as the weak in his efforts to insure that free speech does not carry a license to libel respectable men for their success, because he feels that since the beginning of civilization wealth has found its way into the hands of men who think accurately, men with definiteness of purpose, men with keenness of imagination and the initiative to translate imagination into useful service. It is this Lyndon Baines Johnson philosophy that asserts that the very best method of distributing wealth is that of distributing the principles of achievement by which wealth is procured; and

"Whereas the Honorable President-elect, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, chose Vice President-elect LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, recognizing that the greatest natural resource of this country is neither the money in the banks, nor the minerals in the ground, nor the trees in the forest, nor the richness of the soil, but that it is the mental attitude, the imagination, and the pioneering spirit of the men who have mixed experience and education with these raw materials that have transferred them into various types of useful service for the people of our own country and for the people of other nations; and

"Whereas the great secret of LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON'S happiness and success is that he reflects the truth that the wealth of the Nation is not in any material, tangible thing, but that it is in the intangible power of thought as expressed by our leaders who understand and apply vision, wider horizons, greater ambitions and initiative; and

"Whereas the wise selection of this native son of Texas as the vice-presidential nominee for the Democratic Party provided the strength needed to bring together the different factional groups in our country which was necessary for a victory for the Democratic Party; and

"Whereas Senator JOHNSON followed in the footsteps of two other illustrious Texans, the Honorable John Nance Garner, of Uvalde, affectionately known to his many friends as 'Cactus Jack,' and the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, known to all of us who love and respect him as 'Mr. Sam' and 'Mr. Democrat'; and

"Whereas as the eldest son of Samuel Ealy and Rebekah Baines Johnson, central Texas pioneers, and as lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, on active duty in 1941–42, this Democrat and former State director of the National Youth Administration of Texas has upheld his own definition of success: that it is the power to acquire whatever a man demands of life without violating the rights of others; and

"Whereas he has worked for harmony and understanding and sympathetic cooperation between leaders of industry and the officials of our Government in such a way that every citizen will benefit, directly or indirectly. His tolerance on all subjects and his strict discipline over personal emotions have given this country a dynamic leadership: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of Texas expresses its unending appreciation to the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, Vice-President-elect, and favorite son of this State, for his Texas traits of definiteness of purpose, promptness of decision, thorough knowledge of his occupation, and for that internationally known obsessional desire to render useful service; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Vice-President-elect LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON and to our most honorable President-elect John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in humble esteem of their election to the highest offices in the most democratic country in this universe, and with our most sincere good wishes for an administration that will serve not only this glorious country but all of the people of the world who must have freedom to survive.

"JAMES A. TURMAN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"DOROTHY HALLMAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

The petition of Geza Korda, of New York, N.Y., relation to neonazism and international bolshevism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Livestock Association at its last annual meeting, which was held in Wichita about a year ago, adopted a resolution in regard to watershed development.

Kansas has an outstanding program for the control of water runoff and the preservation of our soil.

The Kansas Livestock Association has an outstanding membership, composed of ranchers, farmers, and livestock men generally. No group in our State is more interested in, or actively engaged in the promotion of watershed control than this association.

I think I should mention that Kansas, through soil conservation districts, has pending at the present time 46 applications for assistance under Public Law 566, and 13 applications covering well over 1 million acres awaiting priority assignment.

The future growth and development of our State will be determined largely by the amount of water we can conserve for beneficial use. Everyone must agree that our No. 1 problem is to keep water back where it falls.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION—WATERSHED

I

We feel that the upstream water program deserves much more consideration than it is now receiving. It is in these vast upper reaches of the river basins that a great majority of our agriculture, and particularly livestock, is produced: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association urge Congress to appropriate funds for upstream works of improvement; namely, SCS technical assistance, ACP assistance, watershed planning and construction funds, and the Great Plains program; and that these funds be proportioned according to the flood damages incurred and the water needs of the areas involved.

II

Whereas on some of our small watersheds, conflicting programs are proposed: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association recommend the upstream program initiated by local people be given priority. If, at a later date a downstream reservoir becomes necessary either for flood control or water storage, the site will still be available protected from siltation.

III

Whereas large flood control structures have been authorized for many years, and no further action taken, thereby preventing other water programs from being initiated: Be it therefore

Resolved, That authorization be revoked if project construction funds have not been appropriated within 10 years.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 709. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 710. A bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 711. A bill to amend section 9(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the requirement of good health with respect to unmarried employees or Members electing to provide survivor annuities to their dependents; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 712. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 713. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Stassinopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 714. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON):

S. 715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit amortization over a 60-month period of facilities to produce new industrial products derived from certain agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 716. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the district courts for the southern and eastern districts of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 717. A bill to authorize civil actions for the review of administrative determinations as to the use of lands of the United States

for grazing purposes to be instituted in judicial districts in which such lands are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 718. A bill to establish a U.S. Passport Service within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 719. A bill to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act, authorizing grants for construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities, providing for Federal guarantee of loans for construction of group practice medical or dental care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of stimulating economic growth and activity, providing additional jobs for the growing labor force, and permitting the replacement of obsolete and inefficient machinery and equipment by the allowance of reinvestment depreciation deductions; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. CANNON):

S. 721. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 722. A bill for the relief of Aideh Kobler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. FONG, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 723. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in financing a minimum foundation program of public elementary and secondary school education, in order to more nearly equalize educational opportunities, improve teachers' salaries, construct schools, and otherwise improve the quality of such education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 724. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to Purvis C. Vickers, Robert I. Vickers, and Joseph M. Vickers, a copartnership doing business as Vickers Bros.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 725. A bill for the relief of Barbara W. Trousil and her sons Edward G. Trousil and Robert E. Trousil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 726. A bill to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 727. A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to State and local law enforcement officers who are killed or injured while, or as a direct result of, enforcing any Federal law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 728. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Ruisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 729. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the allocation of defense contracts to areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 730. A bill for the relief of Kim Fang Chin;

S. 731. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Tjaden; and

S. 732. A bill for the relief of Yick Yuen Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 733. A bill to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 906); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 734. A bill to repeal section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the commodities clause; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 735. A bill to prescribe the oath of office of justices and judges of the United States; and

S. 736. A bill to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. THURMOND when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 737. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

S. 738. A bill to amend section 202(8) of the Classification Act of 1949 so as to exclude pilots from such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 739. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to the method of computing interest earnings of special treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund, to provide for permanent indefinite appropriation to said fund, and for other purposes; and

S. 740. A bill to provide for allotment and advancement of pay with respect to civilian employees of the United States in cases of emergency evacuations in oversea areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 741. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 742. A bill to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local historical significance which are threatened with destruction by federally financed programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 743. A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 744. A bill to establish a National Portrait Gallery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 745. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week commencing July 9, 1961, as National Environmental Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted a resolution (S. Res. 79) establishing the Select Committee on Civil Defense, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF SENATE GREETINGS AND FELICITATIONS TO THE U.S.O.

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 80); which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the United Service Organizations are dedicated to serving the religious, spiritual, social, welfare, recreational, and educational needs of members of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas the United Service Organizations have provided an invaluable contribution to the welfare of the men and women of our Armed Forces throughout the world; and

Whereas February 4, 1961, marks the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Service Organizations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends to the United Service Organizations its greetings and felicitations together with its

highest commendations for the invaluable contributions which such Organizations have made to the welfare of our men and women in the Armed Forces throughout the world.

PUNISHMENT FOR USE OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN FURTHERANCE OF ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, more decisive Federal action against organized crime is urgent. In my opinion, it is time to mobilize the full power of the Federal Government against interstate crime syndicates which are milking the public of billions of dollars each year.

The number of crimes committed in the United States is increasing at an annual rate which is four times greater than our population increase. The annual cost of fighting crime to the American taxpayer is estimated by J. Edgar Hoover, the outstanding Director of the FBI, at over $22 billion, nearly one-third the cost of running the entire Federal Government for a year. The situation is reaching perilous proportions. Public impatience with ineffective, piecemeal efforts is fully justified. Life magazine concluded an editorial on this subject recently with the question, "Just who's running this country anyway?" The implications of that question are frightening. The awesome power of the underworld is a threat to the safety of every citizen and imperils our national welfare. I will not mince words on this subject. Crime is at war with America. It is true that America declared war on crime.

Twentieth century criminal operations will never be successfully combated with the antiquated weapons of another day. The Federal Government has shirked its responsibilities in this fight against the forces of the underworld. We have been frightened off by slogans which have been used to shape a timid and reluctant approach to the exercise of the Federal Government's powers and responsibilities. It is time to modernize our anticrime machinery.

I have for many years advocated legislation which would make it a Federal offense to use the facilities of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the States. This legislation has been opposed by some well-meaning people who believe it represents too great an enlargement of Federal jurisdiction. In my opinion, however, this opposition is mistaken.

The Federal Government has not been so hesitant in dealing with any national problem as in dealing with the problem of organized crime. It has told farmers how much corn they can grow for consumption on their own farms. It has left no segment of national transportation and communications unregulated. It has required the most detailed reports and outlined specific practices in connection with labor unions. While many questions are raised about the particular policies in effect at various times, hardly anyone any longer questions the fact that the Federal Government has a role to play in all of these areas.

Only interstate crime has managed to avoid a comparable Federal program. The number of FBI agents is less than one-fourth the number of policemen in New York City alone. I am as concerned about the dangers of a national police force as anyone, but it is apparent that we can still go a long way before giving any substance to this specter. And I am as concerned about States rights as anyone, but in the field of interstate crime, as in other interstate activities, it is apparent that there is at least joint Federal-State responsibility.

Since I first presented my interstate crime bill in 1954, in the other body, more and more people have become convinced of the need for some such Federal action. I recognize that measures such as this need widespread public support for acceptance—but I sense an accelerated development of such support in recent years. A National Crime Commission, which I also favor, would be an important step in mobilizing the law enforcement resources of the Nation against crime. But I believe that it would merely be a prelude to the full exercise of the Federal Government's responsibility to fight this menace. The interstate crime bill would still be needed to remove the shackles from Federal law enforcement and permit a long overdue, full-scale Federal-State drive against interstate crime.

Indeed, even the interstate crime bill is only one of a number of measures which I believe are vital to a full-scale counteroffensive against organized crime. In my opinion, a 10-point program is required to give the Federal Government the tools it needs to fight the criminal syndicates threatening our security. A summary of this program follows:

First. A comprehensive measure to make it a Federal offense to use the facilities of interstate commerce to commit specified State offenses.

Second. A bill to permit State and Federal law enforcement officials to use electronic and other modern investigative devices under court supervision and to prohibit such activities by blackmailers and other unscrupulous persons.

Third. A bill to broaden the coverage of the perjury laws.

Fourth. A bill to allow the United States to appeal from lower court decisions sustaining motions to suppress the use of evidence.

Fifth. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices.

Sixth. Bills to make our narcotic laws and treatment facilities more effective.

Seventh. A bill to broaden the provisions of the present immunity statute.

Eighth. A bill to broaden the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act to include all felonies or offenses punishable by more than a year in prison.

Ninth. A group of three bills to curb the transmittal of gambling information, paraphernalia, and devices.

Tenth. A bill to prohibit tax deductions for expenses incurred in connection with the conduct of illegal activities, such as gambling.

The portions of the program relating to the Fugitive Felon Act, gambling, and tax deductions were recommended by Attorney General Rogers, and have already been introduced as legislation. I have introduced very similar legislation in previous Congresses and I have cosponsored these bills.

I am today introducing the interstate crime bill and the other bills in my program will be ready for introduction at an early date. I hope all these proposals will receive the prompt attention of the Congress.

I have already called this legislation to the attention of Attorney General Kennedy, and in the near future I intend to discuss this interstate crime bill and other anticrime proposals more fully with the Attorney General. From discussions I have already had with him, it is apparent that he is aware of the perilous threat to our national welfare posed by the crime syndicates. It would be my purpose in meeting with the Attorney General to enlist the full support of the Department of Justice in my efforts to obtain long overdue congressional action against the barons of the underworld.

Let us remember Apalachin and make certain that no such law enforcement fiasco is ever repeated. The professional hoodlums have been sneering and thumbing their noses at America for too long. It is time to oil the wheels of justice to make it possible for the machinery of the law to function effectively against the invisible government of the underworld.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States. I ask unanimous consent that a brief analysis of the bill and its text be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 710) to punish the use of interstate commerce in furtherance of conspiracies to commit organized crime offenses against any of the several States, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the analysis of chapter 19 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after item 372 the following new items:

"373. Conspiracy to commit organized crime offense against any of the several States.

"374. Conspiracies resulting in murder, maiming, or great bodily harm."

SEC. 2. Title 18, United States Code, is further amended by inserting immediately after section 372 of such title the following new sections:

"§ 373. Conspiracy to commit organized crime offense against any of the several States.

"If two or more persons conspire to commit any organized crime offense against any of the several States, and one or more of such persons, to effect the object of the conspiracy, delivers for shipment or transports

in interstate commerce any article, or deposits in the mail or sends or delivers by mail any letter, package, postal card, or circular, or transmits or causes to be transmitted in interstate commerce any message or communication by wire or radio, or receives any article, letter, package, postal card, circular, message, or communication after such shipment, transportation, sending, delivery, or transmission, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is punishable by a lesser maximum fine or imprisonment than provided in this section, the maximum punishments for such conspiracy shall not exceed such lesser maximums.

"As used in this section, the term 'organized crime offense' means any offense proscribed by the laws of or the common law as recognized in any State relating to gambling, narcotics, extortion, intoxicating liquor, prostitution, criminal fraud, or false pretenses, or murder, maiming, or assault with intent to inflict great bodily harm, and punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary or by death.

"§ 374. Conspiracies resulting in murder, maiming, or great bodily harm

"If as a result of any conspiracy violating section 371, 372, or 373 of this chapter, any person is murdered, maimed, or subjected to great bodily harm, each conspirator shall, in lieu of any other penalty or limitation, be punished as herein prescribed: (1) by death if any person is murdered and if the verdict of the jury shall so recommend; (2) by imprisonment for any term of years or for life if any person is murdered and if the death penalty is not imposed; or (3) by imprisonment for not more than ten years if any person is maimed or subjected to great bodily harm."

The analysis presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

S. 710 would amend chapter 19 of title 18, United States Code by adding two new sections to that chapter, namely section 373 and section 374. Section 373 provides that a conspiracy by two or more persons which makes use of interstate commerce to commit any organized crime offense against any of the several States is a crime and punishable by up to 5 years in jail and a fine of not more than $10,000, or both. "Organized crime offense" is defined as any offense recognized by State law relating to gambling, narcotics, extortion, intoxicating liquor, prostitution, criminal fraud, and other crimes.

Section 374 provides that if any person is maimed, murdered, or subjected to great bodily harm as a result of any conspiracy violating section 371, 372, or 373 of chapter 19, each conspirator shall be punished according to the provisions of section 374 in lieu of other penalty prescribed by law.

ELIMINATION OF INEQUITY IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the requirement of good health with respect to unmarried employees or Members electing to provide survivor annuities to their dependents.

Under present law, a married person is not required to pass a medical examination in order to name a survivor as the beneficiary of his civil service annuity. But an unmarried person must be found by the Commission to be in good health in order to exercise that privilege. My proposal would eliminate the requirement of good health for unmarried civil servants with surviving dependents in line with the standards for married civil service employees.

This inequity in law was first brought to my attention by a post office clerk with 44 years Government service. He complained that, because of a heart attack and his unmarried status, he was prevented from naming his dependent sister as his annuitant. Occasionally such situations exist in which elderly dependent parents, as well as other surviving close relatives, are left without means of support upon the death of an unmarried worker. This is a grave injustice.

In a nation founded on the principle of universal equality, we cannot allow one standard for marrieds and another for unmarrieds in such instances. I feel it is high time we put an end to this discrimination against the honorable states of spinsterhood and bachelorhood by allowing these civil servants an opportunity to provide for dependents surviving them. Enactment of this proposed legislation is at least a step in the right direction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 711) to amend section 9(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the requirement of good health with respect to unmarried employees or Members electing to provide survivor annuities to their dependents, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COINAGE AND SALE OF DUPLICATES IN BRONZE OF GOLD MEDAL PRESENTED TO ROBERT FROST

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last year I introduced the bill (S. 3439), authorizing the President to present a medal to Robert Frost in recognition of his poetry. This bill became Public Law 86–747, and presently the Bureau of the Mint is engaged in designing the actual medal for Mr. Frost. I have been informed, however, that an additional authorization is needed to allow bronze duplicates of the medal to be struck for public sale. This would require no further appropriation, since the project would pay for itself. I therefore file a bill for appropriate reference which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of the medal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 712) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INCREASED USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, earlier this year I introduced a bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes and to promote new crops. The legislation I introduced has become S. 173, and now lies in the Senate Agricultural and Forestry Committee.

The general purpose of this legislation was outlined in a lengthy statement I presented to the Senate on January 5, and which I have stated in two previous Congresses. Generally speaking, the legislation is designed to carry out the recommendations of the Welsh Commission, more commonly referred to as the President's Bipartisan Commission on New Crops and New Industrial Uses for Agricultural Products.

At this time I shall not go into all the details behind this legislation, inasmuch as it was fully explained in my remarks on January 5, 1961, and which can be found on pages 194 and 195 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

The reason for introducing this second piece of proposed legislation on the same subject is to broaden the scope of the legislation and to meet the suggestions and objections of various natures which have in past years prevented this legislation from being enacted.

While the Senate has consistently endorsed this legislation overwhelmingly, there have been problems to arise when the legislation came up in the House. Following conferences with several distinguished Members of the Senate and the House, it has become apparent that this second bill, which I, along with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], now introduce, is the more likely answer to the realization of new crops and new industrial uses for agricultural products.

I feel that this proposed legislation will satisfactorily bring about a concerted and concentrated effort in the field of agricultural research, which will be of tremendous benefit, primarily to the farmers of our Nation, as well as to the industrial progress of the country.

I send to the desk a bill which I introduce at this time, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] joins me in the introduction of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 714) to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am today joining with the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] in introducing a bill to carry out the recommendations of the Welsh Commission.

This was the Commission appointed pursuant to an act of Congress to recommend a program of new industrial uses for agricultural products.

The productive efficiency in American agriculture is such that its capacity to produce far exceeds the need for food and feasible exports. Curtailment of production has not proved a satisfactory answer. The answer is new uses for

these blessings which we refer to as agricultural surpluses.

The coal, the oil, and the minerals that are mined from the earth are but a soil bank of a long time ago. From the surface of the earth, we can produce those things which supply all of man's wants. In the foreseeable future, we can supply from agriculture a great portion of man's needs. The Welsh Commission has so recommended.

On two occasions, the Senate of the United States has passed legislation to implement the Commission's report. These two bills have not become law. The bill being introduced today is designed to overcome many of the problems raised and, at the same time, make it possible to set up an effective program to cope with America's No. 1 domestic problem—the farm problem.

The Commission recommended a single Administrator, more or less independent of the Secretary of Agriculture, to start immediately a program of research, trial commercialization, and pilot testing, to the end that our surplus crops can be used in industry. As an alternative, the Commission suggested a board or an administrator under the Secretary of Agriculture, but having certain independent powers. It is not my purpose to argue the virtue of the Commission's recommendation on these two points.

I believe that the Commission's recommendations were right and that the benefits outweighed the disadvantages. However, two facts remain. Without the active, sympathetic, cooperative, and aggressive support of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture, this program cannot succeed. It can succeed if it has such support from the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department. It is also true that there would be danger of some duplication of research and other activities if this program were set in motion independent of the Department of Agriculture. The bill being introduced today has been drawn to meet this problem.

It vests in the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility for an industrial uses program. The proposal has certain built-in safeguards to prevent it from being used merely as a devise to enlarge the Washington bureaus. The bill grants to the Secretary the authority to enter into contracts with States, colleges, experimental stations, private persons, private corporations, and others for the purpose of carrying on the necessary research, pilot testing, and trial commercialization. I believe that this is a far better approach than adding to the existing laboratories and other facilities of the Federal Government. The Secretary can contract for a specific job and expect specific results. When the contract is over, the taxpayers of the country are not required to continue a bureau forever. The responsibility of non-Government persons and groups supporting the Welsh Commission is evidence of the desire of our educational institutions, our States, private persons, and private corporations to contribute to this problem. To compel the utilization of existing non-Federal facilities and personnel, this proposal provides that not to exceed 5 percent of the annual appropriation to be made to carry out the act can be spent for the purchase or building of additional facilities.

Another significant change is in the bill. We propose to utilize the State agricultural experiment stations in carrying out research projects in furtherance of the purposes of the act. The bill provides that 20 percent of the annual appropriation shall be distributed by existing formula to the States for use by the State agricultural experiment stations. These stations can make a distinct contribution, particularly in the field of finding and developing new crops for which there is an industrial demand.

This bill grants authority for the sale by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus crops at a price below the support price to any person or company who will use them for an industrial purpose. An industrial purpose is defined as a purpose other than for use of human or animal consumption. It also provides that a contract can be entered into for a period of 5 years for such surplus commodities in order to assure the concern a continuing supply of the commodity at the agreed price.

AMORTIZATION OF FACILITIES TO PRODUCE NEW INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS DERIVED FROM CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as a companion bill, I am introducing at the same time a separate bill dealing with the same objective. It is a tax bill. It must be considered by a different committee and, therefore, the bills are separate. This tax proposal would grant a rapid tax writeoff to any taxpayer, person, or corporation that acquires or builds facilities to convert our surplus into new industrial uses.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Finance will consider these measures at an early date and accord them favorable action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 715) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit amortization over a 60-month period of facilities to produce new industrial products derived from certain agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], a bill to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York.

The bill would provide:

First. Three additional circuit judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Second. Six additional district judges for U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Third. Two additional district judges for U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

The need for additional judges in the Second Circuit and the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York has been established beyond a doubt. Extensive studies have been conducted not only by the Congress, but also by bar associations and other interested private groups. It now takes from approximately 2 years in the southern district to 4 years in the eastern district to reach trial in an ordinary civil case. This certainly cannot be called adequate justice for the litigants involved.

The proposals for additional judges, which we advocate, are based upon a report of the Judicial Conference of the United States and are actively supported by the bench and bar of the affected jurisdictions.

Also, these new judgeships were recommended in a joint report by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York; New York County Lawyers' Association; Bronx County Bar Association; Federal Bar Association, Empire State Chapter; the Maritime Law Association of the United States; and New York Patent Law Association. Their report points out that because of the particular location of the southern district, it handles over one-third of all antitrust cases, and almost half of the admiralty cases pending in the entire Nation.

The size of the six-member Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has not changed since 1938. This proposal would add three additional judges to that court to help cope with the tremendous increase in the court's business.

For the past 5 years, the number of cases filed per judge in the second circuit, which comprises New York, Connecticut, and Vermont, has been over 50 percent more than the national average. In the first half of the fiscal year 1960, the second circuit had more cases filed with it than any other circuit except the fifth circuit.

In the eastern district of New York, up to 4 years may pass before a case filed is reached for trial. Periodically, corps of visiting judges have even been enlisted by the eastern district to aid in clearing its congested calendars. The caseload per judge in this district is the highest in the country. By increasing the number of district judges in the eastern district from six to eight, the present caseload per judge would be considerably reduced.

The southern district of New York is the largest district court in this country. Its calendar on December 31, 1959, represented one-fifth of all of the civil cases pending in the district courts. Yet, the district's 18 judges comprise only one-twelfth of district court judgeships in the 86 Federal districts. Since 1957, the caseload per judge of both civil and criminal cases in the southern district has increased over 10 percent. It is hoped that by increasing the number of judgeships from 18 to 24 in this district that all litigants will be granted a speedy

and deliberate determination of their lawsuits.

Proposed legislation for new judgeships has bogged down before in political controversies about the appointees. The litigant who must wait years to have his case heard is not interested in the political affiliation of the presiding judge, but he is vitally concerned with his qualifications. To expedite the administration of justice these judgeships should be appointments on merit, and we propose to cooperate toward that end.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 716) to provide for the appointment of additional judges for the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments in regard to the bill introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I am the chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which is making the study to improve the judicial machinery of the United States in the Federal courts. We shall, within the next few days, make our report. I am glad to say it will, to a very large extent, carry forward recommendations along the lines of providing additional judges in New York and in other States in the United States.

We have realized the dire need for more judges in the United States in order to expedite the business of the courts and to do justice to the people of the United States. I am glad the Senator has introduced the bill. We shall probably introduce a bill to cover the entire United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. We are very glad to see this new spirit, because during the last administration we felt that we needed action, and we did not get it. I am very glad the New Frontier is going to inspire the committee on this matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, this is not a new spirit. If the Senator will recall, the subcommittee reported the bill last year, and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary endorsed the bill and reported it to the Senate, but no action was taken.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my friend.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I hope this year the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will have greater influence with the leadership in getting the bill scheduled for consideration. That seemed to be what caused the difficulty in the last session. I anticipate that under the New Frontier we may get some action this year.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I certainly hope the Senate will pass the bill.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, the need for additional judges in the southern and eastern district courts of New York, as well as the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, has grown beyond all proportions. The proposal offered by my distinguished colleague, Senator JAVITS, and myself is designed to effectively deal with the question of calendar congestion and consequent trial delays in these Federal courts.

Our proposal would provide for six additional judges in the southern district of New York and two additional judges in the eastern district of New York. The bill would also provide for three additional judges in the second circuit.

According to Mr. Wil Shafroth, Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, long delays in the administration of justice are mostly confined to the larger cities of our Nation. The median time from filing a case in a metropolitan district court to trial may range from 13 months in the southern districts of Florida and California to 37 months in the eastern and southern districts of New York.

All delay and congestion in our Federal courts is not attributable to a need for extra judges. To some extent I believe that the problem may be resolved by more efficient administration of our courts. The antiquated procedural aspects of our Federal court system must and should be modernized to insure effective and expeditious administration of the court's business. To this end, I know the Subcommittee on Improvements in Federal Judicial Machinery, of which I am a member, will carefully examine all aspects of court congestion. This will be done with a view to implementing changes in the Federal procedure which will continue public confidence in our courts as instruments of justice.

Over the years, many eloquent appeals have been heard from distinguished jurists and lawyers for the Congress to act upon legislation such as we now propose. The pleas of the litigants have also been heard.

It is in the hands of the judicial machinery of our country that the protection of the rights of our citizens is placed. When this machinery does not have the capacity to handle with due deliberation and speed the work to which it is assigned, congressional action must be taken to insure that no party to a suit in a Federal court is denied justice through delay.

In proposing this much-needed increase in the number of Federal judges for the New York area, it is hoped that the new President will approach the appointments on a nonpartisan basis. Much of the delay in enacting this legislation is directly attributable to the actions of some who have sought to play a game of political chairs with the Federal judiciary. Hopefully, the appointments in the new administration will be of as high a caliber as the appointments under President Eisenhower. Many litigants in the United States are denied justice because of delay. These individuals are not much interested in the party affiliation of the judge who presides at their trial. They are, however, essentially interested in the judge's qualifications.

In order to expedite the administration of justice, these judgeships should be appointed without limitation to any political party, but should be selected on the basis of the highest qualifications.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, the "President's Page" from the American Bar Association Journal, by Whitney North Seymour, the president of the American Bar Association. Mr. Seymour's remarks are particularly salient with respect to the question of the extra judges needed to improve our judicial machinery.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S PAGE

(By Whitney North Seymour)

In many parts of the United States, our courts need help, and the organized bar, National, State and local, should do everything possible to see that they get it. While we continue to pursue many other objectives such as continuing legal education, legal aid, spread of the rule of law, in the end our prime responsibility is to see that the machinery of justice operates as fairly and smoothly as possible. Whether we are judges or practicing lawyers, this is our first task. But it is not ours alone; it is one we discharge in the public interest. When we encounter obstacles, as we often do, we should get the public to understand the problems and help us solve them. There are many things that judges and lawyers cannot accomplish alone; the public must also put its shoulder to the wheel and we should encourage it to do so.

The most pressing of these problems and the easiest to solve is the provision of extra judges needed in the Federal courts. Here we have the most expert possible testimony as to the needs, based upon observation and study by those most directly involved. The Judicial Conference of the United States, composed of trial and appellate judges from each circuit and presided over by the chief justice, has been concerned with the problem for years. It is aided by the well-qualified Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. No action has been taken on the conference recommendations for extra judges in the last 5 years. The need has grown. In some places, like the southern district of New York, it is no exaggeration to say that the situation has become desperate. Congress should no longer defer action and all of us should do what we can to insure prompt action. There is little use in seeking to place blame for the past, but there should be no occasion for criticism of future inaction.

On a related matter, we should do all we can to see that delays in confirmation of qualified lawyers nominated as Federal judges are eliminated. There have been a number of such delays in recent years even though the nominees had previously been found qualified by our Federal Judiciary Committee and its aid was available to the confirming authority. Delay in confirmation prejudices the courts where the new judges are badly needed, but it also prejudices the candidates and the prospects of getting highly qualified lawyers to accept appointment if they must stay for a long time in the twilight zone of the unconfirmed nominee.

In the States, too, our courts need help. In some States there are movements for modernizing the structure of the courts. Thus in New York a proposal for streamlining the courts in New York City seeks to modernize a structure which dates back more than a century. In other States there is a movement for improved methods of judicial selection. In still others the pres-

sure is for a modern system of court administration so that judgepower can be efficiently mobilized to help where congestion is worst. In others there is need to modernize procedure or to provide the judges with other tools to help them administer justice more efficiently. All such plans in one way or another are intended to improve the administration of justice.

In all these movements we should remember that fairness and deliberation must not be sacrificed to mere speed or statistical symmetry. Sometimes the natural conservatism of the bench and bar or the comfort of old ways prevents unanimous support, but usually the leaders of the bench and bar are in the forefront of such movements. The slowness of their progress is frequently due to lack of public understanding and support. Legislatures often have a way of turning a deaf ear to movements for judicial reform when their spokesmen are entirely in the profession. Thus it behooves us to have the leaders in other aspects of community life—business, education, church, social work and the others who have an understanding of the importance of the true administration of justice—link arms with the lawyers. When that is done, the courts will get the help they need.

In all these movements, it is important to be careful not to throw out the baby with the bath water. Reform is sought because we seek the ideal in the administration of justice. This implies no disrespect for current administration and no reflection on the great majority of our hard-working judges. They should not consider that they stultify themselves when they stand shoulder to shoulder with those who advocate needed reform. A learned, efficient and independent judiciary, supported and assisted by a trained and independent bar, must always be our goal. Antiquities, structural or procedural, and excessive political influence in judicial selection are inimical to this great obligation. And we must strive to have the public understand and support our programs for here, again, we serve not our own interest but the public interest.

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS INVOLVING GRAZING RIGHTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize civil actions for the review of administrative determinations involving grazing rights to be instituted in judicial districts in which such lands are situated.

The bill is identical to S. 3174 of the 86th Congress, which I introduced, for myself and Senator DWORSHAK, on March 10, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of my explanatory remarks which accompanied the introduction of that bill may be reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHURCH

This bill, if enacted, would accomplish a reform which is much needed. Under the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act, livestock operators in the West apply for and are granted permits to use the public lands for grazing. The grazing fees they pay are based upon the number of animals grazed, and the number of months the range is used.

To promote stability, and to do away with the roving operators who made range management so difficult in the early decades of this century, the Taylor Act set up an adjudicative, quasi-judicial procedure. It made eligibility for these permits dependent upon a system of commensurability of base private property, that is, it made the development by the applicant of hay and private forage to carry his cattle operation in the months when the Federal range should not be used a condition prerequisite to eligibility for a grazing permit, and set up a system of priorities.

A system of advisory boards, local, State, and National, was set up, and later the Administrative Procedures Act was made applicable.

As an element of administrative due process, appeals lie to the courts, usually in the form of petitions for the review of a final and adverse determination of the Secretary of Interior.

Venue for such actions lies in the District of Columbia, where that officer maintains his official abode.

This bill would change this requirement, as to determinations involving grazing licenses, privileges, or permits, and make it possible to bring the action, which otherwise could be brought only in the District of Columbia, in the district where the grazing lands involved are situated.

This is eminently sensible. The Secretary makes his determination based upon a record, and is himself almost never a witness. The witnesses are his agents and employees, and in 95 percent of the cases these witnesses are at the site—the district grazier, the State bureau of land management manager, and similar officers.

The appellant is the cattle or sheep operator. To require him to come to Washington to prosecute his appeal in the crowded courts of the District of Columbia is to effectively deny him his right of appeal.

Mr. President, on January 29, the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee held a hearing on grazing problems at Twin Falls, Idaho. Witness after witness demanded this reform. The Idaho Cattlemen's Association, the Idaho Woolgrowers, and the national organization of each group have demanded it.

Simple justice requires it.

Mr. CHURCH. I would add, Mr. President, that both the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, of Arizona, and the Assistant Secretary for Land Resources, Mr. Carver, of Idaho, alluded to the precise problems which this bill seeks to solve in the course of their respective confirmation hearings before the Interior Committee. Accordingly, I am hopeful that it will receive favorable executive agency reports, and that it may be promptly enacted.

In addition, several members of the Interior Committee, and a number of other Senators from public lands States, have informed me of their interest in this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the bill may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill may lie at the desk for 1 week, in order that Senators who approve of the bill may add their names as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

The bill (S. 717) to authorize civil actions for the review of administrative determinations involving grazing rights to be instituted in judicial districts in which such lands are situated, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1402 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Any civil action for the review of a determination made by an officer of the United States with respect to grazing rights on any land of the United States may be brought in the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which such land is situated, or if such land is situated in more than one such district, in any such district."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 113 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"1696. Action for review of certain administrative determinations.

"In any action instituted in conformity with section 1402(c) of this title against any officer of the United States in the district court for any judicial district other than the one in which the office of the defendant officer is situated, any process may be served upon that officer by delivering a copy thereof to the United States attorney for the judicial district in which the action is instituted, and such attorney shall promptly notify the defendant officer of the action so taken."

(b) The analysis of that chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1696. Action for review of certain administrative determinations."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act—

(a) shall take effect on the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act; but

(b) shall have no application to any action instituted before that day.

U.S. PASSPORT SERVICE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a U.S. Passport Service within the Department of State.

The objective of this bill is to give concrete recognition to the present importance of the Passport Office, its outstanding record of accomplishments, its increasing contribution and service in the promotion of international travel, and its potential as a public relations asset to the Federal Government.

The provisions of this bill were originally proposed by the Committee on Government Operations in a bill, S. 3340, reported to the Senate in the 84th Congress—Senate Reports Nos. 1604 and 1605, March 1, 1956.

Also, in the 86th Congress, the committee held hearings on another bill, S. 2095, which, among other provisions, provided for the reorganization of the Passport Office, similar to the proposal I am now submitting to the Senate. Full details relative to the objectives of this proposal are set forth in a committee print dated June 22, 1960, on Reorganization of the Passport Functions of the Department of State, prepared by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations.

The bill would abolish the Passport Office and elevate its status to a service. It would also remove the administrative jurisdiction over the proposed

U.S. Passport Service from the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs and place it under the supervision of the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, with direct responsibility for its operations vested in the Secretary of State. This proposal accords with recommendations of the first Hoover Commission, that "all components and functions of the executive departments of the Government should be vested in the head of such departments."

The Secretary of State announced, on September 13, 1960, that the proposal advanced by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, to establish a U.S. Passport Service, would become effective on September 15, 1960, stating:

> The designation of "Service" will more accurately describe the functions performed by this important area of the Department of State in providing passports and related services for U.S. citizens.

The announcement also set forth the importance of the operations of the Passport Office.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952—Public Law 414, 82d Congress—placed the Passport Office under the jurisdiction and administrative control of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Since this status was established by statute, some doubt exists as to whether the directive of the Secretary can become effective from a legal point of view. It may, therefore, be necessary for the Congress to authorize the proposed transfer and change in name of this activity by legislative action. That is the objective of the bill I am introducing in the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 718) to establish a U.S. Passport Service within the Department of State, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HEALTH FACILITIES AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Health Facilities and Training Act of 1961."

Mr. President, I submit a detailed analysis of the bill and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 719) to improve the public health through revising, consolidating, and improving the hospital and other medical facilities provisions of the Public Health Service Act, authorizing grants for construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities, providing for Federal guarantee of loans for construction of group practice medical or dental care facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The analysis presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF HEALTH FACILITIES AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

(Title I: Revision of Title VI of the Public Health Service Act; Title II: Grants for Medical, Dental, Osteopathic and Public Health Teaching Facilities Construction; Title III: Guarantee of Loans for Construction of Group Practice Medical or Dental Facilities.)

In addition to substantive amendments of greater significance described below, title I of the bill would revise title VI of the Public Health Service Act, relating to assistance in the construction of hospitals and other medical facilities, to clarify and simplify many of its provisions and to eliminate provisions which are executed or no longer of value to the program.

SECTION 101

Section 101 of the bill restates title VI of the Public Health Service Act.

The existing title VI contains six parts:

Part A: Declaration of Purpose.

Part B: Surveys and Planning.

Part C. Construction of Hospitals and Related Facilities.

Part D: Miscellaneous.

Part E: Declaration of Purpose With Respect to Diagnostic or Treatment Centers, Chronic Disease Hospitals, Rehabilitation Facilities, and Nursing Homes.

Part F: Surveys and Planning With Respect to Diagnostic or Treatment Centers, Chronic Disease Hospitals, Rehabilitation Facilities, and Nursing Homes.

Part G: Construction of Diagnostic or Treatment Centers, Chronic Disease Hospitals, Rehabilitation Facilities, and Nursing Homes.

Parts B and F have been executed and their provisions have, consequently, not been continued in the draft bill. The other provisions of the title which are still appropriate have been continued, with revisions as indicated, but without separation into different parts. Many of the differences in language between the existing law and the bill are a consequence of this elimination of separate parts dealing with hospitals and public health centers on the one hand and other types of medical facilities on the other. In the following material, describing the bill and comparing its provisions to existing law, there is rarely any reference to this type of difference.

Declaration of purpose (sec. 601)

The new section 601 provides that the purpose of title VI is—

(a) To assist the States in their programs of construction of public or other nonprofit medical facilities necessary for furnishing adequate hospital, clinic, or similar services to all their people.

(b) To stimulate the development of new or improved types of facilities.

(c) To promote research, experiments, and demonstrations, and the coordination thereof, relating to the development and utilization of hospital, clinic, or similar services, facilities, and resources.

The differences in the declaration of purpose from the existing provisions of sections 601 and 641 of the Public Health Service Act reflect the changes in the other provisions of the title.

Authorization of appropriations for construction grants (sec. 602)

This section replaces the existing authorizations of appropriations in sections 621 and 651 of the existing law. It authorizes appropriations for each of the fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964 of the following amounts for grants for construction of the following types of public or other nonprofit facilities: (a) $150 million for construction (which includes modernization) of hospitals and public health centers; (b) $40 million for construction of facilities for long-term care; (c) $10 million for construction of diagnostic or treatment centers; and (d) $10 million for construction of rehabilitation facilities.

The $150 million authorization for hospitals and public health centers is the same as the existing authorization for construction of such facilities. The $40 million authorization for long-term care facilities replaces the existing $20 million authorization for grants for chronic disease hospitals and $10 million for grants for nursing homes, and the $10 million for diagnostic or treatment centers replaces the existing $20 million authorization for grants for the construction of such centers.

State allotments (sec. 603)

This section provides for allotment among the States of the sums appropriated pursuant to the revised section 602 of the Public Health Service Act for each of the types of facilities.

Under subsection (a) of section 603, the allotment to each State for each type of facility for which an appropriation is authorized would be an amount bearing the same ratio to that appropriation as the product of (1) the population of the State, and (2) the square of its allotment percentage bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. There would, however, be a minimum allotment for each type of facility—$400,000 in the case of construction of hospitals and public health centers, $200,000 in the case of long-term care facilities, and $50,000 each in the case of diagnostic or treatment centers and rehabilitation facilities.

The increases needed to provide the minimum allotments would be derived by proportionate reduction in the allotments of the other States. These provisions on minimum allotments would not be applicable to the Virgin Islands or Guam.

The formula for allotting the appropriations is the same as in existing law (secs. 624 and 652), although based on the actual appropriations instead of on the authorized appropriations as under existing law. The existing minimum for construction of hospitals and public health centers, however, is $200,000 and the minimum for diagnostic or treatment centers is $100,000. The minimum in the bill of $200,000 for long-term care facilities replaces a minimum of $100,000 for chronic disease hospitals and $50,000 for nursing homes. These provisions also differ from existing law because the latter does not specify the method of securing the funds needed for the minimum allotments.

Subsection (b) of this section sets forth the meaning of "allotment percentage." As under the existing law (sec. 631(a)), this percentage would be based on the relative fiscal resources of each State, reflected by its relative average per capita income as compared with the average per capita income of the United States, but with a minimum of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of 75 percent, and with the percentage for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands set at 75 percent.

Also as under existing law (sec. 631(c)), the State populations will be determined on the basis of the latest figures certified by the Department of Commerce.

Allotments to the States would, under section 603(c), remain available for 1 year beyond the year in which allotted. This is the same as existing law (secs. 624 and 652).

Section 624 of the existing law, which is applicable to hospitals and public health centers, increases the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each category of facilities to the extent of any allotments for such type of facilities which are unobligated at the end of the period for which they are available, any amounts authorized to be appropriated but not appropriated for the

preceding fiscal year, and any amounts which are not allotted to any State because of its failure to have an approved State plan. These provisions of this section have never been used and their continuation would not appear to serve any useful purpose in the foreseeable future. It should be noted that part G, relating to ther types of medical facilities, does not contain any provision for increasing the authorization of appropriations in this manner.

Maximum number of beds for purposes of Federal aid (sec. 604)

This section provides that an application for construction of a project to provide inpatient care may not be approved if the number of additional beds provided by the project, when added to the existing beds and the number of beds provided under previously approved projects, exceeds the maximum number of beds specified in regulations. The number of existing beds would be the beds which are included in the State plan as in effect for the fiscal year in which the application is approved or disapproved.

The maximums so established would be increased for any State to the extent of the number of general hospital beds which were determined to be excess in any particular area in the State and were eliminated from consideration for purposes of the first State plan approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this bill. Since grants for construction of tuberculosis hospitals would no longer be authorized, the revised section 604 includes a provision for treating beds for tuberculosis patients, which are included in any project for a general or mental hospital approved after June 30, 1961, as general hospital beds and mental hospital beds, respectively.

The provisions of this section replace the existing provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 622 which provide for general regulations by the Surgeon General prescribing the number of general, tuberculosis, mental, or chronic disease beds required for adequate hospital services and their distribution throughout the State, subject to stated maximums of (1) in the case of general hospital beds, 4½ beds per 1,000 population in States with 12 or more persons per square mile, 5 beds per 1,000 in States with 7 to 11 (inclusive) persons per square mile, and 5½ beds per 1,000 in States with 6 or less persons per square mile; (2) in the case of beds for mental patients or chronic disease patients, 5 and 2, respectively, beds per 1,000 population; (3) in the case of beds for tuberculosis patients, 2½ times the average annual deaths from this disease in the State during 1940–44. The existing law (sec. 622 (c)) also contains a similar provision for regulations on the number and distribution of public health centers (subject to a stated maximum).

State plans (sec. 605)

This section sets forth the provisions which a State plan must contain in order to be approved for purposes of participation by a State in the program established by title VI of the Public Health Service Act.

A State plan to be approved must:

(1) Designate a single State agency to administer or supervise the administration of the State plan and contain satisfactory evidence of its authority to carry out the plan.

(2) Provide for designation of a State advisory council with representation from the various public or other nonprofit groups concerned with the program and from consumers and with representation from rehabilitation groups (or, if not, the plan must provide for consultation with such groups).

(3) Set forth, on the basis of a statewide inventory of existing facilities and survey of need and (to the extent required by regulations) on the basis of community, regional, or area plans, the number of general, mental, or long-term care beds needed to provide adequate facilities for inpatient care, the public health centers needed to provide adequate public health services, the diagnostic or treatment centers needed for minimum diagnostic or treatment services to ambulatory patients, the rehabilitation facilities needed to assure reasonable access to rehabilitation services for disabled persons, and (effective July 1, 1962) the extent to which hospitals and public health centers are in need of modernization.[1] The determinations under this part of the State plan as to the facilities needed would be made by the State agency in accordance with criteria established in the Surgeon General's regulations. Also a plan would have to be inculded for distribution for each of the four types of facilities.

(4) Set forth a construction program in conformity with the above and which provides for the needed facilities (of the various types, including, after June 30, 1962, needed modernization) for people residing in the State.

(5) Set forth the relative need for each of the types of facilities with special consideration for those serving rural communities or areas with relatively small financial resources, and for comprehensive rehabilitation facilities operated in connection with a university teaching hospital, and provide for construction in the order of such need insofar as financial resources available therefor and for maintenance and operation made possible; except that effective July 1, 1962, a State could split its allotment for construction of hospitals and public health centers between new construction projects and modernization projects for which an exceptional need exists, but with the limitation that no modernization project could be approved before a new hospital project which is in an area without any acceptable hospital beds and which meets the financing and other requirements of section 606(a).

(6) Provide minimum standards, to be fixed in the discretion of the State, for the maintenance and operation of facilities providing inpatient care which receive Federal assistance, and include, effective July 1, 1963, provisions for the enforcement of these standards.

(7) Provide methods of administration prescribed in the Surgeon General's regulations, including a merit system for personnel, except that the Surgeon General would be prohibited from exercising any authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation, of individuals employed pursuant to such a system.

(8) Provide for periodic review of the State agency's construction program and for submission of appropriate revisions and modifications.

(9) Provide for a hearing for applicants for construction projects (other than research projects under sec. 617) and for submission of required reports to the Surgeon General.

The requirements referred to in items (1), (2), (7), and (9) above are the same in substance as the requirements in existing law (pars. (1), (2), (3), (6), (8), and (9) of sec. 623(a)). The requirements set forth above in items (3) and (4) differ from existing law substantially (par. (4) of sec. 623(a)), primarily because of the deletion of the existing provisions relating to regulations of the Surgeon General (sec. 622 (a), (b), and (c)), the deletion of the provision requiring the State plan to provide for adequate facilities without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color and for those unable to pay, and omission of any provision for assistance in the construction of separate facilities for separate population groups in certain States (sec. 622(f)), as well as the addition of provisions relating to modernization of hospitals and public health centers. The requirement in item (5) above is similar to existing law (sec. 623(a)(5)), its difference stemming primarily from the deletion of the separate provisions on regulations now contained in the existing law and addition of provisions relating to modernization of hospitals and public health centers. The requirement described above in item (6) is substantially the same as the existing law (sec. 623(a)(7)) except for the requirement of inclusion of the enforcement provisions. Under existing law, however, the inclusion of minimum standards of maintenance and operation of federally aided facilities is mandatory only for hospitals and public health centers. The requirement set forth above in item (8) is the same as existing law (sec. 623(a)(10)), except that the Surgeon General would indicate the times when appropriate revisions or modifications of the State construction program should be submitted.

The Surgeon General would be required to approve any State plan complying with the above requirements. Any disapproval of a plan or modification thereof would be subject to a hearing before the Federal Hospital Council, and to reversal if the Council determined that the plan or modification complied with the statutory requirements. No changes could be required in the State plan, by reason of any change in regulations, more frequently than every 2 years except with the consent of the State or in accordance with further congressional action.

These provisions are substantially the same as those in existing law.

Approval of projects for construction (sec. 606)

This section sets forth the requirements which must be met by applications for construction projects. Such applications may be submitted by a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a public or other nonprofit agency, either individually or jointly. The application must include a description of the site; plans and specifications for the project in accordance with the Surgeon General's regulations prescribing general standards of construction and equipment; and reasonable assurance—

(1) of title to the site either in the applicant or a public or other nonprofit agency which is to operate the facility;

(2) of adequate financial support for completion and maintenance and operation of the facility;

(3) that prevailing local wage rates will be paid;

(4) of compliance with the Surgeon General's regulations on competitive bidding (as defined in such regulations) in letting construction contracts and on bonding, insurance, and similar protective measures;

(5) that the facility will provide community service without discrimination on account of race, creed, or color; and

(6) that the operation of the facility, if it provides inpatient care, will be in compliance with applicable State standards.

The Surgeon General is to approve any application which meets the above requirements but only if—

(1) sufficient funds are available from the applicable State allotment to pay the Federal share of the cost of the project;

(2) the State agency has certified the Federal share for the project and the project is approved and recommended by it; and

(3) the Surgeon General finds that the application meets the requirements set forth above and is in conformity with the State plan, that the project is entitled to priority under the State plan over other projects

[1] Modernization includes alteration, major repair (to the extent permitted in regulations), remodeling, replacement, and renovation of existing facilities.

for the same type of facility, and that approval of the application is not prohibited by section 604 (establishing maximum numbers of hospital beds for purposes of Federal participation in the cost of construction of projects).

An application for a diagnostic or treatment center from someone other than a public agency or an organization which owns and operates a nonprofit hospital could be approved only if it was primarily for diagnosis, or diagnosis and treatment, of mentally ill persons, or the service area for the center has no hospital (and none is proposed in that area under the State's program) and the center is for general diagnostic, or diagnostic and treatment, services, and only if the corporation which will own and operate the center is sufficiently broadly owned or controlled, in the judgment of the Surgeon General, to assure communitywide interest in the operation of the center.

No application may be disapproved by the Surgeon General without affording the State agency an opportunity for a hearing. Amendment of an approved application is subject to approval in the same manner as described above.

The requirements which must be met by an application for a project are substantially the same as the requirements on this subject in the existing law except that the existing law does not specifically require assurance that a community service will be provided by the facility. In addition, under existing law a diagnostic or treatment center applicant must either be a public agency or an organization owning and operating a nonprofit hospital. There are also other differences of a relatively minor nature attributable to the absence of the provisions on general regulations and to other changes in the existing law. As under existing law, the provision on availability without discrimination relates only to discrimination in the admission of patients.

Payments for construction (sec. 607)

This section describes the procedure for making payments to applicants with respect to their approved projects. Upon certification by the State agency, based upon inspection by it, that the applicant has earned an installment through the performance of work or the purchase of materials for a project, the installment due is to be paid. The payment is made to the State, or to the applicant if the State is not authorized to make the payments to the applicant. However, if the Surgeon General has reason to believe that any act, or failure to act, has occurred which might require withholding of funds under section 608, the payment may be withheld pending action under section 608, or corrective action, after the State agency has been given notice of opportunity for a hearing under that section. The total of these payments for a project may not exceed the Federal share of the cost of the project.

The revised section 607 also provides that where an amendment to an application has been approved or the estimated cost of the project has been revised, any resulting additional payment with respect to the project may be made from the applicable allotment for the fiscal year in which the amendment is approved. Of course, if funds are still available from the applicable allotment for the fiscal year in which the original application was approved, payment may also be made from that allotment.

This section is substantially the same as the provisions on the same subject in section 625(b) of the existing law. The differences are due primarily to a modernization of the provisions describing the payment procedure and to the changes made in other parts of the law; e.g., the withholding section.

Withholding of payments (sec. 608)

This section provides that further payments may be withheld, in whole or in part, from any State if the Surgeon General makes certain findings after affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing. The withholding may occur if the Surgeon General finds failure to comply substantially with any of the provisions required to be included in the State plan, or failure to carry out, or inability to carry out, any assurance required to be given in a project application, or substantial failure to carry out an approved project's plans and specifications, or, finally, failure to provide adequate State funds for administration of the State plan each year.

If the Surgeon General makes any of these findings, further payments may be withheld for all projects involving construction of the particular type of facility involved or for all types of facilities, or for only the particular project or projects affected by the action or inaction which occasioned the hearing. The withholding action, however, would not apply to any project already approved which is not directly affected by this action or inaction. The withholding would continue until there is no longer any failure to comply or, if compliance is not possible, until the State has arranged for repayment or has repaid the Federal funds to which the recipient was not entitled.

This section is the same in substance as section 632(a) of existing law with one exception. Under the existing law withholding may occur upon a finding that Federal funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been allotted or paid. Inasmuch as payments to a project applicant are made only after certification by the State agency that the applicant has earned the funds through purchases or performance of work, there would appear to be no need for continuing this provision.

Judicial review (sec. 609)

This section provides for judicial review of the Surgeon General's refusal to approve a construction project, and of his action withholding funds under section 608, by the U.S. court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located. In such a proceeding the Surgeon General's findings of fact would be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

The judgment of the court of appeals would be subject to review in the Supreme Court on certiorari or certification.

This section is the same as section 632(b) of the existing law.

Recovery (sec. 610)

This section provides for recovery by the United States of its proportionate share of the current value of any facility constructed with the aid of funds under this title of the Public Health Service Act if, within 20 years after construction is completed, the facility is transferred or sold to any person, agency, or organization not qualified to be an applicant for a project under this title of the Public Health Service Act or not approved by the State agency or its successor or if, within such period, the facility ceases to be a public or other nonprofit facility. The bill provides, however, that this right of recovery shall not constitute a lien on the facility prior to judgment.

This section is the same as section 625(e) of existing law except that existing law provides, in cases in which there is no sale or transfer, for recovery only if a hospital, diagnostic or treatment center, rehabilitation facility, or nursing home ceases to be a nonprofit facility.

In addition, the disclaimer against creation of a lien does not appear in existing law.

Adjustment of allotments within a State (sec. 611)

This section provides for transfer by the Surgeon General, at the request of a State, of a portion of a State's allotment for one type of facility (other than its allotment for rehabilitation facilities) to its allotment for another type of facility. However, no transfer could be made from any other allotment to the allotment for construction of hospitals and public health centers.

In order to secure such a transfer from the allotment for long-term care facilities or diagnostic or treatment centers, the State would be required to certify to the Surgeon General that a reasonable opportunity has been afforded to prospective project applicants to submit approvable applications for the utilization of funds in the category for which the allotment was originally made and that there have been no approvable applications in such category. To secure such a transfer from the allotment for hospitals and public health centers, the State would be required to certify to the Surgeon General that use of the transferred funds as requested by it would better carry out the purposes of this title of the Public Health Service Act.

This section is similar to section 654(b) of existing law. It differs from existing law in that the provisions have been extended to include transfers from (but not to) allotments for hospitals and public health centers and to (but not from) allotments for rehabilitation facilities.

Transfer of allotments to another State (sec. 612)

This section provides that, in accordance with regulations, a State may file a request with the Surgeon General to transfer a portion of any allotment to it under title VI of the Public Health Service Act for any type of facility to an allotment of another State. This addition to the allotment of the second State could be used to meet a portion of the Federal share of the cost of construction of a facility in the second State. The request could be granted by the Surgeon General only if he (and, in the case of a rehabilitation facility, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) found (1) that construction of the facility will meet needs in the State making the request and (2) that use of the specified portion of the allotment, as requested by the State, would assist in carrying out the purposes of title VI.

A transfer under this section from an allotment for rehabilitation facilities could be made only to an allotment of another State for rehabilitation facilities; and a transfer to an allotment for construction of hospitals and public health centers could be made only from the corresponding allotment of another State.

This section is the same as section 637 of existing law, except that under existing law a transfer from an allotment of one State may be made only to the corresponding allotment of another State.

Regulations (sec. 613)

This section provides that all regulations under title VI of the Public Health Service Act could be prescribed only after consultation with the Federal Hospital Council. (In addition, all regulations of the Surgeon General would have to be approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.)

Under existing law (secs. 633(a) and 622), the Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe various kinds of regulations. Administrative regulations need be approved only by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The regulations referred to in the existing section 622, on the other hand, must also be approved by the Federal Hospital Council. In addition to the regulations governing administration of the State plan, referred to above, these include regulations relating to the number or extent of various types of facilities required to provide adequate hospital or other services, the general manner for determining the priority of various projects, general standards of construction and equipment for the various types of facilities, nondiscrimination on

account of race, creed, or color, and provision of facilities for those unable to pay.

Federal Hospital Council (sec. 614)

Subsection (a) of this section provides for a Federal Hospital Council to consult with the Surgeon General in administering title VI of the Public Health Service Act. The Surgeon General would be Chairman of the Council and there would be eight members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Four of the eight appointees would have to be outstanding in matters relating to the provision of hospital, clinic, and similar services, and three of these four would have to be authorities on the operation of hospitals or other types of medical service facilities. The other four appointees would represent consumers of hospital, clinic, and similar services, and would have to be familiar with the need for such services in urban or rural areas.

Under subsection (b) of section 614, appointed members of the Council would have 4-year terms of office, except for those appointed to complete an unexpired term. No member could serve continuously for more than two terms.

The Council would, under subsection (c), meet at least once a year. The Surgeon General could also call additional meetings if he felt it necessary to do so. In addition, he would be required to call such a meeting if requested by three or more of the Council members.

Subsection (d) of section 614 would authorize the Surgeon General to appoint advisory and technical committees.

Appointed Council members and members of committees would, under subsection (e), be paid up to $50 per day plus travel and subsistence expenses while serving on business of the Council or a committee.

This section is for the most part the same as section 633(b) of existing law. It differs from the existing law to the extent necessary to reflect the addition of the categories of facilities added by the 1954 amendments (which added the provisions for chronic disease hospitals, diagnostic or treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes). It also omits provisions for staggering the terms of the Council members since the present members, whose terms are already staggered, will serve out their terms of office. Finally, the authority to appoint special advisory or technical committees would be lodged in the Surgeon General, instead of in the Council as under existing law.

Conference of State agencies (sec. 615)

This section provides for conferences of representatives of State agencies responsible for administering State plans approved under title VI of the Public Health Service Act. An annual conference of representatives of all such agencies would be required. A conference of representatives of all such agencies requesting it would also be required if the request is made by at least five agencies. In addition, the Surgeon General could hold a meeting of the representatives of all or any such agencies when he deemed it necessary or proper.

This section is the same in substance as section 634 of the existing law.

State control of operations (sec. 616)

This section prohibits Federal supervision or control over the administration, personnel, maintenance, or operation of any facility aided under this title of the Public Health Service Act, except as otherwise specifically provided.

This section is the same in substance as section 635 of existing law.

Research, experiments, and demonstrations in utilization of medical facilities (sec. 617)

Subsection (a) of this section provides for the conduct by the Surgeon General of research, experiments, and demonstrations relating to effective development and utilization of services, facilities, and resources of hospitals or other medical facilities. It would also authorize him, after consultation with the Federal Hospital Council, to make grants-in-aid to public or private nonprofit entities, institutions, or organizations for research, experimental, or demonstration projects relating to the development, utilization, or coordination of such services, facilities, or resources. These grants could be made for construction projects for experimental or demonstration hospitals or other medical facilities as well as for other kinds of projects.

Grants for projects made in any fiscal year under this section could include amounts (to be paid from the appropriation for that fiscal year) for succeeding years.

Except in unusual cases, the total paid under this section with respect to any project for construction of facilities or acquisition of equipment could not exceed two-thirds of the cost of the project. The prevailing local wage rate requirement of section 606 and other appropriate provisions of that section would be applicable to construction projects under section 617.

A report to the Congress on the administration of this section together with the Secretary's recommendations, if any, for amendment of its provisions would be submitted by January 1, 1964.

This portion of section 617 differs from provisions on the same subject in section 636 of existing law in several respects. First, the statement of the authority in this section of existing law is put in terms of "carrying out the purposes of section 301 with respect to hospital facilities." This reference has been omitted. Second, authorization of grants for construction of experimental or demonstration facilities has been added. Third, the limitation on Federal expenditures in the form of grants-in-aid to $1,200,000 in any fiscal year has been deleted.

Subsection (b) of section 617 in the bill is new. It is patterned after section 707 of the Public Health Service Act which relates to recapture of Federal payments made with respect to construction of health research facilities. Under this subsection the United States would be entitled to recover its pro rata share of the then value of a facility constructed with the aid of funds granted under section 617 if, within 20 years after its completion, (1) the owner ceased to be a public or nonprofit institution, or (2) the facility ceased to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed or for provision of hospital or other services for which construction projects may be approved under title VI. The Surgeon General could, however, for good cause, consent to a different use of the facilities.

This subsection also provides that this right to recovery shall not constitute a lien on the facility prior to judgment.

Grants for planning coordinated medical facilities system (sec. 618)

This section would authorize grants to public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations to pay not to exceed two-thirds of the cost of projects for developing comprehensive regional or metropolitan area or other area plans for coordination of medical care facilities and services provided by such facilities. Grants to the State agencies to pay not to exceed two-thirds of the cost of projects for providing technical assistance to public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations in developing these regional metropolitan area, or other local area plans would be included. Appropriations under the section would be authorized for fiscal 1962 and the 2 succeeding years.

These grants could be made only for projects which have been approved by the State agency and would be made on terms and conditions determined by the Surgeon General. Installment payments, made in advance or otherwise, would be authorized.

The existing law does not authorize grants for these purposes.

Loans for construction of hospitals and other medical facilities (sec. 619)

This section would authorize loans for hospitals and other medical facilities in accordance with the same procedures and subject to the same limitations and conditions as would be applicable to the making of grants under this title. These loans for projects in a State could be approved only if sufficient funds are available from the State's allotment under section 603 from the type of facility involved—and the loans would be made from this allotment and paid directly to the applicant.

The amount of any loan, or of any loan and grant, with respect to any project could not exceed the Federal share of the cost of the project. Loans could be made for periods of up to 40 years and would bear interest at a rate arrived at by adding one-fourth of 1 percent per year to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent.

The Surgeon General could agree to modify the terms and conditions of any loan to the extent he determined it to be necessary to protect the Federal financial interest.

If, prior to repayment of a loan, the facility with respect to which it was made is transferred to any person, agency, or organization not eligible to file for a grant under this title or not approved by the State agency, or which ceases to be public or nonprofit, the unpaid balance of the loan would become due immediately; and the transferee would also be liable for payment.

Definitions (sec. 620)

State: Subsection (a) of section 620 defines State to include Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia. This is the same as section 631(d) of existing law, except that Alaska and Hawaii, now being States, would no longer be mentioned specifically.

Federal share: Subsection (b) of section 620 defines the Federal share as the proportion of the cost of construction of a project to be paid by the United States. It also specifies the methods for determining the percentage of the cost which shall constitute the Federal share.

In the case of projects for which payments are to be made from the allotments for construction (which includes modernization) of hospitals and public health centers, the Federal share will be determined in one of two ways. If any State desires, it may include in its State plan standards meeting certain requirements. In such a case the Federal share will be determined in accordance with these standards. These requirements are that the standards provide equitably for variations between projects on the basis of objective criteria related to the economic status of areas and such other factors as the State may desire and may be permitted by regulations. However, these standards may not provide for a Federal share of more than 66⅔ percent or less than 33⅓ percent.

If a State does not include the standards described above in its plan, its Federal share for all projects in the State will be the percentage, specified by it, between a minimum of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of either 66⅔ percent or the State's allotment percentage, whichever is lower.

In the case of projects for the construction of all other types of facilities, i.e., projects for long-term care facilities, diagnostic or treatment centers, or rehabilitation facilities, the States will have a choice as to the method for determining the Federal

share. For these projects the Federal share may be the share determined in accordance with the standards included in the State plan and meeting the requirements described above, or the single percentage, applicable to all such projects in the State, of 50 percent, or the percentage selected by the State between a minimum of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of either 66⅔ percent or the State's allotment percentage, whichever is lower.

The State agency would be required to notify the Surgeon General in writing each year of the Federal shares which it had elected for projects in the State approved by the Surgeon General during such fiscal year. This notification would be given prior to the approval by the State of the first project during such fiscal year and the election would be applicable to all projects approved by the Surgeon General during the year.

This definition is the same in substance as the provisions in sections 623(e) and 631(k) of existing law, except that under the existing provision relating to the variable Federal share (sec. 623(e)) the factors on which the variations are based must include the relative need for additional facilities. The provision with respect to the other factors to be considered in devising these standards is also slightly different.

Hospital: Subsection (c) of section 620 defines this term to include general, mental, and other types of hospitals. It also includes related facilities operated in connection with hospitals, such as laboratories, outpatient departments, nurses' home and training facilities, and central service facilities. Specifically excluded, however, would be hospitals furnishing primarily domiciliary care, hospitals primarily for the care and treatment of tuberculosis patients, and (except when used in the definition of facility for long-term care, diagnostic or treatment center, or rehabilitation facility) hospitals primarily for the care and treatment of chronic disease patients.

This definition differs from the definition of hospital in section 631(e) of the existing law because of the omission of public health centers and the exclusion of tuberculosis hospitals and chronic disease hospitals.

Facility for long-term care: This facility is defined (in subsec. (d)) as one providing inpatient care for convalescent or chronic disease patients requiring skilled nursing care and related medical services, but only if it is a hospital or is operated in connection with one, or is a facility in which the nursing care and medical services are prescribed by, or are performed under the direction of, a person licensed to practice medicine or surgery in the State. Specifically excluded from this term are facilities primarily for the mentally ill or tuberculosis patients. Also excluded is any other facility furnishing primarily domiciliary care unless some portion of it is primarily for the provision of medical or nursing care. In such a case, that portion of the facility would not be excluded.

This definition is a combination of the definition of hospital for the chronically ill and impaired and the definition of nursing home in subsections (m) and (o), respectively, of the existing section 631, with differences due primarily to the combination of the two.

Public health center: This term is defined (in subsection (e)) as a publicly owned facility for the provision of public health services. It also includes, if operated in connection with such a facility, other related publicly owned facilities, such as laboratories, clinics, and administrative offices.

This definition is the same as the definition in section 631(f) of existing law except for the specific limitation of related facilities to those which are publicly owned.

Diagnostic or treatment center: Subsection (f) of section 620 defines this term as a facility for the diagnosis or for the diagnosis and treatment of ambulatory patients—

(1) which is operated in connection with a hospital; or

(2) in which patient care is under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice medicine or surgery in the State. In the case of dental diagnosis and treatment, patient care must be under the professional supervision of persons licensed to practice dentistry in the State.

This definition is the same as the definition in section 631(l) of existing law.

Rehabilitation facility: This term is defined as a facility operated for the primary purpose of assisting in the rehabilitation of disabled persons through an integrated program of medical evaluation and services and psychological, social, or vocational evaluation and services, which are rendered under competent professional supervision and in the case of which—

(1) the major portion of the required evaluation and services is furnished within the facility; and

(2) either the facility is operated in connection with a hospital or all medical or related health services are prescribed by, or are under the general direction of, persons licensed to practice medicine or surgery in the State.

This definition differs from the definition of the same term in section 631(n) of existing law in one significant respect. Under the existing definition the program of rehabilitation provided in the facility must include medical, psychological, social, and vocational evaluation and services whereas under the revised definition the program need include only medical evaluation and services and one of the other three types of evaluation and services.

Nonprofit: This term is defined in subsection (h) of section 620 as meaning, with respect to any facility, a facility which is owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

This is the same in substance as the definition in the existing section 631(g).

Construction: Subsection (i) of section 620 defines this term as including the construction of new buildings and modernization and expansion of existing buildings. It also includes the initial equipment of any such buildings (including transportation facilities) and replacement of obsolete built-in (as determined in accordance with regulations) equipment in any of such existing buildings, as well as architects' fees. Excluded, however, are the cost of off-site improvements and, except with respect to public health centers, the cost of the acquisition of land.

This definition is the same as the definition in section 631(h) of existing law, except that the existing definition specifically includes medical transportation facilities whereas the new definition would not be limited as to the type of transportation facilities included and except for the addition, through the use of the defined term "modernization," of renovation, modernization, replacement and repair of existing buildings, and the addition of replacement of obsolete built-in equipment in existing buildings.

Modernization: This term is defined (sec. 620(j)) to include (in addition to modernization) alteration, major repair (to the extent permitted in regulations), remodeling, replacement, and renovation.

Cost of construction: This term is defined in subsection (k) of section 620 as the amount found by the Surgeon General to be necessary for the construction of a project. It is the same as the definition in the existing section 631(i).

Title: Section 620(l) defines the term "title," when used with reference to a site for a project, as a fee simple or any other estate or interest (including a leasehold if the rental therefor does not exceed 4 percent of the land's value) which the Surgeon General finds sufficient to assure at least 50 years undisturbed use and possession for the project.

This is the same as the definition in section 631(j) of the existing law.

SECTION 102

This section provides the effective dates for the revision of title VI of the Public Health Service Act which would be effected by section 101 of the bill.

The revision would in general be effective July 1, 1961. However, applications approved by the Surgeon General prior to July 1, 1961, under the existing law would be governed by the existing law. In addition, the allotment percentages which were promulgated by the Surgeon General for purposes of title VI of the Public Health Service Act during 1960 will be effective for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962. Finally, the terms of office of the members of the Federal Hospital Council who are still serving on the Council on June 30, 1961, will expire on the date they would have expired if this bill had not been enacted. This will assure continuation of the staggering of the terms of office of members of the Council.

TITLE II. GRANTS FOR MEDICAL, DENTAL, OSTEOPATHIC, AND PUBLIC HEALTH TEACHING FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

DETAILED EXPLANATION

In general

Title II of the draft bill would amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act by adding to it a new part B to authorize a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health to expand their enrollment capacity.

Appropriation authorization

Annual appropriations aggregating not more than $100 million would be authorized for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1966. Of this, an aggregate amount of $75 million would be available for grants to schools of medicine, osteopathy, and public health; and $25 million for grants to schools of dentistry.

Institutions eligible

Participation in the program would be limited to public or nonprofit schools accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for the purpose by the Commissioner of Education. A new school which had not been in operation long enough to be eligible for accreditation by such bodies at the time of its application for a grant, would be deemed accredited for purposes of this program if the Commissioner found (after consultation with the appropriate recognized accrediting body) that there was reasonable assurance that the school would meet accreditation standards upon completion of the project.

Availability of grant funds

Construction costs: Costs of construction would include construction of new buildings and the expansion of existing buildings. Costs of remodeling and alteration of existing buildings could be considered expansion costs if the remodeling or alteration was an integral and essential part of the expansion of the same or a different building. Architects' fees and initial equipment of a new building or of the expanded, remodeled, or altered part of an existing building could be included; costs of acquisition of land and offsite improvements could not be included.

Amount of the grant: Grants could be made in amounts up to 50 percent of so

much of the cost as the Surgeon General (after receiving the advice of the Council, hereafter mentioned) determined to be reasonably necessary to increase the applicant's capacity for training physicians, dentists, osteopaths, or professional public health personnel. In determining such amount, the Surgeon General would be required to exclude from the costs of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant made (or assured) for the construction that was to be financed in part by a teaching facility grant, plus (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other grant.

Relationship to research construction grants: The research construction grant program authorized by the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956 (Public Law 835, 84th Cong.) and later extended until June 30, 1962 (Public Law 85-777) provides Federal assistance for the construction of facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health. (Present title VII, Public Health Service Act, to be redesignated part A of that title). While schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health participate in this program, along with nonschool research institutions and the science departments of universities, these grants are premised upon additions to or improvements in research capacity without regard to whether the proposed construction will also effect an increase in the applicant school's capacity to train physicians, dentists, or professional public health workers. By contrast, the new construction grant authority would limit aid to new schools or to existing schools for teaching facilities which increase the applicant's training capacity, and would establish priorities for grant approval based on relative effectiveness for such expansion. Unlike the existing authority for research construction grants, part B of title VII of the Public Health Service Act (as revised by the draft bill) does not employ the concept of "proportionate use" of a multipurpose facility for the determination of construction costs to be included in calculating the amount of the grant. Costs of construction to be aided under this part would in all cases be determined solely on the basis of teaching requirements. The fact that a facility needed for teaching will have a collateral or incidental use for a related purpose, such as research, would not impair the eligibility of an application or reduce the amount of the grant; any additional space or equipment to be constructed or installed primarily because of its intended use for research would be eligible for aid only under the research construction grant authority in the newly designated part A.

Grant procedures

Conditions of grant approval: In order to approve an application for a Federal grant for a teaching facility (to be filed before July 1, 1965) the Surgeon General would be required to determine—

(a) that the applicant was an eligible institution;

(b) that the application was supported by reasonable assurances that (A) the facility would be used for purposes of the teaching for which it was constructed for at least 10 years after completion; (B) sufficient funds would be available to cover the non-Federal share of the costs of construction; and

(C) sufficient funds will be available when construction is completed for effective use of the facility for the teaching purposes for which it was constructed;

(c) that the proposed construction is for a new school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, or public health, or for construction which will expand the training capacity of an existing such school;

(d) that the application does not include aid for construction of a facility of the types aided under the hospital and medical facility construction program; and

(e) that there is reasonable assurance that laborers and mechanics employed in the construction of the facility will be paid at prevailing local wage rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

Order of approval: In considering applications for grants the Surgeon General and the Council would be required to take into account—

(a) the relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding capacity for the training of first-year students of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy, or for the training of professional public health personnel, and in promoting an equitable geographical distribution of opportunities for such training (giving due consideration to population, available professional personnel in such fields, and available training resources in various areas of the Nation); and

(b) in the case of an applicant in a State which had in existence a State planning agency, or which participated in a regional or other interstate planning agency, the relationship of the application to construction or training programs being developed by such agency for such State, and if the agency had reviewed the application, any comment thereon submitted by it to the Surgeon General.

Payments: Upon the approval of an application, the Surgeon General would reserve the amount of the grant (as determined by him) from any appropriated funds available therefor. Reservations of such amounts could be amended either upon approval of an amendment of the application, or upon revision of the estimated cost of the construction of the facility. Payments could be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in installments consistent with construction progress.

Recapture provisions: The United States would be entitled to recover its pro rata share of the then value of the aided facility if, within 10 years of completion, (a) the owner ceased to be a public or nonprofit school, or (b) the facility ceased to be used for the teaching purposes for which it was constructed. The Surgeon General could, however, consent to a change of use for good cause, determined by him in accordance with regulations. The amount of the recovery could be settled by agreement of the parties or by action in the U.S. district court.

Advisory Council

The bill would provide for a National Advisory Council on Medical Teaching Facilities consisting of the Surgeon General (as Chairman) and the Commissioner of Education as ex officio members, and 12 members appointed by the Secretary. Four of the 12 appointed members would be selected from the general public; and 8 from among leading authorities in the field of higher education, at least 4 of whom would be required to be persons particularly concerned with training in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, or the public health professions. In making such appointments, the Secretary would be required to give consideration to such factors as (1) experience in the planning, constructing, financing, or administration of schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, or postgraduate schools of public health, and (2) familiarity with the need for teaching facilities in all areas of the Nation.

The duties of the Council would include advice and assistance to the Surgeon General in the preparation of regulations and with respect to policy matters related to the administration of the teaching facility construction grant program, and in the review of applications for grants. The Surgeon General would be directed to make appropriate provision for consultation between and coordination of the work of this Council and the work of the National Advisory Council on Health Research Facilities and of the Federal Hospital Council with respect to matters bearing on the purposes and administration of this program.

Prohibition of interference with institutional affairs

The bill expressly forbids any Federal control, under color of authority implied from the bill, over the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any institution.

Encouragement and assistance of State and interstate planning programs

To further the development of State and joint or coordinated regional or other interstate planning or programs for relieving shortages of training capacity and opportunities for training in the fields of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health, the Surgeon General would be authorized to provide technical assistance and consultation to State and interstate bodies. The bill contemplates that the planning activities of such agencies would include development of plans and programs for the construction of needed teaching facilities, for promoting the effective use of such facilities, and for providing adequate financial support for the training institutions. In the case of regional or other interstate planning agencies, the Surgeon General would also be authorized to provide financial assistance for projects for the planning of such programs.

TITLE III. GUARANTY OF LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GROUP PRACTICE MEDICAL OR DENTAL FACILITIES

DETAILED ANALYSIS

Title III of the bill would establish a program of Federal guarantees of bonds of private group practice agencies or organizations to assist them in financing group practice medical or dental care facilities.

Under this program the bonds issued by these group practice agencies or organizations to finance the construction of these facilities would be backed by the credit of the United States through the medium of debt service guarantee contracts pursuant to which the Surgeon General would guarantee payment of the debt service on such bonds as long as they remained outstanding.

Guarantee contracts

Section 301 would authorize the Surgeon General to enter into contracts pursuant to which he would undertake to guarantee payment of the debt service on bonds sold by group practice agencies or organizations and payable in 30 years or less. The guarantee would cover the debt service on such bonds, to the extent that the pledged revenues prove inadequate. The aggregate amount of such guaranteed bonds outstanding at any one time would be set by the appropriation acts, but in any event would be limited to $30 million. No new contract could be entered into after June 30, 1966.

Establishment of fund

Section 302 would establish a revolving guarantee fund which would be used by the Surgeon General to finance the costs, including administrative expenses, involved in carrying out the bond guarantee program. All receipts of the Surgeon General in carrying out his functions under this new program would be deposited in this fund and all expenses of the program would be paid from the fund. Moneys in the fund not immediately needed in the operation of the program could be invested in obligations of the United States or obligations which are guaranteed by the United States or obligations which are lawful investments for federally supervised fiduciary, trust, or public funds.

Fee for guarantee

Section 303 would authorize the Surgeon General to charge and collect guarantee fees to cover all expenses of the program and to establish a reserve for possible losses. Such fees could be included in the amount of the bonds guaranteed and would be large enough so that they would in the aggregate cover, insofar as practicable, administrative expenses and losses under the title.

Borrowing authority

Section 304 would authorize the Surgeon General, in case moneys in the fund are insufficient to meet the obligations of the fund, to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury the additional amounts needed to meet the fund's obligations, including the principal of and interest on bonds guaranteed pursuant to debt service guarantee contracts. The interest rate on Treasury borrowings would be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with comparable maturities.

Administration

Section 305 contains technical provisions directing or authorizing the Surgeon General to perform functions necessary in the administration of the guarantee program.

Subsection (a) would require the Surgeon General to prepare an annual budget in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act, and to maintain accounts for auditing by the General Accounting Office as in the case of commercial transactions, also in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act. However, the making of debt service guarantee contracts and similar transactions by the Surgeon General would be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government.

Subsection (b) would authorize the Surgeon General, in connection with his functions under this section, to prescribe rules and regulations (but consulting with the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to those relating to interest rates and the terms and conditions of bonds guaranteed under this title), sue and be sued (but subject to the Attorney General's authority to conduct litigation on behalf of Federal agencies), foreclose property and remodel, dispose of, or otherwise deal with it (but State or local civil or criminal jurisdiction and civil rights under State or local law would be preserved), make payments in lieu of taxes, sell or exchange property and securities, insure property and other assets, modify contracts or agreements under this section, and include such other provisions in contracts as he deems necessary.

Subsection (c) would merely provide an exemption from the advertising requirements of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes where the amount of any contract for services or supplies on account of property acquired by the Surgeon General under this section is not more than $1,000.

Definitions

Section 306 contains definitions of terms used in this title of the bill.

The term "construction cost" is defined as the cost of construction of group practice medical or medical and dental facilities and the land on which located, and including only such equipment as may be permitted by the Surgeon General's regulations.

The term "bonds" is defined to mean any bonds, notes, interim certificates, certificates of indebtedness, debentures, or other obligations.

The term "group practice facilities" is defined as facilities for diagnosis or diagnosis and treatment of ambulatory patients (under appropriate medical or medical and dental care) which are primarily for the provision of health or medical services by a medical group. The term "medical group" is, in turn, defined as a partnership or other association of licensed medical or medical and dental practitioners who, as their principal professional activity and as a group responsibility, engage in coordinated practice primarily in the group practice facilities and who (in connection with such activity) share common overhead expenses and records and substantial portions of equipment and staffs, and which has a minimum of professional personnel, equipment, and staff prescribed in the Surgeon General's regulations.

The term "group practice agency or organization" is defined as a private agency or organization undertaking to provide comprehensive medical or medical and dental care to members or subscribers on a group practice prepayment basis. This care may include hospitalization, and it may be provided directly or through arrangements with a medical group (as defined above). The term also includes any private nonprofit agency or organization, established for or in connection with improvement of medical or dental care in the community, which will make the group practice facility for which it requests guarantee of a loan available to a medical group for use by it. Finally such term also includes a medical group (as defined above).

The term "State" would include Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

Authorization of appropriation

Section 307 would authorize appropriation of sums necessary to carry out the purposes of the title. Such appropriations would have to be paid to the Treasury before July 1, 1966.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the bill has three titles.

Title I is Revisions of Title VI of the Public Health Service Act.

Title II is Grants for Medical, Dental, Osteopathic, and Public Health Teaching Facilities Construction.

Title III is Guarantee of Loans for Construction of Group Practice Medical or Dental Facilities.

The bill proposes to revise, to consolidate, and to improve the hospital and medical facilities construction grant program, the so-called Hill-Burton Act program. It would amend the section of the law which authorizes a 5-year program of construction grants for teaching facilities, to expand the opportunities to teach medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health. It would authorize a 5-year program of Federal credit assistance to construct group practice facilities.

This is the new way in which to provide medical service for our people. Together, these proposals set forth sound public or institutional planning for facilities, personnel, and organization of services to meet present and future requirements for health and medical services for our people. They are the result of an enormous amount of work by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I have the honor to present them to the Congress.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO REINVESTMENT DEPRECIATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will help stimulate economic growth and activity and provide additional jobs by the revision of our outmoded depreciation policy. Replacement of obsolete and inefficient machinery and equipment will be possible through this bill which permits the allowance of reinvestment depreciation deductions. Under this concept past depreciation deductions are adjusted to conform with current replacement costs.

In many industrial plants there is a great contrast between the parking lot and the factory. The parking lot is crowded with cars that are new or a few years old at most, with recent improvements and conveniences taken for granted. Inside the factory are old machines, still running, not the best or most efficient, but kept in line because there is not enough money for needed replacement and rehabilitation. Hard as it is to believe, this is the fact, and its urgency is beginning to be realized. Congress is informed about it, the Treasury is investigating it, economists are studying it, and accountants and lawyers are working out plans for the practical solution of the problem.

The managers of industry, who are responsible for designing, acquiring, and using its tools and machines, freely admit that one-third of these are old-fashioned, outmoded, and inefficient—in a word, obsolete.

This is not the concern of industry alone. It would take about $100 billion to replace the machinery and equipment its managers and operators admit is obsolete, an amount roughly equal to one-third of the national debt. Furthermore, economists estimate that this figure grows by $5 to $6 billion every year.

Any attempt to correct this condition or any failure to recognize or remedy it would have repercussions throughout our entire economy and would affect the daily life of almost every citizen.

This condition is primarily the result of a continuous, and continuing, failure to permit the managers of industry to deduct from taxable income an amount, called depreciation, sufficient for them to maintain existing machinery and to replace it when it becomes uneconomical to operate.

Our antiquated depreciation system was conceived in the depths of the great depression and was based on the proposition that so long as a wheel will turn a machine will not be discarded. Under modern operating and technical conditions this assumption is fantastically unrealistic.

Without exception the industrial nations of the world, other than ourselves, have adopted liberal and progressive depreciation systems. Their industrial machinery is newer and more efficient than much of ours, partly because of the Marshall plan and other types of aid, and partly because of the tax incentives to scrap a good machine in favor of a better. This is one of the prime causes of the difficulties so many of our manufacturers have in meeting foreign competition.

At several hearings before Senate and House committees, Congress has been assured by nationally recognized experts that our present depreciation system is stifling economic development, slowing down the growth of national income, and

reducing employment. Furthermore, these same experts have produced evidence, so far unchallenged, that there will be little or no immediate loss of revenue if depreciation is increased and substantial gains in the not very long run.

One of the first items of business of the new Congress should be legislation to give the managers of industry the right and opportunity to maintain existing machinery and to replace what should be discarded by a change to a realistic, liberalized depreciation system.

The bill which I have introduced places before the Congress the concept of reinvestment depreciation deductions for income-tax purposes.

The purpose of this bill is primarily to stimulate economic growth and activity. This, in turn, will provide more jobs for our growing labor force and, by permitting manufacturers to replace obsolete and inefficient machinery, will make it possible to compete with countries such as West Germany and Japan, which have more favorable tax laws than are found in this country.

Inadequate depreciation allowances, a condition which this bill is intended to correct, are a burden upon both large and small business, but the burden is proportionately much heavier on small business. The small business is at a considerable disadvantage because of its limited access to the capital markets and the necessarily higher cost of providing capital in small amounts. While it would be imprudent for any business to borrow merely to replace wornout machinery and equipment, it still would be easier for a large organization to do this than a small one. While it is a well-known fact brought out by witnesses before both the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, and before the Ways and Means Committee that about one-third of the productive machinery and equipment now in use in this country is obsolete, the proportion of obsolescence is much higher in the smaller industries. In the textile industry, for instance, where the units are predominantly of small or medium size, about 50 percent of the machinery is obsolete. This, of course, makes for higher costs, and makes competition with well-equipped foreign countries much more difficult.

Another reason why inadequate depreciation is a burden to both large and small business is that in this country the smaller organizations are frequently the suppliers of the larger ones, and stimulation of the smaller business alone would not produce the best results even for the smaller business. For example, most printing companies are comparatively small, yet their customers are predominantly the larger organizations. The same is true with tool and die shops, and the makers of specialized parts for the electrical and electronic industries.

In introducing this bill I do not mean to imply that it is the only answer to the depreciation problem. It is one of several feasible solutions which have been put forward. All of them deserve the careful consideration of the Congress. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will consider and act on the depreciation problem during this session.

Current deductions for additions to depreciation reserves on business assets purchased in periods of lower prices are inadequate to cover the costs of replacement. This fact is irrefutable. As a result, our income tax system does not permit businesses to deduct amounts sufficient to maintain the level of their existing investment in plant and equipment.

Businessmen are forced into this tax squeeze at a time when it is vital that we increase the rate of economic growth in our economy. This is a case where tax policy has failed to keep in step with the economic needs of our country.

The report of the hearings before the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate and the several hearings on this subject before the Ways and Means Committee impressed me with the practical possibilities of the reinvestment depreciation solution to this problem.

The name "reinvestment depreciation" is descriptive of the bill because the bill provides a deduction for depreciation measured by the cost of the reinvestment necessary to maintain the size of the taxpayer's investment and because this deduction is limited to the number of dollars actually reinvested. In other words, the bill is designed to adjust past depreciation deductions to conform with current replacement costs but only if an additional dollar amount equal to the corrected depreciation deduction is actually reinvested by the taxpayer.

Under the bill the correcting depreciation adjustment is not made until the asset subject to the adjustment has been sold, abandoned, or dismantled. At that time all speculation has been removed as to what actual replacement cost at the end of the asset's life will be.

The reinvestment depreciation deduction is conditioned on actual reinvestment by the taxpayer of an amount equal to the replacement cost of the old assets sold or dismantled during the year. Determination of the replacement cost of an asset is a simple mathematical computation by which the historical cost of the old asset is converted into current dollars by applying an annual price index to be supplied by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is not necessary that the old asset be replaced precisely. The deduction is allowed if an equivalent investment is made in any eligible assets.

The basis for tax purposes of the new replacement assets is reduced under the bill by the amount of the reinvestment depreciation deduction which is taken by the taxpayer at the time of the reinvestment. Thus, the bill does not permit depreciation deductions in the aggregate to exceed actual dollar costs. Over the years, depreciation deductions will not exceed tax basis.

The reinvestment depreciation treatment provided by the bill will be optional with the taxpayer. Once elected, it will be binding for subsequent years and it will apply to all eligible assets sold or dismantled during the year.

Any gain on the sale or other disposition of the replacement assets which is attributable to the reinvestment depreciation deduction taken when these assets are acquired will be taxed as ordinary income. Consequently, the bill could not be used to obtain deductions against ordinary income at the price of a later capital gains tax.

Since reinvestment does not ordinarily coincide exactly with the sale or dismantlement of old assets, the bill makes provision for a 2-year carryforward of the unused or unreinvested difference between the original cost of the old assets sold or dismantled during any year and their replacement cost at that time.

When a bill which provides for additional deductions from taxable income is being considered a natural and proper question is, What will be the effect on the revenue? Testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in November 1959 and March 1960 indicates, however, that what might be called the gross revenue loss will be offset by the tax on the increased income generated by the expenditure of the funds required to be invested under the provisions of the bill. Therefore, the Treasury will suffer no short run revenue loss and will be laying the foundation for future gains.

This is borne out by the experience of Canada where depreciation deductions were greatly liberalized in 1946 and 1949. The Canadian legislation has been in effect from that time to the present. The Canadian experience, described to the Committee on Ways and Means by a witness at the hearings on March 2 and 3, 1960, indicates that no loss of revenue resulted from the use of a depreciation system much more liberal than ours.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week to enable Senators who may wish to do so to join as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 720) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of stimulating economic growth and activity, providing additional jobs for the growing labor force, and permitting the replacement of obsolete and inefficient machinery and equipment by the allowance of reinvestment depreciation deductions, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective with respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1961, chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting after section 167 the following new section:

"SEC. 167A. REINVESTMENT DEPRECIATION

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—At the election of the taxpayer, there shall be allowed as a reinvestment depreciation deduction, with respect to the amount invested by the taxpayer in the purchase or construction of eligible business assets, the amount by which the reinvested amount exceeds the section 167A basis of eligible business assets sold,

abandoned, or dismantled during the taxable year, but the deduction for the taxable year shall not exceed the sum of:

"(1) the amount by which the aggregate historical cost, adjusted in the case of each asset by the price index as proclaimed by the Secretary exceeds the section 167A basis of eligible business assets sold, abandoned, or dismantled during the taxable year, plus

"(2) the reinvestment carryovers to the year.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ELIGIBLE BUSINESS ASSETS.—The term 'eligible business assets' means tangible property used in the taxpayer's trade or business or held for the production of income which is of a type which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167, and which is not—

"(A) property of a kind which would properly be includible in the inventory of the taxpayer if on hand at the close of the taxable year; or

"(B) property held by the taxpayer primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of his trade or business.

"(2) REINVESTED AMOUNT.—The term 'reinvested amount' means the total amount paid or accrued by the taxpayer during the taxable year in the purchase or construction of eligible business assets, reduced by the amount (if any) by which

"(A) the section 167A basis of all eligible business assets sold, abandoned, or dismantled in previous years to which the taxpayer's election under this section applies; exceeds

"(B) the total amount paid or accrued by the taxpayer during such previous years in the purchase or construction of eligible business assets.

Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a taxpayer may elect to treat the cost of the purchase or construction of eligible business assets as paid or accrued for the taxable year in which such assets are put in use in lieu of the taxable year in which such cost is actually paid or accrued.

"(3) HISTORICAL COST.—The term 'historical cost' as applied to any asset means the unadjusted basis (for purposes of computing gain upon sale or exchange) of such asset as provided in section 1012 or as otherwise provided in subchapter C, K, O, or P, but without regard to the reduction provided in paragraph (4) of subsection (c) of this section.

"(4) SECTION 167A BASIS.—The term 'section 176A basis' as applied to any asset means the historical cost of such asset reduced, if such asset was acquired during a taxable year for which an election of the provisions of this section was in effect, as provided in paragraph (4) of subsection (c).

"(5) PRICE INDEX PROCLAIMED BY THE SECRETARY.—The term 'price index proclaimed by the Secretary' means that price index, or composite of price indexes, for the calendar years 1913 through 1960 and for each subsequent calendar year after the close of 1960, which is selected by the Secretary or his delegate and proclaimed as most accurately reflecting changes in the cost in the United States of machinery, equipment, buildings, and other tangible assets generally subject to an allowance for depreciation and generally used in business.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) ADJUSTMENT OF HISTORICAL COST BY PRICE INDEX.—The adjustment of the historical cost of an asset by the price index proclaimed by the Secretary shall be made by increasing or decreasing the historical cost by the percentage increase or decrease in prices, as shown by the price index proclaimed by the Secretary, between the calendar year in which the asset was acquired and the calendar year in which the taxable year commenced during which the asset was sold, abandoned, or dismantled. If an asset was acquired prior to March 1, 1913, it shall be considered as having been acquired on such date.

"(2) TREATMENT OF GAIN ON RESALE.—Gain from the sale or exchange of property, to the extent that the adjusted basis of such property is less than its adjusted basis determined without regard to the reduction provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection, shall be considered as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in section 1231.

"(3) TREATMENT OF ASSETS WITH CARRIED-OVER BASIS.—In the case of an asset the basis of which is determined in whole or in part by reference to the basis of such asset in the hands of the transferor from whom it was acquired, the acquisition of such asset shall not be considered a purchase for purposes of paragraph (2) of subsection (b), the historical cost of such asset shall be its unadjusted basis in the hands of the transferor increased or decreased by gain or loss recognized to such transferor, and the date of its acquisition by such transferor shall be considered the date of its acquisition for purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(4) ADJUSTMENT TO BASIS OF ASSETS.—The basis of an eligible business asset acquired or put in use during a taxable year for which the taxpayer has a deduction determined under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the portion of such deduction attributable to the acquisition or use of such asset. The amount so attributable shall be determined by prorating the deduction determined under subsection (a) among the assets composing the reinvestment amount in proportion to their basis determined without regard to this paragraph.

"(5) ELECTION.—The method and time for electing the provisions of this section shall be prescribed by regulations by the Secretary or his delegate. Election of the provisions of this section shall be binding for all subsequent taxable years of the taxpayer until terminated with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

"(d) REINVESTMENT CARRYOVER.—If, for any taxable year for which an election under this section is in effect, the amount determined under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) is greater than the amount of the deduction allowed for such year under subsection (a), the excess shall be a reinvestment carryover for each of the two succeeding taxable years, except that the amount of the carryover to the second succeeding taxable year shall be reduced by the amount (if any) by which the deduction under subsection (a) for the first succeeding taxable year was increased by reason of such carryover."

CONVERSION OF SHIPS IN PRIVATE YARDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with the problem of tax-free Federal competition with taxpaying private industry. This bill would require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards.

Senators BUSH and CANNON have cosponsored this bill with me, and I ask unanimous consent that it lay on the table for 1 week in the event that other Senators, equally concerned by Government competition with private industry, might also want to join in sponsoring this measure.

If this bill had been law during fiscal year 1961, private shipyards would have received $294.5 million more in repair, conversion, and alteration work. If this bill becomes law this year, private shipyards will receive in fiscal year 1962 $368.8 million more in repair, conversion, and alteration work.

These figures are based on the difference between the estimated 20 percent work which private shipyards presently receive and the 75 percent they will receive under the provisions of this bill.

My colleagues might be interested to learn the dollars and cents involved in this legislation. In fiscal year 1961 a total of $535.5 million will have been spent on naval ship repair, alteration, and conversion. In fiscal year 1962 a total of $670.5 million has been asked for.

Democratic and Republican administrations alike have proclaimed that Government competition with private industry must be eliminated or minimized. But, in spite of these declarations of national purpose, the navy-yard complex has been permitted to operate at high rates of activity while private commercial ship repair yards have been forced to lay off thousands of skilled workers. The result of this policy is that while employment today in the Government-owned, Government-operated naval shipyards is relatively stable, employment in the private yards is at an unprecedented low level.

It may amaze my colleagues to learn that the Navy performs most conversions, alterations, and repairs of naval vessels in navy yards. The last figures I saw showed that in recent years an average of 80 percent of this work was sent to navy yards, while only 20 percent was awarded to private commercial yards on a competitive basis.

But, what makes this distribution even more nonsensical is the fact that private yards can do the same work for less money. A repair estimate that crossed my desk the other day put a value of approximately $5,000 per displacement-ton on this saving.

More substantiation is found in the recent announcement that an aircraft carrier contract was awarded to a private shipyard for approximately $40 million less than the navy yard's estimates. And a top naval official—a man who should know, the Chief of the Bureau of Ships—has publicly stated that the navy yards could save $95 million each year if the management and production techniques of private yards were adopted.

It is hard for me to believe that the executive department will not seize this opportunity to save money without jeopardy to our defense posture. Even more, passage of this bill, resulting in a greater volume of Navy contracts to private ship repair yards, will improve our mobilization readiness to meet all future contingencies and multiply tax revenues to meet the overall burdens of national security.

To those Members of the Senate having navy yards in their home States, we offer this observation from the Journal of Commerce on December 8, 1960:

Since a shift of naval contracts to private yards would find the latter doing precisely the kind of work the Navy's own yards would have otherwise been doing it follows that

no very great hardship would result for the demand for labor from private shipyards would increase almost proportionately with the number of navy-yard layoffs. We say "almost proportionately" because there is some evidence that private yards can do with fewer men on a given project than navy yards.

Mr. President, enactment of this bill would provide an immediate opportunity for the Government to get more for every defense dollar appropriated for work on naval vessels while at the same time stimulating the taxpaying private sector of our economy. Senators BUSH, CANNON, and I urge that it be given prompt and thorough attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 721) to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship repair yards, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1961

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill best described by its title, "To authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in financing a minimum foundation program of public elementary and secondary school education, in order to more nearly equalize educational opportunities, improve teachers' salaries, construct schools, and otherwise improve the quality of such education."

I am very pleased that Senators JAVITS, AIKEN, FULBRIGHT, ANDERSON, KUCHEL, FONG, and WILEY join me in the introduction of this bill.

I know that the administration will have its own bill, but I hope they will study this bill. It would advance equal educational opportunity throughout the country. I think it secures, as closely as any bill can, freedom of the States from Federal control. And it uses a formula which, I believe, deals fairly with all the States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an explanation of the bill, tables showing the estimated State allotments, and the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement, tables, and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 723) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in financing a minimum foundation program of public elementary and secondary school education, in order to more nearly equalize educational opportunities, improve teachers' salaries, construct schools and otherwise improve the quality of such education, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement, tables, and bill, presented by Mr. COOPER, are as follows:

EXPLANATION OF COOPER BILL PROVIDING A MINIMUM FOUNDATION PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION, WITH 4 YEARS OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION, TEACHERS' SALARIES, AND OTHER EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AS DETERMINED BY THE STATES

"Equality of opportunity lies at the basis of the entire Republic. No child can begin to have equality of opportunity unless he has in his youth, above all, effective schooling" (S. Rept. No. 425, 80th Cong.).

"The purpose of this act is to assist the States in financing a minimum foundation program of public elementary and secondary school education designed to provide more nearly equal opportunities for the Nation's children by raising the quality of such education in the States and districts in greatest need of assistance" (sec. 2, 1961 Cooper bill).

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill would assist the States in equalizing educational opportunity within and among the States through Federal allotments of $20 per public school child, with larger amounts to those States which, after making a maximum reasonable effort to provide support for schools, would still be unable to guarantee a minimum educational program.

It is designed to give fair representation to the educational needs of every State, and to make it possible for those States which cannot now provide public school education approaching the national average to do so within 4 years.

The flat grants of $20 per pupil in average daily attendance, for each of 4 years, could be used for emergency school construction, for better teachers' salaries, or to otherwise improve the quality of education in school districts in greatest need of assistance. These grants would help achieve equality of educational opportunity within the abler States.

The grants of more than $20 per pupil, based on need, would help the low-income States bridge the gap between a fair allocation to education of their resources and the cost of adequate public school education. They would help equalize educational opportunities among the States, in the national interest.

These variable grants would go to the neediest States first, and would be used to raise the lowest levels of education first. The foundation goal would be reached in four annual steps, so that by 1965 every State could offer public school education equivalent to the present national average.

MAINTAINING STATE EFFORT

To receive an allotment, States must maintain at least their present level of public school current expenditures per child.

APPLICATIONS AND STATE PLANS

The States would submit an application to the Commissioner of Education containing a plan for use of the allotment in improving their public school education. The State plan must give priority to school systems in greatest need of assistance. The States would also submit an annual report on the use of the allotment toward accomplishing the objectives of their plans.

The plan-and-report feature should encourage development of a constructive program, and would present the State's accomplishment to public view. However, approval of the State plan would not be required as a condition of Federal assistance.

ALLOCATION FORMULA

1. The minimum foundation for each State is computed as $400 times the number of children in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools. ($325 first year, $350 second year, $375 third year.)

2. Four percent of total annual personal income (latest 3-year average) is taken as a fair measure of the State's resources available for education.

The State's allotment—or Federal share in the minimum foundation—is: (A) One-half the amount by which the minimum foundation (1) exceeds 4 percent of State income (2); or (B) $20 per public school child, whichever is larger.

ESTIMATED COST	*Million*
1st year	$710
2d year	790
3d year	890
4th year	1,000
4-year cost	3,390

The 4-year program contemplates Federal assistance amounting to $80 per public school pupil for every State, which should be of substantial aid to emergency school construction and toward better teachers' salaries. Included in $3,390 million total above, for this part of the program: $2,680 million.

The remaining $720 million represents the additional cost of equalization grants to the low-income States, at $70, $130, $215, and $305 million for the 4 years. Six States would receive amounts exceeding $20 per pupil the first year; 11 the second year; 15 the third year, and 18 the fourth year. These estimates assume State income per child remains stable. If it increases, as seems likely, equalization amounts needed will decrease.

NEED FOR EQUALIZATION

The best objective measure of the fiscal capacity of the States to provide any service is their total personal income, as computed annually by the Department of Commerce. The need for a national equalization plan for public school education arises from the fact that the personal income per pupil in some States—such as West Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, North Carolina, Arkansas, South Carolina, and Mississippi—is one-third that of Delaware, New York, New Jersey, and Illinois, and in fact is only half the national average.

Even though these low-income States assign a substantially larger share of their State and local resources to education than do the more fortunate States, they cannot hope to achieve educational levels approaching the national average investment per pupil in teachers' salaries and operating expenses. For example, even if Mississippi were to raise its current expenditures for education from 3.3 percent of its income to 4 percent—a level reached by only 3 States and well above the national average of 2.8 percent—it could still afford a level of education scarcely more than half that of the national average, now about $400 per pupil and a presently desirable goal.

Aid-to-education proposals which offer flat amounts such as $25, $30, or $50 per child, or an average of $20 per child weighted by a construction formula from $12 in New York to $30 in Mississippi, do not meet this basic problem. In South Carolina, for example, 4 percent of State income amounts to $223 per child—about 55 percent of the desirable minimum State average—leaving a discouraging "education gap" of $177 per child per year.

EQUALIZATION PROPOSED

This bill proposes that the Federal Government contribute an amount equal to half the cost of bridging that gap—or approximately $89 per public school pupil in South Carolina by the fourth year.

The equalization amounts for the other low-income States scale down to $20 per pupil, according to the difference between 4 percent of their income and the goal of public school education averaging $400 per child.

The $400-per-child base would be reached in four annual steps. The first year it would be set at $325—making additional funds available to the five or six lowest income States in amounts they could be expected to constructively use. The second-year base of $350 would bring five of the next most critically needy States into the equalization program. By the fourth year, 18 States having incomes less than approximately 75 percent of national average would be receiving grants larger than the basic $20 per child—and in direct proportion to the gap between their resources and basic educational needs.

By allocating 4 percent of their income to current educational costs, and by sharing equally with the Federal Government the remaining cost of adequate public education, these States could by 1965 assure education averaging $400 per child—approximately the present national average.

PRESERVATION OF STATE AND LOCAL CONTROL

Federal funds would be pooled with State education system funds, and could be used for any educational purpose for which State funds could legally and constitutionally be used.

Not only administration and control of the school systems, but determination of the financial level of education remains wholly with State and local governments under this bill. There would be no shadow of Federal control. The Federal and State responsibilities remain quite separate.

The formula used is essentially a yardstick for assigning the extent of Federal responsibility in making possible more nearly equal opportunities for all children. It avoids all Federal standards except the desirable expenditure-per-pupil goal implied by the formula itself.

This is accomplished by basing the Federal share not on what the State does spend, as in matching, but on the gap between the State's financial capacity and a standard of education measured in dollars.

The State may spend more or less than 4 percent of its income, as it is doing now. It may exceed the Federal contribution in closing the "education gap" and provide better-than-average schools. Or it may fail to match it—in which case its level of education, while improved, will continue to lag.

But the Federal assistance can provide a powerful incentive by making adequate levels of education possible in many areas for the first time. The foundation plan would say, in effect: "It is a Federal responsibility to help meet essential public-school costs which exceed a fair share of State and local resources. We will share with you the extra effort required to bring more nearly equal opportunities to every child, in the national interest."

FORMULA JUSTIFICATION

(A) The figure of $400 as the minimum foundation for public school current expenditures (excluding capital outlay and interest) per child in average daily attendance, is approximately the present national average. With rising educational costs, and general acknowledgment that the national effort should be increased, this seems modest enough as a goal 4 years hence.

(B) The interim foundation figures of $325, $350, and $375 per child in the first, second, and third years of the program were selected as reasonable steps toward the fourth-year goal—to prevent waste, to permit planning of expanded State programs, and to encourage greater State efforts over the 4-year period. The effect is to allocate equalization funds first to the neediest States, and to raise the lowest school standards first.

(C) The figure of 4 percent of income—as a measure of the State's capacity to meet basic educational needs—sets a high standard for State effort toward better levels of public education. Only New Mexico, South Dakota, and Louisiana now devote this proportion of their income to running their schools. Seven other States—Wyoming, North Dakota, Arizona, Utah, Montana, South Carolina, and Oregon—spend 3.5 percent or more; the national average is 2.8 percent and most of the higher income States spend less than 2.5 percent. While a low-income State would not have to spend 4 percent under the bill, it could not reach desirable levels of education even with Federal assistance without doing so.

(D) The figure of half as the Federal share. While it can be argued that Federal assistance should make up the entire difference between a reasonably large State-local effort and minimum standards, this proposal is for only half that amount, requiring still further efforts by the States to achieve education equivalent to the national average. Therefore, this plan may be considered conservative, and the minimum weighting for the lowest income States in any realistic approach to equalizing educational opportunity.

(E) The figure of $20 per child in average daily attendance for States not in the lowest income group is similar to the amount voted by the Senate last year for school construction in needy districts and teachers' salaries, which, however, was weighted. The flat $20-per-pupil grants in this bill do not penalize the States where educational costs per pupil and construction costs are higher, and which contribute a larger share of Federal revenues.

PRECEDENTS

The principles employed by this bill were recommended last year by the Committee for Economic Development in their study "Paying for Better Schools." It can be considered as combining the Taft equalization and flat-grant proposals.

This plan is analogous to the minimum foundation plans of many States, which combine equalization and flat-grant provisions and which have successfully raised levels of education within the means of the States. It is designed to give fair representation to the educational needs of every State, based on its number of students, and to contribute realistically toward equal opportunity and a minimum level of education for every child, in the national interest.

SHORT COMPARISON

Recent proposals which include aid for teachers' salaries have these terms, grants and estimated costs.

1961 Cooper bill: Salaries, construction and other. Four years, with continuing equalization grants. $20 per pupil in ADA for most States; larger grants scaled to need for low-income States. First-year cost—$700 million.

S. 8 (as passed Senate 1960): Salaries or construction. Two years. Average of $20 per school-age child, weighted by State income from $12 (New York) to $30 (Mississippi). First-year cost—$928 million.

Hovde Task Force, January 6, 1961: Salaries, construction or other. Continuing. $30 per pupil in ADA; plus $20 per pupil in States below 70 percent of national average income; plus $20 per pupil to cities over 300,000 population. First-year cost—$1,460 million.

Murray-Metcalf (S. 2, H.R. 22, 1959): Salaries or construction. Continuing. $25 per school-age child first year; $50 second year; $75 third year; $100 fourth and following years (H.R. 22 as reported, $25 for 4 years). First-year cost—$1,126 million.

Cooper bill to provide a minimum foundation for public school education

ESTIMATED STATE ALLOTMENTS PER CHILD

	1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year		1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year
New York	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00	Florida	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00
Delaware	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Arizona	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Illinois	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Kansas	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
New Jersey	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Texas	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Connecticut	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Maine	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Rhode Island	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00					
Massachusetts	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Virginia	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.66
Alaska	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Hawaii	20.00	20.00	20.00	21.37
Pennsylvania	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Oklahoma	20.00	20.00	20.00	29.95
Missouri	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00					
Maryland	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	North Dakota	20.00	20.00	23.82	36.32
Ohio	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Louisiana	20.00	20.00	29.16	41.66
Nevada	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	South Dakota	20.00	20.00	29.22	41.72
Wisconsin	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Kentucky	20.00	20.00	30.14	42.64
California	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00					
New Hampshire	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Idaho	20.00	21.50	34.09	46.59
Michigan	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	New Mexico	20.00	22.09	34.59	47.09
Indiana	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	West Virginia	20.00	29.38	41.88	54.38
Oregon	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Georgia	20.00	29.86	42.36	54.86
Washington	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Utah	20.00	31.75	44.25	56.75
Minnesota	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00					
Nebraska	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Tennessee	21.13	33.63	46.13	58.63
Wyoming	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Alabama	34.83	47.33	59.83	72.33
Colorado	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	North Carolina	35.14	47.64	60.14	72.64
Vermont	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Arkansas	42.12	54.62	67.12	79.62
Iowa	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	South Carolina	51.23	63.73	76.23	88.73
Montana	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Mississippi	60.69	73.19	85.69	98.19

NOTE.—Allotments per child in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools. Computed as ½ the difference between 4 percent of State personal income per child and the foundation level of $325 1st year, $350 2d year, $375 3d year, $400 4th year. Or, $20 per child, whichever is larger.

Assumes State income per child remains the same in 2d, 3d, and 4th years. States ranked by personal income (3-year average 1957–59) per public school child (in ADA 1959–60). District of Columbia allotment: $20 per child.—Table A, Jan. 1, 1961.

Cooper bill to provide a minimum foundation for public school education

ESTIMATED STATE ALLOTMENTS

	1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year		1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year
New York	$48,905,680	$48,905,680	$48,905,680	$48,905,680	Texas	$36,736,260	$36,736,260	$36,736,260	$36,736,260
Delaware	1,457,840	1,457,840	1,457,840	1,457,840	Maine	3,574,420	3,574,420	3,574,420	3,574,420
Illinois	29,449,960	29,449,960	29,449,960	29,449,960					
New Jersey	18,423,860	18,423,860	18,423,860	18,424,860	Virginia	14,945,960	14,945,960	14,945,960	15,439,600
Connecticut	8,380,860	8,380,860	8,380,860	8,380,860	Hawaii	2,646,880	2,646,880	2,646,880	2,828,800
Rhode Island	2,292,200	2,292,200	2,292,200	2,292,200	Oklahoma	9,270,180	9,270,180	9,270,180	13,881,800
Massachusetts	15,569,280	15,569,280	15,569,280	15,569,280					
Alaska	721,140	721,140	721,140	721,140	North Dakota	2,421,860	2,421,860	2,884,937	4,398,600
Pennsylvania	34,964,360	34,964,360	34,964,360	34,964,360	Louisiana	12,618,160	12,618,160	18,395,250	26,231,600
Missouri	13,614,620	13,614,620	13,614,620	13,614,620	South Dakota	2,731,940	2,731,940	3,991,937	5,699,400
Maryland	10,493,760	10,493,760	10,493,760	10,493,760	Kentucky	11,088,280	11,088,280	16,712,625	23,642,800
Ohio	33,719,520	33,719,520	33,719,520	33,719,520					
Nevada	1,122,660	1,122,660	1,122,660	1,122,660	Idaho	2,943,800	3,178,250	5,018,125	6,858,000
Wisconsin	12,932,920	12,932,920	12,932,920	12,932,920	New Mexico	4,041,580	4,463,825	6,989,812	9,515,800
California	63,279,320	63,279,320	63,279,320	63,279,320	West Virginia	8,328,400	12,233,500	17,438,750	22,644,000
New Hampshire	1,889,720	1,889,720	1,889,720	1,889,720	Georgia	15,786,060	23,568,025	33,434,312	43,300,600
Michigan	29,679,420	29,679,420	29,679,420	29,679,420	Utah	4,283,540	6,800,975	9,478,187	12,155,400
Indiana	16,719,420	16,719,420	16,719,420	16,719,420					
Oregon	6,608,020	6,608,020	6,608,020	6,608,020	Tennessee	15,197,138	24,189,225	33,181,312	42,173,400
Washington	11,278,460	11,278,460	11,278,460	11,278,460	Alabama	23,990,162	32,600,175	41,210,187	49,820,200
Minnesota	12,118,660	12,118,660	12,118,660	12,118,660	North Carolina	35,069,800	47,544,400	60,019,000	72,493,600
Nebraska	5,171,740	5,171,740	5,171,740	5,171,740	Arkansas	15,352,225	19,908,550	24,464,875	29,021,200
Wyoming	1,285,200	1,285,200	1,285,200	1,285,200	South Carolina	27,286,525	33,943,950	40,601,375	47,258,800
Colorado	6,757,240	6,757,240	6,757,240	6,757,240	Mississippi	27,584,700	33,266,600	38,948,500	44,630,400
Vermont	1,295,220	1,295,220	1,295,220	1,295,220					
Iowa	10,598,740	10,598,740	10,598,740	10,598,740	$20 per child, United States	640,354,520	640,354,520	640,354,520	640,354,520
Montana	2,656,000	2,656,000	2,656,000	2,656,000	Equalization	69,324,770	131,258,315	213,369,808	305,781,500
Florida	17,217,740	17,217,740	17,217,740	17,217,740					
Arizona	4,584,880	4,584,880	4,584,880	4,584,880	Total	709,679,290	771,612,835	853,724,328	946,136,020
Kansas	8,558,780	8,558,780	8,558,780	8,558,780					

NOTE.—States ranked by income per public school child. States below the line receive equalization grants (more than $20 per pupil). District of Columbia included in total, at $2,034,220 each year.

Allotments computed as ½ the amount by which minimum foundation exceeds 4 percent of State income, or $20 per public school child, whichever is larger. Minimum foundation is product of number of pupils in ADA in public elementary and secondary schools times $325 1st year, $350 2d year, $375 3d year, $400 4th year. Pupils for 1959–60 school year. State personal income, 3-year average 1957–59. Increase in school enrollment not projected.—Table B, Jan. 1, 1961.

State comparison—Income, public school pupils and current expenditures—supporting data for Cooper bill providing a minimum foundation for public schools

	Annual personal income	Public school current expenditures	Current expenditures as percent of income	Public school pupils	Income per pupil	Present current expenditures per pupil		Annual personal income	Public school current expenditures	Current expenditures as percent of income	Public school pupils	Income per pupil	Present current expenditures per pupil
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*				*Thousands*	*Thousands*		*Thousands*		
New York	$42,817,000	$1,146,125	2.7	2,445	$17,510	$585	Montana	$1,313,000	$47,647	3.6	133	$9,887	$427
Delaware	1,259,000	28,842	2.3	73	17,272	460	Florida	8,468,000	227,837	2.7	861	9,836	310
Illinois	24,635,000	544,950	2.2	1,472	16,730	457	Arizona	2,200,000	80,709	3.6	229	9,597	390
New Jersey	14,692,000	373,271	2.5	921	15,949	512	Kansas	4,097,000	131,650	3.2	428	9,574	384
Connecticut	6,625,000	151,356	2.3	419	15,810	420	Texas	17,242,000	535,798	3.1	1,837	9,387	330
Rhode Island	1,752,000	40,540	2.3	115	15,287	417	Maine	1,648,000	42,516	2.6	179	9,221	326
Massachusetts	11,801,000	269,750	2.3	778	15,159	413	Virginia	6,701,000	172,638	2.6	747	8,967	275
Alaska	540,000	16,441	3.0	36	14,976	585	Hawaii	1,182,000	33,083	2.8	132	8,931	378
Pennsylvania	23,949,000	620,191	2.6	1,748	13,699	421	Oklahoma	3,941,000	129,987	3.3	464	8,503	320
Missouri	8,734,000	207,199	2.4	681	12,830	355	North Dakota	991,000	38,264	3.9	121	8,184	345
Maryland	6,717,000	166,143	2.5	525	12,802	415	Louisiana	4,995,000	202,624	4.1	631	7,917	370
Ohio	21,137,000	525,090	2.5	1,686	12,537	388	South Dakota	1,081,000	42,741	4.0	137	7,914	350
Nevada	694,000	18,770	2.7	56	12,363	435	Kentucky	4,362,000	116,216	2.7	554	7,868	275
Wisconsin	7,798,000	218,873	2.8	647	12,059	422	Idaho	1,129,000	37,280	3.3	147	7,670	285
California	37,832,000	1,081,847	2.9	3,164	11,957	494	New Mexico	1,545,000	61,592	4.0	202	7,646	365
New Hampshire	1,125,000	27,468	2.4	94	11,907	363	West Virginia	3,032,000	96,953	3.2	416	7,281	255
Michigan	16,999,000	512,657	3.0	1,484	11,455	424	Georgia	5,728,000	190,430	3.3	789	7,257	236
Indiana	9,349,000	264,927	2.8	836	11,183	373	Utah	1,534,000	56,849	3.7	214	7,162	340
Oregon	3,590,000	127,172	3.5	330	10,866	448	Tennessee	5,085,000	146,365	2.9	719	7,069	228
Washington	6,057,000	200,823	3.3	564	10,741	430	Alabama	4,397,000	135,901	3.1	689	6,384	217
Minnesota	6,440,000	218,574	3.4	606	10,628	415	North Carolina	6,355,000	207,750	3.3	998	6,368	240
Nebraska	2,731,000	75,123	2.8	259	10,561	320	Arkansas	2,194,000	74,182	3.4	365	6,019	242
Wyoming	678,000	26,608	3.9	64	10,551	454	South Carolina	2,963,000	105,368	3.6	533	5,563	223
Colorado	3,537,000	106,246	3.0	338	10,469	407	Mississippi	2,314,000	77,379	3.3	455	5,091	226
Vermont	656,000	20,631	3.1	65	10,130	339							
Iowa	5,255,000	172,527	3.3	530	9,916	400	United States	361,896,000	10,153,803	2.8	31,916	11,339	390

Total annual personal income, 3-year average 1957–59. Current expenditures for full-time public elementary and secondary schools, 1957–58 school year. Current expenditures as percent of income, col. 2 divided by col. 1. Pupils in average daily attendance in full-time public elementary and secondary schools, 1959–60 school year. Income per pupil, col. 1 divided by col. 4.

Source: Department of Commerce; Office of Education. Present current expenditures per pupil, NEA estimate 1960–61 school year.

S. 723

A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in financing a minimum foundation program of public elementary and secondary school education, in order to more nearly equalize educational opportunities, improve teachers' salaries, construct schools and otherwise improve the quality of such education

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Educational Opportunities Act of 1961."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to assist the States in financing a minimum foundation program of public elementary and secondary school education designed to provide more nearly equal opportunities for the Nation's children by raising the quality of such education in the States and school districts in greatest need of assistance.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(2) the term "State" includes Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia;

(3) the term "State education agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools;

(4) average daily attendance shall be determined in accordance with State law, and in determining Federal shares under section 4 for any fiscal year, the average daily attendance used shall be that of the second preceding fiscal year;

(5) total personal income of a State for the purpose of determining such State's Federal share under section 4 for any fiscal year shall be the average of the total annual personal income of such State for the calendar years ending in the second, third, and fourth preceding fiscal years, according to data available from the Department of Commerce;

(6) current expenditures per public elementary and secondary school child of a State shall be determined for any year by dividing the total expenditures during such year, excluding expenditures for interest, debt service, and capital outlay, and any amount received under the provisions of this Act, for public elementary and secondary school education by such State and all subdivisions thereof by the average daily attendance in the public elementary and secondary schools of such State during such year.

MINIMUM FOUNDATION AND FEDERAL SHARE THEREIN

SEC. 4. (a) For the purpose of this Act, the minimum foundation for each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1961, for public elementary and secondary school education in each State shall be the product of the average daily attendance in the public elementary and secondary schools in such State, as determined under section 3(4), multiplied by—

(1) $325 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961;

(2) $350 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962;

(3) $375 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963; or

(4) $400 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, or

for any fiscal year thereafter.

(b) The Federal share of such minimum foundation shall be—

(1) in the case of each such year beginning before July 1, 1965,

(A) one-half the amount by which such minimum foundation exceeds 4 percent of the total personal income for such State as determined under section 3(5), or

(B) the product of the average daily attendance in the public elementary and secondary schools in such State as determined under section 3(4) multiplied by $20, whichever is larger, or

(2) in the case of each such year beginning on or after July 1, 1965, one-half the amount by which such minimum foundation exceeds 4 percent of the total personal income for such State as determined under section 3(5).

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b), the Federal share for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and each fiscal year thereafter, shall be such amount as is determined by the Commissioner to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND USE THEREOF

SEC. 5. (a) For each fiscal year beginning on or after July 1, 1961, the Commissioner shall determine the Federal share for each State which has submitted an application for such year under the provisions of section 6 and which meets the requirements of section 7, and shall pay to the State education agency of such State an amount equal to such Federal share. Such payments shall be made from amounts appropriated for the purpose of this Act as soon as possible after such amounts become available for payment.

(b) If the amount appropriated for any fiscal year for payments to the States under the provisions of this Act is less than the total of the Federal shares for all States for such year, the payment to each State under the provisions of this Act for such year shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to such State's Federal share for such year as such amount appropriated bears to such total of Federal shares.

(c) Payments received under the provisions of this Act shall be available for disbursement by the State education agency, either directly or through payments to local public-school jurisdictions or other State public-education agencies, for any expenditure for elementary or secondary school purposes for which educational revenues derived from State or local sources may legally and constitutionally be expended by such State.

APPLICATIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 6. The State education agency of each State which desires to receive a payment under the provisions of this Act shall submit an application to the Commissioner which—

(a) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under the provisions of this Act;

(b) contains a plan for using such funds for public elementary and secondary school education purposes in order to provide for school building construction, increases in teacher's salaries, improvement in the quality of classroom instruction, additional instruction in science, mathematics, and languages, acquisition of improved school equipment, improvement in school administration, and other improvements in elementary and secondary school education consistent with the purpose of this Act, in addition to that which would be accomplished without funds provided under this Act, and with priority being given to the areas in the State having the greatest need; and

(c) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of funds received under this Act.

CONDITION

SEC. 7. No State shall receive a payment under the provisions of this Act for any fiscal year unless the current expenditures per public elementary and secondary school child of such State for the second preceding fiscal year was at least equal to the average of the current expenditures per public elementary and secondary school child of such State for the third fiscal year preceding such year of payment and the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959.

REPORTS

SEC. 8. Each State receiving a payment for any fiscal year under the provisions of this Act shall submit to the Commissioner, not later than January 1 following the termination of such year, a report on how such payment was used, with particular emphasis on how it was used to accomplish the objectives of the State plan or otherwise to improve public elementary and secondary school education in the State.

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

SEC. 9. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and each fiscal year thereafter, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a national effort is urgently necessary to help the States meet the mounting shortage of public elementary and secondary school classrooms as well as many other educational needs that would help bring our national educational level up to par.

According to the Office of Education, there was a shortage of 142,000 classrooms as of the fall of 1960, almost 7,000 more than the shortage in the previous year. This figure is based on reports from 50 States and the District of Columbia, and shows clearly that the Nation is still faced with a serious problem of providing enough facilities for its public school children. Overcrowding has affected 685,000 pupils in 35 States who are on curtailed or half-day sessions, the Office of Education reports.

It is also shocking to learn that, as of 1957–58, there still were 25,341 one-teacher schools in the United States. The little red schoolhouse, certainly an anachronism in this nuclear age, is still with us.

The bill which I am cosponsoring with my colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], extends Federal assistance to the States for public elementary and secondary schools in a way designed to accomplish two basic objectives: First, equalization of educational opportunity in low-income States; and second, emergency assistance for needed school construction and incentive to improve teachers' salaries in all the States.

Also, I shall do all I can to see that under any Federal aid to education plan the Supreme Court decision of 1954 regarding unsegregated public schools is respected.

The equalization part of this plan would make it possible for every State to provide within 4 years a minimum level of education for all public school children. It would do so by helping the low-income States bridge the gap between a fair allocation to education of their resources and a minimum level of education, measured in annual dollar costs per pupil.

The States would submit to the Office of Education a plan for the use of Federal funds in their public school educational program. The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to meet and consult with State education officials.

At the same time, the flat-grant part of this plan would provide assistance to all the States for needed school construction, improved teachers' salaries, or other direct educational purposes consistent with the objectives of this legislation, at the rate of $20 per public school child, for each of 4 years.

To accomplish its twofold purpose, Federal funds would accordingly be allocated to the States on a formula reflecting both objectives. The present national average expenditure per student in the public schools is about $400, and this is a currently desirable goal for minimum educational levels. To do this, the States would receive, first, one-half the difference between 4 percent of their total personal income and $400 per public school child; or, second, a flat grant of $20 per public school child, whichever is larger.

The formula used is essentially a way of extending Federal responsibility for seeing that equal educational opportunities are available for all children in the national interest. This bill has the additional virtue of avoiding every fore-

seeable possibility of Federal control, leaving the initiative and standards at the local level where they belong, with the sole exception of this desired expenditure per pupil goal contained in the formula.

The principles employed in this bill combine the equalization experience that has been so successful in most States for intrastate purposes and the flat-grant proposal. It also includes elements of the bill adopted by the Senate last year and is designed to give fair representation to the educational needs of every State, and to contribute realistically toward equal opportunity and a basic level of education for every child in the Nation.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC FACILITY LOAN PROGRAM OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This bill is almost identical to the bill that was introduced and so well championed through the Senate at the last session by the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; but he suggested that I take the lead in the matter in this session.

For several years there has been a need for an expansion of this program. Public works projects at the State and local levels must be encouraged. Such a process strengthens our Nation at the grass roots on a lasting basis and aids business, industry, and labor while it is going on and, in many respects, for years thereafter.

The instant bill is similar to S. 1955 of the 86th Congress, introduced May 15, 1959. Instead of enacting that bill into law, the 86th Congress merely expanded the revolving loan fund of the Community Facilities Administration from $100 million to $150 million. This was done by House Joint Resolution 784, which became Public Law 86–788, approved September 14, 1960.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate favorably reported S. 3670, the omnibus housing bill of 1960, said report being dated June 14, 1960. There was a provision in that bill to increase the revolving fund for public facility loans by $100 million. In making this report, the committee stated:

> Since applications on hand will deplete the funds available for making loans under this program, and since many small towns and cities still need adequate public facilities, which they find it impossible to finance other than through the public facility loan program, this section provides an additional loan authorization of $100 million.

The situation today at the Community Facilities Administration is not unlike that on June 14, 1960, I understand, despite the fact that $50 million was added last year by Public Law 86–788. Moreover, if the restrictions limiting loans to municipalities of 10,000 or less population and relegating the program to water and sewer projects primarily are removed, the present fund would be exhausted very quickly.

The instant bill removes these restrictions and thus broadens the program. It increases the loan fund from $150 million to $1 billion, of which $400 million may continue on a revolving basis.

The interest rate formula for loans requires a charge of one-quarter of 1 percent added to the current average yields on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States. It must be remembered that here we are dealing with States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions thereof who have the right to issue local bonds in many instances for local public facility improvements. The marketability of those bonds and the inducement to issue them are problems involving local taxation, the bond market, and the interest rate question. Adding one-quarter of 1 percent to the average U.S. obligation yield does not amount to a subsidized interest rate and should be sufficient to cover the costs to the Government.

I do not propose that all municipal bond financing be channeled through the Federal loan program. On the other hand, I would encourage necessary local projects that may be in danger of postponement due to prohibitively high interest rates.

The bill would raise the maximum loan term from 40 to 50 years with a provision for a 2-year postponement of principal and interest payments under circumstances warranting such action.

On the whole, I would point out this bill is an implementation and refinement of an existing program. It is necessary both in times of national recession as well as in times evidencing encouraging signs of recovery. An undertaking now by the Federal Government to lend money to local communities will, in the long run, be the most economic way to proceed. Many public works problems if allowed to proceed unchecked may well prove unsolvable and when acute later will be vastly more expensive to correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 726) to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT TO CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to State and local law enforcement officers who are killed or injured, or as a direct result of, enforcing any Federal law.

If we are to arrest the alarming increase in crime in this country, the best possible people must be attracted to law enforcement work. In order to accomplish this, our law enforcement officers must be better paid, and they need to have more adequate security when they retire or when they are disabled. Unless we can provide these incentives it is going to be hard to maintain the high caliber of people entrusted with the enforcement of our laws. I think there is a duty on the part of Federal, State, and local governments in this connection. A great many State and local violations are also violations of Federal statutes. Local law enforcement officers are very frequently called upon to assist in the enforcement of Federal statutes as well as State laws, and occasionally they may be killed or disabled while doing so. So I think it is proper that the Federal Government join State and local communities in a program of seeing that our law enforcement officers have better protection.

Accordingly, I am introducing this bill which provides for payment to the extent of one-third of the amount set forth in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. It is contemplated that the State and local governments would make similar provisions if they have not already done so. I believe such a joint undertaking would help us retain good men and women in the law enforcement service, and I believe it is equitable from the viewpoint of the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 727) to extend the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to State and local law enforcement officers who are killed or injured while, or as a direct result of, enforcing any Federal law, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

KIM FANG CHIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Kim Fang Chin. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 730) for the relief of Kim Fang Chin, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kim Fang Chin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Wing Seung Chin, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Kim Fang Chin shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

CHARLES F. TJADEN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for

the relief of Charles F. Tjaden. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 731) for the relief of Charles F. Tjaden, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles F. Tjaden may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

YICK YUEN LEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am offering a bill today for the relief of Yick Yuen Lee, the adopted child of Mr. and Mrs. Soon Lee who are residents of my State. My bill would grant nonquota immigrant status to Yick Yuen Lee, a native and citizen of China and now living in Hong Kong.

During the 86th session of Congress, I introduced a similar bill, which was subsequently referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, but upon which no action was taken. At that time, Mrs. Soon Lee was not yet a citizen of the United States. Mrs. Lee is now a naturalized citizen, as is her husband, and I believe that this fact will prove to be very helpful in consideration of the bill.

I ask for sympathetic consideration at the earliest possible time of the bill I am introducing, that it be appropriately referred, and printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 732) for the relief of Yick Yuen Lee, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yick Yuen Lee, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Soon Lee, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Yick Yuen Lee shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

HIGHER BENEFITS UNDER THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the time is again here for the Congress to make another upward adjustment in the maximum weekly benefit payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. Such an adjustment is demanded if the benefit structure of this statute is to be brought back into harmony with the spirit and letter of the act. To that end, I am introducing a bill to amend section 6, the benefit section of the Longshore Act, and it is my hope that this measure will receive early and favorable consideration.

Before briefly explaining the need for this bill, it is important to point out that a similar proposal, introduced by Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, passed the House during the closing hours of the last session. The bill died in this Chamber when it failed to receive the required unanimous consent for floor action. The significant point is that the bill was fully considered by a committee on the other side and was unanimously approved. It is thus unfinished business from the 86th Congress.

This amendment would increase the maximum weekly disability benefit from $54 to $70. That $70 maximum, however, would be available only to employees earning $105 a week or more. Those making less than $105 a week would receive two-thirds of their actual earnings. In addition to adjusting the maximum permissible benefit, the amendment would revise the basis for computing death benefits and the total money allowance payable for temporary injuries to conform with the new weekly maximum benefit.

There is substantial justification for this amendment. Under the established theory of compensation insurance, workers injured in the course of their employment are entitled to recover a benefit equivalent to two-thirds of their weekly earnings. This policy was embodied in the Federal Longshore Act and is stated repeatedly in its provisions.

The plain facts are, however, that an overwhelming majority of the 500,000 maritime and other workers covered by the Longshore Act now are receiving nowhere near their rightful benefit. They are being shortchanged by the dollar ceiling which controls the amount of the maximum benefit. That ceiling, which is presently $54, was last adjusted by Congress in 1956. It is currently far out of joint with wage levels and living costs.

For example, I need only to point to west coast longshore earnings for 1959 as compiled by the Pacific Maritime Association, an organization of shipowners and stevedore employers. These figures show that average weekly earnings for all longshoremen for the year 1959 amounted to $115. When we apply the two-thirds ratio to that figure, we find that it would justify a benefit ceiling of some $76.

Other figures compiled by the PMA are even more illuminating. They reveal that the middle 50 percent of the west coast longshore workers earned $126 weekly. When you compare these figures, or even the $115 previously cited, with the $81 used as the basis for the present dollar ceiling of $54, it can readily be understood why there is substantial reason for the Congress to revise upward the maximum benefit now permissible under the Longshore Compensation Act.

Under the circumstances, the proposed amendment is a matter of simple equity. It merely increases the maximum allowable weekly benefit to a level approximating a two-thirds ratio of average prevailing wages. It restores to longshoremen, ship repair workers and others engaged in the hazardous occupations covered by the act the opportunity to qualify for a disability benefit that has a reasonable relationship to lost wages.

The distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] joins me in cosponsoring this proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 733) to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 906), introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 906), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed $70 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than $18 per week: *Provided, however,* That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than $18 per week, he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

SEC. 2. Section 9(e) of the said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than $105 nor less than $27 but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

SEC. 3. Section 14(m) of the said Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(m) The total money allowance payable to an employee as compensation for an injury under this Act shall in no event exceed in the aggregate the sum of $24,000: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to cases of permanent total disability or death: *And provided further,* That in applying this limitation there shall not be taken into account any amount payable under section 8(g) of this title for maintenance during rehabilitation of any amount of additional compensation required to be paid under this section for delay or default in the payment of compensation or any amount accruing as interest upon defaulted compensation collectible under section 18."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective as to injuries or disability sustained on or after the date of enactment.

REPEAL OF SECTION 1(8) OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, KNOWN AS THE COMMODITIES CLAUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate ref-

erence, a bill to repeal section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the commodities clause. This section, commonly referred to as the commodities clause, presently restricts a railroad from transporting in interstate commerce commodities which it owns—other than timber and the manufactured products thereof—produces, or in which it has any interest, except commodities used in its business as a common carrier.

The request for introducing the bill was made by the Transportation Association of America. In their letter of January 12, 1961, they point out that—

> This legislation would be noncontroversial within the transportation industry because this proposal has been given careful study by all eight panels in the TAA cooperative project (user, investor, air, highway, freight forwarder, pipeline, railroads, and water), and all either favor or would not oppose its passage.

The ICC as presently constituted, I am informed, has not considered and has not taken a position on the proposal.

For the following reasons I recommend that the bill be introduced: First, other carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, most of them in competition with the railroads, have no similar prohibition and some haul their own products for sale to others; second, the rail carriers by establishing separate corporations have been able to circumvent the laws effectively; third, conditions have changed since the commodities clause was enacted with the ICC now having jurisdiction to correct and prevent discrimination and preferential treatment, thus dispensing with need for the commodities clause; fourth, many large shippers carry their own freight in their own vehicles in direct competition with railroads; and fifth, other sources of income that may be derived by railroads from producing and transporting their own products in commerce would give the railroads other sources of badly needed revenue.

Therefore, so that Congress may consider putting all forms of regulated carriers on an equal footing—from the standpoint of being able to engage in nontransport enterprises—I am introducing this bill to repeal the commodities clause.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum giving a discussion of the various aspect of the commodities clause be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 734) to repeal section 1(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, commonly known as the commodities clause, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

> The Hepburn Act of 1906 contained the so-called commodities clause. This was aimed at a particular type of discrimination. It had been found that railroads which owned coal mines or engaged in the production of other commodities in competition with independent producers had a distinct advantage over the independents. By charging high rates, the railroad could undersell and force out its competitors and monopolize the production of the commodity in question. If the railroad paid no rates on the goods it produced, its advantage in maintaining high rates on this particular commodity was obvious. If the railroad-owned industry, operating as a subsidiary of the railroad company, paid transportation charges on the goods it shipped the advantage to the railroad in maintaining high rates was the same, since the payment of the freight charges was simply taking money from one pocket and transferring it to the other. To prevent this type of discrimination, Congress sought to separate the railroad business from other forms of enterprise. In effect, the commodities clause prohibited a railroad from engaging in the production of goods commercially, but the result was accomplished indirectly. The law prohibited a carrier engaged in interstate commerce from transporting articles in interstate commerce which it had produced or in which it had an interest. Lumber, however, was excepted from the rule because of the many small railroads owned by lumbering concerns and constructed as adjuncts of lumbering operations. The commodities clause did not prevent railroads from producing commodities for their own use. The clause was aimed particularly at the monopolization of anthracite coal production by the railroad companies. Discrimination resulting from such activities of railroad companies had been strongly condemned by the courts before the enactment of the commodities clause. (*New York, New Haven & Hartford R. Co.* v. *Interstate Commerce Commission*, 200 U.S. 361 (1906).)
>
> The clause has had the effect of preventing railroads from engaging in manufacturing, mining, and other activities in competition with independent producers served by their lines. The effectiveness of the commodities clause has been weakened, however, because the courts have held that a carrier may transport commodities produced by a corporation the stock of which is wholly owned by a holding company which also owns all of the stock of the railroad, unless the control of the railway is so exercised as to make it the alter ego of the holding company. This ruling was made in *United States* v. *Elgin, Joliet & Eastern Railroad Co.* (298 U.S. 492 (1936)). The stock of the railroad company, as well as that of various companies producing steel and steel products, was owned by the United States Steel Corp. The same rule was reaffirmed in *United States* v. *South Buffalo Railway Co.* (333 U.S. 771 (1948)), where transportation by the South Buffalo Railway Co. of commodities produced by the Bethlehem Steel Co. was found not in violation of the commodities clause although the stock of the railway company was substantially all owned by the Bethlehem Steel Corp., which also owned the stock of the Bethlehem Steel Co.

OATH OF OFFICE OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prescribe the oath of office of justices and judges of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 735) to prescribe the oath of office of justices and judges of the United States, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanation presented by Mr. THURMOND is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO CORRECT JUDICIAL OATH

> The oath prescribed by statute for U.S. justices and judges does not comply with the constitutional requirement for oaths of judicial officers. Article VI of the Constitution provides, in part, that "the Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."
>
> The oath now prescribed by section 453 of title 28 of the United States Code is as follows: "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as _____ according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God."
>
> From the reading of this portion of article VI of the Constitution and section 453 of title 28 of the code, it is obvious that the oath prescribed does not require judicial officers to support the Constitution in compliance with article VI. In the oaths of the other officers named in article VI, my research reveals no such omission.
>
> While it is my understanding that in practice a majority of judicial officers are, in fact, administered an additional oath by which they swear to support the Constitution, the requirement of the Constitution is mandatory and is by no means discretionary. This bill would, therefore, amend section 453 of title 28 of the United States Code to prescribe the following oath for judicial officers of the United States:
>
> "I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as _____. So help me God."

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR PERSONS APPOINTED TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the primary purpose for the institution of government is for the establishment and maintenance of equitable order in society, and were it not for the essentiality of order in society, men would be foolish to subject their liberty to the potential threat of despotic perversion of the institution of government.

It has been well said that "a government is no better than the hands that administer it," for no matter how well conceived is a form of government, it will either be ineffective, on the one hand, or tyrannical on the other, if not both, should its administration fall into the hands of inept or unqualified persons. It is, therefore, necessary that a plan for government include not only an outline of the structure of that government, but must also include safeguards to insure

that qualified administrators exercise the powers vested in the government.

One manner by which such safeguards can be secured is through free elections at the hands of the people subject to the particular government. Experience has proved, however, that it is impractical and, indeed, unwise to select all of the high officials of government by direct elections. When such a determination is made, however, other safeguards must be instituted to insure that the people's business will not be executed ineptly, capriciously, or despotically. One type of such safeguard is available through the means of establishing absolute qualifications or general criteria for appointment to the particular office in question.

Under our constitutional system our forefathers conceived, and time has substantiated, that it was impractical to fill judicial offices by popular election. The Constitution itself establishes no qualifications for appointment to judicial offices, so that any criteria for eligibility exists, if at all, in the recesses of the minds of the President who appoints and the individual Members of the Senate who confirm these high offices.

Mr. President, there is no substitute for experience, and this adage is particularly pertinent in the judicial branch of the Government. Experience in fields related to the law, broadening as it may be, cannot qualify an individual for the far-reaching considerations and judgments required of a U.S. Supreme Court Justice. In recent years the stability of the law has been seriously impaired, due in no small part to the lack of judicial experience among the appointees to the High Court. For the benefit of our society today and for our posterity for years to come, it behooves the Congress to eliminate an outstanding deficiency in our governmental system by enacting statutory qualifications on which eligibility for appointment to the Supreme Court would be contingent. For that purpose, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

This bill would require as a prerequisite to appointment as Chief Justice or Associate Justice of the Supreme Court a minimum of 5 years' judicial experience on the district court or circuit court of appeals of the United States, or on an appellate court or court of general jurisdiction of one of the several States. It would further provide for a rotation of these appointees among the several judicial circuits of the United States.

I sincerely hope that this measure will be given early and favorable action by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 736) to establish qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to revise the effective date of certain increases in compensation granted to all employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

My attention has been directed to an inequity which has been and is being perpetrated against employees of the Government Printing Office who exercise a right granted them by the Congress.

The Kiess Act, which was enacted on June 3, 1924 (44 U.S.C.A. 40, Public Law 276, 68th Cong.) provides that the rate of wages for the employees of each craft in the Government Printing Office shall be determined by negotiation with the Public Printer. If the Public Printer and the committee representing a craft or trade fail to agree, a right of appeal is granted to either party to the Joint Committee on Printing.

When the Joint Committee on Printing makes its determination, any wage increase is effective as of the date of final determination.

If the Joint Committee on Printing is able to hear the appeal within a reasonable time after it is filed, there is no substantial loss in wages to the employees concerned.

However, the scheduling of an appeal by the Joint Committee on Printing is not only completely out of the control of the Public Printer and the employees, but is subject to the uncertainties with which the Congress is continually beset.

Let me explain. Suppose one of the crafts received an offer on its wage anniversary date of March 1, 1960, of 10 cents per hour increase. The employees in the particular craft appeal pursuant to the Kiess Act to the Joint Committee on Printing which hears the appeal on March 20 with a final determination made on March 20. The new wage scale is effective on March 20 with a loss of the increase in the original offer for about 20 days.

However, let me take the actual case of the 1,400 printers in the Government Printing Office whose wage anniversary date was August 8, 1960. The printers filed an appeal with the Joint Committee on Printing on August 19, 1960, and urged that an early hearing be held on the issues raised in the appeal.

The Senate must recall the situation which existed in this body last August, and we must appreciate why the Joint Committee on Printing was unable to hold a public hearing on the printers' appeal. However, the adjournment of the 86th Congress and the normal delays incident to the organization of the 87th Congress means that at least 6 months may go by before the printers may receive a final determination of their appeal filed on August 19 of last year.

Because these printers have no control over the date their appeal is heard, it would be consistent with justice and equity not to penalize them for deciding to exercise a right of appeal granted them by the Congress.

I am, therefore, introducing a bill which would make any increase effective on the date when the appeal is filed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 737), relating to the determination of wages, salaries, and compensation of employees of the Government Printing Office, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DESIGNATION OF NOVEMBER 19 AS "DEDICATION DAY"

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day.

During a trying period of our Nation's history almost 100 years ago, there was delivered at a then quiet battlefield in Gettysburg, Pa., an address to be etched forever in American history.

The words of Abraham Lincoln, as he delivered the Gettysburg Address, may well be heeded by the citizens of our Nation today. The purpose of the resolution I am proposing would serve to remind all Americans of the dedication to the principles of democracy which are echoed from the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of my joint resolution and the Gettysburg Address printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and the Gettysburg Address will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Gettysburg Address of President Abraham Lincoln is an outstanding classic and will touch the hearts of men and inspire them with faith in our matchless Republic as long as time endures; and

Whereas in that address Mr. Lincoln adjured his fellow countrymen to dedicate themselves to the principles of democracy in order that government "of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth": Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That November 19, the anniversary of the delivery of the Gettysburg Address, be and hereby is, designated in our calendar of special days as Dedication Day.

That the President of the United States is requested to proclaim November 19 as Dedication Day and to suggest that the address be read on that day in schools and public assemblages throughout the United States and its possessions, on our ships at sea and wherever the American flag flies.

Lincoln's Gettysburg Address presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Fourscore and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation

so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL FUELS STUDY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of January 9, 13, 23, and 26, 1961, the names of Senators BENNETT, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BUSH, BUTLER, BYRD of Virginia, CAPEHART, CARROLL, CHURCH, DODD, DWORSHAK, HILL, HOLLAND, JACKSON, JAVITS, JOHNSTON, KEATING, KERR, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MILLER, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, SCOTT, SPARKMAN, and SYMINGTON were added as additional cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4) establishing the Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study, submitted by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators) on January 9, 1961.

UNIVERSITY OF FREE CUBA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 26, 1961, the name of Mr. PELL was added as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) requesting the President to establish a "University of Free Cuba" to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes, submitted by Mr. MUNDT on January 26, 1961.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, those interested in the welfare of our youth are greatly concerned about the ever increasing volume of obscene literature and pornographic material that is disseminated through the mails.

At the last session, Congress enacted legislation that gave the courts additional authority in dealing with this problem. The former Postmaster General, Arthur Summerfield, waged a relentless battle against the distribution of obscene and lewd materials through the mails.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has introduced a bill (S. 162) which would create a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials. I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Commission would be empowered to further study the effects of the dissemination of this material on our youth and to make recommendations for further curtailing its distribution.

In the last session of Congress, we passed a law on the impounding of this mail; and it has been of great assistance to the Post Office Department.

We must keep in mind that in the distribution of this material, we are dealing with a business that has a volume of about $1 billion annually.

It is essential that we also keep in mind that freedom of communication is a basic personal right of all Americans if the law is not being violated.

This problem should be studied further; and I am confident that the Commission proposed in the Mundt resolution will come up with recommendations that will resolve this problem.

The unscrupuolous people who deal in this field are in it to make money, without regard or respect for their country or people anywhere. They will do anything to gain a dollar; hence, they connive to protect their filthy merchandise through the use of private mail. There is no question in my mind but that this adds to the growth of juvenile delinquency. Every citizen must be on the alert, for we must protect our young people.

U.S. FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the RECORD of January 30, is a list of the cosponsors of the bill (S. 407) to establish a Foreign Service Academy, which I introduced on January 13, 1961. The name of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] was inadvertently omitted from this list. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Nevada be included among the cosponsors when the bill is next printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ALLOWANCE OF LAWFUL EXPENDITURES FOR LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES AS LEGITIMATE BUSINESS EXPENSES — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 467) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income, introduced by me on January 17, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDY OF UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 65) to authorize a study of unfavorable balance of international payments, submitted by me on January 23, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SUBMIT CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports pursuant to Senate Resolution 226, and Senate Resolutions 231 through 241, of the 86th Congress, be extended to February 20, 1961. This request concerns annual reports of certain subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Speech by him entitled "Russia's New War Against the World's Free Nations," delivered before the Ravenswood Junior Chamber of Commerce on January 26, 1961.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL COPPER CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the mining industry finds itself in a crisis. Copper production has been cut 10 percent within the past several weeks. The price of copper is now under 30 cents a pound, and large numbers of miners throughout Montana and other Western States have been laid off. In Butte, Mont., the number, according to press dispatches, amounts to 400 miners who have been released because of the decline in the price of copper and, I would assume, the oversupply of the red metal throughout the world.

Butte—which has furnished this country "the richest hill on earth"—is in difficulties, not only because of this most recent cut, but also because of the changeover from shaft mining to open-pit operations. This changeover means, of course, that more copper can be produced with fewer men and more machines. The copper industry, like so many other mining industries, has been

subjected to a feast or famine cycle. I believe it is high time that something be done to bring stability to this most important segment of the economy of Montana and, for that matter, of the rest of the Nation, as well.

As one who has been opposed to cartels, I have come to the conclusion that in special situations they can perform a good, strong, and worthwhile industrial use. They have not been used in this country, because of the fact that if anything along this line were to be attempted, it would very possibly come in conflict with the antitrust laws.

After much thought and consideration, I have come to the conclusion, in view of world conditions, that the only way to face up to the ups and downs which prevail in the copper industry is a cartelization of sorts, under careful supervision, agreed to and supported by the copper-producing nations of the world. It is my belief that the President of the United States should assume the initiative and should call an international copper conference for the purpose of stabilizing that industry to the extent that steady production on an agreed-to, year-round basis can be maintained and firm prices achieved, so as to give stability to the industry and to those employed by it.

If, in this way, an international agreement could be reached, I think we could do away with the feast or famine cycle, give security to our miners and smeltermen and their families, and give assurances to the copper industry on an international level so that they could proceed on an agreed-to, prorated basis to operate on a year-round schedule.

I make this plea primarily in behalf of the miners and smeltermen of Butte, Anaconda, and Great Falls, Mont.; but, in doing so, I make it also on the part of those who are affected by similar circumstances in other Western States, as well. Yesterday, I dispatched to the President of the United States a letter urging that he undertake to lend his great influence and prestige to the calling of an international copper conference for the purpose of reaching an agreement which will bring stability to the industry and security to the workers who depend on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
January 30, 1961.

The HONORABLE JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A difficult economic situation exists in Butte, Mont., and in other western mining camps relative to the fall in the price of copper and an oversupply of the red metal in this country and throughout the world. I am enclosing for your consideration a copy of a statement I intend to make on the floor of the Senate tomorrow, and I urge, in behalf of the people of Montana as well as the rest of the Nation dependent upon the copper industry, that you consider most earnestly and carefully the possibility of calling an international copper conference to stabilize prices on a worldwide basis, to encourage production on a year-round basis, and thereby to bring security to those of our people who are dependent upon copper for a livelihood.

This is an extremely important matter, and I would appreciate your utmost consideration of it.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Respectfully yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Ukrainian people have fought gallantly in defense of their freedom and independence since 1918; and this year marks the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of their independence.

Their courage in the face of the suffering and sacrifice they have gone through has won the admiration of all freedom-loving people.

I extend to them my congratulations, and I pray that their efforts will be greatly rewarded.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from Mr. Bohdan Muzyka, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Kansas City Branch, be made a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
KANSAS CITY BRANCH,
January 16, 1961.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: January 22, 1961, will mark the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, which took place on January 22, 1918, in the capital of Ukraine, Kiev, as a culmination of national desires and aspiration of the Ukrainian people.

Although the young Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of states, including the Soviet Russian Government, it was subjected to treacherous attack and assault by Communist Russia which through devious ways, including overt military aggression and subversion from within, endeavored to destroy the independence of the Ukrainian people and turn Ukraine into a colony of Moscow. For almost 4 years, beginning with the establishment of the Ukrainian Central Rada in March 1917, the Ukrainian people fought gallantly in defense of their freedom and independence, but deprived of all military, economic, and diplomatic support by the West, they could not sustain the pressure of Moscow and by the end of 1920 Ukraine was overrun by the Communist troops of Moscow.

But the freedom-loving people of Ukraine have never accepted the yoke imposed upon them by Communist Russia and have continued to fight for their liberation. During the past four decades of enslavement the Ukrainian people have amply demonstrated their devotion to freedom and the ideals of liberty and independence of their country by waging relentless wars and opposition to the Communist rule of Moscow.

Both the U.S. Congress and President of the United States of America have recognized the plight of the Ukrainian people by respectively enacting and signing the Captive Nations Week resolution, which enumerated Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved by Communist Russia.

During the debate at the U.N. General Assembly session in the fall of 1960, a number of Western statesmen, including the Honorable John G. Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, the representative of the Republic of China and others, raised their voices in protest against the persecution and enslavement of the Ukrainian people by Communist Russia.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in this city are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence on January 22, 1961, in a fitting and solemn manner. We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the common struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. We, therefore, respectfully ask you to make an appropriate statement on the floor of the U.S. Senate (or House of Representatives) on January 22, 1961, in commemoration of the 43d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

At this moment, when the Communist world, headed by Communist Russia, is marshaling its forces against the free world, as announced in the Communist manifesto in Moscow on December 6, 1960, we here in the United States, enjoying the blessings of liberty and freedom, should demonstrate our sympathy to and understanding of the Ukrainian people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

We hope that you, sir, fully understanding the meaning and significance of the observance of the 43d anniversary of Ukraine's independence, will make such a statement on or about January 22, 1961, and will insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, thus manifesting your solidarity with the plight and struggle of the Ukrainian people to regain their freedom.

Respectfully yours,

BOHDAN MUZYKA,
Chairman.
MICHAEL BILLYK,
Secretary.

FOUR-COUNTY AREA IN NORTHERN WISCONSIN WILL WELCOME AREA REDEVELOPMENT AID

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, in his stirring state of the Union address, President Kennedy again called for action to relieve chronic unemployment and promote growth in our so-called depressed areas. I am sure all of us share his concern about the plight of these areas, for each is a concentration of human waste and misery.

It is plain that not all the areas of persistent and substantial unemployment have been so classified by the Department of Labor. Some regions of small population experiencing severe economic distress have not yet been surveyed and placed in one of the categories of area labor markets described by the Department of Labor.

One such area is that surrounding the city of Ashland in northern Wisconsin. The Bureau of Employment Security is currently surveying this area and will report soon on its exact employment situation. But one does not need statistics to know that this is an area of widespread, substantial, and persistent economic distress.

In the past few weeks I have received letter after letter describing the conditions of this area. These same letters provide heartening evidence of local initiative aimed at promoting economic development. A Four County Development Group has been formed, covering Ash-

land, Bayfield, Iron, and Price Counties. The group is mounting an intelligent, realistic attack on the problems which have contributed to the persistent slump.

Several communities in the area have passed resolutions asking that they be declared eligible for area redevelopment assistance of the kind provided by S. 1. Here is additional proof that the program provided by this bill will be welcomed by the affected communities.

I should like to document the economic situation in the Four County-Ashland area, and the efforts to promote needed economic redevelopment, by asking unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point letters and resolutions which I have received.

There being no objection, the letters and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR COUNTY DEVELOPMENT GROUP,
Ashland, Wis., January 17, 1961.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: The 1960 census shows that this four county area has an outmigration figure of 11.7 percent. The 1950 census showed an outmigration percentage of 11.9. It should be obvious that this area in north Wisconsin is one of marked and continuous decline, due mostly to lack of economic opportunity.

It is the unanimous opinion of the Four County Development Group that this outmigration will increase in the next 2 years because of the present trend of closing or curtailing industrial output in the area. Since we are a region with tremendous potential in our natural resources—minerals and forests—this continued and catastrophic decline can be attributed to a badly planned and managed national program in which abundant and potential resources are completely neglected. For instance: in just the four county area alone, we have an estimated annual surplus of 250,000 cords of undersized trees that will soon have to be cut from the forests to allow trees of quality to reach full development for the future. What can be done with this surplus material? This only solution at the present time is to burn it as waste.

The solution of a problem such as this is not primarily a local nor a State function. It is too big and costly. It is a part of the design for the conservation of resources on a national basis, especially in regard to our forests.

Our group has asked the State employment service to conduct an unemployment survey to determine if we can be declared a disaster area. However, valid and helpful as it might be, an unemployment survey will not present the total picture of the economic and social decline that continues to plague this area. Therefore, we are asking for your help in getting our four county region designated as a disaster area, and we hope that you will support any legislation that will help improve our stagnant and deteriorating condition.

The four county development group is convinced that it is possible to improve the area economy by Federal help in the following:

(1) Financing a mill or a pilot plant to process our surplus deciduous trees into newsprint;

(2) A program of experimentation, connected either with the pilot plant or the Forest Products Laboratory, to determine possible new uses for various wood products from the same type of trees noted above;

(3) Government aid for financing local dairy development in other lines beyond fluid milk.

The four county development group wishes to thank you for your interest and help in our problems. We appreciate very much all the effort you have extended in our behalf.

Yours truly,

F. W. ALTENBURG.

ASHLAND COUNTY BOARD,
Ashland, Wis., January 14, 1961.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE: A few days ago we mailed you several copies of the Ashland Daily Press, in which we marked two items—one on William F. Jewell, of Detroit, representing the Department of Commerce, and speaking to a fine group of citizens in the city hall on the matter of unemployment, etc.; and another item on a meeting of the Four County Development—Ashland, Iron, Bayfield, and Douglas.

At both these meetings it was brought out that the loss of employment in Ashland County was more serious than at first realized. State director of employment in Ashland, stated his early report in 1960 showed 7 percent unemployed in this area, but admitted it could be much higher now. We hear estimates and unofficial figures that it could run up to 15 percent.

You will remember, the North Western dock is no more, and that was a severe loss, in manpower as well as in revenue. Then there is a letdown in the plants now operating, two being the Veneer and Splicewood plants, in Mellen and Ashland. No markets, no operate might be the summation. About the only activity in an industrial way is in Ashland, and only one in Mellen. The rest of the county must shift for themselves. When our economy hits the low that it is in, and getting worse, someone, and many will be hit hard. There is little farming, and woodwork has been the mainstay. Well, that is finished now. No market for the logs, so that means no cutting, and no pay. Ashland County will not advertise for bids until spring on their timber holdings, etc., hoping for a market by then. These people can tighten their belts only so far.

We understand no bills have been acted upon in Congress as yet under the distressed area clause, but we hear there are over 40 of them pertaining to the same thing. That will take time. But we hope something is done on it, and soon.

We speak of prosperity, but we will never get it by building plants in other countries, and then having them flood this Nation with their products, and throwing plants here out of business. We have deeply appreciated your views and actions on the tariff situation, and surely men can see the wisdom of limiting imports.

There is a sore need for a paper mill plant in north Wisconsin, what with hardwoods in profusion. Even with selective cutting we would have ample to operate the mill, even as they demonstrated in southern United States a year ago. It would seem it is about time we developed something in this country, and have the benefit coming to worthy American citizens, and the Nation, too, to come in for revenue.

We are holding a county board meeting in early February. Would you kindly, Senator PROXMIRE, please write to us, and let the board know what the situation is in Washington, and your own personal views, and what it looks like.

The Ashland County board extends its best wishes, along with the county officials, for a successful term. If there is anything we can do to aid you in any way, please let us know.

Sincerely,

KENNETH TODD,
Ashland County Court House.

P.S.—What about commodity surplus, conducted economically in counties like ours, through a department such as the welfare department, and not set up an expensive one, costing more than the surplus received?

WATW, INC.,
Ashland, Wis., January 27, 1961.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: This letter is written in behalf of the Ashland Chamber of Commerce. At present, it is my pleasure to be serving as president of this group.

Recently, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce urged its membership to oppose the type of legislation proposed in S. 1. However, the board of directors of our chamber wholeheartedly endorses any legislative steps that will aid in our efforts to lift our community and area out of the economic doldrums. With 15 percent or more of our labor force unemployed, we are in urgent need of assistance. Our hopes are not for assistance in the form of extension of unemployment compensation or the like, but in immediate work projects that will lead to long-range development, as well as assistance in the form of capital that we can use to develop new or existing industries.

In the next few days, we will be completing a preliminary report of the economic situation in our area. We have been working with the Department of Commerce in this regard. Upon completion, we will mail a copy to you for your personal examination.

Bill, your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

EUGENE A. HALKER.

GLIDDEN AREA
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Glidden, Wis., January 18, 1961.

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR:

"Whereas the employment situation in the town of Jacobs (Glidden post office), Ashland County, Wis., is at an alltime low; and

"Whereas it would appear that the number of people on the relief rolls will be greatly increased: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Glidden Area Chamber of Commerce in regular session, Do petition the Federal authority to designate the area known as the town of Jacobs, and area, Ashland County, Wis., as a depressed area and entitled to the Federal aids to be allowed such depressed areas."

The foregoing resolution was introduced by James Bonney. Motion to adopt the foregoing resolution by Oscar Schraeder, seconded by John Wasseleski. Motion to adopt passed.

Dated at Glidden, Wis., this —— day of January 1961.

GLIDDEN AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
James Bonney,
JAMES BONNEY, *President.*
Annabelle Wiedenhoeft,
ANNABELLE WIEDENHOEFT, *Secretary.*

TOWN OF JACOBS,
ASHLAND COUNTY, WIS.,
Glidden, Wis., January 16, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Member of Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: The town board, town of Jacobs, in a regular session held on January 13, 1961, adopted a resolution that this area be declared a depressed area, and directed that a copy of the resolution be forwarded to you.

We are enclosing a copy of the resolution and assure you that anything you may do will be appreciated.

By directive of the board, I am,

Yours truly,

JAMES BONNEY,
Chairman, Town of Jacobs.

RESOLUTION, TOWN OF JACOBS, ASHLAND COUNTY, WIS.

"Whereas the employment situation in the town of Jacobs (Glidden post office), Ashland County, Wis., is at an alltime low; and

"Whereas it would appear that the number of people on the relief rolls will be greatly increased: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the town board, town of Jacobs, in regular session, Do petition the Federal authority to designate the area known as the town of Jacobs, Ashland County, Wis., as a depressed area and entitled to the Federal aids to be allowed such depressed areas. The above resolution was introduced by James Bonney. Motion to adopt the foregoing resolution was made by Bernard Peterhansel and seconded by Harold Johnson.

"The motion was passed.

"Dated at Glidden, Wis., this 13th day of January 1961."

The above is a certified copy of the resolution adopted by the town board, town of Jacobs on January 13, 1961.

PATRICK A. TWOMEY,
Clerk, Town of Jacobs.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolved, That the Mellen Lion's Club in executive session strongly appeal to you to use your utmost endeavor to promote the passage of Senate bill 690 as we firmly believe that a successful pilot plant will insure the building of a proper mill to utilize the surplus wood which we have abundance of.

In examining the inventory of Ashland, Bayfield, Iron, and Price Counties, it shows much more timber available than one new mill could use; and that is only considering timber products which should be cut if the best forestry practice were followed.

A papermill located in this four county area would go a long way in building up the economy in this depressed area.

Thank you and our best wishes.

FRED C. FLEINER,
Secretary.

CONCERN FOR THE U.S. DRY BATTERY INDUSTRY IN 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, typical of many American industries confronting potentially disastrous foreign competition today is the U.S. dry battery business. The U.S. Government sets virtually no barriers to the importation of unlimited quantities of dry batteries. It is easy to see how Japanese manufacturers, rehabilitated, thanks to U.S. money, are now in a position to undersell our own companies.

Over 8,000 jobs in the U.S. dry battery industry stand in the balance; an annual payroll of more than $35 million is at stake. The State of Wisconsin is an important center in the dry battery industry, employing between 20 and 25 percent of all employees engaged in this industry. These people are employed at the Burgess Battery Co., Mineral Point, and at that company's Platteville plant. They are employed at the Marathon Battery Co. in Wausau, and the Ray-O-Vac Co., Madison. State chamber of commerce figures show that the Marathon firm employs 575 people in Wisconsin; Ray-O-Vac employs approximately 1,400; while the Burgess firm employs approximately 160 at both plants.

On Friday, January 6, 1961, some 34 employees of the Burgess Battery Co., at Mineral Point were laid off. They are expected to be rehired in April of 1961, when work on a new Government contract will begin. Extremely low costs, marginal standards of living, and nominal import duties allow Japanese manufacturers to flood the United States with huge quantities of cheap batteries.

But I want it clearly understood, Mr. President, that I believe we should maintain the freest trade policy consistent with our defense necessities. The United States now has a favorable balance of trade, and is thus benefiting from the free flow of goods across national boundaries. My own State of Wisconsin, according to the latest figures available, exports more to foreign countries than it imports from them.

But U.S. industry deserves consideration. Most important of all is the undeniable fact that our battery industry is essential to our total defense effort. In World War II, and in Korea, batteries powered the proximity fuse, walkie-talkies, radio and electronic equipment, thousands and thousands of vital communications and battle devices. Can we afford to allow foreign competition to imperil the capacity of this essential industry? Survival of the dry battery industry is by no means assured if the present situation is allowed to continue.

We cannot afford to have this vital U.S. industry, which was deemed essential in World War II and Korea, deteriorate. In 1959 the industry was called upon to supply over 300 million battery cells for military use throughout the world. Dry batteries are an essential and vital part of our national defense effort.

Why, we ask ourselves, do the Japanese themselves not take action of their own accord, raise their prices at our ports to a reasonable level, establish a secure quota program? Why does our Government not act to protect a vital domestic industry?

Some action must be taken, either voluntary action by the Japanese or sober remedial action by our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD following my remarks a statement of facts on the U.S. dry battery industry and Japanese battery imports.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS: U.S. DRY BATTERY INDUSTRY AND JAPANESE BATTERY IMPORTS

1. The dry battery section of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) is concerned over the flooding of the United States with imports of transistor radio batteries from Japan.

2. The dry battery section of NEMA includes the seven U.S. manufacturers responsible for virtually all of domestic dry battery production.

3. These seven companies are: Acme Battery Corp.; Bright Star Industries; Burgess Battery Co., Division of Servel, Inc.; Marathon Battery Co.; Ray-O-Vac Co., Division of the Electric Storage Battery Co.; Union Carbide Consumer Products Co., Division of Union Carbide Corp.; and U.S. Electric Manufacturing Corp.

4. The seven companies employ approximately 8,000 people for the manufacture of dry batteries. The annual payroll for these employees is approximately $35 million.

5. The domestic manufacturers have dry battery plants in these States: New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, North Carolina (Union Carbide employs about 1,200 people at Greenville, Charlotte, and Asheboro), Vermont, Illinois, Wisconsin (Ray-O-Vac, Burgess, and Marathon employ approximately 2,000 people in battery manufacture), Iowa, Ohio, and Massachusetts.

6. Sales of transistorized radios—the primary consumer outlet for these battery types—have been increasing dramatically in the United States. In 1957, the first important sales year for transistor types, sales of transistorized portable radios nearly equaled sales of vacuum tube models. In 1960 transistorized sets outsold vacuum tube models at a rate of 7 to 1, with about 7 million transistor radios offered for sale in the United States.

7. U.S. manufacturers make about 120 different types of radio batteries, a complete line to satisfy all consumer requirements. However, three transistor types, No. 1015, No. 216, and No. 226, make up over 50 percent of the total radio battery sales. The Japanese export to the United States only the most popular types.

8. Batteries, being perishable, suffer an inevitable loss of strength in the time required to ship them from Japan to the United States—even if originally they equaled U.S. battery quality, a questionable assumption.

9. In 1961 it is estimated that U.S. production of transistor radio battery types will remain at the 1960 level (12 million batteries) or drop, while, if uncontrolled, U.S. imports of Japanese transistor radio batteries will rise 225 percent, totaling 16,146,000 for the year.

10. Comparative data in units:

	1959	1960	1961
U.S. production	5,800,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Japanese imports	3,350,000	7,355,000	16,146,000

U.S. imports of Japanese transistor radio batteries were eight times greater in 1960 than in 1957.

11. The U.S. dry battery makers pay an average of $2 per hour to production workers. Japanese dry battery manufacturers pay about 30 cents an hour to production workers.

12. Import duties on Japanese batteries are negligible today (17.5 percent). Japanese No. 216 type transistor batteries sell at U.S. port of entry for about 15 cents. U.S. manufacturers sell No. 216 batteries to distributors for about 70 cents. Comparative selling prices of other types are equally disproportionate.

13. Transistor radio battery types are used today in special military communication equipment and other devices. It is essential that domestic battery capacity be maintained and research and development be encouraged.

The position of the Dry Battery Section of NEMA is that, if the trend in Japanese imports is allowed to continue, there is a very real danger the U.S. industry will lack the capacity to supply military and defense battery needs in the event of a national emergency. The dry battery industry played a high priority role in both World War II and Korea and modern military communication devices, powered by transistor battery types, place even more severe demands upon the industry's capacity and continuing technological development.

14. Remedial action:

(a) The Tariff Commission can be asked to approve higher duties on Japanese made batteries.

(b) The Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization can be asked to declare tran-

sistor radio batteries vital to national security with a recommendation for appropriate action.

(c) The Japanese may voluntarily establish annual quotas for transistor battery exports to the United States—a course of action which the Japanese took in 1956 regarding textiles, in 1958 regarding transistor radio sets, and in 1961 regarding bicycles.

CBS TELEVISION BROADCAST DOCUMENTS HOUSE DEBATE ON RULES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how timely, informative, and fair television can be in bringing the complex and controversial issues of our time into tens of millions of America homes was demonstrated brilliantly recently on an issue of immense importance to the Congress.

At this very moment our colleagues in the House of Representatives are deciding the fate of their Rules Committee. On the outcome of this debate, we are told, will hinge the fate of much of President Kennedy's program. Students of the democratic process throughout the country are watching with keen interest to see the outcome of this attempt to increase the membership of the House Rules Committee.

Less than a fortnight ago the Columbia Broadcasting System's news division presented a CBS report on "The Keeper of the Rules: Congressman Smith and the New Frontier." The program brought the details of the rules fight to a wide audience, who, I suspect, may have found this description of legislative maneuvering as fascinating as a good western.

The narrator of the program, Mr. Howard K. Smith, concluded by saying:

A few hours ago, we had no ending to this report on "The Keeper of the Rules," for events were moving to a climax * * *.

That climax is now at hand.

I therefore ask consent that the script of this CBS program, which was shown on January 19, 1961, be placed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KEEPER OF THE RULES: CONGRESSMAN SMITH AND THE NEW FRONTIER

(CBS Reports, January 19, 1961)

HOWARD K. SMITH. This is Howard K. Smith, in front of the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C. The program you are about to see has been in preparation for several weeks. However, news developments just since yesterday have given our topic a new immediacy. A caucus of Democrats in the House of Representatives, yesterday, has cleared the stage for a decisive vote on our topic next week on the floor of the House. So, events in Congress are moving towards a climax, tonight, on the eve of the inauguration of John F. Kennedy as President of the United States.

Tomorrow, on this platform, the 35th President of the United States will raise his right hand and take the oath of office.

Mr. KENNEDY. I solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution, so help me God.

Mr. SMITH. On the platform, tomorrow, will be Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Truman, Mr. Hoover, Chief Justice Warren—and the great names of the Senate and House whose advice and consent are essential to the effectiveness of the new President. Among them, but out of the spotlight, will sit a man who, until the past few weeks, was almost unknown to the public, a man whose political power casts a deep shadow over John F. Kennedy's new frontier and the future deliberations of the House of Representatives. Even today, it is doubtful that one American in a thousand can recognize his face and he has never appeared on television. His name is HOWARD W. SMITH. He is 77 years old. He first walked down those steps in 1930, and has not lost an election since, despite Presidential purges, liberal onslaughts and editorial bombardment. The most historic was Franklin Roosevelt's attempt to purge him in 1938.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You and I all know that progress may be blocked by outspoken reactionaries. As the head of the Democratic Party, charged with the responsibility of carrying out the definitely liberal declaration of principles set forth in the 1936 Democratic platform, I feel that I have every right to speak in those few instances where there may be a clear-cut issue between candidates for a Democratic nomination, involving these principles, or involving a clear misuse of my own name.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that President Roosevelt tried to purge you in 1938. Was that a problem?

Representative SMITH. Some of the people who wanted to do the purging, I remember, said in the newspaper that they were going to use me as a laboratory experiment to see how the thing worked. The experiment did not work very well.

Mr. SMITH. And it is no secret that the President-elect and the Democratic high command would feel more comfortable without the presence of this controversial Democrat. As chairman of the House Rules Committee he stands astride the path toward the new frontier like a parliamentary colossus. Life magazine said that he had "little respect for either free enterprise or democracy." But Raymond Moley of Newsweek has called him one of the two ablest men in Congress. Gib Crockett's recent cartoon in the Washington Star illustrates the Democrats' dilemma. The "U.S.S. New Frontier," captained by John Kennedy, may be dashed against the rocks of the House Rules Committee—rocks shaped in the craggy image of HOWARD W. SMITH. Whether you voted for or against Kennedy and JOHNSON, the imminent contest between the young man from Massachusetts and the old gentleman from Virginia will have a vital effect upon all our lives.

The Rules Committee has been said to work for conservation and to have stopped liberal legislation. That is true, is it not?

Representative SMITH. I think that is a fair criticism.

Mr. SMITH. HOWARD WORTH SMITH, who sits in that chair has been on the front pages of the Nation's newspapers more in the past 30 days than in his previous 30 years as a Congressman from Virgina. The Rules Committee, which he heads, has been catapulted from obscurity to nationwide prominence. All the oratory, the campaign promises and the brave and eager hopes, must in the end, run the gauntlet of the men who sit around this table in the Rules Committee chamber. And at their head, sits the 77-year-old keeper of the rules, HOWARD W. SMITH, Judge SMITH to his colleagues. Powerful, little known to the public, a man whose action, or inaction, can mean the success or failure of the new administration. Once the House Rules Committee was a dry paragraph in a dull civics book. Today, it is a focal point of national controversy, and tomorrow a new President must reckon with its power. Some 20,000 pieces of legislation are introduced during a session of the Congress. Let's take, for example, a bill to raise the minimum wage, one of the key points of the Kennedy program. After being introduced in the House, it goes to the House Committee on Education and Labor. If it clears that committee, it goes on to the House Calendar. Then it is up to the Rules Committee to determine when and under what conditions the bill may be debated, if it may be debated at all. In addition, the House Rules Committee can prevent a conference between the Senate and the House to adjust differences on similar legislation. This flow of legislative traffic has been directed by and indeed has been dominated by Congressman HOWARD SMITH. We will meet the keeper of the rules in just a minute, but first, we hear from two leading members of his committee, Congressman RICHARD BOLLING of Missouri, the leader of the liberal Democrats.

Representative BOLLING. Under certain circumstances, the House Rules Committee can flout the will of a majority of both the House and the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. And CLARENCE BROWN of Ohio, the senior Republican on the committee.

Representative BROWN. This is supposed to be the Congress of the United States, the greatest deliberative body in the world. Now, you can be too rapid in your decisions as well as too slow.

Mr. SMITH. We interviewed Congressmen BOLLING and BROWN separately, then joined their remarks, so that you might hear their divergence of views. First, their opinions of the keeper of the rules. Democrat BOLLING says of Democrat SMITH:

Representative BOLLING. He is a real obstructionist as far as my judgment in majority rule and as far as legislation, that in my opinion, is absolutely essential if this country is to survive.

Mr. SMITH. Republican BROWN says of Democrat SMITH:

Representative BROWN. Well, I think that Judge SMITH is one of the most able, most distinguished men that I have ever known in public service.

Representative BOLLING. Well, in the first place, I consider him a real friend. I admire him a great deal. On substantive issues I disagree with him almost always. He is, in my judgment, a perfectly honest, extreme conservative, who fights with every method that he can find to support his position, and his position from my point of view, is essentially negative. He's against almost every piece of legislation that comes before the Rules Committee and is of major national importance.

Representative BROWN. He's a man that's always a gentleman. He's always courteous. He's always thoughtful and I have never known him to do a little or mean thing; although he's strong in his convictions at times and will often state them rather frankly, he won't mislead you.

Representative BOLLING. And one of the interesting things to watch over a period of years and I have been in effect, working, you might say, with him or against him, for about 6 years. One of the interesting things to watch is the way he plays all these different things, the way a great conductor conducts an orchestra. It's really fascinating. If he sees that he's going to be overrun here, unless it be in the civil rights field, and there he will go down to his death, his legislative death—fighting. But on an economic issue, or a welfare issue, if there are—let's say there's five or six of them, he'll play them as carefully as he can and very skillfully to kill as many as possible, but if he has to knuckle under in order to get X by going along with A he will. It's really magnificent skill. As a legislative technician I can only admire him.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Rules Committee reflect the will of the majority in the House of Representatives? Congressman BROWN and BOLLING differ. Republican BROWN.

Representative BROWN. The power of the Rules Committee is actually the power of the House and of the House leadership. Now, the Rules Committee, if I may go further, is the leadership committee of the House. Not because I'm on it, but in spite of that fact, I might add, it represents the majority and the minority leadership, and because of the fact that it does represent the party in power, primarily, the makeup of the Rules Committee has always been eight and four for a great many years—eight of the majority party and four of the minority party. So that the majority party may be able to work its will with legislation in most instances.

Representative BOLLING. The committee is nominally eight to four, Democrats, Republican. But Mr. SMITH is an extreme conservative. Mr. COLMER of Mississippi, the second ranking member, is an extreme conservative and allied with four extremely conservative Republicans, they have six votes, and those of us, the rest of the Democrats, the other six Democrats, who range from moderate to liberal, only have six votes and it takes a majority to carry a motion. You have to have seven votes if everybody's present. You have to have six votes if one of them is absent, but this 6–6 is a real roadblock in, from my point of view, in the face of progress. They are always in a position to demand an extra pound of flesh and they usually do.

Representative BROWN. I'd like to say something here, if I may. I've spent 45 years and better in my life as a newspaperman. I often tell my friends I make the honest part of my living out of being a newspaper publisher, and I read with a great deal of interest some of the reports that are published out of Washington about the activities of the Rules Committee. More misinformation, more incorrect statements made about the Rules Committee than any other committee or activity on Capitol Hill. Now, if the Rules Committee takes a position opposite yours, then it's a reactionary action on the part of the Rules Committee, but if it agrees with what you request, then the committee's all right at the time. And yet I've the experience of having people come to me and ask me to "Please, whatever you do, hold the bill in until after my primaries are over, because either way I vote on them, I will be in trouble at home." And then I get letters from his home areas in which they say: "Now, we know what you people are doing. You're blocking this bill because our own Congressman has written and told us that it was the damnable Rules Committee that was blocking consideration of the bill."

Representative BOLLING. Do we need a better minimum wage? Do we need to do something about our educational system? Do we need to do something about our older citizens who require urgently, medical care? My answer to all three of those is—of course we do and we should, as a responsible group of people in Congress see to it that there are not tricks, tactics within one small committee that can be indulged in by a small group of men to flout the will of the people of the United States, of the majority of the Congress and of the responsible leadership of the party in Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Critics of the Rules Committee charge it obstructs legislation by unnecessary delay, but Congressman BROWN stresses the need for deliberation.

Representative BROWN. The Rules Committee serves a very useful purpose at times. When controversial legislation is raced through the legislative committee, by delaying or prolonging of the hearings until the Members of the Congress, themselves, until the country, itself, that is the people of the United States, including commentators like yourself, have an opportunity to digest the legislation brought out, know what's in it—see the weak points and the strong points, discuss it and debate it and decide in their own minds what action they believe should be taken on it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. BOLLING says that the Rules Committee doesn't always obey the rules.

Representative BOLLING. It is the keeper of the rules of the House and as far as I know, it's the only committee of the House that consistently flouts one of the rules of the House. One of the rules of the House requires that every standing committee will have a regular meeting day. Now, this may be once a week, twice a month, once a month, but although it has been brought up in the committee, I know this because I've done it myself, the Rules Committee has no regular meeting day. This has obvious implications. It means that the calling of meetings is entirely up to the chairman or a very determined majority of the committee which is willing to fly directly in the face of the chairman, as it has been, as it has done at least once and take over the committee and force a meeting. I say once. This was done in 1957, in the last stages of the first civil rights bill to pass the Congress in more than 80 years. We had to literally take the committee away from the chairman in order to get a resolution passed, get a resolution out that was necessary. So it's a fascinating thing. You would think that conservatives would honor existing rules, but the rules of the House are specific, that there must be a regular meeting day and yet the Rules Committee has never had a regular meeting day to my knowledge.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. HALLECK, the Republican leader of the House met recently with Democrat SMITH of the Rules Committee and told reporters he expected to do "business as usual" with him. We asked Congressmen BROWN and BOLLING whether that meant the Republican Southern Democrat coalition in the Rules Committee would continue.

Representative BROWN. Well, in the first place, I don't think Mr. HALLECK here, if he said that and I don't remember just what he said—I wasn't present. If he said that referring to any so-called coalition, I don't think he ever used the word, "coalition." In the Rules Committee he may have referred to the fact that quite often a great many of the conservative Democrats in the Congress, not all of them from the South by any means, some of them from other parts of the country, including my own State, vote with the Republicans in favor of the conservative, rather than the radical position on some legislation, or some particular legislative bill, so I don't think he's talking about a coalition in the Rules Committee.

Representative BOLLING. Well, of course there's a coalition. There's always been a coalition. There's been a coalition in very effective force since about 1938, when President Roosevelt, in effect, lost control of the majority in Congress. This fact was obscured by the fact that we very quickly thereafter, were involved in international problems and war, but the coalition has been effective since that time and one of its great bastions, one of its great, strong points in this battleline between what I consider to be extreme conservatism and moderate and liberal progressivism, has been the Rules Committee. Sure there's a coalition. All you have to do is look at the way they behave. There are too many, too many examples of Mr. HALLECK and Mr. SMITH working absolutely in perfect coordination. Incidentally, I suspect Mr. SMITH sometimes of being the leader of that coalition.

Mr. SMITH. Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH has represented the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia for 30 years, a longer period of service than all but 10 of his 436 colleagues in the House of Representatives. We talked to him in the House Rules Chamber, the room that he has dominated with his skill and with his seniority. We asked him about the four Presidents during whose tenure he has served beginning with Herbert Hoover.

Representative SMITH. Well, I think Herbert Hoover, like most of our Presidents, was a very great man. I think he was a victim of a condition that was growing up when he first became President and it culminated during his session.

Mr. SMITH. What about his successor, Franklin D. Roosevelt?

Representative SMITH. Well, I think he was a very great man, although he didn't think I was a very great man.

Mr. SMITH. You met him personally and talked to him, didn't you?

Representative SMITH. Oh, yes; numerous times.

Mr. SMITH. And were relations, personal relations, good?

Representative SMITH. They had to be with Franklin Roosevelt, because he was one of those fellows that you couldn't be in his presence 5 minutes that you weren't impressed with his personality, and he just sort of fascinated anybody he came in contact with.

Mr. SMITH. But when you were out of his presence for 5 minutes it became easier to disagree with him?

Representative SMITH. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH. How about President Truman?

Representative SMITH. Well, I never had too much contact with President Truman. I think he was a very forthright kind of a person, very strong in his views.

Mr. SMITH. How about President Eisenhower?

Representative SMITH. I think he—no man was ever in the White House who didn't try harder to do a good job and a good, honest job than the present President.

Mr. SMITH. Well, the Rules Committee has been said to work for conservatism and to have stopped liberal legislation. That is true, is it not?

Representative SMITH. I think that is a fair criticism. Now—yet it has it merits. You can take a bill that is controversial. It comes freshly out of a committee. They come right up here and get a rule. Then next day, or the next 2 or 3 days, they debate it on the floor of the House and when the country finds out what it's all about, the bill is passed.

Now if a bill comes to the Rules Committee and it is very controversial, then Members are privileged to come in—not only members of that committee, but the Members of the House and out of common courtesy, we do hear any Member that wants to come up here and say anything about a bill that is pending—and I don't think there's any criticism of that. Now when it's stopped up here and then there comes a great crowd of Members up here, some for the bill and some against the bill, these newspaper boys get hold of it, and they begin to write about it and it begins to go back to California and Arizona and all the rest of the States and the people begin to read about it, and then you begin to get propaganda, so to speak; in other words, real democracy begins to work, the grassroots, the people back home are writing in here and saying, we think this bill ought to be passed or we think it oughtn't to be passed.

Mr. SMITH. Well, sir; among the many powers that you have that were not, I think, originally envisaged is the power to disappear from Washington when Congressmen are hunting for you to have a ruling on legislation. On one occasion, when you disappeared in 1956 and Congressmen clamored for your return, someone said: "He probably is on board the *Nautilus* probing the polar ice cap." And once in 1957, you said: "I had to leave because a barn burned

down on my farm." And Speaker RAYBURN said: "I never suspected he would resort to arson." Is that not true?

Representative SMITH. Well, all that was in good clean fun, you know, those comments, but some folks might be surprised to know the number of people from both sides of the aisle, who have, under deep stress about bills, come to me and said: "Judge, we wish you'd take another vacation. We'll get up a pot and pay for it." This year, everybody I think that came to see me wanted to help paint my barn or something like that, all in good fun. Now, I did take one vacation. I reckon, I spend more time in Washington than any Member of either the House or the Senate. I normally don't take vacations. It happened that my daughter and her family from Texas were spending their summer vacation down at Nags Head, N.C., and things were pretty hot up here, I'll admit that, and they were sort of getting under my skin and everybody else had had a vacation. I hadn't had any and I just up and left here and I didn't want to be bothered. So I went down and visited my family in North Carolina, at Nags Head for just 1 week and then all this furor arose. But as soon as I got back, I conferred with the Speaker about what he wanted out of the Rules Committee. We had no difficulty. The whole thing was settled very briefly but it gave opportunity for, as I say, a lot of good fun. I don't recall—I recall having a barn burn down. I don't recall having had to leave Washington.

Mr. SMITH. Well, sir, as you know, many critics have said that you have gone beyond the simple matter of making rules. The New York Times published an article some time ago which said that "the Rules Committee is a third branch of Congress, equal to and sometimes superior to the Senate and the House of Representatives," and Congressman CLEVELAND BAILEY, of West Virginia, charged the committee with un-Democratic and un-American gag rule procedure." What do you say to that?

Representative SMITH. Well, I'd say about the remarks of CLEVE BAILEY— "Old CLEVE" comes up here every time we open the door. He gets courteous and fair treatment always. We're all good friends. He is privileged to criticize us and we are likewise privileged to criticize what he is trying to get through. Of course, the New York Times article—I would say there's very little truth in that. Now, the Rules Committee very rarely declines to give a rule on a bill, probably two or three or four during a session. Now, when that happens, the House has its option of what to do about it. Now, remember this—and everybody ought to be willing to recognize it—that if there's one rule in the House of Representatives that is inviolate and that is majority rule, and if the majority of the House wants to debate a bill, there are ways provided in the rules by which they can do it, and neither the Rules Committee nor the leadership or anybody else can stop them, the majority of the House, from working their will on legislation.

Mr. SMITH. Well, sir, it is true, is it not, that the Rules Committee is unique, there is no comparable body in the Senate? Aside from making rules, you screen legislation; you determine when it will be debated; you state the length of time for debate, the kind and quantity of amendments or substitutes that will be permitted and you can also prevent the House of Representatives from having a conference meeting with the Senate on similar legislation. Isn't that unique?

Representative SMITH. Now, of course, that's a necessary function. Somebody's got to do it. The question is, Shall the majority leader in the Senate do it, in the Senate, or is it better that 12 men in the House coming from all sections of the country who have a bird's-eye view of the whole thing should do it, rather than have one man do it. Now, if the functions of the Rules Committee are restricted, then who's going to do it? Somebody's got to decide how much of this multitude of various and sundry kinds of legislation is going to come to the floor to be debated because time doesn't permit you to do it all.

Mr. SMITH. Well, what about the complaints of excessive delays by your committee? Is it the same on other committees?

Representative SMITH. Oh, I think it's been going on more or less ever since I've been on the Rules Committee and before that time it used to be that the power of the chairman was such that if he didn't like a bill that his committee voted out a rule on, he'd just put the whole mess in his pocket and never reported it to the House. Now, that caused a change in the rules so that under the rules if the committee votes for a rule, I'm compelled within 3 days to file it in the House and I always live by the rules.

Mr. SMITH. Well, could you tell me about your philosophy of government? What do you think should be the role of Government in national life?

Representative SMITH. I think that the Constitution of the United States was an inspired document, and I think we've departed a good, long distance from the fundamental principles of the Constitution. Well, to touch on a very controversial thing is the school integration decision of the Supreme Court and the accepted view of Government officials and I think of the public, that whatever the Supreme Court of the United States says is the law of the land. Well, I think you've got to go back to that Constitution and see what our forefathers provided should be the law of the land. They set up the three, executive, legislative and judicial departments, separate and independent. That was all right in itself, but we come to this question, which is the fundamental question, I think, and that is whether the Supreme Court can, in any instance that it sees fit, declare a principle of law that's unknown to the American people in the past and say that that is a part of the Constitution of the United States. Then you don't have that anchor, and the first thing you know, the personnel of the court changes, the law of the land changes, just because maybe one man on the Supreme Court has passed away and another has taken his place. Now, that is a very dangerous thing.

Mr. SMITH. But in the case of the segregation issue, that was a unanimous decision by the Supreme Court, wasn't it, a unanimous ruling, I mean?

Representative SMITH. That was a unanimous Supreme Court, but it revoked and repealed what had been the law of the land for over a half century.

Mr. SMITH. Well, in regard to the question of school segregation and school integration. Now that has been tested and retested and confirmed and reconfirmed in one court after another all over the country. Doesn't that give an additional validity to the Supreme Court's decision?

Representative SMITH. Well, I didn't want to get into a discussion of the controversial segregation question. I'm talking about the general principle and I just don't—I think that's a very careless, lackadaisical way to establish the law of the land, because it's subject to change at any moment when the philosophy of the members of the Supreme Court changes.

Mr. SMITH. Well, Judge SMITH, about a year ago, the Washington Daily News had a report on civil rights legislation which said that the chief opponent of civil rights in Washington is Howard K. Smith. Now, my name is Howard K. Smith and I know I've done nothing to earn that distinction so I'm going to assume that was a typographical error and you were meant. Is it true?

Representative SMITH. No, don't put that on me now. That's your burden. Now, you carry it.

Mr. SMITH. Then you would deny it, that you're opposed to civil rights legislation?

Representative SMITH. Oh, no, I am opposed to most of the civil rights legislation that has been proposed.

Mr. SMITH. Now I would like to ask you the philosophy, the rationale, that you apply in opposing civil rights legislation. What is the—is it possible in modern times to resist the granting of equal rights to all members of the Nation?

Representative SMITH. What are rights? What do you mean by rights?

Mr. SMITH. I mean the voting rights, for example.

Representative SMITH. Uh—voting rights. Oh, I come back again to the Constitution, and under that the States fix their own voting rights—are supposed to do so, and the eligibility of people to vote in the presidential election is determined by, under the exact terms of the Constitution, to be the same as the eligible voters to elect the most numerous branch of the State legislature. And I've always questioned the right of, and do now, of the Federal Government to stop and determine who can vote in a particular State.

Mr. SMITH. Well, the Constitution states this is the 14th and 15th amendments which are part of the Constitution.

Representative SMITH. And that's a very debatable question.

Mr. SMITH. In what respect—could you tell me?

Representative SMITH. Because that one provision of the Constitution, which you have mentioned, the 14th amendment and because, you know the 14th amendment was a very controversial thing at the time it was adopted, and many people believed that it was not adopted, and the then Secretary of State believed it was not adopted and he refused to certify it until Congress passed a resolution directing him to certify it and he did, and that's the history of the 14th amendment, but that's neither here nor there. It's part of the law of the land now, but I think that——

Mr. SMITH. Well, as part of the law of the land, doesn't that limit the amount, the degree to which a State can write its own voting laws? It requires the States——

Representative SMITH. Well, that's probably the present law, yes. I'd say I just don't agree with it because fundamentally, I think the most basic thing in the old Constitution is the 10th amendment which provides that the Federal Government shall exercise no powers except those specifically granted. Now, I don't ask anybody to agree with me about that. You asked me my views and I'm giving you my views and I respect other people's right to have their views on the same subject.

Mr. SMITH. Well, Carl Sandburg once wrote that the United States is, not the United States are. The Civil War was fought over the number of that verb and the issue is now settled for all time. Do you agree with that?

Representative SMITH. I'll agree that he's a very able historian.

Mr. SMITH. Well, Judge SMITH, what is the philosophy behind segregation? I, like you, am a southerner. I was born on the banks of the Mississippi River and completely reared in Louisiana, but I spent 20 years as a foreign correspondent. I have two children, one who was born in Paris, one in London. They're here now in Washington. They go to integrated schools and they ask me: "What is all the fuss in New Orleans about? What's objectionable about integration? Why is segregation good?" Now, what is the answer to that?

Representative SMITH. Well, of course that runs back over generations, back to the days

of slavery. The southern people have never accepted the colored race as a race of people who had equal intelligence and education and social attainments as the white people of the South. I would say that it goes more directly to the question of what they want, what people want to do. I don't agree at all that the Negro people, the vast bulk of them, want to go into white schools, and I don't agree that the vast bulk of the white people want to go into Negro schools. That has proven itself, because after the segregation laws have been broken down by the Supreme Court—you see very few colored people that want to go into the white schools and I'll tell you why—because I've lived amongst colored people all my life—on most friendly terms and we have them in our own vicinity. They don't want to go to the white schools. In recent years, they've got better schools than the white children have in my country. There are different standards, different modes and different social and educational qualifications that they just don't fit.

Mr. SMITH. No, I'm not trying to argue with you. I'm just trying to get your views on this question of them not wanting to. Well, isn't it possible that what the individuals like, frequently runs contrary to national interest? For example, if you polled all school kids on universal education, they probably would produce a majority opposed to it. They'd rather stay home or play hooky. And in fact when universal suffrage was first being discussed, I think if you had asked most people whether they wanted to have it, most of them would have been indifferent to it. Yet, it was necessary and inevitable, so doesn't, don't national interests sometimes override what local people want?

Representative SMITH. No.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have no concern that discrimination or even battles, like that in New Orleans, over discrimination, may hurt our standing with all the new nations that are being born all over the world, in a world in which 80 percent of the people are nonwhite? Don't these quarrels imply that white people think they're superior to people of color, and doesn't that offend these people we need to get along with?

Representative SMITH. Well, I'll answer you by going way out on a limb and that is that I think that for some time our Government has been paying too much attention to what other people think, rather than what the American people think, and I am very much concerned about whether our kowtowing to this nation, that nation and the other nation isn't making us more enemies than friends. The idea of racial intermixture is abominable to us and we don't think it ought to happen.

Mr. SMITH. Well, under the Kennedy administration, do you foresee a lonely conflict between the administration and the rules committee, as, there, frequently it's talked about a great deal in the papers and I saw a cartoon in the papers the other day in which you probably have seen that too. That's the picture of Kennedy advancing toward what he called the "new frontiers," and he's stopped by a bull—one large horn of which says "The House Rules Committee." Do you foresee much of the legislative conflict over that program?

Representative SMITH. I sincerely hope that it will not be so far to the left that it will not be reasonably acceptable to the American people. Now, I can't give you any guess on it because it depends upon what the new President proposes to do. I could name several things that I could, as an individual Member of Congress, could not vote for.

Mr. SMITH. Well, could you name those for me?

Representative SMITH. Well, for a long time, the States haven't been recognized as States to the extent of the provision in the Taft-Hartley Law that the States should have the right to work laws: that is, States should have the right to prohibit people from being compelled to join a union in order to work for their living. A very un-American principle, I've always thought. Well, the platform proposes to do away with the States "right to work laws." I would be violently opposed to that. The platform, the Democratic platform, proposes to do away with all literacy tests and give us a mixture of intelligent voters with voters who don't know what it's all about and can't read and write and find out what it's all about.

SMITH. Well, we're watching a new administration coming to power now. We know, in general, what its program is going to be. We don't know the specifics, but we do know that it calls for more Government participation in national life. Probably more Government expenditure. What do you think of that general program?

Representative SMITH. I have a very dim view of these features of it.

Mr. SMITH. To understand the depth of the Rules Committee controversy and the role of Chairman SMITH, it is necessary to examine the methods by which the committee works. There are differing views as to its performance and they are mirrored by Congressmen BOLLING and BROWN. As before, we interviewed them separately and joined their responses. We asked if Chairman SMITH accepted the principle of majority rule. Democrat BOLLING.

Representative BOLLING. This last year, we had a couple of examples where he was perfectly willing to stand opposed to the rule of the majority, not just of the House, but of both the House and the Senate. The classic example of this is when the House had passed a school bill, the Senate had passed a school bill, and Mr. SMITH and his cohorts on the Rules Committee prevented those two differing bills from going to conference. So although a majority of U.S. Senators and a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives had voted for action in this field, six men in the Rules Committee were able to prevent that action.

Mr. SMITH. Republican BROWN.

Representative BROWN. The majority can always control action of the House. I think if you'll bear with me a moment. I'd like to point out that the granting of a rule to bring a bill to the floor is only one of the methods that are followed by the legislation leadership in the Congress or in the House to bring legislation off the floor. Bills can be brought up and many are under suspension of the rules.

Representative BOLLING. Suspension isn't much good when you have a fairly close fight; when you feel that you have a majority but not an overwhelmingly majority, suspension is out of the question because that is a suspension of the rules and requires a 2 to 1 vote, a two-thirds vote, so this is really not much help.

Representative BROWN. Then of course you can bring bills up under Calendar Wednesday procedure. That is any Wednesday, within the entire session of Congress, chairman of the proper legislative committee can call a bill up if its been reported to his committee without going to the Rules Committee.

Representative BOLLING. The use of Calendar Wednesday is pretty awkward. It can be done. We forced out several bills during the regular session in 1960 by the use of Calendar Wednesday or the threat of Calendar Wednesday. The depressed areas bill was the one that we actually brought to the floor, under the provisions of Calendar Wednesday, but it has disadvantages because you have to finish up that particular piece of legislation in the same sitting.

Representative BROWN. They can be brought up, of course, under another method and that is by the discharge petition route.

Representative BOLLING. Well, the discharge petition is actually opposed by a great many perfectly honest Members of Congress. It requires a constitutional majority. It requires a full majority of the full membership of the House. That means that if we have 437 Members, it's 219. If there are some vacancies it comes down accordingly, but it's very difficult to get a discharge petition signed up because of this reluctance on the part of some liberals as well as conservatives to sign discharge petition.

Mr. SMITH. Suspension of the rules, Calendar Wednesday, discharge petition. Unfamiliar expressions that may mean the difference between accepted or rejected legislation. Some of those methods may have to be used to force some points of the Kennedy program out of the House Rules Committee. We asked the keeper of the rules what he thought about parts of the Kennedy programs, specifically about raising the minimum wage and extending it to more workers.

Representative SMITH. Well, I originally got in trouble with the New Deal by opposing the minimum wage law, and I've always taken the position that it was just as unconstitutional to fix a minimum wage as it would be to fix a maximum wage. Now, to my mind, if you can fix a minimum wage, you can, by the same rule, fix a maximum of what a man may earn.

Mr. SMITH. Now, it's sometimes said that some of the features included in that platform and some that Senator Kennedy mentioned in his campaign, which require considerable expenditure, are very necessary if we are to compete with the Russians. They are, for example, turning out more scientists than we are now, more doctors than we are and such things as that, and if we don't give Federal aid to education, we can't get teachers, sufficient teachers of sufficient quality to turn out the requisite number of people we need to compete with the Russians. Do you believe that's a valid argument?

Representative SMITH. No. First place, you don't know what Russia's doing, except you do know they're doing a lot of lying. What's going on behind the Iron Curtain we simply don't know. But can you tell me any phase of human endeavor by a government of people that has progressed more rapidly, and done more in the past decade than public education?

Mr. SMITH. No.

Representative SMITH. All right. Now, we're doing mighty good on public education. Why do things that are so controversial that they hurt the cause, rather than help it? I think that when you're getting along well and doing an extraordinarily good job, you'd better not rock the old boat too much with controversy.

Mr. SMITH. Now, how about legislation for depressed areas which is a feature that both Senator Johnson and the President-elect have been very interested in? That'll cost money.

Representative SMITH. Well, we had a bill up about that last year—about depressed areas and it came before this committee, and I read the bill and the report, and the report undertook to set out what were depressed areas. Well, you'd be shocked to know that that official document listed about half the counties in the United States as being depressed. Now, let's do something sensible. You take a spot that, by reason of a particular condition, does need help and need it badly. I would not be adverse, I'm

not hardhearted—God knows, I've had, I started off poverty stricken myself, a good part of my life, and I know what it is. I was born 18 years after the close of the Civil War and the victims of the Civil War in the South didn't have any Marshall plan. We just had to eat cornbread and molasses if we could find it. I was born and raised on a farm under those conditions when if there ever was a depressed area, it was the Southern States. Now, if you want to take the places that really need it, but when you want to build a great, big gravy train and start it rolling across the United States taking in any community that can make a case under some cockeyed, impractical formula, of being a depressed area and dish money out of another State and give it to that State, I'm not for it.

Mr. SMITH. How about medical care for the aged? What do you think about that as an idea?

Representative SMITH. I think that's pretty much the same kind of a thing and I think that is so controversial and the opinions about it are so divergent, that I don't want to express any opinion about it, any final opinion, now, and I said before, I'm sympathetic to human wants and human needs, but this thing of universal, medical aid to people of a certain age group would just chuck your hospitals so full of people that you'd have to start a crash program to build hospitals. Where are you going to put them?

Mr. SMITH. Well now, let's turn to foreign aid. There is a move now afoot to increase the amount of foreign aid abroad that we give or lend. What do you think of that?

Representative SMITH. Now, I think we've reached that phase of it, where we are making more enemies than friends by this foreign aid. I think it should be very limited. My own record is, that since I thought the Marshall plan had done the job, I stopped voting for foreign aid. Of course, I'm in the minority on that as I'm in the minority on most of the things that I think. I think since that cutoff period came, when these people were in as good shape as we were, that then we either should cut it off or we should make it a worldwide thing. Now, when we've just tried to make it a worldwide thing, we've finally waked up and realized that we are wrecking our economy and wrecking our finances with the things that we are doing outside of the United States and largely for other people, though indirectly for our own defense. Now, when we finally wake up and see our situation, how our gold is flowing out, how our bonds can't be sold, how our dollars are getting pretty close to the rocks, and we go to these people that we have lifted up and put on their feet, and put them in good shape and say to them, "Now look boys, now is the time for you also to come in and help the world, just like we helped you." And they say, "Oh, no, Uncle Sap, you keep on doing this thing. We don't feel like doing it." Now that's the situation you're in.

Mr. SMITH. How much of a program like this do you think Kennedy will be able to get through?

Representative SMITH. I have no idea. I think in the first place, that the idea expressed in the Democratic platform of a permanent foreign aid thing is far beyond what we ought to do, and instead of enlarging it, I think we should curtail it.

Mr. SMITH. Well, Judge SMITH, Congressman HALLECK, the leader of the Republicans in the House of Representatives, has been to see you, who are in a way the leader of the southern Democrats in the House, and he came away and told reporters that he hopes "to do business as usual with you." Does that mean that the coalition is going to continue?

Representative SMITH. Well, I don't know of any difference—all this talk you hear about a Republican and conservative coalition. There never has been and I hope never will be such a thing as a coalition. The only time that that occurs is when we think alike on a certain measure and it's by no means unanimous on either side. The majority of the southerners may vote against or for a certain measure and the majority of the Republicans may do it. The next measure that comes along, there will be a different division, but as for a coalition, nobody could form any formal coalition here. Our southerners are just from heredity standpoint, just Democrats and they go along with the Democratic administration, whenever their conscience will let them and when it won't, they exercise that duty and their privilege of voting their sentiments. And the Republicans can vote the same way. It's all right by us and we're very happy to have them on our side.

Mr. SMITH. Is it true to say that that happens more and more often on controversial legislation, in recent years?

Representative SMITH. Well, it has been more advertised in recent years.

Mr. SMITH. Well, in regard to liberal legislation and the tendency of Government to take a larger part in national life, I think you probably saw the results of the President's Commission on National Goals recently which recommended a program that would require more Government intervention in national life and more expenditure, though that committee was made up for the most part, I think, of conservatives and it was appointed by a conservative President. Does that possibly indicate that that is the trend of the times and that the philosophy that you have mentioned runs counter to the trend?

Representative SMITH. Of course, it has been the trend of the times—ever since I've been in Congress, more Government spending, more Government interference with the liberties of the people and the privileges of the people, more deficits. When I came to Congress, the national debt was infinitesimal, hardly, I don't remember what it was, maybe $20 to $25 billion. Now to think of $290 billion and then this constant pressure to raise it. I remember 2 years ago, we raised the debt limit twice in one session, in one Congress. Now, I've always in my life been a sort of a businessman and I just don't see. I've been a banker, president of a bank for many years. I don't see that kind of financing. Why you can keep on spending more money than you've got.

Mr. SMITH. Well, in your own keynote address at the Virginia State Democratic convention in May 1960, you said: "Perhaps we have drifted away so far from the moorings that bound us to our forefathers' conception of our system of government that it is too late to return." Does that mean you've given up hope for the kind of conservation that you are in favor of?

Representative SMITH. I don't think that a man who has fixed convictions in a legislative position ever should give up hope. I just believe in fighting for your conviction and I believe in the other fellow fighting for his conviction—a continuous, running battle. I'll never stop advocating the principles in which I believe.

Mr. SMITH. Until a few hours ago, we had no ending to this report on the keeper of the rules, for events were moving toward a climax as immediate as the inauguration which takes place here tomorrow. The latest phase of our story began right after election day when Democratic leaders decided they had to break the ultraconservatives' grip on the bottleneck Rules Committee. Several plans were considered. Yesterday morning, House Speaker SAM RAYBURN proposed the plan finally settled upon to a caucus of House Democrats here in this building. The plan is to increase the numbers on the Rules Committee sufficiently, to be able to outvote the ultraconservatives. The Democratic caucus agreed to the plan, though Chairman SMITH himself said no. Next week, the plan will be taken to the floor of the House of Representatives for the decisive vote. The keeper of the rules and the Democrats who support him will fight against what they call packing the Rules Committee, and today, the Republican House policy committee met and voted to join forces with Democrat SMITH to fight the plan. That is the end of our report, tonight, but anyone who knows Congressman HOWARD SMITH knows that that is not the end of this drama. As we said earlier, every Thursday night at this time, "CBS Reports" will be presented on alternate weeks with "Face the Nation." Next week, the first "Face the Nation" debate, originating live from the Capitol Building here in Washington. The debators—two of the most sharply defined political spokesmen, here. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, a Republican and a conservative, and Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, a Democrat from Minnesota—a liberal. The subject: "Does a Big Federal Government Threaten Our Freedom?" The third man in the ring will be Howard K. Smith, who now bids you good night.

PILOT PROJECT IN TEACHING LITERACY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I received a letter from Miss Nell Peerson of Florence State College, Florence, Ala., which I feel is of such great interest that it is worthy of printing in the RECORD. Though Miss Peerson is a constituent of my esteemed colleagues, the Senators from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. HILL], she wrote me on this occasion because of some comments I had made in a speech at the Woman's National Democratic Club about the substandard educational program of the Nation.

A portion of Miss Peerson's letter is hereby quoted:

Since World War II pinpointed the fact that so many of the adults of our Nation are illiterate, or functionally illiterate, States are becoming aware of the need to put on intensive literacy programs.

I am sure you will be interested in a pilot project of teaching literacy over the Alabama educational television network that we are conducting at the present time. This project was made possible through a grant from the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and is being administered by the Florence State College. Alabama is fourth from the bottom in literacy.

At the recent White House Conference on the Aging which I attended, our education section recommended that the Federal Government provide funds to assist the States in eradicating illiteracy.

Sincerely,

NELL PEERSON,
Director, Literacy Project, Florence State College.

ROBERT FROST AND THOMAS DOOLEY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, millions of Americans saw the great American poet, Robert Frost, for the first time as he played an important part in the inaugural ceremonies by reading one of his poems, especially dedicated to the occasion.

Two days earlier those same millions had been saddened by the death of Dr. Tom Dooley, whose short life had been dedicated to carrying a gift of brotherhood and assistance to thousands who

might not otherwise have had their lives so brightened. From the octogenarian poet, Robert Frost, to the 34-year-old doctor, Tom Dooley, may seem a gap of years and space. But the meaningful phrases of the poet had their impact on the doctor who wore around his neck a Saint Christopher medal with part of Robert Frost's poem "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening" inscribed on it.

Those words were:

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

Dr. Dooley fulfilled those promises.

BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 1 of last year there appeared in the Washington Post and in other newspapers around the country a very informative column by the noted American journalist, Mr. Walter Lippmann.

Mr. Lippmann writes of his visit to Brazil and what he learned there. He deals with a subject that is of increasing importance to American people, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Walter Lippmann)

In our short visit to Brazil I often found myself having to explain why I had never been to South America before and why it was that I had come now. I had not come before, I said, because during the two World Wars the critical issues had their center in our relations with Europe and Russia, and a man cannot hope to know everything and to go everywhere. I had come now to South America because I was curious, and because we had realized in the United States that with Western Europe recovered, one of the great historic dramas of the future was being prepared in this hemisphere. The theme of the drama was how the Latin American nations would rise out of their colonial past into the modern age.

There is no better place to observe this drama than in Brazil, and having only a limited time to travel we spent it all in four Brazilian cities—in the new capital of Brasilia, in the ancient Portuguese colonial capital of Bahia, in Rio de Janeiro, and in the great industrial center of Sao Paulo. What happens in Brazil, infinitely more than what happens in Cuba or Guatemala, is likely to be decisive for Latin America. For the territory of Brazil is as big as all the rest of Latin America, and there probably are at least as many, perhaps more, people who speak Portuguese as speak Spanish.

The main reason why what happens in Brazil is likely to be decisive is that although Brazil is an underdeveloped country, it is far from being a primitive and backward country. Though it has great social problems of poverty, disease, illiteracy, it has also an impressive capacity to govern itself, a core of cultivated and confident leaders, and a capacity to learn the modern technology. I had no feeling in Brazil, as I have had in certain countries in other parts of the world, that the problem was insoluble within the existing order of things. There could be failure and catastrophe in Brazil. But there is no reason why there should be. The essential human and natural resources, the social tradition and the social order are favorable to success.

The revolution of which Castro is a symptom exists under the surface in Brazil as it does everywhere in this hemisphere. But it is far under the surface. It is kept far under the surface because under both Presidents Kubitchek and his successor, Janio Quadros, there exists a very strong sense of national and social purpose. Although Brazil is a very free country with free elections and a high level of human tolerance, the Brazilians are strongly led. They have brought their economic development to the point where, as a leading Brazilian economist put it to me, "We have started down the runway but we have not yet gotten up enough speed to achieve the takeoff."

On the question of our relations with Brazil I talked with many people, Members of Congress, high administration officials, reporters, editors and publishers, businessmen, bankers and diplomats. At first I was much troubled. For it seemed to me that in their rejoicing, which was general, over Kennedy's election they were building up false hopes and expecting too much. The fear haunted me that they had not understood the consequences of the changed international position of the United States, and that they were hoping we could do in South America what we had done in Europe in the days of the Marshall plan and the dollar gap.

But I came to see that this was a superficial first impression. Although I did not have a chance to talk with the President-elect, who was in London, I did see men close to him who had worked with him and knew him well. The truth, I venture to think, is that the Brazilian Government is quite well aware of the situation of the dollar, and of the political consequences in the relative power and position of Europe and North America. I believe that they are adjusting themselves to this new international situation, and that the problem of Brazilian-American relations is wrapped up within this adaptation. That is to say, what they will expect of us is help in achieving the takeoff but the help they will expect will not involve deeply the international monetary exchanges.

To plan and organize this kind of help will require ingenuity and resourcefulness, qualities that have been notably lacking in recent years, and they may require minor changes in our laws. In one way or another we shall have to give aid by sending wheat and oil and coal, of which we have a surplus and they have a deficit, and we shall have to assist them in funding their external debts.

Gradually, I began to see what has gone wrong in our relations with Brazil. Inattention and mediocrity and lack of understanding are the causes of the trouble. The rulers and leaders of Brazil feel that since the death of Franklin Roosevelt there has been nobody for them to talk to who had power and who cared about them. Since his death they have had no access to the key people in this country and they have not had contact with the best minds devoted to political and financial international affairs. The deterioration began under President Truman, and the story is generally believed that Secretary Acheson told a leading Latin American diplomat that he was not interested in South America, and that the Latin Americans could talk to one of his subordinates.

Whether the story is true or false, what it signifies is the nub of the matter. It is generally believed in Brazil that when President Kubitschek visited Washington, President Eisenhower went through the ceremonies for him but told him to talk about business to subordinate officials.

When the Brazilians have come in contact with the second and third level, they have found, so they say, that whether under orders from above or by their own preconceptions these officials did not understand or sympathize with the problems of an underdeveloped country.

What kind of understanding have the Brazilians not found in Washington during the past 10 years? The point is crucial but it is complex, and I am compelled to simplify, perhaps to oversimplify. In Washington, the Brazilians say, they have been confronted with men in the Treasury, the State Department, and the World Bank who have looked upon the Brazilian inflation through the eyes of the classical economists of a highly developed country like the United States or Great Britain. That is to say, they have thought that inflation meant that production was at a maximum and that the Government and the people were trying to buy more goods than existed. The remedy for inflation in the classical economics of advanced countries is to spend less and to save more.

This may be true for the United States, say the Brazilians, but it is not true for Brazil. There is inflation in Brazil although there is much unemployment and there is no full use of the productive resources. Inflation occurs because the economy is strangled by its own backwardness, by the lack of electric power and of fuel, of roads and transportation, of education, of public health, of those underlying facilities which are essential to the expansion of a free industrial economy. A country in Brazil's stage of development cannot cure inflation by retrenchment alone, however desirable and necessary it is to do away with the marginal waste and corruption. In order to make its economy work, it must build what the Brazilians like to call the infrastructure—that is to say the public facilities without which a free economy cannot exist and expand.

The Brazilians believe that Senator Kennedy and his economic advisers understand what the conservative Eisenhower economists do not understand—the role of the public sector in a free economy. They expect, under the new administration, to meet much more sophisticated men when they come to Washington.

I do not think that they think that a Kennedy administration can or will or should pay their international deficits. On the contrary, there is a deep moral revulsion against financial dependence on the United States, and the reasons for this arise not from their being anti-American but from their own growing sense of self-respect. They are within sight of economic independence, and more and more they feel and act like an independent nation.

What about their foreign policy? I must warn the reader that what I have to say here is not based on information but on inference. For what it may be worth, I believe that the Brazilian leaders know that the postwar period has ended, that the kind of action represented by the Marshall plan is no longer possible. But they need capital from abroad, and to get it they will have to go to the unsentimental capital markets of the world, and they will have to become eligible for loans by playing according to the more orthodox rules of the game.

To do this they will have to take measures at home to eliminate the more obvious forms of unproductive spending—principally the subsidies to keep down the cost of living. These measures will, of course, be unpopular. Unless all the signs fail, the new Quadros administration will be determined to make it perfectly clear that its financial orthodoxy is not directed by the United States. For that reason, and also for other reasons, we should not be surprised to see the Government strike out rather boldly and spectacularly away from the established line of U.S. foreign policy. Almost certainly the Quadros administration will recognize the Soviet Union and probably also Red China. It may well aline itself frequently in the United Nations and

elsewhere with countries like India, Egypt, and Yugoslavia.

If this happens, it will be no reason for going into hysterics. Brazil will remain our friend, bound to us by long tradition, by economic and strategic ties. The new Quadros administration derives from the state of São Paulo which is the greatest industrial complex and the largest monument to free enterprise in South America. Quadros has been elected President because he has done such great things in São Paulo and, whether or not he recognizes Peiping or works with the neutralists, he has had and will have the support, not only of large masses of the people but, of the financial and industrial communities of Brazil.

Under him Brazil with its own energy and purpose, and with our understanding and aid, can and should acquire the momentum to achieve the takeoff toward economic independence.

RESOLUTION OF WALLOWA COUNTY POMONA GRANGE NO. 22

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received many expressions of concern from Oregonians over the impairment of our domestic wool industry brought about by continued importation of lamb and mutton from foreign countries.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution passed by the Wallowa County Pomona Grange No. 22 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It is my hope that the Congress and the administration during the current session will find an equitable solution to this vexing situation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLOWA COUNTY POMONA
GRANGE NO. 22,
Oregon, December 16, 1960.

The following resolution was adopted at the November session of Wallowa County Pomona Grange held on November 12, 1960, at Lostine, Oreg.:

"Whereas imports of lamb during the current year were 10 percent of the U.S. production last year and sold for 15 percent less than fresh lamb; and

"Whereas this practice causes serious harm to the sheep industry, which the Government is encouraging through lamb and wool promotion, and is inconsistent with the program established by the Government to protect and promote lamb and wool production: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by Wallowa County Pomona Grange, That we oppose this practice, and notify our Congressmen and Senators to take steps to establish lamb import quotas and protect the sheep industry, and notify them that we favor continuing the wool incentive program and lamb promotion work."

A copy of this resolution is to be mailed to our Senator from Oregon, and our Congresmen from this district, as well as to the Oregon State Grange and the woolgrowers organization in Oregon.

RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Oregon Wool Growers Association, in their annual convention at Portland, Oreg., on November 20, 1960, adopted a number of resolutions setting forth the position of the organization upon many facets of our national legislative program.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a number of these resolutions which I commend to my colleagues for their consideration.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC., FOSSIL, OREG., ANNUAL CONVENTION, PORTLAND, OREG., NOVEMBER 20, 1960

COMMITTEE ON LAMB AND WOOL

Lamb grading

The Oregon woolgrowers generally believe present grading standards for lamb are an improvement and should be maintained and used.

We strongly oppose the practice of placing USDA grades on imported meats. U.S. grades should be reserved for U.S. production, labeled as such.

Carcass research

The carcass research programs that are now underway should be accelerated. We believe that study should emphasize the lesser known cuts and aim to present them in more appealing fashion for the housewife.

Oregon growers and researchers must keep high yield and a high percent of lean meat in mind as goals in progress.

Retail marketing

The sheep industry is of considerable economic importance to Oregon. Lamb producers believe that their position would be greatly improved if retail outlets would merchandise lamb with an equal markup to beef and pork. Historically, the percent markup has been greater on lamb and to bring this in line with other red meats would give the housewife opportunity to consider all three types of meat on a similar price basis.

Tariff

Present U.S. tariff on lamb, wool and mutton are entirely inadequate. Current rates encourage import of both live and frozen lamb and mutton. These products are in direct competition with domestic production. The Wool Act of 1954 and 1958, was set up to encourage domestic production. An increase in tariff or a suitable import quota would provide some protection and encouragement for U.S. producers to receive at least cost of production prices. Such a move would make foreign and domestic lamb and mutton competitive.

We recognize recent tariff changes which have improved the producers' position in relation to manufactured woolen imports.

Wool Act

Inadequate tariff protection is resulting in a flood of our domestic market with low cost of production wools and wool products. Therefore, we urge all members of the Oregon Association and the National Wool Growers to work for the renewal of the National Wool Act.

Import tariffs

We urge effective tariffs on foreign wool and wool fabrics. We commend the increased tariff on wool fabrics.

We do not believe woolgrowers should be in the middle when the State Department bargains with a foreign government.

* * * * *

Wool research

We recommend continuation of wool utilization research.

H. A. COHN,
Chairman.
BEN NEWELL,
Secretary.

* * * * *

Federal land improvements

We believe in the multiple use principle, but improvement cost should be paid by users that benefit from them.

Land improvements that help recreation, wildlife, livestock, or watersheds justify funds from those users in proportion to benefits expected.

WALT LEEHMAN, Jr.,
Chairman.
ELGIN CORNETT, *Secretary.*

Grazing military lands

We recommend that grazing on all public land controlled by defense agencies be administered by the Federal agency handling grazing at the time it was turned over to the Defense Department. We are opposed to any policy of offering use of these lands at competitive bid.

WALT LEEHMAN, Jr.
ELGIN CORNETT,
Secretary.

Emergency seeding

We recommend Federal agencies use automatic financing for reseeding burned areas similar to prevailing deficit financing practiced on fire suppression by the U.S. Forest Service.

ELGIN CORNETT,
Secretary.

* * * * *

Wilderness bill

We reaffirm our stand on withholding public land for wilderness areas. We believe the multiple use principle should be the guiding policy.

ELGIN CORNETT,
Secretary.

Public land development

Development of public lands which result in better forage for game, livestock, and improved watersheds is considered a profitable investment. Potential development has been neglected, and a long-range plan is needed.

We believe an increase in Federal funds is justified for use in developing public range areas.

ELGIN CORNETT,
Secretary.

Grazing appeals

Final appeals on public land grazing decisions now are tried in Washington, D.C. This is too costly for average operators and often not satisfactory to either side. * * * As far as possible, all differences should be settled locally by district officials and advisory boards.

WALT LEEHMAN, Jr.
ELGIN CORNETT,
Secretary.

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION, TAXATION AND TRANSPORTATION

I. *Be it resolved,* That the Oregon Wool Growers Association go on record as being opposed to the importation of red meats, frozen, fresh, chilled or of live animals destined for slaughter.

* * * * *

III. Extension of time for foreign sheepherders employed in the United States. In some communities in Oregon there is greater and greater dependence upon Basque herders permitted entrance under special congressional act. At present, contracts with such workers are limited to 3 years. It requires at least a year to familiarize these persons with the terrain, climate, feed conditions, and special requirements for the job.

We endorse California Range Association's effort to get this time extended to 5 years. If this is done, the Oregon association members will be in a position to use more of such labor.

Copies of this resolution should go to the California Range Association, the National Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Bureau of Labor, and Oregon congressional delegation.

* * * * *

V. This organization strenuously opposes all "make-work" or "featherbedding" practices in the transportation industry. Such practices cause higher freight rates than necessary and cause lower prices to ranchers and higher prices to consumers. Also, these practices make progress impossible and hold operating procedures where they were 40 or 50 years ago. Such things would be intolerable in most other industries. We, therefore, favor a nonpartisan study to determine the effects of such practices upon transportation costs.

* * * * *

DISEASE AND SANITATION COMMITTEE REPORT

1. This association, recognizing that the solution to many disease control problems lies in research, urges the continuation of research programs in sheep diseases by Oregon State College and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

* * * * *

4. This association supports the California Wool Growers Association, the National Wool Growers and various veterinarians' organizations in their efforts to prevent introduction of sheep diseases with the importation of live lambs from Australia and New Zealand or other countries, and further advocates that current shipments of live lambs be stopped until adequate steps are taken to assure that both animal and human diseases are not brought into the United States with such shipments.

EDDIE AHREMS,
Chairman.
ROBERT STERLING,
Secretary.

"MAN AND THE STATE"—ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. SPRAGUE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Miss Jeanne Jewett, administrator of the Oregon State Public Welfare Commission, has kindly made available to me an outstanding speech given to the October 11, 1960, west coast regional conference of the American Public Welfare Association meeting in Portland, by the Honorable Charles A. Sprague, a distinguished former Governor of Oregon, now the editor of the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg.

The theme of the address, "Man and the State," reflects concisely the changed public attitude toward the field of social legislation and welfare which has occurred since Herbert Spencer in 1884 published his essays: "Man Versus the State."

Governor Sprague has set forth most lucidly the distinction between the political philosophies of our totalitarian opponents and those that, irrespective of political party, we hold here in the United States with regard to social legislation. As he puts it, in the totalitarian countries the theme would be: "The State Versus Man"; with us it is "Man and the State."

Mr. President, because of the significance to us at this time of the message contained in Governor Sprague's address, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN AND THE STATE

(Address by Charles A. Sprague)

Ladies and gentlemen, yours is a very new profession—workers in the field of public welfare. Even the profession of social work in which your association is a part is not old, save for that carried out under religious auspices. This is the centennial year of the birth of Jane Addams, who is hailed as a pioneer in social work in America, who at Hull House in Chicago, made one of the initial attacks on the problems of the slums. Then there was Florence Kelley, another pioneer in social work, long executive of the National Consumers' League, the one who, after the disastrous fire in the Triangle shirtwaist factory in 1911, led the fight for legislative action for the protection of working people. From such leadership developed the profession of the social worker. And with the expanding participation of government in welfare activities your own organization emerged. Your growth has paralleled the growth of the public welfare program. In studying the program for this conference I am deeply impressed with the scope of your professional concerns and the intensity of your effort to develop the techniques for grappling with the problems confronting you in your daily work. Some professional organizations seem to devote much of their time to organizational chores and promotion. I note little of that on your program. I commend you for your devotion to your true professional responsibilities, something which I have long noted in my contacts with those engaged in welfare work.

We all recognize that our broad public welfare program got its start during the years of the great depression. That is particularly true with respect to meeting needs for subsistence. Prior to the 1930's poor relief was occasional and limited. The counties had a small fund for what was called indigent relief. For the aged there was the poorfarm, often the subject of grand jury investigation and criticism, shunned as long as possible by the self-respecting poor. A small beginning had been made in the way of the mothers' pension, and county pensions for the aged. The Federal Government left care of the destitute to the States and the States left it to the counties. In 1933 when the Oregon Legislature set up the first State relief committee to administer a 1932 Federal act to provide relief and work relief, it was definitely stated that "providing relief for those in need for lack of employment was the obligation of the counties." To finance the work of this committee the legislature appropriated the sum of $15,000, and directed that it come from revenues of the liquor administration, because of the poverty of the general fund. (That remained the source of funds for old-age assistance and public welfare until 1949 when the burden was transferred to the general fund. No longer did it become necessary for Oregonians to drink more whisky to do better by the old people.)

The advent of the New Deal of course plunged government—Federal, State, and county—into relief of the destitute in a big way. It did mark a change in the public philosophy. Actually though, that change had been coming. For example, the Oregon law of 1913 establishing a commission to set standards for wages and working conditions for women and children in industry was an important breakthrough, also the enactment of child labor laws and workmen's compensation for injuries.

The old philosophy was one of strict individualism. It had excellent roots. The springs of the Declaration of Independence can be found in 18th century political liberalism. Feudalism had collapsed, divine right of kings had been challenged. Jefferson echoed the tone of the age when he set down the "self-evident truth" that "all men are created equal" and that they enjoy the inalienable rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" which led right up to his validation of self-government, even if it took a revolution to achieve it. The same year in which Jefferson thus proclaimed the doctrine of political liberalism, Adam Smith published his book on "The Wealth of Nations."

That became the bible of economic liberalism. Its philosophy is epitomized in such terms as "freedom of contract," "free enterprise," "free competition." This was the prevailing philosophy in which the United States was born and nurtured and under which it prospered in amazing fashion. That philosophy of individualism and the competitive society received an undergirding from science with the publication of Darwin's books and the interpretation of his theories by such men as Huxley and Herbert Spencer. The catchwords became "natural selection," "struggle for existence." Thus Nature was in league with Adam Smith. In America this economic philosophy came to full flower. Remember the Horatio Alger books where the promise of riches waited only on personal pluck and individual effort. This was the country of the self-made men, who rose from poverty to riches, giving living proof of the virtue of the American system.

It came to be realized, however, that absolute freedom of competition ended in the law of the jungle: "Nature red in tooth and claw"; "They should take who have the power, and they should keep who can." The first rebellion against the absolutes of freedom of contract came in England where the industrial age first came to flower. Time after time laws were enacted to temper the winds of ruthless competition in the labor market. These changes came not without struggle. The friends of the old philosophy had for their spokesman none other than Herbert Spencer, distinguished social philosopher of the 19th century. He it was who coined the phrase, "survival of the fittest," and the phrase was a compact expression of his philosophy. In 1884 he published a group of essays in a book entitled "Man Versus the State." He condemned as violations of individual liberty numerous acts such as these:

"An 1860 act which made it penal to employ boys under 12 not attending school and unable to read and write.

"An act of 1863 which empowered certain boards to borrow money repayable from local taxes to employ and pay those out of work."

Spencer was opposed to taxes for public schools and free libraries. He wrote:

"Legislators who in 1833 voted £30,000 a year to aid in building schoolhouses never supposed that the step they then took would lead into force contributions, local and general, now amounting to £10 million; they did not intend to establish the principle that A should be made responsible for educating B's offspring; they did not dream of a compulsion which would deprive poor widows of the help of their elder children."

Here is the gist of his philosophy regarding relief of the poor at public expense:

"Kinship of pity to love idealizes its object—thus it happens that when the miseries of the poor are dilated upon, they are thought of as the miseries of the deserving poor, which in large measure they should be. * * * Say rather * * *. They are simply good-for-nothings, who in one way or other live on the good-for-somethings—vagrants and sots, criminals and those on the way to crime, youths who are burdens on hard-worked parents, men who appropriate the wages of their wives, fellows who share in the gains of prostitutes."

And again:

"There is a notion, always more or less prevalent and just now vociferously expressed, that all social suffering is removable, and that it is duty of somebody or other to remove it. Both these beliefs are false."

Another passage from Spencer's "Man Versus the State" has a very modern parallel. Perhaps it was the inspiration for recent

action of the Louisiana Legislature, approved by Gov. Jimmie Davis. To quote:

"When in wartime, 'food for powder' was to be provided by encouraging population—when Mr. Pitt said, 'Let us make relief in cases where there are a number of children a matter of right and honor, instead of a ground for opprobrium and contempt'; it was not to be expected that the poor rates (taxes) would be quadrupled in 50 years, that women with many bastards would be preferred as wives to modest women, because of their incomes from the parish, and that hosts of taxpayers would be pulled down into the ranks of pauperism."

"Man Versus the State"—that is the classic expression of the philosophy of rugged individualism, of individual responsibility, and of the denial of social responsibility. It has had many echoes in the debate that has raged in this country over public welfare ever since the programs initiated in the 1930's. At the national level the debate now seems to be not so much over whether, but over how and how much.

We may laugh at the quaint ideas of Herbert Spencer, his fears over levying taxes for schools and libraries and poor relief. Yet there is merit in defense of an individualist philosophy, for its destruction leads to the opposite extreme, the collectivist philosophy which might be characterized as "The State Versus Man." We have examples of such in our own generation. The Soviet Union with the weapons of the police state imposed the socialist system on its people. It destroyed individual freedoms, freedom of contract, freedom of enterprise, made individuals the pawns of the state. It became the Welfare State par excellence. The people had security of a sort, cradle to the grave security, of a sort, but a security which rewarded them with little substance and robbed them of precious freedoms of thought and of endeavor. Even worse is the example of Red China. There we have the ultimate in submergence of the individual to the state. The Chinese commune is an anthill society. It provides barracks living, with the family, the historic social unit in China, disrupted at the behest of the commune. The working masses are mobilized and drilled uniformly in their tasks. Food—of a sort—is provided at a commons. And all the while the government radio brays the propaganda line of the People's Republic. Freedom is gone. The workers have less freedom than did the serfs of old. Their security is the security of common want and deprivation.

That is the picture of "The State Versus Man." It is utterly revolting to all who have been nurtured in the freedoms cherished in the West. Under that philosophy the state is everything; the individual nothing. Thus far communism has failed as an economic system; but even greater is its failure as a social system. In other words individual freedom does have virtue, and must be preserved, and with it a large measure of individual responsibility.

I remarked earlier that the advent of public welfare marked a real change in the public philosophy, a change from the individualist philosophy that had prevailed throughout our national history. But it is a change in moderation, not a shift to the opposite extreme. If we do not follow Herbert Spencer's philosophy of "Man Versus the State," neither do we accept its opposite: "The State Versus Man." Instead we in America are embarking on a new course which may be described as "Man and the State." Here we are endeavoring to develop the cooperative society embracing the individual and society. We are trying to retain the system of incentives and rewards and freedom of economic adventure, along with full freedom of thought and expression, yet invoking the authority of the state to mitigate the law of the jungle and to tap the resources of the group to insure subsistence or assistance for the less fortunate.

What we recognize is this, that in our fast-paced industrial organization whose watchword is efficiency in production, there are many who cannot qualify, who cannot hold the pace. Industry is like a big wheel rotating at steadily accelerating speeds. Those who can't hang on are thrown off. They go on the scrap heap unless there is salvage. They include the less skilled, those who are physically or mentally deficient, the aged. But we have found also that our industrial and agricultural mechanism is so productive that it can take care not only of those active in the work, it can spare some of its substance to care for those who have no place on the assembly line. Provision of welfare aid is thus one of the costs of modern industrial efficiency. This provision is extended most readily to children and the aged and to the disabled, with limited provision for those who are unemployed. It is a modern attempt to carry out the Christian admonition to bear ye one another's burdens.

What we are attempting then is a reasonable balance between man, the individual, and the state, or society. This is not easy. In an economic organization as fluid as our own it is difficult. The real wonder is that this indescribably complex organism, the American economy, functions as well as it does, though better, we feel sure than if it were administered by a central, political bureaucracy.

The welfare work in which most of you are engaged is chiefly palliative. You provide relief, you do not prescribe a cure. Undoubtedly our most grievous problem is that of recurring unemployment. We hope we have learned how to avoid another perilous depression, though we can't be too sure of it, but we are plagued with occasional dips in the business cycle with resulting unemployment. In these periods workers are laid off for long or short periods. Then we have pits of chronic unemployment, as in coal mining, where the wheel is on dead center. And we have the very serious problem of migratory farm labor, indispensable for the harvest, promptly expendable when the harvest is over—a problem with heavy economic and social implications. We are making a beginning in requiring improved living conditions for these families, but there remains the vexing problem of migrant families during the off season.

Some of them may be of Spencer's undeserving poor, but still they are human beings, and their children ought to have some chance at the good life. We must get away from the habit of regarding human labor as if it were tapwater to be turned on or off at will.

As welfare workers you confront specific cases of need arising from these and other conditions—in fact, your lives are circumscribed by caseloads. You can treat only the consequences, and as public employees you have less freedom than did Florence Kelley who fought for legislative action. But there is within your field of competence opportunity for social service as well as for approving a relief grant. The study prepared by the Social Policy and Action Committee of the Oregon Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers recommended that more attention be given toward counseling on family problems and toward rehabilitation of those capable of becoming self-supporting.

As public employees in a field still controversial you are often targets for criticism or even attack. You are middlemen. On the one hand you must serve those who are in need and who are eligible for public aid. On the other you are the distributor of funds taken from others by force of law, many of whom may be in very straightened circumstances themselves. And biennially a legislative committee puts your leaders on the spit for a grilling.

I know that many times you must be distressed because of the limits of aid under which you must work. You see the need in humble homes, in children who suffer from malnutrition, who are poorly clad and housed; or the aged couple, lonely, ill, waiting, at times even longing for the end to come. You dare not let your sympathies drain all the blood from your hearts. Neither should you let your familiarity with distress make you calloused so that each case becomes merely a number and a folder in the filing case. Nor can you become God and dictate the lives of these human beings though you may be tempted to. You are not the state, and in our scheme of things the state still respects the liberties of the individual.

You are the agents of the state, commissioned to dispense the funds which the public provides to minister to human need.

In such work you must have a heart, and you must also use your heads. For you are on the firing line, and the way you perform does much to sustain the balance I spoke of between the individual and the state.

We have definitely moved away from the strict individualist society extolled in Spencer's "Man Versus the State." We positively abhor its opposite, the collectivist philosophy of the state versus man. Upon our generation, upon us as citizens, upon you as welfare workers, upon legislators, upon leaders of thought and upon those also who are then beneficiaries of public bounty depends the success of our endeavor for the cooperation of man and the state.

RESOLUTION OF OREGON DIVISION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Judge Carl Etling, president of the Izaak Walton League of America, Oregon division, 1958 Southwest Upper Hall Street, Portland, Oreg., has forwarded to me a resolution adopted by the Oregon division of the league on November 26. It concerns the basis of appointment to positions in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture by the new administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Land Management, and the National Park Service in the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture are the Federal agencies primarily concerned with the management of the Federal land and the Nation's renewable natural resources; and

Whereas the highest type of sustained professional management of this Federal land and resources is essential to the economic health of this and future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League in convention assembled at Salem, Oreg., on November 26, 1960, recommends to the President, the Congress, and the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture that the selection of heads of all the agencies mentioned above, and their subordinate officials not appointed under civil service, be based upon proven professional competence in scientific natural resource management as well as administrative ability, without reference to party affiliation.

FEDERAL ACTION FOR EDUCATION REQUESTED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY IS ESSENTIAL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in President Kennedy's inspiring, forthright and dynamic state of the Union message yesterday, he said:

> Our classrooms contain 2 million more children than they properly have room for, taught by 90,000 teachers not properly qualified to teach.

He spoke further of the war babies of the 1940's, who overcrowded our schools in the 1950's, and are now descending, in the 1960's, upon our colleges, and he added that our colleges likewise were unprepared.

He told of our lack of scientists, engineers, and teachers whom our world obligations require.

He spoke of our neglected oceanography, saline water conversion, and the basic research that lies at the root of all technological progress, and his conclusion, which I quote:

> Federal grants for both higher and public school education can no longer be delayed.

A mighty chorus of "amen" should go up.

When President Kennedy said that there were some 90,000 teachers not properly qualified to teach, he pointed to a condition which is nationwide, that exists more in some States than in others, but which may be said to be almost general throughout the Union. In Alaska, 145 teachers employed directly by the State for the 1960–61 school year have not earned a bachelor of arts degree. Recently, Alaska's Assistant Education Commissioner Theron F. Borden listed several reasons why the State of Alaska has been forced to hire teachers who have not completed a college course.

"The main reason," Mr. Borden said, "is that we just do not have the money to pay fully qualified teachers the salary they could command elsewhere."

Mr. President, the State of Alaska has, for years, been noted for paying its teachers adequate salaries. During the eight legislatures during my governorship, from 1939 to 1953, each legislature raised the salaries of the school teachers and did so with virtually no pressure or lobbying on their part.

It was done because those Alaska legislators believed—and I fully shared their belief—that the school teacher is one of the most valuable elements in our society, and that he or she is entitled to be compensated in accord with the important responsibility of educating the future citizens of the Republic. For many years, Alaska's teachers' salaries were as high as almost any in the Union, and although Alaska was a territory, it paid its teachers out of its own tax revenues more than did some 40 States, making allowance for the much higher cost of living which existed in Alaska and still exists. Now, however, other States have begun to catch up and have, in many instances, caught up. They, too, have belatedly begun to appreciate the importance of the teacher, especially since the drifting of teachers into other callings, because of inadequate recognition of their value, has created a shortage which can be remedied only by making the teaching profession remunerative in proportion to its importance, and endowing it with the dignity that rightfully belongs to it. But there is still an indispensable need for Federal action.

In the 86th Congress the Senate passed an excellent education bill, which I was happy to cosponsor, which provided that appropriations made to each State could be used by the State either for classroom construction or aid to teachers' salaries, thus nullifying the constant and unwarranted allegation that Federal aid means Federal interference. Unfortunately, the Eisenhower administration served notice on the Congress that the bill would be vetoed if teachers' salaries were included, and this no doubt was a factor in the other body's failure to act. Let us hope for a more favorable outcome in the 87th Congress.

There is also, I believe, a need for action on the State level. The last Alaska Legislature to raise teachers' salaries was the 1957 Territorial Legislature, 4 years ago. Teachers' salaries in Alaska are based on experience and length of tenure and they vary with the region, being higher in the areas remoter from Seattle, where higher transportation costs bring higher living costs. The 1957 legislature fixed teachers' salaries in the first division, that is to say in southeastern Alaska, at from $4,500 to $6,900; in the third division, which is the greater Anchorage area and westward, from $4,900 to $7,300; and in the second and fourth divisions—which are in northern and northwestern Alaska, and in the third division west of the 152d parallel from $5,200 to $7,600.

In addition to that, every school district has also the right to increase the territorial scale. Fairbanks, for instance, augments the scale for its principals, teachers and superintendent. A teacher with a minimum training in his or her first year would receive $5,200. Under the territorial scale, Fairbanks pays $6,000.

Unfortunately, although the cost of living has substantially increased in Alaska as elsewhere, these salaries have not been increased in the last 4 years, and it is earnestly to be hoped that the 1961 legislature, now in session, will see fit to bring these salaries into conformity with the increased living costs, and reaffirm thereby the splendid long-standing tradition and example of past Alaska legislatures.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Alaska Daily Empire headed "145 Alaska Teachers Have No Bachelor of Arts Degree," be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIVE ALASKA TEACHERS HAVE NO BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE

One hundred and forty-five teachers employed directly by the State for the 1960–61 school year have not earned a bachelor of arts degree, the Department of Education said today.

Assistant Education Commissioner Theron F. Borden listed several reasons why the State was forced to hire instructors who hadn't completed a college course, normally an unbending requirement for the teaching profession.

"The main reason," Borden said, "is that we just do not have the money to pay fully qualified teachers the salary they could command elsewhere."

The poor housing facilities which are available for teachers at rural schools was a close second.

Other reasons, Borden said, include the high transportation costs of getting to and leaving Alaska and the lack of medical facilities in many places throughout the State.

Of the 145 teachers hired this year who do not have a BA degree 49 ar employed in the second and fourth divisions, 60 in the first division, and 36 in the third division.

Borden said the 621 teachers directly employed by the State last year earned an average salary of $5,710, including a $400 annual cost-of-living differential paid in the third division and a $700 annual differential paid in the second and fourth divisions.

Borden said Alaska's low starting salary, $4,650 for an inexperienced teacher with a bachelor of arts degree, exclusive of a living differential, has compounded the State's recruiting problems, not only in getting teachers to come to Alaska, but also keeping them.

The State cannot pay a teacher in a State-operated school more than $6,900 a year, regardless of his education or experience. The State must conform to the teacher schedule established by law.

On the other hand, administrators of the schools in the State's 28 incorporated school districts are not tied to a rigid salary schedule. The State schedule acts only as a minimum to them.

Because of that, Borden said, the incorporated districts can and frequently do raid the State's teacher roster through the simple process of offering a teacher more money than the State could legally pay him.

In Anchorage, for instance, Borden said some top-rated teachers are receiving as much as $2,300 a year more than the State's top salary, which hasn't been adjusted for years.

Borden said three State-operated schools in the State were forced to keep their doors closed until October 1 this year because the State couldn't recruit the teachers to man them.

A three-teacher school at Sand Point, in the Aleutians, has been operating with only two teachers since the third quit on November 1. The State, Borden said, will not be able to get a replacement until the fall college term ends late this month.

Mr. GRUENING. This article, revealing a part of the condition which exists in the 50 States, gives emphasis to President Kennedy's pointed remarks about the need of catching up in the field of education and atoning for the flagrant neglect in this field which we have suffered during the last 8 years.

INDICATORS OF CURRENT BUSINESS TRENDS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on January 26, the Bureau of National Affairs issued Indicators of Current Business Trends. I ask unanimous consent that the indicators appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the indicators were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDICATORS OF CURRENT BUSINESS TRENDS

Steel: Output up 1.1 percent to 1.5 million tons last week; 52 percent of capacity.

Autos: Last week's assemblies down 13 percent to 96,000; 45 percent under a year ago.

Machine tools: December orders 19 percent over November; 1960 trailed 1959 by 1 percent.

Personal income: December down $2.3 billion; payrolls off $2.5 billion.

Carloadings: Freight volume down 14.8 percent from 1960 in week of January 14.

Lumber: New orders for latest week reported down 13 percent from a year ago.

Employment: Jobless claims up 229,000 this month, to a 32-month high.

Failures: Total up to 15,445 in 1960, 10 percent over 1959; highest since 1940.

Finance: Treasury 90-day bill rate off for second week, to 2.23 percent.

PROGRESS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, when Secretary of Agriculture Benson spoke recently about his 8 years in office he said:

When the history of this period of our agriculture is written years hence, this will be revealed as a period of great and lasting progress.

I ask unanimous consent that a box score of that progress, taken from the latest official figures made available by the Department of Agriculture, the Budget Bureau, and the President's Council of Economic Advisers, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Benson box score

	1952	1960	Change
Total net income ..... billion	$15.3	$11.6	Down 24 percent.
Net income per farm (current prices)	$2,829	$2,563	Down 9 percent.
Parity ratio ..... percent	100	80	Down 20 percent.
Farmers' share of the consumers dollar ..... do	47	38	Do.
Commodity Credit Corporation losses ..... million	$67.4	$1,133	Up 17 times.
Yearly expenditures for the U.S. Department of Agriculture	$1,242	$6,201	Up 5 times.
Expenditures for stabilizing farm income ..... million	[1] $247	$3,950	Up 16 times.
Number of employees in U.S. Department of Agriculture	66,000	85,000	Up 30 percent.
Number of farms in United States ..... million	5.4	4.5	Down 16 percent.
Farm population in United States ..... do	24.3	20.8	Down 15 percent.
Interest paid per acre (index)	$108	$213	Up 97 percent.
Total farm debt ..... billion	$14	$25.7	Up 84 percent.

[1] 1953.

OGDEN R. REID, AMBASSADOR TO ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation about the recent arrival in the United States of Ambassador Ogden R. Reid of New York from Israel. It will be remembered that in May 1959, when his appointment was being considered by the Senate, Ogden R. Reid was one of our youngest envoys, and his nomination received rather close scrutiny. He was given a most searching and critical examination as to his qualifications. It is therefore with great pride that I report that he served his ambassadorship with distinction and dignity. He has made solid friends for us by his ability and understanding.

When he left Israel he was accompanied by many moving tributes in the Israel press. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks quotations from Davar and Herut, as well as a general summary from the Israeli Home Service, with respect to observations made about Ambassador Reid on his departure from Israel.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jerusalem, Israeli Home Service, in Hebrew, Jan. 19, 1961]

Several morning papers devote their editorials to the departure of American Ambassador Ogden Reid and his wife. Under the headline "Friends on a Mission of Friends," DAVAR (Histadrut—Ed.) says that Reid was an ambassador in the full meaning of the term—precisely because he is not a professional diplomat and because he tried, together with his wife, to become closely acquainted with the country and its inhabitants through the study of Hebrew and the fostering of first-hand contact with various circles of the population.

Davar recalls that a courageous and wise President occupied the White House at the time when the state of Israel was established, which was the golden age in the history of the relations between Israel and the United States. The paper notes that there were people in Israel who had misgivings when a new President was elected 8 years ago. However, when the new President assumed his post in the United States, it became clear that friendship for Israel is not restricted to one party in the United States but is shared by both American parties. The paper expresses its confidence that now, when another change is taking place in the U.S. Government, it will be proven again that American friendship for Israel is permanent.

Herut—(Freedom Movement—Ed.) says that Reid did everything he could to foster sympathy for the American people among the Israeli public and its various classes. The paper says that Israel's citizens bid farewell to the ambassador and his wife with feelings of respect and friendship and express their conviction that the foundations of real friendship between us and the great western democratic power were strengthened during Reid's term of office.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague in his tribute to Ogden Reid. Ambassador Reid has performed magnificently as our representative in Israel. It was my pleasure to be in Israel during his tenure and to see firsthand what an outstanding job he has done in that country.

The dynamic, progress-minded nation that is Israel recognized in Ambassador Reid a representative alert to its spirit, cognizant of its problems, and indefatigable in the dedication he brought to his mission. Through his efforts the bridge of understanding and friendship between the United States and the Republic of Israel has been strengthened to the mutual benefit of both nations.

This is heartening, of course, to those of us who supported him when the confirmation of his nomination was before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the estimate of the Senators from New York of the services rendered by Ogden Reid. I remember when his appointment was being considered by the Senate that doubts were expressed. I believe he has requited and lived up to every expectation we had of him for the job to which he was appointed.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks.

THE CONNALLY RESERVATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the January issue of the American Bar Association Journal there are several articles concerning the Connally reservation. I would like to especially recommend one of them, "The Connally Reservation and National Security."

This article is authored by a warm and personal friend, Frank B. Ober, Esq., a prominent Baltimore, Md., attorney. Mr. Ober has served in the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, is a past president of the Maryland State Bar Association, and needless to say knows of which he talks.

Up until the present, debate on the Connally reservation has been pro or con with no middle ground or alternative proposals being considered. Mr. Ober, in his article, however, outlines in detail a new approach to the problem which was approved by the Maryland State Bar Association at its recent convention. It spells out certain areas of interest which the United States has traditionally considered to be in its domestic jurisdiction and therefore would be excluded from the Court's jurisdiction. It also contains a national security clause with other exceptions and substitutes a right to withdraw from the Court at any time for the present provision which permits withdrawal only on 6 months' notice.

This is a new approach, Mr. President, and it may be the vehicle to produce unanimity among the opposing viewpoints. It should be closely studied by all, especially since its gives specific treatment to national security considerations which I think have been largely overlooked in the past in connection with the Connally reservation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Ober's article entitled "The Connally Reservation and National Security," in the January issue of the American Bar Association Journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONNALLY RESERVATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Frank B. Ober)

The Connally amendment to the U.S. reservation to its acceptance of the compulsory

jurisdiction of the World Court in 1946 empowers the United States and not the World Court to determine when matters should be excluded from its jurisdiction because "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." This amendment[1] followed long-established practice; was adopted by a 51–12 vote of the Senate and was prompted by a "desire to safeguard the vital interests of the United States".[2] The particular concern voiced by Senator Connally at the time was the fear that such vital matters as the Panama Canal, immigration, and tariffs might be considered "international" by the Court.[3] Recent relevant treaties have deepened this concern because the interpretation of treaties in legal disputes is explicitly vested in the World Court by article 38–2(a) of the statute,[4] thus making such questions "international." Moreover, the conception of what is "international" has for other reasons also concededly expanded.[5]

The 249-member House of Delegates of the American Bar Association this year, by a bare majority of those present who voted (114–107), reaffirmed its 1947 recommendation that the Connally amendment should be repealed. This new and close vote (compared to its two-thirds vote in 1947 of those present and voting) reflects primarily the growing doubts of the Bar due to intervening events—including the Cold War[6] and the change in the United Nations due to the doubling of its membership through the admission of new states.

Thoughtful lawyers therefore increasingly question whether this is the time for unilateral judicial disarmament. They find the repeal of the Connally amendment would leave standing our commitment to give 6 months' notice before withdrawing from compulsory jurisdiction. It becomes imperative therefore to study all reservations and conditions of other nations and not merely the Connally type—of which there are but four (other than ours)—if we are to understand our position compared to that of other nations if the Connally amendment should be repealed.

Plainly, the question of repealing Connally, which is so vital a protection to our security in important areas, cannot be settled by the vote of a bare majority of the house of delegates. For sound constitutional reasons treaties (like proposals for constitutional amendments) require a two-thirds Senate vote for ratification. Nor has the public accepted the house of delegates' vote as very convincing.[7] Nor should it be, for the current arguments for outright repeal ignore facts not only relevant but of fundamental importance to any informed decision on this matter so vital to national security. These facts must be brought out in the open and debated by the bar if recommendations by lawyers are to have any influence. These omissions include (1) ignoring the non-Connally-type reservations of other nations; (2) ignoring the increase in Communist and other biased judges in the World Court which will be inevitable because of the admission of 17 new members to the United Nations, including 16 African states who have but recently achieved independence; (3) ignoring the obvious fact that a more fundamental condition to trust and confidence in the World Court has always been agreement in advance on clear rules of international law and what are and what are not justiciable legal disputes.

RESERVATIONS BY OTHER NATIONS

The chief argument for repeal of our reservation, which is repeated in substance by all of the proponents of repeal, is that England, France, India, Mexico, Liberia, Sudan, South Africa copied our reservation; and "As experience demonstrated the self-judging type of reservation to be unwise * * * England, India, and France dropped it from their acceptances. To date 33 nations have accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction without such a reservation. * * *" It is even argued that such repeal "would only place our relations with the Court on the same basis as those of France, the United Kingdom, Canada and 30 other nations."[8]

They do not even mention, much less candidly explain:

(a) That France in the third of its four present reservations excepts "disputes arising out of a crisis affecting the national security or out of any measure or action relating thereto."[9]

(b) That Britain not only has nine specific reservations and reserves the right to terminate on notice, but expressly reserves in Section 2 of its declaration of adherence the right "at any time by means of a notification * * * to the Secretary General and with effect as and from the moment of such notification * * * to add to, amend, or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations."[10]

(c) That India not only withdrew her Connally-type reservations, but at first even withdrew her acceptance entirely and on readhering September 14, 1959, provided (as do all other British Commonwealths) that she may withdraw on notice.

(d) That three of the four nations above listed by proponents of repeal as still having Connally-type reservations in addition may terminate on notice. Thus, if the Connally-type reservations were repealed by all of these four nations, Mexico alone would be left in the same position as the United States in being required to give 6 months' notice before it could terminate its acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

(e) That only 13—not 33 other nations as stated by proponents—have in any meaningful sense accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court without strong safety provisions. Since these 13 include no Communist nation and none with whom we are likely to have a serious dispute, their acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction has little importance.[11]

Proponents of repeal of Connally in their numerous articles discuss only that type of reservation. Of course, they should not properly be charged with intentional omission of important facts, but no one can doubt the relevance and importance of the present French and British reservations above quoted, nor the great importance of the right to terminate on notice reserved by all but 13 of the 33 other nations claimed by the proponents to have accepted compulsory jurisdiction.

Is there any real difference in substance between acceptance on a treaty-by-treaty basis and the right to terminate jurisdiction immediately on notice if a member so stipulating does not want to be sued in the World Court? It will probably be argued that acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction with the right to terminate on notice puts those 22 nations so doing in practically the same class as the United States which would have to give 6 months' notice if Connally were repealed. But (1) neither our 6-months-notice provision nor the veto power over Security Council enforcement would furnish any protection to the United States, since our official position is that the United States would consider itself bound to carry out any decision of the World Court during such 6 months' period,[12] and (2) by contrast, the

---

[1] This was accomplished by adding the words "as determined by the United States," our entire reservation, including the Connally amendment, being often called in the current debate the Connally Reservation. For practice see Finch, 46 A.B.A.J., 852.

[2] See report of American Bar Association Section of International Law quoted in Senate Hearings on S. 94 before Foreign Relations Committee, 86 Cong. 2d Sess., pages 304, 337 (hereinafter called Senate Hearings).

[3] Senate Hearings 303–4.

[4] "Statute" as used in this paper refers to the Statute of the International Court of Justice annexed to the United Nations Charter.

[5] For expanding conception of international law see Professors Briggs and Swebel, Senate Hearings 47–50; 1959 Section of International Law, Rep. ibid. 300, 325–333. See also Baltimore Evening Sun editorial of March 23, 1960, commenting on our position that South African riots are not solely "domestic."

[6] E.g., loss of a dozen nations and one-third of world's population to communism; that no Communist nation has ever accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the court with or without reservations; that Russia has broken 50 treaties (Senate Hearings 220), stirred up wars as in Korea and Hungary, and is currently threatening trouble over the RB–47, in Congo and in Cuba, on our own doorstep.

[7] Washington Post, Sept. 1, 1960; U.S. News, Sept. 12, 1960. Representatives of much larger groups than the American Bar Association, such as veterans' organizations, testified against repeal in the Senate hearings.

[8] Rhyne, 46 A.B.A.J., 750 (July 1960); see also report of American Bar Association World Peace Through Law Committee 8, 14, 30; Tondel, 46 A.B.A.J., 726; Larson, 46 A.B.A.J., 729; minority report of the Thompson Committee (Dean) at page 9; Winslow reply to Holman, page 24; Jessup, Sen. Hearings 412. Pakistan omitted because of the new declaration—see note 11, infra.

[9] This reservation is in addition to, and is not limited to, domestic issues and covers the much broader field of international disputes. That the World Court will ever attempt to avoid the clear intent of this reservation or to intervene in any matter which France considers affects her national security, because of its judicial power over jurisdiction (absent such exception), is inconceivable and its successful assertion of such jurisdiction is practically impossible.

[10] Britain also has a safety provision in its ninth reservation, requiring adherence of nations bringing suit against her for a period of at least one year which, if contained in the United States' reservation, would prevent Cuba, for example, from seeking the aid of the World Court as she is now threatening in connection with our Guantanamo base, apparently intending to adhere for that purpose.

[11] Ten have no fixed period of adherence and so may withdraw at any time; 12 have expressly reserved the right to withdraw on notice. This classification is based on the text of the acceptances in the 1959–60 Intl. Ct. of Justice Year Book, page 233 ff., except that Pakistan on September 12, 1960, withdrew its Connally-type reservation but is included among the 12 nations expressly reserving right to withdraw on notice. The 13 other nations that do not have either security or Connally-type reservations, and which cannot terminate on notice, in addition to our allies, Nationalist China, Japan, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg and Turkey, are Switzerland, Finland, Sweden, Cambodia and Liechtenstein. The Administration, as evidenced by the testimony of Secretary of State Herter and Attorney General Rogers (Sen. Hearings 16, 21, 25, 26, 304 ff.) seems to follow without examination the statements of the leaders in the American Bar Association movement for repeal, and evidences no awareness of the importance of the non-Connally-type reservations.

[12] Senate Hearings, Rogers 29–30; Humphrey 89. Indeed, we have solemnly covenanted in Article 94–1 of the Charter itself to comply with such decision.

right of the World Court to decide even pending cases would end on withdrawal by any nation reserving the right to terminate on notice.[13]

Incidentally, some of the very leaders in the proposal to repeal Connally have been suggesting seriously the desirability of abolishing the veto that they now claim is a safety provision.[14]

CHANGING PERSONNEL OF COURT AND BIAS

The proponents of repeal argue at length that past voting records of the 14 foreign judges of the World Court show that we may safely trust important issues to that Court. They even attempt to thus show that the two Communist judges now on the Court can be trusted. In so doing, they ignore entirely the Communists' own statements, as well as those of our own Attorney General and other competent authorities, that Communist judges are agents of the state and not independent.[15] There can be no doubt that judges from other monolithic governments also act as agents of the state in exactly the same manner as do Communist judges. The conception of an independent judiciary is true in relatively few countries.

To America lawyers, who make every effort to keep politics out of the selection of judges, the electoral machinery for the World Court is indeed shocking. It is hardly likely that the political maneuvering so clearly evident in recent years, and particularly during the latter months of 1960, in the General Assembly and the Security Council will suddenly cease when judges of the World Court, one of its organs, are to be considered. Nominations are (under a complicated procedure) really made by the executives of the member nations, each of which may nominate a judge, but none can have more than one judge.[16] Can anyone really doubt how any judges nominated by dictators like Castro, Nasser, Trujillo, Sukarno, Nkrumah and Toure and many others, whether Communist or not, will vote on issues which their bosses deem vital to their own nations?

The election of judges is by concurrent action of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The 11-member Security Council already has one permanent Communist member, and when the neutralists led by Nehru (and also many western nations) have their way with the admission of Red China, there will be two permanent Communist members. But in addition to that, the majority of the Security Council (six) are elected by the General Assembly biannually—which thus has the ultimate control of the composition of the Security Council. The United States has but one vote out of 99 (the present membership of the General Assembly). By contrast, the African bloc alone has a vote of 26.[17] Yet it is not merely those who openly cooperate with the Soviets, like Nkrumah, but Nehru, who is currently reported as saying the United Nations Charter is "weighted too much in favor of Europe and the Americas at the expense of Asia and Africa." [18]

We are not concerned with diplomatic reasons for the tremendous changes now going on, or with the future of the United Nations, but solely with the obvious fact that the electoral machinery for World Court judges plainly invites political maneuvering. It should be manifest to all that as the present six vacancies are filled and as a third of the Court is triennially renewed, the World Court will include not only two Communist judges as at present, but more and more judges, whether coming from Communist or other monolithic states, who will regard themselves as agents of their respective states with no tradition of an independent judiciary. If we are interested in nonpolitical and unbiased judges, is not such political jockeying and maneuvering in the changing General Assembly (and indirectly in the Security Council) and the future personnel of the World Court infinitely more important than the past voting records of prior judges (so stressed by proponents), which largely reflect (a) their selection by a smaller number of more advanced nations before the cold war became so hot, and (b) decisions in cases which have not involved matters of the magnitude which could lead to peace or war, or which involved national security?

The present argument is not whether biased judges will constitute a majority of the Court. No lawyer wants even a few biased judges. Decisions often turn on a few votes. For example, there were 5 dissents and 1 partial dissent out of 14 judges sitting in the World Court in the Corfu case (Senate hearings, 360). There were divided opinions in 75 percent of the cases heard in the last term of our own Supreme Court, including a 5-to-4 division in a matter involving Federal supremacy over the States.

It can hardly be doubted how the admittedly Communist judges would act in cases that might involve, for example, Cuba and Panama. But would not judges from the Arabic countries, in view of the recent cancellation of the canal lease, be likewise biased? So that matter, how would judges from the South American bloc react? Or on questions of confiscation and expropriation of property in Cuba or elsewhere, how would judges from countries which have recently indulged in the same practice free themselves of their national interest? Our Guantanamo Naval Base, under perpetual lease from Cuba (obtained after we had freed Cuba from Spain), is concededly the keystone of our Caribbean defense. Castro currently threatens to have our rights determined by "international law." Are we really willing to delegate its disposal, which may involve our national survival, to such a court? [19]

If the issues involved are minor legal disputes not really involving fundamental issues, then we must realize and accept the view that a program of world peace through law must be much more gradual than its proponents suggest. If, on the other hand, the World Court is really to decide issues involving international disputes of a magnitude which may lead to war, then we must be prepared to transfer from our elected representatives to a World Court decisions involving fundamental national foreign policy and our national security. If the latter, few judges on a World Court will find it humanly possible to divorce themselves from their overriding interest in and their loyalty to, their own country and its allies.

Are there then any rules limiting the jurisdiction of the World Court and defining the law it would administer?

VAGUENESS OF JUSTICIABLE DISPUTES AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Bar associations spend much effort in making domestic law more certain and predictable through codification, uniform statutes, restatement of the law, etc. Courts demand precision of statute as a protection to defendants in the criminal courts. Where is the precision in the international law which nobody has attempted to codify? Yet, certainty is of transcendant importance to whole nations if the program of "world peace through law" is to resolve issues which may really involve peace or war. Do we find any real guide for judges from 15 nations in the loose language of article 38 of the statute?

1. International custom as evidence of a general practice accepted as law? Surely customs have varied widely between nations and have been both accepted and rejected at various times, so that there is little area where agreement is general. Or in

2. Principles of law recognized by civilized nations—Moslem? Asian? South American? African? Is Cuba civilized after 60 years of independence, or Congo after 90 days? But can the World Court say members of the United Nations are not even civilized? [20] Or in

---

[13] See McCardle doctrine, United States Constitution. Corwin (1952) page 614; see also 14 Am. Jur. 388; 6 C.J.S. 173. No delay is involved, since the Executive can give notice—Senate Hearings 31.

[14] E.g., Rhyne, June 1954, Wisc. Bar Bulletin.

[15] As Vishinsky himself says (Soviet Constitutional Law 55 and 390): "The court of the Soviet state is an inseparable part of the governmental machinery of the proletarian dictatorship. . . In content its activity is identical with the activities of other agencies of administration which have the task of protecting and strengthening the revolutionary order. . . The program of the Communist Party repudiates the principle of separation of powers." See also Dean Stason, of Michigan Law School, American Judicature Society Journal, February, 1960; U.S. News, August 29, 1960, page 35; Editorial, Christian Science Monitor, August 20, 1960. Attorney General Rogers: ". . . The law in the Soviet Union is what the Communist Party says it is." 45 A.B.A.J. 1182; Rhyne: "It is clear that the Soviet legal system is under the domination of the Communist Party . . .", 45 A.B.A.J. 249; Benes: "Law and legal institutions have become tools and weapons of the Communist state. Their purpose and aim are to serve the new regimes in their efforts to reconstruct society and to suppress the enemies of communism. The concepts of communism jurisprudence are entirely alien to those which have been accepted and developed for centuries in the Western World." 40 A.B.A.J. 487. See also 35 id. 269; 37 id. 101; 41 id. 408.

[16] Senate Hearings 45, 51.

[17] Changes in the Security Council will inevitably follow. It is widely conceded that the close vote this year indicates Red China will be admitted next year. When the remaining 19 African colonies are freed and admitted to the U.N., the African bloc, 85 percent illiterate and largely uncivilized, with but a slightly larger population, will have 45 times the voting power of the United States. The United States' voting power will be further diluted on the admission of 18 more Asiatic nations.

[18] The Nehru statement was reported in the Baltimore Sun, October 4, 1960; the population figures are reported in various publications—see, for example, U.S. News, October 3, 1960; and the shifting power has been widely commented upon—see, for example, U.S. News, August 22, 1960; New York Times, September 18, 25 and October 2, 1960. The reductio ad absurdum is that 31 of the present member states are not as large as a single average state of the United States, like Maryland, and yet have 31 times the voting of the entire United States. Indeed, there are a number of them not as large as a single Maryland county. Moreover, what has happened to the basic reform project of weighted representation, advocated long before the United States' voting strength based on numbers alone had dropped to its 1 percent present level of absurdity—e.g., Rhyne, *supra*, note 14. Khrushchev is reported widely to be trying to rule or ruin the U.N. itself. But, irrespective of ultimate or present success in such efforts, nobody can believe that Communist judges on a World Court will block their master's wishes on issues their bosses deem vital.

[19] See Hanson Baldwin, Saturday Evening Post, Sept. 24, 1960.

[20] Yet neither Communist nations nor many of the new members are "civilized" under orthodox definitions—e.g., 1 Oppenheim, "International Law" 1905, p. 31; Hall, "International Law" 1909, p. 39.

3. Publicists' teachings. There will be much difference of opinion on who are authoritative publicists and, as pointed out above, it is conceded that the area of international law is increasing.

Nor could decisions of the World Court have much effect as precedents (statute, art. 59). Surely, it is infinitely more important in this realm of conflicting ideologies, legal systems, opposing rules of publicists, than in the field of relatively uniform domestic law to codify, or at least define, the rules in advance. Lack of certainty was but recently stated to be the basic cause of the widespread distrust and disuse of the World Court.[21]

Then again, there is no clear rule on what is justiciable and what is political. This goes to the heart of the matter and is not solved by restriction to legal disputes. The claim [22] that matters so politically important as the Berlin and Suez crises could be materially affected by judicial decisions seems incredible. Does anyone actually believe that significant parts of these issues will be left to a court to decide in the light of current history? Or the Cuban crisis, where (absent a political solution by the Organization of American States) the President has indicated the (unilateral) Monroe Doctrine will be invoked if necessary to hemisphere defense and our national safety?

It is now argued by proponents that a World Court would be helpful to the collection of financial claims. Aside from the legal problem posed by the limitation of access to the World Court to only nations as parties, under Article 34(1) of the statute, there is no substantial record of its successful use for this purpose in the past, and certainty of law in this limited area is just as essential for a World Court as for a domestic court.

CONCLUSION

The cold war since 1946 has demonstrated the imperative need for caution in unilateral judicial disarmament. It is submitted therefore that this is not the time to repeal the Connally amendment because (1) it would weaken our position vis-a-vis, not only Communist nations but substantially all great powers, unless we substitute some of their non-Connally type safety conditions or reservations; [23] (2) the World Court will inevitably include more and more Communist and political judges as the relative voting power of the more advanced Western nations continues to decline through the admission of numerous little primitive states; (3) there is the obvious absence of a code or clear rules of international law or definition of legal disputes realistically protecting us from judicial interference with our foreign policy, upon which we depend for national security.

On the other hand, if the world peace through law program is reoriented to give priority to the solution of these problems, it may, as nations gradually gain confidence, be helpful in the limited area where disputes are really subject to judicial solution. However, any implication that this alone will bring peace is a harmful delusion. Manifestly, all history proves that most wars are due to political disputes, which can only be solved by agreements reached after the give and take of diplomatic negotiations—in which judges would have no rules and for which they have no qualifications.

Let us hitch our wagon to the stars, but not deceive ourselves by substituting slogans for solutions—nor, as lawyers, omit relevant facts and ignore alternative solutions in the current debate on Connally.

[21] E.g., Rhyne, supra, note 14.

[22] See World Peace Through Law Committee Report, page 24.

[23] Such as (a) the right to withdraw at will, like most of the great powers, or (b) a clearer national security reservation, which was the obvious intent of the Connally Reservation and which is inherent in a conception of national sovereignty. It should be noted that such reservations are much broader than the Connally-type reservation, since they plainly would cover political disputes as well as legal disputes. (c) Professor Sohn (46 A.B.A.J. 25) called sixteen reservations major without counting the right to withdraw at will, and suggested alternatives to outright repeal. These also should be studied instead of being blandly ignored as they are by the leaders in the repeal movement.

THE BASIC PROBLEM OF LATIN AMERICA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a very scholarly, enlightening, and forthright article which appeared in the New York Times magazine of December 4, 1960. It was written by our distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and is entitled "The Basic Problem of Latin America."

In it the distinguished Senator suggests that we must start planning and coordinating our oversea policies in regard to Latin America. He refers to the "beachhead societies" along the coasts of Latin America, and the wide gap between those beachheads and the poverty-stricken masses in the interior. It is his wise belief—and well should it be observed by Members of the Congress—that our country, along with Latin American countries, should integrate and coordinate their policies, if we are to make our future position in Latin America meaningful and truly helpful.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASIC PROBLEM OF LATIN AMERICA

(By MIKE MANSFIELD)

When the new administration takes office in January it will find the old problems of Latin America still on the doorstep of the White House. It will not be able to step over or around these problems. It is going to have to face them frankly, decide promptly what can be done about them and begin in earnest to act on them.

As a nation, we have reawakened to our stake in the Western Hemisphere and certain recent actions of Congress reflect this reawakening. We have, for example, expanded the lending facilities of our Export-Import Bank and joined in the creation of the Inter-American Development Bank. Most recently, Congress proposed a broad new approach to the inter-American problems in authorizing $500 million to begin a new aid program. And Under Secretary Dillon followed through at the inter-American economic meeting at Bogotá, Colombia, with a pledge of U.S. cooperation in dealing with Latin America's economic and social problems.

In short, the legal means for a new approach to Latin America have been accumulated. Their effective use awaits the touch of alert and sensitive leadership from the new administration.

The importance of that kind of leadership in inter-American affairs cannot be overemphasized. Unless it is present, there is a danger that we shall interpret the Latin American situation primarily in terms of Castroism and communism. If we do so, the basic problem will elude us. To be sure, Castroism and communism are powerful forces, but they are in the nature of an effect rather than a cause. Underlying their presence on the stage in Cuba and in the wings elsewhere in Latin America is a more fundamental factor.

In plainest terms, the basic problem of Latin America is that the social structures of many nations of the region are seriously out of date and cannot endure in their present form in the second half of the 20th century. They cannot endure for the simple reason that they do not deliver enough education, enough food, shelter and clothing, enough medical aid, enough of the conveniences that are taken for granted in this country and are relatively commonplace in Western Europe and even in Soviet Russia. Most important, they do not provide for a sufficient number of people that intangible but essential element of prideful participation in the present and hope for the future which is the keynote of political stability.

The inability of many Latin American nations to meet the needs of their people arises not so much from underdevelopment as from extremely lopsided development. In Peru, for example, during a plane flight of 2 hours one can travel to places that differ in development by several centuries.

That is the extent of the lag between the capital of Lima with its wide boulevards, plazas, skyscrapers, modern conveniences and traffic problems and the quiet, wretchedly poor villages in the Andean highlands to the east, inhabited by illiterate Indians who scratch out a bare existence using primitive agricultural methods. Flying 2 hours further to the east, the plane sets down in an isolated clearing in the Amazonian jungle stalked by tribespeople who still hunt with poison-tipped darts. Here the social lag is measured in millennia.

In Lima itself, a literate and cultured minority live surrounded by a vast urban poor whose lot is one of unspeakable squalor. The poor know what decent housing is but they do not have it. They know that modern medical care can cure but they are not cured. They know that education is beneficial but they are not educated. In short, the decencies of modern life are clearly visible to them and, just as clearly, beyond their reach.

Peru is not unique. Lopsided development is to be found in greater or lesser degree in just about every nation in Latin America. It is a consequence of the unique complex of cultural and economic forces that has shaped these societies over the centuries.

The modern Latin American nations began as beachheads in the New World in much the same way as did our original 13 States. Unlike this Nation, however, the social structure of most of our southern neighbors more or less atrophied in this form.

The European-derived minorities in the cities provided the economic organization necessary for a limited tapping of the great natural wealth of the interiors, which was funneled abroad largely in the form of exports of food and raw materials. The returns from these exports were hoarded or spent abroad or were stopped largely at the beachhead cities. This process underlies the great concentration of wealth in a few hands and the spectacular growth of some Latin American cities into islands of lush modernism and great culture in a sea of social stagnation.

For the many Latin Americans in the city slums and particularly in the hinterlands, the process has had little constructive relevance. Through generations they have continued to live out their lives in ancient Indian and tribal patterns. Or if they have been drawn into the process, it has been to provide the labor to grow, to extract and to move commodities to the beachheads. They have received few benefits in the form of sufficient food, better health, greater comforts and opportunities for self-development.

Not only in an economic sense have most of the people of Latin America been bystanders, or mere cogs, in the beachhead societies. They were also bypassed for a long time by the concepts of responsible government and freedom when these ideas invaded Latin America in the 19th century.

These new clarions did not reach much beyond the beachheads and they were heard almost exclusively by the small minorities. The balance of the populace was summoned by them, if at all, only at moments of quixotic flareup which changed rulers without bringing about changes in the basic structure of Latin American society.

The pressure for deep change in this structure, however, has been accumulating steadily for several decades, notably since World War II. It is fed from intricate sources but certainly it is due for the major part to the stagnation of agriculture under antiquated systems of production and exploitative systems of land tenure at a time of rapidly expanding population.

It is fed, too, by the beginnings of an industrialization that has intensified urban concentration and brought more and more people into a direct awareness of the inadequacy of their lot in contrast to the glaring wealth and opportunities of a few.

Perhaps most of all, the accumulating pressure for deep-seated change is a consequence of modern communications. Ideas no longer stop at the beachheads. The slum dwellers of the Latin American cities and the poverty-stricken villagers of the hinterlands alike have heard the message from this country, from Europe, and from Soviet Russia.

Millions of Latin Americans are now persuaded that a stoic suffering of misery or repression is not a virtue. The more that this concept is disseminated and takes root, the more the pressure for change intensifies and along with it the search for leaders capable of bringing about such change.

Responsible Latin American statesmen know that the long-range problem confronting their countries is to convert the beachhead societies into stable national structures. But the immediate problem is to cut the social lags which exist between the cities and the hinterlands, between the affluent minorities and the poor in the cities themselves. For, because of these lags, the pitch of the demagog more often than not is able to rise above the voice of reason, and the tangible promises of repressive ideologies tend to swamp the abstractions of freedom.

An adequate solution to the immediate problem of social lag is essential if durable progress is to be made on the long-range problem of developing responsible, stable governments in Latin America.

The key to the solution is an indigenous leadership which has the courage to risk shifting substantially the base of political support from the entrenched and powerful few to the many. Even if the shift is made, the leadership must still have the wisdom and restraint to use this broadened political power not for a new entrenchment of personal power but for the building of institutions of freedom and progress.

That kind of leadership has not been conspicuous in Latin America until comparatively recent times. But it is beginning, now, to appear with increasing frequency. Wherever it has appeared, as in Venezuela and Peru, to cite just two examples, its hold is still most tenuous. The old centers of power contract slowly and the social lags still breed demagogs.

Yet, in spite of these obstacles, the transition from beachhead to modern states must go forward. If it is not led by those who believe in freedom, it will surely be pushed by those who do not. Specifically, any Latin American nation which tackles this problem must move on several fronts simultaneously:

1. It must act, at once, to alleviate the most glaring inadequacies in diet, housing, and health from which tens of millions of people suffer.

2. It must improve agriculture by diversifying crops, broadening land ownership, expanding cultivable acreage, and introducing modern agricultural techniques on a wide scale in order to increase production, particularly of food.

3. It must bring about the establishment of a steadily expanding range of industries.

4. It must wipe out illiteracy within a few years and provide adequate facilities to educate an ever-increasing number of highly trained technicians, specialists, and professionals to provide the whole range of modern services.

5. It must end the relative isolation of the beachheads from the interiors and the parts of the interior from one another by a vast enlargement of existing systems of transportation and communications.

Effective free government in Latin America can achieve much of what needs to be done by marshaling the unused or partially used labor potential and capital of its own people. It can act to transfer initiative, energies, and resources from Paris and Monte Carlo, so to speak, to Arequipa and Tucumán.

But even if these sources have been tapped, the total capacity for doing what must be done is likely to fall short of the job. It is precisely at this point that recognition of our long-range national interest, and acceptance of the responsibilities of leadership in this hemisphere, can be decisive.

In the past our economic policies respecting Latin America have not been focused on the problem of the beachhead nature of its societies. We have dabbed at the inner difficulties of the Latin American nations with small point 4 programs and in other random ways. These have helped—but in a most limited fashion.

The emphasis of our policies has been on encouraging the flow of private U.S. investment. This approach has had the effect of reinforcing the beachheads rather than modifying them. For the most part, the products and returns of this enterprise flow abroad or are held in the beachhead cities. Only a relative handful of Latin Americans have benefited.

If we aim our policies at the problem of the transition from the beachheads, it should be readily apparent that our agricultural surpluses will have great relevance to the immediate problem of massive malnutrition in Latin America. There is great relevance, too, in the capacities of the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank and other sources to the expansion of transportation and communications facilities. Finally, the new aid program authorized by Congress can be pointed directly at the enormous needs in housing, health and education.

Aid from the United States will not help to end the beachheads if it continues to be applied haphazardly. It will be effective only if it moves in coordinated channels toward specific, measurable goals of social and economic development in Latin America.

To bring about such a flow we must first centralize control over the various aid sources within our own Government. Second, we must insist that the Latin-American leaders plan and act with us to use aid in combination with the energies and resources of their respective countries to build sinews, rather than symbols, of modern progress.

Unless we accept for ourselves, and are able through leadership and diplomacy to get recipient countries to accept, the idea of an integrated approach for all future aid activities, development in the Americas is not likely to be brought about under the aegis of freedom. A new and larger sprinkling of aid in the old random pattern will produce little growth. Better prices and a larger market for coffee, sugar or whatever may act as tranquilizers but they will not cure the ill.

As a nation, we have got to face up to that fact. So, too, must the Latin Americans. That is the challenge to the new administration. It is a challenge to rid our Latin-American policies of sterile slogans and shibboleths which have heretofore obscured the problems. It is a challenge to supply the national and hemispheric leadership and the administrative followthrough that will use existing resources in a concentrated program to enlarge the beachhead societies of Latin America into truly national, democratic states.

The success of that effort is essential to Latin America's future. It is essential to the future of this Nation.

RELEASE OF TWO AMERICAN FLIERS BY RUSSIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last week the Soviet Union made a grandstand play by releasing two American fliers Russia had held illegally since last July, when, in a plain act of piracy on the high seas, the Communists shot down a U.S. RB–47 reconnaissance bomber over international waters.

Certainly we all rejoice for the men and their families who had been so cruelly and so unnecessarily separated by the Communist pirates.

At the same time, we should not delude ourselves that the cold war is now thawing. This was no act of humanitarianism on the part of the Communists. It was a transparent propaganda move to score a palpable hit with the rest of the world. Undoubtedly, Mr. Khrushchev hopes we will interpret his action as an indication of Soviet willingness to make concessions in the interest of relieving tensions between the two great powers.

As the Washington Post and Times Herald pointed out in an excellent editorial last Friday:

> It is no more a concession than the agreement of a recalcitrant child, in expectation of reward, to stop throwing stones or breaking up the furniture.

What reward—or ransom—President Kennedy paid to Mr. Khrushchev for the release of our two fliers held hostage by the Russians has not yet been revealed to the American people. I sincerely hope our new administration has not begun a policy of appeasement as part of its self-styled "quiet diplomacy."

For, if the administration paid a big price to obtain release of 2 Americans, Mr. Khrushchev will demand an even bigger price to reveal the fate of 11 other Americans whose unarmed transport was shot down by Soviet fighter planes in September 1958. According to a Soviet magazine recently published, the 11 United States airmen parachuted to safety and were promptly imprisoned by the Soviets. The same magazine has just retracted this statement, but doubt persists.

If Mr. Khrushchev truly desires to ease cold war tensions, let him come clean about this incident. If he does not, then we can only assume that he intends to use his captives as political

pawns in the cold war, just as he has done in the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point three analytical statements on these questions: the Post editorial, an article by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of January 27, and an article by Roscoe Drummond in the Post of January 28.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1961]

CHEERS FOR WHAT?

All Americans will rejoice that the two surviving RB–47 fliers have been released from their prison in the Soviet Union. Unquestionably this move does, as President Kennedy remarked, remove a serious obstacle to peaceful relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. But before there are too many handsprings, it is useful to analyze what the Soviet Union has really done.

The RB–47 incident was not at all in the category of the U–2 flights over the Soviet Union, which Mr. Kennedy has wisely ordered not be resumed. In those overflights the United States was legally the offender. The RB–47 was shot down by Soviet planes over international waters, and the affair was misrepresented by the Soviet Union in an obvious attempt to embarrass the United States at the time.

What, then, does the release signify? It merely permits the Soviet Union to purge itself in some degree of an action which was illegal in the first place and which cost the lives of four other Americans. This could have been done at any time during the last 6 months in response to the entreaties of President Eisenhower. The Soviet Government delayed the step in a transparent effort to ingratiate itself with the Kennedy administration with the appearance of a concession.

The release is to be welcomed on its own account, and there will be hopes that it will pave the way for some sort of mutual interest negotiation. But the mere cessation of outrageous behavior makes Mr. Khrushchev not one whit less an implacable adversary. It is no more a concession than the agreement of a recalcitrant child, in expectation of reward, to stop throwing stones or breaking up the furniture.

WHAT ABOUT THE OTHERS?—FATE OF 11 FLIERS UNEXPLAINED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is every reason to welcome the action of the Soviet Union in freeing the two U.S. fliers whose plane, the RB–47, the Russians shot down over the international waters of the Barents Sea last July.

But it would be an egregious mistake to construe this gesture as in itself easing any of the significant tensions of the cold war or as offering evidence that the Soviets want to negotiate productively with President Kennedy.

Mr. Kennedy is making it clear that he does not intend to be drawn into premature, unprepared summit talks. To him, this means proof that there is some basis for a meeting of minds.

To free two American fliers who should never have been detained and whose plane should never have been shot down (since it was not over Soviet territory) is no evidence whatsoever that Mr. Khrushchev wants to settle anything with Mr. Kennedy except on Soviet terms.

It may be evidence that Mr. Khrushchev wants to build a little good will before approaching the new administration on any score. As such it should be accepted for exactly what it is—a rectification of something which was wrong in the first place.

What about the 11 Americans who had not been heard from since their unarmed U.S. transport plane, which lost its bearing a few miles over the Soviet-Turkish frontier in September 1958, was shot down by Soviet fighter planes?

At that time the Soviets turned over the bodies of six dead U.S. airmen and blandly assured us that they had not seen, had no knowledge of, and had done nothing to the other members of the crew.

The news, which has now come out via East Germany and was reprinted perhaps accidentally by a Soviet magazine, is that the Soviets captured the 11 fliers after they had parachuted to safety and immediately imprisoned them. There is still no word from them or about them: Mr. Khrushchev says he doesn't believe the Soviet magazine.

You will recall that shortly after this incident Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan was visiting Washington in the interests of trade and good will. I recounted something of the behavior in this report at the time:

Mr. Mikoyan put on a heavy act of injured innocence when the President, the Vice President, Secretary Dulles, and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee kept asking him about what happened to the 17-man crew of the American plane.

Mr. Mikoyan pulled out all the stops. He was pained; he was hurt; he was mystified; he was excruciatingly baffled by the picky questions which the Americans oddly insisted upon putting to him. He held up his hands in a grand gesture of puzzlement to Mr. Nixon and exclaimed: "Why should we hide anything? Why are Americans so suspicious about this?"

Finally, in his interview with Secretary Dulles he made as though he could stand it no longer and professed to be downright irritated because the officials of the United States did not seem to accept his personal and official assurances that the American transport had not been shot down, that it had crashed of its own fault and that (beyond the 6 bodies of the 17-man crew) the Soviets had told all—absolutely.

We still do not have the answer to Mr. Mikoyan's rhetorical question: "Why should we hide anything?" but we do have the answer to his other question: "Why are Americans so suspicious?"

We are suspicious because the whole Soviet explanation was fishy on its face and the denials have now been found to be untrue. The Soviet magazine, in reprinting an article from an East German Communist publication, discloses that the 11 unreported U.S. fliers were detained by the Soviets and have been held incommunicado ever since. This, despite repeated Soviet statements that they had not found them.

It should not be overlooked that the Soviets took the case of the two U.S. RB–47 fliers, now released, to the U.N. Security Council, demanding that the U.N. condemn the United States for violating international law. When the Security Council suggested the facts be investigated, Russia vetoed this proposal. Preposterous idea, investigating the facts. Now that the two RB–47 fliers have been freed, what about the other 11? Or does Moscow want to hold them back to build more good will?

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 27, 1961]

U.S. PRICE FOR RELEASED FLIERS—PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON SOVIET ACTION VIEWED AS LEAVING SOME QUESTIONS

(By David Lawrence)

What ransom price did the U.S. Government pay the Soviet Government to effect the release of the two fliers from the RB–47 who were kidnaped on the high seas and held for 7 months without being permitted to communicate with their own Government? Did this country make any concessions to the Soviets, and, if so, just what were they? Some Senators are asking these questions.

As one studies the transcript of President Kennedy's first news conference, it is apparent that the administration here has not given to the American people the whole story of just what happened in the exchanges of messages between Moscow and Washington in the last few days.

One of the newsmen asked this question: "Mr. President, can you tell us something about what your role was, if you had one, in the release of these fliers? Did this come about as a consequence of some action you took?"

Mr. Kennedy did not answer the question. He simply said that "this matter has been under discussion" by the American Ambassador in Moscow and Soviet authorities.

The reporters were not satisfied with this avoidance of the issue and asked the President this question:

"In consequence of Mr. Khrushchev's apparent indication last week of a willingness to release the American fliers, have you sent any communication to him through Ambassador Thompson or otherwise?"

Mr. Kennedy's answer was: "We have had several exchanges with the Soviet authorities. I do not believe that one has taken place since the release of the prisoners."

Later in the news conference, there was a further colloquy on this subject:

Question: "Did the Russians ask any quid pro quo or did we make any concessions to them in exchange for the release of these fliers? If not, how do you account for this remarkable turnabout in their relations with us?"

Answer: "The statement which I have made is a statement which the U.S. Government put forward on this matter, which I read to you earlier in regard to overflights. I would not attempt to make a judgment as to why the Soviet Union chose to release them at this time. I did say in my statement to Mr. Arrowsmith (earlier in the press conference) that this had removed a serious obstacle in the way of peaceful relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and I would judge that they desire to remove that serious obstacle."

Question: "Does that mean, sir, that they accepted a reassurance of no more overflights as an exchange?"

Answer: "It is a fact that I have ordered that the flights not be resumed, which is a continuation of the order given by President Eisenhower in May of last year."

This leaves unanswered exactly how and why and when the pledge was given to the Soviet Union that no more U–2 overflights would be authorized.

For one thing, Mr. Kennedy made it clear at the news conference that the shooting down of the RB–47 was in an entirely different category from the U–2 incident. Actually, the RB–47's fliers were forced down over the open seas, where they had a right to be. If there was no connection between the U–2 flights and the RB–47 incident, the question naturally arises as to why Mr. Kennedy felt it necessary to announce that during the discussions with the Soviet Union on the release of the RB–47 fliers assurances had been given that the U–2 flights would not be resumed.

The inference is clear that, whether the commitment not to resume U–2 flights was given in a conversation at Moscow by Ambassador Thompson during the last few days separate from the one about the RB–47 fliers, the Soviets themselves took the two to be related and based their action on it.

In other words, the Soviets wanted to appear before the world as having achieved a diplomatic victory, and so they insisted upon some assurance concerning the overflights.

When this was given, the Soviets of their own initiative decided to release the fliers. It may well be argued whether the United States was party to a "deal" but the plain facts are that, simultaneously with the release of the RB–47 fliers, a commitment was announced by President Kennedy that there would be no more U–2 overflights.

This is in some respects a disappointing turn of events. The United States has a right to fly far above the ground and the Soviet Union insists upon the same right when it sends satellites around the globe that take photographs from high altitudes—a form of observation for military purposes.

There is no pledge as yet, moreover, that the Soviet Union will stop its espionage here in the United States or infiltration in other parts of the world, particularly Cuba, where it is openly assisting a government that is hostile to the United States.

Mr. Kennedy struggled through the press conference without making a definite statement as to how much the United States conceded to get the release of fliers whom the Soviets, of course, had no right to force down in the first place.

DEDICATION OF NORTH MIAMI BEACH OSTEOPATHIC GENERAL HOSPITAL, MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech which I gave in Miami, Fla., November 20, 1960. The speech was delivered at a banquet held for fund-raising purposes for the proposed Osteopathic General Hospital of North Miami Beach, Fla.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OREGON, NOVEMBER 20, 1960, MIAMI, FLA.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have gathered together tonight not only to dedicate the financial drive for a wonderful North Miami Beach Osteopathic General Hospital to its noble purposes, but also to rededicate ourselves to the moral obligation of promoting man's humanity to man. The privilege and trust inherent in your invitation to participate with you in this dedication ceremony moves me very deeply.

As the offices of the American Osteopathic Association well know, during my 16 years in the Senate I have always supported and will continue to support equality of consideration for members of the osteopathic school of medicine in any medical hospital or medical research program in which the Federal Government may play a part.

This proposed hospital in a very real sense will be both a physical monument to, and an inspiring symbol of the self-sacrifices of the many men and women both in and out of the osteopathic profession who will make this haven of mercy and medical care a reality. As the American Osteopathic Association has stated, "Your osteopathic hospital is more than bricks and stainless steel, more than costly equipment and specially designed facilities. These are only adjuncts to the basic characteristics of your hospital—friendship and service."

I would add that such a hospital as this is also a manifestation of the devotion of its sponsors, contributors, and staff to the spiritual teaching that we are our brother's keeper. I happen to be one in public life who believes that the primary obligation of a legislator is to seek to translate into legislation great moral principles. In my work in the Senate I ask myself the controlling question whenever a controversial piece of proposed legislation comes before me, "On which side of this issue is the best interest of human values to be found?" When I'm satisfied that I have the facts with which to answer that question, my vote becomes automatic in support of the human values. I would stress that point tonight because it is so pertinent to the humane cause which we have met to support.

In this day of crisis throughout the world, and great domestic concern in our American democracy, it behooves us as free men and women to reflect a bit on the meaning of freedom and the social, economic and political ingredient which give it strength as a way of life. Let us never forget that freedom is made up of people, not of things. The dynamics of freedom are the generating forces of human living. The wealth of our democracy is human wealth, not materialism. Our wealth as a nation is not our smokestacks, mercantile empires, farms, factories and Wall Streets. Our true wealth is the precious priceless value of human life, of boys and girls, of men and women, of all our people.

I'm afraid this truism is too often lost sight of, due to the myopia caused by our many human frailties. Inborn human selfishness, lust for power—economic, political, yes, and social—sometimes create shriveled and pigmy characters out of human bodies which God created for more noble ends.

Our constitutional fathers wrote and breathed into the constitutional framework of our democratic form of government this emphasis upon human values. They made clear both in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution that the primary purpose of our system of self-government is to promote the general welfare of all of our people. The Anglo-Saxon maxim of promoting the greatest good for the greatest number was one of the philosophical tenets which motivated the American colonists in their revolt against the British Crown. Their inspired words written into our revolutionary history, left no room for doubt that this Republic was created to promote the general welfare of all its people. They made clear that the people were to be the masters of the state, and not the state the masters of the people. In their struggle for American freedom, they wrote the greatest Constitution for the self-government of a free people ever penned by the hand of man. It provided for those checks which would guarantee a government by law but which would assure that government could be administered by men in furtherance of the common good.

As an old professor, permit me to refresh your classroom memories of the historic fact that our constitutional fathers so emphasized human values as being the basis of democratic government that they provided checks within the Constitution aimed at protecting the economic weak from exploitation by the selfishness of the economic strong. This struggle from the time of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Adams, Hamilton and the others has gone on from generation to generation right down to our day and will continue so long as the American people love freedom and self-government.

It has given us a democratic system of government dedicated to the proposition that freedom for the individual is dependent upon his being guaranteed both political and economic freedom of choice. It is this inseparability of political and economic freedom of choice that distinguishes us from all forms of totalitarianism. My point is simple of proof. Show me any people living under any form of a state economy and I'll show you a people who have lost their political freedom of choice. I care not which it is—communism, state socialism, fascism, or any of the forms of cartelism—the end result, as far as the individual is concerned, is a complete loss of his right to self-government.

You may be asking yourself the question, "Mr. Senator, what does the philosophical discussion of freedom that you have been giving us have to do with the cause of the North Miami Beach Osteopathic General Hospital?" My answer is, "Just everything if you will apply these principles to your obligations of citizen statesmanship." Let me tell you why I say that. I am afraid that too many Americans are too busy with their problems of daily living to appreciate the fact that the statesmanship of the men in government usually will not rise above the citizen statesmanship of the average citizen. The Congress, for example, is but a great mirror reflecting the image of the citizen statesmanship of the American people. If you will practice the ideals which you want your government to reflect, then the men and women who administer your Government will respond to your example. Most politicians are just made that way. Please note that I put it in language of responding to your example, rather than to your pressures. I always try to be kind to politicians. They have a hard lot at best. But no matter how we word it, the fact is that in the last analysis the people of America are the government, and the government will be no better than the statesmanship of the people.

The obligations of citizen statesmanship are myriad. You are meeting tonight to consider one of your local obligations to citizen statesmanship in respect to supporting this hospital. The total structure of our system of self-government is built out of the fulfillment by each individual of his citizenship obligation on a local, State, and National level.

Our conscience tells us that we cannot deny that as good citizens we owe a moral obligation to translate into action those ethical and spiritual teachings to which we bow our heads in synagog and church, but which we are prone sometimes to sidestep and leave to others to put into practice.

From the standpoint of everything I have said tonight, I would suggest most respectfully that good citizenship at every level—local, State, and National—including keeping faith with our faith, being true to ourselves, calls upon us to support this financial drive by helping build a hospital memorial to the teaching of the Golden Rule.

Each one of us would respond immediately if accident or misfortune struck down the body and health of a dear one. We would go to the rescue and aid of a stranger stricken in our path. One of our finest traits as a people is our almost unconscious automatic response to the Golden Rule when misfortune strikes a blow within our presence. Yet misfortune for many stalks this community and every community of our land every hour of every day. The problem calls for joint individual action on a community level to meet a group problem that serves individual needs.

The financial drive for this much-needed hospital offers each citizen of this community both an opportunity to be true to his ideals of public service and a chance to carry out his duty as a good citizen by making his community a better place in which to live.

The construction of this hospital for the people of North Miami Beach is typical of what I think is a reawakened interest and concern for the medical care available to the American people.

There seems to have been an upsurge in the last few years in many areas of health care. In Congress, the drive for insurance against medical expenses has seen a program of this kind adopted for Federal employees and for retired Federal employees. Adding health insurance for the aged to the social security program, has gained so much headway that it seems to have real prospects of enactment next year.

This activity in the public sector has stimulated more activity in the private sector. Insurance companies are emphasizing, now, special policies aimed at the health needs of people 65 and over, heretofore the most neglected of all age groups.

A part of this same upsurge has been the Hill-Burton construction program. Under it the Federal Government has helped our localities to meet the hospital needs of our growing population by sharing the cost of their construction. I am pleased to note that osteopathic hospitals are among those eligible for Hill-Burton funds. As you know, this is one of the example of equality of consideration for osteopathic medical service which many of us have supported in the Congress.

A third aspect of our growing interest in health care is the vast increase in funds raised privately and appropriated by Congress for medical research. Funds for the National Institutes of Health, which concentrate on research in such areas as mental health, cancer, and heart disease have reached a high this year of over half a billion dollars, compared to $60 million 8 years ago.

I think that the American people are beginning to realize that a nation that can spend billions every year for research in the techniques of war and mass destruction, can also afford to step up its research in the causes and cures for disease. This progress in medical research will undoubtedly continue in the years ahead. I hope it will. We already know that such scourges of mankind as diphtheria, cholera, smallpox, and tuberculosis can be controlled and even wiped out. We are hopeful that the same can be done with cancer and many forms of heart disease.

But their control takes two things: First, the know-how; and second, the availability of necessary medical care to everyone in need of it. These objectives can only be met by combined public and private action. The huge sums of money for medical research must almost necessarily come from the Federal Government, though I do not discount the research being financed by private contributions.

Some funds for hospital construction can and should come from the Federal Government, but funds from State, local, and private sources are equally vital.

In the area of health insurance, the major part of this load will continue to be borne by private or cooperative arrangements. But such programs as union management health and welfare funds, group insurance and private insurance policies will continue to carry the major share of the health financing burden.

In many ways, the success of these health financing programs are the key to the health standards of the American people.

The necessary research and the necessary financing arrangements to bring this medical care to all in need of it must be a community project, just as this hospital has been a community project. By "community" I mean private, local and Federal participation. It will take the best efforts of all to make Americans as healthy as we know it is possible for us to be.

I have an abiding confidence in the willingness of the American people to meet their civic responsibilities once they fully appreciate and understand the need of any given social trust.

The need for this hospital is considerable, the call for citizen statesmanship is clear. I am confident that the conscience of each individual will hear that call.

I leave each of you in the sanctum of your conscience. In that communion will come the answer to my closing question—How much are you willing to invest in the Golden Rule by contributing to this financial drive for the building of the North Miami Beach Osteopathic General Hospital?

TRIBUTE TO THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, on January 14, 1961, there appeared in John Herling's Labor Letter an account of the award of a plaque of honor to James T. O'Connell, former Under Secretary of Labor, by his fellow employees.

Upon receiving the award, Mr. O'Connell paid tribute to the career civil service. As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I was particularly interested in his appropriate and well-worded remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

James T. "Joe" O'Connell, Under Secretary of Labor for the past 4 years, leaves his post on January 20, highly regarded for outstanding administrative competence which made the Labor Department one of the most efficiently run agencies in Government. It's difficult to measure the exact degree of efficiency in such a complicated field, but there is no doubt that Joe O'Connell, a modest man, combines in an unusual degree qualities of sensitive understanding of human values along with forthright executive responsibility.

In a farewell award ceremony, over which he presided, O'Connell was himself presented with a plaque of honor by Labor Secretary Mitchell in behalf of his fellow employees. Earlier Mitchell had introduced his successor, Arthur Goldberg, to the assembled employees, but the climax of the emotion-packed occasion really came when O'Connell responded to the unscheduled award in these words:

"I cannot tell you how much I appreciate the sentiments that are contained in this plaque. I finish just almost precisely 4 years of service when I leave this office at high noon on next Friday. I told the Secretary, when I came, that I would serve throughout the administration and I intend to carry that out to the second. I am a great protagonist of the Federal career civil service and whatever I may have been able to do, whatever success we have had in this administration and we are proud of our achievements, we can only achieve through a body of career civil servants who have the dedication and the competence of the men and women of the Labor Department. Federal service is more than many occupations, more than most occupations, a vocational career. It is one to which people devote their lives essentially out of a sense of dedication and a desire to achieve for their fellow citizens. And I will say that this sense of dedication, its degree of competence, cannot possibly exist in a greater degree in any other part of the Federal Government than it does here in the Department of Labor. I leave this Department and the Federal service with gratitude to the people who have worked with me, and really with a somewhat heavy heart because I have been doing what I like to do."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

CIVIL DEFENSE SHOULD BE REAPPRAISED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, every day of the year over $10,000 of hard-earned taxpayers' money is being thrown down the drain on what is theoretically known as a civil defense program.

The wasteful, fantastically muddled Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, with its satellites in State and local governments, has managed to squander over a billion dollars during the past 9 years.

Mr. President, have civil defense operations caused any American to be one whit safer today in event of enemy attack than he was 9 years ago? Has our industrial and economic establishment gained one iota more immunity from a nuclear attack than it had 9 years ago? To the contrary, the conditions of modern warfare, coupled with the colossal ineptitude of the civil defense planners, have made civil defense as now operated as obsolete as tallow dips, Civil War cannonballs, and the gatling gun.

If all facts were known, an indictment of this billion dollar boondoggle would read like a roster of malpractice and misfeasance before the bar of public opinion: waste; inefficiency; unrealistic, in fact schizophrenic planning; and inability to overcome public apathy which is rapidly burgeoning into widespread public resentment.

Americans are entitled to know what they are receiving for this throwaway of their tax dollars. They are tired of the multitude of foolish schemes put forth periodically by high-salaried civil defense officials.

Of course, the boondogglers who have been in charge of this outmoded agency have to do something to justify their overpaid, underworked, plush positions. Shortly before this administration took office, they came up with a scheme whose foolishness rivals anything previously proposed or perpetrated by them.

It is my information that the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization planned to ask Congress for a $50 million appropriation to equip all powerplants to transmit a signal which would sound off buzzers plugged into electrical outlets in American homes. These buzzers are to cost at least $5 apiece, and on a national basis the public would be hoodwinked into spending $250 million for them.

Mr. President, how absurd can these officials get? Assuming for the sake of argument that this ridiculous scheme was implemented, what would people do once the buzzing began?

Unbelievable as it may sound, at one and the same time, OCDM officials advocate both evacuation and shelter programs. In Cleveland, Ohio, evacuation is preached. Residents are told to flee on highways toward a neighboring city whose residents are told to flee toward Cleveland. In the meantime, civil defense officials have caused signs to be placed on these highways warning that they will be closed to civilian traffic in event of enemy attack. Try and figure that one out.

Silly as it is, this fact really does not make much difference as no reasonable person can imagine the entire population of Cleveland or any other American city trying to evacuate at one time. Traf-

fic congestion and panic would bottle up any city's exits within minutes. Even assuming ample warning time—which there will not be—the chaos would be unbelievable.

The truth is that the theory of evacuation in this missile age is not only silly, but dangerous. Enemy submarines off our coasts could hurl rockets with nuclear warheads as far as 1,500 miles inland with accuracy. We would be lucky to have 3 minutes warning. Intercontinental ballistic missiles fired from within the Soviet Union would take 15 to 18 minutes to reach their targets in this country. It is absurd to even consider the possibility of evacuation under these circumstances.

Nevertheless, only a few weeks ago John J. Pokorny, civil defense director of Cuyahoga County in which Cleveland is located, said that the civil defense plan is still to evacuate Cleveland in event of a nuclear attack. Mr. Pokorny and officials who reason like him appear to be living in a fanciful world of unreality—a world which disappeared during the closing days of the Second World War when the first atomic bomb was exploded.

He strongly urges that 500,000 of these boondogglers' buzzers be installed in all homes and business establishments in Cuyahoga County at a cost to individuals of more than $2½ million. In addition, the country's 133 screeching sirens costing taxpayers $300,000 will continue to be used—for the benefit of those who are outdoors when and if the buzzers ever go off.

At 12:30 o'clock every Monday noon, in my home city of Cleveland, the civil defense sirens sound. People do not know whether to run or hide or go to the nearest cocktail bar.

At the same time, Mr. Pokorny planned to spend $90,000 more of taxpayers' money to hire 12 more useless full-time employees, sitting around waiting for the bomb to fall. Half of this money was to come from the Federal Government under a matching grant whereby the city of Cleveland would have been required to ante up the remaining $45,000. Fortunately for the taxpayers, Cleveland's outstanding and extremely capable mayor, Anthony Celebrezze, refused to permit the Cuyahoga County civil defense organization to spend that money to hire these needless additional employees. Mayor Celebrezze's action made Cleveland the first city in the Nation to reject this subsidy which is an outrageous misuse of Federal funds. It is my fervent hope that mayors and municipal officials in other American cities will follow Mayor Celebrezze's lead in saving American taxpayers' money.

It appears that even some of Mr. Pokorny's colleagues have become fed up with the silly schemes and needless spending of tax dollars. Mrs. Dorothy Koller, the civil defense director of Akron, Ohio, announced that she also has rejected the "money to hire more help I do not need," from the Federal Government. Mrs. Koller turned down $8,250 which was allocated for Akron. In doing so she directly contradicted the theories followed by her colleague 25 miles away in Cleveland, Ohio, when she said:

> Evacuation is for the birds. There simply can't be enough advance warning.

She went on to say:

> We don't need the money and we don't want them telling us what to do.

Some civil defense administrators, not as wise and sensible as Mrs. Koller, advocate evacuation and others, such as in Buffalo, N.Y., and other places, advise building shelters. Are we to run, hide, or both? The conditions of modern warfare make shelters of little or no use in saving American lives. The total destruction and remaining radioactive elements from a nuclear attack would be such that underground shelters in basements and backyards would offer little, if any, protection.

Scientists have estimated that a few days or weeks of nuclear war would leave 100 million Americans dead. The remaining population would be dazed, hurt, starving in the midst of radioactive debris. The industrial and transportation system on which our lives depend would be in total ruin.

Shelters in a target area would be crushed, their occupants charred and suffocated by the blast and heat. Shelters beyond the target area might offer some protection from fallout except that no one knows what the target area will be or by how far a bomb might miss.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield.

MR. GRUENING. I should like to commend the Senator from Ohio very highly for his effective, persistent campaign against one of the greatest wastes of the taxpayers' money which is taking place in our time. I hope he will persevere in this effort.

It is well known that this administration will need more money for truly essential projects than present tax revenues will afford, and that the way to get the money is to cut out waste. One conspicuous example of waste is that to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio is pointing.

Does the able Senator from Ohio know of any State that has yet had the wisdom to reject Federal matching funds and refuse civil defense assistance?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. No State has, in fact, rejected such assistance. It is too seductive an offer, and enables more folks to be placed on the public payrolls in the States to feed at the public trough. That is why I pay tribute to the great mayor of the city of Cleveland, the Honorable Anthony Celebreeze. He rejected $45,00C of Federal money.

Mr. GRUENING. Could not the money which is wasted in this manner be used equally effectively to provide jobs on useful projects, such as the construction of necessary public works, schools, hospitals, the providing of increases in teachers' salaries, pollution control, resource development, and other great needs which are far more pressing than the great civil defense boondoggle, as the able Senator from Ohio so rightly calls it?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The Senator from Alaska is absolutely correct. I propose to speak on that subject in a few minutes. I thank the Senator for his excellent comments and am glad that we are in agreement.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, even if they survived, the occupants of shelters would come out to a world of chaos. Our cities would be pulverized, streets lost with all rescue equipment beneath the rubble, hospitals and doctors gone. Two-thirds of their inhabitants dead and the rest in a state of shock. Little could be done before plague and disease would set in and finish the work of annihilation.

Mr. President, significantly, I know of no civil defense official in Ohio who has himself taken the trouble to build a shelter. A national shelter system, ineffectual as it may be, would cost anywhere from $20 to $100 billion. Officials of the National Planning Association recently estimated the cost at $60 billion. Even then whatever use they might conceivably have may be outmoded by an even deadlier type of attack—biological warfare. Will any responsible Government official endorse a $20 to $100 billion questionable gamble at best under these conditions?

Dr. Edward U. Condon, one of America's most eminent nuclear physicists, recently stated that civil defense is a waste of time. He went on to say that bomb shelters and plans for evacuation are delusions that cannot possibly provide protection as there is no known protection against thermonuclear bombs.

Mr. President, in the face of these facts the civil defense boondogglers have the audacity to recommend that $50 million of public funds be spent and individuals coerced into spending a quarter of a billion dollars on this foolhardy buzzer scheme. This when money is desperately sought for a multitude of vitally needed programs for the continued growth of our economy and the welfare of all Americans—as the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska pointed out—aid to education; cleaning up our polluted rivers and streams; elimination of slums; aid to depressed areas where millions of Americans cannot find a dollar for food, much less $5 for these silly buzzers; these and many others.

To consider appropriating funds for such a project appears to be an insult to every American taxpayer.

Mr. President, why spend good money after bad? Funds already appropriated for a so-called national warning system have been utterly wasted. A recent study for the Army by Johns Hopkins University reported that our present national warning system is basically unsound, that the present national alerting communication network can involve serious transmission delays, and that a reevaluation of the Conelrad radio warning system indicates that it should be abolished. It stated that adequate warning of an attack is impossible under present conditions.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it was reported in the press that Leo Hoegh, former Director of the OCDM, refused to allow the author of this critical report to appear at a national meeting of civil defense workers. This was an attempt by a public official to suppress the truth. Perhaps Mr. Hoegh cannot be blamed for wanting to hide the fact that for 8 years little or nothing has been done to create an effective air-raid warning system.

Of course, during those 8 years, the sirens continued to screech, the boondogglers fed at the public trough, people were lulled into a false sense of security, and all the while American taxpayers footed the bill.

Mr. President, all of us can be proud of the thousands of patriotic Americans who, as volunteers, gave their time and efforts often at great risk to themselves in times of flood, fire, and other natural disasters. These fine men and women can and will continue to serve as auxiliary firemen, policemen, and sheriffs. Or a volunteer national disaster corps could be created to utilize their services. Americans always have and always will continue to help their neighbors without the doubtful leadership of the OCDM and paid officials safe behind desks.

Civil defense as now conducted is leading Americans astray on the dangers of nuclear war and its terrible aftermath. Civil defense officials have given Americans only one security—the security of ignorance.

It is far safer for Americans to face the facts than to continue to seek refuge in costly illusions. We were all proud yesterday when the President, in his message on the state of the Union, faced up to the facts and told the American people the truth.

Mr. President, John F. Kennedy has taken office without commitment to OCDM leaders or their programs. In one of his first acts as President of the United States he has indicated his doubts as to the present effectiveness of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and his interest in providing Americans with a sane civil defense program.

In announcing that he will name Frank Burton Ellis, a New Orleans lawyer, to be Director of the OCDM, the President said that the new Director's first responsibility will be to review the structure and functions of the agency. It is noteworthy that he asked Mr. Ellis to work with the Budget Director and defense officials—officials of the Armed Forces—in scrutinizing OCDM and its role and in doing so said:

I await the results of this survey with interest and concern.

In my view, no civil defense program can or will adequately protect our citizenry should war strike. The survival of 180 million Americans—indeed, of all mankind—depends not on civil defense but on peace—on solid, workable international agreements to disarm.

We ought to be talking about building homes for our people rather than hoodwinking them with foolish talk of evacuation, underground shelters, and alarm buzzers.

We should be considering ways and means to feed the two-thirds of humanity who go to bed hungry every night, rather than telling Americans to store away a 2-week supply of food in useless holes in the ground which would become firetraps in a nuclear attack.

Instead of wasting untold billions on bomb shelters, we should put just a portion of those dollars into forging links of friendship with other peoples. Their friendship will contribute far more to our safety than shelters to jump into after it is too late. It is interesting to note that many who talk the loudest about civil defense have the least to say about peace.

Civil defense today is a myth. In the nuclear age we must devote our efforts to the utmost toward finding a peaceful solution to the world's problems. It is our only permanent shelter.

Mr. President, Americans, in my judgment, will not, when fully informed, tolerate waste, inefficiency, and ineptness in connection with matters upon which their very survival depends. Americans are entitled to know the truth about our civil defense preparedness.

I question the value of the tremendous outlay of taxpayers' money for civil defense, in terms of what it has done and what it will do for the defense of the Nation.

It adds nothing to our deterrent power. If anything, it is a liability.

The entire civil defense program could well stand a thorough investigation. Therefore, Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution calling for the creation of a select committee of the Senate to study and investigate the nature of the problems involved and the validity of present solutions, the effectiveness of present Federal, State, and local organizational structures, and the extent to which current methods utilize our Nation's skills, talents, and resources. The committee will further be charged with the task of recommending remedial legislation to provide America with a sound, realistic civil defense program.

Mr. President, the defense of our civilians is a major part of the total defense effort of the Nation. As such, it should be in the hands of those who know most about defense—the leaders of our armed services. It should not be in the hands of civilians wearing armbands nor should it be in the hands of political hacks who would like to continue to spend vast amounts of the taxpayers' money, as has been done during the last 9 years.

I was delighted to read the recommendations to then President-elect Kennedy made by the task force called the Committee on the Defense Establishment, headed by our very able and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and including many of the Nation's foremost authorities on our defense needs. Certainly no American is more concerned with or more familiar with our defense requirements than is the senior Senator from Missouri.

The report stated that there should be established a unified command in charge of the National Guard and Reserve elements of all the services. In addition to its other functions, this command would be responsible for civil defense, and would report directly to the Chairman of the Joint Staff. It would, in effect, make the National Guard and Reserve units responsible for civil defense, under the direction of the Pentagon.

Mr. President, placing civil defense within the Military Establishment is the only logical means of providing it with a stable platform and basic support. Everyone knows that in the event of nuclear war martial law would be declared at once; and in such a crisis civil defense would be subordinated to the military, in any case. In Canada and in Great Britain, our allies, civil defense is a function of the Home Guard, a part of the military services of those countries. Neither in Canada nor in Great Britain is there any boondoggling outfit similar to the one we have had in this country during the past 9 years.

In event of nuclear attack, the suggested unified command would immediately mobilize to save lives, maintain order, and get the country on its feet again.

Placing the responsibility for the defense of our civilians on our military leaders, coupled with a mass program of education on survival in a nuclear attack, using all media of communication at our disposal—schools, television, radio, newspapers, and magazines—is the only answer to the problem of civil defense.

Mr. President, even during the War Between the States—or the Civil War, as we in the North call it—a war which, under modern conditions, would be considered a brush-fire war, President Abraham Lincoln immediately suspended the writ of habeas corpus and became in effect, dictator of the northern forces and of the Union. Of course, that is what would occur today if we were attacked and a national emergency were declared.

Mr. President, you have served your country in time of war, and left your home and your loved ones, and served in combat. You know full well what a hard-boiled Army sergeant would say to any has-been politician wearing an armband, if in the event of great emergency and nuclear attack, he attempted to interfere with the movement of our Armed Forces or with the movement of civilians in such time of grave danger.

Mr. President, if we are to have a civil defense program, such drastic revisions of present tactics must take place, to give Americans any realistic hope for survival. It is encouraging that the President and the new administration, as one of its first actions, has called for a reappraisal of our entire civil defense program. It is my hope that the Congress will cooperate, and that one of the first steps we shall take will be the establish-

ment of a committee such as the one I have outlined here today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair receive and appropriately refer the resolution I have sent to the desk.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) establishing the Select Committee on Civil Defense, submitted by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, was received and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Civil Defense (referred to hereinafter as the "committee") consisting of five Members of the Senate, of whom three shall be members of the majority party and two shall be members of the minority party. Members and the chairman thereof shall be selected in the same manner as members and chairmen of standing committees of the Senate are selected. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(b) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate. A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(c) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

(d) The committee shall cease to exist on December 31, 1961.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation with respect to—

(1) the nature and extent of the problems involved in the protection of the civilian population of the United States from hazards incident to enemy attack in time of war;

(2) the extent to which effective solutions for such problems have been provided by programs adopted under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 and other existing legislation;

(3) the effectiveness of present organizational structures and operational methods of Federal, State, and local agencies charged with civil defense responsibilities;

(4) the extent to which those structures and methods employ with maximum effectiveness the skills, talents, and resources of the Nation for the solution of those problems; and

(5) legislative and other means whereby existing civil defense programs and organizations can be improved to provide more adequate protection for the civilian population of the United States from the hazards resulting from enemy attack in time of war.

(b) On or before December 31, 1961, the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendations for any additional legislative or other measures which it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the solution of problems of civil defense.

SEC. 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATIVE TO AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield, if it is understood that in yielding to me he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate, for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 45) to investigate matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies.

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 45) to investigate matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in order that the Senator from Oklahoma may meet an emergency which will take him away from the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 10 minutes to him without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, Calendar No. 4, Senate Resolution 45, is the business before the Senate. The report on that resolution from the Committee on Rules and Administration is before the Senate, the committee having acted favorably upon the resolution proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma for himself and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The resolution provides for the expenditure by the committee, for the year February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, of not to exceed $135,000 to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

It is the hope of the Senator from Oklahoma that the resolution may have the approval of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I note from the report that the emphasis seems to be upon those matters primarily associated with the development of weapons systems and military operations. Is the resolution dictated by an emergency situation?

Mr. KERR. It was not intended to be directed primarily to those activities. I believe the language is:

> To examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including * * *.

The only reason why that language is in the report is that it is in the Senate resolution which established the jurisdiction of the committee, on the one hand, with respect to civilian activities, excluding from it those matters which are specifically assigned to the Defense Department.

It was the thought of the Senator from Oklahoma, as he prepared this resolution, that, in order to be completely able to avoid any activity that would constitute a conflict of interest, we would have to know exactly what both of them were in order that we might differentiate between the two and maintain the line of separation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolution. I thought if there were an urgent or emergent situation of which we ought to be advised, in view of that language, a further statement might be desirable for the information of Members of the Senate.

Mr. KERR. It is not the position of the Senator from Oklahoma that there is an emergent situation. It is the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma, and it was the opinion of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that in order to honor the language in the resolution which created the committee this language would have to be put in the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the resolution, it would create a brand new subcommittee to conduct an investigation under the auspices of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. KERR. It also provides authority to employ and to have available consultants for the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. That answers the next question I was about to ask.

Mr. KERR. These men may be employed in the Government or out of Government. When these men are called from other positions in the Government, the resolution would authorize funds for reimbursing the department from which they were called, in case they were placed at the disposal of the committee. When civilian consultants were provided, the resolution would provide funds with which to pay them, as well as funds to pay expenses of the committee or its members or its staff, in carrying out assignments under the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since it is apparent, from what the Senator has said, that he intends to hire special investigators——

Mr. KERR. Special assistants to the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Special assistants to the subcommittee—why could the work not be done by the present staff of the parent committee? If I correctly understand the situation, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has a staff of four professional staff members and six clerical workers. I wonder why this contemplated investigation could not be carried on by the committee itself. Is the committee staff so busy they cannot do it?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma has recently become the chairman of this committee; and he feels that the responsibilities of the committee are of such considerable proportions and specifications in matters that are so new, even to experts, that he needs assistance.

I have observed that men have become experts on space within 6 or 8 or 10 or 12 months, and I am sure if others have done so it is possible to do so. The Senator from Oklahoma will try to emulate their example, but is not confident of becoming an expert in such a limited period of time. It is the belief of the Senator from Oklahoma that he needs access to trained scientific personnel, which he hopes will be made available to him and to the committee, in order to have more confidence in his ability to meet the full responsibilities of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the study is primarily for the purpose of preventing duplication. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. Not primarily. That is one of the objectives.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then it is mostly for the purpose of preventing duplication.

Mr. KERR. No. In whatever we do we must maintain the avoidance of duplication.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. KERR. When we succeed in avoiding duplication we shall have only begun to provide the information which I think is necessary for the committee and for its members, to meet the wide range of responsibilities the committee has which are not in duplication of functions of the Armed Forces.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator stated a moment ago, there is an item of $25,000 in the proposed budget for the subcommittee which provides for reimbursements to agencies. There is also an item of $20,000 for consultant expenses. Does this mean there will be employment of experts in these fields in addition to those engaged by the Government departments?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What are to be the qualifications of the two top staff members? One will receive $16,102.90 per year and the other $15,013.27. What are the qualifications of those men which make it possible for them to carry out their duties?

Mr. KERR. I would hope their qualifications would be sufficiently great in the field of science—both in respect to knowledge and ability to develop knowledge for themselves and for the committee—that the difficulty would be one of finding men with the qualifications we seek willing to serve for those salaries, rather than one of overpaying them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that those men have not yet been employed?

Mr. KERR. They have not. They have not been selected.

Mr. ELLENDER. They have not been selected?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma has talked with a number of persons he has in mind for this work, and thus far has been unable to get any to whom he has talked to agree to serve for the salary which is possible under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was very hopeful that the committee would be able to do the work with its own personnel. I repeat that the committee presumably has experts in this field now employed as well as an adequate clerical staff. With the assistance of the three armed service departments I thought sufficient data could be obtained, without the necessity for reimbursing agencies, to guide the committee in its determination of what ought to be done.

Mr. KERR. The personnel are available in the services, and their services have been offered to the committee.

One of the things the Senator from Oklahoma feels he, as chairman of the committee, and the members of the committee will be required to do is to maintain the integrity of the civilian authority and responsibility in the field of space.

I am sure my good friend from Louisiana is aware of the fact that when an expert is assigned to the committee by the Navy, one of the things the expert will be able to do is to help convince the committee members that the Navy ought to have a larger responsibility in the area. When an expert from the Air Force or from the Army is assigned a similar attitude is present.

That is a wholesome attitude, and I think it is justified, but it is the hope of the Senator from Oklahoma that he will be able to get the kind of technical assistance he seeks for the committee without having to reach into the services to get it, because he wishes to be able to arrive at whatever decisions are necessary from a purely objective viewpoint rather than from one which has been provided for him by the services, despite a high respect for all of the services.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator indicate about how long the subcommittee will be needed?

Mr. KERR. I do not believe there is language in the resolution which specificially says there will be a subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I read the resolution to say that an additional staff is to be provided. We refer to these groups as subcommittees.

Mr. KERR. I should like to be able to tell the Senator the answer to his question, but I cannot. I remind the Senator of the experience the Senator from Oklahoma had as the chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources. A substantial sum of money was obtained by that committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am aware of that.

Mr. KERR. I believe the record justifies the statement that the Senator from Oklahoma will not squander this money.

Mr. ELLENDER. I compliment the Senator from Oklahoma for being one of the few who conducts himself in this manner. The Senator has done a good job. The Select Committee on National Water Resources did its work and filed its report. Now the committee has been disbanded.

Mr. KERR. The committee has been terminated, and at least two-thirds of the money has been returned to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. However, I venture to say that the provision for the two experts and the money to reimburse the various agencies, as well as expenses for consultants, will be a recurring item from year to year for this study. I hope I am mistaken in my assumption.

Mr. KERR. I cannot assure the Senator that it would or would not be. I can only say I will do the best I can.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget submitted by the subcommittee, which appears on page 3 of the report, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base per annum	Gross per annum	Monthly gross	Total gross
Staff:					
Member	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.91	$16,102.90
Do	2	7,380	15,013.27	1,251.11	30,026.54
Clerks	4	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	24,208.44
Subtotal, staff expense					70,337.88
Administrative:					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)					420.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,550.00
Contribution to employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000)					250.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies					25,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					4,000.00
Consultant expenses					20,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					2,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					442.12
Subtotal, administrative expense					64,662.12
Total					135,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 45, $135,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 45) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by the rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for his great courtesy.

THE PROGRAM FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, about a year ago, I addressed the Senate concerning the forestry program which had been submitted to the Congress the previous year by the Department of Agriculture and its Forest Service. It is a program to strengthen and promote the intelligent use of our Nation's forest resources and to move steadily along a planned course to achieve these goals.

The amount of money for the forestry and research construction program, including funds for the research facilities to carry on this essential work, at the time the report was presented, was 13 times the amount that we were then providing, and at that time the money that was being expended for research, omitting construction, was 4½ times the amount then being presented. Those figures graphically illustrate the continued neglect—from year to year and from decade to decade—toward one of our greatest resources, if not the greatest, that we have.

A year ago I referred particularly to how the 181 million acres of national forest might be put to work more completely, providing for the timber, forage, water, wildlife, and recreational needs of the people.

I spoke also of the research required to put a sound scientific basis under the protection, management, and utilization of these valued public resources, as well as under the entire forestry resources of the country.

Unfortunately, this fine program with its financial requirements amply spelled out for the period of 5 years, has not been adequately provided for during the first 2 years of the plan. The budget for fiscal year 1962, just released shows an increase of $14,200,000 to the Forest Service for this program. This is encouraging, of course, but $52,300,000 is needed to bring the program up to the necessary level of its second year of the 5-year plan. To do so will directly add to the Treasury of the United States, prevent fire and pest losses, and benefit greatly the development of all the varied resources of forest lands. Therefore, I heartily endorse the increase of $14,200,000 in the current budget. Further, I advocate the added $38 million being provided as rapidly as possible in order to bring the program to full schedule.

The forestry research projects, which are part of the program for the national forests, are of special interest and concern to me. They are a relatively small part of the whole national forest program but in my judgment they are an important and vital part. The 1962 budget increase for this research over what was made available last year is only $1.5 million, whereas the increase should have been $8 million in accordance with the level for the second year as the Department had outlined in its program for the national forests. I wish to expand in some detail on just what this forestry research part of the overall program requires.

This research program, first presented to the Congress in 1959, provides for an orderly increase of research activities and the building of research facilities to achieve in the next few years a balanced attack on the most important resource problems.

The program would aid in the development of national forest timber, forage, water, wildlife, and recreation. It would benefit equally the forest lands operated by other Federal agencies, small private owners, large industries, and the States.

Some progress has been made in building up research financing to the levels which this carefully developed plan would require. Nevertheless, the program has fallen behind the annual rate of growth projected by the Department of Agriculture.

The following table shows where we stand with respect to reaching the second-year level of this important research program. I ask unanimous consent that the table showing these relative positions be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forest research—Budget estimate, fiscal year 1962 compared with increase needed to reach 2d-year level of program for the national forests

Forest research	Appropriated, fiscal year 1961	Budget requirement, fiscal year 1962	Budget increase, fiscal year 1962	Additional increase required to reach 2d-year level for national forest program
Forest and range management research	$8,737,000	$8,947,000	$210,000	$1,000,000
Forest protection research	3,174,000	3,751,000	577,000	623,000
Forest products utilization	3,527,000	4,097,000	570,000	530,000
Forest resources research	2,265,000	2,408,000	143,000	257,000
Subtotal, research program	17,703,000	19,203,000	1,500,000	2,500,000
Construction of research facilities	1,075,000	1,075,000		4,000,000
Total for forest research	18,778,000	20,279,000	1,500,000	6,500,000

Mr. STENNIS. I propose that this worthwhile program be brought to planned financing by adding $8 million to the research budget of the Forest Service instead of the $1,500,000 as proposed by the budget for fiscal year 1962.

This addition would include $2,500,000 for research studies of forestry problems

and $4 million for construction of badly needed research laboratories and related facilities.

I have visited some of the programs that are already in progress and find totally inadequate facilities to carry on this fine work. I have found some of the most highly rated scientists in the Nation—men of great talent, training, and learning—working in sheds, almost sitting on nail kegs, and using boxes for desks in carrying on this highly important work that reaches far into the future in its possibilities with reference to our forests and forest products.

BENEFITS OF RESEARCH

The many benefits that flow from a well-conceived program of basic and applied research in forestry hardly need reviewing here, but I want to mention a few of the more significant ones.

Of these benefits, the tree-planting program, in particular, has my deepest concern and interest. I have a deep personal knowledge of this vital phase of forestry research.

We have in this country 50 million acres of idle land capable of growing trees. Private, State, and Federal tree-planting programs have skyrocketed and we now plant more than 2 billion trees a year. Production of these healthy small trees depends on new methods of tree culture, disease control, and other technical knowledge.

Just last October, I visited a forest genetics laboratory where scientists are doing amazing things with pine trees. They are selecting and breeding superior species that will yield more pulp, grow faster, and resist the ravages of diseases and insects. I recently learned that a type of slash pines has been bred that will yield four times as much pine gum for naval stores as run-of-the-woods trees.

Research helps forest land managers in finding new methods to control pests, grow and utilize timber, handle domestic livestock grazing, produce better cover and food for wildlife, control fires, improve water supply and reduce erosion, market timber products more readily and at greater profit, utilize recreational opportunities more effectively.

The laboratory which I visited was in the Deep South, on the Gulf of Mexico. It is working on special programs in connection with what is called the coastal plain pine, or the longleaf pine, the slash pine, and the loblolly pine. There I saw products which have already been produced, and which show me for a certainty that this research will revolutionize production and bring about a growth in this entire area of the country which will produce four times as much pine for naval stores, for example, and produce high quality lumber, as well as another type which grows much faster, where that type of tree is needed. It will also produce a species which has great resistance to disease, and has much more resistance to insects than other species. In other words, Mr. President, they are producing a supertree.

I learned, by the way, that in connection with this type of research that more than 75 years ago the German Government carried out the basic research for this type of pine tree, on which we are now getting started. In other words, the hand of necessity reached in on them a long time ago. Until now we have had a great, almost inexhaustible supply.

This is another graphic illustration showing that we must use foresight in improving the quality and production of these products against the day, which is not too many years away, when the population of our country will be double what it is today. I understand that the estimates show that that will occur around the year 2000. That will be the beginning with reference to the time that the benefits will flow from this far-reaching, well-planned, and very effective research which is being carried on.

I have spoken of my personal knowledge with reference to the laboratory I visited. Other areas in the Nation require different research programs. They must do the same work in research because of the fact that a different tree is involved, and because the climate is different, the insects are different, and the diseases are different. Therefore the problems vary with climate and conditions of the kind I have mentioned. There are geographical situations which vary, and which must be taken into account in carrying on the proper kind of work, and to do that the proper facilities must be set up.

Mr. President, this is not a deluxe laboratory that I am talking about. I still have some austerity left in me, and so does the National Forest Service. This is bone and muscle construction. It is right down to earth. Here we are dealing with realities.

The same thing is true with reference to the equipment that is necessary to carry on this work. The people who do this work must have some modern weapons. They must utilize modern equipment. The scientists cannot carry on this kind of research without these weapons, any more than a surgeon or other medical man can carry on the modern practice of medicine without a microscope and other instruments of that kind.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi is making a very important contribution. I should like to call his attention to the fact that the 1962 budget contains a request for $81,000 for continued research at the Warren-Kingston Research Center in connection with the forest research program. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will be amenable to including in the 1962 budget the total figure of $200,000, to which he has alluded, and which is required for additional construction for this very much needed research center in Warren. Would the Senator give consideration to it?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Pennsylvania can rest assured that the Senator from Mississippi will certainly support that project. It is included in the list of projects which I intend to discuss in a few minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I am very glad that he feels as he does. I assure him that I will help in whatever way I can in connection with the program, specifically in connection with the activity alluded to, at Warren.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. It is an important project. It has to do with forest recreation and wildlife in connection with that acreage in his great State. It has long been neglected. It is something from which the people themselves will benefit in the form of a recreation area, but it also has very far-reaching benefits involved in other ways.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi should be complimented on his very able exposition of the need for implementation of the program for the national forests. Few of our national projects are of more importance to the long-range interests of the American people.

Included in the Senator's presentation was a $125,000 item for the Forest Soils and Silviculture Laboratory at Sewanee, Tenn., and it should be pointed out that the Sewanee Laboratory has made a remarkable record despite inadequate quarters and facilities.

For a number of years, this regional research unit has been furnishing valuable information and guidance to timber growers in the Highland Rim area of Tennessee and Alabama by determining the growing capacities of soils, recommending species of trees to be planted in cutover land, prescribing thinning procedures best suited to bringing a crop of timber to merchantability, and in many other ways putting to practical use the techniques of silviculture.

What the Laboratory needs to further increase its effectiveness is the enlarged laboratory and greenhouse space called for in the proposal of the Senator from Mississippi and it is to be hoped this space will soon be provided.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. It is certainly a much needed item. The $125,000 item, for the entire laboratory, is another example of what I have referred to as a bone and muscle project. There are no fringe, deluxe trimmings here. It is a down-to-earth cost. It illustrates what can be done with a small laboratory. I know what can be done with a small laboratory. I know from personal information and knowledge of the area that a highly important program is being carried on there.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In my State, in recent years, tens of millions of trees have been planted as a result of the forestry research work and the work of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, and too, because of the work which the Senator from Mississippi has been doing in securing

increased funds each year for this type of work.

The point is now being reached in North Dakota where the forestry people feel that some research must be done, because it is now becoming necessary to combat diseases and other problems which are developing. We have a forestry school, at Bottineau, N. Dak. I understand it is proposed that a $130,000 laboratory be established there. That is something which we need urgently. It would serve a wide area and a State where trees are both needed and greatly appreciated.

I commend the Senator from Mississippi for the fine work he has done in this field over many years.

Mr. STENNIS. I know of the Senator's interest in this work, which has been expressed heretofore on the floor and more particularly in the Committee on Appropriations, where he has been very effective in bringing these problems very forcefully to the attention of the committee and the Senate. The laboratory to which he has referred is called the Plains Shelter Belt Laboratory. It cost only $130,000. It is a relatively small amount for the program which is being carried on there.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have always felt that one of the finer programs adopted by the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration was the shelterbelt program. It is a program which is appreciated by all persons, no matter to what party they belong.

Such a program has been established in all the States throughout the Great Plains area. It is in this field, again, that research is needed to continue the program.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his fine explanation.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HICKEY. I commend the Senator from Mississippi for his reference to the University of Wyoming. I should certainly be remiss if I did not commend him and express to him the gratitude of the alumni of the University of Wyoming and the people of Wyoming for his consideration.

I believe I am the first alumnus of that university to be a Member of this body. I am very proud of the consideration which has been shown the university by the Senator from Mississippi. Certainly the activity which is evidenced by this appropriation is something which will mean much to a State which has only one school of higher education, one university, which is being used more and more within the State by the functions of State government and National Government in its proper perspective presently and in the future, I sincerely hope, playing a part in the general well-being of the individual State.

I reiterate my sincere commendation of the Senator from Mississippi on behalf of myself and the people of Wyoming, who are interested in the university.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his kind remarks and also for his very strong support of the facility which is proposed to be located at the University of Wyoming. His State has certainly sent one of her finer alumni to the Senate. I am proud to see him here, hard at work.

The sum involved for the proposed laboratory is only $150,000, which is another illustration of the small amount of money, relatively speaking, which is necessary to carry on this most useful work.

I have had the pleasure of walking over the campus and grounds and of seeing the buildings of that fine university. The people of Wyoming have every reason to have great pride in it.

I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I feel certain that the president of our university, Dr. G. D. Humphrey, who is a former resident of the State of Mississippi, and who has come to Wyoming and has become one of our outstanding citizens, keeps in close contact with the Senator from Mississippi. I am sure he would want the Senator from Mississippi to know that we appreciate his activities in our behalf. I am sure the Senator's acquaintanceship with Dr. Humphrey, a former resident of Mississippi, is, in part, responsible for his devotion to our university.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I am very proud of what Dr. Humphrey has done for my State and his home State through his services in former years as president of Mississippi State University. I take great pride, also, in his splendid achievements and outstanding record as president of the University of Wyoming, one of the leading institutions of our country.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I apologize to the Senator from Mississippi for further interrupting his speech, but I understand the present occupant of the Chair would like to have me make my comment now, so that I may relieve him.

I desire to commend the Senator from Mississippi for his comments on behalf of expanded programs for forest research. His leadership in evolving research facilities for better utilization of forest products, for control of insect and disease infestations of our forest, is well known in the Congress and among those engaged in forest management in my home State.

I am pleased to note that his proposal for new forest research projects includes a unit for silviculture and wildlife habitat research at Bend, in my home State of Oregon. It is my understanding that the city of Bend has donated a 10-acre site to the Forest Service for construction of facilities. Present quarters and research facilities are inadequate. I wish to commend the city of Bend for its generous action in helping to promote forest research. This aid is consistent with the work of the Bend Chamber of Commerce for improved reforestation programs. It is my hope that the sum of $150,000 can be secured in the near future so that the new research center can be established at Bend. It is important that action be taken soon, because the donation of land by the city has a reversion clause, whereby the property will go back to the city if not utilized by the Forest Service. I wish to extend my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for this keen interest in solving the many problems which affect forestry.

Mr. STENNIS. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is showing her usual keen interest as well as alertness in looking after matters which affect her great State. I am very proud to know of her interest in, as well as her knowledge of, the program which is proposed at Bend. That program will cost only $450,000. It is an illustration of the cooperation which exists between the local government and the Federal Government. As the Senator has mentioned, the city of Bend has offered or donated the ground and perhaps other facilities, while the Federal Government is taking the lead in the far-reaching program of experimentation and research in forestry.

Lest we get the figures out of balance, I have referred to these projects as costing such a small amount, but I point out, as I shall do again in my speech, that last year the records show that the income to the Treasury from the sale of forest products and related activities in the national forests was $747,200,000, while in the same year the actual full cost of all the operations of the Forest Service, including research and everything else, was $138,400,000. So the actual income is already considerably more than the total cost of the operation, including research and other activities.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a little less than a year ago, on February 8, I listened with rapt attention while the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi was unfolding the importance of the research program in forestry. I was very happy to associate myself with him then, and I do so again today.

I can think of few programs that are more useful, more valuable, and more nearly completely self-sustaining than this one.

As the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, this is not an expenditure; it is an investment. It is an investment of Federal funds which will return to the Treasury manifold the amount which was expended. Certainly the benefits will ramify in all directions, will create new industry, new products, and will provide additional employment. It is a national program.

Senator STENNIS has pointed out the advantages of research in the State of Mississippi—in the Deep South. A well-known hymn contains the line:

> From Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strands.

We have an analogy in the wide spread of this program—from Mississippi on

the Gulf of Mexico to sub-Arctic Alaska—in last year's proposal when the Alaska laboratory was eliminated in consequence of drastic cuts by the Bureau of the Budget. The relatively small sum of $250,000 had been provided to construct a research laboratory in the vast interior forests of Alaska which have hitherto been neglected. It is again in this year's program.

As those familiar with our National forest resources know, Alaska has two national forests along its southern coast, the Tongass and the Chugach, where there are great stands of virgin timber, mostly western hemlock, Sitka spruce, red and yellow cedar. But the vast interior, which covers an area larger than the combined areas of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, has timber resources of which we know comparatively little, and as to which little research has been done. Vast stands of black spruce, white spruce, cottonwood, birch, aspen, and tamarack are located there. For the purpose of developing these timber resources, of finding new uses for them, it is hoped that the laboratory near Fairbanks will again be included in the program. I hope that this year the program will be approved in its entirety and will not be cut down, as it was during the last administration. I hope the Alaska program will be operated in close conjunction with the University of Alaska, which is in that interior forest area and will be a very appropriate location for it. I am hopeful that if this program becomes a reality, a working arrangement for the research between the University of Alaska and the U.S. Forest Service may be established. Such a cooperative venture should be beneficial to both.

Let me say that even before the inauguration of this administration, I had written letters in support of this program to the then Secretary of Agriculture-designate, Mr. Orville Freeman, and to the Secretary of the Interior-designate, Mr. Stewart Udall, because although this is a forest research program, much of it in Alaska would be on the public domain, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and even more important, I wrote to the Director of the Budget-designate, David Bell; and if the Senator from Mississippi agrees, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, one of those letters and a statement I made last year in the Senate on February 9, 1960, in support of this forest research program.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I shall be glad to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for his remarks. He is unusually alert with respect to this program, as well as other programs in his State. I do not believe that this money could be better spent in any other State, for Alaska has one of the large areas of timber reserves and timber resources of our Nation. This program and this work apply to more than the standing trees; they also relate to future timber growth and future generations. So I thank the Senator from Alaska for his comments.

Mr. HART. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HART. I wish to join the other Senators in expressing appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for the leadership he has given in this effort. I suppose each of us represents a State which, in varying degree, sees the need for, and in many cases the urgency of, the action he suggests.

It is my privilege to sit on the Forestry Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We in northern Michigan have seen direct benefits accrue to a wide area in upper Michigan, by reason of the research laboratory there. The people of Michigan owe to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi a debt which I am happy to acknowledge. This laboratory's increased appropriation resulted largely from his efforts.

I most assuredly will continue to join him in seeking to persuade the Congress and the executive branch to recognize the importance of this effort and to achieve the obtainable goals he has outlined.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his valuable support of this entire program.

The Senator from Michigan has stated that he is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Let me say that he is a highly important member of the committee. This program is not new to him; but it is running way behind schedule. This is not a new venture. The need certainly exists, and is established; and every one of the facilities called for in this proposal has been approved by the National Forest Service. In fact, at my request the Service weighed the relative need for the facilities; and this proposed program is really based on the results of the Forest Service's program of intensive study, of several years ago. So all of this is authorized; we simply have not been able to obtain the necessary funds.

Let me say that of all the things that have come to my attention since I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee, one of the most difficult to understand has been our inability to provide these relatively small sums of money for a program which already is paying its own way.

Mr. HART. Madam President, I should like to make a further comment, although perhaps while I was out of the Chamber the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made this point, for I noticed that he was speaking when I entered the Chamber. He and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and I last week had a most encouraging meeting with the new Secretary of Agriculture, in regard to this matter.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, that is very encouraging news. My words were not critical of any Appropriations Committee in the past, of course. This program is really just getting underway for more thorough realization of this much needed work. I greatly appreciate the Senator's interest in it.

Madam President, I shall now proceed with my remarks, but I do not expect to keep the floor very much longer.

IMPROVED RESEARCH FACILITIES NEEDED

The $4 million increase I am proposing will provide, with what is already in the budget, for new or improved facilities at 20 locations. Senators would be interested in knowing that the few new research laboratories that recently have been built and put into operation have already shown some surprising dividends.

As I have said before to this body, forestry research has not been well provided for, over the years. I have seen men attempt to do complicated research with mediocre equipment in made-over barracks, shanties, or other improvised quarters built during the CCC days of the 1930's. Good men will not, and need not, work on jobs where scientific facilities are so limited. This is why I put emphasis on a carefully planned and gradual building program. We now have that plan, and I propose that we see to it that it is implemented.

Madam President, I see in the Chamber at this time the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. Some of the most fruitful, far-reaching, and most beneficial work in all forestry research for the Nation has been done in his State. In fact, the parent laboratory for all the genetics research for all types of pine originated in California, under the private grant of a single man who began the laboratory; and later the Federal Government was so impressed with what he had done that it took over the laboratory. I understand that this gentleman is still living in California, at the ripe age of 85 or 86. A few years ago I had some correspondence with him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi permit an interruption?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, I wish to salute my friend, the Senator from Mississippi. I do not know of any finer or more fruitful labor in the Congress than that which has been consistently performed by my good friend, the able Senator from Mississippi, in this most important field involving the forests of America, their protection and their preservation.

The able Senator from Mississippi is quite correct. The interest he has indicated in this subject is shared by the people of California. There we have great expanses of public land and beautiful forests. As recently as last fall, I saw great fires sweeping over parts of the areas owned by the Government of the United States. The verdant green was destroyed. A frightful loss ensued. What can be done by the Congress to

combat such destruction through proper legislation and appropriate techniques in developing control? The Senator points to the answer.

I wish to congratulate the Senator, not only on what he has done, but what he continues to do to promote this important cause.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from California.

Madam President, I have listed here four high priority construction projects and the amounts provided for in the budget estimate. I am also listing 16 additional projects which I strongly recommend should be included in the budget. All of these construction projects have been developed from the original forestry plan and from discussions with the scientists involved.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the items be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Forestry research construction

CONSTRUCTION INCLUDED IN BUDGET

Location	Research facilities	Estimated cost
1. Riverside, Calif.	Forest Fire Laboratory	$975,000
2. West Thornton, N.H.	Forest Watershed Management Laboratory	50,000
3. Gulfport, Miss.	Insectary for insect research	25,000
4. Grand Rapids, Minn.	Greenhouse and headhouse	25,000
Total for projects now in budget		1,075,000

ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROPOSED

5. Bozeman, Mont.	Forest and Range Management Laboratory	$175,000
6. Wenatchee, Wash.	Forest Soils and Hydrology Laboratory	300,000
7. Flagstaff, Ariz.	Ponderosa Pine Silviculture Laboratory	175,000
8. Moscow, Idaho	White Pine Disease and Silviculture Laboratory	300,000
9. Fairbanks, Alaska	Forest Protection and Silviculture Laboratory	350,000
10. Laramie, Wyo.	Range and Watershed Management Laboratory	150,000
11. Bend, Oreg.	Silviculture and Wildlife Management Laboratory	150,000
12. Bottineau, N. Dak.	Plains Shelterbelt Laboratory	130,000
13. Warren, Pa.	Forest Recreation and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory	200,000
14. Parsons, W. Va.	Watershed Management Laboratory	75,000
15. St. Paul, Minn.	Regional headquarters office and laboratories for Lake States Forest Experiment Station.	1,250,000
16. Madison, Wis.	Preplanning for expansion of Forest Products Laboratory and site acquisition.	300,000
17. Sewanee, Tenn.	Forest Soil and Silviculture Laboratory	125,000
18. Crossett, Ark.	Loblolly Pine Silviculture Laboratory	50,000
19. Olustee, Fla.	Greenhouse, insectary, and other minor research facilities	70,000
20. Alexandria, La.	Forestation and Protection Laboratory (remodel and equip building acquired from surplus).	200,000
Total for additional construction		4,000,000

FOREST AND RANGE MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, the increase proposed for research on production of timber, watershed, range, recreation, and wildlife habitat resource problems would strengthen work now underway but going ahead far too slowly in relation to the importance and difficulty of the problems.

I have already referred to the progress being made in forest tree improvement, but here is one productive field of research that needs speeding up.

The Congress is well aware of the water problems our Nation must face in the years ahead. Most of our water comes from forested lands. Some of our research is pointing the way to improving water yields and at the same time protecting the soil of the mountain watersheds.

The demands for timber, grazing, recreation, and other uses are mounting to levels where better methods of harmonizing these forest uses with the elements of good watershed practices must be developed.

I am not going to extend my speech on the need for looking ahead with reference to future needs of water, both fresh water and commercial water, as well as salt water, in the decades and centuries ahead; but I think it is one of the major problems that we face. This Nation is wasting time, or letting time run out, in preparing for the enormous increase in demands that are just around the corner with reference to water supply. We all know that protection of our forest lands is one of the major needs in connection not only with controlling water but saving it for use.

The rangelands in and adjacent to the forests support large numbers of domestic livestock and millions of game animals that depend on forage and browse. Research in forest recreation has much to accomplish.

FOREST PROTECTION RESEARCH

I am proposing a further increase of $623,000 for research on protecting forests from fire, insects, and disease. Perhaps in these problem areas we have seen some of the greatest dividends through research. We can all be proud of the Forest Service work in determining how to protect forests from these destructive forces that are no respecters of property or landownership. But we are still taking heavy losses from fire, insects, and disease—about 44 billion board feet of saw timber per year in mortality and growth losses—almost as much timber as we grow and normally use in a year.

FOREST PRODUCTS UTILIZATION RESEARCH

The further increase of $530,000 proposed for forest products utilization research would provide for intensification of research at the Forest Products Laboratory and the regional forest experiment stations on problems of developing new and improved uses for wood, especially for the low qualities and little-used species of timber.

FOREST ECONOMICS AND MARKETING RESEARCH

Finally, I suggest a further increase of $257,000 for forest economics studies and marketing research. The problems of the small forest ownership are still the key to significantly better management practices in the country today.

In conclusion, I want to make one point. I have proposed nothing spectacular. Rather, I am suggesting that we bring up to schedule a program that has been carefully prepared, discussed before, but only partially implemented.

To do this will require only an additional $6,500,000 over that contained in the budget estimate, or $8 million over last year's program. I believe Senators will agree that experience has shown research of this kind brings benefits many times greater than its cost. The benefits to the people of the United States from this forestry research will be great. This is truly a national program and one that will help keep this country's forest resources strong.

Again, I endorse entirely the full program as outlined heretofore before the Appropriations Committee by the U.S. Forest Service. I urge the immediate increase of $8 million for the National Forestry Research program, which I consider on an extreme emergency basis.

In fiscal year 1960, the U.S. Forest Service brought to the Federal Treasury, from the sale of forest products and related activities, the sum of $148,200,000. Most probably, the amount thus brought into the Treasury will increase from year to year. For the same year, fiscal year 1960, the total of appropriated funds for the U.S. Forest Service was $138,400,000. These are actual figures which show that the U.S. Forest Service now has an income from forest products and related matters far exceeding the amount appropriated for this agency. I anticipate that this will continue for many years to come.

Proper and adequate forestry research requires time, a great deal of time. Laboratories cannot be built overnight, nor can scientists, technicians, and other necessary personnel be assembled overnight. And it is no overnight job to plan a program and to conduct the long and tedious trial-and-error procedures so necessary. And even more time will be required to convert the beneficial results of research into practical realization in supplying and meeting our actual needs and in strengthening our economy.

Too much valuable time has already been lost. We cannot afford to lose another hour. We must preserve and put to better use what we now have. We must produce more and better products for the years ahead when we know the steady increase in population is certain to impose a tremendous burden on our natural resources. Within less than 15

years the population of the United States is expected to reach a total of 300 million. By the year 2000 our population is expected to reach 375 million. The growing demand for timber resources and for all other goods and services needed in the future from well-managed forest lands requires that we make adequate preparation now to meet these future demands.

We must begin to close the gap. There is no substitute for time in forestry research.

Over and over again, the U.S. Forest Service has proven it is doubly worthy of any mission assigned it by the Congress, given the necessary money to carry out the work. Among its many achievements has been outstanding pioneer work in the growth, management, and care of forests and forest lands so as to show to private owners of timberlands, large and small, the wisdom and value of modern management methods and practices. The U.S. Forest Service is staffed with dedicated personnel of proven worth and high morale, devoted to the great cause they serve.

Let us give to this program at least the minimum needs. We can thus insure that our forests will provide a fuller share than ever before of their goodness and bounty for our people and our way of life. And, our forests will continue—for all time to come—their unmatched contribution to the security and permanence of our great Nation. Our own generation, and all future generations, will be amply rewarded. And our Nation will be greatly strengthened.

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his longstanding efforts in behalf of additional research in the realm of his interest. As a colleague of his on the Committee on Appropriations, I can say that his efforts in this regard have always been one of the bright and refreshing elements in those sometimes tortuous deliberations.

I particularly commend the Senator on the proposal he is submitting today for an additional $150,000, to be added to the budget, for the range and watershed research laboratory at my university, the University of Wyoming, in my hometown of Laramie, Wyo. Additional space is needed there to do this type of work.

I should like to say again, in this same context, that the Senator from Mississippi has stood shoulder to shoulder with those of us from many parts of the Nation who have been trying to do everything possible not only to put the forests of the Nation completely to work in the national interest, but also to make sure that they will be available for uncounted years to come and for untold generations.

On the 19th of this month I wrote to the then President-elect Kennedy, to urge that the program for the national forests, as well as the appropriations for the National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management, be stepped up. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is now in the Chamber, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] joined me in this request and also signed my letter. We made this appeal to the President because we feel that in recent years this very worthwhile national interest has suffered from neglect, and because we have been going backward instead of forward. There is a $2 billion backlog of conservation work to be done on our national forest lands alone if we are to meet the demands for timber, water, and recreational opportunities which will be made upon us in the very near future by our expanding population.

I should like to call particular attention to the efforts initiated by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in setting up a meeting with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in order to state the urgency of this kind of approach.

Unemployment is at a level which we have not suffered since the days of the great depression. By making the supplemental appropriation of $50 million which we suggest during the fiscal year 1961, and by making the $92 million addition to the 1962 budget which we suggest, we shall be able to put thousands of people to work in the so-called depressed areas of the Nation. We estimate that there are few areas of expenditure in which such a large proportion of the money spent can be spent in the form of wages.

On January 23, we met with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to press our case. We are sincerely hopeful that our program will receive favorable consideration, and that it will form a part of the recommendation on natural resources which President Kennedy has promised us during the near future.

Again I commend the Senator from Mississippi for his initiative and his leadership in this situation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his words and also for his very fine and active effort in behalf of the national forestry program, and also with respect to the related programs that he has already mentioned, of land management, and other matters, which are so vital.

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that our letter to President Kennedy, as well as the budget proposals we have prepared, be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 19, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT-ELECT: The future of our Nation depends to a very significant extent upon the vigor with which we undertake the overall task of conserving our natural resources. Our ability to fulfill our international obligations and to maintain effectively the position of world leadership which we have already staked out, is inextricably tied to our willingness to meet the challenge of resource management on our 180 million acres of national forests, our 500 million acres of public domain and our 17 million acres of national parks.

This is a request that we move to meet this challenge.

The course is charted in the form of the well-documented program for the national forests, Project Twenty-Twelve of the Bureau of Land Management and Mission 66 of the National Park Service. The burden of bringing these programs to fruition falls heavily upon us now because of the default in meeting its conservation responsibility of the administration which is now coming to an end.

In addition, unemployment in the Nation is at a 20-year peak and there are severe economic problems besetting certain areas of the Nation due to long-continued chronic unemployment. This problem too, requires our considered attention. In the unfulfilled conservation needs upon our public forest lands, we have a way both to serve the cause of conservation and to meet the unemployment crisis.

In order to serve both these objectives, a supplemental increase of $50 million should be made in the 1961 budget for the Forest Service. The work to be stressed is outlined on the attached budget analysis. For the most part, these are activities which will provide the largest number of jobs for the unemployed per dollar spent. These moneys would be allocated heavily to performance of tasks in areas where chronic unemployment is so serious that the existence of large numbers of new unemployed wage-earners creates a real economic emergency.

A basic conservation need is to advance the program for the national forests speedily. This program calls for placing the budget level of the Forest Service at $320,600,000 by the fiscal year 1965. It is already lagging. It is to correct for this that it is proposed to add, in fiscal year 1962, $91,959,000 to the funds which are available now and to those suggested as a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1961. The Forest Service's budget level would thus become $285,160,000 in 1962 compared to the $143,201,000 now available. The final step would be to reach the $320,600,000 level in fiscal year 1963.

With heavy emphasis on areas of chronic distress and underdevelopment, this program would create the opportunity to move ahead with long overdue conservation measures. The almost $2 billion backlog of national forest conservation work would be accomplished on a timely basis.

For the Bureau of Land Management and the Park Service, modest but essential increases are suggested for fiscal year 1962. The locations of the lands managed by these agencies is not such that they are as readily capable of giving positive assistance in combating chronic unemployment in the areas which now pose the gravest problems.

The lands of the Bureau of Land Management in particular, however, need special conservation improvement if they are to fulfill the functions which they must in the growth of America's economy.

We represent States which contain a very significant portion of the lands upon which these developments would be undertaken. We feel, however, that this overall program constitutes an indispensable contribution to the building of an American economy sufficient to the burdens it will be called upon to bear in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senator.
ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.
PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senator.
GALE W. McGEE,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, proposed fiscal year 1962 budget [1]

	Maximum level needed	Actual funds, 1961	Supplement needed for year 1961	Increase over 1961 revised	Total need, 1962	Fiscal year, 1963
National forest protection and utilization:						
Forest land management:						
National forest protection and management:						
Timber resource management:						
Sales administration and management	$26,786,000	$20,175,000	0	$1,825,000	$22,000,000	[2]
Reforestation and stand improvement	40,997,000	4,430,000	$23,000,000	13,570,000	41,000,000	[2]
Recreation, public use	30,712,000	14,595,000	6,000,000	9,905,000	30,500,000	[2]
Wildlife habitat management	7,033,000	1,535,000	2,000,000	1,965,000	5,500,000	[2]
Range resource management:						
Management	6,820,000	3,145,000	0	1,055,000	4,200,000	[2]
Revegetation	3,453,000	1,770,000	1,500,000	730,000	4,000,000	[2]
Improvements [1]	4,779,000	2,150,000	500,000	1,850,000	4,500,000	[2]
Soil and water management	10,611,000	2,078,000	6,000,000	5,422,000	13,500,000	[2]
Mineral claims, leases and other land uses	11,470,000	4,684,000	1,000,000	2,816,000	8,500,000	[2]
Land utilization projects	3,258,000	1,225,000	1,000,000	675,000	2,900,000	[2]
Forest fire protection	28,778,000	14,887,000	7,000,000	5,813,000	27,700,000	[2]
Structural improvement for fire and general purposes	18,493,000	9,740,000	0	8,260,000	18,000,000	[2]
Rehabilitation of burns	[3]	1,050,000	0	150,000	1,200,000	[2]
Total, national forest protection and management	193,190,000	81,464,000	0	54,036,000	135,500,000	[2]
Fighting Forest Fires [4]	[3]	5,000,000	0	0	5,000,000	[2]
Insect and disease control:						
White pine blister rust control	2,500,000	3,265,000	0	0	3,300,000	[2]
Other pest control	6,500,000	3,780,000	0	2,420,000	6,200,000	[2]
Subtotal, insect and disease control	9,000,000	7,045,000	0	2,455,000	[5] 9,500,000	[2]
Acquisition of lands (Weeks Act)	100,000	100,000	3,000,000	0	3,100,000	[2]
Total, forest land management	202,290,000	93,609,000	50,000,000	56,491,000	200,100,000	202,290,000
Forest research:						
Forest and range management research	12,873,000	8,260,000	0	3,240,000	11,500,000	0
Forest protection research	5,441,000	3,004,000	0	1,596,000	4,600,000	0
Forest products utilization research	6,828,000	3,353,000	0	1,647,000	5,000,000	0
Forest resources research	2,158,000	2,140,000	0	560,000	2,700,000	0
Forest research construction	6,000,000	1,075,000	0	9,925,000	[6] 11,000,000	0
Total, forest research	33,300,000	17,832,000	0	16,968,000	34,800,000	33,300,000
Forest roads and trails:						
Construction and maintenance [7]	85,000,000	30,000,000	0	15,000,000	45,000,000	0
Purchase of access roads	[8]	1,000,000	0	4,000,000	5,000,000	0
Acquisition of lands, special acts, and for Superior National Forest	10,000	760,000	0	−500,000	260,000	0
Grand total	320,600,000	143,201,000	50,000,000	91,959,000	285,160,000	320,600,000

[1] Includes $700,000 cooperative range improvements indefinite appropriation.
[2] All programs to be at maximum annual level set forth in col. 1.
[3] Amount depends on fire damage each year.
[4] A token appropriation balance supplied by deficiency.
[5] Includes $1,881,800 chargeable to cooperative programs with private land owners.
[6] For the construction of a new Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., plus research facilities at: Durham-Raleigh, N.C.; Riverside, Calif.; Warren, Pa.; Carbondale, Ill.; St. Paul, Minn.; Hubbard Brooks, N.H.; Wenatchee, Wash.; Boise, Idaho; Fairbanks, Alaska; Flagstaff, Ariz.; Bottineau, N.Dak.; Corvallis, Oreg.; and Stoneville, Miss.
[7] Includes $1,743,000 for research on problems affecting private forest land.
[8] Included above.

Bureau of Land Management

	Actual funds, 1961	Increase needed to meet conservation needs	Proposed, 1962		Actual funds, 1961	Increase needed to meet conservation needs	Proposed, 1962
Lease and disposal of land and mineral resources	$7,843,100	$1,956,900	$9,800,000	Maintenance of physical facilities	$50,000	$50,000	$100,000
Management of grazing lands	2,912,300	1,387,700	4,300,000	Weed control	791,200	1,808,800	2,600,000
Forestry	5,832,500	2,167,500	8,000,000	General administration	1,542,200	257,800	1,800,000
Cadastral surveys	2,801,200	2,698,800	5,500,000	Construction (exclusive of indefinite appropriations)	350,000	3,650,000	4,000,000
Soil and moisture conservation	5,202,500	2,297,500	7,500,000				
Fire suppression	400,000	0	400,000	Grand total	27,725,000	16,275,000	44,000,000

NOTE.—This is a long-range program for this agency named "Project Twenty-Twelve". Detail figures are not available but the first year forecast for a budget to meet conservation needs is $50,000,000. The outgoing administration will probably seek a $10,000,000 income over 1961. Heavy stress is placed upon land management program to strengthen conservation needs through investment.

National Park Service

	Actual funds, 1961	Increase needed to meet conservation needs	Proposed, 1962		Actual funds, 1961	Increase needed to meet conservation needs	Proposed, 1962
Management and protection, National Park Service:				General administration	$1,581,000	$119,000	$1,700,000
1. Management of parks and other areas	$15,583,000	$1,917,000	$17,500,000	Construction:			
2. Forestry and fire control	1,043,000	207,000	1,250,000	1. Building and utilities	18,523,000	6,477,000	25,000,000
3. Soil and moisture conservation	106,000	94,000	200,000	2. Acquisition of land and water rights	2,705,000	795,000	3,500,000
4. Park and recreation program	2,442,000	558,000	3,000,000	3. Roads:			
5. Concession audit and management	396,000	104,000	500,000	Parkways	14,000,000	8,000,000	22,000,000
				Roads and trails	16,000,000	8,000,000	24,000,000
Subtotal	19,570,000	2,880,000	22,450,000	Subcost	51,228,000	23,272,000	74,500,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities:				Grand total	87,577,000	28,073,000	115,650,000
1. Roads and trails	6,452,000	548,000	7,000,000				
2. Building and utilities	8,746,000	1,254,000	10,000,000				
Subtotal	15,198,000	1,802,000	17,000,000				

NOTE.—There is a long range program for the national parks "Mission 66" now in its 5th year but substantially behind the investment schedule. The agency budget of the outgoing administration will probably be $5,000,000 above last year but this amount is well below funds needed, especially for construction items. The proposed budget would grant an increase of $28,073,000 to bring Mission 66 on to its schedule.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] could not be here today. He is interested in this program. I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter from him to the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, relating to this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
January 31, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When the Forest Service announced in 1959 its "Program for the National Forests" we in Alaska were greatly heartened as we felt at long last that research on the neglected interior forests of Alaska could be inaugurated. Valiant efforts were made following the announcement of that program to obtain funds for the establishment of an office-laboratory for timber and fire protection research at Fairbanks, Alaska, estimated to cost $250,000.

The budget for the 1961 fiscal year, as I recall, included approximately $1 million for three forest research construction projects in the country, one in North Carolina, another in Oregon and a third in Mississippi. The Alaska project was not included nor is it found in President Eisenhower's 1962 fiscal year budget of $1,075,000 for research construction in various other areas.

As you know, the Forest Service has jurisdiction over close to 21 million acres of coastal forests in Alaska. These, however, are not the only forest areas of the 49th State.

The coastal national forest areas of Alaska have been contrasted with the forest areas of interior Alaska by the Forest Service. In its book "Timber Resources for the Future" the Forest Service reports that:

"Interior Alaska has a commercial forest area almost as large as that of Oregon and Washington. It has about one-half as much timber volume in cubic feet as the State of Washington and about 60 percent as much board-foot volume of sawtimber. Timber cut is only a fraction of 1 percent of current growth.

"Total timber resources of interior Alaska are substantially greater than these of coastal Alaska. Although per acre timber volumes are much greater in the heavier stands along the coast, interior Alaska has about 10 times as much commercial forest area and about twice as much timber volume as found in coastal Alaska."

Yet so little is known about the forests of interior Alaska, and they are so inaccessible at the present time, that the Forest Service, in "Timber Resources for the Future" excluded interior Alaska from its general analysis of the American forest picture. However, the Service did comment in the book about the problems of interior Alaska's forests—fire, insects, disease, underutilization, inaccessibility.

Funds which would make possible a Forest Service facility at Fairbanks in the nature of a forest products laboratory and forest experiment station would help to unlock the mysteries of the great interior Alaska forests and would assist America to prepare for the timber consumption challenges of the years ahead.

Such a facility would deal with a renewable resource which would never become exhausted if properly cared for. We need the research facility, however, to do the job which desperately needs to be done. The area which would be served by such an Alaska facility covers an estimated 100 million acres, the principal species of timber there being white spruce, white birch and cottonwood.

I urge that sufficient funds on the order of $350,000 be requested for the facility itself and for whatever personnel would be needed to start the desired program on its way.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am most grateful to my eminent colleague from Mississippi for yielding to me at this time. It is a privilege to participate in discussion of the very splendid program which my friend has sponsored again and again in his capacity as an individual Senator and as one who is especially knowledgeable in the subject matter. I regret I was unable to reach the Chamber earlier, because, with his customary graciousness, the Senator had advised me of the speech he was to give this afternoon.

I made an attempt to be present throughout his address.

In my home city of Elkins, W. Va., the headquarters of the Monongahela National Forest is located. During the time I was privileged to have the responsibility of serving in the U.S. House of Representatives, I took an intense interest in the development of the vast domain which now constitutes that important forest area.

There is necessity now, perhaps to a greater degree than ever before, to carry on meaningful programs of research in the development and expansion of forest products.

I observe that my genial friend from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is present in the Senate. I point out that, in my home county of Randolph, in the year 1960, one lumber company produced raw timber worth $750,000, which was sold to one furniture manufacturer in North Carolina. It would have made me very happy if this lumber could have been transformed into finished furniture in West Virginia. But it was shipped to North Carolina, in this instance, by one producer of the timber from commercial forests to one manufacturer in the State of North Carolina.

We are constantly apprised of the problem of industry growth in West Virginia. We trust that improved marketing will result from the development of our highways and that we may carry on a natural development of our products, rather than see them shipped to North Carolina, for example, for the manufacture of furniture and other items fashioned from timber. We hope that in our own State, near the source of supply, we may have the establishment of plants on an orderly basis to produce certain products we believe we, as well as North Carolina, can successfully manufacture.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the effort which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is carrying on so assiduously will be joined in by other Members of this body.

I pledge my labors to the end that research in the field of forest products will function to a greater degree than in the past.

FORESTS OFFER OPPORTUNITIES TO EXPAND INDUSTRIAL ECONOMY

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, many States of the East are confronted not only with exploding populations, but, also, they are running out of land for recreation purposes. Expanding suburban areas, highway development and other land-encompassing activities place a premium on available sites for camping, hiking, skiing, hunting, and fishing.

West Virginia is more blessed with natural resources than many of the heavily populated Eastern States. Forest covered mountains, outstanding scenery, adequate sources of water, miles of rivers and streams, abundant wildlife and an unmatched climate are major assets.

But our first need is to understand and appreciate the real assets we have, then move to develop and use them more intensely.

The forests of West Virginia offer excellent opportunities to expand the industrial economy of the State. Two-thirds of the State's land is forested. Jobs from new wood-using industries could well take up much of the slack in employment resulting from declining coal production and mine mechanization.

However, if West Virginia is to capitalize on its natural resources, both as a result of becoming a recreational center of the East and through additional industry, a greatly stepped-up program of forest research and conservation practices is essential. Forest fires must be eliminated. Cutting of timber must be accomplished under more scientific methods, and thousands of acres of now burned-over or cut-over lands must be planted to trees.

Nature evidently intended West Virginia's mountains to be permanently under forest cover because over two-thirds of the State slopes at gradients in excess of 25 percent; more than a quarter has 40 percent slopes or greater.

Keeping these slopes protected with trees is essential to hold the soil and protect the watershed. There are many mountain streams in West Virginia and no less than six important rivers. Yet, streamflow and water supplies fluctuate. Serious fires damage important watersheds so that rivers run low in summer, while concentration of mining and other industries in the narrow valleys results too frequently in pollution of the streams.

A sound conservation program to reforest our lands and protect our watersheds will result in more game and fish—and more hunting and fishing opportunities will greatly increase West Virginia's attraction as a tourist and recreation center.

But, without proper management and protection, our natural resources will continue to dwindle and our opportunity to capitalize on the State's wonderful natural beauty will be lost.

BUILD UP PRIVATELY OWNED NATURAL RESOURCE VALUES

For 10 years in the early part of the century West Virginia forests provided

over a billion board feet of lumber annually. And it was as fine a quality of hardwood as was produced anywhere. While most of the old growth, virgin timber has been cut, the potential for growing good timber still exists. The forest soils in most of the State are rich; the climate is good for trees, and the growing seasons are long.

About 10 million acres of land in West Virginia are capable of growing commercial timber. The latest studies of forest growth in the State showed that these forest lands were growing only 908 million board feet of sawtimber a year, about 92 board feet per acre annually. The woodlands are capable of growing several times that amount, and, by proper timber management, we eventually should be able to harvest 3 or more billion board feet each year in place of the average of 650 million board feet cut in recent years.

Today many of the forests of West Virginia are understocked with good timber and overstocked with trees for which there is little or no market. There are 4¼ million acres of forest in need of treatment to improve the growth of potentially valuable trees.

There are over half a million acres unstocked or so poorly stocked with trees that artificial means are necessary to put them into production. When timber is harvested, it must be done under sound silvicultural practices so that valuable, not worthless, trees will promptly restock the area. We are losing vast quantities of potential timber every year to destructive agents, principally diseases, insects, and fires.

These conditions have all been known for a long time—but too little has been done about them. The public and private efforts so far have only scratched the surface in correcting the undesirable conditions. More than 90 percent of the commercial forest land in West Virginia is privately owned; 66 percent of the private land is in 133,000 ownerships of under 500 acres each.

The hardwoods which our mountains will produce so well are valuable primarily for sawtimber or veneer. They can be used for pulpwood, and other small-sized products, but it so happens that such small-sized hardwoods are a drug on the market nearly everywhere. New industries to utilize this present growth are needed.

POSSIBLE FOREST-BASED INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Production of pulp and paper offers one of the major opportunities for further development of wood-using industries in West Virginia. In spite of the rapid growth of markets for pulp and paper, and the availability of suitable timber resources, West Virginia is one of the very few States still without pulp and paper mills. Large plants in adjoining States—at Luke, Md., and Covington, Va., for example—depend largely on hardwood pulpwood similar to that available in generous quantities in West Virginia.

Other factors, such as water supply, transportation facilities, and nearness to major consumer markets likewise are favorable to development of the pulp and paper industry in West Virginia. From the standpoint of timber supply, several large pulp and paper mills could readily be supported in the State, each providing as many as 1,000 workers in the woods and mills and even larger numbers in indirect employment.

Opportunities also exist for various other types of new or enlarged wood-using plants, such as for the manufacture of hardboard or particle board to use a portion of the available timber supply.

More local employment also might be developed, for example, through greater local remanufacture of lumber now shipped to out-of-State markets. This could include the local manufacture of furniture or furniture parts, hardwood flooring, pallets, or other partially fabricated products used in various manufacturing industries or in construction.

Such expansion of forest industries will require capital for new or more efficient plants, and will require capable management, as well as more effective and concentrated marketing efforts.

IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO WEST VIRGINIA

The Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture manages and protects 904,056 acres of national forest lands in West Virginia—the Monongahela National Forest and part of the George Washington National Forest. With stepped-up development, as envisioned in the Federal Government's program for the national forests, these forests could contribute much more to West Virginia's economy.

The Monongahela National Forest has been named the birthplace of rivers, and rightly so, because the headwaters of the Ohio and the Potomac rise within its boundaries. Many other streams that feed the Potomac rise within the George Washington National Forest.

National forests are managed for best use of all the resources and, therefore, play an important role in the economy of the State. The Monongahela National Forest provides an estimated 2 billion gallons of water daily—enough to fulfill the needs of 14 million people. Other resources are harvested in such a manner as not to interfere with the regularity of stream flow; that is, only selected mature timber is cut and logging roads are laid out so as not to cause erosion.

Mature timber from the forests provides sawmills, furniture plants, steel mills, and mines with a part of their needs. The timber harvest has increased from 8,751,000 board feet in 1950 to 27,094,000 board feet in 1960. It is estimated that during the next 10 years 35 million board feet could be cut annually under sustained yield scientific practices.

The present harvest furnishes about 160,000 man-days of work a year to forest and factory employees who cut and process the material. Increased harvest means more jobs.

The Forest Service also protects the timber against fire, insect infestations, and disease epidemics. Likewise, the Forest Service has helped nature increase timber production by planting 15,000 acres of burned and cutover land, mostly to pine and spruce. To afford some idea of what this can mean, the Clover Run white pine plantation within the Monongahela National Forest is growing at the rate of nearly 1,000 board feet per acre per year compared to a statewide average of less than 100 board feet per acre. Planting not only provides timber for tomorrow's industries, but stabilizes the water runoff.

West Virginia's national forest land offers a variety of recreation opportunities which bring tourist dollars to the State. Since World War II, annual recreation visits have jumped from 140,399 to 1,047,500. In the Monongahela National Forest the Forest Service has preserved such areas as Cranberry Glades with its arctic tundra, orchids, and cranberries which make it a botanists' wonderland. Other areas are now being developed such as the Smoke Hole, providing an up-to-date picnic ground where oldtime residents who have left the valley gather for a reunion each Fourth of July.

In cooperation with the State, the Forest Service has improved hunting and fishing in the forests. About 169,300 of the recreation visits to West Virginia national forests were for fishing and 351,400 for hunting. The money collected from each hunter and fisherman using the national forests has been used to build lakes and stabilize streambanks. To aid hunters, primitive camp units have been established at such places as Dolly Sods.

Local roads and schools benefit from the national forests. Twenty-five percent of the receipts from timber sales, natural gas royalties, grazing fees, and special land uses goes to counties in which the forests are located. Last year—fiscal 1960—$175,791.80 was divided among the 11 Monongahela National Forest counties—Grant, Greenbrier, Hampshire, Hardy, Nicholas, Pendleton, Pocahontas, Preston, Randolph, Tucker, and Webster. An additional 10 percent of the $703,000 total receipts was allocated for expenditure on national forest roads and trails.

The Forest Service conducts research in the management, marketing, and utilization of West Virginia timber through the northeastern forest experiment station located at Elkins and Upper Darby, Pa. During recent years guidelines have been developed for improved management of the mountain hardwood forests to increase both yields and quality of timber crops. Research in measures to control erosion on logging areas is of particular importance. Technicians from the northeastern station also are studying possibilities for further industrial development based on the 10 million acres of productive forest land in the State. These studies include an inventory of all forest lands to provide detailed information regarding West Virginia's forest resources by counties or other local jurisdictions; investigations of possible improvements in processing and marketing practices that would lead to greater efficiency and wider markets for locally produced forest products; and appraisals of the feasibility of establishing new plants and expanding

wood-using industries based on West Virginia timber resources. Research results are passed on to forest managers, landowners, and industry through demonstrations and publications.

A PROGRAM TO ACCELERATE NATIONAL FOREST RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, it is my judgment that an intensified buildup of national forest resources in West Virginia, as in other States, would be a sound investment and a substantial boost to the economy. From a stepped up improvement program would come more jobs—and what State needs new employment opportunities any more than does West Virginia. Likewise, such a program would mean enhancement of recreation and tourist attractions, and it would bring about a long-term increase in the capital value of the State's vital resource—its forests.

Such increased development has been projected in the Federal Government's program for the national forests, calling for accelerated work in these public forests.

It will be my purpose to propose to appropriate authorities within a few days some immediate and long-range possibilities within the Government's program for the national forests which could be highly beneficial to West Virginia and other States with surplus labor markets and conditions of economic distress.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his very timely remarks. I know of the Senator's interest in and alertness toward programs which affect his State.

I am reminded of a very practical illustration in this regard. There is not a great acreage owned by the Forest Service in my State, but some land was purchased in the early 1930's. Two years ago I drove from Hattiesburg, Miss., to Biloxi, Miss., a distance of about 80 miles, and went through one of the national forests. In the area of 80 miles we passed 27 industrial units of one kind or another, which extended from a small pulpwood gathering point to a modern electric sawmill. There were 27 different manufacturing plants of one kind or another using raw material from the national forest, although a generation before that had been totally wasteland.

This is an illustration of the industrial payroll, the provision of livelihood, which will come as a result of proper forestry practices.

Madam President, no discussion of this subject would be complete unless we mention and also thank the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The continued fruits, for many years to come, of his vision and leadership in the field of forestry research is just one of the many achievements of his during his years of constructive service here.

EXHIBIT A

JANUARY 17, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture-Designate,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On February 8 and 9 last, Senator STENNIS and others, including myself, discussed a very valuable program for forest research and development which had actually originated in the Forest Service and had been submitted to the Congress by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson. It called for the initial expenditure of $6 million. But the Bureau of the Budget, which was supreme in the last administration, slashed this program to $1,780,400, less than one-third, with the result that the greater part of it was eliminated.

I am vitally concerned with this program's authorization and appropriation therefor during this session of the Congress. As was pointed out on the floor during the last session, this is not an expenditure—it is an investment which will return the amount expended many fold.

My particular concern, apart from the great value of the whole program, is that among the eight laboratories which it proposed for forest research in such diverse States as North Carolina, Oregon, Mississippi, California, Arizona, New Hampshire, Michigan, and North Dakota, there was also a moderate amount—$250,000—requested for a forest research laboratory near Fairbanks in Alaska. The significance of this location is that for the first time in history a serious effort was proposed to study the potentialities of the vast interior forests of Alaska. These are not part of the two national forests in Alaska, the Tongass and the Chugach, and in consequence of these areas not being specifically designated as forest areas, there has been both neglect and lack of knowledge of these vast timber stands of white and black spruce, birch, tamarack, cottonwood, and aspen. So although this program would seem not directly to concern the National Forest Service in the sense that jurisdiction of these areas in Alaska is under the Department of the Interior, except for some of these lands that sooner or later may be selected by the State, it is a program which is of vital concern, I am sure, to the National Forest Service, which will conduct it.

I am therefore hopeful that you will give your fullest support to the necessary budgetary recommendation. A full account of what this program means is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 2, pages 2165–2172, with a followup in volume 106, part 2, pages 2327–2329. For your convenience, I am enclosing herewith the pages of the RECORD just referred to.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING.

FORESTRY: THE ADMINISTRATION SLASHES OUR NEEDS DRASTICALLY AT HOME BUT SPENDS LAVISHLY ABROAD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] our able colleague, presented a forceful and eloquent plea for a comprehensive American forestry program. It was a program for forest and range management research, a program for forest protection research, a program for forest products utilization, a program for forest resources research. It is a sorely needed program for the conservation, amplification, and fuller utilization of one of the Nation's most basic and vital resources, namely, our timber and wood products.

Our able colleague, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] went into illuminating detail on the vital reasons for this overdue program, a program nationwide in scope and nationwide in its benefits. I do not propose to repeat the telling reasons which he gave for this imperative national need, but I recommend his speech to our colleagues and to the Nation generally.

Now, it should be pointed out that it is not primarily Senator STENNIS' program, although he has presented it with the endorsement of his wide experience in this important field, and with his keen concern for proper conservation and extension of the wise use of this great and potentially greater, national forestry resource. The fact is that this program originated in the Federal agency, the Forest Service, and was submitted by the Cabinet member who heads the Department of Agriculture, which includes the Forest Service.

Secretary Ezra Taft Benson officially sponsored this fine program and gave it the endorsement and backing which his position as the head of the Department of Agriculture connotes.

For the application of this program, for the construction and equipment of research facilities in North Carolina, in Oregon, in California, in Arizona, in New Hampshire, in North Dakota, in Michigan, in Mississippi, and in Alaska—widely scattered and diverse forestry areas—and for their operation and staffing, $6 million was requested by the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1961—the year starting next July 1.

It is not a large sum. Indeed, it is a modest amount, considering the tangible beneficial results that will accrue. It should be considered not an expenditure, but an investment. It is an investment that will be returned to the Nation many times, and over and over again. It will increase the supply of wood products, it will widen their use, it will move toward meeting the multiple needs of our exploding population. It will tend to lessen the steadily mounting costs of one of the essential materials used in construction, in furnishings, and in a hundred synthetic products derived from wood.

Mr. President, what happened to that program? What happened to the request of the head of one of this administration's major departments, the Department of Agriculture?

I will tell the Senators. The request of the President's Secretary of Agriculture for $6 million was cut down in the President's budget to $1,780,400. It was cut to less than one-third of the amount requested and needed.

Now let us consider this interesting conflict within the body and bosom of this administration. The head of one of its major departments presents an essential, wise, and indeed long overdue program for conservation and development of a basic natural resource, a renewable resource if wisely administered, an expandable resource, if the necessary research is supplied under the proposed program.

But another branch of the same administration, the dominating branch as we are increasingly discovering, the Bureau of the Budget, slashes the program by 70.33 percent or to only 29.67 percent of amount requested.

Mr. President, it becomes my duty to point out again in this field, as I have in other fields, the striking disparity and contrast between the President's attitude toward programs and projects for the American people and his attitude toward the same kinds of programs and projects in foreign countries for the benefit of the people of those foreign nations.

On last Wednesday during the course of the debate on the bill to aid education in the United States, and again on Thursday, the day following, I asked the minority leader, who so ably represents the administration's point of view, and on this occasion so emphatically represented it in opposition to Federal aid to teachers' salaries, whether he would also oppose Federal aid for teachers' salaries in the foreign aid program. I did not get an answer, although I asked the question three times. Obviously, it could have been embarrassing for the able junior Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, to admit the patent and to me shocking fact that this administration, from President Eisenhower down, and including, of course, the Vice President, who cast the deciding vote against the Clark amendment for Fed-

eral aid for teachers' salaries, is taking the position that while we must cut drastically at home, we must spend lavishly abroad. The Eisenhower-Nixon administration, Mr. President, will go down in history as the first administration that put the interest of the foreign nation ahead of the interest of our own.

For, Mr. President, we have, again and again, under this administration, in every field of human endeavor, seen the slash in domestic programs either by veto or threat of veto or by the vote of the Republican Members, coupled with the injunction that we must not cut a nickel from foreign aid.

We have heard it again and again. We have seen it again and again. We now see it and shall see it in the field of forestry. The administration's budgeteers have cut the administration's own forest program by more than two-thirds. If it is to be restored, it will have to be done by the Democratic Congress.

Now let us contrast what the Eisenhower administration has asked in the field of forestry, for foreign countries. That we have been told must not be cut. Of course, we do not yet know what the administration will ask for foreign countries in forestry for fiscal 1961. But we can judge what we will be asked to approve by looking at what this administration has asked and secured in the past—with, I repeat, the injunction that it must not be cut.

Let us start with fiscal year 1955 projects, agriculture, and natural resources. I shall read down the line. There are 30 items in foreign countries:

FAR EAST

China: Logging operations improvement, $355,000.

Laos: Development of lumber industry, $134,000.

Philippines: Forest management and forest products laboratory, $325,000.

Vietnam: Reforestation and erosion control, $92,500.

Regional: Study of U.S. mechanical extraction of timber by J. O. Egerton, of Malaya, $3,160.

NEAR EAST, AFRICA, AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Tropical forestry training, Puerto Rico, $15,000.

Iran: Forestry and conservation, $81,238.

Jordan: Afforestation and watershed protection, $500,000.

Lebanon: Range management and forestry, $36,000.

Liberia: Forest conservation, $69,500.

Libya: Forestry, Tripolitania, $13,875; forestry, Cyrenaica, $33,905.

Pakistan: East Pakistan Forest Research Laboratory, $78,600; Chittagong Hill Tracts timber extraction, $254,660.

Turkey: Forest range and watershed management, $1,500; forestry, $30,800.

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

United Kingdom: Forestry program, $63,500.

The United Kingdom seems to be fairly prosperous, but we are endowing its forestry program to the extent of $63,500.

EUROPE

Spain: Organization and methods for the prevention and control of forest fires and forest pests, $4,032; forestry-range management, $4,032; use of mechanical equipment in forestry, $4,032; forest utilization and products, $4,032.

YUGOSLAVIA

Third country training—Forestry practices and policies, $4,800.

Yugoslavia is not quite behind the Iron Curtain, but for that country, managed by a dictator, we are inculcating forestry practices and policies to the extent of $4,800.

LATIN AMERICA

Chile: Reforestation, soil and water conservation in the area development program, lands and colonization, $19,500.

Colombia: National forestry experiment station, $13,378.

Costa Rica: Forestry development and conservation, $13,881.

Guatemala: Tropical forestry training course—this is a modest amount—only $629.

Haiti: Technical assistance in forestry, $8,900.

Mexico: Tropical forestry course, $2,175.

Paraguay: Forestry, $14,324.

Peru: Agriculture and natural resources, $2,480.

So in the fiscal year 1955 we expended for 30 items in foreign countries a total of $2,184,427; in other words, substantially more than this administration is willing to give our own great nationwide program in this year.

Now let us talk about the fiscal year 1956.

FAR EAST

China (Taiwan): Forestry, JCRR, $63,000; RETSER forestry, $60,000; forest policies and management plans, JCRR, $25,000.

Korea: Forestry development, $112,000.

Laos: Development of lumber industry, $200,000.

Philippines: Forest management and Forest Products Laboratory, $155,000.

Vietnam: Reforestation and erosion control, $76,130.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Greece: Training in forestry, $10,290.

Iran: Forestry and conservation, $53,068.

Jordan: Forest management, $40,000; afforestation and watershed protection, $37,000.

Lebanon: Range management and forestry, $17,000.

Pakistan: Chittagong hill tracts timber extraction project, $169,630.

Turkey: Forestry development, $36,650.

AFRICA

Liberia: Forest conservation, $78,980.

Libya: Forestry, Cyrenaica, $145,400; forestry, Tripolitania, $104,400.

EUROPE

Spain: Forest utilization and products, $3,000; forestry, $24,840; forestry range management specialists, $12,900; reforestation mechanization specialist, $4,000.

Yugoslavia: Forestry, $27,076.

LATIN AMERICA

Chile: Chilean-American Agreement for a Program of Silviculture Assistance, Corfo, $33,500; reforestation, soil and water conservation in the area development program, lands and colonization, $25,000; reforestation, soil and water conservation in the area development program, lands and colonization, $21,950.

Colombia: National forestry experiment station, $17,600.

Guatemala: Fifth international tropical forestry course in Costa Rica, $490.

Haiti: Technical assistance in forestry, $12,851.

Paraguay: Forestry, $24,812.

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

Miscellaneous dots: Tropical forestry training in Puerto Rico, $5,500.

Regional total: Regional forestry specialist, Panama, $15,900.

Total, 1956, $1,612,967.

This is a trifle less than we are willing to give the United States for its program this year.

FAR EAST

Cambodia: Forest resources development, $20,000.

China: TA Shu Shan logging operations, $481,000; forestry, $82,000; forest policies and management plans, $18,000; forestation and tree gum, $40,000.

Korea: Forestry development, $168,000.

Laos: Conservation and development of forest resources, $44,000.

Philippines: Forest management and Forest Products Laboratory, $46,000.

Vietnam: Reforestation and erosion control, $13,000.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Iran: Range and forest management, $56,000; project for contributing to the completion of forest surveys in Iran, $151,000.

Pakistan: East Pakistan Forest Research Laboratory, $165,000; Chittagong Hill Tracts timber extraction project, $270,000.

Turkey: Forestry development, $355,000.

AFRICA

Liberia: Forest conservation, $59,000.

Libya: Forestry, $23,000; forestry, $196,000.

Under the heading "Oversea Territories" we find Somalia. Somalia is a little former Italian colony that is about to become independent. It is still not entirely free from the apron strings of its mother country, but Uncle Sam feels it is incumbent upon him to help this little nation. I wonder why the mother country cannot take care of it meanwhile.

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

Somalia: Forestry development, $3,000.

United Kingdom: U.S. dry-zone silviculturist to Nyasaland, $27,000.

Nyasaland is also still a British colony. Why the mother country cannot take care of its children before it cuts them loose, and why Uncle Sam has to rush in, I fail to understand.

EUROPE

Spain: Forestry demonstrations, $41,000; reforestation mechanical specialists, $4,000; forage and range management demonstration, $16,000.

Yugoslavia: Forestry, $38,000.

LATIN AMERICA

Chile: Reforestation, soil and water conservation in the area development program, $13,000; reforestation, soil and water conservation in the area development program, $22,000.

Haiti: Technical advisory assistance to Societe Haitiano-Americanne de Developpement Agricole, $12,000.

Paraguay: Forestry, $15,000.

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

British Guiana: Preliminary forest survey project, $2,000.

Total, 1957, $2,380,000.

So, for the third time, we are spending more in 1 year for forestry programs in foreign countries than this administration is willing to grant our own country.

In the Far East we have a new candidate, Burma, which for a long time refused our aid, but has now weakened, under the insistence of the United States that aid be extended to that country.

Fiscal year 1958 projects:

FAR EAST

Burma: Forestry, timber extraction, $690,000.

Cambodia: Forestry resources development, $135,000.

China (Taiwan): TA Shu Shan logging operations, $256,000; forestry development (JCRR), $81,000.

Laos: Conservation and development of forest resources, $12,000.

Philippines: Forest management (including college of forestry), $132,000.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Iran: Range and forest management, $38,000.

Jordan: Afforestation watershed protection, $100,000.

Pakistan: East Pakistan Forest Research Laboratory, $41,000; Chittagong hill tracks, timber extraction, $300,000.

Turkey: Forestry development, $65,000.

AFRICA

Liberia: Forest conservation, $54,000.
Libya: Forestry, $335,000.

OVERSEA TERRITORIES

Somalia: Forestry, $17,000.

EUROPE

Spain: Forestry demonstrations, $46,000; organization and development of a forestry grazing service, $4,000.
Yugoslavia: Forestry, $55,000.

LATIN AMERICA

Chile: Forest development, $45,000.
Colombia: National forest resource development, $45,000.
Costa Rica: Forestry, $15,000.
Haiti: Technical advisory assistance to Societe Haitiano-Americaine de Development Agricole, $22,000.
Paraguay: Forestry, $21,000.

OVERSEA TERRITORY

British Guiana: Check cruise of forest survey in Bartica area, $1,000.

British Guiana is another British colony. The total for the year 1958 is $2,510,000. Again we spent substantially more for forestry in foreign countries in 1958 than the administration is willing to give our own country for 1961.

Fiscal year 1959 projects:

FAR EAST

Cambodia: Forest resources development, $80,000.
China: Forestry development (JCRR), $79,000.
Laos: Conservation and development of forest resources, $28,000.
Philippines: Forest management, $224,000.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

Iran: Range and forest management, $115,000.
Jordan: Afforestation and watershed protection, $38,000.
Pakistan: East Pakistan Forest Research Laboratory, $26,000.

AFRICA

Liberia: Forest conservation, $230,000.
Libya: Forestry, $359,000.

OVERSEA TERRITORY

Somalia: Forestry, $3,000.

EUROPE

Spain: Forestry demonstrations, $57,000.
Yugoslavia: Forestry, $192,000.

LATIN AMERICA

Colombia: Forest resources development, $48,000.
Guatemala: Forestry school, $21,000.
Paraguay: Forestry, $6,000.
Peru: Forestry resources development program, $19,000.
Total, 1959, $1,525,000.

Total foreign aid expenditures on forestry programs, fiscal years 1955 through 1959, $10,212,394.

Mr. President, for one measure of the fantastic disproportion that exists between the Eisenhower-Nixon policies of lavish expenditure in foreign countries and the reverse at home, let us look at one of the many foreign countries which has been the object of this administration's solicitudinous and lavish expenditure. I refer to the little island of Taiwan, or, as it is more widely known, Formosa.

In the 5 years from 1955 to 1959, inclusive, the United States has expended on the forestry projects of that little island alone the sum of $1,540,000. This expenditure in forestry in Formosa is only a minute fraction of the total amount that has been spent out of the U.S. Treasury in almost every enterprise conceivable by the mind of man in Formosa. But I am today dealing only with the forestry program and contrasting what the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is now doing or not doing in this important field in the United States, and what it has done and is doing in foreign countries.

Now, as I have said, we have expended on Formosa $1,540,000 in the last 5 years. Formosa is one two-hundred-and-fourteenth the size of the United States prior to the admission of Alaska and Hawaii. The relative size of our two countries may not be an exact indication of their relative needs or desires in any given field, yet in the field of forestry, it may serve as an approximate yardstick of the Eisenhower-Nixon generosity abroad and its parsimoniousness at home.

Yet in the field of forestry, which may serve as an approximate yardstick of the Eisenhower-Nixon generosity abroad, $1,540,000 was granted for forestry purposes to Formosa, an area one two-hundred-and-fourteenth the size of the United States, which is only a little less than the $1,780,400 granted this year for our own great Nation's forestry program. If we divide the Formosa program into years, it averages $308,000 a year. However, if we relate Formosa's size to that of the United States before the admission of Alaska and Hawaii, it will be seen that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has been 32 times more generous to this small island than to our own Nation.

Mr. President, I could elaborate on this subject to demonstrate conclusively, by chapter and verse, the striking contrast between the attitude of this administration, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, toward the needs of our own country and to those abroad. Forestry is merely one more example.

During the delivery of Mr. STENNIS' speech,

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, I join my colleagues in complimenting the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] on his very eloquent speech, a copy of which I hold in my hand. I also recognize, with my colleagues, the fine work that has been performed by the Senator from Mississippi in connection with our forest reserves, over the years.

It is my privilege and pleasure and high honor to serve with the Senator on the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and I certainly wish to pledge my assistance toward any effort to increase appropriations to the amounts needed in order to effectuate the 5-year plan submitted some time ago by the Secretary of Agriculture. I have always felt that our forest resources—as the Senator from Mississippi so ably pointed out a few minutes ago—are perhaps the greatest of our natural resources. Unless our forest resources are conserved, we cannot hope to conserve our soil resources or our water resources. I believe that regardless of the expenditures required in order to effectuate the program we have in mind, it is a bargain; it will be a bargain at any price; and I believe the time has long since passed when we should give our attention to this very important matter.

I am pleased to note that in the prepared statement of the Senator from Mississippi he has listed, among the items proposed for additional construction, a watershed management laboratory at Parsons, W. Va. I shall certainly do everything I possibly can to see to it that the required funds are included in the measure which passes the Senate; and I shall join the Senator from Mississippi in his attempts to secure the additional funds needed for the entire program.

I also take this opportunity to thank the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] for his kind remarks in regard to my efforts in conjunction with his and those of other Members of the Senate, in the endeavor to reach the goal which all of us seek to attain.

On December 30, 1960, I wrote to the then President-elect John F. Kennedy, urging a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1961 in the amount of $45 million so as to assure immediate employment opportunities and put the 5-year plan on schedule. The letter was as follows:

DECEMBER 30, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President-elect,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT-ELECT KENNEDY: I am extremely pleased with the vigorous way in which your task force on distressed areas applied itself to devising workable solutions to a difficult problem. You have my assurance of complete support in reaching a successful conclusion.

One recommendation strikes me as holding forth great promise, for it will enable us to meet today's problem—unemployment—and help solve one major problem—chronic unemployment caused by resource dissipation.

I refer to the task force subcommittee and full committee recommendations for additional funds for the national forests. It is my understanding that there exists a backlog of useful conservation work on the national forests which could produce an estimated 75,000 jobs, nationwide, for a 3-year period at an annual cost somewhat in excess of $500 million. A more modest program, producing 22,000 jobs annually could be undertaken at an annual cost of $140 million.

I would like to urge that at least the more modest program be adopted and that a supplemental appropriation be sought for fiscal year 1961. If the program could be placed in operation March 1, 1961, an appropriation of $45 million would assure immediate employment opportunities.

By the careful selection of the work to be done with heavy concentration on timber stand improvement, reforestation, soil and water management, recreation, wildlife management, and fire protection, it would be possible to maintain a situation where two-thirds of every dollar spent went for payroll and the balance for equipment, transportation and overhead. This would meet the criteria we both seek of a project with maximum job opportunities in gainful employment to the jobless.

In addition, the conservation benefits would be of the type which bring lasting improvement through resource development.

The figure I present to you represents my best judgment based upon my 1959 efforts in the Committee on Appropriations to meet our unemployment problems. The suggestions I make are in essence a speeding up of the program for the national forest as presented to the Congress in 1959 by the Secretary of Agriculture, with a shift in emphasis to the job-producing phases.

If we move forward, we will be fulfilling not only obligations to erase the hardship of the recession, but also to enable America to restore her resource strength for the troubled years that lie ahead. I know of no

better way to invest in America's future, and I am hopeful that this great work will have your endorsement. To implement these recommendations, I request that, soon after you take office, a supplemental budget estimate in the amount needed for the balance of fiscal year 1961 be transmitted to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

Prior to my having written to Mr. Kennedy, I wrote to the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, on December 20, 1960, requesting facts and figures which might reveal opportunities to alleviate economic distress in West Virginia, with particular reference to the possibilities within the zone of influence of the Monongahela National Forest. That letter to Mr. Benson was as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1960.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, for some time I have been very much concerned over the deepening economic distress which has been developing in many areas of West Virginia. In this connection the Department could assist me by furnishing specific economic and workload data concerning areas of potential natural resource development in my State.

I am now persuaded that the time is opportune to assemble data which will set forth the possible development of natural resource values, so outstanding in West Virginia and in which so little real progress has been made. I have particular reference to recreation area development to meet rapidly increasing public demand and cultural work in the cutover timber stands to enhance future timber production.

To this end I am calling upon the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and agencies of the Department of the Interior to bring together facts and figures which may reveal opportunities to alleviate economic distress in areas of my State. For the Department of Agriculture I am particularly interested in the possibilities within the zone of influence of the Monongahela National Forest. It seems to me that there is a real chance to develop new recreational facilities not only to provide greater opportunity for outdoor enjoyment and public use of the forest, but also to gain the advantage of a general stimulation of the local economy which would certainly result. This broad purpose could also be served through expanded timber-stand improvement, development of roads and trails, and watershed improvement work, which would furnish constructive employment opportunities where such needs are urgent.

With reference to the Department of the Interior, I am aware that the National Park Service, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, is now conducting a study of possible recreation developments in the Potomac River basin, much of which is in West Virginia. West Virginia recreation resources, however, include much more than the Potomac basin. For example, Blue Stone Reservoir and its environs in the southern part of the State offer considerable potential for such activities.

It occurs to me in viewing the total opportunity for natural resource development in West Virginia that consideration might well be given to the possibilities of land acquisition to consolidate existing Federal holdings and to provide additional areas for optimum development of natural resources, including recreation.

I will appreciate your asking the Forest Service of the Department to study the opportunities in West Virginia along the lines I have indicated. I feel sure that much of the information is readily available and that it could be brought together in a compact form which would be very helpful to me. If further information concerning my request is needed, may I suggest that you please contact me.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U. S. Senator.

On that same date, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, and requested that consideration be given to the provision of additional areas for optimum development of natural resources, including recreation. My letter to Secretary Seaton was as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, for some time I have been very much concerned over the deepening economic distress which has been developing in many areas of West Virginia. In this connection the Department could assist me by furnishing specific economic and workload data concerning areas of potential natural resource development in my State.

I am now persuaded that the time is opportune to assemble data which will set forth the possible development of natural resource values, so outstanding in West Virginia and in which so little real progress has been made. I have particular reference to recreation area development to meet rapidly increasing public demand and cultural work in the cutover timber stands to enhance future timber production.

To this end I am calling upon the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and agencies of the Department of the Interior to bring together facts and figures which may reveal opportunities to alleviate economic distress in areas of my State. For the Department of Agriculture I am particularly interested in the possibilities within the zone of influence of the Monongahela National Forest. It seems to me that there is a real chance to develop new recreational facilities not only to provide greater opportunity for outdoor enjoyment and public use of the forest, but also to gain the advantage of a general stimulation of the local economy which would certainly result. This broad purpose could also be served through expanded timber-stand improvement, development of roads and trails, and watershed improvement work, which would furnish constructive employment opportunities where such needs are urgent.

With reference to the Department of the Interior, I am aware that the National Park Service, in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, is now conducting a study of possible recreation developments in the Potomac River basin, much of which is in West Virginia. West Virginia recreation resources, however, include much more than the Potomac basin. For example, Blue Stone Reservoir and its environs in the southern part of the State offer considerable potential for such activities.

It occurs to me in viewing the total opportunity for natural resource development in West Virginia that consideration might well be given to the possibilities of land acquisition to consolidate existing Federal holdings and to provide additional areas for optimum development of natural resources, including recreation.

I will appreciate your asking the National Park Service of the Department to study the opportunities in West Virginia along the lines I have indicated. I feel sure that much of the information is readily available and that it could be brought together in a compact form which would be very helpful to me. If further information concerning my request is needed, may I suggest that you please contact me.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

On January 6 of this year, I met with the incoming Budget Director, Mr. David Bell, during which discussion I made the following statement:

The program for the national forests calls for investing $1.7 billion in the national forests over the next 12 years. The fiscal year 1961 budget for the program elements was $143 million. In 5 years, according to the schedule, the budget should rise to $320 million.

Additionally, there is a sizable backlog of similar conservation work not included in the program amounting to possibly a $1 billion investment.

The program can be compressed. The program emphasis can be shifted. For example, reforestation and stand improvement investments total $375 million.

By the fifth year, the level of funds is scheduled to rise from $4.4 million to $41 million. Over the life of the program, 3.9 million national forest acres out of almost 4.5 million acres needing such work will be reforested.

To meet distressed area needs, the proposal is to compress the time element and place the emphasis where there is chronic unemployment.

During the early years, those programs with high employment requirements will be stressed. Fortunately, these are programs requiring relatively few skills. The type of work to be accelerated will channel from 66 to 80 percent of the money spent into salaries for the jobless.

The long-range benefits are also large because the forest resource will be rehabilitated, paving the way for industrial redevelopment. In West Virginia, public forests should be extended.

The Weeks law and the Bankhead-Jones Act contain authority for forest expansion and submarginal land retirement.

Funds are needed for land acquisition in fiscal year 1962 to permit efforts in this direction. This will be of value to areas such as Huntington and Charleston—well removed from present national forests.

Costs of land purchase in West Virginia for the 880,000 acres in the Monongahela Forest bought in the thirties averaged $4 an acre. This national forest covers 10 percent of the State's forest land. Purchase of another 500,000 acres, strategically located, could prove especially beneficial once the land is redeveloped. Cost would be about $5 million. Land acquisition is not now included in the program for the national forests.

West Virginia's 9.8 million forested acres offer a dual opportunity. The first is for the present—their improvement through rehabilitation. The second—the benefits that will flow from an increased forest-based industry once they are rehabilitated.

By the year 2000, the western forests will have been depleted and the eastern forests, which are three-fourths of our forest land and production capability, will either be ready to come back and serve or will continue in virtually their present unsatisfactory state.

The eastern forests are depleting in quality and thus utility even though today timber growth is technically in excess of timber cut. The reason for the excess of growth is the lack of utility of the material being grown. It is either a species not commercially desirable, a quality which defies manufacture, or a volume per acre which cannot economically support its removal.

WEST VIRGINIA'S FORESTS

In West Virginia, the 9.8 million acres are mainly in private ownership. There are only

880,000 national forest acres and less than 100,000 acres in State and county holdings. The 8.9 million private acres are owned by 133,000 people with the average being 67 acres. Three-fourths of the acreage is in holdings under 5,000 acres and the balance is owned by 112 persons or corporations for a total of 2½ million acres. Only 3 percent of West Virginia's forests is owned by the forest producing industries in contrast to an average of 13 percent for the Nation. One-third of the private forests, 3.2 million acres, is owned by 100,000 farmers. Sixty-one percent is owned by 35,000 other owners such as mines and business and professional people.

A FOREST PROGRAM FOR THE STATE

The opportunities for progress are dictated by the structure of the present ownership. On the national forests, which are mainly depleted lands bought to be rehabilitated, there is a substantial opportunity for real progress. Much of this land was acquired in the 1930's and World War II. Subsequent events stalled proper conservation investments. The minimum investment needed in West Virginia to fulfill the program for the national forests is in excess of $15 million. In reality, it is possibly twice that much since that program contemplated spending only enough to take care of currently urgent work. Among the key investments scheduled under the program is $3.6 million to improve 168,000 acres and plant 19,000 acres. An example of the minimum nature of the program is that there are substantially more national forest acres in need of rehabilitation. The recreation program cost an investment of $814,000—wildlife management $1.4 million, soil and water management $700,000, fire protection $426,000, structure improvements $742,000, roads approximately $7 million. In addition, the Forest Service estimates that an annual expenditure of $1.5 million is needed for proper administration. Currently, the total Forest Service expenditure in West Virginia for annual operations and investment is about $1½ million. Thus, the level of operations is substantially less than 50 percent of what is needed. Timber stand improvement is a major necessity which has the advantage of providing jobs now while building a solid perpetual improvement base. Research programs will be helpful in devising ways of utilizing the present forest material to the largest extent possible. Recreational developments and an adequate road and trail network will provide a base for a vastly expanded outdoor recreational industry drawing people from the more populous surrounding States.

The second opportunity is the rehabilitation of the smaller private holdings. This can be done through the Soil Conservation Service and agriculture conservation payment programs and special programs administered by the Federal and State forest services. The problem in West Virginia is the financial condition of the landowner. He lacks cash and he has no incentive to do for the future what he cannot even do for himself today. He has inherited forest and farmland depleted by unsound practices. It can be argued that there is a national duty to make the investments for the future that the present landowner cannot make, and further, that he is not responsible for the present condition of his land. In addition, the benefits will accrue to the future, not to the present landowner. A program would involve the Federal Government underwriting 100 percent of the cost of the improvement work. The massive program of private land improvement would raise the income of the present owner because he could be employed in the improvement work, and in addition, presently unemployed people would be utilized as crews to perform conservation work. It would be desirable to require agreements that conservation investments would be protected and this could readily be accomplished.

Another approach is to expand public ownership of forest land. One way is through a massive extension of the national forests. Another is to select key areas around the State where holdings of 40,000 to 50,000 acres would be acquired as demonstration forest units. A holding of this size would be large enough to serve at least one or more industrial establishments for manufacturing, and thus, in the long run, provide new job opportunities in areas where none now exist. The Weeks law contains adequate authority for such land acquisition and the program can be implemented by Executive decision plus appropriations. Very possibly, the cost of the land which would be something in the neighborhood of $10 to $20 an acre, plus the investment for rehabilitation, would turn out to be cheaper in the long run than were all efforts concentrated on improving lands in private holdings. In any program of land acquisition, there are bound to be philosophical objections from the timber industry but this is a very small component in West Virginia. Here then is a clear case where leadership in the Senate and by the Governor can establish a climate of opinion which shows the advantages forcefully to the people of the State. In addition, county commissioners, whose concern is often with taxes, now must be enlisted as warm supporters of the program.

These three steps—expanded conservation works on the public forests, a similar effort on private forests, and the expansion of public forest holdings, if successfully prosecuted in the next decade, will meet West Virginia's needs for redevelopment on a timely basis.

Madam President, following my meeting with Mr. Bell, I wrote to him, as follows:

JANUARY 9, 1961.

The Honorable DAVID BELL,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELL: I enclose for you a copy of my forestry letter of December 30, 1960, to President-elect Kennedy, as promised at our Friday meeting. It was very good of you to give us your time and I am most appreciative.

In retrospect, I think the salient facts are that the Forest Service has a well conceived, economically sound program. How fast should we move to assure conservation needs? How much can program emphasis be changed to meet depressed area requirements? We know that to meet conservation needs, the Forest Service budget should rise to $320 million by fiscal year 1965. To be on schedule for fiscal year 1962, requires a $53 million increase. This is the minimum we should contemplate. The optimum, I believe, is an advance of $140 million—starting with the proportionate increase of $45 million as a supplemental for fiscal year 1961.

On the change in emphasis, I believe we should move ahead at full speed in the depressed areas, completing the Forest Service work there in 3 years. This will bring these areas closer to par with the Nation, thus paving the way for basic industrial expansion.

Remembering your question on ACP cost sharing, I wish to point out that section 7(a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which prescribes the agricultural conservation payment program, sets forth five policies. The first four are resource conservation matters, while the fifth, which I shall state, is—

"Reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms."

It is my view that the low-income farmer can be better served by the ACP program. As I said at our meeting, he cannot afford to do the things for the future. I believe we should utilize section 7(a)5 to reimburse him for his farm. This will fulfill both the conservation and human resource objectives of the act.

I recognize the virtues of cost sharing, but I do not believe we can reach the heart of the low-income farmer's problem if we expect him to share costs.

I have every confidence that further exploration with the technical experts will produce a worthwhile program which will meet every test that must be applied to assure both executive and congressional support.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

On January 23, I met with the new Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, to further pursue the important matter of increased appropriations for the Forest Service. The following statement was made by me to Secretary Freeman:

In 1959 the Secretary of Agriculture presented to Congress a plan for investing $1.7 billion in the national forests for the period fiscal years 1961–1973. It called for annual stepups in the level of appropriations by about $41 million per year for 5 years until the budget level of $320 million was reached. It covered every aspect of national forest activities except land acquisition.

This program was designed to help assure that the national forests could meet their responsibilities in the years ahead to supply timber, forage, and recreation. It was designed to assure that the soil and water would be protected and that essential research woud be done.

We in the Congress thought so well of this plan that we added money to the 1960 budget over the protests of the Secretary and the Budget Director. We were disappointed in looking at the fiscal year 1961 budget to see that the Secretary, despite an enthusiastic interest, had failed to seek the $41 million increment for what he had called the first year of this great program. We again added funds and brought the program up to within $13 million of the first year planned increase.

We fear that the fiscal year 1962 budget will widen the deficiency.

There are two compelling reasons why we should move more rapidly than even that plan envisioned.

It is good conservation and good for the Nation. We have delayed too long and cannot afford to do less than this plan called for.

There is now a recession and on top of this there are numerous areas of chronic unemployment and underdevelopment near the national forests. The national forests can provide jobs for the unemployed and they in turn can move the national forest program ahead.

I want to urge that we get to the $320 million level contemplated for attainment in the fifth year by the outgoing administration, by the fiscal year 1963 budget, rather than the fiscal year 1965 budget. Specifically, I wish to urge that we provide a supplement of $50 million for 1961, a $92 million increase for fiscal year 1962, with another $35 million increase in fiscal year 1963. I hasten to add that the 1963 figure is not a firm one, for the program must be corrected to meet increased costs due to last year's Pay Act. The amount needed in 1963 to reach the proper operating level will be somewhat higher.

For the balance of this year we need $50 million and for the year immediately ahead, I urge $92 million. I think we only need consider these two figures. I introduced the

other material to emphasize that we are talking about a well planned long-range program.

President-elect Kennedy's task force on distressed areas has recommended up to $50 million as a supplemental for 1961. This money is to be used on a series of important conservation jobs that share one common denominator. They put two-thirds or better of every dollar spent into work for the jobless. This money was to provide jobs at $1.25 per hour in the forests near distressed areas. Work such as reforestation, stand improvement, soil and watershed treatment, and recreational development is the type to be stressed.

I have suggested $50 million to be sought and made available March 1 of this year. This will measurably advance important conservation work while giving real help to the jobless. The work these men do will build for America's future.

Secondly I urge amending the fiscal year 1962 budget coming up to Congress soon, to seek a $92 million increase over the present budget level. Here again, I would place heavy emphasis on the work to be done in the States with depressed areas.

Once we reach an adequate budget level, the Forest Service will have the capability to complete these important conservation jobs.

This will give us in West Virginia a chance for redevelopment.

A second step is to allocate money for extension of the national forests into the southern part of the State and to perhaps create some demonstration forests in the western part of the State. I estimate that $5 million would help substantially.

Over the last several years we have spent $2,500,000 to complete purchase of the Superior wilderness area in Minnesota. I have supported this because it is what your people wanted. In West Virginia we do not want to be an economic wilderness any longer. We seek forest development and rehabilitation. I believe that a forest purchase program will do this.

Another step I would urge is expansion of the aid to private forestry.

As a first step, I support the principle of a special supplemental to SCS to move into distressed areas. I also view with favor the earmarking of ACP funds for permanent forestry practices on low-income farms, the cost to be 100 percent by the Federal Government. I think this is the only effective way to reach small farmers whose income level is so low that they cannot help themselves.

Madam President, the correspondence and statements which I have read into the RECORD are expressive of a few of my efforts in connection with increased appropriations for our national forests. My efforts are not entirely documented by the correspondence and statements I have referred to today. I have long been actively interested in the national forests, and I shall continue to bend my efforts toward the improvement of our timber stands through conservation and reforestation, the provision of adequate recreational facilities, the preservation of our forest watersheds, and the protection of our forest wildlife.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. He has stated, most correctly, that this need must be met at once; and I suggest to all Senators that they appear at the hearings of the Appropriations Committee and, after familiarizing themselves with the actual need and what these small laboratories will do, that they urge that this appropriation be made now. We are already many years late with this work. I suggest that Senators always point out that this resource is presently producing income, and it is also a reproducible resource for both the present generation and future generations.

Mr. KUCHEL. A valuable service, Madam President, has been performed today by a distinguished U.S. Senator.

I have had the pleasure of sitting as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for the last 2 years. I have seen the leadership of the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the able chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and other Senators in the cause of providing adequate funds for the U.S. Forest Service.

Madam President, I come from the State neighboring yours. The Government of the United States owns approximately half of the land of California. We have great expanses of public lands, with great and beautiful virgin timber. Large national forests are located in California.

On many, many occasions since I first came to the Senate I have seen the devastation and the holocausts which have been wrought by forest fires in my State.

We heard today what the able Senator said about research conducted by reason of a private grant by a public spirited Californian, the results of which research have been made available to the people of the entire United States, for their benefit.

I remember that in the last session of Congress the executive branch, among other things, recommended the establishment of a new research facility in the State from which I come, to be located in the county of Riverside. I remember the leadership the able Senator from Mississippi gave to that particular cause in the Committee on Appropriations, and I well remember that the committee approved it and the Senate approved it. It is with complete and poignant regret I also recall that the other body refused to go along with the proposal.

The able Senator from Mississippi has indicated the astounding explosion of population which is occurring today and which will continue to occur in the future in this country.

The Congress of the United States can perform no more constructive service than to follow the recommendations which were laid before us a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and to proceed to step up the programs by which the splendid U.S. Forest Service may modernize itself and may press forward in the field of research with respect to the needs of the forests of America.

I rise simply to salute the Senator from Mississippi and to say I have every confidence that once again the Senate will confirm, by its vote, the recommendations the Senator has made. I fondly hope that in this Congress the other body, on the other side of the Capitol, will see fit to likewise approve those recommendations

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly appreciate the Senator's fine remarks and his splendid cooperation in regard to these programs heretofore. The place I visited was Placerville, Calif. I referred to that city a while ago. The gentleman who started that genetics research project, at his own expense, was James G. Eddy, of Seattle.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, once again I wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi for his vision, foresight, and tireless efforts on behalf of our Nation's forestry research program. I concur fully in his request for an additional $8 million for the research budget of the Forest Service for fiscal 1962.

It gave me special pleasure to learn that the city of Bend, Oreg., is included in the Senator's proposal. I shall give my enthusiastic support to the item of $150,000 for the silviculture and wildlife habitat unit at Bend. At the same time I wish to commend the foresight of the city of Bend for its cooperative activities in connection with this meritorious project.

The subject of forest and range management research for which the Senator from Mississippi is also seeking a substantially increased appropriation is one which also reflects the Senator's genuine interest and true leadership in advancing the cause of enlightenment through research.

The Forest Service has 80 million acres of rangeland which it administers and the Bureau of Land Management has over 160 million acres of rangeland under its jurisdiction.

There is a pressing need for range research to determine ways to increase the carrying capacity of our public grazing lands, and to more quickly restore them to their full fertility and water holding capacity.

Last fall, a number of us in the House and Senate joined together to ask the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a range appraisal study similar to the magnificent research the Forest Service conducted on America's timber resources.

Mr. Cecil Edwards of the Oregon Cattlemen's Association has been in close contact with me about the need for such a study and he has taken a position of leadership on this matter.

Mr. Roy Kilpatrick, an outstanding Oregon attorney, has discussed this problem and the problems of our Oregon cattlemen with me on a number of occasions and I am most appreciative of his help.

It is my hope that as we move forward in research we shall do a better job, a more complete job and a timely job in solving the knotty questions involving better range utilization.

I hope that this administration will review the suggestions that we made last fall and that the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, will join together and demonstrate

that they can cooperatively advance the cause of conservation.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the senior Senator from Oregon.

ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE IN CONNECTION WITH INTERPARLIAMENTARY ACTIVITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2, Senate Resolution 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 40) to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and reception of foreign officials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The resolution under consideration, Senate Resolution 40, would authorize the Committee on Foreign Relations to expend not more than $5,000 for the receiving of foreign visitors and for assisting in the preparation for such interparliamentary conferences as may arise throughout the year. It also would authorize the committee to employ one additional professional staff member to assist in the reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, and in the arrangements of such conferences. It is my understanding that of the $5,000 appropriated last year, approximately $2,400 was returned. The full amount was not expended.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 16, 1961.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: There has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, Senate Resolution 40, to provide assistance to Members of the Senate in connection with interparliamentary activities and the reception of foreign officials. This resolution, which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations on January 13, is similar to Senate Resolution 245, agreed to by the Senate on February 9, 1960. It will enable the Senate to continue its practice of receiving foreign dignitaries and furthering interparliamentary relations in Washington, D.C., initiated in 1958 under the terms of Senate Resolution 259.

Senate Resolution 40 would authorize the Committee on Foreign Relations to expend not more than $5,000 for the receiving of foreign visitors and for assisting in preparation for such interparliamentary conferences as may arise throughout the year. It also authorizes the committee to employ one professional staff member to assist Members of the Senate in the reception of its international guests and in the arrangement of such conferences.

As the committee report on the resolution indicates, Senate Resolution 250 last year enabled Members of the Senate to receive many foreign officials of governments abroad, including members of parliaments. Out of the $5,000 which that resolution authorized, it is estimated that the total cost for these receptions came to $2,600, or $2,400 less than the expenditures authorized.

A copy of the committee report on the current resolution is enclosed. I very much hope you will be able favorably to consider the resolution at an early meeting in order that the Senate can thereafter give it early consideration.

Very truly yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 40) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to assist the Senate properly to discharge and coordinate its activities and responsibilities in connection with participation in various interparliamentary institutions and to facilitate the interchange and reception in the United States of members of foreign legislative bodies and prominent officials of foreign governments, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to employ one additional professional staff member to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay the actual and necessary expenses incurred in connection with activities authorized by this resolution and approved in advance by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which shall not exceed $5,000 from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers certified by the Senator incurring such expenses and approved by the chairman.

STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 3, Senate Resolution 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 41) to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, briefly, the resolution would authorize the expenditure of $160,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the next year in order to continue inquiries now being conducted into the foreign policies of the United States. These inquiries have particular reference to Latin America and other geographical areas of the world where the United States has substantial interests and also cover aspects of world armament control. The resolution is similar in text and purposes to Senate Resolution 250, agreed to on February 9, 1960, which authorized the expenditure of $185,000 by this committee last year. This resolution, therefore, provides $25,000 less than the amount voted by the Senate at the last session of Congress.

The committee's activities for the past year and its plans for undertakings under the proposed resolution are described in Senate Report No. 3, which accompanies this communication. The report also contains the subcommittee's proposed budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
January 16, 1961.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to call your attention to Senate Resolution 41, to authorize a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy by the Committee on Foreign Relations. This resolution was reported from this committee on January 13, and was referred the same day to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Briefly, the resolution authorizes the expenditure of $160,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the next year to continue inquiries now being conducted into the foreign policies of the United States. These inquiries have particular reference to Latin America and to other geographical areas of the world where this Nation has special interests, and also cover aspects of world armament control. The resolution is similar in text and purposes to Senate Resolution 250, agreed to February 9, 1960, which authorized the expenditure of $185,000 by this committee last year. This resolution, therefore, is $25,000 less than the amount voted by the Senate last session.

The committee's activities for the past year, and its plans for undertakings under this resolution are described in Senate Report No. 3, which is enclosed. The report also contains the committee's proposed budget for the requisition of $160,000.

I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration will give this resolution favorable consideration at an early meeting in order that it might come before the Senate at an early date.

Very truly yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, of the amount appropriated last year for this study, $96,000 is being returned to the Treasury. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is approximately correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I note from the report made from the Committee on Foreign Relations that this $96,000——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I was relying on my memory without reference to the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the budget submitted to the committee as a whole.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget, Committee on Foreign Relations, Feb. 1, 1961, to Jan. 31, 1962

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)
STAFF			
Legal and investigative staff member	1	$8,040	$16,173.19
Editorial and research:			
Staff member	1	3,240	7,267.26
Staff assistant	1	5,580	11,849.85
Do	1	5,040	10,872.25
Administrative and clerical:			
Assistant clerk	1	2,640	6,052.11
Do	1	2,640	6,052.11
Do	1	2,460	5,687.56
Do	1	780	2,539.62
Do	1	780	2,539.62
Clerical assistant	1	2,040	4,836.96
Do	1	2,040	4,836.96
Subtotal, staff	11		78,707.49
ADMINISTRATIVE			
Contributions to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)			362.00
Contributions to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of salaries)			5,115.00
Contributions to employees Federal employees group life insurance			570.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)			40,000.00
Witness fees, expenses			5,000.00
Stationery, office supplies			1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)			1,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)			14,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents			1,000.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies			10,000.00
Contingent fund			3,245.51
Subtotal, administrative			81,292.51
Grand total			160,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 41, $160,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

SEC. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $160,000 for the period ending January 31, 1962, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS OF CERTAIN AREAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 5, Senate Resolution 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 47) to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, the amount requested represents a substantial reduction from the amounts previously obtained by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. For the past 2 years the amount obtained has been $200,000 a year. We have made a number of changes in the staff, including a number of reductions in personnel, and while I am not absolutely positive that the amount of money requested will be needed, I think it is the only safe amount with which we can proceed. It represents a cutting in half of the appropriation which the committee previously has had.

There are several investigations that the committee may undertake that will use the great bulk of the money requested. For example, there is the investigation of fuels and the investigation suggested by the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], which has to do with the conflict of claims of the Federal Government and the States in the field of irrigation, reclamation, and the rights to water in the Western States particularly. We do, however, believe that the lesser sum of $100,000 will be sufficient for the work of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the new chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for having cut in half the amount requested for the work of this investigating subcommittee. As I understand, the money requested will probably be used to pay for the services of technicians.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I wish to say frankly to the Senator from Louisiana that the staff is not completely determined upon. There are many individuals who, for various reasons of their own, will be taking retirement perhaps 3 or 4 months from now. There will be a shakedown period in which the staff will be settled. But there will be four technicians and four stenographic helpers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then I am correct that it is possible that the number of technical staff members indicated on the budget may not be employed during the entire period of the life of the resolution?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. We expect the number to shrink very rapidly after the 1st day of May.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the budget submitted to the committee as a whole.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total or period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Technical: Staff member	1	$7,680	$15,540.51	$1,925.04	$15,540.51
	1	7,020	14,380.58	1,198.38	14,380.58
	1	6,240	13,009.76	1,084.14	13,009.76
	1	6,180	12,904.32	1,075.36	12,904.32
Clerical: Stenographer	1	2,940	6,059.70	554.97	6,059.70
	2	2,820	6,416.65	534.72	12,833.30
Subtotal, staff expense					75,328.17
Administrative:					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					378.72
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,896.33
Contribution to employees' Federal employees' group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					278.36
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					10,000.00
Contingent fund					9,009.42
Subtotal, administrative expenses					24,671.83
Total					100,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 47, $100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 47) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 6, Senate Resolution 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 48) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, based upon the studies made of the subcommittee's budget for the years 1959 and 1960, which were at the $150,000 level, the increase for this year to $178,000 takes into account the 7½-percent across-the-board pay raise of July 1, 1960, and the commensurate increases in retirement, and so forth, which also come out of the subcommittee's budget. The funds allotted for travel and hearing expenses were based upon the costs of previous hearings held by the subcommittee.

For the 11th consecutive year cases before the juvenile courts have increased, with 773,000 cases having been reported in the year 1959, and preliminary reports coming to the subcommittee from juvenile courts, police departments, and other officials in control of juvenile delinquency and crime detection indicate that in their estimation 1960 thus far has surpassed 1959 in its total number of delinquency cases. The recently released FBI reports for the first 9 months of 1960 on adult crime rates, which show an 11-percent increase, and which normally parallel juvenile figures, seem to substantiate this observation. The subcommittee's request for $178,000 seems fully justified when we realize that the career of one habitual delinquent costs this Nation approximately $90,000.

Simply put, if we can through our efforts prevent only two children from turning to a life of crime, the subcommittee will have paid for itself. So it seems to me that the expenditure of these moneys is certainly warranted. There is plenty of information to support the need for the continuation of this committee.

It has already served a great purpose in the country, and its work has resulted in the enactment of needed legislation. Additional legislation in this field has already been introduced, and other bills will soon be introduced for committee action. This subcommittee has alerted the people of this country, as no other activity in our land has alerted them, to this growing, terrible problem which afflicts us. For all these reasons, and for additional ones, I believe the appropriation of this money for this purpose is more than warranted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senate and the Nation is very fortunate that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has agreed to be the chairman of this very important subcommittee. He had a great deal of experience as NYA Director in Connecticut and in other positions dealing with young people, in helping them to better opportunities in life.

The increase in juvenile delinquency and in adult crime is one of the alarming things in the country today.

The power of investigation of the subcommittee, in throwing the spotlight of public opinion upon educational facilities, upon slums, upon job opportunities for our young people, upon the obligation of parents, upon bringing together various agencies which deal with juvenile delinquency, in trying to correct improper conditions in prisons, where young people are sometimes thrown into company with hardened criminals, has been very important in focusing attention and in bringing about a great deal of activity in these fields.

Already there have been filed many important bills upon which the subcommittee will have to hold further hearings and to give further consideration. There is a bill which deals with post-hospital treatment for drug addicts. Another bill deals with the publication of indecent and obscene literature in the District of Columbia. Already the traffic in pornography has been tightened up by virtue of bills passed as the result of hearings held by the subcommittee. There is also a bill dealing with practices in connection with the placing of minor children for adoption where interstate commerce is involved. The Senate last year passed a bill for grant-in-aid to States for training of administrators to deal with juvenile delinquency. The bill did not pass the House. That is another problem that is coming up.

I know from the report I have seen that several important hearings are on the agenda, which will be conducted in good fashion under the leadership of the Senator from Connecticut.

I wish to join in supporting the resolution.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee. He has authored and sponsored very important proposed legislation, introduced only yesterday, which I am hopeful will be the subject of hearings soon, so that effective and prompt action can be had on it in the Senate and later, I hope, in the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder whether the Senator would place in the RECORD at this point a list of the bills which have been actually enacted into law as a result of the hearings held by the subcommittee over the past 8 years.

Mr. DODD. Well, one bill is the bill having to do with the distribution of pornographic literature, specifically with reference to the interstate transportation of it. That is one bill. Another had to do with the change of venue subject. That permits the prosecution of both the sender and the receiver of this kind of material.

Mr. ELLENDER. But these bills on the distribution of pornographic literature apply not only to juvenile delinquency, but is generally applicable to adults as well. Is that not correct?

Mr. DODD. Yes; except my understanding is—and I believe I am correct about it—that the matter arose in the subcommittee, and that it was before the subcommittee that the hearings were held, that the bill was favorably reported by the subcommittee, and that the action by the subcommittee was the moving force behind the passage of this measure. I believe it is correct to say that through this action the bill received favorable attention on the floor. It is quite true, as the Senator says, that the effects of pornographic literature are not limited to children.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be a matter for interstate commerce.

Mr. DODD. Yes. That would be true of many things.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator put in the RECORD a list of the laws which were enacted by past Congresses for the last 8 years as a result of the hearings conducted by the subcommittee? I understood the distinguished Senator to say a short time ago that juvenile delinquency has been on the rise since 1959. I did not get the exact figure. I believe he said that there has been a rise in the first 9 months of 1960 as compared with 1959.

Mr. DODD. The figure I gave was that for the 11 consecutive years the number of cases before the juvenile courts had increased, with 773,000 cases having been reported in 1959. I went on to say that preliminary reports coming to the subcommittee from various

reliable sources indicate that there will be a greater rise, percentagewise, in 1960.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that is so, that does not speak very well for the subcommittee's work; does it?

Mr. DODD. It does not speak ill of it. I am not suggesting that the subcommittee is going to cure juvenile delinquency this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said that 8 years ago. I said then that the work of this Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency would have no effect on this national problem.

Mr. DODD. I ask the Senator to think of this aspect of the subject. This is something that will take some time to cure. The first thing that seems necessary to be done is to get the public fully alerted and alarmed about it. They must know what is going on. People do not know. They read about this or that or the other aspect, but they do not know the story as it must be known, if our people are to move effectively in this field.

The second thing to do is, having obtained their interest and having aroused them, to try to get better trained people to deal with the problem. That is something that we greatly need all over the country. How do we help to do it? We help by giving information to local communities and cities and States to help them understand what must be done.

I am frank to say that this is not the kind of subcommittee of which the chairman can come before the Senate and say, "Here is what we have done. We have cured the problem. There is no need for this subcommittee any more." This is not that kind of problem and our committee does not operate in that kind of climate or atmosphere. It is a difficult thing to cope with. I do not believe, however, that the enormity of the problem denies the validity of the subcommittee in any sense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, apropos the issue raised by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I am thinking in terms of the contempt case before the Supreme Court, in which the Court dissolved the contempt by stating that all these investigatory proceedings must subserve a legislative purpose.

I have always gone on the theory that all the work that has been done in these investigatory committees must be directed to the legislative purpose. The end result is what the Senate is interested in. I believe it would be an excellent idea if the chairmen of the various subcommittees could, in connection with these money resolutions, furnish a 500-word statement for the RECORD—it would not have to be longer than that—to show exactly what legislation was introduced in the last Congress, what its fate was, how far it had gone, and so forth. Then we could see whether an adequate or rather feeble score has been contrived as a result of efforts.

I do not object to any of these resolutions. I point out, however, that I serve on eight subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary. I cannot even think of how many subcommittees I will be serving on so far as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is concerned. In addition, the minority leader serves as chairman of one of the subcommittees. I have been honored by my committee to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Holidays, Celebrations, and Charters.

In the 86th Congress, some 80 resolutions were submitted, including resolutions for the observance of National Cheese Week, Be Kind to Dogs Week, Little League Baseball Week, National Machinery Week, America's Day, and others. Madam President, you ought to see the list. It is a dandy. Everybody wants to be heard. Every public-spirited organization wants to be incorporated.

I have asked the committee for a tremendous sum of money and one clerk. This ought to make my friend from Louisiana feel good. I asked for the extraordinary sum of $7,500. I feel like an amateur, but I shall not quarrel. I simply say that the amount is to serve a legislative purpose. I think the Senate is entitled to see what the legislative score is, because we continue to fill up tons of hearings. They are sold for wastepaper. Senators do not have time to read them. Let no constituent ever blame his Senator. He cannot take a hearing 2 inches thick and find time to get through it at night. I know I cannot do it. I devote myself to the hearings pretty well, but it is impossible to keep up with this avalanche of reading material.

Frankly, Madam President, I must get in this one clout. I have done it before. I still think that sooner or later we shall have to revamp the hearing system. I believe the British and Canadians could teach us a thing or two, because their royal commissions do not publish hearings. It is an honor to serve on one of those royal inquiry commissions. They dip outside Parliament. When the report is submitted, it becomes a pretty substantial document. It is free from trivia, free from irrelevancies, and immaterial things, and it becomes an extremely useful document. In all candor, I wish I could say as much about our hearings; but I am afraid I cannot.

I confess that I am much like everyone else. If a question is raised in committee which intrigues my fancy, I go off on a tangent, like any other Member of the Senate. So this question is wholly impersonal with me. However, I still believe that we can improve our system and furnish a score sheet for the Senate, to which it is richly entitled. I sincerely hope that that practice can be adopted.

I see present in the Chamber the chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. I serve on that subcommittee. I see the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. I do not believe I serve on that subcommittee. I see the chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. Frankly, I have to look at the book, because I cannot remember all the subcommittees on which I serve. I am a member of the Subcommittees on Constitutional Amendments, Immigration and Naturalization, Antitrust and Monopoly, Administrative Practices and Procedures, Internal Security, Trading With the Enemy, and Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code.

I am the chairman, I will have the majority whip know, of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I think the time has come to give serious consideration to the matter of improving procedure, and I most respectfully suggest that in addition to the 25-odd subcommittees we now have, there should be one more subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. Let us have 21. Let us create a subcommittee to improve investigatory techniques.

I see in the Chamber the chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedures. I serve on his subcommittee, too. If there is any subcommittee chairman under whom I do not serve, will he please hold up his hand? [Laughter.]

Madam President, jocose as this may seem, I think it is a very serious business. These volumes make excellent reference works. We pile the green-covered copies of hearings in the other corner, and over in our corner, too. But who reads them?

I love to think of the hearings we held on the boxing racket. It was great fun. It was spectacular. It is wonderful to sit under the klieg lights, have the television camera shining down, and then have the film appear all over the land, while in the witness chair sits the contender for the light-heavyweight championship, who could not even read or write. [Laughter.] There was the past lightweight champion, Ike Williams. Many others appeared. I must ask my chairman to refresh my memory about all the personages who came before us. It was wonderful. But the most wonderful thing about it was that the caucus room was packed with people who watched. That is the delightful part about those things—to have the people watching and to have the television sending our image out all over the country. But is it a good inquiry technique? Does it deliver the goods? In my judgment, it does not. I would make one exception, I think.

That would be the McClellan committee. That committee really delivered the goods. The money spent by that committee was well spent.

Madam President, I do not indict my own subcommittees. Far from it. I know how hard the chairmen work. But when all is said and done, what are the results, finally? I think perhaps that is what disturbs my distinguished and frugal-minded friend from Louisiana. Year after year he is here assailing these requests for money. He is like Horatius and Herminius and Spurius Lartius at the bridge of the Tiber, rolled in one, trying to roll back the demands; but never, so far as I know, has he succeeded or chopped a nickel off them.

Mr. ELLENDER. We were moderately successful on two or three occasions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now the amounts are growing. In the 84th Congress the Senate authorized $6,893,000 for this purpose; in the 85th Congress, it authorized

$8,283,000. So it will be seen that we came up $1,500,000 from the 84th to the 85th Congress.

In the 86th Congress we authorized $10,758,000. We came up $2,500,000 since the 85th Congress.

This is the 87th Congress. How much more will we authorize? I am not unmindful that some money has been turned back. I recognize that this is a legitimate and necessary function of Congress. The only reason I make these rather desultory remarks is in the hope that the techniques can be improved, that immaterial and irrelevant things can be brushed aside, and that the inquiries can deliver the goods in the smallest package, because constantly we are thinking in terms of streamlining, how to stretch out our funds, how to avoid trivia, and how better to improve the use of our time.

So I wish my great fellow protagonist well. I shall pray for him, knowing that, like the Christian martyrs in the Colosseum, he will be able to say:

Morituri morituros salutant

(We who are about to die, salute you.)

[Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I was very much amused by the eloquent statement made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. It is true that for the past 15 years I have been trying to have some of these appropriations trimmed. Aside from the expenses called for in all these resolutions, thousands of dollars are also spent yearly for printing all of the hearings held by these subcommittees and for their distribution throughout the country.

The resolution which is before the Senate is to increase the amount for the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency from the amount of $150,000 provided last year to $178,000 for this year. Eight years ago this subcommittee was created. The Senator who sponsored the resolution creating it was the former Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Hendrickson. I can well remember when he presented his resolution. He told the Senate that the small amount of $75,000, I believe, would be of great service in exposing the evils of juvenile delinquency and would make the country as a whole take note of what was taking place.

The second year he asked for a little more money—which was granted, over the objection of some of us. He gave us the assurance that that sum would be sufficient to complete the hearings. But, lo and behold, as the hearings proceeded from year to year, more and more money was appropriated, so that up to today, after 8 years, this subcommittee will have been appropriated $1,141,889.82; and it is still going strong. For the life of me, I do not believe that this subcommittee has submitted, even after its hearings over a period of 8 years, any legislation that has in any manner effectively dealt with juvenile delinquency. On the contrary, the chairman of the subcommittee tells the Senate that juvenile delinquency is on the increase, rather than the decrease. In my opinion, that does not speak well for work done by the committee.

Madam President, I have before me the proposed budget for this committee; it is set forth in the report by the Committee on Rules and Administration, on page 6. I ask unanimous consent that the budget be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 11, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Chief counsel	1	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Minority staff member	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Chief investigator	1	5,580	11,849.85	987.48	11,849.85
Investigator	1	3,660	8,117.89	676.49	8,117.89
Editorial and research:					
Editorial director	1	5,580	11,849.85	987.48	11,849.85
Research director	1	6,180	12,904.32	1,075.36	12,904.32
Research assistant	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	4,140	9,090.01	757.50	9,090.01
Secretary	2	[1] 2,940	13,319.40	1,109.94	13,319.40
Assistant clerk (file)	1	1,920	4,593.92	382.76	4,593.92
Assistant clerk	1	1,800	4,350.91	362.57	4,350.91
Stenographer	2	[1] 2,460	11,375.12	947.92	11,375.12
Subtotal, staff expense	15				142,091.27
Administrative:					
Contribution to employees' health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					1,215.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6¾ percent of total salaries paid)					9,235.93
Contribution to employees' Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					402.30
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					15,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,055.50
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					2,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					800.00
Contingent fund					200.00
Subtotal, administrative expense					35,908.73
Total					178,000.00

[1] Each.

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 48, $178,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, the report calls for the customary staff, as provided for all the other subcommittees. It calls for a staff director, who would be paid $16,102.90; a chief counsel, who would be paid the same amount; and a minority staff member—in other words, there must be a Republican to counter the Democrats on the staff—who would receive $14,802.38. I wonder why the Republican is not paid as much as the Democratic counsel, let me say to the Senator from Illinois. I suppose that one is as good as the other.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, we are the frugal type. [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee's budget also calls for a chief investigator, at a salary of $11,849.85; an investigator, at a salary of $8,117.89; an editorial director, to be paid $11,849.85; a research director, to be paid $12,904.32; and so on, down the list.

Madam President, I think there is much abuse in the continuation of these committees. As I have pointed out on many occasions, once they are created, they never seem to die. Instead, most of them have been kept going; and, from year to year, more and more money is demanded for them. This is the case except in a few isolated cases.

Madam President, I should like to point out that the resolutions on the calendar, and which we are considering or are to consider today, call for appropriations totaling $2,481,500; including one new subcommittee—the one we discussed a moment ago—which was created for the purpose of making investigations for the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences.

Even with the deductions in operating expenses which have been made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, whereby $100,000 was saved—and let me also say that I understand that my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina, would trim his subcommittee's appropriation by $50,000—the sum requested for these subcommittees is still about the same as appropriated last year.

I repeat that there seems to be no end to this procedure. On Capitol Hill we have quite a few what I would call professional jobseekers, who seem to be able to remain on various payrolls from year to year. I was very hopeful that a change would be made; I felt that something might be done about this situation during this new administration. But, unfortunately, the trend—as I see it—does not show that.

Today we shall be—and already have been—asked to consider quite a number of resolutions affecting the Judiciary Committee. As I have pointed out on many occasions, each standing commit-

tee of the Senate receives in the neighborhood of $160,000, as I recall, to pay for four professional staff members and six clerical staff members, two of whom are clerks or could be clerks of the committee. With very few exceptions, every standing committee has been authorized to employ more and more technicians. Although the Judiciary Committee has been given the same amount that all the other standing committees receive, the Judiciary Committee will be appropriated $1,575,000 this year—if all these resolutions pending today are adopted. Imagine that, Madam President. In addition to the regular appropriation made to the Judiciary Committee, it can spend $1,575,000 in the event the Senate adopts all the resolutions which are before it today.

I have no doubt—if I am to judge from my past successes—that all these resolutions will be adopted by the Senate. But, Madam President, I believe that all these matters should be called to the attention of the people.

I would say that most of us on Capitol Hill are overworked. The fields in which to work are green. But it seems that many Senators are anxious to give themselves more work than ordinarily they should do; and, as a result of these appropriations to the various committees and subcommittees, it seems certain that either a Senator is given more work or else someone else does the work for him.

Madam President, I should like to say that I shall not make any effort to oppose all these resolutions as they come before the Senate. I merely wish to ask a few questions about certain subcommittees, without delaying the Senate unnecessarily.

But, as I have said, the resolution now before us is a classic example of my theory that once one of these subcommittees is created, there is no end to it. It was supposed to end 6 years ago; but it has been revitalized from year to year, and the record shows that as time passes, more and more money is asked by those who foster it.

Madam President, I shall ask for a division when the time comes to vote on this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a breakdown showing the expenditures and authorizations for the subcommittee studying juvenile delinquency problems during the past 8 years. The record will show that the committee has spent over $1 million during the past 8 years.

As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has pointed out, I do not know what recommendations they have come up with except what we already know, namely, that the problem of juvenile delinquency is caused by juvenile parents. I am wondering if it would not be better to abolish some of these committees and save the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

	Authorized	Spent
1961	$178,000.00	
1960	150,000.00	$122,184.77
1959	150,000.00	128,689.83
1958	75,000.00	49,345.73
1957	60,000.00	49,156.10
1956	82,500.00	82,458.69
1955	165,810.99	159,470.59
1954	175,000.00	221,545.87
1953	44,000.00	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 48. On this question a division has been requested.

On a division, the resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the commitee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $178,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 7, Senate Resolution 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 49) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, this resolution carries into effect what is known as the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] heads this committee. He could not be present, and he asked that I present the matter at this time.

The committee is to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended.

Second, the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States.

Third, the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories, and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and the infiltration of persons who are or may be under the domination of a foreign government or of any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

It will be seen from the wording of this resolution that it covers a great deal of territory and requires a great deal of investigation. I am glad to say this subcommittee has received, year in and year out, what it sought. This is not a new subcommittee, and there will not be a new subcommittee in the future. I think it will become necessary for the subcommittee to remain in existence for some time. I do not think there can be any question in regard to it.

At the present time we have additional troubles on our hands because of certain events that are taking place close to home. I should also like to point out at this time, as an economical measure, that the regular subcommittee staff now indexes all its publications, and it issues a great many publications and indexes which are beneficial to the United States.

It will also be found that the subcommittee has recommended certain bills at certain times and certain amendments to various laws on the statute books. It has done a great deal of work in that field.

We are now checking into situations existing in the United States, and what might be called threats from the outside.

The appropriation requested is slightly increased, but it becomes necessary in order to do what the Judiciary Committee believes is necessary in order to carry out our duty as an investigating subcommittee. Not only did the subcommittee recommend this appropriation, but the entire Judiciary Committee was unanimous in asking for this amount.

The amount requested is more than we had last year, but not as much as we have had in some past years. I do not

see how any Senator can object to the investigation that is going on by this particular committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator said the committee unanimously recommended the amount requested. Were not all the requests recommended unanimously? Was there any objection to any of them?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The full committee approved all of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then they were all unanimous, were they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, but many of them were changed; that is, the appropriation requested was cut down in some instances and some of the amounts were increased by the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know why it was necessary to increase the appropriation this year over last year by $61,000? What will the additional $61,000 be used for?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Some additional investigators are needed. We were not able to do our duty last year as we should have done it. It must be remembered that we were in the thick of a campaign during the latter part of the year, and, in some instances, we did not want it to appear that we were interfering with elections in the States. We held back a little. So we now want to go ahead with proper investigations, since the field is free.

Mr. ELLENDER. Were these investigators paid just the same, even though they did not investigate? What happened?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We did not put them on the payroll. We now wish to put some additional investigators on the payroll, to do the work which should have been done before.

Mr. ELLENDER. If those investigators were not put on the payroll, and the number of people employed evidently decreased, how much money was the committee able to return to the Treasury? Does the Senator have a figure for the record?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We returned some money to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have that figure for the record.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Approximately $8,000, I am informed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the budget which was submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Rules and Administration for this subcommittee.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Internal Security Subcommittee proposed 1961 budget

Salaries	$225,454.84
Health benefit program	1,291.44
Retirement fund	15,449.30
Group life insurance	783.12
Consultants, w.a.e. basis	2,500.00
Contract services	3,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)	17,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)	12,500.00
Witness fees, expenses	12,500.00
Stationery, office supplies	2,000.00
Communications (telegrams, telephone, etc.)	5,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents, postage	1,000.00
Reserve for contingencies	1,021.30
Total	300,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 49, $300,000.

Internal Security Subcommittee

Position	Number	Basic annual salary	Gross annual salary	Monthly salary (gross)	Total
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,820	$17,525.00	$1,460.41	$17,525.00
Associate counsel	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Chief investigator	1	7,440	15,118.71	1,259.89	15,118.71
Investigator	2	4,080	8,968.51	747.37	17,937.02
Do	1	4,020	8,846.99	737.24	8,846.99
Editorial and research:					
Editorial director	1	5,640	11,955.29	996.27	11,955.29
Assistant editorial director	1	5,640	11,955.29	996.27	11,955.29
Research director	1	7,620	15,435.06	1,286.25	15,435.06
Research assistant	1	5,400	11,533.51	961.12	11,533.51
Do	1	3,300	7,388.79	615.73	7,388.79
Investigations analyst	2	7,080	14,486.00	1,207.16	28,972.00
Administrative and clerical:					
Records manager	1	5,100	10,988.24	915.68	10,988.24
Confidential secretary	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.61	8,239.40
Secretary	2	2,880	6,538.19	544.84	13,976.38
Do	1	2,700	6,173.64	514.47	6,173.64
Do	1	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Do	2	2,580	5,930.60	494.21	11,861.20
Do	1	2,280	5,323.02	433.58	5,323.02
Total					225,454.84

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee hereunder, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $300,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 8, Senate Resolution 51.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 51) to study administrative practice and procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, this resolution relates to a standing subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which was created about 2 years ago at the request of the American Bar Association and other groups which seek reform in the Administrative Procedure Act, and in the procedures of departments and agencies of the United States.

The subcommittee has had a modest budget. Its work has been most effective. As the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], said the other day before the Committee on Rules and Administration, it is a very important subcommittee. It is studying reports which have been made to the Congress for the past 15 years and more on this subject.

It is examining the practices and procedures of Government departments and agencies; examining their defects and seeking solutions—particularly the problems of expense and delay.

The request has been for an amount of $115,000. Last year the subcommittee absorbed the salary increase which was voted by the Congress. The approximate unexpended balance will be $17,000.

We are asking $115,000 this year, notwithstanding the salary increase. We have a great deal of work to do.

I think Senators are all familiar with the Landis report, with reference to the regulatory bodies. The subcommittee is also conducting studies of the executive departments, which administer some 106 regulatory statutes and some of which have backlogs almost comparable to that of the regulatory bodies.

The work of these departments and agencies involves hundreds of millions of dollars, as well as the individual rights of people and their property, and how the people can be heard expeditiously and economically.

We are also, as a study group, probing and examining into the so-called backdoor influence in some of the regulatory bodies.

I think this is a very worthwhile subcommittee. We have a competent staff. Our real problem is whether we can hold the staff or whether the executive department will take away our trained men.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the proposed budget submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Rules and Administration for this subcommittee.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed budget, 1961

Position	Number	Annual salary (gross)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:				
Legal and investigative:				
Counsel and staff director	1	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Assistant counsel	2	32,205.80	2,683.80	32,205.80
Economist	1	14,907.83	1,242.31	14,907.83
Minority counsel	1	14,907.83	1,242.31	14,907.83
Secretary	1	6,659.70	554.97	6,659.70
Stenographer	2	12,347.28	1,028.94	12,347.28
Subtotal, staff expense	8			97,131.34
Administrative:				
Contributions to civil service				
Retirement fund, employees health				
Benefit programs, group life				
Insurance for Federal employees				6,313.54
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)				3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)				4,200.00
Witness fees and expenses				2,250.00
Stationery and office supplies				750.00
Communications (telephone and telegraph)				750.00
Publications and documents				300.00
Contingent				305.12
Subtotal, administrative expense				17,868.66
Total				115,000.00

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, for the RECORD I must say that it is entirely possible, depending upon the problems which arise, that this important subcommittee may have to come before the Congress to ask for an additional appropriation. I hope this will not be the case. I hope we can conserve as much money in the year to come as we conserved in the last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 51) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 9, Senate Resolution 52.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 52) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, the subcommittee, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Rules and Administration asked for an appropriation of $450,000 for the work of this group during this year. The committee will return approximately $18,000 to the Treasury.

Madam President, this request involves the same amount the subcommittee asked for and received for its work in the last year. This is a large sum of money.

In the Nation today we know there are price squeezes on the consumer. Every day we read in the newspapers that corporations are merging, which makes it harder and harder for the small entrepreneur to survive. We read about collusive prices, which adversely affect the public and the Government as well. We read about high prices, and the inflexibility of prices, which cause us to lose many of our foreign markets.

This subcommittee has been very busy. It has held a great many hearings, which have been very much in the public interest.

I believe the most important hearing we held during the past year was in connection with administered prices in the electrical manufacturing industry. Although the Government and the agencies of the Government were receiving secret bids, it was found that the bids differed by only a fraction of a cent, or were the same, on equipment, even though it cost $50,000 or $1 million and was made in different parts of the country. I believe it was largely as the result of the evidence which was gathered in these hearings that the Department of Justice was able to bring a suit in Philadelphia, a grand jury proceeding against 17 manufacturers, which resulted in pleas of guilty, and which is now resulting in competition in the sale of electrical equipment, which is a service to the people of the United States and to the Government, involving many hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits.

In regard to two items, transformers and switchgear, the price reductions after these hearings, using simple mathematics, up to the present time involve some $200 million.

The subcommittee will hold other hearings in this field, both in regard to the electrical industry and in regard to identical bids or administered price bids in other industries.

We have held extensive hearings in regard to the drug industry, and bills recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been introduced. I also introduced a bill.

We are now preparing a very comprehensive bill which would help to make the ethical drug industry more competitive and help to straighten out several situations with reference to drugs, both in the Food and Drug Administration and in advertising insofar as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned.

We expect to hold hearings very soon—we are prepared to announce the date very soon—on the counterfeit and false drugs which are flooding the market in many places.

We have held extensive hearings in regard to the lack of competition in the insurance industry and the failure in some instances of State regulatory bodies to provide sufficient regulation. Regulation has been increased, and these hearings resulted in the introduction of a bill in the previous Congress. A bill is to be introduced in this Congress, also, in this connection.

We have held extensive hearings in regard to competitive sports and the application of the antitrust laws, particularly in regard to boxing.

In the sports field I do not think we would have seen the expansion of baseball—and we shall have further expansion in baseball—if it had not been for the hearings and the work of the subcommittee.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, for the benefit of my friend the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I will say that if this important subcommittee had handled no investigation other than the investigation concerning drugs, its appropriation would have been more than justified. This effort has had an effect upon the county hospitals throughout this Nation, and there has been a price reduction which, in my opinion, has saved the counties and saved the people many millions of dollars throughout the Nation. That is the first point.

Second, the investigation looking into the Food and Drug Administration was good for that Administration. Unethical practices were revealed which were important, not only on the basis of ethics, but also as affecting the health of the people. Under the leadership of the able Senator from Tennessee, the committee would have been worth 10 times over the money expended by the Congress for the creation and continuance of this most important subcommittee, even if there had been no other investigation than this investigation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the words of the Senator from Colorado, who has been a very active member of this subcommittee. I believe as a direct result of our hearings pharmaceutical companies have reduced their prices as much as 15 percent across the board, which in 1 year would amount to $45 million.

We find also that States, counties, hospitals, and various other agencies are using formulas in the purchase of drugs under generic names as a result of evidence brought out by the committee, which they say will save them very substantial amounts of money. We have held hearings and filed a report on bread. We have held hearings on boxing. Further hearings will be held and legislative proposals will be presented. We expect soon to hold hearings in connection with hearing aids. We shall have hearings on some consent settlements that have been made. We shall have hearings on pricing policies of concentrated industries in world trade. If time permits, we shall have some hearings in connection with the nickel industry.

We have had hearings on approximately 12 legislative proposals.

Sometimes it is asked what legislation has been passed. Antitrust legislation is very difficult to get through Congress. We were successful in having passed a bill to make the decrees of the Federal Trade Commission final, which will help in its work and save the Federal Trade Commission from having to prove their cases three or four times.

The Senate passed a bill enabling litigants to secure evidence in civil cases without having to go to a grand jury. The bill, however, died in the House of Representatives.

We held extensive hearings on prenotice-of-merger legislation, on insurance legislation, and on other bills that have been before our committee.

I should like to point out also that from time to time Senators have particular monopoly and antitrust problems affecting, for example, price discriminations in such areas as gasoline—gasoline wars—or affecting the price of eggs, or alleged unfair practices in connection with poultry or in connection with the Douglas fir industry. All these communications are sent to the subcommittee, and we try to make investigations and solve the problems. We have been able to help people in many sections of the country upon the request of their Senators.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not those to whom the Senator has referred have applied to a grand jury or some other judicial body to help them prosecute those who violate the law?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In most cases of that kind that have reached us the affected people have already exhausted those remedies. They have been to the Federal Trade Commission and their local district attorneys. They have come to us and we have made investigations. We have sometimes been successful in straightening out the problem, and we have turned what evidence we have received over to the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission, as we did in the electrical manufacturing industry case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator agree that perhaps someone or some agency is delinquent in not enforcing the law if the subcommittee of which the Senator is chairman is able to do what the enforcement agencies have been unable to do?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Such work is a part of our responsibility.

I believe the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice under Mr. Bicks has improved greatly. The Division is doing a better job, but I am not satisfied with the job it has done. We have not had the best of cooperation from it. The Federal Trade Commission has done many good things, but it could certainly be better in the field of enforcement.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the past we have appropriated a good deal of money for the use of this subcommittee, and I know it has done some good.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; we have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall not take any additional time of the Senate, but I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would be good enough to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the laws that have actually been enacted as a result of the many hearings held by the subcommittee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We shall prepare such a list and ask that it be printed into the RECORD at this point. This list will include bills enacted into law and also those sent to the Senate or approved by the Senate.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

YEAR 1960

S. 3483, a bill to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to baseball and to limit the applicability of such laws to exempt certain aspects of baseball, football, basketball and hockey, was brought before the Senate on June 28, amended and recommitted to the Judiciary Committee.

YEAR 1959

S. 726, a bill providing that orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies under section 11 of the Clayton Act shall, if not appealed, become final, was approved by the Senate on March 18 and became Public Law 86–107.

S. 716, a bill giving the Attorney General power to compel the production of documentary evidence required in investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws in civil cases, was approved by the Senate on July 29.

YEAR 1958

S. 1356, a bill to strengthen antitrust enforcement by transferring from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction over unfair and monopolistic trade practices by persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, was approved by the Senate on May 15 and became Public Law 85–909.

S. 11, to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity, was sent to the Senate on July 28, but no action was taken on it.

S. 721, to strengthen the Clayton Act by providing for Clayton Act orders to become final 60 days after issuance if judicial review is not sought and making violations of such orders subject to civil penalties, was approved by the Senate and sent to the House Judiciary Committee.

YEAR 1956

S. 3879, a bill to give auto dealers the right of Federal court review of disputes arising from the failure of the manufacturer to act in good faith in regard to dealer franchises, became Public Law 84–1026.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the budget for this subcommittee

presented by the Judiciary Committee to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:				
Legal and investigative:				
Chief counsel and staff director	1	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Counsel	2	16,102.90	1,341.90	32,205.80
Minority counsel	1	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Do	2	12,904.32	1,075.36	25,808.64
Assistant counsel	1	15,013.27	1,251.10	15,013.27
Do	1	14,275.15	1,189.59	14,275.15
Do	2	12,904.32	1,075.36	25,808.64
Do	1	11,428.05	952.33	11,428.05
Do	2	10,756.25	896.35	21,512.50
Attorneys	1	12,271.64	1,022.63	12,271.64
Do	1	8,603.95	716.99	8,603.95
Investigators	1	12,904.32	1,075.36	12,904.32
Chief economist	1	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Economist	2	14,802.38	1,233.53	29,604.76
Do	1	14,064.24	1,172.02	14,064.24
Editorial and research:				
Hearing editor	1	12,271.64	1,022.63	12,271.64
Associate hearing editor	1	10,060.30	838.35	10,060.30
Administrative and clerical:				
Clerk	1	7,996.37	666.36	7,996.37
Records clerk	1	6,659.70	554.97	6,659.70
Stenographer	1	6,659.70	554.97	6,659.70
Do	4	6,295.16	524.59	25,180.64
Stenographer (minority)	1	6,052.11	504.34	6,052.11
Stenographer	3	5,930.60	494.21	17,791.80
Do	1	5,201.49	433.45	5,201.49
Telephone operator	1	4,229.38	352.44	4,229.38
Messenger	1	3,303.10	275.25	3,303.10
Temporary consultants, when actually employed, gross salary	2			7,500.00
Subtotal, staff expense	38			384,625.89
Administrative:				
Contribution to employees' health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)				2,500.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)				23,000.48
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)				1,500.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies				1,500.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)				23,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)				2,200.00
Witness fees, expenses				5,000.00
Stationery, office supplies				2,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)				3,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents				1,400.00
Contingent fund				273.63
Subtotal, administrative expenses				65,374.11
Total				450,000.00

Mr. ELLENDER. The budget indicates a proposed expenditure for this year of $450,000, and I note that there are 38 employees. Does that number constitute all of the employees?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. 38 employees.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I understand there are 35 employees and 3 "W and I"—when and if employed.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator concludes I should like to say to him that I recognize and I believe the whole country recognizes that he has rendered a great service as chairman of this committee. This committee has brought to public attention not only one excess but many excesses. I recall that the able Senator as chairman of the committee conducted an investigation into the Dixon-Yates contract and into many other matters into which he has inquired. The public interest has been served, and my senior colleague has written for himself a record that is recognized in all corners of our land, and in so doing he has rendered a great public service.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am certainly grateful to my colleague from Tennessee, and I wish to say that with the buffeting which the chairman and members of this committee must take and the large amount of criticism and pressure as the target of a great many lobbies, and being called ugly names on occasions, it certainly is encouraging to have a few words on the other side. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 52) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—

(1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;

(2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and

(3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $450,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 10, Senate Resolution 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 53) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the resolution proposes to authorize for the use of the subcommittee exactly the same amount of money that was awarded to it last year. No increase is requested, even to take care of an increase in activity, an increase which we hope to absorb within the limits of the appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator will insert in the RECORD an explanation of how the money appropriated last year was spent, and what good resulted from the hearings, if any—for example, legislation introduced or enacted.

Mr. ERVIN. I say to the able Senator from Louisiana that I believe a committee serves a twofold purpose; one purpose is the reporting of good bills, and the other purpose is to vote against bad bills. The Senator from Louisiana will remember that last February I exhibited on the floor of the Senate about 4½ pounds of so-called civil rights bills.

Virtually all those bills had been referred to the subcommittee. The subcommittee conducted very extensive hearings on the bills, and reported most of them unfavorably. I believe that in so doing the subcommittee rendered a notable service to the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the subcommittee considered the civil rights bill which was finally enacted by Congress?

Mr. ERVIN. We considered everything except one bill, or perhaps two bills, which came from the Committee on Rules and Administration. We did not consider the Stella School District bill, but we had all the others before the subcommittee, which conducted many weeks of hearings on the bills. In addition to that, the subcommittee made studies of bills dealing with wiretapping, in an effort to arrive at a reconciliation between Federal laws and State laws on the subject, and also with reference to the study of executive privilege. The subcommittee has plenty of work to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the subcommittee deals with constitutional rights.

Mr. ERVIN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that mean the denial of any civil rights?

Mr. ERVIN. Legislation dealing with constitutional rights, other than those dealing with constitutional amendments, which are not referred to this subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I remember my good friend from North Carolina making quite a number of eloquent speeches against the civil rights bill which was finally passed in the Senate. What position did the subcommittee take on that bill?

Mr. ERVIN. The subcommittee had about 4 pounds and 3 or 4 ounces of these bills referred to it. It reported about 2 of them favorably, and the other 78 or 79 unfavorably, to the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the budget which was submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Feb. 1, 1961, to Jan. 31, 1962

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Assistant counsel	2	4,140	9,090.01	757.50	18,180.02
Investigative and research:					
Legislative consultant	1	5,280	11,322.60	943.55	11,322.60
Research assistant	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Editorial assistant	1	2,880	6,538.19	544.84	6,538.19
Investigator	1	2,400	5,566.05	463.84	5,566.05
Administrative:					
Staff director	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Deputy staff director	1	7,380	15,013.27	1,251.10	15,013.27
Secretary	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Secretary	2	2,880	6,538.19	544.84	13,076.38
Subtotal, staff expense					117,306.53
Administrative:					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)					972.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					7,624.92
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					401.76
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					4,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,500.00
Witness fees, expense					3,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,200.00
Newspapers, periodicals, journals, reference material					600.00
Contingent fund					194.79
Subtotal, administrative expense					22,693.47
Total					140,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 53, $140,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the subcommittee vested with the power of investigation as well as the reporting of proposed legislation?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; I believe that it undoubtedly has the right to conduct investigations with a view to determining whether legislation is required or advisable, or whether there is already on the statute books sufficient law to meet particular constitutional problems.

Mr. CURTIS. In previous Congresses the subcommittee has held hearings in which it took testimony of citizens who felt that their constitutional rights had been denied. Is that correct?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; it has held hearings, since I have been a member of the subcommittee, in the field of wiretapping and in the field of the denial of passports. I remember those two fields particularly. The subcommittee also conducted extensive investigations in the field of Government secrecy, that is, the claim of executive privilege to withhold information from Congress and the public.

Mr. CURTIS. What brings this question to mind is that a few years ago certain citizens journeyed to the Capital City of Washington and called upon the subcommittee to complain that they were denied their constitutional right to work, that they were denied the right to go from their homes to their places of employment and to return. I wish to say, first, that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who is now the chairman of the subcommittee, was not then the chairman of the subcommittee. I do not even know whether he was a member of the subcommittee at that time. I am sure he had no knowledge of what happened. The subcommittee, at any rate, denied those people a hearing.

I regard the right to work as one of the basic constitutional rights of American citizens. I dislike to see a subcommittee spend taxpayers' money to investigate whether the rights of someone have been infringed upon through a little wiretapping, or investigate someone who lives in the fringe or shadow of the law, and at the same time have it deny a hearing to people who are deprived of one of their basic rights, the right to labor, and to support their families. I am not lecturing the distinguished Senator from North Carolina—he was not chairman of the subcommittee at that time—but I should like to ask him whether he regards the right to work as a constitutional right.

Mr. ERVIN. In reply to the question of my distinguished friend from Nebraska, I will say that when I was a member of the Supreme Court of North Carolina I had occasion to write an opinion in that field. My study of the authorities at that time convinced me that the right to pursue the ordinary occupations of life is one of the liberties which are guaranteed to the people of this Nation in the Federal Constitution by the due process clause of the 5th amendment as to the Federal Government, and by the 14th amendment as to the States. I wrote an opinion to express that view. The court of which I was a member unanimously concurred in that opinion.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very pleased to hear the Senator from North Carolina say that. I should add that I am not surprised to hear him say it, because I have a profound respect for the opinion of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina on such matters. I believe it is safe to say, however, that the practice of the subcommittee in the past has been to refuse to hear such complaints. Does the Senator from North Carolina know whether that is true?

Mr. ERVIN. I am not aware that that particular plea had been made to the subcommittee. It was probably made to the former chairman. Of course, as to the practice of the subcommittee in the future, that will be governed by the will of the majority of the subcommittee. Any bills which may deal with this subject and which may be referred to the subcommittee will necessarily be the subject of action by the subcommittee. If necessary, it will conduct hearings on them.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senate grants these funds for the subcommittee to carry on the investigations, will the chairman proceed with any preconceived bias or notion that certain categories of violation of constitutional rights are not to be considered?

Mr. ERVIN. So far as I am concerned, I believe the subcommittee has jurisdiction of any matters relating to constitutional rights. Whether the subcommittee in a particular case would take up the study of a particular constitutional right would be something for the subcommittee to consider. I believe that in reaching a decision on that point the subcommittee might well take into consideration, and should take into consideration, to what extent, if any, an entry in that particular field of inquiry might trespass on or conflict with the jurisdiction of another committee of the Senate. In other words, I would not wish to bind myself to state what particular studies the subcommittee would take up, because I believe that would be something which, as chairman, I should have to submit to the vote of the majority of the subcommittee.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand. The distinguished Senator has been very generous in yielding. I merely wish to add that I would not for a moment deprive anyone of his constitutional rights if he is accused of a crime, whatever the situation may be. Those rights are to be protected and preserved. I also believe that we are living in a day when we have forgotten that the rank-and-file people have constitutional rights, too; that the people who have not been accused of crime have constitutional rights; that the taxpayers have some constitutional rights; that the individual who is a law-abiding citizen and who wants to work, but who is deprived of that right, has some constitutional rights.

I do not think it becomes this legislative body or any government tribunal to spend all its time and all its budget and to shed all its tears concerning the constitutional rights of those accused of crimes, and not preserve the constitutional rights of the great body of Americans who are law abiding, who pay taxes, who fight our wars, who produce the goods, and who may happen to be denied their constitutional rights by forces which combine against them.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 53) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $140,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, pursuant to the question asked me by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I ask unanimous consent to have the proposed budget of the committee printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, that has already been done.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 11, Senate Resolution 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 54) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to the revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, the resolution proposes to make available to the subcommittee the same amount as was appropriated last year, with an additional $1,000 to take care of increases made necessary by the Salary Increase Act.

I have been chairman of the subcommittee for 2 years. During the 2 years, a total of $50,000 has been appropriated. I believe I have demonstrated my desire to be economical with the funds of the subcommittee by spending only about $10,000 in the period of 2 years.

This subcommittee deals with the recodification of the laws. It has two authorized employees, one an accountant and another a clerk. Last year the subcommittee handled such matters as the postal codification law. It was the first time the postal laws had been recodified since 1873. The bill contained hundreds of sections and several hundred pages, because in recodifying the law we repealed a great many obsolete laws, and brought together in one place all the laws which were not obsolete. In many cases the phraseology was changed for the purpose of simplifying the statute as much as possible. It was necessary to make a close check of each section in order to make certain that we were not repealing any laws which ought to be retained, and likewise that we were not attempting to clarify language so as to change the meaning of the law in its original form.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that in the past 2 years although approximately $52,000 was made available to the subcommittee, only $10,000 was spent?

Mr. ERVIN. About $10,000 altogether; that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the subcommittee does not have a permanent employee or permanent employees?

Mr. ERVIN. The subcommittee has had one permanent employee and has one now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed budget, Feb. 1, 1961, to Jan. 31, 1962

Position	Number	Base salary per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for budget period (gross)
Staff:					
Legal: Chief counsel	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.91	$16,102.90
Clerical: Secretary	1	3,000	6,781.22	565.10	6,781.22
Total					22,884.12
Administrative:					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					1,487.47
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					930.45
Witness fees, expenses					200.00
Stationery, office supplies					200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, and postage)					100.00
Newspapers, periodicals, etc					50.00
Contingent fund					147.96
Total					3,115.88
Grand total					26,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 54) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to

revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That, if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so elected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $26,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 12, Senate Resolution 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 56) to study and examine the Federal judicial system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, last year the Senate appropriated $150,000 for a study of the Federal judicial machinery, in an effort to improve it. The subcommittee conducted a great many investigations during the past year with the money which was spent. We have spent only $50,000 of the $150,000. We have now as the head of the staff of the subcommittee former Senator Gillette, who is kind enough to work for the subcommittee.

We are asking for only $100,000 for next year. That is the amount we returned after spending $50,000 of the $150,000 appropriated last year.

We are about to submit a report. Based on the work which has been done, I believe it will be an excellent report. It is expected that it will be ready for publication on or before February 20.

We have economized in the past, and I assure the Senate that we will practice economy in the future and will use no more of the $100,000 than is absolutely necessary to do this work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the budget submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for budget period (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Minority counsel	1	7,260	14,802.38	1,233.53	14,802.38
Assistant counsel	1	7,380	15,013.27	1,251.10	15,013.27
Attorney	2	4,140	9,000.00	767.50	1,818.02
Editorial and research: Research assistant	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerk	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Stenographer	2	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	887.16
Subtotal, staff expense	9				81,110.05
Administrative:					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-383)					375.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund					5,272.16
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance					159.20
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					10,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,200.00
Witness fees, expenses					400.00
Stationery, office supplies					400.00
Communications					300.00
Contingent fund					783.59
Subtotal, administrative expense					18,106.36
Total					100,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the Federal judicial system with special reference to (1) the organization, jurisdiction, and venue of the lower Federal courts; (2) the selection, appointment, tenure, and duties of the judges of such courts; and (3) the status of such system under the separation of powers doctrine as one of the three coordinate branches of the Government, with a view to determining the legislative or other measures, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency and improve the operation of such system.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 13, Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 57) to investigate national penitentiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, this is an annual resolution. Very little of the money appropriated is spent; most of it is turned back. I hope the resolution may be adopted unanimously.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I acted as chairman of this subcommittee for several years. The record will show that on the average we never spent more than $1,000 of the $5,000 appropriated each year. We spent less than that last year.

Our chairman, the late distinguished Senator from Missouri, Mr. Hennings, passed away during the year, and I assumed the chairmanship to fill out the rest of the year.

It will be seen that we returned practically all of the money allotted to the subcommittee. It is to be used only in case of an emergency or in the event that some trouble develops at our Federal penitentiaries.

The members of the subcommittee visit the penitentiaries, and I think it will be agreed by all concerned that the visits we have made were well worth while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a)

and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STUDY OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 15, Senate Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 59) to study amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, the subcommittee received $25,000 last year. It has two employees. We are asking for $32,500 this year to take care of an increase in salary and also to cover the expenses of a great many additional hearings which will be necessary by virtue of constitutional amendments which will be proposed to amend the electoral college system.

Last year 40 proposed constitutional amendments were referred to the subcommittee. Twelve of them were the subjects of hearings. Six of the proposed amendments were favorably recommended by the subcommittee.

Two proposed amendments were favorably reported to the Senate by the Committee on the Judiciary; namely, those providing equal rights for women and for the replacement of Members of the House of Representatives in case of disaster.

Three proposed constitutional amendments were passed by the Senate, namely, the enfranchisement of citizens of the District of Columbia; the anti-poll-tax amendment; and the proposed amendment for the filling of vacancies in the House of Representatives.

One proposed constitutional amendment was adopted by Congress and was submitted to the States for ratification, namely, the amendment to provide for the enfranchisement of citizens of the District of Columbia.

Sixteen proposed constitutional amendments were indefinitely postponed after consideration by the subcommittee.

I believe it will be necessary to have the amount requested in order to carry out the program which the committee contemplates.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Based upon the many resolutions which we have been considering, I ask the Senator from Tennessee if the Committee on the Judiciary itself holds any hearings on proposed legislation. Is it the practice to have the subcommittees with their special employees conduct all the hearings for the full committee before any action is taken by the full committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Some subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee hold hearings at which they use the regular staff of the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. In what field? Judging from all the resolutions submitted here from the Judiciary Committee which would authorize the expenditure of more than $1,500,000 for hearings and investigations, it would seem that practically all hearings are to be held by special subcommittees, leaving little or nothing to be done by the Judiciary Committee itself.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Hearings on bankruptcy, railroad reorganization matters, private claim bills, and hearings on——

Mr. ELLENDER. Are special committees provided for them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Not for private claim bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not believe so. They are provided for immigration bills, but not for private claim bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who does that work?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The regular committee staff, and also on any investigations called for in connection with nominations to executive positions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the work the staff members do on private claim bills take up all their time?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It takes up a large part of it, because, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, there are a very great many private claim bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I am familiar with that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; I know the Senator from Louisiana is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because at one time I did that work, with only one clerk to assist me; and, of course, we worked very hard on that assignment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; the Senator from Louisiana did work hard on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that when I was chairman of the committee which used to handle those bills, I reported 52 percent or 53 percent of all the measures reported to the Senate each year; and I did all that with the assistance of only one clerk.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is my information that at the present time approximately 55 or 56 percent of all measures which come before the Senate are reported from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but that includes immigration bills.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; and it also includes private claim bills. I wish to say that the Judiciary Committee has an outstanding staff which works very hard.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not complaining about the staff; I do not say that it does not do its job. But let me also point out that since the Legislative Reorganization Act, there has been established a special force connected with the Attorney General, now Mr. Robert Kennedy, to work on these matters. That force costs the Government, I understand, several hundred thousand dollars annually for its maintenance. It is operated only to look into many of these claims, after they are passed upon by the Judiciary Committee. On the contrary, when I was chairman of the Claims Committee, I was not so fortunate. We had to do all the work ourselves; and each department affected was the one to report to the full committee.

Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the budget submitted by the Judiciary Committee to the Committee on Rules and Administration be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, Feb. 1, 1961, to Jan. 31, 1962

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal, chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Clerical, secretary	1	3,180	7,145.77	595.48	7,145.77
Subtotal, staff expense					23,318.96
Administrative:					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					1,515.73
Contribution to employee's health benefit program					150.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,500.00
Temporary clerical and technical assistance					4,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, postage)					300.00
Newspapers, periodicals, etc					50.00
Contingent fund					665.31
Subtotal, administrative expenses					9,181.04
Total expenses					32,500.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 59, $32,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That, if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall reports its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $32,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE ARTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, related bills which have as their common purpose the advancement of the arts in the United States, as well as the expanded use of the arts in our Nation's foreign policy.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The first measure would establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. In this connection it is important to note that this was first proposed by President Eisenhower in his 1955 message on the state of the Union, in the following words:

> In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation.

In the 84th Congress, pursuant to the request of President Eisenhower, there were introduced in both the House and Senate a number of bills to establish such a new Federal agency; and, in due course, the Senate passed one of the measures unanimously. In succeeding Congresses, hearings have been held; but this small, but significant, measure still remains to be enacted.

During the campaign for President last fall, there was agreement between the candidates on the need for the enactment into law of legislation to establish the Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

Vice President Nixon, in a statement printed in the Saturday Review, on October 29, 1960, declared:

> In my opinion, it would be better, at this time, to appoint an Advisory Council on the Arts, composed of the best-qualified Americans in all the cultural fields, than a Secretary of Culture. In this way, the views of a larger number of competent professionals in the several arts could be heard nationally. This Council should make recommendations to the President and Congress as to the best line of Federal action in support of artistic endeavor. It might also be helpful in suggesting steps by which State and local governments might stimulate private cultural activities.

President Kennedy, on the other hand, pointed out that the platform of the Democratic Party proposes a Federal Advisory Agency:

> To assist in the evaluation, development and expansion of cultural resources of the United States. We shall support legislation needed to provide incentives for those endowed with extraordinary talent as a worthy supplement to existing scholarship programs.

President Kennedy added that—

> If the people send me to the White House, I shall push this program. A gifted child deserves the finest education this Nation can provide. He is a national asset, whether his gift is to paint, write, design a jet airliner or a dramatic set, or explore the cosmos with a radiotelescope. His worth cannot be estimated in the ledgers of the budgeteers.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The encouragement of art, in the broadest sense, is indeed a function of government. It has always been so, in a tradition that extends from the most glorious days of Greece. It will be the responsibility of the advisory agency, which will be appointed in accordance with the pledge of the Democratic platform, to decide in what manner this shall be done.
>
> At this moment, the Federal Government acts as art patron to only one person—the Consultant in Poetry and English at the Library of Congress. And his salary is paid through a private, anonymous bequest.
>
> I think we can do better than that, if only by alleviating the unfair tax burden borne by writers, painters, and other creative artists. They may exist on small incomes for years to perfect their skills, and then be plundered by the Treasury in a single year of plenty.
>
> But the problem is not simply one of money. It is one of attitude. It is a question of whether we are more interested in reading books or making book, in Maverick or Macbeth, Zorro rather than Zola, Peter Gunn or Peer Gynt. In this day of crisis, "Wisdom is better than strength * * * a wise man better than a strong one."

I am pleased to have joined with me in sponsoring this measure Senators CLARK, DOUGLAS, MORSE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, COOPER, and JAVITS.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

The Architectural Forum once said, in noting that tourists from this country spend upward of $2 billion a year to visit the ancient shrines of Europe, that—

> The very things that Americans adore abroad they destroy systematically at home. Old buildings are broken up in the United States as fast as used packing boxes to make way for new ones. * * * The Pyramids, having already stood through 5,000 years, have a better chance of rounding out another cincomillenium than any 5-year-old American masterpiece has of rounding out the decade.

The threat to historical sites by federally assisted highway and housing programs is so pronounced that some 800 organizations have been formed to try and protect at least some of them. At the present time, 22 cities have ordinances protecting historic buildings and sections of those cities, and 50 other cities are considering the adoption of such ordinances. Europe and Asia are way ahead of us in these matters—as is Puerto Rico, for that matter.

According to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, chartered by the Congress in 1949:

> Existing laws have not been overhauled for a quarter of a century and are inadequate to safeguard our landmarks of the past.

When the Historic Sites Act was passed in 1935, the Federal Government played a rather insignificant role in construction programs. This is not the case any longer. The Federal Government today spends great sums of money for programs such as highways construction and urban renewal. I have supported and spoken out in favor of Federal participation in such programs which are vital to our Nation's future. But in the name of progress, I do not think the Federal Government should contribute directly or indirectly to the destruction of objects of historical significance.

As our country moves forward, it is important that the historic reminders of our proud heritage be preserved, not only for this generation, but also for the future generations of Americans. Our Federal Government should be leading the way in the preservation of priceless and irreplaceable sites and objects of historical significance.

This is what the bill I am introducing today has for its objective. The bill would amend the Historic Sites Act of 1935, by providing that when the Secretary of the Interior determines that a site, area, building, or object of national, regional, or local historical significance will be seriously damaged or destroyed by a Federal program or by a State program, financed in whole or in part by Federal funds, he may order a halt to a Federal program and the denial of Federal funds to a State program until such project is modified so as to provide, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, for the preservation of such historical site or building.

This action by the Secretary of the Interior would be instituted by petition on the part of any State or political subdivision thereof, or the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, or any other organization recognized by the Secretary as being concerned with historic preservation, alleging that a historical site, building, or object is threatened with destruction, due to a federally financed project. Upon receipt of such a petition, or upon his own motion, the Secretary would be authorized to conduct public hearings to determine whether the site or building in question is in fact of historical significance.

This bill also provides that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with organizations concerned with historical preservation, shall make a continuing study of ways to promote and encourage the restoration and preservation of historical sites and buildings and antiquities by governments, private organizations, and individuals.

CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACT

The next measure in the cultural package I am offering today on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, in order to make this program a true two-way cultural exchange program in the same way that the Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act provide two-way educational exchanges. I first offered this amendment in the 86th Congress, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., introduced a similar measure in the House as did Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR.

The amendment specifically provides for the inclusion in the cultural exchange program of students and teachers. It is important to state this legislatively in order to clarify the original intent of the sponsors of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 which was that this act should provide for equal representation abroad from the professional and the educational art fields.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., cosponsor with me of Public Law 860—84th Congress, declared in a speech at the annual convention of the American Educational Theater Association, that—

> Under the current program of the President's international cultural exchange program as administered by the Department of State, of 115 attractions which have been sent abroad, only a half-dozen or less than 6 percent, have been educational talent—university or college theater or music groups. * * * This program is so weighted with professionals that it might justly be called the 6 percent program rather than the President's international cultural exchange program. It should also be noted that there is no cultural exchange in the program at all.

I myself in a speech in this House on January 13, 1960, pointed out that—

> Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow and Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker in Delhi have requested the State Department to send young educational talent in the arts to Russia and India. However, the administration has only talked about this exchange and no young talent has been sent to either of these countries.

The failure to include young people from our country's educational institutions in the President's cultural presentations program as was intended by the authors of the Humphrey-Thompson Act—Public Law 860, 84th Congress—is all the more astounding when we recall President Eisenhower's own call for top priority to a massive interchange of students in his historic speech at Delhi University in India in December 1959. At that time President Eisenhower said:

> More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils, I believe mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together. In so doing, they will concern themselves with the problems, possibilities, resources, and rewards of their common destiny.
>
> Through the centuries nations have sent their youth armed for war to oppose their neighbors. Let us in this day look on our youth, eager for a larger and clearer knowledge, as forces for international understanding; and send them, one nation to another, on missions of peace.

Unlike the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts which, during the years which have passed since their enactment, have provided for the exchange of some 35,000 students between the United States and other countries, a similar provision for reciprocal exchange is totally lacking in Public Law 860, 84th Congress and, as a result, our cultural relations with other countries have not developed as rapidly as they should have and as these difficult times demand.

The amendment I am sponsoring today is necessary to demonstrate to other peoples that the United States is interested, and deeply so, in their cultural and artistic achievements.

At the present time the box office is the final arbiter of the cultural attractions from abroad which are seen by our people. As a result, the American public sees many artists from Europe and the Soviet Union but very few from Asia, Africa, and South America.

In view of the very rich cultural tradition and heritage of all these great continents which are now in ferment this is a grave loss to our people and a tremendous impediment to our understanding of the peoples who live there.

Most competent observers agree that a cultural exchange program which would make it possible for the people of the United States to see the art and artists of those nations on a regular basis would be a development of the utmost importance. This is especially true in view of our worldwide commitments and the leadership which we must now provide.

Surely it is true that unless Americans of all ages take the trouble to learn a great deal more about the languages and the culture of the peoples of these vast continents than we are presently doing we may not long be able to preserve our own way of life now so widely under attack.

A NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Madam President, the final bill I introduce today on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is to establish in Washington a National Portrait Gallery.

Such a gallery would be a significant contribution to the cultural status of our Nation's Capital.

It is only appropriate that Washington—the political hub of our great country—should also stand out as a center of culture. The Congress should do all that it can to promote the arts and the reputation of Washington as a center of culture befitting to the Capital City of the leader of the free world nations.

A National Portrait Gallery will make a major contribution to our national life, will foster patriotism, and educate the coming generation in what our country stands for.

The small portrait gallery located in Philadelphia's Independence National Historical Park shows even in its present stage of development how inspiring such a gallery can be.

The new national cultural institution which I propose would be in the historic Patent Office Building in the heart of downtown Washington, at Seventh and F Streets NW., now occupied by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

The Patent Office Building was originally designed for museum purposes by Robert Mills, architect of the Washington Monument and the Treasury Building in Washington.

The administration had urged that this historic building be destroyed, but the Congress in 1958 passed legislation to save it for use as an art museum by the Smithsonian Institution. I was proud to have joined with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], Representative FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey, and others in working for preservation of this historic building.

This bill, which I introduce today, would make the National Portrait Gallery a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution, with status equal to the National Gallery of Art.

The General Services Administration has reported that the Patent Office Building could be converted easily for use as a portrait gallery. The report noted that this is in accord with the view of Dr. David E. Finley, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the other members of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Dr. David E. Finley, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, has declared:

> There is a great need for a National Portrait Gallery in Washington. Many portraits of important historical personages are now being held by the trustees of the National Gallery of Art for permanent display in a National Portrait Gallery.
>
> The Smithsonian Institution also has a collection of nationally important portraits which cannot at the present time be adequately displayed. In addition, there are numbers of portraits of persons who should be represented in a National Portrait Gallery, now in the hands of private collectors, which might become available if a suitable building is provided.
>
> The usefulness of a gallery of this kind has long been demonstrated by the National Portrait Gallery in London with its famous collection of portraits of persons who have contributed to the making of British history.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that these bills lie on the desk through Friday of this week so that any other Senators who may desire to cosponsor them may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

> By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. JAVITS):
>
> S. 741. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development

of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 742. A bill to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local historical significance which are threatened with destruction by federally financed programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 743. A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 744. A bill to establish a National Portrait Gallery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, January 22 marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic—the largest captive, non-Russian nation both in the U.S.S.R. and behind the Iron Curtain.

Although the independence of the Ukrainian nation was short lived, this day is significant as a reminder that there still burns in the hearts of men the hope and dream of freedom. Nations, just as individuals, are endowed with faith and we who cherish our own freedom share with the brave Ukrainian Republic the faith that the day will come when the Ukrainian people will once again realize their independence.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 14, Senate Resolution 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 58) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, again, this is a subcommittee headed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the chairman also of the full committee. He has asked that I explain this proposal to the Senate.

This is a matter dealing with immigration and naturalization. All bills dealing with that subject go before the Judiciary Committee. Last year 940 private immigration and naturalization bills were received by the subcommittee. That was during the 86th Congress—630 were disposed of, 406 of which were reported favorably to the Senate by the full Judiciary Committee, and 224 of which were indefinitely postponed.

I know I do not have to call to the attention of the Senate the increased load we have concerning matters of this kind. That being so, I do not deem it necessary to go into detail and explain the resolution further than to say that the $125,000 that the subcommittee is asking for is an increase of $9,000 over the request of last year, but that increase is requested only because of the salary increase bill that we passed last year. It is really the same amount being requested.

It is true that there are approximately 3 million aliens in the United States, and with that number, we can imagine how it causes more work for this particular subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the budget submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration by the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed budget, standing Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Feb. 1, 1961, through Jan. 31, 1962

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Professional staff member	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Investigator	1	7,320	14,907.83	1,242.31	14,907.83
Do	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
Research:					
Research director	1	6,480	13,431.56	1,119.29	13,431.56
Research assistant	1	5,820	12,271.64	1,022.63	12,271.64
Do	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
Administrative and clerical:					
Secretary to staff director	1	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	7,267.26
File and record clerk	1	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	7,267.26
Stenographer	1	2,340	5,444.53	453.71	5,444.53
Do	1	1,620	4,005.31	333.78	4,005.31
Subtotal staff expense	11				115,364.83
Administrative:					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,500.00
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					600.00
Contribution to Federal employees group life insurance					350.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					600.00
Stationery, office supplies					200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Contingent fund					185.17
Subtotal administrative expense					9,635.17
Total					125,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 16, Senate Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 61) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, it will be recalled that the amount requested is the same as that requested last year. There is more work involved within our committee. In recent years, that committee has taken into its jurisdiction the matter of life insurance and hospitalization, both of which are continually being studied at the present time. Technicians are required to really do the job in that particular field. We are involved in that field, and we must do our duty.

The amount requested is the same amount as that requested last year, and the committee is returning $15,851.35 of

the amount appropriated last year. I assure the Senate we shall do the best we can in the coming year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget requested be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and investigative:					
Special counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Investigator	1	4,380	9,576.07	798.00	9,576.07
Editorial and research: Research assistant	1	3,900	8,603.95	716.99	8,603.95
Administrative and clerical:					
Stenographer	2	2,160	5,079.97	423.33	10,159.94
Clerk	1	1,920	4,593.92	382.82	4,593.92
Subtotal, staff expense	6				49,107.07
Administrative:					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					3,191.95
Contribution to employees Federal employees' group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					171.72
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					2,000.00
Witness fees and expenses					500.00
Stationery and office supplies					600.00
Communications (telephone and telegraph)					350.00
Newspapers, magazines, and documents					150.00
Contingent fund					16,429.26
Subtotal administrative expenses					25,892.93
Total					75,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 61) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the complete reorganization of the entire postal rate structure, (b) the establishment of better service to the public, and (c) the operation of the postal establishment with greater efficiency and economy;

(2) the operation of the Federal employees' group life insurance and health benefits programs to establish their effectiveness and determine the extent of their financial stability; and

(3) the establishment of guidelines to fix boundaries for keeping positions in the career service and for identifying those which clearly should be filled without regard to civil service procedures.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANT FOR THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 17, Senate Resolution 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 22) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, this resolution has been in effect for about 10 years. It becomes necessary because of the large amount of correspondence of the committee. I ask that the request of the committee be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 22) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 18, Senate Resolution 62.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 62) to investigate the problems of American small and independent business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], is out of the city on official business, but I will be happy to try to explain Senate Resolution 62.

First of all, the committee is seeking $125,000—the same amount as we received last year. Therefore, we propose to absorb within our budget the 7½ percent pay raise granted last year.

Secondly, the committee plans another ambitious series of hearings during the coming 12 months. We feel that our hearings and reports of the past year have resulted in much assistance for the Nation's 4½ million small business establishments. In addition, several of our investigations have brought about substantial savings by the various procuring agencies of the Federal Government. I would guess that our insistence upon competition in the purchase of spare parts by the military departments alone has saved many times the number of dollars spent by the committee for all its work.

Finally, the committee members and the staff have continued to assist all Senators in aiding constituents. We estimate that over 60 Senators called upon the committee many times during 1960 for help and advice on individual cases.

I strongly feel that the money we are requesting will enable us to continue to serve the Senate and the American free enterprise system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on

Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF SENATE DOCUMENT OF COMPILATION OF STUDIES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 19, Senate Concurrent Resolution 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, a similar resolution was passed by the Senate last year. Unfortunately, it was not considered in the House. The resolution is presented again this year. It is very important that the Senate document be compiled and printed. I ask that the concurrent resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was agree to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States foreign policy prepared under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to S. Res. 336, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by S. Res. 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and S. Res. 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STUDY OF VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 20, Senate Resolution 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 43) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 3, line 2, after the word "than", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MR. ROBERT NEAL TO BE IN SENATE CHAMBER

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Robert Neal, a member of the staff of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, who will help me in presenting Resolution 43, be permitted in the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, this is the customary amount for the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, which will continue its usual functions. I shall be glad to give a more detailed explanation, if desired. Otherwise, I shall simply say that approximately $25,000 of the appropriated moneys for the year ending has been unused.

We hope to be able to return some of the money at the end of the year to begin, but that will depend entirely on the extent of the investigation and what unexpected matters we may encounter.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much money was returned?

Mr. STENNIS. In round figures, $25,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget for this subcommittee, as presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (per annum)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and investigative:					
Professional staff member	1	$6,000	$12,587.99	$1,048.99	$12,587.99
Do	1	5,640	11,955.29	996.27	11,955.29
Do	1	5,640	11,955.29	996.27	11,955.29
Do	1	5,580	11,849.85	987.48	11,849.85
Do	1	5,100	10,988.24	915.68	10,988.24
Do	1	5,100	10,988.24	915.68	10,988.24
Do	1	4,380	9,576.07	798.00	9,576.07
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerical assistant	1	4,260	9,333.05	777.75	9,333.05
Do	1	2,940	6,659.70	554.97	6,659.70
Do	1	2,700	6,173.64	514.47	6,173.64
Do	1	2,580	5,930.60	494.21	5,930.60
Do	1	2,460	5,687.56	473.96	5,687.56
Subtotal, staff expense					113,685.52
Administrative expenses:					
Contributions to employees health benefit programs, civil service retirement, and Federal employees group life insurance					10,583.68
Communications (telephone and telegraph)					2,500.00
Stationery and office supplies					2,500.00
Contingent fund					2,000.00
Witness fees and expenses (estimate)					3,300.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations) (estimate)					12,230.80
Reimbursable payments to other agencies (estimate)					10,000.00
Special consultants and staff advisers (estimate)					33,000.00
Total					190,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 43), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATIVE TO FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 21, Senate Resolution 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 50) to investigate problems connected with the flow of escapees and refugees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "than", where it appears the first time to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by chairman of the committee.

Mr. HART. Madam President, the resolution would continue the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, with the assignment of examining, investigating, and making a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

In all fairness, I wish to report that it was the hope of the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], that at the conclusion of this year the subcommittee might be terminated. Instead, the resolution now pending proposes to increase the amount of money for the subcommittee from $25,000 to $50,000.

Why?

I think one need only read the daily press to recognize that although our desire that there be a termination of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny is a laudatory one, history does not concur with our hope. As all of us now know, we are faced with a very dramatic challenge to organize ourselves responsibly to receive an increased flow of refugees from not far away, from Cuba.

The President of the United States, in his first and televised press conference, emphasized, in reply to a question, the fact that plans will have to be made in this regard. He reserved making any detailed statement.

We all know that in the middle of January President Eisenhower received a rather detailed report from Tracy Voorhees, which I am sure all of us have read.

For these reasons, Madam President. I urge that the resolution now pending be agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is it specifically that it is proposed to investigate?

Mr. HART. The hope of the committee would be to determine, first, whether our experience in the face of the increased flow of refugees and escapees suggests that our laws are presently inadequate; and, second, to determine whether there are any areas in which the Federal Government can participate effectively with voluntary agencies to make more livable the lives of those who have joined us as a result of Communist pressure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume the Senator is familiar with the large expenditures we make all over the world in handling various refugee programs. We have them in Hong Kong. We have them in various parts of Asia. We have them in Europe. There seems to be no end to the help requested of us in this field.

Will the subcommittee devote its time to a study of laws to broaden provisions of existing law or would it attempt to decrease the number of refugees coming into our country? I cannot understand what it is specifically the subcommittee would do.

Mr. HART. I am sure the subcommittee will not be able to eliminate the causes which produce refugees.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. HART. Not even increasing the amount requested would produce that desirable result.

I think the subcommittee will give attention to the question of whether the laws which are presently on the books are adequate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the purpose of the subcommittee be to permit more refugees to come into the United States?

Mr. HART. Specifically with reference to the Cuban situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will correct me if I am wrong, but as I remember the RECORD last year showed that this subcommittee was going to function for only 1 year more. I think the year before, the appropriation was $16,000. Now the subcommittee is asking for $50,000. There seems to be no end to this activity.

Mr. HART. As I say, the events of the recent past months suggest that although we would like to wish the problem away it will not go away. I think our obligation is heightened by the incidents out of Cuba.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the budget for this subcommittee as submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proposed budget, 1961, Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees of the Senate Judiciary Committee (period Feb. 1, 1961, to Jan. 31, 1962)

Position	Number	Annual salary (gross)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:				
Counsel and staff director	1	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Assistant counsel	1	14,907.83	1,242.31	14,907.83
Secretary	1	6,538.19	544.84	6,538.19
Subtotal, staff expenses				37,619.21
Administrative:				
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)				243.36
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)				2,445.24
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)				121.82
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)				3,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters fees)				2,400.00
Witness fees and expenses				2,000.00
Stationery, office supplies				700.00
Communications (telephone and telegraph)				600.00
Newspapers, periodicals, journals, reference materials				300.00
Contingent fund				70.37
Subtotal, administrative expenses				12,380.79
Total				50,000.00

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I add to what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said by stating that there is proposed legislation to deal further with the refugee problem, which has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Certainly members of this subcommittee would undoubtedly have views with reference to that proposed legislation.

The refugee and escapee problem is still with us. A prominent Member of the other body, who has dealt widely with immigration matters, has questioned whether there were 40,000 refugees interested in coming to the United States.

The Department of State has informed me that at the end of 1960 there were more than 350,000 refugee-escapees throughout the world. Two hundred thousand of these people fled from the tyranny of Communist East Germany alone, while another 110,000 refugees from Communist China sought refuge in Hong Kong. In addition, 10,000 non-Germans have fled from other European Iron Curtain countries. And let us not overlook the 30,000 Cubans who have fled from the despotism of a "red" bearded Castro.

The subcommittee has important work to do. This work has the interest of many American citizens who have friends and relatives still behind the Iron Curtain, or who have friends and relatives who have escaped from behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtains.

I know under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Michigan this work will go forward.

Mr. HART. I appreciate very much the comments of the Senator from New York. I hope that is true. This is an area in which the Senator from New York has demonstrated, over a long period of time, serious concern.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 50) as amended, was agreed to.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 22, Senate Resolution 55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 55) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "than", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, due to circumstances beyond his control, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is unable to be present at this time. He did, however, leave with me a statement relative to this particular resolution which I would like to call to the attention of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN

This subcommittee is in the midst of an exhaustive study of the disposition of patent rights under Government research and development contracts, and has begun hearings with respect to needed legislation in this field. If the subcommittee holds the hearings needed to complete this investigation of Government patent policy, and anticipated extensive hearings concerning a proposed general revision of the Copyright Act of 1909, there will be a substantial increase in the expenditure for hearings, which were held to a total of only 6 days during the last session. While the Government patent policy investigation is perhaps the most important current work of the subcommittee, in view of the fact that current congressional appropriations for research and development are measured in billions of dollars, there are also many other matters relating to patents as well as to copyrights and trademarks, which will be presented to the Senate for action during this session. For example, the gap between the total fees the Patent Office receives and the amount it spends is growing and is now approximately $15 million. I believe it is important to explore means of reducing this deficit and hearings may also be necessary for this purpose. However, because $43,000 of the appropriation for last year's activities will be refunded, I believe that the subcommittee can perform its work with a budget no larger than last year's budget of $135,000.

The subcommittee's program for this session will include, in addition to the matters noted above, a continuing investigation of the operations of the Patent Office in an attempt to discover means of (1) reducing the existing backlog of patent applications by expediting examination procedures, and (2) improving the ability of issued patents to withstand attack in the courts. The subcommittee will also continue its investigation of patent infringement litigation with a view to reducing the cost of infringement suits, and giving more effective assistance to trial judges in making the technical fact-findings which such suits require. The subcommittee also proposes to continue its production of monographs covering the impact of the patent system upon the economy as a whole.

Madam President, that was the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who is the chairman of the subcommittee, having succeeded our former colleague, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the budget submitted to the Rules Committee.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary for the period Feb. 1, 1961, through Jan. 31, 1962

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Legal and administrative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Associate counsel	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	16,173.19
Assistant counsel	1	6,900	14,169.70	1,180.80	14,169.60
Do	1	5,880	12,377.07	1,036.42	12,377.07
Investigator	1	3,360	7,510.31	685.85	7,510.31
Consultant (when actually employed)	2	8,820	(1)	[2] 1,314.37	7,886.22

[1] $48.6085 per day.
[2] Based on 27-day month but not to exceed 3 months.

Budget of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary for the period Feb. 1, 1961, through Jan. 31, 1962—Continued

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
Staff:					
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	5,880	12,377.07	1,036.42	12,377.07
Secretary	2	3,240	7,267.26	605.60	14,534.52
Do	1	3,000	6,781.22	565.10	6,781.22
Clerk	1	2,460	5,687.56	473.96	5,687.56
Subtotal, staff expense					113,669.95
Administrative:					
Contribution to employees' health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					1,116.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					7,388.55
Contribution to Federal employees' group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					369.36
Reimbursable payments to agencies					1,500.00
Travel (including field investigations)					2,000.00
Hearings (including reporters' fees)					4,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,500.00
Stationery and office supplies					750.00
Communications (telephone and telegraph)					500.00
Newspapers, magazines, and documents					750.00
Contingent fund					956.14
Subtotal, administrative expense					21,330.05
Total					135,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 55) was agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 66) to provide for elected members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Mansfield, of Montana; and Mr. Miller, of Iowa.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Mansfield, of Montana; Mr. Jordan, of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. Keating, of New York; and Mr. Miller, of Iowa.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, after discussing the situation with the distinguished minority leader, I announce that the Senate has completed the business which was before it today. It is our intention to ask that when the Senate adjourns this evening, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon, Thursday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, may I ask the majority leader what he foresees for the end of the week, if anything, and whether or not committees are expected to report any proposed legislation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not believe there will be any legislation—in the sense that I understand the Senator from Illinois to mean the term—reported this week. I am hopeful that we may have some more nominations on Thursday. I do not think it will be possible to have any money bills at that time because the Rules Committee will not meet until tomorrow. If we can get through at a reasonable hour on Thursday—and I think we can—it is the intention to go over until 12 o'clock noon Monday next, at which time we ought to have additional business to attend to. It is the hope of the leadership that the Democratic policy committee will have a meeting on Tuesday next to consider a bill reported from the Government Operations Committee, and if we get the approval of the policy committee, I assume that possibly later next week that measure will be brought to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I inquire of the majority leader if he knows the number and title of the bill which is likely to come before the Senate for consideration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The bill is S. 153, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963. The bill has been reported out by the Government Operations Committee and is now on the calendar, but has not been processed by the policy committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, with respect to the bill which I introduced, a bill to make the Reorganization Act permanent, it would extend it, I think, for a period of 2 years. Insofar as there has been no change in substance in the bill, as we suggested the measure last year, and speaking only for myself, I apprehend that there would be no difficulty in having that bill enacted without undue debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to hear the distinguished minority leader make that statement. If that be the case, aside from this particular proposal, the proposed legislation next week will have to do with nominations and money bills almost exclusively and entirely.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGED AND AGING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, in accordance with Senate Resolution 266, the Senate Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging prepared a report and recommendations for legislation. That report is now in galley form at the Government Printing Office. That report will complete the assignment of the subcommittee, which is a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, and the report will then be filed with the Senate.

However, some additional time will be needed for the minority of the subcommittee to prepare its statement for inclusion in the report. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the time for filing the report with minority views be extended to not later than February 15, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to say a few words with respect to the President's message on the state of the Union, which is somewhat in accord with statements I made yesterday on television, radio, and to the press. In his state of the Union message the President said:

> No man entering upon this office, regardless of his party, regardless of his previous service in Washington, could fail to be staggered upon learning—even in this brief 10-day period—the harsh enormity of the trials through which we must pass in the next 4 years. Each day the crises multiply. Each day their solution grows more difficult. Each day we draw nearer the hour of maximum danger, as weapons spread and hostile forces grow stronger. I feel I must inform the Congress that our analyses over the last 10 days make it clear that—in each of these principal areas of crisis—the tide of events has been running out and time has not been our friend.

Those are rather emphatic adjectives—to be staggered, and to be overwhelmed—but I think I should observe for the RECORD that this is not the first time we have come to grips with a crisis, if we wish to call it that, or with difficult situations that have confronted this Government both at home and abroad. We are moving now into that area of the calendar when we observe the anniversary of Lincoln. I said yesterday

there was a slightly Lincolnesque quality about the speech because it contains a statement to the effect that—

> we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure.

It was on the 19th of November 1863 that that rugged, homely, and dedicated man from Illinois stood in the cemetery at Gettysburg and said:

> We are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

So this paraphrases something of that sentiment. I have no recollection, however, that Lincoln was ever staggered. I have no recollection that he was ever overwhelmed. I have no recollection of that, even in the face of Horace Greeley's Prayer of the 20 Million. Lincoln knew precisely where he had to go. With that dedicated sense that made him, according to H. G. Wells, one of the five greatest men produced in the whole history of mankind, he bore his burden and moved steadily on to a great objective.

Sometimes we forget the resources that are on our side. First, there is our military strength. Our country has never been kissed by a foreign bomb. No destructive weapon has ever fallen on our America the Beautiful. We are strong militarily and we are strong economically. Our people today number 180 million. Our productive facilities are intact. Our resources and our resourcefulness are intact.

I take no pessimistic view of the future.

Therefore, when I said yesterday that I thought perhaps the so-called crisis was slightly overstated I believe I was making fair criticism.

As I listened to the recital of what had to be done on the homefront, I went back to the December issue of the Economic Indicators, 2d session, 86th Congress, which was prepared for the Joint Economic Committee by the Council of Economic Advisers. I shall use only a few figures. When we use a great many figures, we find that they do not always mean very much, because people do not have time to examine them and to make adequate comparison. So I have broken them down a little.

For example, disposable income—what is available for spending—in 1952 was $238.7 billion; in 1953, $252.5 billion. In 1 year it had gone up by $14 billion. In 1958, which was the so-called beginning of the recession year, it was $318 billion. In that 5-year period the disposable income had gone up by $65 billion. The following year, 1959, it was $337 billion. It had gone up another $20 billion. In 1960, on the basis of the third quarter, it had gone to $357,500 million. That was another $20 billion. So disposable income had gone up $119 billion since 1952.

These figures come from the Board of Economic Advisers.

If we look at the personal consumption expenditures, I believe the figures are just as impressive.

In 1952, it was $220 billion; in 1953, $232 billion. So in a year the so-called personal consumption expenditures had been raised by $12 billion.

By 1958, they had increased to $293 billion, which was an increase of $61 billion.

For the third quarter of 1960, they were $328 billion. The figure had gone up another $35 billion. From 1953 to the end of 1960 they had gone up by $108 billion.

I do not believe these figures induce any pessimism about our country.

If we look at personal savings, we note that they were $18,900 million in 1952. They were $29,200 million in the third quarter of 1960. Therefore, personal savings had increased in the 8-year period by nearly $10 billion.

Now we can look at the employment figures. I have freely admitted that there are soft spots in the country. There are some soft spots in the southern end of my own State, and I freely admit it. However, I would like to see this matter kept in perspective.

Our civilian labor force in 1953 was 63 million. By the end of 1960, it had gone to 73.7 million. Therefore, our civilian labor force, exclusive of the military, had increased by nearly 11 million people.

The interesting thing about these figures is that it includes everyone over the age of 14. A great many youngsters are in schools. Perhaps they should be counted in the labor force. Perhaps properly they should be counted. I do not know. I am not a labor economist or a labor statistician. However, I like to make it clear that the figures in the Indicator are the civilian labor force of people over the age of 14 years.

These increased by nearly 11 million since 1952.

Now let us look at the employment figure. It was 61 million in 1952. By the end of 1960, it had gone to 67.2 million. Despite any gloomy figures, we had gained 6.2 million people since 1952 in the labor force—people who were working.

On the unemployment side, the jobless over 14—let us remember that—were 4.1 million in 1959, 3.6 million in January 1960, and 4.5 million in November 1960. That is the last figure I have, because the January Indicator has not come to hand.

Percentagewise, that would be 3.1 percent in 1952, up to 6.8 percent in 1958, and then to 5.7 percent at the end of the year.

But I also like to think of our jobless in terms of our whole population. In 1952 we had 1.9 million, with a population of 157 million. So actually it was a little over 1 percent in 1952. By 1958 we had 4¾ million jobless. We had gotten up to 2¾ percent of the whole population, because the population jumped to 174 million. In 1959 we had gained another 3 million people, and we had 3.8 million jobless. It was 2⅛ percent. In the last quarter of 1960, 4 million were out of work, but the population had gone to 180 million, and the percentage, according to the whole population, was still 2⅛ percent.

So, as I look at the situation I believe the comment that was made on the President's message, to the effect that it was an overstatement in that respect, that it did not take into account the resources we have, was, after all, justified.

I doubt very much whether such adjectives as "overwhelmed" and "staggered" would apply. I like to think in terms of standing with the lady on top of the dome, Freedom, looking all over the country. Trains are still running, carrying merchandise. Millions of trucks are still carrying merchandise. The great productive and distributive system of America is still working. If we can energize the confidence of the people, I believe we can get this job done.

Madam President, one last thought. The first inaugural address I heard was that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1933. I shall never forget it as long as I live, because a biting wind was striking that man in the face as I heard him say:

> We have nothing to fear but fear itself.

I feel certain that Franklin Delano Roosevelt was not staggered; he was not overwhelmed; and he was not insensible of the great, enduring resources of the country.

Let us remember that in the whole history of the Republic, other men have confronted other crises and have taken them in their stride. They saw the potentialities of the country. They saw the great golden goal to which we must repair, and kept character, spirit, and morale intact as the Nation went on to new, higher, greater, and grander goals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, it was with interest that I listened to the remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

Let me say in reply that John F. Kennedy has not been staggered; he has not been overwhelmed; but he has been fully aware of the difficulties which confront our country at this time, and, for that matter, which confront the free world as a whole. He has been confident; he has been courageous; he has been candid.

I was interested in the minority leader's comparison of a statement made by President Kennedy yesterday with a statement made by President Lincoln on the battlefield at Gettysburg. It is true there is a similarity. I point out that there was a similarity also, in one instance, in President Kennedy's inaugural address, when he said:

> For I have sworn before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago.

That is a term which I think could be compared with Lincoln's reference to 4 score and 7 years ago. But I point out that Lincoln's success came in great part because he recognized the peril the Nation was in. Our success is dependent on the same recognition, which is what the President displayed on yesterday, on last Wednesday, and in his inaugural address.

I think the Nation is extremely fortunate to have a young man as President of the United States, a man who was born in this century, a man who went through the fire of the Second World

War, a man who has served in the House and the Senate, a man who has served his State, his country, and the world well.

I am delighted that he has laid the cards on the table and presented the facts to the American people as he has seen them, on the basis of being in office only 10 days.

I am happy also that on Thursday next the President will send to Congress a message on economic recovery and growth; on Monday next, a message on the balance of payments and the part which gold plays in that balance; that within 2 or 3 weeks after that he will send to Congress messages on education, on health, on the budget, and on water and natural resources; and that in March he will be sending to Congress messages on defense, on housing, and on agriculture.

I was interested in the statements by the distinguished minority leader—and I believe I paraphrase him almost correctly, if somewhat freely: "A country never kissed by a bomb" and "a country on which no foreign weapons have as yet fallen."

Yes, that is true. That has not happened yet. But when we consider the advances in the field of science and technology and realize that the intercontinental ballistic missile can travel at a speed of from 12,000 to 15,000 miles an hour, I say that if we are not careful, cautious, and calm, and do not work together; if we allow things to get out of hand; perhaps we will be kissed some day by a bomb or some other sort of nuclear weapon or missile. I hope that day will never come.

I think we live in an exceedingly difficult era. I agree with President Kennedy when he refers to the dangerous decade of the sixties.

Yes, most of us are prosperous at home, but not all of us, because 5½ million Americans are out of work. Furthermore, there are in excess of half a hundred areas known as pockets of poverty, in which people who are able, willing, and eager to work cannot find jobs.

What we have is on the surface. What good is our money if, year by year, it buys less and less? What good is our prosperity, so-called, at home if it is not based on a sound foreign policy overseas? We cannot separate one from the other.

We live in a period of crisis. I think the best thing the President has done, and can do, is to bring home to the American people the facts of life as they really are, not as we would like them to be, not as we would wish them to be.

The times call for greatness, and President Kennedy will furnish that attribute. The times call for courage and cooperation. The times call for both great political parties, in this dangerous era, in this dangerous decade, to unite behind the President of the United States, to the end that we can overcome the difficulties which confront us at the present time; that we can restore the confidence of our allies; and that, together and collectively, we can go forward to greater and bigger things. In that way we will help to preserve the kind of life in which we all believe, the kind of earth which we all desire to have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I have only one thought to add. I think it is possible that sometimes one paints so dark a picture that he believes salvation is beyond reach; and that does no good for the national morale. Therefore, I do not share that estimate of our economic situation.

I am always glad when I can summon testimony from the other side. A distinguished former Governor—and he is a distinguished former Governor—now presides as Secretary of the Department of Commerce. I am sure Secretary Hodges will be a distinguished Secretary of Commerce. Here is a statement just taken from the United Press International news ticker:

> The Department said manufacturers sold a record $365 billion worth of goods in 1960, up 2 percent from 1959. Major advances were scored in autos, machinery, food, petroleum, and chemicals.

Madam President, we are not on our last legs. I have recognized what the distinguished majority leader calls pockets of poverty. But when we draw a general picture, we must remember not only that it has an impact on this country, but that the state of the Union message is read and digested in the chancelleries of the world; and if they see that the United States is in a bad way, that has an impact upon the confidence in this Nation on the part of people abroad.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "One View of the Nation," published in the Wall Street Journal of today. It is very succinctly put and is quite informative.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE VIEW OF THE NATION

Some 30 years ago when Franklin Roosevelt took office, in a time of trouble, he told the Nation there was nothing to fear but fear itself. There were moments yesterday when we thought President Kennedy was trying to scare the Nation out of its wits.

"No man entering upon this office, regardless of party, could fail to be staggered upon learning—even in this brief 10-day period—the harsh enormity of the trial through which we must pass in the next 4 years.

"Each day the crises multiply. Each day their solution grows more difficult. Each day we draw nearer the hour of maximum danger.

"I speak today in an hour of national peril and national emergency. Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation governed and organized such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain.

"I feel I must inform the Congress that our analyses over the past 10 days make it clear that—in each of these principal areas of crisis—the tide of events has been running out and time has not been our friend."

Nor are these areas of crisis, which put the Nation in peril, few in number. The President's list embraces not only the enduring problems of the struggle with communism—in Asia, in Africa, in Europe, in our own hemisphere—but almost every aspect of our life at home, from the state of the economy to juvenile delinquency and stream pollution.

Now that there is trouble aplenty, at home and all over the world, has hardly escaped anybody's notice, and few will quarrel with the suggestion that a "prudent heir" should take careful inventory of his legacies. Yet it seems to us that there is something gravely amiss—and therefore disturbing—in the view of this country's problems which Mr. Kennedy expressed yesterday.

For an accounting, if it is not to mislead the trustees into ill-considered action, must not misread the enormity of present problems simply because they are seen up close for the first time. Nor should it become so preoccupied with the liabilities that it overlooks the assets.

To say that this Nation is in an "hour of peril" is true enough. Almost every hour in our national life, from its beginning, has been one of peril, because a Nation such as ours is always being tested anew. But it is not true, or at least we do not think so, to suggest that this hour makes some precise peak of peril, to be resolved in the instant upon success or disaster.

We ought not to be led by rhetoric to think of the trials ahead as if we had not already passed through enormous ones—some of them within the past 8 years—and so to come to feel that the woe upon us now exceeds all other woe.

By his own confession, the enormity of these problems has only loomed so great to President Kennedy within the past 10 days. Yet they were there before, and they were wrestled with by other men, and in such a way that to this hour at least we have surmounted them. These problems are real, and enduring. To face them is one thing, to be overwhelmed by the thought of them is something else.

And most of all the Nation ought not to be so overwhelmed as to overlook the assets on the balance sheet. If we have troubles in the cold war, we also have many strengths; Mr. Kennedy inherits, among other things, the strongest military force of our times and the support of the civilized part of the world. These instruments have been put into his hands by two previous Presidents, one Democratic, one Republican.

And for all that Mr. Kennedy's advisers seem to tell him otherwise, there are many assets on the domestic balance sheet that marks the beginning of his term. Our economy has proved its resilience. We have outgrown every nation in the power of our productive facilities. And we are the envy of every nation, right now, for the existing wealth of our homes, our hospitals, our schools, our roads, or our rewards for those who labor. There is something a little askew in a catalog that lists only the mishaps encountered or the aspirations unfilled.

The danger here is that by the disproportion we will be led to ill-considered action, to hasty and panicky spending to build arms, to a towering foreign aid program to save the world, to desperate moves to conciliate our enemies, to panicky efforts to shore up an economy not at all tumbling down. There were, indeed, touches of all these things in the President's speech yesterday.

We would not expect the President to be, nor want him to be, unmindful of the problems that face his administration. There are many of them and many of them are grave.

But we would feel more reassured if we were sure that this administration, in its haste to deal with the things which are wrong, will not upset the things which are right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I do not believe the President, in his address on yesterday to the joint session, painted a picture of gloom and doom, as the distinguished minority leader would have us believe. Let me

read what the President of the United States said, in part:

I shall neither shift the burden of executive decisions to the Congress, nor avoid responsibility for the outcome of those decisions.

I speak today in an hour of national peril and national opportunity. Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain. The answers are by no means clear. All of us together—this administration, this Congress, this Nation—must forge those answers.

To state the facts frankly is not to despair the future nor indict the past. The prudent heir takes careful inventory of his legacies, and gives a faithful accounting to those whom he owes an obligation of trust. And, while the occasion does not call for another recital of our blessings and assets, we do have no greater asset than the willingness of a free and determined people, through its elected officials, to face all problems frankly and meet all dangers free from panic or fear.

Madam President, to me, what the President has done is to be candid with the Congress and with the American people. To me, he has stated the facts as he has been able to ascertain them during his first 10 days in office. To me, he has not offered a program based on despair; instead, he has offered a program based on hope, provided all of us work together and help him carry out the responsibilities which that office entails.

So I hope that all of us, regardless of our politics, will put our shoulders to the wheel and will do what we can to help the President of the United States, because the difficulties which are his are enormous and the trust which we must place in him is great. I think he deserves it. I think he needs it. I think he will get it from the American people as a whole.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to assure the President of the United States and I wish to assure my very distinguished and amiable friend, the Senator from Montana, for whom I have so abiding an affection, that I shall always cooperate, because the interest of the country comes first.

But if, in my considered judgment, and as a matter of conviction, the President of the United States goes down the wrong road, I will reach out, with what force and vigor I have, and will seek to clutch him and pull him back to the crossroad and put him on the right road; and if he persists in error, I have no responsibility to go down the wrong road.

I shall certainly fulfill my every responsibility by trying to warn him, by trying to help him, and by saying, "Mr. President, you are on the wrong road, in the interest of this Republic. Come back before despair and destruction overtake you, and do not ask us to go down that road toward destruction with you," if we have a conviction on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, let me say that, as always, the distinguished minority leader is most considerate and most eloquent. But I would point out that he is warning of perils insofar as the President's programs are concerned, when, as yet, there are no perils in those programs, because they have not yet been presented to the Congress and to the people, for their consideration.

I hope that, like Cassandra, the distinguished minority leader will, on occasion, raise his voice in warning. But I express the hope that he will think the matters through before he arrives at such a decision, because the President of the United States will be just as fully dependent upon him and his party as he will be upon the Democratic Party, which he has represented so ably and so well for so many years.

I know that when the chips are down, that sort of cooperation and understanding will be forthcoming.

IMPORTANCE OF FOREST IMPROVEMENT AND FOREST DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HART. Madam President, in the state of the Union message, which has been so thoroughly analyzed by both the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, President Kennedy eloquently and forcefully described the urgency of effectively countering the present recession, and indicated that in the next 2 weeks he will forward to the Congress specific programs to get people back to work.

As I have studied the situation in the northern parts of Michigan—and this applies equally well to other upper Great Lakes areas—one of the most immediately effective Federal programs for stimulating employment opportunities in these areas would be a stepped-up forest improvement and forest development program.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the text of a letter I addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Hon. Orville Freeman. In the letter I outlined the desirability of this national forest program in Michigan. I also ask that the Secretary's reply be printed in the RECORD.

Likewise, I ask that the text of my statement when I released this correspondence and a memorandum on the cost and number of man-days of work that could be brought to northern Michigan areas by such a program be also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR PHILIP A. HART RELEASES LETTER TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN ON DEVELOPMENT OF FORESTS IN MICHIGAN

Senator PHILIP A. HART today released the text of a letter which he had addressed to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman proposing additional appropriations for national forest development programs.

In releasing the letter, Senator HART said, "I am convinced that one of the most effective and useful programs for bringing employment opportunities to northern Michigan is to be found in speeded-up work programs to provide for balanced development of national forest lands. There exists a sizable delay in the 12-year development program of our national forests proposed under the previous administration. There is substantial unemployment and underemployment in the counties in and adjacent to the five national forests in Michigan. It would be possible to compress the 12-year forest development program into the next 3 years and to obtain some 1,373,000 man-days of work in well-rounded forest development.

"Attached to the letter which I sent to the Secretary of Agriculture is a breakdown of the type of work and estimated cost of this 3-year program as it would affect the national forests in Michigan. I have suggested to the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, that serious consideration be given to a $50 million supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1961, and $92 million additional appropriation over the budget request for fiscal year 1962. The program I am suggesting would plan to spend about $12 million a year in Michigan over the next 3 years.

"Investment in forest development provides more man-hours of work per dollar than almost any other Federal program. This represents not only investment in future forest products and forest industries, but an investment in recreation and tourist opportunities as well as jobs."

Attached are copies of Senator HART's letter to Freeman and a memorandum of a national forest program for the State of Michigan.

JANUARY 21, 1961.

The Honorable ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the counties in and adjacent to all five of Michigan's national forests, and in particular in the Upper Peninsula area, there is substantial unemployment. This has been a condition which has prevailed for some time. It is due in a large measure to the underdevelopment of the renewable natural resources and the recreational possibilities.

For some time, along with other Members of the Senate, I have been deeply concerned about the need better to develop our natural resources, particularly those in public ownership.

Last year, when the Secretary of Agriculture requested that the Congress enact the multiple-use bill for the national forest, and we agreed, I looked quite closely into forest matters. I was encouraged to find that there had been prepared a comprehensive program to develop these public forest resources. I was disappointed to discover that the Eisenhower administration viewed this plan—its own product—as either impossible or not worthy of attainment.

The program for national forest development involving a $1.7 billion investment stands on its own feet as a conservation measure of superlative merit. There is not a shadow of doubt that with our projected population growth and our growing resource needs, this program is modest both in scope and projected rate of accomplishment. It is already behind schedule.

Of special significance just now is the capability of a forest work program to meet certain criteria for selection in a recession situation. A substantial portion of the work is in or near areas of chronic unemployment. Many of the projects take relatively few skills, thus able-bodied jobless can be readily utilized without extensive retraining. The Forest Service, by virtue of its extensive fire control experience, can rapidly expand or contract its personnel base. Much of the work can be undertaken at once—not being contingent upon extensive planning or specification preparation.

Several of the more important program elements, such as reforestation, recreational site developments and timber stand improvement, assure that as much as 75 percent of every dollar invested is utilized for salaries yet the capital investment ratio is still extremely high.

The combination of recognized conservation needs and suitability for acceleration at a time and in an area of recession are compelling reasons for a decision to move now. The new frontier of this decade lies in the reconstitution of our resources for the service they can render now and in the critical years ahead.

Permit me therefore to urge that immediate steps be taken to move in the last quarter of this fiscal year on the national forest program.

The current Forest Service budget is $143 million. The program I suggest involves a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1961 of approximately $50 million, an increase for fiscal year 1962 over the resulting 1961 budget of $92 million as outlined in the attached document, and action in fiscal year 1963 which will bring the Forest Service budget up to the level of $320 million. In the process, special consideration should of course be given to programs of work in areas of chronic unemployment and to provide jobs for these now jobless.

I know you will give this your thought and hope you will find it sound.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. HART.

NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAM ESTIMATES FOR THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Work projects listed are a portion of the 12-year program for national-forest lands in Michigan. Many of these projects could be started within 1 or 2 weeks after receipt of funds. Surplus trees are available in the nurseries for expanding reforestation programs.

While the attached lists of projects represent about a 12-year program, the major part of the work could effectively be telescoped into about 3 years. There is also a reservoir of work that goes beyond the 12-year program. This would normally have been programed at a much later date, but much of this work could be moved ahead and accomplished in the next 3 to 5 years.

This work program provides for balanced development of national-forest lands in Michigan. Most of these projects require a relatively high percentage of labor, thus offering maximum employment opportunities. Cost data are based on local going wages.

National forest program estimates

Type of work	Approximate man-days	Estimated cost
MICHIGAN—UPPER PENINSULA		
Timber resource management: Plant trees on 154,000 acres and cultural treatment of 431,000 acres	625,000	$12,644,000
Recreation-public use: Construct 980 family units and related facilities on public campground areas	37,000	1,200,000
Wildlife habitat: Improve 20,000 acres of game habitat, 80 miles of fishing streams, and 230 acres of lakes; control rodents on 60,000 acres	14,000	240,000
Soil and water management: Stabilize gullies, roads, and streams and rehabilitate eroded lands	5,000	101,000
Forest fire protection: Reduce fuel on 8,000 acres and construct 600 miles of firebreaks	75,000	1,548,000
Structural improvements: Construct 20 housing units, 20 service buildings including lookouts and special structures; betterment of existing structures; new radio installations and replacement of substandard telephone lines	15,000	568,000
Forest roads and trails: Construct or reconstruct approximately 1,900 miles of roads and assist in construction of roads by timber purchasers	150,000	8,970,000
Total	921,000	25,271,000
MICHIGAN—LOWER PENINSULA		
Timber resource management: Plant trees on 77,000 acres and cultural treatment on 218,000 acres	300,000	$6,000,000
Recreation-public use: Construct 420 family units and related facilities on recreation areas	17,000	428,000
Wildlife habitat: Improve 40 miles of fishing streams, 230 acres of lakes, and 13,000 acres of game habitat; control rodents on 20,000 acres	10,000	177,000
Soil and water management: Stabilize and rehabilitate eroded lands, gullies, roads, and streams	3,000	61,000
Forest fire protection: Reduce fuel on 400 acres and construct 400 miles of firebreaks	37,000	775,000
Structural improvements: Construct 10 housing units, 10 service buildings, 1 research office-laboratory, lookouts and special structures, new radio installations, replace substandard telephone lines	10,000	364,000
Forest roads and trails: Construct or reconstruct about 1,000 miles of roads and assist in construction of roads by timber purchasers	75,000	4,480,000
Total	452,000	12,285,000

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1961.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: You will be interested to know that I have this date urged on the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers that as a part of the antirecession program there be included an active program of forest improvement and reforestation. Dr. Welch, Assistant Secretary of Federal-States Relations, and Dr. McArdle, the Chief of our Forest Service, are working to submit specific figures as to man-hours of labor and costs. In this connection, it might well be of interest to your constituents that we are moving aggressively here at your instance.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

RACE STUDY URGES USE OF EXECUTIVE'S POWER

Mr. HART. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, which appeared yesterday in the Washington Post, entitled "Race Study Urges Use of Executive's Power." This study and group of recommendations were prepared under the auspices of one of the Nation's most respected organizations concerned with improving race relations in America—the Southern Regional Council. The report contains a well-reasoned, constructive group of recommendations which, if put into action, would go a long way toward providing the kind of leadership and policy which have long been needed in the field of civil rights.

But this is not all that might be done. There remains need for legislative action, as well. I, for one, am hopeful that this Congress will assume its share of responsibility for making progress in civil rights, too. If this can be done, the legislative branch will take its proper place, along with the executive and the judicial, in making the Constitution a living instrument in the protection of the rights of all our citizens.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACE STUDY URGES USE OF EXECUTIVE'S POWER

(By Elsie Carper)

An independent survey suggests that existing Presidential powers, "diligently exercised, could carry the country far toward racial relations that are sane and honorable."

The study, prepared by the Southern Regional Council, a nonprofit organization seeking ways to improve race relations in the South, was published yesterday. The council has offices in Atlanta.

The 48-page report was issued at a time when President Kennedy's administration is formulating policies and programs. Broad recommendations on ways the President may use his powers to combat discrimination are outlined in the report.

One of the major recommendations is a Presidential staff adviser to keep the President informed on racial matters and to coordinate activities of the Commission on Civil Rights and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

The report states that consideration be given to setting up an office, with adequate staff, to serve as a watchdog over Federal programs for compliance with a policy of nondiscrimination.

The Federal Government's own operations, the report declares, need to be a model of just race relations. The Government must hire, fire, and promote with obvious regard for racial equality and eradicate segregation in its offices.

While the survey is limited to official activities of the President, the report makes it clear that the President's personal attitudes and actions also are important.

"A President of robust conviction will lose no occasion, however trivial," the report states, "to show by purely personal action his admiration of principles of equality. Such demonstration may be worth fully as much as Executive orders and formal pronouncements."

Presidential leadership is defined in the report as "a showing of concern, in all the countless acts of the office, that America be a place where men live with each other in confidence, and society cooperates with each of its members in the fulfillment of his search for a good life."

"There would be inestimable value if the President gave, simply and clearly, a declaration of national intent to move vigorously to end all discrimination and disadvantage of race, and pledge that the Federal Government in the conduct of its own affairs would show the way," the report declares.

The council points out that race relations is America's oldest unsolved problem, once again at a stage of crisis. In the past the

crises were resolved by compromise, war, and from 1877 to 1933 by national avoidance of responsibility.

"This ancient and always divisive issue has a claim on us not only for settlement, but for decisive resolution," the report states. "It is a burden which national self-respect demands that we finally lay down."

Honest dealing by the Government and the public toward nonwhite citizens, the report declares, would strengthen the prestige of the United States abroad while continuing discrimination will weaken it.

The report states that Negroes are a disadvantaged tenth of Americans from, literally, the cradle to the grave. America has no undeveloped resources comparable to the reservoir of human talent, which, in the Negro population, is going to waste.

Negroes are not the only minority at a disadvantage and discrimination exists elsewhere than in the South but the racial problems of the South are the acute test of the American ideal of liberty and equality.

The council finds little in the record to encourage the belief that the situation in the South will improve "unless recognized as the Nation's failure, and properly subject to national policy."

National unity, the report states, will be served best if the President speaks forthrightly about racial problems in the South and if statements are confined to what he and the administration are prepared to enforce.

In an obvious reference to the recent riots in New Orleans that followed desegregation of two schools, the report makes this veiled criticism of the Eisenhower administration:

"That a state of near anarchy could exist for weeks in one of our largest cities without any public remark by the Chief Executive is well nigh incredible."

The report declares that within the South there are numerous whites who will give practical, effective support for reform if there is national leadership. Frequent conferences and consultations by the President with southern economic and political leaders would broaden this base of support.

"Preeminently the most compelling unfinished business is school integration," the report states. "Respect for law and Federal authority requires a prompt resolution."

The council urges the President to "publically reconfirm his full support" of the Supreme Court school desegregation decision and his intention to employ his Executive powers to insure compliance.

Throughout the South the burden of desegregating schools has fallen upon Negroes. The council urges the President to direct the Attorney General to look closely into authorizations he has for initiating or intervening in school desegregation cases.

It also urges the President to direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide information and counsel to school administrations and schools engaged in desegregation of schools.

The report states that in the field of housing the policies of the Federal Government, through its mortgage credit aids, public housing and slum clearance programs, "has been a principal architect of housing segregation."

The President should issue an Executive order stating that the national policy is to encourage integration in housing, the report states. It recommends that the administration study proposals to reduce the size and increase the number of public housing projects and scatter them in biracial and all-white neighborhoods rather than place them in Negro and transition neighborhoods.

The administration also should consider a system of "benign quotas" in public housing projects to keep them from becoming all Negro or all white.

The council recognizes that a strict nondiscriminatory order for FHA and PHA housing will reduce the number of starts in the South and hamper or halt urban renewal but believes that Southern opposition should not be a deterrent. Benefits of participation in Federal programs have such a powerful attraction that there is every reason to believe that the slowdown will not last long, the council states.

Other recommendations by the council:

Federal employment practices should be reviewed with the aim of immediate compliance with nondiscrimination. Special effort should be made to recruit qualified Negroes for offices concerned with race relations such as U.S. attorneys, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. marshals, Civil Rights Division, Commission on Civil Rights and housing agencies.

Negroes should be appointed to the Foreign Service but not restricted to positions in African countries.

Federal grants in aid for vocational education and research funds should be withheld from schools and colleges which restrict admissions because of race. The Federal Government should insist that public schools attended by children of military personnel be nonsegregated.

Discrimination in the National Guard and in ROTC units in universities should be ended. The President in making appointments to the service academies should give special attention to Negro candidates who are at a disadvantage in receiving congressional appointments.

The Department of Justice should enforce vigilantly existing statutes and precedents to assure orderly school desegregation and the right of peaceable assembly. Action could prevent violence, reprisal, and intimidation surrounding school desegregation, sit-in controversies, and Negro voting.

The Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department should be staffed with an adequate number of attorneys. Working relationships with U.S. district attorneys should be so defined to permit widespread enforcement of voting provisions of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts.

The Federal Government should undertake a national registration drive, under sponsorship of the President. A side result would be an upsurge in Negro registration in the South.

The separate but equal clause in Hill-Burton Act funds for Federal aid for hospital construction should be reexamined.

The Department of Justice should study ways to end discrimination in interstate travel now clearly established as unconstitutional.

The Federal Government should insist that its contractors follow practices of nondiscriminatory employment. Federal cooperation with discrimination should be ended at once in programs of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and the U.S. Employment Service.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to take this occasion to compliment the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], on the skill and the efficiency she has shown in presiding over the Senate today, during what really is the first full day of business the Senate has transacted this year. She has been diligent in carrying out her duties and she has been fair in her judgments; and I believe that the Senate as a whole is greatly honored to have this distinguished lady as its Presiding Officer on this occasion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I concur in the sentiment the majority leader has expressed. Let me add that in addition to the distinguished way in which the able junior Senator from Oregon presides over the Senate, she fairly suffuses this entire Chamber with her charm and removes from some of the exchanges the severities and the asperities which sometimes mark our deliberations.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, on that gracious note, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon, on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 2, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Nicholas de B. Katzenbach of Illinois to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Robert Kramer, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Line of the Air Force

Abbey, George W. S., 25948A.
Abell, John T., 47613A.
Adamcik, Frank J., 53683A.
Adams, John A., 47240A.
Adams, Leland L., 53625A.
Adams, Robert L., 47090A.
Adams, Roderick B., 32145A.
Addington, Vernal E., 31476A.
Addison, Belmer J., 53532A.
Addison, James M., 47459A.
Ahls, William L., 32177A.
Ahmann, James H., 25949A.
Albach, John S., Jr., 53734A.
Albright, William E., Jr., 25950A.
Alexander, Frank G., 47698A.
Alford, Everett H., 31428A.
Alford, James W., 32076A.
Alker, Philip R., 47771A.
Allen, Fred R., 28814A.
Allen, Lawrence C., Jr., 47365A.
Allen, Owen W., Jr., 28863A.
Allen, Robert H., 27139A.
Allred, Elmer G., 25951A.
Alm, David C., 31571A.
Alsperger, Eugene J., 25952A.
Alverson, Warren J., 25953A.
Ameling, Robert H., 47674A.
Anders, John H., 25954A.
Andersen, Stanley A., 47077A.
Anderson, Alvord V., 3d, 28924A.
Anderson, Carl F., 25955A.
Anderson, Everett E., 56582A.
Anderson, Jack R., 25956A.
Anderson, Marian G., 47495A.
Anderson Robert B., Jr., 32128A.
Anderson, Sidney E., 56754A.
Anderson, Theodore M., 32120A.
Anderson, William D., 47496A.
Anderson, William G., Jr., 47701A.
Andreae, Cornelius T., 32847A.
Anonsen, Charles E., 53623A.
Anstine, Gale B., 53626A.
Antoszek, Henry T., 28818A.
Archibald, Robert G., 47514A.

Arias, Vincent, Jr., 31548A.
Armer, Samuel F., 32807A.
Armstead, Claude E., 47119A.
Arndt, Charles L., 28913A.
Arnet, John E., 25958A.
Arnold, Raymond L., 53622A.
Arnold, William B., 53549A.
Arnow, Arthur E., 55901A.
Arrington, Wallace E., Jr., 28917A.
Arthur, Harold F., 47535A.
Artman, Joseph T., Jr., 25959A.
Askenasy, Eugene K., 32781A.
Asseff, Sam E., 47467A.
Auld, Harry E., 32785A.
Aurand, Kenneth F., 31446A.
Austin, Ronald R., 59508A.
Avallon, Donald J., 53566A.
Axelrod, Harry I., 47663A.
Ayres, Don, 25960A.
Backa, Ralph W., 53556A.
Bacon, Merle D., 56670A.
Bailey, James F., 32129A.
Bailey, Melvin A., 54130A.
Bailey, Morris W., 53582A.
Bain, Hubert L., 28806A.
Baker, Jack T., 53567A.
Baker, James E., 25961A.
Baker, Jax A., 31518A.
Baker, Jay E., 47123A.
Baker, Kendall J., 53470A.
Balden, Harold A., 53787A.
Balderston, Robert E., 32146A.
Ball, George A., 53597A.
Ballantyne, Arnold P., 32163A.
Balogh, John C., 25962A.
Barber, Paul A., 47371A.
Barfknecht, Harold A., 47089A.
Barkus, Robert B., 31416A.
Barnett, Warren K., 53643A.
Barnicoat, William J., Jr., 53753A.
Barrett, John L., Jr., 31550A.
Barrett, Lowell A., 31442A.
Barrows, Ralph E., 47669A.
Barry, John J., 25963A.
Barth, Marvin J., 2d., 25964A.
Basham, Robert R., 31971A.
Bass, Donald C., 53480A.
Bass, Williamson G., 53713A.
Bassett, William W., 32804A.
Bates, Robert L., 59507A.
Bathurst, William D., 26317A.
Baugh, David S., 28959A.
Bavaria, Edward C., 26318A.
Bayless, Ovid L., 47247A.
Beals, Gordon A., 32182A.
Beatty, Joseph A., 47386A.
Beck, Edward M., 53448A.
Beck, Stanley C., 25965A.
Beckwith, Charles A., Jr., 28968A.
Beckwith, Wayne K., 47605A.
Beeler, William F., 31468A.
Beene, Reagan H., Jr., 28919A.
Beggs, Conrad L., 56645A.
Belford, Willis A., Jr., 28848A.
Bell, Edward J., 3d, 28849A.
Bell, Kenneth H., 25966A.
Bell, Robert K., 47169A.
Belmonte, Francis J., Jr., 56647A.
Belton, Waddie L., Jr., 31419A.
Bender, Hubert L., 47265A.
Bennett, Arthur C., 53692A.
Bennett, James B., 53681A.
Benson, Frederick J.R., 32765A.
Benson, Kenneth A., 53561A.
Benson, Varnell C., 47381A.
Bentz, Richard H., 26319A.
Bergmann, William H., 47374A.
Berkowitz, Jerry G., 56770A.
Berman, Leonard J., 47066A.
Berry, Charles W., 47399A.
Bethany, Glenn A., 47621A.
Beynon, Glenn E., Jr., 32798A.
Bills, Walter B., 31612A.
Bina, Melvin J., 56683A.
Binford, Donald D., 32142A.
Birch, Charles P., 32059A.
Bissell, Evert R., 47731A.
Bivona, Charles S., 31445A.
Bjorneby, Walter E., 47228A.
Black, James D., 32822A.
Blaisdell, Charles F., 53568A.
Blevins, Thomas E., 31394A.
Blinn, Donald P., 59726A.
Bloodworth, James O., 3d, 31541A.
Blume, Murray B., 25971A.
Boardman, Henry W., 47338A.
Bochniak, Edward J., 53729A.
Bodenhausen, Max G., 47691A.
Boege, William R., 53644A.
Boehm, John A., 53472A.
Boggess, William A., 25972A.
Bohne, Derwin L., 31987A.
Bohren, Joseph F., 53776A.
Boiko, William, 25973A.
Bolles, Richard B., 31551A.
Bonadies, Alphonse G., 31614A.
Bones, James R., 47282A.
Bonham, John L., 25974A.
Boning, William J., 32047A.
Bono, Richard J., 53565A.
Boone, George T., 28963A.
Booth, Herbert W., Jr., 25975A.
Boren, J. Donald, 47264A.
Borgen, William D., 31993A.
Botbyl, George W., 25977A.
Bott, Donald H., 47575A.
Bouchard, Richard M., 28947A.
Boucher, William A., 25978A.
Bounds, Lowery K., 53499A.
Boverie, Richard T., 25979A.
Bovinett, Lee R., 31396A.
Bowden, Fred L., 56438A.
Bowden, William P., 47593A.
Bowen, Joseph A., Jr., 47220A.
Bowen, Ralph K., 53754A.
Bowling, Melvin G., 53781A.
Boyd, William P., 25980A.
Boyer, Joe C., 28936A.
Boyer, Ronald J., 47607A.
Boyette, Robert T., 56709A.
Boyles, Melvin E., 47259A.
Bozik, Edward E., 32160A.
Bradberry, Harold E., 56620A.
Bradbury, Robert J., 47603A.
Bradley, Charles W., 53551A.
Bradley, Thomas B., 53647A.
Bradshaw, Gene, 28958A.
Bradshaw, Robert D., 32826A.
Brady, Perry B., 53576A.
Bramlett, James D., Jr., 31429A.
Branch, William E., Jr., 28921A.
Brandon, William W., 2d, 53741A.
Brandt, David D., Jr., 47212A.
Brannon, Gordon L., 32200A.
Brantly, Milton L., 28930A.
Branz, Michael H., 28825A.
Brashear, John A., 25981A.
Bratcher, Wayne R., 31565A.
Braun, Richard J., 31391A.
Brazell, Leroy A., 53736A.
Brendel, Jo, 25982A.
Bresee, Don K., 53613A.
Brewer, James E., 25983A.
Brewster, Philip L., 25984A.
Bricker, John C., 25985A.
Briggs, James E., Jr., 32104A.
Bright, Boris E., 28928A.
Brightwell, Herbert F., 32113A.
Brittain, Charles J., 27970A.
Bromley, Robert D., 31975A.
Broom, Phillip W., 53525A.
Brougher, John D., 47451A.
Broughton, Robert N., 53635A.
Broussard, Whitney J., 32043A.
Brown, Alfred D., Jr., 32073A.
Brown, Bill V., 28850A.
Brown, Curtiss E., 31572A.
Brown, George D., 25986A.
Brown, Ivan D., 31463A.
Brown, James T., 25987A.
Brown, Joseph R., 53462A.
Brown, Larry H., 31478A.
Brown, Lawrence A., 32045A.
Brown, Robert M., 47408A.
Brown, Sam S., Jr., 47666A.
Brown, Sheldon L., 47545A.
Brown, Van L., Jr., 53684A.
Brown, Wendell L., 28910A.
Brubaker, Richard E., 25988A.
Brubaker, Robert D., 56617A.
Bruder, Alvin H., 56675A.
Bruha, Harlan L., 47103A.
Brumet, Robert N., 53585A.
Brundage, Harold L., Jr., 53440A.
Bruning, Christian R., 3d, 53432A.
Brunson, James E., 53451A.
Brusini, Andrew R., 56654A.
Bryan, Blackshear M., Jr., 25989A.
Bryant, Herbert M., 53760A.
Bryant, Louis L., 25990A.
Bryant, Ray H., 47600A.
Buchanan, John E., 32130A.
Buck, Theodore R., 31462A.
Buckingham, Jack L., 47263A.
Buckman, Louis C., 56610A.
Buckner, Gerle L., 47690A.
Buechley, Jay F., Jr., 32208A.
Bullington, Robert J., 25992A.
Bulloch, Fulton G., Jr., 47306A.
Bullock, Jerry M., 32072A.
Bulmer, Ronald L., 53516A.
Bunting, Joseph O., Jr., 47511A.
Burch, Charles L., 32092A.
Burgert, Colin R., 32119A.
Burgess, Thomas K., 31520A.
Burke, Walter J., Jr., 31546A.
Burnett, Chester E., 31610A.
Burns, Edward M., 31245A.
Burns, Kenneth D., 25994A.
Burns, Robert C., 31386A.
Burns, Samuel T., 3d, 31477A.
Burris, John W., 31559A.
Burris, Thomas A., Jr., 31973A.
Buster, Gerald O., 47448A.
Butterfield, Robert A., 47384A.
Byars, Howard W., 31414A.
Calbert, Bobby R., 53670A.
Callas, Nicholas P., 25997A.
Calliham, Andrew J., Jr., 32127A.
Cameron, James S., 47269A.
Cammack, Luther S., Jr., 53685A.
Camp, William A., 31573A.
Campbell, Allen M., 47477A.
Campbell, Bruce G., 32201A.
Campbell, Edward J., 53599A.
Campbell, Herbert G., 31384A.
Campbell, Hubert R., 53544A.
Cannon, Lloyd J., Jr., 31491A.
Cannon, William E., 53709A.
Cantelou, Louis W., Jr., 47746A.
Cantrell, Gayle W., 25998A.
Cappelli, Charles E., 47699A.
Carl, Martin J., 47199A.
Carnes, Edward W., 47284A.
Carnes, James R., 47510A.
Carney, Charles R., 28941A.
Carr, Robert J., 47522A.
Carr, Virgil H., Jr., 47675A.
Carr, William S., 53767A.
Carrigan, Robert L., 47198A.
Carroll, Dolpha T., Jr., 53553A.
Carroll, John H., 47554A.
Carter, Frank P., 32093A.
Carter, Jackson B., 26001A.
Carver, James E., 28884A.
Carver, Richard C., 47616A.
Case, Charles W., 47479A.
Casey, Aloysius G., 26002A.
Cash, Eugene G., 47470A.
Cashman, Gerald A., 47335A.
Cassidy, Duane H., 53794A.
Cassidy, John C., 26003A.
Cates, Charles W., 47978A.
Cates, Joseph R., 47772A.
Catlett, Albert W., 28851A.
Caudell, Colven E., Jr., 31554A.
Cavanaugh, John R., 47235A.
Chalker, Marion P., Jr., 53586A.
Chalmers, Frederick W., 47152A.
Chaplin, Stanley W., 47640A.
Chapman, James C., 56655A.
Chapman, Robert E., 26004A.
Charles, Pat, 54929A.
Charles, William M., Jr., 26005A.
Chase, Donald J., 47438A.
Chasse, Albert J., 28844A.
Chavanu, Donald E., 53463A.
Cherry, Richard E., Jr., 26006A.
Chipman, Richard A., 47471A.
Choate, Stanley F., 26008A.
Chovanec, Albin E., 56045A.
Christian, Daniel R., 28953A.
Christner, Alan S., Jr., 26009A.

Christophersen, Edwynn J., 47272A.
Chung, Winchell D., 32774A.
Chur, Lester R., 53458A.
Cipra, Donald J., 32772A.
Circe, Robert J., 53725A.
Clapp, John N., 47285A.
Clark, Francis J., Jr., 32011A.
Clark, Frederich A., 26012A.
Clark, Richard E., 53807A.
Clarke, William H., 26014A.
Clay, James T., 53572A.
Clune, John J., 26015A.
Cobb, Forrest N., 28920A.
Cobb, Francis C., 26016A.
Cobb, Jesse R., 32159A.
Cobble, Billy G., 53633A.
Cocchiarella, Joseph V., 47071A.
Cockes, Elbert D., 47547A.
Coe, John C., Jr., 47529A.
Coffland, Richard A., 56701A.
Cohn, Sanford L., 32827A.
Colbath, Thomas N., 31574A.
Cole, Edward H., Jr., 47137A.
Cole, James G., 53476A.
Collier, Bobby D., 32782A.
Collins, Wesley B., 47254A.
Colovich, Raymond M., 32783A.
Colver, William S., 53529A.
Combs, Wayne L., 28929A.
Comfort, Norman D., 56796A.
Conley, Thomas F., 3d, 47165A.
Conn, Henry L., 47450A.
Connelly, Thomas L., 31497A.
Connet, Robert K., 53718A.
Connors, John S., 47186A.
Conors, Robert W., 47724A.
Conrady, Denis A., 26017A.
Conway, James E., 47506A.
Conway, Oscar C., 28896A.
Cook, Roger D., 53573A.
Cook, William H., 47105A.
Coon, David B., 32842A.
Coons, Donald E., 47069A.
Cooper, Fred M., 47584A.
Cooper, Robert F., 53707A.
Coopland, Victor D., 53719A.
Coppedge, Charles A., 47097A.
Corak, George J., 53437A.
Corbett, Robert M., 47561A.
Corder, Jesse K., 32003A.
Corley, John C., 32763A.
Cornelius, William H., Jr., 31383A.
Cornwell, Jimmy L., 53449A.
Cortelyou, George B., 3d, 32123A.
Cosgrove, John A., 28908A.
Cote, Ronald L., 53726A.
Cotten, Richard E., 47301A.
Cotton, Louis H., Jr., 47122A.
Cottrell, Samuel S., 31537A.
Couch, William E., 28898A.
Courchesne, Leonard G., 32102A.
Courtaney, Dennis E., 28944A.
Covert, James E., 47160A.
Covington, Lowell D., 47176A.
Coward, William E., 32211A.
Cowden, David A., 47191A.
Cowell, Roger R., 32057A.
Cowser, Kenneth R., 47193A.
Cox, James L., 47221A.
Cozort, Gerald N., 32095A.
Crader, Richard M., 47279A.
Craig, Leo L., Jr., 47292A.
Cram, Deryl L., 47542A.
Crawford, Jack C., 56589A.
Crawford, Roy L., 31448A.
Crawford, Van L., Jr., 31519A.
Crego, Richard N., 47732A.
Crews, Carl B., 26018A.
Crews, Glen T., 47222A.
Cribb, Vance N., 47260A.
Cribbs, Charles M., 31422A.
Crim, Azro C., Jr., 56656A.
Cromack, Dana B., 47148A.
Cronin, James H., 26322A.
Cross, Leo O., 31449A.
Cross, William B., 47333A.
Crowe, Robert F., 31389A.
Cruts, Robert E., 47484A.
Cummings, David Q., 56672A.
Cummings, Gerald R., 47642A.
Cunningham, Hugh J., 28837A.
Currier, Vincent E., 47067A.
Curry, Donald L., 32162A.
Curry, Gene D., 56614A.
Curtis, Raymond J., 32087A.
Curtis, Thomas J., 47753A.
Cusenbary, Charles L., 56713A.
Custis, Daniel P., Jr., 47236A.
Cutler, John B., 47286A.
Dagwell, Harry R., 56607A.
Dahlfors, Theodore E., 31523A.
Daily, Madison M., 26020A.
Dale, Walter M., 47353A.
Daley, James P., 31995A.
Dalpra, Clarence E., 53591A.
Dalton, James E., 26021A.
Dalton, Roy C., 32770A.
Dalton, Russell A., 31555A.
Dalton, William M., 28949A.
Dargie, Frederick B., 47630A.
Darling, Thomas G., 47375A.
Dasbach, Leonard W., 47209A.
Daughtry, James W., 26022A.
Davenport, Richard C., 47528A.
Davidek, Leonard J., 47078A.
Davis, Donald V., 53575A.
Davis, James, 53601A.
Davis, James R., 28852A.
Davis, John W., 47127A.
Davis, Quinton, 26023A.
Davis, Richard L., 31398A.
Davis, Robert V., 47370A.
Davis, Ted A., 47429A.
Davis, William G., 53712A.
Davis, William M., 3d, 47173A.
Dawson, Daniel L., 47164A.
Dayberry, Bobbie A., 32097A.
Dean, Grant G., 26024A.
Deane, Raymond E., Jr., 31983A.
Debnam, Thomas F., Jr., 31507A.
Dech, Jack L., 53708A.
Decker, Dwayne Z., 47486A.
Decker, Jason O., 47551A.
Dedes, George P., 47557A.
Deines, Hilmere J., 32762A.
Delaney, Robert E. C., 47110A.
DeLeo, Philip J., 47609A.
Delmar, Robert A., 28882A.
Demos, Charles F., 26026A.
Dempsey, Derrel L., 56677A.
Dempsey, Robert A., 47686A.
Denney, Carl L., Jr., 31435A.
Dennis, Derrol L., 26027A.
DeOgburn, George T., 56646A.
DePaepe, William C., 56743A.
Deppish, Walter C., Jr., 26028A.
Derridinger, Richard K., 31613A.
Dersheimer, George F., 32844A.
Deschaines, Carroll E., 47693A.
Desjardins, John R., 47638A.
Dever, James C., Jr., 47644A.
Devereaux, Alan L., 26029A.
Devlin, Joseph A., Jr., 26030A.
Dewasme, Paul F., 47081A.
Dickens, Charles W., 32090A.
Diebold, James W., 26031A.
Diedrich, William B., 47532A.
Dietrich, Clay, Jr., 31602A.
Dillard, Louis S., Jr., 47670A.
Dillon, Somerville E., 47672A.
Dinsmore, Walter L., 47344A.
Disbrow, Lynnford E., 47096A.
Diven, James E., 47623A.
Dixon, James C., 47161A.
Dixon, Robert H., 31996A.
Dodd, Thomas J., 47673A.
Doerschlen, Eddy J., 56613A.
Donaldson, Ralph L., 28914A.
Donate, Jose A., 56590A.
Doner, Jules C., 53507A.
Donoho, Laurence W., 56738A.
Donohue, Frederic M., 53663A.
Donovan, Harold A., 47664A.
Dooley, David M., 47261A.
Doran, John J., Jr., 47695A.
Dorr, Robert E., 26032A.
Dorsett, Ralph, 31575A.
Dorwart, Roger A., 32834A.
Doty, Jerry D., 32191A.
Douglass, Charles R., 53466A.
Dowler, Donald A., 47153A.
Downs, Timothy J., Jr., 26033A.
Doyle, James K., 28966A.
Doyle, James W., Jr., 47108A.
Dreibelbis, Ryland R., 53667A.
Driscoll, John J., 47980A.
Droste, Ronald E., 31974A.
Drum, Lawrence T., 26034A.
Duckett, Ross B., 26035A.
Duff, Thomas O., 47524A.
Duffley, Edmund M., 47180A.
Dugan, Thomas W., 47627A.
Duggan, Richard J., 47417A.
Duke, Robert G., 47602A.
Duncan, Dean D., 47363A.
Duncan, Wayland E., 47733A.
Dundas, Robert K., 47083A.
Dunham, James G., 47466A.
Dunn, Harry P., 26036A.
Dunne, Robert E., 26037A.
Durant, Richard B., Jr., 47297A.
Durflinger, Dale J., 53696A.
Durham, Douglas D., 31433A.
Durrant, Robert E., 47214A.
Dutcher, Barent C., 32198A.
Eager, Charles E., 47552A.
Earle, Jack D., 47423A.
Eberlein, Marwin G., 53721A.
Ebert, Leroy A., 47653A.
Eberwine, James F., 28883A.
Ebneter, Arnold E., 47138A.
Echols, James R., 56757A.
Eck, Kevin F., 28946A.
Eddins, Neil L., 28841A.
Eddy, John C., 47558A.
Edelblute, John O., 47298A.
Edgar, Charles O., 47293A.
Edgar, John H., 56627A.
Edwards, Gerald R., 53748A.
Edwards, Harold L., 47758A.
Edwards, Jay T., 3d, 26039A.
Edwards, Ollie H., 56671A.
Edwards, William R., 32117A.
Edwards, William T., 47076A.
Edwards, William W., 32131A.
Eells, Gordon L., 53552A.
Eells, Kenneth W., 53675A.
Efting, Warren L., 32170A.
Egan, William M., 26040A.
Egleston, Lemuel R., Jr., 53459A.
Ehrenberg, Earl A., 47351A.
Ehrlich, Elmer A., 47544A.
Einstein, Hans A., 28891A.
Eisele, Ronald C., 31556A.
Eisenman, Richard L., 53142A.
Eldridge, James H., Jr., 32082A.
Elkin, John A., 53478A.
Elliott, John N., 28873A.
Elliott, Melvin C., 47712A.
Ellis, Robert J., 56702A.
Elrod, Watt D., 47655A.
Elsea, Stanley W., 47369A.
Emley, William P., Jr., 26041A.
Emma, Frank J., 47770A.
Emrick, Harry W., Jr., 26042A.
Endris, Louis E., 56684A.
Engelking, Edwin H., 31387A.
England, William D., 53502A.
Englebrecht, Maynard L., 53594A.
Enouen, Paul W., 47139A.
Ensey, Harry R., 47682A.
Entwistle, Oliver H., Jr., 32154A.
Erchinger, Ralph C., 28812A.
Erdmann, Hans J., 47610A.
Erickson, Duane H., 26044A.
Erickson, Robert A., 47223A.
Ernst, William H., 53668A.
Estes, Frederic D., 56694A.
Evans, James F., 53735A.
Eve, Robert D., 47424A.
Evenson, Loren D., 47200A.
Ewan, Franklin R., 47487A.
Eyre, Lawrence J., 47187A.
Fair, Don R., 47520A.
Falletti, Joseph L., 31482A.
Fanning, Francis R., 31532A.
Fanslow, Donald R., 47472A.
Fanucchi, Ledio, 47767A.
Farr, Richard L., 47601A.
Farrar, Walter B., Jr., 26046A.
Fassett, Chester A., 47320A.
Fauser, Rodney H., 31527A.
Feilner, Paul W., 32132A.

Feinberg, Elliott L., 32790A.
Feneley, Francis J., 47143A.
Fenner, Leonard D., 31450A.
Fenton, William E., 47257A.
Ferari, Earl, 47266A.
Ferrante, Jack, Jr., 53731A.
Ferrell, Charles W., 47422A.
Ferrie, Joseph F., 53422A.
Ferris, Delle L., 32187A.
Fiddelke, Verdis N., 56665A.
Fields, Samuel H., 26047A.
Finch, Ronald E., 26048A.
Fincher, Ernest D., 53745A.
Finkelstein, Eugene S., 47707A.
Finkelstein, Herbert A., 32181A.
Finley, Elgan Y., Jr., 53479A.
Fioritto, Benny H., 47283A.
Fischbeck, Edmund W., Jr., 47288A.
Fisher, Donald G., 57595A.
Fisher, Emory L., 47456A.
Fisher, James L., 28970A.
Fitzhugh, Clark S., Jr., 47649A.
Fitzsimmons, Robert, 53464A.
Flanigen, Edwin G., 47144A.
Fleek, Bluford B., 47241A.
Fleek, Clarence E., 31451A.
Flesher, Hubert K., 32199A.
Fletcher, Harry P., 47128A.
Flick, William, 31415A.
Floyd, Charles R., 28960A.
Fluck, Roland F., 28862A.
Fluhr, Wallace E., 28972A.
Flynn, Russell S., Jr., 47462A.
Foister, James W., Jr., 47229A.
Foley, Paul J., 47694A.
Folger, Charles R., 47501A.
Folk, Wilkinson R., 47321A.
Folkman, David I., Jr., 47084A.
Fontaine, Lawrence J., 47490A.
Ford, Edwin, 31382A.
Ford, John D., 47734A.
Foresman, Louis W., 53540A.
Forrester, Cleveland E., 56597A.
Forsbeck, Donald G., 53497A.
Forster, Richard A., 31576A.
Forster, Tom J., 26049A.
Fortenberry, Lawrence J., 56664A.
Foss, Gerald P., 32083A.
Foster, James E., 26050A.
Fowler, Kenneth C., 47488A.
Fox, George M., 56698A.
Fox, Loren J., 47314A.
Fox, Robert S., 47403A.
Fox, Roland R., 47100A.
Francisco, Lawrence R., 47454A.
Franklin, Charles E., Jr., 47716A.
Franzago, Francis J., 56687A.
Fratt, Meryln D., Jr., 32759A.
Fredericks, Barron, 3d, 26054A.
Freed, Arthur I., 32106A.
Freeland, Darrell E., 47549A.
Freeman, Byron J., 32796A.
Freeman, Jack E., 28830A.
Freeman, William E., Jr., 32840A.
Freer, Albert P., Jr., 26055A.
French, William T., Jr., 47742A.
Frey, Eugene W., 53680A.
Freyer, Gustav J., 3d, 26056A.
Fried, Clarence D., 53583A.
Frier, William L., 26057A.
Frisby, Thomas N., 55848A.
Fromm, Robert E., 26058A.
Fronk, Gene A., 28819A.
Fross, Leonard L., 28808A.
Frye, Wayne T., 26059A.
Fuchs, Donald L., 31531A.
Fuller, James R., 47474A.
Fuller, Jerry G., 47437A.
Fuller, John D. P., Jr., 32819A.
Fulton, Dale L., 31999A.
Fultz, James E., 53474A.
Funk, Carl F., 47134A.
Furlong, Arnold E., 28837A.
Furlough, Horace R., 47146A.
Fuss, Joseph P., 56604A.
Gable, Stewart R., 32767A.
Gaffney, John T., 31521A.
Gallagher, George B., 47322A.
Gallardo, Edward F., 47299A.
Galloway, Floyd E., Jr., 28875A.
Gallup, Daniel, 48894A.
Gammage, Paul E., 47210A.
Gapp, Alvie W., 53550A.
Garczynski, Frank B., Jr., 28943A.
Gardner, Donald W., Jr., 53639A.
Garwood, Robert K., 26063A.
Gaskill, Samuel E., 32787A.
Gaucher, Robert J., 31483A.
Gauger, Ronald E., 53710A.
Gay, David, 56579A.
Gaynor, Henry J., 26064A.
Geasland, Robert L., 26324A.
Geer, George M., 31604A.
Gentry, Jack C., 47588A.
George, Drexell A., 32845A.
George, Thomas R., 31465A.
Geralds, Robert A., 31577A.
Gerlinger, Donald, 31378A.
Geron, Richard P., Jr., 47085A.
Gerrow, Irv R., 31552A.
Gersch, Wilbert E., Jr., 32098A.
Gerst, Theodore C., 26066A.
Giancola, John R., 56732A.
Gibson, James A., Jr., 31393A.
Gibson, James K., 53569A.
Gidley, James M., 53802A.
Gieseking, Marlyn E., 53678A.
Giguere, Albert H., 53727A.
Gilbert, Phillip F., 31452A.
Gillespie, Charley P., 31540A.
Gilliland, James E., 31488A.
Gilmore, William R., 26068A.
Gilstrap, Dean O., 32084A.
Giraytys, James, 53656A.
Gish, William F., 32133A.
Glavan, Anthony F., 47452A.
Glenn, Thomas N., 32005A.
Glowa, Daniel S., 47121A.
Godwin, Jerry L., 47224A.
Goetze, Edward D., 47402A.
Goldstein, Richard S., 31533A.
Goode, Jimmy L., 47231A.
Goodman, Norman, 28888A.
Goodwin, Gene W., 53517A.
Gordon, Bruce J., 51692A.
Gordon, John N., 28971A.
Gordon, William S., 47145A.
Gorey, Richard J., 56715A.
Gorman, William T., 32169A.
Gould, Frank A., 32077A.
Graalmann, Richard G., 32780A.
Gracey, Robert H., Jr., 47312A.
Graff, Robert S., 28973A.
Graff, Robert T., Jr., 53759A.
Grahn, John A., 3d, 53701A.
Gramley, Dale R., 26070A.
Grammes, Richard A., 53482A.
Graves, Richard A., 53677A.
Graves, Theodore K., 26071A.
Gray, Bobby V., 47559A.
Gray, Campbell W., Jr., 28832A.
Gray, Charles E., Jr., 53629A.
Gray, Jay D., 54935A.
Grayson, Robert W., 28909A.
Green, Ray G., Jr., 53543A.
Green, Robert C., 28918A.
Greene, Ellis P., 2d, 32091A.
Greenwood, Lester, 47323A.
Gregory, Gerald D., 56688A.
Gregory, William B., 47129A.
Greig, Cyril L., 32180A.
Greve, Reinhold J., 47117A.
Greybill, Henry M., 56686A.
Griffin, Richard A., 53779A.
Griffin, William K., 53785A.
Griffiths, John D., 31549A.
Griggs, Leonard L., Jr., 26073A.
Grigsby, Orin A., Jr., 32079A.
Grimshaw, Cyrus S., Jr., 31411A.
Gronkiewicz, Thaddeus R., 47718A.
Groover, Charles W., 53775A.
Grove, Daniel M., Jr., 32220A.
Gruver, John C., 53730A.
Guiling, John M., 31511A.
Guillotte, Dolphus E., Jr., 47560A.
Gunby, James F., Jr., 53657A.
Gunderson, Lindy C., 28864A.
Gurney, Harlan L., 26074A.
Gute, George W., 26075A.
Haas, John R. C., 53666A.
Hackley, Lewis P., Jr., 32012A.
Haddock, Clovis C., 31430A.
Hadley, Larry M., 32167A.
Hadsell, Joseph C., 53570A.
Haff, Wallace K., 26077A.
Hagen, Vernon D., 53789A.
Hagler, James E., 32006A.
Hahn, Stanford G., 53616A.
Hale, Richard C., 31493A.
Hall, Cornett E., 53509A.
Hall, Gene H., 56546A.
Hall, James G., 47756A.
Hall, John A., 26078A.
Halter, Vincent F., Jr., 32813A.
Ham, Oran C., 53641A.
Hamblin, Robert A., 26079A.
Hamilton, Earl L. B., 53704A.
Hamilton, Edward W., 53698A.
Hamman, Gene E., 28890A.
Hampton, John F., 56746A.
Hancock, Robert A., 47300A.
Haneline, Roger D., 56736A.
Haney, John B., 31516A.
Hanks, John G., 47149A.
Hannold, William R., 31413A.
Hansen, Paul J., Jr., 31623A.
Hansen, Phyll A., 47226A.
Hansen, Robert H., 31432A.
Hansman, Henry J., 31390A.
Hanson, Robert A., 32839A.
Hardin, Thomas H., 53527A.
Hardy, Irby J., 53581A.
Harms, Carl M., 26080A.
Harover, Samuel R., 3d, 26325A.
Harper, James R., 53632A.
Harral, Gene G., 47373A.
Harriman, Richard H., 32206A.
Harrington, John J., 53659A.
Harrington, Lewis B., Jr., 32788A.
Harris, Bobby G., 53477A.
Harris, Price H., 31380A.
Harris, William S., 26081A.
Harrod, Hershel D., 56769A.
Harstad, Kenneth V., 47425A.
Hart, Loren V., 26082A.
Harter, Joseph M., 47130A.
Hartley, Holmes L., 47773A.
Hartman, Thomas A., 56668A.
Hartzler, Victor L., 47271A.
Harvell, Joe L., Jr., 28957A.
harvell, John F., 26083A.
Harvey, Luther T., 56708A.
Hascall, William T., 28865A.
Haskins, Sam, Jr., 32828A.
Hastings, Joseph H., 53778A.
Hatfield, Oliver E., 56747A.
Hatley, Billy W., 47109A.
Hausenfleck, Charles H., 47253A.
Hawkes, James D., 31498A.
Hawkins, George E., 56630A.
Hawkins, John V., 28853A.
Hawthorne, Eugene E., 26084A.
Hayek, Edwin R., 32014A.
Hayes, William C., 56575A.
Haygood, William L., Jr., 26085A.
Haynes, Hilliard G., 2d, 56592A.
Hazelwood, Donald J., 31605A.
Hearn, Gale L., 56680A.
Heath, Robert E., 47124A.
Heathman, Bennie L., 47376A.
Heckendorn, William S., 47091A.
Hecker, Guy L., Jr., 47546A.
Hedden, Merritt E., 47170A.
Heeney, Edwin A., 56636A.
Heikens, Howard H., 47704A.
Heine, Theodore C., Jr., 31562A.
Heinrich, George F., 26326A.
Heiting, Aronld W., 26088A.
Hellberg, Eric N., 47219A.
Heller, Augustin H., 47416A.
Helmich, Gerald R., 56691A.
Hemmila, Herbert W., 31484A.
Hempfling, Robert J., 32829A.
Henderson, Robert H., 53744A.
Henkle, Donald E., 53602A.
Hennessee, Dan M., 26089A.
Henshaw, Charles J., 32110A.
Henson, Charles R., 32812A.
Herndon, Kenneth L., 31453A.
Herning, Charles A., 53706A.
Herres, Robert T., 26091A.
Herrig, Warren J., 53761A.
Herzer, Kaye H., 47166A.

Hess, William C., 56774A.
Hester, Herbert O., 31469A.
Heston, Bryant, 56660A.
Heston, James A., 53617A.
Hetrick, Bradley W., 56739A.
Heyer, Gary L., 56730A.
Hickman, Gerald J., 53542A.
Hicks, James N., Jr., 26092A.
Higginbotham, Thomas J., 56711A.
Higginbotham, William G., 32109A.
High, Ralph J., 26093A.
Hight, Ronald P., 53489A.
Hines, James E., Jr., 47661A.
Hines, Olive J., 26095A.
Hitt, Gerald L., 47747A.
Hockenberry, Richard E., 32080A.
Hocker, Jesse S., 53805A.
Hoeft, Lothar O., 47418A.
Hoffman, Ralph N., Jr., 53621A.
Hogan, Duane L., 26097A.
Hogan, Robert C., 47615A.
Hogg, Donald T., 47478A.
Hogue, Bryce A., 32186A.
Hohman, Charles W., Jr., 56695A.
Holderness, Earl H., 56657A.
Holding, Charles B., Jr., 32197A.
Holiday, Robert C., 53533A.
Holland, Cecil Y., Jr., 53803A.
Holland, Chester A., 53511A.
Hollenbaugh, Ronald R., 53546A.
Hollinger, Wallace D., 47744A.
Hollingsworth, Joe B., 28927A.
Holly, Manford C., Jr., 53697A.
Holman, Jerry P., 26098A.
Holmes, Dean, 53642A.
Holmes, Harold R., 54933A.
Holmlund, Jerome H., 26099A.
Hombs, Harold K., 53628A.
Hood, Arthur E., 53757A.
Hoover, William W., 26100A.
Horan, Edwin V., 53598A.
Horner, Jack D., 26101A.
Horrell, Reginald S., 31594A.
Hosking, William D., 47227A.
Hoskinson, George H., 53650A.
Houghton, Richard B., 56631A.
Houghton, Stanley P., 26102A.
Houlihan, William H., 32830A.
Howard, Franklin D., 47596A.
Howard, Sommers I., 28892A.
Howay, John C., 32775A.
Howerter, Robert D., 53435A.
Howes, Hal W., 26103A.
Hoyt, Ronald E., 56748A.
Hubbell, William M., 31392A.
Huddle, Robert M., 56742A.
Hudson, Fred S., 31504A.
Hudson, James W., 56776A.
Huffman, Roy L., 53806A.
Huhmann, Robert J., 53651A.
Hull, George G., 31624A.
Hullinger, Charles J., Jr., 32071A.
Humphreys, William C., 31485A.
Hunter, Harold M., 31534A.
Huppertz, John F., 31443A.
Hurd, William H., Jr., 32794A.
Hutcheson, Rufus D., 26107A.
Hutchinson, Donald H., 31578A.
Hutchinson, William C., 31616A.
Hutto, Thomas S., 32771A.
Hutton, Harold S., 31579A.
Hyde, Gordon C., 56594A.
Hyden, Robert G., 28876A.
Hyland, Charles L., 47531A.
Hyndman, Richard J., 53798A.
Ince, Olin W., 47251A.
Ingalls, James M., 26108A.
Ingholt, Harald W., 31420A.
Ingwerson, Gerald R., 47643A.
Irvin, George A., 32081A.
Irvin, Max B., 53452A.
Irwin, Robert E., 53660A.
Irwin, Thomas D., 53788A.
Isaacson, Allan C., 47147A.
Isenberg, Jerome R., 56436A.
Iverson, Kendell O., 26109A.
Jackomis, William N., 47093A.
Jackson, Charles P., 31397A.
Jackson, David L., 56721A.
Jackson, Edward L., 53604A.
Jackson, Richard H., 28945A.
Jacobs, Ronald M., 31982A.
Jacobs, William O., 32004A.
Jacobsen, Roger G., 47469A.
Jacobson, Lloyd S., 32795A.
James, Joseph R., 26111A.
Janssen, Frank W., 31381A.
Jarrett, Herman W. P., 32204A.
Jarrett, James P., 26113A.
Jenkins, Johnson A., 53743A.
Jennings, Allen L., Jr., 26114A.
Jervis, Wilfrid C., 56641A.
Jochimsen, Frank R., 56652A.
Johansson, Carl B. L., 26115A.
Johnson, Bernard L., 56725A.
Johnson, Dewey E., 47393A.
Johnson, Forrest G., 53587A.
Johnson, Gerald O., 47346A.
Johnson, Harold F., 47112A.
Johnson, Henry R., 28829A.
Johnson, Jeffery S., 56598A.
Johnson, Joe R., 53791A.
Johnson, Leonard M., 32134A.
Johnson, Maynard K., 53500A.
Johnson, Richard D., 28942A.
Johnson, Richard H., 53688A.
Johnson, Robert D., 31524A.
Johnson, Ronald L., 26117A.
Johnson, William J., 26118A.
Johnston, Loren T., 56606A.
Johnston, Randall A., 32007A.
Johnston, Ted S., 28931A.
Jones, Boyd T., 53592A.
Jones, Jimmy L., 53596A.
Jones, Joe J., 32176A.
Jones, Lem C., 47310A.
Jones, Robert E., 47189A.
Jordan, James M., 53453A.
Jordan, John S., 32210A.
Joyner, Elmer R., 32013A.
Kaiser, Robert A., 26328A.
Kaiser, Robert O., 53522A.
Kalen, Herbert D., 56767A.
Kamins, Gerald E., 47449A.
Kamish, Daniel J., 53514A.
Kane, Frank E., Jr., 53444A.
Kannely, Clifford D., 47204A.
Kapitzke, James A., 47539A.
Kapke, Robert J., 47233A.
Karns, James M. L., 26119A.
Karst, Carl F., 47372A.
Katzman, Harold, 32825A.
Keeling, Wilbur L., 47598A.
Keenan, Henry D., 28911A.
Keene, Marvin B., 32172A.
Kefalas, Peter A., 53723A.
Keith, Robert S., 31580A.
Keith, Ted R., 32053A.
Keller, Ronald T., 47562A.
Kelly, Cornelius B., 3d, 56755A.
Kelly, Fred E., 31508A.
Kemler, Emory N., Jr., 47582A.
Kennan, Thomas F., Jr., 31436A.
Kennard, John F., 47192A.
Kennedy, Bruce F., 47065A.
Kennon, Frederick A., 53606A.
Kenty, William R., 53758A.
Kerin, Bernard M., 47460A.
Kerr, George H., 32192A.
Kessinger, Robert C., 47250A.
Kestner, David G., 31486A.
Key, Norman D., 53780A.
Kicklighter, Edward I., 47242A.
Kickliter, George P., 53768A.
Kidd, Norman A., 47188A.
Killey, Eugene W., 56658A.
Kimball, Merl D., Jr., 31512A.
King, Arthur H., 53431A.
King, Elmer R., Jr., 31426A.
King, James L., 32108A.
King, John R., 47113A.
King, Leonard A., 26121A.
King, Peter B., 32041A.
King, Richard K., 47213A.
Kinney, Charles W., 31464A.
Kirk, Eugene J., 47411A.
Kirk, John C., 53756A.
Kirkland, Bobby J., 32046A.
Kirkpatrick, Matthew D., 26122A.
Kirwin, James M., 26123A.
Kivette, Ralph T., 47218A.
Klenkel, Louis A., 47205A.
Kline, Robert W., 53541A.
Klingensmith, Robert L., 56615A.
Klug, Charles E., 47232A.
Kmiecik, Stanley, Jr., 47183A.
Knapic, Bernard R., 32111A.
Knapp, Ronald K., 26329A.
Knops, Frederick W., Jr., 26124A.
Knott, William J., 53454A.
Knowles, Gordon S., 31427A.
Knowles, Kenneth B., 55900A.
Knox, James S., 26125A.
Knudson, Gene M., 47388A.
Knutkowski, George D., 26126A.
Koble, Dalton L., 53801A.
Koffel, Linwood G., 56621A.
Kohut, Milton W., 53792A.
Kolling, James L., 47984A.
Koon, Robert B., 32178A.
Koops, Gordon G., 26127A.
Kopotic, James D., 47319A.
Kormondy, Robert C., 56681A.
Korte, Roland W., 47412A.
Kortz, Leon L., 55747A.
Kosan, Douglas J., 47612A.
Koski, Charles E., 47120A.
Kostan, James A., 47352A.
Kozuma, Roger T., 32094A.
Kramer, Richard D., 47587A.
Kramer, Walter E., 32153A.
Krause, Albert S., Jr., 31597A.
Krause, John E., 26128A.
Krause, William G., 56580A.
Kreider, Robert J., 31499A.
Kreiser, Guy W., 31492A.
Krejci, Edwin M., 47162A.
Krick, Edward J., 53442A.
Kridler, Robert L., 53715A.
Kriegshauser, James C., 56673A.
Krill, James F., 47461A.
Krill, John L., 47660A.
Kriner, Leland P., Jr., 53554A.
Kronsbein, George W., Jr., 26129A.
Kropp, Ray A., 32195A.
Kroskey, James A., 31421A.
Kroskob, William C., 32054A.
Krulik, Richard L., 32060A.
Kuebler, Emil M., 50897A.
Kuester, Keith C., 53518A.
Kuhlman, Raymond L., 31470A.
Kuhnsman, Donald L., 47073A.
Kuster, Ralph L., Jr., 47491A.
Kyker, James H., 26130A.
Lacy, Wesley D., 47685A.
Legarde, George A., Jr., 31407A.
Lajeunesse, Donald W., 47289A.
Lamberson, Donald L., 28879A.
Lamberton, Kenneth J., 47516A.
Lancaster, Alan H., 56735A.
Land, George A., 53627A.
Landis, Lawrence A., 53640A.
Langford, Willard F., Jr., 53646A.
Lansdell, Robert A., Jr., 53637A.
Lansky, Paul, 26131A.
Lary, Buford D., 47760A.
Lashelle, Kirke, Jr., 28885A.
Lasota, Peter E., 47696A.
Latimer, James T., 47215A.
Latimer, Loring K., 47599A.
Lauderbach, John C., Jr., 47482A.
Lavoie, Paul E., 31489A.
Lawson, John E., 26134A.
Lay, Bobby S., 26135A.
Layne, Raymond R., 26285A.
Leach, James A., 26136A.
Ledbetter, Harold F., 56584A.
Lee, Jack G., Jr., 28828A.
Lee, James W., 28925A.
Lee, Richard J., 55095A.
Lee, Robert E., Jr., 32148A.
Lee, Samuel M., 47521A.
Leipold, Carl M., Jr., 53686A.
Lenihan, William E., Jr., 32778A.
Leomazzi, Ercole R., 28886A.
Leuchter, Charles G., 56726A.
Leventen, George N., 26137A.
Lewin, Thomas J., 32096A.
Lewis, Charles R., 53505A.
Lewis, Donald G., 26138A.
Lewis, Frank W., Jr., 31547A.
Lewis, James P., 47717A.
Lewis, Richard B., 26139A.
Lewis, Richard L., 47332A.
Lewis, Ronald F., 47426A.

Lewis, William B., 32074A.
Liby, William D., 26140A.
Lief, Ronald E., 26141A.
Liesman, Arnold K., 53496A.
Light, Keyolan G., 47447A.
Light, Paul E., Jr., 31617A.
Lightsey, Clovis T., 26142A.
Lindberg, Edwin C., 53537A.
Lindner, Herbert W., Jr., 47530A.
Ling, James G., 32112A.
Links, Gordon R., 31479A.
Linton, Charles R., 26143A.
Lisella, John F., 53579A.
Little, Ronald D., 53722A.
Littlefield, Robert S., Jr., 53608A.
Litton, Delbert W., 47196A.
Livingston, Robert D., 31980A.
Lix, Robert E., 47104A.
Lloyd, William H., 47390A.
Lochocki, Stanley W., Jr., 47389A.
Lockary, Paul F., 47507A.
Lockhart, David M., 47206A.
Loewe, William R., 32017A.
Loftstrom, Bertil E., 32121A.
Logsdon, Paul G., Jr., 32015A.
Lomax, Alan L., 32816A.
Lombardo, Joseph C., 31408A.
Lomurro, Dominic D., 31969A.
Looney, Ervin P., 47563A.
Love, Benjamin F., 56593A.
Lovfald, Peer J., Jr., 26145A.
Lovingfoss, Walter J., 32791A.
Lowell, Douglas W., 47445A.
Lowery, Glenn T., 32815A.
Lowry, John I., 56642A.
Luckey, Kenneth E., 26146A.
Luckie, Mack, Jr., 32773A.
Lueker, Rano E., 26147A.
Lueneburg, Ronald H., 32184A.
Luenenberg, Donald D., 47439A.
Luhrmann, Carlton L., 47702A.
Luke, Guy D., 6722A.
Luna, Edgebert R., Jr., 47396A.
Luna, Norman P., 47169A.
Lundquist, David A., 31560A.
Luse, Jack A., 47216A.
Lutz, Elmer J., 47748A.
Lyle, Bruce R., 47624A.
Lynch, John E., Jr., 32793A.
Lyon, John E., 31517A.
MacCormack, Richard E., 32040A.
Mackenzie, James S., Jr., 31506A.
Mackey, Gerald F., 26149A.
Macleay, Lachlan, 26150A.
MacTavish, Cameron J., 53740A.
Macumber, Harold E., 47764A.
MacWilliam, Charles E., 26151A.
Madsen, Paul J., 56619A.
Maestri, Raymond R., 26331A.
Magdefrau, Carll F., 56669A.
Mahaffy, Craig E., 26152A.
Mahler, William S., 47577A.
Main, George G., 32088A.
Main, Lee E., 31581A.
Makowski, Louis F., 47317A.
Malinverni, Albert, 31515A.
Mall, William J., Jr., 53654A.
Maloney, Douglas H., 47550A.
Maltagliati, Mauro J., 26153A.
Mancuso, Dominic L., 53547A.
Mande, John P., 47324A.
Mandeville, Dean K., 31526A.
Manfredi, Harold D., 31611A.
Manion, James J., 31399A.
Mannino, Philip J., 31495A.
Mannion, James J., 31480A.
March, Clyde V., Jr., 53488A.
Markey, John P., 31402A.
Marks, Robert C., 47361A.
Marley, William H., 32107A.
Marlowe, William R., Jr., 31536A.
Marr, William J., 31403A.
Marsh, Edwin L., 32760A.
Marsh, Louis C., Jr., 32135A.
Marshalek, George M., Jr., 32178A.
Marshall, Henry G., 47564A.
Marshall, James H., 47703A.
Marshall, Joe B., Jr., 32837A.
Marshall, John C., 26154A.
Martin, Charles P., 56639A.
Martin, Eugene P., 56718A.
Martin, Francis M., 47325A.
Martin, Richard A., 47326A.
Martin, Thomas P., 26155A.
Martin, Walter R., 56729A.
Martinelli, Patrick A., 47431A.
Martinez, Edmund E., 26156A.
Martini, Ernest J., 47763A.
Marvin, Byron L., 31970A.
Massey, Billie J., 28893A.
Matheny, William A., Jr., 26157A.
Mathern, Wayne G., 47244A.
Mathers, Donald E., 47589A.
Mathiasen, Roger J., 47350A.
Matthews, Harrison W., 28842A.
Matthews, John H., 53634A.
Matthews, Richard I., 47154A.
Matthews, Stewart B., Jr., 53672A.
Mattson, Hubert D., 47174A.
Maxwell, Harold L., 47359A.
Maxwell, Sidney L., 56601A.
May, Robert C., Jr., 26159A.
Mayhew, William A., Jr., 47614A.
Maynard, Charles G., 47327A.
Mayovich, John P., 53717A.
Mazuzan, Thomas J., 53490A.
McAlister, Walter E., 31522A.
McCabe, William R., Jr., 53534A.
McCallum, Brian K., 32055A.
McCallum, Ewell E., 32067A.
McCarthy, Francis J., Jr., 26332A.
McClintock, Earl D., 28811A.
McClusky, Charles E., 32805A.
McCullough, Lewis L., 53653A.
McCord, Hal E., 47413A.
McCormick, James S., 47336A.
McCormick, Thomas M., 47667A.
McCulloch, Karl M., 56723A.
McCurdy, Laurence T., Jr., 53752A.
McDade, John H., 31395A.
McFadden, Julian R., 53423A.
McFarland, Peyton C., 47708A.
McFarlane, Larimer C., 26160A.
McFetridge, James C., 26161A.
McGael, Donal P. L., 31601A.
McGinnis, David R., 26162A.
McGrath, Richard P., 47280A.
McGrew, Lloyd A., 47489A.
McHugh, John J., 47735A.
McHugh, Thomas B., 56780A.
McIlvain, William W., 47483A.
McIntosh, Daniel G., 31979A.
McKay, William G., 26163A.
McKenna, Louis J., 47195A.
McKenzie, Christy D., 32806A.
McKenzie, Jimmie A., 31582A.
McKenzie, John R., 28871A.
McKenzie, Robert G., 31977A.
McKeon, James P., 56692A.
McKinney, Ivan L., 28854A.
McKitterick, Robert N., Jr., 56703A.
McLain, Roger W., 47476A.
McLaurin, Sidney L., 53630A.
McLawhon, William A., 29405A.
McLean, Charles G., 26164A.
McLeod, Billie B., 47095A.
McLeod, Gordon E., 31619A.
McMath, Leroy, 56578A.
McMichael, Robert L., 56778A.
McNamara, Richard C., 47464A.
McNeeley, William G., 47565A.
McPhail, Angus, 47131A.
McQuade, Richard P., 53690A.
McQuitty, Jerry L., 56611A.
McShane, Robert A., 53689A.
McVeigh, William M., 3d, 26166A.
McVicker, Donald A., 47683A.
McWhorter, Howard H., Jr., 47705A.
Meadows, Alan S., 56741A.
Meadows, Clarence G., Jr., 31471A.
Mears, Arthur R., 47318A.
Meder, Paul O., 56626A.
Medley, James T., 31583A.
Meehan, John D., 26167A.
Meek, John W., 31404A.
Meeks, Gerald E., 53494A.
Mehserle, Henry J., 26168A.
Mellen, Thomas, 47741A.
Melli, Anthony J., 47080A.
Mellor, Thomas W., Jr., 47576A.
Menefee, Carroll, 53483A.
Mercer, Robert D., 56760A.
Merkel, Richard E., 31544A.
Merrell, Ronald D., 57124A.
Merrill, Richard L., 31425A.
Merritt, John, 31501A.
Merten, John E., 26169A.
Mertens, Robert E., 31388A.
Metcalf, Grady W., Jr., 47377A.
Metzger, Paul, Jr., 53716A.
Meuser, Harry H., 47757A.
Mewborn, Rufus W., 31437A.
Meyer, Louis J., 53699A.
Meyer, Ward A., 32085A.
Micale, Peter N., 47364A.
Michalski, Eugene J., 53439A.
Mickelson, William F., 47473A.
Middlebrooks, Robert N., 47754A.
Mihura, Max L., 47400A.
Milam, Kenneth R., 47082A.
Miller, Allen D., 47706A.
Miller, Clark J., 56762A.
Miller, Daniel P., 47294A.
Miller, David L., 26170A.
Miller, Donald B., 47497A.
Miller, Eugene A., 56591A.
Miller, Gerald R., 47181A.
Miller, Hugo J., 53711A.
Miller, James C., 53611A.
Miller, John A., 26171A.
Miller, Louis T., 31487A.
Miller, William L., 26172A.
Miller, William N., 53619A.
Milnor, David P., 26173A.
Milone, Harry, 54934A.
Milton, Joseph P., 53425A.
Minear, Leslie H., Jr., 56779A.
Minett, Cyril W., 31567A.
Mintey, Kenneth E., 32835A.
Miserocchi, Louis F., 47315A.
Mitchell, Derek V., 26174A.
Mitchell, John C., 47713A.
Mitchell, Paul F., 47070A.
Moening, John H., 56734A.
Moffett, William F., 47580A.
Moniz, Frank T., 56439A.
Monroe, David L., 47634A.
Montgomery, Robert L., 53471A.
Moore, David E., 53450A.
Moore, Jack E., 26176A.
Moore, Milton B., 56603A.
Moore, Powell, 53671A.
Moore, Richard A., 28836A.
Moore, Robert G., 56704A.
Moose, Dorman B., Jr., 47729A.
Moothart, Jackie E., 53614A.
Moraveck, George F., 31584A.
Morehart, Paul N., 56600A.
Moren, John B., 56781A.
Morgan, Joe P., 26178A.
Morrill, David C., 28902A.
Morris, Earl J., Jr., 53636A.
Morris, Franklin D., 56640A.
Morris, John J., 26179A.
Morris, William F., 28937A.
Morrow, John C., 47481A.
Morse, Loren K., 31376A.
Moser, George W., 53739A.
Mosey George F., 32126A.
Moss, James E., 26335A.
Mosteller, Lawson P., Jr., 47566A.
Mosingo, William G., 56663A.
Mrazik, William W., 56749A.
Mudd, Joseph F., 26180A.
Muir, Donald L., 32143A.
Mulholland, Allan F., 53673A.
Mullen, Max H., 32168A.
Mumma, John S., 53664A.
Munday, James W., 31438A.
Muns, Robert H., 26181A.
Murphy, Joseph A., Jr., 53687A.
Murphy, Matthew P., 2d, 26182A.
Murphy, Samuel E., 53612A.
Murray, Francis J., Jr., 47155A.
Murray, Patrick T., 53558A.
Murray, Richard D., 53545A.
Musgrove, Don W., 47652A.
Musick, Victor H., 31535A.
Mutch, Edward E., 56764A.
Myers, Allen L., Jr., 31615A.
Myers, Armand J., 47337A.
Myhrum, Roger B., 47267A.
Nadler, Charles P., 32161A.

Nancarrow, George E., 28954A.
Nass, Robert P., 47201A.
Nassr, Michael A., 26184A.
Nast, Wayne A., 32141A.
Naylor, Jerome M., 32811A.
Neeley, Richard M., 53631A.
Neese, John E., 53609A.
Neff, Robert A., 47268A.
Negus, Kenneth D., Jr., 56772A.
Nelson, Glenn H., 53648A.
Nelson, Howard P., 56595A.
Nelson, James R., 53436A.
Nelson, John B., Jr., 47710A.
Neppel, Melvin M., 56756A.
Ness, Albert C., Jr., 56719A.
Neuhaus, Laverne H., 53515A.
Neumann, Russell H., 53503A.
Newbold, Dale G., 53777A.
Newlon, Jerry E., 56638A.
Newman, Russell T., 28938A.
Newman, Stanley C., 28916A.
Newmann, Walter S., 53676A.
Newsom, Franklin D., 47397A.
Newsome, Wesley A., Jr., 26186A.
Nibbelin, David A., 53417A.
Nichols, Carl B., Jr., 53755A.
Nichols, Clyde C., 47750A.
Nichols, Richard H., 28866A.
Nickerson, Wilson H., 26187A.
Nicoloff, George, Jr., 32209A.
Nienstedt, John N., 53589A.
Nightengale, Merlyn E., 26188A.
Nikonovich, Peter K., 47380A.
Nobles, Charles L., 26189A.
Nokes, Roland W., 53782A.
Noonan, John P., 47207A.
Noone, Richard F., 31530A.
Norby, Charles E., 28831A.
Nordhaugen, Leslie D., 53493A.
Norris, Robert W., 56545A.
North, Kenneth W., 53694A.
Norton, Robert A., 53669A.
Notson, Bruce E., 53563A.
Nouss, James A., 53774A.
Nowlin, Klyne D., 47436A.
Nugent, Robert A., 53504A.
Nuhn, Perry R., 31418A.
Nye, Phillip M., 32183A.
O'Brien, Harry T., 26190A.
O'Brien, William J., 53418A.
O'Connell, Joseph E., 53443A.
Oehl, Deen H., 53455A.
Officer, William K., 47659A.
Ogwynn, William S., 47156A.
Oheron, James J., 31406A.
Ohlemeier, William D., 53607A.
Olin, Richard E., 28967A.
Oliver, Alfred, 32848A.
Oliver, Louis R., 47270A.
Oliiges, James J., 53526A.
Olofson, Tom O., 53765A.
Olson, Roy A., 56434A.
Olsson, Carl W., 47553A.
Olver, Kelsey M., 47720A.
O'Malley, Thomas J., 53577A.
Omara, Daniel J., 26192A.
Omernik, Leo E., 47203A.
Onate, Joseph J., 32823A.
O'Neal, Joe R., 28810A.
Ongstad, Axel P., 47328A.
Onions, Fred W., 56616A.
Oplinger, Daniel H., 47340A.
Opperman, Donald E., 31410A.
Orth, William A., 26193A.
Ortiz-Lopez, Jaime, 26194A.
Ortolani, Lawrence D., 47405A.
Osborne, Edward W., 47383A.
Osburn, Leland A., 47517A.
Osterhoudt, William R., 56690A.
Osterman, Raymond C., 53580A.
Ott, Emmett E., 56744A.
Otto, Elmer W., 53520A.
Overfield, James D., Jr., 53492A.
Owens, John D., 53674A.
Owens, Wesley D., 32214A.
Pace, Harvey A., 53700A.
Padden, Maurice C., 53491A.
Palmer, George K., Jr., 47394A.
Pangle, Herbert W., 28932A.
Papaneri, Anthony, 47508A.
Parker, Charles D., 32761A.
Parker, Edwin L., 3d, 32115A.
Parker, Elbert C., 47684A.
Parker, Herbert G., 56750A.
Parkhurst, Donald J., 32016A.
Parks, George B., 26195A.
Parrish, Donald J., 31456A.
Parrott, John W., 53695A.
Parshall, Gerald H., 26196A.
Parsons, Raymond J., 53427A.
Parssinen, Lauri F., 56765A.
Passey, J. Bruce, 53593A.
Passey, Lawrence K., 47275A.
Passmann, Donald J., 53513A.
Patterson, Everett R., 56632A.
Patterson, James D., 47245A.
Patterson, James L., 32099A.
Patterson, Jerrold E., 47115A.
Patterson, Winston D., 26197A.
Patton, David L., 53484A.
Patton, Joseph E., 53620A.
Patton, Orin C., 31528A.
Paul, William B., 47502A.
Paulson, John E., 53795A.
Pawlak, Ronald E., 32136A.
Payne, Earl D., Jr., 26198A.
Payne, John X., Jr., 53799A.
Peake, Glenn E., 53519A.
Pearis, Samuel P., 4th, 31566A.
Pearse, Donald A., 47493A.
Pearson, George C., 56581A.
Pearson, Richard P., 53655A.
Pelzer, James L., 47745A.
Pennington, Robert E., 47347A.
Perry, Hugh D., 47290A.
Perry, Irving R., 56674A.
Pesaturo, Emil W., Jr., 47234A.
Peshkin, Richard A., 47636A.
Peters, Edward W., Jr., 31513A.
Petersen, Richard, 32069A.
Peterson, Richard B., 47075A.
Peterson, Sidney M., 31457A.
Petkash, Joseph E., 56659A.
Petrich, Paul J., 47179A.
Petty, Robert O., 32203A.
Pfefferkorn, Fritz W., 47635A.
Pfeiffer, Joseph C., Jr., 31585A.
Pflugrath, Donald O., 26199A.
Phelan, Robert D., Jr., 31458A.
Phillips, Elisha A., 53600A.
Phillips, Peter J., 28887A.
Phillips, Wayne E., 56624A.
Phipps, Jimmey N., 47650A.
Picardat, Dale L., 26203A.
Pick, Donald W., 47567A.
Pickard, Gerald C., 56716A.
Pickett, Ronald E., 47063A.
Pierson, Lyle C., 32166A.
Pilcher, Harold E., 26205A.
Pile, Roger A., 47538A.
Pillman, Theodore R., Jr., 31509A.
Pishvanov, Nicholas A., 31568A.
Pitts, James L., Jr., 28869A.
Plowden, Robert B., Jr., 47519A.
Poe, Eugene M., Jr., 26206A.
Poehlman, William, Jr., 28939A.
Poelker, Leonard H., 53475A.
Poindexter, Eugene O., 47419A.
Polk, John W., Jr., 47378A.
Porter, Carl P., 27969A.
Porter, Ralph E., 26207A.
Potter, Norwood W., 26209A.
Potts, William G., 53624A.
Powell, Charles E., 26210A.
Powell, Richard, 28895A.
Powell, Vandy M., Jr., 47178A.
Powers, George B., Jr., 53508A.
Powers, Joseph A., Jr., 32824A.
Pratt, William J., 56679A.
Praus, William J., 32157A.
Preece, Roy D., 53424A.
Priaulx, Kenneth L., 47366A.
Priddle, Harland E., 47157A.
Priester, Durward K., 47132A.
Prince, Leo D., 47427A.
Procknal, Eugene S., 26212A.
Proctor, Dan M., 56745A.
Proctor, Henry A., 26213A.
Proctor, Lowell T. L., 28872A.
Prohaska, Charles R., 26215A.
Prokofieff, Igor P., 47184A.
Prosack, Henry G., 47358A.
Pruitt, Cleo G., Jr., 53414A.
Pruitt, Robert F., 56733A.
Pugh, Charles E., 28847A.
Purcell, Robert B., 53786A.
Purdy, William S., Jr., 31593A.
Purkhiser, Joe B., 28948A.
Purves, Dean L., 31621A.
Pustay, John S., 26216A.
Putbrese, Charles E., 53421A.
Pyne, Ernest L., 47503A.
Quasney, William R., 26217A.
Quick, Frederick D., 31968A.
Quick, Robert E., 47237A.
Quinlan, Edward G., 32116A.
Quinn, Richard A., 53764A.
Qvale, Frederick G., 56682A.
Raabe, Paul E., 47248A.
Rabasca, Michael H., Jr., 47631A.
Rabb, Ronnie P., 56707A.
Rachel, Allen K., 56712A.
Radogna, Nathan J., 32100A.
Rahn, John Q., 31439A.
Rainwater, William M., 47249A.
Rambin, Ruven L., 47398A.
Ramirez, Charles J., 31423A.
Ramsey, John E., 47357A.
Ramsey, Raymond C., 53445A.
Randall, Robert E., 31586A.
Rankin, Paul L., Jr., 47355A.
Rardin, Theodore A., 31607A.
Rasmussen, Charles E., 32799A.
Rather, Wally F., 32803A.
Rawlinson, William R., Jr., 32797A.
Rawls, John, Jr., 53588A.
Ray, Don R., 26218A.
Ray, Herbert E., 32165A.
Raymer, Lester C., 31539A.
Raymond, Jewell D., 53428A.
Reading, John R., Jr., 31505A.
Reaves, Donald R., 31385A.
Reddington, Raphael L., 26220A.
Redmon, John E., 47406A.
Reed, Joseph D., 53724A.
Reed, Marion E., 47434A.
Reed, Robert R., 47619A.
Reed, William M., 32196A.
Reeder, William L., 32061A.
Rehkop, Marvin L., 56612A.
Reid, Carl A., 47094A.
Reid, James D., 32075A.
Reid, Marc L., 31997A.
Reilly, Donald T., Jr., 47676A.
Reilly, John J., 47648A.
Reinhart, Royce L., 53784A.
Remington, Donald M., 32221A.
Rentschler, James F., 31494A.
Revers, Donald W., 53446A.
Reynolds, Dale L., 47592A.
Reynolds, Donald R., 32124A.
Reynolds, Kenneth E., 32049A.
Rhoad, Richard H., 56689A.
Rice, Howard L., 32784A.
Richards, Mark R., 32062A.
Richardson, Charles W., 32764A.
Richardson, Jerre B., 31587A.
Richardson, William J., Jr., 47568A.
Rickenbach, Robert A., 53790A.
Ricks, Luin B., 26222A.
Ridgway, Joseph G., 32149A.
Ries, Albert M., 47079A.
Ries, John C., 31564A.
Riggan, Norville L., 47457A.
Riggert, Melvin E., 31592A.
Rigney, Robert E., 53469A.
Rigterink, John W., 26225A.
Riley, Dick N., 47074A.
Ripple, Robert C., 59506A.
Roach, Barry L., 26226A.
Roach, William J., 26227A.
Robb, Ralph E., Jr., 53571A.
Robbins, Durreth D., 31984A.
Robbins, Edward B., 47430A.
Roberts, John C., 31496A.
Robertson, Charles A., 47500A.
Robey, John W., 47243A.
Robillard, Donald F., 56775A.
Robinson, Conrad P., 53536A.
Robinson, James S., 31988A.
Robinson, Roland R., 47585A.
Robison, Darwin L., 31606A.

Rogers, Charles E., 28965A.
Rogers, Gardner E., 53521A.
Rogers, Ross H., 47255A.
Roland, Jimmy, 56751A.
Rolen, James D., 54126A.
Romine, Reed E., 47267A.
Roscoe, Ralph F., 53800A.
Rose, Jack H., 31401A.
Rose, Justus F., Jr., 32820A.
Ross, Dominic F., Jr., 53797A.
Ross, Robert M., 32058A.
Ross, Thomas C., 53595A.
Roth, Frederic E., 32205A.
Roth, Robert C., 47443A.
Roush, Charles H., Jr., 26229A.
Rousseau, Lamont E., 32063A.
Rowe, Philip A., Jr., 28922A.
Rowe, Theodore R., Jr., 47569A.
Rowin, Lonnie J., 47197A.
Rowley, Charles S., 26230A.
Rowley, Donald J., 32056A.
Rubin, Robert M., 47142A.
Ruble, Charles B., 56714A.
Rude, Joseph A., 26338A.
Rummans, John A., Jr., 32122A.
Rumph, John S., 32202A.
Runyan, Jack C., 47628A.
Ruppel, John J., 47740A.
Ruppert, Arthur J., 47295A.
Rush, Alan F., 32105A.
Russ, Lawrence G., 26231A.
Russell, Dale C., 53562A.
Russell, Richard E., 47446A.
Ruthrauff, Donald W., 31595A.
Ryan, John E., 32051A.
Ryan, Kevin T., Jr., 31989A.
Ryan, Ronald J., 47578A.
Ryland, Henry J., 31990A.
Sacher, John R., 31490A.
Sagmoen, William T., 26339A.
Sailer, William G., 56635A.
Salas, Julian, 26232A.
Salisbury, Donald M., 32808A.
Sambogna, Felix L., 47632A.
Samdahl, Richard C., 56699A.
Sampson, Walter E., 26233A.
Sanders, Blake E., 32147A.
Sanders, Howard K., 53703A.
Sandlin, Doral R., 26340A.
Sandvick, Robert J., 47755A.
Sarber, Dwight E., 56653A.
Sargent, Laurence G., 56693A.
Sassone, Richard P., 26234A.
Sather, Robert M., 28856A.
Sautter, Paul F., 56634A.
Saville, Edward A., 26235A.
Saxe, Charles L., Jr., 28940A.
Saylor, Kenneth W., Jr., 31542A.
Scambos, Ernest T., 28926A.
Scarborough, Billiy H., 47341A.
Schaffer, Scott P., 32068A.
Schafroth, Donald M., 32155A.
Schalk, Manfred A., 26236A.
Scharf, Charles J., 47305A.
Scharnhorst, Gordon L., 47150A.
Schaub, Thomas H., 53645A.
Scheidt, Richard J., 53751A.
Schelonka, Edward P., 28969A.
Scherer, James E., 56599A.
Schildknecht, Richard L., 47722A.
Schillerstrom, David O., 47433A.
Schism, William O., 56602A.
Schmertz, Bernie R., 47654A.
Schmidt, George J., 28951A.
Schmidt, Richard H., 53665A.
Schmitt, Edward P., Jr., 32164A.
Schoder, William J., 28868A.
Schofield, Tilden R., 32801A.
Schollenberger, Frederick, 47428A.
Schreiber, Charles G., 53762A.
Schroder, Kenneth S., 53498A.
Schrupp, Walter C., 26238A.
Schuler, William E., 26239A.
Schultz, Andrew M., 26240A.
Schulze, David A., 32050A.
Schuyler, Danny C., 47367A.
Schwab, Gene A., 53649A.
Schwartz, James R., 31596A.
Schwartz, Merwyn L., 53447A.
Schwartz, Richard N., 32156A.
Schweitzer, James A., 31599A.
Scoggins, Jack B., 53468A.
Scott, David R., 26241A.
Scott, Gustavus H., 31972A.
Scott, Jack E., 56752A.
Scott, Rawland L., 53506A.
Scott, Russell J., 28821A.
Scott, William H., 3d, 47342A.
Scrafford, Richard E., 56777A.
Scruggs, Frank P., Jr., 28933A.
Seagroves, Jean C., 26242A.
Sears, Bobby J., 47177A.
Sears, William A., Jr., 31981A.
Secrest, Robert D., 53465A.
Seeber, Bruce G., 47135A.
Seely, Arthur D., 32009A.
Sell, Robert L., 31976A.
Settle, William H., Jr., 56740A.
Severtson, Leonard J., 53523A.
Sevison, Jack R., 31563A.
Sexton, John N., 47296A.
Sferra, Gennaro E., 31417A.
Shaffer, Paul R., Jr., 47086A.
Shaffran, S. J., 26243A.
Shain, E. Rox, 26244A.
Shain, Murray M., 56650A.
Shanahan, John P., 47273A.
Shane, Robert W., Jr., 53737A.
Shanklin, Kenneth D., 31985A.
Shanks, James L., 28857A.
Shapleigh, Edward E., 28934A.
Shelton, Charles I., 26245A.
Shepherd, Thomas G., 31557A.
Sherman, William B., 47308A.
Shields, Bobby T., 28899A.
Shifflett, Milton N., 32137A.
Shimabukuro, Henry, 56697A.
Shinn, Gerard C., 28935A.
Shinnick, Charles E., 32048A.
Shiramizu, Jimmy F., 56618A.
Shires, Warder L., 31474A.
Shover, Donald R., 47309A.
Shriner, Donald Q., 50839A.
Shroeder, Robert J., 56666A.
Shukay, Thomas R., 26246A.
Shull, Paul N., 31459A.
Sichel, Robert M., 32125A.
Siclari, Louis A., 53769A.
Siefken, Rollin S., 47468A.
Siegert, Leonard J., 53557A.
Simmons, Howard L., 31412A.
Simms, James J., 53430A.
Sivils, Howard B., Jr., 28897A.
Sizer, Frank E., 28835A.
Skeans, Ted L., 32042A.
Skroch, Willis G., 32175A.
Slater, John K., 32064A.
Slattery, John M., 47414A.
Slaybaugh, Leslie C., 56768A.
Sloan, George H., 31618A.
Smith, Carlton E., 31978A.
Smith, Charles N. D., 26250A.
Smith, Dennis C., 31431A.
Smith, Donald J., 32776A.
Smith, Donald L., 32189A.
Smith, Donald R., 47158A.
Smith, Doss L., 32846A.
Smith, Ernest L., 32777A.
Smith, Eugene S., Jr., 47625A.
Smith, Gary T., 26252A.
Smith, Gilbert D., 3d, 31500A.
Smith, Harold F., 28858A.
Smith, James A., 31444A.
Smith, Jerry A., 32150A.
Smith, Joseph B., 26253A.
Smith, Kruger B., 56766A.
Smith, Loranzo D., 32138A.
Smith, Lyle W., 53531A.
Smith, Max E., 47485A.
Smith, Norman R. A., 56609A.
Smith, Odie, Jr., 47736A.
Smith, Orlando F., 32217A.
Smith, Richard H., 56661A.
Smith, Richard W., 47092A.
Smith, Robert B., Jr., 56771A.
Smith, Robert L., 32052A.
Smith, Rodney C., 47680A.
Smith, Ronald C., 56728A.
Smith, Ronald T., 56623A.
Smith, Samuel B., 3d, 47700A.
Smith, William D., 31603A.
Smith, William T., 53433A.
Snavely, Richard C., 26254A.
Snouwaert, John W., 47465A.
Snow, Joe H., 32171A.
Snyder, Joel J., 31538A.
Snyder, John A., 47765A.
Solis, Gabriel, Jr., 53501A.
Soppe, Harlan J., 56643A.
Soroka, Ronald J., 53661A.
Sowell, George A., 47392A.
Sparkman, William J., 28834A.
Spencer, Joseph W., 48895A.
Spencer, Richard B., 26257A.
Spiker, Heewannah K., 26258A.
Spillers, Jack C., 31472A.
Spillman, James A., 47590A.
Spinner, Richard A., 28859A.
Spohn, Gary E., 53535A.
Sprague, Donald L., 47723A.
Springer, Philip G., 47441A.
Sprott, William P., Jr., 47118A.
Squires, Alonza F., Jr., 53555A.
Squires, Royal T., Jr., 56720A.
Stack, Maurice G., 28816A.
Stackfleth, Evan D., 56731A.
Stadelbacher, Richard E., 47570A.
Staggs, William R., Jr., 47494A.
Stahl, Billy J., 31379A.
Stamm, Robert W., 53796A.
Stanhagen, John F., Jr., 31400A.
Stanley, James R., 26259A.
Stanley, Kenneth E., 26260A.
Stanley, Verl R., 53590A.
Stargardt, Kenneth H., 28878A.
Stark, Glen A., 53426A.
Starnes, Kenneth B., 53456A.
Stashinski, Clayton O., 53747A.
Stathos, Harry K., 53559A.
Steadman, Jesse D., 26261A.
Steele, William A., Jr., 31440A.
Steen, Frank, 47525A.
Stefan, Thomas J., 28870A.
Stefanelli, Mario J., 26262A.
Stegall, Joseph F., 47313A.
Steigelman, Ozro R., 26263A.
Steinmiller, James E., 53457A.
Stelpflug, William J., 28900A.
Stephens, Albert M., 56608A.
Stephenson, John K., 26265A.
Stephenson, Robert E., 53481A.
Stergar, Gene J., 28903A.
Sternberg, Martin S., 31424A.
Sternenberg, Fred W., Jr., 47407A.
Stevenson, Wilbur M., Jr., 31434A.
Stewart, Francis E., 31553A.
Stewart, Harvey J., 47334A.
Stine, Samuel O., 56759A.
Stischer, Walter M., 56576A.
Stokes, Gale, 47646A.
Stolpe, Robert D., 47591A.
Storz, Forrest E., 32810A.
Stoy, Dutton G., 32821A.
Strader, James T., 26267A.
Straka, David W., 53615A.
Strasner, Harold W., 47728A.
Streit, John E., 28894A.
Strickland, Billy R., 47329A.
Strom, Oren G., 47171A.
Stromberg, Ronald D., 53495A.
Strother, Jesse E., Jr., 47409A.
Strub, James E., 28923A.
Stubbs, John F., 31558A.
Stults, Clifford C., 2d, 53770A.
Stumpff, Glenn H., 56633A.
Sue, Gene C., 32779A.
Sugg, Lem D., Jr., 26341A.
Sullivan, Cornelius J., 26268A.
Sullivan, Floyd A., 31588A.
Sumpter, Thomas W., Jr., 32044A.
Suppicich, Vincent R., 26269A.
Swanton, Thomas J., 53419A.
Sweeney, Francis E., Jr., 32800A.
Sweet, Floyd B., Jr., 28820A.
Swensen, Lynn A., 32213A.
Swift, Richard C., 47246A.
Swindlehurst, John A., 32158A.
Taffet, Harvey, 26271A.
Taft, Gene E., 53415A.
Tanner, H. C., 26272A.
Tarnow, Lawrence M., 27968A.
Tarochione, Steven R., 32070A.
Tatum, Edgar F., Jr., 26273A.
Tauer, John A., 47088A.

Tavenner, Michael S., 47420A.
Taylor, Charles D., 32101A.
Taylor, Donald H., 53512A.
Taylor, James H., 47159A.
Taylor, John T., 32010A.
Taylor, Teddy N., 31994A.
Telford, Arnold L., 28874A.
Tenerello, Guy A., 47555A.
Terhune, Burke C., 56649A.
Terry, Donald W., 53658A.
Tewart, James S., 47581A.
Thackwray, Lee B., 26275A.
Thatcher, Robert W., 32139A.
Theiling, Herbert B., Jr., 32814A.
Thenhaus, Duane L., 31986A.
Thoden, Richard M., Jr., 53728A.
Thomas, Calvin W., 26276A.
Thomas, Noel R., 32140A.
Thomas, William R., 26278A.
Thompson, James K., 28962A.
Thompson, Jerald H., 31966A.
Thompson, Richard M., 31608A.
Thompson, Robert G., 56605A.
Thompson, Robert S., 55094A.
Thompson, Thomas C., 47579A.
Thompson, Wallace H., 47391A.
Thomson, James F., 47687A.
Thornell, Edmund F., 53783A.
Thorpe, Robert G., 47302A.
Thurman, William E., 26280A.
Till, Jerald J., 47385A.
Tillett, Herbie C., 56727A.
Tillman, Edward C., Jr., 47533A.
Timmons, Lloyd S., Jr., 31545A.
Tippin, Stanley L., 32185A.
Todd, Donald O., 47594A.
Todd, Edward L., 47258A.
Tolley, Donald G., 56625A.
Tondl, John A., Jr., 47330A.
Tonz, John J., 28952A.
Torres, Joseph F., Jr., 32792A.
Towles, Billy G., 56586A.
Trachte, Byron W., 31543A.
Tradup, Jean M., 47111W.
Trautmann, Albert R., 26282A.
Trekell, Leslie W., 56678A.
Trias, Jesus A., 53750A.
Trow, Robert E., 53460A.
Trueblood, Mylo A., 47421A.
Trustcott, James J., 3d, 26283A.
Tuck, James E., 47665A.
Tucker, Carle F., 47509A.
Tull, Joe A., 47515A.
Turley, Ernest C., 47689A.
Turner, Alvin R., 28915A.
Turner, Billy C., 27971A.
Turner, James E., 56662A.
Tutterow, Jacob T., 47217A.
Twede, Herman L., 47435A.
Twedt, Kermit O., 47102A.
Tycer, Lawrence D., 53749A.
Tyle, Pallas L., Jr., 32838A.
Tyler, Joseph R., 31598A.
Tyra, Joseph B., 56763A.
Ullerich, Julius C., Jr., 56435A.
Ullman, George F., Jr., 53610A.
Ulrich, Gary H., 32219A.
Unangst, Gilbert, 53746A.
Uptmor, Robert E., 32194A.
Utecht, Ronald E., 56710A.
Uzdavines, Edmond J., 26284A.
Vadnais, Raymond R., Jr., 47172A.
Valentine, Robert T., 56717A.
Valley, John G., 53564A.
Vanausdal, Alton L., 26342A.
Vanbibber, Richard A., 47571A.
Vandegrift, Leroy F., Jr., 32193A.
Vandenack, Thomas R., 31561A.
Vanderhoof, Rodney D., 28904A.
Vandeursen, Ferdinand W., 53691A.
Vanek, Gerald L. L., 47202A.
Vanhorn, Boyd L., 47208A.
Vanhoutum, Richard K., 56676A.
Vanlierde, Frank T., 28813A.
Vanvliet, Gerrit H., Jr., 32215A.
Vartanian, George M., 32212A.
Vaughan, James E., 28861A.
Vaughan, Kenneth E., 47769A.
Vesowate, David P., 47256A.
Veylupek, John A., 32817A.
Vibrock, Charles H., 47291A.
Vickrey, Luster A., Jr., 31620A.
Vipraio, William J., Jr., 26286A.
Vivona, Alexander A., Jr., 31503A.
Voegelin, Alvard M., Jr., 47140A.
Vollmann, Phillip D., 26287A.
Volpone, John F., 26288A.
Vonjess, John G., 32833A.
Voss, Henry D., Jr., 28824A.
Vosler, Richard J., 26289A.
Wachowski, Thomas J., 26290A.
Wacker, Jerome, 47743A.
Wacker, Rudolph F., 26291A.
Wagner, Louis C., 26292A.
Wagner, Robert E., 47068A.
Wagus, Raymond W., 47572A.
Wainwright, Robert D., 47331A.
Waitt, Donald F., 28912A.
Wakin, Malham M., 47751A.
Walden, Ray Y., Jr., 32151A.
Walin, William J., 32757A.
Walinder, Lee E., 47194A.
Walker, Keith L., 26293A.
Walker, Richard C., 47368A.
Walker, Robert E., 53714A.
Walker, Roe E., 53766A.
Walker, Walter E., 47356A.
Walkup, Ernest E., Jr., 31991A.
Wall, Carl D., Jr., 47343A.
Wallace, William J., 47099A.
Waller, Archibald S., Jr., 32086A.
Waller, Philip L., 47185A.
Waller, Robert C., 47658A.
Waller, Robert E., 28905A.
Walsh, James P., Jr., 32065A.
Walters, Harry G., Jr., 31460A.
Walters, Robert A., Jr., 47645A.
Walters, Roscoe E., Jr., 31441A.
Ward, John J., Jr., 47637A.
Wargo, John, Jr., 47230A.
Warner, Charles N., 47726A.
Warner, Larry S., 47688A.
Warnshuis, Adrian P., 47573A.
Warrell, Edwin S., Jr., 47536A.
Washofsky, Meyer A., 56585A.
Watson, Laddie R., 47574A.
Watson, Marion R., 47641A.
Watson, Paul W., Jr., 31569A.
Watson, Richard J., 53461A.
Wayson, Kenneth A., 32768A.
Weatherford, Dewayne L., 56705A.
Weaver, Ralph W., Jr., 31529A.
Webb, Gerald L., 31409A.
Weed, John R., 47534A.
Weeks, Wendell L., 53574A.
Wehling, George E., 28889A.
Weidenhamer, Robert G., 47064A.
Weigart, Adrian, 47692A.
Weigman, Richard J., Jr., 53485A.
Weiland, David W., 53618A.
Weiler, John N., 26296A.
Weingarz, William E., Jr., 56667A.
Weiss, Jerald E., 47136A.
Welch, James D., 47311A.
Welch, Thaddeus B., Jr., 47541A.
Weller, Charles T., 47681A.
Welsh, Jerome F., 47107A.
Wencel, Frank E., 31466A.
Wendt, Phillip J., 32179A.
Wesner, John A., 26297A.
West, James H., 56753A.
Westby, Kenneth L., 28877A.
Weston, William R., 56696A.
Wetmore, Bruce B., 47639A.
Wetzel, Emory S., Jr., 26345A.
Wharton, John F., 47276A.
Whatley, James C., Jr., 26298A.
Wheeler, Lyman E., 31377A.
Wheeler, Raymond D., 47114A.
Wheeler, Roy M., 53560A.
Wheeless, Robert A., Jr., 47556A.
Whelan, Robert E., 53679A.
Whinery, Clarence E., 47125A.
Whipps, Ted G., 47727A.
Whitacre, Roger L., 54129A.
White, Joe M., 53584A.
White, Otis P., Jr., 47633A.
White, Robert B., 47458A.
White, Roman A., 47316A.
White, Roy T., 32207A.
Whitehurst, Rex A., 47098A.
Whitener, Robert P., 47442A.
Whitmore, Bickie B., 47498A.
Whitney, Lloyd D., 47382A.
Whitney, Richard A., 56644A.
Wicks, Oliver G., 47583A.
Wiemann, Alfred H., 31967A.
Wiggins, Jesse P., 32002A.
Wigington, John H., 47401A.
Wilde, Rodney C., 56773A.
Wilkinson, Charles T., 31405A.
Willard, William K., 47527A.
Williams, Alvin W., 32831A.
Williams, Billy J., 47163A.
Williams, Clark E., 47512A.
Williams, Derex, Jr., 32766A.
Williams, Donald R., 31992A.
Williams, Ernest W., 28955A.
Williams, Robert W., 56622A.
Williams, Roger L., 28833A.
Williams, Zeke D., 47126A.
Williford, Mitchell L., 47151A.
Williford, Richard E., 47737A.
Willis, Giles W., Jr., 32144A.
Wilson, Charles E., 26347A.
Wilson, Conrad L., 47444A.
Wilson, Donald F., 53763A.
Wilson, Dwight V., 47618A.
Wilson, George E., Jr., 32832A.
Wilson, Herbert G., Jr., 28880A.
Wilson, Jack W., 47106A.
Wilson, Lewis R., 28843A.
Wilson, Mac F., 47504A.
Wilson, William K., 31461A.
Wilson, William R., 47475A.
Wilson, William T., 32809A.
Wilt, Darrel E., 56737A.
Wiltgen, Joseph N., 56437A.
Windle, Edward W., Jr., 26302A.
Windrath, Donald C., 31570A.
Wine, Leonard J., 47182A.
Winkeler, William W., 32152A.
Winkelman, Arnold H., 26303A.
Winkle, Davy L., 47480A.
Winn, Gene G., 47730A.
Winslow, Joe G., 56761A.
Winstead, Guy H., Jr., 47348A.
Winstead, Jack A., 47709A.
Winter, Malcolm D., 56628A.
Wintrode, John H., Jr., 26304A.
Wisneski, Frank R., 47617A.
Wolfgang, Stephen W., 26305A.
Wolfsberger, Richard E., 28906A.
Wood, Leland R., 26306A.
Wood, Richard W., 47768A.
Woodard, Reagan N., 32843A.
Woodring, Joe L., 31589A.
Woodruff, Robin M., 47626A.
Woodruff, Wesley D., 47238A.
Woodward, Seabrook W., Jr., 47303A.
Woody, Jack D., 53702A.
Wootton, Robert J., 47281A.
Worden, Roy F., Jr., 53705A.
Workman, Theodore E., 28846A.
Worsech, Delmar G., 47719A.
Wotring, John T., 31514A.
Wray, Royce M., 31473A.
Wren, George C., 47662A.
Wright, Bobby R., 56685A.
Wright, Dade M., 56583A.
Wright, Harley D., 47395A.
Wright, Kenneth D., 26307A.
Wustner, Lorenz F., 47304A.
Wyrick, Doyal L., 47133A.
Yacobi, James R., 47597A.
Yahanda, Alfred M., 53524A.
Yannacone, Clement A., Jr., 32078A.
Yantis, Richard P., 26308A.
Yarbrough, Robert L., 47774A.
Yeager, Joseph L., 26309A.
Yelton, Frank M., 47526A.
Yore, Arthur R., 47415A.
Youatt, Don W., 32118A.
Young, Charles G., 47463A.
Young, Russell A., 47738A.
Youngflesh, Richard D., 26310A.
Younts, James R., 31600A.
Yunk, Robert J., 56648A.
Zahm, John E., 47505A.
Zalewski, Leonard A., 47190A.
Zambenini, Robert L., 32001A.
Zar, Allan G., 53526A.
Zartman, John R., 26311A.
Zeiler, Burton D., Junior, 32802A.

Zelten, Donald B., 26312A.
Zerkel, James M., 26313A.
Zimmerman, James S., 26314A.
Zinke, Henry, 47354A.
Zobel, James A., Jr., 47387A.
Zook, David H., Jr., 47101A.
Zuber, Albert J., 47629A.
Zulauf, Elmer J., 47586A.
Zumwalt, James T., 47274A.

Medical Corps

Armstrong, Raymond G., 55813A.
Beering, Steven C., 56053A.
Bonner, Robert H., 55865A.
Broadwater, John R., 55862A.
Camp, Frank A., 55769A.
Cawthron, Mack B., 55763A.
Costin, Ronald E., 55863A.
Dannemiller, Francis J., 56050A.
Debruin, John A., Jr., 55912A.
Drake, Dennis C., 55911A.
Elgart, Mervyn L., 56167A.
Finney, Billy A., 59479A.
Fite, Fulton W., 55814A.
Goldbeck, Larry O., 55870A.
Graves, Raphael K., 55768A.
Griffin, Robert P., 55817A.
Hanson, George E., 55924A.
Harris, Richard C., 55818A.
Hegg, David L., 55914A.
Henneberger, George M., 55766A.
Herrington, Alan G., 55919A.
Lurus, Angelo, 56048A.
Meyers, John E., 55815A.
Munroe, William D., 59478A.
Padrnos, Richard E., 56170A.
Painter, William E., 55917A.
Perry, Carlos J. G., 55866A.
Peterson, Carlton J., 55913A.
Peterson, Emil W., 56051A.
Schaab, Eric, 55868A.
Schmitt, Henry J., Jr., 56395A.
Schultz, R. J. Black, 56397A.
Schwamm, Harry A., 59552A.
Scully, Thomas J., 55765A.
Shortley, Howard F., Jr., 55869A.
Speicher, Carl E., 55816A.
Spencer, Herbert B., 55920A.
Stowe, Fred R., Jr., 55864A.
Sweeney, Donal F., 55867A.
Thomas, Charles N., 56052A.
Turner, Roderick H., 56169A.
Vernooy, Stewart A., Jr., 55921A.
Wahle, William M., 55767A.
Waldman, Irving, 55770A.
Warren, Bruce H., 55923A.
Wegleitner, Mark J., 55764A.
Wildin, Robert E., 56550A.
Wittmer, James F., 55916A.
Wixted, William G., 56049A.
Wolnisty, Carl, 56168A.
Wunder, Willis F., 56054A.

Dental Corps

Aronovitz, Robert, 51023A.
Binzer, William C., 51020A.
Bond, Raymond T., 51027A.
Bottom, James G., 55219A.
Brendlinger, Darwin L., 59493A.
Carey, John E., 51015A.
Crosthwaite, Harold J., 56556A.
DeAngelo, Dante A., 51025A.
DeLorimier, Jacques A., 51029A.
Dobbins, J. W., 51582A.
DuBois, Robert M., 51017A.
Ellison, Joseph S., 51024A.
Ewald, Richard A., 51584A.
Fillinger, Carl N., 56166A.
Flippen, Llewellyn T., 51011A.
Giertych, Henry A., Jr., 56555A.
Goltry, Rodman R., 51026A.
Harris, Ben, 51032A.
Harris, Wayne T., Jr., 56394A.
Helder, John C., 59560A.
Hyland, Paul H., 59605A.
Jewson, Leonard G., 51019A.
Kamish, Phillip, 56164A.
Levy, Douglas M., 51021A.
Lew, Edward K., 51030A.
Mello, Arthur F., 56393A.
Nadeau, James E., 51012A.
Oliver, Fernando A., 51014A.
Oser, Howard A., 51031A.
Richardson, James E., 51016A.
Rushton, John S., 51013A.
Sanchez, Antonio M., 51018A.
Schaaff, Harold J., 51022A.
Westin, Richard P., 51028A.
Willis, Samuel R., 59492A.
Wilson, Brice N., 56554A.
Woolley, Legrande H., 51583A.
Wooten, James W., 56165A.

Veterinary Corps

Fuller, Charles E., 56484A.
Jensen, James P., 55208A.
King, Charles C., Jr., 56485A.
Kriewaldt, Franklin H., 55209A.
West, Joe E., 56486A.

Medical Service Corps

Aboud, Ellis G., 55358A.
Barfield, Aaron H., 49085A.
Barfield, Acie C., 49086A.
Bellor, James R., 32492A.
Blakeney, Joe F., 28011A.
Bousser, James E., 29338A.
Christianson, James D., 32491A.
Currie, William D., 49074A.
Curry, Charles J., 55355A.
Deramus, Charles E., Jr., 56449A.
Ebbers, Robert W., 32589A.
Finn, Joseph J., 28006A.
Fisher, Elwood E., 29341A.
Fisher, Jackie V., 28007A.
Flaugher, Earl W., 55356A.
Frezza, John, 55351A.
Hodges, James M., 28010A.
Holman, Dean S., 49084A.
Ilisley, David B., 49078A.
Insley, Richard L., 56445A.
Jackson, Thames F., Jr., 49087A.
Jacobsen, William G., 56443A.
Jones, Lauris T., 49082A.
Kehoe, Francis J., 32496A.
Kinsley, Earl L., 49071A.
Kittilstad, Owen H., 49083A.
Koehler, John W., 55359A.
Leduc, Robert W., 49077A.
Louis, Arthur, 55354A.
Lucchesi, Rudolph A., 32494A.
Lynch, Jeremiah R., 29342A.
Mann, James A., 32590A.
Marcotte, Victor H., 49090A.
Marschall, Barton R., 32490A.
Martino, Charles W., 56441A.
Mayhugh, Thomas R., 55350A.
McIntyre, Robert T., 56450A.
Mullen, Paul E., 32493A.
Myers, Charles G., 28009A.
Newton, Richard W., 49076A.
Newton, William H., 29339A.
Noggle, John W. G., 49081A.
Park, Curtis G., 56451A.
Penikas, Vincent T., 29513A.
Peterson, Dean L., 29512A.
Pine, Bruce W., 49080A.
Podkin, Albert, 56442A.
Rutten, James M., 55357A.
Schiefer, Alfred C., 28008A.
Seal, Daniel H., 56444A.
Shelton, Jack L., 56448A.
Simmons, Billy F., 32495A.
Skinner, John A., 56447A.
Soto, Carlos A., 49079A.
Thomas, Paul V., 49073A.
Tonn, Arthur H., 49091A.
Wedding, James R., 56446A.
Wexler, Seymour, 55353A.
Williams, Walter H., 29340A.
Wood, James F., 49089A.
Woodruff, Richard E., 49088A.
Zawacki, Henry B., 49072A.
Zimmerman, Rodney J., 55352A.

Nurse Corps

Adams, Ruth E., 56055W.
Bourquein, Rita C., 32604W.
Bruno, Helen, 5138W.
Carey, Eleanor M., 32609W.
Carney, Jeanne A., 54958W.
Connors, Virginia D., 32606W.
Daniels, Lilith J., 51385W.
Felder, Alice E., 56056W.
Kehoe, Mary T., 56563W.
Kneer, Lillian F., 55388W.
Legalle, Barbara L., 56398W.
Meridith, Helen M., 32599W.
Moore, Jacqueline P., 54959W.
Morgan, Lois J., 32610W.
Noble, Nell, 55387W.
O'Toole, Joann B., 56564W.
Patnychuk, Irene, 51383W.
Pavlikey, Mary H., 32607W.
Pratt, Ruth A., 28019W.
Richardson, Rosemary, 32469W.
Scholz, Alice P., 32601W.
Scribner, Dolores J., 56396W.
Studer, Joan R., 51597W.
Taketa, Happy S., 32470W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Reardon, Joan A., 32612W.
Rooney, Patricia J., 56174W.

Chaplains

Boggs, William G., 56419A.
Cain, James J., 55206A.
Cole, Newton V., 56424A.
Eves, Arthur L., 56418A.
Fenol, John C., 55204A.
Franks, William D., 56420A.
Lyons, Leo J., 56422A.
McConnell, Francis P., 55200A.
McGirr, David D., 55202A.
Meskenas, Vincent A., 56421A.
Narron, John B., 55203A.
Vaughn, William J., 56423A.
Ward, Lawrence E. 55205A.

SECOND LIEUTENANTS TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Line of the Air Force

Abbott, Fred F., 50260A.
Abbott, Joseph H., 59082A.
Abel, Richard C., 49741A.
Abernathy, John B., 49742A.
Accountius, Jackie C., 49743A.
Achee, Patrick G., 58558A.
Acheson, Herbert H., 58499A.
Ackerson, Gerald G., 51509A.
Acree, George W., 2d, 58830A.
Adair, Eugene T., 3d, 51495A.
Adams, Jimmie V., 58872A.
Adams, Kenneth B., 51479A.
Adams, Theodore C., Jr., 58486A.
Adamson, Cecil L., 54854A.
Adelsperger, Russell W., 58974A.
Agar, James R., 58630A.
Aiello, Charles F., 58934A.
Aiken, Keith E., 49744A.
Akerson, Edward A., Jr., 58956A.
Akin, Aubrey L., Jr., 55077A.
Albrecht, John R., 58594A.
Albritton, William C., 50291A.
Aldridge, Donald O., 51459A.
Alexander, Kenneth B., 50239A.
Allgood, Wiley A., Jr., 58670A.
Allison, James F., 50269A.
Alsup, Claude F., 58873A.
Anderson, David C., 49745A.
Anderson, Jack E., 58811A.
Anderson, John S., 58707A.
Anderson, Paul W., 51460A.
Anderson, Richard N., 58925A.
Anderson, Wilbur E., 54878A.
Appelle, Walter W., Jr., 50231A.
Arbaugh, Edward D., 58975A.
Archer, Michael E., 51418A.
Argumedo, Bobby J., 58893A.
Arneson, David P., 49746A.
Arnold, Lawrence D., 58416A.
Artman, James B., 50995A.
Asbury, Larry K., 49747A.
Ashley, Donald L., 58510A.
Attarian, Peter J., 58789A.
Autrey, Clarence R., 50221A.
Babineau, Alphee A., 51409A.
Bailey, Bruce M., 58589A.
Baird, Bennett D., 50290A.
Baker, Thomas A., 58556A.
Ballard, James H. C., 49748A.
Ballentine, George D., 51602A.
Ballot, Charles J., Jr., 58605A.
Bamert, Joseph C., Jr., 32525A.
Banaszak, Jerome J., 50174A.

Banner, Hastings W., 50976A.
Barbero, Albert L., 49749A.
Barden, Howard L., 50243A.
Bargar, Robert B., 49750A.
Barker, Robert T., 49752A.
Barnes, Walter J., 49752A.
Barnheiser, Bruce L., 49753A.
Barr, James V., 59075A.
Bartholomew, Charles W., 50176A.
Bartlett, Ronald A., 58666A.
Bartz, James L., 50257A.
Bason, Jimmy R., 59042A.
Bateman, Richard W., 50222A.
Batts, James S., 58651A.
Beale, Robert E., 58514A.
Bedford, Gary W., 58469A.
Beebe, William A., 50998A.
Bers, Alva E., 58472A.
Belcher, Robert A., 58955A.
Bennett, Richard L., 58747A.
Bennett, William T., Jr., 58638A.
Bennison, Thomas C., 55064A.
Benson, Richard L., 58701A.
Bentz, Glen A., 58804A.
Bergh, Palmer A., Jr., 50264A.
Berry, John T., 51480A.
Beyea, Richard S., Jr., 49754A.
Bicher, William N., 49755A.
Bickford, Donald J., 58745A.
Biehn, Donald R., 58571A.
Bielinski, Henry E., Jr., 49756A.
Bigham, Larry J., 55070A.
Biliunas, Roman, 55309A.
Binford, Richard L., 49757A.
Bishop, Henry J., 55071A.
Bishop, James C., Jr., 49758A.
Bishop, Richard F., 58427A.
Bjornson, Donald P., 59081A.
Black, Herbert T., Jr., 51407A.
Blake, Gerald A., 49759A.
Blankenship, Jap W., 50217A.
Blatchley, William M., 50186A.
Bogue, Ernest G., 50252A.
Bolen, Clyde T., Jr., 51603A.
Bond, Charles W., 49760A.
Bonner, Albert A., 3d, 58879A.
Boothe, Kenneth W., 58791A.
Bowers, Donald D., 58602A.
Bowles, Oscar E., 58840A.
Bowman, Robert G., 58582A.
Boyd, John T., 58682A.
Boyd, Robert S., 50994A.
Boyle, Charles P., 3d, 49761A.
Bozzy, Ernest P., 58937A.
Bradley, John B., 49762A.
Bradshaw, Robert G., Jr., 59023A.
Braman, Stanley W., 58410A.
Branan, Carl K., 58590A.
Brandenburg, Lowell E., 58551A.
Brant, Raymond F., 58422A.
Bratton, Robert G., 50270A.
Braun, Cecil O., 58640A.
Brence, Ronald E., 49763A.
Brennan, Thomas J., Jr., 51455A.
Brenner, David G., 58657A.
Bressler, Martin M., 54887A.
Brestel, Max C., 58721A.
Brininstool, Edward P., 58562A.
Brinkman, Peter E., 51473A.
Britton, Edward T., 3d, 49764A.
Brodeur, Richard H., 51493A.
Brooks, Jack D., 51600A.
Brown, Harry W., 3d, 49765A.
Brown, James H., 58958A.
Brown, James H., Jr., 55292A.
Brown, Melvin F., 50119A.
Brown, Olen A., Jr., 49766A.
Brown, William F., 49767A.
Brown, William M., 49768A.
Brubaker, Philip R., 50993A.
Bruce, John R., 49769A.
Brumfield, Tom W., Jr., 50280A.
Buchanan, James L., 2d, 49770A.
Bucher, Richard H., 50980A.
Buckalew, Richard J., 49771A.
Bujalski, Jack P., 49772A.
Bunch, Kenneth J., 51546A.
Bunten, Laurie A., 51486A.
Burch, Truman A., Jr., 58662A.
Burgess, Allen G., 55228A.
Burleson, Kerry E., 58714A.
Burton, James R., 58959A.
Bush, Clarence H., Jr., 58428A.
Bussell, Gerald Q., 58692A.
Butkewicz, Peter J., 54987A.
Butler, William C., Jr., 54919A.
Butschek, Robert J., 58411A.
Byrne, William B., Jr., 50261A.
Cabell, Charles P., Jr., 49773A.
Cade, Hylas H., Jr., 51406A.
Cain, John D., 50281A.
Caldwell, Charles G., 49774A.
Caldwell, Hugh G., 50203A.
Calkin, Maynard S., Jr., 58724A.
Callicotte, Edward L., 55080A.
Callis, David M., 58781A.
Cameron, John H., 49755A.
Canady, James J., 54872A.
Card, Bernard R., 49776A.
Cardwell, Sammy H., 49777A.
Carford, Ronald, 54913A.
Carlson, Nicholas T., 49778A.
Carlson, William K., 51420A.
Carlton, Howard F., Jr., 58994A.
Carnahan, Jack V., 58439A.
Carnochan, John A. F., 58696A.
Carpenter, Charles C., 51424A.
Carroll, Gary K., 50206A.
Carroll, William H., Jr., 54882A.
Carter, Daniel E., 49779A.
Carter, John R., Jr., 49780A.
Cartwright, Thomas F., 49781A.
Cartwright, William E., 49782A.
Carty, Donald L., 49783A.
Castlen, William G., 55055A.
Chapin, Charles T., 58533A.
Chaplin, Richard C., 55886A.
Chapman, Earl E., Jr., 51449A.
Chapman, James W., 2d, 49784A.
Chapman, Willard T., 51435A.
Charrier, Ronald J., 49785A.
Chase, Alan C., 49786A.
Chase, Arthur L., 58777A.
Chase, Charles J., 58918A.
Chason, Lloyd R., 54986A.
Chevalier, John R., 49787A.
Chewning, Jack, 58940A.
Childress, Theodore E., 49788A.
Chrisley, Ronald L., 58880A.
Christensen, Merton J., 58601A.
Christensen, Robert E., 49789A.
Christensen, Ronald E., 58828A.
Christman, Donald O., 58783A.
Chumney, James R., Jr., 50253A.
Church, Wynn L., 59020A.
Cilek, George R., 58546A.
Claffey, Thomas H., 49790A.
Clair, Carl F., 58746A.
Clark, Kenneth W., 2d, 49791A.
Clarke, David K., 51429A.
Clarke, Donald G., 59022A.
Clarke, Herbert F., 58660A.
Clarke, William D., 3d, 58591A.
Claxton, Richards W., 51448A.
Clay, Wayne J., 58429A.
Cleaver, Harold T., 58913A.
Clements, Richard K., 49792A.
Clements, William K., 49793A.
Clendennen, Darby L., 51438A.
Cloutier, Charles G., Jr., 58942A.
Coker, Walter J., 3d, 58786A.
Collins, Robert L., Jr., 58836A.
Colman, Robert D., 50211A.
Concklin, Bert M., 49794A.
Cone, Ronald L., 58779A.
Conley, Charles A., 49795A.
Conn, Bryan R., 50173A.
Connett, David C., 58793A.
Conti, Thomas A. F., 49796A.
Cook, George E., 58754A.
Cook, Grady, 51461A.
Cook, John B., 49797A.
Cook, John H., 51489A.
Cook, Tom R., 58621A.
Cooper, George D., 58446A.
Cooper, Stanley A., 59035A.
Cope, Robert S., 54855A.
Copenhaver, James D., 55072A.
Corcoran, James F., 49798A.
Corley, Vaughn S., 51403A.
Coss, Donald L., 58430A.
Covington, Fred L., 54921A.
Cox, Alan G., 58829A.
Cox, Hugh L., 3d, 58492A.
Cox, James W., 58467A.
Craig, Stuart E., 49799A.
Craig, Terrance R., 51423A.
Cramer, Frederick S., 50285A.
Crawford, Charles B., 58447A.
Cresko, John A., Jr., 49800A.
Crist, Robert B., 50208A.
Criswell, Phillip W., 49801A.
Crook, Richardson H., 58545A.
Cross, Charles A., 58541A.
Crowl, George H., Jr., 59029A.
Crowley, Francis B. 3d, 49802A.
Croxton, Donovan C., 58722A.
Cruciani, Richard O., 51462A.
Crull, Hugh M., Jr., 50205A.
Crumley, Harry R., 58891A.
Cummings, Gerald W., 50210A.
Cunningham, Clair M., 58914A.
Cunningham, Donald A., 51518A.
Curtis, Ellis F., 58871A.
Cushenberry, Anthony S., 58776A.
Cushman, James E., 58852A.
Cutler, Harold G., 58794A.
Cyrus, Jack R., 58552A.
Dailey, Boyd L., 58607A.
Daley, Robert F., 58622A.
Danna, Dominick, 58859A.
Dausin, Lawrence R., 51402A.
Davenport, Bruce B., 49803A.
Davenport, Harold A., 3d, 49804A.
Davenport, Ronald L., 58812A.
Davidson, Alexander K., 59000A.
Davidson, Ricky R., 49805A.
Davies, Thomas H., Jr., 49806A.
Davis, Charles H., 4th, 49807A.
Davis, Esker K., 59070A.
Davis, James B., 49808A.
Davis, James E., 58431A.
Davis, James E., 58567A.
Davis, Rex L., 59058A.
Davis, Stuart C., 3d, 58881A.
Davis, Yale R., Jr., 50981A.
Dawson, Frank H., Jr., 50254A.
Day, Edward L., 58886A.
Daye, Jerry G., 58507A.
Dean, Charles W., 58982A.
Dean, John H., 49809A.
Deaton, Marion C., 55057A.
DeBlasi, Joseph S., 51421A.
DeCamp, Dion E., 58592A.
Dedeker, Bryan W., 50287A.
Deering, Philip A., 50224A.
DeGiovanni, James A., 55578A.
Dehmel, Rolf F., 50288A.
Delano, Lyle M., 58536A.
DeLuchi, Denis A., 58823A.
Demchuk, Sergi L., 58448A.
Demers, Bernard G., 49810A.
Desselle, Don L., 49812A.
Detelich, Robert N., 51463A.
Devitt, William J., 59003A.
Deware, John C., 54989A.
Diaville, Jason G., 58516A.
Dickey, John P., 58985A.
Dickson, John E., Jr., 49813A.
Diesing, William E., Jr., 49814A.
Dillman, Pierre A., 49815A.
Dillon, Richard T., 51550A.
Dischler, Richard C., 58976A.
Dixon, Gerald A., 55060A.
Doerzbacher, Ralph E., Jr., 58847A.
Dollar, Boyd D., 50255A.
Dolliver, Peter H., 50272A.
Donahoe, Harold M., Jr., 49816A.
Dorazio, Silvio L., 50178A.
Doty, Robert E., Jr., 49811A.
Doucette, Arvid S., 49817A.
Dozier, James C., 58981A.
Duboise, Donald E., 51490A.
Dubreuil, Elliott J., 58774A.
Dugan, Michael J., 49818A.
Duhnke, Robert E., Jr., 58973A.
Dulin, William F., 59054A.
Dunn, Jerome, 49819A.
Dunning, William H., 49820A.
Durivage, Henry J., 58712A.
Durkee, Gary G., 49821A.
Durkin, Robert F., 49822A.

Dwyer, Paul H., 58780A.
Easterling, Allen M., 51476A.
Edwards, Donald R., 49823A.
Edwards, Roger S., 50171A.
Eisinger, John L., 59047A.
Eknayan, Armand, 58572A.
Elgan, Jess B., 59012A.
Eliot, Bradfield F., 49824A.
Ellington, Arthur D., Jr., 59038A.
Ellington, Jerald W., 51510A.
Ellis, George E., 49825A.
Ellis, William E., 58432A.
Elson, Charles L., 59004A.
Emmons, John E., 51503A.
Endicott, John E., 51505A.
English, Harry J., 54890A.
Evans, James L., 58978A.
Evans, Ralph B., 58751A.
Evans, Robert H., 49826A.
Fake, Mary L., 58597W.
Falk, Howard J., 58543A.
Fanelli, William B., 58675A.
Fant, Rodney E., 51437A.
Farnam, Richard L., 49827A.
Farney, Earl J., 49828A.
Farnsworth, Ross W., 59078A.
Fay, Leland G., 49829A.
Fenstermacher, Gene, 58433A.
Fernandez, Ralph E., 58875A.
Fields, Richard E., 55066A.
Fields, Robert A., 55081A.
Fincher, Clifton F., 58915A.
Fink, William W., Jr., 58945A.
Fitzgerald, William O., 54917A.
Fleckenstein, John F., 50212A.
Fletcher, Gailon K., 58501A.
Flint, James M., 58867A.
Flora, Gary S., 49831A.
Flowers, Kenneth H., 58693A.
Floyd, Gerald L., 58904A.
Fluhr, James F., 58646A.
Fohrman, William G., 49830A.
Ford, Laymond N., 58691A.
Ford, Richard T., 58445A.
Foscarini, Denny F., 59083A.
Fossett, Malcolm R., Jr., 49832A.
Fox, John F. C., 58608A.
Fox, Robert J., 51604A.
Francis, James A., 58661A.
Francoeur, Ronald A., 58987A.
Frank, Dietrich E., 51439A.
Franke, Thomas J., 54920A.
Franklin, Rodney E., 58857A.
Franzen, Ronald V., 58906A.
Frederick, Philip K., Jr., 50237A.
Free, James M., 58983A.
Fremming, Donald J., 58916A.
French, Terence E., 3d, 54895A.
Friedman, Peter G., 49833A.
Fritch, Roger A., 50279A.
Frost, Douglas A., 51515A.
Frustace, John P., 49834A.
Fry, Robert S., Jr., 58609A.
Frye, John W., Jr., 50274A.
Fuller, Glenn L., 58795A.
Fuller, Richard E., 54896A.
Fuller, Richard E., 58548A.
Gaheen, Alfred F., Jr., 49835A.
Gailey, Robert W., 50268A.
Gaither, John M., 49836A.
Galen, John C., 49837A.
Galloni, Richard J., 58963A.
Gallup, Robert D., 58742A.
Gardner, Henry P., 49838A.
Gardner, Raymond L., 58709A.
Gardner, Wayne D., 49839A.
Garrett, Donald R., 49840A.
Garrett, Robert W., 59033A.
Garrison, William S., 58841A.
Gaskill, Jack D., 54870A.
Gaughan, Lee A., 49841A.
Gauthier, Francis R., 50984A.
Gauthier, Ralph A., 58813A.
Gazzerro, William J., 58877A.
Geddes, James D., 58739A.
Geick, Larry L., 58480A.
Geiger, Francis E., 58782A.
Geipel, Ernest F., 49842A.
Gelinas, Wilfrid E., 49843A.
Gentile, John L., 49844A.
Gericke, William A., Jr., 50179A.
Gerity, Norman E., 51444A.
Gerkin, Ronald M., 58854A.
Gerson, Gordon M., 49845A.
Giambattista, Thom B., 49846A.
Gietzen, Roger C., 49847A.
Giglio, Michael A., 49848A.
Gill, Joel S., 49849A.
Gilreath, John M., 59001A.
Gingrich, Franklin J., Jr., 58642A.
Glaab, Paul E., 58927A.
Gladish, Charles F., 58998A.
Glasgow, Page W., 50180A.
Glazier, Dean H., 58631A.
Gober, Edmund S., 58434A.
Goebel, James W., 58557A.
Goff, Ewing P., 58658A.
Gold, William G., 49850A.
Golob, David R., 58625A.
Goode, Guerry D., 58960A.
Goodwin, Thomas P., Jr., 58762A.
Gopsill, Kenneth M., Jr., 51442A.
Gotner, Norbert A., 58952A.
Gottschalk, Paul H., 50985A.
Goudeau, James F., 59044A.
Grady, William M., 49851A.
Graham, Bruce M., 54858A.
Grant, Dow B., 58521A.
Granville, John M., 49852A.
Graves, Luther W., 59017A.
Gray, Donald L., 58581A.
Green, Charles K., 58455A.
Green, Robert A., 49853A.
Green, Thomas C., 58633A.
Greer, Lee V., 58671A.
Greis, Rudolph, 58957A.
Gresham, Darrel R., 58477A.
Grete, Robert L., 49854A.
Grim, Harry J., 50175A.
Grissman, Robert J., 58716A.
Grzybicki, Alfred T., 49855A.
Guenther, Ernest W., 55073A.
Guenther, Frank J., 49856A.
Guest, Tommy D., 58577A.
Guy, Ronald N., 58831A.
Haase, Richard O., 49857A.
Haeberle, Henry, 59015A.
Haerle, Peter J., 58768A.
Haertel, Hermann, 51456A.
Hagberg, Wayne D., 49858A.
Hagood, James A., 49859A.
Hall, Charles R., 58550A.
Hall, Clayton J., 58964A.
Hall, Howard L., 49860A.
Hall, Michael D., 58759A.
Halsey, Jack L., 49861A.
Haltermann, Robert L., 49862A.
Hampton, John W., 54902A.
Hanavan, Ernest P., Jr., 49863A.
Haney, John D., Jr., 49864A.
Hankins, Donald J., 58665A.
Hanley, William F., 54884A.
Hensen, Harry J., 3d, 49865A.
Hanson, Eugene H., 54908A.
Hanson, Raymond F., 49866A.
Hansult, Charles C., 49867A.
Hardee, Frank D., 50245A.
Harden, David W., 50988A.
Hardie, David R., 58820A.
Hardy, Thomas J., 49868A.
Hargrove, Willis L., 58790A.
Harper, James L., 55069A.
Harper, Kenneth D., 51471A.
Harrelson, Donald B., 51560A.
Harrington, Cyrus R., Jr., 50225A.
Harrington, Paul H., Jr., 49869A.
Harris, Donald W., 49870A.
Harris, Harry G., 58648A.
Harris, Robert D., 58788A.
Harrison, Corbet L., 58610A.
Harwell, William P., 51440A.
Hasegawa, Francis K. H., 49871A.
Hasselbrink, Ernest F., 49872A.
Hastings, Albert F., Jr., 51466A.
Hawkins, Gwendolyn J., 58819W.
Hawkins, William V., 58817A.
Haynes, James L., 55082A.
Heald, William C., 58929A.
Hearne, Richard E., 58943A.
Heffelman, Craig S., 59013A.
Hefferman, John P., 58928A.
Hegg, Wallace D., 58835A.
Heidlebaugh, Gary I., 58420A.
Held, John W., 49874A.
Helms, Adrain C., 51516A.
Helton, Charles T., 58965A.
Helvie, Gail D., 51431A.
Henderson, Bernard L., 58922A.
Henderson, Jesse J., 58584A.
Henderson, Lowell A., 58718A.
Hendrix, Jack L., 58694A.
Henkin, Ernest, 58708A.
Hennessy, John G., 58861A.
Hennig, George R., 49875A.
Henrikson, Henry B., 54871A.
Henry, James P., 58855A.
Hepp, Bruce C., 58924A.
Herculson, Robert J., Jr., 58764A.
Herfel, David L., 59045A.
Herman, Roy E., 58508A.
Hermanson, Robert F., 58653A.
Hernandez, Carlos A., 49876A.
Herndon, Bryce M., 54864A.
Hess, Alfred A., 55063A.
Hess, Donald W., 58966A.
Hettinger, David A., 49877A.
Heverly, Robert E., 58761A.
Hicken, Merle R., 59084A.
Hickey, Dennis E., 58967A.
Hickman, Vincent J., 58450A.
Higgins, James A., 58626A.
Hill, James T., 58488A.
Hillsman, William C., 49878A.
Hines, Richard H., 58909A.
Hirschfeld, William G., Jr., 58977A.
Hitt, George C., 59069A.
Hoag, Peter C., 51499A.
Hoblit, Jerry N., 49879A.
Hocker, James D., 49880A.
Hoerle, James R., 49881A.
Hofmann, Larry E., 51410A.
Honan, Martin F., Jr., 58699A.
Hooper, Donald B., 54990A.
Hope, James R., 55079A.
Hopper, John P., 58688A.
Horrigan, Roger C., 58856A.
Horvath, Joseph L., 58503A.
Howard, Barry J., 49882A.
Howey, James M., 58851A.
Hoy, Walter S., 58487A.
Hudgins, John T., 51451A.
Hudson, Larry E., 51447A.
Hudson, Weldon Y., 59096A.
Huff, Dennis R., 49883A.
Hughes, Harley A., 58684A.
Hughes, Harold B., 58685A.
Hughes, John D., 58554A.
Hulme, Doyle L., 50182A.
Hurd, Peter M., 54994A.
Hurley, Phil C., 51511A.
Hurn, William P., 58765A.
Hurst, Harry H., 49884A.
Hutten, Robert L., 58930A.
Hutton, Lester L., 59056A.
Hyde, John P., 58939A.
Hyde, Robert C., 58866A.
Ivey, James C., Jr., 58482A.
Jackson, Edward N., 49885A.
Jackson, Phillip B., 58949A.
Jaeger, Henry K., 49886A.
James, Curtis R., 51481A.
James, William K., 51482A.
Jamieson, Richard V., 58720A.
Jaquith, Roger H., 58843A.
Jeffcoat, James D., 50183A.
Jefferson, Donald E., 58654A.
Jeglum, Paul M., 50277A.
Jenison, Gross E., 49887A.
Jenkins, Barry W., 59062A.
Jenkins, Frank R., 58635A.
Jenkins, Glenn R., 58417A.
Jennings, Warren C., 54903A.
Jensen, Mark R., 49888A.
Jobe, Paul E., 59085A.
Jobe, Robert E., 50240A.
Johanson, Clayton J., 54894A.
Johns, Clyde L., 58733A.
Johnson, Allen T., 50968A.
Johnson, Daniel L., 49889A.
Johnson, Douglas A., 58677A.
Johnson, Fredrick M., 55074A.
Johnson, Gary A., 58989A.

Johnson, Gordon L., 50214A.
Johnson, John R., Jr., 58935A.
Johnson, Kenneth B., 51415A.
Johnson, Larry D., 58725A.
Johnson, Richard S., 49890A.
Johnson, Robert H., 58667A.
Johnson, Ronald K., 58655A.
Johnson, Ronald P., 54899A.
Johnson, Vardaman F., 51642A.
Johnson, William F., 58518A.
Johnston, Roy C., 58583A.
Jones, Clarence R., 58931A.
Jones, Marvin L., 58502A.
Jones, Michael S., 49891A.
Jones, Richard T., 59009A.
Jones, Robert T., 51414A.
Jones, Robert W., 50262A.
Jones, Wayne W., 58560A.
Kaa, William A., 58512A.
Kaelin, Albert F., Jr., 51419A.
Kagarise, John D., 58414A.
Kane, Donald G., 58424A.
Karges, Donald D., 58498A.
Karlquist, Charles G., 58530A.
Kavanagh, Andrew J., 50265A.
Keating, Robert J., 58513A.
Keefe, Richard E., 49892A.
Keifer, Thomas W., 49893A.
Kelley, William J., 49894A.
Kellogg, Verna S., 2d, 58500W.
Kelly, Edward J., 51554A.
Kempf, Peter T., 58980A.
Kendall, Harold R., 49895A.
Kenefick, George E., 49896A.
Kenyon, Charles A., Jr., 51001A.
Keppler, Richard J., 55826A.
Kerr, John W., 58611A.
Kershaw, John P., 54993A.
Kevin, Hugh D., 49897A.
Kibbey, Richard A., 58689A.
King, Byron W., Jr., 50979A.
King, Jack E., 58773A.
King, John J., 58890A.
King, Johnie, 58771A.
Kingcaid, Milton D., 51513A.
Kirk, Joe R., 58476A.
Kirtley, Robert L., 49898A.
Kittinger, James D., 58555A.
Kjeldgaard, Louis D., 58639A.
Kleperis, John V., 58531A.
Klingelsmith, Richard J., 58885A.
Klos, Arthur G., 49899A.
Klotzbach, George O., 49900A.
Knoblauch, James L., 55078A.
Knowles, Edward D., 59034A.
Koeller, Alfred D., 50250A.
Koerner, William L., 58769A.
Kolacz, Paul A., 50207A.
Kolofske, Bruce F., 54865A.
Koppenhaver, Donald N., 58484A.
Kovacs, John A., 58719A.
Kozler, Ralph, 51445A.
Kramer, Delbert L., 50244A.
Krankel, Josef C., 49901A.
Kranz, John S., 58649A.
Kromer, Donald B., 50235A.
Krotz, Larry D., 54893A.
Krueger, Carl B., 54888A.
Krulls, Gerd E., 58749A.
Kubiak, John M., 49902A.
Kulickowski, Vincent W., 50232A.
Lackey, Robert S., 49903A.
Ladd, Richard E., 51004A.
Laing, Frederick W., Jr., 49904A.
Lake, John M., 58850A.
Lamb, Robert R., 54873A.
Lammers, Kurt M., 54851A.
Lamoureux, David C., 54991A.
Langston, Lloyd H., 51475A.
Langwell, Donald E., 54869A.
Lanier, Lawrence H., 58933A.
Larkin, Lawrence G., 50258A.
Larsen, Carl B., 49905A.
Lavis, Michael P., 58579A.
Lazarus, Allan R., 51003A.
Leaver, Carl A., 51555A.
Lebby, Davis E., Jr., 58837A.
Leet, Albert C., 58702A.
Lenart, Ernest R., Jr., 49906A.
Leone, Nicholas L., 58876A.
Lerum, Glen D., 49907A.
Lewand, Marc E., 58748A.
Lewark, William H., Jr., 50169A.
Lewis, Howard B., 50238A.
Lewis, John B., 58968A.
Libey, Jack A., 49908A.
Lifsey, Truman W., 51487A.
Lineberger, Harold B., 50223A.
Lingo, Brooks E., 58700A.
Lintner, Marvin W., 51464A.
L'Italien, Maurice J., 54859A.
Little, John R., Jr., 58903A.
Livingston, David W., 49909A.
Livingston, George T., 58969A.
Lloyd, Robert Y., 54886A.
Logan, Albert L., 54847A.
Logan, Thomas L., 59041A.
Logeais, Donald A., 58664A.
Lonero, Lawrence, 49910A.
Long, Steven W., Jr., 58496A.
Lord, Ronald H., 51548A.
Lott, Quitman W., 58612A.
Lowry, John R., 58491A.
Lucci, Edward J., 49911A.
Lukstat, Richard H., 50193A.
Lund, William D. R., 58941A.
Lustfield, Stuart L., 49912A.
Lyon, Charles S., 58844A.
Lyon, Donovan L., 58463A.
Lyon, Edward A., Jr., 50251A.
Lyon, Willis Y., 51430A.
Lytle, John L., 50263A.
Macchi, Peter J., 58532A.
MacIntosh, Robert M., Jr., 51488A.
Mack, Donald R., 51494A.
Madison, Leland P., 58678A.
Magnuson, Harold R., 58529A.
Magrath, Terrence B., 49913A.
Malais, Edward J., 49914A.
Maloney, Lawrence R., Jr., 51517A.
Mangan, Robert E., 58824A.
Manley, Thomas R., 49916A.
Mann, George C., Jr., 49917A.
Marples, Robert D., 58679A.
Marrett, George J., 58907A.
Martin, Billy, Jr., 58522A.
Martin, Douglas S., 58882A.
Martin, Martin D., 51477A.
Martin, Terry H., 58838A.
Martin, Thomas P., 49919A.
Mathieson, William J., 58743A.
Mawhinney, Homer A., 58869A.
May, Hollis B., Jr., 58796A.
Mayhew, Jason F., 49921A.
Mays, Melvin W., 58805A.
McAleer, George R., Jr., 49922A.
McAlpin, James J., 58887A.
McAninch, Arthur N., 59072A.
McCallson, Gaylord A., 50229A.
McCann, Robert I., 49923A.
McCausland, Charles, 58588A.
McCausland, Roger W., 58704A.
McClaren, Kenneth R., 58603A.
McCluney, Cliff A., Jr., 58495A.
McCormac, Sam L., 54852A.
McCormick, Thomas H., 49924A.
McCoy, John F., 58442A.
McCrillis, George R., 55058A.
McCullough, Donald J., 49925A.
McDonald, Ronald D., Jr., 58737A.
McDonald, Walter R., 58494A.
McDowell, Edward D., Jr., 58858A.
McDowell, Zim M., 58784A.
McElroy, Joseph D., 49926A.
McElroy, Joseph H., Jr., 58568A.
McFarland, Ernest L., 50289A.
McFarlane, Glen L., 54892A.
McGee, William B., 58849A.
McGugin, Robert M., 49927A.
McKenzie, Robert E., 58834A.
McKeown, Frank J., 58585A.
McKillop, John H., 49928A.
McKinney, Carl A., Jr., 58810A.
McLaurin, Floyd A., 50194A.
McLellan, Paul C., Jr., 49929A.
McLemore, John C., 58970A.
McManigell, Richard H., 49930A.
McMullin, Robert L., 58643A.
McNamara, John A., 49931A.
McPeak, Merrill A., 58758A.
McSpadden, Billy D., 59019A.
Meador, Donald W., Jr., 50276A.
Meador, William E., 59086A.
Meals, Robert W., Jr., 49933A.
Medlock, Charles, Jr., 49934A.
Meeks, Wallace N., 58868A.
Meinig, Frederick R., 58634A.
Meisel, William J., 49935A.
Melly, Thomas S., 58517A.
Melnik, William C., 49936A.
Merrihew, Gary R., 58647A.
Merrill, Peter, 50278A.
Metcalf, William J., 59016A.
Meurer, Philip A., 49937A.
Meyer, Arthur W., 49938A.
Meyer, David W., 58703A.
Meyer, John F., Jr., 55054A.
Michel, Donald D., 58549A.
Middlebrooks, Clifford L., 58599A.
Miller, Alsey C., 3d, 58979A.
Miller, Burton T., Jr., 49939A.
Miller, Donald L., 58624A.
Miller, Harold W., 51506A.
Miller, John C., Jr., 49940A.
Miller, Lawrence L., 59055A.
Miller, Rene J., Jr., 58401A.
Miller, Richard L., 51472A.
Miller, Robert F., 59043A.
Milner, James R., 59006A.
Minar, Gary H., 49941A.
Misenheimer, Philip L., 51432A.
Mitchell, Charles W., 49942A.
Mitchell, George B., 49943A.
Mitchell, Phil E., 51492A.
Mohler, Harlan J., 58415A.
Molina, Leopoldo, 58423A.
Monroe, Kent M., 59066A.
Monson, Norman H., 49944A.
Moore, Donald B., 58888A.
Moore, Donald L., 50168A.
Moore, Max R., 58920A.
Mooy, Olin R., 58413A.
Moran, Carroll G., 58462A.
Moran, Michael A., 49945A.
Morch, Herbert O., 58475A.
Moreman, Ervin B., Jr., 59024A.
Moreton, James E., Jr., 59002A.
Morrill, Merwin L., 49946A.
Morris, David B., 58523A.
Morris, Robert K., 54985A.
Morris, Wayne A., 49947A.
Morrissey, Leonard G., Jr., 58744A.
Morse, Don-Frederick H., 55067A.
Moser, Richard E., 58553A.
Moulton, Philip R., 49948A.
Muerle, Richard N., 50213A.
Mullady, James B., 49949A.
Munger, Robert L. T., 49950A.
Murdoch, Robert F., 51553A.
Murray, Jack R., 58713A.
Muscarello, Andrea A., 59005A.
Mustico, Richard J., 51559A.
Myers, William A., 58870A.
Nabors, Jerry H., 58951A.
Nading, Elvin K., 59097A.
Nagel, John F., 49951A.
Neal, Harold R., 50292A.
Nedbalek, Leon C., 50172A.
Neely, Ralph M., 49952A.
Nelson, Charles C., Jr., 58797A.
Nelson, Fred R., 58511A.
Nelson, Jimmie H., 58732A.
Nelson, John T., 59040A.
Nelson, Keith E., 51507A.
Nesbitt, William F., 3d, 51521A.
Neville, William D., 58629A.
Newport, Maxwell H., 50246A.
Newsome, John W., 58659A.
Nicholas, Donald G., 58668A.
Nicolson, Herbert L., 58947A.
Nimmo, Kenneth R., 58863A.
Nitti, Vincent J., Jr., 58465A.
Noack, Bobby R., 59071A.
Noblitt, James W., 51557A.
Nolan, James F., Jr., 58853A.
Nordin, Frederick R., 51433A.
Norkin, Donald P., 49953A.
Norman, Robert A., 58641A.
Normington, Charles A., 49954A.
Nornberg, Rhody L., 58910A.
Nuckles, James F., 59076A.
Nutting, Gerard J., 54883A.
Nygaard, George M., 58464A.

Oakley, Harry D., 54912A.
O'Brian, Thomas M., 58926A.
O'Brien, Dennis J., 51512A.
O'Bryan, Victor J., 54867A.
Odle, Max L., 58547A.
O'Donnell, Timothy G., 54869A.
Offill, Phillip W., 58686A.
Ojalehto, George D., 49955A.
Olender, Henry A., 50236A.
Olson, Robert E., 49956A.
O'Rourke, Lawrence M., 50200A.
Orr, Stanley, 50267A.
Osborn, Richard D., 49957A.
Ostovich, Theodore, 58839A.
Otto, Harry P., 55076A.
Pace, David H., 58468A.
Palka, Joseph F., 58727A.
Palmer, Nyal E., 49958A.
Palmer, Raymond R., 58816A.
Palmier, Patrick A., 50982A.
Panaia, Vincent A., 49959A.
Parker, Bruce M., 58741A.
Parker, Joseph A., Jr., 58705A.
Parker, Larry F., 50248A.
Parrish, Roger K., 58680A.
Patterson, Walter M., 3d, 49960A.
Patterson, William O., Jr., 54881A.
Patton, Marlow M., 58950A.
Patton, Robert A., 54911A.
Paul, James D., 49961A.
Pearson, Arthur F., 51549A.
Peck, David W., 50197A.
Peck, George E., 59046A.
Pedron, Carlo J., 50999A.
Pejsar, Roderick J., 49962A.
Pentz, Russell H., 51457A.
Perkins, Ottis L., 58992A.
Personius, Glen M., 58917A.
Peszynski, Paul R., 58538A.
Peters, Charles R., 58898A.
Peters, Walter C., Jr., 49963A.
Peterson, Bruce J., 58573A.
Peterson, Charles O., 50069A.
Peterson, Donald A., 58923A.
Peterson, Eldon L., 58619A.
Peterson, Fred H., 58736A.
Peterson, John W., 58645A.
Peterson, Robert L., 58674A.
Pettigrew, Norman L., 58995A.
Pharmer, Lamont H., 58734A.
Phelps, Harold A., Jr., 51551A.
Phillips, Franklin P., 49964A.
Phillips, Glenn K., 49965A.
Phillips, Joseph W., Jr., 50427A.
Picard, Henri J., Jr., 51413A.
Pierce, James L., 49966A.
Pierce, Jay T., 54900A.
Pinaud, Joseph H., 54885A.
Pinkham, Charles T., 49967A.
Platt, James L., 51002A.
Pleis, Roy F., 58598A.
Plummer, Richard T., 58897A.
Poindexter, Harold R., 58539A.
Polk, Jerry G., 58561A.
Poole, Grover C., 58735A.
Porciello, Charles B., 49968A.
Porter, Eugene M., 58697A.
Posey, Milton L., 50218A.
Pratt, Edward A., 58798A.
Preston, Charles R., 58542A.
Price, Richard R., 49969A.
Prime, Louis J., Jr., 49970A.
Prochaska, Jerome F., 49971A.
Profilet, Charles W., 49972A.
Prout, William J., 49973A.
Pryor, Theodore A., 58971A.
Puckette, Cleveland L., 2d, 49974A.
Puff, Robert W., 49975A.
Pyle, Ernest L., 49976A.
Pyle, William E., 50282A.
Quinn, Thomas D., 58663A.
Raab, John O., 58905A.
Raign, Phillip H., 49977A.
Ramirez, Enrique H., 58623A.
Ranone, Nicholas R., 58984A.
Rasmussen, Robert D., 51552A.
Ratledge, Billy R., 50256A.
Ratledge, Bobby J., 50185A.
Readmond, Dean L., 55075A.
Reardon, James R., 55059A.
Reddington, Ivan L., 51508A.
Reddish, Harold D., 59087A.
Redenbacher, Leon R., 58481A.
Reed, Harold W., 49978A.
Reed, Lawrence L., 58489A.
Reese, William D., 50986A.
Reeves, Robert R., 58833A.
Regut, Robert E., 49979A.
Reid, John M., 59030A.
Reilly, Leo B., Jr., 58613A.
Reitmann, Thomas E., 58896A.
Remson, Jack G., 58814A.
Rensch, Donald J., 58827A.
Retterbush, Gary L., 51599A.
Reynolds, James W., 49980A.
Reynolds, Leonard F., 49981A.
Rice, Paul G., Jr., 49982A.
Richards, Jerry D., 58932A.
Ridley, Arthur K., 49983A.
Ridley, Gerald F., 51496A.
Ridolfi, Richard R., 58781A.
Rieke, Don M., 58808A.
Riemer, David G., 50259A.
Ripley, Victor M., 49984A.
Rist, Harold D., 58435A.
Rita, Joseph A., 59088A.
Rivers, Roger A., 59099A.
Roath, William W., 50201A.
Roberts, Albert C., 50209A.
Robertson, George S., 3d, 49985A.
Robinson, Arthur R., Jr., 59073A.
Robinson, Ernest C., 59080A.
Robinson, Gardner L., 50234A.
Robinson, Maurice K., Jr., 49986A.
Rodriguez, Victor B., 59018A.
Roland, Carl J., 58456A.
Rossetto, James L., 49988A.
Rosso, Thomas P., 58860A.
Routon, Harold G., 51478A.
Rowton, Shannon P., 49989A.
Rozinek, James R., 59027A.
Rudolph, Gerald T., 49990A.
Rushmer, Charles R., 59060A.
Russell, Horace L., 51520A.
Rutherford, Theodore A., 51453A.
Ruthman, Jerome E., 58710A.
Ruud, Paul G., 49991A.
Ryan, James H., 49992A.
Ryan, James M., 49993A.
Saad, Edmond M., Jr., 54905A.
Sampson, Richard E., 59068A.
Samuels, Richard E., 58822A.
Sand, Robert B., 51450A.
Sandahl, William L., 58996A.
Sanders, Nelson H., 50283A.
Sanders, Walter H., 58471A.
Sanderson, Clifford R., 51446A.
Sandoval, Joe O., 59021A.
Sanford, Calvin W., 59039A.
Saravo, James V., 59007A.
Saunders, Walter A., Jr., 51425A.
Sauvageau, Francis M., 59028A.
Schaefer, John F., 49994A.
Scharf, Marcus D., 59079A.
Scheidt, John C., Jr., 59065A.
Schettler, Luttrell, 58617A.
Schiefelbein, Gordon, W., 58799A.
Schneider, Benjamin F., Jr., 59067A.
Schneider, John R., 50181A.
Schneider, Wayne K., 58767A.
Schnur, Joel A., 54904A.
Scholz, Joachim E., 51441A.
Schriver, Byron, Jr., 49996A.
Schroeder, John G., 49997A.
Schwind, Andrew S., Jr., 58656A.
Scott, John L., 58600A.
Segrest, Claude H., Jr., 58570A.
Seifert, William K., 58504A.
Seiler, Reginald F., 49998A.
Self, Loy D., 58490A.
Seto, Richard S., 58921A.
Shackelford, Billy F., 58564A.
Shahan, Larry E., 58919A.
Sharon, Dennis P., 49999A.
Sharp, James C., 58690A.
Shatanof, Roger, 58441A.
Shaw, Thurman A., 54876A.
Sheehan, Leo E., Jr., 50000A.
Sheffield, Harry A., 55083A.
Shellenberger, Robert T., 50001A.
Shely, William W., Jr., 50002A.
Sherrill, Gene A., 51465A.
Shershun, Carroll S., 58800A.
Shiffert, John B., 59063A.
Shinn, Thomas W., 58936A.
Shockey, Samuel H., Jr., 58405A
Showalter, Larry A., 58723A.
Shuster, Steve, 58807A.
Siburg, William E., Jr., 58534A.
Simmonds, Donald L., 58632A.
Simmons, George C., 59053A.
Simpson, Albert P., 50003A.
Simpson, William A., 50004A.
Singleton, Paul L., 51422A.
Slafkosky, Alexander R., 50005A.
Slater, Stanley A., 50006A.
Sloan, George M., 50007A.
Sloan, Harold J., 58801A.
Slyder, Richard L., 50008A.
Smart, David E., 58526A.
Smiley, Kenneth S., Jr., 58452A.
Smith, Clarence A., 58865A.
Smith, Colin A., 58412A.
Smith, Donald E., 58997A.
Smith, Eugene M., 58717A.
Smith, Frank M., 50009A.
Smith, Leo W., 2d, 50010A.
Smith, Monroe T., 59456A.
Smith, Richard W., 58695A.
Smith, Rodney H., 55227A.
Smith, Weston T., 58846A.
Smith, Willis A., Jr., 50011A.
Smullen, Harold C., 2d, 51417A.
Snead, Jonathan H., 51000A.
Snyder, Donald, 58470A.
Snyder, Terry D., 50012A.
Soltis, Ronald B., 50273A.
Soper, W. John, 50013A.
Sorensen, Lee E., 51497A.
Sorensen, Norman M., 58848A.
Spearman, Jack L., 58669A.
Spillman, Harry L., 58775A.
Sprague, Nelson J., 58899A.
Sparks, Billy R., 58673A.
Spray, Ronald G., 59064A.
Sprott, Arthur R., Jr., 51443A.
Stalker, Ronald R., 58587A.
Stall, Floyd M., 58802A.
Stallings, William T., 50220A.
Stallkamp, Roger W., 50014A.
Stambaugh, William S., 50015A.
Stark, James D., 50077A.
Statton, Francis H., 50016A.
StClair, Gilbert K., 50226A.
Steigerwald, Joseph G., 59100A.
Stein, Robert G., 58425A.
Stern, Arnold C., 50991A.
Sterrett, Charles R., 58752A.
Stevenson, Richard A., 51434A.
Stinson, Carl R., 59089A.
Stone, Richard, 32849A.
Storr, Richard C., 51452A.
Strachan, John, 58740A.
Strange, John E., Jr., 58575A.
Strickland, Donald C., 59032A.
Strobel, Jack W., 50271A.
Strong, Dale L., 58785A.
Strout, Robert P., 58842A.
Strybel, Walter P., 50017A.
Stuart, Robert S., 58440A.
Stuteville, Joseph E., 58757A.
Sullivan, Dennis J., 58604A.
Sullivan, Robert T., 58756A.
Sullivan, William B., 58436A.
Supe, Gustavus M., Jr., 50275A.
Surovic, Arthur F., 50230A.
Sutherland, Larry W., 50018A.
Sutman, Joseph L., Jr., 50019A.
Sutton, Glenn H., 58652A.
Swain, Whitmel B., 50020A.
Swainston, Richard C., 50204A.
Swanson, Ralph J., 58766A.
Swanson, Richard H., 58809A.
Swart, Samuel H., Jr., 50021A.
Sweeney, James P., 58908A.
Swihura, Edward J., 58596A.
Sylvester, Samuel F., 51556A.
Szewc, Joseph A., 58883A.
Tait, James L., Jr., 58889A.
Taylor, Clyde, 3d, 58770A.
Taylor, Henry L., 58711A.
Taylor, John H., 51474A.
Taylor, Samuel A., 50022A.

Teague, Randolph M., 50023A.
Temperley, Russell E., 59025A.
Terry, C. Morris, 50227A.
Terry, Condon H., 58569A.
Tharp, Lawrence R., 50024A.
Theisen, Lawrence P., 58972A.
Theohary, Thomas, 50025A.
Thiel, Norman G., 58999A.
Thom, Russell A., Jr., 50026A.
Thomas, Roy R., 50027A.
Thompson, Clarence G., 54992A.
Thompson, Leslie B., 58459A.
Thompson, William J., 54866A.
Thorin, Lee A., 58787A.
Thornal, Leroy W., 50977A.
Thornton, Richard B., 54850A.
Thornton, Robert A., 50028A.
Tierney, John F., 50029A.
Tierney, Robert E., 50030A.
Tillman, Richard L., 50031A.
Timberlake, Edward J., 3d, 50032A.
Timmer, Don R., 50033A.
Tinsley, James S. 59037A.
Tipton, James C., 50034A.
Todd, Lewis F., 50035A.
Toffel, Alvin E., 58911A.
Toney, Stanley C., 50036A.
Tonini, Daryl E., 51458A.
Toth, Jack E., 55061A.
Tovrea, Leonard B., 58864A.
Trainor, Peter B., Jr., 50037A.
Tringali, Charles J., 58451A.
Trott, Clifford B., 50038A.
Trousdale, John D., 59031A.
Trudeau, Laurence A., 50039A.
Tulley, Michael G., Jr., 50040A.
Turnage, Baxter H., Jr., 50199A.
Turner, David C., 50041A.
Tyler, Ivan W., 55291A.
Upp, Dean A., 50989A.
Urbanic, Frank A., Jr., 58461A.
VanBuiten, Alan J., 58750A.
VanLiew, George E., 58803A.
VanNote, Thomas E., 58902A.
Varner, George L., 58948A.
Vaughan, Patrick W., Jr., 50987A.
Vaughan, Robert B., 58637A.
Vazquez, Francisco, 58493A.
Veit, Richard F., 56027A.
Vivian, Lloyd W., 59090A.
VonHake, Richard W., 50215A.
Votruba, William K., 50042A.
Voyiaziakis, Stanley, 58457A.
Vreeland, Harry E., 58826A.
Vreeland, Russell E., Jr., 50043A.
Vulkoff, R. Craig, 58535A.
Wade, James R., 50045A.
Wakeman, Edwin B., 58884A.
Walcott, Gordon M., 51491A.
Walker, David L., 3d, 58506A.
Walker, Gordon L., 58845A.
Walker, Roy A., 51412A.
Walls, Francis H., 58614A.
Walsh, Jack E., 59091A.
Walter, Clair E., 58628A.
Walters, Alan A., 59092A.
Walters, Frank P., 58636A.
Walton, Gary K., 58485A.
Walus, Michael A., Jr., 58706A.
Wampler, James P., 58478A.
Wanamaker, James E., 50198A.
Ward, Johnny M., 58687A.
Ward, Robert G., 58566A.
Ware, Donald M., 54915A.
Warfield, David M., 56037A.
Warley, Sinkler, Jr., 49915A.
Warner, George L., 50266A.
Warner, Richard E., 50046A.
Washburn, John I., 50047A.
Washington, Joseph A., 58912A.
Watson, Alan W., 58901A.
Watson, Dennis C., 58672A.
Watts, Clarence F., 54875A.
Watts, George L., 49932A.
Wawak, Stephen, Jr., 50048A.
Waymouth, Laurens S., 58409A.
Weatherson, James G., 50049A.
Webb, John A., 50219A.
Weed, Marvin J., 58437A.
Weenig, Jay F., 58900A.
Weihe, Dean V., 54916A.
Weihl, Clinton G., 58650A.
Weiss, Wayne A., 50050A.
Weissmueller, Courtney E., 51545A.
Welch, Donald J., 50051A.
Wells, Herschel O., 54857A.
Wells, John L., 58832A.
Wells, John T., Jr., 50052A.
Wells, Vaughan L., Jr., 51558A.
Wepfer, Gordon G., 58460A.
Wescott, Gary R., 58821A.
Wester, Albert D., 58497A.
Westergaard, Frederick C., 58944A.
White, Donald D., 58466A.
White, John H., Jr., 59052A.
White, Myron A., Jr., 58473A.
Whitehead, James T., Jr., 58644A.
Whiteman, Gilbert L., 58615A.
Whitfield, Edwin P., Jr., 50242A.
Whitney, Jay A., 50969A.
Whitsett, Charles E., Jr., 54849A.
Whitt, James E., 54891A.
Whittenberg, Jean R., 50053A.
Wickens, Ronald D., 54897A.
Wiegers, Francis A., 54856A.
Wigglesworth, Richard G., 58509A.
Wilda, Robert W., 54918A.
Wilder, James M., Jr., 58524A.
Wiley, Thomas S., 50978A.
Williams, David H., Jr., 54901A.
Williams, Edward F., 50054A.
Williams, Harold J. M., 50055A.
Williams, John C., 51436A.
Williams, Lester R., 50990A.
Williams, Lindsey J., 59093A.
Williams, Morgan G., 58606A.
Williams, William A., 54922A.
Wilson, David L., 51400A.
Wilson, Robert J., 3d, 50056A.
Wilson, William C., 58407A.
Wilton, Franklin L., 54914A.
Winograd, Sanford M., 58426A.
Winquist, Charles J., 58763A.
Winston, Eldon T., 50983A.
Wise, Donna L., 58818A.
Wise, Wesley T., 58953A.
Withers, William E., 58681A.
Witzmann, John H., 50057A.
Wohlfeil, Gordon L., 59077A.
Wolaver, John H., 58565A.
Wolcott, Lewis J., Jr., 54880A.
Wolf, Donn P., 55068A.
Wolff, William A., 50058A.
Wood, Larry W., 59074A.
Wood, William M., 50170A.
Woods, Scott A., 50059A.
Working, Raymond W., 58438A.
Worthington, Edward L., Jr., 58454A.
Wright, David L., 50060A.
Wright, Francis M., Jr., 50061A.
Wright, Philip C., 58815A.
Wright, Wilbur D., 50062A.
Wunderlich, Robert R., 51483A.
Wurzbach, Walter O., 55065A.
Yarr, Daniel J., 50063A.
Yarrish, Joseph, 58616A.
Yaryan, John S., Jr., 58620A.
Yoder, Richard A., 50064A.
Young, Peter J., 50065A.
Young, William M., 50066A.
Zemlicka, Frank K., 50067A.
Zempel, William K., 58528A.
Ziegler, Daniel H., 50068A.
Ziernicki, Robert S., 58520A.
Zirkle, William S., 58458A.

Medical Service Corps

Abercrombie, Thompson T., 55380A.
Adams, Gary L., 56477A.
Compton, John C., 55381A.
Dickes, David W., 51404A.
Farrell, Hugh R., 55376A.
Gillis, John R., 56476A.
Kennedy, John B., 55379A.
Kirchoffer, Wayne P., 56478A.
Neff, Ralph K., 55382A.
Reife, Donald H., Jr., 55377A.
Rittmiller, David A., 51405A.
Thrasher, Lewis J., 55378A.

Nurse Corps

Greer, Delia F., 56410W.
Souder, Sally A., 55930W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1961:

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be brigadier generals

Richard A. Evans
Robert B. Bell

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

August Larson
Richard C. Mangrum
Frederick L. Wieseman
Victor H. Krulak

To be brigadier generals

Henry W. Buse, Jr.
Herman Nickerson, Jr.
William J. Van Ryzin
Raymond L. Murray

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier general

Walter A. Churchill

U.S. AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Joseph H. Atkinson, 90A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

Col. Charles R. Roderick, 5266A, Regular Air Force, to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the U.S. Air Force, under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8351 and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Joe C. Moffitt, AO419945, Colorado Air National Guard.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. DuBois, Jr., AO429378, Missouri Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Leslie C. Smith, AO661245, California Air National Guard.

Col. Emmanuel Schifani, AO663100, New Mexico Air National Guard.

Col. Edward G. Johnson, AO421750, Oklahoma Air National Guard.

Col. Enoch B. Stephenson, Jr., AO727573, Tennessee Air National Guard.

Col. Frank W. Frost, AO395495, Washington Air National Guard.

U.S. ARMY

1. The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

2. The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code,

section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Paul Wyatt Caraway, O17659, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, O18143, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198, U.S. Army.

Lt. Col. Alfred Frederick Ahner, O2018089, Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States, to be Reserve commissioned officer of the Army to the grade of brigadier general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a).

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Edward C. Kenney, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Leonidas D. Coates, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

LINE

To be rear admirals

William E. Ellis	Charles K. Duncan
William S. Post, Jr.	John A. Tyree, Jr.
Harry Smith	Frederick L. Ashworth
John B. Colwell	George H. Miller
Bernard F. Roeder	Benedict J. Semmes,
Thomas R. Kurtz, Jr.	Jr.
Charles T. Booth II	Bernard A. Clarey
Hazlett P. Weatherwax	William I. Martin
John L. Chew	Samuel B. Frankel
John W. Gannon	William T. Nelson
Forsyth Massey	Edward A. Wright
John S. McCain, Jr.	Edwin B. Hooper
Louis J. Kirn	Henry A. Renken
Ralph C. Johnson	Morris A. Hirsch

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Cecil D. Riggs
Langdon C. Newman

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admiral

Herschel J. Goldberg

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be rear admiral

Joseph F. Dreith

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admiral

William C. G. Church

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admiral

Eric G. F. Pollard

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Louis A. Gillies
Wharton E. Larned

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admiral

Levi J. Roberts

Vice Adm. Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr., U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admirals

*Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., U.S. Navy.
*Vice Adm. John McN. Taylor, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Claude V. Ricketts, U.S. Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS AND NAVY

The nominations beginning James B. Glennon, Jr., to be colonel, U.S. Marine Corps, and ending Wilton K. Witzgall, to be second lieutenant, U.S. Marine Corps, said nominations having been received by the Senate on January 17, 1961.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning William H. Schmidt, to be captain, U.S. Air Force, and ending David W. Weiss, to be second lieutenant, U.S. Air Force, said nominations having been received by the Senate on January 10, 1961.

NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Woodrow W. Hill, pastor, West End Baptist Church, Petersburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we approach Thy throne of grace today because we hunger and thirst after righteousness, not only for ourselves but for this troubled world. Thou has placed great responsibility upon our shoulders, but we readily recognize that in our own wisdom and strength we are insufficient to face it alone.

Thy word says "If any of you lack wisdom let him ask God that giveth liberally * * * and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." We courageously study our motives and limitations today and face our need.

We pause at this noonday hour to ask for wisdom and strength. Responsibility is great, and we pray that it might be matched with wisdom from God, with devotion to duty, and with strength to perform.

Grant us Thy grace for living and leading these days; and as we find ourselves being weighed in the balances we pray that we shall not be found wanting. Grant, O Father, that the time might speedily come when other nations of the world might look upon us and say, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 4]

Bennett, Mich.	Knox	Rabaut
Fino	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Jensen	Norrell	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 426 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1961.*

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 127 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That during the Eighty-seventh Congress the Committee on Rules shall be composed of fifteen members.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, as is customary, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is one assignment that I did not seek.

I have deep affection for all parties involved in this controversy, and I have deep respect for the rules of the House.

I am a Democrat. I have always fought my political battles in the battle-scarred uniform of the Democratic Party, and I shall continue to do that. However, I have a firm belief in the position that with the majority rests the responsibility. If the Republican Party were in the majority here today and had the Speaker and they were seeking some means of assuring the leadership leeway to conform to their full responsibilities, as the majority I would vote with them on a similar resolution.

We are a two-party system. My prayer is that never in this great land of ours will we become so confused and

mixed up with different parties that we will become the victim of the lack of authority to function as a majority that exists in some of the states of Europe and of Asia. I believe in a two-party system. Of course, as a Democrat, I naturally want the Democrats always to be leading, at least one jump ahead.

Another thing, we in this Hall of the House of Representatives and all the people of the United States are brothers and sisters. We are partners in this great enterprise called America, and the necessity of affirming our leadership abounds. We are the beneficiaries of a Republic dedicated to us by the trials, sacrifice, blood, and tears from Plymouth Rock, Jamestown, Lexington, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, clear on through to Pork Chop Hill and Heartbreak Ridge in Korea.

Yes; it is my country. It is your country. It is our country. And it is challenged today as it has never been challenged before by a shrewd, wily, calculating, relentless foe. As we sit here in this Chamber today the Russian Bear has its claws in the front door of our yard, and in the backyard there is a Red dragon as long as the back porch. So the challenge is ours.

This is no time for dissension and lack of unity. We must keep our powder dry. We are not at all unlike the pioneer who had his musket loaded and in the rack above the door in his home. He was not an enemy of anybody, he did not want to fight, but let man or beast challenge his right to live, to love, to grow a family, own a home or business, or carry on a farmer's job, or any job, or to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, the old musket came down from above the door and it spoke. We, his descendants, must meet that challenge which confronts us. We must have that same posture as the pioneers.

I hope as we vote upon this resolution that when it ends, whichever way it goes, we can return to our work without malice, without bitterness, without selfishness, proud of the heritage that is ours of a great Republic dedicated to the proposition that freedom is even dearer than life itself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] for the purposes of debate.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who wanted this conflict to come to the floor of the House. I know of no one who could have prevented it from coming here. There is a situation existing which no one can deny. We have reached a stalemate in our Committee on Rules, a stalemate produced because of tie votes of 6 to 6. What is the basic cause of our difficulty? Reflect for only a second. The basic cause is self-evident—it is very simple, and that is that the Committee on Rules is composed of an even number of Members and, therefore, is prone to tie votes. Our Founding Fathers realizing the danger of tie votes in a deliberative body, and as the Senate must always be composed of an even number, two from each State, provided a mechanism in the other body for breaking a tie vote and permitted the Vice President, not a Member of that body, to vote in order to break a tie. But, no mechanism was provided in the House of Representatives. Why? Because the House is presided over by a Member of this body; and, in addition, because it was always contemplated that the House would consist of an odd number or an uneven number of Members. In providing for the first Congresses until after the taking of the first census, each State in the Union was assigned a finite number of Members to sit in those Congresses before the first census could be taken. Each State was assigned a finite number and it added up to 65—an uneven number. Congresses very close in time to the Constitution fixed the membership of the House at an uneven number.

The number provided after the first enumeration was 105; in the second, 141; then 181; 213; 240; 223; 233; 241; 283; 325; 356; 386; 433; and since 1913, 435 with a temporary increase to accommodate Hawaii and Alaska to 437. Every time Congress has fixed the number of the House of Representatives, it has fixed it at an uneven number. When the House has consisted of an even number, it was because of States admitted to the Union after the last decennial census or because the Congress did not fix a finite number, but provided a formula which produced an even number. If you will turn to rule 10 of the rules of the House, you will see, under the permanent rules of the House, every committee of the House is to consist of an uneven number of members except the Committee on Rules. True, in specific Congresses as in this Congress, it has been provided that certain committees of the House shall consist of an even number. If you think there is something sacrosanct about the number 12 on the Committee on Rules, there is no reason for that feeling. It was created as a standing committee of the House in 1880. Prior to that time, it existed as a select committee. When the Committee on Rules was created in 1880 it consisted of five members. That continued until 1910 when the number was increased to 11 members and in 1917 to 12 members and in 1935 to 14 members and in 1945 and since that time, it has consisted of 12 members. So that the numbers on the Committee on Rules have been changed, and have been changed a number of times since that committee has been in existence.

The rules of the House provide the number to be on a committee, but they do not provide the manner in which those numbers shall be distributed between the majority and the minority. What happens? At the beginning of each Congress, the Speaker of the House and the minority leader agree upon the ratio to be assigned to these committees, and it has invariably conformed to the ratio of the representation of the two parties in the House of Representatives, as nearly as it has been possible to do so.

That is not true as to the Committee on Rules, under the custom and the unbroken tradition of the House. The majority party, by custom and tradition, always has a 2-to-1 majority on the Committee on Rules. Under the strength of 12, there have been 8 Democrats and 4 Republicans when the Democrats have controlled the House, and 8 Republicans and 4 Democrats when the Republicans have controlled the House. Why? For the simple and all important reason that the Committee on Rules is an arm of the leadership of the majority party. The majority party has the responsibility of the legislative program of the House. The majority party has the right to bring to the floor of the House the legislative proposals of the committees. Once a proposal is on the floor, each member is a free agent to consider, to decide, and to vote as he sees fit. Because of this traditional organization one who assumes membership on the Committee on Rules must be prepared to exercise a function of leadership. His personal objection to the proposal is not always sufficient reason for him to vote to deny the membership of the whole House the opportunity to express its approval or, equally important, the opportunity to express its disapproval.

Each of us has received from the chairman of the Committee on Rules a copy of a letter which he addressed to Hon. CARL VINSON and Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER. In that letter, he reviews briefly efforts to reach a compromise on this controversy. He states:

> I, therefore, want it clearly understood what we who oppose the packing scheme have offered to do.
>
> We have offered to interpose no obstacles in the Committee on Rules to the five major bills that the President has publicly announced as his program for this session.
>
> We have offered to support a change in the rules to deprive the Committee on Rules of jurisdiction to prevent bills from going to conference.

I submit that this proposal offers no solution.

Article II, section 3, of the Constitution reads as follows:

> He [the President] shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

The proposal of the chairman of the Committee on Rules attempts to impinge upon the constitutional mandate placed upon the President by limiting to five proposals made by the President which that committee will consider. The letter from the chairman of the Committee on Rules is dated January 28. It, therefore, proposed prior to the organization of the House, prior to the appointment of the legislative committees of the House, and before any opportunity for the President to submit his report on the state of the Union and an opportunity to recommend to our consideration such measures as the President may judge necessary and expedient, a limitation of five proposals.

These are troublesome times. Action on this resolution is difficult and unpleasant. In another difficult time the following was said:

> These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine pa-

triot will in this crisis shrink from the service of his country. But he who stands it now will merit and receive the gratitude and love of man and woman.

Those were words written by Thomas Payne and read to Washington's troops immediately before the Battle of Trenton. I would be so bold as to add that he who shows his courage on the floor today will exhibit the hallmark of the patriot.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at the conclusion of debate on this matter and just before the vote is taken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, naturally I have not been too happy in recent weeks over the misinformation, misrepresentation, falsehoods and slander which have been directed against the committee of which I have had the honor to serve for 18 years. There has been much said that is absolutely untrue and not according to the facts. Therefore, I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is the time and place to look at the record.

This resolution was designed and introduced for one purpose and one purpose only, to pack the Rules Committee so as to give either one individual, or a limited few, the power to completely control all of its decisions and actions.

It is exactly similar to the 1937 attempt of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court so as to obtain the favorable decisions he desired.

Never before has an attempt been made to pack any House committee to control its legislative decisions, although the membership of other committees has been changed at times for different but proper purposes.

If the Rules Committee is packed it will be possible for those in control to withhold from or send to the floor for action any and all legislation. More sinister and dangerous is the fact it will be possible for the committee to report any closed or gag rule desired, so as to prevent Members from offering amendments to a bill, or otherwise work their will thereon. Rules could also be reported to waive points of order, so any given bill could carry provisions otherwise contrary to House rules, and even to statutory law.

If the Rules Committee can be packed to obtain political decisions, other committees of the House can likewise be packed. The Ways and Means Committee could be packed to get from it the Forand type of Federal aid bill previously rejected by the committee, or the kind of tax laws some may desire. The same situation could apply to all other legislative committees.

The fallacious argument has been made that it is necessary to pack the Rules Committee to guarantee that certain major administration bills can receive House consideration. Such bills most discussed are minimum wage, medical care for the needy aged, Federal aid for education, housing, and depressed areas. While it is charged House consideration of measures dealing with these same subjects was blocked by the Rules Committee during the last Congress, such charge is absolutely false, for House bills on each of those subjects did reach the floor and were actually approved by the House.

That similar administration bills on these subjects will reach the House floor for consideration during this Congress has been guaranteed by Chairman SMITH, of the Rules Committee. Weeks ago he gave such assurance verbally to House leaders on this matter. Last Saturday, in a letter to Congressmen VINSON and WALTER, he again so pledged himself in writing.

Republicans of the House are not obstructionists. If they disagree with any administration proposal they will have substitute proposals of their own to offer for consideration.

So the adoption of this resolution to pack the Rules Committee is not necessary to make certain the House will have the opportunity to consider the five main administration-sponsored measures which have been mentioned so often.

In the 86th Congress, out of the 146 requests for rules on House bills, only 5 were denied by the Rules Committee. Out of the 19 requests for rules on Senate bills, only 1 was denied.

Charges have been made that an unholy coalition, or coalitions, have existed in the Rules Committee. This may have been true in some instances, for I personally coalesced with my good friend and our well-known liberal colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri, as well as with other liberals, when I moved to report the civil rights bill, which was enacted into law by the last Congress. Mr. REECE, of Tennessee, coalesced with those on the Rules Committee who supported Federal aid to education when he moved to send to the floor, where it was passed, the school construction bill—H.R. 10128.

There is no reason to believe that the Rules Committee, as now constituted, will or can prevent any important legislation from receiving consideration by the House, for the House of Representatives can always work its will on legislative matters.

Wednesday of each week is designated as Calendar Wednesday, at which time the chairman of any House legislative committee can call up a bill for immediate consideration without obtaining a rule to make such action in order.

By a simple majority of the membership signing a discharge petition any bill can be called up for prompt consideration by the full House.

Any measure can also be called up under suspension of the rules procedure and acted upon promptly, providing the Speaker approves.

Bills and resolutions from the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, and House Administration, are usually brought to the floor for action without a rule.

In my nearly a quarter of a century of service here I have never known of a single instance, when the House leadership desired a bill to be brought to a House vote, that such measure was not voted upon.

So actually it is only power which is being sought by this resolution—power to prevent any individual Member, as well as any minority, from a vote or free expression on legislative bills. This is power no little group, no Speaker, no President should seek. This is power no little group, no Speaker, no President, should have.

The majority leadership already have the means and the powers to bring any legislation before the House for consideration. Such have long been exercised.

Do not be misled into voting for this resolution, the adoption of which will establish a most dangerous precedent—one which in future years may greatly injure or completely wreck orderly parliamentary procedure in this body.

No Member should vote to restrict or to hamstring his own rights and prerogatives as a free and equal Member of what has long been known as a free and uncontrolled legislative body—the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to restate a position.

I doubt very much if anything said here is going to change many views on the subject. Essentially, I feel that this is an instance where two wrongs do not make a right.

I believe that this is an unnecessary resolution in order to bring matters to the floor of the House. I do believe the Rules Committee improperly, and unfairly, have been made to appear to be a whipping boy when, indeed, the majority could at all times have worked their will and brought these matters to the floor of the House. However, I also happen to believe that we as a party, ever since I have been here, have agreed on the basic proposition that whichever party obtains the responsibility to organize the Congress should have the necessary power to meet that responsibility.

I remember in the 83d Congress when we won by a majority of 6 at which time we packed the Rules Committee, if one wants to use that term, 2 to 1, or 8 to 4, the Ways and Means Committee 15 to 10, the Appropriations Committee 30 to 20. The principle is a sound principle, and I think in this instance we make a mistake as the Republican Party to oppose this basic proposal.

Finally, may I say that I hope as the result, if this is to prevail, that a third wrong does not come into the fore, and it might. History indicates it might. I hope if this comes about there will not be these gag rules coming out of the Rules Committee waiving points of order, actually forbidding the Members of the House to work their will on certain legislation.

May I say also that I intend to oppose most of the legislation I have heard Mr. Kennedy is going to send up to the House for consideration. I intend to be on the floor to do the best I can to defeat the measures on the merits.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the beginning I am very sorry that I am not given what I consider a fair amount of time in which to discuss this matter. I will have to be brief and quick and I will not be able to yield to anyone.

In the first place, a lot of people around here these days talk about this being a matter of a quarrel between the Speaker and myself. I have served with the Speaker of this House for 30 years. I have no quarrel with the Speaker. He has a right to his convictions; I claim the right to mine. That is an American right, and that is my duty as I regard it in the House of Representatives, to speak and to vote your convictions and not the convictions of someone else. So, if there is any quarrel between the Speaker and myself it is all on his side, and I say that in the kindest spirit and I hope it will not be misconstrued.

When I make this pledge to the Speaker and to the Members of this House, it is a pledge I made when I first became chairman of the Rules Committee. That is, I will cooperate with the Democratic leadership of the House of Representatives just as long and just as far as my conscience will permit me to go. Some of these gentlemen who are laughing maybe do not understand what a conscience is. They are entitled to that code, and I think I am entitled to mine.

These offers to cooperate have been made. You may call it a compromise if you wish, but I want that understood by the Members of the House, because you are setting a bad precedent here today. If you purge this committee, you can purge any committee.

I was surprised to see the Committee on Armed Services engage in this assault on the Rules Committee, because I challenge anybody on that committee to mention any measure that they ever asked for since I have been a member of the Rules Committee that has been held up for a minute. The members of that committee know this is true. There are very few bills that have been held up by the Committee on Rules as compared to the legislative committees of the House. Do you know that there were some 15,000 bills introduced in this House in the last Congress, and do you know that 90 percent of them died in committee and were never reported; in other words, the legislative committees refused or neglected to report 90 percent of the bills and the Committee on Rules less than 10 percent of the bills that came before them.

Now, here is what I want to say to you, and I want to make it a matter of record: There has been a lot of talk about who is interested in this thing. I do not know whose fight this is on the Committee on Rules. I have heard it was the President's. He never said anything to me about it; never made any request of me. Why, this morning the newspapers said it was Khrushchev. Now, I never heard from Khrushchev and I have not heard from Castro, but I have heard from some other people.

Now, here is what I have agreed to do. All of the five bills which the President has announced as his program for this session, which are five bills that I am very much opposed to and will oppose on the floor, I will not oppose his program, as so far announced, in the Committee on Rules. That is a pledge. I have agreed that I will support a resolution that will take from the Committee on Rules the power to prevent bills from going to conference. I have asked that these proposals be submitted to the President to see if it met his requirement, but that request was refused. Everything that I have proposed has been refused.

Now, I add one other thing to this. There has been some talk about my going out and milking cows once or twice. Well, I will make this statement, that so far as I am concerned there will not be any delay, any undue delay on any call that the leadership makes to hold hearings in the Committee on Rules, if these proposals are accepted. If the resolution is adopted I make no commitments.

Now, you have before you this resolution, and what I cannot understand—and it is a very great mystery to me—is what more do you want? You have a resolution to pack or purge or oppose the Committee on Rules laid before you right now. If this matter were left dormant on the calendar, it would remain there for 2 years, and if this committee did something that the House thought it should not do, then you would have cause to complain and could call it up any day and say this committee is doing wrong and "We told you they were going to do wrong, and therefore we will call up the resolution." What better position would you want to be in than that? If that committee refused to give a rule, they could bring the resolution up. Now, I wish somebody would answer that. What do they want? Is it an effort merely to humiliate one chairman of one committee in this House? Well, if it is, nobody can humiliate me except the people who have elected me to Congress 16 consecutive times.

This is a very unhappy thing; it is very unhappy for me. I have tried to be fair in every way I know. But when I am asked to pledge aid to the passage of any resolution or bill in this House that I am conscientiously opposed to, I would not yield my conscience and my right to vote in this House to any person or any Member or under any conditions. Now, if there are any here who conscientiously oppose that position on the part of a Member of this House—and this is a great body—if there is any other Member here who thinks he ought to yield his conscience and the views of his constituency to the will of somebody who is not a member of that committee, then he ought to vote the other way. As for me, I shall sustain my conviction. I want to tell you who started all this. I got into that a little while ago. I do not think Khrushchev started it; I do not think he had anything to do with it. It started here in this House in the last Congress on the 26th day of August when gentlemen exercised their right and took time on the floor to open this assault on the Commitee on Rules. They spoke at length and laid out this plan and several other plans. The gentlemen who spoke on that occasion were: Mr. Flynn, of Wisconsin; Mr. Bailey, of West Virginia; Mr. Wolf, of Iowa; Mr. Thompson of New Jersey; Mr. Baldwin, of California; Mr. Staggers, of West Virginia; Mr. Reuss, of Wisconsin; Mr. Porter, of Oregon; Mr. Holifield, of California; Mr. Pucinski, of Illinois; Mr. Quigley, of Pennsylvania; and Mr. Roosevelt, of California.

That is where this all started. They have a little group, and I think it is still little, known as the study group. Now I have in my hand the monthly issue of Americans for Democratic Action. Have any of you ever heard of that? They claim credit for all this ruckus that is going on here now. I think we ought to be sensible and let this matter lie on the calendar and see whether you are going to have any trouble, because I do not think you are.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a letter sent to all Members of the House last Saturday:

JANUARY 28, 1961.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR CARL AND FRANCIS: You called on me yesterday afternoon to discuss a solution to the controversy of packing the Committee on Rules of the House. You left me to discuss further a proposal which we three thought might be mutually satisfactory. I have heard nothing further from you and assume that all efforts to settle have been rejected. I, therefore, want it clearly understood what we, who oppose the packing scheme, have offered to do.

We have offered to interpose no obstacles in the Committee on Rules to the five major bills that the President has publicly announced as his program for this session.

We have offered to support a change in the rules to deprive the Committee on Rules of jurisdiction to prevent bills from going to conference.

We have brought out of the Committee on Rules a resolution which the leadership can pass in the House next Tuesday if they have the votes, or adopt the wiser course of waiting until the Committee on Rules in the opinion of the leadership, acts in a manner contrary to the wishes of the House, at which time the leadership can bring it up, and pass it, and stack the committee, any time the House wishes in the next 2 years.

Those of us who oppose this packing scheme have offered every honorable solution for the sake of harmony.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. SMITH.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illionis [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves one simple, basic question. What is the real purpose of this pending resolution to amend the rules of the House to provide for an increase in the size of the Rules Committee?

Admittedly, this committee has tremendous power. Its primary function is to review legislation reported to the House and to determine how and when it shall be considered on the floor. The membership of this committee has, for the most part, consisted of senior Members of the House with a broad knowledge of governmental matters and legislative procedures. Traditionally, the ratio has been 8 to 4 majority controlled.

Every committee of the House, as we all know, is vested with great power. Each can determine what bills before it shall be considered, rejected, or reported, and in what forms.

But this committee power, of the Rules Committee or any other committee, is not a power without limit. The rules of the House provide ways and means by which the majority can work its will, and often has, in the consideration of any measure.

The pending resolution does not change the functions of the Rules Committee. It does not in any way take away its powers, which it has and should have for the orderly consideration of legislation.

I ask again, what is the purpose of this resolution? It is obvious. The obvious purpose of this resolution is to "pack" the committee. It is proposed here to convert a screening committee, a senior deliberative committee, into a "rubberstamp" committee for whatever our new President may propose and subject to the dictates of our Speaker.

Surely, we are not going to increase, or reduce, or compose the membership of our committees purely for political expediency. If we adopt this resolution we shall be establishing such a precedent that memberships on committees are to be adjusted in accordance with what any administration may propose and what the present Speaker, or any Speaker to follow, may dictate as to what is to be done with respect to what is proposed.

No one knows what will be the political complexion of the next administration, nor of the Congress, nor who will be our Speaker. What we do here today is by no means as grave as what we do to our future as the Congress of the United States, where we all—each in his own way speaks for the people he represents.

As much as we revere our Speaker, we must not place in his hands, or in the hands of anyone who may become Speaker, complete control over what we do and when we do it. That is what is proposed by this resolution; enable the Speaker to control by membership composition what the Rules Committee decides.

It has been contended that the Rules Committee has been a roadblock to the consideration of important measures. That is not true. In the last Congress the committee granted a rule for the consideration of every major bill for which a rule was requested, with the exception of the depressed areas bill, which was considered under Calendar Wednesday, proving thereby that the House can work its will.

It has also been argued that the Rules Committee has delayed bills being brought to the floor. I do not know of a single measure demanding emergency action that the committee delayed or that has had ill effect on the Nation's welfare. It has been my experience that the committee has always acted expeditiously on anything of an emergency nature.

Other than in emergency instances, nothing is lost but much is gained by delay. It enables us and the people we represent to know exactly what is proposed and why. There is an adage that "haste makes waste." By not acting hastily this committee has on many occasions done a great service to us and the country. John Nance Garner, former Vice President, once was reported to have said, "The country never suffers from the things that Congress fails to do."

That well applies to many of the proposals we hear will be presented to us in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution. I cannot vote for that which is nothing more or less than "a go signal" for any and all legislation, and a move which, in the long run might well haunt those of us who seek to retain the House as a great deliberative body.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said in this Chamber on yesterday, and I quote:

> Our Constitution wisely assigns both joint and separate roles to each branch of the Government, and a President and a Congress who hold each other in mutual respect will not permit nor attempt any trespass.

So, regardless of some newspaper comments to the contrary, this is solely a matter for us to determine—the organization and size of our own Rules Committee.

On January 3, 1945, over 16 years ago, under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, there were appointed eight Democrats and four Republicans to the Rules Committee of the House and this proportion, based upon the majority held by either party in the House, has continued under the rules of the House down through the years, under different Presidents and different majority leaderships, until this very day and by unanimous vote of the House in all cases. Therefore, the question logically arises, why this change now, this year.

There have been statements that it is necessary because in the past a coalition has frustrated the majority will of the membership. But, I ask, how can this be? In every year, during every session, except on the vote to organize the House, there has been a coalition of members of both parties and there will be one on this vote today, either joined to pass or defeat the resolution. In the 10 years I have been here, I have found myself, legislatively speaking, in odd company from time to time on certain pieces of legislation, but this is only the result of men with similar convictions voting similarly on particular pieces of legislation. And, if those people with similar convictions pass or defeat legislation, who can say that this is not a victory for the majority of the Members of the House in connection with any particular piece of legislation, and a victory for the thinking of the people they represent. What is wrong with that? Is there a pending charge that any Member of this House or any group of Members do not vote their convictions or the aspirations of the people they represent? Is there a pending charge that any Member or group of Members are inimical to the best interests of America, or that they are un-American? Of course there is not.

This is a mighty important precedent we debate today. We are not discussing the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee or its powers or procedures. We intend to keep that just as it is. But it is here suggested that we transfer from one group of our members to another group of our members the same authority which now exists. What is so sacrosanct or uplifting or heartening in this shift of power and authority to Members yet unnamed from Members now holding such power by reasons of seniority on the Rules Committee, which is the procedure and tradition governing every other committee assignment in this House. No single member ever spoke and voted so as to please every other member 100 percent of the time. Do we increase our prerogatives as members because we shift authority from those who acted in the past sometimes too slowly or deliberately to suit others to Members, yet unnamed, who might act too rapidly, too ill-consideredly, and who might even impose a gag rule on all the rest of us in connection with legislative matters to be here considered? For in so doing, we must remember we are here establishing a precedent which will haunt us for all time. Any time a legislative committee, regardless of the hearings it has held and the witnesses it has heard, does not quickly respond to the mandate of the leadership, it can be packed overnight by this kind of resolution. This procedure has been followed in some State legislatures in order to render them almost totally ineffective. I should hope to God this would not happen in the U.S. House of Representatives.

We have a new administration. Many of its legislative recommendations for this session have been announced. The present Rules Committee has agreed to report all of these measures under a rule permitting debate and amendment. The present members of the Rules Committee have agreed to send all rules passed by the Senate and the House to conference. In view of this, why the rush to change a well-established and carefully calculated legislative safeguard to all our rights and privileges as Members? We can do it any time it appears to be in the national interest and when there is a proven need.

For, in the absence of threats, promises, coercions, and distortions, I really believe this resolution would today be defeated, if every Member followed the voice that whispers within him. If that should happen, I should

say, as far as my 10 years of service here is concerned, it would be this legislative Chamber's finest hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to enlarge the Rules Committee of the House.

It is just about 24 hours ago when we heard in this House the sobering but stirring message of the President of the United States. As of the minute he spoke, the eyes of the world, particularly the hostile eyes that watch us from behind the Iron Curtain, focused on us in the House of Representatives.

Every move we make is going to be watched by our friends and enemies alike. Every mistake we make is going to be magnified by hostile propaganda so as to make even our friends believe that the Nation and its representatives do not stand back of the President of the United States.

The great young man who addressed us yesterday laid down foundations for action. He courageously undertook commitments. However, the fulfillment of his commitments on which the survival of this Nation and, indeed, the survival of freedom depends, is our job.

The propaganda value of a negative vote on this resolution cannot be overestimated. A negative vote on the resolution will hand our enemies on a silver platter the priceless instrument which will be used in their attempts to destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, before this day is over we must once again face the stark facts brought before us yesterday by our new leader. The eloquence of those facts must have the effect of a command. We must not fail the United States and her leader in our vote today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I read off a list of names of the study group a short time ago, and I inadvertently named Mr. SCHWENGEL who interposed some remarks on another subject and was not a member of that study committee. Also, I did not designate which Mr. Flynn it was. It was Mr. Flynn, of Wisconsin, and not Mr. FLYNT, of Georgia, I am happy to say.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes and 50 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, this proposal to pack the Rules Committee in order to make it a rubberstamp for any one in the Congress or outside it, is one of the easiest to vote against that I have faced in 18 years.

I might say, in reference to the remarks just made by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], that I do not know when any President of the United States, whether new or old, was ever given any authority to make commitments or to announce programs that amount to commands to the legislative branch of the U.S. Government.

There are three reasons why I am against this proposal. First, it is demonstrably not necessary. Will somebody please spell out just what important legislation desired by the Democratic leadership of this House has been blocked by the Rules Committee? In the last Congress, bills reported out by the appropriate committees in the five fields that President Kennedy says are the essentials of his program, were also brought out by the Rules Committee and acted upon by the House.

In addition, the Rules Committee brought out civil rights legislation, which so far as I have observed, the President has not placed on his list of essential legislation.

What important legislation has been held up by the so-called coalition of Republicans with reactionary southerners?

If and when legislation desired by a majority of the Members of the House should be blocked by the Rules Committee, there are remedies and everybody here knows it. By Calendar Wednesday or a discharge petition, any bill can be brought to the floor and acted upon whenever a majority of the Members of the House want it to be brought to the floor and acted upon. Millions of Americans have been misled into believing that the Rules Committee has life-and-death power over legislation, that it exercises a dangerous minority control over any and all bills. It just is not so.

If a majority of the Members do not want a bill passed because they do not think it is good legislation for the country, I ask you why should it be brought out and perhaps jammed through by the kind of pressures we all know exist?

We are grown men and women. Every one of us here knows that frequently Members go to the Rules Committee members and say, "Please hold up that legislation. I do not think it is good, but if it does come out, there is so much pressure in my district that I will have to vote for it."

Are the Members of Congress to be Representatives? Or are we to be reduced to mere delegates of the largest or most powerful groups at home? Are we to be just like the flag on a cash register, registering whatever button is pushed by somebody else? If they push the 10-cent button, the 10-cent flag goes up, without any thought or judgment on our part? If they push the "aye" button, the "aye" flag goes up? Our country is a Republic. It was not expected by the founders that the people themselves could make direct decisions on the complicated issues that come along. It was expected that the people in a given district would select one of their number in whose character, ability, and judgment they had confidence, and send him to Congress to give his full time to studying issues and making decisions in the interest of the Nation.

My title is not Representative of Minnesota. It is U.S. Representative—from the State of Minnesota. I have only one mandate here, and that mandate is to help govern this country the best I can as one member of the board of directors of the United States of America, the greatest organization the world has ever known. If some say that is not democratic because it does not reflect what the pressure groups demand, I deny it. It is democratic in the sense that every 2 years the people in my district can defeat me or send me back, according to whether or not they think I have done a good job as their representative on the board of directors.

It is much like the patient's relation to a doctor. Suppose a lady calls up her doctor and says, "My boy has a stomach ache and he is vomiting. He has a little fever and pain in his stomach. I fear he may have appendicitis. Will you come over and see him?"

What would you think of the doctor if he were to reply, "Please do not ask me to figure out what is wrong and decide what to do? Just tell me what do you want me to do? Do you want me to operate or not operate? Should I operate on the right side or the left side? Tell me what you want me to do and I will do it, whether I think it is wise or not." No; the doctor uses his best judgment as long as he is on the case. If the patient is not satisfied, he chooses another doctor.

Are we to be asked to subordinate and sacrifice our own honest judgment to the pressures of the moment? Everyone knows that many Members, perhaps all of us to some extent on some measures, feel we have to vote the way the crowd wants, if the bill comes up for vote in the House, even though we may believe it is not wise in terms of the total national picture.

So I repeat this proposal is not necessary. The Rules Committee cannot block any legislation that a majority of the Members of the House wants. If the majority does not believe it is good, why should it be passed? Would it be likely to be beneficial to the country?

But the biggest reason I am against this is not just because it is not necessary, and I do not see any real benefits to flow from it. The proposal has real dangers. It is a calculated assault on the whole committee system, which is the best yet devised for providing careful consideration and study of legislation.

Once such a precedent has been established, in order to get some few measures passed that some one or some group outside this House demands, there will, of course, be pressures to pack other committees—Ways and Means, Appropriations, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor—whenever those committees fail to subordinate their own judgment to pressure groups, or the Executive, or to others who have not studied the legislation half as thoroughly as has the Committee.

Should this House be intimidated into abandoning sound committee procedures developed and tested through more than 170 years—and giving the stablest and best government the world has known?

Just what are the good ends that justify such bad means?

Furthermore a packed Rules Committee can be expected to bring out bills under gag rules, making it impossible for Members to propose, debate, and act on amendments. Is that democratic? Is that proper protection of the rights of the minority?

If the proposal before us were one to modify or take away some of the powers of the Rules Committee, that would be a different issue. But this resolution

does not alter in the slightest the autocratic powers it is claimed the Rules Committee has. It merely packs the committee so it will be a rubberstamp in the hands of the Speaker, without appearing to be so. I cannot believe that is being candid, democratic, or wise—whoever the Speaker may be.

So when a proposal is not necessary, will not bring out legislation likely to benefit the country, and entails grave dangers, why should we pass it? I believe it should be defeated.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I am opposed to this legislation. I hope to state some legitimate reasons for that opposition.

I am against it because it is unwise, unjustified, untimely, unnecessary and, therefore, unsupportable. I am not suffering under any illusion here about changing the votes of some of my friends on the right, or possibly even on my side. There have been pressures exerted in this controversy that perhaps would far exceed any argumentative effort on my part. We have even had Mr. Khrushchev dragged into the controversy. I would just like to say that if the President really is concerned about his ability, as reported from unknown sources at the White House, to deal with Mr. Khrushchev if this resolution is not adopted, I would like to have word direct from down there.

I have had an avalanche of mail, most of it handwritten, from people opposed to this resolution. And why are they opposed to it? They are concerned about rash and reckless platform promises repeated in the campaign, some of it added to by some of the task force reports.

As I read that mail from the people of this country, right-thinking people by the millions, I am convinced they are afraid that this effort signals a collapse of the opposition to such unwise measures. They are afraid the floodgates will be let down and we will be overwhelmed with bad legislation.

As a former member of the Committee on Rules and twice majority leader and now minority leader, I know because I have worked there that the Committee on Rules performs a most constructive service for the Members of this body and for the people of this country. I am submitting that the Committee on Rules time and again has responded by granting rules that individual members of the committee did not want; and I know by experience, I have observed, that a determined majority leadership can get action in the Committee on Rules and can get measures to the floor if it wants to. Certainly the Committee on Rules is not obligated to report to this floor every bill that comes before it; and as I look around I see Members who I am quite sure are thankful for that. At the same time, it is not the province of the Committee on Rules to roadblock legislation that ought to be seriously considered. The safeguards against such indiscriminate action are well known.

I say this present effort proceeds first, on a false assertion and second, on a false assumption. The false assertion is that in the last Congress the Committee on Rules did roadblock legislation that should have been considered. As has already been pointed out, that just is not true. All five of the measures that are now called the key measures were considered and all but one of them under a rule, and in that one instance the Committee on Rules did not even have a chance to grant a rule before the measure was called up under Calendar Wednesday procedure.

The false assumption is that we Republicans are going to be obstructionists just for obstruction's sake. That is not true. Why, we have not even filled our two vacant places on the Committee on Rules. I do not think it is fair to assume that the Republicans on the Committee on Rules and in the House of Representatives are going to be unmindful of their responsibility to the Nation.

When I presented our great Speaker to you, I said, "Whenever economic and military well-being is at stake, we on our side will cooperate." I meant every word of that then, and I still mean it.

I suggested that this action is untimely. On the opening day, by action started on the majority side, the number of members of the Committee on Rules was fixed at 12, with the division being 8 and 4. You on the Democratic side designated your members, we designated our two carryover members.

Why is it not the better part of wisdom and good judgment to wait and move along in this Congress and see how the Committee on Rules performs? The chairman of the committee has given definite assurance of consideration of certain measures and, speaking for my side, I do not think it is fair to assume that we are going to have a recalcitrant committee arbitrarily blocking measures that reasonably ought to be considered.

I have heard our beloved Speaker say many times when we have had measures on the floor like this—he has used the phrase, "Wait a minute." If it is good in Texas it is good in Indiana. And that advice is good here today.

I mentioned our great Speaker. When we wound up the last session of Congress the Committee on Rules was supposed to have been such a bad performer, but the Speaker said at that time:

> We have come to the close of one of the busiest and, in my opinion, one of the most fruitful sessions of Congress it has ever been my privilege to serve in. And I am winding up my 24th term.

Some of us on the Republican side did not think we had done quite that well, but, at least, that was the Speaker's opinion.

In the final analysis, speaking for myself, I have no fear of bringing any measure to the floor to be debated and considered here that reasonably ought to come on the floor of the House of Representatives. But I want to say on my responsibility that I carried here on the majority and minority sides, there have been many times I have said, "Thank God for the Committee on Rules," from the standpoint of the welfare of the country I love and serve.

We have had every reasonable assurance here today that proper measures that ought to be considered will come to the floor of the House of Representatives, subject to full debate and action.

I am afraid what we are being asked to do here today under this resolution could signal the breakdown of a very vital part of the legislative machinery, the Committee on Rules which has for many years enabled the House of Representatives to conduct its essential business in orderly fashion.

I ask you to vote against this resolution.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, whether you vote with me today or not, I want to say that I appreciate your uniform kindness and courtesy that has been displayed toward me. This issue, in my mind, is a simple one.

We have elected to the Presidency a new leader. He is going to have a program that he thinks will be in the interest of and for the benefit of the American people.

I think he demonstrated on yesterday that we are neither in good shape domestically or in the foreign field. He wants to do something about that to improve our situation in the United States of America and in the world.

Now, they speak about these five bills. The Democratic leaders of the Senate and the House met with the President of the United States this morning. He is going to send 10 or 12 messages to the House of Representatives in the next few weeks that he thinks are vital to the welfare, the prosperity, and the well-being of our country. The House of Representatives is elected every 2 years, and after the legislative committees hold hearings, after executive session, when every "i" is dotted and every "t" is crossed, and when the chairman comes to the Committee on Rules—and I do not say Rules Committee, because that is not the proper designation; it is the Committee on Rules—comes to the leadership of the House and wants a rule after all of that consideration, I think that the Committee on Rules should grant that rule whether its membership is for the bill or not. I think this House should be allowed on great measures to work its will, and it cannot work its will if the Committee on Rules is so constituted as not to allow the House to pass on those things.

Now, I have a letter here that if I were easily insulted, it would do rather so to me. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the great Committee on Rules, sent out a letter, and in that letter he used the words "stack" and "pack" four times. The gentleman from Virginia, nor any other Member of this House, can accuse me of ever packing any committee for or against anything. It is a reflection on the majority leader. It is a reflection on our great

committee on committees on the Democratic side of the House. And, talk about packing. Away back in 1933 we had a tremendous contest in this House. One side won. They put up a man for membership on the Committee on Rules; our side put up their man, and we at that time packed the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that I was a member of the committee on committees, and my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, is the only Democratic Member in my 33 years that was elected by the committee on committees to the Committee on Rules when he was not recommended by the then Speaker and the majority leader. He was the choice of those of us who were defeated. Might I also say that this is a procedural matter; entirely a procedural matter. The former Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], is paired in favor of it. He recognizes the justice of it. Might I also say to my Republican friends, the other night on television my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], said he was very happy to have the Republicans on our side, not he on your side but the Republicans on his side. This is only a fair proposition and one that should be adopted.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for his splendid contribution.

And then in 1939, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] came to me and said he very much desired to go on the Committee on Rules. I told him I thought it was a mistake for him to go on the Committee on Rules, for various reasons. But he insisted and then we packed the committee with Mr. COLMER.

But a strange thing is in this House today. The Democrats have eight Members on the Committee on Rules who have served there, some of them, a long time, six of them—and I do not think they are long-haired radicals, either, who want to destroy the country—six of the eight are supporting this resolution today to add three Members to the Committee on Rules. To me that is very significant. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] says that he is not going to report anything that violates his conscience and then winds up his talk on the floor by saying you have nothing to fear from the action of the Committee on Rules.

Let us move this program. Let us be sure that we can move it. And the only way that we can be sure that this program will move when great committees report bills, the only way it can move, in my opinion, my beloved colleagues, is to adopt this resolution today.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in the current session of Congress, as in all sessions, there are many issues and problems facing us. The first of these issues we meet head on today.

If these issues, of which this is one, are not determined along the lines of orderly processes, then there is reason to fear that we may have passed the zenith of our national life, and that the United States of America might deteriorate and decline as did the Roman Empire centuries ago. I sometimes think that Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" should be required reading for all Members of Congress.

Truly, the decade of the 1960's might well be described as the decade of decisions. It is a decade which may well confront our people, our National and State leaders alike, with problems of decisions of vastly greater significance than even the decisions of a century ago.

This is neither the time nor the place for dogmatism or exhortation. I intend neither of these.

Rather, I earnestly and briefly wish to express some personal convictions concerning this particular question.

I believe that the sole issue here is whether the House of Representatives shall operate on established rules or change the rules whenever it appeals.

This particular issue is one which we as Members of a legislative body understand. It is one which is sometimes difficult for individuals not conversant with parliamentary procedures to fully appreciate.

Efforts have been made to confuse this issue by saying that the Rules Committee as presently constituted has both the power and the desire to block the legislative program recommended by President Kennedy.

This is not the case.

Efforts have also been made to say that bills conforming to the five points described by the President as his principal legislative program for this year were blocked, bottled up, or pigeonholed in the Rules Committee during the 86th Congress.

This is simply not so.

The chairman of the Rules Committee has given his word to both the President and the Speaker that every single announced portion of the President's program would be cleared for action without delay. He is a man who has never broken his word.

It might be remembered and emphasized here that the Rules Committee, under House rules, not only has the power to grant rules, but that it also determines what kind of rule is granted. For example, it can grant open rules or closed rules. In the former instance, the House is permitted to work its will by amendments, both substantive and technical. Under a closed rule, amendments can be either restricted or prohibited entirely. The Rules Committee, as presently constituted, has been more inclined to grant open rules which is clearly the more democratic method. This I would like to see continued. I believe all persons who believe in free legislative debate and deliberation prefer this method.

In my home State, but not confined to that State, some of the editorial comments and editorials, and cartoons have presented an unrealistic and distorted picture of what this issue has been all about. In fact, some have gone so far as to completely reverse the true roles of the opposing sides of this controversy. Some have either been ignorant or forgetful of their history, because those who have read and studied know, and know well, that in 1910 the Democrats and liberal Republicans revolted against the then Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, a Republican from Illinois, to keep him from completely dominating the House Rules Committee. The rules which are now in effect were the direct result of the revolt against Speaker Cannon and his tyrannical power over the House.

As presently constituted, the Rules Committee could not block or unduly delay legislation even if it wanted to. There are at least four distinct ways, under House rules, by which the House can act on, and work its will on, legislation, notwithstanding the action of the Rules Committee:

First. Every Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday. One Member of the House can demand this procedure, and on Calendar Wednesday, the roll of committees is called in alphabetical order of committees, and as each committee is called, it can call up any bill it desires.

Second. The House can suspend its own rules and frequently does. On alternate Mondays—the first and third Mondays of each month, and at any time during the last 7 legislative days of each session, it is in order for the Speaker to recognize a Member for the purpose of moving to suspend the rules and pass a given piece of legislation. It is probable that more legislation is passed in this manner than after the granting of a rule by the Rules Committee.

Third. Any piece of legislation which a majority of the Members of the House really want can be brought up by means of a discharge petition signed by a bare majority of the Members of the House.

Fourth. The Speaker can call up any Senate passed bill he shall desire without referring it to either a legislative committee or to the Committee on Rules, provided certain conditions exist.

So, if anyone tells you or attempts to tell you that the Rules Committee can block legislation that a majority of the Members of the House really want, then let us be charitable and say that they are simply mistaken or that they have not read the rulebook.

The Rules Committee has operated without major changes for 51 years. Twice, that I know of, the House has hastily changed the rules affecting the orderly processes of the House, and each time at the very opening of the next Congress, the rules have been restored to their present form.

I believe that the best interests of our Nation are served by those established, orderly processes. The Rules Committee in the House, and rule XXII in the Senate are the last bulwarks and safeguards we have against tyrannical and punitive legislation, and I believe that both should be defended against frontal assault, flanking attacks, and any other efforts to destroy them.

For these and other reasons, I oppose this resolution.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against House Resolution 127. It has, for some time now, seemed to me that there has been an unfortunate aspect to the public discussion of this proposal in the form of misguided or de-

liberate misinformation on the need to expand the Rules Committee of the House by three members. Consequently, I want to be on record as saying that if it were true—as it has been many times stated both here and in the news media—that the Rules Committee could block consideration of key legislation by the full membership of this House, then I would vote for this measure without hesitancy. Such control on the part of a small committee is basically repugnent to me as a citizen, and inherently at odds with the concept of representative government. But each of you in this House knows that if the majority of Members desire to consider any legislation, that we have the distinct parliamentary methods to accomplish such consideration on the floor of this House—Rules Committee or no Rules Committee. All of you who were here in the last session of this House can remember that we used the Calendar Wednesday provision of the rules to bypass the Rules Committee to bring to this floor for debate and to vote on the depressed areas bill. We used the discharge petition to bypass the Rules Committee and bring to this floor the Federal pay raise bill. And, time and again, we used suspension of the rules—through a two-thirds majority—to bring bills on the floor of this House, bypassing the Rules Committee.

At the present time, the Democratic majority have a 2 to 1 majority on the Rules Committee, that is, eight Democrats and four Republicans. The Speaker's proposal would pack this committee giving the Democrats a majority of five. However, in fairness, I point out that proportionate representation would only entitle the Democrats to a majority of 3 on a 15-man committee. Also, in fairness, I ask if the assignment of a proportionate number of Republicans would mean that the new administration's program would be jeopardized? To believe that it would is to take, in my view, an unjust position. It was the recently reappointed Republican member, Representative CARROLL REECE, who just last session supported the Federal aid for school construction bill in the committee, and whose vote insured the bill's success to the floor from the committee. Was that obstructionism? We are members of the minority party in this session, but we are a responsible party. The heart of this issue is not the threat that key legislation would be blocked in the Rules Committee—because no such threat exists. It is not the arbitrary size of the committee, though in all fairness Republicans should receive proportionate representation. At the very center of the discussion is the inability and unwillingness of the majority to cope with its membership which stems from the philosophical chaos which cleaves the controlling group. Again, I say if the majority has tough sledding, it is a problem for the majority themselves to solve. The disruption of orderly procedure and precedent cannot possibly be regarded by historians of the future as a substitute for the leadership which is so clearly needed now.

Finally, if this measure should pass, there is the present danger and threat that it will be possible for the newly composed committee to report any gag or closed rule desired which would prevent Members from offering amendments to a bill or otherwise work their will upon it. Surely no one will deny that the Democratic majority has a problem within its own ranks. Then I say, the solution to such a problem lies within their own ranks. If they should decide within their ranks to purge and replace one or more of their own Members who now sit on the Rules Committee, that would be their business. It is a remedy they have immediately at hand, and they could use it promptly. Frankly, it seems strange to me that Republicans should be criticized for the disorganization of the Democratic Party. I vote against this measure now, and if it passes, I believe we will witness a stunning blow against the cornerstone of representative government. Thank you.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a single issue before the House today. It is the issue of power—power to push the program of the new administration through the House with a minimum of effective resistance and with a maximum of speed and conformity to the wishes of the executive branch.

Otherwise the assurances which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has given, combined with the normal parliamentary devices available to the majority, would be sufficient.

Obviously this does not satisfy those who call for adoption of this resolution. Their concern is not to keep on the legislative brakes but to loosen them up, if not remove them. This has as much as been stated in the debate by proponents of this resolution.

Some days ago the arch-liberal columnist, Doris Fleeson, commented that the then President-elect has "all but promised to use his Presidential powers to the utmost." Miss Fleeson added the amazing observation, without any indication of regret, that "recent history suggests that the Presidential powers are subject to very little practical interference by the courts or Congress."

What is here proposed today is to reduce still further this already "very little practical interference" by Congress.

I oppose such action as I will continue to oppose those items in the President's program which I believe contrary to the best interests of our Nation.

I might add that after listening to the President's recitation on yesterday of the very numerous and, in many instances in my judgment very unwise, proposals, which he contemplates sending to Congress, it becomes more imperative than ever that we preserve such checks and restraints on pressure tactics exercised both by the executive branch and by powerful minority groups as we now possess.

Let no one be mistaken about it. If this resolution passes, it will be only the beginning of the pressure tactics.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the House votes on today presents such an elementary proposition for democratizing the procedure of the House that one wonders how it is possible for any Member to oppose it.

Power corrupts—

Said Lord Acton—

and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

From time to time when the ebb and flow of control in the House is moved from one power center to another, and where control became too autocratic, the House has taken action to remedy the situation. In 1910 too much control was centered in the Speaker and on March 19 of that year, the Democratic Party and a group of insurgent Republicans broke the iron grip within which the Speaker held the House through his membership on and domination over a five-man Committee on Rules.

At that time in a very prescient speech, Mr. Underwood, of Alabama, declared that those who favored the resolution then pending to expand the size of the Rules Committee from 5 to 15 members were not making their fight on personalities, just as today we do not make our fight on personalities.

We are fighting a system—

Said Mr. Underwood—

and that system is the system which enables the Speaker by the power vested in him to thwart and overthrow the will of the majority membership of this house.

Mr. Underwood continued:

If this resolution goes through, ultimately, if not today, the Speaker of the House of Representatives will cease to be its leader and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, elected by this House, will become the leader of the majority party in the House. It does not deprive this House of one scintilla of the power to control its business. It does not deprive it of the right of leadership, but it divorces from the Speaker the leadership of the House.

Today, too, Mr. Speaker, we fight a system which has deposited too much power in the Committee on Rules, power which prevents the House from working its will on many occasions. Over the years, this committee has frustrated the will of the majority by refusing to grant rules on major legislation or by insisting that bills pending before it be amended in substantial respects as conditions to the granting of a rule. These are privileges which were never given nor intended to be given to the committee, for the Committee on Rules is supposed to be a traffic artery, not a dead end street.

Passage of this resolution will not destroy the function of the Rules Committee. Rather, it will only temper in measure the power that the committee now possesses. Freedom to appraise and to voice approval or disapproval of legislation still remains in the committee even with passage of this resolution. The membership of the House will still be in a position to receive and give due weight to the opinions of the members of the Committee on Rules.

By this resolution the responsibility for passing upon legislation will be transferred to the body where it rightfully belongs, namely in the membership of

the House. If a major legislative committee of the House after serious consideration has passed a bill, certainly it deserves to be heard by the membership of the House—not necessarily passed, Mr. Speaker, but a chance to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion throughout the country supports the resolution. The Chicago Sun-Times in its very perceptive editorial of January 29, 1961, entitled "Let the House Vote," points out that although it supported Republican candidates for President, U.S. Senator, and a number of Republican candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives, it believes that the Republican leadership in the House is doing the wrong thing in opposing this resolution.

The 20 or so Republicans who are expected to be with RAYBURN on the vote Tuesday—

It says—

are showing commendable nonpartisanship on a matter of principle * * * all the Members of the House and not just the members of the Rules Committee should be entitled to vote on controversial matters. This is the democratic way of government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the editorial of the Chicago Sun-Times, dated January 29, 1961, entitled "Let the House Vote":

This newspaper supported the Republican candidates for President and U.S. Senator from Illinois as well as a number of Republican candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives. We believe, nevertheless, that the Republican leadership in the House is doing the wrong thing in opposing Speaker RAYBURN'S proposal to break the hold that six Congressmen have over all legislation. The 20 or so Republicans who are expected to be with RAYBURN on the vote Tuesday are showing commendable nonpartisanship on a matter of principle.

The six Congressmen are two southern Democrats and four Republicans who, by coalition, control the Rules Committee. They can prevent any piece of legislation from coming to the floor through the normal processes for debate and a vote by all House Members.

The purpose of the Rules Committee should be to introduce order in the scheduling of bills for House debate, not to block legislation. It should decide when, not whether, the House should be permitted to vote on a matter as the Senate majority and minority policy committees do.

Although the Kennedy administration is concerned about its own program being bottled up by the Rules Committee, the committee has, in the past, used its power against the Eisenhower administration, too. And last summer it defied the clearly expressed will of both the Senate and the House when it refused to send to conference an education bill passed by both Houses.

There are only two ways the committee can be circumvented. Legislation can be brought to the floor by a petition signed by half (219) of the House Members. This is a long and tedious process and many Representatives, wishing to dodge taking any stand on controversial matters, won't sign up. Any legislation can be brought up on Wednesdays if it can be squeezed in, but any bill so called up must be disposed of that day. Highly controversial legislation should not be railroaded through in 1 day, even if the votes are there to do it.

Speaker RAYBURN proposes that the membership of the Rules Committee be increased from 12 to 15. The present 3-to-2 ratio of Democrats to Republicans would be retained. But the southern Democrat-Republican coalition would become ineffective. It should be noted, however, that it still could be effective on the House floor.

Much of the opposition to RAYBURN'S plan comes from those who oppose President Kennedy's spending plans. We are against reckless and unwarranted spending, too, but we believe the responsibility for voting such proposals up or down rests with the elected Representatives of all the States, not with the Rules Committee.

At his press conference last week, President Kennedy said that speaking only as "an interested citizen" that he hoped a "small group of men" would not prevent the Members of Congress from letting their judgments be shown. We agree. All the Members of the House and not just the members of the Rules Committee should be entitled to vote on controversial matters. This is the democratic way of government.

While we expect to oppose some of the Kennedy legislation, nevertheless we believe it should have a fair hearing in the Halls of Congress. We hope that when and if it does, there will be enough sufficiently conservative congressmen, Democratic or Republican, to prevent reckless or costly legislation from passing. We are against filibusters in the Senate obstructing the process of government and we are against the Rules Committee in the House doing the same.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution increasing the size of the Rules Committee to 15 members. No more important issue or decision has faced this House in several decades or will face this House this year or for many years to come. On this vote hinges not the power or prestige of individuals or groups comprising this body, but rather the answer to the question of whether the majority will shall rule in this House in considering legislation which will determine the future course of national and world events in these critical times insofar as this House is able to shape them.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that 2 years ago I urged that the membership of the Rules Committee be increased to 15. The outcome of the current debate then would never have been in doubt because of the huge liberal majority make-up of this House at the time. The decision against my proposal was made, but the tragic consequences could not have been foreseen at that time. No one knew then that reasonable men of good faith from the other side of the aisle, interested mainly in the orderly process of Government and legislation in the House, would be replaced by others, motivated largely by partisan, political objectives and their own self-interests. No one knew then that certain members of the majority would splinter off and take counsel only with themselves, regardless of the views of their own leadership and the majority of their colleagues. No one knew then that the forces of reaction of both parties would join together in an unholy alliance dedicated to thwarting the will of the majority of the Members of this House and the Nation itself. If nothing else, this debate has forced into the open for all to see the fact that a coalition does exist between southern conservative Democrats and the minority Republican Party. Despite all their protestations, the leaders of these two groups can no longer smugly deny that they are and have been working hand in hand to thwart the leadership of the House and deny to the majority of the Members the opportunity to participate in full and open floor debate.

This coalition is now fighting to maintain its stranglehold, the key to which is its domination of the Rules Committee. Deprive them of that and the coalition will split asunder when the debate is free and the record open for all to read and the votes recorded for posterity. Then the Republican leadership cannot with tongue in cheek chide the Democratic majority for its inability to produce legislation despite its 2-to-1 majority on the Rules Committee. Our Republican tormentors fail to point out that even in the present Rules Committee, 75 percent of the Democratic members vote for needed legislation, while not one of the Republicans join with them. If the Republicans have any confidence in their position or point of view, we could expect that at least one of them would join the six Democrats to bring these bills to the floor for no other reason than to give the conservatives a chance to vote them down.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this coalition wield such incredible power that they, through their control of the Rules Committee, are even able to deny the House and Senate the right to adjust differences in legislation previously approved by the majorities of both Houses. Now we do know what we are up against and now we must act to overcome the obstacles lying in the path of progress and orderly procedure.

Many argue, Mr. Speaker, that by increasing the size of the Rules Committee to 15 we are undoing the good of the past. Many years ago the Rules Committee was liberalized, as it is termed, by limiting the powers of the Speaker, who up to then literally dictated the committee's activities. We are not now attempting to return to those days. We simply seek to place the Rules Committee in a proper context with relation to the whole House.

The Rules Committee never was intended to be a super, all-seeing, all-knowing independent overseer of the House of Representatives. It is not for the Rules Committee to decide what the House shall consider, but rather the order and the conditions in which it shall consider the legislative proposals favorably reported to the House by the various legislative committees. While the committee may be the traffic coordinator of the House, assuring the orderly procedure of this body, it is not and was never intended to be the arresting officer, judge and jury of legislation. That is the function and duty of the legislative committees. It is for the Rules Committee to simply establish orderly rules of procedure under which these proposals can be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the good people who elected me to this House did so with the feeling that I would be an equal Member of this body with my colleagues chosen by others. My constituents did not cast a free ballot for the office of U.S. Representative to Congress to have the functions of that office limited by one or two or even six other Members. They under-

stand that in a body as large as this the majority shall govern and the policy of that majority shall be established in caucus and put forward in the form of legislation by the leadership chosen by the majority. It is difficult to explain to them how 2 members of the majority can desert the majority's program, join with 4 members of the minority and among them determine the course of action of 431 other Members of this House. This situation makes me and all the other Members of this great body conditional Congressmen, limited in our actions to those proposals agreeable not to the majority, but to the small group comprising the leadership of the coalition. Does their judgment supersede the cumulative judgment of the legislative committees? Do they have some inherent right not afforded the other 431 Members to determine the course of legislation and in that way the Nation's future in these troubled times?

It would appear that they at least think so. Who else would have the audacity and arrogance to even suggest that in exchange for our agreeing to the status quo they would permit us to consider five pieces of legislation said to be the cornerstone of the new administration's domestic program? This offer was an insult to the House and its Members. The fact that it was a bona fide and sincere attempt only heightens the frightening picture of two men telling a nation that they will permit five bills to pass if they can reserve their right to kill off any others that do not meet with their approval.

Mr. Speaker, in the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I am chairman, we consider hundreds of individual navigation projects affecting the well-being of many communities and areas throughout the country. We consider the projects that come before us carefully and approve those with adequate cost benefit ratios. No question of party loyalty is raised, no political considerations are made. These projects are considered solely on their merits. I raise this point, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that this is all I ask of the Rules Committee. To permit us, the Members of the House, the right to consider on their merits the various legislative proposals hammered out of legislative committees after what is often days and even weeks of hard work and lengthy consideration. Is this too much to expect? Obviously, to the present membership of the Rules Committee it is. They have forsaken the fundamental basic tenet of our Republic—the will of the majority shall prevail. They have flaunted principles and precepts which we hold dear. They have ignored the needs of the Nation and taken unto themselves powers never delegated to them. Such a situation cannot be tolerated any longer. The membership of the Rules Committee must be increased so as to convert it into an instrument of responsible party leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to you the heartfelt best wishes and thanks of all of us concerned with the problem confronting us this afternoon. Your leadership has been an inspiration to us all. History will record your valiant efforts. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to the enlargement of the Rules Committee is the clear and present danger that I see of disruption of the democratic legislative procedure.

I concede the right of the leadership to recommend the addition of members to the committee, and the correctness of a 2-to-1 majority so that the majority party can control the programing of legislation. That is their responsibility and duty. But I do oppose and protest the intent at this time of liberalizing the committee to become expressly a rubberstamp of the administration's program. The procedures of the House are now adequate to consider and adopt any legislation desired by the House. It seems to me that the time to change the rules is only when the Rules Committee is derelict, if such a time comes. Certainly, no change of the legislative procedure should be made because of administration pressure. This destroys the separation of executive and legislative.

The great danger is the zeal of the liberals who can and will change the ground rules of debate, through the closed or gag rule, waiving of points of order, and prevention of amendment. Limiting debate and amendment is disrupting orderly democratic legislative procedure. Such a move is hardly a credit to the Democratic leadership at this time or to the so-called liberals. Indeed, throttling debate is a radical move. So by my vote against the resolution I am opposing the change of the ground rules of debate.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution to enlarge the Committee on Rules. My reasons can be briefly and simply stated.

First, the Committee on Rules should be the agent, not the master of the House. Second, I value and will fight for my right to debate and to vote for or against measures on the floor of the House. The country has a right to expect the same.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this body will vote to uphold your position and that of President Kennedy in the matter of the Committee on Rules. I do not believe that a majority of the House of Representatives will agree that any single committee should have the power to halt the legislative process indefinitely—that any single committee should be able to determine the substantive merit of legislation in all fields.

The Committee on Rules should have a function similar to the traffic policeman at the intersection. It should regulate the flow of legislative traffic to the floor of the House, but should not be in the position of creating bottlenecks where none existed before.

Mr. Speaker, there may once have been a good reason to transfer much of the power of leadership to this committee. It seems obvious that any such reason is long out of date. It is time for a change—and this House has never shirked its duty to change its rules and procedures when the time was right. The real mark of genius in our political system, as I have said before, has been its flexibility in meeting new circumstances and situations. The House of Representatives holds a unique position in this system. I am sure it will now adapt itself to overcome what amounts to a thwarting of majority rule, so that we, the representatives of the American people, will have an opportunity to enact President Kennedy's vital program.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many arguments both for and against the move to enlarge the House Committee on Rules and I am sure that if there was more time I would hear many, many more arguments on both sides of the question.

The principal argument that I have heard, both here on the floor and in the corridors and have read and reread in the press in support of the plan to broaden the committee is that without such a move the program about to be submitted by President Kennedy would suffer. It is charged that the Committee on Rules would block the five-point Kennedy legislative program. It is further charged that the committee stands in the way of progress in this country.

All of these arguments are specious, Mr. Speaker. They grow out of an emotion-charged atmosphere, not as the result of calm reasoning and reflection.

The hard facts are these: First, the Rules Committee, though potent, is not all powerful. Second, the Rules Committee, though hesitant to endorse some liberal legislation has, nevertheless, permitted every major bill requested by the leadership to come to the floor for action. Third, the Rules Committee through its able chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], has assured the House, and I have a letter to that effect from the distinguished gentleman, that none of the Kennedy legislative program billed as "must" legislation would be blocked during the 87th Congress.

I need not undertake here a discussion of the methods of getting legislation to the floor. It need only be said that they are numerous and that the majority of the Members of this House controls its destiny, not the members of the Rules Committee.

I would like to clarify the situation as regards the major bills which the committee is alleged to have killed or hindered. During the 86th Congress the Rules Committee approved rules for such measures as the civil rights bill (H.R. 8601), aid to depressed areas (H.R. 5722), school construction bill (H.R. 10128), a bill granting aid to the aging (H.R. 12580), the minimum wage bill (H.R. 12677), and a number of omnibus housing bills, among them H.R. 12603.

What, I ask, can the Kennedy program possibly contain that would go beyond this broad sweep of legislation?

It is noteworthy that all of these bills obtained a rule and were considered by the House.

Can the leadership ask for anything more? Will they get anything more through packing this committee?

Mr. Speaker, the action we take here today will be far reaching, indeed. We are not here acting for today alone; we

are acting to bind ourselves for 2 years and are setting a precedent which may guide the Congress for many succeeding sessions.

I cannot help but think that to pack the Rules Committee now is not only wrong, but is dangerous.

For these reasons, I cannot go along with this resolution and must, in good conscience and to keep faith with my country and my constituents, vote no.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to increase the membership of the House Committee on Rules.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the committee, mentioned in his own remarks today, I have been among those who have led the vanguard in bringing about a more realistic formula for moving legislation through this House. I need not apologize for the fact that I have felt the present structure of the committee has on past occasions frustrated the ability of the House of Representatives to work its will.

While I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Rules and his colleagues feel completely justified in the past actions of this committee, I for one have found it extremely difficult to accept the doctrine that the will of 437 Members of Congress can be frustrated by 6 men.

Every day we here in Congress hear great speeches about democracy representing the will of the people. It is inconceivable to me that we can on the one hand proclaim to the American people that we as a nation have found strength in the representative form of government, but on the other hand, we see the very dynamics of our representative government being thwarted consistently by a handful of men on the Committee on Rules.

I respect the chairman of this committee for his honesty and sincerity, but I could not sit idly by and fail to raise my single voice in protest when I see the fibers of democracy are being weakened through the will of an infinitesimal minority of this body.

The real issue here today is not whether the Rules Committee has done a good job or a bad job. The issue here today is whether every Member of this Congress, both Democrat and Republican, shall be given an opportunity to cast his vote on proposals to help our Nation; or whether this opportunity shall be relegated to the limbo of the Rules Committee files.

I am sure that our action today is not being directed at any single person on the Rules Committee, but rather we are today fighting for a principle which involves the very survival of representative government. Democracy cannot long endure when the will of the people can be frustrated by a handful of individuals. I sincerely hope this resolution will be adopted so that the House of Representatives can indeed work its will as proclaimed in our Constitution. If the Founding Fathers had intended for a super board of individuals to control the workings of this Congress, I am sure they would have so provided in the Constitution.

I earnestly hope that this resolution to enlarge the committee will be adopted here today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us today is crystal clear. We are to decide two basic matters: First, whether or not the House is going to condone the present intolerable situation which gives six men, elected by a small handful of the people of this Nation, the sole right to judge which legislation is to be considered on the House floor by Members elected by Americans from every part of the country; and, second, whether the Democratic leadership of the House will be under the direction of our beloved Speaker, duly elected both in the Democratic caucus and by the House itself on the day this Congress convened, or whether the coalition party led by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is to take over the control of the legislative process in the House of Representatives.

Many of our friends from the other side of the aisle have argued that there is no such thing as the Republican-southern Democratic coalition—that it is merely a coincidence of voting alinements on issues such as area redevelopment, housing and urban redevelopment, minimum wages, aid to education, and similar measures, on which most Republicans and many southern Democrats share ideological convictions.

I have in the past disputed this argument in remarks on the floor, documenting the historical background and development of the coalition over the past generation. However, it seems to me that the acid test of the existing nature of the coalition in this Congress will take place today. Today we vote on a procedural matter of the rules of procedure of the House. While we all realize that in one sense we are, in effect, deciding whether or not we will have the opportunity to debate and vote on the important legislation to be reported by legislative committees in the coming 2 years, we are really voting on a question of procedure. Should the vote on this resolution produce a clear-cut coalition voting alinement, it will prove to the American people once and for all time the actual existence of the Republican-southern Democratic coalition. In such a case the coalition will take on all the aspects of a new political party with a negative outlook reflecting as its objective the obstruction the legitimate legislative processes of the House.

This is not a partisan matter. My Republican friends genuinely concerned as I am over the needs and problems of our Nation which require legislative action during the 87th Congress must surely realize that once they take the first steps down the road of obstructionism and irresponsibility now being counseled by the opponents of this resolution, they will henceforth be entrapped and labeled as part of the negative coalition.

Like you, my constituents sent me to Congress to consider proposals recommended by the President and duly acted on by legislative committees and to cast my vote for or against them when brought to the floor of the House, according to my best judgment as to what is in the best interests of my district and the Nation as a whole. I am proud of this responsibility with which they have entrusted me and in due time I will give an accounting of my stewardship to the voters of my district.

I resent the implication, often expressed by the opponents of this resolution, that somehow I must be protected from political embarrassment by the six big brothers on the Rules Committee in the exercise of this right to vote on legislation reported by legislative committees. Such an implication is insulting to the chairman of every committee and to every other Member of the House who serves on a legislative committee. If we are not to be trusted in our deliberations, we are not deserving of membership in this august body. I reject completely the suggested proposition that somehow those selected to serve on the Committee on Rules are superior beings endowed with greater wisdom or supernatural powers to decide what is best for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hold that it is not unreasonable to expect that the Members of this Congress should have the right and opportunity to debate and vote on the legislative proposals recommended by the Kennedy administration after they have been considered, modified, and reported by legislative committees. Only by the adoption of this resolution can we be sure that we will have this opportunity.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the motion to increase the number of members on the Rules Committee of this House. Those who argue in support of the measure make emotional appeals to democracy, fair play, and the like, but underneath it is nothing but a cynical political grab.

There is a lot of talk about the power of the Rules Committee. Of course it has a lot of power—it could not do its job if it did not. But if a majority of this House believes the committee has too much power, that majority can do something about it by changing the rules governing the committee. If the Congress of the United States cannot control its own committees, then Heaven help us.

But those who support the move to pack the committee do not wish to curtail its power. Rather, if they were to be successful, my money would be bet that they will increase its power if they can do so. What they really want to do is to capture full use of this power for themselves.

If the supporters of this motion held a true majority in this Congress, they would have every right to hold a majority in this, and in every other committee in this House. But the fact that there is no certainty how the vote will go, despite the tremendous pressures that have been brought to bear by the administration and by the Speaker himself, is ample evidence that they do not hold a majority. If every Member here could vote his true personal conviction, free from administrative pressure and fear

of retribution, this motion would be emphatically defeated.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States carefully provided for three branches of the Federal Government, each with its own job to do and a sufficient degree of autonomy to do it. We, the Members of this Congress, are charged with a high responsibility, and not the least part of this responsibility is to keep inviolate the right of this and future Congresses to administer its internal affairs and to do its assigned job without unwarranted interference from the other branches of the Government. If we succumb to this bald effort by the present administration to dictate how we are to operate, we not only will have failed in our duty, but will have set a precedent for knuckling under to administration pressure that may lead to final reduction of Congress to a condition of servitude to administration masters.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recognize this question of membership on the Rules Committee as an extremely important one.

It is vital to the independent work of this Congress.

At issue, it seems to me, are two questions; one of precedent and the other whether or not the administration's program and the program of the loyal opposition will both have a full and fair consideration before this House.

Mr. Speaker, the party of my choice presents a moderate but adequate program for America. In the last campaign, Mr. Nixon received 49.7 percent of the vote cast for President while running on the Republican platform compared to the 49.8 percent received by the winner running on the platform adopted in Los Angeles. Then there are hundreds of thousands of people, as we know, who did not vote for either candidate.

These figures indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the loyal opposition has a mandate, too. It is a mandate to use every honorable means to assure ourselves and the country that our program, as reflected in the platform adopted in Chicago by the Republican Party, be given a chance for a full and fair hearing in this House and an opportunity to be voted on by its Members.

This program is a moderate approach but it is a constructive and realistic one and one which, as Mr. Nixon stated many times during the campaign, is an excellent base from which to start to build for a better America.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that according to published reports at least and endorsed by certain public statements made recently that this administration is veering toward this center position or what I would call a more moderate approach.

With this in mind, it seems to me we should ask the ranking members of the Rules Committee and those who represent the so-called liberal wing on the Rules Committee these questions: First, will the programs of both parties be given a chance to be heard and considered in the committee? Second, when these bills are voted out, will the committee grant rules that will allow full and adequate discussion and amendments so that the Members of the House will be given their right to vote on amendments to the proposed bills after a full and fair discussion of the issues and the problems?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the packing of the Rules Committee has some extremely serious implications which may not be apparent at first blush.

The public has been bombarded with the propaganda that the present Rules Committee bottles up so-called progressive, leftwing legislation. So it is proposed that we pack the Rules Committee with leftwingers to break the bottleneck and open the spending floodgates. Has anyone stopped to think what this new, leftwing Rules Committee will do with some so-called conservative, constructive legislation?

There is an omnibus bill now pending before the Congress which contains 17 provisions to tighten the internal security laws of this nation, to correct some of the asinine decisions of the Supreme Court which have wrecked our security program. When this bill reaches this new stacked Rules Committee, it will not have a Chinaman's chance of getting to the floor. It will make the present Rules Committee under the chairmanship of Judge SMITH smell like a rose by comparison.

There is another more serious evil in this committee-packing business. Once you set the precedent and people realize it can be done, what's going to happen to some other committees?

All of us are aware of the movement afoot to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Since the American people at the crossroads are behind this committee, there is no chance of getting rid of it, but you can destroy its effectiveness by packing it with a few Roosevelts and Cellers. Let these liberals get their foot in the door by packing this Rules Committee and then just watch them move against the Committee on Un-American Activities and possibly two or three others that they do not like.

It is dangerous business. We are playing with fire.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the new year opened with the word "purge" in the air. Even those who planned the deed used the word. But the word struck the public ear with a note which grated against the moral sensitivity of the people. The tone sounded somehow of purification, pasteurization, cleaning of the unclean. Synonyms came to mind—exile, banishment. The people rebelled against the concept of elimination of opposition by physical expulsion. A new concept was proposed which some artist of semantics first called numerical adjustment. And which some realist later called packing.

But purging sounds only a little worse than packing, and the process itself is only a little less subtle. Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. In terms of consequences, purging and packing are equal to the same thing and therefore are equal to each other.

What are those consequences? In their sum total, they amount to usurpation of the independent autonomy of one of the great committees of the House of Representatives. The Rules Committee would become the mere emanuensis of the majority leadership. As such, the majority leadership and not the Rules Committee would have the power to dictate the content and character of each rule regulating debate on each piece of legislation reported for floor consideration. The majority leadership and not the committee would have the power to decide how much time would be allowed for debate, how the time would be divided between the majority and the minority, whether or not amendments would be in order and whether or not points of order would be waived. In the hands of the committee, these powers are diffused among the membership of both parties on the committee and subject to a majority vote of that membership. In the hands of the majority leadership, these powers would be concentrated and consolidated in a small, partisan group and subject perhaps to the will of one member of that group.

From this consequence, further consequences entail. If one committee of the House can be packed and its autonomy usurped, every committee of the House can be packed and its autonomy usurped. This would mean the virtual obliteration of the committee system and the internal system of checks and balances of which it is a part, without which the organizational and functional democracy of the House of Representatives would perish.

The great battle for the votes is about over. The last threat has been made and the last inducement has been offered. Now comes one final appeal. If the resolution does not pass, we are told, America's prestige abroad will suffer. Artfully, the inference is left that an affirmative vote is the only patriotic vote. When America's stature is truly at stake, this appeal is legitimate; otherwise, it is wholly spurious. The spurious appeal always comes only as an afterthought—only after a complete bankruptcy of valid justification. Does anyone really believe that America's stature, her prestige, her world image is at stake on this vote? If so, I can think of nothing which would better enhance that image than a negative vote which would dramatize the determination of the elected Representatives of the people to remain the master of their own house.

Just as I oppose elimination of opposition by physical expulsion, just as I oppose usurpation of the power of the many and consolidation of power in the hands of the few, just so—for the same reasons and to the same degree—do I oppose this numerical adjustment as a transparent effort to pack and thus to destroy the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a few short minutes we in this historic legislative body will face a momentous test.

It is momentous because this vote may well determine whether America starts to move forward again.

It is a momentous vote because, psychologically, it will be a vote of confidence in a new administration now

attempting to solve tremendous problems facing our country. Many words of praise have been uttered about the great ability of men who have been selected to serve in the administration. The words are hollow mockery indeed if they are denied by a vote today.

This will be a momentous vote because it will be the test of the good faith of the opposition. It is the duty of the loyal opposition, where it believes it necessary, to oppose openly and straightforwardly. It is the opposite of duty, for the opposition to block and obstruct by clandestine means.

This vote will be a test of our fundamental belief in the process of representative democracy. It will test whether we want to avoid the responsibilities placed on us by the American people by delegating our responsibilities to six of our colleagues.

There may be better ways than the present proposal to assume our responsibilities but in the nature of things this will be the only opportunity we have to do our duty.

Finally this vote will be a test of loyalty. Not merely loyalty to our party but loyalty to that symbol of the greatest of our party, the man we have chosen to be our legislative leader in every Congress since 1940, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives is probably the most democratic legislative body in the world. It is revered as a temple of responsive government, a symbol of our freedoms. I know that every one of us is proud and honored to be a Member.

But like all human creations, the structure of this House is marred by some flaws. One of the most serious of these, it seems to me, is displayed in every session of Congress by the operation of the Committee on Rules. Surely it is an incredible situation when, in a body supposedly devoted to responsible and equitable majority rule, 6 men have the power to decide in which direction 435 shall move. Surely it is even more incredible that these men, who are not even the duly elected leaders of their respective parties, hold such dictatorial power as to prevent the consideration by this House of important and often vital legislation. Surely we hold our trusts lightly when we permit these men to thwart, disregard, ignore, or mangle measures we know the country wants us to consider.

Mr. Speaker, our committees are generally composed of experienced and knowledgeable men and women from both parties and from all sections of the country. Many of them are experts in their fields. They often devote months to the study of specific legislation in those fields. The bills they report are usually, and justifiably, treated with respect by this House.

Yet how often have we been witness to the spectacle of measures so conceived throttled by the capricious will of half the Committee on Rules? How often have committee chairmen been ordered to modify in line with the biases of the Rules Committee, measures their committees have reported, on penalty of having the bills completely withheld from floor consideration? We are all familiar with numerous incidents of this kind. They make a mockery of democratic procedure.

This is an old complaint, Mr. Speaker. Many Members of this body will recall that something was done about it in the 81st Congress. In 1949 the House adopted a significant curb on the Rules Committee's powers, the 21-day rule. Under this procedure the Rules Committee retained its traffic powers over the business of the House. It even retained some of the ability to delay which it had so long enjoyed. But it lost the almost absolute power to deny to the House the right to deal with measures considered important by the majority.

The 2 years during which the House operated under that rule were happily productive ones. Legislation which had long been desired by the country but frustrated by the Rules Committee was finally brought to the floor. Not all measures were passed, but at least they were considered in open debate. I am not one of those who believe that the House must be protected from declaring its position on important issues, especially when that protection is exercised by men over whose actions there is virtually no control.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. Both great political parties have a stake in democratic procedure. Every section, faction, and interest in this body should have the right to express its views in open debate on all the pressing problems that confront the American people. As the President has said: "Shouldn't the Members of the House themselves and not merely those members of the Rules Committee have a chance to vote on the measures?" By adopting the pending proposal to enlarge the membership of the committee, we will approach more closely the ideal of this House as a responsive and responsible instrument of democratic government.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 127, providing that the Committee on Rules shall be increased to 15 members.

The U.S. Congress is not a political body but is a branch of the Federal Government, composed of representatives of all the American people. Its proper functions are not merely partisan or political but reach much farther than that to the objectives set forth in the Constitution itself, among them, the promotion of the general welfare of all Americans. Well recognizing these things, our great President, as such, has rightly and publicly stated that he would not undertake to influence the decision on the proposed rules change and made it clear that he considered the rules of procedure a matter entirely for the membership of the House of Representatives to decide. Furthermore, a legislative representative from the White House visited my office last week and personally stated to me in emphatic terms that the President was not entering this controversy. In the face of these facts, it has been represented in my district that the pending resolution is a Kennedy proposal and is necessary to his program.

The proposition of changing and liberalizing the rules of the House has been bandied back and forth for many years, certainly more than 4 years because it was a subject of frequent mention when I first came to the House in 1957. Many speeches have been made from time to time on the floor of the House advocating a variety of changes in the rules, most of them constituting pleas for rules changes that would make it easier to pass any sort of bill that might be offered. I say this by way of pointing up the highly significant fact that the move to change the rules is not the brain child of our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, and was not originally initiated by him. I can say this because every Member of the House knows that if the idea had been his in the beginning, and he had thought it a good one, it would have been brought up for consideration by the House a long time ago. It should be noted, too, that the proposal was conceived and set in motion long before our great President was nominated and even before he became a candidate.

The campaign to stack the Rules Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives by increasing the membership from 12 to 15, as it was conducted in my district, was misleading and well calculated to prove embarrassing and humiliating to me as an individual, as a Democrat, and as a Member of Congress. The issue was put before the people of my district on the basis of loyalty to Speaker RAYBURN, to President Kennedy, and to the Democratic Party, and my friends were led to believe that my stand against stacking the Rules Committee amounted to disloyalty to one or the other of them. It was further represented to my people that President Kennedy's legislative program depended upon the adoption of this resolution to change the House rules. Upon this basis, and this alone, hundreds of the good people of my district were encouraged to call, write, or wire urging me to be loyal to the Democratic Party or to Mr. RAYBURN. But this is not a political issue in any sense of the term and I strongly deny that my position on the rules question constitutes disloyalty to my party, its leadership, or to the Speaker.

I yield to no one in my genuine respect and esteem for our beloved Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN; nor do I yield to anyone in my record of loyalty to and active support of the Democratic Party, having supported every Democratic nominee on the ticket throughout my voting life, without a single exception, and having contributed heavily in time, money, and effort to promote Democratic success. I actively supported Mr. Kennedy in the 1960 campaign, just as I have supported every Democrat on the ticket, from President to constable, since 1928 when Al Smith was our candidate. I have held and worked at every menial job in the Democratic organization of my county, precinct registrar, judge, marker, and have served on the transportation and absentee committees. I have served as secretary of the county executive committee, and for the past 25 years have served as treasurer and county chairman

of the Democratic Party. It is unthinkable, therefore, that I should now be a party to preventing House consideration of a Democratic program, or in any other way disloyal to the party for which I have worked these many years.

I cannot believe those who were responsible for representing the rules proposal as a partisan political issue involving party loyalty really anticipated the enormous injustice it would bring upon our congressional delegation. But the effect is no less damaging than if the misrepresentation had been intentional. Whether designed or not, I repeat, it has been embarrassing and humiliating to me as an individual, as a Democrat, and as a Member of Congress; all the more so because the implications and inferences cast were false and unjustly reflect upon my personal integrity and my loyalty to the Democratic Party.

It is unfair to us who oppose the rules change to solicit our support on the basis of party line loyalty or loyalty to Speaker RAYBURN, because it is not a partisan question. Democratic sponsors of the "stacking" resolution, together with Democratic leaders in the House, have appealed to Republicans for support because both Democrats and Republicans are bound by any change in the House Rules. The sponsors say to the Republicans: "This is nonpartisan," but to Democrats and their constituents they say: "Your Congressman is not loyal to the Democratic Party; call, write, or wire him to support Mr. RAYBURN." It is a nationwide campaign, and is directed in large part against the South. It is often referred to here as "the purge of the South."

Aside from all these considerations, and by way of getting right down to "brass tacks" about this matter, what is to be gained by changing the House rules? What will be lost if they are not changed? These are the questions that practical people want answered. The answer is that nothing will be gained if they are changed and nothing will be lost if the present rules are retained. The sponsors of the change allege that they want to get floor action on legislation for Federal aid to education, depressed areas, medical care for the aged, minimum wages, and public housing. Congressman HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, a southern gentleman in every sense of the term, and chairman of the House Rules Committee, has specifically agreed to give prompt consideration to all of this high-priority legislation and to bring it to the floor for prompt action by the House. This agreement on the part of Judge SMITH covers every piece of legislation that the sponsors of the rules change say they are afraid the Rules Committee will "bottle up." Furthermore, the sponsors of the change agree that Judge SMITH's word is his bond and that he will do exactly as he has promised. Yet, it is still insisted that the rules be changed. Why? Having been conceded everything they have publicly said they wanted, why do the sponsors still insist on stacking the committee? The answer is twofold and too obvious to question: First, a favorite pastime in Washington is to slap the South on every possible occasion. Second, some ultraliberal Members of Congress expect to offer some bills which have not been mentioned. I predict with reason that a series of bills will be offered during this session of Congress which will reveal the real reasons behind this move to nullify the influence of southerners now on the Rules Committee.

It would be absurd and ridiculous for a single committee to have power to indefinitely stall congressional action on bills, but this has been widely reported as true. Contrary to these reports, the Rules Committee has not in the past and cannot now "bottle up" and prevent floor action on bills. The most it can do under present rules is to temporarily delay action on a bill, not longer than 7 legislative days. The present rules provide three separate and specific ways to get floor action on any bill. First, if the Rules Committee fails to report a rule on a bill within 7 legislative days, the House by simple majority vote can force a rule and thus bring it out for floor action. Second, if the Speaker desires to do so, he can recognize any Member to bring up a bill under suspension of the rules. Third, on any Wednesday, the chairman of any committee may call up for a vote any bill previously reported by his committee.

The proposal to change the House rules was not initiated by the Speaker, President Kennedy, or by the Democratic leadership. It was originated by a small group of ultraliberals who are always in the forefront in pressing for more and more extreme legislation and for taking authority away from our States and centralizing power in Washington. In a nutshell, that is what the rules fight is about. As I understand their thinking, our people are opposed to these things.

I agree entirely that the Kennedy legislative program, as announced by him many times during the campaign, should be brought up for prompt consideration by the House. Accordingly, I have talked personally with Judge SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, about the rules controversy. He has stated to me personally, as well as on the floor of the House, that his committee would interpose no obstacle whatever to action upon the President's legislative program. He has even gone further than that and offered to support a change in the rules to deprive his committee of jurisdiction to prevent bills from becoming tied up in conference.

In addition to Judge SMITH's agreement to give prompt action on the legislation comprising the Kennedy program, a number of other fair and effective proposals have been offered by our southern group. Congressman COOLEY, dean of the North Carolina delegation, suggested that the Speaker be made an ex-officio member of the Rules Committee so that he would always be able to vote and break any deadlock in the committee. It was also proposed, in the event of a tie vote in the Rules Committee, that the House membership take a vote on bringing bills to the floor, thus assuring that the majority would always prevail. Thus, it is seen that our southern members have offered to assure prompt floor consideration and action on President Kennedy's program. But all of these proposals have been turned down and we who hold the southern viewpoint have been challenged to a winner-take-all showdown. It is regrettable, indeed, that the South is thus being denied any consideration whatever in a matter of serious nationwide concern. This is not the way to promote either party harmony or national interests. The best legislation, like the best human relations, has always resulted from reasonable and honorable compromise.

It is plain, therefore, that President Kennedy's announced program, the proposed legislation that he stressed and to which he gave priority during the campaign, will be promptly brought to the House for its consideration. If this were not true I would unhesitatingly vote to change the rules. But since the Kennedy program is assured of consideration under present rules, I must oppose any change. One of the reasons why I cannot conscientiously vote to change the rules is this: It is generally known here that a small minority group of northern leftwing Democrats expect to offer some extreme legislation that, in our opinion, would be harmful to the country, and particularly to the South. This is not a part of the program outlined by Mr. Kennedy during his campaign, and no Democrat in Congress is in any way obligated to it. On the contrary, I believe our people expect me to oppose extreme legislation that goes far beyond any that our great President has proposed.

In conclusion, I would like to express my regret that it has been considered necessary to the passage of this resolution to resort to outright threats of reprisal in various forms against many of us who conscientiously oppose the rules change as a matter of principle. To threaten to penalize a congressional district for a Member's opposition to the pending proposal is a serious matter, indeed, and raises a question in the minds of our people as to whether Federal funds will be used on the basis of need and public benefit or as a whiplash upon those who oppose it and a reward to those who support it.

For my stand on this question, I have been personally threatened with defeat in the next primary election. In all kindness, and with no animosity, I am compelled by conscience and honor to say that if the price of my continued membership in Congress is support of a proposal which is not necessary to the end it purports to serve, and which I do not believe is good for my district, for our country, or for the Democratic Party, the price is too high; or if in order to hold this high office I must learn to be frightened and to flee in political terror from what I conceive to be my duty, that price, also, is too high. Therefore, I vote my convictions on this issue.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the current proposal of some in the Congress and outside to increase the membership of the House Rules Committee has been presented to the American public in many forms and in some ways that do not always accurately reflect the facts involved, many of us think.

The public has been led to believe that the Rules Committee is composed of a majority of conservatives, or at least moderates, who have time and time again defeated the will of a majority of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Such representation by any person or any news medium is totally inaccurate.

The Rules Committee has been erroneously blamed in the past 4 years for the fact that on several occasions the two branches of Congress have not been able to agree on different versions of legislation. This, of course, is a misrepresentation of the facts. The truth is that the conferees of the House and the Senate were unable to agree on the different versions of the same type of legislation that had been passed by the two branches of Congress. The Rules Committee has been publicly blamed from time to time even for the fact that legislative committees did not report out favorably the exact type of legislation some people wanted. And, while it may appear facetious, it has even been claimed that some Presidential vetoes of bills might not have occurred if the Rules Committee had looked with more favor on such legislation.

Now, as somebody or something has to be blamed for everything, it becomes very obvious that the Rules Committee has been selected to be the "whipping boy" even for those Members of Congress who are seeking an excuse for not being able to do or to get all their people call on them for.

A simple majority of House Members—or 219—can bring any bill or resolution from any committee—the Committee on Rules or otherwise—when they so desire. This procedure of the House of Representatives is known as the discharge petition. Any Member can offer a discharge petition any time he or she desires. Those who propose the packing of the Rules Committee know this and they know, too, that the discharge petition has been used repeatedly for this purpose.

Serious questions in the minds of some Members seem to be: Shall we increase the membership of the Rules Committee this year, 1961, by adding Members who are committed to a certain political philosophy to insure that we have on every vote on any matter before the Rules Committee more liberals than moderates or conservatives? What will the situation be in 1963, 1965, and in the years to come?

Moderates at times have been known to take liberal or even conservative positions. Even liberals sometimes turn conservative, or vice versa. Shall we increase or decrease the membership of the Rules Committee or any standing committee from time to time to meet what appears to be purely political expediency? America needs stability and balance in Washington today and it cannot be obtained in this manner. Such a radical departure will establish an unwise and a dangerous precedent.

To me there is even a deeper principle involved. Every student of our U.S. Constitution knows, and every person who has read our Constitution understands, its provisions with respect to the required complete independence of, and separation of, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.

If the executive branch of the Federal Government can this year, or at any time in the future, through any Member or group of Members, increase the historical membership of committees of the Congress on the alleged theory that action on legislation desired by the executive will be quicker, then we will have destroyed the whole constitutional concept of the separation of powers in our Government.

When I stand—as I have done in the Chamber of the House of Representatives on several occasions, and as late as January 3, 1961—and hold up my hand to Almighty God, in the presence of my fellow countrymen, and solemnly swear to support, maintain, and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, I intend—now and in the future—to do just that.

I cannot escape the conclusion that some of our fine friends who are advocating this change, and who are the proponents of this proposal, are being led unwittingly to undermine constitutional government itself.

In conclusion, I can unequivocally state that if any committee of the House, Rules or otherwise, could thwart or defeat the will of a majority of the membership of the House of Representatives to consider any legislation, then I would be willing to pack, cut, or even abolish this committee. I believe that legislative proposals of our new administration should win committee and congressional approval on their merit.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I told the Congress my position on the proposed expansion of the Rules Committee. My comments can be found on page 1441 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 30, 1961.

I was willing to support the expansion of the Rules Committee under circumstances which would have guaranteed that opposition to the Kennedy program would not be silenced on the floor of the House of Representatives by "gag rules" issued from the Rules Committee. Although many advocates of Rules Committee expansion have discussed this matter with me, none of them have been willing to give such firm assurance. It would appear that the real purpose of this expansion of members on the Rules Committee is to drive the Kennedy program through the House without perfecting or modifying amendments and without deliberate debate. I suspect that advocates of fantastic new Federal empires have suddenly realized that the people really do not favor such programs.

The advocates of expansion of the Rules Committee had a weak case to begin with, but I was willing to go along with them and to be entirely fair in eliminating what can only be characterized as a minor impediment to the Kennedy program. I now find that extremists have taken command of negotiations. The most important objective of these extremists is clearly to use the Rules Committee to gag everyone who opposes any aspect of the Kennedy program. Their demands are dangerous; their guise is false. I unequivocably reject their unreasonable demands, and accordingly I have no choice but to cast my vote against expansion of the Rules Committee.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker—

> If 50 men did all the work
> And gave the price to 5,
> And let those 5 make all the rules
> You'd say the 50 men were fools
> Unfit to be alive.

In quoting Charlotte Gilman, I do not suggest to the Members of this body that we are not fit to be alive, but I do suggest that our folly matches that of the foolish 50.

Through trial and error our predecessors from the 1st Congress through the 86th have developed a wondrously effective system to enable 437 men to deal with the more than 10,000 legislative measures which are introduced in the House of Representatives during almost every session of Congress. It makes sense for a body of 437 men to charge a committee of 38 men to report to the body its recommendations on all proposed legislation dealing with the armed services. It makes good sense for a body of 437 men to charge a committee of 31 men to report to the body its recommendations on all proposed legislation dealing with Banking and Currency. The Members ordinarily seek election to the committees with jurisdiction of a field in which they are most qualified and most interested. And in this body more than a few of the Members are nationally and internationally recognized experts in the fields of the committees and subcommittees on which they serve. After the committee has heard the testimony of those who favor and those who oppose the legislation, after the committee has weighed the merits of the legislation and reported its recommendation to the full body, then the Members of the full body have the evidence they need to be able to discuss the issues intelligently on the floor and decide whether enactment of the legislation would be in the best interest of the Nation and the people who elected them.

The committee system is the only way this great legislative body could accomplish its work and I say the committee system makes good sense. But does it make good sense to give to just 6 men out of this body of 437 the power to prevent every one of the bills recommended by the other 19 standing committees from reaching the floor? Does it make good sense to require a committee of experts to tear the heart out of a legislative proposal, framed only after days or weeks of hearings and committee debate, as a condition for getting the proposal to the floor? Does it make good sense to give any group the power, after imposing its own amendments on a bill, to report it under a closed rule limiting further amendment? Of course it does not make sense. And it redounds to the great glory of this body that whenever any man or group of men has acquired this kind of stranglehold over its orderly parliamentary process, the Members, speaking with the voice of all the people who elected them, have put the legisla-

tive power back where it belongs, in the majority of the Representatives elected by the people.

Some may feel that to take any step now to curb this kind of power would be to part with tradition. I say to permit a small group to usurp the power entrusted by the Constitution and the people to the entire House of Representatives is immoral. To permit this usurpation to continue is to abdicate our constitutional role. But if tradition is important—I say that to fail to curb this kind of power is to part with tradition, not to follow it.

The Rules Committee does not play its present role as an instrument to thwart the majority by any long tradition. Nor does it have 12 members by any long tradition. For 90 years the Rules Committee functioned as a select committee, set up at the beginning of each Congress and authorized to report a system of rules. During this period it exercised no authority over the legislative program or the contents of legislation. So minor was its role, that no appointments were made to it in the 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th and 21st Congress. For many years in its early history it made no reports. It was not until 1880 that it became a standing committee with its membership fixed at five. Nor is the size of the committee sacrosanct. It was increased to 11 members in 1910, to 12 members in 1917, and to 14 members in 1935. Its present membership of 12, 8 representing the majority party and 4 the minority party, was not established until 1945.

Although the legislative powers of the Committee on Rules developed gradually over the years, if there is any function of the committee which can be said to be traditional, it is its function, as Hinds tells us—

> as an efficient means of bringing up for consideration bills difficult to reach in the regular order (IV Hinds' Precedents, sec. 155).

There have been times, when, in exercising this function, the committee was given to an inordinate exercise of its power. One of the factors which made such committee excesses possible was the ex officio membership of the Speaker until 1910. In that year the House revolted, removed the Speaker from the committee and increased the committee membership to 11.

In 1924 the House had to take action to curb a penchant of the chairman of the Committee on Rules for holding in his pocket for weeks at a time resolutions which he had been authorized by the committee to report. It was also in 1924 that the discharge rule was amended to require just 150 signatures on discharge petitions. This number was raised to 218 in 1926, lowered to 145 in 1931, and again increased to 218 in 1935. So you see the Members of the House have at their disposal, and in the past have not hesitated to use, several techniques for increasing or decreasing the power of the Rules Committee, and for changing its role to better suit the needs of this great legislative body. The time has come again for the Members to reassert themselves, to take unto themselves and their committees the power to determine that legislation reported upon favorably by committees will be debated upon the floor, not pigeonholed or pocket vetoed in the Rules Committee.

It was in 1937 that the Rules Committee first began to take away from the majority and assume for itself a role as the shaper of legislative policy, as the virtual final arbiter of what bills will reach the floor. During the last half dozen years it has become increasingly clear that the Members of the House have let a few men on the Rules Committee substitute their own personal and political prejudices for the good judgment of themselves and their committees. In so doing we have lost face in the eyes of the people as an effective and efficient legislative body. I say the time has come again for us to exercise our judgment as men, not marionettes. And to increase the membership of the Rules Committee is a time-honored, traditional way for us to regain our self-respect.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. I do so because I believe enlarging the membership of the House Rules Committee is a reasonable and moderate solution to a serious problem.

It is especially important that Republicans in the House of Representatives support this proposal. If a solid phalanx of Republicans vote against enlarging the committee, the Republican Party leaves itself open to the charge of obstructionism. We cannot permit a vigorous, strong, and needed Republican Party to play such a role. For too long we have borne the criticism for being responsible for the death of certain legislation, when the truth of the matter is the Democrats could well have enacted whatever they wanted with the majority they have in both Houses of Congress. For too long, although the Rules Committee may have been the stumbling block for action on certain legislation, the Democrats have been getting out from under for not delivering their promises by putting the blame on the Republicans. This is the public image, and it is time the picture is changed and that the Democrats accepted their own responsibility. The enactment of this resolution should afford no excuses in the future. What is more, it is vital that all Members of this House be given every opportunity to vote on legislation properly approved by its respective committees.

Each Congressman—Democrat and Republican alike—has a responsibility to act in the public interest. Getting legislation, controversial or otherwise, to the floor of the House is in the public interest and the resolution before us is a reasonable proposal to expedite legislation.

I have vigorously advocated the reinstituting of the 21-day rule to break the bottleneck of the Rules Committee. If the new lineup proposed by this resolution will accomplish the same objective, I am all for it. It seems to me every piece of legislation that has been duly reported by the respective committees of this House should have every opportunity to be voted on by the Representatives of the American people. Likewise, we can be denied the opportunity to vote on legislation already approved by either the House or the Senate where a change of content has been made by either body because this all-important committee determines to bury it. It is high time this kind of situation was corrected.

Mr. Speaker, the plan before us is a long step toward eventual realization of a sorely needed, long overdue, reform.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 212, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—217

Addabbo	Granahan	Nix
Addonizio	Gray	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Alford	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Anfuso	Griffiths	O'Hara, Mich.
Ashley	Hagen, Calif.	O'Konski
Aspinall	Halpern	Olsen
Ayres	Hansen	O'Neill
Bailey	Harding	Osmers
Baldwin	Harris	Patman
Baring	Hays	Perkins
Barrett	Healey	Peterson
Bass, N.H.	Hechler	Pfost
Bass, Tenn.	Holifield	Philbin
Bates	Holland	Pike
Blatnik	Holtzman	Pilcher
Boggs	Hull	Poage
Boland	Ichord	Powell
Bolling	Ikard	Price
Bonner	Inouye	Pucinski
Brademas	Jennings	Rains
Breeding	Joelson	Randall
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Brooks, La.	Johnson, Md.	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Wis.	Rivers, Alaska
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Burke, Ky.	Karsten	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Karth	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Pa.	Kastenmeier	Rooney
Cahill	Kee	Roosevelt
Cannon	Kelly	Rostenkowski
Carey	Keogh	Rutherford
Casey	Kilday	Ryan
Celler	King, Calif.	St. Germain
Chelf	King, Utah	Santangelo
Clark	Kirwan	Saund
Coad	Kluczynski	Scranton
Cohelan	Kowalski	Seely-Brown
Conte	Lane	Shelley
Cook	Lankford	Sheppard
Corbett	Lesinski	Shipley
Corman	Libonati	Sibal
Curtis, Mo.	Lindsay	Sisk
Daddario	Loser	Slack
Daniels	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Spence
Dawson	McFall	Staggers
Delaney	Macdonald	Steed
Dent	Machrowicz	Stratton
Denton	Mack	Stubblefield
Diggs	Madden	Sullivan
Dingell	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	Mahon	Thomas
Doyle	Marshall	Thompson, La.
Dulski	Mathias	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Merrow	Thompson, Tex.
Edmondson	Miller, Clem	Thornberry
Elliott	Miller, George P.	Toll
Evins	Mills	Trimble
Fallon	Moeller	Ullman
Farbstein	Monagan	Vanik
Fascell	Montoya	Vinson
Feighan	Moorhead, Pa.	Wallhauser
Finnegan	Morgan	Walter
Fino	Morris	Watts
Flood	Morrison	Wickersham
Fogarty	Morse	Willis
Friedel	Moss	Wright
Fulton	Moulder	Yates
Gallagher	Multer	Young
Garmatz	Murphy	Zablocki
Giaimo	Natcher	Zelenko
Gilbert		

NAYS—212

Abbitt	Frazier	Moore
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Moorehead, Ohio
Adair	Garland	Mosher
Alexander	Gary	Mumma
Alger	Gathings	Murray
Andersen, Minn.	Gavin	Nelsen
Anderson, Ill.	Glenn	Norblad
Andrews	Goodell	Norrell
Arends	Goodling	Nygaard
Ashbrook	Grant	Ostertag
Ashmore	Griffin	Passman
Auchincloss	Gross	Pelly
Avery	Gubser	Pillion
Baker	Hagan, Ga.	Pirnie
Barry	Haley	Poff
Battin	Hall	Quie
Becker	Halleck	Ray
Beckworth	Hardy	Reece
Beermann	Harrison, Va.	Reifel
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bell	Harsha	Riehlman
Bennett, Fla.	Harvey, Ind.	Riley
Berry	Harvey, Mich.	Rivers, S.C.
Betts	Hébert	Robison
Blitch	Hemphill	Rogers, Fla.
Bolton	Henderson	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Herlong	Roudebush
Boykin	Hiestand	Rousselot
Bray	Hoeven	St. George
Bromwell	Hoffman, Ill.	Saylor
Broomfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Schadeberg
Brown	Horan	Schenck
Broyhill	Hosmer	Scherer
Bruce	Huddleston	Schneebeli
Burleson	Jarman	Schweiker
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Schwengel
Cederberg	Johansen	Scott
Chamberlain	Jonas	Selden
Chiperfield	Jones, Mo.	Short
Church	Judd	Shriver
Clancy	Kearns	Sikes
Collier	Keith	Siler
Colmer	Kilburn	Smith, Calif.
Cooley	Kilgore	Smith, Miss.
Cramer	King, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Kitchin	Springer
Curtin	Knox	Stafford
Curtis, Mass.	Kornegay	Stephens
Dague	Kyl	Taber
Davis, James C.	Laird	Taylor
Davis, John W.	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Derounian	Langen	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	Latta	Tuck
Devine	Lennon	Tupper
Dole	Lipscomb	Utt
Dominick	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Dooley	McDonough	Van Zandt
Dorn	McIntire	Weaver
Dowdy	McMillan	Weis
Downing	McSween	Westland
Durno	McVey	Whalley
Ellsworth	MacGregor	Wharton
Everett	Mailliard	Whitener
Fenton	Martin, Nebr.	Whitten
Findley	Mason	Widnall
Fisher	Matthews	Williams
Flynt	May	Wilson, Calif.
Ford	Meader	Wilson, Ind.
Forrester	Michel	Winstead
Fountain	Miller, N.Y.	Younger
	Milliken	
	Minshall	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Chenoweth

NOT VOTING—4

Bennett, Mich.	Rabaut	Tollefson
Martin, Mass.		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Chenoweth against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILLS TO REPEAL THE FEDERAL TAX ON THE TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS AND ON COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced bills today to repeal the Federal tax on the transportation of persons and on communications.

I feel that the repeal of these taxes is long overdue. As we all know, they were enacted originally not so much for the revenues they would produce, but as a means of discouraging long distance telephone traffic and unnecessary travel during World War II when the telephone lines of the Nation were greatly overloaded and our railroads and other means of transportation were hard-pressed to take care of vital military travel.

These taxes are discriminatory in nature and certainly should be removed without further delay on the part of the Congress. The tax on the transportation of persons is one of the primary reasons for the decline in bus and railroad passenger traffic. The tax is a contributing factor to the great decline in our railroad passenger car fleet, which has dropped to one-half of the 1941–45 level. In case of great national emergency, the Nation's railroads would not have adequate passengers cars to meet our military requirements.

The Federal tax on communications is an unnecessary burden on our taxpayers. The American people were led to believe that it would be repealed shortly after the war, but, as we have learned from experience, there apparently is no such thing as a temporary tax.

THE B–70 WEAPON SYSTEM AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in his first state of the Union message, delivered before the Congress yesterday, President Kennedy made one thing clear: there is nothing on record to indicate that the Communist leaders of Soviet Russia and of Red China have abandoned their plans for world domination.

Undoubtedly, one way in which they aim to achieve that objective is by gaining control of space.

The strategic space race is, therefore, of utmost importance to us. As President Kennedy pointed out last fall and again in his state of the Union message, the United States cannot run second in this vital race. In his own words:

To insure peace and freedom, we must be first.

Further, in the light of recent world events, we must steer a steady course toward increased military superiority in all relevant areas. For military superiority is the only thing which will act as an effective deterrent to Communist attack, and provide our Nation with a reasonably adequate measure of security.

I am taking the floor today to discuss some aspects of this vital issue—in particular, the potential role of the B–70 weapon system in enabling us to achieve, and maintain, military superiority.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, shortly after the adjournment of the last Congress, the Department of Defense announced that it had authorized the Department of the Air Force to proceed with a substantially augmented development program aimed toward the demonstration of the B–70 weapon system capability.

Prior to this announcement the Air Force had been proceeding on a program which involved the fabrication of two prototype air vehicles, known as the XB–70, and also work on a limited basis in connection with the bombing and navigation subsystems.

The new authorization provided the funding for an effort directed toward weapon system prototypes, known as the YB–70, as contrasted to the strictly experimental flight vehicles in the prior program.

Not long after this announcement, and while serving a tour of active duty with the Air Force, I had an opportunity to visit the North American Aviation plant, to view a mockup of the B–70 and to learn of the many revolutionary developments in aerodynamics and manufacturing techniques which have made this aircraft possible.

The B–70 is a new airplane which will operate higher and faster than any combat aircraft the world has ever known. It is expected to insure that the Air Force and the Strategic Air Command will have the proper military vehicle to carry out their combat responsibilities in the post-1965 time period.

Let me review the B–70's military capabilities.

The B–70 is an airplane designed to cruise at three times the speed of sound, roughly 2,100 miles per hour. At this speed it would have an unrefueled range of almost 7,000 miles. With aerial refueling from existing tankers, the range of the B–70 becomes appreciably greater.

The B–70 can carry the heaviest nuclear bombs built—or numbers of smaller ones; whereas in the present state of the art, the ICBM can carry but one warhead, and it is of relatively small yield when compared with what the bomber can carry. Furthermore, if nuclear weapons should be outlawed by agreement, a missile is an expensive one-way vehicle to deliver conventional explosives.

Unlike the missile, the B–70 is controlled by the human factor. The presence of the judgment of a man over the target permits the selection of the best bomb to do the job that must be done. For heavily emplaced targets, only such a manned bomber can carry the heavy

load and deliver it with the required accuracy to prevent any hiding place from being a plausible haven for aggressors.

But more than this, the B–70 will continue that time-for-decision capability which we have known under the shield of a manned bomber force. Manned aircraft can be launched on less than positive information of a possible enemy all-out attack. The situation can then be evaluated while the aircraft are en route, and a decision can be made to recall or attack.

It seems to me that we would place our President in an almost untenable position if we were to rely solely on a missile force. The most awesome decision of history would be the decision to push the button on our unrecallable missiles. And that decision is irrevocable.

It is only with the aircraft portion of our total forces that we give the President a chance to order a launch, and yet not carry out the actual attack should conditions change.

In addition to these capabilities, which demonstrate the flexibility which the B–70 is expected to give us, it has many more potentials.

Armed with the hypersonic Sky Bolt ballistic missile which will travel at roughly 3,500 miles per hour, the B–70 could launch that missile approximately 1,000 miles from the enemy target with a high degree of accuracy.

Armed with many long-range air-to-air rockets it could become a long-range interceptor—seeking out, detecting and destroying the enemy far from our very shores.

Armed with antisatellite weapons, it could become a moving platform from which to launch rockets against photographic or defense warning satellites.

By replacing its combat electronic equipment and some of its fuel compartment, it can be used as a mach 3 transport capable of airlifting people to any spot on the globe in 5 hours.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the international situation, we must continue to modernize our bomber forces, and the B–70 has been selected to replace the aging B–52's. In these critical times, we must give our friends and allies definite visual proof of the state of our combat readiness. The B–70 will provide that proof to both friend and foe alike.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress acted wisely in appropriating additional funds for the development of this weapon system. And I also believe that the executive branch should be complimented for releasing those funds to the Air Force, to permit the return of the B–70 to a complete weapon system development.

I feel that we must carefully monitor the development of this weapon system to insure that the most technically advanced airplane, for the time period in which it is needed, will be in fact produced. From the evidence which I have seen, it certainly appears that the B–70 will meet those requirements. I hope, therefore, that this program will continue to advance with all possible speed.

RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEDICATION OF NEW STATE DEPARTMENT BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include the proceedings and speeches at the dedication of the new State Department Building in Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the fifth day of this month the new building of the Department of State here in the District of Columbia was dedicated in a very interesting and highly dignified manner.

I am pleased to include the following program distributed on this occasion together with the remarks of each of the distinguished speakers of the day:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE BUILDING DEDICATION CEREMONY PROGRAM, JANUARY 5, 1961

Concert	The U.S. Marine Band, Lt. Col. Albert Schoepper, conductor.
Presiding	The Honorable Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State.
Invocation	The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington.
Flag raising:	
"To the Color"	The U.S. Marine Band.
"National Anthem"	The U.S. Marine Band.
Presentation of the Secretary of State.	The Honorable Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State.
Remarks	The Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State.
Benediction	The Right Reverend Angus Dun, Bishop of Washington.
Concert	The U.S. Marine Band.

PRAYER BY THE MOST REVEREND PATRICK A. O'BOYLE, ARCHBISHOP OF WASHINGTON

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Our Father who art in heaven, enlighten our minds today that Thy wisdom—with Thy wisdom—that we may dedicate this building to the high and holy purpose for which it is erected.

We pray that we shall ever as a nation by the conduct in our national and international affairs show forth to the world these truths in which we believe: that government has a moral basis; that a universal moral law is the foundation of a society; that our legal order is subject to judgment by a law that is inherent in the nature of man; that the eternal reason of God is the ultimate origin of all law; that this is a nation under God.

We pray finally that all fellow countrymen may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy law; that we may be preserved in strong union among ourselves and dedicated passionately to the preservation of peace and freedom everywhere throughout the world. These things we ask through Christ our Lord. Amen.

ADDRESS MADE BY LOY W. HENDERSON, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. Secretary, distinguished guests, this is an auspicious day for the Department of State. For the first time in many years its personnel is to be housed under one roof. It is true this this roof is rather extensive and that some of the corridors seem rather long. Nevertheless, the members of the Department are happy that they are finally able to work together in a single building. There is particular rejoicing on the part of those members of the Department who, scattered for years among some 20 subsidiary buildings, have at times felt themselves separated from the main stream of the Department's activity.

We are confident that in this building, equipped with the kind of facilities which a modern foreign office should possess, the Department can make and implement decisions much more rapidly and will in general perform more effectively.

We are also pleased that this building will house the International Cooperation Administration which is an integral part of the Department. Its new location should facilitate even closer cooperation between it and other areas of the Department.

We appreciate the friendliness which has prompted so many of our distinguished guests to join with us today in the dedication of our new building. Among them we see the diplomatic representatives of many countries; Members of Congress; a former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson; a future Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk; representatives of other executive agencies; representatives of the architects and contractors who have made this building a reality; and a number of distinguished citizens from private life.

Before presenting the Secretary of State I would like on behalf of the personnel of the Department and the Foreign Service to express our gratitude to a few of the many persons and firms to whom we are indebted for our new premises.

In the first place we wish to thank President Eisenhower who gave his support to the new building and who has shown a sustained and active interest in it. Without the energetic and effective backing of the late John Foster Dulles, the Secretary of State, and of Herbert Hoover, Jr., Under Secretary of State at the time the project for a new building was being launched, our new building would not be here. We are also deeply indebted to Mr. Dillon, who as Under Secretary, has been of great help to us. We are appreciative of the cooperation and of the suggestions received from the Budget Bureau.

Among the members of the Department to whom we are particularly grateful are the former Assistant Secretary of State, Zeke

Carpenter, and his Deputy for Operations, Tom Estes. Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Estes took the initiative in formulating the project. They carried most of the burden of gaining the support of other interested executive agencies of the Government and of the Congress. Mr. Estes has practically lived with the project since its inception some 5 years ago.

We are also deeply indebted to Mr. Floete and his associates in the General Services Administration, who have been responsible for the supervision of the construction and who have cooperated closely with us during the planning and building stages.

We wish to express our appreciation of the support given to us by the Congress in the carrying out of this project. We are particularly indebted to the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees, Mr. JOHN ROONEY in the House and Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate. The sympathetic attitude with respect to our housing needs shown by these committees was to a large degree responsible for the decision of the Congress to give us the necessary appropriations.

Among those to whom our thanks are due are the architects who carried out the difficult task of designing an extension three times as large as the building to which it was to be affixed. They are Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, of Chicago; Harley, Ellington & Day, of Detroit; and A. R. Clos, of Washington. We are also appreciative of the work of the W. B. Ford Co., of Detroit, assisted by Mary Dunn, of New York, who designed the interiors of the new building.

It was, of course, upon the general contractor, John McShain, Inc., that the main burden of construction fell. We are grateful to this firm for bringing to completion a project so huge and so complicated.

We wish also to express our gratitude to Mr. David Findley and to other members of the Fine Arts Commission who have devoted much time and thought to this project and whose advice has been most helpful.

Mr. Secretary, the whole Department is grateful to you for the support which you have given this project from the moment that you became associated with us. I am happy to report to you that your instructions and those of your distinguished predecessor, John Foster Dulles, have been carried out and that our new building is now ready for dedication.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor to present the Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian A. Herter.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF STATE HERTER

INTRODUCTION

Distinguished guests and fellow members of the Department of State, we meet today to dedicate the new Department of State Building. We meet on the spot where many of us met 4 years ago in January 1957 when President Eisenhower and the late John Foster Dulles helped lay the cornerstone. They did so with the same trowel George Washington used when the cornerstone of the National Capitol was laid in 1793.

With these historic ties in mind at this moment of dedication, it is appropriate to have a look at the past before we turn to the prospects before us.

THE PAST

Most of us who have worked in or with the Department of State for the past 15 years have come to think of New State as a permanent home. But New State was in fact the 21st home of the Department. Our first home as the Department of Foreign Affairs was in a little wooden building 12 feet in width on South Sixth Street in Philadelphia in 1781. The Department then consisted of the Secretary, four advisers and clerks. Since that time we have been moved from Philadelphia to Annapolis, to Trenton and then to Faunces Tavern in New York. From that building, in which Washington delivered his Farewell Address, the Department moved in the 1780's to two addresses on lower Broadway in New York. It was in the latter of these that the Department was located when its name was changed in September 1789 from the Department of Foreign Affairs to the Department of State.

The pattern of movement and growth continues from there: The Department moved back to Philadelphia, where it had six locations between 1790 and 1800 and where epidemics of yellow fever made it necessary to withdraw to the statehouse in Trenton during the summer and fall of 1797, 1798, and 1799.

From 1800 we have, as a Department, lived continuously in Washington. One of our next homes, directly west of the White House, suffered the indignity of being set afire by the British after the Battle of Bladensburg in 1814. Fortunately, the clerks of the Department, under orders from the Secretary, were wary enough to save the records of the Department—which then included the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence—by taking them first to a gristmill on the Virginia side of the Potomac 2 miles above Georgetown, and thence, when that location seemed unsafe, to Leesburg, Va.

While the burned building was being rebuilt, between 1814 and 1816, the Department occupied a house on G Street near 18th Street. In 1816 it moved back into the building west of the White House.

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams supervised the Department's next move, which was into a fine new structure known as the Northeast Executive Building. This building, at 15th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, was the home of the Department from 1819 until 1866.

There followed an interim phase when we were—because of the difficulty of accommodation at the time—housed in one of the city asylums. I am gratified that our letters and memoranda no longer issue from an address of such ambiguous authority. In addition, the building was small and inadequate, and two fires there during the Department's occupancy nearly proved disastrous.

In 1875 the Department moved into another new building—the south wing of the State, War, and Navy Building, more recently known as the Old State Building, at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. Appropriations for this building—with its cantilevered stairways and intricately designed bronze balustrades—were spread over a period of 17 years. This fine edifice was to have been a permanent home for the Departments of State, War, and Navy. But what happened? We not only absorbed the whole of Old State—now the White House Executive Offices—but began to overflow into the several dozen annexes that have plagued our lives and delayed many conferences since the early part of this century.

In 1947 we began the final move into what was then known as the New War Building which, in its extended form, is the one we dedicate today.

These are the dry facts of our search for a physical center—of one location giving way to another. There has been much frustration, much lost effort and lost time. The wide progress that has been made in the formulation of foreign policy has been ground out against considerable disadvantages. Now, however, the Department of State is a complete unit, with easy communication possible between all its parts. We can have no excuse for performance which is not first in its field.

THE PRESENT

This brings us to the present and to the critical question of performance in the field of foreign affairs. What are some of the issues we face?

I think we may find a clue to this question by examining some of the documents of foreign policy interest which were placed in a copper box in a niche of the cornerstone 4 years ago. These papers describe U.S. action in the development of a United Nations police force for troubled areas—at that time the Middle East. They concern the Soviets' suppression of national freedom—at that time the tragic case history of Hungary. They deal with matters of economic cooperation and technical assistance—ones on which we continue to focus as among the most significant aspects of foreign policy. They relate to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. In short, these activities—in the political, military, scientific, and economic fields—are some of the same ones that occupy our attention today regardless of whether the scene shifts to Cuba, the Congo, Laos, or Tibet.

We call these topics foreign affairs. But are they only this? Of course not. The manner in which decisions affecting them are made has become an integral part of our domestic and public life. The depth of our exposure to international events puts many hard questions to us. The future of our leadership in the world and the survival of free nations will be determined by the perceptiveness and vigor of our response.

PROSPECTS

We are in a new month, a new year, a new decade, and a new building. The cause of peace and the chance of consolidating orderly relations among free nations have become a more complicated affair than when Patrick Henry made those passionate appeals for liberty which so electrified the colonies in the 1770's. He spoke on several occasions in Carpenter's Hall in Philadelphia, where the first effort was made to establish a Foreign Service. His words made us conscious of the degree to which the forces of freedom depend on the freedom of forceful expression.

Our words and our ability to perform are under severe scrutiny today. The possible alternative of Communist leadership in the less developed areas challenges all our diplomatic and technical skills. It especially challenges our capacity for determined, long-range action which will promote areas of political, economic, and social stability.

A look at the Foreign Service roll of honor reminds us of the sacrifices that have been made in the past in many corners and capitals of the world. We read of death by exhaustion, earthquake, and exposure; of death by fever, drowning, and hurricane as well as by gunfire and grenades. May our new building serve as a secure seedbed of ideas and actions that will meet the requirements of a swiftly moving age. We live close to many worlds of challenge and opportunity that lie beyond these doors. We look to the areas outside us not for conformity with our external political judgments but for a healthy diversity of opinion among peoples, countries, and institutions that are in the process of consolidating the precarious foundations of independence and self-respect. We face competition, and our response to it brings us to the critical question as to whether we live in a world where the best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity.

My beliefs run contrary to these lines. Our best efforts will continue. They will carry conviction. The dedication of this building will, I know, provoke a rededication by the men and women of this Department to the ideals and actions of the great men who founded our Nation.

This dedication carries light for the future. It is the light of many minds working together. But more than that, it is the practical example of individual freedoms, national independence, and international cooperation.

PRAYER BY THE RIGHT REVEREND ANGUS DUN, BISHOP OF WASHINGTON

May the Lord of Lords and King of Kings who was able to do exceedingly [and] abundantly above all that we ask or think, overrule for good all that is done in this place. May He grant to all who labor here, unswerving loyalty to the best hopes that have been granted this Nation, a just understanding of the aspirations and fears and needs of other peoples, quiet wisdom in times of stress, and courage in adversity.

May the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit rest upon you and all your work, now and forevermore. Amen.

IMPORTS OF MERCHANDISE BY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill aimed at cutting redtape for small business concerns importing merchandise up to a value of $400.

My bill is identical with H.R. 9240 passed by the House last year. The purpose is to increase to $400 the present $250 limit on the value of goods that may be imported by business firms or individuals under the informal entry procedure.

This bill does not affect the amount of duties collected on any items. It concerns only the procedures.

Section 498(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 originally provided a $100 limit upon the value of merchandise permitted informal entry. This ceiling was increased to $250 in 1953. I consider that the higher $400 ceiling provided in my bill is justified by the price inflation that has occurred during the 8 years since the previous limit was authorized. Because of higher prices the shipments qualifying for informal entry are smaller than was contemplated at the time Congress established the present ceiling.

Under my bill the Secretary of the Treasury would retain the discretion, given to him in the Customs Simplification Act of 1953, to establish a lower ceiling for certain types of merchandise and transactions when circumstances warrant his doing so. This bill does not affect the amount of duties collected.

The Committee on Ways and Means last year received favorable reports on H.R. 9240 from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, and the U.S. Tariff Commission made no objection. The committee's recommendation was unanimous. I am hopeful that the House will take favorable and early action on this subject during the present year because many small business firms, especially those dealing in comparatively inexpensive jewelry items, need this relief from complex and burdensome customs procedures.

THE LATE HONORABLE BENJAMIN F. JAMES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I come to address this House this afternoon. My predecessor and your former colleague passed away Thursday of last week.

I had known Ben James for many years. When I first met him he was a commissioner in Radnor Township. I had the privilege of sitting next to him in two sessions of the Pennsylvania Legislature. I had the honor and the privilege to support him every time he was elected to this great and august body.

Ben James will be missed by his colleagues, by his friends and by the Republican Party of Delaware County. We in Delaware County always thought well of Ben's advice, of his fellowship, of his leadership, and of his fatherly help.

Ben was always on the liberal side voting in Harrisburg many times on such issues as to extend the Workmen's Compensation Act, unemployment insurance, provisions to take care of occupational diseases, and other liberal measures. Ben was one of the leaders in our delegation who worked to abolish the Philadelphia wage tax on nonresidents of that city.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in great humility, that I am able to succeed such a fine statesman and gentleman as my friend Ben James.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry when I read of the death of my dear friend, our late and beloved colleague, Ben James. Ben James was one of the finest men I have ever met. As the gentleman has so well said, he was a dedicated legislator but he had other qualities that were attractive. He was constructive, with a refreshing personality. He was a kindhearted gentleman. He was one who appealed not only to his colleagues in the House but to the people of his district and countless thousands of others.

In the death of Ben James I have lost a dear friend and the country has lost one who was truly a dedicated legislator.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness and great sorrow that we learned of the death of our former colleague and friend, the Honorable Benjamin F. James.

Even though he had been ailing for a number of years the announcement of his death on last Thursday came as a shock to those of us who knew him best.

He was taken to Bryn Mawr Hospital, Philadelphia, on Saturday, January 21, for a series of tests. His condition became critical and he passed away on Thursday, January 27.

Mr. James was born in Philadelphia on August 1, 1885. He attended the public schools and furthered his education, extensively, in the graphic arts—serving continuously in this field.

Since 1910 he resided in Radnor Township, Delaware County, Pa.

In 1929 Ben was appointed a member of the Board of Commissioners of Radnor Township to fill a vacancy, and was reelected to two 4-year terms.

As a Republican, in 1938 he was elected to the House of Representatives in the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and served for the next 8 years.

On November 2, 1948, he was elected to the 80th U.S. Congress as the Representative from the Seventh District of Pennsylvania. He continued in that capacity until he voluntarily retired at the end of the 85th Congress because of failing health. The Honorable WILLIAM MILLIKEN succeeded Mr. James in the 86th Congress.

Ben's history is replete with many fine and interesting accomplishments.

As a printer Ben was a great admirer of Benjamin Franklin, and he became the president of the Franklin Printing Co., founded in 1728 by Benjamin Franklin at Philadelphia. For a number of years and until his death he served as the chairman of the board of that company.

He was a past president of the Typothetae of Philadelphia, and of Printing Industries of Philadelphia, Inc.; past president of the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia; member of the Pennsylvania Society of Sons of the Revolution, Union League of Philadelphia, Lions Club of Wayne, Merion Cricket Club, Welsh Society of Philadelphia and the Masonic Fraternity. He was a veteran of World War I, and a charter member of Anthony Wayne Post No. 418, the American Legion.

During his service in the Congress Ben was a valued member of the Appropriations Committee, and served on the Subcommittees of Post Office and Civil Service, and General Government Matters.

As a member of the Subcommittee on General Government Matters his great experience and knowledge of the graphic arts was of great assistance to Maj. Gen. Thomas North, secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and his assistants, in advising them on the program of photographs—colored lithographs—of our World War II cemeteries and the individual graves of our veterans. His devotion to his duties on his other subcommittees was appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. James is survived by his widow Frieda, several brothers and sisters. To

them is extended the heartfelt sympathy of myself and family. I have lost a fine, personal friend.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Benjamin Franklin James the Pennsylvania delegation mourns the loss of one of its most distinguished former members while those of us who were privileged to be counted among the inner circle of his friends are made desolate by this sad event.

Ben James came to the Congress following a successful career in the printing business and 8 years of distinguished service in the State legislature. His success both in business and in politics reflected an integrity and dedication to duty of the highest order, and our colleague in all of his activities brought credit to the honored name he bore. As a former president of the Poor Richard Club he modeled his life after that of the great Franklin and as a descendant of patriotic Welsh stock he displayed the commendable qualities of that sturdy race.

I was privileged to be not only the close friend but also the confidant of our late colleague and the recital of his life's experiences, together with his sage counsel and advice, has made me a bit better able to meet the challenge of this congressional assignment. Ben James was a conservative in the best traditions of that dedicated group and it was his constant concern that America should avoid the pitfalls which dot the pathway of unbalanced budgets and deficit financing. As a member of our Appropriations Committee he earned the respect of his fellow committeemen of both the right and the left and it was his shrewd but kindly insistence that brought to light many facts resulting in benefit to the taxpayer. Generous to a fault with his own money he was downright parsimonious with public funds and he feared inflation as he did the plague.

Ben James was my good friend and I shall miss him greatly. But I shall always count myself richer for having known this stalwart citizen and distinguished public servant. Ben James was forthright in his spiritual concept and he recognized with most of us that this life's journey is but a fleeting experience in preparation for that larger role beyond the sunset where life truly begins and where he now waits in peace.

To Mrs. James, his brothers, and his sisters, goes our heartfelt sympathy together with the prayerful hope that they will find strength for this sad hour in his life of unselfish service.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our colleagues from Pennsylvania and my other colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to our late and beloved friend, Benjamin F. James, of Pennsylvania. We came to the Congress at the same time and I was saddened, indeed when I learned of his passing.

It was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Appropriations where I learned to love and to respect him greatly. He was a great American. We shall all miss him. To the members of his beloved family, I extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about my friend, Benjamin F. James. He was one of the people in the Congress whom we all respected for his integrity and for his quiet dependability. Ben was the type of person who always had the time to talk with you. He had a gentle, quiet laugh that made everyone of us attached to him. Now we hear of his passing and all of us in the Pennsylvania delegation are sad to hear of it. Ben James was one of the stalwarts in the House when he served as Congressman. You always knew where Ben stood when a matter of principle and conscience was involved on a particular vote or a particular resolution or a particular policy, there was never any doubt where Ben would go, and that was right down the line for that policy which he believed to be best for the American people in the long run, and for no temporary advantage or popular gain.

Ben James was always willing to stand up and vote and be counted. To his family and friends, I extend my sincere sympathy in their loss and express my deep gratitude for his friendship.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to that of my colleagues in noting with sorrow the decease of our esteemed former colleague, Benjamin F. James.

Ben James passed away last Thursday, ending a fruitful life of public service. His service in this great body for five terms which ended with the 85th Congress, followed many years of outstanding service as a member of the Pennsylvania General Assembly.

During his many years in public life, Ben James was known for his intimate knowledge of legislative affairs and his dedication to the welfare of his country and his district.

We shall all miss him greatly—the country has lost a great legislator and many of us have lost a good friend. Our sympathies go out to his bereaved widow, Frieda.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that we record the passing of our very good friend, Benjamin F. James, who served with us in the House for 10 years. It can be said that he was one of Pennsylvania's outstanding Representatives in the Congress.

Ben, as we all knew him, was a humble man who had a kindness of heart and the highest concept of citizenship.

He was always calm, gracious, and courteous, and he will be long remembered for his kind words and deeds.

He was a hard, conscientious worker. A man who was greatly admired and respected by all who knew him and by all who were associated with him.

In all things it can be said that Ben was a great citizen and a great American who very ably served his district, State, and Nation.

So it is with great sadness that we record his passing. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed sorry to learn of the untimely death of my very good friend and colleague, the Honorable Benjamin F. James, and wish to extend my deepest sympathies to his devoted wife.

Mr. James and I were close friends for many years and I prize very highly today the remembrance of this unspoken bond.

He was never too busy to lend a helping hand. He was a willing listener, a gentleman, a scholar, and a fine legislator.

The memory of his goodness will endure.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HEART DISEASE AND CANCER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members of this body, I am in deep accord with President Kennedy's quick and compassionate action in providing additional food to people both in the distressed areas of this country and abroad.

I respectfully suggest that this compassionate concern for our distressed people be immediately extended to the fight against mankind's most ancient and devastating foe—unchecked disease.

Mr. Speaker, last year heart disease killed 900,000 Americans. It is the leading cause of death in this country today, and it is rising in its incidence as we prolong life. The cold statistics tell us that 90 million Americans will die of this disease unless medical research produces new treatments and cures. Two-thirds of the members of this body will die from heart disease unless expanded medical research gives us some urgently needed answers.

At the present time, when our national revenues are being cut down by the stagnation of our economy, we can ill afford the tremendous losses in productivity exacted by heart disease. For example, more than 200,000 victims of heart disease last year were in the working age group from 25 to 64 years of age. If these 200,000 people in the prime of their lives had been able to live and work just 1 extra year, they would have earned over $1 billion in 1960 alone.

Our second leading killer is cancer. Cancer today kills 260,000 Americans—twice as many as it killed a generation ago. Last year, cancer killed an American man, woman, or child every 2 minutes.

This merciless killer knows no restrictions or boundaries—it brings down the high and the mighty, as well as the average citizens who are the backbone of this democracy. In the past decade, it has killed a Secretary of State, a half dozen U.S. Senators, more than a score of Congressmen, several of our greatest atomic scientists, some of our greatest military leaders, and many more too numerous to list here.

Just 2 weeks ago, cancer killed Dr. Tom Dooley, aged 34, whose magnificent medical pioneering in the troubled country of Laos has been hailed on many an occasion on this very floor.

What price the life of Tom Dooley?

What price the lives of 2,000 of our children who die each year from leukemia, the most dreaded child killer of them all?

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is solemnly pledged to an all-out offensive against these diseases. Let me quote from "The Rights of Man," the 1960 platform of our party, adopted in Los Angeles in July of last year:

> Heart disease and cancer together account for two out of every three deaths in this country. The Democratic President will summon to a White House conference the Nation's most distinguished scientists in these fields to map a coordinated long-range program for the prevention and control of these diseases.

On several occasions, President Kennedy has emphasized the need for long-range planning and financial support in mapping the ultimate conquest of these diseases. At Warm Springs, Ga., in October of 1960, he said:

> We must provide long-term grants for increased medical research, including basic research. What has already been accomplished in polio and tuberculosis shows what might soon be accomplished for cancer, mental illness, arteriosclerosis, and new ways of prolonging man's productive days instead of just prolonging his life. All of this and more is underway. But now we must do more—not only more money but longer commitments so that experiments can be planned and equipment bought.

A White House conference on heart disease and cancer will be a historic event, for no previous American President has ever called together the great medical scientists of our country to plan a long-range offensive against these diseases.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I express the sentiments of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, when I respectfully urge the President and leader of our country to lose no time in calling together such a historic conference. I am confident that out of such a conference will come long-range plans leading to a massive attack upon these two diseases which have cursed the family of man since the beginning of recorded history.

U.S. GOLD PRODUCTION, GOLD RESERVES, AND THE MONEY SUPPLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the closing weeks of last year I asked the Library of Congress to furnish me with some background information on U.S. gold production, our monetary gold reserves, movements of gold into and out of the United States, the various categories of claims against our monetary gold reserves, and an analysis of the manner in which changes in our gold reserves affect the Nation's money supply. The material I requested was prepared by Mr. John C. Jackson in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library. I believe that my colleagues in this body will also find this information of considerable interest. In these remarks I will summarize Mr. Jackson's findings. I also include the tables prepared at my request as a part of my remarks:

U.S. GOLD PRODUCTION, 1950–60

Gold produced in the United States in the 11 years 1950–60 totaled 20.6 million ounces, equal to less than 4 percent of the 507.6 million ounces held by the Treasury at the end of December 1960. Annual production has diminished, although some upward fluctuations have occurred, since the first year of this selected sequence of years. Production in 1950 was 2.39 million ounces; in 1960 it was 1.66 million ounces.

While gold production in the United States has been declining, world production has been increasing, reaching new postwar peaks in each of the last 7 successive years.

The principal gold producing States are South Dakota, Utah, Alaska, California, and Arizona. Since 1950, South Dakota has produced around 550,000 or more ounces each year, except in 1951 and 1952. Alaska's production has diminished, particularly after 1955, by more than a third; Utah's production has been unstable, but diminishing; California's production in 1960 was only 30 percent of the 1950 level; Arizona's production generally has increased.

South Dakota's production is entirely from gold ore. Alaska's is almost entirely from gold ore. Utah produced gold principally from copper ore, and from copper-lead-zinc ores. California production is principally from gold ore, with some gold being taken also from silver, copper, and zinc-lead-copper ores. Arizona's production is principally from copper ores, and some from combination ores.

TABLE 1.—*U.S. gold production, by State, annually, 1950–60*

[In troy ounces]

	1960 (preliminary)	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950
Mine production of recoverable gold:											
Alaska	180,000	179,918	186,435	215,467	209,296	249,294	248,511	253,783	240,557	239,637	289,272
Arizona	145,600	124,627	142,979	152,449	146,110	127,616	114,809	112,824	112,355	116,093	118,313
California	122,200	146,141	185,385	170,885	193,816	251,737	237,886	234,591	258,176	339,732	412,118
Colorado	62,100	61,097	79,539	87,928	96,668	88,577	96,146	119,218	125,594	116,503	130,390
Idaho	5,660	10,479	15,896	12,301	9,210	10,572	13,245	7,630	32,997	45,064	79,552
Montana	52,400	28,551	26,003	32,766	38,121	28,123	23,660	24,768	24,161	30,502	51,764
Nevada	50,900	113,443	105,087	76,752	68,040	72,913	79,067	101,799	117,203	121,036	178,446
New Mexico	5,400	3,155	3,378	3,212	3,275	1,917	3,539	2,614	2,949	3,959	3,414
North Carolina		965	876	1,373	882	190	214				
Oregon		686	1,423	3,381	2,738	1,708	6,520	8,488	5,509	7,927	11,058
Pennsylvania	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(2)	1,610	1,317	1,134	1,500	1,500	2,179
South Dakota	550,500	577,730	570,830	568,130	568,523	529,865	541,445	534,987	482,534	458,101	597,996
Tennessee		99	124	172	189	221	218	293	241	108	160
Texas									39	32	49
Utah	340,000	239,517	307,824	378,438	416,031	441,206	403,401	483,430	435,507	432,216	457,551
Vermont				62	1,829	181	185	171	162	156	146
Washington		118,934	113,353	89,708	70,669	74,360	66,740	62,560	54,776	67,405	92,117
Wyoming			117	573	762	52	407	1	1	9	
Undistributed	133,780									[3]4	[4]20
Total	1,657,590	1,603,802	1,739,249	1,793,597	1,827,159	1,880,142	1,837,310	1,958,293	1,893,261	1,960,663	2,394,231

[1] See Washington.
[2] See Vermont.
[3] Georgia, 3 ounces; Maryland, 1 ounce.
[4] Maryland, 20 ounces.
Source: Bureau of Mines.

CHANGES IN U.S. GOLD STOCK, 1950–60

The monetary gold stock of the Treasury supports gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks, is held as reserve against U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, and includes a gold balance in the Treasurer's account.

The monetary gold stock was $24.2 billion in June of 1950, and $22.7 billion at the end of that year. The stock has decreased in seven of the subsequent years, and increased in three of the years. The gold balance in the Treasurer's account has diminished in all but two of the years. The Treasury gold stock has diminished slightly under $5 billion net since the end of 1950; a similar but slightly larger decrease has occurred since the end of 1957.

When a gold outflow has occurred, the United States has transferred the gold to foreign ownership, usually without physically removing it from the country. Some of the monetary stock has supplied gold for industrial uses. The United States has been a net importer of gold in each of the years selected, except 1950 and 1951. Earmarking of gold reflects both import and export activity, and changes in ownership.

TABLE 2.—*Changes in U.S. gold stock, annually, 1950–60*

[Millions of dollars]

End of year	Total Treasury stock	Liabilities [1]	Balance Treasurer's account	Change in stock	Net import or export (−)	Change in earmarked gold (increase (−))
1960	17,766.8	17,665.6	101.2	−1,689.3	[2]	[2]
1959	19,456.1	19,350.5	105.6	−1,078.0	302	−1,324
1958	20,534.1	20,138.2	395.8	−2,246.6	260	−2,515
1957	22,780.7	22,272.9	507.8	831.6	104	600
1956	21,949.1	21,458.3	490.7	258.7	106	319
1955	21,690.4	21,199.1	491.2	−21.9	97	−132
1954	21,712.3	21,223.5	488.8	−317.2	16	−325
1953	22,029.5	21,545.7	483.7	−1,156.7	2	−1,171
1952	23,186.2	22,178.9	1,007.3	493.7	684	−305
1951	22,695.5	21,662.6	1,032.9	−10.6	−504	618
1950	22,706.1	21,653.5	1,052.6	−1,721.0	−371	−1,352

[1] Comprises gold certificates held by public and in Federal Reserve banks; gold certificate credit held by Federal Reserve System in gold certificate fund and Federal Reserve note redemption funds; and $156,000,000 against U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890.
[2] Unavailable.

Source: Treasury Department and Federal Reserve System.

CLAIMS AGAINST U.S. GOLD RESERVES

The principal claim against the Treasury's gold stock is the gold certificates issued to the Federal Reserve banks. The certificates constitute the reserves of the 12 district Federal Reserve banks. They impose a statutory limit on the liabilities of the banks. The liabilities are of two principal sorts: Federal Reserve notes—in denominations of $5 and higher—and liabilities for the reserves held by the member banks at the district bank. These two sorts of liabilities together cannot total more than four times the gold certificates held. Currently, they are less than three times as much as the gold certificates; in 1950 they were twice the amount of the reserves. Required reserves increase in prosperity, and decrease in recession. Since the end of 1951 the Federal Reserve banks have needed to hold above $11.5 billion each year.

While Federal Reserve liabilities are a claim on the gold stock, the banks cannot obtain gold according to the amount of their liabilities, but must limit their liabilities according to the amount of gold certificates. Treasury purchases or sales of gold produce a corresponding change in the amount of gold certificates held by the Federal Reserve banks.

The only liabilities of banks in the United States, or of the Treasury, which can be paid in gold are liabilities to foreign governments and central banks, and to the International Monetary Fund. Short term liabilities to foreign official holders totaled $3.6 billion at the end of 1950 and $10.3 billion at the end of October 1960. Partly offsetting these liabilities are short-term claims on foreigners, which increased from $898 million at the end of 1950 to $3.3 billion at the end of October 1960.

Required reserves of $11.6 billion, short-term liabilities of $3.7 billion to international institutions, $10.3 billion to foreign official holders, less $3.3 billion of claims, totaling $22.3 billion, exceeded the gold stock of $18.4 billion in October 1960. The excess of claims, of course, would be greater if nonofficial foreign holdings of dollar balances were added. When appraising the possibilities of excessive demands for gold, notice should be taken of the facts that, first, confidence in the dollar is sufficiently high that foreign holdings continue to grow; second, nearly one-fifth of the claims are from international institutions which are committed to support the international position of the dollar as well as other currencies; third, one-eighth of the foreign dollar balances are held by Germany, one-eighth by Canada, neither of which has bought gold from the United States; and almost one-fifth of the dollar balance claims are held by Japan and by the United Kingdom. These nations would be expected to cooperate in preserving the position of the dollar in the world's monetary arrangements; fourth, other nations need their dollar balances for purposes of payments; fifth, foreign individuals and businesses cannot obtain gold directly from the Treasury, but their demands may lead to central bank purchases from the Treasury. It is also to be noticed that high prices of gold in the London and other gold markets—from which almost two-thirds as much monetary gold was obtained in 1958–September 1960 as from the United States—would tend to direct foreign demand for gold toward the U.S. Treasury. Another factor to consider in estimating the future demand for gold is the size of the reserves held by foreign banks and governments. More than two-thirds of Italy's reserve has been accumulated in the last 3 years. France has acquired nearly two-thirds of its reserve in the same period. Over one-third of the United Kingdom stock has been obtained in the last 3 years. Nearly 90 percent of Japan's holdings have been bought in that period. The adequacy of present stocks cannot readily be judged; several nations in Europe hold more gold in relation to currency and bank deposits than is held by the United States. Japan's gold supply is about 7 percent as much as its annual merchandise and service imports, while the United States reserves are 90 percent as much as the volume of imports. More detailed comparisons of gold supplies and related facts might demonstrate that there is no universal measure of the adequacy of gold supply; and would allow the conclusion that the volume of gold supply does not control a country's rate of economic progress and development.

TABLE 3.—*Required gold certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve banks*

End of year	Required reserves, 25 percent of notes and deposits	Federal Reserve notes	Federal Reserve deposit liabilities	Actual reserve percentage	End of year	Required reserves, 25 percent of notes and deposits	Federal Reserve notes	Federal Reserve deposit liabilities	Actual reserve percentage
	Billions	*Billions*	*Billions*			*Billions*	*Billions*	*Billions*	
1960	$11.63	$28.58	$17.69	37.9	1954	$11.66	$26.25	$20.37	45.1
1959	11.99	28.26	19.72	39.9	1953	12.00	26.56	21.42	44.5
1958	11.85	27.87	19.53	42.1	1952	11.91	26.25	21.34	46.2
1957	11.91	27.53	20.12	46.3	1951	11.56	25.06	21.19	46.4
1956	11.93	27.48	20.25	44.6	1950	10.85	23.59	19.81	49.4
1955	11.82	26.92	20.36	44.4					

Source: Federal Reserve System.

TABLE 4.—*Short-term U.S. banking liabilities to and claims on foreigners*

[Millions of dollars]

End of calendar year or month	Short-term liabilities to foreigners					Short-term claims on foreigners			
	Total	Payable in dollars			Payable in foreign currencies	Total	Payable in dollars		Payable in foreign currencies
		Foreign official	Other foreign	International			Loans to foreign banks	Other	
1950	8,644.8	3,620.3	3,451.7	1,527.8	44.9	898.0	151.1	506.3	240.6
1951	9,302.2	3,547.6	4,041.2	1,641.1	72.2	968.4	177.2	699.4	91.8
1952	10,546.1	4,654.2	4,245.6	1,584.9	61.4	1,048.7	122.9	847.5	78.4
1953	11,648.4	5,666.9	4,308.4	1,629.4	43.7	904.5	156.5	646.5	101.6
1954	12,918.6	6,770.1	4,335.4	1,709.9	43.2	1,386.5	206.5	969.0	211.0
1955	13,600.7	6,952.8	4,726.5	1,881.1	40.3	1,548.5	328.1	1,056.5	163.9
1956	14,939.1	[1] 8,045.4	[1] 5,392.8	1,452.1	48.8	1,945.7	405.4	1,390.8	149.6
1957	15,158.3	[1] 7,916.6	[1] 5,665.3	1,517.3	59.0	2,199.4	385.5	1,666.5	147.3
1958	16,159.1	8,664.9	5,890.8	1,544.0	59.4	2,542.0	439.4	1,904.9	197.7
1959	19,387.5	9,145.1	7,007.1	3,158.1	77.2	2,623.3	497.6	1,908.5	217.2
1960, October [2]	21,430.6	10,291.1	7,323.5	3,681.2	134.8	3,319.3	504.7	2,359.0	455.5

[1] Beginning in August 1956 and again in April 1957, certain accounts previously classified as "Other foreign" are included in "Foreign official."

[2] Preliminary.

Source: Treasury Department.

TABLE 5.—*Changes in monetary gold stocks of selected foreign countries, January 1958–September 1960*

[In millions of dollars]

	Through transactions with—			Gold stock, Sept. 30, 1960
	United States	IMF [1]	Other [2]	
Germany	0	−$114	$461	$2,889
United Kingdom	[3] $1,250	−163	[3] −162	[3] 2,525
Italy	[4] 349	−68	[4] 1,261	[4] 1,994
Switzerland	355	0	−81	1,980
France	322	−66	790	1,627
Netherlands	436	−34	200	1,346
Belgium	426	−28	−219	1,094
Canada	0	−63	−143	894
Portugal	30	0	59	550
Venezuela	−65	0	−193	462
Austria	168	−6	28	293
Japan	[5] 187	−63	[5] 97	[5] 244
All foreign countries	3,803	1,052	2,160	19,434

[1] Gold payments to the IMF on account of capital subscriptions.

[2] Residual figures; including gold acquired from new production, Russian sales, etc.

[3] Through June 30, 1960. Additional $200,000,000 of gold was purchased from the United States in the 3d quarter of 1960.

[4] Through June 30, 1960.

[5] Through Mar. 31, 1960. Additional $15,000,000 of gold was purchased from the United States in the 3d quarter of 1960.

Sources: Derived from data in Federal Reserve Bulletin and International Financial Statistics. First National City Bank.

EFFECTS OF TREASURY PURCHASE AND SALE OF GOLD ON MONEY SUPPLY

Mr. Speaker, the mechanism of the effect of gold purchases and sales on bank reserves and lending power is described in the following excerpt from a pamphlet prepared by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago:

Treasury purchases of gold increase banks' reserves—an inflow of gold into this country ordinarily adds to bank reserves by an identical amount.

Since it is unlawful to hold gold in this country except as it is used industrially and in token amounts, freshly mined gold or gold coming into the country from abroad must be sold to the Treasury. The Treasury pays for the gold with a check on its account at the Federal Reserve bank. The recipient of the check deposits it with a commercial bank for which he receives a deposit account. The commercial bank sends it to the Federal Reserve bank for collection. Funds in the amount of the check are transferred from the Treasury account to the account (reserves) of the commercial bank. The Treasury then sends the Federal Reserve bank a gold certificate for the amount of the check (gold purchased) and the Federal Reserve bank credits the Treasury account with the amount of the gold certificate.

This process may be summarized on the balance sheet of the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks as follows:

1. The commercial bank's deposit liabilities are increased by the amount of the gold seller's check, say $100.

2. The commercial bank's reserves at the Federal Reserve bank are increased by the amount of the check and will appear also as an asset of the commercial bank.

3. The Federal Reserve's holdings of gold certificates will increase by $100. The Treasury's account at the Federal Reserve will be unchanged.

Note that the commercial bank's required reserves will go up by only $20 while its total reserves have increased by $100—leaving $80 which it may lend. Excess reserves result from an inflow of gold in the same way as they do from an inflow of currency.

Treasury gold sales reduce banks' reserves—an outflow of gold destroys bank reserves. When gold is purchased from the Treasury, it is paid for by check. The Treasury sends the check to the Federal Reserve bank for collection. The Federal Reserve bank debits the account (reserve) of the bank upon which the check is drawn. It sends the Treasury a gold certificate for the amount of the check rather than crediting its account. The commercial bank debits the deposit account of the depositor who purchased the gold from the Treasury.

This transaction may be summarized on the balance sheets of the commercial bank and the Federal Reserve bank as follows:

1. The commercial bank's deposit liabilities are reduced by, say, $100.

2. The reserves of the commercial bank are reduced by the amount of the check.

3. The Federal Reserve bank has its gold certificates reduced by a similar amount.

Note that, as was the case when there was an outflow of currency, the loss of reserves exceeds the reduction in required reserves.

Mr. Speaker, acquisitions of domestically produced gold are, in some years, greater than transfers from or to foreign ownership. In other years, these latter transfers are 20 to 40 times as great as annual purchases of domestic gold.

Purchase of domestic gold, and gold inflow or outflow from or to other nations, increase the money supply of the United States by the amount of the purchase, since gold is money in some contexts. Whether it affects the currency and bank deposits which families and businesses have available to spend depends on whether or not the gold flow, first, is offset by action of the Federal Reserve authorities to control the volume of bank reserves; second, affects the willingness of banks to lend within the limits of existing reserves; and third, is deliberately offset or reinforced by public policies with respect to Federal expenditures, international trade, and investment.

In the 11 years 1950–60, gold movements have reduced bank reserves and, therefore, the ability to lend to business, consumers, and governments, by significant amounts in at least 5 years. These generally were years of recession. In 3 boom years, gold movements have increased bank reserves and ability to lend.

The Federal Reserve authorities have taken action which offset the effects of gold movements, or allowed other developments to offset the effects on bank reserves, to a much more substantial degree than they have reinforced gold movements. The table which follows shows the outlines of the offsetting and reinforcing actions.

If bank reserves were managed in conformity with the simplest rules for an international gold standard, the offsetting actions might not have been taken. In the recession years 1953 and 1954 the effects of gold outflows in fact were reinforced by monetary policy, but not so far as to raise interest rates in 1954. The recovery or boom years of 1951, 1957, and 1959 would have witnessed greater availability of bank credit, and the recession years 1958 and 1960 less availability and higher interest rates. If the more sophisticated textbook model were followed, a number of devaluations and revaluations of the dollar would have occurred.

TABLE 6.—*Gold movements and other factors affecting member bank reserves (averages of daily figures for December of each year)*

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Gold movements		Other factors		Net change in member bank reserves
	Increasing member bank reserves	Decreasing member bank reserves	Offsetting gold movements	Reinforcing gold movements	
1960		$1,689	$2,070		$381
1959		1,078	1,101		33
1958		2,247	1,726		−521
1957	$832		−947		−115
1956	259			$36	295
1955		23		−16	−39
1954		317		−324	−641
1953		1,157		−103	−1,260
1952	492			78	870
1951		11	2,930		2,919
1950		1,572	2,672		1,100

NOTE.—In 1960, the gold outflow was offset principally by Federal Reserve Board action to allow member banks to count vault cash as reserves. Open market purchases were the principal offsets in 1959 and 1958, and open market sales were the most important offset in 1957. Gold movements were offset also in 1951, by open market purchases and member bank borrowing, partly counterbalanced by an increase in currency circulation. Gold movements were reinforced in 1956, adding to member bank reserves, by an increase in "float" and open market purchases, offset in part by decreased member bank borrowing. In 1955, currency outflow and open market sales more than offset an increase in float and in borrowing, to reduce reserves. In 1954, open market sales were the principal factor reducing reserves; reduction in currency outstanding increased reserves. In 1953, increased borrowing and currency circulation plus reduced float more than offset open market purchases to reinforce the gold outflow and reduce reserves. In 1952, an increase in currency in circulation was more than offset by open market purchases and member bank borrowing. In 1960, open market purchases more than offset the gold outflow.

TO THE MEMORY OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—A TRIBUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in the tributes to the memory of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the occasion of his birthday anniversary which we celebrated yesterday.

Mere words are not sufficient tribute to our 32d President. Our acknowledgment of his greatness also should be apparent in our determined pledge to work for our country in the humanitarian spirit which Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought to public affairs.

In the aftermath of an inspiring inaugural address, we sense in the new administration of President John F. Kennedy the same humanitarian spirit which moved Franklin D. Roosevelt to lead America out of the depths of economic despair and through the perils of a world at war toward her rendezvous with destiny.

From the magnitude of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's ideals, we gained a new lease on life. We perceived the potential of America. He renewed our belief in the principle of human dignity. Reminding us that "mere survival calls for new pioneering on our part," he inspired us to move forward to lend ourselves and our resources to the betterment of all mankind.

In commemorating George Rogers Clark and his frontiersmen of 1774 Franklin D. Roosevelt, on November 16, 1934, cited their example "to guide us in the conquest of new frontiers of the spirit that are neither physical nor geographical." As we stand on the new frontiers of the 1960's, President Kennedy has similarly challenged us. Our tasks today are no less than they were in the Roosevelt administration. We must devote ourselves to the search for peace in the same manner President Roosevelt was dedicated in his endeavors to bring peace around the globe.

We ought to remember President Roosevelt's words which were part of an address he gave to the young men of West Point Academy, on June 12, 1935, and I quote:

> The greatest need of the world today is the assurance of permanent peace—an assurance based on mutual understanding and mutual regard.

Our tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt should be no less than our total dedication toward this end.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to pick up a newspaper or a news magazine these days without reference to one of the most important domestic problems facing our Nation, a decline in business activity and increasing unemployment. Many times, these items refer to the high inventory of unsold automobiles which is resulting in drastic cutbacks in auto production. There is no question about it, automobile production has a tremendous impact on our whole economy—far more than is generally understood and appreciated.

Last week's U.S. News & World Report carried an article which I ask to have included in the RECORD, about how the auto industry is adding to recession worries as other lines of business have been weakening.

During the past few weeks and months we have heard many suggestions about a possible solution to unemployment by aid for our depressed areas. Without arguing the merit of these suggestions, I remind you of the old adage, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." Why is it necessary for an area to become depressed, to have massive unemployment, and to give away surplus food before we try to act to prevent catastrophe?

Our workers in Michigan want to be active at their places on the production line, not inactive in a Government surplus food line. They do not want dried eggs; they want dried paint on new cars so they can have dried ink on a paycheck that will buy fresh eggs. They prefer to be compensated for employment rather than compensated for unemployment.

With automobile production down, unemployment problems are naturally growing in our area and this marks the beginning of a chain reaction which will be felt in most every congressional district in the country. It is just that simple.

What must be done to stop this? We must stimulate the sale of cars which will increase production, eliminate unemployment, add to the demand for raw materials such as leather, glass, steel, rubber, aluminum, and innumerable other products as well as create business activity with the automobile dealers and finance people in every city and village of the United States.

How can this be done? By lowering the price of automobiles. There is one solution, so practical, so valid, so obvious, and so effective, it is difficult indeed to understand why it has not been done. As I suggested to you in the 85th and 86th Congresses, my answer is to repeal the discriminatory, wartime 10-percent tax on automobiles. This tax was originally enacted to put the brake on automobile production during the Korean war. Now when it is sorely needed, it is time to take that brake off and get the economy rolling and, at the same time, correct a tax inequity that continues to discriminate against an industry providing the lifeblood of one out of every seven persons in the United States.

Today I have again introduced my bill to repeal this tax and it is my hope that the members of the Ways and Means Committee will give this proposal their careful study and consideration as they direct their attention to measures to stimulate our economy and the subject of general tax revision.

The article referred to follows:

A SLOW START FOR AUTOS

DETROIT.—All signs at this point suggest that the auto industry will not give business a lift in the first half of this year.

New cars are not selling as well as the industry expected. In the first 10 days of January, the daily rate of sales trailed December by nearly 16 percent and lagged behind the level of a year ago by more than 11 percent.

Used car sales, too, have been sluggish, and used car prices have fallen.

The backlog: big. With sales slower, inventories of both new cars and used cars tend to remain unusually high. At last report, more than 1 million new cars were in dealers' hands, and the number was increasing in spite of sharp cutbacks in production.

January had been chosen by the industry as the month in which to bring inventories under control. Production was originally set, according to "Ward's Automotive Reports," at about 465,000 cars, down from 522,000 in December and 688,000 a year ago. As the month dragged on, further adjustments trimmed the January estimate to about 450,000.

Short workweeks, layoffs, and week long shutdowns have been widespread, complicating the unemployment problem faced by the new Kennedy administration.

Company officials say they hope to raise output a bit in February and March, in line with seasonal trends. However, layoffs are still being announced here and there.

March, normally the peak month for output in the spring, will, at most, be only a little better than January, if present production schedules hold.

All this is in sharp contrast to the picture drawn for 1961 by company leaders at the time new models were coming out last autumn. Estimates of sales, including foreign cars, then ranged from 6.5 to 7 million, indicating 1961 would be as good a year as 1960 or better. The sales estimates are now being scaled down.

Output this year is estimated by the U.S. Department of Commerce at 5.8 million, down from nearly 6.7 million in 1960, reflecting the prospect of a cut in inventories, in place of the big buildup that occurred last year.

Now the question is being asked: What's gone wrong with the auto market? In the industry, several answers are advanced.

For one thing, the recession undoubtedly is causing some people to put off buying, many dealers and auto officials say.

The stolen sales: There is also a widespread view that heavy clearance sales of 1960 models toward the end of last year stole sales from the 1961 models and cast a shadow over their introduction. Heavy stocks of the old models were on hand when the new models came out in the autumn and, even now, some 1960 models are still available at bargain prices.

For a time, sales of the old models inflated the auto market, making it appear buoyant. Then, as the old stocks were cleared out, the sales slump showed up.

The switch to the compact cars is still being studied for its impact on the market. The complaint is heard that some of the new compacts introduced by the medium-price makes are not helping sales and may be causing the customer to hesitate longer.

Finally, there is the effect of the backup of unsold used cars. A drop in used-car prices means lower trade-in allowances which, in turn, mean higher out-of-pocket costs and larger financing charges for the buyers of new cars. That, of course, makes it harder for the dealer to offer attractive deals.

More customers, but—. Although the auto market has slipped, a recent survey by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center indicates that there are more potential customers for new cars now than there were a year ago.

A whole series of steps is being planned by the companies to meet the problem. Months earlier than usual, they are beginning to offer prizes and rebates to their dealers to induce them, in turn, to offer bigger discounts from list prices to the public.

Production cutbacks are emphasizing the trend away from medium-price makes. Ford is switching its St. Louis plant from making Mercurys to Fords. Studies of new models, smaller than present compacts, are going forward.

Finally, officials say, output for the balance of the year will be geared closely to sales and may even lag behind sales so as to reduce the inventory from the million-car level to around 750,000 by the year's end.

Thus, where last year saw more than 420,000 cars added to inventories, this year may see about 250,000 taken out. Result: a drop in output of 670,000, without allowing for any dip in sales.

That is a program which spells substantially lower output than last year, more trouble for auto workers, and less demand for steel, copper, aluminum and glass, unless auto sales show a far greater rebound this coming spring than the industry is now expecting.

THE WAY THE WORLD LOOKS TO THE VERY YOUNG

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our new President addressed the Nation on the state of the Union. It seems that Mr. Kennedy has an obsession with a black array of terrors, most of them badly out of perspective. He laments all worldly problems and simultaneously tells us what he noticeably neglected in the campaign, viz, that all problems cannot be solved overnight from Washington.

On January 10, 1961, the Dunkirk Evening Observer, one of the finest papers in western New York, addressed an editorial to the youthful outlook of the new Kennedy administration. I would like to share the humor and the wisdom of this editorial with my colleagues. I think it a fitting comment on the entire Kennedy administration to date, and even though written prior to Mr. Kennedy's state of the Union message, it sums up the feeling of many of us with reference to that address:

YOUTH AND EXPERIENCE

Over the Christmas holiday period members of the new administration revealed their outlook as youthful.

Reports indicated great criticism directed at the agencies of Government under Eisenhower and Truman.

That is the way the world looks to the very young. Everything done heretofore to resolve the world's ills is wrong. But it takes the seasoning of experience to learn that the world of humans will still be wrong even after the theoretical corrections dreamed of by enthusiastic youth have been applied.

There comes a time with full maturity when poor old pop will be more fully understood. Then he will not be regarded as so old-fashioned and stupid after all. Youthful brilliance must be compounded with experience to develop any leader to his fullest capacities.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States. The Council would be composed of 21 persons widely recognized for their knowledge, of, or experience in, the arts. They would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for 6-year terms.

This legislation was originally proposed by President Eisenhower in his 1955 state of the Union message to Congress. Following is a quotation from that message:

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation.

Since 1955 bills to implement Mr. Eisenhower's recommendation have been introduced in each Congress on a bipartisan basis. I am happy to join in the effort to enact this legislation.

There is a profound national interest in the encouragement and development of both the practice and appreciation of the arts by our citizens. Not only does art enrich the lives of individual citizens, but our national life and the impact of our country abroad is enhanced by cultural development. In a variety of ways, activities of the Federal Government have an effect upon artistic and cultural development. However, there is today no means for coordinating these activities. The enactment of this proposal to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts would therefore meet a long-recognized need. I hope the Committee on Education and Labor will favorably consider the matter and that early action in the House and Senate will follow.

PACKING THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we now have a Democrat inaugurated as President of the United States. We have a Senate and House. Two-thirds of the membership in each are members of the Democrat Party.

We know what the platform of the Democrat Party is. We have read it. The reference is to the one adopted at Los Angeles.

We know and remember the campaign speeches made by the President when he was a candidate. We know what happened today.

In my judgment, all the talk today boils down to this—that now the President, the Speaker, and the leaders of the Democrat Party insist there be put upon the Rules Committee two additional Democrat members who will be "yes men."

The Speaker and his party leaders were, in my opinion, hunting for two

rubberstamps—just as the party did in the Roosevelt regime. Two on the committee who will vote or "roll over" when the Democrat leadership speaks.

All that being true, the responsibility of putting through the party program rests entirely on your shoulders over there on my right. No longer can you avoid action and its results by charging the Republican Party with obstruction. You have the President, you have two-thirds of the membership of Senate and House. You have the ball. Go someplace. We do not have the votes to stop or hold you. You have 4 years to put across your panacea. If you have the courage of your convictions, put it through and see the results.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have always respected and admired the gentleman from Michigan. He is a member of the same committee on which I serve. I doubt very much if the genttleman wants to stand on the statement that any Member of this Congress, Democrat or Republican, would ever sell out his own best individual judgment and become a rubberstamp for anyone.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not say anything about selling out; no such charge is made or intended. Two hundred and seventeen Members, one less than a majority of the House just yielded to or believed in the arguments and entreaties of the President, the Speaker, the party leaders. You are old enough, have lived long enough, and you have had enough experience in Chicago to know, have you not, that during the Roosevelt administration we had rubberstamp legislation. We had yes-men. It was my privilege to be here when the House passed bills that were not even printed; just a typewritten copy. The bills came in. They were rubberstamped. Many did not know how the legislation was written; what it meant—its effect.

One time the farmers in my district called upon me to explain a farm bill. A group of farmers from six counties was assembled. They said, "I wish you would explain this bill to us." It had 70 or 80 pages. I said, "Well, I cannot." "Well," they said, "you voted against it. Why did you do that?" I said, "Let me have the bill," and I began to read. Do you know what the first paragraph was? In substance it was this: "Whenever the President"—that was Franklin Delano Roosevelt—"shall deem an emergency imminent"—then the bill continued with the granting of power to be exercised by the President. I did not then believe the Congress should grant arbitrary power to any President to be exercised at his whim.

That is what is today proposed and to make the way easier, two rubberstamps, two yes-men, are needed, both chosen by the Speaker, also doubtless the Democrat majority of the Ways and Means Committee will be permitted to approve the choice.

Who wants that kind of legislation? Who wants that power vested in anyone under which they will undertake to reorganize this Government in such way as to transfer the powers of the Congress to the President? Are you in favor of reorganization bills to do that? Are you? Well, I will not ask you to go on record; all I ask you to do is to read what the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and what your Speaker want to do. This will give him the power to select somebody who will be a rubberstamp subject to his request—not sell out—just yield to argument, which overpowers him. I submit to you that the reorganization plan will take away from the Congress that power granted in the very first phrase of the Constitution and confer it upon the President.

THE EISENHOWER-NIXON ADMINISTRATION

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, at noon on January 20, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration passed into history.

I wish those who never came back from bloody Belleau Wood, scarred Iwo Jima, and desolate Heartbreak Ridge now could be in this distinguished Chamber. They could instruct us how to cherish 8 years during which an administration kept the peace with strength and honor.

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration is the first administration which did not disarm America after a war. So it is shocking that a few highly vocal, especially motivated armchair strategists try to discredit such a record. Among the discreditors who flare loudly their discordant trumpets of criticism are those who fiddled soothingly upon their violins of praise for the Truman administration, an administration that ignored the dangers of communism and dismantled the finest conventional armies and the largest air and sea armadas in history.

Today, the United States has rebuilt the strongest, best prepared nation on earth. Let Russia attempt a Pearl Harbor. Our intelligence system will alert us, and our retaliatory forces will strike back and destroy Russia. Said the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, on a March night last year:

> As one familiar with our capabilities, I want to assure you that even if the Communists launched an all-out thermonuclear attack on the United States tonight, nothing could prevent their bringing down upon themselves vast destruction from the retaliatory blows which we would still be able to deliver against them.

Said the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke:

> We are stronger, far stronger, than any potential aggressor. This is true not only of our nuclear weapon capabilities—it is true of our whole military posture.

Said Air Force Gen. Curtis LeMay:

> We maintain military forces capable of deterring Soviet aggression. Our forces are strong enough to prevent war—or win such war if it is thrust upon us.

Mr. Speaker, these clear-cut, concise pronouncements were made not by politicians, not by theoreticians, but by military men. They were made before we had perfected the most nearly invulnerable weapon in the history of warfare, the Polaris.

To those in the other party who sought political benefit in belittling America's military strength, I say now: For the next 4 years your party must bear the awesome responsibility of insuring that Russia does not catch up with the vast military lead this Republican administration bequeathed to you on January 20. And I warn you that the enactment of your platform promises into legislation would so sap the economic strength of our Nation that military preparedness would suffer, and our lead would be lost to Communist Russia, and freedom might die.

BRUSH FIRE WAR PREVENTION

In this dangerous age, let us never forget that we face the outbreak both of brush fire wars and general nuclear wars.

We should be concerned that our capability to extinguish brush fire wars remains constantly ready. For few Americans have forgotten how, on the eve of Korea, we had only a one-weapon capability, the big bomb, and we had only one army division at full strength. The Korean disaster forced the Truman administration to cease famishing the military in order to conduct a crash program of limited war rearmament. So great were the global Communist threats that the military strength of our allies, waning because of apathetic U.S. leadership, had to be built up.

By July 1960, the Eisenhower administration had not only freed many allied divisions from a tiedown in Korea which permitted the Communists freedom of action elsewhere, but also had raised the allied limited war deterrent capability to approximately 200 ground divisions, and some 250 strategically located bases.

Had the Truman administration prepared as had the Eisenhower administration, Korea, had it occurred at all, would have been a mere Lebanon operation, not a taker of thousands of American lives.

The problem of limited war preparedness, I point out, needs constant reevaluation. The vehicles of waging nuclear war are vehicles of the supersonic age, while the vehicles of waging limited war, the steamer, the railroad, the airplane, are still subsonic: It takes about 14 minutes for the Polaris missile to span 1,200 miles to land on target. It takes days and weeks to move divisions of troops by aircraft and ship.

True enough, our airlift performed well in Lebanon, and more recently in the United Nations action in Africa.

Still, the only way that we can decrease limited war reaction time to a par with nuclear war reaction time is by the

development of missile carriers for troops. The best technological research, as yet, makes this impossible. Thus, we must maintain our marvelous aircraft carrier versatility, our allied divisions near troubled spots, and improve our conventional airlift. This means continuing what General Lemnitzer has called a "forward strategy."

Only recently, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration took a bold, imaginative step to supplement this forward strategy. The recent offer of medium range ballistic missiles to NATO can refortify the NATO deterrent and, along with a recommended conventional war buildup, foil any Kremlin attempts to divide and nibble away NATO by actions of a lesser magnitude than a direct attack on the United States. The Eisenhower administration, even in its last days in office, constantly reevaluated military needs, met new demands with the best, latest modern technology and research.

U.S. STRIKE-BACK CAPACITY

Let us now turn to the type of war resulting from an attack by the Soviet Russians on the United States.

What are the Russian capabilities for such an attack?

The recent report on Britian's Institute for Strategic Studies credits Russia with about 35 operational ICBM's, and about 200 long-range bombers. Her fleet of medium-range bombers have a questionable capacity for hitting U.S. targets. Their IRBM's cannot hit targets in the United States. In other words, Russia and Red China combined—the entire Communist axis—have about 235 instruments that have an alleged capability of nuclear delivery upon the continental United States.

What are the comparable U.S. capabilities?

Roaming the seven seas able to hit almost any important part of the Russian heartland, are two Polaris submarines with a combined total of 32 missiles, each missile capable of much more destruction than was rained upon Hiroshima with three of these Polaris submarines soon to be launched. No military man would be willing to trade these invulnerable, flexible, solid fuel, instant reaction missiles of the second generation with the 35 first generation, vulnerable, liquid fuel Russian ICBM's, which in some cases experienced a 30-minute delay before fueling for firing can be completed.

About 16 intercontinental Atlas missiles, a number in firing position; and there are 5 more of these Polaris submarines off the ways which will soon be put to sea, each carrying 15 Polaris missiles.

And, what is even more important, as well as amazing, are two new developments which now have been successfully tested: the Minuteman solid fuel, second generation, long-range missile, which is much more mobile than either the Atlas or Titan and can be transported and fired from railway or ship, making it almost invulnerable to attack; and Samos, the intelligence rocket, which is presently encircling the globe, with equipment capable of taking pictures of all parts of the earth and relaying them back for information and study, which is making such intelligence flights as the U–2 out of date. This intelligence rocket is truly amazing. Russia has nothing comparable to either the Polaris, the Minuteman, or Samos. No wonder the study made since the Kennedy administration came into power in reference to our comparative defense posture says that Russia is not ahead of us.

Over 600 long-range B–52 jet bombers, each carrying more destructive, explosive power than used by all the combattants in World War II, and many equipped with the Hound Dog, a 500 mile range missile. Could these bombers penetrate the Russian air defenses? Secretary of Defense Gates recently noted that, in the past 4 years "American reconnaissance planes have riddled their air defenses and made a proper mockery of their refusal to open their skies as willingly as we would open ours to them." So, it seems apparent that sufficient numbers of these planes, with their bombs and missiles, could reach Russia to destroy Moscow and key industrial areas, not once, but many times over.

Nearly 1,400 B–47 medium-range jet bombers, based in United States and abroad, with a 4,500 statute-mile range and distances beyond with air-to-air refueling.

Only recently SAC placed in operation B–58 "Hustlers," the first of U.S. supersonic medium-range jet bombers which incidentally just broke the world speed record for strategic bombers.

Fourteen aircraft carriers able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force. Well over 200 of these aircraft are with the 6th and 7th Fleets capable of strikes at areas of Soviet military concern.

Eighteen wings of tactical aircraft, each wing with a substantial nuclear attack capability deployed globally.

Sixty Thor IRBM's deployed in England capable of raining nuclear destruction on Russia.

Thirty Jupiter IRBM's being installed in bases in Italy, from which Russia can be hit.

Totaling all this, we see that the United States has well over 2,000 nuclear carrying vehicles capable of reaching Russia. This represents a sizable superiority of destructive power.

SOVIET STRATEGY OF DECEPTION

Mr. Speaker, this military lead over Soviet Russia, which a Republican administration passed to a Democratic administration on January 20, should afford that new administration with no reason for complacency. Time and again military history tells of the disastrous defeat of stronger nations by weaker ones. The instruments of such defeats always have been surprises and deceptions which have destroyed the opponent's freedom of action and will to resist.

I would remind the new administration of the classic deception at the Battle of Cannae. Hannibal baited the Romans into attacking his center, which he steadily withdrew. While the Romans poured their legions into the widening jaws of this trap, Hannibal's reserves closed in on the exposed Roman flanks and rear. A massacre ensued.

For 8 years now, the Kremlin masters have tried to lure America into traps like Cannae. For example, from 1954 through 1956, the Soviets attempted to deceive us into concentrating on an unbalanced, massive bomber buildup, at the very time actually they were switching to missiles.

What is more, the Soviets wanted to decoy our vision by dramatizing one or two dangers, so we would forget other dangers and react in a way which would open up our flanks, our military, economic, scientific, psychological, and spiritual flanks. The Soviets wanted to brainwash America into an inferiority complex which would downgrade our own achievements and thus weaken our will and confidence to remain firm. The Soviets wanted us to think in terms of 1 or 2 crisis years, not in terms of an age of conflict; in terms of a numbers-matching game where Russia picked the weapons, not in terms of military forces, balanced and versatile.

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration fell into none of these traps, and I want the new administration to avoid them.

Neither has the Eisenhower administration deigned to use preparedness as a political football. Despite all the partisan shenanigans during the recent election campaign, the Democratic Congresses during the Eisenhower administration increased the defense budget over the President's request only in election years. In off election years, they cut back so much that during the entire Eisenhower administration, $1,658 million was cut from President Eisenhower's requests.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include a table to document this statement. (See table A.)

In preparedness spending, the Eisenhower administration, standing above politics, avoided the perilous peaks of panic and valleys of complacency characteristic of previous administrations. President Eisenhower and his first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Arthur Radford, geared preparedness to the long pull, where not only would our economic base remain strong, but where there would be adequate forces in being, capable of deterring at any time and place all types of war. The Eisenhower-Nixon administration kept in mind the protracted conflict and the whole danger.

I hope and trust that the new administration will not return us to the past ups and downs of the Truman administration defense programs. But, I am quite concerned about the task force reports submitted recently to the new President. These domestic programs will jeopardize the long-pull policies and imperil our liberty.

MIRACLES IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Eisenhower preparedness philosophy gave birth to a brilliant record in research and development.

After World War II, some Americans debauched themselves in the heavy wine of a White House leadership, unaware that future preparedness would be predicated upon nuclear weapons and guided missiles. As Roman citizens once lulled themselves into false confidence over long outdated legions, the Democratic administration lullabied itself to sleep with outdated World War II ideas. Even worse, the Democratic President placed the vital Atomic Energy Commission into the hands of those against the military uses of atomic energy. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union feverishly searched for atomic means to dominate a sleeping America.

Alarmed by such a setup for disaster, Dr. Edward Teller, as early as 1946, sounded the alarm in Washington. His voice, pleading that America should not discontinue attempts to develop an H-bomb, was drowned in soothing seas of complacency. From 1945 to 1949 the Truman-Lilienthal-Oppenheimer trio blocked even Teller's efforts to make a more effective deterrent of the A-bomb. Continued protests by Adm. Lewis Strauss, plus an August 1949, B–29 flight which luckily recorded evidences of a Soviet A-bomb explosion, plus Dr. Klaus Fuchs' confession that he had been leaking atomic secrets finally awoke the slumbering White House. It was almost too late. We had forfeited much of our atomic lead, and Russia had a good chance of beating us to the H-bomb.

Even after all this, the White House had to be prodded by patriots like Dr. Teller, Admiral Strauss, Senators Hickenlooper and McMahon. Fortunately, the Eisenhower administration later made up for these tragic lost years.

President Eisenhower inherited an equally dangerous lag in guided missiles, for which he had to make up.

In 1946, the Army, using German scientists such as Dr. Wernher von Braun, had started to rebuild the German V–2 for use as a first-stage booster rocket with the already developed WAC Corporal as the second stage. Meanwhile, the Air Force began a program, termed MX–774, to develop ICBM's.

What happened in 1947? Mr. Truman impounded $75 million the Republican Congress had appropriated for research and development, and $17 million of this was to be specifically for missile development. Gen. Curtis LeMay complained that this was the straw that broke the camel's back. The alarmed Chief of Staff, Dwight Eisenhower, warned that—

> In the field of guided missiles we must keep abreast of the rest of the world. Neglect to do so could bring our country to ruin and defeat in an appalling few hours.

Mr. Truman met these warnings by cutting more deeply in 1950 fiscal year. He impounded $735 million of Air Force funds, and ICBM development through public funds came to a standstill.

What was happening in Russia? In 1947 the rocket theories of the German scientist, Sanger, created such great excitement that Stalin assigned top priority to this work and ordered Col. Gugori Tokaev, an aerodynamics expert, to seek out Sanger and his ideas on a superrocket. Tokaev, who later defected, reports that Stalin was almost in a hysterical clamor for such scientific data to build an intercontinental rocket, which, Stalin said, would make it easier for him to talk to the gentleman shopkeeper, Truman.

Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration did increase its research and development budget after the Korean invasion. That budget, however, concentrated on World War II type research and development, and long-range missiles were downgraded. But within the first year after the Eisenhower administration came into office, the President set up a full-scale review of the entire missile program, and in fiscal year 1954, spent over twice as much on longer range missiles than Mr. Truman had done during his entire time in the White House. In any one day last year, the United States was spending 10 times more on ballistic missiles than was spent in all of fiscal year 1952 of the Truman administration.

Marvelous miracles were performed under the Eisenhower administration to make up for the ground lost to Russia. In 1954, the Von Neuman Committee said America could have an operational ICBM somewhere between 1960 and 1963, but under this past administration's leadership the Atlas became operational on September 1, 1959.

In the remarkable Eisenhower administration space program, the United States cut leadtime, came from behind to race ahead of Russia by placing 32 satellites in orbit, obtaining a vast variety of scientific knowledge, and obtaining a remarkable series of firsts in exploration areas where Russia lags in her space program. Russia, by the way, has placed only nine satellites in orbit. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include a table listing these firsts and hence paying tribute to the soundness of NASA's broadly based program. (See table B.)

POLARIS

No development has been more spectacular than the Polaris fleet ballistic missile, originally planned to be operational in 1963, actually operational today.

Problems in shooting a missile from a submerged submarine and hitting a target 1,250 miles away were as fantastic as shooting a beer can off a far distant fencepost, when the marksman, blindfolded, was mounted on a galloping horse.

For the Polaris, a superior brain had to be created to make up for every up and down, side-to-side roll, every sway and yaw of the submarine. In determining the direction of the submarine from true north, 1° error could mean dozens of miles off target. Our other big missiles under development—the Atlas and the Jupiter, for example, used liquid fuel. But liquid fuel missiles in a submarine presented dangers of a sudden explosion, sailors trapped undersea in a doomed vessel. Safer solid fuel rockets, on the other hand, as old as the ancient Chinese, did not, however, have sufficient thrust.

Men like Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, and chief of the Polaris project, Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., faced and accomplished the possible in a little time and took a bit longer on the impossible. These men had the courage to make decisions, to eliminate bureaucracy, to build a superior armed services-research-private enterprise team, and to keep in mind the big picture, the whole package.

Although Washington bureaucrats would have hired a big staff for 6 months to write job descriptions for a still bigger basic staff, Admiral Raborn was no such bureaucrat. Within 10 days after his arrival as head of Special Projects, he had twisted Parkinson's law into reverse, hired his basic staff of 50 people, and was slicing leadtime in two. His men did not dilly-dally with long unnecessary redtape memoranda for the office down the street, but instead they "hot-handed" their questions in person to the person who could give them a prompt, satisfactory answer.

"Red" Raborn built teamwork within his "steering task group":

Lockheed solved the problem of shutting off thrust at the right moment so that the missile would hit the target.

General Electric produced the remarkable fire control and guidance system.

Aerojet-General Corp. tested large quantities of solid fuel which did have adequate thrust.

Westinghouse helped in solving the launching problem.

Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, and other companies, busily constructed the submarine.

Sperry Gyroscope Co. took MIT research and put together a navigational system containing more than 1 million parts.

No wonder Admiral Raborn wrote this for the guidance of many working under him:

> I must be able to reach down to any level of special projects activity and find a plan and a performance report that logically and clearly can be related to the total job we have to do.

Mr. Speaker, let me pass from the particular to the general, philosophize a bit on this success, and point something out to the new administration. We want to know how America can stay far ahead of Russia. If America can cut bureaucracy, make courageous decisions, develop the free-enterprise team, and relate each facet of national activity to the total job of preserving freedom, the free society will stay far ahead of the regimented society.

For the preservation of peace and freedom is, as was the Polaris, a package program.

As to the past 8 years, cynical critics skilled in tearing down instead of building up, of course, can pick apart the package until the whole is lost. Filled with brilliant hindsight and devoid of

any foresight, they can look back over the past 8 years and show how certain things might have been better done.

Certainly, after the fog of unknowns and uncertainties have long since lifted, anyone can see how some things might have been done better. Napoleon wisely spoke from experience when he said that the best general is not a mythical general who makes no mistakes, for only the commander without a command makes no mistakes. The best general is he who makes the fewest mistakes.

The Eisenhower-Nixon administration made mistakes, but fewer mistakes in military preparedness than any administration in American history.

PEACE POWER

Even more important, the Eisenhower administration recognized that peace power is a two-sided coin. On one side is preparedness. On the other side is firmness.

It is easy to coast toward seeming peace, down a low road rutted with secret appeasement and creeping retreat. At Munich, sometime English leaders slid down this way toward what they called peace in their time. At Yalta, sometime American leaders left principle for temporary harmony with an incompatible ally. On the eve of Korea, sometime American leaders left in doubt whether we would defend freedom from communism.

In contrast to these downhill equivocal ways, it is hard to climb to those straight sunlit heights silhouetted by proper peace achieved through preparedness, firmness, and justice. This, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration achieved, and so achieved despite vast handicaps.

Prof. James Atkinson, in his recently published book "The Edge of War," recognizes the biggest of these handicaps. Too many Americans have been for appeasement, although they dared not so call it. They have been frightened into wanting an accommodation with the Russians at almost any price.

Atkinson observes that an article studying the positions of the United States and the Soviet Union, appearing in the London Economist, posed this penetrating question: The Americans' hand is all trumps. But will any of them ever be played? Atkinson concludes:

> The trumps * * * can and will be played by an America that calls back again its greatness. That greatness was of the spirit. And there is yet an America that in this conflict of will can draw once more on its spiritual heritage with the call to action of the Prophet Isaiah: "Strengthen ye the feeble hands, and confirm the weak knees. Say to the fainthearted: Take courage, and fear not."

Unfortunately, there have been those with feeble hands and weak knees and faint hearts during military crises over the use of atomic weapons in defense of freedom or over diplomatic crises in regard to Berlin, Suez, Lebanon, Formosa, Quemoy-Matsu. Some have permitted fear to fester inferiority complexes which would weaken the trumps that America has. Some have been all too willing to let the Kremlin name the suits, set the goals for space programs or economic growth, with America being the weak mimic.

But the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, unwilling to play the weak mimic, took courage, feared not, ended the Korean war, played from the highest trump of all—a free unfettered system, set our own goals, and maintained the honorable peace through military preparedness, diplomatic firmness, and high spiritual faith.

Let credit rest where credit is due. A principle taught in training for World War I has even lasted out the space age. A commander is responsible for whatever his command does or does not do.

In the past 8 years, Dwight Eisenhower was the Commander in Chief. In the past 8 years, every American hearth has been increasingly safe from war and from appeasement.

As these magnificent 8 years blend into the strong heritage that has ennobled the American spirit, I salute our retiring Commander in Chief. I pray that all Americans may be grateful.

TABLE A

Fiscal year	Defense appropriations	Budget requests
1956	$33,082,000,000	$33,700,000,000
1957	36,134,000,000	35,197,000,000
1958	36,648,000,000	39,257,000,000
1959	41,232,000,000	40,830,000,000
1960	40,598,000,000	40,836,000,000
1961	40,991,000,000	40,523,000,000

Summary: During the Eisenhower administration, Democrat-controlled Congresses provided $1,658,000,000 less than the President requested.

TABLE B

Eleven major firsts achieved by U.S. space program during 1960:

Pioneer V: First to send message 22.5 million miles from earth.

Tiros I: First weather satellite—sent back 22,000 photos.

Transit I–B: First navigation satellite to help ships, planes, and submarines to fix positions.

Midas II: First heat-sensing satellite, to direct missile launchings.

Transit II–A: First to carry another satellite into space, to study solar effects.

Discoverer XIII: First satellite capsule recovered after orbit.

Echo I: First reflector communication satellite.

Discoverer XIV: First satellite recovered in midair after orbit.

Courier I–B: First repeater communication satellite.

Explorer VIII: First satellite to investigate methods of improving radio communications, in the ionosphere.

Discoverer XVII: First to record effect of solar-storm radiation on human tissue after long space flights.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ) for 4 weeks, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MILLIKEN, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. ULLMAN for 20 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FOGARTY for 15 minutes on today and tomorrow.

Mr. PUCINSKI for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. COOLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. HECHLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES and include extraneous matter in his remarks under general leave to extend on the resolution passed today.

Mr. LANKFORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, February 2, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 days after receipt. Accordingly, there is submitted herewith, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated report of the House Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives—Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960

Name	Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
			Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [1]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [1]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [1]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [1]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [1]
MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE												
Herbert Roback	France	Franc	342.30	69.85	318	64.90	2,775.30	566.40	44.59	9.10	3,480.19	710.25
Do	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	17-12-6	49.35	24-8-0	68.50	5-3-0	14.50	4-4-0	11.50	51-7-6	143.85
Do	Belgium	Belgian franc	312	6.24	355	7.10	75	1.50	38	.76	780	15.60
Do	Netherlands	French franc			36.75	7.50	14.70	3.00	7.35	1.50	58.80	12.05
Do	Germany	do	52.73	10.76	105.35	21.50	12.25	2.50	13.48	2.75	183.81	37.51
Do	Italy	French franc	82.08	16.75	68.45	13.97	15.68	3.20	13.48	2.75	179.69	36.67
		Lira	7,000	11.27	3,415	5.50	760	1.23			11,175	18.00
Do	Greece	Drachma	441	14.70	1,185	39.50	150	5.00	4.74	15.80	2,250	75.00
Do	Turkey	Lira	264.50	21.82	103.60	8.55	12.10	1.00	7.30	.60	387.50	31.97
Do	Spain	Peseta	847	14.10	1,461	24.35	468	7.80	224	3.75	3,000	50.00
Total				214.84		261.37		606.13		48.51		1,130.85

[1] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Recapitulation:	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,130.85

JANUARY 21, 1961.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

510. A letter from the Chairman, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, transmitting a report on the progress to date of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, pursuant to Public Law 85-470, approved June 28, 1958; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

511. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report relating to the positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 3635. A bill to extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3636. A bill to amend section 613(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the rate of percentage depletion with respect to gold produced from deposits in the United States shall be 23 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3637. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 3638. A bill to permit employees of a State or local government who do not have coverage pursuant to State agreement under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to elect coverage under such system as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 3639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by an individual for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 3640. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 3641. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3642. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3643. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3644. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize payment of operating-differential subsidy to contract carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3645. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3646. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 3647. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 3648. A bill to create a joint congressional committee on salary adjustment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3649. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act so as to permit children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents to be eligible for assistance under the State plans for aid to dependent children established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3651. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3652. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3653. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3654. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3655. A bill to modify the decrease in group life insurance at age 65 or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3656. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to permit employees to acquire an additional unit of insurance under such act by paying both the employee's and the Government's share of the cost of the premiums thereon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3657. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3658. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3659. A bill to prohibit the alteration of U.S. coins for fraudulent purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 3660. A bill to amend the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), relating to adult Indian vocational training; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 3661. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3662. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3663. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3664. A bill to improve the working conditions of migratory and other farm labor in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 3665. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the donation of surplus property to orphanages; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3666. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 3667. A bill to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 3668. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to authorize informal entries of merchandise where the aggregate value of the shipment does not exceed $400; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 3669. A bill to provide for the construction of recreation facilities in the Elephant Butte Reservoir area, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3670. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3671. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include New Mexico among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3672. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3673. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first $600 per year of an individual's earned income shall be disregarded in determining his need for old-age assistance under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3674. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 21 if he is a full-time student; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 3675. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3676. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 3677. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3678. A bill to amend section 1 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an employee shall not lose his current connection with the railroad industry when he is furloughed to accept elective public office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 3679. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 3680. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 3681. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 3682. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3683. A bill to designate the Glen Canyon Dam, to be constructed in connection with the Colorado River storage project, as the "Eisenhower Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 3684. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 3685. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCRANTON:

H.R. 3686. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 3687. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 3688. A bill to provide that the coverage of religious science practitioners under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on an elective basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 3689. A bill to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer withdraws from the production of rice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 3690. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3691. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3692. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 3693. A bill to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution designating the week of June 4–10, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California for the piping and pumping of water from the Gulf of California to Arizona for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution providing for a study to be conducted to determine and report to the Congress on ways and means of expanding and modernizing the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in favor of granting relief to the domestic carpet industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COAD:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 136. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 23; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, requesting that the U.S.S. *Missouri* continue to be berthed at the Puget Sound Naval Ship Yard at Bremerton, Wash.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation and appropriations to provide necessary flood control improvements on the Snohomish River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 3694. A bill for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty Strul and her minor daughter Anna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 3696. A bill for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 3697. A bill for the relief of Stavros Kyriakides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 3698. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sing Ching Yih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 3699. A bill for the relief of Nellie V. Lohry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 3700. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wolf Edward Klawans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 3701. A bill for the relief of Russell R. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3702. A bill for the relief of Jung Hoo Chew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3703. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 3704. A bill for the relief of the O'Brien Dieselectric Corp., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3705. A bill for the relief of James A. Shearer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 3706. A bill for the relief of Michael H. Dugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3707. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 3708. A bill for the relief of Randolph C. Grant, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3709. A bill for the relief of John Stewart Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 3710. A bill for the relief of Giles L. Matthews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 3711. A bill for the relief of Hugh Kunhwa Kim, his wife, Grace Kyu-yun Kim, and their two minor sons, David Dalwon Kim and Timothy Dukwon Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3712. A bill for the relief of Lee Pak Too; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Yedid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3714. A bill for the relief of Janina Maciejewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3715. A bill for the relief of Enzo Bertolotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3716. A bill for the relief of Fritz Frederique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 3717. A bill for the relief of Tomasz Grabiec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 3718. A bill for the relief of Matthias Nock, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3719. A bill for the relief of Pagona Pascopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3720. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Di Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Domenico Carola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Maria Czyz Krupa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Angela Herczeg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Kazimiera Banas Florkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Classroom Shortage Still Acute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, within the next few weeks, or as quickly as the House can complete its organization, and as soon as we receive recommendations from the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor will begin consideration of Federal aid to education. As we go into these hearings, we have the benefit of data reported from the Eisenhower administration on its last day in office—January 19—which showed that as of the beginning of the present school year there was a shortage of 142,000 public elementary and secondary classrooms in the United States.

These data, which are collected, tabulated, and published each year by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have been a perennial source of controversy before the subcommittees in recent years. It is pertinent, however, to point out that this year for the first time, in most instances, the figures supplied by the States were derived from answers to questionnaires completed by local school systems rather than on the basis of State estimates as was more often the case in the past. Therefore, the tabulations of this year's data are firmer, to use the language of the statisticians.

In any event the data which are most significant in all of these annual reports have always been the data which were most acceptable. I refer to statistics on the number of pupils enrolled and the number of classrooms available. In the case of the pupils, they are in school and countable, and it is not necessary to rely on estimates. In the case of the classrooms that exist, they are being used and they are countable, and it is not necessary to rely upon an estimate.

We find that as of last September there were 36,305,104 boys and girls enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States and its outlying parts, and there was available a total of 1,338,560 classrooms.

The report also showed that the number of classrooms available was insufficient to properly house all pupils, and that the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity was 1,868,000. There were about 685,000 pupils in 36 States and the District of Columbia attending school on curtailed or half-day sessions. It is interesting to go back 4 years and review the data in the report showing the situation as it existed in the fall of 1956. At that time 31,527,695 pupils were enrolled in our public school systems, and they were housed in 1,086,766 classrooms. At that time the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity was 2,195,000; thus we find that although the States and local communities have been building in the intervening years at a rate of almost 70,000 classrooms annually, the total number of classrooms available has been increased by only 251,794, and the number of pupils in excess of normal capacity has been reduced by only 337,000. At that rate the gap will be closed some time during 1982 or 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the emergency is now, and every year that the Congress fails to face up to its responsibility, freedom loses ground. Unless we, at the Federal level, step in to close this gap more rapidly than the overburdened and overworked States and local communities are doing, it will be too late. If we complacently sit back and

leave this job to the States and local communities, eventually it will be resolved; but when it is resolved, it will be a matter of academic interest only—for if we wait until 1982 or 1983 to close this gap, we are getting too close for comfort.

Our only and our best guarantee that the big brother concept will never become a reality in these United States is proper educational opportunities for our boys and girls.

Russia's New War Against the World's Free Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in his state of the Union message to a joint session of the Congress on Monday, January 30, President John F. Kennedy warned of the competitive struggle we face with Soviet Russia and Red China. In a speech I had the honor of making before the Ravenswood, W. Va., Junior Chamber of Commerce on January 26, I dealt with some of the facets of this struggle, and offered some proposals as to how we can best proceed—how we must act to prepare ourselves—for our eventual victory.

Because I feel that my colleagues in both Houses would be interested in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA'S NEW WAR AGAINST THE WORLD'S FREE NATIONS, SPEECH OF U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, DELIVERED BEFORE THE RAVENSWOOD JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, RAVENSWOOD, W. VA.

In a moment of keen perception, James A. Garfield, 20th President of the United States, said: "History is but the unrolled scroll of prophecy."

The truth of these words will become self-evident as I unroll for you the scroll of recent history—a history of Soviet maneuvering which foretells a new kind of Communist warfare upon the free nations of the world. It is a warfare patently designed to be bloodless, without hydrogen bombs or intercontinental missiles.

The troops in this new and bloodless war are the masses of enslaved labor in Soviet bloc countries. The strategy for victory over the free nations of the world is the production of an avalanche of low-priced goods, raw materials, consumer durables—all to be studiously dumped on selected world markets.

The victories are to be achieved piecemeal—when economic dislocation hits the target country, bringing large-scale unemployment, hunger and misery—and then revolution inspired by planted Red agents. In each instance, of course, Yankee imperialism will be blamed, and, as in Cuba today, "Hate America," will be the encouraged battle cry.

For the past 3 years, a nervous Federal Government has been watching Russia and China test out this new strategy. At first, it was thought to be a freak occurrence when it was used against three economically poor countries—Bolivia, Indonesia, and Malaya. But now, with the scroll of history unrolled, we know otherwise. We know these three countries were deliberately selected for this new Kremlin directed offensive, because all three have one thing in common: Their economies are mainly based on the production of tin.

The start of the offensive against these three countries began 3 years ago, when tin prices on the world markets suddenly fell almost 30 cents a pound. This was a calamitous happening, and was followed in Bolivia, Indonesia, and Malaya by wholesale shutdowns of mines and processing mills, throwing countless thousands of workers out of jobs. In the demonstrations and riots that followed, as would be expected, Yankee imperialism was blamed.

What had actually happened? Why this tremendous price break? Russia, heretofore an inconsequential producer of tin, had suddenly dumped approximately 25,000 long tons of tin ingots on the world markets. The Communist agitators and cheerleaders in Bolivia, Indonesia, and Malaya said nothing of this.

But it was imperialist America and blood-sucking Great Britain who came to the rescue of those Soviet smitten countries. Between them, it cost over $50 million to fight this Kremlin aggression by stabilizing tin prices again. There were no "Thank you, America" or "Thank you, Great Britain" rallies in Bolivia, Indonesia, or Malaya when this rescue operation brought the unemployed back to their jobs. Capitalist imperialism was still the fall guy.

But to get back at America for this rescue operation, and at the same time to once again test this new economic weapon, Russia began dumping aluminum in England at about 10 pounds sterling (about $28 in U.S. money) per ton under the price being charged by United States and Canadian producers. England, traditionally, has been a large volume buyer of North American produced aluminum, and this sudden Russian excursion into that market brought immediate unemployment in the ranks of Canadian and U.S. aluminum workers at a time when unemployment was already a headache in this country.

How was Russia able to dump aluminum in Great Britain, of all countries? Through a weak clause in the British-Russian trade agreement. Canadian pressure quickly forced Great Britain to limit Russian aluminum sales to her to only 15,000 tons per year. However, Canadian and U.S. producers were forced to cut their prices to Great Britain by 2 cents per pound—or, roughly, by $40 per ton—to meet this Russian thrust.

Then Red China, at the Kremlin's behest, got into the act. India, which the Communists had hoped to subvert, was pulling itself up by its bootstraps via enormous American aid. Japan was flourishing and about to agree to a new defense alliance with the United States. A Kremlin-directed wrecking job was needed.

Japan and India are large and important producers of textiles. This industry is an important economic mainstay in both countries. Traditionally, both these countries have had the sale of textiles to oriental and eastern markets pretty much to themselves. About a year ago, however, Red China, like a bolt out of the blue, began dumping textiles on oriental and Eastern markets at prices far below those which Japanese and Indian producers could charge even with their own cheap labor forces.

Again, it was the United States who came to the rescue by advising countries receiving our foreign aid not to use our dollars for purchases from Red China. In revenge, the Communists directed their Japanese cohorts to riot against President Eisenhower's proposed visit, using the upcoming new defense alliance as an excuse.

Today, Venezuela and the oil-rich Middle Eastern states are the new Kremlin targets—and oil is the commodity by which the Communist imperialists are seeking to break their economic backs.

When Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan visited Cuba last year, he arranged a "sweetheart" trade agreement with Fidel Castro, the Kremlin's South American bearded wonder. In a swap for sugar, Russia agreed to sell Castro all the secondhand tools of war he needed—and all the oil he needed at prices substantially below world prices.

It was a neat deal, wrapped in a pretty bow tie, for, with guns, tanks, and cannon, Castro could flex his military might as a threat against his Latin neighbors, and with Russian oil he could throw a monkey wrench into the economy of Venezuela.

Traditionally, most of the crude oil processed in Cuba has come from Venezuela. For the Venezuelans, this amounted to roughly $100 million worth of business annually—no small change for so small a country—a country whose economy is mainly based on crude oil production. But the Kremlin price to Cuba is $1 per barrel cheaper than the Venezuelan price—this despite the fact that Russia has to deliver this crude oil close to 4,000 miles from its Baku oilfields, whereas Venezuela is practically around the corner from Cuba. And upon whom are the Communists in Venezuela trying to pin the blame for unemployment in that country—unemployment mainly due to Cuba's "sweetheart" oil deal with Russia? Yankee imperialists, of course.

What has been happening to Venezuela has also been happening to the Middle East oil countries. Traditionally, the Arab countries sold their crude and refined products to Far Eastern and oriental countries. India was one of their biggest markets, buying more than $200 million worth of their products each year. But late last year, Russia, the friend of the Arab, made a sweetheart deal with India, offering her oil and oil products at prices substantially below those quoted by the Arab countries. Now, in those oil-rich Middle East countries, unemployment is growing along with misery. And who is being blamed for this? Good old Yankee imperialism.

The time for questioning how it is possible for Russia and Red China to launch this new war against free nations is long past. Instead, we must recognize them as economic juggernauts that can whimsically threaten the welfare of workers in any country they choose.

Of course, the real economic target on which the Kremlin has its aim is the United States. Nikita Khrushchev let the cat out of the bag in a speech he made in Moscow on May 6, 1959.

"The main bulwark of the contemporary capitalist world," Khrushchev said, "is constituted by the United States, which has a more highly developed production and a higher standard of living. In order to achieve victory in the competition between the two systems (capitalism versus communism), we must catch up with and overtake those barriers to competition with capitalism—not with ballistic missiles, not with atomic or hydrogen bombs, but with our organization and unity. With a higher level of production."

The Soviet boss then went on to say, "Having achieved the level of production of the most highly developed state (the United States), we will not stop at that, but will advance with ever greater drive. We Communists say: 'Capitalism will fail as everything obsolete fails and dies away.'"

Well, we cannot say that Mr. Khrushchev has not warned us of our ultimate demise—if we do not take his warning to heart and start doing some hard thinking about it.

Today, although Russian production, by and large, is still not sufficient to materially hurt the United States, it can, by ruthless manipulation, be used to kill off friendly countries one at a time. Such actions, through accumulation, could hurt us drastically by isolating our economy and by cutting us off from world markets.

Current figures on Russian production are not available. But in 1957, the latest year for which we have figures, Russia turned out 91 percent as much iron ore as we did domestically; 58 percent as much cement; 50 percent as much pig iron; and its aluminum output that year was about 22 percent of the world's total. Since 1957, you can bet your last dollar, those figures have been substantially increased.

The threat of Russian production becomes more real when you are aware of this fact: We Americans produce primarily for our domestic market, which takes 95 percent of our end products. The Russians and Chinese Reds, however, can ignore their domestic needs. They can take their entire production of an item and dump it on world markets at fantastically low prices for the explicit purpose of causing economic dislocations in any country of their choosing.

How soon can the Soviets challenge the United States in an economic war? As soon as we let them. As soon as we stop thinking of ways and means of expanding our economy, of getting rid of the economic drag of depressed areas, of revitalizing the education of our youth, of helping business to help itself, of finding means by which to convert our vast natural resources into useful everyday products. This is the challenge facing us—a challenge we must take up, if we and our children are to continue living as freemen.

If we think and act in such terms, then the scroll of history we write today, and which our children will unroll tomorrow, will plainly indicate our prophecy in the future of America—of a greater and everlasting land of human liberty and human dignity.

Military Pay Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, a serious injustice to many military retirees has been allowed to stand entirely too long. Today I have introduced a bill which will restore the traditional relationship which, down through the years, has been maintained between the active duty pay scales and the retired pay scales. The temporary deviation from this tradition which occurred in 1958 must be remedied.

My bill is identical to H.R. 11318, which passed the House unanimously on May 12, 1960, but which was unfortunately not taken up by the Senate. President Kennedy stated in a letter to Lt. Gen. Idwal H. Edwards, U.S. Air Force, retired, president of the Retired Officers Association, and I quote:

> The fact that legislation for this worthy purpose was not enacted during the recent session of Congress is a source of deep regret to me.
>
> The merits of the proposal, so far as I am concerned, are unquestioned.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have in my congressional district the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., and from my membership on the Board of Visitors to the Academy I am acutely aware of the need to retain the Academy's highly trained graduates as career officers. In addition, many retired officers of all services have chosen to make their homes in southern Maryland. Among them are some of the finest combat leaders of two World Wars and the Korean conflict. I appreciate intimately their concern over this arbitrary creation of two classes of retirees.

The inequity, if not corrected, will continue to be very upsetting to morale among those on active duty today. We all know full well what happens to a person on a fixed income because of inflation. The active duty personnel feel they have lost a most valuable and traditional right—real security for the future—in that heretofore they had a retirement system which was geared to the existing pay scales, so that they could look to their retirement with a feeling of security.

In view of considerable congressional interest and the statement by President Kennedy, it is my hope that immediate action can be taken and that time-consuming hearings can be avoided in this case.

Orville Freeman Speaks Out for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, although Hon. Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, has been in office but 10 days, he already has proved to the farm families of America that they now have a champion serving as the chief agricultural magistrate of the land.

In his first days as Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman has spoken out clearly and emphatically in behalf of the people who till our soil. Moreover, he has set in motion the machinery of the Department of Agriculture, to break the cost-price squeeze that is strangling the farm economy.

Mr. Speaker, our farm people have made us the best-fed Nation on the face of the earth. The Communists may rival us in space and in other areas, but behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains they cannot begin to match the productivity of those independent units of capitalism on the family farms of America.

Yet, our farmers are the least rewarded of any group in our total economy.

Mr. Freeman promises the Nation the leadership to restore our farm people to an equitable position in our economy and in our democratic society. On last Thursday he made a very significant statement at the opening of the Conference on Policies and Programs for American Agriculture, held at the Department of Agriculture. What he had to say is important not only to farmers but to all Americans. Therefore, with the permission of the House and in the purpose of bringing the widest possible attention to Secretary Freeman's statement, I am inserting the text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> As I open this conference on policies and programs for American agriculture, and as I welcome you most sincerely to this conference, it is perhaps in order that, as the new Secretary, I share with you my position on the objectives and goals we should seek, and the guiding principles I intend to follow in our efforts to achieve these goals.
>
> The problems of agriculture in the United States today, and the prevailing attitudes toward those problems, present us with a paradox that is both disconcerting and challenging. Agriculture in America today is an industry that, in terms of fulfilling its primary function, has achieved phenomenal success. For the primary function of agriculture is to provide food and fiber to meet human needs. Nowhere on earth, and never in history, has agriculture met this function so well as it has in the United States today.
>
> The American consumer is better fed, and at lower real cost, than ever before. American agriculture has abolished, here in America, one of mankind's oldest anxieties, the fear of hunger and famine. Yet American agriculture is referred to more often in terms of surplus or subsidy than in terms of success. One reason why this is so is that, successful as American agriculture has been in achieving this major function, it does not today provide to farmers the reward that their success deserves.
>
> It is a challenge we face, a responsibility we share, to change this picture—to resolve this paradox.
>
> And therefore I hope we can all agree on the major objectives and goals toward that end.
>
> I believe that we must have a positive, constructive approach to problems of agriculture, directed toward three major goals:
>
> First, we must insure the production of enough food and fiber to supply high standards for all Americans, now and in the years ahead. To this end, we must seek more effective distribution of the products of our tremendous agricultural productivity. We must expand the utilization of our agricultural products; with special concern for those in need, for those in distressed areas, for those whose nutritional standards and dietary habits are below the levels known to be essential for maximum health and physical vigor. In taking immediate steps to implement President Kennedy's first executive order regarding contributions to food allowances for those in need, this Department has already taken a first step toward this goal.
>
> Second, we must assure the efficient American family farm the opportunity to achieve parity of income without exploiting either consumers or taxpayers. Government must provide to farmers, as it has provided to other groups in our economy, the tools by which they can achieve equality of economic opportunity. There is no reason why those who produce—and produce efficiently—commodities essential to life, should not receive, for the capital and labor they invest in that production, a return that is comparable to the return received by others for similar investments.
>
> Third, we must expand our programs to utilize our agricultural abundance as an instrument to encourage economic growth in underdeveloped areas of the world, as one of our greatest weapons for peace and freedom, and thus a source of strength for our Nation and of security for our people.
>
> I trust that there is general agreement on these objectives and goals.

In our efforts to reach these objectives and achieve these goals I intend to follow certain guiding principles.

First, I am convinced that success in this endeavor depends in no small measure on the extent to which we can achieve a much broader understanding of agricultural problems than that which now exists, particularly—but not exclusively—in the minds of the nonfarm public.

Evidences of this need for greater understanding abound. Only recently a Gallup poll revealed that the most frequent complaint on the part of the general public was concern about the increased cost of food; yet the fact is that costs of rent, medical care, and transportation have increased twice as much as that of food during the past 10 years. The relatively slight rise in food costs has been one of the principal noninflationary aspects in our economy in recent years. If the prices received by farmers had increased in proportion to other prices, and if such increase had been passed on to consumers, Americans would pay billions of dollars more each year for food and clothing. And thus, in a very real sense all American consumers have gained, at the expense of the American farmer.

But there is so little general public understanding of these facts that we must, in effect, become salesmen for American agriculture. We must develop a recognition on the part of the general public of the contributions made by agriculture to the high standards of living we enjoy—and a public understanding of the importance of a sound farm program, not only to farmers, but to all Americans.

Second, I intend to seek the greatest possible cooperation, in the development of policies and programs for American agriculture, from farmers themselves, from farmers' organizations, and from the Congress of the United States.

I believe that farmer participation, from the local level on up, is essential to the successful operation of farm programs in a democracy.

I believe that farmers through their own cooperative organizations have done much to improve their own conditions—and I believe that they can and should do much more, and that Government should therefore encourage such activity.

I believe that we must seek the widest possible agreement on broad programs in the interest of American agriculture. I know that this will not be easy. I know there are conflicting and opposing points of view. These differences, I think, are in part due to the fact that in agriculture we have only recently shifted from an economy of scarcity to an economy of abundance, and there are some who have not yet adjusted their thinking to the new conditions. They are also in part due to differing regional conditions and interests.

There will, and should, always be differences of opinion in a free society. I welcome them. But such differences need not preclude a general agreement on objectives and goals, nor a broad consensus on programs essential to achieve these goals.

Third, I hope that a final guiding principle in our development of farm programs and policies will be a recognition of agriculture in terms of its interrelationships with other aspects of our domestic and foreign policy.

Just as American prosperity can never be secure without a prosperous agriculture, so must a successful program for agriculture take into account our entire economy, including help for distressed areas, the interests of consumers, our balance of payments problems, our national strength and security, and our position of leadership in the free world.

I intend to follow these guiding principles in our efforts to reach the objectives and goals I have stated. I ask your help. I regard the task ahead as a real challenge and great opportunity.

The problems of agriculture are difficult and complicated. Our justifiable pride in the phenomenal technological and scientific progress that have tremendously increased our agricultural productivity must be matched by a firm determination to utilize the same degree of talent and effort to solve existing problems of effective distribution and adequate farm income.

As long as two-thirds of the people of the world are hungry, the problem of our agricultural surplus is a world problem as well as a problem of our farm States.

As long as millions of Americans lack adequate standards of nutrition in their diets the problem of stored foodstuffs is more than one of the storage costs to taxpayers and price supports to farmers—it is an integral part of our effort to improve consumption and distribution.

As long as competent and efficient farmers, utilizing the modern methods and scientific advances that have made American agriculture outstandingly successful, are unable to earn a fair return for their capital and labor, we can have no sound and permanent health in our economy.

It is of concern to all Americans that we progress rapidly toward a solution of the farm problem. It is of especial concern to you, as representatives of farmers themselves. I am confident that by working together we can reach such a solution, and it is my hope that this conference will be a constructive step toward that end.

President Kennedy and the 87th Congress: A Preview by Representative John Brademas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from the Third District of Indiana, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, has written a superb analysis previewing "President Kennedy and the 87th Congress," which appears in the January 9, 1961, issue of Christianity and Crisis. A former Rhodes Scholar, Congressman BRADEMAS is serving his second term, and is a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. I know of few Members of Congress whose performance portends such a brilliant future in public life.

In his article, which I commend to the attention of all Members, Congressman BRADEMAS astutely assesses the importance of reform of the Committee on Rules—which the House voted today—by concluding that "no single step will prove more helpful to the success of President Kennedy's program."

The article follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND THE 87TH CONGRESS: A PREVIEW BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BRADEMAS

A natural resource that newly elected Presidents rarely bring to the White House is an understanding of the Congressmen and Senators who are likely to be helpful or harmful on each issue, together with an appreciation of the approach required for results in each case.

One key that the press has almost completely overlooked in assessing the potential effectiveness of President-elect John F. Kennedy in getting his legislative program through the 87th Congress is that Mr. Kennedy has served for many years in both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. He is therefore personally acquainted with nearly all the Members of the Senate and a goodly number of Congressmen. It is of particular importance that he knows the chairmen of the committees in the House, each a kind of Congress in itself. Taken in constellation, and with the Speaker, majority leader, and whip, these committee chairmen constitute the core of the power structure of the House of Representatives.

For a man whose political radar is as sensitive and whose willingness to use the weapons in the Presidential arsenal as probable as Mr. Kennedy's, this personal knowledge of how Congress operates can be enormously valuable in steering his legislative proposals safely into port. He knows where the reefs are and where the channels are, or at least where and how they can be dredged.

During his campaign, Mr. Kennedy repeatedly argued that we could be effective in handling our problems of foreign policy only as we were effective in dealing with our difficulties here at home. "The Latin Americans accepted President Roosevelt as their good neighbor," Kennedy declared, "because they knew him to be a good neighbor in his own country."

Although Mr. Kennedy cannot escape the immediate press of an array of foreign policy problems, his early efforts in Congress will be devoted primarily to his domestic legislative program. The major proposals on which he will seek action have become still more urgent since November because of the legacy of economic recession left him by the Eisenhower administration. On the day John F. Kennedy takes office, he will be confronted by the fact of 5 to 6 million persons unemployed.

These major proposals are: (1) aid to distressed areas; (2) increase in the minimum wage and extension of coverage; (3) Federal support for education; (4) expansion of the housing and urban renewal program; and (5) health insurance for the elderly through social security.

As a second-term Democratic Representative whose first term was spent under a Republican President, I look forward with partisan enthusiasm and, frankly, considerable curiosity to service in Congress with a Democrat in the White House.

Here are some observations—from a sophomore, the reader is again warned—on at least several of the significant factors I would guess will help shape legislation in the 87th Congress.

1. The principal battlefield will not be the Senate but the House of Representatives. The Senate is more clearly under moderate to liberal Democratic control than the House, where the Dixiecrat-Republican coalition can function more effectively. The gradual rise in liberal strength in the Senate is symbolized by the new whip, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. His advancement represents a significant breakthrough of a northern liberal into a pivotal position of leadership in the Senate. Nor does the voting record of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the new majority leader, give conservatives much to cheer about.

It is in the House, more complex and more conservative, that most of the blood will be shed. In late December, as this article is written, a change in the House Rules Committee appears at once more probable and far more important than a change in the Senate filibuster. The Rules Committee has in recent years been much more often and effectively used to block liberal legislation

than the Senators' right of unlimited debate. If the House decides to add more Democratic members to the Rules Committee, or in some other way breaks the power of the Rules Committee to prevent the House from even voting on major legislation, no single step will prove more helpful to the success of President Kennedy's program.

A NEW COALITION?

2. Republicans in both House and Senate who come from urban or suburban areas may be under heavy pressure to turn their backs on the instinctive pleas of my Hoosier colleague, Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, to vote against Kennedy proposals for the sheer joy of obstructionism. Ex-Republican Leader JOE MARTIN, of the President-elect's home State, who was ousted by HALLECK in 1959 after a savage struggle, has already indicated he will not join any anti-Kennedy coalition.

However, it was Senator CLIFFORD CASE of New Jersey, a Republican reelected by 330,000 votes while Kennedy carried his State, who has most boldly whipped the glove across the cheeks of HALLECK and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. In a speech to the National Press Club in Washington last month, CASE attacked the HALLECK-led Dixiecrat-GOP coalition and warned that the Republican Party had better turn from the ultraconservative right if it wanted to start winning elections.

CASE pointed to the November victories of 20th century Republicans like MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine; JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky; and LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, then concluded with a caustic crack at the Wall Street Journal-BARRY GOLDWATER theory of political behavior. "There are people still around," said CASE, "who profess to believe that the reason Republicans don't win more elections is that we fail to offer a sufficiently conservative alternative to the Democrats. On this point, I think the results last month speak for themselves."

Senator CASE's suggestion, that liberal Republicans may even on occasion have to prod along Democratic programs, will be most significant not in the Senate, however, but in the House. Indeed, if I were a Republican Congressman from an urban area looking to reelection in 1962, I would think twice before voting against Federal aid to education, especially if limited to classroom construction (the Republican platform endorsed it), against raising the minimum wage (too many factories from the North and East have gone South), and against expanding social security to include health insurance (Rockefeller's for it). Republican Congressmen need no longer fear White House pressure to stay in line and vote no. They may accordingly vote their districts and, I suspect in many cases, their instincts.

What I am saying and what Senator CASE's argument suggests is that there may well develop under the Kennedy Presidency a new coalition in Congress between the liberal Democrats and the modern Republicans. It will not be a coalition as highly disciplined as the Republican-southern Democratic bloc in the House but, in order to tip the balance in favor of many of the Kennedy programs, it doesn't have to be.

3. There will also be strong incentives for southern Democrats as well to go along with some parts of the Kennedy program.

The South, by and large, supported the Kennedy-Johnson ticket in November. Ties of party loyalty, the pleasures of patronage and the fact that a significant number of southern Democrats are themselves moderately liberal on most issues except civil rights—all these factors will combine to strengthen the Kennedy hand in Congress. Already, it is reported, Senators RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, and GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, have indicated they will support Kennedy's plan for linking health insurance for the elderly to social security—a measure that both opposed in 1960.

4. An essential element in understanding the legislative outlook with a Democrat like Kennedy in the White House and a Democratic Congress is that the veto need no longer be feared.

To put the point another way, under Eisenhower the President's problem was to keep something from happening; under Kennedy, it will be to make something happen. The change will be refreshing.

This reversal of the status of the veto power is really a symbol of the immensely significant shift from a weak and unpolitical President, not disposed to tangle with Congress or to assert his own powers, to a man with a view of the Presidential office that is in direct line with that of Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman. Mr. Kennedy will be a strong President, likely to press hard for his programs and, when necessary, to fight for them. This does not mean he will stubbornly refuse to negotiate and compromise when he cannot win the whole loaf. It does mean that, like Truman and unlike Eisenhower, Mr. Kennedy understands what the Presidential office has been and what it can be.

THE ROLE OF LYNDON JOHNSON

5. It is of course still too early to predict with certainty the role of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON both in and out of Congress. Obviously, when a Senate majority leader becomes Vice President and is succeeded as leader of the Senate by a close colleague of his own party, there may be a period of some uncertainty and even tension as to their appropriate postures in their new positions. We can assume, however, that Senator MANSFIELD will expect to be the Senate majority leader in fact as well as in name.

Yet a man of Mr. JOHNSON's extraordinary personal skills and remarkable drive is not easily smothered, nor do I think there will be any propensity on President Kennedy's part to make the attempt. JOHNSON's all-out support of the Kennedy campaign and the party platform following the convention makes him a far more attractive figure to northern Democrats in January of 1961 than he was in January of 1960.

Vice President JOHNSON will for the first time in his long career operate from a genuinely national rather than a Texas constituency, and the results may be extremely interesting to behold. In late December, for example, President Kennedy announced that the Vice President would serve as chairman of the Committee on Governmental Contracts, which is charged with the responsibility of ending discrimination in work for the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSON, with his intimate links with the professional leaders of the South both in the Senate and out and his close personal relationship with House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, could well become chief broker between North and South on behalf of the Kennedy program.

THE FORECAST: FAIR AND WARMER

6. The Democratic study group (DSG), a loose organization of liberal Democratic Congressmen from the North and West, of which this writer is a member, was both weakened and strengthened by the November results. The DSG was weakened in that many of the 21 defeated Democratic incumbents were identified with its purpose. The DSG was strengthened, however, by the election of Mr. Kennedy because, more than any other group in the House of Representatives, members of the DSG are in sympathy with his views.

The DSG will therefore constitute the most solid bloc of Kennedy supporters in the House, and, I would guess, will cooperate closely with Speaker RAYBURN and Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK in moving the President's program ahead.

7. Here are some other observations on the year ahead in Congress: I would expect some internal Democratic tension on the question of allowing States to use Federal funds to improve teachers' salaries as well as to build classrooms. Speaker RAYBURN is not enthusiastic about the teachers' salary feature; Senator Kennedy has strongly endorsed letting the States expend Federal funds for either schools or salaries, or both.

I would anticipate little legislative action in the field of agriculture during the first session.

In the field of civil rights, I would expect the Kennedy administration, at least in its early months, to rely far more on executive action than on calls for new legislation. For example, Mr. Kennedy said frequently during the campaign that the President could greatly advance the cause of equal opportunity by a stroke of the pen—through an Executive order banning discrimination in federally assisted housing.

8. I have deliberately omitted much discussion of foreign policy in this essay. It is still too soon to see clearly what foreign policy problems Mr. Kennedy will bring to Congress. I suffer, moreover, from the plight of many Congressmen who are deeply interested in foreign policy but who, under our system, are denied the luxury of many opportunities to participate in decisions affecting it.

There is one problem in the field of foreign affairs, however, that I want to mention. Mr. Kennedy will almost certainly be plagued in his relations with Congress by an increasing economic nationalism in many areas of the country, especially where unemployment is serious. To make the point, if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were up for renewal this year, its passage through Congress would be extremely hazardous.

Fortunately, the fact that the President-elect comes from New England will give him a greater sensitivity to the difficulties of industries injured by imports. Friends of both foreign aid and foreign trade, and Mr. Kennedy is a friend, must seek new ways of coping with the political and economic problems here at home that follow trade expansion. Failure to do so will gravely complicate the already difficult task of fashioning progressive foreign economic policies.

To sum up, the relationship between President-elect Kennedy and a Democratic Congress will be significantly different from that existing between President Eisenhower and a Democratic Congress. I believe the relationship will be much more fruitful for our country and its purposes, and I say this from no excess of partisan zeal. Our constitutional system works better with a President who is a strong leader and with a President who understands that politics is the very heart of democratic government. For these reasons President-elect Kennedy offers hope of giving great leadership to our country at a time when nothing less will do.

February 4 Marks the 20th Anniversary of the United Service Organizations, Inc. (USO)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, to the officers and members of the National

Council of the United Service Organizations on the occasion of their 20th anniversary, I extend cordial greetings.

This is an appropriate time, indeed, for public officials, and all of America for that matter, to express heartfelt thanks to the USO for its compassionate assistance to the members of our Armed Forces who are stationed within our country and around the world. The USO has built a record that will continue to be a proud American tradition. It has ministered to the religious, moral, recreational, and welfare needs of the men and women in our Armed Forces. It has brought them a home away from home wherever they have been stationed. The 20th anniversary of the USO should be a time of grateful thanks to this outstanding organization.

Procedural Delays by National Labor Relations Board Extinguish Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I attended, along with most of the other Members of Congress from New England, an important conference here in Washington called by the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO. Mr. J. William Belanger, New England director of the TWUA, presided at this gathering. Mr. William Pollock, general president, and John Chupka, general secretary-treasurer, of this organization, made brief statements.

The special purpose of this meeting was to present to the Members of Congress two documents issued by the Textile Workers Union. The first is an attractively printed pamphlet entitled "Almost Unbelievable." This is a well written but concise and fact packed study of labor-management relations in the textile industry under the shadow of the Taft-Hartley law. The union argues that in the 14 years since its birth, the law has worked against textile workers to deprive them of their basic right to organize. The act and its administrator, the National Labor Relations Board, have reinforced textile employers in their campaign against self-organizing and collective bargaining on the part of textile workers.

The evidence presented in these publications has led the Textile Workers Union of America to charge the NLRB with bias in favor of the employer. TWUA proposes a full congressional investigation of this politically appointed body. The NLRB has, on evidence, amended the law and taken to itself powers which Congress never intended it to have. Congressional investigation is only the first step.

In documenting its charges, the booklet first tells the story of the union, TWUA; the industry, textiles, one of our oldest and most basic manufactures, and the law, the Taft-Hartley Act. Then, the full story unfolds on "the extent and the effectiveness" of the textile industry's massive opposition to union organizing in its sheltered precincts. From surveillance of organizers and union adherents through propaganda methods, rumors, letters to workers, the evidence mounts up. A Senate subcommittee found the story almost unbelievable. Facts show that even violence and gunplay have a role in the all-out attack on the textile worker's right to organize.

For the future, TWUA proposes introduction of a special act—closely following the form and substance of the Railway Labor Act—to govern the traditional and unique textile industry. The evidence underlines the need for serious measures to cope with this national scandal which has been nurtured by the Taft-Hartley law and the obvious pro-management bias of the National Labor Relations Board.

Copies of this booklet have been distributed to all Members of the U.S. Congress and to many members of the public at large. However, a second and companion analysis and compilation has not been so widely circulated. This accompanying material brings right up to date the basic presentation of the printed booklet. The data is completely current; many of the cases detailed in the study are still enmeshed in the dubious processes of the NLRB.

Herewith I introduce into the record one typical case study offered by TWUA in its overall presentation: Case name: Avondale Mills, Inc., Sylacauga, Ala.; Case No. 10–CA–2416.

This case points out the need for an effective injunctive remedy, a need for adequate penalties where employers persistently and flagrantly violate the statute, and the effect of delay, as provided by statute and as injected by administrative procedure, in destroying an organizing campaign.

Here there were two major phases to the company's antiunion campaign. The first phase was a legalistic phase. On November 11, 1954, the company announced to union adherents among its employees that solicitation during working hours violated a plant rule and would be cause for discipline. This policy was promulgated at a time when the company supervisors were actively and coercively soliciting against the union during working hours. From November 16 to November 18 the company discharged three union adherents, purportedly because they had violated the no-solicitation rule.

The Labor Board did not issue a complaint until April 26, 1955 (10–CA–2200, 10–CA–2274). The complaint pertained not only to the no-solicitation rule and the discharges but also to the company's larger pattern of interrogating and threatening its employees and soliciting their withdrawal from the union. The hearing was held June 8, 1955.

While the Board's slow procedures ground on, the company began the second, violent phase of its campaign. On July 21 and 22 a representative of top management stated to a captive audience meeting of the workers that union organizers should be strangled. On July 26 the management request was acted upon. A mob came out of the plant and severely beat up three organizers engaged in a leaflet distribution. On July 29, the union filed charges with the Board. On August 9 organizers again went to the plant to distribute leaflets. They were driven off by a threatening mob of about 100. The same evening the mob drove them out of town. The next day the union requested a 10(j) injunction. The Board never acted upon this request. Any possible doubt as to the justification for an injunction is cleared away in light of the fact that, while the Labor Board would not seek an injunction to protect the public interest, a U.S. district court saw fit to grant an injunction upon the private suit of the victimized individuals. The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama in Gosett against Avondale Mills granted a temporary restraining order on August 12, 1955, and a preliminary injunction on August 28, 1955.

Months later, on February 20, 1956, the Board issued a complaint based upon the violence (10–CA–2416). The company consented to an ineffectual Board order which was issued on April 2, 1956.

By April of 1956 the company's pattern of illegality had completely destroyed the possibility of organizing in the situation. The law's delay and its lack of effective remedies had done the company's job.

The Situation in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1960, an editorial entitled "U.S. Tempts War in Laos" appeared in the Milwaukee Journal.

This editorial was called to my attention by a group of Milwaukee, Wis., residents who wrote to me on January 7, 1961, under the name of the ad hoc committee, expressing their wholehearted support for the stand taken editorially by the Milwaukee Journal and urging that certain steps be taken by our Government to promote a peaceful solution of the situation in Laos.

On January 9, 1961, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Honorable ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, under leave to extend his remarks, included in the RECORD the editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of December 29, 1960, the letter from the ad hoc committee and the list of members of the ad hoc committee. Together with his comments, this material was printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9, 1961.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a report on the information of the ad hoc

committee which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on January 8, 1961, entitled "Stand on Laos Backed by a Committee of 72" and my letter of reply to the ad hoc committee:

STAND ON LAOS BACKED BY A COMMITTEE OF 72—SUGGESTION OF JOURNAL THAT PROBLEM GO TO CONTROL COMMISSION WINS SUPPORT

A Milwaukee Journal editorial, warning that the United States is tempting war in Laos, has been called to the attention of Government leaders by a committee of Milwaukee area university professors, clergymen, labor leaders, Quakers, and members of a number of organizations.

Seventy-two members of the committee backed the Journal's suggestion that the Lao problem be turned over to the international control commission which helped create Laos.

They gave their views in an open letter to President Eisenhower; President-elect Kennedy; Secretary of State Christian A. Herter; Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; the Wisconsin congressional delegation; and the editors of the Journal and the Milwaukee Sentinel.

FAVOR INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATION

"Unless checked by high-minded diplomatic action, the situation in Laos might well precipitate world war III," the committee said. "It is our hope that the problem be referred at once to the established International Control Commission for settlement. We would be pleased and relieved if this most dangerous threat to world peace be placed immediately under active surveillance by the U.N. Security Council.

"We urgently request that U.S. policy toward Laos be based on peaceful international negotiation rather than on regional military intervention. By agreeing with the British and Indian position that the International Control Commission be reconvened, our Government would, in fact, hasten the restoration of peace in Laos. The Journal warns that 'no other sensible alternative seems available and the situation is fast deteriorating to the point where we are risking another Korea, Spain or Indochina.'"

POLICY REEVALUATION URGED

"The time to return from the brink is now. We should reevaluate our foreign policy. We must, through the United Nations, seek peace; otherwise the certainty of disaster looms for us all."

Attached to the letter was a reprint of the Journal editorial.

The letter was signed "the ad hoc committee," indicating that the group was formed for the single purpose of the Laos protest.

The initial meeting forming the committee was held Thursday night at the home of Sidney Peck, chairman of the sociology department at Milwaukee-Downer College. Peck lives at 3044 North Farwell Avenue.

Other members of the committee, all acting as individuals, include:

Norman Adelman, a social worker; Harold Altman, assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Leon Applebaum, UWM assistant professor; Julius Atkins, an attorney and real estate developer; Arthur Becker, UWM professor; Mrs. Phyllis Berentson, a member of the Milwaukee Society of Friends (Quakers); Neal Billings, UWM professor; Valbur Borger, UWM associate professor; Willard Brandt, UWM professor.

OTHER MEMBERS LISTED

Gordon W. Brown, a Quaker; James Brundage, UWM associate professor; Miss Virginia Burke, UWM assistant professor; Miss Miriam Carr, member of the YWCA staff; Martin Cohnstaedt, UWM assistant professor; Miss Carrie Edmondson, president of the Milwaukee chapter of the American Association for the United Nations; Jack Eisendrath, an attorney active in peace and civil rights organizations; Hugo Englemann, UWM associate professor; Joseph Friebert, UWM professor; Gerald Gleason, UWM associate professor; C. L. Golightly, UWM associate professor; Manuel Gottlieb, UWM associate professor; George Goundie, UWM associate professor; Stanley Gregory, assistant regional director of the United Automobile Workers (UAW); Carl Griepentrog, president of the Allied Industrial Workers Union (AIW); George Hall, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin State AFL–CIO; Mrs. Leon Hamlet, a member of the YWCA board; Miss Dorothea Harvey, Milwaukee-Downer assistant professor; David Hiatt, professor at Carroll College, Waukesha; Richard Humphrey, research director for the AIW; Robert S. Jaggard, UWM lecturer.

UWM FACULTY ON LIST

Mrs. Alice Jamosky, wife of a high school teacher; Cornelius Janzen, UWM professor emeritus; Anthony King, business representative for local 75 of the Plumbers' Union; Mrs. Lawrence Kirkpatrick, a Quaker; Harvey Kitzman, regional director of the UAW; Lee Lawrence, UWM professor; Mrs. Frances N. Lee, head of adult education at the art center and clerk of the Milwaukee Society of Friends; David R. Luce, UWM assistant professor; Miss Dorothy L. Meredith, UWM assistant professor; the Reverend Robert H. Midgley of Pilgrim Congregational Church; Miss Mavis Moorman, a Quaker.

Robert B. Notestein, UWM associate sociology professor; Mrs. Virginia Parkman, coordinator for the Milwaukee Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; B. J. Patterson, UWM instructor; Philip Perlson, UWM instructor; Walter Peterson, Milwaukee-Downer associate professor; Matthew Pinter, business representative for the Butchers' Union.

MRS. ROBERTS IN GROUP

Irwin D. Rinder, UWM associate professor; Mrs. Alan Roberts, former president of the Milwaukee chapter of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Miss Pearl Robertson, UWM associate professor; Morton W. Rywick, member of the Milwaukee staff of the Antidefamation League; Erick Schenker, UWM assistant professor; John W. Schmitt, vice president of the State AFL–CIO; Mrs. R. N. Schweitzer, wife of a UWM faculty member and a Quaker; Gordon Shipman, UWM professor; James Silverburg, UWM instructor; James Skelton, Milwaukee-Downer associate professor; John S. Stillman, UWM instructor; Adolph Suppan, UWM professor; Robert Stuckert, UWM assistant professor.

Corneff Taylor, head of the mayor's commission on human rights; Arthur Thrall, Milwaukee-Downer assistant professor; Miss Kathleen M. Vogt, Milwaukee-Downer instructor; Mrs. Frieda Voight, UWM associate professor; Mrs. Kathryn Whitford, UWM instructor; Miss Joyce Wilhelmi, UWM instructor; Rabbi Dudley Weinberg of Temple Emanu-el B'ne Jeshurun.

Mrs. Webster Woodmansee, wife of an attorney and active in the League of Women Voters and a number of liberal groups; Rev. Herbert E. Zebarth of the First Evangelical United Brethren Church; John Zinos, director of district 48 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; and Leonard Zubrensky, an attorney and member of the executive board of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Speaker, both the editorial in the Milwaukee Journal of December 29, 1960, and the letter sent to me by the ad hoc committee implied that the U.S. Government was remiss in failing to take any steps to seek peace in Laos. This and several other points made in both statements required comment. With this thought in mind, and in an effort to set the record straight, I addressed a letter to the ad hoc committee on January 13 and sent a copy of it to the Milwaukee Journ. My letter read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 13, 1961.*

Mr. SIDNEY PECK,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. PECK: This will acknowledge a letter dated January 7, with enclosures, addressed to me by the ad hoc committee. The letter was not signed by any one individual, and I am taking the liberty of sending this reply to you since it was reported that the initial meeting forming the committee was held at your home.

The letter states that the ad hoc committee endorses the views set forth in the editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on December 29, 1960, entitled "U.S. Tempts War in Laos." Further, the committee requests "that U.S. policy toward Laos be based on peaceful international negotiation rather than on regional military intervention."

It is my firm opinion that every effort should be made to resolve the conflict between the different factions in Laos by peaceful and political means. Since the editorial and your statements imply that the U.S. policy has been based solely on a regional military intervention, I believe the entire subject merits careful explanation.

On the same day that your letter was written the Department of State issued a white paper on Laos. A copy is enclosed for your study. The paper sets forth the successive efforts made by our Government to handle the crisis in Laos through diplomatic channels and provides an analysis of the reasoning underlying our position. I hope that this paper receives dissemination at least as wide as that given the editorial and your letter.

Several points made in the editorial require comment. The International Control Commission (ICC) adjourned sine die in 1958. Its reactivation presents procedural and substantive problems that our Government has been actively exploring and will continue to explore. The cochairmen of the Geneva Convention were the British and Russian members. Presumably they could advise the Indian chairman of the ICC to reactivate the Commission. Assuming that this was done, the ICC would need the authority of the Government of Laos to operate in that country. Laos is a constitutional monarchy. Its legal government is headed by Boun Oum who has been invested with power by the King and the Parliament. Thus the Soviet claim that it is supporting the legal government of Souvanna Phouma who has fled to Cambodia has no basis.

The terms of reference of the ICC were set forth in the Geneva agreement of 1954. It was entrusted with control and supervision of the provisions relating to the cessation of hostilities in Laos arising out of the previous war. It is by no means clear that these terms of reference would be entirely applicable to the present situation. The United States is not opposed to the reactivation of the ICC, provided suitable terms of reference for its operation can be agreed upon by all parties.

The Polish member of the ICC is a Communist. There is reason to believe that the Indians do not understand fully the implications of what the Communists are attempting in Laos. It takes no imagination to anticipate the activities and recommendations of a freewheeling Communist and a too trusting member of the Commission. Can it be expected that the independent Government of Laos, fighting for its stability and its very life, could receive much understanding and support from the ICC?

The United States is not trying to take over Laos, nor is it the objective of the United States to create a rightwing government in that country that will adopt a provocative attitude against the North Vietnamese and the Chinese Communists. To my knowledge no responsible official has argued that a landlocked country of 2 million unsophisticated citizens should create incidents against neighbors numbering more than 600 million.

The United States has consistently held the view that Laos should be neutral, that it should not seek membership in any military alliance, that it should have no foreign military bases upon its soil other than those French bases specifically provided for in the Geneva agreements.

The United States has sought through its aid programs to Laos to strengthen that Government by providing the means whereby successive Lao Governments could achieve wide public support among its many tribes and ethnic groups. In partnership with France the United States has provided military assistance and training in the use and maintenance of American weapons in order that the country could maintain internal order and security. The threat to its security is the Communist technique, developed and perfected in China and North Vietnam by Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh, of taking over territory through the gradual buildup of centers of guerrilla control. These centers keep expanding in ever-widening circles until the entire country is taken over. The Communists have developed a carefully worked out propaganda program to accompany this guerrilla tactic for taking over a country. The main theme of that propaganda is that the guerrillas are merely innocent people of the country who hate graft and corruption in government and are trying to correct social injustices. Anyone who opposes these techniques is charged with being reactionary, rightwing, imperialistic and all the rest of the catalog of Communist epithets.

In the case of the recent Souvanna Phouma government, the United States has exerted every effort and all its influence to induce General Phoumi to take up his post in the Souvanna government and to give it his full support. These efforts failed because the foreign directed and assisted Communist subversive and guerrilla apparatus in Laos contrived their failure by progressively drawing the Souvanna government into a web of Communist control. As Communist influence and control increased in Vientiane, the possibility of reuniting the Lao political groups behind Souvanna's government diminished. The net result was the unfortunate series of events which culminated in the coup of early December in an attempt to eliminate Communist influence in Vientiane. This was followed by Kon Le's armed retaliation and the flight of Souvanna and his cabinet from the country.

The real danger is that the confusing course of events in Laos will obscure the tactics of the Communists. Unless we respond realistically to those tactics, we will be blinded by ingenious Communist propaganda. Then another piece of the free world will be yielded up to the kind of existence now experienced by the people of China. Other nations in southeast Asia will be the next victims. Experience shows that Communist pressure will be applied whenever they detect weaknesses. Berlin and Formosa are well-known examples. The United States and its free world allies can only meet these pressures from a position of strength and firmness. Anything less than that is an invitation to Communist advance.

I believe that the United States should preserve an open mind with respect to the ICC. But it is important to bear in mind that the solution of the Lao problem cannot be found in any approach that equates the Communist directed and supported guerrillas with the Royal Government of Laos as two similar parties to a dispute or which equates the assistance that the United States, France, and other free world countries as well as the United Nations are giving Laos with the military support given by the Communist bloc to their guerrilla forces in Laos.

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the liberty of including these several articles and letters in the RECORD in the hope of contributing to a clarification of our Government's efforts and objectives with respect to the situation in Laos.

At present, the new proposal for reviving the three-power Control Commission submitted by the British to the Soviet Union, suggests that the ICC act in close cooperation with King Savang Vathana of Laos through that country's legitimate government. To the best of my knowledge, the Soviet Union has not as yet replied to that proposal.

As President Kennedy clearly indicated in his press conference of January 25, the United States wishes only that Laos may enjoy peace, independence, and neutrality, and have every opportunity to devote its efforts and concern to the well-being of its people.

We are using our influence to promote the attainment of those objectives.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who hath taught us that only in the reach of our love is the richness of our life, may no concern for self or ill will for others blur the goal of our glorious destiny among the nations as the instrument of Thy providence to free the earth from tyranny.

To this end, our God, bless our America.

Thou seest, in spite of the worst things in us which we despise, that in our highest hours our deepest desire is to be the true servants of Thy purpose in these times of social upheaval.

Grant us the grace, O Lord, to cherish and preserve evermore the heritage that is ours through the valor and virtue of those whose record, within these very Halls, has helped make the greatness of our Nation.

Inspire us so to follow their shining example that we may not only hold our inheritance as a sacred and precious trust, but, by our love and labor, leave it with increased luster to those who shall come after us.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 31, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee may be privileged to be in session on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, regardless of whether or not the Senate may be in session at the same time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce our present plan is to commence hearings in the Banking and Currency Committee at 10 o'clock next Tuesday, February 7, 1961, on the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Witnesses desiring to be heard, who have not already done so, should promptly notify the clerk of the Banking and Currency Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTABLISHMENT OF JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS IN THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO ANNUAL INSPECTION OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BALANCE SHEET OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a balance sheet of that company, as of December 31, 1960 (with

accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY MANAGEMENT OF SELECTED ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supply management of selected electronic equipment programs, Department of the Navy, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CONTRACTS WITH LUCKY MC URANIUM CORP., RIVERTON, WYO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission Contracts AI(05–1)–710 and AT(05–1)–769 with Lucky Mc Uranium Corp., Riverton, Wyo., for the procurement of uranium concentrates, June, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that Association, dated March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, GS–17, AND GS–18

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Administration established in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, as of December 31, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Department allocated or placed in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, during the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Commission, in the grades of GS–16, 17, and 18, during the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"CHAPTER 22

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4—Relative to ratification of a proposed Federal constitutional amendment providing electoral college representation for the District of Columbia.

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 39, two-thirds of each House concurring therein, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

" 'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly and senate of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said legislature voting in favor thereof, That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"RALPH M. BROWN,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"HUGH M. BURNS,
"President pro tempore of the Senate.
"Secretary of State.

"Attest:

"FRANK M. JORDAN,
"By WALTER C. STUTLER,
"Assistant Secretary of State."

"CHAPTER 18

"Senate Joint Resolution 5—Relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the granting of representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 39, two-thirds of each House concurring therein, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

" 'SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

" 'Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'SEC. 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

" 'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

" 'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'

"Whereas said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and the assembly of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of the legislature voting in favor thereof, That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"HUGH M. BURNS,
"President pro tempore of the Senate.
"RALPH M. BROWN,
"Speaker of the Assembly.

"Attest:

"FRANK M. JORDAN,
"Secretary of State.
"By WALTER C. STUTLER,
"Assistant Secretary of State."

RESOLUTION OF THE VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Vermont Legislature recently adopted two

resolutions. One of them expresses gratitude and appreciation to ex-President Eisenhower. The other resolution pledges cooperation to President Kennedy in the effort to build a stronger and better country. Both resolutions were adopted by unanimous votes, as I understand; and I submit them to the Senate at this time, and ask that they be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 13—JOINT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING OUR GRATITUDE AND GOOD WISHES TO PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Whereas our beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has just given over the command of the ship of state to his successor and now, once again, becomes a private citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives,

That we express to him on behalf of all our fellow Vermonters our deep appreciation for his great and wise leadership of our country in time of manifest peril;

That our gratitude for his unyielding courage and tremendous exertions of mental, spiritual, and physical energy may lead us to follow his splendid example;

That our best wishes go with him and his charming wife down the years where we hope they find the serenity and joy they so richly deserve; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to forward a certified copy of these resolutions to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford.

RESOLUTION 15—JOINT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING GOOD WISHES AND SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Whereas the administration of President John F. Kennedy begins with the United States still engaged in the so-called cold war resulting from the efforts of certain countries to impose on other and weaker countries an ideology completely opposed to our belief in the liberty and sanctity of the individual human being so that the Nation is in great peril: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives,

That we record our endorsement of the sentiments President Kennedy expressed so well in his inaugural message;

That we extend to him, in answer to his call, our support in his efforts through the months to come to find and implement the ways and means toward peaceful solution of the world conflict now raging;

That we endorse his aim to help other peoples to help themselves;

That we pledge to him our full support by way of personal service and material contributions to make this country even stronger and so better able to fulfill its high purposes; and

That we express to him our sincere wish that he may have Godspeed and good luck in his efforts toward peace with all mankind, and progress and prosperity within the Nation so that the rights and welfare of every citizen may increasingly be secure; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to forward a certified copy of these resolutions to President John F. Kennedy, Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford.

RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I hold in my hand House Resolution 7 from the house of representatives of my State. It is a very worthy resolution to the Congress, and I hope that Congress will take early action on it.

I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE MEMORIAL 7

A memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend educational benefits to veterans who entered or who enter military service after February 1, 1955, and to extend educational benefits to all who enter so long as the provisions of the draft law exist

Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans' education program established by the Federal Government; and

Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans' education program which would not otherwise have been possible; and

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans arising out of their higher education level will more than reimburse the Treasury of the entire cost of the training program by 1970; and

Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

Whereas such Executive order has deprived millions of Americans serving in the Armed Forces of the educational benefits previously extended to veterans; and

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 25th legislative session of the State of New Mexico, That the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend veteran educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or who enter, military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist; and be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution that a copy thereof be mailed, by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of New Mexico.

(Mr. ANDERSON also submitted a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

RESOLUTIONS OF UNITED-ITALIAN AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL, INC.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by the United-Italian American Labor Council, Inc., of New York, N.Y., relating to immigration and Italian democracy and free trade unionism.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas during the 1960 election campaign both presidential candidates—Vice President Richard Nixon and Senator John F. Kennedy—solemnly pledged themselves to humanize, liberalize, and improve substantially our immigration laws; and

Whereas President-elect Kennedy, first as a Member of the House of Representatives and later as Senator, manifested, on numerous occasions, his support of such needed legislation: Be it

Resolved, at this 19th annual conference of the United-Italian American Labor Council, held on December 17, 1960, Hotel Commodore, New York City, To appeal to the newly elected President of the United States, and to the Members of the incoming Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to the following measures:

(a) To implement, without further delay, Public Law 363 which was enacted last year and which provided for the admittance to the United States, extra quota, of about 50,000 close relatives whose approved applications were dated prior to December 31, 1953.

(b) To enact a law, allowing admittance to the United States, extra quota, of family members of American citizens who have registered during the period from January 1, 1954, to date.

(c) To make it easier for skilled workers, needed by the American economy, to be admitted to the United States, and to put on a par the number of such immigrants allowed to countries like Italy with the number allowed to countries like England or Germany; be it further

Resolved, To appeal to the President-elect John F. Kennedy and the new Congress to consider favorably the following necessary measures:

1. To distribute among the members of the North Atlantic Alliance the quota numbers left unused by countries which are today allowed greater quota;

2. To humanize and put on an equitable basis deportations by empowering the President of the United States to pardon individuals when required by the national interest and security, and elementary justice upon recommendation by the Department of State, the Department of Justice, or any competent security agency of our Government;

3. To base the quota allowed to each country on the 1960 census instead of the 1920 census.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING ITALIAN DEMOCRACY AND FREE TRADE UNIONISM

The strengthening of Italian democracy has always been one of the main purposes of the United-Italian American Labor Council. In striving for this objective, we were motivated by our conviction that a strong Italian

democracy is in the best interests of American and world democracy.

In Italy, as elsewhere, free trade unionism is one of the main pillars of democracy. In this realization, our council has continuously given its highest attention to helping the growth of free trade unionism in Italy.

We firmly believe that the safeguarding and promotion of freedom is the paramount issue confronting all mankind. This issue is of the most pressing concern especially for countries like Italy which are so close to the Iron Curtain empire.

All evidence confirms the unceasing Soviet totalitarian imperialist drive to subvert and destroy the defenses of the free world—particularly in countries like Italy—which are on the front line of the defense of the free world.

This is why the Moscow strategists have always given special attention to the disruption of Italian democracy through direct support of its fifth column, the Communist Party and its allies, and the C.G.I.L. which it dominates. Toward this end, the Communist Party of Italy has engaged in "united front" maneuvers with totalitarian neofascists. It has also systematically sought to lure greedy Italian industrialists by helping arrange for their quick profitable economic deals with the Soviet dictatorship.

The campaign for so-called coexistence, now being waged by Moscow, is nothing else than a deceitful, camouflaged drive to destroy freedom and pave the way for Communist domination of the world. This campaign serves as a smokescreen for new attempts by the Kremlin to weaken, divide, and undermine the political and free trade union forces of the democratic Republic of Italy.

Our council, therefore, urges the Government of the United States that:

No official American agency should encourage any political, trade union or cultural group to cooperate on a local or national scale with the Communist Party or the Communist-dominated C.G.I.L. of Italy.

We further call to the attention of all the freedom-loving political and free trade union organizations in Italy the urgent necessity of their greatest vigilance in order to defeat:

1. All attempts by the Communist Party to weaken or wreck the democratic entente which was reestablished in Italy after the bloody riots of July 1960. The more the democratic entente is strengthened, the safer Italian democracy will be.

2. All maneuvers by the Moscow-dominated C.G.I.L. to undermine the two free trade union federations of Italy—the C.I.S.L. and the U.I.L.—through fake unity schemes.

Experience has demonstrated that the permanent isolation and weakening of the Communist fifth column in Italy, as elsewhere, are possible only when democracy is supported by a vigorous, united free trade union movement. It is this unity which we wish for Italy—a unity further buttressed by a free and powerful cooperative movement, which is such a vital necessity for a democratic and prosperous Italy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 44. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate, and make expenditures in connection with, certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 32);

S. Res. 68. Resolution to print a committee report entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government";

S. Res. 70. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ temporarily an additional assistant chief clerk and additional staff and clerical personnel (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 71. Resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Organizing for National Security—Selected Materials";

S. Res. 72. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Report 1096, 86th Congress, entitled "National Policy Machinery in Communist China";

S. Res. 73. Resolution to print additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Organizing for National Security"; and

S. Res. 75. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 34).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 26. Resolution to authorize a study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 69. Resolution to investigate the efficiency and economy of operations of the Federal Government (Rept. No. 37); and

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 38).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 60. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 39).

REPORT ENTITLED "REVIEW OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ACTIVITIES, 1959–60" (S. REPT. NO. 30)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a unanimous report entitled "Review of the Small Business Administration Activities, 1959–60," which I ask to have printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

EXPENDITURES BY, AND TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR, THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 40)

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel, and submitted a report thereon; which resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
(2) corrupt practices;
(3) contested elections;
(4) credentials and qualifications;
(5) Federal elections generally; and
(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 746. A bill for the relief of Yee Mee Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 747. A bill for the relief of Sum Seto and wife, Yee Sun Kam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 748. A bill for the relief of the Princess Anne County School Board, Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to include a pro rata share of the income of foreign corporations in the gross income of taxpayers owning, directly or indirectly, 10 percent or more of the voting stock of such foreign corporations, to repeal the foreign tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BEALL, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. FONG, Mr. MORTON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 750. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 751. A bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 752. A bill to amend section 9 of the Hatch Political Activities Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, so that the rights of Federal employees to participate in political campaigns will be stated with greater clarity; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 753. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make an examination and survey of the Raccoon Creek watershed, Indiana, for soil conservation and recreation purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Marie Loray Legister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request):

S. 755. A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 756. A bill for the relief of Alex Witiuk; and

S. 757. A bill for the relief of Shoji Hirose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 758. A bill to amend section 613(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the rate of percentage depletion with respect to gold produced from deposits in the United States shall be 23 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 759. A bill for the relief of Sadako Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 760. A bill to amend section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 761. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes;

S. 762. A bill to amend section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended;

S. 763. A bill to authorize annual appropriation to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained during any fiscal year in lieu of annual appropriations to restore capital inpairment based on annual Treasury appraisals, and for other purposes; and

S. 764. A bill to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 765. A bill to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park and to provide for certain adjustments necessitated by the installation of a park tour road, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 766. A bill to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 767. A bill to provide for wheat marketing quotas without acreage allotments; and

S. 768. A bill to provide for a wheat marketing certificate plan; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 769. A bill to amend section 2310 of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to determinations and decisions as to procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 770. A bill authorizing construction of the Hidden Reservoir on the Fresno River, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; and

S. 771. A bill authorizing construction of the Buchanan Reservoir on the Chowchilla River, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. FONG):

S. 772. A bill to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 773. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Sarafian and Stiliani Sarafian; and

S. 774. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 775. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act, the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in order to permit certain payments made under such acts to be made in grain with a 10-percent bonus in lieu of cash, if the producer elects the payment in grain from stocks controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 776. A bill for the relief of Salomon Harari, Yvonne Harari, Gracie Harari, Elie Harari, and Henry Harari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. BUSH, Mr. JAVITS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 777. A bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 778. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950; and

S. 779. A bill to amend section 13 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 780. A bill authorizing the District of Columbia to place two statues in the Statuary Hall collection; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 781. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 782. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit certain fully insured individuals who are unemployed and have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits to retire at age 60; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 783. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 784. A bill for the relief of Johnnie Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. PELL):

S. 785. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 786. A bill to provide for appeals from adverse personnel actions affecting employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 787. A bill to prohibit residence requirements as conditions for eligibility under State plans for aid to the blind;

S. 788. A bill to amend section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain charitable contributions to libraries and to historical societies or agencies; and

S. 789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit hospitals from certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARTHY when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN:

S. 790. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N.C., and two electron microscopes for the use of the Duke University Medical Center at Durham, N.C.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 791. A bill for the relief of Janina Huszcza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to address a joint session of Congress annually; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

EXPENDITURES BY, AND TEMPORARY PERSONNEL FOR, THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and employ temporary personnel, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF CONCENTRATION OF DEFENSE ACTIVITIES ON THE WEST COAST

Mr. BUTLER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 82) to investigate the concentration of defense activities on the west coast, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BUTLER, which appears under a separate heading.)

ELIMINATION OF PREFERENTIAL TAX TREATMENT ACCORDED CERTAIN INCOME EARNED ABROAD

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate the preferential tax treatment now accorded certain income earned abroad.

On January 9 of this year I addressed the Senate on the subject of preferential tax treatment of income earned abroad, with particular reference to the effect this treatment has had, and continues to have, on our balance of payments and the outflow of gold, and to inequity as between taxpayers. The bill I now introduce would effectuate the recommendations made in my January 9 address.

This bill proposes two basic changes in the Internal Revenue Code. Taken together, these changes will, in my opinion, repeal major preferential tax treatment for income earned abroad and thereby remove an incentive to the movement of capital overseas. This tax-stimulated movement of capital abroad has resulted in loss of jobs and productive capacity here at home, and has added to our balance-of-payments deficit and gold outflow.

Section I of the bill provides for the taxation, in the year in which earned, of profits of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. taxpayers. Under present law, the profits of a domestic corporation operating abroad in branch form are taxed in the year in which earned. This section of the proposed bill would subject the profits of subsidiaries to substantially the same tax treatment now accorded profits from foreign branches. Since these subsidiaries are, in fact, foreign corporations, they cannot be dealt with directly, and this section, therefore, provides that the domestic taxpayer owning as much as 10 percent of the voting stock of a foreign corporation will be taxed currently on that part of the net profits of the foreign corporation represented by his proportionate share of ownership. The usual rules concerning constructive ownership are included.

Section 2 of the bill provides, in clarification of section 1, that dividends subsequently paid to the domestic parent corporation will not give rise to taxation again if the earnings from which those dividends are paid have already been taxed under provisions of section 1.

Section 3 provides for the repeal of the foreign tax credit, leaving domestic taxpayers free to claim foreign taxes paid as a deduction, as is the case with taxes paid to any one of our States. Present law allows the taxpayer the option of claiming certain foreign taxes as either deductions or credits. Section 3 provides also for the repeal of those sections of the Internal Revenue Code relating to special tax treatment of the income earned by Western Hemisphere trade corporations and China trade act corporations.

Section 4 provides that there shall be no retroactivity, the provisions of this bill, should they become law, applying to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of the act.

Mr. President, the passage of this bill will not, in my opinion, result in either the liquidation of foreign investment or in the stoppage of the flow abroad of all private investment funds. This would not be in our best interests. It would, however, in my opinion, slow down the flow of new funds abroad. This would contribute to the reduction of this movement to manageable proportions. This would, in my opinion, prove beneficial in both short- and long-run aspects of foreign and domestic policy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 749) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to include a pro rata share of the income of foreign corporations in the gross income of taxpayers owning, directly or indirectly, 10 percent or more of the voting stock of such foreign corporations, to repeal the foreign tax credit, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN AREA DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 5, I introduced a bill dealing with area redevelopment. I now introduce a new bill, with some modifications, on the same subject. I have checked with all the cosponsors of the other bill. Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce this bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 750) to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Senators BUSH, CARLSON, WILEY, BEALL, HICKENLOOPER, SALTONSTALL, MILLER, FONG, MORTON, SCHOEPPEL, and YOUNG of North Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION ACT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act.

Public Law 726, of the 79th Congress, created the Indian Claims Commission, for the purpose of allowing various Indian tribes, bands, or identifiable groups an opportunity to submit for adjudication claims which they had against the Federal Government. The 1946 act provided, in section 23, that the Commission would terminate at the end of 10 years from its first meeting, or at such earlier time as it concluded its business and filed its final report with the Congress. During the period from 1946 to 1951, the Indians filed 370 petitions, which were separated into a total of 596 dockets. To date, the Commission has completed action on 128 dockets; and 28 awards, totaling more than $37 million, have been made. Many dockets have been processed to various advanced stages approaching final determination.

It was evident in 1956 that the Commission could not complete its task by April 10, 1957—the date by which the Commission was to have finished its work. Therefore, the 84th Congress enacted amendatory legislation which extended the life of the Commission until April 10, 1962. It is quite clear now that the Commission cannot adjudicate the remaining dockets in 1 more year, and that it will be necessary to further extend the life of the Commission.

In the platform adopted by the Democratic Party in Los Angeles, it was stated that—

> Indian claims against the United States can and will be settled promptly, either by negotiation or other means, to the best interests of both parties.

By the enactment of legislation in 1946, Congress gave recognition to the long-standing grievances of many of the Indian tribes and provided a forum before which they could present their claims. A tremendous amount of work in preparing these very complex cases has been done by the attorneys for the Indians and the attorneys in the Justice Department who defend the United States. We have promised the Indians

their day in court; and, in all fairness to them, additional time must be provided in order to enable the Commission to hear and render judgment on the matters that have been presented to it. The legislation I am sponsoring would allow the Commission to continue until April 10, 1967, unless it completes its mission at an earlier date.

It is my intention, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, to hold hearings on the bill I have just introduced as soon as the executive departments have submitted their reports; and it is my hope that the Congress will enact this legislation promptly, in order that the Commission may proceed in an orderly manner to fulfill its functions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 751) to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO HATCH ACT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the past presidential campaign many complaints were received in my office which prompted me to make a reappraisal of the Hatch Political Activities Act and the Civil Service Commission regulations implementing it.

That act was intended originally to prevent Federal employees from using their position to influence votes, or an election. The Civil Service Commission was given the authority to promulgate regulations setting standards to guide them. This has been done, but in doing so it has accented the negative and ignored the positive with the result that many employees are being denied their rights. The Civil Service Commission regulations, election posters and literature state over and over what cannot be done in the area of political activity by an employee, but in most cases fail to state what legally can be done. This negative approach has led some Federal employees to believe that they can in no way, even remotely, be connected with an election. Some even have a feeling that their right to vote, to publicly voice their preference, or to contribute to the party of their choice has been curtailed, when such is not the case.

I have been informed that the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia experienced considerable difficulty in registering citizens for absentee balloting prior to the election. Many people indicated considerable reluctance to state their party preference. Others even left upon being asked their name apparently because of some fear that their job would be jeopardized.

A patently ridiculous situation was created by several Government agencies when they informed their employees that they could not utilize their car pools in going to the polls from work on election day—this notwithstanding the fact that all year they go to and from work by this method. Such an interpretation of the Hatch Act is ludicrous and how any right thinking, responsible administrator could so interpret it is beyond me. Many complaints of this nature came to my office prior to election day and my staff was instructed to tell them that there was no such restriction in the Hatch Act.

Federal employees also have been criticized as having violated the Hatch Act for bringing their cars onto Government property with stickers indicating the candidate of their choice affixed to the bumper. Federal employees are not prohibited from having bumper stickers indicating their preference on their cars. To insinuate that they are engaging in criminal conduct when and if they drive the car onto Government property is clearly wrong and, in my opinion, is not the type of activity that the Hatch Act was designed to reach.

Because of these negative and ridiculous misinterpretations of the act—which actually make the Federal employee truly a second-class citizen—I am at this time introducing a bill which makes an attempt to affirmatively spell out and state with clarity certain activities which a Government employee can legitimately engage in without fear of reprisal. My bill will, by specific statutory enactment, permit Federal employees' attendance at political meetings, conventions and caucuses as well as membership in political clubs. It gives them also the right to express their views thereat on any political candidate or subject there the subject of discussion. It further affirmatively permits them to contribute money to the party of their choice, to wear political buttons and to display pictures and posters in their homes and on their automobiles notwithstanding that the cars are occasionally brought onto Federal property. It will also permit Federal employees to utilize their car pools in going to and from the polls on election day; and it does away with the mistaken notion of many civil servants that his or her spouse is prevented from actively engaging in political work.

I think that only by positively spelling out the areas of permitted activity in statutory form can the Federal worker be guaranteed his basic rights. Too many times overzealous administrators suffering from a lack of understanding of the law impose restrictions which were never intended by the Congress. It is my intention to see that the Federal employees are protected to the fullest and that this continual imposition of restrictions contrary to congressional intent is stopped.

I wish to have the bill lie on the table for a week so that other Senators who may so desire can join in supporting the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

The bill (S. 752) to amend section 9 of the Hatch Political Activities Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, so that the rights of Federal employees to participate in political campaigns will be stated with greater clarity, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF RACCOON CREEK WATERSHED, INDIANA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make an examination and survey of the Raccoon Creek watershed, Indiana, for soil conservation and recreation purposes.

In connection with the introduction of this bill, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD a copy of a press release which I have prepared on the subject matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 753) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make an examination and survey of the Raccoon Creek Watershed, Ind., for soil conservation and recreation purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The press release presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

U.S. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART today introduced a bill designed to provide additional soil conservation, flood control and recreational development on the Raccoon Creek Watershed in Parke County, Ind.

Specifically, Senator CAPEHART's bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an examination and survey of the Raccoon Creek Watershed to determine what should be done:

1. To promote soil conservation in the area, particularly the prevention of siltation into the Mansfield Reservoir and the construction of such additional facilities as may be necessary for flood control purposes.

2. To promote and provide necessary facilities for outdoor recreation in the area, particularly in the vicinity of the Mansfield Reservoir on Raccoon Creek which was completed on June 6, 1960.

Senator CAPEHART's bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to report the results of the examination and survey to the President and to Congress as soon as practicable. The Secretary is directed to include in the report recommendations for any necessary legislation.

Senator CAPEHART's bill further directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army to provide any assistance, on a reimbursable basis, which might be required to carry out the provisions of the bill.

The bill further seeks to authorize appropriations in such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill.

"The completion of the Mansfield Reservoir has indeed been a great accomplishment for this entire area," Senator CAPEHART said. "The benefits anticipated from the survey envisioned in this bill would be to determine how best to prevent damaging siltation in the Reservoir plus the equally damaging loss of fine topsoil fertile lands on Raccoon Creek. This is a beautiful area in which the Reservoir provides the centerpiece for a program of recreational development to give added value to the entire project."

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS],

as well as the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. WILLIAMS] I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

This bill is designed to enable the United States to sell property vested in connection with World War II, despite the pendency of litigation as to its ownership. The principal property that would be affected by its enactment would be the General Aniline and Film Corp., which has a book value of approximately $120 million. The United States now holds 93 percent of the stock of this corporation vested by the Alien Property Custodian in 1942, and the company has been under the active control and management of the Department of Justice since that date.

It is essential that this huge industrial enterprise be freed from the dead hand of Federal ownership and control. The seemingly endless litigation affecting the company and its continued functioning under the management of the Department of Justice has prevented this company from achieving anything near its full growth and potential.

I am particularly concerned about this problem because the principal plants of the company are located in New York State and neighboring New Jersey. Anything which can be done to spur the growth of the company will also serve to spur employment and stimulate economic activity in the communities affected. It is not good policy for the United States to own and run ordinary commercial enterprises. By enactment of this bill we can get the Government out of the chemical, photographic and other activities in which General Aniline engages and benefit the economy at the same time.

Legislation similar to the proposed bill has been repeatedly endorsed by the Department of Justice which has no desire at all to continue its involvement in this commercial activity. Virtually the only opposition to this bill which I have ever heard has come from representatives of the party in litigation, and as I have pointed out, every safeguard is provided in the event it wins its lawsuit. The bill has received the support of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the AFL–CIO, the Supervisory Association of the General Aniline Corp., the International Chemical Workers Union—which represents most of the company's rank and file employees—and many other knowledgeable persons.

Mr. President, this is an important bill and one which should have early, favorable consideration. Its merit and importance should be obvious to everyone who believes in the free enterprise system. I hope that the bill will have the strong endorsement of the new administration and that it will receive prompt action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 760) to amend section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That upon a determination made by the President, in time of war or during any national emergency declared by the President, that the interest and welfare of the United States require the sale of any property or interest or any part thereof claimed in any suit filed under this subsection and pending on or after the date of enactment of this proviso the Alien Property Custodian or any successor officer or agency, may sell such property or interest or part thereof, in conformity with law applicable to sales of property by him, at any time prior to the entry of final judgment in such suit. No such sale shall be made until thirty days have passed after the publication of notice in the Federal Register of the intention to sell. The net proceeds of any such sale shall be deposited in a special account established in the Treasury, and shall be held in trust by the Secretary of the Treasury pending the entry of final judgment in such suit. Any recovery of any claimant in such suit in respect of the property or interest or part thereof so sold shall be satisfied from the net proceeds of such sale unless such claimant, within sixty days after receipt of the notice of the amount of net proceeds of sale serves upon the Alien Property Custodian, or any successor officer or agency, and files with the court an election to waive all claims to the net proceeds, or any part thereof, and to claim just compensation instead. If the court finds that the claimant has established an interest, right, or title in any property in respect of which such an election has been served and filed, it shall proceed to determine the amount which will constitute just compensation for such interest, right, or title, and shall order payment to the claimant of the amount so determined. An order for the payment of just compensation hereunder shall be a judgment against the United States and shall be payable first from the net proceeds of the sale in an amount not to exceed the amount the claimant would have received had he elected to accept his proportionate part of the net proceeds of the sale and the balance, if any, shall be payable in the same manner as are judgments in cases arising under section 1346 of title 28, United States Code. The Alien Property Custodian or any successor officer or agency, shall, immediately upon the entry of final judgment, notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the determination by final judgment of the claimant's interest and right to the proportionate part of the net proceeds from the sale, and the final determination by judgment of the amount of just compensation in the event the claimant has elected to recover just compensation for the interest in the property he claimed."

FEDERAL LIMITED PROFIT MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to make loans to private builders and nonprofit organizations for the construction of a minimum of 35,000 housing units annually for families of moderate income and for elderly persons. The bill, patterned after the Mitchell-Lama Middle Income Housing program operating in New York State since 1956, will be introduced in the House by Representative JOHN LINDSAY, Republican, of New York.

I introduced this housing bill during the last session, and while it was reported to the Senate by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, it was not acted on by the Senate. Now, President Kennedy's emphasis on housing makes this measure a must in his priority economic program as outlined in his state of the Union message.

In this bill, moderate income families are defined as those "whose incomes preclude them from purchasing or renting conventionally financed new housing with total monthly housing expenditures of 20 percent of their normal stable income as defined by the Federal Housing Administration," while elderly persons are designated as those 60 years of age or more, or those in families headed by elderly persons. The Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation would issue tax exempt bonds up to a maximum of $500 million annually for the purpose of increasing the supply of standard housing available to middle income families with the borrowers limited to a profit of 6 percent on their investment. After the first year of operation, the Corporation could issue as much as $1.5 billion in additional tax exempt bonds with the approval of the President.

The most serious housing gap in the Nation today involves more than 13 million families who are not eligible for low-rent housing but who cannot find or cannot afford to pay for decent housing adequate to their needs. In its favorable report on the Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation last year, the Banking and Currency Committee stated "that there is an urgent need for a supplementary system of housing financing to enable private enterprise to provide homes of sound standards of design and construction" for families of moderate income and for elderly people. Since 1956, New York State has operated a limited profit housing program—established under the Mitchell-Lama law—and it has compiled an outstanding record in this field. The construction of more than 13,000 middle income housing units in New York State has been authorized so far under this program, and nearly 20 percent of these units have already been completed. It is this very successful program, expanded by the voters of New York on two occasions, that serves as the basis for the Federal Corporation I am proposing today. I believe that its establishment is essential if we are to achieve a national housing policy of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family as called for in the Housing Act of 1949.

The primary objective of this new Federal program is the construction of housing units which in a large metro-

politan area such as New York City would carry a monthly rent of approximately $20 to $25 per room. This rate represents a reduction of anywhere from 40 percent to 50 percent below the average rent level which middle-income families must now pay for adequate living quarters. To help promote the construction of units which they can afford, and which will enable many of them to move out of substandard housing they now occupy, those borrowing from the Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation would be limited to a return of 6 percent. Builders would also be assisted in keeping costs under the proposed program through the reduction of the interest rate on mortgages since the funds would be lent at lower cost. It would encourage communities to grant tax abatements on the new middle-income projects without giving up existing revenues from the site, and it would stimulate the use of urban renewal sites for this new construction in order to reduce the purchase price of the land involved. As a result, rents and carrying charges would then be held at levels which could be afforded by middle-income families and elderly persons of modest means.

It is also important to note that the program will enable private enterprise throughout the Nation to better serve U.S. housing needs without substantial cost to the Federal Treasury or prejudicial impact on the budget. Through the issuance of Government-guaranteed bonds which do not require direct loans from the Treasury, the Corporation would lend funds in the form of 50-year, 90-percent mortgage with the remaining 10 percent supplied as investment or downpayments. The borrowing rate would be identical with that charged the Corporation when it secured the funds plus one-half of 1 percent to cover operational costs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 766) to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and for elderly persons, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DETERMINATIONS AND DECISIONS AS TO PROCUREMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 2310 of title 10 of the United States Code, to make a needed correction of a situation that has existed for some time. This bill will allow a review of certain negotiated procurement action by the General Accounting Office, which GAO does not currently have.

The Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 expresses the intent of Congress that purchases or contracts for property or services shall be made by formal advertising. I strongly feel that advertised procurement based on full and free competition between all qualified suppliers, in most cases, will result in the most reasonable prices.

I recognize that some procurements cannot be formally advertised, but I believe that the authority to negotiate should be carefully and discreetly exercised. In any negotiated contract something less than full and free competition is obtained; and, consequently, the basic safeguards afforded by full and free competition may be diminished or lost. Therefore it is cause for concern that only 14 percent of the dollar value of procurements in fiscal year 1960 was accomplished through formal advertising.

I believe that the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, as presently written, permit the use of negotiation many times when the procurement could be formally advertised. I think this situation might be improved if the procurement regulations were amended to require that the use of any exception to the general rule requiring the use of formal advertising be supported by a complete statement of the pertinent facts to show clearly that use of formal advertising would be impractical.

I recognize that for contracts negotiated under recognized exceptions 11 to 16 to the general rule, the Department of Defense is now required to support the decision to negotiate by a finding and determination. A review of these findings and determinations noted that they are generally quite brief and do not provide enough information concerning the circumstances relating to the procurement to clearly show the factors requiring the use of the authority to negotiate. In fact, many findings and determinations are stereotyped and give the reasons for negotiating in terms which are broad and general, rather than specific.

I believe that a careful examination of the use of the authority to negotiate and the development of effective criteria and guidelines for the use of contract negotiators would result in a substantial reduction of negotiated procurement in favor of procurement by formal advertising and would better serve the interest of the Government, taxpayers and industry.

This amendment would not in any way present any serious problems or delay in procurement matters. For years GAO has had authority to question advertising procedures. Yet this has not brought about any chaotic results as are sometimes predicted by the Defense Department in defending its absolute right to negotiate. Even with my amending legislation, procurement actions would not be questioned except in cases where they were clearly erroneous, arbitrary, or capricious, or not supported by substantial evidence, a test that is applied often in law with respect to findings of judgment. Those instances are rare but the important thing is that a salutary purpose would be served by the very fact that if there are abuses of the power to negotiate, these abuses could be questioned.

I ask that this bill be allowed to lie on the table for 1 week in order that other Senators may cosponsor it if they wish.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 769) to amend section 2310 of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to determinations and decisions as to procurement, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RESERVOIRS ON FRESNO AND CHOWCHILLA RIVERS, CALIF.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and my colleague [Mr. KUCHEL], two bills to authorize the construction of reservoirs in California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, for himself and Mr. KUCHEL, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. 770. A bill authorizing construction of the Hidden Reservoir on the Fresno River, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., for flood control and other purposes; and

S. 771. A bill authorizing construction of the Buchanan Reservoir on the Chowchilla River, San Joaquin River Basin, Calif., for flood control and other purposes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, there are two rivers in Madera County, in the Central Valley of California, which flow entirely uncontrolled and almost unutilized.

One is the Fresno River, which flows through the city of Madera, the county seat. The other is the Chowchilla River, which flows through the city of Chowchilla. Both are tributaries of the San Joaquin River.

Both now and then cause damaging floods in these cities and adjacent farmlands.

Both regularly run dry in the late summer and fall months, when water is badly needed in this area.

Studies are underway by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, contemplating the construction of two small reservoirs to control these streams—Hidden Dam on the Fresno River and Buchanan Dam on the Chowchilla. For these reasons I am today introducing, with my colleague [Senator KUCHEL], the two bills to authorize the construction of these reservoirs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL TROPICAL BOTANIC GARDEN IN HAWAII

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to a proposed national tropical botanic garden. The bill would authorize the President to have a complete study made of the desirability and feasibility of creating such a garden in the State of Hawaii.

I have given careful consideration to this proposal, and believe that a tropical

botanic garden would serve a highly valuable purpose, not only for the scientists of our country, but also for the entire Western Hemisphere. No comprehensive tropical botanic garden is available, in either North America or South America, to botanists, geneticists, physiologists, and other scientists concerned with tropical plants. There is a great potential, both for basic scientific inquiry and for applied science, in the field of tropical botany. From it may come results of great benefit to agriculture and to industry. As we press ever more closely on our natural resources, the Tropics may become an important economic frontier. We should explore their full potential. The proposed facility would be a tool for exploration.

There is good reason to provide that the feasibility of a tropical botanic garden be studied in Hawaii. Few other parts of the world—and none, to my knowledge, within the American Union—can support such a range of tropical plants as can Hawaii. In Hawaii there already work many scientists of national reputation, who could help establish this garden, if study proves it feasible and desirable.

Furthermore, this garden, if created, would serve most usefully to train scientists, from both sides of the Pacific, studying at the new Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West. The new center is in Honolulu, at the University of Hawaii. It should be easy to make the facilities of a national tropical garden in Hawaii available for the international community of scholars at the East-West Center.

The bill I am introducing is substantially identical with Senate bill 2921, of the 86th Congress. That bill was passed by the Senate, following the recommendation of the Committee on Public Works. It also received the approval of the House Committee on Agriculture. However, it was placed on the Union Calendar only in the last few days of the second session, and died on the calendar.

I hope the bill will again receive the favorable attention of the Senate, because it has great merit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 772) to provide for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. FONG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PAYMENT IN KIND FOR THREE FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to apply the payment-in-kind idea to the three major farm programs relating to production of crops—the soil bank, crop insurance, and the general farm practice program under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The bill proposes a 10-percent bonus when the farmer elects to take his payments in grains owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation in lieu of cash. This incentive is intended to enable the surplus to dig its own way out whenever one occurs. It would save storage costs.

Today, if a farmer signs up for a program under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, the basic farm program administered under the State and county committees, he is generally paid in cash for his soil conserving practices whether it be for improvement of the soil or the curtailment of his acres. This bill would give him a bonus of 10 percent of the market price if he takes his payments in stored grains.

Today, his crop insurance benefits, if a loss occurs, are generally paid in cash; under this bill, he would get a 10-percent bonus if he took payment in some of the stored grains.

Today, the rent a farmer receives for land put into the soil bank is paid in cash; under this bill he would get a 10-percent bonus if he took payment in kind, that is, in Commodity Credit Corporation grains.

And, of course, none of the grain so accepted would be eligible ever again for support loans. It would have to be fed or sold or kept. Under the provisions of the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would administer the programs in such manner and with such discretion as not to materially affect the market price of the grains involved.

This is an extension of the payment-in-kind idea which I have previously advocated and on which I introduced a bill—S. 946—in the 86th Congress. Growing interest is evident in the idea. I hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will give this bill early attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 775) to amend the Soil Bank Act, the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in order to permit certain payments made under such acts to be made in grain with a 10 percent bonus in lieu of cash, if the producer elects the payment in grain from stocks controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 107(b) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Annual payments authorized to be made under this paragraph may be made, at the option of the producer, in grains owned by the United States. Payment made in any grain shall be an amount equal to the amount of the grain which the cash payment (if payment were made in cash) would purchase, as determined by the Secretary, at prices such as the Secretary determines will not materially impair the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable, encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash, but in no event shall such grain be valued at more than 90 per centum of the market value of such grain at the time such payment is made. Grain delivered to producers under this paragraph shall not be eligible for tender to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to supply such quantities and kinds of grains (to the extent that such grains are available to the Corporation) as may be requested by the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph."

SEC. 2. Section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) To make payment in grains owned by the United States, if the producer so elects, for any loss to be paid by the Corporation under this Act. Any payment made in grain shall be made in an amount equal to the amount of the grain which the cash payment for such loss (if payment were made in cash) would purchase, as determined by the Corporation, at such prices as the Corporation determines will not materially impair the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable, encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash, but in no event shall such grain be valued at more than 90 per centum of the market value of such grain at the time such payment is made.

"(2) Grain delivered to any producer under the provisions of this subsection shall not be eligible for tender to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program. The restriction imposed by this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any payment in an agricultural commodity under subsection (c), if such payment is made in the same commodity which was insured and if such payment is calculated on 100 per centum of the market value of the commodity.

"(3) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to supply such quantities and kinds of grains (to the extent such grains are available to the Corporation) as may be requested by the Corporation for carrying out the purposes of this subsection."

SEC. 3. Section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Payments authorized by this section may be made, at the option of the producer, in grains owned by the United States. Payment made in any grain shall be an amount equal to the amount of the grain which the cash payment (if payment were made in cash) would purchase, as determined by the Secretary, at prices such as the Secretary determines will not materially impair the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable, encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash, but in no event shall such grain be valued at more than 90 per centum of the market value of such grain at the time such payment is made. Grain delivered to producers under this paragraph shall not be eligible for tender to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to supply such quantities and kinds of grains (to the extent that such grains are available to the Corporation) as may be requested by the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE CRIME

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], as chief cosponsor, and also Senators PROXMIRE, LONG of Hawaii, BUSH, JAVITS, SMITH of Maine, LAUSCHE, HOLLAND, CHURCH, BUTLER, METCALF, NEUBERGER, HUMPHREY, KEATING, COOPER, BURDICK, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, BYRD of West Virginia, SMATHERS, CHAVEZ, SMITH of Massachusetts, BENNETT, PELL, CARROLL, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, able and distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, has long been interested in combating organized crime. He has held a number of investigations and sponsored legislation aimed at protecting citizens from the organized criminal element. I have discussed this proposed legislation with him at length and he agrees with the Attorney General and with us in the Senate that a commission of the type envisioned by this bill should be established. He is filing a companion bill in the House of Representatives and I know I speak for the other Senators interested in the bill and I am very happy to have Congressman CELLER's leadership and cosponsorship of this legislation.

Both the Select Committee To Study Crime in Interstate Commerce and the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor Management Field, headed up by Senator MCCLELLAN, found sobering evidence of organized criminal groups operating across State lines, dealing in gambling, narcotics, and murder, and infiltrating some businesses and labor organizations. Since because of the interstate character of these operations it isn't possible for State and local authorities to deal with them with complete effectiveness, what seems to be needed is an advisory commission in the Federal Government which would keep abreast of the activities of organized crime, coordinate the efforts of the 70-odd Federal agencies, lend assistance to State and local law-enforcement agencies by serving as a criminal intelligence clearinghouse, and report to Congress on its findings.

This commission would not be a super-enforcement agency, but a national information service for local police. As the very able former chief counsel of Senator MCCLELLAN'S select committee and the present Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, put it in his useful and informative book, "The Enemy Within":

> Only through a nationwide network can we fight the widespread penetration by criminals into our economy. Its members, appointed by the President, should be nationally prominent, of unquestionable integrity, and experienced in exposing crime. It would not be a national police, but a national information service for local police. With such an organization, even a one-telephone sheriff could prevent a hoodlum, well-known in New York or Los Angeles, from coming into his community and taking over a local union or business. And where it might be helpful, the Commission would hold hearings to expose criminal activity, so that other Federal agencies could take action, or Congress could supplement present legislation.

It is my hope that early hearings can be held on this bill since I agree with Attorney General Kennedy's further statement in "The Enemy Within" that—

> If we do not on a national scale attack organized criminals with weapons and techniques as effective as their own, they will destroy us.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and statements of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy on this subject be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 777) to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Crime, particularly in its organized aspects, has become increasingly a matter of vital concern to the Nation. It is the sense of the Congress that there is a need for a continuing study of the operations of organized crime which, because of its interstate character, is beyond the power of any State to fully and effectively combat. It is further the sense of the Congress that a continuing study should be made of the effectiveness of the various Federal laws in dealing with crime, and that a central body charged with making such a study should assist the various departments and agencies of the Government to coordinate their activities, wherever possible, to effectively suppress and combat the spread of crime through the instrumentalities of interstate commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE CRIME

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall consist of seven members, five to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and two, the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to serve ex officio.

(c) Each member of the Commission appointed by the President shall serve for a term of two years; except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Service of an individual solely as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

(e) The Commission shall elect a chairman from among the members appointed by the President.

(f) Three members of the Commission who are serving thereon pursuant to appointment by the President shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Commission who are not serving in any other office of the United States shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(b) The members of the Commission who are serving in another office of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in such other office, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation of—

(1) the manner in which, and the extent to which, organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce in furtherance of acts which are in violation of the laws of the United States, the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations so utilizing the facilities of interstate commerce, and the nature of the facilities so utilized;

(2) the manner in which, and the extent to which organized crime utilizes interstate facilities, or otherwise operates in interstate commerce, for corrupt purposes in violation of the laws of the United States or of any State;

(3) new devices, methods, and technicalities employed by those utilizing the facilities of interstate commerce in violation of the laws of the United States or of any State;

(4) the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate commerce;

(5) the manner in which, and the extent to which, persons who have engaged, or who are presently engaged, in organized crime have infiltrated lawful business enterprise; and

(6) the adequacy of the parole, probation, and rehabilitation programs of the United States with particular reference to the possible reduction of crime and the removal of its causes.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable subject to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810) but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provision of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the

signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The various departments and agencies of the Government shall cooperate with the Commission in the exchange of information.

(c) The Commission may submit recommendations to the heads of Federal agencies with respect to (1) the coordination of the activities of the agencies charged with the administration of the laws of the United States, (2) the exchange of information between such agencies, and (3) cooperation between administrative officers of such agencies.

(d) The Commission may assist State and local law enforcement officers and agencies by supplying information concerning the activities of criminals in interstate commerce, by providing legal and other assistance at the request of such officers and agencies, by maintaining a file of source material, and by such other means as the Commission may determine to be advisable.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act; except that not to exceed $75,000 shall be appropriated for such purpose for the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act.

REPORTS

SEC. 8. The Commission shall submit a report to the President and to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress and may submit such other reports from time to time as it may deem advisable.

The statements presented by Mr. KEFAUVER are as follows:

STATEMENTS OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY ON THE SUBJECT OF A NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION

"One very effective move would be for each State to set up an agency that would periodically inspect the way law enforcement is being handled in the various localities within its jurisdiction. This has been done in England, and I think it would be most beneficial here. The agency's reports should be made public, so that everyone would know whether his officials were adequately meeting their responsibilities. And each law-enforcement officer would know that his work was being subjected to close scrutiny.

"In my opinion, however, our first and most urgent need is for a national crime commission. This commission would serve as a central intelligence agency, a clearinghouse to which each of the 70-odd Federal agencies and the more than 10,000 local law enforcement agencies throughout the country would constantly feed information on the leading gangsters. The commission would pool and correlate all its information on underworld figures and disseminate it to the proper authorities." (From p. 264 of "The Enemy Within.")

"Only through a nationwide network can we fight the widespread penetration by criminals into our economy. Its members, appointed by the President, should be nationally prominent, of unquestionable integrity, and experienced in exposing crime. It would not be a national police, but a national information service for local police. With such an organization, even a one-telephone sheriff could prevent a hoodlum, well known in New York or Los Angeles, from coming into his community and taking over a local union or business. And where it might be helpful, the commission would hold hearings to expose criminal activity, so that other Federal agencies could take action, or Congress could supplement present legislation.

"The point I want to make is this: If we do not on a national scale attack organized criminals with weapons and techniques as effective as their own, they will destroy us." (From p. 265 of "The Enemy Within.")

"I have felt for some time that such an institution (a national crime commission) is necessary: an intelligence group to attack organized crime as we deal with communism and subversion here in the United States.

"Mr. (J. Edgar) Hoover, for whom I have tremendous respect, has not been enthusiastic for the idea as it has been proposed. I had some conversations and discussions with him, as well as Mr. Anslinger, from the Bureau of Narcotics, and some of the people over in—those who will be over in—the Internal Revenue Service. And I think we have worked out an arrangement whereby we can all work together to attack organized crime here in the United States, and I would hope that this would go along, would evolve over the period of the next year or so and we would see then what was necessary as far as any supplemental legislation to set up a crime commission.

"I would hope, Senator (KEFAUVER), that we could discuss these matters as we work out our plans with you and Senator MCCLELLAN and the other members of the (Judiciary) Committee." (From his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee considering his nomination to the office of Attorney General on January 13, 1961.)

CONSTRUCTION OF DAM AND APPURTENANT WORKS ON LOWER COLORADO RIVER, IN VICINITY OF BRIDGE CANYON, ARIZ.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of a dam and appurtenant works on the lower Colorado River, in the vicinity of Bridge Canyon, in the State of Arizona, approximately 120 miles upstream from Hoover Dam.

This proposed legislation was originally sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and was passed by the Senate, only to die in the House.

Under the terms of the bill, the works will consist of a dam approximately 750 feet high and about 1,950 feet wide at its crest. It will impound nearly 4 million acre-feet of water, and will produce nearly 750,000 kilowatts of power. At this time there is a deficiency of power to serve properly the growing industrial area of the Southwest. Even with the production from Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams and the expected availability of power from Glen Canyon Dam, now under construction, there is need for the full development of the river if it is to reach its maximum potential.

Since all of the present development has been under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation, it is my belief that the remainder of the units to be constructed should be integrated with the present developments, so that the best possible operation of the entire river can be had.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 781) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO PERMIT CERTAIN PERSONS TO RETIRE AT AGE 60

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit certain fully insured individuals who are unemployed and have exhausted their unemployment compensation to retire at age 60.

In view of the record numbers of unemployed now walking the streets of our Nation, and in view of the additional problem faced by our older citizens in finding suitable employment, the need for such a provision in our social security program is indeed urgent.

As the President of the United States told us Monday in his state of the Union message, more than a million of our fellow countrymen have been seeking work and finding none for more than 4 months—many of them for an even longer period. These people are becoming desperate; the situation has become critical.

Our older workers have come to find that they are the first to be laid off, the last to be recalled. When they lose a job, the loss is many times a permanent one, for employers want younger workers. And in today's labor market, an employer finds younger applicants plentiful.

The bill I introduce provides that an applicant for social security retirement at this earlier age must have exhausted his unemployment compensation 120 days prior to filing for social security and must meet all other social security retirement provisions.

The need to provide for these unfortunate older citizens is urgent from their own personal standpoint, as we might well understand. But the need to provide them with buying power with which to buy the goods they need to sustain themselves is urgent from the standpoint of our national economy. Our current economic problem is not one of lack of production, lack of resources, or lack of the desire for goods and services. It stems from a lack of personal buying power.

This we can provide by allowing our older citizens to use their prepaid social security retirement benefits.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 782) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit certain fully insured individuals who are unem-

ployed and have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits to retire at age 60, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROGRAM OF GRANTS TO STATES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a press release prepared by me relating to the bill, together with a memorandum prepared by the Library of Congress on the same subject, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the press release and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 785) to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The press release and memorandum presented by Mr. CLARK are as follows:

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, today introduced the National Cultural Development Act, which would help States develop and encourage artistic programs and projects. The bill was cosponsored by Senators HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

"One of the bright spots on the new frontier," Senator CLARK said, "is the emphasis that President Kennedy is giving to excellence in every field. Encouragement and appreciation of culture and the arts will clearly be one of the hallmarks of the new administration.

"In this century, the United States has ceased to be a backward child in the arts and has become a leader. Our artists are in the first rank of creative and performing ability. Not only do we not need to apologize for their quality; they have given impetus to many fresh directions in which the arts all over the world are moving today. But though we may boast of topflight performers and creative artists, we are still confronted by the fact that cultural projects constantly run into economic difficulties which threaten their lives or make it impossible for them to reach fruition. Gifted students often do not have local artistic horizons which are sufficiently rich in opportunity for advanced training and performance."

Senator CLARK pointed out that his bill would establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts. A maximum of $100,000 would go to each State to help it inventory existing programs, survey the need for additional programs, and develop new and existing nonprofit activities in the arts. Funds could also be used to build public and other nonprofit centers for the performance, demonstration, teaching, or exhibition of the arts; to protect and preserve sites and buildings of national or local historical, architectural, or artistic significance, and to help States develop projects designed to supply leadership, training, and experience in the arts.

Senator CLARK continued: "The ovations that have been given to traveling American artists like Marian Anderson, the 'Porgy and Bess' and 'My Fair Lady' companies, Van Cliburn, the Philadelphia Orchestra, Louis Armstrong, and the New York City Center Ballet indicate the potentially enormous acceptance of American culture abroad. American scientists, for all the brilliance of their achievements, cannot hope to arouse these eager and enthusiastic responses. Yet compare what we spend nationally on scientific programs with what we spend nationally on the arts. Compare our concern with seeing to it that scientists are trained with the haphazard way in which we force artists to scramble for their training, and indeed for their careers. Compare the support we give to ongoing scientific projects to the always shaky future of artistic projects.

"We need a coherent and continuing national outlook and policy toward the arts. The bill I introduce today would establish such a policy and outlook while leaving to the States the initiative as to what specific projects and programs to support.

"That music is the universal language we all know. The other arts as well have universal messages to convey. At a time when we are trying to reach the hearts and minds of people everywhere, there is no more direct route than the arts, no vocabulary which is more eloquent, no vision which can be more readily shared."

STATE SUPPORT OF ARTISTIC AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

(By Anne F. McGrath and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Library of Congress)

A. EXPLANATION OF SUMMARY

This State-by-State summary is a compilation of information selected from the 47 replies received from letters sent by the Legislative Reference Service to the 50 State Governors in February at the request of several Members of Congress. The following questions concerning State support of the "fine arts and cultural activities" were included in these letters to the Governors:

1. What kinds of State-created or State-sponsored agencies exist in your State whose major interest is in cultural activities?

2. Do any other groups or organizations (for example, art councils, commissions, private groups) receive State support for the promotion of cultural activities?

3. Please include any additional information concerning—

(a) the artistic and cultural activities, organizations, institutions, buildings, etc., which receive State funds;

(b) the specific amount of State funds expended for each cultural activity supported;

(c) the sources of such funds in each case (i.e., general revenues, taxes earmarked for such purposes, etc.);

(d) how such funds are allocated to the various State-supported cultural programs.

This survey represents a sampling of how the States in general have expressed their official interest in cultural activities as reflected primarily by the amount of financial assistance made available for such programs. Therefore, it is not intended as a complete report on all the ways in which any individual State encourages cultural endeavors.

1. Form of summary

Due to the wide variety of activities supported, the time periods covered, and the varying amount of detail with which the States answered the survey letters, the information selected from the replies is presented here without further elaboration or interpretation. Each State letter was considered individually. However, because of the variations in the facts reported, it was often necessary to select activities to include on a discretionary basis only—depending to some extent on the amount of information made available. More details concerning the selection of activities are discussed in the next section ("Content of summary").

The State information has been arranged below (pt. B) in alphabetical order—rather than in chart or table form—in order not to invite unwarranted comparisons of State activities. Because of the numerous ways of answering and differences in the extent of the information reported, it is clear that comparisons may not be made on the basis of the following facts alone.

2. Content of summary

Concerning the use of the phrase "fine arts and cultural activities" in the survey, one State requested a definition of this term. The following explanation was presented in the reply to this request:

"We wish to explain that a broad, general phrase such as this has been purposely selected to be used in our letter. It was our hope that, by not further limiting the definition of this phrase, we would thereby encourage its broadest possible interpretation by the States and thus receive the most comprehensive kind of information available.

"For example, in addition to such obviously artistic activities as art museums and symphony orchestras, some of the States have chosen to report such forms of State support as that to State libraries and library associations; historical agencies, museums, libraries, and publications; museums and academies of science and industry; certain State-supported arts and crafts programs and exhibits; memorials and centennial commissions; art festivals at State universities; horticultural societies; garden tours; and even State aid to county fairs. Other States have confined their answers to those agencies receiving State support whose major interest is in cultural activities and have interpreted the term 'fine arts' according to its traditional meaning (that is, painting, drawing, architecture, sculpture, poetry, music, dancing, dramatic art)."

The intention in not further defining this phrase was to encourage the most complete report possible and yet to allow each State the leeway to select and emphasize programs considered most indicative of its own particular interest in support for cultural endeavors.

To be more specific, for the purposes of this report, libraries and related agencies have been considered primarily as educational activities thus distinguishing them from "cultural institutions." However, there are exceptions to this general rule—for example, in cases where a State report includes specific mention of the fine arts programs of its library or where the State library budget includes, let us say, a historical museum. In line with the nature of the congressional request, whenever possible in such cases, an attempt has been made to present a breakdown of the funds involved. However, such a breakdown is not always reported by the respective States.

Also, the cultural and artistic programs of State institutions of higher education are omitted even when a State letter specifically refers, for example, to a university's contemporary art festival. It is presumed that State-supported institutions of higher education in all the States sponsor activities of an artistic or cultural nature to some extent, many of which are not distinguishable from the educational program. Moreover, detailed information relating to this subject was not reported consistently.

Among other categories which were mentioned in certain State replies, but which this

survey does not include, are: Civil War centennial commissions; certain other historical commissions or boards designated as temporary; memorial funds; horticultural activities; wildlife reservations; and garden tours.

Other possible limitations in connection with the following excerpts and other selected information are:

1. Of 50 letters and, in some cases, follow-up letters sent to the Governors between February and May 1960, 46 final replies have been received. One State has sent a partial reply. No information is included about the other three States, therefore.

2. Many of the survey letters were referred by the Governors to offices within the respective State executive departments—e.g., the department of finance or the director of the budget. This fact might present a problem in the case of answers to the question (No. 1) which relates to State-created or State-sponsored agencies whose major interest is in cultural activities. It is conceivable, for example, that a State which actually has statutory provision, for a State art agency but which agency perhaps received no appropriation for a recent fiscal year or biennium might not be mentioned in a letter from the State's department of finance. For this reason, the source and date of each State's information appears at the end of the respective State's excerpts. (Incidentally, the following States reported the existence of a State art council, commission, or similar agency in their replies: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Utah, and Wisconsin. Brief descriptions of these agencies appear in the excerpts below.)

B. STATE-BY-STATE SUMMARY

Alabama

Amount of State funds appropriated for each fiscal year during the biennium beginning October 1, 1959, and ending September 30, 1961:

Department of archives and history	$91,040
Cahaba Historical Commission	2,500
Gorgas Memorial Board	5,000
Hall of fame board	500
Richard Pearson Hobson Memorial Board	5,000
La Grange Historical Commission	500
Alabama Agricultural and Industrial Exhibit Commission	25,000
First White House of the Confederacy	40,000

Source of appropriations: Practically all of these appropriations were made from general State revenues.

Other agencies mentioned without additional information: Alabama Art Commission, Stonewall Jackson Memorial Fund, Fort Morgan Historical Commission, Division of State Parks, Monuments, and Historical Sites, State Department of Conservation.

Other information included: A few private groups or organizations sometimes receive State support for the promotion of certain cultural activities. For example, an annual appropriation is often made for the purpose of providing Spanish-American War veterans an encampment. Also, sometimes appropriations are made for local chambers of commerce.

(Source: Charles Cooper, Director, Legislative Reference Service, Feb. 18, 1960.)

Alaska

Amount of State funds appropriated for last year: Alaska State Historical Museum and Library, $24,950.

Source of appropriations: General revenue fund.

Method of allocation: Allocated by legislative action based on Governor's budget as modified by house and senate finance committees.

(Source: Paul Solka, Jr., special assistant, office of the Governor, Feb. 25, 1960.)

Arizona

Amount of State funds appropriated in 1959 (see "Other information," below):

Arizona Pioneers' Historical Society (Tucson)	$48,535
Sharlot Hall Museum (Prescott)	13,300

Source of appropriation and method of allocation: Legislative appropriation from the general fund of the State.

Other State-supported artistic or cultural activities:

The State museum is located at the University of Arizona and is under the direction of the board of regents of the State universities and State college. Funds for its operation are included in the university appropriation.

Eact year a very fine art exhibit is held at the State fair. This includes not only paintings, but also Indian art—basketry, jewelry, painting, weaving, and pottery making. This is under the jurisdiction of the State fair commission, with funds set aside by the commission from its appropriation.

Other information (re: Arizona Pioneers' Historical Society and Sharlot Hall Museum): The State provided matching funds for the building of the Arizona Pioneers' Historical Society quarters and granted a 99-year lease for the old Governor's mansion at the Sharlot Hall Museum. The funds appropriated by the State are used for upkeep and personnel. Other funds are provided by memberships, organizations, and local governments.

(Source: Mrs. Alice B. Good, director, Department of Library and Archives, Feb. 24, 1960.)

Arkansas

So far as we can determine, the State of Arkansas does not make direct grants to artistic and cultural activities in this State. The State of Arkansas makes direct appropriations for the maintenance of the territorial capitol restoration, and the old State house restoration. The territorial capitol restoration is comparable, on a limited scale, to the Williamsburg restoration.

(Source: Marcus Halbrook, director, State of Arkansas Council, May 26, 1960.)

California

Amount of State funds for last year: Annual arts and crafts exhibit of the California State Fair and Exposition, $27,900.

Source of funds: Funds earmarked for fair purposes.

Other information: The State also maintains as part of its beach and parks program, 19 historical monuments for the purpose of portraying the history, customs, and physical character of early California. The restored gold rush town of Columbia; Sutter's Fort, and Indian museums; selected historic buildings in the city of Monterey; and the Hearst castle at San Simeon.

(Source: Edmund G. Brown, Governor, June 25, 1960.)

Connecticut

Amount of State funds appropriated:

	1959–60	1960–61
State library: Operation of State historical museum	$5,400	$5,600
State department of education: Connecticut Historical Society (a private corporation with own building)	1,000	1,000
State parks and forest commission: Trustees, Henry Whitfield House	14,800	11,400
Harkness Memorial State Park (gift to State):		
(1) 900 bird paintings by Rex Brasher	(1)	(1)
(2) Gillette Castle	(1)	(1)
Groton Monument (Fort Griswold State Park)	300	300

[1] None specified.

Highway department: Preservation of Goodspeed Opera House,[1] $10,000 (1959–61).

Sources of State appropriations: General fund revenues, except in case of highway department.[1]

Method of allocation: Regular State allotment programs after appropriation by State legislature.

Other State-supported cultural activities: Connecticut Historical Commission, Goodspeed Opera House Foundation.

Other information: The Connecticut State Library Building contains memorial hall with its collections, paintings, artifacts, and memorabilia of the history of Connecticut. A history of Connecticut is also being written under the direction of this agency.

Under the State parks and forest commission, the Henry Whitfield House, furnished as a State historical museum, was established as a State agency in 1899. Groton Monument is a monument to a battle in the Revolutionary War similar in style to the Washington Monument.

The highway department has provided funds for the painting of Goodspeed Opera House. The entire restoration is the project of a private foundation comprised principally of residents of Connecticut and New York. The State provided the land for $1, and included parking areas, and additional area. A drive is currently underway for public contributions to restore the former glittering and famous opera house (circa 1876) to its former grandeur as a unique center for contemporary and cultural activities, including possible operation as a festival theater.

(Source: Henry J. Rigney, budget examiner, department of finance and control, budget division, Mar. 14, 1960.)

Delaware

Amount of State funds appropriated:

State museum	$26,950
John Dickinson Mansion	15,350
Lewes Memorial Commission	8,000
Delaware Day Commission	100
New Castle Historical Building Commission	8,450

(Source: Mrs. Lillian I. Martin, chief accountant, budget commission, May 13, 1960.)

Florida

(Defines "cultural" as referring to the "traditional fine arts" and includes only "agencies whose major interest is in cultural activities.")

Florida supports three State agencies whose chief interest is in cultural activities:

1. John and Mabel Ringling Museum of Art at Sarasota includes the art museum, the Ringling residence and furnishings, the circus museum, the Asolo Theater, and extensive grounds. In addition to the collection of paintings, the agency sponsors an artist series, a lecture series, and a motion-picture art series. Total expenditure for this activity in 1958–59 fiscal year was $303,303. These funds came from three sources: (1) A State appropriation of $95,374 from the general revenue fund; (2) income of $188,162 from museum admissions and activities which was deposited in and expended from the incidental fund; and (3) $19,767 from the interest of trust fund which consists of interest earned on a trust fund established by the Ringling will for the preservation and enlargement of the collection. General revenue and incidental funds for the Ringling museum are requested, budgeted, and appropriated as is the case with any other State activity.

2. The Florida State Museum is an adjunct of the University of Florida and is supported by regular university funds which come from general revenue appropriation and university incidental fund collections. Total expenditures for this activity in 1958–59 were

[1] From special fund derived from gasoline tax, highway tolls.

$104,000. Appropriations are made on the basis of the University of Florida request. Actually, a lump sum appropriation within the categories of salaries, expenses, and operating capital outlay is made to the University of Florida for all educational and general operations and the university allocates the amount which goes to the Florida State Museum.

3. The Stephen Foster Memorial Commission operates the Stephen Foster Memorial at White Springs. Aside from the physical park facilities of the memorial and the museum * * * the commission is concerned with the preservation and presentation of the folk arts in the fields of music and dance of the period with which Stephen Foster is associated. Total expenditures of the commission in fical year 1958–59 were $150,306. Of this amount, $70,087 was appropriated from the general revenue fund, $34,719 came from the trust fund income derived from parking fees and concession sales at the memorial, and a $500 scholarship from private contributions. * * * The Stephen Foster Memorial Commission requests and justifies its appropriation before the State budget commission and the State legislature.

Other State-supported activity:

The Florida Arts Commission was established by the 1959 Legislature with an appropriation of $5,000 for the 1959–61 biennium (ch. 59–275, Florida Statutes). As of February 1960 the commission had not been activated. Commission to consist of 9 members appointed by the Governor upon recommendations of board of commissioners of State institutions. "The Governor shall appoint as members * * * citizens and residents of Florida representative of various professional organizations and governmental institutions concerned with the orderly development of the artistic and cultural resources of Florida in the fine arts area and qualified to advise and assist in capturing and symbolizing the spirit and great natural beauty of Florida in permament structures of the State." Members to serve without compensation but to be reimbursed for expenses.

Powers and duties of commission to be concerned with decoration and beautification of public buildings, assurance of a uniformity of artwork within State buildings; advice on the acquisition by gift or purchase of fine artworks and their use and display; and fostering "the development of a receptive climate for the fine arts" in Florida (ch. 59–275, House bill No. 347, June 12, 1959).

Other information: The State does not contribute to the support of any private art groups.

(Source: Harry G. Smith, budget director, State Budget Commission, Feb. 23, 1960.)

Georgia

Amount of State funds appropriated:

	Last year's appropriations
Department of Archives and History	$100,000
State Museum of Science and Industry	25,000
The Georgia Historical Commission	100,000

Method of allocation: All State funds appropriated by the general assembly and none specifically allocated from certain taxes earmarked for special purposes.

Other information: A Georgia Art Commission acts in advisory capacity only, and no State funds are appropriated.

(Source: Ben W. Fortson, Jr., secretary of state, department of State, Feb. 25, 1960.)

Hawaii

Amount of State funds appropriated, source of funds, and description of activities supported:

Hawaii historic sites: One function of the State department of land and natural resources is to locate, identify, and preserve sites of historic significance, such as heiaus (ancient Hawaiian burial grounds), and other historic and prehistoric structures. The public may visit these historic sites without charge. During the fiscal year 1959–60, the sum of $1,680 was appropriated out of the general revenues (general fund) of the State for this program.

Captain Cook Memorial: During the fiscal year 1959–60, the State public archives has expended $200 for the collection and purchase of historical or other materials of Captain Cook, the discoverer of the Hawaiian Islands. Moneys expended were obtained from a special fund created through the sale of commemorative coins of Captain Cook.

Iolani Palace: For the fiscal year 1959–60, the legislature has appropriated, to the department of accounting and general services, out of the general revenues of the State the sum of $75,382 for the maintenance and operation of Iolani Palace, the former capitol of the Hawaiian monarchy. The Palace (State owned) is maintained for historical and cultural purposes and is open to the public without charge.

Hulihee Palace: The legislature has appropriated, to the department of accounting and general services, out of the general revenues of the State the sum of $7,668 for the purposes of operating and maintaining the Hulihee Palace (State owned) for the fiscal year 1959–60. The palace serves as a museum for Hawaiians.

Hawaiian language and arts: A sum of $25,000 was appropriated by the legislature out of the general fund of the State for the 1959–60 biennium for the preservation and study of the Hawaiian language and arts. The University of Hawaii is designated as the expending agency. The sum of $15,000 was allocated for the fiscal year 1959–60.

Hawaii Visitors Bureau: For the fiscal year 1959–60, the legislature has appropriated to the Hawaiian Visitors Bureau, a private nonprofit corporation which is primarily concerned with the development and promotion of the tourist industry, the sum of $750,000 from the general fund of the State. (The visitors bureau is also supported by private funds.) The visitors bureau has allocated the following sums to organizations that promote cultural shows and events:

(a) Aloha Week Commission ($5,000): The Aloha Week Commission promotes the Aloha Week festival, which presents the old Hawaiian customs through parades, events, and displays.

(b) Cherry Blossom Festival ($1,000): Sponsored by the Japanese junior chamber of commerce to display to the public the customs of the Japanese people through cultural shows and exhibits.

(c) Narcissus Festival ($1,000): This festival by the Chinese junior chamber of commerce to display the Chinese customs through cultural shows and exhibits.

Other information:

The definition of "cultural activities" on which Hawaii based the selection of the above information for inclusion in its letter is "all activities which promote and otherwise make available on a communitywide basis knowledge and interest in the fine arts, humanities, the broad aspects of science, and the distinctive attainments; beliefs, traditions, customs, and so forth, which constitute the background of the various racial, religious, and social groups, and which are not presented as part of the curricula of educational institutions."

State support is almost entirely restricted to the preservation and understanding of the rapidly becoming extinct customs, traditions, and so forth, of the Hawaiian people. With the exception of State public libraries, there are no agencies whose major interest is in cultural activities which are created or sponsored either by the State or the counties, such as museums and art academies.

(Source: Department of budget and review, May 25, 1960.)

Idaho

The State of Idaho does not support the promotion of cultural activities except insofar as it may be a support of one of our institutions of higher education.

(Source: Robert B. Hodge, assistant to the Governor, Feb. 16, 1960.)

Illinois

Amount of State funds appropriated:

Type of activity	State expenditure (fiscal year 1959)	Source of revenue	Method of allocation
Historical library	$138,000	General revenue	Legislative appropriation.
State museum	250,000	do	Do.
Publicizing Illinois natural and historic attractions.	33,000	do	Do.
State memorials:			
Operation	341,000	do	Do.
Capitol	180,000	do	Do.
State aid to county fairs	1,410,511	Tax on parimutuel wagers, horseracing.	Do.
State aid to city and county fairs, and expositions.	1,955,087	do	Do.

Source: R. D. Frisch, supervisor of research, budget division, department of finance, Apr. 4, 1960.

Indiana

Amount of State funds appropriated:

	Biennial appropriations
World War Memorial (to World War I veterans)	$106,960
Soldiers' and Sailors' Monument (to Civil and Spanish-American veterans)	63,270
14 memorials in the Department of Conservation (such as George Rogers Clark Memorial)	200,000
New Harmony Commission	50,000
Historical Bureau	79,812

Source of funds: General Fund of the State of Indiana.

(Source: Philip L. Conklin, director of the budget, March 8, 1960.)

Iowa

Amount of State funds appropriated annually:

State Department of History and Archives	$92,500
Herbert Hoover Birthplace Society (private organization)	10,685
Historical Society (private organization)	94,000

(Source: R. C. McClelland, research associate, Iowa Development Commission, Feb. 24, 1960.)

Kansas

Amount of State funds appropriated:

	Fiscal year 1961
Kansas Historical Society, general revenue	$352,130
John Brown Memorial State Park, general revenue	5,810
Kansas Frontier Historical Park, general revenue	9,636
Marais des Cygnes Massacre Memorial Park, general revenue	500
Pawnee Rock Historical Park, general revenue	3,911
Washington County Historical Pony Express Station, general revenue	3,291

Other cultural activities supported:

State funds were appropriated for the purchase of land for the use of the Eisenhower Presidential Library Commission ($50,000 in 1955) and for the Agricultural Hall of Fame ($95,000 in 1960). (There is also a museum of art and a museum of natural history at the University of Kansas. However, as is the case with many other State universities, the amounts expended for cultural activities are not classified separately and are, therefore, impossible to determine.)

An amount of $200,000 is budgeted for a series of pageants depicting the history of Kansas. The amounts shown above for the Kansas Historical Society and the various historical parks include funds for personnel, maintenance of buildings and grounds, and preservation and extension of museum collections.

(Source: James W. Bibb, budget director, department of administration, Feb. 24, 1960.)

Kentucky

Amount of State funds in budgets for fiscal years 1960–61, 1961–62:

Public concerts (especially for school children) from funds allotted to the State Council on Public Higher Education (Louisville Symphony)	$106,000
To commission the painting of murals by a first-class artist for the University of Kentucky Medical Center	50,000
Kentucky Historical Society—museum and publication	108,000
Kentucky State Fair (premiums for art work awarded each year)	1,000

Source of funds: The general fund and trust and agency fund.

Other information: Kentucky has no agency, the primary functions of which are devoted to fine arts and other cultural activities.

Concerning the allotment of funds for public concerts to the State Council on Public Higher Education: Members of the orchestra—that is, the Louisville Symphony Orchestra—also will be available for lectures and film demonstrations as a result of these funds.

Concerning the murals to be painted at the University of Kentucky Medical Center: These murals not only will enhance the aesthetic beauty of this vast medical center, but also will be viewed by thousands of persons during the lifetime of the hospital. A large piece of free sculpture will be centered outside the entrance to the new medical center. This work also will be commissioned by the university in behalf of the State.

Concerning the Kentucky Historical Society: The society maintains a museum filled with art pieces in the old State capitol in Frankfort. * * * The society writes legends for all historical highway markers and approximately 150 of them have been erected since 1948. The society also publishes the official State historical quarterly.

(Source: Robert R. Martin, commissioner of finance, Commonwealth of Kentucky, Department of Finance, May 19, 1960.)

Louisiana

State of Louisiana Art Commission (official State agency created by the legislature in 1938 and supported entirely by State appropriations):

Current annual operating budget, $20,500 (facilities also provided by the State).

Program set up in two major categories: 1. Baton Rouge Art Galleries; 2. Extension Services (including the loan and circulation of free traveling exhibitions and slide talks).

Executive board (serving without pay of any sort): State Superintendent of Education, president of Louisiana State University, president of Baton Rouge Art League.

(Source: Jay R. Broussard, director, State of Louisiana Art Commission, February 1960.)

Maine

Amount of State funds appropriated for current biennium:

	1959–60	1960–61
State created or State-sponsored agencies:		
Maine Art Commission	$3,500	$2,500
State museum	6,272	6,292
State historian	500	500
Park commission (restoration of forts and memorials)	0	48,400
Groups or organizations which receive State grants:		
Knox Memorial Association (toward support of Montpelier)	1,000	1,000
Maine Historical Society	2,750	2,750
Aroostook County (to restore forts)	5,000	0
Various towns, purchase of histories	2,075	0
Maine Federation of Music Clubs for biographical sketches of Maine composers	750	0

Method of allocation: The individuals and groups involved appear before the Legislative Appropriations Committee and explain the need and the funds which are approved by legislative action are then sent directly to the group or organization.

(Source: David F. White, budget examiner, department of finance and administration, Bureau of the Budget, Feb. 29, 1960.)

Maryland

Amount of State funds appropriated in 1960:

Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association to assist the association in perpetuating the old Flag House	$2,500
Baltimore Symphony Orchestra Association, Inc	25,000
Maryland Historical Society (among whose activities are the preparation of historical road markers)	27,500
Maryland house and garden tours to assist Historic Annapolis, Inc. (appropriation provided through the department of economic development	1,000
Maryland State Fair Board	14,400

Source of State appropriations and method of allocation: All amounts listed come from general fund revenues, with the single exception of funds for the Maryland State Fair Board, which come from racing revenue. All amounts are allocated as lump sum grants. In most instances the amounts are stated by law or are calculated on the basis of legal formulas; the remainder are determined in the course of the budget process.

Other information: Although many of the organizations and institutions listed operate on the basis of State charters * * * they can [not] be identified appropriately as State-created or State-sponsored * * * there are no State-created or State-sponsored agencies whose major interest is in cultural activities, but * * * there are groups or organizations * * * which receive State support for the promotion of cultural activities.

(Source: Dwight C. Smith, Jr., budget analyst, department of budget and procurement, Mar. 15, 1960.)

Massachusetts

(Partial reply)

The art commission (for the Commonwealth) has complete jurisdiction over State commissions for sculpture, design of medals, and the like.

An important new venture which began last summer is the Metropolitan Boston Arts Center. The Metropolitan District Commission, which is a State agency, contracted with a local drama group for the production of plays in an open-air summer theater, which was constructed by the MDC.

(Source: Martin Lichterman, research director, executive department, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Mar. 15, 1960.)

Michigan

Amount of State funds appropriated for the current year: Historical commission, $100,979.

Other information: The State of Michigan does not directly support any State, local or private organizations relating to fine arts and cultural activities, as such.

(Source: James W. Miller, controller, department of administration, Feb. 22, 1960.)

Minnesota

State art society: Governing board consists of the Governor, the president of the university, as ex-officio members, and 11 other members appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the senate for 4-year terms. Included in such appointees shall be four artists or connoisseurs of art, one architect, and one person prominently identified with education (no appropriation from the State).

Minnesota State Historical Society: Receives an annual appropriation of $225,000. Although a private body, 89 percent of the operational cost of the society is financed by State appropriation. Construction of the building was by State appropriation, as well as the maintenance and custodial care of the building.

Minnesota State Fair art exhibit: While the State fair board only spends about $5,000 a year on premiums and overhead expenses for the art exhibit, the major portion of the $10 million investment in land, buildings, and improvements of the State fair was by legislative appropriations.

(Source: Florence Reber, department of administration-budget, Feb. 19, 1960.)

The cultural climate in Minnesota is excellent, and we have a multiplicity of activities, largely conducted and supported by private resources. The interest and enthusiasm of our citizens in this respect is indeed fortunate, since * * * the legislature does not appropriate extensively for direct State support in this area.

(Source: Orville L. Freeman, Governor, State of Minnesota, Mar. 1, 1960.)

Mississippi

Pertinent information reported: The legislature in 1958 authorized the restoration of the old capitol located in Jackson. * * * This capitol was erected in 1840 and remained the seat of government until 1903. * * * When it is completed, it will be the State's outstanding museum of Mississippiana.

(Source: J. M. Tubb, State superintendent of education, department of education, Jackson, Miss., Sept. 16, 1960.)

Missouri

Amount of State funds appropriated for 1950–61 biennium:

State museum (contained in the appropriation of the division of resources and development)	$34,000
State historical society	196,675

(Source: George A. Bell, assistant budget director, division of budget and comptroller, Mar. 9, 1960.)

Montana

Amount of State funds appropriated for fiscal year ending June 30, 1958:

Montana Historical Society	$65,208
Montana Fine Arts Commission	66,743

Other information: The fine arts commission spent $1,612 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. This was not a legislative appropriation, but is still considered State funds. The money was received from private donations.

The board of directors of the State historical society is presently appointed by the Governor. The Governor is also chairman of the fine arts commission.

(Source: J. Hugo Aronson, Governor, State of Montana, Feb. 15, 1960; Robert J. Smith, budget analyst, director of the budget, Feb. 25, 1960.)

Nebraska

No such support (that is, State financial support of fine arts or cultural activities) is given to any activity of this kind in Nebraska from any type of State fund.

(Source: Jack W. Rodgers, director of research, legislative council, Mar. 18, 1960.)

Nevada

Amount of State funds appropriated from the general fund:

State museum	$41,757
Nevada Historical Society	29,748

(Source: Grant Sawyer, Governor, State of Nevada, Mar. 11, 1960.)

New Hampshire

Amount of State funds appropriated for fiscal 1960: League of New Hampshire Arts and Crafts, $8,000.

(Source: Leonard S. Hill, comptroller, division of budget and control, department of administration and control, Mar. 2, 1960.)

New Jersey

Tabulation of specific appropriation from "Governor's 1961 Budget Message":

Activity	1959 expended	1960 appropriated	1961 recommended
State capitol development commission	$20,000	----------	----------
State board of architects	38,759	$29,178	$34,496
State museum	334,328	350,293	360,865

Other information:

State financing of these and other activities depend upon the factors of public policy, need, and advisability, and the availability of funds.

It should be noted that some portion of the total State share to education (almost $163 million or 39 percent of the 1961 recommended budget) is used to teach fine arts subjects to students in this State.

(Source: Abram M. Vermoulen, director, division of budget and accounting, department of the treasury, Feb. 26, 1960.)

New Mexico

Amount of State funds appropriated:

Museum of New Mexico (for current fiscal year):	
Anthropology	$64,553
History [1] (presently included in administration).	
Fine arts	46,429
Folk art	39,210
Administration	67,071
Custodial and maintenance	56,212
State monuments	13,663
Publications [1] (presently included in administration).	
Libraries (of cultural and artistic materials)	27,862
Total	320,000

[1] In current reorganization of the museum structure, plans are completed for separate budgeting of funds for a division of history and a department of publication, in the next—1961–62—general appropriation.

(As a separate line item in the museum's budget is the sum of $5,000 administered by the museum for—and allocated to—the Roswell (municipal) Museum, Roswell, N. Mex., for maintenance of an exhibit memorializing R. H. Goddard, the pioneer rocket technologist, whose experiments were conducted in the vicinity of Roswell.)

Historical Society of New Mexico (annual appropriation)	$10,000
Inter-Tribal Indian Ceremonial Association (current annual appropriation from general revenues)	29,300
Old Lincoln County Memorial Commission (current annual appropriation from general revenues)	22,500
The State fair (current annual appropriation earmarked from fair revenues)	1,000,000

Additional information:

Museum of New Mexico: Our principal State agency devoted to cultural activities is the Museum of New Mexico, founded in 1909 by an act of the (then) territorial legislature. It is supervised by a board of regents of seven members, appointed by the Governor. Its fields of operations are four in number: southwestern anthropology, southwestern history, fine arts, and international folk arts. * * * Besides exhibits, related museum activities include public lectures * * * concerts (folk art), film rental service, archival and photograph reference service, traveling exhibits (fine arts and folk art), and the use of the three museum auditoriums by local concert and other nonprofit cultural groups.

The museum also is in charge of five State monuments.

The museum publishes a bimonthly journal * * * with about 80 percent of costs covered by State funds.

State financial support for the museum is in the form of a biennial general appropriation against general revenues.

Historical Society of New Mexico: Closely connected with the museum is the Historical Society of New Mexico, originally founded in 1859 and reestablished in 1881. A private organization, it has statutory right to use certain rooms in the palace of the Governor for the exhibition of its collections, which are in the care of the museum staff. In cooperation with the museum and the University of New Mexico it publishes the quarterly New Mexico Historical Review. It receives an annual appropriation of $10,000, from general revenues, upon a budget prepared and presented to the legislature by the museum in conjunction with the museum's own biennial budget request. Almost all of this amount is expended by the Review publication costs, and the salary of an archivist.

Inter-Tribal Indian Ceremonial Association: A nonprofit corporation designated as a State agency for the purpose of encouraging the preservation and development of Indian arts and crafts and preserving traditional rites and ceremonials. The association presents a public exhibition of ceremonials and wares, by Indians * * * every year.

Old Lincoln County Memorial Commission: A State commission appointed by the Governor to maintain the old Lincoln County courthouse and related buildings as a historical museum.

The State fair: May be considered a cultural activity on the basis of its displays of arts and crafts. It is a State agency, the board of which is appointed by the Governor, for the purpose of holding annual exhibits primarily of agricultural and mineral products and equipment, and other features which the commissioners may deem consonant with the purpose of a State fair. It has its own extensive grounds and buildings in Albuquerque.

(Source: Bruce T. Ellis, acting director, Museum of New Mexico, Palace of the Governors, Mar. 1, 1960.)

New York

Amount of State funds appropriated and descriptions of activities:

Advisory council on the arts: Passed by the legislature in 1960 with a supporting appropriation of $50,000 to survey ways in which the State could encourage appreciation of, and participation in, the fine and performing arts.

Division of archives and history of the State department of education: Administrative costs will amount to about $135,000 in 1960–61. This division prepares materials and exhibits a collection of historical objects. It also assists local historians, erects markers, and manages local records programs.

Commission on historic sites: With an appropriation of about $240,000, the State will maintain 20 historic sites in 1960–61. Among sites which will be preserved, restored, or refurnished by these funds are: Fort Crailo; Johnson Hall; John Brown Farm; John Jay Homestead; Philipse Manor; Schuyler Mansion; Walt Whitman Home; and Washington's Headquarters.

State museum and science service: About $421,000 are expected to be spent for such activities in 1960–61. The State museum maintains exhibits and collections of scientific and cultural interest. (The science service conducts research, publishes results, offers scientific services, and cooperates with other public and private research organizations.)

Marine stadium at Jones Beach: Stadium was constructed with State funds at a cost of $4.2 million. It is leased to private producers during the summer for theatrical performances.

Saratoga Springs Reservation: State leases a theater to a professional summer stock company. Free concerts and chamber music are provided at the reservation's Hall of Springs.

New York State Power Authority: Thomas Hart Benton's murals at the St. Lawrence and Niagara power projects were commissioned by the authority at a cost of about $30,000. The authority also participated with Canada in commissioning Morton Gould's St. Lawrence Suite for the opening ceremonies of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Parks and other facilities are made available for the performing arts, such as the dance festival at Watkins Glen in Finger

Lakes region, the Arena Theater at Albany State Teachers College, and free Shakespearean drama in New York City's Central Park.

New York State Fair: The fair features exhibits of painting and sculpture by professional artists, displays of Indian handicrafts, and fosters achievement in the graphic arts and music in other ways.

Other information included:

At the Governor's request, a bill was introduced in the legislature this year to establish an advisory council on the arts, supported by an appropriation of $50,000. This bill was passed as chapter 313, laws of 1960. The council will conduct a comprehensive survey of the State's cultural resources and make recommendations to the Governor and to the legislature by October 31, 1960, concerning ways in which the State can encourage appreciation of and participation in the fine and performing arts.

The Governor also proposed legislation to create a temporary State commission, supported by an appropriation of $50,000 to prepare for State participation in the [World's] Fair. This became chapter 429, laws of 1960.

(Source: William J. Ronan, secretary to the Governor, executive chamber, May 11, 1960.)

North Carolina

Amount of State funds appropriated for 1959–61:

	Appropriations	
	1959–60	1960–61
State art society	$129,559	$137,105
Department of archives and history	411,944	394,439
North Carolina Symphony Orchestra (grant-in-aid)	30,000	30,000
Old Salem, Inc. (grant-in-aid)	50,000	0
Tryon Palace Commission	72,886	69,055
State museum of natural history	37,676	37,706
Bennett Memorial	50	50
Confederate Museum (at Richmond, Va.)	200	200

Source of appropriations: In North Carolina, State support is a strict term relating to appropriations from tax funds. Where appropriations are mentioned * * * these do not include the activity's operating receipts nor does it include State tax funds spent for capital improvements or other capital outlay.

Other information:

The State art society: A private nonprofit organization instrumental in operating the North Carolina Museum of Fine Art, which has collections valued at about $3 million. About $1 million worth of these collections were purchased with State funds (tax funds appropriation). Also, the building has been provided by State funds. Operating expenses are appropriated in major part by the State.

The State department of archives and history: An agency financed almost entirely by State funds. It operates the State Museum of History (the Hall of History). The agency also sets up historical markers and develops and maintains certain historical sites, including several local museums.

The State museum of natural science at Raleigh (under the State department of agriculture): Established about 1850. Now each of the three major museums in Raleigh—North Carolina Museum of Fine Art, Hall of History, and State Museum of Natural History is each under a different State agency.

The Tryon Palace: Reconstruction and rehabilitation of palace and grounds of the colonial governor in old capital town of New Bern. A private endowment has provided practically all of the capital outlay and physical maintenance. Operating expense is paid by admission fees with the deficit being paid out of State fund appropriations. The property is held in the name of the State.

Historical sites administered by the department of archives and history:

Alamance Battleground (includes a museum) supported entirely by State appropriations; Bentonville Battleground (includes a museum); Brunswick Town (a museum is being developed here); Town Creek Indian Mound (includes a mound temple and a museum); the Covered Bridge; James Iredell House; Zebulon V. Vance birthplace; President James K. Polk birthplace; Charles B. Aycock birthplace; House in the Horseshoe; Temperance Hall.

Town anniversary celebrations to which State has contributed: Town of Bath 300th anniversary celebration; town of New Bern 250th anniversary celebration.

Historical associations which receive State funds:

Roanoke Island Historical Association: A private organization which is involved in presenting the outdoor drama "The Lost Colony" and in the maintenance of old Fort Raleight. The State pays their deficits in curred with reference to these.

The Smoky Mountains Historical Association: Deficits incurred from several summer performances of certain outdoor dramas are met by State-appropriated funds.

Other recipients of State support:

Historic Halifax, Inc.: State assistance for restoring certain buildings.

Gov. Richard Caswell Memorial Park: Historic site administered by an independent commission.

Old Salem, Inc.: State assistance for certain restoration.

The North Carolina Symphony Orchestra: Deficits of this activity are paid by the State. Many of its performances are given without admission charge.

(Source: Charles R. Holloman, budget analyst, education, department of administration, June 1, 1960.)

North Dakota

Funds appropriated by the North Dakota Legislative Assembly are not earmarked for any specific cultural purpose.

In 1959, the State museum received an appropriation of $172,200.

(Source: A. E. Mead, commissioner, North Dakota State Board of Higher Education, Mar. 3, 1960.)

Ohio

Amount of State funds appropriated for the 1959–61 biennium.

	Fiscal 1959–60	Fiscal 1960–61	Biennium
Ohio Historical Society	?609,755	$598,716	$1,208,471
Capital improvements	(1)	(1)	(165,000)
Total			1,373,471
Anthony Wayne Parkway Board (operating expenses)	23,212	23,356	46,568

[1] Not available.

Source of funds: State general revenue fund.

Description of activities:

Ohio Historical Society: This organization (financed partly by State funds) has as its purposes the collection and preservation of records, artifacts, and sites from which Ohio history may be compiled and understood. The society maintains the Ohio State Museum and its extensive library, and 59 State memorials. Its bureau of archives administers and exhibits the important documents dealing with the history of Ohio.

Anthony Wayne Parkway Board: This board plans and promotes, through the cooperation of various local, State, and Federal agencies, the development of a unified system of parks and historical shrines in the 23-county parkway district. It promotes the development of projects and is charged with preparing drawings and reports for the establishment of markers, restorations, and museums. (It has, however, no authority to develop or maintain any project.)

(Source: Department of industrial and economic development, division of research and planning, Columbus, Mar. 11, 1960.)

Oklahoma

If you exclude libraries and historical museums, the State of Oklahoma gives no financial support to agencies of this type. We presume that you do not include libraries and historical museums in this category. No financial support is given to private groups of this type. There is no State art commission or council.

(Source: J. Howard Edmondson, Governor, Mar. 14, 1960.)

Pennsylvania

Amount and source of State funds (for fiscal biennium 1959–61):

The State out of its general fund provides aid in the form of grants to several cultural institutions, however, these grants are given primarily to support the educational program being conducted by these institutions:

Philadelphia Commercial Museum	$60,500
Philadelphia Museum School of Art	193,600
Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh	50,000

Other activities supported: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission whose primary function is the preservation of Pennsylvania's historic heritage is currently cosponsoring a lecture series on Pennsylvania life and culture. The cost of this program, paid out of the Commission's general fund appropriation will amount to approximately $300. The Commission also cosponsors seminars on Pennsylvania culture at the State university.

(Source: David R. Baldwin, budget secretary and deputy secretary of administration, Mar. 7, 1960.)

Rhode Island

Amount of State funds: Direct appropriations (for current fiscal year except as otherwise noted):

Free concerts for public school students	$7,000
Free public concerts	7,000
Free public operatic performances	7,000
Rhode Island Building at the Eastern States Exposition	4,000
Subsidies:	
Rhode Island Historical Society	9,700
Newport Historical Society	1,500
Cocumcussoc Association	1,000
General Nathanael Greene Homestead	1,500
Varnum House Museum	1,500
Old Slater Mill Museum	10,000
Newport Music Festival	5,000
Providence Philharmonic Orchestra	2,500
Irish Music Festival	2,500
Woonsocket Mardi Gras	6,500

Source of funds: It may be generalized that where specific appropriations are voted they are made from general funds and rarely from particular earmarked receipts. No formula can be devised which adequately describes the method of apportioning funds to each program, but the amounts may be said to be predicated upon the widespread enthusiasm with which the citizens of Rhode Island and their representatives embrace cultural and fine art projects.

That this enthusiasm is growing is evinced by the continually increasing expenditures for educational and cultural purposes. For example * * * the increase in [State] appropriations to subsidize cultural organizations was approximately 30 percent [over the last 3 years].

Rhode Island has maintained * * * a generally consistent policy of refraining from taxing educational and related cultural institutions and has even extended this benefit to some of their personnel. More recent application of similar foresight has resulted in the general practice of granting free use of State-owned buildings to private organizations for the presentation of functions in the public interest.

The general assembly, with the assent and cooperation of the executive branch, traditionally holds well publicized commemoration exercises on the occasion of Lincoln's birthday.

Still another enactment of the last legislative session has potentially great significance. The Historic Area Zoning Act enables city and town authorities to draw up regulations for the protection of areas of historic interest.

Other information: The department of public works bears the responsibility for the repair and maintenance of historical monuments. Some of the more important of these are: Butts Hill Fort in Portsmouth, the site of the only land battle in Rhode Island during the Revolutionary War; General Stanton Monument in Charlestown * * *; Great Swamp Fight Monument where the major battle of the Indian King Philip's War was fought in 1675; and Queen's Fort in Exeter which was an ancient Indian fortification.

(Source: Charles A. Kilvert, director of administration, State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Mar. 15, 1960.)

South Carolina

The following related activities appear in the State of South Carolina appropriations for fiscal 1960–61:

Archives department: Calhoun Papers project	$9,592
Confederate Relic Room administration	3,571
Woodrow Wilson home maintenance repairs	650
Poet Laureate	600
To match other funds provided for purchase by the State of a collection of the works of William Gilmore Sims	5,000
Confederate Museum	100
Oakley Park Red Shirt Shrine	1,800

(Source: Appropriations for 1960–61. State of South Carolina—State publication bearing name of E. C. Rhodes, comptroller general.)

Tennessee

Amount of State funds appropriated by the general assembly (for fiscal 1959–60):

State library and archives	$250,000
Historical grants-in-aid	300,000
State museum	[1] 20,000

[1] This is not a separate appropriation; however, the amount set out is expended from the department of education's appropriation for the museum.

Source of funds: General revenue.

Other information:

The State library maintains the legislative reference library and a technical and historical library. * * * In the archives, records of the State government are preserved.

Historical grants-in-aid are made available to some 15 private nonprofit commissions and associations for the preservation of historical sites throughout the State of Tennessee.

In the State museum are preserved and exhibited many costumes and relics of historical periods in Tennessee. The Tennessee archeological exhibit is also located in the museum with many rare specimens in pottery and stone implements and an Egyptian mummy.

(Source: Edward J. Boling, director, division of finance and administration, Mar. 8, 1960.)

Texas

Amount of funds appropriated (for fiscal year ending Aug. 31, 1960):

Library and historical commission	$395,826
State parks board	406,104
Historical State parks	38,234
Historical survey committee	23,020
Museums	131,745

(Source: Jess M. Irvin, Jr., administrative assistant, executive department, May 31, 1960.)

Utah

Amounts of State funds appropriated (according to recent budget):

Utah State Institute of Fine Arts (current budget allocations):	
Art contest	$2,000
Writing contest	2,000
Crafts	500
Utah Symphony Orchestra	13,000
Total	17,500
Utah State Fair Association (typical of recent budgets):	
Fine arts contest (premiums)	$1,150
Ceramics contest	625
Music contest	325
Total	2,100

Source of funds: General revenues.

Method of allocation: Funds are allocated by the art institute board consisting of 13 unpaid directors appointed by the Governor.

Other information: The Legislature of the State of Utah created the Utah State Institute of Fine Arts, effective May 11, 1937, an agency which has been charged with the responsibility of fostering all of the fine arts in Utah. The organizational structure of this agency envisions activities and projects in art, drama, writing, art museum, dancing, and music.

In recent years the total appropriation to the art institute has been $10,000 per year; however, during the current biennium this amount was increased to $17,500.

(Source: Harold L. Gregory, secretary and treasurer, Utah State Institute of Fine Arts, Mar. 14, 1960.)

Vermont

Amount of funds appropriated:

Vermont Symphony	$5,000
Vermont Historical Society (1960)	20,000

Source of funds: General fund. No special taxes are earmarked for these purposes.

Other information: The Vermont Historical Society is a semiprivate State agency which obtains approximately half of its funds from membership and endowment funds.

(Source: Lawrence J. Turgeon, State librarian, May 25, 1960.)

Virginia

Amount of funds appropriated (under current State budget):

The Barter Theater (Abingdon)	$15,000
Confederate Museum (Richmond)	1,800
Valentine Museum (Richmond)	5,000
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts	271,000

Source of funds and method of allocation: Appropriated by the State legislature from the general fund on recommendation of the Governor's budget committee.

Other information: At the Virginia Museum, a combination of State funds and revenues (membership dues, admission fees, sales, desk, etc.) pays for operation and maintenance of the building, salaries, costs of exhibitions, programs, events, and the artmobile. Endowment income and gifts are used primarily for the purchase of art for the collections.

(Source: Leslie Cheek, Jr., director, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Mar. 1, 1960.)

Washington

Amount of funds appropriated (for fiscal 1960):

State historical society (Tacoma)	$55,155
Eastern Washington Historical Society (Spokane)	28,191
State capital historical society (Olympia)	23,993
State museum	25,948
Henry Art Gallery	14,633
Parks and recreation commission museums	46,075

Source of funds: All of these expenditures are supported by the State's general fund except for the parks and recreation commission, which is financed from an earmarked portion of driver's license fees and highway fines and forfeitures.

Other information: The parks and recreation commission maintains three museums at Fort Columbia, Fort Simcoe, and Ginko Petrified Forest. The commission employs a full-time historian, and three museum curators during the summer months. The University of Washington operates the Washington State Museum and the Henry Art Gallery on its campus in Seattle.

(Source: Warren A. Bishop, budget director, office of the Governor, central budget agency, Mar. 10, 1960.)

West Virginia

Amount of funds appropriated:

West Virginia Centennial Commission:	
To be invested for each of the years 1959 and 1960	$100,000
For operating expenses	12,500
State department of archives and history (fiscal 1961)	44,490

Source of funds: General revenue fund.

Other information: The State department of archives and history maintains a library of more than 100,000 volumes.

It also maintains a museum. Moreover, it is interesting to note that contributions to the museum last year cost as much to produce as the department's appropriation. There were approximately 40,000 visitors to the museum last year.

(Source: Cecil H. Underwood, Governor, Mar. 11, 1960.)

Wisconsin

Amount of funds appropriated (1959–61):

	1959–60	1960–61
State fair (department of agriculture)	$1,025,000	$1,025,000
Archeological society	800	800
Fine arts commission	100	100
Historical markers commission	200	200
Historical society	783,210	776,794
Radio council (State radio broadcast system)	234,157	225,843
	1957–58, actual expenditures	
Portraits of former Governors	$5,197	

Description of activities:

State fair: The objectives of this appropriation are to conduct the annual Wisconsin State Fair and to maintain the State fair park and its buildings in line with funds available from operation of the fair, rental received from buildings, income from special events, and revenue from concession rentals.

Archeological society: The archeological society studies and attempts to preserve antiquities. The State appropriation is used to pay for publication of the Wisconsin Archeologist.

Fine arts commission: The commission approves the design, structure, composition,

location, and arrangement of all monuments, memorials, and works of art which become the property of the State, excluding those acquired by the University of Wisconsin and the State historical society.

Historical society: Administration, museum, library, physical plant, business office, field office, education and interpretation, and sites and markers are supported almost entirely from State appropriations. Publications, Villa Louis, Old Wade House, and the historymobile are supported all or largely by private funds.

The library collects and preserves books, pamphlets, periodicals, newspapers, manuscripts, etc.

The museum collects, preserves, and displays objects and pictorial material portraying the history of Wisconsin and the West. The new Federal highway program pays the cost of salvaging historical items * * * but the State must make the initial survey.

The American History Research Center * * * focuses research on local history and operates a grants-in-aid program to encourage writing of local history.

Nelson Dewey Park: This is the State's contribution to operation of the State farm and craft museum at Stonefield.

Sites and markers: This activity has charge of historic sites operated by the society * * * and the preparation and erection of historical markers.

Historical markers commission: To plan and develop a uniform system of marking for State historical, archeological, geological, and legendary sites in the State. The commission may accept aid and support of local public or private groups.

Radio council: The State network now broadcasts 15¼ hours daily Monday through Friday * * * and * * * for 10½ hours on Sunday.

University of Wisconsin: It might also be noted that the Memorial Union Theater, part of the university, is open to the public. The theater schedules concerts as well as stage plays and operas.

Other information: As far as the fiscal operation of the agencies is concerned, the method (i.e., of reporting State appropriations) has one shortcoming. The Wisconsin budget spells out the receipts and disbursements by agency rather than by function. Thus, where functions cross agency lines, it is difficult if not impossible to obtain an accurate estimate of the total funds involved.

A case in point is the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters * * * the appropriation listed covers only the cost of the publication of the academy's Transactions (partly covered by membership fees). In addition the academy has for its library the part-time services of a librarian employed by the Memorial Library of the University of Wisconsin, and is assisted in the planning of its annual meeting and the publication of its Transactions by a professor from the College of Letters and Science of the University of Wisconsin. In addition, some of the work for the academy is performed by an employee of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission, a civil service employee of the State of Wisconsin. For an accurate assessment of the expenditure of State funds on behalf of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, the monetary value of the work performed by these three persons should be taken into consideration; however, as the cost is absorbed by the State agencies which employ these persons there is no information on the value of this item.

A similar situation exists in practically every case, but the figures cited * * * will give * * * proof that the State does expend moneys for these specific activities in the cultural field. It is not possible to obtain an accurate total.

There are, however, two State activities of definite cultural value which are not set out in the budget document because their costs are entirely absorbed by participating State departments: The functions performed by the natural resources committee, and the State board for the preservation of scientific areas. For neither function is there an appropriation for operating expenditures. * * * State employee members of these boards are reimbursed for actual expenses by the departments by which they are employed. We understand that particularly in the case of the natural resources committee the hidden costs might amount to a sizable figure, in that the committee is composed of top-level employees who receive part of their salaries for work performed in the service of the committee.

(Source: M. G. Toepel, chief, legislative reference library, Feb. 26, 1960.)

Wyoming

There is no State agency in Wyoming whose major interest is in cultural activities, and no State appropriation is made for fine arts or cultural purposes. The University of Wyoming does participate in and carry on cultural programs.

(Source: J. J. "Joe" Hickey, Governor, Feb. 16, 1960.)

EXTENSION OF APPEAL RIGHTS TO ALL CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce a bill giving all classified Federal employees the right of appeal from an adverse personnel action to the Civil Service Commission. This right of appeal is now available to Federal workers who are under the Veterans' Preference Act. It has had a very salutary effect in preventing unjust firings and suspensions. The merit of the appeal procedure has been tested and found to be good—its extension to all classified workers is justified.

After the probationary period, a civil service worker would be entitled, before a removal, suspension for more than 30 days, or reduction in grade or pay, to the present 30-day notice with right of reply, and in addition, an appeal to the Civil Service Commission for final determination if he is dissatisfied with the fairness of the agency's action. This system of justice is presently available to veterans in the Federal service, and no reason appears why it should not be extended to all classified employees. Note that this bill does not disturb or impair the Veterans' Preference Act as such, but only expands the appeal procedure.

Mr. President, I am sure that this measure has wide support among those familiar with the problems of Federal employees. I am hopeful that it will receive early consideration by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 786) to provide for appeals from adverse personnel actions affecting employees in the classified civil service, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6(a) of the Act of August 24, 1912 (5 U.S.C., sec. 652(a)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) No person in the classified civil service of the United States (including a person within the purview of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended), who has completed a probationary or trial period of employment, shall be removed or suspended without pay therefrom, reduced in grade or compensation, or debarred from future employment, except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of such service and for reasons given in writing.

"(2) Any such person (except a person within the purview of subsection (b)(3) of this section) whose removal, suspension for more than thirty days, or reduction in grade or compensation is sought shall (A) have at least thirty days' advance written notice (except where there is reasonable cause to believe such person to be guilty of a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed), stating any and all reasons, specifically and in detail, for any such proposed action; (B) be allowed a reasonable time for answering the same personally and in writing, and for furnishing affidavits in support for such answer; and (C) within thirty days after the date of receipt of notice of an adverse decision on such answer, have the right to appeal in writing to the Civil Service Commission and to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, before the Commission in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Commission. After investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the administrative officer concerned and shall send copies of the same to the appellant or to his designated representative. It shall be mandatory for such administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends. This paragraph shall apply to a person within the purview of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, only if he so elects.

"(3) Any such person (except a person within the purview of subsection (b)(3) of this section) whose suspension without pay for thirty days or less is sought shall (A) have advance written notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him; (B) be furnished with a copy of such charges and any and all reasons therefor; (C) be allowed a reasonable time for filing a written answer to such charges, with affidavits; and (D) be furnished at the earliest practicable date with a written decision on such answer. No examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer or employee directing the suspension without pay.

"(4) Copies of all documents and papers in connection with each personnel action taken under paragraph (2) or (3) of this subsection shall be made a part of the records of the department or agency concerned and copies of the same shall be furnished, upon request, to the person affected and to the Civil Service Commission."

SEC. 2. The enactment of this Act shall not affect the operation of any law or Executive order relating to removal or suspensions of officers and employees in the interest of the national security.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit residence requirements as conditions for eligibility under State plans for aid to the blind.

In the great majority of States the blind must still meet residence requirements to be eligible for public assistance under the Federal-State programs. The Federal law at present sets the maximum which the States can impose at 5 of the last 9 years including 1 year immediately preceding application. More than 20 States have residence requirements for the blind which are identical or similar to the Federal maximum.

Residence requirements for public assistance are a legal and cultural lag. They had their origin in the Elizabethan 16th century poor laws, were transferred to the Colonies and later were adopted by the various State legislatures. Meanwhile, the nature of the economy and of community living has changed greatly. The majority of citizens no longer live in small, stable, self-sufficient communities. Urbanization and industrialization have extended the lines of opportunity and also of interdependence. Mobility of workers is characteristic of this new mode of living, and the basis of responsibility has likewise been widened.

The principal argument still used to uphold residence requirements is that those on public assistance will move to States which provide larger benefits. The experience of those States which have removed residence requirements, such as New York, has demonstrated what social welfare workers have long maintained. If public assistance recipients move at all, they do so to seek jobs, to be near relatives, for reasons of health and similar motives.

The facts which argue against residence requirements apply especially against those imposed on the blind. The more than 100,000 blind citizens receiving public assistance already have a serious handicap to becoming self-supporting. Residence requirements increase their problems. The blind in particular need an opportunity to move to places where their skills can be used, without forfeiting their eligibility for public assistance for years to come.

The Congress has taken several steps to assist the blind in rehabilitation. In 1956 the Social Security Act was amended to assure that self-care and self-support would be among the purposes of the various aid programs, including aid to the blind.

However, the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs is limited as long as the blind are discouraged from moving to another State where they might become self-supporting. After they have been trained in a skill, it is not good for them or for the public assistance program to threaten them with ineligibility for public assistance if they seek work outside the State.

The bill which I have introduced takes into account the necessity for States to amend their laws. It would grant the States until July 1, 1963, to eliminate residence requirements for the blind.

I believe, Mr. President, that residence requirements should be abolished in all the public assistance programs. While working for that broader objective, we should give immediate attention to provide one category, the blind, with greater freedom and flexibility to seek employment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 787) to prohibit residence requirements as conditions for eligibility under State plans for aid to the blind, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INVITATION TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE TO ADDRESS A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to invite the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court to annually address a joint session of the Congress.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to establish better communications between the judicial branch of our Government and the Congress, and to foster better congressional understanding of the problems of the courts. Such a practice would in no way interfere with the independence of the Judiciary and, indeed, it would give added recognition to the Court's status as a coequal branch of the Federal Government. It would also present an excellent opportunity to us in the Congress and to the entire Nation to hear the Chief Justice discuss the administration and functioning of the judicial branch of our Government. In much the same way that the President advises us "from time to time" on the state of the Union and on matters he wishes to present to the Congress, this would provide a similar opportunity for the Chief Justice to inform us about the workings of the judicial branch.

Mr. President, I have been interested in this proposal for several years, and I am extremely hopeful that during the 87th Congress it will receive the careful and serious attention which I believe it deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) to invite the Chief Justice of the United States to address a joint session of Congress annually, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as soon as practicable after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the Chief Justice of the United States shall be invited to address the Congress with respect to the state of the judicial branch of the Government and related matters. Upon his acceptance of the invitation, a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be convened to hear his address at a suitable time after the delivery by the President of the state of the Union message to the Congress.

DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF DOMESTIC GOLD

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold.

With gold mines shut down at the same time that U.S. gold reserves are dwindling and are threatened by the continuing flow of dollars to foreign lands, one sure way to help the gold shortage is to get more gold.

This joint resolution would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, for a period of 5 years, to make incentive payments to producers of newly mined domestic gold. The amount of the payment in each instance would be determined by the Secretary, but in no case would it exceed $35 an ounce. This provision recognizes that one mine can get into production at $45 whereas another might take $55. The proposed legislation would not establish a two-price system for gold, nor would it affect the monetary price of gold, which would remain at $35 an ounce. It would not disturb the value of the dollar. No payments under the program would be made during any period in which our gold reserves reach $23 billion, their approximate level 3 years ago.

The outflow of gold is a difficult problem, demanding urgent attention. President Kennedy in his state of the Union message said that he would shortly address to the Congress a message dealing with the gold outflow and his recommendations for meeting it. I look forward to those recommendations. I propose in introducing this joint resolution one way to deal with the gold shortage—to produce more gold.

The text of the joint resolution sets forth its purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and my colleague from California [Mr. KUCHEL] join me in sponsoring this proposed legislation. Hon. HAROLD T. JOHNSON of the Second District of California is introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and

Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, during World War II, mining operations in many gold mines throughout the United States were discontinued pursuant to Government order; and

Whereas, during World War II and subsequent thereto, the cost of mining operations has greatly increased; and

Whereas the price of gold in the United States was fixed during the period of low operation cost at the rate of $35 per ounce by the Federal Government and that price has continued until the present time; and

Whereas as a result of the foregoing conditions more than 95 per centum of the gold mines scattered throughout the United States have been forced to close; and

Whereas the gold reserves of the United States Government have been depleted by approximately $5,000,000,000 during the past three years bringing such reserves to a dangerous level; and

Whereas action should be taken without further delay to stimulate the production of domestic gold and to rebuild the gold reserves of the Government to a safer level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to encourage the discovery, development, and increase production of domestic gold, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, make incentive payments to producers of gold mined, after the date of approval of this joint resolution, in the United States, its territorial possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, upon evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of a sale by any such producer of such gold to the United States. The amount of any such payment shall be determined by the Secretary, but in no case shall such amount exceed $35 an ounce.

SEC. 2. No payments shall be made under this joint resolution during any period in which the gold reserves of the United States Government equal or exceed $23,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to repeal, supersede, or modify existing provisions of law relating to the monetary system of the United States.

SEC. 4. This joint resolution, and the authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate five years after the date of its approval.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

CONCENTRATION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS ON THE WEST COAST

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have long been puzzled as to why there is such a large concentration of defense prime contracts in the State of California when there are 49 other States in the Union. In a State that has 15,717,204 people according to the 1960 census, or only 8.7 percent of the total population, there is an excessively disproportionate share of the total number of defense prime contracts located there.

I do not mean to say that defense prime contracts should be apportioned among the States according to population, but I do make the point that there exists an excessive concentration of these prime contracts in one area when there are other areas, some of which fall into the category of depressed areas, which are being awarded few, if any, of these contracts, notwithstanding their high industrial capacity.

Mr. President, I have inquired of the Defense Department and received its figures for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 giving the dollar amount of prime contract awards by State and by company. In reviewing those statistics, it is interesting to note that during fiscal year 1959, 28.4 percent of all defense prime contracts awarded for procurement were awarded to west coast firms. In fiscal year 1960, the figure was 27.7 percent. But more interesting is the fact that nearly all of those west coast awards went to California business firms. During fiscal year 1959, 24 percent of all prime contracts for procurement were awarded to California firms. In fiscal 1960, 23.7 percent went to California firms.

The situation is even more lopsided in the case of prime contracts awarded for experimental, developmental, test, and research work. In fiscal year 1959, 31.15 percent of all such prime contract awards to business firms went to California firms. Further, of the total of all such awards, 21.5 percent went to two California companies.

Mr. President, I do not mean to say that there have been any irregularities on the part of anyone in California or on the part of any of the executives in the companies concerned or of anyone in the military. I merely question, and I want the Senate to question—Why is it that 1 State out of 50 gets such a high percentage of awards when there are other States with considerable industrial capacity which get little or nothing? Why is it that more of these contracts are not awarded to qualified firms in areas of low employment? Why is there not more dispersion of these important contracts for purposes of national security? Why is a situation permitted to exist where a huge percentage of our research and experimental work can be eliminated by the enemy with a couple of well-placed bombs? Why is it that certain research and missile and airplane firms have trouble getting any defense contracts when their capability and know-how have been proven time and time again? Why is it that there is such a high concentration of electronic industrial contracts in one Western State when there is such great capability in the New England area which is not being fully utilized?

It is the answer to these and many other questions that I desire, Mr. President. In the interests of national defense, I think they must be answered, and I have a responsibility to the people of the State of Maryland to get the answers. I owe it to the unemployed of western Maryland, as well as other areas such as Baltimore where employment is also down. The people, Mr. President, want to know why and I want to know why, and I think the U.S. Senate should want to know why. The situation is serious and demands investigation. I believe the U.S. Senate has a duty to initiate the investigation.

Two years ago I submitted a resolution which called for an investigation of this apparently disproportionate distribution of contracts. It went the way of so many other bills and resolutions—that is, it was referred to committee and thereafter died and was buried.

I am going to submit the resolution at this time and, in view of President Kennedy's recent statements promising to aid distressed areas, I urge the committee and the Senate to act immediately and authorize the investigation and thereby determine whether or not other areas of the country are being discriminated against by the Military Establishment.

Perhaps my suspicions are not justified. Perhaps the way it is being done is the only way it can be done; and perhaps it is best for the country from the standpoint of national security and economic well-being. But let us conduct an investigation and do away with all suspicions and questions. Let us and the American people be sure that the bright glitter of the former military brass which emanates from the upper echelons of so many of the companies concerned does not blind us to the realities of the situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 82) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas, during fiscal year 1960 27.2 per centum, and during fiscal year 1959 28.4 per centum, of all defense prime contract awards for procurement were made to business firms whose principal place of business is on the west coast; and

Whereas, during fiscal year 1960 23.7 per centum, and during fiscal year 1959 24 per centum, of all defense prime contract awards for procurement were made to business firms whose principal place of business is located in the State of California; and

Whereas, during fiscal year 1959 31.15 per centum of all defense prime contract awards to business firms for experimental, developmental, test and research work were made to companies whose principal place of business is located in the State of California; and

Whereas, during fiscal year 1959, of the five business firms receiving the highest total value of awards of defense prime contracts for experimental, developmental, test and research work, for a total of $2,071,331,000 or 41.45 per centum of the total of all such awards, $1,079,174,000 in awards or 52.1 per centum of awards to the top five business firms and 21.5 per centum of the total of all such awards were made to business firms whose principal place of business is located in the State of California; and

Whereas, during the fiscal year 1959, of the ten business firms receiving the highest total value of awards of defense prime contracts for experimental, developmental, test and research work, for a total of $3,034,321,000 or 60.7 per centum of the total of all such awards, $1,287,440,000 in awards or 42.4 per centum of awards to the top ten business firms and 25.8 per centum of the total of all such awards were made to business firms whose principal place of business is located in the State of California; and

Whereas many of the aforementioned companies which produce aircraft, missiles, electronic gear, and other defense material have huge backlogs of orders; and

Whereas other companies, with comparable facilities and employees with equal skills, located in other sections of the United States in many instances have insufficient contract work at their disposal; and

Whereas such concentration of defense procurement and research and development work in one particular area is not in keep-

ing with long established principles of national defense requiring decentralization of defense activities; and

Whereas this high concentration of defense facilities in one section of the Nation is not in keeping with the best interests of natonal economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services or any duly authorized subcommittee therefore is authorized, under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete study and investigation to determine the cause and the scope of the concentration of defense activities on the west coast, and particularly in the State of California, and to recommend to the Senate such legislative or other action as, in the opinion of the committee, is necessary to be taken to assure the defense and to protect the national economy from undue concentration of defense activities.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from August 1, 1960, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $60,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PORTIONS OF SHORELINE AREAS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 543) to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PROVISION OF CREDIT FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES OF TUITION OR FEES TO CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 26, 1961, the names of Mr. GRUENING and Mr. LONG of Missouri were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 634) to provide a 30-percent credit against the Federal individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY on January 26, 1961.

PROGRAM OF SCHOLARSHIP AID TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 26, 1961, the names of Senators GRUENING, LONG of Missouri, YARBOROUGH, and PELL, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 635) to establish a program of scholarship aid to students in higher education, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY on January 26, 1961.

LOAN INSURANCE TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 26, 1961, the names of Senators GRUENING, FULBRIGHT, JAVITS, LONG of Missouri, YARBOROUGH, and PELL, were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 636) to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY on January 26, 1961.

PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF AGE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 243) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age, introduced by me on January 9, 1961.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators) on January 26, 1961, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, BIBLE, JACKSON, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mrs. NEUBERGER may be added as additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. WEAVER TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, on Tuesday, February 7, at 10 a.m. Mr. Weaver will be present.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief counsel of the Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5304, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capital 4-3121, extension 3921, as soon as possible.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS DE B. KATZENBACH, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 9, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on the nomination of Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Robert Kramer, resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Address delivered by Senator BYRD of Virginia before American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 2, 1961.

RETIREMENT OF LOY W. HENDERSON FROM STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that I have learned of the retirement of Loy W. Henderson from the Department of State. On the one hand, I am delighted that he will be relieved of the burden of public responsibility which he has borne so competently for 39 years. On the other hand, I regret that the Government has lost so distinguished and able a public servant.

At the time of his retirement, Mr. Henderson was the highest ranking career Ambassador and the Deputy Secretary of State for Administration. These distinctions, however, were but the climax of a remarkable career which began after World War I, and carried him to all parts of the world on assignments of great trust and responsibility.

On this occasion I wish to extend my personal thanks and, I am sure, the thanks of the Senate, as well, to Loy Henderson for his faithful service to the people of the United States, and to wish him well in whatever he may do in the years ahead. He has been a great, good, and faithful public servant. All of us will miss him, because his advice and his counsel were invaluable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from

the Washington Star of February 1, 1961, which sets forth the highlights of Mr. Henderson's career.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOY HENDERSON RETIRES AFTER 39-YEAR SERVICE

Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration in the Eisenhower administration, retired yesterday after 39 years of Government service.

Mr. Henderson paid a farewell call yesterday on Secretary of State Rusk.

He was the top-ranking career Ambassador in active service and is being replaced by Roger Jones, a Kennedy administration appointee.

Mr. Henderson has been Ambassador to Iraq, India, and Iran. He had served as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration since January 26, 1955. He was appointed career Ambassador March 7, 1956.

His most recent special diplomatic assignment was to tour Africa, setting up American diplomatic missions in the new nations there.

He served as a member of the American Embassy staff in Moscow, from 1931 to 1938.

He returned to Moscow in 1942 and served until 1943 as counselor of embassy. In the late 1920's Mr. Henderson was a third secretary assigned to the Baltic States.

Born at Rogers, Ark., on June 28, 1892, he was graduated from Northwestern University in 1915.

Four years later he became a member of the Inter-Allied Commission to Germany for repatriation of prisoners of war. The next year he worked with an American Red Cross commission to western Russia and the Baltic States.

He was Ambassador to India when that country won its independence and served as the American envoy in Iran when Premier Mohammed Mossadegh sought to internationalize Iranian oil fields.

For the last decade he has been key adviser to Presidents and Secretaries of State on Middle East affairs.

Mr. Henderson has several offers to begin a new career, either at a university or in private business. He plans to rest at his home here, however, before deciding whether to accept any of the offers.

FARM INCOME AND FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a very interesting editorial entitled "Down on the Farm," which was published this morning in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOWN ON THE FARM

Income is down on the farm, all right, and the reports of several of President Kennedy's task forces on agriculture offer little hope that there will be much improvement soon. Perhaps this is only a recitation of the obvious. There has been enough experience with the farm problem to show that there is no broad and tidy panacea. Probably it is wise to chip away at the problem on a commodity-by-commodity basis. What is missing from the reports, however, is a philosophical effort to dramatize the shocking disparity between the farm dweller and his city cousin.

Specific proposals by the task forces are generally unexceptionable. The cotton report recommends largely a continuation of present programs. The feed grain report calls for some increase in price support levels for participating farmers plus intensified land retirement. The wheat report emphasizes the importance of the reform of open-end price supports and the establishment of a more realistic marketing quota geared to annual wheat disappearance, with an adjustment to eliminate the exemption of tracts under 15 acres in size.

The overall observations are what is discouraging. Farm income is likely to decline while output rises faster than consumption. The grain surplus threatens to disrupt livestock industries. There is no solution in emigration from farms, particularly in a period of high unemployment. Farmers would be unlikely to support rigid control programs now. Therefore the most practicable remedies lie in a greatly expanded land retirement effort along with additional emphasis on the rural development program to increase the earning power of persons deriving little from agriculture.

It is difficult to quarrel with these observations, even though they do not appear to set the stage for the vigorous program of supply management that Mr. Kennedy endorsed during the political campaign. And perhaps, since the frames of reference were limited, these reports were not the place for a philosophical discussion of the disequilibrium of the farmer.

Nevertheless, there needs to be frequent reiteration of the substantial disadvantage of the farmer and farmworker in American society, and we hope that Mr. Kennedy will find occasion to do so in the proposals which he promised yesterday to submit to Congress. The problem cannot be judged fairly by the situation of the relative few who are well off or who derive a good thing from governmental programs. The farmer enjoys no minimum wage and has little control over the marketing of his products. Paradoxically, the harder he works the more he often aggravates his problem.

In return for measures to improve his income, patently the farmer must be willing to accept some checks on production. The point, however, is that a society that aims at equal opportunity cannot long be indifferent to his disadvantage. The farmer has increased his productivity on the average more than almost any other producer; but alone of all producers he is penalized for efficiency. The great challenge is to find imaginative means, through the food-for-peace program and similar efforts, of turning this productivity from a curse into an asset.

TEN MAJOR PROBLEMS FACING AMERICA—STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT-ELECT KENNEDY

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the January 15, 1961, issue of This Week magazine included an article, by Pat Frank, containing statements by President-elect John F. Kennedy on "Ten Major Problems Facing America." The statements were made before Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. Two of the statements—those pertaining to education and medical care—are of particular interest, and I wish to call them to the attention of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION

In 1786 Thomas Jefferson wrote: "The most important bill is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness." Again, aid to education is the most important bill—Federal aid—for the resources of States, counties, and municipalities cannot keep pace with our explosive increase in population.

State and local government per capita expenditures for public schools have risen 140 percent in the past 10 years. State indebtedness has increased 500 percent. Many school districts can no longer afford to float school bond issues.

In many States, the choice is a simple one: Federal aid or inadequate schools. Today, we lack 131,000 classrooms we desperately need. The result is double shifts, obsolete, overcrowded, and even dangerous classrooms.

So one of the first items on the Democratic agenda in 1961 is passage of an adequate bill for school construction.

Second, today we need 135,000 more teachers, well-trained and well-paid. Almost 3 million children are being taught by teachers working on substandard certificates. In 1961 I am confident that a Democratic Congress will enact a bill to raise teachers' salaries, and undam the flow of urgently needed, well-trained new teachers to our classrooms.

Third, I will propose the establishment of an Educational Extension Service within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It will research new teaching techniques and methods, and make the results of its work known to 48,600 school districts.

Fourth, we have failed to make a college education available to every young man or woman with the ability to pursue it. In 1959, 100,000 young men and women in the top 10 percent of their high school classes could not go to college because their parents could not afford it. Therefore, I will propose enactment of a Student Loan Insurance Act. Under this program the Federal Government will—in return for a small premium—guarantee student loans made by colleges and universities. Basic responsibility for repayment will rest with the student.

A gifted child is a national asset. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to help him in every way to realize his full potential—for himself, and for his country.

MEDICAL AID FOR AGED

Millions of our senior citizens cannot afford adequate medical care. They are forced to drain their savings, sell their homes, and go into debt to pay doctor, hospital, and drug bills. Eventually, they either become wards of their own children or, in the case of 2,350,000 of them, of public assistance. As the life span of Americans increases, the problem becomes increasingly grave. Like the gifted child, the Nation's senior citizen, his health and dignity unimpaired, is a national asset. He adds skills and wisdom to our resources.

Also, there is a critical shortage of doctors in the country. In 1959, a commission headed by Dr. Thomas Parran, former U.S. Surgeon General, reported that while there was 1 doctor per 613 persons in Russia there was only 1 doctor per 733 people in this country.

In the last session of Congress we tried to enact a bill to provide decent medical care for the elderly under social security, without humiliating the recipients by forcing them to take a pauper's oath. The bill was defeated. But it is imperative that in the coming session the Congress adopt this bill.

This will not end our responsibility for improving medical research, and providing more hospitals and better medical education.

EAST-WEST CENTER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, in a recent article, told how the leadership of the

Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, when he was Senate majority leader, was largely responsible for the establishment of the East-West Cultural and Technical Interchange Center in Hawaii. The Nation and the State of Hawaii owe a great deal to Mr. JOHNSON for his foresight in promoting the project as an instrument of peace and for his skill in obtaining congressional approval of it on a meaningful scale.

My only regret is that this excellent summary of the legislative history of the East-West Center fails to mention the important role played by John A. Burns, Hawaii's last Delegate to Congress. Mr. Burns was instrumental in bringing to the attention of Senator JOHNSON Hawaii's unique advantages to serve as the location for the center. Delegate Burns caused the initial legislation creating the Center to be introduced in Congress, in June 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Star-Bulletin of January 22, 1961, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON'S SENATE MANEUVERS MADE E-W CENTER A REALITY

The new Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, is a man whose legislative finesse has become sharply apparent to Hawaii in the past 2 years.

As Senate majority leader, JOHNSON exercised a large measure of control over what would and would not be considered by the Senate.

When he finally swung over to full support of Hawaii's statehood bill, its long and rocky road through Congress suddenly turned smooth and it all but glided through the first session of the last Congress after it convened in 1959.

JOHNSON's effectiveness again became apparent to the Islands after he adopted the East-West Center project as his own and decided it should become a reality.

Though it was a new project and one for which no widespread public support had been arrayed, even in Hawaii, JOHNSON showed how to cut legislative corners and get results in a hurry.

JOHNSON first announced his proposal for the center on April 16, 1959, and requested the University of Hawaii to draw up plans.

Legislation to create the East-West Center was introduced on June 9. On June 17, Senator JOHNSON went before a closed door meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to urge the center.

The record of this hearing still has not been made public but within the week the full Senate had voted, on JOHNSON's motion, to add a $250,000 initial appropriation for the center to the appropriations bill for the State and Justice Departments.

A few days later an amendment was similarly tacked on to the foreign aid bill to require the Secretary of State to report by January 3, 1960, on a complete plan for an East-West Center in Hawaii.

JOHNSON—who also held the position of chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handled State Department funds—reported that the Secretary of State was favorable to the project.

In 1960, JOHNSON suggested that nothing be done in the House on the authorized legislation.

He had Senators LONG and FONG of Hawaii round up a flock of Senate cosponsors for a full-scale authorization of funds for the center and they got more than half the Members of the Senate.

As a result, it wasn't difficult to amend the mutual security bill, authorizing billions, to add a project of a few million dollars.

As Appropriations Subcommittee chairman, JOHNSON insisted on building up a good case in public hearings in June 1960 for the first $10 million appropriation for the center.

The House is usually jealous of its claimed power to initiate appropriations and taxes and might have killed the East-West Center authorization and appropriation had it not been a pet of Senator JOHNSON, who in turn was allied with House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, JOHNSON's campaign manager.

The bills passed and the East-West Center now is a reality—less than 2 years after JOHNSON's initial speech.

APPOINTMENT OF JAMES B. CASH, JR., AS DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF FHA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday of last week, the President once again called upon one of our very able and efficient staff assistants to join him in the executive branch of the Federal Government. While I am not surprised by the selection of James B. Cash, Jr.—for I have known Jim well and have recognized his talents—for the post of Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, I must truthfully say that I regret very much that he is resigning the position of staff director of the Housing Subcommittee.

I am delighted, however, that Jim is being given the opportunity to exercise his talents in an agency which he, so to speak, grew up in, and I know that his knowledge and experience in the field of housing will be an asset to the executive branch in administering the various FHA mortgage insurance programs.

In many respects, I can think of no person who would be better qualified to serve as Deputy Commissioner. Jim was first employed by the FHA in 1939 as a messenger, when he was 17 years old. Since that time, he has served in progressively important positions, and he has dealt with, on a day-to-day basis, every phase of housing under the purview and jurisdiction of the Federal Government. In 1955 he joined the staff of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency as the assistant in charge of housing matters. In 1958 he was appointed as the staff director of the Housing Subcommittee. Thus one might say that this appointment is a tribute to the career service of the Federal Government.

Jim Cash is indeed a professional in his field. He has been a valuable assistant to members, both minority and majority, of the subcommittee, as well as to members, both minority and majority, of the full committee.

Mr. President, I think it is only fitting that I take the time of the Senate to make this tribute to Jim Cash.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Alabama in regard to Mr. Cash, and add just a few of my own.

Today at 2 p.m. James B. Cash, Jr., the very able staff director of the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, will take the oath of office as Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration. While I sincerely regret that his services will be lost to the Senate, it is extremely gratifying to me that he will assume this very important position in the new administration. It is pleasing to me because, shortly after I became chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I selected Mr. Cash as the member of the committee's professional staff to be responsible for housing matters. Subsequently, Senator SPARKMAN, the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, appointed him staff director of the Housing Subcommittee which, as my colleagues are aware, is one of the most important permanent subcommittees of the Senate. I know that in his service on the Banking and Currency Committee Jim Cash has won the respect and confidence of every member of the committee and, I am sure, of every Senator on both sides of the aisle who has had dealings with the committee.

Members of the Senate will recall President Kennedy's statement before his inauguration that, in making appointments to high Government office, his attempt would be to seek out the best qualified men in the country. Having worked closely with Jim Cash in the field of housing for the past 6 years it is my opinion that the President has fulfilled his pledge with respect to this position.

I do not think I ever encountered a more capable and expert employee of any Senate committee than Jim Cash. He knows the housing field thoroughly and completley. He was never at a loss, at the hearings, for answers to questions in that field. I think he stands as an example of the finest kind of professional employee of the Senate.

The career of Jim Cash is in the highest tradition of dedicated Government service. He came to Washington from my State of Arkansas in 1939 when he was 18 years of age. He began his career with the Federal Housing Administration as a messenger, during which time he completed his education at George Washington University. Because of his ability, dedication, and determination, he has progressed consistently in Federal employment to posts of higher responsibility, with commendations from everyone with whom he has served in each of his positions. In my opinion, the appointment of a former messenger of the Federal Housing Administration as Deputy Commissioner of that organization should be good for the morale of Government employees and, particularly, for those of the FHA.

Mr. Cash is thoroughly qualified to occupy this post of high responsibility. I am proud to see him elevated to this position and I am certain his appointment will receive widespread approval in the Congress, as well as among members of the housing industry. I am convinced he will make a contribution to the improvement of the operation of the Government and I join with my colleagues in wishing him every success in this new position.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to join the junior Senator from

Alabama in paying tribute to James B. Cash, who is leaving the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee today.

Since coming to the committee in 1955, Mr. Cash has devoted himself faithfully and with great ability to the important field of housing. His deep interest in that field, his pleasant and cooperative personal demeanor, and his ability, have been of great aid to the committee in these years when we have had an increasing amount of housing legislation to consider.

Inasmuch as he is to be sworn in today as Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, the committee's loss is the executive branch of the Government's gain. On behalf of the full committee I wish him well, and I join the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing for whom Mr. Cash served as staff director in paying tribute to him for his fine service to the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as most Senators know, one of my very great interests in my 16-year membership on the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has been the broad field of housing.

During that time, specifically in 1955, it became my privilege to work closely in that field with James B. Cash, Jr., known affectionately, to all of us who have worked with him and known him, as Jim.

In 1955, Jim joined the staff of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to handle housing matters. He brought with him a broad knowledge of the field, based on experience he had gained since he first joined the Federal Housing Administration in 1939. He did his job well, so well in fact that in 1958 he was appointed as staff director of the Housing Subcommittee.

Now Jim has been selected by the President as Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration. He returns to his original home with a broad knowledge not only of the housing field, but of its legislative aspects; and I, together with all of those who have worked with him, wish him well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I, also, should like to join other Senators in paying tribute to Jim Cash. I did not come to know Jim until a short time ago, but in this short time I have learned how valuable his counsel and assistance have been to me in relation to housing matters as well as other phases of legislation coming before the Banking and Currency Committee.

His loss will be felt by all the members of the committee in this busy year ahead on housing legislation. Despite the loss to us, I am pleased that he has been selected for the position of FHA Deputy Commissioner.

Indeed, he is well qaulified for this job, and I wish him well in the new assignment.

JAMES CASH AND MILTON SEMER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the appointment of James B. Cash, Jr., staff director of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, to be Deputy Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, and about Milton P. Semer, of the Banking and Currency Committee staff, to be General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I wish to express my pleasure and gratification at their receiving these high appointments, and to congratulate them and to confirm to the Senate what has been confirmed by so many Senators with respect to the outstandingly fine service and distinguished character and patriotism of these two men.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the President has shown great good sense in his selections for important posts in his administration. I must confess to mixed feelings, however, on two recent announcements. When he stated that he had asked James B. Cash, Jr., to serve as Deputy Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, and Milton P. Semer to serve as Counsel to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, I felt he was striking close to home in his search for talent. I admire the President's wisdom in his choices, but I hope he will not carry these "raids" on our staffs too far.

I have had the pleasure of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee for the past 2 years. There I have had an opportunity to observe the good work which Jim Cash and Milton Semer have carried on, serving the Senate and the Nation with intelligence, energy, and resourcefulness. I know that the agencies they are joining will benefit from the knowledge and skill they carry with them from their service on the Banking and Currency Committee. Jim Cash has been a most efficient staff director, and Milton Semer has been an imaginative and skillful counsel.

In his state of the Union message, the President noted the wisdom of the joint and separate roles assigned to each branch of the Government. Mr. Cash and Mr. Semer understand that relationship very well, and I know that we will benefit in our work from their presence in the administration. I wish them all success in their new careers.

LEGISLATION ENACTED AS A RESULT OF ACTIVITIES OF JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in response to a request made on Tuesday, January 31, 1961, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for a list of proposed legislation enacted into law as a result of the activities of the Judiciary's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I should like to submit certain information.

I ask unanimous consent that a résumé on this subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIVE

S. 600. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing and transportation of obscene matter. (Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.) Hearings held by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee in 1955, and reported favorably. This bill was passed and became Public Law 95, 84th Congress, 1st session, and was signed by the President on June 28, 1955.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVEN

S. 1659. A bill to enact the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act in the District of Columbia. (Senators Hennings, Kefauver, and Langer; introduced as a result of hearings by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; hearings held; a similar bill, S. 2032, reported favorably; the House bill, which was identical, passed the Senate; signed into law by the President on July 10, 1957, Public Law 85–94.)

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT

S. 2558. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate traffic in switchblade knives and to prevent these instruments from falling into the hands of juveniles. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Butler, and Clark; introduced as a result of hearings by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee; referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; hearings held on this and H.R. 12850, a similar bill which had passed the House of Representatives; H.R. 12850 was reported favorably and passed the Senate; signed into law by the President on August 12, 1958, Public Law 85–623.)

S. 3667. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing or causing the delivery by mail of obscene matter to minors. (Senators Kefauver and Langer; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; H.R. 6239, a similar bill which had passed the House of Representatives, was also referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; this bill (H.R. 6239) was amended, incorporating the provisions of S. 3667, and reported favorably; the amended bill passed the Senate; the House disagreed with the Senate amendments and the measure went to conference; the conference report was submitted and agreed to by both Houses; signed into law by the President on August 28, 1958, Public Law 85–796.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the following is a résumé of subcommittee legislation for the last 4 years, beginning with the 85th Congress, 1st session, and following the various subcommittee bills through the 2d session of the 86th Congress. The section entitled "Resubmitted Legislation of the 85th Congress" is a group of bills which were developed by the subcommittee in the preceding years and considered worthy of continued subcommittee support:

NEW LEGISLATION 85TH CONG., 1ST SESSION

S. 675. A bill to amend section 2314, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transportation in interstate commerce of articles obtained by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises or through any scheme or artifice to defraud. (Senators Kefauver, Langer, and Hennings; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 980. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare post-hospital treatment program for drug addiction and for other purposes. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Langer, Payne, and Javits; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 981. A bill to create an Advisory Committee on Drug Addiction in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Langer, Payne, and Javits; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 982. A bill to establish a hospital of the Public Health Service in one of the Pacific Coast States, especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of

habit-forming drugs. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Langer, and Javits; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 2558. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate traffic in switchblade knives and to prevent these instruments from getting into the hands of juveniles. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Butler, and Clark; referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

Resubmitted legislation, 85th Cong.

85th Cong. bill No.	84th Cong. bill No.	
S. 355	S. 2193	A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer—Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.)
S. 356	S. 2190	A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in the District of Columbia," so as to provide for the appointment of a referee. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer—Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.)
S. 357	S. 2191	A bill to amend sec. 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia. This bill puts the Director of Social Work under the judge. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer—Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.)
S. 431	S. 728 and S. 4267	A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer—Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)
S. 588	S. 3021	A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. (Senators Kefauver, Langer, and Thye—Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)
S. 1659	S. 2195	A bill to make uniform the law of reciprocal enforcement of support in the District of Columbia. (Senators Hennings, Kefauver, and Langer—Referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported out as S. 2032, and passed into law.)

RÉSUMÉ OF SUBCOMMITTEE LEGISLATION, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

S. 188. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders. (Senator Langer; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 355. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.)

S. 356. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to create a juvenile court in the District of Columbia," so as to provide for the appointment of a referee. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.)

S. 357. A bill to amend section 7 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia. This bill puts the Director of Social Work under the judge. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.)

S. 431. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States in strengthening and improving State and local programs for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 588. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. (Senators Kefauver, Langer, and Thye; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 675. A bill to amend section 2314, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transportation in interstate commerce of articles obtained by false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises or through any scheme or artifice to defraud. (Senators Kefauver, Langer, and Hennings; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 980. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an aftercare posthospital treatment program for drug addiction and for other purposes. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Langer, Payne, and Javits; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 981. A bill to create an Advisory Committee on Drug Addiction in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Langer, and Javits; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 982. A bill to establish a hospital of the Public Health Service in one of the Pacific Coast States, especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Langer, and Javits; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 1455. A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency. (Senators Wiley, Ives, and Thye; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 1659. A bill to enact the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act in the District of Columbia. (Senators Hennings, Kefauver, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; hearings held; a similar bill, S. 2032, reported favorably; the House bill, which was identical, passed the Senate; signed into law by the President on July 10, 1957, Public Law 85–94.)

S. 2558. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interstate traffic in switchblade knives and to prevent these instruments from falling into the hands of juveniles. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Butler, and Clark; referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; hearings held on this and H.R. 12850, a similar bill which had passed the House of Representatives; H.R. 12850 was reported favorably and passed the Senate; signed into law by the President on August 12, 1958, Public Law 85–623.)

S. 3667. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing or causing the delivery by mail of obscene matter to minors. (Senators Kefauver and Langer; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; H.R. 6239, a similar bill which had passed the House of Representatives, was also referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; this bill (H.R. 6239) was amended, incorporating the provisions of S. 3667, and reported favorably; the amended bill passed the Senate; the House disagreed with the Senate amendments and the measure went to conference; the conference report was submitted and agreed to by both Houses; signed into law by the President on August 28, 1958, Public Law 85–796.)

S. 3707. A bill to establish an Interagency Youth Rehabilitation and Conservation Committee. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 3708. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide for the training of qualified personnel for work in various fields involving the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

RÉSUMÉ OF SUBCOMMITTEE LEGISLATION, 86TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

S. 535. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs. (Senator Hennings; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 715. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. (Senators Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; hearings held May 29, 1959; passed Senate on July 6, 1959; referred to the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives on July 7, 1959.)

S. 717. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an after-care posthospital treatment program for drug addiction. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 720. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. (Senators Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 765. A bill to provide for assistance to States and institutions of higher learning for demonstrating or developing improved techniques and practices for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Hennings, Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; hearings held on April 27, 28, May 4, 26, and June 4, 1959.)

S. 766. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States and institutions of higher learning for the training of qualified personnel for work in various fields involving the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Hennings, Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; hearings held on April 27, 28, May 4, 26, and June 4, 1959.)

S. 850. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States, or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof, for the establishment of institutions of a minimum security type for treating and rehabilitating juvenile delinquents. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 2123. A bill to amend sections 1461, 1462, 1463, and 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide mandatory prison sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing or transporting obscene material. (Senator WILEY; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 2562. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter; to combat juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes. (Senators Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Carroll, Eastland, Cannon, Hennings, Humphrey, Church, Talmadge, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, Morse, McNamara, Moss, Bible, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; hearings held August 29, September 9, November 12, 1959, and January 12, 1960.)

RÉSUMÉ OF SUBCOMMITTEE LEGISLATION, 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

S. 535. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs. (Senator Hennings; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 715. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. (Senators Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; hearings held May 29, 1959; passed Senate on July 6, 1959; referred to the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives on July 7, 1959; passed House, amended, June 6, 1960; House asked for a conference June 6, 1960; Senate agreed to a conference June 13, 1960; no action by conferees and the bill died in conference.)

S. 717. A bill to authorize the establishing by the Surgeon General of an after-care posthospital treatment program for drug addiction. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 720. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make unlawful certain practices in connection with the placing of minor children for permanent free care or for adoption. (Senators Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 765. A bill to provide for assistance to States and institutions of higher learning for demonstrating or developing improved techniques and practices for the diminution, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Hennings, Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; hearings held on April 27, 28, May 4, 26, and June 4, 1959).

S. 766. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States and institutions of higher learning for the training of qualified personnel for work in various fields involving the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency. (Senators Hennings, Kefauver, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; hearings held on April 27, 28, May 4, 26, and June 4, 1959.)

S. 850. A bill to provide for assistance to and cooperation with States, or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof, for the establishment of institutions of a minimum security type for treating and rehabilitating juvenile delinquents. (Senators Kefauver, Hennings, Carroll, and Langer; referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

S. 2123. A bill to amend sections 1461, 1462, 1463, and 1465 to title 18 of the United States Code to provide mandatory prison sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing, or transporting obscene material. (Senator WILEY; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 2562. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing or transporting of obscene matter; to combat juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes. (Senators Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Carroll, Eastland, Cannon, Hennings, Humphrey, Church, Talmadge, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, Morse, McNamara, Moss, Bible, and Langer; referred to Committee on the Judiciary; hearings held August 29, September 9, November 12, 1959, and January 12, 1960.)

S. 3436. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act so as to regulate more effectively the shipment fo firearms, known as pistols and revolvers, in interstate commerce, and thereby to assist local jurisdictions in controlling the use of such weapons by juveniles and irresponsible persons. (Senator Hennings; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

S. 694, a bill containing the major provisions of S. 765 and S. 766 and other features was passed by the Senate January 27, 1960. It was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives on January 28, 1960. That committee reported a similar bill, H.R. 12108, but this measure did not come to the floor of the House for a vote.

SUPPORT FOR JOHN N. THOMPSON AND FAMILY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think all Americans must view with tremendous concern the fact that a normal American family has been run out of New Orleans for only one "crime"—because it had the temerity to try to obey the Constitution and the spirit of the United States by sending two of its children to a school being desegregated in accordance with decisions of the local courts and the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. This is a pretty disgraceful situation.

I speak of this because the humble family—the father has only a ninth-grade education himself—ought to have the sympathetic understanding of the American people. I hope those who can help the family—like the employer, who apparently is transferring Mr. Thompson to another location—will help them.

I think the incident should be called to the attention of the country from this high forum, to show what is going on in this country and what is happening to ordinary Americans who seek only to sustain the Constitution.

Incidentally, this involves not only the court decisions, but also the dictates of Holy Scripture, and the fundamental tenets of every great faith in the United States.

I make these remarks to bring this very serious and sad situation to the attention of my colleagues and to the attention of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news story by United Press International, published in this morning's New York Herald Tribune, with relation to John N. Thompson, his wife and six children, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATIONIST'S FAMILY FLEES NEW ORLEANS—DESTINATION UNDISCLOSED; BOYCOTT SPREAD VOWED BY WHITE MOTHERS

NEW ORLEANS, February 1.—Jubilant segregationists whooped it up today after harassing out of town a white family which dared send two boys through a white boycott to integrated McDonogh 19 School.

Thirty-three-year-old, Alabama-born John N. Thompson packed his wife and six children during the night and fled segregationist pressures. His sons, Gregory, 9, and Michael, 8, for the last 3 schooldays attended McDonogh.

They were the first white children to go to the school with three Negro first-grade girls since November 17, the third day of federally ordered integration.

Walgreen's drugstores, which employed Mr. Thompson as a $70-a-week assistant soda fountain manager, announced the former GI had requested and received a transfer away from New Orleans. The firm would not disclose where he was going.

"Well, we got our boycott again," white mothers shouted when the news of Mr. Thompson's surrender broke this morning.

The triumph sparked new segregationist vigor, which had appeared waning, and white housewives vowed to establish a complete white boycott at the city's other integrated school, William Frantz.

A lone Negro first-grade girl attends Frantz with 10 white children. The parents of those white children have resisted threats, vandalism, and economic pressures since the beginning of integration to keep their sons and daughters in the school.

Mr. Thompson enrolled Gregory at McDonogh Friday. Yesterday, Michael joined his brother at the school.

ORDERED OUT BY LANDLADY

The brief crack in the boycott apparently resulted from the concerted anti-integration effort to torment the Thompsons. Their landlady ordered them out of their $70-a-month, four-room apartment. White mothers from the McDonogh School District picketed a Walgreen's store, carrying signs saying, "Walgreen's favors integration." The women promised: "We'll get him fired if it takes a year."

Disheartened school officials, who had hoped the McDonogh break in the boycott would signal a return of white students to the McDonogh and Frantz schools, would make no comment on Mr. Thompson's departure.

The Alabama man, who has only a ninth-grade education, had indicated as late as last night that he would stay in New Orleans and fight the segregationists' efforts to dislodge him. "Anybody who bothers my home is gonna have to mess with me," he had warned.

FEARED HARM TO BOYS

The Thompsons moved into the McDonogh district in December. The two boys first attended a segregated school in nearby St. Bernard Parish (county), because their mother, 27-year-old Mary, feared they might be harmed if they went to the integrated school.

But after enrolling Gregory at McDonogh Friday, the couple said they did so because "we think the teaching is better here." Most of the more than 1,000 white children formerly attending McDonogh and Frantz have transferred to the makeshift school in St. Bernard Parish called Arabi Annex.

The handful of women demonstrators in front of McDonogh today vowed no one else would break their boycott again.

"We slipped up once, but we ain't gonna let it happen again," was their victory shout. "We're gonna patrol out here in shifts. We'll have somebody here all the time."

TRIBUTES TO JOHN HANSON YINGLING

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 31, 1961, adopted a resolution with regard to the services of Mr. John Hanson Yingling, who has served as chief clerk and chief of staff of that committee since March 1, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which was unanimously agreed to by the committee, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas John Hanson Yingling has served the Committee on Banking and Currency as chief clerk and chief of staff from March 1, 1955, until the present time; and

Whereas he has served the committee faithfully and well under the chairmanships

of Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT and Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON; and

Whereas he has carried out his duties during this period in a fashion exemplifying the highest traditions of the Senate; and

Whereas the Committee on Banking and Currency has been benefited and enriched greatly by his conscientious work and wise counsel; and

Whereas he has at all times served the best interests of the committee, the Senate, and the United States; and

Whereas he has resigned to undertake other important duties; and

Whereas his service will be sorely missed by the Committee on Banking and Currency and its members and staff: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency express its deep gratitude to and sincere respect for John Hanson Yingling for his many years of unfailing service and for his devotion to the committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency express its best wishes for John Hanson Yingling's future success and happiness.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Yingling has served the committee with outstanding distinction and success. He has been extremely efficient in the discharge of his duties. I personally concur in everything the resolution contains about Mr. Yingling.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to join with the Senator from Arkansas. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I have certainly profited from the services of "Jack" Yingling. I think he is one of the most able men who has served in that capacity I have ever known. Of course, he is leaving the committee, but he will remain on Capitol Hill, and we shall continue to enjoy his services in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like very much to associate myself with the complimentary remarks concerning "Jack" Yingling. We are really suffering a great loss in the committee. I would not wish to have the attempts of other Senators on the Republican side to obtain recognition prevent our endorsing heartily the complimentary remarks which have been made.

My colleague from New York and I join in enthusiastically supporting what has been said about "Jack" Yingling.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate those remarks very much, and I know Mr. Yingling will appreciate those expressions.

CONSERVATION OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCE HERITAGE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, every generation of Americans must take onto itself the stewardship of our natural resource heritage. The manner in which this responsibility is discharged is of paramount importance to national survival. Indeed, faced as we are with threats of greatly increased economic competition by the Soviet Union, U.S. policies for use of natural resources may decide the rivalry of the future between free and slave worlds in the realm of industrial production.

In the months preceding the 1960 election, an advisory committee on natural resources was appointed to assist the Democratic presidential nominee, John F. Kennedy. As part of its work, the advisory committee conducted public hearings in various parts of the Nation to let the American people speak their minds on natural resource problems. I was pleased, as a member of the advisory committee, to take part in the hearing which was held in Portland, Oreg., under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

As the result of information and opinions obtained at the series of hearings, a meeting of the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee was held in Washington, D.C., on January 17, 1961. The report of the advisory committee was delivered at that time, suggesting policy guidelines on natural resources use and development by the Kennedy administration. So that my colleagues will have ready access to the contents of the report, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the report in the RECORD, along with an editorial from the New York Times of January 19, 1961, commenting on the report.

There being no objection, the report and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISE USE AND CONSERVATION

The report of President-elect Kennedy's natural resources advisory committee is important not only for what it says but also for the fact that it has been made at all. The publication of such a report just prior to the inauguration of the new President emphasizes the significance of the double problem of wise utilization and effective conservation of natural resources, a problem that is mounting in urgency every day. It is most encouraging that the new administration recognizes it, as it is only with full presidential support—exercised through the budget and in other ways—that genuine progress can be made in meeting the critical needs affecting this Nation's natural resources today.

The report covers two broad areas: Development of water and land resources and their conservation. We do not accept uncritically all the statements regarding development. Too many logs have been rolled, too many backs have been scratched, and too many barrels have been emptied of pork for President and Congress not to be obliged to sift most carefully every new project proposed. This does not mean that all such projects are bad. But it also does not mean that merely because a project has the label "flood control" or "reclamation" or "navigation" or "power development," it is automatically a good thing. Many of them are good, but each case ought to be judged strictly on merit; and there should be special stress—because there is a special and urgent need—for two of the programs mentioned: Pollution control and small-watershed development.

On the conservation side, the issues are clearer because the emergency is greater and more immediate. The insanely uncontrolled spread of urban and semiurban blight is daily reducing the amount of land worth preserving for its natural, scenic, esthetic, and noncommercial recreational values. The pressures for exploitation of land already set aside for such purposes are daily growing greater. There is a genuine crisis in conservation at hand; and this will quite possibly be the last administration to be in a position to do something about ameliorating the situation.

The committee's recommendations for preservation of the small amount remaining of primeval wilderness, for enlargement both of the national park and the national forest systems while there is still time, for seashore preservation, for added wildlife and marshland protection, for a youth corps (something like the old CCC) to work on these projects—all these proposals are very much to the point, very much needed, and most or all of them are embodied in legislation that will be coming up in the present session of Congress.

Few matters are more necessary to the long-range welfare of our country. They will cost money; but perhaps a bond program similar to that successfully introduced in New York State by Governor Rockefeller for park development may be launched on a national scale. We have confidence that Stewart Udall will be as fine a Secretary of the Interior as Fred A. Seaton has been, and Mr. Udall is likely to get stronger backing. The first thing the new President can do in this respect is, as the report suggests, to settle existing conflicts between various Federal agencies (the Park and Forest Services, for example)—conflicts which right up to the present moment have only done harm to the cause of conservation, and which only the President can straighten out.

KENNEDY-JOHNSON NATURAL RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

The Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee is proud of the opportunity it had to play a role in the campaign of President-elect John F. Kennedy. Because of the constructive commitments for resource development and conservation made by the President-elect during his campaign, we look forward to an administration that will establish landmarks of achievement toward a constructive program that will protect the rightful heritage of all Americans.

We know that vigorous new leadership is essential to conserve our renewable resources of water, soil, and forests and that full development of these resources is necessary to make possible the growth of our economy essential to America's role in the free world. We believe that the widest enjoyment of benefits of our natural resources should be made possible for the greatest number of people at the lowest possible cost.

An adequate water supply for our growing population will be a major domestic need for many years to come. The physical needs of urbanism greatly accelerate this crisis. With such problems in mind, it is our recommendation that the new resource challenges of urbanism be met by closely coordinated Federal-State efforts. If a new Department of Urban Affairs is created, it should include within its framework a team of experts who can work with the regular resource agencies in meeting some of these problems.

Existing Federal agencies can do the necessary work for a meaningful conservation program. Conflicts between agencies can only serve to delay and defeat achievement of natural resource programs. Policy guidance can come from the President and a council of resource and conservation advisers in the office of the President.

Growing water needs make imperative the development of long range research programs for the conversion of saline and brackish waters.

Research should also be pressed into improved methods for the construction of waterway projects. Full study should be given to the possibility of using nuclear devices for the construction of the projects and the recovery of minerals, including oil from shale.

BUDGETARY POLICY

We welcome the end of the "no new starts" policy. We believe that the national budget policy should distinguish between capital investment and operating expenditures in the natural resources field. The Bureau of the Budget should be used to measure the full benefits of projects in relation to the overall national economy and the national goals of all the people.

The restrictive interpretations of the Bureau of the Budget Circular A-47 should be ended at once. We believe that restudy of the effect of this circular should be ordered by the Bureau of the Budget and all provisions inconsistent with the stated goals of the Kennedy administration should be eliminated or changed. The "taxes foregone" calculation added into feasibility studies by A-47 is an example. Recreation benefits are becoming each year a more valuable part of every type of water project. These benefits should be included in the value of any type of Federal water project. Recreational features should be utilized to the maximum in any type of Federal water project and the value of these benefits should be included in the overall Federal benefits of the project.

The tendency in recent years of the Bureau of the Budget to discourage any projects by excessive requirements for local interests should be modified to meet realistic water needs. Special consideration should be given to the problems of undeveloped and depresed areas.

FLOOD CONTROL AND RECLAMATION

Highest priority should be given to the completion of urgently needed flood control projects already authorized and earliest possible action should be taken toward authorization of projects that have been often delayed because of unreasonable Bureau of the Budget restrictions. We can never achieve the full development of our national economy until we have the assurance of flood protection of all of our river valleys. These projects are income-producing, wealth-creating assets, in addition to protecting lives and property.

The reclamation of land should be restored as an essential part of our natural resources program. The continued development of supplemental water supplies for existing irrigated acres and the opening of new lands for settlement through reclamation are entirely consistent with long-term national objectives. Such development provides a most important basic element to a successful regional economy, a stable, diversified agriculture. The full development of our river basins carries with it not only flood control and reclamation benefits, but power, navigation, and recreational dividends which contribute to the growing economy we seek.

WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT

Few resource programs can directly benefit as many citizens in as many States at so small a relative cost as the small watershed program. Beneficiaries of this program are not merely farmers, but millions of people in towns and cities. The recreational potential, largely unmeasured, will be invaluable to many more millions in the large urban areas. It could be one of the prime forces in bringing lasting help to economically depressed areas.

Already local organizations have applied for help in some 1,400 watersheds containing about 100 million acres of land. Applications are falling off, however, because of the timelag before projects can be reached with the present limited planning funds.

Administration policy should include the following objectives:

(1) A goal of 2,000 watersheds completed or under construction by 1968.

(2) Completion by 1968 of the original pilot watersheds.

(3) Provision of adequate loan funds for local organizations.

(4) Organization of future years' budgets so that resource conservation programs will be separated from unrelated activities. The small watershed program has been handicapped by competing for funds with the many other activities of the Department of Agriculture. It should be considered in relation to related programs of the Corps of Engineers, Reclamation, and other public works activities.

POWER

Long-range energy resource development objectives based upon forecasts of need and the public interest should be established by the Federal Government.

A national energy and fuels policy to guide Federal agencies responsible for resource development should be enacted by Congress to provide:

(1) Progressive evaluation standards for multiple-purpose projects.

(2) Cost allocation formulas for multiple-purpose projects which are consistent with the principle of regulation by competition.

(3) Abundant electricity at minimum cost to the ultimate consumer, whether he is served by investor-owned, local public, or cooperative distribution systems.

(4) Fully adequate conservation of nonrenewable energy sources.

The Department of the Interior, in cooperation with other agencies, must reassert its responsibility to provide long-range planning of generation and transmission facilities to meet future needs, with immediate attention to the economic necessity of interregional Federal transmission ties.

Regional wholesale power supply systems should be made responsible for meeting the expanding wholesale power requirements of all retail electric systems at the lowest possible cost and supplied with as much hydroelectric capacity as is economically feasible for low-cost peaking power and reserve capacity.

Falling water, coal at the mine mouth, atomic energy, or even solar energy could supply the fuel, depending upon conditions in various regions. Because our supplies of coal are plentiful and often more useful when converted to electricity, an important part of the power should be "coal by wire" from the now-depressed mining areas in West Virginia and Pennsylvania and the coal and lignite deposits of the West.

Atomic power, developed and financed by the people, should be made available from Federal nuclear powerplants as soon as production costs can be materially reduced.

NAVIGATION

The waterways of the United States play a vital role in the economic strength and well-being of the Nation. Their improvement and modernization constitute one of the most productive public investments highly rewarding to the American free enterprise economy. The freedom of the waterways from tolls or toll-equivalent charges or taxes is fundamental to their continued contribution to an expanding national economy.

Availability of low-cost water transportation provides a foundation for economic growth which could not occur on a comparable scale in its absence. It has generated a major postwar industrial expansion along the Nation's navigable waterways, providing abundant opportunity for private investment, affording employment of a high productive character for hundreds of thousands of our people, and generating greatly enlarged productive capability for economic welfare and the national defense.

Navigation improvements have exhibited their values most strikingly in stimulating development of resources in regions of the country where growth has heretofore lagged through lack of economic access to markets and sources of raw materials. The rapid increase in tonnages of farm crops shipped by water has been substantially reducing the disparity between central market prices and income realization on the farm. Stimulus to water-dependent industry provided by improvements to harbors and waterways has been of especial benefit to regions suffering from the loss of traditional industries as a result of technological factors. By virtue of modernized water transportation, extensive areas of the Nation have been contending successfully with the forces of economic stagnation and moving toward full participation in national standards of productivity and income.

The emerging problems of the future urgently demand a vigorous rededication to the philosophy of free waterways improvement. Considerations of national security, involving encouragement to dispersion of strategic industry, capabilities for low-cost mass transportation of basic industrial commodities and fuels, economy in the consumption of fuels and scarce materials and optimum recuperative power following heavy nuclear attack, also counsel an expanded program of waterways improvement.

The enormous growth of traffic on the waterway system in the postwar years is beginning seriously to overtax its present capacity throughout extensive reaches. These deficiencies present a grave challenge to more purposeful direction of our national efforts. The demand for water transportation will probably double by 1980. Deficiencies in harbor and channel depths and inadequacies of locking facilities, many in advanced states of deterioration, are choking off development of water commerce and discouraging economies of deeper draft, more powerful vessels. Many of our coastal harbors over the country are not prepared to handle deeper draft vessels and a general program of modernization is needed.

Appropriate remedies for the consequences of past neglect and indifference call for full acceptance of Federal responsibilities for leadership in this vital area of the public domain, informed by recognition of the true public values involved. Failure to move forward with decisiveness on the construction of sound and productive projects can only result in the wanton neglect of our national capabilities at a time when every consideration of national interest dictates the intelligent and effective marshaling of all our resources.

POLLUTION CONTROL

One of the earliest enactments of the 87th Congress should be the Blatnik pollution control bill, vetoed in 1960. In addition to financial assistance to local communities in the construction of sewage treatment facilities, necessary Federal enforcement, research and technical assistance programs should be strengthened.

National pollution policy should establish the goal as one which will protect and enhance the capacity of the water resource to serve the widest possible range of human needs. The goal can be approached only by accepting the positive policy of keeping waters as clean as possible, as opposed to the negative policy of attempting to crowd into a stream all the wastes it might possibly assimilate.

The policy should formally recognize recreation value of water resources as a full partner with domestic, industrial and agricultural values in water quality management and programs.

The administrative level of the water supply and pollution control activities in the Public Health Service and in the States should be commensurate with the importance of the problem.

Research into the use of highly toxic chemical pesticides detergents as a destructive pollutant of land, water, and air should be greatly expanded.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

We recommend congressional passage of legislation which will assure perpetuation of wilderness values. A sympathetic administration can help eliminate confusion and misconceptions which have blocked passage of this legislation in the past. We need to protect specimens of our old frontier just as we need to protect national shrines and art treasures.

Wildlife refuges and ranges must be protected to serve the purposes to which they are dedicated without interference by commercial exploitation. Immediate legislative authorization is needed to establish a revolving fund for duck stamp revenue to permit immediate purchasing of wet lands before drainage destroys these areas. Cooperative programs should be developed to bring about the establishment of extensive wildfowl breeding grounds in Canada.

Production of fish in the lakes and wildlife on the perimeter of our reservoirs should become an integral part of reservoir management. Research into fish production in Federal reservoirs is needed to maximize benefits from them.

The many needs for work in reforestation, soil conservation, park improvement, and wildlife refuge work offers a potential for employment of several hundreds of thousands of idle young men between the ages of 16 and 21 years. Both Federal and State projects could utilize the work of high school "dropouts" in need of work experience and vocational training. Healthful outdoor work would improve the level of physical fitness, reduce juvenile delinquency and generally prepare more useful future citizens.

NATIONAL PARKS

Shoreline parks which should be made available for public recreation are the most critically needed additions to our national park system. They must be acquired before all potential sites are lost to urban development and commercial exploitation.

There is still great need for improving and expanding our national park system to meet the needs of a greatly increasing population. One solution which should be considered is a program of assistance to States and local communities in the expansion of park resources.

FORESTRY

Increased attention to forestry—our great publicly owned national forests, the millions of small privately owned forest tracts, forest research—is one of the most meaningful investments we can make in achieving the economic strength essential to our national goals.

If we are to meet our goals in wood fiber requirements in the next 40 years, our total production must be doubled. All forest land ownership, Government and private, will demand accelerated attention to meet this need. The greatest opportunity for improvement is on the small, privately owned, woodland tracts throughout the country, which represent about half of our Nation's total forest land. Private credit sources are not available to the average small woodland owner for purchase and development of forested properties. Expansion and liberalization of present government credit sources, Federal and State, tailored to meet the needs of the small owner are needed until ready private credit sources develop. More research is needed to show owners how their forest lands can be better managed.

The cooperative forest programs conducted jointly by Federal and State groups should receive the funds which have been denied over the past few years. The programs for our national forests badly need acceleration to meet existing needs.

Consideration should be given to the possibilities for expansion of the national forest system in depressed areas. Investments in our national forests yield direct returns to the taxpayers, as well as long-range benefits to our overall economy.

LATIN AMERICAN EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION CENTER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, New York State has again taken a significant step forward in meeting and coping with the problems which life in the 20th century has imposed on America.

On February 1, the New York State Employment Service opened an information service for Latin Americans. There are at least 15,000 Latin Americans, many of them Cubans, now in New York. Many of these people have had varied experiences, held important jobs, and have much that they can contribute to the American scene. It is a wise and constructive step the State has taken in endeavoring to help these people put their talents to work for democracy.

I am informed that during the first 3 days of its operation about 300 people have come to the center. They have had the opportunity to discuss their needs with the bilingual employees of the State department of labor who staff the center. Many have a good or passable knowledge of English, but for those who do not the city, of course, offers free adult education courses in a number of places to teach English.

This coordinated setup is a fine start toward helping these people to be self-supporting and to contribute their skills to the benefit of the United States. It will be maintained as long as the need exists. I should like to congratulate the forward-looking officials of New York State for this program.

OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on January 26 a Senate resolution (S. Res. 67) was submitted by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I was not present on the floor of the Senate at that time, and the request was made that the resolution lie on the table. The RECORD does not show that unanimous consent was requested, but I assume either that there was a personal request or perhaps the reporter overlooked the request.

I shall not move at this time that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is not present. I have discussed the subject with the minority leader. He requests that I not move at this time to do anything about the resolution.

The main reason I rise at this time is to register on the RECORD my permanent objection to resolutions or bills affecting our foreign relations lying on the table. I do not believe that it is provident for this kind of resolution to lie on the table and be subject to being called up for debate and decision, without any real notice at any time.

The particular resolution to which I have referred is not, in my opinion, objectionable at the moment on its merits, if it is interpreted in one way. If the resolution is interpreted in a different way, in the sense that it means we shall never recognize that country, I think it is certainly objectionable. But that is a question relating to the merits of the resolution.

I now object to the procedure by which a measure of great importance in our international relations may lie on the table and circumvent rule XXV, which provides that proposed resolutions or legislation of any kind should be referred to the appropriate committees unless otherwise ordered by unanimous consent.

Senators know that during the morning hour, and at other times, when few Senators are present, without notice, a resolution or almost any other measure may be considered by unanimous consent. I wish to register my opposition, and to serve notice that I shall object to any such measure following that procedure. I think such measures ought to be referred to the committee of which I am chairman; and at the proper time when the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has returned, I shall move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, if it is necessary to make such a motion, or I shall ask unanimous consent. I wish the RECORD to show, and I want the majority leader and the majority clerk to know that I object. I do not believe this procedure is proper, but for the moment I shall refrain from making a motion. However, I serve notice that when the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is present, I shall move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, apropos of what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has just said, the subject was brought before the Senate in mid-afternoon one day recently, and following a rather extended speech by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. At that time I publicly suggested to him on the floor of the Senate that I thought because of the deep conviction that he cherished on this question, the appropriate way to proceed was to prepare a resolution and sponsor it himself and not ask for cosponsors. Out of that suggestion came the resolution. The procedure was at my suggestion, and it was an inadvertence on my part, I am sure, that I did not ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the table. If the RECORD does not show that I asked unanimous consent, then I am sure that the RECORD must be correct. But that feeling was dictated in my mind by the fact that the Senate on other occasions had voted on this question, and I saw no objection whatsoever to having the resolution lie on the table, subject to a motion at some subsequent time that the resolution be considered by the Senate, rather than being referred to the committee.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], is in New Hampshire at the present time. Since the record has been made on this question, I think we can abide his return, and then have further discussion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree that there is no urgency about the problem, but I

do not want this kind of procedure to be accepted because others approve of it. In my opinion, the fact that a similar resolution has been voted on in the past under different conditions is no reason whatever to support the contention that the resolution to which I direct attention should be voted on now. We have a new administration, and I believe the position of that administration is quite clear with regard to the present circumstances. But the proposed resolution may go far beyond present circumstances, and I do not believe such a resolution should be considered without previous consideration by the committee. Furthermore, regardless of what administration is in power, it should have an opportunity to consider a proposal that affects our foreign relations in the way that this resolution would.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can add only one other statement and that is it is not exactly an extraordinary proceeding because on many ocasions such procedure has been followed, and it is clearly in conformity with the rule, if unanimous consent is requested.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If unanimous consent is requested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall object, and I wish to have notice of any request such as the one of which I speak when it relates to matters of this kind. The Senator from Illinois knows that in the other cases to which he has reference there have been many objections to that kind of procedure. There have been votes on several such requests.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That I know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a great division of opinion about the wisdom of considering any such measures without previous reference to the committee.

THE ROLE OF GOLF IN THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the very distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] I present for inclusion in the RECORD a rather interesting statement which bears the very felicitous title, "The Role of Golf in the Kennedy Administration."

The fears and anxieties of millions of participants of the royal and ancient game of golf have subsided for they have discovered that the love of one Chief Executive for the "game of a lifetime" is reflected by his successor. During the Eisenhower administration golf climbed to new heights—it promises to climb even higher in the Kennedy administration if the advice of my distinguished colleague from Maryland, that State's senior Senator, is followed.

At the annual meeting of the Maryland State Golf Association on January 27, Senator BUTLER addressed himself to "The Role of Golf in the Kennedy Administration." His advice to the various members of the President's Cabinet was poignant and practical. I believe his counsel contains edification for every one of us, and so I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOLF IN THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

(By Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

I know it must have been a great relief to all of you, as it was to me, to learn that the new President of the United States is every bit as fond of golf as his predecessor was and is All that publicity about touch football was so much political camouflage. In fact, news stories out of Florida a few weeks ago revealed that President Kennedy had played golf 6 days in a row. Some of us weekend golfers were momentarily overcome with envy, perhaps, but good sportsmanship reasserted itself, and we wished the President good luck and no need for mulligans off the first tee.

We all know and agree that golf is a wonderful game for relaxation, for getting our minds off things at the office. But I consider golf to be much more than a recreational pastime. Golf can also be most educational. In fact, as this new administration settles down to the demanding task of running the United States of America, I would like to suggest to the various members of the Cabinet that they visit the golf course as frequently as possible for the following reasons:

Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, can practice the highest degree of diplomacy when he catches his opponent teeing up in the rough.

Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, can lead the fight against inflation by not counting whiffs.

Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense, can delve into the mysteries of guided missiles while attempting to keep his ball in the middle of the fairway.

Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, can pick up some pointers about labor conditions when he tries to find a caddy on Sunday morning at 11:30 a.m.

Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, can stimulate the economy with a buy-American program in the pro shop and urging all to use new balls on the waterholes.

Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, can advance the cause of conservation by starting a national program to replace all divots.

Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, can liquidate some of his food surpluses by distributing sandwiches to the higher handicaps before they begin their 6-hour 18 holes.

J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, can experience firsthand the working conditions of postal carriers by carrying his own bag.

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, can personally probe some of the reasons for the serious mental health problem in this Nation while trying to blast out of an overhanging bunker.

Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations, can exercise his well-known eloquence and persuasion while explaining to his partner why he missed an 18-inch putt for a tie on the last hole.

And last, but not least, Robert Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, can right a long-standing injustice by recommending the permanent elimination of the stroke and distance penalty for hitting a ball out of bounds.

If the Cabinet observes my most respectful suggestion to take up or continue their golf, I predict that great successes will come their way. Over 150 years ago it was said that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. In a similar way, it may be written by future historians that the cold war was won on the fairways and greens of Chevy Chase and Burning Tree.

Now, on a more serious note, gentlemen, I would like to discuss briefly some of the problems that confront country clubs and all recreation areas in our rapidly developing society.

A crisis in outdoor recreation appears to be approaching. Each year the gap between the active demand and the opportunities for outdoor recreation grows wider and the gap between potential demand and opportunity wider still. From all signs outdoor recreation in the United States has reached the takeoff point. What up until now has been largely a matter of inconvenience to an increasing number of individuals is turning into a serious national problem that not only concerns the use of many million acres of land but also a large segment of our whole national pattern of life.

The main point is this: We Americans don't just want outdoor recreation, we need it. Moving from farms to cities and suburbs has not meant turning our backs on land and water and open sky. As a people, we don't feel right unless we can get back from time to time to the out-of-doors. If we should ever lose this urge, there will have been a profound change in the national character. Meanwhile, it is abundantly clear that outdoor recreation is not just one alternative use of family income and leisure time that rises and falls automatically with changing costs and fashions. Meeting the demand of such recreation is a national problem of the first rank.

To get some idea of the magnitude of this problem, let's examine the four factors that appear to be the main components of total demands.

1. Population: There will be about twice as many people in the United States in the year 2000 as there were in 1950. Projecting future birth rates is a tricky business but it is reasonable to expect a national population of 240 million in 1980 and 310 million in 2000. We know too that even a larger proportion of the future population will be city people who will have to look to specialized areas for getting outdoors.

2. Buying power: People will have more money to spend—perhaps twice as much per person in 2000 as in 1950. This will greatly stimulate use of recreation areas. Income after taxes averaged about $1,600 per person in 1956. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 is in the neighborhood of $3,600.

3. Leisure: People will have more time for outdoor recreation. The average number of hours worked per week has been dropping steadily, from around 70 in 1850 to around 40 in 1950. The 8-hour day 5-day week is by now nearly standard, and its relation to the great rise in all kinds of outdoor recreation is obvious. The future prospect is for still shorter working days and weeks and for longer and more widespread vacations. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 may well be an average workweek of about 28 hours. Gentlemen, those of us still around will be able to play a leisurely 18 holes after work with no trouble at all.

4. Mobility: People will travel more. In 1900, when steam and electric railroads were the chief forms of transportation (together with the horse), the average traveler covered about 500 miles a year. Today, with the airplane and the family automobile, the yearly average has risen to about 5,000 miles. Although part of the growth represents a great increase in commuting, there still is a large gain left over for leisure travel. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 is an average of about 9,000 miles a year for each traveler. In other words, the golfer of the year 2000 will take in stride a drive of 10 or 20 miles from his home to the golf course.

All four of these forces are pushing in the same direction and all reinforce each other. To get some idea of the total effect, we need to multiply rather than to add. Twice as many people, twice as much income per

person, 1.5 times as much leisure, and nearly twice as much travel comes out to roughly 10 times as much demand for outdoor recreation in the year 2000 as in 1950.

The word "roughly" is used advisedly. We don't know that the estimates for 2000 will turn out as projected. We don't know exactly how they will act upon each other. The total increase in recreational demand might be as small as 5 times or as great as 15 times. But a tenfold increase seems the best single figure.

Now it's as obvious as a straight downhill putt that this increase calls for advance planning. And it so happens that a National Outdoor Recreation Commission has been formed to study the Nation's future recreational requirements and to evaluate the assets available for fulfilling these needs. You might think that any one of you gentlemen here tonight could go to this Commission and receive some valuable information and assistance about where golf courses fit into the future of this country.

But you would be disappointed if you did drop by the headquarters of the National Outdoor Recreation Commission. In fact you would be shown the front door—albeit most politely. Why? Because the act of Congress which created the Outdoor Recreation Commission states that: "Outdoor recreation resources shall not mean nor include recreation facilities, programs and opportunities usually associated with urban development, such as playgrounds, stadiums, golf courses, city parks and zoos."

In other words, gentlemen, you are on your own. But not completely. For instance, the National Golf Foundation was founded as a nonprofit organization in 1936 by the major makers of golf equipment. Its purpose: "To broaden opportunities for all Americans to enjoy golf, the game of a lifetime, by assisting in the development of more golf facilities and the promotion of golf activities of all types, wherever needed." Its function: "To gather and evaluate information in all areas of golf from every possible source, and to make this information available to anyone needing it."

Although the National Golf Foundation is concerned with every area of golf activity, its prime objective is to encourage and assist new golf course development. This emphasis is all important for the Nation's golfing population will always be limited by the number of courses available. At the same time, each new course that opens for play attracts new players to the game. This in turn creates more pressure for additional courses. Because of the very nature of this cycle, there will never be enough golf courses to completely satisfy the demand for places to play.

The golf course development phase of the National Golf Foundation operation is so important that foundation sponsors voted in 1953 to establish a field service to assist more directly in this work. Today the foundation has four representatives; one on the east coast, on the west coast, in the South, and in the Midwest areas of the country.

Harry C. Eckhoff, over in Arlington, is the eastern region director of the National Golf Foundation and was good enough to furnish my office with some information about golf courses in Maryland.

The Maryland-District of Columbia region has twenty-five 9-hole courses and fifty-five 18-hole courses. These figures include private, semiprivate and municipal courses. The golf course population ratio for Maryland and the District of Columbia is 46,110 people per course. That's very high. The national average is 29,711 people per course. There are only three States with a more crowded average than Maryland.

Furthermore, in the last 30 years only one course has been built in the Maryland-District of Columbia area. Twelve semiprivate courses have been built, but two municipal courses have closed down.

What do these figures mean? That the Nation's golf population is growing by leaps and bounds, but that Maryland is not building enough courses to meet this ever-increasing demand.

We are all familiar with the amazing growth of the suburbs in nearby Virginia and particularly here in Montgomery County and Prince George's County. Suburbs need land for houses and playgrounds and schools and parks.

Golf courses seem to be forgotten. It is up to you gentlemen to remind the public again and again of the need for recreation and therefore of the need for golf courses. The Federal Government can do little in this area for it is primarily a State affair.

And the squeeze will get increasingly tighter on open land. There is talk of a giant metropolis stretching from Boston to Norfolk by the year 2000. Fifty or seventy-five million people will live in that great slice of land. They will need and expect recreation. It will be men like yourselves working in conjunction with State planning boards who will insure that room is provided for golf courses.

How can that be done? Well, first the growth of such urban areas demands that State legislation set sound standards and procedures for urban development. You will quickly learn that open space, like charity, begins at home.

Second, the powers and resources of State government need to be marshaled in support of regional-metropolitan planning including planning for the early acquisition of large natural areas.

Third, and most important, State government must gird for the massive assault which metropolitan populations make upon basic resource areas.

To emphasize how important and how needed is your interest, I would like to quote from a letter that I received only yesterday from the Planning Department of the State of Maryland.

"I have searched the records and studies of this agency and the reports of local planning agencies within Maryland. I have been unable to uncover anything specifically referring to tax relief or other measures aimed at encouraging private golf courses for permanent urban land use.

"The subject of open space preservation is receiving wide attention and study. Golf courses are quite naturally a very important factor in open space planning and study.

"As you know, public awareness is just beginning to crystallize on the alarming need to preserve open areas for recreation. The major avenues for an economical solution are largely untried. In any case successful open space preservation will depend upon local attitudes and local planning."

Let me repeat that last sentence, if I may. "In any case successful open space preservation will depend upon local attitudes and local planning."

All of this, gentlemen, adds up to one thing: Outdoor recreation in general and the sport of a lifetime, golf, in particular, needs defenders to guarantee its place in the great urban areas of tomorrow.

If the America of tomorrow is to have something other than miniature golf courses and driving ranges, we all must begin to plan today for a place for new, bigger, and better Chevy Chases and Rolling Roads.

CIVIL DEFENSE IN THE FUTURE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in one of his first acts as President of the United States, John F. Kennedy named Frank Burton Ellis, a New Orleans lawyer, to be Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

In making this appointment, the President stated that the tasks of this Office are of vital importance to our national security and should be organized and performed with maximum effectiveness. He indicated that the new Director's first responsibility will be to review the structure and functions of this agency.

At long last we have the opportunity to cast off the stale policies of the past. These outmoded schemes have caused the waste of over $1 billion of the taxpayers' money over the last 9 years. There is a real possibility that with effective leadership, a realistic, sane civil defense program geared to the needs of the space age can be adopted.

Mr. President, an excellent editorial, "Civil Defense in Future," was published in the Springfield-News Sun, an outstanding Ohio newspaper, on January 29, 1961. Bert A. Teeters, the editor of this newspaper, has long been aware of the waste and inefficiency in our civil defense program and has repeatedly called for a complete overhaul of previous policies.

I believe this editorial convincingly points out the need for a civil defense organization that will keep abreast of the problems involved and seek to offer practical solutions. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate and ask unanimous consent that this editorial be included as part of my remarks and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE IN FUTURE

The appointment of a new chief of civil defense by President John F. Kennedy leads to speculation whether civil defense will be reorganized to the end that it will become a really effective medium for protection of the American people, or whether it will be permitted to continue bumbling along mainly as a means of maintaining a job-desperate bureaucracy.

Attorney Frank B. Ellis, of New Orleans, is the new Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization as civil defense is officially known. In making the appointment, President Kennedy stated that the "tasks (of the department) are of vital importance to our national security. I consider it imperative that they be organized and performed with maximum effectiveness." In view of these statements, it appears likely that there will be some changes made in the future course of civil defense.

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, himself a Democrat, has repeatedly pointed out in the U.S. Senate the inefficiency and waste that have been permitted heretofore under civil defense operations. Despite the fact that he has brought innumerable specific incidents to the attention of the Congress, little practical heed was paid by his fellow Members in the legislative body.

Apparently, civil defense took its place with "home" and "mother" as something for the Senators and Representatives to stay clear of. But in the case of civil defense, only ignorance of its weaknesses kept other Congressmen from joining with Senator YOUNG in demanding corrective steps.

This Nation needs a national defense organization that keeps abreast of the problems and seeks to offer practical solutions. Any policy that ignores established expert organizations such as the police, firemen, sheriffs, State highway patrols, and the like, is obviously an unsatisfactory one.

Perhaps with President Kennedy in the White House, Senator YOUNG will have a more receptive official ear in the future for his complaints and charges.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S DYNAMIC LEADERSHIP

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, those who viewed President Kennedy's second press conference yesterday, televised in accordance with the courageous and imaginative innovation of the Nation's Chief Executive for informing the people of America and the world, could not help be impressed with President Kennedy's mastery of every detail of the national and international picture, the quickness of his mental processes in responding to searching interrogation, his good nature in turning aside sometimes deliberately provocative questions, and the calm assurance and determination with which he has forged ahead to lead the Nation out of an inheritance of grave problems, far graver than those which were faced by any newly inaugurated President, because his problems are not merely national, as were the problems in Lincoln's and Franklin Delano Roosevelt's opening presidential days, but global as well as national.

A penetrating appraisal of President Kennedy's performance appeared in the New York Times, from the pen of that most knowledgeable newspaper commentator, James Reston. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Fighting on All Fronts—President Is Viewed as Accelerating Tempo To Establish His Leadership," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHTING ON ALL FRONTS—PRESIDENT IS VIEWED AS ACCELERATING TEMPO TO ESTABLISH HIS LEADERSHIP

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—President Kennedy is now clearly forcing the pace. Instead of letting it slack off, he is rushing it forward in an obvious effort to make the White House the master force of the Government.

Yesterday and the day before he was working behind the scenes to establish his authority as party leader in the battle over the House Rules Committee. Today he was back in the eye of the television camera commanding the attention of the general public.

This is not a one-front campaign. He is fighting on all fronts at once; insisting on a prudent respect for his policies within his own official family; using the patronage and influence of his office in the perennial struggle for power with the Congress; playing for time on the international scene while organizing the executive, and forcing a national debate on the internal and external condition of the country.

FLOOD OF MESSAGES

No man can be expected to keep up this pace for long. He is not only keeping the initiative with a flood of messages and appearances on Capitol Hill; he is not only taking on a press conference a week, but is continuing to do those casual personal and social things he did as a Senator—going to private dinners and luncheons, leaving his door open to old members of the Senate Club, talking personally on the telephone to dozens of intruders or wobblers with key votes.

But in addition to all this, he is taking on unnecessary things such as meeting returning airmen at the airport and even going on the Dave Garroway television show.

In politics, as in love, however, timing is important and first impressions are vital. Accordingly, he is not sparing himself at the beginning. He is trying to establish who sits at the head of the table in this city, and so far he has been remarkably successful.

The surprising thing is that in the midst of all this turmoil, he gives the impression of being completely at ease. He almost succeeded in making bad news sound attractive at today's news conference. He dealt with it as if it were an inevitable consequence of life, troublesome no doubt, but manageable if handled calmly and with commonsense.

It is not easy to establish rapport with 300 reporters in this new State Department auditorium. The place is cold and functional, the questions often blurred and indistinct. Yet Mr. Kennedy is somehow at home amidst all this streamlined confusion, quick and yet constantly in control.

President Eisenhower was more casual. He often came to these meetings without any announcements and asked for questions at once. This is like stepping up to the plate without batting practice, but Mr. Kennedy does not present such a standing target.

Today, as in his first conference, he threw the opening pitches. He kept the reporters busy taking notes about his opening announcements and then, when he was well warmed up, went to questions.

This is what he is doing in his other activities as well. He is making the running. His theory is that the best defense is a good offense. He hesitated about getting into the Rules Committee battle for a few days, but recovered quickly and ended strong.

When Adm. Arleigh Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations, sang out about foreign policy, the White House saw to it that he was courteously rebuked. When Adlai E. Stevenson, representative at the United Nations, undertook to interpret what the President might do about talking to Premier Khrushchev, the White House immediately let it be known publicly that the President had not talked to Mr. Stevenson on the matter.

Nor did he back away from these pointed lessons in today's conference. He was polite about them, but he left no doubt that he intended to be master in his own house and did not expect any difficulty in reaching agreement on Executive policy.

All this has more to do with style than substance, but style at the start is important. He has grace under pressure, and while the counteroffensive will soon start against him in the world and in the Congress, he is likely to be a formidable opponent.

WILSON'S WORDS

Woodrow Wilson once defined the role of the Presidency in terms that Mr. Kennedy now seems to be following.

"The President," said Mr. Wilson, "can dominate his party by being spokesman for the real sentiment and purpose of the country, by giving direction to opinion, by giving the country at once the information and the statements of policy which will enable it to form its judgments alike of parties and of men.

"His is the only national voice in affairs," Mr. Wilson continued. "Let him once win the admiration and confidence of the country and no other single force can withstand him, no combination of forces will easily overpower him."

This is what Mr. Kennedy has started out to do. He is moving fast to win the "confidence of the country" in the early days while the country is paying attention, and though he still has a long way to go, he has made a good start.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S DEFENSE STUDY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Hanson W. Baldwin printed in the New York Times on February 1, 1961, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

This article, which treats of the Nation's defense position, is remarkably clear and informative. It provides an excellent perspective and a balanced appraisal of the present complexities in defense administration and defense policies.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY'S DEFENSE STUDY—CALL FOR SURVEY OF MILITARY POSITION IN 4 WEEKS BELIEVED IMPOSSIBLE TO FULFILL

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

President Kennedy's references to the Nation's defense posture in his state of the Union message were, as they would have to be, of an interim and incomplete nature.

He directed three specific actions: to increase airlift capacity; to speed up the Polaris submarine program; to accelerate the Nation's entire missile program. All had been forecast; none are revolutionary.

The Nation's military air transport fleet now numbers 1,330 four-engined aircraft. Nearly all are propeller driven, including 635 planes in the Military Air Transportation Service and 120 in the Tactical Air Command, and others in other Air Force commands.

A modernization program to replace many of these with jets and to purchase more cargo craft would require some years for fulfillment. However, an immediate increase in passenger and cargo capability could be achieved by two measures: the chartering of considerable numbers of commercial aircraft; and augmentation of the regular MATS squadrons with reserve transport squadrons called to active duty. Either of these is possible, but both would be costly and would scarcely be justified unless there were evidence of impending emergency.

All the available facts indicate that the United States today has the largest strategic airlift capability in the world. Russia may well have more short-range planes, or a larger tactical airlift, but despite MATS' need for modernization it can leap the oceans and vault to other continents faster with more than Russia appears to be able to do.

POLARIS PROGRAM SPEEDED UP

The Polaris submarine story simply telescopes 9 months in the program. Instead of having 19 missile-firing submarines by sometime in 1965, we shall have 19 (instead of 14) in early 1964. Three are in operation now, 11 are building and money is available for long leadtime items for 5 more. More submarine building ways are available, and it is possible that the next fiscal year's program may be increased from 5 to 10, to get the maximum number to sea sooner.

The acceleration in the missile program across the board should have major effect upon the bases for the missiles, rather than the missiles themselves. The bottleneck in the intercontinental ballistic missile program has been in base construction. The delays have been due to a variety of factors, chiefly too many managers; repeated changes in design; lack of a sense of urgency; and perhaps most important, strikes, labor stoppages and slowdowns.

Sixty Thor intermediate range ballistic missiles (1,725 miles) are emplaced in Britain, ready for action; 30 Jupiters are about ready in Italy, and 15 more are being delivered to Turkey. About 12 Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles (5,750 miles)

are operational at land bases in the United States, and 6 to 10 others are almost ready, with still others scheduled for the near future.

These interim measures, will be augmented by a study, Mr. Kennedy said, of our entire defense position. The President gave every indication of being a young man in a hurry.

DIRECTIVES TO M'NAMARA

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, he said, had been directed to:

"Reappraise our entire defense strategy—our ability to fulfill our commitments—the effectiveness, vulnerability, and dispersal of our strategic bases, forces and warning systems—the efficiency and economy of our operation and organization—the elimination of obsolete bases and installations—and the adequacy modernization and mobility of our present conventional and nuclear forces and weapons systems in the light of present and future dangers."

Mr. Kennedy said he had asked for "preliminary conclusions" upon which he could base legislative, budgetary and executive action by the end of this month.

This Herculean task, which could well occupy a lifetime, is to provide judgments in 4 weeks that will shape our defense future. Mr. McNamara is noted as a go-getter and a man of energy and ability, but any such time schedule as this commits him inevitably to snap judgments. For no man, or no group of men new to the Pentagon, no matter how brilliant, could possibly provide thoroughly studied, carefully factual judgments on matters of such tremendous scope and complexity within the time frame laid down.

The same mistake was made early in the Eisenhower administration when the "new look," with its reliance upon the "massive retaliation" doctrine, was adopted.

OTHER DANGERS POINTED OUT

Mr. Kennedy's principal danger in the military field, aided as he is by a dynamic Secretary of Defense eager to "get things done," is too much speed.

But there are others. One is the danger of absolutism. The President took as his credo the statement that "only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed." There never has been in history and there never can be any such certainty. There is not, and never will be, any absolute security.

Any military policy, like any political policy, must be based on calculated risks. Any attempt to achieve military security beyond doubt is not only doomed to failure but it also could lead to spiraling expenditures and an intensified arms race.

Another danger is that of too much self-assurance. Mr. Kennedy's somewhat stark and austere, though moving, recital of the dangers we face contrasts strongly not only with President Eisenhower's state of the Union message, but also, in the military field, with a recent remarkable speech by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, who retired a few months ago as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

TWINING'S VIEWS RECALLED

General Twining challenged sharply a number of widely held beliefs, that seemed to find some echoes in President Kennedy's message.

The general, whose military knowledge is certainly superior to the President's or to that of the new Secretary of Defense, defined these false beliefs as:

"1. Our Armed Forces are inefficient, mismanaged and wasteful.

"2. The three services weaken our defense by fighting among themselves.

"3. We are second best to the Russians in military power.

"4. We are all about to die in atomic war.

"5. Our national prestige is lost."

These false beliefs add up to a "complacency of despair" that could lead to a "national cringing," he said. We are still the strongest military power in the world, though we must work hard to remain so, he emphasized.

In the field of military policy it should be clear to Mr. Kennedy and to Mr. McNamara that it is to the national interest to make haste slowly. Quick decisions are desirable, but sound ones are imperative.

EFFECTIVE SNOW CLEARANCE PROGRAM FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MODERN EFFICIENCY IS CHEAPER THAN IT MAY SEEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, now that Thursday has arrived—and the third time in a row we have predictions of heavy snow blanketing the city, I feel it my duty to discuss the problems of snow clearance in the District of Columbia. Senators know I am not a civil engineer by training—neither am I an expert in road maintenance, or traffic management. But the continuing and disrupting discomfort caused to the residents of this District, to the Government employees here, and to Government operations generally, week after week, motivates me to inquire why the District of Columbia has been so helpless in coping with this problem.

The ineffectiveness of the District snow control program has resulted not only in impossible traffic bottlenecks and up to 5-hour traffic delays the night before the inauguration of the new President, but it also caused the early discharge of Government employees last Thursday, and may cause further discomfort to many thousands of District people today.

This year, the District of Columbia has seen a great amount of snowfall. This is unusual for this part of the country. Yet, as one who has been accustomed to the cold northern winters of Wisconsin and to the much bigger snowfalls there, I am somewhat surprised at our lack of ability to handle a few extra inches of snow in this Nation's Capital. So far this winter we have had a total snowfall of 22.3 inches in the District of Columbia. On the average, the Washington snowfall totals some 19 inches per year. This certainly is not too impressive when you compare it with average annual Milwaukee snowfalls of more than 40 inches.

Still, we have never had in Wisconsin, as far as I can remember, the same type of breakdown in transportation effectiveness as we have seen in the District of Columbia in the past few weeks. In fact, the city of Milwaukee, where the total snowfall in the last 3 years averaged an unprecedented 62 inches a year, has managed to keep transportation going, permitting the business life to continue, permitting working people to get to work, permitting children to get to school. How is this done?

The city of Milwaukee has 1,300 miles of streets, as compared to a total Washington street mileage of 1,273 miles. All of the Milwaukee streets are plowed in a snow emergency or are salted if they are in a glazed condition. Four hundred miles of main traffic arteries are taken care of first. Usually, a snow emergency is called when snowfall reaches 3 inches. On the average, the Milwaukee snow clearance program has to be put into operation 34 times a year.

Through the use of the new equipment available to Milwaukee, the city is able, within a period of 10 hours, usually nightwork, to do all the plowing that is necessary to take care of an 8-inch snowfall. In heavier snowfalls, plowing is continuous until the streets are cleared.

The city of Milwaukee owns most of the equipment needed for snow clearance operations.

It uses first, 84 salt-spreading dump trucks; second, 117 dump trucks with provisions for plow equipment; and third, 160 rubbish compaction trucks.

In addition, the city uses the following attachments with the above vehicles: First, 15 snow blowers; second, 45 large plows; third, 277 straight plows; and fourth, 3 spreader attachments mounted on dump trucks.

Twenty front-end loaders are also owned by the city and during snow-removal operations they serve two purposes—first, to load the salt trucks, and, second, in conjunction with the dump trucks, to clear major intersections.

Of special interest is the fact that much of this equipment is manufactured by Wisconsin industries. Allis-Chalmers is the leader among them.

Usually, all this city of Milwaukee equipment would not be used unless there were a 6- to 8-inch snowfall. In such cases some 1,500 people are also at work, including 1,000 manual shovelers.

The city of Milwaukee also carries out an extensive program of salting—to take care of glazed snow or sleet. In fact, the city of Milwaukee uses some 20,000 tons—4 million pounds—of salt each year for its snow clearing operation.

To take care of these snow emergencies, Milwaukee's 1961 snow removal budget is $740,000. In 1959 and 1960 the snow clearance budget was $660,000 per year, but due to the severity of the weather, $1.3 million had to be spent each year.

This may appear as a large expenditure of money, yet when analyzed carefully it is quite reasonable, amounting to not more than one dollar a year for each Milwaukee resident.

Our lack of ability to cope with snow problems in the District of Columbia certainly results in much greater expenditure and waste. There are some 240,000 people on the Federal payroll in Metropolitan Washington. When these people were sent home half a day early 2 weeks ago, this certainly resulted in a substantial loss to the taxpayer. Even if we estimate an average pay of $10 a day for these Federal employees, discharging 240,000 of them half a day early cost the Federal Government $1,200,000. One or two additional such snow emergencies might easily cost some $2½ to $3½ million to the American taxpayers. And this does not include the discomfort, the cost of automobile

breakdowns, and the waste of time for all other Metropolitan Washington residents.

It would appear, therefore, that Milwaukee's expenditure of a dollar a person a year for an effective snow clearance program is a very low price to pay. In order to carry out a more effective snow clearance program, it might not be necessary for the District of Columbia to acquire as extensive a supply of equipment as that owned by the city of Milwaukee.

A check of the telephone directory yellow pages indicates that there are in the District of Columbia approximately 70 equipment rental organizations or equipment distributors who would have available the basic equipment of the type used in the Milwaukee plan. There are at least 30 major contractors in the District of Columbia area who have large amounts of this equipment. I am informed that Allis-Chalmers has in operation in the metropolitan area more than 1,000 tractors of its own make, with either shovel attachments or bulldozer blades.

It is estimated that overall there are at least 2,500 tractors with appropriate equipment in the District of Columbia area. There is also available in Washington a large number of scrapers and graders normally used for road construction work and which are idle during a snowstorm. These could be effectively used in snow clearance operations.

It appears, therefore, that the problem is not lack of equipment or lack of personnel. The District of Columbia can undertake a much more effective snow clearance program without necessarily making much of a capital outlay for the purchase of new equipment. Rental equipment is available. The breakdown appears to be in the overall administrative planning and execution of the snow clearance program. What is necessary is not to wait until the snow falls, and then start searching for a solution. What is necessary is an overall preplanned program of snow clearance, which through prearranged contracts, would take advantage of the private equipment and private resources already available in the District of Columbia.

Another point that I wish to emphasize is the lack of enforcement, in the District of Columbia, of the sidewalk clearing laws. Each civilized community recognizes the duty of property owners to keep the sidewalks in front of their property clear and safe for the traveling public. In my own community of Chippewa Falls, I often had to get up and shovel the snow and ice in front of my house. Yet, in the District of Columbia, walks remain covered with ice for a long period of time. The lack of enforcement of this law results in the heavy piling up of ice and snow, which remains on the sidewalks from the time one snowfall ends until a new snow starts, continuously endangering the traveling public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees be authorized to report nominations during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, and that it be in order to consider them at the next session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for Mr. EASTLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Mortimer M. Caplin, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

Ivan A. Nestingen, of Wisconsin, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 20 officers in the Army and Navy Reserve and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President;

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Brig. Gen. Charles Lowman Decker, U.S. Army, for appointment as The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Robert Hall McGraw, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States; and

Brig. Gen. Tom Victor Stayton, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably a total of 408 nominations in the Army in the grade of colonel and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Alvie O. Ashley, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Kenneth E. Be Lieu, of Oregon, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Horne to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say a word about this nomination. John E. Horne came to me in my office within a few months after I came to the Senate, back in November 1946, as my administrative assistant. With the exception of a few brief leaves of absence, he has served as my administrative assistant during all that time. I believe his selection is a most happy one. I am sure we may depend upon John Horne, after he has been confirmed in office, to give us an excellent administration in this most important agency, so vital to the economy of our country. I am delighted that the President has selected him. His selection was made without Mr. Horne's having sought the place. He was asked to take it. I know he will make a good Administrator. I shall be delighted to see this nomination confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining nominations, with the exception of those placed on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service, placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the action taken by the Senate with reference to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE OF YESTERDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at his press conference yesterday, the President was asked a question about an incident involving the revision of a speech by the Chief of Naval Operations. I am delighted that this matter was raised and I quote at this point the text of the question and answer:

Question. Mr. President, this may be a corollary question, but your administration has indicated that it expects officers of the military on active duty to support in their public statements or a least not to be hostile to the foreign policy of your administration.

Does this project itself into other areas? What about the Atomic Energy Commission, and I am talking about economists working for the executive branch who may have differences about economic policy?

Answer. I think that the procedure which we have established is a traditional one, and I think that the Eisenhower administration made, according to the announcements I have seen, over 65 known efforts to make sure that speeches by members of the military were in accordance with the general objectives of American foreign policy.

I think we are going to continue to do that. If a well known, high-ranking military figure makes a speech, which affects foreign policy or possible military policy, I think that the people and the countries abroad have a right to expect that speech represents the opinion of the National Government.

Now, the speech of Admiral Burke which raised this question: When the speech was drafted Admiral Burke may not have known, nor did any of us, whether these fliers would be released, for example, and, therefore, there is some value in coordinating statements made by high-ranking, responsible officials involving national security, coordinating them and making sure that the State Department and the White House and Defense are informed about the speeches and that they represent national policy.

That has been the policy followed by President Eisenhower, and it is the policy which must be followed by this administration.

Now, the question Mr. Morgan asked. It is not intended that this will serve as a restraint on the ability of people in this administration to speak out, particularly when those speeches do not involve national security. I think the important point here is when they involve national security.

In ordinary circumstances this matter would have hardly been newsworthy. What was involved was a commonplace occurrence which takes place and goes unnoticed, perhaps, hundreds of times each week in the various agencies and departments of the executive branch. The facts, as I gather them, were as follows: A naval officer prepared a speech for public delivery. The speech contained significant reference to foreign policy questions. Since naval officers on active duty, any more than any other officers of the executive branch, cannot pursue foreign policies of their own, he submitted the text in advance to the Department of State to make certain that his remarks coordinated with the wishes of the President. This procedure was in accord with a long-established practice. The State Department apparently found some of the content of the speech at variance with its interpretation of the President's desires in foreign policy at the moment. Therefore, the matter was brought to the attention of the White House. Subsequently, the Chief of Naval Operations was requested by the White House to make certain revisions in the speech. The request was complied with.

As I have already noted, Mr. President, the incident was commonplace. The public remarks of subordinates, particularly remarks touching on relations with other nations, and particularly the remarks of civil servants and military officials of higher rank, are frequently revised on direction of a superior authority for a very simple reason: It is essential that in matters of foreign relations that the Nation's position not be confused at home or misinterpreted abroad. It is essential that the Nation speak with one official voice in these matters, and that voice under the Constitution can only be the voice of the President of the United States. All other expressions on foreign relations in the executive branch from those of the Secretary of State on down are, of necessity, its echo.

This concept, Mr. President, is not new. I have expressed it many times in the past with respect to both Democratic and Republican administrations. There is scarcely another Member of this body, on either side of the aisle, who, having taken a particular interest in foreign policy, has not said much the same thing.

What makes the incident in question of sufficient importance to be brought to the attention of the Senate is neither the content of the admiral's speech nor the fact that it was revised. In all honesty, I must say that I have not read the speech in either its original or revised form. I have not done so simply because I would assume that an admiral who leaves the bridge for the lectern while on active duty would not be in a position to say anything of any significance on foreign policy, which has not already been said in substance by the President or the Secretary of State. In Montana, we do not take a horse to the saddlemaker for shoes; nor do we seek saddles at the blackmith's.

So I repeat, Mr. President, it is not the content of the speech or the fact that it was revised which is disturbing. What is disturbing is the possible leak of significant information to foreign nations in violation of a Presidential confidence by subordinates in the executive branch. What is disturbing are the shrill cries of "gag" and "censorship." What is disturbing is the possible implication in these cries that high officers of the military services are to be regarded as exempt from subordination to their Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, merely by the process of describing insubordination as freedom from "gag" and "censorship."

I wish to take up each one of these disturbing factors, Mr. President, in some detail. Let me turn, first, to the matter of leakage of significant information to foreign nations. The nature of the revisions of the admiral's speech has been set forth in considerable detail in the press. These revisions have been widely interpreted to mean that the President intends to make significant changes in policies or at least in the tone of our dealings with the Soviet Union. Some say that the revisions mean that he will now follow the Theodore Roosevelt dictum of "speak softly but carry a big stick."

I do not know whether or not this interpretation is accurate. In any case, that is beside the point. The point is that it is for the President to decide if and when changes are to be made in our policies and diplomacy. And it is for the President to choose the place, the time, and circumstances for making known these changes.

These are decisions for the President to make because the grave responsibility is his, and he is answerable to all the people of the United States. They are not decisions for any subordinate to make except as the President may delegate his constitutional authority to make them.

The President has the right to expect and the duty to insist that there be no meddling with this responsibility. He has the right to expect and the duty to insist that his subordinates, from the Cabinet on down, do not lay open to other nations what they have learned or think they have learned through his confidence. Make no mistake, the detailed nature of the revisions of a speech on foreign policy by a high-ranking official of this Government is a matter of Presidential confidence because it is clearly of the highest interest to other governments.

Mr. President, is it a "gag," is it "censorship," when the President insists that subordinates follow his orders, even though it may compel the subordinates, either military or civilian, to forego some pride of authorship in their speeches? "Gag," Mr. President, is a frightening word to the people of this Nation. So, too, is "censorship" in this Nation, whose basic rights include freedom of expression. But are these words applicable to the incident in question?

Is it a "gag," is it "censorship," if an ordinary seaman in the Navy is admonished not to reveal to the enemy that an admiral intends to revise his tactics or even that he has no intention of revising them? Is it a "gag," is it "censorship," when speeches of lower ranking

defense officials are revised on the direction of higher ranking officials to conform to something which is sometimes called Defense Department policy? Is it a "gag" when a Senator directs his staff not to take a public stand on a public issue which is at variance with his own? Is it a "gag" when the President directs the Secretary of Defense to support a public position on the budget of his Department which may differ from the position which the Secretary has advocated to him in private? Was it a "gag," was it "censorship," when, as has happened within the memory of all of us, a President demanded the resignation of a Secretary of Commerce because the latter's public remarks were at variance with the official position of the United States as expressed by the Secretary of State? Unless all of these examples are to be regarded as expressions of a "gag" or "censorship," I do not see the relevance of the use of these words in connection with the incident in question.

The fact is, Mr. President, that no appointed official of this Government is free now or has ever been free to say and do what he wishes in public at all times and on any matter. The limitations on the exercise of free expression have always been most stringent insofar as officials—military and civilian—with high responsibilities for the security and peace of the Nation have been concerned.

That brings me, Mr. President, to the last factor which I find disturbing in this incident. I hope that I am wrong. I hope that I am unduly alarmed. Nevertheless, I cannot escape the uncomfortable feeling that this incident has skirted very dangerous, very irresponsible grounds in the interests of quick political profit. I say again that I hope I am wrong, for I know that the Members of this body, without exception and at all times, place the national interest above partisan advantage.

The dangerous, the irresponsible grounds, Mr. President, are those which would put professional military leaders, who should be divorced from politics, into the arena of the party politics of the Nation. The dangerous grounds, the irresponsible grounds, Mr. President, are those which would place military leaders on an equal or superior plane, as compared to that of the President and the Secretary of State, in connection with matters pertaining to the most vital foreign policy interests of the Nation.

I do not have to remind the Senate that those who founded this Nation enshrined in the Constitution the principle of civilian supremacy over the Military Establishment. They did so for the very good reason that the prior experience of Western civilization made it clear beyond any doubt that this principle was one of the great cornerstones of human liberty. The principle has been preserved and upheld through almost two centuries without question by the great political and military leaders of the Nation. The principle remains no less important today than it has been in the past, as Mr. Eisenhower so wisely emphasized in his farewell address.

I have no doubt that the present occupant of the White House, who has served in the Military Establishment and is a profound student of the history of human freedom, is equally aware of its importance. I hope that members of both parties will not overlook it.

Let me say, in all fairness, that I mention this principle of civilian supremacy only to put in better perspective the incident in question. I hope it will not be interpreted, in any sense, as reflecting adversely on the present Chief of Naval Operations, the author of the speech. I am confident that the Chief of Naval Operations upholds the principle of civilian supremacy with as much zeal as have his distinguished predecessors. In this instance he acted in accord with the principle. He wrote a speech. The President requested that he make revisions, and he made them.

But, apparently, Mr. President, not everyone has been equally zealous in dedication to this principle. The original draft on the speech was "leaked," a serious act of insubordination in itself. The result was a public challenge to the President's judgment on a matter of foreign policy on the opinions of a ranking officer in our Military Establishment. A further result was that there were raised in the political arena questions even as to the authority of the President over the Military Establishment.

So I conclude, Mr. President, as I began, with an expression of some anxiety over this incident. Its repercussions have done the Nation harm, by revealing to foreign nations what they have no right to know except as the President and Secretary of State decide that they should know. Its repercussions have not served the armed services, because a high-ranking officer—unintentionally, I am sure—has been projected into a political situation, whereas the highest traditions of professional military service in this Nation require that all officers on active duty stand outside politics. Finally, its repercussions suggest that there are those who would gamble with a fundamental principle of liberty—the principle of civilian supremacy—apparently in a scurrying for possible political profit.

I hope this incident is the last of this sort of thing for the duration of the incumbent administration. The entire incident may well be an understandable error, in the light of the transition from one administration to another. But I should like to make clear now that if it is repeated, I hope the President of the United States will take whatever measures are necessary to uphold the authority of his Office and to insure the orderly and coordinated functioning of all parts of the executive branch in vital foreign-policy matters. Furthermore, I hope he will sustain the principle of civilian supremacy against any challenge from whatever source—advertent or inadvertent. Finally, I hope this body will give him whatever support is necessary to these ends. For myself, I pledge him that support now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a copy of a speech I made on February 19, 1955, at the exercises of the 12th officer candidate class, U.S. Marine Corps, at Quantico, Va. The speech was entitled "The Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy." I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated March 1, 1955, in relation to that particular speech, which I received from Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There being no objection, the address and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD at commissioning exercises of the 12th officer candidate class, USMC, Quantico, Va., February 19, 1955)

An elected official can hardly expect universal approval of his position on every issue. Almost invariably some people will agree with him and others will disagree, sometimes very vehemently. And I must say that a Member of Congress pricked by public criticism bleeds at least as profusely as any other human being.

In a decade and a half of service in Congress, I have been on sick call for this reason on a number of occasions. I have learned to accept occasional wounds as a part of my job, as an occupational hazard.

There is one issue, however, which I have repeatedly tackled in Congress and have repeatedly come out, not licking my wounds, but miraculously unscathed. That issue is the preservation of the integrity of the Marine Corps.

While Members of Congress must, out of conviction, sometimes run counter to the immediate flow of public opinion, it is not a very pleasant experience. It is always preferable, if you can do so honestly, to find yourself flowing downstream with public sentiment rather than struggling upstream, half-drowned, against it.

Beyond the natural gratification which comes to an elected official when he finds his own heart and the public pulse beating in perfect unison—beyond that, I have a special pleasure in fighting for the integrity of the corps. As a marine, I take personal pride in the Marines. Of course, I also take personal pride in the Army and the Navy, as an ex-member of each of those services. But I think I may be pardoned if I tend to be a little prouder of my marine background. I was only a private in the Army. I was only a seaman, second class, in the Navy. But with that same perceptiveness which prompted the Marine Corps to recognize your qualities of leadership the Corps also recognized mine. I emerged from my hitch in the Marines as a Pfc.

That distinction, I realize, does not, in itself, qualify me to speak to you on "The Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy." Nevertheles, I feel that the subject is of such great importance that it should be considered not only by privates—buck or first class—and Senators, but by thoughtful Americans throughout the Nation. I think it is an especially pertinent one for you men who are graduating today into command positions in the corps. The Marines have traditionally operated with high effectiveness as a principal military instrument of this Nation's foreign policy during peacetime just as they have more than once proved their tremendous capabilities when the peace has been violated.

One explanation for this outstanding service may well be that the corps has always maintained a strict professional regard for the American principle of civilian control of military power. That principle, as I am sure you have been taught, is absolutely essential for the proper functioning of our system of government. It is not enough that Congress determines appropriations and organizational arrangements, and that the President and his civilian assistants direct

the administrative management of the military. The American concept goes further. It requires that the military shall only be used whenever, wherever, and in whatever manner the politically responsible civilian leadership shall determine, because only that leadership, through elections, can be held accountable to the people of the Nation.

In the present state of world affairs, a system of civilian control is not easily maintained. It is subject to all the stresses and strains that arise from the tense international situation. In a crisis, with the threat of world conflict ever present, it is not unnatural to turn to distinguished military leaders for guidance, to rely heavily on their judgment, and sometimes it is profitable to the Nation to do so. Nevertheless, the principle of civilian control remains essential to democratic government as we know it.

Primary responsibility for the preservation of this principle rests with our civilian leadership; that leadership must be willing to assume the heavy responsibilities of decision in this dangerous world. But I think you will agree that considerable responsibility also rests with the military. They must understand and accept the limits as well as the challenges of their profession in the conduct of the Nation's affairs, particularly its foreign affairs.

Perhaps I can illustrate this point with an anecdote. During the Civil War, the story goes, certain Members of Congress left their desks in Washington and went to the battlefields in Virginia. There, they insisted upon assuming the tactical command of the Union forces. After having thrown the campaign into confusion, they beat a hasty retreat to Washington where they arrived mud-spattered, trembling, and presumably chastised.

If the story is amusing, it is because it is easy to recognize the absurdity of this escapade. These Congressmen apparently assumed that their training in politics equipped them to run the Army. They also distorted and distended the functions of their office out of all true proportion.

The moral of the story is simple enough: Congressmen ought not to assume that political training provides an automatic background for military leadership and, in military affairs, their role ought not to exceed the constitutional powers of their office.

Let us put the shoe on the other foot. The moral is now this: Military leaders ought not to assume that military training provides an automatic background for politics, whether national or international, and they ought not in the formulation and conduct of foreign policy exceed the powers of their appointive office.

Just as the distorted behavior of the Congressmen in the Civil War could have produced tragic results as easily as humorous, so too can the distorted behavior of military leaders.

It has never been easy to draw a clear line as to the area of competence and authority of the armed services in foreign policy. Events of the past 15 years have made it even more difficult. First of all, during this period, some among us, civilian and military alike, have developed a distorted sense of the nature of what this country is trying to do in its relations with other nations and how it can most effectively go about doing it. Foreign policy is simply the course by which we attempt to provide for the safety of the Nation and the advancement of its interests in a complex and dangerous world. That is its only reason for being. To carry out our policy we require military strength but we must also bring into play nonmilitary instruments and measures to influence conditions throughout the world. Possibly it is because these nonmilitary measures are less dramatic, less newsworthy, and tend to affect us and our families less directly, that we sometimes lose our perspective and regard them as less important than military actions. Sometimes there is a tendency to view nonmilitary measures merely as supplements of our military policy, when in fact the reverse is closer to the truth.

You men need hardly to be reminded of this fact. If you know the history of the corps, you know that the Marines have been sent to foreign territories and to oversea bases only from time to time and only after the failure of other methods to protect American citizens and interests. In countless day-to-day situations arising in our foreign relations throughout the world the military instrument is in no way involved.

As for any large scale use of force, it is only when nonmilitary measures fail to produce situations favorable to the vital security interests of the United States, that such use may become necessary. Even then we have invoked military force only in response to aggression. That we have waited for our enemy to show beyond all shadow of doubt that he intends to strike us, rather than strike the first blow ourselves, does not mean that we are slow-witted or even patient. It means simply that we are following a fundamental American principle: That force is the final, not the first arbiter in the affairs of men and nations. Nothing has done more to toughen the moral fiber of this country than that principle. No other single factor has served to sustain our morale during the long and gruelling wars which we have had to fight. Nothing has done more to turn the hearts and hopes of mankind to this Nation. And I hope the day never comes when this Nation shall use its might in any way other than for protection against the arrogant, the aggressive, and the ruthless.

The role of the military in foreign policy, then, is to provide a reserve of power to support negotiations concerning our just interests in the world and to defend those interests if they are attacked. I want to underline the words "reserve" and "support." Responsibility for determining what our interests are and when and how they are to be defended is vested in the President and his Secretary of State. The Department of Defense and other agencies of the Government, in the performance of their duties have an influence in this determination, but final responsibility cannot rest in any body other than the Department of State or the President himself.

Since the beginning of World War II, however, the role of the military in American foreign policy has assumed proportions of great magnitude. During the war the armed services inevitably became the foremost element in carrying out American policy. Since the close of those hostilities the services have continued to serve prominently in this connection, due to the nature of postwar diplomacy and developments.

The occupation of Germany and Japan, and the control of trust territories, among other things, has brought the armed services directly into foreign policy to a degree unprecedented in peacetime. To some extent, the same was true of the so-called Truman doctrine of 1947. Under the Truman doctrine, the Armed Forces not only ran military training missions to strengthen the security of Greece and Turkey against Communist aggression, but of necessity played a significant role in the formulation of policy with respect to those countries. Subsequently, they have had an enormous influence in foreign policy in conection with NATO, mutual aid and military assistance missions in numerous countries, the Korean war, oversea bases, and treaties with nations in the western Pacific.

I think that one of the chief problems emanating from this chain of developments is that in many instances there has been a tendency to treat individual military programs and policies as separate and distinct military affairs, whereas they actually are parts of the totality of American foreign policy. Responsibility for decisionmaking has at times been vested in military officials rather than in foreign policy officials. In other instances there has been a failure to define and clarify lines of responsibility for policy formulation. I say this, not so much in criticism as in recognition of the fact. It is unlikely that anyone planned it that way; it has simply happened—perhaps largely because it was not planned.

The obscuring of the lines of responsibility and authority is perhaps best illustrated in the issuance of public statements by leaders of the armed services. Such statements are usually expressed in military terminology. Often, however, much of their substance is of a foreign policy nature. Perhaps this is unavoidable in view of the complexity of the matters with which they frequently deal. One cannot always draw a clearcut line between military and political and other factors in a given situation.

The question of rearming Germany will serve to illustrate this point, and this example finds a counterpart in practically every other major foreign policy issue with which we are confronted. There are strong military reasons for urging the rearmament of Germany and it is natural for military personnel to see the need in terms of added divisions of manpower, bases, and so forth. But Germany cannot be rearmed in a vacuum. Rearmament cannot be divorced from a whole range of problems concerning European unity, the fears of France, the role of Britain on the continent, the reunification of Germany, and the maintenance of the Western alliance. It seems to me, therefore, that official statements on this subject under our system of government emanate best from our foreign policy officials. They are presumably kept well informed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the military considerations involved and they in turn are best equipped to view such considerations and to express them publicly in terms of the totality of American interests.

I cite this example merely to illustrate the problem of defining the role of the military in American foreign policy. It is not difficult to see the principal reason for the expansion of military participation in foreign policymaking. As I mentioned earlier, the nature of wartime and postwar developments and diplomacy has required a vastly increased use of the military as an instrument of policy.

There is, however, still another factor. The military emerged from the war with great prestige, both at home and abroad, and this prestige has carried over into the postwar period. On the international scene this has led to widespread use of prominent military leaders in diplomatic capacities. At various periods since the close of World War II three of our foremost military leaders during the war have served in positions which were more political than military and which roughly corresponded to their wartime military roles—General Eisenhower as NATO commander, General MacArthur in charge of the occupation of Japan, and General Marshall as Secretary of State. Each of these distinguished military leaders had earned the respect of foreign nations, as well as the American people, through their outstanding military service. Each made an exceptional contribution in their postwar assignments.

Other military leaders have also been called upon for diplomatic or political services—Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Under Secretary of State, and Adm. Alan Kirk, who served as Ambassador to Belgium and Ambassador to the Soviet Union, are two leading examples. I could name 2 dozen other former generals and admirals now holding civilian positions in the Federal Government. Countless others of field grade

are scattered through the civilian bureaucracies of the Federal Government concerned with foreign affairs and international organizations.

This increased use of military leaders in positions of a diplomatic or political nature, of course, has often been due not only to a carryover of the military prestige of these men, but also to their demonstrated ability as well as their availability for such a service.

Without in any way reflecting on the capacity of any individual I do think that the vast expansion in the employment of military personnel in both the making and carrying out of foreign policy is something to which we should give some serious thought. It raises questions not only with respect to our basic values, but also with respect to our basic foreign policy objectives, including our military security.

First, let me say something about the question which I think this trend poses concerning our basic values.

Military officers are not different from anyone else in this country. They come from representative families all over the Nation. They go to the same grade schools and high schools. They hold the same social and religious values. But the military profession exacts from those who pursue it a higher measure of self-sacrifice in the public interest than most other professions. The military as a group must accept a higher degree of training, conditioning, and disciplining toward one objective: to provide military protection for the Nation. That is as it should be and those who enter the profession, like you men, today, understand these conditions.

Like any other professional group the military in their dedication to their primary objective may tend to lose sight of other national objectives. It appears to me, consequently, that when the military in fact make policy decisions or when military techniques are excessively applied to carry out policies which can be more appropriately handled by civilian techniques, we are in danger of having military objectives and values emphasized at the expense of other, broader national objectives and values.

With respect to our basic foreign policy objectives, including military security itself, the expansion of the military role in foreign policy poses some more immediate dangers. Responsibility for our entire foreign policy, which is concerned with international economic, cultural, and political relations, as well as with military affairs, is vested in our Secretary of State. Our military objectives have no meaning in themselves except as they tend to further our nonmilitary objectives. If they are given an independent meaning, if they become ends in themselves, we could easily be led into costly adventures which would only add to the financial and human burdens of the American people and which might ultimately result in widespread public reaction against the military. The best way to avoid a distorted emphasis on military objectives, the way that is provided under our constitutional system, is to require that final authority in foreign policy decisionmaking remain unequivocally with the Secretary of State under the President of the United States.

In terms of our military security specifically, as distingushed from the wider range of foreign policy, it appears to me that a further danger exists. Our military experts may weaken their professional stature through overanxious acceptance of an increased role in policy matters.

In recent years military leaders have been brought into the limelight of public discussions of foreign policy largely as a result of their well-earned public prestige. Civilian political leaders have tended to rely heavily on this prestige gained through military accomplishments in order to support policies affecting our foreign policy. Generals and admirals have been called upon or sent to testify regularly before congressional committees, not only in connection with military appropriations and matters affecting the individual services, but also in connection with broad issues of policy, such as economic assistance programs and international alliances. Military officials, moreover, frequently discuss political issues—not necessarily partisan political issues, but issues of a political nature—at public appearances and press conferences. I may say at this point that the Marine Corps has been singularly free of this type of affliction. To the best of my knowledge, the leadership of the corps has successfully resisted the temptation to assert its expertness verbally and publicly not only in military matters but over the whole range of human affairs. Only an elected official, constantly beckoned by the siren call of the press, radio, and television, can appreciate the extraordinary degree of self-control that this represents. It is one more reason for me to be proud of my personal connection with the corps.

Now what is the danger to our security inherent in the exposure of military leaders—whether sought or unsought—to the political conflicts of the day? It is this: military leaders who are so exposed will find themselves in agreement with one side of a political issue and at odds with the other. They will be applauded by political leaders whose position they uphold and looked upon with suspicion by their opponents. When military officers become subjects of partisan politics they are no longer viewed as unbiased, objective career servants, nor will their military judgments be accepted as those of politically disinterested professional experts. From that, it is only one step to the loss of confidence in the military judgment of our military leaders.

This central problem was clearly illustrated prior to the last presidential election when a Senator publicly called for a change in the membership of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He had, he said, lost confidence in their judgment. The new administration, moreover, subsequently did appoint a new Joint Chiefs of Staff to take a new look at the military program. Surely we cannot have Republican generals and admirals for one administration and Democratic generals and admirals for the next without danger to the national security.

Now, possibly as never before, we cannot afford to play politics with our security. No political party, and no faction of a party, stands in the long run to benefit from military insecurity in this country. Certainly, the armed services as a whole do not.

In mentioning this tendency of some military officers to slip into or to be drawn into the political orbit of our system of government, I do not wish to imply that the military experts should have no contact with Congress. Certainly Congress has a right to know what our military experts think about military matters under consideration in Congress. The danger lies, not in this, but in military officers being employed as experts outside the area of their special competence in support of or in opposition to policy matters concerning which political and not military decision must be made.

There is no easy solution to this problem. Part of the answer lies in the restraint which civilian leaders must exercise to avoid placing military officials on the spot in political issues. Part of the answer must also lie in the fortitude with which military leaders resist the temptation to project themselves into nonmilitary questions.

This problem may seem remote to you men now, but within a short span of years as your careers unfold it may well become for some of you a most pressing and difficult one.

As I mentioned earlier, responsibility for maintaining the proper civilian-military balance in our system of government must be shared by both our military leaders and our civilian political leadership. The military must exercise the utmost restraint in policy matters, and our civilian leadership must be willing to take full responsibility for political decisions.

In foreign relations we need constantly to keep in mind the essential relationship of military force to total foreign policy. Military leaders as well as civilian foreign policy officials must understand the supporting role of military force. Military resources, like other tools of foreign policy, must be available to our politically accountable civilian policymakers when, where, and under conditions prescribed by those policymakers. It is incumbent upon our policymakers that they should take full advantage of military advice, but when the time for decisionmaking comes the civilian policymaker must make the choice and take full responsibility for that choice.

How can we preserve this principle, and at the same time provide for our own military security? There are no hard and fast rules. There is only commonsense and a few guideposts appropriate to the present state of world affairs.

First, it is essential that we maintain the necessary military strength to meet the threat of Communist aggression.

At the same time, however, every effort should be made to use nonmilitary measures to conduct foreign policy wherever possible. They are less costly, and often they can produce beneficial results that are more lasting in their effects. If we are to pursue them successfully, however, we must learn that every nonmilitary action in foreign policy is not an act of appeasement.

I would also suggest that if it becomes clear that we are tending away, rather than towards, a general war, we profit from long years of experience, and place greater reliance on the Marine Corps as the military force to support our diplomacy in foreign policy. In saying this, I am fully aware of the basic need for a multiservice fighting force in modern warfare. We share I know, a great pride in the Marines, and believe them capable of extraordinary feats. But we must admit that the corps has not yet rendered the Army, Navy, and Air Force obsolete.

Nevertheless, I still believe that the proper way to fight brush fires in various parts of the world is not with the forces, trained for general warfare, but with the specially trained self-sustaining, combat-ready forces of the Marine Corps. No other military group is so well suited to immediate service in any part of the world. No other group is more competent to keep the expenditure of force close to the requirements for achieving limited objectives.

Finally, I want to say that the most important element in the preservation of the principle of civilian control of American foreign policy is to require that our civilian foreign policy officials take full responsibility for decisions affecting foreign policy.

Your share in maintaining the proper role of the military in foreign policy is, it seems to me, to keep in mind that every action you take in your official capacities has a bearing on the foreign relations of the Nation. You will either contribute to the stafety and well-being of the United States or you will detract from it; you cannot be neutral. And if you would contribute to it, as I know you wish to do, then you will maintain always a high sense of patriotic and professional responsibility in the fulfillment of your duties. You will find your personal satisfactions in your profession by understanding your part in the perspective of the corps, in the larger perspective of the armed services, and in the perspective of the total interests of our country.

WASHINGTON, *March 1, 1955.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Recently, I had the opportunity to read your address of 19 February 1955 at the commissioning exercises of the 12th Officer Candidate Class, U.S. Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.

In my opinion, your explanation of "The Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy," is a valuable contribution to a better overall understanding of just how national policy is formulated. It certainly coincides with my concept of the traditional function of our military advisory role.

It is my hope that your speech becomes widely read. I congratulate you.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR RADFORD.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for his forthrightness in approaching on a national-security level this very sensitive national question.

I believe that sometimes we are inclined to judge the foreign reaction to pronouncements made in this country from the point of view of the way we would react to them, rather than to sense their effect in other parts of the globe. As has been obvious, in many parts of the world there is not the same proliferation of announcements, pronouncements, and statements from all levels of government or all levels of the citizenry, and thus it is that many statements which come from this country are seemingly overevaluated in other countries, or at least are accepted as being statements of new policy lines.

Thus, for us to indulge in a diversity of pronouncements of the type referred to in connection with this particular incident would, in my opinion, easily invoke, a misinterpretation or misunderstanding overseas of American policy.

So I am delighted that the Senator from Montana has emphasized the significance of this subject as a national-policy issue, rather than one involving the freedom of any particular person to speak.

However, I must confess that I suspect that there is some local purpose, as well, in this incident, because I am afraid that there are in our own ranks—I do not mean in this body; I refer to our country—those who believe that if one can flaunt in the face of the Russians strong words in oratorical outbursts, somehow he proves that our country is strong and has made a dent in the Soviet position, and that thus he is serving the best interests of our country. However, nothing could be further from the truth, for we only fool ourselves if we indulge in such fallacious thinking.

So I believe that the distinguished majority leader has properly brought into focus a keen perception of the importance of such a coordination of policy among all our officials, from the President on down, that must be undertaken with great zeal if we are to present a constructive and consistent foreign policy position before the rest of the world.

The fact that the incident referred to involved a member of the Military Establishment gives it more significance, I believe, than it would have if some of the military were only personally involved, because the person referred to was not personally only indulging in those statements, at all. In short, what is of greater significance is the possibility or likelihood that in the minds of persons in the rest of world, our military have acquired an extramilitary profile.

So, if necessary, I believe we should lean over backward in that respect, not only as a reminder to ourselves, as the majority leader has stated, but also as a reminder to other peoples, everywhere, in order to show that we are not a military people, but that, instead, civilian judgments and civilian policies still prevail in the United States.

I thank the Senator from Montana for the statement he has made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I believe the majority leader has rendered a very important public service in pointing out again and emphasizing to Members of the Senate and to all the people of our country the reasons why the President must speak and must direct, and that he—and he alone—can explain our foreign policy and has the duty of coordinating it.

Even in times of tranquillity, it would be very sad and, indeed, disrupting if some of our officials were to go off in 12 or 15 different directions, as I have seen occur in times past.

I think particularly at a time like this it is very important that America speak with one voice and that our citizens understand, as is provided so wisely by the Constitution, that the one voice must be that of the President of the United States.

Then, too, I think it is well the Senator has pointed out how important it is that there be civilian control over the military in the operation of our Nation. Merely because a person is an important military official, it does not follow that he has the right or the duty to differ with the policy of the President in matters of foreign policy, or that he should desire to do so.

I commend the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. It is well known in this country that, so far as the making and the stating of policy are concerned, they are the President's prerogative. So far as carrying out the policy is concerned, that is the duty of the military services. They do not make policy; they execute it.

I am happy again to emphasize for the RECORD that, so far as the speech by Admiral Burke was concerned, he did follow the precepts laid out in our military-civilian relationships. As I understand, he did present his speech to the White House and the State Department for consideration. They did give their advised opinions, and he did conform that speech to what they recommended.

What disturbs me is that in some way or other—and it was not in the White House—a copy of the original speech was "leaked." That, to me, has the same effect as if the speech had been delivered. Perhaps there are too many press agents in too many departments of the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I was very much impressed with the statement of our President in his state of the Union message that the Executive privilege would not be used to cover up mistakes. I think all of us who have served for so many years with our President know that he wants to give to the public the fullest information that can be given. I think his press conferences as carried over television and radio show that he wants to have the public fully informed. However, of course, it would be disastrous to any administration if we should have 10 or 12 people going off in as many different directions in matters of foreign policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I, too, want to join with our colleagues in commendation of the majority leader for the timeliness of his remarks. I call the attention of our colleagues to the fact that yesterday, over radio and television, when the President was asked a very frank question as to how he would characterize himself politically, he gave a very frank answer. He said he was the President, an elected President, he was a Democrat, and he was a responsible Democrat. The word "responsible" was emphasized. I think the President's action in reference to the statements of any of our leaders—in this instance of Admiral Burke, for whom I have great admiration—was one of responsibility.

As has been indicated on the floor of the Senate today the article of the Constitution which deals with the executive branch, the powers of the Presidency, while a very brief article, makes it explicit, without a shadow of a doubt, that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and that he is the chief spokesman of this Nation in matters of foreign policy. Therefore he must have cooperation; he must be able to exercise the role of the leader and to assure responsible statements.

My other comment is that if there is one thing this country can contribute to the world today at no cost either in material goods or in terms of our own self-interest, our pride, or our honor, it is to cease the use of the invective in matters affecting the Nation's interests. I do not think one proves he is an anti-Communist by the loudness of his denunciation of the evils of tyranny. I think one proves he is an anti-Communist when he understands the conspiratorial apparatus of the Communist machinery, and does the works of freedom. And the works of freedom do not require that one shout about the evils of totalitarianism.

We should presume that most people in this world love freedom; and the only way to bring them closer to the fulfillment of that freedom is by our precept and example.

We have gone through a period of time when the military has, by its very nature, and by the need of self-defense, been put into focus in the national spotlight. In other words, we know we must be strong militarily, and therefore the men in uniform today rank high in our esteem and respect, and they can claim a great deal of public attention.

But, by the same token, this Nation was built upon the principle of civilian authority. This is a country in which we believe in government by law, and not government by men. This is a nation in which the citizen is the honored being or the honored person. I am delighted that the President of the United States has again made it crystal clear to the world, first, that we can be the defender of freedom without constantly shouting the denunciation of the enemy or of Communists; and, second, that we can defend freedom and defend ourselves by having civilian authority as the paramount authority over the affairs of state. I join with all my colleagues in the recitation of the importance, again, of speaking softly and, as Teddy Roosevelt said, carrying a big stick, but also remembering that the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. No one doubts for a moment that this Nation and the free peoples of the world are in great danger and peril. I think I have every right to speak for those Senators on this side of the aisle when I say that we, as Senators, and the people of the United States, have one President, one Chief Executive, one who represents this country as President of the United States.

With respect to matters which concern the security of the American people, and the defense of their freedoms, there will be no division in this Chamber based upon any narrow partisanship. We are all Americans. Questions of national security, defense, and foreign policy will be debated, I have no doubt, in the future precisely as they have been within the past, when I have been permitted to sit here and listen and to participate in them.

In all the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, that gallant leader's hand was upheld on every rollcall in the Senate of our country, and upheld on a bipartisan basis. And I have no doubt that President Kennedy, who seeks precisely the same goals for our country as his predecessor sought, and in many respects using precisely the same techniques that his predecessor did, will be sustained, in the main, upon the same bipartisan basis.

I respect the Chief of Naval Operations. I doubt that history will record a more able, dedicated, patriotic naval officer than Admiral Burke. I have not read his prepared speech. I do not know in what fashion he was asked to change his original comment. I cannot, therefore, comment on the reasonableness of the requested or required changes.

I say to my friend, very frankly, that I respect and approve the theory that our government is and ought to be controlled by civilians, and not by the military. I suggest also that my friend will agree with me, as I can agree with much of what he has iterated, that there ought not to be any "gag rule" in America.

When our security is involved, the President should speak for the executive branch of the government, and we in the Senate should feel honorably free to express our own views, always in consonence with the national interest.

I presume that when members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff come to the Congress to speak with respect to professional military matters within their domain, they will be given the same free opportunity, under examination, and cross examination, to spread upon the RECORD their views, which they were required to iterate in days gone by.

In the whole question of security, Mr. President, I wish to God that every representative of the American Government serving under our able Chief Executive would always make it abundantly clear when he speaks for himself and himself alone, as distinct from when he speaks for the administration, because sometimes one in a position of prominence in this administration, or in any other administration, speaking out publicly upon a matter which concerns the security of the people of the Untied States, can indeed be misunderstood, and his words, though his own and his own alone, nevertheless can be interpreted around this globe—perhaps misinterpreted is the proper word—to represent the views of the American Government.

I do not like to see anyone in a position of authority speak off the cuff with respect to Communist China. The President of the United States, to his everlasting credit, did not in yesterday's television and press interview. He said in part:

> I think that anyone who reads the papers knows of the critical events in Laos, the Communist intervention in that area, and I think that they are aware of the fact that the situation in the Congo is deteriorating sharply recently, with the steady withdrawal of troops taking place by United Nations countries.

He also said:

> The Chinese Communist strength increases, the intervention by the Communists in these critical areas which I mentioned has grown greater, and, therefore, we have to consider whether in the light of this conditional threat, the strength we now have, not only our nuclear deterrent, but also our capacity for limited war, is sufficient. It is not intended as a criticism of any previous action by any previous administration, but merely is an attempt to meet our own responsibility at this time.

I respectfully suggest that our able and distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations should speak with precision—of which he is abundantly capable—and specific authority in the future with respect to comments on such a sensitive matter as that of our relations vis a vis Communist China. I regret his off-the-cuff comments of the other day.

I think also great credit is due President Kennedy for his remarks yesterday, when he was asked a question, to the effect "You made no comment, Mr. President, on Berlin. Some in Germany are apprehensive that that might mean a change of the American Government's position."

Forthrightly, as we have seen him do in the Senate on many occasions, the President of the United States said in effect, "Our policy has not changed. Our policy toward Berlin under the Eisenhower administration continues under this administration."

I say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], as great and able a Senator as sits in the Senate, that he will find no partisan politics here with respect to the security of the American people. If on occasion some of us on this side, or on the other side, see fit to criticize—and some have done so, and others will—it will be done out of an abundance of love for the American system, and it will be done out of a desire, on a bipartisan or nonpartisan basis, to help this administration succeed in the cause of security for the free people of the United States in a world at peace, a place with justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority whip for what he has said, and I assure him I agree that so far as we are all concerned there is no division when it comes to upholding of the hand of the President of the United States in the duties which are his under the Constitution.

I wish to have it understood that the purpose of my remarks today was not in any sense personal. I am concerned about the fact that we hear such terms as "censorship" and "gag," and that there are such things as "leaks," when there should be none. I think it is up to the Congress of the United States—both the House and the Senate—to reiterate time and time and time again that under our Constitution the civilian authority is supreme.

I will say, about Admiral Burke, the Chief of Naval Operations, and General White, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, that both of those men acted properly. Each referred his speech to the proper source so that it could be examined, to learn if there had been any violations of our positions. Each accepted the judgment rendered. In the case of General White's remarks, I understand there were no deletions. In the case of Admiral Burke's remarks, there were a few deletions.

Each man carried out the principles correctly and as he should.

It is the general approach, the idea which is embedded in the history of this country, which we must never forget—that is, at all times and on all occasions the civilian supremacy must be assured.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last year I had the privilege of serving as chairman of a subcommittee appointed

by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to conduct the study of military procurement required by section 4(a) of Public Law 86–89. The other members of this subcommittee were the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

After conducting the necessary hearings, the subcommittee formulated a report that was approved by the full committee and has been printed as Senate Report No. 1900, 86th Congress, 2d session. This report included nine specific recommendations that were brought to the attention of the Department of Defense with a request that the committee be furnished a report on the extent to which the recommendations were implemented. I have received a letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics, dated January 19, 1961, enclosing a report setting forth in detail the action taken by the Department of Defense on the recommmendations of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that this letter, with its enclosure, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. THURMOND. When the subcommittee and the full committee were considering these recommendations, the decision whether to legislate the recommendations or to make them in the form of suggested changes to the procurement regulations had to be made. A bill to effectuate the recommendations in the form of amendments to the Armed Services Procurement Act was referred to the committee. This bill would also have repealed the national emergency authority for the negotiation of contracts except during a national emergency proclaimed in the future.

The subcommittee recommended and the full committee agreed that the recommendations be in the form of suggested changes to the procurement regulations, and that the basic law should not be tampered with unless really fundamental changes were proposed.

I believe the wisdom of this approach has been demonstrated by events of this last fall. Substantially all the recommendations have been implemented. The national emergency exception remains available for use in carefully circumscribed circumstances. The continued availability of this national emergency exception has made possible the award in the United States of certain contracts that otherwise would have been awarded to foreign bidders. This action was taken by the Department of Defense as a part of a program to restrict the outward flow of gold. The amount that will be awarded in the United States for the remainder of calendar year 1961 under this policy is a minimum of $65 million. Since foreign bidders are excluded from the competition under these contracts, the conditions for formal advertising as set forth in section 2305 of title 10, United States Code, cannot be met. Except for the continued availability of the authority to negotiate contracts in a national emergency, it would have been impractical to restrict this business to companies in the United States. Such a restriction seems clearly desirable under present circumstances. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics, dated December 16, 1960, outlining the proposed use of the national emergency exception to accomplish this result, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

EXHIBIT I

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Procurement, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The report on procurement dated August 23, 1960, developed by your subcommittee, contained an analysis of certain aspects of the procurement process in the Department of Defense and included nine specific recommendations. The Department of Defense was requested to provide the committee with a report indicating the extent to which the recommendations for changes in defense procurement regulations have been implemented.

I am enclosing a report setting forth in detail the action which the Department of Defense has taken with respect to the recommendations of the committee. As will be seen from the attached report, the Department proposes to accommodate all of the recommendations of the committee, with the exception of one minor matter dealing with the requirement for written justification when negotiation procedures are used in the purchase of medicine or medical supplies and items for authorized resale.

I would like to express the appreciation of the Department of Defense for the assistance rendered by your subcommittee in its consideration of our procurement practices.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. WERBE, Jr.,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION PURSUANT TO RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE REPORT ON PROCUREMENT, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE

RECOMMENDATION I

The procurement regulations should be amended to state affirmatively a preference for formal advertising whenever this method is practicable.

Department of Defense action

The Armed Services Procurement Regulation was revised on October 2, 1960, to accommodate this recommendation. The text of the revision is as follows:

"1–300.2 Formal advertising: Purchases and contracts for supplies and services shall be made by formal advertising in all cases in which the use of such method is feasible and practicable under the existing conditions and circumstances. Procurement by formal advertising shall be in accordance with detailed requirements and procedures set forth in section II.

"3–102 General requirements for negotiation:

"(a) Procurement shall be made by formal advertising whenever such method is feasible and practicable under the existing conditions and circumstances even though negotiation may be authorized under part 2 of this section."

RECOMMENDATION II

The regulation governing the use of exception 14 should be revised to make clear that use of this exception should not be founded on avoidance of duplication of private investment unless this duplication could be shown to result in additional cost to the Government.

Department of Defense action

The Armed Services Procurement Regulation will be revised to accommodate this recommendation. The text of the revision in paragraph 3–214.2 is as follows:

"However, this exception should not be used to avoid duplication of private investment unless this duplication would be likely to result in additional cost to the Government."

ASPR paragraph 3–214.3 has been changed by adding:

"(A) Would be likely to result in additional cost to the Government by reason of duplication of investment, or

"(B) May require duplication of preparation already made which would unduly delay procurement."

RECOMMENDATION III

The regulation covering the conduct of negotiations should be changed to expand the requirement for discussions with offerors under negotiated procurements.

Department of Defense action

The Armed Services procurement regulation will be revised to accommodate this recommendation. The text of the revised regulation is as follows:

"3–101. Whenever supplies or services are to be procured by negotiation, price quotations (see sec. XVI, pt. 2), supported by statements and analyses of estimated costs or other evidence of reasonable prices and other vital matters deemed necessary by the contracting officer, shall be solicited from the maximum number of qualified sources of supplies or services consistent with the nature of and requirements for the supplies or services to be procured, in accordance with the basic policies set forth in section I, part 3, to the end that the procurement will be made to the best advantage of the Government, price and other factors considered. Negotiation shall thereupon be conducted, by contracting officers and their negotiators, with due attention being given to the following and any other appropriate factors.

"3–805. Selection of offerors for negotiation and award.

"3–805.1. General.

"(a) After receipt of initial proposals, written or oral discussions shall be conducted with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within a competitive range, price and other factors considered, except that this requirement need not necessarily be applied to:

"(i) procurements not in excess of $2,500;

"(ii) procurements in which prices or rates are fixed by law or regulations;

"(iii) procurements in which time of delivery will not permit such discussions;

"(iv) procurements of the set-aside portion of partial set-asides or by small business restricted advertising;

"(v) procurements in which it can be clearly demonstrated from the existence of adequate competition or accurate prior cost experience with the product or service that acceptance of the most favorable initial proposal without discussion would result in a fair and reasonable price. *Provided, however,* that in such procurements, the request for proposals shall notify all offerors of the possibility that award may be made without discussion of proposals received and hence, that proposals should be submitted initially

on the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint which the offeror can submit to the Government."

RECOMMENDATION IV

The regulation on incentive contracts should be amended to require a contractual provision permitting adjustment of the target cost to exclude any amounts by which the target cost was increased because of inaccurate, incomplete, or out-of-date cost data submitted by the contractor.

Department of Defense action

While this recommendation is directed at incentive contracts, the Department of Defense feels that the underlying purpose of a contract adjustment provision should be recognized without regard to a particular type of contract involved. With this in mind, the ASPR regulation will be changed by adding the following provision:

"The following clause shall be inserted in any negotiated fixed-price type contract which is expected to exceed $100,000, unless the contract price is based mainly on adequate price competition, established catalogue or market prices, or prices set by law or regulation, and may be inserted in other contracts or modified to apply to additional subcontracts (including lower-tier subcontracts) where the contracting officer considers that the circumstances of the particular case warrant such action.

"Price Reduction for Defective Pricing Data

"(a) If the contracting officer determines that any price negotiated in connection with this contract was overstated because the contractor, or any first-tier subcontractor in connection with a subcontract covered by (c) below, either (i) failed to disclose any significant and reasonably available cost or pricing data, or (ii) furnished any significant cost or pricing data which he knew or reasonably should have known was false or misleading, then such price shall be equitably reduced and the contract shall be modified in writing accordingly.

"(b) Failure to agree on an equitable reduction shall be a dispute concerning a question of fact within the meaning of the 'disputes' clause of this contract.

"(c) The contractor agrees to insert the substance of paragraph (a) of this clause in any of his subcontracts hereunder in excess of $100,000, unless the price is based on adequate price competition, established catalog or market prices, or prices set by law or regulation."

RECOMMENDATION V

The procurement regulations should be amended to require more specific determinations and findings.

Department of Defense action

The armed services procurement regulation will be changed to accommodate this recommendation by adding the following:

"Each determination and findings prepared in accordance with departmental procedures shall set out enough facts and circumstances to justify clearly the specific determination made. Each determination and findings for authority to negotiate either an individual contract or a class of contracts shall clearly indicate that the use of formal advertising would be impracticable and the reasons therefor."

RECOMMENDATION VI

The regulations should be expanded to include a requirement for written findings before certain of the exceptions may be used to negotiate contracts.

Department of Defense action

Technical changes are being made in the armed services procurement regulation to require written findings prior to the use of exceptions 2, 10, 11, and 12 as recommended in the committee report.

The Department of Defense has considered very carefully whether it should mandatorily require written findings with respect to exception 7 (medicine or medical supplies) and exception 8 (purchases for authorized resale). These exceptions generate a considerable volume of individual procurement actions. The Department feels that the change in ASPR requiring the use of formal advertising, where feasible and practicable, has introduced a new and important restriction on the use of the medical and resale exceptions. This requirement should produce the result which the committee seeks in this area. The further requirement for a written justification adds the requirement for a specific kind of documentation for the decision taken. It is our view that the imposition of written findings in this area would not produce a meaningful result and would introduce a very heavy administrative burden on Defense contracting officers. For these reasons, the Department of Defense does not propose to require written findings when negotiation exceptions 7 and 8 are utilized.

RECOMMENDATION VII

The departments should continue their efforts to develop adequate specifications and to use those that have been developed in an attempt to make practical more procurement by formal advertising.

Department of Defense action

Under the Defense standardization program, the development, distribution, and application of specifications continues to receive priority attention. The Defense Standardization Manual contains policy guidelines to the effect that specifications should establish requirements, insofar as is practicable, in terms of performance. This policy has been adopted in order to permit the solicitation of bids from the largest segment of industry. All elements of the Department of Defense have been made aware of the need for the development of specifications which will increase competition and make practical more procurement by formal advertising. A program has been placed into effect in order to make maximum use of industry specifications that are suitable for military use. We expect that this program will increase considerably the number of items procured under specifications. Additionally, a consolidated index of specifications and standards is being issued. This index will, for the first time, contain all military specifications and standards and those Federal specifications and standards approved for military use.

RECOMMENDATION VIII

The departments and prime contractors should continue efforts to publicize the prospective awarding of subcontracts in an attempt to secure more competition.

Department of Defense action

The Department of Defense is continuing to encourage prime contractors and subcontractors to use the Department of Commerce Synopsis to publicize opportunities in the field of subcontracting stemming from their Defense business. In October 1960 the Armed Services Procurement Regulation was amended to further encourage this activity. A copy of the current regulation is set forth below:

"1–1003.3. Synopses of subcontract opportunities: Prime contractors and subcontractors should be encouraged to use the Department of Commerce Synopsis to publicize opportunities in the field of subcontracting stemming from their Defense business. Prime contractors and their subcontractors will be advised to mail subcontract information directly to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1300, 433 W. Van Buren St., Chicago 7, Ill., under the heading 'Subcontracting Assistance Wanted' and in the form of the following example: XYZ Co., Attn. John Z. Smith, Tele. No. Randolph 6–1111, 102 First Avenue, Chicago, Ill., seeks subcontractor on items to be used in connection with contract No. — awarded May 1, 1960. Coils, induction, DWG. No. 10–742 ——— 10,000 ea.

"(Name, description and quantity of other items or services may be included as long as contract assistance is desired under the same contract number.) If interested, make inquiry before May 16, 1950 to above contractor."

RECOMMENDATION IX

The departments should continue the emphasis that is being placed on the training of procurement personnel.

Department of Defense action

Reports from the military departments indicate that the training of procurement personnel is continuing and that greater emphasis of this activity is planned for future fiscal years. It is estimated that over 3,000 officers and civilians will attend one or more procurement courses during fiscal year 1961. Specific facts with respect to the current and planned programs of each military department are set forth below:

The Air Force

In fiscal year 1960, 943 Air Force procurement personnel students received procurement training under the AFIT program. In addition, 50 students attended a special course for 14 weeks duration in advanced pricing which was conducted for the Air Force under contract by Harbridge House, Inc. During fiscal year 1961, 1,000 students are scheduled for training in the AFIT program.

The procurement training structure within the Air Force is described as follows:

1. Basic.
2. Technical.
3. General.

The basic or initial indoctrination course for selected officers and civilians is provided for by the 6-week procurement officers' course conducted at Amarillo Air Force Base. This phase of the overall procurement training program is under the jurisdiction of the Air Training Command. It has been in operation since February 1955, and has graduated a total of 748 students to date. The programed output for fiscal year 1961 is 89. The mission, composition, and adequacy of this course is constantly being evaluated against the Air Force's actual requirement. It is expected that the Air Force will have an indefinite requirement for this course.

A 6-week procurement specialists' course for airmen and civilians, also conducted by the Air Training Command, was started in 1957 at F. E. Warren Air Force Base. This course went on standby status on October 7, 1958, due to the fact that all Air Force requirements in this category had been met. This course was reactivated at Amarillo Air Force Base on July 1, 1959. In fiscal year 1960, 149 students took this course; 179 students are programed for fiscal year 1961.

Additionally, the Air Force maintains operator level proficiency and provides training which is complementary to career progression by eight regularly scheduled technical courses which are now under the jurisdiction of the Air Force Institute of Technology.

Additional training is obtained for Air Force personnel by attending procurement courses conducted by the other services. The Air Force reciprocates and sets aside quotas in the procurement officers' course and in the AFIT program for the Army and Navy. The procurement law course conducted by the Army Judge Advocate General at Charlottesville, Va., has taken on the aspects of a joint service school. The Air Force has furnished guest lecturers from the USAF General Counsel's Office, and personnel from headquarters USAF and AMC have attended the course.

A procurement local training program is being developed for use in Air Force procurement locations worldwide. The goal is to provide, for field use, a series of how-to-do courses for all procurement and production functions. The course material will be designed for classroom use or individual study. Major courses will include buying, contract administration, pricing, and production. Each major course will consist of a series of independent subcourses. In contract administration, for example, 25 subcourses will be developed in such areas as production administration, facility contracts, industrial property control, spares provisioning procedures, fund accounting and control, and purchase system surveys.

The Navy

Particular attention is being given in Navy training course presentations to the achievement of cost reductions and savings through improved negotiation and pricing practices. For example, the importance of closer scrutiny in the area of subcontracting, as a source for cost reductions and procurement savings, is being emphasized.

These continuing programs are designed to increase both the efficiency of assigned personnel and to train replacement personnel. Currently, five courses are being presented. The "Navy procurement course" provides instruction in laws, regulations, philosophies, and practices of Navy procurement at the intermediate and advanced levels, which includes all military and civilian (GS–9 and above) personnel in procurement assignments. As of June 30, 1960, 257 students have been trained, and 1700 remain to be trained at an estimated rate of 325 per year. The "Navy procurement management for technical personnel course" provides training in the regulations and philosophies of Navy procurement, with emphasis of the impact of technical decisions on pricing. This course is designed for military and civilian (GS–9 and above) personnel engaged in the specification, planning, and requirement aspects of the procurement process. During fiscal year 1961, 140 students have been trained with a remaining 2,000 to be trained at an estimated rate of 700 per year. The "Navy price analysis course" provides instruction in the fundamentals and applications of price analysis techniques, and is designed for negotiators, contract administrators, and material inspection personnel who serve as advisers in the pricing of contracts. Thus far in fiscal year 1961, 175 students have been trained with a remaining 725 to be trained at an estimated rate of 300 per year. The "Navy contract administration course" provides for instruction in the principles and practices of contract administration, and is designed for military and civilian (GS–7 and above) personnel including lawyers, auditors, negotiators, and contract administrators. Thus far in fiscal year 1961, 267 students have been trained with 733 remaining to be trained at an estimated rate of 250 per year. The "Navy property administration course" concerns the administration of Government-owned property in the possession of contractors, and is designed for military and civilian (GS–9 and above) personnel. This course commenced in September 1960, and it is anticipated that all property administrators (216) will attend during the remainder of fiscal year 1961.

An additional course is being developed under this program, which will offer negotiators the opportunity to analyze the art and techniques of contract negotiation and to develop desirable principles and practices. This course is expected to improve the quality of negotiations within the Navy, and, thereby, result in real cost savings in procurement.

The Army

The Army overall has a procurement work force of about 550 officers and 7,200 civilians. To insure the competence of this work force, it is essential that the Army provide the kinds of education that are necessary to supplement the practical experience of the officers and civilians engaged in procurement work. In general, we provide three levels of training: basic, intermediate, and advanced. Considering the courses devoted exclusively to procurement we have, on the fundamental level, the Quartermaster School at Fort Lee. Here, there is offered a 4-week basic procurement course for purchasing and contracting officers. This course has a capacity of 40 students and is conducted 8 times each year. The instruction prepares an officer or civilian for a procurement job at the post, camp, or station level.

For more advanced training, the U.S. Army Logistics Management Center conducts an 8-week procurement management course. This course has a capacity of 80 students and is conducted 4 times a year. All key contracting officers must attend this course. The instruction covers formal advertising versus negotiation, evaluation of prices, contract administration, financing procurement, and related subjects.

The Army Judge Advocate General also conducts a procurement law course at the University of Virginia. It covers all facets of procurement law and is attended by officers and civilians of the three military departments. In addition, the Army conducts a course in contract termination at the JAG School, University of Virgina.

The Army has also developed correspondence courses and provides this material to both officer and civilian employees through the Logistics Management Center at Fort Lee. These correspondence courses cover such subjects as procurement methods, contract clauses, contract administration, the legal principle involved in procurement, and industrial mobilization.

Additionally, the Army selects some career officers for attendance full time at Graduate Business Administration courses at several universities. The subjects which are taken have a direct relationship to the procurement operation. Additionally, there are many on-the-job training programs conducted by the technical services and within the Army commands. It is estimated that in the areas of procurement and logistics that the Army trains between 1,100 and 1,200 personnel annually. These programs are expected to continue.

EXHIBIT II

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the President's directive of November 17, 1960, concerning steps to be taken with respect to the U.S. balance of payments problem, the Secretary of Defense has recently directed the Secretaries of the military departments to reduce by a very substantial amount planned purchases abroad during calendar year 1961 of supplies and services for use in oversea areas. Under this directive certain proposed purchases will be returned to the United States and be made with domestic suppliers only. A copy of the Secretary of Defense's memorandum directing this action is enclosed for your information.

This memorandum requires in connection with such purchases that maximum practicable competition be obtained. However, foreign bidders will be excluded. It is our opinion that because competition will be restricted to the extent of excluding foreign bidders, the conditions for formal advertising as set forth in section 2305 of title 10, United States Code, cannot be met. Furthermore, since the purchases are for supplies and services for use abroad, the Buy American Act (10 U.S.C. 10a–d) is not applicable. These conclusions are supported by the General Accounting Office based on informal discussions.

Hence, in proceeding to make these purchases from domestic suppliers only, it will be necessary, where the negotiation authority of clauses (2) through (17) of section 2304(a) would not otherwise be used, to cite clause (1) of section 2304(a) as the basis for such purchases. Clause (1) of that section, as you know, authorizes the negotiation of contracts where deemed in the public interest during a national emergency declared by the Congress or the President.

I wish to stress that though it is contemplated that clause (1) of section 2304(a) will be cited in many instances in making these purchases, maximum competition will be solicited from domestic suppliers. It is only because foreign competitors are excluded from bidding that such purchases cannot be made on a formally advertised basis in the sense contemplated by section 2305 of title 10. I also wish to stress that its proposed use will only be in connection with procurements of supplies or services for use abroad which otherwise would have been made by our oversea purchasing activities using the authority of clause (6) of section 2304(a).

Because of the interest which your committee has expressed in this area in the past and because the use of clause (1) as set forth above is a broadening of the restrictions which have been imposed by this Department since 1956 on the use of this authority, I wish to apprise you of the situation. As required in the Secretary's memorandum enclosed, periodic reports on such use will be made by the military departments and will be reviewed carefully by this Office.

I am informed that the General Accounting Office has no objection to the use of this authority for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

PERKINS MCGUIRE.

WELFARE STATE AS DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 31, the United Press International quotes Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Presidential assistant and speechwriter, as asserting that the welfare state is the best defense against communism. While the news report states that Mr. Schlesinger emphasizes that he was speaking as an individual and not for the Kennedy administration, this marks the first time, to my knowledge, that a person in such an influential position in Government has made such an admission. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY AID CALLS WELFARE STATE BEST DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM

NEWTON, MASS., January 31.—A welfare state is the best defense against communism, Presidential Assistant Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., said last night.

The Harvard history professor, in a debate with William F. Buckley, Jr., emphasized he was speaking as a private citizen and not as a spokesman for the Kennedy administration.

He and Buckley, a Yale professor and editor of the magazine, the National Review, debated the topic, "Freedom and the Welfare State" at Newton College of the Sacred Heart.

Buckley, a noted conservative, charged Schlesinger with twisting history when

"history inconvenienced him. * * *." He said growing governmental power was "a danger inside a person because it controls his thinking."

Schlesinger said he envisioned the welfare state as one that would provide basic elements for its citizens, such as food, clothing, shelter, education, and opportunity.

Mr. THURMOND. Not only is the welfare state no defense against communism, but there is a serious question as to whether, in practical effect, the welfare state is even an alternative to communism. Both, in essence, are founded on the identical theories of state socialism and are equally antagonistic to the concept of private property. Under communism all property is vested in the state; under the welfare state, the outward vestiges or title to property remain in the individual, but all meaningful attributes of property are exercised by the state through regulation, control, and taxation. Whatever differences might exist are differences in form, rather than substance. The basic premise of both communism and welfare statism is that individual responsibility and initiative are unreliable for accomplishment of the goal for society which both profess, and their goal is conceived solely in terms of materialistic values. Welfare statism must, therefore, be equated with communism in its mistrust of individual liberty and reliance on State control.

If Mr. Schlesinger really meant to imply that we could avert communism by embracing welfare statism, then he is probably correct; for it is improbable that efforts to replace a political system with an identical one under another name, or with one differing only in form, would even be attempted. A defense against communism, however, the welfare state could not be; for between the two, there may be a distinction, but it is a distinction without a difference.

THE ICBM THREAT AND DEFENSE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today, many nations throughout the world are swayed by Soviet promises of coexistence and offers of assistance. The continued Communist thrusts at vital economic areas and underdeveloped countries, floundering on the sea of internal disorder, reemphasizes the fact that the Soviet goal is really world domination by any means. For those who face the facts the Red-written record is clear. And it has been starkly clear since the first unfurling of the Communist banner against God and man. Make no mistake; since that convulsive event, Christian civilization and communism have been locked in a struggle to the finish. Whether the future brings general war, limited war, or only continuing international tension depends upon our action—now and for the next few months.

Too many so-called experts would have you believe that our only course of action is one of countering each move that the Kremlin makes. Mr. President, this is a negative approach and not enough. Regardless of whether the condition is military, economic, or political, this action by itself can only avert disaster by expensive means. A more positive approach with clearly defined objectives is required.

We must always remember that America is the champion of individual freedom and free enterprise. Just as in boxing, the champion is always under close scrutiny for weaknesses that a challenger can exploit. Only so long as we are alert, and strong economically, intellectually, and militarily, will we continue to be the leader of the free world in this relentless struggle to keep men, societies, and nations from becoming enslaved by Communist masters.

All new incidents initiated by the Soviet leaders have resulted only after extensive analysis of our capabilities and attitudes. Insofar as military action is concerned, this resolves itself to two very simple questions.

First, how succesful will the Communist attack be?

And, second, what will be the Communist losses in retaliation?

Since communism and Communist leaders have no respect for human rights, international law, or the other institutions of a free society, answers to these two questions determine the basic decision and the courses of action for implementation of the decision. A condition favorable for the U.S.S.R. in answer to both of these questions must prevail for offensive action. A favorable answer for one alone is not enough.

Therefore, it is clear to me that the initiative to maintain peace rests with the free world and especially with the United States. If the Soviet leaders are convinced that their attacks will fail or that their losses in retaliation will be prohibitive, peace will continue. And it is our sacred obligation to insure that their attacks will fail, and that they will receive retaliation promptly; and that these capabilities are known beyond the possibility of misinterpretation by the Soviet-Sino bloc.

For many years now we have had the most potent strategic retaliatory forces in the world for use in the event of an all-out general war. Their versatility is being improved with the addition of Polaris and nuclear-powered submarines and ICBM missiles. It appears that our plans for maintaining these potent forces are receiving adequate attention.

Mr. President, these forces are not enough. Just because we have adequate retaliatory forces is not sufficient reason to disregard or to downgrade consideration of the question "How successful will the Communist attack be?" We cannot rest on our oars just because we are half safe.

Our country must stand ready with adequate forces to meet any Communist attack, whether it be limited armed conflict or an all-out general war. Today I am not going to discuss further the dire need for a rapid improvement in our limited war capability, but rather I want to focus attention on a general war capability that has been neglected too long.

Since we know that we are primarily concerned with slave masters who know no honor, then we also know that the time and place of any future nuclear attack on this country will not be of our choosing. Under this condition what are our chances of survival? Your guess Mr. President, is as good as mine. However, I do know that the nation that first develops and deploys a system to defend against the threat of intercontinental or submarine-launched ballistic missiles will enjoy a definite strategic advantage. That same nation will also greatly enhance its chances for survival. If such a defense is first developed by Russia, we can expect military action or threats of action almost beyond imagination. The Soviets will no longer be content with economic, political, psychological, and limited war offensives.

Since the development of an adequate defense against ballistic missiles is necessary to gain a major military advantage in the near future, I feel confident that it is high on the Soviet list of priorities for development. To think otherwise would be folly.

Our need for an adequate defense becomes even more critical when one considers the rapid spread of nuclear and missile knowledge to countries other than the United States and the U.S.S.R. Within a very short time many smaller nations—or Soviet satellites—could deliberately or accidentally provoke war with a small nuclear attack.

Some have advocated that we can get an adequate defense against the ballistic missile by the wholesale use of fallout shelters. Passive defensive measures are useful—and we must do more in this regard—but I have yet to see them win a war. The fatal mistake of the French, prior to World War II, was to buy this scheme when aggressive offensive action was available for less than the cost of the Maginot line. I can never accept more, bigger, and better shelters as the only way to preserve our way of life from incoming missiles.

Today, Russia and the West are racing to advance military technology, with a concentration of resources approached in the past only in wartime. If we should fail to grasp the military possibilities or hesitate too long to develop the potential of each new advance in technology we will lose valuable time that cannot be regained in the race for survival. There is no prize for second place.

Therefore, it is imperative that we exploit every possibility to maintain the peace in years to come.

The same experienced Army-industry team which successfully developed the currently operational Army Air Defense weapons systems—the Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules—now girding America's great centers of population and industry, has risen to the occasion again. Mr. President, you will no doubt recall that Nike-Ajax was the first guided missile developed to defend American cities, defense installations, and our people against air attack. Next was the greatly improved version—Nike-Hercules—which can defeat the manned aircraft in any operational atmosphere. This is up to and beyond 100,000 feet. And, the Hercules has proved capable of destroying incoming Army missiles in test flight. This dependable team has now achieved an advanced stage for the Nike-Zeus. This is the only intercontinental ballistic missile defense system under active de-

velopment by any nation in the free world. The many successful component tests to date should prove to the satisfaction of all that the Nike-Zeus weapons system unquestionably is a practical concept. The best scientific and engineering talent of the Army, Western Electric Co., Bell Telephone Laboratories, Douglas Aircraft Co., and others have devoted their best efforts to develop this advanced weapons system. The recent missile-against-missile firings by the Army have shown the early skeptics that once a missile is launched, it flies a ballistic trajectory that is really the same as going down a one-way street. Its interception is therefore predictable and probable.

I am convinced, from the development tests of the components to date, that the Nike-Zeus can provide the defense this Nation needs to meet and master the intercontinental ballistic missile threat. Components of the Nike-Zeus system have been developed and tested in accord with the time schedule established some 3 years ago. Major elements of the system, including the missile itself, have been successfully tested. These facts are adequate testimonial to the competence of all participants.

The critical question now is when can we get the Nike-Zeus into production and deployed to provide the defense that is mandatory. We have already lost valuable time by postponing component production and we cannot afford further delay.

It may well be asked why should we start component production now before the complete system has been tested? The answer is twofold; it saves money and it saves time.

By spending money now to provide a capability for the production of components in quantity, we will save money in the long run. Many of the components are expensive when made in limited quantities by hand. When a quantity production capability is available, the components can be made much less expensively and they can also be used to advantage in other weapon and equipment programs.

The ballistic missile threat dictates that we reduce leadtime to an irreducible minimum. The transition from development to deployment on the sites begins with component production. Delay in a decision at this time on this matter makes it more difficult to keep the Army-industry team and facilities together to field an operational system, and greatly increases the time we will be without an adequate defense.

Former Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker emphasized the importance of speeding Nike-Zeus development and production with the following statement made on August 8, 1960:

> Our Nation needs an active defense against the intercontinental ballistic missile.
>
> I firmly believe the first country to achieve a practical defense against ballistic missiles will gain not only a tremendous psychological advantage but more importantly a very great military advantage.

Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, the Army's very talented and dedicated Chief of Research and Development and a leading advocate of the Nike-Zeus, recently made the following comment on the importance of this vital project:

> We must face [the fact] that if we want a missile defense system in this decade, Zeus is the only answer known to the free world. I would like to be able to hit enemy ICBM's on the launching pad. I'd like to hit them as they come out of the factory door. But today Zeus is the only practical system.

In effect, Mr. President, what the Army needs now is the authority and money to go into production of components. This is essentially what a building contractor does when he starts procuring cement, sand, gravel, lumber, and other materials before building a large structure.

We can have the Nike-Zeus protection for less than the cost of rebuilding a single city or industrial complex. The cost is comparable to the cost of weapons systems developed in the past. And when the human lives at stake are added to these facts, the answer is clear and emphatic. We must start production of the Nike-Zeus now. Further delay increases our risk. We can no longer run the risk of being half safe.

I agree with General Trudeau's recent statement "That it is a lot safer and, in the long run, cheaper to build weapons and not use them than it is to need weapons and not have them."

Mr. President, in order to provide more specific information to the Senate on the Nike-Zeus program, I call attention to two articles published in the January 30, 1961, issue of Missiles and Rockets, the missile space weekly magazine, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one article is a special report entitled "Nike-Zeus Now?" by the distinguished author and defense reporter, James Baar. The other is an editorial entitled "The Nike-Zeus Team."

The special report gives many important facts and figures concerning the Zeus program, pointing out that the future of this program poses for President Kennedy one of the most critical decisons requiring his immediate attention. The editorial points up the importance of an immediate decision on production of Zeus.

NIKE-ZEUS NOW?

(By James Baar)

EIGHT-MILLION-DOLLAR INVESTMENT GETS STRONG BACKING

If Kennedy acts this winter, the North American Defense Command can be expected to begin manning Zeus batteries in early 1964.

That would be more than a year later than would have been possible under the Army's original plan rejected by President Eisenhower.

It would be more than a year earlier than will be possible if Kennedy follows the Eisenhower plan to withhold production money until testing is completed in 1962.

The revised cost of producing and deploying a Zeus network to protect the Nation's strategic forces and the majority of the U.S. population is estimated to be about $8 billion—a figure lowered considerably in the last year through technical advances in the Zeus system.

The initial cost is estimated at about $270 million for the first year.

Three-headed problem

Essentially, there are three factors involved in the decision facing Kennedy:

The first is technical. The Army and its technical experts have insisted since late 1959 that the Zeus system is technically assured and ready to go into production on a concurrent basis with the end of the R. & D. program. A number of experts outside the Army, including several in key positions, have questioned this.

The second factor is economic. The Zeus R. & D. program including obligations planned in the fiscal year 1962 budget proposed by Eisenhower already has cost more than $1 billion. Previous estimates of the cost of deploying Zeus have run as high as $13 billion to $15 billion.

The third factor is strategic. Many military leaders outside the Army contend that the billions of dollars needed for Zeus would be better spent on increasing the size of the U.S. arsenal of strategic striking forces. Army leaders counter that without Zeus the Soviets are being offered a "free ride"; that Zeus would increase tremendously the number of ICBM's the Russians would need for a big war—thereby greatly augmenting U.S. deterrent strength.

All three factors were weighed during the closing months of the Eisenhower administration by an ad hoc Zeus committee set up by Richard S. Morse, director of Army research and development. The committee included key representatives of Defense R. & E. Director Herbert York and then Presidential Science Adviser George Kistiakowsky. Both York and Kistiakowsky have been leading opponents of committing Zeus to production.

Objections overruled

The committee found that during the last year the Zeus R. & D. program has remained on schedule; both its time schedule and its dollar schedule. At the same time, many of the previously questioned technical solutions to the problem of finding, tracking, and destroying incoming ICBM warheads were proven to the committee's general satisfaction.

Moreover, two major theoretical arguments that have been used against Zeus were determined to have been generally vitiated.

One has been the question whether Zeus could discriminate between real warheads and decoys that looked and acted exactly like warheads.

The Army's answer is that after several years of study the only thing that anyone has been able to find that looks and acts exactly like a warhead is another warhead. As one Army official put it: "We can contend with any decoys that anyone in this country can prove to be feasible. We are as advanced as the threat—and more."

A second major theoretical argument that has been used against Zeus is the strong belief among a number of scientists that there must be a cheaper and more effective method. For example, destroying an ICBM during its launch phase or intercepting it with a ray or a cloud of particles.

The Army's answer is that ARPA has spent some $300 million on Project Defender during the last 2 years and so far has found no feasible alternate to Zeus.

Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, chief of Army R. & D. and a leading advocacy of Zeus, recently commented bluntly:

"We must face that if we want a missile defense system in this decade Zeus is the only answer known to the free world. I would like to be able to hit enemy ICBM's on the launching pad. I'd like to hit them as

they come out of the factory door. But today Zeus is the only practical system."

In the field of military strategy, the committee particularly considered increasing military demands for an active antimissile defense. One of the principal leaders in making these is Air Force Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, commander of Norad.

Finally, the committee read recent intelligence reports that the Soviets have an antimissile missile under development.

Recommendation unavailing

In the end, the committee recommended to MORSE that the Army should immediately begin production of Nike-Zeus on an interim basis. The report was passed on to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, but no change in policy resulted.

The final Eisenhower budget called only for obligating about $250 million more in fiscal year 1962 for Zeus to complete the test program. There was no money for production. Moreover, Eisenhower stated flatly in his budget message:

"Funds should not be committed to production until development tests are satisfactorily completed."

The "interim" production program proposed by the committee is based on the minimum number of batteries that it would be feasible to manufacture.

The cost the first year would be about $270 million. The cost the second would be about twice as much.

Such a program would offer two considerable advantages: It could be expanded after the first year to the full program sought by Norad without any loss of time. It could be greatly expanded after 2 years with only some loss of time. Deployment of the first batteries still would be possible in 1964.

Essentially, the committee's recommendation is saying that the saving of nearly 2 years in time is worth the investment of about three-quarters of a billion dollars.

"If you never went beyond the interim program at all, Zeus would be highly useful," one Army official argued recently. "At the very least you would have some means of taking care of mistakes.

"The odds are that sooner or later one of these ICBM's is going to get loose and then what do you do? Even a limited number of Zeus batteries would solve the problem."

The big question

But such considerations are merely side issues. The central issue before Kennedy is whether he considers Zeus' strategic value in the cold war worth the price.

One way of weighing Zeus' strategic value is to consider what would happen to the East-West arms balance if Russia had it.

Zeus is considered capable of intercepting a sizable majority of all oncoming ICBM's. But granting it only an effectiveness of 50 percent would mean that if Russia deployed it the United States would have to expand its strategic striking forces tremendously in order to maintain even the present narrow margin of deterrence.

Moreover, the introduction of an antimissile system into the already complicated deterrence equation would introduce a new element of doubt of great value and significance.

As of today, the ICBM is unstoppable once launched. Therefore, all calculations as to its effectiveness are based on its technical reliability. Active defense measures do not have to be considered as they have had to be for years in the case of strategic bombers.

An antimissile missile would change that completely. The element of attrition over the target would become a fact that would have to be again faced by military strategists for all of their weapons.

GREAT PROMISE

This is the kind of military thinking that has been behind the repeated pleas by General Kuter for beginning the production of Zeus.

"Our most immediate and pressing requirement in aerospace defense is for a defense against the intercontinental ballistic missile," he said last April.

"Opinions regarding the Soviet operational ICBM inventory vary only in number. In the face of this known threat, a threat that could be unleashed by a decision of Soviet leaders, there is a clear requirement for more positive thinking by the scientific community and more positive action in development, construction, and placement of an effective anti-ICBM defense system in the Norad operational inventory."

Then, turning to Zeus, Kuter added:

"This project has shown great promise in its research and development program. The Department of Defense has announced future firing tests of Zeus against ICBM targets of the Atlas and Titan types. Norad expects these tests will be successful and has urged the initiation of production."

On January 6 Kuter said essentially the same thing.

Few military leaders agree more than General Trudeau. As he succinctly put it:

"We dare not become so criminally complacent that we don't even try to defend ourselves."

Interest grows

Regardless of what Kennedy may do about Zeus, there is increasing interest in the program in Congress. As the capabilities of the Zeus system become more apparent, it becomes more difficult for opponents to justify delaying production. At the same time, public statements by military leaders have led to a growing awareness of a need for some active defense against the ICBM.

A number of early hearings by various congressional committees are already being considered.

As always, one of the key factors will be cost. But even the sting of that has been mitigated somewhat by the wide circulation of figures showing what the United States has spent in the last decade for defense against the nearly obsolescent Soviet bomber threat.

In the last several years alone, the Pentagon has spent an average of about $3 billion a year on air defense not including Zeus R. & D. In the last decade, air defense costs have totaled nearly $35 billion.

All factors considered, the chances for a go-ahead for Zeus production this year appear to be good.

The basic reason was perhaps best summed up last month by Lt. Gen. Robert Wood, chief of Army air defenses, when he said in a speech:

"In the hands of the Russian (Zeus), would be carte blanche power for blackmail that might make us reconsider our retort of years ago to Barbary pirates about 'not 1 cent for tribute.' We might pay dearly, for our very lives and freedom are at stake."

THE NIKE-ZEUS TEAM

The Kennedy administration is faced with a major decision on the Nike-Zeus program—concurrency or caution?

The urgent need for that decision is spelled out in the article by Defense Editor James Baar which leads off the special Nike-Zeus report beginning on page 26 of this issue. The arguments for and against are clear. The decision should be made promptly.

Three months of editorial planning and thousands of miles of travel went into this 22-page special report. Missiles and Rockets editors visited Nike-Zeus facilities throughout the Nation, talked to military experts concerned with the program and to dozens of the contractors and subcontractors working on the system. The result is the most comprehensive public report yet made on this controversial weapon system.

We are indebted to the Army and to the contractors for the full cooperation which made this possible.

Two things about the program particularly impressed us. One is the absolute confidence at every technical level that the Nike-Zeus system will work. If that confidence is justified, we can all sleep better at night. The other is the need for an immediate decision on production.

"How long can you hold a team together?" asked one manager. This was echoed elsewhere. In many ways, the Nike-Zeus team is the most experienced ever to work on a missile system. Nike-Ajax and Hercules provided valuable background. If a decision is delayed much longer, this team will begin to break up and drift away from the program. That would be tragic.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] regarding the Nike-Zeus program. It is a program with which I am thoroughly familiar, and I have been from the time of its inception. I have been in all the plants in which the test projects are being manufactured. I am informed—reliably, I believe—that this is the only antimissile missile that the U.S. Government has today, even in the test area. I am also informed—and also reliably, I believe—that it would take 2 years, even if at this time there were authorization for it, to commence the construction of this antimissile missile.

I believe that all of us realize that if trouble comes to us from abroad, it will come by means of missiles. So certainly we need this antimissile weapon, in order to keep such missiles from landing in our territory.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to support the excellent remarks made today by the Senator from South Carolina and his recommendation that the Nike-Zeus program be initiated at once and put into full production.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina in regard to the Nike-Zeus program. I have studied it, and am familiar with it; and I believe it is a program which, from the standpoint of our defense, we should get underway at the earliest possible opportunity. So I hope the Defense Department will promptly take action on it.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND GROWTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 81)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the program for economic recovery and growth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message from the President be printed in the RECORD without reading, and that the message be referred to the appropriate committees having jurisdiction over the subject matters contained therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in his press and television conference yesterday, President Kennedy made the following statement:

Third, I'm announcing that there are going to be set up five pilot projects for food stamp distribution, and that these will be in areas of maximum chronic unemployment. All the areas have not yet been determined, but one will be in West Virginia, one in Pennsylvania, one in southern Illinois, and the other in eastern Kentucky, with a fifth yet to be determined.

It has now been announced that the fifth area will be in Detroit; and I am happy to note that a sixth has been designated in the State of Minnesota, particularly in the areas of distress in the northeastern part of our State.

I was highly pleased with the President's announcement that he was putting into effect the food stamp pilot projects authorized by legislation passed by Congress in 1959. It should be noted that this legislation has been lying idle and unused over this long period of time, when there has been considerable need for an effective program. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was a strong advocate and the author of a bill for such a program, so the approval by the Senate of my food stamp amendment on September 7, 1959, was a matter of great satisfaction to me.

The President of the United States is to be commended for promptly implementing this program to make use of our God-given food abundance to feed the hungry. His action is indicative of the humanitarian spirit of this administration—what I like to call "government with a heart."

The President in his message submitted to Congress today, entitled "Program for Economic Recovery and Growth," announces, as I have said, that one of the six pilot project areas for the food stamp plan is to be northern Minnesota. This will be welcome news to thousands of families in that area of my State which has suffered severe economic problems and a high rate of unemployment in recent years.

To those of us who for so many years have worked for the establishment of a food stamp program, the President's action is indeed satisfying news, and it will bring joy to the hearts of many Americans who through no fault of their own have been denied adequate diets.

I extend particular thanks to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who worked so diligently and perseveringly to make possible this particular proposal which was passed by Congress and has now been implemented by the program of action by the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Order No. 1," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 23, 1961. The editorial relates to the Executive order doubling the amount of surplus foods to be made available to needy families.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDER NO. 1

It is highly appropriate that President Kennedy's first Executive order will have the effect of doubling the amount of surplus foods available to needy families. Hunger has become a persistent, grim problem in many households in depressed areas despite the general abundance of food and the mountainous surpluses in Government storehouses. Mr. Kennedy had a firsthand view of these deplorable conditions during his campaign and promised to act promptly for their alleviation. The country will warmly applaud his timely action to make good that promise.

Still further expansion of the program under which surplus foods are made available to families in need may be desirable if the present volume of unemployment should continue for any length of time. The country can make no better use of its surplus crops than to convert them into food for hungry people. Indeed, it is a reproach to the country that any hunger exists while Government warehouses bulge with surplus wheat and other commodities. President Kennedy has properly said that these surpluses should be regarded as an asset rather than a liability, and the most important single step toward utilizing them as an asset is to transfer ample quantities to the tables of the unemployed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Food for Peace," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 27, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR PEACE

The food-for-peace program which President Kennedy now promises to expand suits this country's humanitarian impulse and the world's economic need admirably. Nearly $10 billion already has been committed to this purpose since 1954 and another $1 billion already has been asked for fiscal 1962. These figures are not large when weighed against either the surpluses that we are spending—$1 billion a year—to store or against the needs of millions of persons in underdeveloped countries living at bare subsistence levels.

Moreover, Mr. Kennedy has given a more affirmative impulse to the whole program, chiefly carried out through Public Law 480, by putting the focus on the good that can be done rather than on the surpluses we can diminish. The law should be renewed when it expires, and changes should be incorporated appropriate to the enlarged objectives of the administration. The $2 billion authorization suggested by the President's task force is not too ambitious.

Perhaps more important even than larger appropriations is the larger view of the problem—a view that sees the surplus as an opportunity instead of a calamity. Actually, as the McNary-Haugen bill advocates of 40 years ago argued, we have no surplus above the human needs of the world. It is only a surplus above ability to buy. We can close that gap much more than we have done. The broadened program proposed, at the same time, is balanced domestically by larger distribution of foodstuffs to Americans in need.

Administrator George S. McGovern will find his program a complicated one. Care must be taken to avoid dumping that would damage existing commercial markets. Price dislocations hurtful to the agriculture of recipient countries must be cushioned. The use of our surpluses to defer or avoid needed agricultural improvements abroad must be prevented. With ingenuity these hazards can be overcome.

It is possible to move most swiftly to perfect our machinery for getting food quickly to areas of disaster-induced famine, and that we must do. Mr. Kennedy's imaginative move accelerating plans to meet the famine in the Congo is an example. In the long run, most of our effort must go to areas of the world where the food deficit is semipermanent. Our enormous food resources may be made into the chief means of putting an end to the threat of starvation which has hovered over mankind since the dawn of human history.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this editorial lays before us in very succinct and concise language the great opportunities which exist for this country in the field of what we call food for peace.

I compliment the new Administrator of the program, George McGovern, a former Representative from South Dakota, for the initiative he has already demonstrated in implementing the food for peace program. Undoubtedly, there will have to be additional authorizations for this program if the suggested plans of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Food for Peace Administrator are to be carried out. I assure those responsible officers of the executive branch that they will surely have my continuing and continued enthusiastic support for this very important project.

PEACE CORPS PROPOSAL SUPPORTED BY AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald reported a poll just taken by Dr. George Gallup in which 7 out of every 10 persons interviewed expressed support for the establishment of a peace corps of young Americans to provide technical assistance to underdeveloped countries.

Having introduced in the last Congress measures to establish such a corps, I was most heartened to see approval for this proposal substantiated by the Gallup poll.

The flood of mail I have received in support of the peace corps shows that it has great appeal to the American people. It indicates that Americans really want to share our technological know-how with underdeveloped nations, in order to assist them in their efforts to improve the living standards of their people.

President Kennedy has placed great emphasis on the establishment of a peace corps, and I am confident that the Congress will give him its support when he asks for the necessary legislation to put this program into operation.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Gallup poll to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS PROPOSAL IS GIVEN WIDE APPROVAL

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., January 31.—President Kennedy's proposal for a "peace corps" of American youth to serve in underdeveloped countries is highly popular with the American public.

Seven in every ten persons in a Gallup poll survey conducted in the middle of January were found to favor the proposal which would help provide technical assistance to foreign countries in such fields as agriculture, medicine, and engineering, through a corps of trained young men. Outright opposition to the proposal was expressed by only about one person in six.

That persons interviewed were thinking in practical terms is evidenced by the fact that two persons in three in the survey would like to have their own sons participate, provided they had the qualifications.

To determine the attitudes toward this proposal—which has been described as an entirely new concept by the group assigned to study the problem—the Gallup poll had its nationwide corps of interviewers ask the following questions of a sample of 1,503 persons:

"It has been proposed that a program be set up to send qualified young men, at Government expense, to underdeveloped nations around the world to give technical assistance in such fields as agriculture, medicine, and engineering. Would you favor or oppose such a program?

Here are the results:

	Percent
Favor	71
Oppose	18
No opinion	11

"If you had a son who was qualified, would you like to have him participate in such a program, or not?"

The results:

	Percent
Yes	66
No	24
No opinion	10

A Kennedy task force assigned to study this proposal to expand assistance abroad by means of a corps of trained young men made the recommendation that the program be started on a "limited pilot basis with no more than a few hundred members."

The report termed "undesirable" the proposal that members of the corps could serve in it 3 years as an alternative to serving in the Armed Forces.

As presently recommended by the task force, a college degree should be a minimum requirement for those to serve in the corps. Members would serve for a minimum of 2 years. They would receive salaries based on the salary scale in the host country, to be supplemented, if necessary.

Older persons were less disposed toward having a son participate in the program, as the following figures indicate:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
21 to 29 years	71	21	8
30 to 49 years	70	21	9
50 years and over	59	29	12

There is virtually no difference between the views of men and women about having a son participate in this corps.

Here is the breakdown by the rank-and-file members of both major parties, and by those who classify themselves as independents:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Democrats	74	14	12
Republicans	67	23	10
Independents	73	18	9

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as we know, the Mutual Security Act of last year authorized the making of a study as to the feasibility of a peace corps. That study has been completed. There has been considerable comment about it. Such a peace corps is a feasible enterprise; and it can do great good, particularly in some of the Asian, African, and Latin American countries. I believe that young Americans are hungry for a chance to demonstrate their ability to do good and to do the works of peace.

TRIBUTE TO DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Tom Dooley Dies at 34." The article was published in the Catholic Bulletin, of St. Paul, Minn., under date of January 27, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNGLE DOCTOR SUCCUMBS TO CANCER: TOM DOOLEY DIES AT 34

NEW YORK.—Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, who devoted his life and fortune to combating communism through medicine in the jungles of Laos, died of cancer in Memorial Hospital here.

Death came January 18, the day after the doctor marked his 34th birthday.

Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, visited the doctor at the hospital on his birthday. The prelate commended Dr. Dooley on his accomplishments and bestowed his blessing.

Other than members of his family, the cardinal was the only visitor permitted to see the doctor.

A pontifical requiem Mass was offered in the St. Louis (Mo.) cathedral Monday for Dr. Dooley. Auxiliary Bishop Leo C. Byrne of St. Louis presided. Burial was in Calvary cemetery, St. Louis. A funeral Mass was offered the same day in St. Patrick's cathedral, New York.

Dr. Dooley was born in St. Louis and attended the University of Notre Dame. He served 2 years as a Navy corpsman during World War II, after which he enrolled at St. Louis University Medical School.

He was graduated in 1953, rejoined the Navy for his internship. He served at beleaguered Haiphong in Communist North Vietnam, where he processed more than 600,000 refugees fleeing from the Reds to South Vietnam.

He was awarded the Legion of Merit for his work by the Navy and also was decorated by President Ngo Dinh Diem of Vietnam.

He wrote a book, "Deliver Us From Evil," about his experiences in Vietnam in 1956. With the proceeds from the bestseller, he returned to the jungles of Laos where he established a hospital to help the natives pull away from what he termed 15th-century medicine to modern techniques.

Dr. Dooley was a cofounder of Medico (Medical International Cooperation Organization) which established nine medical service programs in Asia, Africa and the Middle East.

He turned over his first hospital in Laos to the Lao Government in 1957 and returned to the United States. He wrote a second book, "The Edge of Tomorrow," and devoted the proceeds to building another hospital in Laos in 1958.

In August 1959, it was discovered that Dr. Dooley had cancer of the chest. He returned to this country and the hospital here where he underwent an operation for removal of the cancer.

After a brief convalescence, he returned to Laos and continued his work until last December, when pain from recurrence of the cancer forced his return to the hospital here.

At his alma mater, requiem Mass was offered January 20 for the young doctor.

Members of Notre Dame's sophomore class had gathered last week at a Lourdes grotto on the campus to pray for Dr. Dooley as he lay near death. He asked for the students' prayers in a letter sent to the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, University president, from Hong Kong just before he returned to this country for the last time.

Father Hesburgh said January 19 after the doctor's death, "the university grieves at the passing of one of its most distinguished sons.

"Although young in years, Dr. Dooley exemplified in his life and death a spirit of selflessness and Christ-like charity which has earned the admiration of peoples throughout the world."

And in Laos, a memorial service was held Monday at St. Mary's church in Vientiane for the man who had worked to bring medical aid and hospitals there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 18, the world mourned the loss of one of its greatest humanitarians, Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. At this time I wish to pay my respects to this great American, one of the great humanitarians, and to express my heartfelt and profound sorrow at his tragic death.

Through Medico, the medical organization which he cofounded, the people in the teeming jungles of southeast Asia not only were given the medical care which they so vitally needed, but also were exposed to the wondrous personality of this deeply religious and inspiring young man. "Doctor Tom," as he was called by those who loved him, put into action what so many of us often idealistically talk about—that is, compassionately aiding people less fortunate than ourselves.

Needless to say, Medico suffers from the loss of Doctor Tom's dynamic leadership. However, under the guidance of the dedicated young men and women of the Medico organization, Doctor Tom's work and spiritual message will be continued throughout the world.

Mr. President, I wish to enlist the attention of my colleagues to the program called Medico. I have talked with many of its responsible leaders. It provides an amazing demonstration of what can be done by people who seek to do good work through a voluntary organization. I hope considerably more attention will be paid to it in the years ahead.

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Leverett Ed-

wards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

NOMINATION OF LEVERETT EDWARDS TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

I understand it meets with the approval of all concerned; and I also understand that if the nomination is not confirmed today, Mr. Edwards will go off the payroll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Speaking for the minority, I wish to say that the minority leader and others on this side of the aisle have joined the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the request now being made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF KANSAS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was on January 29, 1861, that Kansas formally entered the Union, as the 34th State. Those were turbulent and trying times in our own State and in the Nation.

On April 12, following the admission of Kansas into the Union, war was commenced between the North and the South over the issue of slavery and States rights.

Although the Civil War was fought principally in the southeastern region of the United States, a bitter contest took place in the Missouri-Kansas arena.

It was during that period that Kansas suffered from sporadic and punishing guerrilla raids. The entire decade from 1854 to 1865 was one of tragedy, turmoil, and torment for Kansas. That period was a test that brought out the true spirit and the rugged characteristics of our Kansas pioneers.

This year, as we in Kansas commemorate our centennial year, we are reminded of those early pioneers, who had the vision and the courage to plan a great State and lay the groundwork for the many blessings we enjoy at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Kansas' 100th Birthday," which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 16, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS' 100TH BIRTHDAY

TOPEKA, KANS., January 30.—This State at the very heart of America—it's both the geographic center of the United States and the geodetic center of North America—is celebrating 100 years of statehood, born of the great struggle which tore America asunder.

The centennial celebration began here yesterday, Statehood Day, and will continue through 1961 with some sort of reenactment or observance almost every week.

Kansas claims the Spanish conquistador Coronado actually explored its prairies 79 years before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock. Settlement began in earnest, however, in 1854 when Kansas was made a Territory under the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which also made it a battleground.

Settlers poured in from both the South and from New England in an effort to settle by force of numbers whether the State would be slave or free.

Kansas for some time had dual Territorial governments, one for each faction.

It was only in 1861, after southern Congressmen had withdrawn from Washington, that Kansas could command a favorable vote on admission to statehood.

Even before admission, however, Kansas had served the Nation well. It provided a gateway to all of the West. From it colorful trails led to Oregon and Santa Fe, N. Mex., the only overland routes to the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest.

Horse-drawn and oxen-drawn wagons by the thousands carried settlers on their hazardous and arduous journeys across Kansas to their destinations farther west.

To this day, ruts ground into the trails by wagons wheels mark the routes.

Tourists may be amazed next May to see one of the largest wagon trains in history taking off from Shawnee Mission to make the 2-week journey along the trail to Santa Fe.

It should be a good show.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senate of the State of Texas, through Senate Resolution No. 20, adopted on January 18, 1961, and signed by Ben Ramsey, president of the senate, and Charles Schnabel, secretary of the senate, extended congratulations from the people of their State of Texas to their sister State of Kansas on its centennial year.

This resolution relates much of the early history which was a part of the development of the great Southwest, which included Kansas, and goes back to 1541 when Coronado visited this area.

The historical background is important now that we are looking back over the past 100 years and our early history.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 20

Whereas occupying the central part of the United States, Kansas was admitted to the Union under the Wyandotte Constitution, adopted January 29, 1861; and

Whereas since it was first visited by Coronado in 1541, in search of the wealth of Quivera, followed by a brief French occupation from 1719 to 1725, the area remained the undisturbed possession of Indians until 1803, when it passed to the United States as part of the Louisiana Purchase; and

Whereas with the development of Santa Fe as a trading center and with the great western trek of emigrants to Salt Lake City and California, the land of Kansas became the route of regular caravans of prairie schooners; and

Whereas Kansas became the storm center of national political passion and its history of primary impact in the preliminary drama of the War Between the States, despite the enactment of legislation designed to avoid mortal combat, such as the Missouri Compromise of 1850 and the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854; and

Whereas the State suffered the ravages of guerrilla warfare and border raids from 1861 to 1865, as the result of the proslavery and antislavery conflicts, which saw the sacking of various towns, followed by Indian raids and battles until about 1873, as the result of the wholesale and wanton slaughter of the buffalo, the chief source of food of the Redman; and

Whereas with the extension of transcontinental rail lines across Kansas, it was to gain undying fame as the destination of the great cattle drives from Texas and the Southwest over such famous trails of yesteryear as the Chisholm and the Jones and Plummer, to the shipping points and railheads of Hays City, Caldwell, Ellsworth, Newton, Wichita, Abilene and Dodge City, the cowboy capital, each destined to win a place in history and in legend through the exploits and escapades of such noted cowmen, merchants, gunfighters, marshals and gamblers as Wyatt Earp and his brothers: Morgan, James and Virgil, Wild Bill Hickok, Bat, Jim and Ed Masterson, Ben and Bill Thompson of Austin, Tex., "Doc" Holliday and "Big Nose Kate," Phil Coe, Luke Short, John Wesley Hardin and his cousins the Dixons and the Clements brothers, Dora Hand and Fannie Garretson, the Younger brothers, the James boys, Shanghai Pierce and "Spike" Kenedy, both of Texas, Joseph G. McCoy, T. C. Henry, Robert Wright, Mayor "Dog" Kelley of Dodge City, Clay Allison, Chalk Geeson, to mention a few of the more famous and notorious and more recently revived through television and radio channels by the popular fictional places and characters, Marshal Dillon, his able deputy "Chester," "Doc" Adams and "Miss Kitty" of the Long Branch, and the Dodge House; and

Whereas, as written by the Honorable John F. Kennedy in "Profiles of Courage," "In a lonely grave, forgotten and unknown" lies "the man who saved a President" and who, as a result, may well have preserved, for ourselves and our posterity, constitutional government in the United States, the man who in 1868 performed what one historian has called "the most heroic act in American history, incomparably more difficult than any deed of valor upon the field of battle," but a U.S. Senator from Kansas, whose name few recall, the Honorable Edmund G. Ross, voted "Not guilty" on the corrupt impeachment charges instigated by the diseased, distorted, amoral and prejudiced mind of one Thaddeus Stevens, Member of the U.S.

House of Representatives from Pennsylvania, against President Andrew Johnson; and

Whereas, with the strengthening of organized society and establishment of law and order, Kansas emerged upon an era of unprecedented agricultural development, economic prosperity, and educational accomplishments which has enabled the State to attain a position of leadership in the commonwealth of States; and

Whereas its contributions to the cultural life of the Nation are found among such celebrated writers, painters, and scientists as William Allen White, Edgar Lee Masters, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Damon Runyan, William Inge, William L. White, Eugene F. Ware, Father Francis J. Finn, Henry Varnum Poor III, John Steuart Curry, Edwin Emory Slosson, Vernon Lyman Kellog, Ernest Fox Nichols, Hamilton Perkins Cady, Drs. Karl A. and William C. Menninger, each outstanding in his particular field; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas to extend the congratulations of the people of the State of Texas to the people of their sister commonwealth on the occasion of the centennial of the Sunflower State as a member of the Union and to wish it Godspeed in the century ahead: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, That the congratulations of the people of Texas be, and they are hereby, expressed to the people of the State of Kansas on the centennial anniversary of its statehood; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution under the seal of the senate be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the Governor of Kansas; to the president of the Senate of Kansas; to the speaker of the House of Representatives of Kansas; to the Members of the Kansas delegation in the U.S. Congress; to the secretary of state of the State of Kansas; and to Mr. James Arness, known as "Marshal Dillon," Miss Amanda Blake, known as "Miss Kitty," Mr. Dennis Weaver, known as "Chester," and to Mr. Milburn Stone, known as "Doc Adams."

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I receive many inquiries from Members of the Senate and from citizens, not only in my home State, but many States over the Nation, in regard to the appointment of postmasters, now that we have had a change in administration.

In the January issue of the Postal Supervisor, published in Washington, and edited by Donald N. Ledbetter, there is an excellent article entitled "The Facts of Life Regarding Postmaster Appointments."

The information contained in this article should be of assistance to all interested in how to secure an appointment, and how the appointments are made.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FACTS OF LIFE REGARDING POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

From time to time inquiries are received from members of the association who aspire to the position of postmaster. Apparently many career supervisors expect to be promoted to the position of postmaster because of qualifications as a postal employee, and do not realize that the controlling factor in postmaster appointments is political endorsement. This is unfortunate but, nevertheless, true. Political endorsement has always been the controlling factor and there are no indications that the situation will change in the foreseeable future.

Because of the widespread interest of our members in this subject we feel compelled to occasionally publish in the Postal Supervisor the facts of life regarding postmaster appointments. When a postmaster vacancy occurs the Postmaster General, upon the advice of recognized political advisers, requests the Civil Service Commission to hold a qualifying examination in one of two methods: (1) A noncompetitive examination when a career employee has the political endorsement for the job; (2) a competitive examination open to anyone who desires to apply, when an outsider has the political endorsement. The political adviser is the local Congressman if his party is in the White House. If the opposite party is in power, the adviser is the leader of the party in that particular city. The political adviser naturally decides upon the person to be appointed before the recommendation goes to the Postmaster General as to type of examination to be held. The Department usually appoints this person as acting postmaster pending outcome of the examination.

In a noncompetitive examination the Civil Service Commission examines the record of the employee recommended and interviews business and professional people of the community regarding his qualifications. The applicant does not compete for the position, but the Civil Service Commission does require that certain standards be met according to the size of the post office.

For a competitive examination, the Civil Service Commission announces the date and receives applications. The examination consists of an interview with the applicant and a check with references and community leaders, as in the noncompetitive examination. After each applicant has been interviewed and checked by the Civil Service Commission, the Commission assigns each one a numerical grade. The persons with the three highest grades compose the eligible register. The political adviser then recommends one of those three for the position. He may select any one of the three with the exception that he cannot pass over a veteran without furnishing the Civil Service Commission with an acceptable reason for doing so.

The name of the candidate selected by either of the above methods is submitted by the Postmaster General to the President of the United States and by him to the U.S. Senate, for the person to be confirmed. The nomination is handled by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and a card notice is sent to each of the two Senators in the State where the post office is located. When both Senators send their approval back to the committee the name is reported to the Senate and the person is confirmed. If either Senator disapproves or fails to return the card, for any reason, the confirmation process is stopped and no action is taken. This sometimes accounts for a person continuing as acting postmaster for many months, or even years. Once a person is confirmed by the Senate, however, he acquires civil service status and cannot be removed without cause. Acting postmasters may be removed at any time.

The National Association of Postal Supervisors does not approve of the present method of selection of postmaster. The association has contended for a long time, and will continue to insist, that the position of postmaster should be filled with a well qualified, career supervisor. Those interested only in a better postal service will find it difficult to argue against that point. In the meantime, however, supervisors who aspire to be postmaster should seek political endorsement. Without it there is no other way.

COLD WAR GI EDUCATION BILL WILL REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the cold war veterans GI education bill offers the most responsible and effective single program now before the Congress to help cut down the extremely serious current and future unemployment among young Americans.

Studies by U.S. Department of Labor experts show that approximately 30 percent—3 out of every 10 people—of those who are currently hunting jobs are under 25 years of age, and most of them are uneducated and unskilled.

Nationally known columnist Sylvia Porter, in a very penetrating article on this subject, reported:

During this decade alone, 26 million young Americans will become jobseekers, a fantastic 40 percent more than entered the labor force during the 1950's. This tidal wave already is visible, and warns the Labor Department's manpower chief, Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, we are just seeing the beginning. This year alone, about 2,200,000 new workers will be hunting jobs; by 1966, the total will be up to 2,800,000; by 1970, around 3 million. The jobless problem already so apparent among younger workers is nothing compared with what it will become unless there are immense improvements in education and training. For the shocking projection is that 30 percent of the 26 million new workers will fail to complete high school and that 2,500,000 of them will not even finish grade school.

Mr. President, these statistics point up very clearly and realistically the great and growing need for enactment of the cold war veterans education program. A very high percentage of these young Americans who, for one reason or another, do not complete grade or high school will serve a term in the military under current draft and enlistment procedures. Under the cold war veterans education program, these young men would be eligible, after they had honorably served their country, to take vocational training courses.

All of us know that a large number of today's best trained and skilled workers are men who took on-the-job training courses under the GI bill after World War II. Having such training is invaluable to the individual, for many individuals to have specialized training and better education is vital to economic health and productive capacity of our Nation.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I will set hearings on the cold war veterans GI bill at an early date. In view of current unemployment and the projections showing increasing joblessness among unskilled workers when greater numbers of skilled workers will be required, I strongly believe that this is one of the most significant proposals before the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be print-

ed at this point in the RECORD. It is entitled, "Untrained Youth."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Jan. 24, 1961]

THE JOBLESS—II: UNTRAINED YOUTH

(By Sylvia Porter)

Three of every ten of our millions of unemployed are under 25 years of age. The jobless rate among young uneducated, unskilled people is by far the highest for any group. Unemployment among those who drop out of high school before getting diplomas is double that among high school graduates.

During this decade alone, 26 million young Americans will become jobseekers, a fantastic 40 percent more than entered the labor force during the 1950's. This tidal wave already is visible, and warns the Labor Department's manpower chief, Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, that we are just seeing the beginning. This year alone, about 2,200,000 new workers will be hunting jobs; by 1966, the total will be up to 2,800,000; by 1970, around 3 million.

The jobless problem already so apparent among younger workers is nothing compared with what it will become unless there are immense improvements in education and training. For the shocking projection is that 30 percent of the 26 million new workers will fail to complete high school and that 2,500,000 of them will not even finish a grade school.

At the same time, the demand for skilled workers will skyrocket. A study by Wolfbein to be released this spring will disclose our country's need for a minimum of 5 million additional skilled workers in this decade just to carry on our normal activities.

We are, in fact, faced with a paradox in the years right ahead of a critical unemployment problem among young Americans and simultaneously a severe shortage of skilled workers.

Not even the soundest tax, budget, unemployment insurance programs, etc., get at the fundamental problem dramatized here.

Since the basic causes of joblessness among young workers are lack of education and training, what are the cures? We must:

1. Give much more guidance and counsel on an individual, community and national level to all children of school age on the essential need for getting the maximum training possible. Warn your children and your friends' children that without ample skills they'll start and stay at the bottom of the job and income pile.

2. Change our attitude now and forever about the status of an American with manual training and, by so doing, help change a youngster's attitude toward being a skilled craftsman. A man who can repair your TV set or banged-up car has an essential place in our economy, just as a surgeon does, and he warrants status, just as a scientist does. Children reflect our attitudes toward occupations, and if we give manual training the respect it deserves, so will they.

3. Provide adequate courses in vocational training. One reason for the appalling rate of dropouts from high school, Wolfbein stresses, is that "we're not giving the vocational courses the kids want and need."

4. Strengthen our school system in every sphere, and this includes vocational as well as academic schooling. Even a seemingly minor point as decent machinery on which a young man can be trained is exceedingly important. Our facilities are just not good enough.

5. Carefully weigh expanding financial help to students who will become skilled craftsmen, just as we are increasing aid to those who will become scientists, engineers, etc. Millions who otherwise will drop to the bottom of the job-income pile then will be encouraged and able to remain in school and obtain training.

To slash our jobless rate and absorb new workers, a strong economic resurgence is imperative, and Congress will pass emergency legislation. But the fundamental solution to the long-term problem of unemployment among our young people lies in a new approach to and new policies on their education and training.

At the opposite end of the age scale is the plight of the older jobless. Tomorrow's column will go into the causes and cures here.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who has been graciously yielding, for being a cosponsor of the cold war GI education bill when it passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to 31, and again this year, when 27 Senators, more than one-third the number in this body, are cosponsoring the bill. The Senator from West Virginia has worked for the bill. His support was one of the vital factors in having it passed before. I am hoping this year the bill will not meet a bottleneck in the House, as it did previously.

APPOINTMENT AS U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION OF DR. STERLING McMURRIN, OF UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am sure that few of President Kennedy's appointments have been received with greater satisfaction by the people of an appointee's home State than that of Dr. Sterling McMurrin, of Utah, to be U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Utah is proud that this post is to be filled by a Utahan. There is no field in which our State makes a greater or more willing effort than that of educating its children. Despite the fact that Utah has one of the highest—if not the highest—educational burdens in the country, for many years we have been at the top, or near the top, in educational performance.

Utah's educational problem is compounded of many factors. We have a high birth rate, and a high public school enrollment. Our school attendance laws are strict, and our zeal for education traditional. As a result, the last figures I saw showed that Utah ranked second in the country in the percentage of its children in public schools.

Utah has met its educational challenge with courage and spirit. It ranks first among the States in median school years completed by persons 25 years or older, and until recently a larger percentage of Utah people over 25 had completed 4 years of college than in any other State.

To make this kind of showing, the people of my State have been spending a larger percentage of their personal incomes on education than those of any other State, and Utah has been first in the Nation in the percentage of its State and local expenditures which go into education.

It can be seen, therefore, why it is gratifying to have a man who is a leader in Utah educational circles and a product of its educational system chosen as the Nation's educational chief.

Just as the people of Utah were pioneers in settling the West, they were pioneers in education, too. With Brigham Young, the great Mormon leader, learning was almost an obsession. His own formal education has been limited to 11 days of classwork, yet one of his first acts upon reaching the Great Salt Lake Valley, after his trek across the country with the original band of Mormon pioneers, was to establish a school. That was in 1847. Two and one-half years later, on February 28, 1850, he founded the University of Deseret, the first State university west of the Missouri, later to become the University of Utah.

In the light of some of the current fears about Federal aid to education, it is interesting to know that a rugged individualist like Brigham Young once sought financial aid for education from Washington. He asked for a Federal grant to keep the doors of his cherished University of Deseret from closing. The money never came, and for 15 years the university was closed down. But its regents demonstrated their dedication to education by meeting regularly during this period to seek ways of increasing Utah's educational opportunities at all levels.

Utah, like many of the other States in the Nation, is again having financial difficulty meeting its educational responsibilities, and I am a strong supporter of Federal aid to education. It has heartened me to know that the founder of our State once trod the same path.

It is even more heartening to be able to point out that the Nation's newly named Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling McMurrin, of Utah, believes in Federal aid, and will help us in our fight.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a list of factual comparisons of Utah and other States in education as printed by the National Education Association in 1960, and also an article from the Washington Post of February 1, which explains in more detail Dr. McMurrin's qualifications for his appointment, and his views on the Nation's educational problems.

There being no objection, the list and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF UTAH AND OTHER STATES IN EDUCATION

UTAH RANKS FIRST

Median school years completed by persons 25 years of age and older.

Percent of population 25 years old and older with at least 4 years of high school, 1950.

State and local expenditures for all public education as percent of general expenditures of State and local governments, 1958.

State and local governmental expenditures for local schools as percent of personal income, 1958.

UTAH RANKS SECOND

Public school enrollment as percent of total civilian population, 1958–59.

Public school revenue from State and local sources as percent of personal income, 1957–58.

UTAH RANKS THIRD

Percent of population 25 years of age and older with less than 5 years of schooling, 1950.

Percent of population 25 years old and older with 4 or more years of college, 1950.

Percent of persons of voting age voting in the presidential election, 1956.

UTAH RANKS FOURTH

Percent increase in current expenditure per pupil, 1949–50 to 1959–60.

Per capita expenditures of State and local governments for all public education, 1958.

Per capita total debt of State governments at end of fiscal year, 1958.

McMURRIN, EDUCATION CHIEF-TO-BE, SUPPORTS FEDERAL HELP FOR SCHOOLS

SALT LAKE CITY, January 31.—The Nation's newly named Commissioner of Education, Sterling M. McMurrin, has been described as a sort of "Plato of the Plains." He is a firm believer in Federal aid for education.

McMurrin, 47, will take leave as a professor of philosophy and academic vice president of the University of Utah to accept the $20,000 a year job as Commissioner.

McMurrin has all the qualifications that might be expected—bachelor and master degrees from the University of Utah; doctorate from University of Southern California; various professorships in philosophy; Phi Beta Kappa key and memberships in many educational, philosophical, and academic organizations; plus a tidy list of articles, books, and reviews, most of them dealing with philosophy, to his credit.

The affable McMurrin is a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) and several of his works have dealt with religion and philosophy. Others probed education.

McMurrin has been University of Utah academic vice president since August of last year. He was dean of the college of letters and science from 1954 to 1960.

A quiet scholar, he has done minor Government duty before and has traveled widely in Europe, the Mideast, Far East, and Russia.

With limitations and precise definitions, McMurrin stands on the positive side of Federal aid to education.

He says: "I see no reason why Federal aid to education must mean some kind of Federal dictation to local institutions. But without a strong, centralized Government agency taking a firm hand in the educational direction of the Nation, we are likely to drift in such a way that our educational institutions will not satisfy the demands of the Nation.

"I believe that certain types of Federal aid are both desirable and necessary for education; that we already have various kinds of Federal aid, and higher education especially would be seriously crippled if such aid were withdrawn. The status of education in the United States would not be what it is today if it were not for the involvement of Federal Government, and the outlay of some Federal funds on education."

SCHOOL CHIEFS UNIT PRAISES M'MURRIN

Sterling M. McMurrin, President Kennedy's nominee for U.S. Commissioner of Education, is known only by reputation to most Washington educators, but, on the basis of that reputation, the appointment drew praise last night.

The Council of Chief State School Officers termed it "an excellent choice."

McMurrin's name was suggested to Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, by executives of the Ford Foundation, it was learned. The Utah educator held a Ford postgraduate fellowship at Princeton several years ago, and served as a consultant to the foundation's fund for the advancement of education in 1958.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to associate myself with the statement of our colleague from our neighboring State of Utah. Those of us who were once in the field of education are always proud to look to Dr. McMurrin for leadership. We are glad that a man from the West who has looked ahead in this all-important realm, in terms of our national interests, has been selected for this high and important job. We in Wyoming not only are happy with our neighbors in Utah about the appointment, but will work in every way to see that his efforts are successful.

Mr. MOSS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming. Having been a leader in the field of education, he knows of the work of Dr. McMurrin.

CORRECTING INEQUITIES IN MILITARY REQUIREMENT IS LONG, LONG OVERDUE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the final budget message of President Eisenhower contains an impressive number and variety of constructive recommendations and suggestions for the consideration of the Congress and the new administration, as well. While some admittedly are controversial or may need thorough discussion, there is one proposal for legislative action which transcends partisanship and is imperative to rectify a most unfortunate inequity unwittingly, I am sure, inflicted by the 85th Congress on a sizable number of Americans.

Even in advance of the budget message, a concrete move was made to deal with the problem to which the President called attention. It is gratifying that my able colleagues from Arizona and New York have introduced proposed legislation, which many of us of this body are cosponsoring, seeking to restore the historic relationship between pay of retired military service officers and the scales for those on active duty, just as President Eisenhower twice has urged. I am a coauthor of S. 401, dealing with this urgently important problem.

This matter should not be, Mr. President, any longer ignored. There is no justification for perpetuating any injustice which not only penalizes some 120,000 individuals who faithfully served their country, but which has also impaired the morale of additional thousands still wearing the uniform of the armed services, and other commissioned services of Government.

Early enactment of retired pay recomputation legislation would be in accord with the positions of the rival candidates for the Presidency during last year's campaign. I wish to point out to my colleagues that both President-elect Kennedy and Vice President Nixon assured the retired personnel who have been made victims of unfair discrimination of full support for corrective action to erase the painful and unjust error committed nearly 3 years ago.

In response to direct inquiry by the Retired Officers Association—representing personnel of seven different and proud services—about the necessity of restoring the pay relationship to the principle followed prior to June 1, 1958, the patriotic men then contesting for the high office of Chief Executive agreed that legislation along the lines of S. 401 is imperative and early action is an inescapable duty of this Congress.

President-elect Kennedy said:

In response to your telegram I want you and those for whom you speak to know that I am deeply concerned over the inequity done many thousands of our devoted retired service personnel in the Military Pay Act of 1958. I, therefore, support the objective of House-passed bill H.R. 11318, which would equalize the pay of military personnel retired prior to June 1, 1958, with those retired thereafter. I believe firmly in the principle of equal pay for equal service and equal merit, and I shall continue to exert my best effort in that direction.

In no less uncertain terms, Vice President Nixon agreed, declaring:

I am wholeheartedly in agreement with your contention which is vigorously supported by President Eisenhower that the Congress should at once correct the unjust pay discrimination against military personnel who were retired prior to June 1, 1958. My feeling is that this legislation should have been passed many months ago. I have believed that the Congress would surely not perpetuate the unfair treatment of this group while it leisurely reexamines the whole complicated service retirement problem. Now, however, as you point out, adjournment seems near at hand and yet Senate action on this legislation is still not scheduled. I am urging the majority and minority leaders of the Senate to see that this injustice is remedied before adjournment and I certainly share your hope that they will respond. I am also sending them your appealing request to me.

The case for treating alike in the matter of retired pay and retainer pay all members of the several uniformed services thus is beyond all political and partisan considerations. We should do no less than respond to President Eisenhower's appeal, originally made a year ago and repeated in one of his last official communications to Congress. I know of no better way to stress the importance of this matter than to quote his words, as follows:

The people affected are in most cases those who have fought through two or three of our major wars. Legislation to correct this situation should no longer be delayed.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the following message has come over the news ticker:

The President's economic policy recommendations and announcements included the following:

Social security: Five improvements in benefits would begin on April 1 if Congress gives quick approval. They would be financed by taxing workers and employers an additional one-fourth of 1 percent each starting on January 1, 1963, when the next regular increase—of one-half of 1 percent each—is due to take effect.

The five proposals are:

Raising the minimum old age pension from $33 to $43 a month; this would help more than 2.2 million persons in the first year.

Increasing the widow's benefit from 75 percent to 85 percent of the amount of her husband's benefit. This would increase payments to 1,550,000 widows.

Broadening disability insurance. Such benefits are paid now only if the disability is expected to result in death or last for a long, indefinite period. Kennedy urged that payments start when the worker has been totally disabled for 6 months.

Liberalizing eligibility. Pensions may be paid now only if the retired person worked in jobs covered by social security in one out of every three quarters since 1950. The proposal would reduce this to one quarter year out of every four.

Permitting men to start collecting retirement pensions at age 62, as women now may do. The pensions would be smaller than are available when payments start at age 65. This would benefit some 600,000 men, and save some men from going on the relief rolls, Kennedy said.

I am very gratified to learn the President has recommended that the retirement age for men be lowered to 62, as is now the case in regard to women.

Since coming to the Congress 8 years ago, I have supported proposed legislation to provide for the retirement of men and women at the age of 60. I have been discouraged to believe that the time has come when one might hope for success toward this end. Consequently, last year I offered an amendment to the so-called medical-aid-to-the-aged bill when it reached the Senate. My amendment would have provided for the voluntary retirement of men at age 62.

I appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance and spoke in behalf of my amendment. The Committee on Finance accepted the amendment, which was cosponsored by 21 other Senators. The Senate itself later agreed to the amendment.

The amendment was eliminated from the bill in a conference with the House of Representatives. I then sought to have the Douglas committee, investigating depressed areas, include a recommendation in this regard in its report to the President, and it did. I was gratified that the Douglas committee recognized the need for permitting men to retire, if they chose to do so, at age 62. I am happy today to note that the President has recognized this problem, and that he has forthrightly and very wisely, I think, included it among his recommendations to the Congress.

I was advised last year by the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration that the additional cost to the social security system would be about one-twentieth of 1 percent if my amendment were to become law. This, according to the chief actuary, was so small that the cost could have been borne within the present financing of the system, and no additional payroll tax would be required either of the employer or of the employee.

This proposal has a great many merits, Mr. President. As I have already stated, it would not, in itself, necessitate an increase in the social security tax rate. Second, and again because of the provision of reduced benefits, it would safeguard the incentive for workers to continue on their jobs so long as they are able to continue, because for each additional month they work they would be sure of a slightly higher lifetime benefit. I hope that this will be assurance enough to those who believe that by lowering the retirement age Congress would be inducing every worker to throw down his pick and shovel or his pen and pencil at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to my friend, the distinguished and lovable Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is making reference to the proposal he has advanced many times in the Senate, a proposal to reduce the retirement age for men on a voluntary basis.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator for the splendid fight he made for this proposal in the previous Congress. I recall that the Senator not only urged the proposal but also did more than speak for it in the Senate. He importuned, in the cloakrooms, in the Marble Room, and in the Senate Restaurant, as well as other places, many of us who serve on the Committee on Finance, for support, and he persuaded us to go along with his amendment.

Unfortunately, as the Senator recalls, I am sure, the amendment was dropped in the conference between the Senate and the House. I am sorry that the conferees did not invite the Senator from West Virginia to discuss the proposal with them until after they had voted to drop his amendment. If they had permitted the Senator to come in and talk to the House Members before the decision was made, my guess is that the Senator might have had better luck in persuading the conferees to keep it.

The Senator has made a very fine appeal for his proposal. My guess is that if the Senator perseveres in his endeavors, as I am pleased to see he is doing, he will prevail and his proposal will be enacted into law.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In the words of Alexander Pope, I am almost constrained to say to the Senator from Louisiana, "Thou wert my guide, philosopher, and friend."

I was very appreciative of the fine assistance given to me last year by the Senator from Louisiana. I say parenthetically that it required no persuasion upon my part to secure the Senator's support. The Senator from Louisiana was very much in favor of the amendment. He did what he could to help bring it to fruition. I congratulate the Senator. I know he joins with me today in expressing gratification at the news which has come to us, that the President of the United States has now recommended to the Congress that this proposal be enacted into law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not know that. I am very delighted to hear that that is the case.

The Senator made the point last year that many people who are 62 years of age or more, when they lose their jobs, simply cannot obtain other jobs. This is especially true when the labor market is in a situation such as now exists, with about 5 million able-bodied men, or more, unemployed.

A man over 62 years of age who loses his job has very little chance of getting another one, as the Senator knows very well. Perhaps we can find some measure, another job possibly by tax incentives or otherwise, to make more job opportunities available for people beyond 50. But with the slack labor market, 5 million people unemployed, many of whom are younger, healthier, more robust, and better educated, the person above 62 who loses his job cannot get another job. Maybe he is not disabled, but he might as well be disabled so far as finding another job is concerned.

I am very happy that the Senator has made this fight, and I believe it is largely because of his efforts in this direction that the President has seen fit to recommend this type of legislation.

Did not the President of the United States, when he was a Senator, vote for the same type of amendment?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe the Senator is correct. I know that the President of the United States, while he was a Member of this body, indicated to me his genuine and enthusiastic support of the proposed amendment. I am pleased that he is well aware of the benefits that would accrue from it, and I am happy to see that the present administration is indicating its real interest in the proposal.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, now that the Senator from West Virginia has succeeded in obtaining the administration's support for his proposed amendment, I hope that the President will place the administration on record behind some of the other measures he voted for while he was a Senator. One of such measures that I have in mind is a bill which was passed unanimously by the Senate to permit veterans an opportunity to take out national service life insurance. The Senator knows that while the measure may not be popular with insurance salesmen, it is very popular with veterans. The measure passed in the Senate by a unanimous vote, but the House Rules Committee buried it. The bill went to the House of Representatives and the House was not even permitted to vote on it; that was the last ever heard of the bill. Perhaps if the President will pursue that subject as President in the way he did by cosponsoring it as a Senator, we may be able to add that measure as one more bit of unfinished business left over from the previous Congress that should be corrected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have confidence that the President will do whatever he can to urge passage of the many good measures that received his support while he was a Member of this distinguished body. I thank my genial and delightful friend from Louisiana for his contribution.

This measure would help a large number of Americans who are desperately in need of help. These are men who, because of disabilities connected with age, or perhaps because of technological displacement or discrimination, are no longer able to support themselves and their families by their own labor.

There are, in fact, a great many reasons why an older man may find himself out of work, often through no fault

of his own. Medical advances have made it possible for many people to live much longer than before. But doctors have yet to release older people from the curse of arthritis or rheumatism, or many other physical ills which may prevent them from holding down a job. A man may have a quick mind, but a tired body, and if the only work he has known is physical labor, there is little chance for him in today's labor market.

The problem of the older worker, the able as well as the disabled, must be recognized as an economic reality in the United States today. We no longer have an economy of small shops and farms, but of enormous corporations, chainstores, and factories. There was a day when a great many older men could count on gradual retirement on their farms or in small businesses. But as these individual and family enterprises have been swallowed up, this possibility has been virtually eliminated.

Our rapidly changing and advancing technology has also adversely affected the older worker. Too often he does not have the basic educational background or the special training needed to compete with younger men on the job market. A college degree, or at least a high school diploma is becoming indispensable for meeting job requirements. More and more of today's job seekers can meet these educational requirements. The older men, however, grew up in an era when a high school education was not the common commodity that it is today. They were dependent upon the school of experience for any training their minds and hands might acquire.

The modern industrial process often requires more than this. Employment services can cite many examples of capable older people who are unable to find jobs because they have not had the opportunity to keep up with technological progress. Even some older auto mechanics have joined the unemployed, not because there are fewer automobiles to be worked on, but because the men themselves lack experience and training in automatic transmissions.

The advent of automation has, of course, posed a double threat to the older worker. Not only have many lost their jobs when machines took over, but they have been unable to regain employment because of lack of training in operating the machines.

The impact of automation on the employment situation in many industries and enterprises has, indeed, been enormous. Detroit has seen what automation can do in the production of automobiles. My own State of West Virginia has had the lesson driven home in the most vivid way—as the machinery has moved into the coal mines the miners have moved into the breadlines. Children have had to go to school without breakfast. Some have had to stay home because they had no shoes. The older men who have known nothing but mining are gradually losing hope, because they know that in the numbered days remaining for them there is no time and no money to start a new life in a new job. They and their families try to survive on "mollygrub," the kind of mash the wives make out of the food surplus which is being distributed in inadequate quantities throughout the State. They watch while possession after possession is repossessed because they are unable to meet their bills.

I have seen what has been happening in the coal mines of West Virginia. I know, however, that it is not only the coal miners who are in trouble today because of automation. Even in the offices spread throughout the country men and women are being replaced by electronic computors, automatic bookkeeping machines, and devices for filing and storing records. In the Armstrong Cork Co. the use of a medium-sized computer has meant that all the calculations needed to determine the gross payroll deductions and net pay for some 3,000 employees in one plant can be made in 8 hours. Formerly about 225 manhours of calculations were required to do this. The New York Life Insurance Co. uses a computer to figure premiums and dividends for $20 billion worth of life insurance policies and the machine types out premium notices for mailing.

The U.S. Department of Labor has reported the following changes in a large bakery after the installation of new automatic equipment. One man operates the equipment that moves 20 tons of flour each hour from railway cars to bins, compared with 24 men who used to move 50 tons of flour into the plant in 5 to 6 hours. In the bread-baking department, the number of workers on each shift was reduced to 50 percent and capacity was increased 75 percent. Jobs in the wrapping department were cut 70 percent, while there was a 75-percent rise in capacity.

There are several key areas of the economy where the impact of automation is especially apparent. In 1955–57, following the recovery from the 1954 recession, employment in manufacturing, railroading, and mining never returned to 1953 levels. In the spring of 1959 there were fewer jobs in those activities than in 1955–57. Automobile output in December 1958, which was only 4 percent lower than in December 1956, provided one-fifth less in production worker employment than 2 years earlier. The railroads, although they carried about as much freight as in late 1957, provided 10 percent less employment. In 1959 the coal mines were about equaling output levels of the year before, but were using 15 percent fewer employees. Steel production in the first quarter of 1959 was 3 percent less than in the same quarter 2 years before, but wage and salary jobs were down almost 12 percent.

I realize, of course, that automation hits younger workers as well as those who are older. But it is the older workers who most often do not have the skills to move into new kinds of work. They are also considerably less mobile than younger men, and find the physical and psychological problems of pulling up stakes and moving to a new community and a new job much more difficult to bear. In a recent survey of displaced textile workers in a number of Massachusetts communities it was found that 45 percent of all the workers had been reemployed by the time of the survey. This was true, however, of only 28 percent of the workers between ages 56 and 65.

The older worker, therefore, is much more affected by the trend in our economy of mass migration of industry. The movement of the textile industry from New England southward is only one example of this migration. In this case—between the years 1947 and 1954—textile employment fell more than 26 percent in the New England States, while increasing in the South Atlantic and East South Central States.

The migration which is hurting the older worker is not confined to movement between regions, but includes shifts of industrial enterprises from cities to suburbs, and from large cities to smaller communities. Here again the older worker has the choice of tearing up his roots and moving into younger communities or of risking being isolated from job opportunities. Neither choice is a happy one for him.

One of the greatest hurdles the older worker has to overcome, and one which is not fully shared by younger men, is widespread discrimination in employment. One charitable person has asserted, "We don't count a man's years until he has nothing else to count." This, unfortunately, is not a sentiment shared by many employers, who tend to count up a man's birthdays before they consider any virtues or talents he may have. Gray hair and a lined face are often insurmountable handicaps in finding employment. This kind of discrimination, I believe, is no less insidious and unfair than discrimination on the basis of color of skin, or religion, or sex.

Nonetheless, it does exist, and has existed for a good many years. The New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Problems for the Aging made a series of studies of age discrimination in employment, and found that in the depressed 1930's a total of 80 percent of the employers studied admitted that they had age restrictions. By the relatively full-employment year of 1948 this proportion had declined considerably, but it was still a high 40 percent.

More recently, a seven-city survey by the U.S. Department of Labor in 1956 showed that of more than 21,000 job openings filed with employment offices during April of that year, more than one-half specified age limits of under 55, 41 percent specified under 45, and 20 percent under 35. In general, it has been found that once a worker gets into his 60's the prejudice against his getting a job or even being interviewed for a job, is considerably greater.

Older workers find, then, that when they lose their jobs their chances for being reemployed are much less than for those who are younger, and they have a demonstrated greater duration of unemployment. This fact came out in the report made for the Senate's Special Committee on Unemployment Problems in 1959 on a study made of the closing of the Packard Motor Co. in 1956, which was concerned with what happened to the thousands of workers who lost their jobs. In the introduction of this report, which was entitled "Too Old To Work, Too Young To Retire," the authors state that—

Along with technological change, decentralization, and mergers, another phenomenon seems to be developing: age discrimination in employment. Even in the full employment peak-production year of 1955 in the Detroit automobile industry, the older workers of the shutdown Murray Body Corp. plant experienced greater difficulty than their younger shopmates in finding new jobs. While the average length of unemployment for the total sample studied was about 3 months, the average for the workers over the age of 45 was twice that amount of time.

If discrimination against older workers exists in time of labor shortages, it is even more intensified during times of mass unemployment, as in the 1957–59 period in Detroit and many other industrial centers. It is no consolation to say that the percentage of unemployed older workers is no higher than that of younger workers. The truth is that the duration of unemployment among older workers (55 years and above) was twice the figure for the younger age groups, during the 1957–58 recession.

Mr. President, before closing I would like to return again to the question of how reducing the retirement age for men under social security would affect their employment situation.

I wish to emphasize that I am convinced that the measure which I have introduced on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH], on January 30, of this year, which takes the same form as my amendment of last year, would not encourage premature retirement of individuals who are physically able to work and who are able to find and to maintain employment.

My experience has been that most men who have been self-supporting throughout their adult lives much prefer work to idleness, and will continue to work as long as circumstances permit. There are a number of factors supporting this view. The Social Security Administration made a survey a number of years ago which resulted in this important finding in regard to old-age beneficiaries: only about 5 percent of them retired voluntarily while in good health to enjoy their leisure. The others had lost or left their jobs for reasons largely beyond their control. More than half the retired workers receiving old-age insurance benefits quit their jobs, but the overwhelming majority of these did so because of poor health. Persons who quit for health reasons, added to those who were forced to retire because they had lost their jobs, brought to more than four-fifths the proportion of beneficiaries who had been forced into retirement.

There is also the fact that today the average age at which persons begin drawing their old age benefits is 68, although they are eligible for them as soon as they reach age 65. There are, therefore, a great many older Americans who have chosen to continue in active employment as long as possible. In June 1959 the number of persons age 65 and over who were entitled to benefits but were not yet drawing them was nearly one and a half million.

Perhaps the most realistic reason for not expecting a rash of voluntary early retirements is the fact that the low average retirement benefit of $74 a month offers very little incentive. Few men would willingly give up their salaries for this kind of benefit payment.

Nonetheless, there are some persons for whom even this amount could mean the difference between maintaining an independent existence or being forced to resort to charity or general assistance, which requires the loathsome paupers' oath for the most meager of benefits. It is these people whom my bill will help

I am convinced of the need to pass this bill, and am gratified that my conviction is supported by the report of Senator DOUGLAS' task force on depressed areas, which recommended passage of my proposal. This task force, composed of representatives of labor, management, and government, made a searching study into the problems of economically distressed areas, including my own State of West Virginia. They heard stories of misery and destitution, stories which are familiar, though no less disturbing, to those of us who represent these areas.

They also heard stories of faith and of hope—of hope that this new Congress and this new administration would recognize that the problems of the people of these areas are problems of national concern, and would act accordingly.

I believe that by reducing the social security retirement age to 62, we shall be doing just this. By supporting this measure, Congress would be helping our older workers share in the benefits of the rich, strong society which they have built for us. Most assuredly, it is a share they have earned.

NEED FOR A NATIONAL FUELS POLICY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, less than a score of years after the turn of the century, when our Nation was still primarily dependent upon coal as a fuel for industrial production, for railroad locomotives, for home heating, and for many other essential uses, and when the coal miners worked long hard hours to provide this great natural resource to a country that was hungry for it, the American poet, Louis Untermyer wrote what today would be called a poem of social consciousness—his famous "Caliban in the Coal Mines." Untermyer said:

God, we don't like to complain;
We know that the mine is no lark.
But—there's the pools from the rain;
But—there's the cold and the dark.

God, You don't know what it is—
You, in Your well-lighted sky—
Watching the meteors whizz;
Warm, with a sun always by.

God, if You had but the moon
Stuck in Your cap for a lamp,
Even You'd tire of it soon,
Down in the dark and the damp.

Nothing but blackness above
And nothing that moves but the cars.
God, if You wish for our love,
Fling us a handful of stars!

In 1917, when Louis Untermyer wrote that poem, there were more than 600,000 coal miners working in the pits. Today, they number less than 180,000. Today, too, many of these miners see plenty of the well-lighted sky, for they are lucky if they average as much as 17 days a month of work.

No poet today can say that our coal miners plaintively beg for a handful of stars. Instead, if he knew what is in the hearts and minds of our coal miners, he would write of their quiet, anxious longing for work in the cold and the dark. He would tell how they are tired of sitting in idleness in the cold atmosphere of their impoverished homes.

Many people think of coal as an obsolete fuel, and in their minds they relate the plight of the coal miner to this erroneous impression. True, coal has lost certain of its markets: to natural gas, to home-heating fuel oil, and to the dieselization of locomotives. Admittedly, the loss of these markets has adversely affected the economic well-being of the coal industry. The industry, however, has made major adjustments necessary to live with these evolutionary changes.

But evolution in the use of fuels does not mean that coal has been relegated to the era of the horse and buggy. Strange as it may seem to some people, coal is still the key catalyst in the making of steel and aluminum, and it provides the ingredient for thousands of medicinal and chemical products.

More than that, coal today is the very sinew of American civilization, the prime factor in our high standard of living, the force behind industrial automation and scientific progress. It is the generative fuel behind most of this country's present production of over 800 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy.

Why, then, in the face of these facts, is our coal industry having economic difficulties? Because certain current market practices, coupled with the lack of a consistent national energy policy, are causing the loss of millions of tons of production and consumption annually.

One such market practice is the excessive imports of residual oil from abroad, priced to sell along Atlantic coast ports at any figure necessary to undersell domestic coal. Last year such foreign shipments of residual fuel oil to this country took almost 10 million days of work from the coal miners of this country, and coal mining families were deprived of $250 million in wages.

Another such market practice is the wasteful dumping of valuable natural gas for steam boiler use, often at less than cost. An example of this is the recent quiet offer of 75 million cubic feet per day surplus natural gas by a large gas pipeline company to a group of eastern utility companies. This gas is being offered on a firm basis from February 1 to October 1 of this year at a price approximately 25 percent less than that for bituminous coal—the fuel which is now being consumed by these utilities.

What does this particular example of dumping mean in human terms? They are the terms to which I must address myself, because the so-called surplus gas will displace almost 700,000 tons of West Virginia coal. It means that this single transaction, if consummated, would add 265 West Virginia coal miners to the ranks of the unemployed. It means it would deprive these miners

and their families of approximately $1¼ million in wages over this February 1 to October 1 period. It means that the United Mine Workers Welfare Fund would be deprived of one-quarter of a million dollars.

In hard economic terms, this single transaction, if consummated, would mean that the coal industry of West Virginia would be deprived of $3 million in revenue, and it would also mean a consequent loss in taxes both to my State and to the Federal Government. In addition, it would deprive the railroads which transport the coal to the utility companies of over $3 million in revenue, with consequent unemployment among, and the loss of wages by, the railroad workers. In fact, its adverse affects would spread to the merchants and service organizations in the areas in which these mine workers and railroad workers live—areas already in the throes of economic decline.

Is this the price that must be paid in order to permit a southwest gas company to dump on the market, at prices far less than those which homeowners have to pay for gas, what it declares is surplus gas? How can there be a surplus of gas when it can be kept in the ground and used for its superior purposes as and when it is needed? The uneconomic waste of this precious resource is bad enough in and of itself; but when it compounds the problem of distressed areas and increases unemployment, it is high time for us to take a close look at our fuels in general and their relationships to the economic well-being of the country.

The loss of skilled workers in the coal mines, now largely operated by highly complex, modern equipment, is particularly serious for America's future. To remain vigorous, and to meet the Nation's necessary growth requirements, the coal industry needs a steadily growing force of trained men. Instead, its work force is being depleted, and there is little incentive to bring new and capable young men into the mines, into the preparation plants, and into allied vital industries such as the railroads.

Today's level of coal production is insufficient to guarantee that the industry could meet the demands it would face in case war shut off the importation of oil and gas from abroad. To supply the energy fuel that our Nation's defense production would require in an emergency, the coal industry would need a basic operating level of at least 500 million tons a year from which to start. This is about 90 million tons more than we produced in 1960.

But even if a war should call for tremendous new contributions from the coal industry, it would have a similar impact on the natural gas industry and the oil industry. All three must be kept vigorous and solvent if they are to fulfill their necessary roles in powering America for peace or war.

The plain fact is, however, that the economic strength of all our domestic fuels is threatened today, and could become critically weak in a short time, unless we act in a sound and determined manner to forestall it. Studies have been made in the past by special commissions, independent groups, and representatives of the executive branch—all seeking a real and lasting solution to our national fuels problem. Almost invariably they have recommended a national fuels policy.

But only Congress, acting through a joint committee of the two Houses, can set the guidelines for the establishment of a national fuels policy. The time for action on such a policy is long past due. The health of our Nation's economy, and the strength of its defenses, makes the establishment of such a policy imperative.

Coal is not the only fuel beset by adverse marketing conditions. The world glut of oil is causing serious concern among domestic oil producers, as prices are slashed and high costs make new exploration and drilling in the continental United States unprofitable. The natural gas industry, hampered by rigid wellhead price controls, rising exploration, pipeline construction costs, and the swelling importation of gas from Canada, is also facing an uncertain future.

Make no mistake: We are dependent upon coal, gas, and oil—and these alone—for our energy needs for many years to come. Hydroelectric power, even after staggering sums have been spent on its development and expansion by the Government and private power companies in recent decades, still supplies only 4 percent of our energy needs. Its potential for further development is sharply limited. Commercial or industrial power from atomic fission is now admittedly many years in the future, because of its extreme cost and still undeveloped technology.

These facts point conclusively to the need for a national fuels policy—a policy which would protect the vital sources of our energy and insure our wise and prudent use of all fuels resources. Many Senators already have joined my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and me in sponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, providing for a study by a joint committee of Congress of all facets of this question. Similar resolutions have been introduced by many Members of the House of Representatives.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 does not specifically provide for the establishment of a national fuels policy, but says that following a thorough study of fuels and energy, which may take as long as 2 years, recommendations for necessary legislation shall be proposed to the appropriate standing committees for consideration and action. This is as it should be, for the matter is too important to be solved on the basis of anything less than complete knowledge of the facts.

For Senators who may not have had occasion to consider the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, I shall attempt to explain briefly what it contains and what it is intended to provide.

First, it would establish a joint committee of Congress, composed of eight Members of each House, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. This committee would be instructed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the available fuel and reserves of the United States, and the present and probable future rates of consumption thereof, and to make a report of its findings and its recommendations to the Congress for its consideration and action in formulating a fuels policy.

Second, the committee would also consider the importance and the reasons for the formulation of an overall national fuels policy to assure the availability of fuels for an expanding economy and for the security of the Nation.

Third, the committee would give consideration to proved and predicted availabilities of our energy resources, projected national requirements for the utilization of these resources, the technological developments in the areas of all fuels, the Government programs and policies now in operation, and the need, if any, for legislation designed to effectuate recommendations in accordance with all of the aforementioned.

Lastly, the committee would make its report not later than January 1, 1963. The expenses of the committee shall not exceed $200,000 a year, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

It is hard for me to believe that anyone who is seriously concerned with the welfare of America, with our continued growth and prosperity, and with our national security, could actively oppose this study. The urgent need for it is well established, and each day of further delay only enhances the danger and the damage to our economy. I cannot too strongly urge that every Member of this distinguished body lend his full support for prompt passage of this vital joint resolution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

COMMEMORATION OF WASHINGTON PEACE CONVENTION OF FEBRUARY 1861

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Nation this year is observing the centennial anniversary of the War Between the States. Virginia, through its State Civil War Commission, is an active participant.

Many phases of that great struggle, and events before and after it, are well known; but others of importance and significance have been largely overlooked or inadequately treated.

Virginia's last minute effort to preserve peace and avert war was such an incident. This effort is to be commemorated as a part of the current program, and I am privileged to note the event in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Members of Congress and others are invited to attend a special service in the Washington Cathedral at 4 p.m., next Sunday, February 5, 1961. The service will commemorate the Washington Peace Convention.

This was a convention called by Virginia in a last desperate effort to prevent war. Twenty-one of the thirty-four States then in the Union responded and sent delegates to the meeting which was held here in Washington, D.C.

The convention was in session from the 4th to the 27th of February 1861. Both the solution adopted by the peace convention and the Crittenden compromise were rejected by the Senate; the war started in 2 months.

The service Sunday will be dedicated to the Washington Peace Convention and the men who tried to prevent the Civil War. The principal speaker will be Dr. Francis Pendleton Gaines, chancellor of Washington and Lee University.

A plaque will be presented by the Virginia Civil War Commission in memorial of the convention. Later the plaque will be installed near the entrance of the Willard Hotel, where the convention was held.

The text of the memorial plaque follows:

THE PEACE CONVENTION

The old Willard Hotel was the scene of the last major effort to restore the Union and prevent the Civil War. At Virginia's invitation, delegates from 21 of the then 34 States met in secret session from February 4 to 27, 1861, in a vain attempt to solve the differences between the North and South. To honor those who worked for peace and unity this memorial is erected by the Virginia Civil War Commission, February 1961.

As in 1861, we today also are confronted with tensions which could erupt in war. In the desire for success in preserving peace during our time, I hope Members of Congress may participate in this tribute to the men of peace of 100 years ago.

TRIBUTES TO HENRY N. TAYLOR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Henry Noble Taylor, a brilliant correspondent for Scripps-Howard newspapers, died in the Congo on September 4, 1960. I take this occasion in the Senate of the United States to pay tribute to this fine young man.

He died in the performance of his duty, while covering a relatively small, but violent, battle between Congolese soldiers and Baluba tribesmen, near the town of Tchilenge, in the chaotic new African republic.

I knew young Henry Taylor well, as I do his parents. His father, the Honorable Henry J. Taylor, is the U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland. I had visited him only a few weeks before the tragedy.

The family home is at Charlottesville, Va. Young Henry was a graduate of the University of Virginia. His body, struck down by a burst of machinegun bullets, now rests at home in Charlottesville.

I cannot find words adequately to express what I feel about the death of this richly gifted young man, who lived so briefly, but whose spirit, I hope, will never die.

In 31 years he had gained a solid foothold on life. His heart clung to traditions. His intellect was clear and unwavering, looking to the future. He steadied himself on the rock of duty.

No inhibitions debarred him from the world of practical life. He had a zest for action and knowledge which led him to the corners of the earth, in a world bewildered by the range of events. He was a gifted writer, with the ability to make meaningful the fragments of history as they developed near and far, day by day.

Accurate and perceptive reporting of the news is one of the most difficult and important requirements of our time. Few men have been more talented and better qualified for their chosen profession.

His fine ability, his trustworthy competence, and his instinct for news were recognized quickly by great newspapers and press associations around the world. Indeed, he earned his recognition and acclaim.

He possessed the love of his friends, the affection of his colleagues, the respect of his sources of news, and the admiration of millions who, although never privileged to meet him, were proud to know him by his work.

His newspaper career began in 1953, after service as an intelligence officer in the Navy. When his untimely death occurred, he was already a recipient of the American Political Science and the Ernie Pyle awards.

In 9 months of 1960, his penetrating dispatches had originated from 24 countries, including the United States. All of us were the beneficiaries of his talents and industry.

His death is a universal loss, and is universally mourned.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate of the United States that some of the tributes to him, which were published at the time, be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Sept. 6, 1960]

IN CONGO CHAOS—HENRY TAYLOR'S LAST DISPATCH: "IF I CAN'T FILE"

(This dispatch is for use Tuesday in case I am unable to file Monday from the Bakwanga hot spot)

(By Henry N. Taylor)

LEOPOLDVILLE, THE CONGO, September 3.—The wholesale weirdness of this chaotic Congo swallows the newcomer before he can even get clear of this ghost city's unnaturally busy airport.

All elements are there at first glance:

The semiliterate Congolese official who stamps your Indonesian visa by accident.

The airport bus which runs out of gas.

Four Red Chinese diplomats arriving with smiles and perfect French, and trunkloads of propaganda.

Blue-bonneted United Nations troops standing all over the place but apparently without orders except to look alert.

The shabby Congolese Force Publique privates, seeming just as bewildered but disturbingly busier.

Rumors, rumors, rumors, rumors.

"The last Belgian paratroops have evacuated Katanga. * * * A new wave of Belgian paratroops has just recaptured Luluabourg. * * * Lumumba has invited in Russian troops. The king of the Baluba Tribe has warned Khrushchev his cannibals will eat any Russian sent here * * *."

You can hear almost anything here.

The fact is, the Congo situation is like an improvised and unfinished trapeze act in which all participants are jostling in midair above a United Nations safety net, which may or may not be strong enough to save those who inevitably will come plummeting down.

The spectacle would be awesomely entertaining if it were not such a threat to world peace.

The Congolese platoons collide with one another in drill practice. They roll on the sidewalk in mirth and break ranks to play mumbiety-peg with bayonets—yet these same comic opera corporals are slaughtering civilians this week in Bakwanga.

The Congo Army's Commanding General Lundula (until 2 months ago a medical corps sergeant) is interrupted in the middle of a press conference by a trigger-fingering buck private who accuses him of giving away military secrets. It is a hilarious thing to see—until you remember this army's total lack of discipline is what has brought the Congo to its present shattered state.

Things are bound to get progressively worse here no matter how many times U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold crosses the Atlantic—worse physically as well as politically.

The jungle rot hasn't spread too visibly yet into the gaudy capital city of Leopoldville where wine cellars are not yet empty in the neon-lit hotels, and radar-guided ore boats still ply the bean-soup-colored Congo River.

But drive away from the city center and you begin to see block after block of shuttered suburban homes, tire-looted cars abandoned along the highways, and indisputable signs that the machinery of this new nation, which is as big as the United States east of the Mississippi, is simply falling to pieces.

When the Congo became independent 2 months ago—and raping began—there were 9,600 Belgian officials in the civil service alongside only 803 Africans. Now there are fewer than 200 Belgians left in the Government.

Walk through the outer offices of big establishments such as the central post office and you see dozens of Africans sitting at their desks proudly but puzzled—outbaskets tidily bare, but inbaskets shoulder high with papers.

Then explore deeply in the inner recesses of the building and you find one weary Belgian, probably with an air ticket to Brussels in his pocket, gamely keeping the whole operation alive for 1 more week.

Of course, the United Nations is doing all it can to keep the country running, bringing in doctors (24 so far from the Soviet Union), electricians, food experts.

But the U.N. cannot prop up every collapse. For instance, the nation's secondary schools are scheduled to open next week and there are only 10 trained African teachers in the whole Congo—to take the place of 1,800 Belgians who now feel safer in Belgium.

Mr. Hammerskjold has done wonders speeding Sudanese soldiers here to stand around.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Sept. 6, 1960]

BIG BATTLE FATAL TO HENRY TAYLOR

Henry N. Taylor, 31-year-old foreign correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, who was killed in the Congo Sunday, was caught in the middle of a violent battle that broke out suddenly between Congolese soldiers and Baluba tribesmen.

When the shooting started, Taylor and two French newsmen tried to get away. Taylor was cut down by machinegun fire. The others escaped after a harrowing experience.

Taylor's companions were Andre Lefevre of Paris Match and Christian D'Epenoux of the French News Agency.

Lefevre's story:

Taylor, D'Epenoux, and I asked Congo Commander Maj. David Nzoigba, if we could go on an operation with his troops. He agreed to

send us on an operation against the village of Lukelenge, 8 miles from Bakwanga.

"He sent on ahead of us a loudspeaker truck and 3 truckloads of 100 heavily armed troops. Fifteen minutes afterward we followed in a civilian car lent us by the Belgian Bakwanga Mining Co.

"We had with us two sedans with officers and one radio jeep. Outside Lukelenge everyone got out and the national army began a loudspeaker message to the villagers, promising protection and safety if they would give up their arms and accept the authority of the Central Government. But there had been so much massacre of the Balubas in the area that the tribesmen were very suspicious.

"About 150 of them began talking to the Congolese Army troops. The tribesmen carried everything from Belgian automatic rifles to poisoned arrows and spears. Some were nearly naked with leaves in their hair. Very few were in regular uniforms.

"As discussion went on—with Government troops scattered along the road—more and more tribesmen kept joining in. Some said they would give up their weapons if the Government troops would put theirs in a truck first and drive it away. But the army refused to do this.

"Talking had gone on now for over 2 hours and we gradually realized that we were outnumbered almost 10 to 1. There must have been a thousand tribesmen wandering around.

"They began to realize their strength. They kept talking to Taylor, D'Epenoux and myself, calling us Communists and spies. They said: 'Go back to your men, tell them to lay down their arms.' They were sure we were Communist bosses.

"Most of them couldn't understand what a journalist was. One of them said we must be writers, and, therefore, poets.

"At one time a tribesman who probably had been smoking hemp—his eyes staring—charged us with a heavy machete. Other tribesmen saved us just in time.

"Congolese forces had placed a mortar in position to shell the village if things went wrong. Taylor, out of simple curiosity, went up to it and touched it and this, too, convinced the Kalonjist tribesmen we were leaders. Taylor was also dressed completely in khaki.

"We realized we were prisoners, completely outnumbered and scattered. One young tribesman with a Belgian automatic rifle, who had been chatting in a quite friendly way with me, suddenly grabbed one of my cameras and said: 'Give me that.'

"It was then I finally agreed that we should all get back into our cars and drive another 5 miles on to the Baluba headquarters of Tshilenge where negotiations would continue.

"I got into our car and sat at the wheel when a Kalonjist tribesman, waving a revolver, pushed me aside and said: 'I am driving.' I moved over.

"Then Henry Taylor, who up to then had been driving, tried to get in on the driver's side. I said: 'Let him drive, Henry. Come round to my side.' At that moment the shooting began.

"As Henry put his hands on the door to come and sit on my right he was hit by a burst of automatic fire that moved all the way up his body from his right thigh to his chest. I flattened myself on the front seat with my head against the door and the tribesman did the same, with his head against his door. This went on for 10 minutes while the car was hit repeatedly by repeated firing. I remember thinking if it were Balubas doing the firing we didn't stand a chance.

"Suddenly the door against which my head had been lying was flung open. I saw a Congolese soldier cocking his automatic, and I said to myself: 'Lefevre, it is all over.'

"He pointed the revolver at the Baluba's head. The tribesman grabbed my arm frantically, tried to pull himself underneath me and screamed: 'No, no.' The soldier fired three times and half the tribesman's head was blown off.

"I thought, 'Well, now, it is my turn.' But the door slammed and I was suddenly alone with the body. I peered through the smashed windshield and saw a Congolese soldier pointing an automatic. I waved at him and he stepped back and opened fire. But he was aiming under the car where three tribesmen were hiding. I could hear bullets smashing into their bodies just under my feet.

"I opened the door and got out to speak to a soldier standing by the body of Henry Taylor, who was still breathing.

"There was still a lot of shooting going on and we could see that Lumumba soldiers were holding about 50 to 100 yards of road leading into the village. There were 20 dead tribesmen lying on the road and about another 100 on both sides, as well as some wounded Congolese soldiers and 4 dead. The soldiers still were firing toward Baluba tribesmen in the bush.

"At one moment I saw an old tribesman come out toward us pointing a pu pu—a gun they make out of any old piece of pipe and fill with bits of metal. It is usually fired by lighting the powder with a cigaret.

"This old Baluba was stabbing at the pu pu with a cigaret, but he couldn't get it to go off. So he turned and started to run but he didn't get far before he fell dead.

"While we were in the car we had heard the Congolese troops shouting 'A l'assaut'—to the attack.

"They charged the crowds and were chasing them in the bush. I watched them finishing off the wounded with bayonets. I took out the last of my three cameras which they had not stolen and started work again.

"We piled back into lorries, taking Taylor's body and Congolese dead and wounded. Some Balubas were coming back at a run, firing from the hip. But Lumumba's men stopped them every time and each time they knocked one down they shouted 'encore, encore' and sprayed the body with bullets.

"Three miles up the road we met reinforcements coming to our rescue. We learned later a sergeant had escaped in a car to fetch them.

"He certainly saved our lives for if he had not done that our retreat would have been blocked by road barricades.

"When we got to the hospital in Bakwanga, Congolese soldiers began to rant at the major and threw down their tin helmets in fury. They were mad because they felt it was our fault they had not been able to open up and finish off the tribesmen long before we were trapped. They were terribly distressed, too, at the death of Taylor.

"A Belgian doctor told us to come in the hospital and hide because it was dangerous for us. We phoned the U.N. which sent Tunisian troops to fetch us," Lefevre said.

[From the New York World Telegram and Sun, Sept. 6, 1960]

Henry Taylor's Body To Be Flown to Capital for Services Friday

WASHINGTON, September 6.—Services for Henry N. Taylor, foreign correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers who was killed in a battle in the Congo Sunday, will be held at St. John's Episcopal Church, Washington, at 4 p.m., Friday.

Burial will be at Charlottesville, Va., Saturday.

Mr. Taylor, 31, was the only son of U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, Henry Taylor, Jr., and Mrs. Taylor. They will arrive here from Berne tomorrow.

Mr. Taylor's body was flown from Bakwanga, near where Mr. Taylor was killed by machinegun fire, to Leopoldville yesterday. It will be flown to the United States Thursday.

Twelve Congolese soldiers tried to board an American Embassy plane yesterday when it landed at Luluabourg to pick up Mr. Taylor's body.

BOARDERS THWARTED

The boarding attempt ended when Sgt. Arnold Ross, of Los Angeles, appeared in the door of the plane with a shotgun.

Lt. Col. Mario De Silvestro, of Philadelphia, assistant air attaché in Leopoldville, said he ordered Sergeant Ross to show the gun when Congolese soldiers tried to arrest him.

Colonel De Silvestro refused to let the Congolese soldiers board the plane. When he descended, one Congolese grabbed his arm and said, "You are my prisoner."

"No, I'm not," said Colonel De Silvestro, and it was then he ordered Sergeant Ross to produce the gun.

Thirty minutes later, when the Embassy plane took off with Mr. Taylor's casket aboard, the same 12 Congolese soldiers lined up in a guard of honor.

Mr. Taylor was struck in the body and leg by a machinegun burst at close range in the small Kasali village near Tchilenge. He was struck as he stood beside his automobile. Some Baluba tribesmen opposing the Congo army troops were armed with spears and bows and arrows, others had modern arms.

Only last January Mr. Taylor received one of the two 1959 Ernie Pyle Memorial Awards established in honor of the columnist and war correspondent who was killed by a Japanese sniper in World War II.

After graduating from the University of Virginia, Mr. Taylor served as naval intelligence officer from 1951 to 1954. He joined the Cincinnati Post, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, as a reporter in 1954.

COVERED TOP EVENTS

During his 3½ years as a member of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, Washington and international staffs, he covered the 1958 crisis in Lebanon, the Cuban revolution, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's tour of the United States, and President Eisenhower's trip to the Far East.

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter gave him this epitaph:

"Harry Taylor was a dedicated reporter. He had experience and judgment in writing on foreign affairs. His death is a tragic one, and his friendly, cheerful personality and keen, accurate news reporting will be greatly missed in the State Department."

PROTEST DEMANDED

In Schnectady, N.Y., Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat of New York, called for "the strongest possible protest" over Mr. Taylor's death.

Mr. STRATTON sent a telegram to Mr. Herter from his home asking that Mr. Herter urge the U.S. Government to file the protest with the Congo Government.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Sept. 8, 1960]

Taylor's Body Due in Capital

WASHINGTON, September 8.—The body of Henry N. Taylor, 31-year-old foreign correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, is scheduled to arrive at Andrews Air Force Base here tonight.

The newsman was killed by machinegun fire in the Congo last Sunday. His body is being flown to the United States by an Air Force MATS plane. The funeral will be at 4 p.m. tomorrow at St. John's Episcopal Church, Washington.

Further tributes to Mr. Taylor were being paid in the American press.

DID HIS JOB

The lead editorial of the Baltimore Sun said:

"No good news reporter would have done other than Henry N. Taylor did. Warned

by the commander of the United Nations force at Bakwanga, in the Congo, that to leave the town was dangerous, Taylor, a Scripps-Howard man, left anyway.

"The only way to know exactly what happens in warfare, large or small, is to go see it. Taylor's job was to know what was happening, and report it accurately. He went to see, and was killed.

GOING AND SEEING

"The only way to know exactly what happens in anything, or exactly what is said or in what tones, is to see it and hear it. Firsthand information is the stuff of news; and news is the material on which opinion in free countries is based. Getting the news firsthand is sometimes dangerous.

"Taylor was the 88th American of his profession to die in the performance of duty in the past two decades. The profession mourns their deaths, and is proud of them."

The Memphis Commercial-Appeal, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, said Taylor's death leaves "the world's journalistic fraternity the poorer." It said Taylor would be eulogized "in adjectives high sounding but completely foreign to his honest, unostentatious personality."

"We have chosen," the editorial continued, "to call him what he was and, so doing, have used the highest of all journalistic commendatory appraisals—that of 'good reporter.'

"Many elements go into the making of a good reporter. Henry Taylor had all—insatiable curiosity, incisiveness, ability to distinguish between fraud and truth, unremitting indignation against injustice, indefatigable zeal, and a passion for accuracy.

"A good reporter is first and last a quester after truth. It was that he was seeking and found unexpectedly in its ultimate, ineffable form when death gave his young and vigorous being immortality on a far jungle road."

The Washington Star said:

"If it may correctly be said that any individual is born to a profession, Henry Taylor was born to be a reporter. * * * Young Henry Taylor had all the energy, the personal courage, the inquisitiveness, and the intellectual interest in the happenings of his time that make up the character of a first-rate reporter.

"In his relatively short career, Henry had not missed many of the big stories—and the chances are that when he missed one it was because he was covering another.

"He was only 31 at the time, but his record is that of a good newspaperman's work. To others in his profession this is the finest tribute."

Ambassador Henry J. Taylor, father of slain Scripps-Howard foreign correspondent Henry N. Taylor, said last night that President Eisenhower has his "everlasting gratitude" for arranging to have his son's body shipped home from the Congo.

Mr. Taylor, Ambassador to Switzerland, and his wife, Fay, were interviewed during a brief stopover at Idlewild Airport on their trip from Switzerland to Washington, where services will be held tomorrow. Both were dressed in black and there were tears in their eyes when they spoke of their only son.

"The President just reached out and brought our boy home," the Ambassador said. "He called by telephone to Geneva and asked me if there was anything he could do.

"It was only through the President's offer to help that our boy is not lost to us in the center of the African veldt. He was killed 500 miles deep in the jungle and communications were nonexistent. He was killed under conditions that were completely barbaric."

Relays of native runners had to be used between the American Embassy in Leopoldville and the jungle site where his son was killed in efforts to recover the body, Mr. Taylor said.

Asked if his son was slain by accident, the Ambassador said: "This was no accidental death. I have all the details."

He did not elaborate on this statement.

Pausing to dry his eyes and regain his composure, the Ambassador said firmly: "We come home a proud family. This boy never started anything he didn't finish."

Mrs. Taylor, who had been silent throughout the interview, added: "We are so proud of him. We've got to be strong because he was strong."

TAYLOR WAS A MEMBER OF THE "SEVEN SOCIETY"

WASHINGTON.—The body of Henry N. Taylor, Scripps-Howard staff writer killed in the Congo Sunday, was to be buried today in Charlottesville, Va., the Taylor family home.

Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower was among the many who attended funeral services yesterday afternoon for the 31-year-old prize-winning reporter at St. John's Episcopal Church on Lafayette Square, across the street from the White House.

Taylor's family and friends learned for the first time at his funeral that he was a member of the "Seven Society" of the University of Virginia, his alma mater. Rev. Donald Mayberry, rector at St. John's, said the society is composed of outstanding men who "even in their college days" are recognized as men "willing to give their lives for others." Membership is never revealed during their lifetime. Dr. Mayberry did not know of Taylor's membership until he entered the church to conduct funeral services. The Seven Society sent a floral wreath.

Taylor's father, Henry J. Taylor, is U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland.

THE FULL LIFE

Dr. Mayberry said he had been "struck by the amazing fullness" of Taylor's life and "the impress he left on the lives of those he touched."

Taylor, he said, was "a man of virtue, of wholesomeness, of integrity, full of the joy of living, and of obvious talent. He was more than a student when he was a student and more than a reporter when he was a reporter," the minister said.

Dr. Mayberry referred to the "mass outpouring of tributes" since Taylor's death, and cited messages from President Eisenhower, Philippine Ambassador Carlos Romulo, and his colleagues in the press.

In addition to Mrs. Eisenhower, those attending Taylor's last rites included Mrs. John Foster Dulles, widow of the former Secretary of State, CIA Chief Allen Dulles, White House Secretary James Hagerty, Assistant Defense Secretary Murray Snyder, Ambassador Romulo, and Actor Robert Montgomery.

OFFICIALS PRESENT

A State Department delegation included Deputy Under Secretaries Raymond Hare and Loy Henderson, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs Andrew H. Berding, Assistant Secretary for European Affairs Foy D. Kohler, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs Joseph C. Satterthwaite, and Press Officer Lincoln White.

The National Press Club of Washington and the Overseas Press Club of New York were represented. Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, sent his personal aide, Comdr. Charles Wilhite, Taylor's friend. Taylor was an officer in the Naval Reserve.

Honorary pallbearers were Roy W. Howard, Jack R. Howard, Walker Stone, Earl Richert, Charles E. Egger, John O'Rourke, R. H. Shackford, Jack Steel, Lowell K. Bridwell, and Jim G. Lucas, all of the Scripps-Howard organization.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Sept. 6, 1960]

IKE EXPRESSES REGRET AT TAYLOR'S DEATH

WASHINGTON, September 6.—President Eisenhower expressed his deep regret today at the death of Henry N. Taylor, 31-year-old Scripps-Howard reporter who was killed in a skirmish in the Congo Sunday.

Press Secretary James C. Hagerty said the President telephoned the reporter's father, U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland Henry J. Taylor, to extend his and Mrs. Eisenhower's personal sympathies.

The President also issued the following statement: "The death in the Congo of Henry N. Taylor is a tragic loss to the newspaper profession and to the country. As a foreign correspondent, Mr. Taylor traveled throughout the world reporting the news developments of our times for the American people. He traveled with me on many of the visits I made to many countries."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Sept. 6, 1960]

ROMULO PAYS TRIBUTE TO TAYLOR

Philippine Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo today described Henry N. Taylor, the late Scripps-Howard foreign correspondent, as a "true American" who made friends for his Nation "because of his sense of justice and square dealing."

"The death of Mr. Taylor," Ambassador Romulo said, "removes from American journalism a talented newspaperman who wrote his stories about Asia and Latin America with fairness and understanding."

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen-Journal, Sept. 6, 1960]

FRIENDS, ASSOCIATES UNANIMOUS IN PRAISE OF HENRY N. TAYLOR

Fellow journalists, diplomats, and others were unanimous today in praise for the abilities of the late Henry N. Taylor, Scripps-Howard reporter killed Sunday in the Congo.

State Department Press Officer Lincoln White said, "News of Mr. Taylor's death has come as a shock to his host of friends in the Department. He has long covered the Department of State for Scripps-Howard and was a member of the State Department Correspondents' Association."

Walker Stone, editor-in-chief of Scripps-Howard newspapers, commented that Taylor "was one of the greatest reporters I ever worked with. His loss is seriously felt by all of his colleagues on Scripps-Howard newspapers."

Republican Vice-Presidential Candidate Henry Cabot Lodge termed his death "a shocking thing." "This fine young journalist had a great future ahead of him.

"He was in my office only a few days ago at the U.N.," Lodge said.

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter praised Taylor as a newsman of "experience and judgment" whose "keen, accurate news reporting will be greatly missed in the State Department."

Stewart Hensley, United Press International's chief correspondent in Washington, a close friend of Taylor, called him "an exuberant news craftsman who wrote at his best with his shoes off.

"He threw himself into his work, and was a tremendously inquisitive man. At the same time, he was a careful reporter who relied more on research and good writing than on sensationalism."

The Washington Daily News summed up Taylor's nature, in an editorial today:

"The news of Henry (Harry) Taylor's death is so shocking that it was difficult to comprehend the meaning of the words as they came tapping through the teletype.

"The reason for that is probably no one around the Washington Daily News was so alive, so eager, so completely the antithesis of death.

"He was just so enthusiastic, so eager for the next assignment, so full of bounce and anxious to test his competence against new difficulties, that telling what he had already done does not picture him at all."

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Sept. 6, 1960]

HENRY TAYLOR

The news of Henry N. Taylor's death is so shocking that it was difficult to comprehend the meaning of the words from the Congo as they came tapping through the teletype.

The reason for that probably is because no one we knew was so alive, so eager, so completely the antithesis of death.

The career of Henry Taylor—Harry to his friends—already was brilliant, demonstrating a seriousness of purpose and maturity of judgment far beyond his years. But his career was just starting.

After a brilliant scholastic record at the University of Virginia and a hitch in the Navy as an intelligence officer, he "broke in" as a cub reporter on the Cincinnati Post only 6 years ago.

He moved into our Washington news headquarters after 3 years and, in the time which intervened until his death, had packed more travel and covered more major stories than many reporters do in a full span of years.

He had won the American Political Science Award and the Ernie Pyle Award, too, but recounting such things does not describe him. He was so interested, so eager for the next assignment, so full of life and anxious to test his competence against new difficulties, that telling what he had done does not picture him at all.

To describe Harry Taylor is to describe the ahead, the trip next week, the ever widening horizon of an aware and youthful man. He was only 31.

Harry's world was tomorrow.

And now he'll have no more tomorrows.

His colleagues in the Scripps-Howard organization are deeply grieved. Our sense of loss cannot be compared to his parents', but we share it with them and offer them our deep and heartfelt sympathy.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1960]

IN LINE OF DUTY

The Congolese machinegun bullets which killed Henry N. Taylor removed from our midst one of the most promising young American journalists of our time. A skilled and painstaking craftsman, he had already demonstrated his high reportorial ability in many situations. It was characteristic of the man that he should have wanted to be as close as possible to where the news was being made, even though the risks were obviously great. He was not the first of our craft to die in the line of duty and probably he will not be the last. But there is a special sorrow at his passing among all those who knew him and realized how much high ability and love of life he possessed.

[From the Geneva Diplomat, Geneva, Switzerland, Sept. 10, 1960]

MIGHTY FINE JOURNALIST

Being a foreign correspondent is one of the most exhilarating professions and sometimes becomes quite dangerous. And so it was for this particular journalist, son of a well-known father. Working more earnestly than most others to prove his merits in the profession, at 30 he had won the Ernie Pyle Award, one of journalism's coveted prizes.

As it must to all men, death came to 32-year-old Henry Taylor from a stray machinegun bullet last week in the Congo, when he was only at the beginning of a distinguished career.

Most journalists in Geneva got to know young Taylor well during the Foreign Ministers Conference last summer in Geneva. Everyone is profoundly distressed that this tragedy has senselessly extinguished such talent.

[Translation from Zurich (Switzerland) Neue Zercher Zeitung, Sept. 6, 1960]

THE DEATH OF HENRY N. TAYLOR—DEEP SORROW IN WASHINGTON

(By Werner Imhoof)

The news of the death in the Congo of Henry N. Taylor, the Scripps-Howard reporter, was received with sorrow by his many friends in Washington, where he had been stationed in recent years. The only son of the American Ambassador in Bern was at the threshold of a promising career. He was an eager, enterprising journalist who was interested in everything and, as his death showed, did not shrink from any risk. He devoted body and soul to his craft and mastered his assignments in an exemplary way. His diplomatic reports were distinguished by their objectivity and clarity and his descriptions by their color and sharp characterizations. His interviews with Fidel Castro, Nikita Khrushchev, or Boris Pasternak revealed much that was worth knowing.

Taylor enjoyed the advantages of the best schools in the United States but he never regarded his education as completed. In recent years in Washington, he dedicated himself to an intensive study of the Russian language and its literature. He was full of ideals and every conversation with him was a refreshing experience; he was a friendly and generous colleague.

It is difficult for everyone who knew him to reconcile himself to the fact that this vital young man of 32 was taken by death in the African jungle and is no longer with us. We think of his parents in this hour and share their sorrow. We will always remember him.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

POOREE THE WORLD

A good reporter goes where the news is and so Henry Taylor went to Africa and kept a jungle rendezvous with death. The world's journalistic fraternity is infinitely the poorer for it. The world was his "beat" and there is no news-important area of it in which he was not known, respected, and liked.

He will not lack for eulogies. He will be described in adjectives high sounding but completely foreign to his honest, unostentatious personality. We have chosen to call him what he was and, so doing, have used the highest of all journalistic commendatory appraisals—that of a "good reporter."

Many elements go into the making of a good reporter. Henry Taylor had all—insatiable curiosity, incisiveness, ability to distinguish between fraud and truth, unremitting indignation against injustice, indefatigable zeal, and a passion for accuracy.

A good reporter is first and last a quester after truth. It was that he was seeking and found unexpectedly in its ultimate, ineffable form when death gave his young and vigorous being immortality on a far jungle road.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner]

HENRY NOBLE TAYLOR

Distant conflicts have a way of coming closer home when the toll they exact involves an American. Such is the loss, keenly felt by all who knew him, in the death of Scripps-Howard Reporter Henry Noble Taylor—hit by machinegun fire while covering the Congo's civil war.

He was of that distinguished company of correspondents whose newsbeat is the world—faithful to assignment wherever duty sends them.

A young man of great ability, with a gift for searching out the facts and succinctly reporting them, he honored the profession he loved and in which he grew to prominence on recognized merit.

Nashville shares the regret occasioned by this tragedy—for he was acquainted in this city, where he had visited along with his family; and was related in middle Tennessee—his mother being from Shelbyville.

It is a loss shared by a vast readership, who knew him by a famous byline.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginia Pilot]

HENRY N. TAYLOR, NEWSPAPERMAN

Death found Henry Noble Taylor at Tshilenge near Bakwanga in the Congo. It may seem an unlikely place, but it was where he always wanted to be and often was—in the middle of the biggest news story of the moment.

As roving reporter for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, Harry Taylor believed in first-hand history and in seeing things for himself. He arrived in the Congo last week and left Saturday for the scene of fierce fighting between government soldiers and secessionists in Kasai province. At noon Sunday, according to fragmentary reports, he was hit by machinegun fire while driving toward Tshilenge and died instantly.

He is the first correspondent to be killed in line of duty in some time. His death, like that of others, is a reminder of the pain and peril that may be involved in getting the news to the breakfast table each morning.

Harry Taylor was one of the best correspondents in the craft. Although just 30 his experience was worldwide. His assignments took him to more than 70 nations during the last 5 years. He interviewed many world leaders, among them Adenauer of Germany, Castro of Cuba, and Nasser of Egypt. He was the last outsider to interview the late Boris Pasternak. His achievements were impressive, and they were recognized by the 1959 Ernie Pyle Memorial Award for overseas correspondence.

A graduate of the University of Virginia and later an aide to Admiral Jerauld Wright, Harry Taylor had many ties with Tidewater. He came here often, most recently in April when he spoke to a University of Virginia alumni meeting. His friends in Norfolk will remember him as he was—buoyant, confident, gregarious, able to tell a story as well as he could write it (very well, indeed), and quick to tell it with appropriate dialect and gesture, eager for adventures of mind and body, full of zest for life and travel. His death brings the Congo crisis home to many in Norfolk with painful reality.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Sept. 7, 1960]

HENRY N. TAYLOR, REPORTER

A young newspaperman of great promise has died in the Congo. He was Henry N. Taylor, 32-year-old roving correspondent for the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers. He reportedly was killed by machinegun fire while covering the fighting between Congolese troops and armed tribesmen in Kasai Province.

Last year Taylor won the Ernie Pyle Journalism Award, which is presented annually in memory of the famous frontline correspondent of World War II. Taylor was a reporter and writer in the Pyle tradition. That meant he had a feel for the color and the human elements in a story. Like Pyle, too, Taylor accepted dangerous assignments. He showed his courage while covering the riots in Tokyo last June and again in the Congo more recently. Again like Pyle, Taylor died doing his job where the bullets were flying.

A member of the Star's staff who met Taylor in Seoul, Korea, last June remembers him for his extremely pleasant, self-assured manner. He had gone far in his profession in only 6 years and had reason to be con-

fident of his ability. His fast-rising career must have brought satisfaction to his father, Henry J. Taylor, a former Kansas Citian who was a newspaperman, author and radio commentator before becoming the present U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland.

Henry N. Taylor joins a long roll of correspondents who risked and lost their lives while reporting the news for the American people. They were dedicated men who ennobled the profession of journalism.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times Dispatch, Sept. 6, 1960]

A BRILLIANT JOURNALIST PASSES

The death of brilliant young Henry N. Taylor in the Congo terminates the career of one of the ablest of American journalists. Harry Taylor was a prominent and popular student at the University of Virginia only about a decade ago, and his success since that time with the Scripps-Howard newspaper chain had been nothing less than meteoric.

He was following in the footsteps of his distinguished father, Henry J. Taylor, now U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, and an internationally known author, magazine writer and journalist (Ambassador Taylor, also a University of Virginia graduate, and Mrs. Taylor have a home at Farmington, near the university).

Their only son had gone to every corner of the world for Scripps-Howard, and covered all the hot spots. So capably had he done so that at age 30 he won the coveted Ernie Pyle Award for 1959.

The courage and determination shown by Harry Taylor in the Congo exemplified journalistic enterprise at its best. Heedless of dangers and obstacles, he was getting the news of the fighting. Just as in World War II, many U.S. correspondents lost their lives "hitting the beaches" with invading troops, and otherwise exposing themselves to enemy fire, so today, in the cold war, newsmen are running similar risks.

Harry Taylor's vivid style and thorough competence as a reporter were matched by great personal integrity and exceptional charm of personality. The death of such a man, in the fullness of his youth and promise, is a loss to us all.

[From the Chicago Daily News]

HENRY N. TAYLOR

Many newspapermen have given their lives in their endeavor to keep the public informed. The latest is Henry N. Taylor, reporter for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, who was killed by machinegun fire while covering the battles between Congolese troops and tribesmen.

It is doubtful if many readers realize, as, in the comfort of their homes, they keep abreast of happenings in the far corners of the world, what devoted zeal goes into the gathering of this news. There is always violence somewhere, and it usually gets reported by men on the spot who wouldn't trust any other source of information.

Perhaps it should be said that these men have no intention of becoming martyrs to their calling. Neither does a fireman when he responds to an alarm. But each understands the risk and willingly accepts it. He does this partly, perhaps, because the spirit of adventure is in him, but he also does it for the satisfactions of performing a useful service.

Mr. Taylor was an exceedingly promising young correspondent, already seasoned at 31. Our sympathy goes to his distinguished father, who is the U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, and to his associates upon the loss of a colleague who was an honor to his craft.

[From the Winchester (Va.) Star, Sept. 7, 1960]

NEWSMAN KILLED IN ACTION

A topflight newsman died in the pursuit of news Sunday.

Henry Noble Taylor, 32-year-old correspondent for Scripps-Howard newspapers, was hit by machinegun fire while reporting the fighting between Congolese Army troops and armed civilians.

Mr. Taylor was a graduate of the University of Virginia and the son of Henry J. Taylor, himself a longtime foreign correspondent and now U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland.

The younger Taylor had covered many top stories in trouble spots throughout the world in the past several years. These included the landing of U.S. Marines in Lebanon in 1958, the Fidel Castro revolution in Cuba, and President Eisenhower's tours of Latin America and the Far East. Mr. Taylor had gone to the Congo from an assignment in Japan, Korea, and Hong Kong, and in between had done an excellent series of articles on the U–2 spy trial in Moscow.

It was only a few months ago that Mr. Taylor and the editor of the Star worked together in Cuba—covering the giant anti-American rally in Havana. We were together the next day, along with Russell Jones of the Columbia Broadcasting System, when another colleague, Jules DuBois of the Chicago Tribune, was surrounded by an angry mob and was saved only by the forces of the Havana police.

Mr. Taylor was a dedicated newsman with courage—and a flair for vivid writing. His potentialities were great and his future brilliant. The newspaper profession has lost a topnotch reporter—and his colleagues a gay and warmhearted companion.

[From the New York Daily News]

TRAGEDY IN THE CONGO

Henry Noble Taylor, an able young Scripps-Howard correspondent and son of Henry J. Taylor, U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, was instantly killed Sunday by machinegun fire in a savage Congo melee which he was covering. Our deepest sympathy goes out to Ambassador and Mrs. Taylor, and our heartfelt admiration to the young man, whose death, like his adult life, was in the finest traditions of U.S. newspapermen.

[From the Cavalier (University of Virginia daily newspaper) Sept. 16, 1960]

(Henry N. Taylor edited this newspaper in his senior year at the university)

HARRY TAYLOR: AN UNTIMELY LOSS

The recent death of University alumnus Harry Taylor brought a shockingly untimely end to one of the most promising young men in the newspaper world today. Indicative of his devotion to public service through journalism is the fact that Harry Taylor died while on assignment in the Congo.

The only son of the U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland Henry J. Taylor, a distinguished journalist and author himself, Harry Taylor was following in the footsteps of his father in a career which the Richmond Times-Dispatch described as "nothing less than meteoric." Ten years ago he was editor in chief of this newspaper and a prominent member of the University community. At the time of his death earlier this month he was an internationally known journalist who just last year had won the distinguished Ernie Pyle Award for his journalistic work.

Few university graduates have attained the distinction which Harry Taylor did in 10 short years. His death is certainly felt a tragic loss not only by those who knew him personally but also by those who know of his outstanding record which will always stand as a credit to the university.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 21, 1960]

OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB HONORS HENRY TAYLOR

Henry N. Taylor, Scripps-Howard correspondent killed recently while covering a battle in the Congo, was honored yesterday at a memorial service in the Overseas Press Club, 35 East 39th Street.

In tribute to Mr. Taylor, a plaque was unveiled on the club's memorial wall. His was the 87th name to appear on the memorial which honors newspapermen who, over the last 2 decades, have been killed in the performance of duty.

Among those paying tribute was Roy W. Howard, president of the World-Telegram, who eulogized the brilliant newspaperman.

Others participating in the memorial service were John Luter, president of the Overseas Press Club; Burnet Hershey, one of the club's founders and a past president, and Robert Montgomery, TV producer and special White House assistant.

A telegram was read from Ambassador and Mrs. Henry J. Taylor thanking the Overseas Club for its tribute to their 31-year-old son.

Mr. Montgomery concluded the services by reading portions of a column dedicated to Mr. Taylor which Robert Ruark wrote following the newsman's death.

AMERICAN LEGION CITES DEEP LOSS IN HENRY TAYLOR'S DEATH

MIAMI BEACH, October 17.—The American Legion Public Relations Commission today adopted a resolution expressing its deep sense of loss and profound regret in the death of Scripps-Howard Correspondent Henry N. Taylor, killed September 4 in the Congo.

Members of the commission, meeting in advance of the Legion convention, stood for a moment in reverent silence.

C. D. DeLoach, commission chairman, was directed to send a telegram to Walker Stone, editor in chief of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, conveying the Legion's deep sense of loss and profound regret. Mr. DeLoach described Mr. Taylor as a young man "representing everything that was good in a newspaperman."

There was discussion about changing the Legion's annual fourth estate award to the Henry N. Taylor Memorial Award. Decision was deferred until next year.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Sept. 6, 1960]

HARRY TAYLOR, IN MEMORIAM

(By Richard Starnes)

This is the kind of man he was; he was the kind of man all men would like to be.

Because he died at age 31, all of us will always remember Henry N. Taylor in terms of youth and tremendous energy and towering enthusiasm. But people who knew his craftsmanship and skill will also remember him as a reporter whose professional competence was of the first order although it had only just begun to flower.

Things came easily to Harry, and if he had been a different sort of person he would, perhaps, have been content to coast through life solely on the basis of his natural gifts. He could have done it that way and still have achieved much. But he was not that sort. He was unwilling to make any glib bargain with mediocrity. Good was not good enough, he always wanted to do his best, and he did his best, and that was considerable.

It is a bromide, but it is true that he died doing his duty. He died swiftly, and for that his friends are grateful. He was not afraid of anything in this life, and he had no

fear of death. His was a risky business and he lived cheek by jowl with the sort of danger that most men live and die and never experience.

He was gay and insouciant, but underneath he was as tough as an old boot. His courage was not the sort one sees in a man who seems brave only because he lacks the imagination and instinct to scent danger. Harry Taylor knew he was going into a dreadfully dangerous territory, a twilight war where there is no way of telling friend from foe until, sometimes, it is suddenly too late. His reaction was characteristic. He knew the peril was there and he laughed in its face. His last message to the Scripps-Howard Bureau in Washington was a lighthearted piece of cablese which said simply he was smearing himself with shoe polish and heading for Bakwanga.

One's reaction to the cruel and wanton death of a friend and admired colleague is subjective. There is a tremendous sense of personal and professional loss, and there is the shock the mind uses to anesthetize itself, and then there is a helpless, bitter anger.

Harry Taylor's death diminished all of us who knew him. In truth, his death is a personal loss to everyone who ever picked up a newspaper expecting to find, and finding, truth and decency in a world where these qualities are often overwhelmed with cynicism and cruelty.

A piece about Harry Taylor ought to be marked by the same candor and gentle honesty that were the marks of the man himself. The night before he lost his life, I was in Washington for the first time in a year or more, and a wonderful good friend of mine and of Harry Taylor was pouring a drink. It was a sweet, cool summer night, a rare thing in Washington, and everybody was happy and relaxed and making plans for an outing the next day. The talk turned to Harry and the last message he had sent, although, of course, none of us knew at the time it was his last. Harry was spoken of in terms of affection and lavish praise, because that was the only way you could talk about him.

I will be honest and say I felt a twinge or two of envy toward this young man who was so full of talent and vitality and who was so clearly destined to be one of the great figures in the difficult demanding profession that was his whole life.

There is not much you can say to a father who has lost his only son. But to Harry's father I will say simply that his son was the man the rest of us would like to have been.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Vice President the Chair announces the following appointments to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference February 6 through 12:

Senator MANSFIELD, Senator MORSE, Senator GORE, Senator CHAVEZ, Senator ENGLE, Senator MCCARTHY, Senator GRUENING, Senator PELL, Senator HICKENLOOPER, Senator SCHOEPPEL, Senator BUTLER, and Senator CURTIS.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the majority leader with respect to the program, both for the rest of the week and the following week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, so far as can be ascertained, the only business next week will be sundry nominations on Monday.

We shall also have money resolutions for various committees which have been reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It is anticipated that next week the Senate will also take up S. 153, a bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

It is my understanding that S. 153 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. It is my further understanding that hearings will begin on Tuesday on the nomination of Dr. Robert Weaver. It is my hope that before the end of the week that nomination will be brought to the floor for consideration, debate, and, I express the hope, confirmation.

That will be the program for next week. I may say to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, that I hope we will complete consideration of the nomination of Dr. Weaver before the Republicans undertake their Lincoln Day journeys.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, February 6, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2, 1961:

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Capt. Donald M. Morrison
Capt. Ned W. Sprow
Capt. Irvin J. Stephens
Capt. James A. Alger, Jr.

The following named persons to the offices indicated:

UNITED NATIONS

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be a deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Kenneth E. BeLieu, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 2, 1961:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

John E. Horne, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1964.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

The nominations beginning Byron E. Blankinship, for promotion to class 1, and ending Michael van Breda Yohn for promotion to class 7;

The nominations beginning William P. Hughes, for appointment to class 1, a consul general, and secretary, and ending William E. MacFarlane, to be a consul; and

The nominations beginning Franklin Hawley, to be a consul general, and ending Donald F. Ewing, to be a secretary.

The above nominations were received by the Senate on January 10 (legislative day, Jan. 9), 1961.

The nominations beginning Wilson T. M. Beale, Jr., to be a career minister, and ending Fraser Wilkins, to be a career minister, said nominations having been received by the Senate on January 20, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1961

The House met a 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 13: 20–21: *Now the God of peace, make you perfect in every good work to do His will.*

Almighty God, whose righteous laws and beneficent purposes permeate the universe in which we live, help us to strive more eagerly to bring our wills into harmony with Thy will.

Grant Thy special benediction of favor upon our leaders and Members of Congress who often stand in difficult places, and are challenged with the responsibility of making right and reasonable decisions.

Bestow the blessing of wisdom and insight upon all who are assembled in counsel and conference seeking to find ways and means whereby mankind shall be led into nobler and happier ways of living.

May the prosperity and abundance which our country enjoys fill us with a profound sense of our obligation toward the less fortunate and needy members of the human family.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord through whom Thou hast come to us and through whom we come to Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 31, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7

Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF VARIOUS COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 137

Resolved, That during the 87th Congress the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 35 members;

The Committee on Armed Services shall be composed of 37 members;

The Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Education and Labor shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 33 members;

The Committee on Government Operations shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be composed of 31 members;

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 33 members;

The Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 33 members;

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall be composed of 31 members; and

The Committee on Public Works shall be composed of 34 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND GROWTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 81)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I. OUR GOALS AND PROBLEMS

America has the human and material resources to meet the demands of national security and the obligations of world leadership while at the same time advancing well-being at home. But our Nation has been falling further and further short of its economic capabilities. In the past 7 years, our rate of growth has slowed down disturbingly. In the past 3½ years, the gap between what we can produce and what we do produce has threatened to become chronic. And in the past year our economic problem has been aggravated by recession and by loss of gold. I shall shortly send to the Congress a separate message dealing with our international balance of payments and gold position.

The Nation cannot—and will not—be satisfied with economic decline and slack. The United States cannot afford, in this time of national need and world crisis, to dissipate its opportunities for economic growth. We cannot expect to make good in a day or even a year the accumulated deficiencies of several years. But realistic aims for 1961 are to reverse the downtrend in our economy, to narrow the gap of unused potential, to abate the waste and misery of unemployment, and at the same time to maintain reasonable stability of the price level. For 1962 and 1963 our programs must aim at expanding American productive capacity at a rate that shows the world the vigor and vitality of a free economy. These are not merely fond hopes; they are realistic goals. We pledge and ask maximum effort for their attainment.

I am proposing today measures both to alleviate the distress arising from unsatisfactory performance of the economy and to stimulate economic recovery and growth. If economic developments in the first quarter of this year indicate that additional measures are needed, I will promptly propose such measures.

THE PRESENT SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

The potential of the American economy is constantly expanding. The labor force is rising by 1.5 percent per year. Output per man rises anually by 2 percent as a result of new and better plant and equipment, modern technology, and improved human skills. These increases in manpower and productivity provide the base for a potential annual growth of 3.5 percent in the Nation's total output. This is not high enough. Our potential growth rate can and should be increased. To do so, we propose to expand the Nation's investments in physical and human resources, and in science and technology.

But in recent years the economy has not realized even its present possible growth. From the peak of the business cycle in the second quarter of 1953 to the top of the anemic recovery 7 years later, gross national product grew only at an annual rate of 2.5 percent. The failure to use our full capacity is the urgent economic problem of the day.

In 1960, the American economy produced $503 billion of output when it was capable of producing at least $535 billion. In the fourth quarter of 1960, actual output could have been 8 percent higher than it was. More than a million and a half unemployed—over one-third of all unemployed—could have had jobs. Twenty billion dollars more personal income could have been earned in 1960. Corporate profits could have been $5 billion higher. All this could have been accomplished with readily available manpower, materials and machines—without straining productive capacity and without igniting inflation.

The performance of the economy in 1960 was not only well below its full capacity; it also fell short of the modest levels expected by the previous administration.

Adjusting all figures to the same statistical basis, the budget projections last January were based on a 1960 national output of $513 billion. In October, output for the year was still expected to exceed $508 billion, implying a rate of at least $521 billion in the fourth quarter. The actual figure turned out to be $503 billion both for the year as a whole and for the last quarter.

Even when the recession ends and economic activity begins to expand again, the problem of unused potential will remain. Even if we were to achieve the $515 billion output projected for 1961 in connection with last month's budget message, the gap between potential and actual output would continue to grow and unemployment would hover between 6 and 7 percent of the labor force throughout the year. Under these circumstances, the expectation of minor improvements in business conditions during the next year provides no basis for complacency, no excuse for inaction. And—speaking out of realism, not pessimism—we cannot rule out the possibility of further deterioration if we fail to act.

An unbalanced economy does not produce a balanced budget. The Treasury's pocketbook suffers when the economy performs poorly. Lower incomes earned by households and corporations are reflected in lower Federal tax receipts. Assistance to unemployed workers and the costs of other measures for alleviation of economic distress are certain to rise as business declines. That is why recession—as our $12.4 billion deficit in the fiscal year 1959 recently reminded us—forces the budget into imbalance. That is why the prospect of surpluses in the Federal budgets for fiscal 1961 and fiscal 1962 is fading away.

GENERAL FISCAL POLICY AND THE BUDGET

The Federal budget can and should be made an instrument of prosperity and stability, not a deterrent to recovery. This administration is pledged to a Federal revenue system that balances the budget over the years of the economic cycle—yielding surpluses for debt retirement in times of high employment that more than offset the deficits which accompany—and indeed help overcome—low levels of economic activity in poor years.

If this economy were operating at full potential, the existing Federal revenue system would yield more than $90 billion in fiscal year 1962, instead of the $82.3 billion now estimated, producing a large budget surplus, and permitting retirement of national debt as well as the further development of Federal programs to meet urgent national needs. Debt retirement at high employment contributes to economic growth by releasing savings for productive investment by private enterprise and State and local governments.

The programs I am now proposing will not by themselves unbalance the budget which was earlier submitted, but are designed to fulfill our responsibility to alleviate distress and speed recovery—both through benefits directly available to needy persons and through desirable fiscal effects on the economy. They will sustain consumer spending and increase aggregate demand now when the economy is slack. Many of these expenditures will automatically cease when high employment and production are restored.

Other measures contained in this message propose necessary uses of national economic capacity and tax revenue for our long-range growth, and are essential even in the absence of a recession. They are proposed because the country needs them, can afford them, and would indeed be poorer without them.

AGRICULTURE

Recession in agriculture has been chronic since the early fifties. Falling farm income has been a drag on the industrial economy, while economic slack has restricted the job openings which might have eased the adjustment process in agriculture. The marginal or displaced farmer is most painfully aware of the interdependence of agriculture and industry. Restoration of the economy as a whole to satisfactory and rising levels of performance is an important prerequisite to restoring farm prices and income to their rightful levels. The American farmer should receive for his managerial skills, his labor, and his capital investment returns that are similar to those received for comparable human talents and resources in other types of enterprise. To this end the administration will recommend further specific measures in a separate message on agriculture to be submitted to the Congress at an early date.

II. MEASURES FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

1. MONETARY POLICY AND DEBT MANAGEMENT

Both full recovery and economic growth require expansion of expenditures for business plant and equipment, for State and local governmental facilities, and for residential construction. To increase the flow of credit for these purposes, long-term interest rates should decline. However, further declines in short-term interest rates, under present conditions, would lead to a further outflow of funds abroad, adding to the deficit in our balance of payments. That would be particularly unfortunate at the present time, just as falling rates abroad have been narrowing the gap between our rates and those of other leading countries.

In these circumstances, monetary policy and debt management must serve two apparently contradictory objectives: checking declines in the short-term rates that directly affect the balance of payments, and increasing the flow of credit into the capital markets at declining long-term rates of interest to promote domestic recovery. These two objectives can be achieved concurrently, but only with close cooperation among all governmental agencies concerned. As a result of measures already underway, there will be an increasing flow of funds at declining long-term rates to finance productive investment. Measures to strengthen this country's ability to hold and to attract internationally mobile liquid funds will be outlined in my subsequent message on the balance of payments.

The Treasury and the Federal Reserve System already are working together to further the complementary effectiveness of debt management and monetary policy. These tools will be strengthened not only for their present tasks but also for restricting inflationary demands on the economy whenever they recur.

2. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

During the 1960's, we must have the energy and vision to lay sound foundations for meeting the problems which will result from the steady growth of our urban areas through the balance of this century. This task calls for new initiative and imagination in a great diversity of fields: in housing construction, in the maintenance and improvement of our vast existing stock of housing, in urban renewal, in the provision of essential community facilities, and many others. It calls for the revitalization of administrative machinery at the Federal, State, and local levels. It calls for more comprehensive and more practical planning for urban and metropolitan areas. I shall shortly make specific recommendations to the Congress for action in this whole vital area.

Meanwhile, to make sure that general expansion of long-term credit is effective in stimulating residential construction, we have surveyed the range of administrative actions which can be taken promptly to help lower the cost of housing credit.

A reduction of mortgage interest rates is already overdue. Despite the easing of the general money market in the past year, the cost of mortgage credit still hangs just below its postwar peak. I have been assured that officers of many leading lending institutions share my view that present mortgage yields are unrealistic, and are prepared to cooperate in an effort to make mortgage money available at lower rates.

Consistent with this appraisal of the present situation, I have directed the Federal Housing Administration to reduce the maximum permissible interest rate on FHA-insured loans from 5¾ to 5½ percent. The resources of the Federal National Mortgage Association in the secondary mortgage market will help to give effect to this change in the rate. The FNMA stock subscription requirement applicable to sales of mortgages in the FNMA secondary market will be temporarily cut in half. I shall request the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to cooperate in advancing this effort to reach a more realistic level of mortgage lending rates.

What is good policy here for the private housing sector is also good policy for public construction activity. Under the program by which loans are made to local public bodies for the construction of public facilities, the Community Facilities Administration at my direction is reducing interest rates on new loans. This program will also be broadened to make eligible for loans many communities and certain types of public facility projects which are now excluded.

I have instructed the Housing and Home Finance Agency to hasten the initiation or completion of those approved projects in which a speedup can be effected without waste. In examining new applications for assistance, HHFA will give priority of attention to projects which are fully planned and ready for construction, and to projects located in areas of chronic unemployment. Under the college housing program, available funds will be committed more rapidly than hitherto planned, and efforts will be made to move forward the starting date for previously approved projects.

The Federal Government will do everything in its ability at all administrative levels to quicken the pace of urban renewal work. Given this assurance, mayors and other local officials can by energetic leadership accelerate projects underway or about to begin. I have today telegraphed the mayors of 297 cities to urge that they review their urban renewal projects to find ways of hastening the completion of these vital civic improvements.

3. TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXTENSION

The number of persons out of work and seeking employment has been rising since the early summer of 1960 and has reached serious proportions in these rigorous winter months. In January 5.4 million persons were unemployed, more than 1.3 million have been continuously out of work for 15 weeks or longer, 600,000 for 6 months or more. In addition, workers involuntarily confined to part-time work numbered 1.7 million, a rise of 200,000 over December.

We have long since decided as a nation that we will not turn our backs upon workers and their families undergoing the hardships of unemployment. Furthermore, we know all too well that the loss of income of the unemployed inevitably depresses consumer spending, threatening to deepen the recession and delay recovery. The flow of wage and salary payments, measured at an annual rate, has fallen by $4 billion from August to December.

Our unemployment insurance system serves to mitigate, in some degree, the hardships of displaced employees and helps to strengthen the economy against the forces of contraction. The total number of persons drawing benefits under that system has risen sharply since the middle of 1960, and in mid-January stood at 3.4 million, 1 million higher than a year ago. Although average benefits amount to only $34 per week, total payments are estimated to have been $430 million in January, compared to $264 million in January a year ago. The number of persons exhausting unemployment benefits has also increased. About 500,000 persons who have exhausted their benefits are still unemployed. During the first 6 months of 1961, nearly 1½ million more persons will use up their unemployment benefits before finding jobs.

In these urgent circumstances, I shall ask the Congress to enact a temporary program for extending the duration of benefits. Under agreements voluntarily entered into between the States and the Federal Government, additional weeks of benefits would be authorized from Federal funds, during the 12 months following enactment, to persons who have exhausted regular benefits since October 31, 1960, and are still unemployed. These extended benefits would equal one-half—up to a maximum of 13 weeks—of the duration provided by the State. The duration of the benefits would be subject to an overall maximum, State and Federal, of 39 weeks. Where the State law already provides

benefits for longer than 26 weeks, the Federal Government would pay, for the period of the emergency, for all weeks of benefits beyond 26, up to a maximum of 39, thus freeing State funds for much-needed increases in benefit amounts. The amount thus going into increased income and purchasing power will be advanced from general revenues and later repaid in full from increased insurance contributions obtained by raising the taxable payroll maximum per employee from $3,000 to $4,800 annually. This increase will maintain the self-supporting basis of the system and enhance its capacity to meet future emergencies.

Our permanent Federal-State unemployment insurance system, which has become an institution essential to the efficient functioning of our labor markets as well as a strong defense against economic contraction, is in need of permanent reform. As I said in 1958, I believe it would be a tragic mistake to embark on a Federal supplementation program geared to the present emergency without also strengthening the underlying system. A mere stopgap approach ignores the role our permanent unemployment insurance system was intended to play, and establishes instead a precedent for falling back on temporary remedies whenever the system is really needed. The standards of the system have proven inadequate to deal with the recession problem.

This time, we must establish a permanent unemployment compensation system which can do the job it was intended to do. A program of Federal legislation designed to revise and strengthen the benefit and financing provisions of the system will therefore be recommended to the Congress by the end of March.

4. EXPANSION OF U.S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

I am directing the Secretary of Labor to take necessary steps to provide better service for unemployment insurance claimants and other job applicants registered with the U.S. Employment Service. This will require expanded counseling and placement services for workers or jobseekers (a) in depressed areas; (b) in rural areas of chronic underemployment; (c) displaced by automation and technological change in factories and on farms; (d) in upper age brackets; and (e) recent graduates from college and high school.

5. AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF THE UNEMPLOYED

Under the aid to dependent children program, needy children are eligible for assistance if their fathers are deceased, disabled, or family deserters. In logic and humanity, a child should also be eligible for assistance if his father is a needy unemployed worker—for example, a person who has exhausted unemployment benefits and is not receiving adequate local assistance. Too many fathers, unable to support their families, have resorted to real or pretended desertion to qualify their children for help. Many other fathers are prevented by conscience and love of family from taking this route, thereby disqualifying their children under present law.

I recommend that the Congress enact an interim amendment to the aid to dependent children program to include the children of the needy unemployed. Temporary action is recommended pending completion of a study of a permanent program to aid needy children and certain other groups now excluded from the Federal-State public assistance programs.

6. DISTRESSED AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The Congress is considering legislation designed to reinforce the efforts of areas of heavy chronic unemployment to improve their economic climate. Although State and local governments, as well as private agencies, have been helpful in many instances, the distressed areas constitute a national problem that is properly the concern of the Federal Government.

The subject has been studied by standing and special committees of the Congress, by individual States, by groups of States, and by private study groups. There is general agreement that we should enact legislation providing the means for loans for private projects, technical assistance, loans and grants for public facilities, and programs for training and retraining workers. I urge that any area development program be flexible enough to benefit urban and rural areas alike and to apply to regions of economic distress which include parts of two or more States.

The immediate subsistence needs of the people of these economically depressed areas must be met, but it is equally important that these areas be enabled to acquire the basic facilities, physical plant, and trained labor force necessary to secure their share of the Nation's economic expansion.

I have already advised the Congress of my interest in such legislation by letters sent to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives last week. I urge that area redevelopment legislation be enacted without delay.

7. DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS FOOD

We are committed to expanding the variety and quantity of surplus foods distributed to persons who, in a nation of unparalleled agricultural bounty, lack adequate diets.

(A) The first Executive order issued in this administration directed the Secretary of Agriculture to "take immediate steps to expand and improve the Government program of distributing surplus food to needy families."

(B) Further, I have instructed the Secretary of Agriculture, consistent with the bill enacted by the Congress last year authorizing establishment of pilot food-stamp programs, to proceed as rapidly as possible to establish pilot programs for needy families in localities in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, eastern Kentucky, northern Minnesota, southern Illinois, and the Detroit area. It is my hope that this pilot program, while providing additional nutrition to those now in need, will pave the way for substantial improvement in our present method of distributing surplus food.

(C) I have also asked the Secretary of Agriculture to make recommendations to improve and strengthen our school lunch program, to make the best possible nutrition available to every schoolchild, regardless of the economic condition of his family or local school district.

8. IMPROVEMENTS IN THE OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM

The current softness of the economy underscores the inadequacy of social security benefits in relation to the needs of many present beneficiaries. The average retired worker's benefit is only $74 a month. A majority of these beneficiaries have no other significant income. The basic principle of our social insurance system is undermined when a substantial number of retired individuals must seek public assistance or else subsist below minimum standards of health and comfort. We must not permit the benefits of retired workers and their families to lag behind rises in living costs; we cannot decently exclude our older population from the general advances in standards of living enjoyed by employed workers.

I recommend that Congress enact five improvements in benefits, to become effective April 1. All are clearly justified in equity and decency. They will increase benefit payments for between 4 and 5 million people in the next 12 months. Besides meeting pressing social needs, the additional flow of purchasing power will be a desirable economic stimulus at the present time. Early enactment will serve this end.

The old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is financed on a sound actuarial basis, with insurance contributions adjusted to scheduled benefit payments. The benefit improvements I am proposing can be covered by additions of one-fourth of 1 percent each to the employer's and employee's contributions, beginning at the next scheduled increase in contributions on January 1, 1963.

The five proposals are:

1. Raise the minimum monthly benefit for the retired worker from $33 per month to $43 per month, increasing benefits for more than 2,200,000 people in the first 12 months. We wish it could be raised higher—but surely we cannot continue benefits at such an unconscionably low minimum.

2. Improve retirement protection by paying actuarially reduced benefits to men beginning at age 62. Present law does not permit a man to become eligible for optional retirement benefits before age 65, although such benefits are available to women at age 62 on an actuarially reduced basis. Provision for paying reduced benefits to men beginning at age 62 would make benefits available to older unemployed workers at comparatively little additional program cost. The plight of the older unemployed man is particularly serious in areas of chronic unemployment. However, the difficulties older workers find in reentering the labor market after losing their jobs or after periods of illness exist in all parts of the country. Frequently, as persons approach age 65 they find it difficult to compete in their accustomed occupations because of physical incapacity which may not, however, have progressed to the

point of total disability. Provision for actuarially reduced benefits at age 62 to men as well as women will provide income for 600,000 people, some of whom would otherwise have to turn to public assistance for support.

3. Provide benefits for 170,000 additional people by liberalizing the insured-status requirement. At present a person can receive benefits only if before retirement he was employed in jobs covered by the social security program for one out of every three quarters after 1950. The proposal is to reduce the required coverage to one quarter out of every four. This is only fair to our present generation of older people, as it brings their eligibility requirement into line with the one that present law contemplates for future generations, that is 10 years of coverage out of a working life of about 40 years.

4. Increase the aged widow's benefit from 75 percent to 85 percent of her husband's benefit amount, raising benefits for 1,550,000 widows. There is no justification either in equity or in the facts of family consumption for this size gap in the level of widows' benefits.

5. Broaden disability insurance protection. The social security program should provide disability insurance benefits for insured workers and their families after the workers have been totally disabled for 6 months. Under present law, disability benefits are available only if the disabled worker's condition is expected to result in death or to last for a long and indefinite period. The proposed change provides benefits in the first 12 months for 85,000 people (totally disabled workers and their dependents) many of whom otherwise have to resort to public assistance. Since it would no longer be necessary to determine that the disabled person is unlikely to recover, the change removes an important barrier to rehabilitation. It also speeds up determinations of disability. While the change has these desirable effects, it would in no sense be an innovation. Similar provisions are contained in many private insurance contracts and other disability programs.

9. EARLY PAYMENT OF VETERANS' LIFE INSURANCE DIVIDENDS

I have asked the Veterans' Administration to advance the payment of the 1961 dividend of $258 million on national service life insurance and U.S. Government life insurance policies. This payment would normally be distributed throughout the year. Substantial amounts should begin to reach veterans of World War I and II within the next 30 to 60 days—the period of slump—when they are most needed and will do the most good. If sound insurance practices justify it, as I hope further study will show, an additional dividend will be paid this year from the substantial funds that have been accumulated.

10. MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE AND EXPANDED COVERAGE

I urge the Congress to raise the minimum wage immediately to $1.15 and to $1.25 within 2 years. This will improve the incomes, level of living, morale, and efficiency of many of our lowest paid workers, and provide incentives for their more productive utilization. This can actually increase productivity and hold down unit costs, with no adverse effects on our competition in world markets and our balance of payments. More than four-fifths of those commodities affected by either export or import trends are produced by industries which would not be significantly affected by a moderate increase in the minimum wage. The proposed new coverage is basically in retail trade and services, which are not affected by shifts in international trade. Moreover, experience with previous minimum wage increases indicates little effect on prices. In the 4 years following the 1956 increase in the minimum wage, the index of all wholesale prices increased 6.6 percent, whereas the prices charged for commodities produced in low-wage industries showed negligible change.

Coverage should be extended to several million workers not now covered. This will extend the wage standard throughout significant low-wage sectors of the labor market. It will require the payment of a minimum starting at $1 for the workers newly included, and a gradual increase to the general $1.25 minimum.

Together, these two principal changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act will go far to protect our lowest paid workers. The proposed minimum rates have been carefully set at levels which will benefit substantial numbers of underpaid workers, but not so high as to prevent ready adjustment to the new standards.

11. ACCELERATING PROCUREMENT AND CONSTRUCTION

(A) I have directed the heads of the Departments and agencies to carry out an immediate review of their procurement and construction plans through the end of the current fiscal year with a view to expediting such procurement and construction wherever possible, giving priority to actions which will have an early effect on unemployment. The steps they are taking will be reported to me by March 1.

(B) I have directed the Cabinet and agency heads to submit by February 17 inventories of (1) going public works projects which can be speeded up quickly, but for which additional appropriations might be needed, (2) needed natural resource conservation and development, light construction, maintenance, repair, and other work which likewise can be speeded up or started quickly, and (3) any additional construction or other projects which could be initiated at an early date.

I have instructed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in consultation with the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, to work with the agencies in carrying out these directives. They will assemble and appraise the project inventories with a view to determining which projects may be suitable for early initiation or acceleration as part of the recovery program.

Excellent possibilities include programs to improve the roads, recreational facilities, and forests in the project work inventories of the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management. A particularly high priority will be assigned to projects located in areas of labor surplus.

(C) I have today instructed the Secretary of Commerce to make available to the States immediately the entire balance of Federal-aid highway funds scheduled for this fiscal year. This acceleration of the availability of $724 million is a first step in speeding up the highway program and getting more projects under construction and more men at work this year.

The Secretary will urge the States to place under contract as soon as possible all those projects which are currently in the final stages of planning.

In addition, I have asked the Secretary of Commerce to recommend to me, as part of the inventory of approved construction projects, called for earlier in this message, means of increasing the flow of Federal highway funds into actual new construction if economic conditions require such action.

12. GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT IN LABOR SURPLUS AREAS

A principal purpose of the proposed Area Redevelopment Act is to create new jobs in chronic labor surplus areas by bringing in new private industries. It would be anomalous for the Government to urge these locations on private industry while ignoring these areas in the location of its own activities. Agencies of the Federal Government, in locating new facilities or deciding upon the use of existing facilities, are directed to give every reasonable preference to labor surplus areas.

And I have today sent a directive to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, and the General Services Administration requesting prompt steps to improve the machinery by which Federal contracts can be channeled to firms located in labor surplus areas.

III. PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PRICE STABILITY

I have emphasized that the solution to our economic problem requires a program that goes well beyond antirecession measures, important as these are to the relief of distress and the reversal of economic decline. Equally important are measures for the longer pull to restore our economy to its full potential and to accelerate economic growth. Fortunately, the measures to overcome recession, to take up the slack, and to speed growth all reinforce each other.

Today, most industries have the facilities to produce well above current levels. They lack only customers. As a nation, we lose not only $30 billion to $40 billion of production per year; we also lose the vital incentives which capacity operation gives for expansion and modernization of plant and equipment. The measures I have proposed to reduce unemployment and stimulate markets will help to restore these incentives for economic growth.

1. SPECIAL TAX INCENTIVE TO INVESTMENT

Expansion and modernization of the Nation's productive plant is essential to accelerate economic growth and to improve the international competitive position of American industry. Embodying modern research and technology in

new facilities will advance productivity, reduce costs, and market new products. Moreover, an early stimulus to business investment will promote recovery and increase employment.

Among the reforms of the Federal tax system which I expect to propose at a later date is a modification of the income tax laws to provide additional incentives for investment in plant and equipment. To avoid a net revenue loss, I will also recommend measures to remove several unwarranted special tax benefits, and to improve tax compliance and administration. It should be possible to reform the tax system to stimulate economic growth, without reducing revenues and without violating the basic principles of fairness in taxation.

2. INVESTMENT IN HUMAN RESOURCES

Another fundamental ingredient of a program to accelerate longrun economic growth is vigorous improvement in the quality of the Nation's human resources. Modern machines and advanced technology are not enough, unless they are used by a labor force that is educated, skilled, and in good health. This is one important reason why, in the legislative programs that I will submit in the days to come, I will emphasize so strongly programs to raise the productivity of our growing population, by strengthening education, health, research, and training activities.

3. INVESTMENT IN NATURAL RESOURCES

The economic growth of the United States has been favored by an abundant supply of natural resources of almost every sort. But resource needs and supplies are not static. As our needs mount, as past reserves are depleted, and as technological requirements change, we must constantly develop new supplies if growth is not to be inhibited.

Exhaustion of low-cost domestic mineral deposits is a growing problem which calls for technological advance and new national long-range minerals policy.

Our water resources programs, including flood control, irrigation, navigation, watershed development, water pollution control—and above all, water desalinization—require priority attention. In addition, we need to develop sound and uniform standards for sharing costs between Federal, State, and local governments.

Improvement of our forest resources will require expanded Government credit sources for the development of woodland properties, more research on forest management, additional funds for cooperative forest programs, acceleration of the national forest program, and improvement of grazing resources.

Also essential to economic growth are long-range energy resource development and accelerated programs for economical production of energy from nuclear sources, including nuclear fusion. We must begin now also to plan for regional cooperative pooling of electrical power. Both efficiency and growth goals will be served if we interconnect our hydroelectric and thermal power resource plants.

4. PRODUCTIVITY AND PRICE STABILITY

Rapid technological change is resulting in serious employment dislocations, which deny us the full stimulus to growth which advancing technology makes possible. Labor and industry have demonstrated cooperative initiative in working out solutions in specific plants and industries. Government action is also necessary, not only to maintain an environment favorable to economic growth, but also to deal with special problems in communities and industries suffering from economic dislocations and to help those who through unemployment are bearing an unfair share of the burden of technological change.

I have dealt with some of these problems elsewhere in this message, in connection with unemployment insurance, aid to depressed areas, and efforts to broaden the services of the U.S. Employment Service.

Government can help further by encouraging labor and management to find ways to smooth the adjustment to technological change and thus to maintain and reenforce the favorable attitude toward economic progress that characterizes American business and labor alike. Accordingly, I shall issue an Executive order establishing the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, with members drawn from labor, management, and the public. The Committee is directed to advise the President with respect to actions that may be taken by labor, management, and the public which will promote free and responsible collective bargaining, industrial peace, sound wage policies, sound price policies, and stability, a higher standard of living, increased productivity, and America's competitive position in world markets. It will consider national manpower needs and the special benefits and problems created by automation and other technological advances. I look to the Committee to make an important contribution to labor-management relations and an understanding of their importance to the stability of prices and the health of the economy.

The course of the American price level depends in substantial measure on wage and price decisions of labor and management. This dependence grows in importance as the economy moves toward full employment. All of us must now be conscious of the need for policies that enable American goods to compete successfully with foreign goods. We cannot afford unsound wage and price movements which push up costs, weaken our international competitive position, restrict job opportunities, and jeopardize the health of our domestic economy.

Price stability will also be aided by the adoption of a tax incentive plan mentioned earlier, which will encourage a higher rate of business investment in improved plants and equipment.

Price increases for many products and services have occurred because these industries have lagged behind in the march of productivity and technological advance. Indeed, in the present economic situation, a stepping up of productivity improvement throughout the economy would contribute to the achievement of price stability.

We must not as a nation come to accept the proposition that reasonable price stability can be achieved only by tolerating a slack economy, chronic unemployment, and a creeping rate of growth.

Neither will we seek to buy short-run economic gains by paying the price of excessive increases in the cost of living. Always a cruel tax upon the weak, inflation is now the certain road to a balance of payments crisis and the disruption of the international economy of the Western World.

Inflation has no single cause. There have been times in the postwar period when prices rose sharply in response to a rate of total spending in excess of our capacity to produce. The Government will not contribute to this process, and we shall use the powerful tools of fiscal and monetary policy to arrest any such movement if it should threaten in the year ahead. Some price increases, particularly among the consumer services, have been caused by the failure of productive resources to move promptly in response to basic shifts in the pattern of demand. We shall seek means to encourage the movement of manpower and capital into sectors of expanding demand.

CONCLUSION

I have sought in this message to propose a program to restore momentum to the American economy. I have recommended measures designed to set us firmly on the road to full recovery and sustained growth. But if these measures prove to be inadequate to the task, I shall submit further proposals to the Congress within the next 75 days. We will do what needs to be done to fulfill the high promise of the American economy.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1961.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in order to inquire about the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are three resolutions reported out of the Committee on Rules. One resolution is to recreate the Small Business Committee, one authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations, and one authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations.

Those resolutions will come up on Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. May I inquire about the resolution concerning the Small Business Committee as to the number provided for.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is hereby created a select committee composed of 15 members.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

PAY CHECKS OF REGULAR EMPLOYEES OF STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it has just come to my attention that a number of the regular employees of standing committees of the House on yesterday and the day before have expressed some apprehension in not receiving their January pay checks on January 31.

I am advised that the Clerk of the House has drawn the checks for all such employees who were on the rolls at the end of the last Congress. They are ready for release upon election of the committees by the House and receipt of appropriate certification for the respective committees of service rendered through January.

The delay arises from the fact that the House has not as of January 31 elected most of the standing committees so that the Clerk of the House was in no position to release the checks because the committees appoint or reappoint the personnel and notifies the Clerk. As soon as that is done the matter can be disposed of immediately.

I regret any inconvenience the delay may have caused, but I feel certain that our faithful and loyal committee employees understand the circumstances causing the slight delay.

I am referring only to the regular employees of the standing committees. Employees working for special and select committees paid by investigating funds will, I understand, be dealt with insofar as appointments and pay are concerned in the same manner as in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Gladly.

Mr. GROSS. What caused the delay? Can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a natural delay. This happens at the beginning of every Congress; and I would say in all frankness that there was a little further delay by reason of the Rules Committee fight.

Mr. GROSS. Quite a substantial delay.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no. Now, I am frank with the gentleman. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion. There was no long delay. Usually it takes from 4 to 6 weeks at the beginning of a new Congress to get started.

Mr. GROSS. Would not the gentleman say there has been an unprecedented delay? I cannot recall any such delay in the 12 years I have been here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not say that it was an unprecedented delay. It was a reasonable delay that the circumstances justified.

DEPUTY SERGEANT AT ARMS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 138

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1961, the basic compensation of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms (charge of pairs), Office of the Sergeant at Arms, shall be at the rate of $7,000 per annum so long as held by the present incumbent. The additional amounts necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONALD H. ACKERMAN, JR.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 139

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, one of the minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named person, effective January 15, 1961, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Donald H. Ackerman, Junior, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum. The additional amounts necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE PUNXSUTAWNEY GROUNDHOG SPEAKS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], may proceed for 1 minute, without objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House—and particularly the new Members—that today, February 2, is the traditional groundhog day.

And that great meteorologist has again spoken from his den on Gobblers Knob in the foothills of the Alleghenies at Punxsutawney, Pa.—my district, where during the last few weeks we have had severe cold, wintry weather.

I am in receipt of information from Punxsutawney that the great prognosticator of the weather, who predicts with amazing accuracy, has spoken.

Hear ye. Hear ye. All ye disciples of the world's greatest weather prophet—the Punxsutawney groundhog.

The time was 7:41 a.m. on a snow-covered knoll near Punxsutawney. When the great Seer of Seers emerged from his den, that weary prophet blinked his eyes at the unaccustomed sunlight.

Would he see his shadow foretelling 6 more weeks of winter, or would there be no shadow meaning an early spring? All waited with bated breath.

"Sorry," said the great Seer, "You might just as well have stayed in bed. It's cold—brrrrrrrr—and it's going to stay that way for another 6 weeks. So put another log on the fire or turn up the thermostat. I'm going back to bed. See you in the spring."

And with that he backed into his den and slammed the door on the outside world and said:

Double, double, toil and trouble,
Six more weeks of snow to shovel,
Icy winds and zero nights ahead,
This is one year I should have stayed in bed.

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN INDEPENDENT COMPETITION OR PITY THE POOR PIG

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman in the 86th Congress of Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Select Small Business Committee, I have had the opportunity to study and acquaint myself rather intricately with small business problems in food distribution.

During the period of time that the committee studied and investigated the problems of small business, I became increasingly aware of the problem facing the small meatpackers and independent firms who are suffering as a result of sprawling corporate food chain retailers. It has been found that these corporations have not limited themselves to the mere integration of wholesaling and retailing functions, but in the field of meat food products they have extended themselves to the point where they feed the cattle—slaughter the cattle—and pack the meat in packinghouses which they own and operate. Now this is indeed an easier, more economical method of handling meat food products—for them. But, what does it do to the quality of meat that we as consumers purchase? One offshoot of this operation is that the cattle involved in these operations and marketed in this way, do not pass through competitive markets.

And, what does it do to the small meatpacker and the independent firm who wishes to produce in quality rather than quantity, and who by the very process of free enterprise is entitled to engage in the business of his choice? He is at a loss to compete with an umbrella producer who integrates his operations in this noncompetitive, paternal manner.

It is out of respect for the independent producer and the dependent consumer, and out of respect for free enterprise and the demands of the consumer, that today I introduce a bill to strengthen independent competition. This bill makes it unlawful for any packer whose gross sales were more than $30 million during the preceding calendar year, or for any person engaged in the business of manufacturing, or preparing livestock products for sale or shipment in commerce, or in wholesale marketing in commerce of meats, meat food products, livestock

products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, or eggs, whose gross sales were more than $30 million during the preceding calendar year to engage in the business of selling at retail under penalty of $50 fine or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

ICEM'S NINTH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on today, February 2, 1961, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM—will complete 9 years of outstanding service to governments and start upon its 10th year in moving migrants and refugees out of Europe to fill the manpower needs of the developing economies of Australia and the Latin American countries.

ICEM, as many of my colleagues in the House who attended its session will recall, was organized at Brussels as a result of the initiative of Members of the House of Representatives.

Starting with 15 governments at Brussels, ICEM's membership has grown to 29 governments. At the last session of the ICEM Council in December 1960, at Geneva, the United Kingdom gave notice of its intention to apply for membership in ICEM as of April 1, 1961. Thus, all countries of emigration in Europe, except Portugal, and all immigration countries overseas will be members of ICEM. These 30 governments have a common interest in cooperating to develop planned migration responsive to their individual policies and needs.

In 9 years of operations, ICEM has moved 1,042,947 persons overseas, of whom 447,178 were refugees.

History will someday record that the movement of these substantial numbers out of Europe who could not be absorbed at the time in the convalescent economies of the European countries, was not only a major factor in easing tensions in European countries and in helping developing economies abroad, but also a demonstration that the free world could maintain a relative freedom of movement which is essential to its existence and a symbol of its character. This was particularly important in 1956 and 1957 when ICEM was able to assist the governments in the rapid and, I may even say, dramatic distribution of over 120,000 Hungarian refugees in resettlement overseas.

In a similar manner, prepared to meet the fast emerging contingencies, ICEM is now assisting in the resettlement of Greeks and Italians returning from Egypt, of Italians and Spaniards returning from North Africa, of Dutch Indonesians returned to the Netherlands, and of Belgians fleeing the boiling caldron of the Congo. The fact that these people with a variety of skills and expertness in many occupations are placed without delay in the underdeveloped oversea economies where their skills are in immediate demand is a substantial contribution to the economy of the free world which cannot afford to waste available manpower, its most precious asset.

Through ICEM, many of the member governments assist each other in their special problems of emigration or immigration. In 1959 Canada provided a 6 months training course at her own expense for immigration officials of Latin American countries. Australia's administrator of immigrant hostels and reception centers is presently advising the Argentine and Brazilian Governments on the establishment and administration of such centers. The Netherlands Government, which has had a long experience in emigration practices, is presently cooperating with ICEM in advising the Belgian Government, which has always been a country of immigration within Europe, with respect to the emigration of her nationals forced out of Congo. Venezuela has recently requested ICEM to provide an expert from another immigration member government to draft a basic code of immigration and to propose a body of immigration policies appropriate to Venezuela's needs.

Emphasis within ICEM has shifted during the past few years from preoccupation with the problems of overcrowded countries in Europe such as Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and Greece, to the equally pressing needs of the less developed Latin American countries which desperately need skilled and semiskilled workers. A major handicap in the economic development of the Latin American countries has been the absence of an adequate force of technically trained workers. The Latin American countries welcome the technical assistance which ICEM can provide in improving their immigration procedures and in establishing the administrations which can determine their needs in terms of numbers and skills, select them skillfully in Europe, and place them satisfactorily after arrival in the country of immigration.

As in other fields of economic life, emigration and immigration countries are finding through ICEM that to achieve their particular objectives unilateral national efforts are not sufficient and must be supplemented by cooperation within the international organization, ICEM, and further, that collectively they must organize and develop positive programs of planned migration to serve their own purposes better. ICEM is therefore engaged in very useful experimentation in methods of cooperation between governments in a highly complex field of government interest and well deserves the continuing support of the U.S. Government. On its ninth anniversary, ICEM deserves a sincere "Well done."

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which, in my humble judgment, may be a means of redirecting and reshaping the lives of millions of people in our Western Hemisphere for the enjoyment of a more abundant and peaceful future.

My bill would amend chapter VIII of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 to provide for the establishment of an inter-American cultural and scientific program to be conducted at institutions of higher learning in the United States—including Puerto Rico.

During the past several years, we have been called upon in the Congress time and again to approve relief programs for various countries, some of which were directly or indirectly tied to our mutual security. We have given untold millions and even billions of dollars worth of agricultural surpluses to people in need. We have furnished technical assistance to distant undeveloped countries throughout the world. Some of these monumental efforts and expenditures have borne fruit. Most assuredly the Marshall plan helped the economic recovery of Europe following World War II. Europe, then, was prc trate, and billions of dollars in American aid became an imperative necessity to help her regain strength so she could once again stand on her own.

The plight of the poor among our neighboring countries in the Caribbean, in Central, and South America seemed less acute at that time of world crisis, so their problems of hunger, illiteracy, inadequate housing, lack of scientific and industrial development, and so forth, were pigeonholed for attention at a more distant and hopefully propitious time.

A few unfortunate incidents occurred which should have reminded us that the timegap, which we had counted upon to give constructive assistance to Latin America in the solution of her problems, had begun to run out, and that the crises, one after another, which were developing in that hitherto friendly area might prove as disastrous to world peace and security as some of those which beset Europe after the war.

May I say that I do not believe the United States can or should over a long span of years attempt to feed, clothe, provide shelter for, and otherwise interfere with the lives of countless millions of people in foreign lands. I think these people have a responsibility to help themselves and their own. I feel that we have a responsibility and should regard it as a privilege to assist them to achieve greater political maturity, economic development, literacy, and social and physical betterment than they have enjoyed in the past. The alternative is chaos compounded upon chaos for all concerned.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that any permanent solution to the problems besetting Latin America and our future relations with the countries of that area can not be found in the mere granting of financial aid, however great the amount,

to bolster existing regimes, even though they may be friendly, or in gifts of food to feed the hungry people. Ways and means must be found to get at the root of their problems, to help the people of these countries to help themselves, and this sort of help is necessary in practically every area of human endeavor if the future peace and prosperity of this hemisphere is to be secured.

The bill I propose, Mr. Speaker, would lay the foundation stones for such a future, where the cultural and scientific interchanges of today might awaken and vitalize many of our good but slumbering neighbors to the south and thus assure them a better and more abundant tomorrow and assure us stable allies to help maintain our traditional liberties and the peace of the world.

The inter-America cultural and scientific interchange program which I propose is far broader in its concept and implications than the proposed hemispheric center in Puerto Rico which has recently been considered as a possibility. I gather that it is the concensus of opinion among a group of educators and experts familiar with Latin American needs, that one hemispheric center in Puerto Rico would not meet the immediate needs of our Nation in a frontal attack on the problems of Latin America. My proposal, on the other hand, calls for the establishment and operation at not more than 12 institutions of higher learning in the United States including Puerto Rico of a wide program designed for inter-American cultural and scientific interchange under the direction of the Secretary of State. It lays emphasis on the establishment and operation of degree-granting graduate institutes for specialized studies in the Caribbean, Brazilian, Central America, and Spanish South American regions, and in all other specific and needful fields and areas to be designated by the Secretary of State. It visualizes the establishment and operation of nondegree granting institutes specializing in North American culture and intensive language studies. It would provide for the stimulation of research and technology, and exchanges related thereto, by the creation of one or more Latin American research service bureaus. It would provide for conferences, short courses, and projects involving an interchange of professors, lecturers, scientists, and other specialists. Very important, in my opinion, it provides for the preparation of teachers and researchers in Latin American fields, and for training students for professional, business, government, and industrial employment, all looking toward the development of better working relationships among the Americas.

My bill provides for grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities from Latin American nations as may be necessary to attract such scholars and authorities to participate in the program at such institutions; for grants, fellowships, and other payments to qualified students from the United States or from Latin America as may be necessary to enable such students to engage in study or training under such program, and making facilities available for study or training under such program to other qualified persons. I propose that training under such program shall be provided to not more than 2,400 students annually, divided approximately equally, to the extent practicable, between students from the United States and students from other nations.

This, in essence, Mr. Speaker, constitutes my proposal for tackling our Latin American relations at the source. I would hope that the Secretary of State might allocate some parts of this program to my own alma mater, the University of Florida, at Gainesville, Fla., which has pioneered with a Latin American cultural and exchange program over a long period of time, at considerable expense to the State of Florida, but with rewarding success. In fact, I am indebted to the Graduate School of the University of Florida and to the extracurricular efforts of 35 distinguished members of the graduate faculty of the University for the specifics in developing a workable inter-American cultural and scientific exchange program. They, naturally, would welcome the establishment of a center at the University of Florida, where many facets of an inter-American program already exist, but they recognize the possible need of a far more extensive program, divided among other institutions with established programs in operation. Successive administrations at the University of Florida have championed an inter-American cultural and exchange program. The great presidents of this University had foresight and vision with respect to the ultimate benefits of such a program to our Nation which transcended that of their contemporaries both in and outside the State of Florida. As a consequence, dozens of Latin American university alumni today occupy positions of high responsibility in agriculture, engineering, commerce, and government, all having a steadying influence in the relations of their respective countries with the United States. Such a program was maintained and nourished for nearly 3 decades with firmness and foresight, against almost insurmountable odds, including public apathy and violent opposition to State expenditures in support of such a program. I say here and now with, I hope, justifiable pride, that if others had had the same foresight as we did at the University of Florida years ago, the story of our relationships with Latin America today may have been vastly different.

Fortunately, the president of the university, Dr. J. Wayne Reitz; the dean of the Graduate School, Dr. L. E. Grinter; and the director of the School of Inter-American Studies, Dr. A. Curtis Wilgus, not to mention nearly a hundred members of the faculty, have had practical experience with and are dedicated to an expansion of the type of program we have so long conducted at the University of Florida. It is for this reason that they gladly share with the Nation and leave to the determination of the Secretary of State the implementation of a broad program of inter-American cultural and scientific interchange, an outline of which I have attempted to encompass in my bill.

I am not wedded, of course, to the exact language of my bill and I realize that many of my colleagues are interested in similar legislation. I want to pay tribute to my colleague, the great Junior Senator from Florida, GEORGE SMATHERS, for the magnificent work he has done in the field of Latin American relations. It would be my intention to work closely with him and the other members of the Florida congressional delegation as well as other colleagues with similar interest to forge a program of education in our institutions of higher learning that will cement the bonds of friendship between the United States and the Latin American nations.

KENNEDY ASSISTANT RECOMMENDS WELFARE STATE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the Washington Post of February 1, 1961, gives the American people an inkling of what may be in store for them if some of the Kennedy understudies have their way. Presidential Assistant Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., according to the Washington Post story, says we must have a welfare state as our best defense against communism. Mr. Schlesinger should know that the Communists would like nothing better than to have a welfare state established in America. This would be right down their alley. I suggest that President Kennedy take Mr. Schlesinger to the proverbial woodshed for a spanking before he spouts off again. The newspaper article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1961]

KENNEDY AID CALLS WELFARE STATE BEST DEFENSE AGAINST COMMUNISM

NEWTON, MASS., January 31.—A welfare state is the best defense against communism, Presidential Assistant Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., said last night.

The Harvard history professor, in a debate with William F. Buckley, Jr., emphasized he was speaking as a private citizen and not as a spokesman for the Kennedy administration.

He and Buckley, a Yale professor and editor of the magazine, The National Review, debated the topic "Freedom and the Welfare State" at Newton College of the Sacred Heart.

Buckley, a noted conservative, charged Schlesinger with twisting history when "history inconvenienced him * * *." He said growing governmental power was "a danger inside a person because it controls his thinking."

Schlesinger said he envisioned the welfare state as one that would provide basic elements for its citizens, such as food, clothing, shelter, education and opportunity.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted three bills dealing with the Federal Highway Act of 1956 and the so-called National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

Each of these bills would, in its own way, remove or lead to the removal of serious and outstanding inequities which have arisen under the act.

Mr. Speaker, under the original plan New York State was to have received 1,227 miles of highways constructed within its boundaries. By the time the Federal Government came to this construction, however, the State of New York had already constructed highways totaling 568.8 miles along these routes, including the New York State Throughway.

The Federal Government refused to reimburse the State of New York for this construction, although it goes without saying that the taxpayers of the State of New York continued to contribute, through taxes, to the highway program. They paid their share for the Federal program and also paid for the major share of the highways that the program should have given them in New York State.

This inequity continues to exist. New York State's own initiative in meeting its problems has penalized the taxpayers unjustly.

I might, if time permitted, point out that there is a lesson to be learned from this inequitable highway situation. Could it not be that massive new Federal spending programs, promising much to everyone, will, in practice, benefit primarily those who are least willing to help themselves?

The bills I introduced today are different ways of approaching the same problem. The first, in the form of a concurrent resolution, would declare it to be the sense of Congress that some relief should be given to all States which built at their own expense along the Federal interstate highway route.

The purpose of this resolution would put the Congress on record as being morally committed to make restitution in some manner at a later date.

The second bill provides for actual reimbursement from the Federal Government of money expended by highways on the interstate routes.

The third bill would make provision for additional mileage to be allocated in each State to compensate for lost interstate highway routes in the past.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these proposals afford the Congress the opportunity to take its choice of methods of giving the States the highways it intended in the original program. It affords the Congress the opportunity to justify its earlier actions and not penalize certain areas where local initiative outshone the Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, let us live up to what we have said we will do.

HOUSING

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today in the city of New York our most crying need is housing. Moreover, the shortages we suffer are not confined to the city of New York. Other great urban centers throughout the Nation are faced with comparable needs. It is equally evident that present programs, designed to fulfill an overall objective of providing decent and suitable living environments for every American family, are falling far short of that goal. This conclusion continues to ring true despite the combined efforts of Federal, State, and local governmental programs in partnership with private industry.

The most critical problem is the lack of middle income housing. The best young talent in our cities—young married couples with children—are being driven out and older people living on fixed incomes cannot carry the rents. In the past decade New York, like many American cities, has lost more than 900,000 middle income families, and our present housing programs, even at maximum efficiency, have not been able to reverse this trend. In 1958 less than one-fourth of the private units being completed in New York City were in the $85 to $125-a-month rental range. And most of these are small units not geared to couples with children. The average monthly rental in privately financed or in title I multiple housing units was $155 per month in 1958 and this average has increased since then. Land costs, construction costs, operating costs, and financing costs together with taxes and profits, are the key factors creating the striking inadequacies in middle and fixed income housing.

In view of these inadequacies and the need to supplement existing housing programs which have failed to cope with them, I have today introduced a bill to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation. This new Federal lending institution would make loans secured by middle income housing projects to qualified borrowers. The Corporation would be started with a $100 million stock subscription by the Treasury and would obtain its funds by borrowing in the private market. Loans not exceeding 90 percent of the development cost would be made to public or private nonprofit or limited profit organizations for a period of 50 years at interest rates equivalent to the rates at which tax exempt Treasury bonds are sold but not to exceed 4 percent. Borrowers would be limited to a 6 percent return and rents would be regulated to insure housing at levels within the means of moderate income families and elderly persons living on fixed incomes. The term "moderate income" has been defined to include those families with total monthly housing expenditures of 20 percent of their normal stable income and elderly persons living on fixed incomes are defined as persons 60 years of age or over. The latter may include any family the head of which or whose spouse is 60 years of age or over.

The aim of such legislation is to provide Federal assistance for housing for families who are not eligible for low rent public housing but who cannot afford decent privately financed housing. Financial assistance will not be in the form of subsidies but rather through loans on terms which will permit reduced rentals.

Lastly, I call to the attention of my colleagues that a program of this nature has been in effect in my State for more than 5 years and much progress has been made. Our State program, however, has been strained to its limit and, despite valiant efforts, the need remains great.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of my State has introduced comparable legislation on this subject in the other body. I am hopeful that we can gain early hearings on this legislation and that we shall have the measure before the House promptly.

SELF-HELP FOR EDUCATION

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced again this year the same bill I introduced in the last Congress incorporating the essentials of what has come to be known as the Scrivner plan. The bill bears the number House Joint Resolution 63.

In the last Congress I opposed the Federal grant-in-aid program for public school construction. I did so for a number of reasons. First of all, according to the reports of the Education Study Committee of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the White House Conference on Education, there is no crisis in the school construction program which the States individually cannot meet without Federal money gifts. Secondly, I became convinced that Federal aid grants would delay rather than stimulate school construction by local school districts and that a Federal grant program would penalize local school districts which have already built all of the schools they need. In a speech on the subject, I pointed out the grave policy issues with reference to private and religious schools which such a grant program would raise.

Primarily, however, my reason for opposing the program was my fear that Federal dominion and control, either immediately or by progressive future steps, would follow as an unavoidable consequence of money gifts. Believing as I do that the Federal Government should not control our local school systems in any measure, I was unwilling to lend my support to such a door opener.

Entirely aside from the foregoing reasons, there is yet another compelling reason why the Federal Government should not launch itself upon this new aid-to-States program. The Federal Government can give to the States nothing which it does not first take from the citizens of the States, and the amount it gives back is the difference between what it takes and what it costs to administer the program, which cost has been estimated as high as 30 to 35 percent of total appropriations.

The bill which I have introduced would save these overhead expenses, preclude the danger of Federal control and enable the individual States to build their own schools, according to the judgment of their own officials with money collected from their own citizens. My bill provides in part as follows:

> That 1 per centum of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

My bill further instructs the Federal Internal Revenue Directors in each State to transfer this money to the State treasurer Thereafter, no Federal official would have any control over it whatsoever, and it would be spent under the exclusive direction of State education officials for educational purposes only.

In fiscal year 1956, the Federal Government collected from all the States and territories in personal and corporate income taxes a total of $62,972,969,000. Under this plan, $629,729,690 would be returned to the States for school purposes every year so long as needed. Virginia's share, based on 1956 income taxes paid, would be $7,387,070.

I understand that the principles of this bill have been incorporated in bills introduced or to be introduced by several Members of the House. I earnestly trust that the committee which has these bills in charge will give them a sympathetic hearing and that this plan will be substituted as an alternative to the proposed Federal grant program which cannot fail to thrust our local school systems into the handcuffs of Federal control.

"THE HARVEST OF SHAME"

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last November 25 the CBS Television Network produced a show by Ed Murrow and Fred Friendly entitled "The Harvest of Shame." Following this presentation I received a number of calls and communications from my constituents expressing their consternation that such conditions as presented in this so-called documentary should exist in this country.

Recently the AFL–CIO sponsored a showing of this TV production for Members of Congress. As a matter of fact it took place on Monday, January 30.

I have asked for this time today, Mr. Speaker, to point up some obvious misrepresentations and inexcusable omissions of this CBS presentation, "Harvest of Shame." The American Farm Bureau Federation did an excellent analysis of the film and using this as a basis, together with other information researched by my office, I should like to set the record straight to answer those constituents of mine who have expressed their concern, and to let all the American people for that matter, know precisely what the true picture is concerning our migratory farmworkers.

In the first place, throughout this production, the term "migratory labor" is employed as though it included local workers who are not migratory, or that the term is synonymous with the total number of farmworkers. Actually, the domestic migratory labor force constitutes only about one-ninth of all such laborers in the United States. Another one-ninth are from Mexico.

I feel that it is a serious and inexcusable omission that this broadcast does not give credit for the progress that has been made in recent years, namely, in housing facilities, the adoption of more modern laws by the States, valiant efforts made by local authorities, the uptrend in the farm wage rates, and other very important factors. Failure to cite these improvements gives false impressions.

The opening scene is what this show calls a shapeup for migrant workers in Florida and the opening comment is: "This is the way the humans who harvest the food for the best fed people in the world get hired." Then, one farmer looks at this and says, "We used to own our slaves. Now we just rent them."

Now, in the first place in these days, only a very few people are hired through the procedure just described, so it is not at all typical. In the second place, under the circumstances involved in this particular situation, how else can harvest workers be employed; that is, particularly when many farmers need only a few workers or need help for only a few days and many persons are seeking such employment? A more common, and certainly a more judicial term for such work is "day haul."

Why did these show producers not explain that the U.S. Employment Service, in cooperation with State employment offices, promotes this type of employment? Would it have spoiled their show? As a matter of fact, the Department of Labor requires farmers to cooperate in day-haul programs whenever feasible as a condition of eligibility for interstate recruiting of domestic workers and/or the hiring of Mexicans.

This is a strange type of reporting—the cub type—especially in a show that purports to be a documentary presentation. This is a far cry from the popular and accepted professional understanding of what a documentary is and should be.

Even more surprising is the realization that if this is a slave-labor practice, is it not odd that it is sponsored and endorsed by the U.S. Department of Labor?

An old and commonly used propaganda trick resorted to in this show is the quoting of a person or persons without naming them. This presents an image to the viewer without backing it with facts. Furthermore, it is used by those who want to avoid responsibility for the accuracy of the quotation.

In the introduction, the statement is made that "it is the 1960 grapes of wrath that begins at the Mexican border in California and ends in Oregon and the State of Washington." Now, I feel it only right to recall that the people depicted in the "Grapes of Wrath" were homeless and came from the Dust Bowl area. They were seeking any kind of work at all—at the depth of the depression—when no work was available. Certainly this is, to say the least, out of date, and one can only think, deliberately so in view of the information now available to anyone who takes the trouble to ask for it.

Now, let us look at today's scene. On the west coast in these days farm migrant workers not only are looking for work, but finding it easily, and at fairly decent wages, as I shall show presently. In fact, average pay in the three States aforementioned, as of July 1, 1960, as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture are as follows:

Basis for wage payments	California	Oregon	Washington
Per month with house	$295.00	$246.00	$264.00
Per month with board and room	215.00	189.00	206.00
Per hour with house	1.14	1.15	1.21
Per hour without board and room	1.22	1.21	1.26
Composite rate per hour	1.182	1.162	1.213

Real earnings are substantially understated by the foregoing figures for two main reasons: They are merely cash wages received, and do not reflect any valuation whatever for the prerequisites that are provided to workers, such as housing, meals, transportation, a supply of water, electricity, fuel, and so forth, and they do not include estimates of piece-rate earnings even though workers paid for piecework commonly earn more than those paid by the hour.

And now, here is another great big surprise. The next sentence of the script says:

> It is the story of men and women and children who worked 136 days of the year and averaged $900 a year.

When improperly used without explanation, these statistics, from the annual report of the Department of Agriculture, are grossly misleading. It reminds me of the city editor who said to his newest reporter, "Did you check the facts? If you did not, and evidently you did not, you simply have not got a story unless the facts stand up under close investigation. They do not, so you have not got a story."

A breakdown of these figures shows that the total hired farm labor force varies from 900,000 persons in winter

months to 2,800,000 during the last summer harvest season. It is important to note here that the harvest labor force includes hundreds and even thousands of local people who never migrate to seek farm work. Among them are children, retired persons, housewives, and others. These people work only a few weeks a year on farms at the harvest period and are not in any sense of the word members of the farm labor force. Most of them are interested only in local jobs of a temporary nature and never have been, nor are they now, migratory workers. Others in considerable numbers seek employment on the farms of neighbors after their own harvesting is done and then call upon their neighbors to help them bring in their own crops.

To add all these groups together and give the impression that all are constantly migrating is little short of outright criminal misrepresentation. And the producers of this show have cited these data without making any reference whatever to available statistical information. Nor have they interspersed any explanatory interpretations, although they easily could have done so.

Another gross inaccuracy occurs when, part way through the script, the narrator says:

> From towns like this throughout Florida and throughout the South, the 2 to 3 million move out on their annual migration, which ends in late November. They carry with them whatever little they possess.

And near the end of the script, Mr. Murrow asks:

> Must the 2 to 3 million migrants who help feed their fellow Americans—

Here we have still another surprise. Not only is this statement totally inaccurate, but the producers of this show knew it was inaccurate. A Columbia Broadcasting System press release dated October 20, 1960, announcing the broadcast referred to the estimated 3 million workers who migrate with America's ripening crops. The next day, the press relations director of the American Farm Bureau Federation wrote to a certain Mr. David Lowe—who actually filmed the production and who, I am told, has previously contacted the Farm Bureau Federation—and informed him that the total number of migratory farm workers was far fewer than 3 million and even provided him with references to verify the facts.

It is interesting to note at this point that page 111 of the Farm Labor Fact Book, published by the Department of Labor, and cited in a press release sent out by the Farm Bureau group over the signature of then Secretary of Labor Mitchell, reports:

> Approximately 400,000 different individuals at some time of the year engage in migratory farm work. This figure excludes some 150,000 dependents who travel with the migrant workers, and a roughly equivalent number who remain in the home base areas.

More recent and detailed data is reported monthly by the U.S. Department of Labor in Farm Labor Market Developments in which monthly estimates of the estimated employment and origin of seasonal hired agricultural workers are reported. Data for the latest 12-month period are as follows:

Employment of seasonal farmworkers

[In thousands]

	Total seasonal farm labor employment	Foreign (mostly Mexican workers)	Domestic workers		
			Total	Local	Migrant
1959—November	823	185	638	493	145
December	399	97	302	248	54
1960—January	343	77	265	233	42
February	328	72	256	218	38
March	309	71	238	205	34
April	417	81	336	284	52
May	766	109	657	543	114
June	1,225	137	1,089	867	222
July	1,200	123	1,077	784	293
August	1,112	133	979	716	263
September	1,282	184	1,099	848	251
October	1,316	236	1,079	823	256

Now please note that, although there might have been a few thousand more persons looking for work—but not many more than that because July is a peak harvest month in most areas during which almost all farmers who grow crops have a high requirement of labor—the greatest number of domestic migratory workers employed in any month during the 12-month period shown in the foregoing table, was 293,000 in July 1960. Assuredly this is a sizable difference from the 2 to 3 millions cited by Mr. Murrow.

The Farm Bureau people tell me that their letter to Mr. Lowe calling his attention to the error was acknowledged by telephone accompanied by a promise that they would take another and closer look at their statistical data. Another disappointing surprise, at least, to me, was that the only apparent result of the protest was that the 3 million cited in the press release was scaled down to 2 to 3 millions in the Murrow-Friendly television production itself.

I protest that this is not honest reporting and I submit that this also is an understatement. The facts were available. The error was pointed out. I cannot come to any other conclusion than that this was gross misrepresentation and that the explanation offered was anything but a lame one.

Still another inconsistency comes to my attention. At one point the narrator asks a migrant: "How much did you earn?" The reply was: "One dollar." The presumption here, although not clearly stated, was that the dollar was all that worker earned for that day. I submit that the average viewer could with understandable justification assume that this pay situation was normal.

Furthermore, in the opening scene, a man trying to assemble a crew of workers is quoted as saying, "Over here—75 cents a day we're paying today."

Actually, the facts are quite different and they are readily verifiable to anyone who wants them. Data on farm wages are reported in great detail by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This data, for July 1, 1960—presumably about the date when most of the pictures in "Harvest of Shame" were filmed—are as follows—from Farm Labor, U.S. Department of Agriculture, July 11, 1960:

U.S. average wage rates paid by farmers as of July 1, 1960

Basis on which wages are paid:	
Per month with house	$200.00
Per month with board and room	149.00
Per week with board and room	36.75
Per week without board and room	47.50
Per day with house	5.30
Per day with board and room	6.90
Per day without board and room	6.50
Per hour with house	.92
Per hour without room or board	1.02
Composite rate per hour (calculated from above data)	.812

At this point I find it difficult to improve upon the phraseology of the American Farm Bureau Federation release sent to my office. It says:

> As indicated in the above table in a different connection the wage data shown are cash wages only and are substantially understated because (1) they include no valuation for housing, room and board, meals, food, transportation, water, electricity, fuel, and other prerequisites provided to farmworkers and (2) these official estimates do not include earnings of piece-rate workers who commonly earn more per hour or day than workers employed on a time basis.

It certainly is misleading, and grossly so, to represent what one woman said that she made and to fail to balance this statement with readily available average wage data from official sources.

Some of these wage rates may not be high compared with wages paid to skilled industrial workers, but they are high in relation to what the farmer earns from employing them; accounting for the rapid adoption by farmers of new technology which is reducing migratory labor employment at a rapid pace.

Whatever the situation relative to farm wage rates may be, it certainly is also inadequate reporting to fail to note, whatever the situation may be, that it is improving. Between 1950 and 1960 farm wage rates increased 47 percent according to reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, despite declining farm prices and incomes. It is a fair assumption that the woman just cited above who was presumed to have earned $1 a day was apparently not working very hard. The minimum rate for picking

beans, the work that she was engaged in, in that area was 60 cents a hamper. Most workers will have little difficulty picking two hampers or more an hour.

The worker was questioned during the Murrow-Friendly production concerning her children whom she said she had not left in a nursery because it would have cost her 85 cents and she did not have the money to pay for it.

What the picture failed to note is that this worker's husband has had a full-time permanent job at the Okeelanta Sugar Refinery since 1956 and earns $83.50 a week as reported by the Tampa Tribune of December 7, 1960.

Still another instance of inadequate reporting is brought to my attention in the Murrow-Friendly production which referred to the regulation of transportation of produce and cattle, and then goes on to say that—

> Only six States have laws providing for the safe transportation of migrants within their borders.

Failure of the show to note that the existing regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to the transportation of workers by motor vehicle seems an inexcusable oversight.

Legislation authorizing this has been in existence since 1956 and fairly comprehensive ICC regulations have been in effect for several years. To fail to mention this cardinal fact is certainly error by omission and gives a distorted untrue picture of the situation. Incidentally, no agricultural organizations opposed the enactment of the legislation authorizing the issuance of these regulations. This also is not mentioned. How could the producers of this show overlook the fact that Secretary of Labor Mitchell has commented on the number of serious accidents in which people have been killed purely because there is no interstate standard with regard to safety? Although it is understandable that Secretary Mitchell might be misinformed in this respect, it is inconceivable that the producers of "Harvest of Shame," having devoted 9 months to this subject, would not know of the existing regulations.

Another misleading scene appears in this show. It depicts overloaded trucks filled with farm workers, but it fails to note that these are trucks hauling workers to nearby fields near their homes, leaving the viewer to suppose that they are trucks heading for distant points. The trucks pictured would not be in compliance with ICC regulations for interstate travel. Had this scene and these facts been cited, this scene would have had no useful part in the show.

And still another point. The film pictures an accident involving a truck in which 21 migrants were killed. This accident occurred 3 years ago. Every form of transportation is subject to accident. Yet the film gives no evidence that injuries to migrant workers per mile traveled runs any higher than for other groups of travelers.

At still other points in the script the narrator interviews workers who invariably turn out to be persons with large families. One has 9 children; another has 14; still another, 5; and still another, 8 or 9 girls; and finally, one with 9 children. It really taxes the imagination to understand how it is possible to avoid a social problem when people who do not own their own homes and who do not have a permanent job have families as large as these. In any event it is a little hard to understand why some people think farmers are to blame for this situation. Yet that is the implied inference running through Mr. Murrow's production.

Mr. Murrow says in his production that there are 600,000 of these migrant children who must be educated. At this point may I point out the testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee given on May 2, 1960, by Mr. Ralph C. M. Flynt, Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Education, who said:

> No accurate national figure of the total number of migrant children exists, but estimates range from 350,000 to 500,000.

A still lower figure is cited in the following quotation from Farm Labor Fact Book, page 111, by the U.S. Department of Labor:

> Approximatley 400,000 different individuals at some time of the year engage in migratory farm work. This figure excludes some 150,000 dependents who travel with the migrant workers.

I call your attention to a paper dated September 4, 1959, entitled "Employment and Child Labor of Migrant Children," which is furnished to the Farm Bureau Federation and is cited by me in this extension. It was issued by the Office of Education and it says the Department of Agriculture estimates that in 1954 there were about 320,000 children under 18 years of age who were dependent upon the earnings of migrant farmworkers. Nearly half of these migrated with their families, including about 100,000 children less than 14 years of age.

Even if we recognize the fact that a serious problem of education of migrant children exists, we see no valid purpose in exaggerating the size of the problem.

The film's portrayal of large migrant families is another distortion of facts. Some migrant families may be large; but obviously most are not. The official estimates cited above regarding the number of migrant children compared with correct data relative to the number of migrants discloses this fact beyond the shadow of a doubt.

As to Mr. Murrow's assertion that—

> The U.S. Office of Education reports that the migratory workers have the highest rate of illiteracy in the country. Approximately 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant workers finishes grade school. Approximately 1 out of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma.

We have inquired of the Department of Education concerning the source of this information. But we have not been able to find it. The Farm Bureau Federation furthermore reports that they have read a mass of reports furnished to it by the Office of Education without finding anything to support these estimates. Further inquiry shows that even the Secretary of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor and the staff of the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee cannot give us the source of this information. Mr. Harvey Poole, a Negro leader of Belle Glade, Fla., deeply resentful of this slur, has completed a list of children of migrant workers who have received college degrees. Furthermore, according to Sam Mase, a staff writer of the Tampa Tribune, by December 5 Mr. Poole's list of migrant children who had received college diplomas had grown to more than 100 persons; and this is only a small segment of the migratory farm labor force. Further interesting light is thrown upon this subject according to the Farm Bureau Federation who advises us that the records at Lake Shore High School in Belle Glade, Fla., showed that more than 30 percent of the graduates of that high school during the past 5 years have been migrant children—and that more than 20 percent of them have gone on to college.

I further call to your attention the fact that the Friendly-Murrow production fails as usual to reflect the major progress that has been made in this respect in recent years. I call to your attention the Report to the President on Domestic Migratory Farm Labor of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, which says on pages 17 to 18:

> There is a definite trend, particularly since 1954, of increased and sustained interest on the part of State departments of education, local school districts and communities, and private organizations to provide for the educational needs of migrants.

The producers of this show must have looked far and wide to discover the most dilapidated type of housing that they could find for the script, and it shows a number of views of tumbled-down housing facilities occupied by migrants. The television production does not balance this showing of the worst housing with comparable presentation of relatively good housing provided to farm workers in many areas, nor does it adequately reflect the fact that the provision of good housing for a period of a few weeks is a tremendous financial burden that farmers have sought to meet as best they can and are meeting to an extent not made clear at all by the picture. This in spite of the fact that improvements in migratory labor housing which have been and are being made are recognized easily by anyone who is at all close to the situation. To quote from one of the numerous sources, the U.S. Department of Labor, in a publication titled "This Is How 12 Camps for Migratory Workers in Agriculture Are Operated," the preface says:

> The responsibility (for providing adequate housing) is being met with steady and progressive improvement in housing for migratory workers.

At one point Mr. Murrow said that—

> Some migrants have tried to leave the endless migratory stream.

And he adds:

> Wherever this happens, the local slum areas expand.

Although a substantial number of migratory workers do settle down every

year and become permanent residents of many communities resulting in the creation of slum areas, most of them do so without any adverse effect on the community. Such migrants commonly become permanent farm employees' supervisors and many of the farmers for some find jobs outside of agriculture.

Another fallacy which we noted with some surprise is the idea given by this production that the migrant somehow is caught in a trap from which he cannot extricate himself. This may be true of some workers who have limited skills, but to many the door is open and many use it. The facts brought to my attention also show that as far as finding permanent farm jobs is concerned about the only absolute prerequisite beside physical is willingness.

The number of misstatements and inferences that occur in this production seem endless. And still another point, the narrator asserts that the employment of Mexican and other foreign workers "depresses the wage scale of the domestic migrants." The only inference that can be drawn from this incomplete statement is that the use of the word "depresses" makes one feel that farm wages are being driven down by the presence of these workers. Actually, nothing could be further from the truth.

Farm wages in the decade between 1950 and 1960 increased 47 percent according to official reports by the Department of Agriculture, and in all areas farm wages increased by approximately the same percentage; and please note that this was during a period in which farm prices and farm incomes actually were declining. We find another improbable suggestion of facts at another point in this production when the narrator questions a minister about his crew leaders. The minister says that—

> The grower pays them 45 cents to pick a crate of tomatoes and then they go around and pay the laborer 12 cents at the most.

Of course, it is quite true that some crew leaders do not treat their workers fairly, but it is equally true that many farmers get blamed for the practices of their crew leaders.

The facts, so wildly improbable, that are stated in this production lead me, and would lead anyone, to the general assumption that the producers of the show question many people and carefully select the most extreme adverse reactions and conditions and then report them in such a manner that they mislead the viewer to suppose that this situation is normal.

As to the breadline scene toward the end of the program, the commentary says that this happened in the United States in 1960 and that this is a line of human beings waiting for a ration of canned goods, milk, and bread. The facts are that the breadline of hungry migrants appearing in this documentary was not a current situation according to Sam Mase writing in the Tampa Tribune, who said the two representatives of the sponsors, Philip Morris, Inc., were sent to Florida to investigate complaints of the Murrow-Friendly production. This scene, it was learned, represented instead a period several years ago when a big freeze destroyed most of Florida's vegetable crops leaving migrants unemployed.

Certainly the public is entitled to unbiased and factual presentation of the issue in any television production that is proclaimed to be a documentary. In summary, I can only say that the producers of this show shirked their elementary responsibility of honestly reporting what they depicted. It is a highly colored propaganda job; not only does the production mislead the public but the farmers are irreparably damaged by the image given to the general public by this production. I cannot express too strongly my conviction that the public and the farmers have a right to expect our television broadcasting companies to do a more objective presentation of any factual situation and certainly to be more objective than they were in their presentation of "Harvest of Shame."

And finally, Mr. Speaker, since Edward R. Murrow a coproducer of this show has recently been appointed by President Kennedy as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, I hope that he will not find it necessary to distort the facts so grossly as was done in "Harvest of Shame" when he enunciates our position and policies to the rest of the world.

POLARIS WEAPONS SYSTEM

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I need not remind this body of the many hopes which bore fruit with the completion at the first Polaris submarine and of its successful missile tests last summer—2 years ahead of schedule. This revolutionary concept has incited the acclaim of the free world—and the envy of those who would bury us. It has been lauded at home and abroad as the atomic war deterrent which should restore a degree of stability between nations on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

It is an instrument of war, but conceived, developed, and perfected by a nation whose greatest desire is to live in peace with all nations. But in these times to live in peace is to live in strength. Our strength can be maintained only as long as we are receptive to new ideas and new developments.

The recent decision by the Secretary of Defense to arm our first nuclear-powered cruiser, the U.S.S. *Long Beach*, with the Polaris missile demonstrates that our Defense Department is going ahead with new ideas and exploiting technological progress.

But what does this mean in terms of our national defense posture? First, Mr. Speaker, it signifies a determined effort to maintain part of our nuclear retaliation on the high seas, free to move on 70 percent of the world's surface—with no fixed address—but away from our populated cities and industrial centers.

No longer will our fixed missile sites be the sole concern of our antagonists—now he must also deal with an illusive foe at sea whose precise location is not known.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Navy has some older ships, including World War II cruisers now in mothballs which could be readily configured and armed with Polaris missiles. By utilizing these ships and the proven Polaris missiles we can create a mobile, well dispersed fleet of considerable strength and versatility.

I strongly endorse the extremely important decision to place Polaris missiles in the atomic-powered U.S.S. *Long Beach*. The new administration and this Congress certainly will realize the value of the Polaris-*Long Beach* marriage and will insure that many other weddings of this type are consummated in the future.

THE POLARIS PROJECT

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with remarks just made by my colleague from California. He was one of the original supporters of the Polaris project when some did not share his enthusiasm or foresight. He knows of what he speaks. We now have two Polaris submarines at sea—on station ready to respond to our Nation's needs.

The New York Times—November 16, 1960—published excerpts from Admiral Burke's message to the crew of the U.S.S. *Robert E. Lee* just before she departed Charleston in November for her first deployment. The sentiments expressed are shared by many of us—and I quote in part:

> It must be somewhat incongruous that you will prove the value of this system if the need for it never arises. Yet, all the thinking, the hard work, the frustrations and the choice of accomplishment are rooted in the hope that this weapon will never be required to perform. If this need should arise, however, for the protection of civilization against a ruthless, barbaric and immoral system, your ship and the missiles it carries may contribute to the salvation of that civilization.

All our defense efforts are predicated on the premise if the need should arise.

But it occurred to me as I read a Wall Street Journal editorial recently that if there is merit in shifting our retaliatory power out to sea to dilute a possible surprise attack on this country—the same line of thought should serve to benefit our allies as well. It is my understanding that there is considerable anxiety among our friends in NATO over what countries will or will not have nuclear weapons—fearful that

one country may turn on another. These fears may be justified—I do not know—but fears create dissension and we strive for unity among our NATO partners—a united and strong NATO is the bedrock of a peaceful world in our day.

A possible approach to subdue this uneasiness may be within our grasp. To shift the seed of dissension from sovereign lands to the freedom of the high seas would require no more than extending the Polaris-cruiser concept to insure the protection of our NATO partners.

I am no military expert and do not pretend to be, but any plan to establish a sizable portion of our atomic retaliatory strength on the vast expanse of the seas will receive my support.

The Wall Street Journal editorial referred to is as follows:

SECRET WEAPON

It was Edgar Allen Poe's theory that if you wanted to hide something effectively the best means was to place the object in fairly open view, thus thwarting searchers who could be counted on to jimmy the safe, dismantle clocks and slash mattresses. The searcher would be inclined to overlook something placed right under his nose.

Mr. Poe would probably have nodded wisely this week when the best efforts of the United States, Dutch and British Navies were unable to find a gleaming 20,000-ton luxury liner that was hijacked in the Caribbean. These navies, presumably equipped with elaborate electronic devices for detecting missiles looping in from outer space and submarines lurking on the ocean bottom, spent 3 days scooting around the West Indies before catching even a glimpse of a cruise ship that can't make better than 21 knots.

Well, maybe there's a little lesson in nuclear-age strategy here. If the West is ever forced to launch a counteroffensive against the Soviets it perhaps should be spearheaded by the *Queen Mary*, with whistles sounding and pennants flying. The great vessel would probably be dropping her gangplanks in Murmansk while the Russians were still watching the western sky.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, because it is my firm belief that the youth of the United States have both the need and the desire to fit themselves for a world of increasing technology, and because many deserving and intelligent youngsters are prevented from attending a college or a university because of increased cost of attending an institution of higher learning, I have introduced H.R. 3549. This bill will allow young men and women who might otherwise be deprived of the advantages of a college education to attend the institution of their choice and to defray the costs through an income tax deduction of $1,000 per year for each year they are full-time students.

Let me emphasize that it will not merely exempt $1,000 for a college student, but if the student is a dependent already qualifying for a $600 exemption, the $1,000 exemption will be in addition to that amount.

This is the most realistic method of helping promote higher education, I believe, and is more in keeping with our constitutional freedoms—to allow the taxpayer to retain more of his rightfully earned wealth and to spend it for higher education if he wishes, rather than taking it from him in taxes and doling it back to him.

I have done considerable research with regard to the cost of a college education for today's young people. The cost of tuition has risen steadily since 1939, as has the cost of living. A parent who must pay for the education of several children today finds that, although his own income may have increased during the past 20 years, the percentage of the increase is much lower than the cost of maintaining even one child, while he or she is obtaining the education so necessary if that child is to make full use of his ability and contribute to the general welfare of our Nation.

During the past 10 years, the costs of attending college have risen from $1,120 to $1,300 in the case of publicly controlled institutions and from $1,674 to $2,100 in the case of privately controlled institutions. These figures are based on data compiled by Ernest V. Hollis & Associates and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Recently, much has been said about the need for more and better teachers, more scientists, more technicians, more and better doctors—in almost any field of our rapidly expanding economy, the need for better instruction and more instructors is apparent. It seems to me that the responsibility of the Federal Government is to encourage young men and women to become well versed in their chosen fields, and at the same time to leave them free to choose.

It is my feeling that better use of funds could be made by making them available at the source—the family—through an income tax exemption for each individual attending an institution of higher learning on a full-time basis. This would eliminate the tremendous cost of administering loan funds and the controversial loyalty oath requirements for qualification to obtain loans.

I have arrived at the flat $1,000 per year exemption for each full-time student after examining the reports of a number of independent organizations. This amount would be immediately available to the student and his family without the mortgaging of future income for repayment of a loan. Further, we must increase our efforts to educate more of the talent of our Nation through programs that will assure that no student of ability who desires to attend college will be denied his opportunity because of financial need. We should make every effort to insure that qualified young men and women are given an opportunity to develop their abilities for the betterment of our Nation as a whole, as well as for the benefit of the individuals.

I believe it is most important that we encourage individual effort to obtain the benefits of higher education. We face serious problems in the area of educating our young people and I am convinced that enactment of H.R. 3549 would assist families to send their children to college—families which now are unable to do so because of rising education costs and confiscatory tax rates.

In a time when every problem is met with cries of "We need Federal aid," I believe this approach is the most realistic—to leave the people with their own money to be invested in their children's education, rather than taking it from them in taxes, then giving part of it back to them in the form of Federal aid to education.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE USO

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, February 4, 1961, marks the 20th anniversary of that civilian contribution to the morale of the Armed Forces known as the USO. The great work of this combined operation has innumerable aspects, and has, for its varied purposes, drawn upon the charity and patriotism of the entire civilian population of the United States.

Those who have, through circumstances of age or illness or other disabling condition, been relieved of the duty or denied the privilege of serving the country in uniform, yet owe it to their country to serve in what way they can—they owe it, too, to those whose lives are subject to the discipline and tedium of the military way, to ease that way by whatever contributions, in money, in time, in thought, and in action, may be open to them. I thank God that, through the past 20 years, so many have been found in our country, willing and eager to devote their time, whether in full-time jobs or in part-time volunteer work, and to donate their money either directly or through various charitable organizations, to this great united enterprise.

I believe the civilians of the United States, and also those who have completed their assigned terms of military service, have shown a loyal and enthusiastic recognition of the fact that the USO is our civilian participation in national defense. It is essential to every one of us, as American citizens, that we make this united effort to keep the traditional American characteristic—the unity of citizen and soldier.

It is the ambition of the USO, and of the American people acting through the USO, to keep the American soldiers and sailors, and others in the Armed Forces, from feeling that they are utterly separated from their own humankind, and suspended in an impersonal existence of discipline, orders, plans, loneliness, and the long spaces of waiting boredom that seem inseparable from the military way of life. The USO has been our bridge

to them—our means of making them know that they are not alone and forgotten, not an unappreciated and disregarded sacrifice in the cause of our safety, but a real and active and very important part of our society. We bind ourselves to them through the USO, by many ties of affection, of common aspirations and religious sentiments, of intellectual and educational aspirations, of shared entertainment and companionship.

It is best, of course, when we can give ourselves directly—when we can go in person to USO entertainments, when we can participate in educational activities, when we can make plain by personal contact that our friends, our sons and daughters, and all who are with them in the great effort to preserve America and freedom from the dangers of today's world, are held in warm affection and appreciation by those whose liberties they guard. But next best is to contribute to the great religious and charitable organizations that make up the USO, and to the United Funds and Community Chests that finance it. But the essential is the spirit, the state of mind and heart, in which we act. If we know, and if we make it plain that we know, that the members of the Armed Forces are our own friends and relatives, undergoing hardships, submitting to rigorous discipline, and risking injury and death, for our sakes, they will not need at any time to feel alone. They will benefit by the knowledge of our caring, more than by any material gift we could possibly hand them, or any material service we could perform. May the spirit of the USO continue forever to keep America strong, brave, and united.

UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the 20th anniversary of the USO—United Service Organizations—is an appropriate time for Americans to publicly reaffirm their gratitude for the work of this fine voluntary group.

Since February 4, 1941, the USO has been working to heighten the morale of the young men and women in our Armed Forces at home and around the world.

A lonely feeling overcomes the young people in our military service away from home—many for the first time. The USO has met this problem by offering clubs and centers and entertainment troupes to our Nation's military forces.

The USO has served the spiritual, religious, social, educational, and welfare needs of our youth with extreme understanding. It has helped further character development begun at home. All in all, it has strengthened the abilities of our military personnel to serve our country.

It is with sincere gratitude and pleasure that I extend greetings to the United Service Organizations and its contributing organizations for service rendered during the past two decades to millions of young men and women in our Armed Forces throughout the world. They deserve our continued and wholehearted support.

ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a little different version of the groundhog, coming from Indiana. At least, they told me he came out and took one good long look at this "New Frontier," shook himself almost to death, went back in his hole, and does not know whether he will ever come out again or not.

I am sorry the distinguished majority leader left the floor. We just rammed through, in about 30 seconds, a resolution putting somebody on the payroll at $7,000 a year base. That means about $14,000 a year gross. It was someone I never heard of, and I doubt whether many Members of the House have, while we in the House from Indiana have a duly elected representative from our State, certified by a Democratic secretary of state, attested by a Republican secretary of state, and we cannot get him on the payroll. I think it is time, if business is so rushing, and we can put those on without questioning their necessity or ability, that the duly elected Representatives of Congress ought to be seated so that they can draw their salaries and represent their constituents.

TRADE POLICY CONFERENCE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time in order to advise my colleagues that there will be a meeting in room 1301 New House Office Building, the Committee on Banking and Currency. A group of Members of Congress are desirous of setting up a task force to work toward bringing about major and basic changes in our trade policies. I know that many of you are interested in that particular phase of our legislative work. The meeting will be held at 3 o'clock.

PROPOSED HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a committee in the House of Representatives on employment and economic growth. I shall include a copy of the resolution at the conclusion of my remarks.

Under my resolution, the chairman of this committee would be the Speaker of the House.

The members of this committee would include the majority leader of the House, the minority leader of the House, and the chairmen of six standing committees whose jurisdiction in one way or another effects the Nation's employment and economic growth.

Those committees are the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Speaker and the other Members of this House who would be members of this committee have a combined total of 279 years of practical experience in dealing with the problems which beset our Nation today.

Earlier this week we heard the President of the United States in his state of the Union message outline the many problems that confront our Nation, and I am certain the President will send recommendations up to this body for their solution. Without in any way disturbing the tradition that the President proposes and Congress disposes, I feel there will be considerable overlapping of jurisdiction by the various standing committees of Congress which will be asked to deal with these problems.

In order to solve the problem of economic growth and persistent unemployment, we cannot approach it with piecemeal methods. We must attack unemployment along a broad front which includes foreign trade, tax revision, aid to depressed areas, extension of minimum wage standards, housing, and automation. Since the various standing committees have overlapping jurisdictions in dealing with this entire problem, I believe our action can be more effective if we have some method for coordinating a decisive program.

Each of our existing standing committees now deals with one aspect of this problem. I feel very strongly that the solution will not be found if we continue to try to approach it on a piecemeal basis. That is why I have today suggested that the senior Members in this Congress, by virtue of the fact that they are chairmen of these standing committees and each of these committees touches upon some aspect of the overall economic problem, make up this new advisory committee on employment and economic growth.

I feel that with the combined experience of the Speaker and the chairmen, sitting around a large table and discussing their respective views, suggestions and jurisdictions, we will be able to come up with a much more effective program.

I have the highest regard and respect for the professors and various others

who will play an important role in guiding the administration by suggesting various solutions to the problems of America, but I have an equally abiding regard and respect for the experience of those Members of the House who would be members of the committee I proposed today.

I think every one of the men who would be on this committee has had vastly more practical day-to-day experience in dealing with these problems than all the professors put together.

This would in effect be a congressional task force composed of experienced legislators who over the years have successfully combined theory with practical action.

Let us look at the record of these gentlemen.

Our distinguished Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, has served in the Congress since 1913. He has seen the evolution of Europe after two wars. He has had the opportunity to observe very carefully how the various aspects of national and international relations can affect the ultimate economic growth of America. Mr. RAYBURN has helped draft legislation which took us out of the tragic depression of the thirties. Who is better qualified in this country today to recognize the fact that we have 5½ million people unemployed with perhaps another 4 or 5 million people working on a part-time basis than our distinguished Speaker? And who is more competent to recognize which proposals will succeed and which will fail—based on many years of experience—than the Speaker?

I have said many times that a man who is employed only 3 or 4 days a week is not much better off economically than a man who is on general relief, as far as take-home pay goes. These are realities that many of our university theorists overlook while the Speaker recognizes them because of his practical experience in dealing with human problems.

We would also have on this committee the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, who has been here since 1928, the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, here since 1935, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. SPENCE, here since 1931, and whose committee must produce a housing program to stimulate our Nation's building industry as well as aid to depressed areas; the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. POWELL, here since 1945, and whose committee must deal with minimum wage standards as well as work rules and strikes which affect economic growth; and we also would have the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. MORGAN, here since 1945.

Why do we bring in the Committee on Foreign Affairs? There are those who say we need not worry too much at this time about foreign imports. I wish these people would come to Chicago and see what foreign imports are doing to our electronic and clothing industry. Out in Chicago, 22 of our major electronic producers are working a 3- or 4-day week, and expecting the situation to become much worse before it gets better.

Therefore, I say the Committee on Foreign Affairs should be represented on this legislative task force and some solution should be found to the problem of tariffs and quotas and competition from foreign imports.

I strongly believe this problem will become immensely worse before it becomes better, when we see nations throughout the world today building their industry postwar potential; when we see the common market of Europe; when we see the Outer Seven, and the increased production in Japan and Germany. Certainly the United States, in order to continue economic growth and in order to sustain our economy without vast and persistent unemployment, is going to have to recognize the increase in competition from foreign imports. It is not enough to say that we are exporting $14 billion worth of goods and importing only $11 billion so we have a favorable balance of trade. The American man-hours displaced by foreign competition must be considered.

I have recommended that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs sit in on this special committee so that a sensible program can be worked out without destroying our traditional reciprocal trade agreements.

We also would have on this committee the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Mr. HARRIS, who has been here since 1941 and whose committee also deals with foreign trade; the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER, who has been here since 1923, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, who has been here since 1931. Whether we have 12 or 15 members on the Committee on Rules, I certainly believe the chairman of the Committee on Rules should sit in on discussion of these problems so that his committee will be able better to understand how the various proposals complement each other to produce an effective program of action.

Finally, we would have on this committee the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. MILLS, who has been here since 1939. There will have to be serious consideration given to tax revision, and who has a broader grasp of this problem than Mr. MILLS?

American industry will have to be given faster depreciation writeoffs and a greater break in the tax structure so that there will be an incentive to invest money in American industry here in the United States rather than seek advantages investors get in foreign countries. For instance, today we see Germany allowing a very fast writeoff, less than 5 years. We see Ireland giving American investors a 10-year moratorium on taxes and helping finance up to 50 percent of plant investment.

I am not at all persuaded by those who calmly predict the balance of payments problem will solve itself. It is entirely reasonable to believe that America's economic growth will be seriously impaired without tax revision particularly when all over the free world, investors are being wooed with greater profit incentive programs.

There is one final aspect of this problem which I should like to touch upon briefly because it affects economic growth and may well determine whether the United States will be able to provide full employment for a labor force of 75 million people expected by 1970. The world today is divided between two major powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. I suspect many investors fear that should these two powers ever be driven into a nuclear war, it will be these two countries which will suffer the greatest degree of physical devastation with the smaller powers perhaps even escaping mass bombings altogether. Sooner or later we must face up to the fact that investors may be seeking protection for their investments by locating in other areas of the world for this very reason and thus we must give them an even greater incentive to risk investment in our country.

Certainly the Committee on Ways and Means must give consideration to the tax structure as an incentive to solve this problem of unemployment and economic growth.

With the combined experience of 279 years of legislative action, I think the Members of Congress whom I have suggested for this special committee are more thoroughly qualified to discuss these problems on an overall basis than perhaps any single group in the country. I would like very much for the House to give serious consideration to the creation of this type of committee so that a comprehensive program for employment and economic growth can be developed and moved for final action.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman had a similar resolution up for consideration in the last Congress. At that time the gentleman had provided for the chairmen of these committees to make up this new committee. Then I asked him the same question, I think, that I am going to ask now. If you have the Speaker and the chairmen of all the committees on this committee, are you not ignoring the minority in your resolution?

Mr. PUCINSKI. We have the minority represented.

Mr. BOW. The ranking minority member of each committee?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No. We have the minority leader.

Mr. BOW. You are going to have how many members on this committee?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Ten.

Mr. BOW. You have 10 members on the committee, and in your generosity you let the minority have at least 1 member of the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct, but I do think we ought to have the minority represented.

Mr. BOW. Does not the gentleman think the minority ought to have a little more equal representation, when you take the vote we had in the presidential

election, which was close, and the close vote here the other day on another question? It seems to me, in view of the division of eight or nine Democrats and just one member from the minority side, the gentleman should remember that the minority party has more people at work than ever before in the history of this country.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman raises a very valid question. I thought of the gentleman when I was preparing this resolution because I remember the same question being raised by the gentleman last year. However, I decided against including the ranking minority members of these standing committees on this special committee for the simple reason that it would then make it an extremely large committee and difficult to assemble. This committee, really, is an advisory body. It is not superseding in any way the work of standing committees so that the minority, which is now represented on the standing committees, would continue to have its voice. This would be, in effect, a sort of steering committee to try to view this whole problem of unemployment and economic growth from an overall standpoint. These gentlemen would meet together, discuss their respective jurisdiction, and then farm out to the respective standing committees their assignments to try to solve the problem. But, at least we would have in this Congress some overall body that would look at the broad perspective of the problem rather than the piecemeal approaches which we frequently find in this body. We, for instance, will very shortly have legislation dealing with depressed areas and legislation on minimum wages. I think it would be more helpful to all of us in this Congress if we had the wisdom and experience of these men whom I have named to sort of give us guidance on a broad overall front. That is why I did not include the ranking minority members because then this committee would be much too big and much too unwieldy, I am afraid, and it would become just another committee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. If you were to add the ranking minority members of the committees, you would still have a committee smaller than the Committee on Ways and Means and smaller than the Committee on Appropriations and smaller than most of the standing committees of the House. I am sure the gentleman is not going to say today that the Committee on Ways and Means is unwieldy and cannot work well today or that the Committee on Appropriations is in such a category.

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, not at all.

Mr. BOW. It seems to me that what the gentleman is doing is denying the minority the right to be heard on such a committee. I repeat again that the minority is very much interested in this question. The minority has some knowledge of the creation of jobs because we have had more people working under the administration of the minority than were ever employed before in the history of this country, and it seems to me they should have a right to be heard on this committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Illinois has recognized the rights of the minority by including the minority leader on this committee. If the gentleman from Ohio wishes to join with me in trying to get serious action by the House on this resolution, I certainly would have no objection nor would I oppose any amendment to include the ranking minority members of the standing committees.

Mr. BOW. I am sure that I would attempt to amend it if it came to the floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would have no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has taken into consideration the possibility that the chairmen of these committees that make up overall his committee and possibly the minority members that he speaks of could, under certain circumstances, come from one area, or say two areas, of the Nation and leave out entirely some very large populated area of this country such as the East or the Northeast.

I ask you if, when our Founding Fathers set up our Government, they did not intend that the House of Representatives would be detailed in their analyses of the matters affecting the Nation, and leave to the Senate the overall function that you are now attempting at this time to constitute this committee to do. Namely, their committees over there are composed of Senators who have statewide representation but are fewer in number on each of their committees because of the necessity of only dividing 100 Senators as compared to the House of Representatives where we have 437 Members.

Mr. PUCINSKI. With all due respect to the other body, I have always felt that the real dynamics of our Republic are reflected right here in this assembly, in this representative body by those of us who have to stand up for election every 2 years where we reflect the immediate problems of our respective communities that we represent than, perhaps, do the Members of the other body.

With all due respect to the other body, as I say, I feel that right here in the House, if we had this committee looking at the problem of unemployment and economic growth, with the ideas and solutions stemming from this power, not necessarily on a geographical basis, these 10 men would be free to look at the problem from every perspective rather than from the narrow geographical perspective that many of us find ourselves frequently doing.

Mr. BARRY. I would like to inquire further if his party did not have a policy committee in the House of Representatives?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. BARRY. The Republican Party has a policy committee in the House of Representatives, and upon frequent occasions this committee meets and it accepts recommendations from Members, and they formulate a policy which they think is for the best interests of the Nation at large.

I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he does not feel that his party has not also formulated policies in their policy committee, and that we then come together and that these very men he speaks of who are the leaders of their committees—if they do not serve as policy members for every consideration, so that we get the same overall national thinking both on your side and on our side.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The record of the policy committee on our side is best demonstrated by the outstanding record written in the 86th Congress. But nevertheless I do feel that these men with their vast experience in their particular fields—the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, undoubtedly one of the most qualified men of America to discuss taxation; the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, outstanding in his qualifications to discuss foreign affairs—I am suggesting today that if we try to bring closer correlation between the wealth of experience that these men individually represent to look at the problem of unemployment and economic growth, we will develop a much more effective program of action.

Mr. BARRY. Would it be the idea that the committee would vote on various propositions affecting the Nation?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, sir. This would be a purely advisory committee. It would not have any votes. The legislation would still move through the respective committees that we have today.

Mr. BARRY. If the members could not agree, would there be a minority report?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am not anticipating there would be any reports either way. The committee would try to come together and approve a strong program. If the committee chooses to make recommendations, it is welcome to do so.

We do not want to infringe upon or abrogate the rights of any standing committee in this House.

Mr. BARRY. As I understand the gentleman's statement, however, what validity to the standing committees of the Congress would it have unless it were by unanimous adoption by the members of the committee?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sorry, I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. BARRY. What validity would the recommendation of the committee have unless it was unanimously approved by all members of the committee?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I just do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. BARRY. You have 10 men, members of this committee; you want to put a program through, or perhaps it is thought to be desired on a national basis, to centralize the program of the Congress. If seven agree and three disagree what have you created? You have got nothing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You have an agreement of seven men.

Mr. BARRY. Then you would have a minority report.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The members of the committee might very well support legislation along those lines.

Mr. BARRY. So you are right back to partisanship and sectionalism, are you not?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, not in any way. I do not see how the gentleman can draw sectionalism or partisanship from the fact that three men might disagree with seven.

Mr. BARRY. You quite possibly would go back to sectionalism and partisanship.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not follow the gentleman to that conclusion.

Mr. BARRY. I am just trying to help the gentleman in what he is attempting to do, for it has many attractions. I do not see from what he has told me thus far that the committees that he has outlined—and his objective may be very fine—I do not see how it would help in the direction he would intend it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I welcome the gentleman's support. Perhaps he can help perfect it; perhaps we can eliminate some of the traps the gentleman is worried about.

I have merely suggested a particular program here today. By no means am I suggesting that it is final, but I do feel very strongly that we can provide the answers to many problems confronting America today by drafting and capitalizing on the wealth of experience and knowledge that these Members of Congress have accumulated over the years they have been here. I think it is almost tragic if we do not. We read many articles about America's problems and suggestions for their solution with interest. I have the highest respect for the authors of these articles or task force reports. But I think the big challenge is to solve these problems, and I think it would be of utmost help, by capitalizing on the practical experience of our senior Members serving as a group. The gentleman knows himself that very frequently an idea looks excellent in theory, but does not work when put to the test of practicality.

These men have had practical experience, and I am suggesting that we make use of this experience.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his suggestion; it is an excellent one if it can be made to work. The gentleman has made particular reference to the question of our increasing imports of foreign-made goods. If the gentleman will bear with me and has the time to do it, for maybe 2 minutes, I want to describe a situation that is really indescribable, and one that is the most discriminatory and which I am sure will be of great interest to my friend.

The Federal Power Commission 18 months ago entered an order permitting the construction of a pipeline from Canada to the city of Butte, Mont., an 18-inch gasline. That is in direct competition with coal produced in my State of West Virginia. The Commission has since authorized the construction of pipelines using Canadian gas to be piped into the United States from Canada totaling 1,670 million cubic feet.

Now, all that gas comes in direct competition with another basic fuel, coal, When I offered an amendment to our Revenue Code to declare natural gas a liquid fuel, the State Department came up with the argument that we would have to change an agreement we entered into in 1957 at Geneva with other nations that are party to the International Trade Agreements Act, for under that act we drew up an agreement with the Dominion of Canada in which we placed natural gas on the free list. I am making this statement because I want to inform the Members of this House and the public in general what the situation is.

They were not nice enough to tell the people that that lousy trade agreement has a provision in it that if we want to ship a ton of West Virginia coal into Canada we must pay 50 cents a ton to the Dominion of Canada before we can offer the coal for sale. Here is the possibility already authorized of 1.357 billion cubic feet of gas daily coming into the United States. A lot of people say that we should not have a fuel study made of the relative merits and the relative standing of our basic fuels in this Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We do not need a new committee or commission in Congress to arrive at what is wrong with that situation, do we?

Mr. BAILEY. It is an idea. I would like to see it developed, even if it does not prove too worthy.

Mr. GROSS. We know what is wrong, do we not?

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman's situation here today is such that he is one of the few people in this Congress who has the intestinal fortitude to stand up and make a speech of this kind in face of the situation that confronts America today. I do not think this matter of loss of gold is a greater menace than the Russians. I say what I have referred to is the most serious thing facing America today.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. The time has come when we cannot sell American jobs down the river to buy American friendship.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia. We have a serious situation in reference to imports coming into this country. I stood with the gentleman in the past.

Mr. BAILEY. And I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. But I would like to ask the gentleman a question. This occurs to me by his reply to some of the questions asked by the gentleman from New York. If we are going to set up this committee with a major committee of the House, the Speaker and all of the members are of the Democratic Party. Now, is it necessary that we have a resolution creating a committee in as grave a situation as the gentleman points out? All of them could get together and solve this. Do we have to have a committee? Will they not meet together, discuss the situation, and if there is some remedy, suggest it to the House? Does the gentleman think we need to have a committee?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Perhaps not.

Mr. BOW. They are interested in the same matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure they already meet together, but I would like to give some recognition, some official recognition, to the fact that we are fortunate in this House to have men with this vast experience who in these days can provide many ideas and many suggestions as to technical matters.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. Perhaps if we are going to have a committee of that kind I would like to offer another amendment to get men like the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] on it, men who have definite feelings on this question of tariffs. Maybe we could get the gentleman to serve on such a committee.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say that for two successive Congresses, both sessions of the 86th Congress, and this Congress, I have introduced a bill to try to put natural gas on the dutiable list, take it off the free list and put in on the dutiable list. I have not even got a half-way promise of a hearing by the Ways and Means Committee in 2 years. You talk about a roadblock in the Rules Committee. It is about time we take a look at the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentlemen for their contributions to this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore referred to a resolution, which follows:

Resolved, That the Rules of the House of Representatives are hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLIII

"Committee on Employment and Economic Growth

"1. This rule is adopted by the House in the realization that the problems which affect employment and economic growth are of such a nature (a) that their solution will involve legislation relating to automation, foreign investments, imports, labor rules (including minimum wages), the Federal tax structure with special emphasis on depreciation allowances, and other problems, (b) that different sections of such legislation fall within the jurisdiction of several standing committees, and (c) that it is essential for a sound solution of problems which affect employment and economic growth that a procedure be provided under which the activities of the several standing committees considering problems which affect employment and economic growth be coordinated, through study, discussion, interchange of information and views, and other means of cooperation.

"2. There shall be a Committee on Employment and Economic Growth which shall consist of the Speaker, who shall be the chairman, the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairmen of the following standing committees: Committee on Banking and Currency; Committee on Education and Labor; Committee on Foreign Affairs; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Rules; and Committee on Ways and Means.

"3. In the light of the statement contained in the first paragraph of this rule, it shall be the duty of the Committee on Employment and Economic Growth to—

"(a) provide an orderly and effective procedure for assigning to particular standing committees responsibility for dealing with a particular problem which affects employment and economic growth, and

"(b) make general recommendations for the solution of domestic and international problems which affect employment and economic growth.

"4. The provisions of rule XI, other than paragraphs 25, 26, 28, and 29 thereof, shall not apply with respect to the Committee on Employment and Economic Growth."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND JOB DISCRIMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President's state of the Union pledge to initiate within the next 14 days those steps primary to national economic recovery was most heartening.

The State of Michigan, from which I come, is one of the numbers of major industrial areas listed by our U.S. Department of Labor as hardest hit by sustained joblessness and economic recession. My congressional district, the 13th of Michigan, runs through the very center of Metropolitan Detroit—that part of the State of Michigan which the 1960 Senate report on "The Impact of Unemployment in the 1958 Recession" cites as having felt the effects of the economic recession more heavily than any other major community in the United States. Since that time, there have been slight upturns and then again falls in the employment level, the general condition remaining critical. At the start of December 1960, employment in the State had turned downward again and the reduction due to widespread layoffs and production cutbacks was expected to accelerate in the next 60 days. Unemployment totaled 192,000 and the jobless made up 6.7 percent of the total labor force.

It is not difficult for any of us to realize the expectations with which the President's pledge was received in such communities where men and women have been without employment to provide means for feeding and clothing their families for as much as 2 and 3 years. Certainly the realities of our national economic position have pressed in upon us and must evoke a fitting and adequate response by this Congress.

As we prepare to move into this action, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the attention of the Congress to a major facet of the problem of economic recovery and the sustained and balanced growth we would accomplish. This is the necessity, in this age of scientific and technological advance, for development and utilization of our full manpower capacities. Unemployment because of discrimination on account of race in the area of job opportunities and unemployment and underemployment because of discrimination on account of race in the utilization of manpower are serious factors which must affect our national economic growth as it has affected our present economic position. In the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights hearings, in Detroit, Mich., during December 1960, expert highly significant testimony was presented by a distinguished trade unionist, Horace Sheffield, on behalf of the Trade Union Leadership Council, graphically illustrating the economic situation of Negroes in the United States today and its effect upon the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, I present that testimony for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

BRIEF ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND JOB DISCRIMINATION

(By Horace L. Sheffield)

The Trade Union Leadership Council exists for the purpose of devoting its energies toward the goal of eliminating all forms of racial discrimination in our country. As an organization consisting exclusively of union members we naturally concentrate on two decisive areas:

1. We are committed to the proposition that every person ought to have the right to earn a decent living for himself and his family not in theory but in practice.

2. We believe that every man ought to have the right to learn a job that will enable him to make a decent living.

Without the right to earn and the right to learn a man cannot be said to have established first-class citizenship in his community and Nation. My testimony is an attempt to draw a balance sheet of the progress and the lack of progress in eliminating racial discrimination in job opportunities and in job promotions. The facts will speak for themselves and, it must be said candidly they tell a story that we have a long way to go in both areas that I shall be talking about.

What is the situation in regard to Negroes having the right to earn a decent living? This depends, of course, on the economic climate and the employment situation. Here is what the October 1960 report of the U.S. Department of Labor entitled "The Economic Situation of Negroes in the United States" says:

"Unemployment rates are generally higher among Negroes than among white workers. One factor is the disproportionate number of workers who are in unskilled work. The ratio is about two Negroes to one white worker where unemployment is regularly heavier. Another is the frequently lower seniority of Negro workers, because of their more recent entry into factory and office work.

"In the 1958 downturn, unemployment rates rose in all groups. The rate rose about as much for nonwhite as for white men, and continued roughly twice as high. About 14 percent of the nonwhite male workers, a large proportion of them from unskilled and semiskilled occupations, were unemployed and seeking work in 1958, compared with an average of about 6 percent of white workers. By 1959, both rates had declined, but that of nonwhites had declined relatively less. About 11.5 percent of nonwhite men were still unemployed, compared with 4.6 percent of whites."

Nor is this the complete picture of the fact that Negroes are the hardest hit by unemployment and they have most of the worst jobs in our society. The report adds:

"Unemployment rates vary according to age in both white and Negro groups. In 1959, with 4.6 percent of white males unemployed, unemployment at ages 14–17 and 18–19 was about 12 and 13 percent. But nonwhite males unable to find work averaged 18.8 percent at age 14–17, and 27.2 percent at 18 and 19 years old. Many young Negro girls also were unemployed."

And finally, because of the concentration of Negroes in less skilled jobs and generally with lower seniority, "involuntary part time and part year work was more prevalent among Negroes than white," according to the same U.S. Department of Labor report.

The importance of these unemployment figures is that they portray the general conditions which we are discussing, the problem of a man having a right to earn a living, of finding a job. In Michigan and in Detroit the unemployment problem has been especially aggravating and thus has aggravated the economic problems of the Negro. Detroit has been persistently in the U.S. Department of Labor's category of "area of substantial and persistent labor surplus." Even this November with auto production and sales at nearly record high levels, Detroit remains in that category, according to the November report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. According to official Michigan figures Detroit had 7.3 percent of its labor force unemployed (November 1960) and Michigan as a State had 6.7 percent of the total labor force or 193,000 unemployed in November 1960. Chronic unemployment has been a plague on the Detroit industrial scene for too many years with untold and unrecorded human suffering and waste primarily but not exclusively hitting Negroes.

An indication of the difficulties inherent in the Detroit situation may be ascertained by analysis of the following facts about the speed of absorption in the job market, as taken from the report of the City of Detroit Commission on Children and Youth entitled "Technical and Trade Employment of Youth in the Detroit Metropolitan Area," January 22, 1960.

The following tables are self-explanatory:

Age	Percent not employed	
	White	Negro
16 to 19	63	76
20 to 24	22	35
25 to 29	11	21

20 percent of all white boys 14 to 17 were employed.
6 percent of all Negro boys 14 to 17 were employed.
(Average percent employed in 4 predominantly Negro high schools, 5.5 percent.)
26 percent of all white girls 14 to 17 were employed.
1.5 percent of all Negro girls 14 to 17 were employed.
(Average percent employed in 4 predominantly white high schools, 36 percent.)

As the commission says: "At every step of the way Negro youth are being absorbed in the job market more slowly than white youth. Greater effort must be exerted to bring all young people into the job market quickly but a particular effort must be made with regard to the employment of Negro youth."

The correlationship between unemployment and lack of education may be seen in the statistics for Michigan as reported in "Manpower in Michigan," Michigan Employment Security Commission, March 29, 1960. The report says:

"Two-thirds of the unemployed job applicants registered with the Michigan Employment Security Commission on November 15, 1959, failed to finish high school."

That is, out of 164,700 applicants for jobs registered with the MESC, 110,122 had less than a high school graduation. To complete the picture of the job status of the Negroes in the Detroit metropolitan area where in 1950 Negroes represented 9.3 percent of the total population, it should be added that while one out of every four white workers held a job that was classified as a skilled occupation, only one in eight Negroes were in similar categories. Furthermore, 1.8 percent of all skilled white workers were in apprenticeships while only seven-tenths of 1

percent of all Negro skilled workers were in apprenticeships. Of the 3,517 apprentices in the Detroit metropolitan area only 76 were Negroes and this was in 1950 when Negro participation in apprenticeships was perhaps at an alltime high because of the GI training program. Since the normal replacement rate in skilled occupations due to death, retirement, and other reasons is between 2 and 3 percent it is clear that the Negro apprentices now available are not even sufficient in number to replace Negro skilled workers already employed.

Some of the areas in which there is an enormous gap between the proportion of Negro and white skilled workers includes:

Number of Negroes in skilled work:

Negro:	*Percent of all employed*
Tool and die makers (159)	0.7
Structural steel workers (26)	.5
Printing craftsmen (15)	.9
Carpenters (360)	.2
Electricians (163)	2.1
Machinists and job setters (900) [1]	5.2

[1] The reason this figure runs this high may be due to machine operators reporting themselves as machinists.

The latest authoritative figure we have been able to obtain for the automobile industry was that in 1950, 42.3 percent of the laborers were Negro, 18.3 percent were operatives (production men) and only seven-tenths of 1 percent of tool and die makers were Negro.

The scope of the problem of training in skilled and other work for the Negroes may be seen in the following situation:

At the General Motors Institute in Flint which enrolls 2,400 students in a 5-year work and training program, there is not a single Negro student. Under their rules students can apply directly but are not admitted unless a division sponsors them.

In recent years we are fortunate that in Michigan detailed studies of three areas excluding Detroit have been made of employment training and placement patterns which furnish significant information on the question of employment and job discrimination. These studies were done by the Employment Advisory Council of the Michigan Fair Employment Practices Commission, and I presume will be placed in the records of these hearings. Among the highlights are the following comments. In the Muskegon area the Advisory Council reports:

"Because most Negroes were introduced to industrial employment in the last several decades, it is expected that they would enter at the unskilled level. However, the examination of minority employment patterns in Muskegon indicated that where Negroes are employed, very little upgrading of their skills has taken place. Moreover, it was found that in 3 of the 6 manufacturing industry groups examined which employed an average of 8,000 people and representing 13 firms and one-third of the total manufacturing work force, there was no evidence of Negro participation in the work force at any level, with the single exception of an engineer trainee.

"In the nonmanufacturing area, the employment pattern is similar to the industry pattern. In the six areas examined here, isolated exceptions of Negro participation on a merit basis can be found. However, in the majority of the areas, Negroes are either not employed, are employed in maintenance, or menial positions. One firm in the area has made considerable progress in employing on merit basis.

"The primary metals industry employs the greatest percentage of nonwhite workers than any other industry in Muskegon. Of the two major foundries, Negroes comprise 50 percent of the work force in one, and 30 percent of the work force in the others. The great bulk of this group are classified as unskilled. There are no Negroes to be found in the supervisory levels, and very few at the skilled level. One foundry indicated that they would upgrade skills if required to, but that they preferred to recruit skilled people, when needed, from the open market. One major foundry reported several Negroes working as semiskilled grinders. Declining employment in this industry has placed many Negroes on the unemployment and welfare rolls. Several respondents observed that when a Negro is laid off at the foundry, he seldom finds employment elsewhere.

"Auto and aviation parts: The great majority of Negroes employed by the three major firms in this industry group were hired during the war. One firm has approximately 250 Negroes, employed during the war, who have remained. They are utilized as production workers. Few Negroes can be found in the semiskilled or skilled categories. There is one Negro jet welder trainee. Another large firm employs approximately 100 Negroes. None are employed as skilled workers. However, there are some semiskilled molders in this group. A third company, observers point out, hire Negroes on the basis of merit for production work."

In the Lansing area the report states:

"Motor vehicle and equipment:

"There are six firms in this industry which employed an average of 20,000 people in 1957. Two firms in this group are the largest employers of Negro workers. Negro employment ranges between 700 and 1,200 workers in the two firms, depending upon demand. Except for one technician, the vast majority of this group are classified as unskilled manual workers. There are no supervisory personnel, and very few workers classified as skilled in this group.

"The other four firms in this group employed, in 1958, an average of 3,200 people. Sixty Negroes were employed in two of the firms. Of these 60, 50 were classified as unskilled, 5 as semiskilled and 5 as skilled. No Negroes were employed in supervisory or clerical categories, however officials at both plants indicated they would be willing to hire Negroes in clerical capacities. Two firms out of the six have never employed Negroes. An official of one of these firms indicated that they were not anxious to hire Negroes. There was an absence of Mexican or Jewish employees in the plant.

"Forging: The second largest utilizer of minority group workers in the manufacturing area is the forging industry. The seven firms in this group maintained a work force of 1,400 people in 1957. Of these seven firms, four employed Negroes. The four firms' employment average in 1957 was approximately 1,050. Included in this group were about 100 Negroes. About 80 percent of this group were classified as unskilled. In several plants, however, Negroes were found in such semiskilled and skilled jobs as hammermen, crane operators and heat treaters. Although the other three firms in this industry group do not employ Negroes presently, all had employed Negroes during World War II and in the postwar period. Fifty Mexicans were employed in six of the seven firms, predominately in semiskilled positions. However, of the 15 Mexicans employed by one firm, 10 were working as molders, a skilled classification.

"Machinery: There are 10 machinery shops in the Lansing area that employ over 25 people; their combined employment total, in 1957, was 1,400. The five firms that were interviewed had an average annual employment of 1,100 in 1957. No Negroes were employed in any capacity by four of the five firms. One firm employed one Negro welder. Company officials in several firms stated that they had never known a Negro to apply for work at their plant. All of them indicated that they felt that few Negroes possessed the necessary skills to work in a tool and die shop."

In the Kalamazoo area the findings are:

"MANUFACTURING

"Durable goods: At the present time there are only three significant manufacturing firms which are reported to totally exclude Negro workers. Two of these firms are to be found in machinery manufacturing industries. Except for two new firms which have relatively recently moved into the community, Negroes in this industry are confined to unskilled categories. Relatively speaking, Negroes are being utilized to a greater extent in the metals and transportation industries than was the case in 1950.

"Nondurable goods: The most significant change in this group of industries has occurred in the chemical industry. One firm today had more Negro employees than were involved in the total industry in 1950. Observation has also indicated change in the paper and miscellaneous manufacturing industries; from all indications there has been little change in the number of Negroes in foods, textiles, and printing industries. There has been little change in the relative number of Negroes involved in finance, retail and wholesale industries. The Negro labor force has significantly increased in size in transportation, government, social and professional services industries.

"Occupations: The changes in the occupational distribution of Negroes has been more significant than has industrial shifts. For the first time Negroes are occupying sales, clerical, technical and professional positions in paper, chemicals, transportation, finance, transportation equipment, government, public utilities, retail and wholesale, social service, and miscellaneous manufacturing. During this same period, skilled Negro workers entered the bricklaying industry for the first time. Observers report that company assignments, collective bargaining agreements, union resistance, and traditional upgrading practices have tended to limit opportunities for Negroes to be upgraded to semiskilled and skilled positions in paper, transportation equipment, machinery and metals industries. Observations indicate that in the clerical field, there are apparently more opportunities than qualified applicants."

All of this material provides a statistical portrayal of the large areas of unresolved problems we have in the field of racial discrimination. Without going into a broad sociological analysis of all the factors involved, it is mandatory that we do talk about the controllable factors in this situation. There is a summary analysis of 4 years of claims experience by the Michigan Fair Employment Practices Commission published in January 1960, that gives some facts on the causes and sources of racial discrimination in employment in Michigan.

In the 4-year period from 1956 through 1959, employers were respondents in 85.1 percent of the cases handled by the Michigan FEPC. Unions and employment agencies were respondents for about 7 percent each of the remaining cases; 86.4 percent of the employers involved are classified as industrial or commercial; 49.8 percent of the cases involved discrimination in hiring. The primary responsibility of employers in practicing racial discrimination appears to be established by the analysis of the Michigan FEPC.

As union members, the Trade Union Leadership Council is not surprised by the establishment of the fact that in many instances antilabor forces are anti-Negro and vice versa. It is not accidental that in those areas in America where the Negro has the most difficult time in establishing his rights as a citizen including the right to vote, are the same areas in which the most violent

antiunion feeling exists. I am referring, of course, to the South.

Our understanding of this basic idea explains why we are a trade union organization and why we believe that unless the Negro makes progress labor cannot make progress and unless labor makes progress, the Negro cannot make progress.

However, having stated these fundamental truths, it is also necessary to say why the TULC is not satisfied with the progress labor has made in the field of eliminating job discriminations. How could anyone really be satisfied with the picture that the studies of Michigan have drawn for us, and Michigan certainly is one of the enlightened States in the Union.

As a matter of fact, at the rate of progress in equalizing the differences in the proportion of white and Negro workers in skilled trades, Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP pointed out that it will take Negroes 138 years or the year 2,049 to secure equal participation in skilled crafts, training and employment. No one can read the study entitled "The Negro Wage Earner and Apprenticeship Training Programs," published by the labor department of the NAACP, February 24, 1960, without being gravely disturbed at the vast scope of the unfinished problem.

Perhaps this study will help explain why Negroes are increasingly impatient with many of their friends including segments of the organized labor movement who keep talking primarily about the progress of the past and the need for gradualism and patience.

Our concern is increased rather than diminished when we hear soothing words from some of our friends, especially when we look at the decade ahead. On December 5, 1960, Millard Cass, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, projected the manpower requirements in the skilled trades during the next 10 years. Cass said:

"The skilled labor force will increase by 2.3 million by 1970. Building trades craftsmen, mechanics and repairmen and skilled machining workers will account for most of the increase. There also is a growing need for skilled workers in the fields of electronics, instrumentation, missiles, satellites, and automation machinery."

Cass called apprenticeship the best and oldest method of training skilled craftsmen.

"Yet we are training far fewer craftmen through apprenticeship than we are losing.

"Only one-third of the brickmasons, one-fourth of the electricians, one-tenth of the carpenters, one-fourth of the plasterers, and a little more than one-fourth of the plumbers needed each year will qualify through apprenticeship." (Detroit Free Press, Dec. 5, 1960.)

The contrast between the great promise and opportunity and the real situation for Negroes in the skilled occupations is pointed up by the following summary from the NAACP study:

"The increasing complexity and specialization of the Nation's economy will also contribute to the need for additional skilled craftsmen. Contrary to much prevailing opinion, new fabricating processes and the application of automation and other advanced techniques in industry tend to foster, rather than diminish, the need for highly trained artisans. Indeed, economic growth and technological progress are, in part, inextricably dependent upon the availability of skilled craftsmen. Together these factors augment requirements for manual specialists and help govern the creation and proliferation of employment opportunities in skilled-craft occupations.

"While demand for skilled craftsmen is increasing, the available supply of potential artisans has decreased.

"Ideally, Negroes should constitute 3.62 percent of the total employed in each of the enumerated skilled-craft occupations. As can be seen, Negroes are underrepresented in 32 and overrepresented in 22 of the 55 occupations comprising the classification. The figures also reveal that Negroes are least likely to be employed in skilled-craft jobs commanding high skills and prestige with significant economic rewards such as compositors and typesetters, electricians, tool and die makers and setters, sheet metal workers—and are most likely to be employed in occupations which are arduous and dirty—cement and concrete finishers, forgemen and foundry workers, molders, rollers and roll hands.

"Underlying the absence of Negroes in significant numbers from skilled-craft employment is their almost total exclusion from apprenticeship training programs. At the present time Negroes are not becoming apprentices, even to the degree needed to offset natural losses occurring among nonwhite craftsmen.

"As is readily apparent, Negro apprentices do not even constitute as high a proportion of skilled novices, 1.69 percent, as Negro artisans compose of skilled craftsmen, 3.62 percent.

"Negro youth are excluded from formal training programs by a variety of factors, not all of which are to be regarded as specifically anti-Negro.

"Of these, the following appear to be the most important:

"1. Because of past discriminatory practices, Negro youth are not presented with skilled Negro role models upon which they can identify and make the correct preparatory decisions toward skilled occupations via apprenticeship training.

"2. Other influences are misinterpretation of the industrial environment, absence of informed and effective counseling and generally poor vocational guidance.

"3. Because of the above factors, large sections of the young Negro labor force are inadequately prepared for skilled training opportunities. This appears to be especially true in terms of quantitative and qualitative training which should be undertaken in secondary schools.

"4. Some Negro youths overcome the above barriers and are able to qualify for apprenticeship openings. These, however, are shrouded in an aura of mystery which cannot be penetrated by individuals or groups denied previous involvement with the skilled occupational milieu.

"5. The virtual secrecy surrounding apprenticeship openings results from the system of informal and haphazard recruitment which characterizes apprenticeship programs. This system is supported by organized labor, management, and government because it corresponds to a variety of interest of the major parties to formal training programs.

"6. Equally important, apprenticeship remains closed to the public—and especially Negroes—because individual employers, aware of the benefits of apprenticeship restrict the opportunities to their offspring, relatives, or friends. As a result, many apprenticeship programs are characterized by a broad pattern of nepotism and cronyism, to the benefit of individual family units of certain limited ethnic and religious groupings."

As far as Michigan is concerned a similar kind of need for skilled workers is indicated in the period from 1960 to 1970, according to the MESC study, "Manpower in Michigan." This is indicated by the anticipated growth by industry in Michigan from 1960 to 1970. The study states:

"Employment in nearly all of Michigan's industries will grow in the decade of the sixties because of the increased demand for goods and services by our growing population. However, industries will vary widely in their rate of growth. Two major sectors of the economy will be moving ahead much faster than the average. These are services, excluding government, and trade. Growth will also occur at a faster than average rate in construction and in the group of industries classified as finance, real estate, and insurance. Government will grow at about the average rate. Although there should be some expansion in the transportation, communication, and utilities group, in manufacturing, and in mining, the rate will be much slower than the average. Measured in terms of employment, agriculture will actually be moving in the opposite direction and is expected to decline nearly 15 percent during the next 10 years. Farm mechanization and improvement of plant varieties and breeds of farm animals will actually result in greater production with fewer workers."

RECOMMENDATIONS

Certainly the factual evidence presented in our testimony as well as that of other witnesses before these hearings indicates that a total campaign is necessary on local, State, and Federal levels to effectively wipe out disgraceful existence of discrimination and second-class citizenship in far too many phases of American life. Without attempting to present a complete program, which is beyond our competence and province, we want to bring forth the following recommendations for public consideration:

1. In terms of broad policy unless the new Federal administration passes effective legislation to eliminate chronic unemployment in the depressed areas of America, American Negroes will suffer most heavily from lacking the right to earn a living because there will be no jobs available for them.

2. Although many improvements are possible in benefits given, in scope and function of the MESC, we want to call attention to a particular problem that has been largely overlooked. We understand that the budget of the MESC is geared to and affected by the number of job replacements it makes. Since there is more difficulty in placing special applicants, young, inexperienced, older physically handicapped, veterans, as well as Negroes, and also women, there is a tendency for employees of the MESC to concentrate on those kind of applicants who can most easily be placed. Sometimes it may take 2 or 3 hours to endeavor to place a so-called special applicant as compared to 5 or 10 minutes for a normal applicant. Budgetarily no more time is allocated for the one type of applicant than the other. What the present budget requirements fail to recognize is that the special applicants have become the major area of activity and should be recognized as such.

An entire new system of giving credit for placing people ought to be put into effect which might, for example, give one unit of credit for placing an easily referred applicant and perhaps 5 to 10 units of credit for placing a more difficult-to-place person.

3. There can be little argument that the Michigan FEPC needs to be appropriated a more adequate budget so that it can enlarge its inadequate staff. It can probe more deeply into this problem with studies in depth. Likewise, the State FEPC law ought to be amended to give the commission more power so that it could initiate its own investigations and thus work more successfully in this area.

4. There is no question that the official attitude of the AFL–CIO as incorporated in its constitution "to encourage all workers without regard to race, creed, color or national origin to share in the full benefits of union organization," is admirable. However, it is also clear there is a big gap between the promise and the performance in far too many unions, especially where occupational skills are required. The snail's pace of

progress that has been reported simply is insufficient to cope with the problem, nor is good will or good intentions sufficient. This is why the TULC make a public recommendation that Federal labor legislation ought to be amended to include a nondiscriminatory oath or affidavit on the part of both unions and their officials and employers as a precondition to using the NLRB. Unions or employers found guilty of discrimination ought to be denied the privilege of using the NLRB facilities.

5. Finally, we believe that the strengthening of organizations like the TULC and the Negro American Labor Council with which the TULC is associated is indispensable within the labor movement to serve as a social force conscientiously dedicated to the proposition that all men are equal in the right to earn and the right to learn, among other basic human rights.

HOW NOT TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT IN NEW YORK STATE—SOME CRITICAL COMMENTS ON A SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY FACULTY TEAM REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article reporting criticisms made by Mr. Solomon Barkin, director of research for the Textile Workers Union of America and a member of President Kennedy's recent Task Force on Distressed Areas, on a recent study of the problem of distressed areas in New York State prepared by a faculty team of the Business Research Center of Syracuse University for the use of the State's Temporary Commission on the Economy. In introducing this article I added some critical comments of my own with regard to the general approach of this particular study.

Surprisingly enough—

I said—

this faculty team completely opposed the idea of assistance to economically distressed areas, and proposed instead that the ultimate solution to the problem was the transfer of unemployed workers to other areas of the country where jobs were more plentiful.

To me this solution is not only inhuman but also represents no solution at all to the distressed areas problem but rather only a surrender to it. In effect, it says that "the only way New York State, for example, can solve her unemployment problem would be to move out our people lock, stock, and barrel from New York to, let us say, California."

Subsequently, I received a telephone call from Prof. Sidney C. Sufrin of Syracuse University, one of the individuals who had prepared the report, objecting to my comments on the ground that they had been based merely on an account of the report which appeared in the New York Times. The Syracuse University group, had not, of course, favored me by sending me a copy of their original report, but at my suggestion Professor Sufrin did send me a copy of his report, together with a covering letter embodying his disagreement with my comments, and I assured him that after reading his report I would make in the RECORD whatever corrections or alterations in my original remarks I felt might be justified.

Here is Professor Sufrin's covering letter, which, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point:

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Syracuse, N.Y., January 24, 1961.

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing a copy of the report which we prepared on distressed areas and also a copy of the summary statement about which I spoke to you on the telephone today.

I would appreciate very much if you would in some fashion amend your remarks in the January 16 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the point of view you ascribe to us is not the point of view we have. We obviously never recommended that "the only way New York State, for example, can solve her unemployment problem is to move out our people, lock, stock and barrel, from New York to, let us say, California." A small marginal movement of people would in many instances, solve the unemployment problems in the State of New York; however, as you will see we do not suggest this as the only, or even the preferred solution. Incidentally, in terms of numbers, New York's chronic unemployment is not very great. About 92 percent of our population live and work in prosperous areas. New York is not a distressed State. Discounting cyclical swings, New York is a prosperous State.

Furthermore, we urge that any action which strengthens the economic structure of an area should be undertaken since this creates a viable economy which employs its population. I do hope you will amend your remarks.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY C. SUFRIN,
Professor of Economics and Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, having now read both the report itself and this accompanying letter, I must say that I do not find any basis for making any substantial revision in my earlier remarks. In fact, as one who has been fighting the problem of chronic unemployment in upstate New York since 1953, as a city councilman, as mayor of the city of Schenectady, and now as Congressman from the 32d District, I am instead even more appalled with the conclusions of the Syracuse University group and more vigorously opposed to them than was the case after reading the original very accurate account of their findings in the New York Times.

The difference between myself and the Syracuse University group are not the result of any reportorial inaccuracy or incompetence. Rather they go to the very heart of the No. 1 economic problem we face in New York State. Let me summarize these differences.

First. The Syracuse University study is entirely defeatist in approach. It believes basically that there is little that communities suffering from unemployment can really do to help themselves. It recommends instead that such communities reconcile themselves to a reduced level of activity. They say this about our areas of chronic unemployment:

The fact that some communities of New York are static or stagnant, typically the smaller communities, off the beaten path, raises the question of what can be done for them. Probably the first question is "Should anything be done for them?" The analysis suggests that economic forces are at work which would, over time, solve the problems of such communities by establishing a new and lower equilibrium of economic activity. A subsequent policy question is "Has a dynamic economy such as New York State the patience and, in a sense, the indifference to such communities to let the people slowly drift away until some newer and probably lower level of economic equilibrium is obtained?" This is essentially a political situation, the solution of which will not flow from the logic of analysis.

And in more specific terms they also say:

The Mohawk Valley with what may reasonably be considered endemic underemployment, because of its size, must be regarded as the State's No. 1 industrial problem area. Gloversville, Amsterdam, and Johnstown are cities in transition, and the direction of their change seems neither clear nor determined. Schenectady is in the throes of readjustment but probably to a lower level of industrial activity than that which marked its peak.

In other words, there is nothing we can really do about these distressed areas except to reconcile ourselves to accepting what they refer to as readjustment to a lower level of economic activity.

This, as I said before, is most emphatically not an attempt to solve our unemployment problem in New York State. It is rather an abject surrender to it, which fortunately the people in the communities directly affected in contrast to the members of this Syracuse University group, have been unwilling to do. Anybody can run away from a problem or readjust himself to it. It takes courage and initiative and resourcefulness to stand up and fight. This is what the people in our area have been doing, and this is what I have been trying to help them to do.

Second. The Syracuse University report is pessimistic about those community efforts now underway in Schenectady, Amsterdam, Johnstown, and Gloversville, as well as elsewhere in New York State, to halt this economic decline and restore and redevelop the job situations of these affected areas—the same sort of approach provided for in the so-called distressed areas bill, of which I have long been a cosponsor and an enthusiastic supporter, and which is item No. 1 on the legislative agenda of the Kennedy administration. Here is what their report says on this point:

Perhaps most distressed or static communities have made attempts, varying from halfhearted to all-out to attract business and industry. There is no evidence that community or regional development corporations and activities have been very successful in New York, or New England. This is a flat statement but one which we think is justified. In Amsterdam, a com-

munity so terribly hit by the departure of the rug and carpet industry, a community in which heroic developmental attempts have been undertaken, the net effect has been to induce some employers to the area but the attracted, induced employment is still markedly below the previous high level of employment.

The New York and New England experiences show few examples in which the number of jobs supplied by induced industry equaled the number of jobs lost by migration. This is not to argue that communities with chronic unemployment haven't the responsibility to attempt to attract industry. It is an observation that such attempts are not likely to be successful in regaining the former economic position, and finally insuring growth. * * * Our charge * * * has been to address our attention primarily to the static or distressed areas of the State. In this regard we believe that the State as a whole and ultimately these areas themselves will benefit more if development of the State's economy is not distorted by attempts to influence industrial location in an uneconomic fashion. Needless to say, I cannot agree that what we have been doing is worthless.

Third. The group's only significant positive recommendation is to move the unemployed out of unemployment areas into some other areas where jobs are plentiful. "Selective migration," they call it. Here is what they say:

One alternative is to assist, with public support, the training and education of people to seeks jobs elsewhere. This means the training in skills as well as in the idea of choosing places to go. This is a potential subject of a great debate in New York State economic development. The facts tend to support the wisdom of assisting people to move rather than putting all the eggs of public policy in the basket of attracting industry.

To be sure this is billed as just one alternative to community efforts to attract new jobs, but as a practical matter it is the only meaningful alternative to community redevelopment offered in the report. The other two alternatives—trying to attract a Government facility, and trying to attract service industries as well as manufacturing jobs—have long been such an integral part of existing community redevelopment programs as our own experience in Schenectady and Amsterdam have demonstrated, that I am surprised that any responsible study of unemployment in New York State could have so completely missed this obvious point. In effect, the Syracuse University group puts all of its own eggs in the selective migration basket. Needless to say, I totally and completely oppose their recommendation. I repeat what I said before. It is no solution at all to the problem of chronic unemployment areas, but only abject surrender to it. I for one will have no part of any such course. The job of redevelopment is difficult to be sure, but I do not for one moment believe it is foredoomed to failure.

Fourth. The Syracuse University study discloses a surprising unfamiliarity with the real nature and extent of unemployment in New York State. It maintains, for example, that unemployment is concentrated mainly in the less populated sections of the State. It calls the cities along the east-west axis—from Albany to Buffalo—prosperous.

As a matter of fact these are some of the areas of our State hardest hit by unemployment, as I for one have good reason to know. But do not take my word for it. Here are the current figures as given to me by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics—showing total numbers of people unemployed in our major population centers—including those of the east-west axis—in November, the percentage which they represent of the labor force, the total number of persons on unemployment insurance in November 1960, the total for December 1960, and the percentage of increase.

City or area	Total unemployment, November 1960	Percent of labor force	Unemployment insurance, November 1960	Unemployment insurance, December 1960	Percent increase
Albany-Schenectady-Troy	18,100	6.7	8,063	9,676	20.0
Buffalo	44,500	8.5	23,726	30,524	28.0
New York City	296,000	5.4	162,039	211,958	30.8
Syracuse	13,400	6.0	7,951	9,883	24.3
Utica-Rome	10,800	8.1	5,871	8,008	36.4

Fifth. In my opinion, the Syracuse University study attempts to disguise the real seriousness of unemployment in New York State and to play it down. In this vein, Professor Sufrin says:

Incidentally, in terms of numbers, New York's chronic unemployment is not very great. About 92 percent of our population live and work in prosperous areas. New York is not a distressed State.

This in my opinion is plain, unadulterated bunk, as the figures I have just referred to already demonstrate so conclusively. If 92 percent of the people are working, then 8 percent must be unemployed. Is this what Professor Sufrin regards as not very great in terms of numbers? Does he believe that such unemployment is normal and acceptable in New York State? Well, I certainly do not think it is, and I do not think the hundreds of thousands of people in our State who are out of work think it is either. It is just a matter of whose job is missing, yours or his, whether the unemployment problem is "very great in terms of numbers."

Sixth. Finally, Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out that the Syracuse University group's conclusions against the advisability of community redevelopment programs have already been repudiated by the very State administration for which they were prepared, in Governor Rockefeller's own proposal to the 1961 legislature for a statewide distressed areas bill almost identical in scope and approach to the program for which President Kennedy and many of the rest of us have been working and fighting here on a national level for well over 2 years and, which was discharged by the Syracuse University group.

Mr. Speaker, I have welcomed this opportunity to read the Syracuse University report and to comment on it in the pages of the RECORD. But a careful perusal of the report only reinforces my earlier estimates of it.

Our unemployment problem in New York is a most serious one. It cannot be solved by ignoring it or by repeating over and over again the words that we are really very prosperous after all. It cannot be solved by deceiving ourselves that if we have 92 percent of the working force employed, then it is relatively unimportant that we should also have 8 percent unemployed. It certainly cannot be solved by surrendering to it, by accepting decline as inevitable, or by undertaking to ship out our unemployed people across State lines into other areas.

New York State faces a desperate and serious challenge to our continued health and survival as a first-rate industrial State. That challenge can only be met by the development of programs that will not merely put back to work our unemployed people—whether it be 8 percent or 18 percent—but will also get our economy growing again so as to be able to absorb the added numbers of new young men and women who are being added annually to the labor force. And we need to do this quickly before the forces of decline become too great to reverse. Only in this way can the job be done and the fight won. The counsel of this report is essentially a counsel of defeat, resignation, and inaction. I certainly cannot and will not subscribe to it. We can no more successfully appease the forces of unemployment and economic decline than we could successfully appease Hitler.

Unfortunately, when it comes to concrete suggestions to meet these genuine needs of our State and our people and to win, as win we must, the battle of unemployment in New York, the Syracuse University report must, I am afraid, be found wanting.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am curious to know whether the learned professor of Syracuse University gave you any definition of a marginal worker.

Mr. STRATTON. I was unable to find any such definition in the report, I will say to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have long tried to find out the definition of a marginal farmer, and I wondered if the gentleman could tell me what a marginal worker is.

Mr. STRATTON. I am afraid I would be unable to answer the gentleman's question, except that I have found in the report, as I sometimes find in other reports of those who approach this problem from a purely academic way, that failure to recognize that the extent of unemployment just depends upon whose job it is that is missing. If it is your job or my job, it is chronic unemployment, but if it is somebody else's job, it is just a recession or readjustment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Without attempting to analyze the Syracuse University report, I wonder if it would not be true to say that perhaps they have analyzed the situation as it is and the gentleman is analyzing the situation as he would hope it could become.

Second, may I ask the gentleman this question. The gentleman is a Congressman from New York, as is the present speaker. For the last 2 years we have had a Governor, Governor Rockefeller, who when he took office activated the department of commerce and appointed as its chief, the former president of the New York Telephone Company, Mr. Keith McHugh, as the man to do what he could in promoting enterprise in the State of New York. In the last year, in fact, in the last month, New York State has opened an office in California, and before that an office in Chicago, for the purpose of attempting to attract business to the very area of which the gentleman from Schenectady is speaking. I would like to inquire if the gentleman knows whether or not the Syracuse University report in any way attempts to summarize the activities of the department of commerce during the last 2 years in their strenuous efforts to attract industry to the areas he has discussed today.

Mr. STRATTON. I may say to the gentleman from New York that the report, as I just tried to point out, falls down in attempting to report the situation as it is, because they say that the area on the east-west axis, for example, in the populous sections, is prosperous, whereas the facts reveal otherwise. Anybody who lives in that area knows that to be the case.

Secondly, with regard to the efforts of the State department of commerce, to which the gentleman has referred, the conclusions of this report are that all such efforts are almost completely worthless.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, for whom I have a great deal of respect and affection has taken several trips with me, and we have discussed matters in his district. One of the things I have always heard him speak of with pride is the fact that Syracuse University is in his district. I certainly would not want the RECORD to show that this great university which is recognized not only in the State of New York but throughout the length and breadth of the education world should be brought into disrepute by the Congressman from that district. While he may disagree with the report, which is his privilege, I certainly hope he will delete from the RECORD the reference that says the people of Syracuse University are not able to cope with the problem. Certainly, he would not want to say those from Syracuse University are less able than those from Harvard University.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will permit me, I think while I know his attention was very closely focused on our subjects of discussion during our tours as members of the Naval Reserve and not on any other object or matters, it so happens that the city I come from is Schenectady and not Syracuse, and the university in my district is Union College and not Syracuse University. However, let me say to the gentleman, I certainly would want to say nothing that would disparage this great educational institution in the city of Syracuse. I am simply directing these remarks to this particular report prepared by a particular team of members of the faculty of the Business Research Center. I have many friends in the city of Syracuse and in Syracuse University. I think they are, perhaps, more aware of the unemployment situation than this particular group seems to me to be.

Mr. SAYLOR. Is that the same school that used to have a football team?

Mr. STRATTON. Well, as you can see, we in New York are accomplished in many fields.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE SPEAKER CAN TAKE IT AND HAND IT OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that the task of presiding over the House, keeping order, is a most difficult one requiring exceptional ability, courage, and patience, is obvious to one who has, on a few occasions, watched the House in action.

Composed as it is of individuals who have been selected by a group of qualified voters presumably numbering never less than 344,587—often more—each Congressman naturally has and should have a good opinion of himself; usually thinks and should think that he possesses worthwhile qualifications to serve in the House, a body which has no counterpart elsewhere.

It imposes burdens upon our people; protects or denies the degree of freedom and the opportunity which each of us inherited, which has made our country, since its birth, the outstanding goal of all people who desire freedom, prosperity, contentment.

As suggested, each Congressman comes to Washington with a desire to serve the best interests of his people and his country, because he has been selected as one of many. Quite naturally, a few of us, if not all, considers himself something of, may it be said, a star, entitled to at least a part in the limelight.

Hence it is that the Speaker's task is so extremely difficult. The House might sometimes be compared to a wild, unruly herd, ready and eager to stampede in any or all directions and without the slightest warning.

The Speaker has performed his difficult task ably, courageously, and with patience.

When, day before yesterday, the House had under consideration a measure, the adoption of which would enable the administration to, with the Speaker's help, make it less difficult to enact its policies into law, inevitably and quite naturally, the Speaker was deeply concerned. He not only endorsed the party platform, the President's program, but as one of the people's leaders, the Vice President being from Texas, a former Member of the House, and, some say, the Speaker's protege, he was deeply concerned.

The controversy had existed for some time. The discussion was not only earnest; unjustifiably it had reached the verge of bitterness, and the issue was in doubt.

Victory finally rested with, some say, the Speaker, more affectionately referred to as Mr. SAM. Others, like the New York Times, lauded Mr. Kennedy, our President, as the victor.

My own careful reading of the press shows a failure to attribute any part of the credit for the victory in this hard-fought political battle to that small group of 20 courageous, independent Republicans, who, believing sincerely in their conclusions, notwithstanding their party's position, cast the deciding vote.

Because of their adherence to their sense of duty, they are, and should be, recognized as the deciding factor which made possible the victory.

Permit citation to the RECORD which shows the Speaker's ability "to take it."

To close the debate, the Speaker, though he seldom does, took the floor. He first thanked us all for our "uniform kindness and courtesy displayed" toward him. He stated that the issue was a simple one; that we had elected to the Presidency a new leader, that the President had a program. In substance, he declared that it was the duty of his party which, by the way, has a two-thirds majority in the House as well as in the Senate to enact the President's program into law; that the Committee on Rules should grant a rule on any legislation which had been considered with approval by a legislative committee and the leadership of the House.

In the opinion of some, the adoption of that suggestion would make of the Committee on Rules, but a rubberstamp. The position asserted by the Speaker was and it is that when the leadership of the majority party and the legislative committee has submitted a bill, the Rules Committee should, willy-nilly, OK it.

Then the Speaker further said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1579:

> Now, I have a letter here that if I were easily insulted, it would do rather so to me. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] chairman of the great Committee on Rules, sent out a letter, and in that letter he used the word "stack" and "pack" four times. The gentleman from Virginia nor any other Member of this House can accuse me of ever packing any committee for or against anything. It is a reflection on the majority leader. It is a reflection on our great committee on committees on the Democratic side of the House.

Unfortunately those creating and disseminating publicity have caused the word "pack" to carry an implication not good. Legislative history, however, shows that it has always been congressional procedure and the objective has been good, not bad.

When the Labor Department was created, the Congress said:

> The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

In the 86th Congress, when the Committee on Education and Labor was established—and the procedure was not new—the majority party was given 20 members, the minority, 10, and rightfully so, because the party in control of the House should control the House committees so that legislation may be enacted, supporting the position of the dominant party. This for the reason that only as the issues are sharply drawn can the people at the next election determine which party should receive approval.

When the Department of Agriculture was created, these words were in the statute:

> The general design and duties of which (Department of Agriculture) shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture * * * and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

On that committee went Members whose interests lay in promoting the interests of agriculturists. The free distribution of seeds, though it created "good will", became a scandal and the practice was abolished.

Other departments had a like interest, that is, to promote welfare, secure benefits, for individuals belonging to certain groups.

Hence, it is a little difficult to understand why so many seem to think that packing a committee when it is done by a majority of the Congress is wrong. Your humble servant thinks that procedure is inevitable, that it is necessary in order to reflect a true picture of the political philosophy of the party in control; that it is wrong when—and only when—a minority—for the rule in this country should be by the majority—uses that procedure to put across a legislative program not approved by the majority, whether of the House or of the people.

Immediately after the Speaker announced that he would have been insulted by the letter from our colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] if he were easily insulted, he told us when he had participated in packing a committee, approved of the practice. He said:

> Away back in 1933, we had a tremendous contest in this House. One side won. They put up a man for membership on the Committee on Rules; our side put up their man, and we at that time packed the Committee on Rules with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Later, referring to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] who, in 1939 expressed to the Speaker a desire to go on the Committee on Rules, the Speaker said:

> I told him I thought it was a mistake for him to go on the Committee on Rules, for various reasons. But he insisted and then we packed the committee with Mr. COLMER.

Then, referring to the President's program, the Speaker said:

> Let us move this program. Let us be sure that we can move it. And the only way that we can be sure that this program will move when great committees report bills, the only way it can move, in my opinion, my beloved colleagues, is to adopt this resolution today.

The House, by a majority of 5 of those voting—217 in all—2 less than a majority of the membership of the House, then proceeded to do just that.

A packing procedure, with which many of us find no fault when used by a majority of the House, is a procedure to which your humble servant cannot subscribe when used by a minority.

The President—whose program the Speaker supports, which the Speaker tells us must be enacted into law—did not receive a majority of the votes cast at the last election; and, while he is our President, he never received a clear-cut, decisive majority endorsement of his legislative program.

Those who support and represent the President should not, in fairness, be permitted to establish a procedure, the practical effect of which may be to prevent full and fair discussion, clarification of and amendments to proposed legislation.

There is an entirely different issue to which I wish to refer, and that is the inconsistency of the majority party's position on the "people's right to know."

INCONSISTENCY

The leopard does not change its spots? But the Democratic Party can change its policy whenever it thinks it expedient to do so. It has orders to charge forward to the "new frontier" but the Commander in Chief says "To the rear, march."

Why this statement? A look at the Moss subcommittee gives us the picture.

The special Subcommittee on Government Information of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives was chartered on June 9, 1955, by Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations.

Congressman JOHN E. Moss was made chairman of the subcommittee and convened the first hearing on November 7, 1955, when there was "called together some of the Nation's leading editors, reporters, correspondents, columnists, broadcasters, and other experts in the information field to discuss the problem of restrictions on the flow of information from Federal executive and independent agencies."[1] It was, in other words, a panel of those who collected and sold news or information commercially for profit.

By the end of the latest scheduled hearings on April 23, 1959, the subcommittee had accumulated a printed record of 4,260 pages, plus hundreds of printed pages of reports and answers to questionnaires.

Three reports have been put out by the subcommittee since its last hearings.

To what end? Not counting the expense of printing its voluminous record and other hidden costs, the subcommittee has cost the taxpayers more than a third of a million dollars, including over $62,000 in 1960, when it held no official hearings. Has it managed to open any doors in its 5 or more years of prying?

In the Evening Star for January 28, 1961, Staff Writer Richard Fryklund writes:

> Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has ordered the armed services to stop taking their policy and strategy arguments to the public.

After indicating that Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, was reported as among the first to feel the effect of the prohibition, Mr. Fryklund continues:

> The crackdown also has been felt on the lower echelons of the three services. Officers who had been willing in the past to explain policy problems now say they have been directed to stop talking.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Official information officers also are giving considerably less information than under the Eisenhower administration, and more time is spent clearing answers to questions with a variety of other agencies.
>
> The crackdown is being traced to President Kennedy and his press secretary, Pierre Salinger.

The following day, in commenting editorially on the gagging of the two aviators released by the Soviet Union because "the State Department did not wish to place in jeopardy any chance of improving our relations with the Soviet Union," the Sunday Star stated:

> This invites the inference that if the returned fliers were able to talk such chances would be in some manner injured; on the other hand, they will be improved if the facts known by the fliers are not known to the people of the United States.

In his report on "The First 5 Years,"[2] Congressman JOHN E. Moss, who by now should be something of an expert on the "people's right to know," has this to say:

> Secrecy—the first refuge of incompetents—must be at a bare minimum in a democratic society, for a fully informed public is the basis of self-government. Those elected or appointed to positions of executive authority must recognize that government, in a democracy, cannot be wiser than the people.

Obviously, he was referring to members of the executive department who were Republican. Will he now characterize the Kennedy appointees in like manner?

Will he and the other Democrat member of the subcommittee now say that Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who has presumably "ordered the armed services to stop taking their policy and strategy arguments to the public,"

[1] H. Rept. 2947, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4.

[2] H. Rept. 2084, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 36.

is hiding behind "Secrecy—the first refuge of incompetents?"

Personally, I cannot agree with any such interpretation of Secretary McNamara's action. It is still my opinion, regardless of the political tinge of those holding office, that it is neither expedient nor justifiable to require all executive officers to disclose deliberations leading to decisions on matters which, under the Constitution, are referred to them.

President Kennedy, apparently disagreeing with the philosophy of Mr. Moss, seems to assume, as do many of us, that the President, having exclusive power in certain fields, cannot without endangering our security make public everything that happens.

Never have I forgotten my shock when an Assistant Secretary of Defense and the General Counsel of the Department of Defense were arbitrarily muzzled by Chairman Moss when they attempted to respond at one of his hearings to his allegations of "unnecessary governmental restrictions" on information. Perhaps the fact that they served under the administration of another political party accounts for the difference between Mr. Moss' reaction then and his silence now.

The lack of the usual "press agentry" on this occasion cannot be because the subcommittee supposedly went out of existence with the 86th Congress, for it was reported by the UPI as publishing a report on January 13 and by the Evening Star as beginning an investigation on January 25.

I yield back the balance of my time.

A NEW STAMP FOR THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have suggested to J. Edward Day, the new Postmaster General, that he begin the 1961 commemorative stamp program by issuing a stamp in honor of the New Frontier.

This theme, set forth in the President's magnificent inaugural address and detailed in the state of the Union message which we heard on Monday, is beginning to stir the heart and mind of every American. President Kennedy has, in effect, issued a clarion call to the people of this Nation, a call to move forward against the weighty problems of 1961 in the pioneering spirit of our ancestors. Surely it is most fitting that we issue a commemorative stamp memorializing this message and symbolizing the zeal and dedication with which we hope to face the future. Surely, too, such a stamp, entering the homes and families of so many Americans, will do much to stir the response which the President and the needs of this Nation so urgently require.

I have further suggested to Postmaster General Day that the design for the stamp might well be inspired by the evocative poetry of the President's inaugural address.

COMMUNICATION EXCISE TAX LEVIED ON MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR OF COOPERATIVE OR MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY EQUIPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to exempt cooperative and mutual telephone companies from paying an excise tax on their cost of repairing and maintaining rural telephone lines and equipment.

Purpose of this bill is to prevent about 1 million Americans who live in remote and rural parts of the country from being denied telephone service.

The communications excise tax originally was levied as a wartime regulatory tax. When it went into effect, internal revenue agents did not seek out the 1,000 small cooperative and mutual companies throughout the United States to impose the tax.

These small companies were never informed and generally have not been informed to this day that the excise tax was capable of being interpreted to cover their costs of repairing and maintaining their equipment. In most cases this job is done either by the actual labor of members of the cooperative or through assessments covering only the actual cost. As these companies have no income and filed no tax statements, they never learned they might be held liable and they have never collected the tax from their members.

Today spot checks are being made on these small companies. The Internal Revenue is not initiating only collection of the taxes for the present year. It also is seeking to collect taxes for previous years. It would be necessary for the cooperatives to go out and collect the tax from their members. Effect would be to impose such a financial burden on members of the small, nonprofit or cooperative firms that it would put the telephone firms out of business.

Why did these cooperatives come into being, and why have not these families received service from commercial telephone companies?

When cooperative members sought service from commercial firms they were turned down. Commercial firms explained the costs were too high to justify installing poles and lines to serve persons in remote or rural areas. The resulting revenues would not have justified the investment. It would have required higher rates to be charged to existing subscribers to make up for the losses to rural area service. It is doubtful that State regulatory commissions would have permitted such extensions.

As a result of this situation groups of farmers in many areas joined together as cooperatives to provide themselves with telephone service. With their own hands and materials, in many cases, they installed poles and strung wires. Some of this work amounted to merely stringing telephone wires on fence posts or trees.

Because of the economic situation the cooperatives are not competing with commercial companies. In fact, cooperatives are complementary to the commercial operations. In spite of the development of the cooperative telephone companies, statistics released this week by the Bureau of Census report only 65 percent of the farmers have telephones.

Rather than discouraging creation of cooperatives of this type, the law should exempt them to encourage further growth to service persons still without telephone service.

Cooperatives are connected into commercial telephone systems. The cooperative members receive bills for commercial telephone company switching and local and long-distance services. The excise tax on this service is paid and will continue to be paid by cooperative members under this proposed legislation.

The question is not whether members of cooperatives should pay the excise tax. It is whether they should pay it on assessments charged by the cooperatives for maintenance and repairs or on the value of labor performed by members.

The members of one small telephone cooperative in my district, if required to pay excise taxes on previous years, would have to pay $11,000. This amount would put the cooperative out of business.

This firm, in a protest to internal revenue officials, stated the tax was unfair because it was not equally levied.

Reply from the internal revenue officials was, the cooperative in my district had the privilege of informing the Government which members of other cooperatives were not being charged so the tax could be fairly collected.

The Rural Electrification Administration has done an excellent job in providing loans enabling many small cooperatives and mutual companies to improve their facilities. But the loans will not help if the telephone companies are taxed out of business.

Many of you have questioned the wisdom of even retaining the excise tax. It has been renewed continually despite its original purpose, to limit telephone use during wartime instead of serving as a revenue raising measure. More than two dozen bills to abolish the communication excise tax have been introduced in this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting the exemption for cooperative telephone companies to prevent 1 million Americans from being deprived of telephone service.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RAY, for the week, beginning February 6, on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DIGGS, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. STRATTON, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, for 15 minutes on Tuesday, February 7.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. BARRY), for 5 minutes on February 7.

Mr. SISK (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri (at the request of Mr. NATCHER), for 5 minutes on Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include a speech by Mr. WHITTEN.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

(At the request of Mr. BARRY, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. SCHERER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NATCHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALBERT.

Mrs. GRANAHAN in two instances.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 6, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

512. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 79); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

513. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

514. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 42d Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Miami Beach, Fla., October 15 to 20, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

515. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during December 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

516. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a copy of the Annual Report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1960, and a copy of the report of the annual inspection of the home, 1960, pursuant to 24 U.S.C.A. 59 and 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

517. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia,' approved February 18, 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

518. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, D.C. Transit System, Inc., requesting an extension of 60 days to file a certain report which was due to be filed by January 31, 1961, pursuant to section 8 of an act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

519. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a copy of a balance sheet of Potomac Electric Power Co. as of December 31, 1960, filed with the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia pursuant to an act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 979); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

520. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) negotiated fixed-price contracts AT(05-1)-710 and AT(05-1)-769 with the Lucky Mc Uranium Corp. (Lucky Mc) for the procurement of uranium concentrates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

521. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of supply management of selected electronic equipment programs within the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

522. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of military assistance program requirements for the Army and Air Force of Korea; to the Committee on Government Operations.

523. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, pursuant to Public Law 86-380; to the Committee on Government Operations.

524. A letter from the executive director, the American National Theatre and Academy, transmitting certain reports and minutes of the American National Theatre and Academy for the year 1960; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

525. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, relative to suspending deportation in the case of Aldo Pagani also known as Albert Pascal or Pascel, A5542123, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

526. A letter from the Administrator, Maritime Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1960; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

527. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a report covering supergrade positions authorized by Public Laws 85-469 and 85-726, pursuant to Public Law 84-854; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

528. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the General Services Administration report on positions compensated under authority of Public Law 623, 84th Congress, during calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

529. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the annual report of positions in the Small Business Administration established in grades GS-18, 17, and 16, as of December 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

530. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of the Department of Defense on civilian positions in this Department allocated or placed in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 during calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

531. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Cultural Center, transmitting the Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, pursuant to the National Cultural Center Act of 1958; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House on January 31, 1961, the following reports were submitted on February 1, 1961:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 23. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to conduct studies and investigations within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 46. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 75. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 3725. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 469

Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 3726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3727. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost U.S. citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3728. A bill to amend title 38 so as to authorize the Administrator to assign a total rating for compensation to a veteran granted service connection for blindness of one eye who subsequent to separation from active duty incurs blindness in the remaining eye; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3729. A bill to prohibit residence requirements as conditions for eligibility under State plans for aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 3730. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3731. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 3732. A bill relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishment of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 3733. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 3734. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3735. A bill to establish a National Advisory Commission on Interstate Crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3736. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3737. A bill to provide for the approval of the 1956 payment in lieu of taxes made to the city of Holyoke, Mass., under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 3738. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3739. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to provide for an Assistant Secretary to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to direct said Bureau; to authorize Federal funds to conduct and encourage research and studies into the fields of gerontology, geriatrics, and allied problems of senior citizens; assist in the operation of projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3740. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to certain retired employees entitled to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3741. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,500 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3742. A bill to amend section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the compensation of chaplains employed by the Veterans' Administration shall be considered as a rental allowance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 3743. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3744. A bill to encourage needed evaluation of rehabilitation potentials of, and the provision of rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who may engage in gainful work or achieve substantial ability of independent living, thereby eliminating or reducing their burden on others and contributing to their dignity and self respect; to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit evaluation and rehabilitation facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 3745. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 3746. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3747. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that drug advertisements must contain certain information; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 3748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 3749. A bill to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide penalties for malicious damage to certain private communication facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 3750. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3751. A bill relating to rates of postage on third-class matter mailed by certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3752. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3753. A bill to extend health benefits to the survivors of retiree annuitants who died before April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3754. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3756. A bill to encourage needed evaluation of rehabilitation potentials of, and the provision of rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who may engage in gainful work or achieve substantial ability of independent living, thereby eliminating or reducing their burden on others and contributing to their dignity and self-respect; to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit evaluation and rehabilitation facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 3757. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3758. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 3759. A bill to correct the inequities of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3760. A bill to include certain service performed for Members of the House of Representatives as annuitable service under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 3761. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3762. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual may receive child's insurance benefits even though he has attained age 18 if he is under 21 and is a full-time student attending a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3763. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3764. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3765. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3766. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 3767. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD of Missouri:

H.R. 3768. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 3769. A bill to establish a price-support level for milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3770. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 3771. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3772. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R 3773. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, concerning the sale or disposal of uniforms; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3774. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 3775. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported oranges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 3776. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 3777. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for tuition, fees, and books to certain public and private institutions of higher education for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 3778. A bill to create a Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3779. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 3780. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 3781. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 3782. A bill to amend chapter VIII of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 to provide for the establishment of an inter-American cultural and scientific interchange program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3783. A bill to make the treatment under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of certain foundations, all of which are closely associated with State colleges and universities and which act as intermediary recipients and administrators of gifts for the exclusive use or benefit of those colleges and universities with their consent, identical with that of those institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY (by request):

H.R. 3784. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation, and for other purposes," approved July 28, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3785. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the State of Washington for the purpose of purchasing Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3786. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish, in the State of Washington, an institution for the care, custody, and education of certain juvenile dependents and delinquents; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3787. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 3788. A bill to provide for the transfer of the U.S. vessel *Alaska* to the State of California for the use and benefit of the department of fish and game of such State; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 3789. A bill to amend section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to eliminate the ceilings on the use of foreign currencies for informational and educational activities carried on with funds provided under authority of that act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3790. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3791. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that any article of medical equipment or machinery imported by a State or its political subdivision for certain purposes shall be free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 3792. A bill to provide farms primarily engaged in wheat production with minimum wheat acreage allotments adequate to support the farm family; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 3793. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make stability of prices an explicit part of the economic policy of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 3794. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3795. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3796. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3797. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3798. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3799. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 3800. A bill to amend section 4253 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the communications tax certain amounts paid to mutual or cooperative telephone companies for the repair or replacement of poles, wires, and other equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 3801. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture to make joint investigations and surveys of watershed areas for flood prevention or the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, and for flood control and allied purposes, and to prepare joint reports on such investigations and surveys for submission to the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 3802. A bill to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 3803. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 3804. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 456 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3805. A bill to enable the States to provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 3806. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act (as reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937) to require that prices stated in milk orders issued thereunder be expressed on a per quart basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3807. A bill to amend section 501 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require owners of civil aircraft to show proof of financial responsibility for damages arising out of operation of such aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 3808. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3809. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 3810. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to prohibit the calling of the National Guard into Federal service except in time of war or invasion or upon the request of a State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3811. A bill to amend section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code to limit the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal laws or the orders of Federal courts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3812. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the donation of surplus property to public libraries which are tax supported in whole or in part; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 3813. A bill to provide that the provisions of the Natural Gas Act shall not apply to the sale of natural gas, as an incident of its production and gathering, by an independent producer not engaged in the interstate transmission of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3814. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, to permit judicial review of decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in compensation and pension claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3815. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3816. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not sever service connection of any veteran's disability when he has been in receipt of compensation for 10 or more years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3817. A bill to amend title V of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that each veteran treated in a Veterans' Administration facility shall, upon request, be assigned to a ward in which all patients are of the same race as the veteran making the request; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3818. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior during the calendar years 1961 and 1962 to continue to deliver water to lands in certain irrigation districts in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution designating the third week in June of each year as National Amateur Radio Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 191. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.J. Res. 194. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies to be conducted by contingents from the Armed Forces in connection with the daily raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution providing for equitable reimbursement in money or substituted mileage to the States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution expressing the intent of Congress that naval and Marine Corps officers captured by the enemy during World War II who were authorized for promotion during captivity and subsequently promoted after release be entitled under the authority of section 2 of the act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, ch. 166) to pay, allowances, and precedence from the date of rank stipulated in the later appointing orders; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 140. Resolution for consideration of appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 141. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations coming within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 142. Resolution to create a Committee on Employment and Economic Growth; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 143. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries, relating to housing; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 144. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 143; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing the electoral college system and establishing a system of popular elections for the election of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow the oil shale industry the same depletion allowance as that accorded the oil and gas industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend educational benefits to veterans who entered or who enter military service after February 1, 1955, and to extend educational benefits to all who enter so long as the provisions of the draft law exist; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to afford protection for domestic industry in the field of international trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 3819. A bill for the relief of Carey George Delapenha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3820. A bill for the relief of Mary Cooke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3821. A bill for the relief of Ivy Gwendolyn Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3822. A bill for the relief of Ahsabet Oyunciyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 3823. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 3824. A bill for the relief of Pfc. Philip Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 3825. A bill for the relief of T. W. Hall & Co. and/or Hall Import & Export Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3826. A bill for the relief of Sam Abdnor (Abdelnour); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 3827. A bill for the relief of Krishna Kallianpur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3828. A bill for the relief of Ghassan Omary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3829. A bill for the relief of Yanni J. Vatikiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3830. A bill for the relief of Gopinath Kallianpur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 3831. A bill for the relief of Michael Antony Kottiath and Nalini Mascarenhas Kottiath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wu-Ming Tsao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Miss Franca Buttazzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Maria Concetta Magri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3835. A bill for the relief of Lourdes Z. Nisce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 3836. A bill for the relief of Sarolta Mendel Takacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 3837. A bill providing for the posthumous award, in the name of Congress, of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 3838. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of Stanford University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 3839. A bill for the relief of Stefanos Georgios Mattes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 3840. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Carolina Power & Light Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 3841. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Collins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 3842. A bill for the relief of James Delbert Hodges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 3843. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Louei Chei Shang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3845. A bill for the relief of Richard O. Wolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3846. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3847. A bill for the relief of Wong Sill Lim (also known as Tsang Sill Lim), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3848. A bill for the relief of Edward Y. Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3849. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of Charles H. Denny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3850. A bill for the relief of Clark L. Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 3851. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adele Chalom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3852. A bill for the relief of Antigone Ligias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Ralph (Yunsoo) Kahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3854. A bill for the relief of Vassilious, Polyxeni, Savas, and Rana Irene Trilivas (Trilvas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3855. A bill for the relief of Dwylia McCreight and John T. McCreight, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Maria Rosaria Sirignano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Albert and Zehava Markovits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3858. A bill for the relief of Peter Petros Petsako; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 3859. A bill for the relief of Demetre Kotsiris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3860. A bill for the relief of Jordan Tomicic (Giordano Tomicich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 3861. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Scialom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 3862. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 3863. A bill for the relief of Woody W. Hackney of Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. Res. 145. Resolution favoring the advancement to the grade of captain of Comdr. Edward White Rawlins, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

46. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lucien Trumeime, Lewiston, Maine, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to several communications addressing himself to a redress of grievances concerning deprivation of his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

47. Also, petition of Frances Jean Reuter, Geneva, Switzerland, petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to a redress of grievances against certain officials of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Putting Brainpower Back To Work in the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, not only a breath of fresh air but some good solid thinking is sweeping through the Post Office Department. I refer to the intention of the new Postmaster General to depend on the brains and skill and devotion of human beings, with the assistance when practical of machinery, to speed the delivery of the mails. His predecessor seemed to have had the emphasis in reverse: Machines were to do the thinking and the postal employees the plodding routine of feeding the machinery.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 86th Congress, I found the morale of the postal employees to be at an all-time low, and the quality of the service reflected that. In common with so many other Departments in our Federal Government, however, the Post Office Department is now coming alive, and I am delighted to see the start Postmaster General Day is making.

As far as the Post Office Department is concerned, the feeling now seems to be that "a new day sweeps clean."

Federal Aid to Education Is Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the last official acts of the Eisenhower administration was the release by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming of recommendations of national objectives in the field of education together with an urgent plea that we get on with the job without delay.

Dr. Flemming, when he released the studies and made his plea on Thursday, January 19, was still the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, as such, was the official spokesman for the Eisenhower administration in this matter.

One of the reports dealt with the task confronting public elementary and secondary education in this country, the other with problems in higher education.

It is clear from these and many other reports—

Dr. Flemming said in releasing the studies—

that it will require a gigantic effort during the next 10 years both to expand our educational system and to improve still further the quality of American education.

It is imperative, in my opinion, that we do both—and that we waste no more time in getting on with the job.

It is significant that the report recommended an average salary increase for teachers of 50 percent by the year 1963–64, and an annual 2-percent increase

over the second 5-year period. The report also called for construction over the 10-year period of 607,000 classrooms, of which 416,600 should be built during the first 5 years.

It is further significant that the report did not separate the need for salaries and construction in the matter of priority, nor in the matter of Federal responsibility.

These studies, in the words of Secretary Flemming—

make it abundantly clear that the Nation will not achieve the long-term objectives in the field of education that we must achieve unless the Federal Government assumes a far greater share of the total responsibility than it has to date. Action on the part of the Congress in the elementary and secondary area as well as in the area of higher education is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to these studies and to the remarks of Secretary Flemming in order to invite them to the particular attention of those of our colleagues who follow the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Indiana. I do so to remind them that when we begin the legislative process to enable the Federal Government to assume its greater share of responsibility to education, that we shall not merely be acting upon the recommendations of the new Kennedy administration, but we shall be acting, as well, upon the recommendations of the Eisenhower administration.

In the time context in which these reports were released, and in which Dr. Flemming made his official comments, we may look upon them as a heritage which the last administration has left in the hands of those members of President Eisenhower's party who continue to function here in Washington.

Salute to National Freedom Day and Its Originator, the Late Major R. R. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 1, was National Freedom Day, commemorating the date in 1865 when President Abraham Lincoln approved the resolution adopted by Congress proposing the 13th amendment to the Constitution, outlawing slavery in the United States. Under legislation sponsored in 1948 by the late U.S. Senator Francis J. Myers, at one time the Representative in the House of the congressional district which I now have the honor to represent, President Truman in 1949 issued a Presidential proclamation calling for an annual observance of National Freedom Day.

Since the House was not in session yesterday, I am taking this opportunity today to call to the attention of the membership the historic occasion National Freedom Day commemorates. And I also want to pay tribute here to an outstanding Philadelphian, the late Major R. R. Wright, who first proposed establishment of National Freedom Day and whose years of devoted effort and energy finally led to congressional action establishing this annual official observance.

Equal Pay for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the women of Alaska, through the Woman's Clubs, Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, and other civic and social groups are in the forefront of the battle to obtain equal rights for men and women through the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Since the first act of the men of Alaska's first territorial legislature in 1913 was a grant to the women of the right to vote, it is more than fitting and proper that Alaska be out in front to assist in removing remaining anachronistic inequalities based on sex. Accordingly, I take this opportunity of expressing my full support of the pending resolution which would pave the way for the equal rights amendment, in addition to stating that I have today introduced a bill to provide equal pay without discrimination on account of sex ir interstate employment. This bill, which coincides with the draft recently proposed by the Department of Labor, is admirably explained in a statement issued last week by Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL "TO PROVIDE EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN INTERSTATE EMPLOYMENT"

This proposal is designed to provide a means within the scope of the Federal regulatory power to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer. It is part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The proposal would apply to employers whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. The administration of the act would be vested in the Secretary of Labor and procedures for enforcement and wage collection authorized similar to those now utilized by the Department of Labor in the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The contributions employed women are currently making to our economy are vital to the production of essential goods and services. The demand for these goods and services will grow materially in the next decade when the national population is expected to increase by 28 million persons. Six million more women workers will be required by 1970 to meet growing consumer needs. This means that within 10 years there will be at least 30 million women in the labor force. To facilitate the effective use of these workers and to encourage the highest development of their skills, widespread application of the equal pay principle should be promoted by Congress. Federal equal pay legislation, eminently justified in the interstate commerce area it will affect directly, will also pave the way for extension of equal pay practices to all areas of employment.

The present practice of paying lower wage rates to workers of one sex for the same or comparable work as that performed by the other sex has an undesirable effect on many aspects of the life of our Nation. Such practice tends to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the living standard of workers. Unfair competitive advantages are enjoyed by employers who follow this practice. Further, the resulting low wage levels often prevent the maximum utilization of worker skill to the detriment of morale and, in turn, of production.

Beside the tangible economic disadvantages of discriminatory wage practices, they are opposed to the fundamental American principle of justice. Moreover, the knowledge of their existence reflects on the prestige of the United States in affairs around the world.

For these reasons, it is of great importance that Congress act to eliminate discriminatory pay practices from the channels of interstate commerce.

Highway Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, during the past year we have heard much about the necessity of opening new frontiers for America and providing opportunities and programs for the growth of our economy. We have used these terms as attractive political slogans and talked in nebulous generalities. No one, including the inventors of the new frontier and growth philosophy, has as yet clearly pinpointed any new program which is going to provide for this growth or open one of these new frontiers. Some will seek new, untried, and costly socialistic boondoggles to stimulate this growth and open so-called new frontiers as political payoffs to special interest groups.

The irony is that they will do these things while they ignore and pay little attention to the great highway program which, since the very day of its inception in 1956, has been opening new frontiers daily for all Americans in every nook and corner of these United States—a mammoth program that is providing an unprecedented economic growth, not for any special group but for all Americans who, in our complex society, must daily depend for their very existence upon the rapid and safe movement of people and goods from place to place.

Because this vitally needed endeavor which is now well underway is facing many roadblocks and pitfalls, it might be well for me to take a few minutes to briefly review a little of its history and point out the magnitude of the undertaking so that those who are looking for new frontiers and growth will realize that we have had underway for 4 long years not only the biggest public-works

program in the history of the world but a program that will bring a greater return to the economy for every dollar invested than any other program in the history of the world.

When President Eisenhower took over in 1953, he decided that a new and dynamic highway program had to be brought into being to break the traffic snarls and bottlenecks that were slowly but surely strangling a large segment of the American economy. He decided that our outmoded and deteriorated highway system had to be rebuilt in the shortest possible time to reduce the tremendous and shocking loss in life and property which was increasing at an alarming rate.

Those of us on the Roads Subcommittee in the Congress, who in 1954 began the formulation of legislation to make the President's program a reality, at first had no conception of the magnitude of the undertaking, even though we knew that we were embarking on the biggest public works program in the history of the world. We had only a faint glimmer of the difficult and complex problems which would be encountered in the planning and construction of this highway system.

We get some idea of the magnitude of this program when we realize that, if we could have a public works program which would combine the Panama Canal, the Grand Coulee Dam, and the St. Lawrence Seaway into one tremendous construction project, and then multiply it 35 times, we would have the equivalent of this highway construction program I am talking about today.

Aggregates—sand, gravel, crushed stone, and slag—needed for the Interstate System alone would supply material to build a wall 50 feet wide and 9 feet high completely around the world at the Equator.

The portland cement concrete that will be used in the Interstate System would build more than 80 monoliths the size of Hoover Dam. That much concrete would provide six sidewalks to the moon. The cement alone would fill three trains of cement hopper cars with their locomotives in New York City and their cabooses in San Francisco.

The bitumens—tar and asphalt—to be used in pavements, bases, and shoulders of the Interstate System would provide enough material to build driveways to 35 million homes. With two vehicles in every driveway, they would accommodate almost all of the vehicles in the United States. Loaded in tank cars, the bitumen would require five trains each stretching from Chicago to New Orleans.

Total excavation for the Interstate System calls for moving enough material to bury the whole State of Connecticut knee deep in dirt. Scraped up in one colossal pile, it would have a volume of 1¾ cubic miles.

The bridges on the Interstate System, in aggregate, will be long enough to span the Rio Grande River, lengthwise. There will be nearly 50,000 of them, two-thirds for railroads and highway grade separations, river and stream crossings, and frontage roads. The rest will be structures at highway interchanges, which will average about 4 miles apart.

The steel required for the interstate System will take about 30 million tons of iron ore, 18 million tons of coal, and 6½ million tons of limestone. The total steel requirements are almost twice the annual steel consumption of the automotive industry. Each mile of the system will need the amount of steel, on the average, required for the nails in 1,700 frame houses.

The structural steel alone required for the Interstate System would be enough to build 170 skyscrapers the size of the Empire State Building. Reinforcing steel needed would provide 16 railroad tracks across the United States.

Form lumber and timber piling required for the Interstate System would take all of the trees in a forest of more than 400 square miles. The timber piling, laid end to end, would reach from Seattle to Buenos Aires and back again.

Enough culvert and drain pipe will be needed for the Interstate System to equal combined water and sewer main systems of six cities the size of Chicago. You can about double these amounts if you would include the work to be done on the primary, secondary, and urban roads and streets of this country during the time we are building the Interstate System.

The petroleum products to run the army of roadbuilding machinery used in Interstate System construction alone would provide a million automobiles with a 6-year supply of gasoline, oil, and lubricants.

It is impossible to calculate the additional amounts of oil and gasoline which will be consumed by motor vehicles whose use will be stimulated by the building of these highway systems. Yet your brothers in the oil industry are conducting a shortsighted campaign which is really hurting this road program. Speaking as one of the ultraconservatives of the Congress and one of the top champions of private enterprise, I think that the oil industry should either hire a psychiatrist or put across its knee some of the boys in its public relations department who are conducting the present vicious antihighway campaign.

Now, of course, they will say they are only fighting to have the temporary 1 cent Federal gas tax removed because the total Federal and State gas taxes are too high. First, I should point out that it is the public which pays this tax and not the oil companies. The total State and Federal taxes amount to about 10 cents per gallon. As long as these gas taxes are not diverted for other uses but go into the building of better and safer highways, I am convinced that the motorist is willing to pay them.

When we were formulating the 1956 Highway Act, I supported the oil people in their effort to set up a highway trust fund so that all Federal gasoline taxes would go directly to this fund and be used exclusively for highway purposes. The oil people and others had been fighting against diversions of taxes for many years. They won their fight when the 1956 act was passed. This is one of the fine features of that act, a tremendous accomplishment for the oil people, the public, and highway users.

As I said, motorists are willing to pay gasoline taxes as long as those taxes are used for more efficient highways because they realize that these highways result in savings not only in life and property and driving time, but also in automobile and truck operating costs. Let me show you why I say that motorists are willing to pay if the taxes are used to build modern highways.

I recently used the Florida Sunshine Turnpike. Motorists and truckers go many miles out of their way to use this toll road. Between Miami and Fort Lauderdale, a distance of exactly 15 miles, the toll charge is 50 cents. If a car gets 15 miles to a gallon, the thousands of motorists that travel this section each day are paying a tax or charge amounting to 50 cents for each gallon of gas consumed, for the privilege of using this modern turnpike. They pay this 50 cents in addition to their State and Federal gasoline taxes.

When the Interstate System is completed, you will have almost 41,000 miles of highways built to the same standards as the Florida Sunshine Turnpike, which the motorist will use without any toll charge. In view of what I have said, I do not believe that the motorist is objecting to paying the current tax to build and maintain the type of highways provided in the 1956 Highway Act.

In fact, one of the reasons why I so vigorously supported the 1956 Highway Act was that it provided that we pay for these highways as we build them, that we do not pass the cost on to future generations as we have done with so many of these Federal programs in the past. As needed as this program is, I am opposed to financing any increased cost for completing it by deficit financing. The financial condition of the Federal Government is at this moment too precarious for us to engage in the luxury of financing the increased cost of even this vitally needed highway program on borrowed money.

We all know the Interstate System alone is going to cost approximately $13 billion more than was estimated by the experts when we passed the enabling legislation in 1956. The cost then was estimated at $27 billion. The Congress provided that amount for the trust fund so that these highways could be constructed on a pay-as-you-build basis. Now we should have the courage to provide the additional Federal share of approximately $11 billion the same way. To do otherwise by further increasing the national debt is immoral.

Deficit Government spending is the chief cause of inflation. If we again start this inflationary spiral, which has been slowed down during the past 6 years, we will further increase the cost of completing our highway program and thus compound our problems. Today the United States owes $290 billion, which is $50 billion more than the combined debts of all of the other nations of the world. In addition to this $290 billion, we have committed ourselves for services already rendered for another

$350 billion that is going to come due in the next 1, 2, 5, 10, and 15 years, and so forth. This insidious and diabolical inflationary thief—this modern Frankenstein—created in large part by our own folly of continued deficit spending, has already increased the price of every commodity we manufacture on American soil so that more and more each day we are no longer able to compete with foreign-made products that are flooding our American shops and counters.

I do not believe those of us who are so vitally interested in this highway program—even those who are building it and supplying material—are so greedy and unconcerned about the effects of the inflationary spiral that they want the money for the increased cost of this highway program, without regard to how it is raised or provided. I believe you men and those other industries which are direct beneficiaries should not come to the Congress this year and just say: "We do not care how you get it. Just provide the money and give it to us."

We must realize that there are people who oppose this program. There are those who are hurting this program with their opposition. Let us take a look for a few minutes at the roadblocks this highway program is facing.

I have already mentioned the oil industry. Of course, they say they are for the road program. However, in attempting to win their fight to knock off 1 cent of the Federal gas tax, they have sponsored advertising and radio programs and created the climate which has resulted in widespread charges of graft, corruption, inefficiency, incompetency, and waste in the administration of this program and the building of these highways.

Now we are all aware of the fact that another of the major sections of the 1956 Highway Act provides that the users and beneficiaries of these highways pay for them in proportion to their use and the benefits derived. Most users claim that they are being discriminated against and that there are some beneficiaries of this great new highway system who are not contributing anything to the trust fund.

The reports and scientific studies required by the 1956 act are coming into the hands of the Congress at this very moment. There has been no opportunity to review them or study the findings contained therein. These reports, of course, will tell us many things. They will tell us whether or not there are other beneficiaries of this highway system who should contribute to the trust fund and how much. They will also indicate whether present users are paying too much or too little in proportion to the benefits which such users derive. These reports will tell us also the cost of building and maintaining highways of sufficient standards to carry the respective loads of the various classes of users and, therefore, what proportion of those costs should be assigned or charged to each class.

Before I leave the oil industry's assault on the highway program, I want to ask it this question: If the temporary 1-cent tax should be removed, will the oil industry guarantee a 1-cent reduction in the price to the consumer at the pump? Or will the price stay the same and the oil industry take for itself the $500 million each year which now goes into the trust fund?

I do not want to be too hard on this great industry because through efficient operation and management it has over the years kept the price of oil and gasoline at a low level. In truth and in fairness we must say that the rate of increase in the cost of gas and oil to the consumer has been far less than practically all other commodities. If at this time, because of increased costs which every industry faces, the oil industry needs an additional cent, then it should have the courage to say so. Because of its fine record over the years, very few will complain. It should not try, however, to get the increase by going through the back door and taking it away from the road program.

The reports from the exhaustive and scientific AASHO tests just concluded in Illinois will give all of those interested in highway construction invaluable data as to the types of material, construction, and design that are best suited to build the most efficient, safest, and most economical highway in any given location.

It is not going to be easy for Members of Congress, even with these reports before them, to come up with exactly the right answer. The experts, some of whom have axes to grind, are already placing different interpretations and conclusions on the data contained in these reports. It is going to be a real hassle before any final answer is written. As you can see, it is too early for me to discuss the content or even speculate on the outcome.

Let us go back for a minute to the charges of waste, corruption, inefficiency, and fraud in the highway program. First, I want to repeat what I have said time and time again. Starting back in 1956 when I addressed the American Association of State Highway Officials at Atlantic City for the first time, I pointed out that in a program of this magnitude, involving the expenditure of billions of dollars at all levels of government, and involving millions of people, both in and out of government, you were going to attract some chiselers and grafters; and that you were bound to have some waste, inefficiency, and even fraud. I warned at that time that the one thing which could kill this program and lose for it the public support which it needs would be the development of widespread waste, fraud, and corruption.

I urged all highway officials and those connected with the construction end of this program—in fact, everyone who had anything to do with it—to zealously guard against wrongdoing of any kind—to police its own industry or profession in the execution of contracts and particularly the acquisition of rights-of-way. I argued that those who opposed this program for political reasons or otherwise would exploit to the utmost any and all shortcomings.

There has been some waste, some inefficiency, some corruption, and some fraud brought to light. There will be more. The enemies of the roadbuilding program have seized upon these revelations. They have exaggerated and distorted the shortcomings in the Congress, in the press, and on the air.

It is easier for them to do so because we all know that the news media like to write about failures, controversy, frauds, and shortcomings, rather than accomplishments. As I have said, our Highway Investigating Committee has uncovered wrongdoing in various States. There is more to come.

But the failures, the weaknesses, and the derelictions in this program are infinitesimally small compared to the tremendous number of splendid and outstanding accomplishments. The chiselers, the grafters, and the incompetents are also infinitesimally few compared to the many honest, experienced, and dedicated men, both in and out of government, who are exerting their skills and ingenuity by diligent and hard work to make this colossal highway system a monument of accomplishment for the good and the welfare of all of the people of the United States.

What worries me is that there will be created in the minds of the American people a bad or distorted image of this highway picture, whereas in truth and in fact, as I have indicated, the good far outweighs the bad. Those in your industry, gentlemen, who are willing to cut corners and thumb their nose at ethics, not only are guilty of basic wrongdoing, their real crime lies in the fact that they might help to scuttle this program and thereby do serious harm to the great majority of you whose very lifeblood depends upon keeping the construction levels as provided by the 1956 act. Since you have invested capital and expanded your organizations on the assurance that these levels would be maintained throughout the 15-year period, it is essential that there be no cutbacks.

In the interest of self-preservation, if for no other reason, I urge you to get tough with those who want to make a fast buck by shady practices. Let us not furnish the enemies of this program with the club to clobber it.

Before I close, I want to call your attention again to one facet of this controversy which I think is tremendously important if we are to have an adequate highway system to meet our traffic needs on the completion date about 1972. There are those in high powerful places who feel that our new highways are too grandiose and colossal, as they put it; that our rights-of-way and median strips are too wide; that our interchanges are too complex and costly. These they call frills.

Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, one of the most powerful men in the Congress of the United States, says he is for better roads, but he is one of the leading advocates of cutting back standards of construction and design. Now I am a great admirer of HARRY BYRD. I follow his philosophy of government; in fact, my voting record is as conservative, if not more conservative, than the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

A short time ago I reread his article published by the Sun Oil Co. entitled

"What We Must Do To Get Better Highways." There have been hundreds of thousands of reprints of this article made and distributed by the oil people. I agree with most of the general principles enunciated by the distinguished Senator in his article; in fact, I have discussed some of them in this speech today. He wants to build these highways on a pay-as-you-go basis. As you know, so do I. He does not want to engage in any deficit financing. I think I made my position abundantly clear on deficit financing. He says we need highways. I most certainly agree.

But with $13 billion more needed than is provided by present revenues for the trust fund, he suggests that we cut user taxes, that we stretch out the program and cut back on the standards of design and construction to which I have referred. He evidently forgets that traffic, like our population, is growing at an accelerated rate, far beyond that predicted by the experts just 4 years ago. He forgets the tremendous economic loss and loss of life that results from each day's delay in the completion of the program.

We need to build permanence into the new highways to protect this multi-billion-dollar investment from becoming obsolete at the very moment it is completed. In the years past the most crucial failure in highway construction has been to underestimate traffic, the potential of the automobile, and the urgent need for sufficient highway capacity. As Charles Noble, one of the outstanding highway engineers in this country, said in his testimony before a Senate committee:

> We must realize that, if we cannot buy the right-of-way adequate for future widening, we do not have the right location. * * * We must not allow today's desires and pressures to blind us to tomorrow's needs. * * * If we are to provide suitable highways for the future, we must provide more vision than our forefathers. * * * Of all past errors, none so haunts highway officials today as the failure to provide adequate rights-of-way for highway growth.

In the Wall Street Journal we find this quote which pretty well answers the question as to what constitutes real waste:

> Some of these plans may look too big for their britches in 1959 but they'll fit just right in 1979. It doesn't make sense to build something new and then have to rebuild it in 10 years. That's real waste.

We do not need to depend on the Wall Street Journal. The parts of the Interstate System which pass through our urban areas and which are built to the standards of design which HARRY BYRD and his followers want to cut back are already carrying almost capacity loads, and we are still 12 years away from the target date for completion of the Interstate System.

As I have indicated, only through public confidence in and support of the road program will we be able to raise the additional funds to complete this job.

In order to get this widespread backing, we must constantly call to the attention of the American people just what these new highways will do. Interstate highways alone would:

First. Save $550 million in gas consumption, brake and tire wear, and vehicle operating costs.

Second. Save $727 million now wasted on traffic accidents.

Third. Save $825 million in time lost by commercial vehicles.

Fourth. The controlled-access highway is 2½ times safer than the ordinary highway. If traffic volume increases 50 percent as predicted in the next 10 years, there will be 55,000 fatalities per year unless safer roads cut the rate. Highways engineered for safety, like the Interstate System, by 1970 will be saving at least 6,500 lives per year. Chances of having an accident on congested streets are 30 to 50 times greater than on our new expressways.

In these days when we are using our best brains and spending billions of dollars to beat a path to the moon, we cannot neglect a safe and quick way to grandmother's house or the factory door.

Compensation of Chaplains Employed by the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the compensation of chaplains employed by the Veterans' Administration shall be considered as a rental allowance.

In 1955 Congress passed a law whereby clergy are now permitted to deduct from their income tax returns a sum equivalent to the fair rental, or purchase value of living quarters. This is in the event that they do not receive such quarters as part of their stipend. As far as I have been able to gather all churches, church colleges, and religious agencies have aided their ordained employees by the required statement that a certain part of their salary was in lieu of living quarters.

All military chaplains avail themselves of the reduction in taxes that come to them by virtue of their being paid as officers. Their quarters are tax free.

However, this leaves out in the cold the Veterans' Administration chaplains who are paid as civil servants, and who, therefore, do not receive this reduction in taxes. Neither do they receive the fringe benefits of convention expenses, car allowances, wedding and funeral fees enjoyed by their brethren in direct church work, or the paid expenses of administrative officers.

Until recently none of the VA chaplains have been permitted the privilege of having their taxes withheld. Their petitions for this convenience have been denied because they were clergymen and therefore exempt by law from withholding taxes. However, when they asked for favorable interpretation of their tax status as clergymen they were denied this deduction and told that they are civil servants. Now the Veterans' Administration has ruled that all chaplains who are not members of a religious order will have taxes withheld.

The injustice of this discrimination against a small group of clergymen—less than 300 fulltime VA chaplains—is readily apparent and I strongly urge that serious consideration be given to my bill by the Members of this House.

New Farm Leaders for a New Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is once again my privilege and pleasure to bring to the attention of the membership National Future Farmers of America Week, which will be celebrated this year from February 18 to 25. This organization, composed as it is of young men who will be responsible for the future expansion and prosperity of American agriculture, is certainly deserving of our consideration.

The Future Farmers of America organization, which was launched at Kansas City, Mo., in 1938, has now grown to approximately 380,000 active members in 9,000 chapters located in farming areas throughout the 50 States and Puerto Rico. In order to be eligible for membership a boy must be studying vocational agriculture in a public secondary school. The FFA is sponsored by the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with various State boards for vocational education and local high school departments of vocational agriculture.

In the Second District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, there are many chapters of the Future Farmers of America, and I know from personal experience the immeasurable influence for good these boys exert on their rural communities. It is a pleasure to visit with these young men and their families when I travel throughout Kentucky, and it is truly gratifying to observe their enthusiasm for farming as a vital and satisfying way of life.

When we stop and reflect that agriculture is the Nation's largest single industry, that it is basic to our economic and social stability, and that more than a third of our working force is employed in the production, processing and distribution of agricultural products, we begin to realize how essential it is that this country have a constant supply of new farmers each year. These young men must be experienced and trained in all the complexities of modern farming operations, for today's successful

farmer must have skill in science, business, mechanics, and other technological advances which the industry has undergone in recent years. In addition, he is expected to be capable of leadership in the affairs of the community as frequently he is the man of education, substance and stability to whom others look for guidance in promoting programs beneficial to all. The local FFA chapters provide the technical training that is so necessary for success under modern conditions, and they also instill in the boy the ideal of public service which makes the youth a good citizen as well as a good farmer. To illustrate the emphasis the FFA places on training, each member is required to conduct a farming program at home or on another farm and this program is designed to operate at a profit. Using this method the Future Farmer may expand his farming enterprises as he learns, and by the time he has completed his schooling he will be successfully established in a farming career.

The theme for the observance of FFA Week this year is "Developing New Leaders for a New Era." This is most appropriate for in an age of ever-expanding population when the hungry of the world look to America with hope we will need new agricultural leaders who are prepared and unafraid to undertake the responsibilities of this new era. Not only must we insure that our own citizens have an adequate diet, but we must accept the problem of the undernourished of other nations. To face this challenge with wisdom and compassion, we must rely on the new generation—the Future Farmers of America. To these young men belong the "heritage of the past and the strength of the future." As an affirmation of their faith in the future, the FFA Creed begins:

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds.

It is indeed a pleasure to commend the Future Farmers of America and their leaders on the vital role they are playing in America's future.

Loula D. Lasker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words of tribute to Loula D. Lasker. Miss Lasker died on January 28, 1961. The good deeds which made up her life represent the kind of person that she was.

Miss Lasker was a graduate of Vassar College and of the New York School for Social Work. Throughout her life she was concerned with the situation of the newly arrived immigrant and with the living conditions of the poorer people in our large cities, especially New York. In 1921, she was appointed by the U.S. Commissioner of Immigration a member of a commission to advise about giving welfare assistance to immigrants who were not yet able to depend upon themselves for their needs. She founded, and was board chairman of the Citizens Housing & Planning Council of New York; she was a member of the board of the Urban League of Greater New York, of the National Housing Conference, and of the National Housing Foundation. She wrote a number of articles on the needs of immigrants and war refugees, and on housing and urban renewal.

Miss Lasker was a vice president of Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America. Hadassah has provided, for those who have found refuge and a new home in Israel, a wide system of medical and social services. From 1952 until 1955, she was chief editor of Hadassah Newsletter, which is the periodical of Hadassah.

Loula Lasker's life was a response to the suffering of others. Motivated by compassion, she was capable of expressing this in practical action which helped provide for the needs of others. The number of those who owe her a place in their remembrance is great indeed.

The President's State of the Union Message Proposals on Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that President Kennedy's state of the Union message showed concern over military preparedness, but I was disappointed that it misconstrued the national strategy which has preserved the peace since the Korean war by charging that there has been a lack of consistent, coherent military strategy.

On this score, I would commend to the Kennedy administration a study, entirely above partisanship, entitled "American Strategy and Strength." Although sponsored by a task force of Congressmen appointed by the chairman of the House Republican policy committee, the study utilized the guidance and advice of 20 other experts from academic and professional life.

Clearly outlined in the study are five concepts which make up a consistent, coherent military strategy: First, the long-pull concept; second, the mixed-force concept; third, the conventional war shield of allies and the massive mobile striking sword of the United States; fourth, the indestructibility and mobility of the deterrent; fifth, constant capabilities in being.

Take the mixed-force concept. In presenting the defense appropriations bill to Congress last spring Representative MAHON, the Democratic subcommittee chairman, clearly explained the importance of maintaining a flexible mix of all forces, instead of relying on one weapon, one service, or one strategy. Even the nearly invulnerable Polaris cannot solve all of our defense needs.

If the new administration is in a quandry about national strategy, I suggest that it can make no greater mistake than to throw out this concept in favor of some magic solution. It has been used effectively for the past 8 years. It has been accepted by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

For this concept to function properly, all services must be represented.

I was surprised to learn that President Kennedy's reevaluation of our military preparedness was to be conducted on a crash basis by a special study group of civilians, not by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

President Kennedy's address spoke of the "absence of basic assumptions about our national requirements." The "American Strategy and Strength" study outlines in detail the basic assumption. We must gear our defense policies to the long pull. We must plan not just for 1 so-called year of maximum danger, but for decades of maximum danger.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-one is a dangerous year, but neither more nor less dangerous than 1953. Then we had much of our limited war capability tied down in the indecisive Korean war. Nineteen hundred and sixty-five and 1970 will be dangerous years too.

We must not permit a crash strategy to replace our long pull strategy. When a new weapons system proves itself, as the Polaris now has, it is appropriate to set up the production of the system. But it is foolish to gear or explain every step-up to some supposed new turn of events in the Communist strategy. Theirs is a strategy of zigzags calculated to force us into a zigzag defense.

The President's address mentioned interservice rivalries, a problem we constantly must strive to remedy—but not at the price of shutting off the opinions of military heads of the service. Impartial observers felt that former Secretary Gates had made more progress in this area than any previous Secretary of Defense. It is no comedown for the new administration to learn from a good example of a previous administration.

As to the President's three immediate steps for preparedness, I am glad to see he followed the example of President Eisenhower last year in directing increased attention and funds to our airlift and our Polaris program. The President announced that he has directed prompt action to accelerate our entire missile program by emphasis on improved organization and decision-making. He has announced a worthy goal. However, this is easier said than done, but as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I pledge in the future as in the past my eager support of this goal. I am not too sure that the way to accomplish this is by setting up ad hoc committees such as the Symington Task Force on Reorganization and the recent study group the new administration set up to reappraise our defense strategy. I have confidence in the present Chiefs of Staff, and the judgment of General Lemnitzer.

I believe strongly in a continuing reassessment of our defense needs. For-

mer Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates pointed out on September 30, 1960, that an annual budget cycle is no longer satisfactory, and that in the future the defense budget will have to be revised on a month-to-month basis to meet technological breakthroughs.

On the same day he announced, for example, that an additional $25.2 million has been released to the Army for the purchase of personnel carriers, tanks, and rifles.

Regardless of the budget cycles, we must spend whatever is necessary whenever it is necessary to take advantage of technological developments and to insure continuously modernized conventional forces perfected to meet any and all challenges.

But deterrence is not just a matter of spending money. It may be fatal to spend money on weapons which quickly become obsolete. Defense is not a one-way street, but is a two-way affair where we must veer off neither in the direction of too much too soon, nor too little too late. Russia would like nothing more than for the United States to develop the wrong type of weapons. Having the right type of weapons depends upon experience and judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The new administration, in my opinion, would honor itself and the Nation, and would fortify our prestige abroad, if it would avoid the political temptation of trying to play down the achievements of a predecessor in order to build up its own. The preservation of peace since the Korean war is no small accomplishment. The development of the Atlas, the Pershing, the Titan, the Polaris, and the atomic powered submarines are praiseworthy.

Let the new administration not belittle the past but forge forward to perform new deeds of preparedness.

Finally, in its search for a national strategy, I commend to it the eight key points of the "American Strategy and Strength" report:

1. Survival alone is unacceptable as the objective of American strength and strategy. Liberty, justice, and open societies are the only goals worthy of our heritage, and these are promoted by the rule of law, by a stable world, and by independent, internally healthy republics.

2. These can be accomplished by a national cold war strategy which becomes a public affair, understood and enthusiastically supported by people in all walks of life.

3. The first steps of this strategy have already been accomplished: Since 1953, national policy has renounced any defensive method of meeting aggression on the terms of the aggressor, has embraced a diplomacy of firmness which has deterred a Soviet adventure in Berlin, invasion of Formosa, reinvasion of Korea, and Soviet takeover in the Middle East.

4. The military phase of this strategy has achieved effectiveness by the mix of forces, incorporated with a worldwide shield of troops from the free world alliance and a sword of massive, mobile, and indestructible striking force, capable of varying and calibrated responses.

5. In the scientific phase, real progress has been made in integrating scientific and national purpose. American technology, in comparison with Russia's, is more broadly based, devoted to the welfare of mankind, and has produced far more solid scientific data from space exploration. If the public and the political leaders will give greater attention to basic research and education, in a climate of decentralized responsibility and creativity, and understand and support efforts such as the new 10-year NASA program, American science will win the resurgent confidence of the world and antiquate Iron Curtains.

6. The "long-pull" policies initiated in 1953 have ended the peaks and valleys characteristic of American preparedness since the Revolutionary War and have given stability within the Armed Forces and within the national economy. No sound economic alternative for the cold war has been offered to this policy, and this task force overwhelmingly endorses it as a basic premise for both preparedness and the preservation of economic freedom and health.

7. Improved psychological techniques and timing are necessary, but by far the best antidote to the attempted Communist strategy of conditioning is an ideological initiative, not to force beliefs, but to articulate beliefs through purpose and public conscience.

8. Essential to a dynamic public strategy is a continuity of successful policies from one administration to the next, an offering of a real alternative by those who criticize, policymaking machinery within Congress to produce responsible partisanship, and executive machinery for overall evaluation and articulation of our strategy and strength. The foundation of any public strategy is national character, conviction, and confidence.

Watershed Speech by Representative Tom Steed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1961, my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, the Honorable TOM STEED, addressed the Oklahoma Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts annual convention meeting in Oklahoma City.

Mr. STEED has long been a leader in the development of the small watershed program. He was a cosponsor of Public Law 566 in the 83d Congress which launched the program in its present form. Today he is serving as a member of the Kennedy-Johnson Natural Resources Advisory Committee and continues actively to seek implementation of the watershed program through his work on the House Committee on Appropriations.

Congressman STEED's district has responded to his leadership with the local interest and initiative basic to the success of this program. Ten small watershed projects have been approved for actual construction in the Fourth District, some of them now far advanced. Included are well over 1 million acres in all 10 counties of the district.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD Mr. STEED's speech before the watershed association convention. He tells the story of a program vital to Oklahoma and previews its future under the new administration:

WATERSHED BANQUET SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE TOM STEED, JANUARY 16, 1961, AT BILTMORE HOTEL, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, such a wonderful introduction by Judge Fishel, your president, would prove me less than human if I was not highly flattered, undeserving as I am of so many fine compliments.

Even so, it is very true that an opportunity to appear on this program is one that I find especially pleasing because I do not believe anyone can be given a greater honor than to have a part in the great program you espouse, a program that offers so much to this generation and even more to those generations yet to come.

With you, I share an intense pride in the huge progress we already have made in the field of soil and water conservation in Oklahoma. We all know this great watershed program is the heart and key to the overwhelming needs of our land for an effective conservation program.

As I look back over the last several years, and recall the other occasions when I have participated with you in this movement, I am impressed with the strides we already have made. The large amount of activity presently underway, the fact our great State of Oklahoma leads the Nation, and the fact that my great Fourth Congressional District leads all the rest, in this work is a source of satisfaction difficult to put into words.

Not many years ago, we knew this program and its vast promise mostly as a theory—a dream in which so many believed. Now, we can see it unfolding as a reality. Not many years ago, the prime interest of us all was to get a watershed plan underway as a new start. So much progress has now been achieved that tonight we can dare to dream of a day not far off when we can glow with pleasure at the knowledge of a watershed that has been completed. And while we know that soil and water conservation is and always will be an endless battle, we do know that this particular phase of the program is the foundation which first must be accomplished before all the other steps can have real meaning.

As we review these accomplishments, and as we thrill at the scope of our work now underway, and as we beam with hope and pride for even greater progress immediately ahead, it is well that we pause to take stock of some of our achievements and the reasons for them.

To begin with, Oklahoma's record in this field has been made possible largely because of the outstanding leadership that has been accorded us. Without the determined leadership of men like Judge Fishel, your president, along with all his associates at the State and local levels, this whole thing could still largely be just an idea upon paper instead of an actual, physical unfolding reality.

In addition, I think it is high time to give greater voice and emphasis to the contribution that Oklahoma's Legislature has made to our program. Many members of the State legislature are here tonight. Many members of this legislature are and have long been active members at many levels in watershed affairs in their own right. I am proud to be able to say that Oklahoma's Legislature has done more, particularly in the field of finance, to help the watershed program than any other State in the entire Nation. Without this remarkable help it would have been impossible for Oklahoma to have gone forward so far and so rapidly as we have. It is high time that all the citizens of Oklahoma became better aware of the great credit these men are entitled to have in this fine success story. I know we can count on them to continue this task of cooperation.

Finally, without the mass effort, faith, and confidence of all our people at the local level, combined with the long years of hard, unselfish service so many in this room have contributed, little would be of record at all. This is one program where not one spadeful of progress could be accomplished without those citizens at home having first taken the steps, done the work, and kept the faith that inaugurated the many projects now blessing our great State.

Thus, it behooves us tonight to look closely into the immediate future. I feel that we are now at a stage of activity where we need the best, the most experienced, and the most reliable leadership at every level we can command. I believe the next few years will make or break the dream we have.

And I am not unmindful of the key part that must be played in Washington at the Federal level. Since the control projects largely are financed by Federal funds, we all know that appropriations by Congress will determine almost entirely how far we can go in the years ahead. We must, then, I am sure you will agree, be concerned to the utmost about what this present session of Congress will do in this regard.

Today, the President's budget message was delivered to Congress. I have the proposed appropriations for the soil conservation program contained in this budget. And while the totals are somewhat greater than the current fiscal year, the amounts recommended are woefully short of what this program needs.

The budget proposal contains an overall request for watershed protection in fiscal year 1962 of $46,287,000 as compared to $42,048,000 in the current year. Despite this slight increase in the total, the budget proposes to cut the amount for planning to $3,722,000 as compared to $5,204,000 for this year. This would result, if allowed to stand, in a reduction in the number of planning parties from 43 to 30, or approximately 1 party for each 2 States.

Actual construction proposed in the budget is $38,294,000, including $1,542,000 for pilot watershed, as compared to $31,271,000 for this year. Since the amount for this year includes a $5 million carryover, the new construction funds asked represent a fairly good, substantial increase. The difficulty is, however, that even with this increased request the total construction program falls at least $17 million below what is actually needed in the forthcoming year. In other words, if an increase over the amount asked is not granted, many projects now ready for construction will be delayed.

The flood prevention phase of the budget, including the Washita Valley, is $19,463,000, compared to $19,570,000 for the current year. While this means the program will continue at about its present pace, it still is less than most of us felt could be wisely used in the year ahead.

With the coming of a new administration, one that is pledged to a greater interest in this total program, we in the Congress are hopeful of achieving increases and improvements. Knowing this program already is far behind schedule, it seems incredible that any additional delays can be tolerated.

One of the factors we believe is working to a betterment of this program is the advisory committee which President Kennedy used during the campaign and which is still functioning at his request. As a member of this committee I can assure you that many factors this program needs are being considered. We believe that policy changes, even amendments to the law if necessary, must be accomplished if we are to take full benefit from the experience we have already had in this work. To do less is patently unwise.

All of which seems to me clear indication that this is a year of great import to the conservation program for America. New policy, new funds, new application of ideas, new enthusiasm, and new determination, are within our reach. I admonish you to heed all these factors, to repledge your devotion and determination so long nurtured by you, to the end that we can bring this great program out of its swaddling clothes and make of it a full-grown man in America's future.

We can now see daylight ahead. We have finished the long upward climb. It is now time for us to look ahead with anticipation of two big achievements at such annual gatherings as this—important new starts on the one hand, and completed tasks on the other. The wheel of conservation fortune will have at long last turned full cycle. Thank you.

Address by Senator Byrd of Virginia Before American Coalition of Patriotic Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address delivered by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, before the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., at 12:30 p.m. today.

The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia is one of the greatest statesmen of the Nation. In this vital speech, he urges a return to those fundamental principles of our republican form of government which have made our country the greatest nation in the world.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, AT THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am honored by your invitation to attend this meeting of so many people who, through patriotic organizations, are dedicated to preservation of the great principles on which this Nation was founded.

In relatively few generations we have become a world power. Historically, the lives of nations are measured in hundreds of years. You and I want this Nation's life to be the longest and the best.

We achieved our liberty, our freedoms, and our greatness by adherence to fundamental principles. They are still the source of our strength; but we are allowing departures from them to accumulate.

All around us there are signs indicating the need for recurrence to our national doctrines as they were laid down in the wisdom of our Founding Fathers. It is becoming urgent that we should take heed.

Thomas Jefferson, in an 1816 letter to Samuel Kerchival, said:

"A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; the second for a third; and so on till the bulk of society is reduced to misery without sensibilities, except for sin and suffering.

"The forehorse of this frightful situation is public debt. Taxation follows that, and in its train there is wretchedness and oppression."

I think it is generally conceded that Jefferson and Washington were the greatest men this Nation has produced. Jefferson formulated our purposes and our system of government; and Washington put them into operation.

No nation ever had higher purposes; and no better system of government has ever been devised. It is not a pure democracy; but it is a brilliant practical approach to it. Its underlying principles must not be chipped away.

They represent fundamentals conceived in revolution against oppression and autocratic power exercised by a remote Central Government. I cannot imagine that the people of this country want them abandoned.

Our forefathers were willing to fight and die for our national objectives: liberty, the conditions of freedom, and a system of government designed forever to guarantee this cherished state for our people.

We know from the experience of our history that this guarantee requires division of authority in a manner to avoid the evils of centralized power within the Nation * * * and to utilize the strength of national power abroad.

These fundamental principles are the key to our strength at home and our prestige in the world. This is why the United States is a union of sovereign States which are federalized for specified purposes.

The purposes of the Federal Government are clearly specified in the national Constitution which the States adopted. And under the Bill of Rights, powers not specified as Federal are retained by the States and the people.

This is in accordance with the wise counsel of Jefferson. As Minister Plenipotentiary to France, he saw at firsthand the reactionary oppression of concentrated power in the nations of Europe.

From Paris he wrote home urging us to make the States one as to everything connected with foreign relations, and keep them the several States as to everything purely domestic.

To insure against concentrated power, the framers of our system not only decentralized it as between the Federal and State Governments; they also provided for three independent branches of government at each level.

In addition, there are still other checks and balances, such as provision for Executive veto, with congressional authority to override; judicial review; the Constitution's provision for its own amendments, etc.

Fundamentally, the principles underlying our system hold that people, in their local environment, are entitled to maximum freedom in the pursuit of happiness with minimum subordination to central authority.

No American was ever more constructively liberal than Thomas Jefferson; and no one has been more eager for sound progress in furthering the general welfare of the people and the Nation.

But his was a sound liberalism, developed from a conservative base: strong Federal, State and local governments in their respective areas * * * sound financing * * * republican form of government * * * informed electorate, etc.

These are not deterrents to progress. They contemplate growth in the Nation's size, resources, and population. They are capable of providing the freedom necessary for varied approach to worthy objectives.

One of the great fundamentals of our system was its freedom for individual initiative through which our people could start at the bottom and raise themselves to the top unrestricted by stifling paternalism.

Another was its promotion of the free enterprise system under which the Nation grew great in sound progress and free competition at the marketplace. This is impossible in a bureaucratic straitjacket.

We are founded on capitalism. Under our form of government this provides the means for our pursuit of liberty, freedom and inde-

pendence. How else could we achieve material prosperity with cultural accomplishment?

We do not necessarily defend the status quo; neither do we assume that change is necessarily progress. Basically, I think we wish to solve our problems by methods conforming to our fundamental principles.

We have a deeply rooted mistrust of central government. Too frequently it undermines our principles, limits our freedom, deprives us of the fruits of our labor, and curbs our initiative.

George Washington warned us that our Government "will become despotic only when the people have been so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other." This, I believe.

Another Washington warning is equally applicable today. Here is what the first President of this country said: "Let there be no change by usurpation; * * * it is the customary weapon by which free nations are destroyed."

There can be no doubt about the wisdom of the great men who founded this Nation, and the sound system of government they established. They knew the weaknesses of human nature, and tried to forestall them.

Times and circumstances change, but principles do not. We have abused the freedoms, the form of government, and the system of free enterprise which were our national heritage.

Sound progress should be our primary purpose as individuals and as a Nation. In either case sound progress is the source of strength. But in neither case is progress sound unless it is based on sound financing.

We have been on a deficit financing basis for 24 of the last 30 years. Our national debt is $290 billion, and we are not paying it off. Our total debt—Federal, State, local, private—is a trillion dollars.

It is easy to blame the war for this tremendous Federal debt. But $30 billion of it has been added since the end of World War II. Much of this is due to the ever-increasing centralization of government.

Ours is a government originating in the sovereignty of the States. Neither the Federal Government nor the local governments have any power or authority except that granted by the sovereign States.

Our strength lies in the principle of decentralized authority through a system of government designed to concentrate our power against foreign enemies and at the same time protect our domestic freedoms.

It is one thing to be free from foreign domination. It is another thing to be free among ourselves—free from domination by a remote Central Government of our own careless creation.

Centralize in Washington the power, the Government, and the authority over a Nation so vast in size, and so diversified in interest as ours, and you destroy the wisdom of the Government and the freedom of the people.

This is what is happening. We are changing our system of government, not by amendment to the Constitution as provided in our basic law, but by means far more subtle, and equally as effective.

If we study the record, it is not difficult to trace these changes over the past 30 years. They take the form of all kinds of aid and subsidies, but the overall effect is centralization.

We are finding ourselves enticed into centralization by Federal paternalism, forced into centralization by Federal usurpation of power, and driven to centralization under the burden of public debt.

I wish we could say this trend is abating. It is not. It is continuing. It is subverting our sstem, changing our attitudes, and hobbling our will for freedom.

When we test the tendencies of our time we find not only that too many of them are in violation of our fundamental principles; we find they lack practical and frugal approach, and they are unproductive of sound progress.

Summarized, the trends are toward: (1) Increasing Federal paternalism with fiscal deterioration; (2) increasing usurpation of power by the Warren Court; and (3) increasing influence by arrogant labor leaders.

We find continual deficit and increasing debt. We find continual inflation and drop in the purchasing power of the dollar. We find balance of payments deficits, and we find our gold reserves dwindling.

We find growing Federal subsidies flowing to business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, and individuals.

We find nearly 40 million people will receive Federal payments this year totaling some $40 billion, including social security. With their families 40 million people could total half of our population.

We find Federal usurpation of State and local authority. We find usurpation of powers as between one branch of government and another, and here the Warren Court is the principal offender.

We find concentration of power under the selfish pressure of organized minorities and demand for further paternalism through Federal programs. These are both present and proposed.

All of this adds up to a constant chipping away of our freedoms. If progress has been slowed down in recent years, the cause has been too much centralization of Government; not lack of Government programs.

Excessive centralization inevitably produces the evils of state socialism. Socialism might have gone even further and faster in the United States except for the British failure in socialized industry, and the occasionally effective conservative coalition in Congress.

Caution signals are flashing ominously in the trend of Federal court decisions. They are undermining our system at all levels. This can be traced back to the 1930's when the President started packing the Court.

Judicial usurpation of power has reached a peak with the Warren Court. Its decisions have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with executive authority and usurped the powers of Congress.

There is no doubt that the Warren Court is undermining our system and contributing to centralization of power; and thereby it is sapping our national strength. This makes us more vulnerable to destructive forces at home and abroad.

From experience we have learned that the more government is centralized, the more easily it is influenced by leaders of organized pressure groups. Political target areas and the ruling officials are more concentrated.

We have learned that the more Government is centralized in Federal bureaucracy at Washington, the more it is susceptible to the arrogant influence of labor leaders.

They now propose that the Federal Government outlaw State right-to-work statutes. Think of this: In the past 30 years strikes in this country have prevented nearly 3 million man-years of work, pay, and production.

We concede to citizens the privilege of organizing, and to legitimate labor unions the privilege of collective bargaining when they represent their members. But we also concede to people the right to work if they choose.

Power breeds power, and labor leaders are insatiable in their demands for special privileges and immunities. Federal nullification of all State right-to-work laws is high on their present list of demands.

They want membership in a union to be a condition of employment. Nearly 50 million, or 70 percent, of those employed in the United States are not now members of the big national and international unions.

Generally speaking, State right-to-work laws provide that the right of individuals to work shall not be denied on account of either membership or nonmembership in labor organizations.

The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes States rights in this field. Labor leaders want this provision repealed. Without it we could expect the Warren Court to strike down every State right-to-work law in the country.

Twenty States to date have enacted right-to-work laws, eight of them with constitutional amendments adopted by referendums. If they are not desired, the people of the States who approved their enactment could bring about their repeal.

But the labor leader pressure is at the Federal level. They want Federal action for wholesale nullification of the States rights which these laws represent, and the individual liberty they protect.

I regard the right to work as I do the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. States have the right, responsibility, and duty to protect this fundamental freedom. This is my position and I shall fight for it.

When irresponsible labor leaders virtually shut down the country, our national security is imperiled; when they stop production and wages, our economy is impaired; when they force wage increases without increased production, they create inflation.

Such power in the hands of willful labor leaders is dangerous. It is fundamentally wrong. It is an abuse of our basic freedoms. I do not believe our people want such a situation to continue.

I have been speaking almost exclusively of weaknesses we have allowed to develop at home. But for years we have been playing the role of world banker, world policeman, and world Santa Claus.

Our weaknesses at home cannot help manifesting themselves in our international affairs. They are doing this now, and it is serious. It is showing up as deficits in our balance of international payments.

This balance of international payments is a complex subject; but, oversimplified, it is the dollar value accounting of the debits and credits of all our transactions with the rest of the world.

And, in short, we have been paying out to foreigners more than we have been taking in from them; and they may demand payment of their claims against us in either dollars or gold.

They have been taking too much of our gold. If this is allowed to go too far, it could affect the value of our money. As a leader in the free world, nothing is more important than confidence in the dollar.

Foreign aid is responsible in a large measure for the fact that we are paying out to foreigners more than we are taking in. They have formed the habit of reaching into the Federal Treasury, just as we have at home.

Of course there are other factors in this international situation such as foreign trade, migration of American business abroad, interest rates, etc. But to stop or drastically reduce foreign aid would help our position.

In the sprawling Central Government we have allowed to develop, it is difficult to see the full implications of the weaknesses I have described. We should take warning from present threats to the value of our money.

We have continual inflation at home; foreign governments and banks are syphoning off our gold. There is reason to be concerned over confidence in the dollar both at home and abroad.

If the dollar goes down so do we and the free world. It is difficult to visualize the effects of such a catastrophe upon us personally; upon the strength and integrity of this Nation, and upon our allies.

I know we do not want this to happen. I believe we have the will and the fortitude to prevent it. Our weakness lies largely in irresponsible spending by an overcentralized Federal Government.

People are looking to the Government for handouts. Business and agriculture are looking for subsidies. State and local governments are looking for payments. Foreign nations around the world are looking for aid.

These are signs of weakness; not the elements of strength. They are in violation of the very principles on which our Nation, our form of government and our free enterprise system were founded.

I believe we want the fundamentals of our system perpetuated. Basically, the requirements are: simple honesty and individual initiative * * * self-reliance and willing work * * * constructive production and free competition, and * * * progressive development and sound financing.

We have the elements for sound individual progress, and therefore national progress. We have the people, resources, climate and geography; our system was designed for freedom, including freedom to work with incentive.

We are in a new era of atomic energy, rockets and space. We have increasing population, resources, productive know-how, and capacity. In such conditions representative democracy with free enterprise should thrive soundly for the good of mankind.

Our problems are many and complex. Many of them could have been avoided with ordinary frugality and commonsense. The pressures are great for continued centralization at home, and profligacy both at home and abroad.

But we have reached a peril point. There is now one paramount requirement. The American dollar must be defended and strengthened. Confidence in it must be maintained.

Inflation must be stopped at home. The foreign drain on our gold must be stopped. To do this the Federal budget must be balanced now, with a show of determination for fiscal responsibility.

Fiscal responsibility means continuing balance of expenditures and revenue with planned reduction in the huge Federal debt. It means return to ordinary fundamentals of sound government soundly financed.

This means stopping irresponsible raids on the Treasury of the Central Government by both our own people at home and foreigners around the world.

This is not too much to ask for the preservation of a great nation and the free world. It is really asking only responsible citizenship, good government, and fiscal soundness.

I believe with responsible citizenship, good government and fiscal soundness there would be no fear for the future. Without these, there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. We face these alternatives today.

Chemicals and the Food Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a notable address by our colleague, Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the most pressing domestic issue of the day is a fair return on agricultural labor and investment in America—and especially in the Central West. It is second only to provision for a permanent, wholesome, and ample food supply for the Nation and our allies.

No one in the Congress or the executive department is better fitted to pass on these two vital questions than Mr. WHITTEN. I therefore include as a part of my remarks his address on the subject before the 27th annual meeting of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association at the Hotel del Coronadom, Coronado, Calif., on September 27, 1960, as follows:

CHEMICALS AND THE FOOD SUPPLY

It takes so few of us to produce food, clothing, and shelter for the rest of us, that the rest of us provide the highest standard of living for all of us.

In that short statement lies the secret of our wonderful standard of living. Also, in those few words, "It takes so few of us," is found the underlying cause of most of our present farm problems and an invitation for even greater ones for the future.

Under our competitive and political system, the very fact that so few now feed and clothe the Nation means less and less voice in government for agriculture. As their numbers have become fewer, the farmers' influence in public affairs, in the political arena, has become less and less.

We all believe in free enterprise, but if you analyze the situation you soon find that our free enterprise has been free only under the laws as written by the Congress and the State legislatures. There has been competition as to how these laws were written.

It has been said that all anyone wants is a fair advantage—an advantage which he wants others to agree is fair for him to have. One way to get such advantages declared fair is to pass a law and have the law declare it fair. With the first Congress the fight was on; and such efforts have continued to be the main order of business in every Congress since.

Early in our history, protective tariffs were written into law; and a good argument could be made for such protection, especially in the early days. Many protections against competition have been granted, and rates reflecting a fair return on investment for utilities are provided by laws. There are many others.

About 40 years ago labor was given the right to organize and to strike. Laws have been passed requiring the payment of minimum wages.

It was only about 25 years ago, after a drastic break in agricultural income had led off a depression, that agriculture began to receive somewhat equal treatment in law. Farm support prices were tied, by law, to the cost of what the farmer bought. Many of these laws have since been repealed or modified. Agriculture today operates in an economy where advantages to labor and industry are provided by law; and for all practical purposes such laws are not going to be repealed. Only recently the President of the United States asked for the passage of a law requiring a further increase in minimum wages; and as of now the President and congressional leaders are pushing for such legislation, the major point of difference being the hourly rate—$1.15 or $1.25. Whatever the merits, it can only have the effect of further increasing labor's share of the income dollar and of raising farm costs at a time when farm costs are already going up and farm prices are going down—largely as a result of laws increasing compulsory minimum wages and reducing the minimum price support required for agricultural commodities.

Since 1950 the minimum wage required to be paid labor has been increased by law from 75 cents to $1; and the average hourly earnings of factory workers, by reason of the right in law to organize and strike, has increased from $1.46 to $2.29 during this period.

During this same period the Congress passed, and the President signed, laws reducing by an average of 20 percent minimum prices which must be paid for agricultural commodities. How could this happen? It happened because of the increased influence of labor and the declining influence of farmers in the Congress and in the Government; and, I may say, in the elections which preceded such laws.

Since 1950, labor and industry's take of the consumer dollar has increased from 50 cents to 62 cents, an increase of 25 percent; and the farmers' share, of course, has dropped from 50 cents to 38 cents, a decrease of the same 25 percent.

As this situation developed, the farmer, in an effort to offset higher cost and lower price, increased his production—thus adding to our burdensome surplus for which the Treasury paid out billions of dollars, about 50 percent to the farmer and 50 percent to warehousemen, carriers, middlemen, and so forth.

DECLINING INFLUENCE OF FARMERS

With the endless competition for the consumer dollar between labor, industry, and agriculture; with the endless search by newspapers, periodicals, magazines, radio and television for subscribers, advertisers and public following; and with the competition for votes by candidates for public office, it is easy to understand that our political system leads to an appeal to the 88 percent of our people who are nonfarmers, rather than the 12 percent who live on the farm.

Twenty-five years ago farmers had a substantial share of political power, as evidenced by the farm bloc in the Congress. Today, while the farm vote may still be crucial in practically every State in the Union in electing U.S. Senators, it is doubtful that the farm vote is significant in over 25 percent of the districts in the U.S. House of Representatives. In our legislative bodies perhaps 40 percent of the members have a farm background, and thus some understanding of the Nation's dependence upon a healthy agriculture. In the next generation, however, since only 12 percent of our people are now on farms, there will be very few legislators indeed who have any knowledge or understanding of agriculture.

Today legislation and Government policy is dominated to such an extent by nonfarmers, the 88 percent of our population, that in a majority of congressional districts I truly believe the fish and wildlife groups are a larger political factor in matters concerning agriculture, where there is any conflict of desire, than the farm group. Pending before Congress when it adjourned, favorably reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was H.R. 12419 which would give virtual veto power to the Fish and Wildlife Service over the most essential operations in agriculture. This bill would require the Department of Agriculture to obtain approval of the Fish and Wildlife Service before it could begin any insect or disease control program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals.

Several days ago, I came across an article in the August edition of Commentary, which is published in New York City, in which the author, Asher Byrnes, attempts to show that the farm problem comes from having given too much attention and having placed too much reliance on farmers as the basis for a sound and strong nation throughout history.

Significant is the following note as to the author. I quote:

"Asher Byrnes collaborated with Ezra Taft Benson in the research and writing of 'Freedom To Farm.' He has been confidential assistant (representing the nonfarm point of view) to Secretary Benson."

You will note Mr. Byrnes represented the nonfarm view as confidential assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture. It was this man who helped write the Secretary's book, "Freedom To Farm," which advocates reduced protections in law for agriculture, while laws are being passed increasing the share of the income dollar going to labor.

Apparently experts at making an appeal to the 88 percent, the nonfarm group, are to be found in every nook and cranny of Government. It is no wonder the public no longer understands there must be controls on storable commodities, where 1 year's overproduction may be in the way of the next year's crops, if there are to be price supports. No wonder most of the American people see no distinction between that situation and that of perishable commodities, where overproduction one year may not affect the next.

I am sure neither our Appropriations Committee nor the Congress, nor the American people knew of this man behind the door of the Secretary's office, stressing the nonfarm view to the Secretary on a confidential basis.

While the farmers no longer have the numbers to offer the percentage of votes so essential under our system to preserve parity of influence in the Congress, I would point out to those who believe that, since there are seven times more nonfarmers than farmers, the potential market follows such population statistics, that agriculture still offers perhaps the greatest single market for industrial goods.

Agriculture uses more finished steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. It is one of the Nation's largest users of electrical power. Its inventory of machinery alone exceeds the assets of the American steel industry and is five times that of the automobile industry.

FACTS FREQUENTLY IGNORED

There are fewer people on the farm, but capital required to farm has increased as rapidly as the number of people farming has been reduced. The number of farms has dropped from 5.6 million in 1950 to 4.6 million in 1959. The investment of capital required per farm has increased from $16,979 in 1950 to $33,455 in 1959.

More capital is required per farmer or farmworker than for his counterpart in industry. The average investment per farmworker is $20,700 as compared to $17,800 per factory worker.

As the amount of capital required has doubled, the cost of capital, through interest rates, has increased from approximately 3 percent to approximately 6 percent. As the amount of capital invested has increased, the risk has also increased.

The more capital the farmer has to invest, the more gross income the farmer must have to assure a fair return. Further, capital must be obtained in competition with others who require such capital, which makes it more costly to the farmer than the labor it replaces. Asher Byrnes, the adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture, makes the unsound assertion that the more capital the farmer must invest to farm, the better off he is. The author seems to believe that the farmer need only to eat up his investment to be prosperous. Doubtless, this is one of the nonfarm sources of many of the Secretary's unsound ideas.

Someone has said that to farm today on a scale which might provide a comparable livelihood to others requires not only enough capital to start a bank but enough nerve to rob a bank; and unless the farmer is lucky, he is apt to find he did the latter without intending to.

For the future, the problem of reduced influence seems likely to become worse rather than better. Interest in and understanding of agricultural problems is decreasing as our rural population declines and our young people turn to other occupations and ways of life. Last year, of 411,437 students attending those colleges and universities teaching agriculture, only 31,722 were enrolled in the agriculture departments.

Agriculture today is the one place where a young man cannot enter into business on credit and ever hope to pay out. With only 12 people out of 100 now on the farm, as I have pointed out, there will be few legislators in the next generation who have any knowledge of agriculture; and the voice of agriculture in the Halls of the Congress will indeed be weak.

SOME FACTS WE MUST REMEMBER

Food, clothing and shelter are as much basic necessities for life as ever. Any nation looking to the future must protect the source of such basic necessities, the natural resources. Such resources can be protected for the present and future only as those who presently have title to them receive a reasonable return above costs.

Worn-out countries of today got that way because too little of what was taken out of the soil was put back. There, too, consumers demanded food and fiber at less than the cost of production.

For a sound and steady source of food there must be a prosperous agriculture; for a prosperous agriculture there must be a financial return adequate to cover production costs, including labor expended, and a proper return for capital invested and risk incurred.

Today, in my opinion, the greatest threat to our standard of living is not the cost of defense, nor attack from abroad, but the ill-advised and unwise acts at home which build up in the public mind a prejudice against agricultural interests generally, usually to obtain preferment by the 88 percent, perhaps for public office, or perhaps to obtain their support by having further advantages for labor or industry declared fair by law.

It has been said that almost anyone or any nation can stand adversity—but that it takes the best, individually, or as a nation to stand prosperity. Truly, it appears that what is happening today tends to support such thought.

FARM INCOME SHOULD COME FROM MARKETPLACE

Agriculture should get its return, as do industry and labor, from the consumer as a part of the retail price. Existing farm laws intended that.

Where labor and industry pass their increased take, under law, on to the consumer as part of the retail price, more and more in recent years the farmer (agriculture) has been forced to look to the Federal Government for a larger and larger part of a smaller and smaller net income.

The share of the consumer dollar which formerly went to the farmer and is now going to these other groups has required the farmer to look to the Federal Treasury. Significantly the amount paid out of the Treasury to agriculture is approximately the exact amount that, through law, other groups have increased their share of the consumer dollar. Thus, it may be argued that the costs to the Government of what the farmer receives from the Treasury is really a replacement of income resulting from changes in the law increasing the share of the national income for other groups.

This transfer of a part of the farmers' income from the marketplace to the Treasury does not save money for the consumers, for the taxpayers are the consumers and the consumers are the taxpayers. By paying from the Treasury rather than as part of the retail price, the consumer is merely making his payment as a taxpayer rather than as a consumer.

Should this 12 percent of the population, our farmers, fail to receive a fair return from the marketplace or from the Treasury, not only could it lead to depression but it could also mean we would be maintaining our standard of living by drawing on the natural resources of the country, all in order that the consumer may get food and fiber below the cost of production. This, in my judgment, is a major reason for the depleted condition of China and India and other wornout countries of the world.

SOME SIMPLE ARITHMETIC

We know net farm income is volume times price less cost. We know the net income of our farmers, including soil bank payments and other Federal programs, has dropped from $14.4 billion in 1952 to $10.9 in 1959.

If that disastrous trend in farm income is to be corrected, volume must be increased, cost reduced, or price increased, or some of each. There is no other way.

Volume: Certainly to increase volume would be no answer for we have too much volume in the trouble areas now.

Cost: Research has helped with costs. We cannot say too much for research. Without it the public would probably be hungry and all farmers bankrupt. However, the increase in capital required to use the results of research, plus the increased take of labor and industry, under law, has increased costs faster than research has been able to reduce them.

It is to be noted that much of our agricultural research results in increased production; and to benefit from research findings a greater and greater outlay of cash is required, which increases the capital required and the risk incurred.

There is one area where total costs could be saved. We should make it possible to save the total cost of producing surplus units by not producing them. This would save farmers and the Nation billions of dollars annually if the farmer received a fair price for producing what we do need.

Price: Here we have a chance. We should enable the farmer to obtain a reasonable price for the quantity of production actually needed for domestic consumption and foreign trade. This would help the farmer and the Government. Certainly, it is more sound to provide a means to obtain a fair price for two bushels of corn than to assure a reduced price for three bushels, one bushel of which we do not need.

In seeking a solution to the economic problems of agriculture, several facts are evident:

1. What we have been doing hasn't worked. After spending or committing ourselves to spend nearly $26 billion, the record shows the situation to be three to four times worse in terms of surplus inventories of CCC.

2. Farm income is now so low, even with the sale of the overproduction to the Government, that farm purchasing power must be protected from a further drop.

3. Any future farm program must provide that farm income shall come from the production of that quantity of product necessary for domestic and foreign markets. In the interest of the overall national economy, such production must reflect farm costs plus a reasonable profit. Such income should come from the marketplace.

4. To bring about correction, we have one factor which should enable us to scale back overproduction without injury to farm income or further cost to the taxpayer during the period of adjustment. This is the $9.2

billion of CCC commodities on hand which are already paid for. Commodities from these stocks should be offered to farmers in consideration for cutting back farm production.

If such a plan were put into effect, there would be a number of important benefits to the national economy—(a) the Government would save storage costs, (b) price support costs would be reduced in line with production actually eliminated, (c) farmers would save the cost of producing extra units of production for which there is no market. Further, no additional outlays of funds would be required to accomplish this objective, since commodities to be used are in Government stocks and will otherwise be given away under Public Law 480.

Once production and demand are in reasonable adjustment under this program, it would appear that fair and reasonable price supports should be provided for the farmer's share of the domestic market. Any overproduction should be eligible for foreign markets at world prices. If this course were followed, the cost to the Government would be negligible.

The other course which might be followed would be to continue price supports on total production, limited to domestic and foreign markets. If this approach were used, the Government would continue to pay the cost of the difference between the support price to offset high American costs and the world market.

Whichever course is followed, or if some other answer is to be found, it is my belief that the Department and the Congress should get together without delay on a plan to use surplus commodities on hand to get farmers to cut total production of wheat and feed grains—the area of greatest difficulty at the present time—which commodities must be considered together.

AGRICULTURE FACES ADDITIONAL PROBLEM

Today, because of declining numbers, not only agriculture but the entire Nation is being threatened on another front. This threat has come about largely through lack of knowledge as to just how much we are all dependent upon chemicals for our supply of the cheapest, finest, most plentiful, most nutritious food of the greatest variety that any nation ever had.

It should be recognized that many chemicals are necessary in order to protect the public health. Failure to use pesticides could result in the production of foodstuffs far more harmful to human health than the relatively insignificant amount which has been condemned because of misuse by only a handful of growers. Today, pesticides must be used by farmers to produce the high quality and low-cost foods which the consumers of the United States demand. Except for the use of sprays and dusts, the cost of living would increase substantially because of damage to crops from pest and disease.

The development of more effective pesticides is one of the reasons why only 12 percent of the people in this country are able to feed the other 88 percent, leaving that 88 percent free to produce other things—a situation which has never before existed in the history of the world.

Appeal to the 88 percent and the dangers therein were pointed up this year.

THE CRANBERRY AND CAPON INCIDENTS

In the cranberry case a few growers misused chemicals in violation of instructions. In the capon case, our scientists suddenly saw possible dangers where they had seen none before. In each instance after appropriate action was taken and the public health was protected, the public was needlessly frightened by stories released to the public press.

In the cranberry situation the whole market for good cranberries was virtually destroyed. The damage reached such proportions, the President requested that, since the damage to producers of good cranberries resulted from the Government's action, the producers whose market for good cranberries had been destroyed by this publicity should be paid. They were paid, and the cost was charged up to agriculture, though agriculture—or 99 out of 100 cranberry farmers—was not at fault at all.

The handling of the entire matter through the press indicates a political appeal to the 88 percent of nonfarmers. Truly, as one Congressman said, "If the farmers had wrapped the cranberries, even the few bad ones, in cigarette papers, it would have been all right. No one in Government would have dared condemn them."

There is so much to indicate that to be true it is frightening.

Today we see groups making further efforts to curry favor with the 88 percent nonfarmers. It is becoming popular to advocate a showing of zero tolerance on anything used in producing, handling, or protecting foods. I repeat, protection of the public health is vital. We must protect our health. However, to insist upon any such thing as zero tolerance, would rule out the air we breathe and even the water we drink. Actually to follow any such policy would greatly endanger all of us, as a result of the contaminated, scarce, and poor quality food which would be available under such a policy.

CHEMICALS ESSENTIAL TO ENTIRE ECONOMY

In the excitement that has resulted from this widespread publicity, after the fact, there is a tendency to discredit all chemicals used in the production, processing, and distribution of foods. This is true despite the fact that two agencies of the Federal Government—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture—have broad powers to regulate the use of chemicals, and they exercise these powers for the protection of the public every day of the year.

It is hard for anyone not closely associated with agriculture to realize how utterly dependent we all are on chemicals. They are as necessary as the tractors and combines, or fast transportation and refrigeration.

In addition to endangering the public health, a ban on agricultural chemicals would so reduce food supplies and upset the orderly movement of foods to market that the effects would reverberate throughout our entire economy.

The first effect would be a sharp reduction in the quantity of salable food. This would be accompanied by decreases in quality, and large-scale losses in transit, storage, retailing, and in homes.

It is estimated by officials of the Department of Agriculture that, if it were not for the use of chemicals, fertilizers and pesticides, in 5 years the cost of a very inferior quality of food to the American consumer would double, and in 10 to 15 years the people of this Nation would be short of essential foods.

Prices would soar in response to smaller supplies, despite poor quality. Production costs would increase as yields decreased, giving rise to further price spirals.

The traditional one-fifth of income spent for food would no longer feed a family. The ratio could easily go to one-half or more. This would have a quick and drastic effect upon production of and purchases of other goods, such as appliances, furniture and automobiles.

Such is the importance of an abundant and reasonably priced food supply in our economy. Any action that brings about a material change in the ratio of money spent for food would cause severe economic repercussions.

During the years 1935–39, we spent 23 percent of our incomes for food. If we had bought in 1959 the same kinds and quantities of food we ate in 1935–39, we would have spent only 15 percent.

Greater buying power enables us to take advantage of the abundant food, including the animal products, provided by an efficient, modern agriculture. Along with the animal products, we expect and enjoy fresh vegetables and fruits all year long. Modern refrigeration and transportation ended our seasonal eating habits and provided balanced diets the year round.

It is common in most other countries for people to spend half or even more of their income for food. United Nations figures for 1958 show that the people of certain other countries spend the following percentages: Italy, 46 percent; Japan, 51 percent; Ceylon, 57 percent; and Nigeria, 71 percent. In much of the world, what we consider essential foods are not to be had at any price.

The development of our high level of agricultural efficiency has not been easy. Behind it has been (1) a wealth of natural resources (somewhat depleted today), (2) a relatively small population (rapidly changing), (3) extensive research, and (4) full application of research results, supported by a farsighted people and their Government.

FARMING WITHOUT CHEMICALS

Production of commercial quantities of many of our common vegetables would cease without pesticides. Late blight, which caused the 1845 famine in Ireland, is prevalent in this country and could wipe out our potato crop whenever conditions were favorable to the disease, if there were no spraying or dusting. Early blight is nearly always present and must be controlled to obtain economic yields. Early and late blight can completely destroy the tomato crop in epidemic years, unless checked by proper spraying and dusting.

But even if all diseases were banished by some miracle, we would still have the insects. Without insecticides we would have to plant twice as much acreage, half for insects, and half for ourselves.

Certain insects that attack more than one crop are especially dangerous without the use of pesticides to hold them in check. For example the corn earworm, the most damaging pest of corn, also attacks tomatoes as the fruitworm and cotton as the bollworm. Keeping this migratory pest under control with insecticides in the South helps curtail infestations later in northern crops, such as tobacco, alfalfa, corn and beans. Florida's $10 million sweetcorn industry depends on control of the corn earworm with insecticides. Before the newer insecticides came along, sweetcorn grown in Florida or Texas could not be marketed because of the worm-eaten ears.

The limabean growers were almost put out of business in the Eastern States until an economical chemical control was found for downy mildew. Even with pesticides, it is difficult to raise marketable quantities of beans due to the Mexican bean beetle attacks. This insect alone causes $3.5 million loss to bean production every year. Powdery mildew and rust alone would probably prevent yields high enough to supply the demand.

Without pesticides our winter supplies of fresh vegetables, grown in the South and Southwest, would disappear from the markets. We also depend upon other chemicals to control weeds in many vegetables. Carrots, kale, mustard, collards, spinach, and other leafy vegetables would be priced out of the market if herbicides were not used to weed them, displacing costly hand labor. In some sections the cost of growing spinach would go up $162 per acre were it not for chemical weeding.

Fruit production: Commercial production of apples would be impossible in this country without the use of insecticides and fungicides. Seventy percent to eighty percent

of the Virginia apple crop would be lost if no insecticides were applied. In Missouri, losses due to insects in unsprayed Missouri orchards are more than 50 percent on summer varieties and 100 percent on fall and winter varieties. In New York, 50 percent to 99 percent of the fruit was destroyed annually by insects where no insecticides were used on trees that received the regular fertilizers and fungicides. In Connecticut, less than 5 percent commercially usable fruit is produced where no insecticides are applied.

Without pesticides, peaches and cherries would rapidly disappear from our markets. Brown rot alone would take all of our eastern-grown peaches. Attacks by the plum curculio and the oriental fruit moth make control of this disease virtually impossible, so they must be controlled too. The peach tree borer would kill many trees, adding to loss of the crop.

We could not have eradicated the Hall scale in California if we had had no insecticides to combat this imported pest that threatened the entire stone fruit production in this country, and consumers would have suffered.

A number of diseases that infect grapes, cranberries, and raspberries would drive these fruits off the market unless chemicals are used regularly. Prices for strawberries would skyrocket to the point of taking them off the market without the use of herbicides to replace the costly labor needed for weeding the crop.

When the Mediterranean fruitfly struck at the Florida citrus industry again in 1956, we could have easily lost this major supply of citrus if we had not eradicated this pest with insecticides. We could be eating grapefruit and oranges with maggots in them—if the fruit were available at all. Canned citrus juices that would pass inspection could become so limited, because of this pest, that production of this essential part of our diet would be reduced well below the national demand. We could produce some citrus of inferior quality wtihout chemicals but we would need more acres of new groves, adding to the cost of production. At best, the small supply of fruits would be available at only certain seasons—not the year round as it is today. And this does not take into account the losses that would occur due to diseases of citrus.

Field crops and forage: The greenbug, an aphid which attacks small grains, which caused $18.5 million average annual loss in the past, resulting in higher costs to producer and consumer, is now controlled by chemicals. The European corn borer still causes serious damage to corn. Chinch bugs would cause an average loss of over a million dollars a year in corn and sorghums, except for the use of insecticides which has reduced these losses to a few thousand dollars a year. Much of our small grains and corn would not get above the ground if we did not treat the seeds for a variety of diseases that affect the seedlings and the mature plants. Grain rusts would increase if we did not have herbicides to assist in destroying the barberry plants which are intermediate hosts of this disease.

Witchweed, a parasitic plant that can play havoc with corn production would take over great sections of our Nation except for herbicides. If this pest ever reaches our Midwest Corn Belt from its present location in the Carolinas, the results could be most serious and far reaching.

If no weed killers had been available last year, 16 million acres of corn would have required at least 2 extra cultivations at a cost of $3 per acre. We would have to give up the weeding of 20 million acres of small grains and flax, a practice that is possible for the first time with herbicides.

Ranchers would once more be forced to market thousands of cattle at unfavorable times if we abandoned the use of insecticides to protect our winter ranges from grasshoppers. Farmers would find it necessary to plant fields two or three times and risk their crops to grasshoppers and go bankrupt in the process. Insecticides are particularly valuable in dry years when grasshoppers build up, and when every blade of grass must be conserved to keep our beef production from falling off drastically.

Livestock and poultry: Cost of pork would greatly increase if we did not have effective chemicals to check internal parasites. Similarly, mutton prices would greatly increase except for chemicals, for production would be unprofitable in the Midwest and eastern United States, and on irrigated lands in the West.

Production of eggs, chickens, and other poultry would be out in the South and Southwest if insecticides were not used—particularly under present mass production methods; and the consumer would pay more and more.

The eradication of the cattle tick in the South, brought about by the use of chemicals, has increased the availability of good quality beef at lower prices. If we abandoned this protection, the ticks that transmit the dread cattle fever would again take over and virtually stop economic production of beef in the South—with serious effect on our overall food supply.

If we stopped using chemicals to protect cattle, hogs, sheep, and poultry from only six major external parasites, we would add well over $100 million to the annual cost of production, which of course would be passed on to the consumer. Our available sources of meat and milk could be drastically reduced without the use of these protecting chemicals.

Except for using insecticides against cattle grubs, milk production would probably be reduced 10 to 20 percent. Grub holes in hides can lower the quality of leather while increasing its cost, and destroy $5 of meat per head.

If it were not for pesticides the screwworm would destroy the Southeast as a source of beef, ruining the local economy, reducing the quantity and increasing the cost to consumers.

Cotton production: We know that pesticides have enabled the cotton farmer to stay in business. Carefully kept records over the past 37 years in Louisiana, Texas, and South Carolina show that except for pesticides cotton yields would have been about 50 percent in the boll weevil belt where the average annual losses from 1949 to 1954 were more than $350 million. In Arizona, the yield of lint is very closely correlated with the degree of pest control. Just think how low farm income would have been. Bankruptcy would have been the order of the day.

If farmers did not treat their cottonseeds with chemicals to control the seedling diseases, they would have to plant two or three times the acreage now planted and the crops would be so late that they would be susceptible to even greater damage from the boll weevil, and cost of cotton to the mills would triple.

CHEMICALS IN MARKETING

On the farm chemicals can spell the difference between good yields and none, and to the consumer plentiful supply at low prices, or scarcity and high prices. In the marketing process, chemicals can make the difference between making a quality product available at the market place, or not getting it there at all.

A moratorium on chemicals in marketing channels would cost billions of dollars in losses due to insects that attack stored products, part of which would be borne by the producer and part by the consumer. Very little of our processed foods could meet requirements of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for purity, soundness, and wholesomeness and then the American people would face a greatly reduced standard of living.

Even with present chemicals, stored-product insects feed on and spoil grain valued at more than $240 million a year, tobacco exceeding a value of $17 million, and peanuts valued at more than $11 million, all of which increases the cost to the farmer and increases the price to the consumer. Present losses of grain would triple if chemicals could not be used to protect stored products from insect damage. Losses in tobacco would increase tenfold.

These unwelcome pests are a particular hazard to the dried fruit industry. With chemicals now in use losses can be held to about 6 percent of annual production. They would climb to 20 percent if no chemicals were permitted. This would cause 14 percent less supply, which could mean several times that increase in retail price.

Stored-product insects would add billions to the cost of putting wool and animal hair products on the market if chemicals were not used to protect these commodities. Present losses of $360 million would be increased many times, again to the detriment of the consumer as well as the farmer.

A moratorium on chemicals would also increase processing costs throughout marketing channels. Processing damaged fruit and vegetables is more expensive than processing sound products. The cost of trimming decayed parts from the produce would run into several thousand dollars a week in large-scale plants—all of which would have to be reflected in prices demanded and paid.

Costs for removing spoiled produce at major food markets would spiral and add to the cost and risks of the salable products. Losses from major markets now average between $25 and $30 million. Losses from spoilage in the New York market alone cost more than $1.8 million yearly. Commodities sold must bear the cost of that which has spoiled.

Banning chemicals used to retard spoilage and loss of quality after harvest would result in reduced supplies and shorter periods when some products are available. For instance, it used to be difficult to store California grapes for the Christmas season. Now, thanks to the control of gray mold with sulfur dioxide fumigation, plentiful supplies of grapes are still on the market in April and May.

EXPERIENCE IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Some say we should rely on nature and natural enemies of destructive diseases and pests. Nothing would cut our standard of living in half quicker than such a course. All we have to do is to look around the world today and see for ourselves how the people fare where food producers have to fight without modern chemical weapons.

Let's begin with the Middle East. For centuries, desert locusts have been sweeping over these semiarid lands, leaving ruined crops and starvation in their wake.

In Pakistan, severe locust invasions, attacks of swarming caterpillars, or blackheaded cricket outbreaks often cause losses running as high as 80 percent in localized areas. Near famine is the result. A rice paddy infested with stem borers in parts of West Pakistan produces so many grainless ears that harvesting is uneconomical and the crop good only for grazing by cattle. Sugarcane borers often reduce yields by half.

It is almost impossible to maintain supplies of grain in storage in India because of the ravages of weevils, bran beetles, and the world's worst pest of stored grain—the khapra beetle. This pest reproduces at an explosive rate, and the surface of bulk-stored grain literally crawls during a heavy infestation.

Stored-grain pests are so bad in tropical areas of the world that the race to eat the

grain before insects devour it results in alternate periods of plenty and near famine. The people compete with the pests for survival. Their low standard of living thus becomes understandable.

Members of the grain-handling study group that returned from Russia only a few weeks ago report that the Soviets are having trouble with a beetle—the klop cheropashka—in the Ukraine and Caucasus. This pest, which attacks wheat kernels in the milk stage, has reached pestilence proportions. Scientists have made some progress in developing a control, but there seems to be a breakdown in bridging the gap between research and application in the field. This could be another threat from Russia.

Communist China has neither the chemical supplies nor the equipment to deal with the enormous losses caused by insects and other plant and animal pests. The best the Chinese can do at present is to organize the peasants into brigades using simple and inefficient hand control methods.

The distribution of cattle in Africa is determined primarily by the presence or absence of the tsetse fly. This is a major reason why an African child, once weaned, may never again taste milk.

Closer home, the cattle tick and the human warble or torsalo fly cause tremendous losses to hides and to beef and milk production in Central and South America. Mortality among calves may be as high as 70 percent in some of the more heavily infested areas.

A recent report from Argentina indicates that 50,000 calves succumbed in a year's time to screwworm—the same one we have in this country. They have no effective means of dealing with this pest.

There is another point I want to emphasize about the importance of chemical pesticides in producing our food supply. That is the matter of quality. Consumers in the United States now demand produce that is free of blemishes and infestation.

But in the Middle East, it is common to find insect larvae in the fresh fruit placed on the tables in the best hotels. And this, of course, represents the choicest of the crop. You can imagine the rusty, scabby, pitted fruit offered in the public markets. We wouldn't consider such produce up to standard and we wouldn't put up with it in the United States.

Any study made of the Middle or Far East makes us agree with Dr. John H. Lilly, of the University of Massachusetts, who said:

"The Bible doesn't say so, but it is a pretty safe bet that the forbidden apple that tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden was wormy."

We must not let our own food products deteriorate to the point that consumers refuse to buy them, or pay double for poor quality if they do.

PRESENT EFFORTS MUST CONTINUE

As chairman of the subcommittee handling agricultural appropriations, I am proud of the part I have in the work that American industry and scientists of the Department of Agriculture have been doing in this field in recent years. Truly I am convinced it takes all-out effort on a continuous basis, merely to hold the line.

We must discover new ways to control insects and other agricultural pests by developing new techniques for the use of chemicals and other materials if we are to hold our own. The American public needs to know this whole story.

Periodically, the Department of Agriculture publishes bulletins which show the necessity for and benefits to the American people of chemicals. One of the latest is picture story No. 127 entitled "Chemicals and Food" which was released in August. This release describes by word and picture the effect of various insects on many of our food crops. It also discusses various control methods for crops and livestock and emphasizes how essential these are to the production of wholesome and nutritious food for the consumers of the Nation.

The publication of this information is timely and most helpful. Unfortunately, however, published by the farmers' department, it is read primarily by farmers who already appreciate the necessity for use of chemicals. And after all, they number only about 12 percent of the population. It is doubtful that the 88 percent will ever know of this bulletin or of these facts.

We must get these facts to the American people to protect them from themselves.

After all, if the food supply ever becomes short, more and more people will be required to produce food, and more and more of the consumer income will be required to buy food, leaving fewer people to produce, and less and less money to buy automobiles, air conditioners, television sets, and the million and one gadgets which are luxuries to much of the world but are accepted in our country as virtual necessities today.

PUBLIC HEALTH MUST BE PROTECTED

In the interest of the public health we must see to it that all the developments and findings applied today by the users of research results are not used even by a few to make a ready dollar, regardless of consequences. By the same token we must not permit the overzealous or politically ambitious, in efforts to curry favor with the 88 percent of our people who are nonfarmers, to destroy or dry up the safest, the most nutritious, the cheapest, and the widest variety of the most plentiful supply of the best food that the people of any nation ever enjoyed throughout history.

In protecting the public health of today we must not permit anyone to endanger the public health of the future by prejudicing public opinion against the very means which makes our ample supplies of wholesome and nutritious food available. We must not permit anyone to lead the consumer to destroy his own golden goose.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, at the beginning of another week of counsel, with the deep desire that on this high hill of the Nation's welfare, all our deliberations may be begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we enter this forum of the people's hope through the gateway of prayer.

We thank Thee for memories of our fathers, who, in turbulent days, maintained their souls in peace and poise, and came through more than conquerers. Beget in us, their children, the secret of their strength, and in these days let us not be affrighted.

To our Nation and to ourselves, grant inner assurance that will not be shaken by the rage of deluded men.

As Thy servants and the people's in this temple of democracy, save us from any perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. Upon the altar of our freedom may there ever be lifted the offering of humble and contrite hearts.

In this day of destiny for us and for the world may we be worthy of our vocation as keepers of the sacred flame.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 2, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN WORKERS—TEMPORARY PARTICIPATION FOR FINANCIAL AID TO STATES FOR CERTAIN NEEDY CHILDREN—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has received a letter from the President of the United States. The clerk will report the letter.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith two bills: (1) To establish a temporary program for the payment of additional unemployment compensation to workers who have exhausted their State benefits; and (2) to authorize Federal financial participation for a temporary period in State aid to needy children of unemployed parents. I recommended such legislation on February 2 as a part of this administration's program for economic recovery and growth.

The need for prompt enactment of this legislation is clear.

In January, 5.4 million workers were without jobs. About 3.4 million were receiving unemployment compensation, and about one-half million who had already exhausted their unemployment compensation were still unemployed.

Unemployment compensation provides unemployed workers with necessary purchasing power. When this compensation is exhausted the purchasing power ceases. This has a serious impact not only on the worker and his family, but

on the economic health of the entire economy. The costs and effects of mass unemployment arising from a national recession clearly reach across State lines. The problem is national in scope, and the Federal Government has the responsibility for taking action as soon as possible to meet it. That is why I propose this temporary program as a first step. The extension of the unemployment compensation program will permit 3 million workers to receive benefits totaling about $950 million.

There is also a pressing need for improving our public assistance. Pending completion of a study of a permanent program in this area, we should take action to help the States provide assistance to children whose need results from the unemployment of their parents. In some cases, the unemployment benefits of these parents have been exhausted; in others, such benefits are not payable or are not sufficient to meet the needs of the large family. Therefore, as part of a national temporary program dealing with the problems of the unemployed, some assistance for the children of needy unemployed workers should be provided.

The enclosed letters from the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare describe the legislation in more detail.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and proposed legislation will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar. Thereafter, we can have the morning hour.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. William R. Shuler, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; and

Rex Marion Whitton, of Missouri, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Wendell Blancke, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad, the Central African Republic, and the Gabon Republic.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Palmer, 2d, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Nigeria.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Borden Reams, of Nevada, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey, and the Republic of Niger.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis H. Russell, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry S. Villard, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas K. Wright, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

The VICE PRESIDENT. without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed by the Senate thus far today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] wished to be present to comment on this nomination. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination go over at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abram Chayes, of Massachusetts, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this nomination be passed over until we can contact one of the Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have known Phil Klutznick for a long time. He is by all odds one of the ablest persons who has served in government. He came here a number of years ago, to work in the housing field; thereafter, he returned to private enterprise. He has developed, among other things, west of Chicago, one of the most monumental and successful housing enterprises I have ever seen.

This nomination is an excellent one, and I fully concur in it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the Senator from Illinois has commented as he has on the nomination of Mr. Klutznick. I think the Senator's statement is not only an excellent and a generous one, but, as the Senator from Illinois has said, is well deserved.

I have known Mr. Klutznick for many years, and I served with him at the United Nations. I join in supporting the nomination.

Mr. HRUSKA subsequently said: Mr. President, I support the confirmation of the nomination of Philip M. Klutznick as the U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It is my privilege to have known Mr. Klutznick for more than 30 years. We first met when we were fellow students at the law school of Creighton University, of which both of us are alumni. Even then there was evident in him much of that energetic attitude which he has displayed since that time in all of his activities. He engaged well not only in his studies, but also in the extracurricular and community activities at that time.

The field of activities of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations is complex and extended. The activities no doubt are frustrating and even baffling to those who seek to deal with them.

However, I am confident that Mr. Klutznick will apply his talent, experience, and unbounded energy with assurance; and if a program can be made fruitful in that area of activity by anyone, this man certainly will do it.

His vast business experience is fortified not only by experience in the Government departments and agencies in Washington, but also by his service some years ago, as an alternate delegate to the United Nations, and by community service of wide range and creditable acquittal.

Mr. Klutznick will be helped in the discharge of the duties he is undertaking by reason of the extensive travels in which he has engaged from time to time both on business and on pleasure errands.

I wish him well in his new post, and I restate my confidence that he will give a good account of himself in the duties of his post.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ivan A. Nestingen, of Wisconsin, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have known Mayor Nestingen for a number of years. He was mayor of the capital city of our State; and, as such, he was highly regarded. I am very happy to say that it pleases many people to know that he has received this appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mortimer M. Caplin, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be Assistant Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth E. BeLieu, of Oregon, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think every Member of the Senate is familiar with the work that has been done here on the Hill by Kenneth BeLieu. His nomination has been well taken by Members on both sides of the aisle; and I believe he will continue to be a very worthy public servant. He always has rendered constructive public service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure the President of the Senate, who is presiding on this occasion, would, in particular, like to be able to say here some kind and well deserved words about Mr. BeLieu. Therefore, let me, as the acting majority leader, state that I consider this appointment an excellent one. Mr. BeLieu will surely be a strong right arm to Mr. Connally, the Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations in the Army be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to consideration of the nomination to the Development Loan Fund.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been informed that a statement relative to Mr. Coffin will be made, but that we should proceed with the nomination. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MUSKIE subsequently said:

Mr. President, it is a pleasure to endorse a good friend and a close political associate of the past decade, Frank M. Coffin, the President's nominee for the post of Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund. I am sure that most of you know him, either by reputation or from personal association. I want to enter my wholehearted support of his confirmation.

Frank Coffin brings to the task assigned him an impressive background. In high school and at Bates College he was a superior student, graduating from Bates summa cum laude. His legal training at Harvard Law School was marked by the same scholastic achievement, and he received his LL.B., cum laude.

From 1947 until 1956, when he left the law to become a candidate for Congress, Frank Coffin was known as one of Maine's most brilliant lawyers. He served as law clerk to the late Federal District Judge John D. Clifford, and then worked as trial lawyer for one of Portland's most prominent law firms.

In addition to his law practice, he devoted his energies to community programs. His civic leadership in the community chest, on the board of education for his home city of Lewiston, and as corporation counsel were recognized when the junior chamber of commerce named him as one of Maine's outstanding young men.

Frank Coffin entered politics to give new life to an ailing party and to bring quality and meaning to party platforms. As Democratic State chairman in Maine from 1954 to 1956, he succeeded in both endeavors, demonstrating the organizational ability which has marked his subsequent career in public office.

Frank Coffin's career in Congress has been outstanding. He was elected to the 85th Congress and was appointed to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Reelected in 1958, he received the additional appointment as a member of the Joint Economic Committee. He served on both committees with great distinction. It was his work which brought about the Foreign Affairs Committee study of United States-Canadian relations. As a result of this study, carried out by him and Congressman Brooks Hays, the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Committee was established. Last year he conducted a monumental examination of the European Common Market.

Mr. Coffin's interest in the Development Loan Fund is not new. He was one of those who participated in the drafting of legislation establishing the agency in 1957. He has sponsored significant amendments to the original act in subsequent sessions of Congress. He has made two exhaustive reports on the agency to Congress, in 1959 and in 1960.

All of these achievements have been possible because of Frank Coffin's keen intellect, his wide-ranging intellectual interests, and his capacity for hard work. He is persuasive and convincing in his actions and his words, because he brings to his presentations thoughtful, meaningful, and careful preparation. He speaks softly, but with the authority of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding.

Frank Coffin is a man in a generation, and we are fortunate to have the opportunity to work with him and gain the benefit of his service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks editorials from four Maine newspapers, as follows:

Editorial entitled "Coffin Should Do Well," from the Lewiston Evening Journal of January 26, 1961.

Editorial entitled "Kennedy Makes a Wise Choice," from the Lewiston Daily Sun of January 27, 1961.

Editorial entitled "Mr. Coffin Joins the Team," from the Portland Sunday Telegram of January 29, 1961.

Editorial entitled "Coffin's Talents Recognized," from the Waterville Morning Sentinel of January 30, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewiston Evening Journal, Jan. 26, 1961]

COFFIN SHOULD DO WELL

It is pleasing that one of New England's outstanding young men should receive an important post within the new Kennedy administration. It is even more pleasing when this young man happens to be a native of the twin city area. Our reference, of course, is to the naming of former U.S. Representative Frank M. Coffin to head up the U.S. Development Loan Fund Corporation.

Due to a Republican landslide in Maine in the national election, Coffin was defeated by Gov. John H. Reed for the governorship. Since the former local attorney's return to Washington there has been much speculation regarding his future within the Kennedy administration.

There has been general expectation that any office offered him would be in the foreign affairs arena. As a Congressman Coffin displayed interest in foreign affairs and had the distinction of being named to the House Foreign Affairs Committee during his two terms of office. This was unusual in itself, as few freshmen House Members have been appointed to this highly important committee.

Coffin showed a flair for understanding foreign relations problems. Among his achievements was participation in a deeply analytical report on Canadian-American relations. Many of the recommendations contained within this report should serve the United States in the months ahead, since there has been growing restlessness displayed by our neighbor up north over what many Canadian leaders consider to be too much American economic influence in the Canadian economy.

Frank Coffin's new post technically establishes him at the Assistant Secretary of State level. It will not be completely unfamiliar to him in one respect, for he was among those who aided in drafting the bill to create the Development Loan Fund. The basic objective of the agency is to make available long-term loans under the Nation's mutual security program.

In accepting the office Coffin told the Journal that he believed the fund could make a major contribution in promoting progress, stability, and freedom orientation "to the one-third of the world's population on which our long-range chances for peace probably depend." We expect Frank Coffin to do an excellent job as Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

[From the Lewiston Daily Sun, Jan. 27, 1961]

KENNEDY MAKES A WISE CHOICE

This newspaper is gratified to learn that one of the significant policymakers of the Kennedy administration, in a post that will assume growing importance as the months pass, will be Frank M. Coffin, the former U.S. Representative of this congressional district, and the Democratic candidate for Governor in last November's election.

Mr. Coffin, it was revealed a day or so ago from Washington, will shortly move in as Director of the Development Loan Fund, an agency set up 4 years ago to supplement the foreign-aid program. Operating as a Government corporation, it makes loans to underdeveloped countries, on longer than conventional terms, and also advances credits for projects abroad for which other financing is not available. That is about all we know about Mr. Coffin's new job, but we expect to learn a good deal more, and it is rather impressive to discover that this corporation will control, if the full budget appropriation is approved, a fund of $700 million.

From what we know of Mr. Coffin, and what we think we know of the new President, this corporation will play an important role in the cold war, with the available funds allocated imaginatively but also wisely.

There are, outside the Communist world, hundreds of millions of people whose transition from a primitive to a modern machine economy can only come about through huge investments in the exploitation of their natural resources and raw materials—power, metals, timber, machine tools, food, and all the rest. We need them on our side, and President Kennedy could not have selected a better strategist and field general than Mr. Coffin.

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, Jan. 29, 1961]

MR. COFFIN JOINS THE TEAM

President Kennedy's appointment of Frank M. Coffin as Director of the Development Loan Fund is acknowledged in this State with much enthusiasm. The qualifications of the former Congressman from our Second District are such as to make the appointment well received everywhere. Here in Maine we add that extra measure of pride and warmth reserved for local boys who make good.

The former Lewiston attorney served his district and his State as well as a Congressman as he had earlier served his party as its State chairman. We believe he would have served well as Governor. He may yet do so. For the present he will direct his considerable talents and demonstrated energy in the service of the whole country—and other nations too, for that matter.

While the post for which Mr. Coffin has been chosen is not of the first-line status of a Cabinet position, he is not heading some obscure agency which churns along in routine fashion whatever its direction or management. His agency performs a vital effort in the foreign aid program by its handling of long-range development loans which many times prove more effective than outright grants. Not only does such procedure encourage sound handling of such aid by the recipients but also is of particular value in those many nations where pride is hurt by the charity stigma of outright grants. Through its offices nations may be advanced credits for projects that cannot be otherwise financed, another procedure by which friendly relations may be cemented.

Mr. Coffin is admirably equipped for this role in which he will be involved in policymaking in the State Department. As Congressman the Maine man served on the Foreign Affairs and Joint Economic Committees, and did so with distinction. Among other things he made himself something of an expert on the problems posed by the European Common Market and the relations of the United States with Canada. The significant role of the Development Loan Fund cannot fail to be enhanced by his presence at its head.

President Kennedy's appointments have been generally well received. The selection of Mr. Coffin for this high Federal post is in line with the best of these.

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel, Jan. 30, 1961]

COFFIN'S TALENTS RECOGNIZED

The qualifications of Frank M. Coffin for the position of Director of the Development Loan Fund are unquestionable.

The former Maine Representative to Congress is recognized throughout Maine and in Washington as a man of ability. He made a tremendous impression on the leadership of the House during his service in that body and was recognized by appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Joint Economic Committee.

He served with distinction in Congress and his defeat last fall in his campaign for the Maine governorship was a reflection of credit to the Republicans rather than a discredit to him.

It is always pleasant to have a Maine man recognized in Washington but it is especially so when the man recognized is one of Mr. Coffin's stature.

President Kennedy is to be praised for his selection of Mr. Coffin for this important State Department post.

AMBASSADOR AT LARGE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota desire to have the Senate proceed with the nomination of Mr. Harriman?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. President, because the Senator to whom I referred is now present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, today the Senate has before it the nomination of one of this country's most distinguished public servants, W. Averell Harriman. We are all very fortunate that Governor Harriman has agreed to serve the new administration.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. Harriman for a great many years.

Mr. Harriman brings to his new post of Ambassador at Large the experience of nearly 30 years of public service in the fields of international relations, domestic economic affairs, and State government.

He served with distinction as Ambassador to Russia during World War II.

He was later Ambassador to Great Britain, immediately following the war.

As U.S. representative in Europe under the Marshall plan, as our representative to NATO, and as Director of the Mutual Security Administration, he helped forge the Western alliance against Communist economic and military aggression.

His service as Secretary of Commerce and Governor of New York provide an intimate knowledge of the American economic and political scene, which will prove valuable in the carrying out of his duties with the new administration.

His friends in the Senate wish him well in his new job as U.S. Ambassador at Large.

Averell Harriman is an American patriot in the highest tradition of public service.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I am glad to support the confirmation of the Honorable W. Averell Harriman to be Ambassador at Large.

The long list of official positions he has held in the service of the United States and his State attests to his ability, his experience, and the confidence in which he has been held.

In 1950, I attended as an adviser to Secretary of State Acheson, the London and Brussels meetings of the Council of Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Conference, the second and third meetings of the Council. At those meetings the first steps were taken to establish a NATO defense force and at the Brussels meeting in December 1950, former President Eisenhower was chosen the first NATO Commander. The Organization of European Economic Cooperation was strengthened in meetings outside NATO and at the meeting measures were considered looking toward the entrance of Western Germany into NATO.

In connection with all of these important measures, Governor Harriman, who then was the U.S. Ambassador at Large in Europe, gave invaluable advice and judgment.

He has the experience, the judgment, the purpose to enable him to serve our country at this time with value and distinction. I am glad to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is conceivable that some Members on the minority side, and also some on the majority side, of the Foreign Relations Committee may wish to have data in connection with the nomination of Mr. Harriman printed in the RECORD. If so, I ask unanimous consent that that privilege be extended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois amplify his request so as to include statements by Senators on other nominations as well?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with all nominations considered by the Senate today, if any Senators not now on the floor desire to have printed in the RECORD short observations with respect to the nominees, that privilege be accorded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I happened to be on the floor; thus, I do not come within the unanimous-consent request which was made and agreed to.

Therefore, I should like to say that I think these nominations are excellent in all respects; and I approve of all of them, and am delighted to be able to vote for their confirmation.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that morning business is now in order.

OUTFLOW OF GOLD—INTERNATIONAL BALANCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the reading of the message be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair is informed that the message has been read in the other body.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I wish to say that I had some opportunity to examine this message this morning. It is by all odds one of the most important messages that will come to the Congress, because it deals with the ebbing outflow of gold and with the whole question of international balances.

Yesterday I had an opportunity to examine my own thinking a little. I was in the House of Representatives when the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 was enacted. I had great misgivings about that measure 26 years ago, because that act vested in the United States all gold coin and all gold bullion, and also took away from the Federal Reserve Board and Federal Reserve banks all claims to gold. On the heels of that activity finally came the proclamation under which the value of gold was raised to $35 an ounce.

The measure had a design. We were in a depression, and admittedly so. Therefore the value of gold was raised from roughly $21 an ounce to $35 an ounce by the very simple expedient of taking so many grains of gold out of the standard gold dollar. I sometimes wonder whether our difficulties did not really begin with the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. To be sure, the design was to raise prices, but when gold value is taken out of the dollar, many more dollars are required to buy an ounce of gold, which is a polite monetary way of saying that the dollar is cheapened. When the dollar is cheapened, more of the cheaper dollars are required to buy the same article of merchandise. Certainly while the objective was probably a laudable one, a difficulty ensued, and the gold problem has been besetting us from that time to this. Among the reasons for our

difficulties, as pointed out by the President, are:

More favorable interest rates abroad on short-term paper; expenditures by soldiers and their dependents; the balance of trade, wherever it is not in excess and in our favor; the export of capital, as in the case of the Ford Motor Co., when it bought the remaining British-owned stocks in its British subsidiary at a cost of $345 million.

I do not know how effective the proposals suggested by the President would be. Every one of them will require very careful scrutiny, including, of course, our relations with the International Monetary Fund. To most people, I suppose, it seems a rather bewildering and puzzling problem, and yet when we draw off and take a good perspective look, it is not so puzzling after all.

This is an important message because, in view of the diminution of our gold reserve, statutory commitments as to the amount necessary for gold backing of our currency, plus commitments already in effect abroad, could, I believe, exceed the entire gold stock of the country, which has dwindled from a high $22,008 million, as I recall, in 1957 or 1958, to $17,006 million. It is small wonder that there is concern in the administration, and small wonder that there is concern through the whole industrial fabric of our country and also abroad. Confidence is elusive, ephemeral, and hard to define, but when confidence ebbs, we must look out for our economy.

There being no objection, the message from the President was referred to the Committees on Banking and Currency, Finance, and Foreign Relations.

(For text of President's message see House proceedings for today.)

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND GOLD

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the President's message, of this morning, on balance of payments and gold, is an excellent, firm, and vigorous statement outlining programs for action on many fronts. This message is especially reassuring in that it repudiates, without any equivocation, any resort to protectionism or any thought that our balance of payments situation will prevent our doing whatever is necessary in our foreign economic assistance program.

I am much pleased at the President's notice of the importance that increased agricultural exports can play in this problem. I have been deeply gratified by his statements, and those of other members of the administration, that they will proceed as vigorously as possible to bring into the picture increased exports of our agricultural commodities.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agreements concluded during December 1960, under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with the Governments of Korea, Brazil, Vietnam, and Indonesia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1960, together with a report of the annual inspection of the home, 1960, by the Inspector General of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., requesting an extension of 60 days in which to submit the annual report of that system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PEOPLE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "ECONOMIC INQUIRY INTO FOOD MARKETING—INTERIM REPORT ON FROZEN FRUIT, JUICES, AND VEGETABLES"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Economic Inquiry Into Food Marketing—Interim Report on Frozen Fruit, Juices, and Vegetables" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including a report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS–16, GS–17, AND GS–18

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Board in the grades of GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in that Administration in the grades of GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Cultural Center, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Center, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

"Whereas there are several million persons past the age of 65 in the United States; and

"Whereas this age group is afflicted with most of the same problems which face the population in younger age brackets, especially with regard to food, clothing, shelter, medical care, employment, and profitable use of leisure time; and

"Whereas the agricultural States and the lesser industrialized States of the United States are financially unable to furnish a grant to these aged persons in keeping with their needs; and

"Whereas this age group would retain much of their self-respect and personal satisfaction if they were given an opportunity to work and earn a small supplement to their budget; and

"Whereas such persons are penalized by earning any amount of money under the present Federal Social Security Act; and

"Whereas this age group would not only assist themselves from a monetary point of view and from the point of view of personal satisfaction from being needed and wanted, but would also help the Nation by their fruitful employment; and

"Whereas a precedent has been established by requiring the State agency to disregard the first $50 per month of earned income to the blind in arriving at a determination of need for that category; and

"Whereas the old persons of our Nation should not be penalized by an inequitable provision in the law denying them similar rights to the indigent blind persons; and

"Whereas the 1961 White House Conference on Aging recognized the inequities in the Federal social security law and resolved that that Conference request the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to provide that a State may exempt the first $50 of earned income in determining an old person's need: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 63d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):*

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully urged to amend title I of the Federal Social Security Act to provide that any State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of the individual claiming old-age assistance; except that, in making such determination, the State agency may disregard the first $50 of earned income.

"SEC. 2. That upon the adoption of this resolution, a copy of same shall be furnished by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, and to all members of the Arkansas delegation to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"Whereas it is becoming apparent that the United States must eventually turn more and more to synthetic sources to supplement its petroleum resources, and for this reason the promotion and development of new

domestic sources of fuel oils, including the mining and production of oil shale, is essential; and

"Whereas the depletion allowance now allowed on the mining of oil shale is less than that accorded the oil and gas industry; and

"Whereas the oil shale industry, in the exploration and promotion of oil shale deposits and in the mining of oil shale, should be given the same tax treatment as is accorded the oil and gas industry, in order to expand the oil shale industry and create a competitive market between the two industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Act so as to provide that the depletion allowance allowed on the mining of oil shale be raised to 27½ percent of the value of the oil produced from oil shale mined; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the farmers of the Columbia Basin entered into a contract with the U.S. Department of the Interior in October 1945 providing for repayment for their land, for construction of irrigation canals, for the irrigation water they use, and for $8 million for installation of drainage facilities in the Columbia Basin; and

"Whereas these farmers have honorably met all their obligations under the terms of this contract since its inception; and

"Whereas recent studies indicate that the cost of completion of the drainage system for that portion of the Columbia Basin presently receiving water has been underestimated by $36 million; and

"Whereas this gross miscalculation was not the fault of the farmers; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation during recent years has proposed that the farmers of the Columbia Basin renegotiate this contract with the Department of the Interior to the end that these farmers would be required to pay the entire $36 million for this underestimated drainage system; and

"Whereas these farmers are among Washington's finest citizens, laboring long hours daily and living on meager and uncertain incomes; and

"Whereas Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson, and Conservation Director Earl Coe, as chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission, have all urged that a 2-year moratorium be declared on all charges against Columbia Basin farmers for drainage construction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington, That we join in requesting that President John F. Kennedy direct that this 2-year moratorium be now declared on all charges for drainage against the farmers of the Columbia Basin, thus allowing time for complete study of this problem by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and agencies under his direction; and be it further

"Resolved, That we congratulate the farmers of the Columbia Basin, not only for their labors and courage in converting the Columbia Basin from a desert to healthy, productive farmland, but also for their calm persistence in the face of seemingly overwhelming obstacles, and for their faith in the ultimate fairness of the legal democratic processes under which we live; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall; and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico relating to the extension of benefits to certain veterans which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the foregoing resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. CHÁVEZ on February 2, 1961, page 1615, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A resolution adopted by the Abilene, Tex., Chamber of Commerce, relative to the construction of a proposed addition to the existing postal facilities in Abilene; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HICKEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the livestock industry is one of the main industries of the State of Wyoming and a necessary industry of the United States; and

"Whereas the said industry has sought adequate protection from excessive imports of meat and livestock from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the said industry and allied businesses have been seriously affected by such imports and are threatened with further inroads to their economic existence by the continuation of such imports; and

"Whereas the numerous organizations within said industry have repeatedly and to no avail sought relief through the executive department of the United States by its application of the escape clause and peril point provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as amended; and

"Whereas the policies and practices in the field of international trade if permitted to continue present a threat to all domestic industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to remove the authority of the executive department to act on the escape clause and peril point provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as amended and place such authority in the hands of Congress where the constitutional authority and responsibility is vested; be it further

"Resolved, That quotas be exacted on imports of dressed and live meat animals as well as wool, woolens, and other meat animal products; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Joseph J. Hickey, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, chairman of Agriculture Committee of House and the chairman of Agriculture Committee of Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION S

"Whereas Dakota Territory, of which North Dakota was a part, was created on March 2, 1861, out of part of the land of the United States known as the Louisiana Purchase, and the year 1961 will be the 100th anniversary thereof; and

"Whereas North Dakota is making elaborate plans to commemorate the creation of the Dakota Territory this year; and

"Whereas in addition to the many events and activities the people of the State will observe regarding this historic event they would certainly appreciate commemorative stamps being issued by the Postmaster General honoring the Dakota Centennial Celebration in 1961: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Postmaster General is requested and urged to issue commemorative stamps which will honor the 100th anniversary of Dakota Territory and help the people of North Dakota celebrate this historic event; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Postmaster General, and all members of the North Dakota congressional delegation."

NEW JUDGESHIPS NEEDED IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York. The resolution sets forth the serious problem which the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York has had in trying to cope with a tremendous backlog of cases without any increase in judge power since 1936. The resolution points out that the serious delay in the disposition of cases in this district can be alleviated only by the addition of five judges permanently assigned to the court.

Mr. President, the conditions outlined in this resolution cannot be permitted to persist. I hope that Congress will give early attention to the long overdue need for additional judges in this district as well as in the southern district of New York, which also has a critical court congestion problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the eastern district of New York is a Federal judicial district and its territorial jurisdiction includes the five counties of Kings, Queens, Nassau, Richmond, and Suffolk, having a combined population in excess of 6½ million people, which is greater than 43 of the 50 States of the Union; and

Whereas this district represents one of the fastest growing areas in the country in population, industry, and economic power, and has had a 22-percent increase in population in the last decade alone; and

Whereas there are at the present time only six U.S. district judges regularly appointed and assigned to this district, which number has not been increased since 1936; and

Whereas the backlog in civil cases in this district in 1959 was so great there was an average delay of over 4 years between the commencement of such actions and the trial of the same, and necessitated the temporary assignment of five additional judges from other judicial districts to this court in an effort to reduce the backlog; and

Whereas it was also necessary to have additional judges from other districts temporarily assigned to the criminal part of said court; and

Whereas the number of regularly assigned judges in this district are so few that it permits usually only the assignment of one judge to the criminal part of the court; and

Whereas there is presently a backlog of criminal cases awaiting trial, which are delayed because of such shortage of judges; and

Whereas it is the firm belief and conviction of the Federal Grand Jurors' Association for the Eastern District of New York, Inc., that justice delayed is justice denied; that the tremendous past growth and indicated future development of the eastern district has and will continue to add to the number of cases initiated in this court and that this condition can be alleviated only by the addition of five judges permanently assigned to this court: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, adopted by the membership at a meeting duly called and held on January 23, 1961, be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, to the chairman of the Judiciary Committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives and to the duly elected Members of Congress representing the eastern district of New York, and to the various bar associations.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS CITY (KANS.) SYNOD OF EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas City Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church at its last annual meeting in Elmo, Kans., adopted resolutions regarding the necessity of controlling nuclear weapons testing and urged continued negotiations for a general reduction and control of armaments.

The churches representing the Kansas City Synod bespeak the sentiment of many of our religious denominations regarding these two important matters affecting our international relations.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That Kansas City Synod recognizes the immediate necessity of controlling all kinds of nuclear weapons testing and advocates a persistent effort on the part of the United States for a multilateral agreement on the cessation of such testing.

Be it resolved, That the Kansas City Synod encourages our Government to continue negotiations in good faith for the general reduction and control of armaments—conventional, nuclear, biological and chemical.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., be inserted at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County express its appreciation to the special committee on distressed areas and its chairman, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, for the consideration and interest given to the problems of northeastern Minnesota and urge that said committee continue its efforts, and that assistance and aid be recommended and granted to this area for development of its natural resources.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing certain expenditures by the Committee on Public Works; which resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT ENTITLED "LOCAL 706, PLUMBERS AND STEAMFITTERS UNION, EL DORADO, ARK."—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 42)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted a report entitled "Local 706, Plumbers and Steamfitters Union, El Dorado, Ark.," pursuant to S. Res. 249 and section 5 of S. Res. 255, 86th Congress, 2d session, which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 792. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 793. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 794. A bill to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 795. A bill to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes;

S. 796. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 797. A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 798. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due and owing and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 799. A bill to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to public sales; and

S. 800. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, and Mr. FONG):

S. 801. A bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. HART):

S. 802. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 803. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 804. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 805. A bill for the relief of Yu Liao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 806. A bill for the relief of David Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 807. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 808. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a national parkway in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 809. A bill to authorize the transfer of a Bureau of Reclamation bridge across the Colorado River near Needles, Calif., to San Bernardino County, Calif., and Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 810. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 811. A bill to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 812. A bill to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 813. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 814. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the punishment of any individual who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for indecent molestation of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 815. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a new contract with the city of Sturgis, S. Dak., with respect to the use of sewage facilities of such city by the Fort Meade Veterans' Hospital, Sturgis, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 816. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 817. A bill for the relief of Octavio Jimenez Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 818. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove the manufacturers' excise tax on croquet balls and mallets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 819. A bill to provide for suitable works of art in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Wise Farmer; and

S. 821. A bill for the relief of Valentine Augustus Toote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S.J. Res. 45. Joint resolution designating May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S.J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with reference to income taxes on nonresident individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

REQUEST FOR PRESIDENT TO URGE CERTAIN ACTIONS FOR LITHUANIA, ESTONIA, AND LATVIA

Mr. KUCHEL submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEDUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL FEES AND TUITION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable individuals to deduct educational expenses for themselves or their dependents up to the amount of $300 per year.

No one can doubt that the education which an individual receives is often the determining factor in his future success or failure. At no time in our Nation's history has that been more true than today. The money which an individual spends on education, for himself, for his children, or his other dependents, may well be the most important investment he ever makes. More importantly, money spent upon education pays dividends far into the future for the whole country.

Therefore, I believe, Mr. President, that the Federal Government should encourage individuals to invest in education by permitting at least a part of the expenses of education to be deducted from Federal income tax payments. Businesses are permitted to deduct business expenses on the grounds that these expenses generate further business and, in the long run, additional revenues. This is surely true of education, for the differences in income levels among those with high school, college, and graduate degrees is a very well known fact.

I have limited the amount which may be deducted under the terms of this bill to $300. Personally, I favor a much larger figure, because I know that education is a very expensive business these days, with many indirect and associated costs as well as the fees and tuition. But in view of the large amount of revenue loss which would result if a larger deduction were permitted, I have felt compelled to restrict my proposal to a $300 deduction for direct expenditures for tuition or fees to an educational institution.

The Internal Revenue Service has informed me that the revenue which would be lost by permitting such a tax deduction today would amount to about $300 million a year. However, I firmly believe it would repay itself many times over from the increased earnings of those who could thus afford additional education.

Furthermore, tax deductions are permitted under present law to philanthropists and others who make charitable donations to educational institutions. Why should this deduction be denied to those who, often at greater personal sacrifice, pay their money to educational institutions in order to educate their children or themselves?

Mr. President, the Federal Government must continue to assist our people in obtaining an education for themselves and their families. The Government must likewise continue to aid in the necessary construction of college and university facilities. The Federal Government must continue to assist in the financing of various scholarship programs. The Federal Government must support and initiate important and worthwhile research which can contribute to our Nation's future security. But let us not forget, while we help the institutions, that the crux of the problem often lies with the individuals or the parents of the individual who must find the money to pay the tuition and education fees.

My bill would permit the deduction of any tuition and fees paid to any recognized educational institution. This would include tuition paid not only to colleges and universities, but also to private schools, parochial schools, technical training schools, summer schools—in short, to any of the recognized places of education. It would not, however, apply to persons who receive direct grants from States or communities under State laws designed to block school desegregation.

This is a new concept, more extensive than any which have previously been introduced. I have deliberately presented it in this form. Those persons who are ready to spend their money on education, for themselves or for their children, should be encouraged and aided to the greatest extent possible by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 792) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section

217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. TUITION AND FEES PAID TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an educational institution for tuition and fees for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such educational institution.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) EACH INDIVIDUAL.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees with respect to any one individual only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed $300.

"(2) SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees for the spouse of the taxpayer only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(c) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Amounts paid for tuition and fees with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DEPENDENT.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning assigned it by section 152(a).

"(2) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'educational institution' has the meaning assigned to it by section 151(e)(4).

"(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses).

"(2) INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING STATE OR LOCAL FINANCIAL AID TO AVOID DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid for any individual with respect to whom any payment is made by a State or local government under a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for children who attend private schools in the area of their residence, or who attend public or private schools away from the area of their residence, if it is determined that the purpose of the State or local law is to provide financial assistance—

"(A) for the education of children in an area where any public school is closed to avoid compliance with the decisions of the courts of the United States with respect to segregation in public schools, or

"(B) for the education of children in an area where public schools are open and have complied with such decisions (whether or not such compliance was pursuant to a specific order of a court of the United States) whose parents or guardians do not wish them to attend a school which is part of a school system in which any school has complied with such decisions.

For purposes of this paragraph, any State or local law granting concessions with respect to State or local taxes for amounts paid by parents or guardians in providing an education for children residing in an area described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for such children."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out:

"SEC. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees paid to educational institutions.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) TUITION AND FEES PAID TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—The deduction allowed by section 217 (relating to tuition and fees paid to educational institutions)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS OF FRAUDULENT AND OTHER UNETHICAL BUSINESS PRACTICES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices.

Fraud, deception, and illegal practices by unscrupulous operators have cheated Americans from Maine to Florida and New York to California. Fly-by-night business organizations and unethical security salesmen have milked millions of dollars from consumers and investors each year.

In addition to the suffering inflicted on the American public, legitimate businesses have also felt the impact of distrust generated by these individuals. State law enforcement agencies have been quick to move after uncovering evidence of illegal operations; however, due to the manner in which these people conduct their businesses, such evidence is difficult to obtain. Even after an unscrupulous business operation has been driven out of one State, it will often migrate to another State and continue its fraudulent activities. A central file containing a pool of information gathered by State and local law enforcement agencies pertaining to unethical and fraudulent business practices would help put an end to the constant hunt for the sly fox.

My proposal would provide for such a central filing system in the Office of the Attorney General similar to that maintained by the FBI on criminal activities. Here would be compiled records of injunctions, dissolutions and other civil actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices which would be made available to all law enforcement bodies.

Time is of the essence. Daily reports are received of the underworld moving into more and more legitimate businesses. Whether the criminal wears a mask and carries a crowbar, or wears gray gloves and carries a list of stocks, we should be vitally interested in his apprehension. This is an important measure for launching a counterassault against the treasury of the underworld. I hope it will have prompt consideration and approval.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief analysis of the bill and the text be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 793) to authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized to provide, within the Department of Justice, for the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of records of injunctions, dissolutions and other civil or administrative actions involving unethical or fraudulent business practices.

SEC. 2. Any records acquired, collected, classified and preserved pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be made available by the Attorney General for exchange with, and for the official use of, any duly authorized official of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions.

The analysis presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

S. 793 would authorize the Attorney General to maintain records of fraudulent and other unethical business practices. It would further provide that these records be made available for the use of and exchange with any authorized officials of Federal, State, and local governments.

CLOSING OF RAILROAD STATIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill to amend the Norris-La Guardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The proposal was the outgrowth of a decision rendered on April 19, 1960, by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Chicago & North Western Railroad against the Telegraphers Union.

A special subcommittee composed of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], held public hearings but no further action was taken before the adjournment of the 86th Congress.

I reintroduce that measure, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I made before the special subcommittee on June 21, 1960, together with an Associated Press article entitled "Mitchell Heads 15-Man Railroad Study Group."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Illinois and the article referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 794) to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Railway Labor Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement and article presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. Chairman, the bill which this subcommittee is considering today is the result of a recent decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case involving the Chicago & North Western Railroad and the Telegraphers Union. According to the facts stated by the Court the railroad was faced with the problem of having many of its stations only 7 to 10 miles apart. The stations had been established this close together about 100 years ago before farmers and others living in the rural areas along its route had trucks, automobiles, and good roads. In those days the farmers had to have railroad stations close at hand because they hauled their produce and other goods by horse and wagon over inadequate roads. Now, however, with our network of good rural roads and the extensive use of trucks, the stations as close together as 7 or 11 miles were no longer of economic value. They were handling little if any business and the personnel manning them were working less than 1 hour a day and sometimes as little as 12 minutes a day yet drawing a full day's pay. The railroad therefore developed what it called a central agency plan which meant it would consolidate the activities of certain of the stations along its route. It obtained the permission of the various State commissions to make this consolidation.

In South Dakota the public utility commission, in approving the consolidation, found that the employees affected in that State averaged 59 minutes of work a day and that the maintenance of such stations on a full-time basis would constitute mismanagement because of the lack of public need.

The railroad offered to bargain with the union concerning how this plan would be put into effect, including the transfer of the personnel to other jobs, severance pay, and an arrangement for limiting the number of layoffs per year to an agreed percentage of the total number of jobs of the union, over and above the reduction in the number of such employees by attrition.

The union rejected these offers of the company to bargain collectively and instead it demanded that the company amend the existing labor contract to provide that no job then in existence could be abolished or discontinued without the consent of the union. When the company declined to accede to this demand, the union issued a strike call and the company obtained an injunction barring the strike which the court of appeals made permanent under the Norris-LaGuardia Act on the ground that the union's demand was not within the realm of collective bargaining. The Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 decision reversed the lower court and called upon Congress to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the related acts, if it did not agree with the judicial interpretation which it was placing on the language of those acts, saying:

"If the scope of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is to be cut down in order to prevent 'waste' * * * Congress should be the body to do so."

This bill is designed to do that and only that. It permits change and progress and yet protects the right of collective bargaining as to the terms of employment. As I stated at the time I introduced the bill, and I quote:

"I want to emphasize, however, that this progress requires due regard for the welfare of those whose lives are dislocated by such progress and that the bill is not intended to change the law on bargaining as to rates of pay, rules, working conditions, severance pay, and other matters."

There is no intention in this bill to in any way eliminate the requirement of collective bargaining as to any of the matters pertaining to a job. The bill relates only to the question of whether or not there should be a job.

I want to give several examples of this to make it clear. In the railroad case this would be the question of how many railroad stations the railroad had to have. In other situations it might be that a building was installing escalators to replace some of its elevators. The bill would make the decision as to the number of elevators it would keep, a question for the company to decide. The number of elevator operators required to man the elevators would, of course, depend on hours of work and many other factors, all subject to collective bargaining. Or, take any of our industries in which there are constant changes in products and services. In the electronics industry transistors are now doing much of the work formerly done by vacuum tubes. If this Supreme Court decision stands, a company would not be able to change from the manufacture of vacuum tubes to the manufacture of transistors without the consent of the union if the change required the elimination of any jobs in the vacuum tube division.

It would mean, if this statute and the interpretation which the Supreme Court has just placed on it had been in existence 50 years ago, that we would still have men making horse blinders unless the union of horse blinder employees consented to the discontinuance of their jobs. On this same point the Wall Street Journal recently had an interesting article on photocopy machines in which it gave this example:

"To submit evidence of a bone fracture to an insurance company, the Allegheny General Hospital in Pittsburgh simply runs an X-ray photo through a copying machine and a doctor circles the break and writes in the patient's name. The nickel-a-copy duplicate represents a 100-fold saving over the making of another X-ray film at a cost of $5, as the hospital used to do."

Just by having a clerk use a photocopy machine instead of an X-ray technician using an X-ray machine the hospital saved $4.95 out of $5. It therefore has that 100-fold saving in its X-ray department available to use for additional nurses and other medical services. We all know that the cost of medical treatment is high today. Should the Supreme Court be permitted to make it even higher by its decision, bearing in mind that many of our hospitals, particularly in rural areas, could be subject to this type of union demand?

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 22, 1960]

MITCHELL HEADS 15-MAN RAILROAD STUDY GROUP

President Eisenhower today named Secretary of Labor Mitchell to head a 15-member commission to investigate the dispute between railroads and the operating unions over work rules and practices.

The President selected Mr. Mitchell upon the recommendation of the railroads and the five railway labor organizations involved in the controversy over what the railroads call the featherbedding problem.

In announcing the membership of the Commission, Mr. Eisenhower said the group represents "a major and constructive innovation that will prove to be a significant achievement in the progress of labor-management relations toward greater maturity and stability."

"In resolving this problem in a manner fair to the men, helpful to the industry, and in the best interest of our country, the members of the Commission will provide service of incalculable value," Mr. Eisenhower added.

FOUR OTHERS NAMED

Mr. Eisenhower said he was particularly pleased that Mr. Mitchell, who will leave office January 20 when the Kennedy administration takes over, had agreed "to provide this additional and significant service to our Nation in the cause of industrial peace."

In addition to Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Eisenhower named four other public members of the Commission.

He also approved the recommendations of the carriers nominating five members and the recommendation of the operating unions which resulted in the setting up of the Commission.

The group can only make recommendations after its scheduled 1-year study is completed. But officially it can seek to persuade the industry and the unions to go along with recommendations or proposals during that time.

WORK BEGINS NEXT MONTH

All members of the Commission, except one, were on hand when Mr. Eisenhower announced the appointments. Immediately after the 14 members present conferred briefly. Their real work, however, is not expected to begin until some time next month.

Mr. Mitchell described today's meeting as a get-acquainted session. The formal organizational meeting will be held in Mr Mitchell's office January 6.

Mr. Mitchell said this is the first time that a Presidential Commission has been set up as the result of a voluntary labor-management agreement.

The railroads had insisted upon setting up the investigation Commission with its recommendations to be binding. The unions at first objected to the Commission plan but agreed to it when the railroads yielded on their insistence that the recommendations be binding.

The longstanding dispute involves what the railroads describe as make-work practices or featherbedding. They contend this costs them in the neighborhood of $500 million annually.

AGREEMENT OF UNIONS

The unions, disputing this, say the rules and practices involved, such as placing a fireman on diesel locomotives, make for greater safety. They also contend that the overall work force on the railroads has been reduced to such an extent in recent years as to jeopardize safety.

As public members, in addition to Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Eisenhower named the following:

John T. Dunlop, of Belmont, Mass., professor of economics of Harvard University, who was the only Commission member absent today; Charles A. Myers, of Weston, Mass., and the staff of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Francis J. Robertson, of Washington, D.C., attorney and arbitrator, and Russell A. Smith, of Ann Arbor, Mich., arbitrator.

The five members nominated by the carriers:

Daniel P. Loomis, of Washington, president of the Association of American Railroads; T. A. Jerrow, of St. Paul, Minn., vice president of operations, Great Northern Railway; Guy W. Knight, of Philadelphia, director, labor relations, Pennsylvania Railroad; J. E. Wolfe, of Chicago, vice president of personnel, Chicago, Burlington, & Quincy Railroad, and B. B. Bryant, of Huntington, W. Va., assistant vice president of labor relations, Chesapeake and Ohio Railway.

Nominated by the operating brotherhoods were:

A. F. Zimmerman, of Cleveland, assistant grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; S. C. Phillips, of Cleveland, assistant president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers; S. W. Holliday, of Vancouver, Wash., vice president, Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen; H. F. Sites, of Harrisburg, Pa., vice president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and James W. Fallon, of Minneapolis, vice president, Switchmen's Union of North America.

The railroads and the unions will bear the expenses of their members of the Commission. The public members will receive expenses and a per diem fee from the Government, but the amount has not been set.

MORE EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, a bill to provide for more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes.

The proposed bill, which I send to the desk, would authorize the President to reorganize the Executive Office, including its various components as he deems best in the interest of efficiency, expeditious administration, and better management of the office.

I request that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Maurice H. Stans, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 795) to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, a draft bill entitled "A bill to provide for the more effective organization of the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes."

The proposed bill would carry out a recommendation of the President communicated to the Congress in his budget message on January 16, 1961. In that message the President stated:

"The duties placed on the President by the Constitution and the statutes demand the most careful attention of the staffing and organization of the President's Office. While the present organization of the Executive Office of the President reflects many constructive steps taken over a period of years, much remains to be done to improve the facilities available to the President. The first requirement for improvement is for the Congress to give the President greater flexibility in organizing his own Office to meet his great responsibilities.

"Specifically, the Congress should enact legislation authorizing the President to reorganize the Executive Office of the President, including the authority to redistribute statutory functions among the units of the Office; to change the names of units and titles of officers within the Office; to make changes in the membership of statutory bodies in the Office; and, within the limits of existing laws and available appropriations, to establish new units in the Executive Office and fix the compensation of officers. Such action would insure that future Presidents will possess the latitude to design the working structure of the Presidential Office as they deem necessary for the effective conduct of their duties under the Constitution and the laws. Enactment of such legislation would be a major step forward in strengthening the Office of the President for the critical tests that will surely continue to face our Nation in the years to come. These matters are obviously devoid of partisan considerations."

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

USE OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY BY STATE DISTRIBUTION AGENCIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes.

This bill is introduced at the request of the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is similar to a bill (S. 3493) on which the committee held hearings last year.

Section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator—now the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies for utilization by such Federal agency, without reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency. The act further provides that the State agency may utilize, without reimbursement, the property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in carrying out the program of distribution of surplus property to education, public health, or civil defense activities.

I ask that a letter dated January 17, 1961, addressed to the President of the Senate and which was referred to the committee, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 796) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
January 17, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We herewith forward for consideration a draft bill "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes." This draft has been prepared in cooperation with the General Services Administration.

For the purpose of facilitating the operation of the programs for disposal of Federal surplus property for educational, public health, or civil defense purposes, section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator (now the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization), and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies (i.e., the State agency within each State designated under State law to distribute Federal surplus personal property allocated for educational, public health, or civil defense use within the State). These agreements "may provide for utilization by such Federal agency, without payment or reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency in carrying out any such program, and for making available to such State agency, without payment or reimbursement, property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in connection with such utilization."

The draft bill would amend this section in two ways:

1. Subject to the approval of the Administrator of General Services, it would enable a State agency to obtain the use of donable Federal surplus personal property, under and subject to the terms of a cooperative agreement, for its own administrative needs in carrying out the disposal programs, after this Department or the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has determined that the desired property is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective operation of the State agency in performing its functions in connection with the surplus property disposal programs.

The advantages of allowing the State agency limited access to such property are twofold: (a) The use of donable surplus property in lieu of property of the Federal agency that would otherwise be made available to the State agency under present section 203(n) authority lowers the cost of the program to the Federal Government, (b) the use of donable surplus property by the State agency in lieu of property that would otherwise have to be purchased by that agency acts to reduce the charges assessed against the donee institutions by the State agency in order to cover its costs of operation.

2. The draft bill would permit legal title to surplus property the use of which is thus made available to a State agency under a cooperative agreement, to be vested in that agency upon a determination of the Administrator of General Services that such action is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective use of the property. This authorization is directed primarily at expediting the State agency's use of surplus motor vehicles in administering the donation programs; vesting the legal title to the

vehicles would best enable the agency to comply with State motor vehicle registration laws. A corresponding advantage is that the Federal Government would avoid any claim of tort liability arising from the allegedly negligent operation of those vehicles by State employees.

We would appreciate it if you would refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advised on December 30, 1960, that it perceives no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

PROVISION OF QUARTERS, AND SO FORTH, TO CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, a bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States.

This bill would continue the basic authority now granted Government agencies by the act of March 5, 1928 (5 U.S.C. 75a) and it would clarify existing statutory authority for the providing of quarters, household furniture, and other services to civilian employees of the Government who occupy Government quarters.

In the 86th Congress, an identical bill was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and that bill was passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget addressed to the President of the Senate requesting the introduction and consideration of this proposal, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 797) to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C. January 13, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit herewith a proposed bill "To authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the proposed bill is to provide for the charging of uniform and equitable rates for occupancy of Government-owned quarters on a rental basis. The bill would consolidate and restate related provisions of law and regulations which authorize the furnishing of quarters to Government employees, and it would vest authority in the President to prescribe regulations which would insure fair and consistent treatment for all persons—civilian employees, military personnel, and non-Government personnel—who occupy rental housing under like circumstances. A more extensive explanation of this proposal, its background, and purpose is provided as an attachment to this letter.

An identical proposal was introduced in the 86th Congress by Senator McCLELLAN as Senate bill 3486. It was reported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations in Report No. 1570 and was passed by the Senate on June 14, 1960. The bill was referred to the House of Representatives where it rested at adjournment.

Since this proposal, if enacted, will improve and clarify Government administration of employee housing facilities and services, I recommend its favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

SOLUTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PROBLEM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as the newly appointed chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I have been immersed in the reports and hearings of the subcommittee and orienting myself in its activities of the last 7 years. The record of the subcommittee is replete with evidence of the struggles all over the Nation of law enforcement and other public officials as they endeavored to cope with a postwar plague of this social disease more commonly called juvenile delinquency.

The reports of the subcommittee—particularly in the past 4 years—have warned the Congress of the threat to our national welfare posed by an ever-increasing rise in the type, number, and seriousness of juvenile crime, which permeates every stratum of our society. In the 11 years between 1948 and 1959, juvenile crime increased 177 percent. This phenomenal growth reflects a serious lag on the part of those authorities and organizations responsible for coping with the problem and on a society that permits it. It also reflects unfavorably on the Congress for not stepping in to help the States where the States have been unable to help themselves.

During these 11 years, juvenile crime has not only increased in its frequency, but has made basic changes in the patterns, socially and geographically. Also the seriousness in the nature of the crimes has changed significantly. There is more brutality, more sadism, and more wanton ruthlessness. The crimes have become increasingly serious and more senseless than ever. This cannot be permitted to continue.

It is because of these truths that I introduce this measure to provide Federal assistance for projects to develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems. It also provides that $5 million shall be spent yearly for the next 5 years to help States train qualified personnel to work in the delinquency field in the areas of prevention, treatment, and control.

A similar measure was introduced in the last Congress and passed by the Senate providing $2,500,000 a year for these purposes. The Delinquency Subcommittee has repeatedly been told by experts that the $2,500,000 appropriation was both necessary and welcome, but that it was only a token—a beginning in the vast job yet to be done. Mr. President, I share those sentiments. If delinquency is to be combatted at a local level, then communities need the tools this legislation provides.

In introducing this measure, I take cognizance of the general advance in the public awareness of the seriousness of the problems that have been encountered in implementing antidelinquency campaigns. For the last 7 years, the Delinquency Subcommittee in crisscrossing the Nation has heard an ever-rising chorus of pleas by State, county, municipal, and private organizations for aid of this type. We now have a new administration, and it will be more responsive to that chorus, I believe.

In local communities across the Nation, there has been much frustration and duplication in trial-and-error experiments to cope with urgent delinquency problems. While some projects have succeeded admirably, others have had considerably less success. In all cases, however, the experiments have been hampered by a lack of funds, a lack of coordination, and in particular, a lack of adequately trained personnel. All told, it has been indicated to the Delinquency Subcommittee that this critical lack of trained personnel—and the virtually nonexistent facilities to train them—has been a contributing factor to the other deficiencies.

Permit me to cite some examples of how critical this personnel problem is:

The Honorable Donald E. Long, of Portland, Oreg., who represents the feelings of a good many judges of the United States, has said that in his opinion the training provisions of this type of Federal legislation were the most important needs of the present generation.

The judge pointed out that of the 2,000 juvenile courts in the United States, many of them have county judges, and only half of the counties in our country that are dealing with delinquents have even minimal probation services. The judge stated further that a study by the National Probation and Parole Association indicated a need for 15,000 probation officers dealing with the problems of juveniles. Yet at the time of the study, there were only 2,100 probation officers dealing with children alone, and 3,400 serving both children and adults. What makes matters even worse, only 1 out of 10 of these probation officers had completed any type of training for the job. An additional 4 out of 10 lack a college degree and are not eligible for professional training. When this occurs, we compound the seriousness of an already grim situation.

In the opinion of Judge Long:

Many of them (the probation officers) were qualified, but it is staggering that they had

not the skills and the training that they should have * * * in dealing with the behavior problems of the children coming to the various juvenile courts.

For this reason the judge concluded that—

Priority first should be given to a training program to assist the volunteer organizations, to assist the States and local communities in providing under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an efficient program of training.

From another part of the country, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Delinquency heard in Philadelphia from Dr. E. Preston Sharp, executive director of the Youth Study Center and one of the outstanding authorities in the field of delinquency, who stated:

There are training schools and institutions for the rehabilitation of delinquent children, and one of the most difficult tasks is the training of persons who work with and live with the children. We have to go out on the street and select them on the basis of personality adjustment and background and give them a couple of days of orientation and put them to work.

It is inconceivable to me that these situations can be allowed to continue in this Nation. I have become painfully aware of the confusion and evil that result from this paucity of trained workers in the delinquency field, and I hope every other Member of the Senate feels likewise. From an analysis of waves of violence in New York, it appears certain that the major contributing factor was a tremendous shortage of available personnel to meet a problem that all authoritative persons knew was approaching rapidly.

Here in Washington it was shocking to learn that the District's social agencies were forced to hire people of questionable moral standards. These untrained and unqualified personnel eventually brought their evil proclivities on young children who had been committed to our institutions ostensibly for retraining. Thus, instead of retraining children to have socially acceptable attitudes, they were trained further in their warped and distorted views of adult society, which was now exposing them to incompetent, morally depraved adults.

Mr. President, this is a disheartening picture I am painting, I know, but I feel compelled to do so. With knowledge of these facts, I am certain the Congress will act.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I commend this bill to the attention of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 802) to provide Federal assistance for projects to develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STATE OR LOCAL PARTICIPATION IN EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill the purpose of which is to require that in all emergency relief programs, such as drought relief, and so forth, underwritten by the Federal Government, there shall be a minimum of 25 percent State or local participation.

Under the existing law the Federal Government is underwriting all of the cost of these emergency relief programs, with the result that there is little incentive on the part of the State and local communities to supervise the distribution and to insure that the relief goes to those for whom it is intended.

It has been disclosed that under this program with non-State participation, millionaire ranchers, owners of race horses, and other unqualified types of operations have been declared eligible for relief payments.

For instance, the fabulous King Ranch received several thousand dollars in relief with no objections being raised by the State administrators, presumably on the assumption that the Federal Government was assuming the cost anyway.

In another instance the owner of the racehorse Swaps, even while his horse was winning the Belmont Sweepstake, was applying for and receiving relief payments.

One self-styled rancher with only a polo pony and a bird dog was drawing relief to feed his livestock.

Recognizing these abuses the administration in previous years strongly recommended this proposed legislation but no action was taken.

This proposal should be enacted by Congress now. At the present time these programs are not being utilized; therefore, it would be much easier to make this correction now and be ready for a future situation should another emergency develop.

The outlining of a definite formula of State participation would put the State legislatures on notice as to the rules under which they could participate.

This proposal can be strongly recommended as being necessary from the standpoint of good administration as well as being a step toward turning back to the States those functions which can be best administered at local levels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 803) to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1933, the Intercoastal Shipping Act.

An identical version of this bill, S. 3005, passed the Senate during the 86th Congress, 2d session, March 28, 1960.

Mr. President, when the Senators from Alaska urged the Federal Maritime Board to order a suspension of the proposed increased freight tariffs filed by carriers in the Alaska trade, it was said by the Board that no suspension order would issue. Instead, the Board announced that the increased tariffs would become effective prior to hearings. This announcement distressed everyone who realized that, whatever the outcome of the hearings, the consumers in Alaska would be faced with the burden of increased tariffs—a burden that would not be lifted under the procedure followed by the Board.

Therefore, the Board was asked to justify its refusal to suspend the proposed increased rates until the objectors to those rates could be heard. The Board's justification was that, under existing law, the Board can suspend proposed increased tariffs for no longer than 120 days, or 4 months, and that 4 months is too short a period to complete hearing procedures.

It must be said that Alaskans are not sympathetic to this justification. In the first place, the Board could complete hearing procedures in many controversies within the 4-month time period. In the second place, the suspension of rates even for 4 months would allow time for at least a partial development of the legal issues and the facts. There can be no doubt that Board rulings, after even a partial development of the issues and the evidence, would provide a sounder basis for decision than ex parte procedure can afford.

In view of the Board's statements on this matter, it appears advisable to broaden the Board's authority to suspend proposed tariff increases. The bill introduced today would allow the Board to suspend such increases for 7 months, instead of for the 4-month period now permitted. For easy reference, the bill would amend section 845 of title 46, United States Code. The 7-month period corresponds to the period of suspensions which the Interstate Commerce Commission may enforce under paragraph 7, section 15, of title 49, United States Code. The bill introduced today will add desirable uniformity in the powers of two leading regulatory agencies whose activities affect transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 804) to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

YU LIAO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Yu Liao.

It is my practice to introduce very few private bills and then only when the recipients are most deserving and where no real possibility of administrative relief appears available to them.

Mr. Yu Liao was born in Hengsan, Hunan Province, China, in 1921 and came to the United States as a student in 1948. He is the librarian at the University of Idaho and Dr. D. R. Theophilus, president of the university, has high praise for him as a person and an efficient employee.

Mr. Yu Liao cannot return to his homeland, which is under Communist control, and he has no family or ties in Taiwan. He is loyal to our country and its institutions and, at the earliest opportunity, wishes to become a citizen. I share his hope that his dream will become a reality.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 805) for the relief of Yu Liao, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to make permanent the National Wool Act of 1954, which expires on March 31, 1962. This law was originally enacted, with strong bipartisan support, on a trial basis. It was extended in 1958.

There is now before the Senate a bill to extend the act for 3 years. But because of the success of this program and because of certain outstanding features of the act, which I will outline, I now urge that this law be made permanent.

The act provides for an incentive price for shorn wool to be established at such a level as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be necessary to encourage an annual production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool. The payments under the program are limited to duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures up to 70 percent of such collections.

Wool has always been an important commodity in our national security, especially in times of national emergency. Our tenuous international situation makes it extremely important to have a vigorous domestic wool industry. Also, in large areas of our country, sheep raising is a major enterprise, which bolsters many of our local communities, particularly in the intermountain West.

The 1954 Wool Act has the following outstanding features to commend it:

First, it is self-financing. Seventy percent of the wool duty revenues are used to pay the costs of supports to producers. The remaining 30 percent are paid into section 32 funds for other agricultural commodity supports.

Second, it does not adversely affect our foreign trade. It does not require raising tariffs to protect domestic growers' prices against the lower prices of imported wools.

Third, it prevents the Government from being in the wool merchandising business. CCC wool stockpiles reached a peak of 523 million pounds in September 1946, under former loan programs begun in 1943, and a peak of 150 million pounds in May of 1955, under loan programs begun in 1952. These huge surpluses have now disappeared under the National Wool Act.

It is necessary that this bill be acted on as early as possible in this Congress, so that the woolgrowers can make their plans for next year and obtain the necessary financing from loan agencies to carry on their operations. In fact, they actually have to plan almost 2 years ahead. This is because they have to buy their replacement breeding stock 1 year for the following year's production. And it is important that the act be made permanent so that woolgrowers can make proper long-range plans for their industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 807) to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 703 of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 910, 72 Stat. 994; 7 U.S.C. 1782), is amended to read as follows: "Such price support shall be limited to wool and mohair marketing on or after April 1, 1955."

NATIONAL PARKWAY THROUGH SOUTHERN UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to authorize the creation of a national parkway through southern Utah. The proposed parkway would connect the complex of national parks and monuments in southwestern Utah with the Glen Canyon Recreation Area and national monuments in southeastern Utah.

At the present time, the people of America are being denied, except at great inconvenience and hardship, the opportunity to see some of the most spectacular and majestic country in the world. Where 1,187,000 people visited Grand Canyon National Park during 1960, only 6,500 visited Natural Bridges National Monument, only 1,100 visited Rainbow Bridge National Monument, and only 2,800 visited Hovenweep National Monument, all in southeastern Utah.

Compared to the vast number of visitors at Grand Canyon, the 102,500 visitors at Capitol Reef National Monument, 272,000 at Bryce Canyon National Park, 115,800 at Cedar Breaks National Monument, and even the 575,800 visitors at Zion National Park seem relatively small. Yet, these areas offer as much, and even more, to the American public as does Grand Canyon. If the proposed southern Utah parkway is built, many thousands more visitors will see the unique and spectacular scenery of that area.

PARKWAY WOULD BE A NATIONAL PARK IN ITSELF

No matter which route were to be selected through southern Utah, it would open up a veritable wonderland of nature. The parkway itself would be virtually a national park in its own right, traversing, as it would, areas which can only be described as fantastic.

In addition to making a spectacular area accessible, the parkway would also open up the vast Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, extending up the Colorado River 186 miles. There are three sites on the west side of the river, in addition to the two immediately above the dam, which could be served by the parkway. The same may be said for two of the five sites along the east side of the river.

The sites along the west moving from south to north are Hole in the Rock, Oil Seep Bar, and Bullfrog Creek. On the east are the Shock Bar and White Canyon sites. Some of these are now accessible only from the air.

This great national recreation area is being turned over to the National Park Service for administration beginning this year. President Eisenhower budgeted $839,000 for this area for the fiscal year beginning next July 1.

PATTERNED AFTER EASTERN PARKWAYS

The Southern Utah Parkway would be patterned after the 478-mile Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia and North Carolina, and the 450-mile Natchez Trace Parkway in Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi. In addition to these parkways, there are 11 others on the parkway system, ranging in length from 3 to 72 miles. There are 1,138 miles on the entire national parkway system. Most of the small parkways are in the Washington, D.C., area. It is interesting to note that all of the parkways are in or south of Maryland and in or east of Mississippi. There are none west of the Mississippi River.

Under present law, Congress appropriates $16 million yearly for national parkways. On the basis of current authorizations, all existing national parkways will be completed by 1971.

FEASIBLE ROUTES AVAILABLE

I understand that there are at least four feasible routes across southern Utah, any one of which could serve as a parkway route. All would require a bridge across the Colorado River, where only ferry service at one location now exists. There are at present no improved roads traversing this magnificent area. The only good road to the north is State Highway 10, connecting Salina and Price, which is a 400-mile trip compared to the estimated 180-mile parkway. To travel between the two areas via the southerly route, one must go about 370 miles. This route goes to Tuba City and across Arizona through the Navajo Indian Reservation. This latter

road still affords some rugged going although it is being improved under recent legislation, which I was happy to support. The only route in between, which the average tourist would dare to venture upon, is State Highway 24 connecting Loa, Bicknell, Torrey, and Fruita with Hanksville and Green River. A major segment of this road is graded, but it is well to the north of my proposed parkway. It involves a diversion of over a hundred miles for the traveler wishing to visit the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in southern Utah.

FULFILLS A DREAM

The parkway would fulfill a great dream of mine, for which I have worked for years, a great scenic loop road in southern Utah. Not only would it be a delight to the American people in general, but it would greatly promote tourism, and enhance economic activity in many of our southern Utah towns, some of which have had serious population losses because of lack of economic opportunity.

As part of my efforts to fulfill that dream, I successfully sponsored an amendment to the 1956 Highway Act, making possible the Cove Fort to Denver interstate highway through central Utah. In 1960, I joined to support the Case of South Dakota-Allott amendment to fund the Denver to Cove Fort highway for the first time. This increased Utah's share of interstate highway funds by $8 million or more yearly, beginning in fiscal year 1962. To further implement this dream, I led the effort to get State Highway No. 54 across Bryce Canyon National Park underway, and pushed added appropriations for State Highway No. 24 through Capitol Reef National Monument. In this same spirit, I sponsored an amendment in 1956 to raise Utah's forest highway annual allotment from $750,000 to $1 million and later backed an amendment boosting it to $1,100,000. Similarly, I successfully sponsored and supported amendments increasing appropriations for roads in national parks and for national parkways, which have brought unheralded road development in Utah's national parks and monuments.

I have inserted provisions in the parkway bill, designed to protect all public land users to the maximum possible extent.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will approve the southern Utah national parkway bill, both for the good of America and for the people of Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 808) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a national parkway in the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to establish and maintain, within the State of Utah, a national parkway (including recreational areas, traffic interchanges, bridges, service roads where ingress and egress from private property would otherwise be denied because of the parkway, and such other structures as the Secretary may deem desirable) connecting the national parks and monuments in the southwestern part of Utah and the national recreational areas and monuments in the southeastern part of Utah.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of establishing the parkway authorized by the first section of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with appropriated or donated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, such land and interests in land (including structures and improvements thereon), as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) Administrative jurisdiction with respect to Federal land and interests in land required by the Secretary in order to establish the parkway authorized herein may be transferred from the administering agency to the Secretary under terms acceptable to the agency and the Secretary.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, to connect with the parkway such roads and trails as may be necessary for the protection, administration, or utilization of any adjacent or nearby national forest, and the resources thereof. The Forest Service and the National Park Service shall, insofar as practicable, coordinate and correlate such recreational development as each may plan, construct, or permit to be constructed, on lands within their respective jurisdictions which, by mutual agreement, should be given special treatment for recreational purposes.

SEC. 4. In the administration of the parkway established pursuant to this Act, the Secretary may issue revocable licenses or permits for rights-of-way over, across, and upon parkway lands, or for the use of parkway lands by the owners or lessees of adjacent lands, for such purposes and under such nondiscriminatory terms, regulations, and conditions as he may determine to be not inconsistent with the use of such lands for parkway purposes.

SEC. 5. The parkway authorized to be established pursuant to this Act shall, except as otherwise provided in this Act, be administered by the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary, in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.

The Commission would be composed of members of Federal departments with a substantial interest in water resources development, representatives of the States of Indiana and Illinois and a representative from the Wabash Valley Interstate Compact Commission.

The Commission will:

First. Serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in the Wabash Basin.

Second. Prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, integrated joint plan for water and related land resources development in the Wabash Basin.

Third. Recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects in the Wabash Basin.

Fourth. Foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the Wabash Basin.

In order to carry out these duties the Commission is authorized to engage in such activities and to make such studies and investigations as are necessary or desirable.

The need for this Commission is apparent when we consider the many different organizations and interests on the Federal, State, and local levels which have some part in controlling and developing the waters of the Wabash River and its tributaries. On the Federal level there is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Corps, the Public Health Service, the National Parks Service, and others. On the State and local levels there are State agencies, township committees, and local groups.

The bill attempts to bring together in the Commission all of these interests in order to develop a well-integrated and comprehensive plan for the utilization of water resources in the Wabash River Basin.

The type of plan provided for in this bill has been prepared in the past for certain areas of the United States and has been found to be of great value in the formulation and selection of projects for construction. Examples of these studies are the comprehensive reports on the New York-New England region, the Arkansas-White-Red River Basins in southwestern United States, the Columbia River, the Missouri River, the Mississippi River, and the Ohio River.

Three national advisory commissions on water resources have recommended the type of commission established by the bill. The first such recommendation was made by the Committee headed by President Herbert Hoover. The other two Water Resources Commissions were established by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower.

Indiana has suffered from the ravages of floodwaters because of the lack of coordination and the stop-and-start history of our flood-control efforts. In recent years the monetary damages from these floods have amounted to $140 million. These damages could have been prevented had there been a well-coordinated, planned effort of flood control which would have moved ahead 10 or 15 years ago.

It is time that Indiana moved ahead and started developing an adequate and comprehensive plan of flood control for the Wabash Basin. The Commission established by this bill will give us the start we need.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 811) to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

STATE TAXATION OF INCOME OF NONRESIDENT INDIVIDUALS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to State taxation of the income of nonresident individuals.

The operative part of the proposed amendment reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power to establish uniform laws prescribing the terms in conformity with which the States shall be permitted to levy and collect taxes on the income of nonresident individuals.

This proposal is the same as Senate Joint Resolution 140 of the 86th Congress, which I had the honor of introducing.

By way of background, this proposal was drafted after the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments held hearings on two other proposals—Senate Joint Resolution 29 and Senate Joint Resolution 67 of the 86th Congress—on this same subject.

The hearings on these joint resolutions brought into bold relief the fact that the several States are making a veritable jungle out of what can best be described as interstate taxation. Some States are literally taxing everything they can get their hands on and some things they cannot.

If the matter were not deadly serious for the victims, it would be almost comic. For example, some States are levying and collecting income taxes on airline pilots who fly over but do not land within their territory. This is absurd. If all States followed this example, an airline pilot might have to pay 20 or 30 State income taxes each year.

I will grant that this is an extreme case, but there are numerous inequities which afflict a huge number of citizens who live in roughly 20 States, and who work across State lines in another State. For example, there are more than 200,000 citizens and residents of Connecticut and New Jersey who work in New York City and who are subject to the New York State income tax. They must pay this tax in addition to a full tax load in either Connecticut or New Jersey.

In my view, New York may be entitled to collect some taxes from them for services rendered. Yet, because of provisions in the New York law, these unfortunate individuals pay up to 45 percent more than New York residents on the same income.

Furthermore, they probably would not have to pay any New York tax if Connecticut and New Jersey, like Massachusetts, had an income tax which was applicable to nonresidents, including New Yorkers. Adoption of such taxes would result in mutual credits for income taxes paid in the State of residence.

At the moment, adoption of such a tax is the only defense for States which do not have an income tax. It is defense by retaliation, and it has been rejected, at least, for the moment, by Connecticut and New Jersey.

Because of the inequity of the situation—and perhaps because of the possibility of retaliatory legislation by Connecticut and New Jersey in the future—Governor Rockefeller tried last year to persuade the New York Legislature to adopt changes in the New York Tax Code to equalize deductions by out-of-Staters. Even this partial relief was turned down by the New York Legislature.

I understand that Governor Rockefeller is again attempting to persuade his legislature to accept his proposal. I certainly hope he is successful.

Needless to say, if adequate and equitable relief is not furnished by such States as New York, all States which have not already done so will be forced into adoption of income taxes applicable to nonresidents.

In the end, because of mutual credits, this will result in massive bookkeeping, but very little tax money for any State.

There is a similar problem with respect to State taxation of out-of-State corporations. However, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, the Congress has power to deal with this problem.

Unfortunately, Congress has no power to regulate interstate taxation of incomes of private individuals. This problem can only be solved by a constitutional amendment.

Personally, I favored the approach which is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 29 and Senate Joint Resolution 67 of the 86th Congress, and which would, in effect, ban taxation of incomes of nonresidents. However, even if both Houses of Congress adopted such an amendment by a two-thirds vote, which is most unlikely, there is not much hope that three-quarters of the States would ratify it, since, roughly, 30 States now have taxes which apply to nonresidents.

The joint resolution which I am introducing today would not ban taxation of incomes of nonresidents, but, rather, it would empower Congress to eliminate the inequities in such taxation.

It would forestall the 20 States which do not have an income tax from adopting one for purposes of retaliation and self-defense.

It would eliminate such inanities as taxation of pilots flying over a State.

It would get the several States out of the jungle into which they have gotten themselves in their wild scramble to lay hands on taxable income.

It is my hope that we can have hearings on this joint resolution soon. I believe it is a sound approach to a most serious problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to State taxation of the income of nonresident individuals, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BRAVE LITHUANIA—A SEVEN-CENTURY QUEST FOR FREEDOM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

Mr. President, on February 16, 1961, the Lithuanian-Americans will commemorate the 708th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian kingdom in 1253 and the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania in 1918 following the First World War.

The Communist exploitation of this great people and her neighbors in Estonia and Latvia is so shocking that it warrants the concern of freemen everywhere.

The quest for freedom of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors goes back many centuries.

In the 13th century, Mindaugas united the Lithuanian tribes to meet expanding German pressure, and in 1253, by the authority of Pope Innocent IV, he was crowned the first and only king in Lithuanian history. His assassination in 1263 brought a return to paganism.

Torn between alliance with Russia and Poland and family rivalries, by 1413 Lithuania had moved into union with Poland—they had a common parliament by 1569—as both countries sought to rid their lands of the German Teutonic order.

Late in the 18th century, however, Russian rule arrived and, as a result of the carving up of Europe by the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Russian czar became not only the King of Poland but the Grand Duke of Lithuania. Russian oppression grew tighter in the late 19th century as Lithuanian newspapers, journals, and books were prohibited in the native tongue. Russian was the only language taught in the schools. However, the spirit of freedom could not be subdued and Lithuanian newspapers were smuggled across the border and into homes throughout the little land.

A growing quest for freedom and a penchant for independence resulted in a Congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates meeting at Vilnius in September 1917. The council of 20 which resulted from these sessions, proclaimed an independent Lithuania on February 16, 1918. As the German troops retreated westward and the Red army followed in its wake, the inevitable Communist regime proceeded to entrench itself. Soon the Polish army under Pilsudski pushed back the Communists and by 1921, after a period of wavering control by outside power, and with part of her boundary still uncertain, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations.

The uncertain status of the Lithuanians is well illustrated by the ease with which first the Germans and then the Russians included her in their sphere of influence by secret protocols to the German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact of 1939.

On June 15, 1940, an ultimatum to form a friendly government and immediate occupation by the Soviet army de-

cided the issue. Within a month, a phony election with handpicked candidates resulted in a unanimous request to incorporate Lithuania in the U.S.S.R. It is estimated that on the night of the occupation over 30,000 Lithuanians—mostly the educated ones and the leaders—were deported to Siberia. Others were executed on the spot.

Then with the attack on Russia came the German invasion and its purges and exterminations. Following their retreat, a second Soviet occupation occurred in 1944. In the next 4 years, almost 300,000 Lithuanians were uprooted and deported—many with the agricultural collectivization of 1949.

In their rise and fall, Estonia and Latvia have followed a similar course: Exploitation by both native and foreign oppressors; cabinet instability and a multiplicity of political parties; and eventual incorporation into the Soviet Union as the fall of the Iron Curtain clanked shut because of an army of occupation, rigged elections, and the mass deportation of political prisoners. Such has been the sad and trying history of these gallant and spirited peoples.

This attempted suppression of human freedom justly deserves the attention of the President and the Senate of the United States and all the free peoples who participate in the United Nations. Soviet troops should be withdrawn; political prisoners and others who have been exiled and imprisoned should be returned to their homes; and free elections should be held under United Nations supervision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in full at this point in the RECORD and that it lie at the table for 1 day for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, submitted by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas the Baltic people, Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians, under Communist control were and still are overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians and Latvians desire, fight and die for their national independence; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America maintains diplomatic relations with the Governments of the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced "incorporation" into the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets (a) to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, (b) to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps; and be it finally

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia under its supervision.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE ARTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 31, 1961, the name of Senator LONG of Missouri was added as additional cosponsor to the bills S. 741, S. 742, S. 743, and S. 744, relating to the arts, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on January 31, 1961.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 783) to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park, the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], may be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS IN THE ARTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 785) to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, and for other purposes, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] may be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONVENTION ON THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold hearings on the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—on Tuesday, February 14, at 10 o'clock in the committee room, No. 4221, New Senate Office Building. The hearings will be public and if necessary will resume on Wednesday, February 15, at the same hour.

The principal witnesses will be Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. George Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address by him broadcast over Wisconsin radio station on the weekend of February 5, 1961.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Excerpts from speech delivered by him before National Cotton Council of America, Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tenn., Tuesday, January 31, 1961.

LIBERALIZATION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am pleased that President Kennedy has taken action to liberalize the public facilities loan program.

In his press conference on February 1, the President announced that the unrealistic restrictions on the program will be removed. I have tried on three occasions to obtain passage of legislation which would make this program more effective in aiding communities in the construction of needed community improvements. These measures were consistently opposed by the Republican administration. I did not reintroduce my bill this session, in the hope that the President would take the necessary administrative action to expand the program.

Our population is rapidly becoming more urbanized, thus increasing the pressures on public facilities of all types. It is estimated that the number of rural households will decline by 900,000 in the next decade. Such a drastic shift in population to the urban areas will compound the difficulties already facing cities and towns throughout the country. A helpful attitude on the part of the Federal Government can be of much assistance in solving the problem of overtaxed public facilities.

Before the President's announcement last week, the community facilities loan program was limited to cities under 10,000 in population and loans were made for the construction of water and sewer systems only. It was useful to the smallest towns with the worst credit ratings, but did not touch the problems of the majority of our communities. The President's order removes the population restriction and makes the loan program available to all communities, regardless of size. It also removes the restriction limiting the program solely to

water and sewer loans. The reduction in the interest rate will also be an important factor in assisting financially overburdened local governments.

Since the loan program went into operation, 594 applications have been received, of which 353 were approved; 54 communities in Arkansas have received assistance under the program. One of the most important Arkansas loans was that which cleared the way for construction of the bridge over the Mississippi River near Helena.

I am sure that there will be much greater interest in this program now that the restrictions have been removed. In addition to supplying long-needed help in removing the local public works backlog, the expansion of this program should have a beneficial effect on the Nation's economy. I am sure that it will have a substantial psychological effect on the construction industry at once, although it will, of course, take some time for the direct effects of the expanded program to be felt on the economy.

Only $60 million remains available for this loan program before the authorization limit is reached. With the renewed activity which the removal of the restrictions will bring about, the authorization limit will probably be reached shortly. I hope that the administration will seek to have the authorization increased, and I will certainly do everything I can to secure favorable congressional action on such a request.

The President's forceful action will go a long way toward making the program more effective in assisting communities in solving their public works problems. This action is, I think, indicative of the spirit of the new administration.

ICA RULING JEOPARDIZES GREAT LAKES TRADE AND COMMERCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, late in 1960 administrative action was taken to cut down the gold flow out of the country. Included in the efforts was an action through ICA to cut back subsidies for shipment in foreign-flag vessels of commodities under its programs.

In areas where both foreign-flag and U.S.-flag vessels service the needs of the country, this cutback may have proved workable.

In practice, however, very serious problems have arisen—particularly as these relate to trade and commerce in the Great Lakes and through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

If allowed to go into full effect, the directive threatens to seriously dislocate, and to a large degree "kill off," trade and commerce.

The reason for this is that about 40 foreign flags service the Great Lakes, as compared to only 1 American line.

This would jeopardize the economy, jobs, flow of trade and commerce, traffic services to businesses and industries, and jeopardize the United States and Canadian investments in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Following the order, I contacted the White House, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, and the ICA, to urge a revision of the directive, providing either first, a blanket exemption of lakes traffic; or second, that the order be held in abeyance until a thorough hearing could be held on all the ramifications which the order would have upon trade and commerce in the region.

Unless some action is taken along this line, it may have serious consequences for the whole lakes region—many areas of which are now suffering from economic setbacks.

In response, ICA has offered the following compromise:

First. A hearing to be held of interested parties affected by the order as soon as convenient.

Second. In the interim, all reasonable requests to be granted for exemption of contracts under consideration that may be jeopardized by the order.

Great Lakes interests are now preparing to present their case to ICA. Because of the far-reaching impact which this order could well have upon the economy of the upper Midwest, as well as that of the country, however, I believe this warrants the attention of Congress.

At this time I request unanimous consent to have the following items printed at this point in the RECORD: First, a copy of the ICA regulation; and second, responses of port directors, mayors, and others, concerned with the trade and commerce on the lakes, on the adverse impact which the order would have upon traffic.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ICA POLICY RE OCEAN SHIPPING ICA-FINANCED COMMODITY PROCUREMENT

1. In further implementation State Department instructions dated December 5,[1] following policy approved concerning ICA payment ocean shipping costs ICA-financed commodities: Ocean shipping costs of all commodities, materials and equipment procured from MSP program funds shall be eligible for ICA financing only if transported on U.S.-flag vessels, except where foreign-flag vessels are required to assume timely delivery of merchandise and provided that such exceptions received prior approval from ICA, Washington. Pursuant to present legislation, Public Law 664 (Cargo Preference Act) at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of goods financed by ICA will have to continue to be shipped on U.S.-flag vessels.

2. Host country may thus continue to ship on non-U.S. bottoms up to 50 percent of the gross tonnage of goods financed by ICA, but ICA will not finance ocean shipping costs such shipments except as noted above. Host country, therefore, will have to use own resources to meet such costs.

3. New policy applicable goods covered by PA's, PA/PR's, PIO/C's and PIO/T's to be issued on or after February 1, 1961, except as regards PIO/C's to be issued to fund lumpsum contracts already in being. Until such time as ICA Regulation 1, section 201.7, formally amended, language incorporating new policy paragraph 1 above to be included appropriate procurement documents prior signature and issuance.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 31, 1961.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

International Association of Great Lakes Ports and the port of Milwaukee have urgently requested the International Cooperation Administration to reconsider and postpone its order effective February 1, 1961, which provides that U.S. Government will no longer pay ocean freight costs on U.S. foreign aid cargoes moving in non-American vessels. As we interpret the order, it may for all practical purposes remove Great Lakes ports from present participation in handling foreign aid cargoes. More than 40 ocean steamship lines serving Great Lakes are foreign-flag services. Only one regular service, American Export Lines, is American-flag subsidized service. In addition to threatening the principal general cargo volume of Great Lakes ports, and especially agricultural commodities, it is our opinion that ICA order may defeat congressional policy and intent in requiring St. Lawrence Seaway to be self-liquidating by toll charges on cargo and vessels using seaway. If ICA order dries up substantial portion of outward general cargo volume from the Midwest, it will simultaneously shrink toll revenues to U.S. and Canadian Governments required to assure self-liquidation St. Lawrence Seaway. We emphasize also that Government may suffer heavy added costs in inland freight charges, unless Government aid cargoes move to nearest Midwest port of exit. Large economies have been realized to Government recipient nations and commercial shippers by using nearest Midwest port of exit. Diversion of Government aid cargoes to seaboard may also shrink steamship services with resulting detriment to commercial shippers as well as to ports. As you know, large public and private investments have been made in lake region for new general cargo terminals and port improvements. Federal Government making large expenditures for seaway, connecting channels, and deepening lake ports. All such investments, public and private, will be jeopardized if normal expectations of participating in foreign aid cargo movements are nullified. ICA order apparently runs contrary to congressional declaration of 50–50 ICA use, and while it may benefit American merchant marines, it may also jeopardize international relationships in critical period of world tension. Great Lakes region and ports are urgently requesting reconsideration of this order; clarification of its effect on Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway traffic; and opportunity for representatives of Great Lakes region and this association to confer with ICA and if necessary with Secretary of Agriculture. Respectfully urge that you use your influence to seek reconsideration and deferment of ICA order pending complete study its effect on Great Lakes seaway operation and international relationships. Thanks your consideration.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LAKES PORTS,
H. C. BROCKEL,
Chairman, American Section.

GREEN BAY, WIS.,
January 31, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram sent International Cooperation Administration this morning: "Advised only today of order effective tomorrow which on the basis of U.S. Government withdrawal from payment of freight costs except in American bottoms will completely deprive Great Lakes ports of participation in movement of foreign aid cargoes. These cargoes principally produced in Great Lakes area must under this directive move to tidewater ports where American flag vessels will be available the 40 steamship lines serving the Great Lakes with one single exception being foreign flags. Imposition of such restrictions disastrous to Great Lake ports. Urge reconsideration and postponement of

[1] Reference memo: ICA Small Business Memo No. 60–10, dated Dec. 12, 1960.

order and if necessary conference concerning matter with Lake ports representatives. Please advise."

This is development of most threatening nature to entire State. Your most effective assistance earnestly solicited.

BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
JOHN F. SAINSBURY,
Port Director.

KENOSHA, WIS.,
January 31, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Copy wire to ICA: "Request immediate reconsideration of order effective February 1, 1961, that U.S. Government no longer pay ocean freight costs on title 3 goods moving on vessels of foreign flags. Effect of this will practically dry up overseas commerce on Great Lakes. Tremendous Federal and Canadian investments in St. Lawrence Seaway will be jeopardized. Very heavy investments of municipal port authorities and private operators will be wasted and international relations with Canada and our other foreign friends will deteriorate. This financial loss may be greater than savings on gold reserves."

Please exert influence for suspension until this matter can be reconsidered.

KENOSHA BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
W. CASEY SCHMITZ,
Chairman.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
January 31, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Great Lakes Commission with concurrence of U.S. Section International Association of Great Lakes Ports respectfully seeks your support for request for reconsideration ICA order halting U.S. payment ocean freight cost on aid cargoes moving in non-American vessels. Commission telegram today to ICA expresses concern order may adversely affect exports via regions ports many of which include substantial investment of State and/or municipal funds and which presently have regular services primarily by foreign vessels. Fear order will unfairly deprive lake ports rightful share exports under aid program originating in Great Lakes area and Midwest. Respectfully request your aid in staying order effective February 1 and obtaining reconsideration with opportunity for further representations by region.

MARVIN FAST.

SUPERIOR, WIS., *January 31, 1961.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to exercise your office to stay and rescind February 1 order of International Cooperation Administration in its detrimental application to payment ocean freight on relief cargo carried by the vessels of foreign register. Effect of order will be staggering irrecoverable blow to the anticipated economic value of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway in this distressed area. Will completely counteract all our past efforts toward future development.

M. HAGEN, *Mayor.*

GREEN BAY, WIS., *January 1, 1961.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building:
Washington, D.C.:

Today we wired International Cooperation Administration urging reconsideration and postponement of order effective February 1 that will completely deprive Great Lakes ports of participation in foreign-aid cargoes and suggested a conference with lake ports representatives. Your assistance in preventing the order from becoming effective is respectfully solicited.

R. C. BRETH, *Secretary.*

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
February 1, 1961.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The Milwaukee Overseas Ship Agents Association representing steamship lines serving the port of Milwaukee and engaged directly in foreign commerce urgently and respectfully solicit your good efforts to recommend a deferment of the ICA order effective February 1 pending complete study of its effect on the St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes.

ANTHONY VITALE.

RACINE, WIS.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D.C.:

Has been brought to our attention the very serious situation that may develop with consequences international and relating to our Great Lakes ports' incomes, will you strongly recommend as urgent to the International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., that your port and city of Racine through your offices, reconsiders order effective February 1, 1961, providing that U.S. Government will no longer pay ocean freight costs on U.S. foreign aid cargoes moving in non-American vessels. It seems to me that now on our commission is the time to rally to the cause of the international situation of our American Government, rather than tearing this apart or casting it asunder, and we hope you will see the virtue of acting on this to have this order changed, and will appreciate your immediate and most effective effort and will appreciate your so advising this office.

Respectfully,

F. M. YOUNG.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator refer to the order requiring that all shipments be in U.S. bottoms, or ships?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join the Senator from Wisconsin in his protest. What the order means simply is that shipping on the Great Lakes in many areas will be stopped entirely, insofar as any foreign commerce is concerned.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his comments. I have worked on this matter for days. The result is that there has been an agreement to have hearings in which the parties interested can be heard. I think it is probable that in the hearings there will be developed evidence of what injury will result from this regulation. It will mean injury not only to shipping, but injury to the U.S. Government. It will mean loss of revenues. It will mean that the Government will have to pay for the interest on bonds issued for construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

EXPANDING TRADE AND COMMERCE THROUGH THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence development program offers one of the greatest opportunities in U.S. history for stimulating the economy of the upper Midwest and the Nation. How? By providing a less expensive, deepsea water route to the ports of the world for the products of our farms and factories.

Now that the seaway is completed, however, I believe it would be a great mistake to forget about it—to assume the attitude that progress "will take care of itself," and that the desirable volume of trade and commerce will automatically find its way through the waterway.

By experience, we have learned that this almost never happens.

The American people have a $140 million investment in the waterway. Unless the project is made to "pay off" this will mean loss to the taxpayer. A far greater loss, however, would be that of failing to take advantage of the new economic opportunity offered by the waterway.

I have long felt that a vastly expanded effort is needed to encourage a larger flow of trade and commerce.

I sincerely hope that members of the Appropriations Committee will sympathetically consider this matter when the appropriations bill comes up for consideration.

Recently, I was privileged to receive a letter from Marvin Fast, executive director of the Great Lakes Commission, conveying the views of the commission, on the need for greater efforts to expand traffic through the seaway. I request unanimous consent to have the letter and a release from the Great Lakes Commission printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LAKES COMMISSION,
ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
February 2, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the direction of the Great Lakes Commission this endorses expanded traffic developmental activity by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and respectfully recommends action by the Congress to increase funds for this purpose as urged recently by the Corporation's advisory board.

For your information this recommendation also was transmitted to the President, Secretary of Commerce and Bureau of the Budget in communications dated January 27, 1961.

In supporting an expanded traffic developmental program by the Seaway Development Corporation the commission—which is a joint and official agency of seven Great Lakes States—stresses the self-liquidating nature of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In the commission's view compliance with this requirement of self-liquidation requires traffic developmental activities by the Corporation not possible under present budget policies. The commission therefore recommends additional funds for such activities so as to permit the Corporation to assist in the achievement of the maximum usage of the seaway's navigation facilities on which self-liquidation depends.

Expansion of traffic developmental activities by the Seaway Development Corporation also is suggested by additional considerations. We note, first, the importance of stepping up efforts to increase U.S. exports and the country's trade surplus as a means of reducing the outflow of gold resulting from the present deficit in the balance of payments.

We point out in this connection that the seaway was intended to create new exports, commerce which would not move in the foreign trade of the United States without the seaway. It therefore would appear to be especially in the national interest at this time to promote such new trade and, it follows, to permit the Seaway Development Corporation to engage in traffic development to a greater degree. Secondly, the cost of developmental activities ultimately will not be borne by taxpayers but, because of the seaway's self-liquidating feature, by those paying tolls for its direct benefits.

Copy of the enclosed release, which contains the full text of the commission's letter to the Secretary of Commerce, also is being sent to Members of Congress from the Great Lakes area.

In view of your special interest in the seaway and the Great Lakes we hope you will find it desirable to give this recommendation your special attention. Your support of increased funds as recommended by the commission will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN FAST,
Executive Director.

The Great Lakes Commission today announced it has recommended the Federal Government provide increased funds to expand the traffic developmental program of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Marvin Fast, executive director of the commission, in releasing the text of the commission's letter to Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, said the commission's recommendation also has been submitted to the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

The commission's letter stated present Federal budget policies do not permit the desired level of traffic development activities by the Seaway Development Corporation. Fast added that such programs have been extremely limited, almost nonexistent, under the present policy. Noting the statutory requirement that the seaway is to be self-liquidating, the letter said additional funds for such activities are needed to permit the Corporation to assist in the achievement of the maximum usage of the seaway's navigation facilities on which self-liquidation depends.

As further reasons for enlarging the Corporation's traffic developmental program, the commission mentioned the present efforts to increase U.S. exports as a means of reducing the outflow of U.S. gold. "The seaway," the commission said, "was intended to create new exports, commerce which would not move in the foreign trade of the United States without the seaway. It therefore would appear especially in the national interest at this time to promote such new trade, and, it follows, to permit the Seaway Development Corporation to engage in traffic development to a greater degree." The commission also pointed out that all of the cost of the developmental activities ultimately will be borne not by taxpayers but by users of the seaway paying tolls for its direct benefits.

Fast explained the present restrictive policy of the Federal Government is based on its view that tax funds should not be used to promote the seaway in competition with other alternative routes. "That policy," said Fast, "is based on two fallacies. First, it overlooks a major purpose of the seaway—which is to create new export opportunities for industry and agriculture in the Great Lakes area and entire Midwest. Second, it overlooks the seaway's self-liquidating feature, which means the cost of traffic developmental activities will be recovered from toll revenues."

Fast indicated the Eisenhower budget for 1962 submitted to Congress last month continues the present restrictive policy. He said only $11,000 was received for promotion of the seaway, even though it is understood a substantially larger sum was requested by the Corporation at the recommendation of its advisory board. The commission's action now, according to its executive director, is an effort to obtain a change in Federal policy under the Kennedy administration.

The Great Lakes Commission is a joint State agency with advisory responsibilities on Great Lakes developments and programs. It includes as members all of the Great Lakes States except Ohio.

The text of the commission's letter of January 27 to the Secretary of Commerce is as follows:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the direction of the Great Lakes Commission this endorses expanded traffic developmental activity by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation and respectfully recommends support by the Department of Commerce for increased funds for this purpose as urged recently by the Corporation's advisory board.

"In supporting an expanded traffic developmental program by the Seaway Development Corporation, the commission—which is a joint and official agency of seven Great Lakes States—stresses the self-liquidating nature of the St. Lawrence Seaway. In the commission's view compliance with this requirement of self-liquidation requires traffic developmental activities by the Corporation not possible under present budget policies. The commission therefore recommends additional funds for such activities so as to permit the Corporation to assist in the achievement of the maximum usage of the seaway's navigation facilities on which self-liquidation depends.

"Expansion of traffic developmental activities by the Seaway Development Corporation also is suggested by additional considerations. We note, first, the importance of stepping up efforts to increase U.S. exports and the country's trade surplus as a means of reducing the outflow of gold resulting from the present deficit in the balance of payments. We point out in this connection that the seaway was intended to create new exports, commerce which would not move in the foreign trade of the United States without the seaway. It therefore would appear to be especially in the national interest at this time to promote such new trade and, it follows, to permit the Seaway Development Corporation to engage in traffic development to a greater degree. Secondly, the cost of developmental activities ultimately will not be borne by taxpayers but, because of the seaway's self-liquidating feature, by those paying tolls for its direct benefits.

"Favorable consideration by the Department of Commerce of this recommendation will be appreciated by the commission.

"Sincerely yours,

"MARVIN FAST,
"Executive Director."

CENSORSHIP

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago today the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision which is viewed with grave misgivings by many Americans. The decision upheld a Chicago ordinance requiring the licensing of movie films by a police censor board before they can be exhibited. Four members of the Court strongly dissented.

Because of the potential impact this decision could have on the first amendment to our Constitution and because of the potential impact the decision could have on all the news media—television, radio, and newspapers—I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 27 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO LICENSE FOR CENSORS

Americans concerned with keeping the Bill of Rights in good repair will view with grave misgiving the Supreme Court's decision this week upholding film censorship in Chicago.

As on many civil liberties issues, the Court split 5 to 4, with Justice Clark writing the majority opinion, in which Justices Frankfurter, Harlan, Whittaker, and Stewart concurred. They upheld the authority of Chicago's police censor board to require that every moving picture be submitted to it for licensing before being exhibited to the public. A local ordinance authorizes the censors to ban showings for reasons of obscenity, immorality, portrayal of depravity, or violence, incitement to riot, and the like.

A community's power to punish obscenity, and especially its power to protect young people from filth, was not at issue in this case. The question was solely whether a community can exercise this power through the particular means of prior censorship. The Court majority ruled in effect that it doesn't matter much how this authority is exercised. Established constitutional doctrine permits the restraint of free expression for certain limited and valid reasons, such as protection against obscenity, and so the majority held that there is no "absolute freedom to exhibit, at least once, any and every kind of motion picture."

But this is a misleading way to state the issue. Actually the manner in which restraints on free expression are applied does make a great deal of difference, and prior censorship has always been one of the most abhorrent. When every film, every book, or every newspaper must be submitted to a censor, the censor's standards rather than those of free individuals tend to dominate or to throttle expression. Furthermore, as Chief Justice Warren pointed out in his dissent, joined by Justices Black, Douglas, and Brennan, a censor's decisions are much less likely to be governed by respect for due process and all the safeguards of individual rights than are those of a court.

The Clark majority endeavored to make clear that in sanctioning film censorship it is not saying anything whatever about censorship of books, newspapers and other means of expression. But Justice Warren makes the point that there is no sound ground for distinguishing between free expression in films and free expression in print. Curbs applied to the one may with equal reason be applied to the other. It is essential, therefore, that any restraints be fully justified by real danger to the community, and applied with full respect for due process of law.

It is interesting that Justice Brennan joined the dissenters in condemning censorship, because it was he who wrote the Court's majority opinion in the Roth case upholding the power to restrain free expression for the purpose of punishing obscenity. The principles he set forth in that case remain controlling. He said that subject matter "utterly without redeeming social importance," which would include obscenity, does not enjoy constitutional protection, but other utterances do. And he made the standard of obscenity a relatively flexible one, to be measured by common understanding and practices, the general community attitude and tone.

Thus Justice Brennan believes that the community can protect itself again obscenity, but not by the method of subjecting all works in a given medium to prior censorship and licensing. Surely that is the rule of commonsense. What it means is that the power to limit free expression shall rest with the courts and not with policemen; that it

will be exercised sparingly, with restraint and full regard for due process of law; that it will be applied to offenses actually committed rather than to potential abuses.

WE MUST END ARMS RACE, SECURE A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the year ahead what America does may well determine the fate of the world.

Golden opportunity awaits, side by side with the impending disaster of nuclear catastrophe. I assert that positive, intelligent action can make this an age of hope fulfilled.

For more than a decade, the world has teetered on the edge of disaster. Vast arsenals of the most devastating weapons ever devised by man have been stockpiled by major powers. This futile arms race must be stopped. History of the 20th century to this good hour demonstrates that armaments races between nations led to World Wars I and II. We must end the armaments race with the Soviet Union and Red China by definite agreements, with adequate safeguards, before the most terrible of all wars—perhaps the final war—is precipitated.

Mr. President, today there is reason to hope that the oppressive tension that grips the world will at long last be lifted.

Behind the bluster and bombast of Soviet leaders, I firmly believe, lies an earnest desire for a halt to the arms race.

We all know well that it has always been the wish of our people and leaders to live in peace, to devote our wealth and energy not to weapons of destruction but to those causes which will promote the spread of peace and plenty thoughout the world.

We must find a common language with our antagonists to reach what I hope is the common goal of disarmament and a reduction of cold war tension.

President Kennedy has firmly stated his goals to be an early successful conclusion of nuclear test ban negotiations and a beginning toward effective disarmament, plus adequate safeguards.

It is for us, as Senators of the United States, to help him in his efforts.

Indeed, we must not fail. The longer we wait, the greater become the possibilities of a war no one wants.

Mr. President, nuclear weapons have made war obsolete as an instrument of national policy. The horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki make this abundantly clear.

Man has outgrown war. Science has made it both impractical and impossible, if mankind is to endure on this planet.

According to informed scientists, America today has stockpiled more than 1,000 hydrogen bombs and could readily produce 50,000 more. There is no reason to believe that the Soviet Union does not possess an equal arsenal and an equal potential.

Each hydrogen bomb is capable of wiping out an entire major city.

These are sobering statistics, Mr. President. What more is needed to wipe the thought of war from anyone's mind?

But there is more. Developments in chemical and bacteriological warfare add a new dimension to any conflict, a dimension as terrible to contemplate as nuclear holocaust. Further, we—and the Soviets—possess silent, undersea striking forces capable of raining death from great distances, and swift overhead missiles capable of reaching their targets from thousands of miles away in less time than it takes any of us to drive home at night.

In the near future, Red China will possess nuclear arms. France already has nuclear capability. In fact, nuclear capability appears within reach of many small nations. It is no longer a monopoly of powerful nations.

It is clear, Mr. President, that time is running out. Only prompt, positive action can stem the onrush toward a garrison world. Students of history know that from the turn of the century to this good hour every armaments race on the part of one great nation against another, or group of nations against others, has eventually led to war.

We, as Senators of the United States, probably will have the opportunity to help speed the world toward the day when fear of nuclear war is a thing of the past.

But if we and the world fail now there is no telling what fantastic limits the arms race might reach or what fantastic new weapons of destruction might be developed.

Nor do we know if the opportunity will ever come again to halt the terrible race toward war.

LUNCHEON HONORING FORMER SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 19, 1961, it was my pleasure to attend a luncheon in honor of our good friend, former Senator Theodore Francis Green. This luncheon was given in recognition of Senator Green's devoted service over the years in the best interest of the nationality groups. The groups present at the luncheon brought for Senator Green, as remembrance of the occasion, several valuable and meaningful souvenirs with a special significance in that they related to dates and events in his lifetime. It was said however, and I agree, that "the real gift is the love and devotion for Senator Green of all of our nationality groups who have worked for so long under his leadership."

Following these presentations, Mr. Rusk, the Secretary of State, addressed the group. Because of the importance and timeliness of his message, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK

We honor Senator Green today for several reasons: For his many effective years of public service, for his leadership as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and particularly, in the presence of this company, his work on behalf of the nationality groups.

Americans of first or second generation immigrant origin today number more than 35 million.

They are men and women whose families came to this country because they believed in freedom—because they wanted to find new liberty, and new opportunity.

The fact that America is a land of people from every corner of the earth—the fact that here all are citizens alike, no matter of what origin—is one of the great truths that we have to speak to the world.

In the present struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of dictatorship, this is a fact that stands out strongly for our cause everywhere.

From whatever country they have come, they are now Americans who can testify that under the Constitution of the United States they have found an opportunity to play a full part in self-government—and that is one of the most important things which we have to say to the world today.

The general notion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is more than a slogan of revolutionary America—it is a scarlet thread of long-range American policy and operation.

Our nationality organizations and our foreign language press have done an excellent job in telling the world what America means, and we honor them for that. Some have told the story to relatives in other lands through their letters; others by the personal example of the leadership which they have achieved in the affairs of our country.

In addition, through travel abroad, many of you have become personal ambassadors. About one-third of all visas issued to American visitors to Europe are currently issued to persons of foreign birth—persons who, on their visits, have direct family contacts through which they can and do spread the story of America, in a much more personal and effective way than this can be done by any official agency.

In all of this, we are indebted to you of the nationality organizations and to your press for helping to maintain and improve the picture of American democracy abroad.

There are other ways in which you have helped.

You have kept alive the knowledge of foreign languages, which our country so much needs.

You have helped to strengthen our knowledge of other cultures, and to broaden our fellowship with men and women on other shores.

You have often been the first to perceive the special problems which the United States has faced in its relations abroad, and to help our leaders here at home to understand those problems.

You have helped new immigrants to find a ready welcome and an opportunity to participate in the public life of our country much more quickly than they might otherwise have done.

For Senator Green, the idea that all are equal regardless of national origin, race, or creed, is not only a principle of constitutional law; it is a truth which he feels in his heart, and on which he has based his public life.

I am delighted that he is to continue in a permanent and close connection with the Committee on Foreign Relations, which he has led so well. We need him in Washington, and I hope he will always maintain that same close relationship with the Department of State from which we have drawn much wisdom.

His devotion to the cause of freedom everywhere in the world dates from the days of Woodrow Wilson, of whose concepts he has been an ardent and consistent supporter—and his name is known in every country to which American idealism has penetrated.

We salute him as a great Senator, a great friend of the nationality groups, and a great American.

FOOD FOR PEACE COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on October 31, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy, then the Democratic nominee for President, appointed a six-member group to study new ways of using our farm abundance overseas for the relief of the hungry for economic development. Having for many years been of the firm conviction that our farm abundance should be treated as a blessing rather than a curse, and that this God-given abundance should be used in a more positive fashion to help the people of other nations—especially those in the underdeveloped countries—I was, therefore, greatly honored when President Kennedy appointed me to this group. Chairman of our committee was the distinguished Murray D. Lincoln, president of CARE and president of the Nationwide Mutual Insurance Cos. Other members were Donald Murphy, director of editorial research, Wallace's Farmer; George Forell, professor of systematic theology at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary; William Benton, former Member of the U.S. Senate from Connecticut and chairman of the board of Encyclopedia Britannica; and Mrs. Mary Lasker who has been an active supporter and leader in health research programs.

On January 19, our committee submitted its report to President Kennedy. Because of the widespread interest in our report and in this whole subject of food for peace, I am asking unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The concept and philosophy upon which our report is based is summarized in the report in these words:

Food, to satisfy hunger, and fiber, to clothe the needy, are the most elementary necessities, without which man is incapable of moving on to higher forms of satisfaction and fulfillment.

U.S. agricultural productive capacity is the Nation's most precious treasure, the result of favorable climate, the industry of our farmers, the achievements of our science and technology. The production of food and fiber is what we do best in the world.

It is the aim of the United States to put this agricultural capacity to the fullest use to meet human need, and promote human advancement and development, both at home and abroad.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

(A report of the Food for Peace Committee appointed by Senator Kennedy, October 31, 1960, submitted by the committee to the President-elect, January 19, 1961.)

FACTUAL SURVEY

World food needs

The average daily calorie consumption is adequate in European countries, and more than adequate in some of them; but calorie intake throughout the Far East is well below the necessary level, and not up to acceptable standards in western Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Moreover, serious dietary deficiencies exist even in some countries where the daily average calorie intake is substantial. Hundreds of millions of people subsist on diets short of energy value, lacking in proteins and fats and oils.

Per capita food production in the underdeveloped countries has fallen since the years before World War II. Agricultural output in these countries is in a grim race with rising population. Over the next 10 years, it is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that food production per capita in the underdeveloped countries will increase by only one-third of 1 percent a year. This means that these countries cannot possibly feed their people adequately by their own efforts alone.

Importance of U.S. farm exports

Exports of farm products in 1960 were about 11 percent of the total value to the farmer of all his sales, domestic and foreign. Compared to farmer net income ($11.6 billion in 1960) exports were of course much greater. Exports in fiscal 1960 were equivalent to about 65 percent of the total value of farm surpluses held by the CCC on June 30, 1960.

Cash value to farmer of all sales in 1960: $34 billion.

Dollar value of all U.S. farm exports—fiscal 1960: $4.5 billion.

Dollar value of CCC holdings, June 30, 1960: $7.2 billion.

How U.S. farm exports are financed

U.S. agricultural exports valued at a total of $4.5 billion in fiscal 1960 were the second highest annual total on record:

(a) Dollar sales: Of this total $3.1 billion went for a dollar return. The greater part of our dollar sales are straight commercial transactions, without Government aid; a lesser part, ranging from 30 percent to 40 percent in recent years, is sold with Government assistance in the form of Government credit or Government subsidies. Such subsidies, either in cash or payment in kind, are provided to the exporter to enable him to offer certain of our products at competitive prices in the world market.

(b) Special export programs: Of total U.S. exports of $4.5 billion in fiscal 1960, $1.4 billion, or 31 percent, was financed through special programs, mostly under Public Law 480 and the Mutual Security Act. For this $1.4 billion we did not get dollars in return. Some of it was sold for inconvertible currencies, and some of it was in the form of grants. The local currencies acquired by the United States from these transactions is expendable only in the country of issue and only in ways authorized by U.S. law and agreed to between the United States and the foreign government concerned.

The various special programs that went to make up this $1.4 billion total in fiscal 1960 are as follows:

1. Foreign currency sales under title I of Public Law 480: This is the largest of the special programs, accounting in fiscal 1960 for 18 percent of total U.S. farm exports. Sales agreements specify, among other things, what is to be done with the local currency proceeds. Most of these agreements are for no more than a year's duration although the agreement with India, signed on May 4, 1960, was for 4 years. By and large, these sales do not interfere with commercial exports of the United States or other countries.

2. Foreign currency sales under the Mutual Security Act: This act requires that a certain amount (currently $175 million) of the MSA appropriation be used to buy U.S. farm surpluses and sell them to foreign countries for local currencies which are then used, by agreement, to further mutual security programs. In spite of precautions, a certain portion of these sales inevitably replace commercial U.S. exports.

In fiscal 1960, disposals under the Mutual Security Act accounted for 4 percent of total U.S. farm exports.

3. Emergency relief operations—title II of Public Law 480: These are not sales but grants or donations of CCC stocks to meet emergencies, such as famines or disasters, and to provide supplies for institutions and school lunch programs.

In fiscal 1960, these grants totaled 2 percent of total farm exports.

4. Donations—title III of Public Law 480: CCC stocks are donated to voluntary U.S. relief, welfare, or religious agencies operating abroad, or to intergovernmental relief organizations such as UNICEF, for feeding needy people in foreign lands. Shipments under these programs went to 92 countries last year.

In fiscal 1960, these shipments represented 2 percent of total farm exports.

5. Barter—title III of Public Law 480: Under the barter program the CCC swaps its stocks, acting through private traders, for the value equivalent in strategic materials for the U.S. stockpile, or for materials needed in offshore defense construction or military assistance. This program is heavily criticized, as the bartered farm products often interfere with regular dollar markets, and U.S. stockpiles of strategic materials have just about reached the limits of conceivable usefulness.

Total exchanges under this program in fiscal 1960 were 3 percent of all farm exports.

6. Long-term credit sales—title IV of Public Law 480: Under this provision the United States may sell farm surplus for dollars on a long-term credit basis with a period of up to 20 years for repayment. No sales have yet been made under this authority, which has existed for a year and a half.

What is the volume of our exports under the special programs?

In the 5-year period ending June 30, 1959, exports under these special programs accounted for 35 percent of our total farm exports; 1960 was the first year since 1956 that they fell below a third.

In terms of specific commodities, over the past 6 years ending June 30, 1959, these programs accounted for 75 percent of our total exports of wheat, 59 percent of our total exports of rice, 57 percent of our total exports of vegetable oils, and 36 percent of our total exports of feed grains and 35 percent of our exports of cotton.

Where are our exports going?

Dollar exports: In 1958–59 eight countries took three-fourths of our dollar exports. These countries were: United Kingdom, Canada, Belgium-Luxembourg, West Germany, Netherlands, Japan, Venezuela, and Cuba.

Latin America, in that year, got $417 million, or about 17 percent of our dollar exports; Europe got $1.2 billion or about half; all of Asia, including the Near East, $450 million or about 19 percent; and all of Africa got the least, $45 million, about 2 percent.

Special exports: Europe as a whole still takes about 40 percent of our special program exports, with Asia taking another 40 percent and Latin America and Africa together taking only a little better than 10 percent. The big recipients in Europe are Spain, Yugoslavia, Italy, Poland, and France. In Asia they are India, Korea, Pakistan, and Taiwan.

What is being done with the local currency proceeds under the special programs?

The CCC is reimbursed in dollars by congressional appropriations for the value of the commodities sold for local currencies, plus the value of shipping costs. Under Public Law 480, the local currency received from sales is placed in a U.S. account in the foreign country to be disbursed in accord-

ance with the agreements. Various agencies of the U.S. Government are responsible for various kinds of expenditure; the Department of Defense for military purchases, the ICA and DLF for loans to the local government, etc. The Bureau of the Budget has to approve any use of these funds for U.S. agencies' expenditures—such as embassies, etc. Local currencies collected under the MSA Act—a small percentage of the total—are handled differently, as counterpart funds.

Out of $3.5 billion worth of local currencies collected under Public Law 480 by April 1, 1960, only $1.4 billion has been disbursed. Collections, of course, run well behind shipments. Total shipments on that date were $4.8 billion.

The two major uses of the local currencies are economic development loans to the foreign country and military procurement.

As of April 1, 1960, $293 million of local currency proceeds had been allocated to military procurement for the common defense, mostly in the countries of Korea, Pakistan, and Turkey, with Taiwan a poor fourth. To this should be added $115 million for the housing of military families overseas. On the same date, $741 million of local currencies had been disbursed to foreign governments under loan agreements for economic development. The ICA administers these loan agreements.

Of this $741 million, the Far East got $112 million; the Near East and south Asia, $234 million; Europe, $275 million; Latin America, $120 million; Africa, nothing. The biggest country recipients—all over $50 million—were Japan, India, Israel, Italy, Spain, Yugoslavia, and Brazil.

The largest share of these disbursements ($315 million) goes for development of industry and mining, including sizable disbursements in Yugoslavia, Israel and India for power generation and distribution. Agricultural development projects, including irrigation, account for $171 million. Health and sanitation purposes claim the smallest amount, $10.8 million, and educational purposes claim little more—$15 million—with substantial expenditures for education only in Yugoslavia and Spain. Transportation, community development and miscellaneous purposes account for the rest, $230 million.

Other purposes for which the local currencies are used account for relatively minor sums. They are (1) activities for developing export markets for U.S. agriculture, $27 million; (2) purchases of goods for other friendly countries—three-way deals—$54 million; (3) grants for economic development purposes, $68 million (in five countries only—Ceylon, Greece, India, Pakistan, and Yugoslavia); (4) loans to private businesses, mostly American firms, $66 million. (All figures as of April 1, 1960.) The balance is used for the payment of the expenses of U.S. agencies abroad, and the CCC is reimbursed from the appropriations of the agency concerned.

Things that can be done now by administrative action under existing law to improve the program

I. Change in conception and philosophy: The conception, the philosophy, and the nomenclature of "surplus disposal"—disposal of unwanted food, feed, and fiber—to this day underlies and permeates U.S. legislation and the outlook and activities of the Department of Agriculture, imposing limitations upon full use of our agricultural capacity to meet human need, as well as conscious or subconscious feelings of guilt and frustration upon the Government, and, indeed, all Americans. It is of fundamental importance to work toward a national food policy which recognizes the following:

Food, to satisfy hunger, and fiber, to clothe the needy, are the most elementary necessities, without which man is incapable of moving on to higher forms of satisfaction and fulfillment.

U.S. agricultural productive capacity is the Nation's most precious treasure, the result of favorable climate, the industry of our farmers, the achievements of our science and technology. The production of food and fiber is what we do best in the world.

It is the aim of the United States to put this agricultural capacity to the fullest use to meet human need, and promote human advancement and development, both at home and abroad.

In adopting this conception, we will be concerned about nutrition and the fact that we are not producing enough of certain agricultural commodities (oils and fats, meats, butter, nonfat milk, soybeans, peas, etc.) as are needed to sustain adequate diets either for our needy in the United States or for the needy abroad.

To realize the aim of the United States, as stated above, and at the same time secure a fair return to the farmer, it will be necessary to bring about shifts in production from wheat and corn into the oils and fats and protein foods needed for a nutritional diet.

II. Increasing the food available to the needy in the United States: Any consideration of "Food for Peace" must be prefaced with the emphatic statement that all steps possible should be taken to improve and extend the feeding and clothing of the needy in the United States, for law, justice, and public opinion give these clear priority.

The special task force named by President-elect Kennedy to draw up a program of action to assist people in economically distressed areas of the United States has recommended, in part I, section 1, of its report, certain specific actions. Virtually all of these things may be done by administrative action under existing law, although in some cases new interpretation of the law may be required. We urge that these recommendations be implemented without delay.

III. Increasing the use of food for peace abroad:

1. Shipment under long-term loans, repayable in dollars over 20 years with low interest rate:

The 86th Congress added in the summer of 1959 a new title IV to Public Law 480 authorizing such loans (in addition to local currency sales under title I and grants under titles II and III). Not a single agreement has been concluded under this provision owing chiefly to two things:

(a) The Bureau of the Budget has refused to authorize the Department of Agriculture to seek from Congress reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for funds committed long term under title IV even though requests for reimbursement are invited in the law itself. This being the case, loans under title IV would only tie up and reduce CCC funds for 20 years.

(b) The National Advisory Council has looked with disfavor on long-term loans on consumer goods and obstructs such loans on agricultural commodities under title IV.

It is not certain how eager foreign countries are or would be to contract dollar loans under title IV; but inasmuch as there are in some countries mounting objections to further local currency purchases under title I and grants under title II, it could be that operations under title IV would become important if obstructions were removed.

It is recommended, in connection with the revision and extension of Public Law 480 which must occur this year, that title IV be amended to extend the repayment period to 40 years, specify an interest rate of 2 percent, and to accept payment in dollars, goods, or services.

2. Food in direct payment for labor on public works or economic development projects: Economic experts have long urged that surplus foods be granted to the governments of underdeveloped countries for direct payment in kind to labor working on dams, roads, ports, and other public works projects contributing to the development of these countries.

The 86th Congress authorized this in the summer of 1959 as an amendment to Public Law 480, but it remains a dead letter for several reasons:

(a) The provision was limited in point of time, and expires on June 30, 1961. This time limitation makes operations under the provision unattractive to some governments who are understandably reluctant to embark upon programs of doubtful continuation. Assurances that the new administration will seek removal of this time limitation might encourage expanded operations at once. Removal of the time limitation in subsequent legislation could very well result in an enormously useful program.

(b) The administration has issued instructions to the field, regarding the use of this provision, which were so stringent and constricting as to assure its nonuse. New instructions to the field are necessary.

(c) Under the law the International Cooperation Administration may not use its dollar funds in connection with public works projects, although it may sell some food or fiber for local currency to acquire simple tools and implements. This should be changed in a revision of Public Law 480.

(d) Apparently no effort has been made by our Government to combine food payments under this provision with economic development projects financed by the Development Loan Fund, or the International Development Association. Some effort and coordination here might produce spectacular results.

(e) What is needed here is strong top-level encouragement, dedicated enthusiastic people down the line, and proper Government organization and coordination.

3. Government-to-government food grants for school lunch programs: Such programs have been enormously successful in Italy and Japan (these are being "phased out"), Tunisia, and (through CARE) in Egypt, yielding not only great human benefits but political benefits as well. The International Cooperation Administration has declined to extend these programs to other countries on the following grounds:

(a) The minimum requirements for school lunch programs are bread and nonfat dried milk. Cheese, soybean oil, dried peas, and the like are, of course, desirable additions, and any one of them might in case of necessity substitute for nonfat milk. Under existing agricultural policies we are not certain that any of these commodities except wheat (for bread) will be in official surplus and available. Even a continuous surplus of nonfat milk is uncertain. There is, therefore, a legitimate reluctance to initiate programs without being certain of being able to follow through on them. This obstacle to expansion of the school lunch programs abroad can, of course, be removed by policies and arrangements which will assure sufficient quantities of the necessary commodities on the shelf to supply the prospective needs.

(b) Another obstacle is the fear that countries aided in school lunch programs will take them for granted as a permanent handout without effort to take them over and continue them with their own resources. The administration has declined to initiate programs without hard and fast phaseout arrangements. Phaseout and takeover arrangements are ultimately important, but they have been given such undue emphasis by the administration as to stunt the program. There is no question that the school

lunch program could be expanded with great human and political benefits. Here, again, top-level directives and enthusiastic, competent, dedicated staff down the line are the essence of the problem.

(NOTE.—It should be emphasized here that both with regard to the school lunch program and the public works program (see 2, above), there is considerable opportunity for the proposed Youth Peace Corps. Simple problems such as steady delivery or operating simple machinery, mixing powdered milk or opening cans or assuring sanitation on school sites assume enormous significance in many backward countries. A Youth Peace Corps might be exceedingly useful.)

4. Expanding the operations of the voluntary agencies: Simply through administrative action the relief and welfare programs carried on in foreign countries could be considerably expanded. These operations are at present greatly restricted by phaseout and other requirements. At the present time 20 U.S. voluntary agencies plus UNICEF and the U.N. Relief and Works Administration distribute foodstuffs in 99 countries and dependent areas. Largest distributors are Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. These 22 agencies have handled nearly 2 billion pounds of foodstuffs per year with a dollar value of nearly $200 million. This could be increased substantially with simple changes in regulations. It is estimated the agencies could handle in the neighborhood of 5 billion pounds per year by relaxing the phaseout restrictions laid down by the Francis committee.

These food programs yield enormous returns not only in strong and healthy bodies but also in friendship for the United States.

5. National food reserves: In 1957, Senator HUMPHREY introduced a resolution into the 1957 session of the United Nations General Assembly, calling for international cooperation to help food-deficit countries establish and maintain national food reserves and to build the necessary storage facilities, and it was passed. Since then, however, the administration has made no move to provide U.S. action which is essential to implement it.

It is generally recognized that because of lack of foreign exchange the food deficit countries most in need are unable to build national food reserves from purchases, and that if these are to be established, it will have to be done by means of food grants from the surplus producing countries.

There are, of course, many advantages to minimum national food reserves in chronically food deficit countries (especially India, Pakistan, Korea, Turkey, Egypt, and Brazil). Without reserves, markets in these countries are frequently upset by the operations of speculators who drive up prices mercilessly, causing great hardship and starvation. Also, in case of famine or other disaster, there are great delays in bringing in relief stocks from thousands of miles away.

From the point of view of the United States it would be of advantage to help food deficit countries create and maintain national food reserves because of the high storage charges in the United States. Grants for national food reserves would, of course, be largely a one-shot operation, but it might help at once to relieve the storage position and reduce storage costs in the United States.

There is no specific provision in Public Law 480 for grants to foreign countries for the purpose of building up national food reserves. Nevertheless, the President possesses adequate authority under existing law to help a number of countries make a good start toward building adequate food reserves. Subsequently it will be desirable to acquire specific authority in a revision of Public Law 480.

New legislation required

1. Immediate: Immediate additional authorization is needed for local currency sales of surplus agricultural products during the calendar year 1961 under title I of Public Law 480, and these funds should be requested independently of the thorough revision of Public Law 480 which should be requested of Congress later in the session.

The last extension of Public Law 480 authorized $1.5 billion a year for title I sales for the two calendar years 1960 and 1961. The program has moved along rapidly, however, and of the total authorization only a small amount is now uncommitted. Remaining funds will be committed or in negotiation before the end of February, and unless additional authorization is enacted before that time, negotiation of some programs of substantial size will probably have to be delayed.

Secretary Benson has sent to Congress a request for an additional $1.1 billion authorization for 1961. This figure, however, should be carefully reconsidered; it may very well be too small to accommodate transactions even now in prospect, much less those which might appear as a consequence of new administration. Upon evidence available, it appears the supplementary figure should be at least $2 billion for the remainder of calendar 1961.

2. Some time during the current session of Congress: Public Law 480 will necessarily come before the Congress for extension at the current session. Some of its most important financial authorizations (including that under title I) expire on December 31, 1961. A thorough revision of Public Law 480 to transform it from a surplus disposal act to a food-for-peace act is recommended. The revised Public Law 480 should make provision, among other things, for the following:

(a) A new statement of purpose which will transform what is now a surplus disposal act into a food-for-peace act designed to use American agricultural capacity to the fullest practicable extent to meet human need the world over and to promote world economic development.

(b) Centralized coordination and direction of the food-for-peace program.

(c) Authorization for a 5-year program. This is imperative if we are to have an effective food-for-peace program. Foreign governments must know several years in advance what they can count on from us if they are to plan ahead their own economic development; and it is also imperative if the United States is to bring about the necessary shifts in domestic production so it will have the right kinds of stocks on its shelves to meet the needs of the program.

(d) Authorization for title I sales at the rate of $3 billion a year. During the calendar years 1960 and 1961 title I sales are running at the rate of between $2 and $2.5 billion per year, and there are considerable potentialities for expansion.

(e) Authorization of emergency assistance under title II, through grants of surplus agricultural commodities, over a period of 5 years, at a rate not exceeding $500 million a year, to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other emergency relief requirements. Authorization should also be added to make grants of such commodities to assist friendly nations in establishing, expanding, or carrying out programs for the relief of chronic hunger and malnutrition.

(f) Title IV should be revised to extend the repayment period for long-term supply contracts to 40 years, and the interest rate should be specified as not exceeding 2 percent per year, repayment to be accepted in dollars, goods or services.

(g) Grants of surplus agricultural commodities over a period of 5 years to help food deficit countries, under agreements, build up and maintain minimum national food reserves (in accordance with the U.S.-sponsored resolution adopted by the United Nations on February 20, 1957).

(h) The negotiation of agreements with friendly countries to establish in such countries binational, nonprofit foundations to foster and promote research, education, health and public welfare, and to grant to such foundations unexpended local currencies which accrue to the United States as repayments of principal or payment of interest on local currency loans heretofore made by the United States under Public Law 480 or made hereafter under the Food for Peace Act.

(i) General authorization to the President, without restriction, to use or dispose of foreign inconvertible local currencies accruing to the United States under Public Law 480 operations in order to accomplish the following:

1. Maximum savings in U.S. dollar expenditures abroad;

2. Maximum practicable support of programs in foreign countries agreed to by the United States; and

3. Fullest support of the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

The steady accumulation of large amounts of inconvertible foreign currencies is placing great and increasing burdens upon U.S. foreign relations and holds potentialities which are highly dangerous. The numerous restrictions imposed by Congress upon the use or disposition of these currencies prevents their most effective use either for saving dollar exchange or for promoting U.S. objectives abroad. A number of highly competent surveys of the problem of local currencies have been made in recent years, and they all reached the conclusion that great executive latitude is required. It is important for the Government, the Congress, and the American people to recognize that these local currencies are assets that are usable only in the countries of issue, with the agreement of the countries of issue; that they are not substitutes for dollars; and that they should not be subjected to the appropriations process.

U.S. policy toward food distribution by the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization

The U.S. delegation to the United Nations submitted a resolution to the General Assembly in the fall of 1960, subsequently passed, which (1) requires the FAO to consider methods by which present programs for moving surplus food can be improved, and (2) calls on the FAO to study what new techniques can be developed to add to the uses of surpluses. The FAO findings and recommendations are to be reported to the United Nations Economic and Social Council in June 1961.

The FAO Council has already taken action to gather a small group of independent experts to assist in the task, to arrange for consultations with other groups, and has established an Advisory Committee of 13 FAO member nations, including the United States, to advise the Director General on his report to ECOSOC. This group of independent experts is to meet in late January of this year, and the Advisory Committee in late March or early April.

The United States, having initiated this activity, has no policy. It is necessary to develop one without delay.

There are two possibilities: (1) to make the FAO merely a clearinghouse with regard both to surpluses and the needs of other countries, or (2) to launch the FAO on a positive action program in certain countries, such as the Congo, where bilateral operations are difficult or impossible.

The Clearinghouse Approach

Under the clearinghouse approach, FAO would become a focal point for (1) advising recipient countries of the different pro-

grams under which commodities are available from recipient countries, (2) helping recipient countries frame program requests, (3) advising supplying countries of changes needed in program policies or operations to make them more effective, (4) a continuing analysis of surplus availability and needs and (5) supplying technical assistance to recipient countries with respect to transportation, storage, and distribution problems. One of the major considerations in the activity would be to insure that special programs did not encroach on established commercial trade. This is purely an advisory function.

The Positive Action Approach

Supplying countries would notify the FAO of the amounts and kinds of commodities they were prepared to deliver for stated forward periods. These stocks would remain in supplying countries under their control. Recipient countries having emergency food needs resulting from such events as crop failures, earthquakes, civil disturbances, or having severe, chronic malnutrition problems, and preferring to deal with a multilateral system, would apply to FAO. Agreements would be negotiated between the FAO and the recipient countries, and would include such terms as commodities, amounts, delivery schedules, and so forth. FAO would match these needs against supply commitments and decide which supplying country or countries should fill the needs. Upon order from FAO, the supplying country would be responsible for shipping commodities to the recipient country. Thus the supplying country would not only donate the commodities, but would pay costs of transportation. The commodities would be donated free of charge to recipients. FAO would provide supervision and end-use checks in the receiving countries. Other supplying countries would be invited to commit supplies for use under this program, but participation by other countries should not necessarily be a condition for the United States supporting the FAO approach.

At an early date the United States could make known that it is prepared to furnish a fixed amount of commodities, for example, $100 million worth for a 3-year forward period. Commodities which the United States could make available regularly during this period would include wheat, wheat flour, corn, cornmeal, and intermittently, depending upon CCC inventory conditions, nonfat dry milk, butter, cheese, rice and vegetable oils.

These operations would be the responsibility of a new commission within FAO. The commission would require staff help in Rome and in the field. The head of the commission would report only to the Director General on high policy matters. The Director General and the Commissioner would be advised by an advisory committee of FAO member countries representing both supplying and receiving countries.

The FAO approach would supplement present food distribution efforts. It would give a relatively simple action role to FAO which, if handled successfully, can be supplemented with other activities at a later date. Third, it would not lay down a cost share rule for other supplying countries. The surest way to kill any FAO action role is to fix a percentage contribution required of other countries of the world.

We strongly recommend that the United States support in the United Nations the positive action approach to food distribution through the Food and Agriculture Organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our recommendations are of two kinds: First, those having to do with changes in policy, administration, and legislation to improve the existing porgrams, most of which are explored at length in the body of our report; and, second, those suggesting additional measures to support and enlarge the food-for-peace concept in a national and international context.

I

1. Change policy emphasis from surplus disposal to world food needs: The present food-for-peace program remains, in its basic philosophy, a program for the disposal of unwanted U.S. surpluses. Consequently, the achievements of the food-for-peace program have been obscured and its possibilities have not been fully exploited. A new approach is needed—an approach which will emphasize that two-thirds of the world population is suffering from inadequate diet, malnutrition, and in some cases from outright starvation; that the United States is the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in world history; that adequate diet is essential to the prompt stabilization of new governments and new nations and a necessary foundation stone for their future economic development; in short, that America's agricultural productivity properly used is of basic importance to our whole foreign policy.

Such a new approach will not only help to solve the problem of our present surpluses but also will demonstrate that in many foodstuffs, particularly proteins, we have deficits rather than surpluses.

The most important single recommendation of our committee is that our Government should make this deliberate change in the emphasis and direction of our food-for-peace program. Inevitably this will require adjustment in production and marketing policies. Ultimately, however, such adjustments may well have the effect of expanding commercial markets overseas for a wider range of American agricultural products.

2. Improvements in the administration of food-for-peace programs: We recommend the following administrative measures to increase the outflow of agricultural products under the food-for-peace program. These measures can be undertaken without additional legislative authority or without changes in existing authority.

(a) The Government should utilize the authority vested in it by title IV of Public Law 480, adopted in 1959, authorizing transfers of surplus agricultural commodities under long-term loans repayable in dollars with low interest rates for periods up to 20 years. Present obstacles to the exercise of this authority should be overcome, and the program should be initiated as soon as possible.

(b) The Government should exercise the authority conferred by an amendment to Public Law 480 in 1959 to make grants of surplus commodities to underdeveloped countries for direct payment in kind to labor engaged on public works projects within the countries. This authority has hitherto not been exercised. It might very well stimulate, through the use of our food, major improvements in the local countries such as dams, roads, and ports, which would contribute materially to their economic growth.

(c) The Government should extend school lunch programs overseas. The feeding of school children at their schools is one of the most efficient ways to supplement inadequate diets and to improve health in the underdeveloped countries.

(d) The Government should help establish minimum national food reserves in countries suffering from chronic food shortage, as recommended by the United Nations General Assembly. Even in the absence of authority to provide food on a grant basis for the establishment of food reserves, much can be done under existing authority to help create such reserves.

3. Expanding the operations of the voluntary agencies: American voluntary agencies have played a great part in the distribution of agricultural commodities overseas. The Government should remove all unnecessary obstacles to their operations. In particular:

(a) The Government should make firm supply commitments to the voluntary agencies for longer time periods.

(b) The Government should modify present restrictions requiring programs to be planned so that they will terminate in a specific and limited period of time. In areas of the greatest need "phase out" restrictions are a handicap to setting up and carrying on useful programs.

(c) The Government should process certain agricultural commodities to permit their more efficient use by the voluntary agencies. Particularly, we would recommend the processing of soybeans to provide fats and oils for voluntary distribution, and the processing of cotton into textiles for use as sheets, pillowcases, and other items in hospitals and charitable institutions overseas.

Furthermore, open market purchases should be made where necessary in support of voluntary programs.

4. Legislative measures: We recommend the following legislative measures:

(a) Immediate authorization of at least $2 billion for the balance of calendar 1961 under title I of Public Law 480.

(b) Public Law 480 should be exended for a 5-year period. It will expire, at least in its most important provisions, on December 31, 1961. Total authorization under title I of the extended act should be at least $3 billion a year instead of the present $1.5, and under title II, $500 million a year.

(c) Public Law 480 should be revised not only to include larger authorizations, but to improve the concept and the administration of the program. In particular, the bill should expand the loan authority to permit 40-year loans for the purchase of agricultural commodities; it should provide specific authority to grant agricultural commodities to establish national food reserves; and it should confer authority to create binational foundations for the use of local currencies in health, educational, and other activities; and it should contain full authorization to the President, without restriction, to use, manage, and dispose of local currencies accumulating under the program in order to save dollars and make the fullest contribution to the foreign policies of the United States.

5. Food distribution through the U.N.: We recommend that the United States seek the establishment under the FAO of a food-distribution agency to operate in areas where bilateral approaches are difficult or impossible. Such an agency could draw supplies from surplus countries and direct them to deficit areas. It should not, of course, duplicate or interfere with satisfactory national operations in the field. At the outset, its concern would be primarily with areas which are particularly the responsibility of the United Nations, such as the Congo. Later on its activities might be expanded to fill any obvious gaps in the nation-to-nation programs.

In addition, the FAO should continue to expand its present function as a clearinghouse for statistical information of food needs and food surpluses.

6. The food-for-peace director: The food-for-peace program necessarily involves both the Agriculture Department and the State Department, the former being responsible for the food supply and the latter for international relationships. It would be unwise, in our opinion, to attempt to place entire responsibility for the food-for-peace program in either of these two major departments. In addition to State and Agriculture, other departments and agencies are involved in the program, including the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department.

To insure that the program functions vigorously, therefore, it is necessary to have

a central point of responsibility and initiative. We are pleased to note that the President-elect has recognized this in the appointment of a Food for Peace Director. In our opinion this officer should continue to be responsible to the President and serve as his principal adviser and agent in connection with the food-for-peace program. The Food for Peace Director should be responsible for establishing policies, for determining the requirements in oversea areas for food and fiber under the program, for expediting the fulfilling of these requirements, for coordinating the operations of the program, for collecting and publishing information and data on the program, and for reporting on it to the President. The Food for Peace Director should have sufficient staff to carry out these functions, and direct access to the President when required.

It will be appropriate to consider the reallocation of statutory powers and authorities only after some experience of the program under the new Director. At the present time we are not prepared to make recommendations on the rearrangement of statutory powers and responsibilities.

II

1. National Advisory Committee on Food for Peace: We recommend that the President appoint a National Advisory Committee on Food for Peace. This would be a committee of citizens representing the major voluntary organizations in the areas of education, oversea distribution and technical assistance, labor, religion, business, agriculture, and the cooperative movement. It would be the function of this committee to review the program from time to time, to make recommendations of policy to the President, and to enlarge public understanding of the importance of the program.

2. World Food Conference: There is great need for world education and world understanding of nutritional needs and food production problems. It is particularly important that the newly developing areas do not neglect the agricultural side of their economic programs and at the same time that they lift their sights on the nutritional levels of their countries. Furthermore, systems of emergency feeding and distribution to the needy are rudimentary or nonexistent in many countries, and local voluntary organizations need to be created or motivated to take part in these activities.

To stimulate a great international effort in this whole area of food, fibers and nutrition, we recommend that a world food conference be called, bringing together from each participating country not only government representation but also delegates from farm cooperatives and voluntary distribution organizations. This conference might be called by the FAO, and in any case it should be held under its leadership. The initiative for calling such conference might well come from the President.

3. Food-for-peace missions—Africa: We recommend that special missions be sent to a number of countries and regions to explore with governments in these areas the possibility of raising nutritional standards through the use of our agricultural products, expanding their own agricultural production, and improving food distribution. In our opinion, much is to be gained through well-staffed, high-level intergovernmental surveys of this character. A few areas might well be chosen as pilot areas.

In particular, the food needs of Africa, which seem to have been neglected under the current food-for-peace program, demand immediate attention. In India, where a massive food-for-peace program has already been set on foot, a survey of nutritional needs might be useful for forward planning.

Such missions should have their commission and instructions from the President. They might well be selected and organized by the Food for Peace Director, and include prominent American citizens not in Government, as well as appropriate governmental officials.

THE COST OF LIVING AND FACTORY EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Pay Buys Less Than in 1955," written by Bernard D. Nossiter, staff reporter, and published in the Washington Post of January 28, 1961, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The article indicates that factory workers with jobs ended 1960 worse off than in 1955 as living costs inched up to another peak last month.

Not only are we burdened with the increasing and very difficult problem of unemployment, to which President Kennedy in his economic message has made such graphic reference, but we are also burdened with the rising cost of living, which, despite wage increases, has continued to increase. The wage increases have failed to keep pace with the rising cost of living, so that the average American worker finds himself a little less better off than he was in 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAY BUYS LESS THAN IN 1955

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Even factory workers with jobs ended 1960 worse off than in 1955 as living costs inched up to another peak last month. The Labor Department reported yesterday that 4 percent had been sliced over the year from the buying power of the average worker's paycheck.

A combination of steadily rising prices and the business slump are the basic reasons, although snowstorms made the December picture even bleaker.

But more disturbing is the trend over 5 years in the affluent society. Here's what has happened to the purchasing power of weekly take-home or after-tax pay for a married factory worker with two children (the totals are expressed in dollars of the same buying strength that money had during 1947–49):

December 1955	$63.64
December 1956	64.86
December 1957	61.89
December 1958	64.35
December 1959	65.74
December 1960	63.02

So, the employed workers' pay bought less last month than in any recent year except slump-ridden 1957.

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS

Normally, the figure rises from November to December because overtime increases, but it fell 14 cents last month. The storms played some part. But so did the latest recession which has brought the heaviest layoffs in the higher paid steel, auto and machinery industries.

The 5-year pattern raises some new questions about the structure of the economy. Some experts think that the repeated slumps and weak recoveries—another way of talking about slow economic growth—can be traced to a lack of demand or buying power from the great mass of consumers. While the figures for factory pay are far from conclusive, they strengthen this argument.

If the plight of factory workers is typical of wage earners generally—the biggest portion of the population—then, this argument goes, the Nation's incomes are badly distributed. Relatively bigger pay increases are needed in the middle and lower brackets to buy the goods that an expanding industry can produce. This theory suggests that idle plants and idle men are the result of an inadequate demand for the Nation's potential output.

TEN DOLLARS BUYS LESS

As for living costs or consumer prices in December, they behaved about as they have all year. They rose one-tenth of 1 percent above November, largely because of higher meat and housing costs.

The Labor Department's index has edged upward in 10 of the last 11 months and now stands at 127.5. This means a middle-income city dweller pays $12.75 for goods and services that cost $10 between 1947 and 1949.

The November to December rise will lift the pay of about 150,000 aircraft, metal, and trucking workers 1 and 2 cents an hour. Their contracts have escalation clauses that tie wages to changes in the index.

CLIMB UNINTERRUPTED

Last month's prices averaged 1.6 percent above December a year ago. For 1960 as a whole, living costs rose 1.5 percent or a little less than the annual rise over the past 5 years.

But the climb has been uninterrupted. The buying power of the 10-dollar bill of 1955 was trimmed to $9.05 last year.

In 1960, every major sector of the cost index rose except transportation. Lower auto prices held this component down. The biggest advances, as usual, were in medical care. The climbing costs of hospital insurance outstripped the bigger fees charged by doctors and dentists. Drug prices, under attack by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee began edging down in recent months.

AMMUNITION FOR KENNEDY

The bigger gains in hospital insurance will provide ammunition for proponents of President Kennedy's medical care plan.

The recession, as usual, has had no effect in lowering living costs. Since the business high point in May, consumer prices have risen at a yearly pace of nearly 2 percent. Food is higher. So are services, the wide-ranging category that includes haircuts, rents and utility prices. While price tags on some hard goods have been trimmed, commodities as a whole have gone up, too.

DISTRICT ABOVE AVERAGE

In the Washington area, the Labor Department counted food prices only last month. They rose four-tenths of 1 percent from November or twice as much as the national average. From December a year ago, local food was 3 percent more expensive or in line with costs across the country.

Last month housewives here paid more for chicken, beef, veal, eggs, flour, tomatoes, potatoes, and bananas. Oranges were cheaper and so were chocolate bars because those with a sweet tooth got more candy for the same price.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF THE BURNS CREEK PROJECT IN THE UPPER SNAKE RIVER VALLEY, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as certified by Idaho's Secretary of State, the Honorable Arnold Williams, did on February 1, 1961, approve House Joint Memorial No. 2, petitioning the Congress and the President of the United States to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Burns Creek

project in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and to implement such authorization with necessary appropriations.

My esteemed colleague, the Honorable HENRY DWORSHAK, the senior Senator from the State of Idaho, and I have introduced at this session of the Congress, S. 66, a bill to authorize the construction of the Burns Creek project.

Mr. President, concurring in the expressed sentiments of the resolution, I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the multiple-purpose use of the water resources of the Snake River has become the backbone of the economy of Idaho during the past more than 50 years, the Palisades Reservoir and powerplant, which is located on the upper Snake River near the eastern boundary of Idaho, being the most recent addition to this multiple-purpose use; and

Whereas at the time of and ever since the planning of the Palisades project it was and has generally been recognized by the Federal Power Commission and other Government departments, as well as by many persons and groups interested in the development of the resources of this State, that the maximum benefits to the Nation and to the State of Idaho in terms of power production and water storage for irrigation purposes will be attainable from the Palisades project only through the construction of a reregulating dam downstream to link irrigation storage releases with the powerplant of the Palisades project, and the Burns Creek project was designed for integration operationally and financially with the Palisades project in order to attain the maximum of complementary benefits from both projects; and

Whereas there is urgent need in the State of Idaho for greater power production and increased reservoir capacity for the storage of water for irrigation purposes; and

Whereas the Burns Creek project was determined to be feasible by the Secretary of the Interior in his report, dated February 26, 1957, and both the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget reported favorably on legislation to authorize this project by letters directed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the 85th Congress, which committee reported favorably on the bill (S. 2757) in the 85th Congress which would have authorized the construction of the Burns Creek project, and recommended that it do pass: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, to proceed with all due speed to enact legislation similar to Senate bill 2757 of the 85th Congress authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and to implement such authorization with necessary appropriations; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

JOHN A. CARVER, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF INTERIOR FOR PUBLIC LAND RESOURCES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am very proud of my former administrative assistant, John A. Carver, Jr., who has been appointed Assistant Secretary of Interior for Public Land Resources in the Kennedy administration.

I think one of the finest accolades afforded Mr. Carver resulting from his appointment was an editorial in the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, one of the outstanding newspapers of the West.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN CARVER'S WASHINGTON APPOINTMENT

Idaho and the Pacific Northwest are fortunate indeed in the appointment yesterday of John A. Carver, Jr., of Boise, as Assistant Secretary of Interior for Land Resources in the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

As administrative assistant to Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, Carver has won a fine reputation in congressional circles since he went to Washington, D.C., just 4 years ago. CHURCH has been one of the most spectacularly endowed freshman Senators to arrive on the Washington scene in many sessions. His oratorical skill, quick grasp of complex issues and persuasive personality made his youth an asset rather than a liability in the age-conscious, seniority-bound Senate. CHURCH impressed his fellow Senators quickly with some excellent speeches on major issues—Heils Canyon Dam and statehood for Alaska, for example—and zoomed to assignments on key senatorial committees which are prized by Senate veterans.

Naturally, the administrative assistant of such a remarkably successful senatorial newcomer would be eyed closely by the major participants in Federal policymaking. An administrative assistant, to be sure, does not transform his boss into an outstanding Senator. However, the complexities and pressures of modern political life dictate that any senatorial office must function as a team operation if it is to function well. The administrative assistant who does his job capably is a figure to be reckoned with in Washington politics, and the practitioners of politics know it.

They quickly learned that Carver was one of the assistants who did his job superbly. A thorough student of government, a keen observer of politics, and a dynamic, forward-pushing advocate of political action, Carver quickly became one of the outstanding senatorial assistants in Washington. His own talents for effective government were sharpened rather quickly by contact with one of the best of the Capital's administrative assistants, Irving Hoff, aid for many years to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington. Carver and Hoff became good friends and close political associates, and Hoff was an outstanding tutor in the ways of Washington.

It is not surprising then that the driving, dedicated Kennedy team, searching everywhere for the talent, energy, and zest for government which are essential to a successful administration, should select this vigorous young Idahoan to supervise the land resources agencies and programs within the Interior Department.

The assignment will not win much public notice, perhaps, because Carver will function in the background, with the next Secretary of the Interior, Representative Stewart Udall, Democrat, of Arizona, heading the entire operation. But Carver will have an important voice in such Interior Department areas as grazing and Indian affairs, for example.

Obviously this will be a voice, whether publicly raised or carefully modulated behind the curtain of public affairs, which will be of tremendous importance to Idaho and the Pacific Northwest. The region should be grateful that an able, intelligent, and dedicated Idahoan has been chosen for this vital role in the next administration.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just learned that the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, our 17th nuclear-powered submarine, has successfully completed its first sea trials. It is the fifth nuclear-powered submarine capable of launching Polaris missiles and with the *George Washington*, *Patrick Henry*, *Robert E. Lee*, and *Theodore Roosevelt*, will provide a powerful, moving, virtually undetectable deterrent against attack.

These nuclear-powered submarines, which are the backbone of our Polaris-firing fleet, owe their present success, in large measure, to the efforts of one man, one dedicated and determined naval officer who first appreciated their significance many years ago. I am referring to Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

Admiral Rickover's achievements were officially recognized by the Navy in January when he was awarded the Navy's highest peacetime award, the Distinguished Service Cross. Now, as twice in the past, rumors are flying to the effect that the Navy is planning to retire Vice Admiral Rickover. I sincerely hope that these rumors are mistaken. I sincerely hope that the Navy can and will keep Admiral Rickover in a position where he can continue to contribute his great talents and abilities to the strengthening of American security. In this time of national crisis, we cannot afford to dispense with the services of Hyman G. Rickover for any reason whatsoever.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Secretary of the Navy and I believe all possible steps should be taken to see that Admiral Rickover is retained in the U.S. Navy. The scheduled increase in production of missile-bearing nuclear-powered submarines make the services of Admiral Rickover more necessary than ever for our country's strength.

THE NEED TO STUDY CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on January 26 I cosponsored and commented on two conflict-of-interest bills which have been referred to the Judiciary Committee. It is my impression that a great many people would like to see the Congress revise and update our conflict-of-interest statutes and seriously study ways in which to apply similar

statutes to the Members of the Congress. We cannot have a double standard in national ethics.

The recent confirmation of the nominations which President Kennedy submitted to the Congress raised a number of questions about the severity and impact of the conflict of interest statutes which now apply to the executive branch. This would be an appropriate time to review this entire matter and at the same time carefully study the ways in which to implement new conflict of interest statutes to apply to Members of Congress and employees of the legislative branch.

The New York City Bar Association has done a significant amount of research in this area and has presented a number of proposals which would be of interest to the committee. A great many other groups and interested individuals have developed ideas and programs which would be well worth our study.

Mr. President, last month, the Washington Post commented editorially on the need to undertake such hearings. Their editorial has just been called to my attention. It is an excellent and thoughtful statement on the need to revise and restructure our executive conflict-of-interest statutes. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF SERVICE

The Senate Armed Services Committee has taken the only obvious course open to it under the law in requiring incoming high Defense Department officials to give up all financial interest in firms doing business with the Department. The law has been interpreted to require divestiture even though the interest may be small and the connection remote between said business and the official's duties. The holding of 10 shares in an electric company that sells power to some remote airbase, or a share in almost any paper clip company are, we take it, verboten. The law was thus applied to Mr. Eisenhower's Secretaries and could hardly be softened by a mere committee consent.

So vast and varied are the operations of the Defense Department that there is hardly any important industrial investment opportunity that is not foreclosed under this interpretation of the law. The statute is nearly a century old but, on its face, remains as fair and necessary as any simple rule in this field can be. The effect today, however, is to demand wholly outrageous sacrifices for an opportunity to serve.

The several ways suggested in the hearings by which the law's effect could be softened without compromising its basic intent ought now to have the fresh and sympathetic attention of Congress. And while they are at it, Members might well look to their own favored legal position in this respect. They could more gracefully exact these tributes to purity from others if they themselves had to make at least some formal accounting of potential conflicts.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR—SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the only international trade fair scheduled annually in the United States west of Chicago is celebrating its 10th anniversary in Seattle, Wash., April 20–30, 1961. It is the oldest international trade fair in the United States.

This is the Washington State International Trade Fair, a nonprofit organization supported by the State of Washington, by ports of entry in our State, and by business and labor organizations in our area.

Through its first 9 years our trade fair has been a display of products and a cultural exchange between all the nations of the Pacific rim. It has grown constantly larger and more effective and this year is expanding to include European and African nations for the first time.

Our trade fair is a meeting place for buyers and sellers. It includes a merchandising clinic where American business methods are fully explained and demonstrated to our visitors' satisfaction. It is a place where lasting associations are formed for mutual profit and friendship.

This annual international gathering on the shores of Puget Sound is a reminder that we are all neighbors in the modern world.

The personnel who come from Europe to our trade fair arrive in 10½ hours and American store buyers, representing 43 million Americans reach Seattle by jet in less than 2 hours.

Thus, buyers and sellers from all over the world meet in Seattle as quickly as they met only a few years ago, at a county seat.

We invite all of you to our trade fair to see the remarkable displays and to meet with our friends and business associates from all over the world.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business in the morning hour, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business, Calendar No. 28, S. 153.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, S. 153.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 153) to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Arkansas desires to discuss the reorganization bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is nothing new in the proposed legislation. The bill would simply extend the Reorganization Act, in all of its terms and provisions, identically as it is at present. It would extend until June 1963, the time for the President to exercise the authority and powers which the present act confers upon him.

In times past, in the course of the development of the present law, controversies have arisen with respect to its provisions, its limitations, the authority it grants, and the veto power of Congress with respect to reorganization plans. The conflicting views, however, over the past dozen years, have finally been resolved. Each side has made some concessions. The result is that the statute now, in my opinion, adequately preserves the integrity of the legislative process, and, at the same time, confers upon the President the power to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. No agency of the executive branch of the Government is now exempt from that authority. This was not true in the original acts passed by Congress.

So far as I know, there is no objection to the bill or to the statute in its present form.

The power to reorganize has been given to past Presidents; certainly the same authority should be accorded to President Kennedy and the new administration. I therefore trust the bill as reported by the committee will pass.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas in his statement relating to this proposal. The President and the new administration need the new reorganization authority, as did the preceding administrations. As the Senator has so well stated, we in the Committee on Government Operations believe, as a result of the many times this legislation has been before Congress, that the so-called wrinkles have been ironed out; that we have been able to arrive at a working relationship between the two Houses of Congress and the executive branch, so that all possible authority that is required for an effective reorganization is granted, while at the same time the legislative branch has not abrogated its responsibility in the field of legislative action.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is true. No one has received everything he wants in the proposed legislation; but I do not believe there is anything really at issue now which is fundamental to either side. I believe the bill provides adequate power for the President, in all areas of the executive branch of the Government, to submit reorganization plans, even to the extent of establishing new departments of government. That was an issue at one time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At one time there were as many as 21 different agencies. That situation simply limited the President's field of operations to such a point that it was almost ineffective. In my judgment, the bill in its present form contains adequate safeguards for Congress and adequate, broad author-

ity for the President to accomplish the results desired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. President Eisenhower was fully aware of the need for authority of this kind, because of the ponderous nature of government and the growing complications and functions of government year after year. As a matter of fact, the question of reorganization and the extension of the act on a permanent basis were matters for leadership discussion. I made some endeavor in the last Congress to secure the consideration of the President's bill for a permanent Reorganization Act.

I have no objection to the extension of the act for a 2-year period, but I want the record to be abundantly clear that the previous administration was fully aware of the need for the reorganization authority and endeavored to secure its enactment; but, tragically enough, we failed. I am grateful, therefore to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for bringing the bill before the Senate at an early date in the new session, because I think what is sought is necessary. The reorganization of the Government is a continuing process, one which must be carried on almost constantly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished minority leader. There are different views with respect to whether the act should be made permanent. As we proceed each 2 years to reevaluate and renew the authority and to extend the act further, we may all conclude later that the authority should be made permanent and, therefore, not be subject to review each 2 years by Congress.

The fact that today the Senate can consider a bill without any change in the last statute enacted is indicative that if reorganization powers are needed continuously, now that the issues have been resolved, hereafter we might well consider making the authority permanent, though I am not making an unreserved committal at the moment. However, I think it has been well that we did not make it permanent in the beginning, because in the processes of reviewing the act at intervals, we have so improved it that now I believe it is a pretty good law. The fundamental considerations of the executive branch and of Congress are pretty well protected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that what the Senator from Arkansas says generally about the law and the objectives of the law is all right. The law deals, I know, with the whole executive establishment, but there are some agencies which are the arms of Congress, so established by law. In other words, they report to Congress. It is true that we allow the Executive to make the appointments to the agencies. Most of the nominations come for consideration before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am the chairman. Those agencies include the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, among others. In the basic law creating those agencies, which is very clear in its implication, they were intended to be creatures of Congress, to do certain work which Congress intended they should do. Congress could not spell out, for instance, the type of power license to be issued. We created the Federal Power Commission and said, "Let the Commission act for Congress and hold hearings and make the decisions."

Such agencies come under the executive branch of the Government only insofar as the President may appoint its members. Congress placed the appointive power with the President. The nominations of the commissioners are confirmed by Congress.

I have no objection to what the Senator from Arkansas or the administration is trying to do with respect to the reorganization of some of the agencies. I suppose no one has been more critical of the so-called independent agencies in the administration than I have. However, many of the agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, have had more work thrust upon them.

No one has been more critical of the independent agencies than I have been or my committee has been, and they have done some things which, in some cases, have required amendments to the law. We have submitted some proposed amendments. In other cases, the agencies weave around themselves a web from which they do not seem to be able to extricate themselves administratively. Sometimes there is a question of the sufficiency of personnel.

In addition, sometimes the number of the members of such a commission is at issue. I am not critical of individual commissioners; but it has been suggested that the Interstate Commerce Commission might be less unwieldy if, instead of having 11 members, it had 4, 5, or even 3 members.

It has been suggested, at the other extreme, that there be a director, and also a board of appeals, in case some persons did not like action which had been taken, and wished to appeal.

It is true, as was pointed out by the Landis report and by our committees during the last 5 or 6 years, that the average case before one of these agencies takes 15 or 16 months, and sometimes takes even years. The result of such delay is that the barn door may be locked after the horse has been stolen. In addition, many small firms, such as trucking concerns, cannot afford to have adequate representation before these agencies in Washington.

I believe that the members of these agencies individually do very fine work; but the collective situation is a bad one.

So the purposes of Senate bill 153 are good. However, we must remember that these agencies are arms of Congress.

Let me point out to the Senator from Arkansas that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction over these agencies, which have been created chiefly in the field of transportation, interstate commerce, communications, railroads, buslines, pipelines, and so forth. Suppose the President sends to Congress a plan calling for reorganization of the Interstate Commerce Commission, let us say. Our committee has responsibility for that agency, and reports to the Senate the nominations of the members of the Commission, and makes recommendations regarding the action to be taken by the Senate on the nominations. Our committee is also constantly concerned with any necessary changes in the laws relating to the Commission. In other words, all that responsibility rests with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. If such a message were sent to Congress, it would be referred to the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]; and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would have nothing to say about the proposed reorganization, despite the fact that, actually, we believe such a reorganization should be made.

I refer to the practicalities of this situation and the responsibilities of the standing Senate committees in regard to these matters. In particular, I refer to the responsibility of our committee, because the situation as regards these agencies is unusual, inasmuch as they are arms of Congress. Is our committee to be abolished? Are we to be allowed to have anything to say about plans to reorganize these agencies? It is true that we have an opportunity to testify before the Government Operations Committee, and the Senator from Arkansas would be most generous in that respect. But this situation is one which we confront from day to day in regard to measures which relate to activities in interstate and foreign commerce, which are the responsibility of our committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is actually referring to the rules of the Senate. I have no authority to make any committal which would contravene the rules of the Senate.

My own view is that there would never be any objection by me, as a Member of the Senate, to having the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter concerned study such a plan and also make its recommendations.

But it is my understanding that—as the rules now provide—when a reorganization plan is sent to Congress, it is referred to the Committee on Government Operations; but in order to have any action taken on the plan, a resolution of disapproval must be submitted. Any Senator can submit it, as I understand. In other words, if no such resolution is submitted and voted on, the plan will go into effect. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So if such a reorganization plan came to the Congress, if the Senator from Washington decided that his committee wished to investigate and consider and hold hearings on the plan, the committee could proceed by means of authorizing the chairman of

the committee to submit a resolution of disapproval, and that resolution would be referred to the Committee on Government Operations; and before that committee, the Senator from Washington could be heard. But there would never be any objection on my part to having any committee which had legislative jurisdiction of the subject matter also consider it. However, of course, I cannot change the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that. But I am trying to work out some satisfactory arrangement, because this matter is a peculiar one. Our standing committees have jurisdiction over various fields. For instance, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has jurisdiction over that field, although the Executive has authority to determine the policies of the Department of Agriculture and to appoint the Secretary of Agriculture.

On the other hand, our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce handles five independent regulatory agencies which are arms of the Congress; and those agencies report to the Congress, not to the Executive. So that places a somewhat different responsibility on our committee.

Personally, it is satisfactory to me to have the Committee on Government Operations take over this responsibility; and if that were done, it would save me a great deal of work.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But I am not seeking additional work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, I am not speaking for the committee.

The other day, in the Committee on Rules and Administration, we discussed this matter, and I was almost tempted to say that all of us might as well resign, and then attempt to be appointed to membership on the Committee of Government Operations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would not object to that——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Neither would I because the committee has an excellent chairman.

But the various standing committees have responsibility for the agencies to which such reorganizations relate.

Suppose there came to the Congress a message which called for reorganization of the Federal Power Commission or the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee which works with those agencies and has to pass on the laws and the policies which affect them would then have nothing to say about such a reorganization, except as that committee might report to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The standing committee which has legislative authority in that field might report a resolution of disapproval.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the committee would have to appear before the Committee on Government Operations, just as any other witness would, in order to discuss the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course the chairman of that committee and its other members would be welcome to appear before the Government Operations Committee. But, in my judgment, there is nothing to prevent the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has legislative jurisdiction, from immediately taking up any such reorganization plan which might be submitted; and that committee could consider a resolution of disapproval and could hold hearings on it, before it reported it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Our committee could consider such a resolution and could hold all the hearings on it that it wished to, but could not vote on it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, it could be voted on by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and if our committee did not act on it within 10 days, that committee could submit a resolution to discharge our committee from further consideration of the resolution.

I understand what the Senator from Washington is referring to. However, so far as the rules of the Senate are concerned, I am powerless to make to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce some committal that I would have no authority to initiate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It seems to me this matter is not at all insoluble. First of all, if a majority of the Senate disagreed with a reorganization plan, the plan would be dead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under the leadership of the Senator from Washington, held hearings on a plan which related to reorganization of one of the regulatory agencies which come within the jurisdiction of that committee, and if the committee subsequently expressed its disapproval of the proposed reorganization——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or its approval.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, either one. If it expressed its approval, that would have great effect in assuring all other Senators that the plan was satisfactory, because that committee is much more expert in regard to matters which relate to the entire area of the regulatory agencies.

If the committee expressed its disapproval, and then reported to the Senate a resolution of disapproval, certainly that would have its effect on the thinking of the other Members of the Senate. Indeed, I venture to say that such a resolution of disapproval by the Senator's committee would carry with it a majority vote in this body, because of the high regard which all Members of the Senate have for that committee, as well as for the other committees. We generally go along with the recommendations made by our committees, because they have their specific assignments.

But, under the rules, the Senator from Arkansas would be required to hold some hearings on all reorganization plans if resolutions of disapproval were entered. However, this does not prevent other committees from holding hearings on exactly the same subject.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This would be the procedure: If it were desired to have adopted a resolution of disapproval, that committee would then report to the Senate that resolution, but it would then be referred to the Committee on Government Operations. However, as the distinguished acting majority leader has said, there would certainly be quite an influence in this body if a committee sponsored a resolution of disapproval. I think the Senator from Minnesota will vouch for the statement that I am not as enthusiastic about some of the reorganization plans as are some of my colleagues, and some of the members of my committee. I have opposed as many of them as I have supported, particularly those that became controversial. I have not gone overboard. However, there is involved a rules problem that I cannot resolve for the Senator; but I will cooperate with his committee, and every committee in Congress that has legislative jurisdiction, with respect to getting their sentiments and getting their views, and giving them every opportunity for study.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas would do that. The only reason why I raised the point was that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for example, has jurisdiction over matters relating to the Commerce Department. When it is suggested that we would have no reason to examine the reorganization plan of the President referring to an executive department, I point out that, in the narrow field of these particular agencies, they are arms of the Congress by the basic laws which established them; and that becomes a little different matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator. I would be very jealous about wanting to know what the effect and impact of these reorganization plans would be. In some areas, sometimes it might be better to deal with the matters by legislation, rather than by reorganization plans. There have been some reorganization plans in the past when I felt reorganization was not the proper approach; that a legislative approach was needed, where there would be an opportunity for amendment, change, and modification, as we discussed and studied the problem, because a reorganization plan, as Senators know, is not subject to amendment. Sometimes I think we defeated one or two on the floor of the Senate when we felt the matter could be dealt with better by legislation than by a reorganization plan, or where the reorganization plan simply went too far, and did something we felt it should not do. The proponents came back with another reorganization plan. I think that occurred in one or two instances. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With reference to the so-called Landis report, and there have been others that were similar, I agree with the objectives, because, surely, we need to do something about the independent agencies; but they are arms of Congress. There are a lot of "Hill" lawyers who try to tell us the situation is different, but they are not correct. I think no responsible person looking at the history of the basic legislation establishing these agencies will doubt that they are arms of Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that he is to be commended for discussing the matter at this time. I think he is performing a real service. All I can say is that I cannot go beyond the rules, but I can assure the Senator that he will have every cooperation from the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations to see that his rights are protected, to the end that reorganization plans do not go beyond what they are supposed to, or fail to meet responsibilities that they should meet.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the Senator from Washington that if anybody feels the Senate may not have an opportunity to pass on any reorganization plan, there is the right to discharge a committee from consideration of a specific matter, and we have the right to exercise that power. So at no point does it get beyond the control of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; and once the matter gets on the calendar, it is privileged, and can be brought up at any time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was my pleasure and honor to serve under the distinguished Senator from Arkansas at the time the reorganization bill was put into effect in 1949. As one who voted with the Senator and helped to consider the matter when it originally became law, it was my hope that eventually these powers would come back to Congress, and we would not be surrendering the power of reorganization indefinitely.

It has been my impression in recent years that all the reorganizations that have been accomplished by reorganization plans could have been accomplished by means of legislation, if needed. I speak only for myself, but what I fear, in this regard, is that over a period of time Congress shall have surrendered this power, and it shall never repose with us again. The President may come to feel that Congress need not be consulted, or that it is not within the power of Congress to regulate both executive and independent agencies. However, if the President cared to follow that procedure, it would be simple as an infringement of the executive prerogatives, for some of us to oppose a reorganization plan that we thought might not be wise.

I hope the Senator will consider, both as chairman of a committee and as a Member of this body, that these powers should, perhaps after the end of 2 years, at least reside in the Congress for a while. Congress has been willing to cooperate with the Executive. I believe that, whenever a reorganization proposal has had merit, Congress has granted it to the President by means of reorganization, just as it would by not interposing an objection to a reorganization plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may point out that right now it is back in the hands of Congress. Congress can extend this power, grant it again, or withhold it. I believe it expired in June 1959. It has been in the Congress since that time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say I think it is a very healthful situation that it comes back to the Congress from time to time, and, if there is no real necessity for passing reorganization bills, that it stay in the Congress. I would agree that a new administration, for a period of time, should have power to submit reorganization plans.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are those who feel, and they are conscientious about it, that the authority should be granted only for a certain period, that the power should come back to Congress every 2 or 3 years, so we can review it and see what has been done under the law, with the idea of amending existing statutes, or withholding the authority if it has not had good results. There is a difference of opinion as to whether reorganizations have had good results. I have seen some pass that I did not think were good. The resolution of disapproval was defeated over my protest. However, I cannot always be right, and out of the whole there has come some good, because it is difficult for Congress to process legislation in these fields. We all know that. The machinery is quite slow in these fields. But if presented, we have an opportunity to vote on the proposals. It does expedite matters, to say the least. I would not argue that expedition and efficiency and better organization always go hand in hand.

There have been instances in which reorganizations which were good in improving the economy and the efficiency of the Government have been effected.

Under the law the Congress will have the final say. The Congress can veto any proposal.

Originally, it took a concurrent resolution of both Houses to veto a reorganization plan. I always opposed that. I would oppose it now. Under the terms of the law one House of the Congress can, by a resolution of disapproval, prevent a reorganization plan from becoming law. That is the way it should be, in my judgment. I would not vote to relax that restraint on the part of the Congress. I think that power should be vested in the Congress. If one House votes to disapprove a reorganization plan, it cannot become law, exactly the same as the situation if one House disapproves a bill, which does not become law. That is the provision with regard to reorganization plans.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree thoroughly with what the chairman of the committee has said. This will not vacate permanently the power of the Congress. I was one who, in the committee, held the position that a 2-year extension was long enough. That would give us a chance to look at the matter again, which I think we should have. I think also that the Executive does have a responsibility to make suggestions of this kind.

With respect to the question raised by the Senator from Washington, I think the Senator can get some consolation from the terms of the act itself, as the language appears on page 5 of the report. There is at least an implicit recognition of the point the Senator makes concerning agencies which are responsible to Congress and which are created as branches of the Congress.

Section 7 reads:

> When used in this Act, the term "agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

That language certainly implies that those areas of executive activity which are in fact branches of the Congress are considered to be in some special classification as to which Congress has a special responsibility.

Speaking for the minority, I concur completely in the willingness expressed by the chairman of the committee to take any and every step necessary to see to it that the appropriate legislative committee does have an opportunity to hold hearings and does have an opportunity to make its recommendations. We are not trying to superimpose our judgment upon all the committees of the Congress. This is our responsibility. We have a right to make recommendations in respect to it. Certainly, the legislative committees which have responsibilities in areas such as those the Senator mentioned, I think not only should have the right but also have the duty to hold hearings and to make recommendations, pro or con.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me quite clear that the only agencies which are to be exempted from the operation of the law are the two mentioned in the act itself. All the other regulatory agencies, as to which the distinguished Senator from Washington expressed concern, are to be included within the purview of the law. Whether that is a wise course or not is another matter, but it seems to be very clear that the enumeration of the two in the act will exclude all the others.

It is quite apparent, from looking at the list of agencies which have been reorganized in the past, as shown on pages 8, 9, and 10 of the able report of the distinguished committee, that many of the agencies mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Washington, whose activities fall within the peculiar field of jurisdiction of the committee which he so ably heads, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have been reorganized in the past.

Those reorganizations have stood. I note that in at least one case, that of the

Federal Power Commission, a majority of the Senate, expressing its will upon the matter, did not approve the reorganization, but the majority was less than 49, then required by the terms of the law to be cast against any particular reorganization plan to stop it from becoming operative.

If the Senator from Florida is correctly advised, it would now require 50 or 51 affirmative votes to be cast against a particular program, or in favor of a resolution to disapprove a reorganization plan, in the Senate, to upset it. On that point is the Senator from Florida correctly advised?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is incorrectly advised on that. Under the present law it requires only a majority of those who are present and voting. The provision to which the Senator referred has been changed. That was the provision of the former act. The present act provides for only a majority vote.

I have always maintained that is the correct procedure. It maintains and preserves legislative integrity over these matters. The reorganization plan may not become law if a majority of either House opposes the plan. In that circumstance a plan should not go into effect, in my judgment.

That is the law as it is now written. I hope the provision will remain that way. So far as the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations is concerned, the law is going to stay that way. We do not wish to prevent the President from presenting his plans—whatever plans he has—but I do not wish to see the Congress abdicate its responsibility. I should like to preserve legislative integrity.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator will find that provision on page 5 of the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the Senator for his insistence that a majority of the Members of the Senate participating in a session when a quorum is present certainly should have the right to disapprove a reorganization plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I fought for that provision for years, and we finally obtained it. The House has gone along with it now.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the distinguished Senator on that.

I should like to ask whether the Senator from Florida is correct in his understanding that all regulatory agencies are within the purview of the act in question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. They are.

Mr. HOLLAND. The only agencies excluded as being peculiarly a part of the legislative branch are the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. That is my interpretation of the language.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in expressing some reluctance to approve the proposal, since it runs that far. However, I recognize the fact that, with all the press of business which is upon the Congress, some initiative has to be given to the Executive even in this field. I am willing to approve the proposal simply because the press of business is so great that I know the committees having jurisdiction over these matters cannot give them the careful attention they need.

I comfort myself with the fact that the Senator from Arkansas has insisted upon changing the older rule, so that now a majority of the Senate present and debating a measure can turn down any reorganization plan, regardless of what is the attitude of the other body.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. A majority of the other body, with a quorum present, considering the measure, can turn down a proposed reorganization plan regardless of what may have been the attitude of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

The proposal, as first adopted, was that it was necessary for both Houses to pass a concurrent resolution to veto a plan, and a number of agencies were exempted. The administrative branch of the Government kept insisting upon not placing the exemptions in the act, with the result that we finally were able to get an agreement that it took only a majority of the total membership of one House to veto a reorganization plan. Now we have it to the point that it is like any other legislative process; a majority of those who are present and voting can defeat a plan. That is the way it should be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend. There is one other matter in connection with this proposed legislation on which I should like to ask a question, so that he can state his opinion for the RECORD.

The Senator may recall that the Senator from Florida objected strenuously to the general terms of the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, because when that reorganization plan became effective, with certain very minor exceptions which were stated in the plan, the Secretary of Agriculture was given, until the end of time—unless the legislation is changed—the discretion, the right, and the authority to reorganize that important Department at any time and upon any basis, the entire scope of the operation being so broad as to make it difficult to think of anything which could not be done at the sole will of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The important question, in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], is that such reorganizations as may be submitted under the proposed legislation should be in sufficient detail in order to prevent the recurrence of legislation under which a carte blanche blank check would be given to the head of a department to reorganize in any way he sees fit all of the multiplicious activities of his department.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, I can speak only for the Senator from Arkansas. One of the weaknesses in the reorganization program is that the reorganization plans submitted do not spell out, as Congress would by statute, what we wish to do, and too frequently such reorganization plans are vague and leave a residue of power in the agency to do things that are not adequately spelled out.

Under the proposed plan we have the opportunity to disapprove, if a department submits vague plans, or plans that convey powers indefinitely to the head of the reorganized agency.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the intention of the distinguished chairman of the committee and all the members of his committee to require that reorganization plans be submitted in such detail as to advise Congress as to what is intended?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know that I shall be asked, but if I am asked by the executive branch of the Government, I shall certainly reply that it is very vital in my judgment to spell out such plans in detail. I know that the executive branch cannot spell out every little minor detail, but the plan ought to be so concise and explicit that we shall know what kind of law we are asked to pass. I believe there have been instances in which the plans were not so detailed, and I have opposed some of them. It is up to us to take care of whatever plans come to us in that way. That is all I can say.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for expressing the view that programs submitted under the authority of a bill, when it is passed and becomes law, should be explicit, and I join in that expression. I serve notice now that when reorganization plans come to the floor of the Senate which do not contain a reasonable degree of explicitness, the Senator from Florida will oppose them with all his vigor, because he does not think we should delegate to any President or to the head of any department such wide and unlimited powers as, for instance, were granted under the reorganization plan of the Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately that plan is still in force. I make that statement without intending any adverse comment as to the present Secretary of Agriculture. The Senator from Florida made a much stronger statement, as he recalls, upon the subject when the predecessor of the present Secretary of Agriculture was serving. In my judgment it is a question of not giving to any one man, no matter how wise, well informed and benevolent he may be, complete authority to undo and remake a very important agency of our Government at his discretion and almost at his whim. I do not think we can safely follow such a pattern. I do not propose to follow such a pattern if it is included within any reorganization plan. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I am hopeful, and I believe that the remarks in the Senate today on this subject may have some influence upon future actions taken. I hope they will, because it would never be a pleasure to me to oppose any reorganization plan sent to us by the President of the United States. I should only oppose such a plan from

a sense of duty, or because I am unable to resolve my doubts or differences about it.

Sometimes I think the members of the executive branch of the Government and those who prepare such plans have not given the thought and study to them that they should have received before they send them here. If adequate thought and study are devoted to such plans, I feel confident that in most instances the Congress will go along with the plan, and in that way we shall bring about some reorganizations that are needed, and we shall all be serving the best interests of our Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make this comment in order that the thoughts of the members of the committee may be more helpful to the executive branch. I feel very much as does my committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. When reorganization authority was first presented to us in 1949, I was one of those who felt that both Houses of Congress should have to register disapproval. But as we proceeded and saw the plans come down, both in the Truman administration and in the Eisenhower administration, I believe we came to the conclusion that Congress should exercise its legislative responsibilities as the present act indicates or prescribes, namely, that a majority of those present and voting in only one House of Congress is required to negate a reorganization plan on a resolution for disapproval.

I will say to the Senator from Florida that I, too, was concerned about the broad sweep of reorganization authority in not only the Department of Agriculture reorganization plan, but also in 1952 in the plan of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a result of the rejection of the plan of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1952, a more detailed plan, with more particulars—whether it was better or not may be questioned—was given to us in 1953. By the rejection of one plan the Congress set certain standards and guidelines for the acceptance of another reorganization plan. I hope that those in the executive branch who will be responsible for advising the President on matters of reorganization will read this record very carefully. I hope they will have in mind the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON], the comments of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the comments and observations of the chairman of the committee and, I hope, even my own comments, because while there were differences of opinion on reorganization authority at one time, as between the chairman of the committee of which I am a member, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from Minnesota, those differences were long ago resolved. I believe our committee, which spent months in the study of reorganization plans, is pretty much of one mind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe we are unanimous, and I suggest that that kind of unanimity is worthy of careful consideration. But, as stated by the Senator from Arkansas, I should like to reserve any right of criticism or even of analysis until we see what is submitted to us. I think we ought to give the executive branch the authority requested, and that the executive branch should act within the spirit of the discussion we have had.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank Senators who have contributed to the discussion. I think we are all indebted to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for bringing to our attention his views, thereby providing a fuller discussion of the bill, of the authority, and what is to be hoped for.

In conclusion, I again express the hope that such plans as the President may send to us will be well thought out before they are submitted, and that they will contain a great deal of detail and be explicit as to what is proposed so that we shall understand what the results will be.

If that is done, I believe we can give the assurance that the Committee on Government Operations will undertake to analyze them and present a report to the Senate which will clearly define what the results of the legislation will be if approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 153) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C. 133z–3), as last amended by the Act of September 4, 1957 (71 Stat. 611), is hereby further amended by striking out "June 1, 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1963".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INTERIM REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF THE PIPEFITTERS AND PLUMBERS LOCAL 706, EL DORADO, ARK. (S. REPT. NO. 42)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, one of the investigations initiated by the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and continued by the staff of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations after the select committee went out of existence, related to charges of improper activities of officers of local 706 located in El Dorado, Ark. This local is a member of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

The select committee had received numerous complaints from members of local 706 alleging that moneys collected from union members and others for the privilege of working on an $82 million Federal arsenal project in Pine Bluff, Ark., during the period 1951–54 were not properly accounted for. It was further charged that officials of this local misused union funds; that large amounts were collected and mysteriously disappeared; and that they had rigged an election which involved members of local 706.

A hearing in executive session by the select committee was held on March 22, 1960. The select committee authorized me, as chairman, to make the proceedings and record of that hearing public at my discretion.

On August 10, 1960, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations authorized further hearings on this matter.

On August 16 and 17, 1960, additional testimony was taken in executive session. To eliminate the need for rehearing the testimony taken before the select committee on March 22, 1960, the previous testimony was made part of the record of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on August 16, 1960.

On September 23, 1960, the subcommittee voted to make public the executive testimony taken in August of 1960.

On August 17, 1960, when the subcommittee completed its hearings on this matter, I permitted counsel who represented certain officials of local 706 to read the complete record of the hearings and file, on behalf of his clients, any additional evidence he deemed pertinent to the inquiry. On October 2, 1960, additional testimony in the nature of affidavits was submitted to the subcommittee which was made a part of the official record of the hearings.

CONCLUSIONS

First. Before the Pine Bluff project got underway in 1951, representatives of local 155 in Pine Bluff, Ark.; local 706 in El Dorado, Ark.; and local 665 in Little Rock, Ark., entered into a joint venture agreement which Earl Griffin, financial secretary and treasurer of local 706, was to supervise, and, after expenses, divide the proceeds of the moneys collected on the Pine Bluff project equally among the three locals.

Second. For the privilege of working on the Pine Bluff job, those workers who came within the jurisdiction of local 706 and who worked in excess of 16 hours a week paid a $3.50 weekly assessment to local 706, while those workers who worked in excess of 8 hours, but not more than 16, paid $1.50 weekly assessment.

Third. Shortly after the project got underway, the United Association informed locals 665 and 155 that they did not have to pay any assessments to local

706. Earl Griffin, in direct violation of this directive, continued to collect assessments from all workers whether members of these or any other locals.

Fourth. Although Mr. Earl Griffin contends that moneys collected from the nonmembers of local 706 were voluntary contributions, the evidence before this subcommittee is contra and clearly shows that assessments were levied and collected from these workers under duress and under fear of loss of their jobs.

Fifth. Although these assessments continued, Earl Griffin did not share the proceeds with the other two locals in violation of the joint venture agreement.

Sixth. Even granting that some of these workers may have considered these assessments voluntary contributions, nevertheless it is conclusively established that these assessments as to many of the workers were not voluntarily paid, but were exacted from them as a price they had to pay for the privilege of working on this job. The collection of these assessments by Earl Griffin constituted violations of the legal provisions of—

(a) The international constitution of the United Association: Section 158 of the 1951–55 United Association's constitution prohibits the collection of "any monetary contribution for the privilege of working" from any member of the United Association who worked on the Pine Bluff job, but was not a member of local 706.

Section 153 of the same constitution applied to workers who were not affiliated with the United Association. Under this section, permits for work could not be issued to nonmembers of the association. This prohibits any collections from these nonmembers for the privilege of working. Mr. Earl Griffin denied that work permits were issued by this local union, but he did admit that workers came to the union office and received work referrals to go on the job. These work referrals which were issued by local 706 were in fact work permits and violated this section of the bylaws of the constitution:

(b) The Federal kickback statute: Title 18, section 874, of the United States Code, which is known as the Federal kickback statute, was violated when moneys were collected from workers on the Pine Bluff job in violation of the constitution of the United Association. The statute of limitations, which is 5 years, has run on this offense.

(c) Arkansas right-to-work law: Title 81, section 202, the right-to-work statute of the State of Arkansas, provides that no moneys shall be paid as a prerequisite to, or condition of, or continuance of employment. Under this statute, job assessments paid by nonmembers of local 706 must be supported by a written consent to prove that they are voluntary payments. No signed written consent was obtained by any of the foremen from any of the nonmembers of local 706 showing that such law was complied with. The statute of limitations, which is 3 years, has run on these offenses.

Seventh. Receipts: Mr. Earl Griffin issued instructions to his job steward on the Pine Bluff job, Alfred "Red" Yocom, that only members of local 706 were to be furnished receipts when they made their weekly payments to local 706. The failure of Mr. Griffin to furnish receipts to nonmembers of local 706 and to obtain their written consent before collecting any moneys from them is indicative of the fact he was aware that forced assessments were being collected which he knew was violative of Federal and State statutes, as well as the constitution of his own union.

Eighth. Failure to keep proper records: The failure of Earl Griffin as financial secretary and treasurer of local 706 during this period to properly receipt and account for the moneys collected on the Pine Bluff job as specified in section 105 of the constitution of the United Association is evidenced not only by Mr. Griffin's failure to instruct Mr. Yocom to keep records of the moneys he collected on the job, but Mr. Griffin's failure to furnish Mr. Yocom with receipts when he received the moneys from him.

Ninth. The subcommittee staff was obstructed from the very beginning of its investigation into the Pine Bluff Arsenal project by the delaying tactics of both Earl and Ermon Griffin to produce certain financial records of local 706. After the subcommittee had sought these records for 11 months, Mr. Earl Griffin alleged when he appeared before the subcommittee that some of these records were found 1 hour before he left for Washington to testify.

Tenth. The records that Earl Griffin finally produced disclosed that all moneys collected on the Pine Bluff job, whether they be called voluntary or involuntary payments, had not been deposited and properly accounted for in the union's treasury.

Eleventh. Missing funds: Approximately $111,444.22 of funds collected as assessments by Earl Griffin's local from workers on the Pine Bluff job has mysteriously disappeared. Of a total of $214,976 collected from August 7, 1951, through June 20, 1953, only $103,531.78 was deposited in the union joint-venture bank account. Mr. Griffin, the responsible agent for the collection of this money, has failed to produce any records and has failed to account for and explain what happened to this sum of $111,444.42 which was collected.

Twelfth. Questionable expenditures: Earl and Ermon Griffin are guilty of extravagant and unnecessary expenditures of union funds from local 706 during the years 1952–58. The union collected during these years in excess of $735,000 and expended in excess of $631,000. As of August 17, 1960, less than $10,000 remained in the treasury of local 706. Included in the expenditures were $71,880 for the purchase of two airplanes, one of which it still operates.

Thirteenth. A number of questionable purchases were paid for by local 706. They included Christmas gifts and hunting and fishing equipment. Other items included duck stamps, rifles, pump guns, fishing rods and reels, a 14-foot boat and outboard motors, hunting pants and coats, and so forth. Although these expenditures were approved by the local's finance committee, no breakdown was ever furnished to the general membership of the union.

Fourteenth. Rigging election: In December 1955, after Earl Griffin became an international representative of the United Association, with jurisdiction over pipelines in the Tulsa, Okla., area, he, along with his brother, Ermon Griffin, participated in the rigging of an election in local 798, located in Tulsa, Okla.

Fifteenth. Through the concerted efforts of these two union officials, the union books of some 40 members of local 706 were transferred into local 738, 11 days before the election. On December 11, 1955, these local 706 union members were transported from the union hall of local 706 in El Dorado, Ark., at the expense of local 706, to a polling place in Baton Rouge, La., one of the sites selected for the election of local 798, although the headquarters of the local are located in Tulsa, Okla. These men were instructed to vote for Jim Craddock, who was reelected business manager of local 798. After the election on December 31, 1955, the union books of these men were transferred back to the 706 local. It will be noted that these 40 votes comprise about 9 or 10 percent of the total votes cast.

Sixteenth. The members of local 706 who transferred into local 798 voted illegally in this election. The 1955 bylaws of the constitution of the United Association specify that in order to be eligible to vote in a local election the voter had to be a member of the local union for a period of 60 days before the election.

Seventeenth. In brief, the subcommittee concludes that both Earl and Ermon Griffin have breached their trust as union officials of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry. Earl Griffin has failed to account for approximately $111,444.22 in assessments illegally collected from nonmembers of local 706 on the U.S. Government Pine Bluff, Ark., Arsenal project during the years 1951–53. The collection of such moneys was violative of the international constitution of the United Association, and constituted criminal violations of the Arkansas right-to-work law and the Federal antikickback statute. It is clear that men guilty of these practices should not be permitted to hold union office or be entrusted with union funds. The record of the hearings and subcommittee findings will be brought to the attention of the Internal Revenue Service, the law enforcement authorities, and other interested agencies of the Government. The record of these hearings has already been brought to the attention of the United Association. So far it has taken no action. The subcommittee feels that labor has an obligation to clean its own house. The United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry has a clear duty in this instance to deal effectively with this flagrant abuse of trust and responsibility. Failure of the responsible officials of the United Association to take appropriate action could only be

construed as condonation and approval. We are reluctant to believe that the officers of the United Association will refuse to take appropriate action.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the press release which I issued on the report.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE FROM SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations made public today its interim report on activities of Local 706, Steamfitters and Plumbers Union, El Dorado, Ark.

Executive hearings on this matter were held on March 22 and August 16 and 17, 1960, and were made public on September 28, 1960. The testimony disclosed that Earl Griffin, currently an international representative for the United Association of the Steamfitters and Plumbers Union and formerly the head of local 706, and his brother, Ermon Griffin, current secretary and treasurer of that local, have breached their trust as union officials of local 706.

The evidence clearly establishes that Earl Griffin has failed to account for more than $100,000 of approximately $214,000 in assessments collected from workers on the U.S. Government Pine Bluff, Ark., arsenal project during the years 1951–53. The collection of such money assessments from many hundreds of workers who were nonmembers of local 706 was violative of the International Constitution of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry and constituted criminal violations of the Arkansas right-to-work law and the Federal kickback statute.

Uncontroverted testimony was heard by the subcommittee which showed that Earl Griffin and his brother, Ermon, acting in concert participated in the rigging of an election in local 798, located in Tulsa, Okla., in December 1955.

Other testimony also disclosed that Earl and Ermon Griffin are guilty of extravagant and unnecessary expenditures of union funds from local 706 during the years 1952–58. The union collected during these years in excess of $735,000 and expended in excess of $631,000. Two years later, as of August 17, 1960, less than $10,000 remained in the treasury of local 706.

Included in the expenditures were $71,880.39 for the purchase of two airplanes, one of which it still operates. A number of questionable purchases were made by local 706. Among these purchases are included hunting and fishing equipment, duck stamps, rifles, pump guns, fishing rods and reels, a 14-foot boat and outboard motors, hunting pants and coats, etc.

The subcommittee in its report finds that these union officials who breached their fiduciary responsibility should not be permitted to hold union office or be entrusted with union funds. The record of the hearings and subcommittee findings will be brought to the attention of the Internal Revenue Service, the law enforcement authorities, and other interested agencies of the Government.

The record of these hearings has already been brought to the attention of the United Association. So far it has taken no action. The United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipefitting Industry has a clear duty in this instance to deal effectively with this flagrant abuse of trust and responsibility. Failure of responsible officials of the United Association to take appropriate action can only be construed as acquiescing in and condoning such improper conduct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AND CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I announce that when the Senate completes its business today, it will adjourn until noon on Thursday.

On Thursday we will proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 25 through 38, the so-called money resolutions relating to committees and subcommittees of the Senate. I should like to have all Senators on notice that on Thursday we will take up these resolutions, with the hope that we may be able to complete consideration of them on Thursday.

MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD AND MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

I have also appointed to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

EARLY ACTION ON PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE PROJECT WILL SAVE MONEY AS WELL AS BEACH AREA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, upon introduction of S. 4, the proposal to establish a National Seashore Recreation Area on Padre Island, I urged early action on the basis that this very worthwhile project will cost much less now than at some later date. Delay will not only mean additional cost, but in this case it will mean that more and more of the choice beach areas will be taken over by private interests and in many cases the public will be fenced away from the beaches.

Dr. Edward Higbee, distinguished professor of geography and agricultural economics at the University of Delaware, has written a highly informative book on population pressures on natural resources entitled, "The Squeeze."

Dr. Higbee warns:

In the past 50 years, while ocean frontage has increased in value 10,000 percent, American population has doubled from 90 to 180 million. Fifty years hence, if there is such a thing left as undeveloped seashore, perhaps $500 a front foot might look like a steal. The ocean beach is one commodity which will not stretch. * * * Congestion along the ocean's edge is unlike congestion anywhere else because time is fast running out when something really effective can be done about it. * * * The public appears doomed to fight a rearguard action from here on out.

Mr. President, in 1935 the National Park Service first urged that Padre Island, which is America's longest, southernmost natural beach, be preserved as a public recreation area. That effort failed. Since that time it is estimated that land values on the beach island have increased 800 percent. If the handful of private interests who oppose this project manage to delay it much longer, they may accomplish two things: they may continually build up the cost of the property to their own profit, and perhaps keep all of the choice beach areas for private use with only small, less desirable beaches being kept open to all of the people.

One of the major newspapers of Texas, the Corpus Christi Caller, has been a leader in the fight for Padre Island National Seashore. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "National Survey Supports Fast Action on Padre Plan," published in the January 25, 1961, edition of the Corpus Christi Caller.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SURVEY SUPPORTS FAST ACTION ON PADRE PLAN

There is a well-justified sense of urgency in the current effort to gain congressional approval, and State and local cooperation, for making the major part of Padre Island a national seashore area forever preserved for general public enjoyment.

The point against further delay was made in a story in the Caller recently which indicated that land values on Padre Island have increased 800 percent in the past quarter century. The case for urgency has been nationally documented in a book of population pressures on natural resources, "The Squeeze," by Dr. Edward Higbee, professor of geography and agricultural economics at the University of Delaware. Dr. Higbee makes this carefully researched estimate:

"In the past 50 years, while ocean frontage has increased in value 10,000 percent, the American population has doubled from 90 million to 180 million. Fifty years hence, if there is such a thing left as undeveloped seashore, perhaps $500 a front foot might look like a steal. The ocean beach is one commodity which will not stretch."

Dr. Higbee's survey finds that only 24 miles (6½ percent) of the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts is now publicly owned, and more than half of that is in three reservations: Acadia National Park in Maine, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in North Carolina, and Everglades National Park in Florida. Only 295 miles of the Pacific Coast's 1,743 miles are in State and Federal reserves. And not all the publicly owned land is open to the general public. He concludes:

"Congestion along the ocean's edge is unlike congestion anywhere else because time is fast running out when something really effective can be done about it * * * the public appears doomed to fight a rearguard action from here on out."

It was in 1935 that the National Park Service urged acquiring unspoiled seashores along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts as public recreation areas. Since then only Cape Hatteras has been so preserved. That opportunity for a Padre Island preserve was

missed, at great cost. If the current opportunity is missed, the cost of any future effort may easily prove prohibitive.

Dr. Higbee reports that the 18-year effort to acquire the Cape Hatteras seashore area has paid off by increasing summer visitors in 5 years from 100,000 to 348,000, hiking nearby private property values by 50 to 100 times, and bringing property tax receipts in that area higher than they were before the seashore area was removed from the rolls. This but further underlines the sense of urgency that the Padre Island project should stir.

TELECAST "HARVEST OF SHAME" UNFAIR TO FLORIDA AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on November 25, 1960, the Columbia Broadcasting System televised a program entitled "Harvest of Shame," which related to the migratory agricultural workers and their families. The transcript of this telecast was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1961, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. It appears at pages 1145 through 1150. The film covering the telecast was replayed, with sound, in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building on Monday, January 30, 1961.

This telecast is grossly unfair to both migrant agricultural workers and their employers. It presents migrant workers in a highly unfavorable light, and their employers as hardhearted exploiters of their labor. It is unfair not only to Florida agricultural employers and employees but also to those of other States in which agricultural migrants work. This includes the eastern seaboard from Florida north through New Jersey and New York, the Pacific coastal States of California, Oregon, and Washington, and other States.

Following the program, the Philip Morris Cigarette Co., which sponsored it, sent two of its executives, Robert W. Norris and James C. Bowling, to the Belle Glade, Fla., area to investigate the facts.

Because Florida was placed in the peculiarly invidious position of introducing the telecast at great length and of terminating the telecast at great length, these gentlemen naturally came to the vegetable-producing part of Florida to make their investigation for the Philip Morris Co.

Mr. Bowling stated that the network would not permit the sponsors to review the program in advance and that no one in the firm had any idea of its contents until the broadcast. Both Mr. Norris and Mr. Bowling said they were convinced, after visiting Florida areas where migrant labor was utilized, that the show was unfair; that it does not paint an accurate picture; and that they found in Florida "a dedicated people who have worked for years to improve the life of the migrants." At this point, Mr. President, I shall read into the RECORD an excerpt from a Tampa Tribune article, which is entitled "Cigarette Firm Bought Documentary Sight Unseen," and which was written by Mr. Sam Mase, a highly reputable staff writer for the Tribune:

CRITICISM OF CBS FOR MIGRANT LABOR FILM IS JUSTIFIED, SAYS SPONSOR OF SHOW

(By Sam Mase)

Two top executives of Philip Morris, Inc., told the Tribune yesterday Floridians were justified in denouncing Columbia Broadcasting Co. for its production of "Harvest of Shame," a Philip Morris-sponsored television documentary on the problems of migrant farm laborers.

When citizens of Florida charged the TV show presented a distorted scene of migrant conditions in Florida, Joseph F. Cullmann III sent the two executives here to investigate conditions and report back to him.

They are: Robert W. Norris, director of personnel and community relations for the firm, and James C. Bowling, director of public relations.

CBS SHOW UNFAIR

Both men said they were convinced after visiting areas in the State where migrant labor is utilized that the CBS show was unfair to Florida because it failed to depict the great progress this State has made in behalf of migrants.

Norris and Bowling commended the Tribune for presenting an accurate account of the migrant situation in order to offset the adverse impression created by the television program.

Bowling said his firm bought the "Harvest of Shame" show in good faith that it would be an outstanding public service based on a true picture (good or bad) of the migrant story.

The public relations man said CBS would not permit sponsors to review its "CBS Reports" series in advance.

* * * * *

Speaking of the impression of Florida the documentary conveyed to a nationwide audience, Bowling said "the picture is not as black as portrayed."

DEDICATED PEOPLE

He said that on the contrary, he and Norris found in Florida "a dedicated people who have worked for years to improve life of the migrants."

The men noted that the film did not present efforts and progress of dedicated people who worked to improve conditions.

"We were impressed with the progress and feel it should have been shown (on the program)," Norris said.

* * * * *

Mr. President, the progress which Florida has made and is making in the field of migrant labor is shown by the following statements by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Migrant Labor, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. President, this morning I notified the office of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] that I intended to make this speech at this time, and I also notified the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], because they had had some part in the discussion of the telecast.

I was advised that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] was snowbound somewhere and could not be here. I do not know why the other two Senators are not present on the floor.

The first statement by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] was made at a hearing in Fresno, Calif., on July 8, 1960, and is as follows:

I might say that Florida is probably the most enlightened State we have seen in the total picture of migrant State problems.

Again, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey said in an address in Boston on May 21, 1960:

In Florida, to even a greater degree than we had found in many other States, we found many people who do not believe in limiting their vision. They are concerned. They want to know what was happening in that shack seen from the highway. They are remembering the forgotten people. They believe that "any person can change," and they are working to bring about that change.

In his extension of remarks reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 27, 1960, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey said:

Mr. President, the migrant worker in the United States today often experiences hardship, danger, and exclusion as he travels from one State to another, from one crop to another, each year. In many parts of the Nation, however, he also experiences something more—community concern about the problems which face him and members of his family.

The Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor spent 3 days in southern Florida last week and there we saw evidence of this community concern in abundance.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to present some of the specific misrepresentations in the "Harvest of Shame" program which are so unfair to both migrant workers and their employers. Quotations are from the script, which I have personally read in full, and which already appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where it was inserted by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 1

Approximately 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant laborers, finishes grade school. Approximately, 1 of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma.

THE FACTS

If the producers had wanted to exercise any reasonable degree of care to present the truth, they could have easily found by questioning school authorities in Palm Beach County that there are a number of children of migrants in that one county alone who are college graduates. They would have learned of the following: Ollice Davis, coach and teacher at East Lake High School in Pahokee; Gerald Berk and Earlene King Hudson, teachers at Lake Shore High School in Belle Glade; Eugene Lincoln, teacher at Lincoln High School in Riviera Beach—his wife, Lavena Lincoln is a registered nurse at a West Palm Beach hospital—Willie Pifron, band instructor for several schools in the Lake Okeechobee area; Delois White, teacher at Okeechobee Elementary School; Helen Verence, Doris Harrell, and Julia Johnson, teachers at East Lake Elementary School in Pahokee; and Estelle Pifron, teacher at East Lake High School.

I am advised that all these college graduates were children of migrants or were migrants themselves, through high school, and that Eugene Lincoln, Gerald Berk, and Earlene King Hudson were migrant agricultural workers even during most or all of of their college careers, joining the migrant stream during the summer months and returning to college in the fall.

Another prominent college graduate, who does not live in Florida, is the nationally known missionary, Mrs. Billie Davis, who is married to a minister and now lives in California.

These people do not fit into the film's insulting inference that migrant workers are so exploited that they cannot and do not make educational progress. These are well educated and useful citizens who are a credit to their State and Nation and to the type of workers from which they came.

With reference to the percentage of migrants who graduate from high school, the records at Lake Shore High School in Belle Glade show that over 30 percent of the graduates during the last 5 years have been migrant children; of that number, over 20 percent have attended college or have graduated. To be specific the number of migrant children so graduating was 65 and the number of such graduates who have attended college is 15.

Mr. President, I am indebted to Mrs. Ruth S. Wedgworth, of Belle Glade, Fla., for her assistance in checking and rechecking these facts—which I have read into the RECORD as facts—on the educational progress of migrant workers. She is a well-educated, longtime resident of the Belle Glade area; and for a number of years she has been one of the leaders in the economic, cultural, and governmental progress of the area.

I may say that Mrs. Wedgworth is the widow of a gentleman, who a few years ago was a very distinguished member of the experiment station staff at Belle Glade. Mrs. Wedgworth has led in all kinds of worthwhile, progressive civic activities in her area and in her State.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 2

I quote from the telecast:

People have been killed purely because there is no interstate standard with regard to safety.

The reference was to travel by migrant workers.

The facts are as follows: A statute enacted in 1956 authorized the ICC to regulate interstate transportation of workers by motor vehicle. Pursuant thereto, the ICC issued comprehensive regulations which have been in effect for several years.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 3

Again I quote from the text of the transcript and of the motion picture:

SECOND HAWKER. Over here—70 cents a day. We're paying today. . . .

* * * * *

MURROW. . . . The hawkers are chanting the going piece rate at the various fields. This is the way the humans who harvest the food for the best fed people in the world get hired.

The facts are these: This is not the way most of such people are hired. Less than 50 percent of the migrants engaged in harvest farm work are hired through this procedure known as day haul.

This is sometimes a necessary means of employing workers, where a farmer needs them only a few days. The U.S. Employment Service, cooperating with State employment services, has promoted this means of employing farm labor in many areas, including the State of Florida.

In fact, the Department of Labor requires farmers to cooperate in day haul programs, wherever they are feasible, as a condition of eligibility for interstate recruitment of domestic workers and/or the employment of Mexican Nationals. If this is a "slave" labor practice, it is one that has been promoted for many years by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The network denies that there was any inference that the "70 cents a day"—and I have quoted those words from the telecast—means that this is the total earnings of a worker for a day's work. It is true that the commentator did say "The hawkers are chanting the going piece rate at the various fields." However, there would be few viewers who would understand the meaning of the term "piece rate." All would understand the expression "70 cents a day" to mean that is the total earnings of a worker for a day's work.

The inference that a dollar or less a day is the usual income of such workers is further discussed in connection with the next misrepresentation.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 4

Mr. LOWE (interviewer). How much did you earn?

Mrs. KING. A dollar.

The inference was that Mrs. King earned $1 for picking beans from 6 a.m. to 3:30 or 4 p.m.

The facts are these: The prevailing base—minimum—rate for picking beans in the area is 60 cents a hamper. Most workers have little difficulty picking two hampers or more an hour. Good bean pickers can pick 20 bushels per day, for which they are paid 60 to 75 cents, and sometimes as high as 90 cents per bushel. If Mrs. King earned only a dollar for a day's work, she either was not working very hard or she was in a very unusual situation. Perhaps she felt that in view of her husband's employment and income—and in a moment I shall refer to that—there was no real necessity of pressing for a substantial income that day.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 5

Mr. LOWE. How many children do you have?

Mrs. KING. Fourteen.

The inference was that Mrs. King must support 14 children on a dollar a day.

The facts are these: Mrs. King has seven children living and seven who are dead, two having been stillborn. Lest it be alleged that these deceased children were the victims of inadequate medical care, due to the financial plight of this family, the record shows—and I quote from the public record—that in 1958, the county welfare agency in West Palm Beach paid $943.80 to St. Mary's Hospital for the care of Katherine King, still living; and, additionally, over $1,000 in hospital and medical bills has been written off by the local hospital and doctors at Belle Glade, in connection with medical treatment afforded the King family over the last several years.

Mr. President, this is a peculiarly interesting addition to the facts. Mrs. King's husband, Will King, has been a permanent seasonal employee at a sugar mill near Belle Glade since 1956, when he started at $66 a week. He works there 4 or 5 months each year, and now receives a salary of $83.50 per week. His employer provides him life insurance, workmen's compensation coverage, and Blue Cross-Blue Shield coverage, free of charge.

By deliberately leaving out these facts, Mr. President, the telecast created a wrong impression.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 6

Here the reference is to Florida. This part of the program occurred toward its end:

MURROW. * * * The Sunshine State welcomes them back: Homestead, Immokalee, Pahokee, Belle Glade and hundreds of other communities. This is home. New housing is available. The rent, $15 per room, per week.

The facts are these: An exhaustive survey by those who are directly concerned in the Homestead, Immokalee, Pahokee and Belle Glade area, indicates that ordinarily housing for migrants rents for a maximum of $7 per week for a one-room apartment, and $12.50 paid for apartments consisting of living room, bedroom, kitchen, and bath. In the latter instance, the living room may also be used for sleeping purposes. There may be rare instances of housing for migrants renting as high as $15 per room per week. If so, those who conducted the survey were unable to find it. If it does, in fact, exist, it is highly unusual—not the usual case, as indicated by the script. When it is considered that this housing is subjected to terrific abuse at the hands of the tenants, who occupy it seasonally for brief periods, the cost of housing is considered to be relatively low.

Incidentally, Mr. President—and the film was silent on this point—Florida has a State law regulating the safety and sanitation of migrant labor camps. Under it, the State board of health prescribes minimum standards relating to construction, sanitary conditions, light, air, safety, protection from fire hazards, equipment, maintenance and operations of camps, and other matters necessary to protect the life and health of occupants. Based upon these standards, the board of health licenses migrant labor camps; and it has the authority to revoke licenses of those who do not meet these standards.

MISREPRESENTATION NO. 7

LOWE. Mrs. Doby, wouldn't you ever care to have a house of your own?

Mrs. DOBY. I'd like to have a house that—we plan to buy one if we could ever get enough to pay down on one, we'd buy one.

LOWE. Do you think this will ever happen?
Mrs. DOBY. Well, it don't seem like it.

Mr. President, let us see what the facts are.

After this program, Harvey Poole, a Belle Glade Negro leader, compiled a list of migrants who, since 1952, have moved out of migratory-housing quarters into homes of their own in the Belle Glade area alone. He reports that there are approximately 100 families on his list. This contradicts the inference in the film that there is almost no hope for migrants ever to own homes of their own.

I would be trespassing upon the Senate's time, Mr. President, if I should cite in detail other specific false impressions which are created by the CBS telecast. I believe the examples I have given are sufficient to show that the producers of this telecast were, to put it mildly, careless of the truth. A number of individuals were interviewed and filmed under the impression that their comments were to be included in the program. They subsequently found that the interviews and films which did not support the impression the producers wished to create were deleted. The housing shown was the worst the producers could possibly find. There was no balancing presentation of relatively good housing provided farmworkers in many areas. Everything supporting the view desired by the producers was included; everything not supporting it was excluded.

The film was propaganda, pure and simple.

As a result, the brighter side of the migrant labor story failed to emerge. The production excluded everything which might tell the story of the progress which has been made in recent years in this field: the improvement in housing, the enactment of State legislation of various kinds—not only in our own State, but in other States—the efforts of local authorities, the upward trend in farm wage rates, and the progress in education. Regarding education of migrants, the report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor says:

> There is a definite trend, particularly since 1954, of increased and sustained interest on the part of State departments of education, local school districts, and communities, and private organizations to provide for the educational needs of migrants.

Mr. President, I am willing to give the producers the benefit of the doubt as to their motives in presenting this so-called documentary. Perhaps they wanted to contribute to the improvement of a situation which needs continual improvement. However, good motives are no excuse for playing fast and loose with the truth, which is what was done. Slanted documentary films are fully as unethical as rigged quiz shows. Perhaps they are more dangerous to a free society, since they present a false picture as a basis for shaping public opinion and the laws resulting therefrom.

I have no evidence, Mr. President, that the executives of the CBS network which telecast this program had knowledge of its unfairness before its original presentation. However, when they continue to actively cooperate in promoting the showing of this film, as they did in the presentation last Monday—January 30—at the New Senate Office Building Auditorium, they make it impossible for me to feel that they are proceeding with the caution and fair play which the American public has a right to expect from those who hold and use a valuable franchise given by all the American people.

SPENDING FOR SUBSIDIES BENEFITS CONSUMER

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as a farmer, I have become increasingly concerned about the rift that has developed in recent years between farm and nonfarm people. It is getting to be a very common thing for publications of all kinds and individuals everywhere to bitterly criticize farmers.

Many of them think that farmers are getting rich, at the taxpayers' expense. Oftentimes the criticism goes so far as to claim that farmers no longer work very much and that they have an easy life. As a farmer, and one of only three left in the U.S. Senate, I have long been concerned about this.

Perhaps we who are farmers feel it more keenly than do others. This is one of the reasons why I so deeply appreciated the speech made at a farm forum held recently in Fargo, N. Dak., by Mr. Ovid Martin. It was an effective and masterful defense of farmers. Mr. Martin is rated as a great journalist, and I believe most people who read his AP stories on farm matters would have to agree that he has been most fair and accurate in all his reporting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks a summary of Mr. Martin's speech carried in the Fargo Forum of February 3. Also, Mr. President, I ask that a news story in the same issue be inserted, which is entitled, "Martin Tells Fargo Farm Forum Spending for Subsidies Is Benefiting Consumer."

There being no objection, the summary and news article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Farmers Forum, Feb. 3, 1961]

AMERICA'S AGRICULTURE ENVY OF RUSSIA—NO DRASTIC CHANGES IN FARM PROGRAMS SEEN

(EDITOR'S NOTE. The following is a condensation of the talk given by Ovid A. Martin, Associated Press farm writer, Washington, D.C., at the banquet session Thursday evening of the first Fargo Farm Forum.)

(By Ovid A. Martin)

I am convinced from the facts that are available to me that agriculture is not getting the economic returns to which it is entitled.

The outlook for sharp changes in farm programs is cloudy to say the least. Certainly we have a new administration and a new Congress—both of the same political party. That has not been the case for several years.

The new President is committed to take more aggressive action to improve the farm economy. He is expected to push ahead toward this objective, but he may not try to use some of the measures and devices he outlined during the campaign. He did stress farm production and supply management controls as an important device for stabilizing farm income. Much opposition to this device has been raised.

I would expect the new administration to push first for broadened outlets for agriculture's abundance. It already has increased donations to the needy at home. It is expected to take bolder action than in the past to move food to foreign outlets. This may require U.S. establishment in some backward areas of facilities for unloading at ports, and transportation and distribution into interiors of countries now lacking such facilities.

Some increase in price supports above Eisenhower administration levels is to be expected—but not to levels prevailing when the Eisenhower administration took over 8 years ago.

The new administration's efforts to control production may be limited in the beginning to crops already under control—cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and a cropland retirement program for feed grains, soybeans and the like. It undoubtedly will try to push through Congress a certificate plan for wheat. But this plan has tough sledding ahead among wheat farmers.

All and all, it appears that drastic changes in farm programs will face stiff opposition in Congress despite the fact it is controlled by the President's own party.

Why do I say this?

One reason is a lack of feeling that there is an urgent need for action with regard to the farm situation. There has been much talk about depressed industrial areas and urban unemployment. But little is being said about the farm situation. This goes for President Kennedy's economic advisers.

There was a time when downturns in farm income caused alarm in the cities and in Congress. There was a realization a farm depression would spread to the city. But this fear has just about disappeared. That is because the farm population makes up such a small part of the total population that a depressed agriculture no longer cripples the entire economy as it once did. Yet, there may well be a close tie between agriculture's reduced level of buying power and unemployment in the steel industry and in other industrial areas now worrying our leaders.

Another factor in the situation is the declining strength of farming areas in Congress. City Congressmen now write farm legislation—what there is of it. Urban lawmakers are growing more and more opposed to farm programs. They see in them higher food prices for their consumers and higher taxes for the taxpayers.

We already hear in Washington that many city lawmakers are asking, "Why should I support stronger farm programs when farmers themselves voted against them?" They refer, of course, to the fact that many midwestern farm States voted Republican in the last election.

Another barrier to stronger farm programs is the fact that organized agriculture itself is divided on remedies. Some farm groups want more Federal aid and others less. This division influences some Congressmen to vote against farm bills.

Perhaps the biggest stumbling block to agriculture is the image of the farmer held by many nonfarm people. From the farmer's standpoint, it is not flattering. The image is reflected in editorials in city newspapers and magazines, in consumer remarks at grocery stores, and in discussion groups.

It is reflected in remarks like these:

"The farmer must be getting rich from the looks of my grocery bill."

"The farmer gets paid to do nothing."

"I wish I were subsidized as is the farmer."

"No wonder taxes are going up the way the Government wastes money on farm surpluses and subsidies."

And so on and on. You have heard remarks like this.

The reflection of this image bobbed up during the recent inaugural parade. When Secretary of Agriculture Freeman passed along, a loud-mouthed spectator shouted derisively, "You getting ready to give the farmers bigger subsidies." The guy got a cheer from many of those around him.

Let me say I am not here to defend or criticize the farmer. It is the job of the reporter to stick to the facts and not to take sides in controversies and issues.

But the farmer needs no defense. I am convinced by the facts that no group or industry has contributed more toward the economic development of this Nation than has agriculture. No industry has shown an increase in efficiency of production that compares with that shown by agriculture.

The United States has grown from a Nation in which one of every four workers had to produce food, to a Nation in which 1 farmer is producing food for 24.

Productivity of the American farm worker is growing more than twice as fast as the productivity of workers in industry. Government reports show that since 1950, output per man-hour in nonfarm industry has risen 2 percent a year. In agriculture the increase has averaged 5 percent a year—2½ times as much as that in industry.

How the Russians would like to have our agriculture and its so-called surplus problems. Agriculture is their one big weak point. A group of us who accompanied former Secretary of Agriculture Benson on a tour of Russian farms in 1959 saw how desperately the Soviet leaders are trying to get more food produced. They are having no great success, as recent reports from Moscow indicate.

Who has benefited from this marvelous increase in productivity of American farms? Many farm leaders say consumers mostly, rather than farmers. There are facts to back them up.

Consumers are spending an average of 20 percent of their incomes for food. They are eating better than ever before. Today's diet would have taken 32 percent of consumer incomes before World War II.

How about farmers? What has agriculture's technological revolution brought them in economic terms?

Farm income has gone down in the last 10 years. Today the farmer gets about 38 cents of the consumer food dollar. It was 45 cents 10 years ago and 53 cents in 1945. The average per capita income of the farm population is slightly less than $1,000 a year. That compares with about $2,300 for the urban population.

Why this discrepancy in incomes? I believe it reflects a lack of appreciation on the part agriculture is contributing to the Nation.

Agriculture, as a segment of the economy, has not been as aggressive as have industry and organized labor in telling of its accomplishments. It has not been tooting its own horn. Rather it has been content to sit back and take whatever recognition others might give it.

We are living in an age of propaganda—an age in which various forces are fighting for men's minds, not only in the international field, but in the domestic one as well. He who does the best job of telling his story usually comes out on top. We may not like it that way. But that's the way things work.

The American people want to be fair. I believe the city image of the farmer can be changed. An urban appreciation of agriculture's contributions would, I am sure, make a change in attitude toward farmers' efforts to get a fair return for what they do.

Farmers have every reason to hold their heads high with pride. I am confident the facts show there is no room for an inferiority complex in agriculture.

How is agriculture to get its story across? Some may not agree with me, but I believe agriculture must match industry, labor, and the professions in laying its side before the public.

The others have what is called public-relations programs. They employ specialists in this field to use the various avenues of communication and information to get their stories told. Agriculture needs to do the same.

Perhaps farmers, through their various organizations, should set up a promotional agency—one that would use the press, radio, television, the movies, the pamphlet, and the speakers' platform—to enlighten the public as to farm accomplishments. Success in such a venture would help not only agriculture but the rest of the country as well. The result would be a greater understanding and a desire to share the Nation's wealth more equitably.

[From the Fargo Forum, Feb. 3, 1961]

MARTIN TELLS FARGO FARM FORUM: SPENDING FOR SUBSIDIES IS BENEFITING CONSUMER

Ovid A. Martin, Associated Press farm reporter in Washington, said here Thursday night that in his opinion much of the spending for so-called Government subsidies benefits the consumer as well as the farmer.

Martin, who has covered the farm beat in Washington for 23 years, said that in his opinion, so far as food goes, the consumer is better off, or at least as well off, today as he would be if there were no surpluses or no farm program.

The farm reporter, who addressed the banquet of the Fargo Farm Forum in Fargo Memorial Auditorium, said he was disturbed by criticism of the spending of Federal money to store farm surpluses because the same criticis—the consumers—are paying for storage in other industries without realizing it.

"Other industries store reserves," he said, "and who pays for that? Well, the consumer pays. But the difference is that they see the cost of the agricultural stores and they don't see the cost of the other."

He noted also that such things as Federal inspection of meat, poultry and grain and other Federal operations in the field of farming rebound to the consumer's benefit.

"I think," he continued, "that there is some unfairness here. On balance, in my opinion, the consumer is better off, or as well off, as if we had no surplus or no farm program."

Martin made these observations during a question period after a talk in which he suggested that farmers should get together to tell the public of agriculture's vital contributions to the economy of the Nation.

It is time, he said, for agriculture to start "tooting its own horn," rather than to do as it has done—"sit back and take whatever recognition others might give it."

The banquet marked the midpoint of the 2-day forum, which ends today with meetings at 9 a.m. and 1 p.m.

Martin, the only newsman in Washington assigned solely to farm news, said a basic cause for declining farm income in the face of the farming industry's tremendous contributions to the Nation's economic development has been what he termed the unflattering image of the farmer held by many nonfarm people.

One result of this image, he said, is the increasing lack of concern among the public and in Congress regarding farm problems.

He predicted that drastic changes of any kind in farm programs during this session of Congress will face stiff opposition for two principal reasons:

The lack of feeling that there is an urgent need for action with regard to the farm situation.

The declining strength of farming areas in Congress, with urban lawmakers seeing in farm programs higher prices for their consumers and higher taxes for their taxpayers.

Noting that he was speaking as a reporter and not taking sides, Martin said that the farmer needs no defense before consumers, industry or any other segment of the population.

"I am convinced by the facts that no group or industry has contributed more toward the economic development of this nation than has agriculture," he said. "How the Russians would like to have our agriculture and its so-called surplus problems."

To get their fellow countrymen to appreciate their contributions to the Nation, Martin said, farmers must realize we are living in an age of propaganda, in both foreign and domestic fields.

Farmers, he said, must get into this fight for men's minds and suggested that through their various farm organizations they set up a promotional agency to tell the public about farm accomplishments.

"I believe agriculture must match industry, labor and the professions in laying its side before the public," he said.

"The American people want to be fair," he continued. "I believe the city image of the farmer can be changed, and an urban appreciation of agriculture's contributions would, I am sure, make a change in attitude toward farmers' efforts to get a fair return for what they do."

John D. Paulson, editor of the Fargo Forum-Moorhead News, presided at the banquet. The Forum-News and the Fargo Chamber of Commerce are sponsoring the farm forum.

Paulson said the farm forum was the logical result of a growing feeling among farm and city people in this area that the only thing that will succeed in promoting the region is a combined farm and city effort.

He introduced Royal Berstler, Mapleton, secretary of the Red River Valley Fair Association, who presented plaques to members of the NDSU livestock judging team, who were special guests.

The team won the world championship livestock judging contest at the International Livestock Exposition in Chicago last November.

Coach Marle Light introduced the team members: James Carr, Baker, Minn.; Ray Kleppe, Dawson, N. Dak.; Paul Brackelsberg, Minot, N. Dak.; Richard Knutson, Oakes, N. Dak.; Keith Bjerke, Northwood, N. Dak., and Mike Brandvick, Killdeer, N. Dak.

TELEVISION'S "OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE" SERIES BRINGS HISTORY TO LIFE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the past few weeks I have commented on television's unique thrust into our hearts and minds. I have placed in the RECORD a selection from the growing number of distinguished news feature programs in which this unprecedented communication impact has been put to great good purpose.

Another unique boon we now enjoy from television is American history brought to life. Viewers around the

country received a brilliant taste of this in the program "The Invincible Teddy," based on the life of President Theodore Roosevelt, which was broadcast 3 weeks ago.

In this program television's tremendous ability to take the viewer by the hand and lead him back through a magic time machine into the realism of life was focused on actual events in the life of this great President.

Teddy Roosevelt was a complex and unusual human being. This program retells just a few years of his life: the period of his first entry into active politics, the subsequent death of his first wife, his trip to the West, his return home and second marriage, and his reentry into politics, which this time he terms public service. Yet this relatively brief glimpse in the life of the man is enough to greatly deepen our insights into his character and personality.

Rereading the script of this program has made me freshly aware of the excellence of the writing that is going into television. As in the case of fine plays based on historical events, this script uses the small detail, knowingly perceived, to give us a better, clearer understanding of the broad train of events. To do this well is a test of the writer's art, and this script passed with top marks.

The other scripts of television programs which I have placed in the RECORD also bear witness to the fact that some of the crispest, most compelling writing now being done is television writing. This new medium has enlisted the efforts and output of writers of unusual distinction, and the results can be seen in the many scripts of high literary merit.

The program which I would like to place in the RECORD today was written by Mr. Tad Mosel, and was broadcast in the NBC "Our American Heritage" series on January 13 of this year. I am informed that the ratings for this series have not been high, even though it has been presented in prime evening time, and I find it encouraging therefore, that the sponsor, the Equitable Co., has continued the series into what is now its second season. There can be little doubt that the quality of the smaller audience, drawn by the high quality of such a program, may be worth as much to a sponsor as the quantitatively larger mass audience attracted by programs of less distinct merit.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of the program "The Invincible Teddy" based on episodes in the life of President Theodore Roosevelt, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INVINCIBLE TEDDY

(By Tad Mosel)

ACT 1

(Fade in: A room at 6 West 57th Street, New York City. It is crammed with furniture and mementos. The camera holds on the entire room for a moment, then slowly moves in.)

NARRATOR. They say rooms tell us all we need to know about the people who live in them.

(Camera holds on a Harvard pennant, pictures of athletic teams, and a lone oar leaning in the corner. Camera moves to a mouldy stuffed pelican, its beak piercing a piece of paper on which is a legend.)

Pelecanus onocratulus. Benesoolf, December 22, 1872. Length 59.5. Wing 25.5. Tail 10.5.

(Camera moves to a pair of boxing gloves. Then to a glass case filled with rocks, etc.)

Sixty-five relics, correctly identified and catalogued, collected on the banks of the Nile at the age of 14.

(Past a full gun rack on the wall and crossed fencing foils. On to an imposing solemn bookcase.)

Blackstone's Commentaries, Parsons on Contracts, Washburn on Real Property.

(Cut to: An open book on the seat of a leather easy chair.)

Robert Browning.

(On to an easel, a sketch pad, an unfinished drawing of a ship, on to a large Bible, open on an ornate bookstand. Move in close to page.)

"But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father give the commandment, even so I do."

(Camera moves slowly back.)

"Arise, and let us go hence."

(Hold on entire room again.)

Theodore Roosevelt, New York City, 1881. Aged 23.

(Roosevelt enters. He is followed by Joseph Murray.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You don't mind the smell of formaldehyde, do you?

Mr. MURRAY. It is rather penetrating, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Taxidermy is the one pursuit guaranteed to insure privacy. Even the maids won't come in here. You like Browning? "I sprang to the stirrup, and Joris, and he; I galloped, Dirck galloped, we galloped all three!" By Godfrey, sir, have you ever made the trip from Ghent to Aix on horseback?

Mr. MURRAY. No, Mr. Roosevelt, I haven't.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Bully good ride.

(Murray points to picture.)

My honeymoon, sir.

Mr. MURRAY. You've just returned from abroad, haven't you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Climbed the Jungfrau and the Matterhorn. And my bride turned out to be the best traveling companion I have ever known. Sit down, sit down. What's your business?

Mr. MURRAY. As you know, Mr. Roosevelt, some of us in the 21st District Republican Club——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Blast.

Mr. MURRAY. I beg your pardon?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Excuse me, Mr. Murray, I'm preparing a naval history of the War of 1812 and I must make corrections when I see them. Continue. I'm listening.

Mr. MURRAY. Some of us intend to oppose the renomination of Trimble for the State assembly——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You may count on my support. I took my stand against Trimble when he blocked the street-cleaning bill. Who can we put up against him?

Mr. MURRAY. Some of us were thinking of you, sir.

(Roosevelt goes to the easel and draws vigorously.)

Mr. Roosevelt, sir, I have just suggested that we nominate you for the State legislature, and you stand there drawing a ship.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I should run against Trimble, it would look as if I had had selfish motives in opposing him in the first place. It would weaken the stand I took on street cleaning.

Mr. MURRAY. From the many vigorous stands you take at our meetings, we assumed you would jump at the chance of participating actively in politics.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In England, recently, I took a stand on Henry Irving's Othello, but that does not mean I want to be either an actor or a moor in Venice.

Mr. MURRAY. Why did you join the Republican club?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because it was there to be joined. Whatever made you think I could win the nomination?

Mr. MURRAY. The name of Roosevelt is highly respected in this district. The upper classes were your late father's friends. The lower classes have never forgotten his philanthropies.

(Anna "Bamie" Roosevelt enters with a coffee tray.)

BAMIE. Excuse me, Teddy, I've brought you coffee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Bamie, may I present Mr. Murray. This is my sister Anna, and of all the Roosevelts, she most resembles my dear father. Mr. Murray wants me to go into politics, Bamie. What would father have said?

BAMIE. The only time he tried politics, I'm afraid he was a miserable failure.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Then maybe this is my chance to vindicate him.

Mr. MURRAY. Then you'll do it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I don't think so.

Mr. MURRAY. Have you any immediate plans that would prevent you from accepting the nomination?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. None.

BAMIE. There's his book to be finished, of course, and a month or so in the Dakotas for some good hunting. Then he's about to start his second year at law school, and there's his work as trustee of the Orthopedic Dispensary and the New York Infant Asylum. And he's enlisted in the National Guard.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Otherwise, I have no plans, so it's not time lack, it's the inclination.

Mr. MURRAY. You're interested in just about everything, aren't you, Mr. Roosevelt? What will you settle down to eventually? bird watching? taxidermy? mountain climbing?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There's plenty of time to decide on a career.

Mr. MURRAY. I know other young men of your class, Mr. Roosevelt, who are still saying that at 50.

(Alice Lee Roosevelt and Edith Carow enter.)

ALICE. Edith's going home, Teddy. She wants to say goodnight.

Mr. MURRAY. Good evening, sir. Good evening, Mrs. Roosevelt.

BAMIE. I'll call your carriage.

ALICE. Edith's just been telling me the fun you used to have when you were children, Teddy.

EDITH. Fun? All he did was drag me on backbreaking hikes to spy at birds.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Edith was an admirable hiker.

EDITH. She had to be if she wanted Teddy's company.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. She was also an outrageous flirt.

EDITH. And he, my dear Alice, was just like Mr. Browning's "pertest little ape that ever affronted human shape: full of his travel, stuck on himself."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. "Sing a song of acids."

EDITH. "Base and alkali."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. "Four-and-twenty gases."

EDITH. "Baked into a pie."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. "When the pie was opened."

EDITH. "Wonderful to say."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. "Oxygen and hydrogen."

BOTH. "Both flew away."

(Bamie enters.)

BAMIE. Edith, your carriage is here.

EDITH. Just coming, Bamie. Welcome home, Teddy. Thank you for a lovely eve-

ning. Goodnight, Alice. I know you're going to be happy.

ALICE. Dear Edith——

EDITH. Good night.

(She and Bamie go.)

BAMIE (as they go). I hope you'll be able to attend the Patriarch's Ball next week, Edith——

ALICE. Am I an admirable hiker? Teddy dear, I love all your friends so very much, but I don't seem able to get close to Edith Carow. Were you and she sweethearts?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Some people thought so.

ALICE. But were you? Don't squeak in my ear.

(He squeaks in her ear. She steps back.)

ALICE. Teddy, answer my question.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Oh, Alice! My sunshine. Never, by any word or action or even thought, never have I loved any girl but you, nor will I ever, on my solemn oath. What is it, Sunshine?

ALICE. I have been reading another one of your diaries.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What year? Have I written something to upset you?

ALICE. "March 26, 1880. Complete physical examination today. Dr. Sargent says my heart is my weak point, that I must beware of too much exertion, that I must in fact even avoid running upstairs. Otherwise my life will be a short one."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. "My reaction was prompt. I answered that I was going to disobey these instructions to the letter, that if I must live the kind of life he prescribed, I preferred dying young."

ALICE. That was only a year and a half ago.

(He tears out the page and throws it away.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That page was unfit, Sunshine. I've been fighting death all my life, Alice, and by heaven, I've licked it. When I was just a boy, my dear father said to me, "Teedie—" they called me Teedie in those days. "Teedie, you have the mind but you do not have the body, and without the help of the body, the mind cannot go as far as it should." Then his face became very grave, and he called me Theodore, as if I were grown up. "Theodore," he said, "you must create your body. It is hard drudgery, but I know you will do it." And I did it, Alice. Where there was just flesh, I made muscle. I expanded my chest by inches. I even made myself grow taller.

ALICE. But you can't make a good heart, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Listen. That's the best heart you'll ever hear.

ALICE. In all ways.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. How do you make those pretty waves?

ALICE. With water. Oh, Teddy, I'm so frightened of death.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (O.S.). Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In here, Mother.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy. Bamie tells me you're considering going into politics, and I want to know if it's absolutely necessary? After all, you come from prominent landowners and clergymen, at least on my side. And everybody knows that politics are not controlled by gentlemen but by saloon keepers and horse car conductors and the like. Rough, brutal and unpleasant men, all of them.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If that is true, Muffie, then it means that the people we know do not belong to the governing class, and it's time they did.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. So you are going into politics?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Why not?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (putting her handkerchief to her nose, waiving at the air). Have you been stuffing animals again?

(She hurries out.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My life, Alice.

(Dissolve to: Closeup of saloon.)

Mr. MURRAY. Beers for the house—on Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. FISCHER (contemptuously). A dude from Fifth Avenue.

(Pull back to see a low saloon on Sixth Avenue near 55th Street. Joseph Murray at a table. Fischer, the owner, stands.)

Mr. MURRAY. Good healthy American stock. Not a blot on the "scutcheon." And he's not machine. What's more, he's a crusader. Once he's elected——

Mr. FISCHER. If he's elected.

Mr. MURRAY. He won the nomination hands down, didn't he? Look at the votes he can bring us. All his Fifth Avenue friends. And he's a law student at Columbia College, you know, so we'll get all the athletic teams and the faculty——

Mr. FISCHER. And what about us on Sixth Avenue? What's his kind got to offer my kind?

Mr. MURRAY. That's exactly why I've asked him here tonight, so you can see for yourself what he has to offer. Just listen to him. That's all I ask.

Mr. FISCHER. What's his name again?

Mr. MURRAY. Roosevelt. T. Roosevelt.

Mr. FISCHER. Why'd you say T. Roosevelt?

Mr. MURRAY. Because that's his initial.

Mr. FISCHER. What's it stand for?

Mr. MURRAY. Theodore.

Mr. FISCHER. Theodore? You might as well give us an Algernon or a Percy.

(There is something of an explosion as Roosevelt bursts into the saloon, calling loudly, attracting a great deal of attention.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Joe, where are you? Joe Murray? I'm sorry to have kept you waiting, Joe, but I couldn't get away from the FCDC.

Mr. MURRAY. A secret university organization.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (squeaking). The Family Circle dancing class, Joe. One of Ward McAllister's innovations. And I got so involved in quadrilles and lancers and polkas that I lost all track of time.

Mr. MURRAY. Becoming quite a fad. I'd like you to meet Mr. Fischer, the proprietor. Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. How d'you do, sir. Where's the kitchen?

Mr. FISCHER. What?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Where's your kitchen?

Mr. FISCHER. What's he going to do out there?

Mr. MURRAY. I'm not sure.

(The kitchen door bangs open and Roosevelt reappears.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Bully.

(Rushing to Fischer, pumping his hand again.) I've dined at Delmonico's and all the others, Mr. Fischer, and your kitchen's as clean as the best of them.

Mr. MURRAY. Sit down Mr. Roosevelt, and have a drink.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not for me, Joe. I don't believe in it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Roosevelt means he doesn't believe in drinking for himself.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Ale's all right, and a little wine now and then doesn't hurt.

Mr. FISCHER. If we send you to Albany, Mr. Roosevelt, how do we know you'll be fair to the liquor interests?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because I intend to treat all interests fairly.

Mr. FISCHER. All right, let's start with the license fees. What'll you do to lower them?

Mr. MURRAY. As Mr. Roosevelt's manager, I can assure you that he——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What do you pay?

Mr. FISCHER. Two hundred dollars.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. By Godfrey, that's not right.

Mr. MURRAY. You see!

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's not enough, Joe. Not half enough.

Mr. FISCHER (in a fury). I think you're a prohibitionist, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Oh, no, sir. You don't catch me there. Prohibition is a curse. I will oppose them with all my strength.

Mr. MURRAY. I told you, Fischer, that Mr. Roosevelt would stand up for you.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's foolish to hope for the enforcement of such laws. People will find ways to drink. You liquor sellers know this, and we don't frighten you for a minute. We do frighten you if we try to regulate your traffic, to see that as far as it can be made, it shall be made decent. That's why I do not favor prohibition and I do favor a high license fee.

Mr. FISCHER. Hear that, boys? Theodore is out to scare me.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What did you call me, sir?

Mr. FISCHER. Theodore. That's your name, isn't it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, it's my name, and I don't mind your calling me by it, although I haven't given you permission to. What I do mind is the manner in which you said it.

Mr. FISCHER. What d'you wear that ribbon on your glasses for, Theodore? Why don't you tie it in your hair, Theodore?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I have everyone's attention for a moment. I'd like you to listen carefully to the manner in which Mr. Fischer, here, is addressing me. Mr. Fischer, if you'll oblige.

Mr. FISCHER. Won't mama's boy catch cold out in them tight pants, Theodore?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Roosevelt, please——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Theodore is a perfectly good masculine name, deriving from the Greek "theos" meaning god, and "doron" meaning gift. Gift of God. The tone of voice in which Mr. Fischer is saying it implies a slur on my manhood and masculinity, if not on the manhood and masculinity of all Theodores. I trust I have made my position clear. Is it clear to you, Mr. Fischer?

Mr. FISCHER. Why sure, Theodore.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My glasses, Joe. I can't see a thing. Give this man a glass of cognac.

BARTENDER. A glassa what?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Brandy. Are you all right, Mr. Fischer? Sir, your face is dirty.

(He turns to address the room.)

As a man is privately moral, so is he publicly moral? You have seen my private morality. Was it fair?

(A slight murmur and mumble.)

Well? Speak up.

(Muttering from the group.)

That, gentlemen, is the kind of justice you will receive if you see fit to send me to Albany in the coming election. I shall go untrammeled and unpledged. I will obey no boss and serve no clique. Are you ready, Joe?

(He puts a coin on the bar, gives the brandy to Fischer, receives his handkerchief in return, swings his cape over his arm and supports a very limp Joseph Murray out of the saloon.)

Mr. MURRAY. In the future, Mr. Roosevelt, I think it might be wiser if you saw to the college boys and your friends on Fifth Avenue, and left the other end to me.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That's the way, Joe. Divide the duties, then everything gets done.

(Dissolve to: Bamie and Alice in a small sitting room. Bamie is at the desk, answering neat piles of correspondence. Alice reads Teddy's diaries.)

BAMIE. It really is exciting, Alice. Teddy has received support from the most unexpected places. Elihu Root. And Moses Taylor Pyne. He writes that although he is a Democrat, he is supporting Teddy.

(Mrs. Roosevelt enters.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. I'm so nervous. I don't know how you can be so calm during an election. Any news yet?

BAMIE (back to her work). It's too soon, Muffie. The polls have just closed. I thought you were going to the opera.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. On Teddy's election night?

BAMIE. You said you were. With the Lanes.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. The Lanes. Oh, dear, Bamie, I forgot. It was last night I was going to the opera. I know because it was Tristan, and they only do German on Mondays. Oh, blast! I wish this election were over with. It's reached the point where I can't remember my own name.

(She crosses to hall.)

Mr. Murray.

Mr. MURRAY. Where's Mr. Roosevelt?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy, Mr. Murray is here.

(Spreading the sheet on the floor.)

Before you say a word, Mr. Murray, I want you to stand on this, for you've been walking through nothing but slush.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe I have the pleasure of addressing the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt.

ALICE (embracing him). Teddy, you won.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (beaming, all teeth). By Godfrey, sir, you may call me Teddy.

Mr. MURRAY. By 1,500 votes. Twice the usual margin. What a day it was. All the young men from Columbia College turned up at the polls and wanted to know where the tough districts were.

It was the cleanest election in 20 years. I must spread the good news. Congratulations, Teddy.

(Murray leaves.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (kissing Teddy). If it's what you really wanted, Teddy, I'm happy for you.

(Bamie enters.)

BAMIE. The neighbors are coming in. They want to congratulate you.

ALICE. You'll have to make a speech.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (gathering up the sheet). Heavens, my hall carpet.

ALICE. Let me help you.

(She and Alice go out, and voices may be heard.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Did you think I'd win, Bamie?

BAMIE. Whatever you do, Teddy, you do thoroughly. Yes, I thought you'd win.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Blast. I just did it. Out of the corner of my eye. And now I'm suddenly responsible for the welfare of several thousand people I don't even know. That's the end of the law studies.

BAMIE. You weren't really serious about law.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I just wonder if a few years from now I'll be putting politics on the shelf to make room for some new career. And a few years later, will I be putting that career on the shelf—I wonder if father is looking down on me and shaking his head, "Teedie, Teedie." As if I were a little boy.

(Edith Carow appears in the door, unnoticed.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want him to be proud of me, and he wouldn't be. Look at this room. I'm sick of this hodge-podge, Bamie, this maze of half-started lives.

EDITH. Even when you were little, Teddy, you never could decide if you wanted to serve the world, yourself, God, or your father.

(She advances to hug him.)

EDITH. I've just heard the news. Congratulations.

(Gallery:)

ALICE. Oh, Muffie, must you always be late?

MUFFIE. For once in my life I was early, and I stopped in this little shop.

ALICE. Oh, Muffie, isn't it exciting? It's the first time we've heard Teddy speak in the assembly.

(Dissolve to: Teddy on the floor of the assembly.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am proposing is simple in the extreme and does not warrant this prolonged discussion. I am simply seeking the reestablishment of a means of inflicting corporal punishment upon male persons in certain cases only. Any man who inflicts brutal or unusual pain or violence upon the person of any female or a male under 14 years of age deserves to be whipped and to be whipped publicly. The only way this can be accomplished is by the erection of outdoor whipping posts.

(Crowd reacts.)

(Cut to: Gallery.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. That sounds like a very sensible proposal.

(Cut to: Assemblyman.)

ASSEMBLYMAN. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Roosevelt has an excellent suggestion but let us hope he will not stop at the whipping posts. I propose a vote of thanks and wish him Godspeed in the reestablishment of the stocks, the pillory and the rack, and once having advanced to this point, there will be little trouble in paving the way for the thumbscrew and the ducking stool.

(Cut to: Alice and Mrs. Roosevelt, her packages piled high on her lap, in the gallery.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. What's the matter?

ALICE. They're laughing at Teddy. They're laughing at him.

(They lean closer together. Teddy is heard screaming "Mr. Spee-kar. Mr. Spee-kar," over the roaring laughter.)

ACT 2

(Fade in: Mrs. Roosevelt and Bamie in the sitting room. Bamie cuts articles from the newspapers and Mrs. Roosevelt pastes them into a scrapbook.)

BAMIE. What's that you're hiding?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Do we have to save every single article, Bamie? Why can't we just keep the pleasant ones?

BAMIE. Father would want Teddy to pay special attention to the unpleasant ones.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. But this one is dreadful. "When young Mr. Roosevelt finished his affecting oration, the house was in tears—the house was in tears of uncontrollable laughter." Oh, Bamie, after almost three terms, they're still laughing at him, even in the newspapers. Why do they keep reelecting him if all they're going to do is laugh at him?

BAMIE. They didn't laugh at him over the Westbrook affair, or Jay Gould——

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Of course I never understood that anyway. Isn't Mr. Gould a wealthy man?

BAMIE. Very.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Then why did Teddy attack him so? It seems to me he's turning against his own kind.

BAMIE. Mr. Gould is a member of the criminal wealthy class, Muffie. I say good for Teddy.

(Alice enters.)

ALICE. Hasn't Teddy come in yet?

BAMIE. Those meetings go on all night sometimes.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. You go to bed, dear. We'll wait up for him.

ALICE. No, Muffie, I must be down here when he comes in. I don't want him to think I spend all my time lying down.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. But when a woman is expecting a baby, dear, she's supposed to rest. My dear, there's nothing wrong with being tired.

ALICE. Have you ever known Teddy to be? Of course not, he won't let himself.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy's not having the baby.

(A door slams off.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Blast. They should be arrested, but I'll wager they've bought off every policeman on the force.

(Kissing Alice.)

How are you, Sunshine? Shouldn't you be resting?

ALICE. I'm not tired, not a bit.

BAMIE. What's happened, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'll fight them any way they want to, with words or insults, or even pistols, as long as it's in the open. But when they attack a man in the dark of night, as he's turning into his own gate.

ALICE (frightened). Did someone attack you, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (squeaking). Of course not, Sunshine. I outfoxed them.

(He kisses her. A maid enters.)

MAID. Excuse me, Mr. Roosevelt, there's a Mr. Gompers to see you.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. At this time of night?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Samuel Gompers?

MAID. He just said Gompers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There can't be two men walking the earth with an idiot name like that. Take him to my study.

(He implies "in chains." The maid goes.)

Now they're invading my very hearth.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. He might have sent in a card.

BAMIE. Isn't he the labor organizer, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The Cigarmakers International, if you please.

(He strides out of the room, blood in his eyes.)

(Dissolve to: Samuel Gompers, waiting in Teddy's study. Roosevelt storms in, closing the door.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Gompers, as I was peacefully walking across 57th Street this evening, not an hour ago, a number of the more anarchistic leaders of your Cigarmakers International tried to ambush me in the middle of 57th Street.

Mr. GOMPERS. I knew nothing of this, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. All because I opposed that blasted tenement bill of yours.

Mr. GOMPERS. I came here to reason with you.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm a reasonable man, but——

Mr. GOMPERS. You don't seem to be.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Hold on, Gompers, I'm the most reasonable man in the world and you know it. Proceed, reason with me.

Mr. GOMPERS. (Almost with a sigh.) The purpose of our bill, Mr. Roosevelt, is merely to prohibit the manufacture of cigars in tenement houses. Despite popular belief, we are not staging a revolution or——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And I say it is unthinkable to interfere with an employer, to tell him where and how he can make or have made his cigars.

Mr. GOMPERS. All I want to do is to improve the working and living conditions of the people I represent.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Rot. You're the worst enemy of the people you represent. It is criminal to teach a poor laborer that he is a victim of conspiracy and injustice, when in reality he is merely working out his fate with blood and sweat as men who are worthy of the name always have done and always will have to do.

Mr. GOMPERS. You profess to be fair to every American citizen; are laborers not included?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is up to the man to change his conditions, not up to his government. All the State can do is see that no wrong is done him by someone else——

Mr. GOMPERS. No wrong is done him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (overriding). And that all alike have a fair chance in the struggle to improve themselves.

Mr. GOMPERS. A fair chance in the——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Stop repeating what I say.

Mr. GOMPERS (direct, almost aggressive). Mr. ROOSEVELT, our bill has gone to the committee on cities of which you are a member. I'd like to know what progress has been made.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We're investigating conditions. Isn't that what you wanted?

Mr. GOMPERS. Where?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We're holding meetings at the St. James Hotel.

Mr. GOMPERS. But the cigars are being made in the tenements.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We're calling in witnesses, of course. Landlords, employers——

Mr. GOMPERS. The landlords are the employers.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The landlords, the employers, the laborers themselves——

Mr. GOMPERS. Why not go to the tenements?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I imagine we'll make a tour eventually.

Mr. GOMPERS. And I imagine you'll permit the landlords to map out your tour.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Are you suggesting our investigation will not be fair?

Mr. GOMPERS. The landlords will only let you see what they want you to see. I suggest you make an unofficial tour with me tonight.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And won't you show me only what you want me to see.

Mr. GOMPERS. Of course! Then later on, after your official tour, you'll have seen both sides.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. At this hour? The whole point is to see the people working, isn't it?

Mr. GOMPERS. You will see the people working.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We can't just poke our way in.

Mr. GOMPERS (opening his satchel). I have here a cheap set of Dickens' works. You and I, Mr. Roosevelt, are going to be book agents for an evening.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (taking a book, turning it over in his hand, suddenly laughing his squeaky laugh). By Godfrey, that tickles me. But we can't go from door to door selling books at midnight.

Mr. GOMPERS. Night and day are all the same in the tenements, as you will see if you are willing to be fair.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. All right, Gompers, I'll go! How's that for being fair?

Mr. GOMPERS. Bully.

(Dissolve to: Alice in the sitting room. Mrs. Roosevelt joins her.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Alice, why are you up so late?

ALICE. It's suicidal weather, Muffie. If one were easily influenced by such things, life wouldn't seem worth living. The very air suggests death and decay, doesn't it?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Teddy wouldn't want you to sit up for him like this. He'd want you to go to bed. He won't think you're being weak.

ALICE. I've been to bed, Muffie. I can't sleep.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. That uncomfortable?

(Alice nods.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Would you like me to send for the doctor?

ALICE. No.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Just uncomfortable?

(Alice nods.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Well then, dear, I'll sit up with you. Only I think I'll stay over here, because I've had a feeling all day that I'm coming down with a cold, and I don't want you to catch it.

ALICE. Don't sit with me if you're not feeling well.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. I know what it is to be uncomfortable—as you are. Bamie, of course, arrived punctually, with no fuss. But Teddy, he came into the world as if on a dare. (Softly, shaking her head.) Oh, yes, I remember what it is to be uncomfortable.

ALICE. I hope my baby looks like Teddy.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. No, you don't, Alice, because he looked like a turtle. I must get you some ginger preserves. That's what I had for lunch the day he was born, and they tasted so good. I'd actually been out shopping that morning. And when my time came, late in the afternoon, every doctor in the neighborhood was ill in bed, if you can believe it. But my mother was with me, and Mother Roosevelt, and I remember how comforting their presence was.

ALICE. Yours is comforting too, Muffie.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Is it? Is it, really? Well now, that pleases me very much. Except Bamie would be annoyed with us for sitting down here in the cold.

ALICE. Bamie wouldn't know how to sit with me like this.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Bamie is so very efficient. I used to run the house, you know, and handle the servants and plan the menus, but she does it so well that I let her do it now. Although it leaves me feeling rather useless sometimes. (Dabbing her forehead with her handkerchief.) Do you think it's unusually warm in here?

ALICE (overlapping). Was that the front door?

(They listen.)

(Cut to: Teddy, just inside the front door, ashen, upset. He suddenly is wracked by coughing and desperately tries to smother it.)

Mrs. ROOSEVELT (off, softly). Teddy? (He enters the sitting room.) It's your asthma again, isn't it? After all these years.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (reassuringly). No, Muffie, it's just this filthy weather.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Where did you go with that funny Gompers man?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (wearily). Don't laugh at him, Muffie. (Then trying to be bright and jocular.) He's the first labor leader I've ever known who spoke grammatically. (He laughs and puts his arm around her.) What are two of my girls doing up?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Talking about you, dear. But now that you're home, I'm going to bed. I won't kiss either of you good night, though, because of my germs. I think I'm coming down with a cold. Good night.

ALICE. Good night.

(She goes. Teddy immediately turns away, another stored-up, heaving cough.)

ALICE. Oh, Teddy, it is your asthma.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I won't have it be.

(He sprawls, exhausted, into a chair, forcing himself to breathe deeply, to control and bring a rhythm to his breathing, audibly counting.)

One, two, three.

ALICE. Oh, Teddy, I'm going to have this baby as if it were nothing at all. I'm not even going to make a sound.

(He is now breathing more easily and puts his head back. She sits on a stool at his feet.)

ALICE. Is there anything I can get you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (closing his eyes, half mumbling). These men, Alice. These fiends.

ALICE. What men, dear?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. They import these poor ignorant devils—Bohemians who can't even speak English, they bring them in by the hundreds. And they literally lock them up in tenements, sometimes two families to a room. And there they sit, round the clock—making cigars. And they pay them $3 a week and they charge them $3 a week for dirty food and verminous lodging. And the tobacco is piled in the corners, and the children sleep on it when they're not working. And the consumptives. We were pretending to sell these people books. Books. And one little girl saw a picture in one of the books, and she laughed, and she pointed to the picture and then to herself as if to say, "It's me." It was Little Dorrit in Marshalsea Prison. (He takes off his glasses and rubs his eyes.) I've always felt that if a man believes something, he should believe it unswervingly and live by it to the end of his days. I do not believe in this tenement bill before the house. It is wrong.

ALICE. Can't wrong ever be right, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (smiling affectionately at her foolishness). Never, Sunshine. That I know. And yet I have seen what I have seen. And I feel I must support Samuel Gompers. But I cannot and will not change my beliefs, which means I must support a man whose principles I decry. That I cannot do, either. (Suddenly sitting forward, slapping his knee.) And I won't. After all, if this bill were passed, those poor devils would be thrown into the streets to shift for themselves in a strange, foreign city. They might even forfeit their livelihood.

ALICE. But if they go on as they are, Teddy, mightn't they forfeit their lives?

(They cross to hall stairs.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You go to bed, Sweetheart, I have some work to do.

ALICE. Are you sure you're all right, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes. Good night.

ALICE. Good night, Sweetheart.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You must promise not to have the baby until I return from Albany.

ALICE. I'll have it whenever you say.

(He goes off to his study. She returns to her chair where she sits in the dark, gazing out the window at the cruelest of all Februarys.)

(Dissolve to: The lobby of the Delavan Hotel. Gompers comes downstairs, a bellboy carrying his suitcases.)

Mr. GOMPERS. Get me a carriage, please. (The boy goes. Gompers turns to the desk.) Do you know if Mr. Roosevelt has returned from the capitol?

CLERK. Not to my knowledge, Mr. Gompers. And if I may say so, sir, we always do know it when Mr. Roosevelt passes through the lobby.

Mr. GOMPERS (sternly). He is not a theatrical entertainment, you know.

CLERK. I'm sorry, sir.

Mr. GOMPERS. It's time people started taking Mr. Roosevelt more seriously. He's a man to be reckoned with.

(He sees Roosevelt coming in.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Gompers.

Mr. GOMPERS. I'm on my way to catch the 6 o'clock, Mr. Roosevelt, but I did want to thank you again for your efforts in our behalf.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Just don't misunderstand my motives. Whatever I did, I did solely in the interest of public health.

Mr. GOMPERS. Your speech this morning was truly impassionated. It was the deciding factor that turned the tide in our favor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (squeaking). I'll tell you a secret, Mr. Gompers. This morning I could have defeated the Devil himself and all the legions of hell, single handed, in open combat. You see, 10 minutes before I rose to speak, a telegram was put in my hand. I'm the father of a baby girl.

Mr. GOMPERS (shaking his hand). Congratulations.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (beaming, all teeth). Thank you, sir.

Mr. GOMPERS. Then you'll be going to New York tonight, too, won't you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. All's well at home. I'll stay till tomorrow. My aldermanic bill is to be put up for its final passage.

CLERK. Telegram, sir.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You and I must keep in touch, Mr. Gompers, for your problems aren't over yet.

Mr. GOMPERS. They never will be, Mr. Roosevelt. (He opens it. His expression changes.) What is it?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You say you're going on the 6 o'clock?

Mr. GOMPERS. I've a carriage waiting.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (grabbing his arm). Come along.

Mr. GOMPERS. Your baggage, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Come along.

(Roosevelt is pushing him toward the street.)

(Dissolve to: The front hall of the Roosevelt house. Edith Carow hurries across the hall, Teddy enters.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Edith.

EDITH. I can't tell you, Teddy. Bamie must do it.

(She hurries up the stairs as Bamie comes down to face Teddy.)

BAMIE. There's a curse on this house, Teddy. Alice is dying, and Mother is dying, too.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Muffie?

BAMIE. Our little Muffie. Typhoid. We thought it was a cold.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Alice.

(Teddy rushes past her and up the stairs.)

(Dissolve to: Alice in bed. Teddy enters and leans over her.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Alice? My Sunshine?

ALICE. Oh, Teddy, I failed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Never, Sweetheart, we have a beautiful baby girl, just as sunny as her mama.

ALICE. I failed. I've tried, honestly I have, to make myself live—it was in my mind to—but you said the mind isn't good without the body, and—I've tried to grow taller. But Teddy, I keep, I keep getting smaller. I grab each breath. (She closes her eyes and tries to breathe deeply.) One, two, and then there isn't. (She struggles pitiably for a moment, then becomes calmer. She gazes at him clearly.) Where's Muffie? She promised to come and sit with me.

(Bamie has entered quietly.)

BAMIE. Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'll find out where she is.

(He steals softly out of the room, leaving Bamie at Alice's bedside.)

(Dissolve to: Mrs. Roosevelt in bed. A chair nearby is covered with a sheet. Teddy comes close.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What's this sheet for, Muffie?

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. For the doctor, of course, when he calls. Think of the places he has been, Teddy. The diseases he has come in contact with. I don't want him to bring any more germs than necessary into my house, or to leave them on my chairs, at any rate. Do you see how efficient I am? Now let me see, do I have any instructions for you and Bamie? Is there any place where I'm supposed to be? Why hasn't Alice come to sit with me?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You'll see her very soon, Muffie.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. After all, I've only a little cold. Now let me see. Is there any place where I'm supposed to be? Would you like me to hear your prayers, Teddie?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, Mama.

Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Put that sheet on the floor, dear, under your knees.

Now let me see. Is there any place where I'm supposed to be?

(He tries to pray, but sobs instead. It doesn't matter, for she no longer hears.)

ACT 3

(Dissolve to: Teddy, in study. Bamie enters.)

BAMIE. The nurse has agreed to stay on, Teddy, so Baby Alice will be in capable hands. When are you returning to Albany?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Efficient, even unto death, aren't you?

BAMIE. Someone has to keep the house running.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm going West, Bamie, as soon as possible.

BAMIE. At this time of year? Your term in Albany isn't half over.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm leaving politics.

BAMIE. For good?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have to be where there's activity, strenuous activity. I need the roundups and the hunting and the fighting. (Suddenly brandishing the rifle over his head in an outburst of outraged grief.) By Godfrey, I wish there'd be a war.

BAMIE. That remark would make father very proud of you.

(Joseph Murray appears.)

Mr. MURRAY. Teddy?

BAMIE. Look, Teddy, here's Mr. Murray.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Hello, Joe.

Mr. MURRAY. I guess this February weather is never going to end, is it. My feet are wet, Miss Roosevelt, maybe I should have something to stand on. That was clumsy, wasn't it? Just trying to recall pleasanter days.

BAMIE. It's good of you to come and see us, Mr. Murray.

Mr. MURRAY. It was a beautiful service yesterday.

BAMIE. You were there. Thank you for that.

Mr. MURRAY. Maybe you and Teddy didn't see all the people there. Mayor Grace and Mayor Seth Low from Brooklyn—and Titus Sheard.

BAMIE. Did you hear that, Teddy? How could they leave Albany, Mr. Murray?

Mr. MURRAY. The assembly adjourned yesterday, Teddy.

BAMIE. In the middle of a session? That's unheard of.

Mr. MURRAY. After the journal was read, there was a resolution, and it set forth the condolence of that assembly in the hope that it might serve to fortify you (he takes a sheaf of papers from his pocket). Fortify you (reading), "in this moment of agony and weakness." There were seven speeches made before the vote. I've brought you copies.

BAMIE. Look, Teddy—O'Neil, Isaac Hunt, Lucas Van Allen——

Mr. MURRAY. Even our enemies, Teddy.

BAMIE (reading): "We can say nothing to console our friend. We, his fellow members, who are here today in the full enjoyment of our health and happiness, all that we can say to him is: Be still, and know that God is just."

Mr. MURRAY. Then the resolution was passed.

BAMIE. What was the vote?

Mr. MURRAY. Unanimous. Tammany and all. That body of men rose to its feet like a great wave. And the assembly was adjourned. But I thought you'd like to know.

BAMIE. They're not laughing at you any more, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'll finish out my term. That's all.

Mr. MURRAY. Putting another career on the shelf? What would his father say?

BAMIE. He'd shake his head and he'd say "Teedie, Teedie."

(Fade in: Film clip of desolate, snow-driven prairies. Teddy's voice comes in over the scene.)

ROOSEVELT'S VOICE (tired, subdued). Dear Bamie, here in the Badlands this is known as the winter of the iron cold. The cattle lie frozen everywhere, and they say that any man who survives it deserves to call himself a man. I will not be home for Baby Alice's first birthday, for it is also the first anniversary of the loss of her dear mother, and I prefer to spend it in the desolate, grim beauty of this place, with its lonely prairie and broken land.

(Cut to: Film clip of a violent roundup, dust and hot dry sun.)

(Coming in with booming vitality.)

Dear Bamie, today I was in the saddle at 2 a.m. It has been 5 weeks since I had breakfast as late as 4 a.m. When I am sleepy, I rub tobacco in my eyes to keep them open. On the range, they laugh at me for my grammar, for whereas the other cowboys holler "Giddyap." I am often heard to shout, "Hasten along there, quickly." I have finished writing a new book called "The Hunting Trips of a Ranchman."

(Cut to: Teddy, with his rifle, creeping stealthily through the brush. His voice comes through an excited whisper.)

Dear Bamie, I find my blood leaping with sheer buoyant lightheartedness. The statesman, question mark, of the past has been merged, alas, I fear for good, into the cowboy of the present. Best love to baby Alice, and tell her, if she yet understands the English language, that her daddy will visit his sunshine girl for Christmas.

(The creeping figure has poised his gun and now empties it wildly. In the silence that follows.)

Today I shot a 9-foot bear.

(Dissolve to: Teddy's study. See him stowing his books into packing cases.)

EDITH. Bamie? Bamie, it's Edith. (She enters.) Good morning, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Good morning, Edith.

EDITH. Bamie invited me to spend the day with her, so I brought along your birthday present.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Aren't you being a bit premature? My birthday isn't until the end of the month.

EDITH. My invitations to this house are becoming increasingly rare. I warn you, it will make you look a fool on the range, because it's something for the opera. But then, I'm trying to lure you back to civilization. It's true. I'm not going to let you return to your precious Dakota. Did you have fun last night? I haven't danced so long and so late in years. And I'd completely forgotten how graceful you are on the dance floor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Any man worthy of that name is not graceful, Edith, he's well coordinated.

EDITH. And pompous, too. Let me help. Why are you packing?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Now that I'm settled out there, I miss my books and collections.

EDITH. There's plenty of time for that, because you're not leaving us for months and months yet.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As a matter of fact, I've decided to cut short my visit.

EDITH. Can't you at least stay until February? For Baby Alice's second birthday.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Baby Alice doesn't even know who I am, Edith.

EDITH. That's your fault, isn't it? Is this a sudden decision?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. This morning.

EDITH (after a moment). What's it like out there? Where do you live? Who looks after you?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. My ranch is called the Maltese Cross. I live in a cabin. I look after myself.

EDITH. It sounds lonely.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have never minded loneliness.

EDITH. I have always minded it. I can't imagine anyone deliberately seeking it out.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (briskly). Here they only talk about democracy, Edith. Out West they have it. Complete separation from the past. Each morning symbolizes the start of a new life.

EDITH. Complete separation from the past. Is that what you really want?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have not missed public life for a moment.

EDITH. I was thinking more of your personal life.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have none.

EDITH. You could have. Oh, Teddy. It's been almost 2 years since Alice died.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. For joy or for sorrow, Edith, that side of my life has been lived out.

BAMIE. I didn't hear you come in, Edith.

EDITH. Hello, Bamie. Mother wants to know if you and Teddy will come to us for dinner tonight.

BAMIE. Of course we will. We'd love to, wouldn't we, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm sorry, but I've made other plans for dinner.

BAMIE. What plans have you made?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Other plans.

EDITH. I think I'll go see Baby Alice.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Bamie, may I remind you it's not right for Edith to come here quite so often.

BAMIE. Edith is my dearest friend, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I'm not sure it's wise for her to be seen entering and leaving the house so freely.

BAMIE. And you won't go to her house, not even with me.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I won't do anything that could possibly be misinterpreted as disloyalty to the memory of Alice. For the duration of my visit perhaps you'll warn me when Edith is going to be here so that I may absent myself.

BAMIE. All right, dear. This parcel just came from Putnam's. How many books did you write out West?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's a book about Alice. (He hands her a copy.) I want you to read it.

BAMIE (taking it). Thank you.

(Sitting room.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Joe Murray.

Mr. MURRAY. Teddy, you're looking fit. I have something important to tell you. I need the smell of formaldehyde. (They walk through hall to study.) Look at that barrel chest—all rugged and tanned.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think I've finally won my battle for strength. Really won it this time, Joe.

Mr. MURRAY (sitting busily). Good. Then you're all set to go to work. This is to go no further. Mayor Grace wants you to consider the presidency of the board of health.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The board of health?

Mr. MURRAY. That whole department needs cleaning up, Teddy, and you're just the man to do it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Me?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, the incumbent's been indicted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What for?

Mr. MURRAY. Accepting a bribe in the course of his official duties.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The man ought to be publicly horsewhipped.

Mr. MURRAY. No, not that again, Teddy. Of course you may think the position beneath your dignity——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have never been that kind of a snob and you know it.

Mr. MURRAY. Then you would accept?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. You've ambushed me, Joe. No, I would not.

Mr. MURRAY. You just want me to talk you into it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not. I'm going to the Dakotas. This time forever.

Mr. MURRAY. Now, Teddy, you're not going to spend the rest of your life chasing cows.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I made a pledge to myself to be through with public life, and by Godfrey, I am. From now on its adventure. And writing on the side.

Mr. MURRAY. Why, Teddy? I could understand at first. The whole world went wrong and you had to get away. Of course, you did. But now it's time to come back.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Whatever success I had in politics was mainly accidental.

Mr. MURRAY. Now, Teddy—I wouldn't say that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I mean, I went into it out of the corner of my eye, and that's how I sailed through the whole thing. But in the past year and a half—since Alice—I find I must care very greatly for whatever I do, or I simply cannot do it.

Mr. MURRAY. Teddy, that's just the very thing you needed to put you head and shoulders above every other man in public life.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But now I don't want to hear any more about public life.

Mr. MURRAY. All right. When I first came to you 4 years ago and asked you to run for the legislature, I was just looking for a votegetter, and that's all I got. A nice young man in politics, that's what you were. But you became a professional. You took a big step forward in your life, Teddy. But now you're on the verge of taking two steps backward. What do you want to be now, a nice young man in a cowboy suit? A nice young man in literature. Then a nice young man here, a nice young man there, until there's nothing left of you but a nice old man nowhere. Or will you, for once in your life, finish what you started? And become the man you can become. Whatever you do, Teddy, I'll always be proudest of the fact that I discovered you.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And I'll always be proudest of the fact that the man who discovered me was absolutely straight.

(They shake hands. Bamie enters, the memorial in her hand.)

BAMIE. Teddy, I've read your memorial to Alice.

(She holds out the book.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That's for you to keep, Bamie.

BAMIE. I don't want it. (She hands him the book.) Have you read what you've written?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No.

ROOSEVELT'S VOICE. "She was beautiful in face and form, and lovelier still in spirit; as a young flower she grew, and as a fair young flower she died. Her life had always been in the sunshine—and when I lost my heart's dearest, the light went from my life forever."

(He gazes at the page, then closes the book. He removes his glasses, places them on the closed book, and rubs his eyes.)

(Dissolve to: Bamie and Edith in the small sitting room, trimming a Christmas tree.)

EDITH. Why hasn't he come out of his study all afternoon, Bamie? He even insisted on having his lunch sent in to him. Is it because I'm here? Doesn't he want to see me for some reason?

BAMIE. Dear Edith. I think he's afraid he wants to see you too much.

EDITH (after digesting this for a moment). I don't know whether to be flattered or heartbroken. I think all I really am is sad. And not only for myself. But for the whole world that he's forsaking.

(Teddy enters.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, Edith. Bamie.

BAMIE. Would you like some tea, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, thank you.

EDITH. I must be on my way.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Don't go, Edith. What I mean is—you're welcome to stay.

EDITH. Thank you, Teddy. But it's late.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well then, Bamie, perhaps you'll have Edith's carriage brought round.

BAMIE. Of course, Teddy.

(She goes.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Edith, once you told me I had to decide if I wanted to serve the world, myself, God, or my father.

EDITH. Imagine your remembering.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, at last I've decided. I want to serve them all.

EDITH. How can one man do that? Even you, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It's very simple. You see, I must first determine what God would think, what the world would think, and what father would think. Then I'll know what I think. In any given situation, I take my time. Forgive me Edith, if I take my time.

EDITH. I have time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. By Godfrey, is it too late to accept that invitation for dinner?

EDITH. Of course not.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And perhaps you'll do me the honor of attending the Patriarchs' Ball on the 27th.

EDITH. Thank you, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And then there's the New Year's Ball the Astors are giving——

BAMIE (entering). Your carriage is here, Edith.

(Edith kisses Teddy's cheek and goes.)

TEDDY. Do you know why I wrote this book, Bamie?

BAMIE. Out of the most beautiful of motives. You were so afraid Alice might fade away from you.

TEDDY. I wanted this book to keep her alive. (After a moment.) But it doesn't do that, does it?

BAMIE. No, Teddy.

TEDDY. Alice is dead.

BAMIE. Yes, dear. And it's time to go on.

TEDDY. Do you remember how poor Muffie used to worry about slush in the streets. Of course, if the city had a decent street-cleaning service, there wouldn't be slush in the streets. But how can we have decent street cleaning when the head of the board of health is a thieving rascal.

BAMIE. Does slush come under the jurisdiction of the board of health?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Did you know he's been indicted? Mayor Grace wants me to take his place. And blast it, maybe I will.

BAMIE. Are you going back into public life, Teddy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I took a pledge never to return to public life, and I am not a man to break a pledge. No, Bamie. This time, I am going into public service.

BAMIE. What's the difference?

Mr. ROOSEVELT (sternly). Public service is public life with a conscience. It is both a calling and a career.

BAMIE. You don't have to make a speech at me, Teddy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Unpack those books for me, will you, Bamie? What would father say?

BAMIE. Well now, I'll have to think. First of all, I'm sure he'd call you Theodore——

Mr. ROOSEVELT. What would he say, Bamie?

BAMIE. He'd say, "Well, Theodore, if you're determined to go into public service, I dare say one day you'll become President."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I suppose I shall.

(She laughs. He is severe.)

Is that funny?

BAMIE. You agreed so quickly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Well, by Godfrey, if I ever do become President, I'll bet I make a good one.

(He leaves the room, erupting into the world. Bamie begins putting the books back on the shelves as the camera pulls back.)

NARRATOR. A year later, in December of 1886, Theodore Roosevelt was married to Edith Carow. They had five beautiful and heroic children. His marriage was happy and complete. At the age of 43, he was the youngest man ever to become President of the United States.

(Cut to: The statue of Roosevelt at the Museum of Natural History in New York City.)

Orator, statesman, educator, naturalist, hunter, philanthropist, author, humanitarian. But the name of Alice Hathaway Lee Roosevelt was never spoken, or written, ever again. Only in his self-made heart did she remain. Forever young. Forever fair.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am gratified that the President's message concerning the balance-of-payments problem has demonstrated a full comprehension of that problem and the steps necessary to meet it. It would have been unrealistic to have expected him to offer any new and magic solutions.

With few exceptions, he has proposed to continue and expand the necessary corrective actions initiated by President Eisenhower.

Especially important was his emphasis upon the necessity of keeping America competitive in world markets. This will require restraint by both labor and management.

President Kennedy's firm grasp of these matters demonstrates his wisdom

in keeping Secretary Dillon as a link between the old and the new administration.

IMPORTANCE OF AIDING ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED AREAS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a matter I have spoken about on many previous occasions—the need for legislation specifically designed to aid economically distressed areas. Such legislation was passed by the 86th Congress, and the hopes of millions of our fellow Americans were stirred by this action. But their hopes, regrettably, were short lived—cut in their flourishing moment by the unjust knife of a Presidential veto.

But now, in this 87th Congress, these hopes have a right to be nurtured again—and fulfilled. And in connection with these hopes I would recall to my distinguished colleagues a few lines of apropos poetry penned by that profound, New England lady, Emily Dickinson:

> We never know how high we are
> Till we are called to rise;
> And then, if we are true to plan,
> Our statures touch the skies.

Mr. President, I remember these lines because the eyes of millions of our fellow Americans are upon this 87th Congress, waiting to see "how high we are"—waiting anxiously and trustfully to see whether we have the stature to make it possible for them to reach for a paycheck instead of a handout.

The Americans I refer to are the chronic unemployed who, paradoxically, live in areas of great natural wealth—wealth which begs for exploitation by muscle and machine—but wealth which ironically lies untapped amid a sea of human despair. It lies there either for lack of the means by which it can be profitably converted for man's purposes, or because its profitable conversion is thwarted by economic circumstances which include thoughtless import policies.

This tremendous untapped or underdeveloped natural wealth, sitting as it does in areas of abysmal human poverty, reminds me of the words George Herbert penned centuries ago:

> For the want of a nail the shoe is lost, for want of a shoe the horse is lost, for want of a horse the rider is lost.

Mr. President, it is for just such a "nail" that the people of our economically depressed areas look hopefully to this 87th Congress to supply. For once they have the "nail" it will become possible for them to "shoe" their rich natural resources and ride again toward a better, more productive, and satisfying life.

What is this "nail" they beseech us to supply? It is aid—enriching, repayable aid—not a handout. It is aid in the form of long-term, low-interest-rate loans; aid in the form of engineering and technical assistance; aid in research to develop new products and new uses for their abundant natural resources; aid in helping them to find new markets for their products; aid in building and improving roads to make better marketing conditions possible; aid in the construction of water storage basins for industrial and human consumption; and aid in curbing the kinds of thoughtless imports that have pounded and pummeled previously thriving industries into comatose conditions.

Why, one might ask, should the Federal Government concern itself in this matter? Aside from the Biblical admonition that we are our brother's keeper, there is a more pressing consideration which we cannot ignore: an economically healthy America—an America sturdy and strong in all of its national fibers—can remain forever the cathedral of hope for freemen everywhere. But can we expect this of an America with festering areas of economic sickness?

Why, one might also ask, cannot the individual States supply aid to their own areas of economic distress? For the most part the affected States are too poor themselves—poor because so many of their people and so much of their industry have been idle or partially employed over a long period of time. Yet, the affected States have done all they can do to help themselves and their people, many to the full measure of their capabilities. And I submit that they are continuing to use every medicant at their disposal to help their sick areas.

But one cannot tap a maple tree for sugary sap when its roots are embedded in dry, moistureless soil. One cannot expect States with economically distressed areas to be able to furnish the overall kinds of assistance these areas need.

My own State of West Virginia is a good case in point. It is an example of a sturdy, self-reliant people living in the midst of abundant natural wealth. Yet, tragically, my State has had a consistently higher record of unemployment over the past few years than any other State in the Union. In 1958, it had an unemployment rate of 10.4 against a national average of 6.1; in 1959, the rate was 8.3 against a national average of 4.4; and in 1960 the rate was 8.7 against a national rate of 4.9. Today, 295,665 people in my State, according to the latest report, who otherwise would starve, are receiving surplus Government food.

These figures do not truly reflect the whole picture. This is only half of the picture. The other half is underemployment. Today our operating coal mines are working on an average of 17 days a month. Our steel mills and metal fabricators are operating at about 50 percent of capacity; and our clay, pottery, and glass manufacturing plants are also operating at that low level.

Today, a major number of the cities and towns of my State are classified as labor surplus areas—Charleston, Huntington, Logan, Wheeling, Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Martinsburg, Morgantown, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant, Ronceverte, Welch, Williamson, and all of Mineral County. In addition, there are scores of smaller towns and hamlets which are equally bad off.

Can it be presumed, then, that a State so beset by so many areas of longstanding unemployment and underemployment can supply the needed wherewithal to aid its people in exploiting its untapped and underdeveloped natural resources? Obviously not. To ask the question is to answer it.

Even the fine financial institutions of my State cannot possibly meet the challenge confronting us. Only one bank in West Virginia has assets as high as $80 million. The next largest bank has assets of approximately $78 million. The next largest bank has assets of about $74 million. The next two largest banks have assets of approximately $70 million each. A total of 12 banks have assets of more than $30 million, while all the rest have assets ranging from $1 million to $25 million. By comparison, I point out that any of the several major banks in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area have, individually, anywhere from two to three times the assets of the largest bank in West Virginia.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news story published in the Washington Evening Star of February 1, 1961, which gives the relative U.S. ranking of several banks in this area.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGGS NATIONAL KEEPS RELATIVE U.S. RANKING

(By William A. Millen)

The American Banker, daily banking newspaper, said today the Riggs National Bank has maintained its relative position of No. 51 among the Nation's largest commercial banks. It had record deposits of $517,166,676 at yearend.

The American Security & Trust Co., with $355,371,318 in deposits, held its same relative rank of No. 85.

The National Bank of Washington, with $285,999,791 in deposits, jumped six places to No. 108.

The Union Trust Co., with $116,948,328, was placed No. 248 in the Nation's 300 biggest U.S. commercial banks.

The publication said the Suburban Trust Co., Hyattsville, Md., showed a sharp gain of 31 places with a new ranking of 171 on its yearend deposits of $175,691,932.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point information from the 60th annual report of the commissioner of banking of the State of West Virginia showing the assets of State banks and the assets of National banks in West Virginia.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reports of conditions of State banks and trust companies as of June 30, 1960

Bank:	Assets
Athens, Bank of Athens	$1,685,615.32
Barboursville, the First State Bank	1,225,932.45
Beckley, Bank of Raleigh	11,378,070.66
Beckley, the Raleigh County Bank	15,330,428.64
Belington, Belington Bank	1,845,769.63
Berwind, Berwind Bank	375,489.76
Bluefield, the Commercial Bank of Bluefield	7,329,338.61
Bridgeport, Bridgeport Bank	3,098,299.20
Bruceton Mills, Bruceton Bank	1,534,600.30
Buckhannon, Adrian Buckhannon Bank	5,354,558.92

Report of conditions of State banks and trust companies as of June 30, 1960—Con.

Bank:	Assets
Buffalo, the Buffalo Bank	$2,166,235.83
Cairo, Farmers & Merchants Bank of Cairo	803,591.22
Charleston, Bank of West Virginia	9,458,725.04
Charleston, Kanawha Banking & Trust Co	24,897,952.19
Charleston, the Kanawha Valley Bank	77,527,530.19
Charles Town, Bank of Charles Town	7,165,836.24
Charles Town, Peoples Bank of Charles Town	3,294,657.47
Clarksburg, the Lowndes Bank	13,998,126.53
Clay, Clay County Bank	2,926,415.75
Clendenin, Farmers & Citizens State Bank	2,848,425.19
Danville, the Bank of Danville	3,081,755.43
Dunbar, the Bank of Dunbar	6,549,675.74
East Rainelle, the Western Greenbrier Bank	3,444,595.69
Elizabeth, Wirt County Bank	2,171,835.17
Elkins, Davis Trust Co	4,741,043.11
Fairmont, Community Savings Bank & Trust Co	3,120,984.92
Fairview, the Bank of Wadestown	1,604,005.68
Follansbee, Bank of Follansbee	1,731,103.37
Follansbee, Citizens Bank of Follansbee	2,871,546.83
Franklin, Pendleton County Bank	2,537,900.86
Gassaway, Bank of Gassaway	2,690,612.32
Glenville, Kanawha Union Bank	4,256,457.93
Grantsville, the Calhoun County Bank	4,939,301.53
Greenville, Bank of Greenville	396,761.47
Harmon, the Stockmans Bank	809,252.05
Harrisville, the Union Bank of Harrisville	3,871,974.23
Hundred, Bank of Hundred	1,850,054.33
Huntington, Huntington Trust & Savings Bank	9,294,239.79
Huntington, the Security Bank of Huntington	3,132,382.74
Huntington, the Twentieth Street Bank	22,684,712.19
Hurricane, Putnam County Bank	3,700,073.86
Iaeger, the Bank of Iaeger	3,981,084.30
Keyser, Farmers & Merchants Bank	5,632,750.35
Lewisburg, Greenbrier Valley Bank	3,567,009.59
Lost Creek, the Harrison County Bank	1,764,121.69
Man, the Bank of Man	1,924,322.16
Mannington, First Exchange Bank	2,755,888.05
Marlinton, Bank of Marlinton	3,056,957.85
Martinsburg, Merchants & Farmers Bank	3,874,761.09
Martinsburg, the Peoples Trust Co	5,449,683.87
McMechen, the Bank of McMechen	3,237,710.59
Middlebourne, Tyler County Bank	950,523.09
Mill Creek, Bank of Mill Creek	1,918,242.18
Milton, Bank of Milton	4,375,891.60
Morgantown, Farmers' & Merchants' Bank	12,460,651.52
Moundsville, Marshall County Bank	1,961,878.43
Moundsville, Mercantile Banking & Trust Co	$6,469,902.65
Mount Hope, Bank of Mount Hope	3,832,637.41
Mullens, the Peoples Bank of Mullens	6,044,649.98
New Haven, Mason County Bank	2,651,885.89
New Martinsville, New Martinsville	2,190,817.74
Nitro, Bank of Nitro	3,920,444.04
Oak Hill, New River Banking & Trust Co	4,589,756.09
Parkersburg, Commercial Banking and Trust Co	11,253,185.36
Parkersburg, Union Trust & Deposit Co	14,289,688.46
Parkersburg, Wood County Bank	12,719,145.35
Parsons, the Tucker County Bank	1,841,692.16
Pennsboro, the Community Bank	1,315,730.21
Petersburg, the Grant County Bank	3,261,398.78
Petersburg, Potomac Valley Bank	2,872,882.98
Pineville, the Castle Rock Bank of Pineville, Inc	3,996,392.72
Princeton, Mercer County Bank	3,458,501.69
Princeton, Princeton Bank & Trust Company	13,513,737.97
Rainelle, the Bank of Rainelle	2,521,551.15
Ranson, Blakeley Bank & Trust Company	2,389,778.31
Ravenswood, Jackson County Bank	5,754,384.96
Ripley, Bank of Ripley	3,972,972.19
Romney, the Bank of Romney	3,571,012.41
Shepherdstown, Jefferson Security Bank	1,686,533.93
Shinnston, Bank of Shinnston	3,127,374.18
Sistersville, First-Tyler Bank & Trust Co	4,528,404.53
South Charleston, the Chemical Bank & Trust Co	3,249,332.60
Spencer, Traders Trust & Banking Co	4,872,809.79
St. Albans, the Bank of St. Albans	7,160,967.10
St. Marys, the Pleasants County Bank	2,565,185.27
Farmers and Merchants Bank of Summersville	4,602,464.27
Summersville, Nicholas County Bank	3,960,767.11
Terra Alta, the Terra Alta Bank	1,221,583.73
Thomas, the Miners & Merchants Bank	1,325,821.07
Union, the Bank of Monroe	2,715,622.32
Walton, the Poca Valley Bank	1,133,974.82
War, the Bank of War	2,220,494.08
Wardensville, Capon Valley Bank	974,795.37
Wayne, Wayne County Bank	3,379,025.25
Weirton, Bank of Weirton	24,528,107.98
Weirton, the Peoples Bank	15,262,235.04
Wellsburg, Wellsburg Banking & Trust Co	4,299,534.68
Weston, the Citizens Bank of Weston	8,458,087.92
West Union, West Union Bank	1,974,828.45
Wheeling, the Bank of Warwood	3,427,504.81
Wheeling, Half Dollar Trust & Savings Bank	15,255,998.03
Wheeling, Security Trust Co	15,765,658.66
Wheeling, South Wheeling Bank & Trust Co	$7,014,527.67
Wheeling, Wheeling Dollar Savings & Trust Co	50,707,415.96
White Sulphur Springs, Bank of White Sulphur Springs	5,439,198.80
Whitesville, Whitesville State Bank	2,445,397.00

Reports of condition of national banks as of June 15, 1960

Bank:	Total resources
Alderson, First National Bank	$2,671,689.40
Ansted, the National Bank of Ansted	1,607,133.92
Beckley, Beckley National Bank	18,584,862.80
Berkeley Springs, Citizens National Bank of Berkeley Springs	3,078,799.11
Bluefield, First National Bank	32,045,303.92
Bluefield, Flat Top National Bank	15,751,242.89
Buckhannon, Central National Bank	7,988,323.50
Cameron, First National Bank	3,755,620.01
Ceredo, First National Bank	6,590,821.35
Charleston, Charleston National Bank	86,775,539.86
Charleston, City National Bank	6,815,931.93
Charleston, National Bank of Commerce	27,294,204.79
Clarksburg, Empire National Bank	24,483,931.16
Clarksburg, the Merchants National Bank	8,103,142.94
Clarksburg, Union National Bank	29,516,658.57
Davis, National Bank of Davis	1,390,321.36
Elkins, Citizens National Bank	7,269,409.01
Elkins, Tygarts Valley National Bank	3,499,665.81
Fairmont, City National Bank of Fairmont	8,434,520.00
Fairmont, First National Bank in Fairmont	21,397,145.49
Fayetteville, Fayette County National Bank	2,997,005.52
Gauley Bridge, Gauley National Bank	1,408,265.86
Grafton, First National Bank	5,876,779.78
Hamlin, Lincoln National Bank	5,367,732.69
Hinton, First National Bank	6,350,217.66
Hinton, National Bank of Summers	5,838,467.30
Huntington, First Huntington National Bank	67,014,986.08
Huntington, Guaranty National Bank	21,543,655.30
Kenova, First National Bank	2,528,815.93
Keyser, National Bank of Keyser	5,264,024.39
Keystone, First National Bank	5,554,968.84
Kingwood, Albright National Bank of Kingwood	5,618,043.29
Logan, National Bank of Logan	20,419,462.54
Madison, Boone National Bank	6,725,207.35
Marlinton, First National Bank in Marlinton	2,008,823.00
Martinsburg, Citizens National Bank	5,828,810.11

Reports of condition of national banks as of June 15, 1960—Continued

Bank:	*Total resources*
Martinsburg, Old National Bank	$9,512,770.88
Matewan, Matewan National Bank	4,807,907.49
Monongah, the First National Bank	1,470,012.15
Montgomery, the Merchants National Bank	6,611,682.63
Montgomery, Montgomery National Bank	8,862,680.90
Moorefield, South Branch Valley National Bank	2,783,320.54
Morgantown, First National Bank	23,027,416.39
Moundsville, First National Bank	5,192,928.32
New Martinsville, First National Bank	8,281,051.85
Northfork, First Clark National Bank of Northfork	3,383,423.03
Oak Hill, Merchants & Miners National Bank	5,908,944.86
Parkersburg, Parkersburg National Bank	21,206,972.07
Parsons, First National Bank	1,412,868.01
Peterstown, First National Bank	1,449,986.13
Philippi, First National Bank in Philippi	5,192,730.30
Piedmont, First National Bank	4,467,938.30
Point Pleasant Citizens National Bank	5,889,287.71
Richwood, Cherry River National Bank	3,718,811.73
Ripley, First National Bank	5,720,376.96
Romney, First National Bank in Romney	2,017,951.24
Ronceverte, First National Bank	3,336,529.87
Rowlesburg, Peoples National Bank	1,501,173.10
St. Marys, the First National Bank	3,783,137.36
Salem, First National Bank at Salem	1,975,480.34
Sistersville, Union National Bank of Sistersville	3,132,702.09
South Charleston, First National Bank	11,519,949.03
Spencer, First National Bank	4,952,253.15
Sutton, Home National Bank	3,615,979.29
Terra Alta, First National Bank	1,559,702.07
Vienna, Ohio Valley National Bank	3,987,754.14
Webster Springs, Webster Springs National Bank	2,359,783.79
Welch, McDowell County National Bank	18,076,456.21
Wellsburg, Wellsburg National Bank	3,695,376.65
Weston, Weston National Bank	5,191,252.03
West Union, First National Bank	1,411,508.24
Wheeling, First National Bank & Trust Co	7,094,631.79
Wheeling, National Bank of West Virginia	17,399,035.68
Williamson, First National Bank	9,046,315.87
Williamson, National Bank of Commerce	8,107,153.03
Williamson, Farmers & Mechanics National Bank	1,586,624.38

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I have stated before, Mr. President, the people of West Virginia are sturdy and self-reliant. They are the kind of people who pay homage to the words penned by Thomas Dekker more than 300 years ago:

> Man was not created to be an idle fellow; he was not set in this universal orchard to stand still as a tree.

My people are tired of standing in idleness—of viewing the gauntness of their own shadows amid immense natural wealth. All they want is opportunity—opportunity to do the productive labor they know they can do, and for which they have been trained. This opportunity can come to them through the means of long-term, low-interest-rate loans and other kinds of assistance—assistance which only the Federal Government can afford them.

Mr. President, let me picture for Senators the towns of Davis and Thomas in West Virginia—adjacent towns which once had about 15 active coal mines in their immediate vicinities. I was in those two towns yesterday. I was told by town leaders that 37 percent of the total population has left the county of Tucker, in which those two towns are located, in the last 10 years. I thought of the children I saw one day a couple of years ago, marching down the street, participating in high school band activities. One of the store owners, as he stood outside his establishment, almost tearfully pointed out to me that the young people of the town were leaving, that there was nothing to keep them, nothing upon which they could pin their hopes for the future. I thought of the Pied Piper of Hamlin—how, when he went away, he took the children of the community with him, and how they never returned.

There are many towns and communities in West Virginia which have experienced the same sad story we heard a long time ago in the Pied Piper of Hamlin.

Mr. President, today none of these mines in the Davis and Thomas area is functioning or fully functioning. As a result, these two towns are economically distressed. Yet, one small functioning modern mine producing, say, 350,000 tons of coal a year at a rate of 2,500 tons per man per year, would give employment to approximately 140 or 150 men in these towns, plus employment made available to people in auxiliary services.

But to develop one such new mine in the Davis and Thomas area and to equip it with new and efficient machinery of the new and smaller kinds only recently developed would require an investment of approximately $1 million. For about $1 million, some of the vigor of the towns of Davis and Thomas can be renewed. In short, for the want of a nail, the shoe is lost.

What is true of the Davis and Thomas areas is equally true of many other areas in my State. A little bit of low-interest capital here and there would mean an end to much human idleness and despair.

Let me, however, draw still another picture of what long-term, low-interest-rate loans can mean to the people of West Virginia. My State has been blessed by nature with 100 separate seams of coal—black gold, as it is sometimes called. Of these, only 41 are of minable thickness. At present, production is obtained from only 30 of these seams. This production, almost 118 million tons in 1959, came from 1,601 mines. But of this number of mines, more than 50 percent were diggings operated by from 2 to 14 men—men used to vicissitudes but not easily dejected—men who pooled their meager resources to pay the required $10 mining license fee and buy needed picks and shovels.

When it is realized that West Virginia is the most important bituminous coal-producing State in the Union, and that many of its coal seams are of exceptional quality, then one cannot fail to recognize the economic importance of these 2- to 14-man small mines—almost 900 in number. Over 10,000 people are employed in such small-mine operations in my State, and their daily coal production is roughly estimated to be about 130,000 tons.

The Department of Mines in my State, fully cognizant of the old proverb that mighty oaks from little acorns grow, has sponsored a technical assistance program for these small mines. This program has been helpful, but the operator of a small mine still feels like a man trying to bat a ball with one hand tied behind his back. He is still without the capital he needs with which to purchase the kinds of machinery and equipment that would make his mine a truly productive enterprise and a realistically profitable one.

Where can the small mine operator get the needed capital? In most instances he has no substantive equity to pledge. Few banks lend venture capital on the promise of ceaseless labor and sweat, no matter how prospectively rich the mined seam of coal may be. Yet, what better way can we foster and promote free enterprise than by finding a way of providing at least an important portion of the needed capital?

Give the bee pollen and it will make honey. Give the small entrepreneur the capital he needs and he will create wealth—the kinds of wealth that can transform our areas of chronic unemployment and underemployment into areas of job opportunities and business activity, the kinds of wealth that will enable millions of our working Americans to purchase the products and services created by the labors of millions of other Americans. In short, as we stimulate the economy of every currently depressed area, we also stimulate better economic conditions throughout the length and breadth of our land.

But a necessary handmaiden to long-term, low-interest-rate loans is research—research to find new products and new uses to which we can put our great natural wealth. Today, for example, if my State's 900 small mines were as highly productive as our 700 medium and large mines, my State would be producing coal without enough markets to consume the production. Thus, one can readily see that any Federal program to aid depressed areas should incorporate a comprehensive research program, perhaps

in cooperation with the affected States, the affected industries and the affected labor organizations.

Insofar as coal is concerned, some research has been and is being done to find new markets and to renew lost markets. The program, however, has been a meager one despite the stimulation given to it through the Coal Research and Development Act passed by the 86th Congress. My colleagues of the 87th Congress will have to determine whether the competent administration of this act requires the enriching blood of enlarged appropriations. Certainly, research, which has thrust us into the space age, can find many new potentialities in this wonderful, though mysterious and complex mineral we know as coal.

But when we consider legislation to aid our depressed areas, we should also examine the dark cloud that hangs over them in the form of cheaply produced imports. It would be wasteful to spend money and effort to rehabilitate our depressed areas only to have all of our good works washed away by the menacing flood of such imports.

Take, for example, the flow of imports of residual fuel oil and the consequent displacement of domestically produced fuel and energy. No other coal-producing State has been so adversely affected by the level of such imports as has West Virginia. Each year, in lost wages to coal miners, the cost of such imports is estimated to be around $145 million to my State alone. But more than that, there is the additional loss of countless millions of dollars in profits and wages to the railroad industry and to other industries.

Today, even under a quota system of imports, foreign residual fuel oil unloaded in our country is equivalent to 30,642,000 tons of coal per year. In terms of lost labor for our miners, based on a national average of approximately 12 tons of coal production per man per day, the loss is 2,553,500 man-days of work.

West Virginia ranks second in the Nation as a glass producer. My State also boasts the world's largest plate glass factory, located in Charleston. But because of an upward trend in flat glass imports, this vital industry is economically sick. In the Morgantown area alone, one of the leading glassmaking regions of my State, three glass manufacturing plants have shut down in the past several years due to the unequal competition of cheaply paid, foreign labor produced glass imports.

In the early 1950's a thousand workers were employed in Morgantown's glass factories. Currently, employment is down to less than 600. And those who are fortunate enough to have jobs are now employed only 2 or 3 days a week.

The growing level of imports has also adversely affected the clay and pottery industries of my State, causing islands of unemployment in many of the cities and towns. The idle people of these communities are rightfully resentful that little or nothing is being done to curtail the kinds of imports that throw them out of work.

We worry about the flow of gold reserves, and a Presidential mission is sent abroad to see what can be done about the situation. But the real rascal causing our gold outflow is seldom spoken of—the imports for which we have to pay in gold—the imports which are not only the real drain on our gold reserves, but a drain as well on the resources of our fellow Americans—the imports which are casting them out of jobs and forcing them to live on Federal handouts of surplus food packages. This is a situation too intimately connected with the economic distress of many of our communities to be ignored. It is a situation to which we must address ourselves with utmost speed. We must take the bull by the horns and curb the importation of such foreign products which directly affect the economic well-being of any American community. In all good conscience we cannot do otherwise.

There are other important facets which we must consider when planning for the revitalization of our depressed areas, and one of these is highway construction and highway improvement. Good roads have a direct bearing on the economic health of an area, on its potential to produce and to trade. In this connection, a wag once said about my State, "It's difficult to get into it and almost impossible to get out of it." He was referring, of course, to the fact that there are almost no modern highways leading into West Virginia. And perhaps this is one of several good reasons why the State of West Virginia has been suffering a general economic decline.

For example, there is not a single good road up the Monongahela Valley from the Pittsburgh industrial complex to the Morgantown-Fairmont-Clarksburg area of West Virginia. There is not a single good highway leading into the northern part of my State—potentially one of the finest recreational areas in the United States. In fact, in this age of increasing highway transportation, the roads in West Virginia are at least 30 years behind in time.

Yet the people of my State are carrying a very heavy long-term bonded indebtedness on road construction—so heavy, in fact, that it is almost impossible for the State to plan very much new highway construction. In addition, because of the mountainous topography of much of my State, the cost per mile of construction is much above average. The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads estimates that on a national average it costs 150 percent more to build a road in West Virginia than elsewhere in the country.

The roadbuilding problem of my State is further complicated by the vast areas of nonproductive and subproductive land. The few settlers in these areas cannot pay for the required roads. Yet these nonproductive and subproductive areas are among those which are especially well suited for recreational purposes if they are made accessible to the general public.

Thus, a federally aided roadbuilding program must become an integral part of any effort to revitalize the kinds of depressed areas such as those in West Virginia. Such an action would not only open these areas to economic opportunities, but would serve the immediate purpose of putting many idle people to work. We can accomplish this action by amending the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, as amended, to permit additional apportionment of funds for road construction in nonproductive and subproductive land areas.

As we examine the many things we must do to revitalize our economically sick communities, one which we must not overlook is that of accelerating and expanding the Federal-State pollution abatement program to improve water quality and supply. We must do this not only for public health purposes, but also for the purpose of encouraging industrialization as well. The present lack of good water in many of our depressed communities is an economic handicap of the first magnitude. An example of this is related in a recent report of the Tug Valley Chamber of Commerce, located in Williamson, W. Va. This report declares:

> Recent investigations by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in our area have revealed that we do not possess a satisfactory supply of industrial water resource for any type of industry which would require some. In fact, there are a few cases in which we have been completely eliminated from consideration for an industrial location, because we did not have an adequate water supply to offer industrial clients.

This report, from which I have quoted, goes on to call the nearby Tug River a disgrace, and it says of the adjacent Guyan River that it is a mass of black, filthy liquid, too thick with impurities for fish to live in, and too impure for human utilization.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that the area referred to in this report by the Tug Valley Chamber of Commerce is one of the worst economically distressed areas in the United States. The city of Williamson, W. Va., and its immediate vicinity, has lost 23.1 percent of its population since 1950, because of its economic plight. Mingo County, which embraces Williamson, has a total population, according to latest census figures, of 39,318 people. Yet of this total, almost 5,000 employable people are unemployed, and about 41 percent of the population are eligible for surplus food.

In the face of this area's dire economic hardship, when it had opportunities for economic recovery through the location of new industries, its polluted waters defeat it. Can there be a more piercing reason for expanding the Federal participation in water pollution abatement?

At present, one small federally aided program for water pollution abatement is partially underway in Williamson—I say partially underway because the city is having some difficulty in raising its required share of the expense. Only 30 percent of the cost is met by the Federal Government. This imbalance and its attending hardship on a depressed community speak eloquently of the need for close examination of the Federal pollution abatement program as it may relate to an economically distressed area.

First off, we must recognize water pollution as an adverse economic condition—a condition which makes economic recovery on the part of a depressed area

extremely difficult. Then we should consider the realistics of such situations by increasing Federal participation—say by switching the current ratio of 30–70 to 70–30 or even 75–25 for depressed areas. Such action would not be a handout, for over the years the beneficial results would mean greater tax revenues accruing to the Federal Government.

Still another facet of the overall problem of aiding our depressed areas lies in the plight of education and the educational systems of these areas. Not only are they suffering a loss of qualified teachers, a steady deterioration of their school buildings and a lack of funds to build additionally needed classrooms, but they are also suffering the loss of student morale—student interest. Sadly enough, in these areas of severe economic hardship, growing numbers of students are becoming disenchanted with education because they do not see how education, in the face of longtime economic suffering on the part of their parents, can bring them job opportunities They have seen the educated and the uneducated standing alike in line for surplus food packages, and they question whether going to school is worth such inglorious equality.

In West Virginia, the educational process is in an extreme crisis. We have 1,242 schoolrooms to replace because of obsolescence and dilapidation, as well as 680 new rooms to build to take care of excess student population. We have 1,316 students attending half-day school sessions. Approximately 85 percent of our rural schoolteachers are unqualified to teach because our local school districts have no alternative but to hire untrained teachers. Our qualified teachers are leaving the State at every opportunity because their average pay is $3,980 per year against a national teacher pay average of $5,215 per year.

My State ranks 43d out of 50 in educational expenditure per pupil—$240 against a national average of $369. Of the students entering the ninth grade in West Virginia, only 61 percent remain in school to graduate. The national average is 65.7 percent. But the picture is blacker regarding those who do stay in high school and graduate. Only 25 percent of them go on to college against a national average of 52 percent.

In the face of this distressing picture of education in West Virginia, the challenge before us must forge immediate action to furnish Federal aid to school systems in areas of economic depression. We must act to make funds available for school construction in terms which will not further burden such areas, and we must assist them in reaching pay levels for their teachers which will keep them from leaving the State for greener pastures.

In the space age, and in the competitive struggle with Russia for the minds of men, and for our own future security and freedom, we cannot afford the luxury of masses of poorly educated or undereducated children. Whatever the price we must pay for good education, the cost is cheap enough.

Mr. President, in taking inventory of the measures we must enact if we are to rescue our depressed areas from the economic morass in which they find themselves, I would call attention to the Youth Conservation Act introduced in the 86th Congress by my distinguished colleague, Senator HUMPHREY. The purpose of this act was to provide healthful training and employment opportunities for young men—employment in conservation work, and in the development of our natural resources.

Unfortunately, this inspired piece of proposed legislation never became the law of the land. I say "unfortunately" because almost 3 years have passed since the senior Senator from Minnesota introduced this measure in the 86th Congress, in May 1958. The 3 years that have passed since that date are lost years—lost not only in time, but also in the use to which they could have been put in helping reshape the idle and frustrated lives of many unemployed young men.

Now more than ever, the urgent need for passage of such legislation is before us. Now more than ever, as we seek ways to give new life to depressed areas, the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps becomes a primary task. I say this because today depressed areas are losing their young people—their future, if you will—in ominous numbers. The older people see their blood of tomorrow flow away to areas of economic opportunity. And this flow, if not induced to stop, can only compound the difficulties facing long-term rejuvenation of distressed areas.

A Youth Conservation Corps can help young people to stay within areas adjacent to their homes—keeping them busy with reforestation work, with construction of camping and vacation facilities in our national parks; with the development of roads and trails through these parks, with the improvement of scenic splendors within park areas. Such a Conservation Corps would mean jingling money in the pockets of our idle young people, instead of sullen or careless thoughts in their heads.

To the depressed areas, not only will a Youth Corps mean the infusion of new money into their economies, but also the bolstering of their long-term economic prospects through new and improved tourist and vacationist facilities and attractions. The American tourist dollar has been an important factor in aiding the recovery of distressed European countries. In 1959, the latest year for which figures are available from the U.S. Department of Commerce, American tourists and vacationists spent $2.4 billion in foreign countries. If a greater part of this money could be attracted to our own vacation areas, it would make well worth whatever we expend to make such areas desirable places to visit.

In this connection, the establishment of additional national parks and monuments, and the acquisition of more land for existing ones, is another positive step we can take to aid our depressed areas. For example, there is every reason to believe that the extension of, say, the Monongahela National Forest into south-central and southwestern West Virginia, or the extension of Harpers Ferry National Monument into the northeastern counties of my State, would be immediately beneficial to the people in those regions. Not only would such extensions bring tourist and vacationist dollars to those areas, but work opportunities as well through the National Park Service.

Mr. President, each of the needs I have briefly outlined are indelibly related to the revitalization of our depressed areas. Together, they are a ladder upon which the people in these areas can climb out of the well of economic hardship and onto a plateau of well-being. We cannot leave out any rungs in this ladder. For this reason, it would be well for us to petition all departments, their agencies and bureaus, and all the independent agencies and commissions, to be mindful of our depressed areas and to seek within themselves for ways and means of aiding those areas.

Shakespeare has said:

> The miserable hath no other medicine but only hope.

But if hope is a medicine, let us fill the necessary prescription with the best possible ingredients.

For many years now, this country of ours has been an angel of aid to the economically sick countries of the world, unselfishly expending our fortunes on them in earnest concern for their well-being. But the time has come now for this angel to look homeward—to show the same kind of earnest concern for its own economically sick areas. The 86th Congress showed great virtue in this respect. Nothing less can be expected of the 87th Congress.

RETREAT FROM FREEDOM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as a lawyer with a high respect for the judicial process, and as a legislator strongly conscious of the separation of powers of our governmental structure, I hesitate even to allude to a Supreme Court decision, much less criticize one.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, in commenting on what promises to be a historic opinion, I find myself in rather eminent company—the Chief Justice of the United States, who is one of America's most preeminent citizens and a former great California chief executive; three other esteemed members of the Supreme Court; and innumerable writers, commentators, and editors of leading newspapers—all of whom dissent from the 5-to-4 decision in the Chicago censorship case—Times Film Corporation, Petitioner against City of Chicago, et al.—which the Court handed down on January 23.

This case involved the constitutionality of a city of Chicago ordinance which makes the police commissioner—and on appeal, the mayor—the censor and licensing authority over all motion picture film prior to its public exhibition in that city. In this 5-to-4 decision the Court sustained the constitutionality of this form of censorship and for the first time in our Republic sanctioned the doctrine of prior restraint.

I wholeheartedly concur with Chief Justice Warren, who, for the four dissenters, in a scholarly, heavily documented, and sharply worded opinion, stated:

I cannot agree with either the conclusion reached by the Court or with the reasons advanced for its support. To me, this case clearly presents the question of our approval of unlimited censorship of motion pictures before exhibition through a system of administrative licensing. Moreover, the decision presents a real danger of eventual censorship for every form of communication, be it newspapers, journals, books, magazines, television, radio or public speeches. The Court purports to leave these questions for another day, but I am aware of no constitutional principle which permits us to hold that the communication of ideas through one medium may be censored while other media are immune. Of course, each medium presents its own peculiar problems, but they are not of the kind which would authorize the censorship of one form of communication and not the others. I submit that in arriving at its decision the Court has interpreted our cases contrary to the intention at the time of their rendition and, in exalting the censor of motion pictures, has endangered the 1st and 14th amendment rights of all others engaged in the dissemination of ideas.

The truth is, Mr. President, that the American constitutional tradition of freedom has correctly recognized that no one has sufficient wisdom nor the right to say in advance what another may publish, paint, produce, exhibit, or say. As the New York Times observes:

If the movie, or the printed sheet, is obscene or slanderous or otherwise impermissible under the statutes, its distribution ought to be blocked after its appearance in accordance with already approved legal procedure.

This fact is emphasized forcefully in editorials in the January 25, 1961, issues of the New York Times, Washington Post, and Los Angeles Mirror, as well as the magazine Broadcasting for January 30, 1961, and the Commonweal, one of America's leading religious weeklies, for February 10, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1961]

RETREAT FROM FREEDOM

By the narrowest possible majority the Supreme Court has endorsed the right of local authorities to impose prior administrative censorship on the movies. In this 5 to 4 decision we think the minority, headed by Chief Justice Warren, took the sounder view and the one that in the long run will prevail.

In saying this, we hold no brief for an industry that has churned forth—alongside many admirable productions—a stream of sex-crammed, crime-strewn motion pictures pandering to lascivious instincts and degraded tastes. In its grasp for the box office, the industry has called down on its own head the demand for censorship now heard so widely. One could almost say it deserves what it gets.

But one cannot say this if one has regard for the most fundamental principles of freedom that far outweigh in importance the faults of the movie industry. Such principles are freedom of speech and freedom from prior censorship. The Supreme Court itself held in the Miracle case in 1952 that "expression by means of motion pictures is included within the free speech and free press guarantee of the 1st and 14th amendments." Since then it has repeatedly limited the authority of censorship boards.

But in the present case it was asked for the broadest possible ruling against arbitrary and prior censorship. We regret that it did not give such a ruling; for in our view it is as potentially dangerous for any board to prevent a film from being shown in the first instance as it would be to prevent a handbill or book or newspaper from being printed. If the movie, or the printed sheet, is obscene or slanderous or otherwise impermissible under the statutes, its distribution ought to be blocked after its appearance in accordance with already approved legal procedure.

In 1957 the Supreme Court upheld the Government's right to act against obscenity, and also the right of a city (New York) to obtain an injunction against distribution. But the difference between those rulings and this one is that they involved court action; this involves administrative fiat. In those cases the burden was on the State to attack the publication; in this it is on the producer or distributor to seek permission, which may be rejected without cause. There is a world of difference.

We do not believe that any administrative body should have the right thus to stop a publication or a film before its appearance. Prior censorship leads too easily to the stultification of ideas. But absence of censorship does not imply absence of responsibility.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 1961]

THE CURTAIN FALLS

It is hard to foresee the extent of the baleful consequences which may flow from the Supreme Court's sudden and inexplicable enthronement of censorship in a 5–4 decision on Monday. The majority, speaking through Mr. Justice Clark, says in the Times Film Corp. case that "we are dealing only with motion pictures." But if the majority is right in its astigmatic view of the first amendment, what it says can be applied with equal logic to every other form of expression—the theater, television, books, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers.

Today, no more than four States and a handful of cities permit censors to decide what their citizens may see in motion picture theaters. But who can foretell how far repression in the name of morality will be extended now that the Court has licensed it? Hollywood, banal enough in much of what it produces anyhow may now be even more governed by Comstockery and Grundyism.

The case before the Court involved a film known as Don Juan—a cinematic rendition of Mozart's opera, Don Giovanni. In Chicago, a film can be exhibited to the public only if it can win prior approval by the police commissioner or some underling connoisseur of the arts designated by him. The exhibitors of Don Juan sought a permit without submitting their film for inspection, were denied it and sued for injunctive relief. It would be hard to invent a clearer case of prior restraint—censorship in its blackest and most blatant form.

Freedom from prior restraints on expression was achieved in England with the abandonment of licensing in the 18th century even before the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. The first amendment to the Constitution established that freedom as fundamental law for Americans—and went beyond it to give expression an unprecedentedly privileged and protected position in the new world. It was this protection and privilege accorded to speech and to the press that constituted, as James Madison put, "the essential difference between the British Government and the American Constitution."

The founders of the American Republic were determined that here expression should be unfettered by any official regulation; and they were willing, for the sake of the great benefits to be derived from this freedom, to undergo the risks involved in giving wide latitude to silly, salacious, and even seditious utterances. If they did not mean expression to be absolutely free, they meant at least to insure it the largest practicable freedom; they meant it to be punishable, if at all, only upon a due process trial and not at the whim of some petty official

---

[From the Los Angeles Mirror, Jan. 25, 1961]

HOLD BACK THE MOVIE CENSORS

There's real danger to our freedom of expression in the Supreme Court's ruling on censorship of movies.

The test case involved only movies. The film company claimed the right to show anything, subject only to local obscenity laws.

The Court said that was claiming too much under the Constitution.

But Chief Justice Warren foresaw a threat of censorship over every form of communication.

The danger is that censors may run wild, demanding prior examination of other media before showing or publication.

It's time for caution. The Court's ruling was no carte blanche for every State and municipality to set up censorship laws.

The target of the would-be censor is not confined to material which some would consider obscene.

Fanatics of every shade attempt to strangle political expression when it disagrees with their ideas.

Let some of these persons gain control of a censorship post and we lose our freedom. They mean well. Most censors do.

The main concern of the moment is that the 4 States with well-intentioned censorship laws not be joined by the other 46.

The four should repeal theirs.

[From Broadcasting, Jan. 30, 1961]

SPECTER OF CENSORSHIP

It is not improbable that broadcasters, along with all media, will someday find themselves suffering under censorship that is traceable to a decision reached by the U.S. Supreme Court last week.

By the narrowest of majorities—5 to 4—the Court upheld the constitutionality of motion-picture censorship. Broadcasters can take small comfort in the observation of the majority that the decision applied to no media other than movies. As the minority said, in an eloquent dissent written by Chief Justice Earl Warren, "the decision presents a real danger of eventual censorship for every form of communication, be it newspapers, journals, books, magazines, television, radio, or public speeches."

Of all the endangered media, television and radio, it seems to us, are the most vulnerable. They alone are already licensed by the Federal Government and their performance already subjected to periodic review. It is not an impassable distance from Supreme Court approval of local censorship, as in the Chicago case decided last week, and an assertion by the FCC of authority over broadcast programing. The Chicago city government claims the right to censor movies on the grounds of protecting the public interest. It is in the public interest that broadcasting is regulated by the FCC.

Last week's Supreme Court decision is the more ominous for broadcasting because of the prevailing mood of the new administration. James M. Landis, the President's overseer of administrative agencies, has repeatedly said that the FCC ought to exert stronger control over programing. Newton Minow, the FCC Chairman to be, has expressed similar views. We imagine that by

now both have committed the Supreme Court's majority opinion to memory.

Do we seem unnecessarily alarmed? Four distinguished members of the Court took this minority view:

"Let it be completely clear what the Court's decision does. It gives official license to the censor, approving a grant of power to city officials to prevent the showing of any moving picture these officials deem unworthy of a license."

The question under consideration, the minority said, applies to "any city, any State, or the Federal Government."

Do broadcasters need a rallying cry to arouse their interest in this subject? Here is what Justice Douglas wrote in a separate dissent in which the other dissenters concurred:

"The first amendment was designed to enlarge, not to limit, freedom in literature and in the arts, as well as in politics, economics, law, and other fields. Its aim was to unlock all ideas for argument, debate, and dissemination. No more potent force in defeat of that freedom could be designed than censorship. It is a weapon that no minority or majority group, acting through government, should be allowed to wield over any of us."

To read the dissenting opinions is to be convinced that the majority decision runs counter to the benchmark cases of the past. Clearly there will be chance for reappraisal by the Court. When that chance will come or how cannot now be known. But broadcasters must do what they can to make it come as soon as possible.

The Motion Picture Association of America has already announced its intention to seek some kind of relief from the decision of last week. It would be to the benefit of broadcasting if the NAB at least conferred with the movie group to explore ways of joining forces.

SCOTUS CENSORSHIP DILEMMA

Because of dire consequences that could ensue from Supreme Court decision in motion-picture censorship case, publishing interests are strongly urging petition for reconsideration by losing Times Film Corp. While chances of Supreme Court reconsideration usually are remote, attorneys feel that in light of sharply divided Court (5 to 4) and strength of dissenting opinions, reconsideration might be entertained.

First to urge immediate petition to rehear was American Book Publishers Council, Inc., which indicated it would support this move amicus curiae (as friend of Court). American Newspaper Publishers Association likewise was being importuned to lend its support, and it was learned Friday that strong segments among broadcasters favor amicus curiae participation through NAB in light of precedent-shattering opinion which would invoke censorship "before the fact." NAB board session in Palm Springs, Calif., February 8 to 10, will consider participation.

[From the Commonweal]

FREE SPEECH AND MOVIES

* * * * *

Censorship is a very delicate and difficult business, and it is not helped by the extremists on both sides—those who think that every piece of obscenity published is a blow struck for freedom and the vigilantes who would ban first and ask questions afterward. As Justice Clark noted, every city has "the duty to protect its people against the dangers of obscenity in the public exhibition of motion pictures." But the steps taken to protect the people against the evil of obscenity must not bring about the danger of a worse evil—the loss of the precious and perishable commodity of free speech—and this is the danger which the dissenting opinion discusses. Weighing the evils and the dangers in the question of prior film censorship, we would have to aline ourselves with the dissenters.

We think Chief Justice Warren is on strong ground when he points out that the majority opinion gives no explanation for its special treatment of movies among all the various communications media. In 1952, it must be remembered, the Supreme Court ruled in the Miracle case that moving pictures were covered by the guarantees of free speech and free press in the 1st and 14th amendments.

The argument that movies are somehow specially censorable—even though prior censorship of all other media is unconstitutional—we find unconvincing. The mass audience, the vividness of the communication, the tender age of those exposed to movies—all these conditions are met, to a greater or lesser degree, by other forms of modern communication. As the minority opinion asked, why should movies be singled out for government censorship by a society which fears and abhors state-controlled press or radio or communications systems generally?

As for the danger of removing precensorship from movies altogether, we can only say that it is a danger to be faced. It might be, as Justice Clark charged, that without prior censorship any and every kind of film could be shown at least once. But if law-enforcement officials are prompt and conscientious in arresting and prosecuting those who exhibit obscene films this danger is not likely to be great.

Even more important, such a procedure puts the burden of proof not on the individual, as does the system of prior licensing, but on the State, which is where this burden belongs. Any conflict between the State and a citizen is an unequal one by definition, since the State has virtually limitless resources of funds, personnel and equipment in its police and legal agencies. Nowadays especially, one would think, our concern would not be to strengthen the already vast powers of government but to safeguard the rights of the individual citizen who for one reason or another arouses the displeasure of the governmental colossus.

It is, we think, unreasonable and unjust to put restraints on individual freedom because of what the individual might do, and particularly in the extrasensitive area of free speech and free communication. With Justice Warren and the other dissenters, we fear that the power to withhold a license from a film—or a book or anything else—without the necessity to show cause or even to give a reason, is not in the best interests of a healthy democracy. We are surprised at the inconsistency of the many avowed champions of individual rights who are hailing this latest Court decision. What they are now cheering, it seems to us, is tighter state control of the very lifeline of the democracy they cherish.

HOUSING COSTS FOR THE AGED ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Washington Post for Sunday, January 8, 1961, published an article disclosing a situation sadly prevalent among too large a proportion of our senior citizens. It is a story which far too often is told to me by elderly correspondents, both from my own State and from the District. It reveals a situation which, in common humanity, ought to be corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I refer be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

PLIGHT OF MAN, 84, POSES CASE FOR TALKS ON AGING

A retired District grocer typifies the problems which delegates to the White House Conference on the Aging will debate when they gather here next week.

The 84-year-old man lives on public assistance payments of $87 a month. After he has paid his $60 monthly room rent, he has less than $1 a day for the rest of his needs.

On this sum, or a little more or less, he has somehow been existing for 20 years since he lost his grocery store in a legal dispute.

HEALTH PROBLEM INCREASES

Now his health is failing.

He lives in a large room with little kitchen in a tidy apartment house on a quiet street. There are few personal things in the room, but it is immaculate. The door to the hallway is left ajar, so that the sounds of people in the elevator may take the edge off his loneliness.

He has no wife or relatives and the friends of good times have slowly left him as bad times came.

Before December, he lived in a $70 room. His rent allowance from public assistance was $36. But since he was eating in restaurants, his food, clothing, and incidentals allowance was $60. By skimping on food and getting a little help from his church, he managed.

But the public assistance division told him he was paying too much for a place without cooking facilities and even too much for one with them. He looked about and found his present lodgings.

FOOD ALLOWANCE DROPS

Since he could cook in his new and cheaper quarters, he learned that his rent allowance would rise $11 but his food and clothing allowance would drop $14. His move had cost him $3.

Medicine bottles and boxes are neatly stacked on a little table in his room. A rosary lies next to them, and a half-empty bag of peanuts. The refrigerator contains only bread.

"I've been living on bread," he says. "I have a kitchen now, but what can I buy to cook? And how can I do my laundry and have my hair cut?"

"I can't find any cheaper place. Now I just wait for the end."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is simple dignity and infinite pathos in that concluding remark:

I can't find any cheaper place. Now I just wait for the end.

It is a terrible indictment of the failure of our society to find a solution to a problem which touches upon a large number of our elderly citizens. Decent, safe, and comfortable housing for the aged, at a cost within their means, should not be an unreachable goal. It can be had without too large a drain upon the public resources. It is my hope that the delegates to the White House Conference on the Aging will give strong support to programs designed to meet this need.

There is, however, a method of approaching this particular problem locally and in part, available to us. What is needed is a changed attitude upon the part of our welfare officials to the pressing human needs they are called upon to meet. Such a changed attitude, however, cannot be expected until and unless the rules and regulations governing the granting of public assistance are changed. In the District of Columbia—and I am sure that the situation is the

same in many other communities—there is a policy, binding upon caseworkers, restricting the amount which can be permitted in the relief budget for the payment of rent to a flat maximum amount. The shelter allowance in the District for a single person receiving old-age assistance, where cooking facilities are provided, is $36 for rent, $6 for fuel, $3 for utilities, and $2 for refrigeration—a total of $47 a month. This shelter allowance is based upon a regulation which provides that actual costs up to a maximum can be allowed. The $47 a month shelter allowance has been unchanged since the date of its inception on July 1, 1953. Seven and one-half years have brought increased costs in rent in the District, since that time; and the older people are not exempt from this process. It is high time, in my judgment, for a revision of the budget standards to be made. I would suggest to the Public Assistance Advisory Council and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that they take a good look at this situation, in order to determine what changes are needed, and, where justified, to make the needed changes.

Mr. President, in Proverbs 28, verse 27, we are told:

He that giveth unto the poor shall not lack: but he that hideth his eyes shall have many a curse.

We have no excuse for hiding our eyes, for we have a duty and a responsibility to men and women in the public charge in their declining years.

TRIBUTE TO SELMA BORCHARDT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News of Saturday, January 7, 1961, contained a news story worthy of more than passing comment. It concerned the tribute paid to a dedicated educator upon the occasion of her retirement from the school system of the District of Columbia.

Selma Borchardt, a lawyer in her own own right, as well as a teacher, is known to those of us who have served on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, as a great woman of untiring energy, wholly dedicated to the upholding and advancement of educational values. In every issue affecting the teaching profession she has been in the forefront of those who sought to convince and persuade the Congress of the desirability of the legislation she advocated. Although she has earned many honors, in my judgment, the accolade given her by her colleagues, through her election to important posts in the American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, was for her most precious, since it provided an opportunity for service to all teachers.

Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Public Education Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee, through hearing her testimony upon a great many District teachers' bills, I have come to appreciate the sterling qualities of Selma Borchardt. I treasure that knowledge. In the productive years which lie ahead, I wish for her every good wish for the continuation of her career of dedicated service. Her retirement, I feel sure, is but the freeing of her energies and capacities for much further hard work in the interests of the boys and girls of this city and our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news item to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 7, 1961]

EASTERN HIGH TEACHER RETIRES—MISS BORCHARDT'S SERVICE CITED

(By Martha Strayer)

"Probably no classroom teacher in America has contributed more to high school education than Miss Selma Borchardt," Eastern High School Principal Lynn S. Woodworth told the District School Board in a tribute to Miss Borchardt, who was retired yesterday.

Mr. Woodworth reported some of her educational achievements, such as addressing educational meetings in Tokyo, Rio de Janeiro, and Dublin.

The Federal Government sent her to Denmark, Holland, France, and Italy as a post-World War II educational observer, and she was the only classroom teacher in America named by President Eisenhower as a delegate to the White House Conference on Education in 1955.

CHAIRMAN

She was chairman of the Curriculum Committee for the District delegation at President Eisenhower's 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth.

At Eastern High School, where Miss Borchardt taught until 1945, she was chairman of the English department, developed the school's remedial reading program and coordinated its reading clinic and speech correction activities.

She helped greatly in the school's readjustment to integration.

She addressed 200 patriotic, religious, education, and civic meetings in 1 year, 1957.

All these things Mr. Woodworth listed, but he omitted Miss Borchardt's career as a teachers' union leader.

ORGANIZER

She helped organize and direct the local teachers' union. She is a vice president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFL–CIO).

She helped get a teacher pay raise through Congress. She will devote her leisure to educational research.

BORROWING AUTHORITY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have had the privilege since 1957 to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress, it will be recalled, we passed into law substantial amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. Included in those amendments was new authority for the Railroad Retirement Board to borrow, for a temporary period, from the railroad retirement fund, amounts necessary to cover unemployment insurance benefits when the demand for such benefits was high. That borrowing authority was contained in section 308 of Public Law 86–28.

The subcommittee very carefully considered the advisability of granting that borrowing authority. In our view, it was an important aid to efficient administration to permit it. It allowed the Board to avoid crisis calls for help from the U.S. Treasury and the Congress when the payment of unemployment benefits became heavy during recession periods. On behalf of the subcommittee, I can say we studied with great care the actuarial soundness of this authority. It was our belief that the railroad retirement fund, out of which railroad retirement benefits are paid, would in no sense be endangered by the temporary loans for the payment of unemployment benefits.

Nevertheless, despite our care, a number of persons who have written to me and to many other Senators have given voice to their concern that their railroad retirement benefits would become endangered by such temporary transfer of funds. Because of this concern, I requested the Railroad Retirement Board to furnish me with a brief report on the problem. I should like to introduce for the RECORD two letters from Howard W. Habermeyer, Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board. The first of these is dated December 20, 1960, and refers to two tables, which are attached. The second one is dated January 13, 1961. In my view, this report from Mr. Habermeyer is most helpful in reassuring those who have been uneasy concerning the long-range soundness of the railroad retirement fund.

I ask unanimous consent to have this material printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,
Chicago, Ill., December 20, 1960.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is with reference to your request of June 10, 1960, for a complete report "regarding the operation and solvency of the railroad retirement fund" as of the end of this year in the light of section 308 of Public Law 86–28 (approved May 19, 1959). This section authorizes the Railroad Retirement Board to borrow funds, under certain conditions, from the railroad retirement account for the payment of benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The enclosed table "A" shows the amounts borrowed and repaid (with 3-percent interest) from time to time pursuant to the provisions of section 308 above referred to. It also shows that the balance of principal and interest due the railroad retirement account as of the end of November 1960, was $149,947,520.

The reserve in the railroad retirement account as of the end of November 1960 was $3,780,210,748. This amount includes the above-mentioned $149,947,520 due the railroad retirement account from the railroad unemployment insurance account.

The enclosed table "B" shows the estimated amounts that will be due the railroad retirement account from the railroad unemployment insurance account (including 3-percent interest) at the end of each of the calendar years 1961–65, depending upon the maximum contribution rate in effect for such calendar years. It is estimated that the reserve in the railroad retirement account at the end of 1965 will be $4.2 billion.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD W. HABERMEYER,
Chairman.

TABLE A.—*Statement of borrowings, repayments and balance due, under authority of sec. 308(a), Public Law 86–28; 73 Stat. 25, at monthly intervals from July 1959 through November 1960*

Period	Gross borrowings for month	Accrued interest for month	Repayments for month		Amount due railroad retirement account at end of month		
			Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Total
1959—July	$1,000,000	$245.90			$1,000,000	$245.90	$1,000,245.90
August	31,500,000	45,250.01			32,500,000	45,495.91	32,545,495.91
September	20,125,000	57,549.17	$16,450,000	$36,827.88	36,175,000	66,217.20	36,241,217.20
October	30,606,000	131,938.69			66,781,000	198,155.89	66,979,155.89
November	26,005,000	198,729.11			92,786,000	396,885.00	93,182,885.00
December	15,125,000	187,579.20	27,775,000	211,428.28	80,136,000	373,035.92	80,509,035.92
1960—January	21,845,000	231,635.76			101,981,000	604,671.68	102,585,671.68
February	14,869,000	262,776.89			116,850,000	867,448.57	117,717,448.57
March	1,245,000	256,018.04	18,525,000	235,555.33	99,570,000	887,911.28	100,457,911.28
April	13,195,000	260,434.02			112,765,000	1,148,345.30	113,913,345.30
May	8,215,000	297,803.68			120,980,000	1,446,148.98	122,426,148.98
June		247,738.77	22,481,000	416,079.75	98,499,000	1,277,808.00	99,776,808.00
July	8,650,000	258,593.75			107,149,000	1,536,401.75	108,685,401.75
August	16,455,000	299,845.89			123,604,000	1,836,247.64	125,440,247.64
September	5,500,000	270,561.49	19,040,000	469,355.51	110,064,000	1,637,453.62	111,701,453.62
October	21,165,000	307,476.37			131,229,000	1,944,929.99	133,173,929.99
November	16,425,000	348,590.21			147,654,000	2,293,520.20	149,947,520.20

Source: Prepared by the Director of Budget and Fiscal Operations of the Railroad Retirement Board.

TABLE B.—*Estimated status of railroad unemployment insurance account, fiscal years 1961 through 1965, under various contribution rate assumptions*

[In millions. (D)=deficit]

WITH PRESENT 3¾ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Balance, beginning of year	Contributions credited to account	Interest on debt to railroad retirement account	Benefit payments	Balance, end of year
1961	$97(D)	$156	$4	$200	$144(D)
1962	144(D)	161	5	175	163(D)
1963	163(D)	166	5	170	172(D)
1964	172(D)	170	5	165	172(D)
1965	172(D)	170	5	165	171(D)

WITH 4 PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961

1961	$97(D)	$156	$4	$200	$144(D)
1962	144(D)	172	4	175	151(D)
1963	151(D)	178	4	170	148(D)
1964	148(D)	182	4	165	134(D)
1965	134(D)	182	4	165	120(D)

WITH 4¼ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961

1961	$97(D)	$156	$4	$200	$144(D)
1962	144(D)	184	4	175	140(D)
1963	140(D)	180	4	170	124(D)
1964	124(D)	194	3	165	98(D)
1965	98(D)	194	2	165	71(D)

WITH 4½ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Balance, beginning of year	Contributions credited to account	Interest on debt to railroad retirement account	Benefit payments	Balance, end of year
1961	$97(D)	$156	$4	$200	$144(D)
1962	144(D)	195	4	175	128(D)
1963	128(D)	201	4	170	101(D)
1964	101(D)	206	3	165	62(D)
1965	62(D)	206	1	165	22(D)

WITH 4¾ PERCENT CONTRIBUTION RATE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1961

1961	$97(D)	$156	$4	$200	$144(D)
1962	144(D)	206	4	175	117(D)
1963	117(D)	213	3	170	77(D)
1964	77(D)	218	2	165	25(D)
1965	25(D)	218	[1]	165	28

[1] Less than $0.5 million.

NOTE.—For these estimates, average conditions are assumed for the years after 1961, with neither serious recessions nor unusually high levels of prosperity. Detail may not add to totals shown because amounts are rounded to nearest million. Interest income not shown because it would be less than $0.5 million in all cases except possibly the last year with a 4¾-percent rate. No allowance made for possible transfers from the administration fund.

Source: Office of Director of Research, U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, Dec. 13, 1960.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD,
Chicago, Ill., January 13, 1961.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This will supplement my letter to you of December 20, 1960, concerning the effect of the borrowing authority contained in section 308 of Public Law 86–28 on the solvency of the railroad retirement account.

As shown from table A submitted with my letter of December 20, 1960, amounts borrowed from the railroad retirement account for the payment of benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are being repaid from time to time. Thus, the total amount borrowed at various times in the period July 1959–November 1960 was nearly $250 million, but this amount was reduced by repayments from time to time to less than $150 million, and the reserve in the railroad retirement account at the end of November 1960 was some $3.7 billion.

That this borrowing authority is essential is obvious from the table marked "B" submitted with my letter of December 20, 1960. This table shows that if the current contribution rate of 3¾ percent of taxable payroll continues in effect, there will be due from the railroad unemployment insurance account to the railroad retirement account on June 30, 1965, an amount estimated to be $171 million. Despite this increased deficit in the railroad unemployment insurance account, however, it is estimated that the reserve in the railroad retirement account will at that time be $4.2 billion, or some $500 million greater than it was at the end of November 1960. Were it not for this borrowing authority, there would have been no funds in the railroad unemployment insurance account to pay the claims of the many thousands of unemployed and sick railroad workers, and there would be no funds in the next 5 years to pay any such claims. What is also obvious from table B is that the indebtedness to the railroad retirement account will not be eliminated in the next 5 years as long as the current contribution rate of 3¾ percent continues. But this circumstance, in the light of the figures referred to, does not, in the Board's opinion, warrant the conclusion that this borrowing authority constitutes any threat in the foreseeable future to the solvency of the railroad retirement account.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD W. HABERMEYER,
Chairman.

TARIFF RELIEF FOR SEED FARMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on December 23, 1960, the Oregon Crop and Livestock Reporting Service released summary figures upon one of the more important agricultural products of my State. These figures indicate the strong interest in seed crops displayed by many Oregon farmers who devote their energies to the production of this important group of commodities.

I was pleased to note that Oregon ranked first in the Nation in the production of the following varieties of seed: Merion Kentucky bluegrass, chewings fescue and red fescue, bentgrass, crimson clover, common vetch, and the ryegrasses. As a matter of fact, in 1960, Oregon produced all of the Nation's supply of chewings fescue, perennial and common ryegrass seed. In addition, Oregon growers produced nine-tenths of bentgrass and common vetch seed, more than four-fifths of the national production of red fescue, over half of the Merion Kentucky bluegrass seed grown, two-

fifths of the crimson clover, and about one-fourth of the national production of hairy vetch and alsike clover seed.

That this important segment of Oregon's agricultural economy is not in the healthiest of conditions, however, is shown by the hard statistic that while the value of Oregon seed crops in 1959 was $25.3 million, in 1960, this had been reduced to only $17.5 million—a drop in value of some $7.9 million.

Many responsible growers of Oregon feel that this economic loss is attributable, at least in part, to the failure of the Tariff Commission and the administration to control imports of seed from other countries. The $7.9 million deficit in receipts from these seed crops would seem to lend substance to this point of view.

It is my hope that in the coming year the Tariff Commission will give heed to the representations made to it by Oregon producers who are seeking equitable remedies, in order that a further decline may be avoided.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full summary to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON SEED CROPS, 1960 ANNUAL SUMMARY—TOTAL PRODUCTION AND VALUE DOWN

Production of Oregon's 16 major grass and legume seed crops for 1960 was estimated at 213 million pounds clean seed, according to the Oregon Crop and Livestock Reporting Service. This is 12 percent less than the 242 million pounds produced in 1959, but nearly one-fifth larger than the 1949–58 average of 181 million pounds. Lower seed production during 1960 was primarily due to the smaller common ryegrass crop which accounted for one-half of all the seed produced in Oregon.

Harvested acreage for the 16 seed crops estimated for Oregon during 1960 was slightly lower than last year and average while value of production for all Oregon seeds, based on returns to growers up to December 1, 1960, was estimated at $17.5 million, down nearly one-third from 1959.

Larger values of production during 1960 for alfalfa, red clover, white clover, Austrian winter peas, and common vetch were offset by the decline in value of the other seed crops. Alsike clover production and value was the lowest since the early 1930's.

OREGON SEED PRODUCTION RANKS HIGH IN NATION

Oregon's 1960 seed production ranked first in the Nation for Merion Kentucky bluegrass, Chewings and red fescue, bentgrass, crimson clover, common vetch, and the ryegrasses. Austrian winter peas, ladino clover, and hairy vetch ranked second with white and alsike clover third, and tall fescue fourth. Red clover and alfalfa seed produced in Oregon ended in ninth place. In 1960, Oregon produced all of the Nation's Chewings fescue, perennial, and common ryegrass seed, more than nine-tenths of the bentgrass and common vetch, more than four-fifths of the red fescue, over half of the Merion Kentucky bluegrass, more than two-fifths of the crimson clover and about one-fourth of the hairy vetch and alsike clover.

SOME SEEDS HIT RECORD PRODUCTION

Record high production was realized on alfalfa, red clover, crimson clover, and Chewings fescue seeds during the 1960 crop year in Oregon. Alfalfa, with the second largest acreage of record, had a record high yield with an estimated production 52 percent larger than last year. Red clover seed, with the largest acreage of recent years and above average yield, produced nearly two-fifths more than last year. Production of crimson clover was nearly one-fourth above last year's record level, primarily due to the largest acreage on record and an above average yield. Chewings fescue seed production for 1960 was nearly one-tenth above 1959 due to record high acreage and yield. Production of white clover seed was slightly above last year and 6 percent above average. Tall fescue, with a record high yield, produced 2 percent more seed than 1959, while acreage remained unchanged.

The 1960 perennial ryegrass production, second largest of record, was down slightly from 1959 but far above the 1949–58 average. Other seeds with crops smaller than last year but having above average seed production during 1960 included common ryegrass, 22 percent below last year but 36 percent above average and the third largest crop of record. Red fescue seed production for 1960 totaled 4.2 million pounds, 11 percent below last year, but still the second largest crop of record. The 1960 Merion bluegrass crop, second largest of record, was 16 percent below last year but far above average. Hard frosts during May in central and eastern Oregon hurt many Merion bluegrass stands and reduced yields below earlier expectations. Both red fescue and Merion bluegrass acreages were the largest to date. Bentgrass seed production totaled 5 million pounds, one-fourth below the 1959 crop, but still more than one-third above the 1949–58 average. This year's crop yields turned out sharply below forecast indications. Growth was heavy and lodging in stands caused sizable seed losses.

SHARP DECLINE NOTED

Oregon seed crops which declined in production this year were alsike clover, one-third below last year and the smallest since 1930; Ladino clover, 23 percent below 1959 and the smallest since 1937; hairy vetch, 37 percent below last year and the smallest production of record. Austrian winter pea and common vetch seed production, while above 1959, were far below average.

U.S. CARRYOVER AND SUPPLY

The carryover of old crop seed by dealers and farmers on June 30, 1960, totaled 262.5 million pounds, 7 percent above last year's stocks of 245 million pounds, but 22 percent under average. The initial supply of 27 kinds of seed (1960 production plus carryover by dealers and growers) for use in the 1960–61 plantings totals 1,072.3 million pounds, virtually the same as the 1959–60 season total, but 15 percent below average.

Oregon seed crops, 1960 annual summary—Seed crops: Acreage, production, and value, 1960 with comparisons

Seed crop and State	Acreage harvested			Production, clean seed			Value of production	
	Average 1949–58	1959	1960	Average 1949–58	1959	1960	1959	1960
				Thousand pounds	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
Alfalfa:								
Oregon	7,540	9,500	11,000	2,290	3,610	5,500	$1,206	$1,485
Idaho	34,000	29,000	30,000	5,794	7,975	11,100	2,337	2,942
Washington	22,300	20,000	19,000	11,088	8,600	7,600	2,864	2,090
California	130,000	153,000	141,000	52,518	58,140	51,465	19,186	16,983
United States	1,033,970	745,500	702,200	151,546	129,268	130,323	37,592	35,830
Red clover:								
Oregon	17,900	15,000	23,000	3,054	3,300	4,600	894	1,012
Idaho	31,250	34,000	29,000	9,134	9,860	8,120	2,968	1,908
United States	1,375,355	1,138,600	1,069,800	85,755	86,831	89,765	22,401	18,847
Alsike clover:								
Oregon	8,490	5,500	3,000	3,237	1,650	1,110	312	189
Idaho	13,100	9,000	5,000	2,728	1,710	1,450	328	254
California	3,710	3,300	1,000	1,517	1,023	500	191	85
United States	63,760	33,200	25,200	11,309	6,010	5,160	1,119	852
White clover:								
Oregon	1,330	1,300	1,400	211	221	224	106	146
Idaho	9,970	15,500	14,500	2,293	3,875	2,320	1,686	1,438
United States	35,670	27,400	32,450	4,180	4,640	3,940	2,343	2,610
Ladino clover:								
Oregon	9,510	1,300	1,000	1,540	169	130	96	83
California	23,400	16,000	21,000	4,752	4,160	4,200	2,288	2,520
United States	34,650	17,300	22,000	6,490	4,329	4,330	2,384	2,603
Merion bluegrass: [1]								
Oregon	3,257	5,700	7,500	577	1,608	1,350	1,849	1,202
Idaho	647	1,300	1,600	135	410	432	492	419
Washington	2,360	4,600	5,600	364	1,058	1,176	1,270	1,058
United States	6,519	12,830	15,070	1,138	3,174	3,099	3,733	2,820
Chewings fescue: Oregon	17,250	24,000	25,000	5,094	10,560	11,500	2,904	1,840
Red fescue:								
Oregon	5,650	11,000	12,000	1,791	4,730	4,200	1,253	714
Washington	1,080	1,600	1,600	432	720	608	176	103
United States	7,190	13,400	14,200	2,348	5,702	4,958	1,480	845
Tall fescue:								
Oregon	15,150	5,000	5,000	4,817	2,700	2,750	486	344
United States	122,513	110,500	145,300	27,232	22,134	31,331	3,665	3,550

[1] Short-time average.

Oregon seed crops, 1960 annual summary—Seed crops: Acreage, production, and value, 1960 with comparisons—Continued

Seed crop and State	Acreage harvested			Production, clean seed			Value of production	
	Average 1949–58	1959	1960	Average 1949–58	1959	1960	1959	1960
				Thousand pounds	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousand pounds*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
Bentgrass:								
Oregon	18,300	23,000	22,000	3,758	6,670	5,060	$1,467	$1,417
Washington	2,180	1,000	500	187	95	38	34	15
United States	20,480	24,000	22,500	3,945	6,765	5,098	1,501	1,432
Austrian winter peas:								
Oregon	25,700	8,000	7,600	25,350	6,000	6,992	201	217
Idaho	21,300	28,000	32,000	30,683	42,000	36,000	1,428	1,170
Washington	7,170	500	600	8,300	425	510	14	16
United States	55,820	36,500	40,200	65,554	48,425	43,502	1,643	1,403
Crimson clover:								
Oregon	5,850	15,000	21,000	2,102	6,450	7,980	1,516	1,237
United States	124,308	73,500	86,000	19,269	13,477	18,700	3,278	3,167
Hairy vetch:								
Oregon	44,900	28,000	18,000	15,022	9,240	5,850	924	573
United States	197,170	98,000	90,000	36,480	22,060	21,390	2,256	2,128
Common vetch:								
Oregon	30,300	8,000	9,000	13,233	4,080	5,400	212	281
California	1,150	1,000	1,000	403	300	220	18	14
United States	31,860	9,000	10,000	13,802	4,380	5,620	230	295
Common ryegrass: Oregon	98,600	124,000	115,000	78,369	136,400	106,950	7,502	3,957
Perennial ryegrass: Oregon	25,600	46,000	48,000	20,960	45,080	43,200	4,418	2,765
Total Oregon seeds	335,327	331,300	329,500	181,405	242,468	212,796	25,346	17,462
Other seed crops, United States:								
Sweetclover	278,410	136,900	130,200	45,451	27,507	27,696	2,416	1,856
Lespedeza	715,190	582,500	464,000	142,730	124,295	90,625	12,382	11,069
Timothy	274,580	296,500	289,000	38,501	44,098	46,875	4,751	2,755
Redtop	79,400	60,000	52,000	5,338	5,325	4,460	1,498	696
Orchardgrass	60,100	48,000	52,500	11,984	8,985	11,880	2,020	1,850
Kentucky bluegrass				20,223	3,550	29,400		
Sudangrass	111,100	64,300	73,000	54,683	38,248	44,811	1,878	2,366
Smooth bromegrass	81,535	39,700	66,700	14,061	4,943	11,443	755	1,080
Crested wheatgrass	40,520	38,500	35,200	3,643	2,745	2,754	625	439
Lupine	57,360	13,000	9,000	44,987	10,050	7,060	419	276
Purple vetch	24,800	45,000	26,000	7,818	8,100	3,900	535	312

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to announce I intend at a later time to discuss in some detail, here on the floor of the Senate, some of the policies of the Tariff Commission. However, I prefer to wait until there is some indication as to whether the Tariff Commission proposes, on its own, to change some of its practices which, I believe, have been doing great harm to various segments of American agriculture, including not only the seed industry, but also some of our other industries, and with particular reference to the fruit industry.

Let me point out that it was never the intention of Congress that segments of American agriculture must wait until damage was done, before the Tariff Commission proceeded to carry out its responsibilities under the laws applicable to it. It was the clear intention of Congress that the Tariff Commission should function in a preventive capacity, so as to see to it that the signals of economic harm were raised long before segments of American agriculture were damaged.

Unfortunately, the record shows clearly that on too many occasions the Tariff Commission has permitted irreparable damage to be done to some segment of the Nation's agricultural industry before the Commission has carried out any of its responsibilities in connection with its statutory duties.

I sincerely hope that by raising this question in regard to the plight of the seed industry in this country, today, the Tariff Commission will take note of my observations, because as a representative of a great agricultural State, I have no intention of sitting mute in the Senate while such damage—for which, on too many occasions, the Tariff Commission has been responsible—continues to be done to the agricultural economy of the Nation.

RULES AND REGULATIONS FOR TREATMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS BY RESEARCH GROUPS RECEIVING FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last year the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] introduced a bill, numbered S. 3570, of which I was happy to be one of the cosponsors. The bill provided some rules and regulations for the treatment of experimental animals by research groups receiving Federal research funds.

The bill was subsequently attacked very strongly by medical research organizations and many persons in the medical profession. Last fall there appeared in Science magazine a letter from Prof. Bradley T. Scheer, chairman of the department of biology at the University of Oregon, in which he made what I regard as a very sound and worthwhile analysis of the bill and its purpose. I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Scheer's letter to Science magazine printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The bill S. 3570 recently introduced into the Senate by Senator COOPER and others, "to provide for the humane treatment of animals," has been strongly attacked both in Science [132, 7 (1960)] and in the Bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research. These attacks have given what I think to be a false idea of the nature and intent of the bill, and of the motives of its sponsors, and prompt me to make a carefully considered statement of my own opinion.

The issue of humane treatment itself is a moral one: To what extent are we justified in inflicting pain and discomfort on other organisms in our search for knowledge? Bill S. 3570 takes the position "that living vertebrate animals used for scientific experiments shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed, and humanely handled." This is a statement with which, I think, most biologists would agree in principle; personally I should feel more comfortable if the words "potentially valuable" were inserted after the words "scientific information," but I think that the efforts of the National Society for Medical Research, the Animal Care Panel, and the American Physiological Society over the past several years have been directed toward the general aims stated above.

The second issue posed by the bill is a practical political one: Granted that humane treatment is desirable, is legislation, and in particular this legislation, the best means to assure it? The alternatives would seem to be voluntary action by the investigators or local control by individual communities. The charges recently brought against Stanford University and the College of Medical Evangelists in California show that local action under the influence of extremist pressure groups may still endanger medical research; it seems probable that the existence of Federal legislation of the type proposed in S. 3570 would do much to protect laboratories against this sort of local attack. The question of voluntary action is a more debatable one. In my own experience I have never come across an instance of wanton cruelty to experimental animals, but I have encountered numerous cases of neglect due to callousness, inadequate facilities, inexperience, or carelessness; again, it would seem that S. 3570 would help to eliminate such instances.

The reasonable objections which have been made to the specific provisions of S. 3570 are well summarized in the Science editorial: "Advanced approval of experimental plans by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, burdensome recordkeeping, annual or more frequent reports to HEW, additional costs and a new and unnecessary amount of

redtape." As I read the bill, it seems to me that the requirements are not greatly beyond those now in force. Every application for Federal research funds requires submission of an experimental plan which is approved by a panel of scientists. I hope that all of us who publish results of animal experiments do at least the amount of recordkeeping specified by the bill. Every Federal research grant now requires an annual report. The only additional features are that the experimental plan must specify what animals are to be used and what type of experiments are to be performed; there is nothing in the bill requiring advance approval of every minor change in experimental procedure. The report, also, must specify the animals used and the procedures employed, but there is nothing in the bill to say that this must coincide exactly with the plan proposed. Compliance with the provisions of the bill will cost more, insofar as the existing laboratories do not provide adequate facilities for the animals used, but this should result in better experimental results as well as more humane care.

The National Society for Medical Research has devoted much attention to the provision for inspection of facilities and for certificates of compliance with regulations to be laid down by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; this is presumably the redtape with which Science is concerned. At present, every institution receiving grants from Federal agencies is visited—or if you wish, inspected—by officers of those agencies. On the basis of past experience, I think that we have nothing to fear from these officers, who have abundantly demonstrated that their main aim is to further research of the highest quality. Any regulations which HEW might lay down under an act of the sort proposed would, I think, not depart from this aim. In any event, the bill gives no police powers to HEW or anyone else, so that work sponsored by any but Federal agencies would not be in any way affected.

In sum, I cannot find in this bill the evils which the National Society for Medical Research or Science profess to see, and I would urge my colleagues who are interested in animal experimentation, humane treatment, or both, to read the bill with care, to make their own appraisals on the basis of their own judgments, and to communicate these judgments to their representatives in the Congress.

BRADLEY T. SCHEER.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Kentucky contemplates reintroducing his bill at a later time in this session. I shall, at a later time, present some information I have received in opposition to the bill in the form in which it was introduced last year.

I feel it is only fair to see to it that the points of view of both the opponents and proponents of the bill are made available for the study of our colleagues in the Senate before any further action is taken on the bill.

I think it is quite possible some of the objections to the bill may lead to a consideration of some modification in the language of the bill, or possible amendment to the bill, in case it is introduced in its original form.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate very much the references made by the Senator from Oregon to the bill I introduced last year. As the Senator will remember, the purpose of the bill was to assure humane treatment of animals used in federally financed research.

After I introduced the bill—and the Senator from Oregon and other Senators joined in introduction of the bill—I was flooded with letters of protest from various sources, many of them from people engaged in research, who made the assertion that the bill, if passed, would very seriously interfere with all such research. Others have said that its hidden purpose is to stop all research with animals.

I have also read the articles that have been appearing in the magazines. I must say that those articles and advertisements, sponsored by the antivivisection society, must have cost a great deal of money. They say, on the contrary, that it is a ruse for actually approving the use of animals for research.

I am not an expert in this subject. It could very well be true that the bill should be modified. I assume it would be the function of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to consider modification when it reaches the committee.

I intend to introduce the bill again. I hope the Senator from Oregon will join me in its introduction. I am sure that most people doing research use humane methods, as has been stated in their letters, and I know it is not the intent of any of the bill's sponsors to interfere with their search in any way. But there may be some who should not be engaged in research; and if they are using methods which are not humane or necessary, or if animals are neglected in some places prior to their use by qualified researchers, then I think there is a real purpose in the bill.

I was much interested in one article I read only yesterday, which will appear in one of the leading magazines in a short time. It said, commenting on the "dangers" of the bill which I introduced, that it would "torpedo" medical research, that it would "strangle" it.

I assert that the statements which have been made are exaggerated, and most of them are without any foundation at all. I would say some of them have evidently been devoted to preventing any kind of judgment as to what kind of methods are being used.

Research with animals has produced great benefit for humanity and society, as a result of methods which have been developed to treat human disease. I am sure that the lot of animals killed or injured for that purpose is not always pleasant or happy or without pain. Surely, if the lives of animals are to be taken for our benefit—to help mankind—standards ought to be established to treat those animals humanely. That is the purpose of the bill.

As I have said, I have no scientific knowledge as to whether the particular provisions of the bill are extreme or whether it should be modified. But I say flatly the purpose of the bill is not in any way to inhibit, frustrate, or interfere with research. It is to encourage research, for the best research is carried out as humanely as possible.

The bill does have a humane purpose. When animals are to be used to save human life or treat disease, surely we can establish methods to give assurance the animals are well treated. If one does not care about life in one form, he may not care about life in any form.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his comments. I shall make available to the Senator from Kentucky the material I am now having a staff member study in connection with this bill, preparatory to submitting recommendations to me as to whether or not he would advise any modification of the language of the bill. As soon as that study is completed, I shall make it available to the Senator from Kentucky.

The purpose of the bill, as stated by the Senator from Kentucky, is exactly the same purpose he stated when the bill was introduced, a purpose of which I approve.

There is no question about the fact that the purpose of the bill is to meet the complaint on the part of some persons within our country who state that research with animals is not conducted in the most humane way possible. It certainly is not unsound or unfair for us to take the position that, consonant with research objectives, these experimentations should be carried on in a humane manner. That is all that is sought by the bill; and if that objective can be accomplished with some modification of the bill, so far as I am concerned I would have no quarrel with any amendments.

But I am sure, may I say to the Senator from Kentucky, that he and I are dealing with one of those "hot potatoes," legislatively speaking, in which we are bound to displease some, no matter what course of action we follow. The Senator will recall that last year, or the year before, we finally passed a humane slaughter bill. The proposals that were made by some of those who have very deep feelings about problems of slaughtering were, in my judgment, so extreme that, if we were to comply with the wishes of some of them, all of us would become vegetarians, because to adopt their policy would have involved the closing down of all the slaughterhouses in America. We could not possibly have operated slaughterhouses in America if we had carried out the proposals that were made in regard to how animals were going to be slaughtered. That is, it would not have been possible to conduct slaughterhouses on the basis of the American free enterprise system; and I would be the first, in this field, as in any other, to oppose nationalization of any segment of our economy, may I say, as a liberal.

So what we tried to do in the slaughterhouse bill was to find an area that answered the question in regard to humane proposals for slaughtering actually being advocated. To the extent that they were followed, we thought they ought to be incorporated in the bill. We passed the bill. Perhaps the Senator from Kentucky or some other Senator has heard of some calamity which has followed the passage of the bill, but I have not heard about any.

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. MORSE. I think it has come to be recognized that we did at least a fairly good job in meeting a problem which needed to be met.

The Senator from Kentucky has referred to the antivivisectionists. One of the communications I received in regard to the bill was from a distinguished doctor in this Nation. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky will recognize the name the moment he takes a look at the letter. It was a pretty rough letter on both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Oregon. In fact, it said that we had surrendered to the antivivisectionists.

When someone writes to me in that vein I am inclined to suspect that there is a great big hole in his case, because if he has the evidence and the facts which support his position he does not have to accuse Senators of engaging in some form of surrendering to or "buckling under" to some legislative group in the country.

I replied to the good doctor by pointing out to him that I had always made clear I did not adopt the point of view of the antivivisectionist; but the fact is, as I said, that some of our finest citizens in all the communities of America share the antivivisectionist point of view. They are as sincere as are those who are opposed to their point of view, and as sincere as those of us who feel that our responsibility as legislators is to try to find the middle ground between the antivivisectionists and those who feel that no legislation in regard to humane treatment of animals, in respect to experimentation and laboratory tests, should be passed at all.

I said that I happen to be one who believes it is essential, in the interest of protecting human existence, to make use of animals in experimentation in the medical field, and in endeavors to help us bring to an end some of the great disease scourges which plague mankind, but I also hold to the point of view that there is this much which can be said for the position of the antivivisectionists, although they want to go much further: They are certainly correct in pointing out that if there is any lack of humaneness, if there is any unnecessary suffering and cruelty inflicted upon animals in the carrying out of experimentations, then it is necessary to devise proper controls and improvements in laboratory techniques to keep the suffering to a minimum.

I shall discuss this matter at greater length later, when I bring to the Senate the study I am having made by a staff member.

Let the RECORD show that the senior Senator from Oregon is not going to support the extreme position taken by the antivivisectionists, which, when all is said and done, would have the effect of saying, "Pass legislation which stops the use of animals in this whole matter of experimentation in the laboratories which are seeking to carry on investigations to solve some of the great disease problems which plague mankind."

That is the position I take. I should like to confer with the Senator from Kentucky in the next few days about his bill, before he introduces it, if he thinks it is feasible to wait for that period of time.

Mr. COOPER. I will be glad to do so, and I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Oregon.

I am not an antivivisectionist, and of course I do not adhere to that point of view. I know we have to have experiments and we have to use animals in these experiments.

I am sure that in most places over the country those who are engaged in these experiments observe, as best they can, humane procedures, but the charge is made that some do not.

Even to have the bill introduced, to bring it before the committee, and to allow hearings to be held upon it, will certainly establish whether any law is needed. If none is needed, the committee can decide the point. If the bill which I have introduced is not proper for the purposes we both seek, the committee can make whatever modifications are necessary. I have served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I know it is a good committee.

I have received letters from deans of medical colleges and universities which have said flatly the bill would stop all research. After I had written to them explaining the purposes of the proposal, I have also received letters from several which said, "We think it is all right. Let the matter be heard."

I know this much about the Senator from Oregon—he is not afraid of any outcry which may be raised about a bill before it has even been discussed and considered by a committee. I know he knows I am not.

Let the matter be heard. I agree with the Senator. I remember the situation which occurred when the humane slaughter bill was introduced. A great outcry was heard all over the country, that the passage of such legislation would stop the processing and distribution of food. It was claimed that passage of such legislation would put people out of business, especially the small packers, and that it was a move to help the great packing industry—although that part of the industry was not in favor of the proposed legislation either, and fought it. The Senator remembers that. It took about 2 years to pass the bill.

Finally, a reasonable bill was passed. I have asked what has happened since then. I have learned that the Department of Agriculture has already secured 87 percent compliance in this field, and secured that in less than half a year that the act has been in force.

I am sure the Senator also remembers a bill which was was called the wild horse bill. I always liked the title. Although I am from Kentucky, which is a horse State, when the bill was first brought to my attention, I was puzzled by its reference to wild horses. I learned that there was a problem in the West in regard to catching wild horses. I think the horses were being chased by airplanes, and various inhumane ways were used to capture them.

That bill was fought. It was said that it was necessary to do the things being done to capture the horses. The committee considered the bill. The Congress passed the bill. I do not believe it has ruined the wild horse industry.

The Senator is a horseman, and can tell me about the subject.

Mr. MORSE. It might have increased the cost of dog meat a little bit, but that was probably either necessary or desirable.

Mr. COOPER. I am very happy to have the Senator's contribution.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Kentucky that in answering the distinguished doctor I took the liberty of stating it was my position—and I was sure it was the position of the Senator from Kentucky—that when hearings were held on the bill, if evidence could be brought forth that the bill needed either modification or defeat the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Kentucky would follow where the evidence led, but that the proponents of the bill, being responsible citizens of this country, had a right to petition their Government for consideration of the subject matter of the bill, and that right alone justified the introduction of a bill for hearing, as the Senator from Kentucky has indicated this afternoon.

I happen to be a member of the committee to which the Senator refers. If the bill is introduced and is referred to our committee for hearings, I will see to it that all sides of the question receive a full and adequate hearing, so that they can present their evidence in support of their respective positions.

Mr. COOPER. I hope the bill will be referred to the subcommittee of which the Senator is chairman. I had the honor of serving with the Senator from Oregon on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for 5 years. I served on a subcommittee with him, and remember very well one bill which we considered for 2 years, the Railway Labor Act. Whatever agreement or disagreement others may have with the Senator from Oregon—and we all differ at times with each other on various subjects—I may say that I never saw a chairman of a committee or of a subcommittee who took more pains to give everyone on both sides a chance to be heard, to hear the evidence, and then to consider the evidence submitted and work out bills properly based on that evidence, than did the Senator from Oregon. I know his conscientious methods from intimate association with him on committees, and I am glad to have the opportunity to tell what I have observed during my various terms in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Kentucky is very kind and gracious. His leaving the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a great loss to the committee, and I wish I had the power of suasion which would induce him to return to the committee, because I would very much like to have him on the committee again.

REFORESTATION—A NATIONAL CHALLENGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last year the Senate considered and passed unanimously Senate Joint Resolution 95. It was cosponsored by our majority leader,

the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; the Republican whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the ranking Republican on the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; as well as by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr STENNIS], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], my late colleague, Mr. Neuberger, and myself.

We were all motivated by the warning well expressed in 1958 by the chief of the Forest Service when he said:

> Within the next 10 years 48 billion trees need to be planted, mainly on small ownerships, if the wood requirements of a larger population are to be met by the year 2000.

In the period between the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 95, and prior to the time it was reported favorably by the Senate Interior and Agriculture Committees, the Senate received reports from the executive branch which were, in my judgment, both misleading and inaccurate. In a moment I shall discuss the reports, but I am happy to mention at this point that the Senate ignored those reports, as it should have.

Last fall I proceeded to dig deeper into the reforestation needs in the national forests in the State of Oregon. The Forest Service responded to this request—and I might add here that the response was thorough and accurate.

MISLEADING THE CONGRESS MUST STOP

I wish to express my gratitude that President Kennedy has said in such forthright terms that his administration will not hide from the truth. By way of contrast, let me give you this example of how the executive branch leadership of the Eisenhower administration attempted to mislead the Congress and the American people.

In a letter dated September 1, 1959, the Bureau of the Budget, speaking of tree planting on Federal lands, said Senate Joint Resolution 95 was not necessary because the "existing authorization is adequate for Federal lands." The Bureau further said:

> Reforestation * * * can proceed on a systematic basis (S. Rept. No. 1653, pp. 11–12).

I submit, and the record will show, that this report by the Bureau was in no way responsive.

The Department of Agriculture report of September 28, 1959, on Senate Joint Resolution 95 was equally unresponsive. It spoke of plans to reforest 3,900,000 national forest acres but the Department's budgets had been totally inadequate to meet even one-tenth of the job. On November 23, 1959, a Bureau of the Budget letter referred to the "current accelerated trends"—Senate Report No. 1653, pages 12–13.

The Bureau contended that "If planting continued—at the 70,000-acre rate of 1958—about 80 years would be required to plant or seed the more than 5 million acres of Federal lands needing restocking."

I quote in particular this statement, which is a masterpiece of misstatement.

> However, during the last 5 years substantial gains have been made in the rate of planting Federal lands over previous periods.

The committee report showed quite conclusively, with respect to the national forests, that planting to reduce the backlog of land needing reforestation was at an annual rate of 103,000 acres in the decade of the 1930's and that, on a comparable basis, the average in the last decade was less than 23,000 acres.

I am pleased that President Kennedy stated forthrightly in his state of the Union message that he will cause his executive office of the Bureau of the Budget and the departments to be so operated that they supply proper information to legitimate questions. It is my judgment that the national interest was ill served over the last several years by executive efforts to mask the facts.

THE QUEST FOR THE FACTS

I was so concerned about our lack of progress in reforestation that I directed further inquiries to the Forest Service relative to the situation in Oregon. Timber is Oregon's No. 1 business and the condition of our national forest is of vital importance to our welfare. I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence I have had with the U.S. Forest Service be set forth in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

THE LACK OF PROGRESS IN REFORESTATION

Mr. MORSE. In contrast to the Bureau of the Budget's contention that there has been progress on the reforestation, I find that, in fact, we have been actually slipping backward on the national forests.

In fiscal year 1953, on non-timber-sale areas in Oregon there were 393,000 national forest acres suited to the commercial growth of timber that needed planting. On timber sale areas there were 8,076 acres. By 1960, the timber sale acres needing planting had grown to 56,810 acres and funds were not available to plant 22,204 acres. In 1953 there were 401,076 national forest acres needing planting and today there are 437,620 acres for which reforestation funds are not on hand. In the space of 8 years the national forest acreage needing planting in Oregon alone has grown almost 10 percent. I submit this is not progress as the American people understand the meaning of the word.

The average rate of reforestation with appropriated funds for the last 7 years has been a mere 1,385 acres yearly which is less than was done in fiscal year 1953. Reforestation on timber sale areas can be largely accomplished under the Knutson-Vandenberg law which permits a portion of timber sale receipts to be allocated to this work. Collections have not been sufficient here to accomplish this work on a timely basis. I am pleased to see, however, that the record shows better recognition of this problem the last few years.

My purpose in making these remarks at this time is twofold. First, I want to register my emphatic disapproval of the preceding administration's practice of looking at a bleak picture with rose colored glasses, as in this case. What we do in reforestation affects our national well-being. We fool only ourselves when it is falsely proclaimed that all is well in our forests. I want our new and capable Budget Director, Mr. David Bell, and our excellent new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, to know that this practice reached out to cover almost anything that the old administration wanted to obscure.

The ability of the Kennedy administration to face up to problems and the American people's ability to understand the complex problems will be only as good as the facts that are presented. I am most heartened by the fresh, clean approach President Kennedy has put forward. I am delighted to hear that we are returning to a government which has as its guiding principle the words found in John 8:32 "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

OUR CONSERVATION NEEDS INCREASE

My second concern relates to the subject of conservation. We should not for a moment overlook the fact that we face a conservation test. America's position in the year 2000 will be as much affected then by the things we do—or fail to do today—as by the decisions made in that eventful year. If we do not march forward now to fulfill our obligations we cheat our children of the destiny which should be theirs. A child who is not educated in the sixties cannot take his rightful and proper place in our society 40 years from now. A citizen who can be President of this Nation in the year 2000 may be born this very year. We must educate him for the year 2000 and the challenge of that bright century. The forests and forest resources our people will need in the year 2000 must be started now. They too require time and training to develop just as does presidential timber.

So I say that the vigor with which we approach natural resource development and protection will be the measure of how well and how faithfully we are guiding ourselves to meet the future's needs.

I have every confidence in democracy's ability to meet mankind's spiritual, moral, and material hopes. The revolution of ideas we started in 1776 can and must be the revolution that wins men's hearts and minds. We carry freedom's cause. If it should falter too much or fail it will not be because another form of government is superior. It will come to pass because we failed to meet our responsibilities.

My plea today is that our National Government act vigorously to meet on a timely basis the challenges that confront us. My hope is that the vital work of reforestation receives proper recognition as an important national objective.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
August 15, 1960.

DR. RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MCARDLE: It would be most helpful to me for use in the 87th Congress before the Senate Appropriations Committee

if you could provide me with the following material:

1. An estimate of the acreage in Oregon within the national forests which has been damaged by forest fires in the past 10 years and which has not been reseeded.

2. The cost of a crash program to restore trees to this area if the work were to be completed within a 2-year period.

3. The amounts currently budgeted for reforestation and the time it would take under presently budgeted amounts to restore past damage alone.

Your courtesy in providing these estimates to me will be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our regional office in Portland, Oreg., has furnished us with the information requested in your letter of August 15, 1960, concerning reforestation of burns in Oregon.

During the 10-year period calender years 1951–60 (to September 1, 1960), a total of 105,676 acres of national forest land was burned in Oregon. Most of the commercial forest land in this burned area has been planted or has restocked naturally, but as of September 1, 1960, there remain 19,885 acres which will need to be restored to timber productivity by seeding or planting.

The region estimates cost of a 2-year crash program to restore trees to this area at $994,250, based on an estimated cost of $50 per acre. Of course completion of the job in the 2-year period would hinge on the availability of planting stock. Normally it requires two growing seasons in the nursery to produce stock of sufficient size for outplanting. To insure meeting the objectives of a 2-year crash program, we would need to step up our nursery production schedule not later than the spring prior to the 2 fiscal years in which the project was to be completed.

For the current fiscal year, the regional forester has advised that approximately $168,000 has been programed for the reforestation of burns in Oregon. It is estimated it would take about 6 years to complete the job of reforesting the 19,885 acres of burns at this annual rate of spending.

We should like to point out that the 19,885 acres presently in need of reforestation will, unless proper provision for reforestation is made, continue to build up at the approximate rate of 2,000 acres per year. The 2,000-acre figure represents the average annual acreage of commercial forest land burned over during the past 10-year period, which it will be necessary to plant or seed in order to restore the land to timber production.

We certainly appreciate your interest in our reforestation job in the State of Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief.

OCTOBER 18, 1960.

DR. RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief, U.S. Forest Service,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MCARDLE: Thank you very much for your letter of October 10 in which you supplied certain data on reforestation needs in the State of Oregon.

A review of my August 15 request, which prompted your reply of October 10, leads me to believe that my request may not have been entirely clear. It is true that reforestation statistics are voluminous and can be applied from different base points. In view of that fact, it appears that what I need is an up-to-date recapitulation. When I go before Senator HAYDEN's Appropriations Committee I like to have my facts precise and well documented.

If it is possible to do so without too much trouble, I would appreciate your reassembling the situation as it has developed since 1952 when the data for timber resources for America's future was collected. What I would like to have are separate year by year and cumulative analyses of the reforestation needs on commercial and noncommercial timberlands in Oregon. With respect to commercial timberlands, I would also like to have the reforestation situation resulting from timber cutting.

The tables requested herein should show the beginning acreage in need of reforestation in all three categories, the amount added each year due to fire and other causes of loss, and through logging, the acreage planted, its total cost and per acre cut, the net acreage remaining to be planted, and the rate of increase or decrease for each year.

In the case of logging to the extent that the Knutson-Vandenberg Act collections are insufficient to permit completion of the job with those funds, this acreage and cost should be shown.

In general, I would like to be in a position to demonstrate both the amount that must be available to deal with current losses and the amount needed to reduce the backlog of old burn areas. To illustrate this point it would be helpful to have a scheduling out of the program of the national forests for the 12-year period in Oregon and the extent to which Oregon's needs will be met, based upon the average allocation made to Oregon over the past 5 years.

It is a matter of deep concern to me that the acreage needing planting continues to grow. We are not making real progress as long as this situation exists.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Forest Service,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1961.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in further response to your letter of October 18, 1960, requesting information on reforestation needs in the State of Oregon.

We asked Regional Forester Stone to furnish us with certain statistical data not available here. This information has been received and is presented in attached tables 1, 2, and 3. Although you will find most of the tables self-explanatory, some comment may be helpful.

Table 1 reflects the progress made in reforestation of clear-cut sale areas. We have found that from 80 to 90 percent of these clear-cut areas must be reforested artificially if we are to avoid long delays in reproducing the forest and prevent loss in sustained-yield production. During the past 8 years, progress made in reforesting the clear-cut portions of sale areas has been fairly good. Nevertheless, we recognize the need for better financing with Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds, plus a modest amount of supplemental financing with appropriated funds, to insure that all areas will be reforested promptly. The 56,810-acre backlog of planting includes 34,606 acres on which planting is scheduled from Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds already collected. It will be necessary to finance planting of the remaining 22,204 acres with appropriated funds. Lack of sufficient Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds to finance needed reforestation work on clear-cut areas results when there is (1) increase in the cost of goods and services between the time the sale is made and the reforestation work actually is done, (2) insufficient timber value on the sale to permit collection of adequate Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds to do the total reforestation job, and (3) failure of initial planting or seeding effort.

Table 2 shows the unsatisfactory progress being made in reforesting nonstocked and poorly stocked nonsale areas. Unlike the timber sale areas in table 1, financing of this particular reforestation job is dependent entirely on appropriated funds. The amount of reforestation work accomplished during the 8-year period was in direct relation to the amount of money appropriated by Congress for such work, bearing in mind of course the total reforestation needs of all the national forests.

During the 8-year period the total nonsale area in need of planting or seeding increased by some 33,514 acres, practically all as a result of burns. During that same period we succeeded in reforesting only 11,098 acres. As a result, the 1952 backlog of 393,000 acres was increased by 22,416 acres.

Referring to table 3 you will note that average planting cost per acre has risen sharply since fiscal year 1953. Part of this increase may be attributed to the steady rise in costs of materials and services. An even more important factor in the rising cost of reforestation work has been the increasing amount of ground preparation done prior to the actual planting or seeding operation. Experience shows adequate ground preparation in Oregon is essential to assure success and it pays off. We have found that total ground preparation as contrasted to none or only partial ground preparation results in a higher percentage of plantation success, hence less need for costly replanting or reseeding.

Concerning your request for an analysis of reforestation needs on noncommercial timberland in Oregon, may we point out that the reforestation of noncommercial forest land is not being considered now or in the foreseeable future. Our immediate concern, and our chief concern for many years to come, will be the reforestation of the commercial forest land, a job on which we are still far from making satisfactory progress. Table 19 in USDA Forest Resource Report No. 14, entitled "Timber Resources for America's Future," shows 185,000 acres of deforested noncommercial forest land on the national forests in Oregon, as of 1952. Primarily as a result of the 1959 and 1960 fires, we now estimate this figure has increased to 200,000 acres.

Reforestation of noncommercial timberland in Oregon basically has not been explored. The large area of commercial forest land in need of reforestation is one of the primary reasons for deferment of reforestation of noncommercial lands. The primary purpose of reforestation of noncommercial lands in Oregon would be for watershed protection. Natural vegetation, even though not timber species, usually provides sufficient cover for noncommercial deforested areas (primarily burns) to hold soil in place under most Oregon conditions. Where erosion control problems develop after burns, we usually find that the most effective rehabilitation measures are contour trenching, channel clearing, and grass sowing. Funds appropriated by Congress for "rehabilitation of burns" are in part used for these latter purposes and are being so expended on 1960 burns on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

You indicated a desire for a reforestation schedule for Oregon, based on the program of the national forests. The 12-year program calls for the reforestation of 487,000 acres of commercial forest land, composed of nonstocked and poorly stocked land, recent and current burns, and fill-in planting in understocked stands to bring them up to satisfactory stocking. This estimate does not include the acreage which will be planted on clear-cut sale areas during that period, to be financed primarily by Knutson-Van-

denberg Act funds, and which we estimate will total about 480,000 acres. Such a program would require the average annual reforestation of 40,583 acres with appropriated funds and 40,000 acres with Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds, or a total of 80,583 acres annually. We have not yet prepared an annual breakdown for reforestation objectives in the short-term phase of the program for the national forests.

We are most appreciative of your interest and concern for our reforestation problems in Oregon and are hopeful that much greater progress can be made in this important job in the years immediately ahead.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief.

TABLE 1.—*Reforestation progress on clear-cut sale areas*

[Acres]

(1)	Estimated area clear cut annually (2)	Reforestation accomplishments: Planted or seeded (3)	Naturally reforested (4)	Total reforested (5)	Remaining area in need of planting or seeding: Annual (6)	Cumulative (7)
1953	14,410	5,734	600	6,334	8,076	8,076
1954	18,565	9,423	1,550	10,973	7,592	15,668
1955	22,305	12,199	850	13,049	9,256	24,924
1956	22,940	12,747	1,530	14,277	8,663	33,587
1957	24,290	21,985	1,420	23,405	885	34,472
1958	23,140	16,362	620	16,982	6,158	40,630
1959	33,055	24,221	1,860	26,081	6,974	47,604
1960	42,745	33,539	----------	33,539	9,206	56,810
Total	201,459	136,210	8,430	144,640	----------	[1] 56,810

[1] Knutson-Vandenberg Act funds are available, and plans are made, for planting or seeding all but 22,204 acres of this total. Planting of the 22,204 acres will have to be financed with appropriated funds.

TABLE 2.—*Reforestation progress on nonsale areas* [1]

[Acres]

Fiscal year (1)	Estimated area in need of planting or seeding: Added annually (2)	Cumulative (3)	Planted or seeded [2] (4)	Remaining area in need of planting or seeding—cumulative (5)
As of—				
1952	----------	[3] 393,000	----------	[3] 393,000
1953	1,599	394,599	1,399	393,200
1954	338	394,937	218	393,320
1955	3,360	398,297	790	395,890
1956	1,995	400,292	1,140	396,745
1957	1,675	401,967	1,675	396,745
1958	1,498	403,465	1,268	396,975
1959	9,843	413,308	2,208	404,610
1960	13,206	426,514	2,400	415,416
Total	33,514	426,514	11,098	415,416

[1] Nonstocked and poorly stocked, including recent burns which have not restocked naturally.

[2] Financed by appropriated funds.

[3] Backlog of nonstocked and poorly stocked commercial forest land on Oregon national forests, as of 1952 (from table 19, "Timber Resources for America's Future," USDA Forest Resource Report No. 14, January 1958). This is made up largely of old burns but includes an unestimated small acreage of old cutovers on sale areas and on lands acquired in a deforested condition. These old cutovers have failed to regenerate naturally and in some cases past plantations failed.

TABLE 3.—*Summary of annual reforestation accomplishment and costs, Oregon, fiscal years 1953 to 1960, inclusive*

Fiscal year (1)	Average planting cost per acre (2)	Appropriated funds (P. & M.): Acres (3)	Cost (4)	K-V funds [1]: Acres (5)	Cost (6)	All funds: Total acres (7)	Total cost (8)
1953	$24.90	1,399	$34,835.10	5,734	$142,776.60	7,133	$177,611.70
1954	28.25	218	6,158.50	9,423	266,199.75	9,641	272,358.25
1955	29.11	790	22,996.90	12,199	355,112.89	12,989	378,109.79
1956	28.83	1,140	32,866.20	12,747	367,496.01	13,887	400,362.21
1957	31.28	1,675	52,394.00	21,985	687,690.80	23,660	740,084.80
1958	34.34	1,268	43,543.12	16,362	561,871.08	17,630	605,414.20
1959	38.37	2,208	84,720.96	24,221	929,359.77	26,429	1,014,080.73
1960	46.11	2,400	110,664.00	33,539	1,546,483.29	35,939	1,657,147.29
Total	----------	11,098	388,178.78	136,210	4,856,990.19	147,308	5,245,168.97

[1] Funds collected and available for expenditure on timber sale areas under authority of sec. 3 of the Knutson-Vandenberg Act of June 9, 1930.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I read with interest the recommendations of the President to deal with the short-term and long-term aspects of the balance-of-payments problem. I think it is a very comprehensive and helpful statement.

In his message he notes the desirability of expanding agricultural exports. I would suggest, in this connection, that the administration and Congress give consideration to strengthening the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture, the function of which is to study means, and to take action to encourage agricultural exports. It has done exceedingly well in the last 8 years, when agricultural exports have risen to their highest level.

This action would be consistent with the President's recommendation to strengthen the commercial attachés of the Department of Commerce. I would also urge that the representatives of the State Department at the GATT negotiations examine closely the restrictive quotas and tariffs placed against the export of many U.S. agricultural commodities, and work for their reduction.

I point to a specific example. The common market countries of Europe have agreed to place heavy ad valorem duties on the import of some agricultural crops not produced in their countries. The common market countries are today the chief dollar markets for many agricultural commodities. If their restrictions go into effect, I believe we will see a great reduction in our dollar market for farm products.

I discussed this matter with Mr. Douglas Dillon, when he was Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. I did so at that time because it applied to tobacco in my own State. Tobacco has had a 30 percent ad valorem duty placed upon its importation. But it applies to other agricultural products as well. He knows the problem. Last year he directed our representatives at the GATT meetings in Geneva to seek a reduction of the heavy ad valorem duties that were to be imposed by the common market countries.

Some of these duties will become effective this year, and then will rise gradually over a period of years. This subject needs immediate attention and very

forceful representation at the GATT meetings on the part of the State Department.

Unless immediate attention is given to this problem by the State Department and strong representations are made at the GATT meetings, I believe we will see a loss in our greatest dollar market for farm products.

I bring up this question because the President has given great stress in his recommendation to an increase in the export of agricultural products.

I should like to make another comment on the President's message concerning the balance of payments problem. Many of his recommendations are designed to immediately curtail the flow of dollars overseas for services and for investment. This will reduce the balance of payments gap and deter the flight from the U.S. dollar.

However, in the long run, one basic requirement for a solid and lasting solution of the problem depends on the increase of our exports. If this is to occur, our products, as the President states, must be made more competitive in the world market.

Several methods are suggested in his message to make our products more competitive. Some of them would involve a long period of time. For example, proposal for tax reform, to encourage modern plants and tooling, for increased productivity and lower unit cost, could not quickly show results. This is true of some of the other recommendations that have been made and perhaps will be made. I am thinking of what will occur in the interim period, before these basic steps to make our products more competitive can become effective.

The President suggests in his message an answer that I think should be emphasized very strongly. It is that business and labor in this immediate period should exercise great restraint about price and wage policies. If there should be great advances in price at this time, or in wages without valid cause, exports will fall, and competitive imports increase. The emergency measure proposed might become ineffective.

The second important matter in connection with the balance of payments problems is simply one of confidence. If the American people have confidence in our economy, if they have confidence in the proper management of our fiscal and monetary affairs and our budget then the movement of dollars overseas for investment will be reduced. If other countries do not have confidence in the management of our governmental affairs, and our fiscal and monetary affairs, they will withdraw their investments and make their claims against our gold stocks.

This is nothing new. When I was in Europe after the election, I talked to people in several European countries. At the NATO Conference I talked with many representatives from those countries. In England I talked to members of the House of Commons. Many of them said, "Although any emergency action you take with regard to the balance of payment problem will be immediately adverse to us, yet we know that such action must be taken, because in the long run our economic and fiscal situation is related to the strength of the American economy and upon the proper management of its fiscal and monetary affairs."

I have read very carefully the recommendations made by the President concerning the economic problems of our country. I certainly find no objection to, and support his emergency recommendations, because the emergencies created by unemployment must be met as a human problem. We must also attempt to solve the long term problems of our country. However, we cannot escape the necessity of maintaining expenditures at a reasonable level as compared with revenues to prevent inflation and the lack of confidence caused by recurring deficits. If attention is not given to the problem, then people, here and abroad, will lose confidence in the ability of our country to manage its affairs. In that case, whatever short term measures are taken, I doubt if we could really solve the balance of payments problem.

The emergency problem of the unemployed must be faced, defense and long term needs commenced; but great restraint must still be exercised in the making of expenditures which are not essential and necessary to the emergency and basic needs of the Nation.

The President's message emphasizes the necessity of great sacrifices on the part of the American people. I concur in the necessity for sacrifice. However, his first message to Congress dealing with economic measures, particularly to meet emergency problems, does not, in my judgment, call for great sacrifices by the American people or Congress.

The sacrifices by the Congress and the people will be evidenced by the kind of expenditures which are made; whether they are essentially for emergency purposes; whether they are for defense and long-term needs and interests of the country; or whether we simply use the call for action as an excuse to add expenditures not related to basic needs—creating unnecessary deficits and inflation.

I say this approving very strongly of the necessity for emergency expenditures to solve the problem of unemployment. I say this supporting very strongly the need for meeting the issue of the long-term needs of the country in the field of education.

The sacrifice will be evidenced by the willingness of management and labor, faced with the problem of the balance of payments and an economic downturn, to restrain higher prices and wages unless based on valid reasons.

And if I may say so—because I think the administration has started well—the administration can give the leadership toward sacrifice, by resisting measures which do not deserve first priority, by building confidence in its fiscal, monetary, and budgetary policies as it moves toward its goals. For confidence in the leadership of the United States will be the greatest asset of our country.

OPPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA INTO THE UNITED NATIONS SHOULD BE CLEARLY STATED AND VIGOROUSLY PURSUED

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the proposed admission of Communist China into the United Nations is still a vital and crucial issue. So is the attitude and policy in this regard of our administration and of officials of our Government in high positions.

There was widespread and justified concern and distress at the expression of apparent futility in continued U.S. resistance to admission for the assigned reason that such resistance was foredoomed to failure.

An opinion too often heard expressed is that Communist China will soon have enough votes and that America had better prepare for that defeat.

Mr. President, the fact and the truth still remain that to admit Red China would be a monumental mistake. It would bring into virulent action a great many factors and troubles which would forebode serious setbacks and ills for the cause of the free world.

By way of brief reminder only, the admission of Red China into the United Nations would result in the following: First, admission to membership of a government which was imposed upon a country with the help of a foreign power; two, membership of a government which is against the principles of the United Nations; three, membership in the United Nations of a government which is at war with the United States, even though the present status of that war is one of a shaky armistice; and four, a country's United Nations membership which would weaken Japan enormously; impair and perhaps destroy the will of many small nations to resist attachment to the Communist world; and, of course, be a gross betrayal and impairment of our historic and treaty obligations to Taiwan.

It is not inevitable, Mr. President, that this happen if a forceful and vigorous position is taken on the issue. The admission of Communist China can be defeated in the United Nations Assembly if the proper presentation of the merits of America's position is made in good faith; and if there is a pledge that we will continue our opposition in the United Nations Security Council if necessary to carry the issue.

To do otherwise than to clearly state and vigorously prosecute this point of view would be to abandon moral force, which the United States has always understood to be the foundation and core of our participation in United Nations activity.

It would be wrong and harmful for Red China to be admitted to the United Nations. It is even greater error and more harmful to be defeatist about the issue and to meekly suggest submission to the bludgeoning efforts of Red China and her protagonists, for the assigned reasons that we are bowing to the inevitable.

It is not my intention at this time to go into the many and complex ramifications of this subject, Mr. President. This has been done before, on this floor, and much more competently than I could do.

The purpose of my remarks at this time is twofold: First, to restate and reaffirm the proposition and position previously taken by the Senate in declaring its sense to be against admission of Red China to the United Nations; and, second, to bring to the attention of this body and of those who follow its activities two very splendid statements on the subject at hand.

One is an editorial by David Lawrence published in the February 6, 1961, issue of the U.S. News & World Report. The editorial is entitled, "Defeatism?"

The other statement of position is part of the testimony given last week, before the Senate Internal Subcommittee, by Jay Lovestone, on the "Meaning of the New Communist Manifesto" of December 1960.

Mr. Lovestone is considered an outstanding authority on the history, objectives, and procedures of the Communist Party and of communism.

Some 40 years ago he was a member of the Communist Party, and, in fact, served—in the early 1920's, as I recall—as general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Before he was expelled from the party in 1929, he served as a member of the executive committee of the Communist International; and, as such, he participated in the formulation of documents similar to the manifesto of 1960, to which he addressed himself in the course of his testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member.

Since 1929, he has devoted his efforts and energies to constant and painstaking study, investigation, and analysis of Communist programs and actions. He has cooperated energetically, fully, and constructively in activities exposing, publicizing, and legislating against such programs and actions.

Although Mr. Lovestone is now consultant on international affairs for the AFL–CIO, his appearance before the Internal Security Subcommittee was not in that capacity, but, rather, was as an individual who was giving his opinions and evaluations based on his years of study and practical experience in the subject field.

His responses to questions about Red China's admission to the United Nations and the deplorably defeatist attitude of some of our Government's highly placed officials merit the careful attention of Members of this body, as well as of all others who are concerned with this most vital issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Lawrence's editorial to which I have referred, as well as selected excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Jay Lovestone.

There being no objection, the editorial and the excerpts from the testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 6, 1961]

DEFEATISM?

(By David Lawrence)

For several weeks now a spirit of defeatism has been permeating some of the comments on Far Eastern problems by prominent men in this country.

An opinion often heard expressed is that Red China will soon have enough votes in the United Nations to secure a seat on the Security Council and that America had better prepare for that defeat.

The new administration in Washington is, of course, being watched from abroad to see whether there is any sign of softening in our policy toward the Communists. Unfortunately, the viewpoint of the British and other governments which have recognized Red China is that the United States should change its position.

This would be a fatal error. It would mean trouble for everybody in the Far East. To bow to Red China would demoralize South Korea, the Philippines and the Chinese on Formosa. All together, these have a sizable military force which it would be senseless for us to weaken or discard. British sympathizers with Red China have never ventured to say whether England would supply the military forces that our side would lose if Red China is admitted to the Security Council of the U.N.

The real chance of a new war is in the Far East. America has kept the peace largely by a policy of firmness embodied in what is known as the Eisenhower resolution. It was passed by both Houses of Congress by an almost unanimous vote.

Red China knows we have drawn a line in the Far East. Will we defend it? Regrettably in the recent political campaign the question of urging the Nationalist Chinese to withdraw from Quemoy and Matsu was debated. It was a mistake ever to let this question come into the political forum.

President Kennedy, however, has shown no signs of weakening on the main issue, though his speeches did leave the impression that he wasn't certain about holding Quemoy and Matsu.

More disconcerting perhaps than any other factor in recent days has been the comments by some of Mr. Kennedy's principal advisers. They have been talking about the "inevitable" admission of Red China into the United Nations. One adviser—Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who has been appointed to the White House staff—even speaks of the admission of the Peiping regime to the U.N. as "a reasonable price to pay" in order to get Red China and the Soviet Union into "a system of reliable arms control."

Both Adlai Stevenson, who is now the American Ambassador to the United Nations, and Chester Bowles, the new Under Secretary of State, have expressed their views indicating a belief that Red China will eventually be admitted to the U.N. To predict it is a sign of weakness. Many people in the free world will come to regard such comments as part of a trend toward the abandonment of moral force.

It is not customary for an athletic team to go into a game announcing in advance that its defeat is inevitable. Where is our faith in the power of American idealism? Why do we concede we cannot win a debate in the U.N. on the merits of this question? Has Red China changed since the U.N. itself declared by formal resolution that the Peiping regime was the aggressor in Korea? Have we in America forgotten the 157,000 casualties we suffered there? Will the United Nations have any real influence in the world if it sacrifices its own self-respect and yields to the Communist bloc?

An American statesman once made this plea:

"Moral power can be a powerful force in the world. That is not a mere pious hope. It is the judgment of every realist throughout history. It was Napoleon who said that 'in war, moral considerations make up three-fourths of the game.' It was Admiral Mahan who said that physical force was useful only 'to give moral ideals time to take root.'

"The need is for more effective political use of moral power. The moral law, happily, is a universal law."

These words of the late John Foster Dulles, in a paper submitted to the Amsterdam assembly of the World Council of Churches in September 1948, are as valid today as when they were written.

Why should we retreat on the moral issue of Red China? Why can't we convince our allies that idealism wins far more battles than materialism?

President Kennedy at his first news conference said "there has been a rather belligerent attitude expressed toward us in recent days by the Chinese Communists."

Yet some of the advisers to the President and some of his principal supporters in the press still seem to favor appeasement of the Red Chinese.

This is not the road to peace but the road to war. Defeatism on our side causes the enemy to miscalculate—to assume we will not fight for our policies.

What is needed is not defeatism, but a counteroffensive in behalf of idealism—a strong manifestation of moral power. Otherwise, we will find the United Nations gradually stripped of the only force that can save mankind.

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY ON FEBRUARY 2, 1961, OF JAY LOVESTONE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

Senator JOHNSTON. So your position, then, is that we must hold onto Berlin and not weaken in the least, because if we do we are liable to lose all of Europe, isn't that true?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I will go further than that. If we weaken we are not liable to lose it, we are very likely to lose it.

Senator JOHNSTON. And we wouldn't be long about it?

Mr. LOVESTONE. No; it wouldn't be long, because it is like a snowball, it is like an avalanche, the people say, "You have got to be realists," and "realists" means you have got to yield to the other fellow, you have got to accept the other fellow's position when you want to avoid an issue. And that is what we have.

Senator HRUSKA. Don't we have a little bit of that in connection with the admission of Red China to the United Nations right here in this country? What are your views on the admission of Red China to the United Nations, Mr. Lovestone?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I think it would be a major disaster for our country if we were to admit Red China in the United Nations, if we were to allow it to be admitted—and I will tell you in a moment why. There is an Afro-Asian bloc there. That bloc doesn't have a very effective leadership. That bloc is divided. In that bloc there is an enormous amount of influence exercised by Tito, who, though he supports Moscow on every practical question, still is a sort of a warning to Nasser, "listen, be careful, you know you can do business with him but be a little careful."

If Communist China comes in, Communist China becomes the leader of the Afro-Asian bloc. And let me say to you, the first

country where we would be weakened enormously is Japan, which is still the most important country in the Far East from the standpoint of economic and potential military strength.

What would happen to the smaller countries, Burma, Nepal, Afghanistan, let alone countries like Malaya, Ceylon, or Indonesia? They will say, "If United States has thrown in the sponge, why should we stick around and get socked? There is no point in being hostile."

And there would be, not a breadline but a pushing line of everybody wanting to do business and submitting to Mao Tse-tung.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say we must not allow China in the United Nations. Do you mean we should not give up our opposition to it, or do you have in mind that there is some way in which we alone can literally stop it?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I will tell you what I wouldn't do. I wouldn't announce in advance that Communist China is sooner or later coming into the United Nations. I think that sort of talk is useless, even if that were the case. It would be useless.

Senator HRUSKA. Is it harmful?

Mr. LOVESTONE. It is harmful. You hurt your own case and cause, assuming that is our case and cause, that we are opposed. If we are not, I think we ought to say so openly. But the argument has been made that you cannot ignore the existence of a country with this population. And here I beg leave to read a page or so that I have on this question in my original report, because I think that covers it:

"Neither our country nor any other nation can ignore the existence of a country with the population, area, strategic importance, and Communist aims and activities of Mao Tse-tung China. Our national security demands that we do not ignore it, but be ever vigilant against its subversive efforts and ever stronger to meet its potential aggression. In this light, our Government has negotiated with Chinese Communist representatives in Korea, Poland, and Switzerland. But this has not required our Government to accord the Peiping regime diplomatic recognition. Even if Communist China were to become a signatory along with other powers, let us say to an international disarmament treaty, that would not require our Government granting Peiping diplomatic recognition. Lest we forget, years before our Government recognized the Soviet Union, we did not ignore it and signed jointly with it and others the Kellogg Pact on disarmament.

"It would be a catastrophe for our country—on the basis of such differences between Moscow and Peiping—to do anything which would, in effect, help reduce, let alone eliminate, the irritations or overcome the disputes between Moscow and Peiping. Recognizing Communist China, voting it into U.N. membership, or providing it with the technological and economic assistance which Moscow cannot provide, would strengthen Peiping and thus seriously weaken our country's international position and prestige. Such steps would only help remove the friction and jealousies between the two Communist giants and weld their ranks and strengthen their vast armies geared for further aggression."

And I maintain that it should be the policy of our Government not to eliminate, not to soften, not to do anything which would remove those contradictions and irritations, but rather pursue a course which would promote the contradictions in the enemy camp, just as they do against us.

Now, you will say to me, what do you say we must do at all costs?

I will tell you what I would do, positively. I would say to every ally, and I would say to every country in Europe, "We consider the admission of Communist China a blow to our most vital interests, and we insist, and we will take note of your conduct, that you vote against or do not vote for," and bring it down that way, instead of yielding to the pressure of some of our weaker allies and announcing in advance that we are going to admit them anyway, they are going to come in anyway sooner or later, I would stand firmly, and I would work for this position.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say that with the knowledge, of course, Mr. Lovestone, that this Government has taken the view that the admission of Red China is a matter of representation and, that it is a question of whose credentials are to be accepted, and this must be decided at the General Assembly and, by vote, isn't that correct?

Mr. LOVESTONE. That is a very interesting question you are raising. And it involves, I think, a need for a fundamental reexamination of some of the principles of diplomacy. It has been said that effective controls by the government of any country is the test for recognition, not the mere credentials, but effective control. Now, I maintain that that was all right in the days of Grotius, and that was all right even up to World War I. But something has happened in the world which invalidates that. And what is that? Today the test of effective control is no longer valid, because Communists in any country can get the assistance of a foreign government to establish a dictatorship and rule by terror, and that means effective control, and it no longer means representation but repression of the people.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Lovestone, I am sure I didn't get my point across. I believe you are talking about recognition in the sense that one nation recognizes another. I was referring to your statement that we should do this thing, I paraphrase you, to coerce our allies into voting against the admission of Red China in the United Nations.

Mr. LOVESTONE. I say convince them.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Now, you know that the United States has taken the position, has accepted the view that getting Red China into the United Nations is not a matter of admitting a new country to the United Nations, but is a matter of saying, Red China is truly China, China is in the United Nations, we will recognize the credentials of the Red Chinese, we will put Mao Tse-tung in, he is China, that is the present situation, is it not?

Mr. LOVESTONE. There is a division of opinion on that. I know what you say is true——

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, if it were not a matter of representation, of credentials to accept, if it were a matter of letting the new nation in, it would go before the Security Council, would it not, and we have a veto in Security Council, and if it were a matter of letting a new nation in, we could use that veto to keep Red China out without going through this rigmarole you were talking about of convincing others to get their votes, because if we lose—if they are two-thirds in favor of letting them in in the General Assembly then they are in.

Mr. LOVESTONE. It is a question of what you consider the problems to be, procedural or substantive. If they are substantive, we have the veto power. If they are procedural, we can get licked on a majority.

Mr. SOURWINE. Even though a number of years ago an American Secretary of State said this was a procedural problem, as you call it, is there any reason why this country couldn't reverse its stand, if it is a matter of national importance as you say it is, and declare that this is a matter of substance, and that it must be passed on by the Security Council?

Mr. LOVESTONE. I think this country not only can, but must take the position that this is the most substantive question that can face United Nations, and it should take the position that no government or no regime is eligible for membership in the United Nations which (a) was imposed upon a country with the help of a foreign power; and which (b) is against the principles of the United Nations; and (c) which is at war with the United Nations—which the Mao Tse-tung regime is today, there has never been an end to the war, there has been an armistice, a shaky one. And I think on those three grounds our Government should take the position that this is the most substantive matter that can confront us in the United Nations.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday, at noon, at which time the money resolutions will be taken up.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned to Thursday, February 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 6, 1961:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, O18722, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frank Hamilton Britton, O18703, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Thigpen Duncan, O18878, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, O18645, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Augur Hewitt, O18713, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ray Joseph Laux, O42102, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Curtis James Herrick, O18538, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Michael Illig, O20330, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, U.S. Army.

Col. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard William Doan, O20057, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Alan Beresford Todd, O42088, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Patrick Howard Devine, O31975, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Bradford Rosson, D23556, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Edward Peters, O31646, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386, U.S. Army.

Col. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Jarvis Tolson, 3d, O20826, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Henry Chiles, O20295, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, O20636, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Travis Tabor Brown, O19574, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Albert Symroski, O19753, U.S. Army.

Col. Milburn Neil Huston, O30612, U.S. Army.

Colonel Horace Greeley Davisson, O20650, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, O31799, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Martin Worthington, O19797, U.S. Army.

Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, Jr., O30409, U.S. Army.

Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, U.S. Army.

Col. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Charles Haneke, O20263, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

Abrams, Creighton W., Jr., O20296.
Adams, Donald L., O31339.
Adams, Duval S., O42997.
Albro, Robert D., O31360.
Arnold, Leslie A., O30815.
Arp, David H., O31445.
Ashenfelder, William F., O40008.
Atkins, Edwin L., O30809.
Austin, Edward L., O38805.
Bagley, Ray M., O42902.
Baker, Jack B., O30239.
Bankus, John T., O42799.
Barkin, Albert, O51809.
Barton, Douglas C., O38829.
Bealke, Jacob W., Jr., O31365.
Benson, Henry K., Jr., O20331.
Bess, Walter B., O20151.
Billingslea, Charles, O20367.
Bishop, Loren E., O40091.
Blair, Richard A., O42858.
Bodine, Donald R., O20238.
Boerner, Otto M., O30747.
Bower, Harvey, O19912.
Boyer, Oscar R., O19934.
Breaks, Robert W., O20273.
Bush, Robert B., O30692.
Butler, Bradford, Jr., O31425.
Cato, Raymond L., O20195.
Chaffin, Andrew D., O20153.
Chiles, John H., O20295.
Clapper, John, Jr., O42835.
Clifton, Chester V., Jr., O20246.
Cole, Glenn, O19917.
Cole, Roy W., Jr., O20277.
Collier, Clay O., O42928.
Conine, James C., O30203.
Connerat, William H., O30730.
Connor, William M., O20137.
Cooke, Thomas W., O20307.
Cordes, Clifford F., Jr., O20186.
Covington, Carroll M., O40083.
Crawford, Claude L., O20266.
Crownover, Robert L., O42968.
Cupello, Albert R., O38822.
Curtis, Donald McB., O38837.
Cuttino, Thomas E., O31397.
Daly, John H., O20284.
Davidson, Richard P., O42785.
Dawalt, Kenneth F., O20226.
DeMelker, Bert, O30679.
Devine, Patrick H., O31975.
Dews, Omer S., O40079.
Dickens, Randolph C., O20290.
Dilley, John H., O19861.
Donnell, Thomas W., O30663.
Doran, Roy E., O38892.
Douglass, George A., O30296.
Drain, Jesse C., Jr., O20318.
Duncan, William D., O31466.
Dunn, Edward C., O20245.
Durbin, William F., O51748.
Dyer, Kenneth R., O40065.
Eason, James F., O30435.
Edmunds, John D., O30323.
Edwards, David L., O20359.
Elliott, Ralph H., O30744.
Evans, Benjamin F., Jr., O20368.
Ferguson, Robert G., O20267.
Field, Raymond F., O42784.
Finley, George A., O20136.
Franks, Robert B., O40041.
Frazier, Leroy E., O30678.
Frederick, Horace B., O42891.
Funk, Myron A., O30798.
Furphy, Foster LeR., O20163.
Furrell, Alfred W., O42894.
Galanti, Philip J., O30684.
Ganns, Ralph R., O20184.
Gaston, Frederick H., Jr., O20276.
Gerard, Paul T., O30445.
Gillette, Shelby L., O30727.
Glover, Bob H., O30680.
Gooding, Clarence E., O20258.
Goodwin, James E., O20158.
Goshorn, John A., O31465.
Gramzow, John G., O30735.
Grondona, Richard J., O42439.
Grothaus, Donald G., O20221.
Gullion, Maurice B., O42826.
Hagerty, Harry E., O30685.
Hahney, Everett G., O20185.
Hall, Harry A., O51819.
Hall, Lewis A., O40089.
Hall, Sylvester A., O40057.
Haneke, William C., O20263.
Harrison, Joseph H., O31396.
Harvey, Raymond J., O20116.
Hauschultz, Earl H., O42789.
Hayes, Thomas J., 3d, O20134.
Hector, John R., O30717.
Heintges, John A., O20281.
Hemion, Roger H., O40075.
Heister, David W., O20191.
Hill, Richard F., O42973.
Hill, William W., Jr., O31348.
Hines, John D., O38900.
Hirshorn, B. J. Leon, O51762.
Hoffman, Paul O., O30517.
Holderness, Stephen W., O20157.
Holterman, Gordon H., O20135.
Hoskot, Nathaniel R., O31379.
Hughes, George E., O30733.
Illig, James M., O20330.
Isham, Carl T., O19856.
Jacoby, Arthur M., O20125.
Jeffrey, Jack C., O30763.
Jenkins, Charles A., O31369.
Johnson, Finis G., O40067.
Johnson, Lester B., O42963.
Jones, John P., Jr., O30807.
Jones, Thomas B., O42919.
Keist, Benjamin F., O38843.
Kelly, John E., O20156.
Kerkering, John H., O20120.
Kessler, Robert H., O20178.
Keyes, Richard W., O31467.
Kieffer, Pierre V., Jr., O20122.
Kinard, William H., Jr., O20180.
King, Laurence T., O30713.
Kuhn, William A., O31419.
Lampert, James B., O20147.
Landrum, James E., Jr., O20216.
Landry, Wilmer C., O20208.
Laughlin, George T., O30723.
Laurion, Lawrence E., O20150.
Layne, Clyde L., O20317.
Layton, Charles B., O30729.
Lee, Eugene M., O31474.
Lee, Frank E., O42775.
Leer, James B., O20370.
Leidenheimer, John L., O30795.
Lockhart, Eugene E., O20181.
Lutz, Robert R., O30767.
Lynch, John M., O20377.
Malevich, Steven, O30660.
Marden, Lyman P., Jr., O40086.
Markey, Lawrence B., O38826.
Marr, Lloyd M., O31420.
McCabe, Robert E., O20269.
McCarty, Roy D., O20119.
McCormac, Weston A., O30716.
McCormick, Harold D., O42765.
McElheny, John D., O20170.
McPhail, Thomas D., O30613.
Merriam, Wheeler G., O30759.
Michaelis, John H., O20328.
Middleton, Marter D., O51767.
Miller, Norbert C., O38905.
Milliken, Charles B., O20340.
Millson, Cyril A., O42922.
Mohlere, Edward D., O20286.
Montgomery, Waldo W., O42890.
Moore, John J., O31355.
Moore, Richard H., O30721.
Morris, Howard A., O20136.
Moynahan, James McC., O42848.
Muth, Edwin A., O30670.

Myers, George E., O51765.
Norris, Ned T., O20222.
Nowe, Charles F., O31460.
O'Donnell, Robert J., O51786.
O'Keefe, Keith T., O30669.
Orton, Eugene M., O51844.
Oswald, Paul F., O20160.
Otto, Thomas W., O30799.
Overby, Carl H., O30487.
Page, Gordon B., O40046.
Page, Reginald J. B., O20149.
Palmer, Bruce, Jr., O20117.
Partridge, Robert B., O20204.
Peck, Allen L., O20327.
Peeke, Charles M., O19810.
Pennington, James C., O42749.
Persons, Howard P., Jr., O20167.
Phelps, Preston V., O40026.
Philips, Burton K., O40048.
Pillivant, Ray A., O19761.
Porter, Roy V., O31328.
Powell, Beverly E., O20237.
Prall, Josef A., O51772.
Pratt, Ford E., O31433.
Prince, William R., O20219.
Quinn, James F., O31454.
Redfield, Robert S., O30704.
Reger, Hamilton, O30700.
Reichel, Michael J., O40087.
Reisner, Raymond W., O51656.
Ripple, Richard W., O20312.
Robb, John E., O42790.
Robinson, Leonard G., Jr., O31448.
Rochford, Allan B., O42876.
Ryder, William T., O20298.
Safford, Robert H., O20244.
Saholsky, Bolick A., O31331.
Salet, Eugene A., O30790.
Sampson, George P., O42926.
Satterwhite, Seymour B., O31431.
Schoenfeld, Walter E., O31342.
Seigler, Thomas J., Jr., O30789.
Shea, Leonard C., O20231.
Shell, Robert H., O31472.
Shuler, William R., O20118.
Shurm, Vernon A., O31436.
Sievers, William E., O20299.
Slayden, William M., 2d, O30754.
Slobe, Elmer L., O42867.
Smith, James P., O30772.
Smith, Selwyn D., Jr., O20194.
Smith, Stephen E., O20142.
Smith, Vernon M., O39993.
Smoak, John R., O31463.
Snyder, Howard M., Jr., O20213.
Springer, Robert R., O30624.
Stanwix-Hay, Allen T., O51759.
Stricklen, William A., Jr., O31473.
Summers, Robert R., O42841.
Sutherland, Edwin VanV., O20173.
Swain, Oren, O20176.
Thurston, Clair H., O31453.
Tibbs, Richard B., O30688.
Tiffany, Raymond H., O20348.
Tomlinson, Robert B., O31354.
Torrey, John D., Jr., O20217.
Townsend, Dured E., O31430.
Townsend, Horace E., O30578.
Turnage, Benjamin O., Jr., O20360.
Van Fleet, Raymond, O51801.
Vaughan, Curry N., O31407.
Von Kaenel, Howard E., O30527.
Walker, Fred L., Jr., O20293.
Walker, Robert T., O31368.
Waters, Charles H., O20114.
Watts, James K., O30752.
Wells, James F., O30654.
West, Bland, O31378.
Westmoreland, William C., O20223.
White, Emmett R., O31334.
Whitney, Carl L., O31435.
Wiechmann, Joseph H., O19874.
Williams, Edward W., O20205.
Williams, Jack L., O42800.
Williams, John M., O20319.
Withers, Edwin J., O42921.
Wyatt, William O., O40020.
Yarborough, William P., O20362.
Yatsewitch, Gratian M., O31442.
Yost, Joseph B., O20201.
Zeigler, Clyde C., O19720.

To be colonels, Chaplain

Gaskins, Steve P., Jr., O26392.
Hundley, Maury, Jr., O26424.
Murphy, Charles J., O30879.

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Anderson, Robert S., O22268.
Benenson, Abram S., O24295.
Bergman, Philip A., O22772.
Burry, William C., O23569.
Crane, Francis S., O39664.
Dickerson, Robert B., O40103.
Draper, Stuart L., O23599.
Eberhart, Claude M., O51967.
Eyerman, Melvin F., O21026.
Patton, Thomas E., Jr., O21674.
Shuey, Harold E., O23640.
Spann, Franklin L., O23641.
Sullivan, Benjamin H., Jr., O22770.
Wier, James A., O26416.

To be colonels, Dental Corps

Avary, Hugh D., O30838.
Brayshaw, Horace A., O29307.
Gray, Eugene W., Jr., O51183.
Gullickson, Herbert L., O21694.
Hagerman, Calvin G., O22252.
McConnell, Leon G., O21464.
McCracken, Gerald A., O21695.
Miller, Paul A., O30843.
Priebe, Winlaw A., O21465.
Radford, Lawrence C., O21462.

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Berry, Floyd L., O38866.
Bohn, Gordon A., O31075.
Carlquist, Philip R., O31011.
Clark, James F., O43161.
Guenther, Augustus J. D., O31067.
McMeen, Edwin D., O31109.
Murphy, George E., O31047.
Pappas, Allen, O31056.
Parker, R. L., O31057.
Read, Robert N., O38864.
Smith, Glenn K., O20563.
Webb, Joseph E., Jr., O29271.
Whitley, Fenner H., Jr., O31106.
Wingo, Ronald H., O31098.

To be colonel, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Robinson, Ruth A., J45.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Adkins, Donald V., O89857.
Alexander, Walter D., O85825.
Amazeen, Charles P., Jr., O89673.
Amlong, William E., O91738.
Arcari, Joseph J., O88557.
Ault, John W., Jr., O84941.
Barge, Walter S., O89697.
Barnebey, Hoyt W., O89698.
Bartlett, William G., Jr., O81775.
Baxter, Wayne H., O85868.
Benoit, Peter B., O89319.
Bingham, Ellis D., O89030.
Bloedorn, Garry W., O89737.
Borneman, Frederick H., O87478.
Bradley, John W., O87686.
Brantley, Danon L., O91167.
Brown, Oreal L., O89766.
Brugger, Karl A., O82311.
Brumbaugh, Larry W., O89187.
Carr, Glenn P., O82473.
Case, Ralph W., Jr., O91182.
Chapple, Gerald R., O89813.
Clarke, Robert L., O82493.
Cordonnier, David J., O81786.
Coseo, Gregory F., O89446.
Crowley, Bruce B., O85515.
Daniel, Joe H., O83886.
Daniel, William D., Jr., O88040.
Dardy, Leo J., O89873.
Davis, Hal W., O87723.
Deas, Carter L., O76064.
Distefano, Herbert C., Jr., O89896.
Dodson, Charles R., O83700.
Douglas, Henry A., O82548.
Evans, James A., O90637.
Field, Charles N., Jr., O89482.
Fitzwilliam, James C., O91823.
Fraunfelter, Edgar R., O89486.
Friedenwald, Robert L., O82587.
Gardella, John L., O89210.
Garoutte, Max W., O82596.
Gibson, Neil F., Jr., O82602.
Goetzke, George R., O91251.
Goodchild, Gerald B., O89215.
Green, Marvin R., Jr., O89335.
Gregory, David T., O81795.
Griffin, Clarence M., O82617.
Hamilton, William A., O88266.
Harman, Walter D., O82642.
Harris, Donald M., O89337.
Harris, William K., O83916.
Hart, James E., Jr., O88090.
Haynie, William S., O89339.
Henderson, James M., Jr., O83919.
Hill, Harvard H., Jr., O82659.
Hill, Robert P., O82660.
Hittner, Leon B., O88737.
Holland, Gerald R., O88741.
Hurelbrink, Gerald W., O89514.
Hurley, Paul C., O89515.
Hummel, Theodore W., O88749.
Iaconis, Emil P., O89225.
Ivers, Larry E., O88110.
Jackson, Norwood E., O82341.
Jameson, Gene L., O90119.
Jew, Soot M., O82686.
Johnson, David W., O82688.
Jones, John B., O82693.
Kaine, George R., O82697.
Kastenmayer, Walter W., Jr., O89521.
Kaufman, Patrick S., O82709.
Kosmowski, Jerome A., O81847.
Lane, George H., Jr., O89240.
Laubscher, Alan L., O82742.
Lauby, Robert F., O88781.
LeBourdais, Carl J., O88417.
Lindsey, Richard C., O82753.
Longabach, Gordon A., O82760.
Loughboro, John P., O83941.
Lowe, Larry E., O83942.
Lowrey, Austin, 3d, O83837.
Lowry, Louis L., O88800.
Maddox, Bobby J., O82767.
Mahalko, Gerald J., O90230.
Malloy, Shaun T., O91918.
Mann, Douglas J., O82772.
Martin, Willard L., O88812.
Massey, Lee T., O90243.
Matthews, John B., Jr., O82781.
McAllister, James H., O88144.
McDermott, Joseph B., O91455.
McKenzie, Peter P., O89106.
McMullan, Frank W., O89256.
Messick, Thomas R., O82804.
Miller, Charles E., O90302.
Miller, Richard H., O88293.
Morgan, Clarold F., O81851.
Muhlenfeld, William F., O85629.
Murphy, James D., O82831.
Myers, Charles M., O82834.
Neely, Cecil N., O89020.
Newbanks, Ronal R., O82844.
Oliva, Albert J., Jr., O90356.
Palumbo, Patrick J., O82862.
Parker, David M., O89272.
Patterson, James L., O89125.
Petesch, Gary L., O81821.
Posz, John R., Jr., O82882.
Puccinelli, Ronald S., O89372.
Rash, Stephen E., O82894.
Rehm, Walter E., O89374.
Rice, James W., Jr., O89375.
Richey, Charles G., O85367.
Riscassi, Robert W., O88189.
Rose, Rocco V., O89284.
Schafer, Floyd J., O89592.
Scher, Donald M., O89593.
Schultz, Norman O., O88920.
Segers, Joseph W., Jr., O84268.
Siegel, Eugene E., O88932.
Sivils, Doye O., O87617.
Skelly, James G., O90490.
Smith, Fletcher B., Jr., O91512.
Smith, Sam G., O89384.
Smith, Samuel J., O82980.

Spaulding, Richard A., O90509.
Statler, James B., O82995.
Stiner, Carl W., O84001.
Taylor, Alfred E., O89299.
Totin, John R., O88981.
Tyler, James R., O82372.
Walsh, Raymond M., O92036.
Walter, John L., O83050.
Warren, Peter J., O81835.
Weiffenbach, William L., Jr., O84019.
Widmer, Edwin R., O89009.
Wilkins, Jesse B., Jr., O99608.
Wilmot, Richard W., O90615.
Winzurk, William F., O89648.
Wise, Paul E., O89312.
Works, Richard E., O91431.
Wright, Gregory F., O85391.
Young, Wallace J., O87673.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bates, Robert A., O82412.
Bock, William, Jr., O85725.
Fountain, Donald B., O91233.
Piercy, John P., O91354.
Waller, Donald A., O88517.
Weaver, Joseph U., Jr., O87659.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Jones, Addie B. L., N2961.
Teele, Kathryn M., N2967.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be lieutenant colonel

Morrow, Frank W. (Medical Service Corps), O83545.

To be major

Myers, John W. (Medical Service Corps), O84824.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Kays, John M. (Chemical Corps), O88408.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be captains

Bachman, Clayton J., Jr., O4006652.
Boyd, David T., O4023722.
Brinkpeter, Paul F., O4003614.
Burton, Thomas M., O955634.
Deibel, Robert E., O4006422.
Dillon, Robert E., O2014732.
Eisenbraum, John M., O1882172.
Felch, James F., O1120707.
Galloway, William W., Jr., O1933654.
Ganevsky, Walter J., O2265400.
Gardiner, William P.
Lugenbeal, Leo H., O1931774.
Martz, Donald W., O1913401.
Massengale, Eugene W., O4005475.
Moore, Clay P., O4000295.
Murphy, John F., Jr., O2028432.
Pride, Daniel H., O1873931.
Rhotenberry, R. M., O2262331.
Roscher, William G., O1885892.
Simms, Carl H., O994890.
Skaggs, Ray F., O1341827.
Soldow, James J., O969789.
Stephens, Rome O., O1324797.
Stranathan, Joseph W., O2033735.
Street, Thomas J., O199152.
Valdez, Benjamin F., O4009118.
Warden, Donald W., O1877474
Watson, Shelley F., O4001291.

To be first lieutenants

Ament, Robert L., O4069722.
Appling, David A., O5000032.
Baker, Robert M., Sr., O5405002.
Bishop, Donald E., O4069633.
Campbell, George E., O4010835.
Culbreth, Edward C., O4044718.
Davies, Richard A., O4015807.
Dunham, Edward K., O5301680.
Goode, David E., O5700151.
Keys, Robert W., Jr., O4075419.
LaCombe, William F., O2268517.
Luther, William H., O4060720.
Norbo, Gary J., O4076332.
Norton, James A., O5500004.
Pace, Donald L., O4058244.
Smith, James A., O4056727.
Strzok, Peter P., O5505064.
Studebaker, Robert L., O4056505.
Tucker, Lee W., O4077207.
Wilkins, Aaron E., II, O4036312.
Williams, Jerry A., O2269087.
Wolfgang, Albert E., O4010331.
Womack, Kenneth S., O4045765.
Woods, Roger B., O4062477.
Young, David C., II, O2300405.

To be second lieutenants

Abreu, Ronald P., O5702925.
Appleton, Forrest W., O5401952.
Baucom, Donald C., O5304293.
Beaumont, Marion E., O5303404.
Benson, Robert J., O5006399.
Bohach, John L., Jr., O5704643.
Butts, William T., O5300391.
Cercy, James C., O5205431.
Crysel, James W., O5308419.
Doherty, William J., Jr., O5001498.
Elledge, Don T., US54226594.
Finnerty, Ronald E., O5507962.
Fowkes, Reginald B., O5208512.
Hancock, James B., O5305970.
Hardy, Teddy J., O5403634.
Hart, John B., O5411074.
Hartley, Bobby J., O5405435.
Hopper, Robert F., O5304342.
Jones, Charles C., O5401296.
Kane, John S., Jr., O5205036.
Karegeannes, Harry G., O5303718.
Keegan, Ambrose J., O5005437.
Krausse, Stanley D., O5403984.
Little, William E., Jr., O5405252.
Manely, James E., O5508888.
McConnell, Gerald B., O5400433.
McDonald, Warren J., O5300550.
McMahan, Emmet K., III, O5402869.
Mount, William J., O5502547.
Myers, Charles T., III, O5402342.
Nalaboff, Lloyd P., O5002731.
Piecuch, Joseph J., O5000436.
Richardson, Odie B., Jr., O5303620.
Schott, Joseph D., O5402478.
Secrest, Bobby P., O5402485.
Snell, Douglas H., O5304269.
Snowden, John R., O5502369.
Varnon, Jerry R., O5310700.
Vitale, Michael L., O5000625.
Wichert, Gilbert H., O5307162.
Williams, Stuart H., O5507564.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Arundel, Janice C., R2605.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Carr, Mary J., N762569.
Rivera, Jeanne E., N900041.

To be captain, Chaplain

Barry, Raymond E., O1942362.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Cavazos, Edmund, Jr., O5500323.
Ohlenbusch, Robert E., O1942331.
Strader, Robert J., Sr., O2265664.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Foster, Kendall W., Jr., O5003954.
Gillespie, Marion R., O1888649.
Knospe, William H., O4039718.
Michie, James L., O5703063.
Rugani, Peter R., O1885905.
Rusinko, Andrew, O2285390.
Ylitalo, Elmer W., O2297991.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Cardenas-Lartigue, Gilberto, O2263289.
Rada, Roy A., O1936156.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Stookey, James L., O1878619.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Ozburn, Mary S., M2289506.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Miller, Patricia M., N2295238.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Browne, John P., O5200646.
Nicholas, Talbot J., O2299814.
Renner, Robin L., O2299751.
Thornock, John R., O5700321.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Aguilo, Juan M., O4041787.
Cordes, Charles K., O4065929.
Duncan, Malcolm P., O2298305.
Goiser, John L., O2300462.
Gross, Joseph O., O2298138.
Holmes, Robert A., O4035918.
Levine, Seymour.
Linder, William R., O2300515.
McIntosh, Donald E., O2300524.
Parker, Jerry M., O2300493.
Powell, Kenneth A., O2300492.
Zalis, Edwin G., O2300644.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Brekhus, Dennis A., O5504048.
Crawford, John C., O4068892.
Hill, William D., O5504262.
Lamb, William O., O2292888.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Bucci, Thomas J., O2298053.
Pulliam, James D., O2296252.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Caldwell, Doris L., L2287358.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Brown, Donald W., O5311078.
Ives, Dan I., O5409859.
Stone, Leland M., O5402416.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Berlin, Theodore
Bevans, Nathan E.
Bowles, Robert L.
Brunsell, Rolland H.
Camp, Charles H.
Cantrell, James E.
Carter, Thomas N.
Draganosky, Eugene A.
Fulton, Robert C.
Garza, Daniel L.
Harbin, Robert L., Jr.
Harrison, James B., Jr.
Hauer, Richard W., Jr.
Hill, Thomas W.
Janke, Thomas A.
Jedlicka, Victor J.
Jenkins, David L.
Johnson, Reginald D. A.
Kuchta, Frank H.
Leahey, Raymond
Linehan, John C.
McGarry, Leo J.
Pease, Hugh R.
Perkins, Jacob H.
Quash, Joseph A.
Rozycki, Alan A.
Ryan, Lawrence J., Jr.
Salden, Dan R.
Sava, Richard
Schneider, Roy L.
Steen, Tyrone L.
Whitehurst, James T., III
Yost, Harold S.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adam, Andrew H.
Adamsky, Allan F.
Adler, Richard S.
Alessandri, Pietro U.
Alfaro, Daniel V.
Alpern, Stephen I.
Alix, Richard
Almes, Richard G.
Altorfer, William G.
Anderson, Charles E.
Anderson, Eugene L.
Anderson, Robert S.
Anderson, Steven B.
Andrew, Edward L.
Andrews, James B., II
Anjier, Louis J., Jr.
Anthony, Ronald T.
Appleby, Robert B.

Archambeau, Jason R.
Arnold, Billy R.
Arnold, John P.
Ashapa, Myron R.
Atherton, Frederick S., Jr.
Aucoin, James S.
Bailey, Gary L.
Bailey, James S., Jr.
Bains, William J.
Baker, Barrie M.
Baker, Junius O., Jr.
Baker, Tracy, II
Baker, William P., Jr.
Balda, Jerome F.
Bangasser, Fredric D. H.
Bankson, Peter R.
Barber, Major J.
Barnes, Bruce A.
Barnhart, William E.
Barrett, Thomas A.
Bartlett, Charles M.
Basta, James M.
Baxter, John W.
Beebe, Neil L.
Beem, Gladwin G.
Beers, Bradford B.
Belcher, Frederick D.
Berberich, Dennis E.
Bergen, John J.
Berkley, Clyde J.
Berman, Jay M.
Bernardi, Roger L.
Bertelsen, Geoffrey H.
Beyer, Lawrence M.
Bickford, James V., III
Biese, John J., Jr.
Billingsley, John D., Jr.
Binkewicz, Joseph B.
Bird, Jo W.
Bird, Samuel R.
Bitgood, John J.
Blackwell, Joseph W., Jr.
Bodziony, Ronald
Boehman, Richard J.
Boiardi, John J.
Bonville, George P.
Borowsky, Kurt T.
Bowe, Matthew A., Jr.
Bowles, Norborn S.
Bowling, Ernest R.
Bowman, Wade A.
Boyersmith, Joseph C.
Brabazon, John J.
Bradbury, Richard A.
Braddock, Robert C.
Brady, John H., Jr.
Brannon, John D.
Brauer, Paul F.
Breen, John F.
Breiten, John A.
Brennan, Lawrence
Brennan, Richard P.
Brodie, William C.
Brooks, Ronald E.
Brown, Gary A.
Brown, James P.
Brown, Kenneth J.
Brown, Ronald P.
Brown, Wade G.
Brown, Willard G., Jr.
Broyles, Robert F.
Bruno, Joseph D.
Buck, Robert F. X.
Buckley, Michael J.
Bulger, Donald H.
Burch, Edgar F., III
Burgess, Douglas R.
Burke, Charles P.
Burnside, William F.
Busby, John F.
Buttner, Peter
Byrnes, Thomas J.
Call, Duane T.
Cameron, James E.
Canellis, George W.
Carlin, Francis J., Jr.
Carter, Alfred H.
Casey, Francis B., Jr.
Celtruda, Joseph O.
Cephas, Leonard M.
Cerreta, Francesco M.
Champagne, Shelton J., Jr.
Chauvin, Charles E.
Chauvin, Charles F., Jr.
Childress, Robert L.
Chin, Richard C.
Chittick, James R.
Christophersen, Frederick N.
Cisneros, Marc A.
Clagett, Donald C.
Cleland, Robert J.
Cleveland, Donald L.
Clingan, Patrick A.
Clinton, Daniel R.
Cochran, Alexander S., Jr.
Coffey, Frederick
Colitti, Michael J.
Collins, Michael P.
Connal, Peter
Connor, John J., Jr.
Cooper, Victor D.
Copeland, William C., Jr.
Coston, Morris L.
Cowburn, Frederick C.
Cowling, Bobby W.
Creeden, Cornelius T.
Cronhimer, John F.
Cronin, John J.
Cronin, Michael J.
Crowder, George L.
Crumley, Dennis V.
Crumley, Michael H.
Crump, Harry F.
Culberson, Henry E.
Cummins, John B.
Cunningham, Wells E.
Daignault, David W.
Darby, Leonard M., III
Davidson, John P., Jr.
Davidson, Paul R.
Davis, Charles L.
Davis, Thomas J.
De Biasio, Robert L.
Delaney, Daniel V.
Delaney, John E.
De Martini, John D.
De Vito, Francis J.
Devlin, Owen F.
Dial, William K.
Diaz, James R.
Di Battista, Joseph
Di Caprio, Patrick R.
Diehl, John L.
Dill, Anthony A.
DiNapoli, John A.
DiSabito, David M.
Doak, Peter
Doleman, Edgar C., Jr.
Domingo, Anselmo R.
Donovan, John E.
Dow, Richard H.
Dow, William A.
Dranchak, Ronald J.
Durel, Francis M., II
Durell, William E., Jr.
Durham, Robert S.
Dzwonkiewicz, John, Jr.
Eaton, Hal S.
Eaton, Roberto C.
Eby, Clifford J.
Eckel, Robert R.
Eng, Ping
Etheredge, Thomas J., III
Evans, Floyd L.
Fairris, Marion T.
Faison, James C., Jr.
Faison, Robert H.
Fang, Donald R.
Farquaharson, Glen D.
Farr, John F., Jr.
Farrell, William G., Jr.
Featherston, Jimmy J.
Federoff, Oleg V.
Feisthamel, George W.
Ferguson, Paul S.
Fields, Dwight G.
Fitch, Kenneth L.
Fitzgerald, Robert C.
Fitzpatrick, Richard H., Jr.
Flanigan, Desmond W.
Fletcher, Tyrone P.
Floyd, Charles W.
Fonken, Stanley L.
Foster, Edward S., Jr.
Foster, Harry G., III
Foster, Stephen
Freeman, Reed H.
Frusciante, William J., Jr.
Fuqua, James R.
Gabarro, John J.
Gage, James R.
Gallagher, William J., Jr.
Gallucci, John V.
Gardner, William C.
Garland, Franklin P.
Garner, Joe A.
Gates, Daniel J.
Gentry, Denton E.
Ghiselin, Richard G.
Gibbon, Jerome L.
Ginsburg, Norman I.
Glabus, Edmund J.
Glenn, Richard T.
Godin, Roger A.
Goff, Gordon D.
Golvach, Duane J.
Goodwyn, Richard B.
Gordon, Robert A.
Gore, Perry L.
Gors, Kenwood J.
Goss, Joseph B., Jr.
Gough, Samuel N., Jr.
Graham, Barry F.
Gray, Peter A.
Graycar, Edward W.
Grazulis, Louis A.
Greenwood, Ronald L.
Gregory, Joel E.
Gunther, Donald J.
Helbleib, Duane W.
Hale, Robert J.
Halperin, S. Rafael
Hampton, Don H.
Hanner, Erik R.
Harman, Richard A.
Harmon, David, Jr.
Hatch, George S.
Hatch, Robert W.
Haugland, Harlan K.
Haulsee, Richard W.
Haveman, Kenneth J.
Hawkins, Karl D., Jr.
Hayes, Richard D.
Haynes, Frederick D.
Heaton, Charles E., Jr.
Hehir, John J., Jr.
Helton, Michael R.
Hemingway, Peter W.
Hemmer, Paul S.
Henk, Harold A.
Hern, Jay R.
Herndon, Doyle L.
Herts, Charles R.
Herzog, Lawrence A.
Hibbs, William N.
Hiller, Herbert L.
Himmelsbach, Robert B.
Hitzfelder, Jerome L.
Hobart, Charles W.
Hodge, James D.
Hodgson, George G.
Hoffman, Vernon C., Jr.
Hoffmann, Ludwig C., III
Holaday, Richard K.
Holter, John H.
Hoover, Roger K.
Horton, Charles R.
Horvath, John M.
Houillon, Robert H.
Householder, John M.
Howard, Ronald G.
Hudanich, Raymond F.
Hudson, Bruce A.
Huff, Daniel P.
Hughes, Billy M.
Hughes, William G.
Humbert, Wilson L.
Humphrey, David B.
Hutton, Stewart P.
Hyatt, Harold S.
Ingersoll, John T.
Iooss, Paul R.
Jackson, Michael G.
Jacobs, Terrance M.
Jarrell, Norman D.
Jeffers, Walter
Jennison, Kenneth R.
Jobe, Thomas R.
Johannesen, Nils P.
Johansson, Stephen E.
Johnson, Carl H., Jr.
Johnson, Ronald A.
Johnson, Theodore W.
Jolley, John R.
Jones, Malcolm W.
Jones, Richard C.
Jones, Thomas A.
Jones, Thomas C.
Jones, Thomas H.
Josephson, Robert G.
Jungmann, Monroe J.
Kawamoto, Dennis F.
Kawamura, Norman I.
Keech, William H.
Keegan, Mel G.
Kellim, Ronald R.
Kensler, Daniel L., Jr.
Kerscher, Thomas E.
King, Francis A.
King, Frederick L.
King, James R.
Kirwin, Patrick J.
Kish, Robert S.
Kluwe, George E., Jr.
Knipling, Edward B.
Knox, Dean W.
Koehler, Leo, Jr.
Koestner, John R.
Korhonen, John E.
Korn, Leonard E., Jr.
Kot, Mitchell R.
Kovacs, Jerome P.
Kraus, Robert H.
Kraus, Robert J.
Kroeger, Henry F., Jr.
Kroeger, Robert H., Jr.
Kuhlman, George W., Jr.
Kurstedt, Harold A., Jr.
Kuta, Raymond F.
LaBorde, John F., Jr.
Laffoon, Glenn A.
Lamando, Chester J., Jr.
Lampshire, Bradford G.
Landolfa, Anthony R.
Lane, John J.
Langhorne, Thomas O., Jr.
Langley, Jerry L.
Langway, Richard M.
Larkins, Aaron J.
LaSorsa, John M.
Lauritzen, John A.
Lawler, James O.
Leadbetter, Richard A.
Ledbetter, William N.
Leeds, John R.
LeFon, Charles A.
Leidenheimer, John L., Jr.
Lenfest, William F.
Leonard, James H.
Lezaj, Edwin G.
Lilienthal, Peter F., II
Limbach, Edward W.
Liming, Franklin G., Jr.
Lingo, Johnny P.
Lisko, Donald W.
Lockwood, Robert H., III
Loftus, Peter G.
Loiacono, Patsy J.
Longino, Lester R.
Loud, Brewster M.
Lovellette, Lindell J.
Lowdon, Graham N., Jr.
Loy, Brian A.
Lucheta, Roger A.
Luster, Stephen
Lutz, Donald A.
Lynn, Clyde D.
Mabius, Leonard J.
MacDowell, Carl M., Jr.
Mach, William C.
MacIntyre, John A., Jr.
Maggio, Stephan
Magnus, William L.
Mahecha, Edward H.
Maher, Patrick J.
Mahon, Thomas J.
Maksimowski, Richard J.
Manly, Charles L.
Mann, William R.
Mannion, Donald H.
Marr, Francis C.
Martin, William H.
McBride, Dennis P.
McCann, Richard W.
McCarden, Carl M. A.
McClure, Richard B.
McCormack, John C.
McCormick, Robert D.
McCown, Fred E.
McDannald, Eugene R., Jr.
McDaris, Lawrence F., Jr.
McDevitt, James J.
McDonald, Edward J., III
McDonald, James R.
McDuffy, Clifford
McGrath, Walter J.
McGuire, Arthur B., Jr.
McKee, Anthony J.
McKee, Arthur J.
McKee, Harris B.
McMahon, James J.
McMurray, Donald B.
McNiff, James J.
McNiff, John J.
McNulty, Stewart J.
McNutt, Joseph K.
McSherry, Leo J., Jr.
McWilliams, James L.
Mello, Charles W.
Meredith, Bruce A.
Mermelstein, Lee
Merritt, George K.
Merritt, William E., Jr.
Metscher, Theodore A.
Meyer, Edward C.
Meyer, Robert C.
Milhorn, Charles L.
Miller, Charles A.
Miller, John D.
Miller, Richard W.
Millott, James F.
Minshall, Charles W.
Mitchell, Dana W.
Mitchell, David G.
Mitchell, Robert C.
Mitchell, William R.
Mitchum, John A.
Moffett, Joseph U.
Moi, Arne N.
Molino, Michael A.
Momorella, Joseph J.
Monford, Ronald T.
Montano, Peter D.
Montefusco, John A.
Moore, Billy F.
Moore, Jack D.
Moore, Virgil C.
Moore, William E.
Moore, William G., Jr.
Morehead, William C.
Morrison, William H., III
Morse, Joseph G.
Moseman, James F., Jr.
Moss, Peter J.
Mowery, Robert W.
Mueller, Mark B.
Mueller, Roy M., Jr.
Mullally, John S.
Mullens, Frederick T.
Mulvey, Peter B.
Murphy, John M.
Myers, David P., Jr.
Nagle, Bruce D.
Nash, Norman W.
Naughton, Richard L.
Nelson, Anthony C.
Nelson, Raymond J.
Newsome, Joseph D.
Nicholas, Denis
Nickisch, Craig W.
Nieberding, Michael W.
Nolan, John A.
Norris, Thomas H.
North, John L.
Novak, Ladislav J.
Nowlin, John B.
Nunes, Gilbert S.
Nunziato, Carl A.
O'Brien, John E., Jr.
O'Brien, Richard T.
O'Connor, Paul M.
O'Dea, Lawrence P.
Offer, Robert D., Jr.
Ohmart, Robert D.
Okumoto, Stanley K.
Ollie, Louis W.
Olsen, John W.
Olson, David E.
Olson, Jerome A.
Olson, Robert R.
Opiteck, Robert J.
Orton, Robert D.
Overstreet, Joseph S.
Owen, Jerry D.
Owens, Ronald C.
Paben, Paul T.
Painting, Joseph P.
Palladino, George F.
Park, Richard P., Jr.
Parke, Robert F.
Parks, Edwards S., Jr.
Parsons, Wayland D.
Pascoe, Philip T.
Pasto, James F.
Patla, Norbert I.
Pendergast, Robert W.
Perriello, David G.
Perry, Marion G.
Perry, Wilson D.
Pesek, Thomas H.
Petersen, Elwin A.
Petry, David L.
Philippovic, Gordon
Phillips, James S
Phillips, John C.
Phipps, Oren P.
Pierce, Donald L.
Pierson, Prince E.
Pinson, Jon M.
Piotrowski, Karl P.
Pleasant, Arnold R.
Podmilsak, Ronald W.
Poirier, Robert D.
Pojmann, David M.
Polonko, Joseph J.
Pons, Donald G.
Poorbaugh, Donald J.
Pope, George D.

Postillion, John F.
Powell, William E.
Prentice, Leland E.
Purtill, Michael S.
Quandt, Donald L.
Racine, Armand E.
Raffani, Joseph
Ramirez, Archimedes
Raymond, Conley T.
Reagan, Wesley F.
Reicher, Neil
Rembert, Donald M.
Renfro, Ronnie J.
Reublin, Robert J.
Ribaudo, Charles A., Jr.
Rice, John T.
Richards, John F.
Richardson, James K., Jr.
Richfield, Robert F.
Rickman, Jack R.
Riddick, Larry G.
Ries, Norbert P.
Riley, James A.
Riley, John W., Jr.
Ringmacher, Nelson E., Jr.
Rives, Jack D.
Roberts, Kenneth J.
Robertson, William F.
Robinson, John D.
Rogers, Lee E.
Rollins, George N.
Romero, Robert, Jr.
Roney, James A.
Roof, William R.
Rosenberg, Louis T.
Rotrock, Glen K.
Rowe, Robb W.
Rudnick, James J.
Runkles, Charles E.
Runnion, Lawrence G.
Russell, Melvin W.
Russell, William E.
Saarel, Douglas A.
Sackowitz, Russell M.
Sadusky, John J.
Salierno, Joseph T.
Salmon, Joseph F.
Samojlowicz, Adrian A.
Sande, Ralph C.
Sarff, Thomas E.
Satterfield, Hammond H.
Schlam, Elliott
Schmidbauer, James P.
Scott, Howard H.
Seddon, Alfred E.
Semelka, Frederick, Jr.
Semester, James S.
Senft, Michael C.
Serafini, Terry A.
Seto, Stanford P., Jr.
Sgouros, Pantelis
Shanower, Frank D.
Shappee, Robert D.
Shea, Robert E., Jr.
Sheehan, John A.
Shell, John C., II
Shepard, William S.
Sherman, John R.
Shiner, Clyde R., Jr.
Shoemaker, George G.
Shoffner, Wilson A.
Shuba, Louis J.
Shultz, Robert E.
Sica, Robert A.
Silva, Joseph L.
Simmons, Herbert S.
Sims, Larry P.
Skane, Martin B.
Skjervheim, LeGrant B.
Skrzyniarz, Robert J.
Slack, Duane A.
Sliney, William E., Jr.
Small, Michael C.
Smethurst, Robert G.
Smith, Charles D.
Smith, Clay R., Jr.
Smith, Courtland L.
Smith, Donald J.
Smith, Douglas W.
Smith, Robert A.
Smith, Robert H.
Smith, Thomas A.
Smith, Timothy E.
Smith, Virgil R.
Smith, William R., Jr.
Snodgress, Wilder M.
Snyder, Charles R.
Snyder, John F.
Spataro, William J.
Speed, Thomas C.
Spencer, Roger W.
Spisak, John J.
Sponski, John J.
Spreha, Henry A., Jr.
Spurgeon, Thomas E.
Stanley, Richard P.
Stanton, James W.
Stawiany, William B., Jr.
Steele, Harry W.
Steele, Rowland G.
Stephens, James T.
Sterneckert, Richard W.
Stevens, Thomas G.
Stewart, Michael M.
Stombres, Richard A.
Stone, Donald C.
Stonehocker, Herbert F., Jr.
Strack, John R.
Strand, Ronald R.
Stringas, Thomas
Stuerman, Duane H.
Stuhlmuller, Kimball R.
Sturm, William F.
Sullivan, Donald B.
Summers, James B.
Surro, Robert A.
Sutton, John M., Jr.
Swango, Robert W.
Sykes, Henry A.
Sykes, Worthy F.
Szeman, Edward R.
Tacelosky, Robert J.
Taggart, Carl D.
Tarrall, Mahone T., III
Tastad, Joel M.
Tate, George W.
Tate, Van B.
Taylor, Glenn A., Jr.
Taylor, John B., Jr.
Teliska, John J.
Theologos, John J.
Thompson, Claude S., Jr.
Tigue, John J., Jr.
Timmermeyer, Richard P.
Tomarchio, Anthony J.
Tompras, Nicholas C.
Toomepuu, Tonu
Towler, John C.
Truxillo, Edmond J.
Trzos, Frederick
Turberg, Joseph R., Jr.
Twiss, Dennis C.
Tykal, Robert W.
Udick, Ralph A.
Underwood, Harry W.
Valieant, John H.
Venberg, Walter W.
Ventantonio, James B.
Viccione, Daniel M.
Vreeland, Richard W.
Wacker, Stuart A.
Wadeson, Otto T. P.
Wagner, Clifford C., Jr.
Wagner, David W.
Wallace, William F., III
Walter, Stephen
Ward, Albert N., III
Ward, Peter H.
Warren, Henry E., III
Waterston, Robert J., III
Webb, James R.
Webb, Richard G.
Weld, Seth L., III
Wells, Joe K., Jr.
Welsh, Fred M.
Westmoreland, James A.
Wheeler, Eugene C.
White, Charles H., Jr.
White, Dewey E.
White, Gerrit A.
White, James W.
White, Robert A.
Whitley, Lee R.
Whitlock, Charles L.
Wilcock, Walter D.
Wilkie, Robert L.
Wilkinson, Gordon R.
Willard, Myron J.
Williams, Frank L., Jr.
Williams, John F.
Williams, Stanton
Williams, Timothy P.
Williamson, Donald A.
Wills, Alton G.
Wilson, David C.
Wilson, Robert B.
Witten, John D.
Wolf, Gerald S.
Wood, Eldridge D., Jr.
Wood, James B.
Yager, Lawrence W.
Yamachika, Roy T.
Yorio, Ralph J.
York, Val D.
Young, Glen C.
Young, Robert B.
Yurasits, Robert F.
Zaruba, Robert M.
Zeh, Dale W.
Zerries, Alfred W.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 6, 1961:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

John Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of General Services.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, to Ecuador. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

W. Wendell Blancke, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Congo, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad, the Central African Republic, and the Gabon Republic. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Joseph Palmer 2d, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Nigeria. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

R. Borden Reams, of Nevada, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Dahomey, and the Republic of Niger. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Francis H. Russell, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Henry S. Villard, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Mauritania. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

Thomas K. Wright, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Abram Chayes, of Massachusetts, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Frank M. Coffin, of Maine, to be Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund.

UNITED NATIONS

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois, to be a representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Ivan A. Nestingen, of Wisconsin, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Alanson W. Willcox, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Mortimer M. Caplin, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William H. Orrick, Jr., of California, to be Assistant Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Kenneth E. BeLieu, of Oregon, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

IN THE U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell, O16684, U.S. Army.

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3307, 3442, and 3447:

Brig. Gen. Charles Lowman Decker, O18549, U.S. Army, to be the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Hall McCaw, O38722, U.S. Army, to be Assistant Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Tom Victor Stayton, O18417, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Mervyn MacKay Magee, O18478, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, U.S. Army.

Col. John Graham Zierdt, O20623, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, U.S. Army.

Col. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 3284 and 3307:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Thomas James Hartford, O18330, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Juan Cesar Cordero, O222751, Army National Guard of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Russell Boyt, O266555, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Anthony Long, O274572, Army National Guard of the United States.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a).

To be major generals

Col. Paul Milton Booth, O327750, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Arthur Young Lloyd, O253763, Army National Guard of the United States.

The nominations beginning Alvie O. Ashley to be first lieutenant, and ending Jimmy Wayne Woliver to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on January 17, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

1 Chronicles 16: 31: *Let men say among the nations, the Lord reigneth.*

O Thou who hast laid upon our President, our Speaker, and the Congress Thy hand of high commission, may they be true to the stewardship of responsibility and opportunity which has been entrusted to them.

In these perilous times may they have a clear vision of the vast domain of Thy divine sovereignty and of that eternal kingdom of righteousness and peace whose sun never sets.

Hear us in our prayer of intercession as we bring to Thy listening ear and understanding heart our care and concern for Thy needy children who are standing with their backs against the wall in a desperate struggle, almost overwhelmed with despair.

Grant that our Nation, which Thou hast blessed so abundantly, may be delivered from self-complacency and self-interest and may our hearts expand with sympathy and our hands extend in helpfulness to all the poor and distressed members of the human family.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 2, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

U.S. DELEGATION OF MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, he did, on Thursday, February 2, 1961, appoint as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guadalajara, Mexico, from February 6 to February 12, 1961, the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. SAUND, California, chairman; Mr. RUTHERFORD, Texas; Mr. MONTOYA, New Mexico; Mr. NIX, Pennsylvania; Mr. McDOWELL, Delaware; Mr. INOUYE, Hawaii; Mr. NORBLAD, Oregon; Mr. SPRINGER, Illinois; Mr. BROYHILL, Virginia; Mr. DERWINSKI, Illinois; Mr. NELSEN, Minnesota.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER TO THE UNITED STATES FROM PUERTO RICO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 146) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 146

Resolved, That Antonio Fernós-Isern, the Resident Commissioner to the United States from Puerto Rico, be, and he is hereby, elected an additional member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Armed Services, and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 147) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 147

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley (chairman), North Carolina; W. R. Poage, Texas; George Grant, Alabama; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Clark W. Thompson, Texas; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Harlan Hagen, California; Lester R. Johnson, Wisconsin; Ross Bass, Tennessee; W. Pat Jennings, Virginia; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida; Merwin Coad, Iowa; J. Floyd Breeding, Kansas; Frank A. Stubblefield, Kentucky; Harold B. McSween, Louisiana; Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii; Ralph R. Harding, Idaho.

Committee on Appropriations: John M. Slack, Jr., West Virginia.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; Clyde Doyle, California; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; Richard E. Lankford, Maryland; George Huddleston, Jr., Alabama; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; A. Paul Kitchin, North Carolina; Daniel B. Brewster, Maryland; Frank Kowalski, Connecticut; Samuel S. Stratton, New York; Jeffery Cohelan, California; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; Otis G. Pike, New York.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence (chairman), Kentucky; Wright Patman, Texas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Abraham J. Multer, New York; Hugh J. Addonizio, New Jersey; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Martha W. Griffiths, Michigan; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; Charles A. Vanik, Ohio; J. T. Rutherford, Texas; William S. Moorhead, Pennsylvania; Clem Miller, California; Jacob H. Gilbert, New York; Edward R. Finnegan, Illinois; Robert G. Stephens, Jr., Georgia; Fernand J. St. Germain, Rhode Island.

Committee on District of Columbia: John L. McMillan (chairman), South Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; James C. Davis, Georgia; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; William L. Dawson, Illinois; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Abraham J. Multer, New York; John Dowdy, Texas; J. Carlton Loser, Tennessee; George Huddleston, Jr., Alabama; Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina; Frank W. Burke, Kentucky; Jeffery Cohelan, California; Fernand J. St. Germain, Rhode Island.

Committee on Education and Labor: Adam C. Powell (chairman), New York; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Phil M. Landrum, Georgia; Edith Green, Oregon; James Roosevelt, California; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Elmer J. Holland, Pennsylvania; John H. Dent, Pennsylvania; Roman C. Pucinski, Illinois; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; John Brademas, Indiana; Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut; James G. O'Hara, Michigan; Ralph J. Scott, North Carolina; Neal Smith, Iowa; Charles S. Joelson, New Jersey.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Thomas E. Morgan (chairman), Pennsylvania; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Omar Burleson, Texas; Edna F. Kelly, New York; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Alabama; J. L. Pilcher, Georgia; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Dante B. Fascell, Florida; Leonard Farbstein, New York; D. S. (Judge) Saund, California; Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Michigan; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Delaware; William T. Murphy, Illinois; Cornelius E. Gallagher, New Jersey; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; Thomas F. Johnson, Maryland; John S. Monagan, Connecticut.

Committee on Government Operations: William L. Dawson (chairman), Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Jack Brooks, Texas; L. H. Fountain, North Carolina; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; John E. Moss, California; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas; Dante B. Fas-

cell, Florida; Martha W. Griffiths, Michigan; Henry S. Reuss, Wisconsin; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia; Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan, Pennsylvania; John S. Monagan, Connecticut; Neal Smith, Iowa.

Committee on House Administration: Omar Burleson (chairman), Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Lesinski, Michigan; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Edith Green, Oregon; Robert A. Everett, Tennessee; John J. McFall, California; Robert N. Giaimo, Connecticut; Hugh L. Carey, New York.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Wayne N. Aspinall (chairman), Colorado; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; Walter Rogers, Texas; Gracie Pfost, Idaho; James A. Haley, Florida; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; J. T. Rutherford, Texas; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; D. S. (Judge) Saund, California; Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico; Ralph J. Rivers, Alaska; Roy A. Taylor, North Carolina; David S. King, Utah; Harold T. Johnson, California; Julia Butler Hansen, Washington; Arnold Olsen, Montana; Hugh L. Carey, New York; Richard H. Ichord, Missouri.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Oren Harris (chairman), Arkansas; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Kenneth A. Roberts, Alabama; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Walter Rogers, Texas; Samuel N. Friedel, Maryland; John J. Flynt, Jr., Georgia; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania; John Jarman, Oklahoma; Leo W. O'Brien, New York; John E. Moss, California; John D. Dingell, Michigan; Joe M. Kilgore, Texas; Paul G. Rogers, Florida; Robert W. Hemphill, South Carolina; Dan Rostenkowski, Illinois; James C. Healey, New York.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler (chairman), New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank Chelf, Kentucky; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; E. L. Forrester, Georgia; Byron G. Rogers, Colorado; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Jack Brooks, Texas; William M. Tuck, Virginia; Robert T. Ashmore, South Carolina; John Dowdy, Texas; Lester Holtzman, New York; Basil L. Whitener, North Carolina; Roland V. Libonati, Illinois; J. Carlton Loser, Tennessee; Herman Toll, Pennsylvania; Robert W. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Herbert C. Bonner (chairman), North Carolina; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan, Missouri; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; Herbert Zelenko, New York; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Thomas L. Ashley, Ohio; John D. Dingell, Michigan; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Torbert H. Macdonald, Massachusetts; Alton Lennon, North Carolina; Victor L. Anfuso, New York; Thomas N. Downing, Virginia; Bob Casey, Texas; Thomas F. Johnson, Maryland; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Charles A. Vanik, Ohio.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray (chairman), Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; James C. Davis, Georgia; John Lesinski, Michigan; Kathryn E. (Mrs. William T.) Granahan, Pennsylvania; Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; Dale Alford, Arkansas; David N. Henderson, North Carolina; Arnold Olsen, Montana; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York; Richard H. Ichord, Missouri; M. Blaine Peterson, Utah.

Committee on Public Works: Charles A. Buckley (chairman), New York; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Robert E. Jones, Alabama; Frank E. Smith, Mississippi; John C. Kluczynski, Illinois; T. A. Thompson, Louisiana; Iris Faircloth Blitch, Georgia; Jim Wright, Texas; W. R. Hull, Jr., Missouri; Kenneth J. Gray, Illinois; Frank M. Clark, Pennsylvania; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; John J. McFall, California; Gracie Pfost, Idaho; John Young, Texas; Frank W. Burke, Kentucky; Harold T. Johnson, California; Robert E. Cook, Ohio.

Committee on Rules: Carl Elliott, Alabama; B. F. Sisk, California.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Overton Brooks (chairman), Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Victor L. Anfuso, New York; Joseph E. Karth, Minnesota; Ken Hechler, West Virginia; Emilio Q. Daddario, Connecticut; Walter H. Moeller, Ohio; David S. King, Utah; Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico; Bob Casey, Texas; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; John W. Davis, Georgia; William Fitts Ryan, New York; James C. Corman, California.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Francis E. Walter (chairman), Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; Clyde Doyle, California; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; William M. Tuck, Virginia.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Olin E. Teague (chairman), Texas; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; James A. Haley, Florida; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Robert A. Everett, Tennessee; Thaddeus J. Dulski, New York; Wm. J. Randall, Missouri; Roland V. Libonati, Illinois; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Delaware; Julia Butler Hansen, Washington; G. Elliott Hagan, Georgia; Horace R. Kornegay, North Carolina; Joseph P. Addabbo, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—GOLD OUTFLOW—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 84)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The gold outflow of the past 3 years has dramatically focused world attention on a fundamental change that has been occurring in the economic position of the United States. Our balance of payments—the accounting which shows the result of all of our trade and financial relations with the outside world—has become one of the key factors in our national economic life. Mainly because that balance of payments has been in deficit we have lost gold.

This loss of gold is naturally important to us, but it also concerns the whole free world. For we are the principal banker of the free world and any potential weakness in our dollar spells trouble, not only for us but also for our friends and allies who rely on the dollar to finance a substantial portion of their trade. We must therefore manage our balance of payments in accordance with our responsibilities. This means that the United States must in the decades ahead, much more than at any time in the past, take its balance of payments into account when formulating its economic policies and conducting its economic affairs.

Economic progress at home is still the first requirement for economic strength abroad. Accordingly, the first requirement for restoring balance in our international payments is to take all possible steps to insure the effective performance of our own economic system—to improve our technology, lower our production and marketing costs, and devise new and superior products, under conditions of price stability. The real wealth of a nation resides in its farms and factories and the people who man them. A dynamic economy producing goods competitively priced in world markets will maintain the strength of the dollar.

Thanks to our international reserves we have time, if we use it wisely, in which to strengthen our domestic economy and make it fully competitive with that of other nations. Our situation is one that justifies concern but not panic or alarm.

In my message on February 2, I dealt with the measures for reviving our domestic economy. The steps I now propose will strengthen our dollar position and insure that our gold reserves are employed effectively to facilitate the commerce of the free nations and to protect the stability of their currencies. Because these steps supplement the policies for strengthening our domestic economy, and because we can take them calmly and deliberately, they are not for that reason any less important or less urgent. Those that are within the present authority of the Executive will be the subject of vigorous action. Where action by the Congress is required I urge early consideration and approval.

For the past decade our international transactions have resulted in a deficit—payments that were in excess of receipts—in every year except that of the Suez crisis, 1957. The surplus of our exports over our imports, while substantial, has not been large enough to cover our expenditures for U.S. military establishments abroad, for capital invested abroad by private American businesses and for Government economic assistance and loan programs. All of these outlays are essential. Our military establishments in foreign countries protect the national security. Private investment promotes world economic growth and trade and, through the return of profits to our country, will strengthen our balance of payments in future years. Our economic assistance programs, much the smallest of these three items in its effect on payments balance, is vital in the continuing struggle against tyranny and oppression, and the poverty on which they feed.

Over the period 1951 to 1957 the deficit in our balance of payments averaged about $1 billion annually. These did not result in a net outflow of gold from the United States; foreign monetary authorities, banks, and private individuals held these earnings as dollars or claims on dollars. Thus our gold reserves were $22.8 billion at the end of 1950 and $22.9 billion at the end of 1957. But during

these years the dollar holdings by foreign countries increased from $8.4 billion at the end of 1950 to almost $15 billion at the end of 1957.

These earlier deficits in our balance of payments were, in fact, favorable in their world effect. They helped to restore foreign monetary systems by enabling foreign countries to earn the dollars which they needed to rebuild their international reserves. They made it possible for the industrialized countries of Western Europe to restore the convertibility of their currencies, thus freeing world trade and payments from exchange control. This was of benefit to the export trade of the United States. However, this growth in foreign dollar holdings placed upon the United States a special responsibility—that of maintaining the dollar as the principal reserve currency of the free world. This required that the dollar be considered by many countries to be as good as gold. It is our responsibility to sustain this confidence.

In 1958 and 1959 the deficit in our balance of payments sharply increased—to $3.5 billion in 1958 and to $3.8 billion in 1959. This came about mainly because of lagging exports and rising imports. There was no significant increase in our outlays for military expenditures, private investment, or Government economic assistance. However in these years, unlike the period 1951–57, the deficit resulted in large transfers of gold to foreign accounts as well as a further increase in foreign dollar holdings. For the 2 years together, 1958 and 1959, gold transfers to foreign accounts were $3 billion while foreign dollar holdings by foreign countries increased by another $4.3 billion. These gold transfers did not make the underlying balance of payments fundamentally worse. They did reflect a decision by foreigners to take more of their earnings in gold and to hold less in dollars.

Last year, 1960, the surplus of our exports of goods and services over our imports increased from $2.2 billion in 1959 to $5.8 billion. This was caused, principally, by an increase—amounting to more than $3 billion—in our exports. This once more reduced what may be called our basic deficit—it was only about $1.5 billion for the year. However, during 1960 there was a large movement abroad of short-term capital. Favorable interest rates abroad, a high rate of growth and good investment prospects in Europe, and some speculative fears concerning the future value of the dollar all played a part. It is estimated that this outward flow of short-term funds was between $2 and $2.5 billion, and this was the crucial factor in raising the overall deficit to $3.8 billion. Of this, $1.7 billion were transferred in the form of gold and $2.1 billion took the form of increased foreign dollar holdings.

An outward movement of short-term funds such as that which occurred in 1960 should not be considered a part of the basic deficit. Such movements are quickly reversible in response to changes in interest rates and other business factors here and abroad. Moreover, insofar as short-term funds transferred to foreign financial centers consist of U.S. owned capital, they create U.S. claims against the recipient country. In the new era of convertible currencies upon which we have entered, we may expect that short-term money will continue to flow back and forth. I have requested the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to work for still closer cooperation between the monetary and financial authorities of the industrialized free nations with a view toward avoiding excessive short-term money flows which could be upsetting to the orderly development of international trade and payments.

In sum our basic deficit of $1.5 billion is of manageable proportions. And it is this basic deficit which affects the real strength of our currency. But the time has come to end this deficit. It must be ended by responsible, determined, and constructive measures.

There are other factors which lend basic support to our monetary and financial position. Our gold reserve now stands at $17.5 billion. This is more than 1½ times foreign official dollar holdings and more than 90 percent of all foreign dollar holdings. It is some two-fifths of the gold stock of the entire free world.

Of this $17.5 billion, gold reserves not committed against either currency or deposits account for nearly $6 billion. The remaining $11.5 billion are held under existing regulations as a reserve against Federal Reserve currency and deposits. But these, too, can be freed to sustain the value of the dollar; and I have pledged that the full strength of our total gold stocks and other international reserves stands behind the value of the dollar for use if needed.

In addition, the United States has a quota in the International Monetary Fund of $4.1 billion. This can be drawn upon if necessary and our access to the Fund's resources must be regarded as part of our international reserves.

Finally beyond its liquid international reserves, the Government and citizens of the United States hold large assets abroad. Western European countries whose currencies are now strong owe us long-term governmental debts of $2.9 billion. Our private short-term assets abroad now are estimated at $4½ billion. Our long-term private investments in foreign countries—including both plants owned directly by American companies and securities of foreign business and governments owned by Americans—total over $44 billion, exceeding foreign investments in the U.S. economy by some $28 billion. In any reckoning of international assets and liabilities, the United States has a strong solvent position.

In short, powerful resources stand behind the dollar. Our gold and monetary reserves are large; so are the physical and monetary assets we hold throughout the world. And, in the years ahead, if the program I previously outlined is pursued, the dollar will have the added strength of the reviving power of the American economy itself.

Certain firm conclusions follow:

1. The U.S. official dollar price of gold can and will be maintained at $35 an ounce. Exchange controls over trade and investment will not be invoked. Our national security and economic assistance programs will be carried forward. Those who fear weakness in the dollar will find their fears unfounded. Those who hope for speculative reasons for an increase in the price of gold will find their hopes in vain.

2. We must now gain control of our balance-of-payments position so that we can achieve overall equilibrium in our international payments. This means that any sustained future outflow of dollars into the monetary reserves of other countries should come about only as the result of considered judgments as to the appropriate needs for dollar reserves.

3. In seeking overall equilibrium we must place maximum emphasis on expanding our exports. Our costs and prices must therefore be kept low; and the Government must play a more vigorous part in helping to enlarge foreign markets for American goods and services.

4. A return to protectionism is not a solution. Such a course would provoke retaliation; and the balance of trade, which is now substantially in our favor, could be turned against us with disastrous effects to the dollar.

5. The flow of resources from the industrialized countries to the developing countries must be increased. In all that we do to strengthen our balance of payments, we must be especially mindful that the less developed countries remain in a weak financial position. Help from the industrialized countries is more important than ever; we cannot strengthen our balance of payments at the expense of the developing countries without incurring even greater dangers to our national security.

6. The United States must take the lead in harmonizing the financial and economic policies for growth and stability of those industrialized nations of the world whose economic behavior significantly influences the course of the world economy and the trend of international payments.

To carry forward these policies I propose a program for action, which may be divided into two parts. The first part describes those measures which will improve domestic monetary arrangements and strengthen international cooperation in economic and monetary policy. These measures will help us better to meet short-term demands on reserves such as those of recent years. The measures in the second group are designed to correct the persisting basic deficit in our balance of payments.

I. MEASURES TO EASE THE SHORT-TERM DEMAND PROBLEM

1. MEASURES TO IMPROVE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY INSTITUTIONS

Increasing international monetary reserves will be required to support the ever-growing volume of trade, services, and capital movements among the countries of the free world. Until now the free nations have relied upon increased gold production and continued growth in holdings of dollars and pounds sterling. In the future, it may not always be desirable or appropriate to rely entirely on these sources. We must now, in cooperation with other lending countries, begin to consider ways in which international monetary institutions—espe-

cially the International Monetary Fund—can be strengthened and more effectively utilized, both in furnishing needed increases in reserves, and in providing the flexibility required to support a healthy and growing world economy. I am therefore directing that studies to this end be initiated promptly by the Secretary of the Treasury.

2. USE OF U.S. DRAWING RIGHTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The United States has never made use of its drawing rights under the International Monetary Fund to meet deficits in its balance of payments. If and when appropriate, these rights should and will be exercised within the framework of Fund policies. The United States will also support continued efforts in the Fund to facilitate drawings by other members in the currencies of industrialized countries whose payments positions are in surplus and whose reserves are large. This will help to reduce the burden now borne by the dollar.

3. SPECIAL INTEREST RATES FOR DOLLAR HOLDINGS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND MONETARY AUTHORITIES

(a) The Federal Reserve Act should now be amended to permit the Federal Reserve System to establish separate maxima for rates of interest paid by member banks on time and savings deposits held in this country by foreign governments or monetary authorities (sec. 19, par. 14). This authority when exercised, would enable American banks to make a maximum competitive effort to attract and hold dollar balances which might otherwise be converted into gold. At the same time domestic rates, when desirable for reasons of domestic policy, could be held at a lower level. I will shortly send to the Congress a draft of the needed legislation.

(b) I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to use, whenever it appears desirable, the authority already extended to him by the Second Liberty Bond Act to issue securities, at special rates of interest, for subscription and holding exclusively by foreign governments or monetary authorities. The exercise of this authority could provide an additional inducement to hold foreign official balances in dollars.

(c) As a final means of holding or attracting foreign dollars, the Congress should enact a measure designed to unify the tax treatment accorded the earning assets of foreign central banks. At present, income derived by foreign central banks of issue from bankers acceptances and bank deposits is exempt from tax under section 861 of the code. Income from U.S. Government securities, however, is taxable to foreign central banks in the absence of applicable tax treaty provisions or a special ruling exempting a particular bank from taxation under particular circumstances. Suggested legislation will shortly be forthcoming.

4. PROHIBITION OF HOLDING OF GOLD ABROAD BY AMERICANS

The recent Executive order forbidding the holding of gold abroad by Americans will be maintained. It was fully justified on grounds of equity. It will also help to prevent speculation in the gold market. I am directing the Secretary of the Treasury to keep me advised on steps being taken for effective enforcement. I place everyone on notice that those few American citizens who are tempted to speculate against the dollar will not profit in this manner.

II. MEASURES TO CORRECT THE BASIC PAYMENTS DEFICIT AND ACHIEVE LONGER TERM EQUILIBRIUM

1. ACTION BY THE SENATE TO APPROVE THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

I earnestly request early action by the Senate approving U.S. membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The OECD, in which the industrialized countries of Western Europe, the United States and Canada will be joined, is of vital importance for assisting, on a cooperative basis, the developing countries of the free world. It will also provide a solid framework within which we can carry out intensive and frequent international consultations on the financial and monetary policies which must be pursued in order to achieve and maintain better balance in the international payments position.

2. EXPORT PROMOTION

The Department of Commerce will provide energetic leadership to American industry in a drive to develop export markets. Firms and industries will be encouraged to step up their efforts to develop exports and given every assistance in doing so. As American industry comes to realize the vital role of export earnings for our foreign policy, I have little doubt of its response.

We will promptly increase our commercial representatives and facilities abroad. This is a joint program of the Departments of Commerce and State which must proceed with drive and conviction in order to produce effective results. The budget which has already gone to Congress requests $1,250,000 for the State Department to add 41 Foreign Service commercial attachés overseas, together with 48 experienced foreign nationals and supporting American staff.

The new budget requests will also allow an increase in oversea commercial facilities. The Commerce Department is doubling its trade mission program from 11 to 18 per year and will provide more useful information to our oversea posts. I am ordering rapid completion of our two new foreign trade centers at London and Bangkok and have requested the departments to explore whether three more could be added next year in Africa, Latin America, and Europe.

3. COST AND PRICE STABILIZATION

Our export promotion efforts, no matter how well devised or energetically pursued, will not be effective unless American goods are competitively priced. Our domestic policies—of government, of business and of labor—must be directed to maintaining competitive costs, improving productivity and stabilizing or where possible lowering prices. Measures to achieve these ends which are important for the domestic economy are even more vital for our international competitive position. I have already stated my intention of creating an Advisory Committee on Labor and Management Policy to encourage productivity gains, advance automation and encourage sound wage policies and price stability.

4. EXPORT GUARANTEES AND FINANCING

Our Export-Import Bank must play an increasingly important role in our export promotion efforts. Last year the Export-Import Bank announced a widening of the facilities which it offers for extending credit to American exporters. Despite the improvements made, these facilities are not yet adequate, nor are they comparable to those offered by foreign countries, especially those offered to small and medium-sized exporting concerns and those offered for the financing of consumer goods. I am directing the president of the Export-Import Bank, by April 1, to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Treasury, as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, a new program under the Export-Import Bank to place our exporters on a basis of full equality with their competitors in other countries. Also, I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to initiate and submit by the same date a study of methods through which private financial institutions can participate more broadly in providing export credit facilities.

5. FOREIGN TRAVEL TO THE UNITED STATES

Foreign travel to the United States constitutes a large potential market hitherto virtually untapped. American travelers annually spend some $2 billion in foreign countries. Foreign travelers only spend about $1 billion in this country. Economic conditions in many foreign countries have improved to the point where a strong travel promotion effort by this country can be expected to yield significant results. The Department of Commerce, in cooperation with the Departments of State and Treasury, will announce shortly a major new program to encourage foreign travel in the United States along the lines envisaged in S. 3102, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON at the last session of the Congress. This program will include the establishment of travel offices abroad; new advertising campaigns; action to simplify our visa and entry procedures for temporary visitors; and efforts to relax foreign restrictions on travel to the United States. The program will be energetically administered in the Department of Commerce. I am asking the Secretary of Commerce to report in full on plans and prospects by April 1.

6. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Our agricultural industry, which is of unparalleled efficiency, must make its full contribution to our payments balance. I am directing the Secretary of Agriculture to report on all feasible and internationally desirable means of expanding our exports of farm products, and to emphasize the need for great expansion as a primary objective of our new farm programs.

7. POLICY ON ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Our foreign economic assistance programs are now being administered in such a way as to place primary emphasis on the procurement of American goods.

This assistance, accompanied as it is by the export of American products, does not therefore have a significantly adverse effect on our balance of payments. (Not more than 20 percent of the funds expended for economic grants, development loan assistance, technical assistance, and contributions to international organizations, which amounted to $2.6 billion in 1960, is today available for expenditures outside the United States, and we intend to keep an even closer review of these items.) These restrictions will be maintained until reasonable overall equilibrium has been achieved. Then the United States will discuss with other capital-exporting countries the desirability of instituting common policies for worldwide procurement in the administration of economic development or assistance programs.

8. TARIFFS, RESTRICTIONS AND DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST AMERICAN EXPORTS

Quota discriminations against American exports have largely disappeared with the return of currency convertibility. We will press for prompt removal of the few restrictions that still exist, as well as for the maximum liberalization of remaining nondiscriminatory quotas in other industrialized countries, which apply mainly to agricultural exports. In the tariff negotiations now going forward under GATT we shall seek the fullest possible measure of tariff reduction by foreign countries to the benefit of our exports.

9. PROMOTION OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

We shall press those Western European countries with strong reserve positions to eliminate the restrictions they still maintain limiting the opportunities for their citizens to invest in the United States and other foreign countries. Also, we are initiating, through the Department of Commerce, a new program to bring investment opportunities in the United States to the attention of foreign investors in the industrialized countries.

10. ABUSE OF "TAX HAVENS." TAXATION OF AMERICAN INVESTMENT ABROAD

I shall recommend that the Congress enact legislation to prevent the abuse of foreign "tax havens" by American capital abroad as a means of tax avoidance. In addition, I have asked the Secretary of the Treasury to report by April 1 on whether present tax laws may be stimulating in undue amounts the flow of American capital to the industrial countries abroad through special preferential treatment, and to report further on what remedial action may be required. But we shall not penalize legitimate private investment abroad, which will strengthen our trade and currency in future years.

11. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE CONTRIBUTION TO THE LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES AND THE COMMON DEFENSE

It is indispensable that the industrialized countries of the free world join in undertaking systematic budgetary contributions for economic assistance to the less-developed countries and the common defense. These contributions should be fully commensurate with their economic and financial positions. Some countries are fulfilling this responsibility; it is a matter of disappointment that others have not yet undertaken to do so. Such actions are important in the short run to achieve a better balance in international trade and payments. Even more important, they are essential to the continuing and effective discharge of our common responsibilities for free world security, economic growth and stability.

12. REDUCTION OF CUSTOMS EXEMPTION FOR RETURNING AMERICAN TRAVELERS

After World War II, as part of our efforts to relieve the dollar shortage which then plagued the world, Congress provided for two additional increases of $300 and $100 in the duty-free allowance for returning travelers, for a total of $500. The primary purpose for this change having vanished, I am recommending legislation to withdraw this stimulus to American spending abroad and return to the historic basic duty-free allowance of $100.

13. CENTRALIZED REVIEW OF DOLLAR OUTLAY

Through the Bureau of the Budget, it has long been our sound financial practice to centralize the review of total spending of the departments and agencies of the Government of the United States, including their spending abroad. Under present circumstances, foreign outlays must be examined in a new perspective. Accordingly, I am instructing the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, to develop special procedures for analyzing that part of the requests of departments and agencies for spending authority which will involve oversea outlays to insure that our budgetary decisions will be taken with full understanding of their projected impact on the country's balance of payments.

14. U.S. MILITARY EXPENDITURES ABROAD

National security expenditures abroad constitute one of the largest items in the outflow of dollars, amounting to about $3 billion a year. We must maintain a fully effective military force wherever necessary and for as long as needed. While it is clear that we must exercise maximum prudence in our dollar outlays abroad, it has become clear that the present limitation on dependents was not the best way to accomplish this savings, and that this limitation was seriously hurting morale and recruitment in the Armed Forces. At the same time, the Secretary of Defense has informed me that equivalent dollar savings could be made through other measures, including limitations on expenditures abroad by military personnel for tourism and the purchase of durable consumer goods. Accordingly, I have directed him to rescind the limitation on dependents and instead to put these measures into effect immediately.

I have also asked him to review the possibilities for savings in the logistic support of our forces, including the combined use of facilities with our allies. We shall also, where appropriate, urge the purchase of the newer weapons and weapons systems by those of our allies who are financially capable of doing so. We shall continue the policy inaugurated last November of emphasizing U.S. procurement for our military forces abroad wherever practicable, even though some increased budgetary cost may be incurred. Since foreign procurement of this nature has amounted to almost $1 billion a year, significant savings in dollar outflow can be expected—and I am asking the Secretary of Defense to report on these and the other savings by no later than April 1, to see if further steps are needed then.

CONCLUSION

These measures, combined with increasing confidence in the dollar abroad and steady economic growth at home, can cure the basic long-term deficit in our balance of payments and check the outflow of gold. They symbolize a new dimension of this Nation's foreign and domestic economic policies—a new area of difficult problems—but they are problems which can be met by forceful and timely legislative and executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1961.*

PROPOSAL ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND AID-TO-DEPENDENT-CHILDREN PROGRAM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an explanation of H.R. 3864 and H.R. 3865.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am setting forth below for the information of the Members some details as to items covered in the press release which was issued on February 3, announcing that the Committee on Ways and Means, beginning on February 15, 1961, will hold hearings on the proposals of the administration to provide a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, H.R. 3864, and to extend the Federal-State aid to dependent children program to include unemployed parents, H.R. 3865.

The explanations of the two bills follow:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF H.R. 3864 TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A TEMPORARY PROGRAM OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION TO INCREASE THE WAGES SUBJECT TO THE FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

This bill would provide a prompt, though temporary, extension of unemployment compensation for workers who have exhausted their rights to regular unemployment compensation and are still unemployed. Prompt action is essential. In January, 5.4 million workers were without jobs. About 3.4 million were receiving unemployment compensation, and a half million who had already drawn all the compensation to which they were entitled were still unemployed. It is estimated that under this bill about 3 million workers could receive temporary extended unemployment compensation totaling about $950 million.

Unemployment compensation payments provide workers with necessary purchasing power. The aggregate effect of unemployment compensation payments on consumer expenditures is great. For January, compen-

sation payments are estimated to have been $430 million. When compensation is exhausted, this purchasing power ceases. This represents a serious hardship for the individual, and when the number of exhaustions is high, the cumulative effect depresses the overall economy.

Unemployment, particularly recession unemployment, is a national problem. The Employment Act of 1946 makes the Federal Government responsible for maintaining the Nation's economic well-being particularly with respect to maximizing employment. Given this responsibility, the Federal Government cannot ignore the need for taking action to meet the problem of mass unemployment arising from a national recession, the costs and effects of which clearly reach across State lines.

This bill would provide temporary extended unemployment compensation to individuals who exhausted regular unemployment compensation after October 31, 1960 (or such later date as the State may select), and before April 1, 1962. Workers who had established their entitlement before April 1, 1962, could draw the extended compensation for weeks of unemployment after such April 1, but in no event would such compensation be payable for any week of unemployment beginning after June 30, 1962.

The amount of temporary extended unemployment compensation payable under the bill would equal 50 percent of a worker's regular unemployment compensation, up to a combined total (Federal and State) for any individual of 39 weeks for total unemployment. In order to avoid treating inequitably States which have already extended duration beyond 26 weeks for at least some workers, the Federal Government will reimburse such States for unemployment compensation paid to a worker, in excess of 26 times his weekly benefit amount, still subject, however, to the overall maximum of 39 times his weekly benefit amount. This reimbursement would apply both to regular State duration in excess of 26 weeks and to extended State unemployment compensation paid only in times of high unemployment.

Temporary additional unemployment compensation would be paid only in States which choose to enter into agreements with the Secretary of Labor under which they would act as agents for the Federal Government.

The temporary program proposed would be financed out of the proceeds of an increase in the taxable wage base for the Federal unemployment tax. The program is a Federal program born of the Federal interest in the effects of unemployment. It is suitable, therefore, that the cost of financing this program be spread among employers in all the States. States which usually bear a disproportionate share of recession unemployment would not have to bear the total financial burden of the temporary extension of unemployment compensation. The proposed financing would serve, with more equitable effects among States, to pool the risk and costs of recessionary unemployment, which is more a national than a State problem.

There are other advantages to financing the program in the manner proposed by the bill. Such a federally financed program can be put into operation in all States much more quickly than one financed out of State funds. It would be possible under this bill to start paying temporary additional compensation for weeks of unemployment beginning 15 days after enactment of the program. Only 17 States paid their workers extended unemployment compensation under the 1958 program. In some of these States, legislative action was needed and would be needed now were a similar program to be enacted. Moreover, financing extended duration should not increase the interstate competitive tax burden on employers in States with heavy unemployment. The unequal burden may tend to discourage the vitally needed expansion of industry in those States which need it most.

The bill would amend the definition of wages in section 3306(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Under the amendment the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax would be $4,800 a year instead of $3,000. Although moneys from the general funds of the Treasury will be made available for the immediate financing of the temporary extended unemployment compensation program, such moneys will be returned to the general funds out of the proceeds of the increased Federal revenues that will result from the increased taxable wage base proposed.

If the increase in the taxable wage base is made effective for the calendar year of 1962 and thereafter, it will result in additional revenues through fiscal year 1966 of about $695 million, an average of something less than $175 million a year. This, combined with additional revenues resulting from the recent increase in the Federal unemployment tax by 0.1 percent beginning with respect to taxable year 1961, will make it possible to pay for the temporary extension of unemployment compensation proposed by this bill by June 30, 1966, and at the same time to pay for the administrative costs of the entire employment security program, and build up a substantial balance in the Federal unemployment account for advances under title XII to States in financial difficulty.

The increase in the taxable wage base is a desirable improvement, apart from its role in financing these temporary benefits. It is the best way to increase the revenue under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. The increased revenue would build the Federal unemployment account and the employment security administration account to their specified levels faster than under the present law, thereby saving interest on advances from the revolving account to the administration account.

An increase in the wage base is long overdue. When the $3,000 base was established in 1939, it covered 97 percent of payrolls taxed under the unemployment insurance program; today it covers only about 60 percent of payrolls. The taxable wage base under the OASDI program has been increased several times in recognition of increases in wages, and now stands at $4,800, the base proposed for the Federal unemployment tax.

An increase in the wage base will also assist those States that are hard pressed for revenue. Continued use of the $3,000 wage base has contributed to a steady decline in State reserve funds because contributions on this limited base do not increase in proportion to increasing benefit liabilities of the program.

States are hesitant to increase their taxable wage base without similar action being taken in all other States for fear of being placed at a competitive interstate disadvantage. Those States that do not need increased revenue to finance an adequate unemployment compensation program can adjust their tax rates downward under their experience rating systems. A tax base more representative of wages will permit experience rating schedules with more spread in employer rates and thus better indication of variations in employer experience.

Proposed Changes in Aid to Children To Include Unemployed Parents, H.R. 3865

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

It is proposed to broaden the coverage of title IV of the Social Security Act, under which grants are made to States for aid to dependent children, so as to provide assistance with Federal help to children who are in need because of the unemployment of a parent. This proposal would:

(a) Enable the States to include in their Federal-State aid to dependent children program not only the children deprived of care and support because of death, continued absence, or incapacity of a parent, but also the families where a parent is unemployed.

(b) Provide that States desiring to extend their Federal-State aid to dependent children program to the families of the unemployed be required to enter into cooperative arrangements with the State employment service to assure maximum utilization of that service in returning the unemployed parent to work. These arrangements would include provision for appropriate registration with the public employment service.

(c) State the intent of Congress that the additional funds made available be used for assistance to needy unemployed families who are either ineligible for assistance or who receive inadequate amounts of assistance and that the additional Federal funds are not intended to replace State and local funds now aiding needy persons.

(d) Become effective as of April 1, 1961, and would expire June 30, 1962.

(e) Temporarily increase the limitations on Federal funds which may be paid to Puerto Rico for public assistance.

REASONS FOR PROPOSAL

(a) Federal grants to States under present law provide assistance only to the needy aged, blind, and disabled, and to dependent children who are deprived of parental support or care solely because of the death, continued absence, or the physical or mental incapacity of a parent. Where a family is in need because the father is unemployed, the family cannot receive assistance under the federally aided program of aid to dependent children.

(b) Assistance to other needy persons, such as the unemployed, must come from State and local funds without Federal sharing in the cost of such assistance.

(c) States make varying provisions for needy persons not included under the four federally aided categories, and in many States assistance is not available to persons in need because of unemployment or is inadequate because State and local funds are limited.

(d) The proposed change in the Federal law to include children of unemployed parents would enable the States to provide assistance with Federal help to families in need because of a parent's unemployment.

(e) The provision for the establishment of cooperative arrangements with the public employment service will further the objective of helping these needy families to again become self-supporting.

(f) This measure will help meet the needs of a substantial number of unemployed families, including those not covered by the unemployment compensation program and those who have exhausted their benefits under that program.

(g) Without an increase in the existing limitation on public assistance funds, Puerto Rico would not receive additional Federal funds.

PROGRAM DATA FOR AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Current data:	
Number of families receiving assistance, November 1960	795,012
Number of children receiving assistance, November 1960	2,341,615
Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1960	$665,700,000
Increases under proposal to aid unemployed (assuming passage by Apr. 1, 1961, and participation by all States):	
Average monthly number of families—more than	250,000
Average monthly number of children—more than	750,000
Increase in Federal funds for the 15 months period Apr. 1, 1961 through June 30, 1962	$305,000,000

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 6, 1961

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the immediate program and what he might tell us, those of us particularly on my side of the aisle who are wanting to get away some time this week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know of no further program this week, except possibly some committee resolutions like today. Of course, there will be some messages from the President. There will be one tomorrow I expect on minimum wage legislation and there is one I think expected on Thursday on social security, as I am reminded by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the Speaker, and myself, had a brief conference last week in connection with the matter of Lincoln Day speeches. We have agreed that when the House adjourns next Thursday it will adjourn to meet on the following Monday; and when it meets on the following Monday we will adjourn until the following Wednesday. In other words, I may say to my Republican friends that they could start now. I know of no one who is going to raise the point of no quorum; I hope not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his consideration. He has extended to us his usual fine courtesy.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tomorrow to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 75 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies with respect to the following matters within the jurisdiction of the committee:

(1) the administration, management, and operations of the Post Office Department and the postal field service;

(2) the mailability of articles and printed matter generally, including, among other things, the mailing of obscene matter and the mailing of unsolicited articles and matter with requests for payment or contributions;

(3) the application, operation, and effect of the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the management of civilian personnel of the Federal Government, including matters relating to (A) compensation, (B) position classification, (C) examination, (D) appointment, (E) assignment of positions excepted from the competitive service to schedules A, B, and C under rule VI of the Civil Service Rules, (F) allocation of positions to, and distribution of positions in, grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, (G) actions taken pursuant to section 505(1) of such Act, as amended by Public Law 85-462, (H) promotions, (I) reduction in force, and (J) separation from the service by action other than reduction in force;

(4) the desirability and effect of contracts, agreements, or arrangements for the performance, by and through sources outside the Federal Government, of personal, administrative, and management services;

(5) the effect of the contracting practices of the Federal Government on the availability and utilization of personnel qualified for the performance of essential functions of the Federal Government;

(6) the organization, management, and operations of the United States Civil Service Commission, including the delegation of authority to the department and agency Boards of Civil Service Examiners and the audit and control thereof;

(7) operations under the Classification Act of 1949 and other laws relating to the compensation of civilian officers and employees of the Government;

(8) actions taken and directives issued as a result of the investigations and studies, conducted by the committee under authority of H. Res. 32, Eighty-third Congress, H. Res. 304, Eighty-fourth Congress, and H. Res. 139, Eighty-fifth Congress, with respect to the utilization and dual supervision of civilian employees in or under the Department of Defense;

(9) dual supervision of civilian employees, creation of civilian positions, number of civilian positions, and other matters relating to conservation of manpower, in such departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government as the chairman of the committee may designate;

(10) (A) the organization, management, and operations of the Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce and (B) Government statistical and related activities other than those of the Bureau of Census;

(11) insurance plans and programs of the Government for Government employees and related matters; and

(12) the operation and effect of training programs under the Government Employees Training Act. *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself now such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the few resolutions that are brought in at the beginning of every session giving to the standing committees and certain select committees the jurisdiction to issue subpenas and require the production of papers. It is necessary in connection with the investigations which the standing committees are required to make.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the minority approves this resolution. I have no requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 23 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the continental United States and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, as well as roads and highways.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States and Canada, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the continental United States and Canada, except that two subcommittees thereof, not exceeding six members and not exceeding two staff members each, as authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, are hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places without the United States, in connection with highway conferences.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a similar resolution, applying to the Committee on Public Works. I might add, as I did not with reference to the last resolution, that all of these resolutions which I am presenting now and which will be presented in the future unless otherwise noted are identical with the resolution applying to the particular

committee involved as obtained in the 86th Congress, and giving such resolutions the same authority as they have heretofore had.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this resolution on the minority side and, therefore, on behalf of the minority approve the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE—PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 46) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1961, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of fifteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of the potentialities thereof; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and (4) to study and investigate problems of small business enterprises generally, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided,* That the committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

SEC. 3. The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 5. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], a member of the committee.

JOHN E. HORNE, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the Senate's confirmation of John E. Horne, former administrative assistant to Senator Sparkman, as the new Administrator of the Small Business Administration—an agency which can, under proper direction and an understanding of the intent of Congress in creating SBA, be of vast aid to the national economy.

Mr. Horne's appointment seems an excellent one.

I make particular reference to the Small Business Administration because I have had contact with the agency several times since the Congress created it in 1953. For the most part, my experiences with SBA have been unsatisfactory. I found what appeared to be a startling disinterest, even a lack of understanding of the agency's purposes and possibilities on the part of the Administrators and some of their top deputies and assistants. This ineptitude and inefficiency has extended to many of SBA's regional offices over the country.

It is customary for these top Washington jobs to be filled by political appointees under what is known as a schedule C classification. I have no objection to that system; in fact, I think it is reasonable and desirable for the administration in control to be allowed a choice of men for key positions who are in tune with the objectives of their political party and of their President. However, these appointees to major policymaking offices should be qualified for and interested in the work they are to undertake. President Kennedy has been selecting such men.

Until this appointment of Mr. Horne, it seems evident that SBA has not been under the direction of men who really had an interest in or an understanding of the agency. Records of the three men who have been Administrators of SBA since 1953 will bear out that statement.

INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. Speaker, I supported legislation creating the Small Business Administration, just as I voted in 1958 to make the agency permanent and to enlarge its functions and authority by creation of an additional branch—the Small Business Investment Division, now known as the SBIC.

The Investment Act was championed by my esteemed Texas colleague [Mr. PATMAN], who has long been active and a leader in the House Small Business Committee. When the SBA investment division was set up, it was hailed as an ideal means of channeling vast amounts of private capital into small business enterprises everywhere. Wendell Barnes, then Administrator at SBA and, incidentally, a man who had no small business background prior to his appointment, predicted there soon would be many hundreds, or thousands, of small business investment companies licensed by SBA all over the land.

KILL SBA DEPARTMENT BY APPOINTMENT

The record shows that, after 2 years, there are only about 180 of these investment companies. The whole project is flattening out. There seems to have been no sound or orderly effort to explain or exploit the SBIC project to holders of private capital who might have become interested. Barnes and associates goofed—they failed "to get the ship off the ground."

I have heard it said many times, and experiences related to me by some of my constituents bear it out, that it is easier for a small businessman to get a loan from a commercial bank than from SBA. We all know that Congress never intended the SBA to be a giveaway or gravy train operation whereby loans are made indiscriminately to unsound or unworthy applicants. But it definitely is the duty and should be the policy and practice of SBA to sincerely counsel with every reputable and responsible small businessman seeking SBA assistance.

CONGRESS IGNORED

One of the most questionable actions by ex-Administrator Barnes—one that, in my opinion, disregarded and flaunted the intent of Congress—was his so-called confidential, but I prefer the word "furtive" memorandum of August 1959, to all SBA regional directors wherein he ordered them to cut down on loans to small businesses everywhere. I call that action furtive because no member of the Senate or House Small Business Committees was advised, so far as I can ascertain, of this memo's content or intent before it was sent out. Did Mr. Barnes fear that his order would be frowned upon by the Congress? Obviously, that must have been his reason for keeping it secret.

The impact of that Barnes cutback order still is being felt, as was pointed out a few days ago by the Senate Small Business Committee. SBA loans have steadily decreased as the turndown of loan applicants has increased. That has been a factor in the present downturn of our national economy, I contend. I have in my files correspondence from a constituent who is a reputable and long-time businessman. He wanted an SBA loan and his local commercial bank was ready to participate with SBA on a sizable basis and administer the loan.

My constituent took his case to the Chicago SBA office and "encountered a calm resistance at every hand." Those are his own words. He had prepared a prospectus showing his assets and his ability to liquidate the loan he sought. The Chicago SBA officials gave it only a slight glance and turned him down.

Can we blame this businessman for being disgusted and embittered?

I daresay that scores of Members of this Chamber have had similar complaints from small businesses in their districts.

The disinclination of SBA under ex-Administrator Barnes and his own handpicked successor, a nonbusinessman named Philip McCallum, to go promptly into complaints submitted to them by Members of Congress has been annoying and frustrating. If there ever has been an SBA congressional liaison officer to help Congressmen with their constituents' complaints, I have never seen him or heard from him.

Consider how other agencies spring into action to help a Member of Congress get to the bottom of the American people's complaints and you can see how derelict SBA has been, under Barnes and McCallum.

I wish to emphasize at this point, Mr. Speaker, that my criticism of past SBA management is in no manner intended to reflect upon or cast doubt upon the fine career civil service employees of SBA. With very few exceptions, they are sincere, dedicated, and competent people who sought against heavy odds to do good jobs. They have been obliged to follow the policies and the orders of their bosses—"gravy train" appointees—who knew little and cared less about SBA, the intent of Congress, or helping to keep the national economy in high gear.

This must have been a frustrating and discouraging state of affairs for the civil service people at SBA.

IGNORE CONGRESS ORDER BY SBA BUREAUCRAT

I personally know of one case in point. It concerns a man who was for several years a Congressman's top assistant. He is well and favorably known to a great many Members here, on both sides of the aisle, as well as to their staff people and staff people of our committees.

This man decided to become a career Federal employee. He attained civil service status and joined SBA. One of his first orders from the schedule C appointee who ran his department was that he was to have no contacts with Capitol Hill. This is hard to believe and impossible to justify, considering the man's background and wide knowledge of House procedures and personalities. Actually, his Hill contacts could have been invaluable to SBA—but they were tossed aside.

This is just one example of the unrealistic handling of SBA since 1953.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, it is good that a man of John Horne's background and acquaintance on Capitol Hill is taking over at SBA. Having worked a long time for Senator SPARKMAN and having constant contact with the Senate and House Small Business Committees, he has known that agency since its inception. Too, he knows what Congress expects of SBA and he knows what Members of Congress have been up against in their dealings with the agency.

I am confident that a new era of sensible and sincere guidance is dawning for the Small Business Administration. I know my colleagues join me in saying "it is about time."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and now yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the author of the resolution, for the purpose of offering an amendment which has been agreed to by the leadership on both sides.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN of Texas: Page 1, line 2, after the words "composed of," strike out "fifteen" and insert "thirteen."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as indicated by our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], this amendment has the approval of the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], the ranking minority member. The amendment reduces the membership from 15 to 13, as proposed in the resolution, which is the same as the number provided in the last two Congresses. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the committee be composed as it has been in the past?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This select committee is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. The committee has never handled its work in a partisan way, and the division has been fairly close within the committee between the two parties.

Mr. PATMAN. The committee has been very satisfactory, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It has rendered rather able service through the membership of the committee regardless of political affiliation, and I think it is very important that the gentleman point out that the committee will remain as it has in the past. This is a wise action. The membership will be divided 7 to 6; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDRESS BY CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, within the near future the 87th Congress will again be faced with the very important and most interesting subject matter on the program of Federal aid to education and especially the question of whether or not Federal aid to education should be provided to private schools and schools of various religious denominations.

Much has been written and said on the Federal aid to these private educational institutions and I have had the pleasure of reading an excerpt from an address by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York. So that the Members of the House may have an opportunity to read his remarks, I include his statement:

EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

In the lead editorial in the Chicago Catholic New World of January 14 it is stated: "One of President-elect Kennedy's task forces—pointedly described by some as a tax force—has proposed a $9,300 million program of Federal aid to education." Of the total amount, $5,800 million would be allotted to public elementary and high schools.

No Catholic schools or schools of other religious denominations are included in the task force proposal. For many millions of American parents, this means that they will be taxed more than ever before for the education of their children but that they cannot expect any return from their taxes, unless they are willing to transfer their children to a public grade or high school.

The Task Force Committee consists of six of our country's distinguished educators, which outlined a general program of financial assistance for all public schools as follows:

1. To provide $30 per annum a pupil, based on average attendance in public schools. The boards of education should be authorized to use the funds for construction, salaries or other purposes related to the improvement of education.

2. To provide $20 per child for States with personal income per student in average daily attendance in public schools that is below 70 percent of the national average.

3. To provide an amount equivalent to $20 per child in average daily attendance in the public schools of the great cities (over 300,000 population) which are facing unique and grave educational problems.

I believe and I state that these recommendations are unfair to most parents of the Nation's 6,800,000 parochial and private school children. Such legislation would discriminate against a multitude of America's children because their parents choose to exercise their constitutional right to educate them in accordance with their religious beliefs. Under these proposals parents would be compelled to surrender both freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the education of their children as a condition for sharing in Federal education funds, which is in direct violation of the liberties guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

In this day when, according to communism's chief salesman Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Union is fighting to enslave the world by conquering men's minds, it is imperative that our Nation provide every child with the teachings necessary to develop his moral and intellectual abilities to their highest potential. The requirements of the national defense as well as the general welfare of our country demand that, in educational opportunities, no child be treated as a second-class citizen. Hence, it is unthinkable that any American child be denied the Federal funds allotted to other children which are necessary for his mental develop-

ment because his parents choose for him a God-centered education.

To me it is also unthinkable that Congress would deny a child funds to study mathematics, science, and languages simply because his parents supply additional funds for the study of religion. This would be penalizing both the child and his parents because of their religious beliefs.

As an American whose loyalties have been challenged only by Communists, I cannot believe that Congress would accept the proposals of the task force and use economic compulsion to force parents to relinquish their rights to have religion taught to their children. I cannot believe that Congress would discriminate against Lutheran, Baptist, Catholic, or Jewish parents—Americans all—in the allocation of educational funds.

I cannot believe that Congress would enact a program of financial assistance to elementary and secondary education unless all children were granted equal educational privileges, regardless of the school they attend. This procedure would insure the civil rights of independent school children and of their parents, and would then incorporate in the task force programs, the first amendment principles of religious and academic freedom in the pursuit of truth.

Our Constitution not only demands that all children be treated alike regardless of their exercise of religion in the choice of school, but Congress has established many precedents of this equal treatment. To quote just a few:

In the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952 Congress provided for direct grants to veterans to enable them to pay tuition in the school of their choice. Many GI's used these funds to pay tuition in the Nation's 474 Protestant, 265 Catholic, and 5 Jewish institutions of higher education.

In the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 Congress provided for direct grants to students whose fathers died as a result of the Second World War or the Korean conflict. Many of America's orphaned students are using these grants to pay tuition in church-related colleges. And, in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 Congress provided for direct grants to graduate fellows many of whom are pursuing their studies in universities under religious auspices.

A number of States have also adopted the method of direct grants to students in extensive scholarship programs which give the award winners freedom of choice in education.

It is a matter of record that programs of direct grants to students and children attending church-related schools do not breech the wall of separation of church and state. Discussing the GI bill, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School observed that it "does not believe that this assistance to veterans was designed to help, even indirectly, the institutions." This means that Congress can subsidize children and students without subsidizing the schools.

The Task Force Committee on Education calls for a flat grant of $30 annually for each public school child for all States. By denying this measure of equality to church-related schoolchildren and their parents, the task force proposals are blatantly discriminating against them, depriving them of freedom of mind and freedom of religion guaranteed by our country's Constitution whose first amendment was adopted to protect the individual person from government repression, the very danger implicit in the proposed program of the task force.

If Congress were to comply with the task force proposals as outlined by its committee (and once again I express my faith that Congress would not do so), and compel a child to attend a State school as a condition for sharing in education funds, it would be engaging in thought control, which, as Justice Jackson remarked, "is a copyright of totalitarianism, and we have no claim to it."

Therefore, dear friends, in the hazardous present and the increasingly perilous future that we face, I beg your prayers that Americans may forever be free to worship God as conscience directs; prayers for our beloved country, her leaders and her people; prayers that, as we go forward to the great tasks ahead, we may rededicate ourselves to God with a single will for peace and righteousness for all.

PRESIDENTIAL ASSISTANT SCHLESINGER AND THE WELFARE STATE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week newly appointed Presidential Assistant Arthur M. Schlesinger speaking as a private citizen and not as an administration spokesman at Newton College of the Sacred Heart in Massachusetts made the statement that a welfare state is the best defense against communism.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this Harvard College history teacher whom President Kennedy has appointed as an intimate White House aid and adviser believes and is telling our youth that the welfare state is the best defense against communism.

Mr. Khrushchev's own statement on the other hand contradicts Presidential Adviser Schlesinger. And who will say Mr. Khrushchev is not something of an authority on the subject? Mr. Khrushchev recently stated:

> We cannot expect Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism until they suddenly awake to find they have communism.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me Mr. Khrushchev has a real ally in White House Adviser Schlesinger—well intentioned though he may be. Small doses of socialistic welfare as preached and promoted by the Americans for Democratic Action is the way Mr. Khrushchev plans his international conspiracy.

God save the President and this Nation from some of his socialistic friends. That President Kennedy and the Congress will see to it the United States has the strength to stand up and defend ourselves from without I have no doubt. But can this Nation withstand the subtle misguided Trojan Horse idealists from within?

President Kennedy's adviser calls the welfare state a defense against communism.

Mr. Khrushchev—who ought to know—says the welfare state is the beginning of communism.

The way it looks to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the welfare state is the one sure way to make the Khrushchev boast come true—that our grandchildren will be raised under communism.

RESETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN REFUGEES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the act of July 14, 1960—Public Law 86–648—a law enabling the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, the Attorney General has forwarded to the Congress a report of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization on the initial 6-month operations undertaken under the new law.

In view of a new wave of highly misleading information pertaining to the number of refugees desiring to enter the United States, I wish to make this report available to all Members of the Congress.

The report reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Operations under the act of July 14, 1960 (Public Law 86–648), were carried out by the Immigration and Naturalization Service during the period ending December 31, 1960, in Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, determination having been made by the Department of State on July 18, 1960, that refugee situations existed in the first five countries named, and on December 12 with respect to Lebanon.

On July 23, 1960, the Secretary of State furnished an advisory report pursuant to section 2(a) of Public Law 86–648 setting forth the statistics available at that time, and on October 3, 1960, furnished a further report advising that for the period July 1, 1959, through June 30, 1960, a total of 22,285 refugee-escapees, as specified in section 1 of the act, had availed themselves of resettlement opportunities offered by nations other than the United States. Accordingly, based upon the 25-percent formula set forth in the act, not more than 5,571 refugees, within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, could be paroled into the United States during the first 6-month period ending December 31, 1960. Certifications furnished by the High Commissioner's representatives are accepted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as evidence of mandate status.

During the latter part of July and the first week of August, a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and of the Department of State traveled to various locations in the five countries, to confer with appropriate officials, with a view to working out arrangements for speeding the implementation of the parole program.

By the first week in August the registration of refugees falling within the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees had begun. Through the cooperation of the local authorities, international organizations, and voluntary agencies, registration forms were made available throughout each country in which the parole operation was placed in effect. While all organizations having contact with or interest in refugees were invited to assist in the registration, it was recognized that the work of registering the refugees would be carried out in the main by the voluntary agencies. All

persons and organizations involved were informed of the need for registering the refugees as rapidly as possible because under the terms of the law, the number of refugees who could be paroled during the first 6-month period would be calculated on the basis of the number of mandate refugees resettled during the period of World Refugee Year, July 1, 1959 to June 30, 1960, whereas the number who could be paroled in any succeeding 6-month period would be calculated on the basis of those resettled during the immediately preceding 6-month period.

A system of priorities was established for the processing of refugees who registered under the law. First priority was to be given to in-camp refugees, in accordance with the year in which they became refugees, highest priority being given to those who had been refugees for the greatest number of years. Out-of-camp refugees were to be given a lower priority, but here again the refugees within this group were to be given priority in accordance with the year in which they became refugees. However, in view of the small number of registrations, it was not necessary to follow the priorities.

In order to carry out the provisions of Public Law 86-648 relating to the parole of refugees, the force of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in Europe was increased by the addition of five officers and five U.S. citizen clerical employees. Examination of all parole applicants consists of the identical medical examination, including X-rays by physicians of the U.S. Public Health Service, as is accorded normal immigrant visa applicants, and interrogation and fingerprinting of each principal applicant and accompanying member of his family under the age of 14, by U.S. immigration officers. The records of security, intelligence and other agencies of this Government are examined, as are the records of the countries in which the refugees are processed. Refugees are not interviewed in any country until the Secretary of State has advised of the completion of negotiations with the foreign government to establish, (1) the right of return of any refugee whose parole would be revoked within 24 months of arrival in the United States; (2) the right of officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate any parole applicant or other refugees; and (3) the right of access to records within the control of the foreign government which would have a bearing on the eligibility and admissiblity of the parole applicants.

As of December 31, 1960, a total of 6,334 refugees had registered. Action taken with respect to these refugees as of that date is as follows:

Found qualified by immigration officers	5,141
Rejected	339
Applications closed for other reasons	354
Pending	500
Total	6,334

The 339 refugees were rejected for various reasons, as follows:

Not within criteria	16
Security grounds	82
Criminal grounds	29
Medical reasons	33
Immoral	11
Undesirable	22
Resettled	66
Spouses and children of the above	80
Total	339

The 354 cases in which the applications were closed represent cases in which the refugees after registering took advantage of resettlement opportunities offered by other countries or withdrew their applications for other reasons.

The 500 cases pending as of December 31, 1960, were mainly refugees who had failed to appear for interview or who for some other reason could not be interviewed prior to December 31, 1960.

Prior to December 31, 1960, documents relating to 972 refugees had been delivered to the Inter-Governmental Committee for European Migration, which arranges for the transportation of the parolees to the United States, and 387 refugees had physically arrived in the United States. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a) of the act of July 14, 1960, there are enclosed reports containing statements of facts in the case of each of these refugees.

Upon arrival at a U.S. port of entry, the refugee-escapee is furnished a form I-94 showing date and port of parole. The form is retained by the alien as evidence of his status in the United States and as evidence of his compliance with the alien registration requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The relating file is forwarded to the district director having jurisdiction over the alien's intended place of residence in the United States. The refugee's place of residence is verified and a control is established in the district office, to insure examination after 2 years to determine eligibility for permanent residence status.

No refugees were paroled into the United States prior to December 31, 1960, under section 2(b) of Public Law 86-648 as "difficult to resettle" cases. Aliens afflicted with tuberculosis, who would be eligible for admission under the provisions of section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957, will be paroled under section 2(a) of the act. A number of these aliens will be paroled into the United States during 1961.

The registration of mandate refugees desiring to go to the United States is essentially complete as of this time in the countries in which the parole program has been operating. The voluntary agency representatives in each country have been striving to locate refugees to register. It appears that registrations hereafter in these countries will be primarily from recent arrivals and from refugees who for one reason or another do not wish to register at this time but later decide to do so. With respect to new arrivals, approximately 70 percent of the persons arriving in Italy and claiming to be refugees, approximately 12 percent of those entering Austria, and approximately 9 percent of those who enter Germany, are granted mandate status. From all reports, the economic situation in Germany, Austria, and France is such that refugees in those countries, other than those who are handicapped or who especially desire to go to the United States, are not anxious to embark upon an immigration venture and hence generally are not interested in registering. Jobs are available in all three countries, since all are in need of workers. In addition to the placement of 200,000 refugees from the East, Germany is reported to have imported 330,000 workers from other countries during the past year. In France, where jobs are plentiful, there is reported to be a housing shortage which no doubt has prompted some refugees to register for parole, who otherwise might not have done so.

Various public and private surveys have included in their estimates of in-camp refugees any nonnational who is residing in public housing. The majority of these people feel that they are established in the country and do not desire to migrate for the reasons set forth above. The Service's attention has been focused on refugees who have been furnished not only housing, but food, clothing and possibly allowances and who have no private income, and who desire to migrate. It is this last group that World Refugee Year and the Public Law 86-648 was designed to eliminate.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,
Commissioner.

EXTENSION OF THE SUGAR ACT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a new extension of the Sugar Act. My bill establishes an effective period of 6 years which should be sufficiently long to determine the economic feasibility of growing sugar in new areas of the country as well as to provide independent capital an opportunity to protect its investment in the necessary sugar processing plants.

My legislation offers further opportunity to implement the President's policy of developing new frontiers. These frontiers are at our own back doors where some prospective sugar farmers have been denied the right to grow and sell sugar within their own country to fulfill our domestic needs. It will add new jobs across the Nation. It will promote the economic growth of our country. It will raise farm income which, in the words of our President, has declined 25 percent in the last decade.

My bill will expand the production in old beet growing areas, the mainland cane areas, and, in addition, allow new producers a small share in this important industry.

I urge my colleagues to review this legislation which I have introduced today so all of us can work together to promote this segment of the New Frontier.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE USO—FEBRUARY 6, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the 4th of February marked the 20th anniversary of the founding of the United Service Organizations—the USO.

There is not a veteran of World War II or Korea who does not remember the work done by this organization. To all Americans the USO has meant a place where men and women of our armed services could find a bit of America—a home away from home. But while the USO is associated in the minds of many with wartime conditions, the fact is that this organization has continued its effective operation during the time of peace. Today, as before, its program continues.

In major cities abroad, at seaports, you will find a USO club ready to assist members of the Armed Forces. Not only do they maintain a healthy atmosphere for recreation but they render assistance and give advice. They arrange sightseeing tours, accommodations, and educate our visitors with the local customs. Thus, they are performing a task of creating good will toward Americans in uniform.

In these faraway places you will find the dedicated and trained members of the USO staffs. Their great work for the countless Americans who have sought haven in their clubs continues today on the same high level of accomplishment.

I think it right to commemorate the anniversary of the USO and to extend the good wishes of this distinguished body for continued success to the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, and the National Travelers Aid Association, who, united to form the USO, have, and shall continue to fill, a great need and perform a noble service for which all Americans, civilians or military, are grateful.

TIMES DO CHANGE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in 1861, the northern radicals had what amounted to a psychiatric obsession—to free the slaves. In 1961, the northern radicals have what amounts to a psychiatric obsession—to enslave the free.

THE LEAD AND ZINC ACT OF 1961

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I joined in sponsoring the Lead and Zinc Act of 1961 through the introduction of H.R. 3768, which is commonly referred to as a bill to stabilize the lead and zinc mining industry.

It should first be made clear that the term "stabilization of lead and zinc" is not apropos in reference to the bill and, in my opinion, tends to minimize the dire emergency now existing in the lead and zinc domestic mining industry. It is not a bill to stabilize the industry alone. It is not a bill which should be referred to as a tariff or subsidy measure, but is a bill which must be passed by this body and signed into law in order to "save" a great industry in these United States.

The so-called lead belt area in my district produces one-third of the lead mined in the United States. Formerly, it was a prosperous area with the outlook for a still better future, but today, with 50 percent of the lead consumed in the United States being imported, with lead selling at the price of 11 cents a pound, and with the resulting unemployment, it has become an area of vacant store buildings and one which lives in constant fear of still another mine being shut down.

Last week, National Lead Co., at Fredericktown, Mo., announced the cessation of its mining and milling operations, which will result in 160 more men being out of jobs. The shutting down of operations is an old story for St. Joseph Lead Mining Co., the Nation's largest producer. In 1952 St. Joseph Lead Mining Co. employed 3,064 men in my district. During 1960 it employed only 2,203 men, which number has further decreased in recent weeks.

Almost 30 percent of the miners have lost their jobs. The area has been designated by the Department of Labor as an area of persistent substantial labor surplus, a depressed area. This Congress cannot fail to act any longer. Administrative inaction has been shocking. As a matter of fact, the preceding administration has even refused to follow the recommendations of its own tariff commission, which recommendations, if they had been adopted and implemented, would have prevented the deplorable conditions now existing.

Let me say that I am an adherent of a free trade policy. I realize that our Nation must import in order to export. It is fundamental that if another nation with whom we trade can make bicycles cheaper than we, we should manufacture automobiles for their purchase, and let them make bicycles for our purchase, and both nations will benefit. But it is equally fundamental that we can not indulge in laissez-faire free trade policies when we no longer indulge in laissez-faire domestic policies. And if we continue to so foolishly indulge, we should gird ourselves for a still greater gold crisis and the designation of the United States of America as a great importing nation, rather than an exporting one. It is not only a problem of higher labor costs, but also a problem of higher tax cost, which we assess upon ourselves to pay the tremendous price of our foreign aid program, which program, to a great extent, has been a contributing factor in the increased lead and zinc importations.

The purpose of this bill is to save the domestic lead and zinc mining industry—to restore the industry to a sound and stable condition, while promoting a fair and more reasonable balance between foreign and domestic supplies.

The Lead and Zinc Act of 1961 provides for the following: First. A limited subsidy to be paid from tariff receipts on imported lead and zinc and not at the cost of the American taxpayer, with controls as follows:

(a) The subsidy payment is limited to sales of new production of domestic ores and concentrates up to 2,000 tons of lead and 2,000 tons of zinc in any 12-month period.

(b) The payment is based on the difference between 16 cents per pound for each metal and the actual market price.

(c) Any company or any individual miner may receive only one subsidy on production up to a maximum of 2,000 tons of lead and 2,000 tons of zinc per year regardless of the number of mines he may own, lease, or operate.

Second. An import tax on lead and zinc concentrates and metal consisting of (a) a permanent tax of 2 cents per pound on lead and zinc metal and 70 percent of this, or 1.4 cents per pound on ores and concentrates; and (b) a removable tax of the same amount on both metals that is applied if the domestic market price of either metal goes below 13½ cents per pound and is removed when the market prices rise above 14½ cents per pound.

Third. A compensatory tax on the lead and zinc content of imported manufactured goods. This is 2 cents per pound in addition to present levies with an increased amount on two zinc items. Lead and zinc entering the United States as manufactured goods directly displaces domestic mine production. These duty rates are proposed by the U.S. manufacturers of lead-zinc products.

Mr. Speaker, this is one piece of legislation which must be adopted to assure the continued employment of miners and the exploration, development, production, and continued growth of domestic lead-zinc mines. We do not want charity, grants, relief, or aid. We want the means of helping ourselves without expense to the Government of the United States. This bill will make available those means, and I might also add, at the same time, it will help to alleviate our gold crisis as importations of zinc and lead are now a $200 million business each year.

AN AUDIT OF THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my good fortune on a number of occasions during the past several years to confer on agricultural matters with Mr. Carl H. Wilken, director of research for the National Foundation for Economic Stability, with headquarters at 1757 K Street NW., here in Washington.

Using official reports of various agencies and departments of the Federal Government, Mr. Wilken has made an analytical study, which essentially is an audit, of the economic record of the United States from 1910 to 1960.

On the basis of this study, he concludes that prices of farm products and other raw materials must be in balance with wages and capital costs. Without a raw material income in balance with the rest of the economy, he asserts we cannot earn the income required to buy the production needed to meet payrolls and capital costs.

In a speech on January 23, 1961, before the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa, Mr. Wilken offered a synopsis of his audit of our economy. In my opinion, no individual is better qualified to speak on the economic problems of the United States, and I include his important message as part of my remarks.

I would particularly call to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Wilken's statement that agriculture in 1960 was

underpaid $28 billion in ratio to payrolls and capital costs:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Farmers Grain Dealers Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy to have this opportunity to meet with you as one of your guest speakers and to give you the results of an analytical study, which was essentially an audit, of the economic record of the United States as a whole from 1910 through 1960.

I would like to stress, first, that the study is based on the official record of the United States as compiled and published by the different agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Second that the study is impartial and was made independently of any organized group, political or otherwise.

To illustrate the importance of the study, I would like to point out that the United States in 1960 operated at less than 90 percent of capacity in productive facilities, as compared to the labor force and capital investment. In addition, the United States had an overall operating loss of approximately $46 billion on the goods and services we did produce.

As a result of the economic errors which led up to the lack of production and operating loss in 1960, the State of Iowa in 1960 was underpaid $1.95 billion for her farm production, a sum equivalent to $700 per capita for the people living in Iowa.

This loss will continue in 1961 and can increase very rapidly unless something is done about it.

During this period of 50 years in which many of us have lived we have had seven distinct depressions. As a result of these depressions we have had periods of unemployment, loss of production, and loss of income. In addition, millions of our citizens have lost their savings and equities in homes and other properties.

But in this period of time we lost none of our natural resources. We had an ever-increasing population which, in turn, produced an increase in both consumers and producers. We lost none of the facilities with which to produce. But, the audit reveals that we lost over $1,500 billion, a sum which is more than five times the total public debt at the present time.

I have gone through all of those depressions and, in my opinion, on the basis of the economic record of the United States, we have the finest and most productive economy in the world, and the greatest economic confusion in history. For example, in the last 9 years the American people have been told that we were in an era of great prosperity. My audit of the record proves that in the 9-year period we poured out billions of dollars of income throughout the United States and the world.

But we did not earn all of the income we spent. The record reveals that in the past 9 years the United States has been operating at a loss. In not one single year since 1951 have we had enough national income to meet the increases in total wages and capital costs involved in operating the United States. Starting in 1951, with a small surplus of national income, as compared to total wages and capital costs, we have reached a point where approximately 30 percent of our national income is being created by debt expansion.

The proof of this conclusion lies in the fact that from the end of 1950 to the end of 1960 we have added approximately $480 billion to the total debt (public and private), an average of $48 billion per year. If we were prosperous, why did we add this fantastic sum to the mortgage against the wealth of the United States? I will return to this period and point out in detail why the debt was incurred.

ANSWER TO OUR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The important question I would like to have you ask yourself is, why didn't we learn our lesson from the seven depressions? Obviously our textbooks on economics do not contain the answers.

However, the answer can be found in the most widely read book in the world—the Bible. It can also be found in an audit of the United States, which has the most complete economy and the most complete economic record of any nation in the world. I am going to point out in my discussion how an audit proves the accuracy of the answer in the Bible.

The Bible states very specifically that, "Every laborer is worthy of his hire." I would like to stress that it says "his hire" and does not say that same hire. It means that every segment of our economy should be compensated in direct proportion to the amount of goods and services produced for society.

I will translate this into the answer to our economic problem. The secret to having a fully operating economy on an earned basis is to maintain price balance between farm products and other raw materials, total wages and salaries paid out, and the capital costs involved in operating the various segments of the economy. Having given you the answer in one sentence, I could say "thank you" and sit down.

But, the answer I have given you brings up the question, why is it the answer? It is the answer because we have an economy that is a twofold operation, production and marketing. We apply labor and capital to our natural resources to produce farm products and other raw materials. Then we move these raw materials to the factory and process them into finished goods. This is the production cycle.

To keep the production cycle going, the goods produced have to be sold and used. We measure the many items which make up the cost of producing raw materials, and the various steps in our economic system with price. If we pay a proper price in the different steps from raw materials to consumption, we automatically create the income to use what we produce.

If, however, we underpay agriculture, which is directly and indirectly responsible for the income of approximately 40 percent of our population living in towns of 5,000 and under and the area surrounding them, this segment of our economy cannot buy its share of the goods which must be sold to meet the payrolls and capital costs. If labor is underpaid, then the labor force cannot buy its share. Finally, if we do not have an adequate return for capital costs, we cannot earn the savings, and profits or new capital for the economic expansion required to keep up with our increase in efficiency and population.

To prove that this is the case, I am going to give you a synopsis of the economic record from 1929 to 1960. It will illustrate the confusion and the many errors we have made and the results in terms of dollars of income.

TRADE TURN OF GROSS FARM INCOME

In 1941 a summary of my research work was published. It pointed out to society that agriculture was the gear wheel which determined how fast the economy of the United States could operate and expand on an earned basis. The gear ratio was set forth in specific terms. It emphasized that for each $1 of gross farm production we would create in the primary market to make it possible to pay $1 of factory payrolls. Further, that as this new dollar of earned income passed from hand to hand in our economic cycle it would generate $7 of national income. In reverse, it pointed out that if we underpaid agriculture $1, we would lose the $1 of factory payrolls and $7 of national income.

I have had some interesting experiences with this ratio. In 1948 the late Vice President Barkley used it in addressing an audience at Des Moines, Iowa. I have heard other Members of Congress use it.

On the other hand, I have read articles written by economists, newspaper columnists, and editors which ridiculed the ratio as some strange mystic theory. When I read these articles I immediately knew that the writer of them did not know what the record is nor has he used it in arriving at his conclusion.

THE OPERATION OF THE RATIO

In 1929 the United States had a national income of $87.8 billion, the highest income ever reached up to that time. Economists far and wide were telling the American people that we would never have another depression because we had learned how to prevent them.

Four years later, in 1933, the value of our farm production was $6.8 billion less than in 1929. The average economist and businessman pays little attention to agriculture, and seems to think that farm production is free, or just something that happens. He reasons that if agriculture is underpaid $1 billion, society will save $1 billion on its food bill and have $1 billion with which to buy some other products. This is the theory that has created a complete misconception which has prevailed throughout our Nation since 1951, relative to the drop in farm prices.

Commonsense should tell us that with agriculture, which after all is part of the economy as a whole, being paid $6.8 billion less in 1933 than in 1929 it should have at least reduced the national income $6.8 billion even though it had no further effect on the rest of society.

But, that is not what happened. In 1933 the national income had dropped to $40.2 billion, a loss of $47.6 billion for the Nation as a whole or approximately seven times the underpayment to agriculture.

How about the factory payrolls? In 1953 the U.S. Department of Agriculture published a chart which proves that from 1919 to 1951 for each $1 of cash farm income in the United States we did have approximately $1 of factory payrolls. From 1929 to 1933 factory payrolls dropped almost dollar for dollar with the drop in gross farm income. I would like to add that in 1929 to 1933 the income of the State of Iowa dropped 55 percent, or in proportion to the drop in the value of Iowa's farm production.

The drop in farm prices in 1929 was blamed on a surplus of farm production, but the record proves that there was no surplus produced at the time in the United States. The reduction of national income, as a result of the seven times turn of the farm dollar, as farm prices were permitted to drop, created a shortage of money with which to buy our output. In 1932 we had the interesting situation of having nickel sandwiches and 12 million people out of work without the nickel to buy one.

In the period 1933 to 1940 we killed little pigs and permitted acres of farmland to grow up in weeds. We had two severe droughts to help get rid of the surplus, and we had low farm price supports. We solved absolutely nothing. We merely stabilized the depression at a little higher level than in 1933.

In 1940 we had 11 million more consumers than in 1929; we had $6 billion less income, about the same amount of total debt against the economy that we had in 1929, and we had 9 million unemployed.

How about the surplus? In spite of all our efforts, aided by two droughts, we had 1 billion bushels of wheat and 10 million bales of cotton in storage. Why? Because we never had the courage to bring back the farm price structure so that we could create the income to utilize our production.

In 1939 the war broke out in Europe. The competitive effect of imports was removed and the speculative markets by the latter part of 1942 had increased farm prices to the 1925–29 level. Then, and not until then, did we get back to a fully operating economy. With the restoration of farm prices, our national income in 1942 moved up to $137.7 billion a gain of $56 billion in 2 years.

I would like to stress that the income we had in 1942 was not the result of inflation. It was reflation and a return to the 1925–29 price level which we should have had the good commonsense to maintain.

Had we maintained the 1929 price level we would have moved up from $87.8 billion of income to $137.7 billion in 1942 without the depression following 1929, and again from 1937 to 1938.

Using the 2 years as the end years of a 14-year period, the audit reveals that in the 12 years from 1930 to 1941 we paid agriculture an average of approximately $6.5 billion less than the average of the 2 years 1929 and 1942. During the 12 years we lost $562 billion of national income, or approximately 7 times the underpayment to agriculture.

THE 90-PERCENT PRICE SUPPORT

In 1941, I sent a copy of my publication to the 48 State secretaries of agriculture. They had a national organization and asked me to meet with them. Mark Thornberg was your Secretary of Agriculture at the time. I went over the record with the leaders of this group, and they took the lead in inducing Congress to enact the 90-percent price support bill in 1942. I might add that it was opposed by many leading economists who are taught that farm prices in the United States should be at world levels. It was also opposed by some farm leaders, and by President Roosevelt.

The purpose of the bill was twofold. First, by paying the farmer a price in balance with wages and capital costs it would assure the farm production with which to win the war. Of equal importance, by protecting the income from farm production the bill would protect the national income so that we would have the income to finance the war.

The year 1943 was the first year that the 90-percent price support became effective. Let us take a look at the record. The national income moved up from $81.6 billion in 1940 to $170.3 billion in 1943, an increase of approximately 109 percent. How about total wages and salaries? Total wages moved up from $52 billion to $109.6 billion, or 110 percent. How about gross farm income? It moved up from $11 billion in 1940 to $23.4 billion in 1943, an increase of 112 percent. This illustrates how national income, total wages, and gross farm production should move approximately in balance. In this rapid rise of income the national income increased approximately $7 for each $1 of increase in gross farm income.

How about farm surplus? With the increase in income the Government established price ceilings to prevent a level too high for farm products and even rationed the supply of food which consumers could buy in order to protect the supplies for the military forces.

The 90-percent price supports worked effectively and efficiently in the 10-year period 1943–52. During this period, we did not produce any surplus of farm products, and the price of farm products at wholesale averaged almost exactly 100 percent of parity as compared to other products at wholesale. In the past 25 years the American people have discussed parity prices, but few people really know what it means. I am going to give you a simple and permanent formula:

The Department of Labor publishes monthly the record of wholesale prices. If you will get this record and compare the price of farm products at wholesale with the prices of other than farm products at wholesale you will have the most accurate parity equation that can be compiled. The 1943–52 period was the most recent, the most accurate, and the longest period in history of parity or price balance between rural America and industrial America.

To illustrate this formula, in the period 1910–51 the wholesale price of farm products averaged almost exactly the same as the price of all products at wholesale. At every point in this period that farm prices dropped below parity or the price level of other products, we had depressions, unemployment, and loss of income.

During 1960, the prices of other products at wholesale were approximately 128 percent of 1947–49, and farm prices averaged approximately 89.1 percent. Dividing 128 into 89.1 percent, the parity for agriculture in 1960 was approximately 70 percent. This means that in 1960 we were losing 30 percent of the source of the earned income the United States should have had to meet payrolls and capital costs.

In 1946–50 farm prices averaged approximately 100 percent of parity, and we exported an average of $90 million per year more farm products than we imported. There was no surplus problem. Then something happened which seems to have been missed by our economists and business leaders. Great Britain in 1949 devalued the pound from $4.05 to $2.80. This reduced the buying power of people paid in British pounds 30 percent below our parity level. On the other hand, it reduced the price of commodities produced in many parts of the world 30 percent in terms of our parity level.

The direct result was to reduce our exports of farm products and increase our imports. In the fiscal year 1950–51 we imported $1.7 billion more farm products than we exported. Since the devaluation of the British pound we have imported approximately $6 billion more farm products than we exported. About two-thirds of the so-called surplus was produced in the rest of the world, and not in the United States.

Net imports of approximately $4 billion in the 4 years 1950 to 1953, plus errors of administration by the Office of Price Stabilization in 1951, forced farm prices downward.

Normally, the drop in farm prices following 1951 would have forced a reduction in national income in direct proportion. But in 1950 the Korean war broke out. In 1946–50 the debt expansion in the United States averaged $20.7 billion per year. In the 4 years 1950 to 1953 the total debt was expanded an average of $38 billion per year. The spending of this increase of $18 billion per year of borrowed money, above the 1946–50 level, created the markets to offset the loss of markets in rural areas due to lower farm prices.

In 1953 the Republican Party took over the administration of the United States. The Korean war ended, and steps were taken to cut back the spending of borrowed money. In addition, the administration asked that farm price supports be reduced, thus setting the stage for further losses in gross farm income and earned national income.

At the time I was employed by the Joint Committee on Defense, a part of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in line with my duties, I prepared a memorandum for Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, who was chairman at the time, and the late Senator Maybank, who was the ranking Democrat on the committee. I told them that if the debt expansion was reduced and farm prices were not restored to parity we would go into a depression before 1953 was over.

Senator CAPEHART sponsored a series of meetings and luncheons for several Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and invited in the heads of a number of leading corporations. I was also invited to attend and speak. At these meetings I pointed out what would happen. They did not believe me, or could not get anything done about it. In July 1953 we started to move into a depression.

Then, instead of restoring the lost income from farm production, the administration asked Congress for further reductions in price supports. On the other hand, the economic advisers to the President prepared a speech, delivered in the fall of 1954, in which the American people were told that we were going to move up to a national income of $500 billion. If the American people have a fault, it is that they like to make money. As a result, in 1955 corporations and private citizens borrowed $72.4 billion in the nature of a mortgage against future income, and proceeded to spend it.

The spending of this borrowed money offset the loss of markets in rural areas, and we had what appeared to be prosperity. In spite of the spending of this fantastic sum of $72.4 billion of borrowed money in 1955, the value of our farm production moved downward.

The debt expansion in 1955 was far beyond our rate of savings and profits. In 1956 the debt expansion dropped back to approximately $44 billion a year. This total, plus the spending of borrowed money in 1955, was an average of $58 billion per year.

But, the debt expansion in 1956 was greater than our rate of savings and profits, and in 1957 the debt expansion dropped back to $38 billion, or approximately in ratio with actual earnings.

In January 1957, when I was doing private research, I told Senator CAPEHART that we were going into another depression before the year is over. The question is: How did I know? I knew that the debt expansion was not enough to offset the loss of markets in rural areas. Senator CAPEHART consulted with some of his colleagues but they were too busy with other things. Furthermore, the American people were being told that we were in a period of great prosperity.

In 1957, we moved into another depression. Then, again, instead of restoring economic balance between rural and industrial incomes with a restoration of farm prices, the administration asked for a further reduction in price supports, thus again reducing the earned income of the farmer, and also the United States.

How did we get out of it? During the campaign you heard the Democratic Party accuse the Republican Party of having a high-money policy. But the records of the Government prove that in 1959 we added $72.9 billion to the total debt, almost twice the amount of available money in terms of profits and savings.

This again offset the loss of markets in rural areas and, again, in spite of the spending of $72.9 billion of borrowed funds in 1959, farm prices moved downward.

In December 1959, I prepared a memorandum for Senator CAPEHART in which I told him that our economy would grind to a halt in 1960 and that the Nation would be very fortunate if we were not in another recession by November. Economists far and wide in January were predicting a big boom, and again in consulting with his colleagues, he found they weren't interested in doing something about it.

The final figures for debt expansion in 1960 will be available in May 1961. My estimates indicate that the debt expansion in 1960 will approximate $65 billion, not enough borrowed money to offset the loss of earned income generated by new farm production. The proof lies in the reduction in our total output of goods and services in 1960.

A simple balance sheet of the United States proves that to meet 1960 payrolls and interest on the debt we have accumulated, we should have had a national income of $466 billion. We had approximately $420 billion, or an operating loss of $46 billion. Of importance is the fact that we had to borrow

and spend $65 billion to create the $420 billion we did have.

How about the future? Without a restoration of price balance between agriculture and industry it will require approximately $75 billion of borrowed money in 1961 to keep our economy operating at 95 percent of capacity. The question is: Who is going to borrow this money? The debt expansion of the private segment of our economy is already at a dangerously high level, and the public debt is far beyond what it should be.

The point I wish to drive home is that this is not a political problem. It is a matter of having a price for domestic production of farm products and other raw materials which will keep them in balance with current payrolls and capital costs.

This brings up the question, what will it cost to restore farm prices to balance with the rest of our economy? The answer is, nothing. With farm prices in balance with current wages and salaries and capital costs we can earn $480 billion of national income with a debt expansion of only $48 billion, or in direct ratio to profits and savings. As I have pointed out, in 1940 to 1943 as farm values were restored to 1925–29 levels, our national income increased from $81.6 billion to $170.3 billion. There was no cost. We gained $88.8 billion in 3 years. In other words, we can have $60 billion more income with about $27 billion less debt expansion than will be required if we do not restore farm prices.

In the last 10 years agriculture has been underpaid $157.8 billion as compared to increases in total wages and capital costs. The direct result has been a loss in the source of earned income of approximately $1,100 billion in the United States. How did we operate?

We borrowed approximately $190 billion over and above all savings and profits. The spending of this $190 billion of borrowed money, through a five times turn in trade channels, created $950 billion of unearned income. This offset the loss in earned income to that extent. The rest of the income was lost entirely by three depressions in the last 8 years.

How about repayment of this excessive debt? During the course of several meetings a leading New York economist was invited to discuss with me the desirability of an audit and I asked him, "What is the operating profit of the United States?" He answered, "I do not know what you are talking about." I immediately knew that he had not made an audit.

I am going to tell you what the operating profit of the United States is. It is approximately 20 percent of the national income. Therefore, to repay the $190 billion of excessive debt added since 1951 it will require $950 billion of future income to earn the profit to pay off this additional debt. In the meantime until it is paid, we will have to earn approximately $5 of national income to earn each $1 of interest on this excessive debt.

Summed up, to meet the interest on the addition of total debt amounting to $480 billion since the end of 1950, it will require $120 billion more of future income per year to earn the profit required to pay the interest at an average rate of 5 percent. We have been told a lot about a free economy in the years that have passed. But the record proves that we have always had a system under which debt repayment was not free. It has always been a fixed contract in terms of interest and principal payments.

I ask you this question: How can you as an individual, or how can we as a nation, meet our financial obligations unless the income of the United States is kept in balance with the debt we have incurred?

TRANSLATED TO IOWA

Up to this point I have been talking in billions about our national economy. In the same way that it is possible to make an audit of the United States it is possible to make an audit of every State, including the State of Iowa.

In the last 10 years the agricultural industry was underpaid $157.8 billion. Iowa's share of this underpayment was $10,880 million. This is an average of over $1 billion per year. This underpayment has moved up from approximately $200 million in 1951 to $1.95 billion in 1960. In 1961 it will exceed $2 billion unless something is done about it. The underpayment in 1960 was approximately $700 per capita in the State of Iowa.

Let me analyze this underpayment. This total of $10.88 billion not having been paid to the State of Iowa could not be used to buy goods and services. Businessmen in the State lost this market for goods and lost the operating profit involved to pay wages and capital costs.

The State lost revenue from tax receipts on income and lost income from the sales tax which would have resulted from the additional sales. This money could have been use to build schools, roads, and other public improvements, but it was not available. Finally, about 20 percent of the $10.88 billion would have been operating profit and savings for the people living in Iowa. It would have found its way into bank deposits and other financial reserves with which to expand the economy of Iowa. All of it was lost as the result of the underpayment for the farm products produced in Iowa.

Next let me ask you the $64,000 question. The underpayment for Iowa's farm production, as I have pointed out, has gradually increased since 1951 until in 1960 it amounted to approximately $700 per capita. What have the farmers, businessmen, and bankers in Iowa done about it? I am afraid that you have to answer, nothing outside of a little grumbling.

It happens that I was born in Iowa and attended Iowa schools and a son and daughter of mine graduated from the University of Iowa. I am going to tell you what is wrong with Iowa. The State, in spite of its wonderful school system has a tremendous inferiority complex. You have been waiting for some wise man from the East to solve your problems.

Farmers, businessmen and bankers have paid dues to national organizations of various kinds and, in turn, have been given the wrong information and swallowed this information hook, line and sinker.

You have been told that there was something wrong in protecting the price of farm products and have supported legislation which destroyed the relative income of Iowa's agriculture and the income of the State in which you live.

IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURE IN IOWA

In 1951 the value of Iowa's farm production was equal to approximately 62 percent of the entire income of the State. In addition, over one-half of Iowa's industries were engaged in processing farm products. You have permitted the income of agriculture and the dollar income of the industries processing farm products to be reduced.

Under our political system we have a representative form of government and Iowa has had the right to elect two Senators and eight Representatives to represent the State on the Board of Directors of the United States (the Congress). How could these men represent Iowa and its people for the benefit of the State of Iowa, unless they were willing, no matter what their political affiliation might be, to demand equality in price for the production of Iowa with other States in the Nation as a whole?

Let me point up the political loss which has been added to the loss of income. Iowa still is an area with room for economic development. In the recent census the results show an increase in population for the Nation in the last 10 years of approximately 19 percent. The increase in Iowa was 5 percent. Why was it only 5 percent? Because of the underpayment for farm production, you had to export young men and women from Iowa to other States. The people living in Iowa had to pay the costs of feeding, clothing and educating these men and women from a subnormal income. They left Iowa because of economic conditions. They could earn more in other States.

As a result of this export of population the State of Iowa is to be penalized, and in the future we will elect only seven Members of the House instead of eight Members which we now elect. You will lose one vote on the Board of Directors of the United States.

Now, let us use a little arithmetic. The $1 billion of underpayment per year to agriculture in the State of Iowa in the past 10 years would have meant an additional income of $2,000 per capita for 500,000 more population in Iowa. This additional population would have prevented the loss of one Representative and would have provided Iowa with 500,000 more consumers.

During the period from 1929 I have watched the State of Iowa quite closely because as I have pointed out it is my home State. The State legislature has provided funds for a development committee supported by taxes. Why has not this committee made an audit of the State of Iowa to find out the origin of State income and its importance in State development?

Next, let me ask a direct question. What chance has the State of Iowa to develop unless the key industry of the State, agriculture, which traditionally has produced products equal to 62 percent of the entire income of the State, is prosperous? How is the State of Iowa going to obtain new capital for development unless it earns the new capital from farm production?

After talking to you it is easy for you to ask the question, if what you say is true why has not something been done about it? In 1947 Congressman HOEVEN of Iowa, now the ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced a bill (which I helped him to prepare). This bill would have permanently supported 12 basic farm crops at 90 percent of parity. This legislation would have protected the income of the State of Iowa. At that time the other seven Congressmen from Iowa joined with Mr. HOEVEN in introducing the legislation.

The bill was necessary to replace the 90 percent price support bill passed in 1942 because it was to have expired automatically on December 31, 1948. But, an interesting thing happened. A leading Iowa newspaper ridiculed this type of legislation and a leading farm organization threatened to defeat some of the Members from Iowa at the next election.

The bill was not passed, and in 1948 Congress passed two bills. The House passed an extension of the 90 percent price support legislation, and I would like to point out that the Republican Party in 1948 had a majority in the House. The Senate, however, passed a sliding scale price bill with price supports to be from 60 to 90 percent of parity. In the conference on the two bills both of them were passed, the 90 percent price support to continue through 1949 and the other bill to take effect January 1, 1950.

With the passage of the bill to reduce price supports farm prices moved downward

in 1948 to 1949. What was the effect on the State income of Iowa? From 1948 to 1949 it dropped $531 million. I tried to prevent that from happening.

The next question which you may have is "How about the consumer?" In Japan the average monthly wage is approximately $40 per month, or less than one-half the weekly wage of industrial workers in the United States. Japan just recently announced a price support of $2.74 per bushel for wheat produced in 1961.

In the 10 years 1943 to 1952 the average price of corn to the farmer was approximately $1.42 per bushel. The price of hogs to the farmer was approximately $18.50 per hundredweight, and the average price of cattle was approximately the same. The average price of prime cattle was approximately $28 per hundredweight. Remember that this was the actual average price for 10 years.

The hourly wage in industry in the same period was approximately $1.28 per hour. In 1960 the average hourly wage in industry will approximate $2.30, or an increase of approximately 80 percent. Simple arithmetic proves that the average industrial worker could pay 80 percent more for farm products in 1960 than he could in the 10-year period 1943–52.

For farm prices to be in balance with the increase in wholesale prices since 1943 to 1952 the farmer should be receiving approximately $2.42 per bushel for wheat, $1.86 for corn and approximately $23.50 per hundredweight for the average hog and cattle production. Prime cattle at parity should be approximately $36 per hundredweight. You can compare this with the prices you are being paid today and you have a clear picture of how much you are being underpaid. As I have pointed out, it totaled an underpayment of approximately $1.95 billion for the total farm production in Iowa in 1960.

Of importance is the question, how did labor obtain this increase? First it obtained the passage of legislation to curtail labor's production to 8 hours per day. Any labor above that had to be paid with time and a half.

Next, they were able to organize in such a way that they can force industry to pay the wage, or close up. It is not my purpose to argue whether this is right or wrong. My purpose is to set out the facts from my audit.

I want to state very clearly that I am not here to tell you what to do, but to point out that arithmetic is an accurate science and that you are going to have to decide the kind of program which you want.

To remain in balance with the increases in wages and capital costs, you must have a minimum of 90-percent price supports to assure equitable exchange for what you produce as compared to what you buy.

If you do not want price supports and want to follow the advice to do away with them, then I want to warn you that you had better get the storm cellar ready for the collapse.

If farm prices are not maintained in balance with adequate price supports, then wages and capital costs will have to be reduced to balance eventually with the food bill which society is willing to pay.

Removal of price supports would find farm prices moving down to 1942 levels. Your principal crop, corn, is already at 1942 levels. Such a happening for all farm products would force a repetition of 1929–33. What would it involve in terms of dollars? It would mean a reduction of 55 percent of the 1960 national income, or an annual loss of $230 billion. It would force a reduction of 55 percent in wages and salaries. It would reduce all property values 55 percent and would force the repudiation of 55 percent of the total debt of $1,050 billion at the end of 1960.

If this is to be our course, we will have proved to most of the world that capitalism under the American system has failed.

Furthermore, after the collapse has taken place, similar to the economic collapse in 1929 to 1933, nothing will have been solved. We will still be faced with the problem of keeping farm prices in balance with the price of industrial products.

In conclusion, I want to thank the Farmers Grain Dealers Association for the opportunity to meet with you at your annual convention. You have a wonderful organization covering the State of Iowa, the leading farm State. The members of your organization make audits, annually, of the records of the many grain dealers to arrive at a profit and loss statement.

Why don't you as an organization get busy and make an audit of the United States and of Iowa's part in the economy as a whole? It isn't necessary for you to help me make it. I have made it.

But, you or someone else must make such an audit if the people in Iowa along with other States are to have the direction they need in solving the so-called farm problem, which in reality means to solve the problem of a solvent and prosperous United States.

Farm prices at parity protect the markets which industry needs to meet payrolls and capital costs. These markets, in turn, protect the jobs and the wages which are paid to labor. Of still greater importance is the fact that farm prices in balance with other products at wholesale will protect the income of the United States, and will assure the earning of new capital with which to expand our economy in direct proportion to our increase in efficiency and population.

And, finally, no matter what kind of political Government you have, the United States cannot earn the income to buy our total production if the prices of farm products and other raw materials are not at parity or in balance with wages and capital costs. Why is this true? It is true because arithmetic is an accurate science, and without a raw material income in balance with the rest of the economy we cannot earn the income required to buy the production needed to meet payrolls and capital costs.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, on Monday next, for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD, on February 16, for 1 hour.

Mr. SIKES, on Monday next, for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. CONTE, on February 7 (at the request of Mr. SHORT), for 1 hour.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter).

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. MILLER of New York.

Mr. ALGER in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. BAILEY, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. WILLIS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 7, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

532. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of two proposed bills: (1) a bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; and (2) a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

533. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a copy of the 26th Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the Report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

534. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, relative to providing war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, and upon request for any department or agency of the United States, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

535. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting copies of a report of contracts negotiated under 10 U.S.C. 2304(a)(11) and (a)(16) covering the period from July 1 through December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

536. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission, transmitting the 44th Annual Report of the U.S. Tariff Commission, pursuant to section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

537. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3864. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3865. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3866. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3867. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 3868. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by providing for fair competition between domestic industries operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act and foreign industries that supply articles imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 3869. A bill to implement the enforcement of the internal revenue laws relating to alcoholic beverages by allocating 1 percent of the alcohol taxes collected for enforcement purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 3870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit railroad corporations to take full advantage of tax relief measures enacted or granted by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3871. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3872. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 3873. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the designation of individuals to receive survivor annuities under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 3874. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable (subject to the existing actuarial reductions) to both men and women at age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 3875. A bill to amend section 9(d)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3876. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3877. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 3878. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 3879. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3880. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the town of Afton, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 3881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3882. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3883. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3884. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, and loan guaranty benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 3885. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 3886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 3887. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N.C., and two electron microscopes for the use of the Duke University Medical Center at Durham, N.C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 3888. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the excise tax on general telephone service shall be permanent the same as the taxes on other communication services, but to allow a taxpayer a credit against such tax for State and local taxes paid by him on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 3890. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 469 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 3891. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 3892. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 3893. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3894. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 3895. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3896. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 3897. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel and Tourism and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PFOST:

H.R. 3898. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3899. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 3900. A bill to amend section 277 of title 10, United States Code, to provide post exchange and other privileges for persons transferred to the Retired Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 3901. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3902. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Highway Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 3903. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 3904. A bill to amend section 9(d)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 3905. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.J. Res. 195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.J. Res. 196. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California (by request):

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the need for a revision of the social security program to make more adequate provision for needy aged persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report "Communist Target—Youth—Communist Infiltration and Agitation Tactics"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 148. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the Select Committee on Small Business authorized by House Resolution 46; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 149. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 141; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 150. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 1, House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to afford protection for domestic industry in the field of international trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REIFEL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States for the continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the amendment of title I of the Federal Social Security Act, relating to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation similar to Senate bill 2757 of the 85th Congress, relating to the Burns Creek site in the Upper Snake River Valley, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation increasing the personal exemption and the deduction for dependents under the Federal income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, against granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to pass legislation granting medical assistance to the aged under the Federal Social Security Act, and eliminating the pauper's oath; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, for the continuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and commending their past and present actions; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to requesting that President John F. Kennedy direct that a 2-year moratorium be declared on all charges for drainage against the farmers of the Columbia Basin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 3906. A bill for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3907. A bill for the relief of Lucio Benedetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3908. A bill for the relief of Theresa Woonsin Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 3909. A bill for the relief of Tio Sien Tjiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 3910. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 3911. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Bernat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3912. A bill for the relief of Chikoko Shinagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3913. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Baicic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 3914. A bill for the relief of Walter Weber (also known as Walter Phillips); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 3915. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 3916. A bill for the relief of Bimla Singh Narang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3917. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Zuchowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 3918. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosa Torres-Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER (by request):

H.R. 3919. A bill for the relief of Heh Ik Chang (Harry Chang Glover); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3920. A bill to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3921. A bill for the relief of A. Hameed Naz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 3922. A bill for the relief of Mr. Elizabeth G. Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3923. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. George L. Nielson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Galib Kahraman and his wife, Zekiye Kahraman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Marica Logonder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 3926. A bill for the relief of Joseph S. Tawil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 3927. A bill for the relief of Leo F. Reeves; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3928. A bill for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 3929. A bill for the relief of Albert W. McConchie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 3930. A bill for the relief of Robert Freund, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 3931. A bill for the relief of Francesca Indelicato and Renzo Orazio Indelicato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H.R. 3932. A bill for the relief of Min McFadden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

48. By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Petition of Charles S. Martin, Shreveport, La., National Petitioning Committee for Constitutional Government of America and Clyde G. King, Shreveport, La., chairman, Legislative Committee, National Petitioning Committee for Constitutional Government of America calling for impeachment of the Supreme Court of the United States for violation of the Constitution in accordance with article II, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of residents of the Seventh California District asking Congress to support legislation which would ban pay television in all forms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

50. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Marjorie Cook and others, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a program for the systematic and definite prevention of Government waste, and a constitutional amendment providing for the eventual retirement of the national debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

51. Also, petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to a redress of grievance relating to the suppressing of news in regard to a criminal conspiracy against him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Boy Scout Movement Grows With America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National Boy Scouts of America Week will be observed this year from February 7 through 13, and I feel it is most appropriate at this time to salute the Boy Scouts on their 51st birthday.

This most worthy organization was incorporated in the District of Columbia on February 8, 1910, with application papers which stated:

That the purpose of this corporation shall be to promote, through organizing and cooperating with other organizations, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues, using the methods which are now in common use by Boy Scouts by placing emphasis on the Scout oath, or promise and law, for character development, citizen training, and physical fitness.

With such a high purpose the Boy Scouts of America were bound to succeed and grow, but the growth which has followed has, I am sure, exceeded many times over any estimate the signers of the application for incorporation may have had.

One measure of the growth that I find particularly worthy of note is that during the year 1950 the Boy Scouts of America reached a registered membership of 2,795,222. The youth of our country who were born during 1950 will reach their 11th birthday this year and be eligible to join an organization which in that short span of time has achieved an active membership that far exceeds the 5-million mark and a total membership that by the end of this year will be well beyond the 30-million mark.

Such figures stand by themselves as the highest tribute that can be paid to every adult in this country who has contributed countless hours of his time to the building and perpetuating of the Boy Scouts of America.

It is my belief that the early leaders of the scouting movement, who began with such high ideals and purpose, have fully met and passed on to their successors the responsibility they assumed in molding the character, mind, and body of the boys who joined with them in this great adventure. The 1,356,432 volunteer men and women who lead the Boy Scouts of America deserve our respect and gratitude for the outstanding work they are doing with the youth of our Nation. It is my firm conviction that only through organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America can inroads into the appalling increases in juvenile delinquency be made. The Scout troop provides the competition, the feeling of belonging to a group, the incentives to achieve and learn, and the opportunities to become self-reliant which are so essentially a part of the growing boy's needs. Some youths who do not, or will not, join a Scout troop often become members of a gang where courage, loyalty to the group, and aggressiveness are distorted to acts of destruction and violence. Where the scouting movement is strong and vigorous, we find proportionately less juvenile delinquency—it is one of our greatest assets in dealing with the wayward boy.

In closing I feel it is appropriate to note that for the first time we have a President of the United States who as a youth was a member of this organization. It is a pleasure and a privilege to pay tribute to the Boy Scouts of America who so ably exemplify in their daily lives their pledge "to do my duty to God and country."

Strengthening Free Enterprise as Antirecession Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the U.S. economy—now undergoing pangs of unemployment and business and industrial lags—should, I believe, enlarge the role of free enterprise in resolving our economic problems, rather than depend too much on Uncle Sam.

Over the weekend, I was privileged to comment on aspects of this approach to our economic difficulties in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATION, FEBRUARY 5, 1961

The Nation today—if it is to successfully meet the challenge of the times—must: Further mobilize its people and resources; blueprint a realistic "plan of action" for the future; and then forge ahead—confident of our ability to solve the difficult tasks confronting us at home and abroad.

Among the major problems is the need for bolstering the economy.

The horizon, of course, is thickly populated with economic physicians—listening intently with stethoscopes to the heartbeat of the Nation.

Following such fiscal examinations, however, they differ widely on theories of cause and cure.

As a nation, we must be realistic and face the hard economic facts of life, particularly those relating to unemployment, and business and industrial lags.

Personally, however, I do not believe the X-ray picture is as clouded economically or otherwise, as some of the analysts' diagnoses.

By experience, we have learned that the health of individuals, or nations, depends to a large degree upon a positive—not a negative—attitude. This is essential if the patient is to see the problems in perspective and carry out the proper remedies.

At this time, the Nation can ill afford to have confidence in our system undermined, our progress downgraded, and our faith in a free system's ultimate ability to succeed, supplanted by economic pessimism bordering on disillusion and despair.

To the contrary, the Nation needs an injection of optimism—fully justified, I believe, by past performance—and then fortified by creation of realistic, constructive plans to meet the challenges ahead.

Now, what can be done? Among other things, we need to: realistically emphasize, as I mentioned, the positive aspects of the picture—not enlarge the negative out of proportion; create workable plans to resolve the economic difficulties; get rid of the pass-the-buck attitude that would attempt to let Uncle Sam do the whole job; encourage the cooperation of all segments of the economy.

All of us have a vested interest in, and a fundamental responsibility for, contributions to our economic progress.

Fortunately, there are many bright spots in the economy. These demonstrate that—while real difficulties exist in some areas—other segments are prospering and moving forward at record rates of activity.

To deal with the soft spots in the economy, however, we need action, not just words; realistic plans, not just dreams; work and sweat, not just wishful thinking.

Now, what are some practical ways to do the job?

Fundamental steps, I believe, include the following:

1. Explore for new ways and means by which job-creating business and industry—the real foundation of our economy—can be encouraged to expand activities, reemploy the unemployed, and generally get the economy rolling forward at a good rate of progress.

2. Insofar as necessary, expand construction of housing, highways, airports, and other programs.

3. Better utilize the technical assistance and guidance programs available from Federal and State Governments to bolster the economies of local communities.

4. Encourage "bootstrap," self-help efforts to communities—wherever this is possible.

Again, I would emphasize that the successful solution of our current economic problems depends upon citizens—free enterprize—government—in designing and carrying out the plans to strengthen the economy—with everybody carrying a fair share of the load.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

In his state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy proposed, among other things, the following steps: Improvement of the unemployment compensation program; more liberal distribution of surplus foods to families of unemployed; redevelopment programs for areas with chronic labor surplus; stimulation of housing construction; tax incentives for sound, planned investment; and other measures.

The Congress, of course, will need to consider these and other proposals for bolstering the economy. The big job, of course, is to find ways and means to serve both the immediate and long-range interests of the country.

EMERGENCY STEPS

In addition to the evolvement of new programs, there are currently a number of steps which can and should be taken to deal with the situation—particularly in hard-hit areas.

Recently, I contacted a number of Federal agencies, including the Departments of Labor, Commerce, and Defense, and the Small Business Administration—to urge maximum assistance to people, to hard-hit communities, as well as greater cooperation with agencies of the State government attempting to deal with the situation.

For Wisconsin, I recommend the following steps:

First. A survey of unemployment by the Labor Department to single out the communities of greatest unemployment;

Second. A special study by the Area Development Office of the Department of Commerce to find ways and means by which hard-hit communities can take immediate, and long range, measures to bolster the economy;

Third. Efforts to channel Government contracts, as available, to hard-hit areas;

Fourth. Provide communities with available technical assistance and guidance through Federal agencies to help them help themselves.

NEEDED: EFFORTS TO STRENGTHEN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Over the years, so-called antirecessionary policies have been developed involving largely actions to be taken by the Government or its agencies dealing with economic problems. The popular trend, unfortunately, is to look to Uncle Sam to take the necessary steps; feeling that the free enterprise system—partially impaired by the economic difficulty—can just hobble along as best it can.

Logically, the free enterprise system—the breath and life of our economy—should lead the way to greater economic progress.

The injection of more tax dollars into the economy, of course, can provide some help. However, these are unnatural to the working principles of a free economic system—for the most part, temporary by nature—and fail to serve, within the framework of free enterprise, the long-range interests of growth and progress.

Free enterprise—not the Government—creates the giant's share of U.S. jobs and goods and services that serve our people. The American people, I believe, should be rehabilitated from the long habit of overlooking free enterprise as the right vehicle for reinvigorating the economy.

In the light of these factors, I believe we need a new look at the situation, to determine how free enterprise can play a more significant, effective role in times of economic crisis. The study, I believe, should include exploration of the following possibilities:

1. Encouragment of business and industries to advance plans for expansion of operations (perhaps with carrot-type inducements in tax treatment, insurance or other methods);

2. Encouraging more people to invest in businesses and industries. Today there are more than 12½ million shareholders in U.S. enterprises. The injection of more savings dollars into such enterprises could, I believe, have a reinvigorating effect on the economy;

3. Public confidence too, is a major factor in fighting trends toward recession. The painters of doom and gloom—in my humble judgment—do the country a great disservice by disproportionately blowing up the difficulties but not putting them in proper perspective in relation to the overall strength of the nation.

These, and other, steps, I believe, are worthy of considering in attempting to strengthen the ability of our free enterprise system to promote normal growth and progress as well as to deal with economic crises.

Soon, I shall reintroduce my bill in Congress to establish a National Economic Council. The purpose would be to provide top level planning of economic policies and programs. The objectives, too, I believe, should include a special study to analyze—and enable us to better cope with—the up-and-down cycles in the economy. In addition, the Council would evaluate conditions and long-range trends domestically and internationally and provide guidance and more effective planning within our free enterprise system.

Unless we successfully bolster the economy, we will find it increasingly difficult to cope with the fluctuations in our domestic economy as well as to compete on the world market. If, however, we can provide the farsighted planning, I am confident that the resources, know-how, ingenuity and great production capacity of the U.S. free enterprise system cannot only hold its own in international competition, but further strenghten our dynamic domestic economy—the greatest in world history.

Louisiana Interested in Maryland's Outdoor Show at Cambridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana has a special interest in the annual outdoor show at Cambridge, Md., in the congressional district of Representative THOMAS F. JOHNSON. Each year the Louisiana Fur and Wildlife Festival selects a queen and alternate queen for this event. One attends the outdoor show and the other the annual Louisiana Mardi Gras Ball in Washington. This year's queen is Miss Debra Ann Labove, of Cameron, La., in the district of Representative T. A. THOMPSON. Miss Labove will participate in the Mardi Gras ball February 11. The alternate queen is Miss Myrna Viator, of Delcambre, in my district, who took part in the outdoor show staged on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of last week.

One of the features of the show, which is conducted for the purpose of advertising the natural resources of Maryland, is a muskrat skinning contest as part of the recognition of the fur industry. Fur, of course, is one of the leading industries in Louisiana and the Third Congressional District, which I have the privilege of representing, is the greatest fur-producing area in the United States.

About 10 years ago an exchange of visits between Maryland and Louisiana muskrat skinning experts was inaugurated. In other words, Maryland representatives go to Louisiana and Louisiana contestants visit Maryland. Carrying Louisiana's colors in the competition at Cambridge this year were John Broussard, of Creole, and Isaac Broussard, of Hackberry. Delaware, Virginia, New York, and New Jersey also compete. Winner this year was Russell Insley, of Cambridge.

The outdoor show was founded in 1938. One of the founders was Mr. Emmett Andrews of Cambridge, who has been with the Federal Government for some 19 years, presently with the Central Intelligence Agency. He has maintained his interest over the years in the show which is sponsored by the Cambridge Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Address by Hon. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, Before National Cotton Council of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from a speech delivered by me before the National Cotton Council of America, at the Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tenn., on January 31, 1961.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Excerpts from speech by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, before the National Cotton Council of America, Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tenn., Tuesday, January 31, 1961.

You represent all segments of a great industry—production, processing, manufacture, and sales. Your guests include representatives of many allied interests. This opportunity for discussion with you will be helpful, and your views will be appreciated.

Cotton and cotton products are staples of our domestic economy and our foreign trade. You are affected by both Government at home and world affairs. Under present conditions cotton manufactures are especially sensitive to tariff revisions.

From association with you and those you represent, I know of your good work. Your constant study of conditions at home and abroad must give you deep concern today; as they do me. I have a working knowledge of your purposes and objectives; and I hope you know mine.

I am a conservative; I have been called unreconstructed. I wear the label with pride if it marks me as one who fights for the fundamentals on which we have developed the finest system of Government ever known. I fight for these fundamentals because I believe in them.

I believe sound progress should be the primary purpose in every man's life. Sound progress is the source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing; this is another application of checks and balances which have been so useful in our Government.

I believe it is the sound productivity and strength, developed under our free enterprise system, that have brought us to world power in a few generations. Historically, lives of nations are measured in hundreds of years. I want this Nation's life to be longest and best.

I believe continuing centralization of government destroys freedoms and strength. We have already gone too far. With excessive centralization comes excessive central

edict and regulation, and excessive Federal competition and taxation. It produces the evils of state socialism.

I believe our people want our system perpetuated and strengthened. Basically, the requirements are: Simple honesty and individual initiative, self-reliance and willing work, constructive production and free competition, and progressive development with sound financing.

I believe that with responsible citizenship, good government, and fiscal soundness, there would be no fear for the future. But without these, there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. I think we face these alternatives today.

I admit a feeling of anxiety, and I suspect most of you know it too. Our Government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home. This Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest. The need for constructive discipline and restraint is clear.

Our strength is being sapped by deficit financing indulged in too long; Federal paternalism grown too big; the Warren Court grown too mighty; and labor leaders grown too powerful. These are subverting our system, changing our attitudes and hobbling our will for freedom.

From experience we have learned that the more government is centralized, the more easily it is influenced—if not yet controlled—by leaders of organized pressure groups. Certainly, the political target areas and ruling officials of government are more concentrated.

I regard the right to work as I do the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. States have the right, the responsibility and the duty to protect this fundamental freedom. Twenty States to date have enacted right-to-work laws. I shall fight to preserve them.

The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes States rights in this field. Labor leaders want this provision repealed. Without it they could reasonably expect the Warren Court to strike down every State right-to-work law in the country regardless of the expressed will of the people.

Judicial usurpation of power has reached a peak in the Warren Court. Its decisions have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with authority in the executive branch of the Federal Government and usurped the powers of Congress.

There can be no doubt that the Warren Court is undermining our system of government, contributing to centralization of power and authority; it is sapping our national strength at its roots. This makes us more vulnerable to destructive forces at home and abroad.

The Conference of State Chief Justices said development of immense power in the Supreme Court is second only to increasing dominance by the National Government. It said the Court was not only the final arbiter of the law; it has become the maker of social and economic policies.

Evidence of Federal paternalism and domination is all around us. It is clearly obvious in Federal subsidies which are flowing to business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, education, States, localities and individuals.

There are nearly 100 Federal programs through which Federal payments are made to States, localities and individuals. These are in addition to Federal payrolls, contracts for goods and services, etc. The number has been rising, and there are now proposals for more.

Nearly 40 million people will receive Federal payments this year totaling some $40 billion, including social security. Forty million people with their families could be nearly the equivalent of half of our population looking to the Federal Government for money.

This Nation has been on a deficit financing basis during 24 of the past 30 years; and, despite the optimistic estimates from some quarters, I predict another deficit in the current year; and we can count ourselves fortunate, indeed, if there isn't a larger deficit next year.

When I came to the Senate in 1933, the Federal debt was $16 billion. It is now $290 billion. It has gone up some $30 billion since the end of World War II. Total debt in the United States—Federal, State, and local, corporate and personal—now totals $1 trillion or $1,000 billion.

Continuing national deficits and debt are among the prime causes for inflation. The value of the dollar is now 46.5 cents, on the 1939 index. It has dropped every year in the past 10, except 1955. It dropped in all but 3 months in the past year. It will drop further.

Our situation is characterized by debt, deficits and inflation. Such a state of affairs cannot inspire confidence; but we have run into international trade balance troubles, and we need confidence in the dollar such as we have never needed before.

For 15 years the United States has been the world's banker, the world's policeman, and the world's Santa Claus. The American dollar is showing the strain. Loss of confidence in the dollar would be disastrous, and we should understand what it would mean.

In the sprawling Central Government we have developed it is difficult to see the full implications of the weaknesses I have described. But their combined effect finally is coming partially to light in the realization that we are running heavy international payments deficits.

This involves our gold reserves; they are seeping away. It involves confidence in the dollar. Currencies in numerous free world nations are tied to the American dollar. Loss of confidence in the dollar could be disastrous not only in the United States, but to freedom everywhere.

What is this balance of international payments which suddenly is so important? It is the dollar value accounting of the debits and credits of all of our transactions with the rest of the world; and for years we have been spending abroad more than we have been taking in from other countries.

In 10 years our expenditures abroad, including foreign aid, have exceeded receipts from foreigners by some $21 billion. Our cash deficits in foreign transactions in the past 3 years have become alarming. This dangerous situation must be corrected.

Foreign governments and foreign central banks may take payment for these deficits in dollars, or they may demand our gold at the rate of $35 an ounce. They have taken $5 billion from our gold reserves in 3 years; and $7 billion since 1950. Our free gold is now at its lowest level in 20 years.

There are some obvious incentives for foreign holders to leave a substantial part of their dollar receipts here on deposit, or invested in short-term securities, rather than withdraw the gold. But decision to hold dollars rather than take the gold depends on confidence in the dollar.

Outstanding foreign claims total $18 to $20 billion; about half of these are in official accounts and gold could be demanded. Some $12 billion in gold is dedicated to our currency and Federal Reserve deposits. More than half of our undedicated gold is gone; less than $6 billion in free gold is left.

Nothing confronting us today is more important than restoration of full confidence in the dollar—confidence in the stability of its purchasing power, and confidence in its convertibility into gold. This can be done only by maintenance of sound fiscal position.

The balance of international payments is a complex account of many activities—some public and some private. A summary of entries for 1960 shows:

Receipts from export of goods and services brought in $26.9 billion.

Payments for import of goods and services (including tourist expenditures abroad) cost us $20.3 billion.

This left an excess of trade receipts over payments of $6.6 billion.

But other payments leaving the United States more than offset this trade surplus. These included: Direct military expenditures abroad, $3 billion; net long-term private investment abroad, $2.4 billion; net short-term private investment abroad, $1 billion; net government foreign loans and grants, $2.7 billion; and payments for pensions, private remittances, unrecorded transactions, etc., $1.1 billion.

These figures are condensed and projected. But they are accurate enough to tell the 1960 story: we spent $3.6 billion more abroad than foreigners paid us. For the third consecutive year our deficit in the international payments balance exceeded $3 billion.

Our merchandise exports were the bright spot in the balance-of-payments picture. Combined with import reduction they gave us a substantial trade surplus, but not enough to offset the great outflow in other areas. But continuation of this surplus is questionable as textile men know.

Raw cotton exports had a good year; I wish the finished goods situation were better. Raw cotton was one of five key commodities in which 1960 exports exceeded 1959 shipments. Others were steel mill products, unmanufactured aluminum and copper, and commercial aircraft.

I am a firm advocate of sound foreign trade on a reciprocal basis, but I do not believe tariffs should be an adjunct of our foreign policy. For a while, after World War II, we were virtually the only source of supply, but we have never assumed our rightful place in world trade.

Traditionally, not enough of our vast agricultural and industrial production potential has gone into sound and profitable export. Only 4.5 million of the men and women in our work force are employed in foreign trade activities; and presently too many of them are unemployed.

I know the traditional handicaps: I know the new ones too. The days of the intolerable Hawley-Smoot-type tariffs are gone and should never return. The days of subsidized foreign production at the expense of our own must go too. A great deal of constructive work needs to be done.

We who serve on the Senate Finance Committee, struggling with taxes, tariffs, and customs * * * like you, are acutely aware of at least some of the problems of foreign trade. Some of them have been created by excessive use of foreign aid detrimental to our own people.

Foreign aid will burden our taxpayers for generations. Gross foreign economic assistance since the end of World War II has totaled nearly $65 billion. Too much of this has gone to close so-called dollar gaps resulting from World War II destruction and exhaustion in competitor nations.

These gaps have been more than closed. Foreign competitors have been subsidized with our money, materials, machines, and know-how. We built modern factories for aggressor nations who are our competitors. Much of our international payments difficulties stems from Germany and Japan.

Segments of our trade activity are feeling the effect of these subsidies in low-wage areas. In some instances they are pricing our merchandise and commodities out of world markets, including our own; they are putting our business out of production and our people out of work.

Aid for food and shelter is one thing; foreign aid as an instrument of foreign policy which, in excess, is turned against us, should be considered in a different attitude. Some of the professional foreign aiders scattered through the Government can't understand this.

Not all of the foreign aid shows up in foreign assistance appropriations and expenditures. We find some of it in tariff agreements. More foreign-aid money is being sought for new places, and so are additional tariff concessions. Some of the tariff proposals involve textiles.

I believe in free, competitive enterprise and trade. These are fundamental to our system; they are the basis for sound prosperity. They are just as sound internationally as they are domestically. But free competition contemplates reciprocity under one set of rules.

Assuming proper administration, I have favored the reciprocal trade idea since Cordell Hull proposed it nearly 30 years ago. The objective was to increase foreign trade on a reciprocal basis. I supported it in my first Senate speech, and I treasure Secretary Hull's letter of appreciation.

There is some basis for question as to whether current administration is on the right track. Certainly, Cordell Hull never thought reciprocal trade agreements would be dominated by foreign policy or engineered through the GATT (this is short for General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

The GATT has been accused of being an instrument of foreign policy, acting too frequently without regard for the meaning of reciprocity. Members of Congress have questioned the wisdom of some 30 nations passing judgment on our tariff agreements. There is need to look into GATT.

The executive branch has refrained from requesting authorization for participation of U.S. representatives in the GATT. The subject has been a matter of considerable discussion in congressional committees, but specific legislation has not been enacted to date.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be up for renewal next year. In view of accumulating criticism and current conditions, I would have to say extension of the act will not be easy. International payments will be one factor; segments of our industry damaged by foreign imports will be another.

I regret that the Tariff Commission was not allowed to include products made of cotton in its investigation under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. I was disappointed by the fact that my protest to the President in this matter was unsuccessful.

This is regrettable because increasing imports of finished cotton goods are a fact; so are closed mills and unemployment. It is well that the cotton industry has taken the lead in studying agricultural problems. Agriculture, and cotton in particular, have many problems; and acreage reduction is no cure.

I hope you emphasize implications of foreign competition. Legitimate competition is best met by sound research, production and prices. Government-made distortions are difficult. The Government should not damage our industry or make it profitable for business to migrate; but this is happening.

Recent growth of investment abroad by U.S. corporations is unprecedented. Direct investment of all kinds now exceeds $30 billion (book value). The increase is averaging more than $2 billion a year, exclusive of oversea earnings reinvested. This is long-term private investment affecting the international payments balance.

The emphasis of this migration is shifting from raw materials to finished products. The more obvious reasons include: Getting inside export barriers; establishing new bases for export into markets where we are losing out; and sending more manufactures back into the United States.

There are other reasons too, including Government incentives—present and proposed—such as tax advantages, investment guarantees, financial assistance, export credit insurance, etc. And, of course, areas offering low wage and production costs, as compared with ours, exist in many parts of the world.

It should be noted that $2.7 billion in foreign loans and grants flowed out of the country in 1960. Most of this was foreign aid, which contributed heavily to our balance of payments deficit. Reduction in these expenditures would be a big factor in controlling our loss of gold.

Our problems are many and complex. Many of them could have been avoided with ordinary frugality and efficiency. We have reached a point now where there must be agreement on one paramount objective; the American dollar must be defended and strengthened; confidence in it must be maintained.

This was a strong Nation with a sound system. But we have been subjecting it to irresponsible abuse; this must be stopped. We are in a dangerous storm; I think we can weather it if we are willing to accept and apply discipline and restraint in both public and private affairs.

We are in a new era of atomic energy, rockets, and space. Our population is increasing. Our resources are great. Our productive know-how and capacity are unsurpassed. In such conditions, with commonsense, representative democracy with free enterprise should thrive soundly for the good of all mankind.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another of my "Washington Reports":

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas)

House organization is almost complete. Republican (minority) and Democrat (majority) parties have each assigned their members to their committees, respectively. The Democrat members of the Ways and Means Committee assign the Democrats. The Republican committee on committees has completed the Republican assignments. The House majority leader (RAYBURN, of Texas) and minority leader (HALLECK, of Indiana) earlier reached agreement on committee realignment between parties, based on the new proportion of Democrat and Republican Members. So the committees generally are 3 to 2 Democrat-Republican instead of the last Congress' 2 to 1 ratio. This realignment assures a more strenuous contest over controversial legislation.

The Presidential prayer breakfast of the 17th Annual International Christian Leadership Conference was as usual a tremendous experience. Deeply moving and thought-provoking talks were given by the President, Vice President, Senator Lausche, and Billy Graham, all the more significant to everyone present, no doubt, because of the religious issue in the campaign. To me there was the realization of the unity and conviction of those who believe in Deity as opposed to the world's nonbelievers. From this comes the strength of our great Nation. This experience was particularly memorable for me since I was privileged to extend greetings and a message from the Members of the House Prayer Group. I had the opportunity to meet or chat with the President, Vice President, Billy Graham, Adlai Stevenson, Cabinet members Rusk, Day, Goldberg, Dillon, McNamara, Hodges, Senators Carlson, Lausche, and Stennis, and Judges Boyd Leedom and Marvin Jones, and Metropolitan Opera Singer Jerome Hines. I am sure now as I was then that we have no problems we can't solve through determined effort motivated by spiritual conviction. The President remembered the occasion when we both shared the rostrum reporting on the Hoover Commission status of legislation in Senate and House respectively before the Chamber of Commerce.

The President's message on balance of payments and gold was a good one. Some noteworthy highlights include: (1) Recognition that we are the "banker of the free world" and that any potential weakness in our dollar spells trouble; (2) interest rates should be increased to hold and attract foreign investment in this country; (3) in reckoning international assets and liabilities, the United States is solvent—Western European countries owe us long-term governmental debts of $2.9 billion and our private investments total $48½ billion, exceeding foreign investment in the United States by $32 billion; (4) we will seek the fullest possible measure of tariff reduction by foreign countries to the benefit of our exports (long overdue, as I see it); (5) American goods must be priced competitively maintaining competitive costs, improving productivity and stabilizing, or where possible, lowering prices. These are worthy objectives but not to be reached by Government control and planning but by free, competitive-market enterprise. The message sidesteps the wage-price spiral forced on us by labor leaders demanding pay increases beyond productivity, which is largely responsible for pricing us out of the world market. Yet the message is there for those responsible. So it isn't more Government control we need but more understanding and cooperation by pressure groups, like labor, willing to work within the framework and by the ground rules of free enterprise. This includes, too, those business groups guilty of price fixing and other monopolistic actions, violative of free enterprise.

The missile gap, is it or not, is the subject of speculation here. Apparently campaign analyses and statements were inaccurate. Some of us tried hard to present the correct picture of U.S. strength based on known facts. Always in Washington it's the same old story—the need for doing your homework, studying and understanding. I suspect some campaigned so hard the homework was neglected.

The President's health message asking for medical care for the aged under social security was a great disappointment to me for very sound reasons. The Ways and Means Committee studied this long and hard last year and decided against it. Here are some of the reasons why we did: (1) Only those covered by social security are thus aided and these without evidence of need, even millionaires would be covered; (2) there is no evidence of lack of medical care in this country because of lack of money to pay for it; (3) U.S. medical care is the best in the world because as private enterprise there is incentive, resulting in men wanting to be doctors. Government-controlled medicine, where tried in the world, results in shortage of doctors and technicians, and facilities, hence poorer medical care; (4) the program is socialized medicine, the

President's statement to the contrary notwithstanding. The doctors, hospitals, and facilities will be authorized by Government, fees regulated, auditing, policing, and penalties prescribed, necessarily, to see that the Government intent is fulfilled. All this is Government control and adds up to socialism; (5) there will not be free choice as depicted—only a choice of those doctors authorized and facilities available. This is not a free choice. Again there's a failure to do the homework, to know the truth, to learn the facts. Federal Government doesn't even have a record or knowledge of the largest area of medical care in the United States, the local efforts. Surely we should start with knowledge, not a politically decided need. So now it's up to the people not to be hoodwinked.

Tax Rebates to States for School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the January 23 edition of the Washington Post carried the following release from the Associated Press dealing with a proposal made by Gov. Michael DiSalle of Ohio to the executive committee of the Governors' conference:

TAX REBATE PUSHED TO AID U.S. SCHOOLS

A proposal by Gov. Michael V. DiSalle of Ohio to let States have part of the money collected for Federal income taxes to spend on schools was approved Saturday by the executive committee of the Governors' conference.

Among the executive committee members approving the plan was Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland.

DiSalle's resolution calls for the Federal Government to return to any State 5 percent of the Federal income tax collected there.

The State, in return, would be required to spend 40 percent of that money for operating and construction costs of schools. Gradually, over a period of from 5 to 10 years, it would become mandatory for the State to spend all of the money on schools.

DiSalle said he was particularly pleased that his proposal was approved by eight Governors, four Republicans and four Democrats.

The proposal will be submitted to President John F. Kennedy. If he considers the idea a workable one, the Governors will develop the details before going to Congress to ask for legislation.

DiSalle said one big advantage to this proposal would be that it would eliminate the fear of those individuals who say that Federal aid to schools would necessarily mean domination of local school boards by Washington.

After reading the above article, I immediately wired Governor DiSalle, and the text of my wire follows:

JANUARY 24, 1961.

The Honorable MICHAEL DISALLE,
Governor, State of Ohio,
Columbus, Ohio:

Have just read Associated Press release concerning your proposal to permit States to retain 5 percent of Federal income taxes collected within the State for purpose of school operation and construction costs.

I note you plan to develop details before coming to Congress for legislation.

I have introduced this legislation in the 85th, 86th, and again in the 87th Congresses and my present legislation is identified as H.R. 46 and H.R. 47. The former permits the District Director of the Internal Revenue to transfer to the State treasury 1 percent of all Federal and corporate income taxes and the latter provides for an appropriation to the individual States of 1 percent of all Federal and corporate income taxes for school operation and construction costs.

I would be most happy to cooperate with you and the executive committee of the Governors' conference in endeavoring to bring these proposals to a successful conclusion.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

I further wrote to our new President, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, the following letter:

JANUARY 24, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a copy of an Associated Press release which appeared in the January 23 edition of the Washington Post. The release briefly covers a proposal submitted to the executive committee of the Governors' conference by the Honorable Michael DiSalle of Ohio relative to a Federal tax rebate to States for school aid.

It will be noted that the proposal received the endorsement of a number of Governors, and it is planned to submit same to you for your consideration. If you consider the idea a workable one, the release goes on to state that the Governors will develop details and approach Congress for legislation.

I have introduced such legislation for the past number of years, in fact my original bills were introduced in the 85th Congress. This Congress they are identified as H.R. 46 and 47, copies of which are enclosed. I personally feel the ideas contained in these bills are worthy of serious consideration by you as I have found them to be readily acceptable to a great number of people.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I have been advocating this type of a program since 1956, and have introduced legislation in each Congress to implement it. Unlike Mr. DiSalle's proposal however, my legislation asks for only 1 percent of all personal and corporate income taxes and requires that the entire amount be expended for educational purposes.

Under the proposals I have pending in the House, H.R. 46 and H.R. 47, the States would have direct control over the expenditure of the money turned over to them. Every person I have spoken to who is opposed to any Federal aid to education, and every person I have spoken to who is an advocate of Federal aid to education, insist he wants no bureaucracy or Federal control. My resolutions will meet that desire, for it need not add a single person to the Federal payroll and would surely eliminate any possibility of Federal controls.

The concept of my proposals is not exactly new, as legislation somewhat along the same lines was introduced as far back as 1949. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that any monetary assistance given to the States must be derived through taxation. Under my proposals, the States would receive 100 percent of the money representing the 1 percent withheld from the personal and corporate taxes; rather than leaving a portion of it here in Washington to cover the cost of a large administrative overhead.

The proposals would also meet the argument which faced the Congress last year as to whether any moneys could be used for teachers' salaries. If the States retained this money, which incidentally would be from their own people, it could be expended by them in any fashion they saw fit. If their facilities were sufficient, they could earmark it for salaries. If their teachers' salaries were sufficient, they could earmark it for construction; or halve it, however they saw fit.

I urgently request the membership of this body to give earnest consideration to these proposals and ask that those members of committee who would be called on to consider such legislation weigh heavily the merits of these proposals.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, Edith Nourse Rogers was a dear friend. She was a fine woman, a true representative of her constituency, a dedicated public servant, and an outstanding American patriot.

On January 16, 1961, a tribute was paid to her by her able and worthy successor, the Honorable BRAD MORSE, and colleagues who served in this House with this distinguished lady whose untimely passing last fall shocked all of us. At the time of the tribute to her I was inadvertently prevented from participating. But in view of the high regard, affection, and respect I hold for Mrs. Rogers, I would like to include in this RECORD my feelings about this wonderful woman.

I became well acquainted with Edith Rogers in my 2 years in Congress. It did not take long to know her. She was warm and personable, sweet and considerate, fair, perceptive, and courageous.

She used to come over to me on the floor of this House and discuss my district problems. Being ever curious about what was going on all over this Nation of ours, she seemed as concerned about matters affecting my district as if it were her own. This she did, I am sure, with others, and as a result was knowledgeably sympathetic to the problems facing our Nation.

I served with Edith Rogers on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I should say I served under her, for I respected her vast seniority on this committee and considered her as my mentor. I am still awed by the warmth with which her name was hailed by veterans and their organizations as they appeared before our committee and at public functions. An introduction of Mrs. Rogers always brought cheers and enthusiastic ap-

plause from the rank and file of these men who fought our country's battles. They stood to a man to hail her. She would modestly rise with her slight frame, smile sweetly and humbly, and with a wave of her hand create a feeling of benevolence and understanding that would pervade the entire room.

Edith Nourse Rogers departed life carrying with her the affection of all of us who knew her for she had brought joy into our lives with her friendly and sunny disposition. She left us possessed of our admiration and gratitude because of her large contribution as a legislator to the strength and betterment of our Nation and its citizenry.

The USO's 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1961, the United Service Organizations, more popularly known as the USO, celebrated its 20th anniversary, and I think it fitting for all Americans to pay tribute to those who have helped to realize its purposes and goals.

I can think of no group which has done more to support the morale of America's fighting men and the women of our auxiliary forces than has the USO and certainly all who have served in this Nation's Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard during the past 20 years must agree.

Organized a few months before the attack on Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into the worst holocaust of all time, the USO immediately went to work on a task no agency of Government could perform. It brought to our Armed Forces everywhere spiritual, social, welfare, recreational, and educational activities so vital to high morale.

Although there are figures available to us on the military cost of World War II, the Korean conflict and the years between and since, no price tag can be placed on the contributions made by the USO to America's defense. All our modern weapons, the high caliber and training of our Armed Forces and, indeed, America's great economic and industrial resources, would have been of little consequence had we lacked the morale to carry through our fight to ultimate victory.

The USO was born at a meeting of the six agencies which today still continue their work in this field. They are the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army and the National Travelers Aid Association.

Although the need for the USO is greatest in wartime, today's international tensions and the necessity for us to maintain two and a half million men and women in uniform here and throughout the rest of the world make it imperative that the vast services of this organization be continued. For this reason, more than 200 USO clubs presently are maintained throughout the United States and in Korea, Japan, the Philippines, the Canal Zone, Guam, Okinawa, Puerto Rico, Morocco, France, Italy, Turkey, and Greece.

Last year, the 40,000 USO volunteers helped provide the following services to our Armed Forces:

Visits to USO clubs, 36,223,768.
Servings at snack bars, 7,469,435.
Answers to 5,320,063 questions.
Counseling about marital and personal problems to 113,006 service families.
Obtaining suitable housing for 116,814 dependent GI families.

Despite the enormous scope of these activities, the USO is even better known for the millions of cups of hot coffee it has served and the topflight entertainment it has taken to our armed services in all corners of the globe.

More than 20 million veterans of World War II and the Korean war have seen these shows. Playing before audiences ranging in size from 15 to 15,000, they have been put on everywhere from the jungles of China-Burma-India, to the "cow pasture" circuit in Normandy. More than 700 times every day and night, the curtain rose on USO shows in even the most inaccessible spots on earth—the Aleutians, distant Arctic bases, Greenland, Iceland, Labrador; in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa and all Pacific outposts; in Turkey, in Greece and elsewhere in the Middle East; in Germany, France, Italy, England, Spain, and throughout the rest of Europe; all over north Africa, our scattered bases in the Caribbean, in Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone.

In all, the USO has put on 457,263 performances for our armed services in the 20 years of its existence. Its entertainers have performed for an aggregate audience of approximately 240 million GI's. A Broadway show would have to run continuously for 1,100 years to play before so many people.

At present, the USO is staging more than 2,000 of these productions annually for GI audiences of approximately one million.

Mr. Speaker, to today's cold war it is vitally important that we keep the curtains rising on these shows, for they are one of the piers upon which our military morale rests.

Human Touch in the Department of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have been closely connected with the operations of the Department of the Interior for a number of years.

I am delighted to report to my colleagues that since January 20, there have been changes at the Department of the Interior indicating that we may hereafter look to that Department for the highest type of government administration. These changes have been and are being wrought by our former colleague, the recently confirmed Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, who is applying his well-known energy, his superior intelligence, and his excellent judgment to the objective of building a government department of which we may all be proud.

Secretary Udall on taking office realized at once that he must have the support of the more than 50,000 employees in the Department of the Interior if he were to succeed in his determination to improve the operation of the Department. He also appreciated that recognition of the skills and abilities of this great army of dedicated public servants was essential to gaining their support.

According to local news reports, on the third day of his regime, Secretary Udall issued a call for and met with as many employees of the Department as could crowd into Interior's big auditorium. At that time he promised Interior employees that working with him would be an exciting experience and an adventure.

We in the new administration at Interior want employees with imagination and new ideas—

He told them:

We need workers who are bold enough to question us on our ideas. We value this type of employee far more than the clock watcher and the timesaver.

I was delighted also to learn from press and radio and television reports of February 2 that Secretary Udall is expanding even further the use of the effective human touch in dealing with and inspiring the Department employees. He has instituted a program of calling small groups of workers personally to his office and talking to them about the problems involved in their particular jobs.

As a guide to his objective in maintaining a new and closer liaison with Interior employees, Secretary Udall makes reference to the statements made by President Kennedy in his state of the Union message about our distinguished Federal civil service. In this connection I append for ready reference the inspiring words of the Chief Executive relating to employees of the executive department:

We have found it full of honest and useful public servants—but their capacity to act decisively at the exact time action is needed has too often been muffled in the morass of committees, timidities, and fictitious theories which have created a growing gap between decision and execution, between planning and reality. In a time of rapidly deteriorating situations at home and abroad, this is bad for the public service and particularly bad for the country; and we mean to make a change.

I here pledge myself and my colleagues in the Cabinet to a continuous encouragement of initiative, responsibility, and energy

in serving the public interest. Let every public servant know, whether his post is high or low, that a man's rank and reputation in this administration will be determined by the size of the job he does, and not by the size of his staff, his office, or his budget. Let it be clear that this administration recognizes the value of daring and dissent—that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change. Let the public service be a proud and lively career. And let every man and woman who works in any area of our National Government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and honor in future years: "I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need."

Responsibilities of the Director of the Food-for-Peace Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the appointment by President Kennedy of our former colleague, George McGovern, as Special Assistant to the President, Director of the food-for-peace program, brought favorable reaction throughout the country, and particularly among the Members of the House of Representatives.

The ability, the vision, the courage, and his excellent experience, qualifies George McGovern for this important and responsible position, and in making this humane program, instituted by President Kennedy, a success.

The President recently demonstrated his great interest in the use of our agricultural abundance overseas by defining the duties of Director McGovern in an Executive order, and an accompanying memorandum to the heads of executive departments, both of which I include in my remarks:

EXECUTIVE ORDER AMENDING PRIOR EXECUTIVE ORDERS TO PROVIDE FOR THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Whereas American agricultural abundance offers a unique opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way, and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples around the world; and

Whereas exports of farm products are of great importance to the domestic economy, furnishing approximately 11 percent of total farm income; and

Whereas many Government functions and activities relate to the movement overseas of agricultural products and commodities, and a number of Government agencies have responsibilities in connection with these activities; and

Whereas it is of fundamental importance that we have a national food policy directed toward using our agricultural abundance as a national asset to meet foreign policy objectives;

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Executive Order No. 10900 of January 5, 1961 (26 F.R. 143), headed "Administration of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended," is hereby amended by renumbering sections 6 and 7 thereof as sections 7 and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 5 the following new secton 6:

"SEC. 6. Director of the food for peace program: Subject to the direction of the President, the Director of the food for peace program (provided for in a letter of the President bearing the same date as this order) shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and coordination of the functions hereinabove delegated or otherwise assigned to officers or agencies of the Government. The foregoing provisions of this section shall not be construed as terminating any delegation or other assignment of function made by other sections of this order."

Sec. 2. Executive Order No. 10893 of November 8, 1960 (25 F.R. 10732), headed "Administration of mutual security and related functions," is hereby amended by adding at the end of part I thereof a new section III, reading as follows:

"SEC. III. Director of the food for peace program: Subject to the direction of the President, the Director of the food for peace program shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and coordination of the functions under section 402 of the act (22 U.S.C. 1922). The foregoing provisions of this section shall not be construed as superseding any delegation or other assignment of function made by the act or by other sections of this order."

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1961.*

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1961.

I have today issued an Executive order relating to the duties of the Director of the food for peace program. This order amends Executives Orders 10893 and 10900, providing for the administration of the mutual security and related functions and of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, respectively. It provides that the Director of the food for peace program shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and coordination of the functions under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, as well as those functions under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 which are delegated by Executive Order No. 10893. These provisions of law deal with the use of American agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

The purpose of this memorandum is to describe further the role of the Director of the food for peace program, who will be located in the Executive Office of the President.

American agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples all around the world. We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity. We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad. Humanity and prudence, alike, counsel a major effort on our part.

Many Government functions and activities relate to the oversea movement of agricultural commodities and products of the United States. It is important that responsibility for coordination of all these efforts be centralized so that they can become more meaningful—a more useful instrument of our foreign policy, and more efficient.

Accordingly, I expect to look to the food for peace Director, working under my direction and with the Secretaries of State and Agriculture in particular, to exercise affirmative leadership and continuous supervision over the various activities in this field, so that they may be brought into harmonious relationship.

The most immediate task which I have asked the Director to undertake is that of conducting an intensive review of all these activities and considering possible improvements in them. He will communicate to me the results of this review and his recommendations for improvement, including recommendations for such legislative changes as may be necessary. I have asked the food for peace Director to consider very carefully the intimate relationships between our foreign agricultural activities and other aspects of our foreign-assistance program and to develop the necessary programs and policies in coordination with the Mutual Security Coordinator.

I know that in all of his endeavors the Director will have your full support and cooperation.

This memorandum shall be published in the Federal Register.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 4, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, Feb. 4, 1961)

The Rules Committee enlargement from 12 to 15 (see three preceding newsletters) was a victory for Speaker RAYBURN and the radical Democratic House leadership. Liberal (radical) domination of the Rules Committee assures quicker and easier programing of the President's program for House consideration. The close vote, 217 to 212 (for: 195 Democrats, 22 Republicans; against: 64 Democrats, 148 Republicans) also heralds endless close battles on the House floor over the controversial issues, particularly since the administration and the House leadership pressured many Members to vote for the change. It was a historic debate. Only 4 Members of the 437 Members were absent (there are 2 vacancies; 2 Members left hospital beds to be present).

Excerpts from debate include:

KILDAY, of Texas: "The Committee on Rules should consist of an uneven number of members to prevent the existing stalemate of the votes."

BROWN, of Ohio: "Misinformation, misrepresentation, falsehoods, and slander have been directed against the committee."

CURTIS, of Missouri: "The Rules Committee unfairly and improperly has been made to appear to be the whipping boy when the majority could at all times have worked their will and brought legislation to the floor. The Rules Committee does not possess the power and has not possessed the power to keep legislation off the floor of the House."

SMITH, of Virginia: "The ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) claim credit for all this ruckus that is going on now. Fifteen thousand bills were introduced in the last Congress and 90 percent died in House committees while the Rules Committee only neglected to report 10 percent of the bills that came before them. Why not wait until

the Rules Committee refused to give a rule to make a change, instead of now?"

AREND, of Illinois: "It is proposed here to convert a screening committee, a senior deliberative committee, into a rubber stamp committee for whatever our new President may propose, and subject to the dictates of the Speaker."

MILLER of New York (quoting President Kennedy from the day before): "'A President and a Congress who hold each other in mutual respect will not permit nor attempt any trespass'; in the absence of threats, promises, coercions, and distortions, I really believe this resolution would today be defeated if every Member followed the voice that whispers within him."

WALTERS, of Pennsylvania: "We must stand back of the President of the United States. We must not fail the United States and her leader in our vote today."

JUDD, of Minnesota: "I do not know when any President of the United States, whether new or old, was ever given any authority to make commitments or to announce programs that amount to commands to the legislative branch of the U.S. Government. The proposal has real dangers. It is a calculated assault on the whole committee system, which is the best yet devised for providing careful consideration and study of legislation."

HALLECK, of Indiana: "It is unwise, unjustified, untimely, unnecessary, and therefore insupportable. This present effort proceeds first on a false assertion and second on a false assumption. The false assertion is that in the last Congress the Committee on Rules did roadblock legislation. The false assumption is that we Republicans are going to be obstructionists just for obstruction's sake. This is not true."

RAYBURN, of Texas: "We have elected to the Presidency a new leader. He is going to have a program that he thinks will be in the interest of and for the benefit of the American people. Let us move this program. Let us be sure we can move it. And the only way that we can be sure that this program will move when great committees report bills, the only way it can move, in my opinion, my beloved colleagues, is to adopt this resolution today."

ALGER, of Texas: "The great danger is the zeal of the liberals who can and will change the ground rules of debate, through the closed or gag rule, waiving of points of order and prevention of amendment. I concede the right of the leadership to recommend the addition of members to the committee and the correctness of a 2-to-1 majority so that the majority party can control the programing of legislation, but I do oppose and protest the intent at this time of liberalizing the committee to become a rubberstamp of the administration's program. The House must do its work independently of the administration and Executive influence."

President Kennedy's state of the Union message and economic report form a two-part description of his outlook and intentions as Chief Executive. These two messages differ markedly from those of former President Eisenhower.

The state of the Union message was, at the least, as ominous and gloomy in portent as any of his campaign statements. There is no mistaking the President's excellent rhetoric and his grasp and command of language. There is, however, difficulty in analysis, as I see it, of his grasp and understanding of both our present situation, including the enormity of the tasks confronting us and of the basic structure of our economy. This, in turn, makes appropriate a reevaluation by each person of the role of Federal Government in our lives, both the executive and legislative branches of it. These messages lead to tremendous contradictions. Yes, there is "national peril and national opportunity" just as there is tremendous pain and unhappiness as against great opportunity, accomplishment, and joy in individual human life. So we come to the need for both understanding and the proper outlook. Many scenes in life are bleak or glowing with promise, depending on whose eyes behold them.

The generalities of the state of the Union message were spelled out in more detail in the economic report. Economic report excerpts which particularly provoke thought (and which we should study against my yardstick: (1) Is it a function of Federal Government; and (2) can we afford it?) include:

1. In the past 3½ years the gap between what we "can" produce and what we "do" produce has threatened to become chronic. Realistic aims and goals for 1961 are to reverse the downtrend in our economy, to narrow the gap of unused potential, to abate the waste, and misery, of unemployment, and at the same time to maintain reasonable stability of the price level.

Question: Is Federal Government intended either to be the judge of this matter or to prescribe its solution? Do we believe in Federal judgment and planning of our economy?

2. Annual growth rate of 3.5 percent in the Nation's total output is not high enough. Our potential growth rate can and should be increased.

Question: Isn't this inferring omniscient judgment and too heavy reliance on Federal subsidy as the solution?

3. Annual growth could have been greater; there could have been more employed; corporate profit could have been more. All this could have been accomplished with readily available manpower, materials, and machines without igniting inflation. How, when all Federal programs recommended more spending of money that first must be taken in taxes from people and industry?

4. The problem of unused potential will remain. True, and so it will always be; that's life and its challenge, not a reason for more Federal aid.

5. This administration is pledged to a Federal revenue system that balances the budget over the years of the economic cycle—yielding surpluses for debt retirement in times of high employment that more than offsets the deficits which accompany low levels of economic activity in poor years. Contradictory or false—even in years of our Nation's highest employment, Federal spending goes up, not down, and the possible surpluses evaporate. Indeed, our employment is highest now in history and yet President Kennedy proposes gigantic new spending.

6. Debt retirement at high employment contributes to economic growth by released savings for productive investment by private enterprise and State and local governments. This can be accomplished by reduced Federal spending, not increased spending as President Kennedy recommended.

7. The President then recommends Federal spending programs that will put money in people's hands to sustain consumer spending and increase aggregate demands now when the economy is slack. So here's the clash: Is it more sensible to tax, sending money to Washington where it is ladled out through Federal programs or return it to the people's hands by reduced Federal spending and tax cuts?

8. We must strengthen our school lunch program to make the best possible nutrition available to every school child, regardless of the economic condition of his family or local school district. Try the yardstick on this one: Is this indeed the role of the Federal Government?

9. This administration will not distort the value of the dollar in any fashion. This is a commitment. Contradiction: Increased Federal spending will incur deficits which create inflation which destroys the dollar.

My own further observations include: President Kennedy seems to lack a fundamental understanding of the free enterprise economic system. Federal Government is not responsible for our economy nor to feed, clothe and house us. Government, when government action is needed, is best closest to the people.

(2) Human rights and freedom are God given, not government given. Government aid presumes government control and the individual dependent on government aid is subject to control—this is not freedom.

3. The dominant problem of peace and survival is assured by a strong defense. A strong defense rests on a strong economy. Any weakening of our free competitive enterprise economic system endangers our very survival.

4. Federal Government judging needs and proposing solutions frequently is analogous to the "man rocking the boat while proclaiming there's a storm at sea."

5. Arthur Schlesinger, Presidential assistant, provides a clue to the President's thinking perhaps in his stated belief that "a welfare state is the best defense against communism, and a welfare state is one that provides basic elements for its citizens such as food, clothing, shelter, education, and opportunity." My interpretation is the reverse. The welfare state is communism, which is a Socialist state.

6. President Kennedy's criticism of our ills might well be directed at his own party which has controlled all legislation the last 6 years.

Legislative Program for Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1961, I had the privilege of addressing the membership of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C. The following is a copy of the address which I delivered:

Chairman Al Hartnett, Mr. Dick Carter, Mr. Ken Peterson, and members of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, I am pleased to accept your invitation to address you at this conference on legislation and civil rights.

Only the affection for my good friend, Ken Peterson, your legislative director and the high esteem in which I hold your union could induce me, a New Yorker, to plow through 18 inches of snow, when traveling was banned and the roads impassable, to come to Washington to speak to you on these vital subjects. The beautiful snow blanketing our city and the District of Columbia reminds me of an old Italian saying which my mother used to recite, "When the snow melts, the garbage is seen."

The snow which has accumulated during the past 8 years has melted and we see the garbage, refuse, and offal underneath. In his valedictory speech, President Eisenhower spread a blanket of white snow over the activities of the past 8 years. He pointed out the seemingly great progress that was made during the past 8 years, the prosperity which we seemingly enjoy, and the security which surrounds us. President John Kennedy, in his state of the Union address pointed out what lay underneath the blanket

of snow and jolted us from our smug complacency and the feeling of self-satisfaction.

The snow having melted, we find that today we are now faced with 5½ million without jobs, with 1 million searching for work for more than 4 months, and over 500,000 having exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits, bankruptcies have reached the highest level since the great depression, housing starts in 1960 were 400,000 less than 1959. One-eighth of those without jobs include the unemployed in depressed areas, the recent graduates unable to use their talents, and those unskilled workers laid off in the automobile, apparel, metal, and machinery industries. While construction is off and profits falling, consumer prices are rising. This paradox is brought about not by competitive commodities, but by those commodities made by those quasi-monopolistic industries who raise their unit prices and charge high profit differentials when their plants are not in full operation. High wages are not the cause of the paradoxical situation.

As legislators, we have duties to perform. We cannot remain idle in the hope that economic forces unaided by Government will solve our problems. The great depressions prove that laissez faire will not work in our present economy. We, who take pride in calling ourselves liberals recognize that immediate action is necessary for the preservation of our ideals, the promotion of our economy, and the welfare of our Nation. President Kennedy, during the campaign, talked of the new frontiers. The new frontiers in America are our cities and not the space beyond. Over 130 cities in the United States have populations over 100,000. Twelve years ago, Congress declared our goal to be a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family. Today we still have 25 million living in substandard housing, we still have 19 States without minimum wage laws, we still have 9½ million senior citizens over 65 years of age with incomes of less than $1,000 per year. We have 15 States which have major areas with more than 6 percent chronic unemployment. We still have approximately 2 million students whose education is impaired because of lack of funds or because of lack of educational facilities. There are many other areas of activity, but I wish today to discuss five of the most essential subjects for which we prayerfully seek legislative action:

1. Minimum wage from $1 to $1.25, and to extend coverage.
2. Aid to depressed areas.
3. Federal aid to housing.
4. Federal aid to education.
5. Medical care for our aged under social security.

The first two deal with preserving and improving our purchasing power; the second two, promoting, developing, and preparing for our future; and the last, taking care of our workers in the twilight of their careers.

MINIMUM WAGE

One of the great issues to confront Congress this year is the increase in minimum wage and the extension of coverage. The only thing that money cannot buy is poverty. The objective of minimum wage law is to insure a minimum standard of living necessary for the health, efficiency, and general well being of the workers. What is our present situation with respect to the minimum wage law?

Today there are 7.6 million families and single individuals with under $2,000 a year. At the present minimum wage, with a 40-hour week, a worker before taxes earns $2,080 per year. The Labor Department estimates that a family of four requires $4,680 per year to have a modest, but adequate standard of living.

Approximately 20 million American workers are denied the protection of the minimum wage law in any respect. On a State level, we find 19 States have no minimum wages whatsoever.

Five States have provisions for wage boards, but they have not acted. Arkansas, whose legislators inspired the Landrum-Griffin bill, has a minimum wage law for skilled labor of 16 cents an hour. Kentucky has a minimum wage law of 40–50 cents per hour. Ohio, which people believe is a progressive State, has a minimum wage of 70 cents per hour for hotels and restaurants, and 27½ cents an hour for laundries, and $11–$15 per week for beauty parlors. Only 11 States have minimum wage laws equal to Federal standards. Therefore, 39 States of our Union have substandard wage provisions. The States have failed to act in this area and it behooves us on a Federal level to fill the vacuum.

Excluded from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act are all our domestic workers, the employees in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; 97 percent of employees in the retail trades; 80 percent in the services as in hotels, restaurants, and laundries; 56 percent in construction, although by bargaining arrangements, they can take care of themselves; 34 percent in finance, insurance, and real estate; 30 percent in wholesale trade.

What I have said I believe demonstrates that we do need a Federal minimum wage law, increasing wages and extending coverage.

What are the prospects of success in this Congress, and why will there be opposition?

A Federal minimum wage law with extended coverage to 8 million as in the Roosevelt bill, or even 3½ million people, will equalize the competitive advantages which Southern States and less progressive States possess by reason of low wages. It is my contention that the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill was not inspired by a desire for reform of union democracy, but because the Republicans who favored industry and the southern Democrats believed that by passing the Landrum-Griffin bill, it would prevent the interference with the industrialization of the South. These States will fight to maintain their economic advantages enjoyed by them because of low wages, no compulsory workmen's compensation laws, and no provisions for rehabilitation of injured workers. A Federal minimum wage law in agriculture will exercise and wipe out the exploitation of migrant labor and Mexican braceros, whose numbers now reach 1,300,000; 800,000 migrant workers, and one-half million Mexican braceros.

We will hear many cries of anguish by the opponents of increasing minimum wages. They will cry out that an increase in minimum wages will bring about inflation, cause unemployment, and bankrupt industries. History and experience belie their complaints.

A study of the Department of Labor made in 1954 showed that the increase of minimum wage to 75 cents in 1950 did not cause unemployment. Rather it retarded it. It demonstrated that the increase to 75 cents per hour from 1938 to 1951 brought about an increase in the level of wages by 171 percent; whereas in high wage employment, the increase was 121 percent, and the increase in manufacturing wages increased by 148 percent. This report showed no loss of employment and very few bankruptcies, even in the South. The U.S. Department of Labor reported that the rise from 75 cents to $1 per hour did not result in an increase in the consumer price level, nor the wholesale price level. A study at Cornell showed that the increase to $1 per hour did not contribute to price inflation.

What are the prospects for passage? We must take guidance from the vote on the Trimble bill to expand the Rules Committee. This is an indication of things to come. Twenty-two Republicans voted to expand the Rules Committee, and the measure passed by a vote of 217 to 212. Last year when the minimum wage bill was being considered, 27 Republicans voted against the Kitchin-Ayres amendment to the Roosevelt bill. I don't expect that we can get more votes unless we conduct our campaign more intelligently, and we must adopt measures and provisions which will not antagonize a segment of Congressmen. We must make haste slowly in this field. It is more important, in my opinion, that we obtain extended coverage rather than the increased minimum. I am concerned more with increasing the pay of the lowest paid workers than increasing the minimum wage in the industries now covered.

You, gentlemen, have a job to do. You cannot expect Congressmen to follow you blindly. The closeness of the election indicates the sentiment of the people and its conservatism. Your job and your function is to convince the uncertain with facts and figures, to destroy the arguments of inflation, unemployment, and high prices with historical experience. You cannot rely upon the blind faith that Congressmen will follow for the sake of following.

FEDERAL AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Tied in with minimum wages is Federal aid to depressed areas. Fifteen States have major areas of unemployment. Many other States, approximately 20 in number, have minor areas of unemployment with surplus of labor. Loss of industry to other States, automation, depletion of resources, and vicious foreign competition have created unemployment and depressed areas. West Virginia, parts of Connecticut, and parts of Pennsylvania have suffered tremendously. This problem is one of the great challenges of the 87th Congress. In the 86th Congress, we passed S. 722, but President Eisenhower vetoed it. On four occasions, Republicans defeated aid to depressed areas. Last year the Senate sustained the President's veto by a vote of 45 to override and 39 against. No two-thirds vote was forthcoming. This year we can be confident there will be no veto.

We will have a great opportunity then to carry out the intent of the Employment Act of 1946, which prescribes maximum employment, production and purchasing power. President Kennedy has already taken affirmative action. He has ordered former Congressman George McGovern, administrator of his food program, to use our abundance and surplus to feed our indigent and underfed.

We look forward to providing a revolving fund for private projects in industrial and rural areas, to enhance industrial expansion and provide job opportunities. We, progressives, are dedicated to the proposition that all Americans should have a chance to share the national wealth. I am happy to be able to continue my support for this program of aid to depressed areas.

FEDERAL AID TO HOUSING

The new frontiers of America are our cities. The 1960 census indicates that 130 cities in the United States have populations of 100,000 or more. My own city has reached a population of 8½ million. The most important problem in our cities is housing. Today we have 25 million people living in substandard housing. We need 2 million housing units a year, single-family housing, and multiple dwellings. Substandard housing means soaring rates of crime, juvenile delinquency, ill health, and a breakdown in moral and social standards.

The history of the past 8 years in housing is deplorable. In 1960 we had 1,200,000 housing starts, 400,000 less than 2 years ago. It is ironic that we in the cities who pay the major portion of the income tax are denied

public housing by those States which receive grants-in-aid at almost equal to their income tax contributions. We, in New York, pay 20 percent of income taxes, and together with Illinois and California and Pennsylvania, we contribute 42 percent of all the tax collections, and we are denied by short-sighted Representatives the right to live in decent housing.

Two years ago, after two Presidential vetoes, the Congress approved 37,000 public housing units at a cost of $18½ million. Opponents of the public housing program said it would bankrupt our country. Our Commodity Credit Corporation, whose funds are derived from income taxes and congressional appropriations, pays $700 million annually to store our surplus grain, and no Republican or Representatives of agricultural States cry out that this outflow is bankrupting our Nation.

The liberals or the progressives have proposed a 10-year program to restore our cities, provide for a balanced suburban development, eliminate our blight and our slums, and to provide for a comprehensive transportation program, including bus, rail transit, commuter railroads, as well as highway programs and construction of airports.

The benefits of increased housing are apparent. It means employment for the tradesman, the plasterer, the electrician, the carpenter, the plumber, the appliance dealer, the architect, the surveyor, and the lawyer.

With a President who favors housing for sales and rentals, who recognizes the need for college housing and housing for the elderly, who recognizes that Fannie May can pump prime the economy, who will not be veto happy, we are confident that we will succeed in this important area.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

One of the great battles of the 87th Congress will be in the field of Federal aid for education. Our Nation has been founded on the principle that an educated electorate is a selective electorate. Our Bill of Rights, with its freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press will have very little meaning if our people are uneducated. We recognize in the face of world competition, that we must stimulate our educational processes to develop scientists, educators, the economists, and the artists to compete with less endowed but more aggressive nations.

Little doubt exists that many States have not fulfilled their obligations to provide educational facilities and opportunities. The high cost of construction, the unattractive teachers' salaries, as compared to blue collar workers, have discouraged localities and States to expand their facilities. Our educational system has been falling apart. Since 1946, State indebtedness has increased by 500 percent, local government by 200 percent, and Federal Government by less than 10 percent. Federal matching funds are granted for highways, hospitals, and welfare. No matching funds are provided for educational facilities. Consequently, States spend their limited funds where they can find matching funds from our Federal Government.

From a selfish point of view, we, in the State of New York, because of the small allocation to New York State, would oppose Federal funds for school construction. But we in New York feel that we are part of a nation. If we provide funds for school construction in our own State, we should not be penalized by not being able to divert it to supplement our teachers' salaries. We should obtain a measure which will give the State discretion to allocate its funds for school construction or to supplement teachers' salaries in order to attract competitive schoolteachers.

The cry has been raised that Federal funds will lead to Federal control of education. Previous history refutes such a contention and belies such fears. Since 1861, under the Morrell Act, we have had land-grant colleges in every one of our States teaching agriculture. In those grants there have been provisions for teachers' salaries, and never have we had criticism of Federal control in the operation of land-grant colleges. Federal funds are granted for teachers' salaries in federally impacted areas and no criticism has been raised against it. School lunch programs have been afforded our youth and no Federal interference in its operation is discernible. GI educational benefits have been granted without complaint that Federal interference is present. So much so, that the veterans of Korea are clamoring for similar benefits. The complaint of Federal interference is baseless from the point of view of past history.

Education has become a matter of highest national concern and responsibility as vital to freedom's future as the national defense program. Last year, the House passed a bill, H.R. 10128, by a vote of 206 to 189. This bill died because the House Rules Committee refused to allow the appointment of a joint Senate-House conference committee to resolve the differences between the Senate and House bills. Now that the Rules Committee has been liberalized, we expect no such difficulty, and we, liberals, are confident that we shall get an adequate education bill.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

A government moral fiber is judged by the regard it has for its youth, its sick and its aged. Medical care for the aged is a test of our moral fiber. The Forand bill, which liberals embrace and espouse, provided medical care for the aged under social security. This bill is an insurance plan, which is feasible, inexpensive and humane. It is not a giveaway. It is grafted upon a social security program which is financially solvent and derives its revenues from joint contributions from employer and worker while the worker is employed. It gives medical care after retirement and maintains a worker's freedom of choice of doctor. This bill was rejected by the Ways and Means Committee upon the recommendation of the Republican administration and by the vehement opposition to it by the AMA. A so-called medical care program was approved, which depends upon the cooperation of States which have demonstrated their indisposition and disinclination to contribute which requires a fee payment by persons over 65 and the payment by the aged persons of the first $250 of medical expense above $250. Thereafter 80 percent of the cost would be paid by the administration. Public welfare recipients need make no contributions. Persons with incomes of $2,500 annually would be ineligible. In view of the fact that 60 percent of our 16 million persons over 65 years of age have incomes of less than $1,000 per annum, this plan was a cruel hoax.

President Kennedy has recommended that men as well as women be eligible at the age of 62 for benefits, but that their benefit payments be proportionately reduced. The success of the liberal proposal depends, in my opinion, on the influence of the President on the members of the Ways and Means Committee and upon the Senators. With assistance from the public and with the President going to the airwaves to advise the people to call upon the recalcitrant Members to support a Forand-type bill, we have hope of success. With the Rules Committee reorganized, a rule permitting floor amendment can be acted upon in the House of Representatives, the House may be able to work its will.

I do not talk of other liberal programs, such as immigration, civil rights, migratory and Mexican labor unemployment, insurance with dependency benefits, or foreign aid. This is part of our program. We are on the way to new frontiers and the Federal Government will play its role in a diminishing world with the programs to provide for expanding human problems.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Nehemiah 2: 20: *The God of heaven, He will prosper us; therefore we His servants will arise and build.*

Eternal God, our Father, in this moment of prayer, may we be inspired with a resolute determination to have a larger part in bringing to a victorious issue mankind's struggle to build the kingdom of freedom and peace, of justice and righteousness.

Gird us with the faith and fortitude of the Founding Fathers who bequeathed to us the liberties which we enjoy and charged us with the responsibility of safeguarding the great traditions of our beloved country.

May the Members of this Congress be sensitive and responsive to the needs of humanity and find their hearts enlarged with a vision of the dawning of a better day for men and nations everywhere.

We pray in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 153. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]; the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]; the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]; the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]; and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; members to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, February 6 to February 12, 1961.

APPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE OF DR. JAMES T. RALPH OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State have been proud that President Kennedy has called upon a number of Californians to serve our country in the new administration.

Some have previously served California in the administration of Gov. Edmund G. Brown. One of those whom the Governor least wanted to lose has just been nominated by the President as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Agricultural Stabilization. He is Dr. James T. Ralph. Before coming to Washington Dr. Ralph served as deputy director and as director of the California Department of Agriculture.

During his service with the California Department of Agriculture Dr. Ralph worked closely with the members of the State board of agriculture, including the president of the board, Mr. John S. Watson, a dairy farmer in my district. Working together, they have been successful in changing the orientation of the department from that of a policing agency to an agency serving agriculture in the public interest.

Dr. Ralph has been educated for service to agriculture at colleges and universities in three States: Tennessee State College, Iowa State University, and Stanford University. He has experience working with agriculture in Tennessee, in Iowa, in Kentucky, and in California. These represent three of the main agricultural regions of our country.

Dr. Ralph is a proponent of greater bargaining power for farmers and of returns on labor, on investment, and on management in agriculture equal to returns on similar skills and similar capital in other industries. In California he especially has been known for his support for self-help marketing agreements and orders, and for bargaining associations. Under the California self-help approach farmers design, vote in, administer, and pay for their own regulatory programs to solve the economic problems of their industry without cost to the taxpayers as such. His program in California was well supported and participated in by leaders of many commodity organizations and of both political parties.

At the age of 35, Dr. Ralph is one of the ablest agricultural administrators in the country. He has the ability and knowledge and also the energy to face up to the great task ahead of working with Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to help American farmers attain their rightful share of the national income.

Californians are proud to be able to give the United States a man of such qualifications for the great work which must be done. Members of the California congressional delegation from farm areas have united in our support of Dr. Ralph, confident that he will render outstanding service to agriculture and to his country.

RETIREMENT OF MR. A. T. BURCH AS ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article appearing in the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the functioning of our democracy there is a close relationship between those in the public offices and those who carry an equal public responsibility as members of the press.

For 15 years A. T. Burch was the associate editor and chief editorial writer of the Chicago Daily News. It would be hard to overmeasure his influence on public opinion in the second city in America, and indeed of all the Middle Western section.

Under his direction the editorial page of the Chicago Daily News seemed always to be fair. If Mr. Burch presented one viewpoint in one of his editorials, and it was in a field of controversy, invariably he gave space to a columnist or to writers of letters from subscribers to present an opposite viewpoint. The result was that the readers of the editorial page of the Chicago Daily News under the direction of Mr. Burch were left with the feeling that Mr. Burch was not attempting to force his own ideas upon them, but having expressed his own thinking afforded equal opportunity of expression to those in disagreement so that the readers, being informed, could make their own conclusions.

During 15 years Mr. Burch personally interviewed the candidates for the public offices in Chicago, on the local, the State, and the National level, and it was largely on his judgment that the recommendations of the Chicago Daily News were based.

I never knew a more conscientious newspaperman nor a finer gentleman. This does not mean that I was always in agreement with his decisions, but I felt that Mr. Burch went about his work with a conscientious desire to be fair to the candidates, to the public, and to the philosophy of his newspaper, which was independent Republican.

During the period of his editorship, the Chicago Daily News, while owned by a publisher at one time mentioned among the Republican presidential possibilities, was instrumental in exposing large thefts of the public moneys by the then Republican State treasurer of Illinois, and on two occasions supported the Democratic nominee for Governor when that seemed to Mr. Burch and his newspaper in the public interest.

On February 1 Mr. Burch retired from active service after a long career of dedicated service. I think it is proper that the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States should pause in its legislative deliberations to note his retirement. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, at this point I include an article from the Chicago Daily News announcing the retirement of A. T. Burch, and I ask that any of my colleagues who desire to pay tribute to Mr. Burch may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks:

ASSOCIATE EDITOR BURCH RETIRES

A. T. Burch has retired as associate editor and chief editorial writer of the Chicago Daily News.

The widely known and respected journalist has directed this paper's lively and provocative editorial page for more than 15 years.

His association with the Daily News will continue, however.

Burch will write a weekly column of fact and opinion and will also serve as a consultant to the paper.

He will be succeeded February 1 as associate editor by John M. Johnston, a longtime colleague on the Daily News editorial page staff.

Johnston, a veteran newspaperman, is former city editor and chief editorial writer for the Cleveland Press and onetime assistant managing editor of Business Week magazine.

He also worked with Burch at the Press where the latter preceded him as chief editorial writer. Burch also served as executive editor and associate editor of the Cleveland paper.

The two came to the Daily News in 1945.

"A. T."—as Burch is known—started his newspaper career before World War I as a reporter on the Topeka Daily Capital.

Besides his nearly 20 years with the Cleveland Press (where he started as a reporter), Burch was an editorial writer on the Topeka State Journal, a financial reporter on the New York Tribune and a special correspondent in Europe for the Capper publications.

In his years on the Daily News, A. T. (for Angelus Teague) has authored some of this paper's most incisive and provocative editorials.

He insists that his editorial writers steer clear of the rarefied air of the ivory tower (an occupational hazard) by keeping in close touch with the men who report the news and with the men who make the news.

Thus Burch, Johnston and other Daily News editorial page staffers are widely known among public figures—in politics, industry, and the arts.

A fighter for press freedom, A. T. regularly writes and lectures on the subject.

"We do not conceive of the freedom of the press as a privilege conferred on our trade," says Burch. "It is the public's right we are defending."

And he is a stanch believer in a newspaper's duty to investigate.

"The noblest services of American newspapers to their readers have been their exposures of public corruption and politically protected crime," he says.

"There has not been a year when American newspapers have not exposed and destroyed conspiracies against the public purse and the public safety."

Of his successor, Burch said:

"I should like to express my personal pride and pleasure in the fact that John M. Johnston is to succeed me as associate editor of the Chicago Daily News.

"When I joined the Daily News in 1945, I was asked if there were, anywhere in the United States, a man I specifically desired to strengthen the Daily News editorial page staff.

"I said then, and I still say, that I value John Johnston's abilities in this field above those of any other newspaperman I know anywhere in the country."

Mrs. CHURCH. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentle lady from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand here today to take merited cognizance of the retirement from the associate editorship of the Chicago Daily News of Mr. A. T. Burch, whose understanding of local, State, National—and, in fact, international—happenings and trends has made him for some years one of those who has wielded great influence in molding public opinion and obtaining constructive action in our great Chicago area.

The 13th District of Illinois, which it is my privilege to represent, is fortunate, also, in being able to claim Mr. Burch as a constituent. All who know him and who have had the privilege of his quiet counsel would, I know, wish to join me today in expressing our appreciation to him and of him for the part that he has played so long and with such distinction in our community.

Mr. Burch was born and educated in Kansas—taking both his bachelor's and master's degrees from Washburn College in Topeka. His first newspaper assignment was with the Topeka Daily Capital. Seeking wider activity, he next served with the New York Tribune. He became special correspondent in Europe for the Capper publications before returning to Topeka as editorial writer for the Topeka State Journal. From 1927 to 1945, the Cleveland Press was fortunate to have him on its staff, first as reporter, then as chief editorial writer, executive editor, and finally as associate editor.

It was in 1945 that Mr. Burch came to Chicago as associate editor for the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. Burch has taught as well as practiced journalism. He served first as instructor and then as assistant professor at Washburn College; and later expressed his interest in training young journalists at Western Reserve University and at Fenn College in Cleveland.

Mr. Burch, whose modesty is equal to his acumen, would himself not call attention to his war service. His friends, however, would tell you of his active participation in the Army in the First World War, in which he was, in fact, wounded in the Meuse-Argonne offensive.

In recounting this activity, Mr. Speaker, we who are proud to be friends of Mr. Burch would not seem to indicate in any way that, in relinquishing his associate editorship with the Chicago Daily News, he is retiring from activity. Such withdrawal would be impossible to one whose pattern of life and thought has shown a zeal for discovering truth; for reporting that truth as he saw it, impartially and objectively; and for seeking, on the basis of what he believed to be truth, a solution of reason and hope for the many problems that hold this troubled world in seeming endless grip.

We have taken this time to write into our annals a permanent record of a philosopher-friend whose retirement would be marked for us with even more signal regret were we not sure that his friends and all in his community to whom he has given unselfishly of his time, his experience, and his capacity, will continue to be able to benefit from his interest and counsel.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Illinois in paying deserved tribute to A. T. Burch upon his retirement as associate editor of the Chicago Daily News. After a decade and a half of outstanding service in the field of journalism.

Possessed of a keen mind and deep understanding of civic, social, and political problems, Mr. Burch's contribution to the countless thousands of readers of the Chicago Daily News has been one of immeasurable scope and value. Few who have known him over the years failed to recognize his broad knowledge of the affairs of government. Perhaps his greatest asset is his ability to analyze people in public life without tempering his personal judgment because of any basic disagreement in his own philosophy or conviction.

It is my sincere hope that his future years will be abundant in good health and happiness.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in extending my every good wish to A. T. Burch in the years of his retirement. He is a fine man and has had the respect even of those who did not always agree with him. I am a Democrat, and I am from Chicago. I guess everyone in the House knows that. When it comes to doing something for Chicago, there are no party lines and from the bottom of my heart I have appreciated the support for our legislation for Chicago that has been given us from both sides of the aisle. As a distinguished editor, Mr. Burch has given 15 years of his life to serving Chicago, according to his views and the policy of his newspaper, and I am happy to join in this tribute to him.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend his remarks my colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, has commented to this House, on the retirement of A. T. Burch, associate editor of the Chicago Daily News, a note of appreciation for service to the community and State of Illinois.

I should like to add a short statement of acknowledgment and appreciation to Mr. Burch, who for the past 15 years served his paper and his community so ably.

Although the Chicago Daily News has mainly followed the Republican policy line in its endorsement of candidates and in its policies and platforms, we Chicago Democrats many times found friendship in Mr. Burch and an attentive ear to our aims and purposes and the willingness to hear both sides of a matter. Many times, as a result of his fairmindedness, Mr. Burch has practiced the right of editorial freedom with the result that some Democratic candidates and office holders received deserved words of praise for their outstanding ability and accomplishments. It is to Mr. Burch's credit that men such as our Governor, Otto Kerner, were applauded in editorial comment despite the Republican tendencies of his paper's publishers.

At a time when the Chicago newspapers and the government of the State of Illinois, county of Cook, and city of Chicago, seem to be polarizing toward opposite ends, and I and many of my Democratic colleagues on all levels of government in Illinois grieve the retirement of such a man as A. T. Burch from the newspaper scene of Chicago.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of mixed emotion that we of the Illinois delegation recently learned of the retirement of Mr. A. T. Burch, associate editor and chief editorial writer of the Chicago Daily News.

Just the thought of a famous newspaperman retiring refutes our belief in the immortality of the press, whose great names were not born to die. Yet, very few of his contemporaries remain on the active list—the others are in distant, marble-dotted fields, where silence lays to rest the old traditions of the press—able, beautiful and virtuous.

The many and varied experiences with politicians did not develop in him the attitude of the cynic. He learned the frailties of poor humanity the hard way—misplaced confidence in characters.

He knew the hard, fast rules of politics—loyalty to organization regardless of the dictates of reason. He saw the mighty in its ranks stoop to the smallness of their sordid aims and wicked ambition. He heard their cursing and mutterings at the world, in political defeat. He stood with his pen aloft wondering if he would complete the sentence that would result in drastic exposure. He became expert in discovering the phonies who used politics for self-aggrandizement. He could fathom the sincerity or shams and pretenses of the parties.

He developed the wisdom of recognizing true leadership in men. It restored his belief in human nature. He became a part of the careers of these great men. He gloried in inking this greatness with indelible words upon the public mind. He soothed his conscience in placing these leaders in their proper perspectives before the public eye.

He had learned so much by living apart from the satanic characters that he knew so well, that it was easy to see the good in other men, and build their careers in celebrity and power.

After many years of only newspaper titled importance as a toiler with soul and brain, stretching to the limit of his mental endurance, discretion and wit—our distinguished editor approaches the promised land of retirement—his heralded entry into the doom of the "newspaper morgue."

Sometimes, when I think of these men of the press who move across the public scene to write history, I wonder if, at

the end, whether most of them are facing debt and fighting anonymity.

We pray that our distinguished friend will enjoy his well-earned vacation from his former arduous duties and seek new and interesting horizons, with God's blessings.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to pay tribute to one of the truly great men of my State, Angelus T. Burch, associate editor and chief editorial writer of the Chicago Daily News, who retired on February 1, 1961.

Mr. Burch's journalistic record is long and full. He has always served in the interests and welfare of others. It is regrettable that he is retiring. I came to know Mr. Burch intimately as a member of the Chicago City Council and as a member of the Chicago Plan Commission from the time he came to Chicago from Cleveland 15 years ago.

Over the years, Mr. Burch has written a remarkable record of service to the readers of the Chicago Daily News and the people of Chicago in providing constructive editorials, and significantly selected reports on local, State, national, and international affairs.

Mr. Burch's newspaper career proves that he had the acumen of a statesman as well as a truly informed editorialist. He wrote and reported for the Topeka Daily Capital in 1917, was on the editorial staff of the New York Tribune in 1919. He was the instructor of journalism at Washburn College, Topeka, Kans., and later became assistant professor and head of the department of journalism at Washburn College.

Mr. Burch was a special correspondent in Europe for the Capper publications in 1924, and in that same year became a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Prior to coming to the Chicago Daily News, Mr. Burch was on the editorial staff of the Cleveland Press for 20 years.

Mr. Burch had a code which he stood by steadfastly in that he believed that the American people need up-to-date, reliable information media to keep abreast of happenings affecting their security and progress.

Angelus Burch was a dynamic leader in a score of public causes and skilled in bringing the newspaper guns to bear on such targets as presented themselves in civil corruption and moral wrong. As kindly overseer of his newspaper devotion there was reassurance and encouragement just in knowing that he was on the premises.

Life will be weaker and printer's ink lighter in the fact that Angelus Burch will no longer be at the keys of his typewriter.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the free press of the United States and the editorial independence and integrity that it has always maintained is one of our Nation's priceless assets. We as a nation have also been served by men of outstanding personal ability who have devoted themselves to careers in the field of journalism. Mr. A. T. Burch, retiring associate editor and chief editorial writer of the Chicago Daily News, ranks as one of the great journalists in the tradition of American newspapers.

Mr. Burch began his career with the Topeka Daily Capital and also served with the New York Tribune before becoming a European correspondent for the Capper publications. Upon his return he became an editorial writer on the Topeka State Journal and was also on the staff of the Cleveland Press for almost 20 years. In 1945 he became associate editor of the Chicago Daily News. In addition, Mr. Burch was instructor and later assistant professor and head of the department of journalism at Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.

As a lifelong resident of Chicago, I can attest to the tremendous civic accomplishments and great contributions to public service that A. T. Burch has championed through the editorial page of the Chicago Daily News. I join the many grateful citizens of the Chicago metropolitan area in thanking him for his devotion to high ideals and in wishing him health and happiness in the future.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement.

Pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. PATMAN, Texas; Mr. BOLLING, Missouri; Mr. BOGGS, Louisiana; Mr. REUSS, Wisconsin; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Michigan; Mr. CURTIS, Missouri; Mr. KILBURN, New York; Mr. WIDNALL, New Jersey.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement.

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 46, 87th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House:

Mr. PATMAN, Texas, chairman; Mr. EVINS, Tennessee; Mr. MULTER, New York; Mr. YATES, Illinois; Mr. STEED, Oklahoma; Mr. ROOSEVELT, California; Mr. ALFORD, Arkansas.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC OBJECTORS ON THE PRIVATE AND CONSENT CALENDARS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce the appointment of the following Members on the Democratic side on the Objectors Committee of the Private Calendar: the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

As Democratic members of the Objectors Committee on the Consent Calendar: the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL].

MAINTAIN INTEGRITY OF THE CAREER CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of information garnered in part, but by no means exclusively, from press reports I am forced to the reluctant conclusion that some shenanigans are going on in the executive branch with reference to civil service and the merit system.

I gather, for example, that the Post Office Department is putting pressure on the 15 regional operations directors whose jobs are under civil service to vacate their positions either by resignation, retirement, or the acceptance of demotion.

I gather that the Department has requested the Civil Service Commission to transfer these positions to schedule C classification—making them strictly political appointments—but that it has not seen fit to wait for action on this requested change in the rules before applying the more direct approach.

I gather also that there have been other less-publicized cases of high-ranking career civil service employees in the executive branch who have been the target of the revival of the spoils-system tactics in the form of resignation requests.

I gather from the same general sources that the Civil Service Commission has already consented to the designation of 25 additional schedule C positions in the Post Office Department, 14 of which were transferred from the competitive civil service with the result that present civil service personnel in these positions have been or may be reduced in grade or removed entirely—all without charges.

I gather that, despite the sweet talk about close cooperation of top management with employees at all levels in the Department of the Interior, an order has been issued which, whatever its purposes and motives, raises serious apprehensions among the Department personnel as to whether political considerations are to determine appointments and promotions in that Department. I refer to the order that all appointments and promotions in grade 5 and above must be approved by the Secretary's office.

I gather also that a freeze has been ordered on all promotions in the Post Office Department in grades above postal field service 4.

The present deplorable situation is, I must add, not without its humorous aspect. Such is the zeal of the eager

beaver patronage dispensers that a candidate for postmaster of the city of Washington, itself, has been selected and endorsed despite the fact that that position is presently occupied by a duly confirmed postmaster. This raises the question in my mind as to whether the next step will be a proposal to put all postmasters under schedule C.

I have today addressed a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I have been privileged to be a member for the past 6 years, directing these reports and allegations to his attention.

In thus writing the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I have in mind the statement which he made in a letter to the Clerk of the House under date of September 14, 1960, transmitting a committee report entitled, "Maintaining the Integrity of the Career Civil Service." I know that my able and distinguished chairman is completely devoted to this objective. In this letter the chairman said:

> It is deemed appropriate, also, to emphasize, reaffirm, and restate the functions of this committee to maintain and strengthen the merit system in the Federal Civil Service and to protect the rights of career civil servants. This report provides a record of existing safeguards and guarantees established in furtherance of the committee functions. It will serve as both a guideline and reminder of the restrictions which must be observed by executives in making necessary personnel adjustments. It will at the same time assure individual career employees that there will be no abridgment of their rights by reason of political or personnel patronage contrary to the merit system.

It is my purpose, as soon as the committee is constituted, to request a detailed investigation by the committee or a specially designated subcommittee as to the accuracy of the allegations cited above and particularly to determine whether the intent of Congress as expressed in civil service laws and regulations is being violated.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE]?

There was no objection.

MISSILE GAP

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of this House must share my admiration for the speed with which the New Frontiersmen succeeded in closing the missile gap they found such a threat to our security a few months ago.

When one pauses to consider what the Kennedy administration has accomplished in just 18 days in this vital area of our defense, it is nothing short of miraculous. In fact, the first 100 days of FDR's first administration pales into oblivion by comparison.

The American people now are assured that the Kennedy-McNamara team in this short period has closed the missile gap.

Excepting only the creation, I believe it is safe to say there is no parallel in recorded history for this amazing feat of accelerated research, development, and production.

Even allowing for admitted American know-how and production genius, it is almost unbelievable that so much could be accomplished by so few in so short a time.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I trust my colleagues in the House will join with me in a salute to the New Frontier. With this auspicious beginning, if I may be permitted to indulge in a cautious prediction, it would not surprise me to learn that in the next few days the alleged decline in U.S. prestige abroad—also the subject of much political discussion last fall—will suddenly skyrocket along with our missiles into spectacular new orbits.

ATTACK ON CIVIL SERVICE PROCEDURES

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] for what appears to be an attack on the civil service procedures that have been in existence for so long. For some strange reason the editorial writers of the newspapers have been very quiet. I have heard no rumblings from the Civil Service League or others who are supposed to be concerned about this matter. I think this is something that Members of the House on both sides of the aisle should look at very, very carefully, so that civil service employees will not be tampered with.

THE REPUBLICANS ARE 8 YEARS LATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to two speeches by Members of the House on the Republican side, about career men in the civil service. Of course, they are just building up a strawman to knock down. They are 8 years late. They must have been talking about what happened 8 years ago when former President Eisenhower took office, because certainly they went right through the Democrats. They took them out of office or transferred them to all parts of the country. I had one dear friend who was collector of internal revenue. They shipped him out to Minnesota thinking that he would resign, but he went out there and came back to Boston demoted. So the gentlemen must have been referring to what happened 8 years ago. They are 8 years late.

CIVIL SERVICE PROCEDURE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is not at all difficult to go along with the majority leader in this particular. We as Republicans are 8 years too late. We always make a mistake which helps his side. Whenever we happen to get in control we let the opposition stay in, and when you get in you kick every one of us out, the moment you reach a desk.

CIVIL SERVICE PROCEDURE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, I do not recall that the Republicans at any time screened everybody from grade 5 and up for political purposes as the present Secretary of the Interior is reported to be doing. If the gentleman can tell me of any instance in which the Republicans screened employees from grade 5 and up, in any department or agency, I wish he would tell me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. They instituted a promotion examination for supervisors in the Post Office. They were put on the list in accordance with the grades received, but they could not go any place. They had to go to the Republican State committee to get clearance. When anything like that happens, when a man has to go through the Republican committee, why, we Democrats could not stand that. We are purer than the Republicans.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman still has not cited an instance such as I have suggested.

ANTISATELLITE CAPABILITIES OF NIKE-ZEUS MISSILE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I would like to call to the attention of the House a crucial aerospace defense problem now facing these United States.

Our ideas about what makes a strong military defense have changed in revolutionary fashion these past few years.

We are becoming more deeply aware that a strategic air force second to none is not alone sufficient to provide the United States with the security that this country must have in these perilous days.

As Russia installs on the launching pad its 50th ICBM armed with a devastating nuclear warhead, even the promise of a powerful U.S. counterstriking force of ICBM's within the next 2 years does not meet the true dimension of the defense challenge that faces us.

Just increasing our ICBM and Polaris striking power—projects I support with all the vigor I can command—is not enough.

The time has come for the administration, Congress, the press, and our people to face the fact that the United States will struggle in a straitjacket if it does not parallel its retaliatory ICBM with an anti-missile-missile defensive weapon system against the ballistic blackmail of the Soviet Union.

Unless we have such a defense in being within the next 2 or 3 years, the United States will be wide open for another Pearl Harbor disaster—a disaster indescribable in terms of liberty, lives, and treasure.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need for this terrible possibility to come to pass—if we are ready to make the sacrifices which President Kennedy in his state of the Union message indicated he would seek of us all—for providence has blessed us with the precious time required to remedy this great defect in our overall military posture.

However, I must warn that time is growing critically short, and both the administration and Congress must make decisions and make them quickly, if we are to provide this Nation with an anti-missile-missile defense system that will not only meet the threat of today but the need of tomorrow.

The answer is the Nike-Zeus, the anti-missile missile which the Army today has brought to the stage of advanced development. This missile killer is the only answer now available to any nation of the free world wherewith to meet the threat of devastating nuclear-armed 18,000-mile-per-hour Soviet ICBM. There is no other defense weapons system now on a free world drawing board or in a research laboratory that can do the job. There is only the U.S. Nike-Zeus.

This Army antimissile missile is now slated for crucial final test in the Pacific this year. A complete three-stage Nike-Zeus, triggered by its highly complex radar tracking and control systems, will be fired from the Point Mugu, Calif., range soon.

This series of crucial trials, extending over 1961, will be climaxed early next year with actual battle tests between the nuclear-armed Nike-Zeus and our own Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

The Army's antimissile missile will be hurled from Kawajalein Island against the Air Force's ICBM fired from the west coast.

This momentous experiment is designed to demonstrate that the Nike-Zeus can intercept the 18,000-mile-per-hour Atlas and knock it out of the air—without detonating the cataclysmic nuclear warhead.

Scientists of the great Army-industry team are confident that this can be done. Tests at the White Sands, N. Mex., Proving Grounds progressively have proved the concept.

The final Pacific tests will also feature the extraordinary Zeus "radar brain" that guides the antimissile missile to its kill at hypersonic velocities.

Mr. Speaker, such a breakthrough in antimissile development is as fabulous and historic as the creation of the Atlas itself.

Working on this weapons system are the Army and such leaders of American industry as Western Electric Co., the Bell Telephone Laboratories, Douglas Aircraft, Thiokol, and Sperry Rand. Western Electric is the Nike-Zeus' prime contractor; Bell Telephone is in charge of research and design.

President Eisenhower's 1961 fiscal year budget proposed spending $287 million for continued Nike-Zeus research and development. That's approximately the same he proposed in his fiscal year 1962 budget submitted as he left office this year.

However, President Eisenhower's final budget failed to provide funds for starting limited production of the proved components of the Nike-Zeus system.

The vital decision to rectify that omission now faces President Kennedy, his advisers, and this Congress.

I particularly draw to the attention of this House the point that, to my knowledge, in this past decade of revolutionary progress in defense science and technology, no major American weapons system has suffered such restriction upon limited production of component parts—the Air Force's Atlas did not suffer this; nor the Navy's Polaris; not even the Army's Redstone.

The Army, in my opinion, has made a strong case for limited production of Nike-Zeus components at this time. This could be done, I am told, with the addition of less than $175 million to the present Army budget. These funds would get production underway and further advance final research and development work on the full weapons system.

Mr. Speaker, the starting of production of the Nike-Zeus immediately will buy the precious time that we need. If production is delayed, this country stands to lose months and maybe years in the race with Russia to create and bring to operational status the world's first anti-missile missile defense against ICBMs.

There are strong indications from within the Soviet Union that their anti-missile missile project has, and is now receiving, the highest military priority.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of this House to a dispatch as far back as November 22, 1960, by the United Press International, dateline London, which said—and I quote:

> Recently, reports reached here from behind the Iron Curtain suggesting that Russia is working with top priority and at top speed on an antimissile missile.

Our intelligence services, I am reliably informed, have definite evidence that the Soviets have been concentrating on such an antimissile missile project for a number of months.

In light of these facts, Mr. Speaker, we can come to no other conclusion than that the Soviets are now marshaling all their dictatorial might in order to surpass the United States and seize the world diplomatic and military initiative through perfection of this missile killer.

Should the Soviets be first to develop an antimissile missile and install it in defensive positions around the Soviet Union, the Kremlin will possess the power of political blackmail at the summit.

Should the Communists gain first and exclusive control of this weapon, they will command a "third dimension" in modern war. They will be in a position to contain our power effectively to retaliate, and they may throw the dice in the great gamble—they may launch a nuclear strike upon this Nation with an ICBM surprise attack.

This is a possibility that this Nation and the rest of the free world cannot countenance.

As the dedicated, hard-driving Chief of Army Research and Development, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, puts it, and I quote:

> We could find ourselves standing naked in a nuclear hailstorm. We must get busy; we must give this Nation and the free world the umbrella needed against this menace.

Again I quote this brilliant officer:

> We must face the fact that if we want a missile defense system in this decade Zeus is the only answer known to the free world. I would like to be able to hit enemy ICBM's on the launching pad. I'd like to hit them as they come out of the factory door. But today Zeus is the only practical system.

This defense problem is not an Army problem. It is a problem for the Nation. It is a problem we must solve—and quickly—if this Nation is to have a defense capability to meet the growing Soviet ICBM threat.

The editors of Army magazine stress this in their February edition devoted to an exhaustive analysis of the Zeus question. In the first of a series of articles, they report the views of Air Force Lt. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, commander of the North American Air Defense Command, as follows:

> Now our most immediate and pressing requirement in aerospace defense is for a counter to the intercontinental ballistic missile.

At the present time the most advanced project under way in this critical area is being conducted by the Army on the Nike-Zeus system.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am heartened to see general officers of two great services—the Air Force and the Army—helping to forward this vital defense system in the national interest. I find it refreshing to note there is no interservice rivalry apparent here, Mr. Speaker.

The lead article in Army further reflects Air Force General Kuter's view as follows:

In aerospace defense we stand on the edge of the sixties, facing the air-breathing threat of today, and looking forward to a tomorrow that holds the certainty of an ICBM threat, and not far distant, the requirement to defend against hostile satellites.

If this unsteadies you, look skyward.

With the launching by the United States of Samos—our latest reconnaissance satellite—on January 31, 1961, followed by the 7-ton sputnik heaved into orbit by the Soviet Union just 4 days later, the question of antisatellite defense demands immediate attention.

Could we, if necessary, blind the eyes of an enemy spy in the sky orbiting over the United States?

More specifically: Can Nike-Zeus be modified to extend its antimissile capabilities and become an antisatellite killer?

The answer to that crucial question lies in studies already made to determine if Zeus can provide this Nation with such antisatellite capability. These studies have shown that an antisatellite potential does exist in Nike-Zeus.

For example, the capability of tracking very small hypervelocity objects at great ranges, which the remarkable Zeus radars now have, is an essential element of such an antisatellite defense weapons system; and secondly, the capability of achieving extreme accuracy outside the earth's atmosphere, which again the Zeus now possesses, is an absolute requirement for antisatellite weapon defense.

A satellite, like an ICBM, has a predictable path. Satellite velocity is predictable. Satellites, like ICBMs, are susceptible to "kill."

The Nike-Zeus system has the advantage of being open ended; that is, a component of the system can be changed or even replaced without redesigning the whole system. Therefore, the Zeus system is receptive to modification which could provide the altitude and range required by an antisatellite weapon system without affecting its antiballistic missile capability.

The critical question that now faces us as to how soon we can get the Nike-Zeus into production and deployed as an anti-ICBM weapon, equally comprehends the vital factor of antisatellite defense.

The key to this question is production now. Delay in a decision at this time results in only one thing—loss of invaluable time.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of the Nike-Zeus is small when one considers the costs of rebuilding such cities as New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, and Denver.

And when the loss in human life is contemplated, the cost of approximately $8 billion over a period of 8 years to assure our security seems eminently reasonable. In the last decade we have spent some $35 billion in air warning and defense systems—and they, too, were necessary and I supported them.

This is a great Nation of ours. We have the capability of meeting all of our defense needs regardless of how great they may be.

I believe we can all agree with the testimony of General Trudeau before committees of this House when he says:

It is a lot safer and, in the long run, cheaper to build weapons and not use them than it is to need weapons and not have them.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to act. I hope every Member of this House will read the current issue of Army magazine. I hope every Member of this House will support immediate action for limited component production of the Nike-Zeus system.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the short lead article of the current issue of Army, page 29.

This Nation can never risk being either second best or half safe in matters affecting our security.

It is my hope that President Kennedy and his advisers will study these views of Air Force Lieutenant General Kuter as they concentrate on one of the most critical decisions of our time—the most dramatic action on the New Frontier in national defense—production of Nike-Zeus.

The article referred to follows:

NORAD'S CHIEF CALLS COUNTER TO ICBM MOST IMMEDIATE AND PRESSING NEED IN AIR DEFENSE OF CONUS

In aerospace defense we stand on the edge of the sixties, facing the air-breathing threat of today and looking forward to a tomorrow that holds the certainty of an ICBM threat, and not far distant, the requirement to defend against hostile satellites.

It was but 10 years ago that we actually embarked on an active air-defense program. It was in August 1949 that the first mushroom cloud blossomed behind the Iron Curtain signaling an end to U.S. atomic-weapons monopoly. Russian atomic-weapons ownership coupled with the initiation of the Korean conflict dispelled any doubts about the need for an effective air defense.

In the decade since 1950, planners have persevered. Requirements for weapons and systems were planned and stated. Planned improvements were invented, designed, developed, built, and placed in the hands of people trained to get the most out of them.

Today our current air-defense system has a respectable degree of capability against the air-breathing weapon threat. This system, under the operational control of the North American Air Defense Command, has resulted from a pooling of the best talent that the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Royal Canadian Air Force, and industry could muster.

However, now our most immediate and pressing requirement in aerospace defense is for a counter to the intercontinental ballistic missile.

At the present time, the most advanced project underway in this critical area is being conducted by the Army on the Nike-Zeus system. This project has experienced considerable success in its research and development program. The Department of Defense has announced future firing tests of the Zeus against ICBM targets of the Atlas and Titan types. Norad hopes that these tests will produce successes which will result in a decision to initiate production.

Additionally, the respective successes of the United States and the Soviet Union with satellites cast a shadow of significant portent. In order to avoid a future gap between our defensive capability and Russia's offensive capability similar to the present gap between our capability to defend against the Russian ICBM and their offensive ICBM capability, we must attack the problem of satellite defense with no less talent and vigor than the Russians are putting into their satellite program.

In aerospace the established defense functions of detection, identification, interception, and destruction must close the gap between the exploding perimeters of the overall aerospace concept.

Norad believes strongly that an acceptable degree of aerospace defense not only insures survival if deterrence should for any reason fail, but will provide the only effective deterrent if and when parity is established between offensive forces. Norad is dedicated to the proposition that we shall be first to produce an acceptable degree of aerospace defense.

WAGE-HOUR LEGISLATION

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, there has just been received from the administration a minimum-wage bill. As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I assign this to my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and commend him for his untiring efforts in this field.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks immediately following those of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks the material included in the letter from the President to you, Mr. Speaker, which would include the letter from Secretary of Labor Goldberg to the President in explanation of the bill. Then I would ask unanimous consent to include the text of the bill at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration, I am today introducing its wage-hour proposals in the House of Representatives. These amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act would provide an increase in the Federal minimum wage to $1.15 an hour during the first year, $1.20 during the second year, and $1.25 thereafter for those employees who now have minimum wage protection.

It would also provide for those employees brought under the act for the

first time, a minimum wage of not less than $1 an hour during the first year, $1.05 the second year, with time and one-half for hours in excess of 44 per week; $1.15 the third year, with time and one-half for hours in excess of 42 a week; and $1.25 thereafter, with time and one-half for hours in excess of 40 a week.

The President of the United States, in his economic message to the Congress on February 2, 1961, stated, in urging an increase in the minimum wage, that—

> This will improve the incomes, level of living, morale, and efficiency of many of our lowest paid workers. * * * This can actually increase productivity and hold down unit costs, with no adverse effects on our competition in world markets and our balance of payments.

The bill also would extend minimum-wage protection to an additional 4.3 million employees, including 2.9 million in retail and service enterprises. This extension of the act's benefits would be accomplished, however, without deviating from its present interstate commerce basis of coverage. Individual employees "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" would continue to be covered by the act. In addition, a new category of employees—those employed in certain enterprises engaged in such activities, primarily in retailing—would be brought within the act's coverage.

The President, in his economic message on extension of coverage, said:

> This will extend the wage standard throughout significant low-wage sectors of the labor market. * * * Together, these two principal changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act will go far to protect our lowest paid workers. The proposed minimum rates have been carefully set at levels which will benefit substantial numbers of underpaid workers, but not so high as to prevent ready adjustment to the new standards.

It is anticipated that brief minimum-wage-hour hearings will begin on Friday, February 17, 1961, with Secretary of Labor Goldberg.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House, I enclose, immediately following the letter of Secretary of Labor Goldberg, an explanation of the bill and the text of the bill.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
February 6, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a draft bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act and a statement explaining its purpose and effect.

This bill is designed to carry out the recommendations outlined in your February 2 message for increasing the minimum wage and expanding the coverage of the act. It would raise the standards of the act to keep pace with our general economic progress and needs and extend its protection to an estimated 4.3 million additional workers.

More than 20 years have passed since Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 to provide a modest floor under wages and an equally modest ceiling over hours. A whole generation of Americans have entered our work force since Congress pledged itself to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of minimum standards of living necessary for the health and general well-being of our workers. Unfortunately, for many American workers the conditions deplored by the 75th Congress are still with us today. We must not leave these workers with no more assurance in 1961 than they had in 1938 that their wages will provide the minimum standards of living to which they are entitled.

Our objective is clear—to provide a minimum living standard of $1.25 an hour and to extend the protection of the act to employees of large enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

The draft bill will accomplish this objective. It would expand the coverage of the act to include the following categories of enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce:

1. Any enterprise which has one or more retail or service establishments if the annual volume of sales of the enterprise is not less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes);

2. Any enterprise which has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning, or clothes repairing if the annual volume of sales of the enterprise is not less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes);

3. Any enterprises engaged in a local transit business;

4. Any establishment not included in categories 1, 2, or 3, if the annual volume of sales of the establishment is not less than $250,000 ($350,000 in the case of construction), exclusive of excise taxes:

5. Any gasoline service establishment if the annual gross volume of sales of the establishment is not less than $250,000.

Changes have been made in the exemptions provided in the act to adjust to the new coverage provisions. While workers in large retail and service establishments would be protected under the proposed bill, no change would be made in the present exempt status of hotels, motels, restaurants, and motion picture theaters. The new proposal would extend minimum wage protection to, but not change existing overtime exemptions for, onshore fish processing and gasoline service establishments.

The proposal would also increase the hourly minimum wage for employees who now have the protection of the $1 minimum to $1.15 the first year, $1.20 the second year, and $1.25 thereafter. For the newly covered employees an initial minimum wage of $1 an hour would be provided, increased to $1.05 the second year, $1.15 the third year, and $1.25 thereafter.

In addition, the bill would provide a three-step increase in existing wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Sixty days after the effective date of the amendments or 1 year after the effective date of the most recent wage order, whichever is later, these rates would be increased by 15 percent. One year after the 15 percent increase goes into effect the rates would be increased by 5 percent, and a year later by an additional 5 percent. However, different rates would apply if they are recommended by review committees, to be appointed under the procedures set forth in the bill.

The minimum wage rates for employees in these islands who would for the first time be brought under the act would be established by wage orders recommended by special industry committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor within 60 days after the enactment of the amendments.

No maximum hours requirements would be established for newly covered employees during the first year so that their employers could make the initial adjustment to the minimum wage before being required to comply with an overtime provision. Subsequently, employers of the newly covered workers would have 2 years in which to adjust to the 40-hour workweek standard.

Finally, the bill would amend the act to provide for more effective enforcement of its provisions by authorizing the courts, in injunction proceedings, to order the payment of minimum wages or overtime compensation found by the courts to be due employees.

These changes proposed in this bill are comparatively modest in nature. They have been needed for a long time. Their merits were fully demonstrated in hearings, deliberations and debate on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act during the 86th Congress, last year. I recommend them to you now as viable proposals on which Congress can act effectively and expeditiously.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961

The bill would provide urgently needed improvements in the Fair Labor Standards Act by extending its protection to millions of Americans working in the large enterprises of our country and raising its standards to keep pace with our general economic progress and needs.

The bill would provide an increase in the Federal minimum wage to $1.15 an hour during the first year after the effective date of the amendments, $1.20 during the second year, and $1.25 thereafter for workers who now have minimum wage protection under the act.

It would also provide a minimum wage of not less than $1 an hour during the first year, $1.05 the second year (with time and one-half for hours in excess of 44 in a week), $1.15 the third year (with time and one-half for hours in excess of 42 a week) and $1.25 thereafter (with time and one-half for hours in excess of 40 a week) for employees who would be brought under the protection of the act.

Each of the wage order rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would be increased by 15 percent, 60 days after the effective date of the amendments or 1 year from the effective date of the most recent wage order, whichever is later. A year after the 15-percent increase these rates would be increased an additional 5 percent, and 2 years later by another 5 percent. These increases would be superseded if, under the procedures outlined in the bill, a review committee is appointed by the Secretary of Labor for a particular industry and the committee recommends a different rate.

The minimum wage rates applicable to employees of these islands who would be brought under the act for the first time would be established by a wage order effective no sooner than 60 days after the effective date of the amendments. This order would be issued pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee which the Secretary of Labor would be required to appoint within 60 days after enactment of the amendments.

In addition, the bill would (1) broaden the coverage of the act by extending its provisions to include employees of five different categories of enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce; and (2) provide more effective procedures for enforcing the act.

1. MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS

Since March 1956, the effective date of the $1 minimum, the Consumer Price Index has increased by 11 percent. During the 4 years, 1956 to 1959, the real product per man-hour in the private sector of the economy increased by 11 percent. (Estimates for 1960 are not yet available.) Since March 1956, average hourly earnings in manufacturing have increased by 19 percent. The increase in earnings of the average factory worker has been large enough to both offset the increase in the cost of living and to provide

such worker with a roughly proportionate share of the benefits of increased productivity. In contrast, workers whose wage rates are at the minimum wage level have not benefited from the upward movement of the American economy. Also, workers whose wages have remained at the minimum since the $1 rate became effective have suffered a decline in real earnings because of the increase in the cost of living.

The adjustments in the minimum wage rate provided by the bill would restore the original value of the $1 minimum in terms of purchasing power, and also allow workers whose wages are at the minimum level to share in the benefits of the increased productivity of the economy.

This schedule of minimum rates for workers now protected by the act is the same as provided in the bill passed by the Senate on August 18, 1960. A year ago it was estimated that an increase in wage payments of $452 million would be required to raise to $1.15 the wages of the estimated 2,420,000 employees who were paid less than that amount. Special wage surveys conducted by the Department of Labor in the fall of 1960 indicate that the impact of these rates would be substantially less than was estimated a year ago. It is now estimated that an increase in wage payments of $336 million, on an annual basis, would be required to raise to $1.15 the wages of the 1,906,000 covered employees who are now paid less than that amount. This substantial reduction in the indicated wage impact of a minimum rate of $1.15 should remove any doubt as to the ability of employers to adjust to a 15-cent increase immediately without substantially curtailing employment.

During the second year, the 1,906,000 employees now paid less than $1.15 an hour and the 511,000 who are paid between $1.15 and $1.20 would receive wages amounting to $558 million more than they are now being paid. After the second year, these 2,417,000 workers and the 604,000 who are now paid between $1.20 and $1.25 would receive wages amounting to $836 million more than they are now being paid.

For newly protected workers, the initial minimum wage rate would be $1 an hour. The rate would be increased to $1.05 after 1 year, to $1.15 after 2 years, and to $1.25 after 3 years. Thus, employers of the newly protected workers would be allowed 3 years to make the adjustment to the $1.25 minimum rate to insure that the adjustment could be made without substantial curtailment of employment.

Although the minimum rate of $1.25 for newly protected workers would not be established before 3 years had elapsed, low paid workers would receive substantial increases in wages before that time. During the first year, the 804,000 workers who are paid less than $1 would receive wage increases amounting to $242 million. During the second year, these 804,000 workers and the 147,000 who are paid between $1 and $1.05 would receive increases to $1.05 amounting to $100 million on an annual basis. During the third year, these 951,000 workers and the 389,000 who are paid between $1.05 and $1.15 would receive increases to $1.15, amounting to $234 million. During the 4th year, these 1,340,000 workers and 325,000 who are paid between $1.15 and $1.25 would receive increases to $1.25, amounting to $293 million. Thus, the 1,665,000 employees who are now paid less than $1.25 an hour would, after 3 years, be receiving annually $867 million more than they are now being paid.

2. OVERTIME PROVISIONS

The bill would retain the 40-hour workweek standard for employees now protected by the act.

For newly protected workers, no maximum hours requirement would be established during the first year so that their employers could make the initial adjustment to the minimum wage before being required to comply with an overtime provision. Subsequently, employers would be allowed 2 years in which to adjust to a 40-hour workweek. During the second year after its effective date, the bill would require that the newly protected workers be paid one and one-half times their regular rates of pay for hours over 44 in a workweek, during the third year for hours over 42, and thereafter for hours over 40. Except for the 1-year delay this maximum workweek schedule corresponds with that of the original act of 1938, which also provided a 44-hour workweek during the first year, a 42-hour workweek during the second year, and a 40-hour workweek thereafter.

3. EXPANSION OF COVERAGE

The bill would extend minimum wage protection to an additional 4.3 million employees, including 2.9 million employees in retail and service enterprises. It would also extend the overtime and child labor provisions of the act. This extension of the act's benefits would be accomplished, however, without deviating from its present interstate commerce basis of coverage. Individual employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce would continue to be covered by the act. In addition, a new category of employees—those employed in certain enterprises engaged in such activities—would be brought within the act's coverage.

"Enterprise" would mean the related activities performed by any person for a common business purpose of providing goods or services, or a combination of them, to others. It would include all such activities, whether they were performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units. However, the term as used in the bill does not include eleemosynary, religious or educational organizations not operated for profit.

A locally owned and controlled retail or service establishment would not be considered other than a separate enterprise because of a franchise or group purchasing or group advertising arrangement with other establishments, or because it occupies premises leased to it by a person who also leases premises to other establishments.

Under the bill the term "enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" includes five specifically described categories in which one or more employees are so engaged, including employees who handle, sell, or otherwise work on goods that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person. If an enterprise comes within one of these five categories, all of its employees are covered regardless of their duties. However, employees of certain of the enterprises would continue to be exempt from the act's minimum wage and overtime provisions, and still others would be exempt from the overtime provisions only.

The first category of new coverage is any enterprise which has one or more retail or service establishments if the enterprise has at least $1 million in annual gross volume of sales, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated.

The second category is any enterprise which has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning, or clothes repairing if the enterprise has at least $1 million in annual gross volume of sales, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated.

The third category is any enterprise where the employer is engaged in operating a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway or local trolley or motorbus carrier, regardless of sales volume.

The fourth category is any establishment not included in any of the enterprises listed above which has an annual gross volume of sales of at least $250,000 ($350,000 in the case of an establishment engaged in construction), exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated.

The fifth category is any gasoline service establishment having an annual gross volume of sales of at least $250,000.

A proviso to the definition of "enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" would exclude so-called mom and pop stores. Under its provisions, if the only employees of an establishment are its owner or persons standing in the relationship of parent, spouse, or child of such owner, the establishment would not be considered as, or part of, such an enterprise and its sales would not be included for the purpose of determining whether an enterprise is in one of the categories heretofore mentioned.

4. DEFINITIONS

Apart from the definitions already referred to in connection with coverage, the definition of wage in section 3(m) of the act would be modified by giving the Secretary authority to determine the fair value of facilities furnished by the employer on the basis of average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. The bill also provides that the cost of board, lodging, or other facilities would not be included as a part of wages if excluded by a bona fide collective bargaining agreement.

The bill would add a new section 3(p) to the act defining "American vessel" as a vessel which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States. An amendment to section 6(b) of the act would require the payment to seamen on American vessels of not less than the rate which will provide them, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the minimum hourly rate applicable to other employees newly subject to the act. Off-duty periods provided by employment agreements or periods when the employee is not at the direction of a superior officer either performing work or standing by would be excluded from hours worked.

5. EXEMPTIONS

The minimum wage and overtime exemptions provided by sections 13(a)(2), 13(a)(4), and 13(a)(13) of the act for certain retail or service establishments would be made inapplicable to employees of enterprises meeting the new coverage test provided by the bill, with the following exceptions: (1) Employees of motion picture theaters; and (2) employees of hotels, motels, or restaurants.

In addition to making the minimum wage and overtime exemption in section 13(a)(3) inapplicable in laundry and cleaning establishments of enterprises which have annual receipts of $1 million or more, the bill would remove the exemption for employees of laundry and cleaning establishments which have annual sales of between $250,000 and $1 million and which are in substantial competition in the same metropolitan area with an establishment that does at least 50 percent of its business in interstate commerce.

The minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees employed in a local retailing capacity would be removed.

The minimum wage exemption applicable to employees engaged in fish processing and distributing fish and related products would be limited to offshore activities.

The minimum wage and overtime exemption for switchboard operators in any public telephone exchange with no more than 750 stations would be replaced with an exemption for operators in any independently owned public telephone exchange which has no more than 750 stations.

The minimum wage exemption for employees of local transit companies would be removed.

The minimum wage exemption for seamen would be made inapplicable to seamen employed on a vessel which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States.

An overtime exemption would be added for employees of gasoline service stations.

An overtime exemption would be added for salesmen of automobiles and trucks employed by a retail or service establishment.

The 14-week seasonal industry exemption under which overtime payment is not required except for work in excess of 12 hours a day or 56 hours a week would continue. The bill would also provide a 14-workweek exemption (with same hours of work limitation as referred to above) for the first processing, etc., of fresh fruits or vegetables and the first processing in the area of production of any agricultural or horticultural commodity during seasonal operations. If an industry qualifies for both exemptions it would be eligible for an aggregate of 20 weeks in any calendar year, of which not more than 10 weeks may be of unlimited hours, and 10 weeks of limited hours.

6. AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE MORE EFFECTIVE PROCEDURES FOR ENFORCING THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

Under the present provisions of the act, the Secretary of Labor has no authority to require the payment of minimum wages and overtime compensation not paid in compliance with the law, except where an employee requests that an action be brought by the Secretary. The bill therefore also includes an amendment to the act which would establish a more effective method of enforcing the act by authorizing the Federal courts to order the payment of the actual amount of unpaid minimum wages or overtime compensation to employees in injunctive actions brought under section 17. In this way, employers found by the courts to be unlawfully withholding from employees minimum wages and overtime compensation owing under the act could be required to make payments of the amounts found due by the courts, without the necessity of the employee or employees involved initiating or requesting such action.

In calendar year 1960 investigative activities of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions revealed an estimated $30 million in unpaid minimum wages and overtime compensation for nearly 200,000 employees. Of this amount, $16 million has not been paid, and the Secretary has no authority, in the absence of an employee request, to require payment.

Since the Department of Labor can make compliance investigations of only approximately 5 percent of all currently covered establishments in 1 year, the investigations undertaken must have a spreading effect. If an adequate level of compliance with the law is to be achieved, these investigations must result in continuing compliance in establishments investigated and also in furthering compliance in uninvestigated establishments.

The proposed amendment would make these investigations much more effective by providing a practical method for requiring payment of the amounts of any wages or overtime compensation which an employer has failed or refused to pay, as required by the act. Placing the probability of financial liability on those employers who are presently careless of their obligations under the act would increase the level of compliance with the statute, and would protect complying employers from the unfair wage competition of the noncomplying employers.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE COVERAGE FOR EMPLOYEES OF LARGE ENTERPRISES ENGAGED IN RETAIL TRADE OR SERVICE AND OF OTHER EMPLOYERS ENGAGED IN COMMERCE OR IN THE PRODUCTION OF GOODS FOR COMMERCE, TO INCREASE THE MINIMUM WAGE UNDER THE ACT TO $1.25 AN HOUR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (m) of section 3 of such Act, defining the term "wage", is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the cost of board, lodging, or other facilities shall not be included as a part of the wage paid to any employee to the extent it is excluded therefrom under the terms of a bona fide collective-bargaining agreement applicable to the particular employee: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such board, lodging, or other facilities for defined classes of employees and in defined areas, based on average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. Such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wage paid to any employee."

(b) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(p) 'American vessel' includes any vessel which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States.

"(q) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"(r) 'Enterprise' means the related activities performed (either through unified operation or common control) by any person or persons for a common business purpose, and includes all such activities whether performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units but shall not include the related activities performed for such enterprise by an independent contractor: *Provided,* That within the meaning of this subsection a locally owned and controlled retail or service establishment shall not be deemed to be other than a separate and distinct enterprise by reason of any arrangement, which includes, but is not limited to, an agreement (1) that it will sell, or sell only, certain goods specified by a particular manufacturer, distributor, or advertiser, or (2) that it will join with other locally owned and controlled concerns in the same industry for the purpose of collective purchasing, or (3) that it will have the exclusive right to sell the goods or use the brand name of a manufacturer, distributor, or advertiser within a specified area, or by reason of the fact that it occupies premises leased to it by a person who also leases premises to other retail or service establishments.

"(s) 'Enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce' means any of the following in the activities of which one or more employees are so engaged, including employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person:

"(1) any such enterprise which has one or more retail or service establishments if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than $1,000,000, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated;

"(2) any such enterprise which has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than $1,000,000, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated;

"(3) any such enterprise which is engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier;

"(4) any establishment, not included in an enterprise described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, if the annual gross volume of sales of such establishment is not less than $250,000 (or $350,000 in the case of an establishment engaged in the business of construction or reconstruction, or both), exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated;

"(5) any gasoline service establishment if the annual gross volume of sales of such establishment is not less than $250,000:

Provided, That an establishment shall not be considered to be an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or a part of an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and the sales of such establishment shall not be included for the purpose of determining the annual gross volume of sales of any enterprise for the purpose of this subsection, if the only employees of such establishment are the owner thereof or persons standing in the relationship of parent, spouse, or child of such owner."

SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "production of goods for commerce" wherever they appear the following: "or employed in any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 4. (a) (1) Section 6(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after the word "who" in the portion thereof preceding paragraph (1), the words "in any workweek."

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 6(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) not less than $1.15 an hour during the first year from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961; not less than $1.20 an hour during the second year from such date; and not less than $1.25 an hour thereafter, except as otherwise provided in this section."

(3) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of section 6(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) if such employee is employed in American Samoa, in lieu of the rate or rates provided by this subsection or subsection (b), not less than the applicable rate established by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with recommendations of a special industry committee or committees which he shall appoint in the same manner and pursuant to the same provisions as are applicable to the special industry committees provided for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by this Act as amended from time to time."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who in any workweek (i) is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, as defined in section 3(s) (1), (2), or (3) or in an establishment described in section 3(s) (4) or (5), and who, except for the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, would not be within the purview of this section, or (ii) is brought within the purview of this section by the

amendments made to section 13(a) of this Act by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, wages at rates—

"(1) not less than $1 an hour during the first year from the effective date of such amendments; not less than $1.05 an hour during the second year from such date; not less than $1.15 an hour during the third year from such date; and not less than the rate effective under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) thereafter;

"(2) if such employee is employed as a seaman on an American vessel, wages at not less than the rate which will provide to the employee, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the hourly rate prescribed by paragraph (1) of this subsection for all hours during such period when he was actually on duty (not including off-duty periods within such period which are provided pursuant to the employment agreement or periods aboard ship when the employee was not on watch and was not, at the direction of a superior officer, either performing other work or standing by)."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The rate or rates provided by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be superseded in the case of any employee in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands only for so long as and insofar as such employee is covered by a wage order heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee appointed pursuant to section 5: *Provided*, That (1) the following rates shall apply to any such employee to whom the rate or rates prescribed by subsection (a) would otherwise apply:

"(A) The rate or rates applicable under the most recent wage order issued by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, increased by 15 per centum, unless such rate or rates are superseded by the rate or rates prescribed in a wage order issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under paragraph (D). Such rate or rates shall become effective sixty days after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 or one year from the effective date of the most recent wage order applicable to such employee theretofore issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee appointed under section 5, whichever is later.

"(B) During the second year after the applicable effective date under paragraph (A), not less than the rate or rates prescribed by paragraph (A), increased by an amount equal to 5 per centum of the rate or rates applicable under the most recent wage order issued by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, unless such rate or rates are superseded by the rate or rates prescribed in a wage order issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under paragraph (D).

"(C) During the third year after the applicable effective date under paragraph (B), not less than the rate or rates prescribed by paragraph (B), increased by 5 per centum of the rate or rates applicable under the most recent wage order issued by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, unless such rate or rates are superseded by the rate or rates prescribed in a wage order issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under paragraph (D).

"(D) Any employer, or group of employers, employing a majority of the employees in an industry in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, may apply to the Secretary in writing for the appointment of a review committee to recommend the minimum rate or rates to be paid such employees in lieu of the rate or rates provided by paragraph (A), (B), or (C). Any such application with respect to any rate or rates provided for under paragraph (A) shall be filed within sixty days following the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 and any such application with respect to any rate or rates provided for under paragraph (B) or (C) shall be filed not more than one hundred and twenty days and not less than sixty days prior to the effective date of the applicable rate or rates under paragraph (B) or (C). The Secretary shall promptly consider such application and may appoint a review committee only if he has reasonable cause to believe, on the basis of financial and other information contained in the application, that compliance with any applicable rate or rates prescribed by paragraph (A), (B), or (C) will substantially curtail employment in such industry. The Secretary's decision upon any such application shall be final. Any wage order issued pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under this paragraph shall take effect on the applicable effective date provided in paragraph (A), (B), or (C).

"(E) In the event a wage order has not been issued pursuant to the recommendation of a review committee prior to the applicable effective date under paragraph (A), (B), or (C), the applicable percentage increase provided by any such paragraph shall take effect on the effective date prescribed therein, except with respect to the employees of an employer who filed an application under paragraph (D) and who files with the Secretary an undertaking with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the Secretary for payment to his employees of an amount sufficient to compensate such employees for the difference between the wages they actually receive and the wages to which they are entitled under this subsection. The Secretary shall be empowered to enforce such undertaking and any sums recovered by him shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee or employees affected. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(2) In the case of any such employee to whom subsection (b) would otherwise apply, the Secretary shall within sixty days after the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 appoint a special industry committee in accordance with section 5 to recommend the highest minimum wage rate or rates, in accordance with the standards prescribed by section 8, not in excess of the applicable rate provided by subsection (b), to be applicable to such employee in lieu of the rate or rates prescribed by subsection (b). The rate or rates recommended by the special industry committee shall be effective with respect to such employee upon the effective date of the wage order issued pursuant to such recommendation but not before sixty days after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961.

"(3) The provisions of section 5 and section 8, relating to special industry committees, shall be applicable to review committees appointed under this subsection. The appointment of a review committee shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any special industry committee required to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 8, except that (i) no special industry committee shall hold any hearing with one year after a minimum wage rate or rates for such industry shall have been recommended to the Secretary by a review committee to be paid in lieu of the rate or rates provided for under paragraph (A) and (ii) where an increase in the minimum wage rate or rates provided for in paragraph (B) or (C) shall have become effective for such industry without an application having been filed under paragraph (D), no special industry committee for such industry shall hold any hearing within one year after such an increase shall have become effective. The minimum wage rate or rates prescribed by this subsection shall be in effect only for so long as and insofar as such minimum wage rate or rates have not been superseded by a wage order fixing a higher minimum wage rate or rates (but not in excess of the applicable rate prescribed in subsection (a) or subsection (b)) hereafter issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendation of a special industry committee."

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by designating such subsection as subsection (a)(1), by inserting after the word "who" the words "in any workweek", and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the word "and" in lieu thereof and adding the following new paragraph (2):

"(2) No employer shall employ any of his employees who in any workweek (i) is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, as defined in section 3(s)(1), (2), or (3), or in an establishment described in section 3(s)(4), and who, except for the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, would not be within the purview of this subsection, or (ii) is brought within the purview of this subsection by the amendments made to section 13 of this Act by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961—

"(A) for a workweek longer than forty-four hours during the second year from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961,

"(B) for a workweek longer than forty-two hours during the third year from such date,

"(C) for a workweek longer than forty hours after the expiration of the third year from such date,

unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed."

(b)(1) Subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "in excess of forty hours in the workweek" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in excess of the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)."

(2) Such subsection is further amended by striking out clause (3) thereof and the portion of such subsection which follows clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) for a period or periods of not more than fourteen workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year (i) in an industry found by the Secretary of Labor to be of a seasonal nature, or (ii) in an industry engaged in the first processing of, or in canning or packing perishable or seasonal fresh fruits or vegetables, or in the first processing, within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary), of any agricultural or horticultural commodity during seasonal operations, or in handling, slaughtering, or dressing poultry or livestock: *Provided*, That in any industry to which both clauses (i) and (ii) apply, such period shall not exceed ten workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year,

and if such employee receives compensation for employment in excess of twelve hours in any workday, or for employment in excess of fifty-six hours in any workweek, as the

case may be, at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed. In the case of any employee employed in an industry to which both (i) and (ii) of clause (3) apply, the provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply during a period or periods of not more than ten workweeks in the aggregate in any calendar year, which shall be in addition to the period or periods provided with respect to such employee in clause (3)."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out everything therein after the semicolon and inserting in lieu of the semicolon a period.

(d) Paragraph (5) of subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "forty in a workweek" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "in excess of the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)".

(e) Paragraph (7) of subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "forty hours" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)".

(f) Subsection (e) of section 7 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "forty hours" and inserting in lieu thereof "the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)", (2) by striking out "section 6(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (b) of section 6 (whichever may be applicable)", and (3) by striking out "forty in any" and inserting in lieu thereof "such maximum".

(g) Subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "forty hours" both times it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under such subsection".

WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 6. Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act is amended by inserting after the word "industries" where it appears in the first sentence the words "or enterprise"; and by inserting after the words "production of goods for commerce" where they appear in the second sentence the following: "or in any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce".

CHILD-LABOR PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or in any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 8. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 13 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to—

"(1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, or in the capacity of outside salesman (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act); or

"(2) any employee employed by any retail or service establishment (except an establishment, other than a hotel, motel, or restaurant, in an enterprise described in section 3(s)(1) or an establishment described in section 3(s)(5)), more than 50 per centum of which establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services is made within the State in which the establishment is located. A 'retail or service establishment' shall mean an establishment 75 per centum of whose annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services (or of both) is not for resale and is recognized as retail sales or services in the particular industry; or

"(3) any employee employed by any establishment (except an establishment in an enterprise described in section 3(s)(2)) engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics, more than 50 per centum of which establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of such services is made within the State in which the establishment is located: *Provided*, That 75 per centum of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of such services is made to customers who are not engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, or communications business: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall not apply to any employee of any such establishment which has an annual dollar volume of sales of such services of $250,000 or more and which is engaged in substantial competition in the same metropolitan area with an establishment less than 50 per centum of whose annual dollar volume of sales of such services is made within the State in which it is located; or

"(4) any employee employed by an establishment which qualifies as an exempt retail establishment under clause (2) of this subsection and is recognized as a retail establishment in the particular industry notwithstanding that such establishment makes or processes at the retail establishment the goods that it sells: *Provided*, That more than 85 per centum of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods so made or processed is made within the State in which the establishment is located; or

"(5) any employee employed in the catching, taking, propagating, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life, or in the first processing, canning, or packing such marine products at sea as an incident to or in conjunction with such fishing operations, including the going to and returning from work and loading and unloading when performed by any such employees; or

"(6) any employee employed in agriculture or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways, not owned or operated for profit or operated on a sharecrop basis, and which are used exclusively for supply and storing of water for agriculture purposes; or

"(7) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Secretary issued under section 14; or

"(8) any employee employed in connection with the publication of any weekly, semiweekly, or daily newspaper with a circulation of less than four thousand the major part of which circulation is within the county where printed and published or counties contiguous thereto; or

"(9) any employee employed in a motion picture theater; or

"(10) any individual employed within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary), engaged in handling, packing, storing, ginning, compressing, pasteurizing, drying, preparing in their raw or natural state, or canning of agricultural or horticultural commodities for market, or in making cheese or butter or other dairy products; or

"(11) any switchboard operator employed by an independently owned public telephone exchange which has not more than seven hundred and fifty stations; or

"(12) any employee of an employer engaged in the business of operating taxicabs; or

"(13) any employee or proprietor in a retail or service establishment which qualifies as an exempt retail or service establishment under clause (2) of this subsection with respect to whom the provisions of sections 6 and 7 would not otherwise apply, engaged in handling telegraphic messages for the public under an agency or contract arrangement with a telegraph company where the telegraph message revenue of such agency does not exceed $500 a month; or

"(14) any employee employed as a seaman on a vessel other than an American vessel; or

"(15) any employee employed in planting or tending trees, cruising, surveying, or felling timber, or in preparing or transporting logs or other forestry products to the mill, processing plant, railroad, or other transportation terminal, if the number of employees employed by his employer in such forestry or lumbering operations does not exceed twelve.

"(b) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to—

"(1) any employee with respect to whom the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to establish qualifications and maximum hours of service pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935; or

"(2) any employee of an employer subject to the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; or

"(3) any employee of a carrier by air subject to the provisions of title II of the Railway Labor Act; or

"(4) any employee employed in the canning, processing, marketing, freezing, curing storing, packing for shipment, or distributing of any kind of fish, shellfish, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, or any byproduct thereof; or

"(5) any individual employed as an outside buyer of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk, in their raw or natural state; or

"(6) any employee employed as a seaman; or

"(7) any employee of a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier, not included in other exemptions contained in this section; or

"(8) any employee employed as an automobile salesman by a retail or service establishment engaged in the business of selling automobiles or trucks; or

"(9) any employee of a gasoline service station."

PENALTIES AND INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 9. (a) Section 16(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The right provided by this subsection to bring an action by or on behalf of any employee, and the right of any employee to become a party plaintiff to any such action, shall terminate upon the filing of a complaint by the Secretary of Labor in an action under section 17 in which restraint is sought of any further delay in the payment of unpaid minimum wages, or the amount of unpaid overtime compensation, as the case may be, owing to such employee under section 6 or section 7 of this Act by an employer liable therefor under the provisions of this subsection."

(b) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 17. The district courts, together with the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the District Court of Guam shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of section 15, including in the case of violations of section 15(a)(2) the restraint of any withholding of payment of minimum wages or overtime compensation found by the court to be due to employees under this Act (except sums which employees are barred from recovering, at the time of the commencement of the action to restrain the violations, by virtue of the provisions of section 6 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947)."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of 120 days after the date of its enactment, except as otherwise provided and ex-

cept that the authority to promulgate necessary rules, regulations, or orders with regard to amendments made by this Act, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and amendments thereto, including amendments made by this Act, may be exercised by the Secretary on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, bills dealing with minimum wages and a broadening of the coverage of such bills have had extensive hearings in past years. In view of this I take it my friend is not going to hold such extensive hearings this year as have been held in the past.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say to my distinguished majority leader that it would seem to me such extensive hearings would not be necessary in view of the voluminous testimony already taken on the subject. The bill is substantially in accordance with those of previous sessions. I would assume that hearings could be concluded in a relatively short time.

MISSILES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried a front-page article written by a staff reporter, that should be of interest to all, especially those who have been led to believe and are saying that America is becoming second class, that we are militarily inferior to Russia, and that there is a great missile lag that endangers our country:

Current defense studies by the Kennedy administration indicate that President Eisenhower's downgrading of the dangers of the Soviet missile lead was largely correct, although some step up in U.S. programs is essential.

Conclusions now are that there is no evidence that Russia has embarked on a "crash" program of building intercontinental ballistic missiles or that any missile gap exists today.

CONCLUSION BACKS IKE

The conclusions reached about the missile gap and the dangers it presented are similar to those reached by President Eisenhower and his Pentagon chiefs, and quite different from claims made by many Democratic critics in recent years.

During the political campaign, Mr. Kennedy was critical of the Eisenhower military record, but did not go as far as some other Democrats in talking about the danger of the missile gap.

This account is especially interesting considering that this newspaper was an aggressive supporter of Candidate Kennedy and is now a strong supporter of his administration.

It is indeed fortunate that the accusations of American weakness are being clarified and identified, that is, as political propaganda. For more than 4 years many in Congress, including myself, have been emphasizing the facts of America's growing and formidable military strength.

It is true that our long-distance surface-to-surface missile program was canceled in 1947 and was only recommenced in a strong manner in 1953, but it is a fact that our growth in development and production of military missiles in the last 8 years is one of America's really great technological achievements. A recent instance was the successful testing of the Minuteman, one of our most modern and mobile missiles, which was completed 2½ years ahead of schedule. Our missile programs are replete with stories of fantastic progress and success.

I believe the true facts of American strength and weakness should be brought to the attention of our people, but that information should be real and factual, not an attempt to downgrade America for political reasons nor to frighten the American people into demanding certain weapons because some missile salesman wants to sell them.

"The truth shall make you free" is as applicable to defense facts as it is to anything else. Now that the campaign is over, perhaps we can have a refreshing return to truth.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution urging the President to call a White House conference on highway safety. We need such a conference to organize a national campaign to reduce the annual highway accident toll of more than 38,000 deaths and nearly 5 million injured.

The public realizes that highway accidents are a major public health problem but, unfortunately, not all of those in positions of responsibility are working together.

Failure to enact a uniform motor vehicle safety code is a good example. Since 1926 leading experts in the field have been urging the States and local communities to adopt a uniform highway safety code. Progress has been made but we have a long way to go.

One purpose of a White House conference would be to call the attention of our lawmakers to the need for early action in this field. The States need to be warned that as long as they fail to exercise their responsibilities, there will be a growing demand for Federal action. For my part, I strongly urge local self-government, but if local responsibility breaks down, Federal legislation may be the last resort. We just cannot go on killing nearly 40,000 people on our streets and highways every year.

We need uniform highway safety laws, but there are other ways the States can help out the traffic toll. We need safer vehicles. Medical experts and others tell us that this is the quickest and easiest way to cut the accident toll.

In testimony last Congress before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the American Medical Association presented nine safety features which could and should be built into our automobiles.

The States could force the industry to include these safety features in future automobiles.

The Honorable Lewis L. Strauss, the then Secretary of Commerce, in a report entitled, "The Federal Role in Highway Safety," submitted to Congress March 3, 1959—House Document No. 93, 86th Congress, 1st session—has this to say:

There are residues of weakness in automotive design and function, however, to which manufacturers and public officials alike need to give further attention.

Minimum standards for some motor vehicle safety features have been established by cooperative efforts chiefly of automotive engineering groups and government at appropriate levels.

Many States require certification through their motor vehicle departments that these standards have been met. An expansion of such standards, and a more widespread use of the certification process by the States, would lead to quicker adoption of desirable vehicle safety features.

A representative group, meeting in a White House conference could impress upon the States the urgency of taking early action on motor vehicle safety and uniform highway safety laws.

A very good example of something that could and should be done is to establish safety standards for motor-vehicle hydraulic brake fluid to eliminate a very serious problem which is a menace to anyone who drives on our highways.

Some 27 States and the District of Columbia have attempted to do something about this by legislation but only 10 States require registration and certification that individual brake fluids conform to minimum standards. Many States which do not require registration do not designate any method of enforcement.

In a test made by Chrysler Corp. engineers, and reported in Automotive News August 15, 1960, it was found that 28 percent of the brake fluids on the market in the Detroit area were substandard. Every vehicle using substandard brake fluid is a menace to life and limb to anyone on the highways because of the low boiling point of this inferior fluid, resulting in brake failures at critical moments.

I have introduced a bill (H.R. 2446) to establish Federal safety standards for brake fluid. It would be much better if the States would establish standards and set up enforcement procedures but if the States do not act, the Federal Government must. If the Federal Government has a responsibility in the field of highway construction, it has a responsibility to see that commerce on these highways is protected from such hazards as brake failures caused by hazardous brake fluids shipped in interstate commerce.

A WAY EVERY SHIPPER AND IMPORTER CAN HELP PROTECT THE VALUE OF HIS DOLLAR

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this article from the New York Times of February 7, 1960:

A WAY EVERY SHIPPER AND IMPORTER CAN HELP PROTECT THE VALUE OF HIS DOLLAR

(America's ships carry only a small percentage of our foreign trade. A way to raise this percentage and improve our balance of payments follows in this timely suggestion by John M. Franklin, chairman of the board, United States Lines.)

Recently we have been hearing a great deal about how our gold reserve has dwindled, and how gold is still flowing out of this country. We have heard concern expressed about our balance of payments and its effect on America's own dollar gap. Economists evaluate the immediate severity of this situation in varying degrees but generally agree that such a trend could adversely affect the value of our dollar.

Our Government has already taken steps to reduce the spending of dollars abroad. And in the last few months our exports have again begun to exceed our imports. Both of these developments are in the right direction and will contribute toward bringing about a more favorable balance of payments and a sounder fiscal climate in which to do international business.

MR. FRANKLIN'S SUGGESTION

There is another way in which this situation can be improved, a way in which every American shipper and importer can share, a way of helping to restore a better monetary situation virtually without cost or effort, in fact, with definite advantages to the merchant himself.

This is simply by designating vessels of American registry when there are shipments to be made.

LET'S START CALLING THE SIGNALS

Buying foreign transportation and paying American dollars for it is the same as buying any other foreign commodity. It is literally exporting dollars. Unfortunately, the tendency is for American shippers to accept terms of sale or purchase under which they lose control of routing. This leaves the choice of vessel largely in the foreign buyer's or foreign seller's hands.

The foreign buyer in most cases specifies a foreign flag line—usually his own. The result has been that British ships now carry 70 percent of Great Britain's trade. Japanese ships carry 57 percent of that nation's overseas shipping. But at the present time American ships are carrying only a small percentage of our total foreign trade.

EVERY INCREASE IMPORTANT

Even at this very small percentage the use of American-flag ships now contributes almost $1 billion annually to the U.S. balance of payments. So it is easy to see how, simply by specifying shipment by our American ships, a shipper or importer can make an important contribution to improving America's dollar gap.

At the same time shippers and importers get the most for their money on American ships. Consider the facts:

American and foreign freight rates are virtually identical on regular liner vessels.

American ships are held to the highest safety standards by strict Government requirements.

American ships are modern and well equipped—must be replaced on a regular schedule.

Sailings by American ships are frequent and dependable. American lines serve 400 major world ports on 37 essential U.S. trade routes.

Officers and, with minor exceptions, all crewmen on American ships are American citizens and trained to American standards.

Toward continuing to provide this superior service, America's steamship operators right now are working on a program of replacement and improvement. Already 11 new cargo ships and 4 new combination passenger and cargo vessels constructed, 57 cargo ships and 3 "combos" are now building or have been contracted for, and another 16 cargo ships are expected to be authorized this year. These 91 ships will cost $1 billion, all of it to be expended in this country for materials and wages, and will provide 280 million man-hours of work. United States Lines' share in this program will amount to $450 million.

Don't you agree that all this adds up to one thing—that it makes good sense for every shipper to look first into shipping by an American ship? It helps maintain the security of our dollar. It helps maintain a vigorous, healthy, growing merchant marine for America's foreign trade. It helps provide for America's security.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, one of the more important tasks that this Congress faces is that of taking a long, hard, second look at our Federal-aid highway program. As I have said before, we are finding out that we may have, here, only a very shaky hold on the tail of a very large bear.

Among the questions for which we must find answers are: When will the program for the National Interstate and Defense Highway System be completed in view of its present financial dilemma? What is its actual cost going to be? How will the necessary funds be developed? Who should share the tax burden? And so on and on.

In wrestling with these difficult and complex questions, it would be my sincere hope that we do not forget that, so far at least, the Congress has inadvertently penalized certain of our more progressive States for being progressive. I refer, of course, to the fact that a few States have never been reimbursed, in any fashion, for those preexisting miles of toll or free highways that measured up to the standards set for the Interstate System and have been incorporated into that system as integral parts. My State of New York is the principal victim of this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, research into this matter will indicate to those of my colleagues who are new to the problem that the Congress has previously expressed its intent to determine whether or not the Federal Government should reimburse those certain States for such mileage, as well as the time, method, and amount of such reimbursement, if any. This is as far as we have ever gone, the principal reason for stopping at that point being that, at the time of expressing such intent, we had very little information as to how much mileage was involved, what the cost thereof was, and what were the various formulas for reimbursement that we ought to consider. All of this information is now available to us, being contained in a report from the Secretary of Commerce entitled "Consideration for Reimbursement for Certain Highways on the Interstate System"—House Document No. 301, 85th Congress, 2d session—which should be required reading for every new Representative from the States of California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas, as well as New York. These are the States that have suffered the major losses, although every State, except Alaska and Hawaii, and even the District of Columbia have, in this fashion, "lost" some interstate mileage.

On February 1, 1959, the Secretary of Commerce somewhat reluctantly submitted two proposed formulas for making such reimbursement without recommending either formula or even the proposition of reimbursement itself. For those who may be interested, this additional information can be found in committee print No. 1 of the Committee on Public Works, 86th Congress, 1st session, under the title "Proposed Formulas for the Reimbursement of the States by the Federal Government for the Cost of Certain Highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." The chief reason the Secretary balked at then recommending reimbursement was the cost thereof, namely, $4,295,600,000, at a time when the estimated cost of completing the Interstate System was already far in excess of the anticipated revenues that would be available, under existing legislation, for its financing.

That dilemma continues unchanged, unless for the worse, even today. As I have said before, however, if this is an injustice, and I think it surely is, we should not permit the cost of doing equity to blind us to the principles of equity. Each year that we postpone resolution of this issue, the reimbursable mileage in question will depreciate in value. That, I feel, is adding insult to injury.

Accordingly, in the last Congress, I introduced H.R. 7512, which would simply establish the policy of reimbursement, freeze the reimbursement figures, and postpone for further congressional action the time, method, and manner of financing such reimbursement. Although other reimbursement bills have already been introduced in this Congress by other Members, I doubt that they have much practical chance of adoption, in view of the overriding financial problems involved in completing the rest of the Interstate System. I have, therefore, reintroduced my bill in this Congress as H.R. 1076.

I hope and trust that, in behalf of their States, the old and new Members from those States I have previously mentioned, as well as all other interested Members, will take a look at my proposal, and I shall also hope that it will be given full and earnest consideration by the Committee on Public Works when it begins to go into this and related highway problems.

Under unanimous consent I include an editorial entitled "Penalized for Progress" as taken from the January 1961 issue of Roads, the official publication of the New York Good Roads Association:

PENALIZED FOR PROGRESS?

Elsewhere in this issue is a chart showing the State's leadership in construction of its 1,227-mile network of interstate routes. We can be—and are—proud of this achievement. As the Empire State, it is fitting that we should set the pace in expressway development as well as in other fields.

However, our lead in interstate construction is due largely to designation of the thruway as an interstate highway, despite the fact that the thruway was constructed with bond funds and not with 90 percent Federal aid.

No one can fail to appreciate the many benefits and advantages the completed thruway has brought our State. In effect, however, the Federal Government is penalizing New York for its vision in constructing the thruway before commencement of the expanded interstate program.

While other States are due to receive 90 percent Federal aid for all their interstate highways, the amount that would have been apportioned for thruway construction has been denied to New York.

In addition, we are receiving reduced allocations of Federal interstate funds each year since such funds are granted on the basis of cost to complete the system, and our share, including the thruway, is nearer completion than most others.

We have urged Congress in the past to recognize its obligation to provide New York State with reimbursement or compensatory mileage for the thruway. We urge it again, and will continue to do so as long as necessary.

Until this obligation is met, New York remains the victim of a costly and utterly deplorable injustice.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES TO INVESTIGATE, SUBPENA, AND SO FORTH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that on Thursday next the following House resolutions will be taken up. These resolutions relate to giving several committees mentioned therein the right to investigate, subpena, and so forth:

House Resolution 78, relating to the Committee on Armed Services.

House Resolution 60, relating to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

House Resolution 86, relating to the Committee on Agriculture.

House Resolution 108, relating to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 143, relating to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

House Resolution 56, relating to the Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 49, relating to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the inaugural address of President Kennedy, followed by his message on the state of the Union, clearly shows that the President understands and appreciates the intent and purpose of international communism. His stepping up of our national defense and his firmness in the field of foreign affairs has already been evidenced.

Within a few weeks after taking office he has given leadership of action. One of the most important elements of our national defense is the Polaris missile and the Polaris submarine especially adapted for this type of missile. The recent order of the President for the immediate construction of five additional nuclear powered submarines, each carrying 16 Polaris missiles, and authorized last year by the Congress, is highly commendable. The American people support such leadership.

This action of President Kennedy means that by the end of 1963 we will have 19 Polaris submarines which otherwise would not have been completed until late 1964. This is simply one of the steps President Kennedy will take to strengthen our national defense for any emergency.

At the present time three of these powerful submarines have been commissioned. And I might say that the Congress started this program. The Members on both sides of the aisle who were here are the ones who started the Polaris program.

As I said, three have already been commissioned. Three more will be added to the fleet this year and there will be three others completed in 1962. The program originally provided for the completion of five each in 1963 and in 1964. The order of the President means that the last five will be completed by the end of 1963, which will be at least 9 months prior to the original intention.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to say that I served on the select committee with the distinguished majority leader as chairman of that committee. At that time we heard testimony on the matter of the Polaris missile and we were impressed with the practicability of this missile and the possibility that it had in the defense of this country. And, further, the distinguished chairman at that time, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], loaned his support and his efforts to the pushing of this program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. In other words, Congress took the responsibility before the Polaris missile was perfected to the extent that it has been, to authorize and appropriate money for the building of the submarines. It was the leadership that started in Congress and then adopted by the executive branch.

My remarks are not to be construed in any way as criticism. I want to give credit to this body, of which I am a Member, because the building of the submarines was initiated in this body, and in both branches of the Congress of the United States.

Furthermore, there is the building up of our troop transports, so that by July, rather than 4 years later, jet troop transports will be ready to transport our infantry anywhere where a brush war occurs. The President is to be congratulated and supported in such leadership, for in the field of a strong national defense, second to no other nation or combination of nations, and a firm foreign policy, the Members of Congress, without regard to party strongly support such leadership and action.

The recent criticism of the Soviet press on the President's determination to have a stronger national defense clearly shows they recognize President Kennedy will be a strong and courageous Chief Executive.

For when the Soviet press criticizes the President—and they would not do it unless the Soviet leaders ordered it—I am satisfied that our President is taking the right course.

And in what the President has done to date and what he will do in the future, to strengthen our defense forces, President Kennedy is taking the right course, for this follows the basic policy of peace through strength.

In the same article of a few days ago, Izvestia, the Soviet Government newspaper, attacked President Kennedy for what he said in his message on the state of the Union in relation to the liberation of Eastern European countries. For this is one of the real weak spots of the Soviet conspiracy of world domination.

The article in Izvestia mentioned that the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe, the people themselves elected their present path of development.

Everyone, including the Communists, knows that this is a falsehood.

The Soviet Union would not dare permit the people of Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other satellite countries to have a secret ballot, supervised internationally or by the United Nations to determine their own form of government.

The Communists know that the people of the Eastern European countries would overwhelmingly reject communism of any type as their form of government.

We remember the pain and anguish of Khrushchev a few years ago when the Congress passed the captive nations resolution, which resolution I offered in the House of Representatives. As a Member

of the Senate, President Kennedy voted for this resolution. He realizes that the people of these countries despise communism as do you and I, and they are praying and waiting for the day of deliverance from the domination of the Communist regime imposed upon them and maintained by Soviet military strength.

If Khrushchev and his associates in the Kremlin feel that a majority of the people of these countries prefer their present imposed Communist regimes, why does not the Soviet Union permit the people of the Eastern European countries to have a secret vote, supervised by impartial observers to determine whether they want communism or democracy—whether they want the Communist dictatorship or a government of laws as their form and type of government?

Our Government and other free nations should put this challenge to the Soviet Union.

With many nations recently emerging from colonialism what would they think about the refusal of the Soviet Union to permit the people of any satellite country freely in a secret ballot to determine their own form of government? What effect would such a demand have upon the countless millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain and the refusal of that demand, who despise communism? They would know the free world has not forgotten them. It would keep alive their hopes and stimulate their desire and determination for an early deliverance.

It would powerfully strengthen in the favor of the free world a weak link in the armor of international communism. For, in case of war, Khrushchev and his associates in the Kremlin will know that the many millions behind the Iron Curtain who despise communism and the Communist oppressor would rise in revolt against them. And when President Kennedy gave expression in his recent message to the hope of the liberation of the Eastern European countries, Khrushchev and his associates know that the President sent a message of hope and strength to the people of those countries. By his official recognition that they should be liberated he dealt a telling blow to one of the really weak links of world communism. For the peoples of these countries have known liberty and its meaning and significance, and if necessary they are willing to fight to regain independence and liberty.

Speaking for myself, and I am, as I realize, a rather lone voice, I challenge Khrushchev and his associates to allow the peoples of Eastern European satellite countries to have a free plebiscite with a secret ballot internationally supervised, such as under the auspices of the United Nations, to determine their own form of government.

SOVIET SATELLITES

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to say, just before he issued his challenge, that he was alone in his efforts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said I realized I am a rather lone voice. I realize there are others who have a rather lone voice; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I remember the gentleman was on a committee years ago that held hearings exposing the Communists, but the gentleman must admit there are and were others.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but I feel happier in the United Nations. I am not talking about today, but the United Nations, if we would insist on a plebiscite internationally supervised, if the free world would constantly challenge the Soviet Union, this is a weak link, in my opinion, and it is one of the greatest advantages we have, because those millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain are a reserve power in our favor. They hate and despise communism.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot yield any more time. I just wanted to call to the gentleman's attention that in his party he has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], and I do not know of anyone who has done more or is trying to do more against the Communists than Mr. WALTER and many others including my colleague from the Third District of Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. McCORMACK. When I talked about a lone voice, I was talking about some others, too. We are a lone voice.

NO MISSILE GAP

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the front pages of almost every newspaper have come out with headlines reporting that President Kennedy's advisers have reported that there is no missile gap. In other words, the downgrading of our country by the members of the present administration was merely campaign oratory, and the implication that President Eisenhower had misinformed America is proved untrue.

Of course, President Eisenhower and his administration have been proved right, and we again have to contemplate with sorrow and shame a new low in politics.

It is better to lose an election than to win by such methods. The following paragraphs are taken from today's Wall Street Journal:

Kennedy's advisers have concluded the United States currently faces no missile gap.

Also, there is no danger of Soviet superiority in overall destructive power. These tentative appraisals were said to have been reached during a survey Kennedy has ordered Defense Secretary McNamara to make of U.S. defenses. McNamara was instructed to have a final report ready for the White House by the end of February.

The conclusions strongly resemble those made by the Eisenhower administration and contrast sharply to Democratic campaign charges that U.S. military might is declining in comparison with Russia's.

The new Pentagon experts have found no signs of a Russian crash program to build up its long-range missile arsenal. At the same time, the survey shows no evidence that Russia is lessening its efforts to continue strengthening its total military machine.

Despite the optimistic report, the possibility remains that the Kennedy administration may make broad changes in the $42.9 billion defense spending plan recommended by Eisenhower for the next fiscal year. The Pentagon already has accelerated construction of five Polaris submarines and disclosed plans to buy 53 additional aircraft for hauling troops and equipment. Other Pentagon changes also are contemplated.

UNJUSTIFIED OIL PRICE INCREASES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised by constituents in my district in upstate New York that fuel oil prices for homeowners in this area during this particularly severe cold spell have just been increased by an additional one-half cent per gallon, placing these prices now at the highest level in history. In the Cooperstown area, for example, the figure is at 16.5 cents a gallon.

What particularly concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that this increase has been dictated not by the dealers themselves, who get nothing from it, but rather by the producers. In fact the price increase really represents a reduction in the percentage of profit for the individual local oil dealer.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third price increase in fuel oil this winter in the upstate New York area. In December, referring again to the Cooperstown area, the price was 14.7 cents per gallon. On December 16 the price jumped to 15.5 cents a gallon. On January 6 the price increased to 16 cents a gallon, and on February 4 was increased to 16.5 cents a gallon.

It is hard to believe that this latest increase has been dictated by anything except a desire to get all the traffic will bear while the weather stays cold.

One of the most important aspects of our economic stability is to hold the line against inflation, and one of the first steps toward inflation lies in unwarranted increases in the price of commodities like fuel oil which are particularly in demand by individual homeowners.

Two years ago when I first entered on this office, I commented with regard to a similar price increase being made under similar circumstances and I have been reliably informed that as a result of these comments the decision of the industry to follow this increase with still another was reconsidered and rejected.

Now we seem to be back at the same old stand again. I cannot believe that these increases have been necessitated by economic considerations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am referring this matter to the appropriate committees of Congress which are concerned with unwarranted price increases and I hope that some way can be found to protect the consumers of upstate New York against unnecessary actions caused by weather changes beyond their control.

LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE ARTISTIC STANDARDS IN OUR FEDERAL ARCHITECTURE

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills which would provide for the purchase and care of works of art in public buildings and for the preservation of historic buildings and sites which have deteriorated.

The Commission of Fine Arts, which advises the President and both Houses of Congress upon matters of art under the provisions of the act of May 17, 1910, is on record as deploring the dearth of painting, sculpture, and other ornamental features in public buildings constructed since World War II and now being built. The Commission points out, Mr. Speaker, that the plainness and severity of postwar architectural design demands supporting features which only the arts can supply. Unfortunately, budgeting for these decorative features has almost been entirely suspended and, when included, experience has shown that money for works of art is the first item to be eliminated if bids exceed expectation and cuts must be made.

To alleviate this situation, the Commission of Fine Arts has strongly urged that the Congress establish a method whereby, under the administration of the General Services Administration and with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, a continuing fund will be established to be used to provide works of art in public buildings. The Commission believes that if such a fund is established it will allow works of art to be placed where they are needed, and will eliminate the likelihood of their being stricken entirely from the plans. It is also the Commission's belief, Mr. Speaker, that no time limit should be imposed on the use of the fund in order that it can be most economically used for the best artistic development, and that in succeeding years percentages of funds for building programs can be added to the fund as they are authorized.

The administration of such a fund would require no change in the functions which the Commission of Fine Arts and the General Services Administration now perform, but it will assure that money is available when required to complete the designs of governmental buildings and adjacent grounds, and prevent the barren monotony that only the judicious use of art can remedy.

Also implementing the recent recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts, Mr. Speaker, is a second bill which I have introduced to provide for the preservation of historic buildings and sites owned by the United States. I am confident that the enriched inspirational value of our public buildings, not only to our contemporaries but to future generations as well, will pay handsome dividends on what little additional dollar investment we may make in the artistic improvement of our new public buildings and in the preservation of historic buildings and sites which represent an artistic expression of the past.

I am pleased to note here that similar legislation has been introduced in the other body, Mr. Speaker, and has elicited wide bipartisan support. I earnestly commend the bill to your thoughtful and favorable attention.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, for 15 minutes, on Monday, February 13, 1961.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. BAILEY), for 1 hour, on Thursday, February 9, vacating his special order for Wednesday, February 8.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN, for 15 minutes, on February 9.

Mr. ALFORD, for 60 minutes, on Monday, February 13.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. PIKE), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, February 9.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. SHORT), for 1 hour, on February 9.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mrs. MAY.

(At the request of Mr. PIKE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. STRATTON.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 153. An act to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

538. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A Bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

539. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the 10th report on the operations of the Selective Service System for the period ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

540. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all settlements made under the authority of section 2732 entitled "Property loss incident to service; members of Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps and civilian employee," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, pursuant to title 10 United States Code, section 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 49. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct investigations and studies; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 56. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 6). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 60. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation of matters relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy and the oversea operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy; without amendment (Rept. No. 7). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 78. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; without

amendment (Rept. No. 8). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 86. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations; without amendment (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 108. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 10). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 143. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries relating to housing; without amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 3933. A bill to provide for the determination of which lands above the 326-foot contour of the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir shall be retained by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3934. A bill to provide for the determination of which lands above the 326-foot contour of the John H. Kerr Dam and Reservoir shall be retained by the United States, and for the reconveyance of the remainder of such lands to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 3935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under that act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 3936. A bill to amend section 2(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 3937. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 3938. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first $50 per month of an individual's earned income may (in the discretion of the State agency concerned) be disregarded in determining his need for old-age assistance under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 3939. A bill to provide for suitable works of art in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3940. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall save historic buildings owned by the United States; and to provide that the Administrator of General Services shall be responsible for preserving and restoring certain works of art owned by the United States and for high standards of architectural design and decoration for Federal public buildings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3941. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 3942. A bill to prohibit private employment agencies from recruiting minors for out-of-State employment without making certain findings; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3943. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of $2.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II or the Korean conflict to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 3944. A bill to provide for Federal assistance, on a dollar-matching basis, to State and local governments and agencies thereof for planning, constructing, operating, and maintaining water conservation and water storage projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3945. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3946. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to provide hospital care for peacetime veterans on the same basis as such care is provided for wartime veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3947. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3948. A bill to eliminate the requirement that veterans have served for 90 days or more to qualify for certain benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 3949. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Mobile, Ala.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 3950. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that veterans have served 90 days or more during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict to qualify for pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3951. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3952. A bill to relieve certain members of the Armed Forces from liability to repay to the United States certain payments erroneously made to them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3954. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3955. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3956. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3957. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3958. A bill to authorize Federal loans to colleges and universities for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of classroom buildings and other academic facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3959. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase to 40 cents per hour the minimum wage applicable to blind workers and to provide for periodic increases beginning January 1, 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3960. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3961. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by providing for fair competition between domestic industries operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act and foreign industries that supply articles imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3962. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 3963. A bill to establish a national sinking fund to be used to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 3964. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3965. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3966. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 3967. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3968. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend section 1332(c) of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to diversity of citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3970. A bill to provide for the construction of a 500-bed general medical and surgical Veterans' Administration hospital at or near Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 3972. A bill to reduce to $100 the exemption provided by paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 for returning residents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 3973. A bill to provide for the coverage of physicians by the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3974. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3975. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3976. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3977. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits in certain cases for brothers, sisters, and other relatives of individuals who die fully insured under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 3978. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.R. 3979. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3980. A bill to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 3981. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 3982. A bill to establish a Commission on the cultural resources in the Nation's Capital, and to provide a comprehensive plan for the effective utilization of such resources in carrying out a long-range program to make the Nation's Capital equal in cultural matters to the capital cities of other nations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 3983. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make expenditures to prevent accidents and to promote the safety and occupational health of members of the Army on active duty and civilian employees of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3984. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 3985. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty upon the importation of bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3986. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restrictions on the importation of hardwood plywood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 3987. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3988. A bill to provide for temporary additional unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3989. A bill to provide that the birthplace of Adm. David Glasgow Farragut shall be a national shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 3990. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 3991. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Bridge Canyon project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 3992. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 3993. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3994. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3995. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the Secretary of the Army of certain real property to be used for the expansion of the national cemetery at Grafton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3996. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the Secretary of the Army of certain real property to be used for the expansion of the national cemetery at Grafton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 3997. A bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act to exempt from its application certain small railroads whose boilers are insured; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3998. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3999. A bill to provide an additional day of annual leave for Federal employees to permit such employees to observe special holidays in the locality concerned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4000. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY (by request):

H.R. 4001. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 4002. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4003. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4004. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4005. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4006. A bill to encourage needed evaluation of rehabilitation potentials of, and the provision of rehabilitation services to, handicapped individuals who may engage in gainful work or achieve substantial ability of independent living, thereby eliminating or reducing their burden on others and contributing to their dignity and self-respect; to assist in the establishment of public and private nonprofit evaluation and rehabilitation facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 4007. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4008. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4009. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4010. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 5 percent increase in rates of disability compensation, to liberalize effective dates of certain awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 7 percent increase in rates of disability compensation, to liberalize effective dates of certain awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4012. A bill to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 4013. A bill to reduce to $100 the exemption provided for returning residents by paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4015. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers for the purpose of refinancing outstanding indebtedness, to purchase machinery and equipment, and to broaden use of the disaster loan revolving fund; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4016. A bill to provide for a survey to be conducted by the Secretary of the Army with respect to certain possible projects for recreation on the Tallahatchie River, Coldwater River, Yocana River, and the Yalobusha

River in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4017. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.J. Res. 197. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 199. Joint resolution providing that the United States shall not participate in any civil action except as a party to such civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 200. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 151. Resolution authorizing investigation of effects of foreign trade on American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 152. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the cost of foreign aid; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H. Res. 153. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Agriculture to conduct a study of the issuance of milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. Res. 154. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Highway Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 4018. A bill to provide that the Secretary of State shall assist Rebecca A. Harrison in the prosecution of her claim against Japan arising out of the death of her husband; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4019. A bill for the relief of Rebecca A. Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 4020. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sevim Zafer Altolka Ipar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4021. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiku Kishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4022. A bill for the relief of Maria Giovanna Ciafrei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4023. A bill for the relief of Mieczyslaw Bajor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4024. A bill for the relief of Adela Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4025. A bill for the relief of Grazia Masanotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4026. A bill for the relief of Ralph M. Salvas and Maurice J. Salvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 4027. A bill for the relief of Keith K. Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4028. A bill for the relief of Lennon May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH (by request):

H.R. 4029. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Seraydarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4030. A bill for the relief of Robert A. St. Onge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4031. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4032. A bill for the relief of Fitzgerald Devonish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 4033. A bill for the relief of Pietro Pirri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4034. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. David V. Kyrklund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4035. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Pensacola Interstate Fair, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

52. By Mr. VANIK: Petition of the city of Maple Heights, Ohio, requesting the Congress of the United States to investigate the price control activities of the Standard Oil Co. in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

53. Also, petition of the village of Parkview, Ohio, memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the fixing of gasoline prices in the Cleveland area and to enact appropriate legislation thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

54. Also, petition of the village of North Randall, Ohio, memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate the fixing of gasoline prices in the North Randall Village area and to enact appropriate legislation thereon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

55. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Velma Edmonds and others, Salinas, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to strengthening and implementing the effectiveness of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to the United Service Organizations on Their 20th Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in two short decades the USO has become a cherished American tradition, and with good reason. None with the slightest knowledge of war is able to disregard the morale factor; and none who has ever experienced USO hospitality and service can doubt its uplifting effect upon American morale.

Established in the dark days of 1941, prior to our entrance into World War II, the USO set out to provide a home away from home for the great mass of American citizen soldiers and sailors. That the effort was wholly successful is attested to today by millions of grateful American veterans.

Symbolic of our national cause was the mixture of religious agencies which joined in the formation of the USO. Symbolic of the American will were the services provided by the USO program.

We had a war to win and while we were winning it, we expected to forgo the comforts of home. But the USO did its valiant best to upset our expectations.

Never in the history of warfare has the spirit of home penetrated so close to the men at the front.

USO services can be said to include community and travel information, counseling on personal and family problems, parties, housing bureaus, dances, discussion groups, craft classes, USO shows, picnics, dormitories, sightseeing, snackbars, and religious literature.

These and countless other facilities have made war less hideous to millions of Americans over the past 20 years; a fact for which the Nation is profoundly thankful.

At the present time USO is operating in 245 locations within the United States and 22 places overseas. American servicemen in Anniston, Ala.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Rome, Seoul, Cannes, and Casablanca—all are able to enjoy the services of the farflung USO.

Today, in the midst of the ominous cold war era, 2½ million young Americans remain in the military service of the American Government. Almost half of

them are under the age of 25, and many are away from home for the first time in their lives.

We may hope that the world situation will change for the better. Indeed, we pray it will, and soon. Yet, until that is the case, we must retain our military and naval strength in foreign parts. It is therefore up to the people at home, through USO, to extend the boundaries of every city and town to our young people overseas, in order that the American qualities of character may be preserved.

Safety Inspections of Viscount Turboprop Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent series of accidents which attended the most famous of American-built turboprop aircraft, the Lockheed Electra, I was interested and concerned with a report which appeared in the New York Times of January 22 suggesting the possibility of certain structural imperfections in another turboprop aircraft also extensively in use in the United States, the Viscount.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point the article in question:

NEW VISCOUNT ALERT—VICKERS URGES SAFETY CHECK ON TURBOPROP AIRLINERS

LONDON, January 20.—Operators of Viscount airliners throughout the world were again alerted tonight to inspect their air fleets for safety. Four hundred of the British turboprop airliners are flying.

Vickers Aircraft, the manufacturers, advised precautions after a minute crack was detected in the wing spar of an Indian Airline Viscount. A company spokesman said there was no need for alarm.

"The latest cracks have been found in the top spar boom, which carries no load," he said.

Cracks were found earlier this month in the lower spar boom of two Viscounts operated by Central African Airways. Vickers also advised inspections then.

Because the article appeared in a very obscure position in the newspaper and because I saw no follow-up notice from any other source that the warning issued by the manufacturers of the Viscount aircraft was to be followed in the United States, I dispatched the following telegram to the Federal Aviation Agency and to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

January 21 New York Times contains published report manufacturers of Viscount aircraft, Vickers Aircraft Co., in England, have advised all operators of Viscounts to inspect aircraft of this type for safety in connection with reported cracks in wing spars and have also recommended reduced speed pending final safety determination. Please advise me soonest possible what action has been taken by your organization and by U.S. Viscount operators in response to this warning.

In response to these telegrams I received communications both from Whitney Gillilland, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and from James T. Pyle, Acting Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these communications at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 30, 1961.

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference your January 23, 1961, telegram regarding New York Times report on Viscount cracked spar attachment fittings. Emergency measures recommended by manufacturer not applicable to U.S. registered aircraft since these aircraft have modified spars with increased sectional area and are made of different material. However, as precautionary measure, all Viscount aircraft will be inspected at a routine inspection interval.

JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1961.

Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STRATTON: This refers to your January 23 telegram inquiring about the recently reported spar cracking difficulties of the Vickers Armstrong Viscount aircraft.

Matters of this type are routinely handled by the Federal Aviation Agency in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and the Board has no direct responsibility for initiating action in such matters. However, the Board's accident investigation responsibilities require that its engineering staff keep abreast of service difficulties of this type and our personnel are generally familiar with the problem involved in this service difficulty.

The spar cracking difficulty stems primarily from the type of aluminum alloy used in the fabrication of the wing spars of the first 80 Viscount aircraft. All of these early model Viscounts were delivered to foreign airlines and none are operated by U.S. airlines. The wing spars installed in the Viscount aircraft operated by the U.S. carriers (Capital Airlines, Continental Airlines, and Northeast Airlines) were fabricated from the softer L-65 alloy instead of the harder DTD-363 alloy used in the first 80 aircraft, and are not as susceptible to the type of cracking found in the earlier model spars. Accordingly, the emergency inspection note that Vickers issued earlier this month applied only to those airlines operating the earlier model Viscounts and did not apply to the U.S.-operated Viscounts.

As a precautionary measure, however, Vickers has suggested to the operators of the later model Viscounts that they conduct a one-time ultrasonic inspection of the spar splice areas in the near future. It is our understanding that the Federal Aviation Agency is presently considering making this inspection the subject of one of their mandatory airworthiness directives. You may wish to contact the Federal Aviation Agency relative to specific aspects of this problem.

We trust that the above information will be of assistance to you. Please let us know if we may be of further help.

Sincerely yours,

WHITNEY GILLILLAND,
Chairman.

I am glad that the Viscounts in operation in the United States are not of the same type as those on which the difficulties were discovered abroad. At the same time, I am pleased that an investigation is nevertheless going forward on all of these aircraft operating in the United States so that the public interest may be completely protected and so that there will be no possible repetition of the accidents that occurred with the Electra.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include also a press release issued from my office following the receipt of the telegram from Mr. Pyle:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—All Viscount aircraft operating in the United States will be inspected to determine the adequacy of their wing structures, Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York, announced today.

STRATTON said he had been informed of a decision to this effect by the Federal Aviation Agency in response to his request.

STRATTON had asked the FAA to inform him what steps had been taken to determine the safety condition of Viscount airliners operating in the United States after press accounts had indicated that the British Vickers Aircraft Corp., manufacturers of the Viscount, had alerted operators throughout the world to conduct a special inspection of their planes for safety.

Vickers had advised these precautions after a minute crack was detected in the wing spar of an Indian Airline Viscount.

STRATTON said he had been informed by James T. Pyle, Acting Administrator of the FAA, that: "Emergency measures recommended by manufacturer not applicable to U.S. registered aircraft, since these aircraft have modified spars with increased sectional area and are made of different material. However, as precautionary measure, all Viscount aircraft will be inspected at a routine inspection interval."

Four hundred of the British turboprop airliners are reportedly now in operation around the world.

Economic Recovery and Growth—An Energetic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President has given the 87th Congress his message for economic recovery and growth for the United States. It is an energetic, realistic program, calling for full utilization of our human, natural, and technological resources. Its singleness of purpose is to stimulate our economic recovery and to promote the growth of our Nation.

There is no difference between a depressed economy and a depressed human being. Both need stimulus. Both need direction. Both need reinforcement. President Kennedy realistically recognizes these needs and has offered a program of direction by reinforcement to satisfy them. It utilizes our existing resources to a maximum degree with a minimum of contrived encumbrances.

For the hungry schoolchild of unemployed parents, he suggests distribution of our surplus food to provide that child, and others like him, with the energy he needs for his full growth and development. The hungry child is not unlike

a starved economy. In distressed areas where we have high unemployment and the discouraging consequences of such inactivity, the President urges Congress to enact the distressed area redevelopment program which is designed to reinforce the efforts of State and local governments and private agencies in alleviating the needs of the unemployed.

There are those who fear that this legislation will discriminate against California. I do not share that fear when I know that the food stamp plan is already a reality in San Bernardino County, and when I review the latest unemployment figures in California which stand at 7.2 percent in southern San Diego County and climb over the 16-percent mark in northern Ukiah and Fort Bragg. I find particularly encouraging the recommendation that these surplus labor markets be favored by Federal agencies and private industry when placing contracts or locating new facilities.

The President asked Congress to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 as one way of protecting a surplus labor market in a depressed area, and at the same time providing incentive to the worker and increasing productivity for management. He recommended that coverage be extended to include the several million workers primarily employed in retail trade and services, and to boost the wage standard throughout significant low-wage sectors of the labor market. The legislation he suggested would require payment starting at $1 per hour minimum for workers newly included with a gradual increase to a general $1.25, thereby creating a transitional period of adjustment for participants. This legislation is designed to stimulate incentive and thereby production, and at the same time improve the standard of living, morale and efficiency of our low-income worker.

To further implement enlightened recovery, the President intends to issue an Executive order establishing a President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. Its members are to be drawn from labor, management, and the public. Such a committee would recommend action to promote free and responsible collective bargaining, industrial peace, sound and stable wage and price policies.

Parenthetically, may I suggest the advisability of including the legislative branch of Government in membership on the Advisory Committee. A well-rounded advisory committee of this kind, working together with the President, could provide invaluable insight in the problems of labor and management, and the concentrated efforts of such a committee could constructively contribute to the harmonious fulfillment of wage-price decisions, full employment, price stability, and successful competition with foreign markets.

As the President included in his program the youth of our Nation and their needs, he also considered our aged and their needs. This important and too often overlooked group is finally to be considered in terms of "equity and decency." Five proposals were recommended: First, raising the minimum monthly benefit for the retired worker from $33 to $43 per month; second, permitting men to receive benefits beginning at age 62; third, liberalizing the insured-status requirements; fourth, increasing benefits for aged widows from 75 to 85 percent of their husband's benefit amount, and fifth, broadening disability insurance protection for totally disabled workers to 12 months.

I am particularly gratified by these proposals since they have been included in legislation which I have urged in past years.

These measures that I mention now are tokens of a very broad, carefully considered program to help those individuals in our Nation who today need the most help. Tomorrow will feasibly present new problems involving yet other segments of our society and our Nation as a whole.

If today's program is any indication of the care with which these problems will be met in the next 4 years, and I think it is, then we can look forward to energetic directives from our new administration. When enacted by Congress, they will give America the economic base to utilize all of its resources to the advantage of the many and for the profit of all.

USO Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to express sincere greetings to the United Service Organizations, Inc., which celebrated its 20th anniversary last Saturday.

At the moment our Nation is not engaged in active warfare, but our youth are stationed around the world to defend the peace. The USO brings to them evidence of the concern and well wishes of the folks back home.

The USO is known in every part of our globe. The combined interests of its contributing voluntary organizations make it a significant aspect of our defense efforts. These voluntary organizations deserve special mention. They are: the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army, and the National Travelers Aid Association. These volunteer organizations have assisted in giving to the young men and women of our Armed Forces the religious, social, welfare, recreational, and educational influences they so desperately need away from home.

Leaders in our Armed Forces and parents alike have observed that the USO has kept in step with the new elements involved in our present cold war. The citizens of our Nation have learned that USO operations in the continental United States and overseas must be continued. Absence of the USO would result in serious damage to the morale of our youth who are serving these United States.

This is an appropriate time, indeed, to express our faith in and appreciation of the USO. Again, I extend my warm greetings.

Symposium by the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., on the Subject of Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1961, the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., held a symposium at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, on the Immigration and Nationality Act. About 75 representatives of various organizations interested in the immigration laws participated in the symposium. Speakers were Congressman Emanuel Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives; Mario T. Noto, Assistant Commissioner of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service; and Dominick F. Rinaldi, Assistant Deputy District Director in New York, of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. After the speeches, there was a stimulating question and answer period in which many knotty problems were discussed and uncertain legislative positions clarified. Valuable suggestions were made by the audience which proved fruitful to the participants and the panelists rendered a stimulating account, not only of the provisions of the immigration law, but the administrative handling of discretionary relief cases and the processing of specialist applications under first preference status.

As the chairman of the conference, I uttered a few preliminary remarks, acted as the moderator, and expressed the gratitude of the federation for the contributions of the panelists and the participation by the interested organizations. The following is a summary of the remarks made by Congressman CELLER and the addresses delivered by Mr. Noto and Mr. Rinaldi, and my own preliminary statement. I believe that the discussions will prove informative and enlightening to those interested in our immigration laws:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

In the name of the Federation of Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, we welcome you to this symposium.

This morning we are to discuss a subject which not only vitally affects 250,000 human beings who can come to these shores each year, but also has psychological, economic,

and social effects upon the free and oppressed world. Traditionally our country has been the home of the brave, the land of the free, and a haven for the homeless tempest tossed. Emma Lazarus captured the spirit of the hospitality of America when she penned the stirring words about our Statue of Liberty, and I quote:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free
The refuse of your teeming shores
Send these, the homeless tempest tossed to me
I lift my lamp besides the golden door."

As we embark in the sixties and the New Frontiers, as the new administration prepares to take office, we have high hopes and great expectations. Our President-elect has demonstrated by word, oral and written, that he is cognizant of our Nation's background and strength, that he is sensitive to the harshness and inequities of the immigration law and its administration, that he is keenly aware of the drives to liberalize our immigration law, and that he is ready to give leadership for quick remedial action.

President-elect Kennedy in a letter to me has approved programs which will (1) reunite families, (2) give refuge to displaced peoples, (3) reallocate unused quotas, and (4) update the quota base from 1920 to 1950. We love him for his promises and we will thank him for his deeds.

However, we gather here today not to criticize the law or to praise the President-elect. We come here today to analyze, to consider, to hear an explanation of the law and its administration, to discuss, to resolve, and to choose a choice of action.

In the words of Woodrow Wilson, we see the bad with the good, the debased and decadent with the sound and vital. Our duty is to cleanse, to reconsider, to restore, to correct the evil without impairing the good, to purify and humanize our immigration law without weakening or destroying it. We desire to know, to discuss, and to resolve.

We have men here on our panel today who are the leaders of thought and action. Despite their failure to attend Harvard University, they have quick, incisive, and brilliant minds. Our first speaker is one who lives the spirit of Emma Lazarus, who constantly tries to keep the flame of liberty burning bright, who is the dean of the New York congressional delegation, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, a great American, and a greater humanitarian, EMANUEL CELLER.

CONGRESSMAN EMANUEL CELLER URGES MAJOR REVISIONS IN IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Until and unless we remove the obsolete principle of immigration based upon national origin from our immigration law, the United States cannot lay claim to having kept faith with its own traditions. The theory of national origins, upon which the allotments of immigration quotas is based, was developed in the early part of the 20th century when, following World War I, this country dug its head into the sands of isolationalism with its xenophobic fear of aliens who were not of Anglo-Saxon stock. Northern Europe was favored over southern Europe; the Nordic races above the Slavic and Mediterranean peoples.

Yet, the fact is that the whole pattern of the national origins fabric has been shredded since the 1924 act. By enactment of special refugee legislation, by the enactment of special nonquota legislation relating to the principle of the reuniting of families, and by nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere, the national origins theory has lost all practical meaning. Why, then, retain it on the books? It stands as an indictment not only as against American tradition but also American logic. Special legislation for refugees, escapees, spouses, etc., came from such countries as Italy, Spain, Poland, Czechoslovakia, all countries whose quotas, under the law, are severely restricted. We note, too, that much immigration from the Western Hemisphere, particularly from Canada, is not of Nordic origin. Many people who fled persecution in the last 20 years have settled in Canada, Brazil, Argentina and their children, as native-born citizens in the Western Hemisphere, entered the United States without regard to quota allotments. Mexicans have entered in large numbers as have Puerto Ricans.

I maintain, therefore, that the national origins theory has become a useless but festering appendix in the body politic of all countries. It, therefore, makes much more sense to eliminate the national origins theory and make our laws consistent with our own national interest. This could be accomplished by basing our immigration allotments on:

1. Self-need (admission of tailors when tailors are in shortage; admission of skilled workers when particular skills are required).
2. On the principle of reunification of families.
3. On humanitarianism, particularly in the area of refugees and escapees.
4. New seed immigration that will revitalize and bring adventurous blood into the United States.

Based on such standards, we could serve ourselves and the world in a much more logical manner.

Genius springs up everywhere and under a commonsense policy of immigration, a contemporary Christopher Columbus or Marco Polo of Italian origin, or Einstein of Austrian origin, or a Pablo Casal or Cervantes of Spanish origin could not face the barriers faced today.

There are other necessary revisions such as the elimination of differences between native born and naturalized citizens. We need also the imposition of a statute of limitations so that a person cannot be deported for an act committed years before enactment of the 1952 act. In my estimation, this is an ex post facto provision and thus antagonistic to our conception of American jurisprudence.

ADDRESS BY MARIO T. NOTO, ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, U.S. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, BEFORE CONFERENCE ON IMMIGRATION SPONSORED BY FEDERATION OF ITALIAN-AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATIONS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, INC.

Never before in the history of our national existence has it been so important to focus the image of the American peoples upon the rest of the world. In this we examine what manner and quality of men and women are we.

We are a people and land of immigrants. Our national character today and our place as leader in the community of nations is a story of growth and development. This has been the product of the multinationals who migrated here. The amalgamation of this foreign blood has given this Nation strength, wisdom, and courage. In return for their acceptance to this land, the immigrants and their children have rewarded it with their contributions to government, science, culture, and countless other avenues of human endeavor.

Because of the blessings bestowed upon this country, it has been and shall be always the world's leading provider of opportunity. And more than any other place in the world, hundreds of thousands of people each year seek to enter here to adopt this land as home for themselves and their children.

The immigration policies of the United States are intrinsically integrated with the social and economic development of the Nation. The varying fluctuations of world conditions of necessity influence the formulation or revision of our national policies. The rapid geographical and governmental changes occurring on this globe cannot be overlooked.

The basic national policy on immigration was pronounced by President-elect John F. Kennedy, who on October 8, 1960, replied to an inquiry from the Honorable ALFRED E. SANTANGELO that "the men and women who have come here from abroad have built America into the greatest country in the world. If America is to move ahead, we will have to draw on the skills of men and women of other nations, just as we have in the past. And if our country is to be the leader of democracy in the world, our immigration policies should conform more fully to the principles of equal justice on which our country was founded."

Congressional enactment will ultimately express the will of the people. What specific proposals will be made by the executive branch to the Congress must await the advocacies of the President-elect and his administration.

Looking backward, during the past Congresses, numerous proposals have been sponsored for legislation. Time does not permit their statement here. However, the enactments are few.

In the last Congress a number of immigration and nationality bills pending were left uncompleted. Among the laws enacted were the refugee bill sponsored by Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and the extension of the Mexican Farm Labor Act to December 31, 1961, sponsored by Congressman B. F. SISK, of California. The refugee bill became law on July 14, 1960. It provides for the parole into the United States of refugee-escapees who are under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and who fled their country because of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion and can no longer return there. One of the significant proposals left uncompleted was the judicial review bill which would limit the court reviews of deportation cases. This bill has been left pending in prior Congresses also. It is designed to avoid the numerous court reviews instituted by an alien to be deported solely for the purpose of delaying and frustrating the Government's mandate. In effect, it would require that judicial action for review of the administrative process be started in the district where the deportation hearing was held or where the alien resides. It would provide a single method of review of deportation orders for aliens not in custody, that is, by a petition for review in the appropriate court of appeals. Aliens in custody pursuant to a warrant of deportation would obtain review solely in habeas corpus proceedings. A deportation order would not be reviewed until all administrative remedies are exhausted. Exclusion orders would be reviewable only by habeas corpus. Administrative findings of fact would be conclusive if supported by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence.

In the short period during which the 87th Congress has been in session, already numerous bills have been introduced. Among these are provisions which would revise the quota system and the distribution of quotas; revise classes of preferences within specified quotas; admit certain escapees and refugees to the United States; add the waiver of tuberculosis to permanent law permitting the admission of certain afflicted aliens; restore illegality as a ground for cancellation of naturalization; amend the Immigration and Nationality Act by specifying that the burden of proof in cancellation cases shall be upon the Government to prove its case by a preponderance of evidence; and the reunion of close family members by grant of nonquota status.

As the session of Congress continues, other proposals will be submitted. Needless to say, on each of these issues, there are pros and cons. What changes are in store in the future are subject to conjecture. One thing is certain, that when the wisdom and judgment of our executive and legislative branches are combined together, the outcome will be just and expressive of our national will.

REMARKS BEFORE THE FEDERATION OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATIONS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK BY DOMINICK F. RINALDI

President of the federation, Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, Congressman CELLER, members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen, Congressman SANTANGELO asked me to speak today on some of my experiences in Europe and to provide some information as to quotas under the immigration laws.

In 1952 Congress passed the Immigration and Nationality Act which is the basic law governing immigration and naturalization.

You are all familiar with the quota system under which there are limits placed on the number of immigrants that may come to the United States. In addition thereto other immigrants, too, may come to the United States regardless of the quota allotted to that particular country. Such immigrants, known as nonquota immigrants, include, among others, spouses and children of U.S. citizens. From time to time special legislation has been passed to make certain categories of quota immigrants nonquota immigrants.

In the fiscal year 1959, 97,657 quota immigrants were admitted to the United States and, exclusive of natives of the Western Hemisphere, approximately the same number were admitted as nonquota immigrants. From Italy, which I know you are interested in, there were admitted 16,251 immigrants, of which 5,871 were quota immigrants and 10,380 were nonquota immigrants.

Although a person is registered under the quota or has been accorded nonquota status, this does not mean that he may automatically come to the United States. In addition to quota restrictions, the individual must not be of a class which renders him inadmissible to the United States. The Immigration and Nationality Act enumerates some 31 classes who are not eligible to receive a visa or be admitted to the United States. These deal primarily with subversive, criminal, immoral or narcotic classes. The law provides that a person who admits the commission of or is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude prior to entry is excludable from admission to the United States. Experience in administering the law demonstrated that in certain cases this was not just and created undue hardship. The hardship involved was primarily the separation of families. Many cases involved a wife in the United States whose husband had to remain in a foreign country. He could not be admitted to the United States because many years back he had been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude but, say for the past 15 or 20 years, had not been convicted of a crime and has led an exemplary life. The only relief that was available to such an individual was to have a private bill introduced and passed in Congress on his behalf.

Recognizing the need for remedial legislation, Congress passed a law on September 11, 1957, which is known as the act of September 11, 1957. This law provides, among other things, that where a person had been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude and was excludable from the United States because of this, an application could be filed with the Immigration and Naturalization Service to waive this ground of excludability, and the Attorney General, in the exercise of discretion, could waive such excludability, provided the applicant had a spouse, child, or parent who was either a citizen of the United States or a legal resident alien, and the exclusion of such alien would cause an extreme and unusual hardship to said spouse, child, or parent in the United States.

As officer in charge in Rome, Italy, it was my duty to adjudicate these cases as to those applicants residing in Italy, Malta, Spain, Portugal, and Africa. In some of these cases what rendered the individual excludable from the United States involved nothing more than the stealing of firewood by a person to heat his home. Of course, there were others who had engaged in a course of criminal conduct and who had never been rehabilitated. These cases, of course, were adjudicated accordingly.

Other types of cases handled were of people who were excludable from the United States because at one time or another they had engaged in prostitution. World War II and the stationing of military forces overseas increased the incidence of prostitution. Many a young girl, because of economic conditions, engaged in this practice for some limited time and then fell in love with and married a member of our military forces and became a good and faithful wife and mother. However, under the law, she is excludable because she had engaged in prostitution, in spite of the fact that subsequent to marriage she led an exemplary life. It is obvious that in these cases undue hardship would have resulted in not permitting the wife to join her husband when his military duty overseas was completed. A waiver of excludability, where warranted, was granted in this type of case.

As most of you are aware, it was and is difficult for childless couples to adopt children in the United States. The demand is greater than the supply. However, in Europe it is the reverse. The supply is greater than the demand. An adopted child born in a country in which the quota is not oversubscribed does not present any problem. Prior to September 11, 1957, adopted children born in oversubscribed quota countries could not enter the United States except under the fourth preference of the quota, which preference was and is usually heavily oversubscribed, even though such children had been adopted by citizens of the United States. The Immigration and Nationality Act was amended on September 11, 1957, to provide that a child who was adopted while under the age of 14 and who had resided with the adoptive parents for 2 years and was in their legal custody for 2 years after the adoption would be granted nonquota status. This, of course, has a very limited application, and, in order to meet these conditions, the U.S. citizen adoptive parents in effect had to travel abroad, go through the lengthy process of adoption, and then remain there for 2 years with the child in order to qualify. This amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act is of a permanent nature.

In addition thereto Congress, by the same act, provided for special nonquota visas to eligible orphans who were adopted or were to be adopted by U.S. citizens. An eligible orphan is defined as a child under 14 years of age who has no parents by reason of death or desertion, or who has one parent by reason of death or desertion of the other parent, and the remaining parent is incapable of supporting the child. Needless to say, the orphanages in these various countries are full of these children.

The law entrusted the Immigration and Naturalization Service with the duty to see that no frauds were involved in such cases and, further, that the interests of both the child and the adoptive parents were safeguarded.

As to members of the military forces and their wives, not much of a problem was presented. In most instances, they had seen the children and, in fact, the children had been released in their custody by an orphanage, and they were rearing the children in their home as their very own. However in many instances a U.S. citizen couple adopted children by proxy or were anxious to have such children come to the United States to be adopted without ever having seen the children and with no knowledge of the mental or physical condition of such children. Sometimes these couples dealt with a reliable social voluntary agency but, in many instances, did not.

Our office overseas, in determining whether the child was eligible for this speical nonquota visa, in some instances discovered that the child had a physical or mental condition of which the couple here in the United States had no knowledge. Although these conditions sometimes were not of a nature to render the child excludable on medical grounds, these conditions were brought to the attention of the adoptive parents so that they could have a complete history of the child. In some instances, mothers signed releases not knowing that they had irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption. This occurred in several instances where some unscrupulous individuals represented to the mothers that by signing such document the children could emigrate to the United States, without advising them that they were giving up all parental rights and duties as to the children. This law relating to eligible orphans expires June 30, 1961.

Another part of our work overseas was to determine the validity of claims of many that they were custom tailors. The Immigration and Nationality Act provides that under the quota, first preference, up to 50 percent of the quota, be made available to immigrants whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of high education, technical training, specialized experience or exceptional ability. A survey determined that custom tailors on men's clothing were in this category. In view of the fact that the quota for Italy is heavily oversubscribed, many attempted to qualify as tailors in order to obtain first preference status even though they were not tailors. As a result of our investigation it developed that more than 25 percent were not tailors or did not have the required experience as tailors. Many were farmers or barbers who had never held a needle in their hands. Yet they were able to obtain documents to the effect that they were tailors who had practiced the trade for more than 5 years. It was necessary to weed out these individuals because of the fact that they were using up the quota at the expense of those who primarily were the spouses of resident aliens residing in the United States. The spouse of a resident alien residing in the United States is eligible for a third preference and as a result the waiting period for the spouse or child of a resident alien to come to the United States was being increased more and more.

The foregoing activities, I believe, are of interest to you. Of course our activities were not limited to these. We provided service to the public by approving visa petitions to accord second, third, and fourth preference status right on the spot, extending reentry permits to those who for legitimate reasons could not return to the United States before the validity of their reentry permits expired, and other matters too numerous to enumerate.

The National Wool Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the National Wool Act of 1954 is to expire on March 31, 1962, and, therefore, should be before the Congress during the current session for extension. Today I introduced a bill which would make permanent the act, because time and again this act has proved itself to be a sound program which has worked well for the sheep industry and the consumer.

As you are aware, the 1954 Wool Act is self-financing, with 70 percent of the wool duty revenues used to pay the costs of supports to producers. The Wool Act does not tend to unbalance our foreign trade markets, and it allows domestic wool to go to the market, rather than into Government storage, as was the case before its enactment in 1954.

Prior to enactment of this legislation, wool stockpiles were built up under former loan programs. The sheep industry, as a result, faced grave problems in marketing. However, the Wool Act enabled reduction and elimination of these Government stockpiles, while at the same time, wool production was able to increase to the benefit of the industry and consumers alike.

It is also important to the industry that consideration of the National Wool Act be made as early as possible to enable growers to plan ahead and obtain financing for their operations in 1962 and future years.

The 20th Anniversary of the USO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, February 4, marked the 20th anniversary of the founding of the USO. All of the millions of service men and women whose lives were touched by this friend will vouch that the incorporation of the six private welfare agencies into a separate soldier welfare organization for a joint national program of morale, recreation, welfare, and religious work to the Armed Forces of the United States on February 4, 1941, was one of the greatest services of all time to fighting men and women.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the USO and the fine record it has made. As long as we have millions of young Americans under arms all over the world, there remains a need for the USO, especially in places where there are few suitable community facilities near large training centers and large oversea stations. It is my hope, therefore, that this organization will continue as a growing tradition and serve as long as there is a need to have armed forces for the safety and security of the free world.

The USO job is just not the free coffee, the place to relax, the piece of stationery, the star spangled entertainment. The USO's main concern is for the religious, spiritual, social welfare, and educational needs of members of the Armed Forces, serving their country in lonely places far from home.

Since the funds to support these activities come directly from the American people, contributing through their annual United Fund-Community Chest drives, I feel that there will never be a lack of funds to indicate to our young men and women in the armed services that the people back home do care and want to help ease their trials and tribulations through the USO while they are away from home.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. George E. Meetze, D.D., pastor, Incarnation Lutheran Church, Columbia, S.C., and chaplain of the Senate of South Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in Heaven, who by Thy merciful providence hast permitted us to live in a democracy, where the voices of many must be heard, and the rights of many preserved, we are today particularly conscious of the fact that we must face a multitude of conflicting opinions that must be resolved in shaping public policy.

Give us wisdom and patience as we struggle to understand each other's points of view.

Help us always to be willing to yield to that which is right, and just, and fair.

Help us to require of ourselves the same standards of ethics we demand of our competitors.

May we join together our labors of heart and brain and brawn, that our beloved Nation may continue to grow strong spiritually and economically.

This is our morning prayer, in the name of Christ, the Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 6, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. SAUND, of California (chairman); Mr. RUTHERFORD, of Texas; Mr. MONTOYA, of New Mexico; Mr. NIX, of Pennsylvania; Mr. MCDOWELL, of Delaware; Mr. INOUYE, of Hawaii; Mr. NORBLAD, of Oregon; Mr. SPRINGER, of Illinois; Mr. BROYHILL, of Virginia; Mr. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; and Mr. NELSEN, of Minnesota, as members on the part of the House of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, for the meeting to be held in Guadalajara, Mexico, from February 6 to February 12, 1961.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri; Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana; Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. CURTIS, of Missouri; Mr. KILBURN, of New York; and Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, as members on the part of the House of the Joint Economic Committee.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. HOLIFIELD, of California; Mr. PRICE, of Illinois; Mr. ASPINALL, of Colorado; Mr. THOMAS, of Texas; Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico; Mr. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; Mr. HOSMER, of California; Mr. BATES, of Massachusetts; and Mr. WESTLAND, of Washington, as members on the part of the House of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION AND VOTE ON NOMINATION OF DR. ROBERT C. WEAVER, TO BE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that today the Senate consider and vote upon the nomination of Dr. Robert C. Weaver to be the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that yesterday the Banking and Currency Committee reported Dr. Weaver's nomination, following a vote of 11 to 4. Had the Senate been in session on yesterday, no unanimous-consent agreement would, of course, have been necessary today. The hearings are printed, and have been available since 9 o'clock this morning.

For the information of the Senate, let me state that if the Senate concludes, today, its action on the money resolutions now on the calendar—and this was announced on Monday—and on Dr. Weaver's nomination, it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate adjourn from today until Monday; and then we would plan to have

the Senate adjourn from Monday, after transacting whatever business the Senate then may have before it, until Thursday; and then, upon completing our business on Thursday, it is planned to adjourn from then until Monday, February 20—whereby our distinguished Republican colleagues during this period may well extol the virtues of Abraham Lincoln; and we would give them the opportunity to extol those virtues all of next week and, in fact, for time immemorial.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my distinguished compatriot from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is always a pleasure to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Minnesota will extend that time a little more, we can include the Father of our Country, George Washington, and also Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that this was just a part of the surprise package we thought we would hold up after we had extolled the virtues of Abraham Lincoln. Undoubtedly we shall have the traditional Washington's Birthday commemoration in the Senate; and when the majority leader returns, he will be able to give us some proper guidance, for the benefit of both the minority leader and all other Senators, with respect to extolling the other great American patriots.

Mr. President, the leadership does not contemplate any rollcall votes today, if the business already stated can be completed today. It is my understanding—and I hope I am not in error—that there was no anticipation of a rollcall vote on any of the items on the calendar today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust that what the Senator from Minnesota has indicated is true. Previously, we had an understanding that insofar as possible any record votes would be avoided while a good many Members are away. A delegation of 12 Senators is now in Mexico, at the Interparliamentary Union meeting. Others are abroad in the land, to deliver some of the Lincoln Day speeches, and so forth; and I thought we had in the nature of a commitment that there would be no record votes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Delaware wishes to speak in the morning hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, inasmuch as under the rule there will be the usual morning hour, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR EXPERIMENTAL OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Administration for experimental or research work, covering the period from July 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF GENERAL SALES MANAGER, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the month of September 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Agency (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

OWNERSHIP OF MOTOR VEHICLE LIABILITY INSURANCE BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a directive issued by that Department, relating to the ownership of motor vehicle liability insurance by Department of Defense personnel and its solicitation and purchase, dated January 19, 1961 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that System, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS ON ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the month of November 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNCLAIMED FUNDS ACT FOR LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the administration of unclaimed funds held and owing by life insurance companies in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated January 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CLAIM OF U.S. DISPLAY CORP. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim of the U.S. Display Corp. against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders relating to the adjustment of immigration status of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Aldo Pagani, also known as Albert Pascal or Pascel, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to the alien, together with the reason for ordering suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION 90

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas the residents of the unincorporated territory of Guam, Americans all, though they are not entitled or eligible to vote in the national election, were overjoyed and delighted at the election results in which the Democratic nominee for President and Democratic nominee for Vice President of the United States were duly elected to their respective offices, the most significant and prestigious offices in the world; and

"Whereas the people of Guam, in demonstrating and manifesting their enthusiasm at the victory of the Democratic nominees, through their duly elected legislators of the Sixth Guam Legislature, adopted Resolution No. 7 on the 11th day of January 1961, which said resolution requested and memorialized the Secretary of Guam, acting as Governor of Guam in the absence of the Governor, to designate and appoint the 20th day of January, 1961, as a holiday for the

territory of Guam, in honor of the inauguration of President John F. Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON; and

"Whereas in further expounding the confidence and trust of the people of Guam in their new President and Vice President, numerous statements were made on the floor of the legislature during its January 20, 1961, session, all wishing the new administration success in its New Frontiers program, and the members of the Guam Legislature, joined by the observers in the gallery, ended by a rendition of 'God Bless America'; and

"Whereas the Sixth Guam Legislature, although knowing and being fully cognizant that the Secretary of Guam is a Republican and a Republican appointee, nevertheless adopted the said Resolution No. 7 in good faith and not with the intention of embarrassing a Republican Secretary of Guam, and knowing further full well that such a request or petition would not sit too well with the said Secretary of Guam; and

"Whereas since the transmittal of the said Resolution No. 7 on the 13th day of January, 1961, the Secretary of Guam has yet to even acknowledge receipt of the same, and it is the consensus of opinion among the members of the Sixth Guam Legislature that, as a matter of good taste and common decency and down-to-earth courtesy, the Secretary of Guam representing the President of the United States on Guam, should at least acknowledge the receipt of the same, notwithstanding his refusal to grant the request and petition of the people of Guam to so designate and appoint the inauguration date of President John F. Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as a holiday for the territory of Guam; and

"Whereas this is but one of the many manifestations of the arrogance and contumacy of the Secretary of Guam in dealing with the Legislature as a body, and the members thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Secretary of Guam, Mr. A. M. Edwards, Jr., be and he is hereby respectfully informed and advised, that the people of Guam, Americans all, are represented within their Government, by the duly elected members of the Sixth Guam Legislature, and that a request or petition from the Legislature, or from any person for that matter, should at least be acknowledged, even though no action is taken on the subject matter because of Mr. Edward's partisanship and arrogance; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States; to the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of Interior; to Mr. A. M. Edwards, Jr., Secretary of Guam, and to the Governor of Guam."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 2

"A Joint Memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the multiple-purpose use of the water resources of the Snake River has become the backbone of the economy of Idaho during the past more than 50 years, the Palisades reservoir and powerplant, which is located on the upper Snake River near the eastern boundary of Idaho, being the most recent addition to this multiple-purpose use; and

"Whereas at the time of and ever since the planning of the Palisades project it was and has generally been recognized by the Federal Power Commission and other government departments, as well as by many persons and groups interested in the development of the resources of this State, that the maximum benefits to the Nation and to the State of Idaho in terms of power production and water storage for irrigation purposes will be attainable from the Palisades project only through the construction of a reregulating dam downstream to link irrigation storage releases with the powerplant of the Palisades project, and the Burns Creek project was designed for integration operationally and financially with the Palisades project in order to attain the maximum of complementary benefits from both projects; and

"Whereas there is urgent need in the State of Idaho for greater power production and increased reservoir capacity for the storage of water for irrigation purposes; and

"Whereas the Burns Creek project was determined to be feasible by the Secretary of the Interior in his report, dated February 26, 1957, and both the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget reported favorably on legislation to authorize this project by letters directed to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the 85th Congress, which committee reported favorably on the bill (S. 2757) in the 85th Congress which would have authorized the construction of the Burns Creek project, and recommended that it do pass: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, to proceed with all due speed to enact legislation similar to Senate bill 2757 of the 85th Congress authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and to implement such authorization with necessary appropriations; be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

Five resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION AND THE DEDUCTION FOR DEPENDENTS UNDER THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX LAW

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the personal exemption, under the Federal income tax law from $600 to $1,000 for persons under the age of 65, and increasing the amount of deduction allowed for dependents of such persons from $600 to $1,000; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth."

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST GRANTING CONCESSIONS ON TEXTILE AND FISH IMPORTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass no legislation granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PASS LEGISLATION GRANTING MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED UNDER THE FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AND ELIMINATING THE PAUPER'S OATH

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation granting medical assistance to the aged, funds for such assistance to be raised under the Federal Social Security Act, and eliminating the pauper's oath; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I PENSIONS COMPARABLE TO THOSE GRANTED TO VETERANS OF WARS PRIOR TO WORLD WAR I

"Whereas it has been the policy of the United States to assist its veterans by granting them a pension, in consideration of their services in the Armed Forces of their country in time of war; and

"Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting veterans of World War I pensions comparable to those granted to veterans of wars prior to World War I; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth, and to each member of the Veterans' Affairs committee of the House of Representatives of the United States."

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION ELIMINATING ALL RESTRICTIONS ON THE EARNING CAPACITY OF RECIPIENTS OF BENEFITS UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation eliminating all restrictions on the amount of money which may be earned by recipients of benefits under the Social Security Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR VETERANS IN THE CITY OF WESTFIELD

"Whereas the General Court of Massachusetts urges upon the Congress of the United States the importance of keeping alive the memory of our veterans; and

"Whereas a fitting resting place should be provided for such veterans in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to establish a national cemetery for veterans in the city of Westfield; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OUTLAWING SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, on the 17th of May 1954, by unanimous decision, held that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place; and

"Whereas the same court expressed its desire that its decision should be complied with with all deliberate speed; and

"Whereas the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction equal protection of the laws; and

"Whereas the interests of orderly government demand that respect and compliance be given to orders issued by courts possessed of jurisdiction of persons and subject matter: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO NAME THE VETERNS' HOSPITAL IN JAMAICA PLAIN 'THE CONGRESSWOMAN EDITH NOURSE ROGERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL'

"Whereas the late Congresswoman, Edith Nourse Rogers, was one of the most illustrious women to serve in the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas during her lifetime she displayed a deep and abiding concern for all veterans: Therefore be it

"Resolved, that the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to name the Veterans' Hospital in the Jamaica Plain district of the City of Boston 'The Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Hospital'; and be it further

"Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 expires on March 31, 1961; and

"Whereas the destruction by the present Government of Cuba of normal commercial and other relationships between that country and the United States of America, and the destruction by that government of much of the Cuban sugar producing capacity have eliminated Cuba as a major supplier to the American market, not only for the present but for many years to come; and

"Whereas the expansion of the domestic sugar industry will alleviate problems in both the agricultural and industrial sectors of our economy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give favorable consideration to amending the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide that any reduction in the Cuban sugar quota be assigned to domestic beet and cane sugar producers, and that such increase be so allocated as to foster the development of a stable industry and encourage the building of additional beet processing plants to serve in the development of new beet sugar areas and new growers in established areas; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of New Mexico."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Kenneth D. Barrett, of Orlando, Fla., relating to a program to develop and implement particularized training for those who will explore and develop the potentialities of space; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

A resolution adopted by the Tomer Butte Barracks 1375, Veterans of World War I, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a pension for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by local union No. 3, United Brick and Clay Workers of America, relating to cutthroat competition from foreign imports; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Council, Order of the Sons of Italy in America, at Miami, Fla., relating to immigration and naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution, of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO AMEND THE U.S. SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO APPROVE A STATE PLAN WHICH PROVIDES AN EXEMPTION OF $50 PER MONTH OF EARNED INCOME IN THE OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE AND AID-TO-DEPENDENT-CHILDREN CATEGORIES

Whereas the State of Oklahoma in the 26th session of its legislature did enact legislation directing the public welfare commission of this State to revise and liberalize its budget in ascertaining the need of any person eligible to receive old-age assistance and aid to dependent children payments; and

Whereas the legislature further directed that the welfare commission in so doing consider the increased cost of living and except from consideration earned or inconsequential resources or unpredictable wages or salary in an amount of an average of $50 per month; and

Whereas this action was taken by the Oklahoma Legislature with a view toward relieving unnecessary idleness and encouraging industry and a semi-independence on the part of the welfare recipients of this State; and

Whereas, since the passage of this 1957 act by the Oklahoma Legislature, increases in the cost of living as well as an increased standard of living have been the order of the day, this being applicable to all members of our community of States, those engaged in regular employment as well as those on welfare; and

Whereas, in the years following the passage of this act by the Oklahoma Legislature, the Congress of the United States has found it necessary to enact legislation liberalizing certain classes of assistance category benefits and to extend social security benefits for eligible recipients; and

Whereas the members of this senate recognize that any amount of earned income has a wholesome effect on the individual, regardless of his years or economic status, and the result of earning one's own way creates a more desirable atmosphere for the individual and the community alike; and

Whereas worthwhile activity for a person of senior years is of proven medical benefit, such activity postponing both mental and physical deterioration, and symbolizes that great American heritage of industry and independence for each individual: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend title 1 of the U.S. Social Security Act which would permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to exempt $50 per month earned income in determining need in the old-age-assistance and aid-to-dependent-children categories; be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—RESOLUTION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Special Committee on Rehabilitation Services, State Legislative Council, of the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO AMEND THE U.S. SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO APPROVE A STATE PLAN WHICH PROVIDES AN EXEMPTION OF $50 PER MONTH OF EARNED INCOME IN THE OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE AND AID-TO-DEPENDENT-CHILDREN CATEGORIES

Whereas the State of Oklahoma in the 26th session of its legislature did enact legislation directing the public welfare commission of this State to revise and liberalize its budget in ascertaining the need of any person eligible to receive old age assistance and aid to dependent children payments; and

Whereas the legislature further directed that the welfare commission in so doing consider the increased cost of living and except from consideration earned or inconsequential resources or unpredictable wages

or salary in an amount of an average of $50 per month; and

Whereas this action was taken by the Oklahoma Legislature with a view toward relieving unnecessary idleness and encouraging industry and a semi-independence on the part of the welfare recipients of this State; and

Whereas since the passage of this 1957 act by the Oklahoma Legislature increases in the cost of living as well as an increased standard of living have been the order of the day, this being applicable to all members of our community of States, those engaged in regular employment as well as those on welfare; and

Whereas in the years following the passage of this Act by the Oklahoma Legislature the Congress of the United States has found it necessary to enact legislation liberalizing certain classes of assistance category benefits and to extend social security benefits for eligible recipients; and

Whereas the members of this committee recognize that any amount of earned income has a wholesome effect on the individual, regardless of his years or economic status, and the result of earning one's own way creates a more desirable atmosphere for the individual and the community alike; and

Whereas worthwhile activity for a person of senior years is of proven medical benefit, such activity postponing both mental and physical deterioration, and symbolizes that great American heritage of industry and independence for each individual: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the special committee on rehabilitation services (the executive committee of the State legislative council concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend title 1 of the U.S. Social Security Act which would permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to exempt $50 per month earned income in determining need in the old-age-assistance and aid-to-dependent-children categories; be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

PETITION ON ARAB-ISRAELI TENSIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition which has been sent to me by a group of my constituents from Rochester. They urge, and I fully agree, that steps be taken at once to initiate direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab nations, so that the needless friction and economic warfare in the Middle East can be brought to an end.

The accomplishments of the State of Israel over the last decade and a half are a testimonial to the abilities and determination of its citizens. They have found in Israel a refuge from the persecutions they endured under Nazi, Communist, and other tyrannies. A peaceful settlement of outstanding differences would bring to Israel and to its neighbors new opportunities for economic, social, and political achievement from which the whole free world would benefit.

Unfortunately, I cannot include in the RECORD the names of all those who have written to me along these lines, but I can include the fine statement which they have endorsed.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, strongly urge that affirmative action be taken by the United States to solve the following problems in the Middle East:

1. That direct negotiations be arranged between Israel and the Arab nations to solve their differences;

2. That free and unrestricted passage of ships from all countries be permitted in the Suez Canal;

3. That the U.S. Government do all in its power to end trade restrictions, blockades, and economic boycotts against nations or business firms that trade with Israel; and

4. That the Arab refugees be resettled in lands of Arab nations.

COMPULSORY CHURCH ATTENDANCE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the eastern New York zone of the Lutheran Laymen's League, at Delmar, N.Y., relating to compulsory church attendance of military personnel.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY CHURCH ATTENDANCE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Whereas compulsory attendance at religious services in military establishments, as, for example, at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, is contrary to the true American spirit and a flagrant violation of the first article of the Bill of Rights and may involve infringement of conscience; and

Whereas we gratefully remind ourselves of the value of the basic American concept of freedom of worship, and that we claim it for ourselves and all of our fellow men and specifically for our Lutheran cadets at West Point; and

Whereas we affirm our confessional practices as Lutherans, freely to worship according to the practices of our faith, and without compulsory attendance at non-Lutheran forms of worship; and

Whereas we earnestly and emphatically continue to deplore the constitutional violation of the American constitutional rights of our fellow Lutheran cadets at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and the continual offense to their Christian consciences: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition the legislative branch of the Government and the commanding general of West Point to take such action as will—

1. Abolish the present compulsory attendance of its military personnel at divine services; and will

2. Afford an opportunity for each denomination at its own expense to provide spiritual care for its members wherever this is not being done; and be it further

Resolved, That we object most strongly to the unconstitutional and illegal requirement of the U.S. military that Lutherans attend the compulsory cadet service; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution of protest be transmitted by the eastern New York zone of the Lutheran Laymen's League, an affiliate of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, to the legislative branch of the U.S. Government and the commanding general of West Point requesting appropriate action be taken speedily to remedy this deplorable and objectionable condition.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. 451. A bill to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies (Rept. No. 43).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing certain expenditures by the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 44).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 33. Resolution creating the Special Committee on Aging (Rept. No. 45).

ELIZABETH J. DOUGHTON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 83) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Doughton, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth J. Doughton, widow of Walter L. Doughton, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

THELMA AUSTON BROWN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 84) to pay a gratuity to Thelma Auston Brown, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate, hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Thelma Auston Brown, widow of Coy Brown, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. DODD, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 822. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy to research and develop an integrated, operational science to win the nonmilitary part of the global struggle between freedom and communism and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 823. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Jesse Lee Caudill, of Palmer, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 824. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 825. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Yeannakopoulos; and

S. 826. A bill for the relief of Chiang Tsai-Teh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 827. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands belonging to the United States to the County of Pima, State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 828. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of lead and zinc in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract for lead and zinc research, and for other purposes; and

S. 829. A bill to designate the Glen Canyon Dam, to be constructed in connection with the Colorado River storage project, as the Eisenhower Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. PELL):

S. 830. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 831. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and to revise certain provisions of such act in order to promote safety in air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 832. A bill for the relief of Antoni Zolkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 833. A bill for the relief of Nurisa Tozan, Mayrani Tozan, and Araksi Tozan; and

S. 834. A bill for the relief of Lydia Knabian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. HART):

S. 835. A bill to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to permanently extend the veterans and Armed Forces dairy program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 836. A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 837. A bill for the relief of Jozef Sznajder; and

S. 838. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lovrich (also known as Josip Lovric); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 839. A bill to provide for trial and appellate divisions in the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (by request):

S. 840. A bill for the relief of Rogelio Curiel-Ceballos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 841. A bill to amend the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 842. A bill to amend section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Zoe J. Bithos; and

S. 845. A bill for the relief of Ruu-kwang Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. JORDAN):

S. 846. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 847. A bill to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 848. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 849. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward J. Steichen, U.S. Naval Reserve (retired), to the grade of rear admiral on the Naval Reserve retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 850. A bill for the relief of Matias T. Falcasantos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 851. A bill to assist business enterprises, communities, and individuals to make necessary adjustments required by changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policies of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 852. A bill to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 853. A bill to make Abraham Lincoln's birthday a holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 854. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 855. A bill making the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 856. A bill to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management and control of the water and related natural resources of the Delaware River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers and duties of such agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 857. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HART, and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 858. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist States and their political subdivisions in preserving open space land in and around urban areas which, for economic, social, conservation, recreational, or esthetic reasons, is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas and their suburban and rural environs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 859. A bill to provide for the establishment of a farm electrification research laboratory in the State of Minnesota; and

S. 860. A bill to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 861. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 862. A bill authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Old Fort

Davis, Jeff Davis County, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 863. A bill to provide that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 864. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bong Oh Kim;

S. 865. A bill for the relief of Wieslawa Barbara Krzak; and

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Jose Erasmo Reina (Lajara); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KEATING):

S. 867. A bill to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

S. 868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide a 5-year carryover for charitable contributions made by individuals in excess of amounts deductible for the year in which made; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 869. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act; and

S. 870. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act to extend Federal supervision of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and provide necessary assistance, to enable such tribe to make an orderly transition to its status after such supervision ends; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. MORTON):

S. 871. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800, the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 872. A bill vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima Volcanic Islands, Pacific Ocean area; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 873. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the townsite of Rupert, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 874. A bill to increase certain compensation benefits payable pursuant to the War Hazards Compensation Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 875. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 876. A bill to provide for tariff import quotas on sheep, lambs, mutton, and lamb; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 877. A bill to reduce to $100 the exemption provided for returning residents by paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 878. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 879. A bill to amend section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to exempt from the provisions of such act certain intermediate harvesters or handlers of fruits and vegetables; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 880. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the United States Merchant Marine Academy;

S. 881. A bill to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad;

S. 882. A bill to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

S. 883. A bill to extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain possessions of the United States;

S. 884. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants; and

S. 885. A bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 886. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. MILLER, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 887. A bill to prevent the service or consumption of hard liquor aboard commercial passenger aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 888. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Utah to Joseph A. Workman; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 889. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1960 so as to extend for 4 years the period of retroactivity of certain amendments made by section 202 of such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Irene Essley; and

S. 891. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Leon O. Beck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 892. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Arbuckle reclamation project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 893. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to assist in the planning and financing of the construction of county agricultural buildings; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 894. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ernest Mountain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. PELL):

S. 895. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 896. A bill for the relief of Zahra Hossein Golji; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 897. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. McGEE):

S. 898. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 899. A bill for the relief of Liu Shui Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 900. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of Mobile, Ala.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 901. A bill to advance the marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys, to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense, to expand ocean, coastal and Great Lakes resources, to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and laboratory facilities, to expedite oceanographic instrumentation, to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments, to enhance the public health and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. COOPER):

S. 902. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 904. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment of equal minimum monthly payments for recipients of aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title;

S. 905. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that considerations with respect to the ability of the family or relatives of a blind individual to provide for his support shall be disregarded in determining his need for aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title;

S. 906. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Federal financial participation in State programs of aid to the blind established pursuant to such title;

S. 907. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to prohibit the States from requiring that an individual encumber, or divest himself of, title to his property as a condition of eligibility for aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title; and

S. 908. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to liberalize the restrictions with respect to possession of property or other resources imposed as a condition of eligibility for aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILEY):

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ELIZABETH J. DOUGHTON

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 83) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Doughton, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

THELMA AUSTON BROWN

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 84) to pay a gratuity to Thelma Auston Brown, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 85) favoring the unification of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 86) to investigate matters pertaining to migratory labor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rules XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers, and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be fixed so that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FREEDOM COMMISSION AND FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference, to the appropriate committee a bill to create a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy to research, develop, and project an integrated, operational science to win the nonmilitary part of the global struggle between freedom and communism and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science. I am joined today in the sponsorship of this bill by Senator DOUGLAS, Senator CASE of New Jersey, Senator DODD, and Senator SMATHERS; and I request unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 1 week to enable other Senators who may wish to do so to join us in its sponsorship.

I introduced this bill, which has become popularly known as the Freedom Academy bill, in the 86th Congress along with cosponsors Senators DOUGLAS and CASE of New Jersey and companion legislation was introduced in the House by Congressman SYD HERLONG and Congressman WALTER JUDD. On August 31, 1960, the Senate approved our bill to establish a Freedom Academy in this country; however, the sine die adjournment of the 86th Congress prevented the House from taking action. I am advised that Congressmen HERLONG and JUDD will reintroduce this measure in the House within the next few days.

Mr. President, this bill has one primary aim—the substantial improvement of the cold war capabilities of the United States and the free world so that we can win the cold war struggle with the Communists. To accomplish this aim the bill proposes two coordinate courses of action. First, the creation of an agency in Government, to which is specifically delegated the responsibility for developing a systematic, integrated applied science of nonmilitary action appropriate for utilization by the United States and other free world nations in the global cold war struggle with the Communist world; and, second, the establishment of a training institution to be known as the Freedom Academy wherein courses in this applied science of nonmilitary warfare can be offered to a wide range of individuals, including Government personnel, teachers, trade unionists, businessmen, clergymen, association and organization representatives, as well as others.

Mr. President, we are already at war with the Communist world, and let no man doubt the verity of that fact. The war, of which I speak, is nonmilitary in character. Its weapons are planned riots, propaganda, diplomatic blackmail, coups d'etat, and all the other techniques of political warfare. The threat to the security and survival of the free world posed by this nonmilitary struggle is every bit as great as that posed by a thermonuclear attack.

This nonmilitary war, like a military war, demands vast and intensive preparation; it requires trained personnel, research and development activities, and highly sophisticated weapons systems.

While the Communists have systematically prepared for this nonmilitary aggression for over 40 years and have been directing coordinated and well-planned political warfare attacks against us for more than 16 years, we have continued to avoid preparation in this area and have remained largely passive insofar as any counterattack by us in the certitude that right must win over might. Our counteraction has on occasion been ingenious and imaginative, but it has in the main been developed on an ad hoc basis. Such off-the-cuff planning will not suffice; its glaring vulnerability has already been amply demonstrated in China, Japan, Iraq, and the waters of the Caribbean.

Mr. President, we urgently need a Manhattan project to develop the tools, the tactics, and the trained personnel to fight and win the cold war. I humbly submit that the passage of the Freedom Academy bill can provide us with that Manhattan project to bring us to combat readiness in the cold war.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for what he has done.

I am honored to join my distinguished colleague in presenting the Freedom Academy bill for the consideration of the Senate.

This bill, as the Senators will recall, was passed by the Senate in the closing days of the last session. Unfortunately, it proved impossible to bring the measure to a vote in the House, in the brief time that remained.

In reporting the Freedom Academy bill favorably to the Senate last August, the Judiciary Committee described it as one of the most important ever introduced in the Congress. For my own part, I consider this an understatement.

I believe that on the enactment of this measure may depend whether or not we survive as a free nation—whether our grandchildren will know the meaning of freedom, religion, morality, justice, brotherly love, and all the other values we hold dear, or whether they will be enslaved and molded into godless robots by a triumphant Communist regime.

I do not exaggerate. Time is running out for the free world. Since the end of World War II, 700 million people, a third of the world's population, has fallen under Communist rule. The Communists are on the offensive in Latin America, in Asia, in Africa. Another 15 years like the past 15 years, Mr. President, and I am afraid there will be no free world left to defend.

We have lost and lost and lost in the cold war for one primary reason: we have been amateurs fighting against professionals. So long as we remain amateurs in the critical field of political warfare, the billions of dollars we annually spend on defense and foreign aid will provide us with a diminishing measure of protection.

Shortly after their takeover in Russia, the Bolsheviks set up a system of political warfare development and training centers. Today they have special centers for Soviet students, special centers for Latin American students, for African students, and for Asian students.

At lower level, these schools have produced graduates who have been taught how to argue their position, make propaganda, and win converts; how to infiltrate trade unions and mass organizations; how to organize strikes; how to set up Communist fronts; how to win popular support on limited issues; how to incite spontaneous riots; and how to go about seizing power. At top level, the graduates of these training academies have made a careful study of all the vulnerabilities of Western society, and have been taught how to exploit these vulnerabilities, how to plan a coordinated attack employing the full spectrum of political, economic, psychological, and social weapons. These trained conflict managers have also been taught the ultimate art of confounding their enemies through the orchestration of crises on a global scale.

It was estimated, at the hearings held last year by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, that these training establishments have graduated more than 100,000 professional revolutionaries. This is a frightening figure when one considers that it takes only a handful to incite a riot or to take over in a country like Cuba.

The possession by both sides of large stocks of nuclear weapons makes all-out war increasingly improbable. This may be some consolation, but it does not protect us from Communist subversion. On the contrary, ever since the nuclear stalemate first developed, the Communists have been placing increasing emphasis on the political warfare sector. Here they have scored brilliant successes, because in this sector we have no serious defenses, no cadres of trained personnel, little understanding.

Let us face up to the fact that the mightiest defense establishment in the world was helpless, in fact worthless, when it came to preventing a Communist takeover in Cuba. It was also of no utility in preventing or countering the Communist-led riots in Bogotá, Caracas, and Tokyo. In each of these instances, the Kremlin, with an outlay of some thousands of dollars, was able to inflict massive political defeats on the United States.

There is a serious gap in our defenses, Mr. President. The measure we propose today is intended to close this gap. The establishment of a Freedom Academy will, for the first time, give us an agency encharged with the single task of developing a science of counteraction against Communist subversion, and of training Americans, yes, and nationals of other free countries, in this science.

I urge my colleagues of the Senate to give this measure their most earnest consideration. Although we have given the matter much thought, I do not pretend—and I am sure this attitude is shared by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota—that the measure as we have presented it is perfect in every detail. Perhaps there are certain ways in which it can be improved. The essential matter is the establishment of a Freedom Academy and of a research and personnel training program. It is to this matter that I ask the Senators to direct their attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a brilliant article by Mr. James Burnham, which appears in the current issue of Ordnance magazine. Mr. Burnham is the author of several books on the cold war, and is generally recognized as one of our outstanding authorities on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STICKS, STONES, AND ATOMS

(While the United States has been stockpiling nuclear armament the Communists have been taking over country after country by the use of well-directed mobs equipped with only the most primitive weapons.)

(By James Burnham)

Not long after the United Nations patchwork expeditionary force was rushed—or, perhaps better, sucked—into the Congolese maelstrom, a striking news photograph was widely printed in the American press. It showed a truckload of soldiers about to start off for the Léopoldville suburbs. The men were part of a crack, British-trained unit of the Ghana Army.

As displayed in the picture, they were standing at attention in the truck, in two close, smartly drawn ranks. Suspended from the left arm of each soldier was a round shield, looking as if it had been snatched from a museum's medieval armor collection or from the prop room of a grand-opera company.

A friend of mine, an able and hardworking officer now at the Pentagon, noticed this picture and smiled. "The Sir Galahad weapon system. How's that for defensive armament in the nuclear age?" he asked sarcastically. He was much surprised when I commented: "It's not too bad, as a matter of fact. Better than most."

In these Ghanian shields, a light, strong aluminum alloy has replaced the wood, leather, brass, and iron of ancient bucklers. Their purpose is protection against the sticks, rocks, and stones thrown by rioting mobs. In the nuclear age, stones function as weapons a good deal oftener than nuclear bombs and have won many more battles.

On both sides of the Iron Curtain many strategists believe that a curious law applies to the quantum jumps in firepower that have marked the weapons development of the past two decades. Beyond a certain limit—already passed by H-bombs—the more powerful the weapons become the less chance there is that they will be used. The reason for this is that fewer and fewer occasions would be taken to justify their use.

This is true ever. if one side had a monopoly. You are not going to start throwing H-bombs around to halt a border skirmish in the Cameroons or to block a change of government in Paraguay. When both sides possess the superpowerful weapons, the appropriate occasions are reduced to the brink of zero.

Indeed, many analysts are convinced that the only event that would be taken by either side as a sufficient motive for launching the most powerful weapons would be an attack with such weapons by the other side. If this puzzling conclusion is true, then an all-out unlimited war can take place only through faulty intelligence or an accidental launching.

In practice there seems to be a still more paradoxical corollary to this law of the inverse relation between the power and use of modern weapons. The more powerful the new weapons that exist, the more primitive the weapons that are actually used. Castro conquered Cuba with small arms, mimeograph machine and portable radio transmitters.

The rioting mobs of Tokyo, Seoul, and Ankara that overturned governments and forced the cancellation of the visit of the head of the most powerful nation in the world were armed with nothing more than their fists, the staves used to raise their placards, and paving bricks, plus a few knives and revolvers. In the Congo, we have gone back to clubs, rocks, blowguns, and magical spells.

It is terribly hard for Americans to understand something so simple. In uniform and out, we have been dutifully trying to learn about grandiose weapons systems made up of infinitely complex aircraft, bases, carriers, nuclear devices, ballistic missiles, nuclear submarines, electronic computers, inertial navigators, and what not.

On a single system of this sort—for example, Polaris, Titan, Minuteman, or the B–52 complex—we are ready to spend 5, 8, or 10 billions of dollars as well as immense quantities of manpower, effort, technical ingenuity, and scientific intelligence.

It is well and good and necessary that this should be. But at the same time we seem to have difficulty in focusing our attention, not to speak of our brains and dollars, on the weapons systems by which the struggle for the world is, in fact, being fought.

We should more frequently remind ourselves that only two nuclear devices—crude, relatively low power types at that—have ever been used for combat purposes. In the 15 years since that parenthetic employment there have been many victories and defeats vast in scope and lasting in consequences. Power over many nations, whole regions of the earth, hundreds of millions of human beings, has changed hands—all without benefit of direct nuclear leverage.

Those rioting mobs of Tokyo, Seoul, and Ankara needed no A- or H-bombs, or planes or tanks or even guns to topple governments. Gandhi and Nehru had no strategic air force to help them drive the British Raj out of the Indian subcontinent.

Indonesia, Iraq, Cuba, Bolivia, Egypt, Guatemala, Vietnam, Cambodia, the Congo, the Rhodesias. * * * It is mostly sticks and stones, rifles and submachine guns—and the mobs of course: the mobs are a primary element of the weapons systems that have been deciding most battles and campaigns of the struggle for the world.

Words also, of course—the words of agitation and propaganda, zeroed in on minds—for in these battles of our age, unlike the old nursery rhyme, words as well as sticks and stones can break our bones.

From 1945 until sometime after 1950 we possessed a monopoly in operative nuclear arms and thus overwhelming superiority in overall firepower. But it is in those same years that our enemy made his greatest conquests since 1917, seizing eastern Europe, with 100 million inhabitants and mainland China, with 600 million.

The weapons systems that he employed for these achievements were based, not on physical firepower, but on psychological and political warfare methods, both defensive and offensive.

Defensively, it was necessary for him to counteract, negate, and sterilize our nuclear capability. Communist reasoning never forgets that a weapon—any weapon—is only a powerless bundle of matter apart from human minds and wills.

The biggest bomb ever built or building is less than David's slingshot without a mind and will and arm able and ready to use it.

With atomic capability added to our force already in being in 1945, we were in a position, materially speaking, to enforce our views, to reduce the Soviet threat to manageable proportions, and thus to guarantee for a reasonable future both national security and world peace. This possibility conflicted with the Communist objective of world domination, so the Communists struck back, hard, brilliantly, and successfully. The main impetus of their strike was directed against the minds and wills of men.

Their agents, dupes, and ideas were already present in many strata of American life, including scientific circles, the institutions that affect public opinion, and certain of the agencies of Government. They were thus in a position from the very beginning to counteract our nuclear projects and capability—from the inside as well as through external pressures and diplomacy.

The main thrust of the first Communist reply to our nuclear weapons monopoly was thus psychopolitical, against the minds of the men who were making the weapons (technicians and scientists) and the men who controlled it (the leaders of government and public opinion).

The Communist objective was to deprive the United States of the political benefit of its nuclear capability, to denature the bombs, not by the physical process described in the textbooks, but by political, psychological, and moral means. In this case, as more generally, the Communists acted to confuse and disorient their enemy, to entangle him in contradictory policies, and to destroy his will to resist.

Under this defensive psychic screen, which successfully counterweighed their enemy's material superiority, the Communists went ahead systematically with the phased subjugation of the east European nations. At the same time, in a theater still more vast, they carried through the conquest of mainland China and its absorption into an expanded Soviet Empire.

Although there was, of course, fighting, some of it rather large scale, the China campaign was essentially a political-warfare operation. (I am using the term "political warfare" in its most general sense, as covering all types of agitation, propaganda, subversion, economic manipulation, rioting, terror, diversionary diplomacy, guerrilla and paramilitary actions, etc.: everything, in sum, short of the employment of the main formal armed forces.)

The Communists' polwar campaign for the conquest of China opened in 1920. It was completed in 1949 without the mass intervention of the main armed forces and with a total expenditure of probably less than half a billion dollars.

Although most professional military men, unlike their civilian counterparts, know that we are in a fight, I get the impression that very few of them can take a weapon system seriously unless it comprises a lot of firepower. They can analyze learnedly the merits of strategic manned bombers versus submarine-carried Polaris versus railroad-borne Minutemen.

They will thoughtfully debate the role of conventional limited-warfare forces. They can envisage, without qualms, spending $10 or $20 billion to develop weapon systems based on one or another or all of these concepts, together with the assignment of personnel and time and resources that go with money of that order.

But if you suggest—as I have often done in lectures at the various war colleges—spending any such sum, or a tenth such a sum, for systems based on Blanquist cadres, crowd manipulation, guerrillas, psychological warfare, paramilitary operations, subversion, bribery, infiltration, with specialized, mobile, ranger-type units in active supporting reserve—in short, if you suggest all-out political warfare (polwar)—the best response you can ordinarily hope for is a skeptical smile.

Yet it is the polwar weapons systems that have been winning all the battles. What good are Atlas and Polaris in Laos, Cuba, Algeria, the Congo, or in the swarming streets of Tokyo, Ankara, Jakarta, and Budapest?

It has been demonstrated over and over again in the past 15 years—indeed, since 1917—that modern polwar systems can smash governments and armies, and take over territory, peoples, and nations. Isn't a weapon system that can defeat the British, Dutch, and French armies, that can seize Czechoslovakia, China, and Cuba, worth spending a few billions on? The real worth of any weapon system, in the last analysis, should be measured by what it can accomplish, not by its size, complexity, cost, or physical firepower.

Naturally I am not suggesting that a polwar system should operate in a military vacuum. B–52's, Atlas and Polaris missiles are not being used, but the fact that they might be is a solid foundation for every kind of conflict operation. An effective limited-warfare arm, present always as a threat and ready for appropriate use, naturally strengthens any sort of political-warfare campaign.

A conflict apparatus adapted to the mid-20th-century struggle for the world consists of three primary forces, elements, or arms:

1. The massive retaliatory (deterrent) force, which remains as the ultimate reserve.

2. The mobile, limited-warfare (brushfire) force. This, too, remains normally in reserve but in more active posture than the retaliatory force, ready for quick intervention in any area where security or interest requires the direct presence or use of military power.

3. The political-warfare force. This force—which by its nature includes a multitude of activities and agencies, both governmental and civilian—is the active vanguard. Under the shield of the retaliatory force, and backed up by the limited-warfare force, with which it collaborates, the polwar force continuously engages in the day-by-day operations of the protracted conflict.

True political warfare, as understood and practiced by our enemy, is not mere rivalry or competition or conflict of some vague kind. Political warfare is a form of war. It is strategic in nature. Its objective, like that of every other form of war, is to impose one's own will on the opponent, to destroy the opponent's will to resist. In simplest terms, it aims to conquer the opponent.

Within the frame of that general objective, the specific objective of each specific polwar campaign is always defined in terms of power. The purpose in conducting polwar operations is always to increase one's power in some definite way or to decrease the power of the opponent. In either case, positive or negative, the aim is to alter the power equilibrium in one's favor.

The power objective may be grandiose—conquest of a nation, disintegration of an empire; or the minor takeover of a trade union, scaring a parliament into defeating a bill, or the sabotage of a factory. But whether big or small, the objective is always power.

These are the principles in terms of which our enemy has planned and mounted his polwar operations since the summer of 1903 when, through the founding of the Bolshevik faction, he launched his enterprise for the conquest of the world. Moreover, although he realizes that polwar in some instances may not be able by itself to reach a decision and may have to be supplemented by full-scale military measures, he is convinced that

in at least some cases political warfare alone can bring the decision.

By now he has ample evidence to support this belief. Czechoslovakia has been conquered twice in this century—once by Hitler and once by Stalin—by a purely polwar campaign, without the commitment of major armed forces. China also, as we have noted, was won essentially by polwar methods. By these same methods American nuclear testing has been stopped dead for more than 2 critical years.

Not a year passes but that these methods do not smash several governments. And right now they are swinging an island at our strategic doorstep into our enemy's power system.

Although we are in fact spending several billion dollars yearly on nonmilitary phases of the cold war, very few of these go for what can properly be called political warfare in the true sense—the sense accepted by our enemy. Our professional military leaders have traditionally regarded political warfare (or psychological warfare, as it is more usually and inadequately termed) as being merely an auxiliary and relatively minor supplement to military operation.

The cold-war activities of nonmilitary agencies—foreign aid, truth (or information) campaigns, student (or cultural) exchange, even much of the clandestine activity of CIA—are for the most part not true polwar operations. They are not political warfare because we do not really think of them as literally war.

We are trying to get the better of a competitor and opponent, certainly; to block certain of his moves, divert others, influence him to make certain changes in his behavior and policies. But we are not trying to impose our will on him in any general way, and certainly we are not trying to defeat him.

In other words, we do not conceive our cold-war operations strategically. Often they have no clearly defined objective at all. When they do have an objective, this is seldom understood in terms of power.

In a genuine polwar system, foreign aid is only a key to open a national door for the conduct of field operations; information and propaganda are not a school lesson to teach pale truths about how nice one is, but a psychological weapon to undermine, divert, and injure one's enemy; student scholarships are not a charity handout to the needy, but a cover for training activist cadres.

Because we decline to fight genuine, strategically conceived warfare, a considerable part of our billions in foreign-aid dollars has been wasted, squandered on useless projects, filtered into the pockets of corrupt local residents, or used to build up industry for the enemy or his friends to inherit.

Let me point the contrast by returning in conclusion to the specific matter of riots and mob action, bearing in mind that this is only one of a hundred polwar fields. How many men and women (women are exceedingly important in crowd management) do we have in training today for the mission of exploiting crowds, mobs, and street riots to our political advantage? Do we have any?

How many persons in the agencies of our Government have ever made a thorough study of the historical, psychological, and technical problems of handling mobs and mass riots? Is there even a single one?

The Bolshevik approach to mobs, riots, and command of the streets is very serious indeed. In his design for the revolutionary party—the conflict apparatus—Lenin, like Bakunin and Nechaev before him, incorporated the ideas of Louis Blanqui, a French revolutionist who lived from 1805 to 1881. Blanqui first became prominent in the 1830 revolution and devoted the rest of his life, in and out of prison, to revolutionary conspiracy.

He believed that the key to successful revolt was the development of a small, secret cadre organization. Normally the cadres would remain underground, abstaining from political affairs. They were to be trained in the manipulation of crowds and the use of small arms and improvised weapons (sticks and stones) accessible to crowds.

In the 1848 and 1870 revolutions in France, the practical cogency of Blanqui's ideas was proved. In 1870 it was his cadres who were primarily responsible for the overthrow of the Third Empire and the establishment of the Paris Commune—the first revolutionary, proletarian-led dictatorship.

During the past 2 years there have been mass riots in the streets of many major cities of the non-Communist world: Caracas, Montevideo, Lima, Baghdad, Havana, Capetown, Léopoldville, Algiers, Seoul, Ankara, Tokyo, Vientiane, San Salvador, and Saigon, among others. Nearly all have been directed against political friends of the United States or against policies favorable to the United States.

Besides promoting fiercely anti-American attitudes, these riots played an essential part in the overthrow of no less than eight governments that were firm allies of the United States: in Venezuela, Iraq, Cuba, South Korea, Turkey, Tokyo, El Salvador, Laos. The governments were overthrown just as thoroughly as by outright military defeat. Unguided mobs may shake but they do not overthrow regimes. They do not spontaneously produce consistent slogans and select strategic targets.

The coordinated operations of these recent riots, and their high measure of success, are the product of trained Bolshevik neo-Blanquists.

In the next year or so the communized Government of Cuba will either be overthrown, or the enemy will move on to the staged takeover of Central and South America. In the next year or so, non-Communist regimes must retain power in the Indochinese successor states, or the enemy will move on to the staged takeover of the entire Southeast Asian peninsula.

For both operations, H-bombs are useless. Is it not obvious that we are not likely to meet either of these challenges unless we decide to lift our Cinderella political-warfare system from the scullery floor where we have so far left her in rags and tatters?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, one of the cosponsors of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very happy to join in sponsoring a bill to establish a Freedom Academy. I should like to emphasize that, in addition to providing for exposing the tactics of the various Communist Parties, which is a necessary task, the measure also calls for stressing the positive and constructive features of democracy. I regard it as an essential part of any anti-Communist work that, while we should properly emphasize the great hypocrisies and cruelties within the Communist system, we nevertheless should stress the healing and benevolent qualities of democracy, which permit us to make changes, without violence, inside our Nation. It is because this measure provides for constructive and positive features that I take special pleasure in serving as a cosponsor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this particular proposal. I cannot help believing that the necessity for our being on the affirmative in the battle against communism is long past due. I understand the proposed Academy will train talented young people, and enable them to get the information and background not only with respect to the weaknesses of the Communist system, but how best to battle the dogmas and doctrines of the Communists and at the same time present to the uncommitted areas and peoples of the world the great virtues of our democratic system, and to make them wish they had such a system in their countries. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his leadership in this field.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, before closing I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "What We Must Do To Win the Cold War," which appears in the February 1961 issue of the Reader's Digest. This article states a most persuasive case for the Freedom Academy and urges its establishment. I sincerely extend my appreciation and applause to Charles Stevenson for writing this timely article and to the editors of the Reader's Digest for publishing it.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this article be printed at this point in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received; and, without objection, it will lie on the desk as requested, and the article referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 822) to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy to research and develop an integrated, operational science to win the nonmilitary part of the global struggle between freedom and communism and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, and read twice by its title.

The article presented by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

WHAT WE MUST DO TO WIN THE COLD WAR

(By Charles Stevenson)

President Kennedy vowed before the election that under his leadership the United States would at last seize the initiative in the cold war. Nothing is more imperative. But before he can even make a start, our new Commander in Chief must face up to a shocking and bitter reality. He must capture control of the defiant, faceless bureaucracy firmly entrenched in Washington. Its weak-kneed efforts to merely hold off communism instead of fighting back are leading us to defeat even as it tries to keep the White House from interfering.

The situation is not new. In 1955, Nelson Rockefeller was secretly assigned by President Eisenhower to try to make our arthritic cold-war machinery work. He recalls his mission "was bitterly resented by the State Department," which regarded this White House interest as an invasion of their

authority and responsibility. After 8 months he quit in frustration. "You could just go against a wall of opposition so far, and then it was useless," he says.

Since the days when we were told that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers, too many men in the State Department have persisted in the dangerously wistful belief that if we don't annoy the Reds they are bound to see how well meaning we are and will stop harassing us. Incredibly, this philosophy has infected the highest quarters of our Government. And all the while the Kremlin, teasing our naive desire to reach an understanding, through the outworn tradition of polite negotiation, toys with us by hot and cold maneuvering as it inches forward toward total victory.

Compare our cold war operations with the deadly, single-minded efficiency of Soviet maneuvering. Typical was the way the Communists brought about the Japanese riots that forced cancellation of President Eisenhower's trip to Japan last summer and caused the United States to lose face all over the world.

Under Khrushchev's direction Japan had already been infiltrated. Trained native Japanese cadres were sent to gain control of the Japanese Teachers' Union with its 500,000 members. Soon Japanese children were being taught that the U.S.S.R. is their real motherland, the United States their bloodthirsty imperialistic foe. Other trained agitators were sent into the Japanese colleges to take over the Zengakuren, a students' organization with shock troops that beat up uncooperative students and professors. Communists also eased their way into Sohyo, the country's labor federation of 3,500,000 members, and into Japan's powerful Socialist Party. Six months before the riots, 88 key Japanese Communists were smuggled into the country from Russia and China, where they had spent 8 years in Communist academies learning to manipulate men's minds.

As the time for Eisenhower's visit neared, millions of dollars were smuggled into Japan from Russia and China, and poured into more than a hundred front groups to build war fears to the point of hysteria. The value of the yen was unsettled by Communist currency manipulations in Hong Kong. Red radio stations blanketed Japan with hate-America propaganda. The Russian foreign office sent out thinly veiled threats of atomic annihilation.

The first demonstrations by students, along with workers paid a half-day's wages by agitators, started peacefully enough. By nightfall, however, the leaders had them lined up 20 abreast in a phalanx of locked arms. Whistles blowing a rhythmic beat brought chants of "down with the treaty" and the earth literally shook under their dogtrot. Day after day the performance was repeated. None of it was spontaneous. It was a massive action planned and carried out by professionals, and amateurs were no match for them.

This is cold war, Russian style. They have a name for it—agitprop—planned conflict in which agitation, propaganda, trade, diplomacy, threats of war, and promises of peace are coordinated in an ever changing, worldwide offensive. It is all masterminded in the Kremlin from a cold war operations center—a vast chamber with floor-to-ceiling maps on which are displayed, country by country, the latest summations of mounting tensions. Here, just down the hall from his own office, Premier Khrushchev confers daily with Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, with Party Secretary Mikhail Suslov, who runs Moscow's international network of professional agitators, and with his other cold-war commanders. One word sends a vast array of flexible cold war weapons into an integrated action to brainwash entire nations.

How do our own cold war planners respond? In the case of the Japanese riots, the Communist machinations were well known in Washington, via intelligence reports. But the information never received proper consideration at the White House.

As far back as 1948, before he became Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles called for establishment of a new executive department dedicated to the task of nonmilitary defense, just as the Secretary of Defense heads military defense. Its goal: to contest the Communist Party at the level where it is winning its victories. It was to be a flexible organization that would conceive winning strategy and make the swift day-to-day, hour-to-hour decisions, for in this era of sudden crises, the difference between victory and defeat depends as much on split-second maneuvering as in a shooting war.

Instead, we are doing the same old things in the same old way. We have today at least eight different foreign-aid funds, separately administered by six different agencies, through which we have handed out $50 billion just since the Korean War. (Our every setback abroad is habitually blamed on the insufficiency of these funds, totally ignoring the fact that the Reds for their success have similarly paid out only a billion and a half.) There is a U.S. Information Agency, whose officials have been so eager not to cause offense that a radio commentary critical of Communist philosophy was canceled even as it got started. There are four separate intelligence services: Army, Navy, Air Force, and Central Intelligence Agency. And there is our sprawling State Department with 14,000 employees, which insists on being the top layer in this bureaucratic cake.

In theory this complex is guided by the National Security Council. Cold-war problems are tackled by the NSC's Planning Board. But the board's members are the assistant secretaries of the several departments of government, each committed to its own vested interests. Faced with the desirability that their recommendations be unanimously agreed upon, basic decisions are anonymously watered down and anonymously rewritten time and again to avoid conflict. Only after endless haggling are these documents, passing as America's new proposed grand strategy, offered to the NSC.

"Thus a passive resistance develops to dilute recommendations up to the President and downward to the agencies charged with carrying out policy," says Col. William R. Kintner, the Army's psychological-warfare expert, who has worked with the NSC structure and studied our cold-war machinery. "There is a natural tendency to sidestep and hedge, to evade problems and react to situations with half measures haltingly applied. And progress reports to the President (on which he must rely for information about the world situation) often tend to conceal lack of progress."

Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army, has testified that policy papers, after weeks of writing and rewriting, had to be discussed by the Council for 5 more weeks before receiving final approval. The result of this cumbersome procedure, explains W. W. Rostow, professor of economic history at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is that "American policymaking consists of a series of reactions to major crises. Having failed to define, to anticipate, and to deal with forces loose in the world, we suddenly find ourselves face to face with the problems never recognized or swept under the rug."

What happens when our policy is finally determined? Once a week the Vice President, Secretaries of State, Defense, and Treasury, the Budget Director, and the Director of Civil Defense and Mobilization constitute themselves as the NSC itself, and for a couple of hours advise their chairman, the President, about the cold war. Once he makes a final judgment they leave it up to another subordinate bureaucratic group, the Operations Coordinating Board—which has no enforcement authority—to try to persuade departments to carry out the decision. Even the personal assistant to the President, appointed to coordinate the entire setup in his name, had to cajole department heads even to attend a conference. Nobody has concise directive authority.

It is bad enough that the National Security Council system is inoperable. But the shocking fact is that it is sometimes used by the State Department bureaucracy as an instrument for actually defying the White House. In 1956, for example, State so balked at producing the facts required to bring a desperately needed reappraisal of our Middle East policies before the President that another of Ike's top cold war lieutenants quit in disgust. Shortly afterward we were caught in stunned surprise when our British, French, and Israeli allies attacked Nasser's Egypt.

More recently, when Cuban dictator Fidel Castro visited the United States in 1959, the FBI rushed to the State Department a devastating report on the growing seriousness of Communist influences around him. Other similar FBI reports followed. But State deliberately suppressed this information. At one point State even refused to allow Cuba to be brought up for discussion before the President in NSC meeting. The subject finally got to NSC attention only because a Presidential assistant personally prevailed upon CIA Director Allen Dulles to provide a special NSC briefing as to what was happening in Cuba. State then had to reply.

In one country a few hundred thousand dollars would have helped a genuine but impoverished democratic party to provide transportation so the people could get to the polls to vote down Communist influences taking them over. We were too shy to supply the money for this purpose. Yet today that country's Communist-infiltrated government is given millions in a single year as foreign aid.

Even stranger has been the refusal of the bureaucracy to permit the distribution abroad of pamphlets designed to show how government based on personal liberties is superior to communism. The pamphlets were developed at the order of Adm. Arthur Radford as a study course called Militant Liberty for American servicemen. However, when it was proposed that these ideas be made available to other countries opposing communism, NSC's anonymous bureaucratic planners even refused to let the subject come up for NSC discussion. Then in 1957 Ecuador appealed directly for Spanish translations of Militant Liberty to be used in a citizenship program for the Ecuadoran police and armed forces and possibly in the schools.

"Along with technological aid we also need ideologic aid," begged El Commercio, one of the country's leading newspapers. Ecuador's President was enthusiastic. Our Ambassador in Ecuador traveled to Washington to push the plan. Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy had already given approval. But the necessary final State Department clearances never came.

A year and a half later Ecuador's Minister of National Defense sought action through a formal note. "Efforts are being made with systematic persistence by a considerable number of Communist agents to distort the thinking of members of the armed forces in Ecuador," he warned. He pleaded that the study course was needed to oppose vigorously the dialectics and sophistries of Communist propaganda which were creating uneasiness and confusion.

Still nothing happened.

"The program was just killed by inaction," says Admiral Radford. "Some bureaucrats just have a horror of initiating things." And thus by timidity and bureaucratic buckpassing, our State Department killed an opportunity to come to the aid of a friendly country that wanted our help in combating communism. Partly for lack of this help, Ecuador today has a tough problem of communism on its hands.

There is one obvious solution to the mess the bureaucracy has made. As early as 1953 studies of the National Security Council complex called for a person to sit at the President's right hand along with a staff of specialists in diplomatic warfare, propaganda, intelligence, trade warfare, foreign aid support, and military liaison to counter Communist intrusions.

These classified studies are still locked up, but their substance was openly voiced by courageous citizens. On April 5, 1955, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff appealed for a Cold War Strategy Board with a Chief of Cabinet rank. "In gearing to fight a hot war," he said, "we call in military strategists and tacticians. Likewise, we must have specialists to fight a cold war * * * a mobilization of hard, knowledgable anti-Communists who understand the issues and for whom it is not merely a job but a dedication."

At one time President Eisenhower, realizing the desperate need for a sort of super Cabinet chief to ride herd on foot-dragging departments, wanted to put whipcracking Gen. W. Bedell Smith to the job, even without portfolio. But Smith was then in poor health, and Ike hesitated to impose on him. Another time Vice President Nixon was suggested for the task, but the State Department prevented any appointment.

Throughout 1955, Nelson Rockefeller served at the White House with his main assignment to try to develop a more imaginative, creative approach to carrying out National Securty Council policy. Rockefeller was shocked by the slow, even sluggish operation of the whole setup. He was distressed by the vast number of State Department personnel who, by dominating the NSC machinery, were able to avoid unbiased evaluation of their actions. When he sought to obtain independent reports for the President as to the true state of the Department's progress, its officials complained to the President that he was "causing trouble" and "raising havoc with an orderly and effective procedure."

Moreover, Rockefeller was dismayed by the lack of centralized, up-to-the-minute information as to what was going on in the cold war around the world. When he sought to remedy this by having a room set aside where maps, visual aids and copies of the latest cables, and analyses would be quickly available to the President and his aides, State blocked him. At wit's end he offered to finance the entire operation himself. At that, he was informed that it would be illegal to spend private money in a public building. After thus failing to get through the bureaucracy's quagmire of negativism, Rockefeller could only resign.

The bitter opposition to Rockefeller is easy to understand, because his approach does not harbor incompetence. He says: "We have to get fast honest appraisals and have the courage to admit something is not working, the policy is not right, the program is not right, and revise it."

Yet the stupidity that results when individuals become cogs in a vast bureaucratic machine bent on self-protection and maintaining the status quo is compounded by an even more fundamental weakness: the appalling lack of understanding of communism's complex tactics by key people handling our foreign policy, propaganda, economic aid, and oversea relations. "If there's a single denominator," testified C. D. Jackson, one of those who put in time as a Presidential assistant trying to straighten out the cold war mess, "it is the difficulty of finding Americans who have the elementary knowledge of the conflict and how to go about our end of this very real and continuing war."

The obvious remedy proposed by such students of communism both in and out of government is a Freedom Academy that will be democracy's answer to the Communist training schools for the tactics of world revolution, a West Point to teach our own cold war managers, diplomats, ICA, and USIA people the full scope of the Communist strategy and to equip them with the ways to carry the war back to the Communists and win. It would also offer postgraduate courses to high school and university teachers, and would be open to any of the 50,000 foreign students in American colleges.

The idea was brushed off by the Washington bureaucracy, but important Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats, came to its aid and introduced Freedom Academy bills in House and Senate. The Senate Judiciary Committee, unanimously reporting out the measure, described it as one of the most important ever introduced in Congress, a practical, fundamental approach to our national survival.

"We have failed to recognize sufficiently that it takes more than dollars to win the cold war," added Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota. "It takes individuals who have been trained."

"The amateurs will always lose against the professionals," said Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota. "I want some professionals on our side."

Nevertheless, because of departmental opposition, it was not possible to slip the measure through the Senate until the closing hours of the last session; then it died because the House failed to act. "The horrible thing is that there is a complete failure to comprehend the menace of communism even among many Members of Congress," Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, Democratic vice chairman of the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee, told me. And his record shows that he is no Red witch hunter.

So for failure to fight back, the net is pulled in on us. The Communists set up more revolutionary training schools not only in Latin America and in Asia but in the United States itself. Riots and revolutions sweep Latin America. Our southeast Asian allies slip toward neutralism, and with Communists in their governments teeter toward complete Red takeover despite vast amounts of foreign aid. Even our attempts to bring peace to the Congo through the United Nations are impeded by Communist influences in that organization, and this despite the fact that we are producing the millions of extra dollars needed to keep the show going and finance the U.N. effort.

Meantime, we bobble every chance to score against our opponents. Last fall our Government knew that Cuba's Castro had paid in advance for Harlem lodgings. Yet when he stalked out of a midtown New York hotel crying he wasn't wanted, our information services remained politely aloof instead of exposing his lie to the world while Havana, Moscow, and Peiping had a propaganda field day all over Latin America.

The way to stop this sort of defeat by default is already on the record. We must set up a cold war commander, as proposed back in 1953 and 1955, working in close consultation with the President and heading a small professional staff of men skilled in total political warfare. They must have whatever authority is needed over the current operating departments to see that their orders are carried out instantaneously. Executive efficiency is necessary if we are to win the very real war in which we are engaged.

We must also have a Freedom Academy. Its first task will be to acquaint our diplomats and department officials with the facts of life about Communist aims, strategy, and tactics for as the congressional report on the Academy stated: "The various agencies and bureaus can be shuffled and reshuffled * * * but until they are staffed by highly motivated personnel who have been systematically and intensively trained in the vast and complex field of total political warfare, we can expect little improvement in our situation." The Academy will graduate highly motivated elite cadres for freedom. Then with such personnel, we can develop a science of counteraction against Communist subversion. We can, for example, begin to counter such Communist-front techniques as anti-colonial and anti-imperialist campaigns with more valid anti-violence, anti-censorship, anti-suppression-of-speech campaigns.

Thus organized, with bold imaginative leadership and with more freedom fighters ever strengthening our framework, we can at last begin to win some battles of our own and not just in the free world, but among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I call the attention of the distinguished minority leader to a bill which has been introduced today by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] entitled "A bill to create a Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy."

I have not read any of the bill. It has just been introduced. However, I believe it is the same bill, or certainly is very similar to the bill, introduced in the last session, S. 1689, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

When the bill was introduced last summer, I said then that I wished to serve notice that if a similar bill were introduced in the next Congress I expected to raise the question of jurisdiction and to insist that a bill of a similar nature be referred for consideration to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The object of the bill is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is concerned with developing ways and means to combat the spread of communism. That is the principal object of many such bills, including the foreign-aid bill.

I ask unanimous consent, if the minority leader agrees with my statement, that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, first let me address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

So far as the Chair or the Parliamentarian may know, was there a specific request made today that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, rather than to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill which was introduced last year was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was referred to that committee last year. It went to the Committee on the Judiciary without my having had notice to that effect. I had never heard of the bill until it appeared on the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The introducer of the bill is the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And certain cosponsors.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Speaking only for myself, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I would have no objection to a rereference of the bill. However, I think I am duty bound to ascertain from the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] whether he has any objection to having the bill referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is the chairman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I gave notice last summer, in the course of the debate on the floor, that I would expect to take this action if the bill were reintroduced this year.

I give notice now that I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has not been referred to committee yet. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations because I am confident that the subject matter of the bill clearly brings it within the jurisdiction of that committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall try to get an expression on this question without delay, probably before the afternoon is over, or within the next 30 minutes. Perhaps we can get an answer to the question. Then the bill may be referred to the Senator's committee, if that is the wish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas withhold his request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In case the matter cannot be concluded, what will be the action of the Chair in referring the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the bill would be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, unless it was, by unanimous consent, referred elsewhere.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had reserved the right to object. Without being offensive to the Senator, I think I should object until I can check further into the matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will withdraw my request. I want to know what the status is without my request. I will reserve my request until the Senator from Illinois has had an opportunity to confer with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] may be a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the bill in question was passed by the Senate last year. I happened to be walking through the Chamber at the time. Only two or three Senators were on the floor. It was passed by the Senate at that time.

I could not agree more with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The bill very properly should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I myself have in a bill which, in certain aspects, reads on the details of the bill in question.

I hope the bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That is where it belongs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have since conferred with the minority leader. He informs me that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has no objection. Therefore, I renew my request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

UTILIZATION RESEARCH PROGRAM FOR THE DEPRESSED LEAD-ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which calls for a major acceleration in research by the Bureau of Mines to develop new uses for lead and zinc. It is my hope and expectation that this new research program will result in increasing the market for lead and zinc products, which would do much to assist the depressed lead-zinc industry.

Last year, I sponsored a bill prepared by the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, which would have imposed flexible tariffs on imports of lead and zinc at a sufficient level so that miners could have jobs and so mining operations could make a modest profit. Unfortunately, Congress refused to take favorable action on this meritorious bill. However, another bill of a similar nature is being developed, which I intend to join in sponsoring when it is introduced in the Senate, and I hope Congress and the President will give it their approval.

The bill which I have introduced today is designed to supplement the tariff approach. In our preoccupation with the problem of imports, we tend to overlook the fact that lead and zinc have been losing some of their markets to competitive materials.

The lead-zinc industries in 1958 sharply accelerated their research programs, recognizing somewhat belatedly that producers of competitive materials were doing extensive research designed to develop new uses of their materials. Lead and zinc producers in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Great Britain, South America, and Australia are all cooperating in these programs.

Lead projects begun include research on the use of lead in ceramics, lead cable sheathing, heat emissive properties of the metal, lead alloys, the semiconductor properties of lead compounds, and also lead as a shielding material for nuclear reactors. Research projects on zinc include new finishes for zinc die castings, development of improved zinc die casting alloys, corrosion of galvanized hot water tanks, wet storage stain of galvanized sheet, cathode protection of marine tankers, improvements in zinc lithographic plates, zinc battery cans, and exposure tests of exterior house paints containing zinc oxide.

The Department of the Interior, under the Eisenhower administration, has engaged in research directed toward reducing costs of mining and milling. These studies have covered basic and applied aspects of rock drilling and ground support, improvements in recovery procedures, and studies in extractive metallurgy. Projects planned but not yet initiated include fundamental research in the field of zinc base die casting alloys, and expansion of the use of electrolysis. My bill is designed, among other things, to increase research along these lines, which might very well open up new markets for lead and zinc.

In addition to acceleration of the research program by the Bureau of Mines, my bill would give authority to the Department of the Interior to contract for research—authority which the Department does not now have. In the case of coal, the coal industry felt that such a program was needed and supported legislation for the establishment of an Office of Coal Research. It may be that when hearings are held on my bill, the lead and zinc industries may wish to support an amendment to create an Office of Lead and Zinc Research. I am certainly open to such a suggestion.

The bill provides for the creation of an advisory committee from the lead and zinc industries, so that there will be no duplication of research effort. I am indebted to Robert Bernick, the astute Salt Lake Tribune business editor and mining expert, for alerting me to the great possibilities of an expanded lead-zinc research program, contained in an article which he wrote late last year. Similarly, Royce A. Hardy, a former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, gave me his full cooperation and assistance in development of the bill and the approach which it embodies.

I ask unanimous consent to include at the close of my remarks a list of research projects now being conducted by the Lead Industries Association and the American Zinc Institute, together with a list of seven projects which have been considered by the Bureau of Mines but deferred because other work was given higher priority, and the text of my bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and lists will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 828) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of lead and zinc in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract for lead and zinc research, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may—

(1) develop through research, new and more efficient methods of preparing and utilizing lead and zinc;

(2) contract for, sponsor, cosponsor, and promote the coordination of, research with recognized interested groups;

(3) establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various fields of lead and zinc research to assist in the examination and evaluation of re-

search progress and of all research proposals and contracts and to insure the avoidance of duplication of research; and

(4) cooperate to the fullest extent possible with other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government and with State governments, and with all other interested agencies, governmental and nongovernmental.

SEC. 2. (a) Any advisory committee appointed under the provisions of this Act shall keep minutes of each meeting, which shall contain as a minimum (1) the name of each person attending such meeting, (2) a copy of the agenda, and (3) a record of all votes or polls taken during the meeting.

(b) A copy of any such minutes or of any report made by any such committee after final action has been taken thereon by the Secretary shall be available to the public upon request and payment of the cost of furnishing such copy.

(c) Members of any advisory committee appointed from private life under authority of this section shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of their duties as a member of such advisory committee. Such members shall also be entitled to travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at the rates authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for all persons employed intermittently as consultants or experts receiving compensation on a per diem basis.

(d) Service by an individual as a member of such an advisory committee shall not subject him to the provisions of section 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or, except with respect to a particular matter which directly involves the Department of the Interior or in which the Department of the Interior is directly interested, to the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of that title or of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

SEC. 3. Research authorized by this Act may be conducted wherever suitable personnel and facilities are available.

SEC. 4. No research shall be carried out, contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act, unless all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. Whenever in the estimation of the Secretary the purposes of this Act would be furthered through the use of patented processes or equipment, the Secretary is authorized to enter into such agreements as he deems necessary for the acquisition or use of such patents on reasonable terms and conditions.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall submit to the President and the Congress, on or before February 15 of each year, beginning with the year 1962, a comprehensive report concerning activities under the authority of this Act, including information on all research projects conducted, sponsored, or cosponsored under the authority of this Act during the preceding year.

SEC. 6. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Sums appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act shall remain available until expended.

The lists presented by Mr. BENNETT are as follows:

EXPANDED RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN ZINC INSTITUTE AND LEAD INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION

LEAD

Programs newly initiated or extended:
A study of lead base alloys.
Fundamental investigation of lead powder metallurgy.
Active metallurgical programs:
A study of lead base alloys.
Study of vibration attenuation characteristics of lead asbestos pads.
Fundamental investigation of lead powder metallurgy.
Fiber reinforced lead.
Continuous extrusion of lead cable sheathing.
Lead for sound attenuation.
Investigation of methods for producing lead-coated steel.
Active chemical programs:
Lead chemicals.
A fundamental study of organolead chemistry.
Anticorrosive properties of lead pigments and compounds in water reducible ferrous metal primers.
Lead in ceramics materials—fellowship programs:
High emission lead compounds.
Wettability of lead glazes upon structural clay bodies.
Phase relationship and physical properties of selected ceramics systems.
Low temperature lead enamels containing molybdenum and bismuth oxides.
The use of lead in glazes.
Development of ultra low loss dielectrics.
Fundamental behavior of lead in glasses.
Study of ferroelectrics containing lead compounds.
Polymorphs of lead oxide.
The kinetics of the reduction of lead in ceramic systems.
Ferroelectric behavior of lead hafnate-barium hafnate and lead hafnate-strontium hafnate systems.
Active electrochemical lead research program:
A fundamental study of surface reactions of lead.

ZINC

Programs newly initiated or extended:
Development of improved zinc die casting alloys.
Fundamental investigation of zinc powder metallurgy.
An investigation of resistance spot welding of galvanized carbon steel.
Zinc in ceramics material:
Phase relationships and physical property measurements of zinc oxide systems.
The use of zinc oxide in glasses.
Active metallurgical programs:
Improvement of zinc lithographic plates.
Development of improved zinc die casting alloys.
Fundamental investigation of zinc powder metallurgy.
Development of improved dry cell battery anodes.
Rolled zinc in architecture.
Effects of steel metallurgy and bath composition on galvanized coating properties.
Active electrochemical programs:
Wet storage staining of galvanized sheet.
Finishing of zinc die castings.
Zinc anode installations for marine tankers.
Cathodic protection of crab pots.
Surface characteristics of zinc in aqueous media.
Surface characteristics of zinc.
Exposure of galvanized and competitive sheet material.
An investigation of electrochemical finishes for zinc.
Zinc and zinc chemicals for boiler protection.
Active chemical programs:
Development of improved zinc oxide paint primers.

BUREAU OF MINES

PROJECTED ADDITIONAL RESEARCH ON LEAD AND ZINC

Research in new alloy systems using lead and zinc base for alloys of less common metals, particularly rhenium, ruthenium, and yttrium. Could be done either at Rollo, Albany, or Reno. Cost: $25,000 per year for 3 years.

Expansion of present work in use of microorganisms to extract lead and zinc from complex ores. Could be done at Albany or College Park. Cost: $30,000 per year.

Research in use of ultrasonics in electro deposition of zinc. Cost: $30,000 per year.

Research in extension to lead and zinc of the fused-salt electrolysis technique now used in titanium. Cost: $20,000–$25,000 per year.

Fundamental research on solidification mechanisms involving surface tensions, shrinkage, etc. Should be extension of work being done at Rollo on zinc based die casting alloys. Cost: $40,000 first year. Possibility of sharply increased requirements in future.

Research in electrolysis of galena concentrates involving treatment of lead sulfites directly. This could be done at Rollo. Cost: $35,000 the first year.

Feasibility study to determine whether complex lead and zinc ores could be treated directly by electric smelting. Could be done at Albany where electric energy is low cost. Cost: $40,000 the first year.

EISENHOWER DAM

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the name of the Glen Canyon Dam to the "Eisenhower Dam."

Glen Canyon Dam is the key structure in the billion-dollar upper Colorado River storage project which was authorized by Congress in 1956. It lies just south of the Utah-Arizona border on the Colorado River. The dam, now under construction, will create a 23-million-acre-foot lake when filled, extending 186 miles up the Colorado.

The upper Colorado bill which authorized the Glen Canyon Dam, together with other dams and irrigation projects, received the bipartisan support of Congress. The congressional delegations of the Upper Basin States all worked vigorously for its approval. However, no individual played a more key role or more justly deserves the honor which this bill would confer than Dwight David Eisenhower.

It is still with a thrill that I recall his pronouncement early in 1954 which threw the full weight of the executive branch of Government behind the upper Colorado project. Thereafter, it had his unrelenting support, which was given concrete expression in his state of the Union messages and in his budget messages.

Incidentally, it may be of interest to note that the name of Glen Canyon was not selected to honor any person or any event. It was selected merely because there happen to be a number of glens or coves in the area. Certainly it would be more appropriate to name the dam for a man whose interest in the project and whose support for it helped transfer this mighty dam from a dream to a reality. I can think of no better way to honor a great man, a great general, and a great President than to rename the Glen Canyon Dam the Eisenhower Dam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 829) to designate the Glen Canyon Dam, to be constructed in connection with the Colorado River storage

project, as the "Eisenhower Dam," introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], a bill to extend and improve the Federal Airport Act, which expires June 30, 1961.

We are proposing a 4-year, $280 million extension of Federal grants for airport construction and development on a new basis which establishes an overriding priority for projects which contribute to aviation safety.

Until we have licked the problems of aviation safety, we should not squander a cent of Federal tax money for less essential purposes. We must devote our efforts to the safety of air travel. The airport conveniences and comforts can come later.

The major provisions of our bill may be briefly summarized as follows:

First. A 4-year program of $70 million a year, the current law provides $63 million a year. This will insure a continuity of the program, and permit long-range planning with reasonably increased amounts.

Second. The bill creates a top priority for airport development projects which contribute to public safety, and gives the priority projects a first call on the State's share of the Federal airport funds. The Federal discretionary funds, continued from the present law, would be available only for projects which qualify for the safety priority.

Third. Nonsafety projects, under the bill, could be undertaken if Federal funds are available from a State's allocation after the safety priority requirements have been met.

Fourth. Projects which contributed to safety would be eligible for 50–50 Federal matching as provided in the present law. Nonpriority airport projects, under the bill, would receive Federal aid at a reduced rate which, in general, would require 75 percent State and local funds and 25 percent Federal grants. This provision will further emphasize the priority nature of safety projects.

We believe this bill will put the emphasis where it belongs—on airport safety programs in an effective and responsible way.

Because the present law expires in less than 5 months, we believe the subject should receive the early attention of the committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the bill lie on the table until Tuesday, February 14, for the convenience of other Senators who may wish to join in cosponsoring it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 831) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and to revise certain provisions of such act in order to promote safety in air transportation, introduced by Mr. COTTON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) strike out clause (3) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) 'Priority airport development' means (A) any work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport or portion thereof which is necessary in the interests of public safety, including the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, but excluding construction, improvement, alteration, or repair of any buildings or portion thereof other than those required to house air traffic control activities, weather reporting activities, and communications activities related to air traffic control, and (B) any acquisition of land or of any interest therein or of any easement through or other interest in air space which is necessary in the interests of public safety for the development, operation, or maintenance of any public airport.

"(3a) 'Nonpriority airport development' means (A) any airport development which would be priority airport development except that it is not necessary in the interests of public safety, and (B) the construction, alteration, or repair of airport passenger or freight terminal buildings or other airport administrative buildings, but not including the construction, alteration, or repair of airport hangars."; and

(2) In subsection (a) (5) strike out "airport development" and insert in lieu thereof "priority airport development or nonpriority airport development".

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1104) is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) before the period at the end of the first sentence insert "and the sum of $66,500,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962, June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965"; and

(2) In subsection (b) before the period at the end of the first sentence insert "and $3,500,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962, June 30, 1963, June 30, 1964, and June 30, 1965".

SEC. 3. Section 6 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1105) is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out the second sentence in subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof "Each amount so apportioned for a State shall, during the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated and the fiscal year immediately following, be available for approved projects for priority airport development in such State or sponsored by such State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State, except that if no further projects for priority airport development are to be proposed during the remainder of such two-year period for location within such State or by such State or an agency thereof, then such amount or the remainder thereof shall be available for approved projects for nonpriority airport development in such State or sponsored by such State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State. Any portion of such amount which remains unobligated shall be transferred to the discretionary fund established under subsection (b) of this section and shall be available in accordance with the provisions of such subsection.";

(2) In subsection (b) after "approved projects" wherever appearing herein, insert "for priority airport development"; and

(3) Strike out subsection (c).

SEC. 4. Section 10 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1109) is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out clause (1) of subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) in the case of a project for priority development of a class 3 or smaller airport, 50 per centum of the allowable project costs of the project, or in the case of a project for nonpriority development of such an airport, 25 per centum of the allowable project costs of the project;";

(2) In clause (2) of subsection (a) after "50 per centum" insert "in the case of priority airport development and 25 per centum in the case of nonpriority airport development";

(3) In subsection (b) after "shall be increased" insert ", in the case of priority airport development,", and after the period at the end thereof insert "In the case of nonpriority airport development the percentage increase under the provisions of the preceding sentence shall be reduced by one-half."; and

(4) In subsection (c) before the period insert a comma and "except that in the case of any project for nonpriority airport development such minimum percentage shall be 25 per centum and such maximum percentage shall be 37½ per centum".

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective after June 30, 1961, but only with respect to amounts obligated after such date under the provisions of the Federal Airport Act.

EXTENSION OF VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES DAIRY PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to permanently extend the veterans' and armed services' dairy program.

The veterans' and armed services' dairy program has functioned efficiently since 1954, to provide butter, cheese, and milk acquired for price support purposes to our Armed Forces.

These nourishing dairy foods have gone to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Merchant Marine Academy, and to veterans' hospitals.

The program has not cost the taxpayer a penny. Dairy products acquired to accomplish the objectives of the price support programs are donated to the Armed Forces and veterans' hospitals.

My bill specifically authorizes the CCC to reimburse the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense for purchases of fluid milk which the Secretary of Agriculture determines will accomplish the objectives of the price support programs. The CCC has provided such reimbursement since the program started, because utilization of fluid milk directly offsets the purchase of other dairy products to support prices.

In 1960, the following quantities were donated under the program: 15.9 million pounds of butter, 500,000 pounds of cheese, 100,000 pounds of dried milk and 280 million quarts of fluid milk.

A recent survey of the soldiers' food preferences showed that milk topped the list, and other dairy products ranked

high. These foods are available as a result of price support programs. It is commonsense to put them to good use by donating them to the military.

The program has worked efficiently for 7 years, during which time it has twice been extended by heavy affirmative votes of Congress. Unless renewed it will expire December 31, 1961. It is time to make it permanent.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table through Monday next so that additional Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 835) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to permanently extend the veterans and Armed Forces dairy program, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], be added to my name and that of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in sponsoring the veterans and Armed Forces dairy program and making it permanent.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Small Business Act.

At the outset it might be well for me to review briefly the action taken on a similar bill in the last Congress. This bill is similar to H.R. 11207, 86th Congress, 2d session, which passed the House on June 6, 1960, and as amended and passed by the Senate on July 1, 1960. The House did not accept the Senate amendments and requested a conference. A conference was held on August 26, 1960, and the conferees failed to agree. No further action was taken on the bill. The bill I am now introducing is identical to S. 3903, which I introduced in the closing days of the last session, after the conferees failed to agree.

At the time I introduced S. 3903 last summer, I pointed out that it was a modification of the Senate passed version of H.R. 11207. Those changes were designed to meet the objections of the House and others to certain provisions of that bill.

This bill would increase by $75 million the authorization for the revolving fund for the Small Business Administration's regular business loan program.

The bill also seeks to secure for small business a greater participation in Government procurement, particularly subcontracts.

The share of the Government procurement dollar secured by small business continues to decline. In the first quarter of fiscal 1961, July–September 1960, small companies received $767,047,000, or only 14.8 percent of military prime contracts awarded. This compares to 17.9 percent in the first quarter of fiscal 1960, and 16.1 percent for the entire 1960 fiscal year. These figures are especially disturbing to small business since in 1954 small business received 25.3 percent of the amount of military prime contracts awarded.

It is of great interest to small business that a report issued by the Department of Defense entitled "100 Companies and Their Subsidiaries Listed According to Net Value of Military Prime Contract Awards, January 1, 1959–December 31, 1959" shows that in calendar year 1959, of the $21,728,100,000 net value of military prime contracts awarded, $15,908,700,000 or 73.2 percent was awarded to 100 companies. In fiscal 1960 this figure had risen to 73.4 percent. This report also shows that only 20 companies received 49.8 percent of the net value of the military prime contracts awarded. In fiscal 1960 this percentage was again 49 percent.

The Department of Defense continues to award an overwhelming proportion of its procurement dollar by negotiation rather than formal advertising. Statistics furnished by the Department of Defense in its publication entitled "Military Prime Contract Awards, July 1959–June 1960" show that 67.3 percent of net value of military procurement actions was negotiated with a sole source, thus effective competition was lacking. This is $15,424,470,000 out of a total of $23,688,533,000. Only 13.8 percent of the net value of the procurement awards was by formal advertising.

These figures are of particular importance to small business since small business in fiscal 1960 received 39.4 percent of all the advertised awards, but only 12.4 percent of all negotiated awards.

This concentration of contracts awarded to 100 large companies, plus the increased reliance of the Department of Defense on negotiated contracts has made subcontracts of great importance to small business.

The explanation given for this trend away from competitive advertising is the complexities of the new weapons and the exigencies of time. I cannot believe that the lessening of effective competition, which the negotiation method of procurement brings about, is desirable, or that in most cases competition would lengthen the time of delivery of needed weapons.

I believe that competition would stimulate delivery, and history shows also that it adds incentive to competing companies to provide better products.

I am also convinced that increased emphasis on negotiation with a sole source by the Department of Defense is because the Department finds that this is the easiest method to use. It is not permitting small business to participate to the extent it rightfully should in our defense effort, and both the country and the small business community suffers from this lack of full participation.

Of course, small business is not qualified to handle some of the large procurement contracts entered into by the Government. However, small business should be permitted to participate to a greater extent in subcontracting. Here is where small business can play an important role, even in connection with the large contracts for complex weapons.

The Small Business Administration has a legitimate procurement function to perform. It is directed, by law, to insure, insofar as possible, that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government be placed with small business enterprises. This bill would, among other things, extend that directive to include subcontracts. It also provides for the promulgation by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, after consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics, the Administrator of General Services Administration, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, of a small business subcontracting program.

There is a small business subcontracting program in effect now in the Department of Defense, but it has not been successful in obtaining for small business a fair and decent share of subcontract awards. Statistics furnished by the Department of Defense shows that, of 293 contractors reporting under the Department's small business subcontracting program, only 18.8 percent of their total receipts for military work was awarded as subcontracts to small business in fiscal year 1960. This bill is an attempt to put life and effectiveness into a small business subcontracting program for all the procuring agencies of the Government.

The bill provides that the program shall contain such provisions as may be appropriate, first, to enable small business concerns to be considered fairly as subcontractors and suppliers under Government procurement contracts, second, to insure that prime contractors and subcontractors shall consult with the Small Business Administration when requested to do so by the Administration, third, to enable the Administration to obtain from any Government procuring agency such information and records concerning subcontracting by its prime contractors and subcontractors as the Administration may deem necessary. The bill provides that the program shall not prescribe the extent to which any contractor shall enter into subcontracts or specify the business concerns in which subcontracts shall be granted.

The bill also provides that every contract for goods and services in excess of $1 million and every subcontract in excess of $500,000 shall contain a provision requiring the contractor or subcontractor to conform to this small business subcontracting program.

This small business subcontracting program provision has been amended in several respects in an attempt to answer the criticisms of the Department of Defense, and others, which were made to the bill as introduced in the last session. These changes are not designed to weaken the participation of the Small Business Administration in this subcontracting program but merely to clarify our original intent.

The bill requires publication in the daily U.S. Department of Commerce "Synopsis of U.S. Government Proposed Procurement, Sales and Contract Awards," with certain exceptions, of all military procurement actions over $10,000 and all civilian procurement actions over $5,000. This provision will give small business a more complete list of what the Government is buying. Large corporations retain representatives in Washington to furnish this information to them. The small businessman generally cannot afford to do this. The publication of this information should prove of great benefit to the small businessman.

The bill will also amend the program of grants for studies, research, and counseling in small business problems by providing that a corporation formed by two or more eligible entities will be eligible to receive a grant. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee heard testimony in the summer of 1959 that such a corporation in some States would be in a position to be able to enlist the various talents, financial assistance, and other facilities of other agencies within a State in implementing the purposes of the grant. The bill also provides that the SBA may require, as a condition to a grant, that an additional amount not exceeding the amount of the grant, be furnished from sources other than the SBA. However, if the grant or any portion is used to counsel individual small business concerns, an amount equal to the amount of the grant must be provided. I believe these amendments will improve this program.

The bill would simplify the reporting requirement of SBA by requiring an annual report to the President and the Congress, instead of the semiannual report presently required. The SBA would be able to include in this report the material it now reports quarterly regarding its progress in liquidating the assets and winding up the affairs of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The bill would require the Attorney General to make annual report on any activities of the Government which may adversely affect small business in the antitrust field. The bill would eliminate certain quarterly reports that the Attorney General makes under the Defense Production Act.

Finally, the bill would indefinitely extend the section 502 loan program under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to State and local development companies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be placed in the RECORD following my statement.

I introduce the bill in behalf of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 836) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF S. 836, A BILL TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Sections 1 and 2 are technical.

Section 3 would increase the authorization for the SBA revolving fund for its regular business loan program by $75 million.

This increase will make the total amount of the revolving fund $1,050 million. The SBA estimates that this increase will permit the continuation of its loan program until well into fiscal 1962.

Section 4 provides that section 3648 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the prepayment of rentals for safety deposit boxes which the SBA requires to store collateral for its loans. Section 3648 states that "no advance of public money shall be made in any case unless authorized by the appropriation concerned or other law."

Section 5(a) amends section 10 of the act:

1. To require the SBA to make reports to Congress and the President annually (on December 31) rather than semiannually as presently required.

2. To permit SBA to include in its yearly report the quarterly report it now is required to make on its progress in liquidating the assets formerly held by the RFC.

3. To require the Attorney General to make surveys and submit yearly reports to Congress on any activity of the Government which may affect small business, for the purpose of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, promote undue concentration of economic power, or otherwise injure small business. The Administrator of SBA may also request the Attorney General to make supplemental surveys if special need for such surveys should occur.

Section 5(b) amends section 708 of the Defense Production Act by eliminating the requirement that the Attorney General must make quarterly reports to Congress and the President setting forth the results of his surveys of mobilization programs authorized under the Defense Production Act. It would, however, leave in the requirement that the Attorney General report quarterly on activities under the voluntary agreements under that section.

Section 6 would amend subsection 2(a) of the act to add the words "or subcontracts" to the policy declaration of the act. The intent of this proposal is to encourage a greater allocation of subcontracts to small business.

Section 7 amends subsection 8(b) of the act:

1. By inserting in paragraph (8) after the word "concerning" the words "and for the purpose of review to have access to records involving."

This would allow SBA to have available to it more complete records of all procurement actions.

2. By amending paragraph (11) by inserting after the word "contracts" whenever it appears the words "(including subcontracts made pursuant thereto)."

This is designed to allow SBA to make studies of the Government's procurement processes to insure that more procurement subcontracts are placed with small business concerns.

Section 8 would add a new subsection 8(d) to the act to provide that SBA shall institute a small business subcontracting program after consultation with Department of Defense, General Services Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission. This program shall contain provisions, (1) to enable small business concerns to be considered fairly as subcontractors and suppliers to prime contractors or subcontractors of Government procurement contracts, (2) to insure that prime contractors and subcontractors shall consult with SBA when requested to do so by SBA, and (3) to enable SBA to secure from any procuring agency any information and records concerning subcontracting as it may require. Every contract for goods and services of $1 million or more and every subcontract of $500,000 or more shall contain a provision requiring the contractor or subcontractor to conform to this subcontracting program.

This program will place the Small Business Administration in a position to act as an effective salesman for the interests of the small business community.

Section 9 would add a new subsection 8(e) to the act to empower the Secretary of Commerce to obtain notice of all defense procurement actions of $10,000 and above, and all civilian procurement actions of $5,000 and above. Certain procurements are excepted from this requirement.

This amendment is designed to give notice of a larger number of Government procurement actions to businessmen.

Section 10 amends subsection 7(d) of the act regarding grants for studies, research, and counseling—

1. To permit a corporation formed by two or more eligible entities to be eligible to receive a grant.

These new corporations would be able to give a broader financial and scholastic scope to the subject matter of the grant than would a single grantee.

2. To provide that SBA may require as a condition to a grant that an amount not exceeding the amount of the grant be furnished from sources other than SBA.

3. To provide that if the grant or any part of it is used to provide counseling to individual small business enterprises SBA shall require a matching of the amount of the grant.

The additional money received as a result of these amendments should improve the effectiveness of the grants program.

Section 11 would extend indefinitely the authorization for loans to State and local development companies authorized by section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Under the present law the authority to make such loans expires on June 30, 1961.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN PAYMENTS IN PROVIDING HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the higher education of our young people is such an important problem that it warranted a place in the President's state of the Union message delivered on January 30 of this year. President Kennedy said:

> One-third of our promising high school graduates are financially unable to continue the development of their talents. The war babies of the 1940's, who overcrowded our schools in the 1950's, are now descending in the 1960's upon our colleges.

Today, I am introducing a bill that will help correct this situation by allowing income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education. May I be the first to point out that this bill is not designed to solve all of our educational problems. There are several proposals now pending before the Congress concerning aid to higher education through tax relief in the form of credit or deductions. I hope this whole matter can be thoroughly studied to bring forth a solution that is sound and practicable.

The bill I am introducing will make it easier for more people to gain a higher education. It should also serve as an incentive for others to go on to school who normally would stop after completing the 12th grade.

The bill would provide in the case of an individual that there shall be allowed a deduction of any amount paid during the taxable year for tuition or fees to an institution of higher education by the taxpayer, his wife or a dependent at a level above the 12th grade.

The bill further provides a deduction for books and supplies required by an institution of higher education and for the ordinary and necessary expenses for meals and lodging of the taxpayer, his wife, or a dependent, while away from home attending an institution of higher learning.

Another provision of the bill would allow as a deduction any amount paid to an institution of higher education to be used to provide scholarships at a level above the 12th grade.

Representative WILLIAM R. HULL of Missouri's Sixth Congressional District has already introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives that contains the same provisions I have outlined.

Each bill is primarily designed to enable lower-income bracket families to send their children to college at a minimal cost to the Government. The financial impact of the bill would find that income tax savings, on a percentage basis, would be most marked in the lowest income group and would decline in significance as one moved through the income scale.

Representative HULL quoted a privately conducted survey that indicated such an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code would result in an average income tax reduction of 0.8 percent. Reduction in the total gross income reported on tax returns would amount to 1.03 percent as compared to 1.12 percent for medical deductions under present rates.

From Internal Revenue records, it is estimated that, by 1956 rates, the tax savings would be approximately $270 million from a total of over $32.7 billion income tax revenue.

Figures are important, but there is no way of estimating what it will cost the United States to match the Communist world in space science and to keep abreast of technological developments.

The bill I introduce today will supply a personal incentive basis for improving our educational system.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 843) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education, introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEVELOPMENT CREDIT CORPORATIONS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], my colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 so as to permit certain Federal savings and loan associations to participate in financing business development credit corporations.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 846), to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Without regard to any other provision of this subsection, any such association whose general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits aggregate a sum in excess of 5 per centum of its withdrawable accounts is authorized to invest in, to lend to, or to commit itself to lend to any business development credit corporation incorporated in the State in which the head office of such association is situated, in the same manner and to the same extent as the statutes of such State specifically authorize a savings and loan association organized under the laws of said State to invest in, to lend to, or to commit itself to lend to such business development credit corporation, but the aggregate amount of such investments, loans, and commitments of any such association outstanding at any time shall not exceed one half of one per centum of the total outstanding loans made by such association, or $250,000, whichever is lesser."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on May 23, 1960, on behalf of the junior Senator from North Carolina and myself, I introduced a similar bill, S. 3581. I did this with no expectation of enactment during the last Congress, but rather to have the benefit of such comments as might be made on that bill. I have received a number of comments, and the bill I am introducing reflects these changes.

Business development credit corporations have been established in many States. Generally these make it possible for banks, insurance companies and other financial institutions to contribute their backing to the development of their States through private financing of sound ventures, without any Federal or State money. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee last year issued a committee print on the subject of development corporations and authorities which contains much useful information.

I am proud to say that North Carolina, along with the New England States and New York, was one of the leaders in this movement. The Business Development Corp. of North Carolina has been operating effectively for 5 years. Its most recent annual report, the fourth, covered the year 1959. It showed that the corporation had made disbursements on 49 loans totaling $3.8 million, and that it expected to disburse soon 16 additional loans totaling $2.7 million. According to the report the loans helped to maintain the employment of more than 5,000 people and created employment for an additional 8,000 people. The report showed that the North Carolina Business Development Corp. was financed by $1 million received from 1,860 stockholders and by over $5 million advanced by 145 members, including 92 commercial banks, which had made available $2,809,000, 13 life insurance companies, which had made available $1,005,000, and 40 State building, savings, and loan associations, which had made available $1,093,000. It has been paying interest on money borrowed from its members at the rate of 4¼ percent and 5¼ percent. Net income for 1959, before provision for reserves or income taxes was $59,932, and the first 6 months of 1960, $32,936.

In North Carolina and a number of other States, including Hawaii, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, State savings and loan or building and loan associations have been specifically authorized to participate in financing these development credit corporations through buying stock, making loans, or some similar device. Most of these States have imposed restrictions on the amounts which these associations may make available to business development credit corporations. Some of these States limit the investment to a percentage of the total outstanding loans of the association—one-half of 1 percent, 1 percent, or 2 percent. Some of these States limit these investments to a percentage of surplus, undivided profits and reserves, or guarantee funds—1, 2, 2½, or 3 percent. Some States also impose an overall limit on the amount of the investment—$100,000, $250,000, $500,000, and in one case $250,000 for smaller institutions and $500,000 for larger ones.

I have not made a complete study of all State statutes and interpretations of them on this subject. Consequently, I am not in a position to say whether other States may permit savings and loan associations to invest in these corporations, either by specific provision or under some general provision for "financial institutions." In my judgment, however, the roll of States which I have called already is ample to indicate that there is widespread agreement that savings and loan and building and loan associations can and should participate in these programs.

It is consistent with the dual banking system and the dual system of savings and loan associations to authorize Federal savings and loan associations to participate in these programs.

The bill which I am introducing is based on these principles. In the first place it permits Federal savings and

loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations only "in the same manner and to the same extent as the statutes of such State specifically authorize a savings and loan association organized under the law of said State" to do so.

The several State statutes vary widely in the legal forms through which financial institutions are authorized to participate in business development credit corporations and make money available to them. The bill was drawn in such fashion as to give to Federal savings and loan associations just as wide authority with respect to the manner of participation as the State savings and loan associations have. But a Federal savings and loan association would not be permitted under the bill to invest in a business development credit corporation, unless the law of the State specifically permitted a State savings and loan association to do so.

By limiting Federal savings and loan association to investments "to the same extent" as a State savings and loan association it was my intention to provide that a Federal savings and loan association in a State would be subject to the overall limitation imposed on State savings and loan associations in that State, whether this might be a percentage of total outstanding loans, a percentage of profits, reserve funds, surplus or guaranty funds, or a flat dollar limitation.

In addition, the bill I am introducing would limit Federal savings and loan associations, even in a State where the State law permits a larger investment, to one-half of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans or to $250,000, whichever is lesser. I have changed this provision as the result of comments made on S. 3581. I have made this change after careful consideration of the many different limitations which various State laws have imposed. This limitation is higher than is permitted in many States, but in such States the limitation of the State law would apply and not the limitation in such bill.

There are few States which would permit State savings and loan associations to invest a larger percentage of their assets in a development credit corporation than one-half or 1 percent or $250,000, and in such cases Federal savings and loan associations would be subject to more restrictive provisions than would apply to State savings and loan associations.

I have based the bill upon the experience of North Carolina. Originally, North Carolina imposed a ceiling of 1 percent of a State savings and loan association's total outstanding loans. After experience under this law, North Carolina, with general approval, lowered the figure to one-half of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans. In such States, and in the few States where there is no limit in the State statute, this bill would restrict Federal savings and loan associations more closely than State associations. I realize that this may cause difficulties. Nevertheless, I think it is desirable to place some reasonable limits on the investments of Federal savings and loan associations, regardless of State law. In any event, it would seem clear that it would be better for a development credit corporation to have some funds from a Federal savings and loan association, rather than none, as is the case under present law.

On the basis of the average figures shown in table 46 of the Fact Book for 1960 of the U.S. Savings & Loan League, these percentages would give the following results in an association with total assets of $10 million:

Total assets	$10,000,000
Withdrawable accounts	8,600,000
5 percent of withdrawable accounts	430,000
Mortgage loans	8,360,000
1 percent of mortgage loans	83,600
One-half of 1 percent of mortgage loans	41,800
General and unallocated reserves (comparable to general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits)	690,000
2 percent of $690,000	13,800
3 percent of $690,000	20,700

The bill also contains a restriction based upon the 1959 amendment to the Home Owners' Loan Act, which authorizes Federal savings and loan associations to make loans to develop real estate. Under this bill a Federal savings and loan association can only invest in a business development credit corporation if the association's general reserve, surplus and undivided profits amount to 5 percent of its withdrawable accounts. This will limit participation in this program to Federal savings and loan associations which are well and soundly financed.

I have emphasized in this statement the limits which this bill impose on participation by Federal savings and loan associations in the business development credit corporation program. I do so only because I wish to make it abundantly clear that this bill does not impose any appreciable risk upon Federal savings and loan associations and does not involve any appreciable diversion of savings and loan funds from their primary purpose, the financing of homes.

I should like in conclusion to emphasize again the importance of the business development credit corporation program and the benefits which it has brought to North Carolina and to many other States. Enactment of the bill I am introducing will, in my judgment, enable business development credit corporations in many States to do a bigger and better job, by permitting Federal savings and loan associations to carry a modest but still significant share of the program.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a memorandum on the subject be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE LAWS ON INVESTMENT BY SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS IN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CREDIT CORPORATIONS

Many State laws have authorized State-chartered savings and loan associations to invest in State-chartered business development credit corporations. Summaries of these provisions are set forth in this memorandum, including particularly references to the limits imposed on the amounts of such investments. The memorandum covers all the State statutes on the subject included in the committee print, "Development Corporations and Authorities," dated December 2, 1959, and in recent issues of the Legal Bulletin of the U.S. Savings & Loan League. The list is believed to be complete; however, a complete analysis of all State statutes has not been made. In addition, in a few cases it is believed that the State statute might be interpreted as authorizing such investments, but not sufficiently clearly to warrant inclusion in this list.

Hawaii: Act 288, regular session laws 1957, approved June 5, 1957, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by an association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 188).

Kentucky: Senate bill 155, laws 1960, approved March 21, 1960, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by associations of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans, with a further proviso that a business development corporation may, in its articles of incorporation, reduce the loan limits of building and loan association members to one-half of 1 percent of total outstanding loans. (See U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1960, p. 174.)

Maine: Chapter 104, laws 1949, effective August 6, 1949, created the Development Credit Corp. of Maine, and authorized loan and building associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a ceiling on such loans by associations of 2½ percent of the association's guarantee funds (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 199).

Maryland: Chapter 822, laws 1959, approved May 5, 1959, created the Development Credit Corp. of Maryland and authorized savings and loan associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 2 percent of the association's guarantee funds, subject to a further overall limit on loans by any member of $250,000 (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 215; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 169).

Massachusetts: Chapter 671, acts and resolves 1953, approved July 3, 1953, created the Massachusetts Business Development Corp. and authorized cooperative banks and savings and loan associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a cooperative bank or savings and loan association of 1 percent of the guarantee fund and surplus of the association or cooperative bank (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 222).

Minnesota: Chapter 896, session laws 1957, approved April 29, 1957, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 2½ percent of the association's guarantee funds, surplus and undivided profits (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 245).

Mississippi: Senate bill 1600, laws 1960, approved March 23, 1960, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 2 percent of the association's outstanding

loans. (See U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, May 1960, p. 116.)

New Hampshire: Chapter 328, laws 1951, approved July 10, 1951, created the New Hampshire Business Development Corp. and authorized building and loan associations and cooperative banks to become members of it and make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association or a cooperative bank of 2½ percent of the guarantee funds of the association or cooperative bank (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 248).

New Jersey: Chapter 218, laws 1957, approved January 6, 1958, appears to authorize savings and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under the act and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans of 2 percent of each member's capital and surplus, or $100,000, whichever is lesser (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 266).

New York: Chapter 863, laws 1955, effective April 29, 1955, created the New York Business Development Corp. and authorized savings and loan associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 2 percent of the association's guarantee funds, subject to a further overall limit on loans by any member of $250,000. (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 282.) Chapter 595, laws 1959, approved April 20, 1959, adds a proviso that in the case of a member having capital and surplus in excess of $12,500,000, the overall ceiling is $500,000 instead of $250,000 (U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 177).

North Carolina: Chapter 1146, 1955 session laws, ratified May 20, 1955, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The law originally imposed a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans which was later reduced to one-half of 1 percent (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 310).

North Dakota: Chapter 109, laws 1959, approved March 17, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of small business investment corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by savings and loan associations of 2½ percent of the association's guarantee funds, surplus and undivided profits (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 328).

Oregon: Chapter 660, laws 1959, approved May 27, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 3 percent of the association's capital and surplus (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 344; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 180).

Pennsylvania: Senate bill 1093, laws 1959, approved December 1, 1959, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 2 percent of the association's undivided profits and general reserve funds, subject to a further overall limit on loans by financial institutions of $550,000. Senate bill 1096, laws 1959, approved December 1, 1959, amends the Pennsylvania Building and Loan Code to authorize building and loan associations to invest in shares of any State or regional business development credit corporation created under Pennsylvania law (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 364; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, January 1960, p. 48).

Rhode Island: Chapter 3045, Public Laws 1953–54, approved February 11, 1953, created the Rhode Island Development Co. and authorized building and loan associations and cooperative banks to become members of it and make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by building and loan associations and cooperative banks of 2½ percent of the guarantee funds, surplus and undivided profits of the association or cooperative bank (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 387).

South Carolina: Act 983, laws 1960, approved May 24, 1960, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of county business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans. (See U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, September 1960, p. 229).

South Dakota: Chapter 314, session laws 1957, approved March 6, 1957, authorizes savings and loan associations to become nonstockholder members of business development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law provides that the articles of incorporation of the business development credit corporation shall determine what lines of credit are to be established by nonstockholder members (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 146).

Tennessee: Chapter 170, laws 1959, approved March 19, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 1 percent of the total outstanding loans of the association, with a proviso that a development credit corporation may, in its articles of incorporation, reduce the loan limit of building and loan associations to one-half of 1 percent of total outstanding loans (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 424; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 182).

Virginia: Chapter 80, session laws 1960, approved February 24, 1960 (Virginia Code, sections 13.1–140 to 13.1–156), authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of industrial corporations created under that act, and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by savings and loan associations of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans.

Washington: Chapter 213, laws 1959, approved March 20, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by savings and loan associations of 3 percent of the association's guarantee and reserve funds (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 442).

West Virginia: Chapter 25, laws 1959, passed March 10, 1959, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 444).

Wisconsin: Chapter 656, laws 1955, approved November 18, 1955, authorizes savings and loan associations to become nonstockholder members of business development credit corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The act provides that the articles of incorporation of a business development credit corporation shall determine lines of credit for nonstockholder members (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 450).

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE TOWN OF TELLICO PLAINS, TENN.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain two-tenths acre parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.

In 1931 a group of citizens of Tellico Plains donated to the U.S. Forest Service a two-tenths acre plot of land on which the Forest Service built a machine shop. Because the Forest Service has moved its machine shop to Etowah, Tenn., the Forest Service no longer has need for the land, and the town would like to have the land back. Since the Forest Service states it will have no further use for the property, it is hoped it can be returned to the town which so generously donated it 30 years ago.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 848) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn., was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NATIONAL EXPORT POLICY ACT OF 1961—NATIONAL IMPORT POLICY ACT OF 1961

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], I send to the desk for appropriate reference two bills, one entitled "The National Export Policy Act of 1961," the other entitled "The National Import Policy Act of 1961."

I ask unanimous consent that the bills may lie upon the desk until the close of business on Monday for other Senators to join in sponsorship. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that I hope to have the privilege later in the day of addressing myself to the very major policy questions bearing directly upon our present most serious problem, the imbalance of our international payments, which are dealt with by these bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

S. 851. A bill to assist business enterprises, communities, and individuals to make necessary adjustments required by changed economic conditions resulting from the trade policies of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 852. A bill to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I introduced earlier today a bill called the National Export Policy Act and one called the National Import Policy Act.

The economic growth of this country and the free world depends to a very large degree on a steady expansion of trade that can be sustained throughout this decade with the United States retaining its present role as world trade leader. But that objective may well prove unattainable unless Congress, with the backing of the new administration, acts promptly to establish a national trade policy for imports as well as exports. That is the fundamental purpose of the National Import Policy Act of 1961 and the National Export Policy Act of 1961 which I introduced today for myself and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The President, in his recent message on the balance of payments and gold, placed great emphasis on U.S. export expansion as a major step which will help correct our international payments deficit and stem the gold outflow. Although it is surely not a new idea, a massive export drive is urgently needed. Our current payments deficit amounts to $3.8 billion. Without our trade surplus of $4.9 billion in 1960 resulting from a new sales record for U.S. exports, our deficit would have doubled and converted the gold situation into a genuine crisis undermining the stability of the dollar.

A most serious omission in President Kennedy's balance-of-payments message was the failure to mention to the Congress the all-important fact that U.S. export expansion implies maintaining and possibly even expanding U.S. imports. If the Federal Government is going to embark on new programs to help industries increase their sales in foreign markets, then it should also provide adequate protection and assistance for those at home adversely affected by foreign imports. Unless that happens, a wave of old-fashioned protectionist pressure can sweep this country and destroy the chances for an export expansion program, burying it under a mountain of new trade restrictions designed to keep out foreign goods.

In his message, President Kennedy did recognize that "a return to protectionism is not a solution."

Such a course—

He said—

would provoke retaliation.

Our trade with the six Common Market countries in Western Europe is a case in point. In 1960, our exports to them were an estimated $3.4 billion, an increase of more than $1 billion over 1959. But that increase would not have occurred without the prior existence of reasonable tariff agreements which permitted U.S. businesses and consumers to purchase an additional $700 million in imports from Common Market countries during 1959. If we surrender to protectionist pressures now and try to artificially improve our favorable balance of trade with these nations by imposing new trade quotas and tariff barriers, they will retaliate. Almost overnight, we could find our current trade surplus of $1 billion with these six nations wiped out.

Therefore, if the Federal Government pursues its announced program for export expansion, as I firmly believe it should, it must also recognize its responsibility to help those who may be hurt by a national policy for export expansion. If the administration tries one without the other, it is inviting an alliance of firms, labor groups, entire industries, and whole sections of the country to fight U.S. trade expansion. That must not happen, and I do not believe that such action is inevitable if Congress moves promptly to implement a sensible import policy. Accordingly, the National Import Policy Act of 1961, which I introduced today, as one part of a national trade policy, deals with the danger of protectionism in the United States attributable to injury from imports to domestic business and employment.

Two remedies are proposed in my bill. First, it gives the President the authority to "phase out" over a period of 7 years new tariff protection afforded by a Tariff Commission recommendation to any product; and, second, it provides adjustment assistance to enable individual businesses, individual workers, and communities to adjust to the national policy which dictates increased imports.

In order to accept these imports, we must meet the needs of businesses and workers who may be seriously endangered by them. Basic to this issue is the point that, while we have an estimated 200,000 to 400,000 workers concerned in businesses like some branches of textiles, and certain fabricated metal items, gloves, and so forth, which may suffer seriously from import competition, we have an estimated 4 to 5 million who are engaged in the production of everything from autos to medicines for export.

Another vital factor is the Communist challenge, for the Communists, through state trading, are in a position to take many of the products we now import off the hands of our supplier nations if we do not do so. Khrushchev said in 1955:

We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purposes.

He has indeed declared war upon us "in the peaceful field of trade."

We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system.

The Communist-bloc trade, with 41 nations in the less developed areas of the free world, more than doubled between 1954 and 1958; and by the middle of last year, 1960, the bloc had doubled its trade and payments agreements with free world nations. Indeed, Soviet-bloc trade expansion with the free world nearly doubled in the last 6 years, while our share remained, though much greater in size, generally stable.

The concept of adjustment assistance to workers, business, and communities adversely affected by the increasing flow of imports concentrated on a few sectors of the U.S. economy is basic to the ability of our Nation to continue its role of free world economic leadership. The responsibilities of this leadership include the maintenance of the stability of the dollar upon which the free world's currencies are based, and which is therefore the primary medium of economic progress. The $35 billion annual rate of U.S. trade—imports and exports—is the major determining factor of dollar stability, representing more than 60 percent of our international transactions during 1960.

These responsibilities also include ratification of U.S. membership in the OECD—Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—which is to come up for Senate approval in the very near future. The U.S. gross national product represents more than half of the $900 billion annual product of the 20 OECD countries, and U.S. trade represents more than one-fourth of the OECD countries' annual trade. In the last analysis, the full effect of U.S. economic weight can be translated into effective action in the OECD only through expanding trade.

Although imports may cause some injury to segments of the national economy, we cannot afford to reduce our 16 percent share of free world trade since it represents quantitatively, after defense expenditures, our largest commitments to international affairs. Neither, however, can we afford to permit such injury to take place without doing everything in our power to alleviate its consequences.

The National Import Policy Act of 1961 is designed to meet this situation and it would do so at an approximate cost of between $100 million and $150 million per year or an amount equivalent to the tax revenue derived from $1 billion in U.S. exports. On the other hand, a reduction of $1 billion of imports could help probably no more than 2 percent of our present unemployed, while many times that number of workers would lose their jobs if there was any substantial slump in U.S. exports.

Under the terms of the National Import Policy Act of 1961, assistance to alleviate serious injury from imports would be available from the Federal Government in the form of loans, tax incentives, and technical aids to qualified businesses, communities, and industrial development corporations; together with special unemployment compensation, retraining assistance, provisions for early retirement, and relocation allowances for workers.

For workers unemployed as the result of increased foreign imports, the act would set up a program to assure unemployment compensation for at least 6 months at a rate of 70 percent of the average weekly wage in their respective States, with the difference between State unemployment payment levels and the compensation provided under this act to be made up by the Federal Government.

Those among these unemployed workers who cannot find new jobs because of their advanced age would become eligible to receive their regular social security retirement benefits at age 60, with such payments to be made out of general revenues, and not out of the social security trust fund. Perhaps 10,000 workers would not be able to find suitable employment because of advanced age, and

would want to retire. At the rate of $1,000 per worker, this would cost about $10 million per year. Even at the end of 5 years, this should not exceed $30 million per year.

In addition, vocational training would be available to workers, as well as relocation allowances, should they be unable to find new employment in their own labor market areas.

At present, the Government's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training promotes and services the training of more than 200,000 apprentices and thousands of other workers, at the cost of slightly more than $4 million a year. A doubling and intensification of this effort would be called for, especially with respect to grants, subsidies, and contributions. The cost may amount to $10 million a year. In addition, perhaps 50,000 workers could be enrolled in full-time courses, costing $150 per worker. The cost to the Federal Government would be $7.5 million a year.

Relocation assistance to help workers move to other labor market areas may have to be given to 10,000 workers, at an average cost of $200 per worker. The total cost would come to $2 million.

Larger businesses, communities, and industrial development corporations found eligible under the bill's criteria would have recourse to a $100 million revolving loan fund, so that they could finance the adjustments necessitated by our policy in support of increased trade. A $50 million fund to supplement the present Small Business Administration's disaster loan fund would be authorized to help smaller companies adjust to the same circumstances. In addition, the bill amends the Internal Revenue Code so that more liberal depreciation allowances and more rapid amortization would be available to seriously affected enterprises.

I ask unanimous consent that summary analyses of both bills may be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the analyses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE NATIONAL EXPORT POLICY ACT OF 1961—A BILL TO ENCOURAGE AND PROMOTE THE EXPANSION THROUGH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE OF DOMESTIC EXPORTS IN WORLD MARKETS

Section 2: Finds and declares that foreign trade represents a strong and vital element in the economic leadership of the United States, and that the expansion of exports by and through private enterprise is the most positive means of meeting the balance-of-payments deficit as well as of increasing importance to the domestic economy. Proposes to provide a coordinated and augmented program of Government action designed to assist U.S. manufacturers and businessmen in recognizing and developing the opportunities in export markets.

Section 3: Establishes a Council for Export Promotion, under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Commerce, and including the Under Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Agriculture, the President of the Export-Import Bank, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers Establishes an Advisory Committee on Export Policy, whose nine members are representative of industry, export operations, banking and finance, labor and agriculture, and includes experts in international economics and business administration.

Provides that the functions of the Council for Export Promotion are to coordinate the export services of the U.S. Government, to promote the speedy and direct extension of these services to U.S. private business, to implement, review, revise and augment the pertinent recommendations of the Interagency Export Promotion Task Force which was established in 1959, and to undertake a thorough study of the export services provided by Government with a view to making specific recommendations for legislative and administrative action to improve these services. The Council is to make a yearly report to Congress.

Section 4: Amends section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, to give specific and detailed authorization to the Export-Import Bank to engage in a program of short- and medium-term export credit guarantees giving coverage of up to 85 and 90 percent, respectively, with the total amount of guarantees outstanding not to exceed $500 million at any one time.

(NOTE.—The Export-Import Bank has during the past year instituted a program of short-term export credit guarantees against political risks and has implemented its program of medium-term credit guarantees against commercial risks. (Medium-term guarantees against political risk, now made available by the Bank on an individual basis only, have had little response from the export community. The need is for a general program fully backed by the Congress of complete guarantees for all classes of export credit.) This legislation (the National Export Policy Act of 1961) specifically authorizes the Bank to extend short-term guarantees against commercial risks and medium-term guarantees against political risks, showing the clear intent of Congress that the Bank round out its present program, thus reenforcing the general authority which the Bank has under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.)

The President of the Bank shall undertake a continuous comparison of the operations and effectiveness of the U.S. export credit guarantee program with the programs pursued by other leading exporting nations, and include his findings in his annual report to Congress.

Section 5: Authorizes and directs the Department of State to expand and augment its export services to U.S. businessmen by (a) undertaking market surveys and other commercial research activities in foreign countries and, when necessary, hiring private U.S. or foreign firms for the purpose; (b) placing advertisements in foreign news media, in order to provide institutional advertising for U.S. products and in order to describe the services available to potential foreign buyers at U.S. foreign service posts; and (c) establishing, with the Department of Commerce, permanent or temporary trade information centers at international trade fairs.

Section 6: Authorizes and directs the Department of Commerce to expand and augment its export services to U.S. businessmen by (a) undertaking an expansion of the export services provided by its field offices in the United States; (b) placing advertisements in U.S. news media to advertise foreign trade opportunities and export services available to U.S. businessmen; (c) establishing, with the Department of State, a limited number of pilot projects in foreign market areas to provide warehousing and other basic support facilities for private U.S. export operations (these facilities would be permanent and designed for eventual purchase by private U.S. firms or export associations); and (d) increasing the number of trade missions going overseas in order to provide for a more thorough coverage of foreign market areas.

Section 7: Amends section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to authorize the use of foreign currencies held by the United States for the implementation of the programs in sections 5 and 6 of the National Export Policy Act of 1961.

Section 8: Authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL IMPORT POLICY ACT OF 1961—A BILL TO ASSIST BUSINESS ENTERPRISES, COMMUNITIES, AND INDIVIDUALS TO MAKE NECESSARY ADJUSTMENTS REQUIRED BY CHANGED CONDITIONS RESULTING FROM THE TRADE POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Section 2: Recognizes the need for U.S. participation in world trade in order to maintain a sound domestic economy and healthy international relations, and establish a national import policy to provide assistance to business enterprises, individuals and communities so that they may make the adjustments required by changed conditions resulting from U.S. participation in world trade.

Section 3: Authorizes the President to delegate the powers he receives under this act. Provides that the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government engaged in carrying out the functions of this act will consult with each other. By precedent, this could call for the setting up of an interdepartmental National Import Policy Committee with a chairman, possibly the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, or the delegation of these powers to an existing agency of Government.

Section 4: Establishes an Advisory Committee on Import Policy, composed of nine members broadly representative of production, commerce, finance, agriculture, labor, and consumer interest. One of the members shall be a member of the National Export Expansion Committee which was established as a result of the export promotion program announced by the President on March 17, 1960. This Advisory Committee, similar to the one established for the Export-Import Bank, would advise in the operation of this act.

Section 5: Establishes the criteria for eligibility of business enterprises, communities, industrial development corporations, and individuals or organizations representing individuals for assistance under this act. The President is to issue certificates of eligibility valid for no longer than 18 months, which he may cancel when he feels they are no longer necessary—including in the event of congressional action to change the tariff or quota structure in the United States.

A business enterprise is eligible, if the President finds that it has suffered serious economic injury resulting from increased imports, or is threatened with such injury, after—

(a) The Tariff Commission makes a finding of serious injury, or the threat of serious injury, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act (the escape clause) to an industry of which the business enterprise is a member; or

(b) The Tariff Commission makes a recommendation for relief under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which permits tariff relief in order to eliminate differences in cost of production between foreign and domestic items; or

(c) The Tariff Commission does not make such findings or recommendations for the industry but does find that the application was made "in good faith and with reasonable cause"; or

(d) The Tariff Commission, under section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act (the peril point provision), reports to the President the lowest rate of duty—either higher or lower than the existing rate—or other least

restrictive customs treatment for an item which must be maintained in order to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing this item, and the findings of this report are not complied with; or

(c) The Tariff Commission has made an investigation and report under section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, which provides for such investigations and reports at the request of the President, either House of Congress, the House Ways and Means Committee, or the Senate Finance Committee, and the business enterprise is a member of an industry which has been the subject of such an investigation.

A community is eligible, when it has substantial and persistent unemployment as the result of reductions in personnel by businesses in industries investigated by the Tariff Commission if these reductions in personnel are due to increased imports.

An industrial development corporation is eligible, if it is operated to achieve a more balanced and increased level of economic activity in a type of community cited above.

An individual is eligible, if he is unemployed as the result of reductions in personnel by businesses in industries investigated by the Tariff Commission, if his or her last regular employment was in such a business and if the reductions in personnel are due to increased imports.

In addition to the above criteria, the President would have to consider what portion of a business enterprise's production is directly and adversely affected by increased imports. Furthermore, a business enterprise, community or industrial development corporation would have to present plans for effective programs of economic adjustment before being eligible for assistance. A worker, of course, would not have to meet these last two requirements.

This section furthermore amends section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act and section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to authorize the President to place a time limit of not more than 7 years on any additional import restrictions which he adopts upon the recommendation of the Tariff Commission, and to reduce such additional restrictions on a specified, gradual basis.

SUMMARY OF SECTION 5

The distinctive feature of this section is that it permits assistance to a business, community and worker adversely affected by increased imports, even when the Tariff Commission does not find serious injury to the entire industry. This prevents the establishment of additional import restrictions when only part of an industry is seriously injured, and thus eliminates the accrual of windfall profits for the more efficient members of the industry under the cover of import barriers. Furthermore, the eligibility for assistance of workers and communities seriously injured by additional imports is separate both from the eligibility of industries and of individual business enterprises.

The criteria for eligibility are strict; there must be a thorough investigation by the Tariff Commission upon the findings of which the President can base his decision. The Tariff Commission must also find that the application was made with reasonable cause, and the affected elements of an industry (except the workers) must present effective plans for which they apply.

Section 6: Provides the President with administrative powers under this act specifically the power to make rules, regulations, and procedures for the carrying out of his functions in determining eligibility for assistance.

Section 7: Provides for loans to larger business enterprises, communities, and industrial development corporations which are eligible for assistance. A $100 million revolving fund is established for this purpose.

Section 8: Provides for loans to small business enterprises which are eligible for assistance; $50 million is added to the present Small Business Administration disaster loan fund for this purpose.

Section 9: Amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide for more liberal depreciation allowances and more rapid amortization of property of business enterprises eligible for assistance.

Section 10: Provides for technical and managerial aids to business enterprises, communities, and industrial development corporations in making application for assistance, and, if possible, in making the necessary adjustments without Government assistance. If assistance is required, these aids will also be provided to help those receiving it to make effective use of it. This technical aid will take the form of advice and counsel on good management and related matters.

SUMMARY OF SECTIONS 7–10

These sections are designed to give economic assistance and incentives through loans, tax policies and technical aids, so that those elements of our private enterprise system which are seriously injured by increased imports may again become competitive.

Section 11: Provides that unemployed workers eligible for assistance will receive unemployment compensation for at least 6 months at a rate of 70 percent of the average weekly earnings in their State. The difference between the payments provided by the regular State unemployment compensation programs and the amounts which are provided to the workers by this act will be paid by the Federal Government. Special provision is made to assure a worker who is eligible for assistance a minimum of unemployment compensation for a period of no more than 3 months, if he works in an on-the-job or in-plant training program approved by the Secretary of Labor and if this work pays no more than the partial earnings allowance permitted by his or her State.

Section 12: Provides for the payment of benefits equal to the full social security retirement benefits which workers would receive at the regular age of retirement, if the Secretary of Labor determines that an eligible worker of 60 years of age or older is unable to find employment because of his age. Payments will be out of general revenues; not the social security trust fund.

Section 13: Provides for programs of retraining and vocational rehabilitation for eligible workers, under the supervision of the Secretary of Labor.

Section 14: Provides for the payment of moving expenses of an eligible worker and his family when the Secretary of Labor determines that there is no job opportunity in his or her labor market area but that there is such opportunity elsewhere in the United States.

SUMMARY OF SECTIONS 11–14

These sections are designed to give assistance to workers unemployed as the result of increased imports so that they may be tided over during their period of unemployment and so that they may adjust to the new economic situation.

Section 15: Authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

INDIGENT DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States, which I introduce on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an explanation of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 854) to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement submitted by Mr. JAVITS follows:

Senator JAVITS today introduced for himself and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, legislation to establish a nationwide system of public defenders to represent indigent defendants in criminal court cases. The bill also provides that grants may be made to legal aid societies, bar associations and similar groups rendering free legal service to defendants in U.S. district courts who cannot afford to hire counsel.

Similar legislation sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEFAUVER, and ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, passed the Senate last year but no action was taken on it by the House of Representatives. It has been endorsed by the Department of Justice, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association and other leading bar associations throughout the country.

Commenting on the bill, Senator JAVITS said: "Although the sixth amendment to the Constitution states that every accused person is entitled to the assistance of counsel for his defense, regardless of ability to pay, the widespread practice of assigning lawyers to represent indigent defendants usually without compensation is often haphazard and ineffectual. Legal authorities agree that it does not always result in the proper administration of justice.

"According to the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, from mid-1957 through mid-1958, more than 50 percent of all defendants in criminal court cases in 106 major cities were unable to afford legal counsel. For example, the number of indigent defendants in Oakland, Calif., was reported to be 60 percent of the total; in New York City, over 50 percent; in Chicago, Ill., 55 percent; and in Boston, Mass., 75 percent. The association further reports that some type of public defender system, supported by the State or local government, or provided by voluntary groups like legal aid societies does exist in 16 States. However, in 27 counties in the United States with a total population of about 20 million there is no such service available and indigent defendants must rely solely upon lawyers who may be appointed by the courts.

"The inadequacy of the present system is apparent in the results disclosed by one national survey which estimated that 4 out of every 10 indigent defendants held on criminal charges received no legal assistance whatsoever. Of the remaining 60 percent who did have some sort of aid, only about one-third received an effective defense, it was reported.

"Such studies, substantiating testimony by legal experts and my own first hand experience in developing a public defender program for youths under 21 while attorney general of New York State, have convinced me that Federal legislation is required, if the scales of justice are to be kept in balance in cases involving indigent defendants. They must never be weighted against the accused because he is financially unable to

employ a skilled, experienced lawyer to defend him.

"Granted that it is the duty of the prosecuting attorney to protect the innocent as well as prosecute the guilty, but, in practice, the district attorney or U.S. attorney is most effective in presentation of evidence against the person charged with a criminal offense. If the accused person's constitutional guarantee is to have real meaning, then his lawyer must be equally able and willing to counter with an adequate defense.

"The proposal I am introducing would provide that each U.S. district court may appoint a public defender to be paid out of Federal funds, the sum to be fixed by the Judicial Conference of the United States based upon services to be performed. Provision is made for a maximum salary of $16,000 per annum, or an amount $2,500 less than the salary of the U.S. attorney in the district, whichever is lower. Ninety percent of the U.S. attorneys are paid between $12,500 and $15,000 annually, and the remainder receive between $18,000 and $20,000 per year. Whenever the court decides that a defendant is too poor to hire counsel, it may assign the public defender. However, the bill preserves the court's present power to appoint counsel other than the public defender and such counsel is to be paid on a case-by-case basis, with daily compensation not to exceed $100.

"There is a key provision in the bill authorizing the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts upon recommendation of the Judicial Conference to make grants to bar associations, legal aid societies, and similar groups giving free legal services to indigent defendants with the aggregate amount of any such grants made annually to any judicial district shall not exceed $30,000. There are undoubtedly several areas in the country where a small expenditure of Federal funds would enable legal aid societies to expand materially the volume of work they now handle."

In New York City, where it is estimated that nearly 6 out of every 10 persons accused of criminal cases seek voluntary legal aid, the local Legal Aid Society reports that it assisted 35,123 indigent defendants during 1958. In the Federal courts of the southern and eastern districts which take in New York and 11 neighboring counties, the society was called upon to represent one or more defendants in almost 70 percent of all criminal cases tried in them.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to make the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday. I introduce the bill on my own behalf, and on behalf of the Senators from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON and Mr. COOPER], and the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. HARTKE].

I point out that Lincoln's birthday is not a legal holiday. We have eight such holidays, of which his birthday is not one. Washington's birthday, of course, is a legal holiday. I also point out that Senators who have joined in sponsoring the bill come from the various States which Lincoln's life touched—where he was born, where he lived, and where he worked. I hope very much that in the spirit of Lincoln's birthday we may have action upon the bill.

Following Lincoln's birth in Hardin, Ky., in 1809, he moved with his family to Spencer County, Ind., in 1816 where he received much of his schooling. In 1830, Lincoln settled in Illinois where he first practiced law and soon after embarked on a career of public service.

I am delighted to have such distinguished, bipartisan sponsorship of this legislation honoring Abraham Lincoln. His historic impact on the moral conscience and the destiny of our Nation, which he sacrificed his very life to serve, has made Abraham Lincoln an American immortal who belongs to all ages and to all our people, regardless of their political affiliation or the region in which they may live. Presently, 18 States do not observe February 12 as an official holiday. Favorable consideration of the legislation being introduced today would enable the citizens of every State in the Union to honor Lincoln as we already honor George Washington—he would become the second individual and the second President whose birthday would be celebrated throughout the land as a legal holiday.

This year, 1961, marks the 100th anniversary of the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln as the 16th President of the United States. It also signals the start of the centennial observance of the beginning of the tragic Civil War which ultimately unified our people in a march to national greatness, and social, moral, and industrial achievements unsurpassed in modern times. Once this Nation freed itself from the intolerable bonds of human slavery, America went forth to meet the challenges of the industrial revolution with all its economic might. The fundamental principles and the constitutional freedoms which Lincoln championed and which were preserved and strengthened in our Civil War are today the precious goals of most of the people in the world. Our freedom and our strength fans the flame of hope for many millions trapped behind the Iron Curtain. The accomplishments which our freedom has made possible are the aspirations of still more millions in the less developed areas who in 1961 are trying to free themselves from the bonds of poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

Historian Bruce Catton wrote in his article in last Sunday's New York Times magazine:

> During the Civil War, the U.S. flag became the living symbol of hope and freedom to a great many people who had never had any of either of those things; and a century afterward, the fact that these people were Negroes, recently transplanted (against their own will) from Africa, takes on a profound meaning. Very few of our national assets today have a greater latent value than this one.

Today Abraham Lincoln is the hero of all free peoples. He has become a beloved symbol internationally of the American spirit of equality and fair play, and Lincoln's memory should have this further recognition in his native land.

Lincoln's devotion to liberty for the individual and to obtaining for him political equality and equality of opportunity are well known. His efforts at conciliation with the South, his plans to bring the blessings of liberty and its enjoyment to all Americans, and his plans to reunite the American people were unhappily cut short by an assassin's bullet.

President Lincoln bespoke the spirit which moves many of us today when he stated in his second inaugural address:

> With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in.

He was a man whose principles called for the support of measured progress in the field of freedom for the individual with which he is most closely identified by history. It is our fervent hope that this measured progress may continue in the same spirit which he—and many of his southern countrymen such as Gen. Robert E. Lee—would have had it continue.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 853) to make the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMISSION TO DEVELOP THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senators from New Jersey [Mr. CASE and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BOGGS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the management and control of water and related natural resources of the Delaware River Basin.

Since under rule XXV matters involving flood control, waterpower, and navigation are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred for consideration to that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Governors of the four States and the mayors of New York City and Philadelphia have approved the agreement.

The distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], when he was Governor of his State, participated in the drafting of the agreement. The agreement will be introduced in the legislatures of the four States in the same form as it is being introduced in Congress. It has already been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania.

The proposed compact is unique in providing that the Federal Government shall join as a full party to the compact. Previous interstate agreements on river basin development and other matters have merely been assented to by the Federal Government.

The compact would create a five-member commission consisting of the

four Governors and an appointee of the President to plan the multipurpose use of the water of the basin, which drains 12,750 square miles and serves the domestic and industrial needs of 16 million people in the four States. The commission would have authority over flood control, water supply, pollution control, hydroelectric power production where feasible, recreation, fish and wildlife improvement, soil conservation, forestation and watershed management. Navigation would remain the exclusive concern of the Federal Government.

The compact recognizes present decisions of the Supreme Court regarding allocation of Delaware River water among the States, but provides that future applications for diversion of water will be made to the Commission, subject to appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Disputes would thus be settled without recourse to prolonged litigation in the lower courts.

While the Commission would establish a comprehensive plan and provide common direction for operations of the 19 Federal agencies and approximately 60 State agencies which are concerned to some degree with the water resources of the basin, it would not supersede those agencies. In the construction of dams, it would work through the Corps of Army Engineers, which is now completing a multipurpose study of the Delaware.

The Commission would be financed by appropriations, grants, and loans from Federal and State powers. It would have no taxing powers, but could issue revenue bonds and impose charges for products and services. The compact will be in effect for 100 years, with the proviso that the Federal Government may withdraw by law at any time.

Mr. President, the compact is a unique piece of proposed legislation, resulting from hard work in all four States and coordination with the Federal Government. It began as long ago as 1954. I hope it will receive the favorable consideration of the President and will become law before this session of the 87th Congress adjourns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 856) to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management and control of the water and related natural resources of the Delaware River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers, and duties of such agency, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I am very pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill to create an interstate-Federal compact for the regulation of the Delaware River Basin. The four riparian States—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware—and the Federal Government will, it is hoped, become parties to this agreement for unified water planning throughout the 12,750 miles of the Delaware River watershed.

The need for this agreement is painfully evident today. The Delaware River Basin supplies about 800 million gallons of water daily to New York City and about 100 million to New Jersey. Although it occupies less than 1 percent of the land area of the United States, the Delaware River Basin service area has 13 percent of the Nation's population and generates 17 percent of national personal income.

For the planning and regulation of this vital river basin, there are in existence at present 25 Federal agencies, 14 interstate agencies, and 43 State departments, boards, and commissions. The need for an overall authority for control and planning is obvious.

This compact has the approval of the Governors of the four States concerned and of the mayors of the two large cities that are involved. It is a very valuable instrument, carefully conceived and drawn up. The five-member commission, with one representative from each State and one appointed by the President, will have the responsibility of formulating and keeping current a comprehensive plan for the development of the water resources of the whole basin, of constructing dams, reservoirs, and other facilities, and of allocating water supplies in an equitable apportionment.

Mr. President, this is a historic document, which has been approved by the Governors and mayors involved. I hope that the Senate will give it full approval so that we may move ahead in the all-important field of water resource development.

CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the end of the 1st session of the 86th Congress—now almost a year and a half ago—Senator Kennedy and myself filed S. 2636, a bill to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Congressman KEITH filed a companion bill in the House. Since that time extensive consultation has been held concerning this project with planners, economists, conservationists, and officials at all levels of government. Two sets of hearings have already been held by both the House and Senate Subcommittees on Public Lands. Last June, Senator Kennedy and I presented a committee print of our bill, the revisions of which reflected testimony given and commentary offered about the project. On January 3 of this year, Congressman KEITH reintroduced the original legislation on the House side.

At the hearings last June, Senator Kennedy commented:

> I am convinced that the time is ripe for the establishment of this park along the lines recommended in the bill which Senator SALTONSTALL and I filed last summer and which we have attempted to improve and clarify since that time. * * * I am fully persuaded that this bill in its general conception and framework is adapted to the special requirements of a park on the lower cape.

At the same time—8 months ago—I testified:

> Further delay can only inconvenience everyone and harm the basic interests of the project. Individual homeowners won't know what to do with their property. Long-range zoning and economic planning efforts of the towns will be frustrated. Further commercial inroads will corrupt more of the area's natural beauty. * * * We must continue to move forward before it is too late.

Today, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], I introduce for appropriate reference a revised bill to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore Park. This bill makes no changes in the basic provisions of the committee print of last spring, since Senator SMITH and I believe that testimony offered at the hearings and advice given by experts in the field prove them to be uniquely sound for the area involved. The new bill does contain certain boundary revisions, based on requests made after long deliberation by the respective boards of selectmen of the six lower cape towns.

We feel that this project has been thoroughly investigated by Congress, and that the basic opinion of it here on the Senate side is strongly favorable. We have talked with the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, Senator BIBLE, and he informs us that he is most willing to hold final hearings to take further testimony from representatives of the local towns, the Park Service, and other interested parties at a very early date. Secretary Udall said recently that he regarded this project as priority No. 1 on the list of important seashore proposals. The bill we are introducing today has been drafted as a result of close cooperation and consultation between our offices and with the Park Service and the White House staff. Congressman KEITH is continuously very helpful to us on the project.

The boundary revisions in the new bill—involving slightly under 1,500 acres to be excluded from the original park—are made in an attempt to consider reasonably the genuine growth needs of the towns concerned and at the same time to preserve the contiguity of the park so necessary to proper administration and conservation. Boundary revisions are made in four of the six towns concerned, and in every case involve specific areas among those requested for exclusion by local officials. In a fifth town a significant change has been made in the administration and use of a body of land which will remain technically part of the park but will be excluded from the park's normal public activities. The sixth town made no boundary revision request at all.

We would like to point out that Mr. Ben H. Thompson, Chief of the Recreational Resources Planning Division of the National Park Service, testified on the cape last December that the boundaries of S. 2636 were the minimum which the Park Service could recommend considering all of the circumstances. He pointed out that the exclusions proposed

at the hearings would, in the opinion of the Park Service, greatly impair the project. We mention this in order to point out candidly that the land exclusions included in the bill we are filing today, made in the interest of the local towns, already to some degree threaten sound conservation planning.

In Provincetown, our new bill excludes 332 acres of the province lands contained in the original bill out of a section which the Provincetown Board of Selectmen requested be excluded. In Truro, 308 acres in the Rider Beach area outlined by the board of selectmen has been omitted from the park. In Wellfleet on the southeast side of the Herring River 325 acres requested by the board of selectmen have been excluded. In Eastham 491 acres of a large area of land in the northern part of the town requested by the board of selectmen to be excluded from the park have been taken out. Orleans asked for no boundary revisions.

In Chatham we have designated Morris and Stage Islands as a nature sanctuary which shall be administered in such a way as to preserve the flora and fauna in the area and to prohibit camping and other major activities and developments for the accommodation of visitors. Morris and Stage Islands will thus be related to Monomoy Island, lying directly to the south, which is presently administered as a wildlife refuge. This change answers both the valid concern of the Chatham Board of Selectmen that increased traffic congestion would necessitate widening the streets and thus impair the traditional charm of the town, and the worry that if Morris and Stage Islands were included as a regular part of the park, a tent site encampment might result on the islands destroying their natural beauty. With Morris and Stage Islands administered as a nature sanctuary, as under our new bill, neither traffic nor tenting problems could develop because ordinary public uses of the area are expressly prohibited.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] intended to make in connection with the introduction of the bill. He found it necessary to be out of town today, and therefore is unable to make the statement himself.

The President pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 857) to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MASSACHUSETTS

It is a privilege to join with my colleague Senator SALTONSTALL in introducing legislation to establish the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Cape Cod is rich in beauty and rich in history. The Pilgrims made their first landing there, at Provincetown, before settling at Plymouth. The great whaling fleets of the 18th and 19th centuries originated on the cape. In recent years, as more and more acreage on the east coast has been turned over to suburban development, Cape Cod has become one of the few relatively unspoiled areas, where those of us who love the sea can retreat, for a weekend, a vacation, or a permanent home.

The basic principle behind this bill is the same as that behind other national park legislation. It is the principle that the natural resources of our country should be preserved for the benefit of all the people. Unless a park is created, preservation will soon be impossible. Commercial development of the cape, in the last 10 years, has been very rapid. If the trend continues, the great beach and lovely inland spots, long accessible to the public, will be fenced off for private use. If this happens, the Commonwealth will have lost its best available parksite.

The bill also embodies another principle. It recognizes the historic way of life and the scenic integrity of the cape and provides a means for their preservation. It protects existing property interests, preserves the tax revenues of the towns and recognizes the right of the citizens of the cape to have a voice in the management of the park. Moreover, the new revisions of the boundaries afford a very generous grant of land for additional private development.

I will be happy to work with Senator SALTONSTALL, with Congressman KEITH, and with the citizens of the cape in finalizing this legislation for early passage. I hope we can enlist the cooperation of all the people of all the townships. While I realize there are shades of opinion on some of the issues, which deserve consideration, I am thoroughly convinced of the need for establishing a national park to preserve the natural beauty of the cape for the benefit of its present residents, and for all the people, for all time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the coastal and shoreline area on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, possesses unique cultural, scenic, historic, scientific, and recreational values; and

Whereas these values are an important and irreplaceable part of the heritage of the United States; and

Whereas these values should be preserved and enhanced for the benefit and inspiration of all of the people of the United States of present and future generations; and

Whereas an adequate and representative portion of Cape Cod should be set aside and developed to assure its unimpaired use and enjoyment for varied cultural, scenic, historic, scientific, and recreational purposes: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the area comprising that portion of the land and waters located in the towns of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and described in subsection (b), is designated for establishment as Cape Cod National Seashore Park (hereinafter referred to as "the park").

(b) The area referred to in subsection (a) is described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the Atlantic Ocean one-quarter of a mile due west of the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean on Cape Cod at the westernmost extremity of Race Point, Provincetown, Massachusetts;

thence from the point of beginning along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean, Cape Cod Bay, and Provincetown Harbor in generally southerly, easterly, and northerly directions rounding Long Point and then southwesterly to a point a quarter of a mile offshore of the mean low-water line on the harbor side of the dike depicted on the United States Geological Survey Provincetown quadrangle sheet (1949) crossing an arm of the Provincetown Harbor;

thence northerly, along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the low-water line at the dike to a point easterly of the point of intersection of the sand dike with the boundary of the Province Lands Reservation as depicted on the said Provincetown quadrangle sheet;

thence westerly to the said point of intersection of the dike and the Province Lands Reservation boundary;

thence along the boundaries of the Province Lands Reservation northwesterly to the point where it crosses the southwesterly right-of-way line of State Route 6A;

thence northwesterly along said southwesterly right-of-way line of said State Route 6A for approximately 2,400 feet;

thence crossing said State Route 6A, and in a generally northwesterly direction for approximately 4,500 feet to a point approximately 400 feet beyond the southern boundary of the Province Lands extended southwestward from Clapps Pond;

thence northeasterly approximately 7,800 feet to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of Race Point Road, said point being approximately 900 feet generally north of a corner of the Province Lands Reservation boundary;

thence southeasterly to the easternmost corner of the Province Lands Reservation, being near United States Route 6;

thence leaving the said easternmost corner along an extension of the southerly reservation boundary line easterly to the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6;

thence along the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 in a generally easterly direction crossing the Truro-Provincetown town line to and continuing in the town of Truro to a point four-tenths of a mile southeasterly of Highland Road;

thence leaving the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 and running due east two-tenths of a mile;

thence turning and running in a southeasterly direction paralleling the general alinement of United States Route 6 and generally distant therefrom two-tenths of a mile crossing Pamet Road and continuing to a point three-tenths of a mile southerly thereof;

thence westerly to Mill Pond Road and crossing it and continuing along the southern right-of-way line of said road to its intersection with Old County Road;

thence following the easterly right-of-way line of Old County Road southward to a point opposite the southerly right-of-way line of Ryder Beach Road and its intersection with Old County Road;

thence eastward to a point 300 feet east of the easterly right-of-way line of said Old County Road;

thence in a southerly direction paralleling Old County Road at a distance of 300 feet to the east of the easterly right-of-way line of said road to a point 600 feet south of the southerly right-of-way line of Prince Valley Road;

thence in a generally westerly direction, crossing Old County Road and the New

York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad right-of-way to the southern extremity of the Town Landing and Beach in the Ryder Beach area, and continuing to a point in Cape Cod Bay a quarter of a mile offshore from the mean low-water line at said extremity of the town landing and beach;

thence turning and running along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of Cape Cod Bay in a general southerly and easterly direction rounding Jeremy Point and thence in a general northerly direction along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line on the westerly side of Wellfleet Harbor to a point one quarter of a mile due north of the mean low-water line at the eastern tip of Great Island as depicted on the United States Geological Survey Wellfleet quadrangle sheet (1958);

thence north to the mean high-water line on the north shore of the Herring River estuary in the vicinity of its confluence with Wellfleet Harbor;

thence following the mean high-water line southwesterly, northwesterly, and northeasterly to the easterly right-of-way line of Chequesset Neck Road at its crossing of Herring River;

thence following the course of Herring River along the 20-foot contour line of the southeasterly shore thereof to a point near Mill Creek;

thence crossing Mill Creek in a northeasterly direction to the 20-foot contour level near to and northeast of the confluence of Mill Creek and Herring River;

thence following generally northerly and easterly along the easterly edge of the Herring River marshes on the 20-foot contour to a point north of which the easterly right-of-way line of a medium duty road, as depicted on said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet, crosses northward across a marshy stream near the juncture of said medium duty road with Bound Brook Island Road;

thence crossing said marshy stream along said easterly right-of-way line of said medium duty road, and continuing in a northerly direction to the 20-foot contour level on the north side of said marshy stream;

thence following the 20-foot contour line westward approximately 1,000 feet to its intersection with an unimproved dirt road, as depicted on said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet, leading from a point near the juncture of Bound Brook Island Road and the said medium-duty road;

thence following said unimproved dirt road northwesterly for approximately 1,600 feet to the 20-foot contour line bordering the southerly edge of the Herring River marshes;

thence following said 20-foot contour line in an easterly direction to Route 6;

thence crossing Route 6 and continuing to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of a power transmission line as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet;

thence in a general southerly direction along the said easterly right-of-way line of a power transmission line to the Eastham-Wellfleet town line;

thence southeasterly for a distance of approximately 5,200 feet to a point due north of the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of Nauset Road with the northerly right-of-way line of Cable Road;

thence due south to the intersection of the said easterly right-of-way line of Nauset Road and the said northerly right-of-way line of Cable Road;

thence in a general southerly direction crossing Cable Road and along said easterly right-of-way line of Nauset Road to a point 500 feet north of the northerly right-of-way line of Doane Road and its intersection with Nauset Road;

thence west to a point 500 feet west of the westerly right-of-way line of Nauset Road;

thence southerly and westerly 500 feet from and parallel to the said right-of-way line of Nauset Road to the easterly right-of-way line of Salt Pond Road;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of said Salt Pond Road to its intersection with the southerly right-of-way line of Nauset Road;

then westerly along the southerly right-of-way line of Nauset Road to its intersection with the easterly right-of-way line of United States Route 6;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 to a point four-tenths of a mile southerly of the intersection of Locust Road and United States Route 6;

thence easterly to a point one-tenth of a mile from United States Route 6;

thence turning and running in a generally southerly direction paralleling the general alinement of United States Route 6 and generally distant therefrom one-tenth of a mile to a small stream approximately one-tenth of a mile beyond Governor Prence Road extended;

thence southeasterly along the stream and continuing to the Orleans-Eastham town line;

thence along the Orleans-Eastham town line to the southerly tip of Stony Island;

thence generally southerly in the town of Orleans to the easterly edge of the Nauset Harbor Channel as depicted on the United States Geological Survey Orleans quadrangle sheet (1946);

thence in a generally southerly direction along the said easterly edge of the Nauset Harbor Channel to a point due south of the southwesterly tip of Nauset Beach on the north side of the entrance to Nauset Harbor from the Atlantic Ocean as depicted on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence due south to the twenty-foot contour in Nauset Heights as delineated on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence generally southerly along the said twenty-foot contour to a point about one-tenth of a mile northerly of Beach Road;

thence southwesterly along a line intersecting Beach Road at a point two-tenths of a mile easterly of the so-called Nauset Road leading northerly to Nauset Heights;

thence southerly to the head of a tributary to Little Pleasant Bay at the northerly tip of Pochet Neck as depicted on the said Orleans quandrangle sheet;

thence generally southerly along the thread of channel of the said tributary passing westerly and southwesterly around Pochet Island and thence southwesterly into Little Pleasant Bay passing to westerly of the northerly tip of Sampson Island, the westerly tip of Money Head, and the southwesterly tip of Hog Island following in general the center line of Little Pleasant Bay to Pleasant Bay;

thence generally southeasterly in Pleasant Bay along a line passing midway between Sipson Island and Nauset Beach to a point on the Chatham-Orleans town line one-quarter of a mile westerly of the mean low-water line of Pleasant Bay on the westerly shore of Nauset Beach;

thence generally southerly in Pleasant Bay in the town of Chatham along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the said mean low-water line of Pleasant Bay on the westerly shore of Nauset Beach to a point a quarter of a mile south of the mean low-water line of the southern tip of Nauset Beach;

thence easterly rounding the southern tip of Nauset Beach along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel thereto;

thence generally northerly and northwesterly, and westerly along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean on the easterly shore of Nauset Beach and on to the outer cape to the point of beginning.

Also included in such area are lands located in the town of Chatham and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the northwesterly corner of the boundary of Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge at the mean low-water line on the western shore of Morris Island;

thence generally southerly, westerly, southerly, easterly, and northerly along the exterior boundary line of said Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge to a point on the northeasterly corner of said refuge located on the mean low-water line on the eastern shore of Morris Island;

thence northerly, westerly, and southerly along the mean low-water line of Morris Island and Stage Island to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as "Secretary") is authorized to acquire by purchase, gift, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, within the area which is described in section 1 of this Act or which lies with the boundaries of the park as described pursuant to section 3 of this Act (both together hereinafter) in this Act referred to as "such area"). Any property, or interest therein, owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by any of the towns referred to in section 1 of this Act or by any other political subdivision of said Commonwealth may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have authority to incur obligations and enter into contracts involving the expenditure of funds authorized by section 10 of this Act for the acquisition of property and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

(c) The Secretary is authorized (1) to use donated and appropriated funds in making acquisitions under this Act, and (2) to pay therefor not more than the fair market value of any acquisitions which he makes by purchase under this Act.

(d) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within such area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(e) As used in this Act the term "fair market value" shall mean the fair market value as determined by the Secretary, who may in his discretion base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him.

SEC. 3. (a) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage in the area described in section 1 of this Act that is in the opinion of the Secretary efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish Cape Cod National Seashore Park by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

(b) Such notice referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall contain a detailed description of the boundaries of the park which shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 1 of this Act. The Secretary shall forthwith after the date of publication of such notice in the Federal Register (1) send a copy of such notice, together with a map showing such boundaries, by registered or certified mail to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and to the board of selectmen of each of the towns referred to in section 1 of this Act; (2) cause a copy of such notice and map to be published in one or more newspapers which circulate in each of such towns; and (3) cause a certified copy of such notice, a copy of such map, and a copy of this Act to be recorded at the registry of deeds for Barnstable County, Massachusetts.

SEC. 4. (a)(1) The beneficial owner or owners of improved property which the Secretary acquires by condemnation may elect, as a condition to such acquisition, to retain the right of use and occupancy of the said property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term of twenty-five years, or for such lesser time as the said owner or owners may elect at the time of such acquisition.

(2) The beneficial owner or owners, not being a corporation, of a freehold estate in improved property which property the Secretary acquires by condemnation, who held, on September 1, 1959, with respect to such property, an estate of the same nature and quality, may elect, as an alternative and not in addition to whatever right of election he or they might have under paragraph (1) of this subsection, to retain the right of use and occupancy of the said property for noncommercial residential purposes (i) for a term limited by the nature and quality of his or their said estate, if his or their said estate is a life estate or an estate pur autre vie, or (ii) for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, or at the death of the survivor of them, if his or their said estate is an estate of fee simple.

(3) Where such property is held by a natural person or persons for his or their own life or lives or for the life or lives of another or others (such person or persons being hereinafter called "the life tenant"), with remainder in another or others, any right of election provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be exercised by the life tenant, and any right of election provided for in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be exercised by the concurrence of the life tenant and the remainderman or remaindermen.

(4) The beneficial owner or owners of a term of years in improved property which the Secretary acquires by condemnation may elect, as a condition to such acquisition, to retain the right of use and occupancy of the said property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term not to exceed the remainder of his or their said term of years, or a term of twenty-five years, whichever shall be the lesser. The owner or owners of the freehold estate or estates in such property may, subject to the right provided for in the preceding sentence, exercise such right or rights of election as remain to them under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection.

(5) No right of election accorded by paragraphs (1), (2), or (4) of this subsection shall be exercised to impair substantially the interests of holders of encumbrances, liens, assessments, or other charges upon or against the property.

(6) Any right or rights of use and occupancy retained pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of this subsection shall be held to run with the land, and may be freely transferred and assigned.

(7) In any case where a right of use and occupancy for life or for a fixed term of years is retained as provided in paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of this subsection, the compensation paid by the Secretary for the property shall not exceed the fair market value of the property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary, less the fair market value on such date of the said right retained.

(8) The Secretary shall have authority to terminate any right of use and occupancy of property, retained as provided in paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of this subsection, at any time after the date when any use occurs with respect to such property which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in regulations issued pursuant to section 6 of this Act and in effect on said date: *Provided*, That no use which is in conformity with the provisions of a zoning bylaw approved in accordance with said section 6 which is in force and applicable to such property shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard. In the event that the Secretary exercises the authority conferred by this paragraph, he shall pay to the owner of the right so terminated an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remained on the date of termination.

(b)(1) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within such area in all of the towns referred to in section 1 of this Act for one year following the date of its enactment.

(2) Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within such area in any one of such towns during all times when such town shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

(c) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to any particular property which is used for commercial or industrial purposes during any periods when such use is permitted by the Secretary and during the pendency of the first application for such permission made to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this Act provided such application is made not later than the date of establishment of the park.

(d) The term "improved property," wherever used in this Act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling the construction of which was begun before September 1, 1959 (hereinafter referred to as "dwelling"), together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the land so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be at least three acres in area, or all of such lesser amount as may be held in the same ownership as the dwelling, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto.

SEC. 5. (a) As soon after the enactment of this Act as may be practicable, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning bylaws for purposes of section 4 of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning bylaws whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning bylaws and any amendment to any approved zoning bylaw submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of the adoption by the town of such bylaw or such amendment. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, nor shall its effect be altered for purposes of section 4 of this Act by issuance of any such amended regulations after the date of such approval, so long as such bylaw or such amendment remains in effect as approved.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning bylaw or zoning bylaw amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property within the boundaries of the park which is situated within the town adopting such bylaw; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the park, by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning bylaw consistent with the laws of Massachusetts.

(c) No zoning bylaw or amendment of a zoning bylaw shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the park, or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such bylaw or amendment.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended by reason of the adoption and approval, in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, of a zoning bylaw applicable to such property (hereinafter referred to as "such bylaw")—

(1) is made the subject of a variance under or an exception to such bylaw, which variance or exception fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in the regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of the passage of such bylaw (but if such bylaw has been amended at the time of the passage of the most recent amendment), or

(2) upon or with respect to which there occurs any use, commencing after the date of the publication by the Secretary of such regulations, which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in such regulations (but no use which is in conformity with the provisions of such bylaw shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard), the Secretary may, at any time and in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may agree with the owner or owners of such property to refrain from the exercise of the said authority during such time and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem to be in the best interests of the development and preservation of the park.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property located within the park as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with the provisions of

this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 7. (a) In order to provide compensation for tax losses sustained by the towns referred to in section 1 of this Act as a result of certain acquisitions by the Secretary of privately owned real estate and improvements thereon pursuant to the provisions of this Act, payments in lieu of taxes shall be made to each such town in which such real estate is located, and which has been authorized, under the laws of Massachusetts, to assess taxes upon real estate to the person who is in possession thereof and to assess taxes upon any present interest in real estate to the owner of such interest, in accordance with the following schedule: For the calendar year in which the real estate is acquired in fee simple absolute, an amount which bears the same proportion to the full amount of tax assessed thereon in such year as the number of days remaining in such year after the date of acquisition bears to the number three hundred and sixty-five. In any case where an amount in excess of the difference between such proportionate amount and such full amount has already been paid to the town by or on behalf of the owner or owners from whom the real estate was so acquired, payment of such excess amount shall be made as reimbursement to such owner or owners out of such proportionate amount and only the balance remaining of such proportionate amount shall be paid to the town. For the two succeeding calendar years there shall be paid on account of such real estate an amount equal to the full amount of tax assessed thereon in the year of acquisition.

(b) No payments in lieu of taxes shall be made on account of real estate and improvements thereon in which the Secretary has ever acquired less than a fee simple absolute under this Act.

(c) As soon as practicable after real estate taxes have been assessed by such towns in each calendar year, the Secretary shall compute and certify the amount of payments in lieu of taxes due to each of such towns, and such amounts shall be paid to the respective towns by the Secretary of the Treasury out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any property acquired by the Secretary after December 31 of the twenty-fifth year following the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the property acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535); as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with laws of general application relating to the national park system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496); except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) (1) The Secretary shall develop for appropriate public uses such portions of Cape Cod National Seashore Park as he deems especially adaptable for such uses, including camping, swimming, boating, sailing, hunting, fishing, the appreciation of historic sites and structures and natural features of Cape Cod, and other recreational activities of similar nature. The Secretary may also provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features of Cape Cod by establishing such trails, observation points, and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for the purpose. Except for such public use areas and except for improved property therein, the park shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development of the park or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken by the Secretary which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in the area described in section 1 of this Act or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as he may designate.

(2) In developing the park the Secretary shall provide public use areas in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish for its owners or occupants the value or enjoyment of any improved property located within the park.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, land and waters now or hereafter included in any migratory bird refuge within the boundaries of the park shall continue as such refuge under applicable laws and regulations, but such lands and waters shall be a part of the park and shall be administered by the Secretary for public uses not inconsistent with the purposes of such refuge under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Nothing in this Act shall limit the power of the Secretary to acquire lands and waters for any migratory bird refuge. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, Morris and Stage Islands shall be administered as a sanctuary in which the flora and fauna shall be preserved and where camping and other such major activities and developments for the accommodation of visitors shall be prohibited.

(d) The Secretary may permit hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the park in such areas and under such regulations as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall consult with officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and any political subdivision thereof who have jurisdiction of hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, prior to the issuance of any such regulations, and the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative arrangements with such officials regarding such hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, as he may deem desirable, except that the Secretary shall leave the regulation of the taking of shellfish to the towns referred to in section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established a Cape Cod National Seashore Park Advisory Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission). Said Commission shall terminate ten years after the date the park is established under section 3 of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of nine members each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary as follows:

(1) Six members to be appointed from recommendations made by each of the boards of selectmen of the towns referred to in the first section of this Act, one member from the recommendations made by each such board;

(2) Two members to be appointed from recommendations of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

(3) One member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Commission established by this section shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members thereof.

(f) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the members of the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of Cape Cod National Seashore Park, and shall consult with the members with respect to carrying out the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act.

(g) No permit for the commercial or industrial use of property located within the park shall be issued by the Secretary without the advice of the Commission, and after its termination, without the advice of the board of selectmen of the town in which such property is located, if such advice is submitted within a reasonable time after it is sought.

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; except that no more than $16,000,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 11. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

URBAN SPRAWL AND OPEN SPACE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist States and their political subdivisions in preserving open space land in and around urban areas which, for economic, social, conservation, recreational, or esthetic reasons, is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas and their suburban and rural environs. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that it lie at the table through February 21 so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor the measure may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 858) to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist States and their political subdivisions in preserving open space land in and around urban areas which, for economic, social, conservation, recreational, or esthetic reasons, is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas and their suburban and rural environs, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Open Space and Urban Development Act of 1961."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that a combination of economic, social, governmental and technological forces have caused an unprecedentedly rapid and and wasteful expansion and sprawl of the Nation's urban areas, which has created critical problems of service and finance for all levels of government and which, combined with a rapid population growth in such areas, threatens severe problems of urban and suburban living, including the loss of valuable open space land in and around such areas, for the preponderant majority of the Nation's present and future population.

It is the purpose of this Act to help curb urban sprawl and prevent the spread of urban blight and deterioration, to encourage more economic and desirable urban development, and to help provide necessary recreational, conservation and scenic areas by assisting State and local governments in taking prompt action to preserve open space land which is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas, in accordance with plans for the allocation of such land for open space purposes.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) As used in this Act, the term "open space land" means any open or preponderantly open land, including agricultural land, in and around urban areas which (1) has economic and social value as a means of shaping land use and community development in a more economic and desirable manner; (2) has recreational value; (3) has conservation value in protecting water supplies, providing water pollution or flood control, and preserving forest, wildlife, fishery, or other natural resources; or (4) has historic, scenic, or esthetic value.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "urban area" means any area which is urban in character, including those surrounding suburban, rural, and semirural areas which, in the judgment of the Administrator, form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential governmental, institutional and other activities.

(c) As used in this Act, the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") shall (1) undertake a thorough review of the operation of all programs under the jurisdiction of such Agency and its constituents and shall issue such regulations or directives or make such recommendations to the President and to the Congress as he deems necessary to more effectively utilize and coordinate such programs to the greatest extent feasible to further the objectives of this Act; (2) study and make appropriate recommendations with respect to more effectively utilizing and coordinating the operation of other Federal-aid programs so as to increase, to the greatest extent feasible, their contribution to open space land needs in urban areas; (3) study and make appropriate recommendations on the extent to which Federal land holdings may more effectively be utilized for park, recreation or open space purposes in urban areas; and (4) make studies, by contract or otherwise, on such matters as the relationship and value of open space land to urban development, present and future needs, legal or administrative or financial procedures and problems involved in preserving such land, and the extent to which such needs are being or can be met by other Federal programs, State and local governments, and private effort.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to request directly from any executive department, agency, or instrumentality information necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information directly to the Administrator.

(c) The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, which shall be printed and transmitted to the Congress not later than January 31 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for assistance under this Act; (2) the total cost of the open space land preserved or provided with assistance under this Act and the manner in which the preservation or provision of such land was effected; and (3) the physical location and geographical size of such open space land and its relation to present and anticipated concentrations of population.

FEDERAL GRANTS

SEC. 5. (a) To help prevent the spread of urban blight and deterioration, to encourage more economic and desirable urban development, and to help provide necessary recreational, conservation and scenic areas in the Nation's urban areas, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to any State, county, municipality, or other political subdivision of a State; or to any public agency or instrumentality established under State or local law or interstate compact which is acceptable to the Administrator as capable of carrying out the provisions of this Act, to help finance the acquisition of title to, or interests in, open space land, the preservation of which is of regional or areawide importance and essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of an urban area: *Provided*, That the amount of any such grant shall not exceed 25 per centum of the total cost, as approved by the Administrator, of acquiring title to, or interests in, any such land, or not exceeding 35 per centum of such cost in the case of a grant extended to any regional agency or body which (1) is established under State or local law or interstate compact, (2) is acceptable to the Administrator, and (3) exercises responsibilities consistent with the purposes of this Act for an urban area as a whole.

(b) The Administrator, on and after July 1, 1961, may, with the approval of the President, contract to make grants, with respect to the acquisition of title to, or interests in, open space land aggregating not to exceed $100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $100,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all grants contracted for under this Act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

(c) Grants shall be made under this Act to assist in the acquisition of title to, or interests in, open space land and shall not be made to defray development costs, project or nonproject operating expenses, or ordinary governmental expenses.

(d) In the processing of applications for assistance under this Act, the Administrator shall consider the extent to which communities benefiting from such assistance are encouraging, through zoning regulations and otherwise, orderly residential and other community development and renewal and are encouraging the availability of an adequate supply of decent housing at reasonable cost.

(e) In extending assistance under this Act, the Administrator shall require the preservation or provision of open space land with a minimum of public expenditure through the utilization wherever possible and appropriate of such techniques as the zoning of land, the acquisition of development or easement rights, acquisition and lease back, deferral of taxes on land kept open, tax adjustments for gifts or bequests of open space land, and the foreclosure of tax delinquent property which is suitable for park and recreation use or which can be traded for more suitable open space land.

(f) No open space land provided or preserved with assistance under this Act shall be converted to uses which are inconsistent with the purposes for which such land was provided or preserved without the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall issue no such approval unless there is compelling evidence that such other uses are essential to, and in accordance with, an official comprehensive plan for the urban area as a whole. The Administrator shall require that the proceeds from the disposal of title to, or interests in, any open space land provided or preserved with assistance under this Act shall be used to further the objectives of this Act.

(g) The extension of financial assistance under this Act with respect to any area shall be coordinated to the greatest extent possible with other public or publicly assisted programs for the same area.

PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) Where there exists an open space plan which is an integral part of an official comprehensive plan (as described in section 701(d) of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended) for an urban area as a whole, or for any municipality, county, or political subdivision of a State, or part thereof, within such urban area, no financial assistance shall be extended under this Act for the preservation or provision of any open space land within such urban area unless the preservation or provision of such land is in accordance with whatever plan includes the area in which such land is situated and is largest in geographical scope.

(b) In the processing of applications for assistance under this Act, the Administrator shall give preference to those proposals for the acquisition of title to, or interests in, open space land which are in accordance with an open space plan which is an integral part of an official comprehensive plan for the urban area as a whole, and subsequent to three years after the enactment of this Act, shall approve no applications proposing acquisitions which are not in accordance with such a plan as described in this subsection.

(c) For the purpose of this section, the Administrator shall consider as an urban area any intrastate portion of any urban area that embraces two or more States, and may make grants for the provision or preservation of open space land within such portion in accordance with the requirements described in subsections (a) and (b) of this section. Subsequent to three years after enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall specify such requirements as he deems appropriate for the coordination of plans for any such intrastate portion with the plans of applicants for assistance with respect to the provision or preservation of open space land in other intrastate portions of the same urban area.

(d) The Administrator shall extend no assistance under this Act for the preservation or provision of open space land (whether or not in accordance with an open space plan that is an integral part of an official comprehensive plan) which is located within a substantially larger area of open or preponderantly open land unless there exists, or is being initiated forthwith, a detailed

plan for the future use and sound and orderly development of that portion of such larger area within the jurisdiction of the applicant as the Administrator determines is necessary to meet foreseeable development needs. The Administrator may allow such portion of any assistance extended under this Act as is necessary for such detailed development planning.

CLUSTER DEVELOPMENTS

SEC. 7. (a) In order to further the objectives of this Act, to increase the availability of housing, to reduce community facility costs, and to curb urban sprawl and scatteration, the Administrator may, upon application, contract to make grants to any municipality to promote, in accordance with a comprehensive plan for the locality involved, the clustering of residential development on any privately-held tract of land, if—

(1) not less than 25 acres of such tract will be dedicated permanently, and without cost to the community, as open space land; and

(2) the clustering of development on the nondedicated portion of such tract will be permitted in such manner as to maintain at least the same average density of development for such portion as would have obtained for the tract as a whole if open space land were not dedicated as provided in paragraph (1).

any grant under this section with respect to any such tract shall not exceed an amount equal to 10 per centum of the cost to the dedicator (as approved by the Administrator) of the open space land so dedicated.

(b) The aggregate amount of contracts for grants under this section in any one year shall not exceed 5 per centum of the total amount of contracts which may be entered into during such year under section 4(b): *Provided*, That the total amount of contracts which may be entered into during any fiscal year under section 4(b) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the aggregate amount of contracts entered into under this section during the preceding fiscal year.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE I OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

SEC. 8. (a) Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"PARKS, PLAYGROUNDS, OR PUBLIC RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

"SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title—

"(1) if, in the public interest, any land to be acquired in connection with an urban renewal project should be used in whole or in part as a site for a park, playground, or other public recreational facility, and such use is in accordance with the urban renewal plan for such project, the site shall be made available without cost to (with the approval of the governing body of) the locality in which the project is undertaken; and

"(2) the capital grant otherwise payable under this title with respect to such project shall be increased by an amount equal to that part of the gross project costs which the Administrator determines is attributable to the land which is made available for such use.

As used in this section, the term 'public recreational facility' means a facility (1) the public cost of providing the site for which comprises a substantial part of the total development cost, and (2) from which public recreational benefits are derived."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable only to urban renewal projects with respect to which contracts for capital grants are entered into under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 after the date of enactment of this Act.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 9. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the open space land in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I believe this is the first time that proposed legislation of this kind has been introduced in the Congress. It derives from a growing awareness—if not alarm—over the chaotic and enormously wasteful sprawl of our urban areas, and the consequent disappearance of our lovely old farms and pastures, quiet streams and wooded hills under the onrushing blade of the bulldozer.

It is intended to help reserve some of nature in our metropolis and arrest the cancer of urban sprawl and the blight and deterioration following in its wake. To put it another way, the bill is intended as a creative tool to help us enhance the quality and character of our cities and towns, large and small, and at the same time lessen the pressures that lead to a squandering of our limited and sometimes nonreplaceable human and material resources at a period in history when we need them most to meet our grave international and defense responsibilities. I hope to show that we can not only help make our urban environments the true hallmark of our civilization that they should be, but that we can conserve our resources in the process and lessen the expenditures that would otherwise have to be made in a variety of areas, from urban renewal and housing to highways and flood control.

A great deal of work has gone into the preparation of this legislation, through research and consultation with numerous experts, governmental officials, and interested organizations and individuals. I believe the bill is sound and feasible both in concept and approach, yet I recognize that the subject is new and complex. I hope that this matter will receive the serious consideration of Congress, and that there will be opportunity for extensive hearings and thorough and constructive discussion of both the problem and the legislation.

Mr. President, before introducing the bill I asked for an evaluation of it by several organizations, and I ask unanimous consent that their responses to my request be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
February 6, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you for your letter of February 2 requesting the comments of the U.S. Conference of Mayors with respect to a draft bill concerning open space. I have discussed this matter with Mr. Harry R. Betters, executive director of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and we have studied the proposed bill.

The subject of this legislation has long been of concern to the mayors of the Nation's larger cities. It is our hope that it will receive broad sponsorship, early consideration, and approval, in the Congress. Should hearings be scheduled on this proposal, witnesses on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors should be included among those invited to appear in support of the legislation. If we might be of service in any way in promoting passage of the bill, please let us know.

As soon as the bill is introduced we shall distribute it to our membership—the cities of the Nation with populations of 30,000 or more—for their specific comments and shall make such comments available to you and your staff.

With best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. GUNTHER,
General Counsel.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS,
February 6, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We are pleased to note that you have recognized through a legislative proposal the problem of undirected urban growth and the possibilities through the acquisition and preservation of open land space for promoting sound community development.

Local communities pressed by the problems of exploding growth have an essential need for tools which will assist them to acquire open lands for future needs, and in particular for park, recreational, and educational uses. State governments have been concerned increasingly with the broader area problems of conservation and water resources.

For these reasons, we welcome any assistance which can be given to States and their political subdivisions in this task. A system of matching grants made available by the Federal Government to these political jurisdictions would certainly be helpful in promoting and supporting actions toward sound urban and metropolitan area development.

I am sure that you are cognizant that the problem of how to direct urban growth is a complex one which requires thorough study and discussion. Your proposal is a focus for such interest and attention.

We wish to assure you that in this effort you have our full support.

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. LANGE,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: County officials from all over the Nation are becoming increasingly aware that immediate, vigorous, effective steps must be taken to secure an adequate amount of open space for future use both in urban and rural areas.

We have been privileged to review your preliminary drafts of proposed national legislation to bring to bear the resources of the Nation toward a solution of this critical problem. The first drafts of this legislation reflect a very great deal of careful thought, and we at the county government level are sure that this measure can and will stimulate the type of careful critical evaluation which this complex problem demands.

We at the county level cannot emphasize too strongly our sense of urgency that some constructive action must be taken in the very near future by all levels of government

and private initiative. We would like to submit for your consideration recent editorials and articles which outline in far more detail the deep concern felt by county officials in the problem of securing an adequate amount of open space for recreational and other purposes.

DAN W. GRAY,
President.

AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to review your proposed "open space" bill.

We are, of course, most interested in seeing solutions developed for the tremendous problems besetting urban areas as a result of the great population increases over the last two decades. The rate at which open land is being indiscriminately developed for urban uses is to say the least alarming. There is no question that future urban and suburban development in order to be properly conducive for healthful urban living must of necessity furnish the amenities that only open space can provide.

We welcome the introduction of your bill. We feel that the discussion the proposal will engender and the attention it will focus on the problem will make a very considerable contribution to the ultimate solution. Federal interest and assistance are unquestionably needed.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK HEALY, Jr.,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The proposal for a national program to assist in the preservation of open space around urban areas is of great interest and encouragement to people who are concerned with problems of urban expansion and metropolitan sprawl.

The need for steps to be taken for proper conservation of open space parallels the seriousness of the conservation movement in the early 1900's, led by President Theodore Roosevelt and Governor Pinchot. Your foresight in introducing this very progressive measure at this time offers an appropriate partnership with current urban renewal efforts.

Recognition by the Federal Government of the wastes and hazards of present urban sprawl, as a national problem, will greatly advance the opportunities of building better communities and cities. This measure in recognizing the need for a comprehensive approach will guarantee the application of sound community development principles.

The partnership approach with local governments, basing their programs on local planning objectives, would insure that each urban area could develop its program as it saw fit.

The professional planners of this country will follow your proposed Open Space and Urban Development Act of 1961 with great interest.

Very truly yours,

W. C. DUTTON, Jr.,
Executive Director.

WASHINGTON CENTER FOR METROPOLITAN STUDIES

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We have read with interest the draft of your bill to authorize the preservation of open space land in urban areas, and are glad to respond to your invitation of February 2 for comments on the measure at this stage of its development.

We have valued the opportunity to discuss the bill in its earlier form with Mr. Ames and greatly appreciate your attendance during the recent conference on open spaces in metropolitan areas, which we conducted as part of work we are doing at the request of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I am sure you are already aware of our deep conviction that the control and preservation of open spaces in the large urban areas of our country is not only an an important neglected area from a recreation and conservation point of view, but is fundamental to any real effort to control urban development, and to channel the future growth of our cities into more economically and socially desirable patterns. It cannot have escaped your attention that a profound growth of interest in these aspects of the problem is manifesting itself in publications and in many declarations by private and governmental organizations. Among these we have been particularly impressed with the January 1961 issue of the Architectural Forum and with the statements to be found in the recent report of the President's Commission on National Goals. Consequently, you may be assured that your bill is meeting an urgent need and should receive widespread support. Commenting more particularly on the detailed provisions of the bill, we were glad to see the provisions in section 7 to encourage a more strongly clustered pattern of urban development.

This is certainly the key to the future pattern of our great cities. This is the best way we can tackle the problem of urban sprawl. The alternative to the present pattern of low-density, formless suburbs that lack either significant urbanity—such as centers of commerce, education, culture, or for civic purposes—or land for social purposes in the form of parks and gathering places, and which have steadily ignored the natural geographical consequences of building in flood plains, on wet-lands, or in ways that adversely affect the water table, needs to be strongly stated in demonstration projects.

A stronger emphasis on the "new towns" concept as tentatively explored here during the 1920's, or accepted as the basis for the major development of British housing policy during the war, should be attempted as the legislative history of the bill is unfolded in hearings and other interpretations.

While the development of an organized program of open spaces, private as well as public, with Federal as well as local support, is the primary objective to be sought, there can be no hope that metropolitan area planning will ever be so scientific that we will know the use of such lands forever. Indeed the pressure to develop existing parks and open spaces that we now have, and use them for highways, buildings, or other purposes, warns us this is the case. Therefore, the attention paid to the conversion of lands originally acquired for open space is an important provision in the legislation. If not here, then in some section to be added to the bill, we suggest you may wish to consider adding a stronger provision that open lands acquired under this legislation might include land required for future urban growth.

The program of grants which is contemplated in the bill is one that we have scrutinized carefully because of the obvious interest which the executive departments concerned with fiscal policy will give it. On the whole, it seems to us these provisions are well conceived and do not require any further development.

I have not commented on other features of the bill because these seems to me generally sound and well conceived, and I have nothing to suggest with respect to the shape of the bill as a whole.

* * * * *

Thanking you again for the opportunity to be of service in this matter, and with renewed appreciation for your effective leadership in this important realm, I am,

Sincerely,

FREDERICK GUTHEIM,
President.

AMERICAN RECREATION SOCIETY

FEBRUARY 9, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The legislative committee of the American Recreation Society joins me in approval of the positive, constructive, "open space legislation" introduced on February 9, 1961, in the Senate.

Unless legislation of the type you propose is passed, we can say goodbye to open spaces and parks as a recreation resource. The preservation of open spaces from encroachment is urgent.

The recreation profession and those who participate in recreation services understand and support legislation for open spaces as a resource for the future. We know that open lands for the future recreation needs of the Nation must be acquired today at distances related to population.

This legislation makes it possible for cities, towns, and counties to take action where previously many could not.

With more income—more need for the wholesome recreation use of leisure—more citizens than ever before—will they have parks and open space resources for their recreation? Or will their only heritage in the future be the concrete slum, cloverleaf, and congestion.

When hearings are scheduled, we would appreciate the opportunity to bear testimony in support of this important legislation.

Sincerely,

HOWARD JEFFREY,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The National Association of Home Builders has a deep and natural concern with the problem of proper community development. Through our Community Facilities Committee we have for several years undertaken programs designed to encourage sound planning for necessary community facilities.

Our association of 43,000 members is on record as favoring a soundly conceived program of Federal assistance to communities for the establishment of appropriate planning for community development.

We look forward with interest on the proposed Open Space and Urban Development Act of 1961. We hope to study this legislation carefully and would appreciate the opportunity to be invited to testify on this bill when hearings may be called for that purpose.

Sincerely,

E. J. BURKE, Jr.,
President.

RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE

FEBRUARY 9, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In response to your letter of February 7, I am happy to comment briefly upon the ideas contained in your draft bill on open space. Time has not permitted a detailed analysis of the bill at this time. Hearings on it will undoubtedly

reveal means by which it can be strengthened and made more effective to meet its general purposes. The whole pattern of relationship between Federal Government and the cities of the Nation must be considered also. My comments are thus to the general idea rather than to the specific provisions of the bill.

In my view, it is extremely timely that the Federal Government should give serious attention to the problems of preserving open space within our cities. Every student of the urban scene has been deeply impressed with the rapid disappearance of open space in and around our larger cities. The latter have been growing rapidly in population and in area, especially since the war. Moreover, their prospective growth in the years ahead is still greater. My own research has led me to estimate that the urbanized area in the United States will more than double by the year 2000. Unless positive steps are taken soon the lands now open will become covered with houses, factories, or streets; and, once covered will be permanently lost as open areas.

Open space in and adjacent to cities serves several purposes as various city planners have pointed out. My own concern has been primarily with open space for recreational use. Today we have about three-fourths million acres of parks and recreation land under city and county ownership and management in the United States. According to usually accepted standards of adequacy for such land we should have slightly more than twice this area today to serve our population adequately. By the year 2000 we should have about 6 million acres of city and county park and recreation land on the same basis. While it may be impossible to provide adequate area within the densely crowded parts of our older cities, the opportunity still exists in the growing suburbs. It is on the new suburbs and on those not yet built that we must focus our attention.

It seems to me that a real Federal interest exists in this problem. The programs of the Federal Government, especially in housing, but also in transportation, vitally affect the development of our cities. Moreover, the fact that most of the people in the country now live in cities demands that the Federal Government respond to their needs.

There is one aspect of this problem which perhaps has had inadequate attention. Provision of an adequate system of open spaces in and around our cities need not deprive our Nation of productive farm and forest land. As our cities have grown in the past much land has been idled speculatively in anticipation of future urban growth. Although this land is not now used, yet it is not open space in any meaningful sense, for its continuation in an open status is not assured nor is it generally available for public use. On the other hand, such presently idle land could be set aside in meaningful permanent open space uses available to the public for recreation or other uses. The amount of this idle land as nearly as I can estimate is nearly as great as the area actually used for urban purposes. If part of it could be set aside as open space it could meet the problem at least to a major extent and without serious impingement on either agriculture or forest.

I am glad to see serious attention directed to this problem and I hope that constructive legislation to deal with this can be agreed upon.

Sincerely,

MARION CLAWSON.

NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE,
February 8, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I appreciate very much having the opportunity to review your bill for the Open Space and Urban Development Act of 1961.

This legislation is directed toward meeting one of the most serious problems which has grown out of the massive and unplanned growth of metropolitan areas throughout the country. In my opinion, Federal assistance to State and local governments in acquiring sizable portions of the remaining open space in and about metropolitan areas is long overdue and is of the utmost importance in achieving a sound framework for future community development and redevelopment. The urgent need for prompt action along these lines is further emphasized by the continuing large population growth in metropolitan areas which will occur over the next two decades.

In my opinion, the provisions of the Open Space and Urban Development Act of 1961 are sound and would provide an effective basis for action by the Federal Government in this problem area in cooperation with local governments. On behalf of the National Housing Conference, I therefore strongly support this bill and urge its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

NATHANIEL S. KEITH,
President.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
February 9, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The American Institute of Architects is in complete accord with the objectives of your proposed open space legislation and will support it.

We will make copies of the bill available to Chairman Carl Feiss and members of the AIA Committee on Urban Design for detailed study and comment and will pass on to you any recommendations they may have to offer.

It will be appreciated if you will keep us advised as to hearings as I feel sure we shall wish to have the opportunity to appear in support of the comprehensive program of open space preservation in order to prevent spread of urban blight and deterioration.

Please be assured of the continuing interest of the architectural profession in all matters relating to the improvement of human environment.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM H. SCHEICK,
Executive Director.

OPEN SPACE FOR RECREATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the phrase "open space" is perhaps a somewhat unfamiliar one. In the context of the urban environment it means many things. It means recreational areas, conservation areas and just simply the preservation of a bit of nature in the midst of and around the concrete and the steel of our cities and towns.

We all know that the United States still has vast stretches of beautiful and untrammeled land. We have also a magnificent National and State park system—not enough to meet our future recreational needs that are growing rapidly with our increase in income, mobility, and leisure time—but we are faced with the fact that the West, with one-seventh of the population, has about four-fifths of all our publicly owned land, while the Northeast, with one-fourth of our population, has only one seventy-fifth of this land. Both the upper Midwestern States and the South suffer a similar disproportion of population to open land.

We have yet to really accept the implications of the fact that we are an urban Nation. Already the large majority of the people live, work, and die within the confines of a mere 20 million acres of land, out of a total of some 1.9 billion acres, and almost all of our future growth will be concentrated in only a few hundred large and small urban areas scattered over almost every State in the Union. We have an obligation to meet the recreational needs of these people within a reasonable distance of their homes. And if we don't, the great wilderness and forest preserves that we treasure now will become the park slums of the future.

OPEN SPACE FOR CONSERVATION

The problems and needs are the same in the field of conservation though the recognition of them is not as universal as in the case of recreation. We have our Audubon societies which seek the conservation of land for the protection of our birds and waterfowl. We have societies dedicated to the protection of our wildlife. We have tree clubs seeking the preservation of our forests. We have biologists and other scientists interested in maintaining ecological communities in their natural state so they may study the mutual relation between organisms and their environment. We have our garden and flower clubs. We have our farmers and agricultural scientists who rightly recognize the long-range folly of destroying our richest first-class agricultural land despite our present surplus agricultural capacity. There are groups for the protection of our fishery resources and the preservation of the wetlands necessary to provide the biological substance that keeps our fish alive.

There are many other such groups. Their individual voices may not be loud but we must somehow make sure that they are heard, and that their needs are met.

Of more general importance is the relationship of land to problems of water supply, and flood and water pollution control. We long ago recognized the importance of watershed areas but we have yet to effectively relate them to the urban environment. We are spending considerable sums for drainage and to avoid the costly destruction of floods, yet we have failed to realize that to adequately control floods we must have open land. The land cannot absorb a downpour when most of it is taken up with roads and streets, houses and garages, sidewalks and driveways.

OPEN SPACE FOR SCENERY

No less important is the need for open space for the sheer beauty and delight of it. Nearly every city and town has its own Brandywine, its Muir Woods, its Rock Creek Park, its Everglades, its Shenandoahs, its Cook County Forest Preserve, its Glen Helen in Ohio, and its Jackson Square in New Orleans. Whether large or small, whether breathtaking or merely pleasing to the eye, these parks and squares and natural preserves have an importance that we may not often express but that are still deeply felt by most.

Areas such as these, together with the farms and pastures and wooded hills around our towns, serve us in many ways.

The urban life has great advantages—the thrill and excitement of vibrant activity, close contact, and endless cultural and commercial variety—but it is a crowded existence and tensions inevitably run high, even to the point of group violence. We all sooner or later feel the need to escape to calmer surroundings. There is a certain psychic relief in open space that cannot be underestimated. It gives us visual relief from the tangled, jarring, and often monotonous sight of urban development, and a sense of orientation and community identity. Very few can picture the location of every street in town but most of us can immediately place the location of an attractive park or open space in our mind's eye.

But the bill is more than an extension of our park programs into our cities. It is more than an urban conservation program and more than an attempt to preserve some scenic areas in our cities and towns—important as all three of these purposes are.

OPEN SPACE TO CURB URBAN SPRAWL

The bill is intended above all as an attack on urban sprawl and the deterioration it sets in motion. It is a bill to cope with the future, not to remedy the past. We are now urbanizing at a rate of more than a million acres a year. In the last 15 years we have put almost two-thirds as much new land to urban uses as we did in all the previous years in the history of our country. We all want this growth to continue, but there is a difference between growth and sprawl. The question is whether we wish to continue with our haphazard, wasteful and often deeply unsatisfying pattern of development, or whether we wish to create something of lasting value, to marshal our resources and revitalize our entire urban environment, both at the fringes and at the center.

Let us look at what has been happening.

We have for some time been in the grip of a combination of powerful economic, social, governmental, and technological forces. Higher wages, the automobile, the highway program, status symbols, and home-mortgage insurance programs are just some of the instruments of this force. But where is it all leading us?

HIGHER TRANSPORTATION, URBAN RENEWAL, EDUCATION, AND HOUSING COSTS

For a long time it has been a symbol of status to move farther and farther out of the urban complex. Improved standards of living and the mobility of the automobile have made it possible for ever-increasing numbers of people to do so. But the farther out we go, or the greater the sprawl, the more difficult it becomes for private enterprise to provide modern mass transportation service without going bankrupt in the process. The automobile becomes the only mode of transportation available and monumental traffic jams build up with everyone converging inward to work from the outlying suburbs. These traffic jams, in turn, make surface mass transportation in the central areas just as ineffective as the automobile.

This dependence on the automobile to get to work also creates extraordinary demands for more roads, streets, and highways to carry them. The construction of the highways, in turn, attracts new residential, commercial, and industrial development seeking to take advantage of the initial accessibility, however short lived it may be. The new development then creates demands for more streets, roads, and highways, and the cycle continues.

The impact of this decentralization on downtown areas is plain to see. Business wilts in the traffic congestion, property values sink, tax revenue declines, slums multiply, and the need for a larger urban renewal program intensifies.

Out in the sprawling suburbs, communities find themselves building five small schoolhouses to serve the same number of children that attend one larger schoolhouse in the higher density centers, because there is just so far that children can travel to school. Since there is hardly a home that yields sufficient tax revenue to pay the costs of educating a child living in it, little wonder that homeowners are feeling the pinch on their property taxes and that communities and States are looking to the Federal Government to share the burden.

And then there is the effect of urban sprawl on the availability and cost of homes. It has been estimated that to meet our housing needs in the coming decade we will need upward of 2 million new homes a year. Can we really hope to meet this goal when the greater the sprawl or scatteration, the greater the costs for streets and roads to service the homes, the greater the cost for earthwork, storm drains, sewage disposal, water supply, utilities, and irrigation? Someone has to bear those costs—either the people of the community through taxes, or the developer, who may absorb some of the cost but will certainly be passing a good part of it along in the cost of the house to the buyer. And with the tendency of many financially desperate communities to force more and more of the costs onto the developer, we are making it more and more difficult for people to find homes at prices they can afford.

Lastly there is the loss of usable open space to urban sprawl. First it is the picturesque farm and green pasture, then the golf course which many find nice to look at even if they do not play, then it is the patch of woods to stroll or hunt or birdwatch in, then it is the open field where the kids play ball. And we end up with endless rows of nearly identical houses, each with its own small front yard and strip on each side that no one uses. There is still the treasured backyard, but gone is even the illusion of rural life and natural surroundings that provides such intangible but important relief from the city's asphalt and cement.

I wonder how many people there are who went to considerable expense to seek out a home next to or near some open space land, lured by the advertisements to developments with names like Sleepy Hollow Estates, Lakeview Manor, and Forest Valley Acres, only to find their few rural amenities gone by the time they had finished the last downpayment on the furniture.

And when the open space is gone, I wonder how many people in the years ahead will enjoy even the amenities of their own suburban development, before the deterioration sets in.

What we have, then, is not only the nonreplaceable loss of open space and other natural resources, but the dissipation of ever greater amounts of money on problems that have been caused in large measure by this aimless sprawl and haphazard development, at a time when we should be consolidating our strength to meet the international challenges and perils of our age.

THE LOS ANGELES EXAMPLE

This dissipation of effort shows up nowhere more clearly than in a study prepared by the Southern California Research Council in 1958. It was estimated that for each new family moving into Los Angeles County, a total of $13,290 in public capital investments would be required over a 12-year period. A full $10,200, or 76 percent, of that amount would have to go for just the streets, roads and highways necessary to enable these families to move around in an area where urban sprawl has run rampant. The next highest investment is for schools, totaling $2,160. It is evident that these two expenditures leave very little left over for water supply, flood control, sewerage, hospitals, parks, and other public institutions.

In effect, the people of Los Angeles—and the people of every other urban area—are paying just to keep abreast of the costs of urban sprawl.

By and large, we have ignored the implication of these trends for the future. Somehow, we seem to feel that the future will take care of itself and that everything will be all right. But every now and then, the future looms up large, with stark and frightening immediacy.

A JETPORT FOR NEW JERSEY

For example, last year the New York Port Authority declared that the New York region would need a new jetport to meet the rapidly increasing air traffic needs of the largest of all our metropolitan areas. It suggested that the jetport ought to be located about 25 miles west of New York City in Morris County, in one of the most lovely semirural areas left in the New Jersey portion of the New York metropolitan region.

Even the New York Times—which does not often wax emotional—described the area as "a region with land and rangy rail fences, of houses that antedate the Revolution, estates with winding drives—a terrain of hills and dells that takes on, under a light snowfall, the enchanted quality of a Christmas card."

The location of a jetport there would tear a full 10,000 acres out of the countryside for just the runways, hangars and terminals, to say nothing of the thousands of additional acres that would be needed to house the 20,000 people

working at the airport, and the commercial and service trade activity that would spring up to serve the new population. It was estimated that the whole enterprise would generate perhaps $500 million worth of economic activity in the area each year. All this by the year 1970 if the plans materialized. The "Great Swamp" area, as it is inelegantly called, would be no more.

The moral of this story is not that the Wright brothers should never have invented the airplane, but rather that there did not at the time, and still does not, exist any genuine regional consensus about the future for this area.

The only thing we now know is that a great many people definitely do not want a jetport there. But what will happen to that area in the face of perhaps imperceptible but inevitable population and other developmental pressures. Already more than 4 million people live in the nine county area of northern New Jersey. By 1975 the population will have grown to anywhere from 5.5 million to perhaps 8 million. And, unless some bold steps are taken, much of it will pour into the Great Swamp area and the rest of Morris County, which is already one of the fastest growing counties in New Jersey. As another New York Times article said:

> It appears that the Great Swamp, within a few years, will be the nucleus of a thickly populated urban area.

The question is, are the people of northern New Jersey merely opposed to a jetport and not to any other unforeseeable kind of development? Or do they believe its present quality should be preserved, at all costs, in its entirety? Or do they want part of it preserved as it is and part of it developed?

It is obvious that these questions cannot be answered without a genuine commitment to a plan for the area and the region as a whole, a plan that has official backing and full public support. Of course, they can gamble on the articulation of area sentiment through the formation of emergency committees and the like, but it is quite a gamble unless the issue is big, dramatic, and immediate.

And it is equally obvious that, in addition to a plan, the people must have a program, a willingness to spend the money necessary to preserve the open space land, whether in the great swamp or any other area. Of course, there is always zoning, but in the face of imminent development pressures, it has a very short life expectancy.

I deeply hope that the people of northern New Jersey will find a satisfactory long-range answer for the great swamp area, whatever they wish it to be. I hope, too, that the same intense interest and concern will be extended to other vital areas in New Jersey—to the future development of south Jersey, to the lovely countryside around Princeton, to the Delaware Valley, to the Lake Wawayanda area, to Round Valley and Spruce Run, and all the other areas of great scenic beauty in the Garden State.

OPEN SPACE A NATIONAL PROBLEM

But the open space problem is not just a New Jersey problem, nor just an eastern seaboard problem, nor just a big city problem. There are over 200 major urban areas in the United States and many more rapidly growing smaller ones. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the open space problem is of paramount importance to our newly emerging urban and metropolitan areas. The Atlantic seaboard megalopolis—spreading from Boston to Newport News—will be doing well just to preserve what bits of green it can from the onrush of intense urbanization.

But most of our other urban areas in the United States still have an opportunity to be the masters of their future development and not the victims of it.

Ten years ago there was the little town of Irving, Tex., population 2,621, lying peacefully between Dallas and Fort Worth. Today Irving, Tex., is the fastest growing town in that great State, with a population of over 45,000. It is sprawled over an area of 20 square miles, and last year it tried to annex an additional 44 square miles. It is suffering all the financial, economic, and social problems that have become so common around the United States.

It is the Irvings of America that are springing up all the time that need an open space program most of all, not because there is any lack of open space in Texas, but because these towns need a mechanism for creating the kind of urban environment they want and should have.

I am not suggesting, Mr. President, that there is a single answer to how Irving, Tex., or Cedar Rapids, Iowa, or any other city or town should grow. The last thing anyone would want would be to put their growth into a straitjacket of uniformity. The needs and desires of people in different areas throughout the country will vary widely, as they should.

But I have no doubt that most of our urban areas could grow in a much more economical and desirable manner than they have been, with the help of a little foresight, commonsense, and the financial mechanisms necessary to carry out their plans.

TYPES OF URBAN GROWTH

It may be that some areas will want to seek a return to the central city in a massive effort of renewal and rehabilitation, if population trends and other conditions warrant the effort. There is also the possibility of what is called planned sprawl, to achieve minor economies through better design and planning. Many thoughtful students of urban affairs recommend the channeling of future growth into new and separate satellite cities or suburban communities around the present urban area.

Here in Washington the National Capital Planning Commission, after extensive study, is considering the corridor form of development to carry out its year 2000 plan. This is in a sense a compromise between the new satellite city concept and return to the center concept. It involves the channeling of future growth into several corridors radiating out of the present Washington urban area, giving the area the appearance on a map of an old-fashioned Dutch windmill with six or so thick blades extending out from the hub. Each of these corridors would be located on a spinal cord of express highway and rapid transit leading to the downtown area, tying both the fringe and the core together as a more dynamic whole. Development would be clustered along each of the spines extending out as far as future growth demands, and between these corridors would be large wedges of open space to provide the necessary park, recreational, conservation, and scenic areas for the region as a whole. This is certainly one of a number of feasible and realistic alternatives to urban sprawl. It would permit economic and yet flexible development within the corridors and, at the same time, provide ample open space for all the people of the region to enjoy without having to travel unreasonably far for it.

CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT

Still other urban areas may wish to experiment on a more piecemeal basis with the so-called cluster concept. This idea was made famous in Radburn, N.J., with a cluster development which is even today regarded as one of the finest examples of efficient land use anywhere in the country. Other examples exist with Chatham Village in Pittsburgh and Baldwin Hills in Los Angeles. Among the newer efforts is also near Los Angeles, Laguna Niguel, which was designed by Victor Gruen. This is a 7,000 acre tract of rolling rangeland bordering the Pacific Ocean designed to become a community of 30,000 people. It will feature both low- and high-rise apartments, as well as 10,000 single-family homes and several garden apartments all clustered around a town center, leaving a great part of that beautiful land looking much as it did when the Spaniards first saw it several hundred years ago.

Another example was described in the January 1961 issue of Architectural Forum on a so far unsuccessful effort to promote cluster development on the lovely 516 acre Whitney estate in Old Westbury, Long Island, also designed by Victor Gruen. The development would feature 247 townhouses occupying only 6 percent of the land, leaving the remaining 94 percent as open space for a golf course, tennis courts, and woodland. With conventional 2-acre lots, the same number of houses would all but smother the entire area. And most interesting of all, the cost of developing the land conventionally would cost almost $1.1 million, or nearly 100 percent, more than the estimated $1,169,400 cost of the development under the Gruen plan.

Mr. President, while the pictures and designs of this development tell more than words, I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Architectural Forum, January 1961]

BUILDINGS FOR THE SUBURBS

If, as seems likely, most of the 17 million new households to be settled in America by 1975 must be in the suburbs, the suburbs must find a new kind of housing or run out

of open space. Today's tract houses on ¼- to 2-acre lots are not the answer: they eat up too much land. Nor are high-rise apartments jampacked together; they destroy suburban openness in a different way.

Perhaps the answer lies in some such scheme as that detailed on these pages; a cluster of 247 townhouses occupying only 6 percent of their tract, allowing the remainder to be devoted to golf courses, woodlands, and recreational space of other kinds. This is no pie-in-the-sky scheme. It is a hardheaded proposal for the development of the famous 516-acre Whitney estate in Old Westbury, Long Island.

The promoter of this idea is Norman Blankman, a real estate investor who, after purchase of the Whitney estate for $2 million, was inspired by William H. Whyte's persuasive writings in Life and Fortune about America's urgent need for preserving open space. Having decided to carry the Whyte torch into the staid community of Old Westbury, Blankman selected an architect who also had fresh ideas about residential development: Victor Gruen.

Instead of following the local zoning ordinance and dividing the tract in the usual manner into a maximum number (236) of 2-acre lots served by a network of streets, it was proposed that 247 attached townhouses be grouped in 10 wings projecting out from both sides of a spinelike 500-car garage. The garages would be subdivided into 10 individual areas, each serving one wing, and would be roofed over with pleasantly landscaped communal facilities. Between the garage and each housing wing would be a residence lobby, similar to those in luxury apartment buildings, and a service lobby. From each of these lobbies would extend a corridor wide enough to permit attendant-driven electric vehicles (called horizontilators) to carry passengers and freight to and from the houses.

The two- and three-story houses would range in size from 7 to 10 rooms (3,400 to 4,900 square feet), and would sell on a cooperative basis for cash downpayments averaging $50,000 plus monthly maintenance charges and carrying costs on the $50,000 mortgages. Ultimately the developer would turn over control and management of the entire property to a cooperative set up by the homeowners.

Equally lush would be the outlying property: 150 acres would be preserved in their natural woodland state, 205 acres would be made into two golf courses, and 138 would be used for other recreational purposes. In other words, each of the families in this project would have at its disposal not the usual suburban acre of lawn and garden, but all the greenery and recreational facilities of a nature preserver and country club combined.

For the developer, the plan has the advantage of reducing site improvement costs (see table) and building costs. There would be also important advantages to the town: (1) There would be no public streets to maintain—they would be maintained by the cooperative. (2) There would be no public utilities to provide and maintain—they also would be provided by the developer and would be subject to taxation. (3) There would be few public school children residing in a development at this economic level. (4) As a result of these factors, the net taxable value of each townhouse would be about twice that for comparable dwellings in an ordinary subdivision.

On the other hand two dangers have been pointed out in the plan: (1) the possibility that the open spaces in the project might not be kept open—that the cooperative corporation at some future date might sell off some of its land for conventional house development; and (2) the possibility that the pioneering project might fail, leaving a partially completed development on the land and providing the basis for the promoter to request relaxation of development standards. The first contingency could be guarded against by deed restrictions and covenants or by granting an easement in the open spaces to the village, and Blankman agreed to do so. The second contingency is not quite so easy to insure against, but Blankman agreed not to start construction until he had made 100 firm sales and then to dedicate at least 200 acres of the site to this initial cluster development. He further agreed that successive stages would not be built until sold, or would be developed as 2-acre housing.

These two liabilities of the plan were not considered critical by the planners who have studied the project—Hugh Pomeroy, planning director of New York's Westchester County, and Stanley B. Tankel, former planning director of New York's Regional Plan Association. (Said Tankel: "If anything resembling the present character of the estates of the North Shore of Long Island is to be retained * * * the principle of clustering will be one sound basis for it.")

Despite these endorsements and the approval of adjacent property owners, a good part of Old Westbury did not take kindly to the project. Some members of the local civic association (which represents about half the village's families—mostly newer residents and smaller property owners) resented being told that the proposed use of the property was better than their own 2-acre subdivisions. Others were concerned about the street traffic the golf clubs would generate and about the urban implications of the term "townhouses." Out of 115 replies to a survey of the association's 215 members, 66 did not favor the proposals. The others were for it or on the fence.

This survey was merely a sampling of public opinion; the real decision was up to the village's mayor and four trustees. They voted against the extraordinary project. The opponents were not prepared to revise the 2-acre zoning ordinance without complete assurance that the pioneering project would be a success and this, of course, was impossible to guarantee. Although they recognized the project's numerous advantages, they questioned whether there was a solid market in Old Westbury (22 miles from Manhattan) for this quantity of a new kind of superluxury attached housing.

Blankman, however, is not easily discouraged by his reverses. He is now planning precisely the same kind of cluster development in another Long Island town like Old Westbury. Says he, "We are utilizing to the fullest the lessons we learned in Old Westbury and are hopeful of success on our second try. Certainly, we are convinced that it is important to the future of the American countryside that this pioneering idea be given its chance."

Land development costs

	Standard plan	Gruen plan
Earthwork	$318,830	$64,400
Paving	585,460	144,000
Storm drains	459,630	109,000
Sewage disposal	486,000	293,000
Water supply	295,400	119,000
Electric distribution	345,140	253,000
Landscaping	190,000	39,000
Irrigation	10,000	13,000
Management building	45,000	45,000
Outdoor lighting		19,000
Shade structures, benches, etc		80,000
Total	2,735,460	1,160,400

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, no matter what form our urban development takes, the important thing is that we begin looking toward the future and not just to how we can best patch up past mistakes. Many towns and cities are preparing plans for the various types of growth I have described, but the success of their efforts will depend to a considerable extent on the leadership and assistance provided at the national level. I believe very strongly that we must have a more vigorous effort by all levels of government in coming to grips with the problems of future urban growth. The vitality of our central cities, the success of our highway and many other existing Federal aid programs, depend on it.

It is my hope that the bill I have introduced will at least provide a constructive approach to this effort. I view it as a catalyst to action by all levels of government and by private enterprise in preserving open space which, together with comprehensive planning, will help provide a means of achieving better urban development.

The Federal Government has a vital role to play in this effort where cooperation and partnership is essential and I am glad that this fact is becoming increasingly recognized. President Kennedy last October gave attention to this critical problem when he endorsed a report on urban problems prepared for the conference of mayors in Pittsburgh which stated:

> Recreation and open spaces: City parks and public spaces are priceless assets. We have taken for granted the open country around our cities which has stood for generations in farms or woodlands. Today we are running out of open spaces, and recreation areas are rapidly disappearing. Nation, State, and regional park systems must now be developed on a planned basis to meet the needs of a growing population.

The Regional Plan Association of New York recently completed an exhaustive and detailed study of the open space needs in the tristate area. I cannot too highly recommend to anyone interested in this area the series of reports prepared by this group, particularly the final report entitled "The Race for Open Space," the report prepared by Shirley Adelson Siegel entitled "The Law of Open Space," and the one on "Nature in the Metropolis." These reports contain a great deal of information of nationwide applicability. The final report stated the impact of the Federal Government on the region's growth and open space problems in these succinct terms:

> The U.S. Government has had a very great impact on recreation and open space in the New York metropolitan region, an influence far beyond the implications of the 2,746 acres of parks and wildlife lands that it owns here. It has over 55,000 acres in military properties and other institutional lands, most of which are in their natural state; the Corps of Engineers carries out projects controlling beach erosion and floods; the Department of Agriculture and the Fish and Wildlife Service assist in the production of food on land and water and in promoting good conservation practices.
>
> The Federal Government's greatest impact on open space is the influence of its programs and policies on the region's overall development. No more important decisions are made affecting this development than the national policies guiding home mortgage insurance, urban renewal and highways.

Although it has not yet appeared to realize it, the Federal Government determines more than any other level of government what kind of a region this shall be. The result of Federal policies has been to encourage our region and all others across the country to explode outward in every direction with little rhyme or reason and with no regard for preserving a bit of green space in the process.

This study prompted the New York Times to observe that "the hour is already late. The longer we wait to buy park land, the more it costs if it can be bought at all." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, as well as a number of other editorials from various New Jersey newspapers, all of which call attention to the seriousness of the problem and the need for prompt action, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

THE HOUR IS LATE ON PARKS

Calmly, factually, practically yet eloquently the case is put for acquiring and preserving park land in and near the New York metropolitan area in the final report of a 2-year study described in detail in this morning's Times. The title of this report, "The Race for Open Space," tells the story of urgency. This is the final document of the park, recreation, and open space project, sponsored jointly by the metropolitan regional council and the Regional Plan Association, which was financed by the Old Dominion Foundation, with supplementary help from the Taconic and Victoria Foundations.

The purpose was to determine need and recommend ways to acquire. The assumption is unchallengeable that "open space is a fundamental element in any decent and desirable living environment." There is an "inexorable rush to the outdoors." Yet the pace of park land acquisitions is found to be declining relative to the region's growing population.

One objective is balance, to be attained by getting enough recreation land, conservation land and residential open space. To a certain extent the suit has to be tailored to the cloth. No one in his right mind hopes to reach, for Manhattan, the acceptable ratio of 10 acres of park land per 1,000 population; it would require an area bigger than the island itself. But, in and beyond the 22 counties in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, with their 550 municipalities, sound provision can be made for the future by use of foresight and tax sweat.

The bill for doing what needs to be done is put at $1,900 million, at 1960 land prices. Cost would be shared by Federal Government, States, counties, cities, towns, and—hopefully—private philanthropy, perhaps encouraged through an open space foundation, with revolving fund, to hold land in escrow until government could afford to take over and develop. The hour is already late. The longer we wait to buy park land the more it costs, if it can be bought at all.

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Feb. 2, 1961]

THE GOVERNOR IS SPEAKING TO YOU

In proposing to the legislature a $60 million program bearing in his budget message the subtitle "Green Acres" Governor Meyner is in fact challenging the plain people of the State. In itself the Governor's argument in favor of a joint program of open-space acquisition ($45 million for the State, $15 million for the towns and counties in matching funds) is impeccable:

"We have reached the now or never point. New Jersey faces an open-space crisis. Its land resources are disappearing at a startling rate, while the price of those sites which remain continue to soar. Future urbanization could leave us without places to play and hunt and fish, places to contemplate the beauty of virgin land. Foresight is needed so that those who follow us may have a fit inheritance. We should act now."

And the way in which he proposes to act is the right way, through a bond issue. The future has a stake in this program. It can and should help to pay. But in New Jersey a bond issue, the creation of debt, can be effected only by vote of the people at referendum. And on the November ballot will be another bond issue, the $40 million issue for the immeasurably necessary expansion and construction of State institutions. Traditionally voters shy away from saying yes to two bond proposals on any single ballot. Traditionally Americans have risen to meet the genuine needs of their time. It is quite a challenge the Governor has thrown down.

[From the Camden Courier Post, Jan. 12, 1961]

STATE PROGRAM FOR OPEN SPACES

One of the least publicized achievements of Governor Meyner's administration is one of its most important and praiseworthy.

In the past 7 years, New Jersey has bought up 130,000 acres of "open land" from private owners. It now has a total of 275,000 acres of such land, suitable for recreational purposes or already developed for them.

Now the Governor is proposing, in his message to the 1961 legislature, that the State double its "open land" holdings. He wants this done within the coming 10 years.

"The emerging needs of the 1960's require that we plan now for continued growth," says the message—and it contains no truer words. These needs embrace recreational areas just as much as they do other types of development. Without recreational development, our development in other directions will be stunted.

Cost of acquiring the additional 275,000 acres Meyner wants the State to acquire cannot be estimated down to the penny or even down to the dollar. The Governor is being commendably frank in saying it may range between $25 and $75 million.

What we do know for a certainty is that the quicker the land is bought the less it will cost, and the longer the purchase is delayed the more it will cost—if it is still available for purchase at any price.

Another thing that we know for a certainty is that a State which at the beginning of this decade is committed to half-billion-dollar annual budgets for operating expenses can without the slightest difficulty afford to spend—over the period of the full decade—even the $75 million for open land that is the highest estimate of its cost.

It is encouraging, and an earnest of the Meyner administration's sincerity in this matter, that the State even now is in the process of acquiring a tract that will be one of the most valuable components of the "open land" program.

This is a 6,800-acre site in Sussex and Passaic Counties known as the Lake Wawayanda region, which the National Park Service has described as "the most significant site" for public recreational purposes remaining in the whole Delaware River Basin. It is being sold by the New Jersey Zinc Co. for approximately $1 million, part of which will come out of fishing and hunting license fees.

Governor Meyner indicates he will ask for the money to finance the full 10-year land purchase program in his budget message later this month. He also is asking the legislature for a conservation easement law that would permit desirable recreation lands to be preserved as is, under private ownership, with a guarantee against being taxed on their potential urban value. The legislature should give favorable consideration to both these requests.

[From the New Brunswick Daily Home News, Nov. 1, 1960]

PARK LANDS OF THE FUTURE

When New Yorkers go to the polls a week from today they will be offered the opportunity to authorize a State bond issue of $75 million for the purchase of park lands.

New Jersey voters will have no such opportunity; but we hope that by the time another Election Day rolls around, sentiment in Trenton will have grown in favor of acquisition of park lands and the people will be offered an opportunity to vote on such a bond issue.

New York legislators, despite the State's vast size, realize that desirable land for park uses is rapidly being expended on other uses. This is particularly true on the fringes of urban and suburban districts where parks are most urgently needed.

New York knows that investment in park lands today will save many dollars tomorrow. It knows that the only guarantee of sufficient park and recreation areas for the burgeoning populations of the future lies in the acquisition of land now.

Here in New Jersey our problem is much more serious than is New York's. We do not have available a vast upstate area, easily reached by good roads. We do not have mountain wilderness which can be bought and held. We do not have large undeveloped areas through the lakelands.

New Jersey is small and much of New Jersey's land is now removed from possible park uses. Our little lakeland is highly developed. Most of our ocean front is already removed from park uses.

Our population is growing apace and so is our industry. Each year sees thousands upon thousands of acres of open land going into residential and industrial uses.

New Jersey must act swiftly to guarantee the people of its future sufficient land for parks.

The acquisition of park lands is properly financed by borrowing. The land will be entirely for use in future years and it is entirely appropriate that the cost of purchase should be paid over a term of years and in part by those who will enjoy the fruits of the purchase.

We think that New Jersey legislators should begin soon to plan broadly for adding to New Jersey's park land holdings before time runs out. We are confident that a bipartisan effort along this line would find strong support among the electorate.

[From the Asbury Park Evening Press, Sept. 30, 1960]

INTERSTATE COMPACT NEEDED TO MEET FUTURE PARK NEEDS

Proposals for a long range program to provide the recreation and park areas which will be needed in the next 25 years in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan region have been advanced by the regional planning association and the metropolitan regional council.

These groups coordinate through planning the objectives and needs of the 22 counties that make up the metropolitan region. Since they lack official standing they have neither the power to tax nor the ability to finance the steps which must be taken to make their proposals a reality.

The need to plan park facilities for the millions who reside within the region cannot be denied. With each passing year the available park sites diminish and the population increases.

Like so many desirable public projects, parks must compete with such urgent matters as schools, highways, and welfare service in the face of a shrinking tax dollar that has been preempted to a large degree by national defense costs. Yet without the attention directed to the need for parks by the studies just released the next generation will discover our natural resources depleted and recreational opportunities inadequate.

Our future park lands must receive a higher priority in public expenditures. Because their use will overlap county and State boundaries there is little hope of acquiring enough parks except through an interstate compact and private subscriptions from foundations not committed to educational or scientific goals.

Here is an opportunity for regional planners. Let them devise, acting as agents of New York and New Jersey, the tax and revenue formula by which their recommendations can be fulfilled. By integration with the Federal Government's national park program some of the desirable sites, such as Sandy Hook in New Jersey or Fire Island in New York, may some day be converted to the use which has been recommended for many years by those who have studied the subject.

An interstate compact was needed to achieve the goals of the Port of New York Authority. It offers the only method presently available to satisfy the ambitious park program of a metropolitan region which embraces 22 counties and for which a comprehensive plan must be developed.

[From the Passaic Herald-News, Sept. 28, 1960]

MUCH MORE PARK SPACE NEEDED

The message of the final report on the park needs of the tristate New York metropolitan area, entitled "The Race for Open Space," may be illustrated by its recommendations for our immediate area.

Passaic County, the report says, has 1,078 acres of county parks. The county should have 9,000 acres by 1985, "if the recreation demands of the county's population are to be served." Bergen County, the report says, has 3,218 acres of county parks, and should have 18,000 acres by 1985.

The explanation for the anticipated need for so much more park space is contained in a few figures. There are, in the 22 New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut counties included in the metropolitan area, 7,000 square miles of land. Of this amount, 1,000 square miles are unsuited for use because they are too swampy or too steeply sloped. The remaining 6,000 square miles are expected to be "completely urbanized," another way of saying they will be converted into city areas before the year 2000.

The bill for providing the park facilities which the report deems essential for future needs is a staggering $1,900 million at today's prices.

The report is a project of the Metropolitan Regional Council and the Regional Plan Association. It contains many valuable suggestions which should engage the attention promptly of municipal, county, and State officials. Some are inexpensive, yet extremely important, such as the one that trees be protected by law from the depredations of developers, "who typically bulldoze sites clear of all trees because, presumably, this reduces construction costs." The report says that while trees "may not be a substitute for parks, they contribute greatly toward making the urban environment more pleasant."

The report should be helpful in arousing public interest in parks and recreation facilities. Because of this, it is welcome.

[From the Atlantic City Press, Sept. 28, 1960]

SOUTH JERSEY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Continued growth of south Jersey is of prime concern to all who live and work in the area. It also is the No. 1 objective of the Southern New Jersey Development Council.

Consequently the development council's annual conference here was a matter of general interest. The various exhibits depicting the region's industrial, agricultural and recreational facilities gave evidence of the diversification of our economy.

The 400 local, regional and out-of-State industrialists, industrial realtors and municipal leaders who attended the conference are interested in development. They also are aware that development without planning may not be an unmitigated blessing.

Because of the realization, much of their discussions were devoted to this topic. There were panel discussions on "the value of coordinating local and regional planning" and "utilities planning for area growth."

Albert M. Cole, former Administrator of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, told the closing session of congestion and related problems resulting from unchecked and unplanned development.

Comprehensive planning, he said, is "the pooling of all resources, harnessing and channeling them by thinking ahead, maintaining guidelines and acting to develop the area for its highest and best use."

"Planned areas for a planned future" was the way he described south Jersey's need.

Planners are unanimous in believing that extensive amounts of space should be left open in the suburbs to protect water suppliers, to provide recreational areas and to meet future requirements for parks, school sites and highways. So-called urban sprawl has been eating up farmlands and open spaces at an astonishing rate.

We need industrial development and residential construction. We also need to conserve natural open land for lush farms and for the ideal setting for rest and recreation. We need to preserve the distinctive flavor of our shore resorts where relief may be found from the tensions of urban life.

To maintain a balance calls for planning. In diversification lie both our strength and our allure.

[From the Newark Evening News, Sept. 27, 1960]

OPEN SPACE

The final report of the park, recreation and open space project, sponsored by the Metropolitan Regional Council and the Regional Plan Association, is disturbing and challenging. We have failed to set aside enough open space, and there isn't much time to save what little remains.

In these conclusions the report expresses the fears of many who have been studying the trend of development in the metropolitan region embracing New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut. The area is growing so fast that park and recreation needs are "racing with the bulldozer" as new housing and industry spread over the countryside. Unless the public moves a lot faster, the bulldozer is going to win and the victory could be irreversible.

Open space has been so much a part of the American landscape that we have come to take it for granted.. Relatively few have been aware of the steady decline in empty acres or anticipated the unhappy consequences of their loss. Even Essex, with a county park system that receives high praise in the report, has only a quarter of the park lands it should have, and other north Jersey counties have done much less.

The price tag attached to the land acquisition program recommended in the report is a large one, but the longer we wait the bigger it will get. And if we wait too long there will be no land available at any price the public could afford.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies held an extensive conference on the open space problem with a number of experts in the field and in its memorandum for that conference it was noted that:

In recent years the process of urbanization has consumed a million acres a year, and although it has produced a profusion of sites for homes, factories, highways, airports, and land for other purposes, urbanization has not brought about satisfactory environments for cities, or their outlying communities. We have lost opportunities to structure the growth of metropolitan regions, to preserve desirable features of land, and the opportunities for recreation and the continued enjoyment of the natural beauty of the landscape. We now have endless sprawl serving to compound the difficulties.

The situation will worsen drastically unless bold measures are taken to control the process of urbanization.

It is in this spirit that the bill was prepared and it is my hope, when the problem has been recognized and when the policy and approach have been thoroughly discussed, that bold action will be taken.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill provides first that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency undertake a thorough review of the operation of the program administered by the HHFA and its constituent agencies to determine how these programs can more effectively be utilized to meet our open space needs. The Administrator is also directed to study the relationship of other Federal programs to the open space problem and to study the extent to which Federal land holdings might be more effectively used for park, recreation, or open space purposes in urban areas.

As the Regional Plan Association has indicated, a number of Federal programs have already had a considerable impact on open space in urban areas, not all of them salutary. Intensive effort ought to be made to better utilize and coordinate these programs—from the urban renewal program to the highway program to the activities of the Corps of Engineers.

Second. The bill proposes a program of action to help preserve park, recreation, conservation, and scenic areas in and around our cities and towns with a 5 year $100 million a year program of grants to share 25 percent of the cost with State and local governments of acquiring and preserving such land. Because this is essentially a regional problem and because the funds are limited to the provision or preservation of land which is of regional importance, grants may be made for 35 percent of the cost, as an incentive, to regional agencies or bodies which, for the purposes of the act, embrace the entire urban area.

GRANTS VERSUS LOANS

Before going any further, Mr. President, I would like to take the time to describe why the bill provides for this type of assistance rather than, for example, a loan program. Looking at the broad prospective of the problem over a long period of time, it is evident that the needs for open space are considerable, running into billions of dollars. For example, the Regional Plan Association

calculated the needs of the New York metropolitan region alone at $1.9 billion at 1960 prices. I understand that the cost of acquiring open space land in accordance with the Washington, D.C., year 2000 plan will approximate $2 billion. I have no projections for the Nation as a whole but it is easy to see from these illustrations that they will be substantial. Recognizing our serious international and defense commitments in the immediate years ahead, it seems to me more prudent to provide for a low-matching grant program than a full Federal loan program. In this instance, a loan program would require an outlay of $400 million a year to do the same job that a $100,000 grant program would in sharing only 25 percent of the total cost with State and local governments. While the loans would be repaid, the short-run impact on the budget would be much more severe.

In addition, there is no evidence that, except where constitutional debt limits are a problem, State and local governments are unable to borrow money at current rates to successfully finance an open space program. In fact, the people of New York have just approved a $75 million bond issue for park and recreation purposes, and Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, has just recommended a $60 million bond issue for similar purposes in my State. The real question is one of incentive and a recognition of the importance of the problem. If that is so, then the incentive would have to be either in the form of grants or low-cost loans which, over the long run, involve considerable public expense, in addition to adding to the Treasury Department's already difficult financing problems. And, of course, a low-cost loan program would preempt, rather than encourage the participation of, our commercial lending institutions when no need for doing so has been demonstrated.

Returning to the bill, the funds are limited to acquisition costs only and not for development costs or operating expenses. Furthermore, there is a provision to require the preservation of open space land with a minimum of public expenditure. Often open space land can be preserved for less than the cost of full acquisition. In fact, open land can be preserved through zoning at no public expense at all. However, there are, of course, limits to the use of the power of zoning, after which it becomes merely a mechanism for unfairly depriving people of their property rights. But even where the use of this power is completely justified as, for example, in the zoning of flood plains along the banks of a river for the public health and safety, it is not likely to last long under heavy developmental pressure.

EASEMENTS

In many areas not immediately in the path of urbanization, open space land can often be inexpensively preserved through the purchase of easement or development rights. Under such an arrangement, for example, a farmer would be permitted to continue the present use of the land but not to subdivide or develop it. William A. Whyte, Jr., who has written extensively on this technique of preserving open space through the purchase of development rights, has cited several cases where such rights have been obtained at nominal cost. In California, for example, authorities have been buying easements from farmers to prohibit both subdivision and tall structures around airfields at a cost of about $15 an acre. As one nears areas of development, however, the cost of these rights begins to approach the price of full acquisition, rendering this procedure ineffective. There are also the techniques of acquisition and leaseback, the deferral of taxes on land kept open, and the foreclosure of tax delinquent property which would be suitable for park and recreation use or which could be traded for a more suitable site. The Administrator is directed to require the utilization of these techniques wherever they are legally possible and appropriate.

Disposal of any land acquired or preserved with assistance under the bill must have the approval of the Administrator and must be in accordance with a comprehensive plan for the urban area as a whole. The proceeds from such disposal are to be used to further the objectives of the act.

PLANNING FOR BETTER URBAN GROWTH

Mr. President, I have stressed the regional nature of this problem and the need for areawide cooperation and planning if the objectives of an open space program are to be fully realized. Consequently, the bill contains several provisions to encourage planning for better urban growth and development.

After 3 years following enactment, no assistance would be provided for open space acquisition that was not in accordance with an open space plan for the urban area as a whole. The open space plan has to be related to and an integral part of a broad comprehensive plan of the kind undertaken with assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act, otherwise it has no real meaning. Also after 3 years, the Administrator would be authorized to require where necessary the coordination of plans for intrastate portions of an interstate urban area, as a condition of assistance, because obviously New York City's open space plan will differ depending on whether or not the existence of the Palisades in New Jersey is taken into account in the formulation of those plans.

These are the long-range procedures that I think are necessary for an effective open space program, but we are faced with the fact that many urban areas of the United States have not completed or progressed very far with the kind of planning envisioned. Yet time is running out on many vitally important open space areas which obviously ought to be saved while they are still available. These are areas that would occur to nearly everyone after a short walking tour of the countryside. So for the first 3 years the bill would require only that, where these plans do exist, the acquisition be in accordance with whatever available plans are largest in geographical scope. And preference is given in this interim period to proposals for acquisition which are in accordance with a related open space plan for the urban area as a whole.

In addition to these broad-scale regional plans we have a more immediate problem in planning for a more rational and sound development on the fringes of the urban complex, where most of the growth is occurring. This detailed kind of planning for the location of streets, roads, sewers, zoning, platting, and so forth, is vitally necessary if we are to start coming to grips with the chaos of urban sprawl. So whenever open space land is acquired within a substantially larger area of open land, this detailed planning must be initiated for that portion of the larger area within the jurisdiction of the applicant that the Administrator determines is necessary to meet foreseeable development needs. The Administrator may allow portions of any assistance extended under the act to undertake this detailed planning.

AID TO ENCOURAGE CLUSTERING

These are the major provisions of the general program. But, in addition, a small part of the grant authorization is made available to the Administrator to make grants to encourage experimentation with the kind of cluster developments that I described earlier. I believe, Mr. President, that encouragement of this type of development is of great importance if we are to have any hope of coming anywhere close to meeting our open-space needs within the limited local, State, and Federal resources that can reasonably be made available for this purpose. In the past, gifts and donations of land have accounted for a substantial part of our present urban park and recreational areas. But, so far, private enterprise has not been brought into play. Yet the homebuilding industry—the second largest in the United States and providing jobs and economic activity in a host of related fields—stands to benefit tremendously from an effective open-space program.

As I mentioned earlier, more and more of the costs of providing the community facilities for residential development are being forced onto the homebuilders and developers. While the cost of land still remains a No. 1 problem, the cost of developing land and providing the facilities is by no means insignificant, as can be readily seen from a comparison of the costs on the proposed cluster development in Old Westbury, Long Island. I have been told—and I believe it to be true—that many developers would be more than willing to make a substantial contribution to meeting our open-space needs at no cost to the public if they could achieve a corresponding saving in development and facility costs by gaining permission to build the same number of homes on the nondedicated portion of a given tract as they would have built on the whole tract had they not dedicated any part as open space. Unfortunately, many communities, for financial and other reasons, have been unwilling to

accept dedications of open-space land in this kind of arrangement.

To help cover planning, maintenance, insurance, and other indirect costs, the bill would permit the Administrator to make grants to communities of not more than 10 percent of the cost of any open space land of 25 acres or more that has been dedicated without cost to the community, provided the community permits the clustering of development on the nondedicated portion of the tract in such a manner as to maintain at least the same average density of development for that portion as would have obtained for the tract as a whole.

OPEN SPACE FOR THE CENTRAL CITIES

Finally, Mr. President, the bill provides an amendment to title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to encourage the provision of park, playground, or other public recreational facilities in our urban renewal areas. The reason for this amendment is simply that the economic facts of city life are such that few parks are being provided where they are most badly needed—in our congested, slum-ridden, and busy central cities to help lessen the dangers of juvenile delinquency and open up a bit of our cities to a little sunlight and green earth for those who live there.

Generally speaking, a city acquires the land, clears it, and then resells it for private development at a lower cost. The loss involved is shared two-thirds by the Federal Government, one-third by the local community. However, under normal circumstances, the development of new commercial and residential activity will generate an increase in property tax revenue to more than cover the one-third cost to the community within the first few years after completion of the project. Such, however, is not the case with a park. The city not only has to meet its one-third share, which is an immediate out-of-pocket expense, but it also loses the greatly increased tax revenue that would be obtained if the park were put to commercial or residential use. The economics are such that in New York, for example, an extensive urban renewal project for the west side of the city, which originally envisioned a long, green mall running through the center, was eliminated in the final plans.

The amendment is designed to achieve more park and recreational areas in our cities by allowing the Federal Government to bear the full cost of the land dedicated to park or playground or recreational use. The city, of course, would have to forego the revenue that it could otherwise have obtained by developing on it. I might point out, however, that not in all cases is there a complete loss of the potential tax revenue increase. For example, if the park is properly located, adjacent property values will also rise, though not as rapidly to provide the same tax revenue as if there had been development on the park itself.

Not only do I believe this encouragement is necessary to satisfy the park and recreation needs of our cities, but I believe it will also greatly help to discourage further blight and deterioration of the surrounding areas. For as the mayor of East Orange, James Kelly, has perceptively commented: "When the amenities go, blight moves in."

These, then, Mr. President, are the main features of this bill. They provide for a full-scale effort by all levels of government and encouragement of private enterprise to preserve open space of strategic regional importance to the urban areas, to generate open space of more local value in and around our suburban communities through cluster development, and to open up the center of our cities once more to sunlight and fresh air. I earnestly hope that this measure will stimulate interest and a concern with the problems I have mentioned and that the bill itself will receive serious and sympathetic consideration of the Congress.

FARM ELECTRIFICATION RESEARCH LABORATORY IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the establishment, in the State of Minnesota, of a U.S. Farm Electrification Research Laboratory to serve farm families of the Midwest and the Nation.

In our present-day agricultural crisis we see the fantastic contradiction wherein there is a constant rise in the cost of things the farmer must buy and a constant decline in the income from the products he has to sell. During recent years we have come to call this situation the agricultural cost-price squeeze. Whatever it may be called, the problem is one that has to be solved if our economy is going to be able to move forward the way we want it to.

I firmly believe we must utilize every possible device to break up this dreadful cost-price squeeze. Rural electrification has already demonstrated effectiveness along this line. In the mid-thirties REA certainly brought light and hope to an area that was underdeveloped or distressed, by any and every standard. Rural electrification helped the people to help themselves to a better life.

But there is more to the breakthrough to a better life on the farm and in rural areas than to get lights and a TV set—important as this has been. Electricity can help cut the farmer's costs. It can reduce his crop losses, which serve to increase his costs. It can improve the quality of his product.

We know these things from our experience of the last few years. But electricity holds a greater potential and it is to find out the practical aspects of this potential that we need to give our farm electrification research adequate facilities to perform effectively.

The potentialities for utilization of electric power on the farm are enormous. Consider what electric power can contribute to farming:

Take the matter of manpower. Livestock labor on the farm is still about 75 percent handwork. In poultry production, for example, it takes about 39 man-hours to produce $100 worth of products. In beef production, about 22 man-hours are required to produce a like amount of product. In dairy production, 53 man-hours. Simply in terms of the dollar value of a man's labor, this is not efficient work.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that only about 4 percent of the total horsepower expended on a farm is supplied by electricity. The typical dairy farmer lifts, carries, or pushes 20 to 30 tons of material per cow per year. Electric power could do many of these jobs, with proper equipment, for only a few cents a day.

Automatic and semiautomatic machines—milking, feeding, watering, cleaning—have already alleviated many farm chores. And in doing so they have reduced costs of production. But the surface is barely scratched. There is room for improvement of existing machines and methods. We should have new electric-powered devices to further modernize farm operation—for collecting, cleaning, and candling eggs, for example; for distributing ground feed from a central location—to substitute electric power for manpower wherever possible in farm labor.

Farmers have truly been serious victims of increasing production costs over the past years. Their income has shrunk as the spread between cost of production and the price received for farm produce has narrowed. Lowering his cost of production is one way to help improve this situation. Electricity can do it and then the farmer can increase his profit margin.

The farmer's costs can be reduced if he can reduce crop losses. As anyone who has lived on a farm knows so well, loss of crops or animals for one reason or another can be catastrophic. In 1959, to cite a valid illustration, we lost $25 million worth of poultry—probably 75 percent of this loss was due to respiratory diseases caused by improper ventilation of the houses in which the birds were raised. Limited research work is now being done in Georgia and Mississippi to determine the relation of temperature, humidity, and air ionization to the incidence of respiratory diseases in poultry, and to develop equipment that will provide the proper environmental conditions for raising healthy poultry. Here again, though, the money being spent for research in these problems is miniscule in proportion to economic losses suffered as a result of neglecting modern methods. Electricity, properly adapted, can provide the lighting, heating, and cooling for efficient environmental control of crops and animals.

Or, to cite another area of extensive economic loss to the farmer, it is becoming increasingly evident that pesticides and insecticides alone will not effectively protect crops against insect destruction. The race goes on to develop new formulas to control destructive insects that have become resistant to insecticides already in use.

Electric insect traps using ultraviolet light, infrared energy and other forms of electromagnetic waves have been used to detect and control some insects. Experiments to date encourage a much

greater research effort to design light traps for the control of insects, and to reduce the extensive use for this purpose of poisonous and toxic chemicals.

The farmer of the sixties knows that he can improve his product, plant or animal, by the proper use of electric-powered machinery and appliances; heaters, for example, for incubators, brooders, graindriers; coolers for eggs, milk, poultry houses; temperature control of storage facilities.

The potential of artificial lighting in farming operations production is only beginning to be explored. Plant response to artificial electric illumination has been under study at Beltsville, in Indiana, and in California. Some applications of artificial light are being used by commercial growers in greenhouses and outdoors to regulate growth and flowering of floral crops. A considerable amount of research is needed to determine the types of lamps most suitable for various crops, and to develop designs for experimental growth chambers that will produce maximum growth.

What we must do is to stimulate the flow of such techniques and devices out of the laboratory and into the hands of the farmer so that he might improve the quality of the product he delivers to the consumer and improve his own income situation in the process.

To have brought electricity to most of the Nation's farm homes is not enough. Farmers must have the techniques and the machinery to improve their farming methods, to raise their incomes. Electric power can make a great contribution to a healthy agricultural economy. But the trail to the new frontiers of modern mechanized farming starts in the research laboratory.

Existing facilities and personnel for electrification research are most inadequate in relation to the potential of electric power utilization on the farm.

Theoretical and applied research in the farm applications of electric heat, light and power to date has been accomplished by the efforts, usually of a cooperative nature, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, State agricultural experiment stations, power suppliers and manufacturers of equipment.

Since 1944, the USDA Agricultural Research Administration has done the basic research work in the development, improvement and testing of farm and household electrical equipment. With present congressional appropriations, USDA farm electrification research is being conducted in 15 locations in 14 States, and at Beltsville, Md., by a professional staff of only 24 agricultural and electrical engineers. Twenty of the engineers engaged in this activity in cooperation with State experiment stations are provided laboratory and office space by the State station. The only Federal laboratory space available for farm electrification research is a 2,500 square foot section of the Agricultural Engineering Laboratory at Beltsville. This laboratory was built for research in farm field machinery, and is presently needed for that purpose.

The facilities, personnel, and money assigned to rural electrification research by the Federal Government are insufficient, indeed, when considered in relation to the potential of this activity—and to the practical accomplishments that can be gained only through research.

Let me mention some examples: Improved plant growth through artificial lighting; insect control with light traps; inset control in harvested grain by means of radio-frequency treatment; electro-magnetic radiation control of weeds and weed seeds; radio frequency treatment to convert hard seed to immediately germinable seed; high frequency drying of grain to improve nutritional and germination properties; ultraviolet lamps for the possible increase of milk flow and egg production; heat pumps for heating and cooling; solar heating—and cooling—for conditioning forage and grain, heating livestock shelters and residences.

This list suggests but a few of the exciting possibilities in rural electrification research.

To give to this vital work the attention it deserves, in the interest of our Nation's agricultural prosperity—I am proposing with the introduction of my Senate bill, the establishment of a national farm electrification research laboratory, in the State of Minnesota, where our interest and contribution to the rural electrification program is a proud chapter in the history of the American farm and farmer.

As a leader in an imaginative program of cooperative research, such a facility will make a great contribution to opening new frontiers in farming through electrification research.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 859) to provide for the establishment of a farm electrification research laboratory in the State of Minnesota, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish, equip, and maintain in the State of Minnesota, a central research laboratory, and at such laboratory, to conduct a program of research concerned with developing new and better methods of utilizing electricity to improve the quality of agricultural commodities and products, and to improve, modernize, and reduce the costs of farming operations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire land and interest therein, and to accept in the name of the United States donations of any property, real or personal, to the laboratory established pursuant to this Act, and to utilize voluntary or uncompensated services at such laboratory.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized and directed to cooperate with other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, States, State agricultural experiment stations, and other State agencies and institutions, counties, municipalities, business, or other organizations, corporations, associations, cooperatives, universities, scientific societies, and individuals, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; but no amount in excess of $2,000,000 may be appropriated for the original construction and equipping of the laboratory authorized by the first section of this Act.

LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY PROTECTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry.

I introduced a similar bill in the last session of Congress and it passed the Senate on July 16, 1959. However, when the bill reached the House, certain provisions contained in it were objected to by members of the House Agriculture Committee. I have redrafted the bill to meet those objections.

Mr. President, the proposed legislation would give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to properly dispose of animals which have been brought into this country or moved interstate in violation of a Federal quarantine, or which have been found on such movement to be infected or exposed to a dangerous communicable disease.

The Department of Agriculture is now powerless to seize and dispose of many such animals regardless of the disease involved as they can proceed against the violator only through normal court action. The disposal of animals under the proposed new authority would be in conformity with the requirements of the situation; for instance, one action might be taken in the case of foot-and-mouth disease and an entirely different action in the case of a less dangerous disease.

My bill also recognizes the dilemma in which the Department of Agriculture and the livestock producers of the Nation would find themselves in the event of an emergency outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease and the inability of an individual State to carry its share of the eradication effort. The proposed legislation would give the Secretary of Agriculture power to act in case of an extreme emergency, such as an unchecked outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease.

The Department of Agriculture has close cooperative arrangements with all the States looking toward the prevention of any such emergency condition through prompt cooperative action. In most circumstances these arrangements would prove most successful, but, in view of the increasing international traffic and the periodic outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada and Mexico, we must be prepared to act immediately in case of an outbreak of an extremely dangerous foreign disease. We must also consider the possibility of biological warfare against our livestock.

In addition, the bill pertains to payments of indemnities, the cleaning of facilities, and the authority to inspect. The provisions regarding importation of

livestock into the United States are necessary in order to deal adequately with such long incubation period diseases as scrapie and with livestock that have at one time or another been diseased or exposed to foot-and-mouth disease.

The remaining portion of the bill would amend current legislation to make the present laws to protect livestock and poultry more applicable to any disease. It also would relieve some uncertainty as to the coverage of Department of Agriculture employees under the statutes prohibiting assault upon or interference with the work of certain Federal employees.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 860) to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as used in this Act unless the context indicates otherwise—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The term "animals" means all members of the animal kingdom including birds, whether domesticated or wild, but not including man.

(c) The term "United States" means the States, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, and the District of Columbia.

(d) The term "interstate" means from a State or other area included in the definition of "United States" to or through any other State or other such area.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary, whenever he deems it necessary in order to guard against the introduction or dissemination of a communicable disease of livestock or poultry, may seize, quarantine, and dispose of, in a reasonable manner taking into consideration the nature of the disease and the necessity of such action to protect the livestock or poultry of the United States: (1) any animals which he finds are moving or are being handled or have moved or have been handled in interstate or foreign commerce contrary to any law or regulation administered by him for the prevention of the introduction or dissemination of any communicable disease of livestock or poultry; (2) any animals which he finds are moving into the United States, or interstate, and are affected with or have been exposed to any communicable disease dangerous to livestock or poultry; and (3) any animals which he finds have moved into the United States, or interstate, and at the time of such movement were so affected or exposed.

(b) Whereas the existence of any extremely dangerous, communicable disease of livestock or poultry, such as foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, or European fowl pest, on any premises in the United States would constitute a threat to livestock and poultry of the Nation and would seriously burden interstate and foreign commerce, whenever the Secretary determines that an extraordinary emergency exists because of the outbreak of such a disease anywhere in the United States, and that such outbreak threatens the livestock or poultry of the United States, he may seize, quarantine, and dispose of, in such manner as he deems necessary or appropriate, any animals in the United States which he finds are or have been affected with or exposed to any such disease and the carcasses of any such animals and any products and articles which he finds were so related to such animals as to be likely to be a means of disseminating any such disease: *Provided,* That action shall be taken under this subsection only if the Secretary finds that adequate measures are not being taken by the State or other jurisdiction. The Secretary shall notify the appropriate official of the State or other jurisdiction before any action is taken in any such State or other jurisdiction pursuant to this subsection.

(c) The Secretary in writing may order the owner of any animal, carcass, product, or article referred to in subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or the agent of such owner, to maintain in quarantine and to dispose of such animal, carcass, product, or article in such manner as the Secretary may direct pursuant to authority vested in him by such subsections. If such owner or agent fails to do so after receipt of such notice, the Secretary may take action as authorized by said subsections (a) and (b) and recover from such owner or agent the reasonable costs of any care, handling, and disposal incurred by the Secretary in connection therewith. Such costs shall not constitute a lien against the animals, carcasses, products, or articles involved. Costs collected under this section shall be credited to the current appropriation for carrying out animal disease control activities of the Department.

(d) Except as provided in subsection (e) of this section, the Secretary shall compensate the owner of any animal, carcass, product, or article destroyed pursuant to the provisions of this section. Such compensation shall be based upon the fair market value as determined by the Secretary, of any such animal, carcass, product, or article at the time of the destruction thereof. Compensation paid any owner under this subsection shall not exceed the difference between any compensation received by such owner from a State or other source and such fair market value of the animal, carcass, product, or article. Funds in the Treasury available for carrying out animal disease control activities of the Department of Agriculture shall be used for carrying out this subsection.

(e) No such payment shall be made by the Secretary for any animal, carcass, product, or article which knowingly has been moved or handled by the owner thereof or his agent in violation of a law or regulation administered by the Secretary for the prevention of the interstate dissemination of the communicable disease, for which the animal, carcass, product, or article was destroyed or any law or regulation for the enforcement of which the Secretary enters or has entered into a cooperative agreement for the control and eradication of such disease, or for any animal which has moved into the United States contrary to such law or regulation administered by the Secretary for the prevention of the introduction of a communicable disease of livestock or poultry.

SEC. 3. The Secretary, in order to protect the health of the livestock or poultry of the Nation, may promulgate regulations requiring that railway cars; vessels; airplanes; trucks; and other means of conveyance; stockyards; feed, water, and rest stations; and other facilities, used in connection with the movement of animals into or from the United States, or interstate, be maintained in a clean and sanitary condition, including requirements for inspection, cleaning, and disinfection.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate regulations prohibiting or regulating the movement into the United States of any animals which are or have been affected with or exposed to any communicable animal disease, or which have been vaccinated or otherwise treated for any such disease, or which he finds would otherwise be likely to introduce or disseminate any such disease, when he determines that such action is necessary to protect the livestock or poultry of the United States.

SEC. 5. Employees of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary for the purpose, when properly identified, shall have authority (1) to stop and inspect, without a warrant, any person or means of conveyance, moving into the United States from a foreign country, to determine whether such person or means of conveyance is carrying any animal, carcass, product, or article regulated or subject to disposal under any law or regulation administered by the Secretary for prevention of the introduction or dissemination of any communicable animal disease; (2) to stop and inspect, without a warrant, any person or means of conveyance moving interstate upon probable cause to believe that such person or means of conveyance is carrying any animal, carcass, product, or article regulated or subject to disposal under any law or regulation administered by the Secretary for the prevention of the introduction or dissemination of any communicable animal disease; and (3) to enter upon, with a warrant, any premises for the purpose of making inspections and seizures necessary under such laws and regulations. Any Federal judge, or any judge of a court of record in the United States, or any United States commissioner, may, within his jurisdiction, upon proper oath or affirmation indicating probable cause to believe that there is on certain premises any animal, carcass, product, or article regulated or subject to disposal under any law or regulation administered by the Secretary for the prevention of the introduction or dissemination of any communicable animal disease, issue warrants for the entry upon such premises and for inspections and seizures necessary under such laws and regulations. Such warrants may be executed by any authorized employee of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 6. (a) Whoever knowingly violates any regulation promulgated pursuant to the provisions of sections 1 through 5 of this Act shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

(b) The Secretary may bring an action to enjoin the violation of, or to compel compliance with, any regulation promulgated or order issued under said sections, or to enjoin any interference by any person with an employee of the Department of Agriculture in carrying out any duties under said sections, whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that such person has violated, or is about to violate, any such regulation or order, or has interfered, or is about to interfere, with any such employee. Such action shall be brought in the United States district court, or the United States court of any Territory or possession, for the judicial district in which such person resides or transacts business or in which the violation, omission, or interference has occurred or is about to occur. Process in such cases may be served in any judicial district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found, and subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend the court in any judicial district in any such cases may run into any other judicial district.

SEC. 7. Section 11 of the Act of May 29, 1884 (58 Stat. 734), as amended (21 U.S.C. 114a), is further amended by inserting the words "any communicable diseases of livestock or poultry, including, but not limited to," after the word "eradicate".

SEC. 8. (a) The first section of the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264), as amended

(21 U.S.C. 123), is further amended by striking out the phrase "cattle or other livestock" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any animals", and by inserting after the word "disease" the words "of livestock or poultry or that the contagion of any such disease exists or that vectors which may disseminate any such disease exist in such State or Territory or the District of Columbia".

(b) Sections 2, 3, and 4 of such Act (33 Stat. 1264, 1265), as amended (21 U.S.C. 124, 125, 126), are further amended by striking out the phrase "cattle or other livestock" each time such phrase appears in those sections and inserting in lieu thereof the words "quarantined animals".

SEC. 9. The first proviso under the heading "General Expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and fifteen", approved June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 419), as amended (21 U.S.C. 128), is further amended by striking out the phrase "cattle or other livestock" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "quarantined animals".

SEC. 10. Section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "wild birds and animals," the following: "any employee of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out any law or regulation, or to perform any function in connection with any Federal or State program or any program of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands of the United States, or the District of Columbia, for the control or eradication or prevention of the introduction or dissemination of animal diseases,".

SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 12. The authority conferred by this Act shall be in addition to authority conferred by other statutes. Any provision of any other Act inconsistent with the provisions of this Act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

AMENDMENT OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], I introduce a bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective and enlarged program of water pollution control. This is a companion measure to one which is being offered today in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN BLATNIK of Minnesota, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works.

The Water Pollution Control Act, as passed in 1956, authorizes Federal matching grants of $50 million a year for 10 years to help communities construct needed sewage treatment plants. The Federal grant for any one project is limited to $250,000, or 30 percent, whichever is smaller.

As Senators will recall, in the last Congress I joined with Representative BLATNIK in offering legislation to expand this grant program by increasing the annual authorization to $100 million. Congress approved an increase in the annual authorization to $90 million, but, unfortunately, President Eisenhower vetoed the bill. This bill will do what was sought to be done last year. I say "unfortunately" because I am firmly convinced that this program of joint Federal-State effort has, beyond a shadow of a doubt, proven its worth.

Since the Federal grants program began in 1956 sewage treatment construction across the Nation has nearly doubled. In the preceding 5-year period, 1952–56, such construction averaged $222 million annually. In 1957 construction awards totaled $351 million; $389 million in 1958; $349 million in 1959, and an estimated $350 million in 1960.

The Public Health Service itself estimates that even this construction rate is not adequate to meet the country's needs. Public Health Service estimates that the construction rate must be at least $575 million annually for the next several years if we are to catch up with the backlog of needed sewage treatment construction programs and keep up with greater pollution loads resulting from increased population and industrial development.

The best argument for this Federal grant program is to simply cite the fine results that have been attained already under this program—after only 4 years of operation. And this increase in sewage treatment construction programs has taken place without the Federal Government encroaching upon the States. The Public Health Service, in administering this program of grants, has kept its hands off in deciding where the money will be spent; the States themselves have been making such decisions.

Mr. President, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956, has indeed been an outstanding success. It has demonstrated what the Federal and State Governments can accomplish by working together. The continuance and the expansion of such a program is, in my opinion, an absolute necessity.

This legislation is definitely in the public interest. It cannot be charged that this is a reckless expenditure of Federal funds. Its provisions are sound and designed to bring the sewage treatment program up to the minimum required level.

The bill which we are offering today in the Senate and in the House would amend the present act as follows:

1. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES

First. Increase annual authorization for construction grants from $50 million to $125 million and total grant authorization from $500 million to $1,250 million.

Second. Increase maximum grants from 30 percent of the cost of the project, or $250,000, whichever is smaller, to 30 percent of the cost, or $600,000, whichever is smaller.

Third. Permit projects serving more than one municipality to receive a grant equal to the pro rata total of each project's allowable grant.

Fourth. Authorize reallocation of unused State allocations to States where applications for funds exceed regular allotment.

Fifth. Extend provisions of Davis-Bacon Act to projects receiving construction grants.

2. FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

First. Make all navigable waters and coastal waters subject to Federal abatement enforcement authority, whether or not there is a showing of interstate pollution, if abatement action is requested by a State or a municipality with the concurrence of the State.

Second. Authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to issue final orders in enforcement actions.

Third. Make discharges from Federal installations subject to administrative findings and recommendations in Federal water pollution abatement actions conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Fourth. Establish $25 million enforcement construction grants fund to be available for financially hard-pressed communities required to construct treatment facilities as a result of Federal enforcement action, such funds to be available over and above the regular State allotment of construction grant funds.

3. RESEARCH

First. Authorize establishment of field laboratory and research facilities for expanded water pollution control research activities, including the establishment of regional laboratories in different sections of the country.

Second. Authorize special study of Great Lakes pollution problems.

4. STATE AND FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

First. Retain State's primary rights and responsibilities for the control of water pollution.

Second. Extend the provision for Federal grants to State and interstate water pollution control agencies for administration of their programs and increase Federal participation from $3 million to $5 million.

Third. Establish independent Water Pollution Control Administration within Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer Federal water pollution control program and activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill remain at the desk until February 16 to permit additional cosponsors who may wish to join on this measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 861) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

OLD FORT DAVIS, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the rugged grandeur of the Davis Mountains, in Jeff Davis County, Tex., stand the ruins of historic Old Fort

Davis, Tex. For more than a quarter century, from the time of its founding in 1854, soldiers barracked at this frontier outpost, fought off Apache uprisings, and as best they could protected the widely separated ranches and the "forty-niners" who were traveling overland on their way to California.

During the 86th Congress, I introduced a bill to authorize the establishment of a national historic site at Old Fort Davis, in Jeff Davis County, Tex. It is one of the very few forts that the National Survey Commission found to be worthy of serving as a national monument.

The Honorable J. T. RUTHERFORD, the able Congressman from this westernmost district of Texas, has been the principal sponsor of the measure to declare Old Fort Davis a national historic site. I warmly commend him for this action and leadership, and again support him by the introduction of this companion bill in the Senate.

It was my good fortune from the years 1927 to 1931, to make my home in El Paso, in this Trans-Pecos area of Texas. Upon a number of occasions I visited Fort Davis and Old Fort Davis. It seems obvious that the old fort, which is situated near Big Bend National Park, should be restored as part of the nationwide Mission 66 program designed to preserve, protect, and restore for all Americans many national historic landmarks. Thousands of visitors to the Big Bend would be much more likely to visit Old Fort Davis, too, if it were declared a national historic site. It is at the approximate midpoint of the route from Carlsbad Cavern National Park, on the north, to Big Bend National Park, on the south, and is a natural stopping point for the park visitors.

Old Fort Davis was established in 1854, on the order of Jefferson Davis, then U.S. Secretary of War. It was on the road of the camel caravan experiments carried out by the army before the Civil War. It withstood Indian attacks for many years, and finally, in 1861, was abandoned by Union troops to the Confederate forces. In the next 6 years, the fort was almost wiped out by repeated Apache attacks. When the Union soldiers reoccupied it in 1867, they had to rebuild it. For 14 more years it was used as the base from which to fight warring Apaches.

With the end of danger from the warriors under Geronimo, Vittorio, and Cochise, the last troops left colorful Old Fort Davis in the summer of 1891, closing out a chapter in American frontier history which always should be preserved. Under the command of General Grierson, the famed commander of a Civil War cavalry raid, and other commanders, the fort played its successful part in closing the old West and opening the new. Many of its buildings still stand. Its history has been well told by Judge Barry Scobee, the historian of the Davis Mountains, in the volumes published by him.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Old Fort Davis, near the town of Fort Davis, Jeff Davis County, Tex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 862) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Old Fort Davis, Jeff Davis County, Tex., introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INAUGURATION DAY A NATIONAL LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago we were privileged to take part in the historic inauguration of the President and the Vice President of the United States, a privilege which is repeated every 4 years.

Letters have come to me, as I am sure they have also to other Senators, expressing regret that the writers were unable to view any of the inaugural activities on television or listen to them on the radio, because they had to be at their offices or places of employment or schools. Now that television and radio coverage is so complete, the privilege of being present through these media at a Presidential inauguration is available to every citizen of this country. I think it should be a right as well as a privilege. Therefore, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make Inauguration Day a legal holiday throughout the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Monday.

This holiday is not to be one for holiday's sake. It is to be a holiday which can be a means of heightening citizen interest and awareness. As President Kennedy said in his historic inauguration address on that day:

> We observe today not a victory of a party but a celebration of freedom—symbolizing an end as well as a beginning—signifying renewal as well as change.

Mr. President, it is in this spirit that I believe Inauguration Day should assume national significance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 863) to provide that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED CREATION OF SINGLE FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create at Cabinet level a single Federal transportation agency.

There is no central responsibility in the entire executive branch today for the formulation of transportation policy and for the establishment of executive leadership.

There is a growing recognition that national transportation is out of balance today. As the Cabinet study prepared for President Eisenhower put it last year:

> It is less a national system than a loose grouping of individual industries.

We have built vast networks of highways, railways, inland waterways, seaports, airways, airports, and pipelines; and, as the Cabinet study put it, we have done so with little attention to conflict among these expanding networks.

To administer these programs, various Federal agencies have mushroomed. None of these is concerned with the needs of the other. Each one tends to serve as special advocate for its own kind of transportation.

The Federal Government spends untold billions on transportation activities. But dollars cannot pull these disjointed, conflicting, and unequal programs together. Neither can money alone produce clear objectives which would help bring lower prices to shippers and consumers, by permitting and encouraging each form of transportation to do the job which it does best.

We ought to be able to identify these subsidies and to regulate them in a coordinated fashion.

We need a single department to pull this distorted picture back into balance. Only in a stable framework can we bring order out of the present uneconomic jungle of unrelated and diverse systems.

On May 26, 1960, I introduced a similar bill, which, of course, died with the end of the 86th Congress. I am pleased to have again as cosponsors, Senators JAVITS and KEATING, of New York.

Our bill would put the nonregulatory transportation functions of our scattered Federal agencies together under one roof, under a separate Department of Transportation. It would transfer to the new Department, headed by a Secretary of Transportation, the functions of the Federal Aviation Agency, the Maritime Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, and certain other agencies with obviously related roles and missions.

I believe that the regulatory commissions, where possible and appropriate, should exercise the important function of regulation, and that they will perform it better if this is their sole function.

The purpose of the bill is to transfer to the new Department the present promotional and executive functions of the regulatory commissions. Thus, the Interstate Commerce Commission would no longer administer railroad loan and safety programs, as it does today. Similarly, the Civil Aeronautics Board would no longer concern itself with discovering new types of subsidy to be granted to air carriers, but would leave it to the new Secretary to determine what, in the overall transportation interest, ought to be subsidized, and to what extent.

The bill does not direct which administrative, nonjudicial functions of the existing regulatory boards and agencies are to be transferred to the new Department. It gives the new Secretary time to investigate and study the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and other

regulatory agencies. With the basic objective of consolidation wherever appropriate, the Secretary would then report his recommendations to the President and Congress.

The development of the new Department would be, accordingly, a two-step operation; and that would be a sound approach, in my judgment.

Last May, when we first introduced the bill there was considerable evidence in the record to support his proposal. Since then, I believe, the record is even more complete.

First, both the Hoover Commission task force recommendations and the Rockefeller Bros. report supported the creation of a single agency to coordinate the present jumble of Federal programs in this field. To these can now be added the January 16 budget message of President Eisenhower, the Commerce Department study on transportation, and the staff report on "National Transportation Policy," prepared for the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member.

Furthermore, the long-range implications of the Landis report on regulatory agencies, prepared for President Kennedy, appear to support this objective, even though Dean Landis would postpone to another day such a step.

The differences between Dean Landis and me are essentially on matters of timing, I think. His report itself suggests that the creation of a single Federal transportation agency may be desirable. He argues, as I do, that the Federal Government's role in transportation needs, to put it mildly, to be clarified.

He agrees that we have a jumble of conflicting objectives in our Federal programs. His report to President Kennedy recommends the creation of special offices to coordinate our transportation policies within the Executive Office of the President. He would aim eventually for the objective which my bill proposes. I believe he will eventually come to see no alternative to my approach.

We in the East are particularly concerned with the need for preserving and strengthening mass transportation facilities. It is not enough, though, to stem the flow of passenger-train discontinuances until some realistic action can be taken to put commuter service on a going basis—even though the sponsors of this bill have been pressing very hard for the achievement of that vitally important goal, too.

We know what would happen to our area without mass transportation. A few weeks of snowfall have given us just a small taste of what that kind of disaster would produce if cars and buses were the only way to get in and out of New York City.

The steps required to save train service are not enough, vital as they are. Unless all our transportation systems can be kept in balance, the short-range solutions will likely prove patchwork indeed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 867) to establish a U.S. Department of Transportation, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Transportation Act of 1960".

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an executive department of the Government to be known as the United States Department of Transportation (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"), at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Transportation (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for heads of the executive departments.

UNDER SECRETARY AND ASSISTANT SECRETARIES

SEC. 3. There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Transportation, such Assistant Secretaries as shall be determined by the President to be necessary, and a General Counsel, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions and duties as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for under secretaries (other than the Under Secretary of the Department of State), assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of the executive departments. The Under Secretary (or, during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

PROVISIONS OF LAW APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 4. Except to the extent inconsistent with this Act, all provisions of law applicable to the executive departments generally shall apply to the Department.

SEAL

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Secretary may, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, and unless prohibited by some specific provision of law, perform any function vested in him through or with the aid of such officials or organizational entities of the Department as he may designate.

TRANSFERS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 7. (a) The Federal Maritime Board is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce with respect to such board are transferred to the Secretary.

(b) The Maritime Administration is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce being administered through such administration are transferred to the Secretary.

(c) The Bureau of Public Roads is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce being administered through such bureau are transferred to the Secretary.

(d) The Defense Air Transportation Administration is transferred to the Department and all functions of the Secretary of Commerce being administered through such Administration are transferred to the Secretary.

(e) All officers and other personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily in relation to any board, administration, bureau, or function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department.

(f) The office of Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation in the Department of Commerce is abolished.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

SEC. 8. The Federal Aviation Agency, together with its personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments, and the unexpended balances of its appropriations, is transferred to the Department where the Administrator of such agency shall exercise his functions subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO FURTHER TRANSFERS TO THE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of determining and making recommendations with respect to which functions of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government with respect to transportation are administrative, promotional, or nonregulatory in nature, in order that all such functions may be transferred by law to the Secretary to be exercised in a coordinated manner, the Secretary shall make an investigation and study of the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and such other departments and agencies of the Government as he deems appropriate to carry out the purpose of this section. The Secretary shall make a complete report of his study and recommendations under the provisions of this section to the President and the Congress not later than January 31, 1962.

(b) All departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall provide the Secretary with such information as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

TRANSFER MATTERS

SEC. 10. All laws relating to any agency or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any agency or in connection with any functions transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency or any officer of the United States acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act; but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity of a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate agency or officer of the United States.

EXPENDITURES AUTHORIZED

SEC. 11. The Secretary is authorized to make such expenditures (including expendi-

tures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks, books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 12. The Secretary shall make at the close of each fiscal year a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and the Department, describing the work done by the Department, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department.

AMENDMENT

SEC. 13. Section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"Eleventh: The Department of Transportation."

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 14. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Department to carry out the provisions of this Act and to perform any other duties which may be imposed upon it by law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 15. The provisions of this title shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act except that sections 7 and 8 shall be effective after ninety days following such date of enactment.

TAX CARRYOVERS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at the request of one of my constituents from Schenectady, N.Y., I introduce, for appropriate reference and study, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to provide a 5-year carryover for charitable contributions made by individuals in excess of amounts deductible for the year in which made. Under the terms of the bill, it would be permissible for individuals to claim, over a 5 year period, tax deductions on the full value of such gifts as property or real estate, which by their very nature could not physically be split up over more than 1 year.

Under the present law, people who donate money can divide their contributions over the years, so as to benefit from maximum tax deductions, whereas people who donate real property often are unable to claim the same tax relief for an overall donation of the same value.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 868) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide a 5-year carryover for charitable contributions made by individuals in excess of amounts deductible for the year in which made, introduced by Mr. KEATING, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF MENOMINEE TERMINATION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at the request of the Menominee Indian Tribe, of Wisconsin, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Menominee Termination Act. I am joined in sponsorship of these measures by my senior colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Termination for the tribe is scheduled to take effect April 30 of this year. It is my understanding that the tribe is making serious efforts to accomplish the necessary steps which will provide a basis for successful termination.

During the past few weeks a tribal delegation, led by Mr. Jerry Grignon, has been here in Washington, to seek assistance and advice on the best means to get the help they need to help themselves. As a result of their discussions, they have submitted the proposed amendments to their termination act. These amendments have been authorized by resolutions of the tribal general council.

Local self-government will impose on the tribe a heavy financial burden which they will have a hard time carrying, due to a serious decline in the lumber industry, their chief source of income. The termination plan was based on the harvesting and marketing of 29 million board feet of timber. But during the past 6 months the amount of timber sold was less than 5 million board feet, about one-sixth of the volume specified in the termination plan. It is essential that a firm financial underpinning be provided for the tribe's affairs, if termination is to be successful.

The first bill would place the tribe's termination on a tentative basis for 8 years, and would continue for a similar period their exemption from Federal taxes. It would provide authorization for a long-term loan to enable the tribe to modernize and develop their business operations and tribal enterprise.

In addition, the bill would revise the present requirements for distribution of stumpage payments, to enable the tribe to use their revenues in a sensible, constructive manner. It would also charter their corporation under a Federal charter, and would provide for recognition of the provisions of the laws of Wisconsin relating to the government of the tribe.

The tribe believes that these amendments are needed in order to make termination work. I am, therefore, introducing this bill at their request. I hope the Department of Interior will now give their needs very careful study and consideration. It may be that some of the provisions of this bill could be improved upon or drafted in a more satisfactory manner, to better help the tribe to terminate successfully.

In addition, I am introducing a second measure which would give the Secretary of Interior authority to postpone termination, if he determines that more time is needed, to a date he determines is reasonable. Enactment of the second bill is needed because of the shortness of time that is now pressing on the tribe. It may not be possible to get the full reports, based on a careful investigation in the field, which will enable the Department to comment satisfactorily on the other bill. Enactment of the second bill would allow the Secretary to provide as much extra time as he thinks necessary.

Mr. President, one of the best informed and most trusted spokesmen on matters affecting the Menominee Tribe is Mr. George Kenote, a representative of the Department, and himself a Menominee. On February 6 Mr. Kenote sent to the President a letter outlining the situation now facing the tribe. Mr. Kenote has made a copy of his letter available to me, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred: and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. WILEY), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 869. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act; and

S. 870. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act to extend Federal supervision of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and provide necessary assistance, to enable such tribe to make an orderly transition to its status after such supervision ends.

The letter presented by Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1961.

Re Menominee Indians of Wisconsin.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Menominee Termination Act, as now pertaining, will terminate all Federal jurisdiction over the Menominee Tribe of Indians, their properties, forest and other on April 30, 1961. There remain 63 working days to that date.

Speaking as one who has been closest to the termination problem, in all respects, for the past 5½ months (in addition to 18 months in 1958–59) and in spite of extensive study and many hours of day and night time attention to ways and means of implementing the Menominee Termination Act and the tribal termination plan, it is valid and honest to say that neither the Federal Government, the State of Wisconsin (including local counties), nor the Menominee Tribe is in a position to make a decent termination of Federal jurisdiction by April 30, 1961.

The simple and direct reason is that there is a lack of sufficient and knowledgeable persons who can devote full time. The program development, scheduling and resolution of serious and basic questions and problems is more tedious, difficult and time consuming than persons not directly in the work can fully realize.

For example, in spite of 18 months of negotiation and review up to October 30, 1959, it was not until January 18, 1961, that the Department of the Interior could finally pass upon the Menominee termination plan. In spite of a supposed settlement of the public school problem in mid-1959, the problem again arose in May of 1960 and has just been more or less finally resolved in the past month. The Menominee Indian Study Committee of Wisconsin recognized the necessity for a full-time State official to assist with the implementation of the local government problem early last fall, its recommendation is now before the State legislature as an emergency measure. If it passes the position must yet be filled, then the man will have less than 63 working days to termination date. There is not enough time to complete governmental reorganization necessary. This problem is vast and complex, and has been seriously and terribly oversimplified.

It would seem to me that the Menominee Tribe, as a small segment of a real and native minority people, deserves more considerate and real attention from the political conscience of the United States in its present dilemma. Working this problem out is more than a one man full-time job, and should be recognized as such. The Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD has recognized the problem for what it is, as evidenced by his telegram to Interior Secretary Udall on January 27.

In addition to the above, the economic plight of Menominee business affairs have reached an alarming new low. The past earning history of the Menominee Indian mills and logging operations, used for study purposes, had averages about $550,000 through fiscal years 1953 to 1958. This $550,000 earnings history made the Menominee business and governmental situation after termination extremely marginal, as everyone cognizant of the problem acknowledges. An annual average of $400,000 is necessary to support government, over $100,000 for other new costs. It was believed that the total earnings would improve by reason of a larger forest cut to be permitted after termination, an increase from an annual 22 million board feet maximum to a 29 million probable cut, without an appreciable rise in overhead or labor and other costs. Under existing conditions, this forecast is subject to real suspicion and should be seriously considered.

For 1959 our operating profit dropped to $62,753, which added to the stumpage profit of $310,841 for the same year dropped the total from the $550,000 average to $373,594. The 1960 operating profit again dropped, this time to $56,310, but added to the stumpage profit of $473,028 increased the total to $529,329. The first 6 months of fiscal year 1961 shows a net operating loss of $35,896 and a stumpage profit of only $157,727, for a total of $111,831 in profits. We see little encouragement for any improvement at this time.

As of June 30, 1960, we had in round figures $2,275,000 in remaining tribal funds. Assuming this figure could remain fairly constant to April 30, 1961 (which now appears impossible), after deducting a stumpage payment to individual members, required by Federal law, made in November of 1960 in the amount of $464,700 another due as of April 30, 1961 probably in a similar amount, and at least $400,000 in direct property taxes for the period May 1 to December 31, 1961, we would have about $835,600 in operating funds to carry on business operations. According to the recent operating statement and the business outlook, we will have considerably less than $835,600 with which to start post termination operations. Our average annual operating budgets have required about $1,800,000, without any sizeable capital improvements or additions.

Construction work, and supporting and dependent industry, have been cut back drastically in this area as elsewhere. At the present time we have a total of 375 employees in our mills and forest operations, about 75 percent of this group earns from $1.34 to $1.39 per hour on a 40-hour week basis. Strict business sense would compel us to reduce the number of employees. To do so would only transfer them to the relief rolls. As almost the sole tax support of the community, in the initial years after termination, the business operations will have to indirectly carry the relief load. Our goal for a viable local economy must gear itself to at least 600 decently paying jobs. To do this we need development funds, experience and know-how, and a reasonable trial and error period. We believe we have a competent board of directors to take over and manage the new Menominee Corp., but it too needs time and experience with the new problem situation, created by termination and the serious business condition.

The health and welfare of this community, and that of the neighboring community, are newly and directly hard pressed as a direct result of termination and the decline in our business situation. On January 1, 1961, the Menominee tribal hospital closed for the first time since 1926. The nuns who had operated it were forced to leave because of a lack of funds and physicians' services. This hospital represents at least a $750,000 tribal investment and now stands idle. Through tribal financing and action by 1956, we had reduced the incidence of tuberculosis to 4 reportable cases, it has now risen to 35 active and some suspicious cases and will mean a direct and probably unsupportable burden for the new community. The roughly outlined municipal budget for welfare and related matters after termination rounds off at about $90,000 without this sanitaria item now evident, and without the now anticipated direct relief burden upon the community.

At a recent meeting of the adjoining county medical society and the municipal hospital board, which is getting the brunt of the burden since the closure of the Menominee tribal hospital and the delimiting of medical services, it was pointed out to tribal representatives that hospital and medical services bill are becoming a serious problem to the society and the hospital board. They were asking for some relief from tribal sources, we could promise nothing in our present plight. About 370 of our employees are covered with a limited hospital and surgical insurance program, it does not pay for medical services other than surgery. It is all the mills and the employees can afford and it is proving insufficient. The Public Health Service interim clinical services program is limited but a godsend, it will cease on April 30 under present conditions.

In view of these, and many resultant problems, the Menominee General Council on January 9, 1961, by resolution proposed a quite reasonable program. Copies of the resolution have been circulated. It also sent two delegates to Washington to present its problem who are reportedly having a difficult time. Again, as a person most intimately and directly knowledgeable of the Menominee problem, I urge serious attention to it as an emergency measure.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. KENOTE.

INCREASED EARNINGS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, who is unable to be present today, has asked me to introduce a bill which he is sponsoring to amend title II of the Social Security Act which would increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn while receiving benefits under such title.

I submit the bill for appropriate reference and also ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Kentucky with respect to this bill which he is introducing, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 871) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. MORTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON, IN CONNECTION WITH INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AMENDING TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill proposing to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the amount an individual is permitted to earn while receiving benefits under title II.

Prior to enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1960 (P.L. 86-778), the program applied an earnings test which required a recipient under age 72 to forfeit 1 month's benefit for each unit of $80 or fraction thereof by which his annual earnings exceeded $1,200. The new earnings test, which became effective on January 1, is somewhat more liberal in that it calls for the withholding of $1 in benefits for each $2 earned between $1,200 and $1,500, and on a dollar-for-dollar basis above $1,500.

The bill which I have introduced would simply raise the earnings-test base from $1,200 to $1,800 annually by substituting the amount of $150 for the figure $100 where it appropriately appears in title II of the Social Security Act. I do not feel that the Congress is inclined at this time to eliminate completely the earnings qualification, but I do believe that its attitude would be receptive to further easing a requirement which unfairly restricts the ability of our elder citizens to manage their retirement financial affairs.

I would guess that a fair percentage of our social security retirees are content with retirement per se without any necessity of working for a supplemental income. They have programed their retirement and managed their financial resources for the day of genuine, leisurely retirement. On the other hand, we have those individuals who must supplement their benefits to live comfortably and those persons who prefer, and would be happier, to have some kind of employment, but are hesitant to work lest they endanger their social security benefits.

The income from employment is rewarding in itself, but there are other satisfying benefits, and those persons who desire should not be completely discouraged from pursuing useful and active lives in some employment capacity after retirement. Frequently, they live longer and enjoy better health when they have something constructive to do. Raising the earnings ceiling also would ease many of the inflationary pressures which strike hardest at those with fixed incomes.

People regard their social security benefits as a matter of right in which they have invested and which they are entitled to receive without fear of being penalized for a willingness to work, regardless of whether their desire for employment is motivated by choice or by necessity. It is my understanding that the administration's journey to the New Frontier calls for maximum utilization of our Nation's human, natural, and material resources. The Nation's older men and women who are ready, willing, and able to work should not be denied their opportunity to contribute productively to our economy. To do so, would constitute a waste of a valuable human resource.

MAINTENANCE OF IWO JIMA MEMORIAL ON MOUNT SURABACHI

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would vest in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi. Our U.S. marines are very anxious to have this Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Sura-

bachi designated as an American battle monument. We are all familiar with the famous picture of the flag raising on Iwo Jima after the bloodiest battle in the Pacific campaign where American marines killed or wounded in the first 72 hours exceeded the casualties of the First Battle of Manassas.

It is my information that the monument is made of concrete and is erected on the crater of an old volcano at Surabachi Island and is in a position where it is seen by very few people except occasional Marine Corps visitors to the island. Fifteen years ago it was in poor condition. It was cracked and is very likely in much worse condition now. In order to provide greater care and maintenance for this monument, on the site where the most historical and publicized flag raising in World War II occurred, it is hoped that this bill can be enacted into law giving the Battle Monuments Commission jurisdiction over it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 872) vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima Volcanic Islands, Pacific Ocean area, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REDUCTION TO $100 THE EXEMPTION PROVIDED FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, 3 days ago the President of the United States sent a message to Congress outlining several recommendations to deal with the problem of our unfavorable balance of payments. This unfavorable balance has resulted in an increased gold outflow from our shores and in greater than desirable claims upon our gold by oversea interests.

The President submitted one recommendation dealing with the customs exemption granted to returning American travelers from abroad. Our citizens have been able to travel to foreign lands in increasing numbers each year.

In another time, following World War II, most of the world needed help. We were in a position to grant assistance to relieve what was known as the dollar shortage. Congress granted two additional increases of $300 and $100 in the duty-free allowance for returning travelers, which was at that time only $100. This made a total of $500 of exempt value a tourist or other traveler could bring back to this country without incurring a customs charge.

I have prepared a bill which would follow the President's recommendation and return to the basic duty-free allowance of $100. The exemption of $100 is accorded if a returning resident arrives from a contiguous country which maintains a free zone or free port, or from any other country after having remained beyond the territorial limits of the United States for not less than 48 hours. In other words it removes the $300 additional exemption now contained in the law for absences of not less than 12 days and reduces the basic exemption from $200 to $100. You will recall that in his message of February 6, the President refers to this as a return to the historic basic duty-free allowance.

The amendments in section 2 are technical amendments.

Section 3 of the bill in effect postpones the effective date of the amendments for 30 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 877) to reduce to $100 the exemption provided for returning residents by paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

GIFTS AND BEQUESTS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY FOR U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 880) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a draft bill, with accompanying statement of purposes and provisions, which is designed to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The proposed legislation would amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order that gifts and bequests of personal property for the benefit of the Merchant Marine Academy could be accepted and administered by the Secretary of Commerce.

The draft bill is patterned after a statute authorizing administration of gifts and bequests to the U.S. Naval Academy. The draft bill contains a provision to implement the suggestion of the Comptroller General of the United States with respect to the cash residue of a gift made for a specific purpose.

On January 4, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROVISIONS OF DRAFT BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO ACCEPT GIFTS AND BEQUESTS OF PERSONAL PROPERTY FOR THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Secretary of Commerce through the Maritime Administrator is responsible for the administration and maintenance of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., an institution of the Government for the schooling and preparation of young American men to become officers of the U.S. merchant marine.

Under existing law (Public Law 485, 80th Congress; 62 Stat. 172) private contributions may be given to the Academy for the specific purpose of assisting in defraying the costs for the construction of a chapel and a library on the Academy grounds. However, there is no statute that authorizes the direct acceptance of gifts or bequests of personal property, money, or other intangible property, for general use in connection with enhancement of the facilities at the Merchant Marine Academy.

In recent years there have been requests from philanthropic persons and organizations to make donations of money and specific items to the Academy. While these donations can be accepted in certain instances under existing law (Public Law 537, 83d Congress; 68 Stat. 566), the process is burdensome.

The alumni of the Academy is growing each year with many obtaining positions of importance in the maritime fields and allied industries. It is reasonable to anticipate that a number of such graduates will desire to show their appreciation for the background and education they received at the Academy, in a similar manner that many such persons do for private institutions of learning. Additionally, the maritime industry as a whole receives benefits from the existence of the Academy, and has evidenced a desire to contribute scholarships and other items of similar benefit to the school.

The draft bill is patterned after the statute authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the U.S. Naval Academy, which is found in section 6973 of title 10, United States Code. The draft bill, however, contains one provision (the last sentence in the new subsection (c)(1) that is not contained in the foregoing statute. This sentence was included to implement the suggestion of the Comptroller General of the United States that specific provision should be made for the disposition of the residue of any gift made for a specific purpose after the accomplishment of that purpose. The provision made by the bill is that unless the donor has manifested a contrary intent, the Secretary of Commerce may disburse such residue for a purpose that in the judgment of the Secretary is as close as practicable to the specific purpose for which the gift was made.

DOCUMENTATION OF VESSELS SOLD OR TRANSFERRED ABROAD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with

a comparative print showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and comparative print will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 881) to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and comparative print presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
January 18, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill "To revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad."

The purpose of the draft bill is to permit the documentation of vessels which are sold or transferred in whole or in part to a citizen of the United States while on the high seas or in a foreign port. The present statutes provide for retention of the privileges of a vessel of the United States by any vessel so sold or transferred until its first arrival in the United States. This fact, combined with the fact that there is no specific authorization for documentation of such vessels, has led to long-standing construction that the Department is without authority to authorize documentation in those cases.

Certain inequities result inasmuch as the vendee or transferee is unable to record his bill of sale or record a mortgage on his vessel until it returns to the United States. Further, the new owners are sometimes at a disadvantage in dealing with officials in foreign ports since the owners are unable to establish their interest in the vessel by official U.S. documents. Present-day communications and postal services make further continuation of this situation as unnecessary as it is undesirable.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the proposed bill and the accompanying comparative print before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House. During the 86th Congress, the Department submitted an identical legislative proposal which was introduced as S. 3632.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget in a letter dated January 12, 1961 that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPARATIVE PRINT SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE PROPOSED BILL TO REVISE SECTION 4166 OF THE REVISED STATUTES (46 U.S.C. 35)

Changes in existing law made by the above-described proposed bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter is quoted):

Section 4166 of the Revised Statutes. * * *

[When any vessel, registered pursuant to any law of the United States, shall, while she is without the limits of the United States, be sold or transferred in whole or in part to a citizen of the United States, such vessel on her first arrival in the United States thereafter, shall be entitled to all the privileges and benefits of a vessel of the United States: *Provided*, That all the requisites of law, in order to the registry of vessels, shall be complied with, and a new certificate of registry obtained for such vessel, within 3 days from the time at which the master or other person having the charge or command of such vessel is required to make his final report upon her first arrival afterward.]

"A vessel of the United States which, while outside the limits of a customs collection district of the United States and not in any port designated as a port of documentation outside any such customs collection district, is sold or transferred in whole or in part to a citizen of the United States, may be documented anew as a vessel of the United States in such manner and upon such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That if any vessel so sold or transferred is not redocumented while abroad, it shall nevertheless be entitled to all the privileges and benefits of a vessel of the United States up to and for the purpose of its first arrival thereafter within a customs collection district or within a designated port of documentation outside any such customs collection district."

PRIORITIES FOR MERCHANT VESSELS IN INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need for the legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 882) to provide emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for legislation, to provide for emergency authority for priorities in transportation by merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation would authorize a system of ship warrants. It is based upon previous experience in World War II under Public Law 173, 77th Congress, approved July 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 591), and repealed July 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 449). This bill is strengthened in the light of certain shortcomings of the World War II law, which were met by administrative action, and provision for which should be incorporated in the frame of the legislation.

The Department recommends enactment of this legislation. In addition to being an important authority as part of the readiness program in the interest of security, the legislation is desirable to meet the commitments on the part of the United States for exercising this authority in accordance with policy adopted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the event that coordinated efforts of these nations become necessary.

On January 9, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

———,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION BY MERCHANT VESSELS IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The draft bill would authorize the President, during any period in which vessels may be requisitioned under section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1242), whenever he deems and proclaims it to be in the interest of national security or the maintenance of essential supplies and services, to prescribe regulations for the issuance and revocation of warrants and governing the use of services and facilities under the act with respect to any vessel using or seeking to use such services or facilities. Whenever the warrant system is prescribed, it shall terminate upon proclamation of the President to that effect, or as Congress by concurrent resolution may provide, and in any event the act itself will terminate 5 years after date of enactment.

The system of warrants for merchant vessels under the act is designed to enforce priorities in congested ports to those vessels of greater importance to our national security, to secure the maximum economic use of available vessels and port facilities and services, to prevent the waste of scarce materials and supplies in servicing vessels which might be engaged in activities harmful or less essential to the interest and programs of the United States, and to prevent unreasonable increases in charter hire and freight rates for ocean transportation. Such coordination in time of war or active mobilization is of high critical importance to the United States and to its allies or associates who will be exercising similar controls in the event that coordinated efforts of nations become necessary. Under the bill, vessels desiring to use the shore and port service or facilities or marine insurance services of this country would be required to secure a warrant or similar document as a condition to the use of such facilities or services. The use of these facilities or services would be prohibited to any vessel not having such a warrant.

As a condition on the receipt of a warrant, the vessel operator would be required to enter into undertakings with respect to the trade in which the vessels of the operator are employed, the voyages undertaken thereby, the passengers or cargoes to be carried, and to abide by fair and reasonable maximum charter and transportation charges. In determining such rates and charges, the President is directed to give due consideration to the valuation principles prescribed in section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1242). A breach of any undertaking would subject the operator to the forfeiture of his warrant and thereby the loss of use of port and shore facilities and services, as well as insurance for ship and cargo.

In considering applications for warrants, the President is authorized to consider certain circumstances, including the origin and previous operating history of the vessel, the price and terms upon which the vessel may have been sold or transferred, as well as the operating practices of the applicant. Such provision for withholding of warrants in cases where there is a history of failure to assist the Government or of activities ham-

pering the Government's programs and objectives, has the objective of securing the most tonnage for services contributing to the purposes of the act.

The regulations under the act may be made applicable to the use of any facilities for loading, discharging, lightering, or storage of cargo, any facilities for the furnishing of oil, coal, or other fuel, supplies, stores, or food, or any facility for the overhauling, drydocking, reconditioning, or repair of vessels, or furnishing marine insurance. The President may except from the regulations types of vessels the control of which he determines not to be required for the purposes of the act.

The proposed system of ship warrants for use in war or national emergency is not new or untried but is based upon previous experience in World War II under Public Law 173, 77th Congress, approved July 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 591), and repealed July 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 449). The bill is strengthened in the light of certain shortcomings of the World War II law, which were met by administrative action and which should be incorporated in the frame of the legislation.

In any emergency period requiring mobilization of the Nation's shipping and other resources involving great acceleration of the use of supply and repair facilities for shipping, ports will be subject to congestion and strain. In such times it will be vitally important to carefully control the use of vessels in the movement of cargoes. The international character of shipping makes special provisions of law desirable in order to prevent deterioration in the situation of our country and any allied or associated countries. To have statutory authority available will have the ultimate advantage of securing for the United States and cooperating nations the use of tonnage from the world's supply. The existing large Government-owned reserve fleet of merchant vessels is now 12 to 18 years old and is not in itself a guarantee of national safety so far as shipping facilities in time of war or defense emergency are concerned. No matter how well maintained a reserve fleet may be it takes at least some days to move it into operation. Tonnage and control of operating tonnage will be immediately vital in the event of attack which, it must be assumed, will be sudden and sweeping in scope.

The bill contains several sections of a supplementary or administrative character which will be noted section by section.

Section 4 provides that operators of listed facilities in the United States and places within its jurisdiction shall be governed by the regulations regardless of existing contracts.

Section 5 provides that it shall be the policy of the United States to coordinate the authority granted by the act with the exercise of similar authority by allied or associated nations.

Section 6 defines the word "person" so as to include any entity capable of entering into a contract.

Section 7 is an interpretative provision to prevent the imposition of any condition that a vessel owner relinquish the care and supply of his vessel to any other person.

Section 8 is designed to preserve the coastwise laws of the United States from modification, but does not exempt vessels engaged in coastwise trade from the provisions of the act. This section also provides that the act is in no way to affect authority already granted by the Defense Production Act (extended in part until June 30, 1960). A severability clause is included.

Section 9 authorizes the President to delegate any power and authority conferred on him by the act (exempt the issuance of proclamations) to the Secretary of Commerce or the head of a department or agency deemed appropriate by the President, and authorizes redelegation of such authority to appropriate officials in the department or agency. Provision is also made for interdepartmental coordination in carrying out programs under the act in relation to other programs of the Government.

Section 10 exempts the functions exercised under the act from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (except as to section 3 thereof, which contains requirements as to notice to the public, and provides also that no secret matter need be published).

Section 11 provides penalties for violation of the act, the regulations, or orders issued, with a maximum penalty of $10,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment. United States courts having territorial jurisdiction are given jurisdiction over offenses.

Section 12 relieves persons who comply with rules, regulations, or orders issued under the act, from damages or penalties resulting from compliance, notwithstanding that such rule, regulation, or order may be declared invalid by judicial or other competent authority.

The Department recommends early consideration and enactment of this legislation. In addition to being an important emergency authority as part of the readiness program in the interest of national security, the legislation is desirable to meet the commitments on the part of the United States for exercising this authority in accordance with policy adopted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the event that coordinated efforts of these nations become necessary.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL BOATING ACT OF 1958 TO CERTAIN POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain possessions of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a comparative type showing changes in existing law by the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and comparison will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 883) to extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain possessions of the United States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and comparison presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, January 19, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain possessions of the United States."

The purpose of this proposal is to extend the application of the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to certain U.S. possessions, viz., the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. Authority for the numbering of motorboats in these jurisdictions by the Federal Government expired on April 1, 1960, the effective date of the repeal of the act of June 7, 1918, as amended (46 U.S.C. 288). The Federal Boating Act of 1958 did not authorize these possessions to inaugurate their own numbering programs as all the States and the District of Columbia were privileged to do. This incompleteness in the law is discriminatory and presents a step backward in maritime safety and law enforcement in these geographical areas. The amendment would close this gap and permit these possessions to number motorboats operating in their waters, and in the event that the possessions do not elect to do so the Coast Guard would administer numbering in these areas.

The cost of inaugurating a new Federal numbering system in these U.S. possessions will not require additional appropriations.

It is respectfully requested that you lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget in a letter dated January 12, 1961, that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. GILMORE FLUES,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW BY THE PROPOSED BILL

Matter proposed to be omitted enclosed in brackets; new matter quoted (72 Stat. 1754 (46 U.S.C. 527–527h)).

SEC. 2. (5) The term "State" means a State of the United States, [a Territory of the United States,] "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam" and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. (a) Every undocumented vessel propelled by machinery of more than 10 horsepower, whether or not such machinery is the principal source of propulsion, using the navigable water of the United States, [its Territories] "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam" and the District of Columbia, and every such vessel owned in a State and using the high seas, shall be numbered in accordance with this Act, except—

(1) foreign vessels temporarily using the navigable waters of the United States, [its Territories] "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam" and the District of Columbia;

(2) public vessels of the United States;

(3) State and municipal vessels;

(4) ships' lifeboats; and

(5) vessels designated by the Secretary under section 7(b) of this Act.

SEC. 8. (c) Commissioned, warrant, and petty officers of the Coast Guard may board any vessel required to be numbered under this Act at any time such vessel is found upon the navigable waters of the United States [its Territories] "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam" and the District of Columbia, or on the high seas, address inquiries to those on board, require appropriate proof of identification therefrom, examine the certificate of number issued under this Act, or in the absence of such certificate require appropriate proof of identification of the owner of the vessel, and, in addition, examine such vessel for compliance with this Act, the Act of April 25, 1940, as amended, and the applicable rules of the road.

SEC. 13. The applicability and the jurisdiction for enforcement, upon the navigable waters of the United States, [its Territories] "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam" and the District of Columbia, of the laws of the United States and of any State which require the numbering and otherwise regulate the use of undocumented vessels, shall be as follows:

(1) Such laws of the United States shall be applicable and enforced on such waters by law enforcement officers of the United States.

(2) Such laws of any State in a State having a numbering system approved by the Secretary under section 3(c) of this Act shall be applicable and enforced on such waters by law enforcement officers of the State or by law enforcement officers of the appropriate subdivisions of the State.

(3) Nothing herein shall preclude enforcement of State or Federal laws pursuant to agreements or other arrangements entered into between the Secretary and any State within the contemplation of section 9 of this Act.

(4) Nothing herein shall interfere with, abrogate or limit the jurisdiction of any State: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary shall not approve any State system for numbering which does not fully comply with the standards set forth in section 3(c).

PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN SERVICES BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose and need, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 884) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1961.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants, and copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

On January 12, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

Section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of August 2, 1946, 60 Stat. 810, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), provides as follows:

"The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other act, may procure the temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws (but as to agencies subject to the Classification Act of 1949 at rates not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate payable under such Act, unless other rates are specifically provided in the appropriation or other law) and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 5 of title 41."

Under the foregoing provision and the current Department of Commerce Appropriation Act the Department is generally limited to payment of individuals at rates not in excess of $50 per diem, specified in the appropriation act, unless otherwise specified by law.

The purpose of procuring the services of experts and consultants is ordinarily to accomplish one or more of the following objectives:

1. To secure specialized opinion not available within the Department or accessible within other Government agencies;

2. To obtain outside points of view, to avoid too limited judgment on critical issues of administrative or technical action;

3. To obtain advice regarding developments in industrial, college or university, or foundation research;

4. To obtain for especially important projects the opinion of noted experts whose national or international prestige is conducive to success of an undertaking;

5. To secure citizen advisory participation in developing or implementing Government programs that by their nature or by statutory provision call for such participation; and

6. To obtain the services of specialized personnel who are not needed by the Government on a full-time basis, or who cannot serve full-time or regularly.

To accomplish the objectives listed above, it is necessary to obtain the services of individuals who are truly expert. Under civil service requirements (Federal Personnel Manual, p. A–7–13) an expert must be a person of excellent qualifications and a high degree of attainment in a professional, scientific, technical, or other field. His knowledge and mastery of the principles, practices, problems, methodology, and techniques of his field of activity, or of an area of specialization within the field, must be clearly superior to that possessed by persons of ordinary competence in the activity. His attainment must be such that he will usually be regarded as an authority or as a practitioner of unusual competence and skill by other persons engaged in the profession, occupation, or activity.

In years past a maximum limitation of $50 per diem (equivalent to approximately $13,000 per annum) has generally sufficed to enable the Department to procure the services of persons who meet the Civil Service Commission's criteria for experts. In recent years, however, increasing difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the services of individuals who are truly qualified as experts because of the fact that such individuals in private employment now receive compensation at rates substantially in excess of the $50 per diem ($13,000 per annum) rate available for serving the Government. In numerous instances the experts whose services are desired receive twice as much as the maximum Government rate, or more. As a result, the Department is handicapped severely in procuring the services of experts and consultants under 5 U.S.C. 55a.

The authority requested is substantially similar to that recently approved by the Congress for the Federal Aviation Agency (sec. 302(1), act of Aug. 23, 1958, 72 Stat. 731, 745, 49 U.S.C. 1343(g)); for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (sec. 203, act of July 29, 1958, 72 Stat. 432, 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(9)); for the Panama Canal Company (sec. 201, act of July 13, 1959, 73 Stat. 208, the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960); and for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (sec. 301, act of July 13, 1959, 73 Stat. 208, the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960).

FLEXIBLE RATE OF INTEREST FOR GOVERNMENT FINANCING UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of purpose of the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 885) to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1961.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of draft legislation "To provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes," together with a statement of purpose and provisions of the proposed legislation.

The Department believes that this draft bill would provide an adequate basis for meeting all costs of the Federal ship mortgage loan program including interest, administrative expenses, and a reserve for possible loss.

On January 6, 1961, the Bureau of the Budget advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft legislation to the Congress. The Budget Bureau further advised that enactment of this legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PROVISIONS OF DRAFT BILL TO PROVIDE A FLEXIBLE RATE OF INTEREST FOR GOVERNMENT FINANCING UNDER THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The purpose of the draft bill is to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a flexible rate of interest, to be charged by the United States upon the unpaid balance of the purchase price of vessels it sells under that act, which will be sufficient to cover its cost of borrowing money, its administrative expenses connected with the credit transaction, and a reserve for probable losses.

Under existing law, the rate required to be charged upon such unpaid balances is 3½ percent per annum which is not at present sufficient to cover the foregoing costs.

The draft bill would add a new section 512 to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which would provide that when vessels are sold under that act, on credit, the interest that shall be charged on the unpaid balance of the purchase price shall be a composite rate consisting of two components.

The first component would be a rate equal to the current average market yield, during the month preceding the execution of the contract to sell the vessel, as determined by

the Secretary of the Treasury, on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of maturities comparable to the vessel mortgage maturity. This would cover the cost to the United States of borrowing money. During the month of December 1960, this rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with other lending transactions of the United States, was 3⅞ percent per annum.

The second component would be a rate, determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be sufficient to cover administrative expenses and probable losses, which shall be not less than one-half of 1 percent per annum and not more than 1 percent per annum, except that during the period during which the vessel to be sold is under construction the charge to cover administrative expenses and probable losses shall be not less than one-quarter of 1 percent and not more than one-half of 1 percent.

The foreging minimum and maximum rates to cover administrative expenses connected with the credit transaction, and a reserve for probable losses, are the same as the minimum and maximum premium rates which are authorized under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, for mortgage insurance under that title. These rates provide sufficient flexibility, in the opinion of the Department of Commerce, so that, for the foreseeable future, the draft bill will authorize a rate which will cover administrative costs and a reserve for probable losses.

The composite interest rate which the draft bill would require be charged on the unpaid balance of the purchase price of vessels sold under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, during January 1961 (if the draft bill had then been law), would be (except for the period during which the vessel is under construction) a minimum of 4⅜ percent per annum and a maximum of 4⅞ percent per annum. These minimum and maximum rates consist of (A) 3⅞ percent per annum which during December 1960 (the month preceding the month during which the hypothetical contract of sale was entered into) was the current average yield of marketable obligations of the United States with maturities comparable to 25 years, plus (B) a minimum of one-half of 1 percent and a maximum of 1 percent to cover administrative expenses and a reserve for probably losses.

In addition to changing the interest rate on the unpaid balances of vessels sold under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, the draft bill would change the minimum charter rate on vessels chartered under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Section 714 of that act now provides that the minimum charter rate on such vessels shall be 4 percent per annum of the foreign cost of the vessel plus 3½ percent of the depreciated foreign cost of the vessel computed annually upon the basis of a 25-year life of the vessel. This minimum charter rate is intended to recover a 4 percent per annum depreciation charge plus 3½ percent per annum interest. Since 3½ percent per annum does not cover the Government's cost, the draft bill would substitute for the 3½-percent rate the flexible rate which it provides upon the sale of a vessel.

The draft bill would amend all of the sales provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to incorporate the interest provisions provided by the new section 512.

If vessels are built under title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, by the United States because the purposes of that act could not be carried out under title V, the draft bill would require that if such vessels are sold on credit, the interest charged upon the unpaid balance of the purchase price be at the rate provided in the draft bill, rather than at the rate of 3½ percent which is required by existing law.

The flexible interest rate would also apply to the sale of vessels acquired under title XI of the 1936 act through an assignment to the Secretary of Commerce of a vessel mortgage which he has insured under which there has been a default giving rise to a right to foreclose.

The draft bill would also amend Public Law 85–521 which authorizes the construction of two superliners, one to be operated in the Atlantic and one in the Pacific, and the sale of the vessels at prices fixed in that act with the terms of payment provided in section 502(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. These terms of payment under existing law include interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum. The draft bill would change this interest rate to the flexible rate it provides for the sale of other vessels. This rate, if the contract to sell the vessels had been executed in January 1961, would be a minimum of 4⅜ percent and a maximum of 4⅞ percent.

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MORSE, RANDOLPH, SMITH of Massachussetts, and PELL, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act.

We are introducing this bill as the official proposal of President Kennedy's administration—as to how the minimum wage should be increased and coverage expanded to now-exempt workers.

Briefly, the bill will increase the minimum wage—in 3 steps—from the present $1 to $1.25 an hour.

For those brought under coverage for the first time—the minimum wage would rise from $1 to $1.25 per hour—in 4 steps.

Approximately 4.3 million workers would be brought under the protection of the act—2.9 million of these would be in the retail service industry.

Provisions are also made for the gradual inclusion of newly covered workers under the overtime provisions of the act.

A more detailed explanation of the bill can be found in the letter which accompanied Secretary of Labor Goldberg's transmission of the bill to President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, along with a more complete explanation of the bill, be printed following my remarks.

No person concerned with the problems created by low wage rates in some industries and some areas believes that this bill presents the full answers to those problems.

But as one who believes that we will ultimately enact legislation that will give every worker the protection of a minimum wage, I am proud to sponsor this bill as a major step toward full coverage.

I further believe that a 25 percent increase in the minimum wage will bolster our immediate efforts to counter the present recession—and provide stability for the long-range future.

I know I speak for the majority of the members of the Senate Labor Subcommittee when I promise our best efforts to realize enactment of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 895) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MCNAMARA are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
February 6, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a draft bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act and a statement explaining its purpose and effect.

This bill is designed to carry out the recommendations outlined in your February 2 message for increasing the minimum wage and expanding the coverage of the act. It would raise the standards of the act to keep pace with our general economic progress and needs and extend its protection to an estimated 4.3 million additional workers.

More than 20 years have passed since Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 to provide a modest floor under wages and an equally modest ceiling over hours. A whole generation of Americans has entered our work force since Congress pledged itself to correct and as rapidly as practicable to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of minimum standards of living necessary for the health and general well-being of our workers. Unfortunately, for many American workers the conditions deplored by the 75th Congress are still with us today. We must not leave these workers with no more assurance in 1961 than they had in 1938 that their wages will provide the minimum standards of living to which they are entitled.

Our objective is clear—to provide a minimum living standard of $1.25 an hour and to extend the protection of the act to employees of large enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

The draft bill will accomplish this objective. It would expand the coverage of the act to include the following categories of enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce:

1. Any enterprise which has one or more retail or service establishments if the annual volume of sales of the enterprise is not less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes);

2. Any enterprise which has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning, or clothes repairing if the annual volume of sales of the enterprise is not less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes);

3. Any enterprise engaged in a local transit business;

4. Any establishment not included in categories 1, 2, or 3, if the annual volume of sales of the establishment is not less than $250,000 ($350,000 in the case of construction, exclusive of excise taxes);

5. Any gasoline service establishment if the annual gross volume of sales of the establishment is not less than $250,000.

Changes have been made in the exemptions provided in the act to adjust to the new coverage provisions. While workers in large retail and service establishments would be protected under the proposed bill, no change

would be made in the present exempt status of hotels, motels, restaurants, and motion picture theaters. The new proposal would extend minimum wage protection to, but not change existing overtime exemptions for, onshore fish processing and gasoline service establishments.

The proposal would also increase the hourly minimum wage for employees who now have the protection of the $1 minimum to $1.15 the first year, $1.20 the second year, and $1.25 thereafter. For the newly covered employees an initial minimum wage of $1 an hour would be provided, increased to $1.05 the second year, $1.15 the third year, and $1.25 thereafter.

In addition, the bill would provide a three-step increase in existing wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Sixty days after the effective date of the amendments or one year after the effective date of the most recent wage order, whichever is later, these rates would be increased by 15 percent. One year after the 15 percent increase goes into effect the rates would be increased by 5 percent, and a year later by an additional 5 percent. However, different rates would apply if they are recommended by review committees, to be appointed under the procedures set forth in the bill.

The minimum wage rates for employees in these islands who would for the first time be brought under the act would be established by wage orders recommended by special industry committees appointed by the Secretary of Labor within 60 days after the enactment of the amendments.

No maximum hours requirements would be established for newly covered employees during the first year so that their employers could make the initial adjustment to the minimum wage before being required to comply with an overtime provision. Subsequently, employers of the newly covered workers would have 2 years in which to adjust to the 40-hour workweek standard.

Finally, the bill would amend the act to provide for more effective enforcement of its provisions by authorizing the courts, in injunction proceedings, to order the payment of minimum wages or overtime compensation found by the courts to be due employees.

These changes proposed in this bill are comparatively modest in nature. They have been needed for a long time. Their merits were fully demonstrated in hearings, deliberations and debate on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act during the 86th Congress, last year. I recommend them to you now as viable proposals on which Congress can act effectively and expeditiously.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961

The draft bill would provide urgently needed improvements in the Fair Labor Standards Act by extending its protection to millions of Americans working in the large enterprises of our country and raising its standards to keep pace with our general economic progress and needs.

The bill would provide an increase in the Federal minimum wage to $1.15 an hour during the first year after the effective date of the amendments, $1.20 during the second year, and $1.25 thereafter for workers who now have minimum wage protection under the act.

It would also provide a minimum wage of not less than $1 an hour during the first year, $1.05 the second year (with time and one-half for hours in excess of 44 in a week), $1.15 the third year (with time and one-half for hours in excess of 42 a week) and $1.25 thereafter (with time and one-half for hours in excess of 40 a week) for employees who would be brought under the protection of the act.

Each of the wage order rates in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands would be increased by 15 percent, 60 days after the effective date of the amendments or 1 year from the effective date of the most recent wage order, whichever is later. A year after the 15-percent increase these rates would be increased an additional 5 percent, and 2 years later by another 5 percent. These increases would be superseded if, under the procedures outlined in the bill, a review committee is appointed by the Secretary of Labor for a particular industry and the committee recommends a different rate.

The minimum wage rates applicable to employees of these islands who would be brought under the act for the first time would be established by a wage order effective no sooner than 60 days after the effective date of the amendments. This order would be issued pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee which the Secretary of Labor would be required to appoint within 60 days after enactment of the amendments.

In addition, the bill would (1) broaden the coverage of the act by extending its provisions to include employees of five different categories of enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce; and (2) provide more effective procedures for enforcing the act.

(1) MINIMUM WAGE PROVISIONS

Since March 1956, the effective date of the $1 minimum, the Consumer Price Index has increased by 11 percent. During the 4 years, 1956 to 1959, the real product per man-hour in the private sector of the economy increased by 11 percent. (Estimates for 1960 are not yet available.) Since March 1956, average hourly earnings in manufacturing have increased by 19 percent. The increase in earnings of the average factory worker has been large enough to both offset the increase in the cost of living and to provide such worker with a roughly proportionate share of the benefits of increased productivity. In contrast, workers whose wage rates are at the minimum wage level have not benefited from the upward movement of the American economy. Also, workers whose wages have remained at the minimum since the $1 rate became effective has suffered a decline in real earnings because of the increase in the cost of living.

The adjustments in the minimum wage rate provided by the bill would restore the original value of the $1 minimum in terms of purchasing power, and also allow workers whose wages are at the minimum level to share in the benefits of the increased productivity of the economy.

This schedule of minimum rates for workers now protected by the act is the same as provided in the bill passed by the Senate on August 18, 1960. A year ago it was estimated that an increase in wage payments of $452 million would be required to raise to $1.15 the wages of the estimated 2,420,000 employees who were paid less than that amount. Special wage surveys conducted by the Department of Labor in the fall of 1960 indicate that the impact of these rates would be substantially less than was estimated a year ago. It is now estimated that an increase in wage payments of $336 million, on an annual basis, would be required to raise to $1.15 the wages of the 1,906,000 covered employees who are now paid less than that amount. This substantial reduction in the indicated wage impact of a minimum rate of $1.15 should remove any doubt as to the ability of employers to adjust to a 15-cent increase immediately without substantially curtailing employment.

During the second year, the 1,906,000 employees now paid less than $1.15 an hour and the 511,000 who are paid between $1.15 and $1.20 would receive wages amounting to $558 million more than they are now being paid. After the second year, these 2,417,000 workers and the 604,000 who are now paid between $1.20 and $1.25 would receive wages amounting to $836 million more than they are now being paid.

For newly protected workers, the initial minimum wage rate would be $1 an hour. The rate would be increased to $1.05 after 1 year, to $1.15 after 2 years, and to $1.25 after 3 years. Thus, employers of the newly protected workers would be allowed 3 years to make the adjustment to the $1.25 minimum rate to insure that the adjustment could be made without substantial curtailment of employment.

Although the minimum rate of $1.25 for newly protected workers would not be established before 3 years had elapsed, low paid workers would receive substantial increases in wages before that time. During the first year, the 804,000 workers who are paid less than $1 would receive wage increases amounting to $242 million. During the second year, these 804,000 workers and the 147,000 who are paid between $1 and $1.05 would receive increases to $1.05, amounting to $100 million on an annual basis. During the third year, these 951,000 workers and the 389,000 who are paid between $1.05 and $1.15 would receive increases to $1.15, amounting to $234 million. During the fourth year, these 1,340,000 workers and 325,000 who are paid between $1.15 and $1.25 would receive increases to $1.25, amounting to $293 million. Thus, the 1,665,000 employees who are now paid less than $1.25 an hour would, after 3 years, be receiving annually $867 million more than they are now being paid.

(2) OVERTIME PROVISIONS

The bill would retain the 40-hour workweek standard for employees now protected by the act.

For newly protected workers, no maximum hours requirement would be established during the first year so that their employers could make the initial adjustment to the minimum wage before being required to comply with an overtime provision. Subsequently, employers would be allowed 2 years in which to adjust to a 40-hour workweek. During the second year after its effective date, the bill would require that the newly protected workers be paid one and one-half times their regular rates of pay for hours over 44 in a workweek, during the third year for hours over 42, and thereafter, for hours over 40. Except for the 1-year delay this maximum workweek schedule corresponds with that of the original act of 1938, which also provided a 44-hour workweek during the first year, a 42-hour workweek during the second year, and a 40-hour workweek thereafter.

(3) EXPANSION OF COVERAGE

The bill would extend minimum wage protection to an additional 4.3 million employees, including 2.9 million employees in retail and service enterprises. It would also extend the overtime and child labor provisions of the act. This extension of the act's benefits would be accomplished, however, without deviating from its present interstate commerce basis of coverage. Individual employees "engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" would continue to be covered by the act. In addition, a new category of employees—those employed in certain enterprises engaged in such activities—would be brought within the act's coverage.

"Enterprise" would mean the related activities performed by any person for a common business purpose of providing goods or services, or a combination of them, to others.

It would include all such activities, whether they were performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units. However, the term as used in the bill does not include eleemosynary, religious, or educational organizations not operated for profit.

A locally owned and controlled retail or service establishment would not be considered other than a separate enterprise because of a franchise or group purchasing or group advertising arrangement with other establishments, or because it occupies premises leased to it by a person who also leases premises to other establishments.

Under the bill the term "enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" includes five specifically described categories in which one or more employees are so engaged, including employees who handle, sell, or otherwise work on goods that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person. If an enterprise comes within one of these five categories, all of its employees are covered regardless of their duties. However, employees of certain of the enterprises would continue to be exempt from the act's minimum wage and overtime provisions, and still others would be exempt from the overtime provisions only.

The first category of new coverage is any enterprise which has one or more retail or service establishments if the enterprise has at least $1 million in annual gross volume of sales, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated.

The second category is any enterprise which has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning or clothes repairing if the enterprise has at least $1 million in annual gross volume of sales, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated.

The third category is any enterprise where the employer is engaged in operating a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway or local trolley or motorbus carrier, regardless of sales volume.

The fourth category is any establishment not included in any of the enterprises listed above which has an annual gross volume of sales of at least $250,000 ($350,000 in the case of an establishment engaged in construction), exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated.

The fifth category is any gasoline service establishment having an annual gross volume of sales of at least $250,000.

A proviso to the definition of "enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" would exclude so-called mom and pop stores. Under its provisions, if the only employees of an establishment are its owner or persons standing in the relationship of parent, spouse, or child of such owner, the establishment would not be considered as, or part of, such an enterprise and its sales would not be included for the purpose of determining whether an enterprise is in one of the categories heretofore mentioned.

(4) DEFINITIONS

Apart from the definitions already referred to in connection with coverage, the definition of wage in section 3(m) of the act would be modified by giving the Secretary authority to determine the fair value of facilities furnished by the employer on the basis of average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. The bill also provides that the cost of board, lodging or other facilities would not be included as a part of wages if excluded by a bona fide collective bargaining agreement.

The bill would add a new section 3(p) to the act defining "American vessel" as a vessel which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States. An amendment to section 6(b) of the act would require the payment to seamen on American vessels of not less than the rate which will provide them, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the minimum hourly rate applicable to other employees newly subject to the act. Off-duty periods provided by employment agreements or periods when the employee is not at the direction of a superior officer either performing work or standing by would be excluded from hours worked.

(5) EXEMPTIONS

The minimum wage and overtime exemptions provided by sections 13(a)(2), 13(a)(4) and 13(a)(13) of the act for certain retail or service establishments would be made inapplicable to employees of enterprises meeting the new coverage test provided by the bill, with the following exceptions: (1) employees of motion picture theaters; and (2) employees of hotels, motels, or restaurants.

In addition to making the minimum wage and overtime exemption in section 13(a)(3) inapplicable in laundry and cleaning establishments of enterprises which have annual receipts of $1 million or more, the bill would remove the exemption for employees of laundry and cleaning establishments which have annual sales of between $250,000 and $1 million and which are in "substantial competition in the same metropolitan area" with an establishment that does at least 50 percent of its business in interstate commerce.

The minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees employed in a local retailing capacity would be removed.

The minimum wage exemption applicable to employees engaged in fish processing and distributing fish and related products would be limited to offshore activities.

The minimum wage and overtime exemption for switchboard operators in any public telephone exchange with no more than 750 stations would be replaced with an exemption for operators in any independently owned public telephone exchange which has no more than 750 stations.

The minimum wage exemption for employees of local transit companies would be removed.

The minimum wage exemption for seamen would be made inapplicable to seamen employed on a vessel which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States.

An overtime exemption would be added for employees of gasoline service stations.

An overtime exemption would be added for salesmen of automobiles and trucks employed by a retail or service establishment.

The 14-week seasonal industry exemption under which overtime payment is not required except for work in excess of 12 hours a day or 56 hours a week would continue. The bill would also provide a 14-workweek exemption (with same hours of work limitation as referred to above) for the first processing, etc., of fresh fruits or vegetables and the first processing in the area of production of any agricultural or horticultural commodity during seasonal operations. If an industry qualifies for both exemptions it would be eligible for an aggregate of 20 weeks in any calendar year, of which not more than 10 weeks may be of unlimited hours, and 10 weeks of limited hours.

(6) AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE MORE EFFECTIVE PROCEDURES FOR ENFORCING THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

Under the present provisions of the act, the Secretary of Labor has no authority to require the payment of minimum wages and overtime compensation not paid in compliance with the law, except where an employee requests that an action be brought by the Secretary. The bill therefore also includes an amendment to the act which would establish a more effective method of enforcing the act by authorizing the Federal courts to order the payment of the actual amount of unpaid minimum wages or overtime compensation to employees in injunctive actions brought under section 17. In this way, employers found by the courts to be unlawfully withholding from employees minimum wages and overtime compensation owing under the act could be required to make payments of the amounts found due by the courts, without the necessity of the employee or employees involved initiating or requesting such action.

In calendar year 1960, investigative activities of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions revealed an estimated $30 million in unpaid minimum wages and overtime compensation for nearly 200,000 employees. Of this amount, $16 million has not been paid, and the Secretary has no authority, in the absence of an employee request, to require payment.

Since the Department of Labor can make compliance investigations of only approximately 5 percent of all currently covered establishments in 1 year, the investigations undertaken must have a spreading effect. If an adequate level of compliance with the law is to be achieved, these investigations must result in continuing compliance in establishments investigated and also in furthering compliance in uninvestigated establishments.

The proposed amendment would make these investigations much more effective by providing a practical method for requiring payment of the amounts of any wages or overtime compensation which an employer has failed or refused to pay, as required by the act. Placing the probability of financial liability on those employers who are presently careless of their obligations under the act would increase the level of compliance with the statute, and would protect complying employers from the unfair wage competition of the noncomplying employers.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 35 OF THE MINERAL LEASING ACT OF 1920

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under the act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 898) to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act, introduced by Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. McGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, the principal provision of this bill would return to the States 90 percent of the income derived within their borders under terms of the Mineral Leasing Act.

Under present law each State receives 37½ percent of such income; 52½ percent goes into the Federal reclamation fund; the remaining 10 percent is paid into the Federal Treasury. Our bill proposes to add that portion which now goes to the reclamation fund to the share returned the State in which the income was produced.

This bill should in no way impair the financing of those Federal reclamation projects which have done so much to develop our great Western States. The Federal Government is finally reimbursed by the users for its expenditures on these projects.

In many public-land States the Federal Government owns more than half the total acreage; in my own State of Wyoming, for instance, it owns 52 percent of the surface outright and the mineral rights on another 13 percent of the land. We of the public-land States need the revenue earned from our lands to meet the increasing demands placed upon the States.

The bill itself is based upon three major premises: First, that a similar bill was previously introduced by a gentleman very dear to me, a former Senator from Wyoming, the late Senator Lester C. Hunt; second, that the history of this type of legislation indicates quite clearly that the States east of the Mississippi have never been confronted with certain problems with which we in the West are confronted; and, third, that more recently, Alaska and Hawaii have been given a greater proportion of their mineral rights.

In addition, there is great equity on the side of a larger share of income from mineral production for the States, and at a later time I shall document this and put it in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce two bills, and I ask that they be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, may I say that they are introduced on behalf of myself and the following Senators: Messrs. LONG of Louisiana, HUMPHREY, MORSE, BARTLETT, RANDOLPH, ENGLE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MOSS, SALTONSTALL, JAVITS, and COOPER.

The bills relate to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that the bills may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and also that the bills may lie on the table for 1 week to allow other Senators to cosponsor them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bills introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 902. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1961."

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, unless otherwise indicated, references to "the Act" are to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended.

SEC. 3. Section 302(a) of the Act is amended by deleting the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "In order to facilitate the formation and growth of small business investment companies, the administration is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to purchase the debentures of any such company in an amount not to exceed the lesser of $1,000,000 or the amount of the capital and surplus of the small business investment company from other sources."

SEC. 4. Section 303(b) of the Act is amended by deleting the words "50 per centum" and inserting, in lieu thereof, the words "100 per centum."

SEC. 5. Section 304 of the Act is amended by adding the following subsection "(d) equity capital provided to incorporated small business concerns under this section may be provided directly or in cooperation with other investors, public or private, incorporated or unincorporated, through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis."

SEC. 6. Section 305(b) is amended by deleting the phrase "other lending institutions" and inserting in lieu thereof, "other lenders, public or private, incorporated or unincorporated, including the Small Business Administration."

SEC. 7. Section 308(a) of the Act is amended to read, "Wherever practicable the operations of a small business investment company, including the generation of business, may be undertaken in cooperation with banks or other investors or lenders, public or private, incorporated or unincorporated, and any servicing or initial investigation required for loans or acquisitions of securities by the company under the provisions of this Act may be handled through such banks or other investors or lenders on a fee basis. Any small business investment company may receive fees for services rendered to such banks or other investors or lenders."

SEC. 8. The last sentence of section 308(b) of the Act is amended by striking "guaranteed as to principal and interest by," and inserting in lieu thereof "insured by instrumentalities of."

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act, the Investment Company Act of 1940, or any other Act shall be construed as preventing any small business investment company from issuing "restricted stock options" qualifying under Internal Revenue Code (1954) section 421 (26 U.S.C. 421), as amended, and such "restricted stock options" are hereby specifically authorized.

SEC. 10. Section 502 of the Act is amended by striking subsection 6 thereof.

S. 903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Finance.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for losses) is amended by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i), and by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

"(h) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—

"(1) RESERVE FOR LOSSES ON CERTAIN INVESTMENTS.—In the case of a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, there shall be allowed, in lieu of any deduction under subsection (a) for any loss sustained on any investment described in section 1243(1), a deduction for a reasonable addition to a reserve for losses on such investments.

"(2) AMOUNT OF ADDITION TO RESERVE.—The reasonable addition to a reserve for losses under paragraph (1) for any taxable year shall in no case be less than the amount determined by the taxpayer as the reasonable addition for such year; except that the amount determined by the taxpayer under this paragraph shall not be greater than the lesser of—

"(A) the amount of its taxable income for the taxable year, computed without regard to this section, or

"(B) the amount by which 20 per centum of the taxpayer's total investments described in section 1243(1) at the close of the taxable year with respect to losses on which this section applies, exceeds its reserve for losses on such investments at the beginning of the taxable year."

(b) Section 166 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for bad debts) is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h), and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—In the case of a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the reasonable addition to a reserve for bad debts under subsection (c) for any taxable year shall in no case be less than the amount determined by the taxpayer as the reasonable addition for such year; except that the amount determined by the taxpayer under this subsection shall not be greater than the lesser of—

"(1) the amount of its taxable income for the taxable year, computed without regard to this section, or

"(2) the amount by which 20 per centum of the taxpayer's total loans to and investments in small business concerns at the close of the taxable year with respect to which this section applies, exceeds its reserves for bad debts at the beginning of the taxable year."

SEC. 2. Section 532(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from accumulated earnings tax) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 542(c)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exception of small business investment companies from definition of personal holding company) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of the preceding sentence, a shareholder of a small business investment company shall not be considered as owning any proprietary interest in or stock of a small business concern solely by reason of his ownership directly or indirectly of stock of such small business investment company."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 851(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for definition of regulated investment company) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) which, at all times during the taxable year, is a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (whether or not registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended)."

(b) Section 851(b) of such Code (relating to limitations on definition of regulated in-

vestment company) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not apply to any corporation which is a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, whether or not such company is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 1243(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to losses of small business investment companies) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) a loss is on equity securities (including stock received pursuant to a conversion or exchange privilege) acquired pursuant to section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and in accordance with regulations of the Small Business Administration prescribed under such section, and".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after June 11, 1960.

SEC. 6. Section 1371(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of small business corporation) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) have as a shareholder a person (other than an estate or a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958) who is not an individual;".

SEC. 7. Except as provided in sections 3 and 5 of this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

IMPROVEMENT OF PROVISIONS FOR THE BLIND UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference five bills to improve the aid to the blind provisions of the social security program.

These improvements are designed to make assistance to the blind a help, rather than a hindrance—as now—toward rehabilitation. They will help change the status of the blind from needy persons to taxpaying citizens.

During the 86th Congress I introduced a bill, S. 3449, which proposed to transform the federally supported State aid to the blind programs conducted in accordance with the provisions of title X of the Social Security Act from programs offering only the barest minimum subsistence to needy blind persons, to programs offering these people an opportunity to achieve their own rehabilitation—to achieve economic independence through their own efforts.

I was very gratified when the social security amendments passed by Congress last year contained one of the provisions of my bill. This provision changed the earned income exemption for blind aid recipients from the fixed and inflexible amount of $50 per month of earned income, to the flexible formula of $85 of monthly earned income, plus one-half of the monthly earned income in excess of this amount. The incorporation of this sliding-scale formula into the Federal aid to the blind law will not only allow, but will encourage and stimulate energetic, ambitious blind men and women to work their way from dependence upon public assistance to the attainment of full and satisfying economic self-sufficiency.

Amending title X of the Social Security Act so as to increase the earned income of blind aid recipients was a fine and praiseworthy action by Congress. I am proud that I had a part in this achievement; but our blind fellow citizens need much more help than this in their struggle to free themselves from the public assistance rolls, in their valiant struggle to gain economic independence, to live productive and satisfying lives.

Although thousands of blind persons, recipients of public assistance, are able-bodied and employable, with skills, aptitudes, and talents qualifying them to engage in many fields of economic endeavor—and although many blind men and women are employed in just about every economic imaginable pursuit—still it is difficult for them to obtain work commensurate with their talents and abilities—it is very difficult for them to obtain work of any kind—and all because of public attitudes which even now, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, continue to regard blindness as a condition of helplessness, continue to regard blind people as helpless and hopelessly dependent.

For a blind person to establish himself in a small business or to enter upon the practice of a trade or a profession requires much courage, determination, and effort without limit. These men and women deserve our highest commendation; but, even more, they deserve our help, all of the help and encouragement we can possibly give them. And we can give them the help and the encouragement they need and so richly deserve by enacting into law the bills I am introducing today. For all of these bills are designed to make public aid to the blind programs a help, rather than a hindrance—as they now are—toward rehabilitation for those who must seek financial assistance from these programs.

The five bills do the following:

First. Provides that real and personal property to a minimum amount of $3,000—assessed valuation less encumbrances—may be possessed by blind aid recipients, and they shall be allowed to possess and retain additional amounts of such property as may be needed to fulfill an approved plan for their rehabilitation.

This bill recognizes that, if a man who is blind is to rebuild his life, he will need and should have available for his use such property as he has to help him on his difficult road back to economic self-sufficiency.

It also recognizes that to completely pauperize a man is to so demean and degrade him that it may serve to convince him of his utter worthlessness as an individual. It may serve to confirm in him a spirit of futility and defeatism—the very reverse of the attitude he must have to achieve rehabilitation—and as a direct result he may never make that extra effort needed if rehabilitation is to be achieved.

Second. Establishes equal minimum payments for blind aid recipients with each State to determine its own particular equal minimum payment in accordance with its own circumstances and conditions.

Enactment into law of this proposal would entitle all eligible blind persons to a specified minimum amount of financial assistance to meet their basic needs. It would diminish the need for extensive investigations to establish eligibility and would allow blind aid recipients to retain control over their own lives, a control which is gradually assumed under the present system prevailing in public assistance, by the social workers who determine the recipients' needs, resources available to meet their needs, and how much they may spend for each item of their particular budget.

The bill recognizes the need to encourage initiative, the need to strengthen a spirit of independence in blind aid recipients if they are to successfully make the transition from dependence upon public aid to independent lives.

Third. Eliminates the obligation of the relatives of a needy blind person to contribute toward his support.

To require relatives of a blind aid recipient to contribute financially toward his support is to make the blind person a burden upon his family. Inevitably, animosities develop toward the blind person because of the hardships or inconveniences which result to the family from this additional drain upon its resources and reserves.

This bill recognizes that the blind person's needs must be a concern of the total community, that meeting these needs is an obligation of the total community—the needy blind person's needs are an obligation of his family only to the extent that the members of the family are a part of the total community. Just as the blind person's needs and the satisfaction of these needs are an obligation of the entire community, a responsibility of all, so the restoration of the needy blind person to a productive, contributory life will be a gain for all, a benefit shared by the entire community.

Fourth. Prohibits the practice in aid to the blind of granting assistance to needy blind persons only upon the condition that they subject their property to a lien or similar encumbrance.

It is my belief that, if a blind person requiring public assistance is so fortunate as to possess a home or other property, he should be allowed to retain it, free from the imposition of liens or encumbrances by the public assistance authorities, so that this property may be available for his use, to assist him to return to normal life and livelihood.

Fifth. Increases the Federal financial contribution in federally supported State aid to the blind programs in order that payments to needy blind persons may more adequately meet the minimum needs of those who must apply for urgently needed financial help.

This bill proposes to raise from $65 to $75 the ceiling on the matching of State funds by the Federal Government and to increase the Federal share of the monthly average payment from the present $24 of the first $30 to $30 of the first $35.

Enactment of this bill into law will help to bring up blind aid payments in the Nation to a point where they will more nearly meet minimum standards of dignity, decency, and health.

Mr. President, adoption of the five aid-to-the-blind bills I have introduced today will finally give meaning and effect to the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act which provide that, among other things, self-care and self-support should be considered as objectives of the various federally assisted public aid programs.

The purpose of my bills is to so reconstruct title X of the Social Security Act that needy blind persons will be helped to change their status from needy persons to taxpaying persons; that they will be helped to achieve the goals of self-care and self-respect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 904. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment of equal minimum monthly payments for recipients of aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title;

S. 905. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that considerations with respect to the ability of the family or relatives of a blind individual to provide for his support shall be disregarded in determining his need for aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title;

S. 906. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide for increased Federal financial participation in State programs of aid to the blind established pursuant to such title;

S. 907. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to prohibit the States from requiring that an individual encumber, or divest himself of, title to his property as a condition of eligibility for aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title; and

S. 908. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to liberalize the restrictions with respect to possession of property or other resources imposed as a condition of eligibility for aid to the blind under State programs established pursuant to such title.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) to amend the joint resolution of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 9 of the joint resolution of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended, entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Civil War, and for other purposes", is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, not to exceed $125,000 in any one fiscal year."

PLAN TO MAKE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT REFLECT THE VOTE OF THE STATES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, demands for a change in the method of electing the President and Vice President have increased since the last election where the total electoral vote of many States went one way or the other by very small margins, and and where some electors did not vote in accord with the majority or plurality given by the people of their States.

Proposals for reform, however, run into various objections. To meet those objections and also to make possible the required ratification by three-fourths of the States, I have had drawn and do now introduce a constitutional amendment which would, first, abolish the electoral college; second, preserve for each State presidential unit votes equal to the number of their Senators and Representatives; and, third, divide those votes between the candidates according to what they get yet avoid the splintering effect of ordinary proportional voting by requiring that a candidate receive at least one-third of the votes in a given State to get any of its presidential unit votes.

The one-third requirement makes it possible for even the smallest State with two Senators and one Representative to have its presidential vote reflect its popular vote.

The advantages of this plan are these:

First. No defections by presidential electors. There would be no electors.

Second. No gerrymandering of districts. There would be no districts.

Third. No winner-take-all of a State's votes by razor-thin margins. The last fraction would decide only the final presidential unit vote of a State.

Fourth. No burden on candidates or political committees to target their campaign to districts. The ability of special interest or bloc voting to swing a State's entire electoral vote would be eliminated.

Fifth. No burden on voters to learn new presidential district lines. The State would continue to be the only presidential district.

Sixth. No State would lose its presently constitutionally guaranteed voice in presidential selection. The presidential unit votes of any State would continue to be equal to the number of its Senators and Representatives.

Seventh. And positively, it should be pointed out that this plan would increase the importance of voting. Each individual voter could be assured that his vote would count in determining the result whether he voted with the majority or minority in his particular State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a further statement I have prepared, an analysis of how the plan would have worked in the case of the 1960 presidential election, and also the text of the proposed constitutional amendment may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible for that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Each State shall be entitled to a number of presidential and vice presidential unit votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. There shall be held in each State an election to determine what candidates for the offices of President and Vice President shall receive the presidential and vice presidential unit votes of that State and the number of such votes each shall receive. Voters in such election shall vote for the candidate of a political party for President and for the candidate of the same political party for Vice President. The voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The places and manner of holding such election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of President and Vice President is to begin.

"SEC. 3. On or before the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December following the election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists showing the number of votes cast in such State for each of the candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. On the sixth day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the fourth day of January and not later than the tenth day of January, the President of the Senate shall in the presence

of the House of Representatives open all the certificates and the result of the election shall then be ascertained. For such purpose, the presidential unit votes of a State shall be divided among the candidates for President as follows:

"(1) If each of two candidates receives more than one-third of the total popular votes received by all candidates, each of such two candidates shall receive a number of presidential unit votes which bears the same ratio to the total of such presidential unit votes as the number of popular votes received by him bears to the number of popular votes received by both such candidates, except that (a) where such candidates would be entitled to unequal fractional parts of a presidential unit vote, such unit vote shall be given to the candidate entitled to the major fractional part thereof, unless each such candidate would thereby become entitled to an equal number of presidential unit votes, in which case it shall be given to the candidate receiving the greater number of popular votes, and (b) where such candidates would be entitled to equal fractional parts of a presidential unit vote, such vote shall be given to the candidate receiving the greater number of popular votes, unless they received an equal number of popular votes, in which case such unit vote shall be divided equally between them.

"(2) If the candidate of only one political party receives more than one-third of the total popular votes received by all candidates, the candidate of that political party shall receive all of the presidential unit votes.

"(3) If no candidate receives more than one-third of the total popular votes received by all candidates, the presidential unit votes of such State shall be divided in the manner prescribed by paragraph (1) between the two candidates receiving the greatest number of popular votes.

"The vice presidential unit votes of a State shall be divided among the candidates for Vice President in the same manner.

"The person having the greatest number of presidential unit votes shall be the President, if such number is a majority of the whole number of such votes; and if no person has such a majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those receiving presidential unit votes, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. In choosing the President the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.

"The person receiving the greatest number of vice presidential unit votes shall be the Vice President, if such number is a majority of the whole number of such votes; and if no person has such a majority, then from the persons having the two highest numbers on the list of those receiving vice presidential unit votes, the Senate shall choose the Vice President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any person who, except for his death, would have been entitled to receive a majority of the presidential or vice presidential unit votes.

"SEC. 4. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, Article II, of the Constitution, and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 5. This article shall apply to the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents whose regular terms begin more than two years after its ratification.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

The statement presented by Mr. CASE of South Dakota is as follows:

PROPOSAL FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORAL SYSTEM

We have seen in the last few months what possibly will be the last erratic performance of the electoral college. I am hopeful that this time the determination for change is strong enough to succeed.

Governments which derive their legitimacy from expressions of the popular will through the electoral process must be grounded upon a true reflection of the popular will. Our constitutional system is held by our people to be a vehicle for the empowering of their choice of leaders as that choice is expressed in the electoral process.

The fact that a government can be empowered through the erratic and unpredictable workings of an undisciplined system of national elections in this country constitutes a menace to the legitimacy of our Government. The interjection between our citizens and their choice for President of an intermediate group who are not legally bound to elect the choice expressed by the voters constitutes a cruel perversion of what has been for well over a century the almost universally acknowledged source of power of the President of the United States—election by the people.

However the electoral college was intended to function, we know that it is not in that way functioning. The electors are not members of their communities selected by the people as best suited to decide for whom the vote of the community should be cast. They are, instead, expected to be transmitters of the choice of the people. Despite this the electors are legally able to distort the expressed will of the people.

PROPOSALS UNDER CONSIDERATION

This situation has long been recognized. This body is at present considering several newly offered variations of meritorious proposals which have previously been considered.

The proposals are of three basic types. The first is to make the election of President and Vice President wholly determined by the total popular vote of the Nation, abolishing the method of casting the vote for President and Vice President by State units. The second proposal is to retain the concept of voting by units, but to change the unit itself from the State to a more compact body, thereby making the unit vote more nearly reflective of the will of the people of the area. The third is to retain the State-unit system but to divide proportionally the unit vote among the various candidates.

These proposals are not new, but they are good proposals. That they are good proposals is attested to by the fact that they have been so often disinterred. They would each largely correct the faults at which they are aimed. But none of these proposals has ever been accepted. And they are not likely to be accepted now for the same reasons that they have before been rejected.

INTENTIONS OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS

The writers of the Constitution intended in the design of the electoral college not only to interpose between the people and the selection of the President of the United States a device to make for a wiser choice than a popularity contest might make, but they intended also to provide a protection for the smaller States and the newer States to better allow them to safeguard their interests against those of the larger States.

The Connecticut compromise, which led that colony to join the Union, gave all States two Senators, regardless of size, and based presidential electors on Senators as well as Representatives. These two electors for each State's two Senators, historically gave smaller rural States some strength to offset the immigrant population that tended to cluster in cities. Since 33 of the 50 States benefit by that provision and since 37 States would have to ratify a constitutional change, it is doubtful that direct election by popular vote can be achieved regardless of what arguments may now be advanced.

Most citizens of the newer States or of those whose populations are small are not prepared to surrender their strengthened status. They value this status. These States were given this status by the Constitution and there is no constitutional way of depriving them of it without the consent of many of them.

CONGRESSIONAL OR ELECTORAL DISTRICT PROPOSAL

The proposal to base the presidential election on congressional or electoral district units would deliver one electoral vote to the candidate receiving the majority of the popular vote cast in each district with provision to make consequential victory in each State by delivering to the candidate who receives the most popular votes two additional electoral votes.

I believe that such a system would be more equitable than is our present system. There are objections, however, which I consider to be fatal to this proposal. One objection concerns unequal representation. Another concerns the gerrymander.

We all know that the people of the various congressional districts are not equally represented. Some of these districts contain three or four times the number of people who reside in others. In my own State of South Dakota under a congressional district system and in accordance with the present apportionment, the vote of a person living on the west bank of the Missouri River would carry an influence equal to three votes of persons living on the east bank of that river. This could also be made true of electoral districts to be established by the State legislatures.

Too, and especially now after the decennial census, we are all mindful of the gerrymander. The boundaries of congressional districts are too often drawn so as to overrepresent the weight of one political party at the expense of another. I see no reason for inviting this kind of activity into the realm of the election of President and Vice President of the United States. I do not believe that in an effort to correct one fault in our electoral process we should knowingly make provision for other faults of this magnitude.

A MODIFIED ELECTORAL PROPOSAL

So, Mr. President, I am introducing a Senate joint resolution for deliberation as a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It may take a few words to be technically correct, its effect is simple and clear.

This is to abolish the electoral college but yet to retain the State-unit method of voting and to proportion the votes cast by each State between the candidates who receive more than one-third of the popular vote.

I believe, Mr. President, that such a system would utilize the better features of proportional representation, the giving a voice to a substantial minority, but would prevent the extreme splintering of parties which some forms of proportional representation encourage. This is the telling objection to other proposals before this Congress in previous years and again before this Congress at present calling for the adaptation of some form of proportional representation to our electoral system.

The prospect of splinter parties each representing a small percentage of the voters of the country attempting to form governing coalitions which could well be unstable is not attractive to the American voter. This measure which I recommend would remove such a potentiality by requiring that a party, to obtain any unit votes in a State, must attract over one-third of the popular vote.

These other proposals have been before the country at other times and have been rejected.

The approval of this resolution would recognize the historical position of the States of smaller population and of the newer States but would give meaning in every State to the presidential election.

It would avoid the throwing of a whole State bloc of votes on a paper thin margin. At the same time it would make it worthwhile to vote in every State since nearly all votes would then have impact on the national result.

EXAMPLES OF APPLICATION

Examples drawn from the recent presidential election and applied to the system I propose demonstrate its intention.

In Illinois there was a margin of 8,858 votes between the Democrat and the Republican candidate. On the strength of these 8,000-plus votes the 27 electoral votes representing the 4¾ million voters in Illinois were cast. This 8,000-vote margin negated the 2,368,988 votes cast in Illinois for the Republican candidate.

By the proposal I offer Illinois would have divided its vote: 14 votes for the Democrat candidate to 13 votes for the Republican candidate.

A senatorial race, directly affecting only one State, is different. Such a contest is an act complete in itself, necessitating that the votes for one candidate for the Senate be nullified by the fact that another attracted more votes.

The election of a President, elected to be President of all the States, is a process of which the individual State elections are only contributory. The nullification of the losing candidate's vote must ultimately occur, but to allow this on the State level is a distortion of a fair election process.

In a presidential election a small margin of votes in each of a few large States can swing the national election against the candidate with the most popular votes. The composite votes of the losing candidates who attract significant support in the States should carry weight nationally.

Further examples are readily cited. Hawaii cast 3 electoral votes for Mr. Kennedy on the strength of 115 popular votes. By the method I support the margin would have been 2 to 1.

California, instead of casting 32 electoral votes for Mr. Nixon on the strength of 35,000 popular votes would have divided—17 votes for the winner and 15 for the loser. The 35,000-vote plurality would have decided to whom the last two votes should go, not to whom the entire bloc of 32 should go.

This method of election would correct the situation in several of the States where a voter feels that, since his vote would not count anyway, there is no reason to vote. Nearly all votes cast for a major candidate would count in the national tally.

A MORE ACCURATE REFLECTION OF THE POPULAR VOTE

Had this method been in effect at the time of the recent election, Mr. Kennedy would have won the election but by a much smaller margin—271 unit votes to 261 with 5 unpledged. I am including for the record the results of the recent election for all the States had the count been computed by this method.

LESS CAMPAIGN STRAIN

Since we talk of easing the strain of the campaign on the candidates, we should apply this consideration to the electoral district electoral vote proposal now before the Congress.

If that measure were adopted, the campaign for the presidential election would shift from the level of the State to that of the electoral district, multiplying the burden and the expense of campaigning. The character of the electoral district would then be unduly emphasized. The appeal would be directed to the more restricted interests of the district instead of to the broader interests of the State, for the presidential candidate would be the victim of those considerations important to blocs of voters in each district. The issues of the entire campaign would thereby be atomized.

The State could delimit electoral districts almost as it pleased, but to impose its reasons for its delimitation on the presidential candidate would be unduly to impose the reasons of the State on the entire Nation.

This proposal which I offer seeks to make valuable every vote cast for a major candidate.

It seeks to recognize the historical position of the States.

It seeks to heed the just criticism that a large bloc of votes in a State can be nullified by the fact that only a few more votes were cast for another candidate.

It would prevent the rise of splinter parties and the specter of coalition governments which are often encouraged by other proportional representation systems.

It would retain the protected status of the 33 smaller and newer States; and, significantly, it would make it possible to obtain ratification of an electoral reform measure.

Other proposals are before the Congress. I hope they may all be analyzed and studied by the committee staff and that hearings may be had early in this session.

The 1960 presidential election

POPULAR VOTE

Nixon-Lodge	34,108,474
Kennedy-Johnson	34,221,531

ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Nixon-Lodge	219
Kennedy-Johnson	303
Others	15

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT VOTE (AS COMPUTED BY THIS SYSTEM)

Nixon-Lodge	261
Kennedy-Johnson	271
Unpledged	5
Nixon-Lodge	5
Kennedy-Johnson	6
Alabama	11
Nixon-Lodge	2
Kennedy-Johnson	1
Alaska	3
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	1
Arizona	4
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	5
Arkansas	8
Nixon-Lodge	17
Kennedy-Johnson	15
California	32

The 1960 presidential election—Continued

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT VOTE (AS COMPUTED BY THIS SYSTEM)—continued

Nixon-Lodge	4
Kennedy-Johnson	2
Colorado	6
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	5
Connecticut	8
Nixon-Lodge	1
Kennedy-Johnson	2
Delaware	3
Nixon-Lodge	6
Kennedy-Johnson	4
Florida	10
Nixon-Lodge	4
Kennedy-Johnson	8
Georgia	12
Nixon-Lodge	1
Kennedy-Johnson	2
Hawaii	3
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	1
Idaho	4
Nixon-Lodge	13
Kennedy-Johnson	14
Illinois	27
Nixon-Lodge	7
Kennedy-Johnson	6
Indiana	13
Nixon-Lodge	6
Kennedy-Johnson	4
Iowa	10
Nixon-Lodge	5
Kennedy-Johnson	3
Kansas	8
Nixon-Lodge	6
Kennedy-Johnson	4
Kentucky	10
Nixon-Lodge	0
Kennedy-Johnson	10
Louisiana	10
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	2
Maine	5
Nixon-Lodge	4
Kennedy-Johnson	5
Maryland	9
Nixon-Lodge	6
Kennedy-Johnson	10
Massachusetts	16
Nixon-Lodge	9
Kennedy-Johnson	11
Michigan	20

The 1960 presidential election—Continued

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT VOTE (AS COMPUTED BY THIS SYSTEM)—continued

Nixon-Lodge	5
Kennedy-Johnson	6
Minnesota	11
Nixon-Lodge	0
Kennedy-Johnson	3
Unpledged	5
Mississippi	8
Nixon-Lodge	6
Kennedy-Johnson	7
Missouri	13
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	1
Montana	4
Nixon-Lodge	4
Kennedy-Johnson	2
Nebraska	6
Nixon-Lodge	1
Kennedy-Johnson	2
Nevada	3
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	1
New Hampshire	4
Nixon-Lodge	7
Kennedy-Johnson	9
New Jersey	16
Nixon-Lodge	1
Kennedy-Johnson	3
New Mexico	4
Nixon-Lodge	21
Kennedy-Johnson	24
New York	45
Nixon-Lodge	6
Kennedy-Johnson	8
North Carolina	14
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	1
North Dakota	4
Nixon-Lodge	13
Kennedy-Johnson	12
Ohio	25
Nixon-Lodge	5
Kennedy-Johnson	3
Oklahoma	8
Nixon-Lodge	4
Kennedy-Johnson	2
Oregon	6
Nixon-Lodge	15
Kennedy-Johnson	17
Pennsylvania	32
Nixon-Lodge	1
Kennedy-Johnson	3
Rhode Island	4

The 1960 presidential election—Continued

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT VOTE (AS COMPUTED BY THIS SYSTEM)—continued

Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	5
South Carolina	8
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	1
South Dakota	4
Nixon-Lodge	6
Kennedy-Johnson	5
Tennessee	11
Nixon-Lodge	11
Kennedy-Johnson	13
Texas	24
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	1
Utah	4
Nixon-Lodge	2
Kennedy-Johnson	1
Vermont	3
Nixon-Lodge	7
Kennedy-Johnson	5
Virginia	12
Nixon-Lodge	5
Kennedy-Johnson	4
Washington	9
Nixon-Lodge	3
Kennedy-Johnson	5
West Virginia	8
Nixon-Lodge	7
Kennedy-Johnson	5
Wisconsin	12
Nixon-Lodge	2
Kennedy-Johnson	1
Wyoming	3

YOUTH APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BENNETT, BRIDGES, JAVITS, PROUTY, SCOTT, and WILEY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution establishing an annual Youth Appreciation Week. I believe, that by recognizing the overwhelming majority of our young people who bring credit to their families, communities, and country, we shall be able to remove the spotlight presently placed upon the deeds of a minority of our youth who persist in acts of juvenile delinquency.

Not only will this resolution recognize the outstanding qualities of American youth, but at the same time it will show a respect for the dedicated work in the interest of youth by the many religious, civic, and fraternal groups throughout our land.

In connection with the introduction of this resolution, I wish particularly to recognize the work of the Optimist International. This fine group has sponsored, for a number of years, Youth Appreciation Week in communities all over the United States. Its example has been instrumental in the introduction of this resolution.

Youth Appreciation Week envisions public recognition and top news coverage of the good things accomplished by our youth, thus displaying an example for young people everywhere to follow. I strongly urge that the Congress give prompt and favorable consideration to this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and that it lie on the table for 3 days, so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor this measure may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the great majority of our young people are good citizens living decent, upstanding, honest lives, and contributing generously to the heritage of our Nation and to the home, church, school, and community, and all citizens should show their appreciation to our youth for their positive accompliahments; and

Whereas in order to promote a more active participation of families in family affairs, to stimulate civic organizations and other groups to show publicly their respect for the great majority of our young people who are good citizens, to encourage all communications media to recognize youth through regular and special features and programs, to stimulate greater interest among people everywhere in providing wholesome recreational and social activities for youth, to illustrate the great influence religion has on the lives of young people and to encourage their active participation in religious activities, to encourage parents to rededicate themselves to the responsibilities of parenthood, and to encourage a greater interchange of ideas between adults and young people leading to a broader understanding of their mutual problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seven-day period beginning on the second Monday of November in each year is hereby designated as Youth Appreciation Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the 83d Congress, 1st session, on January 16, 1953, with Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, as cosponsor, I introduced Senate Resolution 35, declaring the sense of the Senate that the Republic

of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all the people of Ireland in a free plebiscite, determined and declared to the contrary.

On January 6, 1955, in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, with Senators Kennedy and MURRAY as cosponsors, I introduced Senate Resolution 11, which was identic with the resolution introduced in the 83d Congress.

On January 11, 1955, with Senators Kennedy, Murray, Purtell, and Mansfield as cosponsors, I introduced Senate Resolution 21, which was identic with the earlier resolutions.

On March 16, 1955, in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, with Senators Beall, Bender, Barrett, Kennedy, Kuchel, Malone, Langer, Mansfield, Murray, O'Mahoney, Pastore, Purtell, Kefauver, Ives, and Magnuson, I introduced Senate Resolution 81, identic with those heretofore introduced.

On January 25, 1956, in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, along with Senators Barrett, Beall, Bender, Bush, Chavez, Ives, Kennedy, Kuchel, Mansfield, McCarthy, Murray, O'Mahoney, Pastore, Purtell, Malone, Langer, and Magnuson as cosponsors, I introduced Senate Resolution 192. While it was slightly different in form, its purpose was the same, and recited that it was the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all the people in a free plebiscite determined and declared to the contrary.

Since that resolution was submitted, one of the distinguished cosponsors, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, has been elevated to the Presidency of the United States.

I again submit this resolution for appropriate reference and do hope that all who have heretofore manifested an interest in this matter will, through their good offices and efforts, undertake to achieve action on this resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 85) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas, on June 6, 1919, the United States Senate adopted resolutions favoring self-determination for the people of Ireland and the House of Representatives in the Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, adopted a House joint resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desire to live, all of which action was influential in securing freedom for twenty-six of the thirty-two counties in Ireland; and

Whereas the maintenance of internal peace and security requires settlement of the question of the unification of Ireland; and

Whereas twenty-six of the thirty-two counties of Ireland have been successful in securing international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has as its basic law a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution; and

Whereas, on the fourteenth day of December 1955, the United Nations by appropriate action admitted the Republic of Ireland into full membership into the United Nations with all the duties and responsibilities which go with such membership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless a clear majority of all of the people of Ireland in a free plebiscite determine and declare to the contrary.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL FUELS STUDY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BRIDGES, SALTONSTALL, BUSH, COTTON, MUSKIE, PROUTY, DODD, SMITH of Massachusetts, PELL, JAVITS, and PROXMIRE, I submit for appropriate reference, amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, a concurrent resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on National Fuels Study.

We in New England have been deeply concerned with the economic consequences of the mandatory oil imports restrictions program ordered by President Eisenhower in March of 1959. These restrictions have sharply curtailed the supply of residual oil into the New England States, with resulting severe economic consequences. This year alone, the oil imports restrictions will cost the New England States over $10 million in increased costs.

It is the consumer who suffers. Our electric utilities industries, which require huge quantities of residual fuel, reflect these increased fuel costs in increased electric rates. Increased costs to the manufacturer, which weaken our competitive position both in domestic and foreign markets, add to the burdens of the consumer. It is the 9 million citizens of New England—and indeed citizens throughout the East—who pay for the mandatory oil import program.

The New England Senators have repeatedly expressed their opposition to the continuation of these quotas.

We appreciate that these quotas have been imposed because of distressed conditions in certain segments of our Nation's fuel-producing industries.

Because of these distressed conditions, the fuel producing industries have asked Congress to create a committee to develop recommendations for a national fuels policy. It is their hope that this committee will be able to analyze the problems of the fuel producing industries and will make recommendations for the effective utilization of government progress to assist these industries.

We in New England feel that this is a desirable objective, and we recognize that adequate supplies of fuel and energy resources in all forms are essential for the national welfare. We recognize that the national economy depends on the maintenance of healthy basic fuel industries. We recognize that the availability of competitively priced energy resources is a matter affecting our Nation's security.

Marketing and production practices of industry, regulations by government departments and administrative agencies, import and quota considerations, and indeed, consumer preferences, all have a vital effect on the maintenance of a healthy fuel producing industry and the availability of adequate supplies for our Nation's economy. It is clear, therefore, that it is a subject calling for exhaustive study of the entire question, for coordination between government and industry, and for clear-cut recommendations in the field of national fuel policy.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, which has been filed to create a joint congressional committee to accomplish these objectives, however, is oriented almost entirely to considerations of the producing industries. The New England States produce no fuel of their own. They are completely a consuming region.

We are therefore vitally interested in this proposed study of national fuel policy, particularly as its recommendations may affect the consumer. The mandatory oil imports restrictions have made us acutely aware of Government policy and regulation in this all-important field. The amendment which I am offering today on behalf of various New England Senators is based upon an exhaustive study of fuel policy and the mandatory quota program conducted by the New England Council. These amendments would direct the committee, once established, to consider the interests of the consuming public and to consider the importance of maintaining competition in the supply and distribution of fuel to both industry and the public.

We believe that the amendments are vitally important, not only to New England but to the Nation as a whole. No study of our national fuel policy and no recommendations which might flow therefrom could be complete without a consideration of the effect of those recommendations upon the public at large. Certainly the problems of the fuel-producing industry must not be considered in a vacuum. The interrelation of those problems to other phases of our national economy is of real concern not only to the consuming public but to the long-range interests of the fuel-producing industry as well.

The inequities of the current oil imports restrictions program and the heavy price which the consuming public pays for this program demonstrate vividly the need for effective Government action in this field.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these proposed amendments be reprinted in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

On page 4, line 11, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", and between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(3) consider the interests of the consuming public, including the availability in all regions of the country of an adequate supply of various fuels at reasonable prices and

including the maintenance of a sound competitive structure in the supply and distribution of fuel to both industry and the consuming public."

On page 5, line 5, strike out "and" and after such line insert the following:

"(5) existing competitive patterns in the distribution and marketing of fuel oil including the effect on all regions of the country of adequate supplies of all types of fuels.

"(6) the effect upon the consuming public and user industries of any recommendations made under this study, and of existing governmental programs and policies now in effect.

"(7) the effect of any recommendations made pursuant to this study on economic concentrations in industry, particularly as these recommendations may affect small business enterprises engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of fuel and"

On page 5, line 6, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(8)".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator, and would have joined in these amendments except for the wish to restrict them, and I understand fully, to the New England Senators.

Mr. PASTORE. No, that is not correct. We can extend the amendments for sponsorship, if the Senator feels he would like to be a cosponsor.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to be.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from New York be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. I also ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTRACT FOR USE OF SEWAGE FACILITIES BY CITY OF STURGIS, S. DAK.—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 815) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to negotiate a new contract with the city of Sturgis, S. Dak., with respect to the use of the sewage facilities of such city by the Fort Meade Veterans' Hospital, Sturgis, S. Dak., introduced by me on February 6, 1961, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS TRADE ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 30, 1961, the name of Mr. BUSH was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 675) to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators) on January 30, 1961.

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS INVOLVING GRAZING RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of January 31, 1961, the names of Senators MCGEE, CHAVEZ, BURDICK, CANNON, BIBLE, HICKEY, LONG of Hawaii, CARROLL, YARBOROUGH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, MOSS, MORSE, DWORSHAK, and GOLDWATER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 717) to authorize civil actions for the review of administrative determinations as to the use of lands of the United States for grazing purposes to be instituted in judicial districts in which such lands are situated, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH on January 31, 1961.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DETERMINATIONS AND DECISIONS AS TO PROCUREMENT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 2, 1961, the names of Senators LONG of Missouri, MORSE, DOUGLAS, RANDOLPH, HUMPHREY, CASE of New Jersey, and JAVITS were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 769) to amend section 2310 of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to determinations and decisions as to procurement, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN on February 2, 1961.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

Statement prepared by him on the subject "Should a Senator Be Bound by His Party Platform?" published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 28, 1961.

By Mr. BUSH:

Statement by him commemorating 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

HEALTH CARE INSURANCE FOR THE AGING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators AIKEN, COOPER, PROUTY, SCOTT, FONG, COTTON, KEATING, and SALTONSTALL, I wish to make the following statement relative to the President's message on health care:

The administration proposal is inadequate. It does not meet the objections made last August to the Kennedy-Anderson bill which the Senate defeated, because it: First, fails to include the millions over 65 not covered under the social security system; second, does not provide for preventive care that senior citizens need most; third, fails to enable individual States to use their differing medical resources to provide more than minimum care; and fourth, makes no provision for voluntary health plans.

There is widespread recognition that support from the Federal Government is essential for an adequate program of health care insurance for the aging.

We are confident that there is a basis for a satisfactory bill during this session of Congress which will cover not only those on social security but also the millions of Americans over 65 who are not on social security.

TRANSACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH HANGAR AT DOVER AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to outline an unusual transaction involving the Government's disposal and the Delaware State Highway Department's acquisition of a hangar which had been declared surplus at the Dover Air Force Base.

After a series of maneuvers, the result was that the Government gave the hangar away, and paid approximately $22,000 to get it moved. The Delaware State Highway Department paid $25,900 for the same hangar as it stood on Government property, and then paid an additional $36,950 to get it moved and erected on nearby State property.

Thus, we find that both the Federal Government and the State of Delaware were paying to get the same hangar moved off Federal property; and, in addition, the Delaware State Highway Department was paying $25,900 for the hangar.

Attorney General Bove, in his interim report to the Delaware State Highway Commission, first called our attention to this unusual transaction. The Government had declared the hangar as surplus in early 1958; and, under the Federal law, any State agency which indicates an interest in such property gets first priority.

The Delaware State Highway Department expressed no interest; and, therefore, the demolition and removal of the hangar were made a part of an overall construction contract which was then being advertised by the Army Engineers.

James Julian, Inc., of Delaware, was the successful bidder on this overall contract—No. DA–36–109–ENG–6956.

The overall contract includes bids for the construction of certain additional facilities and improvements on the Dover Air Force Base, along with the bid for the demolition and removal of this hangar and certain smaller buildings.

The bidder submitted a lump-sum unit price of $22,000, to include the cost of demolition and disposal of this hangar and certain other specified farm buildings which were located on some recently acquired adjacent Government property. The Government recognized that the bulk of this charge represented the contractor's cost estimate for the demolition and disposal of the hangar.

The next lowest bid submitted to the Government for the same demolition work was $30,000.

Instead of moving the hangar, however, James Julian, Inc., the successful bidder, sold the hangar to the Delaware State Highway Department for $25,900, with arrangements whereby this State agency would pay all dismantling and moving costs.

Then the Delaware State Highway Department paid the McCormick Construction Co. an additional $36,950 to move the hangar a few miles to State-owned property.

Subsequently the State highway department erected a building inside the hangar, at a cost of approximately $150,000.

The Air Force states that there is no record that the Delaware State Highway Department ever indicated any interest in the hangar at the time when it was declared surplus.

The Government claims that based upon its past experience, these surplus hangars do not have a good resale value, and that the bid charging for the demolition and disposal was normal.

However, if the State agency wanted the hangar, no one seems to know of any reason why this agency did not attempt to get it directly from the Government on at least the same terms as did the successful bidder. If the Federal Government was going to pay approximately $22,000, most of which was for the demolition and disposal of the hangar, this payment could just as well have been made to the Delaware State Highway Commission; or if the Delaware State Highway Commission was going to pay $25,000 for the hangar, why should not it have paid this sum directly to the Federal Government?

As evidence that these hangars do not normally have a good resale value, the Government called attention to a previous sale from the same Air Force base. In December 1954, hangar No. 38 at the Dover Air Force Base was declared surplus. In that instance the Government paid for its dismantling and for having it piled and covered with a plastic covering, following which the Government advertised for bids. The highest bid received for the disassembled hangar and the cover was $156; this bid was received from the Cleveland Wrecking Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

On that occasion the Delaware State Highway Department expressed no interest in the hangar; but later, after the second hangar had been declared surplus and the Government had contracted to pay for its dismantling and removal, the Delaware State Highway Department in its generosity stepped forward, paid $25,900 for the building, and assumed all responsibility for all moving costs.

In all fairness, it should be pointed out that in the absence of the Delaware State Highway Department's being able to produce evidence of its having attempted to obtain the hangar directly from the Air Force base prior to its disposal, I think the criticism of this transaction should be directed against the commissioners of that State agency, as further evidence of their negligence to protect the public interests.

It should be noted that the Delaware State Highway Department is the same agency which in recent months has been under the severe criticism of the attorney general of Delaware, and is the same State agency which I criticized in the Senate on January 9 and 13, 1961, as condoning improper practices on the part of some of its officials and employees, and I criticized it for not having properly protected the public interests in its expenditures of State and Federal funds under the Federal Highway Act.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two letters. The first is dated January 16, 1961, and is signed by Maj. H. B. Barke, acting district engineer, Baltimore, Md. The second is dated January 31, 1961, and is signed by Col. Carl M. Nelson, of the Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER
DISTRICT, BALTIMORE,
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
Baltimore, Md., January 16, 1961.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to our telephone conversations on January 12 and January 13, 1961 relative to the disposition of hangar building materials at the Dover Air Force Base under a construction contract with the Government.

This district has a contract with James Julian, Inc. under contract DA-36-109-ENG-6956 for the construction of alert and operational aprons, washrack, and outside utilities at Dover Air Force Base, Del. Work under this contract has been physically completed. Under the provisions of the contract, the contractor was required to demolish and remove certain specified miscellaneous farm buildings and a hangar. All buildings and structures specified for demolition and removal became the property of the contractor and were required to be removed by him from the site. An excerpt of the pertinent provisions of the specifications are inclosed.

The contractor submitted a lump sum unit price of $22,000 for the demolition work including the cost of disposal. The next two (2) bid figures for this payment item were $30,000 and $65,000 respectively. The Government estimate for this work was $37,510.

Bids for all work to be performed under this contract were as follows:

(a) James Julian, Inc., $3,073,886.75.

(b) Williams Construction Co., Inc., $3,276,232.00.

(c) Henry C. Eastburn & Son, Inc., $3,494,017.60.

(d) Government estimate, $3,209,618.00.

A review of the district records for this contract do not reveal any information pertinent to a possible agreement made between the Government and the State of Delaware for transfer of the hangar to the State.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. BARKE,
Major, Corps of Engineers,
Acting District Engineer.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1961.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your inquiry of January 6, 1961 addressed to the Administrator, General Services Administration, with regard to the disposition of a hangar at Dover Air Force Base, Del. Your letter was referred to this department as a matter of primary interest to the Air Force.

A search of the records with regard to this matter was made in Air Force Headquarters. I am advised that the District Engineer who handled the disposal of the hangar involved examined the records and reported that the name James Julian does not appear in the record. A hangar, No. 38, was sold in December 1954. The sale was completed and the hangar removed on December 12, 1954. The highest bid received was $156. The hangar had been piled and covered with a plastic covering for several months. Parts of the frame had become weakened by rot. The amount received was for the disassembled hanger and cover only. The plastic cover was torn in several places. No equipment was included. The high bidder was the Cleveland Wrecking Co., 1400 Harrison Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. The bid was signed by B. Abramson, assistant secretary, and attested by F. T. Malone, secretary.

Prior to the sale of the hangar, information giving notice of the sale was publicly displayed in the places where such notices normally are posted. A number of Invitations for Bid were distributed. It does not appear that the State of Delaware was directly offered the hangar. However, public notice of the impending sale had been given. Invitations for Bid had been distributed in April 1954, approximately 9 months before the sale finally took place.

I trust this information will be useful. If we can do anything further to assist you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

CARL M. NELSON,
Colonel, USAF, Congressional Inquiry Division, Office of Legislative Liaison.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD excerpts from a recent report compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads, in which the Bureau outlines its reasons for rejecting Federal participation in one of the overruns which previously had been recommended by the Delaware State Highway Department.

This case speaks for itself, and is further evidence of the loose manner in which the commissioners of this agency have been exercising their responsibility.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REPORT

On Project F-116(8) an audit citation was made of 60,414 cubic yards of select borrow, 3,901.5 tons of hotmix asphaltic concrete, 16,704.83 square yards of topsoil, 60,559.98 square yards of mulching and 2,201.54 square yards of sodding for a total citation in the amount of $148,677.31. The bureau audit citation states in part:

"Audit of the State's voucher and the engineering review of the quantities claimed has disclosed that the necessary justifications or documentation in the State's files with the appropriate change order, was not available in order to support the overruns."

The reply from the State, dated November 5, 1959, stated in part:

"Our records do not contain documentation which would support the need for these additional quantities. We accept deduction for the items."

Subsequent discussion with the division engineer indicated that in the past, the State was not required to submit all field change orders and plan changes to the division office for approval prior to the commencement of the construction work. It also appeared that the State would submit an overall request for past approval of overruns and construction plan changes at the completion of project construction. The

team was further advised that it was the practice of the State to request an audit review of their project records prior to the preparation of their final voucher, and that it was conceivable that based on this review, the State would identify questionable contract items and overruns as nonparticipating costs, and claim reimbursement on those items which would be reimbursed without additional verification.

The division engineer advised the team that procedures relating to approval of contract overruns, change orders and pre-audit reviews have been recently revised. No pre-audit or review of individual contract items, prior to receipt of the final voucher, is made; the State has been advised that Federal participation will not be allowed in those instances where the work has been performed prior to Bureau consideration of the proposed change; and statements will be required from the State in justifications of quantities overruns.

DESEGREGATION AT NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on January 24 Federal District Judge Irving R. Kaufman, in a brilliantly worded decision, ordered desegregation of a predominantly Negro school in New Rochelle, N.Y.

Judge Kaufman found that deliberate gerrymandering of school district lines was responsible for making Lincoln School, in Westchester County, a Negro school.

I believe Judge Kaufman's decision was a historic one; and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a New York Times editorial of February 4 entitled "No Double Standard"; a copy of the news story from the New York Times of January 25, 1961; and excerpts from Judge Kaufman's decision, which appeared in the New York Times on January 25.

There being no objection, the editorial, the article, and the excerpts from the decision were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1961]

NO DOUBLE STANDARD

In the several days that have passed since Federal District Judge Irving R. Kaufman ordered desegregation of an almost wholly Negro elementary school in New Rochelle, N.Y., we hope South and North alike have had an opportunity to read an opinion declaring so decisively that there can be no double standard.

The judge, sitting in New York City, found it no accident, but a gerrymandering of school district lines, that made Lincoln School in Westchester County a Negro school, and kept it so with 454 Negro children and 29 white students. It was "semantics" to defend status quo on the basis that this was a neighborhood school. White children living in the district somehow found their way out to other schools. But for years, despite agitation within the community, the board of education did nothing to conform with the 1954 Supreme Court decision against segregation, while excusing itself on the ground it could find no ideal solution. It feared permissive zoning, or allowing students free choice of schools to attend, would produce chaos.

With logical disdain Judge Kaufman dismissed one flimsy excuse after another for the inaction that perpetuated this island of school segregation. He ordered the board to present a plan by April 14 for desegregation to begin no later than the 1961–62 school year. So all deliberate speed toward equal opportunity applies alike to North as well as South. We applaud a forthright court decision with its implied warning to any other school district in the North where the shoe fits—not many, but some.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1961]

NEW ROCHELLE IS ORDERED TO DESEGREGATE A SCHOOL—U.S. JUDGE RULES IN FAVOR OF NEGROES, SEEING DELIBERATE POLICY OF BIAS—BOARD MUST FILE PLAN BY APRIL

(By Edward Ranzal)

A Federal judge ruled yesterday that the New Rochelle Board of Education had "deliberately" created and maintained a racially segregated school.

The judge, Irving R. Kaufman, ordered the board to present to him before April 14 a plan to desegregate the predominantly Negro school, starting no later than the 1961–62 school year.

He accused the board of gerrymandering districts—moving neighborhood lines so that Negro children would be forced to attend the Lincoln School.

Judge Kaufman asserted that the board had been preoccupied with semantics at the expense of realities for the last 11 years. He wrote:

"This is not a case where the existence of an all-Negro school is an unfortunate fortuity. The Lincoln School was established as an all-Negro school by the gerrymandering of district lines, and by the transfer of white children residing in the district to schools outside the district.

"The board of education of the city of New Rochelle was responsible for both of these policies. Subsequent to 1949, the board by its arbitrary rejection of all proposals for change has purposefully maintained Lincoln as a segregated school. This decision is rendered on the facts in this case and holds that, in the instant situation, constitutional rights have been violated."

Judge Kaufman declared that the U.S. Supreme Court's decision condemning segregation in schools in 1954 was a lesson in democracy and imposed a legal and moral obligation upon officials who had created or maintained segregated schools to undo the damage which they had fostered.

"Compliance with the Supreme Court's edict was not to be less forthright in the North than in the South," he said. "No double standard was to be tolerated."

Judge Kaufman's decision, accompanied by a 48-page opinion, was a victory for the parents of 11 Negro elementary pupils who were denied the right to register in any school but the Lincoln School.

PARENTS ARRESTED

A number of the parents were arrested when they disregarded an order by a State court and accompanied their children to white schools to register. Final action on the arrests was put off pending Judge Kaufman's findings.

The parents brought their case into Federal Court on the premise that the Constitutional rights of their children had been violated. Judge Kaufman conducted a 5-day hearing. Witnesses for the board of education vigorously contended that the charge of racial segregation was absurd.

Judge Kaufman ruled, however:

"The defendant's conduct has violated the Constitution, denying plaintiffs the right to the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th Amendment.

"I find that the Board of Education of New Rochelle, prior to 1949, intentionally created Lincoln School as a racially segregated school, and has not, since then, acted in good faith to implement desegregation as required by the 14th Amendment; and that the conduct of the board of education even since 1949 has been motivated by the purposeful desire of maintaining the Lincoln School as a racially segregated school."

SEES LONG POLICY

Since 1930, Judge Kaufman said, the board adopted a policy of gerrymandering that led to the confining of Negroes within the Lincoln School district as the population shifted.

Judge Kaufman said that the district changes had never been noted in board minutes, nor had they been reflected on official school maps for many years. He said that white children living in the Lincoln School district were permitted to withdraw and register at nearby schools.

Since 1949, Judge Kaufman said, numerous civic groups have exerted pressure on the board to alleviate the problem. Judge Kaufman continued:

"For 11 years the board has discussed the problem, hired experts, made surveys, and constantly reiterated its belief in racial equality and the necessity for equal opportunities.

FINDS DEEDS LACKING

"But, in these 11 years, it has taken no action whatsoever to alter the racial imbalance in the Lincoln School. It has met the problem with mere words, barren of meaning, for they were never followed by deeds."

Judge Kaufman said that he could not accept the proposition "that in this relatively small community in the North, men of good will, wisdom and ingenuity could not have devised a plan for the orderly desegregation of the Lincoln School."

Paul Zuber and Thomas L. Roberts represented the parents. The board of education was represented by Murray C. Fuerst and Julius Weiss.

BOARD COMMENTS

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y., January 24.—The school district policies of most communities in the North will require revision if Judge Kaufman's decision is sustained, a lawyer for the New Rochelle Board of Education said today.

The lawyer, Julius Weiss, said the decision invalidated the neighborhood school policy in New Rochelle. He said most northern communities had similar policies, which require children to attend schools in the neighborhoods where they live.

Negro leaders hailed the decision as giving their children a chance for better education in predominantly white schools, even though the schools were far from home.

New Rochelle has 12 neighborhood elementary schools, 2 junior high schools, and 1 high school.

Mr. Weiss said that all the facts submitted to Judge Kaufman had recently been submitted to Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., the State commissioner of education, and that Dr. Allen had rejected the Negroes' complaint.

DENIES SEGREGATION

"We have no segregated schools—just neighborhood schools," Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, president of the school board, said today. "I feel that the board has acted lawfully. We have drawn no racial, color, or religious lines."

He and Mr. Weiss said Judge Kaufman's decision would be studied in detail before a decision on a possible appeal was reached. The lawyer asserted the case could go to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Dr. Herbert C. Clish, superintendent of schools, said the board would meet February 1 to determine procedure.

Paul B. Zuber, counsel for the Negro parents, said the decision made him "very happy for the people of New Rochelle and the people throughout the country."

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1961]

EXCERPTS FROM RULING ON SEGREGATION

After hearing and observing the witnesses, and carefully examining the large amount of

documentary evidence submitted, I conclude that the defendant's conduct has violated the Constitution, denying the plaintiffs the right to the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

I find that the Board of Education of New Rochelle, prior to 1949, intentionally created Lincoln School as a racially segregated school, and has not, since then, acted in good faith to implement desegregation as required by the 14th amendment; and that the conduct of the Board of Education even since 1949 has been motivated by the purposeful desire of maintaining the Lincoln School as a racially segregated school.

The years between 1949 and 1960 have been 11 years of agitation for New Rochelle. For 11 years, responsible civic-minded organizations and groups have urged that something be done to correct the Lincoln situation; for 11 years the board has discussed the problem, hired experts, made surveys, and constantly reiterated its belief in racial equality and the necessity for equal opportunities.

But, in these 11 years, it has taken no action whatsoever to alter the racial imbalance in the Lincoln School. It has met the problem with more words, barren of meaning, for they were never followed by deeds.

A NEW EPOCH

In 1954, the Supreme Court rendered its opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra*. This decision heralded a new epoch in the quest for equality of the individual. It called for responsible public officials throughout the country to reappraise their thinking and policies, and to make every effort to afford Negroes the more meaningful equality guaranteed to them by the Constitution.

The Brown decision, in short, was a lesson in democracy, directed to the public at large and more particularly to those responsible for the operation of the schools. It imposed a legal and moral obligation upon officials who had created or maintained segregated schools to undo the damage which they had fostered.

And compliance with the Supreme Court's edict was not to be less forthright in the North than in the South; no double standard was to be tolerated.

The Brown decision also increased the public agitation for change in New Rochelle. But the board paid little heed to the Brown doctrine.

This, then, completes the picture of board intransigence and refusal to act through the years. The "freeze" placed by the board in 1949 on the already gerrymandered boundaries of the Lincoln district remained unchanged, despite 11 years of public agitation, pleas, and advice from distinguished educators and sociologists. And, what is more, the board has not evidenced any intention to change its policies in the future.

DISCUSSES THE LAW

Any discussion of the applicable law must begin with the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education, supra*. Principles long accepted by psychologists and sociologists were given the stature of the law of the land.

The Supreme Court made it clear that in the field of public education, separate but equal was inherently unequal, and hence violative of the Constitution. Thus, the operation of separate schools for whites and Negroes was proscribed.

Those school authorities throughout the country which had operated such separate schools were instructed to implement desegregation, in good faith, "with all deliberate speed."

I hold that the Board of Education of New Rochelle, by its conduct in the years prior to 1949, created and established the Lincoln School as a segregated, Negro school. Thus formulated, the present case falls squarely within the plain meaning of the Brown decision.

The unanimous court, speaking through Chief Justice Warren, declared that segregation of Negro children, especially in their formative years, "generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

The court further emphasized the necessity of giving these minority-group children the opportunity for extensive contact with other children at an early stage in their educational experience, finding such contact to be indispensable if children of all races and creeds were to become inculcated with a meaningful understanding of the essentials of our democratic way of life.

That the benefits inherent in an integrated education are essential to the proper development of all children has been reiterated time and again by the many witnesses in the present case, including those called by the defendant.

With these principles clear in mind, I see no basis to draw a distinction, legal or moral, between segregation established by the formality of a dual system of education, as in Brown, and that created by gerrymandering of school district lines and transferring of white children as in the instant case. Cf. *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot, supra*.

OPPORTUNITY LACKING

In a community such as New Rochelle, the presence of some 29 white children certainly does not afford the 454 Negro children in the school the educational and social contacts and interaction envisioned by Brown.

The Constitution imposed upon the board the duty to end segregation, in good faith, and with all deliberate speed. It is patently clear that this obligation has not been fulfilled.

The board argues that the study which it has given to the problem, and the surveys which it has requested, conclusively indicate its good faith.

But the fact remains that, in 11 years, not one single act was taken to implement these expressed principles. And, the board's attitude, as indicated by its overt conduct, has been one of negation; it has publicly disclaimed all responsibility for the Lincoln problems.

REBUILDING DISCUSSED

The board urges, however, that its decision to rebuild the Lincoln School on the same site constitutes a start in the right direction.

It is most difficult to conceive of the rebuilding of the Lincoln School as good-faith compliance with an obligation to desegregate. In fact, this seems the one sure way to render certain continued segregation at Lincoln.

The board attempts to excuse its inaction on the ground that admittedly there is no "ideal" solution to the Lincoln problem. But, inability to find a perfect answer is hardly justification for refusal to do anything.

I cannot accept the proposition that in this relatively small community in the North, men of good will, wisdom, and ingenuity could not have devised a plan for the orderly desegregation of the Lincoln School.

If school boards could satisfy their obligations under the 14th amendment merely by waiting complacently until an ideal solution presented itself, the Brown decision, and the advances in the area of individual equality which it represents, would be a virtual nullity.

Constitutional rights are determined by realities, not by labels or semantics. The Supreme Court has affirmed that courts must look through the guise in which school officials seek to clothe their unconstitutional conduct.

Turning to the realities of the instant case, the inference is inescapable that the board's deliberate intransigence and inflexibility for the last 11 years in the face of public pressures and expert advice were motivated by a desire to continue Lincoln School as a radically segregated school, and thus not to alter the racial balance in the city's other elementary schools.

This becomes especially clear when the board's conduct subsequent to 1949 is examined against the background of the pre-1949 gerrymandering and transfer of white children. No other rational purpose can be attributed to the board's almost fanatically rigid adherence to district lines which were established in the first instance out of a desire to separate whites and Negroes.

This does not necessarily mean that individual members of the board are segregationists or racists. But it is apparent that they have failed to accept or recognize their moral and legal responsibilities and have chosen instead to yield to pressures of certain groups who wish to avoid an influx of Negro children into the schools in their districts.

The defendant argues, however that the neighborhood school policy is a reasonable and educationally sound one and thus that it is not violating the Constitution in adhering to it.

But this argument ignores the essential nature of the plaintiffs' position. They are not attacking the concept of the neighborhood school as an abstract proposition. They are, rather, attacking its application so as to deny opportunities guaranteed to them by the Constitution. It is a legal truism that "acts generally lawful may become unlawful when done to accomplish an unlawful end."

The neighborhood school policy certainly is not sacrosanct. It is valid only insofar as it is operated within the confines established by the Constitution. It cannot be used as an instrument to confine Negroes within an area artifically delineated in the first instance by official acts. If it is so used, the Constitution has been violated and the courts must intervene.

The board raises several other contentions in an attempt to justify its conduct. With respect to its refusal to institute permissive zoning, or to allow the Negro children to register at other schools at the start of the 1960 school year, the board argues that it would be violative of the law to accord Negroes special privileges not allowed to other minority groups.

OTHER SCHOOLS CITED

It points to the fact that several other elementary schools in New Rochelle have student compositions which are primarily of one religious or national origin group, and argues that if permissive zoning privileges were afforded to the Lincoln pupils, the same privileges would have to be given to these other minorities. This, it says, would produce chaos throughout the school system.

But the Constitution is not this color-blind. The Brown decision dealt only with Negroes; it was based on factual findings which may not be applicable to other minority groups. Furthermore, the chaos envisioned by the board seems more fanciful than real, since no other groups or persons in New Rochelle have requested permission to attend schools outside the district in which they reside.

Nor is there evidence that any other school district was gerrymandered or deliberately set up to embrace an ethnic group. In addition, there are instances where it is not only justified, but necessary, to provide for such allegedly "unequal treatment" in order to achieve the equality guaranteed by the Constitution.

Finally, the board's principal contention, which it has asserted throughout these pro-

ceedings, is that the existence of an all-Negro or a predominantly Negro school is not, in and of itself, a violation of the Constitution. The constant reiteration of this argument indicates the board's preoccupation with semantics at the expense of realities. This is not a case where the existence of an all-Negro school is an unfortunate fortuity.

The Lincoln School was established as an all-Negro school by the gerrymandering of district lines, and by the transfer of white children residing in the district to schools outside the district.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR BOTH

The Board of Education of the city of New Rochelle was responsible for both of these policies. Subsequent to 1949, the board by its arbitrary rejection of all proposals for change has purposefully maintained Lincoln as a segregated school. This decision is rendered on the facts in this case and holds that, in the instant situation, constitutional rights have been violated.

Litigation is an unsatisfactory way to resolve issues such as have been presented here. It is costly, time consuming—causing further delays in the implementation of constitutional rights—and further inflames the emotions of the partisans.

Men of good will, such as the individual members of the board submit they are, could have solved and still can solve the problem by exercising the judgment and understanding for which they presumably were chosen. The school board is a public body charged with a public responsibility.

This responsibility must be exercised solely in the best interests of the children attending the schools. The board cannot relieve itself of this responsibility by giving the community whatever result might gratify the impulse of the moment. Nothing can be permited to conflict with the board's moral and legal obligation.

DIRECTS COMPLIANCE

In determining the manner in which the Negro children residing within the Lincoln district are to be afforded the opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution, I will follow the procedure authorized by the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, and utilized by many district courts in implementing the Brown principles.

Thus, I deem it unnecessary at this time to determine the extent to which each of the items of relief requested by plaintiffs will be afforded. Instead, the board is hereby ordered to present to this court, on or before April 14, 1961, a plan for desegregation in accordance with this opinion, said desegregation to begin no later than the start of the 1961–62 school year. This court will retain jurisdiction in this action until such plan has been presented, approved by the court, and then implemented.

JUSTICE FOR INDIGENT DEFENDANTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 30, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], introduced a bill, S. 655, to provide the necessary machinery in order to protect the legal rights of indigent defendants in trials before U.S. district courts.

In the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I introduced, at the request of the Department of Justice, an identical bill to provide for the representation by counsel of indigent defendants in criminal cases tried in the district courts of the United States. This bill, S. 895, passed the Senate on May 20, 1960, and then came before the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary. The House committee held hearings on a similar House version of this measure, but no action was taken before Congress adjourned. I therefore welcome Senator KEFAUVER's introduction of S. 655, cosponsored by Senator JAVITS and by me.

Under our system of law people who come before the bar of justice are afforded full opportunity to plead their case, to be represented by counsel, and to be advised fully of the charges against them. It is this openness of our judicial system which is also its strength. Unlike the law in totalitarian states, where the trial is often secret and the defendant is not afforded adequate legal counsel, we believe that regardless of the offense it is the right of all our citizens to be represented by competent counsel. Yet indigent people often lack the funds to hire professional service.

Over the years, we have developed a system of voluntary legal services whereby able members of the bar have undertaken, free of charge, to defend citizens who are in trouble in the criminal courts. However, not all members of the bar are trial lawyers. Not all those who are trial lawyers are versed in criminal law. Consequently, a heavy burden rests on a small number of criminal attorneys to make certain that indigent defendants are properly protected.

Under the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Tennessee, provisions are made for the establishment of a regular Office of Public Defender, to be compensated by the district courts, whose regular duty it will be to undertake the defense of indigent defendants.

I am a little bit concerned with section (b) of the bill, and I wish to explain why.

I believe that the creation of another position at $10,000 a year does not answer the question. I think that the portion of the bill which provides the authority to appoint a counsel for an indigent defendant has great merit. Whether the rate therein of $35 a day, in these days, when the dollar has been seriously impacted, is sufficient, needs to be considered. My own opinion is that $50 a day would not be too much in serious cases. I also feel that the bill should contain a provision that the attorney appointed should not be a relative of the judge. Whether or not the authority of the judge to appoint counsel should be limited to simply indigent cases is a matter that should also be given consideration by the appropriate committee.

Enemies of our American society have frequently accused us of allegedly having one set of laws for the rich and one set of laws for the poor. They assert that the poor man will be punished for a crime for the commission of which a rich man might escape the penalty of the law. They further charge that in criminal cases it is the poor who will end up in the penitentiary or receive capital punishment, while the rich escape with comparatively light sentences. It is the purpose of the bill, introduced by the senior Senator from Tennessee and cosponsored by Senator JAVITS and by me, to completely demolish such accusations.

I should like to note that my bill of last year was originally prepared on the recommendation of the recent Attorney General William P. Rogers.

It would appear to me that this bill would also agree with the outlook and philosophy of our new Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy. In this connection I should like to quote from the statement of Attorney General Kennedy when he appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary as Attorney General-designate:

> I think that there are great advantages in this whole field for the people with greater wealth over the people that are not as well off, and I expect, I know we are going to study that whole matter to try to help and assist the unfortunate who perhaps cannot pay for attorneys, cannot pay for appeals, cannot pay for appeals all the way to the Supreme Court.

I hope that the Senate will give earnest consideration to the bill and the amendments which I have suggested.

AMBASSADOR JOHN HAY WHITNEY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently the Honorable John Hay Whitney returned to this country after 4 years as Ambassador to Great Britain. He is now on a special mission for President Kennedy.

Mr. Whitney's record of distinguished service in this most important foreign post has been the subject of much comment both in the American press and the British press. He has done an outstanding job and all of us should be proud of him. He has been a great public servant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the New York Times, January 12 and January 16, 1961; the Economist, January 14, 1961; Manchester Guardian Weekly, January 19, 1961; London Daily Mail, December 29, 1960; London Times, January 12, 1961; Glasgow Herald, January 13, 1961; London Evening Standard, January 12, 1961; comment from Mr. Randolph Churchill's column, "News of the World"; and editorials from the Sunday Times and London Telegraph be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 12, 1961]

WHITNEY HONORED BY BRITISH GROUP—LORD HOME ASKS FOR UNITY AT A FAREWELL TRIBUTE TENDERED BY PILGRIMS

LONDON, January 11.—The Earl of Home, Britain's Foreign Secretary, and John Hay Whitney, retiring U.S. Ambassador, stressed tonight the need for continuing British-American cooperation in defending the non-Communist world.

They spoke at a farewell dinner for Mr. Whitney given by the Pilgrims, an organization dedicated to promoting understanding with the United States. It was one of a series of tributes paid to the Ambassador and Mrs. Whitney.

In their travels to almost every part of Britain, the Whitneys have earned a great deal of respect and affection. Their departure is widely regretted.

Lord Home said World War II need not have happened if Britain and the United

States in the interwar years had seen eye to eye, if they had shared a common realization of the threat to both of them, and has shown a common sense of purpose in meeting it.

COMMUNIST THREAT CITED

Asserting that the two countries had cooperated since the war, he said that the threat today to both, and indeed to the whole non-Communist world, was different in kind but "no less inimical to our interests."

Lord Home declared that no one could have done more than Ambassador Whitney to create the present close understanding between Britain and the United States.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1961]

AMBASSADOR WHITNEY RETURNS

Returning from 4 genially successful years as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, John Hay Whitney had a few remarks to make about the system which makes it impossible for any man not independently rich to represent this country in an important post abroad. Mr. Whitney would have been popular and useful even if he hadn't been amply supplied with money of his own; but if he hadn't been so supplied he couldn't have afforded the London post at all.

He did not complain. He is not a complaining man. He merely observed that it is "intolerable to have to have money to have the job." The money and the ability may go together, as they did with Mr. Whitney. Then again they may not. In any case, this country is not so poor that it has to sell pencils to support its Ambassadors in the style it expects of them.

Mr. Whitney is going into newspaper work as president and publisher of the Herald Tribune. Good wishes from both sides of the water will follow him in this venture. This newspaper warmly wishes him well.

[From the Economist, Jan. 14, 1961]

MR. WHITNEY: A FRIEND'S FAREWELL

To tell the truth abroad for his country: for the 4 years since he came to London in the sour aftermath of Suez, this has been the simple aim of the American Ambassador who is now going home to run his New York newspaper. Both Britain and the United States have a deep debt to this good man.

* * * * *

Mr. Whitney's remedy, speaking as both Ambassador and newspaper owner, is always "to explain ourselves more candidly to each other." Utter candor, in a frame of trust, is certainly the right prescription—and it is the counsel of an honest-to-goodness friend who has been more widely known and liked than any Ambassador one can recall.

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly, Jan. 19, 1961]

Lord Home praised the work as Ambassador of one whom everyone from Prime Minister to stable-lad always called affectionately "Jock." No one could have done more, under the inspiration of President Eisenhower, to foster cooperation and understanding.

[From the London Daily Mail, Dec. 29, 1960]

A GOOD FRIEND

If there is any regret in this country at the election of a new American President it is because it means the departure of Mr. John Hay Whitney who has been U.S. Ambassador here for the past 4 years. He came when Anglo-American relations were at a low ebb. He leaves when they have rarely been better—and much of this desirable state of affairs is due to Mr. Whitney himself. He has been one of the best, most active, and most popular envoys ever to come from Washington to London. He has made a host of friends in all walks of life and has performed a great many acts of charity of which little or nothing is known. Mr. "Jock" Whitney is a good American—none better. But he is also a good citizen of the world. If all diplomats and statesmen could say the same there would be little wrong with the world today. We shall miss him.

London Times, January 12, 1961: "In a tribute to Mr. Whitney's work as Ambassador, Lord Home said that under the inspiration of his great chief and friend, President Eisenhower, no one could have done more to create the cooperation and understanding.

" 'You may rely on us,' Lord Home added, 'to build upon this work which you have done and we look forward eagerly to working with Mr. Kennedy, who has shown himself to be a man both of energy and resolve.'

"MR. MACMILLAN'S TRIBUTE

"Lord Home read a message from Mr. Macmillan in which the Prime Minister said that Mr. Whitney has served 'both our countries well.' It was always sad to say goodby to a friend, especially when that friend 'has worked with us during 4 difficult and distinguished years and has done so much to strengthen the friendship between our two countries.' "

Glasgow Herald, January 13, 1961:

"SUCCESS OF A MISSION

"It is not yet definitely known who Mr. Whitney's successor will be—the eminent and experienced Mr. David Bruce or another—but Mr. Whitney has created a great stock of British good will toward him."

London Evening Standard, January 12, 1961: "Lord Home read a message from Mr. Macmillan in which he said: 'Since Jock Whitney came to the Court of St. James's the Anglo-American alliance has gone from strength to strength.

" 'There have been some trials and tribulations, but we have overcome them and I can now say that the cooperation and understanding between us have never been closer.

" 'Much of the credit for this lies with Jock Whitney. I send him my profound thanks for all he has done.'

"More than 400 pairs of hands clapped a salute—among them those of Lord Kilmuir, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Hugh Gaitskell, the Lord Mayor Sir Bernard Waley-Cohen, and Mr. Iain Macleod, the Colonial Secretary. And there was a message to 'my friend Jock' from the Prime Minister.

"As the glasses became emptier, the cigar smoke swirled thicker, and Mr. Whitney swallowed harder, Lord Home, the Foreign Secretary said: 'We come here with mixed feelings—feelings of satisfaction and of fulfillment in the distinction with which you have borne your arduous official duties and the honor with which you have represented your country.

" 'We are losing a stanch and true friend of Britain.

" 'The Ambassador has laid upon his term of office the stamp of his own personality.' "

Randolph Churchill's column "News of the World": "Mr. John Hay Whitney left for the United States yesterday, after 4 years as the American Ambassador to the Court of St. James. I cannot offhand think of any American Ambassador who has made a greater success in Britain over the last 30 years."

Sunday Times: "Blessed by nature with a most attractive personality, and by fortune with the means of expressing it, Mr. Whitney has worked tirelessly to understand us and to help us understand his country. It would be hard to find any other foreign Ambassador who has made so many friends in all walks of life. He has without doubt made a large personal contribution to stronger Anglo-American relations."

London Telegraph:

"END OF A MISSION

"A Pilgrims' dinner last night to Mr. John Hay Whitney was a fitting farewell to an American Ambassador who has been greatly liked. When Mr. Whitney took up his appointment 4 years ago, the shadow of Suez was between this country and the United States. The need was to remake friends rather than to influence people. It is fortunate for us all, then, that he is a man of such far-reaching friendliness. His interests—ranging from painting, through films, journalism and business to horses—led him to travel widely in Britain and brought him into touch with many people far outside the narrow circles of diplomacy. The loan to the Tate of his magnificent collection of modern French paintings, and the home in Surrey which he will retain, are witnesses to the measure of his success and to the degree in which Mr. Whitney has not merely shared but also contributed to British life.

"Not every embassy is to be assessed in these terms. Different circumstances demand different abilities. But if, as seems possible, Mr. Whitney turns out to be one of the last of the wealthy political appointees from Washington to the Court of St. James's, he need not fear comparisons. As he said last night, when Britain and America have been in trouble, 'it has more often than not been because of a failure in communication.' Mr. Whitney has helped to reopen the lines and to keep them open in difficult times. He has left relationships better than he found them. He can look back upon his mission with some pride and, we hope, with a great deal of personal pleasure also."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my able friend from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I simply wish to add my own endorsement to what the Senator has said. I join in congratulating Ambassador Whitney, who is a personal friend of mine, as many Senators know, and who I know from my personal experience has made one of the most outstanding records any Ambassador to the Court of St. James has made.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from New York and am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I join my colleagues from Missouri and New York in expressing appreciation for the fine work Mr. Whitney has done. He has been most thoughtful and considerate with respect to all requests of all visitors from the United States who have gone to London during the time he has served there.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am sure the distinguished gentleman will be extremely grateful for the remarks of the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I am delighted to hear the remarks of my distinguished friend from Missouri concerning Mr. Whitney, whom I have known for many years and whose service to humanity, as well as to his country in recent years, has been outstanding. I am delighted the Senator

from Missouri has brought this to our attention this morning.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join with the Senator from Missouri and others Senators in commending Ambassador Whitney, both for the excellent job he did for 4 years as our Ambassador in London and for his recent assignment by the President to continue to serve our country in the West Indies.

Ambassador Whitney is an energetic and devoted American. The President is to be commended for his foresight and good judgment in continuing Ambassador Whitney as leader of the United States delegation in the delicate negotiations which are taking place in the West Indies.

I hope that in the years ahead the continued opportunities will be offered to Ambassador Whitney to serve his country in the very fine manner in which he has so distinguished himself in the past.

THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, to emphasize the logic of the antirecession efforts proposed by President Kennedy, it is interesting to note the following recent announcement from the Department of Commerce:

Sales and new orders received by manufacturers edged down further in December after seasonal allowances. Unfilled orders on manufacturers' books eased off further in December to a year-end aggregate of $45¾ billion, a $6 billion decline over the year.

In addition, the February 2 report of the Bureau of National Affairs contains a series of indicators regarding current business trends. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDICATORS OF CURRENT BUSINESS TRENDS

Steel: Output last week down 2.2 percent; capacity rate less than 51 percent.

Autos: Mid-January sales 14,850 daily, 18 percent behind a year ago.

Inventories: Manufacturers' stocks decline $350 million in December.

New orders: December down 1 percent, to $28.5 billion; defense business firm.

Prices: Consumer index up 0.1 percent in December, to 127.5 percent of 1947–49.

Construction: January rate down more than seasonally, to $55 billion.

Sales: Department store volume in 4 weeks ended January 21, decreases 2 percent.

Employment: Jobless claims down 94,700 in January 14 week, to 3,194,000.

Finance: U.S. 13-week borrowing rate up to 2.3 percent after 2-week drop.

REX M. WHITTON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I made before the Senate Committee on Public Works regarding the nomination of Rex M. Whitton, of Missouri, to be Federal Highway Administrator, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SYMINGTON BEFORE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 3, 1961

Mr. Chairman, all the people of Missouri, as well as my distinguished colleague Senator LONG, who is with us here this morning, and myself, are very proud about this appointment by President Kennedy of Mr. Rex Whitton to the position of Federal Highway Administrator.

Mr. Whitton was born on a farm in Jackson County near Hickman Mills, Mo. He worked his way through the University of Missouri, graduating in 1920 and receiving the degree of bachelor of science in engineering.

He began working with the Missouri Highway Department immediately upon graduation and has been with that Department, Mr. Chairman, for over 40 years.

He has moved up steadily through the ranks. He was the engineer of maintenance for 15 years, and became chief engineer of the highway commission in 1951. He is generally given chief credit for being the driving force behind Missouri's 10-year road program which began in 1952. Under his leadership we believe that Missouri has led the Nation in the development of the interstate highway system.

Mr. Whitton has received the two major national highway awards. He served as president of the American Association of State Highway Officials. As a member of this committee, Mr. Chairman, in fact, the chairman was kind enough himself to observe to me one time how impressed he was with the presentation Mr. Whitton made before this committee, when I had the honor to be a member of it.

As I wrote you, Mr. Chairman, and as I would like to present to the other members of the committee, Mr. Whitton has given concrete, practical proof over the years as an able and dedicated public servant.

I personally, as well as the rest of us in Missouri, do not believe that his knowledge of the problems of highways is exceeded by that of any other American today.

I thank the Chair and the members of the committee for letting me make this statement.

I feel that all of you know Mr. Whitton's record just about as well as I do, because you have often consulted with him and had him testify before you on other matters.

I would like to express my appreciation that you have allowed me to open in order that I may go to another committee hearing.

PRICE FIXING AND BID RIGGING IN THE ELECTRICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have been deeply shocked by the articles which have recently appeared in the newspapers concerning the violation of Federal antitrust laws in the electrical industry by fixing prices and rigging bids. I have in my hand an article from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Jailed Industrial Chiefs Slated for No Favors." I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is only another in an unhappy series of news stories documenting the trial of electrical firms for violating antitrust laws.

During the years that I have been in public office I have believed strongly in the free enterprise competitive system which has built this country and made it great. Free competition and enterprise have stimulated research and the development of new tools and services of the electronic age. We have seen much of this enterprise come to Massachusetts. In past months we have heard of the improper use of power of labor union officials which has been under study by the Senate, and in recent months commentary about labor's irresponsibility with regard to the wage-price spiral has increased. But when high officials in the offices of vice presidents or less plead guilty to having been involved in illegal activities, then the shoe is distinctly on the other foot. And this comes at a time when we in this country are more aware than ever of the threat to our way of life by an ideology which we hate.

It seems to me that the electrical firm case demonstrates a shattering lack of understanding of and dedication to the principles by which our free economic system exists. My own confidence in America's strength is shocked at such conduct. The dynamic stimulus under our way of life which comes from free competition, initiative and sound business, banking and industry operating as free as possible of Government control, is what has made us great. But this stimulus cannot be sustained without a constant sense of commitment to our national interest and to our national ideals. I repeat, I am particularly bothered by the fact that high-ranking members of powerful firms, vice presidents, no less, can be so involved in illegal activities that they plead guilty rather than to stand trial. And this is especially true when those in even higher office than the vice presidents claim they do not know what was going on. Those high-ranking officials who are ultimately responsible are either not doing their jobs or are not being candid.

I do not wish these remarks, Mr. President, to focus exclusively on one phase of our industrial complex because my concern is that this lack of commitment which I speak of is more widespread than that. For instance, there has been considerable publicity given recently to serious conflict-of-interest cases among high business officials in the automobile industry.

In closing, Mr. President, let me say the Congress and the administration must be ever watchful to see that those who have high, responsible positions throughout our society live up to the ideals of our free enterprise system as we know it in the United States.

EXHIBIT 1

JAILED INDUSTRIAL CHIEFS SLATED FOR NO FAVORS

PHILADELPHIA, February 8.—The seven high-salaried electrical firm executives, who start 30-day jail terms in neighboring Norristown next Monday, will get no preferential treatment.

Though they ran million-dollar businesses and collected annual salaries of up to $130,000, they'll follow the same prison routine of any prisoner.

The seven men were sentenced Monday by U.S. District Judge J. Cullen Ganey for

violating the Federal antitrust laws by fixing prices and rigging bids.

TERMS BEGIN MONDAY

U.S. Marshal William A. O'Brien said the men—three from General Electric Co., two from Westinghouse Electric Corp., and one each from Cutler-Hammer, Inc., Milwaukee, and Clark Controller Co., Cleveland—will be driven to the Montgomery County prison by his deputies Monday morning.

O'Brien said he originally planned to take the men to a Philadelphia jail, but it was overcrowded.

Federal regulations allow prisoners sentenced to less than 60 days to be admitted to approved State or local prisons, at the discretion of the marshal in the sentencing district.

Warden Andrew J. White, of Montgomery County prison, said the men will be awakened at 6:30 a.m. They will be assigned two to a cell.

He said he didn't know if they would be given jobs, such as bookkeeping work in the office, adding "It all depends if they want to work."

Lights in the prison go out at 9 p.m. and radios must be turned off at midnight.

The warden said visitors are allowed 2 days a week—from 1 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. Wednesday, and from noon to 3 p.m. Saturday. Visitors may give prisoners money to spend at the sundry store, but no presents.

HAIRCUTS ARE FREE

Prisoners receive daily mail, including newspapers. They may send letters as well. Haircuts are provided free of charge in the prison barbershop.

The cells to be occupied by the men are about 18 by 20 feet in size, have sinks, tables, and stools. Some have stone walls and others steel.

The prison sentences were imposed on J. H. Chiles, Sharon, Pa., Westinghouse vice president; W. S. Ginn, Schenectady, N.Y., GE vice president; Lewis J. Burger, Fort Wayne, Ind., former manager of GE's switchgear division in Philadelphia; George E. Burens, Philadelphia, also a former GE switchgear manager; C. I. Mauntel, Philadelphia, Westinghouse steam division sales manager; J. M. Cook, Milwaukee, Cutler-Hammer vice president, and E. R. Jung, Cleveland, Clark Controller vice president.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROGRAM FOR THE NATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Mr. William S. White, a nationally syndicated columnist, has once again shown his broad grasp of the national scene in his February 1 column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star under the heading "Moderates' Fears Unfounded."

Mr. White has long been a perceptive observer and a writer of unusual acumen. I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERATES' FEARS UNFOUNDED—KENNEDY'S PROGRAM FOR NATION CALLED REASSURING THUS FAR

(By William S. White)

President Kennedy has now dropped the other shoe and in the sound of its falling there is nothing whatever to alarm the great moderate political center of this country.

Quite plainly the moderates' view is to be largely his view—so long as he and they can keep in check the extremists, both the ultraliberals and the ultraconservatives.

All who had feared we might be entering an unwisely liberal era clamorous with professional theories and marked by wild spending and hot-eyed reformism can now put an end to their anxieties.

They can genuinely feel reassured—as already does the moderate and usually controlling center in Congress of both parties. So, too, do important sections of business, both big and little, as may be seen in Wall Street and also in the private remarks of business spokesmen.

For Mr. Kennedy's state of the Union message to Congress, in which he laid down his basic purposes, establishes all these things:

1. A deep respect for—and a good deal of savvy about—the free enterprise system. (This should not have been too surprising; this young President's private fortune is unashamedly valued by him and he knows what system it came from.)

2. A prudent intention to make haste slowly—not to try to howl a great deal of legislation through Congress at the double-quick, as was done in the national emergency of the first hundred days of the first New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

3. A determination to defend the integrity of the American dollar in the world's money markets at every cost.

4. A resolution—which ironically may turn out to be actually tougher than in the more conservative Eisenhower administration—to require far greater cost-participation in aid programs by our foreign friends.

5. An intention to reward and back up good administrators in the Federal service to a degree not known in our time.

6. A firm resolve to negotiate at the summit with the Soviet imperialists only when and if some conceivable good can come of it—and only when and if the balance of power lies clearly on our side and not theirs.

True, some who are not necessarily ultraconservatives are nevertheless anxious about some parts of the Kennedy program, notably an increase in the minimum wage, permanent aid for areas of chronic unemployment, and an expansion of public-subsidy housing.

These plans, however, will unfold as less far reaching and less costly than might at first be supposed. Moreover, the reasonably conservative in and out of Congress should find great comfort in one largely overlooked Kennedy project. This was his pledge to give tax relief to businessmen coming forward with sound plant expansions. Already, the ultraliberals are grumbling that this point is altogether too Republican in tone. In fact, of course, it is simply soundly conservative—neither Democratic nor Republican in origin.

It is true, too, that some Republican leaders are thrusting at one or another of the President's economic plans. This, too, however, reflects no wide or real Republican fear. It is only their way of keeping their hand in.

So the sum of it as of now is this: Mr. Kennedy has demonstrated no slightest purpose to become the hero of the leftwing; to put class against class; or even to become a hotly partisan President. He just wants to run a calmly effective national shop. He is not here to make America over; he is here to make some repairs, but no revolution.

"NATO" FOR THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for more than 2 years I have been strongly urging that the United States take the lead through its membership in the Organization of American States to support the creation of a hemispheric peace patrol.

This peace patrol, or security force, would be made up by contributions from the member nations of the Organization of American States and would operate under its jurisdiction. It would serve as a force in being to carry out effectively the mandates of the OAS in preserving peace and order in the hemisphere. It would act as an effective deterrent to military adventurers and aggressors, and would guarantee the integrity of national borders in our hemisphere.

President Kennedy, in his fine state of the Union message, pledged the full cooperation of our delegates to the OAS in working with other member nations to strengthen that body as an instrument for preserving peace and preventing foreign domination in the hemisphere. I felt greatly encouraged by his comments because it seems to me an indication that the United States will see the necessity for establishing an OAS security force if the OAS is to be strengthened and made more effective. Until such time as the OAS has the power to curtail military aggression or intimidation and to put down the sword rattling antics of petty despots it will not have reached its maximum effectiveness as a union for preserving peace in our hemisphere.

Today I am happy to report that one of the outstanding American Legion installations, the Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29 of the American Legion in Miami, Fla., has unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing my proposal for the establishment of an inter-American security force.

I am particularly grateful for the support from this patriotic organization, and I am proud to be a member of the Harvey W. Seeds Post. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ENDORSING A "NATO" FOR THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Whereas Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida, a member of Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, has publicly proposed from his seat in the Senate the formation of an inter-American police force to combat Communist troublemakers in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the need for the creation of such organization similar to NATO, be directed by the Organization of American States, as imperatively urgent; and

Whereas the post is proud and honored to claim Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS as a member whose rugged Americanism is an example to all America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national commander of the American Legion and its executive committee be, and they are hereby, urged to throw the support of the American Legion to the proposal of Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS that a "NATO" be created and operated under the jurisdiction of the Organization of American States.

Passed and adopted unanimously by Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion, Department of Florida, in regular meeting assembled January 13, 1961.

GEORGE C. SMITH,
Post Commander.

Attest:

JOSEPH A. FRIEDMAN,
Adjutant.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, our Nation has been blessed throughout its history with great leadership in times of great challenge. We are doubly blessed in this momentous era with courage and responsibility both in the White House and the Vice Presidency.

Last Sunday Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON delivered an address in New York before B'nai Zion. He said at that time: "We are going to live history in the months ahead."

I submit that his words and his deeds will form a proud part of that history. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very proud as Vice President of the United States to be here with you. The title is new. But the bonds of our friendship are old and strong, and I cherish them. For such friendships—and for the honor you do me tonight—I am deeply grateful.

For half a century, B'nai Zion has worked to make real the dream of Israel. Work remains. But the dream has been realized. Israel exists. It is growing, thriving, and maturing.

Through both B'nai Zion and the Jewish National Fund you have played a key role in Israel's success. Your great dedication to this work has won renown and has earned high returns in the well-being and vitality of the people you have helped.

But I am not here to talk of what has been or must be done in Israel. My purpose here is to talk of our own land—of what we ourselves must do for both ourselves and for all men, whose freedom we cherish as we cherish our own.

Thirty years ago, as a boy barely turned 21, I saw in Washington the beginning of a new era. From the steps of the Capitol, on a cold inaugural day in 1933, great words of courage went forth from a great heart—the courageous heart of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His inspiration quickened the pulse of a prostrate Nation. It brought to life the strength of a sturdy people. It readied a whole generation of Americans for their rendezvous with destiny.

Two weeks ago I was privileged to stand on those same steps and hear—as you heard—great words go forth to the Nation once more. These were words of challenge from a man who speaks the confidence of a determined generation—John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Once again, I have felt the pulse of the Nation quicken. Once again, I know—and I believe all Americans know—that a new era has begun, an era that may well be remembered as the great epoch of American maturity and responsibility.

We are going to live history in the months ahead.

But it should be made clear we are not going to relive it. This year of 1961 is not 1933. A nation weak then is strong today. A nation impoverished then lives with abundance today. A nation uncertain and uninformed then is experienced and wise today. The task facing Franklin Roosevelt was to help the Nation recover the strength it had lost. The task facing John Kennedy is to lead the Nation to use the strength it possesses so bountifully.

In 1933, the Nation needed a New Deal. Today there will be no dealing. The cards of history have already been dealt. We shall win the future—or lose it—by how we play the hand we hold.

The hand we hold is strong. We have abundance no other nation enjoys. We have resources no other nation equals. We have a history of respect and trust among other peoples as we, in turn, pay a decent respect to the opinions of mankind. We have a cause more compelling than any the world has known before—a cause loved by allies who stand with us and feared by adversaries who stand against us, the cause of freedom itself.

This can be the winning hand, if we are worthy of it.

To be worthy of it, our purpose must be sure, our decisions responsible, our moves bold, and our confidence infinite. React we must to the thrusts of those who threaten the peace. But the pursuit of peace must be more than reaction to the moves of its enemies. As we have—in three great wars of this century—marshaled the full capacity of our people to assure success, so we must make no less an effort to assure success in our efforts toward peace.

This will be done.

For this new day—and this new age—patriotism will no longer be a wartime spirit alone. It will be the spirit of peacetime. We shall hope that the sacrifice of time and comfort in the meadows of peace will make unnecessary—and, in time, unknown—the futile sacrifice of life and limb on the fields of battle. Despots and dictators since time began have asked that men sacrifice their lives in war. Government of freemen can surely ask that men and women give of their years to be servants of peace rather than soldiers of war.

Arms we must have. Arms our citizens must bear. The arms we ask to be borne must be always and only the best—and nothing less. We shall be prepared to defend and to hold by our strength this mid-century beachhead of peace—and, God willing, we shall by our resoluteness enlarge it.

But we know that when tyranny retreats into its inevitable oblivion, that retreat is far less likely to come at the end of a bayonet than before the irresistible power of the physician's syringe, the teacher's chalk, the surveyor's tangent, the nutritionist's ladle. Peace must be waged with its own weapons. No nation, no alliance of nations has yet forged such weapons in sincere quantities. It is our privilege—and our unique opportunity—to begin.

I speak of these things tonight—before this audience—because I know that you, as do other Americans, understand these essentials of the challenge we face.

Modern Israel is aware of the challenge of the pursuits of peace. It is a part of that Middle East of which President Kennedy spoke last year, "The Middle East needs water, not war. They need tractors, not tanks, and they need bread, not bombs." Israel understands that development depends upon the basic resource of human talent, and its institutions aborning are invigorated by eager students, now coming from many lands. It understands that practical problems often yield to advancing knowledge; its basic and applied research is attracting the lively interest of the general community of science—whether in medicine, the use of arid lands, or the desalinization of water.

Dedication, hard work, the nourishment of talent, the extension of knowledge—these are the weapons of peace around the world. There are many lands awaiting the fulfillment of stirring aspirations. There are others who can help, and their ranks are growing. Those who would be free from both misery and fear can know that they have ready allies in the struggle for both progress and liberty. Where ground has not been broken for the seeds of freedom, we must set the plowshares to work—and we will. But where freedom has found its roots and begun to grow, we must not turn away.

Toward all the people of all lands, whatever their religion or race or system, we feel the deepest interest in their well-being. Our aspiration for them is opportunity—the opportunity to know better lives, reach higher goals, participate more justly in the promise of this century.

Preventing war is not of itself enough. For the people of the Middle East the margin of bare survival is too narrow to make tolerable the maintenance of costly burdens of arms. We hope the day will quickly come when these burdens can be reduced. This is essential not only to world peace but to the improvement of the lives of the people of the Middle East.

The works of peace are global works. This administration will work for peace in the Middle East as it works for progress in Africa, for social justice in Latin America, for freedom in Asia, for strength and accord in Europe, and for a climate of mutual trust with the Soviet Union. Peace, social justice, freedom, accord, mutual trust—these are the vistas beyond the cold war which give meaning to our present struggle and which sustain the sacrifices we must be prepared to make.

Thirty years ago courage was required for our Nation to find its way again. Today the need is for challenge—challenge to fulfill the potential of its strength, to play wisely the strong hand history has dealt us. New, confident, vigorous leadership is at the helm—using the winds of the century, rather than being used by them.

No one says, no one believes the sailing will be all smooth.

We recognize the wisdom of Tom Paine, in the early hours of the Republic, when he told his countrymen: "Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict the more glorious the triumph."

The conflict will be hard but the triumph of peace and freedom will, when it comes, be glorious—not for Americans alone but for all men who cherish freedom as we ourselves do.

AGRARIAN REFORM IN THE AMERICAS—ADDRESS BY DAVID HUME

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, President Kennedy in his state of the Union message called for the appropriation of a $500 million fund pledged by the Act of Bogotá to be used "as a first step in the sound development of the Americas."

Among the objectives of the Act of Bogotá is assistance in programs of land reclamation and land settlement with a view to promoting more widespread ownership and efficient use of land.

Mr. President, the other day it was my very happy privilege to meet a young man by the name of David Hume, who practices law in Maryland. He showed me a speech he had made at the 12th Inter-American Bar Convention at Bogotá last week, attended by lawyers of the Americas. This speech, which he wrote and delivered, is entitled "Agrarian Reform in the Americas." It is one of the finest and most perceptive speeches on this subject I have ever been privileged to read.

He pictured for the first time the fact that the United States itself has been the leader throughout history in agrarian reform, and he traced the act from 1862, the first homestead act, down to the present time, pointing out how this very revolutionary idea, as it is now called, was actually one which was inspired by the leaders who founded this Government of ours.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and I commend it to the attention of other Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRARIAN REFORM IN THE AMERICAS

(Address by David Hume before the Inter-American Bar Convention, Bogotá, Colombia)

Agrarian reform, increasingly embodying one of the great problems of this age, is almost as difficult of definition as it is of solution.

Cursed and reversed, damned and deified, declared both monster and savior, the redistribution of lands under this principle has challenged successfully the best of minds and the worst of intentions.

For many legal theorists, agrarian reform is simply an organized change in land tenure; for others it is a program to improve the relative position of small agricultural units in the economy; for those intent on establishing the best methods to finance it, the reform has been called "a change in land tenure, organized and directed by the state, for the purpose of obtaining better distribution of land, followed by supplemental measures to increase agricultural production."[1]

It is the stuff of which dreams and nightmares are made. For the impoverished and landless farmer, it is hope; for the very rich absentee landlord, it is the Devil's work, come to take by theft what is impossible to take by law.

HISTORY

The history of agrarian reform is the history of mankind extending throughout that period which we know and into the age where we can only guess. Thirty-five centuries before the wheel and the horse reached Egypt from Asia, we find the ancient Egyptian civilization with an agricultural system recognizable even today. In the golden age of the Pharaoh, known in that arid land as "the giver of water to the earth," we find the system where by decree one-quarter of each harvest was shared amongst the inhabitants of the district which produced it, while the other three-quarters were set aside for the expenses of administration—in other words, for the salaries of the officials and for the cost of maintaining those relatively few citizens who dealt directly with the Pharaoh himself.

The pyramids do not tell the story; and were it not for the advanced writings—I do not use the word civilization—of that time, the history of this ancient farmer would be still mute.

If the nomadic tribes who descended on the fat prizes of civilization met with less than a spirited resistance, the answer might well be found here.

Basically there was to be no change for thousands of years, down through the civilization of the Tigris and Euphrates and into the time of what we call modern civilization.

It is interesting to note that, under the Code of Hammurabi some 20 centuries before Christ, landed proprietors were made responsible to the state for the upkeep of the canals on their land. We sense, even by this fragment of historical minute, that the land itself was beginning to suffer.

Somehow the conscience of kings lagged far behind the scientific ingenuity of the subjects. In the basin of the Yellow River, the Chinese farmers, not yet imprisoned in the servitude which was to be their lot, were fighting for survival by clearing and draining the land, providing it with a system of irrigation, pouring it with crops, and turning the great plain into a garden in which the first citrus fruits were developed.

Thousands of miles away and hundreds of years later, we glimpse more clearly the great Greek culture and by the seventh century before Christ, we can hear the great Solon lashing out against a system which already found the Greek farmer in bondage, and setting a limit on the amount of land which could be held by any landowner.

Sparta appears just long enough for us to recognize her third-class citizens, the Helots, peasants attached to the land on which they worked, men whose life was held in such contempt that they could be killed with impunity.

The baton of world leadership passed from hand to hand, from the Greek to the Roman and almost unnoticed to the barbarian who was our immediate parent.

There were protests; there were laws, and there was frustration. The Caesar Maximian was to take his place on the podium of history as one who had suppressed the peasants of Gaul, who were, according to Gibbon, "confined to the soil either by the real weight of fetters or by the no less cruel and forcible restraint of the lords."

Almost unnoticed, too, at that time except by a handful of those who believed, was the proclamation of a new and thrilling concept that man was beneficiary of a soul given only by God and taken only by God. The farmer, the coloni partiarii, unprotected by the agricultural codes of the Egyptians and those who followed, was to find that, in religion at least, he was at long last a part of the brotherhood of man.

For many it was still a well-kept secret.

For many it still is.

Adam Smith looking back on this period had this to say of the situation: "In the ancient state of Europe the occupiers of land were all tenants at will. They belonged more to the land than to the master. The people on the land could not marry without consent of the lord; they could not acquire property except in unusual circumstances, and when they did, it was in the name of the master." As Smith was writing this in the latter part of the 18th century, he noted that the practice had not changed in "Russia, Poland, Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia, and parts of Germany."

Pliny the Elder had looked into the future and said "Latifundia will be the ruin of Italy." He apparently spoke with good cause. As the Roman discipline broke down, the landless mobs assembled in Rome. In a classic example of attacking a symptom rather than a cause, the Caesars built for the increasingly unruly rabble vast coliseums and arranged the great spectacles to take their minds off their troubles. Whether this was considered cheaper in the long run than agrarian reform has been lost to us in the mists of time.

The beautiful land was obviously being wasted even faster, by this time under the prevailing system and Pliny and Columella, with a sense of urgency felt even now, denounced agricultural slavery as wasteful and expensive. They openly mourned the death of incentive in the Roman farmer. The philosophers agreed: "Whatever work he does beyond what is sufficient to purchase his own maintenance can be squeezed out of him by violence only and not any interest of his own."

Long after Rome and concurrent with the Crusades, we can note in passing that at last, by the Assize of Jerusalem, exact evaluations had been placed on the men bound to the soil: Three slaves equaled 12 oxen equaled 1 war horse equaled 300 pieces of gold.

In the common law nations which developed, the land tenure system was dominated by the metayers, or as they were called in Scotland the "steel bow tenants," or as dignified by Blackstone, the "bailiffs," those deserving subjects appointed by the feudal lords to collect the rents and taxes, and to enforce their laws.

The Latin American pattern of land tenure was being developed in Spain and Portugal. As the Spanish drove the Moors back into the sea, they left the mark of their own brand of feudalistic tenure in their wake. For the farmer who had fought to free himself from his foreign master, we can only guess at his disappointment. For the land itself, the release from the conservation-minded Moor spelled disaster. The irreplaceable topsoil, which had taken 10,000 years per inch to create, bled unchecked into the rivers and out to the sea.

Almost 18 centuries were to pass from the time of the birth of Christ before man could bring himself to begin an earnest application of those principles which would recognize that he need not die before he could claim a plot of land as his own. For the warrior who disdained the plow and grasped the sword of conquest, land was the incidental road to plunder. In a world dedicated to the law of violence, feudalism was both cause and result.

It was the explorer who was to change everything, albeit unwittingly, with the discovery of a new world. In the beginning the changes to come were hardly visible. Within 25 years, in 1513, of the first landing of Columbus, Charles V had issued a royal decree ordering the distribution of caballeria and peonia lands to his conquering troops. His careful distinction between caballeros and infantes would have been surprising only if it had not been made (over 300 years later in 1818 the Congress of Angostura of Venezuela carefully retained the spirit of the royal decree).

Along with the first European exports—science, religion, modern weapons of war, smallpox, and venereal disease, came the feudal system of the civilized world which, insofar as the tiller of the soil was concerned, must have made the communal system already employed by the great ruling Indian tribes seem a veritable paradise. Someone with an eye for administrative cleanliness decreed in Bolivia by 1572 that the individual tribute of the farmer was to be 8 pesos per person. It is hardly likely that an official eyebrow was raised.

Unseen, unnoticed, unexpectedly the seeds for agrarian reform, so long dormant, now began their germination. While the aristocracy concerned itself with immediate wealth only to be transported to the homeland, the new arrivals who tilled the soil pushed deeper and deeper into the wilderness and farther and farther away from constituted authority. The inherent dignity that attaches to a man who has his own home, who tills his own soil, who stands as master of his own family unit, began to assert itself. The farmer and the priest alone did not seek the quick trip home.

As man suddenly found himself independent in the wilderness, while his former masters were busy with more important matters, the spirit created for his new found dignity continued to grow and by the latter part of the 18th century the whisperings of individual revolution burst into the roar of full war on the American continents as the tillers of the soil from many lands turned on constituted authority from abroad.

In a world uniformly dedicated to the political principles of the divine right of kings, to an acceptance of governments which took for granted that the transfer of land included the transfer of human beings on that land, the trumpeting of the equality of man was echoed and reechoed. The peoples of the Americas almost as one rose to the words blazing across the horizon:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. * * * That to secure

[1] I–A Cles, Cita de Carroll, Thomas F., Bangkok, Thalandia, Diciembre de 1954, F.A.O.

these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The magic words were not fulfillment, but the promise had been made.

There was hope.

It has been said that the Latin American wars of independence, unlike that in the United States of America, were fought by and for a ruling elite with the bulk of the population participating much as the vassals of the Middle Ages had fought for and with their feudal lords.

So long as the curse of slavery hung heavy on the lands of the New World, the distinction appears a fragile yardstick.

If it be possible to establish the moment in time for a concrete beginning to a new system of land tenure, the historian of today might well pause here.

The death rattle of slavery was beginning for the keen of hearing, although it took almost three-quarters of a century of agony and blood to finally kill it.

The vast armies of the landless were plunging toward the freedom they had sought so long. Slowly at first but ever gathering momentum, legislatures recognized the new status for men of the soil and new laws were placed on the statute books of the world. The executive and the judiciary were to complete the encirclement of the problem.

Desire and power were married at this auspicious moment.

LEGISLATION

By 1796 a land act was passed by the Congress of the United States of America, and by 1803 a congressional committee was sending questions to the Secretary of the Treasury—questions having to do with the size of the tracts, the methods of sales, the amount of interest to be charged, and the credit systems to be employed.[2]

By 1797 settlers along the great Ohio River, in what would have appeared sheer presumptuousness only a few years before, were asking for 400 acres per family, and by 1806 the pioneers who had ventured without authority to settle on Government land were asking the Government for title without pay. These were the squatters.

The North American squatter, whose counterpart was called agregado in Argentina, tolerado in Bolivia, precario in Chile, precarista in Cuba, or ocupante in still other nations, was no longer a villein. By a series of preemption laws enacted between 1800 and 1841, he began the purchase of lands in the public domain—land belonging to all the people and which he was to own in fee simple.

More than 1 billion acres of public lands were disposed of by the Federal Government of the United States under various programs, all directed to the consummation of the ancient dream that each man should have the opportunity to occupy a parcel of land, not his grave.

Not all the legislation in the United States was good; not all the statutes effected their avowed purpose, and there was no clear-cut delineation of effort. The recital of the legislative enactments cannot help, however, but carry a certain excitement to the student of this subject. There was the original Homestead Act of 1862 by which a man acquired title to 160 acres of land after building a habitable house, cultivating a part of the land, and residing on it for a period originally set at 5 years but later reduced to 3; the enlarged Homestead Act of 1909 which increased the acreage allowable to 320 acres for homesteaders in the arid West; the Stock Raising Homestead Act of 1916 which increased the acreage to some 640 acres.

On another front, irrigable lands in Federal reclamation projects were opened in 1902; lands within the national forests were opened in 1906.

The territory disappeared in vast chunks: 61 million acres to veterans; 11 million acres under the Timber Culture Act of 1873; 14 million acres under the Timber and Stone Act; and still another 10 million acres under the Desert Land Act of 1877 as modified in 1891.

The agencies necessary to assist in the great programs which then ensued included the Farm Credit Administration, established in 1916 to meet the need for long-term, low-interest loans for the purchases of the farm land, the establishment of Federal Land Banks and of National Farm Loan Associations.

As the United States of America was to discover, the battle for freedom for her citizens of the soil required constant attention. As a consequence, in the early 1930's with the great depression which paralyzed the economic world, it became necessary to establish credit cooperatives, to establish measures to alleviate the condition of these farmers who stood to lose what their immediate ancestors had gained. There was emergency legislation—a provision for operating loans; liberal mortgage laws; but most important, under the Farm Home Administration the provision of educational facilities by county supervisors to work with the farmers in preparing farm-management plans, to set up and keep farm records on a scientific basis and to analyze and render advice on farm problems as they occurred.

Beginning with the Smith-Lever Act of 1941,[3] agricultural research was established through a system encompassing the major political subdivisions—the Federal Government, the States, the counties, and to some degree private organizations. Cooperatives were established and encouraged; marketing facilities were created and maintained.

It had taken the whole of man's history to accomplish, but the tiller of soil had found his opportunity.

Simultaneous with the efforts of the United States, the independent nations of Latin America faced the challenge and were well into the attainment of the goal before the ancient lands in Europe and Asia followed.

Simon Bolivar's Trujillo Decree of 1825 had taken a deep cut at the feudal system in Bolivia by demanding cash payment to the laborers on large farms. It mattered little that the decree was unsuccessful; a beginning had been made. By successive acts in 1842, 1850, and 1863, the efforts were continued to raise the standard of living of the agricultural workers. There was no nation in Latin America that had not turned to the task.

The legislation in Latin America was in many instances even more directly pointed to the issue than that utilized by their neighbor to the North.

In Guatemala, Decree No. 900 in 1952 establishing agrarian reform was based directly on the 1945 Constitution prohibiting Latifundia and requiring the land to be returned to the State. Decree No. 900 was repealed in 1954 and replaced by the Agrarian Statute in 1957.

The National Constitution of Paraguay adopted in 1940 provided in Article 13:

"In no case will private interests prevail over the general interests of the Paraguayan nation. All citizens are obliged to lend their cooperation."

Article 21 of the National Constitution of Paraguay provided:

"The Constitution guarantees private property, the content and limits thereof to be fixed by law, bearing in mind its social function. No one may be deprived of his property except by virtue of a judgment founded in law. The ownership of property of all kinds may be legally changed by expropriation for reasons of social interest defined by law, which shall also determine the manner in which compensation shall be made. The law may fix the maximum land area that a single individual or a legally constituted company may own, and any in excess of that amount shall be sold at public auction or be expropriated by the state for distribution."

Article 22 contained this dynamic language:

"Every Paraguayan home shall be situated on a piece of land belonging to the family."

Twenty-five years previously Mexico had established the law of agrarian reform as one of the bases for their revolution in 1910 and 2 years later had incorporated that law into the Constitution of the Republic.

The same basic understanding of the problem was mirrored in the laws of Uruguay in the series of statutes commencing in 1923 where we find the expropriation of lands based on "public utility."[4]

THE LAW

As law gradually replaced force in man's evolution, the strident voice of the warrior was muted by the softer but more compelling voice of the lawyer and the jurist. If those who still yearn for the limited comfort of the feudal system need a villain to receive their contempt, let them look for him amongst our professional ancestors. It was the lawyer and the jurist who more than any other were to saw through the fetters which bound his brothers to the soil.

For the lawyer interested in the affairs of the Americas, and particularly in the problem we now discuss, an examination of the principal legal theories which supplemented the actions of the executive and the legislature may be of interest.

Facts change, circumstances vary, the law reflects. When there is plenty of land and a relatively few people demanding a portion which they insist in their birthright, the task of distributing the land is relatively simple, and at first blush it may appear that this was the case in my own country.

Let me suggest to you that we examine the legal doctrines applicable to determine if in fact there is not in our systems of jurisprudence adequate justification to distribute not only public but private land into the permanent tenure of private individuals—to have and to hold, to dispose of as they see fit, and to bestow as they desire.

Put another way: Can the state legally acquire any land, public or private, compensating the owner with public moneys, and then grant or sell this land to individuals who will become the new owners in fee simple? Let me submit not only that the question may be answered in the affirmative if applied to our past legal history but that it be answered in the affirmative for the future.

For reasons more of convenience than necessity, let us look then to the cases which deal with the element of the actual taking of land which pertains in some degree to all our nations represented here today. Generally known as expropriation or appropriation in England and the Latin American nations, the taking is known by the principle of eminent domain in the United States of America.

Eminent domain reduced to its minimum might be defined as the power of the sovereign to take property for public use without the owner's consent.[5] Although the name eminent domain is of comparatively recent

[2] Documento del Senado No. 56, 85th Congreso, Primera Sesión.

[3] Véase Estudio de Políticas nacionales sobre Propiedad Federal de Tierras, Doc. 56, 85th Congreso, Primera Sesión.

[4] La ley del 20 de Setiembre de 1939 y del 21 de Setiembre de 1941.

[5] *Scott* c. *Toledo*, 36 F. 385.

origin, the power has been exercised probably since the days of the Romans.[6] Hugo Grotius is credited with originating the term eminent domain and is generally recognized as being responsible for the crystallization of the legal theorem upon which it is based.[7] By today's interpretation the theory of eminent domain, by whatever name, is nothing more or less than an inherent political right which is considered so vital to the very existence and safety of the government[8] that the property right of the individual is subordinated to the welfare of the community.[9]

In the early history of our juridicial ancestors, we know that all land was owned of right by the king, and that individual ownership was merely a holding by the king in return for performance of governmental functions. Under feudalistic tenure, the king as a consequence had a prerogative right, later recognized in common law, of entering upon private property, with the purpose of erecting defenses against a public enemy, or to protect the nation against the inroads of the sea.[10] The sovereign also had the prerogative right of performance and preemption—the right to seize provisions for the use of the royal household without the consent of the owner, and later, perhaps a little reluctantly, to pay for them at a fair valuation made by appraisers. The theory underlying these rights was the foetus of what was to become eminent domain. The characteristics of the power of eminent domain in England are summed up by Nichols,[11] as follows:

"The power of eminent domain was thus well established in England by the time of the American Revolution, and the obligation to make compensation had become a necessary incident to the exercise of the power.

"Besides, the public good is in nothing more essentially interested, than in the protection of every individual's private rights, as modeled by the municipal law. In this and similar cases the legislature alone can, and indeed frequently does, interpose, and compel the individual to acquiesce. But how does it interpose and compel? Not by absolutely stripping the subject of his property in an arbitrary manner; but by giving him a full indemnification and equivalent for the injury thereby sustained. The public is now considered as an individual, treating with an individual for an exchange. All that the legislature does is to oblige the owner to alienate his possessions for a reasonable price; and even this is an exertion of a power; which the legislature indulges with caution and which none but the legislature can perform."

Eminent domain was used in the American Colonies but the procedure of its use varied from Colony to Colony and ranged from a taking of private property without judicial process to the use of the old writ ad quod damnum. The colonial period's use of the power is summed up by Nichols in section 1.22(14), as follows:

"It will thus be seen that the power of eminent domain was exercised in the American Colonies, and that the obligation to make compensation for land taken, although not treated as an absolute right, was recognized in all of the Colonies except South Carolina as soon as property of that character had attained sufficient value to make the taking of it more than a nominal injury. On the other hand, the exercise of the power was not restricted to the public use, at least in the narrow sense in which that phrase is commonly used today, but eminent domain was used in behalf of mills, and of private roads and in a certain sense of private drainage, as freely as in the case of public highways. In short, the history of eminent domain in the American Colonies seems to sustain a doctrine that the power of eminent domain, as it exists untrammelled by constitutional limitations, extends to the taking of property within the jurisdiction of the State for the public good, subject only to the moral obligation of making compensation."

The original basis of the theory was to change so that today eminent domain is not considered a property right or an exercise by the State of ultimate ownership but more a part of the basic structure of State sovereignty. Thus, today in the United States, the power of the Government to acquire and hold that land which is needed for the execution of many constitutional powers is unquestioned; and when that property cannot be taken by voluntary arrangement with the owner, the taking by the government which follows is limited by the power of just compensation and the constitutional provision that no person shall be deprived of his property without due process of law. Let us examine for a moment how this power has been utilized since colonial days.

It has been used, of course, to acquire the necessary sites for public buildings,[12] as a protection to public health and safety[13] for public libraries,[14] for purposes of education,[15] for public parks,[16] for the preservation of places of historical interest,[17] and even for the acquisition of public fisheries,[18] for public highways,[19] for railroads.[20]

A clear statement of the doctrine of eminent domain in the United States upon entering the twentieth century is to be found in the *Kohl* case.[21] Mr. Justice Strong stated the position of the court with a logic and a precision which precludes any ambiguity:

"It has not been seriously contended during the argument that the United States Government is without power to appropriate lands or other property within the States for its own uses, and to enable it to perform its proper functions. Such an authority is essential to its independent existence and perpetuity. These cannot be preserved if the obstinacy of a private person, or if any other authority, can prevent the acquisition of the means or instruments by which alone governmental functions can be performed. The powers vested by the Constitution in the General Government demand for their exercise the acquisition of land in all the States. These are needed for forts, armories and arsenals, for navy yards and lighthouses, post offices, and courthouses, and for other public uses. If the right to acquire property for such uses may be made a barren right by the unwillingness of property holders to sell, or by the action of a State prohibiting a sale to the Federal Government, the constitutional grants of power may be rendered nugatory, and the Government is dependent for its practical existence upon the will of a State, or even upon that of a private citizen. This cannot be. No one doubts the existence in the State governments of the right of eminent domain—a right distinct from and paramount to the right of ultimate ownership. It grows out of the necessities of their being, not out of the tenure by which lands are held. It may be exercised, though the lands are not held by grant from the Government, either mediately or immediately, and independent of the consideration whether they would escheat to the Government in case of a failure of heirs. The right is the offspring of political necessity; and it is inseparable from sovereignty, unless denied to it by its fundamental law. Vatt. ch. 20, 34; Bynk, lib. 2, ch. 15; Kent, Com. 338340; Cooley, Const. Lim. 584, et seq."

THE PRECISE USE OF AGRICULTURE

At this point it is worth while to examine what might have been the position of the U.S. Government with respect to land reforms if our Nation had been confronted with the same set of basic facts that confronts a great many Latin American nations today. The first North American Conservation Conference held in February, 1909, in Washington, D.C., had this to say in its declaration of principles in part dealing with the subject of lands:

"We recognize land as a fundamental resource, yielding the materials needed for sustaining population, and forming the basis of social organization. Increase in the pro-

---

[6] Anales de Tácito, Libro I, p. 75.

[7] Véase discusión, De Jure Belli et Pacis, Lib. III C. 20.

[8] *Sweet* c. *Rechel*, 159 E.E.U.U. 349, 379 (1895).

[9] Véase anotación, ibid., 40 L. Ed. 188, Dominio eminente.

[10] Es de interés destacar las leyes aprobadas desde 1917 por el Congreso de los Estados Unidos sobre control de inundaciones solamente.

Ley pública No. 367, 64 Congreso 39 Est. 948, Marzo I, 1917.

Ley Pública No. 277, 66 Congreso 41 Est. 1059, Junio 5, 1920.

Ley Pública No. 320, 66 Congreso 41 Est. 1105, Febrero 27, 1921.

Ley Pública No. 372, 66 Congreso 41 Est. 1354, Marzo 3, 1921.

Ley Pública No. 528, 67 Congreso 42 Est. 1505, Marzo 4, 1923.

Ley Pública No. 892, 68 Congreso 43 Est. 1000, Febrero 26, 1925.

Ley Pública No. 391, 70 Congreso 45 Est. 534, Mayo 15, 1928.

Ley Pública No. 775, 70 Congreso 45 Est. 1228, Febrero 19, 1929.

Ley Pública No. 678, 74 Congreso 49 Est. 1508, Junio 15, 1936.

Ley Pública No. 738, 74 Congreso 49 Est. 1570, Junio 22, 1936.

Ley Pública No. 761, 75 Congreso 52 Est. 1215, Junio 28, 1938.

Ley Pública No. 396, 76 Congreso 53 Est. 1414, Agosto 11, 1939.

Ley Pública No. 228, 77 Congreso 55 Est. 638, Agosto 18, 1941.

Ley Pública No. 534, 78 Congreso 38 Est. 887, Diciembre 22, 1944.

Ley Pública No. 526, 79 Congreso 60 Est. 641, Julio 24, 1946.

Ley Pública No. 858, 80 Congreso 62 Est. 1175, Junio 30, 1948.

Ley Pública No. 516, 81 Congreso 64 Est. 170, Mayo 17, 1950.

Ley Pública No. 202, 82 Congreso 65 Est. 615, Octubre 24, 1955.

Ley Pública No. 566, 83 Congreso 68 Est. 666, Agosto 4, 1954.

Ley Pública No. 780, 83 Congreso 68 Est. 666, Agosto 4, 1954.

Ley Pública No. 99, 84 Congreso 69 Est. 186, Junio 28, 1955.

Ley Pública No. 685, 84 Congreso 70 Est. 522, Julio 11, 1956.

[11] Vol. I, #1.21(5).

[12] *Kohl* c. *E.E.U.U.*, 91 U.S. 367 (1876).

[13] *New York City Housing Authority* c. *Muller*, 270 N.Y. 333 I.N.E.

[14] *Johnson* c. *Baltimore*, 158 Md. 93, 148 Atl. 209, 66 A.L.R. 1488.

[15] *Albright* c. *Sussex County Lake & Park Commission*, 71 N.J.L. 303. 57 Atl. 398.

[16] *E.E.U.U.* c. *Gettysburg Electric R. Co.*, 160 U.S. 668 (1896).

[17] *E.E.U.U.* c. *Gettysburg Electric R. Co.*, 160 U.S. 668 (1896).

[18] Esto incluía la adquisición de bancos de ostras y su uso declarado público bajo las leyes existentes; el uso de los bancos de ostras de una subdivisión política o condado estaba confinado a los habitantes de ese condado. *Cox* c. *Revelle*, 125 Md. 579, 94 Atl. 203.

[19] *Rindge Co.* c. *Los Angeles County*, 262 U.S. 700.

[20] *E.E.U.U.* c. *Joint Traffic Association*, 171, U.S. 505 (1898). *Cherokee Nation* c. *Southern Kansas R. Co.*, 135 U.S. 641 (1890).

[21] 91 U.S. 367 en pag 372.

ductivity of the soil is a growing need, and the possession of the land by the men who live upon it not only promotes such productivity, but is also the best guaranty of good citizenship. In the interest of the homemaker we favor regulation of grazing on public land, the disposal of public lands to actual settlers in areas each sufficient to support a family and the subdivision of excessive holdings of agricultural or grazing land, thereby preventing monopoly."

In 1930 the Natural Resources Board in a report by its Land Committee stated:

"Ownership of land by individuals in fee simple absolute was established early in the history of this country in spite of early attempts to establish a semimanorial system in some of the Colonies.

"This system has become so firmly established in the United States that individual ownership of land has come to be considered widely, not as a privilege granted and protected by the State, but as the natural state of affairs.

"This attitude, strong in the early years of our national history, led to Federal and State programs to put public lands into private ownership as rapidly as possible. Public ownership was considered for the most part only as a step in the transfer of practically all of the lands into private hands.

("Report of the Land Committee to the National Resources Planning Board, Public Land, Acquisition in a National Land-Use Program; Part I: Rural Lands, Washington, 1940, p. 1.")

Thus it is now readily apparent that if it had been necessary to issue a policy declaration by the United States with regard to land reform, the question would be one of the degree of public benefit involved insofar as extension of the doctrine of eminent domain is concerned. More especially, the question becomes one of necessity for the development of the resources of a community or of a State. In *Clark* v. *Nash*,[22] it was pointed out that two lines of authority then existed, neither of which attempted to lay down a fixed rule as a guide in all cases. One line of authorities, in a general way, held that by public use is meant a use by the public or its agencies, i.e., the public must have the right to the actual use in some way of the property appropriated. The other line of decisions was to the effect that it is a public use within the meaning of the law when the taking is for a use that will promote the public interest and tends to develop the great natural resources of the commonwealth.[23]

The Federal Supreme Court, while emphasizing the great caution which must be exercised in the matter, has consistently recognized the inadequacy of use by the general public as a universal test; it has taken the view that there may be exceptional times and places in which the very foundations of public welfare cannot be laid without requiring concessions from individuals to each other, upon due compensation, which under other circumstances would be left wholly to voluntary consent, and that the question is largely one of state policy.[24]

The doctrine that public benefit may be sufficient without a right of use on the part of the public, to justify a taking of property under eminent domain as for a public use, is recognized, however, in a leading case involving irrigation, decided by the Federal Supreme Court. The Court had this to say on the subject: [25]

"While the consideration that the work of irrigation must be abandoned if the use of the water may not be held to be or constitute a public use is not to be regarded as conclusive in favor of such use, yet that fact is in this case a most important consideration. Millions of acres of land otherwise cultivable must be left in their present arid and worthless condition, and an effectual obstacle will therefore remain in the way of the advance of a large portion of the state in material wealth and prosperity. To irrigate and thus to bring into possible cultivation these large masses of otherwise worthless lands would seem to be a public purpose and a matter of public interest, not confined to the landowners, or even to any one section of the State. The fact that the use of the water is limited to the landowner is not therefore a fatal objection to this legislation. It is not essential that the entire community, or even any considerable portion thereof, should directly enjoy or participate in an improvement in order to constitute a public use."

It may well be that the law itself and those intellectual processes which go into the formulation of the law were best stated by a judge of the South Dakota Supreme Court in 1921 in a case styled *Wheelon* v. *South Dakota Land Settlement Board, et al.*[26]

Faced with the determination of the constitutionality of a statute authorizing loans to war veterans to enable them to purchase land and in the course of the determination to decide whether the action amounted to a personal gratuity or donation forbidden by the Constitution, Justice Gates revealed himself as something more than a judge looking coldbloodedly at the law of the land.

In the course of the opinion, the Justice looked squarely at the problem and asked the question:

"Is, then, the promotion of land settlement a public purpose?" [27]

And by way of a partial answer he quoted from a Professor Elwood Mead, the author of "Helping Men Own Farms": [28]

"We are only just beginning to realize that our future is likely to be determined primarily by the relation of the people to the land. The chaos of Russia has grown out of land hunger; no one fears the safety of France, where nearly half the people are landowners. We have often stated, but little heeded, the facts that we are ceasing to be a landowning nation, and that the landborn are drifting to the cities. We have yet to learn what the older countries of the world already know—that keeping people on the land in the years to come must be one of the main endeavors of civilized nations. People cannot be kept on the land where nonresident ownership and tenantry prevail. Nothing sort [sic] of ownership of the land one toils over will suffice to overcome the lure of the city. At any sacrifice, at any cost, the people who farm the land must be enabled to own it. On such ownership the life of a modern nation may depend."

And he quoted from a Washington case which he felt was in point and this language is important: [29]

"Our problem, then, is reduced to this: Is the raising of funds by taxation, and the expenditure thereof for the purchase of land to the end that it be subdivided, improved, and disposed of as by the terms of this act provided, the exercise of the power of taxation and the expenditure of public funds for a public purpose? It may be well doubted that there has ever come to the American courts any more vexatious question than that of determining whether or not a particular purpose for which public funds were sought to be raised by taxation and expended is a public purpose, when the particular purpose in question lay within the twilight zone wherein the minds may reasonably differ as to such purpose being a public one; the bounds of which zone are ever changing with the passing of time, and within which new problems of public welfare always first appear. That such a question when arising in the courts has proven so vexatious is, we apprehend, because of its inherent nature, in that, in its last analysis, it is not one of exclusive legal logic, but is one more or less of policy and wisdom, properly determinable in the light of public welfare, present and future, in a broad sense, and hence is not a pure judicial law question, except in those cases clearly outside of the twilight zone we have alluded to."

And through the Washington court he reached out to another judge, thousands of miles away on the other side of our vast land and cited this language: [30]

"The courts have never attempted to lay down with minute detail an inexorable rule distinguishing public from private purposes, because it would be impossible to do so. Times change. The wants and necessities of the people change. The opportunity to satisfy those wants and necessities by individual effort may vary. What was clearly a public use a century ago may, because of changed conditions, have ceased to be such today. Thus, the Mill Act which came into being in the early days of our parent Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and was adopted by our own State, was upheld as constitutional because of the necessities of those primitive times. The courts in later days have strongly intimated that were it an original question it might be difficult to sustain it in view of present industrial conditions. *Murdock* v. *Stickney*, 8 Cush. 113; *Salisbury Mills* v. *Forsaith*, 57 N.H. 124; *Jordan* v. *Woodward*, 40 Me. 317. On the other hand, what could not be deemed a public use a century ago may, because of changed economic and industrial conditions, be such today. Laws which were entirely adequate to secure public welfare then may be inadequate to accomplish the same results now.

"Is there not abundant room for arguing that the development of our unoccupied lands suitable for agriculture, by a land policy which would encourage the settlement thereon of homeowning farmers, will materially contribute to the welfare of our people as a whole? Can it not be argued with a fair show of reason that not only will such a policy ultimately lead to the enchancement of the material wealth of the State, but that it will also make for better citizenship, better notions of necessity for law and order, and a sounder and saner patriotism?"

And he quotes: [31]

"Whether or not the work contemplated by the act is strictly a work of internal improvement we do not need to determine, because it clearly is a business enterprise which will tend to the development of the resources of the State. That does not admit of argument."

So much for the taking of the property. The measure of damages to the individual from whom land is taken has over the years been set forth with well-defined criteria and includes remote and speculative damages; [32] the loss of productive and rental value; [33] compensation for interference with the use

[22] 198 U.S. 361, 49 L. Ed. 1085 (1905).

[23] *Nash* c. *Clark*, 27 Utah 158, 75 P. 371.

[24] *Nash* c. *Clark*, 198 U.S. 361 (1905) afirmación caso citado.

[25] *Distrito Fallbrook de Riego* c. *Bradley*, 164 U.S. 112, p. 161 (1896).

[26] 181 N.W. 359 Citado y Anotado 14 A.L.R. 1145.

[27] Ibid., en pag 1148.

[28] En la pag 10 de ése trabajo; ibid en pag 1148.

[29] Ibid., p. 1149.

[30] Ibid., p. 1150.

[31] Ibid., p. 1150.

[32] *E.E.U.U.* c. *Chandler-Dunbar Compañía Hidroeléctrica*, 229 U.S. (1913) 53.

[33] *Chicago* c. *Taylor*, 125 U.S. 161 (1888).

of property; [34] for the obstruction of access; [35] for the expense of fencing; [36] for water supply damage; [37] for diversion of traffic; [38] and of course for court costs.[39]

But in a much broader sense, it is for us to determine the damages accruing to our countries from not taking any action at all, from fleeing before a controversy which demands solution, or from hoping wistfully that the problem itself will disappear.

The final answer to the problem of agrarian reform, when it comes, will have its origin in many areas—the social conscience, science, and, mainly, the law and its interpretation.

Each nation shall decide.

Each of us, as lawyers and as jurists, must decide.

THE FUTURE

The future, empty for so many generations for men alined with the soil, is suddenly crowded with those who have the capacity and the desire to solve the problem of agrarian reform.

On the political front as each individual nation hammers away at the specific solutions for its own particular problems, we find the great international bodies, the United Nations and the Organization of American States, directing their vast energies to the development of research and other factual data necessary to intelligent solution.[40]

In the field of our political activity, we must recognize the tremendous impact of the Act of Bogotá adopted by the Committee of Twenty-one on September 13, of last year, which set forth an inter-American program for social development which should be directed to the carrying out of specific measures in the field of agrarian reform, as considered appropriate in each country. The words themselves and the thought behind the words are of such vital importance that we cannot help but examine them closely:

"A. Measures for the improvement of conditions of rural living and land use

"1. The examination of existing legal and institutional systems with respect to:

"(a) Land tenure legislation and facilities with a view to ensuring a wider and more equitable distribution of the ownership of land, in a manner consistent with the objectives of employment, productivity and economic growth;

"(b) Agricultural credit institutions with a view to providing adequate financing to individual farmers or groups of farmers;

"(c) Tax systems and procedures and fiscal policies with a view to assuring equity of taxation and encouraging improved use of land, especially of privately owned land which is idle.

"2. The initiation or acceleration of appropriate programs to modernize and improve the existing legal and institutional framework to ensure better conditions of land tenure, extend more adequate credit facilities and provide increased incentives in the land tax structure.

"3. The acceleration of the preparation of programs for:

"(a) Land reclamation and land settlement, with a view to promoting more widespread ownership and efficient use of land, particularly of unutilized or underutilized land;

"(b) The increase of the productivity of land already in use; and

"(c) The construction of farm-to-market and access roads.

"4. The adoption or acceleration of other government service programs designed particularly to assist the small farmer, such as new or improved marketing organizations; extension services; research and basic surveys; and demonstration, education, and training facilities."

While I would leave the field of ecclesiastical law to others more qualified, let me suggest that the student of this subject read the statement on agrarian reform by His Excellency Raul Zambrano Camader of our host country to ascertain the powerful voice which has been raised by those dedicated to the work of God.[41]

On quite another front we must recognize that the scientific developments of today, unthought of yesterday, are out of date tomorrow. A few years ago we found ourselves calling the 20th century the atomic age and now it seems certain that the glib label was attached too soon. In the field of salt water conversion alone we find ourselves on the verge of a breakthrough which would enable us to convert salt or brackish water into fresh water so that irrigation by this method will soon be economically feasible.[42] In those sections of the world where water has meant the difference between peace or war, feast or famine, plenty or poverty, life or death, the splitting of the atom cannot possibly mean as much as this one great development.

And from ourselves—from the lawyers and jurists of the Americas we have a great intellectual reservoir available for the solution of not only this problem but the problems the future may bring. One may read with a bemused detachment now what one of our great national leaders once said of the Western United States:

"What do we want with this vast worthless area—this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts and those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable and covered to their base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, cheerless, and uninviting, and not a harbor on it?" [43]

It may come as a great shock to my own countrymen to know that this statement was made by the incomparable Daniel Webster. And I use it not by way of criticism of a man whose vision was limited by the shortcoming of his own time but as some indication that we must not, we cannot, lose confidence in what it is possible to do by men of vision and good faith.

The frontiers of our ancestors once lay along the boundaries of the sea. Ours lie beyond space. The spirit that reached one can reach the other.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last November, shortly after he was elected Vice President of the United States, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON made the following statement:

I can assure you that the Kennedy administration believes in the fullest possible freedom of public information; that secrecy will not be invoked to cover up embarrassing human errors and painful facts; and that Senator Kennedy intends to establish an effective governmental machinery to support the public's right to know.

This is a rather encouraging statement, but the events that have followed that statement have not been too encouraging. For example, Adm. Arleigh Burke was made to rewrite his speech. A blackout has been thrown around Captains Olmstead and McKone, the fliers of the RB–47 who have returned from Russia.

The Columbia Broadcasting Co. strangely called off a program that was to be developed regarding Russian spies. After the first Cabinet meeting in the White House reporters were not able to get information from Cabinet members, which is rather unusual in view of the fact that they had been able to do so previously.

Other events have occurred that would raise doubts about the Vice President's statement.

First, there was the embarrassment caused the chief of the New Frontier when one of his scouts announced the discovery that there is no missile gap. Now the flag of doubt is being waved by the White House, aided by the button-down minds of the Washington Post who have so long preached the need of full disclosure. It depends, I suppose, on who or what is being disclosed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Right To Know," published in the Arizona Republic of February 3, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Last November, shortly after he was elected Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON addressed the Associated Press Managing Editors Association at Williamsburg, Va. What he said was so important that we would like to quote a portion of his address, which was engraved on a plaque and presented to the Vice President. Declared Mr. JOHNSON:

"In the years ahead, those of us in the executive branch must see that there is no smokescreen of secrecy. The people of a free country have a right to know about the conduct of their public affairs.

"I can assure you that the Kennedy administration believes in the fullest possible freedom of public information; that secrecy will not be invoked to cover up embarrassing human errors and painful facts; and that Senator Kennedy intends to establish an effective governmental machinery to support the public's right to know."

---

[34] *Bauman* c. *Ross*, 167 U.S. 548 (1897).

[35] *E.E.U.U.* c. *Welch*, 271 U.S. 333 (1910).

[36] *Condado de Tillamook* c. *Johnson*, 190 P. 159 (1920).

[37] *E.E.U.U.* c. *Alexander*, 148 U.S. 186 (1893).

[38] *Jackson* c. *Chicago Ry. Co.*, 41 F. 656.

[39] *E.E.U.U.* c. *Intols*, 26 F. Cas. 482, F. Cas. No. 15441.

[40] I-A ECOSOC Series, OEA/Ser. H/VI:ES-CERA-Doc. 21/60 Rev., ES-CERA-Doc. 14 (English) Rev., April 25, 1960; ES-CERA-Doc. 12 (English), June 1960; ES-CERA-Doc. 10 (English), April 7, 1960; ES-CERA-Doc. 13 (English), Apr. 19, 1960; United Nations: Progress in Land Reform E/2526 (1954); United Nations: Progress in Land Reform, Second Report, E/2930, ST/ECA/42 (1956).

[41] Su Excelencia Raul Zambrano Camader cita como, base de su posición a los textos encíclicos: Leo XIII, Rerum Novarum (14) Quadragessinio anno, No. 45, No. 47, No. 48, No. 49, Pio XII Set. 1944.

[42] Datos sobre la Conversion de Agua Salada, Comisión de Educación e Investigación para un mundo libre, Wash. D.C. Abril de 1960. Agua Dulce de Mar Bureau de Investigaciones, Econom. U. de Maryland, College Park, Vol. 12 No. 3, Dic. 1958 Informe de la Conversión de Agua Salada de 1958 Ministerio del Interior Enero 1959, etc.

[43] Reclamation Logrós y Contribuciones Comisión No. 1, 86 Congreso, Ia. Sesión, Pag 2.

Those are fine sentiments, well expressed. But they don't seem to have very much to do with the events of the last 2 weeks. Let's look at the record:

Item: Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, was told to rewrite a speech because it might prove "provocative" to the Russians.

Item: A complete blackout was thrown around Captains Olmstead and McKone, the RB-47 fliers released by the Soviet Union. Even their wives were ordered to maintain secrecy about their husbands' experiences in a Communist jail.

Item: The Columbia Broadcasting Co. canceled a television program reportedly based on factual incidents of Russian spying. Although there was no evidence of Government pressure, the network threw out the show because "it was not in keeping with what the executive branch is trying to do at the moment—convey a softer line toward Russia."

Item: After President Kennedy held his first Cabinet meeting in the White House, members of the Cabinet refused to talk to newspaper correspondents about what had gone on. In previous administrations, such reports were commonplace.

Item: While releasing the so-called "prestige polls" that featured last year's election campaign, President Kennedy made it clear at his first televised press conference that a good many executive department reports could not be made public.

Item: Press Secretary Pierre Salinger told the Washington press corps that too much military information was being made public. He said a compilation of published reports regarding American military strength had come very close to the correct figure, and that steps would be taken to prevent so much information reaching the public.

All of these items, any way you look at them, amount to a restriction of the American right to know. They may not be a conscious effort to shroud Government action in secrecy, but gagging public figures and limiting the fields of information certainly do not jibe with Vice President JOHNSON'S assurance that "the Kennedy administration believes in the fullest possible freedom of public information."

CONSERVATISM NOT BACKWARDNESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, appearing in that excellent conservative magazine National Review for December of 1960 is a most provocative article prepared by one of the Nation's most penetrating writers and speakers, William Rickenbacker. It is entitled "Onward to Yesterday" and challenges with clarity those who would ascribe to conservatism the characteristics of backwardness. One gathers from the writer's argument the clear evidence that to the contrary, it is the desire of the liberal or should we better say the radical to fly backward through time to the bureaucratic governments our forefathers fled from. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONWARD TO YESTERDAY

(By William F. Rickenbacker)

Common phrases, like common coins, enjoy currency at their face value. If the phrase be witty or the coin shiny, the mass of men accept it in a spirit of unquestioning belief. But in dogmas as in dimes we find the hallowed coin; and here I should like to examine a certain phrase that runs freely through the land today although it has within it all the marks of counterfeit.

We have all heard it said or seen it in print or—God forbid—we may even have entertained it ourselves. It is the opinion that conservatism involves turning the clock back; and in another coinage we find it wittily asserting that the motto of conservatism is, "Onward to Yesterday." But this is clipped coinage, and the time has come to halt its circulation.

The idea that conservatism looks backward fails on two counts. It involves, first, the drastic misconception that conservatives are attempting to operate a kind of cold-storage warehouse of history; that the ideal world of the conservatives is a sort of suspended animation; that life in a conservative world must be cold, limited, and gloomy. The second grievous misconception lies in the implication that the phrase must be exclusively pejorative; that what is old must therefore be bad; that whatever has rooted in the past cannot grow straight or bear fruit today; that, therefore, only the new is good.

To say that conservatives would turn the clock back is to apply to the discussion the cartoonist's technique of selective exaggeration. Of course it is true that the conservative would preserve and even enhance some aspects of the past, but the crucial difference between the cartoonist's slander and the actual fact is that the conservative desires to preserve only those values that seem to him worthy of preservation. He discriminates.

Anyone who thinks that to select a few good things from the past is the same as to turn the clock back does not understand the difference between running a museum and a junkyard. The conservative discriminates, and somehow even the word discrimination, like the word criticism, has begun to carry overtones of evil. But it is the function of intellect to discriminate, to recognize essential differences, to select. This is what the conservative does when he studies history. He exercises his judgment upon the past in order to select from the tradition of his fathers and the history of his race the enduringly admirable qualities of humanity. This is what the conservative does when he looks at the times he lives in. He criticizes the present in order to identify those men and those ideas that seem most suitable to the task of carrying on the admirable traditions of the past. And this is what the conservative does when he looks to the future. The essence of conservatism is discrimination, selection, choice, judgment—exercised not only upon the past, but upon the present and upon the future.

The conservative finds in history all of the elements that we see in the world today. Tyrants rule and slaves suffer today as they did 3,000 years ago in Egypt and Persia, 2,000 years ago in Rome, 1,000 years ago in Peru, 500 years ago in Mexico, 200 years ago in France, 100 years ago in the American South, 50 years ago in Korea. Today, just as in the times of Solomon, men stagger under the only slightly less intolerable oppression of unjust taxation and decadent currencies. Today we recoil before a floodtide of public dishonesty; it was no different when Diogenes held up his lamp at noon to find an honest man, or when it was thought that crucifixion was a just punishment for robbers as well as saviors, or when the vile act of treason was punished by the no less vile sentence of being hanged, drawn, and quartered. Society has always detested the tyrant, despised the thief, abhorred the traitor. The conservative hates these when he finds them in history, as he hates them when he sees them now. He would not turn the clock back to such as these.

LEARNING FROM HISTORY

But the conservative finds also in history the life of Jesus and His message of love and mercy; he witnesses the human thirst for liberty in every country of the Western World throughout 3,000 years; he measures the growing demand for justice; he notices a general public approval of the ideals of honesty and fair dealing. If we must turn the clock back to secure these values, shall we not do so?

The conservative comes to know in history the repeated agonies of repeated tyrannies, the consuming poison of unremitting hatreds, the price of faithlessness. He finds in history the justifying wisdom of the ideals of love, justice, liberty, truth. And he turns to the future not indiscriminately to perpetuate the past with all its evils and its goods, but to improve upon the past in preserving only the best of it and snuffing out the worst. The conservative works for a world that will have no slaves; for a government that will work without extortionist taxation; for liberty without mob rule; for justice; for a society that will make a habit of honesty and true speech; for humane learning.

The conservative turns the clock back? Rather he turns to the past to make plans for the future. And his plans are revolutions.

ENDURING STANDARDS

It is necessary to emphasize that when the conservative passes judgment on the past and the present he does not act, as it were, in a vacuum. In order to judge, one must have a standard of judgment; and underlying the conservative's whole approach to the world and the lives of men is his belief that there are enduring standards that not only may, but must be, applied to men and thoughts and actions both past and present. The recognition of absolute standards is the bedrock of conservative philosophy. The conservative is not one of those moral relativists who would declare that each act must be judged only in the light of the times, or according to the psyche of the actor, or according to the necessities of the situation. The conservative does not pardon the man who thieves and murders in the next village, nor does he pardon the man who murdered and thieved in the preceding century. The conservative believes that a standard of value, if it is to be a standard, must apply today as it applied yesterday. The fourth dimension, that of time, may apply to the measurement of material things; but it cannot apply to the measurement of ideals. A moral ideal is a good ideal or a bad ideal, no matter what time of day it is.

A mountain catches on its peak the last glow of the setting sun, and Solomon in awe lifts up his eyes to it, singing of God. Even if the mountain in time washes into the valley and is no more, as the geologists tell us it will, still the poem endures. There will be other sierras and other sunsets, and other men to respond in love and awe before the beauty of creation. What Solomon sang of one mountain will be, in time, false. What he said about man's relation to mountains will always be true.

Grandfather planted the seed of a good apple and promised that we should have good apples from the tree. For a time we did. But then the winds came, and the worms, and also came another breed of planter, not a father but a city father, who planted not a tree but a blotch of concrete speedway through the orchard, and the apples do not burst upon the branches now. What grandfather said about one tree is false. But we took a seed from the last apple and planted it, and someday we shall have fine apples again. What he said about the good fruit of the good seed was true and will be always true.

It is the qualities that endure, not the things. The unearthly gospel of love, the human thirst for liberty, the purity of truth, man's love for the beauty of the wilderness—these endure. Tomorrow, as yesterday, the mass of men will hate the robber and fight for liberty and give their souls for love. Time will not change these values. Time has been unable to change these values.

It is important to repeat that it is the mass of men who have spoken on these things. The doctrine of love, the pursuit of sweet liberty, the standard of honesty, the ideal of justice—these are not the passwords of a shady little band of schemers, these are not the invention of this morning. These are the goals toward which the mass of men have struggled for thousands of years. Human history cannot be understood as a voluntary effort by the mass of men to attain the goals of slavery, hatred, and injustice. Human history roars at us with its record of terrible struggle against slavery from the time when Moses led his nation out of Egypt; it appeals to us in its message of love from the time when Jesus walked upon our earth; it records the growth of justice from the reign of Hammurabi. Liberty, justice, love—is it not these ideals that have been the constantly recurring aspirations of the mass of men throughout recorded history, is it not these that have developed, though ever so slowly, against the unremitting pressure of the ancient tyrannies? These values are human values, valid yesterday, valid today, valid tomorrow in human life. The mass of men have testified to their worth and to their price. They are not affected by time. They exist unchanged throughout history. It is these values that the conservative must select from his reading of history; these that he uses to measure the past, to criticize the present, and to plan for the future. As to the indictment that conservatives would turn the clock back, the defense rests.

ARE OLD THINGS BAD?

The second error involved in the phrases "onward to yesterday" and "turning the clock back" arises from the concealed premise that anything that is old is bad. We have touched upon this in our description of the sources to which the conservative goes when he looks for enduring principles, and we need not develop further the assertion that the dimension of time cannot apply to moral values. There are other things to say about this assumption that what is old is bad.

The most striking objection is that we have to exclude the statement itself. For if the lives and actions and the thoughts of yesterday are worthless today, what must we say tomorrow about today's assertion that what is old is worthless? Will not that assertion then be old? The man who says this must believe that he has got hold of the only permanent truth in the universe; and one rarely meets a man so wise. I doubt the man, and I doubt the statement.

Furthermore, the assertion that what is old is bad does not lead to necessarily admirable societies, and we can get along very well without it. Let me live in a society dedicated to liberty, justice, love, mercy, truth, and humane learning, and I shall find it very easy to live without the man who says that what is old is bad. His truth may be truth, just as the frog's croaking has a certain ring of sincerity in it; but it has no practical effects. We know the practical effects of dedication to liberty, justice, mercy, love, and the panoply of excellences identified by the noblest minds over the centuries. These things work. Let us then work with these things.

These things are old, but they are not old like a fish in the marketplace at noon. They are as old as humanity itself, and as true and as consistent. One might as well complain that humanity is no good because humanity has been here before. These values are, in the highest sense, the only thing that humanity truly is. They exist in the most permanent and gracious domicile this side of the mind of God—namely, the minds and hearts of men and women.

THE PATTERN OF YEARS

There seems to be also a serious lack of proportion in this objection that what is old is bad. For it may not be so old, after all. It is probable that humanity has existed on the earth for a hundred million years, during most of which time we have been contending with beasts in the darkness. If we plotted this history in a straight line, we should find that the unrecorded history of the race occupies 99.997 percent of the length of the line, and that the history that we have been discussing here occupies only the final infinitesimal fraction of that line. If we plotted the history of humanity on the face of a 24-hour clock, we should have to turn the hands back only 2.7 seconds to get to the time of Moses. Are these 2 seconds so important in themselves that we must forego the opportunity to listen once again to the lofty discourses of the last 3,000 years?

It took a long time for humanity to reach the pinnacle of Sinai. Much since then has happened, not all of it good. There have been saints who were ahead of their times, and there have been monsters who would have driven us back to the wilderness of cruelty and hatred. The pattern of the last 3,000 years runs approximately upward only when we connect the peaks with the peaks. Some of the peaks of the past still overshadow us, despite our 20th-century-long climb.

Is it, then, so heinous a crime to look back to the glories of our history in order to measure ourselves? It is as if we were navigators far from land: the only fix that we know for certain is the location of our point of departure, and that point becomes our principal reference in steering an outbound course. Can we not also assure ourselves of steering a straight course ahead by taking pains to leave a straight wake behind us? We go most accurately forward by referring most truly to our starting point. Like it or not, we are navigating through history on our sea of present troubles.

Even if our recorded history did actually stretch back 100 million years, we should be justified in referring to it. For the longest barrel fires the straightest shot. But we are not talking about a history of unthinkable distance. It is only the last fraction of our story that comes down to us. From the Exodus to us it is only a wink of the eye of eternity. All of recorded history is now, here, with us present: it is not buried in the jungle under snakes. What was written 3,000 years ago speaks to us now; what men fought for then we fight for now; what men longed for then we strive for today; the dreams endure. To look back only 3,000 years into a history of 100 million years is not to turn the clock back. It is simply to look at the clock to find out what time it is.

CRIMINAL ANTITRUST CASE INVOLVING ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FIRMS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in Philadelphia during the past 3 days the Nation's largest criminal antitrust case in history was concluded with the sentencing of a great number of electrical equipment firms and some of their executives on charges of price fixing and bid rigging.

Apart from the fact that virtually every large manufacturer in the industry was involved, this case is distinguished by the forthrightness of Federal District Judge J. Cullen Ganey in imposing jail sentences as well as fines upon several of the individual defendants.

For too long, too many executives and so-called organization men in too many of our most important industries have engaged in such practices as this case has exposed, in the well-supported belief that the full force of our antitrust laws would not be brought to bear and, if convicted, they would be let off with a mere fine, a fine, incidentally, which very likely would be paid out of profits derived initially from the consumer.

Now anyone inclined to so flout the law will think a long time before risking a term in jail, whatever may be the system of rewards—in promotion, security, large salaries and so on—afforded under a company policy that winks at illegal shortcuts to so-called professional success.

I cannot agree with the plea of the attorney for one of the defendants: that the court should consider what it would do to this man to put him in jail with what the attorney described as common criminals who have been convicted of embezzlement and other serious crimes. What greater crime of avarice is there than the very crime committed by these defendants, which is, in effect, stealing from the public

On the other hand, I agree with Judge Ganey's observation that—

> One would be most naive indeed to believe that these violations of the law, so long persisted in, affecting so large a segment of the industry and finally, involving so many millions upon millions of dollars, were facts unknown to those responsible for the conduct of the corporation.

Are we to assume that, under the circumstances cited by Judge Ganey, such activities as took place within General Electric, for example, were not known to its chairman, Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner? I think not. Here is a top executive who, had he sold stock which he had purchased under stock options as of April 1959, would have netted approximately $2 million after payment of capital gains taxes. What was Mr. Cordiner being paid for if he was unaware that violations of the law were so widespread within the ranks of his company?

GE leans on a feeble reed when it points out that for years it has had a company rule directing strict obedience to the antitrust laws. I am sure that GE's top executives know that a company rule—or a Federal law, for that matter—is worthless without vigorous enforcement.

The Philadelphia case, however, presents a larger challenge which Judge Ganey so well articulated when, after pointing out the large number of corporate and individual defendants involved, he observed:

> This is a shocking indictment of a vast section of our economy, for what is really at stake here is the survival of the kind of economy under which America has grown to greatness, the free enterprise system.

If the uncommitted nations are to choose our system over the alternative

of state control and eventual dictatorship, then we must repair the model that we have offered the world, and do it quickly. There must be self-appraisal and self-discipline by the great industries upon which our economy so heavily relies. I think that what has taken place in Philadelphia this week will help to bring this about.

Mr. President, the importance of this case is such that I request unanimous consent that a copy of Judge Ganey's presentencing observations be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with an excellent editorial of the Evening Star of February 8.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE'S STATEMENT IN THE ELECTRICAL ANTITRUST CASE

Before imposing sentence, I want to make certain observations concerning the bills of indictment here involved.

They cover some 48 individual defendants and 32 corporations which comprise virtually every large manufacturer of electrical equipment in the industry. This is a shocking indictment of a vast section of our economy, for what is really at stake here is the survival of the kind of economy under which America has grown to greatness, the free enterprise system.

The conduct of the corporate and individual defendants alike, in the words of the distinguished assistant attorney general who headed the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice have flagrantly mocked the image of that economic system of free enterprise which we profess to the country and destroyed the model which we offer today as a free world alternative to state control and eventual dictatorship. Some extent of the vastness of the schemes for price fixing, bid rigging and job allocations can be gleaned from the fact that the annual corporate sales covered by these bills of indictment represent a billion and three-quarter dollars.

Pervasiveness likewise may be judged by the fact that the sales herewith are concerned with a wide variety of products and were made not only to private utilities throughout the country, but by sealed bids to Federal, State and municipal governments.

COMPANY OFFICIALS SCORED

This court has spent long hours in what it hopes is a fair appraisal of a most difficult task. In reaching that judgment, it is not at all unmindful that the real blame is to be laid at the doorstep of the corporate defendants and those who guide and direct their policy. While the Department of Justice has acknowledged that they were unable to uncover probative evidence which could secure a conviction beyond a reasonable doubt, of those in the highest echelons of the corporations here involved, in a broader sense they bear a grave responsibility for the present situation, for one would be most naive indeed to believe that these violations of the law, so long persisted in, affecting so large a segment of the industry and finally, involving so many millions upon millions of dollars, were facts unknown to those responsible for the conduct of the corporation and, accordingly, under their various pleas, heavy fines will be imposed.

As to the individual defendants, the Attorney General who secured the indictments and the present Attorney General who has, by letter, wholeheartedly agreed with the Government's recommendation that in the great majority of cases in well-documented briefs strongly insisted on the individual defendants serving prison sentences due to the serious nature of their violations.

It is not to be taken as disparaging of the long and arduous effort the Government has made, and even more, the highly efficient and competent manner of its doing, that only in these instances where ultimate responsibility for corporate conduct amongst those indicted, vested, are prison sentences to be imposed. Rather am I convinced that in the great number of these defendants' cases, they were torn between conscience and an approved corporate policy, with the rewarding objectives of promotion, comfortable security and large salaries—in short, the organization or the company man, the conformist, who goes along with his superiors and finds balm for his conscience in additional comforts and the security of his place in the corporate setup. In that this can in any wise be a defense to their misconduct is conceded but long probationary periods where a watchful eye can be kept on their activities, fines will suffice for their first offense.

THE BRIGHT SIDE

But this is the sordid, greedy side of the situation and yet there is a bright side. Each and every one of those indicted, both corporations and individuals, faced up to the situation realistically and readily admitted by pleas of guilty and nolo contendere, their violations. For this much must be said, not alone in the saving of great time and expense to the Government, in preparing and trying these indictments which would have covered 2 or 3 years, but above and beyond that it would cause to point up and emphasize an already unsavory past, which these admissions of guilt, it is hoped, will quickly move this great industry to a thorough reappraisal of their various competitive systems and help move the Nation's economy forward under the banner of free enterprise.

Finally, I want to thank, as well as compliment, although they need no accolade from me, all counsel here involved. For the Government, the Attorney General, and especially Mr. Robert A. Bicks, head of the Antitrust Division, who spearheaded and coordinated in a highly competent fashion, the action which resulted in these bills of indictments, as well as Mr. Charles L. Whittinghill, and Mr. Baddia J. Rashid, and likewise Mr. William L. Maher, all of the Justice Department's antitrust staff, whose unfailing courtesy to the Court was most helpful. To all of counsel for defense, I am likewise very appreciative, since at every turn they have given the Court the utmost cooperation and both orally and in written brief, have, with deep conviction, pleaded their various clients' causes, and if they were not persuasive in their arguments, it was not for any lack of industry on their behalf nor for enthusiasm in its presentation.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 8, 1960]

ANTITRUST JAIL TERMS

It may be true that some or all of the men who have been sentenced to jail in the electrical antitrust case were, in a sense, victims of longstanding practices in their industry. It also is obviously true, however, that they can hardly be considered innocent victims.

In the first place, they entered pleas of guilty or nolo contendere (no defense). Secondly, these men were not clerks. Some were vice presidents of the largest corporations in the electrical industry, and one, at least, received a salary in excess of $100,000 a year. There is no escaping the conclusion that they knew what they were doing when they participated in secret meetings with supposed competitors and resorted to codes in fixing prices and rigging bids—in plain violation of the antitrust laws.

There is a dispute as to whether the topmost officials in the corporations involved were aware of what the second-flight officials were doing. During the sentencing a lawyer for General Electric took vigorous exception to a suggestion by Judge Ganey that the policymaking corporate officials must have known what was going on. However, another lawyer, representing a GE vice president, told the judge that his client had followed long-established company policy in getting together with competitors. In any event, Judge Ganey took the view that the real blame is to be laid at the doorstep of the corporations and those who guide and direct their policy—even though there was not sufficient evidence to indict the latter. One would have to be naive indeed, he said, to believe that these violations of the antitrust laws over such a long period of time and involving so many millions of dollars were facts unknown to those in the highest echelons of the corporations involved.

Whatever one's estimate as to this disputed point, there can be no doubt, as Judge Ganey put it, that the admitted violations have flagrantly mocked that image of the economic system of free enterprise which we profess to the country. The penalties now imposed, in particular the jail sentences, may seem harsh, especially in the cases of those defendants with records as men of high standing in their home communities and in the business world. The facts of this case show, however, that firm action by the court was justified—not alone as punishment but as a warning to others who may be similarly tempted. We have no doubt that this was anything but a pleasant business for former Attorney General Rogers and those members of his staff in active charge of the case. But it was their duty to prosecute, and they deserve the tribute paid to them by Judge Ganey.

PRESS ACCOUNT OF VOTE ON CHANGING COMPOSITION OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, today I am sending the following letter to Hon. Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 9, 1961.*

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I thought the newspaper reports of your recent news conference were most unfortunate and I think in justice to yourself and the Kennedy administration you deserve an opportunity to clarify the record.

The impression given was that you justified calling Members of the House of Representatives relative to the upcoming vote on changing composition of the Rules Committee on the ground that it was within "the rules of the game—the game of politics"—to remind them of projects in which they might be interested. I cannot believe that is what you intended.

I have been in Congress 24 years, two-thirds of which has been when there was a Democrat in the White House, one-third a Republican. Never in that time from Secretary Ickes to the present have I assumed or even hinted that the man who sat where you are now sitting was there to deal off the resources of the Nation which are in the custody of the Interior Department.

When I have had occasion to present a matter to a Secretary of the Interior or any of his division heads, I have always taken it for granted that the man on the other side of the desk was there to do an honest job and a fair job and was not there to "dicker" away the natural resources for political advantage at the price of any congressional convictions. I am sure that is your congressional experience. I believe you would

agree with me that if they were to be sold, it would be far better that they be sold for cash than for the integrity of a vote on Capitol Hill.

I can recall having been contacted twice in the Senate by an administration spokesman relative to a matter coming up for vote. On neither occasion did the person refer to or imply that other matters pending would have their fate determined or delayed by the way I voted. And in both of these instances I voted when the time came as I believed, which happened to be contrary to what the administration desired. But never then or afterward did I presume that any matter within the purview of that person or agency would receive anything but a fair and prompt consideration on its merits.

As I said, I thought the impressions given by press accounts of the news conference were unfortunate and that you deserved an opportunity to clarify your position—hence this letter. I shall be glad to read your reply on the floor of the Senate.

With respect and concern,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there may appear in the RECORD the report of the press conference by the Associated Press, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and an account of the conference, written by Julius Duscha, and printed in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

UDALL DEFENDS ACTIONS IN HOUSE RULES FIGHT

Interior Secretary Udall does not think he did anything improper last week when he telephoned Members of the House prior to the vote on enlarging the Rules Committee.

Mr. Udall said he believes he was playing "by the rules of the game" in trying to help clear the way for the Kennedy legislation.

"I got a result or two," he added.

The comments were made in a news conference discussion yesterday of whether the Congressmen's votes, for or against diluting the power of the conservative coalition in the Rules group, would affect the fate of resources development projects in their districts.

Mr. Udall, a former Member of the House, never did say just what he told anybody.

REASONED WITH THEM

"I talked to friends and reasoned with them," Mr. Udall said, and added that no one has said he did any improper things.

Pressed as to what he said to Representative CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado, Mr. Udall declined to say but added:

"I think all of us in the House understand the rules of the game. I discussed the rules of the game and other things of interest.

"I don't think this administration has done anything differently along this line than has been done before, other than in followthrough, field generalization, and organization—and maybe more vigor."

CHENOWETH WAS PAIRED

The Secretary would not commit himself on whether Mr. CHENOWETH'S vote on the Rules Committee issue affects the proposal for construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project in his district.

Mr. CHENOWETH was recorded in opposition to the rules change, paired against a backer of the plan who failed to get to the House session.

"I'm not terribly unhappy at what he did," Mr. Udall said of Mr. CHENOWETH.

But he expressed belief the votes of those who did not favor the rules enlargement will be remembered by the people on the other side of the issue when the time comes to consider their proposals and assignment of priorities.

[From the Washington Post]

UDALL TELLS REPORTERS HE PLAYS THE GAME OF POLITICS TO THE HILT

(By Julius Duscha)

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall discussed the rules of the game yesterday with a candor as refreshing as all outdoors.

The game is politics as it is played in Washington. And, Udall indicated, it is a tougher contest than touch football.

The subject came up at Udall's news conference when a reporter noted that some Congressmen thought the Secretary's role in the House Rules Committee fight was improper.

Udall called Representatives from Western and Southern States that are always seeking new Interior Department projects.

Well, said Udall, who has the crew cut and the square jaw of a professional football player, he was just following "the rules of the game * * * the rules of national politics."

DENIES ANY THREAT

The Secretary denied that he had threatened any Congressmen with the loss of projects in his district if he did not vote right. And how did the men with whom he had talked vote?

Udall looked at the ceiling and then at the reporters and said, "I got a result or two."

The reporters laughed and Udall's mother beamed. Mrs. Levi S. Udall is visiting Washington and included the press conference in her itinerary.

By then neither Udall nor the reporters wanted to return to such Interior Department staples as dams, reclamation projects, oil imports, and lead and zinc quotas.

"This Department has always been a 'sensitive' area," Udall went on to note. The reporters knew what the Secretary meant, but he added: "We handle more than one-fourth of the bills that pass in Congress."

PLAYING TO HILT

When the critical comments of Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, Republican leader in the House, were mentioned, Udall said HALLECK refers to himself as "a gut fighter" who plays the game "to the hilt."

"I'm afraid he doesn't like it," Udall added, "when other people play it to the hilt, too."

The Secretary said that he "didn't do anything that other Cabinet members had not done," but that perhaps the Kennedy administration has "a better follow-through, better field leadership and more vigor" than some of its predecessors.

Udall noted that a pilot saline water conversion plant was located in San Diego "where a particular political situation existed" in 1959 by former Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. Studies by Interior Department experts, Udall said, indicated that two other west coast sites would have been better than San Diego from a purely technical point of view.

When the Secretary was asked whether the vote of Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado, against Speaker SAM RAYBURN'S plan to increase the size of the Rules Committee might throw the Frying Pan-Arkansas reclamation project in his district into the fire Udall said that Representatives have memories, after all.

But Udall denied that he would "engage in any partisan forays."

Of course, he noted, there are always questions on priorities.

"I'm not saying all this is political," he concluded, "but just a little bit of the rules of the game."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the statement of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], during which he read the letter he addressed to the Secretary of the Interior. I, too, read the two press accounts of the news conference held by the Secretary of the Interior. It surprised me very considerably. I thought it was in the nature of serving notice on all New Frontiersmen: "Check your guns and your voting record at the door. The project line forms on your right."

One could not read those reports in the press without coming to that kind of conclusion. I sincerely hope that that is not the situation, and that the Secretary of the Interior will undertake to clarify his position in response to the letter which the Senator from South Dakota has addressed to him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wondered if my distinguished leader saw in the press of yesterday a comment ascribed to the new Postmaster General, that various division heads around the country would be removed and be replaced by men with whom he could work. He said at the time that that was not politics. However, I cannot understand it in any other way. It seems to me that as all these New Frontiersmen march to the New Frontier whacking their way through the bush they will whack their way through good appointments made by the former administration. I wonder if my distinguished leader agrees with me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It looks like a little payola.

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement made by me on September 27, 1960, entitled "The Religious Issue." I believe it is of permanent value, and for that reason I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE

(By SAM J. ERVIN, JR., U.S. Senator)

I happen to believe this declaration of the Constitution of North Carolina: "All persons have a natural and inalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences." For this reason, I regret the undue emphasis being placed upon the so-called religious issue arising out of Senator Kennedy's membership in the Catholic Church.

We ought to be slow to censure any man because of his religious affiliation. Not one man out of 10,000 acquires his faith by investigating and weighing the evidences of its authenticity. Birth and environment ordinarily determine our religious affiliations. We accept without question the beliefs of those among whom we are born and reared. If one is born of Catholic parents in a Catholic home, he is virtually certain to be of that faith. This is true of Senator Kennedy. If

one opens his eyes to the light of day in a Protestant home, he is virtually certain to be a Protestant. Such is true of me.

If we are to face squarely the religious issue and its implications, we will do well to recall some observations made by the late Chief Justice Stacy, one of North Carolina's wisest sons of all time, in the opinion which he wrote for the Supreme Court of North Carolina in *State* v. *Beal* (199 N.C. 278).

Chief Justice Stacy said in that opinion:

"For some reason, too deep to fathom, men contend more furiously over the road to heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walks on earth"; and "It would be almost unbelievable, if history did not record the tragic fact, that men have gone to war and cut each other's throats because they could not agree as to what was to become of them after their throats were cut."

The Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States were acutely aware of these truths. They saw with the eyes of history the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition, the massacre of the Huguenots of France, the slaughter of the Waldensians in the Alpine valleys of Italy, the hanging and jailing of English and Irish Catholics by Protestant England, the hunting down of the Covenantors upon the crags and moors of Scotland, the hanging and branding of Quakers and the banishing of Baptists by Puritan Massachusetts, and the hundreds of other atrocities committed in the name of religion. They also knew that even during their lifetimes those who refused to conform to the creeds of the churches established by law, such as the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in Ulster, the Catholics in England and Ireland, and dissenters in various American colonies, had been barred from civilian and Military offices, had been compelled to make contributions of money to the teaching of religious doctrines they disbelieved, and had their marriages annulled and their children declared illegitimate for daring to speak their vows before clergymen of their own faiths.

The Founding Fathers were determined that these things should not occur in America. To this end, they inserted two provisions in the Constitution of the United States.

The first of these provisions appears in article 6 and declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust in the United States."

The second appears in the first amendment and states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The purpose of these constitutional provisions was to create a complete and permanent separation of church and state by keeping the state's hands out of religion and religion's hands off the state.

I cherish the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state as the most precious part of our heritage as Americans. It must be preserved if liberty of any kind is to endure. This is true because political liberty cannot exist where the state is controlled by any religious institution, and religious liberty cannot exist where religious activities are dominated by the state.

Let us consider the exact nature of the religious issue raised against Senator Kennedy. Some Protestant ministers and laymen, whose sincerity I do not question, state their fear that Senator Kennedy does not accept the constitutional doctrine of the separation of church and state and in consequence might be subject to pressure from the Catholic Church in governmental affairs in case he is elected to the office of President. They do not assign as the basis for their fear the deeds or words of Senator Kennedy. They cite things done or said by Catholic clergymen in this or other lands in this or other centuries to indicate that the Catholic Church desires to control both religious and civil affairs.

Be this as it may, it is manifestly unjust to charge any candidate for any political office, be he Catholic or Protestant, with personal responsibility for the acts and utterances of any or all of the clergymen of his church.

To be sure, any voter has a right to inquire whether any candidate who solicits his support entertains any personal convictions which would disable him to perform in a proper manner the duties of the office he seeks.

If Senator Kennedy should be elected President, he would be required to take the following oath before entering upon the execution of the office: "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

This being true, any voter has an undoubted right to make inquiry whether or not Senator Kennedy entertains any personal religious convictions which would impair his capacity to perform this oath of office.

This inquiry has been made of Senator Kennedy many times. Senator Kennedy has repeatedly assured us that he is dedicated to the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state and the preservation of religious liberty it is designed to secure for all Americans; that he entertains no personal religious convictions which would impair in any way his capacity to perform the duties of the office of President according to the Constitution; and that he would not be responsive in any way, as President, to any ecclesiastical pressures or obligations of any kind that might in any fashion influence or interfere with his conduct of that office in the national interest. I accept these assurances of Senator Kennedy at face value. I do this for three reasons:

1. Having served in the Senate with Senator Kennedy for more than 6 years, I know him to be a man of truth.

2. Senator Kennedy has given proof of his devotion to the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state during his service in the House and Senate. For example, he joined me last year in voting against a proposal that tax money be used to aid Catholic Parochial schools.

3. As commander of a PT boat in the South Pacific in the Second World War, Senator Kennedy distinguished himself in combat with the Japanese and suffered serious wounds, winning the Purple Heart and other decorations. I deem it not amiss to add in this connection that Senator Kennedy's brother, Joe Kennedy, made the supreme sacrifice for our country in the Second World War and was posthumously awarded the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism in action.

For these reasons, I have an abiding conviction that any American can support Senator Kennedy for the Presidency with complete confidence that Senator Kennedy will preserve, protect, and defend the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state.

UNITED STATES-JAPANESE RELATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the 100th anniversary of the ratification of a treaty of amity and commerce between the United States and Japan is an appropriate occasion for a brief review of the stormy course of relations between these two countries, ranging from peaceful trade to war by treachery and, finally, to an alliance against the further spread of communism in the Orient.

Two of my friends and neighbors, Col. and Mrs. George M. Brooke, Jr., of Lexington, Va., recently returned from a trip to Japan, and Colonel Brooke, professor of history at Virginia Military Institute, gave an interesting account of the trip to the Rockbridge Historical Society. In his remarks, he contrasted the Japan and the Japanese of today with the country and the people with whom his grandfather, John Mercer Brooke, had dealt a century ago when, as a young naval officer, he played a distinguished part in opening that country to Western civilization and to industrial development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of Colonel Brooke's remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN, 1860–1960

Last spring Mrs. Brooke and I were amazed and delighted to receive from the Association for Japan-United States Amity and Trade Centennial an invitation to visit Japan for the last 2 weeks in May as the guests of the association. The accompanying letter from Mr. Taizo Ishizaka, the president of the association, reminded us that 1960 marked the 100th anniversary of three epochal events which had done much to cement friendly relations between the United States and Japan. These events were:

1. The visit of the first Japanese embassy to the United States.

2. The formal exchange of ratifications of a treaty of amity and commerce between the two countries.

3. The dispatch of the Japanese warship *Kanrin Maru* to San Francisco. This was the first Japanese vessel to cross the broad Pacific.

Attaching great significance to these historic events, the Amity Association, which is composed of a dozen organizations including the America-Japan Society, the Federation of Economic Organizations, the Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Association and the Japan Foreign Trade Council, combined with the Japanese Government to make 1960 a truly memorable year. Among the many projects sponsored were: the inviting of American guests to Japan, the Black Ship Festival at Shimoda, the documentation and publication of historical materials, the sending of a good will mission to America, the publication of commemorative postage stamps, the erection of markers at Uraga and elsewhere, and the sending of a Kabuki theater troupe to America. In the United States the Government and private organizations interested in Japanese-American friendship carried out somewhat similar though less ambitious projects. On the governmental level in Japan much was planned too; the ratification of the United States-Japan Security Treaty, the visits to America of Premier Kishi, and of Crown Prince Akihito and the lovely Princess Michiko, and a visit to Japan by President Eisenhower. I know of no cause in history where a comparable effort has been made by one country to strengthen its bonds of friendship and commerce with another through a commemoration of historic events.

But how was it that Mrs. Brooke and I became involved in this matter? That is a long story, but, in short, it was because of the work of my grandfather, Lt. John Mercer Brooke, of the United States Navy. Mr. Ishizaka's letter explained that "taking cognizance of this happy and historic commemoration, it has been decided by our association to extend our most cordial invitation to the descendants of the illustrious Americans

who rendered outstanding services in that epochal period in advancing the relations between our two peoples as well as to the presidents of the Japan societies and to the leaders of the Japanese circles in the United States." I came under the first category, as did my sister, Mrs. Bruce R. Day, of Seattle, who also received an invitation. It was a most gracious gesture on the part of the Japanese to include Mrs. Brooke and Mr. Day in the invitations. The other 21 guests were people who have been active in promoting understanding during their own lifetime.

Since last January I had, at the request of the Association for Japan-United States Amity, been editing for publication as part of the centennial celebration journals kept by my grandfather while in Yokohama in 1859–60 and on the *Kanrin Maru* in 1860. These journals revealed that Brooke had done much over a period of several months to help the Japanese people who were just beginning to open their doors to the West after 250 years of seclusion.

Our gala excursion of 1960 is of lasting interest to this community only because it throws the spotlight on John Mercer Brooke who during the course of his life had many close associations with Lexington. He had entered the U.S. Navy in 1841 at the age of 14 and in 1849 he married his Norfolk cousin, Mary Elizabeth Selden Garnett. Mary was the younger sister of Louisa Garnett, the wife of Gen. Thomas Hoomes Williamson, first head of the department of civil engineering at the Virginia Military Institute. Some of General Williamson's descendants live in Lexington today. In the 1850's naval officers were sent on long cruises and exploring expeditions which entailed protracted absences from home. While Brooke was so engaged his wife frequently visited the Williamsons in Lexington, and when Brooke was able to secure leave he joined her here. John Brooke's mother had died when he was a young boy and his father, a professional Army officer, died in 1851, so if Brooke had a home during the 10 years preceding the American Civil War it was Lexington. Following the war he was appointed professor of astronomy, geodesy, and related subjects at VMI, and eventually he became the first head of the department of physics.

Brooke's wife, Mary Garnett, died a year before Appomattox, but in 1871 Brooke married Kate Corbin, the widow of "Sandie" Pendleton, "Stonewall" Jackson's chief of staff whose short and eventful life has been portrayed so well by Prof. W. G. Bean of the Washington and Lee history department. "Sandie's" father was Gen. William Nelson Pendleton, Lee's chief of artillery in the Army of Northern Virginia and for many years the rector of Grace Episcopal Church, now the R. E. Lee Memorial Church. The Misses Gadsden are descendants of this distinguished fighting clergyman. John Brooke's son George by his second marriage attended VMI before entering the Army as a career, while his daughter Rosa married Henry Parker Willis, a Washington and Lee professor.

John Brooke's Japanese adventure was the climax of a 20-year career in the U.S. Navy which embraced routine cruises in many parts of the world and extensive exploring and surveying work in the North Pacific Ocean. In 1854, while on the exploring and surveying expedition to the North Pacific Ocean, Bering Strait, and the China Seas, Brooke visited Japan. This was a few months after Perry's visit with his famous black ships. While with the North Pacific expedition Brooke in the launch of the expedition's flagship *Vincennes* surveyed the east coast of Japan from Shimoda to Hakodate, these being the two ports which the Japanese had just opened to American trade as a result of Perry's treaty. This 3 weeks' voyage which required landings for observations and supplies took Brooke and his small crew to parts of Japan never before visited by an American and aroused tremendous curiosity among the natives. Upon his return to the United States Brooke published an article describing this unique experience.

In 1858 Lieutenant Brooke, while assisting in the preparation of the charts based on the recent North Pacific surveys, was selected by the Secretary of the Navy to run a survey from San Francisco to Hong Kong in order to determine the best steamship route between those two ports. Sailing from the United States in the small surveying schooner *Fenimore Cooper*, Brooke arrived at Hong Kong in May 1859. After making necessary observations at the British port, he set out for Japan late in June as he hoped to assist Townsend Harris, the American Minister, by surveying during the autumn various treaty ports which had just been opened to American trade by the Treaty of Yedo. Brooke proceeded from Hong Kong to Okinawa, which he had visited 5 years earlier when with the North Pacific expedition, and from there he followed the Ryukyu chain to Tanega Shima and Kyushu, the latter being the southernmost of the main Japanese islands. From the tip of Kyushu the *Fenimore Cooper* headed north, hugging the east coast of Japan to Kanagawa, a new treaty port which is now a part of the huge city of Yokohama. The voyage from Hong Kong to Kanagawa consumed 2 months because the schooner was entirely dependent upon the winds, and, moreover, Brooke made observations and conducted surveys enroute. Brooke was an acute observer and recorded his impressions of the natives he met on the islands along the way in his voluminous journals.

Late in August, while Brooke was ashore conferring with Townsend Harris, a heavy storm came up and the *Cooper's* crew found it necessary to beach the vessel near Yokohama. The schooner was condemned when subsequent examination revealed that many of her timbers were rotten. The Russians extended a helping hand in this matter. They were very much in evidence at Kanagawa in 1859 as they were eager to obtain commercial concessions. Brooke's relations with the Russians were excellent and, in fact, Commodore A. A. Popoff, the commander of the Russian squadron and an engineer, was of considerable assistance to Brooke in examining the *Cooper* after she was wrecked.

From August 1859, to February 1860, Brooke and his small crew were stranded in Japan. It was a period of ferment in Japanese history. Not for another 9 years would the Meiji restoration break the power of the Shogun and restore the Emperor to the central place in Japanese life, but change was in the air. The powerful forces of discontent which had surged beneath a deceptive calm were rising to the surface. Japan had become a battleground between those elements who believed the country's salvation lay in adopting Western techniques and those who wished to revert to the old order. Under such conditions it was not unusual for foreigners to be cut down in the streets by disaffected sword-wielding samurai. As a wise precaution, Westerners carried arms and slept with pistols under their pillows. During his 6 months' sojourn Brooke witnessed many kaleidoscopic changes and he saw both the good and bad traits of Japanese character laid bare.

The Japanese Government had designated Kanagawa as a treaty port, but already the neighboring fishing village of Yokohama was threatening to supersede it. Foreign merchants tended to congregate in Yokohama and conduct their transactions there. Financial speculation was rampant, for according to Western standards gold was greatly undervalued in terms of silver, so foreigners brought into Japan all of the silver coins they could get their hands on in order to exchange them for Japanese gold coins. There was also speculation in Japanese swords which were made of the finest steel and some of which were hundreds of years old. Like a disease, speculation infected the foreign colony until the Government cracked down. Brooke, who felt that such financial manipulations were not consistent with his position as a naval officer, observed from the sidelines, virtually alone. The growing demand for Japanese goods had already brought about changes in the commercial market. Prices were higher than they had been 5 years before and the quality was often not as good. Nonetheless, Brooke, who came to regard himself as a rather canny shopper and whose advice in such matters was sought after by his friends, bought such articles as his limited Navy pay and uncertain future would permit. Among his purchases were a pair of swords, a set of Kutoni cups, and a lacquered writing desk.

While in Japan Brooke worked closely with Townsend Harris and E. M. Dorr, the American consul general at Kanagawa. The Japanese had already decided to send their first diplomatic mission to America in the steam frigate *Powhatan*, the flagship of the U.S. East India squadron. Departure was scheduled for early 1860, but during the months of preparation for the mission, the *Powhatan* spent much time in the China Seas. So it was only natural that the Japanese authorities should turn frequently to Brooke with questions of a scientific, naval, or geographic nature. Such information Brooke was happy to furnish. By his patience, knowledge, and cooperation Brooke won the confidence and respect of the Japanese, and when the Japanese Government resolved to send a warship of its own across the Pacific as an advance agent of the *Powhatan*, it requested Brooke to go along as an adviser.

The vessel selected for the voyage was the Dutch-built corvette *Kanrin Maru*. She was essentially a sailing vessel, but she did have an auxiliary engine and could carry a 6 days' supply of coal. The Japanese manned the vessel with a full crew, from admiral to common seaman. Over the past few years the Japanese had received some instruction in navigation, seamanship, and steam engineering from the Dutch, but they had had very little experience over deep water because for 2½ centuries it had been against the laws of the Empire to take a vessel outside Japanese territorial waters. On the voyage the Japanese demonstrated proficiency in steam engineering, and in navigation some of the officers were excellent, but in seamanship the Japanese displayed a woeful lack of knowledge and training.

The *Kanrin Maru* left Uraga on February 10, 1860, 3 days ahead of the *Powhatan*, and followed the great circle route to San Francisco. The trip, made almost entirely under sail, took 37 days. A winter crossing would have been uncomfortable under the best of conditions, but with some of the roughest weather in years, the voyage was not only exceedingly uncomfortable but dangerous as well. This bold venture of the Japanese most certainly would have failed had it not been for the skill and hard work of Brooke and the handful of American seamen from the *Fenimore Cooper* who had accompanied him aboard the *Kanrin Maru*. As it was, the voyage was regarded as a great success and it became an important milestone along the road of Japanese commercial and naval progress. The Japanese learned well their lessons in seamanship, and after the *Kanrin Maru* had undergone necessary repairs at the Mare Island Navy Yard, near San Francisco, she returned to Japan under her own officers by way of the Hawaiian Islands. The Japanese were most grateful to Brooke for all he had done in

Japan and aboard the *Kanrin Maru*, and upon arrival of the vessel at San Francisco Brooke was invited to help himself to a chest containing gold coins supposedly worth $80,000. But as a naval officer, Brooke did not feel free to accept this generous offer.

Just 1 year after Brooke's return to America the Civil War broke out, and it changed the course of his life. After the war Japan purchased from the U.S. Government the surrendered Confederate ironclad *Stonewall*, and Brooke hoped to get the job of navigating the ship to Japan. But the hate engendered in the conflict died hard and Brooke was not successful, even though he enlisted the help of his old friend, Adm. Samuel Phillips Lee. He, also, seems to have considered the possibility of security an appointment as a naval adviser to the Japanese Government, but the necessity of taking care of his young daughter by his first wife forced him to give up the idea.

Brooke's impressions of Japan and her people are of more than passing interest, because with an analytical and keen mind he combined an observant nature. Two decades in the Navy had given him an opportunity for wide reading as well as extensive travel to the far corners of the earth where he had encountered people of many different cultures. He was able, consequently, to see a country in perspective and was not so likely to be blinded by prejudice. In Brooke's view, the Japanese were intelligent, honest, adaptable, and polite. Brooke who had some talent as an artist felt that the Japanese in the simplicity and beauty of their painting were without peers. In a remarkable way the Japanese with a few strokes of the brush could instill within their pictures the vital spirit of their country. Being of a reserved and dignified nature himself, Brooke seems to have liked the formal code of etiquette practiced in Japan and to have found the exchange of official visits agreeable. His sensitivity permitted him to respect Japanese social customs without in any way forgetting his duties and responsibilities as an American naval officer. As for the natural beauties of the country, Brooke was much impressed and wrote his wife that "no one who has not seen Japan can form from descriptions by others any idea of the scenery." He commented that "there is a wildness and an elegance, a delicacy of form and tracery which the monotonous blue ridge [sic] does not afford."

The comments and predictions regarding Japan that Brooke made 100 years ago are in many respects valid today. Distrusting British and more emphatically Russian imperialism in the Far East, Brooke believed that the United States should do everything in its power to win the friendship of Japan and to bolster that country's strength. He informed Senator William C. Gwin, of California, that "it is of the utmost importance that such relations commercial and others as will enable the United States to exert a decided influence in that quarter of the globe should be cultivated." Despite Brooke's friendly relations with the Russians at Yokohama he was suspicious of their designs and fearful that they would attempt to seize the northern Japanese island of Hokkaido. It was Brooke's feeling that the Japanese realized the continuance of their independence required friendship with the United States and the adoption of Western techniques. While urging the establishment of an American steamship line to the Orient, Brooke insisted that responsibility was the handmaiden of profit. As the United States had opened Japan to trade, so must the great Western republic assume responsibility for Japan's preservation.

As has been suggested, Brooke was in Japan at a time pregnant with change. It was an era when not only tradition, but the very fabric of Japanese society was threatened. So Brooke was not surprised that there should be antiforeign sentiment. What did surprise him was that in such difficult circumstances the Japanese should show such forbearance toward outsiders. Peeking into the future Brooke predicted that when the advocates of seclusion saw that their policies were outmoded and further resistance was in vain, they would join forces with their opponents and push Japan along the road to progress and power.

The trip Mrs. Brooke and I made to Japan in May, 1960, was of course a pleasure jaunt with overtones of good will. It is a tribute to the long memories and kind feelings of the Japanese people that they should seek after 100 years to pay honor to the memory of an American naval officer by inviting his descendants to visit Japan. Such historical consciousness of mind and generosity of spirit are not often encountered in the complex world of today.

The Japanese, taking care of all the arrangements, did everything in their power to make our trip not only enjoyable but memorable. The red carpet was rolled out from the beginning. Meeting three members of our party at Friendship Airport—a happy omen—near Baltimore, we took a jet for Los Angeles where we were joined by six or more of our party and transferred to a Japan Air Lines DC–7, the City of Tokyo. Since our visit the DC–7's have been replaced by jet-powered DC–8's, so we like to think of ourselves as pioneers of a sort, albeit plush-bottomed. Our flight was by way of Honolulu and Wake Island and as comfortable as one could expect a 24-hour plane trip to be. As we were chasing the sun we had little darkness. But such confusion as trying to keep up with the time changes by constantly resetting our watches was soon forgotten as we washed our faces with hot towels, relaxed in our happi coats, and were served a succession of tempting foods and soothing beverages by beautiful Japanese stewardesses. It was a far cry from the slow and monotonous trip made by John Brooke in his small schooner 100 years ago.

Coming down through the blanket of clouds and landing at Tokyo International Airport is quite an experience. Instead of the fishermen and village people attired in exotic native dress whom the *Cooper's* crew encountered on the coast of Japan, we saw thousands of smiling, well-dressed people—chiefly wearing Western style clothing—massed on the ramps and platforms of the airport, many waving flags. Among these people were great numbers of well-disciplined schoolchildren garbed in their distinctive black uniforms. After having our picture taken and being greeted by a number of officials and Miss Black Ship Festival, a beauty queen attired in a lovely kimona, we were given our centennial badges—which featured the *Kanrin Maru*—served with the Japanese equivalent of orange crush, and whisked away to the Imperial Hotel in the heart of Tokyo, the largest city in the world.

At the hotel we were showered with gifts and invitations and that evening at a reception met many friends of Japanese-American amity, including Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II. I, being the grandson of Lt. John Brooke, was promptly tapped for a radio interview that night. This first day set the tone for a considerable part of our visit, during which there were a number of receptions, dinners, dedications, and interviews, and a great many speeches, both in Tokyo and other cities. As I was the only male descendent present of an American who had contributed toward Japanese-American understanding during the period being commemorated, I was singled out for personal attention. As the old saying goes, I was king for a night, and before the visit was over I had been interviewed on the radio by the Voice of America and the U.S. Armed Forces Far Eastern Network, for the newspapers by the Shipping and Trade News, and on television by N. H. K. for the program, "What's My Secret?" My secret, of course, was that I was John M. Brooke's grandson, and I must add that the experts guessed it. All of these interviews related to Brooke and the work I was doing on his journals which are to appear in English and Japanese as one of seven volumes to be published by the Amity Association as a part of the centennial activities. Strangely enough, Brooke is much better known in a country he visited over the period of a few short years than he is in his own country. This is a paradox of history.

Our party gathered over a period of about 3 days and included couples from Honolulu, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, Oreg., Seattle, Chicago, New Orleans, and Washington, D.C. Many of these men were presidents or past presidents of Japan-America societies. Particularly distinguished were Dr. Francis B. Sayre, the founder of the Washington, D.C., society and a former High Commissioner to the Philippines and Assistant Secretary of State; Dr. Hugh Borton, president of Haverford College and outstanding authority on Japanese history; Dr. Gregg Sinclair, president emeritus of the University of Hawaii. We elected Dr. Sayre as our leader and on appropriate occasions he made presentations and spoke in our behalf. I was particularly happy at one dedication when he asked Mrs. Brooke to lay a wreath at the unveiling of a statue of Commodore Perry in Shiba Park in Tokyo. Mrs. Brooke discharged her duty admirably. Being a comparative youngster and having strong legs, I was designated liaison man to coordinate the efforts of our party and those of our Japanese guides.

Whenever we traveled by bus or train we were accompanied by Mr. Sakito Sato, Secretary of the Association for Japan-U.S. Amity and Trade Centennial, and a half-a-dozen guides, interpreters, a photographer, and even an umbrella holder. They had been carefully chosen and did much to add to the pleasure of our trip. The photographer took one picture after another and when we got home we were thrilled to receive a beautiful picture album graphically portraying our visit. Our itinerary was planned with meticulous care and I do not believe it would have been possible for us to see more than we did in the 2 weeks allotted for the visit. V.M.I. had kindly granted me leave and I must confess that during our stay in Japan, Rockbridge County seemed as far away as Jupiter.

Highlights of our visit were the Black Ship Festival at Shimoda, a yukata party at a Japanese inn on the Izu Peninsula, a visit to the Shinto shrine at Nikko, drives to Lake Hakone, and to Lake Chuzenji and the Kegon Waterfall, and 2 wonderful days at Kyoto, the ancient capital. In addition to the planned part of the program, we had a delicious dinner with Prof. Eiichi Kyooka and his charming wife in their home. The professor, my collaborator in the publication of the Brooke journals, is the grandson of the renowned Fukuzawa Yukichi, one of the pioneers of liberal education in Japan during the Meiji Restoration, and, interestingly enough, a secretary on the *Kanrin Maru* during her epic voyage.

The Japan we visited in 1960 was far removed from that my grandfather viewed 100 years ago. But certainly its beautiful scenery is changeless. And the basic qualities of the Japanese people have not changed, either. In a little more than one generation, from the beginning of the Meiji Restoration in 1868 to the defeat of Russia in 1905, Japan was transformed from a quaint, medieval society based on an agricultural economy into one of the great powers of the modern world. The victory over the Russian bear demonstrated that not only did Japan have

powerful land and sea forces, but a mature industrial plant as well. However, it would be too much to expect that during this period of fantastic growth, which is perhaps unique in history, Western civilization should have permeated all facets of life. As Brooke had predicted, the dissident elements of his time joined forces with the opposition and catapulted Japan into the mainstream. But in many ways the change was more apparent than real. The old order had been covered with a glossy veneer. Meanwhile Japan moved ahead.

In the 1930's the picture changed as the militarists, firm believers in Japan's divine destiny and dedicated to the use of force to achieve it, took over. They led Japan down the road to destruction, to Pearl Harbor and beyond. Not only did World War II inflict incalculable physical damage upon Japan, but it jolted her society to its foundations. This was the first time since the establishment of the dynasty in 660 B.C. that Japan had tasted defeat in a war. What many patriots had thought impossible, had happened.

Yet in 1960, Japan is once again a nation to be reckoned with. In a miracle as great as that of West Germany, Japan has risen from the rubble of war. Shorn of her military might she once more stands forth as a commercial and industrial giant. She represents, despite the loss of her empire in the war, one of the four great industrial complexes of the world. She ranks first in shipbuilding and is a leader in other lines. Since the war Japan has concentrated on high quality goods and with a rush has moved into the field of electronics and high-precision instruments. Her cameras and transistor radios are second to none.

Mrs. Brooke and I were amazed at the apparent prosperity of the country. The war damage had been repaired, the streets were full of busy people, and the shop windows were full. The great department stores of Tokyo and Kyoto compare favorably with those in America. Needless to say, we made some purchases. But, unlike my grandfather, we were more worried about exceeding our customs allowance or going over the weight limit for air travel than anything else.

In explaining Japan's economic resurgence, it is easy to say that American economic assistance and the relief from the burden of armaments is the explanation. But that is only part of the answer. We must not forget that Japan made prodigious strides after 1868 when she was bothered by armament expenditures and was not the recipient of largess. It is worth noting that by nature Japan has been poorly endowed. In area she is slightly smaller than California, or about 3½ times the area of Virginia, yet her population is 93 million, half that of the United States. Japan has adequate waterpower, low-grade coal, and sulfur. She has 22 of the 33 minerals that are essential for a modern industrial power, but most of these are in very short supply. She must import coke for her steel furnaces and 80 percent of her iron ore. Though heavily forested, Japan supplies only 60 percent of her own needs in wood products and paper. Japan is mountainous which condition promotes erosion and makes much of the soil unsuitable for crops. Only 17 percent of the land can be used for agricultural purposes.

What then explains the fact that Japan has in the past 100 years taken her place among the great industrial powers? Certainly part of the answer must be found in the quality of the Japanese people themselves and their peculiar structure of society. The Japanese of today like the Japanese of 100 years ago are intelligent, adaptable, and industrious. They have vast energy, are highly literate and, as a result of their environment, they must be thrifty. The Japanese, also, are dextrous with their hands which makes them unusually adept at assembling complicated mechanisms. The peculiar structure of Japanese society is such that the people working together appear stronger than the sum total of the parts. It has been said that Japan has a web society. Interdependence and cooperation are stressed more than individual rights. Certainly one of Japan's greatest assets lies in her human resources.

By the very nature of our visit to Japan we were brought in contact with people who were friendly toward the United States. These people were leaders of Japanese life and were drawn from the universities, business, and government. With such limited contacts it would of course be rash in the extreme to draw hasty conclusions. I can say, however, that we did venture out to some extent on our own, and nowhere did we meet any display of ill-feeling toward the United States. Outside the Heiian Shrine in Kyoto, which Mrs. Brooke and I visited alone, we were approached in friendly fashion by groups of Japanese schoolgirls and schoolboys. A group of college youths talked to us to test their efficiency in English. Their spokesman, who has since written me, was from Hiroshima. The anti-American riots began 4 days after our arrival and were fully covered in the English language newspapers. During one or two of our sightseeing tours in Tokyo we saw long lines of students parading with placards and we were informed by our guides that they were demonstrators. But there was no demonstration of animosity toward us, though our bus was plainly marked to show who we were. We kept no pistols under our pillows as John Brooke had done. It was my conviction at the time and has been since, that these riots were organized and led by Communists and other extreme leftists. They did not represent any appreciable part of either the Japanese masses or their responsible leaders. They did achieve some of their goals. Premier Kishi resigned and President Eisenhower's visit was canceled, but the American-Japanese Security Treaty remains. The recent elections upholding Premier Ikeda and the National Liberals support the view that most Japanese are friendly to us.

The Japanese are, however, fearful of another war. The horror of the atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the fire bombs scattered over all of the major cities but Kyoto will not be forgotten for many generations. I think the thought is well expressed by the winsome girl guide who accompanied us on our tour. In a letter to me she wrote: "I really wish your country and mine could have friendly relations with each other and no war in this world forever." This same idea was expressed in different words by the very intelligent wife of an eminent Japanese professor, when she said that before she faced another war she would commit suicide. I have no doubt she meant it.

So in Japan we have many people who are somewhat neutralist in their thinking with regard to foreign affairs, but in most other respects are exceedingly friendly to the United States. In trade, we are Japan's best customer and she is our second best customer. Japan must trade or die. The Japanese are realists. It is obvious that should they lose our trade they will turn to the Red bloc. This would affect the balance of power most adversely. Militarily Japan and the United States need each other. The Japanese islands anchor our chain of bases in the western Pacific; should we lose out there we would be pushed back to Pearl Harbor. As Lieutenant John Brooke suggested 100 years ago, Japan and the United States in both trade and national defense have a common destiny. Friendship and understanding can go far toward achieving that goal.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this year, we are celebrating another anniversary—the centennial of the unfortunate War Between the States. Since it is not generally known that John Mercer Brooke, later known to his friends in Lexington as Col. John Mercer Brooke of the Department of Physics of VMI, was Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography of the Confederate Navy, I am inserting a statement concerning Colonel Brooke's service with the Confederate Navy and his subsequent service as a science teacher at the Virginia Military Institute.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

John Mercer Brooke, distinguished naval officer, scientist and scholar and longtime professor at the Virginia Military Institute, spent his entire life in the advancement of knowledge and learning. His life actually encompassed two careers—the first of which began when he put to sea just after turning 14—which brought far-reaching contributions in science, navigation and oceanography, and education.

Born near Tampa, Fla., on December 18, 1826, John Mercer Brooke was the son of Brevet Maj. Gen. George Mercer Brooke, U.S. Army, of Virginia, and Lucy Thomas Brooke, of Massachusetts. His mother died when he was only 9 years old and 5 years later young Brooke became a midshipman in the U.S. Navy, serving aboard ship in both the Atlantic and Pacific. In 1845, he entered the newly established Naval Academy and was graduated 2 years later. He then began a series of assignments, which were full of adventure and challenge and enabled him to put his talents to work: He served with the hydrographic party of the Coast Survey under Lt. Samuel P. Lee; with Matthew Fontaine Maury at the Naval Observatory in Washington where he invented a deep-sea sounding apparatus by which the bottom of the ocean could be mapped accurately (for this contribution to science he received the Gold Medal of Science from the Academy of Berlin); in 1854 he served aboard the *Vincennes* on the North Pacific and Bering Straits Surveying and Exploring Expedition; in 1858, he was assigned the duty of surveying a route from California to China, and in the schooner *Fenimore Cooper* made deep-sea soundings and important surveys of several Pacific islands and of a considerable portion of the east coast of Japan.

This work was interrupted when a cyclone wrecked his ship while he was ashore in conference with the American Minister at Yedo. During his wait for passage he established cordial relations with Japanese authorities and he subsequently assisted in the navigation of the Japanese Corvette *Kanrin Maru* when it brought the first Japanese Minister to the United States in 1860.

He entered the service of the Confederate Navy upon the outbreak of the Civil War and served as a commander and Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance and Hydrography. He planned the reconstruction of the *Merrimac* as an ironclad and made other significant contributions in the field of ordnance.

In 1865 he joined the faculty of the Virginia Military Institute as professor of physics and astronomy and served for 33 years until his retirement in 1898. He was colonel and emeritus professor of physics from 1899 until his death in 1906.

Maury-Brooke Hall, which houses the Department of Chemistry of VMI, is a memorial to him and to Maury, who also served on the institute faculty after the Civil War.

The connection which John Mercer Brooke established with the Virginia Military Institute has continued through the years. Both

his son, Col. George Mercer Brooke, U.S. Army, and his grandson, Col. George Mercer Brooke, Jr., are graduates of the Institute and George Mercer Brooke, Jr., is professor of history at that institution.

ALASKA: GIBRALTAR OF THE NORTH

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, what I regard as a most significant military paper on Alaska in particular, and on the far north in general, was presented at Fort Richardson, Alaska, only last week by Col. Willard Pearson, operations and training officer for the U.S. Army in Alaska. Colonel Pearson spoke before a civilian group at the headquarters post of the Army in Alaska. What he had to say should be heard by every American because what he said is important to the defense of this country.

It is Colonel Pearson's conclusion that should another war come the Arctic Ocean will have the same strategic significance as the Mediterranean had in World War II.

A logical case for the stationing of ICBM's or IRBM's in Alaska is presented in this paper by Colonel Pearson. He points out that an ICBM stationed at Fairbanks, Alaska, would have a capacity to reach targets in most of western Europe, Russia and China. It is simply a proposition that the distances are shorter from the polar regions to these places than from elsewhere.

The argument has been made that it would cost more to place missiles in Alaska than in some other places and that we cannot afford the higher construction and maintenance costs. It has long been my belief that acceptance of this theory is equivalent to saying we cannot afford to defend ourselves. And there are few of us who would not reject any such contention. This very point is most adequately covered by Colonel Pearson, who states:

> Higher initial costs for military operation in Alaska are offset by the political stability which assures retention of bases over the long term. Funds spent in the 49th State are retained in the U.S. economy rather than being spent in oversea areas where political affiliations are subject to change.

These considerations should be emphasized and kept in mind and acted upon, rather than being subordinated as has been the case.

Mr. President, I believe that Colonel Pearson's views are so important to the entire Nation that they ought to be given the utmost publicity and accordingly I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address he delivered at Fort Richardson on January 30, 1961, be printed in full following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA, GIBRALTAR OF THE NORTH

INTRODUCTION

Following World War I, it was the airplane flying the polar routes that initially focused attention on the military importance of the Arctic regions. Later, after World War II, this interest heightened with the development of the long-range land-based missile. More recently, however, the nuclear-powered submarine, a mobile missile base cruising in northern waters, has brought the strategic importance of the far north into even sharper focus. Should there be a war, and we pray there will be none, these weapons—jet aircraft, land-based missiles, and missile-carrying submarines—will give the Arctic Ocean the same strategic importance the Mediterranean held in World War II.

The gateways to the Arctic, the Bering Strait on the west, the only sea link between the Arctic and Pacific Oceans, and the Norwegian Sea on the east, correspond to the Straits of Gibraltar and the Red Sea in the Mediterranean. Within this context Alaska is the Gibraltar of the North, and it is separated from Russia by 55 miles of water, United States Little Diomede Island and U.S.S.R's Big Diomede Island in the Bering Strait are less than 3 miles apart.

The strategic significance of the northern regions has not been fully appreciated considering post World War II weapons now available—let alone potential new developments in weapons, transportation, communications, and nuclear power. The purpose of our presentation this afternoon is to—

First: Point out the strategic importance of the far north with special reference to Alaska.

Next: Examine the implications to the U.S. Army, and

Finally: Recommend an Army program to improve the ability of the ground forces to operate in the north.

FIRST THE STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FAR NORTH

We in the military define the area of northern operations as that area enclosed by the 50° isotherm for the warmest 4 months of the year. The 50° isotherm is an imaginary line encompassing those areas of the Arctic and subarctic where the mean daily temperature for the warmest 4 months of the year does not exceed 50° F. You can see that it covers all of Alaska, Canada, a part of the upper Midwest, Greenland, the upper Scandinavian Peninsula, 65 percent of Russia to include all of Siberia, and half of Korea. This is the area we are going to talk about. Its strategic significance can best be appreciated from an analysis of the following factors: (1) Geographic, (2) political, (3) economic, (4) psychological.

Geographic: A glance at a polar projection of the globe shows Europe, Asia, and North America come closest together at the North Pole.

The shortest distance between the principal population and industrial centers of Eurasia and North America is over the polar regions. Note the difference in distance from the center of the United States to Moscow via the great circle route versus the polar route.

Here is another comparison. Again we see that the distance from the center of the United States to Moscow via the polar route is roughly 4,500 miles, whereas from Thule, Greenland, to Moscow is a mere 2,300 miles.

An ICBM located in Fairbanks, Alaska, having a range of 5,000 miles could easily engage targets in most of Western Europe, Russia, and China.

A missile firing from Alaska to China has a significant range advantage over a missile located on the west coast of the United States firing on the same target. Note range differences (1,900 miles). You can see that by using bases in the far north we gain a significant range advantage over similar bases located in CONUS.

Next for a consideration of water based missiles.

The Polaris-equipped submarine, operating from Alaskan bases, and using the Arctic Ocean as a mobile underwater launching platform to achieve concealment, dispersion, and surprise has a range that can launch missiles south into Eurasia; generally as far as the 50th degree of latitude. This would include the British Isles, France, northwest Europe to include the Scandinavian Peninsula, and a huge chunk of Russia to include the Trans Siberian Railroad. From the Barents Sea the Polaris missile can fire over Moscow and hit the Black Sea.

These shorter distances to the heartland of the United States and Eurasia from Arctic bases insure greater accuracy for missiles, heavier payloads, less time in flight as well as fewer failures in flight. Greater accuracy and heavier payloads reduce the overall force requirements. The reduction in flight time to target increases the chance of achieving surprise and reduces the time a missile is subject to attack. It also reduces the time the enemy has to react to a surprise attack. These reduced distances via the polar route bring the strategic importance of the Far North into sharp focus when viewed through the lens of our rapidly developing ability to travel above, across, or under the Arctic.

We must secure maximum warning of an air or missile attack on the United States launched from Eurasia. To get maximum warning the curvature of the earth requires us to locate our warning stations as near the top of the world as possible in order to look down on the other side. This is the point where radar located in the United States might first pick up a missile launched from Eurasia versus the point of pick-up when the radar is located in the Arctic. The DEW line was located along the Arctic Circle for this reason. For the same reason our BMEWS (ballistic missile) and Midas (missile detection) sites are being located in the Far North. These BMEW's and Midas sites become strategic targets because of their limited number, criticality in the early days of a general war and the long period of time required to rebuild them if destroyed. The location of these strategic targets on our northern outposts obviously increases the strategic significance of these outposts.

Thus in the Far North, geography combines with the increased range of modern weapons to highlight the strategic importance of the area as an advanced outpost for early warning, interception of air missile, or satellite attacks and for launching attacks or counter-attacks.

Political: We shall mention this only briefly because the political aspects are so obvious. Since the end of World War II, U.S. rights in many bases overseas have been either restricted or revoked outright. Even our position in the Caribbean, once considered impregnable, is under political attack.

Forces in Alaska, on the other hand, are on U.S. soil. They are not subject to pressures by foreign political complications. The world is shrinking in size with the continuing improvement in our means of transportation and communications. As this process continues we predict the political security afforded our bases in the 49th State will become an increasingly significant consideration in the deployment of our military forces.

Economic: A modern power must protect its economic potential and mobilization base in a nuclear war. A nation will seek to fight as far as possible from its heavily populated and industrialized areas. The vast undeveloped areas of the Far North permit the dispersion of military forces away from heavily populated and industrial centers. This not only provides passive protection to our retaliatory forces but also reduces the vulnerability of our industries and civilians to missile counterbattery fire and radioactive fallout.

Higher initial costs for military operation in Alaska are offset by the political stability which assures retention of bases over the long term. Funds spent in the 49th State are retained in the U.S. economy rather than being spent in oversea areas where political

affiliations are subject to change. Furthermore, the drain on U.S. gold reserves caused by stationing large forces in foreign countries was dramatically illustrated by a recent Presidential decision to evacuate a large number of military dependents from oversea bases. This directive does not apply to Alaska.

Psychological: Should an enemy secure even a limited beachhead on the most bleak coast of northern Alaska, she could proclaim to the world that U.S. territory had been successfully invaded. Invasion of U.S. soil would adversely influence the uncommitted nations in the early stages of a general war. An invader would gain great psychological and propaganda value from even nuisance raids on U.S. soil. Remember if you will, the near panic and hysteria that developed on the west coast following the attack on Pearl Harbor at the outbreak of World War II. The political implications and public opinion would develop pressures for an early counterattack against enemy lodgments on the Alaskan periphery.

The strategic importance of the Far North arises from its geographic location on the shortest route between North America and Eurasia. The military significance is further increased by important political, economic, and pyschological factors.

So much for the strategic importance of the Far North.

WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS TO THE ARMY?

The Army's objective in war is destruction of the enemy and occupation of the enemy's heartland. Before the decisive battle for the heartland is fought, there will be strategic outposts which must be first seized or neutralized.

In World War II, for example, the Japanese considered capture of the dense, steaming, fever-invested jungles of New Guinea strategically necessary. Why? This island became a strategic base for blocking the principal U.S. oversea supply route into Australia, as well as a staging area for attacking that continent.

On the other side of the globe the Allies and the Axis were at the same time fighting for control of the hot, barren, deserts of north Africa. The strategic north African coast provided bases for ground, sea, and air forces to control the Mediterranean as well as staging areas for attacking the soft underbelly of Europe.

In the far north, the Germans captured Norway and attempted to cut the allies' northern sea route to the Soviet Union. The Japanese likewise struck in the north and attacked the Aleutian Islands.

You can see that in World War II major forces were thus deeply engaged in jungle, desert, and arctic warfare on strategic outposts long before fighting the final battle in the more temperate climate of Europe. Similarly, in any future war between the United States and a power on the Eurasian land mass, significant air, sea, and land battles will be fought over the arctic basin as the opposing forces contest for this strategic outpost.

In the early stages of a general war opposing forces would strike swiftly to: (1) destroy or neutralize each other's military potential in the far north; (2) protect their northern flanks by dominating the arctic regions; and (3) develop offensive bases to support by missile fire invasions by land, sea, and air of the enemy's heartland.

Possession of the Arctic Basin by an unfriendly power jeopardizes the security of the United States. For example in the initial phases of a general war, it would be of great importance to neutralize missiles located on the arctic rimland firing megaton weapons on the industrial complex in the United States. It is doubtful if this neutralization could be successfully or completely accomplished by bombs or missiles alone. You recall in World War II, German V2 rockets, firing on London from the northern coast of Europe, were neutralized only after the army overran and occupied the sites. Early neutralization is even more critical today than it was in the days of the model T type V2 rocket because of the greater destructive power of modern weapons.

The enemy will likewise attempt to neutralize our military potential in the far north. Initially he may attempt this with nuclear missiles. He may supplement his missile fire by limited airborne and seaborne attacks, submarine-borne patrols landed at night, and guerrillas parachuted at night into sensitive areas or by major airborne and amphibious attacks to seize critical ports, bases, and centers of communications. Our military installations must be defended against all forms of attack. A large measure of this task will fall to the U.S. Army.

The implication to the Army is obvious—the Army must be prepared to conduct offensive and defensive operations in the far north.

This capability should exist now to provide swift reaction in the early stages of a general war when control of our strategic outposts is essential. This would provide increased assurance that we can successfully defend Alaska and our northern frontiers. This is essential because Alaska and the far north are strategic links in the defense of the Northern Hemisphere. In a general war, these northerly areas will provide advance staging bases for launching air, sea, and ground attacks against Eurasia. Further, we may have to turn to Alaska to develop its mineral resources to replace oversea sources of supply which have been disrupted or destroyed. These then are the implications of the strategic importance of the northern area.

You may ask the question: Can large forces conduct offensive and defensive operations in the far north? Let's go back and consider the Finnish war for just a moment.

The Finnish-Russian war was fought generally between 60° and the Arctic Ocean. In 1944 there were 6 German divisions, 15 Finnish, and 73 Russian divisions, or a total of 94 infantry, armored, and mountain divisions committed to this area. Superimpose Alaska on this battleground and we find the Russian-Finnish war took place between the 60° of latitudes that pass through Seward, Alaska, and the Arctic Ocean. Harsh climate, mountainous terrain, dense forests, and lack of surface communications will not bar troops from fighting when the strategic prize is worth fighting for. What kind of an army program is needed?

Our current program is an excellent one. During the past year, we have made substantial progress in many areas. Several USARAL reorganizations have reduced overhead personnel with corresponding increases in combat strength. Our Army Reserve units have been reorganized to better satisfy mobilization requirements. We are working more closely with the Alaska National Guard, particularly in joint training.

The shift of research and development activities from Fort Churchill to Fort Wainwright will consolidate cold weather testing in Alaska in the next year.

Our Nike-Hercules units have pioneered the way in firing missiles from tactical sites near populated areas. This year, in exercise Willow Freeze, we will have over 7,000 personnel participating. It is the largest maneuver in Alaska since the end of the war.

However, we are not completely satisfied with our current program. To be complacent and smug in a changing world is to invite disaster. We are looking ahead to the next 3 to 5 years and we would like to point out some areas we feel need emphasis.

We recommend the following three-point program:

First point: Greater research and development effort and year-around testing of materiel, under both winter and summer conditions.

The most promising areas for improving the Army's operational capabilities is the development of specialized equipment. We need to increase the tactical mobility of the combat units and their necessary logistical support units. To do this, special equipment is needed. Liddell Hart, in his book, "The Red Army," states, quote: "Hitler lost his chance of victory against Russia because the mobility of his Army was based on wheels instead of tracks." For ground mobility on the battlefield we need improved tracked transportation with year-round mobility. The optimum tracked vehicle will negotiate over the snow in winter, through the water in the spring breakup, and across the muskeg and rocks in the summer. Allied with this problem of ground mobility is the need to develop navigational aids and techniques for movement across the uncharted wasteland of the north.

Exploitation of the potentialities of air mobility for moving troops, equipment, and supplies, promises to be a decisive factor in establishing supremacy in the north. We must develop equipment and techniques to capitalize on the mobility of Army aviation.

Reduction in the diversity, volume, and weight of the soldier's clothing and equipment is a requirement for soldiers operating in any theater of operations. It is of special importance to the soldier in the north because of the heavy clothing worn and the difficulty of moving over rugged terrain under adverse weather conditions. Progress in this area will not only enhance soldier morale and efficiency but will also increase individual and unit mobility.

Northern operations will be characterized by dispersion of units over vast areas creating a communications problem. For adequate control of these units, radios of greater range, reduced weight, and increased reliability are needed. Ways must be found to increase battery life in subzero weather.

Other important areas for research are employment of nuclear weapons, adequacy of conventional weapons, operational rations, resupply techniques, and maintenance of all types of equipment.

Second point: More rugged, realistic training in northern operations.

Past maneuvers in Alaska have provided outstanding training for participating units from CONUS. The locale of these maneuvers has been in south and central Alaska. These exercises must be made progressively more difficult by conducting them in the Brooks Mountain Range, in the tundra of northern Alaska, and along the Arctic coast.

The usual winter maneuvers reveal the obvious or superficial shortcomings, but are not long enough to uncover more fundamental weaknesses and strengths in personnel, equipment, and doctrine. Annual expeditions of 1 or more month's duration should be conducted during the winter and summer. Movement of tactical units over the old pioneer sled trails from Fairbanks to Nome, from Nome to Point Barrow through the Anaktuvuk Pass in the Brooks Range is needed. Overland movement from Alaska across northern Canada to Greenland is recommended. The Army should seek to develop trained men and equipment to retrace Admiral Peary's route to the North Pole on a recurring basis.

A hard core of expert mountain climbers must be trained. Training can be conducted on the many mountains in Alaska with an ascent of Mount McKinley as the graduation exercise.

Expeditions of this type would provide:

1. Superior training in land navigation, communications, resupply procedures, physical conditioning, living in the field, and small unit leadership.

3. Rugged test of equipment under prolonged stress more nearly approaching combat conditions.

4. Realistic tests of tactics and techniques.

Improved personnel procedures which will attract, motivate, and retain individuals trained in cold-weather techniques.

Quality rather than quantity must be the goal in training personnel. A small number of highly trained individuals and units should be developed to provide the nucleus for rapid expansion during mobilization or as forces in being for immediate deployment to key strategic areas in event of war.

This can be achieved as follows:

1. Designate the two battle groups in Alaska and one or two battle groups in the continental United States as ski and mountain units. The words "ski and mountain" should appear as part of the unit's designation to clearly identify it as a special unit. No major changes in organization would be required. The battle groups would be issued the necessary specialized equipment. These ski and mountain battle groups would conduct annual maneuvers and expeditions in the Far North along the lines I have just suggested. They would do so on a recurring basis to attain the highest degree of individual and unit proficiency and esprit.

2. Provide qualification badges for expert skiers and mountaineers. These badges, which are common in European armies, would:

(a) Provide incentives to achieve higher standards of individual skills;

(b) Develop pride by giving recognition to individuals achieving these standards; and

(c) Facilitate mobilization and peacetime assignments to the ski and mountain units, the Army's cold weather and mountain school, and to staffs of higher headquarters requiring their specialized knowledge—in the same manner parachutists are assigned to airborne units, the airborne school, and staffs of higher headquarters.

3. Expand and publicize the current program of screening incoming replacements having experience in the National Ski Association and the American Alpine Club, and assigning them to Alaska upon completion of their basic training.

4. Permit repetitive assignments of personnel possessing skiing and mountaineering skills to Alaska, or to other areas where these skills may be applied.

These personnel procedures will attract, retain, and motivate the individual soldier to become more professionally skilled in the specialized techniques of northern operations.

This 3-point program is a feasible and practical one. With the acquisition of Fort Wainwright at Fairbanks, Alaska, the Army now has facilities immediately available to support increased R. & D. activities in Alaska. We believe there is adequate land in Alaska available to support testing of our long range missiles coming into the Army's inventory. An expanded R. & D. program in Alaska would increase the military strength in Alaska as well as bolster the economy of the State.

The training program and personnel control procedures discussed above can be adopted within present personnel ceilings. The number of troops participating in the current maneuver program can be reduced to permit execution of the revised program within the present budget.

Examples of failures to prepare for northern operations can be found from the Napoleonic Wars to the Korean conflict. Adoption of a program along these lines is necessary to insure the Army's readiness to meet the challenge of operating in the Far North in the missile age.

SUMMARY

Now let me summarize the three points we want to leave with you:

Point No. 1: The Far North is of great military significance in the missile age, particularly as a strategic outpost in the initial stages of a general war. Please remember also that this area comprises a large section of North America and Eurasia.

Point No. 2: The Army must be prepared to conduct offensive and defensive operations in the Far North since opposing forces will attempt to neutralize each other's military potential in the strategic outpost of the Arctic. In the final analysis, this will be accomplished only when the Army forces occupy the ground.

Point No. 3: The Army must have a program to improve its operational potential in the Far North. A realistic program that will prepare the Army to fight at any time or anywhere in the northern areas.

Alaska can serve as the Army's testing and training ground to achieve this objective. Alaska, the Gibraltar of the North, is destined to play an increasingly important role in the future planning for the defense of the free world.

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion recently about the Congress enacting legislation which will result in reducing farm production in this country. I believe that the situation requires a word of caution lest we go too far in that direction. Therefore, I had prepared a statement to deliver on the floor this afternoon which would probably take 10 or 15 minutes. However, in view of the pending business, which will be rather generously discussed and may run for some time, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I had prepared be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

If the development of a farm program were merely a matter of raising prices for farm commodities, it would present a comparatively simple problem.

However, as a lot of people know, the development of a workable and equitable agricultural program is one of our more complex rather than one of our simplest challenges.

Whatever plan is devised for the American farmer not only has its effect on all the people of the United States but most of the people of the rest of the world as well.

There are seven different facets which have to be considered in formulating any national farm program.

These are:

1. Effect on the farmer.
2. Effect on the consuming public.
3. Effect on the community.
4. Effect on the national economy.
5. Effect on the national security.
6. Effect on international relations.
7. Effect on our Government.

First, we must consider the effect on the farmer himself.

Here again, if the farmer's welfare depended upon price alone, the matter could be solved by a stroke of the congressional pen.

However, an effort to solve the farmer's economic problem by adjusting price alone could well decrease his income and his living standards.

It is net income which determines the farmer's welfare and net income is determined by price times quantity less costs.

Over 10 years ago experts in the Department of Agriculture found that a farmer producing a full crop at a lower price level would make more net income than if he produced a smaller crop at a much higher price.

This loss of income would be due to the fact that in these days of high capital investment, overhead costs such as taxes, depreciation, and insurance do not go down with reduced production and the costs of producing a bushel of grain or a pound of meat may be drastically increased.

In the event that reduced production is brought about through cropland retirement, the farmer must also consider the effect on the farm and the regular markets which may have depended upon him to deliver a relatively uniform supply each year.

The second facet in devising or improving a farm program is the effect it will have upon the consuming public.

If we could restrict any increases in consumer prices to the increase necessary to return to the farmer a fair price for his product the result in increased costs to the consumer would be negligible.

That happy solution is not in the cards, however.

When the price of milk to the dairyman goes up one-half cent a quart, the price to the consumer rises 1 cent.

And this increase in the price of milk is about the minimum percentage of increase which the consumer may expect from any rise in farm prices.

The spread between farm and consumer prices is at an alltime high and shows every sign of going higher.

Great strides have been made in processing, packaging, and merchandising food products and it is probably unfair to draw a strict comparison between the costs of today and those of even 10 years ago.

Nevertheless, we may expect that any increase in price to the farmer today may be reflected in a much greater increase in consumer prices.

A considerable part of the money appropriated by Congress for farm research is actually spent for research for the benefit of the consumer.

As a result, the American people today enjoy the finest quality of food in the widest variety and in a quantity that insures a record low percentage expenditure of the consumers' dollar.

There may be more savings to be made in processing and merchandizing food products, but the public cannot and should not expect further subsidization at the expense of the farmer.

The third facet of a farm program represents its effect on the rural community.

A reduction in the permissible production of a community can and would result in lower income, loss of business for mercantile concerns, less employment and possible loss of population thus adversely affecting State and Federal contributions to local school, highway, and other public programs.

It is entirely possible that reduced production might also result in the loss of local processing plants or at least compel their merger with those of other similarly affected communities.

Since reduced amounts would reduce the amount of business to be done by local storage and marketing farm cooperatives the cost of operating such cooperatives would be bound to increase for each unit of production.

The United States was founded on the rural communities that make up the backbone of the Nation. While the wealth created in these areas now tends to concentrate in the cities, the fact remains that the strength of the Nation still emanates from these communities and any damage done to these thousands of rural districts constitutes damage to the whole country.

The third factor to be considered in modeling a farm program is its effect on the national economy.

About 10 percent of our total population is actually employed on the land. This number, which at one time amounted to 80

percent, has gradually been reduced as technology has steadily increased the per capita productive capacity.

However, as the number of persons actually working on the land has been shrinking, the numbers that are engaged in producing farm supplies and transporting, processing, and handling commodities has steadily increased.

So when we consider our agricultural problems we are actually considering the problems of nearly one-third of our working force rather than just those of the 10 percent who work on farms.

Adjustments in farm production would affect millions of people engaged in producing fertilizers, spray material, automotive equipment, packaging material, and a thousand other items of industrial manufacture.

It would affect those engaged in transportation of all kinds, including ocean shipping, as well as those engaged in milling, packinghouses and other processing plants, handling and merchandising, and the billion-dollar storage industry.

When we affect the employment of these people, we also affect their purchasing power and their ability to buy the output of the farm itself. The interests of farm and city people are inextricably interlocked in this respect.

Next, let us consider the effect of farm programs on our national security.

Wars, hot or cold, are not won by arms alone. Food and fiber supplies are as essential as bombs and rockets.

The United States today has the greatest supply of food available anywhere in the world.

In the event of war, we could support our own Armed Forces. We could feed our civilian population. We could feed and help clothe many other freedom-loving nations of the world.

No other country in the world is so well prepared to feed and clothe its civilian population and its armed forces in the event of war. This in itself is a strong deterrent against war.

However slight the possibility of a hot war may be, we are even now in the midst of a cold war the consequences of which could be disastrous.

Here again, the enormous productive power of American agriculture is one of our strongest bulwarks of defense.

During the last 6 years we have disposed of $9 billion worth of surplus agricultural production to other nations on favorable terms.

This disposal is in addition to the enormous quantities of farm commodities sold on the regular dollar export market.

Our surpluses have averted famines, prevented inflation, and stabilized governments in many countries.

It is the knowledge that in the United States there is food available for any emergency that encourages other countries to fight successfully against the encroachment of totalitarianism.

The United States is strong militarily today, yet all our guided missiles, all our aircraft, and all our nuclear submarines would be virtually useless should our agricultural production fail.

In the interest of national security it is essential that we produce substantially more food and fiber than we need. But farmers alone should not be expected to carry the cost of this insurance and accept lower prices simply because in meeting the overall needs of the country they have depressed their own markets.

Taking up the sixth facet of our farm problem and ignoring the military aspects for the time being, let us consider what the effect of a sharp reduction in farm production would likely mean to other parts of the world and to our international relations.

Last year (1960) we exported about $4.7 billion worth of farm products. Our dollar trade alone amounted to $3.2 billion.

Our exports of wheat have now gone past the 500 million bushel mark.

Thanks to the revision of the cotton program in 1958, we have recovered our foreign market and are now exporting at the rate of 7 million bales a year.

A large part of our merchant marine is engaged in transporting these products.

We enjoy this enormous foreign market because some 2 billion people in the world are not self-sufficient and because we produce more than we need.

It is true that we subsidize the export of some of these commodities in order to meet competitive world market prices. It is also true that if we charged a price comparable to that prevailing in the United States, plus carrying and handling charges, that our export trade would be far less.

Subsidization is not necessarily bad, especially when it makes possible a large expansion in our whole economy.

Should we develop a farm program which would materially decrease our supply and increase costs to foreign buyers, it is a certainty that a great agricultural boom would develop in other parts of the world, notably in Africa and South America and much of our present large export market would be permanently lost.

The seventh and final facet of the agricultural picture is the effect which compulsorily reduced production or increased farmer dependency on public funds or further Government controls could have upon our form of government.

Some proposals have been made which to be effective would require strict controls over every acre of productive land.

If we in effect require the licensing of the use of the land is it not just a short step to the licensing of processors, handlers, and even purchasers? Would not price controls be inevitable? How far can we go in regimenting one class of people without eventually requiring similar Government controls over all people?

I will not dwell on this prospect any further but will simply point out this fact.

In every country where there is surplus production today, the farmer is virtually free to produce and is his own master.

In every country suffering from food shortages, government has attempted to control both the farmer and the land.

Is there any question as to which category we want to be in?

In pointing out the risks involved by any abrupt changes in our farm programs, I am not undertaking to say there should be no changes at all.

I am not saying that there should be no subsidies or that we should immediately abandon all controls over production.

In fact, we should always try to keep our programs up to date, realizing that in agriculture as in other business, change is the order of the day.

I am simply pointing out the many considerations that have to be given such changes and to urge that great caution be used lest we do more harm than good.

I am very apprehensive over proposals to sharply reduce production. It is entirely possible that an overall reduction of 10 percent in farm crops could bring on substantial unemployment and thereby depress markets for all goods including farm commodities.

It is doubtful if the overall production in this country is greater than our national economy and national security demands, although I readily concede there is a production imbalance among commodities.

There is a recognizable surplus of wheat and a lesser amount of feed grain which may be called surplus under present conditions.

Cotton which was in surplus only 2 years ago is now well in balance and the cotton program should not be disturbed.

Before restricting our overall productive capacity, I would make every effort to find a sound use for what is now erroneously considered surplus.

Many millions of Americans still have unbalanced diets. A billion people now furnishing a fertile field for Communist propaganda are actually underfed. We have not yet exhausted all avenues to increased industrial outlets.

Certainly the farmer needs new legislation. Not legislation that will put him still further under Government domination, however, but legislation that will permit him to improve his own income and better serve the consuming public without fear of Federal prosecution.

He needs the right to join with his fellow farmers in the marketing of more crops, a right which Congress has thus far denied him because of pressure from monopolistic-minded enterprises.

If we pay more attention to rights and less to compulsion we will be farther along the road to a more prosperous agriculture.

If we will only regard our production as a bounty rather than a liability we will find that instead of being a cause for worry it is really a reason for much rejoicing.

BRAVE LITHUANIA—A SEVEN-CENTURY QUEST FOR FREEDOM

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] which appeared on page 1736 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1961, with reference to the continued oppression of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

On February 16, 1961, Lithuanian-Americans will commemorate the 708th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Kingdom in 1253 and the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Republic of Lithuania in 1918.

The distinguished senior Senator from California presented concisely and clearly the long history of oppression which has beset these Baltic nations. He has, in a concurrent resolution, requested that Congress request the President of the United States—

To bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets first, to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; second, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps; and finally that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision.

I am in complete agreement with the Senator's resolution and I hope that the Congress will act upon it promptly and overwhelmingly.

REPORT ON REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last December 5, President-elect Kennedy released to the press the committee report on reorganization of the Defense Establishment. At this time I ask unanimous consent that this report, together with the press release on it, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO SENATOR KENNEDY FROM COMMITTEE ON THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Since its appointment on September 14, 1960, the committee, within the limits imposed by the time available, has attempted to bring up to date various earlier studies of the administration and management of the Defense Department and related defense agencies and organizations.

In the course of its consideration of possible changes in the Defense Establishment, the committee, in accordance with your instructions,[1] has made use of the extensive materials on that subject which have been developed during recent years through the work of congressional committees and of private study groups.

Some of the proposals advocated by such committees and groups fall short of, while others would go beyond, the measures recommended by this committee.

While thus taking advantage of the great body of source material available to it in the area of defense management and administration, the committee has not met formally with others. Nevertheless, individual members of the committee have had the benefit, in arriving at their present conclusions, of the general thinking on many of the matters dealt with in this report of a number of former officials in the Defense Department.

In any appraisal of the U.S. military posture one salient factor stands out above the rest. That is the threefold significance of reaction time at this stage in history:

First is the unprecedented strategic value of time—the ability to react instantly against aggression in this nuclear-space age.

In World Wars I and II our country had at least 18 months to build and mobilize its defenses.

If there should ever be a world war III, we would be fortunate to have 18 minutes to react.

Second is the crucial time element in the United States versus Soviet arms race—the need for early selection among alternative weapon systems and for shorter leadtimes between conception and use.

Third is the effect of time on defense cost. Regardless of how much the people of this country spend, they cannot buy time. Yet we tend to forget the costly effect of building weapons which have become obsolescent as a result of delay.

Only by giving full recognition to these all-important time factors can the Defense Establishment of the United States be strengthened in a meaningful way.

BACKGROUND OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The existing structure of the Department of Defense is still patterned primarily on a design conceived in the light of lessons learned in World War II, which are now largely obsolete.

The piecemeal amendments to the basic legislation effected in 1949 and 1958 and the "reorganization" of 1953 did not alter the essential character of the U.S. military organization, deployed on the basis of whether a military man travels on land, sea, or air. Hence, it can be truly said that since 1947 there has been no fundamental change in the scheme of organization of our Armed Forces.

Yet, during this period of nearly a decade and a half, the whole state of the art in military science has been revolutionized, as epitomized in the transitions to the jet, nuclear, and space ages.

No longer is the prime mission of the military forces of the United States to prevail in a World War II type of open warfare; now it is to insure the defense and survival of the Nation in the current era of cold war and protracted conflict, with always the possibility of nuclear attack.

Changes of comparable magnitude have taken place in the international political conditions which constantly accentuate the military risks to which the United States is now subject.

Although two partial reorganizations of the Defense Department since 1952 failed to bring the organizational structure of the Department into line with the requirements of today's military conditions, the necessity for modernizing the defense organization has been widely recognized, and both the administration and the Congress have been repeatedly urged to take further measures.

In 1958 the Rockefeller Bros. report recommended major changes in the Military Establishment to remedy those central weaknesses in its structure which have contributed to the lag in U.S. weapons systems development versus that of the Soviets.

In 1959 Senator COOPER proposed a bill designed to make improvements in the administration and control of the Defense Department, and in 1960 Senator SYMINGTON introduced amendments to the National Security Act which would have effected further reorganization of the Defense Department.

It was in the light of such bipartisan moves that the Democratic platform for 1960 called for "a complete examination of the organization of our Armed Forces," as a first order of business of the next administration, and that Senator Kennedy asked this committee to produce for him "a concrete program with specific proposals in the clearly defined field of its responsibility."

Throughout all proposals, past and present, to make more effective the Defense Department organization has run one central theme—the clarification and strengthening of the authority of the Secretary of Defense over the entire U.S. Military Establishment.

There are some who believe, even prior to the 1958 amendments to the National Security Act, that existing legislation provided ample basis for the Secretary's authority. Others took a contrary view. It is the conclusion of this committee that the doctrine of civilian control will be compromised as long as any doubts exist on this vital point.

Besides resolving any such remaining doubts, there are three major objectives to be sought in modernizing the present Defense Department structure:

First, there must be a shortening of the time factor in bringing new weapons systems from conception to utilization without duplication and wasted effort. Under the existing multilayered structure it is only possible to reduce administrative; i.e., decisionmaking—leadtime by crash procedures set up for key programs such as the Special Projects Office of the Navy now in charge of the Polaris program and the Ballistic Missile Division established by the Air Force to expedite the ICBM program. This ad hoc streamlining of weapons systems management inevitably slows up progress in other areas.

Furthermore, for today's advanced weapons, such as missiles, and tomorrow's possible new ones, such as space vehicles, there is no longer any validity in separating the development and production cycle into two parts. This has been the practice with World War II type and other conventional weapons which, when developed, can be manufactured by production line techniques.

With the present need for concurrency in many stages of weapons systems management, and with the relatively limited number of any given advanced weapon that will be produced, rigid distinctions between research and development and procurement and production organizations are no longer needed, and their performance should be more closely coordinated in the interest of economy in time, money, and motion.

Second, the predominance of service influence in the formulation of defense planning and the performance of military missions must be corrected. At present, defense planning represents at best a series of compromised positions among the military services. Action by the Joint Chiefs of Staff takes place, if at all, only after prolonged debate, coordination, and negotiation between the staffs of the three service chiefs in preparing them to represent the points of view of their services in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

No different results can be expected as long as the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff retain their two-hatted character, with their positions preconditioned by the service environment to which they must return after each session of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Nor can the Joint Staff become fully effective in developing the basis for clear military judgments unless the present degree of influence exercised by separate service thinking is sharply reduced.

In short, there is a clear need for defense interest rather than particular service interest.

Third, there must be more effective utilization of human effort and material resources in the Defense Establishment.

This can only be achieved through a flexible organization conforming to the present day nature of military missions instead of traditional service concepts. Such a change in organization would tend to minimize the duplication and delay growing out of the present multiple layers of control and the overlapping among military programs and operations caused by steadily increasing interservice rivalry in effort to fulfill common missions.

No longer can this Nation afford the luxury of letting each service strive to develop in itself the capability of fighting any future war by itself. The national resources available for our country's defense effort are in limited supply, and we cannot afford such waste of either manpower or funds.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEFENSE DEPARTMENT REORGANIZATION

In order to accomplish the objectives mentioned above, the committee recommends the elimination of the present departmental structure of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, but would preserve the military services as separate organic units within a single Defense Department. Such a step would do away with the present departmental service Secretaries and their Under and Assistant Secretaries, 15 in all.

Certain of the defense reorganization proposals that contemplate this change, such as the bills introduced during recent sessions of Congress by Senator COOPER (S. 2728) and Senator SYMINGTON (S. 2957), have made provision for replacing the present service Secretaries with three new Under Secretaries of Defense for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The committee (including its chairman) now believes, however, that, by perpetuating separate service secretariats, it will be more difficult to subordinate service interest to national interest. The committee therefore considers that it would be wise to discontinue what is now a dual system of civilian control as a result of interposing between the Secretary of Defense and the services themselevs a set of Secretaries identified with each service.

Vesting directly in the Secretary of Defense the administration of the services would be consistent with the functional scheme of military operations already now reflected in the unified commands, would concentrate civilian control in the Department of Defense at one level instead of two, would reduce the delays incident to obtaining separate service department coordination, and would facilitate effective civilian

[1] As contained in your release of September 14, 1960, attached hereto as exhibit B.

direction of defense policy as distinct from military operations.

Since the 1958 amendments of the National Security Act, the chain of command runs from the President to the Secretary of Defense, and, through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to the commanders of the unified and specified commands. The only change in this operational chain of command contemplated by the recommendations of the committee would be to substitute the Chairman of the Joint Staff for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Thus, orders to commanders of unified and specified commands would be issued by the Secretary of Defense (or by the Chairman of the Joint Staff by authority and direction of the Secretary of Defense). These commanders, in turn, would continue to have full operational control over the forces assigned to them.

Under the new structure proposed by the committee the military services would retain their existing responsibilities for adminstrative and logistic support of the military commands. The chain of command for such purposes, as distinguished from operational direction of the military commands, would run from the President to the Secretary of Defense to the Chiefs of the services rather than to the military departments through their Secretaries as at present. The effect of this one change in the chain of command for nonoperational functions would be to shorten the chain—again, reduce delay—and to place the Chiefs of the separate services (who would no longer serve on the Joint Chiefs of Staff) in direct line of command with the Secretary of Defense from whom their orders would issue.

The end result should be to accomplish what the committee believes to be a major objective in any change of the Defense structure; namely, to make the Secretary of Defense the civilian official in the Department of Defense with unquestioned authority and control over all elements of the Department of Defense at all levels.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Strengthening civilian authority

1. The military services would be retained, but the present departmental structure of the Army, Navy, and Air Force would be eliminated. This in turn would do away with the present positions of service Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries. The services would remain separate organic units, albeit within a single department (as is the case today with the Marines), and subject to the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

2. There would be created two new Under Secretaries of Defense, one for weapons systems and one for administration. Together with the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary, they would comprise the planned statutory appointees in the Department.[3] In addition, the Secretary of Defense may designate such civilian assistants as he deems necessary.

The 7 existing offices of Assistant Secretary of Defense (in addition to the 15 service secretarial offices) would be abolished. Their functions would be absorbed by directorates set up under the two new Under Secretaries. This directorate organization would be subject to change by the Secretary of Defense and should not be frozen into a pattern fixed by legislation.

3. The Under Secretary of Defense for Administration would be responsible for activities such as financial management (comptroller), personnel, legal, transportation and communications, legislative, congressional, liaison, public information, and health and medical.

As rapidly as possible all military personnel would be subject to similar recruitment practices, rules for training and length of service, pay for comparable responsibilities, and flexibility of assignment and transfer within and among the services and the service schools and academies.

There would be unified direction and responsibility for all service schools and other military educational institutions.

4. The Under Secretary of Defense for Weapons Systems would be responsible to the Secretary for the complete cycle of weapons development, procurement, and production; and also for construction and installations, including bases, housing, and depots.

These activities would be managed through three directorates; namely:

(a) The Directorate of Research and Engineering, which would take over the functions now carried on by the present Director of Defense Research and Engineering, and in addition would be responsible for the following activities now located in the office of the Secretary of Defense:

1. The Science Advisory Board (formerly the Strategic Missiles Evaluation Committee).

2. The Research and Development Policy Council.

3. The Defense Science Board.

4. The OSD Ballistic Missile Committee.

The functions heretofore exercised by the Advanced Research Projects Agency would be absorbed in the new Research and Engineering Directorate.

(b) The Directorate of Procurement and Production, which would be responsible for all procurement and production functions.

(c) The Directorate of Facilities, which would be responsible for all activities regarding facilities and installations, including responsibility for the planning and construction of facilities for research and testing of weapons, industrial-type facilities for weapons production and maintenance, facilities for weapons operation and use—such as missile and space vehicle launching installations—and noncombatant facilities such as on- and off-base housing.

5. There would be created a Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Arms Control who would serve as the Defense liaison in that area with the State Department; and also with other agencies as designated.

B. Command of military operations

6. The Joint Chiefs of Staff would be reconstituted so the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs (to be redesignated Chairman of the Joint Staff) would be the principal military adviser to the President and the Secretary of Defense.

The Chairman would preside over a group of senior officers from all services to be known as the Military Advisory Council. Each of such senior officers would be appointed by the President and would no longer have any functions or responsibilities in the service from which he came and to which he would not return.

In addition, the Chairman would direct the Joint Staff enlarged commensurate with the added responsibilities of the Chairman.

7. Each of the services would have a chief who would not serve on the Joint Staff or the Military Advisory Council; and who would report directly to the Secretary of Defense.

8. There would be established the following unified commands, the commanders of which would report directly to the Chairman of the Joint Staff:

(a) A strategic command, responsible for all strategic missions.

(b) A tactical command, responsible for all limited and conventional defense missions.

(c) A defense command, responsible for all continental defense missions.

Each of the above unified commands will include all personnel, equipment, and weapons systems required for the performance of its respective missions.

To the extent that any regional or area specified commands would be required in addition to the above-listed unified commands, their commanders would also report directly to the Chairman of the Joint Staff. Such commands would be composed of units assigned from the unified commands.

9. There would be established a unified command in charge of the National Guard and Reserve elements of all of the services. In addition to its other functions, this command would be responsible for Civil Defense, and would report directly to the Chairman of the Joint Staff.

C. Budgetary procedures

10. The Secretary of Defense would be required to present to the appropriate committees of the Congress a detailed explanation of the military requirements for all missions and Defense Department operations prior to the presentation of the defense budget to the Congress.

11. The appropriation of all defense funds would hereafter be made to the Secretary of Defense. Certain categories of the defense budget such as Research and Development and long-leadtime procurement would be put on a multiyear instead of a 1-year justification and appropriation cycle.

Respectfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT,
STUART SYMINGTON, *Chairman.*
CLARK CLIFFORD.
THOMAS K. FINLETTER.
ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC.
FOWLER HAMILTON.
MARX LEVA.

[3] Mr. Leva, while agreeing that there should be a drastic reduction in the number of Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries, believes that the Secretary of Defense needs the assistance of several additional Under Secretaries of Defense.

EXHIBIT B

PRESS RELEASE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

After consultation today with Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Senator John F. Kennedy issued the following statement about the former's survey for Senator Kennedy of the organization and management of the Nation's defense structure.

Senator Kennedy said that he had approved the appointment by Senator SYMINGTON of the following individuals to this Committee on the Defense Establishment:

Clark M. Clifford: Lawyer; Washington University (St. Louis); partner in Clifford & Miller; Special Counsel to President of the United States (1946–50); assisted in drafting National Security Act of 1947; U.S. Navy (1944–46); naval aid to President of the United States, 1946; Navy Commendation Ribbon.

Thomas K. Finletter: Lawyer and author; University of Pennsylvania; partner in Coudert Bros.; Special Assistant to Secretary of State (1941–44); Chairman, President's Air Policy Commission (1947–48); Secretary of the Air Force (1950–53); U.S. Army (1917–19).

Roswell L. Gilpatric: Lawyer; Yale University; partner in Cravath, Swaine & Moore; Under Secretary of the Air Force (1951–53); member of Rockefeller special studies project (1956–57); member of advisory panel to Joint Congressional Subcommittee on Military Application of Atomic Energy.

Fowler Hamilton: Lawyer; University of Missouri and Oxford University; partner in Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton; Special Assistant to Attorney General of the United States (1938–42); Chief of Enemy Branch of

Foreign Economic Administration (1942–43); Chief Legal Counsel, U.S. Department of Justice (1945); General Counsel Senate Subcommittee on Airpower (1956); former member of joint intelligence staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Marx Leva: Lawyer; University of Alabama and Howard University; partner in Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington; attorney in OPA (1941) and WPB (1942); served with U.S. Navy (1942–45), received combat citation; Special Assistant to Secretary of Navy (1947) and Special Assistant and General Counsel to Secretary of Defense (1947–49); chairman, civilian-military review panel for special committee of U.S. Senate (1957).

Dr. Edward C. Welsh will serve as Executive Director of the Committee: Economist; Lafayette College, Tufts University, and Ohio State University; university faculties (1930–42); Deputy Administrator of OPA (1946–47); Chief, Antitrust and Cartels Division in Japan (1947–50); legislative assistant in U.S. Senate (1953 to present).

Senator Kennedy said that he and Senator SYMINGTON had reviewed the scope, procedure, and objectives of the work to be done by the Committee.

Senator Kennedy also said:

"The work of the Committee will be focused upon the administration and management of the Defense Department and related defense agencies and organizations.

"It will deal with such matters as the relationships between civilian and military, decisionmaking in the Defense Establishment, the role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the lag time in the introduction of new weapons.

"The Committee will not make another sweeping investigation or study of defense, military policies and resources such as has been so ably and thoroughly done in recent years by various House and Senate Committees, and by such private groups as the Gaither and Rockefeller committees, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Carnegie Corp., the great universities, and others.

"Rather it will utilize their splendid work as its primary source for facts, analyses and informed opinion on the narrower field of defense management and administration with which it is called upon to deal.

"The principal problems are well known; and the information needed for their analysis is readily at hand.

"The crucial questions are those of judgment as to what changes should be made in the organization and administration of our defense agencies to eliminate or at least to diminish the present crippling effect of these problems upon our defense power.

"In this critical area of judgment the Committee will seek the views of each branch of the armed services and of defense industries and it will also seek the opinions and counsel of qualified and experienced civilians irrespective of their political affiliation or particular service backgrounds.

"We must improve the administration of our defense agencies and we must do so without delay. To that end, the Committee will make recommendations to me as to the measures, whether legislative or executive, that should be taken to achieve two primary and related objectives: (1) To obtain a defense adequate to protect the Nation and to enable it to discharge its international responsibilities; and (2) to obtain such a defense within the framework of a free and solvent economic system.

"In short, I expect this committee to produce for me a concrete program with specific proposals in the clearly defined field of its responsibility.

"At my request Senator SYMINGTON has undertaken to have his recommendations in my hands before December 31, 1960, so that the new administration could take such steps, including the recommendation of appropriate legislation to the Congress, as may be necessary to remedy present basic weaknesses in the administration and management of our National Defense Establishment."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, since the issuance of the release there has been a steady flow of criticism from a group which invariably opposes any change of any kind in the current structure of the Defense Department.

Many of these attacks on the proposals of this committee have been circulated throughout the country.

Members of the armed forces of other countries have also been asked to work against the findings of the report.

As a result of this governmental and privately financed effort, anyone who was relatively uninformed or uninterested might conclude that there was little public approval of the recommendations in the report.

But the reverse is true. Actually a large majority of the editorial comment of this country favored the report.

As illustrations, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD: the Boston Herald, December 11, 12, 13, and 14; Newsday, Long Island, December 6; Aviation Week, New York, December 12; the Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia, December 7; the Evening Star, Washington, December 7; the Atlanta Constitution, December 6; the Pittsburgh Press, December 8; the Detroit Free Press, December 7; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, December 10 and 12; St. Louis Globe-Democrat, December 8; Kansas City Star, December 6, Joplin, Mo., Globe, December 8; Springfield, Mo., Leader and Press, December 6; the Denver Post, December 8; the Seattle Times, December 6; Sacramento Bee, December 7; Los Angeles Times, December 7.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Herald, Dec. 11, 1960]

FOR A DECISIVE DEFENSE

The next war, if it comes, will not be fought by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. It will be fought by all three under a unified command.

No one doubts that, yet every effort to bring into being now a unified defense structure capable of unified decisions arouses violent opposition. Every move in that direction brings out the same old set of bugaboos.

The Defense Reorganization Committee headed by Senator SYMINGTON has offered a new plan which stops well short of real unification. Yet it moves far enough in that direction to arouse all the familiar objections.

The plan retains the 3 services, but abolishes the separate service departments and the 15 civilian Secretaries, Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.

Defense powers are concentrated in the Secretary of Defense, and he receives the advice of a single chairman of the joint military staff instead of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as at present. This chairman would preside over a group of senior officers from all services, to be called the Military Advisory Council. These officers would be totally and permanently divorced from the services from which they came.

Now the typical protests against this plan run like this:

1. To put in the hands of one man, the chairman of the joint staff, the power of all military decision would be setting up a Prussian-type general staff capable of establishing a military dictatorship over the country.

2. To give the power of decision to one man raises the danger of a fatally wrong decision.

3. This one man, coming out of one of the services, Air Force, Army, or Navy, would promote his service at the cost of the national security.

4. The formulation of decisions by senior officers who are relieved of the necessity of carrying them out would result in plans more and more unrelated to reality, and in the final stages meaningless.

We will deal with these objections, one by one, the first herewith and the others in later editorials.

The first objection is totally without historical basis, and yet it continues to crop up.

The Prussian general staff was an army staff only, and not an interservice staff. We have had this kind of staff organization in each of the services for half a century.

No major power has ever had a true interservice general staff with a single chief of staff. If we adopt the Symington plan, we shall be the first to go this way.

Does this mean that the United States will go three times as fast in the direction of a militaristic dictatorship as did the Kaiser's Germany—or Hitler's Germany or Tojo's Japan or Stalin's and Khrushchev's Russia?

It does not mean anything like that, for the reason that the deep and abiding principles of our society are against it. If this country had, like the Kaiser's Germany, a long tradition of glorification of the military, we might be in danger. But we would be in much more danger from a general or admiral elected President and Commander in Chief than from an interservice staff chief.

This is not Prussia, and the Symington plan is not a Prussian device. It is America needing an integration of defense adequate to prepare for a war that will recognize no segregation of services.

[From the Boston Herald, Dec. 12, 1960]

FOR A DECISIVE DEFENSE—II

The critics of defense unification offer one especially interesting argument. They say that several decisions are better, or safer, than one decision.

It is better, they think, that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force should each be working on its own strategy of weapons development. In that way, the argument goes, the chance of a wrong choice of weapons is diminished by a third.

They acknowledge the waste and inefficiency, but insist that such a calculated inefficiency is better than to be caught with the efficient but wrong preparation.

The defense reorganization plan presented to President-elect Kennedy by the Symington committee takes a substantial step toward unification by setting up a super-service decisionmaking council headed by a single Chief of Staff advising the Secretary of Defense and the President.

This has been criticized as a Prussian-type general staff, and that criticism we buried, we hope, on Sunday.

Another criticism is the concentration of power in one man.

What many critics miss is that the present multiple decision process did not come about by deliberate choice, but was the natural result of making the three services semi-autonomous and independently ambitious.

A bad situation has been rationalized into a virtue.

Ultimately there is one decision to be made no matter what the defense setup is. It was a decision that was made—though mostly by inadvertence—to let the three services work out independent weapons programs.

If such independent programs are an example of soundly calculated inefficiency, then there is no reason why a single Chief of Staff could not make the same decision and sell it to the Secretary of Defense.

The difference is that this would be a deliberate and reasoned decision, not an accident of a three-headed Defense Department.

Of course the single interservice Chief of Staff can be wrong in his advice to the Secretary of Defense. But the Secretary is no rubber stamp. On any important issue, he will demand to know the alternatives, and he will call before him all who can advise him.

What counts is that the single chief, being a military leader shorn of his service connections, can provide a far more integrated defense view than the present service minded Joint Chiefs of Staff. (A later editorial will deal with this issue of service neutrality.)

The defect of the Symington plan may be that it will not muffle the purely service voices enough—that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force may still influence decisions in parochial ways.

To say that multiple decisions are better than one decision is to say that a little bit of anarchy is a good thing.

In defense it is not.

[From the Boston Herald, Dec., 13, 1960]

FOR A DECISIVE DEFENSE—III

Why does America have a three-defense system? Is it really better to have Army weapons and strategy, Navy weapons and strategy, and Air Force weapons and strategy? Or do we have it that way because the three services, fashioned out of the wars of the past, cling to the mold of the past?

You have heard it said that three defenses are better than one because one defense may be the wrong one. But this really means that no service trusts the system of another service.

There is no single defense system because there are today no top-ranking military men uncontaminated by service preoccupation. A single Chief of Staff could have the advice of the three services, but as long as he remained an Army or Air Force general or a Navy admiral, he would be suspected of identifying himself with the service where his career has been spent and where long time associates would be unforgiving of desertion.

The Symington committee, which has reported a Pentagon reorganization plan to President-elect Kennedy, offers a means of obtaining some de-serviced men to stand at the top of the military heap as neutrals. One of them would be an interservice Chief of Staff, who could present to the Secretary of Defense and the President an integrated defense system with the selected weapons to go with it. This would be the first time that any major country has made a general staff truly general.

This Chief of Staff and his advisory council would be chosen by the President. They would on appointment be shorn of all service connections, and they would never return to their services.

As far as it is humanly possible, the designers of our defense would have but one loyalty and one preoccupation, the national service.

This psychological transformation stands the test of experience. Men given higher and broader responsibilities rise and grow to them. The commanders of combined operations cease to be one-service men and become three-service men.

Defense Secretary Gates has put his Navy career so far behind him that today the Navy chafes at many of his decisions. President Eisenhower's only sign of service origin has been at a football game. General Norstad gives the NATO force a totally interservice standing.

A three-service training in Korea for this three-service chief and his council would be still better. And that degree of unification will surely come in time. But for the present, we can be assured that one-service commanders can meet the challenge of integrated war.

Let this be understood: the one defense that would come out of this would not be the dictate of one military autocrat. No service voice will be stilled. No competent Secretary of Defense will accept uncritically the recommendations of this Chief of Staff or fail to weigh alternatives. Nor would there be any lack of hedges against unexpected military challenges to our country.

But we could have a concentration of the defense spending and effort that are now diffused and scattered to satisfy the compromises of interservice rivalry.

The effectiveness of military decision divorced from command will be the subject of another editorial.

[From the Boston Herald, Dec. 14, 1960]

FOR A DECISIVE DEFENSE—IV

The historical distinction between land battles, sea battles and air battles has dissolved in the all-encompassing scope of modern weapons. A Polaris missile may be fired from the sea or from the land. Its strategic targets must be shared with plane-borne bombs. Air transport and tactical air operations are necessary accessories of land forces.

Yet Americans not only preserve this dead land-sea-air separation in its three defense system, but meet suggestions for unification with alarm that one service may be advanced at the cost of the other two. Not only must defense decisions be made by consensus, but they must be by consensus of anachronisms.

The partial unification plan proposed by the Symington committee has not escaped such criticisms. We have commented on several in previous editorials.

A further objection made to the Symington plan is that the Chairman of the Joint Staff and the members of his Military Advisory Council, all of whom would be totally divorced from their service connections, would be removed from operations. Removal from operations, the contention is, would put them into a planning ivory tower, where decisions would be less and less related to reality.

This is a belated criticism. In the 1958 reorganization, President Eisenhower reminded Congress that the Joint Chiefs of Staff find it difficult to find time for joint planning because of their concurrent duties as chiefs of the services. Thus the 1958 reorganization provided for delegation of service responsibilities to the vice chiefs.

The ivory tower danger, if it exists, is already with us.

Moreover, separation from service preoccupations permits a broader, whole defense outlook by the men who must evolve a national, rather than an Army, Air, or Navy defense.

The three services remain in the Symington reorganization, but the absurdity of reproducing them in the top civilian staff is abandoned. Army, Navy, and Air Secretaries go, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense is set up to act by functions rather than by services. Thus there would be an under secretary of defense for weapons systems and an under secretary for administration.

This would mark an important advance toward the "defense with solvency" that President Eisenhower has sought. No longer would there be three clamoring voices for weapons appropriations, with compromise and duplication tainting the defense budget.

Instead, just two people of equal rank will bring to the Secretary of Defense a statement of needs and a statement of resources to meet them with well-considered priorities.

The plan also consolidates the three intelligence services. No longer will the Navy intelligence find a blockade of China to be practicable, while Army and Air Force regard Hong Kong to be a hopeless leak for a blockade. No longer will U–2 photographs be interpreted by the services to fit their own concepts of attack.

The fears of the Navy that even partial unification would hurt are unfounded. To say that Polaris would never have been produced if there had been a Joint Chief of Staff overlooks the fact that the Navy itself had to be forced to accept Admiral Rickover's Polaris submarine.

The Navy, which now gets very much the short end of defense appropriations, might well stand to gain by the Symington plan. In the competition for the Joint Chief and the Advisory Council members, Navy officers, being as able as the officers of the other services, have quite as much chance for appointment.

The steps to unification disturb some because unification is new. Modern warfare is new, too. Very new.

The failure to unify is the truly great danger.

[From Newsday, Dec. 6, 1960]

THE SYMINGTON PLAN

The administrative mess in the Department of Defense has been a scandal for years. Unification of the services, intended by Congress, has never become an actuality. This accounts for waste in administering the Armed Forces and for the slowdown in missilery that has put us far behind Russia, even though we are now beginning to catch up.

The only way to slice through this tangle of red tape is with a sharp pair of scissors. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, the former Secretary of the Air Force, has provided this cutting edge in a report to the President-elect. A committee of experts headed by SYMINGTON has recommended:

1. Abolition of the civilian secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force, making the Secretary of Defense the supreme arbiter—essential for quick decision in event of a nuclear war.

2. In all, abolish 22 civilian officers, and tighten up the operation of the joint chiefs of staff, who would no longer wear "two hats"—the first as members of a "unified" service, the second as representatives of their branches of service.

This, the Symington committee thinks, might save about $8 billion which could then be plowed back into new weapons and an arms control program. Its solutions sound drastic, but they make sense. At one stroke, they would wipe out most interservice squabbling, and provide for a Department of Defense with a single, responsible head—responsible, of course, to the President, who is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

"The Secretary of Defense," says SYMINGTON, "would have unquestioned authority and control over all elements of the Pentagon at all levels." This is what it was hoped would happen when, under President Truman, Congress passed the military reorganization bill. It has not happened because the individual services have spent their time lobbying, squabbling, and undercutting one another, most notably in the field of missiles.

There may be risk in this single-handed control—though limited risk, since the President is the final arbiter, as he must be. But

there is more risk in the present cumbersome system, and far more chance of tactical paralysis if—God forbid—the world should come to or topple over the brink of nuclear war. There may be a fierce struggle in Congress, whose Members all have their favorite branches of service, but that struggle should be resolved by the full, firm support of the President.

We must have a military organization that is smart, shrewd, flexible, and second in the world to none.

[From Aviation Week, Dec. 12, 1960]

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION PLAN

(By Robert Hotz)

The Defense Department reorganization plan submitted to President-elect John F. Kennedy is a basically sound approach to one of the most critical problems facing the Nation. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, who headed the group, has a background in modern defense problems matched by few people in active public life today. All of his conferees also have been seasoned by practical experience in trying to run various parts of the Defense Department machinery in the postwar years.

This defense reorganization plan is aimed at molding a Defense Establishment capable of coping with the problems of today and tomorrow in contrast to the earlier postwar efforts that were basically aimed at perfecting the defense machinery to correct the past errors revealed by World War II. It is a forward-looking plan that recognizes that the basic problem now facing our Defense Establishment is time. It is this time factor, originating in the fantastic advances in propulsion and compounded by the technical pace of Soviet military technology, that is the key to the success or failure of every phase of the defense effort. The committee's report expressed this salient point extremely well in the following language:

"First is the unprecedented strategic value of time—the ability to react instantly against aggression in this nuclear-space age. In World Wars I and II our country had at least 18 months to build and mobilize its defenses. If there should ever be a world war III, we would be fortunate to have 18 minutes to react.

"Second is the crucial time element in the United States versus Soviet arms race—the need for early selection among alternative weapon systems and for shorter leadtimes between conception and use.

"Third is the effect of time on defense cost. Regardless of how much the people of this country spend, they cannot buy time. Yet we tend to forget the costly effect of building weapons which have become obsolescent as a result of delay.

"Only by giving full recognition to these all-important time factors can the Defense Establishment of the United States be strengthened in a meaningful way."

CIVILIAN CUT PROPOSED

The Symington recommendations strike straight to the heart of the delay problem in the defense structure which is in the vast overlay of civilian secretariat that has been added to the office of the Secretary of Defense in the past 6 years. It seeks to leave virtually intact the operational activities of the military services themselves and does not recommend a single service with single uniform and single promotion list.

We strongly believe that the first and most effective attack on delay can be made at the level on which the Symington group has taken aim. This superstructure of civilian secretariat with its surrounding complex of ad hoc committees ad nauseam has been the principal cause of stretching out an already complex decision-making process in a period when galloping technology made compression of this process more vital than ever before. Only when this bureaucracy was circumvented by special management techniques such as the Air Force's Ballistic Missile Division, the Navy's Polaris special projects office or the unique, acidulous techniques of Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover has new technology flowered into major weapon systems in sufficient time to be militarily effective. It may be politically unpalatable for the incoming administration to abolish 22 high level jobs in the Defense Department secretariat that normally would be available to "deserving Democrats" as a reward for political services. But this may be a good yardstick by which to measure just how earnest the new President will continue to be about solving the basic defense problems.

FACING TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

The addition of a special assistant to the Secretary of Defense for arms control is another step in the right direction. Hitherto, the problems of disarmament have been approached in a vague aura of moralistic cant without any regard for the very real technical problems any genuine effort to achieve this goal would involve. This new post could make a tremendous contribution toward developing technical methods of insuring real enforcement of arms control agreements and guarding against this Nation stumbling into disastrous technical pitfalls such as could easily result from unrealistic nuclear test ban agreements.

Any measures that can transform the Joint Chiefs of Staff from a debating society into an overall strategic planning and decision-making group will also contribute toward a better defense posture. There are many other aspects of the Symington group's proposals that deserve fuller discussion than this space permits and we know there will be no lack of public debate on these proposals in the ensuing months. Heavy fire is certain to be directed against them and any other programs with similar aims by the military mossbacks and the political logrollers who will fight bitterly to preserve personal prerogatives regardless of the cost.

We predict that these perennial snipers at attempts to modernize the Defense Department machinery will find surprisingly little public support in this debate. The American people are pretty well convinced of the necessity for streamlining and modernizing our Defense Establishment in keeping with the technological pace on which it must be based. They are growing more and more intolerant of the waste, delay, and self-seeking service sniping that already has been tolerated far too long.

[From the Evening Star, Dec. 7, 1960]

PENTAGON PLAN

The Symington committee's proposals for revamping our national defense structure have been received with notable caution by President-elect Kennedy. Said he: "It is an interesting and constructive study which I know will be carefully analyzed by the Congress and the incoming administration."

Mr. Kennedy's gingerly approach is quite understandable. For the Symington recommendations, when bundled together, constitute too big a bite to be downed in one gulp. Many of the proposals will be bitterly opposed in the Pentagon, principally by the Navy. This is especially true of the recommendation to abolish the Joint Chiefs of Staff and substitute what in effect would be a single chief of staff, who would be the principal military adviser to the President and the Secretary of Defense. This is strong medicine, which also would run into determined opposition in Congress—the more so because the Joint Chiefs' system has been working with increasing effectiveness under Defense Secretary Gates. The question, really, is whether the reorganization measures which have been put into effect have had a fair trial, and we doubt that Mr. Kennedy will be eager to do battle in the next Congress on the basis of the Symington proposals unless and until this question has been satisfactorily answered.

We hope, however, that this report by the Symington group will not be studied, analyzed—and then forgotten. For while a layman can hardly hope to appraise in detail the adequacies and the inadequacies of the Pentagon structure, there surely is room for improvement. There ought to be no question about the authority of the Secretary of Defense to impose national policy on the services. Procedures that are needlessly time consuming become increasingly dangerous in this nuclear age. And as the report puts it: "No longer can this Nation afford the luxury of letting each service strive to develop in itself the capability of fighting any future war by itself. The national resources available for our country's defense effort are in limited supply, and we cannot afford such waste of either manpower or funds."

In short, while there is little prospect of prompt adoption of the proposals in this report, a report which has been prepared by a group of able, experienced and patriotic men, the recommendations certainly deserve the close study and analysis mentioned by Mr. Kennedy. And we are of the opinion that at least some of them, if put into effect, would serve to reinforce our national security.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Dec. 6, 1960]

DEFENSE UNIFICATION TO GET NEW TRY

President Eisenhower and President-elect Kennedy should have a lot to talk about in their conference today.

In addition to discussing transition of power from one administration to another, they might talk about the highly controversial space-age reorganization of the Defense Department. Yesterday the debate was brought squarely into the open again in dramatic recommendations by a study group headed by the man most mentioned as the next Secretary of Defense, Senator STUART SYMINGTON.

As everyone knows, Senator SYMINGTON has been a frequent and telling critic of the Eisenhower administration's defense policies. A former Secretary of the Air Force, the Senator long ago observed the waste and duplication in developing space-age forces among the three rival services. And while the Eisenhower administration has made gestures toward unification, the rivalry has continued, defense costs have skyrocketed and criticism of the total effort has mounted.

The Symington group's recommendations envision a unified defense command under a single Secretary. The Army, Navy and Air Force would be retained as separate military divisions without their separate bureaucratic structures. A joint staff would replace the Joint Chiefs—a staff further removed from control of the separate services.

To simplify the task of weapons systems and procurement, the recommendations call for an under secretary for weapons systems responsible for research and engineering, procurement and production and installations of all armed services. This should save, says the report, about 8 billions a year.

One of President Eisenhower's strongest points has been his military background. He is a former general and war hero. Few have dared to challenge his opinions and none successfully. Efforts at unification and reorganization have met with an avalanche of opposition from generals and admirals intent upon maintaining the status quo. Ike has been their strength.

The recommendations are bound to stir up another hornet's nest politically and

otherwise. But SYMINGTON and his group have performed a needed public service and the Kennedy entourage already is demonstrating its willingness to explore "new frontiers."

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Dec. 8, 1960]

MR. SYMINGTON HAS A PLAN

We would not presume to pass on all the ins and outs of Senator STUART SYMINGTON'S new plan for the Defense Department, as submitted to President-elect Kennedy. It is not something for snap judgment—even the President-elect, who asked for the plan, would do no more than say it was "interesting and constructive."

It is both. All in all, it seems essentially solid. Certainly the assumptions on which the plan is based are sound. To quote:

"It can truly be said that since 1947 there has been no fundamental change in the scheme of organization of our Armed Forces. Yet, during this period of nearly a decade and a half, the whole state of the art in military science has been revolutionized, as epitomized in the transitions to the jet, nuclear, and space ages."

We do not believe, and do not construe the SYMINGTON report to imply, that the military is not aware of these new ages, or that our military leaders have been sitting on their haunches.

But the Military Establishment is so huge and ponderous, the redtape so rife, that even a constant effort at reorganization hardly is enough. It would take a real jolt to produce a modernization in keeping with the times. And there is no better time for such a jolt than the advent of a new administration.

Even if the President-elect should put his full steam behind this plan, it is bound to have hard going in Congress. People get set in their ways—the military and Congress in particular. Moreover, the force of the military lobbies cannot be underestimated.

The Navy League and the Association of the U.S. Army have been against such plans in the past. So have the Senate and House committees which must deal with the problem. Only the Air Force Association seems in accord.

Senator SYMINGTON says his plan was devised to save time and money. Both now are being wasted. He thinks the money saving might amount to $8 billion a year. If he is half right, the plan is worth while.

"Defense reorganization," says CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, "so far has failed. I trust the President-elect means business."

We can earnestly underwrite that statement.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Dec. 7, 1960]

REMODELING PLANS FOR THE PENTAGON

The Defense Department reorganization plan which Senator SYMINGTON handed President-elect Kennedy will surely be the subject of much controversy before its full implications are even evident, let alone put into effect.

The essence of the plan is to strengthen the authority of the Secretary of Defense and centralize control in his hands.

To this end, the Symington report recommends that the offices of Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with their Assistant Secretaries and Under Secretaries, be abolished, although the three services would be continued.

The nature of the Joint Chiefs of Staff also would be materially revised, with more emphasis on advice and planning and less on operations.

This naturally envisages a greater degree of unification, and that may prove the rock upon which the Symington proposals will founder, as have others of similar aim.

Nevertheless, Senator SYMINGTON and his conferees recognize that military concepts in a nuclear age have changed. The United States, he pointed out, had 18 months to mobilize in World Wars I and II. In world war III, the United States would be fortunate if it had 18 minutes to prepare.

That obvious fact alone suggests the need for centralized control and responsibility—and for a much greater degree of service unification.

Senator SYMINGTON believes his plan, if put into effect, would save about 20 percent of our present defense expenditures. That saving, however, would be plowed back into new weapons development.

This idea, coming from Senator SYMINGTON, is not at all surprising. He has been one of the foremost critics of the so-called missile lag. It would hardly be in character for him to propose a reorganization plan which did not materially accelerate development of space-age weapons.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 10, 1960]

DEFENSE AND VESTED INTERESTS

If searching discussion and vigorous argument attend the Symington defense reorganization plan, the outlook for national security will be improved. If vested interests devote themselves to a selfish campaign, and apathy prevails where watchfulness should, the chances of shoring up our defenses will be greatly diminished.

Already there are reports of growing opposition based simply on fear that traditional interests, roles, and missions will be curtailed. The battlelines are being drawn with the Army and Navy opposed to most of the plan and the Air Force favoring it. Judging by the way in which the Eisenhower reorganization plan was chopped down in 1958, the old vested interests in Congress and in industry may be expected to add to the purely negative stand. Perverse opposition is just what President-elect Kennedy hopes to avoid. He so signified when he limited his comment on the plan to hope that it would be analyzed and considered in Congress and the administration.

Those who are prone to turn thumbs down on the main points of the Symington plan should stop and ask themselves a few questions. Is the Key West definition of roles and missions as set forth in 1948 adequate in this dawning era of revolutionary weapons systems? Is congressional power in the field of military affairs dependent on service rivalries? Is defense second to the interest of any bureaucracy in maintaining the status quo? Should any one of the military services be limited in scope to land, sea, or air?

If the answer to these questions is "No," then it must be conceded that the Symington plan merits concentrated study.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 12, 1960]

THE SYMINGTON PLAN

The thought-provoking Symington committee plan for reorganization of the Defense Department merits the analysis and consideration President-elect Kennedy promises his administration and Congress will give it. The committee headed by the Missouri Senator points out the many serious deficiencies in our Military Establishment and provides a blueprint for overcoming them. If these deficiencies are to be removed, the blueprint may have to be revised, extensively perhaps, but if its spirit prevails the Pentagon may become the up-to-date Defense Department it should be.

It has long been obvious that our present military structure, conceived before the revolution in weapons technology and occasionally patched here and there, was not suitable for the requirements of today Several nonpartisan reports made since President Eisenhower took office emphasized this, but little was done about them. Mr. Eisenhower's attempt at reorganization in 1958, for which he belatedly fought, failed to attain several of the goals outlined in the Symington report. If Mr. Kennedy is to strip the layers of fat from the Pentagon, overcome the ranks of special privilege in the military services and in Congress, cut Pentagon redtape, simplify the complexity of the defense structure and achieve a more efficient allocation of resources among the services, he is going to need the strongest support.

Perhaps the most important point in the Symington plan is to give the Secretary of Defense direct control over all the military services. This would be accomplished by having the Army, Navy, and Air Force chiefs report directly to the Secretary. The three service Secretaries, each with an Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary, would be eliminated, thus concentrating civilian control at one level instead of at two. In this cutting away of excess personnel, the seven Assistant Secretaries of Defense also would go.

In line with this move would be replacement of the present Joint Chiefs of Staff with a single new position, Chairman of the Joint Staff. He would be principal military adviser to the President. Thus the line of authority would extend from the President to the Secretary of Defense and then to the Chairman of the Joint Staff.

The new chairman also would preside over a proposed military advisory council made up of senior officers who would leave their individual services and not return to them after completion of their tours of duty. This would seem to be an excellent way to save them from the service pressures and traditions which can interfere with making decisions on the basis of overall national security. It is this handicap which has adversely affected the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

[From the St. Louis Globe, Dec. 8, 1960]

SYMINGTON'S PENTAGON REFORM

The defense plant is the biggest, most profligate department of the Nation's Government. To curb waste spending, more important to gear defense to the nuclear age, Senator STUART SYMINGTON and his five-man committee have proposed to President-elect Kennedy the most drastic Pentagon reform ever offered in Washington.

If overall criticism is justified, it should be that in some respects the plan is not drastic enough. Certain functions of the rival services—functions the report ignores—should be consolidated for economy and efficiency.

The top-to-bottom reorganization recommended by the Symington group is in the main splendid. Unquestionably it will cause an upheaval in Congress and among top defense brass. Army, Navy and Air Force have powerful lobbies and last-ditch friends, who will do battle in Senate and House for the status quo.

If this hard-hitting reorganization is to get anywhere in Congress, new President Kennedy will have to fight for it immediately after taking office. It must make the legislative hurdles in the "first 100 days," at least gather necessary momentum before the administration's honeymoon wears off.

Mr. SYMINGTON thinks if his program is adopted, it would lop $8 billion a year from the present level of defense spending. How he arrives at this figure, he does not reveal. But without doubt that amount could be saved if Pentagon extravagances, duplicate operations, and open-end spending were eliminated.

The Senator says the savings would be plowed back into new defense expansion. There should be no quarrel with that. It's needed. But the country ought to get maximum defense for every military dollar expended.

Among principal changes advocated by the Symington report would be elimination of the three service Secretaries—Army, Navy, and Air Force. Each service would be headed by a chief. But the chief would not be a member of a strategy-planning Joint Chiefs of Staff. There would be no joint chiefs. The services would all be under a Chairman of the Joint Staff.

This streamlines command from the President to the Defense Secretary, to the Joint Staff Chairman. The Chairman of the Joint Staff would have a Military Advisory Council, composed of senior officers of the Army, Navy and Air Force who would be separated from their service and who would not return. This council would plan strategy and tactics.

The reform would banish 22 Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries. Defense was topheavy in Secretaries.

Each service would remain separate, but units of all would be drafted into three or four "unified commands"—a strategic command, a tactical command and a defense command for the continent, with possibly a command in charge of Reserves and National Guards.

While the Symington blueprint looks toward ending the costly rivalry in nuclear and space developments by different services, it omits eliminating the tremendously expensive procurement system, in which each service buys and stockpiles for itself.

This often means Government bidding against itself. Services vie for needs, even for stores that prove unneeded.

There should be one procurement catalog for all the services—certainly for common items such as foods, tools, certain weapons, clothing, bedding, and the like.

Another area where there should be consolidation is in the medical realm. Economy and certainly efficiency would be far better served if there were a single pool of doctors, dentists, nurses, hospitals, and hospital facilities for the whole defense plant.

This would make it easier to shift medical groups or individuals where they are most needed. After all, an Army or Navy doctor treats the same diseases, broken bones, or traumas in much the same way.

There seems no reason either why the services should not consolidate in the chaplain department. Again efficiency and perhaps economic stewardship would be served by a single corps of chaplains, who could be assigned to the service as need dictates.

The Symington prospectus for broad-scale reorganization of the defense plant is a long stride in the direction of a stronger defense for America on a more intelligent basis. The plan can be improved. But basics of this reform should be accepted by the military and adopted by the new Congress.

[From the Kansas City Star, Dec. 6, 1960]

NEW DEFENSE PLAN HITS AT UNIFICATION BARRIER

The Symington report on reorganizing the Defense Department goes far beyond most previous recommendations. And thinking up ways to improve the efficiency of the Armed Forces has been a favorite Washington pastime since the end of World War II.

The military program has actually undergone four major revisions in the last 13 years. Each time the changes were hailed by their originators as the best of possible plans. Each time the country was told that now we would have maximum efficiency at minimum cost. Results have consistently fallen short of the rosy expectations.

Optimism also characterizes the advisory committee which Senator SYMINGTON headed at the request of President-elect Kennedy. Senator SYMINGTON has said that the recommendations of his group would cut present military spending by about 20 percent or $8 billion a year.

How would this vast sum be saved for other purposes? The heart of the Symington proposal is the elimination of the civilian Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, along with their Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries. These civilian officials have served as a buffer between the Secretary of Defense and the separate services. In effect their executive powers have been used to curb sweeping unification measures. Thus, what Senator SYMINGTON recommends is a much larger degree of unification through the removal of barriers maintained by law.

Apparently, the suggested new approach would be evolutionary. It would not establish a single service in one uniform. This goal of the Air Force is opposed by Army and Navy leaders. And the opponents of unification have strong allies in Congress. The most influential of these allies are Democratic committee chairmen from the South. They will have to be persauded before any Kennedy-Symington plan of far-reaching defense changes can be adopted.

The Symington recommendations seem to promise a new effort for extremely important improvement. There is compelling evidence of waste and duplication in the Armed Forces as they are presently organized. A much more efficient and less wasteful system should make billions available for expanding defense needs. The country needs the best possible organization against the perils of the nuclear age. We hope that the next Congress will make progress toward a sounder military structure.

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe, Dec. 8, 1960]

THE SYMINGTON DEFENSE PLAN

For several years Missouri's Senator STUART SYMINGTON has been militantly preaching reorganization of the Defense Department to improve its functional efficiency in line with the nuclear space age, and to eliminate waste. Now, what undoubtedly is largely his plan, has been laid before President-elect Kennedy in a report by a six-member Committee SYMINGTON heads.

The recommendations, difficult for a layman to judge, surely are entitled to a full hearing before Congress on merit. The Senator says the reorganization plan could save up to $8 billion a year by cutting civilian personnel and eliminating much redtape and duplication of efforts by the still rival services. The plan seems to be aimed at a genuine streamlining of the Defense Department through real unification. And the Senator contends it will make us stronger faster.

Quite frankly, Senator SYMINGTON forecasts the savings probably would have to be reinvested in new weapons developments and arms control efforts to keep abreast technological progress in the space age. However, to gain this same end President-elect Kennedy estimated in the campaign that defense appropriations might have to be upped as much as $3.5 billion a year. So that if the savings of which Senator SYMINGTON speaks could be realized, it well might avoid a net increase in the total national defense bill, which already takes the biggest end of the taxpayer dollar to the Federal Government. This is all the more reason the Symington plan should be thoroughly studied and considered.

Prior to the Democratic National Convention, some SYMINGTON critics accused the Missouri Senator of using defense as an issue to gain the presidential nomination. That charge cannot possibly be valid now. A former Secretary of the Air Force, SYMINGTON also has been accused of favoring the Air Force. Yet the plan just submitted, as we understand it, calls for drastic unification of all service forces, far beyond that contemplated under the 1958 unification plan.

It well may be that the senior Missouri Senator has performed a singularly distinguished and vital public service through his studies and his recommended solutions. And with the national security and the national pocketbook so deeply involved, the plan merits nothing less than a fair hearing, despite military service rivalries and any service prejudices by other Members of Congress.

In any event, for the benefit of military service morale as well as for the welfare of the Nation, this matter of reorganizing the Defense Department should be settled, instead of being continually haggled over.

[From the Springfield Leader and Press, Dec. 6, 1960]

STREAMLINING JOB

Senator STUART SYMINGTON's proposals for a sweeping reorganization of the Defense Department appear—at least, at first glance—to make extremely good sense.

In brief, here is what the Senator proposes:

Abolishment of all Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretary, 22 in all. These 22 posts, all filled by civilians, are divided among the three major services, Army, Navy, and Air Force. In their place, SYMINGTON would establish two new Under Secretaries overall, one for administration and the other for weapons, and an assistant for arms control (disarmament, etc.).

Abolish the Joint Chiefs of Staff and replace it with an Advisory Council representing all three services over which the Secretary of Defense would serve as Chairman and adviser to the White House.

While a layman's knowledge of the Defense Department's organization is necessarily limited, the proposal, it seems to us, would eliminate a lot of deadwood and a lot of interservice feuding—would tend to a much stronger, more facile chain of command from the White House down to the lowest echelons of the three services.

Most important, were nuclear war to come, the Secretary would be in instantaneous control, from top to bottom, with no bickerings, no delays, nothing to hamper him in instant decisions such war would immediately demand—decisions whose speed and full authority could mean life or death for the United States and for the free world.

Such reorganization should strip a great deal of fat from the Defense budget, also, it would tend to melt away much of the unwieldy bureaucracy of the Department.

That's one of the sharpest criticisms of our Government: bureaus and departments once established tend to spawn sections and the sections subsections and sub-subsections—bent only on self-perpetuation once their functions have been outmoded or outgrown. It is true of every department, every bureau of Government.

This appears to be an honest attempt to wipe out some of those outmoded sections and to revitalize the whole Department.

Senator SYMINGTON says it would result in economies of up to $8 billion a year. We suspect he speaks with optimistic tongue in political cheek in his estimate, and yet we'd expect substantial savings. That in itself is an achievement in these days.

And we'd suggest this: There's no man in either House of Congress as qualified to speak with authority about this particular Department as Senator SYMINGTON, for he once was its head.

With a layman's suspicions of bureaucracy, we'd venture a guess that if every department and bureau in Washington were similarly shaken up and streamlined, there would be an incalculable high gain in governmental efficiency and savings of taxpayers' dollars.

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 8, 1960]

REORGANIZATION OF DEFENSE SETUP MUST BE DONE, DESPITE OPPOSITION

The question is not whether President-elect Kennedy and the new Congress should reorganize the Department of Defense, as a study committee headed by Senator STUART SYMINGTON has suggested, but how to get the job done.

The Department is at present a loose and sometimes unhappy coalition of rival forces—Army, Navy, Air Force, and (at times a powerful competitor on its own) the civilian defense bureaucracy.

At one time or another these forces can be found competing for decisionmaking authority, political influence, weapons, manpower, civilian specialists, promotions, publicity, and, most of all, dollars.

Each is wedded to different concepts of strategy and tactics for use against the Nation's potential enemies, and each devotes some portion of its time to strategy and tactics to be used against its Pentagon rivals.

Not only is the situation wasteful of billions of dollars—unconscionable as that is—but, far more important, it is imperiling the security of the United States.

Now, in circumstances like these, a vigorous incoming President who cares more about saving the Nation than about avoiding an unpleasant fight has only one real course.

He must order reorganization, and he must see that it is carried out. Not a token reorganization such as President Eisenhower barely got in 1958, but a real, count-for-something shakeup.

Much of what the Missouri Senator's committee recommends would have this effect, although it would still fall short of the total unification that would end rivalry and duplication of effort forever.

Under the Symington proposals, the Army, Navy, and Air Force would remain, but they would be under a revised administrative setup that would—presumably—subordinate their rivalries and increase their teamwork.

Among the best of the Symington proposals are:

Centralization of full defense powers in the Secretary of Defense, with appropriations made by Congress to him rather than to the separate services.

Creation of a single Chairman of the Joint Military Staff, presiding over a Military Advisory Council composed of senior officers detached for the rest of their careers from their individual services.

Abolition of the separate Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force and their respective civilian Secretaries and subsecretaries.

Creation of four major commands centering on missions rather than services: (a) Strategic Command, for the unlimited war; (b) Tactical Command, for the limited war, (c) Defense Command, for the defense of the United States and (d) the Home Front Duty Command, including National Guard and civil defense.

Creation of three departmentwide directorates to deal with special areas in which the services have either been competing or working at cross-purposes.

One of these is research and engineering. Along this line, the Government has indulged itself in the luxury of six different agencies dealing with missiles, with obvious attendant waste.

Another is procurement and production. Committee after committee has reported on the fantastically wasteful practices of the military services in procurement of even such mundane items as fences, typewriters, screws and underwear.

Instance after instance has been reported of one service buying an item new at high, often ridiculously high, prices while another was putting the same thing on surplus disposal at tremendous loss.

Instance after instance has been reported of negotiated, rather than competitive bid, contracts being let for property at prices above even the retail, let alone mass purchase discount prices.

Instance after instance has been reported in which cost-plus-profit contracts went to companies with influence but no experience in making items they had to design from scratch that other companies with experience but less influence could have delivered at far less cost.

The Senate committee of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois estimated that $3 billion could be saved through improved procurement practices. But the American Legion puts it even more strongly. Its national security commission figures as much as $5 billion could be saved by instituting service-wide catalog reforms alone.

Admittedly, it is not going to be a picnic for the new President to shake the military out of its accustomed grooves.

In the first place, there is ego and prestige involved.

There are promotions and pay and private little empires.

There are cozy relationships between services and individual, and influential, Members of Congress—and these involve patronage, pork barrel, and even Reserve commissions.

There are cozy relationships between services, or parts of services, and big firms which do billions of dollars worth of business with the Government and know how to lobby masterfully.

And there is just plain inertia, in both the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government, because nobody likes an unpleasant fight.

Nonetheless, the facts of life for the United States in the world of the 1960's are not particularly pleasant. Only an America that is ready to do its best will survive. In defense, the best means a real new look.

The new President will have to produce that new look. It will take all his executive and political ability, all his energy and his toughness, but he can do it.

If he can't make the executive branch changes with the power of his office, or the legislative changes with the influence of his office, then he will have to go to the people for help.

And when the people are fully aware of the whole story, by godfry, he'll get that help.

[From the Seattle Times, Dec. 6, 1960]

GUIDELINES TO PENTAGON REFORM

President-elect Kennedy talked during the recent election campaign in terms of an approximately $2 billion increase above present national defense expenditures of some $41 billion.

The significant Symington committee report—undertaken at the behest of Mr. Kennedy, and made public yesterday—offers a purported blueprint for reducing military spending by about $8 billion.

Contrary to what might appear at first glance, the findings of the Symington group concerning potential savings are not incompatible with Mr. Kennedy's thinking concerning the need for an early increase in the defense budget.

The President-elect and the experts who contributed to the Symington report have an identical principal objective.

That objective is, in Mr. Kennedy's words, a nuclear retaliatory power "second to none," and conventional forces "so mobile and modern" they can wipe out brush-fire aggression before it spreads.

The Symington recommendations through which the possible $8 billion saving is envisioned would require considerable time to become effective.

They could not, therefore, have much, if any, effect upon defense spending in the next fiscal year—Mr. Kennedy's immediate concern.

Although the Symington report is debatable in all its details, and although it will not necessarily become White House doctrine, it does represent an impressive coming to grips with this urgent and all-important problem:

How to bring and keep Defense Department organization as up to date as the revolutionary new weapons systems that that organization must manage?

The chief recommendations put forward by the Symington committee are not new. Some of them, particularly those dealing with the unified-command concept, are extensions of reforms begun by the Eisenhower administration.

The suggestion that defense funds be appropriated directly to the Secretary of Defense, rather than to the separate services, was urged last winter by Erwin D. Canham, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Many authoritative voices have urged consolidation of all armed-services procurement under a single director—a reform that SYMINGTON believes would save billions.

And a number of versions have been put forward of the Symington proposal for divorcing senior military advisers from their individual services.

But the important thing about the Symington report is that it offers the incoming administration an excellent starting point from which to work toward overhaul of the massive Pentagon machinery, which now is fueled by 56 cents out of every Federal tax dollar.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Dec. 7, 1960]

KENNEDY TACKLES TOUGH SERVICES REFORM ISSUE

President-elect John F. Kennedy has received a plan drafted at his request by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, for unifying and pruning the U.S. Defense Establishment at an estimated saving of $8 billion annually.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower before he took office proclaimed himself deeply dedicated to the principle of unification of the Armed Forces. All servicemen in one uniform was his sloganeering approach to the problem.

Yet in 8 years Eisenhower achieved little or nothing to advance unification. The Symington proposal, very similar to the report of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, would cast adrift the absurd business of the air, land, and sea branches competing with each other for funds, control of weapons, and status.

Under the Symington proposal there would remain the Secretary of Defense and a special military adviser to the President.

The trouble with the present competitive situation between the men of sea, air, and land is that it makes impossible a long-range plan with full coordination behind it.

SYMINGTON would abolish the special secretaryship for the three services and substitute a chief at the staff level rather than have a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Symington proposal would not only eliminate the secretaryships but their 7 assistants, 15 civilian officers being wiped out.

Waste would be eliminated by mass purchasing, by quicker decision on missiles and by doing away with duplications in probably the biggest bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Over the years the lobbies of the three services have created powerful friends for themselves. Kennedy will thus encounter rough going in Congress but no rougher than the situation he met when his PT boat was sliced in two in the last World War.

Many administrations have used the study technique to delay action. But the fact

Kennedy assigned this study before he took office indicates he means business about streamlining a part of Government, which, at present, militates against coordinated strategy, wastes large sums of money and invites a needless degree of lobbying from both the service and the civilian sectors.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 7, 1960]

TOWARD MUCH-NEEDED REVISION

The all-important details of the defense reorganization plan drawn up by President-elect Kennedy's advisers have not yet been spelled out, and probably won't be until they are presented to Congress. In broad outline, however, the goals and policies recommended deserve the most serious consideration.

ECONOMY PROGRAMS

America's Defense Establishment has undergone four major reorganization programs since 1947. Each shakeup in the Department has been prompted by the need for better distribution of specific functions and for greater economizing. But little economizing has actually been brought about, for with the burgeoning of departmental overseers has come waste and duplication. The plan put together by the Symington group is aimed largely at cutting into the civilian bureaucracy and reducing the wasteful and debilitating rivalries between services.

Recognizing the need for rapid decision making and combining both authority and responsibility in a single source, the new proposal would do away with the three service secretaries, under secretaries and assistant secretaries. Elimination of much of this civilian bureaucracy would have the result of bringing the Office of the Secretary of Defense into closer contact with the service chiefs. The bureaucratic buffer between the services and the Defense Secretary has in the past often delayed important decisions and frustrated needed action.

THE CHAIN OF COMMAND

The chain of command, then, instead of running from the Secretary of Defense down through service secretaries and their civilian staffs would instead run from the Secretary directly to his military staff. Each service would have its own chief. These men would be aided by a military advisory council, composed of senior officers appointed by the President who would, in theory at least, act not as champions of their individual service but rather as overall defense advisers.

In addition, three command groups made up of units of all forces would be established. The strategic command would be responsible for all long-range planning and strategic missions. The tactical command would concern itself with actual battlefield operations. The defense command would be responsible for continental defense.

Anyone familiar with past efforts toward reorganization of the Defense Department can see at a glance the reasoning behind the proposed changes and also the violent protests which are sure to follow. If adopted in its present form the new plan would force an end to interservice squabbles over missions and responsibilities, setting down once and for all the cooperative function of each service. The costly system of parallel weapons development, the disputes over which service should control this or that weapon, the narrow parochialism of service viewpoints—all of these would be severely subdued, if not eliminated.

THERE WILL BE BATTLES

But oft-repeated recent history indicates that the individual services and their powerful congressional allies would certainly fight bitterly against such a drastic reorganization. Each service, jealous of its own traditional role, would battle to maintain and increase that role, rather than sharing or giving it up entirely as the new plan might require. The Air Force, for example, wants control of all strategic planning and missions. For this reason it covets the Navy's Polaris. The Army, meanwhile, cannot meet its new limited-warfare role without adequate air transport and tactical air support. The Navy at the same time insists on maintaining its present fleet organization, both below and above the sea.

Each service, under the reorganization proposal, would stand to lose some of its traditional functions. But tradition and special interest are secondary to the overall needs of the Nation. The inability of the services to eliminate waste, duplication and harmful rivalries, despite four previous attempts at reorganization, make clear that some new effort is needed. The suggested reorganization plan for these reasons merits careful study by the new administration and Congress.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Dec. 7, 1960]

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSAL

Every proposal for streamlining the Nation's defense setup encounters the same pattern of responses.

First, the enraged brass of the various services tells why it wouldn't work. Second, their sentimentally or politically committed friends in Congress lay down their own barrage of argument. Finally, the furious wrangle bewilders the public, leaving it half convinced that the proposal might weaken our defenses.

President-elect Kennedy, knowing this pattern well, is therefore understandably cautious in his comment on the plan prepared at his request by a committee headed by Senator STUART SYMINGTON. He has called it "interesting and constructive," and promised that it will be carefully analyzed.

The Symington committee's proposals are almost revolutionary. The identity of the services would be retained, but their chiefs would no longer sit as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and be responsible for grand strategic planning. Control of the whole Defense Establishment would be concentrated in the hands of the Secretary of Defense, without the intermediate layer of Secretaries for Army, Navy, and Air. One Under Secretary would be in charge of weapons development and procurement for all the services, another for all administration. Existing commands would be reorganized on functional lines.

The most striking aspect of the proposals is the vast responsibility it would put in the hands of one man, the Secretary of Defense. It will take that kind of concentration of power to end harmful interservice rivalry.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 9 I introduced in the Senate, along with 18 cosponsors, Senate Joint Resolution 25 which provides for a commission to study and report on the influence of foreign trade upon business and industrial expansion in the United States. In connection therewith, there appeared a very interesting article in the Chicago Sun-Times of the 1st of February, written by Victor Riesel, carried as an advertisement, and sponsored by local 1031 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers on the whole subject of the impact of imports on the American markets, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTOR RIESEL: INSIDE LABOR—JAPS PLAY BOTH SIDES; WOO CASTRO'S TRADE

NEW YORK.—The Japanese plan to hit us off our east coast and reawaken memories of that morning off the west coast. This time they plan to dump into Cuba tons of civilian material vitally needed by the Fidelistas.

Thus, the Nipponese will bolster our newest enemy with the products of an industry we revived for the men of Tokyo after they ceased being the enemy.

For several months now the Japanese Government has been bargaining with Dr. Mario Alzugaray, Havana's Ambassador to Tokyo. He has given the Nipponese officials a list of Castro's needs. As international merchants, they have given Dr. Alzugaray their prices. On January 4 he flew to Cuba for instructions. Now our friends in the Orient await his return with definite orders and cash deposits in hand.

Yet, while dealing with Cuba, the gentlemen of Japan claim our friendship and say we betray such fraternity by seeking to cut down the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of starvation-wage goods they're dumping into the United States.

These very same Japanese merchants have called on their Federal Ministry of International Trade and Industry to help them stave off angry anti-Japanese sentiment spreading through our own labor and management circles.

But the Japanese will have to do more than protest This they would know if they had observers at Wednesday's emergency session in Washington of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy.

In this group are 15 unions, ranging from Jack Potofsky's Amalgamated Clothing Workers to carpenters, glassworkers, electrical workers, and even lumberjacks.

Why are they meeting? Well, glare at a statistic or two: There were 27 million cotton shirts dumped into the United States by low-wage countries last year. Virtually all of these came from Japan and Hong Kong.

During 1960 almost 30 million knit shirts poured into the United States from the same lands which pay a munificent 10 cents an hour to their workers.

Apparently a lot more of us than realize are wandering around in Japanese and Hong Kong trousers. These production centers sold some 19 million pairs of pants in the United States last year.

And here is a figure on just plain cotton fabric which might startle you. The Japanese sold 90 million square yards of cotton goods in 1960. But this was lower by 12 million square yards than in 1959. Why? Because it's beginning to cost the Japanese more to produce cotton fabric. So they have to sell it at a higher price in the United States.

Right here you have the reasoning behind one plan to save U.S. industry being proposed to the Washington emergency meeting today by Frank Darling. He is leader of Chicago Local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. His union followers, makers of "radionic" parts and equipment, have lost some 15,000 jobs in a year. Here is what Darling suggests in order to force the Nipponese to pay a living wage to their people or quit selling in the United States:

Every Japanese exporter should pay a duty at our customs office equal to the difference between the wages he pays in his country and the legal minimum here.

When the Japanese corporations raise wages and pay pension, welfare, and other fringe benefits equal to our basic minimums, then the men of Tokyo should be permitted to sell freely in the United States.

Perhaps this sounds harsh. But it is harsher to be a cutter of pants, or a sewer of shirts, and suddenly find after many years that the pay envelope has $5 less in it because of Japanese competition. In the clothing industry, for example, the average workweek last year was 34.6 hours. But in 1959 it was 37.4—a loss of more than 3

hours a week for those who are working. But what of the jobless?

And then we find ourselves betrayed by our friends across the seas who seek a profit even if it means taking Castro's grim trade.

The gentlemen of Japan are not going to win friends and influence the American people that way.

STEVENSON COMPROMISES UNITED STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under date of February 1, 1961, the Illinois State Journal, of Springfield, Ill., carried an editorial entitled, "Stevenson Compromises United States." I thought it might be of general interest, so I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have it so printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT MUST ACT—STEVENSON COMPROMISES UNITED STATES

What we had expected, but feared, has happened. At his first press conference since becoming Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson compromised the position of the United States. He has, in fact, left us as naked and exposed as could a faltering frightened commander on a field of battle.

He told reporters that he guessed President Kennedy would be happy to meet Premier Khrushchev, that it was his opinion Mr. Kennedy would welcome the opportunity to become better acquainted with Mr. Khrushchev, that he thought the release of the two captured RB–47 fliers was motivated by a sincere desire to better relations with the United States, and that he, personally, would welcome normalization of relations with other countries, including Communist China. Later, he lamely added some conditions to his statement—remarks on Red China.

At one point, Mr. Stevenson said he was not speaking for the President. He certainly was speaking for the United States, and his remarks will so be interpreted in every capital in the world, including Moscow and Peiping.

The U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations does not speak out on world affairs for his own amusement. This naive attitude disqualifies Mr. Stevenson for the important position to which he has been appointed by President Kennedy. We do not presume to tell Mr. Kennedy what to do or to try and guess what is in his mind, but Mr. Stevenson's departure from public life would be most welcome to most thoughtful and responsible Democrats as well as Republicans.

Mr. Kennedy had displayed an obvious reluctance to bestow high responsibilities on Mr. Stevenson, and did so only on the insistence of the liberal-radical factions to whom Mr. Stevenson has been their political Messiah.

In the end, Mr. Stevenson, who most wanted to be President, and then Secretary of State, finally settled, with some show of churlishness, for the ambassadorship to the United Nations. He thought he was entitled to bigger things.

Mr. Stevenson is a man consumed by ego and buffeted by indecision. He so yearns for importance and stature that like a drowning man clutching at straws, he reached out for bizarre and reckless positions to attract attention. He seems to have no anchor in judgment or responsibility. He just talks.

While Mr. Stevenson was sounding off at the United Nations, his superior, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, didn't help matters. While he refused to comment on Mr. Stevenson's remarks, which in itself is an unusual situation, he himself said he wanted to put the record straight on another matter: The Kennedy administration is willing to attend summit conferences, if it believes they can be useful.

He said the administration did not want to freeze its position. Well, Mr. Stevenson took care of that. He made the administration's position a mess of slush. Nobody in this country now knows where the administration really stands in regard to Premier Khrushchev and Communist China.

The record, as far as the rest of the world is concerned, is what Adlai Stevenson said at his press conference. If Mr. Kennedy is to be the strong President, which he so expressed a desire to be during the campaign, he should and must act at once. He can start getting strong with Mr. Stevenson.

OPERATION MIKE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I received a letter from Pfc. Clifford Anderson, of Oak Lawn, Ill., who is stationed overseas. In this letter he refers to efforts of himself and some of our servicemen to raise funds to send a young Korean orphan to medical school. They call it Project Mike. I think it is worthy of wider attention and I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have it so printed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINENTAL SERVICE CLUB,
168TH MEDICAL BATTALION, APO 301,
San Francisco, Calif., January 30, 1961.

The Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: Because of your interest in the people-to-people program as one of the best means of implementing world peace, we felt you might be interested in a project being sponsored by a group of enlisted men in Korea.

There is a 19-year-old boy who works as interpreter for the Continental Service Club here on the 168th Medical Battalion compound near Seoul. He is a very intelligent and dedicated young man who has had everything against him from the start, but still manages to have hope for the future. His parents were killed in the Korean conflict and since then he has supported himself and attended school where he has achieved high academic standing. This likeable lad wants very much to enter the medical profession, both because he loves medicine and feels that it would be the best way for him to help his people. No comment is needed on the worthiness of this goal. The implementing of it is another matter. Mike cannot put himself through medical school and we who know him are also financially unable to help. We feel that rather than immediate material aid which so quickly dissipates, giving Korea one educated person where education is a rarity would, in future years, multiply many times in value. He could provide medical aid in a country that sorely needs it, and provide intelligent leadership, one of the biggest deterrents to international communism. We have, therefore, instituted "Project Mike."

"Project Mike" is simply a fundraising campaign whereby the enlisted men stationed here will contact friends and neighbors back home, asking for donations to raise the money necessary to put Mike through school. The American Korean Foundation has consented to handle the funds for us through their New York office.

The reason I am writing this letter is that on February 22, 1961, we will be having a kickoff ceremony, when "Project Mike" will be given a wider audience than at present. Our publicity committee suggested that a few words from you would give the project added momentum. A short note or telegram to be read at that time would be most appreciated.

Thank you so much for taking time from your busy schedule to read this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD L. ANDERSON.

PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 4 there appeared an article in the financial section of the Washington Post and Times Herald, written by Mr. J. A. Livingston. Mr. Livingston is a regular staff contributor for the newspaper, and I know that his opinions are rather widely followed. I believe the article in question is of more than ordinary interest and merits greater distribution, and hence I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS OUTLOOK—KENNEDY'S MESSAGE COULD BOOMERANG

(By J. A. Livingston)

"Seven years of diminished economic growth * * * 9 years of falling farm income * * * business bankruptcies highest since the Great Depression * * * some 5.5 million without jobs * * * construction off * * * a million automobiles in inventory * * * too many Americans have less to spend for items that cost more to buy * * * in the last 3 years a total outflow of gold of nearly $5 billion."

(Quick, Willie, the storm shelter. That's your President speaking. Mr. John F. Kennedy. Things are bad. Mighty bad. Got stocks? Better sell 'em. Planning to buy a car? Better not. You'll get it cheaper later on. Ditto on that house your wife was looking at. Save your money.)

President Kennedy's dismal catalog on the state of the economy may have been calculated to instill confidence—confidence in his forthrightness, confidence in his willingness to call an Eisenhower recession an Eisenhower recession. But it is certainly not calculated to accomplish what all of us, including the new President, very much want: promotion of an economic upturn.

Fortunately, Americans are discounters, skeptics.

When, in October 1929, John D. Rockefeller, the elder, reassuringly said publicly, "My son and I for some days have been purchasing common stocks," and President Hoover promised "prosperity around the corner," people generally examined the economic debris around them and said, "Oh, yeah?"

Will they also say, "Oh, yeah," today as they examine their own financial fortunes? After all, 66 million persons do have jobs.

In describing the Eisenhower darkness before the Kennedy dawn and promising that conditions will get worse before they get better, the President provided himself with a self-serving alibi. If economic conditions improve—if an upturn comes in the second quarter or the second half—he can say, "Fine, we, the Democrats, did it." And if things get worse, he can say, "That's what Eisenhower handed me."

(And, why, Willie, if he felt that way, did he describe Eisenhower as "one of two great Presidents" to whose messages he had listened in Congress?)

Yet, the new President inserted one reassuring sentence to forfend fear: "All this is cause for concern—but it is not a cause for panic."

And he announced plans that will support production and employment and help to turn the economy around:

Extending unemployment compensation for those who have exhausted benefits, accelerating the Polaris program, speeding orders for transport planes, and increasing military spending when and where needed all tend to improve buying power and business. Such actions are more important than words and, therefore, the President's words need not be taken at their face value.

Nonetheless, the President took a risk.

Automobile sales in January have been disappointingly similar to those of January 1958. In 1957, sales in November and December were encouraging, then came 1958, ugh.

You and I have to feel pretty good to want to spend money. We have to feel sure of our jobs. And we have to do a good deal more car buying to turn auto production upward, which, in turn, will generate demand for parts which will cause steel mill activity to rise which, in turn, will justify the recent optimism in the stock market.

It's all right to call a recession a recession, a spade a spade, and a slump a slump. But it's also well for a President to note that his words might just carry weight; therefore, he must weigh them.

The President might have pointed out that we have had three postwar recessions (one Democratic and two Republican), that they've all been short, and this one has been going on for almost a year without any symptom of dismay or panic.

It's no more certain that things will get very much worse than that they will quickly get better. Eisenhower didn't turn over to Kennedy a boom. But it's not fair to present it as a total bust.

And if the new President hopes for some Republican support for his program, denigration is no way to get it.

OPINION OF JUDGE OMER POOS IN U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CASE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on June 9, 1958, the U.S. Civil Service Commission issued a letter of charges directed against the State of Illinois and Glen D. Palmer, director of conservation, charging Mr. Palmer with improper political activities. The letter asserted jurisdiction on the ground that allegedly Mr. Palmer was paid in part from Federal funds made available to the State of Illinois.

The Commission issued an order, an appeal was taken to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District, Southern Division, of Illinois, the appeal was heard by the Honorable Omer Poos, judge of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Illinois at Springfield.

Judge Poos has handed down a 58-page opinion, in which the case is remanded to the Commission with directions to set aside the order and dismiss the letter of charges.

This decision is contra-Oklahoma against the U.S. Civil Service Commission (330 U.S. p. 127 (1947)).

In this opinion Judge Poos carefully explores the facts involved, the source of funds through appropriations by the general assembly, the constitutional aspects involved since Mr. Palmer was a State officer and not a State employee, the question of Federal interference in the police powers of a State contrary to the 10th amendment, and other questions which in the judgment of the court distinguished this case from the Oklahoma case cited above.

Inasmuch as the constitutionality of the Hatch Act is brought into question this decision will be of great interest and importance, and for that reason merits the widest possible currency.

The opinion will be printed in the law reports, of course, but they receive rather limited attention, and I think there will be many people in the Government who will be interested in this decision. I apprehended that the Civil Service Commission, through the Attorney General, will probably take an appeal either to the Federal circuit court of appeals or to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The opinion is rather long, but I still believe it ought to go in the CONGRESSIOAL RECORD, so I ask unanimous consent that the opinion be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, SOUTHERN DIVISION—GLENN D. PALMER AND STATE OF ILLINOIS, PETITIONERS, VERSUS U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, RESPONDENT—CIVIL NO. 2696

OPINION OF THE COURT

This case is here on appeal from an order of the U.S. Civil Service Commission. The State of Illinois and Glenn D. Palmer, director of conservation of the State of Illinois, perfect the appeal from the order.

The Commission issued its letter of charges to the State of Illinois and Glenn D. Palmer, in which it charges that it was in receipt of information which warranted it, under the provisions of section 12 of the act of August 2, 1939, as amended July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767 (U.S. Code, title 5, sec. 118k)), in making an investigation of improper political activities of Glenn D. Palmer, director of department of conservation, State of Illinois. The letter stated that the term "Republican Party" means a political party whose candidates for presidential elector received votes in the last preceding election at which presidential electors were selected; the term "political campaign" means the political campaign of a candidate for nomination by, or election as the candidate for nomination by, or election as the candidate of, a political party as defined above, and the term "political management" means the management of a political campaign as defined above. The letter of charges is dated June 9, 1958, and it charged as follows:

I

That Glenn D. Palmer has been employed by the department of conservation, State of Illinois, since January 28, 1953.

II

That by virtue of said employment his principal employment is in connection with an activity, the department of conservation, State of Illinois, which is financed in whole or in part by loans and grants made by the United States.

III

That while so employed the said Glenn D. Palmer took an active part in political management and in political campaigns, in that:

(a) The said Glenn D. Palmer has served as precinct committeeman and chairman of the Kendall County Republican Committee, Kendall County, Ill., from January 28, 1953, to the present.

(b) The said Glenn D. Palmer did file primary petitions for precinct committeeman of the Republican Party with the county clerk, Kendall County, Ill., on January 18, 1954, and January 16, 1956, and as a result thereof was a candidate for and elected to that position in the primary elections of April 13, 1954, and April 10, 1956.

(c) The said Glenn D. Palmer did solicit signatures on his own behalf on a primary petition for precinct committeeman of his Republican Party in the town of Bristol, Kendall County, Ill., for the primary election held on April 8, 1958.

(d) The said Glenn D. Palmer did file with the county clerk, Kendall County, Ill., a primary petition for precinct committeeman of the Republican Party and an oath and statement of candidacy for the primary election of April 8, 1958.

(e) The name of Glenn D. Palmer did appear on the ballot as a candidate for and the said Glenn D. Palmer was elected as a Republican Party precinct committeeman, Bristol Township, Kendall County, Ill., in the primary election of April 8, 1958.

IV

That the acts herein described on the part of Glenn D. Palmer are in violation of section 12a and section 15 of the act of August 2, 1939, as amended.

This letter was dated and signed in Washington, D.C., by the Assistant General Counsel of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and was duly served on the respondents, the State of Illinois and Glenn D. Palmer.

The State of Illinois and Glenn D. Palmer filed answers to the letter of charges, issue was joined, and the matter came on for hearing before the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Glenn D. Palmer entered into a stipulation with the Commission at the hearing, the effect of which admits the political activity described in paragraph III of the charges. This stipulation was entered into on September 3, 1958, and later, on October 24, 1958, a further stipulation was made in which it was agreed that Glenn D. Palmer has held the office of director of conservation of the State of Illinois from January 28, 1953, to the present, and that the salary of the director of conservation of the State of Illinois is $12,000 per annum.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission made its case by three witnesses, James H. Wilder, a bookkeeper in the treasurer's office of the State of Illinois; Francis A. Whitney, supervisor of accounting in the department of conservation; and Sam A. Parr, administrative assistant in the department of conservation of the State of Illinois, all of whom developed the facts on which the Commission entered its order against Glenn D. Palmer and the State of Illinois.

The facts show that all moneys spent by the department of conservation are appropriated by the General Assembly of Illinois, the legislative branch of the State government; that no Federal money is spent by the department, the department only spending money in accordance with moneys appropriated to it by the general assembly. This is in accordance with the constitution of the State of Illinois, which provides, in article IV, sections 17 and 18, as follows:

"SEC. 17. No money shall be drawn from the treasury except in pursuance of an appropriation made by law and on the presentation of a warrant issued by the auditor thereon; and no money shall be diverted from any appropriation made for any purpose, or taken from any fund whatever, either by joint or separate resolution.

"SEC. 18. Each general assembly shall provide for all the appropriations necessary for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the government until the expiration of the first

fiscal quarter after the adjournment of the next regular session, the aggregate amount of which shall not be increased without a vote of two-thirds of the members elected to each house, nor exceed the amount of revenue authorized by law to be raised in such time; and all appropriations, general or special, requiring money to be paid out of the State treasury, from funds belonging to the State, shall end with such fiscal quarter."

Thus, under the above-quoted sections, the general assembly must, every 2 years, appropriate all money spent in running State government. This money can only be withdrawn from the State treasury on a voucher issued by the auditor of public accounts.

The facts further show that there are nine divisions in the department of conservation, namely, the division of park memorials, forestry, fisheries, game, game management, engineering, law, education, and the general office; that all the divisions in the department of conservation are financed through the game fund except engineering, parks, and forestry. All divisions are administered by the director. The director's duties are full time. The duties that the director is required to fill are almost a two-man job. The size of the department requires of him 60 hours a week to handle the work. He is a member of from 9 to 12 committees; is required to run the administrative staff, and to administer the entire conservation program, including the ramifications of the entire 9 divisions. He must travel throughout the State and out of the State on conservation business; also within the department there are 10 to 12 boards, commissions, and councils which the director, under statutory duties, must run. In addition to the statutory duties, other duties are planning of lakes, acquisition of land, engineering, stocking of lakes, 30 memorials and 45 parks to be looked after, plus 2 conservation areas, new picnic areas to be looked after, new additions to buildings to be supervised, new buildings in process of erection to be supervised, the collection of admission fees, new highway construction to lake areas, construction of lakes, game propagation, many game farms, the rearing, raising and distribution of game birds, supervising personnel, personal interviews with fish and game enthusiasts, requests for stocking of fish to be disposed of and the delivery of fish to lake areas, experimental work with new species of game birds for Illinois, development of game propagation lands, forestry and nursery developments, distribution of trees to the public, accounting in connection with all projects, preparation of budgets, educational film service, public relations work, filling speaking engagements at public fish and game meetings. He must also meet the public who come to his office on conservation matters. These duties are all required by State law. In addition to these duties, he also has duties with Federal-aid projects, and included among these are the setting up of various developments and new projects and those that might come under Federal aid are submitted by the department to Federal governmental agencies for approval and then turned over to the coordinator, a State employee, who must have his name submitted to and his appointment approved by the Federal Government, after which appointment he handles all such projects and from time of approval he takes over and does the departmental work on these projects. This is done under the rules and regulations of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, a division of the U.S. Department of the Interior. The department of conservation has had such a coordinator since 1942.

The duties of the coordinator are to take the project or projects over and carry through until completion, and after completion send the reports in to the Federal Government for reimbursement so that the State of Illinois can recover the moneys appropriated by the general assembly.

The record further shows that all money spent on these projects is State money, appropriated by the general assembly. The requests for reimbursement are prepared by the coordinator and signed by the director. State regulations require this. The agreement between the State and the Federal agency requires that the coordinator is to be in principal control of all Federal aid projects. The rules of the Federal agency that require this are in the Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Manual, section 170, paragraphs 171.1 through 172.1, which, in brief, provide for the appointment of the coordinator and that he will serve as the principal administrative head of the Federal aid program and be responsible therefor through completion.

These various programs are provided for under the following Federal acts: namely, Pittman-Robertson, Dingell-Johnson Act, and the Clarke-McNary Act.

The Pittman-Robertson Act (16 U.S.C.A. 669) provides as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the States, through their respective State fish and game departments, in wildlife restoration projects as hereinafter in sections 669–669b, and 669c–669l of this title set forth; but no money apportioned under said sections to any State shall be expended therein until its legislature, or other State agency authorized by the State constitution to make laws governing the conservation of wildlife, shall have assented to the provision of said sections and shall have passed laws for the conservation of wildlife which shall include a prohibition against the diversion of license fees paid by hunters for any other purpose than the administration of said State fish and game department, except that, until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature held after September 2, 1937, the assent of the Governor of the State shall be sufficient. The Secretary of the Interior and the State fish and game department of each State accepting the benefits of said sections, shall agree upon the wildlife restoration projects to be aided in such State under the terms of said sections and all projects shall conform to the standards fixed by the Secretary of the Interior (Sept. 2, 1937, c. 899, sec. 1, 50 Stat. 917; 1939 Reorg. Plan No. II, Sec. 4(f), eff. July 1, 1939, 4 F.R. 2731, 53 Stat. 1433)."

It is under this section and the other provisions of the act that Congress has made available funds received from taxes laid on firearms, shells and cartridges, to the Secretary of the Interior for use by him in cooperation with the States for wildlife restoration.

The Dingell-Johnson Act (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 777) is in the same language as the quoted provision above except that the available tax revenue to create the fund is received from taxes laid on fishing rods, creels, reels, and artificial lures, baits and flies for fish restoration and management projects.

The Clarke-McNary Act (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 563) provides as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, and on such conditions as he deems wise, to stipulate and agree with any State or group of States to cooperate in the organization and maintenance of a system of fire protection on any private or State forest lands within such State or States and situated upon the watershed of a navigable river. No such stipulation or agreement shall be made with any State which has not provided by law for a system of forest-fire protection. In no case shall the amount expended in any State exceed in any fiscal year the amount appropriated by that State for the same purpose during the same fiscal year."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 564, provides as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, in cooperation with appropriate officials of the various States or other suitable agencies, to recommend for each forest region of the United States such systems of forest-fire prevention and suppression as will adequately protect the timbered and cutover lands therein with a view to the protection of forest and water resources and the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 565(b) provides as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, to transfer, without reimbursement or at such prices and upon such terms as he may impose, to States and political subdivisions or agencies thereof fire lookout towers and other structures or improvements used by the Forest Service for fire prevention or suppression purposes, and the land used in connection therewith if such land is outside national forest boundaries when they are no longer needed by the Forest Service for such purposes but are of value to the State or political subdivision or agency thereof in its fire protection system: *Provided*, That if any property so transferred is not put to use for the purpose for which it was transferred within two years from the date of transfer, or if, within fifteen years from the date of transfer, any such property should cease to be used for the purpose for which it was transferred for a period of two years, title thereto shall revert to and immediately revest in the United States."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 567, provides as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cooperate with the various States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants, for the purpose of establishing forests, windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots upon denuded or nonforested lands within such cooperating States, under such conditions and requirements as he may prescribe to the end that forest-tree seeds or plants so procured, produced, or distributed shall be used effectively for planting denuded or nonforested lands in the cooperating States and growing timber thereon. The amount expended by the Federal Government in cooperation with any State during any fiscal year for such purposes shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make expenditures on the certificate of the State official having charge of the cooperative work for the State that State expenditures as provided for in this section have been made. There is authorized to be appropriated to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section not more than $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950; $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; and $2,500,000 for each subsequent fiscal year."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 567(a) provides as follows:

"For the purpose of stimulating the acquisition, development, and proper administration and management of State forests and of insuring coordinated effort by Federal and State agencies in carrying out a comprehensive national program of forest-land management, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with appropriate officials of any State or States for acquiring in the name of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, such forest lands within the cooperating State as in his judgment the State is adequately prepared to administer, develop, and manage as State forests in accordance

with the provisions of this section and section 567(b) of this title, and with such other terms not inconsistent therewith as he shall prescribe, such acquisition to include the mapping, examination, appraisal, and surveying of such lands and the doing of all things necessary to perfect title thereto in the United States: *Provided*, That, since it is in the national interest to modify, limit, or change in any manner whatsoever the future ownership and administration by the United States of existing national forests and related facilities, or hereafter to restrict or prevent their extension through the acquisition by purchase or otherwise of additional lands for any national forest purpose: *Provided further*, That this section and section 567(b) of this title shall not be construed to limit or repeal any legislation authorizing land exchanges by the Federal Government, and private lands acquired by exchange within the limits of any area subject to a cooperative agreement of the character herein authorized shall hereafter be subject to the provisions of this section and section 567(b) of this title."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 567(b) provides as follows:

"No cooperative agreement shall be entered into or continued in force under the authority of section 567(a) of this title or any land acquired under sections 567(a)–567(c) of this title turned over to the cooperating State for administration, development, and management unless the State concerned, as a consideration for the benefits extended to it thereunder, complies in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture with the following conditions and requirements which shall constitute a part of every such agreement:

"(b) In order to insure a stable and efficient organization for the development and administration of the lands acquired under sections 567(a)–567(c) of this title, the State shall provide for the employment of a State forester, who shall be a trained forester of recognized standing.

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture and the appropriate authorities of each cooperating State shall work out a mutually satisfactory plan defining forest areas within the State which can be most effectively and economically administered by said State, which plan shall constitute a part of the cooperative agreement between the United States and the State concerned: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be held to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from later agreeing with the proper State authorities to desirable modifications in such plan.

"(d) No payment of Federal funds shall be made for land selected for purchase by the United States under sections 567(a)–567(c) of this title until such proposed purchase has been submitted to and approved by the National Forest Reservation Commission created by section 513 of this title.

"(e) Subject to the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay out of any available money appropriated for carrying out the purposes of sections 567(a)–567(c) of this title any State, county, and/or town taxes, exclusive of penalties, due or accrued on any forest lands acquired by the United States under donations from the owners thereof, and which lands are to be included in a State or other public forest pursuant to said sections.

"(f) The State shall prepare such standards of forest administration, development, and management as are necessary to insure maximum feasible utility for timber production and watershed protection, and are acceptable to the Secretary of Agriculture and shall apply the same to lands acquired and placed under the jurisdiction of the State pursuant to sections 657(a)–567(c) of this title.

"(g) That with the exception of such Federal expenditures as may be made for unemployment relief, the State shall pay without assistance from the Federal Government the entire future cost of administering, developing and managing all forest lands acquired and over which it has been given jurisdiction under sections 567(a)–567(c) of this title.

"(h) During the period any cooperative agreement made under sections 567(a)–567(c) of this title remains in force, one-half of the gross proceeds from all lands covered by said agreement and to which the United States holds title shall be paid by the State to the United States and covered into the Treasury. All such payments shall be credited to the purchase price the State is to pay the United States for said land, such purchase price to be an amount equal to the total sum expended by the United States in acquiring said lands. Upon payments of the full purchase price, either as herein provided or otherwise, title to said lands shall be transferred from the Federal Government to the State, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to take such action and incur such expenditures as may be necessary to effectuate such transfer.

"(j) The State shall furnish the Secretary of Agriculture with such annual, periodic, or special reports as he may require respecting the State's operations under its agreement with him.

"(k) When a State or political unit thereof acquires under tax delinquency laws title to forest lands without cost to the United States and which lands are included within a State or other public forest, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the Federal Government, may contribute annually out of any funds made available under section 567(c) of this title not to exceed one-half of the cost of administering, developing, and managing said lands."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 568 provides as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, in cooperation with the land grant colleges and universities of the various States, or in his discretion, with other suitable State agencies, to aid farmers through advice, education, demonstrations, and other similar means in establishing, renewing, protecting, and managing wood lots, shelter belts, windbreaks, and other valuable forest growth, and in harvesting, utilizing, and marketing the products thereof. Except for preliminary investigations, the amount expended by the Federal Government under this section in cooperation with any State or other cooperating agency during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount expended by the State or other cooperating agency for the same purpose during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make expenditures on the certificate of the appropriate State official that the State expenditures, as provided for in this section, have been made. There is authorized to be appropriated annually out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not more than $500,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 568(c) provides as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with State foresters or equivalent officials of the several States, Territories, and possessions for the purpose of encouraging the States, Territories, and possessions to provide technical services to private forest landowners and operators, and processors of primary forest products with respect to the management of forest lands and the harvesting, marketing, and processing of forest products, and where necessary to avoid uneconomic duplication of certain technical and training services, to make such services available to private agencies and persons. All such technical services shall be provided in each State, Territory, or possession in accordance with a plan agreed upon in advance between the Secretary and the State forester or equivalent official of the State, Territory or possession. The provisions of sections 568(c) and 568(d) of this title and the plan agreed upon for each State, Territory or possession shall be carried out in such manner as to encourage the utilization of private agencies and individuals furnishing services of the type described in this section."

The United States Code Annotated, title 16, section 568(e), provides as follows:

"(a) The Congress finds and declares that building up and maintaining a level of timber growing stocks adequate to meet the Nation's domestic needs for a dependable future supply of industrial wood is essential to the public welfare and security; that assisting in improving and protecting the more than 50 million acres of idle non-Federal and Federal lands for this purpose would not only add to the economic strength of the Nation, but also bring increased public benefits from other values associated with forest cover; and that it is the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture in order to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate future resources of readily available timber should assist the States in undertaking needed programs of tree planting.

"(b) Any State forester or equivalent State official may submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a plan for forest land tree planting and reforestation for the purpose of effecting the policy hereinbefore stated.

"(c) When the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the plan, he is authorized and directed to assist the State in carrying out such plan, which assistance may include giving of advice and technical assistance and furnishing financial contributions: *Provided*, That, for the non-Federal forest land tree planting and reforestation, the financial contribution expended by the Federal Government during any fiscal year to assist the State to carry out the plan shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make financial contributions on the certificate of the State official in charge of the administration of the plan as to the amount of expenditures made by the State.

"(d) In any plan that coordinates forest lands under the jurisdiction of any Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain the cooperation and assistance of the Federal agency having jurisdiction and the appropriate State forester in the approval and carrying out of the plan.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section."

This act gives consent of Congress to each of the several States to enter into any agreement or compact, not in conflict with any law of the United States, with any other State or States for the purpose of conserving forests, and so forth. This act is to be carried out by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

Each of the acts contemplates an agreement on the part of Congress with each or any of the States to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the respective purposes therein provided for.

The General Assembly of Illinois has enacted legislation as required by the respective acts to enable cooperation on the part of the State insofar as its constitutional powers permit it to do. This is section 63b, chapter 127, I.R.S. 1959, which provides as follows:

"The department of conservation further shall have the power and authority to enter

into agreements with appropriate Federal agencies in order to better effect cooperative undertakings in the conservation, preservation, distribution and propagation of fish, mussels, frogs, turtles, game, wild animals, wildfowl, birds, trees, plants and forests."

This is the section of Illinois law that enables the State to enter into contracts with Federal agencies as provided in the three Federal acts above mentioned. The record shows that contracts were made with the U.S. Interior Department for fish and game purposes and with the U.S. Agriculture Department for forestry purposes. The record further shows that Federal aid projects are paid for with funds appropriated by the General Assembly of Illinois, and that after projects are completed the State is reimbursed for the Federal portion of the project in accordance with the percentages as provided in the respective Federal acts, and that the Federal funds are then paid into the State treasury upon order of the auditor of public accounts and there remain until the general assembly reappropriates funds. The Federal money received in reimbursement cannot again be withdrawn except upon its appropriation by the general assembly. It thus appears that in the first instance the moneys that are spent by the department here involved is all State money, and that the department is really a mere agency through which Federal funds are channeled into the State treasury in accordance with the contracts made as aforementioned.

It further appears from the record that the only projects that the director has to be concerned with are those contemplated under the contractural agreements entered into with the U.S. Interior Department over fish and wildlife. The forestry programs entered into with the U.S. Department of Agriculture are conducted by the State forester, who, under Illinois law, is appointed by the director, who must qualify with the Federal agency, and that after the State forester is appointed and qualified the director has no further control over him.

It further appears from the record that the total amount of Federal funds channelled into the State treasury over the 6-year period in question is $2,263,661.20, and that the general assembly appropriated for the department, during the same period, the sum of $35,975,405.21. The record for the moneys received under the three Federal acts breaks down as follows:

Pittman-Robertson, $1,438,349.52; Dingell-Johnson, $449,225.39, and Clarke-McNary, $376,086.29. The first is reimbursement of 4 percent; the second is reimbursement of 1.25 percent; and the third is reimbursement of 1.05 percent to the State of the moneys appropriated to the department of conservation during the 6-year period under the respective contracts.

The record also shows the director devoted less than 1 percent of his time to the projects for which the State was reimbursed during the 6-year period, except none to forestry.

The director stated that in all the past history of the department the Hatch Act had never been applied to his office; that he was appointed to his office by the Governor, the appointment was confirmed by a majority vote of the State senate; that his appointment ran for 2 years at a time and that the Governor could remove him only with cause, as provided in article V, section 12 of the Illinois constitution.

The State of Illinois and Glenn D. Palmer raised the question of the constitutionality of section 12(a) of the Hatch Act at the hearing (R. p. 9). The other questions raised in the record are that the department of conservation is not an activity financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government; that neither of the respondents are able to determine from the meaning of section 12 what is meant by the term "loan or grant," because the terms are not defined in section 12; that section 12(a) provides certain exemptions to State employees or officers from the operation of the Hatch Act which applies to elected heads of executive departments of the State who are not covered by the merit or civil service system or program, and it becomes apparent that when the exemption is read, together with other exemptions under section 12(a), the phrase "duly elected" should be interpreted in a broad sense to include "appointed or selected officials," which is a statutory construction problem, the de minimis rule, and because of the discriminatory exemptions provided for Federal executive officers when the same exemptions are not given to State equivalent executive officers (R. pp. 8–10).

After full hearing the commission hearing officer found that the respondent, Glenn D. Palmer, director of the department of conservation, is found to have engaged in political activities clearly in violation of section 12(a) of the Hatch Act, provided that he was subject thereto; that the State of Illinois received substantial grants from the United States for the benefit of the department of conservation; that the director of the department of conservation is not the elected head of an executive department; and finally, in recognition of the defense de minimis non curat lex, the respondent, Palmer, should not be held accountable in this proceeding for political activities. The commission refused to accept the recommendation of the hearing officer as to the de minimis doctrine and held that it was inapplicable in this case. The commission affirmatively found that Glenn D. Palmer violated section 12(a) of the Hatch Political Activities Act as alleged in the letter of charges, and that his removal from the position of director of the department of conservation (with ineligibility for reemployment by the State of Illinois within 18 months) is warranted. The order was duly entered of record, and this appeal therefrom perfected.

It is necessary for the court to examine the record in detail as has been done and to apply the law in the light of all the legal questions raised.

Section 12(a) of the Hatch Act, also designated section 118K, title 5, United States Code Annotated and found at 54 St. Ct. 767, is as follows:

"118K. Employees of State or local agencies financed by loans or grants from United States—Influencing elections; officers or employees defined.

"(a) No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States or by any Federal agency shall (1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any such officer or employee to pay, lend or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes. No such officer or employee shall take any active part in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose, and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. For the purposes of the second sentence of this subsection, the term 'officer or employee' shall not be construed to include (1) the Governor or Lieutenant Governor of any State, or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor, or the mayor of any city; (2) duly elected heads of executive departments of any State or municipality who are not classified under a State or municipal merit or civil service system; (3) officers holding elective offices."

Section 118K(b) provides for hearing for any violation of 118K(a) by the commission and the requisite procedure, by notice to the offender, setting forth the alleged violation and the time and place for hearing and after hearing for the entry of an order finding the violation and fixing the penalty. The penalty clause of subsection (b) provides:

"After such hearing, the Commission shall determine whether any violation of such subsection has occurred and whether such violation, if any, warrants the removal of the officer or employee by whom it was committed from his office or employment, and shall, by registered mail, notify such officer or employee and the appropriate State or local agency of such determination."

If the officer or employee is not discharged within 30 days, the Commission is to certify to the Federal agency supplying money on order requiring it to withhold from its loans or grants to the State an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate such officer or employee was receiving at the time of such violation, all of which must be done by the Commission. Notice of the order must be sent by registered mail, and the order of the Commission becomes final upon the expiration of 30 days after the mailing of notice except as provided in subsection (c). This subsection (c) provides for appeal to the district court, the court to review on the entire record, including all of the evidence taken on the hearing, and shall extend to questions of fact and law. This subsection further provides:

"The court shall affirm the Commission's determination or order if the court determines that the same is in accordance with law. If the court determines that any such determination or order is not in accordance with law, the court shall remand the proceedings to the Commission with directions either to make such determination or order as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law or to take such further proceedings as, in the opinion of the court, the law requires."

During the course of respondent Palmer's directorship, there was in full force and effect the following provisions of the constitution of Illinois (art. V, sec. 6, constitution of 1870):

"SEC. 6. The supreme executive power shall be vested in the Governor, who shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

"SEC. 10. The Governor shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the senate (a majority of all the senators elected concurring by yeas and nays), appoint all officers whose offices are established by this constitution, or which may be created by law, and whose appointment or election is not otherwise provided for; and no such officer shall be appointed or elected by the general assembly.

"SEC. 12. The Governor shall have power to remove any officer whom he may appoint in case of incompetency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office; and he may declare his office vacant and fill the same as herein provided in other cases of vacancy.

"SEC. 23. The officers named in this article shall receive for their services a salary to be established by law, which shall not be increased or diminished during their official terms.

"SEC. 24. Definition and oath of office: An office is a public position created by the constitution or law, continuing during the pleasure of the appointing power, or for a fixed time, with a successor elected, or appointed. An employment is an agency, for a temporary purpose, which ceases when that purpose is accomplished.

"SEC. 25. All civil officers, except members of the general assembly and such inferior officers as may be by law exempted, shall, be-

fore they enter on the duties of their respective offices, take and subscribe the following oath or affirmation: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm as the case may be) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Illinois, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of ——— according to the best of my ability.'

"And no other oath, declaration, or test shall be required as a qualification."

Article IV, section 1 of the constitution of Illinois, provides:

"The legislative power shall be vested in a general assembly, which shall consist of a senate and house of representatives, both to be elected by the people."

In pursuance of this constitutional power, the general assembly, in the year 1917, and as subsequently amended, passed the Civil Administrative Code, providing for the creation of departments of State government. This code is found at chapter 127, State Government, I.R.S., 1959, page 1803. This code, by section 2, provides:

"SEC. 2. The word 'department' as used in this act shall * * * mean the several departments of the State government as designated in section 3 of this act and none other."

Section 3 provides for 15 departments of State government.

Among these is the department of conservation. Section 4 of the act provides:

"Each department shall have an officer at its head who shall be known as a director and who shall * * * execute the powers and discharge the duties vested by law in his respective department. The following officers are hereby created: * * * Among others are: director of conservation, for the department of conservation. * * * director of personnel for the department of personnel."

It is thus apparent that under the constitutional provisions and the laws enacted pursuant thereto that respondent Palmer is a State officer, and not a State employee. His appointment came from the supreme executive power, the Governor. The office was created by the general assembly, in which the Illinois Constitution vests the legislative power to enact laws and create the office by the enactment of laws.

The qualifications of the director of conservation are not prescribed by the code. Section 11 of the code provides:

"Each officer provided for by this act shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by law for his position and to the best of his ability shall render faithful and efficient service in the performance of his duties, to the end that the public interest and welfare may be furthered."

Section 12 of the code provides that the appointment of all officers created by the code shall be made by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the State senate. Section 13 provides a term of office of 2 years. Section 14 provides for the constitutional oath of office. Section 15 provides for a bond and section 20 authorizes the employment of necessary employees. Nothing in the act provides that respondent Palmer shall not be a precinct committeeman, nor is there any provision in the act that prevents him from being a political party county chairman. There is only one office created by the code which requires freedom from political activity, and that is the office of director of personnel. Section 63b 105 of the administrative code provides the qualifications of the director of the department of personnel. This section provides:

"63b 105. The department of personnel shall have an officer at its head who shall be known as the director of personnel. He shall be appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, as provided in the civil administrative code of Illinois, and shall be subject to the provisions of that code, except as herein otherwise provided. The director of the department of personnel shall be a person who shall have had practical working experience in the field of personnel administration. The director shall be selected for appointment from among those persons who, for the 2 years next preceding the appointment, have not been members of any local, State or National committee of any political party, or officers or members of standing committees of any partisan political group or organization. Nor shall the appointee, during his tenure as director of personnel, become a member of any local, State or National committee of a political party, or an officer or member of standing committee of any partisan political group or organization."

The Illinois Personnel Code, under section 63B104c(7) (sec. 4c) of the code, I.R.S., volume II 1959, chapter 127, specifically exempts directors of departments * * * and all other positions appointed by the Governor by and with the consent of the senate from the provisions of the personnel code.

The public policy of Illinois, as declared by its law in respect to political activity, is different from the policy as declared in section 12(118k) known at the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act section in question states among other things:

"No such officer * * * shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. * * * For the purpose of the second sentence of this subsection, the term 'officer or employee' shall not be construed to include (1) the Governor or Lieutenant Governor of any State, or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor, or the mayor of any city; (2) duly elected heads of executive departments of any State or municipality who are not classified under a State or municipal merit or civil service system; (3) officers holding elective offices."

It is apparent that the respondent is excluded from the exempting clause for the reason that he is not an elected officer.

Illinois, in further pursuance of its public policy by its general assembly, adopted "an act concerning elections," and it is known as the election code of 1943. This code is found at Chapter 46: Elections, I.R.S. of 1959, volume I, page 1845. This code provides in detail matters concerning elections. Article 7, section 1, of the code covers the nomination of all elective candidates, and included in this section are the candidates of precinct, township, ward, and State central committeemen. The code also provides a means governing the management of a multiparty system. Article 7, section 2, defines political parties. Article 7, section 8b, provides for the election of a precinct committeeman of each party, and article 7, section 8c, provides for the county central committee. Article 7, section 9, provides for the convening of the county central committee, and its procedures for the election of a county chairman of each political party. This provides for an orderly system of political party management.

From the standpoint of the public policy of Illinois, as declared by its constitution and public laws, it is readily apparent that Respondent Palmer has violated no law of Illinois. The record shows that he is engaged in a pursuit from which he is paid a salary of $12,000 per year. In addition to his salary he is also entitled to pension rights under Illinois law, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, maintenance, and administration of a retirement and benefit system for certain officers and employees of the State of Illinois, their dependents and beneficiaries." Approved July 23, 1943. I.R.S., 1959, Volume II, Chapter 127: State Government, sections 215 through 246. This statute, among other things, provides for benefits to be computed on length and continuity of service (sec. 220).

The Hatch Act authorizes the commission to make a finding that the political activity warrants the removal of the officer, and after notice to the officer and the State of such finding, and a failure to so remove such officer within 30 days, the Commission shall certify to the Federal agency involved this fact, whereupon the Federal agency shall withhold an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate such officer was receiving at the time of such violation, in this instance, $24,000. The record shows that the project or projects have been completed and paid for with money of Illinois. Illinois raises its funds through taxation of its citizens as provided for by Illinois law.

There is no provision of Illinois law that authorizes the suspension of an officer for 18 months, nor is there any specific Illinois law that provides for the discharge of a State officer for a period of 18 months. The director of conservation is appointed by the Governor for a period of 2 years, by and with the advice and consent of the Illinois State Senate, and after confirmation, is to hold office for that term.

There are only two ways by which a State officer of Illinois can be removed from office. One is by impeachment and trial, as provided by article IV, section 24, Illinois State constitution, Illinois Revised Statutes, 1959, volume 1, page 12, which provides as follows:

"Impeachment (sec. 24): The house of representatives shall have the sole power of impeachment, but a majority of all the members elected must concur therein. All impeachments must be tried by the senate; and when sitting for that purpose, the senators shall be upon oath, or affirmation, to do justice according to law and evidence. * * * No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of all the senators elected. But judgment in such cases, shall not extend further than removal from office, and disqualification to hold any office of honor, profit or trust under the government of this State."

This provision of the constitution does not provide the basis for returning a bill of impeachment, but it does provide that the senators shall be upon oath or affirmation to do justice according to law and evidence. The meaning generally ascribed to such provision is that impeachment proceedings generally lie as a rule for treason, bribery or any high crime or misdemeanor in office (*Newsome* v. *Cocke*, 44 Miss. 352, 7 Am. Rep. 686). The grounds must be causes attaching to the qualifications of the officer, or his performance of his duties, showing that he is not a fit and proper person to hold the office (*Maulton* v. *Scully* (111 Me. 428, 89 Atl. 944)).

In *State* v. *Hastings* (37 Nebr. 96, 55 N.W. 774), it is said:

"Where the act of official delinquency consists in the violation of some provision of the constitution or statute which is denounced as a crime or misdemeanor, or where it is a mere neglect of duty, willfully done, or where the negligence is so gross and the disregard of duty so flagrant as to warrant the inference that it was willful or corrupt, it is a misdemeanor in office; but mere negligence or mere excess of power without corrupt intention is not a crime or misdemeanor for which the officer should be impeached."

The Illinois constitution provides, under article V, section 15:

"SEC. 15. The Governor and all civil officers in this State shall be liable to impeachment for any misdemeanor in office."

Thus in Illinois impeachment lies only for misdemeanor in office.

It is to be noticed here that there is no showing that any public funds, either Illinois or Federal, have been wasted through

any political activity, or that the public has in any way been prejudiced. In fact, the rules and regulations which are included in the record amply protect the expenditure of any funds used and expended in any of the cooperative projects here involved from waste or misuse of any kind or type. The projects must be approved by either the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and it must be shown that economy and efficiency in the completion of the projects were attained; on contracts entered into by the State, competitive bidding must be allowed. The State is required to maintain an adequate and competent force of employees to initiate and carry projects through to satisfactory completion. The personnel are to be selected on the basis of their competence to perform the services required, and shall conduct their duties in a manner acceptable to the Secretary. The manual also provides that as to the selection of personnel employed on projects, it should be the policy of every State to develop and maintain a staff of permanent employees, well qualified by training and experience to carry the programs forward in the highest degree of efficiency. Qualifications of all personnel to be employed in technical or responsible supervisory positions must be submitted to and approved by the bureau. In case approval is not granted, Federal participation in payment of salaries and expenses will not be allowed. There is no question here of the violation of any rule laid down by the Federal Government. In fact all rules and regulations must be obeyed or Federal funds will not be paid. It can hardly be said that any grounds exist for the filing of a bill of impeachment as against this State officer under Illinois law.

The other method for removal of a State officer is also provided in the State constitution. Article V, section 12 provides:

"The Governor shall have power to remove any officer whom he may appoint, in case of incompetency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office, and he may declare the office vacant and fill the same as herein provided in other cases of vacancy."

The supreme court of Illinois, in *Wilcox* v. *The People* (90 Ill. 186, 204), in construing this section, has declared that power under the above section to remove exists in the Governor for any one of the three causes specified in the following language:

"Undoubtedly the Governor can only remove for some one of the causes specified; but the removal here was for one of these causes—incompetency. The Governor ascertained the existence of the cause here, and made the removal on account of it. The constitution is silent as to who shall ascertain the cause of removal or the mode of its ascertainment. It simply gives to the Governor the power to remove any officer whom he may appoint, in case of incompetency, etc. It follows, then, that it is with the Governor, who is to act in the matter to determine, himself, whether the cause of removal exists from the best lights he can get, and no mode of inquiry being prescribed for him to pursue, it rests with him to adopt that method of inquiry and ascertainment as to the charge involved which his judgment may suggest as the proper one, acting under his official responsibility, and it is not for the courts to dictate to him in what manner he shall proceed in the performance of his duty, his action not being subject to their revision. The constitution of this State not only declares that the powers of the government of the State shall be divided into three distinct departments, but has expressly prohibited the exercise of any of the powers properly belonging to one by either of the others."

To the same effect, removal only for the causes specified, is *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U.S. 602, 55 S. Ct. 869, 873).

Now the courts of Illinois cannot act to require the Governor to make a finding because, as pointed out, the courts would be usurping a constitutional power that is wholly within the prerogative of the chief executive power, the Governor of the State. Next examine the three causes, (1) incompetency, (2) neglect of duty, and (3) malfeasance in office. The record here shows no incompetency, no neglect of duty in the administration of the office, and no malfeasance in office. It only shows that he is a party precinct committeeman and a party county chairman. Both positions are provided for under the Illinois election code, and no Illinois law prohibits the director of conservation as such from acting in these party positions. The only Illinois department head who is restrained by law from holding such political party positions is the director of personnel. This restraint is provided for by section 63b 105, chapter 127, State Government, I.R.S. 1959, page 1929. Section 63b 104(7), of the same chapter specifically exempts from the personnel code, "(7) directors of departments * * * and all other positions appointed by the Governor by and with the consent of the senate." Thus, under Illinois law, and upon the complete showing in this record, no valid cause exists for removal unless it can be said that the order of the Civil Service Commission, an agency of the Federal Government, can require the chief executive of Illinois to exercise his prerogatives under the Illinois constitution, when in fact no legal cause exists under Illinois law. The Congress of the United States under the separation of powers in the Federal Constitution cannot require the President of the United States to surrender any of his executive powers (*Myers* v. *United States*, 272 U.S. 52, 119, 125, 126, 161), nor can it do so to the Governor of Illinois.

Thus the order of the Commission as rendered under the Hatch Act places Illinois in the anomalous position of being required to summarily discharge the director of conservation when, in fact, under Illinois law no such procedure for discharge is provided for. Illinois, being unable to act, must therefore forfeit, out of the moneys contracted with the Federal agency, a sum equivalent to twice the annual salary of the director; in this case, $24,000. The record in this case shows that Illinois, out of its tax appropriations, has spent the money on the completed project under all the requirements of the three acts of Congress above set out and in strict accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Federal agency as found in this record. Illinois is bound by its own law. It can only act under the law. The moneys spent were appropriated by the general assembly under the authority granted to it by the Illinois constitution, article IX, section 1, which provides: "The general assembly shall provide such revenue as may be needful by levying a tax by valuation so that every person and corporation shall pay a tax in proportion to the value of his, her, or its property, etc."; and by article IV, section 17, which provides: "No money shall be drawn from the treasury except in pursuance of an appropriation made by law, and on presentation of a warrant issued by the auditor thereon; and no money shall be diverted from any appropriation made for any purpose or taken from any fund whatever, either by joint or separate resolution."

Under these sections of the State constitution the tax was levied and the appropriation made to carry out the various project purposes as contemplated by the three Federal acts providing for the cooperative purposes joined by Illinois statutes authorizing the cooperative purposes as above pointed out. Where is Illinois to recover the $24,000 in question? It is faced with the constitutional provision, article IX, section 1, authorizing the levy of the tax, and article IV, section 17, authorizing appropriation and the manner in which it was drawn from the State treasury to complete the project, expecting that the proportionate cooperative share of $24,000 would be repaid; yet it, on the failure of repayment, is also faced with the proposition that to make up the $24,000 under article IV, section 17, "that no money shall be diverted from any appropriation made for any purpose or taken from any fund whatever, either by joint or separate resolution." This can only mean one thing, that under the Illinois constitution and Illinois law, the appropriated fund in question will be short to the extent of $24,000, if the order of the Civil Service Commission is to stand. Illinois has one source of revenue to run the State government and that comes from taxes levied on its citizens. Can it be said that the Hatch Act in this case only incidentally has an effect on certain activities within the State? No case of record, except *Oklahoma* v. *U.S. Civil Service Commission*, has ever so held and in this case the factual matters were not the same as in this case. First, Illinois has not yielded, nor has the director yielded. Both have appealed from the decision of the Civil Service Commission, judicially asserting what they believe are their legal, constitutional rights.

Secondly, as far as this court is able to ascertain from a careful study of the opinions in the court of appeals and in the Supreme Court, this question here involved, that of an act of Congress, striking at the revenue of a State, was never raised. The court in Oklahoma decides three questions, (1) that the United States has no power to regulate local political activities of State officials, (2) that it does have power to fix the terms upon which its money allotments to States shall be disbursed, and (3) that the 10th amendment does not forbid the exercise of the power in the way that Congress has proceeded. As to point 1, there is no doubt and as to point 3, the 10th amendment is not a source of power and cannot be relied upon as a grant of power. Power to act must be found in the grants of power as given to the United States. As to point No. 2, "that Congress has power to fix the terms upon which its money allotments to States shall be disbursed," the Court did not have called to its attention any constitutional provision showing where the power came from, nor was any case shown or called to the attention of the Court that permitted Congress to pass any act that struck at revenue or moneys of the State itself. The State of Illinois, as does the Federal Government, has the right as a prerogative of government to hire and fire its employees, and has the undoubted right to appoint, confirm, and provide the qualifications for State officers free from control of the United States. See *Cummings* v. *State of Missouri* (4 Wall 277, 18 L. Ed. 356, 361), where the Court announces the rule that it well settled and generally recognized that there is a wide range of particular unexpressed powers which have been reserved to the States, such as, for illustration, the right to determine the qualifications for State officers and the conditions on which its citizens may exercise their various callings and pursuits within its jurisdiction. The Federal and State Governments can cooperate to a common end provided each of them is authorized to reach it. This cooperation must be effectuated by an exercise of the powers which they severally possess, and not by an exercise through invasion or surrender by one of them of the governmental power of the other. The power to remove executive officers appointed by the chief executive power is an executive function, and cannot be controlled by the legislative authority.

This proposition of constitutional law is well established under the decision of the Supreme Court insofar as the National Gov-

ernment is concerned in the case of *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U.S. 52, pages 119, 125). The Court said, pages 161, 164:

"Removal of executive officials from office is an executive function; the power to remove, like the power to appoint, is part of the Executive power, a conclusion which is confirmed by the obligation 'to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.'"

The Court further said, pages 119, 125:

"The President is empowered by the Constitution to remove any executive officer appointed by him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and this power is not subject in its exercise by the assent of the Senate, not can it be made so by an Act of Congress."

Again at pages 119, 121, 126, 161:

"The power of removal is an incident to the power to appoint, but such incident does not extend the Senate power to checking appointments, to removals."

The Illinois constitutional provisions are the same as the Federal constitutional provisions concerning power and separation of powers. Article V, section 6, of the Illinois Constitution, is as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Supreme executive power shall be vested in the governor, who shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

And article V, section 10, as follows:

"SEC. 10. The Governor shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (a majority of all the Senators elected concurring by yeas and nays), appoint all officers whose offices are established by this constitution, or which may be created by law, and whose appointment or election is not otherwise provided for; and no such officer shall be appointed or elected by the general assembly."

These sections are similar in import to article II, sections 1, 2, and 3 of the U.S. Constitution, providing for the executive department. As stated in *Myers* v. *United States, supra*, this article prevents the Congress from passing legislation that would provide for removal or recall of an officer nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Since Congress does not have this power as to officers appointed by the Chief Executive authority of the National Government, it certainly cannot be said that it has such authority to provide by legislation for the removal of a State officer appointed by the Governor of Illinois and confirmed by the Illinois State Senate. To say that Congress has this authority would be to say that it has the right to usurp State of Illinois sovereignty. This authority is lacking in the General Assembly of Illinois, and in the Illinois judicial department as pointed out above in the case of *Wilcox* v. *People* (90 Ill. 186, 204).

In pursuance of its constitutional authority the general assembly passed the civil administrative code providing for directors to run the various executive departments of State government. Section 12, chapter 127, I.R.S. 1959, provides that the officer nominated by the Governor to a directorship shall be confirmed by the Illinois State Senate before his appointment becomes effective. The director of conservation is one of the offices authorized by the Illinois constitution under the words, "which may be created by law," found in article V, section 10.

Examine section 12a, title V, section 118k, United States Code Annotated of the Hatch Act, and one finds it is worded as follows:

"No officer * * * of any State, whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants made by the United States, or by any Federal agency shall use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command or advise any such officer or employee, lend or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency or person for political purposes: No such officer * * * shall take any active part in political campaigns. For the purposes of the second sentence of this subsection, the term 'officer' * * * shall not be construed to include (1) the Governor or Lieutenant Governor of any State, or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor * * * (2) duly elected heads of executive departments of any State * * * (3) officers holding elective offices."

Now compare this section dealing with State officers, with section 13a, title V, section 118i, which provides as follows:

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof; no officer or employee in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose, and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. For the purposes of this Section, the term 'officer' * * * shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice-President of the United States, (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of the President, (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments, (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal Laws."

It is apparent, after reading the two sections, that Congress exempts from the provisions of section 13a, title V, 118i, "(3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers, or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws." To exclude this class of officers as set out in subdivisions (3) and (4) would clearly have made this section unconstitutional as a usurpation of executive power (*Meyers* v. *United States*, 272 U.S. 52, and *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States*, 295 U.S. Reports, 602). Congress with these inclusive exemptions in section 13a, 118i, recognizes that its authority is limited in this respect, yet it fails to give the same exemption to the appointed and Illinois State Senate confirmed heads of the executive departments of the State government, and the appointed heads and assistant heads of executive departments of State of Illinois government. Can it not be reasonably and constitutionally said, that while the various acts providing funds as above set out are acts of cooperation between the States and Federal governments, that Congress, in its failure to exempt the heads of State executive departments, who also determine policy, has acted to treat Illinois as an agency of the Federal Government incapable of running its own internal affairs, rather than as an equal independent sovereign fully capable of determining the qualification of its executive officers free from interference of the United States, and also fully capable of providing for the recall of State officers under its own constitutional processes and duly enacted State laws free from interference by the United States?

Article IV, section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, provides:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government."

This provision has been fully considered in *South Carolina* v. *United States* (199 U.S. 437, 454, 50 L. Ed. 261, 26 S. Ct. 110), where the Court said:

"Each State subject to the limitations prescribed by the Constitution, and within its own territory is otherwise supreme. Its internal affairs are matters of its own discretion. The Constitution provides that 'the United States shall guarantee to every State a Republican form of Government,' article IV, section 4. That expresses the full limit of national control over the internal affairs of a State."

Examine 12a, and 12f(1) in the light of this constitutional provision. Congress exerts power to exclude from the term "officer and employee" the Governor, Lieutenant Governor of any State, or any person who is authorized by law to act as Governor, and defines under 12f(1) the term "State or local agency" to mean the executive branch of any State, or of any municipality or other political subdivision of such State, or any agency or department thereof.

The Illinois constitution as above pointed out makes the Governor the supreme executive authority of the State. Section 12f(1) defines the term "State" to mean "the executive branch of any State." It is clear that the Hatch Act, by congressional expression, is directed at the executive branch of State government. Unless there is an executive branch, State government could not exist. The source of power for the executive branch is article V of the Illinois constitution, and the authority for removal of a State officer comes from section 12 thereof. Thus the Hatch Act is directed to telling the State of Illinois that unless Illinois removes the officer, Illinois will not be entitled to share in contracts of cooperation, unless she suffers the loss of twice the annual salary of the officer under contracts legitimately entered into in a spirit of cooperation, or Illinois, you must surrender the right of sovereignty to determine the qualification of a State officer if you expect to share in the contractual right of cooperation offered by the three Federal acts here involved. Illinois undoubtedly has the constitutional right to lay down the rules for the qualifications of State officers in carrying on the internal affairs of State government, irrespective of what Congress may desire, and this power similarly rests in Congress under the Federal Constitution, insofar as the National Government is concerned.

Illinois, in fact, has provided under its own political activities act that employees have the right to engage in political activities. This act is found under "Political activity, chapter 24½, volume I, I.R.S. 1959, sections 38s, 38t, 38u and 38v, page 998. This act provides:

"38s section 1, application of act: This act shall apply to all employees of the State whose employment or tenure is subject to recognized merit principles of public employment.

"38t section 2, prohibited political activity: Any employee subject to this act may be discharged in accordance with the discharge procedures controlling his position during regular working hours in any of the following acts:

"(a) Participating in the organization of any political meeting.

"(b) Soliciting money from any person for any political purpose.

"(c) Selling or distributing tickets for political meetings.

"(d) Assisting at the polls in behalf of any party or party-designated candidate on election day.

"(e) Using or threatening to use the influence or authority of his position to coerce or to persuade any person to follow any course of political action.

"(f) Initiating or circulating any petitions on behalf of a candidate or in support of a political issue.

"(g) Making contributions of money in behalf of a candidate or in support of a political issue.

"(h) Distributing campaign literature or material in behalf of any candidate."

In respect to employees whose salaries are paid in whole or in part by Federal funds, and whose employment is subject to Federal standards for a merit system of personnel administration applicable to grant in aid programs, the prohibited political activities enumerated in this section may not be engaged in at any time, whether during or outside of regular working hours. Violation of this prohibition by any such employee shall subject him to discharge in accordance with the procedures controlling his position. Nor shall this act be deemed to authorize conduct prohibited by the Federal Hatch Act by employees subject to said act.

"38u, membership not to affect employment; contributions not to be a condition of employment; section 3: No employee hereunder shall be denied or deprived of employment solely because he is a member or officer of a political committee, of a political party, or of a political organization or club; nor shall he be required as a condition of his employment or tenure to work or make contributions in behalf of any political party or any candidate for political office."

"38v, Prohibition against inducing employees to violate act, sec. 4: No person shall coerce, induce, persuade or attempt to persuade any employee to violate any of the provisions of this act."

This act, in plain definite language, protects Federal funds from political waste or dissipation by employees or anyone attempting to persuade or coerce them. It was enacted by the general assembly under its prerogative to pass laws. Thus Illinois in its cooperative spirit has done everything that congressional cooperation provides for insofar as congressional cooperation can require under constitutional procedures insofar as its employees are concerned, and it prohibits anyone including a State officer by section 38v or section 4, from coercing, inducing, persuading or attempting to persuade any employee to violate any of its provisions.

In furtherance of carrying out the provisions of the political activities act, Illinois has on its statute books, a personnel code. Section 2 of this act, chapter 127, State government, paragraph 63b 102, I.R.S. 1959, declares that its purpose "is to establish for the government of the State of Illinois a system of personnel administration under the Governor, based on merit principles and scientific methods." Paragraph 63b 104, section 4, of the act provides that "all offices and positions of employment in the service of the State of Illinois shall be subject to the provisions of this act unless specifically exempted in this act." Section 4c, paragraph 63b 104c provides under subdivision 7 for the exemption of directors of departments.

Section 8, paragraph 63b 108, rules, provides that the director of personnel shall prepare and submit rules which shall have the force and effect of law, and that such rules may provide for such exemptions or modifications as may be necessary to assure the continuity of Federal contributions in those agencies supported in whole or in part by Federal funds.

Section 16, paragraph 63b 116, provides that all officers and employees of the State shall comply with and aid in all proper ways in carrying out the provisions of this law, and the rules, regulations and orders thereunder, and section 16, paragraph 63b 118, provides the penalties.

"(1) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this act, or of the rules, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than $50 nor more than $500, or by imprisonment for a period not to exceed 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment. Each violation shall constitute a separate and distinct offense.

"(2) Any person who is convicted of a misdemeanor under this act shall, for a period of five years, be ineligible for appointment to or employment in a position of the State service."

All the provisions of this act protect State employees who are under this act from political coercion. The act provides a comprehensive system for State merit service in accordance with Federal standards of merit employment and the Illinois Political Activities Act in conjunction therewith provides for complete compliance with the act and Federal acts under which State-Federal cooperative programs are carried out. All these State acts were passed by the Illinois General Assembly under its prerogative to pass State laws as provided in article IV of the State constitution. They express the will of Illinois under its prerogatives of government. The personnel code specifically exempts a director of a State department from the provisions thereof, as far as his office is concerned, yet it requires the individual holding the office to comply with its terms when it comes to employee personnel in the office under penalties of a misdemeanor as set out above.

When the provisions of the section 12(a) were before the Senate of the United States for passage, the bill, as first presented, included a provision as follows:

"Officers who are appointed by the Governor of any State by and with the advice and consent of the legislature or either house thereof, and who determine policies to be pursued by such State in the statewide administration of State laws."

This was quite similar to the provision applicable to the officers of the Federal Government as above pointed out. When this provision was about to be stricken, the following colloquy took place:

"Mr. CLARKE of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer this amendment because I do not believe there is any rhyme or reason in excepting such employees from the operation of the law simply because they happen to be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the legislature.

"Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. CLARKE of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

"Mr. MINTON. Does the Senator see any reason why anybody should be excepted? Why should we except the Governor?

"Mr. CLARKE of Missouri. The Governor has been elected by the people of the State, and I can see a reason for exempting him. I can also see a reason for the second exception, elective heads of executive departments of any State. That is an entirely different thing from allowing a State machine to be built up by the persons included in exception 3, who are usually the main cogs in every State machine. To say that a man who is elected by the people of a State shall have a right to appeal to the people of a State whenever he sees fit is one thing. To say that other officials appointed by the Governor or members of the State machine shall be permitted improperly to use Federal funds for the purpose of perpetuating that machine is an entirely different thing.

"Mr. MINTON. Mr. President——

"Mr. CLARKE of Missouri. I again yield to the Senator from Indiana.

"Mr. MINTON. Then, as I understand, it is the Senator's position that he wants to strike out this provision because these people are not elected by the people.

"Mr. CLARKE of Missouri. I say there is an essential difference between those who are elected by the people and those who are appointed.

"Mr. MINTON. In my State, the State highway commissioners are not elected. They are appointed. They are not confirmed by the senate. They do not have to be confirmed in my State. Do they have to be confirmed in the State of Missouri?

"Mr. CLARKE of Missouri. It so happens that they do have to be confirmed in my State, but it seems to me to make no difference whether they have to be confirmed or not, because, in my opinion, there is no basis for a distinction."

This colloquy shows that the only discussion when the amendment striking exception 3 was before the Senate, that Mr. Clarke had in mind the political evil of wasting funds through political activities, and the coercion of individual State employees by State officers. As pointed out above, Illinois has strict laws prohibiting such activities and such coercion. While the Senate denied the right to a State to permit political activity on the State level, it saw fit to grant the right on the national level. While this discussion was taking place, no constitutional lawyer in the Senate stood up to remind Mr. Clarke of section 4 of article IV of the Constitution:

"SEC. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government."

Nor did anyone tell him that this defined the limits of the United States insofar as its dealings with the States were concerned, nor did anyone call to his attention or to the attention of the Senate the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Cummings* v. *Missouri, supra,* which said, speaking of his own State of Missouri:

"But, as it was observed by the learned counsel who appeared on behalf of the State of Missouri, this Court cannot decide the case upon the justice or hardship of these provisions. Its duty is to determine whether they are in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. * * * We admit the propositions of the counsel of Missouri, that the States which existed previous to the adoption of the Federal Constitution possessed originally all the attributes of sovereignty, and they still retain those attributes, except as they have been surrendered by the formation of the Constitution and the amendments thereto; that the new States, upon their admission to the Union, became invested with equal rights, and were thereafter subject only to similar restrictions, and that among the rights reserved to the States is the right of each State to determine the qualifications for office, and the conditions upon which its citizens may exercise their various callings and pursuits within its jurisdiction.

"Qualifications relate to the fitness or capacity of the party for a particular pursuit or profession. Webster defines the term to mean 'any natural endowment or any acquirement which fits a person for a place, office, or employment, or enables him to sustain any character with success.' It is evident from the nature of the pursuits and professions of the parties placed under disabilities by the constitution of Missouri, that many of the acts, from the taint of which they must purge themselves, have no possible relation to their fitness for those pursuits and professions.

"The learned counsel does not use these terms, 'life, liberty, and property' as comprehending every right known to the law. He does not include under liberty, freedom from outrage of the feelings as well as restraints on the person. He does not include under property those estates which one may acquire in professions, though they are often the source of the highest emoluments and

honors. The deprivation of any rights, civil or political, previously enjoyed, may be punishment, the circumstances attending, and the causes of the deprivation determining this fact. Disqualifications from office may be punishment, as in cases of convictions on impeachment. Disqualification from the pursuits of a lawful avocation, or from positions of trust, or from the privilege of appearing in the courts, or acting as an executor * * * may also and often has been imposed as punishment.

"'Some punishments,' says Blackstone, 'consist in exile or banishment * * * others include a disability of holding offices or employments and the like.' (4 Bl. 377)."

Nor did anyone call to his attention *Butler* v. *United States* (296 U.S. 68, 56 S. Ct. 312, 320):

"It is an established principle that the attainment of a prohibited end may not be accomplished under the pretext of the execution of powers which are granted. * * * The power of taxation, which is expressly granted, may, of course, be adopted as a means to carry into operation another power also expressly granted. But resort to the taxing power, to effectuate an end which is not legitimate, not within the scope of the Constitution, is obviously inadmissable.

"Congress is not empowered to tax for those purposes which are within the exclusive power of the States" (*Gibbons* v. *Ogden* 9 Wheat 1, 6 L. Ed. 23). There are indeed, certain virtual limitations arising from the Constitution itself. It would undoubtedly be an abuse of the (taxing) power if so exercised as to impair the separate existence and independent self-government of the States, or if exercised for ends inconsistent with the limited grants of power in the Constitution. *Veazie Bank* v. *Fenno* (8 Wall. 533, 541; 19 L. Ed. 482)."

Nor did anyone call to his attention that his own State, Missouri, was a sovereignty complete within its own jurisdiction; nor did anyone remind him or call to his attention that the constitution of Missouri, whereby the people of Missouri organized a State government, was the supreme law of Missouri, or that it was the source of power within the limits of its borders that created three separate departments of State government free from the interference of the United States in matters concerning its own internal affairs all guaranteed by article IV, section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, nor did anyone call to his attention the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the cases of *McCullough* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat 316, 430 (1819)); *Texas* v. *White* (7 Wall. 700, 725 (1868)); *Lane Co.* v. *Oregon* (7 Wall. 71, (1868)); *Collector* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 113, 125, 126 (1870)); *United States* v. *Railroad Co.* (17 Wall. 322, 329 (1872)); *Pollack* v. *Farmers Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U.S. 429, 586 (1895)); *South Carolina* v. *United States* (199 U.S. 437, 454; 50 L. Ed. 261, 267 (1905)); *Farmers & Mechanics Bank* v. *Minnesota* (232 U.S. 516, 526 (1914)); *Indian Motorcycle Co.* v. *United States* (283 U.S. 570, 575, et seq. (1931)); *United States* v. *Constantine* (296 U.S. 287 (1935)); and *U.S.* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1 (1936)).

This brings us to the crux of the question as to whether or not the Congress can require the general assembly of Illinois to pass a law requiring qualifications for a State office when it wills otherwise, or further stated, does Congress have the power to withhold funds to force such a qualification under its own power, when Illinois has already spent the contracted funds in derogation of its own revenue. It is only the Hatch Act, not Pittman-Robertson, Dingell-Johnson, or Clarke-McNary Acts, that so provide for the political position in question. The answer of the Civil Service Commission is that the Oklahoma case so decides.

The factual situation in the Oklahoma case did not involve the question of contracts legally entered into, or the withholding of funds on completed contracts, provided the State officer was not discharged in 30 days as the Commission must under the Hatch Act so certify to the Federal agency, which is then required to withhold from the State of Illinois, funds equivalent to two years' annual salary, $24,000 as above pointed out.

In Oklahoma, the Court says: "While the United States is not concerned and has no power to regulate local political activities as such of State officials, it does have power to fix the terms upon which its money allotments to States shall be disbursed." There is no citation of constitutional authority to this proposition. The statement, "it does have power to fix the terms upon which its money allotments to States shall be disbursed," is not tested to inquire the extent of the power. There is no question that Congress has the power to levy the tax and to make the appropriations, as provided by the three acts in question, Dingell-Johnson, Pittman-Robertson and Clarke-McNary, nor is there any doubt that Congress has the power to watch over the funds, all as provided under these three acts and the rules enacted thereunder, all of which have been complied with as the record herein shows. The question is whether or not there is a constitutional limitation that prevents Congress from enacting the Hatch Act sections in question. Undoubtedly there is power in Congress to pass the act as to Federal employees, and as to certain Federal officials, and this power comes from congressional prerogatives to pass laws for the running of the Federal Government, all as granted under article 1, section 1, of the Federal Constitution. However, this power is qualified by the provision of the Federal Constitution requiring the United States to guarantee to each State a republican form of government.

The question is whether or not there is a reasonable constitutional limitation that prevents Congress from enacting a law, in this instance section 12 etc. of the Hatch Act concerning State officers, to the extent that it can indirectly control the hiring or firing, and the appointment, recalling or discharging of a State officer contrary to the provisions of Illinois law, duly enacted by the Illinois General Assembly under its State constitutional authority. The Court in Oklahoma says, "The 10th amendment does not forbid the exercise of this power in the way that Congress has proceeded in this case. As pointed out in *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U.S. 100, 124, 657; 61 S. Ct. 451, 462, 85 L. Ed. 609, 132 A.L.R. 1430), the 10th amendment has been consistently construed, 'as not depriving the National Government of authority to resort to all means for the exercise of a granted power which are appropriate and plainly adapted to the permitted end.' The end sought by Congress through the Hatch Act is better public service by requiring those who administer funds for political needs to abstain from active political partisanship. So even though the action taken by Congress does have effect upon certain activities within the State, it has never been thought that such effect made the Federal act invalid."

To this proposition the Court cites *Veazie Bank* v. *Fenno* (8 Wall. 533, 547, 19 L. Ed. 482); *Stearns* v. *State of Minnesota* (179 U.S. 223; 21 S. Ct. 73, 81; 45 L. Ed. 162); *State of Florida* v. *Mellon* (273 U.S. 12; 47 S. Ct. 265, 71 L. Ed. 511); *Helvering* v. *Therrell* (303 U.S. 218; 58 S. Ct. 539; 82 L. Ed. 758); *Wright* v. *Union Central Life Ins. Co.* (304 U.S. 502, 516; 58 S. Ct. 1025, 1033; 82 L. Ed. 1490); and *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U.S. 288, 338; 56 S. Ct. 466, 479, 80 L. Ed. 688).

In *United States* v. *Darby, supra,* the constitutional power was found to exist under the commerce clause of the Constitution, and it was from this source that the power was exerted. In *Veazie Bank* v. *Fenno, supra,* the power to levy the tax was found to exist under the taxing clause. The corporation against which the tax was levied was a private State banking corporation, incorporated under State law, and the tax was levied against a State bank note. The certain activity within the State was not the State itself, or any political subdivision thereof. In *Stearns* v. *State Bank of Minnesota,* the basis was found under the contract impairment clause of the Constitution and the clause authorizing the United States to dispose of its property. The corporation involved was a private railroad corporation. In this case the Court points out, speaking of constitutional power:

"There are, indeed, certain virtual limitations arising from the principles of the Constitution itesif. It would, undoubtedly, be an abuse of the power if so exercised as to impair the separate existence and independent self-government (*County of Lane* v. *Oregon*) of the States, or if exercised for ends inconsistent with the limited grants of power in the Constitution" (19 L. Ed. 482, 485; 75 U.S. 533, 541).

In this case the Court further said:

"That these provisions of the enabling act and the Constitution, in form at least, made a compact between the United States and the State is evident. In an inquiry as to the validity of such a contract, this distinction must at the outset be noticed. There may be agreements or compacts attempted to be entered into between two States, or between the State or the Nation, in reference to political rights and obligations, and there may be those solely in reference to property belonging to one or the other. That different considerations may underlie the question as to validity of these two kinds of compacts or agreements, is obvious. It has often been said that a State admitted into the Union enters therein with full equality with all others, and such equality may forbid any agreement or compact limiting or qualifying political rights and obligations" (45 L. Ed. 162, 174, 179 U.S. 223, 224).

In *Florida* v. *Mellon,* the court refused to take jurisdiction on the ground that the Federal Estate Tax Act was uniform and constitutional under the taxing clause of the Federal Constitution. The power to act in *Wright* v. *Union Central Life Insurance Co.* was found to exist under the bankruptcy clause. In *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority,* the power to act was found to exist under the war and commerce clause, and under the disposition of property clause. Under each of these decisions constitutional power existed under a specific clause of the Constitution. In this latter case the Court reiterated the proposition announced in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland:*

"That Congress may not, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishment of objects not entrusted to the Government" (4 Wheat 316, 423, 4 L. Ed. 579).

In Oklahoma, the court further said: "A hearing was had, conformable to section 12, and the conclusion was reached that Mr. Paris' active participation in politics justified his removal from membership on the highway commission. Oklahoma chose not to remove him. We do not see any violation of the State's sovereignty in the hearing or order. Oklahoma adopted the simple expedient of not yielding to what she urges is Federal coercion. Compare *Commonwealth of Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U.S. 447, 482, 43 S. Ct. 597, 599, 67 L. Ed. 1078)." This last cited case was an attempt on the part of Massachusetts in which the State sought to enjoin the spending of Federal moneys appropriated under the Maternity Act. The basis for disposing of the questions raised was that the two cases involved must be dismissed for want of jurisdiction, without considering

the merits of the constitutional question on the grounds that no justiciable controversy was presented by Massachusetts, and that Frothingham had no such interest in the subject matter, nor was any such injury inflicted or threatened, as enabled her to sue. The court pointed out the jurisdictional line of demarcation. This is particularly pointed out in *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1, 57; 56 S. Ct. 312, 315, 316), where the court said:

"*Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U.S. 447), is claimed to foreclose litigation by the respondents or other taxpayers, as such, looking to restraint of the expenditure of Government funds. That case might be an authority in the petitioners' favor if we were here concerned merely with a suit by a taxpayer to restrain the expenditure of the public moneys. It was there held that a taxpayer of the United States may not question expenditures from its treasury on the ground that the alleged unlawful diversion will deplete the public funds and thus increase the burden of future taxation. Obviously the asserted interest of a taxpayer in the Federal Government's funds and the supposed increase of the future burden of taxation is minute and indeterminable. But here the respondents who are called upon to pay moneys as taxes, resist the exaction as a step in an unauthorized plan. This circumstance clearly distinguishes the case."

Here the State and the State officer, as pointed out in *Oklahoma* v. *U.S. Civil Service Commission*, have the interest to raise the question. The statement is made concerning the simple expedient of not yielding. In the instant case, Illinois has yielded within the limits of her full constitutional power by complying with every standard laid down by the three acts in question. One can see from reading the opinion that the power to enact the act and make the expenditure was given by the taxing power of the Constitution, in *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon, supra*. In *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, the State of Alabama had complied with the terms of the Social Security Act, just as Illinois in the instant case has complied with the provisions of the three acts here involved. The court, in holding that a tax could be levied, found the power to levy the tax under the taxing clause of the Constitution. Specifically the Court held as follows:

"First, the tax, which is described in the statute as an excise, is laid with uniformity throughout the United States as a duty, an impost, or an excise upon the relation of unemployment (57 S. Ct. 883, 887, 301 U.S. 548, 578).

"Second, the tax is not invalid under the provisions of the fifth amendment by force of its exemptions (57 S. Ct. 883, 889; 301 U.S. 548, 583).

"Third, the excise is not void as involving the coercion of the States in contravention of the 10th amendment or of restrictions implicit in our Federal form of government (57 S. Ct. 883, 890; 301 U.S. 548, 585).

"Fourth, the statute does not call for a surrender by the States of powers essential to their quasi-sovereign existence (57 S. Ct. 883, 893; 301 U.S. 548, 593)."

No such questions are raised in the instant case. In fact, Illinois has joined with Congress under the respective acts of cooperation as above pointed out. It is pertinent to point out here that the Court said, concerning acts of cooperation:

"The inference of abdication thus dissolves in the thinnest air when the deposit is conceived of as dependent upon a statutory consent, and not effective to create a duty. By this we do not intimate that the conclusion would be different if a contract were discovered. Even sovereigns may contract without derogation from their sovereignty * * *. The States are at liberty, upon obtaining the consent of Congress, 'to make agreements with one another * * *.' We find no room for doubt that they may do the like with Congress if the essence of their statehood is maintained without impairment" (57 S. Ct. 883, 895; 301 U.S. 548, 597).

As above pointed out, the Hatch Act strikes at disqualification of a State officer, appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Illinois State Senate, with no power under Illinois law to disqualify the State officer for the reason assigned in the Hatch Act.

In *United States* v. *Bekins* (304 U.S. 27, 58 S. Ct. 811), the power exerted existed under the bankruptcy clause of the Constitution. The State consented that individual taxing bodies could file a petition in bankruptcy. The Court said:

"Third. We are thus brought to the inquiry whether the exercise of the Federal bankruptcy power in dealing with a composition of debts of the irrigation district, upon its voluntary application and with the State's consent, must be deemed to be an unconstitutional interference with the essential independence of the State as preserved by the Constitution.

"In *Ashton* v. *Cameron County District*, supra, the court considered the provisions of chapter 9, 11 U.S.C.A., section 301, et seq., authorizing the bankruptcy court to entertain proceedings for the 'readjustment of the debts,' of 'political subdivisions' of a State, 'might materially restrict its control over its fiscal affairs,' and was, therefore, invalid; that if obligations of States or their political subdivisions might be subjected to the interference contemplated by chapter IX, they would no longer be free to manage their own affairs. In enacting chapter 10, the Congress was especially solicitous to afford no ground for this objection. In the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, which was adopted by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in dealing with the bill proposing to enact chapter 10, the subject was carefully considered. The committee said:

" 'Compositions are approvable only when the districts or agencies file voluntary proceedings in courts of bankruptcy accompanied by plans approved by 51 percent of all the creditors of the district or agency, and by evidence of good faith. Each proceeding is subject to ample notice to creditors, thorough hearings, complete investigations, and appeals from interlocutory and final decree. The plan of composition cannot be confirmed unless accepted in writing by creditors holding at least 66⅔ percent of the aggregate amount of the indebtedness of the petitioning district, or taxing agency, and unless the judge is satisfied that the taxing district is authorized by law to carry out the plan, and until a specific finding by the court that the plan of composition is fair, equitable, and for the best interests of the creditors.

" 'The Committee on the Judiciary is not unmindful of the sweeping character of the holding of the Supreme Court above referred to in the Ashton case, and believes that H.R. 5969 is not invalid or contrary to the reasoning of the majority opinion.

" 'The bill here recommended for passage expressly avoids any restriction on the powers of the States or their arms of government in the exercise of their sovereign rights and duties. No interference with the fiscal or governmental affairs of a political subdivision is permitted. The taxing agency itself is the only instrumentality which can seek the benefits of the proposed legislation. No involuntary proceedings are allowable, and no control or jurisdiction over that property and those revenues of the petitioning agency necessary for essential governmental purposes is conferred by the bill.

" 'There is no hope for relief through statutes enacted by the States, because the Constitution forbids the passing of State laws impairing the obligations of contracts. Therefore relief must come from Congress, if at all.

" 'It is the opinion of the committee that the present bill removes the objections to the unconstitutional statute, and gives a forum to enable those distressed taxing agencies which desire to adjust their obligations and which are capable of reorganization, to meet their creditors under necessary judicial control and guidance and free from coercion, and to affect such adjustment on a plan to be mutually advantageous.'

"We are of the opinion that the committee's points are well taken and that chapter 10 is a valid enactment. The statute is carefully drawn so as not to impinge upon the sovereignty of the State. The State retains control of its fiscal affairs. The bankruptcy power is exercised in relation to a matter normally within its province and only in a case where the action of the taxing agency in carrying out a plan of composition approved by the bankruptcy court is authorized by State law. It is of the essence of sovereignty to be able to make contracts and give consents bearing upon the exertion of governmental power. (58 S. Ct. 811, 814; 304 U.S. 27, 49)."

Thus the rule announced in *Ashton* v. *Cameron County District* (298 U.S. 513, 56 S. Ct. 892, 896, 80 L. Ed. 1309) is the law on questions that affect State sovereignty concerning the power of the United States as granted in the Constitution, or that a source of power must be found therein to permit congressional action, the court said:

"The pertinent doctrine now firmly established was stated through Mr. Chief Justice Chase in *Texas* v. *White* (7 Wall. 700, 725, 19 L. Ed. 227):

" 'We have already had occasion to remark at this term, that 'the people of each State compose a State, having its own government, and endowed with all the functions essential to separate and independent existence;' and that 'without the States in union, there could be no such political body as the United States.' Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States, through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States.'

"*Collector* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 113, 125, 126, 20 L. Ed. 122): 'Such being the separate and independent condition of the States in our complex system, as recognized by the Constitution, and the existence of which is so indispensable, that, without them, the General Government itself would disappear from the family of nations, it would seem to follow, as a reasonable, if not a necessary consequence, that the means and instrumentalities employed for carrying on the operations of their governments, for preserving their existence, and fulfilling the high and responsible duties assigned to them in the Constitution, should be left free and unimpaired; should not be liable to be crippled, much less defeated by the taxing power of another government, which power acknowledges no limits but the will of the legislative body imposing the tax. And, more especially, those means and instrumentalities which are the creation of their sovereign and reserved rights, one of which is the establishment of the judicial department, and the appointment of officers to administer their laws. Without this power, and the exercise of it, we risk nothing in saying that no one of the States under the form of gov-

ernment guaranteed by the Constitution could long preserve its existence.'

"In *Indian Motorcycle Co.* v. *United States* (283 U.S. 570, 575, et seq.) relevant cases are collected and the following conclusion announced—'This principle is implied from the independence of the National and State Governments within their respective spheres and from the provisions of the Constitution which look to the maintenance of the dual system.'

"Notwithstanding the broad grant of power to lay and collect taxes, opinions here plainly show that Congress could not levy any tax on the bonds issued by the respondent or upon income derived therefrom. So to do would be an unwarranted interference with fiscal matters of the State—essentials to her existence. Many opinions explain and support this view.

"The power to establish * * * uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies can have no higher rank or importance in our scheme of government than the power to lay and collect taxes. Both are granted by the same section of the Constitution, and we find no reason for saying that one is impliedly limited by the necessity of preserving independence of the States, while the other is not.

"Neither consent nor submission by the States can enlarge the powers of Congress; none can exist except those which are granted. *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1, 56 S. Ct. 312, 80 L. Ed. 477, 102 A.L.R. 914) decided January 6, 1936. The sovereignty of the State essential to its proper functioning under the Federal Constitution cannot be surrendered; it cannot be taken away by any form of legislation. See *United States* v. *Constantine* (296 U.S. 287, 56 S. Ct. 228, 80 L. Ed. 233).

"The difficulties arising out of our dual system of government and the opportunities for differing opinions concerning relative rights of State and National Government are many; but for a very long time this court has steadfastly adhered to the doctrine that the taxing power of Congress does not extend to the States or their political subdivisions. The same basic reasoning which leads to that conclusion, we think, requires like limitation upon the power which springs from the bankruptcy clause (*United States* v. *Butler, supra*)."

It is to be noted also that the tax provided under the Pittman-Robertson Act, and under the Dingell-Johnson Act are not, strictly speaking, a tax or duty within the meaning of the Constitution. (See sections 669(b), 669(b)(1), 669(c), 777(b), 16 U.S.C.A.) Under section 669(b) an amount equal to the revenue accruing * * * on firearms, shells, and cartridges, section 4181, 26 U.S.C.A. is authorized to be set apart in the Treasury as a special fund to be known as Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund to be used under section 669 in accordance with cooperation agreements and under section 777, "there is authorized to be appropriated an amount equal to the revenue accruing from tax imposed by section 3406 (4161) of title 26 on fishing rods, creels, reels, and artificial lures, baits and flies," to be used under section 777 in accordance with cooperation agreements with the States. The money thus raised, though paid into the Treasury, is appropriated in advance to the uses of these statutes, and does not go to the general support of the Federal Government (*Edye* v. *Robertson*, 112 U.S. 580, 28 L. Ed. 798, 803, 5 S. Ct. 247, *United States* v. *Butler*, 297 U.S. 1, 60, 56 S. Ct. 312, 316). The theory of these acts is to afford to the States aid in the various projects within the internal borders of the States, enumerated by these statutes as in this record shown. The sections of the Hatch Act in question seemed to be directed to the end, under the guise of Federal appropriation and spending, of attempting to regulate matters wholly within and instrumentalities and officers of the State of Illinois that are necessary to running the department of conservation, which is in fact the State of Illinois.

It is plain then that the power asserted in Oklahoma did not spring from the taxing clause. The power of the Congress to pass the Hatch Act, applied to Federal employees, springs from the reasonably implied power to regulate and pass laws for the running and perpetuation of the Federal Government. Likewise this same power exists in the State government, and in the exercise of these powers, neither can impose its will on the other, by law or otherwise. Thus inquiry having been fully made, there can be found no authority or power conferred in the Constitution that authorizes the application of the Hatch Act to State officers, nor can there be found any constitutional authority that permits Congress to withhold money due under contracts of cooperation entered into under permission of laws mutually enacted for the benefit of the other. It is further the law that what one State cannot do directly, cannot be done indirectly insofar as the internal affairs of the individual State are concerned without its consent, which Illinois, by its legislative body, has not given. The department of conservation is roughly comparable to the Department of the Interior. Both are essential departments of the respective State and National Governments. Both must be supported by taxation raised through the respective taxing powers of both governments and to say that the Congress can provide a qualification for a State officer contrary to the specific provisions of the constitution and laws of Illinois under the law and facts as herein set out would amount to destruction of principles of constitutional government as we have known it from the time of the creation of the Constitution, thereby reducing Illinois to a mere geographical division of the Federal Government. The Congress has never been permitted, by the Supreme Court, to pass laws that have no foundation in constitutional powers, which are not either expressly granted or reasonably implied from the powers expressly granted.

It is true that a State may consent to a surrender of constitutional power. This is known as the doctrine of consent. The consent must come from the power of the legislative department of State government having the right to give the consent, as, for example, consent to surrender a fiscal power such as was done in the case of *United States* v. *Beakins, supra*. There the Legislature of California had the power to deal with fiscal affairs of the taxing body. This is also permitted under acts of cooperation because the State legislative body has the power to deal with the surrender of legislative power. The legislative body also has the right to control State employees because they come within the right, as likewise the qualifications of State officers where the constitution of Illinois has not so provided. There has been no consent here. The doctrine of waiver of the constitutional rights and prerogatives has never been applied to the sovereignty of a State. In fact, in the absence of consent, the rule is otherwise. This rule of constitutional law is announced in 11 Am. Jur., section 170, page 864, as follows:

"The original 13 States existed prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution and before that time possessed all the attributes of sovereignty. All these attributes except those surrendered by the formation of the Constitution, and the amendments thereto, have been retained. New States, upon their admission into the Union, became invested with equal rights and are subject only to such restrictions as are imposed on the States already admitted. There can be no State of the Union whose sovereignty or freedom of action is in any respect different from that of any other State. There can be no restriction on any State other than one prescribed upon all the States by the Federal Constitution. Congress, in admitting a State, cannot restrict such State by bargain. The State by so contracting with Congress is in no wise bound by such a contract, however irrevocable it is stated to be. It is said that subject to the restraint and limitations of the Federal Constitution, the States have all the sovereign powers of independent nations over all persons and things within their respective territorial limits."

It is pertinent, as to the existence of any such power, to point out what the court said in one of these last-cited cases, *Collector* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 113, 125, 126):

"Such being the separate and independent condition of the States in our complex system, as recognized by the Constitution, that without them, the General Government itself would disappear from the family of nations, it would seem to follow, as a reasonable, if not necessary consequence, that the means and instrumentalities employed for carrying on the operations of their government for preserving their existence, and fulfilling the high and responsible duties assigned to them in the Constitution, should be left free and unimpaired; should not be liable to be crippled, much less defeated by the taxing power of another government, which power acknowledges no limits, but the will of the legislative body imposing the tax. And more especially, those means and instrumentalities which are the creation of their sovereign and reserved rights, one of which is the establishment of the judicial department and the appointment of officers to administer their laws. Without this power, and the exercise of it, we risk nothing in saying that no one of the States under the form of government guaranteed by the Constitution could long preserve its existence."

It is also pertinent here to take note of the fact that Mr. Clarke had this to say:

"I do not believe there is any rhyme or reason in excepting such employees from the operation of the law."

And in response to Mr. Minton's question: "Does the Senator see any reason why anybody should be excepted? Why should we except the Governor?" Mr. Clarke had this to say: "The Governor has been elected by the people of the State, and I can see a reason for exempting him. I can also see a reason for the second exception (elected heads of any executive departments of any State) * * * To say that a man who is elected by the people of a State shall have a right to appeal to the people of a State whenever he sees fit is one thing. To say that other officials appointed by the Governor * * * is an entirely different thing."

And further, "I say there is an essential difference between those who are elected by the people, and those who are appointed"; and further, "* * * it seems to me to make no difference whether they have to be confirmed or not, because, in my opinion, there is no basis for a distinction."

It is apparent from what Mr. Clarke said that he (1) regarded a State senate confirmed officer the same as an employee, (2) that State and Federal constitutional questions never entered into the discussion, (3) that even the Governor of a State was subject to Congressional action in regard to the matter under consideration, and (4) that it was felt that no limits governed the enactment, but the will of the legislative body. As to point 1, the constitution of Illinois provides the distinction under article V, section 24, I.R.S. 1959, page 15, when it says:

"An office is a public position created by the constitution or law, continuing during the pleasure of the appointing power, or

for a fixed time, with a successor elected or appointed. An employment is an agency, for a temporary purpose, which ceases when that purpose is accomplished."

Thus as to this point there is a distinction, and the distinction covers both, whether elected or appointed officers, as being State officers and employees. Thus under the constitution of Illinois there should have been a distinction, but the Illinois constitution was never considered when the act in question was before the senate. As to 2, it has previously been pointed out that the Governor of Illinois, in his office, is the supreme executive power of Illinois, as the President is the supreme executive power of the United States, and as Illinois in its own internal affairs is a sovereign State, free from the trammel or duress of anyone, even the Congress, as is the National Government in the exercise of its powers; the same rule of law governs both in the dealings with each other, as the Supreme Court of the United States has on numerous occasions so decided as herein pointed out, and that the acts of the executive officers appointed by the Governor are in effect the acts of the Governor, just the same as the acts of the executive officers under the executive power of the United States, are the acts of the President.

This has definitely been decided by the Supreme Court in *Marbury* v. *Madison* (2 L. Ed. 67, 70; 1 Cranch 137, 166).

The Court in this case further said, page 164:

"By the Constitution of the United States, the President is invested with certain political powers, in the exercise of which he is to use his own discretion, and is accountable only to his country in his political character and to his own conscience. To aid him in the performance of these duties, he is authorized to appoint certain officers who act by his authority and in conformity with his orders.

"In such cases their acts are his acts, and whatever opinion may be entertained of the manner in which executive discretion may be used, still there exists and can exist no power to control that discretion. The subjects are political. They respect the Nation, not individual rights, and being entrusted to the executive is conclusive. The application of this remark will be perceived by advertising to the act of Congress for establishing the department of foreign affairs. This officer, as his duties were prescribed by that act, is to conform precisely by the will of the President. He is the mere organ by whom that will is communicated. The acts of such an officer, as an officer, can never be examined by the courts."

Use all the above language, but in lieu of the words "President," and "Secretary of State," insert the words "Governor" and "director of conservation," and one can only reach the conclusion that the director of conservation in all his political acts is the Governor or the agent for the Governor acting for him and in his capacity he is subject to no authority but that of the Governor.

If Illinois is to exist as a free and independent State in the exercise of its internal affairs, it must have a Governor, and to say that Congress has the right to provide laws for his removal or suspension in the conduct of the legal internal affairs of Illinois is to say that Illinois is no longer a free and independent State. I believe that when Congress passed the Illinois Admission Act, approved December 3, 1818 (3 U.S. Stat. 536), when it said:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, * * * the people of said territory did, on the 26th day of August in the present year by a convention called for that purpose form for themselves a constitution and State government which constitution and State government so formed, is republican, and in conformity to the principles of the articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory northwest and the people and States in the territory northwest of the river Ohio, passed on the 13th day of July, 1787: *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled,* That the State of Illinois shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever," it meant to create Illinois an independent State with all others, and that when this occurred the only power left in Congress concerning the regulation of its own internal political affairs ceased under article IV, section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, and that the act of admission, approving the Illinois constitution and granting statehood, placed the Illinois constitution beyond the powers of Congress to alter or strike down the constitution and republican form of government found to exist by the passage of the act insofar as the internal political affairs of Illinois are concerned, and that the purpose of section 12(a) of the Hatch Act is to either directly or indirectly accomplish this purpose because when by its specific terms it points to the executive department of State government authorized to determine policies of State government by Illinois constitution and laws, it attempts to determine the internal political affairs of Illinois, those which can only be determined by the Governor, who is answerable only to his State, and to his own conscience. It strikes one making an intense study of what has been said about the powers of the States and Federal Governments, that no person, the President, the Congress, the judiciary, the Governor or the State legislatures can destroy the State government or pass any law that strikes at an executive department of either the State or National Governments. Historically a civil war was endured to preserve the Union and the State governments, and Mr. Justice Marshall said, concerning the integrity of State governments in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 L. Ed. 579, 600, 4 Wheat 316, 403):

"No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common mass."

It appears that if Congress can directly or indirectly prescribe or attempt to prescribe the qualifications of a State officer, or attempt to exert power directly or indirectly against an executive officer in charge of an executive branch of State government, or attempt to strike at penalizing State funds raised through State revenues, as this record shows, that then the prophetic statement which Marshall believed to be untrue, has come true, and Congress has the power to make the States mere geographical divisions of the National Government. Thus it can readily be seen that the Hatch Act, when it points to the executive departments under the Governor, strikes at the supreme executive authority of Illinois, and this it cannot do any more than it could strike at the supreme executive authority of the United States, the Presidency; and as to points 3 and 4 which also come under and are fully elaborated under point 2, the executive power of the State is thus subjected to the will of the Congress subject to no limits except the will of the legislative body. The Congress is not a parliament of the people. It is a separate branch of the Federal Government, and it secures its power from only one source, the Constitution of the United States.

Examine the question in the light of cooperation as contemplated under the various acts here in question. The three acts here involved are framed on the theory that the States may follow the plan of cooperation by adopting State legislation enabling the States to cooperate. The Hatch Act is framed on the theory that it is within the power of Congress, not only to permit cooperation, but to tell the States that unless they cooperate in accordance with the legislative will, which, without constitutional limitations knows no end, that they cannot participate in the enjoyment of cooperative action. Now, for example, if the State does not follow this will, yet enters into acts of cooperation, the State can either recall the State officer or suffer the loss of twice the annual salary of the officer after State money raised through its taxing power has already been spent with consent of the State legislature when it made the appropriation. If this power exists what is there to prevent a future Congress from saying that the withholding of funds shall be 50 or 100 times the State officer's salary? If the power exists Congress would have the right to so do.

The closest most analogous case to be found denies this right. It is the case of *Lane County* v. *Oregon* (74 U.S. 101, 7 Wall. 71, 19 L. Ed. 101, 104), where the Supreme Court, speaking of taxing power, said:

"Now to the existence of the States themselves, necessary to the existence of the United States, the power of taxation is indispensable. It is an essential function of government. It was exercised by the Colonies; and when the Colonies became States; both before and after the formation of the Confederation, it was exercised by the new governments. * * * The Constitution it is true, greatly changed this condition of things. It gave the power to tax both directly and indirectly, to the National Government, and subject to the one prohibition of any tax upon exports and the condition of uniformity in respect to indirect, and of proportion in respect to direct taxes, the power was given without any express reservation. * * * In respect, however, to property, business and persons within their respective limits, their power of taxation remained and remains entire. It is indeed a concurrent power, and in the case of a tax on the same subject by both governments, the claim of the United States, as the supreme authority must be preferred, but with this qualification, it is absolute. The extent to which it shall be exercised, the subjects upon which it shall be exercised, and the mode in which it shall be exercised are all equally within the discretion of the legislatures to which the States commit the exercise of the power. This discretion is controlled by the will of the people expressed in the State constitutions or through elections, and by the condition that it must not be so used as to burden or embarrass the operations of the National Government. There is nothing in the Constitution which contemplates or authorizes any direct abridgement of this power by National legislation. To the extent just indicated, it is as complete in the States as the like power within the limits of the Constitution is complete in Congress."

Place this proposition against the constitution of Illinois and consider that the Federal agency is required to withhold from the State of Illinois, the sum of $24,000. First, the constitution, article IV, section 17, provides: "No money shall be drawn from the treasury except in pursuance of an appropriation made by law"; this is the Illinois constitutional authority under which money from the Illinois treasury was appropriated for use under the three Federal acts above mentioned. Second, the same article provides, "and no money shall be diverted from any appropriation made for any purpose, or taken from any fund whatever, either by joint or separate resolution. The auditor shall * * * prepare and publish a full statement of all moneys expended at such session, specifying the amount of each item and to whom and for what paid," and this

is the Illinois constitutional provision that authorized the spending of State of Illinois moneys under the projects for which the money was spent under the cooperation provisions of the three Federal acts.

It was contemplated under the respective laws of the State and National Governments that a portion of the money would be repaid into the State treasury, and as the record in this case shows a sum approximating a portion equal to 6.3 percent. Now if $24,000 is withheld from the State, the State treasury will end short that amount for the constitutional provision provides, "and no money shall be diverted from any appropriation made for any purpose, or taken from any fund whatever, either by joint or separate resolution." Thus, the effect of the Hatch Act as sought to be applied in this case is to strike at a fund of Illinois' levied and collected under Illinois revenue laws from Illinois citizens and spent as provided by appropriation laws of Illinois, contrary to this constitutional provision. In the case of *Boeing Aircraft Corp.* v. *Reconstruction Finance Corp.* (25 Wash (2d) 652, 171 P. 2d 838, 168 A.L.R. 539, 543 and 544), appeal dismissed (330 U.S. 803, 91 L. Ed. 1262, 67 S. Ct. 972), the supreme court of Washington, the court said:

"In appellant's brief we find the following: 'It is unthinkable that, under a system of government such as we have in the United States, a State may, by its laws or constitutional provisions, defeat the clearly expressed policies of Congress. The supremacy clause was intended to prevent such a result.'

"We cannot so hold, for to do so would effectively do away with the provisions of our State constitution by subjecting those provisions to be continually changed by acts of Congress. The Constitution of the United States has not given that power to Congress, and Congress has only the powers expressly given it by the Constitution of the United States. The American system of government is dual in nature, containing Federal and State sovereignties, each supreme in its appropriate sphere. The States do not get their power from the Federal Government, but from the Constitution of the United States. They exercise those powers independently of the Congress of the United States. The Federal Government has no power to control the power or authority of the State except as such power may have been expressly granted, or as may be necessary to maintain the acknowledged powers of the Federal Government. True, Congress may determine the circumstances under which a State may be admitted into the Union, but that does not give it any powers to change or modify the provisions of the State constitution."

If this power to alter or change the plain meaning of a State constitution existed in the Congress, then Congress could at will prevent a State from discharging its ordinary functions of government. *Educational Films Corp.* v. *Wards* (282 U.S. 379, 391, 75 L. Ed. 400, 51 S. Ct. 170, 173); *South Carolina* v. *United States* (199 U.S. 437, 454, 50 L. Ed. 261, 267), and in *Butler* v. *United States* (291 U.S. 1, 74, 56 S. Ct. 312, 323):

"Congress has no power to enforce its commands on the farmer to the ends sought by the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It must follow that it may not indirectly accomplish those ends by taxing and spending to purchase compliance. The Constitution and the entire plan of our Government negative any such use of the power to tax and to spend as the act undertakes to authorize. It does not help to declare that local conditions throughout the Nation have created a situation of national concern; for this is but to say that whenever there is a widespread similarity of local conditions, Congress may ignore constitutional limitations upon its own powers and usurp those reserved to the States. If, in lieu of compulsory regulation of subjects within the States' reserved jurisdiction, which is prohibited, the Congress could invoke the taxing and spending power as a means to accomplish the same end, clause 1 of section 8 of article I would become the instrument for total subversion of the governmental powers reserved to the State."

These matters have been pointed out because it appears from careful study of applicable constitutional principles that the real constitutional issue was never presented to the court either by briefs and argument, or by law and factual matters as appear in this record. The Supreme Court in *Oklahoma* v. *United States Civil Service Commission* has said that the act in question is constitutional, and this court is bound thereby: but this court believes that in event this case is reviewed by a higher court, the matter in issue should be fully discussed for the purpose of enabling a reviewing court to have before it the full benefit of the constitutional principles involved.

However, the Oklahoma case leaves open the question of the constitutional rights of the State officer. Many of the things pointed out above can be applied factually to the director of conservation, Mr. Palmer, the respondent, who also appeals from the order of the Commission, and this is especially true as far as State law is concerned. These matters having been pointed out above, they will not be further stated.

The Constitution of the United States and of the State of Illinois protect the individual and his rights. The fifth amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides: "No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.", and the Illinois constitution provides under article II, sections 1, 2, 19, and 20, that—

"1. All men are by nature free and independent, and have certain inherent and inalienable rights * * * among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights and the protection of property, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

"2. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

"19. Every person ought to find a certain remedy in the laws for all injuries and wrongs which he may receive in his person, property, or reputation; he ought to obtain by law, right and justice freely, and without being obliged to purchase it, completely, and without denial, promptly, and without delay.

"20. A frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles of civil government is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty."

And article V, section 10 provides:

"10. The Governor shall nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the senate (a majority of all the senators elected concurring by yeas and nays) appoint all State officers whose offices are established by this constitution, or which may be created by law, and whose appointment and election are not otherwise provided for, and no such officer shall be appointed or elected by the general assembly."

Under this latter provision and under and by virtue of section 13, chapter 127, State government, I.R.S. 1959, the director received the appointment as director of conservation of the State of Illinois for a term of 2 years; he was nominated by the Governor, confirmed by the Illinois State Senate, and his commission executed and delivered to him. When he accepted and assumed the duties of the office, his commission was irrevocable for a period of 2 years. Under the above sections of the Constitution of the United States, and of the State of Illinois, by this appointment confirmation and acceptance, he had vested in him legal rights which are protected by the laws of his country and for the U.S. Civil Service Commission under authority of sections 12(a) et seq. of the Hatch Act to order a finding that he was engaged in activities that warranted the State of Illinois in removing him amounts to an act not warranted by law, and which is violative of his vested legal rights.

The question of these legal rights was settled early by the supreme court of Illinois in the case of *Marberry* v. *Madison* (2 L. Ed. 60, 70, 1 Cranch 137, 166), where the court said:

"When an officer is removable at the will of the Executive, the circumstances which complete his appointment is of no concern; because the act is at any time revocable and the commission may be arrested, if still in the office. But when the officer is not removable at the will of the Executive, the appointment is not revocable, and cannot be annulled. It has conferred legal rights which cannot be resumed.

"The discretion of the Executive is to be exercised until the appointment has been made. But having once made the appointment, his power over the office is terminated in all cases whereby the officer is not removable by him. The right to the office is then in the person appointed, and he has the absolute, unconditional power of accepting or rejecting it.

"Mr. Marberry, then since his commission was signed by the President and sealed by the Secretary of State, was appointed; and as the law creating the office gave the officer a right to hold for 5 years, independent of the Executive, the appointment was not revocable, but vested in the officer legal rights, which are protected by the laws of his country.

"To withhold the commission therefore, is an act deemed by the Court not warranted by law, but violative of a vested legal right."

If this be the law and the Chief Executive of the United States could not recall the issuance of the commission, then most certainly the legislative department, vesting such authority in the Civil Service Commission, could not order the discharge of a State officer, or even make a finding that his activity in a political party position permitted by the law of Illinois, warranted his discharge or recall for a period of 18 months and to carry the matter to its logical conclusion the Congress of the United States has no authority to enact by law a provision for withholding from the State of Illinois a sum of money equivalent to $24,000, to accomplish this purpose.

The only right to recall the State officer is for the reasons provided in article V, section 12 of the Illinois constitution. These reasons do not exist in this record, and even if they did, the sole person who is to act in the matter is the Governor (*Wilcox* v. *People, ex rel.*, 90 Ill. 186, 204). This case so holds. The courts of Illinois, under the State constitution, cannot interfere. The State constitution having been ratified and approved under the Illinois Admission Act by the Congress, the act of approval prohibits the Congress from any further action either directly or indirectly when the provision of the Illinois constitution is not in conflict with any provision of the Federal Constitution. The courts of the United States will follow the courts of Illinois in construing the provisions of the Illinois constitution and laws (*South Carolina* v. *United States*, 199 U.S. 437, 454; 50 L. Ed. 261, 267; *Williams* v. *Oklahoma*, 358 U.S. 576, 583; *Morey* v. *Doud*, 354, U.S. 457 470).

As pointed out in *Marberry* v. *Madison*, *supra*, the President, and in Illinois, the Governor, have certain political powers in the exercise of which they can use their own discretion, and are accountable only to their country and State in their political character and to their own consciences.

Speaking of the rights of individuals, the Supreme Court, in *Cummings* v. *The State of Missouri* (71 U.S. 277, at 320), says:

"We do not agree with the counsel of Missouri that 'to punish one is to deprive him of life, liberty or property, and that to take from him anything less than these is no punishment at all.' The learned counsel does not use these terms—life, liberty, and property—as comprehending every right known to the law. He does not include under liberty freedom from outrage on the feelings as well as restraints on the person. He does not include under property those estates which one may acquire in professions, though they are often the source of the highest emoluments and honors. The deprivation of any rights, civil or political, previously enjoyed, may be punishment, the circumstances attending and the causes of the deprivation determining this fact. Disqualification from office may be punishment, as in cases of conviction upon impeachment. Disqualification from the pursuits of a lawful avocation, or from positions of trust, or from the privilege of appearing in the courts, or acting as an executor, administrator, or guardian, may also, and often has been, imposed as punishment. By statute 9 and 10 William III, chap. 32, if any person educated in or having made a profession of the Christian religion, did 'by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking,' deny the truth of the religion, or the divine authority of the Scriptures, he was for the first offense rendered incapable to hold any office or place of trust.

"'Some punishments,' says Blackstone, 'consist in exile or banishment, by abjuration of the realm or transportation; others in loss of liberty by perpetual or temporary imprisonment. Some extend to confiscation by forfeiture of lands or movables, or both, or of the profits of lands for life; others induce a disability of holding offices or employments, being heirs, executors, and the like.'

"In France, deprivation or suspension of civil rights, or of some of them, and among these of the right of voting, of eligibility to office, * * * are punishments prescribed by her code.

"The theory upon which our political institutions rest is that all men have certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; and that in the pursuit of happiness all avocations, all honors, all positions, are alike open to every one, and that in the protection of these rights all are equal before the law."

It follows that the respondent, Glen D. Palmer, is protected in these rights for all purposes as disclosed in this record under the Constitutions of the United States and of the State of Illinois, and to place him under recall or to withhold him from office under penalty to the State of having the Commission order the withholding of funds mutually and cooperatively provided for under the respective acts, both Federal and State, above mentioned, simply because he holds a political party position, or is a member of a political committee, as permitted by Illinois law, is not within the law and would violate his legal vested rights, all of which are guaranteed by both the Federal and State Constitutions as herein above mentioned.

None of the salary of Mr. Palmer, as a State officer, comes from Federal funds. Article IV, section 16 of the Illinois State constitution provides, "The general assembly shall make no appropriation out of the treasury in any private law. Bills making appropriations for the pay of members and officers of the general assembly, and for the salaries of the officers of the government, shall contain no provision on any other subject."

His official pay was provided for the three terms of office of 2 years each by three appropriation bills passed by the Illinois General Assembly. These bills are senate bills Nos. 582, for the biennium beginning July 1, 1953, pages 592, 595; senate bill No. 839 for the biennium beginning July 1, 1955, pages 1277, 1280; and senate bill No. 715 for the biennium beginning July 1, 1957, pages 999, 1003, all found in the session laws of Illinois for 1953, 1955 and 1957. These are all provided in senate bills entitled, "An act making appropriations for the pay of officers and members of the general assembly and certain officers of the State government." The act for each biennium is entitled the same. This is in accordance with article IV, section 16 above quoted. All other funds for the department of conservation, including those for cooperative purposes with the Federal Government, are appropriated under house bill No. 717 for the biennium beginning July 1, 1953, session laws page 313; senate bill No. 410 for the biennium beginning July 1, 1955, session law page 323; senate bill No. 653 for the biennium beginning July 1, 1957, session laws, page 892. The appropriations are made for State officers from the general revenue fund of Illinois, and from the fish and game fund and general revenue fund for running the department of conservation as provided in the respective appropriation bills.

It thus appears that no Federal funds are used to pay the director of conservation. It appears in this record that Illinois funds have been used to pay for the various projects in the first instance, and that although State funds have been so used in a cooperative project, a part thereof and a very small percentage of total funds appropriated to the department of conservation may be repaid by Federal agencies, if and when approved by the Federal agencies. Forestry is divorced from all other activities of the department, and it is under the supervision of the State forester who even must be approved by the Federal agency before the State of Illinois can employ him for the position. It further appears from this record that during the 6-year period in question, that the General Assembly of Illinois appropriated and spent the total sum of $35,975,405.21; that the Federal agencies have approved projects for which Illinois has been reimbursed in the sum of $2,263,661.20, or a total percentage reimbursement of 6.30. This record further shows the numerous and burdensome duties of the director under State law; that practically all that the director had to do with projects connected with Federal cooperative plans was to sign his name to documents to be sent to Federal agencies, sign requests for reimbursement, and then transmit them to the State auditor of Illinois for deposit in the Illinois State Treasury. The record here shows that the director spent less than 1 percent of his time in connection with projects involving Federal aid to fish, game, and wildlife, and no time in connection with forestry. It is a simple problem of arithmetic to thus conclude that less than one-hundredth of his time, when divided into 6.3 percent of the refunded portion, and that his time thus spent would amount to less than .063 percent in relation to total activities financed in part with Federal funds.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission has a rule that is known as the secondary rule of jurisdictional limitation, known as the rule of the maxim de minimis non curat lex. The examiner who heard this case recommended that this rule be followed, the Commission ruling otherwise. The Commission, in the Joseph L. Todd case, docket No. 29, said, "The legal doctrine upon which the second rule rests is well recognized, but we shall cite several authorities." I quote the Commission as follows:

"The legal doctrine upon which the second rule rests is well recognized, but we shall cite several authorities.

"There is a long discussion and grouping of authorities in Broom's Legal Maxims (1939 Ed., p. 88, et seq.) from which we quote a brief excerpt:

"'When trifling irregularities or even infractions of the law are brought under notice of the court, the maxim de minimis non curat lex is of frequent application. * * * The law permits the qualification implied in the ancient maxim. * * * If the deviation were a mere trifle, which, if continued in practice, would weigh little or nothing in the public interest, it might properly be overlooked.

"'See also *Love* v. *Spur School District*, et al. (143 SW (2) 793); *Elfer* v. *Hyberna National Bank et al.* ((1937), 174 So. 387); *Hopkins* v. *Kitts* (94 Pac. 1013; *Rose* v. *State* (Cal. 1940), 105 Pac. (2d) 302).

"'In *Bristol-Myers Co.* v. *Lit Brothers* ((1939), 6 Atl. (2) 843) the plaintiff sought an injunction against an alleged violation of a Pennsylvania statute which forbade selling any commodity for less than the price stipulated by contract with the manufacturer. It was claimed that the defendant had violated such a contract with the plaintiff in respect to Ipana Tooth Paste, in that it gave trading stamps with purchases of merchandise, redeemable in merchandise when stamps had been accumulated representing purchases of $99. The minority of the appellate court agreed with the plaintiff that a sale of goods accompanied by trading stamps is a sale at a reduced price. However, the court held in accordance with the following excerpt (p. 848):

"' '"There is also a time honored maxim of the law which applies in this case, to-wit: de minimis non curat lex. As Broom says in his Legal Maxims: Courts of Justice generally do not take trifling and immaterial matters into account. In the Reward (2 Dods, Admr. R. 269), Sir W. Scott observed, 'The court is not bound to a strictness at once harsh and pedantic in the application of statutes.' If * * * a customer spent $99 in Lit Brothers store for the purchase of 396 tubes of Ipana Tooth Paste (a supply adequate for a long life-time) he would be obtaining in the form of merchandise a discount of 1.76 percent."

"'Thus, apparently holding that a discount of 1.76 percent was de minimis, the court refused an injunction.

"'We now, to show a similar recognition of the maxim by the Supreme Court, quote an excerpt from an opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Stone (1939) in *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Feinblatt, et al.* (306 U.S. 601):

"' '"Examining the act in the light of its purpose and in the circumstances in which it must be applied, we can perceive no basis for inferring any intention of Congress to make the operation of the act depend upon any particular volume of commerce affected more than that to which the courts would apply the maxim de minimis."' '"

If the range of percentages under the de minimis rule runs as high as 1.76 percent to a low of one-tenth of 1 percent, then the percentage of time spent as to total federally aided projects of less than 0.063 percent is within the range and the Commission should have followed this rule in the instant case.

The next question raised by the petitioners is that the director of conservation is not employed in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from the United States or any Federal agency. The record here shows that the State of Illinois, on fish and game matters, spends its money to complete projects that are eligible for Federal reimbursement

upon approval of a project plan. Thus the proportionate part of the money is repaid to the State in accordance with the terms of the cooperative contracts entered into under the sanction of State and Federal law on the subject. Since no money is to be repaid to the United States, it cannot be said that a loan is involved in the commonly accepted definition of a loan. The term "loan" is not defined in the Hatch Act. All words in a legislative enactment, absent a definition in the act itself, must be ascribed their accepted, understood meaning. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th edition, page 1085, defines a loan as a "lending or borrowing of money or other personal property by a person who promises to return it; that which one lends or borrows." Accordingly since under this definition, and as the term "loan" is generally understood, it cannot be said that a loan is involved as to any fish and game contract matter. The same is true as to projects under the Clarke-McNary Act, the Cooperative Foust Management Act of 1950, and the soil bank program. State money is spent, and, after approval by the appropriate Federal agency, reimbursement may be received. No Federal money is repaid, so no loan is involved.

The next question as to whether a grant is involved, since the term "grant" is not defined in the Hatch Act, causes one to look to the meaning of the term. In Webster's New International Dictionary, the term "grant" is defined as "to bestow or confer, with or without compensation," and "a gift or bestowal by one having control or authority over it, as of land, money, etc.," page 1089. While it is true that the State spends its money, anticipating a return of a portion of it, I believe that the term "grant" is broad enough to include the Federal moneys returned or to be returned to the State, under the record in this case.

The facts and law as herein set out are adopted as findings of fact and conclusions of law by the court, and for the reasons herein set out the court finds and determines that the order of the U.S. Civil Service Commission is not in accordance with law.

Accordingly this case is remanded to the Commission with directions to set aside the order, and to dismiss the letter of charges.

Entered this 12th day of January 1961.

HEALTH CARE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the message from the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the message has been read in the House of Representatives and will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate dispense with the reading of the message.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the President's message be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Finance, and that each committee consider those portions of the message which relate to its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

UNITED STATES-SOVIET MISSILE CAPABILITIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 7 there was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald an article written by John G. Norris, staff reporter, under the caption "No Missile Gap Exists, Defense Study Shows."

On the same day there was published in the New York Times, under the byline of Mr. Jack Raymond, an article of substantially the same temper. The title is, "Kennedy Defense Study Finds No Evidence of a Missile Gap."

The first sentence in the Norris article reads as follows:

> Current defense studies by the Kennedy administration indicate that President Eisenhower's downgrading of the dangers of the Soviet missile lead was largely correct, although some stepup in U.S. programs is essential.

I will let the whole article speak for itself, but will read one other sentence. Mr. Norris goes on to state:

> The conclusion reached about the "missile gap" and the dangers it presented are similar to those reached by President Eisenhower and his Pentagon chiefs, and quite different from claims made by many Democratic critics in recent years.

The Raymond article, from the New York Times, is in the same general vein; and there have been other articles along that line.

Now comes something of a denial as to the accuracy of all this, for on the 8th of February, under Mr. Raymond's byline, the New York Times carries the article, "White House Denies Missile Gap Report."

Among other things, a question was directed to Mr. Salinger, the press secretary of the President, with respect to these articles, and he said, "All of them are wrong."

I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense this morning, and I asked him some questions, in the interest of clarification.

I asked, first, if there was a press briefing in the Pentagon by the Secretary of Defense during the first week in February.

Second, if there was such a briefing, whether the people discussed the whole missile problem, including our relationships to this whole problem and our position with respect to the Soviet Union, relative and otherwise.

Third, were all these matters discussed, and did the Secretary see these reports?

Fourth, are these reports in error, or are they correct?

Fifth, is Mr. Salinger right or is he wrong in making the flat statement that all these reports by different and reputable and responsible reporters are wrong?

I think the time has come for a little clarification, mainly so, Mr. President, because this was one of the major items in the campaign of 1960. In the covenant of the party of hope, there was a recital that our military strength was measured in terms of gaps—a missile gap, a space gap, a limited-war gap. There were other recitals to allege and to indicate that the Eisenhower administration had failed in providing adequate security for the country.

Since it was a matter of major controversy and did indeed excite some of the fears and apprehensions of the people, now comes a rather interesting recital out of the Pentagon itself. I should like to know who is right and who is wrong, and whether these very responsible and reputable reporters have given us an inaccurate, inadequate account of what was discussed at the press briefing.

That will be in the nature of authentic and authoritative information for the people of the country, who certainly have the right to know.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief comment, and then I believe the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will wish to make some rejoinder.

There is no doubt that when the news story referred to appeared, many people in Washington—and, I suppose throughout the Nation, and, indeed, the world—were somewhat perplexed by the nature of the headline. On careful examination, however, there is no discrepancy between the concern that leaders of both political parties have had relating to the missile gap and the facts of the situation.

First, we have been told by the Rockefeller brothers in their report of the inadequacy of our defense posture or defense position, including the missile situation.

Second, the Gaither report, which, of course, has never been made public, but about which there has been considerable comment, gave to the American people at least the impression from that comment or commentary that there were serious deficiencies in certain areas of our defense structure.

I think the most important point is to understand that what was reported in the press was the surmise or the analysis of one reporter relating to the comments of an administration official in the year 1961 in terms of total deterrent capacity of our country, rather than merely the singular fact of the missile gap. I think it should also be noted that the greatest concern has been not over either the year 1960 or the year 1961, but the dangers that could be ours in the years 1962, 1963, and on up to 1965.

I am no expert in this field, but I have listened to the argument and I have read the press articles, together with many reports of committees. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as reported by the Baltimore Sun, made it quite clear that he feels that there is

reason to be concerned. As I understand, the Committee on Armed Services will go into this subject in some detail in late February.

More importantly, the Defense Secretary, Mr. McNamara, is now in the first few weeks of an examination of the defense structure and defense strength of this country.

I believe the Wall Street Journal takes a rather fair and reasoned approach to this problem. An article in the Wall Street Journal of today's date states as follows:

MEANING OF "MISSILE GAP"

The "missile gap" phrase refers to a fear, often expressed by Democratic critics of the Eisenhower administration's defense programs, that Russia would have combat-ready between 1961 and 1963 more long-range missiles than the United States would.

The news accounts of the briefing emphasized the supposed finding of "no missile gap" without explaining that this appraisal was an offhand impression. And these accounts centered only on the missile situation today, not on the outlook during the potential "missile gap" period, 1961 to 1963.

What is more significant, the story revealed that the answer given to certain questions placed before the administration official—and I believe the administration official must have been Mr. McNamara of the Defense Department—was that there was no destruction gap or no deterrent gap between the United States and Russia, nor was one foreseen in the immediate future. Besides it was said that counting missiles alone is not a valid way to consider the overall U.S. military strength.

Senators who are members of the Committee on the Armed Forces know this and have explained it to the Senate repeatedly.

All I wish to say, Mr. President, is, Let us hope and pray that there is no missile gap.

Let us not revel in the thought that there might be one, but let us also be willing to face up to the fact that there could be one, and that we should withhold a positive and conclusive judgment until all the facts are in. That is what this Government is attempting to do—to learn the facts, to learn the truth, and to relate the truth. When the truth comes out, if it reveals that the strength of this Nation is adequate to meet any foe, every Member of Congress of the United States will rejoice. If we find it is not adequate, it is the duty of the Congress and the administration to alter that unfavorable balance and to bring the strength of the United States up to whatever is required.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, may the morning business be closed?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion about the problem of time in the morning hour. I was present on the floor of the Senate when the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] took what seemed to me a logical position and was allowed to continue. I now ask unanimous consent to comment on some of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I hope this missile gap discussion will not be made a partisan matter. The entire defense program is now being investigated by the President of the United States. He has access to all the reports, referred to by the distinguished assistant majority leader.

Now there appears to be a considerable difference of opinion about the press stories. The assistant majority leader has placed in the RECORD a story from the Wall Street Journal.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a story published in the Baltimore Sun this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY AWAITING PENTAGON'S "MISSILE GAP" REPORT, PROMISES TO GIVE CONGRESS DATA IF U.S. LAG EXISTS—WEAPONS JUDGMENT WOULD BE PREMATURE NOW, PRESIDENT SAYS—RUSSELL CALLS ROCKET LAG REAL BUT HE DENIES CONCERN

(By Gerald Griffin)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—President Kennedy said today that it would be premature to reach a judgment on the "missile gap"—a comparison of the missile strength of the United States and the Soviet Union—until Defense Department studies are completed.

"Of course," Mr. Kennedy said during his press conference, "it is my hope that the United States is fully secure. I will be pleased if that is the result.

"If it is not, I think it is important that we know about it, and I will say that we will then, or that I will then, take on responsibility of passing on to the Congress this collective judgment as to our position, and what needs to be done."

(Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, quoted last night by the Associated Press from Winder, Ga., said the missile gap is real.

(But the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee added he is "not so concerned about it as some of my Democratic colleagues in the Congress—we are rapidly closing the gap."

(RUSSELL took issue with a since disclaimed report from a high Pentagon source that no missile gap exists.

("There's no question a missile gap does exist," RUSSELL said. "Russia is ahead of us in that she has more powerful rocket engines, engines with more powerful thrust.")

The President undertook, during his meeting with reporters, to calm down the renewed argument over the missile gap which burst out yesterday as a result of press reports that the Pentagon high command thinks there is no missile gap at present—seemingly contrary to one of the central points of Mr. Kennedy's election campaign.

BRIDGES RESUMES ATTACK

But the argument went on today. Senator BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate GOP Policy Committee, said that Mr. Kennedy appeared to feel it necessary to try to "squelch the candor of the Pentagon."

Another Republican, Senator BUSH, of Connecticut, sent a letter to Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, urging that the committee hold hearings in the near future on the Nation's defense posture, "with special reference to the so-called missile gap."

"I can understand," BUSH wrote, "why newspaper stories that the new administration has found a nonexistent missile gap are embarrassing to the President. A substantial part of his campaign was based upon assertions that such a gap not only existed, but was getting larger and larger.

REVERSE ITS FIELD

BRIDGES said the Kennedy administration, in dealing with the missile situation, "has shown an ability to reverse its field as quickly as the best college halfback."

The New Hampshire Senator said that Democratic campaigners, including Mr. Kennedy, had spoken of a growing missile gap during the autumn election campaign. Then, said BRIDGES, word came from administration—no gap.

"Today," he continued, "we heard still another version of the missile story when Mr. Kennedy told his news conference that it would be premature at this time to say whether a gap does or does not exist."

Asserting that the Kennedy administration is confused and lacking in coordination, BRIDGES said further: "We only hope that the next 4 years of the Kennedy administration will not be characterized by the same fumbling that has attended the release of information about U.S. missile capabilities."

One view at the Pentagon is that no missile gap, or more properly, no destruction gap, exists between the United States and the Soviet Union. The point is that the combined strength of the United States—its missiles plus its manned bombers and Polaris submarines—is held to be sufficient to act as a deterrent force to the Soviet Union.

Former President Eisenhower, before leaving office last month, spoke of the missile gap as fiction.

SEES NO "CRASH PROGRAM"

The Eisenhower administration belief was that the Soviet Union had not engaged in a "crash program" to produce long-range missiles and thus had not in fact produced as many as it might have; hence that the missile gap, projected 2 years ago for 1961, had not actually developed.

This belief arose in part from what had happened earlier in the case of heavy bombers. The Soviet Union had developed a heavy bomber comparable to the American B–52, and as a result of that the United States had stepped up its own production of the B–52, but the Russian bomber apparently was not produced in large numbers.

CONCEDED IN 1959

But those Pentagon officials who feel that the missile gap does not exist now, as it was projected 2 years ago, also are understood to believe that a gap would develop if the United States did not go further than it has gone.

Two years ago the Eisenhower administration had conceded the possibility that by 1961 or thereabouts the Soviet strength in intercontinental missiles might be three times greater than that of the United States, although it was argued then that the United States still would have an adequate deterrent force (with its planes) and that in subsequent years, as solid-fuel missiles came into operational use, the gap would be narrowed.

Democrats, among them Mr. Kennedy, Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and others, argued that greater effort on the part of the United States was called for, and that production of such long-range missiles should be stepped up.

In most of the discussions the missile gap was something that was projected into the future, rather than a matter of the immediate present.

CALLED INACCURATE

Yesterday the White House press secretary described as inaccurate the press reports

stating that the Pentagon believed that no missile gap existed. The White House also emphasized that there has been no change in the traditional American policy against starting a preventive war.

This morning the matter was raised at Mr. Kennedy's press conference, by this question:

"Mr. President, in the past 24 hours there has arisen a somewhat hard-to-understand situation concerning the missile gap. An official of your administration, who was identified in some newspapers this morning as Secretary McNamara, has been quoted as saying that the missile gap which was expected and talked about so much did not exist, nor did he see prospects of it.

"ASKS CLARIFICATION

"Your press secretary yesterday afternoon denied the story. Now, I wonder if you can set this record clear, if you can tell us your version of what Secretary McNamara said, and what your feelings are about the missile gap, and how and where does it exist?"

In reply, Mr. Kennedy said:

"My only conversation with Mr. McNamara was not at any off-the-record meeting, if such a meeting took place, but was in a conversation which I had with him yesterday afternoon after the reports appeared.

"Mr. McNamara stated that no study had been concluded in the Defense Department which would lead to any conclusion at this time as to whether there is a missile gap or not.

TALKS WITH SUBORDINATES

"In addition, I talked this morning to Mr. (Charles J.) Hitch, who is the comptroller of the Defense Department, who has been given the responsibility by the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of our strategic weapons, in the same way that Mr. (Paul) Nitze (Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs) is conducting a review of our tactical weapons. Mr. Hitch informed me that no study has been completed on this matter.

"He hoped to have a preliminary study completed by February 20, but he did tell me quite specifically that as of today he is not prepared to make a judgment as to our capacity in strategic weapons.

"There are complicated problems involved. We have the realization that the United States will not strike first and, therefore, we have to consider what will be available to the United States if an attack took place upon us, not only in missiles but also in the other arms of our arsenal, SAC (Strategic Air Command) the Navy, Polaris, and all the rest.

"So I think in answer to your question, the study has not been completed, and it has not come, therefore, across my desk.

"There will be a study of how the budget for fiscal 1961 and 1962 should be changed in view of our strategic position, but that study will not be completed by either Mr. Nitze or Mr. Hitch, or come across Mr. McNamara's desk to be passed to me for some days."

Mr. Kennedy was asked if he feels as strongly about the existence of a missile gap now as he did during the political campaign.

"What I hope to do," he answered, "is to wait until the Defense Department who I have given this responsibility to, Mr. McNamara, and he has passed the responsibility to members of his Department, and I hope that we will have a clearer answer to that question."

WOULD BE PREMATURE

"So that without getting into the discussion of these stories this morning, I did want to say that it is my information that these studies are not complete, and therefore it would be premature to reach a judgment as to whether there is a gap or not a gap."

Another reporter, referring to the evidence that the press dispatches about the missile gap had come from reporters at a background meeting with Secretary McNamara, asked the President what he thinks about such briefings.

"Well," said Mr. Kennedy, "they are hazardous in many cases, and I believe Mr. McNamara might agree with that."

SEES VALUE IN BRIEFINGS

"On the other hand, we will say that they are important, too. I hope it would be possible to work out some satisfactory system where reporters who are charged with covering matters which are particularly complicated, where they would have a chance to discuss with the responsible official on a background basis so that their stories would be more accurate.

"We have—I believe there have been such conversations in this administration already and they have been, I think, useful. This one—evidently a controversy has arisen from it, but I hope that it will be possible for the responsible officials and the reporters who are particularly concerned with that area to work out ground rules so that they could be continued."

Mr. SYMINGTON. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington Post of February 8, 1961, entitled "The Real Gap."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL GAP

The reports that the Soviet Union apparently has not made full use of its lead in military rocketry to create the long-anticipated "missile gap" of the early 1960's need to be kept in careful perspective. Of first importance is the credibility of the information which must, of necessity, be founded upon the limited intelligence available on Soviet military preparations.

If the estimates of missile production are based, as in the past, upon evidence of rocket base construction, they may be subject to considerable error. There is no certainty that fixed bases are involved, even less certainty about what a base might look like. And vast areas of the Soviet heartland are effectively closed.

True or false, the report of present American-Soviet intercontinental missile production parity is apparently at some variance with the latest confidential estimates provided to Congress. More serious, standing alone as it does, this kind of information is extremely misleading, almost irrelevant. It takes no account of the "gap" that really bothers serious students of evolving military technology: the long Soviet headstart in rocketry which, as former Defense Secretary McElroy conceded, gives that country a capacity to outproduce the United States by a critical margin in the next few years.

Nor does it take account of the relative vulnerability of Soviet and American ICBM's, of the advantage that lies with the potential attacker, of the well-known Soviet superiority in short and medium-range missiles blanketing American bases in Europe and of the host of other factors which determine the effectiveness of missile capabilities. The chief strategic threats which the United States and the Soviet Union pose for each other now are their large fleets of supersonic bombers, each capable of getting through to the other side in substantial numbers with their city-leveling loads of H-bombs. The missile rivalry is a rivalry of development to which present production figures offer only a clue.

The stark fact is that the United States now has a handful of cumbersome Atlas ICBM's in well-advertised, "soft" sites that add virtually nothing to the deterrent posture. This country has the beginnings of a Polaris missile submarine fleet of great promise and of very limited immediate utility. It has in prospect for several years hence the less vulnerable Minuteman ICBM and some fancy ideas on airborne missile launchers. Whatever the Soviet Union has today, this country has far to go before its missiles will constitute a broad deterrent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In discussing the recent actions of the Secretary of Defense, I point out that the Secretary of Defense needs no defense from me or anyone else. He is a dedicated public servant. After calling an open press conference, Mr. McNamara was asked by members of the press to give them a background press conference, which, as we all know, is often customary in Washington. Such procedure has been followed by many others. The Secretary of Defense acceded to their wishes. It is unfortunate that now there appears to be a difference of opinion among the newsmen as to what was or was not said.

When the subject came to the attention of the White House, as a result of differences of opinion in the press, the President's position was quite clear. His able press secretary stated,

No such studies have been completed, and no such finding has been made in any study up to the present. Therefore the stories are inaccurate and they do not represent the facts.

So much for that. Comments have been made about the Gaither report, and the Rockefeller report; also there is the report of the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee, presided over by the Vice President, of which committee I had the honor to be a member.

These reports show clearly more defense effort needs to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for a short additional period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I now refer to page 10 of the mimeographed copy of the President's state of the Union speech. On page 10 he said he wanted to promptly accelerate our missile program. This whole subject of missile gap came up 2 years ago when the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, was candid enough to state that at that time we were planning to allow the Russians to obtain a three-to-one lead in long-range missiles.

I have checked, and as of the next due date that lead will be more than 3 to 1, based on estimates we have of the ratios. Of course I cannot disclose the figure. To do so would be to disclose classified information. But inasmuch as Mr. McElroy was forthright enough to give the ratio, I make this comment about the ratio this morning.

Mr. President, if there had not been a calculated and deliberate effort on the part of the previous administration to prevent the now President of the United States from obtaining adequate information as late as last fall about the security of the United States unquestionably at this time he would be in a better position to tell the American people

what the facts are with respect to this whole problem of the missile gap, instead of stating frankly that he wanted a little more time to study the matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. SYMINGTON rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me ask whether the Senator from Arkansas wishes to speak.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I wish to listen to what the Senator from Illinois has to say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am honored beyond words.

To conclude my observations, Mr. President, on the question of the missile gap, I say in all earnestness that I listened, along with, I suppose, 50 million other Americans, when the Democrat covenant was offered last summer. All those who listened had to take account of the language used. The language used with respect to our security was as follows—and now I quote from the platform adopted by the Democrat Party in Los Angeles on July 12, 1960:

When the Democratic administration left office in 1953, the United States was the preeminent power in the world. Most free nations had confidence in our will and our ability to carry out our commitments to the common defense.

Even those who wished us ill respected our power and influence.

The Republican administration has lost that position of preeminence. Over the past 7½ years, our military power has steadily declined relative to that of the Russians and the Chinese and their satellites.

This is not a partisan election-year charge. It has been persistently made by high officials of the Republican administration itself. Before congressional committees they have testified that the Communists will have a dangerous lead in intercontinental missiles through 1963—and that the Republican administration has no plans to catch up.

They have admitted that the Soviet Union leads in the space race—and that they have no plans to catch up.

They have also admitted that our conventional military forces, on which we depend for defense in any nonnuclear war, have been dangerously slashed for reasons of "economy"—and that they had no plans to reverse this trend.

As a result, our military position today is measured in terms of gaps—missile gap, space gap, limited war gap.

Mr. President, the word used there is "gap"—"g-a-p"—many gaps—a "missile gap," a "space gap," a "limited-war gap."

Our countrymen, including some fellow "frontiersmen," heard that come from Los Angeles. I did not say that; it is included in the Democrat platform, and the Democrats made it an issue.

Now come responsible reporters from a briefing with the Secretary of Defense, at the Pentagon; and now we are told—as I recited earlier today—that the Eisenhower estimate of this situation was correct. Who is wrong? Who is right? Are those at the Pentagon right or wrong? Have these reporters misinterpreted everything and conveyed further confusion to the country? I am just as much interested in knowing the truth as is anyone else.

Many years ago a candidate, Wendell Willkie, came before a Senate committee and fenced off a question; he said it was "a lot of campaign oratory."

Mr. President, I am interested in the security of the country, and I did not make the statement to which I have referred. It was made this week at the Pentagon. But the press secretary at the White House said all those reporters are wrong. I simply wish to know who is wrong and who is right.

Mr. President, in connection with this matter, I ask that these remarks and my earlier remarks be assembled at one point in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the various press dispatches to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles are as follows:

WHITE HOUSE DENIES MISSLE GAP "DENIAL"

(By John G. Norris)

The White House said last night that news reports that the Kennedy administration has concluded that there is no missile gap between the United States and Russia are inaccurate.

The news stories, carried in a number of newspapers, referred to Pentagon studies.

"No such studies have been completed and no such finding has been made in any study up to the present," Press Secretary Pierre Salinger declared. "Therefore the stories are inaccurate—do not represent the facts."

Salinger issued the statement after conferring with President Kennedy. He saw Mr. Kennedy along with other Government press officials, including Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

The articles, carried by news services and some newspapers, including the Washington Post, varied in some respects. The Post stated that "current defense studies by the Kennedy administration indicate that President Eisenhower's downgrading of the Soviet missile lead was largely correct although some stepup in U.S. programs is essential."

The story declared that the studies were incomplete and are being made with a view to proposing changes in the Nation's defense program next month.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1961]

NO MISSILE GAP EXISTS, DEFENSE STUDY SHOWS

(By John G. Norris)

Current defense studies by the Kennedy administration indicate that President Eisenhower's downgrading of the dangers of the Soviet missile lead was largely correct, although some stepup in U.S. programs is essential.

An urgent reappraisal of the Nation's military strategy and defense situation is underway within the Government, with a view to proposing changes early next month in the Eisenhower arms budget now before Congress.

Conclusions now are that there is no evidence that Russia has embarked on a "crash" program of building intercontinental ballistic missiles or that any "missile gap" exists today.

The studies show, it is understood, that Russia and the United States have about the same number of ICBM's at present—not a very large number.

They also conclude that while the U.S.S.R. may well gain the lead in the next few years in this crucial weapon, American military superiority in bombers, aircraft carriers, and submarine-launched missiles will prevent any gap in overall strength.

This conclusion does not mean that the Kennedy administration will not ask for any increase in the big missile program or other retaliatory strength. On the contrary, there is every indication that some boosts will be asked, to assure against uncertainties in intelligence estimates and provide a margin of error in case of unforeseen contingencies.

CONCLUSIONS BACK IKE

The conclusions reached about the missile gap and the dangers it presented are similar to those reached by President Eisenhower and his Pentagon chiefs, and quite different from claims made by many Democratic critics in recent years.

Some of these critics have predicted that Russia would gain a 3-to-1 lead in ICBM's in the early 1960's and that this gap would widen. Former Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy once conceded that a 3-to-1 margin was possible if Russia built as many missiles as American intelligence indicated she was capable of, and the U.S. program built what it then planned.

Estimates were published 2 years ago that Russia would have 100 ICBM's and the United States 30 by this time. Both have proved too high.

INCREASES TO BE URGED

The Eisenhower administration used to argue that American bomber superiority assured there would be no deterrent gap even if there was a Soviet missile lead. The new administration is expected to maintain that if its recommendations are followed there will be no destruction gap ahead—that is a period when Russia would have superior power to wreak destruction on the West.

Despite, this, the new administration is expected to recommend bolstering national defense in a number of areas. The surveys now underway at the Pentagon under direction of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara are reported to tentatively include some 25 to 30 items for increase in the budget.

While the Joint Chiefs of Staff are taking part in these studies as they move forward, a fresh viewpoint has been introduced by bringing in more than a dozen outside strategic planning experts from the Rand Corp.

The studies so far are said to have convinced leaders that neither the Air Force counterforce preemptive war concept nor the Navy finite deterrent theory—the other extreme—are sound, but that some middle course strategy is more advisable.

During the political campaign, Mr. Kennedy was critical of the Eisenhower military record, but did not go as far as some other Democrats in talking about the danger of the missile gap. He did call for increased Polaris and Minuteman missile production, a stepped-up bomber air alert capacity and increased modernization and mobility for limited war land forces.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal, Feb. 5, 1961]

THERE GOES THE MISSILE GAP

(By C. L. Dancey)

We have shot off so many missiles and so many kinds of missiles in the past 3 years, that probably few of us realize how really dramatic were the events of the past week.

One longtime science expert from a big metropolitan newspaper shouted out: "There goes the missile gap!" in a fever of excitement when the Minuteman roared into the blue at Cape Canaveral. Certainly, the whole missile business turned an important corner.

The Russians beat us to the punch with the original style, Model-T, liquid fuel missiles, and built one with a much bigger powerplant, but the future belongs to whoever graduates fastest into entirely new types of power-driven rockets, and we have made a very significant step in the past week.

As we have said here many times, the liquid-fueled missile has never been a real, usable military weapon because of the long periods of time required to fuel it—a process that cannot begin until you decide to shoot it, usually.

It has to have "lox" or liquid oxygen to oxidize the fuel, and this means intense refrigeration, delicate fueling, and very complicated "plumbing" systems.

It just isn't a quick action much less "pushbutton" weapon, no matter how much metal it can throw into space, or how fast it can travel with an H-bomb once it gets underway.

Sure, it can get to a target in 20 minutes—but what good is that if it takes a week to gas it up for the trip.

The Navy Polaris was the first "new generation" missile. With a solid fuel (which has much the consistency of hard rubber, like the heel of a shoe) it can be readied in minutes and fired quickly from beneath the sea. (This past week saw the seventh Polaris submarine launched, incidentally. That program is moving very quickly.)

However, the Polaris has a limited range.

The Air Force has been working on a solid fuel ICBM that will go thousands of miles, called the Minuteman. It plans to stow them, unmanned, ready for shooting, in underground pits.

A man in he..dquarters can then literally push a button and from behind a farmer's barn in North Dakota send an H-bomb screaming toward Moscow.

They tried it for the first time last week—and it worked the first time. This may move the whole program up a full year. More than that, this time for the first time in rocket history, the Air Force took an historic gamble. Instead of this being just the start of normal testing—one stage at a time, and finally the guidance system, they decided that in testing the first stage they would assemble the whole package and see what happened.

Everything worked.

This may revolutionize methods, too, and thus speed up other programs.

Other services were not idle while this tremendous breakthrough in the area of military missiles was being made. The Air Force itself launched another Samos into orbit, bringing close the day when we'll have a camera system that will make the U–2 look like a buckboard in the old West.

The Navy, as we mentioned, launched a seventh Polaris sub, as the fleet of underwater patrol boats carrying 16 such rockets each rapidly grows.

The Army provided a Redstone rocket, and the civilian space agency, NASA, used it to launch a chimpanzee into space and back without injury—and he performed trained functions while in flight. Man in space is coming soon. If the Russians don't do it pretty soon—we will.

This has been an historic week. In the words of one top civilian rocket scientist, we have this week substantially pushed back the chances of war for another 7 years.

These new weapons will make it very unwise for the Russians to go to war.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1961]

KENNEDY DEFENSE STUDY FINDS NO EVIDENCE OF A "MISSILE GAP"

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—Studies made since Inauguration Day indicate that the predicted "missile gap" has not yet developed.

The term was widely used during the defense debate that raged 2 years ago, when the Eisenhower administration disclosed it was planning to build fewer intercontinental ballistic missiles than the Soviet Union was capable of producing.

At that time, there were widely published reports that by 1960 the Soviet Union could have 35 nuclear-armed, 5,000-mile-range ballistic missiles to 18 for the United States, and in 1961, 140 to 200 against the United States 54.

There were other published estimates, indicating a similar possible Soviet advantage.

The United States now has at least 9 operational Atlas missiles, along with 2 missile-armed Polaris submarines, each bearing 16 medium-range ballistic missiles.

The Kennedy administration, in studying the country's defense posture, also is understood to have come to the conclusion that the Soviets did not engage in a "crash program" to build intercontinental ballistic missiles.

It appeared from early conclusions that the Soviet Union did not produce as many such missiles as it could have.

At the same time, it is reported that early studies have reinforced the view of the new administration that strategic planning in the past has had many shortcomings.

A study is now underway, ordered by President Kennedy, to determine before the end of the month whether any major changes should be made in the $41 billion defense budget, based on possible alterations in national military strategy.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and his chief aides returned today from a 2-day visit to Strategic Air Command Headquarters and the targeting center at Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr., as part of the strategic appraisal.

He was accompanied by Deputy Secretary Roswell H. Gilpatrick; Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Dr. Herbert F. York, Director of Research and Development; and Dr. Marvin Stern, assistant research director for research and development.

Their visit concerned the U.S. policies on the number of possible enemy targets for which the Nation must prepare, and whether some of the money now going into strategic weapons might not be used for other purposes.

The conclusion that the United States has not entered a period of a "missile gap" is expected to be an important factor in the report on the subject, which will contain budget recommendations.

The basic strategic reappraisal is being conducted by Charles J. Hitch, the Pentagon Controller.

Mr. Hitch, who came to the Pentagon from the Rand Corp., a private research firm that frequently handles Air Force projects, has reinforced his study group with about 10 Rand experts for the report now in preparation.

However, officials of the Army, Navy, and Air Force also have been brought into the preparation of the study. Pentagon authorities have made clear that they are not keeping the services out of the strategic reappraisal, even in its earliest stages.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 8, 1961]

WHITE HOUSE DENIES MISSILE GAP REPORT

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The White House branded as inaccurate today reports that the Kennedy administration had tentatively concluded that there was no missile gap favoring the Soviet Union.

President Kennedy was understood to have been disturbed by the appearance this morning of newspaper reports citing preliminary conclusions of his administration on the subject.

Pierre Salinger, White House press secretary, issued a statement, with President Kennedy's specific approval, that the reports were absolutely wrong.

He would not comment when asked whether these articles had not emanated from an informal meeting between reporters and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara at the Pentagon last evening.

"No such study has been completed," he said. "No such finding has been made in any such study. The stories, therefore, are inaccurate."

The White House also denied, as reported in a Washington newspaper, that the administration was changing its policy against waging any but a retaliatory nuclear war.

The White House denials were issued after Mr. Salinger and other administration information officials met at the White House.

These officials included Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, and Roger Tubby, who holds a similar post at the State Department.

Mr. Salinger was asked whether the President had sat in on the session, and he replied, "No, we went to see him."

Mr. Salinger said that he and his colleagues had discussed the published reports with Mr. Kennedy, but that he would not want to characterize how the President feels.

"I think you know me well enough to know that I rarely make any statements of substance without first discussing it with him," Mr. Salinger said.

The administration was believed to have been sensitive to the reports because so much of the Democratic campaign against the Republicans in recent years was based on the argument over a missile gap.

The defense debate 2 years ago was precipitated when former Secretary of Defense Neil H. McElroy stated that if the Soviet Union built as many intercontinental missiles as it was capable of building, it would have a 3-to-1 advantage over the United States by 1961.

There were various published estimates, confirming the idea that the Soviets could produce more missiles than the United States was planning to produce. This was termed the "missile gap."

In his final state of the Union message last month, President Eisenhower said that the missile gap had proved to be as much of a "fiction" as an earlier concern over a Soviet edge in long-range bombers.

President Kennedy, during the campaign, spoke in New York on the subject, arguing for crash programs to eventually close the missile gap.

Earlier, on August 26, he charged that the missile lag looms larger and larger.

On September 11, in San Diego, Calif., he again cited the missile lag, saying that danger of Soviet missile attack would grow as the Russians built up their reported edge.

Last year, when Eisenhower administration officials sought to impress Congress with new intelligence estimates that the missile gap was not so great as believed earlier, it precipitated a debate over the intelligence estimates themselves.

The published reports today brought a number of Republican attacks on the Democrats for their past criticism of Eisenhower administration's defense policies.

Republican Representatives JOHN RHODES of Arizona and MEL. LAIRD of Wisconsin called for apologies from President Kennedy. They charged that former President Eisenhower had been slandered in past missile gap charges.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, cited reports of the Kennedy administration's reappraisal.

"This is a long word meaning 'We were wrong,'" Senator SCOTT said.

At his news conference, Mr. Salinger was asked why four published articles should all say the same thing on the missile gap. He replied:

"I can only tell you they are absolutely wrong. These studies are not anywhere near completed. Therefore no conclusions have been drawn.

"The stories do not represent the facts."

Asked whether it was a fair conclusion that he was expressing the President's views, Mr. Salinger replied:

"You could make that assumption; yes, sir."

Mr. Salinger said he would not know whether the stories had emanated from a background briefing.

The usual rules for such meetings of newsmen and high Government officials permit use of the material as matters of fact but no attribution to the source.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in reply to my friend from Illinois, let me emphasize that the first message the President sent to Congress called for acceleration of the missile program, acceleration—specifically—of specific missile programs, and also acceleration of the modernity and mobility of the U.S. Army. Now again the President clarified in no uncertain terms this matter of these press assertions. I have already read that clarification into the RECORD. It would be redundant to do it again.

The distinguished minority leader has referred to the Democratic platform. Again may I refer to most unfortunate circumstances. After the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts had been nominated by his party, when he wanted to find out information which would make it possible, after his election, for him to reach decisions with greater celerity, the previous administration, nevertheless, carefully planned and refrained from giving him the information he requested.

Mr. President, I must say that, although there may be some difference of opinion as to exactly what was said or was not said by those who participated in a background press conference called at the request of reporters, there can be no difference of opinion whatever about the fact the President of the United States was refused information he requested about our national defense—as late as last fall. I may add that as a Senator he was completely entitled to the information in question, even though apparently there were in the country at that time some misguided people who apparently felt he would not be elected, because as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he had complete access to information on our own military status and the reports of the Central Intelligence Agency, which briefs the Foreign Relations Committee, and makes up the national intelligence estimates of the United States.

I regret that today there are some who appear to be making a major partisan matter of this affair, as we go into 4 years under the leadership of our great new President, just elected by the people of the United States. To those who would try to make a partisan matter out of a difference of opinion on the part of some newspapermen, let me point out the partisanship of those who, last fall, made it necessary for the President to spend more time, after he was elected, in obtaining the facts about the defense of the United States—facts he went out of his way to try to obtain before his election.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I do not have available to me the transcript of what was said at the Defense Department background press briefing. However, I believe it would be helpful to the American people to keep in mind certain distinctions in terminology.

First, if we are talking about a missile gap, and we define it to mean the difference in the total number of missiles that we have operational on launching pads, as compared with what the Soviets have, the answer is clear, without dispute, that the Soviets have more operational intercontinental ballistic missiles than we have.

Second, if we are talking about a missile deterrent, the argument is over the question: Will our overall retaliatory force, including our long-range bomber force, offset the Soviet advantage in operational intercontinental ballistic missiles?

The thinking at the present time—and I have always said this—is that our long-range bomber force, with the alert being increased, does now offset the numerical advantage which the Soviets have over us in operational intercontinental ballistic missiles.

What the great debate has centered around in the past and what it still centers around today is the question: Where will we be next year and the year after?

I remember vividly the testimony of General Schriever before the Preparedness Subcommittee within the last year or so when he said, in effect, there is nothing you can do now to overcome the numerical advantage the Soviets have in ICBM's, because we did not order them when we should have ordered them. In other words, there is a lag of time.

To corroborate the concern of the President of the United States about this situation, I can only refer to one of the first acts the President took, and that was to step up the Polaris missile program and to step up our other intercontinental ballistic missile programs. What better evidence of concern do we have than the fact that the President took this action?

If any Senator wishes to stand on the floor of the Senate and tell the American public that the Soviets, as of now, do not have more operational intercontinental ballistic missiles than we have, and that we do not have to step up our own programs to prevent the Soviet advantage from becoming greater, I would like to have that Senator come forward at this time and say it. It is contrary to the sworn testimony that we have had before our committee from people who seek no partisan advantage. I believe it would be a disservice to the people of our country if the wrong impression were conveyed.

MRS. SARA R. McKEE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in the Washington Star reporting the passing, yesterday, at the age of 101, of Mrs. Sara R. McKee.

Mrs. McKee was a distinguished Wyoming woman who, with her husband, Thomas L. McKee, founded one of Wyoming's morning newspapers, the Laramie Republican. She attended the University of Wyoming. She stands as one of the hallmarks of Wyoming history. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. MCKEE, 101, EX-NEWSWOMAN

Mrs. Sara R. McKee, 101, a former newspaperwoman and a longtime resident of the District, died Tuesday night at her home, 2900 Connecticut Avenue NW., after a heart attack.

A native of Slippery Rock, Pa., Mrs. McKee, the former Sara Riddle, attended schools in Slippery Rock, and the University of Wyoming in Laramie.

She was the widow of Thomas L. McKee, who founded the Laramie Republican and the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) Daily American. Mrs. McKee worked for both papers.

She was a member of Francis Asbury Methodist Church, 3146 16th Street NW., and had been active in churchwork for years.

She leaves a son, Ray A. McKee, of the home address.

Services will be at 11 a.m. tomorrow at the Hines Funeral Home, 14th and Harvard Streets NW. Burial will be in Aberdeen.

MILITARY ORATORY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Military Oratory Needed Restraint," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Washington Post of February 4, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY ORATORY NEEDED RESTRAINT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The decision of the Kennedy administration to tone down the speeches of the generals on foreign policy is absolutely right, has long been needed.

It is no reflection on the able, dedicated leaders of the armed services, including Adm. Arleigh Burke who was first to be affected.

Evidently Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, with White House approval, has decided to put promptly into practice, the wise credo of Teddy Roosevelt: "Speak softly but carry a big stick."

In directing the military to lower their voices in the cold war, President Kennedy is not planning to give the services less to work with; he is acting to give them more—more defensive power, more limited-war capability. But he is, in effect, directing the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other Pentagon orators to talk about it less.

The administration's decision rests upon a new tactic and an old principle.

The new tactic of the United States is to take some of the name calling out of the cold war and to see if the Soviets might like to follow suit.

The old principle is that significant pronouncements of foreign policy, including foreign military policy, should be made by the President or the Secretary of State. The exceptions are when some other high official of the Government is expressly chosen to do so for a special purpose.

The issue here is not at all one of censorship, but a matter of responsible government. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are advisers to the President. They are advisers to Congress. It is their duty to give their candid opinions to congressional committees when they are asked. But they are not advisers to the country. Therefore, when they speak publicly it is their duty to expound the policies of the President and to speak as little or as much as the President directs.

There are plenty of reasons to justify the decision that Admiral Burke and Air Force

Chief of Staff Gen. Thomas White rewrite a couple of speeches. Too much speaking and too much tough speaking especially when it treads on foreign policy, downgrades and weakens the President's pronouncements in the eyes of other governments.

Such speeches risk misstatement and invite misunderstanding. It isn't just the generals and the admirals who have occasionally done harm by talking out of turn. It is the brigadier generals and colonels and the others down the line who at one time or another, have played into the hands of the Communist propagandists by talking about dropping the bomb and preventive war and thus adding to the false image of America the Communists try to paint.

There well may be times to raise the Nation's voice louder than usual, but if too many raise their voices too often, there will be no way for the world to know which voice is talking policy and which voice is just talking.

I do not suggest that our civilian leaders are necessarily wiser than many of our military leaders. It would not be easy to match the abilities of such men as Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gen. Maxwell Taylor. Actually former Secretary of State Acheson must wish he could withdraw the speech made in 1949 which conveyed the impression to the Communists that we would not rush to its defense if South Korea were attacked. I am simply emphasizing that since the civilian leaders must control the final decisions, they should control the speeches.

No blame attaches to either Admiral Burke or Gen. Thomas White. They submitted their speeches through proper channels. They accepted the decision with grace.

Fortunately the man who had to begin the new speech-editing task and will have to bear the brunt of a thankless but necessary job is a stern-willed, stiff-spined former Washington correspondent of the Newark News, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Arthur Sylvester. Messrs. Kennedy and McNamara chose the right agent.

TELEVISION NETWORK DOMINANCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ol' Network Dominance Raising Corporate Head," written by Lawrence Laurent, and published in the Washington Post of Saturday, February 4, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OL' NETWORK DOMINANCE RAISING CORPORATE HEAD

(By Lawrence Laurent)

A quiet war is raging between Washington television station WMAL–TV and the American Broadcasting Co. Neither station manager Fred S. Houwink nor program director Ted McDowell is willing to talk about the fight, but the station staffers know that a power struggle is taking place and that the station will be the loser.

The public, it should be added, will also lose, with the network stripping the station of its power to meet local needs.

In the most gentlemanly terms, the ABC–TV network wants more of the station's time. It wants to take over the week night 11 p.m. to 12:30 a.m. time period, filling with network news and a repeat collection of Warner Bros. film programs such as "Bourbon Street Beat" and "Cheyenne."

Spokesmen for ABC–TV deny that the station is being pressured to take the new schedule. "All we have done," said a network executive, "is to offer our affiliates additional service. They're free to accept or reject the service."

Such statements are part of a ritual to keep the Justice Department, the House and Senate Commerce Committees and the Federal Communications Commission from looking too hard at the growing dominance of networks over affiliated stations. As with nearly all the hard facts of our hard, commercial world, the dominance has an economic foundation.

The three TV networks have only one direction in which to grow: Each can increase its income only by taking over additional station time. With each expansion, the authority of the federally licensed station is diminished and the authority to meet the needs or wishes or aspirations of a local community is lessened.

The networks, however, don't even have to mention the fact that a nonaffiliated station is in for a difficult time. ABC–TV, for example, is aware in all negotiations that it can always move its Washington business from channel 7 to channel 5. (At various times, the other Washington stations face the same threat. Nationally, in every city with more than three TV stations, the same unspoken threat causes station managers to clear time to meet network demands.)

A radio or TV network, in simplest terms, is a broker for the sale of advertising time. It sells the time of its affiliated stations to national advertisers. From the network, the affiliated station receives an average of one-third of the station's regular rates, plus the network's programs. The network pays the cost of coaxial cable delivery.

Obviously, a station owner prefers to collect 100 percent of his rate card whenever attractive local programs can be made to produce the revenue. At WMAL–TV, as a result of a long series of expensive experiments, a commercially successful and artistically rewarding collection of news programs are in the 11 to 11:30 p.m. time period.

These are the newscast of Joseph McCaffrey, the local news programs of Del Malkie and Ed Meyer, the weather shows of Louis Allen, the sportscasts of Morris Siegel and the show business commentary of Bunny Wneck.

In recent months, the station has also invested heavily in motion picture features and, by TV standards, the collection is first rate.

Thus, the station's reluctance to give up its carefully constructed and successful schedule is understandable.

Network regulation is a no man's land. The FCC contends it can regulate the networks through the stations that are owned by networks. How to protect the network affiliate—usually powerless to speak against economic threats—remains a problem.

If, however, the Nation's entire TV schedule is to be piped out of Manhattan, the whole purpose of the Communications Act is defeated. The local station becomes merely a relay station, harnessed with licensed responsibility but without real authority.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF SECRETARY UDALL

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, apropos the comments made earlier this morning about the Secretary of the Interior, I ask unanimous consent, in order that the RECORD may be fuller than it is, that the account of the press interview carried on the front page of the Washington Post yesterday morning be included in the RECORD, together with the notation from the press itself that this was a moment of refreshing candor, suggesting that the time had come to cut out double talk, when some things are said for public consumption, and other things are practiced. The Secretary of the Interior is to be commended for the forthrightness with which he dealt with his responsibility as the head of one of the most important departments of the Government, certainly one of the most important for those of us who come from the West.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UDALL TELLS REPORTERS HE PLAYS THE GAME OF POLITICS TO THE HILT

(By Julius Duscha)

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall discussed "the rules of the game" yesterday with a candor as refreshing as all outdoors.

The game is politics as it is played in Washington. And, Udall indicated, it is a tougher contest than touch football.

The subject came up at Udall's news conference when a reporter noted that some Congressmen thought the Secretary's role in the House Rules Committee fight was improper.

Udall called Representatives from Western and Southern States that are always seeking new Interior Department projects.

Well, said Udall, who has the crew cut and the square jaw of a professional football player, he was just following "the rules of the game, the rules of national politics."

DENIES ANY THREAT

The Secretary denied that he had threatened any Congressmen with the loss of projects in his district if he did not vote "right." And how did the men with whom he had talked vote?

Udall looked at the ceiling and then at the reporters and said, "I got a result or two."

The reporters laughed and Udall's mother beamed. Mrs. Levi S. Udall is visiting Washington and included the press conference in her itinerary.

By then neither Udall nor the reporters wanted to return to such Interior Department staples as dams, reclamation projects, oil imports and lead and zinc quotas.

"This Department has always been a 'sensitive' area," Udall went on to note. The reporters knew what the Secretary meant, but he added: "We handle more than one-fourth of the bills that pass in Congress."

PLAYING TO HILT

When the critical comments of Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK (Republican of Indiana), Republican leader in the House, were mentioned, Udall said HALLECK refers to himself as "a gutfighter" who plays the game "to the hilt."

"I'm afraid he doesn't like it," Udall added, "when other people play it to the hilt, too."

The Secretary said that he "didn't do anything that other Cabinet members had not done," but that perhaps the Kennedy administration has "a better followthrough, better field leadership and more vigor" than some of its predecessors.

Udall noted that a pilot saline water conversion plant was located in San Diego "where a particular political situation existed" in 1959 by former Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. Studies by Interior Department experts, Udall said, indicated that two other west coast sites would have been better than San Diego from a purely technical point of view.

When the Secretary was asked whether the vote of Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican of Colorado, against Speaker SAM RAYBURN's plan to increase the size of the Rules Committee might throw the Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project in his district into the fire Udall said that Representatives "have memories, after all."

But Udall denied that he would "engage in any partisan forays."

Of course, he noted, there are always questions of "priorities."

"I'm not saying all this is political," he concluded, "but just a little bit of the rules of the game."

THE MISSILE GAP

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the debate on the missile gap continues. Based on the colloquy we have had this morning, I would say that two very helpful statements have been made from the majority side. One is that the missile gap is no longer a partisan matter. That is a good beginning. I do not believe that we could describe last year's statements as being without partisanship.

The second statement from the other side, is that they do not know whether there is a missile gap. I believe that is also a good beginning, even though late. Perhaps the effort can now be made, in the nonpartisan way which has been suggested to ascertain and tell the Nation the actual situation. The question of our national defense is not a partisan matter and ought not to be, as it certainly was made in the last year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, on the U.S. space effort which has some connection with defense, the following records: First, a list of spacecraft injected into orbit. It shows that the United States has sent into orbit 34 satellites; the Russians, 10.

The second record shows that today, the United States has in orbit 21 satellites, the Russians, 3; that 9 U.S. satellites are still transmitting information, while only 1 Russian satellite, the last one, is transmitting.

I think it is very helpful and reassuring to the country to know that the President, in his state of the Union message, said:

> Today this country is ahead in the science and technology of space, while the Soviet Union is ahead in the capacity to lift large vehicles into orbit.

I am hopeful that the atmosphere of nonpartisanship emanating from the majority side, and the acknowledgment that they do not know the precise status of the missile gap, and our defenses, may lead to bringing to the country an accurate statement regarding our total defenses.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACECRAFT INJECTED INTO ORBIT

UNITED STATES

Courier IB.	Explorer IV.
Discoverer I.	Explorer VI.
Discoverer II.	Explorer VII.
Discoverer V.	Explorer VIII.
Discoverer VI.	Midas II.
Discoverer VII.	NRL Satellite.
Discoverer VIII.	Pioneer IV.
Discovered XI.	Pioneer V.
Discoverer XIII.	Samos II.
Discoverer XIV.	Score.
Discoverer XV.	Tiros I.
Discoverer XVII.	Tiros II.
Discoverer XVIII.	Transit IB.
Discoverer XIX.	Transit IIA.
Echo 1.	Vanguard I.
Explorer I.	Vanguard II.
Explorer III.	Vanguard III.

RUSSIA

Lunik I.	Sputnik III.
Lunik II.	Sputnik IV.
Lunik III.	Sputnik V.
Sputnik I.	Sputnik VI.
Sputnik II.	Sputnik VII.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

INTERNATIONAL SATELLITE AND SPACE PROBE SUMMARY

The following space vehicles are in orbit as of February 6, 1961:

Name and country	Launch date	Transmitting
Explorer I (U.S.)	Jan. 31, 1958	No.
Vanguard I (U.S.)	Mar. 17, 1958	Yes.
Lunik I (U.S.S.R.) [1]	Jan. 2, 1959	No.
Vanguard II (U.S.)	Feb. 17, 1959	No.
Pioneer IV (U.S.) [1]	Mar. 3, 1959	No.
Explorer VI (U.S.)	Aug. 7, 1959	No.
Vanguard III (U.S.)	Sept. 18, 1959	No.
Explorer VII (U.S.)	Oct. 13, 1959	Yes.
Pioneer V (U.S.) [1]	Mar. 11, 1960	No.
Tiros I (U.S.)	Apr. 1, 1960	Yes.
Transit I–B (U.S.)	Apr. 13, 1960	No.
Spacecraft I (U.S.S.R.)	May 15, 1960	No.
Midas II (U.S.)	May 24, 1960	Yes.
Transit II–A (U.S.)	June 22, 1960	Yes.
NRL Satellite (U.S.)	do	Yes.
Echo I (U.S.)	Aug. 12, 1960	Yes.
Courier I–B (U.S.)	Oct. 4, 1960	Yes.
Explorer VIII (U.S.)	Nov. 3, 1960	No.
Tiros II (U.S.)	Nov. 23, 1960	Yes.
Samos II (U.S.)	Jan. 31, 1961	
Sputnik VII (U.S.S.R.)	Feb. 4, 1961	Yes.

[1] In solar orbit: others in earth orbit.

Current summary (Feb. 6, 1961):	
Earth orbit:	
United States	16
U.S.S.R.	2
Solar orbit:	
United States	2
U.S.S.R.	1
Transmitting:	
United States	9
U.S.S.R.	1
Complete summary (launched to date):	
Earth orbit:	
United States	32
U.S.S.R.	[1] 8
Solar orbit:	
United States	2
U.S.S.R.	1
Lunar impact:	
U.S.S.R.	1

[1] Lunik III passed once around Moon, then into Earth orbit.

NATIONAL FORESTRY PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on January 31, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] addressed the Senate concerning a forestry program which would bring the Nation's valuable timber, water, range, wildlife, and recreation resources into full production. I join Senator STENNIS in supporting this worthwhile program.

Our forests constitute a great reservoir of wealth that is only partially developed. The income derived from the national forests alone substantially exceeds all of the expenditures for protecting, managing, and utilizing them. Last year, for example, $148 million was returned to the U.S. Treasury from the sale of timber and from other activities. I might mention that 25 Arkansas counties received a total of nearly $1 million as their share of the receipts from the two national forests within the State.

I was particularly interested in Senator STENNIS' statements concerning the need for a strong program of forestry research. Arkansas' forests are one of the State's most valuable economic assets and adequate forestry research is a must if we are to develop the full potential of this natural resource. I have always supported a realistic forest research program and have considered the meager funds spent for this work a wise and prudent investment.

Two years ago officials of the Forest Service presented to the Congress a carefully worked out program for the national forests, including the research needed to put a strong technical foundation under forestry practices. This research program, though well planned and modest in its requirements, has fallen behind a reasonable rate of implementation. President Eisenhower's budget contained an increase of $1,500,000 for research, but this is not enough to do the job. It will take $6,500,000 more to get forestry research up to schedule. I hope that this additional sum will be provided by the Congress.

In my State we have many unsolved problems of timber and watershed management. In the Ozark Mountains, for example, we have opportunities to increase substantially the productivity from millions of acres of forest land. Much of it contains rundown hardwood timber that can be made to produce fine quality growth. Vast areas are covered by unproductive brush. This brushland can be converted to commercial timber production in some cases or to range lands in others. But many technical problems must be solved before public and private land owners can be sure of the best course to follow. The practices that are prescribed must provide for sound watershed management procedures so the soil does not erode and damage streamflow. Only a program of organized research will provide the needed answers.

There is a small research program located at Harrison, Ark., where substantial progress has been made in recent years in developing improved forestry practices. This program, now financed at about $105,000 per year, needs strengthening. My information is that $35,000 additional could be effectively used in expediting research at the Harrison Research Center. This is a small amount in comparison with the benefits which will accrue from this work. I might also point out that if the full amount needed for research were made available, construction of a Loblolly Pine Laboratory at the Crossett Experiment Station would be possible.

The modest increase suggested by Senator STENNIS will get the forestry research program work up to schedule and I endorse it fully.

Mr. President, the program for the national forests lists a number of other activities which require attention if our forests are to serve their greatest usefulness.

An adequate system of roads is essential for intensive management of forests. Without roads, our forest lands will continue to be only partly useful. In Arkansas there are now some 4,033 miles of forest development roads. The Forest Service estimates that an additional 10,875 miles are needed to provide an adequate system for the management of our two national forests. The people of my State need these roads, not only to insure a steady flow of forest products,

but also as a means of access for recreational purposes. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that forest road financing from appropriation funds for the next 2 years should be at the level of $40 million and $50 million, respectively. I hope that adequate funds will be provided to keep the financing of this important work up to the reasonable level projected in the program for the national forests.

Recreation use of the national forests continues to increase rapidly, and many popular sites are regularly overcrowded. This results in rapid deterioration of sites and facilities. We have a long way to go before attaining full utilization of the recreational possibilities of the national forests. This is true of the Ouachita and Ozark National Forests in my State as well as nationally. For example, the program for the national forests recommends that $1,618,000 be spent over a 12-year period on construction of additional recreational facilities in the two Arkansas forests. This plan includes 1,400 family units and related facilities. The program should be expedited as much as possible to accommodate the increasing number of visitors to these forests. It is estimated that more than 90 million visits will be made to national forests in 1961 and it is essential that increased emphasis be placed on a program to provide adequate recreation sites and facilities to accommodate these visitors.

President Eisenhower's budget for fiscal 1962 provides some $16,500,000 for sanitation, cleanup, and maintenance of existing recreation sites on the national forests and for supervision, planning, and construction of new facilities. This includes an increase of $1,400,000 over the 1961 appropriation.

This amount is not enough to keep up with increasing public use and to catch up with the deficit in needed facilities. An additional $4 million will be needed in 1962 to bring the recreation development program up to the requirements shown in the program Operation Outdoors.

An accelerated program of recreation area construction should be initiated at once so that the Forest Service will be able to meet the growing public demand for adequate recreation facilities in the national forests.

Another phase of forestry work which deserves increased attention is the State and private cooperative forestry program. We have an active and aggressive cooperative program underway in Arkansas, under the leadership of Fred Lang, State forester. Additional funds are needed for all phases of this cooperative program and I hope that Congress will give it sympathetic treatment this year.

Mr. President, I was highly pleased to note President Kennedy's statement in his economic message regarding the possibility of speeding up construction work in the national forests. His awareness of the need for accelerating this program is encouraging to those of us who are vitally interested in forestry activities. I hope that as a result of the review of the forestry project backlog requested by the President, supplemental appropriations will be requested of the Congress to expedite work on Forest Service projects. Any additional funds invested in this program will pay ample dividends.

SNOW REMOVAL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the New York Herald Tribune of today has published on the front page an article entitled "City To Melt Next Winter's Snow?"

The subheading reads:

Screvane describes machine that melts as it plows, foresees electronic device to divert storms to sea.

The article quotes Mr. Screvane, the sanitation commissioner of the city of New York, as saying:

What we need is an altogether new concept of snow removal.

The article continues:

Saying that genuine weather control, not mere seeding of clouds to precipitate the moisture but a controllable electronic method of diverting storms would certainly be developed in the future, the commissioner added that "This would be the best snow removal technology—it would be the absolute."

Mr. President, I commend the article to the attention of the harassed Commissioners of the District of Columbia and also to the National Science Foundation. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY TO MELT NEXT WINTER'S SNOW? SCREVANE DESCRIBES MACHINE THAT MELTS AS IT PLOWS, FORESEES ELECTRONIC DEVICE TO DIVERT STORMS TO SEA

(By Robert S. Bird)

Sanitation Commissioner Paul R. Screvane, the man who has to cope with New York City's snow removal problem, took time out yesterday for an interview on this question:

Why, in this age of advanced technology, cannot New York City get rid of its snow more quickly and neatly than it does today?

In an extended answer, Mr. Screvane revealed that some far-reaching new inventions are in the research or development stage right now, and that the day is coming when all approaching snowstorms will be diverted electronically in the skies to dumping places in the sea or to waste spaces on the land.

An interim machine which is being developed for New York City now, he said, may by next winter be traveling around the city streets in truck-trailer units melting the snow as it is plowed. This melter device would transform snow by the ton into instant water for a gutter runoff into the sewers.

Another invention being explored by the chemical industry at the request of the city is the possibility of finding a chemical additive to be mixed into the street pavement. The chemical would provide, when snow falls, an electrolytic melting reaction such as rock salt produces when it is spread over the streets today.

Still another idea under serious examination by the city is the installing of radiant heating units under the pavements of the city's crosswalks, where people cross the streets. Such an invention is actually in use on Fifth Avenue and Park Avenue in front of several stores and office buildings.

It was tentatively considered by the city back in 1949 but was turned down then for various reasons, one of them being that heat for the radiant heating grid under the street crossings would have to be furnished by adjoining private buildings under some arrangement with the city. But Mr. Screvane believes that such bugs could be taken care of.

Rejected completely have been a number of repetitiously proposed ideas which flow into the sanitation department from the public, most of them seemingly sensible but actually impractical, and others merely wild.

A good example of these is a suggestion that comes into the sanitation department after nearly every severe snowfall. That is, to use flamethrowers to melt the snow. This is no good, Mr. Screvane says, because all these fire-throwing and firebox principles employing direct flame don't warm up the pavement or ground beneath the snow. The result is that the snow melts and then freezes, making matters worse than ever.

"The fact is," Mr. Screvane said, "science has allowed snow removal techniques to lag a whole century behind the times. We are still using shovels, just as they were 100 years ago. Of course, then they used horses, whereas today we use horsepower. But basically the techniques are the same. What we need is an altogether new concept of snow removal."

Saying that genuine weather control, not mere seeding of clouds to precipitate the moisture but a controllable electronic method of diverting storms, would certainly be developed in the future, the commissioner added that "this would be the best snow removal technology—it would be the absolute."

Commissioner Screvane, a 46-year-old career man in the sanitation department, was interviewed in his office at 125 Worth Street.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, and morning business is concluded.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing all nominations of postmasters sent to the Senate since the 87th Congress convened and prior to January 21, 1961, and also withdrawing the nomination of Robert A. Bicks, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961; which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis Falk Oberdorfer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General; and

Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Clarence Daniel Martin, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

James E. Webb, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be a deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations; and

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Carlisle Piehl Runge, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Neville Miller, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations on the Executive Calendar be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. William R. Shuler, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rex Marion Whitton, of Missouri, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has informed me that certain other nominations have been reported and are now at the desk. They are as follows: The nomination of Louis Falk Oberdorfer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General; and the nomination of Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Assistant Attorney General.

I understand that these nominations were reported unanimously by the committee, and that there is no objection from the minority leader. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis Falk Oberdorfer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also understand that the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has a nomination to report. I ask that he report it now, and I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I report the nomination of Clarence Daniel Martin, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence Daniel Martin, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for the RECORD, I merely wish to state that Mr. Martin appeared before the committee, and we had quite an extensive hearing on both the nomination and many transportation matters as they affect the country and all modes of transportation. The distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], was present at that time. The committee was unanimous in ordering Mr. Martin's nomination reported.

I also wish to state that, although Mr. Martin is now a resident of California, he was born and raised in the State of Washington. I have known him since he was a young man. I served in the State legislature at the time when his distinguished father was Governor of the State of Washington; and I could not praise too highly the nomination, both as a friend of the nominee and because he is a very capable man.

I am sure that he will do an excellent job in this very complex and sensitive field of transportation and in helping determine the transportation policy of the United States.

I could say a great deal more about Mr. Martin. He is a man of integrity and of great ability, and I think the Government is fortunate to have him leave his business to come to Washington and serve in this capacity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Clarence Daniel Martin, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations which have been confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

ORDER TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF MR. WEBB TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has completed its hearings on Mr. Webb's nomination to be Administrator of NASA; and I ask unanimous consent, in light of that action, since it was unanimous action by the committee, and the minority leader has no objection, that we consider today the nomination of Mr. Webb.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so agreed.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. WEAVER TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Dr. Robert C. Weaver. Will the clerk state the nomination?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to be heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have the honor to present, on behalf of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the nomination of Robert C. Weaver for the Office of Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, with the committee's recommendation that it be accepted and confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

It is a pleasure to be able to present a nomination to this body with the full conviction that the requirements of the office and the qualifications of the man are in every respect suited to each other.

This I feel to be true in the case of Robert C. Weaver. No man, in my judgment, has been proposed for this important office with better credentials, professionally and personally, than Dr. Weaver.

For the past 25 years Dr. Weaver's career has been intimately identified with housing and urban progress of the Nation. He has worked at it, studied it, written about it, and administered it. And he has lived it.

As a Federal official in the 1930's he participated in our first national efforts to erase the economic and human costs of slums. He was an official of the U.S. Housing Authority, which, in 1937, established the principle of local ownership and operation of federally financed public housing for low-income families.

As a State official, Dr. Weaver has served with distinction in two of the highest positions in this field in the State of New York—that of administrator of the State temporary housing rent commission, and earlier as deputy commissioner of housing for the State.

At the municipal level, Dr. Weaver served in 1944 and 1945 as executive director of the mayor's committee on race relations in my own city of Chicago, Ill. Most recently, in the city of New York, he has occupied the important position of vice chairman of the New York City Housing and Redevelopment Board, which is responsible for the direction and administration of the Nation's largest urban renewal and middle-income housing programs.

In addition to his official record, the nominee is also widely recognized as a scholar and student in his professional field, and his talents have been in demand by numerous worthy organizations and foundations. He was graduated with honors from Harvard University, and has earned a master's degree and a doctor's degree.

His professional and public service ranges from his work with the National Committee on Housing in the thirties to his current directorship with ACTION, Inc., a national organization of outstanding citzens to assist communities in renewing their urban areas. He has served as a lecturer at Columbia University, New York University, and, in my own State, at Northwestern University.

Professionally and by experience, therefore, he is eminently qualified.

But Robert C. Weaver is more than a skilled professional. He is also a man of real human understanding. As he stated before our committee, in giving his philosophy of the programs he would be called upon to administer, "The most important thing is people."

His record shows that this has been his motivating theme in his 25 years of varied public service.

As a Negro, Dr. Weaver has studied, written, and done much to advance the progress of the Negro people. He has earned their confidence in his leadership and wisdom, and most recently was named chairman of the board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—a post that he will necessarily relinquish when his nomination is confirmed for Federal office.

But he is equally respected and known for his understanding and work in behalf of all people, irrespective of race—particularly those who by reason of age, income, location, or other cause, have been unable to share fully in the benefits of our national progress and programs in the housing and urban field.

Indeed, all of his professional experience has been devoted to programs designed to help all the people and to improve community conditions for all. In his approach to minority housing problems, Senators will find that his primary concern has been to develop ways to alleviate the underlying causes of racial and community conflict and division—not ways to aggravate them.

Finally, Dr. Weaver is experienced in, and devoted to, our American system of law and of representative government. His assurance to our committee that he would faithfully administer the laws as enacted by the Congress and the policies determined by the President simply reiterates his record of performance in public office over many years. His scrupulous adherence to the law and the policies established by elective bodies and officials has been recognized and praised in all the posts he has held.

I am happy, therefore, to present to the Senate for confirmation as Housing and Home Finance Administrator the name of a skilled administrator, an experienced authority in the housing and urban field, a great human being, and a dedicated American—Robert C. Weaver.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD brief biographical information on Dr. Weaver, bearing on his appointment and qualifications.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON ROBERT C. WEAVER

The designation of Mr. Robert C. Weaver, of New York City, to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Government's overall Agency administering urban and housing programs, was announced in January 1961, by incoming President Kennedy.

Mr. Weaver has been serving as vice chairman of the Housing and Redevelopment Board of the City of New York, a three-man body responsible for the direction and administration of New York's urban renewal and middle-income housing program, currently involving more than a quarter billion dollars in projects, the largest in the country.

He had previously served the State of New York, as administrator of the State housing rent commission, and earlier as deputy commissioner of housing.

Mr. Weaver has been identified with housing and urban problems for the past 25 years. Born in Washington, D.C., in 1907, he attended Harvard University, where he received his B.S. degree cum laude, and later received his M.A. and Ph. D. degrees.

He entered Government in 1933 as associate adviser on Negro affairs in the Department of the Interior, becoming adviser in 1934 and serving also as a consultant with the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration, under which the first public housing and slum clearance projects were built as part of the emergency public works program during the depression.

From 1938 to 1940, Mr. Weaver was special assistant to the Administrator of the U.S. Housing Authority, the agency established to administer the federally aided public housing program enacted in the U.S. Housing Act of 1937. Its successor agency, the Public Housing Administration, is now one of the operating constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which Mr. Weaver has been designated to head.

From 1940 to 1944 Mr. Weaver filled a number of wartime posts in the Federal Government. He served first as administrative assistant to the late Sidney Hillman, head of the National Defense Advisory Commission. In 1942 he was named Chief of the Negro Employment and Training Branch of the Labor Division of the War Production Board, and from 1943 to 1944, was Director of Negro Manpower in the War Manpower Commission.

In 1944–45 he served as executive director of the mayor's committee on race relations in Chicago, and in 1947–48 was a lecturer at Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill. Subsequently he was visiting professor at Teachers College of Columbia University and at the School of Education of New York University. Mr. Weaver has also served as director of opportunity fellowships of the Whitney Foundation and as a consultant to the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Weaver has been active in various national organizations in the housing, civic, and related fields throughout his career. In New York he has served as a member of the board of directors of the New York Citizens Housing and Planning Council, and as a member of the board of the Welfare and Health Council of New York.

Mr. Weaver was elected last year as chairman of the Board of Directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and has also been serving as chairman of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing.

He is a director and a member of the executive and research committee of ACTION, Inc., national citizens organization to advance renewal of blighted urban areas and assist local communites to combat slums. He also was on the executive committee of the National Committee on Housing, citizens organization to advance housing in the 1930's and 1940's.

Other committees and public service groups in which he has served or is serving include the Advisory Committee on Urban Renewal of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the National Selection Committee for Fulbright Fellowships; the Education Reconstruction Committee of the American Federation of Teachers; the board of directors of Provident Hospital, Chicago; the board of directors of the Lavanburg Foundation, which has financed significant moderate-cost cooperative housing developments; the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference; the panel of advisers on the chapter, "Framework for an Urban Society,"

in the recently published report of the President's Commission on National Goals; the Fellowship Committee (as chairman) for the United Negro College Fund; and the visiting committee for the Joint Center on Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.

Mr. Weaver is the author of two books: "Negro Labor: A National Problem" published in 1946, and "The Negro Ghetto," on the minority housing problem, published in 1948, and has also written numerous articles on housing, urban, and minority subjects.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. This has been very much of a bipartisan action in the Committee on Banking and Currency. Thanks to the very generous attitude of our chairman, there was even some thought for a moment that some Senator on this side of the aisle might have the honor of reporting the nomination.

Those of us on our side who voted to support it, wish to join in the reporting of the nomination.

I shall have an opportunity, after our chairman and perhaps other Members of the Senate complete their statements, to say a word in behalf of Dr. Weaver, but for the moment I should like to have the RECORD show that we join in the report to the Senate. Second, I wish to state my deep conviction as to the fact that Dr. Weaver will do a great job and that he has demonstrated his great patriotism as an American.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York, who has been very helpful in this whole matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, shortly after noon, yesterday, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency voted to report favorably the nomination of Dr. Robert C. Weaver to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator, by a vote of 11 to 4. Following that action, the chairman of the committee stated to some members of the press who were present that he understood there would be no controversial matters taken up in the Senate after today, Thursday, and that under the rules of the Senate nominations would go over except by unanimous consent. Hence, the chairman assumed there would be no action on this nomination before February 20.

At 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon the chairman was informed that the leadership wished to bring the nomination before the Senate today. I got in touch with the majority leader, through his secretary, and protested that.

A good many Senators who would like to participate in the debate, and to have the privilege of reading the hearings before a vote on the nomination, are out of town. We have no definite information as to how many are out of town, but we know a number of Senators are out of town.

The answer given was that the leadership felt it was very urgent to act on this nomination, and if we could not get unanimous consent to do so today, there would be a session of the Senate tomorrow.

After conferring with my colleagues on the committee, who merely said, "That does not give us much time to prepare for anything, but it really does not make any great difference to us whether we consider the nomination today or tomorrow," I finally agreed I would not make an objection to considering the nomination today.

I make that statement because, frankly, I did not intentionally mislead the press representatives about when the Senate would consider the nomination. I certainly did not mislead any of those who shared my views about the undesirability of the confirmation of the nomination, because I did not know until 3 o'clock yesterday that we would either consider the nomination today or consider it tomorrow, by a vote to consider it tomorrow.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. When were the hearings printed?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The printed hearings reached me at 10 o'clock this morning. We had to do everything in our power to expedite the printing of the hearings, and we had to waive the usual provisions of letting Senators look over the stenographic transcript.

Mr. EASTLAND. Are there a majority report and minority views?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no report other than the formal one the Senator from Illinois has made, which is that the committee voted to report the nomination favorably. There are no views, either. There is neither a majority report nor minority views.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would not the distinguished Senator say that not a Member of the Senate has read the printed hearings?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That would be a pretty safe assumption. If any Senator has read them he has done mighty well. The printed hearings are 144 pages long.

Mr. EASTLAND. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who says he has read them. I think every other Senator in this body did not know anything about the hearings until he arrived at the Senate today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am quite sure that is correct, because the copy did not reach me until 10 o'clock this morning. That is when it reached my office.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senate met on a Saturday to consider the Cabinet nominations, which went over a day. What is the unusual rush in this matter, by which this person is placed above the members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the opinion of the chairman of the committee, this nomination could very well go over until we complete the recess agreed to between the leadership for the Lincoln Day speeches. In fact, the chairman thought that agreement covered Friday and Saturday of this week, but he was informed that it covered everything except this nomination. I received that information for the first time at 3 o'clock yesterday afternoon.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the distinguished chairman of the committee think the Senate can intelligently consider the nomination, when no Senator has had an opportunity to read the hearings or to study the matter?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The chairman urged that consideration be put off so that Senators could study the hearings. I could not see, though, that we would have more Senators present tomorrow than today. In fact, I thought there might be fewer present tomorrow than are present today.

We have no way of getting those who are away to return to read the hearings, so as between today and tomorrow it was whittle or cut, and the chairman said that under those circumstances he would not be the one to object.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator did not answer my question, or, if he did, I did not hear the answer. Does the Senator think the Senate can intelligently consider this nomination today, when printed hearings have only been available a few hours?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The answer is "No." I merely add that we would not be any better off tomorrow; but we would be if we let the nomination go over until the 20th, to give us an opportunity to go into the subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree that the nomination should go over until after the Lincoln Day recess, but even by tomorrow Senators would have had an opportunity to study the transcript of the hearings.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not need to comment on how many Senators are present in the Chamber, which is the answer to the question as to how many would study the transcript of hearings if the nomination were passed over until tomorrow. My opinion is that there would be fewer Senators present tomorrow than are present today.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I assume the Senator from Virginia has a speech to make on the merits of the nomination.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. Although the Senator from Virginia has not had much time to prepare his speech, he has tried to touch on all the important phases of the questions that were developed during the hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. Apart from the Senator's speech on the nomination, there is no document, report, or other source of information quickly available that gets to the gist of the question; is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. There were hearings which covered approximately 140 pages?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct. The printed transcript of the hearings comprises approximately that many pages. Copies were not available until 10 o'clock this morning, and probably not available to Senators until noon. I do not know when they were placed on the desks of Senators, but probably not until noon today.

Mr. STENNIS. The nomination was opposed by some of the members of the committee; was it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was, very strenuously, by some of the members.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator from Virginia tell us how many members of the committee opposed the nomination?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Four members of the committee opposed the nomination and voted against it. In addition to the chairman of the committee, they were the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. STENNIS. I shall listen to the speech of the Senator from Virginia and will later have other questions on the merits of the nomination.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I oppose the nomination of Robert C. Weaver as Housing and Home Finance Administrator. I oppose his confirmation because I consider that he is a man of demonstrated poor judgment and extreme views, because I consider that he is a crusader and a partisan advocate of controversial views and policies, many of which relate closely to the housing industry, and because I consider that his appointment will injure the housing industry directly and, thereby, injure the whole economy indirectly.

Speaking as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I deem it appropriate to recite briefly the history of this nomination in order to make it clear that while I and other members of the committee have made clear our opposition to this nomination from the start, the committee has proceeded to consider it without delay.

President-elect Kennedy announced his intention to nominate Dr. Weaver on December 31, 1960. I made public my opposition on January 5, 1961. Because of the volume of mail which reached me expressing strong views, pro and con, I gave notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26, 1961, that hearings would be held by the committee, even though the nomination had not yet been received by the Senate. Not until January 30, 10 days after Inauguration Day, was the nomination received by the Senate.

On February 2, 1961, I gave notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that hearings on the nomination would be held beginning on February 7, and continuing morning and afternoon until concluded.

The hearings began on February 7, in the morning, continued that afternoon, and concluded with a hearing in the morning of February 8. An executive session was then held, and the nomination ordered reported out by a vote of 11 to 4, the 4 opponents, as I previously said, being Senator SPARKMAN, Senator BENNETT, Senator BLAKLEY, and myself. And today, on February 9, we are debating it on the floor of the Senate, with printed hearings available to the Members, but only recently received.

The nomination stirred up much controversy. More than 350 letters and telegrams were received by the committee, and I am sure other Senators received many that did not come to our attention.

One matter which caused considerable publicity was my correspondence with the President with respect to Dr. Weaver. Because many letters and statements received by the committee contained allegations unfavorable to the nominee in the matter of past associations, I thought it appropriate to request specific advice from the President on this point, and I did so in my letter of January 30,. I wish to read this letter for the benefit of the Senate.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING,
AND CURRENCY,
January 30, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

As chairman of the committee, I have received a number of allegations with respect to the nominee's associations and affiliations with various organizations alleged to have been cited by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and other groups.

I understand it is customary, in the case of nominations of this importance, for the President to ask the Federal Bureau of Investigation to report to him after a full field investigation of the proposed nominee. If it is in order, I should like to know whether such an investigation and report were made in the case of this nomination, whether such a report was reviewed and evaluated, and whether you are entirely satisfied with the results of such investigation, report, review, and evaluation.

I make this request of you because I am confident that such an investigation and report by the Federal Bureau of Investigation would cover all the allegations of associations and affiliations referred to in the second paragraph of this letter, and I am not in a position to receive such a report made by the FBI for the use of the committee.

Respectfully yours,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

It seemed to me then, and it still seems to me, that it was desirable to have specific advice from the President on this point. The committee did not have access to the FBI reports on the investigation which presumably had been made. The committee could not undertake to duplicate an FBI full field investigation nor would I want to attempt to do so. The committee could not, in my judgment, properly rely on newspaper reports to the effect that other congressional committees did or did not have material of one sort or another in their files, and that Dr. Weaver, therefore, was or was not above reproach.

In short, I do not think that the Banking and Currency Committee, in the absence of the full facts available to the President, could be expected to make an intelligent judgment as to the validity and significance of the allegations received by the committee.

Consequently, I think it was entirely appropriate to request the President to give the committee a specific report on the matter.

I sent my letter to the President on Monday, January 30, the same day the nomination was received by the Senate. On Wednesday, February 1, I gave a copy of my letter to the majority leader, who assured me he would attempt to get a prompt reply. On Thursday, February 2, I spoke to the President's liaison representative, who also assured me he would seek to get a prompt reply. On Saturday afternoon, February 4, the same representative came to my office and discussed the matter with me. He gave me some information, but I told him I could not use oral reports. I reiterated my request for a specific report from the President, and I was led to believe it would be forthcoming at once.

When Monday, February 6, arrived, the day before the hearing and a week since my letter was sent, and still no letter, this was called to the attention of those who had assured me the letter would be forthcoming. And again I was assured the letter would be sent at once.

I was greatly surprised, therefore, when the hour of the hearing arrived on Tuesday morning—10 a.m.— and still no letter had arrived. Frankly, I began to wonder if the circumstances were such that the President could not make a favorable reply to my letter. Repeated calls to the White House were made. Eventually the report was received that the letter was signed and on the way, and an hour after that it arrived here.

By this time it was 12 o'clock, and we were only able to hear from the congressional sponsors of the nominee before recessing for lunch.

I should now like to read the President's letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I have your recent letter concerning my nomination of Mr. Robert C. Weaver to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

As is customary in nominations of this importance, a report on Mr. Weaver was submitted to me by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and this report was fully reviewed and evaluated.

I am most confident that if confirmed, Mr. Weaver will perform an outstanding service for our country as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I am pleased to give you my views in this instance and I appreciate your interest.

Sincerely,

JOHN KENNEDY.

The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency oversees the far-flung activities of the Urban Renewal Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. For these programs alone, the Federal Government has committed billions of dollars of its own credit, and its commitments extend for as long as 40 years into the future. In addition, millions of private individuals and businesses have invested their funds or savings in these programs, either directly or indirectly through financial institutions which themselves place funds in residential mortgages or obligations of housing agencies.

Policies adopted by the HHFA Administrator would extend well beyond the

bounds of these programs, vast as they are. They would have an influence both upon new construction and upon the inventory of existing dwellings. In the volume of construction activity alone, housing accounted for over $22 billion of work put in place last year. This was approximately two-fifths of the value of all new construction activity, and was one-third of total gross private domestic investment. It was approximately 5 percent of gross national product. Over 1,281,000 housing units were started last year, with one-fourth financed by federally underwritten mortgages. In each of the past 12 years, in fact, more than 1 million new units have been started.

Associated with new residential construction is a vast number of other vital activities ranging from schools to roads and shopping centers. Not only are community facilities involved, but also the large building supply industry as well as the home furnishings industry.

The impact of residential construction upon our economy is, indeed, acknowledged to be large. But still greater are the values, equities, and mortgage interests associated with the inventory of over 58½ million existing housing units. Here, the Federal Government has a contingent liability of approximately $60 billion in federally underwritten mortgages. Besides this, it has an indirect contingent liability of perhaps even more by reason of the Federal insurance or guarantee of deposits or shares of lending institutions holding conventional residential mortgages.

The most important reason for my opposition to this nomination is the fact that Dr. Weaver is a crusader and a strong partisan advocate of policies and principles which can only serve to upset the housing market, the housing industry, and through them the entire economy. Dr. Weaver has had these advanced views all his life. The list of books and magazine articles which he has written bear clear evidence of his overwhelming concern with the subject of race relations, particularly race relations in housing. I might add that at the hearing he said he had written so many articles and made so many statements that he could not remember them all. And virtually all of them relate to this one subject. Dr. Weaver's position as chairman of the board of directors of the NAACP is further evidence of this ardent and controlling interest in his life.

I do not want it to be understood that I am criticizing Dr. Weaver for these views. He is entitled to hold them, just as I think that I am entitled to disagree with them.

The point I wish to make and to emphasize with all the strength at my command is that I do not think a person of Dr. Weaver's views and background is an appropriate person to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

I think my opposition to Dr. Weaver may, in fact, be in his interest just as much as in the interest of the housing industry. I do not see how Dr. Weaver can be impartial in any matter having to do with race relations, particularly race relations in housing. How will his former associates in the NAACP feel toward him? Will he be able to look them in the face, if he does not work for integrated housing all over the United States?

Dr. Weaver has assured us at the hearings that he will have nothing to do with policy in this matter. He has assured us that he will not take any step to integrate housing, as Housing and Home Finance Administrator, unless either the President directs him or the Congress enacts legislation requiring this.

I hope Dr. Weaver can carry out these assurances to the committee and to the Senate. I hope he will be able to stick with his determination to take no action which will have these results, in the absence of either a Presidential or a congressional mandate.

But I wonder how he is going to be able to explain his inaction to his associates in the NAACP.

Dr. Weaver has, in article after article, and in his book, "The Negro Ghetto," expressed his support of open occupancy in housing—meaning housing open, without restriction.

He has gone beyond this position, however, and has also advocated affirmative action to integrate housing. The hearings include copies of Dr. Weaver's article on "Class Race and Urban Renewal," from the August 1960 issue of "Land Economics," "Integration in Public and Private Housing," from the March 1956 issue of the "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science," and "Southern Comfort: A Possible Misapplication of Federal Funds," from the summer 1960 issue of the "Journal of Intergroup Relations."

I regret that this matter is being taken up in such haste that it will not be possible for all Members of the Senate to read these articles and see for themselves the enthusiasm and devotion with which Dr. Weaver argues for integrated housing. It seems clear that Dr. Weaver favors requiring that all Federal assistance in the housing field, meaning at least all Federal assistance under the jurisdiction of HHFA, be conditioned upon open occupancy and assurances of open occupancy.

As I said before, Dr. Weaver has said he will not be establishing policy in this field—he will leave that to the President or the Congress. I urge him to carry out this commitment fully and completely. I urge him to carry it out to the extent of not even recommending these policies to the President, no matter how much it may disappoint his former associates in the NAACP.

Dr. Weaver is a highly trained man, and I am sure a most intelligent one. His books and his articles and his statements, and his testimony as a witness, all show his training and his intelligence.

But they do not show good judgment. On the contrary, they show he is a man who adopts extreme positions, positions from which he later has to retreat with embarrassment.

Dr. Weaver explained that his contacts with three organizations on the Attorney General's list of subversive and Communist organizations were slight, and that he ceased his connections when he discovered that they were subversive or otherwise undesirable. In the case of the National Negro Congress, he remembered clearly going to two public meetings, in 1937 and 1940, and he was not sure whether he had been to a third. His memory was hazy as to whether he ever had been a member; at one point he said he was not a member; at another point he said he was not, to his knowledge, a member; and at a third point, he said, "as far as I know I do not know whether I even had membership."

He said he was a member of the Washington Bookshop solely for the purpose of buying books at a discount. Apparently, in spite of his training and background, no suspicion crossed his mind as to the type of organization it was. His resignation appears to have been made under circumstances creditable to him, though unrelated to the purchase of books at a discount.

In Dr. Weaver's connection with the third organization on the Attorney General's list, the Council on African Affairs, he admits frankly that he was a "dupe."

Dr. Weaver's experience in Russia shows even more clearly his lack of judgment and his enthusiasm for extreme positions. In 1946, he went to the Ukraine as a member of the UNRRA mission to the Ukraine.

Apparently he received red carpet treatment there. And when he came back, he started writing articles telling in glowing terms of the wonderful way in which the Soviet had handled its race relations problem. He also signed up for a speaking tour on Russia.

Mr. President, two of these articles on Russia appear in the hearings.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NO RACE PROBLEM IN RUSSIA"—ROBERT WEAVER

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Robert C. Weaver, longtime government employee and first executive of the mayor's commission on race relations, and now on the staff of the American Council on Race Relations, wrote the following article on his return to Chicago from an UNRRA study of economic rehabilitation in the Ukraine.]

If I ever had any doubts that minority problems can be solved, my recent trip to Russia dispelled them.

The Soviet Union, which was rife with anti-Semitism and national hatreds before the revolution is, today, relatively free from intergroup tensions. Conflicts between these groups are unknown, and the man in the street in Russia cannot understand how the United States can claim to be a democratic nation and still persecute its darker citizens. To the Soviet citizen, it seems much more logical and fair to liquidate an enemy of the state than to deny a black man equal rights because of the color of his skin.

The Soviet Union has solved its minority problems by legislative, economic, and educative methods.

A NEGRO GOES TO THE SOVIET UNION

(By Robert C. Weaver)

(Mr. Weaver recently returned from the Soviet Union where he worked with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation

Administration. He is director of community services of the American Council on Race Relations. During the war he was director of Negro Manpower Service of the War Manpower Commission.)

I had been in the Soviet Union 3 months when a Russian said to me, "You are not an American—you are a Negro, aren't you?"

Automatically, I answered, "I am both."

After the incident passed, I realized how revealing it had been. It demonstrated that, like most Negroes in the United States, I consider myself an American, while as a matter of fact the color of my skin makes me a peculiar sort of an American—a citizen without full rights. The question also reflected the popular Russian idea of the status of Negroes in the United States, derived from the extensive discussion of atrocities and discrimination against colored Americans reported in Soviet newspapers.

RACE IS NO HANDICAP

Being a Negro is not a handicap in the Soviet Union. Occasionally it becomes troublesome because there is a tendency to glorify a representative of a race which is oppressed in the leading capitalist nation. For one who asks no more than he be accepted as a human being, with no special treatment because of the accident of his antecedents, this was at times a bother—especially when the novelty wore off in a few weeks.

But the Soviet Union, as far as I saw it, does not have color prejudices. And that was a breath of fresh air.

Russia under the czars was free of color prejudices; but czarist Russia did have other prejudices. The persecution of the Jews is well known, and the many nationalities which make up the nation harbored intense hatreds toward each other. Soviet Russia has done an exceptional job in wiping out these expressions of group chauvinism—and it has done it in a generation.

German occupation rekindled anti-Semitism in certain sections of Russia, but the Government has been and is watching the situation and gives every evidence of being prepared to cope with the problem.

FOSTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE PEOPLE

Russian communism has created a feeling of belonging on the part of the vast majority of the citizens of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Dr. Weaver's comment on these articles was:

I think they were absolutely honest but I do not think they were too sagacious.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Weaver's articles were picked up and reprinted by at least one newspaper which held itself out as a Communist propaganda vehicle.

Remember that when Dr. Weaver went to Russia, he was a man of 38 or 39, a highly educated man with S.B., A.M., and Ph. D. degrees, and 10 years of experience in the field of racial relations.

I consider that Dr. Weaver is understating the matter when he says that he does not think these articles were too sagacious. To my way of thinking, they demonstrate extremely poor judgment, in a man's own field, and a willingness to take extreme and unreasonable positions.

In spite of the chorus of adulation for Dr. Weaver which has appeared from sections of the country, I have some questions about the breadth of his experience. The biography which Dr. Weaver submitted to the Committee indicates that he worked for 4 years in the Interior Department as an adviser on Negro affairs in connection with public housing and slum clearance projects. He next worked for 2 years in the U.S. Housing Authority, again on public housing programs. He worked in various wartime agencies from 1940 to 1944. In 1944–45 he worked for the Chicago Committee on Race Relations. He has taught in Chicago and in New York and has worked for the Whitney Foundation. He has been in the New York City and State government in housing, rent control and urban renewal activities.

Dr. Weaver, however, so far as the record shows, has had no experience in the field of private housing, unless you want to call running a rent-control program in New York experience in private housing. There is no evidence that he has had any experience in the field of home financing, or any connection with savings and loan associations, banks, and other financing institutions. There is no indication that he has had any experience with the private home building industry or the building materials industry.

In my judgment, this shows a most unfortunate bias in favor of Government activity, public housing, urban renewal, rent control and the like—and against the home building industry, the real estate industry and the building materials industry.

Mr. President, it has been claimed that the objection to Dr. Weaver comes from the South. The truth of the matter is that the objection has come from all sections of the Nation. I have with me some letters, only one of which comes from the South. Not another one of them is from the South. They are from New York and Ohio and Illinois and Minnesota and California. They are from all the States outside the South, except the one from Norfolk, Va., which I thought was a very intelligent letter that summed up the opinion of the writer as to his objection. I have all these letters at my command, but instead of taking the time to read samples, to show that the objection is not a southern complaint, I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I feel that the appointment of Mr. Robert C. Weaver of New York as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is unwise and urge strongly that you oppose his nomination.

It is my view that this is a political appointment not based on sound reasons of the public welfare.

It appears clearly to me that Mr. Weaver is a strong advocate of public housing, and his past activities have included support of rent control and other so-called liberal policies.

In a book, "The Negro Ghetto," written by Mr. Weaver, he advocated strongly subsidized housing. He went beyond that to condemn not only FHA for lack of support of policies for which he stands, but also private owners of property whose views on housing do not accord with his.

My opposition to Mr. Weaver is based upon certain policies and philosophies for which he stands which could be highly detrimental to private ownership of property—one of the basic rights of American citizenship.

I feel certain that you will give this matter your usual careful and wise consideration.

Sincerely yours,

TAZEWELL T. HUBARD, Jr.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
February 6, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Please do not confirm the nomination of Robert C. Weaver of New York as Administrator of HHFA. This appointment should be opposed as very unwise. It is purely political and not based on sound reasons of public welfare.

From Mr. Weaver's book, "The Negro Ghetto," it clearly appears that he is a strong advocate of public housing and, of course, his past activities have included support of "rent control" and other so-called "liberal" policies. In New York, he was actively connected with rent control, which continues to this day.

In his book, Mr. Weaver strongly advocated subsidized housing. He went beyond that to condemn not only FHA for early lack of support of policies for which he stands, but also private owners of property whose views on housing do not accord with his.

The policies for which he stands could be highly detrimental in part to private ownership of property—one of the basic rights of American citizenship.

Sincerely,

FRED O. HARBRECHT.

THE NEAL PROPERTIES CO.,
February 6, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: The nomination of Mr. Robert C. Weaver of New York as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency before your committee is one of the most important in the new administration.

As operators of commercial real estate, we are deeply concerned with Mr. Weaver's point of view with respect to public housing and rent control. As State rent control administrator in New York, and the fact that New York City still has it, leads us to believe that a better choice could have been made for this most important unit in the Federal Government. Our opposition is based on this point of his philosophy and on no other.

We appreciate your consideration of this important point when voting on this confirmation.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT C. NEAL,
President.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 5, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington D.C.:

Oppose appointment Robert C. Weaver of New York as Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency. He is entirely too radical, socialistic, anti-private-enterprise with ax to grind for position. Please vote against him.

MARGARET M. DOYLE.

SANTA MONICA TRAVEL SERVICE,
Santa Monica, Calif., February 6, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I would like to protest the appointment of Robert C.

Weaver as Administrator of the very important Housing and Home Finance Agency on the grounds that his qualifications and affiliations are not of the caliber needed in this key position.

It would be my hope that this particular appointment be reviewed and examined very carefully to determine the fitness of the appointee.

There are many good Americans, I am sure, who would be willing to tackle the job. You would be doing your country a service if you would ask the President to select one of them. Otherwise, it is very likely that we will all live to regret the irreparable damage that this appointee could conceivably do in this capacity.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER M. AYER.

THE T. W. GROGAN CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 7, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I simply want to write to voice my disapproval of the proposed appointment of Robert C. Weaver to the post of Director of HHFA. I don't feel he has the proper background and experience to direct this agency and feel strongly that his appointment would be a disservice to the country. I am sure a better choice can be made.

Sincerely,

J. F. PERKINS.

THE FEDERATION OF REALTY INTERESTS
OF METROPOLITAN CLEVELAND,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 6, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We understand Mr. Robert C. Weaver is being considered as Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and that this matter is presently before your committee.

We believe that the office in question is of utmost importance to the most important segment of our national assets—the home. This is true whether it be owned for personal use or for rental. What affects the value of one will ultimately affect the value of the other.

To our knowledge, Mr. Weaver has neither construction nor a real estate background which would make him understand the many complex problems which must be resolved by a person in that position. But of even greater importance is his record as rent director of New York City where, on many occasions, his decisions were found to be arbitrary and capricious and illegal. This alone indicates that he would be unable to hold this position with fairness and impartiality. His book, "The Negro Ghetto," indicates his prejudices, and we believe strongly indicates the use to which this office would be put.

We wish to say unequivocally that our objection is not taken to his race or color. There are fine colored people of exceptional ability who would be able to hold this position with distinction to themselves and with benefit to the Nation as a whole. However, we do not believe that Mr. Weaver with his background and general lack of qualifications could properly carry on this work with welfare toward all and prejudice toward none. We strongly urge his appointment not be confirmed.

Very truly yours,

HENRY DULAURENCE.

BRONX BOROUGH
TAXPAYERS LEAGUE, INC.,
Bronx, N.Y., January 6, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Senate Banking Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I read with interest your opposition to Dr. Robert C. Weaver as Housing and Home Finance Administrator in the new Kennedy administration.

It might be of interest for you to know that Dr. Weaver was the New York State rent administrator under the administration of Gov. Averill W. Harriman, during which time rent control provisions were tightened up and made more onerous on property owners in New York. The policy of the agency during his administration was such that the housing supply in New York was permitted to become further deteriorated under the tight controls.

It is the feeling of this organization that having a man like Dr. Weaver at the head of this very important Housing and Home Finance Agency could turn out to be a forerunner of rent control throughout the United States.

It might also be of interest to you to know that because of the strongest rent control regulations in the city and the State of New York, that the housing supply has not expanded at as fast a rate as in the rest of the country and that the existing housing supply has been permitted to deteriorate. The condition of these two forces has resulted in the Federal Government expending large sums of money in this area on various public housing projects to help fill the gap, which while rent control is in existence cannot possibly be filled.

We, therefore, urge you to continue to oppose the appointment of Dr. Weaver and we also urge you to prevent any further public moneys being spent in New York City and New York State for the subsidy of public housing until rent control is removed.

Very truly yours,

WOLF WITTENBERG,
President.

JANUARY 6, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Senate Banking Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to go on record as being unalterably opposed to the confirmation of Robert C. Weaver as Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

I represent real estate interests. We have never been found in violation of the rent laws (except for extremely minor and debatable matters in a very few cases), but I have suffered through the administration of Mr. Weaver as State rent administrator and he has proved himself unfit for any position of trust, in my opinion, because he has permitted his personal philosophy with respect to the administration of his office to color all his determinations and, as a result, to completely disregard the law he was sworn to uphold.

The 1959 report of the New York State Legislative Commission To Study Rents and Rental Conditions (admittedly a report by the Republican majority) bears out my observations by citing chapter and verse. In footnotes, the report gives 25 cases in which the then administrator (Mr. Weaver) was reversed in decisions, the courts—and the courts have both Democratic and Republican judges—saying, in each case:

"The administrator acted arbitrarily, unreasonably and illegally."

Do we want a man who has acted arbitrarily, unreasonably and illegally as National Housing and Home Finance Administrator?

The report goes on to say: "Many similar cases can be cited."

When the courts say: "There is nothing in the record to support the respondent's (administrator's) position," "the State rent administrator was capricious and arbitrary," when his action in one case was such as to "increase such shortage (the housing shortage)," when another court said "He (the administrator) cannot limit the duty within the range of facts necessary to perform his functions to those he finds it agreeable to determine," another court held his action "unwarranted * * * on the face of the record before the court," can you seriously consider this man for a position of trust?

Arbitrary, unreasonable, acting illegally, capricious—are these the qualities that fit Mr. Weaver for his office?

Yours respectfully,

ARTHUR T. KAPLAN.

BALTIMORE, MD., *January 11, 1961.*

Senator ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Several days ago I read in the Wall Street Journal that you are chairman of a Senate committee that will consider the appointment of Robert C. Weaver to the post of Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I respectfully urge you to do everything in your power to prevent confirmation of the appointment of Robert C. Weaver to the said office.

Please bear in mind that millions of citizens of this country have spent their lives in building up for themselves decent homes, to see their homes ruined by this blight that will be forced upon them; also so many others have spent their lives in paying for a small apartment house so that in their old age they can live in one apartment and collect rents for the other two or three apartments—they likewise will be subjected to this blight; and blight it is, as anyone can plainly see who will look over any neighborhood where Negroes have moved in. Mr. Kennedy and his multimillionaire friends will of course never be touched by this blight.

Very truly yours,

LUCILE W. HENRY.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 5, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: We are writing to protest the confirmation of Mr. R. C. Weaver as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

We feel that Mr. Weaver's office of rent control administrator of New York State, and the fact that he strongly favors public housing would prevent him from being an unbiased Administrator of this very important Government agency. There will be lots of pressure for public housing and we feel that the man at the head of the HHFA should be unbiased and consider what too much public housing is doing and will do to the private industry of rental property, which has to pay a big share of taxes for public housing.

Most places in California and we believe in the Nation have quite a vacancy factor now and we feel that this must be considered in putting up more subsidized housing.

We trust you will make our position known to your committee.

Thank you for your attention to and consideration of this problem.

Sincerely,

FRED H. GERLACH.

NORTHFIELD, ILL.,
February 8, 1961.

Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Opposed confirmation of Robert Weaver as Housing Administrator. His past gullible connections and views do not qualify him for this post.

JEANNETTE C. WILLARD.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 4, 1961.

Hon. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of State of Virginia.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to urge you to vote against and do all in your power to stop the appointment of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, as Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

He is biased, too liberal, and not in the best interest of the public, and very unfair to owners of private property.

His view in his book "The Negro Ghetto" shows he is not the man for the job.

Thank you for whatever you can do to stop the appointment of Mr. Weaver.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD NYVALL.

THE WICHITA NEGRO COLLEGE FUND,
Wichita, Kans.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a Negro publisher of Wichita, Kans. We also head a Negro scholarship fund for eligible Negro students in our city's metropolitan area. We believe that the only way the Negro can solve his apathy is through a thorough education. Therefore, we keep very close contact with Senator ANDY SCHOEPPEL and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

Today, I wish to call upon your cooperation for the opposing of Mr. Weaver to the FHA post. We feel that it would be a discredit to our race to have a Negro in such a high post who isn't qualified educationally, socially, and religiously. This man was picked because Kennedy had to keep his commitment with the vicious and brutal NAACP gang of New York State. Should a high appointment of this type go to a man just because he is a NAACP radical? Therefore, I am urging you to stop this unqualified man's nomination.

We are Negro citizens who believe and will fight for education for the Negro. Not to push the Negro or to make him a political football, but to help him strive for higher goals through education. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. RUFFIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 8, 1961.*

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I strongly oppose the nomination of Robert C. Weaver as FHA Administrator for the following reasons.

1. He is not even a licensed real estate broker.

2. He has no experience as either a broker or as a banker.

3. As New York State rent control administrator he was entirely out of sympathy with our industry. All his decisions and rulings were strongly prejudiced and biased against realty owners, brokers, and builders.

4. Because of his affiliation with NAACP he will only use any public office he may hold purely for the advancement of his own personal views and prejudices the same as he did when he was with New York State.

5. Buyers of homes or renters of apartments at today's current high prices are going to discriminate and refuse to pay fancy prices for the privilege of living in areas populated by Negroes?

6. I believe his appointment, instead of stimulating a building boom, will cause it to dry up.

I sincerely hope your committee and the Senate will reject this very ill-fitting candidate for so important a post.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. DOYLE.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
February 4, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Urge your committee give serious consideration before approving nomination of Robert C. Weaver to head Housing and Home Finance Agency. Mr. Weaver plainly biased for rent control, subsidized housing, urban renewal, and against private ownership of property.

Sincerely,

APARTMENT HOUSE ASSOCIATION OF FRESNO,
EUGENE W. BRINKER, *President.*

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
February 8, 1961.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee of the U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I strongly oppose the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, as the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, solely because of his known liberal policies highly detrimental to private ownership of property which is one of the basic rights of a citizen of the United States of America. The watering-down of this basic right is a sinister part of the total threat to our freedom.

JAMES C. VAN NOY.

BRUCE HOLMAN CO.,
Oakland, Calif., February 3, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I strongly oppose the appointment of Robert C. Weaver as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and I urge you to vote against confirming this appointment.

Mr. Weaver favors rent control, expansion of the public housing program, more subsidizing of tenants, more people on welfare. He favors socialism and is "anti" to a free and private enterprise economy.

He is a dangerous man to be clothed with so much authority.

Cordially and sincerely,

BRUCE HOLMAN.

RENO, NEV.,
February 7, 1961.

Hon. Senator A. W. ROBERTSON,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am sorry I did not write you before and thus encourage you in the good cause to keep out of office Mr. Weaver as Housing Administrator, or any other office, during the promising Democratic administration recently elected.

Until a few months ago, I was a resident of New York City, and thus I am in a position to evaluate, both from experience and through hearsay, the destructive qualities of Mr. Weaver as Housing Administrator of rent control in New York State for so many years.

Believe me, Senator, the appointment of such a man in such an important office in the Government will be conducive only to discredit the Democratic administration.

I base my statements on my personal experience as a tenant and from the runaround Mr. Weaver's office gave me and most tenants in favor of the Republican landlords.

I trust your good colleagues will be awake to this menace and refuse to confirm any man with such a poor record as an administrator.

Wishing you every success in your good and just cause for the betterment of our country, believe me, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK L. PAUL.

I am writing in protest against the Weaver appointment. Is it too late? Philadelphia has been ruined by the mixing of the two races; and the whites have been pushed out of the city. Must they be pushed even further? A homeowner surely has the God-given right to refuse to sell to whom he pleases.

M. JOHNSON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 8, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: I, too, am opposed to the confirmation of Dr. Robert Weaver as Housing and Home Finance Administer. His decisions, while serving in a similar capacity in New York City, only led to race riots and other forms of violence and this record isn't suitable for the rest of the Nation.

He is also a top official in the NAACP, which is dedicated to cause the white majority to lose political and social control and thereby set themselves up as a Negro minority, which, in my opinion, is un-American.

I am also against his confirmation because he could in such position attempt to force the white race to conform to the NAACP ideas of integration insofar as securing Government home loans and rentals; failing in this it would relocate the white majority to second-class citizens, which is also un-American.

I am going to send Senator CLARK and Senator SCOTT a card recommending they vote against his confirmation, but knowing the conditions they have created here in Philadelphia, I am sure it will be of no avail.

Again I commend you for your stand on this issue.

Sincerely yours,

R. WILSON.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 4, 1961.*
Re confirmation of Robert C. Weaver.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Read of President Kennedy's nomination of Robert C. Weaver as Director of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, which comes before your committee for confirmation. Indications are that this man is a radical minority pressure-group leader, convinced that it is perfectly legitimate to use political pressure to attain their ends by overriding not only the property rights but the civil liberties of the majority.

If you will read Weaver's book, "The Negro Ghetto," you will understand his political pressure tactics. Men of this type should not be given a high Federal office. I urge your committee to refuse confirmation of his nomination.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST C. REMPFER.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there is one other letter I wish to place in the RECORD. It comes from Los Angeles, Calif., and is addressed to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Attached to it is an article entitled "Business Conditions Analyzed," written

by Dr. James M. Gillies and published in the magazine California Building Contractor for January 1961. I ask unanimous consent that the first three paragraphs of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS CONDITIONS ANALYZED

(By Dr. James M. Gillies, assistant dean, School of Business Administration, UCLA, and economic adviser to the BCA)

THE NEW HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

President-elect Kennedy's appointment of Robert C. Weaver as head of the HHFA came as a considerable surprise to most housing people for a number of reasons. First, Dr. Weaver is a sociologist by profession with relatively little experience in banking, mortgage lending and general economic matters—and yet it is in these areas that the FHA—certainly one of the most significant agencies within the HHFA—operates. Second, Dr. Weaver is closely associated with public housing and urban renewal and redevelopment and important as these activities may be public housing in particular has been something less than well received in the past decade. Before his appointment he was vice chairman of the New York Housing and Redevelopment Board. Third, Dr. Weaver is a Negro and housing has been a controversial area in the entire issue of civil rights. Fourth, both Congressman RAINS and Senator SPARKMAN, the leading housing men in the House and Senate, come from Alabama and have long followed the southern position with respect to integration. For all these reasons the appointment is certain to be a controversial one and unless a considerable amount of negotiation, not yet apparent, was done, it appears at this early date that the administration may have some trouble in getting the appointment confirmed. Again, on the surface, the appointment also indicates that the national trade associations—particularly the NAHB and the NAREB—have little influence in the selection of top officials in the new administration.

If Dr. Weaver is confirmed it seems almost certain that he will attempt to (1) evolve more programs of urban renewal and redevelopment, (2) push for a revitalized public housing program, and (3) insist on equal rights in all housing for all citizens. Legislation requiring completely open neighborhoods (i.e., absolutely no segregation) in all projects or housing where any type of Government assistance is involved, including FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans, has often been suggested in the past but it has been stopped by legislators from the South. It is almost certain that such legislation will now be pushed. It appears, therefore, at this early date that housing legislation will be more controversial under the new administration than it has been for sometime * * * and there is the possibility that much new legislation will be held back if the administration makes housing one of the major areas in which the civil rights battle is fought.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator mentioned that the nominee was a member of the Washington Book Shop. The Senator knows, does he not, that that is a Communist organization?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was so listed by the Attorney General.

Mr. EASTLAND. Was it not the Communist headquarters in Washington?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was listed, as I understand, because of Communist domination and it engaged in disseminating Communist literature.

Mr. EASTLAND. Communist propaganda?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. What was the excuse given by Dr. Weaver for his membership in it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That it sold books at a 20-percent discount; that he was a student and a reader of books, and wanted to get the benefit of the discount.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Virginia saw the witness and examined him. Does the Senator believe that statement by the nominee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is hardly a fair question to ask the Senator from Virginia whether or not he believed the witness. The President of the United States had that information, and the President of the United States, over his signature, sent us a statement that he had received the information, had evaluated it, and had, in effect, cleared the nominee. He said he would make a good public servant.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator from Virginia is opposing the nominee. Is the Senator opposing him on the ground of the nominee's membership in a Communist front organization or on other grounds?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am opposing him on other grounds, because in the opinion of the Senator from Virginia, there are plenty of good grounds concerning which there can be no dispute.

The witness said he did not know that the Washington Book Shop was a Communist front.

As to the American Negro Congress, the witness said he did not remember whether he was in it or not. The Senator from Texas asked the witness, "Do you know if you were in it?" The witness said in one place he was not a member, and in another place that he could not remember. That was that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the question of the Washington Book Shop has been raised, I wondered if the Senator from Virginia would permit me to read excerpts from the Washington Post for Wednesday, May 21, 1941, and from the Washington Daily News of the same date, which deal directly with this matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Would it not be better if the Senator said that that was fully covered on page 90 of the hearings, and asked permission that page 90 of the hearings be printed at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate that suggestion, but I prefer to read it, because I believe the statement is a complete exoneration of Dr. Weaver in this matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The only trouble is that the statement is rather extended. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] has an engagement to catch a plane. We will have plenty of time to cover what the Senator from Illinois is discussing. He can place the material in the RECORD at this point, and later he can read it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me put it this way: Is it not true that at a meeting of the Washington Book Shop on May 20, 1941, Miss Corienne Robinson, who was secretary to Mr. Weaver at that time, rose on the floor and charged that the Washington Cooperative Book Shop was controlled by disloyal elements, and filed the resignations of nine persons, including Robert C. Weaver?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is what the Post said. But how could I know whether it is true?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Here is the photostat of the article published in the Post.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But I cannot say whether the Post was correct, any more than I could say whether what Dr. Weaver said is correct. For instance, Dr. Weaver, who is a Ph. D., said he was going there only to get some 20-percent book discounts; and I did not comment on the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that Miss Robinson, a spokesman for the group of nine, one of whom was Dr. Weaver, made the following statement:

We declare emphatically our support of the constitutional form of government in the United States, and disavow any action which seeks to state or imply our support of any totalitarian governments, Nazi, Fascist, or Communist, against all of which we are unalterably opposed. We consider continued membership in the bookshop inconsistent with this position, and hereby submit our resignations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That could be true; or it could be as untrue as a statement by one reporter, published in a New York newspaper, to the effect that I was opposing the nomination solely because of objection to his position on race matters. The newspaper published that, but it was not true.

A newspaper has published the item to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, but it may or may not be true; I cannot pass on that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At any rate, I have before me reports from two Washington newspapers, and the reports corroborate each other.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia, the salient paragraphs from these news articles and an editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Without objection——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have no objection, because they are on page 90 of the hearing record, and we had the matter fully before us at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matters submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(The excerpts from the articles and the editorial, submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. ROBERTSON'S remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as I have said, I had only a little time to prepare my presentation.

This morning, I went to the President's prayer breakfast. It was one of the most inspiring events I have known of for a long time. If anyone had any race hatred in his heart, he could not have kept it long, under the influence of the talks made this morning at the prayer breakfast. Certainly if I have any race hatred, I am not conscious of it.

I have stated the reasons why I oppose confirmation of the nomination of a man who has spent his adult life as a crusader of this sort. I do not challenge his right to do so; and I do not challenge his right to have views about desegregated schools or desegregated housing or desegregated lunchrooms or desegregated buses. But he has spent his life in working for all that; and I say that one who has done that, one who has spent his whole life on one endeavor, cannot change overnight. That is the reason why so many persons have written to me letters in which they state they are afraid of what will happen.

I have tried to do my duty to a great industry. I have submitted my view that this nominee is not the right man to take charge of this great industry, which involves, as I have said, in any normal year $22 billion. The housing industry is tremendous in size, and is of very great importance. The jobs of over 1 million men are involved in this industry.

The Senator from Alabama said to us that his colleague from Alabama, the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, said last year that he had a majority of only five in favor of public housing. He said that if we go to open occupancy, he would no longer have a majority for public housing.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for 5 minutes, so that I may report a nomination and request unanimous consent for its immediate consideration? It is the nomination of James E. Webb to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. KERR. Yes; Mr. President, I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I report the nomination of James E. Webb, to be Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and I request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James E. Webb, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Webb was considered by the committee, and was unanimously approved. It is our wish that the Senate advise and consent to the nomination, and then that the President be immediately notified of such action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I was very much pleased to yield to my colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, who is a great man who always works to promote the general welfare.

FEDERAL HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Federal Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate unduly in connection with this matter.

I have tried to discharge my duty—and this task has not been a pleasant one—in regard to what the newspapers say, and correctly so, I believe, is a nomination to the highest position to which any Negro has ever been nominated in the history of the country—a position so high that many persons are urging that the one who holds it be given a place in the Cabinet and that the Agency be given departmental status.

I did not have time to make thorough, careful preparation of this presentation; and thus I was a little surprised, chagrined, and disappointed when I learned that Senators who share my view on this matter did not have time to submit their views.

In any event, I have tried to proceed, without bias or unfairness and without making charges that cannot be proved, to state my objections, as I have presented them this afternoon and summarized them as best I could in the time available to me.

Let me say that even when the members of my committee do not agree, we do not fall out personally. In the committee we get along very well. We did not have any dogfight over this matter, and we do not expect to have a dogfight over any other matter. They respect me, and I respect them. We present our viewpoints, and we argue for them; and then we vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me say that I think the chairman proceeded with fairness in presiding over the meeting of the committee; and I assure him that those who voted differently from the way in which he voted on this issue look forward with him to a constructive year in which the housing facilities of the Nation can be improved.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course Senators can look forward. The chairman has already indicated the direction in which he expects to look.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to join the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in saying that the hearing was conducted with the utmost dignity and decorum. The chairman of the committee was most fair with his colleagues and with the witness. The matter was fairly debated and fairly voted on. I happen to approve of the result—as I shall state later. But I think it due both sides to state that the chairman of the committee is justly entitled to praise for the way in which he handled what I know was, for him, not an easy situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my colleagues very much.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. First, I wish to advise the Senator from Virginia that, as he knows, there is no way to get at the substance of this controversial matter except by referring to points he has made in his summary statement here.

I understand that the Senator from Virginia has based his position partly on the fact that confirmation of the nomination would be, in the opinion of the Senator from Virginia, an injury to the housing industry.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Very definitely, and I shall give an illustration of how it would be.

Mr. STENNIS. I was going to ask the Senator from Virginia to do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A very large realtor in Virginia called me, yesterday afternoon, and said, "I am worried sick over this nomination. I just agreed with a group to go into a 100-unit housing development in the adjoining county, Loudoun County." He said, "When I learned that the committee had voted to confirm him and the press said undoubtedly he would be overwhelmingly approved in the Senate, I notified my colleagues I was not going to risk my money on a unit which would be decleared open occupancy, where we would sell one house to someone supported by the NAACP and we would never be able to sell another one."

That is an illustration of what they are afraid of.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, the Senator from Virginia is chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and, therefore, is in touch not only with the housing industry but other major industries of the Nation. Does the Senator from Virginia share the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi that there are very strong prospects that this matter would very seriously injure and hold back and disrupt economic development in various areas of the country, particularly now that we are in a recession period, making uncertain formation of contracts, making uncertain the development of projects, and throwing into the economy such a disruptive influence that it will take a considerable time even to begin to mend the damage?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In recent weeks there has been a severe fall in housing starts. Part of that is due to many people being out of jobs. We are in what might even be called a recession.

Anyway, we are not under boom conditions. Part of it was due to the fact that some of the housing already built is not selling.

On top of all that, taking this action will definitely discourage people in that field, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Virginia, and mitigate against the reemployment of many persons who are dependent for jobs in the construction industry, and also against those who furnish raw materials, lumber, steel, cement, glass, and all products that go into modern homes, as well as appliances such as cooking stoves, heaters, and what not.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield further, that statement would apply not only to housing projects, but also to utilities, furnishings, and all other products in the entire housing field. Is that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Housing is the largest segment of our economy. It accounts for about 5 percent of the gross national product, and the gross national product is a little over $500 billion. Housing accounts for over $22 billion worth of projects and we are going to give this man great power over this entire industry. He would be the supervisor.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi believes that economic considerations have a way of finally swinging around and having an influence on all related matters. As I understand the Senator from Virginia, he found in his investigation, and from the testimony and letters he has received, that the prospect of affecting the housing industry is nationwide. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is not any doubt about it. Some persons have said, "We do not want to be quoted, but we are up against the same thing in our States."

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator refers to States outside the South, does he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. I make that point because it has been said that this is merely a southern problem. This is an industry which affects 1 million workers and involves more than $22 billion a year. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct, and there is not a single other industry in this Nation of that magnitude. Put all the automobiles together, and that industry amounts to only $12 billion. Housing is the biggest industry we have. Therefore, people are right when they say that the position for which he is chosen is a grand one. Some say they are opposed to it, that it ought to be a Cabinet position, so that more money could be funneled into urban renewal. A man from Chicago said if favorable action is taken, we would have over $40 billion in urban renewal.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What were this nominee's experience and training to qualify him for this position?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I had better read what we had. In the biographical sketch that we had, it was stated that he had been vice chairman of the Housing and Redevelopment Board of New York City, and he had been connected with rent control there. He had been adviser on Negro matters in the Department of the Interior, and a consultant in the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration.

He has had a lot of experience in the philosophy of how to use houses, but he has not had experience in building them, or in banking, or in FHA, or in financing housing.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that he has had no experience which would qualify him for this position?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee could not say that positively, but, in his opinion, the nominee is not a man of first class judgment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think this is a position for a successful and outstanding business leader?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I put into the RECORD a letter written to me in which it was stated we could get any number of good Negroes who would be qualified, and to whom there would not be any objection, but this man is not qualified. Certainly, we could get people to take this position who would be satisfactory and about whom there would not be any question.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The following excerpts from newspaper articles and an editorial were, at the request of Senator DOUGLAS, and by unanimous consent, ordered to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 21, 1941]

Only 300 of the Book Shop's 1,200 members attended the emergency meeting called by the book cooperative at the Burlington last night.

The meeting adopted a resolution denying the communism charge as "flatly untrue" and characterizing such charges as "an attack on every American's constitutional right to read the books and say the things he pleases."

Two or three hours were spent in an attempt to throw out a Book Shop member who is a newspaperman but was not present in his professional capacity.

Also, a group resigned and left the meeting when it was prevented from presenting a resolution questioning the act of Book Shop officials in resigning from the District Cooperative League without consulting the membership.

Said Corienne K. Robinson, spokesman for the group:

"We declare emphatically our support of the constitutional form of government in the United States and disavow any action which seeks to state or imply our support of any totalitarian governments, Nazi, Facist, or Communist, against all of which we are unalterably opposed. We consider continued membership in the Book Shop inconsistent with this position and hereby submit our resignations."

[From the Washington Daily News, May 21, 1941]

BORED FROM WITHIN

The Commies have apparently balled up another good thing. Some time ago, a cooperative venture called the Book Shop was organized here. It was a member of the local Cooperative League, a simple economic enterprise like any other cooperative venture. Impecunious students with a taste for good books and victrola records, cultured modestly paid Government workers and liberals interested in the cooperative movement joined it. Then came the Commies. In their industrious way, they did a lot of the routine work; they "took over." Then the Book Shop fell out with the Cooperative League because it stooged for Stalin.

Last night (see story on p. 5) a part of its membership quit because of the high-handed way those yammerers for democracy, the Commies, ran the show. There is an even larger group of Federal workers who weren't at the meeting last night who are scared to death that the Dies committee, which now has seized the Book Shop membership list, will publicize it in a manner which would tar them all with the Commie brush. It would be tragic if such mishandling of the list would jeopardize the jobs of these decent and innocent persons. We hope the Dies committee will protect them from such embarrassment.

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1941]

Meanwhile, a membership meeting of the Bookshop, a consumer cooperative, last night condemned what it called the illegal seizure of its membership list by the Dies committee and denied insinuations that it is a Communist organization.

At the stormy session, the resignation of nine members of the Book Shop was flung at the platform by Corienne Robinson, administrative assistant in the Office of Racial Relations, U.S. Housing Authority, who asked the presiding officer whether only one side of the question was going to be heard.

David McCalmont, general counsel of the District of Columbia Cooperative League, who surrendered a Book Shop membership list to a Dies committee investigator, waited in the lobby of the Burlington Hotel until the stormy session neared its close, and then he was allowed 5 minutes to make a statement.

He declared that neither he nor anyone connected with the league had any contact with the Dies committee until the agent arrived with the subpena. He said he had severad his connection with the Book Shop because "I no longer have any hope of being able to turn the Bookshop into a genuine cooperative."

Before he appeared, McCalmont's expulsion from the Book Shop membership by its board was approved by the meeting.

In a rebuttal to his statement, Dick Brady, Bookshop representative to the Cooperative League, said the list surrendered to the Dies committee investigator was not an accurate membership list. He said that the list had been marked by McCalmont with the symbols "S" and "R" by members' names, indicating "Stalinist" and "Rochdaleite." The latter term indicates adherence to cooperative principles. Brady said the marking of this list, without evidence but merely on the basis of personal opinion, greatly endangered the jobs and livelihood of several hundred persons.

The resolution adopted at the meeting demanded of the Dies committee the Bookshop's right to defend itself publicly.

About 300 persons attended the meeting, at which a split came when Dorothy I. Cline attempted to get the floor to read a resolution. It would have protested against the recent withdrawal of the Book Shop from the Cooperative League by action of the Book Shop's board of trustees, and would have urged that the board be divested of its powers of office. Miss Cline, community relations counselor with the USHA, was ruled out of order.

Thereupon Miss Robinson announced to the presiding officer, David Wahl, the resignation of herself, Miss Cline, Henry Lee Moon, Betty MacDonald Miller, Robert C. Weaver, John Saks, Lucie Breyer, Arthur Jacobs, Lucia M. Pitts.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, it is not with trepidation, but with a sense of grave responsibility, that I rise and take the floor of this august body to oppose confirmation of an appointee of the President, namely, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, who is now under consideration for the office of Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I have not been in the Senate very long, but I am enough of a student of the Constitution and the theory of the Government of these United States to know that the hour has come to stand up and represent both the people of the great State of Texas and the United States in exercising my prerogative as a Senator to voice my conscience and my views which may not be in accord with those of the President, thereby causing the issue to be joined and be given the benefit of debate of different points of view.

There is a serious responsibility attached to a vote regarding a nominee of the President. Without being critical of my fellow Senators, I think that this is a responsibility that is sometimes taken too lightly in the attitude that it is primarily the President's responsibility; that if he can work with his own nominee, the Senate should not be reluctant to give him an opportunity to do so. This is true in part, but it is not entirely true. It can be carried to extremes very easily in these complex times of a gigantic Government, with numerous officers requiring Senate confirmation.

The Constitution of the United States, in article 11, section 2, subsection (2), gives power to the President to appoint officers of the United States "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." Thereafter, it empowers Congress to vest in the President alone, or in the courts or heads of departments, full appointive power without approval of the Senate. Thus, Congress, under the Constitution, has appointment responsibilities unless and until it divest itself of them respecting inferior officers.

In the instant case Congress has not divested itself of this responsibility and we are not concerned with an inferior officer. The antithesis is true. We are concerned with the highest office in the land, next to the President himself, in the field of housing. It is a tremendously important office and a delicate one, affecting the daily lives and living conditions of millions of our people throughout the length and breadth of the land. The truth of the matter is that the President has appointed to that office, subject to our approval here today, a man who is not well qualified to fill it; a man who is too narrow in his concepts and aims in life to fill it; a man whose judgments in the past have not been sound; and a man who will throw the field of housing into a veritable hotbed of emotionalism and strife under the guise of equal opportunity if he attempts to put into practice even a small portion of his printed and undenied views regarding forced integration and open occupancy. In fact, Dr. Weaver appears to me to be a man who would abolish the term "freedom of choice" respecting the right of a white person to have the freedom of his choice to live in an all-white community. He would abolish all ethnic values—all racial lines—all natural tendencies of members of both white and black races to live among their own kind and color, to achieve the ideal expressed in his writings of the absorption of racial problems in housing by an overall abolition or banishment of ethnic backgrounds.

I sat through every minute of the hearings on Dr. Weaver before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. Our chairman, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], gave him every opportunity in the interest of fairness. I was impressed with Dr. Weaver's quick ability with words. I am sorry to say that this ability appeared to be used primarily to defend, to espouse, or to explain away his obviously deep convictions about mixture of the races in housing, in schools, and wherever the Federal Government is now involved or will be involved in the future. He could not shed the mantle of appearing to carry the torch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People even in a committee hearing, although it was obvious that he attempted to do so.

I pose two approaches to the question of Dr. Weaver's fitness for office, to wit: First. His extremism and lack of good judgment in his affiliations with Communist-front organizations and in his outright gullibility to impressions purposely made on him by the Russians; and second, the fact that most of his concern in the past has been with greater rights for colored people, so much so that he is imbued with this subject as his apparent total and full mission in life. To empower him with the highest Federal housing office in the land would be subjecting our entire housing program to this principle as a guiding light, thereby making the far more important other aspects of the program which are in sad need of expansion take a secondary role.

With respect to the first categorical approach, I interrogated Dr. Weaver at the committee hearing regarding his Communist-front connections. My conclusion is that he was a free joiner. His judgment was not sound. A man of his education should have known better. Sometimes higher education makes one more liberal, so to speak, but it is, in itself, not a justification for joining questionable organizations and for endorsing the programs of organizations without inquiry as to their composition and complexion. Of this he is definitely guilty. He told the committee that if he had known then what he knew later he would not have affiliated himself with some of these organizations—that he left all of them when he found that they were Communist infiltrated. This, nevertheless, shows poor judgment and a tendency to be extremely radical—a characteristic not becoming the top Housing Administrator.

Moreover, he did not disassociate himself from all of these organizations before they were cited officially as Communist-front organizations. The National Negro Congress was cited as a Communist-front organization by the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1939, and Dr. Weaver's name appeared in the Daily Worker, a Communist newspaper, on April 24, 1940, 1 year and nearly 3 months after the official citation as a panel participant in the Third National Negro Congress to be held in Washington, D.C., April 26, 1940. Dr. Weaver had been a discussion leader at the second congress which met in Philadelphia October 15–17, 1937, on the same program that bore a full page public advertisement of warmest fraternal wishes from the Communist Party U.S.A., signed by Earl Browder and William Foster. He told the committee that he attended the third congress in 1940 merely out of curiosity as a spectator, to the best of his recollection. Nevertheless, it is obvious that he was active enough in the Negro congress more than a year after its citation to have his name appear in a Communist newspaper as a panelist on the program. The National Negro Congress was also cited in 1942 by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization.

Dr. Weaver signed a letter of endorsement made public by the Daily Worker in February 1939, and prepared by the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, which committee was an extremist organization later cited by the House committee. The purpose of the letter, to lift the embargo against Spain, might have been plausible. Its sponsors were dangerous.

Dr. Weaver belonged to the notorious Washington Bookshop, and told the committee that he resigned when he discovered it was a Communist front.

Dr. Weaver's book, "The Negro Ghetto," was reviewed in the Communist publication Masses and Mainstream in August 1948. The review entitled J. Crow Realtor, praised the book for its approach in behalf of relief from the enslavement of the ghetto but it criticized Weaver for not going far enough with his socialistic ideas. I placed the review in the record out of fairness to Dr. Weaver because the criticism came from a Communist-cited source.

Dr. Weaver endorsed the program of the Council on African Affairs not very long before its official citation by the Attorney General in 1947. Although he has some prominent company in the endorsement, he stated to the committee that he would not have given the endorsement had he known more of the organization.

Among other things that he did with questionable organizations was to be a sponsor, according to the printed program, of a dinner for the notorious Communist character, Ferdinand C. Smith, on September 20, 1944. He was also a financial contributor to Social Work Today, before this publication was cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I believe one of the most damaging and illustrative writings of Dr. Weaver is an article he wrote entitled, "A Negro Goes to the Soviet Union," appearing in the Michigan Herald on February 16, 1947. The Michigan Herald is listed in the Daily Worker as having a Communist editor at that time. Dr. Weaver had just completed a trip to Russia for UNNRA.

The thesis of his article was the fine treatment given Negroes in Russia, and he commended the U.S.S.R. for its methods of dealing with minorities. He said:

> But the Soviet Union, as far as I saw it, does not have color prejudice. And that was a breath of fresh air. * * * Soviet Russia has done an exceptional job in wiping out these expressions of group chauvinism—and it has done it in a generation.
>
> Russian communism has created a feeling of belonging on the part of the vast majority of the citizens of the Soviet Union.
>
> As a result, different peoples have come to be proud of their backgrounds and culture and to appreciate that in variety there is cultural fertility.
>
> The success of the Soviet Union in diminishing and removing group antagonisms has deep significance for the United States.

Frankly, this article by Dr. Weaver disturbed me deeply. How could he be so gullible on one trip to Russia? Or did he actually prefer the Soviet system to ours? I asked him about this at the hearing and he admitted his error. What I say about him now is that he spoke strongly, unintelligently, and without full consideration of the issues, propaganda, and facts. This shows a quality or a lack of quality that I do not wish to see in the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I placed in the RECORD in rebuttal to Dr. Weaver's article an open letter to all African governments from the executive committee of the African Students Union in the U.S.S.R., reprinted in the December 1960 issue of the AFL–CIO Trade Union News. It is a very strong denunciation by African students of the discrimination, deceit, and brutality that exists in the U.S.S.R.

Respecting my second approach to the instant question, namely, that Dr. Weaver is more concerned with integration than with housing as such, I wish to place in the RECORD here as part of my remarks a bibliography which covers practically all of Dr. Weaver's writings.

There being no objection, the bibliography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIBLIOGRAPHY—ROBERT C. WEAVER

BOOKS

"The Negro Ghetto," New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1948.

"Negro Labor, a National Problem," New York, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1946.

ARTICLES

"Southern Comfort: A Possible Misapplication of Federal Funds," Journal of Intergroup Relations, summer 1960, volume 1, No. 3, pages 14–20.

"Class, Race and Urban Renewal," Land Economics, August 1960, volume 36, pages 235–251.

"Human Values of Urban Life," Political Science Quarterly, June 1960, pages 31–39. (Volume also contains proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, Columbia University, May 1960, in which Dr. Weaver participated.)

"Some Legislative Consequences of Negro Disfranchisement" (with Hortense W. Gabel as coauthor), Journal of Negro Education, volume 26, No. 3: 255–61, summer 1957.

"Integration in Public and Private Housing," the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 304, March 1956, pages 86–97.

"The Effect of Anti-Discrimination Legislation Upon the FHA and VA-insured Housing Market in New York State," Land Economics, University of Wisconsin, November 1955, volume 31, pages 303–313.

"Relative Status of the Housing of Negroes in the United States," Journal of Negro Education, volume 22, No. 3: 343–354, summer 1953.

"Economic Status of the Negro in the United States," Journal of Negro Education, volume 19, No. 3: 232–243, 1950.

"Needed Program of Research in Race Relations and Associated Problems," Journal of Negro Education, volume 16: 130–135, April 1947.

"A Negro Goes to the Soviet Union," Michigan Herald magazine, February 16, 1947, pages 9 and 11.

"Northern Ways," Survey Geographic, volume 36: 43–47, January 1947.

"No Race Problems in Russia," Civil Liberties News (published by Chicago Civil Liberties Committee), November 15, 1946, pages 1 and 2.

"Housing in a Democracy," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, 244: 95–105, March 1946.

"Race Restrictive Housing Covenants," the Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics, August 1945.

"Negro Employment in the Aircraft Industry," Quarterly Journal of Economics, 59: 597–625, August 1945.

"Negro Veteran," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, 238: 127–132, March 1945.

"Hemmed In: A B C's of Race Restrictive Housing Covenants," American Council on Race Relations, 1945 (pamphlet).

"City of Chicago," mayor's committee on race relations, Journal of Negro Education, volume 13, No. 4: 560–562, fall 1944.

"Recent Events in Negro Union Relationships," Journal of Political Economy, 52: 234–249, September 1944.

"Employment of the Negro in War Industries," Journal of Negro Education, volume No. 3: 386–396, summer 1943.

"Negro Comes in Age in Industry," Atlantic Monthly, 172: 54–59, September 1943.

"Defense Industries and the Negro," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, 223: 60–66, September 1942.

"With the Negro's Help," Atlantic Monthly, 169: 696–707, June 1942.

"Federal Aid, Local Control, and Negro Participation," Journal of Negro Education, volume 11: 47–59, January 1942.

"The Negro in a Program of Public Housing," Opportunity (Journal of Negro Life), July 1938, pages 198–203.

"The Urban Negro Worker in the United States, 1925–36," U.S. Department of Interior, Office of the Adviser on Negro Affairs, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938.

"An Experiment in Negro Labor," Opportunity (Journal of Negro Life), October 1936, pages 295–298.

CONGRESSIONAL REFERENCES

House Un-American Activities Report on; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 3, pages 3233 and 3234.

Testimony before Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration, House of Representatives, 77th Congress, 1st session, hearings, part 16, July 15, 16, and 17, 1941, pages 6529–6545.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, there are 2 books and 27 articles or pamphlets. All of them deal with Negro rights, whether they be in the field of housing or in the field of labor. The biographical data on Dr. Weaver illustrate that his life has been concerned chiefly with these subjects.

In the field of housing his book, "The Negro Ghetto," sets forth a plan with as much assistance by controls as is possible for the abolition of concentration of Negroes in urban areas, and their fusion in suburbs and new developments with white people. Dr. Weaver even suggests numerical formulae as patterns for infiltration when it is possible. The book looks to a completely integrated housing idea.

As to articles, beginning with an article in July 1938 on "The Negro in a Program of Public Housing," Dr. Weaver writes continuously for over 20 years for integrated housing, the abolition of restrictive covenants, and fused race relations. A 1957 article entitled "Some Legislative Consequences of Negro Disfranchisement" argues that the South will not let the Negro vote and their civil rights programs are impeded due to the strength of southern Members of Congress. It implies that by enfranchising southern Negroes a purge of southern leaders in Congress could and should take place. This article written by a Washington, D.C., born and Harvard educated Negro, who apparently knows or cares little about the South, will arouse the ire of most anyone who understands the southern life and southern traditions.

In March 1956 an article entitled "Integration, in Public and Private Housing," in the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Dr. Weaver called for more integration in both of these fields.

I realize that some of these quotations have been made before. At the risk of repetition I make them again, because I think they are important. Only last year, in the summer of 1960, Dr. Weaver wrote an article that would indicate his belief that the Brown decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 outlawing segregated public schools is being evaded through federally supported action on the housing front in which there is "Southern Comfort"—his quotes.

If we add all of this together we have the picture of a man more interested in integration than he is in housing. He appears to be intent upon enforcing the school desegregation decision through the housing program, without regard to the question of whether it is yet the law of the land. He appears to be intent upon enforcing this decision through the housing program.

I agree with the Virginia homebuilders and mortgage bankers who filed a statement with the committee that Dr. Weaver, as chairman of the board of the NAACP, cannot be expected to reverse his field as Housing Administrator. His thoughts and aims will be the same and this will harm the whole field of housing.

The private housing market, where most of the housing starts per year occur, will fight harder than ever to avoid Federal entanglements if it is apparent that wherever Federal connections occur there must be forced integration. The private market is not interested in getting involved in emotional, useless, and noisy disturbances over civil rights. Therefore, with Dr. Weaver at the head of Federal housing the private market will avoid Federal contacts and Federal housing will suffer. Perhaps, and most likely, the entire housing market will suffer.

If the field of housing will suffer by this appointment the entire economy will suffer. Whenever we are in even a mild economic slump we turn to housing to stimulate the economy. As recently as 1958 we put into effect a billion dollar par purchase program for the Federal National Mortgage Association to stimulate the economy. A slump in the housing industry will have an equally damaging effect. Housing reaches into many fields—industry, building supplies, real estate, banking and financing, and last but not least, by no means at this time of unemployment, labor. I have serious doubts about the effect of this appointment on the economy of the Nation.

With the rapid expansion of our population and the small portion—less than 15 percent—of that population that is Negro, it is a devastating shame to invite trouble, misunderstanding, and attempted enforcement of Federal rules on integration that will not work in a field so close to the everyday life of all citizens as housing. Dr. Weaver's appointment points in this direction. I trust that the Senate will not confirm him.

A man's home is his castle. Let us not so disturb him that it will be his castle in which to defend himself against an arbitrary and unreasonable government.

I opposed Dr. Weaver's appointment in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I shall vote against his confirmation in the Senate.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am the fourth member of the Committee on Banking and Currency who voted against the approval of the nomination of Dr. Weaver. I am not a southerner, and therefore I feel it is important that I make my statement here today as well.

Much has already been said on the subject which is the basis of my decision. I should like to make it clear that my vote in the Banking and Currency Committee against approving the nomination of Mr. Weaver as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and my floor opposition to his approval is not in any way prompted by his race or color. My impression of this man's background and of his testimony before the committee convinces me that by intellectual capacity and experience he is capable of rendering excellent Government service, in many other situations, but I have grave doubts about the wisdom of his appointment to head the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency.

As has been reiterated here so many times, Dr. Weaver's past writings and statements have shown him to be a zealot for a particular point of view—namely, that all housing programs in which Federal money is used in any way, including FHA, public housing, and veterans housing, should be racially integrated as soon as possible across the board, and in all parts of the country. I will agree that this is one problem that is involved in the overall housing program, but to me there are many others of greater importance. I feel that because of his lifelong and overwhelmed interest in this comparatively limited area, Mr. Weaver might not be able to take a broad enough view of the whole problem, but might subordinate the more important question of providing for total housing needs of all the people to the satisfaction of this goal toward which he has been working for 30 years, and which, if he is confirmed, will be literally within his grasp.

In light of this one dominant interest, Mr. Weaver's supporters are putting him on a very hot spot. They are creating an almost impossible situation for him. Members and leaders of his own race are going to expect more rapid integration of housing just because he has this job. If he cannot deliver, they will blame him.

He said to the committee that until the President issued a directive, he would not move to integrate housing. However, there are many ways in which he can move without a directive to change the present pattern. If he cannot think of them, the leaders of his people will point them out. If he does not follow them, they will assume that he has deserted the cause for which he has worked so hard for 30 years. On the other hand, many of those who strongly oppose Mr. Weaver's point of view of biracial occupancy are going to convict him before he starts. Without the confidence of the major segments of the industry plus large segments of the public in general, he cannot operate effectively in any phase of the housing program.

As further evidence of my reasoning, let me quote briefly from the hearings. In questioning Mr. Weaver, I cited to him from an article he had recently written concerning his goal to wipe out residential segregation in our democracy. These are two sentences taken from his "The Negro Ghetto," at page 360:

> Sooner or later the concept of separate areas for racial groups in America must give way if we want to make a rational approach to our housing problems and avoid the constant threat of racial conflict over space in housing facilities. This means that we must start developing communities open to all groups in our population.

Then, two pages later in the same book, he says:

> New areas open to minorities can be divided into two groups, those developed by public housing and those developed by private housing. Both are needed—

By which, I assume, he means both new areas open to minorities—

> and unless they are forthcoming no other measures for meeting the problems of housing have any chance to succeed.

In pursuing my questioning of Mr. Weaver, I wanted to make sure that I understood correctly that this goal of integrated housing in both public and private units was to be pursued even to the extent of interfering with the natural forces of the marketplace. It seemed to me that if the market forces would not bring about his goal, that from his remarks Mr. Weaver intended to "manage" our housing market to bring it about. It is true that in reply to my question as follows:

> And because the market does not always act to produce the pattern, then you think management should act to produce the pattern?

Mr. Weaver gave a negative reply.

But in further depth questioning, he indicated that he would "want to have a pattern, and that the best time to establish that pattern is at the beginning." I interpret this to mean that he would like to bias the market, so to speak, by setting a Federal pattern at the beginning of his service in order to influence the pattern of residential occupancy. For instance, in one of his recent publications Mr. Weaver made this comment:

> The biracial composition of the project should be established from the start, and the pattern desired in the end should be maintained [by controlling] the entrance of each new group of tenants.

The "by controlling" are my own words.

In the hearings Mr. Weaver elaborated with this comment:

> The second relates to the economics of the problem, and that is the fact that very often the market does not divide itself the way that the planners thought the market would divide itself, and you find yourself in a position of having units which are not readily marketable because they were planned for one group and that particular group does not choose or does not happen to respond to living in it.

He recognizes the problem. I assume from what he said that he believes that the proper authority should be used to continue the pattern, even though people choose not to follow it.

He did paint the picture in the hearings that certain types of approaches can influence the market and that they may be attempted.

I shall not speak at length. In summary, I myself have taken no position on integrated housing, but the fact that Mr. Weaver is a zealot for this cause could result in subordinating to this one issue other more important housing problems which he will face. It might not be his own desire to have this issue play an important role, but because of the practical matters connected with his background and writings, I fear that his hand might be forced and he might find both himself and the Agency inextricably involved in this issue of biracial occupancy, thus impairing the overall housing program.

There is no necessity to repeat the figures which would demonstrate how important this overall problem is in our national economy. I feel that it is so important that we should not risk mixing it in with the other problems, emotionally interesting and desirable as it may be to some persons, including Dr. Weaver, I feel certain; and I am sure he is very sincere in his point of view.

I understand that a yea-and-nay vote may not be taken by the Senate on the confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Weaver; but if there were to be such a vote, I should still feel compelled to vote against the nomination, as I did in the committee.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who attended all the hearings on the subject of the nomination of Mr. Robert C. Weaver, I should like to observe that I am very much impressed with the nominee. I am impressed

with his background of experience in the field of housing; with his intellect; and with his poise and dignity as an individual.

I am very happy to say that I voted for a favorable report to the Senate on his nomination, and that if there were a yea-and-nay vote on the nomination, I should vote for the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the confirmation of Dr. Robert C. Weaver to be Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator. It is no secret that I oppose a number of the programs under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including the public housing and urban renewal programs. I oppose them primarily because the Constitution of the United States gives no authority to the National Government to undertake such activities. I oppose them also because they are financially unsound and socialistic. I have also opposed them, however, because I have detected a consistent goal of promoting housing integration, revealed time and again in proposed legislation dealing with these housing programs, and I am unalterably opposed to forced integration in housing as I am in other fields. I am convinced, and my experience will admit of no other conclusion, that forced integration in my own State is not in the best interest of its people of whatever race they might be. I would make it clear, however, Mr. President, that my decision to oppose this appointment is not based on the appointee's race, but rather in spite of it. I would oppose his confirmation regardless of his race, and I do not propose to be deterred by the fact that he belongs to a minority race.

I should like to note at this point that the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee on this nomination were made available only this morning. While I have examined them, I have not studied them as thoroughly as I would have preferred had more time been available.

My objections to the confirmation of the appointee are twofold. First, in the appointee's rather prolific writings, he has consistently advocated and urged that all housing financed by the National Government be administered under a policy of "open occupancy." While there are some indications that Dr. Weaver, in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee, may have retrenched in his zeal for forcing integrated housing, I am far from convinced that the appointee, if confirmed, would not continue his efforts to make the housing program of the National Government a tool for integration of the races. The Congress, although it has continued and expanded—erroneously, in my opinion—many of these housing programs, has refused to let the tail wag the dog by warping the program through legislation designed to promote racial integration rather than shelter. Such moves have been made in the Congress, and I have opposed them here. I would be somewhat less than consistent if I voted to confirm a man as Administrator of the programs who has supplied through his writings such overwhelming evidence that he is an outstanding advocate of integration through housing.

Second, I am disturbed by the appointee's previous association with organizations subsequently cited or listed by various agencies of Congress and the executive branch as either Communist front or heavily Communist infiltrated. I refer, of course, to the National Negro Congress, the Washington Cooperative Book Shop, the Workers Book Shop, and the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy.

On the evidence available, I would be the last to assert that the appointee is either a Communist, or disloyal to the United States. These associations do, however, open the door to one of two alternative conclusions. Either the appointee at one period in his life concurred, at least in part, with the aims, objectives, and programs of these organizations, or else he was indiscreet in adjudging their purposes and programs. Assuredly, the evidence of these associations by the nominee indicates that the associations occurred prior to the time of the citation of these organizations, which removes any evidence of the appointee's intentional association with a Communist affiliated group. Of the two alternatives stated, I must conclude on the evidence available and in view of the President's letter to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, that the appointee's association did not occur as a result of common aims and sympathies, and therefore must have been a result of not exercising an adequate degree of discrimination in adjudging these groups. This, in my opinion, weighs against the nominee on the question of his ability to exercise sound judgment as a high Government official. To say the least, Mr. President, there are innumerable other people eminently qualified by experience and judgment and, for that matter, also by political affiliation and activities, who could well fill this post.

For these reasons, I oppose the confirmation of this appointee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was one of the four members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who voted against reporting favorably the nomination of Dr. Weaver. It is never a pleasant task to oppose a nomination that any President sends to the Senate. I find that to be true whether the President happens to be a member of my party or a member of the other party. I have never taken pleasure in opposing any nomination which is sent to the Senate by the President. I may say that the times I have opposed such nominations have been few in number.

Mr. President, I am disturbed about this nomination, and I feel that I must oppose it.

I do not believe I am being immodest when I say that during the time I have been a Member of the Senate, I have taken a great deal of interest in the development and maintenance of good, sound, strong, well-balanced housing programs. I still want them to be established and maintained. I hope that nothing will occur to impede or prevent them. That is my concern in regard to this nomination, because Dr. Weaver has stated, time and again, in the articles he has written, in the speeches he has made, and, I say in all frankness, in the statements he made before our committee, his philosophy in connection with these programs. Anyone who reads the committee's report will see that the nominee was frank and forthright in the answers he gave. He did not try to explain away his philosophy. He said those were things in which he believed. I state in all fairness—as may be seen by glancing at the questions I propounded to the nominee and his answers to them—that he said it was not his function to issue directives in regard to what would be done with reference to what he calls "open occupancy"—which, as I interpret it, is just another way of saying forced integration in housing. He said to us that he would carry out the legislation as passed by Congress and the directives as issued by the President of the United States. I think he meant that in good faith. I certainly shall expect him to follow that course of action.

Nevertheless, I take this position because of the philosophy he has expressed and because of the many times he has repeated his statements in regard to his feeling that we ought to have open occupancy or integration in housing—in housing of all types, when supported by the Federal Government. That means more programs than I can enumerate at this time; but it certainly means the FHA housing program, which, after all, is the largest part of the housing program; and it certainly means housing privately built and privately owned and homes with mortgages insured by an agency of the U.S. Government. Those would be covered, according to the nominee's statement. So would public housing, urban housing, renewal housing, college housing, nursing homes, housing for the elderly, cooperative housing, section 220 housing, section 221 housing, and many other kinds of housing that I could name. All housing aided by the Federal Government would be covered. In answering a question asked by the chairman of the committee, the nominee drew a line; he said that would not apply his policies to housing constructed with loans from a savings and loan association insured by the FSLIC.

But that is the only part of the housing programs that receives any aid, direct or indirect, from the Federal Government, that the nominee would except from the housing programs on which he takes his position in regard to forced integration in housing.

Mr. President, I regard this matter from a practical standpoint. I know that among Senators there is a difference of opinion as to whether there should be integration or segregation in housing. That question has been with us for a long, long time; and I presume that it will continue to be.

But regardless of the fact that we concede to all our colleagues good faith in taking their positions, whenever theirs may differ from ours, we know there are great sections of the country in which housing of that type simply will not be

built and programs which seek to put that into effect simply will not be made use of.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he agrees that if the nominee carries out his program in connection with a great many of the existing installations, it probably will cause a great many vacancies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would not be willing to admit that anything the nominee might do could affect contracts which already have been made and put into effect, if that is what the Senator from South Carolina means. I would not concede that the nominee, or that a program of the type the nominee advocates, could affect any contracts except future contracts. I do not believe it could open up contracts previously made with private or public bodies.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But certainly it could affect future ones in that way, could it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Furthermore, as a practical matter, it will. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It will cause vacancies; and in that way it will mean that the Federal Government will lose thousands of dollars, and perhaps millions of dollars.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not wish to discuss the question of causing vacancies, because I do not wish to seem to admit in any way whatever that the nominee could affect past or existing contracts. That is the only reason why I do not wish to discuss the matter of vacancies.

But certainly confirmation of the nomination would have an adverse effect upon future contracts and future undertakings.

This question was before us, here in the Senate, when the Ellender-Taft-Wagner bill was originally enacted into law in 1949. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is the only one of that trio who is still a Member of the Senate. He was a gallant leader in the fight to shape basic housing legislation. As I recall, that bill was passed by the Senate on June 3, 1949. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Louisiana will correct me on that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator permit a correction?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Alabama referred to the bill as the Ellender-Taft-Wagner bill. However, it was first known as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And, as such, it was referred to as the "W-E-T" bill. Later, it was known as the "T-E-W" bill—the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was always the middleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana is not always in the middle.

Of course I know that what he has stated is correct. The Senator from Louisiana was one of the three sponsors of the bill. In 1949, when the bill was before us, here on the floor of the Senate, a provision relating to public housing was being considered; and Senator Bricker, of Ohio, advocated the adoption of an amendment to do the very thing that is now advocated by Dr. Weaver.

I see my friend, the Senator from Illinois looking at the hearings—probably in order to check on some of the quotations I plan to give for his benefit. If that is what he is looking for, I will state they are to be found at about page 19. I admit, as I did then, that Senator Bricker did that, not because he was trying to get the best housing program in the world, but, as a matter of fact, because he was opposed to public housing, and he thought that was a good way to kill it. I think he will admit that is a fair statement. Nevertheless, the burden of defeating that amendment was carried by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]; and he did it manfully and well, and he carried the day.

He made some very practical observation which I think are just as meaningful today as they were then. I am not going to read all of them, but I should like to read one or two into the RECORD, because they bear out the point I am trying to make. I read now from near the top of page 19 of the hearings. The Senator from Illinois said:

> We, therefore, have the choice of voting for the Bricker amendment prohibiting segregation in public housing everywhere and thereby killing the whole program or voting it down, enabling the act to be passed, the slums to be cleared, and the 810,000 dwellings to be constructed, and then let the localities themselves decide this question of segregation in public housing.

I think that was a good statement. I think it is still a good statement. These matters go to the localities, local governments, State governments, and towns. After all, they are the authorities which deal with public housing. I also refer to urban renewal, redevelopment, and some other types of housing that are approved through public authorities. Those public authorities are established first as a result of the enactment of legislation by the State legislatures, and approval by the Governors. The housing cannot be had until that is done. What the legislation does is enable the city, town, county, or the governmental unit to set up an authority. That local unit, by ordinance or appropriate legislation, must act in order to establish an authority. In other words, it is done by local decision.

I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois was recognizing that fact and was stating a good principle, which is as sensible today as it was back on June 3, 1949.

The Senator from Illinois went a little further, and he said:

> Let me point out that of the approximately 140,000 units constructed by the Federal Housing Authority, I believe exclusive of those originally built by the Public Works, 46,000 are now occupied by Negroes, or one-third of the total, despite the fact that Negroes form one-tenth of the population; and in virtually every southern city that I know of dwellings have been constructed for Negroes.

That was a good statement. It was a truthful statement. It is still a truthful statement. As a matter of fact, one of the outstanding programs accomplished in the field of housing has been housing in southern cities and other areas in Southern States to give decent shelter to Negro families.

Just as the Bricker amendment at that time would have killed that program, so will the adoption of a policy of forced integration kill housing programs of this kind in many areas of the country today.

I asked the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] this question, in the course of the debate:

> The question has been repeatedly put to the Senator from Illinois with reference to the defeat of housing if the Bricker amendment should be adopted, and reference has been made, apparently, to the question of defeating the bill. What I want to ask the Senator from Illinois is this: It is true, is it not, that no housing project is to be imposed upon any city or any local housing authority but it is to be placed there only upon application of the local authority?

Senator DOUGLAS said:

> That is correct.

Then I asked:

> Is it not merely good practical sense, which we might as well recognize right here that if the bill should pass and become law with an antisegregation amendment in it, no city or town in Southern States, where segregation is the custom and tradition, and, in most of those States a part of the law, would have any housing project applied for; and is it not also a fact that the South is the place in which the Negroes most need housing?

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said, and I call attention particularly to this very sagacious statement on his part:

> The Senator from Alabama, as always, states the case accurately and with precision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the light of later experience and further developments, would the Senator from Alabama permit me to say that if I were to reply now, I would say, "Sometimes." [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator may amend nunc pro tunc.

But, Mr. President, throughout the debate on the occasion we were in agreement—those of us who were really working for a realistic housing program—that any requirement of integration would defeat housing. It will do it now. I do not know, but it is entirely possible that housing programs which might be affected by a policy of forced integration might pass the Senate of the United States. I do not know. But I think it is quite certain such bills could not pass the House of Representatives.

Let us take, for instance, just one type of housing. That is the type on which we have the hardest fight. Generally, public housing bills pass the Senate without too much trouble, but we know that when they get to the House, they run into rough sledding. As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]

stated earlier today, in the course of the hearings I quoted my colleague from the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee on that side, who told me only a short time ago that, with the present membership of the House, they could count on a margin of only five votes for housing legislation without any restrictive policy. We simply know such bills cannot pass the House of Representatives if a restrictive policy is adopted.

I want to be absolutely fair to Dr. Weaver. I may say this in all fairness, and I want to quote him again, because I expect him to live up to it if his nomination is confirmed: He said it would not be his function to develop or impose such a policy, and he would not do it of his own accord; that he would carry out only laws enacted by Congress and directives handed down by the President of the United States. As a matter of fact, that exchange between him and me is found near the bottom of page 16 of the hearings.

Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have the exchange to which I have referred printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator SPARKMAN. The thing that concerns me is whether or not that would entail writing into a contract, for instance with a public housing authority, a requirement that it be open occupancy in order for that housing authority to get the necessary assistance to proceed.

Mr. WEAVER. I think the answer to that is something that cannot yet be determined. It seems to me the matter of policy here is a matter which will be determined by the Congress through legislation or will be determined by the President through any action that he may take.

The form that any such action would take would be determined by one of those two sources.

Senator SPARKMAN. You would not regard it within your jurisdiction to set up such a determination?

Mr. WEAVER. I think that if it were done as a matter of administration and an executive matter that it would certainly have to be a determination made by the President.

Senator SPARKMAN. In other words, you say that the only way it could be done would be either by legislation from Congress or by directive from the President himself?

Mr. WEAVER. I do not know whether that is the only way it could be done. It seems to me the only way it should be done.

Senator SPARKMAN. Well, "should be done." I will change my statement to "should be done."

Mr. WEAVER. Yes, definitely.

Senator SPARKMAN. And that would be your policy if you were confirmed as the Administrator of HHFA?

Mr. WEAVER. Definitely.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is my fear that the knowledge that the nominee advocates such a policy may permeate the whole housing program and mean its defeat in the Congress of the United States. Or, even if such legislation should pass the Congress, it might cause the authorities in many parts of the country to decline to petition or apply for a program either of public housing or urban renewal or redevelopment, under sections 220 or 221, or elderly housing, or so many different programs that I might name.

It is for that reason that I oppose the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there had not been an opportunity, really, to assemble the major points involved in this question and present them for the consideration of the Senate as they should be presented in such a far-reaching policy matter as we are confronted with today.

Mr. President, not by way of complaint at all, but by way of a statement of the actual facts, heretofore we have been accustomed to rely upon the usual practice when a Senate committee is holding hearings. We do not have to try to follow the hearings amidst many other duties, day after day and hour by hour; rather, we can rely upon the fact that we shall have printed copies of those hearings and a report from the committee with a recommendation, or majority recommendations and minority recommendations, at least, even if brief. Such recommendations are usually stated categorically and in a precise, presentable form, so that we may readily and rapidly study the issues involved and the facts which relate thereto.

Mr. President, I think the RECORD today ought to clearly show that even though this nomination was taken up by unanimous consent, there was no prior warning given that there would be such a request. Certainly, the Senator from Mississippi did not have such notice and did not hear of any other Senator having it. Even though it is customary, and the rule requires, that a nomination lie over 1 day—a rule which was rigidly applied to the nominations of Cabinet members recently appointed—we do not have that opportunity today with reference to this nominee. All we have is what analysis we can make from the printed copy, not of a report, but of the testimony itself.

I point out that the recommendation for confirmation of the nomination is not a unanimous one. At least four Senators on the committee, present and voting, voted against the confirmation of the nomination, which is notice on its face that there are major facts upon which there is not agreement, that is, major policies upon which there is not agreement.

If I may have the attention of the acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY], I feel that the situation with which we are confronted is the result of an oversight on the part of the acting majority leader and certainly is not done by purpose. However, unless we can have a better opportunity to prepare for major matters and have notice, of course, in self-defense the Senator from Mississippi will have to give notice in advance every day, or a Journal notice, that he will object to unanimous-consent requests.

The Senator from Mississippi would be among the last to wish to take such action and would not do so unless driven to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was a conscientious effort made to discuss the unanimous-consent request with Senators. I deeply regret that we did not discuss it with the Senator from Mississippi, and, I suppose with other Senators who are present.

The Senator from Minnesota, the acting majority leader, was attempting to accommodate some of our colleagues who had other commitments and did not wish to have the nomination come before the Senate tomorrow, as could have been done under the rule.

I regret that we have caused the Senator inconvenience. I am sure the Senator knows that and knows of my high regard for him.

I can well understand the feeling the Senator from Mississippi has relating to this procedure. I am sorry we have caught him, in a sense, without time for what he feels would be adequate preparation. I must say that I have never known the Senator from Mississippi to be not well prepared for any encounter. I have a feeling that we shall be given the benefit of his mature judgment and wise observations, even though the procedure was not according to his liking.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, and I assure him and the Senate this is not a personal matter. This is not a personal matter to the Senator from Mississippi, but it is a matter of Senate business, which, as a minimum, certainly requires that more notice be given.

It happens that the Senator from Mississippi returned from his own State in part because of the possibility that this nomination might come before the Senate, but still he had no idea it would come up without a reasonable time intervening after the hearings, and without any report. He did not expect the nomination to be simply thrown out on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, on the facts which have been available in the last few hours from responsible sources, from what I have learned hurriedly, I feel certain that if there had been sent to the Senate the nomination of any person who had, in periodicals, in books, in magazine articles, and in every other way, testified on the other side of this controversial and vexing matter of integration or segregation or racial matters, or any aspect, with such a firm, agitating, crusading record his nomination promptly would have been rejected. As a matter of fact, I do not think his nomination would ever have been sent to the Senate.

I do not think anyone on the other side of this controversial question would have been nominated.

I think it is highly regrettable that such an important subject as housing, with its far-reaching consequences to the economy of the country, affecting so many people, comes up in such a way, with such a background. I do not speak in any disrespectful way of this nominee, but he has a background of agitation and crusading. I admire his frankness, but he has an open and avowed approach to influence and to

determine the policy and the law of the land through the reading into appropriation bills or the reading into programs of a pattern of enforced integration.

We hear those things threatened from other sources. There was a recent report filed, which was altogether ultra vires, by the Civil Rights Commission, recommending that funds be withheld from various Federal programs unless everybody, everywhere, in every community, State, and group, conformed to a pattern of integration. That we find advocated by this nominee.

This is a question directly before the Senate. A vote for confirmation of the nomination will be only another step in that direction.

Are Members of the Senate to be forced to the position of having to oppose appropriations for health programs, vocational programs, agricultural programs, research programs, hospital programs, housing programs, and everything else, because their ideas do not conform to those of some nominee or of some commission?

The policies desired by Weaver and the Civil Rights Commission have never been written into the law. Congress has never passed a law relating to these subjects with such requirements. In fact, some of the Senators who are most friendly to the programs have withheld amendments or provisions of that kind, knowing they would provide an unhealthy climate for the programs and that such is not the way to make progress.

Are we to adopt here and now a pattern outside the Congress, a pattern through administration? I think, without a doubt, on the facts we have before us today we are asked to take a step in that direction.

The proponents of this nomination are setting a pattern. What is the counterstep? Shall all these worthwhile Federal programs—and there are many of them which furnish a wonderful leadership, and the Senator from Mississippi has certainly been interested in them and has actively supported most of them—be brought to a halt? What is the situation? What are we driven to now by way of counterpressure, or whatever term one might wish to apply?

In some of these programs I believe we are fast wading off into the deep, from which there may be no safe return. As an illustration, we have testimony and analyses of testimony that one of the most far-reaching segments of our economy is involved. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] stated figures on the building program, showing that a great percentage of it is Federal, semi-Federal, or federally financed, and involves more than $25 billion a year.

I thought the Air Force was about the largest single major enterprise in this Nation. However, according to the figures presented, as I understood the Senator from Virginia, with $25 billion in gross Federal funds, involved directly or indirectly, and over one million people employed directly involved, major segments of that industry are seriously involved and jeopardized, particularly with reference to future construction. I think that result is generally agreed upon. I believe that economic problems finally swing around to control policies, and when we get into such a major segment of our economy, we tread on dangerous ground.

Speaking of the Senate's responsibility, we are considering this nomination this afternoon for only a few hours, with no report, no analysis, no survey of the testimony, and nothing more than what we can glean from the speeches of those who have had an opportunity to hear the testimony and attend the hearings.

I believe we set the worst kind of example. The housing industry affects the home furnishings, plumbing, and electricity industries, and all the segments that go to make up the great building industry. A healthy building industry is the quickest and best stimulant to the economy of our Nation, and to seriously impair it is the quickest way to start the spiral downward. The Senator from Mississippi believes that the building industry has been the major factor since World War II in our unparalleled prosperity, our high standard of living, and the relatively good times that we have enjoyed during that period.

The Senator from Virginia said that one of the bases for his opposition was that the nominee had been controversial in his views. With all deference, as I scan the record of periodicals and books he has written, which he certainly has the liberty to write, it seems clear to me that he has been far more interested in controversial subjects. He has been more interested in integration than he has been in housing, and he has a stronger record as a crusader than he has in any other field. I do not necessarily condemn anyone who is a crusader. At the same time, people who are engaged over the years and decades in activities of that kind seldom, if ever, have outstanding business judgment. At least the Senator from Mississippi has never seen one who has had it.

He does not have continuity in connection with the business world and practical matters sufficient to carry on a vast and farflung program of such economic importance as the one directly involved here, and particularly as it involves, on the left and on the right, today, next year and on into the decades, such a controversial subject as the question of racial relations, integration of housing, and related subjects.

We are not considering the case of a man who at some other stage had made extreme statements, honest as they might have been, and advocated carrying them out at that time, but, as he said in his testimony on page 73, he still believes in the very principles that are represented in one of his books, and still believes in the causes that are set forth on page 70 of the hearings from the article "Southern Comfort—A Possible Misapplication of Federal Funds." He stated that was his belief then and that is his position now. I assume it will, of course, continue to be his position once he gets in a situation where he can carry out in a very effective way those beliefs, even though there is no legal mandate and no policy in the law to carry out those positions.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the books and articles to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, and which the record shows were offered by the nominee.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOKS BY ROBERT CLIFTON WEAVER

"Hemmed In: A B C's of Race Restrictive Housing Covenants." American Council on Race Relations, 1945.

"The Negro Ghetto." New York: Harcourt Brace. 1948.

"Negro Labor, a National Problem." New York: Harcourt Brace & Co. 1946.

U.S. Office of Adviser on Negro Affairs. "The Urban Negro Worker in the United States, 1925–36." Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Interior Administration by the Office of the Adviser on Negro Affairs. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938.

ARTICLES

"Some Legislative Consequences of Negro Disfranchisement" (with Gabel H. W. Weaver as coauthor), J. Negro ed. 26, No. 3: 255–61, summer 1957.

"Relative Status of the Housing of Negroes in the United States." Bibliography J. Negro ed. 22, No. 3: 343–54, 1953.

"Economic Status of the Negro in the United States." Bibliography f. J. Negro ed. 19, No. 3: 232–43, 1950.

"City of Chicago." Mayor's Committee on Race Relations. J. Negro ed. 13: 560–620, 1944.

"Needed Program of Research in Race Relations and Associated Problems." Bibliography f. J. Negro ed. 16: 130–5. April 1947.

"Employment of the Negro in War Industries." Bibliography f. J. Negro ed. 12: 386–96, 1943.

"Federal Aid, Local Control and Negro Participation." Bibliography f. J. Negro ed. 11: 47–59. January 1942.

"Housing in a Democracy." Bibliography f. An. Am. Acad. 244: 95–105. March 1946.

"Negro Employment in the Aircraft Industry." Bibliography f. Q. J. Econ. 59: 597–625. August 1945.

"Northern Ways." Survey G; 36: 43–7. January 847.

"Negro Comes of Age in Industry." Atlan. 172: 54–9. September 1943.

"Negro Veteran." Ann. Am. Acad. 238: 127–32. March 1945.

"Recent Events in Negro Union Relationships." bibliog. f. J. Pol. Eon. 52: 234–49. September 1944.

"Defense Industries and the Negro." Ann. Am. Acad. 223: 60–6. September 1942.

"With the Negro's Help." Atlan. 169: 696–707. June 1942.

"Human Values of Urban Life." Political Science Quarterly, June 1960; pp. 31–39 (volume also contains Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, Columbia University, May 1960, in which Dr. Weaver participated).

"Race Restrictive Housing Covenants." The Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics, August 1945.

"The Negro in a Program of Public Housing." Opportunity (Journal of Negro Life) July 1938, pp. 198–203.

"An Experiment in Negro Labor." Opportunity (Journal of Negro Life). October 1936, pp. 295–298.

TESTIMONY BEFORE CONGRESS

Hearings before the Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration, House of Representatives, 77th Cong., 1st

sess., part 16, July 15, 16, and 17, 1941; pages 6529–6545.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. A short while ago the distinguished Senator from Alabama stated a point about which I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. As was correctly stated by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the past, public housing was constructed under authorities created in State governments. In a State such as Louisiana or in Mississippi, where there is authority to build public housing, would it be possible for a suit to be brought making an issue of the question of integration to the extent that a court might order integration?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is certainly correct. Inevitably such will be the result of a positive position on the part of the nominee in the strategic position that he will be given.

Mr. ELLENDER. While the Senator from Alabama refused to predict the outcome of such suit, if such a case were decided in such a way as to compel integration of public housing, cannot the Senator from Mississippi visualize all the whites moving and leaving the housing to the colored? This then would create a situation in public housing such as we have seen develop in the District of Columbia.

When I first came to Washington, D.C., some 25 years ago the population was comprised of 63 percent white persons and 37 percent colored. Percentage-wise, attendance in the public schools was about the same—35 to 38 percent colored and the rest white. Since we have had complete integration in the public schools of Washington, D.C., percentage-wise the Negroes constitute 78 percent of the school enrollment and the whites 22 percent. May we not assume that the same result will occur all across this Nation with respect to public housing if the nomination of this man is confirmed?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has accurately pointed out the glaring example of a pattern. He has illustrated not what may happen, but what has already happend in the Capital City. The Senator is correct. There is no doubt in my mind that action described by the Senator from Louisiana would inevitably enforce a more pronounced pattern, with its disrupting influences in the community and also in the economy, not only with respect to future building but as to presently-constructed housing and the continued sound financing of unpaid balances.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thoroughly agree with my good friend from Mississippi. At this time of economic peril of our country now is no time to set up conditions under which the enforced integration of public housing will be assured. I shall vote against the nomination of Robert C. Weaver.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on the point to which the Senator from Louisiana has just referred, I do not know how familiar Senators are with some of the conditions in the city of Washington. Those of us who have been members of appropriations subcommittees and have had some responsibility in connection with appropriations for the District of Columbia and have had an opportunity to see the events that the Senator from Louisiana has related knows the tragic and devastating affect upon the economy and existing conditions. I believe he has given an excellent illustration.

Continuing for a moment to consider the nominee's background, to illustrate that someone on the other extreme of this question would never have been nominated and certainly never confirmed, the nominee is chairman of the board of the NAACP. That is an organization dedicated and devoted to and active in carrying out policies in housing and in almost all the other social relationships that do not represent the policy of Congress or the laws of the land that have been enacted by Congress, but are contrary to the established laws of the States and the established laws of the Federal Government on other subjects.

So we are getting the cart before the horse. We are backing into this matter. I believe it destroys the usefulness of the nominee in this key, critical program in such a sensitive area.

I should like to read an excerpt from the hearings, found at page 75. I referred to this article a few moments ago. I shall read this one paragraph:

MISUSE OF FEDERAL FUNDS?

With or without urban renewal, many southern cities will use every means to accelerate residential segregation. Historically, the continuing existence of racially mixed areas of living in many of the older southern cities and towns has posed no problem of Negroes' participation in most phases of community life. Segregation laws accomplished this. Now that school segregation is doomed, it is inevitable that these urban communities will have a new and intense interest in manipulating residential racial living patterns so as to perpetuate traditional exclusion.

I have read that paragraph to illustrate that right on top of this vexing and highly controversial and uncontrollable problem with reference to the schools, which reaches right into the homes, we come now to another policy which is superimposed on an unsolved problem, further complicating the first and also compounding the second. I do not believe that the Government would undertake to impose such a pattern of confusion, such a pattern of trouble, upon any other people in the world, except some of our own in the areas where the burden will be the heaviest to carry.

However, on top of all that, I believe the most serious challenge to the Senate and the House of Representatives, the legislative branch of the Government, is the continuing assertion of and threat to force policies which are not written into law upon the people of this Nation through the use of money that has been appropriated by those of us in the legislative branch.

What is the alternative, except to strike back through these same money bills? However, that is not the question before us. No money bill is before us. That is not a desirable way to do business. That is not a desirable way to try to retaliate and cut off funds. The way to act is to meet this matter head-on, when these policies are advocated through the administration, through the executive branch of the Government, without law to base them on. The legislative branch should say, "No," and very promptly and very effectively, so that when these policies are to be changed, it will be done through the legislative branch of the Government.

I understand that other Senators desire to speak. Therefore, although I may take the floor again later, for the time being I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of the junior Senator from Mississippi and also the remarks of the junior Senator from Alabama, as well as what has been said by other Senators who are members of the committee. One of these Senators is a Member of the Senate on the other side of the aisle. They voted against the confirmation of Dr. Weaver. I have been very much impressed by what they have had to say. I find myself in the same position in which the junior Senator from Mississippi finds himself. I have not had time to read the hearings of the committee. Therefore, I am handicapped to a great extent in the consideration of this nomination.

However, I am aware of the fact that we ought to act upon the nomination of a man to be at the head of this great Agency, which will deal with all phases of housing, in such way that will enable us to do the greatest amount of good for all the people of the Nation.

Having read Dr. Weaver's books and knowing his position on the subject of integration—and I would say this of a person whether he were black or white, if he held the same position—I believe it will jeopardize housing in the United States, and it will jeopardize it where it is most needed, in my own Southland, if Dr. Weaver's nomination is confirmed.

Instead of increasing, housing will decrease. In that event, we fail to build up in the United States the kind of citizenship that we should have. Nothing will more effectually build up citizenship than the providing of housing for people to live in.

It is up to us to say whether or not this man's nomination will be confirmed. As one who has voted for practically every housing program which has come before the Senate, I say that some Members of Congress who have voted in the past for such programs will not vote for them in the future. We will find that contractors, if they feel it will jeopardize their placing of money into building under the circumstances which will exist, will hesitate to build housing for the people of the United States, who need housing. That will be true not only of housing, which we need in the United States at the present time—and I voted for it—but also dormitories and classrooms for the colleges and schools of this Nation.

I am calling this matter to the attention of the Senate. We will find hesitation on the part of the colleges and universities of our country to go into these programs with a man who, as Director of the Agency, will probably force them to integrate the dormitories. That is what will happen, because if we confirm the nomination, that problem will be facing us in the future.

My State of South Carolina needs housing. We need more schools. I am one who has been advocating aid to education so far as school buildings are concerned. Many persons have spoken loudly about aid to education, but the construction of school buildings is one factor in aid to education that I have favored. I think it will be found that many other Senators also favor it. However, some of them believe that this nomination might in some way affect the housing bills to be put before the Senate and the construction of housing in the United States in the future.

I shall base my vote against the confirmation of the nomination on the ground that I believe it is not in the best interests of the people of the United States in the housing field. When the time comes, I shall cast my vote in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have tried to study very carefully the testimony in the hearings. I do not know Mr. Robert C. Weaver personally. I respect the sincerity of the able Senators from the Southland who have qualms about this nomination. However, as I look at the record, I am reminded of a discussion in the Senate a few days ago about a nominee because of his connection with a certain industry. Some of us questioned whether it was in the public interest to confirm the nomination. But the conclusion was reached that when a man takes the oath of office, when he takes the oath to support the Constitution and to enforce the law, the law presumes not evil, odious things, but it presumes that good shall flow from a high purpose, a high dedication, a high pledge from an honest oath by an honest American.

As I read the record of the hearings on the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, I am impressed by a question that was asked of him and an answer given by him. The question was asked by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and had to do with the subject of integration. The Senator from Utah asked the nominee concerning his belief about so-called integrated housing. The able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] gives me the reference as page 31 of the hearings. I shall give the actual statement, because I think it is very important:

Senator BENNETT. And you do not think that as Administrator of this very important agency that you would want to take steps to bring this about immediately?

The "this" had to do with integration housing.

Mr. WEAVER. I do not think I could if I wanted to, and I do not think I should if I could.

To me, that is a complete answer. Senators know that Mr. Weaver could not do so if he wanted to, understanding the Senate institution as we do.

Mr. President, I support the nomination of Mr. Robert C. Weaver to be the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. Weaver, an acknowledged expert in the field of housing, urban planning, and city redevelopment, brings to his new job great promise of high performance.

This is a time when the need of our cities and communities for planning and order is great; a time when the wise aid and guidance of the Federal Government is needed to assist our cities in the provision of adequate housing for all. I am not speaking necessarily of the problems of the Southland; I am speaking of the great industrial areas of the Nation, entirely away from the Southland, which have a serious slum blight. To me, it is reassuring that a man of such experience and training as Mr. Weaver has should now be appointed to this post.

Robert Weaver holds B.A., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees from Harvard University. From 1933 to 1944 he served in the Federal Government working in the fields of housing, slum clearance, and manpower. Since then, Mr. Weaver has served as director of the mayor's committee on race relations in Chicago; he has taught at Northwestern, Columbia, and New York Universities.

Under Governor Harriman, Mr. Weaver was director of the rent control program of the State of New York; after that he acted as adviser on urban affairs for the Ford Foundation.

Most recently, Mr. Weaver has been the vice chairman of the Housing and Redevelopment Board of the City of New York.

I am pleased and satisfied with this man's qualifications for the post to which he has been named.

The President has said:

I am most confident that if confirmed Mr. Weaver will perform an outstanding service for our country as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The President is a careful, able judge of men, and his support of Mr. Weaver is firm and unequivocal.

That Mr. Weaver is a Negro is a fact which should be of the highest satisfaction to all Americans. Too often in the past the contributions and abilities of the members of this race have not been given the public acknowledgment and tribute which was their due.

In the armed forces of our every war; in such varied fields as diplomacy, science, music, literature; in every way of life, the American Negro has served his country well.

This appointment should come as a source of pride and hope to the 20 million Negroes in the United States; pride that a citizen of our country has received the position to which his qualifications so obviously suit him, without regard to color or race; and hope that soon all Americans will be able to advance as their abilities carry them, without regard to color or race.

I regard this appointment as a part and parcel of the challenge of the New Frontier. Every American, according to their ability, irrespective of race, color or ethnic grouping must be given the opportunity to work, to act, to participate in the forward movement and development of our great Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, without losing the floor, so that I might address a question to the majority whip?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I yield for that purpose to the Senator from Louisiana.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the majority whip tell us what he expects the program will be from now until, say, Monday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announced the program earlier today. We shall attempt to complete the discussion and debate upon the nomination of Dr. Weaver. I had hoped it might be possible to have the Senate move on to a consideration of the so-called money resolutions for committees and subcommittees. It is the desire of the leadership to finish action tonight on the nomination at least, and the Senate will remain in session in the hope that we can do so. Then we can go over until Monday, as was originally announced, to take up the money resolutions.

Mr. ELLENDER. There will be a session Monday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; there will be a session on Monday, beginning at 12 o'clock noon; and at the proper time a motion will be made to begin the consideration of the money resolutions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to give notice that on Monday next I shall report to the Committee on Appropriations on my recent trip abroad. Last year I took two separate trips. For the past 7 weeks, I have been very busy preparing the report. It will be ready on Monday. I hope to present it to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I hope Senators will be present, not only for the purpose of considering the resolutions which will be taken up, and on which the Senator from Louisiana will have some argument or comment, but also to listen to his report.

I compliment the Senator from Louisiana upon the very detailed manner in which he prepares his reports and the many hours of work which go into putting the final touches on them. I have read some of them. He tells me I do not often follow his conclusions, but I enjoy his observations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kind statement.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. WEAVER TO BE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver

to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on occasion I have voted to confirm the nominations of reputable citizens of color. I have no reason to feel in this matter that the nominee is not a reputable citizen, and I understand he is a Negro citizen. I recall voting to confirm the nomination of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, where, as I understood it, the people over whom the Governor would preside were largely colored.

I remember voting for confirmation of the nomination of a Negro citizen, an able lawyer, who had been nominated to be a high-ranking Federal judge to serve in an area where the bar association requested confirmation of the nomination. I have voted for confirmation of the nomination of a reputable Negro citizen to serve the Nation and, I think, the free world, in connection with United Nations matters.

But, Mr. President, I cannot vote and I will not vote for confirmation of the nomination of the citizen who has been nominated in this instance, because I do not think he could possibly do the kind of job that would reflect credit upon the appointing authority or upon the confirming authority or upon himself, and I do not think he could bring about effective, satisfactory, and harmonious results in the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, there are citizens who put their heads in the sand, and there are Members of the Senate who do likewise, and who think, when they put themselves in that posture, that there is no problem. But there is a problem in this field, and it will affect very adversely a very large segment of the housing industry in a great portion of the Nation.

Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, has asked me how long I shall proceed. I shall proceed for only a few minutes in discussing this nomination; and then I shall speak on a subject about which I have prepared a statement which I gave to the press this morning, before I knew this nomination was to be acted on by the Senate today. The statement I issued was on a matter on which I have been preparing for some weeks to speak, as has been well known to the leadership. If other Senators wish to speak when I conclude my remarks on the pending nomination, and before I commence my remarks on the other subject, I shall be perfectly willing to yield to them, in order to permit them to leave, if it is necessary for them to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I realize that the Senator from Florida has a problem, and he has indicated to us the nature of it. Will it be possible for him to yield to other Senators, as he has suggested, without losing his right to the floor, in order that they may make relatively brief statements; and then could we proceed to vote on the pending nomination?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be willing to yield, under the 3-minute rule, to any Senator who wishes to speak on this subject, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor. I would not be in favor of having the Senate vote at that time, because I have notified several Senators that I shall make this speech, and they are expecting me to make it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. About how long will the Senator from Florida address himself to this subject?

Mr. HOLLAND. About 3 minutes or 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I refer to the other matter the Senator wishes to discuss.

Mr. HOLLAND. On the matter of reporting on my official trip to the Inter-American Highway, I shall speak for about an hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Florida be willing to yield briefly to other Senators, before he speaks on that subject?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already advised the Senator that I would be willing to do that. But I have previously advised other Senators that I would speak on the Inter-American Highway at this time. However, I shall be glad to inform the majority leader of the names of the Senators I have so advised, so that they can be contacted. I shall be glad to yield under those circumstances, and then to make my statement on the other subject.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a problem of my own, and I have a speech which I would undertake to summarize in 3 minutes. Would the Senator from Florida be willing to yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I always try to cooperate with my colleagues. But I also try to carry out my commitments. As I have advised the Chair and other Senators, I have already informed certain Senators that I would speak at this time for approximately 1 hour on the other subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me again?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Florida has stated his position and has referred to the assurances he has given to other Senators. I think we are safe in stating, therefore, that no vote will be taken within the next hour and one-half; and I hope Senators will be here to listen to the report the Senator from Florida will make.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be most grateful to the Senator from Florida if, after he has completed his remarks on the pending nomination, he will yield to me for 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to do so, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. President, I was making brief remarks on the pending nomination.

I believe that any matter which shows conclusively to any Senator that it affects adversely the ability of a nominee to do a satisfactory job is a matter which justifies a negative vote on the question of confirmation. In my own mind, I am completely sure that this is such a situation—not only because of the very large number of complaints received from anxious persons in my own State—which, by the way, has for years been the leader in the entire southeastern area as regards the number and the value of housing projects under the Federal housing program—but also because I have received many complaints in communications from other parts of the country.

So, Mr. President, I believe that this nominee is an unfortunate selection for this position, because he could not properly fill the place and, with credit to himself, conduct a harmonious and efficient administration of his highly responsible duties in a very great section of the country and, I think, in a lesser degree, in various other parts of the country outside of the Southland.

Let me briefly remind the Senate that if the pending nomination were one to the Department of the Interior, no Member of the Senate would think of voting for confirmation of the nomination of a person from the eastern part of the country, where there are no public lands or public-land States, inasmuch as the philosophy of such a person may be very different from the philosophy of persons from the public-land States.

If we were considering the question of confirmation of a nomination to the REA, no Senator would dream of voting for confirmation of the nomination of a very successful executive of a private power company who had reiterated his belief that the principles of private power production and sale and taxpayments were the sound ones upon which to stand.

Similarly, if we were considering a nomination to the Federal Power Commission—I remember a time, during the brief tenure in the Senate, when the Senate had a long debate on the issue of the reappointment of a member of the Federal Power Commission, and the sole question was whether his philosophy was in accord with the best interests of the great industry he was to serve. The Senate will remember that it refused to confirm that nomination. As I recall, that nomination was made by President Truman, rather than by President Eisenhower.

If the pending nomination were for appointment to be the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, no Senator would dream of voting to confirm the nomination of a person who was announced as not being in accord with the philosophy of conservation, which is the fundamental purpose that agency serves. The same observation could be made in regard to a nomination to the National Park Service. A similar observation

could be made in regard to a nomination for service in the Department of Defense, or, in particular, in any of the armed services. Who would dream of expecting Senators to vote for the confirmation to such a position of the nomination of one who was a pacifist?

So, Mr. President, except in the case of the sole issue of prejudices—whether right or wrong—that arise from racial differences, the point has always been clearly made and recognized that Senators are not only within their rights, but are acting in accordance with their duty, when they object to and vote against confirmation of a nomination under the conviction that the essential philosophy of the nominee is not in accord with the best performance of the duties of the post involved, or is not in accord with the best interests of the American people as a whole.

I remember that before I came to the Senate, a very eminent appointee to the Supreme Court bench, from the circuit court bench, was denied confirmation upon the sole ground that his philosophy was not in accord with the best interests of the labor movement. All of us remember that occasion, and some of us are not too happy about it. But that is exactly what occurred.

That particular judge of the circuit court of appeals goes down in history as perhaps the ablest man who has served on that court in the memory of anyone now in the Senate.

Mr. President, that completes my brief statement on this particular issue. I yield provided I may have consent to do so without yielding my place.

I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made the first request of me, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I will yield to whichever one wishes me to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, not under the unanimous consent, but to arrange the order?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Pennsylvania would be first recognized. Then if the Senator will give me 3 minutes to get my issued speech into the RECORD and 3 minutes on the subject of the Weaver nomination, that will be pleasing to me, if it will be pleasing to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has succeeded in getting his foot in the door and he is so gracious that I suspect I shall have to yield; but first, as he requested, I yield to the later applicant for time, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his courtesy.

The President of the United States has nominated Robert C. Weaver, an able man, of experience and integrity, to be the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I support that nomination, but I shall do so very briefly.

I said "briefly" because, in my judgment, the debate on the nomination has done the Senate of the United States no good in the eyes either of the country or of the world, and the sooner we can terminate it, the better I think this body will come through this day in the Senate.

That mature men should have been willing to make publicly some of the arguments against the nominee which were heard earlier this afternoon—and I specifically exempt my friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]——

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. And my friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] from what I am now saying—is a sad commentary on the climate in this body today, a climate which still protects an age which has decayed and passed away elsewhere in the country and elsewhere in the world, many, many years ago. That age is gone; it is dead; the country knows it; the world knows it. It is time, in my opinion, that this body learned it.

Mr. President, it is said that this is a controversial nomination; but I ask my colleagues, What is wrong with controversy? Is this not a part of the democratic tradition? How many of us would be serving in this body as Senators of the United States if we had not engaged in controversy during most of our mature political lives?

It is said this nominee should not be approved because he is chairman of the board of the NAACP. What is wrong with the NAACP, I dare to ask on the floor of the U.S. Senate, in 1961? In my opinion, it is an American institution, composed of loyal American citizens, seeking objectives consistent with the U.S. Constitution and the law of the land. I see nothing wrong about this nominee having been an active officer in the NAACP.

It is said this man's philosophy is not in accord with that of many Senators. It is perhaps true that his philosophy is not in accord with some. In my judgment, his philosophy is in accord with the overwhelming majority, not only of Members of the Senate, but of the people of the United States. I commend him for that philosophy. Mr. President, I share it.

We have heard something today of forced integration. But no question of forced integration arises in connection with this nomination. Open occupancy in housing has nothing whatever to do with forced integration. All open occupancy means is that a man, regardless of race, creed, or color, should have an equal opportunity with a man of a different race, creed, or color to purchase, rent, or live in a house which is for sale. That is all it means. Nobody is suggesting anybody is forced to live anywhere he does not want to live. Open occupancy means that all American citizens, regardless of race or color or creed, should have an opportunity, under the law, to acquire shelter for themselves and for their families.

I will not dignify by answering the ridiculous charges made against Mr. Weaver's patriotism and Americanism. They were sufficiently answered during the hearings, which I attended, and I think that issue is, happily, out of this case.

Mr. President, I close with the thought that I hope the Senate before it adjourns tonight will take a big step forward in changing this climate of which I spoke earlier by approving the nomination of an American who speaks for the Constitution, for equal justice under law, for the Bill of Rights, for the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments, and for the rest of the Constitution; a man whose experience, integrity, wisdom, and judgment eminently qualify him for the position to which our President, John F. Kennedy, was proud to nominate him.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, under the reservations made earlier, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield to me for two 3-minute speeches, one on the Weaver nomination, and one on another subject?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield one at a time. I will yield first to the Senator on his speech.

(At this point, as in legislative session, Mr. JAVITS made a statement on U.S. import and export policies, which statement appears in the RECORD elsewhere, under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask my colleague from Florida to yield me 3 minutes on the Weaver nomination.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York, under the previous understanding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened, as has my colleague from Pennsylvania, with the greatest of interest to this debate.

It strikes me we are up against one very hard point. Despite all of the protestations we make about the equality before the law of men and women who are citizens and despite all of the protestations which are contained in the tenets of our respective faiths—whether we be Catholics, Protestants, or Jews—we have come to the time when we actually must face the situation.

There is no difference between us as to the equality; there is a great difference between us as to how it is to be attained. Some of our colleagues who oppose the confirmation of this nomination seem to feel that we should attain such equality only by education, by a process of development, by economics, and by enlightenment as it percolates through the community. They feel it will take more time. But some of the rest of us feel we must have laws to bring about the necessary progress.

There can be no dispute between us, for we are all God-fearing men and women, about the actual results which we want and seek.

So this sums up the argument. A man whom I know is nominated for an important position, namely, to be the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. He is from New York. I have seen him work. He is competent and effective.

He testifies. He gives a perfectly brilliant performance, demonstrating his

knowledge of the subject, his experience, and the way he will enforce, with the greatest of catholicity, the laws passed by the Congress and the rulings laid down by the President.

The Association of the Bar Committee in New York, the lawyers themselves, as shown in the record, say this is not a man who runs beyond orders and beyond statutes. He obeys them. He complies with them specifically, as an American should.

When a man has that kind of record we should cheer and applaud him as the head of a great agency, and we all would, were it not for this deep concern which seems to trouble many.

Let us assume that Senators have no bias against the nominee. What troubles them is that confirmation of the nomination will interfere with the housing industry. They fear that the Congress may not pass bills the Congress would otherwise pass. They fear that the builders may not build structures they would otherwise build.

Mr. President, let us have an end to it. We have to face the problem some time. Our President has had the courage to do so. Let us go along, and face the problem now. Let us face it now, because if we do not, and if this attitude is maintained, we shall give ourselves one of the greatest of handicaps in respect to fighting the cold war. We may lose the whole fight for freedom.

There are 1¼ billion people in the world whose skins are yellow, black, and brown; and they want to know whether a Negro who is competent, who is able—and Mr. Weaver is, because he has demonstrated it—can occupy a great office in the United States. I think a majority of Senators feel he should, and I think it is high time to certify it to this country, and to the world.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield to me for 3 minutes?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York under the same arrangement.

Mr. KEATING. I assure the Senator that I feel my friend from Florida has been generous, and I appreciate his generosity.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week I appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to introduce my friend and fellow New Yorker, Dr. Robert C. Weaver.

In the finest tradition of the body in which we are all so proud to serve, the chairman of the committee, who had previously expressed his opposition to this nominee, with his characteristic sense of fairplay, gave to all of us who favored confirmation of the nomination a full opportunity to be heard, and he treated us with great fairness and consideration.

I indicated at that time that I enthusiastically and wholeheartedly support the nomination of Dr. Weaver to be the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

There has been considerable publicity about the nomination of Dr. Weaver, and all of us who are present are familiar with the various issues which have been raised. Despite the objections of some to the confirmation of the nomination, I am confident that the nomination will be confirmed, and I am confident that the nominee will do an excellent and outstanding job in the high position for which he has been chosen by the President.

Dr. Weaver is a man of the highest of character. He is a devoted public servant. He is a tried and true public servant.. He is a man of deep convictions.

The President has selected to head the Housing and Home Finance Agency an experienced and able man who will administer our various Federal housing and urban redevelopment programs in the spirit in which they have been enacted by the Congress and as directed to do so by the President of the United States. Dr. Weaver certainly possesses the necessary qualifications.

I am familiar with the excellent record which Bob Weaver made in the field of housing and urban affairs as an official of both the State and the city of New York. As a New Yorker, I am very proud of Bob Weaver and of the fine record of achievement he has made.

Finally, Mr. President, a great many Americans and a great many people throughout the world are watching the Senate and can be expected carefully to weigh the action which we shall take on this nomination. There have already been a series of rather unfortunate events surrounding our consideration of this nomination.

I urge the speedy confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Weaver, and I wish him well in fulfilling the heavy responsibilities which he will be called upon to carry out in this very important position.

I am very grateful to my friend from Florida for yielding to me.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, under authority granted me by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I made a field trip over the entire Inter-American Highway starting in Guatemala on December 10, 1960, and ending in Panama on December 20. Our party included George T. Moore, Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce; Oscar H. Nielson, Director, Budget and Management, Department of Commerce; and Bureau of Public Roads representatives B. D. Tallamy, Administrator, Frank C. Turner, Deputy Commissioner and Chief Engineer, and A. F. Ghiglione, Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Operations. Our party was joined during the trip by Ralph P. Agnew, Regional Engineer for the Inter-American Highway. This detailed report of the highway conditions and country developments summarizes our observations during the field trip.

I must observe, in the beginning, that our party was greeted with great hospitality and was rendered every possible assistance by the chief diplomatic representatives of our Nation, their families and staffs, in all of the six friendly nations which we visited. These included the following: in Guatemala, Ambassador Muccio; in El Salvador, Ambassador Kalijarvi; in Honduras, Ambassador Burrows; in Nicaragua, Ambassador Whelan; in Costa Rica, Chargé d'Affaires Kimmel; in Panama, Ambassador Farland.

GUATEMALA

We arrived in Guatemala City on December 10. On December 11, in company with Col. Jose Luis Cruz Salazar, Minister of Public Works, we flew to Huehuetenango, in northern Guatemala, and drove from there through the Tapon section of the Inter-American Highway toward the Mexican border. This section of highway is the most difficult on the entire Inter-American Highway and has been subject to many enormous slides and washouts through the Selegua River Canyon. The highway is now open to through travel; however, it is extremely difficult to traverse in several places because of the temporary detours over the slide sections and around the large washouts. This country is geologically new and very active with sliding hillsides and changing river courses evident throughout the area. It will be many years before the highway is completely stabilized here and free from major postconstruction work. The bridges throughout this section are either completed or under construction and it is estimated that all permanent bridges will be completed by the end of the current dry season in May of 1961.

We returned by car to Huehuetenango where we were entertained at luncheon by Colonel Salazar, after which we returned to Guatemala City by plane.

The section of highway between the Tapon and Guatemala City, which we observed closely from the air, is passable during all weather conditions, and is now under contract for further improvement. By the end of this dry season an asphalt surfacing will be completed through from Guatemala City to San Cristobal thus providing paved connection to the second largest city of Guatemala, Quezaltenango. The section from San Cristobal to the Tapon is a difficult mountainous section on which some slides have been experienced and heavy maintenance will be required though not on the scale of that required in the Tapon gorge. The present contract will reestablish the line and provide an all-weather gravel surface throughout.

On December 12 our party left Guatemala City for El Salvador by car, traveling over 46 miles of paved highway and 57 miles of gravel all-weather road to the border. All bridges on this section are either complete or nearing completion and they will be finished by the end of the 1961 dry season. The unpaved section between Barbarena and Asuncion Mita will not be paved under existing appropriations. This gravel section is heavily traveled and hard to maintain with a smooth surface. It is extremely dusty and should be paved as soon as funds are available.

EL SALVADOR

We drove the entire highway section in El Salvador, spending the night in the capital, San Salvador. Most of the highway in El Salvador was constructed without U.S. assistance many years ago with the result that it is of lesser standard and heavily congested throughout. We visited with the highway officials of El Salvador who stated that they are desirous of realining the highway through their country and anxious to obtain U.S. assistance for this work. They listed three particular improvements considered necessary which are being studied by the Bureau of Public Roads; namely, a short bypass for the city of Santa Ana, a lengthy bypass for the city of San Salvador, and an alternate line leading toward Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras. While the Bureau is studying these alternate lines in cooperation with the El Salvadorean officials, it was understood that no aid of our country was available on these relocations, other than the short Santa Ana bypass, without additional authorization and appropriation by this Congress. Furthermore, I feel that any consideration by our country of participating in such additional work should be postponed until such time as the remainder of the Inter-American Highway throughout Central America has been financed to a paved standard. I advised the El Salvadorean officials that such would be my recommendation.

El Salvador has made good progress in developing her highway network with numerous feeder roads and farm-type roads leading from the Inter-American Highway. A new littoral highway paralleling the Inter-American, being constructed with World Bank loan funds, is now nearing completion along the Pacific coast.

The entire 191 miles of Inter-American Highway through El Salvador is paved. It is mostly of low standard with many curves. The heavy congestion of trucks, buses, and livestock results in slow travel and points up the need for improvement.

As part of the Inter-American program in El Salvador, a 5-mile paved spur road has been built to serve the Pacific coast seaport of La Union. This is the principal seaport serving Honduras and generates much truck traffic.

HONDURAS

On December 13 our party drove from San Salvador to Tegucigalpa arriving at the border between El Salvador and Honduras just before 12 o'clock where the difficulties on crossing borders were brought to sharp focus. Having arrived at the border at noon, the customs station officials were in the process of locking up for the siesta which is observed between 12 and 2 o'clock. During this time all travel across the border is stopped. Only through the help of local officials was the party able to have the offices reopened to permit passage though almost 1 hour's time was consumed in the process. The average traveler, unfamiliar with the language and customs, would have a difficult and frustrating time in such a situation. While waiting for clearance, the party observed a large truckload of flour being unloaded onto the pavement sack by sack. We were advised that this was normal procedure for customs inspection and that most trucks had to be unloaded piece by piece before they could be passed. The obvious cost and delay caused by such unrealistic procedures diminishes the intended use and benefit of the Inter-American Highway. Similar difficulties prevail in varying degrees at all border crossings on the Inter-American Highway. This is a most serious problem that should be solved by the Central American countries. Simplification of these border crossing procedures might be required by us as part of their cooperative effort.

The Inter-American Highway does not pass through Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras. Tegucigalpa is reached by a 70-mile branch road which is being rebuilt to a good standard and paved with asphalt under a loan from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The 94-mile Inter-American Highway through Honduras is being paved under a present contract which calls for completion of all work by the end of the dry season in 1961. That is this summer.

Our group spent the night in Tegucigalpa. Besides our Ambassador, Hon. Charles R. Burrows, we met with the Minister of Communications and Public Works, Juan Milla Bermudez, the Vice President of Congress, Lic. Miguel Alfonso Cubero de Costa, and other ranking officials. These officials were quite interested in securing U.S. assistance to construct an alternate route for the Inter-American Highway which would pass through the capital city, Tegucigalpa. The proposed location would require additional new alinement in both El Salvador and Nicaragua and would parallel the present road though traversing much more difficult mountainous terrain. This would be a large undertaking and, in my judgment, cannot be considered under present agreements and authorizations. We advised our Honduran friends to consider this alternate alinement as a separate highway route rather than to attempt to include or justify it as part of the Inter-American Highway.

NICARAGUA

On December 14 our party drove from Tegucigalpa through to Managua, Nicaragua, a distance of 279 miles. We were met at the Nicaraguan border by the Minister of Public Works, Enrico Sanchez, who remained with us the rest of the day. In Nicaragua, the highway will be completely paved by the end of the 1961 dry season when the present contract for the 49-mile section between Condega and Sebaco is scheduled to be finished.

In Managua, we discussed both the Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road construction with Ambassador Whelan and Minister Sanchez. The economic development of Nicaragua as a result of both of these highways is clearly evident and is appreciated by the national officials. This appreciation of the value of the investment in highways has resulted in excellent maintenance and improvement by the Nicaraguan Highway Department.

On December 15 the party drove from Managua to the end of construction on the Rama Road, a distance of 160 miles reaching to within 20 miles of Rama. That is a road which reaches across Nicaragua, from connections with the Pacific Ocean to connections with the Atlantic Ocean or the Caribbean Sea. The road is being constructed under our commitment to an all-weather gravel surface with 100 percent U.S. funds and is in excellent condition. Funds now available will permit construction through to navigable water on the Siquia River with the exception of a few minor bridges. This highway traverses the eastern rain forest area of Nicaragua, an area that until the road was built had been inaccessible. The evident settlement, land clearing, farming, and development that has kept pace with the construction of this road was most gratifying and was pointed to with pride by the Vice Minister of Public Works and Chief Engineer of the Department of Highways, Manuel Amaya Leclair, who accompanied our party. The clearing and settlement has followed highway construction so closely that in many places little evidence of the dense tropical jungle remains visible to the traveler.

Near the end of construction, the party was invited to the home of Mr. and Mrs. Nossman for lunch. Mr. Nossman is the American Bureau of Public Roads engineer in charge of the contract work on the Rama Road. Their home in the jungle was simple and comfortable and a delightful time was spent there. It was interesting to see how well these people had adjusted to the privations, isolation, and dangers of jungle living. However, it was also brought out that few American engineers will accept such work when no special inducements in the way of pay bonus or privileges can be offered under the civil service system. I was advised that Mr. Nossman receives the same benefits an engineer in the United States receives for similar work and that the Bureau of Public Roads is hard pressed to obtain and keep qualified men in such positions which are truly hardship posts.

The Nicaraguan Government is maintaining the Rama Road in excellent condition and with its own funds is gradually improving the heavily traveled sections with an asphalt surface. Twenty-eight miles have so far been paved with Nicaraguan funds.

COSTA RICA

Since I had, in an earlier visit, traveled the section of the highway between Managua, Nicaragua, and San Jose, Costa Rica, and since that section of 283 miles is now completely paved, I did not consider it necessary to drive over that mileage and our party flew to San Jose on the night of December 15. In San Jose, a meeting was held with the Minister of Public Works, Espiritu Salas, the chief engineer of the Carretera Interamericana, Jorge Carballo, Mr. Moya, director of highways, and our Chargé

d'Affaires, Mr. Kimmel. The work remaining to be completed in Costa Rica was discussed and the need for additional funds to provide heavier pavement over all sections was cited by the Costa Rican officials. Costa Rica is improving sections of the Inter-American Highway near San Jose, particularly the section serving the El Coco Airport which is being improved to a four-lane divided standard with the help of Export-Import Bank funds. These officials also discussed the serious problem being faced in providing adequate maintenance throughout the Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica. This same situation was discussed in the other countries and is one of the most important problems now becoming evident under the increased use of the highway. The authorization for our participating in construction of the Inter-American Highway required agreements from each of the cooperating countries providing for adequate maintenance at the expense of the local Central American nation. These friendly nations are having varying degrees of difficulty in meeting this obligation and some are seeking further assistance. This subject is discussed further at the end of this report.

On December 16 the party drove from San Jose to San Isidro in southern Costa Rica traversing the highest point of the highway at an altitude of over 11,000 feet. The highway is paved from San Jose to Cartago, but is all-weather gravel, with some substandard sections, between Cartago and San Isidro. This section of highway is indescribably beautiful, extending through dense tropical rain forests across the Continental Divide. Insufficient effort is being made by Costa Rica to preserve the beautiful forests along the highway though this would be one of the outstanding attractions to the traveling tourists. Some protection should be provided, at least in a substantial belt on both sides of the highway, by adequate restrictions and reservations.

From San Isidro our party flew in a chartered plane over the section of highway to Palmar Sur since several bridges are under construction and through travel by car is not possible. The highway through this beautiful valley section is practically complete to an all-weather gravel standard and much settlement is taking place. The lower portion of this section traverses the Terreba River Canyon and the party traveled by car back from Palmar Sur in order to view some of the difficult construction. Large slides are being experienced in this canyon section and will require heavy maintenance for a good many years. The party also traveled by car south of Palmar Sur finding the highway in good condition with an all-weather gravel surface, though again several bridges are under construction, and at this time the small streams must be forded. Between San Isidro and the Panama border, 39 bridges remain to be constructed. Contract has been awarded for this work and the party visited several of the bridge sites where construction is already underway. The party had lunch at the United Fruit Co. base at Palmar Sur and observed the remaining highway between Palmar Sur and the Panama border from a U.S. Army plane furnished through the courtesy of the Inter-American Geological Survey. This section of highway traverses heavy tropical rain forests at low elevation and will furnish the traveler with his first view of dense, humid jungle growth. Portions of the highway pass alongside of and through the United Fruit Co. banana plantations which will be of considerable interest to tourists.

PANAMA

The party arrived by IGS plane at David, Panama, in the late afternoon of December 16. We traveled at once by car north to the Costa Rican border covering the recently completed permanent bridges and paving work underway between David and Concepcion. From Concepcion to the border the highway is completed to an all-weather gravel surface and is maintained in excellent condition. The concrete pavement being provided here and elsewhere in Panama is being financed under a special agreement with Panama under which Panama absorbs all costs in excess of the equivalent asphalt-type surfacing provided elsewhere on the Inter-American Highway. Panama claims that this additional cost will be offset by savings in maintenance in future years. However, the financing of this work to the higher standard has resulted in slowing down the Inter-American Highway work through Panama because of difficulties in matching available U.S. funds for remaining sections.

During the evening our group discussed with Mr. Rodolfo de Obarrio, assistant chief engineer, Carretera Interamericana, who entertained us at dinner, the overall problems of construction and maintenance in Panama, together with the general economic advancement resulting from use of the highway. The agricultural potential of western Panama is becoming realized and the access provided by the Inter-American Highway is enhancing the entire Panamanian economy. The night was spent in David.

On December 17 the party drove from David to Panama City, a distance of 271 miles. The section of highway from David to Puerto Escondido, 19 miles, is completely paved with concrete. The section from Puerto Escondido to Guabala, 37 miles, is being graded and will be completed to an all-weather gravel surface under current contract. Through this section many detours are taken over the old National Highway which is of very low standard. From Guabala to Santiago the National Highway must be traversed since the Inter-American Highway will not be completed under existing funds. The National Highway is gravel surfaced and of very low standard. Though it is supposed to be an all-weather surface, it was explained that during the past rainy season sections were actually impassable. The Panama Minister of Public Works agreed in meetings with the Bureau of Public Roads 2 years ago that this section of highway would be improved and paved with Panama funds and would serve as part of the Inter-American Highway until new funds were appropriated for Panama. Panama agreed to do this work in order that funds allocated for construction of the Inter-American Highway bypass of the Guabala-Santiago section could be utilized for additional concrete paving in the vicinity of David.

Near Santiago our party was met by Senor Don Tomas Guardia, chief engineer of the Carretera Interamericana, who took us to meet President Roberto F. Chiari, Minister of Public Works Pablo Bares, and other dignitaries who were visiting Santiago that day. The short discussion with the President and Minister was most cordial and a subsequent meeting was arranged with Minister Bares in Panama City.

The highway from Santiago to Panama City is completed with concrete surface throughout and affords excellent traveling conditions. The party stopped for lunch at the small village of Santa Clara where we were the guests of Senor Don Tomas Guardia.

In Panama City meetings were held with Ambassador Farland to discuss the Inter-American Highway problems in Panama. Of particular concern to the Ambassador are the large claims pending from contractors on the highway. These claims, aggregating close to $2 million, have resulted from disputes as to interpretation of specifications by the Carretera Interamericana. All work in Panama is done by the Carretera Interamericana, with the Bureau of Public Roads approving the reimbursement when this work is completed to design standards. This will amount to two-thirds of the cost to which we are committed under this entire program. These claims, therefore, are disputes between the contractor and the Government of Panama, though any costs resulting from settlement in favor of the contractors will require heavy U.S. participation. Since the contractors on this work are mostly American contractors, the Ambassador was quite concerned to assure more expeditious handling of the disputes. In subsequent discussions with the Minister of Public Works, the party was assured that steps are being taken toward adjudication of these claims.

In the meeting with Minister Bares, which was also attended by Don Tomas Guardia and Rodolfo de Obarrio, our observations made while traveling the Panama highway were discussed and the Minister was pressed for early funding of the work remaining to be done.

One day in Panama was devoted to a briefing by the Panama Canal Company officials and an inspection of the Panama Canal high-level bridge construction project. Construction of this bridge which will be the final link of the Inter-American Highway, over which it will reach Panama City, is proceeding rapidly toward a target completion date of September 1962. The estimated cost

of the project is approximately $20 million. At my request a detailed progress report was made by E. L. Erickson, Chief of the Bridge Division of the Bureau of Public Roads, under date of January 6, 1961, a copy of which has been filed with the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The following observations are generally applicable throughout the Inter-American Highway and cover situations and conditions which must receive attention before the full value of the investment in the Inter-American Highway will be realized.

First. I refer to a recent report prepared by the International Road Federation under date of June 1960, which contains a physical inventory, a discussion of construction and maintenance requirements, and makes a proposal for the creation of an Inter-American Highway Authority in Central America and Panama. The factual observations of this report fairly well coincide with our observations. However, the recommendations of the International Road Federation for creating and funding the maintenance and highway authority which would involve U.S. participation will require further consideration by Congress and also by the other nations affected.

Second. Maintenance problems. The maintenance observed along the Inter-American Highway varied from very good to very poor. It is evident that the lack of proper maintenance has permitted pavements to deteriorate, drainage to become clogged, and slides to remain, in addition to resulting in very poor travel conditions. The agreements developed with each country before construction was initiated on the Inter-American Highway clearly provide that each country, at its own expense, will properly maintain the highway. However, the heavy costs involved in this maintenance appear to have exceeded the expectations of these countries, and they are now finding it difficult to finance the work.

A clear division between construction costs and maintenance costs has not been developed, and as a result considerable postconstruction work has been picked up as construction cost with the cooperative funds, rather than carried as maintenance as is normally done in our country. The sound method of construction through the pumice-type country, whereby stage construction is followed, has resulted in extending the period of construction over many years. Steep slopes have been permitted to remain on original construction with full recognition that some will slide but most will remain steep resulting in great overall savings. However, the removal of those slides that do occur has finally been recognized as a construction cost rather than maintenance and has contributed to the great overruns of construction estimates. Even though these postconstruction costs are now accepted by the Bureau of Public Roads and by the General Accounting Office as a part of the cooperative expense of constructing the highway, the maintenance hereafter must be more adequately assured. The International Road Federation report proposes an authority-type control of maintenance throughout the highway and some such control to assure uniformity may be desirable.

Third. Accommodations and services: Adequate accommodations along the highway are scarce though within the capitals and major cities very good hotel and restaurant services are available. The motel-type accommodations are expected to develop as travel increases over the highway; however, some coordination of this development appears desirable. At present, the traveler is faced with very poor sanitary conditions and relatively dangerous situations if he stops for food or accommodation other than in the large cities. These conditions must be improved before the average tourist will be able to enjoy the full benefit of traveling through beautiful Central America.

Fourth. Developments along the Inter-American Highway: As planned in the original authorization for this highway, the economic value to the countries traversed is becoming apparent. Each of the countries has continued to build its highway systems utilizing the Inter-American as the main artery. Feeder roads and branching development road systems are in evidence, and parallel major highways are now being constructed in several of the countries. Guatemala has nearly completed the Pacific Highway, which parallels the Inter-American Highway, and has constructed with Bank funds a highway through to the Caribbean coast. El Salvador is just completing the littoral highway which parallels the Inter-American along the Pacific coast, and is doing considerable work on feeder roads toward Guatemala and Nicaragua. Honduras is completing the reconstruction and paving of the branch road to serve the capital of Tegucigalpa, utilizing World Bank funds, and is developing roads into northern Honduras to serve the Caribbean seaboard. Nicaragua is using her own money to improve the Rama Road and is carrying on a healthy construction and maintenance program throughout the country. Costa Rica has borrowed money from the Export-Import Bank to develop a four-lane divided highway to the El Coco Airport. Panama is just initiating a sizable penetration road program to develop her north coast areas.

All of these road systems generating from the Inter-American Highway are bringing new industry to these countries. New coffee plantations and large areas of cotton, palm oil, and other crops are in evidence, and great developments in cattle ranching have resulted. All of this industrial development points up the great value already received from the Inter-American Highway and further emphasizes the need for completion of the highway as soon as possible.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

First. After traveling all of the Inter-American Highway now open to public use, we were impressed above every other consideration with the great need for finishing this highway and making it available at the earliest possible date to convenient travel by tourists, truckers, buses, and for the further development of these Latin American countries. It is quite evident that additional funds are required for completing the Inter-American Highway, and regardless of the reasons for exceeding present authorizations the value of this investment is unquestionably great and cannot be completely realized until the job is done. Therefore, I recommend that the Bureau of Public Roads be instructed to make an early estimate and report the amount needed to carry out to completion the original program.

While these additional funds are needed to some extent throughout the six countries that were covered in this field trip, a general priority for completion should be established, in my opinion, in the following order:

First priority. The Tapon section in Guatemala adjacent to the Mexican border must be finished and maintained open to year-round traffic before any other construction work is undertaken with the new funds. This extremely difficult section has, in truth, been the Tapon or "stopper"—which is what Tapon means—of the entire highway. The frequent slides and difficult canyon section subject to river scour during the rainy season have resulted in this section of highway being closed at least several months out of each year since it was originally constructed. Traffic has frequently had to take a long circuitous route via the Mexican railroad to a connection with the Pacific Coast Highway in Guatemala. As a result, dependable schedules for trucks and buses have not been possible, and tourist travel has been discouraged. The Tapon section, a deep gorge of the Selegua River through very rugged mountains will be one of the most spectacular sections on this highway and in itself will constitute a great tourist attraction. The countries south of Guatemala continually point to the uncertainty of travel through the Tapon section as a deterrent to through traffic over the highway and, in effect, a failure on our part to provide them with the potential full benefits of the highway.

Second priority. Of next importance must be the paving with asphalt of those sections of the highway which are now all-weather gravel. These gravel sections, while passable at all times, are disagreeable to tourists and other travelers because of the great dust problem and wear and tear on tires, windshields, and automobiles in general.

Third priority. The section of highway in Panama between Guabala and Santiago has not been completed under present authorized funds, since this section is served by a detour on a national highway, though this detour route is of low standard and mostly of dirt and gravel surface. The Inter-American Highway location will be 62 miles in length, some 15 miles shorter than the present detour, and because of the much better standard will provide a saving of

approximately 1 hour in travel time. In addition, this section of the Inter-American Highway will open up considerable new and potentially valuable land to development. Panama advises that she now has the funds available for her share of this construction cost; and since approximately half of the construction has been completed on this route, it is very important that the remainder be opened up in order that through traffic may be served.

Fourth priority. In recent years, because of the shortage of funds, the asphalt pavement placed on some of the newer sections of the Inter-American Highway has been a light penetration-type treatment which is not a permanent pavement. Some of these sections have already shown weakness; and since maintenance throughout much of the Inter-American Highway is not adequate, it is quite evident that before long many of these paved sections will be in poor condition. The original authorization contemplated an asphalt mat-type surface, and such surfacing should be provided when additional funds are made available.

Second. Each of the Latin American countries desires work on the Inter-American Highway in addition to that listed above and in addition to that which will be covered by the completion of the original project. Such work includes the realinement of substandard sections, the relocation of the highway to serve new areas, and other improvements not included in the original authorization. I recommend that our participation in this additional work be not seriously considered until the above priority work has been completed. Further, none of this work was anticipated under the original authorization, therefore, it should be carefully scutinized before any U.S. responsibility is accepted by enacting further authorizations. These sections of additional work are for the most part worthy projects, though they are not always recognizable as part of the Inter-American Highway.

Third. One of the most serious deterrents to free use of the Inter-American Highway is the difficult border crossing procedures encountered by all travelers. These procedures are so slow, cumbersome, and exasperating that some improvement is absolutely necessary, and I recommend that such should be required by the United States before additional funds are made available for this work. Delays of from 2 to 4 hours at each border are generally experienced by the tourists, and trucking across the borders is discouraged by unreasonable customs inspections requiring complete off-loading of trucks in many cases. Our party, traveling with high officials of each nation, should have experienced the least inconvenience at the country borders. However, such was not always the case, and aggravating delays did occur. It was very easy to realize and appreciate how the unescorted tourist would be treated.

Fourth. Deterioration of sections of the Inter-American Highway that are now receiving heavy truck travel is being accelerated because of the uncontrolled truck loads and truck speeds. Progress is being made in some countries in effecting legislation to impose weight and speed restrictions; however, so far there is no effective control of this important traffic. I join the International Road Federation in its recommendation that a single, overall authority be created to be responsible for such control, which appears to be the logical approach to assuring protection of the Inter-American Highway.

Fifth. There is almost a complete lack of adequate signs along the highway. The tourist is confronted with finding his way through villages and cities with little or no help in the way of highway information. Similarly, there is no central point to which the tourist may refer for information farther ahead along the highway. Rumors as to conditions in the next country are generally pessimistic; and, indeed, the present-day tourist must have a pioneer spirit—as many have shown—to forge ahead. Again I join in the International Road Federation report, which I feel is sound, in recommending that responsibility for these important services be placed under a single, overall authority.

Sixth. The rapid development and settlement of the countryside as the Inter-American Highway has progressed are indeed gratifying; however, they are resulting in complete removal of the natural beauty of some of the areas traversed in each country. The highway dips into deep jungle growth and climbs into mountainous rain forests which would be of great interest to all travelers. Some steps should be taken by these countries to conserve, by wider rights-of-way or by forest reserves, areas that offer such valuable attraction to the traveler.

Mr. President, in order to present in one place a general picture of the condition of the Inter-American Highway, I have secured from the Bureau of Public Roads a detailed compilation, dated January 1, 1961, and entitled "Condition of the Inter-American Highway," covering its entire length through Mexico—where we did not go, this time—and the six nations visited in my recent trip. I now ask to have the compilation incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Condition of the Inter-American Highway, Jan. 1, 1961

	Miles	Condition
Mexico:		
Laredo-Mexico City	761	Paved.
Mexico City-Las Casas	721	Paved.
Las Casas-Comitan	60	Paved, poor.
Comitan-Guatemala border	45	Paved.
Total, Mexico (Constructed entirely by Mexico with her own funds)	1,587	
Guatemala:		
Mexican border-Selegua Canyon	18	All-weather.
Through Selegua Canyon	7	All-weather, narrow, subject to slides.
Selegua Canyon-San Cristobal	73	All-weather.
San Cristobal-Patzicia	75	Being paved.
Patzicia-Guatemala City	37	Paved.
Guatemala City-Barberena	34	Paved.
Barberena-Asuncion Mita	57	All-weather.
Asuncion Mita-El Salvador border	12	Paved, poor condition.
Total, Guatemala	313	
El Salvador:		
Guatemala border-San Salvador	61	Paved.
San Salvador-Honduras border	130	Paved.
Spur, Sirama Y-La Union	5	Paved.
Total, El Salvador	196	
Honduras:		
El Salvador border-Jicaro Galan	25	Being paved.
Jicaro Galan-Nicaragua border	69	Being paved.
Total, Honduras	94	
Nicaragua:		
Honduras border-Condega	34	Paved.
Condega-Sebaco	49	Being paved.
Sebaco-Managua	64	Paved.
Managua-Rivas	69	Paved (27 miles, old, very poor condition).
Rivas-Costa Rica border	22	Being paved.
Total, Nicaragua	238	
Costa Rica:		
Nicarsgua border-Barranca	122	Paved.
Barranca-San Ramon	23	Paved, very poor condition.
San Ramon-San Jose	47	Paved.
San Jose-Cartago	14	Paved.
Cartago-San Isidro	71	All-weather.
San Isidro-Panama border	133	All-weather surface, bridges under construction.
Total, Costa Rica	410	
Panama:		
Costa Rica border-Concepcion	17	All-weather.
Concepcion-David	16	Being paved.
David-Puerto Escondido	19	Paved.
Puerto Escondido-Guabala	37	All-weather.
Guabala-Santiago	62	Under construction.
Santiago-Aguadulce	33	Paved.
Aguadulce-Penonome	28	Being paved.
Penonome-Panama City	92	Paved.
Total, Panama	304	
Grand total	3,142	

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a brief summary of the condition of the Inter-American Highway as of January 1, 1961, as prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Summary of condition of the Inter-American Highway

Country	Total	Paved	Being paved	All-weather gravel	Country	Total	Paved	Being paved	All-weather gravel
Mexico	1,587	1,587			Costa Rica	410	206		[1] 204
Guatemala	313	83	75	155	Panama	304	144	44	[2] 116
El Salvador	196	196							
Honduras	94		94		Total	[3] 3,142	2,383	284	475
Nicaragua	238	167	71						

[1] 133-mile section between San Isidro and Panama border opened to limited traffic only pending completion of 39 bridges now under construction.
[2] 62-mile section between Guabala and Santiago now under construction. Traffic uses all-weather alternate which is 15 miles longer.
[3] The entire length of the Inter-American Highway, excepting the short section in southern Costa Rica, is now open to traffic at all times. This short section may be traveled during the dry season by fording streams over which bridges are now under construction.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, and as a part thereof, a short statement under date of January 1, 1961, entitled "Condition of the Rama Road," compiled at my request by the Bureau of Public Roads.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Condition of the Rama Road, Jan. 1, 1961

	Condition	Miles between points	Miles from San Benito
San Benito		0	0
San Benito to end of pavement	Paved by Nicaragua	10	10
End of pavement to Lovago	All-weather gravel	68	78
Lovago to Villa Somoza	Paved by Nicaragua	18	96
Villa Somoza to Espabel	All-weather gravel	26	122
Espabel to Cedro Macho	Under construction; will be completed to all-weather gravel in 1961.	17	139
Cedro Macho to Rio Siquia	Let to contract December 1960	14	153
Rio Siquia to Rama	Awaits additional appropriation	5	158

The Rama Road begins at San Benito and extends to Rama, a distance of 158 miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I feel that at this point I should state that we must never forget that a little more than half of the entire mileage of the Inter-American Highway—that from Laredo to Mexico City—passes through Mexico, and that Mexico has constructed, with her own funds and her own efforts, every mile of that highway, and all of it is paved.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am happy to say that our party received, throughout its visit in Central America, from every country visited and from every official and private person with whom we came in contact, the most courteous, friendly, and generous treatment that could be described, for which all members of our party are sincerely grateful. The friendly welcome helped us greatly to obtain and bring back to the Senate what I believe is a clear picture of the portion of the Inter-American Highway which lies in Central America.

This is the second detailed inspection trip I have taken, as a representative of the Senate, over the Inter-American Highway mileage in Central America and over the Rama Road. I feel completely sure that the part which our country has played in each of these projects is of lasting value, both from a material viewpoint and as it relates to the furtherance of friendly relations and better understanding between the several cooperating nations and ourselves. The Inter-American Highway will be of lasting benefit to each nation, including our country, which has participated in building it; and the Rama Road will be of lasting benefit to both Nicaragua and the United States.

As a result of the inspection trips mentioned and of my attendance at two sessions of the Pan American Highway Congress, one at Mexico City and the other at Caracas, and as the further result of the large number of attendant contacts with very fine people representing the several cooperating nations, both in their countries and in the United States, I am definitely of the conclusion that there is no more worthwhile field for our rendering assistance where it is needed to our friendly Latin American neighbors than that of helping to provide better highways connecting ourselves with them and connecting each of them with its neighbors.

The engineers who plan and build roads and bridges speak a common language, even though they converse in different tongues; and the business and governmental people who are served by new highways likewise find common ground upon which all can cooperate to their mutual advantage. I doubt whether there is any other field as suitable as that of trunkline highway construction for the cooperation of our Nation with its friendly neighbors throughout Latin America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, first, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield the floor, I shall undertake to obtain a quorum after the Senator from Washington concludes his remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very well.

MARINE SCIENCES PROGRAM

As in legislative session,

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the past few days we have heard a great deal about the missile gap between the programs of the United States and Russia, and there has been much discussion, pro and con, as to whether such a gap exists. That matter has been discussed for some months.

There is one field about which there is absolutely no dispute, however, in regard to the existence of a gap between the programs of Russia and those of other nations, including those behind the Iron Curtain. That gap relates to a field, not of space, but of depth. For many years, we have been sadly lacking in our oceanography program. We find that since World War II, the Russians have probably done more, percentagewise, to "beef up" their program in the field of marine sciences than they have in regard to their programs in connection with any other field, even including space.

In addition, there are many, many other reasons why we should have an oceanography program. Marine sciences could in the future affect the life of every person on the face of the globe.

As I have said on many occasions, we know more about the back side of the moon than we do about three-fourths of the earth's surface. Dr. Glennan, the former head of the space agency, has testified on many occasions before my committee that if something were to happen in the world, what we know or do not know about the oceans of the world, which comprise three-fourths of the world's surface, could be more important than what we do know or do not know about space.

Last year I undertook to introduce a bill to enlarge the program in oceanography, both universitywise, researchwise, shipwise, and in many other ways.

As a matter of fact, in only one school or university in the United States—it happens to be the University of Washington—are undergraduates trained and given a degree in oceanography. That program is one of long standing. If it had not been for the two large and important institutions at Woods Hole and the Scripps Institute in La Jolla, Calif., we would be even further behind in our work in this vast field.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] knows of a group at the Franklin

Institute that have been seriously concerned about this problem, as are all scientists, whether they be in the marine sciences or not.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Washington made a very able and brilliant speech before the scientists of the Franklin Institute, which was commented on favorably. I commend him for bringing the bill up for introduction at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

It was only 2 years ago, probably at the instance of some of us who were concerned in this field, that the National Academy of Sciences, an organization of our brilliant scientific men, established a branch of marine science. This is a field in which everyone agrees there is a great lag. It involves our food in the future. It involves matters of defense. It involves natural resources. One of the top priorities today in the Department of Defense is the problem of being able to have communications under the oceans. We are developing our Polaris program. In 4 or 5 years we will have submarines that will descend 10,000, 12,000, or perhaps 15,000 feet. We have not mapped the oceans. We have no road maps. We need road maps. They are needed as much as are road maps on land. Every time our scientists go out in ships, they find new sea mounts. We do not know all about our currents yet.

A few days ago I had the pleasure of having a meeting with Piccard, the man who went down the farthest in the ocean. I had an interesting experience that day. I was at a luncheon at which next to me sat a member of the Air Force who had flown the highest. So I knew what it was to be between in that particular case.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Was that Ham?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; that was not Ham. It was a human being, the man who had flown the highest.

Mr. KEATING. Ham is a native of this country, and he has gone higher than any individual.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am referring to the human being who went the highest.

I asked Mr. Piccard, "What did you get out of this that was really important to you, more important than anything else?" He said, "Well, we saw a fish at the depths."

It may be significant that life can exist under a pressure of 12 or 13 tons per square inch. Life cannot exist at that depth unless there is oxygen there, and oxygen must come from the top of the water. Therefore, we know there must be currents that go that far down. The problem has to do with sonic relations. Weather is created in the oceans.

I could go on for hours on this subject. Suffice it to say that last year the Senate took cognizance of the importance of this subject, through the committee of which I am chairman. A bill was introduced to correlate the work of the many departments, all of which are important, from the Navy Hydrographic Service to the Bureau of Fish and Wildlife, and including even the Bureau of Mines. There are fantastic magnesium deposits in the ocean, and there are other kinds of minerals there.

The Senate passed the bill unanimously. There was not a single dissenting vote. The bill provided for a program that involved the expenditure of probably $600 million over a period of 10 years. It was a 10-year program, similar to the space program, which is minor in comparison. I am not saying that we should not do the same thing in the area of space developments, because I handle the appropriation on that subject, too; but we ought to pay attention to this matter.

The Senate passed the bill. It reached the House late. I do not know what happened. I do not think there was any objection to the purposes of the bill, but it did not pass.

The Senate committee wants me to again introduce this bill, which I am doing at this time, and I ask for its appropriate reference.

The bill is somewhat similar to the bill introduced last year, but it has been brought up to date in line with our experience. In the past 6 or 8 months we have realized that the bill is more needed than ever. Russia does not send out a single fishing boat, and they are operating in the seven seas, unless six or eight oceanographers are aboard.

The ship which operates out of Woods Hole, Mass., the primary ship we have for research, is 32 years old. We are doing practically nothing, or very little, in this field.

So I introduce this bill again. I have discussed the proposal with the now President of the United States, who is vitally interested in the matter, who voted for the bill last year, who discussed it with me on many occasions, both officially and unofficially.

I introduce the bill again, for appropriate reference; and, in order not to consume time of the Senate on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I had prepared on the bill may appear in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

The bill (S. 901) to advance the marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys, to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense to expand ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources, to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and laboratory facilities, to expedite oceanographic instrumentation, to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments, to enhance the public health and general welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follow:

NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PROGRAM

On Monday, January 30, the President of the United States, in his forthright and inspiring state of the Union message, said these significant words:

"We have neglected oceanography, saline water conversion, and the basic research that lies at the root of all progress."

This bill is designed to overcome our lag in oceanography and in basic research in the marine sciences.

Substantially this is the same bill that the Senate of the United States, without a dissenting voice, and with strong support from both sides of the aisle, approved June 23 of last year.

Previously the bill had received unanimous approval of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman.

Unfortunately no action on marine science legislation was taken in the House of Representatives. Today we are not 1 year, but 2 years behind in the program of marine research and surveys recommended by the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences—National Resources Council.

That Committee, as many of us recall, made its report and recommendations in January 1959, calling attention to our deficiences in ships, laboratory facilities, research equipment and in scientific manpower. These deficiencies still exist.

Almost simultaneously with the Committee on Oceanography report, the Navy issued a similar report emphasizing the Navy's oceanographic research needs, which it declared necessary to "develop the antisubmarine warfare capability required to combat the submarine menace."

"The program is expensive," the Navy report continued, "but when it is considered that there has been no effort to improve research ships in this country for the last 15 years, and that we are proposing a 10-year building program, it becomes obvious that we have 25 years of shipbuilding to accomplish in 10 years."

"At a minimum," the report added, "we must have one SCB–185 (a Navy-designed research ship of approximatley 1,500 tons displacement) at each laboratory and one 3,000-ton ship in each ocean by 1963."

The latter recommendation is, of course, now impossible, considering that each ship requires approximately 2 years to construct.

So we are not 2 years behind in this imperative program, but 17 years behind.

Soviet Russia, in the meantime, has increased the gap between us in oceanographic ships, oceanwide research operations, and ocean-trained marine scientists and technicians.

Only last summer that country had seven large research ships conducting intensive studies of the Gulf Stream all along our Atlantic Coast. We had three small research ships working briefly in the vicinity of Bermuda.

Soviet Russia had research ships working in the Bering Sea, along the Aleutians and in the Gulf of Alaska.

Soviet Russia had then and has now scientific ships superior to our own working in the Indian Ocean, in the North, South, and mid-Pacific, and in the Arctic and Antarctic.

That country also, during the past year, completed and launched four new research ships, of which at least two were of more than 3,600 tons displacement. Our Government last year let contracts for construction of two new research ships of approximately 1,500 tons to be completed in 1962.

The last and only ship in our scientific fleet designed and constructed for oceanographic research is the 298-ton *Atlantis*,

built in 1931. All of our other research ships are converted surplus naval auxiliary vessels, or aging exschooners, purse seiners, tugs, tuna clippers or similar craft.

Our marine laboratories are few in number, cramped, and crowded, and both ships and laboratories are ill-equipped to meet their needs in this scientific age when depth as well as space may hold the key to our survival.

Equally pressing is the problem of scientific manpower.

We do have marine scientists of outstanding competence, brilliant, dedicated men and women unexcelled in their special fields which include physics, marine biology, chemistry, and marine geology.

Many of these scientists were born abroad, received their academic training overseas, and have come to America to become American citizens and to contribute their abilities to strengthening our knowledge of the oceans.

But despite the valuable addition of these scientists, the number of oceanographers in the United States is all too few, less than two-thirds the number of such scientists in Soviet Russia. The schools and institutions for training prospective oceanographers in the United States also are all too few, and only one university in America, the University of Washington, offers degrees in oceanography to undergraduates.

The bill I have introduced today provides incentives and assistance in the form of scholarships to selected undergraduates; fellowships and research assistantships to graduate students and to post-doctoral fellows.

My distinguished colleagues are familiar with the marine sciences and research bill they so strongly and warmly approved last July; with the proposed participation by departments and agencies of our Government in a national, long-range oceanographic program, and with the provisions for coordinating, evaluating and expanding the national program as it progresses.

The objectives of last year's bill have all been retained in the new marine sciences bill I have introduced today.

All of the departments and agencies authorized to participate in last year's bill would also participate in the long-range program envisioned in the new bill.

These include the National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Geological Survey, U.S. Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Office of Education, Office of Naval Research, Hydrographic Office, Beach Erosion Board, Maritime Administration, and Smithsonian Institution.

Duties and responsibilities similar or identical to those stated in last year's proposed legislation would be authorized under the new bill, and sections applying to several of the agencies have been expanded in accordance with recommendations of the agencies or of the Committee on Oceanography.

Of particular interest to many of my colleagues and to the public generally are provisions applicable to the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the formal comments on last year's bill, S. 2692, the Department, through its Acting Secretary, Miss Bertha S. Adkins, referred to the interest of the Public Health Service in estuarine and inshore ocean waters as a future major resource for municipal, industrial and recreational water supplies, in the use of such waters for the disposal of municipal and industrial wastes, and in use of the ocean fisheries resources as they relate to health.

This interest is recognized in section 9(c) of the new bill.

An equally important subsection authorizes and directs studies and research relating to the discovery, determination, production or extraction of medically or pharmacologically important substances from marine organisms, of parasitism in marine animals, and of life processes in the marine environment, knowledge of which may contribute to human health.

I cannot overemphasize the rich potentials of research in this field.

In this connection I wish to quote from a letter I received recently from Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgi, director of the Institute of Muscle Research at Woods Hole, Mass., and a Nobel Prize winner in Medicine and Physiology.

Dr. Szent-Gyorgi said in part, and I quote:

"As you of course well know, the marine fauna is much more varied and richer than the fresh water fauna. We find in the ocean, forms which have unusual specialized chemical, physiological and morphological features which make them particularly valuable for the investigation of basic medical problems.

"Problems in cell division and multiplication, its acceleration and inhibition, the basic problem in cancer, can be effectively investigated in the marine eggs of many different forms.

"Problems in neurology, the mechanisms of nerve activity, can be carried out very profitably on the cephalopods with their giant nerve fiber.

"There is, in progress, work at this laboratory on the metabolic disturbances in diabetes in fish, the animals being rendered diabetic by operative removal of the insulin producing tissue, an operation which is impossible in higher forms.

"The environment of the Marine Biological Laboratory has been very fortunate for the development of my own research in the chemistry of the contractile proteins of muscle tissue, work which can have important significance in understanding the muscle dystrophies."

I have received communications and publications from many other eminent scientists conducting research on various medical or pharmaceutical implications in the marine environment.

They all attest to the far-reaching benefits to health which may possible be obtained through expanding marine research in this field.

Dr. Ross F. Nigrelli, director of the Laboratory of Marine Biochemistry and Ecology at the New York Aquarium, writes in part:

"Marine organisms may be the source of important pharmacological agents. The substances reported (in papers presented at a New York Academy of Science symposium) show a wide range of activity such as nerve-blocking, anti-coagulating, anti-microbial (antibiotic), carcinostatic, heart stimulating, tranquilizing, inhibition of embryonic development, etc., some more powerful than reference biologics. Thus, the substance responsible for paralytic shellfish poisoning, often a public health problem, was recently shown to have a toxicity several magnitudes higher than the most toxic nerve gas known (Dettbarn, Higman, Rosenberg, Nachmansohn, Science, 132, July 29, 1960). Further, holothurin, a toxic substance derived from a sea-cucumber (echinoderm), is a more powerful nerve blocking agent than eserine. Their usefulness as therapeutic agents can only be determined when the products under study are purified and chemically characterized.

"It is my belief that intensive biochemical studies of primitive animals of the sea will yield new organic compounds, and many new chapters will be written in organic chemistry and biochemistry. For example, the late Prof. Werner Bergmann, Yale University, and his students and associates, have shown that marine animals have many different types of sterols (more than 8 in sponges alone) including cholesterol. In more recent studies on sponges, they reported the presence of three new nucleosides, spongothymidine, spongouridine and spongosine (a purine riboside).

"The rationale for undertaking studies on the biochemistry of marine animals, especially the lower invertebrates, is based on the fact that many species show a great diversity of form and function (polymorphism) and many of them have great powers of regeneration, reproduction, growth and control of sex. Most of them are resistant to diseases and elaborate powerful toxins."

Today's Health, published by the American Medical Association, in its May issue of last year, carried an important article titled "Miracle Drugs From the Sea," with the subtitle: "Practically limitless, incalculably rich, and full of useful surprises—this is the tantalizing hodgepodge pharmacopoeia we call the sea."

The article reports in considerable detail the work of Dr. John M. Sieburth of the Narragansett Marine Laboratory and Dr. Paul R. Burkholder, director of Brooklyn Botanic Garden's Kitchaway Research Laboratory, during recent expeditions to the Antarctic, on antibiotics of marine origin, one of which, it stated, "in the test tube is effective against hospital-plaguing staphylococcus aureus."

Surely, this Government, through its Public Health Service and its National Institutes of Health, should receive the authority and funds to expand medical research in the seas and on their organisms when such research holds such golden promise to the suffering and afflicted of mankind.

Dr. S. R. Galler, of the Office of Naval Research, informs me: "There is no evidence in the study of marine animals that these animals are subject to any of the heart diseases man is subject to. We would like to know why."

I am sure my colleagues also would like to know why.

Perhaps the medical programs authorized in this bill I am introducing today will, when the bill is enacted, supply the answer.

Those who attended or who have read the hearings on last year's oceanography bill will recall that at these hearings Dr. Dixy Lee Ray of the Committee on Oceanography and University of Washington testified that no evidence has ever been found of cancer in any of the marine invertebrates. Again this poses the question: Why? Answers to that question may help our medical profession in combating this dread scourge that each year claims so many victims.

In two other areas have provisions of the previous bill been expanded after consultation with scientists within the agencies, with the Committee on Oceanography, and with other experts.

Information developed since the previous bill was introduced and reported has revealed that the Weather Bureau can have a much broader and more useful role in oceanographic research than was envisioned a year ago.

In S. 2692 the Weather Bureau's participation in the 10-year national oceanographic program related only to studies of the interchange of energy between the oceans and the atmosphere.

Section 7(g) of the bill introduced today authorizes and directs the Weather Bureau also to expand studies and investigations of mechanisms by which weather conditions lead to anomalies on ocean surface temperature and the manner in which these anomalies modify the subsequent weather, the basic mechanism of the transfer of momentum from the air to the sea, the relationship of wind velocity over water to that over land, and the extent to which wave pressure, as distinct from wind stress, contributes to the piling up of water against the coasts during hurricanes and other severe storms.

The bill also would authorize the appropriation of sums to the Weather Bureau for

the development or acquisition of instruments for assisting in these studies.

Greater emphasis has been placed in the bill introduced today on providing new and specialized instruments for all agencies requiring such instruments for expanded oceanographic research. There is a very good reason for doing this.

As the Chief of Naval Research stated in reporting to a Special Oceanographic Instrumentation Conference held in Washington, last November: "Considerable concern has been expressed both within and outside the Department of the Navy in regard to the unsatisfactory manner in which oceanographic instrumentation has lagged behind the overall expansion of the rest of the science. Because of this deficiency our knowledge of the ocean environment, the medium in which we (the Navy) operate, has been of a fragmentary nature and from a qualitative and quantitative viewpoint has left much to be desired."

Objectives of the conference included: (1) Determining what instruments or instrument systems need the most immediate attention. (2) who or what group should oversee the development of specific types of instruments, and (3) determine where this development should take place; i.e., at existing laboratories or within industry.

This and other reports on instrumentation needs are the basis for elaborating on authorization provisions for new and specialized instruments in this year's bill. Many of these instruments, the conference indicated, can be developed economically and expeditiously provided funds are made available specifically earmarked for such development.

Instruments authorized in this bill would permit the limited number of professional oceanographers in this country to accomplish greater results and in shorter time from their research efforts. Such instruments also would help bridge the scientific manpower gap until the time when sufficient numbers of oceanographers have been educated and trained to make up the lag that now exists in numbers of marine scientists.

Industry and instrumentation laboratories, it appears from past experience, can produce many new and specialized instruments for oceanographic research more rapidly than our universities can produce professional oceanographers.

Many of the instruments envisioned in conference report, and in this bill, will be capable of operation over an extended period of time, receiving, recording and transmitting important data, without the attendance of any individual.

In the bill introduced today the U.S. Coast Guard has been included in the national oceanographic research program. The Coast Guard was omitted from S. 2692, 86th Congress, partly because of certain statutory limitations.

Present statutory authority, in the opinion of the legal staff of the Coast Guard, does not permit budgeting for oceanographic research except in direct support of the ice patrol. Any other oceanographic research conducted on or from Coast Guard ships must now be initiated by some other agency, funded by the initiating agency, and the personnel and instrumentation supplied by the initiating agency.

This imposes difficult, expensive, and frequently impossible obligations on the sponsoring agency.

The bill I have introduced today would remove the present statutory limitation and permit the Coast Guard to conduct oceanographic research in the national interest with or without the cooperation of other agencies.

No new ships would be required for such research and instrumentation costs would be moderate.

The Coast Guard, in my opinion, has the greatest potential of any Government agency for obtaining certain types of valuable oceanographic data in the quickest possible time and at the lowest cost; providing, of course, this bill is enacted.

The Coast Guard has 347 ships of which many could provide exceptional ocean platforms for obtaining oceanographic data from fixed locations or specific areas in the seas. Such data is now grossly lacking.

Thirty-two of these ships are assigned to the six year-round weather stations, of which four stations are in the Atlantic and two in the Pacific. Eleven ships service the two Pacific stations, one midway between the California coast and Hawaii, one midway between Hawaii and Japan. Twenty-one service the four Atlantic stations, which extend on a broad perimeter from several hundred miles south of Greenland to east of Puerto Rico.

Many of these ships are identical to the largest survey vessels of the Navy's Hydrographic Office.

In the words of a recent Coast Guard report to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, these vessels "represent a research potential significant to even a casual observer."

Enactment of this bill will enable the Coast Guard to realize, in the not distant future, this potential.

At present these weather ships carry little or no oceanographic equipment and only such instruments for marine studies as may be brought aboard by some other agency for some brief or limited program.

Weather ships of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, Norway, and other maritime nations have permanent oceanographic research equipment and instruments aboard and couple marine scientific studies with their meteorological or weather observations.

As one example, the Canadian Government conducts extensive and continuing research from Canadian weather ships assigned to weather station Papa approximately 1,000 miles west of British Columbia and U.S. Government agencies in the Pacific Northwest have benefited from this resarch. I think it would be well to reciprocate this Canadian enterprise and service.

The Eastern Pacific Oceanic Conference, comprised of marine scientists from nations of the Western Hemisphere which touch on the Pacific, has urgently recommended that similar research be conducted from our own Pacific weather stations, November and Victor.

Major costs for such research, at both Pacific and Atlantic weather stations, would be for instrumentation. Authorization for such instrumentation is provided in the bill I have introduced today.

The Coast Guard operates 55 large buoy tenders and 58 small buoy tenders, some of which certainly could be used in connection with telemetering buoys which are projected in this bill.

The 31 lightships operated by the Coast Guard, in the words of that agency, "provide a medium for marine research which is uniquely valuable." Some of the 23 large patrol craft also could no doubt make a significant contribution to our knowledge of the waters they patrol, although their present search and rescue assignments and workload would preclude a broad program.

Use of these ships, as envisioned in the bill I have introduced today, does not preclude the very great need for ships designed exclusively for research, ships with adequate accommodations for physical, biological, chemical, and geological oceanographers, and ships which can go anywhere in the oceans at any time without any possible conflict of other duties.

The legislation proposed in this bill is necessary legislation. It is legislation in the national interest. With the exception of the bill, S. 2692, which was passed by the Senate last June but was not acted on in the House of Representatives, it is the only bill of its kind which has ever been before the Congress and acted on by a committee.

Now what is unique about this proposed legislation?

The answer is that it authorizes a national oceanographic program.

It is true that several of the departments and agencies included in this bill have authority to conduct oceanographic research, but any existing authority is limited authority, limited in scope and limited to the particular department or agency to which it applies.

In other words, instead of one overall authority for a comprehensive, unified, coordinated national program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research and surveys—one that will match the massive Soviet effort—we now have a dozen small agency programs carried on under a dozen separate authorities.

This is not adequate. I am confident that the present administration agrees it is not adequate. If they were adequate why do we not now have an adequate program of oceanographic research and surveys? Why are we being surpassed by Soviet Russia in numbers, tonnage, and quality of research ships, in scientific manpower, in operational activities, and probably in supporting facilities of all kinds?

Why?

The answer is that we have had no national oceanographic program or policy.

Most of our effort in basic marine science has been initiated by private oceanographic institutions and in universities. They have been the pioneers in this important field and, considering their restricted finances and limited facilities, they have done magnificent work.

Many are now receiving some Government assistance for vital research, often through small contracts, or through fragmentary or temporary grants. A 10-year national oceanographic program will facilitate institutions and universities in planning long-range institutional programs and in educating and training scientific manpower to meet the Nation's needs.

Our applied marine research activities have, in general, been dispersed among a multiplicity of small agencies or bureaus in five separate departments of our Government and three independent agencies. Their work has not been correlated or evaluated by any agency, board, or council responsive to Congress. This deficiency would be corrected under this bill.

Mr. President, if defense against enemy submarines is necessary; if transocean commerce is necessary, if our Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf, and Great Lakes fisheries are necessary, if knowledge of the oceans and lakes which wash four-fifths of our national boundary and to a major degree control our weather is necessary, then a long-range, coordinated national program of marine research is necessary, and this is the intent and purpose of the bill which I have introduced today, the proposed Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. WEAVER TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

The Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am opposed to the confirmation of Robert C.

Weaver to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

As of yesterday, Dr. Weaver stated that he had not resigned as chairman of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

With a new administration and many executive nominations being submitted to this Senate for approval, a great deal of time has been taken in discussing the question of conflicts of interest. No greater example of a conflict of interest has ever been presented to this Senate than this attempt to place in a position, where the Administrator thereof is supposed to serve the interests of more than 180 million American people, a man who avowedly represents an articulate and militant minority interest dedicated solely and alone to an alleged furtherance of the welfare of slightly more than 16 million members of our population.

The alpha and omega of Weaver's philosophy is summed up in a sentence contained in an article written by him in 1960, entitled "Southern Comfort: A Possible Misapplication of Federal Funds." Appearing in the Journal of Inter-Group Relations, summer 1960, he said:

> The real problem, therefore, is not one of better housing for Negroes versus integrated living. It is whether the decisions of the Supreme Court regarding tax-supported schools are to be evaded in fact through federally supported action on the housing front.

According to this distorted reasoning, Weaver sees it as his duty to integrate housing through federally supported coercion in order that Negroes and white children can be integrated in the public schools of this country. This specious reasoning is without any foundation in the Constitution, statute law, or in the remotest conception of what might constitute executive authority. It is, however, part and parcel of the NAACP's militant drive to deny to the American people the right of freedom of association and to regiment the country by Government action and force a citizen to live where the Government tells him to live and with whom the Government decrees that he will associate.

Let me read this portion of the witness' testimony:

> Doctor, on yesterday the distinguished Senator from Utah placed in the RECORD an article that you wrote in June of 1960 and published in a magazine relating to group racial relations under the title of "Southern Comfort" and so on. I do not remember the exact title.
>
> You remember the article, sir?
>
> Mr. WEAVER. Yes, sir.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Did that article accurately reflect your present views on the subject of open occupancy?
>
> Mr. WEAVER. I would say in general. I do not remember every word and phrase in it but in general I would say it does, sir.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. In fact, as I recall your testimony, you not only reiterated the views on what we might call desegregation in housing mentioned in that article but you went on to say, as I recall, that you favored Government restrictions in every type of housing except the housing that might be built by a private individual with money loaned by a bank whose accounts were covered by the FDIC.
>
> Mr. WEAVER. I think, sir, what I said was that I favored that any type of housing which received Federal aid should be open to all citizens.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Well, I thought you said that you would not try to stretch the strong arm of the Government to the thin technicality of Federal aid being granted to a homebuilder simply because the money that the bank had loaned him was insured up to $10,000.
>
> Mr. WEAVER. That was right, sir.

The only class of citizens who should be exempt from regimentation by the Federal Government, in this nominee's view, would be one who borrowed money from a private bank, even though the Government did insure the accounts up to $10,000.

Mr. President, frankly, I have never read of a more naive witness before any committee of the Congress. I cannot conceive how a man who has belonged to a half dozen Communist-front organizations would not realize that he was doing business with the Communists, yet that is implicit through his entire testimony. There is a loss of memory. There are excuses.

We are asked to place into a high position in our Government—which, in reality, controls 5 percent of the production of our country—a man who has a pro-Communist background, which cannot be denied from the record.

Mr. President, I shall list affiliations and associations with Communist-front organizations.

AFFILIATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS WITH COMMUNIST-FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

First. National Negro Congress, cited by the Attorney General, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. Nominee admitted serving as a discussion leader at the Second Congress held in Philadelphia in October 1937. Accepted an invitation to speak at the Eastern National Conference of the National Negro Congress, October 1938. Listed as attending the Third National Negro Congress session, April 23, 1940, at Washington, D.C.

Of course, he has forgotten all this, and there is an excuse as to membership in all these Communist fronts. The Senate of the United States, which is the greatest deliberative body in the world, is supposed to accept his lack of memory and his excuses and his pretexts in these matters.

Second. Member of the Washington Book Shop, also known as the Washington Co-Operative Book Shop.

The statement was made that there appeared in a newspaper several years ago the fact that his secretary, in his name, repudiated this organization; but, Mr. President, this is not the only organization. Throughout the years he has associated with numerous Communist-front organizations, and I say that no man ought to be approved to serve in a high office in our country if he has ever been a member of a number of Communist-front organizations, be he black, white, yellow or red. If he were a white man his nomination would be disapproved by the Senate because of these affiliations.

Third. Endorsed the program of the Council on African Affairs, October 1945. The Council on African Affairs was cited as a subversive and Communist organization by Attorney General Clark in his letters to the Loyalty Review Board, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Fourth. Endorsed the program of the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, February 1939. The Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Affairs in March 1944.

Fifth. The nominee's name appears as a sponsor of a dinner held in honor of Ferdinand C. Smith on September 20, 1944. Ferdinand C. Smith was once secretary of the National Maritime Union, CIO, a known Communist who was later deported from the United States.

Sixth. Dr. Robert C. Weaver's name appears as a member of the executive committee of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. His name also appears on the Mayor's Committee on Racial Relations of Chicago, Ill.

About the National Citizens Political Action Committee, the House Committee on Un-American Affairs said, in 1944:

> It has been clearly established by overwhelming evidence that the National Citizens Political Action Committee is the major Communist-front organization of the moment. As a front organization, it represents the Communist Party's supreme bid for power throughout its 25 years of existence in this country.

Mr. President, whom are we trying to delude? Here is a man who has belonged to a half-dozen Communist-front organizations, and his testimony is a pretext of excuses—that he did not know, that he did not understand. Is the great Senate of the United States supposed to confirm on such a basis, taking at face value his statement, which is only a pretext, that he is naive? Can we afford to confirm the nomination of a man who is so naive that he does not realize he was doing business with the Communists over a period of a great number of years?

The nominee visited Russia in 1946 on a mission for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Organization. In an article appearing in the Civil Liberties News, December 15, 1946, he had this to say about Russia:

> If I ever had any doubts that minority problems can be solved, my recent trip to Russia dispelled them.
>
> The Soviet Union, which was rife with anti-Semitism and national hatreds before the revolution, is today relatively free from intergroup tensions. Conflicts between these groups are unknown, and the man in the street in Russia cannot understand how the United States can claim to be a democratic nation and still persecute its darker citizens. To the Soviet citizen, it seems much more logical and fair to liquidate an enemy of the state than to deny a black man equal rights because of the color of his skin.
>
> The Soviet Union has solved its minority problems by legislative, economic, and educative methods. Expressions of nationality or racial chauvinism are punishable by law, and I was told of the application of the law. A Negro newspaperman in Moscow told me that once when he was riding on a train from Moscow to Stalingrad several Americans who were assigned space in his compartment

objected loudly to his presence. Despite the fact that these Americans were engineers and vital to the industrial development of the Soviet Union, they were promptly removed from the train and arrested.

But it is not by law alone that the job of generating appreciation for the differences in the peoples who make up Russia has been achieved. Existence of full employment and the presence of an elaborate system of social security have removed the economic causes for the intergroup tensions and rivalries. Studied action to include all ethnic and nationality groups in the affairs of the nation have put a visible stamp of official approval upon equality of opportunity. And the Communist Party, which is the professional leadership of the nation, has not compromised with prejudice. Any member guilty of racial or nationality chauvinism is summarily dismissed from the party.

More important than any of these measures is the use of education and propaganda to encourage understanding between groups in the Soviet Union. In the schools, in trade unions, in the cultural activities throughout the nation, care is taken to set forth what each ethnic and nationality group has contributed to the growth of the Russian people and to the development of mankind. Media of mass education, sometimes called instruments of propaganda, have been enlisted to spread the facts and create a receptive frame of mind.

Russia has shown the world that group prejudices and conflict can be modified. Its success suggests the instruments which can achieve results. The methods of capitalism and our form of democracy differ from those of the Soviet Union, but in Russia's handling of minority problems we can find valuable methodological tools—tools which are equally applicable to our society, but which will require refinement and redirection.

Mr. President, when we consider that the man who wrote this article was actively associated with Communist-front organizations in the United States, the conclusion is inevitable that he must have had a deep and profound admiration for the Soviet Union and Russian communism. Even high school children in this country know that nothing could be farther from the truth than these statements made by Weaver as to the manner and method that he witnessed treatment of minority problems and minority groups in the Soviet Union. Probably the best study that has been made of minority groups in the Soviet Union was one prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at the request of the Internal Security Subcommittee. This detailed and hideous report concludes:

That Soviet nationality policy has been harsh and often inhuman is shown by the history of over four decades of ruthless suppression of the non-Russian minorities. As the preceding brief survey indicates, genocide, massive discrimination and abuse of power have been and continue to be the chief instruments of the Soviet Government in carrying out its nationality policy.

We see how the nominee upon whom we are about to vote has followed the Communist line throughout the years; and the Senate is asked to place in high position in the American Government for the very first time a man who has been indoctrinated by Communists and who has followed the Communist philosophy.

Mr. President, the catch phrase "open occupancy housing" does not mean open occupancy at all but forced occupancy as it is employed by the nominee and the NAACP. Experience in public housing projects in every city of the United States has demonstrated conclusively that it is impossible to keep white and Negro families living together. Sooner or later the white families move out and the projects become entirely Negro. This has been true in the eastern city areas of the United States for a long time. It is also true on the west coast. In Los Angeles 65 percent of the housing units are occupied by Negro Americans, 18 percent by Mexican Americans, and only 14 percent by white. The Negroes represent only 12 percent of the population of Los Angeles. In San Francisco, on an estimated nonwhite population of 13 percent, 52.6 percent of the occupants of San Francisco public housing projects are Negroes. It is a safe assertion that within a very short period of time Los Angeles and San Francisco will find their public housing units occupied entirely by nonwhite population. The 1959 Annual Report of the NAACP on Housing states the identical line taken by this nominee when it says:

The association maintained that corrective action in this area (housing) can best be achieved by issuance of an Executive order by the President. But continuous efforts in absence of such action were made to effect a more democratic operation of Federal housing programs by administrative changes in policy and procedures.

Does anyone doubt for a moment that this nominee, even without an Executive order by the President, will immediately effect administrative changes in policy and procedure that have never yet been dreamed of?

The intent of Congress, as expressed in the established laws in regard to the entire field of housing, is clear and explicit. When the original Housing Act was before the Senate in 1949, Senator Bricker had proposed an amendment that would have prohibited segregation in public housing everywhere. None other than the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] then said:

We, therefore, have the choice of voting for the Bricker amendment prohibiting segregation in public housing everywhere and thereby killing the whole program or voting it down, enabling the act to be passed, the slums to be cleared, and the 810,000 dwellings to be constructed, and then let the localities themselves decide this question of segregation in public housing.

Later on he said:

Personally I do not believe in segregation; but I also know that the Southern States are firmly committed to that principle, and I do not want at this time to disrupt the United States of America, during a period of grave national crisis, when we are being threatened by the police state, in order to force upon them what I believe to be correct.

There is not a Member of this Senate who does not full well realize that there would never have been a housing program of any kind or character and there will not be one if an attempt is made to enact anything like the Bricker amendment into housing legislation by this Congress.

Mr. President, executive departments and independent agencies have no business attempting to circumvent the legislative intent that is clearly apparent not only in regard to the many phases of housing but in the field of education and every area where Congress has appropriated funds, knowing full well that the funds would be expended to finance segregated facilities.

It is incredible that intelligent people can advocate open occupancy in all areas of housing when we view what has actually happened in public housing projects in the large cities of the United States. The nominee, having served as deputy commissioner of housing, New York State, administrator of the State housing rent commission in New York, and as vice chairman of the housing and redevelopment board of the city of New York, should have an intimate, personal knowledge of that city. The New York Daily News in 1957 made an exhaustive study and report of various public housing projects and here are a few extracts of the conditions that existed in the so-called integrated public housing projects in the city of New York.

This is an impartial survey which was made by a great newspaper in New York City. The nominee's intention is to impose these horrible conditions on the rest of the country. These are conditions in New York City which are described by public authorities as being horrible in the extreme. Why it is desired to impose those conditions upon the rest of the country, I cannot understand. Yet that is what is sought to be done. I read from the New York Daily News, as follows:

Fort Greene Houses, completed 13 years ago next Sunday, is a rotting $20 million slum. It is brick-and-steel Tobacco Road in the heart of New York, off the Brooklyn approach to the Manhattan Bridge.

Certain persons decry conditions in the South, but forget what is happening at home, where the stench is and where the rottenness is.

I continue reading:

The sprawling 37-building project is a city in itself, with 3,501 apartments and more than 14,000 inhabitants. Most of them moved into the State subsidized project to get out of the slums and into a place where they could enjoy decent living conditions.

Today they are, in effect, right back where they started.

Here are some of the things the visitors saw:

Smashed windows in apartments are stuffed with rags, newspaper and cardboard. Obscenities scrawled in four-foot letters cover many walls. Knobs and locks are missing from doors; doorsteps are torn from their moorings.

Ceiling sockets and bulbs are missing, making the hallways a mugger's paradise. Painters who had arrived at apartments before plasterers avoided gaping holes in the walls by painting neatly around the holes.

Hundreds of benches have been demolished, and even the concrete supports for the benches have disappeared.

The outer wall of one building bore a huge wet stain, 10 feet wide and five stories high. A member of the project staff explained: "The pipes in the inside wall of the building must be bursting—again."

Elevators and hallways everywhere reeked of urine.

That is the condition in New York City, which desires to force her culture on the rest of the country.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What is the date of that report?

Mr. EASTLAND. The date is 1957.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is aware, of course, of the fact that Mr. Weaver had nothing whatever to do with that condition.

Mr. EASTLAND. The whole point is that this is Mr. Weaver's philosophy, a philosophy which he desires to impose on the rest of the country. Those are conditions which exist now, under his administration. I continue to read:

In building after building, 6-foot sections of brass trim around the mailboxes have been ripped from the walls.

Of course, they had been stolen.

Condensation on the walls of some apartments was so great that water ran down and onto the floors in meandering rivulets.

Vandalism is a staggering item in the maintenance of the project. Light bulbs are stolen by the gross.

Mr. President, this is an example of the interracialism which we now face.

Doorknobs are stolen for their junk value. Hacksaws have been used to cut heavy brass nuts from firefighting equipment.

This took place in interracial housing in the city of New York.

Drug addiction runs high among the youth population of the project. "Known" cases—and officials emphasize the word "known"—average from 100 to 125 a year. And these youngsters will steal anything they can in order to pay for "reefers" or even more expensive drugs.

I see the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania leaving. I do not blame him. This is the kind of condition he desires to import to an area of the country which has the highest degree of observance of law of any section of the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK. It is with great regret that I shall temporarily absent myself from listening to my very dear friend's eloquent description of conditions in New York City, conditions with which the nominee had nothing whatever to do.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course he did. The conditions exist now, under his administration.

Mr. CLARK. I shall return shortly.

Mr. EASTLAND. I quote further:

Drug addictions run high among the youth population of the project. Known cases—and officials emphasize the word "known"—average from 100 to 125 a year.

Think of that, Mr. President.

And these youngsters will steal anything they can in order to pay for reefers or even more expensive drugs.

That is the culture of the great city of New York, a culture which some Senators desire to enforce on other areas of the Nation.

Their hygienic habits lead to another expense for the project. Urine running off floors of elevators corrodes the interlocks, which prevents the opening of doors unless the elevator is at the floor, and shorts the electrical equipment.

That is the issue before us. Those are conditions which will exist all over the country if this nominee's interracial theories are put into effect.

In Sound View Houses, completed on October 29, 1954, is a 28-month-old baby suffering from rickets, cerebral palsy, scarlet fever, mumps, and dropsy.

This statement does not come from a Southerner who has his heart full of racial prejudice, as is said; it comes from one of the great newspapers of the United States, located in New York City, which discusses conditions in that city. Yet some Senators want to impose those conditions all over the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not an expert on New York City, but I venture to say that I know as much as the Senator from Mississippi does about Minneapolis; and I can say, with all due respect, that Minneapolis has housing projects which are well taken care of.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the interracial problem does not exist in Minneapolis as it exists in New York and other areas of the country. That is the issue before us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wanted to make it quite clear that the Senator can generalize about 49 States of the Union, but not my State of Minnesota.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not trying to generalize about the Senator's State, because Minnesota does not have that problem, and the Senator does not know anything about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We think we have a little information about it.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not have that information.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We can understand the ethnical backgrounds of people. I say most respectfully that it is unfair to make generalizations.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is not unfair. These conditions exist in the nominee's own backyard. They are conditions which he has imposed on the rest of the people there, conditions which the Senator wants to impose on the rest of the country. The excuse is that such conditions do not exist in Minneapolis. Well, Minneapolis is not the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a good part of it.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a great city of great people, but there are other areas of the country, too.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will not argue about the great virtues of the city of Minneapolis, because they stand on their own.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will argue about the great virtues of Minneapolis, and of St. Paul, as well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The burden of the argument rests with the Senator from Mississippi when he makes the generalization he does.

Mr. EASTLAND. I make no generalization. I have quoted specifically from a great newspaper, published in the city of New York, the conditions which exist in New York City.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The great newspaper ought to be ashamed of itself if it has not done something to correct those conditions.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator does not like it because it states the facts. That is the truth. I continue to read:

In Sound View Houses, completed on Oct. 29, 1954, is a 28-month-old baby suffering from rickets, cerebral palsy, scarlet fever, mumps, and dropsy.

The 13 seven-story buildings occupy a 26-acre site, leaving ample space between the buildings and providing plenty of fresh air and sunshine.

The halls reek of urine—and worse. Turning the elevators into mobile toilets is an uncontrolled affliction of many public housing projects but the practice has been carried to the last extreme at Sound View.

That is a condition which exists in New York City. Yet some Senators want to make the rest of the country toe the line to conform with what they believe in. God help the rest of the country if that is brought about.

Evidence of fire blackens the walls of stairways between the floors. Knobs are missing from doorways leading to emergency fire stairs, so that an explosion or fire could trap tenants in public hallways.

And efforts have been made to steal the emergency keys that open elevator doors.

They are stolen from the interracial projects in New York City so that they can be sold for junk.

A notice fixed with tape to the mailbox of one building had been set afire and reduced to ashes.

The halls bore scrawls written in lipstick and expressing sentiments that would put hardened criminals to shame.

So says a New York newspaper:

The reporters found gravel had been scooped up from roofs and strewn on stairs. Sections of concrete at roof landings had broken loose and fallen onto the stairways. Sound View has another claim to distinction. In this project there are many tenants who have to mop, not just the floors, but the ceilings. This is no exaggeration, and in a project just 28 months old.

* * * * *

The Washington Houses in upper Manhattan, so new they are only half occupied, already show the telltale signs of faulty construction, neglect, and deterioration.

This huge project will contain 1,515 apartments.

Six of the 14 buildings are completed and in those apartments News Reporter John Lewis found cracked walls, broken windows, mutilated fire apparatus, garbage in the hallways, leaking plumbing, and a wide variety of other ailments.

The visit to Washington Houses was made last Sunday, tail end of a 3-day holiday for housing authority workers, including porters. Garbage was scattered through the hallways of building after building.

That, Mr. President, is what takes place in the city of New York.

I read further:

On several floors, all the light bulbs were missing, making dark and dangerous passages for the tenants. Tenants reported

that at night they often have to feel their way along the halls to get to their apartments. The bulbs are replaced, they said, after a day or two.

As in other projects, fire hoses were missing or damaged and emergency fire doors had no knobs.

In other words, those materials had been stolen, in order that they might be sold for junk. Those are the conditions that arise from the interracial "stuff" that New York City wants to impose on the rest of the country.

Let me refer now to another situation of that sort:

At 1895 Second Avenue, the knob was missing from the exit door on the ground floor and as a stopgap measure the door was propped open. This condition had existed for weeks.

Thousands of criminal cases in which the attitude of Housing Authority management has been one of indifference or complete unconcern help to explain why many citizens are afraid to venture into the city's housing projects at night and why tenants who want to rear their children properly move out of projects if it is financially possible.

Here's one that happened at Stephen Foster Houses, 112th Street and Fifth Avenue.

A youth of 15, entering the community center to attend a social affair, turned a zip gun and knife over to a member of the staff and asked him to hold them until the evening's merriment was over.

The staff member complied and returned the miniature arsenal as the boy left. He said later he didn't want to get the youth in trouble.

Shortly after he left the center, the boy was caught in a hallway of a nearby building using his weapons to force a girl to submit to him.

The officer arrested him and found that the zip gun had a live cartridge.

God prevent that such horrible conditions should be forced by the Federal Government on the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, that is the great issue in this controversy.

It is the avowed intention of the nominee—far from intending to clean up situations such as the ones I have described—to create new conditions in which the same conditions and situations could arise in every nook and corner of the Nation.

Mr. President, no agency of the Federal Government has a more profound influence on the economic life and welfare of the United States than does the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Its Administrator is charged with the supervision of the Community Facilities Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, the voluntary home mortgage credit program, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. If the man who holds the office of Administrator does not have the full and complete confidence of all the people of these United States, a potentially dangerous and explosive situation is created. It is basic that the economic welfare of the United States rises and falls on the back of the construction industry. When the construction of homes and apartments recedes, the entire economy of the country is profoundly affected, and most recessions and depressions of the past have always started with the decline of home construction. Even now the lumber industry throughout the entire United States is in trouble, because of a lack of demand for lumber products. If there were no other reason to oppose this nomination, this potential lack of confidence in the nominee is a good and sufficient reason.

But, Mr. President, a great issue is facing us. It is whether we are going to integrate the public housing system of the country and force upon the rest of the country the deplorable conditions which exist in New York City. That is what this nominee favors. God prevent his confirmation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the excellent presentation he has made in connection with the major points involved in this issue.

Mr. President, I say with all deference—and I make this statement on the basis of what I know about the situation and what will probably develop—that if the pending nomination were to be confirmed, it would be a source of great regret on the part of the present administration, and would bring great trouble and harm to the administration of the housing program.

Mr. President, earlier today I spoke at some length in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be Administrator of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I oppose Weaver because his background and experience do not qualify him to hold this important post.

I oppose Weaver because his record shows clearly and without question that he is more interested in promoting racial integration than he is in carrying out the Federal housing policies enacted by the Congress.

I oppose Weaver because he does not have the confidence of the housing and construction industry, and will be unable, therefore, to further the housing program and stimulate additional construction in the housing industry. The present recession in this industry will continue and will lap over into other fields.

On the first point, it is true that the recent public offices held by Weaver in the city of New York are in the housing field. However, more important than his recent activities is the fact that at the present time he is chairman of the board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and he has also been serving as chairman of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing.

In addition, in the past he served as executive director of the Mayor's Committee on Race Relations in Chicago.

In my earlier remarks to the Senate, I listed the books, pamphlets, and articles which have been written by Robert C. Weaver, as the list was furnished to me by the Library of Congress.

The most impressive thing about these writings by the nominee is the fact that most of them dealt with race relations and the way in which integration, socially and in housing, can be promoted at a faster pace. This is certainly an excellent reason, along with the other reasons I have given, to oppose confirmation of the nomination of Weaver.

In 1948, the nominee wrote a book called "The Negro Ghetto," and this book was discussed in the hearings held by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on this nomination. I should like to refer to a few passages from this book which, I think, clearly reflect that Weaver can be expected to continue his work as board chairman of the NAACP in his new position as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. For this reason alone, he should not be confirmed.

The Congress of the United States formulates the policies of the Federal Government with reference to housing; and the theories of Weaver, as reflected in his writings, notably "The Negro Ghetto," should not enter at all into the housing picture.

In view of the rapid speed with which this nomination has been brought to the floor, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks, I have not had a full opportunity to read the various books and publications written by Weaver. However, on page 30 of the hearings before the Senate committee, several passages from the books to which I have referred stand out and show that this man's theory is to foster integration in public housing.

I read now from pages 30 and 31:

The ultimate necessity to wipe out residential segregation in a democracy is equally valid in all parts of it.

Sooner or later the concept of separate areas for racial groups in America must give way if we want to make a rational approach to our housing problem and avoid the constant threat of racial conflict over space in housing facilities. This means that we must start developing communities open to all groups in our population.

New areas open to minorities can be divided into two groups, those developed by public housing and those developed by private housing. Both are needed, and unless they are forthcoming no other measures for meeting the problems of housing have any chance to succeed.

In considering smaller projects, location becomes an extremely important factor.

Mr. President, the national housing policy adopted by Congress in 1949 is as follows:

The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

That is a very fine goal, and it has been sought consistently over the years since the time of the enactment of that measure. But this is not the policy of Robert C. Weaver; this is not his background; this is not the way he feels about housing. His nomination should not be confirmed.

Adoption of the new approach and the new attitude and the new concept of the administration would inevitably destroy the policy as set forth by the Congress and would retard the development of this entire program.

In a presentation, prepared by Robert C. Weaver, entitled "Integration in Public and Private Housing," which ap-

peared in the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Weaver said:

> Residential racial patterns assume new significance in light of recent decisions of the Supreme Court banning segregation in public schools. Long before this action, concentration of nonwhites in ghettos had nullified legal prohibitions above the Mason-Dixon line on racially separate schools. After the decisions, residential segregation became a principal proposal for "getting around" the Court's decrees in the South. In all regions of the Nation, restriction of colored citizens to certain areas creates de facto separate neighborhoods and public facilities—including schools—thereby delaying participation and acceptance of nonwhites in the educational, political, economic, and social aspects of American life.

One of the most enlightening articles written by Weaver appeared in the Journal of Inter-Group Relations in the summer of 1960. The article, entitled "Southern Comfort: A Possible Misapplication of Federal Funds," reads in part as follows:

> MISUSE OF FEDERAL FUNDS?
>
> With or without urban renewal, many southern cities will use every means to accelerate residential segregation. Historically, the continuing existence of racially mixed areas of living in many of the older southern cities and towns has posed no problem of Negroes' participation in most phases of community life. Segregation laws accomplished this. Now that school segregation is doomed, it is inevitable that these urban communities will have a new and intense interest in manipulating residential racial living patterns so as to perpetuate traditional exclusion.
>
> The real problem, therefore, is not one of better housing for Negroes versus integrated living. It is whether the decisions of the Supreme Court regarding tax-supported schools are to be evaded in fact through federally supported action on the housing front.
>
> And the matter is complicated by the very nature of the social and economic forces which operate in the Negro community. The middle- and upper-class Negro families, which of necessity occupy accommodations provided in any areas of new housing for nonwhites, are the households most apt to press for integrated schools. Their children are the ones most likely to qualify for immediate transfer on placement and associated tests. By concentrating these families in separate sections, which in the language of the Texas resident and former president of the National Association of Home Builders, are "in proper areas with proper facilities" i.e., segregated, school integration will be delayed and frustrated in large measure.
>
> There is real southern comfort in this possibility. Surely, if it is facilitated by urban renewal and unquestioned by the Federal housing agencies, it represents a serious misuse of Federal funds.

Mr. President, the Congress has announced the policy of the Federal Government in the field of housing. The goal, as I mentioned a moment ago, is a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

Mr. President, the policy is not that such a home must be in an integrated area. Integrated housing is not the policy of the Federal Government. Integrated housing is the policy of Robert Weaver. This has been emphasized time and time again in his writings and in his speeches.

In a report of a speech which Weaver made to the NAACP in July 1959, the New York Times, as shown on page 35 of the hearings said:

> He urged a fight for a Federal policy establishing that housing built with Federal aid or other public funds should be open to all. However, he added, "I'm not naive enough to believe this is going to get integrated housing in many parts of the country."

It is apparent that Weaver's chief concern, as reported in his writings and speeches, has been, not what to do with housing after it is built, or how to build more housing, but primarily ways and means to see that Negroes live in that housing side by side with white people.

The real problem which will face any Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will be how to build more houses and where to get the money with which to build them. Weaver's nomination should not be confirmed, in view of his crusading efforts to force integration in all areas of our Nation, including the housing field.

I have further reason to be concerned about the selection of a man with Weaver's background as the head of the Federal Agency handling our entire housing program. The Administrator of this Agency must be in a position to inspire confidence in himself as an individual and as Administrator, and, by his efforts, to stimulate the construction of additional housing to fulfill a great need which exists in our country. Certainly, Mr. President, in view of Weaver's background and his efforts to force integration of the races, his appointment will seriously undermine our housing program and will destroy all efforts to improve housing conditions in the country.

There is no doubt whatever that this appointment will cause great emotional feelings regarding integrated housing, and may stop the flow of housing capital from mortgage bankers, homebuilders, and building suppliers. There will be hesitation among the lending institutions which ordinarily furnish the capital necessary for the construction of housing, and possibly they will not advance the money, because of the feeling against forced integration and a wish to avoid racial conflicts.

Mr. President, that would certainly be the case in a great area of the country; and I sincerely hope this can be avoided.

Mr. President, a little while ago I listened with keen interest while the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] described the reasons why he is opposing confirmation of this nomination. I want to commend the Senator for his position, which certainly is sound and is entirely in accord with the facts which were brought out before his committee. I heard the Senator refer to the fact that there may be many Federal positions for which Weaver might qualify, but this is not one of them. I completely agree with him and share his grave doubts.

Mr. President, part of the responsibility of the new Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will be to stimulate the construction of additional housing. This is a real problem at the present time, and I greatly fear that the appointment of Weaver will not help the situation at all.

Unfortunately, we are already experiencing a serious recession, especially in the housing industry. Any man who assumes the responsibility of Administrator of this Agency must be one who will inspire confidence in the industry. My sincere conviction is that Weaver cannot inspire such confidence; in fact, his appointment will further depress the industry.

A considerable segment of our economy depends upon a healthy housing industry. The construction of additional homes provides employment for contractors, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, and many other skilled laborers. In addition, such construction provides employment for many other persons in the building supply and manufacturing trades.

Unfortunately, if the present housing recession continues, there will be further unemployment, not only in the housing industry, but in other fields as well.

That is another reason for the great concern, not only in my area of the country but throughout the Nation, over the possible consequences of the nomination, should it be confirmed.

I sincerely hope the Senate, in its wisdom and discretion, under the very important constitutional prerogative the Senate has, will not confirm the nomination.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I wish to state my support of this particular nomination and my respect for the splendid professional qualities and capabilities of Dr. Robert Weaver, the nominee for the office of Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

It seems to me it has been demonstrated in the hearing, but, more significantly, in a lifetime of service, that the nominee is well qualified and has much to offer to the people of the United States in terms of a public housing program. I think the record is manifestly clear that the nominee, Dr. Weaver, will carry out the policy of the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the courts of law of the United States, and that it is the duty of any man who takes the responsibility of an appointment and the confirmation of that appointment to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Dr. Weaver will be a law-abiding official. When one becomes a public official, he loses some of his private identity. He becomes an agent of the public will and of public policy, as we pass acts of Congress, through the Executive orders of the President and through the court decisions of the judicial system.

Whatever may be the argument over personal attitude, the fact is that we are dealing here with a public official, public policy, and public will.

I feel that the President has carefully scrutinized the background of the nominee and that the evidence has been placed before the committee. I invite my colleagues' attention to the fact that the hearing on this particular nomination is possibly the most extensive of any of those that have been held on any of the nominees of the President of the United States in this administration. I

feel that the debate today has surely given an opportunity for every point of view to be expressed; and I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that some years ago the mayor of Chicago set up a Council on Human Relations and asked Mr. Weaver to come to Chicago to assist in its efforts. I have had occasion to talk with one or two persons who were associated with Mr. Weaver in that endeavor. I am advised by them that they found him to be a highly competent person; a skilled, quite able, and altogether dedicated public servant.

I fully concur in the estimate made by the acting majority leader, and I shall certainly support the nomination of Mr. Weaver.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate confirmed the nomination be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to point out that I voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver. I was persuaded to do so upon the basis of reports appearing in various newspapers, including the Baltimore Evening Sun of February 8, 1961, in which it was stated that President Kennedy wrote to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], chairman of the committee which had the hearings on the nomination, that he had fully reviewed and evaluated an FBI report on Mr. Weaver, and the President added "his complete confidence that Weaver would do an outstanding service."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I was present, that I voted for confirmation of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, and that I was very glad to do so.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

STUDIES OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 20. I wish to notify Senators that the intent is to make this resolution the unfinished business for Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that Senators may clearly understand the program for Monday, we shall on Monday, after the usual morning hour, proceed to consider the resolutions which are on the Senate calendar, starting with Calendar No. 25 and going through Calendar No. 38. These are the so-called money resolutions.

As was indicated earlier today, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will make his report as to his trip overseas and his observations with respect to countries visited.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I correctly understand that the resolutions are to be considered immediately following the morning hour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the intention.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the report by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] follow that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The resolutions will be considered immediately following the morning hour. After the resolutions are considered we shall have the report of the Senator from Louisiana. However, of course there is no unanimous-consent request with respect to the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be on the basis of recognition by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that all the business for Monday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as the leadership knows now, that is the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And then it is proposed to adjourn until Thursday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Until Thursday. Then on Thursday it is proposed, after a short session, to adjourn until the following Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the general understanding that during this period there will be no yea-and-nay votes.

Mr. President, I thank our colleagues for their cooperation today in respect to the nomination of Mr. Weaver and for the accommodation which has been accorded to many of our colleagues under these trying circumstances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 13, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 9, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Carlisle Piehl Runge of Wisconsin to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Charles C. Finucane, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Clarence Daniel Martin, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for transportation.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named persons to be captains in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Douglas B. Henderson	Howard W. Schleiter
Robert Wilcox	Clarence N. Daniel
Chester R. Bender	Joseph W. Naab, Jr.
Richard R. Smith	Corliss B. Lambert
Samuel G. Guill	Randolph Ridgely III
Paul E. Trimble	Harold Land
Russell R. Waesche, Jr.	Mark A. Whalen
Joseph P. Martin	William F. Cass
George W. Playdon	Roger M. Dudley
Thomas F. Epley	Albert F. Wayne
Julius E. Richey	Chester I. Steele
Frederick J. Statts	Clarence H. Waring,
Alexander G. Moberg	Jr.
James S. Muzzy	Paul E. C. Prins
Raymond W. Blouin	Edward P. Chester, Jr.
Kenneth W. Donnell	Larry L. Davis
Fred F. Nichols	Roderick Y. Edwards
Theodore F. Knoll	Arthur Pfeiffer
Myron W. Caskey	John F. Kettler
Forrest A. Tinsler	Benjamin F. Engel
Wayne L. Goff	Robert Waldron
Ronald M. Freeman	George T. Murati
Joseph A. Ciccolella	James W. Williams

The following named persons to be commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

William T. Corfield	Raymond W. Siegel
Russell O. Foster	Harry A. Solberg
Charles L. Turner	Robert O. Bracken
James F. Phair	John W. Hume
Robert A. Copeland	Jack E. Forrester
Clinton J. Maguire	Lewis R. Davison
Roger B. Clark	John H. Hawley
George W. Walker	Carol L. Mason
Frank D. Hilditch	Charles E. MacDowell

Elmer P. Mathison
Warren C. Mitchell
Henry A. Campbell, Jr.
Harold F. Lynch
Armand J. Bush
Lester A. Levine
John J. O'Meara
Glenn O. Thompson
Eugene F. Walsh
Samuel E. Taylor
George J. Bodie
Emerson Hayes, Jr.
John W. McCurdy
Warren F. Stevenson
Peter E. Cibney
Joseph R. Steele
Mitchell A. Perry
Garth H. Read
William E. Dennis
Robert J. Lo Forte
Owen W. Siler
Robert B. Moore
Wallace C. Dahlgren
Arthur Hancock
Richard A. Pasciuti
William S. Allan, Jr.
Harry H. Carter
Bernard E. Kolkhorst

The following named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Douglas H. Clifton
Allen C. Pearce
David C. Porter
Abe H. Siemens
James H. B. Morton
Robert R. Hagan, Jr.
David D. Fritts
Oliver W. Harrison
Herbert J. Lynch
Leslie M. Creig
Christopher S. Changaris
Casimir S. Rojeski
James R. Iversen
Philip M. Hildebrandt
Norman L. Scherer
Charles W. Berkman
Paul W. Welker
Loren V. Perry
Elmer Winbeck
Theodore L. Roberge
Nathan Vanger
Charles B. Martinson, Jr.
Leland O. Wilkie
John G. Milosic
Orville C. Hinnen
Olaf T. Sturdy
Harry S. Raleigh
Lee J. A. King
Thomas C. Pennock
Hugh E. McCullough
Hugh J. LeBlanc
Thurston L. Willis
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waitzfelder
Harold D. Muth
Jack E. Stewart
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
Norman P. Weinert
Rubin E. Young, Jr.
Fred J. Michalson
Richard C. Green
Wesley J. Quamme
William C. Akers
Donald D. Davison
Ivan C. McLean
Edward G. Taylor
Franklin F. Bohlk
John W. Cherry
Vincent J. Wernig
Franklin J. Miller
James G. Norman
Russell W. Lentner
Harold A. French
William H. Yates
Sam Pisicchio
Robert D. Parkhurst
Otto F. Unsinn
Walter O. Henry
Verne D. Finks
William L. Aitkenhead
Charles F. Baker
James P. Stewart
James H. Swint
Shirl J. Stephany
Leslie D. High
Patrick G. H. Bursley
Frank E. Parker
Leland C. Batdorf
William F. Tighe, Jr.
Roy K. Angell
Robert C. Krulish
William J. Kirkley
Edward E. Chambers
Robert W. Johnson
Charles S. Marple
Wildred F. Raes
Albert H. Clough
Randolph Ross, Jr.
Robert W. Smith
David E. Perkins
Robertson P. Dinsmore
Alfred J. Tatman
George N. Wood
Albertus N. Schroeder, Jr.

The following named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

William D. Harvey
John D. Franks
Bertrand J. Ronneberg
Kermit R. Meade
Paul A. Yost, Jr.
Henry H. Bell
Philip C. Lutzi
Richard F. Maim
Lambert J. Larson
Cortland G. Pohle, Jr.
John L. Klenk
Earl A. Baker
Swain L. Wilson
Phillip B. Moberg
Lawrence A. White
Wilfred R. Bleakley, Jr.
John S. Phillips
James P. Randle
John H. Fournier
Richard O. Haughey
Richard L. Jacobs
Louis L. Zumstein
Alfred P. Manning, Jr.
George J. Roy, Jr.
Robert W. Witter
John G. Martinez
Ted L. Gannaway
Robert A. Moss
Richard M. Thomas
Daniel L. Muir
Graham Hall
John L. Steinmetz, Jr.
Joseph P. Hratko
Charles E. Martin
Hugh C. Wyatt
Robert C. Powell
George E. Maloney
Richard J. Knapp
Robert Russell
Frederick P. Schubert
Robert B. Grant
Norman S. Morrill
Byron W. Jordan
David M. Kaetzel
Myron E. Walsh
Frank M. Sperry
Cletus J. Walz
Robert F. Ewels
Edmond Janczyk
Peter J. DeLaat, Jr.
Robert C. Branham
Raymond H. Baetsen, Jr.
Robert S. Lucas
Robert A. Carlston
John F. Lobkovich
David J. Linde
Bruce W. Dewing
Robert B. Sims
Gilbert P. Sherburne
William J. Glass
Herbert W. Eley
John D. Costello
Richard B. Brooks
Donald C. Thompson
James R. Kelly
William S. Black
Peter A. Morrill
Clarence R. Gillett
Charles E. Jurgens
Robert T. Platt, Jr.
John H. Byrd, Jr.
Kenneth G. Wiman
John D. Steinbacher
David F. McIntosh, Jr.
Glenn N. Parsons
Robert V. Hackney
Gerald O. Lesperance
Robert G. Moore
Melvin W. Hallock
William H. Clark, Jr.
Carlton E. Russell
Leon D. Santman
Herbert G. Lyons
Willie W. Thurmond, Jr.
John F. Ellis
Robert D. Peters
Warren D. Andrews
Alfred H. Walter
Edwin H. Daniels
Keith B. Schumacher
Ralph C. Hill
Charles E. Mathieu
Glenn F. Young
James E. Grabb
Edward C. Farmer, Jr.
Albert G. Stirling
Ernest E. Rowland, Jr.
David H. Howland
William D. Markle, Jr.
Donald C. Hintze
Bernard A. Hoyland
William E. Lehr, Jr.
Oraeme Mann
Joseph M. Kelly
Hal F. Olson
Roger L. Madson
James A. Kearney
Walter W. Kohl, Jr.
James C. Irwin
Walter D. Fox
Harris A. Pledger, Jr.
William L. King
Donald D. Garnett
Vaughan W. Driggers
Jerome V. Flanagan
Paul H. Breed
Richard P. Cueroni
Arthur P. Roberts
William Russell
Edmund L. Cope
Walter E. Paulsen
Laurence O. Bates
Darrell L. Babcock
Theodore J. Wojnar
Donald W. Smith
George K. Greiner, Jr.
James H. Conrad
Paul T. Anderson
Edward Nelson, Jr.
William B. Clark
Nathaniel C. Spadafora
Arthur Solvang
Calvin E. Crouch
Harry J. Oldford
William E. Smith.
Donald E. Hand
Richard Q. Lowry
Sydney M. Shuman

The following named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Robert Farmer
Richard H. Wight
Martin H. Daniell, Jr.
Edwin L. Rahn
James Napier, Jr.
Hugh M. McCreery
John B. Mahon
Bobby C. Wilks
Thomas C. Volkle
Ronald D. Stenzel
Delmar F. Smith
Calvin P. Lankford
Alvin J. Arnett
Harry J. Reckitt
James E. Hognestad
Horton E. Gafford

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William J. Crockett, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Burke Marshall, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Harold R. Tyler, Jr., resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Herbert Frank York, of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

John P. Duncan, Jr., of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

James E. Webb, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years; U.S. Governor of the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; and a Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

George W. Ball, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; and an Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 9, 1961:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. William R. Shuler, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR

Rex Marion Whitton, of Missouri, to be Federal Highway Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Louis Falk Oberdorfer, of the District of Columbia to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Robert Kramer, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Clarence Daniel Martin, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

James E. Webb, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE

Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 9, 1961:

All postmasters sent to the Senate since the 87th Congress convened and prior to January 21, 1961.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Robert A. Bicks, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Jacob Pressman, Temple Beth Am, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

One life is ours, one moment between two eternities. One more new day begins in that moment.

Help us, O Lord, to use it wisely, that by some word or deed of ours we may make this blessed land an instrument for good here and throughout the world, uniting men in peace and plenty and freedom.

To those of us who dare to judge, to lead, and to legislate for our neighbors, grant clear vision, deep insight, courage to champion the unpopular cause if

that is what we believe, strength to resist temptation, daring to attempt the untried, sympathy to feel the ache and the need in human hearts, and good humor to smile at our frailties and be forgiven them.

When the echoes of this day's debate within these walls are stilled, and each of us returns to the privacy of home, may he find there good health, good cheer, the love of dear ones, the respect of friends, a mirror reflecting an image he is unashamed to face, and Thy divine presence before whose judgment he is unafraid to stand.

One life.

Thou didst breathe it into us and one day wilt take it from us. Help us not to waste it. May we return it, having made this world a little better by what we do today and every day, in service to our fellow man, and in recognition of Thee as the Father of us all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 7, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST MARTIN POPPER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify on February 20, 1961, in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper.

The subpena, as originally served upon me, required that I appear and testify and bring with me certain documents. A motion to quash that portion of the subpena duces tecum requiring the presentation of documents was granted by Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran on February 3, 1961.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to appear and testify without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter to the House for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read the subpena as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, No. 1053–59

(*United States of America* v. *Martin Popper*, defendant.)

To Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington on the 7th day of March 1960, at 10 a.m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Martin Popper* and bring with you the documents as set forth in the attached schedule A.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By CLARICE FULGHESON,
Deputy Clerk.

FEBRUARY 26, 1960.

LEONARD B. BOUDIN,
Attorney for Defendant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 155

Whereas Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, District of Columbia, on the 20th day of February 1961, in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper, criminal case number 1053–59; and

Whereas Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran did, on the third day of February 1961, quash that portion of the subpena requiring the production of documents enumerated in "Schedule A" attached to the subpena; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpena duces tecum of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper, as modified by the order of Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran issued on the third day of February 1961; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify on February 20, 1961, in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, No. 1053–59

United States of America v. *Martin Popper.*

To Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

You are commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, on the 8th of March 1960, at 10 a.m. to testify in the above-entitled case.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
H. KLINE,
Deputy Clerk.

MARCH 4, 1960.

LEONARD B. BOUDIN,
Attorney for Defendant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 156

Whereas Representative CLYDE DOYLE, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, District of Columbia, on the 20th day of February 1961, in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper, criminal case number 1053–59; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative CLYDE DOYLE is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH AND HOSPITAL CARE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 85)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The health of our Nation is a key to its future—to its economic vitality, to the morale and efficiency of its citizens, to our success in achieving our own goals and demonstrating to others the benefits of a free society. Ill health and its harsh consequences are not confined to any State or region, to any race, age, or sex or to any occupation or economic level. This is a matter of national concern.

More than $25 billion a year—over 6 percent of our national income—is being spent from public and private funds for health services. Yet there are major deficiencies in the quality and distribution of these services.

The dramatic results of new medicines and new methods—opening the way to a fuller and more useful life—are too often beyond the reach of those who need them most.

Financial inability, absence of community resources, and shortages of trained personnel keep too many people from getting what medical knowledge can obtain for them.

Those among us who are over 65—16 million today in the United States—go to the hospital more often and stay longer

than their younger neighbors. Their physical activity is limited by six times as much disability as the rest of the population. Their annual medical bill is twice that of persons under 65—but their annual income is only half as high.

The Nation's children—now 40 percent of our population—have urgent needs which must be met. Many still die in infancy. Many are not immunized against diseases which can be prevented, have inadequate diets or unnecessarily endure physical and emotional problems.

These and other problems of health care can and must be met. Only a part of the responsibility rests with the Federal Government. But its powers and resources make its role essential in four areas for improving health care: social insurance, facilities, personnel, and research.

I. HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Twenty-six years ago this Nation adopted the principle that every member of the labor force and his family should be insured against the haunting fear of loss of income caused by retirement, death, or unemployment. To that we have added insurance against the economic loss caused by disability. But there remains a significant gap that denies to all but those with the highest incomes a full measure of security—the high cost of ill health in old age. One out of five aged couples drawing social security benefits must go to the hospital each year. Half of those going to hospitals incur bills in excess of $700 a year. This is over one-third of the total annual income of a typical couple, more than a modest food budget for an entire year. Many simply do not obtain and cannot afford the care they need.

The measure adopted by the Congress last year recognized the problem of those needy requiring welfare assistance to meet their medical costs. But now we must meet the needs of those millions who have no wish to receive care at the taxpayers' expense, but who are nevertheless staggered by the drain on their savings—or those of their children—caused by an extended hospital stay.

In our social security and railroad retirement systems we have the instruments which can spread the cost of health services in old age over the working years—effectively, and in a manner consistent with the dignity of the individual. By using these proved systems to provide health insurance protection, it will be possible for our older people to get the vital hospital services they need without exhausting their resources or turning to public assistance. The self-supporting insurance method of financing the cost of such health services is certainly to be preferred to an expansion of public assistance, and should reduce the number of those needing medical care under the public assistance program. The State and local money thus freed should be further used to help provide services not included in this proposal, and to assist those not covered.

For it should be stressed that this is a very modest proposal cut to meet absolutely essential needs, and with sufficient "deductible" requirements to discourage any malingering or unnecessary overcrowding of our hospitals.

In essence, I am recommending enactment of a health insurance program under the social security system that will provide the following benefits:

First, inpatient hospital services up to 90 days in a single spell of illness, for all costs in excess of $10 per day for the first 9 days (with a minimum of $20), and full costs for the remaining 81 days. Because hospital costs place by far the heaviest and most unmanageable burden on older persons, it is these services that should receive major emphasis in any health insurance program.

Second, skilled nursing home services up to 180 days immediately after discharge from a hospital. To provide an incentive for use of these less expensive facilities, an individual could, in short, receive 2 days of skilled nursing home care in place of 1 day of hospital care when this satisfies his requirements.

Third, hospital outpatient clinic diagnostic services for all costs in excess of $20. These services, too, will reduce the need for hospital admissions and encourage early diagnosis.

Fourth, community visiting nurse services, and related home health services, for a limited period of time. These will enable many older people to receive proper health care in their own homes. I propose that these insurance benefits be available to all persons aged 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirements benefits.

This program would be financed by an increase in social security contributions of one-quarter of 1 percent each on employers and employees, and by an increase in the maximum earnings base from $4,800 a year to $5,000, which would amply cover the cost of all insurance benefits provided. The system would be self-supporting and would not place any burden on the general revenues.

This program is not a program of socialized medicine. It is a program of prepayment of health costs with absolute freedom of choice guaranteed. Every person will choose his own doctor and hospital.

No service performed by any physician at either home or office, and no fee he charges for such services, would be involved, covered, or affected in any way. There would be no supervision or control over the practice of medicine by any doctor or over the manner in which medical services are provided by any hospital. The program is a sound one, and entirely in accordance with the traditional American system of placing responsibility on the employee and the employer, rather than on the general taxpayers, to help finance retirement and health costs.

II. COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The ability to afford adequate health care is to no avail without adequate health facilities. The financial support which will be available under the health insurance program I am recommending will, in itself, stimulate more facilities and services. But our communities need additional help to provide those services where everybody can use them.

A. NURSING HOME CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

There is now a shortage of 500,000 beds in long-term facilities for people who are sick, but who do not require the special services of a general hospital. We must move with greater speed in the construction of more skilled nursing homes, particularly if our new program is to encourage recuperation, if impossible at home, in this kind of facility instead of in our overcrowded hospitals. I am submitting to Congress legislation to double the present authorization of $10 million in matching grants for this construction program.

B. GRANTS TO IMPROVE NURSING-HOME AND HOME-NURSING SERVICES

Increasing the number of nursing-home beds will not alone remedy the deficiency in care. Good operation, good service, and proper safety are essential. Nor do all the aged sick and chronically ill need to be cared for in hospitals or nursing homes. At some stages in their illness many people can fare better in their own homes if proper care is available. But most communities do not have home health services. Even limited home-nursing services are available in less than 1,000 U.S. communities.

I am therefore proposing stimulatory grants to the States, and through them to communities, to improve the quality of services in nursing homes—to develop organized community home-care health services for the aged and chronically ill—to develop health service information and referral centers—to train additional personnel required for out-of-hospital health services—and to assist in meeting the cost of studies and demonstrations of new and improved means of providing out-of-hospital care. An initial annual appropriation of $10 million will lay the groundwork for more efficient and better balanced care for the aged and chronically ill.

To insure maximum Federal attention to the rapid development of this program, I propose that the Congress enact legislation enabling the Public Health Service to create a new Bureau of Community Health to provide the necessary leadership and assistance to States and communities.

C. HOSPITAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Hospitals account for more than $6 billion a year of the Nation's gross expenditures. In this modern age, an enterprise of such size and importance requires continuous and substantial research and development as a basis for operations. Specifically, we need more intensive regional and area planning to attain the maximum economical use from these costly structures; and we need more research into how hospital facilities can be built, and how services within hospitals should be organized and administered, in order to provide the best possible medical care with the personnel available. I am therefore recommending that, in place of an arbitrary appropriations ceiling for research in this area, the Congress have the authority to determine each year the amount

necessary for these purposes; and that the Surgeon General be authorized to make project grants for the construction of experimental or demonstration hospitals and other medical facilities.

III. INCREASING HEALTH PERSONNEL

Adequate health care requires an adequate supply of well-trained personnel. We do not have that adequate supply today—and shortages are growing.

We must increase sharply the rate of doctor and dentist training merely to keep pace with our growing population—and we need far more if, as part of our international responsibilities, we are to help meet critical medical needs in key areas of the world. But we not only fall short of our goal to help those nations by exporting sufficient numbers of doctors to provide the nucleus for a world health program; we are actually the beneficiaries of more than a thousand physicians a year who come from foreign lands to practice in the United States.

We have now 92 medical and 47 dental schools. These graduate only 7,500 physicians and 3,200 dentists each year. If during the next 10 years the capacity of our medical schools is increased 50 percent, and that of our dental schools by 100 percent, the output will still be sufficient only to maintain the present ratio of physicians and dentists to population.

To do this we must have within the next 10 years substantial increases in enrollment in existing schools, plus 20 new medical schools and 20 new dental schools.

But the great deterrent to the establishment and expansion of these schools is lack of funds. Modern medical and dental schools are extraordinarily expensive to build and operate. Teaching hospitals cost even more. A university which establishes a medical and dental school must do so with the expectation of a substantial drain on its financial resources, and most institutions are not able to find such funds.

Moreover, the average cost to the student of 4 years of medical school is over $10,000—a heavy burden to come on top of the cost of a 4-year undergraduate education. Furthermore, once the student obtains his medical degree, he must still look forward to an average of 3 years of hospital experience, at little or no pay, before he can begin his life's work. It is not surprising that 40 percent of all medical students now come from the 12 percent of the families with incomes of $10,000 or more a year. Nor is it surprising, though disturbing, that while college enrollments generally have been soaring, the number of applicants to medical and dental schools has been dropping, and that many of these schools are having difficulty in securing enough qualified students who are able to afford such an education.

The Federal Government has made substantial contributions through fellowships and training aid for graduate students in the physical and biological sciences, and for research training in health fields. The result has been a rapidly increasing number of recruits to these fields.

In contrast there has been very little financial assistance of any kind available to medical and dental students. Only 1 medical student in 10 receives a scholarship from any source, and these average only $500 a year, compared to an average cost of over $2,500. In dentistry even less scholarship aid is available.

Decisive Federal action is necessary to stimulate and assist in the establishment and expansion of medical and dental schools, and to help more talented but needy students to enter the health professions while bolstering the quality of their training.

I have four recommendations to be combined in a single measure:

(A) I propose an immediate program of planning grants to help our academic institutions plan new facilities for medical and dental schools and to explore ways of improving the whole educational process;

(B) I recommend a 10-year program of matching grants to assist in the construction, expansion, and restoration of medical and dental schools to increase their capacity. This program should make available $25 million in the first year, and $75 million annually thereafter;

(C) I recommend a program of Federal scholarships for talented medical and dental students in need of financial assistance. Federal funds would be available for each institution in a total amount equal to $1,500 for one-fourth of the newly entering students, to be awarded in individual 4-year scholarships by the institution in proportion to the student's need, with no student being eligible for more than $2,000 a year;

(D) Finally, I recommend that the schools receive a cost of education grant of $1,000 for each Federal scholarship, to make certain that this program does not work further financial injury upon our medical and dental schools whose costs per pupil are never met by his tuition and fees. In addition to assisting our schools now operating, this feature would also give some encouragement to institutions now doubtful about the burden of establishing new medical and dental schools.

For nursing, I must add, the need and shortage are also great; but the problems are different and more complex. We intend to develop for nursing, as we have for medicine and dentistry, a formulation of needs and training requirements; and appropriate proposals will be submitted to the Congress when completed.

IV. IMPROVING THE HEALTH OF OUR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

While meeting the health needs of the older groups in our population, we cannot neglect the needs of the young. One-fifth of our children under 5 have not been immunized against poliomyelitis. Since 1950, our country has slipped from 6th to 10th place among the advanced nations of the world in the saving of infant lives. Each year some 400,000 babies are born with congenital malformations—and untold numbers of others begin life mentally retarded, afflicted by cerebral palsy or suffering from other serious conditions which require prompt and effective care and additional research.

(A) I am recommending that there be established in the National Institutes of Health a new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, which will include a center for research in child health as well as other broad ranging health research activities not now covered by the specialized work of the existing Institutes.

(B) I am recommending to the Congress an increase in appropriations for the existing maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare programs of the Children's Bureau. By this means, the fruits of our research can move at a faster pace to those who need them most.

(C) In order to provide more unified administration and increased effectiveness of Federal efforts for physical fitness, I am designating the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as the Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Fitness. I am asking him to mobilize the full resources of his Department and other interested agencies toward encouraging public and private agencies and individuals to improve the physical fitness of our Nation's youth; and I am further asking him to report at an early date on the adequacy of existing school health programs and what changes, if any, are needed in the Federal Government's role in the stimulation of such programs.

V. VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

This administration intends to see that the rehabilitation of disabled Americans and their return to active and useful lives is expanded as rapidly as possible. Our Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation and the cooperating voluntary agencies must be assisted in providing more nearly adequate facilities and services to reach the thousands of persons who become disabled every year. We need their talents and skills if our economy is to reach a high level of performance. To this end I shall recommend to the Congress an increase in Federal matching funds to expand the vocational rehabilitation program.

VI. MEDICAL RESEARCH

The next 10 years will require a vast expansion of this Nation's present total effort in medical research, if knowledge is to keep pace with human progress. I recommend:

(A) Extension and expansion of the present program authorizing matching grants for the construction of research facilities.

(B) Removal of the current limitation on the Federal payment of indirect costs of medical research projects, which has handicapped many universities and other research institutions.

(C) An increase in the funds for medical research requested in the budget previously submitted.

CONCLUSION

The measures I have recommended recognize and strengthen the indispensable elements in a sound health program—people, knowledge, services, facilities, and the means to pay for them.

Taken together, they constitute a necessary foundation upon which to build.

The health of the American people must ever be safeguarded; it must ever be improved. As long as people are stricken by a disease which we have the ability to prevent, as long as people are chained by a disability which can be reversed, as long as needless death takes its toll, then American health will be unfinished business.

It is to the unfinished business in health—which affects every person and home and community in this land—that we must now direct our best efforts.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1961.*

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 157) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That during the 87th Congress the Committee on the Judiciary shall be composed of 35 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of resolutions from the Committee on Rules, all of which are of the same nature, and which merely give to standing committees the same investigating power they have had before. I will have to bring them up separately.

Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 49 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following programs of benefits for veterans and their dependents and survivors:

(1) The programs of compensation and pension;

(2) The programs of hospitalization, domiciliary care, medical and dental care and treatment, and furnishing of prosthetic appliances;

(3) The insurance and indemnity programs;

(4) The housing and business loan programs, and the program of furnishing assistance for the acquisition of specially adapted housing;

(5) The programs of education and training (including vocational rehabilitation); and

(6) The furnishing of burial allowances;

with a view to determining whether or not such programs are being conducted economically, efficiently, in the best interests of the Government and the beneficiaries of such programs, and in such a manner as to avoid the misuse of Government funds; whether or not such programs adequately serve the needs and protect the welfare of the beneficiaries of such programs; and whether changes in the law or in the administration and operation of the programs either will lead to greater efficiency and economy or will make such programs more adequately serve the needs of the beneficiaries of such programs.

The committee is also authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study to determine—

(1) the extent to which appeals for charitable contributions are made to the American people, or segments thereof, in the name of American veterans by appealing to the desire of the American people to assist such veterans and their survivors or dependents;

(2) whether an undue proportion of such charitable contributions is used to meet the expenses of conducting such appeals and for other administrative expenses rather than for providing services for or benefits to veterans;

(3) whether any of such appeals are fraudulent in nature;

(4) whether additional supervision of the fundraising activities conducted by organizations chartered by Act of Congress in the name of veterans is necessary or desirable; and

(5) the existence of any other abuses connected with charitable appeals made in the name of veterans.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary, except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is agreeable to the minority leadership.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 56 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete investigations and studies relating to the following matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, namely—

(1) relating to the administration and operation of general immigration and nationality laws and the resettlement of refugees, including such activities of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which affect immigration in the United States; or involving violation of the immigration laws of the United States through abuse of private relief legislation;

(2) involving claims, both public and private, against the United States;

(3) involving the operation and administration of national penal institutions, including personnel and inmates therein;

(4) relating to judicial proceedings and the administration of Federal courts and personnel thereof, including local courts in territories and possessions;

(5) relating to the operation and administration of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act; and

(6) involving the operation and administration of Federal statutes, rules and regulations relating to crime and criminal procedure; and

(7) involving the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; and

(8) involving the activities and operations of interstate compacts.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has the approval of the minority leadership, just as does the other resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 60 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of United States programs of assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the resolution on the minority side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 78 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 4, 1961, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of material, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and disposition of real property, by or within the Department of Defense;

(2) relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense;

(3) involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense;

(4) involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense; and

(5) relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services; and

(6) all other matters within the legislative jurisdiction conferred by law or the Rules of the House of Representatives upon the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important resolution. It has the approval of the minority leadership, and there is no objection to it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 86 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products, and the disposal of agricultural surpluses pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended:

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954;

(3) All matters relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies;

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers;

(5) The formulation and development of improved price support and regulatory programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection and grading of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities;

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees;

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, or outside the United States by subcommittees of not to exceed five members, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at any time during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY.]

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of House Resolution 86 brings to mind a matter that I feel should be kept in mind by members of the Committee on Agriculture.

I refer to mailing out of reprints of Members' remarks in other Members' congressional districts under the privilege of the frank. Specifically I have in mind the distributing a week before the election last November under a Member's frank of highly partisan statements which, if not designed to influence votes, I believe had a minimum lack of such a motive.

This occurred when the remarks of our colleague from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] were circulated free and in the State of Washington under his frank.

It seems to me ordinary protocol between members of the same committee might restrain such procedure. Yet in the Fourth Congressional District of Washington State, so ably represented by our colleague Mrs. MAY, large quantities of a pamphlet entitled "The Farm-

er: His Year of Decision," were distributed free just a few days before the election to the voters in that agricultural area.

The remarks were perfectly proper except for their timing and the fact that they were mailed free under congressional frank.

Let me quote from the remarks briefly to illustrate how lacking in nonpartisan bias the statements were. They started with the rather prejudiced expression as follows:

Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago America's farm families, ravished by poverty, foreclosure, and despair—after 12 years of Republican rule.

The second paragraph began in the same way:

Now after another era of Republican power—their program is wrecked.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, any fair Member to decide as to whether these quotations would be deemed partisan material intended to influence votes and if they should be mailed free at election time.

One section of the reprint, for example, is under the topic "Republican Breach of Faith With Farmers."

Then there follows particulars of what is described as Republican betrayal of solemn pledges.

Republican campaign promises have been violated in spirit as well as in the letter of their content.

This certainly sounds like campaign matter.

And again I quote:

I must state, what now is true—as painful as this may be to me—that Mr. Benson and this Republican administration have injected partisan politics, and have promoted political elements, in our deliberations in the Congress on vital farm legislation.

Should that go free? Especially at election time they involve, it seems to me, a minimum of propriety.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I quote from the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina. He said:

Therefore, the farmer and his family must know that their very economic survival, in agriculture, is deeply involved, when they cast their ballots.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to raise this point of use of the frank at this time with the hope that, perhaps the members of the great Committee on Agriculture in its deliberations will not make the farmer a pawn of partisan action. Certainly, meanwhile, the Committee on House Administration should investigate abuses of the use of the postal frank.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's point is well taken, but, of course, under this resolution there would be no authority to do a thing of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO CONDUCT CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 108) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make investigations and studies into matters within its jurisdiction, including the following:

(1) Policies with respect to competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; measures for increased safety; and adequacy of the national transportation system for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; and the administration by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(2) Policies with respect to the promotion of the development of civil aviation; measures for increased safety; restrictions which impede the free flow of air commerce; routes, rates, accounts, and subsidy payments, airport construction, hazards of adjacency to airports, and condemnation of airspace; aircraft and airline liability; aircraft research and development, and market for American aircraft; and air navigational aids and traffic control; and the administration by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency of the statutes which they administer;

(3) Allocation of radio spectrum; color television; pay television; educational television; ownership and control of communications facilities; technical developments in the communications field; and the administration by the Federal Communications Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(4) Adequacy of the protection to investors afforded by the disclosure and regulatory provisions of the various Securities Acts; and the administration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the statute which it administers;

(5) Adequacy of petroleum, natural gas, and electric energy resources for defense and the needs of an expanding economy; adequacy, promotion, regulation, and safety of the facilities for extraction or generation, transmission, and distribution of such resources; development of synthetic liquid fuel process; and regulation of security issues of and control of natural gas pipeline companies; and the administration by the Federal Power Commission of the statutes which it administers.

(6) Advertising, fair competition, and labeling; and the administration by the Federal Trade Commission of the statutes which it administers;

(7) Research in weather, including air pollution and smog, and artificially induced weather; and the operations of the Weather Bureau;

(8) Effects of inflation upon benefits provided under railroad retirement and railroad unemployment programs; and inequities-in provisions of statutes relating thereto, with comparison of benefits under the social security system; and the operations of the Railroad Retirement Board;

(9) Adequacy of medical facilities, medical personnel, and medical teaching and training facilities; research into human diseases; provisions for medical care; efficient and effective quarantine; protection to users against incorrectly labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices; and other matters relating to public health; and the operations of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration;

(10) Disposition of funds arising from the operation of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and the operations of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission;

(11) Current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges; current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternative source materials;

(12) Increase in traffic accidents on the streets and highways of the United States during recent years; factors responsible for such increase, the resulting deaths, personal injuries, and economic losses; and measures for eliminating such accidents or reducing their frequency and severity.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (interrupting the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has the support of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 143) and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee,

is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including, but not limited to, (1) the operation of the various FHA-assisted housing programs, (2) the operation of the Federal National Mortgage Association, (3) the status and adequacy of mortgage credit in the United States, (4) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, and the role of Government-assisted mortgage programs with respect thereto, (5) the role of housing construction in the national economy, (6) the operation of the privately financed military housing program, (7) the requirement of and demand for Federal assistance in the development of community facilities, (8) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (9) farm housing and the adequacy of farm housing credit.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia (during the reading of the resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was approved by the minority leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE HONORABLE PRINCE H. PRESTON

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late Prince H. Preston.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and sadness that I announce to the House the untimely passing of the Honorable Prince H. Preston.

Mr. Preston departed this life as a result of cancer at the Memorial Hospital in Savannah, Ga., on Wednesday, February 8, 1961, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Immediately upon hearing this sad news, I dispatched the following telegram to Mrs. Preston:

Mrs. Hagan and I extend our deepest sympathy to you and the family in this hour of your great loss. Signed, ELLIOTT HAGAN.

When contacted by the press, I issued the following statement:

It is with sincere regret that I learned of the untimely passing of Hon. Prince H. Preston. Mrs. Hagan and I extend to Mrs. Preston, their two daughters, and other members of the family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. Preston, of Statesboro, Bulloch County, Ga., was born in Walton County, Ga., on July 5, 1908. He attended the public schools of Statesboro, and received an LL.B. from the University of Georgia in 1930, beginning the practice of law the same year in Statesboro. He was elected representative to the General Assembly of Georgia for the term of 1935–36, and was reelected for the term of 1937–38. In 1946, he was elected judge of the city court of Statesboro, but resigned before taking office because of election to the 80th Congress.

He volunteered his services to the U.S. Army in September 1942, entering the service as a private but later being commissioned a second lieutenant in OCS in February of 1943. He was promoted first lieutenant on July 30, 1943, and to captain on May 15, 1944. He commanded Battery A of the 776th Antiaircraft Artillery, Automatic Weapons Battalion, European Theater of Operations.

He was elected to the 80th Congress on November 5, 1946, and reelected to the 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses.

I knew Prince H. Preston as a very likable and personable man and a man of great ability. As my predecessor, I recognize the good things he did in his life and public service. I want the RECORD to show that I appreciate the many contributions which he made to our district, State, and Nation. He started during his first term as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, later changing to the Appropriations Committee, where he was chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce, and related agencies. He served for some time as Democratic zone whip of the House. You gentlemen who served with him know better than I that he made many friends while in Congress and that he had many friends outside of the Congress. And I feel that there is no more appropriate way that I can sum up my remarks than to quote the wonderful words from that wonderful poem by Alfred Lord Tennyson, which poem was submitted to the Congressional Anthology, by three distinguished Members of the House, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, the Honorable E. L. "TIC" FORRESTER, of Georgia, and the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California. I would like to quote first the comments by Representative BOGGS:

Representative BOGGS: This poem expresses a faith and serenity which I believe all of us strive for, but which can only be achieved by the love that one has for his fellow men and for his God.

CROSSING THE BAR

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea,

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

—*Alfred Lord Tennyson.*

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I include the following resolution from the Savannah Chamber of Commerce as part of my remarks.

Whereas Prince H. Preston served Chatham County and the First Congressional District with distinction from 1946 to 1961; and

Whereas this distinguished lawmaker enjoyed the confidence and respect of this organization throughout his tenure of office; and

Whereas the effectiveness of this chamber of commerce was greatly enhanced because of the cooperative aid, understanding, and forthright action of Mr. Preston: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors, Savannah Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled this 21st day of February 1961, That it does hereby express its sorrow at the untimely passing of Prince H. Preston and extends its deepest sympathy to Mrs. Preston and members of the family; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be conveyed to Mrs. Preston and a copy placed in the permanent records of this organization as evidence of its esteem and abiding respect for the memory of this devoted, dedicated Georgian.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night I journeyed to Savannah, Ga., to see my old friend, Prince Preston. I am very glad I did, because I spent with him, according to his family, one of the last rational hours that he had on this earth. Even then the dread disease of cancer had spread to the vital nerve centers in his brain and he was well past medical aid.

During that hour we spoke of many things; we reminisced, we consoled one another, we talked about many of you here, his colleagues, whom he loved. Prince knew he had only a few days, and he knew that we would not meet again on this earth; but his faith was strong, and he was without fear.

At one point when I gave him a message from his old and beloved friend, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, tears welled to his eyes. I told him what the Speaker said, and I quote his words: "Prince Preston was an easy man to love." And so he was, as all of us, his former colleagues, know.

I shall not recount his public service nor review his many contributions to his State and to his country, both of which he loved with a quiet but fierce passion and devotion, for others here will do this better and more abundantly and more adequately.

Some men are efficient, capable, determined, dedicated, courageous, and unafraid. Prince—and how well named he was—was all of these. But most of all he was compassionate and understanding. He obeyed from day to day the injunction of our Lord's greatest commandment, that we love one another. It was my privilege to live with this man summer after summer here in Washington City. He affectionately called me "Roomie." How better to know a man, his character, and his life, than to live with him?

He wore well. So I knew him and loved him for what he was—an understanding and a compassionate man who walked and worked in love of God and man.

To me he was a friend. All of us will miss him, but no one more than his lovely wife and daughters whom all of us join in sending sympathy and devotion.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding to me to pay brief tribute to a very close personal friend and a former Member of the House who passed away yesterday, the Honorable Prince Preston, who represented the First District of Georgia with distinction from the 80th Congress continuously through the 86th Congress, a period of 14 years.

Prior to becoming a Member of the House of Representatives, he served the people of Georgia in the general assembly.

He was not only a statesman, he was also a soldier.

He entered the Army as a private in 1942, was commissioned in 1943, and was released from active duty as a captain, having served as a battery commander and an artillery officer during World War II.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, he served with distinction as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and became highly proficient in the intricate field of Federal appropriations.

During the 86th Congress he was chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies. Whenever he presented a bill on the floor of the House, he was fully versed in all aspects of the proposal.

But Prince Preston did not confine himself solely to learning the problems of government finance. He took an active role in all legislative matters, as well as a very personal interest in the problems of his congressional district.

He had a wonderful sense of humor, coupled with a firm sense of dedication, and a willingness to devote himself to long and arduous hours of work in the interest of his district, his State, and his Nation.

He bore his suffering without outward complaint. In spite of his affliction, he continued to serve his people with all of the stamina he possessed and with a determination that will long be remembered by those of us who saw in this man those rare characteristics of wisdom, dedication, and ability.

The Nation, and the State of Georgia, have lost a man of dedication in an age when men of his caliber cannot be spared.

He was a man of culture, a man of honor, and a man of integrity.

He was affable, but firm; congenial, but determined; friendly and courteous in every way, but always aware of his duty and his obligation as a Member of Congress. He was my good friend, and I shall miss him.

To his wife and children, I extend my sincere sympathy. But I hope that his family will take strength from the fact that while he was on this earth, he contributed greatly to the welfare of his district, his State, and to our Nation.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved and saddened when I learned yesterday that my friend and former colleague Prince Preston passed away.

Prince and I were first elected to the U.S. Congress in 1946. We were sworn in together when the 80th Congress was organized on January 3, 1947.

Before becoming a Member of Congress, Prince had served in the Georgia House of Representatives. He had established for himself there a splendid record as a legislator. In Congress, he quickly demonstrated to his colleagues that he possessed a keen and active mind, a clear understanding of national and international problems, and the will and energy to grapple with those problems.

During the 14 years he was a Member of Congress he made great contributions to the growth, progress, and advancement of his district, the State of Georgia, and the Nation. Through his untiring energy and able approach, he achieved great recognition from the Federal Government for his district and State. Prince possessed a lovable personality and endeared himself to a great host of friends who held him in high esteem and affection. He was never too busy to assist a constituent or a colleague with a problem. My acquaintance and friendship with Prince was one of the greatest rewards of my service in Congress.

It is tragic that he was stricken down in the prime of a rich and useful life. I extend deepest sympathy to his fine wife and the daughters and the other members of his family.

Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram this morning from another warm personal friend of Mr. Preston's, the Honorable OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Louisiana, and he asked me as a part of my remarks to extend to the family of Mr. Preston his deep regret and sadness and to ask unanimous consent that he might later when he returns, extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now gladly yield to our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think the passing of Prince Preston touched me about as deeply as the passing of anyone that I have ever known in the House of Representatives. He was one of the warmest and best friends I had in this House. He was a man of high character, of great abiilty. He was a family man. I have been in his home several times. I met his wife and his two lovely daughters. He was really a fine husband, a fine father, and a fine home man. He and I believed together on most things. It was not long after he came here that I came to understand his high qualities, his fine character, and his splendid ability. With his family, as I wired them yesterday, I shall miss him always, and pray that out there somewhere his spirit is where it should be, and I know that when his spirit approaches the convention of master spirits that they will receive him as an equal, because he had a great soul, a fine spirit. He was a lovely human being.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague of the First District of Georgia and other Members of this body in paying tribute to the life and memory of a beloved former colleague, the Honorable Prince H. Preston. Mr. Preston, for 14 years, represented the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Yesterday I was deeply saddened when we received word that Prince had passed away at Memorial Hospital in Savannah, Ga., at approximately 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

As he answered the inevitable summons which must someday come to each of us I have the feeling that he answered it as he answered all calls of duty during the 52 years of his life, with a feeling of preparedness, a feeling of being ready.

I first knew Prince Preston when he served in the General Assembly of Georgia in 1935 through 1938. It was there that I first knew the warmth of his personality, the spirit of friendship which seemed to pervade his every relationship with those of us who knew and loved him.

Shortly after completing his service in the General Assembly of Georgia, Prince volunteered as a private and entered the U.S. Army in December of 1942. Almost immediately thereafter he entered officer candidate

school and on February 25, 1943, was commissioned a second lieutenant. Shortly thereafter he was promoted to first lieutenant and subsequently, on the 15th of May 1944, to the rank of captain, which rank and which grade he held when he was separated honorably from his service in the U.S. Army, in the service of his beloved country.

Shortly after the end of the war and Prince's return to private life he was nominated judge of the city court of Statesboro, in the early spring primary in 1946. Prince never served as judge because in the fall primary at which Members of Congress are nominated in our State he was nominated as a Democrat for the 80th Congress and was subsequently elected in November of 1946. After being elected to the 80th Congress on November 5, 1946, he was subsequently reelected to the sixth succeeding Congresses.

Prince was a Member of Congress when I first entered this body. He received me as a colleague with the warmth of friendship we had experienced many years before. Our offices were on the same corridor during the entire time of our service together.

He was an able Congressman. He was a devoted and dedicated public servant. He was a good friend. He was a devoted, kind, and loving husband and father. Prince Preston will be missed not only by his loved ones and by his friends at home but by all of us who were privileged to know him and to have served with him in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mrs. Flynt and our children join me in extending to Myrtice, to their two daughters, Ann and Kay, and to the other members of his family, our heartfelt sympathy in this time of sorrow.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my association with, and my friendship for, Prince Preston was not a new thing. We were students together years ago at the University of Georgia. From the time that I first knew him, I felt that here was a man marked for distinction and destined for leadership. I served with him during all the years that he was a Member of the Congress from the State of Georgia. We went to the great Committee on Appropriations in the same year and from that time onward, were even more closely associated. Therefore, I had an unusual opportunity to appraise the man and to appreciate him.

Prince Preston was a kindly man; he was an able man; he was a good man. He had the wonderful knack of making friends wherever he went. Few people in the Congress have enjoyed more close, warm friendships than did he.

In his work, he was cooperative and helpful, but at the same time he was a leader. He accomplished much as a Representative from his native State. It seems only yesterday that he was here with us, active and cheerful. Yet, some of us know that the last few years of his life were troubled years. The dreaded killer which took him away from us already was known to him, yet very few, other than his closest friends, knew that cancer had struck. It is a sad thing that men of great talent who are yet in the prime of life and who possess great qualities of leadership as did Prince Preston must be lost because of this dreaded disease.

My deep and sincere sympathies are extended to his wife and to his family. I know them well and I know, too, how great their loss has been. It is a loss which I, also, feel and share. In these expressions the entire Florida delegation joins with me.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult indeed for me to express my deep sense of loss with the passing of Prince Preston.

Those who knew him best loved him most. Here, truly, was one of God's great noblemen. I have traveled with him to the far corners of the earth; there could have been no finer traveling companion. I have heard him entertain hours on end with his wealth of stories and anecdotes. I have heard him speak of his great love of his family and of his homelife in Statesboro which was so dear to him. I have heard him talk of his deep religious feelings and his great and abiding faith in Almighty God.

His service here in these Halls made this a better country in which to live. He was a devoted public servant, one of courage and great foresight.

Mr. Speaker, I can say no more. I have lost an irreplaceable friend.

To Mrs. Preston and their two daughters, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am grieved to learn that the Honorable Prince H. Preston, a distinguished former Member of this House, passed away yesterday.

I had the honor and privilege of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee during the last Congress and I can testify to his high integrity of character and ability.

Throughout his public life, as legislator and soldier, he served his community, State, and Nation with honor. In deed, we have lost not only a friend, but the Nation has lost a great citizen.

To those of us who served with him, especially in the close contact of a committee, his loss is very personal. As a newly elected Member to Congress in the last 2 years, it was the caliber of a man like the Honorable Prince Preston which gave example and guidance to me. For this, I shall always remain indebted to his memory.

To his family, wife, and children, I join with my distinguished colleagues in extending my profound sympathies and deepest condolences for their irreplaceable loss.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying my own very sincere respects to the memory of our departed friend.

It was my privilege to serve with Prince Preston on the Commerce Subcommittee on Appropriations of which he was chairman.

It was in this service that we who worked with him saw his great abilities emerge. He did a magnificent job.

I want to extend to Mrs. Preston and Prince's daughters my sincerest sympathies.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to hear of the passing of Prince Preston. He was one of God's noblemen.

He was a member of our Committee on Appropriations. He was a tremendously hard worker and always had the courage to stand up for the things he thought were right. The Nation is poorer because he is gone.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to his wife and to his family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a man who lived up to his name, it was Prince Preston, because he was a prince in every sense of the word. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with him. He served his district, his State, and the Nation well. We will miss his sterling qualities and genial personality here in the House of Representatives. He was truly a great Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add my tribute to those of my colleagues and extend to his family my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked this morning to learn of the death of my friend, our late colleague, Prince Preston. Prince and I came to the House together in the 80th Congress and served here for 14 years. I knew him well as a stanch friend and able colleague. He served with great distinction on the Committee on Appropriations and in the House. I join the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. HAGAN, in extending to Mrs. Preston and their children my deepest sympathy in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in offering my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Preston and her daughters on their great loss.

On my first assignment to the Committee on Appropriations, I served with Prince Preston on the Subcommittee on State Department Appropriations and came to regard him as an able legislator and good friend.

He will be remembered as a Representative who served his district well and as a dedicated and fearless chairman who stood firmly for the national interest.

As a Democrat, he acted in the finest traditions of loyal opposition in his last post as chairman of the Commerce Department Appropriations Subcommittee. By being well informed he held the respect of his colleagues. He was always courteous in the southern tradition and witnesses who appeared before his committee often favorably commented about the treatment they received.

It is proper that we should today pay honor to the memory of this distinguished American.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep sorrow of the passing of our old friend and colleague, Prince H. Preston. When he served among us I knew him well and worked with him frequently. Our thinking was alike and our reactions to the many issues which confronted and sometimes perplexed us were almost invariably the same. He was a fearless and courageous legislator. Those of us who knew him and will always recall him, will place him in the select category of "statesman." I join with those who have preceded me today in their feeling of sadness and in their expressions of sympathy to those who survive this old friend of ours.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the sad news of the passing of our esteemed friend and colleague, the Honorable Prince Preston, came to me as a terrific shock. Prince was a tireless worker as a member of the Appropriations Committee of which I am also a member. He was dedicated to duty, faithful to his trust, and a gentleman; yes, a patriotic American gentleman of the highest order, God fearing and God loving. Prince Preston was one of the most considerate and kind men that I have ever known.

Our hearts go out to his loving wife and family. May the same God who called Prince to his heavenly home give his loved ones strength to bear the great loss they have sustained, and may God rest the soul of this great and good man, the Honorable Prince Preston, of Georgia.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to our late former colleague and friend Prince Preston, of Georgia.

I was saddened indeed to learn of the sudden and untimely passing of Mr. Preston. He was a grand gentleman of the Old South and a colleague whom we all learned to love.

Prince Preston and I came to the Congress at the same time as Members of the 80th Congress. We served on the Appropriations Committee together and while serving on this committee Mr. Preston made one of his most significant contributions by investigating spending overseas and pointing out inefficiency and waste in some of our foreign spending programs.

He was a dedicated public servant and always stood firmly behind his beliefs and convictions. He was an untiring worker and an effective Congressman.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Preston and the members of his family.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here today in expressing my deep sorrow on the untimely passing of the Honorable Prince Preston. During nearly all of his service here we were on the Appropriations Committee together, where we were closely associated. Both in the committee and here on the floor of the House, Prince Preston showed a keen mind, a wonderful disposition, and real application to his job. He was truly a fine representative of the people of his district in Georgia, of his State, and of the Nation.

I know of no man who has served here who had more friends or who was a better friend than Prince Preston. We shall all miss him, but we shall all profit by having known him. To his wife and family we express our sincerest sympathy.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with sorrow that I learned of the illness and death of our former colleague from Georgia, the Honorable Prince H. Preston. For many years we had served together on the Appropriations Committee, and I can say with all my heart that he was a man we respect and admired. In him were combined the qualities of leadership and ability to do his work exceedingly well, with a lovable personality that endeared him to us all. I shall always treasure the memory of his friendship.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad moment in the House of Representatives. I rise to join other colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of one who was so recently alive and alert and with us in this Chamber.

Having served for many years on the Appropriations Committee with Prince Preston, I can speak as one who knew him well and who had an appreciation of his wonderful qualities of statesmanship and devotion to duty. I can also speak of his personal qualities. He was a man who loved his friends, who was fair to his opponents, and a man who loved people and who loved life.

Much more could be said, but this is not a time for many words. As I pay tribute to the memory of Prince Preston I wish also to express my sympathy and good will to the loved ones who have been left behind.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, it was only 4 months ago that Prince Preston wrote to me the following:

> Most of us realize that through the years we prepare ourselves for what is almost inevitable if we stay in the game long enough.

This could well serve as our former colleague's farewell to the House of Representatives. Yesterday we learned of his passing. He will be missed by all of us who knew him. He will be missed by his State, and indeed, by his Nation.

It was with much concern that I learned last year that Prince was not well—that he had suffered a recurrence of an illness that had bothered him in previous years. During the weeks that he was hospitalized or confined to his home, I have been among those thinking of him and hoping and praying that it would be possible for him to again be up and doing good for his fellow man.

News of his death brought sadness and sorrow.

It was my good fortune to know for many years this man who so capably represented in Congress a district adjoining one in which I reside. When I came to the House of Representatives 6 years ago, the counsel of Prince Preston meant much to me and I was proud to have him as one of my closest personel friends. He was sincere in his desire to serve his district and contributed much through his committee and legislative efforts toward the betterment of this Nation.

I have conveyed my sympathy to his wife and family who have suffered a great loss. I am sure they know the high regard we hold for this dedicated man who worked among us and how sincere we are in our words today.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, our country lost a great man when Prince Preston was called by death. He was an outstanding public servant devoted to his Nation, his State, and community, who made an enviable record during his tenure as a Member of Congress.

It was my privilege to know Prince Preston and to appreciate his sincerity, his worth, his subtle humor, and his kindly manner.

While the sorrow that those he leaves behind cannot be assuaged by words of ours, I am sure that as time goes on and his life unfolds in its proper perspective, his loved ones will glow in its reflection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I think continually of those gone who were great statesmen in their service here. It seems so long ago, yet their many deeds are not forgotten. And a few are listed only by a line or two in some journal or directory.

The rich treasures of their minds are shrouded in silence and concealed in the secret dreams of their souls now tracing their separate ways as ethereal rovers in the far, wide skies of God's destiny.

And so it was with Prince H. Preston, our distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia. He was of noble heart and mind, yet to know his greatness of character, one must seek out its luster. His keen sense of fairness, coupled with a fearless acceptance of his responsibilities as subcommittee chairman—State Department of the House Committee on Appropriations—won for him many admirers and friends. He was dedicated to the national interest and served his Nation and State with distinction.

As a true southerner, he was a gentleman of polished manners and courtly mein. He loved people and was a warm friend. He was a wonderful narrator of anecdotes, tales, and stories of interesting people and events. He prepared for death as he had lived his life—ready and without fear.

In this great loss of a talented and distinguished public servant, we of the Illinois delegation sadly mourn with his lovely wife and daughters. We pray that God in His omnipotent wisdom will bless him in the hereafter for his deep religious faith and great service to his district, State, and Nation.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our esteemed and respected former colleague, Prince H. Preston, has touched all of us and especially those of us who found his daily greeting and pleasantries, while he was among us, so helpful and invigorating.

A man of simple tastes but one with a broad outlook, Prince Preston commanded both our friendship and our confidence whether he was discussing his favorite pastime of fishing or commenting on the economic situation as viewed from his position on the Appropriations Committee. He lead a full and vigorous life but he was never too busy to observe the amenities as was evidenced when, learning that my family and I were stopping in Statesboro one evening, he sought us out and offered us the hospitality of his home. A dedicated citizen with the traditional polish of a southern gentleman, his public career included a tour of military duty in World War II that took him from private to captain in 3 years of honorable service.

Prince Preston and I were of opposite political persuasions but that fact did not prevent our joining on many issues nor did it ever dim my appreciation of his worth as a representative of his people or his loyalty to his friends. In extending our heartfelt sympathy to the members of his grieving family we can only commend them to a prideful contemplation of the mark he has left in the hearts of his associates and to a firm reliance on the consoling conviction that we shall meet again in the Master's good time these loved ones who have left us for a little while.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad occasion for all of us. Although among his friends and relatives it has been known for some time that Prince was having to yield to the ravages of a dreaded disease, the fact of his death is still a shock. Yet while we experience the feeling of the shock and sadness, always present with the passing of a dear friend, we recognize that here was a man who lived so fruitfully for his country, his family, and his friends that he will continue to live among us. I know of no man with more zest for life, more desire for service, and more willingness to serve all people than Prince Preston possessed and demonstrated in life.

To his charming wife and lovely daughters and to all other members of his family we extend our genuine sympathy and our gratitude for sharing with us the opportunity to live, work, and associate with a truly delightful person and really great public servant.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest regret that Members learned of the passing of our friend and colleague, Prince H. Preston, of Georgia.

Prince Preston had served in the Congress with my father and had been a longtime friend of our family. His brother George is an outstanding citizen of West Palm Beach, Fla., in my district, and also a close personal friend. Through this relationship of our families I knew and admired the high qualities and ability of Prince, and his devotion to his country. His service to the United States through military service and in the Congress has always been of the highest order and reflected great credit on his ability and devotion to duty.

As the Representative of Statesboro and Georgia's First District Prince did great honor to its residents. He was one of Georgia's ablest leaders and won the respect of all her people. As a distinguished member of the important House Appropriations Committee he served this Congress and all our people with characteristic integrity and devotion to principle.

I will always remember Prince for his kindness and consideration to me when I first came to the Congress and his help and advice during the years we served together. We will all remember him as an American who served his district, State, and Nation well.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed grieved to hear of the passing of my good friend and former colleague, the Honorable Prince H. Preston, who passed away yesterday at the Memorial Hospital in Savannah, Ga.

I, of course, had known of Prince's illness for some time, but I somehow felt that he would fully recover from it. The sad and final news has been a tremendous shock to me.

I had the honor to serve with Prince Preston during all the years he was a Member of Congress from the State of Georgia and during most of that time we served together on the Committee on Appropriations. We were both members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, the Judiciary and Related Agencies, of which I am chairman, and I had the privilege of serving under him while he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Commerce.

I have a profound appreciation of a warm and sincere friendship with him. I always valued his counsel and logical approach to the many problems confronting us in our committee work as well as our work on the floor of the House.

Prince was a real gentleman of the Old South and enjoyed the high esteem, love, and admiration of the membership on both sides of the aisle.

The people of the district which he represented for so many years have lost a loyal and genuine friend and the State of Georgia and the Nation have lost a true statesman.

I shall always retain fond memories of our enjoyable association and extend my deepest sympathy to his good wife and daughters.

Not dead to us who loved him,
Not lost, but gone before;
He lives with us in memory
And will forever more.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Prince Preston served our country faithfully in war and in peace. He served with honor and distinction. He was a dedicated American. He was devoted and loyal to the highest ideals of our Republic. We came to the 80th Congress together. I knew Prince Preston well. I know, Mr. Speaker, that he had great faith in the future of our Nation. He believed in the free enterprise system. He had confidence in the individual. He dedicated his life to improving the welfare of that individual.

Prince Preston had a charming personality and was much beloved, respected, and admired by his colleagues. The State of Georgia has lost a great statesman, and we have lost a true friend.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise to pay my respects to the memory of our departed colleague, Prince H. Preston, a close friend and an outstanding legislator.

I have been one of the fortunate Members of Congress to have been able to work with Prince on the patronage committee.

Indeed when one of Prince's stature leaves us, it must become the loss of all who were privileged to benefit from his wisdom, integrity and statesmanship.

Surely as a gentleman, Prince Preston had no peer. When we say "the gentleman from Georgia," there can be no doubt it literally meant the Congressman who had served 12 years the people from Statesboro, Ga.

Mr. Preston was a kind and courteous colleague, who possessed a keen devotion to duty, to his lovely family, and to his country. Few Members of Congress ever enjoyed a finer reputation for hard work and devotion to duty than Prince Preston.

To his countless friends and to his family, I extend sincere sympathy and condolences. Prince's example always will be an inspiration to all of us in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been observed on many occasions that the real measure of a life is in its quality, and not in its length. This truth admirably fits direct personal application to the life of our late great friend and colleague, the Honorable Prince H. Preston, of Georgia.

When Prince Preston, at the age of 52, departed this mortal existence he had left a substantial and indelible imprint for good upon the life of our Nation, his congressional district, and his State.

And surely, those of us who were granted the privilege of serving with him in the Congress, where he labored with distinction for 14 years—and particularly those of us whose good fortune it was to work closely with him as a fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations—are much the richer because his life touched ours as it did.

We shall miss the work of this great and good public servant, Mr. Speaker. And those of us to whom he was a dear friend shall deeply miss the man.

With a profound sense of personal sorrow, I join with my colleagues of this body in extending my deep and heartfelt sympathy to the bereaved members of Prince Preston's family.

May his soul rest in peace.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the regular

order of business today, and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following announcement of appointments to a committee, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 2251, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. HOLIFIELD, California; Mr. PRICE, Illinois; Mr. ASPINALL, Colorado; Mr. THOMAS, Texas; Mr. MORRIS, New Mexico; Mr. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania; Mr. HOSMER, California; Mr. BATES, Massachusetts; Mr. WESTLAND, Washington.

HEALTH BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud today to introduce an updated version of a bill which has become a household word in America—the Forand bill.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, because of certain agreements made earlier in the day, and because of the necessity of certain committee assignments being confirmed, I am compelled to make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of order temporarily since I do not think we should take all afternoon doing something when another agreement was made with the leadership.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in view of what has transpired, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be extended in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud today to introduce an updated version of a bill which has become a household word in America—the Forand bill.

For me, this is an unusual pleasure. I am privileged to be the successor in this House to the original author of that bill, the beloved and respected Aime J. Forand. I know how much Aime Forand's decision to retire was regretted by many of his friends in this House. It was a retirement, however, which he richly deserved after so many years of conscientious service to the people of his district and of the entire Nation.

Aime Forand made many contributions to the general welfare of all Americans. His crowning achievement is the principle embodied in the bill which I am introducing today.

The Forand principle of providing health benefits for our senior citizens as part of the social security system is both economically sound and morally right. It makes it possible for men and women, during their working lifetime, to put aside a few pennies a day and therefore to earn their right to health benefits when they are retired and without or with reduced income. This is the dignified way to do it, without means tests or private charity.

I introduce this bill today primarily to pay tribute to my illustrious predecessor. The bill in its present form is not perfect. Mr. Forand has said this himself. I am pleased to note that the Kennedy administration has received carefully drawn recommendations for modifications of the Forand bill. Many experts have been studying this problem. We have today heard the President's message on this subject and the results of the study. Last year the other body had before it a Kennedy-Anderson proposal for health benefits under social security. I am sure that from all of these ideas will evolve a plan which will meet the needs in this crucial area.

It is almost 4 years now since Aime Forand first introduced his bill. With President Kennedy listing this measure among his five top priorities, and with the recent White House Conference on Aging giving strong backing to the proposal, I feel safe in predicting that before very long the Forand idea will be incorporated in Federal law. This will indeed be a magnificent testimonial to a magnificent man.

RESTRICTIVE QUOTAS ON IMPORTS OF CRUDE AND RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I arise on this occasion to readdress my thoughts to a matter of continuing and increasing concern to my constituents and fellow citizens of Massachusetts and New England. That is, Mr. Speaker, the Presidential proclamation of March 10, 1959, imposing restrictive quotas on the import of crude and residual fuel oil and the potentially discriminatory and inequitable nature of this program upon the consumers of residual fuel oil in the Northeast. At that time, you will recall, the President acted to impose restrictions under section 2 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1954 as amended, basing his decision on the determination that crude and residual oil was being imported in such quantities as to threaten the national security.

Mr. Speaker, it was then and is now, more certainly than ever, my firm and sincere conviction that no justifiable purpose has been accomplished or is being served by the inclusion of residual oil in the mandatory quota program.

Indeed many serious and considerable economic consequences have resulted from these restrictions. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that unless these unfair mandatory quotas are removed promptly, we may well witness as a consequence the expansion of the already significant financial distress to New England into a full-scale economic disaster.

Furthermore, I foresee not only regional misfortune in the form of economic malady in New England and the Northeast, but in fact, the development of a major and very real threat to our national security. Not merely the spuriously fabricated threat to our national security under which certain oil and coal interests have masqueraded the satisfaction of their greed and advanced their financial aggrandizement but, indeed, a genuine threat to our Nation at its world position. A threat promulgated by an ill-advised Executive order which denies and forsakes the basic principle of the American free enterprise tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I speak today not only as an American profoundly concerned with this situation, but as a New Englander vitally interested in the eradication of a national policy designed to foster the economy of one area of this country at the expense of New England. In effect, Mr. Speaker, the continuance of this program will force New England residual oil users to bend unwillingly to the conversion of other fuels, less efficient and desirable, in order that certain other areas and industrial interests might receive special benefits and privileges.

New Englanders do not expect to be recipients of special privileges or preferential consideration in this matter, Mr. Speaker, they ask only that they receive equitable treatment. Most of all, we do not expect to be held responsible for the subsidization of the economically depressed coal producing areas of the Southeast.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I arose on the floor and prophesied certain areas and factors which would be detrimentally affected by the mandatory imposition of restrictive import quotas on crude and residual oil. Subsequently, I made several pleas for the removal of quota restrictions on residual oil, stating my belief that the only logical and certain effect on the oil market would be a disproportionate and unjustified increase in the residual price to consumers in New England and the Northeast as a result of quota restrictions on Venezuelan residual oil—that oil which provides more than 65 percent of New England's residual requirement. Today, I direct my attention to certain facts which tend most indicatively to substantiate the argument that these dire predictions have now materialized into distressing inequities.

Mr. Speaker, allow me first to reiterate my firm objection that the argument which justifies quotas on the grounds that our national security is seriously threatened is as unconvincing as ever and continues to represent a mere crude and ludicrous attempt to clothe the interests of the big oil dealers and soft coal companies in the pious hoopskirt of national security.

In March of 1959, I stated my opinion from this rostrum that not one of the justifications offered by the Executive, Interior Department or the Office of Oil Administration was sufficiently convincing to be conclusive. I submit that this situation has not changed one iota.

No one has yet to prove the oil industry incapable of dealing profitably with foreign producers without benefit of import quotas.

No one has yet disproven that oil continues to be one of our wasting resources.

No one has yet proven it any less desirable to conserve our indispensable natural resources to insure against that national emergency which may find other Western Hemisphere oil producers unwilling and unable to provide our domestic needs and possible military requirements throughout the world.

No one has yet proven that the restriction on imports of residual fuel oil have brightened the already darkened diplomatic skies which cloud our relations with Venezuela and their Latin American neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the oil industry has traditionally proven to be vital to the security of the free world. How long, I ask, shall we continue to expect Venezuela to develop her own oil industry to support the security and needs of the United States and the rest of the free world on an "on again, off again" basis?

In Venezuela, oil is the fundamental pivot of the national economy. Is it not unfair and absurdly unreasonable to continue to ask her to keep her petroleum underground in order that she might cater to our fickle import quota program? My fears grow daily that these restrictions, which represent to Venezuelans a repudiation of the Venezuelan-American tradition of trade reciprocity, might well have repercussions far beyond a weakening of economic relationships. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I can foresee irreparable damage to the spirit of international good will which normally exists between the United States and the Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, consideration of the ramifications of residual import quotas on our relations with Venezuela and her Latin American neighbors is by itself disconcerting; when one considers the effects of the program here at home and particularly on the New England economy, the ramifications become truly alarming.

By way of review, it will be recalled that a considerable portion of the justification for restrictions on residual was the theory that by imposing import quotas on crude and residual oils, the domestic industry would take up the ball and due to the resultant limited supplies of crude and residual oil would be stimulated to greater production with consequent increases in the availability of all types of petroleum products. This, authorities argued, in full knowledge that in the United States residual oil is the least valuable and desirable byproduct of an American refinery, generally selling for considerably less than the crude from which it is refined. Consequently, because of technological advance and manufacturing efficiency, the industry has over the years substantially lowered the yield of residual oil per barrel of crude from 27 to 8 percent in the years from 1945 to 1959. Recent advances indicate still lower yields, leading one to conclude that the trend toward lower percentage yields of residual will continue unless its price moves up sharply, and production of residual becomes financially advantageous to the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, in direct contradiction of the prophesy of the quota advocates, figures show a definite decline in the domestic production of residual oil since the spring of 1959 and the initiation of import quotas on Venezuelan residual.

U.S. Bureau of Mines statistics show that in each quarter of 1960, the average per day yield of residual oil from domestic refineries was at least 22,000 barrels and in some cases as much as 40,000 barrels below the yield volume for the corresponding quarter of 1959. This figure gains considerable additional significance when we consider that during the same period there was a substantial increase in the demand for residual.

Since the imposition of quotas, Interior has found it regularly necessary to increase the quota allocations in each given period for District No. 1, which includes the Northeastern States. Is it not logical to conclude that there must be an increasing demand for a supply of residual oil in this northeastern section? Is it not reasonable to assume then that there has been a significant rise in demand despite the proven decline in supply, and that contrary to Interior opinion, the domestic industry has not been stimulated to increase production of residual oil to meet the increment in demand? This perpetual supply shortage was predicted by me in 1959 and is conclusively borne out by allocation figures which show that in the first quarter of 1961, 593,000 barrels of residual per day have been allocated to District No. 1. In the entire first half of 1960, we note that only 490,930 barrels per day were allocated. Evidently, Mr. Speaker, as Interior predicted that it would, the demand has increased. Plainly, Mr. Speaker, in direct contrast to the prediction of Interior, the domestic supply has not increased correspondingly.

More significantly, however, is a look at facts which reflect not only production but more meaningfully, notice of facts which indicate the actual availability of residual oil on the eastern seaboard States. Mr. Speaker, as old as the cliche may be, "a bird in the hand is still worth more than two in the bush."

According to the latest available statistics from the Bureau of Mines, from 1948 to 1959 the total domestic supply of residual oil available to eastern seaboard States has shown a steady and considerable decline; from a yearly high of over 162 million barrels in 1948 to a low of just short of 119 million in 1959.

It is further indicative and interesting to note that Bureau of Mines statistics show that since 1951 sales of residual oil in eastern seaboard States have grown consistently from a 1948 figure of over 168 million barrels per year to a 1958 figure of over 234 million barrels. These figures are made more meaningful when we realize that the quotations exclude from their total that residual fuel used by the various utility firms of New England and the Northeast, which are fortunate enough to be equipped with dual and alternate fuel burning systems allowing the accommodation of coal during times of increased residual prices.

These quotations show rather conclusively that American producers have not been stimulated to greater productivity as the OIA proclaimed. They show further that neither is there sufficient domestically produced residual oil to supply the demand of New England and the Northeast.

What will be the end result of this never ending cycle of increasing demand and decreasing supply? The economics of the oil industry are far too complex to allow ready application of broad theories to a situation so replete with unknowns, but one conclusion does seem apparent. If existing import restrictions are allowed to continue the alarming price spiral which I and my colleagues have so often predicted will continue to devastate the economy of the New England residual users.

In New England, two elements of the residual oil users market have been grossly disserviced since the spring of 1959. These two groups are the distributors, specifically the smaller, consumer-servicing, localized distributors, and the consumers themselves.

Let us first direct our attention to the plight of the former group, the small, independent, so-called oil jobbers and terminal operators on the eastern seaboard. Historically this segment of the industry has distributed about half of all the imported residual oil.

Today many of the small independent dealers who buy from barges or as the industry says, "under the rack," have been forced into a most inequitable and inefficient purchasing system by that aspect of the quota system which provides allocations on a quarterly basis. This system has proven tremendously unjust to those distributors who are dependent on the larger importers with allocations as a source of supply since neither can, with any degree of certainty enter into the usual annual contract for sales of residual oil—annual contracting being the traditional contractual method of residual sales. In increasing number, the independent small distributors are being forced by the larger suppliers not only to pay increased prices, but they are forced to enter so-called tie-in contracts in order to insure the fulfillment of their own residual demands. These contracts call for the tie-in purchase of other grade fuels and petroleum products for which the distributor has neither a desire or market in order to acquire enough residual for his own customers. Otherwise, distributors are forced to pay substantially higher spot prices for their residual oil. In 1960, the relationship of spot to contract prices widened considerably to the point where the spot price for cargo lots in New York on December 9, 1960, was $2.65 per barrel as opposed to contract quotations of $2.25 per barrel. As this gap continues to widen, small users and new users

without supply contracts will suffer the most. With new quotas being established every 3 months, neither buyers nor sellers are able to make firm commitments for fuel requirements more than a few months in advance. This uncertainty of supply is obviously not very conducive to sound business planning.

I submit without fear of contradiction that, in a country dedicated to the protection and advancement of the small businessman, this policy fostered and administered by the Government, is hardly destined to promote a healthy business climate.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years countless words have been spoken, speeches delivered, articles and telegrams written, and opinions expressed that import quotas on residual oil are both inequitable and unwise. Throughout all of this commentary, there is one strong and just voice of unanimity—prices will rise; the consumer will pay.

Twice in the spring of 1959 and again in August, I warned that with the elimination of foreign competition in the residual oil field, it was only a matter of time until the inevitable price rise was effected. The irrefutable fact of the matter is that prices have most certainly risen. They have done so at an alarming rate and will, I predict, continue to do so as long as restrictions on the import of residual fuel are maintained in such a manner as to allow the control and manipulation of the oil economy by means of policies discriminatory to New England.

Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1960, the median price of terminal purchases of residual oil in Boston according to Platt's Authoritative Industrial Pricing Agency, was $2.54 per barrel. List price per barrel 1 year later, according to Platt's quotations, was $2.62½, a listed price increase of 7½ cents per barrel. On January 28 of this year, just a few days ago, the listed price per barrel in Boston Harbor had zoomed to $2.76½ per barrel; an additional increase of 14 cents. It would be absurdly naive for anyone to assume for one moment that this resultant increase in price will be absorbed by manufacturers, large utility companies and residual dealers. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the burden of increased costs must eventually be shunted onto the shoulders of the consumer. It would be ridiculous to suppose that any business could survive constantly increased production costs without a corresponding and profitable rise in their own charges. Neither, Mr. Speaker, are manufacturers and large users of residual oil attempting to hide or veil this intent from the public. They readily acknowledge that if the restrictions continue and the inevitable uncertainties of supply and potential of shortages are not eliminated they will have no choice but to require additional sacrifice from their customers. Correspondingly increases in production costs will result in all products in which residual oil figures prominently.

A case very much in point is the situation of the Boston Edison Power Co., servicing electric power to over 450,000 residents in the Greater Boston area. Recent increases in the price of residual oil in the Boston area have resulted in significantly increased costs to its consumers over the past 2 years. Most recently in September of last year, price increases of to 9 cents per barrel at Boston terminals skyrocketed the overall cost of electricity to homeowners in the Boston area. Over the past 2 years, advocates of import restrictions and outspoken members of the soft-coal lobby have insisted that we in New England are misinformed and allowing our emotions to sour our better judgment with the argument that New England homeowners would eventually shoulder the additional burden of residual price increases. The Boston Edison Co. just last week informed me that as a result of the September price rise, its Greater Boston consumers would have to pay an additional $1,515,000 on their electric bills in the coming year. Roughly, Mr. Speaker, this represents an increase of $3 per consumer in just 1 year. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these facts speak most eloquently for themselves. Mr. Speaker, plainly we are concerned with our national security. We are anxious for the betterment of our foreign affairs. We strive tirelessly for the advancement of our national economy—both big industry and small business. Most of all, we strive mightily for the protection and preservation of the rights of all our citizens. Where then, is the solution to the problem now confronting us? How do we serve all these masters?

The facts are before us. I have shown here today that not only have certain areas of concern noted in 1959 materialized into economic distress for New England, but, in fact, they continue to grow in intensity in such a degree as to alarm even the most optimistic New Englander. I strongly submit that the restrictions on imports of residual oil continue to threaten the New England economy and do injustice to our national security and that their immediate removal is no longer merely advised, but is, in fact, now dictated, as the only logical solution to this dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, within the week, I expect to forward to the President a petition which I have circulated amongst my New England colleagues in this body. In this petition, we restate our aversion to the discriminatory nature of the import quota program, and unanimously implore the President to act swiftly to exempt residual oil imports from the mandatory quota program. Recalling attention to our previously announced opinion that the best interests of our national security were not at all being served by the program, we unanimously voice concern over the distressing detrimental effect the program is having on the east coast oil-consuming community in general, and on New England in particular. In reviewing the problem as it existed in September of 1959 when the entire Massachusetts delegation signed a similar petition to the President, the petition warns that not only does the situation still portend dangerous economic crises, but that in fact, the entire oil-using segment on the New England economy is increasingly hard pressed by the continuation of this program.

I fully realize that on September 8, 1959, I and certainly none of my fellow Members either, were confronted with the overwhelmingly awesome responsibilities of the Presidency facing our former colleague now. Nonetheless, with full appreciation for the influence these concerns must properly have, are we not justified to now ask of the President, "Do you not now, as you did then, agree that the prompt removal of restrictions on the import of residual oil continues as a matter of urgent and paramount importance to the citizens of New England? Do you not still agree that these quotas are indeed a threat not only to the economy of New England but to the security of our Nation as well? Will you not now, in view of the overwhelming evidence, act in accordance with our most urgent plea?"

Mr. Speaker, the conclusive facts are before us. Daily the situation worsens. New England subsidy of the soft coal and oil industries is now far beyond reason and I respectfully request the cooperation of my colleagues in this body to insure the rescue of the New England residual users from this cancerous and discriminatory economic debasement.

ERNST VON DOHNANYI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend remarks made earlier during the special order of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that 1 year ago today one of the great men of music of our age, Ernst Von Dohnanyi, died in New York City.

This distinguished son of Hungary was a composer of music, a concert pianist, a conductor, and teacher. He was one of the great men of music of our age. For the last 10 years of his life he lived in the State of Florida, working as professor of music at Florida State University. Music was his life and he gave every hour to this great study. He died 1 year ago today while in New York City on a trip to make recordings. From the studio, he went directly to his hotel to bed and there he died, close to the work he loved.

Therefore, in behalf of the entire Florida delegation, and particularly in behalf of myself and Florida's two distinguished U.S. Senators, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and the Honorable GEORGE SMATHERS, I say these words of tribute to his memory.

Ernst von Dohnanyi was born in Pressburg, Hungary, on July 27, 1877. Like many great men of music before him, Mr. Dohnanyi revealed promise at an early age; he played the piano at the age of 6, and began to give public concerts at 9. He studied at the Royal Hungarian Academy of Music in Budapest, where he

composed his first major work, the "Symphony in F," which was awarded the King's Prize in 1897.

Mr. Dohnanyi performed brilliantly as a concert pianist. He was of the late romantic school, and played the works of earlier romantics—Beethoven, Liszt, Brahms. He toured Europe and Britain, and gave his first concert in this country in 1899. In 1919 he was appointed director of the Budapest Conservatory, and, later, was conductor of the Budapest Philharmonic Orchestra and director of the Hungarian radio. He fled the Communist regime in Hungary in 1948, and came to the United States in 1949. He devoted the remainder of his life to teaching music, at Florida State University and Ohio University, and to recording both his own works and those of Beethoven.

Mr. Dohnanyi's musical style does not usually follow Hungarian national themes, but is romantic and eclectic, except for two popular pieces which are of Hungarian inspiration, the "Ruralia Hungaria" and the "Variations on a Hungarian Theme." He composed three operas, three long choral works, a ballet, and three full-length symphonies, and other symphonic and orchestral works. Among the latter, two of the most popular are the suite in F-sharp minor for orchestra, and his "Variations on a Nursery Tune." Besides this, he wrote several pieces of chamber music, the most popular of which are perhaps, the piano quintet and the D-flat quartet, and compositions for the piano, of which the F-minor capriccio is one of the most popular.

In testimony of the extraordinary beauty of Mr. Dohnanyi's own music, I would like to quote from the article on him in the 1954 edition of Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians:

> Not only is his technical accomplishment extraordinarily complete, but the breadth of his phrasing, his command of tone-gradation and the exquisite beauty of his tone are such as to satisfy the most exacting hearer.

We will remember Mr. Dohnanyi as a man who gave us so much beauty; there are few gifts which are more precious.

Mr. Dohnanyi is survived by his wife, Helen, also a dedicated student of music and a wonderful helpmate throughout the years of their life together.

ONE HUNDRED HOUSE MEMBERS SEEK ACTION ON ANTI-BACKDOOR SPENDING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know so well, under rule XXI (4) of the Rules of the House of Representatives no bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations can be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor can an amendment proposing an appropriation be held in order during consideration of a bill or joint resolution which has been reported by a committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations.

However, as Members know, it is possible to circumvent the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations by what is generally referred to as the backdoor approach to the Treasury of the United States. This has been accomplished when the House has passed legislation authorizing various Government agencies to borrow funds from the Treasury and to spend the borrowed funds without the approval of an Appropriations Committee bill properly reported by the committee having jurisdiction to report appropriations.

Such Government agency expenditures are thus authorized by Congressional committees having jurisdiction under the Rules of the House over the agencies themselves and thereby bypass the approval of the Committee on Appropriations. The expenditures are not appropriated and constitute, in my judgment, a trespass of jurisdictional power as well as unwarranted violation of constitutional control and responsibility. Indeed, the General Accounting Office has been highly critical of this procedure.

Mr. Speaker, in May 1959, in the 86th Congress this controversial issue of backdoor spending was raised in the House as a result of amendments to S. 57, the Housing Act of 1959. These amendments were introduced by our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] sought to change the method of financing the programs authorized in the Housing bill so that instead of calling for borrowing necessary funds from the Treasury of the United States a method of direct congressional appropriation would have been required. In other words, the Thomas amendments would have transferred control over the agencies' expenditures to the Congress itself and as such under our House rules to legislation reported out of the Committee on Appropriations.

It was obvious at that time from the remarks and debate on those amendments that the views of those members in opposition was influenced by fear that such programs might be adversely affected as a result of careful scrutiny and screening of the expenditures called for in the bill. As I recall, a statement was made during that debate to the effect that in 1 year 16 bills authorizing $9 billion of so-called backdoor spending had come to the House. That, of course, indicated the immensity of the expenditures in legislation reported by committees not having jurisdiction over appropriations. Also I believe it was said that 12 of the 16 bills originated in the Senate, which points up a practice constituting technical violation of the constitutional prerogative of the House of Representatives to originate legislation on appropriations.

Finally, let me remind the House that on the final vote after the yeas and nays were ordered, the Thomas amendments were adopted by a vote of 222 to 201.

Unfortunately, this action came to naught when the housing bill was sent to conference with the Senate.

With the organization of the 87th Congress, as a strong opponent of backdoor spending and lack of responsible congressional control over the public purse, I organized the bipartisan Committee Against Backdoor Spending. Two Democratic members, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] joined two Republicans the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] and myself. We invited other House Members to sign a joint letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rules asking for a hearing and an opportunity for House consideration of a resolution dealing with this subject. In the letter, which carried the signatures of more than 100 Members from both sides of the aisle, we expressed our opposition to so-called backdoor spending and our support of a change in rule XXI of the rules of the House so that no bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations or other language permitting withdrawal of money from the Treasury without further action by the Congress, or carrying other authority to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations. Likewise, floor amendments for the same purpose would be out of order under the resolution we support. Specifically, our letter called for a hearing on the Smith resolution as introduced in the 86th Congress, a similar resolution having been introduced in the 87th Congress by two other Members, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and myself. My resolution is numbered House Resolution 115.

It will be recalled that President Eisenhower in his final budget message to the Congress reiterated his opposition to financing Federal programs outside the appropriations process.

In support of allowing the House to decide as to the desirability of restoring fiscal responsibility to the Congress, I would only emphasize one point at this time. I am confident a majority of House Members favor this resolution. The total new Members of the House who have expressed themselves to me in support of the Smith resolution plus the total of the Members who are presently in Congress and previously voted for the Thomas amendments adds up to more than a majority.

So, with some real force of groundswell opinion to back us up, the Committee Against Backdoor Spending with optimistic anticipation is seeking restoration to the elected Representatives of the people of the power over Federal Government expenditures.

Year after year partisan disputes arise in this Chamber as to the credit or blame for budget surpluses or deficits or levels of the national debt.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House knows full well the finger of responsibility cannot be fairly pointed with any certainty either way as long as the present practice continues.

When there is no control vested in any one governmental branch or body, how can blame be assessed.

In conclusion, let me say there are many meritorious proposals to create better management of our Federal fiscal affairs. I have sponsored a good number of bills and resolutions myself designed in one way or another to require debt reduction or a balanced budget. However, as long as the present method of authorizing governmental agencies to borrow from the Federal Treasury continues, no plan for good financial policies or practices will be effective. This proposed clarification of the Houses rules making it possible to make points of order against improperly reported appropriations is the most important weapon the House can hold to combat inflation, create confidence at home and abroad in our dollar, and give assurance to the taxpayers of America that their elected Representatives can control the spending of their money.

Having obtained unanimous consent to do so, I include at this point a copy of the letter of the Committee Against Backdoor Spending with the names of those 100-plus Members of the House of Representives whose signatures it bore. Likewise, I include a copy of the resolution which we support and on which an opportunity is sought for the House to act.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the undersigned, wish to express our opposition to so-called "back door" spending.

In this connection, we support the Smith resolution as introduced in the 86th Congress providing for a change in rule XXI of the Rules of the House so that no bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations or other language that will permit the withdrawal of money from the Treasury without further action by the Congress, or carrying other authority to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing such appropriation or withdrawal or such authority be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction.

We urge you to have a hearing on your resolution and hope the Rules Committee will report it to the floor of the House for action.

The Members of the House whose names are shown on the attached sheet have asked that they be included in this request and join us in signing this letter.

Respectfully,

COMMITTEE AGAINST "BACK DOOR" SPENDING.
THOMAS M. PELLY.
JOHN J. FLYNT.
CHARLES B. HOEVEN.
HARRY R. SHEPPARD.
THOMAS M. PELLY, *Chairman.*

NAMES OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WHO SIGNED PRECEDING LETTER

Hugh Q. Alexander, Dale Alford, Bruce Alger, H. Carl Andersen, John B. Anderson, Robert T. Ashmore, James C. Auchincloss, William H. Bates, James F. Battin, Ralph F. Beermann, Page Belcher, Charles E. Bennett, E. Y. Berry, Frank T. Bow, James E. Bromwell, William S. Broomfield, Joel T. Broyhill, Donald C. Bruce, Elford A. Cederberg, George O. Chambers, J. Edgar Chenoweth, Marguerite Stitt Church, Harold R. Collier, William C. Cramer, Glenn Cunningham, Paul B. Dague, John W. Davis, Edward J. Derwinski, W. J. Bryan Dorn, John Dowdy, Thomas N. Downing, Paul Findley, Gerald R. Ford, Jr., James G. Fulton, Peter A. Garland, Milton W. Glenn.

Charles E. Goodell, George A. Goodling, Robert P. Griffin, H. R. Gross, Charles S. Gubser, James A. Haley, Durward G. Hall, Burr P. Harrison, Ralph Harvey, E. W. Hiestand, Craig Hosmer, August E. Johansen, Charles R. Jonas, Clarence E. Kilburn, A. Paul Kitchin, John Kyl, Melvin R. Laird, Delbert L. Latta, Glenard P. Lipscomb, Gordon L. McDonough, Clifford G. McIntire, Harold B. McSween, Walter L. McVey, Clark MacGregor, William S. Mailliard, David T. Martin, Charles McC. Mathias, Catherine May, Robert H. Michel, William E. Miller, Walter H. Moeller, Arch A. Moore, Jr., Walter M. Mumma, Tom Murray.

W. F. Norrell, Harold C. Ostertag, Otto E. Passman, John R. Pillion, Alexander Pirnie, Richard H. Poff, Albert H. Quie, John H. Ray, Ben Reifel, John J. Rhodes, Howard W. Robison, Richard L. Roudebush, John H. Rousselot, Katharine St. George, Henry C. Schadeberg, Gordon H. Scherer, Ralph J. Scott, Don L. Short, Eugene Siler, John Taber, Charles M. Teague, T. A. Thompson, Vernon W. Thomson, Thor C. Tollefson, William M. Tuck, James B. Utt, William K. Van Pelt, Phil Weaver, Jessica McC. Weis, J. Ernest Wharton, John Bell Williams, Bob Wilson, Earl Wilson, Arthur Winstead, J. Arthur Younger.

H. RES. 115

Resolved, That clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government, or other withdrawal of money from the Treasury."

SEC. 2. Clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"4. No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations or other language that will permit the withdrawal of money from the Treasury without further action by the Congress, or carrying other authority to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations, shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing such appropriation or withdrawal or such other authority be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A point of order may be raised against any such appropriation, language, or amendment at the appropriate time during the reading of the bill or joint resolution for amendment."

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am as of this date introducing legislation to provide medical and hospital care for our aged citizens both within and without the social security system, specifically, hospital care up to 60 days, nursing home care up to 120 days, outpatient diagnostic service, and surgical treatment.

During the last session of Congress I had the privilege of cosponsoring, with Congressman Aime Forand of Rhode Island, a bill to provide medical care for those on social security. We recognized last year that this legislation although going a long way to ease the problem still excluded approximately 4 million people, those not on social security. My new bill not only contains the same benefits as the Forand bill but fills the gap left by that proposal and covers the forgotten 4 million Americans who are ineligible for social security. Furthermore outpatient diagnostic service and nursing home care without the requirement of prior hospitalization, neither of which were included in the Forand bill, are now provided in this new bill.

Under the bill men from age 65 and women from age 62 would be covered, either by the social security system, railroad retirement, Federal Civil Service, or a voluntary plan. The voluntary plan entitles men under 65 and women under 62 to contribute at the same rates as social security into a Federal Health Care Trust Fund which would be administered by the Social Security Administration to take care of their medical expenses when they reach retirement age. In order that individuals now at retirement age would not be left out, the new bill contains a provision to give them immediate coverage whether or not they have paid into the fund; such coverage without payment being an emergency step would be effective until January 1, 1964. To be eligible thereafter a person would have to have paid into the fund.

The bill also provides that where widows and orphans are receiving social security death benefits, they would also receive medical coverage. Further, the bill would allow States and municipal governments to enter and insure their employees against medical costs when retired.

The cost of this program remains at the Forand bill rate of one-fourth of 1 percent of the incomes of the salaried, to $15.00 a year maximum; and three-eighths of 1 percent of the incomes of the self-employed to a maximum of $22.50 a year.

The bill offers no danger of Government regulation of medicine. In fact, the terms of the bill specifically forbid it. Its operation would not interfere with the practice of medicine, the manner in which medical services are provided, or the internal management of participating institutions."

I stress the fact that under the plan there would be complete freedom of choice of doctors and medical institutions and that there would be no fixed fees; instead, local conditions would prevail.

I am introducing this legislation at this time in the knowledge that many other proposals to solve this problem will be considered by this Congress. I believe this subject to be of such great significance that it deserves priority action by members of both parties. In this instance, I, a Republican, am privileged to associate myself with this philosophy of health care.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the need for medical care for the elderly. Unfortunately, too little heed has been given to the forgotten 4 million who are not on the social security rolls. My bill

covers all older citizens, for it is an unhappy fact that those not covered by social security are afflicted to the same degree with the ills which beset those who are. And, with medical expenses 50 percent higher for the elderly, the forgotten 4 million not on social security are hit the hardest.

Let us have no more degrading pauper oaths, means tests or the like. Let us instead guarantee to our aged, who have used their lives to enrich our land, an old age free from oppressive fears of sickness and the financial catastrophe it can mean.

CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection .

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1961, the Civil Air Patrol will celebrate the 20th anniversary of its service to the American people. During the two decades of its existence, the patrol has established an enviable record of achievement, and there is every reason to believe that in the years to come it will continue to play an important role in the lives of all the young people and adults associated with it in the development of American aviation.

It is with these facts in mind that I have today introduced in this House a joint resolution to designate December 1 of this year as Civil Air Patrol Day. It is my sincere belief that CAP fully deserves this recognition from the Congress of the United States.

The Civil Air Patrol was born in the critical days just before our entrance into World War II. Its objective was the organization of civilians interested in aviation in such a way that their efforts could best be used in the all-out conflict that appeared certain to come.

During the war, the Civil Air Patrol performed many functions and services that contributed both directly and indirectly to the ultimate victory. One of the most important of these was the patrolling of the Atlantic coast in search of submarines. This coastal patrol was carried on for 18 months before regular units of the armed services were in a position to take over. During this period, CAP pilots flew more than 86,000 missions, reported 173 submarine sightings, destroyed 2 with bombs and depth charges, and reported information to Regular Army and Navy bombers that led to the destruction of many more.

Among its other wartime activities, the Civil Air Patrol flew mail and cargo for the Air Force, transported passengers, towed targets for gunnery practice, and participated in search and rescue work.

In 1946, Congress, recognizing the significance of the Civil Air Patrol, passed a law incorporating it as a benevolent, nonprofit organization. In very broad terms this law defined the purposes of CAP as an organization to encourage the growth, development, and progress of American aviation and as an instrument to provide aviation education and training for its active members.

Two years later, the 80th Congress, in Public Law 557, made the Civil Air Patrol a permanent civilian auxiliary of the U.S. Air Force, a status which it now enjoys.

At the present time about 70,000 adults and young men and women are actively participating in the program of the Civil Air Patrol. They are receiving a type of training, and developing an understanding and appreciation of American aviation, that is as unique as it is important.

The activities of the Civil Air Patrol receive no direct monetary support from the Treasury of the Federal Government. The patrol finances itself through contributions and dues from its members.

The Air Force does, however, provide invaluable assistance in the form of trained personnel. Air Force reservists are also authorized under certain circumstances to work with the Civil Air Patrol. Only from such experts could CAP members receive the specialized training and instruction that is indispensable to a thorough understanding of American aviation.

In addition to its education and training programs, the Civil Air Patrol carries on other activities of major importance. One of these concerns communications. For example, CAP maintains an active nationwide radio network for the dual purpose of training communications personnel and for domestic and military emergencies.

Search and rescue work constitutes another valuable function performed by the patrol. To illustrate, in 1958 CAP personnel flew some 13,343 hours on more than 7,000 sorties for this purpose. Mercy flights, civil defense missions, local disaster relief and emergency operations, ground observer work, and aircraft spotting and marking also form a part of the Patrol's regular operations.

The Civil Air Patrol has every reason to be proud of its accomplishments during the first 20 years of its life. It has every reason to look to the future with full confidence that it can continue to serve its members, their communities, and the entire Nation in a useful capacity.

The record that the Civil Air Patrol has established and the useful role it is now playing in our society entitle it to the respect and admiration of the American people. I am convinced that these sentiments can best be expressed by favorable congressional action on this resolution, followed by a Presidential proclamation, establishing December 1, 1961, as Civil Air Patrol Day.

REPEAL THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to repeal the Federal excise tax on communications services and facilities.

The excise tax on telephone services is one of the few so-called luxury taxes, imposed as a wartime measure, that has not yet been repealed. Originally, the tax was placed on telephone and other communications service to discourage overloading these vital wartime facilities with nonessential use.

Today, telephone service is the only household utility subject to a Federal excise tax. This places telephone service, which is really a necessity for practically all families, in the same tax category as alcoholic beverages, jewelry, cabarets, and so forth. For this reason, I feel that it is a discriminatory tax, and an added burden on all citizens.

The removal of this tax would mean that telephone users would get the full benefit. The telephone companies merely act as a collection agent for the Federal Government in collecting the excise tax, passing on all money collected to the Government. I hope we will be successful in getting this tax repealed in this session.

EXPLORATION OF METHODS OF COMBATING TRAFFIC IN OBSCENE AND NOXIOUS MATERIALS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of certain residents of the 18th Congressional District of California, I have today filed a petition in support of H.R. 1826, introduced by Mr. SCHERER, of Ohio, to create a commission to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

Many religious and service organizations and groups have been urging Congress to take action on this serious and menacing problem which is causing widespread harm to our youth through the dissemination of lewd, obscene, and noxious materials. In fact, I believe the increase in the crime rate of juveniles may well be in direct proportion to the availability of this type of literature.

The Commission, proposed in this bill, would have far-reaching objectives because it would be composed of persons from several walks of life who have knowledge of the seriousness of the problem and the many legal aspects of the suppression of the traffic in obscene materials.

It is of utmost importance that the public, especially parents and school-age children, be alerted about the seriousness of this pernicious traffic. They

should be given guidance in suppressing the distribution of such lewd and obscene matters, and in bringing the purveyors of filth into court.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A PROCEDURE FOR THE HANDLING OF CONTEMPT CITATIONS BY THE CONGRESS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a new procedure by which the Congress may handle contempt citations. I believe that the present system has shown itself to be inadequate to provide for the necessary protection of the legislative function and, at the same time, insure the observance of the civil rights of the individuals charged with disturbing these functions.

There is a very important need to protect the functions of our legislature against disruptions occasioned by willful individuals. We have seen instances of this in the recent past and it is clear that the proper exercise of the legislative responsibilities which we have requires that some punitive measures be available to control or eliminate these disruptions. It is equally clear that the punitive measures which are provided to meet this threat must not disregard the basic civil rights of the individuals who are accused of having created this disruption. And we also have seen cases in the recent past in which these basic civil rights have not been observed.

This dual protection of the Government and the individual would be provided for in my bill by the establishment of a 7-man committee in each House to study and report on contempt proceedings brought by their respective Houses or the committees of them. At present it is the complaining committee itself which conducts a study into the matter and reports on it for the decision of its parent body. The injustice of this situation was evident in the floor debate on the citation of three officials of the Port of New York Authority for contempt in the last Congress. The committee which this bill would establish would be named by the Speaker of the House or President of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress.

I offer this proposal as one of a number of reforms which I feel are essential in the rules of the Congress and in particular in the rules of the House. The strength of our system, and as a major part of this the protection of minority interests, depends largely upon the procedures which we establish to implement our substantive rights. I believe that this proposal will establish a sound procedure to handle questions of contempt.

DEDUCTION FOR EXPENSES OF CARE OF CHILDREN WHILE TAXPAYER'S WIFE IS PHYSICALLY OR MENTALLY INCAPABLE OF CARING FOR THEM

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make possible a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of his children and dependents while, due to mental or physical incapacity, his wife is unable to care for them. The deduction is based upon the idea that in such circumstances, the worker who is gainfully employed and who needs to provide care for his children and dependents to continue his employment, should be permitted a deduction for this necessary feature of his employment. It is, for this reason, limited to those cases in which the expense is incurred for the purpose of permitting the taxpayer to be gainfully employed. The bill further provides that this deduction will be available to women and widowers who have similar expenses in caring for children and dependents so that they may hold employment.

This measure supplements present legislation by which this deduction is available in certain cases, notably for a taxpayer who is a woman or widower as presently defined in the law, and it would equalize the tax treatment of people in this situation.

Sound economic growth requires tax laws which look to the healthy expansion of the economy. I believe that this is a situation in which a tax law could promote the healthy expansion of which I speak, and I believe there is an inequity which should be corrected as soon as possible.

A NATIONAL POLICY FOR PASSPORTS: LEGISLATION TO FACILITATE THE CITIZEN'S RIGHT TO TRAVEL

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, starting with the basic hypothesis that travel by citizens abroad should be as free of government restraint as possible consistent with the requirements of national security, I have today introduced a bill which would make the administrative functions of our Government an aid and not a deterrent in the citizen's right to travel.

Within the limits of the general welfare of the people, the guarantee in our Constitution that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law should be recognized to cover the right to travel. Certainly the right to travel is one of the liberties which distinguishes dictatorship from freedom and I believe that it should be accorded the same recognition as the other freedoms which are guaranteed Americans by the Constitution. Further, I believe that it has been established that contact on a people-to-people basis is a very effective way of creating international friendship in a world torn by tension. Thus, the promotion of travel, rather than its curtailment by administrative difficulties, would help us toward the eventual goal of world understanding which we seek.

As noted above, the general welfare is the context within which this right must exist, and the boundaries which it must observe. Where the exercise of an individual right conflicts with the exercise of the collective rights of the citizen, the former must yield to the latter insofar as the individual more fully realizes his rights as part of the collective group of individuals which we call our country. And it must yield only to that extent.

The act, in its section 3, takes congressional cognizance of the international Communist conspiracy and defines those situations in which its threat to the general welfare will act to outweigh the individual right of travel with an American passport. In section 4 it enumerates the restrictions, based upon the general welfare, in which the right will not be granted. These restrictions are like our traffic laws; they do not attack the right of the citizen to use the roads but rather establish rules so that all citizens may use them easily and harmoniously. It is only with the recognition of the right to travel, which this bill provides, that we can make rules which will facilitate it through intelligent regulation.

This bill, in establishing the regulatory procedures for international travel, recognizes the passport as the key by which the Government controls foreign travel by American citizens. To implement the right to travel, within the general welfare limitations cited above, the passport must be made freely available to the citizens and not be given as a privilege. The passport itself is nothing more than an identification card, letting those countries through which the traveler passes know that he is an American citizen. It requests that the foreign country extend the traveler the protection of its laws while he is in the country. The passport, then, is just an aid to the attainment of the right of travel and restrictions on its issuance beyond those spelled out for the protection of the general welfare are contrary to the enjoyment of the right to travel.

This bill would establish a U.S. Passport Service whose task would be to facilitate the exercise of this right of travel and it also sets forth a procedure of appeal by which the decisions of the Service can be tested by a Passport Review Board and the Federal courts.

I believe that it is imperative that the Congress recognize the right of American citizens to travel, within the broad limitations of the Nation's general welfare, and establish procedures by which the exercise of this right can be facilitated.

WHAT WE MUST DO TO WIN THE COLD WAR

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, revise and extend his remarks, and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Charles Stevenson which appears in the Reader's Digest for February 1961. This well prepared, thought provoking article, in my opinion is worthy of the attention of every Member of this body.

WHAT WE MUST DO TO WIN THE COLD WAR

(By Charles Stevenson)

President Kennedy vowed before the election that under his leadership the United States would at last seize the initiative in the cold war. Nothing is more imperative. But before he can make a start, our new Commander in Chief must face up to a shocking and bitter reality. He must capture control of the defiant, faceless bureaucracy firmly entrenched in Washington. Its weak-kneed efforts merely to hold off communism instead of fighting back are leading us to defeat even as it tries to keep the White House from interfering.

The situation is not new. In 1955, Nelson Rockefeller was secretly assigned by President Eisenhower to try to make our arthritic cold-war machinery work. He recalls that his mission "was bitterly resented by the State Department," which regarded this White House interest as an "invasion of their authority and responsibility." After 8 months of frustration he recommended that the project be abandoned. "You could go against a wall of opposition just so far, and then it was useless," he says.

Since the days when we were told that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers, too many men in the State Department have persisted in the dangerously wistful belief that if we don't annoy the Reds, they are bound to see how well-meaning we are and will stop harassing us. Incredibly, this philosophy has infected the highest quarters of our Government. And all the while the Kremlin, teasing our naive desire to reach an understanding through the outworn tradition of polite negotiation, toys with us by hot and cold maneuvering as it inches forward toward total victory.

Compare our cold war operations with the deadly, single-minded efficiency of Soviet maneuvering. Typical was the way the Communists brought about the Japanese riots that forced cancellation of President Eisenhower's trip to Japan last summer and caused the United States to lose face all over the world.

Under Khrushchev's direction Japan had already been infiltrated. Trained native Japanese cadres were sent to gain control of the Japanese Teachers' Union with its 500,000 members. Soon, Japanese children were being taught that the U.S.S.R. is their real motherland, the United States their bloodthirsty imperialistic foe. Other trained agitators were sent into the Japanese colleges to take over the Zengakuren, a students' organization with shock troops that beat up uncooperative students and professors. Communists also eased their way into Sohyo, the country's labor federation of 3,500,000 members, and into Japan's powerful Socialist Party. A year before the riots, 88 key Japanese Communists were smuggled into the country from Russia and China, where they had spent 8 years in Communist academies learning to manipulate men's minds.

As the time for Eisenhower's visit neared, millions of dollars were smuggled into Japan from Russia and China, and poured into more than a hundred front groups to build war fears to the point of hysteria. The value of the yen was unsettled by Communist currency manipulations in Hong Kong. Red radio stations blanketed Japan with hate-America propaganda. The Russian Foreign Office sent out thinly veiled threats of atomic annihilation.

The first demonstrations by students, along with workers paid a half day's wages by agitators, started peacefully enough. By nightfall, however, the leaders had them lined up 20 abreast in a phalanx of locked arms. Whistles blowing a rhythmic beat brought chants of "Down with the treaty," and the earth literally shook under their dogtrot. Day after day the performance was repeated. None of it was spontaneous. It was a massive action planned and carried out by professionals, and amateurs were no match for them.

This is cold war, Russian style. They have a name for it: agitprop—planned conflict in which agitation, propaganda, trade, diplomacy, threats of war and promises of peace are coordinated in an ever changing, worldwide offensive. It is all masterminded in the Kremlin from a cold war operation center—a vast chamber with floor-to-ceiling maps on which are displayed, country by country, the latest summations of mounting tensions. Here, Premier Khrushchev confers daily with Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, with Party Secretary Mikhail Suslov, who runs Moscow's international network of professional agitators, and with his other cold war commanders. One word sends a vast array of flexible cold war weapons into an integrated action to brainwash entire nations.

How do our own cold war planners respond? In the case of the Japanese riots, the Communist machinations were well known in Washington, via intelligence reports. But the information never received proper consideration.

As far back as 1948, before he became Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles called for establishment of a new executive department "dedicated to the task of nonmilitary defense, just as the Secretary of Defense heads military defense." Its goal: "to contest the Communist Party at the level where it is working, and winning its victories." It was to be a flexible organization that would conceive winning strategy and make the swift day-to-day, hour-to-hour decisions, for in this era of sudden crises the difference between victory and defeat depends as much on split-second maneuvering as in a shooting war.

Instead, we are doing the same old things in the same old way. We have today at least eight different foreign-aid funds, separately administered by six different agencies, through which we have handed out $50 billion just since the Korean war. (Our every setback abroad is habitually blamed on the insufficiency of these funds, totally ignoring the fact that the Reds for their success have similarly paid out only a billion and a half.) There is a U.S. Information Agency, whose officials have been so eager not to cause offense that a radio commentary critical of Communist philosophy was canceled even as it got started. There are four separate intelligence services: Army, Navy, Air Force, and Central Intelligence Agency. And there is our sprawling State Department with 14,000 employees, which insists on being the top layer in this bureaucratic cake.

In theory this complex is guided by the National Security Council. Cold war problems are tackled by the NSC's Planning Board. But the Board's members are Assistant Secretaries of the several departments of Government, each committed to its own vested interests. Since the members are faced with the desirability that their recommendations be unanimously agreed upon, basic decisions are anonymously watered down and anonymously rewritten time and again to avoid conflicts. Only after endless haggling are these documents, passing as America's new proposed grand strategy, offered to the NSC.

"Thus a single 'passive resistance' develops to dilute recommendations up to the President and downward to the agencies charged with carrying out policy," says Col. William R. Kintner, the Army's psychological-warfare expert, who has worked with the NSC structure and studied our cold-war machinery. "There is a natural tendency to sidestep and hedge, to evade problems and react to situations with half-measures haltingly applied. And progress reports to the President (on which he must rely for information about the world situation) often tend to conceal lack of progress."

Gordon Gray, President Eisenhower's last NSC coordinator, has stated that policy papers, after weeks of writing and rewriting, had to be discussed by the Council for 5 more weeks before receiving final approval. The result of this cumbersome procedure, explains W. W. Rostow, professor of economic history at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is that "American policymaking consists of a series of reactions to major crises. Having failed to define, to anticipate, and to deal with forces loose in the world," we suddenly find ourselves facing the "problems swept under the rug or never recognized."

What happens when our "policy" is finally determined? Once a week the Vice President, Secretaries of State, Defense, and Treasury, the Budget Director and the Director of Civil Defense and Mobilization constitute themselves as the NSC itself, and for a couple of hours, advise their chairman, the President, about the cold war. Once he makes a final judgment they leave it up to another subordinate bureaucratic group, the Operations Coordinating Board—which has no enforcement authority—to try to persuade departments to carry out the decision. Even the personal assistant to the President, appointed to coordinate the entire setup in his name, had to cajole department heads into just attending a conference. Nobody has concise directive authority.

It is bad enough that the National Security Council system is inoperable. But the shocking fact is that it is sometimes used by the State Department bureaucracy as an instrument for actually defying the White House. In 1956, for example, State so balked at producing the facts required to bring a desperately needed reappraisal of our Middle East policies before the President that another of Ike's top cold-war lieutenants quit in disgust. Shortly afterward we were caught in stunned surprise when our British, French, and Israeli allies attacked Nasser's Egypt.

More recently, when Cuban Dictator Fidel Castro visited the United States in 1959, the FBI rushed to the State Department a devastating report on the growing seriousness of Communist influences around him. Other similar FBI reports followed. But State deliberately suppressed this information. At one point State even refused to allow Cuba to be brought up for discussion before the President in NSC meeting. The subject

finally got to NSC attention only because a Presidential assistant personally prevailed upon CIA Director Allen Dulles to provide a special NSC briefing as to what was happening in Cuba. State then had to discuss the situation.

In one country a few hundred thousand dollars would have helped a genuine but impoverished Democratic Party to provide transportation so the people could get to the polls to vote down Communist influences taking them over. We were unwilling to supply the money for this purpose. Yet today that country's Communist-infiltrated government is given millions in a single year as foreign aid.

Even stranger has been the refusal of the bureaucracy to permit the distribution abroad of pamphlets designed to show how government based on personal liberties is superior to communism. The pamphlets were developed at the order of Adm. Arthur Radford as a study course called Militant Liberty for American servicemen. However, when it was proposed that these ideas be made available to other countries opposing communism, NSC's anonymous bureaucratic planners refused even to let the subject come up for NSC discussion. Then in 1957 Ecuador appealed directly for Spanish translations of Militant Liberty to be used in a citizenship program for the Ecuadorian police and armed forces and possibly in the schools.

"Along with technological aid we also need ideological aid," begged El Comercio, one of the country's leading newspapers. Ecuador's President was enthusiastic. Our Ambassador in Ecuador traveled to Washington to push the plan. Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson and Under Secretary of State Robert Murphy had already given approval. But the necessary final State Department clearances never came.

A year and a half later Ecuador's minister of national defense sought action through a formal note, "Efforts are being made with systematic persistence by a considerable number of Communist agents to distort the thinking of members of the armed forces in Ecuador," he warned. He pleaded that the study course was needed to "oppose vigorously the dialectics and sophistries of Communist propaganda" which were creating "uneasiness and confusion."

Still nothing happened.

"The program was killed by inaction," says Admiral Radford. "Some bureaucrats just have a horror of initiating things." And thus, by timidity and bureaucratic buck-passing, our State Department killed an opportunity to come to the aid of a friendly country that wanted our help in combating communism. Partly for lack of such help, Ecuador still has a problem of communism on its hands.

There is one obvious solution to the mess the bureaucracy has made. As early as 1953, studies of the National Security Council complex called for a cold-war chief to sit at the President's right hand along with a staff of specialists in diplomatic warfare, propaganda, intelligence, trade warfare, foreign-aid support and military liaison, to counter Communist intrusions.

These "classified" studies are still locked up, but their substance was openly voiced by courageous citizens. On April 5, 1955, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff appealed for a Cold War Strategy Board with a chief of Cabinet rank. "In gearing to fight a hot war," he said, "we call in military strategists and tacticians. Likewise, we must have specialists to fight a cold war * * * a mobilization of hard, knowledgeable anti-Communists who understand the issues and for whom it is not merely a job but a dedication."

At one time President Eisenhower, realizing the desperate need for a sort of super Cabinet chief to crack the whip over foot-dragging departments, wanted to put Gen. W. Bedell Smith to the job, even without portfolio. But Smith was then in poor health, and Ike hesitated to impose on him. Another time Vice President Nixon was suggested for the task, but the State Department prevented any appointment.

Throughout 1955, when Nelson Rockefeller served at the White House with his main assignment "to try to develop a more imaginative, creative approach to carrying out National Security Council policy," he was shocked by the "slow, even sluggish" operation of the whole setup. He was distressed by the vast number of State Department personnel who, by dominating the NSC machinery, were able to avoid unbiased evaluation of their actions. When he sought to obtain independent reports for the President as to the true state of the Department's progress, its officials complained to the President that he was "causing trouble" and "raising havoc with an orderly and effective procedure."

Moreover, Rockefeller was dismayed by the lack of centralized, up-to-the-minute information as to what was going on in the cold war around the world. When he sought to remedy this by having a room set aside where maps, visual aids, and copies of the latest cables and analyses would be quickly available to the President and his aids, State blocked him. At wit's end he offered to finance the entire operation himself. At that, he was informed that it would be illegal to spend private money in a public building. After thus failing to get through the bureaucracy's quagmire of negativism, Rockefeller could only resign.

The bitter opposition to Rockefeller is easy to understand, because his approach does not harbor incompetence. He says, "We have to get fast honest appraisals and have the courage to admit something is not working, the policy is not right, the program is not right, and revise it."

Yet the stupidity that results when individuals become cogs in a vast bureaucratic machine bent on self-protection and maintaining the status quo is compounded by an even more fundamental weakness: the appalling lack of understanding of communism's complex tactics by key people handling our foreign policy, propaganda, economic aid, and oversea relations. "If there's a single denominator," testified C. D. Jackson, one of those who put in time as a Presidential assistant trying to straighten out the cold-war mess, "it is the difficulty of finding Americans who have the elementary knowledge of the conflict and how to go about our end of this very real and continuing war."

The obvious remedy proposed by such students of communism both in and out of government is a Freedom Academy that will be democracy's answer to the Communist training schools for the tactics of world revolution—a "West Point" to teach our own cold-war managers, diplomats, ICA and USIA people the full scope of the Communist strategy and to equip them with the ways to carry the war back to the Communists and win. It would also offer postgraduate courses to high school and university teachers and would be open to any of the 50,000 foreign students in American colleges.

The idea was brushed off by the Washington bureaucracy, but important Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats, came to its aid and introduced Freedom Academy bills in House and Senate. The Senate Judiciary Committee, unanimously reporting out the measure, described it as "one of the most important ever introduced in Congress, * * *, a practical, fundamental approach to our national survival."

"We have failed to recognize sufficiently that it takes more than dollars to win the cold war," added Senator KARL E. MUNDT of South Dakota. "It takes individuals who have been trained."

"The amateur will always lose against the professional," said Representative WALTER H. JUDD of Minnesota. "I want some professionals on our side."

Nevertheless, because of departmental opposition, it was not possible to slip the measure through the Senate until the closing hours of the last session; then it died because the House failed to act. "The horrible thing is that there is a complete failure to comprehend the menace of communism even among many Members of Congress," Senator THOMAS J. DODD of Connecticut, Democratic vice chairman of the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee, told me. And his record shows he is no Red witch hunter.

So for failure to fight back, the net is pulled in on us. The Communists set up more revolutionary-training schools not only in Latin America and in Asia but in the United States itself. Riots and revolutions sweep Latin America. Our southeast Asian allies slip toward neutralism, and with Communists in their governments teeter toward complete Red takeover despite vast amounts of foreign aid. Even our attempts to bring peace to the Congo through the United Nations are impeded by Communist influences in that organization, and this despite the fact that we are producing the millions of extra dollars needed to keep the show going and finance the U.N. effort.

Meantime, we bobble every chance to score against our opponents. Last fall our Government knew that Cuba's Castro had paid in advance for Harlem lodgings. Yet when he stalked out of a midtown New York hotel crying he wasn't wanted, our information services remained politely aloof instead of exposing his lie to the world while Havana, Moscow, and Peiping had a propaganda field day all over Latin America.

The way to stop this sort of defeat by default is already on the record. We must set up a cold war commander, as proposed back in 1953 and 1955, working in close consultation with the President and heading a small professional staff of men skilled in total political warfare. They must have whatever authority is needed over the current operating departments to see that their orders are carried out instantaneously. Executive efficiency is necessary if we are to win the very real war in which we are engaged.

We must also have a freedom academy. Its first task will be to acquaint our diplomats and department officials with the facts of life about Communist aims, strategy, and tactics, for, as the congressional report on the academy stated: "The various agencies and bureaus can be shuffled and reshuffled * * * but until they are staffed by highly motivated personnel who have been systematically and intensively trained in the vast and complex field of total political warfare, we can expect little improvement in our situation."

The academy will graduate highly motivated elite cadres for freedom. Then, with such personnel, we can develop a science of counteraction against Communist subversion. We can, for example, begin to counter such Communist-front techniques as "anti-colonial" and "anti-imperialist" campaigns with more effective anti-violence, anti-censorship, anti-suppression-of-speech campaigns.

Thus organized, with bold imaginative leadership and with more freedom fighters ever strengthening our framework, we can at last begin to win some battles of our own—and not just in the free world, but among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

DAKOTA CENTENNIAL

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I am calling attention to the Dakota Territory Centennial celebration which is being held this year to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Dakota Territory on March 2, 1861.

North Dakota was a part of this territory and the people of North Dakota are making plans for an elaborate celebration of this memorable event.

North Dakota's Legislature is playing a vital part in these plans and has passed a resolution urging the Postmaster General to issue commemorative stamps honoring the Dakota Territory Centennial.

I am pleased by this action of the legislature and I would like to join in urging the Postmaster General to issue such commemorative stamps honoring two great States, North Dakota and South Dakota, on an important anniversary in their history.

THE RELATIVE COST OF SOCIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, although reasonable men can reasonably differ on how much should be spent by the Federal Government to implement legislation generally identified as welfare legislation, we should at least have our facts straight on how much is spent for welfare projects as compared to other Federal expenditures and as compared to previous welfare expenditures, before we praise or condemn the President's program on the ground that it is heavily ladened with welfare items. Such items are usually identified as housing, health, education, revitalization of economically distressed areas, and direct assistance to the needy. The following tables on Government expenditures by function and sources of revenue are revealing:

Total Government expenditures by function

[In constant 1958 dollars]

	Per capita per year		Per family per year		Per family per month		Change in monthly expense from 1952 to 1958
	1952	1958	1952	1958	1952	1958	
Local parks and recreation	2.67	3.95	9.08	13.43	.76	1.12	Up 0.36.
Local fire protection	4.07	5.04	13.84	17.14	1.15	1.43	Up 0.28.
Police	7.40	10.21	25.16	34.68	2.10	2.90	Up 0.80.
Sewage and sanitation	6.89	8.68	23.42	29.51	1.95	2.46	Up 0.51.
Housing and community development.	6.07	4.62	20.63	15.71	1.72	1.31	Down 0.41.
Postal service	18.14	19.20	61.68	65.28	5.14	5.44	Up 0.30.
Public welfare	19.62	21.80	66.71	74.12	5.56	6.18	Up 0.62.
Veterans	17.84	19.94	60.65	67.70	5.05	5.64	Up 0.59.
Hospitals and health	22.21	26.87	75.51	81.36	6.30	6.78	Up 0.48.
Natural resources and farm	34.85	43.15	118.49	146.71	9.87	12.23	Up 2.36.
Interest	44.47	42.48	151.20	144.43	12.60	12.04	Down 0.56.
General control	12.48	14.64	42.43	49.78	3.54	4.15	Up 0.61.
Highways	32.73	50.23	112.28	170.78	9.36	14.26	Up 4.90.
Education	66.64	97.17	226.58	330.38	18.84	27.53	Up 8.69.
National defense	313.71	266.23	1,066.61	905.18	88.88	75.43	Down 13.45.
All other	31.05	33.63	105.57	114.34	8.80	9.53	Up 0.73.
Total expenditures	644.88	667.86	2,192.59	2,270.72	182.71	189.23	Up 3.5 percent.[1]
Personal income	1,896.00	2,071.00	6,446.00	7,040.00	537.16	586.67	Up 9.0 percent.
Personal disposable income	1,654.00	1,826.00	5,624.00	6,208.00	468.67	517.33	Up 10.4 percent.
Personal consumption	1,525.00	1,686.00	5,185.00	5,732.00	432.08	477.67	Up 10.5 percent.

[1] Government expenditures grew only about ⅙ as rapidly as personal disposable income.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960.

All Government expenditures in 1958 were paid from these revenue sources

	Percent
Individual income tax	31
Sales and excise taxes	18
Corporation income tax	18
Property tax	12
All other taxes	5
Total taxes	84
Charges made for services	12
Miscellaneous revenue	4
Total	100

Families provided directly about 70 percent of all money spent by all levels of government.

Source: Statistical Abstract of United States, 1960.

Federal budget expenditures, 1960

[In billions of dollars]

Total expenditures	$78.4
Major national security	43.8
Military assistance	1.8
International aid	1.7
Veterans	5.2
Interest on debt	9.4
Total war expenditures	61.9

Seventy-nine percent of total Federal expenditure in 1960 was war related.

Other than war expenditures	$16.5
International affairs	.4
Labor and welfare	4.4
Stabilization of farm prices	3.6

Federal budget expenditures, 1960—Con.

[In billions of dollars]

Agriculture	1.6
Natural resources	1.8
Commerce and housing	3.0
General government	1.7

Other than war and farm price support, the Federal Government spent $12.9 billion to provide all other services, or about the same amount it spent on the Air Force.

Government purchases of goods and services (per capita in 1958 prices)

Year	Federal national defense	Federal all other	State and local
1939	$24	$75	$169
1946	184	52	129
1954	298	49	198
1958	253	44	228
1960	243	43	255

Source: President's Economic Report, 1959. Economic Indicators, January 1961.

Mr. Speaker, a careful review of the above information reveals that over three-fourths of all Federal expenditures go for such war related items as armaments, interest on the war-created public debt, and veterans' programs; that the ratio of war related expenditures to all other Federal expenditures is approximately 5 to 1; that identifiable welfare items are only a fraction of the one-fifth spent on other than war items; that the single item of interest on the public debt is considerably more than the combined public welfare expenditures by the Federal Government; and that while Federal expenditures for goods and services for other than war related purchases has gone down considerably since 1939, State and local expenditures have risen significantly.

We should observe also that nondefense expenditures of the Federal Government average more than 5½ percent of the Nation's gross national product 30 years ago, while less than 4½ percent of the GNP was allocated to nonmilitary services in the 1960 Federal budget.

The issue of more or less welfare projects and of more or less spending for such projects will and should continue to be studied and debated, but we must know where we have gone before we can intelligently consider where we are going and where we want to go.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD three items pertaining to aid to education.

The first is a paper which the Library of Congress prepared at my request citing the views of the late Senator Robert A. Taft on Federal aid to education. Since the debate over this issue has reached full bloom since the death of

this great conservative, millions of Americans and perhaps many Members of Congress do not realize that Senator Taft was an advocate of Federal aid to education.

The Library's research on the Senator's views follows:

THE POSITION OF THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

SELECTED STATEMENTS

Four examples of the late Senator Robert A. Taft's thinking on Federal aid to education may be cited to indicate the development of his position on this matter. The first was included in the Senate report that accompanied S. 1305, August 24, 1939. Second was in an address given before the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators on March 6, 1947. The third instance was on the Senate floor on March 24, 1948, during the debate on the Educational Finance Act of 1947. At the annual meeting of the American Council on Education on May 6, 1949, the late Senator Taft spoke on the subject "Education in the Congress" and again expressed his views on Federal aid to education. Excerpts from these four instances are as follows:

Senator Robert A. Taft, from Ohio, U.S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Report No. 244, part 2, to accompany S. 1305, August 24, 1939

"If there is any activity in which the people are able to stand on their own feet, without being nursed from Washington, education is that activity. * * * There is another reason why this activity should not be undertaken at the present time. The Federal Government has undertaken many new activities within the past 6 years. The idealism which prompted them and the underlying purpose of many of them have been praiseworthy. * * * It seems unwise to take on another tremendous administrative task before we have digested that which we have already bitten off. * * * Certainly until the budget is balanced, it is unwise to take on another source of permanent and almost unlimited expense."

Address before the American Association of School Administrators, March 1947

"Not only are some of the States poor, but States in general have a limited power of taxation. They cannot raise their taxes much above those of other States, or their citizens and industries would drift into those other States. * * * The Federal Government should assist those States desiring to put a floor under essential services in relief, in medical care, in housing, and in education. * * * Equality of opportunity lies at the basis of this Republic. No child can begin to have equality of opportunity unless he has medical care in his youth, adequate food, decent surroundings, and above all, effective schooling. It is the concern of the entire Nation to see that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution are translated into reality." (The Elementary School Journal, vol. XLVIII, Sept. 1947: 7.)

Address before the U.S. Senate, March 24, 1948

"Four years ago I opposed the then pending bill on this subject (i.e., Federal assistance to education); but in the course of that debate it became so apparent that many children in the United States were left without education, and then it became apparent, upon further study, that that was not the fault apparently of the States where they lived, but rather of the financial abilities of the States, that I could see no way to meet the condition which now exists regarding illiteracy in the United States and lack of education in the United States without some Federal assistance, particularly for those States which today are considered below the average of wealth in the United States. * * * I feel strongly that in the fields of education, health, housing, and relief the Federal Government has a secondary obligation.* * * In my judgment the important thing is to avoid direct Federal action. The moment we have direct Federal action, power is concentrated in Washington. If we can work out an effective State-aid system, which will leave the administration in the States, I believe we can escape the danger of concentration and can remain merely an auxiliary assisting power rather than an actual operating power." (The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, pt. 3, pp. 3347, 3349.)

Address before the American Council on Education, May 6, 1949

"I feel very strongly that in the educational field—as in health, in welfare, and in housing—the primary responsibility and right belong to the State and local governments. This is our constitutional system. I do not know whether the Federal Government has power actually to regulate those fields. It has power to spend money in them, which is derived from the spending power, the power to levy taxes for the general welfare; but there is no direct mention of power in the welfare field or field of education in the Federal Constitution. I think the Federal function is a secondary one in education, to come along and see that it is possible for the State to do the job. The necessity for it arises very largely out of the limited tax power of the State." (The Educational Record, vol. 30, July 1949: 346.)

The second is an open letter which the Honorable LEE METCALF, now a Member of the other body, addressed to former Vice President Richard M. Nixon last September, after the 86th Congress adjourned.

There are millions of Americans who also do not realize that Federal aid to education is an established fact—that thousands of local school districts are now receiving, and have received for many years, Federal assistance both for construction and for operating expenses, including teachers' salaries. Mr. METCALF's letter contains an excellent review of the Federal programs of aid to federally impacted districts, and underscores the fact that these programs have never been marred by Federal control. His letter follows:

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Since I have been traveling over Montana, what I take to be a fairly complete account of your September 11 appearance on the "Meet the Press" television show has just come to my attention.

I am appalled at your statement that Federal funds for teachers' salaries would mean Federal control over the curriculum of the schools.

As presiding officer of the U.S. Senate for the past 7½ years, you must surely be aware that we are now providing Federal aid to education to some 3,500 school districts nationwide in which between one-fifth and one-fourth of the youngsters of this Nation are attending school.

This aid, for school maintenance and operation—including textbooks and teachers' salaries—goes, as you know, to so-called federally impacted areas, where a Federal installation, such as an airbase, has increased the demand for local government services, among them schools.

Under Public Law 874, Congress has provided $688.5 million to school districts in every State in the Union for maintenance and operation of public schools. At least 65 percent of this, or $447.5 million, has been used to pay teachers' salaries.

While this program began under a Democratic administration in 1950, it has always received strong bipartisan support. This act, and Public Law 815, providing Federal aid for construction of classrooms in federally impacted areas, are among the most popular pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress.

In all the years these programs have been in effect, there has never been a charge of Federal control of any aspect of education, including curriculum. Nor has there ever been any directive as to how, how much, or to whom teachers' salaries should be paid.

The most recent proposal for Federal aid to pay teachers' salaries came from President Eisenhower who, in his 27 January 1958 message to Congress, said:

"The administration therefore recommends that the Congress authorize Federal grants to the States on a matching basis, for this purpose. These funds would be used in the discretion of the States and the local school systems, either to help employ additional qualified science and mathematics teachers, to help purchase additional laboratory equipment and other materials, to supplement the salaries of qualified science and mathematics teachers, or for other related programs."

Contrary to President Eisenhower's request, the National Defense Education Act does not earmark funds for teachers of specific subjects, since to do so would give preference to certain aspects of the curriculum and would be Federal control, which the Democratic Congress rejects. The fact remains, however, that the administration, of which you are a part, in 1958 recommended Federal aid to pay teachers' salaries, which you now abhor because you say it would mean Federal control.

The Democratic-sponsored school aid bill, S. 8, which passed the Senate on 4 February 1960, while you were presiding, did not provide Federal funds for teachers' salaries. Instead, it gave to the States the option of using Federal funds to pay teachers' salaries if the States so chose. This was to guarantee to the States and local districts control over their schools, rather than to force them to use Federal contributions for building, as under the administration plan, even if they had to amend their constitutions or change their laws to avail themselves of this Federal aid.

Either you do not know that the administration bill would have provided 17 million Federal dollars for the first year to the States for construction or you chose to ignore the fact. For if, as you claim, this would release State money in like amount to be used for teachers' salaries, it would amount to 94 cents per teacher per month for the present corps of teachers which the U.S. Office of Education says is 135,000 short of meeting present classroom needs. I know no one else who sincerely argues that 94 cents per month would recruit and retain the kind of people our children need as teachers.

If your statements are part of a calculated effort to hoodwink the American people, this scheme is unworthy of one who aspires to the Presidency of the United States. If your statements were based on ignorance, this also should give pause to the voters in November.

Sincerely,

LEE METCALF.

The third is an article which shows that existing Federal programs aiding education are helping, and have been helping for years, pay teacher salaries

both in the public schools and the colleges without in any way undermining the autonomy of local school administrators or impairing academic freedoms. The article, "U.S. Pays Teachers Now," published October 9, 1960, in the Washington Sunday Star, was written by George W. Oakes, a Washington journalist. Mr. Oakes, a Princeton graduate with a master of arts degree in history from Oxford University, has written on education for the Louisville, Ky., Courier Journal as well as the Star. His article from the Star follows:

WHAT THE SPEAKERS IGNORE—U.S. PAYS TEACHERS NOW

(By George W. Oakes)

Although Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon in their first TV encounter argued whether the Federal Government should pay teachers' salaries, in fact, Congress long ago approved a policy under which the Government contributes to such salaries. Federal programs authorized by law have for many years made funds available to teachers in both public schools and colleges.

Here are some of the most striking examples of how the Federal Government helps finance teachers' salaries:

One out of every four public-school children in this country is taught by a teacher who receives part of his salary from the Government under the federally affected area program.

More than half of all vocational training teachers in the Nation's public schools are paid an average of $1,000 a year in Federal funds under the Government's vocational training program.

Last summer alone 14 percent of all the country's public-school science and mathematics teachers were given Federal stipends and dependency allowances which enabled them to attend the National Science Foundation's summer training institutes.

Teachers in land-grant colleges have been entitled to receive Federal funds as a portion of their salary under a program begun nearly a hundred years ago.

All teachers in the District of Columbia public schools have received their salaries from the Federal Government by annual act of Congress since the establishment of the District of Columbia school system.

Several teacher training programs operating under the National Defense Education Act use Federal funds for salaries and stipends of school and college teachers.

In some cases funds are turned over to the States to be allotted by them to the school district, but in other operations the Federal Government gives the money directly to the local school district concerned.

FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREA

The Federal Government provides funds for the operation of public schools in areas that have Federal installations because the local communities are unable otherwise to care for the education of children whose families have been attracted to the region as a result of Federal employment. Most of these areas surround military establishments—Air Force bases, naval dockyards, Army posts, atomic energy plants, etc. In these places local revenue sources have been substantially reduced by extensive Federal nontaxable property and local school needs have been greatly strained by the influx of Federal workers. In the country as a whole, local taxes account for more than half of school operating budgets.

Since President Truman signed this legislation in 1950, more than a billion dollars of Federal money has been made available to almost 4,000 federally affected school districts. This year's appropriation of $187,310,000 is a million dollars larger than a year ago. Both political parties have enthusiastically endorsed this activity.

The program is now so widespread that 25 percent of all the Nation's public school children, or more than 9 million pupils, attend schools in federally affected areas. California receives by far the largest amount of Federal funds because of its many Government operations. Virginia is second and Maryland fourth in distribution of Federal money. The amount of Federal contribution to the total operating expenses of these schools varies from 1 percent to 80 percent. Five percent is a national average.

It is reliably estimated that, on the average, 62 percent of this Federal money is used for the payment of teachers' salaries in line with the national pattern.

Here is the way it works out in the Washington area with its extensive Federal installations: In Arlington County, Va., the Federal Government supplies 15 percent of that county's operating costs of which 61 percent was spent in teachers' salaries. Across the Potomac, Montgomery County, Md., receives 7 percent of its school operating budget from the Government. Of this total 60 percent was used to pay teachers' salaries.

The question of Federal control of those schools receiving Government money does not arise because the law states specifically that no direction or supervision is to be exercised over the personnel, curriculum or program of instruction. The Office of Education deposits the funds in the school district's operating account where they are mixed with State and local contributions.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM

President Woodrow Wilson inaugurated the vocational training program in 1918 based on the idea that vocational training is essential to the Nation's welfare and that the States cannot conduct this instruction without financial aid from the Federal Government. Fifty million dollars a year is currently given to the States according to their population and $685 million of Federal money has been appropriated since the program began. Federal grants must be matched by State or local contributions.

Ninety percent of these Federal funds for the development and improvement of vocational training is spent on teachers' salaries. There are 40,000 vocational training teachers, mostly in public high schools, who derive between 20 and 25 percent of their salary from the Federal Government.

Fifteen thousand out of the 24,000 high schools conduct courses in agriculture, distribution, trades and industries, home economics and practical nursing for 4 million students. The curriculum is determined by the local school board and is in no way controlled by the Federal Government.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

One of the functions of the National Science Foundation is to improve the quality of the Nation's mathematics and science high school teachers. Most of the Foundation's $65 million educational budget is spent for this purpose. In fact the law requires that a minimum of $30 million be used for the supplementary training of secondary school teachers. Nearly all the funds go to pay teachers' salaries. For several years it has been sponsoring 6- to 9-week summer institutes conducted by universities and colleges throughout the country. These institutions select the teachers who attend and fix the course of study.

Last summer, 17,415 science and mathematics teachers—14 percent of the Nation's total—were enrolled in 392 institutes. For their operation the National Science Foundation provided $19 million of which 73 percent was used for stipends, dependency allowances and travel to enable the teachers to attend. Sixteen percent of the Federal funds went for salaries to the college faculties who ran the courses. The subjects studied included mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and other natural sciences.

Also, the Foundation operates full academic year training institutes for high school teachers at a cost of $9 million. Seventy-seven percent of this money is used to compensate the 1,491 teachers in attendance.

DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

In addition, training institutes are being held for 1,751 college teachers in the sciences and mathematics. Of the $2 million which the Government puts up, 68 percent is used to pay stipends, dependency allowances, and travel to the participants and 21 percent for staff faculty salaries.

The National Defense Education Act involves several activities which involve the use of Federal funds for teachers' salaries. As the act is intended to stimulate the study of modern foreign languages, the Office of Education has organized summer training institutes for teachers. This year 2,013 elementary and high school teachers attended 37 such programs conducted in French, German, Spanish, Italian, and Russian. Five such institutes for 117 language teachers are in operation during the present academic year. In order to make it possible for teachers to participate the Government pays them a weekly stipend plus dependency and travel allowances.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Another major purpose of the act is to improve guidance and counseling services in the public school system. This past summer 2,746 high school teachers and counselors attended 83 training institutes. For doing so the Federal Government paid each one a weekly stipend of $75 and a $15 dependency allowance.

The Land-Grant Act of 1862, in providing that land granted by the Federal Government to the State be sold to establish college endowment funds, intended that such money was to go solely for instruction. As a result of subsequent laws appropriating annual Federal funds to maintain the original policy of land-grant colleges receive $5 million this year to help finance faculty salaries. Congress recently increased the amount to $14 million for the coming fiscal year. These funds are used for instruction in agriculture, the mechanical arts, the English language as related to the mechanical arts, mathematics, plus the natural, physical and economic sciences.

CONGRESS SETS SCALE

Ever since the establishment of the District of Columbia school system Congress has not only set the amounts of teachers' salaries but also established the pay scale. Approximately 58 percent of the current $50 million appropriation for District of Columbia schools goes to pay teachers' salaries. The only requirements that Congress has laid down are that:

District of Columbia schools must teach the adverse effects of narcotics and alcohol.

District of Columbia schools must conduct physical education courses 5 days a week.

In addition to all these ways in which the Federal Government helps to finance salaries of teachers in the general education system of the country, there are a wide variety of educational programs which the Government operates completely on its own, such as schools and colleges run by the Defense Department, schools for children of American Indians, the Merchant Marine Academy, and countless others under many Government departments and agencies.

WITHHOLDING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' INCOME TAXES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which would permit the Federal Government to withhold income taxes owed by Federal employees to cities having a population of 75,000 or more.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, has in the last few sessions of Congress been the victim of more misunderstanding than a volume on philosophy. A simple bookkeeping bill, introduced to help city and municipal authorities collect local taxes, this legislation has been attacked as creating a new tax, turning the Federal Government into a tax collection agency for local authorities, and as authorizing the creation of an entire new bureau of the Federal Government.

Nothing could be further from the truth. This bill does not authorize any new tax, nor does it establish any new department of the Government for local tax collection. On the contrary, it is a very simple housekeeping idea which would allow the Federal Government to withhold local taxes from the salaries of its employees in the same way that Federal and State income taxes are presently withheld.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is necessary to dwell at length on the merits of this bill. This legislation received the approval of both the House and the Senate last year and failed of enactment simply because the House took no action on the Senate-approved bill prior to adjournment. Nevertheless, for the record, I would like to point out that the legislation in question received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department and additionally has the endorsement of the Federation of Government Employees, the National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Postal Clerks Union and the National Association of Mail Handlers, which are national associations representing employees who would be directly affected by enactment of this legislation.

This proposal, Mr. Speaker, represents simple reciprocity in extending a policy already established and adopted by the Congress, a policy which commits the Federal Government to cooperation with State governments in the area of withholding and which is based upon firm recognition of their cooperation with the Federal Government in fiscal matters generally and in tax withholding particularly. Implementation of this legislation would impose little increase in cost to the Federal Government. It provides for withholding by the Federal Government only in the case of incorporated cities with populations of 75,000 or more in order to limit the administrative burden to be assumed by the Federal Government. It is, in other words, limited in operation to cities of a sufficiently large population that administration and tax-collecting procedures are already in existence.

In view of the affirmative action in both the Senate and House last year, Mr. Speaker, I commend my bill to your attention and hope that we can take speedy and favorable action on the measure this session.

TO FEDERAL CAREERS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the wisest enactments of the last Congress was the legislation which gave Federal employees a 7½ percent raise in salary. The acknowledgment by Congress of the need to improve the lot of the Federal worker not only made it easier for Government to attract qualified persons, but also was a substantial material and moral aid to the thousands of people who carry out the unglamorous and often unrewarding functions of the Government. The job of placing the Federal worker on a sound footing, however, is unfortunately still incomplete, for there is confusion, failure, and even injustice in our Federal-employee grievance procedures.

In the belief that the full recognition of unions is the first step toward minimizing these evils, I am today introducing legislation to give to Federal employees unions the recognition which they so thoroughly deserve.

Because of the public-service nature of Federal employment, the union rights of these employees are understandably limited in certain respects. But the fact that it is unlawful to strike against the Government should not reduce employee unions to completely impotent and unrecognized representatives of Government employees. Legislation to give full recognition to employee unions for the purpose of grievances and appeals is a must. Some Government departments claim this is already the case in practice; and that therefore such legislation is not needed. If this is true, or to the extent that it is true, passage of this measure will do no harm. If it is not the case, as I believe, then the legislation which I have introduced to grant this recognition is vitally needed.

Mr. Speaker, this need was brought out in a report of the House Subcommittee on Civil Service during the 82d Congress, when a very detailed and excellent investigation was made of our grievance procedures.

The report—which is even more true today than it was 10 years ago—pointed out:

> There has been too little consultation by departments, agencies, and the Civil Service Commission with established employee groups. * * * The subcommittee had an opportunity to observe at firsthand the work being done by the larger employee organizations, and found that these organizations are a real force for good in keeping purely vexatious and frivolous appeals and grievances at a minimum.

In addition to full recognition for employee unions, it becomes clear that there is need not only for improved administration of present grievance machinery—its simplification and clarification—but new legislation to provide an equal rights of appeal for both preference and nonpreference Federal employees within certain limitations. Moreover, it is vital that supervisors be given special training in how to inform their employees of appeals and grievance rights and how to handle grievances properly.

Now I would like to go from this general summary into some detail on this complex subject. After thorough examination and investigation, relying heavily on the yeoman's job done by the House Subcommittee on Civil Service in the 83d Congress, I have found that the following situation seems to exist.

There are literally as many different appeals and grievance systems as there are departments and agencies. The confusion of thinking represented by these many procedures extends, also, to opinions on what should be done to improve them. There is no better exposition of the disparity in administrative handling of appeals and grievances than a simple comparison of the regulations which provide minimum and maximum rights. Three old-line departments, for instance, have no provision at all for real appeals from removals and suspensions. There is no formal hearing or right to confront and cross-examine an accuser. In these departments the charges and the employee's answer are reviewed at bureau level, in the Office of Personnel, and in the Office of the Secretary before the penalty is finalized. At the opposite extreme we find a large department which some time ago reported an average time for appellate proceedings—complete with hearings, reviews, and rereviews—of about 5 months. While it is understood that this period may have been reduced somewhat in recent months, this department's program appears rather more extensive and detailed than necessary.

There is singular unanimity of opinion with respect to the undesirability of the existing situation. Almost to a man, top personnel and operating officials have sharply criticized the complexity and prolixity of the present laws, regulations, and procedures.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the failure of Civil Service Commission leadership in this field became apparent. Weakness and looseness of the Commission's rules and regulations were held responsible for their failure to act under the implied authority of the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 and the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

But the Civil Service Commission is not wholly to blame for the confusion and lack of leadership. During the hearings, concern was expressed at the lack of cooperation on the part of some Government agencies in complying with Civil Service Commission directives.

As a result of its study, the subcommittee had among its findings the following:

First. The primary responsibility for the prompt, economical, and just disposition of appeals and grievances rests with each executive department and agency and is an integral part of overall management responsibility. The importance of this principle has never been fully recognized; nor is it spelled out with sufficient clarity anywhere in the present law or regulations.

Second. The executive branch of the Government is without adequate machinery to guarantee equal and fair treatment to all Federal employees in respect to appeals from adverse personnel actions.

Third. The volume and seriousness of appeals and grievances are directly related to supervisory ability and alertness or the lack of it. It has been conservatively estimated that this one factor is concerned in 90 percent of appeals and grievances. There is urgent need for improvement in supervisory training, especially in the understanding and handling of employees' problems.

Fourth. The departments and agencies are not making effectual use of even such appeals machinery as presently exists. This results from lack of supervisory ability mentioned above and from deficiencies in the appeals machinery itself.

Fifth. There has been too little consultation by departments and agencies—and by the Civil Service Commission—with established employee groups.

Sixth. The subcommittee had an opportunity to observe at firsthand the work being done by the larger employee organizations, and found that these organizations are a real force for good in keeping purely vexatious and frivolous appeals and grievances at a minimum.

Seventh. The appeals procedure of the Civil Service Commission and of the agencies is slow, cumbersome and repetitive, and has far too many steps and levels of consideration, and in some respects is practically useless. The civil service procedure does not even purport to protect nonpreference employees. The Commission affords protection in a negative fashion for preference employees to the extent that it evades jurisdiction of substantive matters and restricts itself to review of compliance with procedures.

Eighth. There is no adequate provision of law for recompense in all cases of erroneous or improper dismissal, suspension, or demotion of Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, the facts speak for themselves. Our present grievance and appeals procedures for Federal employees are desperately in need of overhauling. I hope the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give the House an opportunity to vote on a bill containing the recommendations of its subcommittee. Meanwhile, I urge that the first step be taken for a more fair and workable system by granting full recognition to employee unions, as embodied in the bill I am now introducing.

NEED FOR A NEW UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Spring I was one of a number of Congressmen who introduced legislation to revise the unemployment compensation program. At that time I urged immediate action, pointing out that the period of prosperity would probably not continue indefinitely and that we must be prepared for any future economic crisis.

That crisis is now at hand. We have today more unemployed than at any time since 1940. The unemployment rate is now an alarming 6.5 percent. Many people have been out of work for months; many have already exhausted their jobless benefits. In New Jersey, for example, at the end of 1960, 350 workers were exhausting their benefits every working day.

As in every period of recession, the glaring inadequacies of the program become distinctly apparent. Programs vary sharply from State to State, benefits are more appropriate for the wage cost index of 1940 than of 1961, and the duration of payments is simply too short to meet any extended slackening of the economy.

The President pointed to these problems in his press conference last Wednesday when he emphasized the need to overhaul the entire unemployment compensation program.

The current crisis is too severe to await a permanent revision of the system and again, as in 1958, we will have to authorize supplemental benefits on a temporary basis. But let us not do just this and forget the basic problem. Let us seize the opportunity to create a permanently revised program. We need to increase benefits, extend the length of time for which they are available, and bring uniform standards to replace the present choas and confusion. Had we accomplished this last session, there would be no need for the temporary, emergency legislation which we now anticipate.

If we had such a program, much of the hardship, and perhaps much of the severity of the current recession might have been avoided. It is important to remember that jobless benefits not only help the worker to survive periods of slack, but help the economy itself to ward off recessionary trends or at least to throw them off more quickly. But only a truly adequate unemployment compensation program can accomplish this.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR COLLEGE TUITION PAYMENTS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill, which would provide financial assistance to students and their families in the form of an income tax exemption. This proposal, which I also introduced in a lesser degree last year as H.R. 13073, would allow the taxpayer a deduction up to $1,000 for tuition payments for each dependent or for himself. The aid envisioned in the bill would create no costly Federal bureaucracy, would not open the door to Federal interference or control of education, would raise no church and State problems. It would merely assist parents in their task of providing an education for their children by allowing them to deduct a portion of the expense for tax purposes from their gross income figure.

We have heard so often of late the generalization that in our present advanced society it is imperative both to the student himself and to the society in which he eventually will work that he achieve the maximum education of which he is capable. The better trained an individual is, the higher his potential contribution toward his society.

It is interesting to note the continued emphasis given in the last campaign to the problem of economic growth. Is our rate of economic growth slowing down dangerously in relation to that of the Soviet Union? we were asked. Much was said at the time about the level of interest rates and other Federal monetary policies, and their relation to economic growth. But recently many noted economic experts have stressed what is perhaps a much more basic factor in economic growth—a sufficient source of trained manpower. Earl E. Mundt, professor of economics at New York University, stated recently:

> The most serious long-range labor problem in the United States is that of providing a supply of individuals possessing higher skills and techniques in the productive processes, inventors, scientists, and administrators sufficient in number and adequately trained to keep the Nation in the forefront of current and future progress. The scarcity of such labor is well recognized.

The imbalance between the expanding demands of American business, industry, and science for employees with adequate high level training and a tightened supply is already reaching a critical point, and is expected to get worse in a few years.

George S. Patterson, a business executive, said much the same thing in a recent article:

> The high school or college graduate must know that the opportunity for individual initiative is as great today in this country as it ever was. * * * The most crying need of any company right now is not raw material, not sales, no, not even new capital, rather it is youthful talent.

And John Kenneth Galbraith, the noted professor of economics at Harvard University stressed in his article in the Saturday Evening Post's "Adventures of the Mind" series that the individual worker had become the most important factor in the economic progress of the Nation. He stated:

> Both technological advance and improved skills and abilities are the product of personal development. Machines do not improve themselves; they are the product of improved men. And most technological advance is now the result, not of accident of inspiration or genius, but of highly purposeful effort. Once we had to wait for the Edisons and Wrights. Now, through education and organization, we get something approaching the same results from much more common clay.
>
> So it comes to this. We now get the larger part of our industrial growth not from more capital investment but from improvements in men and improvements brought about by improved men. And this process of technological advance has become fairly predictable. We get from men pretty much what we invest in them.

There are various tax devices designed to get more students into college, to promote research, and to improve the ability of taxpayers to finance the resultant cost. Most proposals will equally benefit all educational institutions and students majoring in art, the humanities, or ancient history, as well as science, physics or mathematics.

Beneficiaries of the proposed tax relief fall into three broad categories:

First. Aids to student, parents, and other benefactors shouldering the cost of attending school. These allow taxpayers to take an additional exemption or deduction, or tax credit.

Second. Aids to persons already in professions. These allow established professionals, such as schoolteachers, to take a deduction for expenses incurred in furthering their education.

Third. Aids to educational institutions. These increase the percentages of income that individuals or corporations may deduct for contributions or liberalize the deductions by industry for expenditures of, or contributions to, funds for basic research at educational institutions.

My proposal aims at helping the parents of the Nation invest in their children, and through their children to invest in the future of the country. Maximum education for each child has long been the hope and dream of every parent, but it has also long been an extreme financial burden. Today's parents find higher education even more important for the future of their children than it was 15 or 20 years ago, but they find the costs continually rising. A recent survey by the U.S. Office of Education, for example, reported that in 1958–59 tuition rates alone in institutions of higher education had increased slightly more than one-third on the average during the past 4 years.

But it may be asked whether the education of those children whose parents cannot bear the financial burden really is that important to the Nation. I have already pointed out the critical importance of an abundance of intelligent, well-trained workers. And statistical studies have shown no correlation between ability and family income. The family earning $3,000 a year is just as apt to have a talented child, whose abilities are needed by his country, as is a family with an annual income of $20,000. My proposal is aimed at helping to ease the financial burden that a college education places on the average family in America. The cost of providing a college education is certainly as staggering a financial burden as excess medical expenses for which a deduction is currently allowed.

Opponents of any type of assistance to parents or students will still argue that there are ways that the student from a lower income family can achieve an education if he really wants to. There are scholarships, there are work opportunities while in school, and so forth. This may well be true. But the fact nevertheless remains that shortage of personal and/or family finances is a prime reason that talented high school students give for not entering college in the first place, or that college dropouts give for leaving college. For example, the U.S. Office of Education conducted a lengthy study entitled "Retention and Withdrawal of College Students," which attempted to determine why students go to college, why they transfer from one institution to another, why they drop out, et cetera. In discussing dropouts, the report stated:

> College dropouts represent an alarming waste of our most competent manpower. Withdrawals cannot be completely eliminated, but they can be sharply reduced—or so many administrators and educators believe. If they can be reduced, the result will be a larger professional work force and a higher cultural and intellectual level of citizenry contributing to the advancement of society.
>
> In college, as in the marketplace, the ability of the consumer to pay for the product is very important. Much attention has been given and more must be given to the problems of superior students who are at an economic disadvantage in financing the cost of attending high quality colleges. Keeping the doors of such institutions open is not enough. While not first in importance, the financial difficulties many high quality students face in entering college must be reckoned with. This lack of financial resources is a major cause of transfer or of dropping out of college altogether.

This report found further that there was a definite relationship between the family income level and the student's persistence in college. It was determined that—

> The median family income of students who persisted to graduation, $5,947, was more than $1,000 above that of students who dropped out during or at the end of the first registration period. This is a statistically significant difference.
>
> The median annual income of parents of nongraduating students was $437 less than that of parents whose children graduated.

We are left then with some inescapable facts. If the Nation is to continue to progress economically, scientifically, and so forth, in the modern world, we will need an ever-increasing supply of talented, well-trained workers. Talented children appear in financially pressured families as well as in families which can afford to send their children to college. Despite scholarship and work opportunities, it is apparently still extremely difficult for some students and their families to finance a college education. When this education becomes impossible for a talented child, both the child himself and the Nation are penalized.

We must therefore find some means of increasing the economic feasibility of college attendance for the bright but financially limited students. The tax device of granting a taxpayer a tax deduction for tuition paid for himself, his spouse, or his dependent is used because I believe it is the most realistic and the most equitable, while at the same time, it does not result in the excessive loss of tax revenues.

What saving will the taxpayer receive from my bill and to what extent will my bill aid him? This depends on the amount of tax income after other deductions and personal expenses. If a person pays no income tax, then, of course, he gets no benefit from a reduction in tax rates or a deduction. If this deduction of $1,000 is added to the law, it benefits those who bear the greatest tax burden.

The following table shows a tax savings for selected deductible amounts for persons in various income brackets. It is assumed that in all cases the taxpayer is married and files a joint return with his wife:

Amount of deduction or exemption	Taxable income after other deductions and personal exemptions				
	$4,000	$8,000	$12,000	$20,000	$100,000
$300	$60	$66	$78	$102	$216
$600	120	132	156	204	432
$1,000	200	220	260	340	720
$1,500	300	330	390	510	1,080
$2,000	400	440	520	680	1,440
$2,500	500	550	650	850	1,800

While a taxpayer with a greater income seems to derive the most benefits, this is so because of the nature of all deductions and exemptions.

I believe that my proposal, to permit a tax deduction up to $1,000 or tuition paid for each dependent, would go far toward helping these children obtain an education, and I commend this bill to the attention of my colleagues for consideration.

HONOR TO OUR VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, February 5, 1961, B'nai Zion, the American fraternal Zionist organization, did honor to a great man. The occasion was its 53d annual order day dinner, held in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf Astoria.

The distinguished guest of honor was our Vice President, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

It was my distinct honor and privilege that evening to present to our Vice President a citation marking the dedication of the Lyndon B. Johnson Woodland in the land allocated to the State of Texas in the American Freedom Forest in Israel.

Despite the hardships of travel, more than 1,000 people assembled that evening to participate in this beautiful function. The dais was graced by important and distinguished personalities from every walk of life.

Messages were received from President John F. Kennedy; the President of the State of Israel, Itzhak Ben-Zvi; Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg; Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff; Speaker Sam Rayburn; Majority Leader John W. McCormack; Senators Mike Mansfield, Henry M. Jackson and Kenneth B. Keating; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; former Senator Herbert H. Lehman; Ambassadors W. Averell Harriman and Angier Biddle Duke; New York State Comptroller, Arthur Levitt; New York State Attorney General, Louis J. Lefkowitz; President of the City Council of the City of New York, Abe Stark; New York State Democratic Chairman, Michael Prendergast; Jacob Tsur, Chairman of the Jewish National Fund of Israel; and Albert Schiff, President of the Jewish National Fund of America.

Among those who lent their names to this occasion as Honorary Vice Chairmen were our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable James J. Delaney, Leonard Farbstein, Paul A. Fino, Seymour Halpern, James C. Healey, Lester Holtzman, Edna F. Kelly, John V. Lindsay, Adam Clayton Powell, John J. Rooney, Alfred E. Santangelo, and Herbert Zelenko; as well as Hon. James A. Farley; Hon. Arthur Markewich; Dr. Emanuel Neumann; Gen. David Sarnoff; Hon. Carmine DeSapio; Hon. Bernard Newman; Hon. Joseph Sharkey; Hon. Charles H. Silver; Abraham Feinberg; Max Greenberg; Conrad Hilton; Dr. Joachim Prinz; George Meany; Jacob Potofsky; Walter P. Reuther; Morris Iushewitz; Moe Rosen; Alex Rose; John O'Rourke; and Rabi Jerome Unger.

Ladies who added charm to the dais were Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson; Mrs. Avraham Harman; Mrs. Harris S. Levine; Mrs. Albert D. Lasker; and Mrs. Abraham J. Multer.

Among those on the dais that evening were our colleagues, the Honorable Joseph P. Addabbo, Victor L. Anfuso, Hugh L. Carey, Jacob H. Gilbert, Eugene J. Keogh, and former Congressman, Hon. Ludwig Teller; Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter; Israeli Consul David Rivlin; Hon. Arthur Levitt; Hon. Barnett J. Nova; Hon. Louis Kaplan; Harry Hirshfield; Dr. Sidney Marks; Dr. Samuel Morgoshes; Hon. Harry A. Pine; Nathaniel S. Rothenberg; Edward Sharf; Dr. Jacob I. Steinberg; Herman Z. Quittman; Paul Hall; Arthur Jacobs; Mendel N. Fisher; and other persons active in our communal affairs.

The invocation was delivered by Rabbi William Berkowitz of the Congregation Bnai Jeshurun.

Dr. Harris J. Levine, honorary president of the Jewish National Fund, acted as toastmaster of the evening.

After greetings from the mayor, His Honor Robert F. Wagner; and the president of B'nai Zion, Hyman J. Fliegel; Congressman Emanuel Celler, on behalf of the congressional delegation, delivered a tribute to the Vice President that was followed by the stirring remarks of Rabbi Irving Miller, president of the American Zionist Council.

The Ambassador from Israel to the United States, His Excellency Avraham Harman, paid his respects to Vice President JOHNSON in words of warm praise. He then delivered a very significant address from which I have excerpted the following:

I would take this opportunity of expressing the gratification of the Government and people of Israel at the fruitful cooperation that there has been between Israel and the Jewish communities of the United States in the past 13 years. There are and can be no political relations between us. We are citizens of Israel and you are citizens of the United States. We owe undivided loyalty to our country as you are characterized by undivided loyalty to yours.

Our respective Governments have cooperated closely in the international arena because they share a deeply rooted common faith in human and national freedom and in international order and cooperation. Between our citizens, however, who are predominantly Jewish, and the Jews of the United States of America the areas of cooperation have thus not been political. Nothing that is said on this subject could possibly be interpreted to mean that anyone has a political involvement in Israel except for citizens of Israel.

Our respective citizens have cooperated primarily in bringing aid and dignity to Jewish refugees. Of 1,300,000 Jewish refugees who found permanent homes in lands of freedom since the end of World War II, 1 million have been able to come to Israel. This has been a great achievement which is largely due to the cooperation between our two communities. There has been an equally fruitful cooperation in cultural and spiritual areas of mutual concern. The revival of the Hebrew language in Israel has provided a great stimulus to Hebrew literary creation as well as to research and scholarship. Increasingly, Jewish communities in various parts of the world have found in the institutions of higher learning in Israel a center of interest. Many Jewish religious and cultural organizations in the United States and other countries have established their own centers in Israel in order to make use of the opportunities for study and research which have developed there. This in turn has given our own people in Israel a greater opportunity of getting to know at firsthand the conditions of Jewish life in various parts of the free world. A striking symbol of this cooperation is to be found in the establishment last year at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem of a School of Contemporary Judaism headed by a prominent scholar from the United States, Dr. Moshe Davis, of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City.

Thus, in expressing the appreciation of the people of Israel for the help we have received from Jewish communities throughout the free world, I can point with deep satisfaction to these two great areas of cooperation between us which have already been productive of so much good in Jewish life.

I then made the presentation to the Vice President, saying:

The year 1961 marks the 53d anniversary of two very important events.

The year 1908 saw B'nai Zion brought into being.

The same year saw the birth of our very distinguished guest of honor.

None foresaw the greatness to which both have grown.

I will not bore you with the story of B'nai Zion. I will take the time, with both pride and pleasure, to recount some of the accomplishments of the statesman who graces our dais with his presence.

Almost a year ago LYNDON B. JOHNSON graciously accepted our invitation to be here tonight. We did not know then that the Senator we were inviting would no longer be one when he appeared here. Nor could we know then that he would come here as the Vice President of the United States.

Once before B'nai Zion honored a Vice President. Many times it has honored Congressmen and Senators. On one occasion, we honored a Senator, who had been a Congressman and who is now President of these United States.

Never before have we honored one man who had been a bootblack, a shepherd, a ditchdigger, a newspaper apprentice, a teacher, a Representative, a Senator, and a Vice President.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON has been all of these.

He is a man who has risen to the heights because he is ever mindful of his humble beginnings.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt saw in him a public servant with a heart, one who could help his fellow man because he had experienced firsthand the problems of youth. His vigor and ability soon marked him as the Nation's outstanding director in the National Youth Administration.

Five successive terms in the House of Representatives gave him an insight into domestic and foreign affairs that can be acquired nowhere else.

After his election to the U.S. Senate, he became its majority leader. His great talent was not for headlines but for accomplishment.

Zionists the world over are grateful to him for his steadfast friendship for the State of Israel. He was its protector, not because it was new or little or Jewish—only because he believed its cause was just, its love of freedom was deep, and its sense of righteousness well founded, did he stand firmly opposed to sanctions against Israel. That is what moved him to insist upon writing into legislation guarantees for freedom of international seaways and to demand and receive written commitments from the executive departments of our Government, insuring fair and equitable treatment not only for the State of Israel, but for all free countries.

Good husband, devoted father, gallant soldier, warmhearted friend, purposeful humanitarian, benefactor of the oppressed, responsible leader, is the man we honor tonight.

I have culled from his public statements a quotation which typifies this great man. He said:

"Americans cannot afford to squabble over the place in which a man was born or the manner in which he worships a just God. We cannot and will not survive if we are more concerned about the texture of a man's skin than the purity of his soul."

A few days ago Jews the world over observed a semiholiday variously called the Jewish Arbor Day and the New Year of Trees.

It brings to the fore the idea of a fresh start, the beginning of a new era, with the events of the past referred to, for guidance to a better future.

The analogy to New Frontiers is obvious.

Just as plain is the reason why we tonight dedicate the Lyndon B. Johnson Forest in land allocated to the State of Texas in the American Freedom Forest.

Permit me to read the memento of this occasion, which I present to him for you. It reads:

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON WOODLAND IN FREEDOM FOREST

"In the ancient and hallowed hills, near the City of Peace, Jerusalem, the cradle of great religions, B'nai Zion, through the Jewish national fund, is proud to plant the

"Lyndon B. Johnson Woodland in the Freedom Forest in tribute to a great statesman, a great American, a true humanitarian and a devoted friend of Israel, as an eternal reminder of American-Israel priceless friendship.

"His name will forever be linked with the eternal and ancient land of Israel.

"In witness whereof we have subscribed our names and affixed our seals on the 5th day of February 1961 on the occasion of the B'nai Zion order day dinner held at the Hotel Waldorf Astoria tendered in honor of His Excellency LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States of America.

"B'nai Zion: Hyman J. Fliegel, Nassi-National President; Herman Z. Quitman, Maskir-Secretary.

"JEWISH NATIONAL FUND OF AMERICA.
"ALBERT SCHIFF,
President.
"MENDEL N. FISHER,
Secretary.
"ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Chairman, Order Day Dinner Committee.
"HARRIS J. LEVINE,
Presiding Chairman."

The Scriptures proclaim: "Thus shall it be done to beloved leaders, a grateful people delighteth to honor."

Vice President JOHNSON thereupon responded with appropriate acknowledgment to those present, and with deep appreciation for the honor bestowed upon him.

He then addressed those present, as follows:

I am very proud as Vice President of the United States to be here with you. The title is new. But the bonds of our friendship are old and strong—and I cherish them. For such friendships—and for the honor you do me tonight—I am deeply grateful.

For half a century, B'nai Zion has worked to make real the dream of Israel. Work remains. But the dream has been realized. Israel exists. It is growing, thriving, and maturing.

Through both B'nai Zion and the Jewish National Fund you have played a key role in Israel's success. Your great dedication to this work has won renown and has earned high returns in the well-being and vitality of the people you have helped.

But I am not here to talk of what has been or must be done in Israel. My purpose here is to talk of our own land—of what we ourselves must do ourselves—for both ourselves and for all men, whose freedom we cherish as we cherish our own.

Thirty years ago, as a boy barely turned 21, I saw in Washington the beginning of a new era. From the steps of the Capitol, on a cold inaugural day in 1933, great words of courage went forth from a great heart, the courageous heart of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His inspiration quickened the pulse of a prostrate nation. It brought to life the strength of a sturdy peoples. It readied a whole generation of Americans for their rendezvous with destiny.

Two weeks ago I was privileged to stand on those same steps and hear, as you heard, great words go forth to the Nation once more. These were words of challenge from a man who speaks the confidence of a determined generation, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Once again, I have felt the pulse of the Nation quicken. Once again, I know—and I believe all Americans know—that a new era has begun, an era that may well be remembered as the great epoch of American maturity and responsibility.

We are going to live history in the months ahead.

But it should be made clear we are not going to relive it. This year of 1961 is not 1933. A nation weak then is strong today. A nation impoverished then lives with abundance today. A nation uncertain and uninformed then is experienced and wise today. The task facing Franklin Roosevelt was to help the Nation recover the strength it had lost. The task facing John Kennedy is to lead the Nation to use the strength it possesses so bountifully.

In 1933, the Nation needed a New Deal. Today there will be no dealing. The cards of history have already been dealt. We shall win the future—or lose it—by how we play the hand we hold.

The hand we hold is strong. We have abundance no other nation enjoys. We have resources no other nation equals. We have a history of respect and trust among other peoples as we, in turn, pay a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind." We have a cause more compelling than any the world has known before—a cause loved by allies who stand with us and feared by adversaries who stand against us, the cause of freedom itself.

This can be the winning hand, if we are worthy of it.

To be worthy of it, our purpose must be sure, our decisions responsible, our moves bold, and our confidence infinite. React we must to the thrusts of those who threaten the peace. But the pursuit of peace must be more than reaction to the moves of its enemies. As we have—in three great wars of this century—marshaled the full capacity of our people to assure success, so we must make no less an effort to assure success in our efforts toward peace.

This will be done.

For this new day—and this new age—patriotism will no longer be a wartime spirit alone. It will be the spirit of peacetime. We shall hope that the sacrifice of time and comfort in the meadows of peace will make unnecessary—and, in time, unknown—the futile sacrifice of life and limb on the fields of battle. Despots and dictators since time began have asked that men sacrifice their lives in war. Government of freemen can surely ask that men and women give of their years to be servants of peace rather than soldiers of war.

Arms we must have. Arms our citizens must bear. The arms we ask to be borne must be always and only the best—and nothing less. We shall be prepared to defend and to hold by our strength this mid-century beachhead of peace—and, God willing, we shall by our resoluteness enlarge it.

But we know that when tyranny retreats into its inevitable oblivion, that retreat is far less likely to come at the end of a bayonet than before the irresistible power of the physician's syringe, the teacher's chalk, the surveyor's tangent, the nutritionist's ladle. Peace must be waged with its own weapons. No nation, no alliance of nations has yet forged such weapons in sincere quantities. It is our privilege—and our unique opportunity—to begin.

I speak of these things tonight—before this audience—because I know that you, as do other Americans, understand these essentials of the challenge we face.

Modern Israel is aware of the challenge of the pursuits of peace. It is a part of that Middle East of which President Kennedy spoke last year, "The Middle East needs water, not war. They need tractors, not tanks, and they need bread, not bombs." Israel understands that development depends upon the basic resource of human talent, and its institutions aborning are invigorated by eager students, now coming from many lands. It understands that practical problems often yield to advancing knowledge; its basic and applied research are attracting the lively interest of the general community of science—whether in medicine, the use of arid lands, or the desalinization of water.

Dedication, hard work, the nourishment of talent, the extension of knowledge—these are the weapons of peace around the world. There are many lands awaiting the fulfillment of stirring aspirations. There are others who can help, and their ranks are growing. Those who would be free from both misery and fear can know that they have ready allies in the struggle for both progress and liberty. Where ground has not been broken for the seeds of freedom, we must set the plowshares to work—and we will. But where freedom has found its roots and begun to grow, we must not turn away.

Toward all the people of all lands, whatever their religion or race or system, we feel the deepest interest in their well-being. Our aspiration for them is opportunity—the opportunity to know better lives, reach higher goals, participate more justly in the promise of this century.

Preventing war is not of itself enough. For the people of the Middle East the margin of bare survival is too narrow to make tolerable the maintenance of costly burdens of arms. We hope the day will quickly come when these burdens can be reduced. This is essential not only to world peace but to the improvement of the lives of the people of the Middle East.

The works of peace are global works. This administration will work for peace in the Middle East as it works for progress in Africa, for social justice in Latin America, for freedom in Asia, for strength and accord in Europe, and for a climate of mutual trust with the Soviet Union. Peace, social justice, freedom, accord, mutual trust—these are the vistas beyond the cold war which give meaning to our present struggle and which sustain the sacrifices we must be prepared to make.

Thirty years ago courage was required for our Nation to find its way again. Today the need is for challenge—challenge to fulfill the potential of its strength, to play wisely the strong hand history has dealt us. New, confident, vigorous leadership is at the helm—using the winds of the century, rather than being used by them.

No one says, no one believes, the sailing will be all smooth.

We recognize the wisdom of Tom Paine, in the early hours of the Republic, when he told his countrymen: "Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict the more glorious the triumph."

The conflict will be hard but the triumph of peace and freedom will, when it comes, be glorious—not for Americans alone but for all men who cherish freedom as we ourselves do.

STATE TAXES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY IN FEDERAL AREAS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such State.

This bill is similar to H.R. 4845, 86th Congress, which I introduced 2 years ago. Revisions that have been made in the bill are designed to perfect it, to make it technically feasible for effective administration.

I recognize, however, that the main objection raised to the bill in the 86th Congress was that it seems to deal with one phase of the problem of legislative jurisdiction exercised by the Federal Government over land areas that it owns and controls. Several of the affected executive departments and agencies and the Bureau of the Budget opposed enactment of H.R. 4845, 86th Congress, primarily on the ground that it was a piecemeal approach to the major problem of legislative jurisdiction.

While this is so, the fact also is that general legislation designed to authorize heads of executive departments and agencies to adjust legislative jurisdiction has not been enacted although previously recommended by an interdepartmental study committee. It matters little why the legislation was not enacted.

We have no assurance that general legislation will be enacted in this Congress although I concede that if it is enacted and implemented as recommended by the interdepartmental committee, the situation that my bill seeks to deal with may be taken care of without separate legislation. But, because I believe that we have a situation that needs immediate consideration, and because it is an area in connection with which Congress has previously dealt separately—tax jurisdiction—I have reintroduced this bill in order to permit commencement of legislative action which could be completed if no general legislation is enacted.

As I said, the bill deals with tax jurisdictions and would merely extend a congressional policy set forth in Public Law No. 819 of the 76th Congress, commonly known as the Buck Act. As you know, the Buck Act provided that private persons and corporations could not claim immunity from specified State and local taxes merely on the ground that the business was conducted on Federal lands. It is the purpose of my bill to amend and extend this act to add property taxes to those that cannot be avoided by private persons or corporations solely because the privately owned property is located within a Federal area.

The bill I have introduced today sets forth clearly that, for the purpose of the new subsection that would be added to title 4 of the United States Code, a property tax would be only such tax imposed directly on, or measured by the value of, property owned by any person other than the United States.

I would be happy if this problem can be solved by general legislation. On the other hand, if it is not so solved, I think that the United States should immediately consent to the levying of property taxes against private property situated on a Federal area in order to eliminate immunity for which there is no good reason.

UNWARRANTED FUEL OIL PRICE INCREASES IN NEW YORK STATE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I brought to the attention of Members of the House the situation created in parts of my district of upstate New York by the callous action of the oil producers, taken in complete disregard of the welfare of the individual local fuel dealers as well as consumers, in pushing through while cold weather lasts the third fuel oil price increase of this winter season, raising prices, in Cooperstown, N.Y., for example, to the highest level in all history, 16.5 cents per gallon.

Yesterday the New York Times in a front page story disclosed that these increases I protested against are not limited to the 32d Congressional District alone but are also prevalent in the metropolitan area of the city of New York.

I have already referred this matter to appropriate committees of the Congress for their scrutiny in order to protect both the local fuel oil dealers and their consumers. The figure now reported in the New York Times story of an increase of 12 percent in the price of heating oil in just 2 months strikes me as dramatically bearing out my previous contention that these increases cannot represent merely changed or complicated conditions, but do in fact represent a callous desire to "get all the traffic will bear."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a better way for the oil industry to lose friends and encourage the kind of restrictive legislation which I understand they oppose than the action that has been taken in my State in these past few weeks.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article from the New York Times:

HEATING OIL PRICE UP 12 PERCENT HERE SINCE FIRST HEAVY SNOW DECEMBER 11

(By Farnsworth Fowle)

The price of home heating oil has risen 12¾ percent here in less than 8 weeks—from 14.1 to 15.9 cents a gallon.

During this period, the city has had a record streak of below-freezing temperatures and three snowstorms.

But the price rise was "not the result of local delivery conditions," the New York Oil Heating Association said yesterday. It said the rise was an "industry increase" attributable to gulf coast cargo costs and to higher tanker charter rates.

A spokesman for the association, made up of both large and small distributors here, emphasized that it did not control prices here. He said they were usually set when one of the major oil companies changed the price.

The spokesman said that the price of 15.9 cents was the basic price in the area, with prices up to 16.3 cents a gallon in some parts of the Bronx and Queens, where deliveries are more costly.

Although supplies are somewhat reduced, there is no imminent shortage that might bring about an increase. In late January, the Nation's oil refineries were operating at only 84.7 percent of capacity. In the late fall and early winter, 59 laid-up worldwide tankers were put back into service to meet the seasonal demand, and 221 more were in reserve on January 15.

A spokesman for the Mobil Oil Co., the major distributor that raised its price here to 15.4 on January 6, and to 15.9 last Friday, said the company had its own suppliers and its own tankers, but that they had been unable to meet this winter's extra demand.

It therefore had to pay three-quarters of a cent more a gallon for spot oil in the gulf coast market, and one-quarter of a cent more to spot tankers for transporting it, the spokesman said.

He said that the wholesale price of light heating oil here was now 11.1 cents a gallon, compared to peaks of 11.3 cents in 1959 and 11.5 in 1957. If retail prices have remained below earlier peaks, he said, it is because the dealers are absorbing the extra cost of distribution in snow-blocked neighborhoods.

The spokesman said that price increases in cold weather always drew more attention than reductions at the end of the winter season.

Another factor mentioned as a possible explanation of the raising of the price by the producer was a general pay increase of 5 percent in the oil industry that came into effect this winter.

It was pointed out that the price of oil is not subject to Government control, although the supply of oil is affected by action at the State level and through Federal import quotas.

In this it is unlike natural gas and electricity, two other sources of household heat, which are subject to controls under public utility regulations.

According to a recent estimate, heating accounts for 40 percent of the oil business in the United States.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend her remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, many times when the subject of civil rights legislation is before the House, our colleagues from the Southern States suggest, with considerable pertinence, that we in the North have less than a perfect record in this area ourselves. I cannot honestly take issue with this contention, though I am not always convinced of its relevance. There are wide areas of segregation and discrimination in Northern States, though it is seldom defended as public policy.

I am very proud to be able to point to an action by the highest educational authority in my State of Oregon, to rid the campuses of our two largest State-supported institutions of one remnant of segregation.

The State Board of Higher Education of Oregon has decided to withdraw recognition, after January 1, 1963, of any fraternity or sorority required by its national charter to practice racial or religious bias in the selection of its members. This order applies to the University of Oregon in Eugene, and Oregon State College, in Corvallis. Portland State College, in Portland, another unit of the State system of higher education, has its own policy against recognizing such segregated clubs.

At the same time, State Senator Alfred Corbett has introduced into the Oregon Legislature a resolution calling for Oregon ratification of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, an amendment which Oregon's Legislature once ratified and later, for poorly conceived partisan reasons, sought to withdraw ratification. Last year, the Oregon Legislature ratified the 15th amendment. Ratification by Oregon of the 14th amendment, like last year's action, will do nothing to affect the status of these amendments which are already a part of the Constitution. But these resolutions do clearly indicate Oregon's position on these questions—which are still controversial after nearly a century.

The following is an editorial from the Portland Oregonian, of January 25, on the the subject of Senator Corbett's resolution:

LET'S FINISH THE JOB

State Senator Alfred Corbett has introduced a joint resolution which would have the effect of putting Oregon, at long last, on record as approving the proposition that no citizen of the United States shall be deprived "of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," or be denied "equal protection of the laws."

This is the essence of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which Oregon legislators ratified in September 1866. But 2 years later, in the heat of the Reconstruction controversy, a Democratic majority of the legislature "withdrew consent" of the State to the amendment by a straight party line vote, 26 to 18. The rescinding resolution set forth that the three-fourths majority of the States by which the amendment had been declared adopted had included Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Georgia, and South Carolina, the legislatures of which "were created by a military despotism against the will of the legal voters of said States, under the Reconstruction acts (so-called) of Congress, which are usurpatious, unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void."

Congress did not see fit to take notice of the Oregon about-face. The original ratification has been allowed to remain on the record. But Senator Corbett has a point in seeking to remove the stain precipitated by the passions of Reconstruction. Surely very few Oregonians, indeed, would object today to the endorsement of the equalitarian principles of the 14th amendment.

The legislature only last session finally got around to ratifying another Reconstruction era amendment, the 15th, which proclaims the right to vote without restriction "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Ninety-odd years ago, Oregon legislators had taken the position that the amendment was undesirable as an invasion of the States authority to control suffrage. In the 1959 legislature, however, the vote for ratification was unanimous in both houses. Senator Corbett's resolution on the 14th amendment deserves the same decisive treatment so that Oregon's sentiments will be accurately reflected on the record.

RABBI JACOB PRESSMAN

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it has been an esteemed pleasure for me to have been able to arrange for the guest Chaplain that today offered prayer in this House. Rabbi Jacob Pressman has traveled a long way from the 26th District of California and from Temple Beth Am in Los Angeles for this occasion. He has traveled greater distances than those measured in miles. In California, Pennsylvania, wherever he has been, Rabbi Pressman is known for his extensive and energetic devotion to the youth of our country. Rabbi Pressman was first in his class upon graduation from West Philadelphia High School and was offered six university scholarships. He accepted the invitation from the University of Pennsylvania and was graduated in 1940, honored by devotion to his academic endeavors with Phi Beta Kappa membership. Possessing his bachelor's degree, Rabbi Pressman then began his study of theology at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York. He graduated from the seminary in 1945 with a distinguished record of accomplishment including the coveted Lehman Public Speaking Award.

Rabbi Pressman was a founder of the west coast branch of the University of Judaism in Los Angeles, as well as one of its first instructors. He is on the board of directors of the Los Angeles Jewish Community Council, a federation of all Jewish activities in metropolitan Los Angeles.

Temple Beth Am, his present synagogue, has a congregation of 850 families, representing 3,500 people. In translation, Temple Beth Am means "house of the people."

REPORT OF GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NLRB

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks and may include charts and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent comments and studies on the subject of delay in administrative agencies, it is refreshing to read the report issued at the end of 1960 by the General Counsel of the NLRB, Mr. Stuart Rothman. I am inserting this report in the RECORD because it shows that in at least one of the independent agencies, efforts to reduce backlogs and delays are paying off.

SUMMARY REPORT, OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF NLRB, CALENDAR YEAR 1960

This summary report for calendar year 1960, prepared by the Office of the General Counsel, is based upon a yearend review of field activities reports of the office.

In August 1959 and January 1960, the Office of the General Counsel put into effect as part of a broader effort two comprehensive management improvement programs, Operation 60 and Operation Challenge.[1] We believe there is a cause and effect relationship between these programs and performance in the latter half of 1959 under Operation 60, and particularly in calendar year 1960, under both.

What a statistical report of this kind cannot reflect is the meticulous care and conscientious effort on the part of the seasoned staff members who deal with the many problems of fact and law arising under the NLRA, particularly those arising for the first time under new concepts brought into the act by Landrum-Griffin changes.

The office has a carefully developed system of deliberation by which every case of novelty or difficulty arising under the act is fully considered by qualified disinterested personnel and by the General Counsel to assure compliance with the congressional intent and the policy and purposes of this act. Every effort has been made to see to it that each case of novelty or exceptional difficulty is most fully considered on the merits.

The improved quality and time performance of the Office could not have been accomplished without the superior performance and cooperation of the regional and Washington staffs.

With respect to the many new members of the staff who have been recently recruited through an "honors" program and are serving their "apprenticeship," I believe that this group has an exceptionally good potential, and that in a short time the agency will have a blue ribbon staff. There were a number of years in the past when the agency apparently lost seasoned qualified personnel and did not have an adequate recruitment program.

The year 1960 saw a general upward improvement in employee grade structures, particularly in the field offices, and there were 341 promotions in 1960, as compared with 207 in 1959, and 147 in 1958.

INCREASING WORKLOAD

The number of unfair labor practice charges and the number of petitions seeking elections filed in 1960 exceeded those filed in 1958 or in the previous record year of 1959.

[1] For those who may have a further interest in the nature of these two management improvement programs, they were detailed in several public talks which are available: "Time and Tide in Taft-Hartley," Jan. 8, 1960; "A Target of Preventive Law in Labor Management Relations," Feb. 18, 1960; "Four Ways to Reduce Administrative Delay," June 9, 1960; "Improving Settlement Procedures," Sept. 12, 1960; "The Role of Settlements in Achieving Compliance With the National Labor Relations Act," Oct. 12, 1960; "Stating Some Principles of Labor Law Administration," Nov. 18, 1960.

Comparison of combined totals of unfair labor practice charges and petitions for elections

	Total	ULP charges	Petitions for elections
1958	19,379	11,422	7,957
1959	21,494	11,689	9,805
1960	22,072	11,392	10,680

CHARGES AND PETITIONS FILED UNDER LANDRUM-GRIFFIN

The Landrum-Griffin amendments created additional unfair labor practices relating to picketing and secondary boycotts and produced, in certain situations, expedited elections.

Thus far, under the amended parts of the act, 561 claims of violation or election requests have been filed. Of the unfair labor practice charges, 273 have been dismissed or withdrawn, 54 have been settled voluntarily by the parties, and 33 have been litigated. Of the petitions for expedited election, 61 have been dismissed or withdrawn, and 56 elections have been held.

NEW UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CHARGES

New ULP charges filed under Landrum-Griffin, 436.

Disposition of these charges:

1. Withdrawal or dismissal, 273.
2. Settlement agreement, 54.
3. Litigation, 33.

PETITIONS FOR EXPEDITED ELECTION

Petitions for expedited election filed under Landrum-Griffin, 125.

Disposition of these petitions:

1. Withdrawal or dismissal, 61.
2. Election (won by unions, 20), 56.

COMPLAINTS ISSUED IN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CASES

The number of National Labor Relations Board complaints issued in unfair labor practice cases doubled from 1958 to 1959, and in 1960 slightly exceeded even the high 1959 level.

In 1960 the National Labor Relations Board issued 1,261 complaints. The greatest number, as usual, are against employers, because the greater number of filings arise under alleged employer violations. The proportion of complaints issued against employers went up and the proportion against unions went down. But each case is decided on its own merits, so in another year the situation could be reversed.

	Complaints issued	Versus—		
		Employer	Union	Both
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1958	672	60	26	14
1959	1,237	63	25	12
1960	1,261	71	23	6

ELECTIONS CONDUCTED

The number of Board conducted elections to determine questions concerning employee bargaining representatives has increased since 1958. Accordingly, in 1960 there were 543 more elections held than in 1959 and 2,120 more than in 1958.

Elections held: 1958, 4,660; 1959, 6,237; 1960, 6,780.

HEARINGS HELD IN UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE CASES

The number of administrative hearings in unfair labor practice cases has more than doubled since 1958. During this past year 845 unfair labor practice hearings were held and the ULP hearing backlog has been cut almost in half.

Hearings pending as of January 1: 1958, 137; 1959, 254; 1960, 417; 1961, 185.

Hearings held: 1958, 371; 1959, 638; 1960, 845.

With the cooperative efforts of the trial examiners, the former spread of hearing dates over a 14-week period from time of request, has now been reduced to somewhat under 5 weeks. The resulting overall time factor element of charge through hearing has been proportionately improved. The trial examiner cooperation is genuinely appreciated.

REDUCING THE TIME DELAY

The period of investigation

In past years a frequent complaint heard from charging parties and practitioners was that the period between the filing of the unfair labor practice charge and the determination as to whether the charge had merit was detrimentally excessive. Two years ago, at the close of 1958, the average unfair labor practice case pending in the first stage of case processing, the investigation stage, was 51 days old. One year ago, the average case in this initial stage was 26 days old. Today, with no diminution in the number of cases, the average case in this stage is only 22 days old, and the backlog has been eliminated. This means that in the majority of unfair labor practice cases the investigation into the merits of the charge is completed and the regional office has determined whether a complaint should issue in substantially less than 1 month from the time the charge is filed.

Number and age of unfair labor practice cases pending under investigation

	Number of cases	Average age
2 years ago	2,261	51
1 year ago	843	26
Today	991	22

The period between a determination of the merits of an unfair labor practice charge and completion of formal hearings

Time factor improvements have also been achieved during the past year in connection with the total elapsed time between filing of the unfair labor practice charge, a determination of its merits, the issuance of a complaint if necessary, and going on to a formal administrative hearing. The period from charge to issuance of complaint has been reduced to 44 days, 83 days over 1958 and 8 days sooner than in 1959. It could be shortened, but time is allowed to permit the interplay of settlement factors between the contesting parties.

Similarly, the span of time between the issuance of complaints and finalization of the formal hearing before the trial examiner has been reduced so that today only 36 days are required for this stage. This represents a decrease of 24 days over the number required in 1958 and 38 days over the number needed in 1959.

Period between filing of unfair labor practice charge, issuance of complaint, and close of formal hearing

	Number days from filing to complaint	Number days from complaint to close of hearing	Number days total (from filing to close of hearing)
2 years ago	127	60	187
1 year ago	52	74	126
Today	44	36	80

The average unfair labor practice case, therefore, now requires only 80 days to proceed from the filing of the charge, through issuance of the complaint, to close of the hearing before a trial examiner. One year ago the time required was 126 days, and 2 years ago it was 187 days.

ELIMINATING "OVERAGE" CASES

In this past year there has been a sharp reduction in the number of cases delayed beyond regional operations schedules. Two years ago there were over 1,900 cases backed up in the investigative stage of case processing over 30 days old. Today the number is minimal (12). Again, 2 years ago, there were 298 unfair labor practice cases over 90 days old pending hearing before a trial examiner. Today the number of such cases has been drastically reduced to 29.

Two years ago, during 1958, 59 percent of postelection regional reports (on objections to the conduct of the election or challenged ballots) required over 45 days to prepare. One year ago, 45 percent of these reports took that long to complete. In 1960 only 19 percent took over 45 days; and today there are only two reports pending which are over 45 days old.

Two years ago, at the end of 1958, there were 586 petitions for election pending dismissal, withdrawal, election agreement, or hearing over 30 days after filing. One year ago there were 505 cases in this category. Today the number is only eight.

Cases delayed beyond time schedules

	Petitions for election pending hearing or information disposition over 30 days after filing	Percent of postelection reports issued over 45 days after election	Unfair labor practice charges pending close of investigation and determination of merits over 30 days after filing	Unfair labor practice charges pending before hearing or settlement over 90 days
2 years ago	586	59	1,449	298
1 year ago	505	45	364	702
Today	8	19	4	29

REGIONAL ADVISORY CONFERENCES AND FIELD OPERATIONAL SCHEDULES

Advisory regional administrative conferences, patterned after the Federal judicial conferences, and including labor and management representatives plus labor law professors, were initiated by OGC during the past year. Two in each region have been held successfully. Their purpose is to permit constructive exchange on matters of mutual concern and to seek ways to improve regional office procedures in all areas. The cooperation and understanding of the conferees in each region is appreciated by the OGC. Much good can come from this means of improved communication between the public and a Government agency. In response to a written question asked of over 450 conferees at recent regional meetings, we were advised almost unanimously that they saw no further need to speed up further OGC regional case processing beyond the present high plateaus. This apparent satisfaction with the elimination of delay at the regional level has been earned by conscientious regional and Washington staff performance.

SETTLEMENTS

The object of the NLRB administrative process is not formal litigation. Among other things, it is the just and expeditious disposition of causes under the law in ways which promote industrial peace and good and stable labor-management relations.

It is in the field of honorable informal disposition of merit cases, and within the contemplated procedures and established Board law, that the noteworthy progress has been made in 1960. In the view that lengthy and costly litigation can often be avoided by negotiation and voluntary settlement, the regional directors in April of this year were requested to expend greater effort to encourage settlement by the contesting parties.

In 1959, the settlement ratio was 47.6 percent. This figure has gradually increased and in the 4-month period beginning June 1960, it stood at 66 percent and has stayed at that level. In October 1960, the settlement ratio was 73 percent. The voluntary processes of the Board can be, and are being, used effectively.

In some regions more than others the improvement has been great. Situations have occurred where a particular region did not have to initiate formal litigation during an entire month because of informal settlement.

Percent of merit cases settled:

July 1, 1959, to Apr. 1, 1960	47.6
Apr. 1, 1960, to present	65.5

The percent of merit cases settled is distinct from nonmerit charges which are withdrawn or dismissed.

Through withdrawal, dismissal or informal settlement, approximately 86 percent of the unfair labor practice charges filed with the agency are disposed of as a matter of OGC Washington and field operations within 30 days.

The frequency of elections conducted as the result of agreement by the parties, rather than by the lengthier route of a Board decision and direction of election, has changed little in past years. The pattern continues of resolving election issues by mutual agreement as follows:

Percent of elections held which were the result of voluntary agreement of the parties:

1958	69.6
1959	71.6
1960	71.7

BACK-PAY RESTITUTION

Two years ago, during 1958, illegally discharged employees received a total of $877,878 in wages they had lost as a result of the discrimination. During 1959, total receipts amounted to $846,170. The amount of backpay collected by dischargees in 1960 was $1,263,132. This ranks well with the record high years, which are computed on a fiscal year basis.

Back pay received by dischargees:

1958	$877,878
1959	846,170
1960	1,263,132

Approximately one-half was obtained through voluntary adjustment without litigation. Compliance officers have been designated in each region. More remains to be done in scheduling regional compliance operations.

SCHEDULING THE WORK IN WASHINGTON AND THE FIELD

Based upon a combination of past experience, practical testing and comprehensive programs for seeking improved administrative efficiency such as Operation "60" and Operation "Challenge," it has been possible to establish administrative case handling time and quality goals. They make all due allowance for required flexibility in time. These goals are stated in terms of reasonable objectives which experience shows have been met by many regions without particular difficulty, rather than the setting of an unattainable pace. For example, the time scheduled for investigation of charges is considerably longer than it takes in the average case. The Office has internal schedules also for meeting its obligations in handling advice, appeals, and other cases.

Hand in hand with time performance objectives there must be continuous effort to achieve high quality professional performance in the interests of the parties involved and the public. A field litigation service program as part of Operation "Challenge" is in effect and the quest for the just determination of causes goes on unrelentingly.

From month to month the success of the cases litigated before the trial examiners and the Board runs between 76 to 81 percent; enforcement in whole or in part of Board cases reviewed by the several circuit courts approximately 70 to 75 percent; injunctions granted by the district courts of cases litigated in final order over 90 percent. The importance of winning or losing a case is not as important as making certain that the cases that are won deserve to be won and those that are lost did not deserve to be lost. It is wrong to require a private citizen to respond to Government processes and to undertake the defense of matters when he did not have to. The Office does its very best, and cannot do less, to make sure that each case is fully investigated, handled in accordance with highest trial standards if litigation is necessary and, most importantly, to make sure that the decision to proceed or not is determined in accord with the body of precedent, practice, policy, and administrative requirements as directed by Congress.

The present operational goals, which permit of full and necessary flexibility in individual cases, are attached. After reaching the high level of performance this year, it was desirable to make certain justified improvements within the present procedures to seek to stay on that high plateau but without involving any new departures from the principles earlier established.

A point worthy of mention is our effort, in the administration of the act, for impartiality and the avoidance of ex parte contacts. The principles guiding the Office of the General Counsel in this area are reflected in two staff memoranda, dated August 6, 1959.[2] These memoranda state unequivocally that, in order to insure fair and objective consideration in the administration of our act, contacts made by means other than by record presentation concerning a particular case shall be made a matter of record and an equal opportunity shall be afforded to other parties or interested persons to present their position.

CONCLUSION

At the year end the progress made in several areas of case handling, and one particularly—that of settlements—is noteworthy.

Unfair labor practice cases continue to be investigated and a decision made on the merits within 30 days of the filing of the charge. However, over 50 percent of such charges are now fully investigated and a decision made on the merits in slightly under 22 days. Normally it might be expected that such an acceleration in this phase of case handling would be accompanied by a corresponding reduction in the quality of the investigation; but such has not been the case. Rather, there is indication that the quality of the investigations is now better than at any time in the agency's history.

The time required at the end of 1958 to process a case from the filing of the charge to the issuance of complaint was 127 days; in 1959 this was reduced to 52 days. Today this time has been further reduced to 44 days—a reduction of 8 days over the 1959 figure and more than 83 days over the 1958 figure.

Comparable progress is noted in the time required to proceed from the issuance of complaint to the close of hearing before a trial examiner. At the end of 1958, the median time required was 60 days; 1 year later, the time was 74 days. In 1960, the time was cut to 36 days—a reduction of 38 days over the 1959 figure and of 24 days over the 1958 figure. There is flexibility in the regional operational schedules to accommodate any requests for delay or postponements which are merited and justifiable in the individual case.

Thus, in summary, we see that the time required in 1958 to proceed from the filing of the charge to the close of hearing was 187 days, or over 6 months. In 1959, this time period was cut to 126 days, or over 4 months. In 1960, the time required was sharply reduced to 80 days as of the year end—just less than 3 months—a reduction of over 50 percent under the 1958 figure.

There is another factor worth mentioning. At the end of 1958, there were over 2,261 cases pending preliminary investigation having a median age of approximately 51 days. Today, there are 991 cases pending preliminary investigation with an average age of 22 days. Thus, not only has the C case backlog been substantially reduced, but for months now the regions have been consistently operating on a current basis.

In the year 1961, the workload of the Office is expected to exceed 1960. In the past few years, the workload has been steadily increasing, and this upward trend can be expected to continue in 1961. While there were influences in 1960 tending to curtail the workload, it was still the heaviest in the agency's history. Because of the administrative and management improvements of 1959 and 1960, the regional and Washington staffs of the Office of the General Counsel are prepared to meet any workload increase in the coming year; the administrative impetus to accommodate a high workload and yet maintain a high standard of performance will continue to be a major factor in the operations of the Office.

STUART ROTHMAN,
General Counsel.

[2] "Communication With Parties and Counsel in Pending Cases," Office of the General Counsel, Aug. 6, 1959; "Equal Opportunity for Parties to Present Views," Office of the General Counsel, Aug. 6, 1959.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) from February 9 to February 14, 1961, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN for 10 minutes today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) for 1 hour on Wednesday, February 15.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) for 15 minutes on Wednesday, February 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANKFORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. CRAMER in four instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. KYL.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. LINDSAY in two instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. JENSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BAILEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BLATNIK.
Mr. WILLIS.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. CLARK.
Mr. EVINS.
Mr. HARRIS.
Mr. ROOSEVELT.
Mr. GIAIMO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 13, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

541. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 16th Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, dated January 1961, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

542. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for September 1960 of the General Sales Manager concerning all sales and disposals with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support; to the Committee on Appropriations.

543. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

544. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

545. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report on the state of the Nation's Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

546. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the administration of unclaimed funds held and owing by life insurance companies in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

547. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of selected supply activities of the U.S. Army Japan Depot-Complex, Sagami, Japan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

548. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone and President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of disposal of foreign excess property by the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended December 31, 1960, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations.

549. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 74th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

550. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of the U.S. Display Corp. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

551. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 4036. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4038. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 4039. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 4040. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4041. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4042. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4043. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4044. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4045. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4046. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 4047. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 4048. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4049. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4050. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 4051. A bill to free farmers from Government control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4052. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to grant the annuities of surviving spouses for the lifetimes of such spouses in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4053. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 4054. A bill to authorize Federal mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4055. A bill to amend the act of August 25, 1959, to authorize the payment of a monetary award to recipients of the National Medal of Science; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4056. A bill to provide certain benefits to the heirs of Government employees who died as a result of the fire on the U.S.S. *Constellation* in the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4057. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4058. A bill to permit withholding on the compensation of Federal employees for purposes of income taxes imposed by certain municipalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4059. A bill to permit States or other duly constituted taxing authorities to subject persons to liability for payment of property taxes on property located in Federal areas within such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4060. A bill to provide that withdrawals and reservations of public lands for nondefense uses shall take effect only upon certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4061. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 4062. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4063. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4064. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4065. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4066. A bill to provide for a Capitol Pages' Selection and Residence Board which shall be responsible for the selection of pages for the Senate and House of Representatives and for providing a residence for such pages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4067. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4068. A bill to require the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4070. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build essential world conditions of peace by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries through the United Nations or its appropriate agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4071. A bill to provide that certain subcontracts may be entered into only in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4072. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4073. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Diplomatic Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4074. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 4075. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for certain expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of his children while his wife is physically or mentally incapable of caring for such children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4077. A bill to establish a national policy relating to U.S. citizens' travel abroad; to establish a service within the Department of State which shall be responsible for the direction, administration, and execution of passport and travel documentation for American citizens and nationals in the United States and abroad; to prescribe procedures relating to the issuance of passports; to establish terms of validity of passports; to establish fees for passports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4078. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4079. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended, with respect to position descriptions, salary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4080. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit the retirement on full annuities, without regard to age, of those officers and employees with 30 years or more of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 4081. A bill to repeal the act requiring the filing of certain information with respect to trade between the United States and its noncontiguous territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 4082. A bill to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4083. A bill to reduce the frequency of reports required of the Veterans' Administration on the use of surplus dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4084. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 4085. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4086. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4087. A bill to provide certain sick leave benefits for postal field service employees who are veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4088. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the provisions which reduce the old-age or wife's insurance benefits of a woman becoming entitled to such benefits before she attains age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4089. A bill relating to the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and the status of that organization under certain laws of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4090. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4091. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for certain amounts received as retirement annuities or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4092. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4093. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4094. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 4095. A bill to amend sections 4(a), 4(e), 7(e), and 15 of the Natural Gas Act relating to rates and contracts of natural gas companies and the granting of certificates of public convenience and necessity to such companies, and relating to hearings and procedure in proceedings before the Federal Power Commission involving natural gas matters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4096. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 4097. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to liberalize the standard for determining the earning capacity of disability annuitants and to permit the restoration of disability annuities in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4098. A bill to provide for the rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing delivery of mail and certain other postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4099. A bill to extend health benefits to the survivors of retiree annuitants who died before April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4100. A bill to make the civil service retirement and disability fund available for annuity benefits authorized by law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4101. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of a pension of $100 per month to World War I veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4102. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4103. A bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4104. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 4105. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4106. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4107. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4108. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 4109. A bill to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4110. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of scholarships for medical and dental education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4111. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of

1954 to provide hospital, nursing home, surgical, and diagnostic outpatient insurance for persons entitled to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, for persons having service covered by the Railroad Retirement and Civil Service Retirement Acts, and for persons electing voluntary coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4112. A bill to amend section 203(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide for an exemption in the case of certain movements of motor vehicles for the account and accommodation of the owners thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4113. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4114. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 4115. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4116. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 4117. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 4118. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel and Tourism and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4119. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 4120. A bill to extend to nonprofit sport fishing or fishing fair or contest organizations and associations the third-class mail rates applicable to certain categories of nonprofit organizations or associations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 4121. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits thereunder for certain foster children and others with respect to whom an insured individual stands in loco parentis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4122. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4123. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 4124. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4125. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported onions, lettuce, and carrots; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 4126. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4127. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 4128. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 4129. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 4130. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 4131. A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4132. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by providing for fair competition between domestic industries operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act and foreign industries that supply articles imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4133. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 4134. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeal and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4135. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4136. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4137. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4138. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4139. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4140. A bill to assist producers of milk to obtain a fair and reasonable price by requiring that purchases by Federal installations be at the prevailing price in the locality; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4141. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Agriculture shall reimburse the occupants of certain cottage sites within the Stanislaus National Forest, Calif., for the cost of moving improvements on such lots to new sites or for the fair market value of such improvements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of irrigation and other water district assessments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4143. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4144. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4145. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 4146. A bill to provide the same beginning date for the exemption from the club dues tax of certain payments for the construction or reconstruction of capital improvements as is provided by existing law as the beginning date for such construction or reconstruction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 4147. A bill to amend section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to restore competitive equality to retailers and other distributors with respect to certain sales to business and other organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4149. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the conservation and improvement of private housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4150. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4151. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes", and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of func-

tional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4152. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4154. A bill to provide that members of the Bad River Band and the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin shall not be subject within their reservations to the fish and game laws of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the rates of pension payable under such section shall be not less than those payable before the effective date of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that a husband or widower have been dependent upon his wife in order to qualify for husband's or widower's insurance benefits on the basis of her wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4157. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4158. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 4159. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4160. A bill to establish a price support level for milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require the placement of recording devices in certain aircraft as an aid to air accident investigation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require air carriers to maintain route maps in conjunction with certain weather information for the benefit of their passengers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4163. A bill to provide that the minimum passing grade for scheme examination of postal field service employees shall be 90 percent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4164. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4167. A bill to prohibit the alteration of U.S. coins for fradulent purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 4168. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 4169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition expenses paid by him for his education, or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents, at a college, university, or other institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 4170. A bill to amend section 120(a) of title 23 of the United States Code so as to increase the limitation on the amount of the Federal share payable in connection with any highway project on the Federal-aid primary system located in an economically depressed area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4172. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4173. A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4174. A bill to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts, to assist in the growth of the fine arts in the Nation's Capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for high standards of architectural design and decoration for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4176. A bill to provide additional punishment for corporate officers violating the antitrust laws, and to provide that such officers may be barred for not more than 1 year from serving in such corporate capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 4177. A bill relating to the income tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 4178. A bill to provide additional unemployment benefits for certain individuals who exhaust their rights to unemployment compensation under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit certain construction workers and other employees to deduct traveling expenses without moving their regular places of abode to each new place of employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 4180. A bill to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4181. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of himself or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 4183. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 4184. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 4185. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency, and for the training of personnel; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 202. Joint resolution designating the week of May 22 to 27, 1961, as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation for emergency feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 204. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.J. Res. 205. Joint resolution designating December 1, 1961, as Civil Air Patrol Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9 to 15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.J. Res. 207. Joint resolution proposing amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 209. Joint resolution designating the second Sunday in October of each year as National Grandmothers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 210. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for

elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items in bills with certain exceptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering the Congress to authorize the President to approve and disapprove separate items in any bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval and reduction of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution recognizing the Polish Legion of American Veterans as a bona fide veterans' organization, and favoring recognition of its representatives in the prosecution of certain claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 158. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. Res. 159. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the declaration by the President of the month of May as Senior Citizens Month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a national cemetery for veterans in the city of Westfield; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to name the veterans' hospital in Jamaica Plain "the Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation eliminating all restrictions on the earning capacity of recipients of benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a national cemetery for veterans in the city of Westfield; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States outlawing segregation in the public school system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting to veterans of World War I pensions comparable to those granted to veterans of wars prior to World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation eliminating all restrictions on the earning capacity of recipients of benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the purchase of milk by agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948 in such a manner as to encourage the domestic production of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the proposal of the enlargement of the Rules Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4186. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Milanne Popovics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Vasilis Karagianis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4188. A bill for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4189. A bill for the relief of Anna Antonia Hummel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.R. 4190. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Waldo Fusaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4191. A bill for the relief of Ligor Simyanoglu, Agavni Simyanoglu, and their daughter, Emilia Simyanoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4192. A bill for the relief of Graziella Orecchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 4193. A bill for the relief of Emiliano Rodriguez, also known as Juan Bautista Hidalgo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 4194. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 4195. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town*, *Maple City*, and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4196. A bill for the relief of Roy A. DeBolt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4197. A bill for the relief of Peter Kevin Sweeny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4198. A bill for the relief of Elpidio Javar Jamilosa and Patricia G. Brillantes Jamilosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4199. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Ferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4200. A bill for the relief of Krste Angeloff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4201. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Kurtales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4202. A bill for the relief of Vladimir (Talevic) Talevski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4203. A bill for the relief of Marie Loray Legister; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 4204. A bill for the relief of Kyung Ok Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4205. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 4206. A bill for the relief of Melvin H. Baker and Frances V. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 4207. A bill for the relief of Falco Rolando Candeloro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4208. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the

United States to Mrs. Harriet La Pointe Vanderventer; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Bucchianeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Stanislawa Wojewodzka Gorna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Bottero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Herman F. and Elizabeth V. Berens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Jan Marchelewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Marcella Bucchianeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Mariano Cracolici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Luigi Lo Bue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4217. A bill for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4218. A bill for the relief of Navroji (Nivi) D. Khandalavala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4219. A bill for the relief of the estate of William M. Farmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Wong Kam Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4221. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Abrams Abramowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. By Mr. HOSMER: Petition of certain residents of the 18th Congressional District of California, requesting enactment by Congress of House Resolution 1826 to create a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

57. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Culver City Bar Association, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to recommending for favorable consideration two additional judges to the District Court of the United States for both the Northern and Southern Districts of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Encouragement of Voluntary Pension Plans by Self-Employed Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have again today introduced a bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. This legislation is similar to the measures which I introduced in the 85th and 86th Congresses, and is identical with the bills previously passed by the House. It would permit self-employed individuals to take a current deduction for a limited amount of income invested in certain types of retirement annuity or trust. The investments would be treated as ordinary income when actually received in later years. This legislation is intended to achieve a greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed persons and employees.

Under the present law, a corporation can deduct from taxes money put into a qualified employee pension plan and the employee is not taxed on this money until he actually receives the retirement income in later years.

Unfortunately, the millions of self-employed persons were somehow overlooked when this provision was made in our 1942 tax law. Thus, these citizens are denied the opportunity to defer taxes on retirement savings.

This legislation would generally apply to persons who are subject to the tax on self-employment income—for social security purposes—including doctors, barbers, druggists, farmers, undertakers, lawyers, accountants, and other self-employed persons.

The bill would permit self-employed persons to take a deduction for a limited amount of income which they voluntarily place into a restricted retirement plan. In general this deduction is limited to 10 percent of net income from self-employment, but not to exceed $2,500 in any one taxable year and it may not exceed $50,000 during the lifetime of the self-employed person.

If an individual is over 50 years of age on the effective date of the proposed act, the limitation on the annual deduction is increased by one-tenth for each year that his age exceeds 50. For example, if he is age 60, the annual limit on his deduction would be 20 percent of income, but not over $5,000. No deduction is allowed for any year beginning after the taxpayer attains age 70.

Let us remove this discrimination against the self-employed. It is just as sound economically to remove this discrimination for the self-employed as it is for the employed individual.

The Members of the House twice have overwhelmingly passed legislation similar to this, and I sincerely hope that this Congress will pass such legislation early in this session.

Should a Senator Be Bound by His Party Platform?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently I had the opportunity to prepare for the Saturday Evening Post a statement on the question of party platforms and their relationship to Members of Congress. This statement was based upon a speech, before the New England Society, which dealt with the subject in considerable detail, and was inserted in the RECORD on January 5.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement which appeared as a signed editorial in the Saturday Evening Post on January 28.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD A SENATOR BE BOUND BY HIS PARTY PLATFORM?

(By Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut)

What is a party platform? Is it a document written on tables of stone, commanding obedience by elected officials, regardless of their own beliefs or their obligation to their constituents?

If a platform is considered merely as a statement of principles, as an indication to the people of the general view within a party, as one avenue of guidance for elected officials, it has a valid place. But if the party platform is to become supreme, and if conformity to its dogma is to become the new test of political integrity and advancement, our present political system will suffer a paralyzing shock from which it will never recover. Elected representatives will cease to be responsible to their reason, their consciences and their constituents, and become responsible instead to party platforms, to political conventions and to that vague obstraction called the will of the people, as divined by party bosses. The forms of our Republic may linger on as picturesque relics of the past, but the substance of representative government will vanish.

I think we should take a good look at the platform-making process. As one who has testified before resolutions committees, served on them, presented planks to the national convention and campaigned repeatedly for public office, I have come to question the value of platforms, both as indicators of the public will and as significant factors in elections.

Those who serve on resolutions committees spend 4 or 5 dreary days listening to the pleas and demands of all the major and minor pressure groups in the country. This testimony is heard in an arenalike atmosphere to the tune of cheers, boos or the bored rustling of the watching crowd. While the show is going on out front, a small group in the backroom, composed largely of staff members who are not even convention delegates writes the party platform. In the end it is the product of the backroom that is rushed to the committee for adoption, often

in the wee hours of the morning under time pressure which permits no real chance to debate more than a few of the planks. The committee swiftly adopts a 400-point blueprint for the future, which is rushed to the convention floor for perfunctory ratification by voice vote. Under the latest innovation, the platform is not even read to the delegates before they pass on it. Instead they are shown a dramatized version, filmed weeks before the convention, which covers some of the highlights.

Conceived in a partisan atmosphere, patched together in headlong haste, adopted without deliberation, riddled with promises to self-seeking groups, pointed toward the winning of an election rather than the governing of a nation—party platforms represent our political process at its weakest point.

The American people have no real voice in platform making. Not one voter in a hundred ever sees the platform of either party, and those who do see them have no way of indicating whether they support or oppose specific provisions. The only way the people could truly be said to ratify platform planks would be to place each plank on the ballot, like referendum questions, to be voted up or down. A ridiculous process, you may think, an impossible burden on the voter. And so it would be. But is it not far more ridiculous to pretend that the people have passed upon a platform when they have not?

Under the American system, people vote not for platforms but for persons, on the basis of what they seem to be, what they have done and what they say they will do. The people control their representatives by accepting or rejecting them on election day, not by passing upon individual questions of policy.

A U.S. Senator should never be the controlled tool of a political platform. He is the representative of all the people of his State and a representative of the Nation. He has, as well, a duty to those who have gone before him and those who will come after him. His task essentially is the search for truth in matters of government. He can determine the truth only by studying each problem carefully and honestly, using all the resources of his office, and making an independent decision based upon his own judgment and conscience.

All the processes of the Senate are founded upon this view of representation. Exhaustive committee hearings and investigations, volumes of testimony, careful consideration of the mail of constituents, long days of debate—all presuppose that Senators will base their final judgment not on last year's party platform but on today's evaluation of the facts presented.

To study and restudy each issue in the light of increased knowledge and changing circumstances, to admit mistakes when shown wrong, to stand against the popular tide when convinced of being right, to measure the claim of each special interest against the claim of the national interest, to distinguish between the call of partisanship and the call of patriotism—this is the duty which history lays upon the members of this Congress and this administration.

The Boy Scouts of America: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, February 7 through 13, 1961, mark Boy Scout Week. It is a privilege to pay tribute to the boys and the adult leaders who comprise the Boy Scouts of America—an organization which has served this Nation with genuine distinction.

Scouting is not something by and for itself. It becomes a part of the community and a part of the organization or institution which sponsors each troop. The success of scouting in America has been no accident. The Boy Scouts of America, as a national organization, does not operate the packs, troops, or units. It provides a program which is available to citizens to use with their boys. This grassroot basis gives scouting a golden opportunity to serve the community. In turn it develops our youth into responsible and intelligent citizens.

Scouting began in America in 1910. Fortunately, from the beginning it has been recognized that to accomplish the aims of scouting, leadership must be given voluntarily by men and women who would see in scouting a real opportunity for service. It is with pride that we can record that adult leadership in scouting has been strong. It has proceeded with enthusiasm to assist our youth with the activities which constitute the program of scouting.

Boy Scout Week is a time to renew our hopes and faith in the youth of America. The continued development of our youth to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight should not be a mere sidelight of desire. Development of our youth into citizens of character with high spiritual ideals and motives is essential if America is to fulfill its mission as a leader in a free world.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on February 16, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated. On this occasion, we in the free world should reflect on the sufferings of the Lithuanian people and of the populations of the other captive nations under Soviet tyranny. Let it be known that the aspirations for freedom of the people of Lithuania have not been forgotten.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on Lithuanian Independence Day be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

On February 16, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be commemorated. The people of Lithuania endured the oppressive rule of Russian autocracy for more than 100 years before it was overthrown by the 1917 revolution.

Early in 1918 they had their chance, seized upon it, proclaimed their independence on February 16, and founded the Lithuanian Republic. By that act, the people of Lithuania once more took their destiny into their own hands, and for about two decades they enjoyed their freedom.

This happy period was brought to an abrupt end in 1940. Soon after the outbreak of World War II, Lithuanians were robbed of their freedom by the men in the Kremlin. Now the present leaders of communism in the Soviet Union proclaim themselves in favor of the efforts of those who seek to break the chains of colonialism. This is nothing but gross deceit. For we know that if it were a sincere statement, the captive peoples of Eastern Europe would have long ago been given the right to self-determination. Rather, the Soviet Union has tried, at every opportunity, to intensify its control over the satellite countries.

Since 1940, the people of Lithuania have not known freedom. Their stern taskmasters have imposed upon them the severest restrictions to their personal liberty. Deportations have been numerous and the people have been denied the right to practice their religion.

The only encouraging part of the tragedy is that these stout-hearted people still cling to their idea of freedom. They still cherish the hope that in the end their sacrifices will not be in vain, and that some day they will regain their freedom.

We pray that one day, in the not too distant future, their aspirations will be realized.

The Shame of Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join Congressman JOHN BLATNIK in the sponsorship of a water pollution control bill. I would like to pause at this point to once again pay tribute to the inspiring leadership my distinguished colleague from Minnesota has provided over the years in combating our Nation's most serious problem—the preservation of our water resources.

Beyond doubt, Public Law 660, the Federal Water Pollution Act, has been one of the most successful Federal incentive grant programs ever enacted by the Congress. Since the inception of the program, just a few short years ago, construction of local facilities has gone up from 60 to 75 percent over the previous 5-year average prior to the time grants were available. Significant as these accomplishments are, we are faced with clear evidence that we are still not doing enough and that if present trends continue, a serious crisis will develop by 1970 as our daily needs for water increase.

The State of Maryland has received over $2½ million in Federal funds since 1957. This amount has resulted in the construction of $11 million worth of sewage treatment facilities. The program in Maryland, I believe, is one of the finest examples of cooperative federalism. It has had the added effect in my State of creating a companion State grant program whereby any municipal corpora-

tion that is helped by the Federal grant is automatically entitled to an additional State grant.

Gov. J. Millard Tawes in his remarks in correspondence to me urging that I vote to override President Eisenhower's veto of H.R. 3610 of the last Congress stated:

> The Federal Water Pollution Act of 1956 has put Maryland in a position where it can now see a solution to its pollution problems.

The increased authorizations called for in our bill are more than adequately justified by thoroughly documented studies of the problem that confronts us in our battle to conserve our water resources. The enforcement procedures which have been outlined in the past, I believe, will become even more effective with the suggested amendments contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great hope that water pollution legislation shall be made the first order of business. The time for study has ended.

Retired Military Pay Equalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during the 85th Congress, we enacted a new military pay law, Public Law 85–422, designed to increase the incentive for careers in the military services and partially to compensate for the shrunken-dollar value. However, personnel retired after June 1, 1958, are included in the law, while personnel retired before that date are not so included.

Since the very beginning of the present military retirement system, it has been practically the undeviating policy that the pay of a retired officer be directly geared to the active-duty pay of an officer of the same rank and length of service. The Cordiner Committee recognized and endorsed this principle in its report and also recognized the fact that a departure from it would break faith with the individuals retired.

Public Law 85–422 established two pay scales for equal merit and equal service. Those officers who were retired prior to June 1, 1958, are paid by one scale and those retired on and after that date are paid by the other. Is this the reward of a grateful country for honorable and heroic service performed during three wars?

This law breaks faith with previously retired officers, and it is my opinion that this precedent will have an adverse effect on the retention rates of personnel now on active duty, thus destroying the principal objective of the law. As a matter of fact, it is contrary to the recommendations of the Cordiner Committee, which unanimously recommended that pay of those retired before the enactment of any new law be computed at the new increased levels as the greatest single incentive for service careers.

Inevitably, many of our younger personnel, who should be encouraged to select service careers, will be deterred by this demonstrated retirement insecurity, with resultant larger personnel turnover. Thus, this matter affects the future caliber and esprit-de-corps of our military services, will be detrimental to national security, and, in the long run, extravagant in manpower and money.

Whereas Public Law 85–422, approved May 20, 1958, gives in general an increase of 6 percent for those officers retired before the effective date of the above law, June 1, 1958, and whereas Public Law 85–422 departs from the time-honored precept of granting to all retired service personnel the full advantages of each pay adjustment, and whereas there has always been an implied contract between the Government and its service personnel to the effect that retired personnel pay would be automatically adjusted as pay acts were revised, I wish to go on record as advocating the passage of immediate legislation, to be effective retroactively, which legislation will extend the full benefits of the new Pay Act, Public Law 85–422, to all retired service personnel without discrimination as to date of retirement.

At this time when high-class personnel is sorely needed for service careers, the encouragement for them to so choose is not there. The result in personnel turnover, caliber of personnel and esprit is not only costly but in my humble opinion extravagant.

Therefore, I urgently request the support of the membership of this House to correct this unwarranted and unjust discrimination and reestablish the time-honored policy regarding the computation of retired military pay.

President Makes Excellent Choice in Naming Rand Dixon Chairman of Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration is already distinguished by the abundance of high caliber and able leaders that the President has appointed to serve as his cabinet officers and in the various agencies and commissions. However, no position could have been filled with a more highly qualified man than that of the recently appointed Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. In naming Mr. Paul Rand Dixon of Tennessee to this important post, President Kennedy made a most excellent and appropriate choice.

Mr. Dixon served with the FTC for several years and made an outstanding record with the Commission. He moved from the Commission to the Senate Antitrust and Monopolies Subcommittee where as Counsel and Staff Director he compiled a most outstanding and notable record.

Mr. Dixon gained vast experience and insight into the operation of this Commission while on the Commission staff and displayed his dedication to the protection of the consuming public and the promotion of fair competition through his effective work as staff director of the Antitrust and Monopolies Subcommittee of the Senate. During his service with this subcommittee, some of the most dramatic and far-reaching disclosures ever made by a committee of the Congress were brought to the public attention. Mr. Dixon is an able lawyer, dedicated in his devotion to the public interest and public service.

Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that President Kennedy appointed Mr. Dixon as Chairman of this important Commission. I predict a record of dedicated service and a performance of which the President and the people of the Nation will be proud.

The Congress Will Respond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Kiwanis magazine of February 1961 by the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, Senator from South Dakota, entitled "The Congress Will Respond." It is a lucid appraisal of the 87th Congress by a distinguished Member:

THE CONGRESS WILL RESPOND

The 87th Congress is the first in many years to begin operations with a so-called undivided Government. It finds the Democratic Party enjoying control over both Legislative Houses and the White House. This fact brings to mind a number of significant questions, not the least of which are: Will this bring about more responsible government? Will it reduce the role of the Republican Party to that of a negative, nagging, antagonistic opposition, and thereby subvert the direction of our national purpose to petty squabbles along party lines?

In attempting to answer these questions, one must, it seems to me, appeal to history. In our own history, the history of America, we find that both systems of government—divided and undivided—have been made to work effectively. Then, too, there have been instances where each has failed. In my own experience of 22 years in the U.S. Congress, I have found that successful government has been attained because of—and not in spite of—sound, responsible party politics.

There can be no doubt that both parties want a better America, a prosperous America, one that continues to move ahead. The difference between the two parties do not really concern goals, but how best to attain these goals; it is a difference not of ends but of means. And, more often than not, much of our national legislation is the result of working out these differences through debate and compromise to achieve good government and a productive, free America.

The key to disagreement in majority and minority government is responsibility. When accepted and practiced, responsibility brings to the Nation united effort working for the national good. And responsibility in government has a peculiar way of making itself felt. It is for this reason that, as the 87th Congress opens with a new President in the White House, I am not seriously alarmed at the prospect of congressional divisiveness along party lines. For when the chips are down on issues of major significance, responsibility will, as it always has in the past, emerge. And it is my conviction that, as usual, it will cross party lines.

This is not to say that there will be no major differences over the role government is to play in the future. But, at the same time, these differences do not stand in the way of progressive programs, for responsibility rests with the President as well as with Congress. A President cannot afford to launch programs that are not, so to speak, "in tune with the times." This has, of course, happened, and it has usually been accompanied with a resultant change in the White House. It has also happened in Congress. But here, too, the American voter asserted his responsibility—when the politician has not asserted his—by stepping into the polling booth and removing from public office those officials who trifled with the national interest by playing politics in the legislature.

And here is the main reason why I expect the 87th Congress to be a typical Congress, a Congress that will be responsible. I refer to the voter. Responsibility begins and ends with the voter. It is still the greatest system devised for successful and productive government. For in our renowned check-system of government, the voter is the final check. If responsibility is not exercised where laws are made, then it will surely be exercised by private citizens on the home front where lawmakers are made.

Twentieth Anniversary of the USO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, the United Service Organizations, Inc., known to millions as USO, celebrated its 20th anniversary. For a fifth of a century USO has served the needs of our service men and women and through them the cause of world peace.

USO was organized in 1941 as a federation of six voluntary civilian organizations designed to meet the religious, spiritual, social, welfare, recreational, and educational needs of the men and women called to serve in the Armed Forces. In hot war and in cold it has admirably performed this task. It provides counseling services, information on travel and housing, recreational facilities and religious instruction to name but a few of its services to millions of young men and women who have served our military service since its founding.

USO was conceived and has developed as a vehicle through which the American people can translate their concern, interest, and appreciation for our servicemen into practical, everyday action. For the millions in the armed services USO provides a bit of home away from home. It is a bridge between military and civilian life; a way through which those who are physically removed from hometown and family can have a part of home brought to them.

I am happy to join with others in commemorating USO's anniversary. USO stands as an unmatched example of American citizens and citizen soldiers cooperating in the task of maintaining world peace.

The 51st Anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation is observing the 51st birthday of the Boy Scouts of America. It has been my great pleasure to be associated with this organization for the past 41 years and most recently as the vice chairman, region 8, Boy Scouts of America. Therefore, I am anxious that we recognize the great voluntary movement from which will come the leaders of tomorrow. Yesterday morning 12 of the highest type young men our Nation has produced reported to their Congressmen and 200 representative citizens on scouting's progress in 1960. They expressed appreciation especially to this body for what it has done to help write the record of scouting.

One has but to read the history of the Boy Scouts of America to recognize the splendid things they have done for the United States of America. Their record in peace and war merits the fullest recognition and support from all Americans. They have proven that organized youth can be a vital force in strengthening the traditions and principles that we all hold so dear.

Counting a membership of 5,164,000 active participants at the present time, and an alumni of over 35 million, the Boy Scouts have proved, too, that the volunteer principle is still vital in our social structure. The dedicated volunteers in scouting—over 1,300,000 of them who guide and direct the boys in their activities, and the handful of 3,500 dedicated individuals who make a career as Scout executives deserve our thanks.

Scouting has not become an organization unto itself. Rather, it has evolved its rich program—so appealing in fun, romance, and adventure to boys—for use by the churches, schools, service clubs, industrial bodies, labor organizations, and farm groups to use as a part of their programs for youth. This has been a vital reason for the great success of the scouting movement.

Scouting has exposed millions of Americans to one of the finest ethical codes ever developed—the Scout oath and the Scout law. Thus, it has become a movement with strong national purpose, a movement dedicated to building love of God and country in American youth, a movement dedicated to building strong and able citizens.

Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., chief Scout executive, introduced the 12 Scouts from scouting's 12 regions. He reiterated a belief held by millions of Americans: "The development of our youth to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight—to be citizens of character, with high spiritual ideals and motives—is not just a desirable thing; it is essential if America is to fulfill its mission as a leader in the free world."

With confidence in the Boy Scouts of America, in its contribution to physical fitness, character building, and citizenship training, as an aid to the home, church and school, we must go forward with it aggressively.

We must keep in mind the vast and increasing numbers of youth growing up in the years before us and safeguard the future of our country by adequately training them to be spiritually minded, dedicated citizens who must in large measure guarantee freedom to the future, not only for America but for all the world.

The 64th Congress on June 15, 1916, granted a charter to the Boy Scouts of America. Ellsworth Augustus, president of the Boy Scouts of America, reminded us yesterday that three of our number were in that Congress; namely, the Honorable Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN of Texas, the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia, and the Honorable CARL HAYDEN of Arizona. On this day as we ercognize scouting's 51st anniversary, we can well pause to pay tribute to these men who personally shared in linking the Congress with the Boy Scouts of America.

To Provide for National Cemeteries in the Central West Coast Area of the State of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida.

In introducing this bill, my primary interest is that those who served their country and have passed on shall be honored by our Nation with a final resting place in keeping with the great and valiant service that they have paid our Nation.

The Department of the Army, in its study of the national cemetery system, has recommended that Florida be served with additional cemeteries. At the present time, two national cemeteries are available to veterans in my State. The fact that one of them is located in the upper western corner of Florida means that many families, whose sons and

fathers can be, at best, provided a last resting place, must go to the expense of paying transportation of last remains for hundreds and hundreds of miles. The other cemetery, the St. Augustine National Cemetery, is closed to future interment.

It will be noted that in my bill I have designated the central west coast area of the State of Florida. This is done because of its close proximity to the center of veterans' population of the State, which in 1946 amounted to 250,000 and in 1960 more than doubled that amount. It is anticipated that within the next 10 years the veterans' population of Florida will again double, straining all available veterans' services, and in the case of national cemeteries we will be completely outdated.

I would urge congressional action at the very earliest opportunity to properly provide and serve, firstly, as recommended by the Army report, and, secondly, as demanded by the Nation's highest increasing veterans' growth.

In considering possible locations, I suggest the use of certain grounds available at the Bay Pines Veterans Hospital, and I respectfully suggest that this be considered along with other locations.

John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing for the establishment of a U.S. Diplomatic Academy to prepare this country for waging an aggressive battle against communism and on the peace front throughout the world.

Our diplomats must be trained in the mores and folkways—the customs and habits—the likes and dislikes, as well as the languages, of the countries in which they represent this country.

My bill encompasses the training and education of students at the academy concerning all aspects of the international Communist conspiracy so they can be more useful to their Government in defeating the aims of this conspiracy. My bill is also designed to meet the present and anticipated needs of the United States for adequately trained officers and employees in the diplomatic service of the United States.

In principle, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the objective of the Freedom Commission and Academy legislation to counteract the Communist organizational weapons, but I am convinced that we must add the positive action of providing a general diplomatic training school in which our future diplomats can learn in a few years some of what John Foster Dulles learned and techniques in diplomacy he developed in a lifetime. He had no opportunity to go to one source, to one fountainhead of general diplomatic learning, to fit himself for his task.

Mr. Dulles knew, perhaps better than any living man, the ever present danger that we face from an alien scheme of life. He was worried that we were not devoting our full energy as we should have to fight back against the subversive weapons used by the Leninists of today.

In his book "War and Peace," Mr. Dulles said:

> There may come a time in the life of a people when their work of creation ends. That hour has not struck for us. We are still vital and capable of great endeavor. Our youth are spirited, not soft or fearful. Our religious heritage and our national tradition are not forgotten.
>
> If our efforts are still inadequate, it is because we have not seen clearly the challenge and its nature. As that is more clearly revealed, we shall surely respond. And as we act under the guidance of a righteous faith, that faith will grow until it brings us into the worldwide fellowship of all men everywhere who are embarked on the great adventure of building peacefully a world of human liberty and justice.

In a study published in January of 1952 by the Rand Corp., "The Organizational Weapon," it was stated:

> The Communists are winning because they have developed a new form of power struggle, a new dimension of political warfare, which makes it possible for them to get to the people in each target nation and to control or manipulate them in ever-increasing numbers in the interest of the Soviets. As long as the Communists can do this and we cannot counteract it, our own diplomacy and aid programs will be largely undercut, while those of the Soviet Union and Red China will achieve success all out of proportion for the money spent.

John Foster Dulles pointed the war with the accuracy of a bombsight.

Without further delay the Department of State should be authorized to establish a diplomatic school modeled after our service academies. The school can be started at once to counteract the Communists and to train free world diplomats to carry the message of peace aggressively to all peoples in all lands.

I therefore urge that Congress take fast action on this subject and authorize immediately the creation of the John Foster Dulles Diplomatic Academy for Peace.

Edward Fields, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a grand and generous gesture made by Edward Fields, Inc., of New York, a firm which manufactures rugs of high quality.

Edward Fields, Inc., has donated a magnificent carpet for the diplomatic reception room of the White House. This rug, created by the Edward Fields designers, Marion V. Dorn and Louis B. Fisher in association with the Fine Arts Commission, is oval in shape and 26 by 36 feet in dimension. Its design incorporates the symbols of all 50 States and it has 50 stars around the border. The rug is valued at wholesale cost of approximately $13,000.

This generous gift for the beautification of the Executive Mansion is in fact a gift to the whole Nation, for which grateful acknowledgment is due by the American people and by their elected representatives.

An Open Letter to All Midwest Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have for many years listened and read articles by the hundreds of so-called professional economists and analysts of our economy, and I have listened to the speeches of some of my colleagues, both in the House and Senate, prescribing their cure for all our economic ills. Yes, and the President in his state of the Union speech to Congress on January 31, 1961, failed in my long-studied opinion to come to grips with the basic cause of our economic problems.

Most every one of those I have above referred to seems to forget that never have we had a lengthy recession or a depression in the United States of America when the purchasing power of our farmer dollar was worth 100 cents in buying power. What then is the solution to the problem of the unemployed, the farmer himself, and the merchant and industry of every nature? Let us take a good clear look at the record. Records prove that when the farmer's dollar is worth 100 cents at the counter he buys more than twice as many dollars' worth of manufactured goods on an average annually than do other Americans on an average annually. That being a fact, then one needs not wonder why we have so many unemployed in the hard goods industries, such as automobiles, farm tractors, trucks, and expensive steel goods of every nature, as well as in many other industries. The pure and simple reason is that the farmers' dollar has for many past years on an average been worth only 80 cents in purchasing power and you may be sure the present economic condition will continue until the farmer's dollar is at par in purchasing power with the price of goods he would like to buy, and would buy if his dollar was at par value. We must stop dreaming up and adopting more of these costly uneffective remedies that cost billions, and cure nothing. Records will also prove that the farmers of the corn and wheat growing, and hog and cattle raising sections of America are the best customers of such goods, as tractors, trucks, and farm machinery, lumber, woven wire, steel posts, and so forth. Facts are, that when their dollar is at par value, the farmers of the Bread Basket of the United States of America

buy more dollars' worth of such manufactured goods than do the farmers in all the other States of the Union combined, which means work for the factory worker, business for the merchant and industry, and in proportion to the farmers' ability to buy.

All of these facts must be taken into account, and the solution of this all-important problem put into effect.

Many Members of Congress agree with me, both Republicans and Democrats, as do a majority of the farmers of the Midwest, and some economists in and out of the Department of Agriculture, that the best, the quickest, and cheapest way to solve most of our economic ills is for Congress to pass a liberal payment-in-kind law for the producers of the wheat, corn, and all other feed grains, which will pay these farmers sufficiently to warrant them to take good productive land out of production until production and consumption is again in balance, and the farmer's income is on a profitable higher stabilized basis.

During the last session of Congress I joined nine of my colleagues in introducing a farm bill which provided for the necessary legislation as set out above. I am sorry that neither the House or the Senate agriculture committees saw fit to even give our bill a hearing. But let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will never give up the fight. We have reintroduced our bill in this session, and I am pleased to say that more Members will introduce companion bills and all of us propose to press for its adoption during this session; to do less would render us unworthy of our place as servants of the people.

Here again are the main provisions of our bill, which I have explained in an open letter to all the farmers of the Midwest.

AN OPEN LETTER TO ALL MIDWEST FARMERS

DEAR FRIENDS: Here is good news for Midwest farmers if our bill is made the law of the land.

As all farmers know, during the past two wars your Government urged, yes pleaded with, you to produce, produce. You did produce beyond all expectations, to your everlasting credit. The wars were won, to a great degree because our side had the greatest supply of food, feed, and fiber.

But we did not alter our farm program to fit our peacetime economy.

As our Republican candidate, Richard Nixon, says, "The Government got our farmers into this mess, now it is the Government's duty to help them out of it."

The costly price-depressing surpluses of wheat, corn, and all feed grains in CCC storage must be materially reduced before you farmers can receive your fair share of the national income. Every schoolboy knows that.

So the question becomes "How can that be done?" Here is the answer devised by 10 Midwestern Republican Congressmen, JENSEN, HOEVEN, GROSS, SCHWENGEL, and KYL of Iowa, ANDERSEN, QUIE, NELSEN, and LANGEN of Minnesota, and WEAVER of Nebraska.

For many months this group spent much time and deep study writing a farm bill, which was introduced in the last session of Congress. I shall explain herein the main provisions of our plan in as few words as possible.

Realizing first of all that we do not have the votes in Congress to pass a farm bill calling for cash payments which would run into billions of dollars, we took the most acceptable recourse left to us, payment-in-kind. Our present stocks are great, and furthermore, are already paid for.

Our plan is an amendment to and not a substitute for any part of the present plan. Hence you may still seal grains just as you do now, and the Conservation Reserve section of the Soil Bank Act would be retained as at present.

Here are the additional benefits our plan provides for you:

First, our plan is voluntary. But to be so, very liberal payments in kind must be offered in order to make it profitable enough for farmers to participate.

1. You would have the opportunity to idle up to 50 percent of your previous 3 years' average acres of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed; and for each idled acre below the said 3-year average you will receive bushel for bushel from CCC stocks according to the historical production capability of the idled land. This record of production is maintained by the county ASC office.

2. A negotiable Government certificate will be issued to you which you as a cooperating farmer may either sell for cash or take the grain for your own use. In either event the grain will be taken out of CCC storage by someone, used up, and be gone forever, with no grain grown in its place on those idle acres. If low feed value corn is accepted, then you will receive more bushels in proportion to its feed value.

3. As soon as our plan is made law, all feed grains and wheat will go up in price, and all livestock, poultry, and egg prices will rise in turn. Thus all farm prices will stabilize on a much higher level. Hence it is not too much to expect that for each acre of corn so taken out of production in Iowa, our farmers will actually receive an average of not less than $70 per acre, with no production costs. Likewise it is a good insurance policy.

Our bill provides that CCC stocks cannot be sold below 105 percent of full parity, to protect you against dumping and driving down prices on the open market.

This happened last year when the demand for oats was strong because of a small crop. The CCC disposed of its stock of oats at 63 percent of parity, costing oats farmers millions of dollars. This must not happen to all grain farmers.

Now, in conclusion, I assure you that almost every Member of Congress from the Middle West, be he Republican or Democrat, will push hard for our plan. Most of them helped us during the last session.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN,
Congressman, Seventh Iowa District.

Greetings to the Estonian National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in greeting you on the 43d anniversary celebration of Estonian Independence Day I sincerely share your sentiments for a free and independent Estonia. The joys of February 24, 1918, have been short lived, but I am indeed pleased to know that the spirit of freedom, the love of liberty, which brought about the birth of the Estonian Republic 43 years ago is very much alive in today's Communist-dominated Estonia. Through their unstinted sacrifices, and with the aid of their friends and sympathizers, the Estonian people will again regain their freedom. Just as their sufferings under czarist autocracy schooled them in adversity, so the more tyrannical and almost unbearable yoke of Communist totalitarianism steels them in their struggle against their oppressors. Let us pray for the victory of their righteous cause and for their freedom.

An Industry Broadcaster Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. Lincoln Faulk, manager of station WCKB, Dunn, N.C., recently addressed a letter to me enclosing statements expressing his views with respect to certain important issues which had been considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In view of the importance of the views expressed by Mr. Faulk, I hope they will be read by all broadcasters and others who are interested in improving broadcasting in the United States.

Mr. Faulk's letter addressed to me, his statements, and my reply letter to Mr. Faulk read as follows:

DUNN, N.C., *January 24, 1961.*

HON. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, House Commerce Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have followed your hearings and have read your reports on the regulatory agencies with a great deal of interest. I must say that I agree, in the main, with your findings and believe you have been both fair and impartial. As a broadcaster, I am really happy that some steps are being taken both by the new administration and the Congress to improve broadcasting for our country. I think, too, that most of those who may dissent will be largely those who wish to operate mainly in their own interests before the public interest.

In this connection, I have prepared some statements for our own Carolina delegation, and I thought maybe you would like to see them, too. Hence, I enclose a couple.

Sincerely yours,

A. LINCOLN FAULK,
Manager.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED 3-YEAR OWNERSHIP REQUIREMENT

(By A. Lincoln Faulk, manager, WCKB, Dunn, N.C.)

I am an independent broadcaster, and by observation and experience strongly urge the proposed 3-year ownership rule for the following reasons:

1. I have been with one station for 14 years, from its beginning, and it is my experience that it took us more than 3 years to gain community confidence and acceptance. It took us more than 3 years of trial and error to find the kind of programing and service which best served the community.

We are still searching for better means and ways to operate in the public interest.

2. Those who are after the fast dollar usually operate as absentees, or they come into the community, operate with all kinds of rates, with unqualified personnel, limited staffs, and little concern for public interest. Such operators often resort to the spectacular to gain momentary audiences and inflated coverages, and then unload the property while it has a puerile and inflated value. Exorbitant claims are made on and off the air, many unjustified or proven, with many practices open to question of honesty and integrity.

3. I do not believe that speculative ownership can operate in the interest of the public nor the industry as a whole.

4. It is obvious that in many cases transfers were obtained without any honest intention of the transferees to operate the station other than for speculation.

5. I do not interpret free enterprise to mean irresponsibility to the public trust of a public facility.

6. I am sure that the rule could be adopted with exceptions made for hardship cases or acts of God.

7. I am sure that the 3-year ownership rule will provide a much better type of broadcaster and therefore result in better broadcasting.

Certainly, a better control at the point of ownership and new station licenses will help to correct many present weaknesses in broadcasting.

MY CONCEPTIONS OF THE DUTIES OF THE FCC

(By A. Lincoln Faulk)

I believe that the FCC was instituted to represent the interests of the public and to protect those interests from abuses and misuses. Therefore, its first responsibility is to the public and to the Congress which brought it into being.

I believe that the FCC has the power and duty to look into programing at all times, and, short of censure, use its power to influence programing in the public interest. It should not be more concerned with quality of signals than with quality of programs. To me, what is heard is as important as is how it's heard.

I believe the FCC should recognize that an applicant's financial abilities can and will affect the kind of signal, performance, and the programs he broadcasts.

I feel the Commission should keep a watchful eye on multiple ownerships which tend to monopolize media of mass communications.

I favor a curb on the apparent use of broadcast facilities for mere speculation. I am in favor of the proposed 3-year ownership rule. It is not possible to reconcile the use of the broadcast facility as a speculative football and the public interest.

I would reemphasize that the privileges of broadcasting also demand assumption of the responsibilities inherent.

I believe the Commission should be free from network and big station pressures, and that just as the Commission must represent the public, it should also be responsive to the largest segment of the industry—the small, medium, and independent broadcasters.

I believe the Commission can obtain healthier broadcasting by powers of influence and suggestion, by eliminating antiquated rules, by more direct forms and less theory, by simplification and clarification of current rules, and by proper and uniform enforcement of these rules.

I feel the Commission has power and rules sufficient, and that they should be applied realistically in broader aspects to bring both private rights and public interest in more complete balance. It should view the spectrum of broadcasting under conditions of the present instead of 25 years ago, and make use of the vast experience available from responsible broadcasters throughout the entire industry.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1961.

Mr. W. LINCOLN FAULK,
Manager, Station WCKB,
Dunn, N.C.

DEAR MR. FAULK: I have your letter of January 24, 1961, enclosing a statement in support of the proposed 3-year ownership requirement of radio station licensees and a statement outlining your conception of the duties of the Federal Communications Commission.

It is certainly refreshing to find broadcasters like yourself express views at variance with views rather frequently expressed by publications and organizations which purport to speak for the broadcasting industry as a whole.

It is my hope that other broadcast licensees will form independent judgments on the subjects discussed in your statements.

With best wishes for your continued success in the field of broadcasting,

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Spectacular Louisiana Mardi Gras Ball Here Next Saturday Night—Inaugurated in 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it was back in 1946 during the Mardi Gras season that the Louisianians in Washington who were thinking about the carnival in New Orleans and wishing they could be there decided to do the next best thing—bring Mardi Gras to the National Capital. About 200 of their number gathered in the Congressional Room of the then new Statler Hotel and inaugurated what has become a leading social event of Washington, bringing national and international publicity for Louisiana—the famed Mardi Gras ball.

The attendance in 1946 will have grown to a turnaway throng of 1,500 when the 1961 ball is staged next Saturday night, February 11, in Sheraton Hall of the Sheraton Park Hotel. So colorful, spectacular, and outstanding has this occasion become that a great number of calls for tickets must be turned down each year because of the increasing demand.

The Mardi Gras ball presents queens of Louisiana's festivals, 26 of whom will participate this year, together with 12 maids. Midshipmen from the U.S. Naval Academy will serve as their escorts.

Each year, honors are paid to a major Louisiana industry and Saturday night's observance will stress the very important role of oil and gas in the State's progress. Past Mardi Gras balls have saluted sugar, rice, forestry, waterways, sweetpotato, and other resources.

Ruling over this year's ball will be G. M. "Jake" Anderson, of Shreveport, La., petroleum executive, and Miss Rita Katherine Long, daughter of Senator and Mrs. Russell B. Long and a junior at University High School in Baton Rouge, La.

The queen will be presented to her king by the Ambassador to the United States from France, M. Herve Alphand. The list of other notables who are to attend will be headed by Vice President and Mrs. LYNDON B. JOHNSON and will include members of the Cabinet, Senate, House of Representatives, Armed Forces, and other dignitaries from Washington and from Louisiana.

As queen, Miss Long will have as her maids, the Misses Jan Adcock, Monroe, La.; Mary Elizabeth Allen, Lafayette, La.; Helen Anne Bienvenu, St. Martinville, La.; Dianne DeFranceaux, Washington; Annette Ducote, Cottonport, La.; Arna Victory Fernandez, Washington; Jean Marie Gremillion, Abbeville, La.; Sandra Hartke, Indiana; Linda Elaine King, Washington; Sandra Newman, Washington; Frances Voorhies, St. Martinville; Sandra Weaver, Jonesville, La.

Members of the King's Committee are N. H. Wheless, Jr., Shreveport; Joe T. Dickerson, Washington; Harold F. Moses, New Orleans; W. E. Wilson, Shreveport; Harold Skinner, Houston, Tex.; Roy Sessums, New Orleans; Sims Regard, Baton Rouge; L. T. Vice, Washington; Keith Pyburn, Shreveport; John Sprague, Washington; McVea Oliver, Monroe.

The Louisiana festival queens who will be presented at the ball and the festivals they represent:

Miss Claudia Adams of Bogalusa, queen of Roses, Rose Festival, Bogalusa.

Miss Shirline Ardoin of Kaplan, queen of Vermilion Fair and Livestock Show, Kaplan.

Miss Jacquelin Bland of Mansfield, queen of Louisiana State Future Farmers of America, Baton Rouge.

Miss Leona Boudreaux of Jefferson Island, queen of Delcambre Fishing Industry, Delcambre.

Miss Jay Browning, queen of Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition, Lafayette.

Miss Celia Chachere of Lafayette, queen of Southwest Louisiana Mardi Gras, Lafayette.

Miss Suzanne Doty of Marksville, queen of Louisiana Livestock and Pasture Festival, Marksville.

Miss Virginia Flick of New Orleans, queen of News Orleans Floral Trail.

Miss Marva Glover, queen of Holiday in Dixie, Shreveport.

Miss Emmaline Hebert of Breaux Bridge, queen of Crawfish Festival, Breaux Bridge.

Miss Patricia Henry of Morgan City, queen of Louisiana Shrimp Festival, Morgan City.

Miss Debbie Ann LaBove of Sweet Lake, queen of Fur and Wildlife Festival, Cameron.

Miss Pat Landry of Belle Chasse, queen of Orange Festival, Buras.

Miss Lyndal Larson of New Iberia, queen of Louisiana Sugar Cane Festival, New Iberia.

Miss Sandra McElwee of Haynesville, queen of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Baton Rouge.

Miss Virginia O'Brien of St. Martinville, queen of the International Rice Festival, Crowley.

Miss Lynda Pote of Shreveport, queen of North Louisiana Delta Festival.

Miss Elaine Perron of Abbeville, queen of Louisiana Dairy Festival and Fair, Abbeville.

Miss Frances Richardson, queen of Louisiana Paper Festival, Bogalusa.

Miss Billie Sue Riordan of Bernice, queen of Louisiana Peach Festival, Ruston.

Miss Ann Robert, queen of Ozone Camellia Association, Slidell.

Miss Jerri Roberts of Joyce, queen of Louisiana Forest Festival, Winnfield.

Miss Eathel Ann Seal, queen, Sweetheart of American Legion, Bogalusa.

Miss Brenda Rita Thibodeaux of Church Point, queen of Louisiana Yambilee Festival, Opelousas.

Miss Mittie Sue Ticac of Maringouin, queen of Louisiana Market Poultry Show, Alexandria.

Miss Anne Waites of Delhi, queen of Cotton Festival, Ville Platte.

The festival queens, accompanied by other Louisianians, arrived by plane today for a busy round of events climaxed by the ball Saturday night. Friday morning there will be a sightseeing tour and a visit to the White House where they will be photographed with the President and a presentation of Louisiana camellias will be made to the First Lady. A luncheon in the Old Supreme Court Building in the Capitol, as guests of the Louisiana Congressional Delegation, will follow and there will be a dinner dance in the Blue Room of the Shoreham Hotel Friday night for the queens, maids, and their escorts. Also scheduled for Friday night is the King's Hour when his majesty of the 1961 Mardi Gras Ball will greet his loyal subjects during a reception from 6:15 to 7:45 in the Burgundy Room of the Sheraton Park.

I have the honor of serving as this year's chairman of the ball. President Felix M. (Dan) Broussard of the Louisiana State Society of Washington is again in general charge of arrangements.

The ball, highlighted as usual by the Krewe of Louisianians, will present a romantic chapter out of Louisiana's past with its theme, "Jean Lafitte, the Pirate." In keeping with the theme, the 100-member Krewe will be garbed in the swashbuckling attire of the buccaneers of yesteryear and will parade before backgrounds duplicating some of the famous settings of old New Orleans.

Featured in the pageant will be the authentic Dixeland jazz music of the Dukes of Dixeland, natives of New Orleans.

Louisianians from the Third District, which I have the privilege of representing in Congress, who are already in Washington or due to arrive here for the ball and other events include:

Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Nehrbass, Lafayette; Mr. and Mrs. Drew Cornell, Lafayette; Ed Kyle, Morgan City; Mr. and Mrs. Pete Guarisco, Morgan City; Chief Justice John B. Fournet of the Louisiana State Supreme Court and Mrs. Fournet; Miss Eugenie Voorhies, St. Martinville; Miss Sylvia Louise Bienvenu, St. Martinville; Miss Judy Coleman, St. Martinville; State Senator and Mrs. A. O. Rappelet, Galliano; Mr. and Mrs. C. T. Kief, Galliano; Mr. and Mrs. Vincent Lopresto, Houma; Mr. and Mrs. Joe Chachere, Lafayette; Mr. and Mrs. Martin W. O'Brien, St. Martinville; Mrs. Jeff Bienvenu, St. Martinville.

Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday February 8 I was privileged to attend a breakfast in Washington of the Boy Scouts of America, labeled the "1961 Report to the Nation Scout". My host was 15-year-old George L. Ashley of 3 Woody Lane, Larchmont, N.Y., an Eagle Scout representing region two which includes New York, New Jersey, and Puerto Rico.

Young Ashley, known as Luke, began his indoctrination into scouting as a Cub Scout 7 years ago. He is now a junior assistant scoutmaster in troop 4 sponsored by the Larchmont Lions Club. He is in the Siwanoy-Bronx Valley Council, Boy Scouts of America.

Luke is recording secretary of his lodge in the Order of the Arrow, scouting's national brotherhood of honor campers. He was junior assistant scoutmaster of his troop at the Fifth National Jamboree last year at Colorado Springs, Colo. He enjoyed wilderness camping at the Philmont Scout Ranch at Cimarron, N. Mex. He has the distinction of having hiked the Appalachian Trail from Connecticut to the New Jersey line.

Luke attends the local high school in my home town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., where he has been vice president of the student council, secretary of his class, and student council representative. His extracurricular activities consist of participation in the school's glee club, football, basketball, and track.

He has earned the God and Country Award, a church award for special study and service in his faith. He is a member of the Methodist Youth Fellowship and has been in his church choir for two years. Like his distinguished father, Luke plans to be a lawyer.

At the breakfast meeting Luke and 11 other Scouts, virtually all of whom were Explorer Scouts (all except Luke, the youngest of the group) addressed the Congressional Representatives and Senators and other guests who were present. They told in forthright and excellent fashion of the benefits of Scouting and of their joy in being part of this tremendously exciting and constructive enterprise. Some of the boys expressed the feeling of the group in explaining how grateful they were to live in a land of freedom, and all of them were keenly aware of the virtues which our country affords its citizens. Luke spoke convincingly and well.

Some of them told of how, at the jamboree at Colorado Springs, where thousands of boys congregated with Scouts from other countries in all parts of the world, there was a spirit of real rapport and understanding despite the barrier of language. Signs and smiles bridged the gaps of oral communication and made it possible for the American boys to offer hospitality to their colleagues from distant lands.

One boy pointed out how, on Sunday morning, a hush came over the camp as thousands upon thousands of boys crisscrossed the huge camp area on their way to their respective church services. Services were held in some 13 denominations, but each boy respected the other's choice of worship. That, pointed out one youngster, is the American way.

Forty-six years ago, under President Wilson, the Congress of the United States granted the first charter to a youth organization; namely, the Boy Scouts of America. At that time the total number of Scouts was minimal contrasted to today's 5 million boys who are enjoying the benefits of this great organization. Its three objectives of build, serve, and achieve, sum up cryptically the fine task it is performing.

Last year it was my pleasure to visit Camp Siwanoy in Westchester County, N.Y., the area from which Luke Ashley hails. The camp is ideally located and splendidly administered and provides an opportunity for boys from Westchester County to enjoy the invigorating experience of outdoor life. This year, I am told by a reliable source, a science camp is going to be established at Siwanoy which will be the last word in the modern approach to the highly technical age in which we live. A number of foundations have manifested an interest in this science camp and it may well set a pattern for Scout camps of the future.

The Federal Government Should Collect Fair and Reasonable Charges for Use of Inland Waterways, Navigation Improvements, Constructed, Maintained, or Operated With Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the second session of the last Congress, I introduced H.R. 12395, a bill to establish the Inland Navigation Commission and to authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements that have been, or are being, constructed, maintained, or operated by means of Federal funds.

No action was taken on that bill in the 86th Congress, although gratifying public interest in it was demonstrated.

The proposal to reimburse the taxpayers by imposing reasonable user charges on those few who directly benefit by enormous public expenditures for domestic transportation facilities, is one that Congress should not treat lightly. The economic strength of this country would have been immensely increased if Congress, through the enactment of that bill, had recognized—and halted—the tremendous and irreparable economic waste that necessarily results from the policy of providing capital for inland waterway operators in the form of free transportation facilities.

Accordingly on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 586, which is identical to the bill introduced by me in the last Congress except for necessary changes in dates. The need for such a bill is even greater today than it was in the early part of 1960. Railroad employment, railroad earnings and railroad ability to handle the transportation necessities that would arise from any national emergency have all fallen off from what they were even in May of last year when I introduced H.R. 12395. This is manifestly bad both for the economic welfare and the national security of our country. This bill, I am convinced, is a means for strengthening both by requiring those who receive special commercial benefits from public funds to pay for the cost of what they receive. In this, I am not suggesting that any favors be granted to railroads or railroad employees. This is not a railroad relief bill; it is a bill for relief of the American taxpayer and relief of the Nation's transportation economy. What I am suggesting is that a major step be taken, by means of the waterway user charge bill, toward a sound fiscal and transportation policy. If this could be done, three major beneficial effects would inevitably follow. First, the transportation facilities of the Nation would more and more tend to be used on the basis of their economic value to the Nation, since the true cost of transportation services would more nearly be reflected in their price. Second, the already overburdened taxpayer would no longer be compelled to contribute millions of dollars of capital to be put to use by others for commercial gain. Third, the Federal Treasury would be reimbursed by those profiting from the public expenditure.

This is not to say that I am opposed to inland waterway improvements for navigation. My position is quite a simple one. If navigational improvements are worthwhile, they can and should be paid for by those who benefit from them. If the use of these improvements is not worth their cost, then we are deluding ourselves and wasting public funds when we authorize such so-called improvements—as we do year after year—and appropriate the tremendous sums required to pay for them. When we do this we are using public tax money desperately needed for public purposes, applying it to the benefit of a few of our citizens who are able to pay for their benefits and at the same time weakening the remainder of our transportation system. Mr. Speaker, this is folly of the most tragic kind.

I will not at this time go further into the purpose and effects of H.R. 586 but I expect to do so at more length in the near future. Meanwhile, I urge that H.R. 586 be considered seriously by this House. In times such as these when international crises spring up without warning in every quarter of the globe, many of them calling for immense expenditures in the direct interest of national security, we cannot longer afford the luxury of pouring money into inland waterway transportation without requiring that it be repaid.

The New Frontier in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the late start in legislative deliberations has given us all an opportunity to evaluate our position—to better know where we are and whither we are tending so we might better know what to do and how to do it. There is much to consider, for there has been a tremendous outpouring of spoken and printed material designed to condition the Congress and the people for almost any eventuality. Any void in the information has been filled by a willing team of journalists who have been more lobbyist than reporter. The time has come to put things in proper perspective.

This situation is nothing new. In those years when the executive leadership has changed, there has been an unsettled period when problems seem greater and solutions more difficult. Casual perusal of campaign speeches before presidential elections and the first utterances of new Presidents after inauguration will show that every such period has been called one of great crisis—the most trying times in history. Collectively, the Presidents of this Nation have been amazingly capable men of immense integrity. All have been, and I am sure, will continue to be, men of honor, with a consuming desire to be notable leaders. Though some may have seemed less political, all have been politicians, the product of our political system. In varying degrees, all have recognized the fact that if there is no job to be done, no record of achievement can be established. A little exaggeration has always been present, if not on the part of the new President, certainly on the part of his political associates. And this exaggeration is possible because, constituted as this Nation is, it has always had problems and will always have problems. But no detractors can obscure the fact that this social, political, and economic system has presented more individual satisfaction through spiritual and material blessings than ever before seen on this globe. Indeed, the system itself creates an ever-increasing scope of desires.

Our ailments must not be minimized. The Nation must be informed—but it need not be informed in a manner which gives aid and comfort to those bent on destroying us. Certainly, a people can be unified through faith and confidence much longer than they can be prompted by fright. The cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" is no stimulus to action in the fact of inconsistency. Real burdens are neglected when genuinely serious needs are hidden among fabrications added for total propaganda effect. Leaders become suspect in their legitimate purpose when they say in the month of October that 17 million people go to bed hungry every night in our blessed land, and in January following they report that "the American people eat better than any people in the history of the world."

The people wonder when they are told in October that a serious missile gap gives all military superiority to the adversary and then our leaders determine one day in February that there is in fact no missile gap. Next day the announcement is declared premature. The Nation has a right to wonder how an executive staff can be reduced through addition of more members, or how the merit status of civil service might be better served through personal, political scrutiny of promotions by a department head. They are entitled to know how additional billions can be spent without proportionate increases in the tax burden of the present and future generations. The man who pays, knows that a tax by any other name is still a tax, even though Government officials cloak the obvious with such phrases as, "The Treasury will be reimbursed for this expenditure of about a billion dollars through raising the limits of income covered in present law." Puzzled citizens are wondering how 6 percent of the world's population which lives in this chaotically depressed Nation can support the other 94 percent of the world in its quest for better education, better industrial growth, and better life in general. We wonder about the state of national politics when Cabinet members say public projects are a legitimate club to force legislators into line and that the nonconformist will soon be a man of extinction.

As long as there are human needs which are not being met, we must be constructively concerned. Every good American wants the best for his country. We want the same things, but our approaches are different. We should resent any implication that if we do not accept the modus operandi of the Chief that we are not interested in people. I would also hope we can all agree that in seeking solutions to our problems we do not abandon or destroy the very system which has secured our multitudinous blessings.

Our current difficulties both real and imagined have been abundantly proclaimed. We have had recommended new methods of solution, methods which sometimes depart from what many Americans consider the traditional way

of economics, society, and government. Most of the solutions suggested involve greater participation of the Federal Government, in many instances replacing activity of individuals, private groups, or our smaller political subdivisions. Proponents of these new solutions usually say the Government must act because other means have failed, and where there is no call to action from the people, a carefully designed public opinion program creates the desire. "If the people do not know what is good for them—if the States do not know what is good for them, we will tell them." "We don't know what you want but we know what we want and you shall have it."

This is why it seems we have more solutions than problems. This is why someone must explain that all change is not progress.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are worried when the Chief Executive says that in the next 4 years, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure and says the outcome is by no means certain. Many of us would like an elaboration on that theme. Does the Chief Executive know something of subversion not generally known? Does he foresee governmental controls of prices, wages, production, and consumption—or abolition of local government? These are not idle worries, for has not a confidant of the Chief Executive said we must adopt the welfare state as a means of avoiding Communist domination? There are many of us, Mr. Speaker, who think such a policy of adoption is similar to an injection of live virus. We fear metastasis of this governmental cancer—this little dose of socialism.

We fear the political doctors have prescribed cures without diagnosing the disease. It is not enough to speak of needs, for naming is not explaining. One cannot logically approach solution of problems without knowing the causes of those problems. What are the causes and what are the symptoms? Then, the suggested remedy must prove practical and beneficial. The solution of one problem must not create another.

We have heard of the symptoms—retarded growth of gross national profit, joblessness, depressed areas, insufficient income for the aged. Is it not possible that these very problems exist because we have already placed too much emphasis on big government and big government spending? Is it not possible that much of the low morals in government is the result of moving too much authority too far from the people? What has caused the inflation which robs the aged? Is not a terrible national debt of $190 billion also a danger sign? Is it a sign of national health to have 40 million people getting checks worth $40 billion from the Federal Government? Does history teach that when the government becomes all things to all people, there is no freedom?

There are, unfortunately, some Americans who think that political discussions require something less than truth—or at least that truth may be subverted to cleverness—that false impressions created by semantics somehow are not as false. Thus, others of us are dismayed when our opposition says, "We are engaged in a battle between those who are contented and those who are concerned." This impression must be corrected: This is not a struggle between the contented and the concerned, but between those concerned with the sensation of short-range solution for political gain and those concerned with the perpetual welfare of this great free Nation and the generations of Americans to come.

It should be unnecessary to say again that when the Government spends it must either tax or defer payment to future debt. The Federal Government cannot give anything it does not first take away from the people now or charge to future generations. Yet, we frequently hear the argument that the Federal Government must undertake some purely intrastate project because the States cannot afford to do the job. Is it foolish to ask how the States collectively can afford to pay for the local programs they cannot afford individually?

One thing which makes Federal spending so popular is lack of fortitude on the part of local officials who want the honey of local projects without the sting of local taxes. These local officials can only share the blame. The Federal Government has continually usurped the taxing authority necessary to local support and local control. No, there are no magicians in Washington who can give something for nothing.

At this time, as always, the Federal Government can take constructive steps to alleviate temporary economic distress. But in the final analysis, genuine prosperity is created only from development of that atmosphere which is conducive to expansion of free enterprise. This involves vital considerations of individual initiative and individual rights. It is not a heartless policy. It is realistic. This is certainly no time to preach that risk capital and reasonable profit are profane terms of the inhumane. To hold any other policy is to adopt the discredited systems and philosophies of those who seek to destroy us.

Would it be better then, to take steps to rebuild and to strengthen, and to actively promote the economic system which has brought this Nation to abundance? Was there ever a time we could cease inspiring a faith in free government, free social life and free enterprise?

Yes; we must be realistic. And this involves recognizing that it is politically expedient to seek the quick solution which is all take and no give. Simultaneously, I plead that we remember it has always been impossible to trade personal liberty for immediate economic security or what seems like economic security, and retain either. It is good to have the bird in the hand, but the bird dies quickly, and the birds in the bush are most elusive.

In this body we deal with vast problems of 180 million people in 50 States and additional areas. Perhaps this realization sometimes overwhelms us and causes us to overlook the simple truths. I know, for instance, that as an individual, in my own personal life, I cannot spend more than I have or there will be dire consequences. Does this same evaluation apply to states and nations?

In our personal lives we admire the neighbor who knows restraint and who teaches that opportunity is more blessed than security. For opportunity allows us to go as high as our own ambitions and self reliance will let us, while security always connotes a leveling to a stage lower than most thinking, ambitious people would choose. There is, after all, an equality in communism or socialism—but it is an equality which results from pushing the top down—not from lifting up the bottom.

Interpreting governmental affairs in this fashion is not irrelevant, for we have assigned to the government our individual responsibility for our moral acts and our economic welfare. How much of the breakup in family life itself can be traced to this transfer of responsibility? What has governmental action done to the institution of family life? The answer is usually clouded by someone's hurried allusion to the difference between legal and moral responsibility but this evasion does not erase the commentary that while one mother still feels the responsibility to care for six growing children, six grown children have no responsibility for one mother. There was an era of our history framed and captioned "the era of dollar diplomacy," and historians of the future may label ours the period of "dollar morality."

I cannot agree that the Federal Government must, or can, replace the responsibility of an individual to himself, the family to its members, the village to its residents, or the State to its citizens.

All of us still give lipservice to saving the American way of life, but too many no longer can identify either what it is they are trying to save or explain why they are trying to save it. No constructive assistance is presented by people in government, official or ex officio, who proclaim that we can save freedom by substituting a welfare state. We cannot believe that the American way of life is a bad dream, and the only way we can avoid the nightmare of communism is to be soothed by the same poison in a smaller dose.

The greatness of this Nation is still in the independent, self-reliant, individual citizen. We cannot continue to destroy the free nature of this individual as a contributing citizen without in the end, destroying the collective freedom of all our people.

New Agriculture Secretary Expected To Break Down Milk Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions called the attention of my fellow Members to the gross inequi-

ties which exist in many parts of our country that prevent the distribution and sale of milk from the Midwest due to artificial sanitary regulations. Many times communities adopt so-called sanitation laws which are designed, purely and simply, to prevent milk products of the highest sanitation levels and standards from competing with local producers. I review this situation with my fellow Members at this time because I believe we have a right to expect a drastic change in the system following the appointment of the former Governor of Minnesota, Orville L. Freeman, as the administration's Secretary of Agriculture.

During Secretary's Freeman's 6-year tenure of office as Governor of Minnesota, he has repeatedly gone on record as opposing artificial sanitary regulations which are designed as economic barriers against the free transportation and sale of milk on an interstate basis. One of the Secretary's recent statements was delivered on Thursday, April 28, 1960, before the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

At that time, Secretary Freeman was testifying on behalf of H.R. 3840, a bill which provided that milk produced and handled in accordance with the high standards of the Public Health Service model ordinance and code cannot be excluded from any interstate market on health grounds.

Perhaps the most accurate way to clearly understand Secretary Freeman's position on these sanitary laws is simply to quote what he had to say before the subcommittee. His testimony was several pages long, but I will select the pertinent sections to demonstrate his stated position.

Governor FREEMAN. Minnesota's presence at these hearings represents part of a continuing program aimed at the ultimate elimination of artificial barriers to the interstate sale of milk and milk products. It has been my privilege to serve as Governor of Minnesota for 5½ years. I am now in the middle of my third term. And from the very beginning we have been deeply concerned with this problem. I went to our legislature during the first term in which I served as Governor urging appropriation for the purpose of trying to further this struggle, both in terms of the appropriate legal remedies and also in terms of bringing to the attention of people around the United States that in the long run artificial barriers were not sound and that all people suffered as a product of them.

Secretary Freeman then reviewed the overall problem of sanitary milk barriers, pointing out the inequities that existed then and still exist now. He stated that Minnesota had attempted to break down these barriers in legal proceedings. He added:

Nonetheless, I think that actions in the courts have commanded attention and created a broader base of public understanding in this matter.

We in Minnesota, too, in addition, I might add, to our concern with just the sanitary codes as such, have been concerned with what we believe to be some abuses of the milk market ordering structure as well. I would emphasize that we certainly do not oppose milk market orders properly drawn and administered to insure continuity of supply for both consumer and producer, but where they again set up tariff walls and artificially high pricing structures and divert parts of our economy at a cost to the total Nation into inefficient production, we feel that here too, as in the case of sanitary regulations, the Nation as a whole pays a price that is unnecessary.

The Secretary then reviewed the historical basis of free trade among the States and concluded his prepared comments as follows:

Discriminatory trade barriers and economic reprisals have no place in America. The prosperity of the midwestern dairy farmer depends on his right to reach markets in those areas of the country where live the great mass of our urban population who are his customers. I urge the protection of that right and also the furtherance of that right of the consumer by the enactment into law of H.R. 3840.

During questioning following his statement, Secretary Freeman also said:

While I certainly agree that the correction of the abuses in the milk market structure is enormously difficult and the complexities of the marketing of milk have more than baffled me, I sincerely believe that the first step to unwinding this complicated ball of wax is the very obvious, and simple, and clear, and unanswerable one that we ought to be able to sell and not be stopped by phony sanitary regulations, and that is the first step in clearing up the whole mess.

It is because of Secretary Freeman's definite position and emphasis on breaking down these artificial sanitary barriers that I believe now we have a right to expect action from him since he is in a position now of being able to change policy and influence legislation. For my part, I already have pending bills along the same general direction of eliminating milk barriers, and in view of Secretary Freeman's position, I believe we have a right to expect effective action on this matter—and soon.

Tenth Anniversary of the Circle in the Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 the Circle in the Square Theater, located at 159 Bleecker Street, New York City, will celebrate its 10th anniversary. It is entirely appropriate that the event should be marked with a celebration in which the New York community will salute the extraordinary accomplishments that have been wrought by the theater and its cofounders and coproducers, Theodore Mann and Jose Quintero.

Just 10 years ago the theater was founded and since then it has made a marked impact on the living theater in New York. It has been an inspiration to Broadway and off Broadway alike and has been enthusiastically acclaimed by critics the world over. Indeed, the Circle in the Square Theater has become one of the cultural strongholds in New York, and therefore, in the country, and has set a high standard for the theatrical community to emulate.

The Square's current attraction, "The Balcony," has been a prize-winning success.

Since the Circle in the Square first presented their revival of "Dark of the Moon" in February of 1951, a total of 20 plays—18 of them directed by Jose Quintero, all of them coproduced by Theodore Mann—have been presented by and at the Circle.

In the Square Theater outstanding productions of important plays by such playwrights as Eugene O'Neill, Thornton Wilder, Tennessee Williams, Truman Capote, John Steinbeck, Brendan Behan, Alfred Hayes, and Jean Genet have been among Messrs. Mann and Quintero's applauded presentations.

Artists of such now recognized stature as Geraldine Page, Jason Robards, Jr., George Scott, Coleen Dewhurst, and Clarice Blackburn have emerged with enhanced reputations from their appearances under the auspices of Messrs. Mann and Quintero at the Circle in the Square. In fact, Miss Page, now in Hollywood filming Tennessee Williams' "Summer and Smoke" for Paramount Pictures was catapulted to stardom with her Circle in the Square appearance in this play. By coincidence, Jason Robards, Jr., another graduate to fame from the Circle in the Square, is also in Hollywood at the present time costarring with Lana Turner in "By Love Possessed."

Nor have playwrights and actors been the only ones who have enhanced the reputation of the Circle in the Square Theater and had their reputations further enhanced through their presentation by the Circle. Jose Quintero, now recognized as a major director on or off Broadway, is a product of the Circle in the Square as well as one of its cofounders and coproducers. And David Hays, now recognized as one of Broadway's outstanding scenic artists, was first represented in the New York theater through his design for the production of the Circle in the Square's presentation of "Cradle Song." He followed this with the design for the Circle's revival of Eugene O'Neill's "The Iceman Cometh" at the Circle, which opened the way to Broadway for him, when the Circle in the Square team of Mann and Quintero achieved Broadway history with their presentation of Eugene O'Neill's "Long Day's Journey Into Night," which virtually made a clean sweep of the theater's awards, including Pulitzer Prize, Critics Circle, Page One and other awards for best play, best director, best actor, the year it was presented.

While Messrs. Mann and Quintero made a staggeringly successful foray on Broadway as coproducers of "Long Day's Journey Into Night," with Jose Quintero directing as well as coproducing this multiple prize winner, the off Broadway

Circle in the Square remains the home base for their mutual and individual operations. Quintero has "left home" to direct other Broadway theater as well as to stage opera at the Metropolitan Opera and productions at the New York City Center as well as his now current first film. And Mann has produced a Christmas concert at Carnegie Hall for each of the past several years. But, whatever else they do, the Circle in the Square Theater is their home. And home is where they keep coming back to work. February 26 will mark the tenth anniversary of their theatrical and artistic home, the Circle in the Square Theater.

I have talked about the importance of the living theater in this Chamber on other occasions. I have introduced and am seeking support for legislation designed to relieve the living theater of the burdensome 10-percent admissions tax, as part of a combined effort to improve the environmental conditions under which the living theater must operate if it is to survive. Therefore, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives this story of an off Broadway theater in my home district, which must be encouraged not only for itself, but for the benefit of the entire theater culture of the United States.

The Christian Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following roundtable discussion sponsored by the Christian Amendment Movement:

Mr. President, the following roundtable discussion is part of a series of 52 programs, sponsored by the Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh 21, Pa., and which is being carried on some 100 stations in the United States at the present time. Dr. A. J. McFarland, field representative of the movement acts as moderator and introduces the program.

Dr. A. J. MCFARLAND. Friends, this program is different than most programs to which you have been listening on this series. We are in Washington, D.C., at our National Capitol, where there are facilities for broadcasting a program such as this, and seated before the microphone are three of our esteemed National Representatives: the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable D. R. MATTHEWS, of Florida; and the Honorable J. FLOYD BREEDING, of Kansas. They are appearing on this program because they believe that a Christian amendment should be added to our National Constitution, and they are supporting this movement in various ways here on Capitol Hill. They are ready to tell you why they believe that the adoption of this amendment will be a good thing for our country.

But before these esteemed gentlemen speak, we want to read the three sections of the proposed amendment so you will know the real purpose of this broadcast, and what these gentlemen are endorsing.

"THE AMENDMENTS

"Section 1: This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God;

"Section 2: This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech or press, or of peaceful assemblage;

"Section 3: Congress shall have power in such cases as it may deem proper to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

This amendment is definitely nonpartisan, and nondenominational. In a recent Congress six Senators and Representatives introduced this Christian amendment resolution, and three were Democrats and three were Republicans. So this amendment has absolutely nothing to do with the political parties, nor has it anything to do with the church. It is strictly a citizens movement.

In the constitution of the Christian Amendment Movement, the first section reads: "The Christian Amendment Movement is an association of American citizens who are united in the effort to bring the United States of America to an acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ, by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

Thus this movement is a movement of citizens, and there is a place in this movement for every citizen of this Nation who believes that Christ deserves the supreme honor of being placed first in our Nation and in our Government.

But we want you to hear from our esteemed Representatives. We want them to tell you who they are, the State and district they represent and then go right ahead and tell you how they feel about this proposed Christian amendment. The first one I am going to ask to speak is the Honorable D. R. MATTHEWS.

Hon. D. R. MATTHEWS. Thank you very much, sir, and as you have said, my name is D. R. MATTHEWS and I am the Congressman from the Eighth District of Florida. I believe in the amendment we are discussing, because after being in Congress for 4 years now, I am convinced that we cannot solve the problems of this world unless we go to the spiritual leadership of Jesus Christ. I am particularly pleased with the fact that in this proposed amendment we have the proper protection for our minority groups, and as you have indicated there is a separation of church and state.

Dr. A. J. MCFARLAND. Thank you very much, Congressman Matthews. The next Member of Congress whom you will hear is the Honorable FRANK M. CLARK.

Congressman FRANK M. CLARK. My name is FRANK M. CLARK, a Member of Congress from the 25th District of Pennsylvania. I am happy to join with my colleagues in Congress who are endorsing the Christian amendment. Our country is a Christian nation and if we are to combat the evil forces of communism we must put Christ into a proper perspective in our national life. The Christian amendment will help to make this a Nation under God. The Christian amendment is nondenominational so should have the support of all.

Dr. A. J. MCFARLAND. Thank you, Congressman CLARK, of Pennsylvania. The third member is my own Representative, the Honorable J. FLOYD BREEDING, of Kansas.

Congressman J. FLOYD BREEDING. My name is J. FLOYD BREEDING, Representative of the Fifth District of the Sunflower State of Kansas. It is indeed a privilege to speak in behalf of the proposed Christian amendment. It has been my privilege to introduce this legislation seeking that the Nation shall devoutly recognize the authority and law of Jesus Christ. I believe that most people want the word of God included in our Constitution. Recent events have shown that nations which reject God tend to make gods of themselves and become inhuman tyrants. If Christ were put at the foundation of our Government it would be the greatest thing that has happened in our Nation since the Constitution was written. "Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Thus it is fitting and proper that the Constitution be amended to acknowledge Jesus Christ as our King and Saviour.

Dr. MCFARLAND. Thank you very much, Congressman BREEDING, and each of you gentlemen for those fine testimonies in regard to the proposed Christian amendment.

I wonder how many realize just how serious a thing it is that our Nation has left all acknowledgment of Christ out of our Constitution.

It was my privilege recently, to attend a worship service in the National Presbyterian Church here in Washington, D.C. Just across the aisle from where I sat was a pew bearing the name of Associate Justice William M. Strong on the nameplate at the end. He was a former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Congressman MATTHEWS would you read for us what Associate Justice William Strong had to say about the omission of God from our Constitution. He said this back in 1871 but it is still just as true today as the day it was written.

Congressman MATTHEWS (reading): "There is no political document so all important to the American people as the Constitution of the United States. All customs, laws, and all forms of administration are shaped by it. Our statesmen are learning their Americanism, as to its letter and spirit from that great instrument. That is as it should be; this was intended from the beginning.

"But at the same time, it is a serious matter if that Constitution should be found wanting in any principle or matter of fact. Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of it may one day be formally declared un-American. And one such serious matter there is; one unnecessary and most unfortunate omission. God and Christianity are not once alluded to, although the Constitution is itself the product of a Christian civilization, and purports to represent the mind of a Christian people. Hence, it is that all laws of this country in favor of a Christian morality are enacted outside the Constitution; they rest only on the basis of what is called common law and as matters seem to be going, it will soon be discovered and decreed that common law is only another name for custom which has no binding force. And then where are we? In atheism, corruption and anarchy."

Dr. MCFARLAND. Thank you Congressman MATTHEWS for reading that statement by Justice William Strong. It seems to me that Justice Strong was doing some very serious thinking when he penned those words. I was especially impressed with his statement: "Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of the Constitution may one day be formally declared un-American."

Congressman CLARK, what is your reaction to that statement?

Congressman CLARK. It seems to me that that is proving true right here in America today. We live under a government that is honest. We pay our debts. Our Government is truthful. What it says it will do, it does. Our Government is generous. We

give billions to help needy people around the world. Our Government has many splendid moral qualities, but Uncle Sam is not a Christian. He has made no profession of his faith in Jesus Christ.

And if we consider the people of this country, we will find that for the most part they follow their Government. They are honest, truthful, just, generous, but the rank and file of the people of America are not aggressively Christian.

Dr. MCFARLAND. Congressman BREEDING let us follow the Honorable William Strong's statement a little further. He says, "What is left out of the Constitution may one day be formally declared un-American." Haven't you found that even good Christian people look upon the placing of this Christian amendment in our Constitution as un-American?

Congressman BREEDING. I am afraid that is true. Our country has long been known as the melting pot of the world, and our Nation is made up of many creeds, colors and races of people, and we have gloried in this almost to the complete exclusion of Jesus Christ and His law. We can show these people our early civil documents, with their Christian emphasis; we can remind them that almost every State constitution acknowledges God in some way but they will still say that to place an acknowledgment of Jesus Christ in our Constitution is not the American way.

Dr. MCFARLAND. I have heard any number of people say, "Isn't it too bad that all acknowledgment of God was omitted from our Constitution when it was written?" Then they usually follow with the inference that it is too late now. Well, it isn't too late, and if ever there was a need for this Christian amendment that time is now. But these people do have a point when they say that this acknowledgment should have been put in at the first, for it is extremely hard to amend the Constitution of the United States.

The first Senator to introduce this Christian amendment resolution in recent years, the late Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, warned us to get ready for the long pull. He said the Christian amendment would not go through soon, but he told us to continue to have the bill reintroduced into each Congress, and someday it would go through. He wrote our office a letter after he had introduced this legislation saying, "I am strong for your Christian amendment resolution."

I suppose that the reason some people hesitate to support this amendment is because they fear it would bring about a union of church and state.

Congressman CLARK, so that everyone will know the exact position of the sponsors of this amendment in reference to this matter of church and state I wish you would read from the constitution of the movement the section on the basic principles of the Christian Amendment Movement.

Congressman CLARK. I will be glad to do it. I am quoting now from the constitution of the movement. "In the light of Holy Scripture and history we hold these principles to be true:

"1. That church and state having their origin from God, are both divine institutions;

"2. That church and state are distinct and separate in the exercise of their appropriate and divinely prescribed powers, and therefore control of the church by the state, or control of the state by the church, is contrary to the divine design;

"3. That church and state in their respective spheres are subject to the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ as head of the church and the divinely appointed Ruler of nations;

"4. That church and state are equally obligated to acknowledge the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ;

"5. That the failure of nations to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ as King of kings must inevitably result in national ruin;

"6. That in order to endure and prosper as a nation, the United States of America must confess the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and King."

Dr. MCFARLAND. Congressman BREEDING, does the church have a monopoly on Christ, or is He also King and Ruler of nations?

Congressman BREEDING. No; the churches have no monopoly on Christ. He belongs to all the churches which profess His name, but He also belongs to the nations. He is King of Kings, the Prince of Peace, the Governor among the nations, and we are told in the Bible "The government shall be upon His shoulder" (Isaiah 9: 6).

Dr. MCFARLAND. Another question, Congressman MATTHEWS. God is acknowledged in almost all State constitutions; does this unite any church with any of those States?

Congressman MATTHEWS. No; certainly it does not. That doesn't mean that we have the uniting of church and state at all, but rather we have a very specific separation of the church and the state as we should have in all our various States.

Dr. MCFARLAND. Over in Europe we find a union of church and state in many of those countries. What would be the difference between what they have there, and what we would have here if we had this Christian amendment?

Congressman CLARK, maybe you can help us out on that.

Congressman CLARK. There, they have chosen some denomination and have made that denomination the established, or state church. Now to do that three things had to take place. All the property of that established church was put in the name of the state. All of the ministers or workers in that state church were paid out of the taxes, and third, the governments of the state and that established church were more or less fused. None of these three things are in any way involved when our Nation adopts the Christian amendment.

Dr. MCFARLAND. Congressman MATTHEWS, in this connection, a word should be said about the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congressman MATTHEWS. A splendid statement in reference to that appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 24, 1956, introduced by the Honorable Ralph E. Flanders. It said:

"The first amendment is designed to prohibit the control of government by any religious organization as the state religion of this country, and also to remove from government the power to discriminate against persons and institutions on the grounds of their religious belief. It does not mean that the state is to be irreligious, nor that it is to be indifferent to the religious practices of its people. It does not mean to infer that the state is purely secular, utterly removed from the sanctions of moral law and order. If we can conceive of our Government as a human institution only, we will approach the situation where the supreme authority in our Government will be the ability of the majority to enforce its will even to the infringement of the basic rights of the minority."

Dr. MCFARLAND. Congressman BREEDING, we know that most any bill that goes through Congress causes debate, and any bill that is debated on the floor of Congress is given a great deal of publicity on radio, TV, newspapers, et cetera. Do you feel that such discussion about our spiritual needs would be a good thing?

Congressman BREEDING. I most certainly do, and I think when this bill gets to the floor of the House there will be a lot of favorable discussion in regard to it.

Dr. MCFARLAND. Thank you, Congressman BREEDING, and each of you gentlemen for your part on this roundtable, and it has been a real privilege to have been on this panel with you, and we hope we may appear together again sometime.

We are sure, radio friends, that these gentlemen will continue to uphold Christian ideals here in Washington, let us continue to uphold them before the throne of grace. Every member of this panel believes in the salvation of the individual, and we all believe that there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby any of us can be saved; but we also believed the Bible when it says, "blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

May God's blessing be upon you gentlemen as you continue to lead forth here in Washington. Friends, let us support these gentlemen by writing to our Senators and Representatives, and tell them to get behind this great cause. Urge them to do all they can to move this bill out of the Judiciary Committee and on to the floor of the House and the Senate. Inform your friends and neighbors about this movement, and let us keep this cause moving across this country. May God bless the Christian Amendment Movement in our prayers.

Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1961

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, after months of painstaking and careful work the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, under the able leadership of Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, issued its report on national water resources on January 30, 1961.

In discussing the nature of the national water problem the committee points out that—

Demands (for water) are projected to increase to 559 billion gallons a day, or 51 percent of streamflow by 1980, and to 888 billion gallons a day, or 81 percent of streamflow by year 2000. At first glance, the projected demand appears to approach frighteningly near the limit of the Nation's available water supply and it will be necessary to vigorously expand programs for water resources development if this demand is to be met. It must be remembered, however, that these are withdrawals, and that, necessary as it may be to provide for them, most of this water is returned to the stream, and can be reused many times, provided steps are taken to maintain its quality.

Mr. Speaker, the key to the maintenance of water quality is water pollution control. As stated in the supplemental views of the Kerr committee report:

The greatly increasing volume of pollution discharged into our waterways, and the increasing burden of new contaminants, exceed the capabilities of treatment by known methods. It is therefore essential that a

crash program of pollution abatement research be undertaken immediately to provide practical methods for protecting water quality.

Three additional lines of action must be vigorously prosecuted: (1) Increased quantities of water must be supplied for dilution during low river stages through construction of reservoirs to store the flows, and by other flow regulation works, (2) the number and capacity of facilities for waste treatment must be greatly increased so that discharges into the Nation's waterways will be within tolerable limits of the stream's capacity. This will require, among other things, a doubling or tripling of the present Federal water pollution control program, and (3) municipalities and industries must refrain from discharging wastes that degrade water quality beyond tolerable limits. This restraint must be either self-imposed, or to the extent required in the public interest, it will have to be provided by legal sanctions. Acceptable progress in these lines of action will be costly and will require continuing and often onerous subordination of individual convenience to the public good. It is clear, however, that the American people, virtually without exception, are insistent that the Federal Government take the lead in bringing about unified action at all levels to accelerate progress in cleaning our water supply. To provide this leadership is now a first task of the Federal Government.

The United States has very little option about whether to undertake this responsibility—it is a matter of either proceeding expeditiously or sustaining major limitations and setbacks in the economy and health of the Nation. There is, of course, abundant justification and precedent for Federal leadership in this area. At stake are national security, public health, interstate commerce, and opportunities for full employment and economic prosperity.

These four short paragraphs set forth the case for an effective program of Federal water pollution control better than it has ever been stated before. I have today introduced a bill providing for such a program, Mr. Speaker, and am hopeful of its early consideration and enactment.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961, H.R. 4036, contains four major provisions: (1) Increased financial assistance to communities for the construction of waste treatment facilities, (2) strengthened Federal enforcement procedures, (3) expanded water pollution research, and (4) improved State and Federal administration of pollution control programs and activities.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITIES

Under existing law there is authorized $50 million annually in Federal grants to communities to assist them in the construction of needed waste treatment facilities. This program has been in operation since 1956. During the 5 years immediately preceding enactment of the program (1952–56) contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction averaged $222 million. During the first year of the program, 1957, contract awards increased to $351 million—a 58 percent increase. In 1958, total contract awards reached $389 million—a 75 percent increase over the previous 5-year average. In 1959 and 1960, contract awards have leveled off at the $350 million level, somewhat below the 1958 record due to the steel strike and general public construction cutbacks. Still, over the past 4 years contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction have averaged almost $360 million annually—an increase of 62 percent over the 5-year average before Federal financial assistance became available.

Under the construction grant program, as of January 31, 1961, a total of 2,581 grant offers have been made aggregating $213 million. These in turn supported construction projects having eligible costs totaling $1,245,400,000. In other words, a Federal investment of $213 million has stimulated local investments of over $1 billion. Every Federal dollar expended has been matched by over $4.50 in local funds—a truly remarkable record.

Despite the great progress made as a result of Federal financial assistance, much more remains to be done. Construction since 1957 has been largely offset by new needs and the number of needed projects remains, as it was in 1957, at more than 6,000 sewage treatment plants. According to the Public Health Service Inventory of Municipal and Industrial Waste Facilities, nearly 2,900 new plants are required for 19.5 million people in communities now discharging raw untreated sewage. There are 1,100 new plants needed for 3.4 million people in communities where existing treatment works are inadequate or obsolete and require replacement. Another 1,630 communities need additions and enlargements of existing inadequate plants to provide satisfactory treatment for 25 million persons.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a technical report to the Senate Select Committee contains the following warning:

Unless the country is ready to take measures to deal with water pollution on a far greater scale than at present, it appears that many streams will become putrescent and rivers will be open sewers.

In addition to the backlog of treatment plant needs, population growth will continue to create new needs. If municipalities are to catch up by 1970, they will have to spend an average of $600 million a year to eliminate the backlog, provide for new population, and to replace plants that will become obsolete. We come nowhere near this level of expenditure at the present time despite the 62 percent increase in construction since 1956. In order to stimulate construction up to the $600 million a year figure H.R. 4036 authorizes an increase in Federal financial assistance from the present $50 million annually to $125 million annually and an increase in the total grant authorization from $500 million to $1.25 billion. Maximum grants per project are increased from 30 percent of the cost of the project or $250,000, whichever is smaller, to 30 percent of the cost of the project or $600,000, whichever is smaller. Projects serving more than one municipality will receive proportionately higher grants.

Based on the experience of the present program which has stimulated over $4 in local contributions for every Federal grant dollar, it can be estimated that the proposed program will result in the construction of projects having a total cost of approximately $600 million—or exactly the national needs.

This construction program will be a boon, also, to many small communities hard hit by unemployment. We already have an inventory of 362 sewage treatment plant projects located in areas of substantial unemployment. The total estimated cost of these plants is over $280 million and the estimated on-site payroll on such projects is over $85 million for 14,200 estimated total man-years of labor. These are projects, ready to go, which can put people to work and contribute to the betterment of the water quality of our Nation's lakes and streams.

FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

Under existing law, the Surgeon General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have authority to enforce the control of pollution of interstate waters, but only when it endangers the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the pollution discharge originates. In such a case, the Surgeon General can, on his own initiative, or at the request of an affected State, institute certain Federal enforcement procedures calculated to procure abatement of the discharge.

First, he calls a conference of State and interstate agencies involved to discuss the occurrence of interstate pollution. An attempt is made to secure abatement at this stage of the proceedings.

Second, if no abatement is secured as a result of the conference, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare calls a public hearing before a hearing board for the purpose of making a finding of interstate pollution, assessing progress toward its abatement, and in the event effective progress is not made, making recommendations to secure abatement of such pollution.

Third, if the recommendations of the Secretary are not followed within a reasonable time he requests that Federal court action be taken by the Attorney General. Such court action can be taken only with the consent of the State or States wherein the pollution is discharged or the State or States where the health or welfare of persons is endangered.

Under this procedure the Public Health Service has initiated a number of enforcement actions. These have been effective but the limited enforcement jurisdiction of the Federal Government makes it impossible to do an even better job. The present law, for instance, excludes from enforcement jurisdiction the greater part of the Great Lakes and their tributaries, the coastal waters of the Nation, many important coastal streams, intrastate water bodies such as the Detroit River, those of Florida and all rivers, streams, lakes and coastal waters of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. International boundary streams such as the St. Lawrence, Ni-

agara, lower Colorado, and Rio Grande Rivers are untouchable under the act, leaving the discharge a moral responsibility to a neighboring nation, to the solicitude of a bordering State or an international creature of a treaty with that nation. The same situation exists as to international streams flowing across the northern and southern borders of the United States into our international neighbors. Examples are the Red River of the north in Minnesota, Lake Champlain in New York, Souris and Riviere Rivers in North Dakota, and the Flathead and Kootewai Rivers in Montana.

The degree of exclusion is graphically illustrated by the following figures derived from a recent study. They show that there are 1,080 municipalities discharging wastes in 845 intrastate navigable water bodies. Other interesting figures illustrative of the exclusion are that, of the estimated 26,000 water bodies in the United States, there are only an estimated 4,000 of an interstate nature.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the present limited enforcement jurisdiction does not permit sufficient latitude to accomplish fully the intents and purposes of the act; namely, the conservation of water resources for the use and benefit of the Nation. We must face the fact that present jurisdiction does not extend to many important segments of some of the major waterways of the country. In addition to the illustrations above, the Missouri River from the Kansas State line to just about St. Louis is an untouchable area under the act. The greater part of the Hudson River is excluded, as are important reaches of the Tennessee, Columbia, Colorado, and Merrimack Rivers.

The enforcement provisions of H.R. 4036 are intended to correct this situation. It does so by making Federal enforcement procedures available whenever there is pollution affecting the health and welfare, whether or not there is interstate pollution. Federal jurisdiction in this kind of pollution situation, however, would be exercised only upon request by a State or by a municipality, with State concurrence.

This is not a sweeping takeover by the Federal Government in the field of pollution control, Mr. Speaker. It merely makes available to the States the resources, facilities, and power of the Federal Government's enforcement procedures in a case involving pollution of navigable waters. Such an extension of Federal authority would serve to improve serious pollution situations which are also of great national importance although not endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates.

In addition to expanding Federal enforcement jurisdiction, H.R. 4036 provides for clarifying and strengthening the role of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the enforcement process by providing that the findings and recommendations of the hearing boards—after the public hearing—shall be the Secretary's findings and recommendations except to the extent modified by him and by providing for the issuance of an order—instead of a notice—by him for abatement of any pollution found to exist. To afford adequate protection for the parties of interest, the bill provides that an appeal from the order can be taken to the U.S. court of appeals and the court's review would be on the record. However, if an appeal is not taken within 60 days the Secretary's order would become final. Such orders will be enforced by U.S. district courts in civil actions brought by the Attorney General at the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Other provisions dealing with Federal enforcement procedures make discharges from Federal installations subject to administrative findings and recommendations in Federal water pollution abatement actions conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4036 establishes a $25 million enforcement construction grants fund to be available for financially hard-pressed communities which might be required to construct treatment facilities as a result of Federal enforcement action. These funds would be available over and above the regular State allotment of construction grant funds.

POLLUTION CONTROL RESEARCH

Four members of the Senate Select Committee called for a crash program of pollution abatement research to be undertaken immediately to provide practical methods for protecting water quality. The full committee recommended an expanded program of applied research for water conservation with special emphasis to research on improved waste treatment methods.

Water pollution research is of prime importance. It provides the fundamental intelligence on the causes of water pollution. Although existing law recognizes research as a basic Federal water pollution control responsibility, present levels of research have remained low.

To stimulate Federal research in this field H.R. 4036 authorizes the establishment of field laboratory and research facilities including the establishment of regional laboratories throughout the country. The problems of water pollution vary from region to region and we must begin to zero in on the particular pollution problems of the different sections of the country if they are to be solved. This can best be done in research facilities located in the area near institutions of higher learning.

H.R. 4036 also authorizes special study of Great Lakes pollution problems.

STATE AND FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

Under existing law, $3 million in grants for States and interstate agencies is authorized to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution control programs. These are matching grants with the States required to provide from one-third to two-thirds of the costs of their programs. In the more than 4 years these Federal grants have been in operation they have stimulated and encouraged significant progress in State and interstate water pollution control programs. Among the effects of these grants on State programs have been increased appropriations, technical and supporting staff, water quality monitoring activities, stepped-up enforcement and expanded research.

Despite this progress, the current State and interstate expenditure rate of $10.6 million must be increased in order to make a significant impact on the Nation's pollution problem in the next decade. Lack of current data on the condition of waters in most of the States, information on industrial wastes, and new control techniques, as well as the qualified personnel to carry them out, remain serious problems. Continued Federal financial support of State and interstate water pollution control programs is essential to consolidate and build upon the gains stimulated by the first 5 years of the grant program. The present program expires June 30, 1961. H.R. 4036 authorizes the extension of this grant program on an indefinite basis with an increase in Federal participation from $3 million to $5 million.

To administer this ambitious undertaking by the Federal Government to clean up the Nation's waterways, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4036 authorizes the establishment of a new operating agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be known as the Water Pollution Control Administration.

It is apparent on its face that this legislation goes far beyond the usual public health legislation in that it assigns to an agency of the Federal Government the responsibility for controlling water pollution to conserve water for all uses—propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, industrial and agricultural—including irrigation—supplies, and other legitimate purposes, as well as public water supplies and protection of the public health. In short, water pollution is no longer primarily a health problem. It is a resource problem with health overtones and I have therefore reached the conclusion that the administration of the program should be upgraded by the establishment of an independent operating agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not intend that my proposal be taken as criticism in any way of the present administration of the program by the Public Health Service. They have done an admirable job, and are to be commended. However, it is time to move on in the fight against water pollution and all it entails. This goes far beyond the area of environmental health. It gets to the core of our very existence as a world power. Such a problem requires the concentrated and undivided attention that only a new operating agency can give it.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to hold public hearings on this legislation in the very near future and am hopeful that this year a truly adequate pollution control program will be adopted by the Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Maj. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Chief of Chaplains, Department of the Army, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we do earnestly pray that Thou wilt keep the United States of America in Thy holy protection.

Shed Thy spirit's light into the hearts of all of us, that our inspiring heritage may compel us on to the final achievement of our Nation's destiny.

Cause us all to put her welfare before personal gain, that we may make daring decisions that will assure peace at home and abroad, prosperity for all people, and continued enjoyment of our cherished freedoms.

Give wisdom, patience, and courage to all Thy servants, gathered here in this Chamber, who have dedicated their lives and energies to the selfless and noble service of our great land of liberty. Give them direction as they create lasting legislation, not only for these exciting, crucial, and consequential days, but for future posterity.

Direct their thinking as they answer the call to conflict and conquest against the tyrannies that would enslave the creative energies of the human spirit. Give them confidence that in these turbulent days, God is still marching on and leading us toward nobler ends, beyond our dreaming.

May they direct this Nation, which was born in rebellion against tyranny, into a new and victorious rebellion against hunger, want, calamity, laziness, disease, and all the evils which bar mankind from the full enjoyment of this bountiful universe.

And in the spirit of a great President whose memory we honor at this time, cause us to know that none can be perfectly happy until all are happy; that none can be perfectly moral until all are moral; and that none can be perfectly free until all are free.

In all things make us good stewards, that our lives may be in accordance with Thy holy will, and that we may use all of our Nation's resources to the fulfillment of Thy purpose, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. To this end, we seek Thy fatherly benediction and the guidance of Thy holy hand. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 9, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR TYDINGS, OF MARYLAND

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I announce the death, last Thursday evening, of a former Member of this body, a colleague of many of us, the Honorable Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland.

Millard Tydings was a friend of mine for many years. I knew and respected the late Senator for some 40 years. When I first came to the Congress of the United States, as Representative of Maryland's Sixth District, Millard Tydings was in the U.S. Senate, and he was gracious, courteous, and helpful to me.

Our Nation honors Millard Tydings for his outstanding service in World War I. He went into service as an enlisted private, and rose to lieutenant colonel. He earned a citation from General Pershing, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Distinguished Service Cross. The Nation honors Millard Tydings for his legislative service—first in the Maryland House of Delegates, where he became speaker; then in the State senate; then in the U.S. Congress. He fully deserves these honors.

On the editorial page of the Baltimore Sun, in its issue of Saturday, February 11, 1961, there appeared a tribute to Millard Tydings written by John W. Owens, a Maryland newspaperman of distinction. I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLARD E. TYDINGS: A MEMOIR

(By John W. Owens)

Millard E. Tydings was built for the wars. Had he been born half a century earlier, he would have ridden with "Jeb" Stuart. In the raid into Pennsylvania and ride around McClellan's army, no soldier would have been bolder or happier.

His first wars were in local politics. Fifty years or so ago, Havre de Grace was mostly under the rule of a delightful old fellow named Michael Fahey. Mr. Tydings, while trying to piece together the beginnings of a smalltown law practice, challenged Mr. Fahey and did quite well. Soon, he looked over Harford County, which was amiably managed in those days by a clublike group in which were Murray Vandiver, Thomas H. Robinson, Mr. Fahey, and a few others. The young Tydings and other striplings clustered around James J. Archer, identified themselves with the progressive movement led by Senator Blair Lee and took over much of the control in the county. Within a short time Mr. Tydings was making war as a member of the House of Delegates. He was active in unseating Mr. Vandiver as State treasurer, a feat which many had supposed to be impossible. But about that time Villa was making trouble on the Mexican border. Mr. Tydings turned from the political wars to those of the Army. He appeared one day in a private's uniform. Less than 3 years later, he took off the uniform of a lieutenant colonel, having made a notable record in Europe and having won several decorations.

In a little while he was back in the political wars, daring as ever and luckier than most men in politics. He went again to the legislature. He became one of a group of vigorous young men around Governor Ritchie. Others were Philip B. Perlman, E. Brooke Lee, and Ogle Marbury. He served in the house of delegates and the State senate and then took the nomination for Congress in the Second District away from Carville D. Benson, a seasoned politician. His daring held and his luck held. In 1926 there was confusion over the Democratic nomination for the Senate. Mr. Tydings came out of the confusion with the nomination. He was almost apologetic about his luck. He was elected and went to work earnestly but thought he would be a one-term Senator. Maryland in those days usually voted Republican in presidential elections and the Republican candidate for Senator in a presidential year always won. But when 1932 rolled around. Mr. Roosevelt carried Maryland and Mr. Tydings was reelected.

His luck held until in 1950 he became a victim of the McCarthy craze. He had been in some danger of trouble in 1938. That year was the year that Mr. Roosevelt put Mr. Tydings on his purge list because the Senator had opposed some of the New Deal's measures. In Maryland a good many people thought they could choose their own Senator without direction from Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Tydings was renominated and reelected without much bother. The campaign of 1944, another Roosevelt-victory year, was easy. Mr. Roosevelt made the best of Mr. Tydings and no other opposition mattered. After the disaster of 1950, willingness to fight it out remained and in 1956 Mr. Tydings won the Democratic nomination for the Senate but illness forced him to resign the nomination. The last few years were sad. The impulse to charge into battle remained, but Mr. Tydings probably knew that ill health would prevent his ever charging again.

He grew steadily in office. He worked, accumulated a large body of information, acquired influence in legislation and built a reputation that went far beyond Maryland. He was conscientious in his duties. In his later years in the Senate, he was one of the first to see the global dangers of atomic warfare and he lost no opportunity to press for disarmament and peace. He was a good man and a good public servant. But at heart, he remained in any responsibility the daring young man who charged into battle against "Mike" Fahey nearly 50 years ago.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to join with my colleague [Mr. BEALL] in informing the Senate of the death of Millard E. Tydings, former Senator from Maryland. The entire Nation has lost an able and courageous statesman. Senator Tydings gave the citizens of Maryland 36 years of public service;

he gave our Nation and Constitution his devotion.

As many of my fellow Senators know, Senator Tydings and I did not agree on all issues. In fact, he was my opponent in 1950. However, one of the great attributes of American politics is that we can respect the sincerity of a man's beliefs even if we do not espouse them. The great tradition of the Senate is that we can disagree without being disagreeable. Because Senator Tydings observed this tradition and because of his great contributions to public life, we shall miss him, and we mourn his passing.

The former Senator from Maryland served in this body for four terms. One of the highlights in Senator Tydings' career of vigilance toward the Constitution came in 1937 when he opposed President Franklin D. Roosevelt's proposal to pack the Supreme Court. From the Senate floor he warned that the President's scheme would make the Court "the continual football of the philosophy which for the moment was predominant in the Congress." He proclaimed:

> What I want is to have the American people drive all three teams and not have the executive and legislative horses combine in forcing the other horse, against the will of the driver, into a direction that the driver may not want him to go.

His unyielding opposition led the President to attempt to purge him from the Democratic Party when he sought a third term in 1938. The people of Maryland applauded the stalwart leadership of Senator Tydings by giving him a record vote in the senatorial primary, and the purge failed.

Senator Tydings sponsored much legislation of great importance, and was also influential in establishing Philippine independence.

The Maryland legislator began his career in 1914 when he was elected to the Maryland House of Delegates, where he served until 1921. From 1919 until 1921 he was speaker of that body. After a term from 1921 to 1923 in the Maryland State Senate, he was elected to two terms in the U.S. House of Representatives. He entered the U.S. Senate in 1927. He served as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Senator Tydings' reputation as a fighter was established early in his life. He served as a private on the Mexican border in 1916 and enlisted in the U.S. Army in World War I. He was promoted through the ranks from enlisted man to lieutenant colonel, was cited by Generals Pershing, Morton, and Upton, and awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Cross, and the Distinguished Service Star by the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

A versatile man, Senator Tydings was an author, amateur playwright, writer of verse, pianist, golfer, and boatman. He wrote three books, "Machine Gunners of the Blue and Gray," "Before and After Prohibition," and "Counter-Attack."

Mr. President, I know that I speak for the Senate when I extend to his wife and family our most sincere condolences. Their loss is our loss, and one for the Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join my colleague, the Senator from Maryland, in expressing sorrow over the passing of former Senator Millard Tydings. He was a fighting man. He was an austere man, but he was a man of great courage and great ability. He served his country well in the First World War, at which time he earned a number of outstanding decorations for heroism on the battlefield. He served his country well in the Halls of Congress. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland with reference to the passing of former Senator Tydings, of the great State of Maryland.

It was my privilege to serve for a number of years with him in this body. As has been indicated by the distinguished majority leader, Millard Tydings was a man of sterling character and great convictions. Many times on the floor of the United States Senate he stood for some of the things that are fundamental to our great Nation, under which all of us are enjoying our existence today.

Maryland and the Nation have suffered a great loss in the passing of Millard Tydings.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I first came to know Millard Evelyn Tydings not long after he became a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Maryland in 1923. We served together for 4 years in that body. In 1926 he and I along with Alben Barkley of Kentucky and Elmer Thomas of Oklahoma became candidates for election to the Senate from our respective States—we were each elected. Robert Wagner, as a Senator from New York, joined with us in taking the oath as Senators on March 4, 1927, and we were all, without interruption, Members of the Senate for the next 20 years.

They are no longer here but I can speak for the then Senators from Kentucky, Oklahoma, and New York when I say that we all enjoyed an unbroken friendship with Millard Tydings and each one of us had the highest respect for his courage in asserting his convictions and his ability to defend them.

No Senator ever rendered greater service to his State than did Millard Tydings; and no man ever rendered greater service as a Senator of the United States to his country, both in time of peace and in time of war, than did Millard Tydings.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to add a brief word of tribute, along with those of my colleagues, to the memory of Millard Tydings.

I had the privilege of knowing Senator Tydings. He was a Member of the Senate when I first came to the House of Representatives, and while I was serving there I soon came to know him. Later, I had the pleasure of serving with him in the Senate.

He was a man of ability, integrity, and courage, and he made a great Senator. His passing from us is a loss not only to the State of Maryland, but also to the Nation.

I certainly extend to Mrs. Tydings, and to their children, my sympathy at his passing.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, during the 10 years that I was privileged to serve as a Member of the Senate with Millard Tydings, I learned to have a great deal of respect for him and for his opinions. He was very sound in his thinking. He never joined in any proposal which would not be in the best interests of his country. He was a great servant of the State of Maryland. I wish to join with all others who regret his passing.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be left open at this point, in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to make appropriate remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that we learned the sad news of the death of our former colleague, Senator Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland.

Millard Tydings was my friend, tried and true. It was my privilege to serve with him in the Congress of the United States for many years, first in the House of Representatives and then here in the Senate.

Through the years, Millard Tydings was esteemed and honored as a patriot, as a statesman, and as a devoted public servant. Our generation and future generations will hold precious his memory and be grateful for the example of his good works and the inspiration of his great courage.

He made many lasting contributions to the strength of our Nation and to the progress and the security of our people. Certainly, nothing could have given him more gratification than his coauthorship of the Philippine Independence Act, which gave to the people of the Philippines their independence and opened for them the new world of freedom.

To his devoted wife, Eleanor, and to the members of his family, I join other Senators in extending my deepest sympathy in this time of their great loss and sorrow.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a

story in the Washington Post of February 11, 1961, containing richly deserved tributes to Millard Tydings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TYDINGS FUNERAL TO BE HELD SUNDAY

Messages of condolence poured in yesterday to the family of former Senator Millard E. Tydings, a leading Democratic spokesman who died Thursday of pneumonia.

At Annapolis, both branches of the Maryland Legislature passed resolutions expressing sorrow over the death of the 70-year-old statesman, Senator from Maryland for 24 years, from 1926–50. He served in both Maryland chambers early in his political career, and his son, Joseph D. Tydings, is now a Harford County member of the house.

Philippine President Carlos P. Garcia also sent a message of condolence to Senator Tydings' widow. It was Senator Tydings who coauthored legislation granting the Philippines their independence.

"Our people will always remember with gratitude that Senator Tydings fought on Capitol Hill for our freedom. In his death America has lost one whose service to his country transcends national boundaries," wrote Garcia.

"With the passage of his independence bill the United States has placed itself in the vanguard of the fight to end colonialism everywhere," President Garcia stated.

"He was a courageous statesman and a devoted public servant. The entire State mourns his loss," Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland said in expressing his condolences. In separate resolutions, both houses of the legislature recorded their sorrow.

Funeral services will be held Sunday at 1:30 p.m. at his home at nearby Oakington, Md., then at St. John's Episcopal Church in Havre de Grace.

Honorary pallbearers will include Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, Maryland Gov. J. Millard Tawes and many other high-ranking officials of the State and Nation.

Surviving are his wife, Eleanor; a son, Joseph D., of Harford; and a daughter, Mrs. Francis Warrington Gillet, Jr.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to read to the Senate on February 22 next Washington's Farewell Address.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON TRAINING OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the training of Federal employees, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON REVOLVING FUND, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the revolving fund, Small Business Administration, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY ACTIVITIES OF U.S. ARMY JAPAN DEPOT-COMPLEX

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supply activities of U.S. Army Japan Depot-Complex, dated February 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED INSURANCE OPERATIONS OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON VALUATIONS OF PROPERTIES BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of valuations of properties of certain carriers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ENROLLED SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 39 of the 86th Congress, 2d session, proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation;' and

"Whereas the amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 39 shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years after its submission: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring):

"1. The proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia, as set forth in this resolution, hereby is ratified.

"2. The Governor shall send certified copies of this resolution to the Administrator of General Services of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION 1

"Resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas both Houses of the Congress of the United States by a joint resolution, a two-thirds majority of each House concurring, proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 39 an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which read as follows:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the elector college to the District of Columbia

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"ARTICLE —

"'"SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"'"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"'"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"': Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

"The secretary of state is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Presid-

ing Officer of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and that he transmit an official notice of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States as provided by the law of this State.

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate this 17th day of January in the year of our Lord 1961.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives this 31st day of January in the year of our Lord 1961.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved February 6, 1961.

"ELWIN L. OUSMEN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed February 6, 1961.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."

A bill (No. 587) enacted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE BILL 587

"A bill to accept the cession by the State of Minnesota to the State of North Dakota of certain parcels of real property and declaring an emergency

"Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota:

"SECTION 1. Whereas, due to flood control work upon the Red River of the North, an avulsion has occurred leaving two parcels of land described as those portions of government lot two in the northeast quarter, section twenty-nine, township one hundred forty north, range forty-eight west and the northeast quarter, section seven, township one hundred thirty-nine north, range forty-eight west of the fifth principal meridian, County of Clay, State of Minnesota, bounded by the thread of the Red River of the North as it existed prior to January 1, 1959, and the new thread of the Red River of the North as established by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under project CIVENG-21-018-59-22, containing respectively 9.78 and 12.76 acres more or less, detached from the State of Minnesota and attached to the State of North Dakota. The State of North Dakota, upon passage by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota of the necessary enabling legislation, does hereby accept jurisdiction over the above-described property, which property shall thereafter be a part of the State of North Dakota and title thereof shall be vested in the city of Fargo, N. Dak.

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in the provisions of the act shall be construed in such manner as to prejudice the title, right, or claim of any person to any of the lands herein involved. The register of deeds of Cass County, N. Dak., shall accept and record, without charge therefor, patents, deeds, or other evidences of ownership or interest in any lands recorded in Clay County, Minn., which were previously a part of the State of Minnesota but are now within the boundaries of the State of North Dakota. Recordings made under the provisions of this section shall have retroactive effect to the date of their original recording in the State of Minnesota.

"SEC. 3. The act of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota referred to in section 1 of this act, together with this act, shall constitute the agreement between the States of Minnesota and North Dakota. The Congress of the United States, upon passage of such acts by the respective Legislatures of the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, is petitioned, pursuant to article I, section 10, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, to give its consent to this agreement and to amend the enabling acts of such States accordingly. The secretary of state of North Dakota shall transmit duly certified copies of this act to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Senators and Representatives of the States of Minnesota and North Dakota in the Congress of the United States, who are petitioned to take such action as they deem proper to procure the consent of the Congress of the United States to this agreement between the States of Minnesota and North Dakota. This agreement shall become effective when it has been ratified and approved by the Legislatures of the States of Minnesota and North Dakota and approved by the Congress of the United States.

"SEC. 4. Emergency. This act is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and approval.

"R. FAY BROWN,
"Speaker of the House.
"GERALD L. STAIR,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"ORVILLE W. HAGEN,
"President of the Senate.
"HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved at 10 a.m. on February 4, 1961.

"WILLIAM L. GUY, *Governor."*

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the sharp decline in our Nation's monetary reserves in recent years and the accelerated rate of that decline in recent months has invited worldwide security of U.S. monetary policies; and

"Whereas the continuing international drain on our gold supply, coupled with the recent increase in speculative buying in world markets, suggests a growing lack of confidence in the stability of the dollar both at home and abroad; and

"Whereas this loss of prestige of the dollar can be attributed in large measure to the erosion of its value during the past 25 years which has resulted from the virtual abandonment on a domestic basis of our traditional and time-tested hard-money policies in favor of managed paper currency supported internally by little more than confidence in the Government; and

"Whereas the drop in gold reserves has been accompanied by a steady dissipation of Treasury 'free' silver supplies through sales to industrial users of the metal at prices below those prevailing in world markets; and

"Whereas this policy of selling Treasury free silver has not only accentuated the problem of monetary solvency but also effectively maintained an artificial ceiling on the open market price to the disadvantage of domestic silver producers; and

"Whereas the worldwide responsibilities which this Nation has assumed requires that we adhere to sound hard-money policies and maintain a currency that is virtually impregnable to the continuing stresses and periodic shocks of international unrest and dissension: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional control over our national monetary policies and restore the integrity of the dollar throughout the world by proceeding with all deliberate haste to enact legislation that will:

"1. Reaffirm this Nation's historical and traditional confidence in gold and silver as monetary metals by fixing the ratio at which the dollar and gold will be made fully convertible and establishing the procedures for orderly restoration of the gold standard.

"2. Abolish all restrictions on the purchase, sale, and ownership of gold by U.S. citzens.

"3. Terminate immediately all sales of gold and silver to industrial users and require the Treasury to retain all monetary stock of both metals exclusively for monetary purposes.

"4. Amend the act of July 31, 1946, to eliminate the seigniorage charge of 30 percent on purchases of silver and thus stimulate production of this metal to assure a continuing supply to our Nation.

"5. Take cognizance of the increased cost of producing gold in this country by raising the price paid to domestic producers for newly mined gold.

"6. Require the executive department, as part of its foreign policy, to encourage and assist other governments to restore gold and silver coinage and currencies convertible into gold as their circulating mediums and standards of value; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the development and utilization of Idaho's abundant mineral resources has always been and must continue to be one of the principal bulwarks of the State's economy, providing not only a source of employment and income but also a sound base for tax revenues and substantial market outlet for agricultural and manufactured products in mining areas; and

"Whereas this basic and essential mining industry has for several years been confronted with adverse economic conditions so severe that many major metal mining enterprises in the State, involving the production of antimony, tungsten, cobalt, and other strategic metals, have been forced out of business, and many others, including our large lead and zinc producers, are being reduced to the status of marginal operations; and

"Whereas the cause of this serious predicament of our mining industry can be traced to governmental policy which stimulates the development and exploitation of foreign mineral resources and permits relatively free access of this low-cost foreign production to U.S. markets; and

"Whereas this policy if continued will not only threaten the economic survival of Idaho's metal mining industry, but will also impose a serious handicap on our Nation's capacity for providing from domestic sources the basic requirements for national defense; and

"Whereas the executive department of the Federal Government and both major political parties, as well as the Conference of Western Governors, have officially recognized the necessity for maintaining a domestic

mining industry that is sufficiently progressive and vigorous to assure a minerals mobilization base adequate for national preparedness and security; and

"Whereas past efforts by the Federal Government to alleviate the depressed conditions which prevail in various segments of the domestic mining industry by means of short-range programs and temporary expedients such as stockpiling and quota limitations have proved ineffective and inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and the house of representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States and the executive department of the Federal Government to develop and adopt as soon as possible a national minerals policy that will guarantee a strong and healthy domestic mining industry by assuring domestic producers a fair and equitable share of domestic metal markets.

"We recommend that this policy be implemented by more effective enforcement of the antidumping laws, and by the imposition of adequate duties on metals and mineral imports to be applied only if and when the price of the metals fall below the peril point level that is required to maintain a sound and healthy domestic mining industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the granting of representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"' "ARTICLE —

"' "SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"' "A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

"SECTION 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"Passed the house on the 20th day of January 1961.

"W. D. EBERLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 31st day of January 1961.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

ROBERT H. REMAKLUS,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H.C.R. 38

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the expenditures and the income of the Government of the United States

"Whereas the U.S. Government is presently indebted in a minimum sum of $295 billion and the debt increases each year; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government now pays approximately $9 billion in interest on the present indebtedness each fiscal year; and

"Whereas the value of a dollar continues to decrease, particularly since World War II, largely due to the inflationary fiscal policy of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the people of the United States are already bearing a practically confiscatory and excessive burden of taxes, particularly from the Federal Government; and

"Whereas 'The power to tax is the power to destroy,' and the present level of taxation on the people has reached the point of diminishing returns: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the general assembly hereby urges and memorializes the Congress of the United States to propose to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as provided by article V of the Constitution, to read as follows, to wit:

"'SECTION 1. On or before the fifteenth day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimate of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of the receipts. The President in transmitting such budget may recommend measures for raising additional revenue and his recommendations for the expenditure of such additional revenue. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimate of the receipts, it shall not adjourn for more than three days at a time until such action has been taken as may be necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year. In case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding one year each.

"'SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the first day of the calendar year next following the ratification of this article.

"'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to each congressional Representative from the State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management, with reference to passing legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on, federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming to the State of Wyoming

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of Wyoming, recognizing that the United States of America owns over 50 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 70 percent of the minerals on, in, or under the lands of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas the surface and minerals constitute an important part of the life and economy of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas most of the revenue derived from the leasing of the surface and minerals in Wyoming is now retained and controlled by the Federal Government, resulting in discrimination involving tax bases and Federal land and mineral holdings among western land States; and

"Whereas the welfare and interest of the citizens of the State of Wyoming demand a more equitable share of the revenue derived from the leasing of the minerals under Federal ownership within the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas Alaska in its Act of Admission was given 90 percent of the mineral royalties on Federal lands and on private lands in which the Federal Government has reserved the minerals; and

"Whereas the tideland States have been granted the mineral rights on offshore submerged lands; and

"Whereas historically, Eastern States were given all of the land within their confines; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming and the Western States have been denied equality of treatment as given Alaska, tideland States, and the Eastern States; and

"Whereas the revenue so derived should be used for the support of schools or other public educational institutions and for the construction and maintenance of public roads within the State of Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby, memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming to be used for the construction and support of public schools, and other public educational institutions, or for the construction and main-

tenance of public roads in such manner as the Legislature of the State of Wyoming may direct; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies thereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator J. J. HICKEY, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

"ALBERT C. HARDING,
"President of the Senate.
"WILLIAM F. SWANTON,
"Speaker of the House Pro Tempore.

"Approved February 8, 1961.

"JACK R. GAGE,
"Acting Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 4

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming

"Whereas bills have been introduced in the last two sessions of the U.S. Congress to establish a national wilderness preservation system; and

"Whereas these bills would create wilderness areas in Wyoming; and

"Whereas the creation of such wilderness areas would interfere with the development of the State's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas for the projection of water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities, which multiple-use concept policy has been in effect for over 50 years, and has shaped the economy of the West; and

"Whereas the welfare and interest of the citizens of Wyoming demand that there shall not be any further extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming; that, furthermore, if such wilderness areas are necessary and desired in other States, that areas adjacent to centers of population be purchased and returned to the wilderness state, believing that such a program could make wilderness areas available to more people of the country than the creation of such areas in the West; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator J. J. HICKEY, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"ALBERT C. HARDING,
"President of the Senate.
"JOSEPH L. BUDD,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 7, 1961.

"JACK R. GAGE,
"Acting Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to employment of persons over 40 years of age

"Whereas responsible surveys have established that workers of middle age, and many older persons, have invaluable assets as employees in highly developed skills, sound judgment, proven production capacities, steadfastness in one job, lower accident incidence, and low absenteeism records: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to remove the basis of such discrimination from national legislation; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies thereof be transmitted to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senators JOSEPH J. HICKEY and GALE MCGEE, Representative WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and Secretary of Labor.

"ALBERT C. HARDING,
"President of the Senate.
"JOSEPH L. BUDD,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 7, 1961.

"JACK R. GAGE,
"Acting Governor."

A resolution adopted by the Long Island General Assembly of the Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N.Y., relating to the acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by Hugh Latimer, president, Free World Committee, Oak Park, Ill., relating to the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Jay Creswell, of Orlando, Fla., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee an the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Middlesboro, Ky., favoring the construction of the proposed TVA steam plant in southeastern Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the chamber of commerce of the city of Middlesboro, Ky., favoring the construction of the proposed TVA steam plant in southeastern Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948 in such a manner as to encourage the domestic production of sugar

"Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 expires on March 31, 1961; and

"Whereas the destruction by the present Government of Cuba of normal commercial and other relationships between that country and the United States of America, and the destruction by that Government of much of the Cuban sugar producing capacity have eliminated Cuba as a major supplier to the American market, not only for the present but for many years to come; and

"Whereas the expansion of the domestic sugar industry will alleviate problems in both the agricultural and industrial sectors of our economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give favorable consideration to amending the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide that any reduction in the Cuban sugar quota be assigned to domestic beet and cane sugar producers, and that such increase be so allocated as to foster the development of a stable industry and encourage the building of additional beet processing plants to serve in the development of new beet sugar areas and new growers in established areas; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of New Mexico."

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE GRANTING OF REPRESENTATION IN THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America, at the 2d session begun and held at the city of Washington, on Wednesday the 6th day of January 1960, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled* (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE—

" ' "SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

" ' "A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." '

"Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Maine hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maine notify the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Administrator of General Services of the United States, and each Senator and Representative from Maine in the Congress of the United States of this action of the legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this resolution."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT—JOINT RESOLUTION OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House Joint Memorial 6 as adopted by the Montana State Legislature requesting extension of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The sugar beet industry is of vital interest and importance to the economy of the State of Montana and I hope that the appropriate committees of the Congress will be able to act on the extension of this legislation at an early date.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

Whereas the U.S. sugar program has been in existence since 1934 and is presently operating under legislation entitled "The Sugar Act of 1948, as amended"; and

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 has provided great stability to the sugar beet growers in Montana and throughout the Nation and has assured adequate sugar supplies to consumers in the United States at reasonable prices; and

Whereas the deterioration of relations with the present Government of Cuba and other international problems prevented the 86th Congress of the United States from taking the necessary action to extend the Sugar Act of 1948 for a term of years; and

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948 is scheduled to expire March 31, 1961, and steps must be taken by the Congress of the United States if continuity of the legislation is to be achieved and if serious disruption in supplies of sugar is to be avoided: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Montana, That the 87th Congress immediately extend the present Sugar Act of 1948 through December 31, 1961; and be it further

Resolved, That prior to recess of the 1st session, the 87th Congress enact legislation for a sufficient term of years to provide a basis for sound economic planning on the part of the sugar industry of the Nation in recognition of the increasing importance of the sugar beet industry to this Nation and the added reliance which this Nation has placed on increased domestic sugar production; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States of America, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senator LEE METCALF, Congressman JAMES F. BATTIN, Congressman ARNOLD H. OLSEN, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

RESOLUTION OF LONG ISLAND (N.Y.) FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., of New York, relating to the establishment of a metropolitan government. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE LONG ISLAND FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

Whereas there is a plan in operation in our Nation today to establish metropolitan government, otherwise known as metro and other names such as annexation, etc., in 15 selected areas; and

Whereas metro all power of government will be transferred to a trained social scientist, council manager, city manager, et al., who will be appointed to the position; and

Whereas this is an infringement upon our constitutionally guaranteed right to choose our public officials through the ballot; and

Whereas metro is a dangerous scheme to destroy the constitutions of our various States and ultimately to force us into world government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 20th day of January 1961, urges all citizens to study this threat to our representative form of government and to oppose it on all local, county, and State levels; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; Governor of New York State; the mayor of New York City; New York senators and assemblymen; members of the New York City Board of Estimates; and all city councilmen.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 681. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences (Rept. No. 46); and

S. 683. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission (Rept. No. 47).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 909. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 910. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to include as creditable service certain service performed by emergency relief project employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 911. A bill for the relief of William H. Brownlee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. JOHNSTON):

S. 912. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 913. A bill to provide for the regulation of fraternal benefit societies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 914. A bill to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia; to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 915. A bill to provide for the administration of unclaimed funds held and owing by life insurance companies in the District of Columbia; and

S. 916. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 917. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act to provide a grant program for the prevention and control of dental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 918. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Stylianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 919. A bill to amend section 9(b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to eliminate the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose no penalty less than ninety days' suspension for any violation of section 9 of the act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 920. A bill for the relief of Aurelia Viernes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 921. A bill for the relief of Martha Uchacz Barras; and

S. 922. A bill for the relief of Maria Gor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 923. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace lateral pipelines, line discharge pipelines, and to do other work he determines to be required for the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake Irrigation Districts in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to any live dramatic (including musical) performance; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 925. A bill to correct injustice by providing for back pay to certain officers as required by the act of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat. 840, ch. 307); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 926. A bill for the relief of Chyn Duog Shiah;

S. 927. A bill for the relief of Juan Chan Montiel;

S. 928. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pilar S. Auad;

S. 929. A bill for the relief of Nikolas Katragazes (also known as Nick Katrys); and

S. 930. A bill for the relief of Manuel Auad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 931. A bill to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications and evidences of title; and

S. 932. A bill to amend the Bonneville Project Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 933. A bill to provide for granting employees of the postal field service time off for one State holiday each year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 934. A bill for the relief of the heirs of J. M. Fidler; and

S. 935. A bill for the relief of Lillian Frank Sclavi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 936. A bill to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. FONG, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 937. A bill to provide for a program of Federal matching grants to the States to enable the States to provide health insurance for individuals aged 65 or over at subscription charges such individuals can pay; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 938. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 939. A bill for the relief of Zlata Dumiljan and Djuro (George) Kasner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (for Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 940. A bill for the relief of Roger Nai-Whei Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 941. A bill for the relief of Ivo da Silva Almeida; and

S. 942. A bill for the relief of Dr. Perkins P. K. Chang (Chang Peng-Keng), and his wife Yu-lh Chuang Chang, and their two minor daughters, Jean Li and Jean Lh Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 943. A bill for the relief of Rolf E. Stolpner;

S. 944. A bill for the relief of Mr. Najm Boulos Rihani;

S. 945. A bill for the relief of Anton Urbancic and Antonia Urbancic; and

S. 946. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Corpacius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 947. A bill to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR RELIEF AGENCY EMPLOYMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, emergency relief agency employees who performed administrative work were considered to be Federal employees and received credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act for that service. Generally speaking, those who held project jobs were considered to be State employees and were not given retirement credit. However, the Civil Service Commission in its regulations has permitted employees who transferred from administrative jobs to project jobs to receive retirement credit for the project employment, but only if compensation for the project employment was at least $100 per month and there was not a break of more than 3 days between the two types of employment.

The bill I have sent to the desk today would write the Civil Service Commission regulation into the law with one change—the maximum break in service would be 90 days instead of 3. The bill as drafted would cover only employees who performed both administrative and project service, and does not attempt to deal with the matter of bringing within the purview of the Retirement Act persons who had only project employment, or persons performing other types of State employment paid for out of Federal funds. Bills covering all or certain groups of these employees have been introduced from time to time and during the last Congress legislation was enacted (Public Law 86–568) providing for coverage of one of these groups, county ASC committee employees, under the Retirement Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the language of this bill printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 910) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to include as creditable service certain service performed by emergency relief project employees, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) Credit shall be allowed for any period of employment as a project employee of an emergency relief agency if the employee (1) was transferred, without break in service of more than ninety days, to such employment from an administrative position under such agency within the same State and (2) received compensation for such employment at a rate not less than $100 per month."

SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by this Act shall apply to persons heretofore or hereafter retired, but no annuity shall be increased by reason of such amendment for any period prior to the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 9(b) of the Hatch Political Activities Act of 1939 to eliminate the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose a minimum penalty of 90 days suspension and loss of one quarter of a year's salary for any violation of the act, regardless of whether it is of a minor or inadvertent nature.

The administration of the Hatch Act over a period of years has clearly demonstrated that this mandatory minimum penalty provision frequently results in an unjust hardship on the Federal employee and a burden on the Government agency which employs him.

The present minimum penalty is unfair to the employee because he must forfeit one-fourth of his annual salary—a large sum if one makes only $3,600 per year—for any violation, no matter how trivial or involuntary. Reference to a few cases decided recently or now pending, will illustrate the type of person upon whom this penalty is falling.

Case No. 1: A Federal employee was a candidate for and elected to the position of election clerk, an office which in most States is nonpartisan. Because the position involved long hours and hard work on election days, and was looked upon in the community as a civic duty, the employee had no opposition and had held the position in several elections prior to becoming a Federal employee. For this infraction the employee had to forfeit one-fourth of his yearly pay and suffer a 90-day suspension.

Case No. 2: A postmaster, since October 2, 1933, authorized his name to appear in a political advertisement published in a local newspaper in July of 1953, endorsing his son as a candidate for the nomination for county attorney. Prior to the primary he helped string a political campaign poster announcing his son's candidacy from a second floor porch of the building which houses the post office to a point on the opposite side of the street. Penalty: 90 days' suspension; loss of 3 months' pay.

Case No. 3: A Federal employee announced his candidacy for the office of the justice of the peace and was elected to the post. After the election, it was brought to his attention that such activity was a violation of the Hatch Act, and he withdrew and never assumed office. Penalty: 90 days' suspension; one-fourth year's pay.

Case No. 4: A Federal employee of long standing was elected without opposition in 1947 to the office of township school director, and reelected twice in

1951 and 1957 by write-in votes. He was advised after the 1957 election that such activity might constitute a violation of the act and withdrew. Penalty proposed: 90 days' suspension without pay.

Case No. 5: A postal employee since October 1946 was a member of a reception committee in 1956 to welcome a former President of the United States as a principal speaker at a political rally held on October 29, 1956. Case pending.

I introduced an identical bill (S. 1061) in the last Congress and it was referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The committee asked for comments by the Justice Department and the Civil Service Commission. The Department of Justice advised the committee by letter, dated April 23, 1959, that it had no objection to the enactment of the bill.

The Civil Service Commission advised the committee by letter of April 15, 1959, that it "wholeheartedly endorses the change which is provided for in the proposed bill."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Civil Service Commission be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1959.

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This is in reply to your request of February 19, 1959, for recommendations and comments on S. 1061.

This bill would amend section 9(b) of the Hatch Political Activities Act (5 U.S.C. 118i (b)) by striking out *"Provided further,* That in no case shall the penalty be less than 90 days' suspension without pay:".

The effect of this amendment would make it possible for the Commission to assess a suspension commensurate with the offense constituting the violation. This would be in contrast to the mandatory minimum penalty of 90 days' suspension without pay now prevailing. The present minimum 90-day suspension without pay is unjust and inequitable. It forces too severe a penalty in the case of an unintentional or minor violation.

The present minimum penalty is unfair to the employee because he must forfeit one-fourth of his annual salary for any violation, no matter how small. This is a severe punishment for the average employee. For instance, a Federal employee earning $3,600 a year, who solicited a few votes in behalf of a partisan candidate, is assessed $900. As another illustration, a Federal employee announces his candidacy for the office of justice of the peace on a partisan ticket. After the election, it is brought to his attention that such activity is a violation of the act and he withdraws and does not assume office. For this violation, he must lose one-fourth of his annual salary.

The harshness of the penalty may also be a burden upon the employee's agency when that agency is denied the employee's services for a 90-day period due to a minor violation.

The Commission wholeheartedly endorses the change which is provided for in the proposed bill. The Commission also favors an additional amendment to section 9(b) which would eliminate the requirement that an employee who violates the section must be removed unless the Commissioners unanimously find that the violation does not warrant removal. As the present language of the act is now construed by the courts, it is necessary for the Commission to provide that the initial decision in Hatch Act cases be made by an administrative officer with right of appeal to the Commissioners. Under the present language of section 9, the decision of the administrative officer must be removal of the offending employee for any violation, no matter how minor. Since only the Commissioners by unanimous vote can impose a penalty less than removal, it is necessary for all employees to appeal to the Commissioners to assure justice to themselves. The Commission's proposal is that the second proviso of section 9(b) be amended by striking the phrases "by unanimous vote" and "by direction of the Commission." The Commission's proposed amendment would make it possible for the Commission to delegate to its administrative officer the power to suit the penalty to the seriousness of the violation, thus requiring appeal to the Commissioners only in those cases in which the employee thinks the penalty imposed by the administrative officer was too severe.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that it has no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 919) to amend section 9(b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to eliminate the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose no penalty less than 90 days' suspension for any violation of section 9 of the act, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPLACEMENT OF CERTAIN PIPELINES IN IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace lateral pipelines, line discharge pipelines, and to do other work he determines to be required for the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake Irrigation Districts in the State of Idaho.

On Bureau of Reclamation projects serving these districts, steel pipe distribution systems have proved defective. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace them. A portion of the cost, not to exceed the repayment capacity of the land served, as heretofore determined, would be borne by the irrigation districts; the remainder would come from power revenues.

There is urgent need for prompt replacement of these pipes, in order to prevent interruptions of service and I hope the bill I am introducing will have prompt and favorable consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 923), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace lateral pipelines, line discharge pipelines, and to do other work required for the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake Irrigation Districts in the State of Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TAXES ON ADMISSIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that taxes on admissions shall not apply to admissions to any live dramatic program, including musical performances. This is a bill which is sponsored in the other body by my colleague, Representative LINDSAY of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 924) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admission to any live dramatic (including musical) performance, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

U.S. ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation to promote the study and the advancement of the performing arts throughout the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 936) to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the general supervision of a Director and a Board of Trustees comprised of 12 private citizens appointed by the President to serve 6-year terms, the Foundation would operate on a budget not to exceed $5 million during its first year, and $10 million annually thereafter. Endorsements of the legislation are attached. The U.S. Arts Foundation would be authorized to:

First. Provide financial assistance to nonprofit groups engaged in the performing arts including theatrical and musical performances, opera, dance, ballet, and choral recitals, and to encourage such presentations in all parts of the United States;

Second. Cooperate, assist, and sponsor international activities relating to the performing arts in consultation with the State Department, including the sponsorship of performances abroad;

Third. Establish and maintain registers of personnel and theaters in the performing arts;

Fourth. Foster and encourage civic and nonprofit private and public educational institutions or Government groups directly concerned with performing arts; and

Fifth. Conduct surveys of these performing arts.

At long last, Congress is on the verge of recognizing that the Federal Government has a responsibility toward the performing arts in our Nation that it can best fulfill in the role of a stimulator and coordinator of the artistic and cultural resources of the United States. New York now has a State program under the direction of the New York State Council on the Arts, set up under State

law, to encourge the arts. President Kennedy has evidenced his interest in such a program for the United States and, in fact, the 1960 Democratic Party platform proposed a Federal advisory agency to assist the expansion of our cultural resources. New York City and other municipalities are helping the arts. In Congress, the number of bills already introduced for this purpose since the beginning of this session is additional evidence of likely congressional action in this field.

The U.S. Arts Foundation, functioning on a modest appropriation of a few million dollars a year spent in conjunction with matching funds of other interested public or private agencies, could stimulate as much as $50 million in nongovernment activity on behalf of our performing arts. I believe that national legislators are expressing heightened interest in such a proposal because of the marked increase in cultural activity at local and State levels. It has impressed upon them that a majority of the American people no longer view the performing arts merely as a "fringe benefit" of modern living squeezed into the entertainment category. We are coming to realize that cultural pursuits are not a luxury but a necessity in our free society as it continues to grow and develop in this space age. While our space missiles and satellites will continue to make headlines abroad, U.S. prestige received enormous benefits from the cultural exchange agreements and foreign tours by American artists like Helen Hayes, Marion Anderson, Van Cliburn, and Louis Armstrong, long before Discoverer I ever went into orbit, and it will continue to do so.

The legitimate expansion of Federal activity in many social and economic spheres in recent years has paved the way now for the Government to develop a partnership concept to help advance the arts through aiding local organizations and sending live performances into areas which otherwise would not receive them. As yet, a television set is no substitute for a family excursion to the theater or a concert or the ballet.

Nor is the desire to advance the arts through governmental participation new. In 1891 Congress established the National Conservatory of Music, which brought Anton Dvorak to this country; it was this American experience which inspired him to compose the New World Symphony.

In 1935 the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—was chartered by Congress. Although its growth was seriously hampered by the coming of the war and by lack of funds, it is now directing with great success our international efforts in the field of music and the theater under the auspices of the State Department. In recent years, Congress established the permanent program of cultural exchange with other nations, granted a Federal charter to the National Music Council, and established a National Cultural Center in Washington, D.C.

Recognition of America's need for frequent performances of theatrical and other works in all parts of our Nation and of the people's unabated desire for such performances prompted me in 1949 to introduce, while a Member of the House of Representatives, a resolution looking toward the establishment of an American National Theater and an American National Opera and Ballet. My present proposal is closely analogous to the British and Canadian Arts Councils which have done so much in their countries to stimulate the performing arts. It is my earnest hope that the present Congress will take cognizance of America's need for an active and expanded cultural life—a need which this bill attempts to meet.

The Foundation would be authorized to accept donations, to collect admissions charges and to utilize the services of volunteers, so that a minimum of appropriated funds would be required. It would have an appropriate number of committees composed of professional people and the general public covering the various aspects of the performing arts to remove any danger of uniformity due to governmental assistance. The panels would judge the artistic worth and cultural significance of works to be presented to determine if they are worthy of support by the Foundation.

An organization functioning in this manner makes baseless the fear of governmental control of the arts and its relatively small cost should cause little anxiety about the level of governmental expenditures. This is, indeed, one case where a drop in the bucket can help quench the cultural thirst of 180 million people.

I believe the U.S. Arts Foundation can enable us to look forward to the day when our Nation will be served by theater, opera, ballet, and music available in all sections of our land—so that no populated place is culturally starved—and the world will honor us for it. The soul of America will in this way be enabled to grow in keeping with the growth of our productive capabilities.

Mr. President, the theme of this bill, it seems to me, is uniquely timely. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues because I think the hour has struck when the United States should show its adulthood and take some interest in its own culture in a governmental way. It has now been demonstrated that this is entirely capable of being done without any distortion of our democratic processes. The plan which I propose to the Congress is precisely the same plan, in general detail, as is now in force in the United Kingdom through the British Arts Council, and in force in our sister democracy of Canada through the Canadian Arts Council. In each case, exactly the same thing is done.

No money is to be invested in bricks and mortar, but money is to be invested to cover the difference between what the box office will produce and what the productions cost, so that productions in the performing arts may be widespread throughout the country. In many parts of the United States we now have a cultural desert. When one is outside of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, or Los Angeles there is very little in the way of performance which people have available, yet the difference between providing and not providing this cultural benefit in financial terms is often minuscule. We estimate it is between $5 million and $10 million a year. Even $5 million a year will stimulate not less than $50 million, because people are willing to pay to see these productions in the performing arts activities which are not otherwise available to the public.

This is my plan, which is modeled on the British and Canadian plans. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in response to what seemed to be the views both of President Kennedy and of presidential candidate Nixon, proposed a plan for an advisory council on the arts. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] proposed a plan for assistance to State organizations for the arts. I am proud to say that the State of New York has already authorized this procedure by law. We now have a council on the arts in our State.

I should like to tell the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is now present, that I shall support any plan the committee chooses. The whole question is before the committee. I shall be equally enthusiastic about whatever plan the committee chooses, even though I think sincerely my plan is the best. Let us get off the ground. We are the only civilized nation of any size or consequence on earth which does nothing about this in a governmental sense.

The Russians have gotten more benefit from sending Oistrakh, their violinist, the Bolshoi Ballet and the Moiseyev Ballet to the United States than they have from Sputnik I, yet we are faced with the concepts of the 18th and 19th centuries, when the development of culture was considered something improper for the Government to engage in.

Mr. President, I hope we shall have early hearings, whether they be on my bill or on any other bill, and that at long last we may get action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation of the Governor of New York, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, on this subject; and endorsements of my bill by Actors Equity, the American Guild of Musical Artists, and the distinguished composer Richard Rodgers.

There being no objection, the proclamation and endorsements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION OF STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY

The growth of music in all its forms and of musical appreciation affords spectacular proof of the cultural progress of our country. This is particularly obvious in the Empire State. Both the city and the State abound in music schools of a very high order. The largest local of the American Federation of Musicians is also in New York City.

The American music conference has compiled an interesting collection of facts and figures on musical activity in the United States. According to its report there are more than 31 million amateurs in our country who play musical instruments for their own pleasure.

In 10 years these numbers have increased some 70 percent. There has likewise been a

steady increase in professional musicians. In short, there is more good music on the American musical scene than in any other country in the world.

The activities of the National Federation of Music Clubs are highly commendable. These thoughtful and vigorously directed organizations devote the month of February every year to the promotion and encouragement of performances of music by American composers.

This is a movement which deserves wide support. In spite of the great increase in music appreciation, and in the number of music lovers, there is need for encouragement of American composers.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of February 1961, as American Music Month in New York State.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

FEBRUARY 1, 1961.

Pleased be advised of our continued support of the arts foundation bill which you now are reintroducing in the Senate. It is our hope that passage at this session will become a reality. Please advise us how we may assist you in enactment of this important legislation.

RALPH BELLAMY,
President, Actors Equity.

FEBRUARY 1, 1961.

Mr. John Brownlee of AGMA and I personally heartily endorse your bill for the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation. * * * AGMA is wholeheartedly behind this bill and offers its help in any possible to aid adoption of the measure.

HY FAINE,
Executive Secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists.

FEBRUARY 2, 1961.

Unless we are committed to being a manufacturing nation with no interest in the mind or heart you should press with all vigor the establishment of the U.S. Arts Foundation to help further the efforts of those who have minds and hearts.

RICHARD RODGERS.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, in accordance with the current practice of the Senate, if no other Senator wishes to be recognized, a Senator who has previously spoken may, I understand, be recognized for another 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to complete what I was saying with respect to the subject of a cultural program with some support from the U.S. Government on the part of our country. In pursuance of the same idea I am glad to announce that a bill identical with the one I have introduced will be introduced in the other body by Representative HALPERN, of New York.

Mr. President, one of the points which has been very much discussed in respect to this whole idea is whether or not to include with the performing arts the visual arts. Such is the practice in both Canada and the United Kingdom and though my bill does not call for it as I am introducing it today, I intend to submit an amendment to the bill in order to include the visual arts, because I think that area is equally important. It is a base of support that should be obtained for this kind of legislation, and I find it accepted in the other approaches which have been designed to meet this subject, and so I think it should be in mind.

Finally, I should like to conclude upon this note. It is very easy to dismiss this subject as being a cause for the "long hairs" and a subject not entitled to the serious consideration of Congress. But anyone who saw the reception accorded the great artists of our country, such as Van Cliburn in Moscow, the reception accorded Marion Anderson in India, the reception which the two ballets that I talked about a minute ago were given in this country, the reception given the Russian violinist Oistrakh and the pianist Gilels in this country and many countries in South America, will realize that we are deliberately foregoing by archaic and old-fashioned ideas one of the most effective instruments in the hands of mankind today, first, to assert the efficacy and the virtues of our free institutions, and, second, to make human beings throughout the world feel that we are people who deserve to be followed, who deserve to be trusted, who have creative ideas and are seeking a life of peace and fruitful living for all peoples everywhere.

Though it is sad that we must put the question on that basis—and yet it seems to me this subject is perhaps the one thing many people will understand—I know of few more important and decisive weapons even in the cold war than the employment of this weapon of culture—effective, powerful, and true—and I hope at long last, with all the bills which have been introduced converging with the attitude of the President, that Congress will act upon this subject.

EXTENSION OF VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES DAIRY PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1961, the name of Mr. LONG of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 835) to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to permanently extend the veterans and Armed Forces dairy program, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators) on February 9, 1961.

NATIONAL EXPORT POLICY ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1961, the names of Mr. KEATING and Mr. SALTONSTALL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 852) to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey) on February 9, 1961.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced two bills concerning small business investment companies. Today I would like to explain why these bills—S. 902 and S. 903—are needed, and to analyze the provisions of each of them.

Our national economy is dangerously stalemated. Congress, by a few legislative changes and the injection of a relatively small amount of additional funds, could do much with the existing programs of the Small Business Investment Act to stimulate the economy. These programs—licensing and lending to SBIC's and making State and local development loans—are in being now. They require no basic new authority. Simple amendments improving opportunities for SBIC's and extending authority for making State and local development loans would involve no grants in aid. Each of these programs is operated on a loan basis and the loans will be repaid with interest at 5 or 5½ percent. Furthermore, tabulations have been made showing that for each dollar of Federal funds invested in small business investment companies, $10 of private investment has been stimulated. Every time the Government makes a local development company loan, local borrowing groups must put in funds of their own, and the small business tenant of the building must expend the necessary capital funds to get the plant in operation. Thus, all of these expenditures of public and private funds under the loan program to local development companies add an effective stimulus to the economy.

Our first bill will be concerned directly with strengthening the provisions of the act. The second bill will contain tax amendments to make investments by SBIC's and ownership of SBIC stock more attractive.

Many of us have great hopes for the Small Business Investment Act. However, the program of licensing small business investment companies was very slow in beginning. By January 1, 1960, only 61 SBIC's had been licensed. Therefore, the small business committee decided to conduct hearings to determine what improvements in the act and in its administration could be made to increase the number of operating SBIC's. Our report to the Senate at the conclusion of those hearings contained several recommendations for amendments to the act and to pertinent provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. Near the close of the session, I introduced two bills to carry out the recommendations of the committee. Although the bills were offered too late to be considered by the appropriate committee, and by the Senate, I felt that they should be available for study and review.

It is my purpose today to reintroduce these bills with some changes and further improvements. The first of the two bills, dealing with the Investment Act, itself, has as its initial provision the authority for SBIC's, including those now in operation, to obtain up to $1 million of their capital from the Small Business Administration in exchange for subordinated debentures of the SBIC's. These funds would be on a matching basis, as they are now. However, the

present limitation is $150,000 of capital funds from SBA. The second provision would permit SBIC's under section 303 (b) of the act, to borrow from SBA funds equal to their capital and surplus. Currently, SBIC's are limited to borrowing from SBA one-half the amount of their capital and surplus.

These first two amendments would give SBIC's substantially greater leverage in their operations. Witnesses informed us at our hearings that the minimum size firms were able to obtain the most advantageous leverage, that is, borrowing a larger ratio of SBA funds in relation to equity investment, but that they were too small to be operated at a profitable level. The new legislation would encourage the formation and growth of SBIC's with a capitalization of $1 to $5 million rather than continuing to encourage SBIC's to remain small. These provisions would apply to existing SBIC's, as well as new ones.

The third amendment would permit SBIC's to participate with any other investors in advancing equity capital to small business concerns.

The fourth amendment contained in this act would make it clear that SBIC's may lend in participation with the Small Business Administration and with other investors, public or private, incorporated or unincorporated. SBA has not permitted SBIC's to participate with the Agency in making loans to small business concerns. However, I see no reason why SBIC's should not participate with SBA or anyone else in financing small business concerns.

The next amendment is a technical amendment making it quite clear that SBIC's may participate with other lenders or investors in supplying services to small business concerns.

Our next amendment would permit SBIC's to invest in obligations that are insured by instrumentalities of the Government. Currently, SBIC's are permitted to invest their funds not reasonably needed for their current operations only in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. This is unduly restrictive on SBIC's and limits them to a low rate of return on funds that may be temporarily uncommitted.

Certainly, no SBIC is going to leave its funds unnecessarily idle or commit them to low-bearing Government securities when it has a suitable opportunity to invest them in higher yielding obligations of small business concerns. Permitting SBIC's to invest in Government-insured obligations will not encourage them to withhold loans and capital from small business concerns, but it will make it possible for them to earn a somewhat improved return on funds not currently committed to small business concerns.

The next amendment would permit any SBIC to grant restricted stock options to officers and employees. The Small Business Administration has published regulations permitting the granting of stock options, but the Investment Company Act of 1940 prohibits these options in publicly held SBIC's. This limitation will make it increasingly difficult for some SBIC's to employ competent and talented executives when they must compete against other private enterprises that have the right to grant such stock options.

The final amendment to the Small Business Investment Act posed by my bill would remove the expiration date for the authority contained in section 502 of the act. Under this section, the Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans to State and local development companies for the purpose of constructing manufacturing and industrial facilities. With this authority SBA has made some 75 loans to communities throughout the Nation. These loans have assisted those communities to construct plants for needed industries. In the early months after the Small Business Investment Act was passed, SBA did nothing to publicize the provisions of section 502. Consequently, practically all of the loans made under section 502 have been made since the spring of 1960. Actually the program is just getting under way, and it would be a tragic error, in my judgment, if authority for the program were permitted to expire.

The first Internal Revenue Code amendment in our tax bill to lend greater encouragement to small business investment companies would permit these companies to establish reserves for investment losses and to add to those reserves each year.

The second amendment would permit SBIC's to establish reserves for bad debts arising from their lending activities. Some other lending institutions are permitted to establish such reserves. It seems to me that the SBIC's with their element of high risk should also be permitted this privilege.

Our third tax amendment would grant SBIC's an exemption from the accumulated earnings tax on earnings reinvested to provide additional financing for small business concerns.

The next tax amendment would clarify legislation which we passed in the 86th Congress to exempt SBIC's from the surtax on personal holding companies. It appears from informal statements of Internal Revenue personnel that the exemption might be construed so that stock of a small business concern acquired by an SBIC could be attributed, by imposition of a constructive ownership rule, to a stockholder of the SBIC. I believe such a construction would totally nullify the exemption granted by Congress. The amendment will leave no doubt on this subject.

The fifth amendment would permit the small business investment companies to pass through their earnings to their stockholders without the imposition of the corporate tax. This privilege is now conferred on investment trusts under section 851 of the Internal Revenue Code. It seems to me quite reasonable that SBIC's which are basically investment trusts should have this same privilege.

The sixth amendment is a technical amendment to make the tax provisions correspond to the substantive provisions of the Small Business Investment Act. In 1960, we amended the Small Business Investment Act to permit SBIC's to invest in other equity securities of small business concerns in addition to convertible debentures. However, the related tax section, section 1243 of the code, has not been amended. The amendment would make a loss on any type of SBA-authorized equity security subject to treatment as an ordinary business loss.

The final amendment would permit a subchapter S corporation, otherwise known as a tax option corporation, to have a small business investment company shareholder and still not lose its status as such a tax option corporation. Present law provides that only individuals and estates can be shareholders of an eligible subchapter S corporation. However, SBIC's, by their investment in convertible debentures and other equity securities, may often become stockholders of subchapter S corporations, and, therefore, should, for the benefit of subchapter S firms, be permitted to own the stock without depriving these small firms of their special Federal tax status.

With these amendments to the Small Business Investment Act and to related tax provisions, the Congress can make sure that the small business investment program and the program of SBA loans to State and local development companies will go forward successfully. In so going forward, these programs will provide a substantial part of the immediate stimulus needed by the economy.

I may add that last Thursday, when I introduced the bills, I asked that they be allowed to lie on the table for 1 week for additional sponsorship. I hope some Senators will become interested in the legislation, which I think will be most helpful to the small business economy, and will join in cosponsoring these measures.

TWELFTH ANNUAL PANCAKE RACE AT LIBERAL, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 12th annual pancake race of Liberal, Kans., will be run tomorrow. This great goodwill event between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, is always held on the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday.

The race is sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Liberal for the promotion of international relations between England and the United States.

It is based on competition between the young ladies of Olney, England, and Liberal, Kans.

Some years ago Liberal heard of this 500-year event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church. The city of Liberal challenged the women of Olney, England, to this race, and it was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, vicar of Olney.

In old England, it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell to be "shriven" of their sins. In 1445, a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes

rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang, but she hurried off to the "shriving" carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus an annual sporting event was born.

I am inviting the members of the U.S. Senate and their staffs and the press to be my guests tomorrow for breakfast in the Senate dining room and the Senate cafeteria, where they will be served the finest pancakes in the world, made from the finest flour in the world, furnished by the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, directly from the "Pancake Hub of the Universe."

Miss Monzelle Emberton will be in Washington representing the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT HAROLD C. CASE, OF BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, President Harold C. Case, of Boston University, a native Kansan, was a guest speaker on January 29—Statehood Day in Topeka, Kans.

His address, entitled "The Past Is Prologue," was delivered at a citywide religious service in Topeka Municipal Auditorium at the invitation of the Shawnee Statehood Day Committee.

This excellent address was most timely, in that it not only reminded us of our rich heritage as Kansans, but also gave great hope for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PAST IS PROLOGUE

On entering the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., one comes on an impres...ve adage carved in stone. It reads, "The Past Is Prologue." At first glance this saying seems to reverse life's normal direction. How could the past be the introduction to anything? On reflection, however, we recognize yesterday's events as forerunners of tomorrow's trends. The past is prologue. We must know history if we are to make history.

A centennial celebration is best understood as vivid awareness of our heritage in order to become strongly and wisely motivated to create an even better future. Properly understood, such events serve not so much for self-congratulation as for self-discipline.

It is pleasant to sing praises of Kansas, to consider the wealth of its soil, the bracing quality of its climate, the sturdy character of its pioneers, and the capacity of its early settlers for being first in the support of important causes.

We recall the first white man, Coronado, who came in quest of gold; the first pioneers who came in search of homes; the first trappers bound for Santa Fe; the Mormons for Deseret; the immigrants en route to the Northwest, the religious leaders, reformers, politicians, scoundrels, and idealists. We may remember the changing panorama of Kansas, the struggles between free and slave forces, the era of the cowboy, the settler who made the prairie blossom as a rose. They have been dramatized in history, legend, poetry, and song.

Life was hard for the first settlers. There were border wars, droughts, floods, grasshoppers, prairie fires, blizzards and dust-storms. Yet they stuck it out. One old folksong tells why. It says:

"We do not live but only stay,
We are too poor to get away."

Yet not only were these unfriendly elements part of the Kansas scene, they actually formed the route to the stars of their ideals through the difficulties of their days. From the crucible of hardship they forged robust character. They laughed at problems, sang heartaches away, and made an adventure of living. Out of this background came a rigorous code of ethics and bold support of truth. One wonders whether comfort recreates the best qualities formed by hardship.

Progressive movements emerged; the anti-slavery crusade, woman suffrage, equal rights, the Populist Party, prohibition, free silver. So creative were our forebears in conceiving new ways to live, that Kansas became a synonym for radical ideas. Many of the so-called leftwing movements of a century ago have become law and are now the framework of conventional society.

Overland freighting on western trails was big business. From the discovery of gold in 1849 to the driving of the last spike of the Union Pacific Railroad in 1869, thousands of wagon trains hauled millions of dollars worth of goods and hundreds of thousands of people westward, toward tomorrow and new hope.

Drivers of ox teams, known as bull whackers, were experts at whip throwing and swearing. One day a bull whacker entered a wagon train office in Topeka and asked for a job.

"Can you drive oxen?" the employer asked.

"Yep," said the bull whacker, "I can drive oxen to hell and back."

"Well, well," replied the freighter, "then I can't use you because our line doesn't stop at that point."

Dried apple pies were served at inns from end to end of the stage lines. They became tiresome and one pioneer teamster wrote about these pies:

"I loathe! abhor! despise!
Abominate dried apple pies.
I like good bread; I like good meat,
Or anything that's good to eat.
But of all poor grub beneath the skies
The poorest is dried apple pies."

In 1854 a very important link between New England and Kansas was established. The Kansas-Nebraska bill opened land to settlers. The Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Co. was chartered. The first colony, led by Dr. Charles Robinson, arrived beside beautiful Mt. Oread and established the town which was to be known as Lawrence, after a Massachusetts family and city.

In that first colony of 29 men, there were 10 mechanics, 5 farmers, 2 merchants, 1 architect, 1 banker, 2 doctors, and a lawyer. They came prepared for any eventuality. The second colony of settlers, including wives and children, numbered 4 musicians. Before departing from Boston, they sang Whittier's Hymn of the Kansas Emigrant. Another, written especially for them began:

"We'll seek the rolling prairie,
In regions yet unseen,
Or stay our feet unweary,
By Kansas' flowing stream.
And there with hands unfettered
Our altars we will raise,
With voices high uplifted
We'll sing our Maker's praise."

The first winter they lived in canvas tents, log houses, shake houses, and hay tents. They chose a beautiful site on the south bank of the Kaw River and named it Topeka, meaning "potatoes", and sometimes referred to by jealous pioneers of other towns as "small potatoes."

Religion was given permanence by the pioneers. Churches were established; camp meetings flourished. Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, and other churches were organized. Every Kansas community was hard-living and God-fearing.

Education was organized by immigrants as soon as they reached Kansas. They infused their new life with learning. At first, there were private schools, the Topeka Academy for one; then by the act of territorial legislature in 1855 "a system of free common schools" was launched. Colleges followed: Highland College, a Presbyterian institution, and Baker University, founded by the Methodists in 1858; a free university atop Mount Oread, in 1864.

Statehood. One hundred years ago today. How thankful we should be for all of the good and great influences that have combined to produce Kansas, our climb "to the stars through difficulty."

But the past is prologue. What about the future? The curtain is rising on the drama itself. Kansas is established, settled, financed; it has tools, government, industry, arts, education.

Like every manifestation of vitality, democracy is many-dimensional. The floor under it is food and clothing and shelter. Men and women and children well cared for of body are not looking for "pied pipers" whose music is the minstrelsy of coercion and violence and doom. Yet no humans really live by comfort or for conveniences.

People inhabit bodies and are spirits. They are oriented upward as truly as a falling stone responds to the pull of gravity. We tread the earth with our feet, but we will fill our lungs with the ozone of imagination. We buy and trade commodities so that we may think, read, talk about, and dream of immensities. We do simple deeds, hoping for exalted results. Occasionally we produce a hero. Then we all take courage and renew our faith.

There is a push from beneath, the warming soil to the swelling seed, but there is also a pull from above. Ideals are glints in darkness, lighting up the sky, and their comet-like trails glow luminously and draw men upward to nobility. It is remarkable that exactly a century after men launched their state with a starlit vision, astronauts are preparing for the first manned satellite to a planet.

It is more satisfying to be pulled by vision than to be pushed by passion.

Beauty alone redeems duty from desperation to dedication.

Together, on this 29th day of January 1961, exactly 100 years after our great-grandparents and their children established a State in this territory, we have come together to revivify, in the face of mounting danger, new, atomic, and planetary, the vision of life which for centuries has brightened the prospects of man.

That we may become so unified of energy and so disciplined in character that we will both gladly live and nobly die, is a faith in the light of which the past is but prologue—a vivid promise of vital future days to come.

In this dramatic moment in history, filled alike with portents of disaster and promises of fulfillment, we cannot afford the luxury of complacency. It is compounded of disdain and distrust. It is the mood of a silly French queen, saying of her subjects as they storm the Bastille demanding food, "If they don't have bread, let them eat cake."

Complacency is the spirit of the privileged person who assumes that people are poor because they are inferior. It is the mood of the alarmist who complains because bins are piled high with surplus grain but feels no compulsion to contribute this food to starving people.

We live in a forcing hour, in a cosmic hothouse—swifter flight, more rapid change, more significant transition, more prospects of independent nations than ever before in history. Electronics have made the planet a vast whispering gallery. Every critical act is relayed from anywhere to everywhere else on earth, within minutes. Down the pathways of every jungle have gone the whispered

messages of hope, of independence, of self-reliance, of leadership.

So, between the tensions of anxiety and the viewing with alarm and the escapes of complacency with their self-deceptions, there is another posture for people with a history who would face the future resolutely. In it, there is the resources of the mind. Intellect separates man from all other animals for it brings the capacity to think, to evaluate, to create, to decide, and to act.

This is an age of education. Thirty-five percent of our college-age young people are now enrolled in institutions of higher learning. This number will probably double in the next decade. In order to recruit leaders, provide facilities and equipment, I predict that we shall double our educational budgets in the Nation in the next 10 years. If this seems excessive, remember that we are now spending 4 percent of our total national product for education in all forms. While Nigeria, a newly independent Republic in Africa, is spending 45 percent of its national product for education.

It is a question finally of the value we place on the life of the mind. Not only do we require more and better formal education—elementary, secondary, and higher, but informal education must impel mature citizens everywhere to seek new knowledge, to evaluate more objectively, and to reach decisions of importance, not on the basis of prejudice but with the support of facts.

Man's most distinctive quality is his ability to adapt and recreate. This capacity exists in all living things. The maple knows how to wrap its roots around the rock; the grass to retain moisture in the soil; the amoeba to withdraw from danger in a drop of water, and the salmon to find its way up its own river to the spawning ground. The swallow knows how to return on schedule to Capistrano; the elk to bugle to its mate; the grouse to perform a mating dance, and the seeing-eye dog to exhibit loyalty to its master.

Awareness is everywhere. But in man it is uniquely expressed. Man alone knows the meaning of time, the difference between youth and age, the distinction between good and evil. He experiences, learns, remembers, and interprets. He is student, scholar, lover, politician, parent, researcher, and citizen. He establishes relationship between two unrelated ideas. A mother croons a lullaby to her baby. A poet writes lyrics of love. A statesman serves his country. This capacity for understanding and valuing distinguishes man from growing grass, spawning fish, and migrating birds and enables him to gain reverence for life.

But no mere glory from the past will light up the present or survive in the future unless religious dedication joins with disciplined effort in this generation.

To awareness, tomorrow's builders must add dimensions. Great objectives extend one's grasp. This is the meaning of the conviction of the Judeo-Christian tradition that "man is created in the image of God." Picturing oneself as obligated to become Godlike in character, the least person among us can perform the greatest deeds. A Maid of Orleans can reaffirm her voices though they consign her to the flames. Marie Curie can declare, "None of us can do much, but each of us can do something. * * * Take the torch of knowledge and of wisdom and build the palace of the future." This is the spirit of Tom Dooley in Laos and Albert Schweitzer in Equatorial Africa. On rare occasions we have been pulled by such large goals. To vindicate our heritage, this pose must become habitual.

We should learn from our past that the common people possess uncommon qualities. Carl Sandburg, in "The People, "Yes," says:

"Between the finite limitations of the five senses and the endless yearnings of man for the beyond
The people hold to the humdrum bidding of work and food while reaching out when it comes their way,
For lights beyond the prison of the five senses, for keepsakes lasting beyond any hunger or death."

This uncommon capacity, striving for the timeless, reaching for keepsakes that last beyond any hunger or death, reveals the true stature of a person and foretells, by his scarcity or plenty, the prospects for civilization.

In a recent issue of Harper's magazine, John Fisher writes about an "innocent-sounding but dreadful book published in England with the bland title 'Uncommon People.'" It sounds like a tedious genealogy. Actually it is an exciting drama. George Villiers was an undistinguished farmer who lived through the reign of Queen Elizabeth I in comfortable obscurity. Yet his record, as noted in the deeds of his descendants, mark him as one of the greatest men of all time. His descendants have been running England most of the time for the past 300 years. Among them are Sir Winston Churchill, Queen Elizabeth II, the Duke of Marlborough, the two noted Pitts. The author says that they collect honors the way a blue serge suit collects lint. A list of their names is like a rollcall of cultural chieftains—Salisbury, Stanley, Stanhope, Cavendish, etc.; but also Bertram Russell, Henry Fielding, Quakers, abolitionists, industrialists, statesmen. Among their greatest qualities are outreach for the uncommon, striving for the timeless, setting cosmic dimensions to their performance, and joining the procession of the great.

Uncommon people are all around us. We must learn to identify, recognize, and honor them. Some time ago I came across such a man. He lived in a one-room house along a country road in New England. He is a woodcutter. Having finished his house, except for one side which promises a second room, he has painted it white and installed a picket fence around it. It was noon on a Sunday. He was sitting in front of his house on an antique chair, wearing a white shirt, accompanying himself to folksongs with a tiny accordion. He could wield an ax to fell a tree. He also knew distilled folk wisdom, deeper than knowledge of scholars. There was greatness.

It is all around us. It requires recognition and support. This is our task.

These are individual responsibilities. But there are collective obligations. Kansas pioneers came to these Great Plains, not in order to escape from something, but to discover something else. They were broadening the concept of a nation, extending the boundaries, pushing back the frontier. Our land has been explored and settled, but the frontier has no limit. Once the outpost of reality was the next township. Now it is the nearest star. Then there were few neighbors. Now the world troops over, around, and into our living rooms. Then we could insulate ourselves. Now a Kansas flier comes home from a Soviet prison—having done reconnaissance for this Nation. He was not a mere Kansan—he was an American. His findings are important not only in Washington but also in Kansas.

Fourteen new nations have been admitted to the United Nations within the past year. If all the emerging countries of Africa included in this group should make permanent alliances with the Soviet bloc of nations, in theory, we of the West could never again win a decision in the Security Council of the United Nations. On the other hand, if all of them should decide to ally themselves with the democratic countries, the Soviets could not win another decision in that world body.

Does this affect you, a resident of Kansas? It decides about your taxes, the draft, and your son's life, the viability of the American economy and the worth of your dollar or your investment or your job. It is the key to the health of your society—and mine. There is no place to hide.

In the Middle West there is a subtle temptation to insulate oneself from world problems. Let it be said tonight that to resist that impulse and to be involved wisely is the key to tomorrow.

Deep concern about world problems, citizenship on a planetary scale, is a sober obligation of every Kansan. In the writings of the Apostle Paul, there is a worthy text for all of us. He says, "I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." This is your clue—if you would make the inspiring past a promising prolog to a magnificent future.

TRIBUTE TO DR. TOM DOOLEY BY DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senate's esteemed Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, always writes beautifully, but yesterday for his column, Spires of the Spirit, published in the Sunday Star, he wrote a singularly beautiful and eloquent tribute to the late Dr. Thomas J. Dooley.

Dr. Dooley's life as a heroic ambassador of friendship for our country and a noble humanitarian ministering in a foreign land to unhappy people, sick, diseased, and suffering, is a lesson and a challenge to each of us.

Tom Dooley brought hope where there seemed to be no hope, he brought light where there was darkness, he brought relief from pain and anguish, and he saved many lives where death hovered close. His words, written in his last days, telling of his spirit and of his faith, and quoted by Dr. Harris, confirm to us the truth of the old Greek philosopher, who declared, "One cannot get closer to God than to give health to one's fellow man."

Mr. President, I pay my tribute to the life, the works, the magnificent courage, and the gallant soul of Tom Dooley, who so truly walked in the footsteps of the great physician; and I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Harris' column may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 12, 1961]

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—MILES TO GO

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

Goodness is the most attractive thing in all the world. Helping others void of the alloy of self is the most fascinating spectacle earth affords. Goodness expressing itself in selfless service is an irresistible combination. That is why in an acquisitive age piled high with material gains, with names galore in the "Who's Who" of success, the name of Dr. Albert Schweitzer, who has given his life to suffering humanity, leads all the rest. His working day has now stretched into the 80's and even the modern world, with its mania for getting, sensing that he has chosen the better part, bows at his feet and exalts his healing hands, and acclaims him as perhaps the greatest human now alive.

It is because the same glory that for so many years has flamed the African hospital, has recently shone in the service of another doctor—now dead at 34—that the name of Dr. Tom Dooley suggests to millions a blazing

meteor flashing across the sky of uncalculated altruism. In the midst of sordid surroundings of misery and brutality on the other side of the world from where he was born, this Missouri boy has been hailed not as the "Ugly American" but as the "beautiful" American. Dr. Dooley in his brief but intense service to the want and woe of the Asian jungles did infinite things for those for whom his care, his medicine, his hospitals, snatched life from the clutches of death. What he was and what he did came as a divine relation to many reveling in the soft luxuries of the West. As an editorial on his life truly put it: "His boyish enthusiasm, his zest, maintained even during his fatal illness, marked him as one of the rare people who reflected the goodness of God and the fulfillment of human potentials for selflessness."

Tom Dooley ended his work at approximately the same meager age span as did "Man's Best Man." We are reminded that the greatest life ever lived came to its earthly close at 33, but that One hanging dead on two crossed beams of wood before He was 34 had invaded more realms, inspired more endeavor, influenced more lives, and captured more hearts than any other person who has ever lived.

How little the incident of one's obituary has to do with the total record. Emerson once remarked: "We do not count a man's years until he has nothing else to count." Alexander the Great conquered the known world and died before he reached the age when cancer took Dr. Dooley. Raphael had decorated Rome with immortal masterpieces and was in his grave in his 34th year. If Thomas Jefferson had died at 34, he would still be the author of the Declaration of Independence. Much is made in this day of health assets in adding years to life. It is a tremendously greater thing to add life to years—that Dr. Dooley did in a way to win the world's grateful applause.

From his early years he had loved the verse of Robert Frost:

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

Yes, he had promises to keep as he extended the benefits of American medicine to the neglected corners of the earth. He had miles to go, and he went miles and miles before he kept the faith and finished his course at 34. He had miles to go in healing the sick, comforting the afflicted, and harboring the homeless before he slept.

He knew that he was on the last mile when 47 days before the end, racked by pain of the malignancy which slew him, he wrote a letter from the jungles of Laos to the president of Notre Dame where he had spent a year in the 1940's as a premedical student. Fond memories of his months in that great institution of learning were flitting through his drug-dulled brain. He felt a compulsion to write to Dr. Hesburgh, the president. To do so he contrived a way of "pumping up the bed a bit, and getting to my typewriter." He states that his cancer was "acting up and though I lack a certain buoyancy in my bones, just now I lack none in my spirit."

As he wrote he was evidently thinking of his hospitals around the world and of the 94 doctor friends who were raising funds for his loved projects. Then comes a superb statement of his religious faith as the fiery affliction was spreading—"I think of one Divine Doctor and my own personal fund of grace. The storm around does not matter—the winds within do not matter. Nothing human or earthly can touch me—a wilder storm of peace gathers in my heart—what seems unpossessable I can possess. What seems unfathomable, I can fathom. What is unutterable, I can utter—because I can pray—I can communicate. How can people endure anything on earth if they cannot have God?"

What can one say after a victorious valedictory like that—except perhaps to quote the verse of an old hymn:

"O may I triumph so,
When all my warfare's past,
And dying find my latest foe
Under my feet at last."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Paul Burgess Fay, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be a deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carlisle Piehl Runge, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Neville Miller to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, to fill the unexpired term of James E. Colliflower, resigned, whose term expires March 3, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

WELFARE STATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2 there were allusions to remarks attributed to Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., concerning the welfare state. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD a letter received from Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., special assistant to the President, dated February 4, 1961.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1961.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2 allusions to remarks attributed to me concerning the welfare state. I fear that these allusions were based on a misunderstanding of the definition I attached to this phrase—a phrase not of my own liking, by the way, but imposed on me by the debate topic to which Mr. Buckley and I were asked to address ourselves.

Two quotations sum up my definition of the "welfare state":

"The scheme of society for which we stand is the establishment and maintenance of a basic standard of life and labor below which a man or woman, however old or weak, shall not be allowed to fall. The food they receive, the prices they have to pay for basic necessities, the homes they live in, their employment must be the first care of the state, and must have priority over all other peacetime needs."

"I believe that the American people feel that our production is so great that we can afford to put a floor under the necessities of life—food, education, medical care, housing—so that every family may have available a minimum decent living."

The conception of a floor under the necessities of life seems to me the heart of the matter. I should add that the first quotation is from Winston Churchill and the second from Robert A. Taft. I can hardly believe that those who denounced me really regard Churchill and Taft as state socialists. My own strong conviction is that the goals set forth in these quotations can be fully achieved under our present economic system.

I should add that I took part in this debate before I assumed my present duties.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.,
Special Assistant to the President.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress the fine work being done in New Bedford, Mass., in combating juvenile delinquency by inserting in the RECORD an article from the Brockton Enterprise. It shows what an alert and active community can do on the local level to handle this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

N.G. UNIT BEATS DELINQUENCY THROUGH POSITIVE PROGRAM—BOYS "GUIDED TO MANHOOD" BY GUARDSMEN IN NEW BEDFORD'S "MINUTEMAN CADETS"

(By Dick Dew)

NEW BEDFORD.—A National Guard unit here operates an antidelinquency program so effectively that many of its teenage members aren't even aware of its success.

Though about one-sixth of the 60 boys in the military-like Minutemen Cadets have been in trouble and are being "guided to manhood," few if any of their fellow members know of it or of the group's lofty aims.

The cadets were founded 3 years ago by the officers and men of Service Battery, 1st Howitzer Battalion, 211th Artillery.

Its formation is credited chiefly to Battery Commander Capt. Joseph Souza who also is adult probation officer in the New Bedford district court.

"We founded the cadets at the request of parents whose youngsters seemed to want and need something of this kind. They just weren't interested in the woodcraft aspects of the Boy Scouts," Souza said.

The cadets are composed of dues-paying boys 13 to 17 years of age who get a full course of preliminary military instruction ranging from military courtesy right up to small arms training during an annual firing range visit.

The youngsters operate under a plebe system with their own officers and noncoms and a seldom-needed court-martial program for those who wander out of line.

National Guard Lt. Donald Lavimoniere is the supervising commander and CWO Neil W. W. Young serves as administrative officer. In addition, almost every officer and man of service battery participates in the program in one way or another.

SLOGAN SUMS IT UP

Captain Souza is perhaps the best person to comment on the success of the cadet program.

He first stresses that the organization was not founded to line up National Guard recruits. "Only one of our discharged (automatic at age 18) cadets has signed up for the guards. That isn't our aim, though, of course, we welcome the boys.

"We have a few boys who have been in trouble. We've tried to hold down the ratio to 10 percent who have either been in difficulty or on the verge of it. We've never had anyone who couldn't or wouldn't be helped.

"We're really not here to lead the boys as much as we are to guide them. We have a slogan of 'guide to manhood' that pretty much sums it up.

"We get these boys when they are at an age that really needs some discipline. They appreciate guidance so long as they don't feel they're being led."

CASTRO CAUSES CRISIS

Generally, the boys' dues and the contributions of the National Guardsmen cover expenses. Their only real financial crisis resulted, strangely, from the rise to power in Cuba of Fidel Castro.

Until that time, the official cadet uniform was fatigues. But when the boys smarted under the jibe, "Castro's Cadets," they hastily converted to suntans with the quiet assistance of their National Guard sponsors and local service clubs.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Secretary of Labor has just completed a trip which dramatically illustrated the unemployment situation in our country. Unfortunately, his time schedule precluded a visit to New England, even though the situation there is also critical.

The latest report of the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security shows that, as of mid-December, 138,000 workers, or 6.3 percent of the State's work force, were out of work. This was above the level of 6 percent which the Department of Labor considers to be critical. These figures reported unemployment for the latter part of December. Since then, the situation has worsened. Bad weather conditions have added to layoffs. The latest figures, which will appear in the next 2 weeks, will certainly show a further deterioration.

Of the eight major employment areas in Massachusetts, seven have more than 6 percent unemployment. Lowell and Lawrence have had severe unemployment for almost 10 years, while Fall River, New Bedford, and Springfield have had over 6 percent unemployment for between 3 and 4 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a table detailing the unemployment situation in Massachusetts be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated unemployment as of mid-December 1960

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Number	Percent of labor force
Boston	56,500	4.6
Springfield-Holyoke	14,450	7.2
Worcester	10,000	7.4
New Bedford	7,340	11.7
Fall River	6,410	11.0
Lawrence	6,410	7.7
Lowell	4,740	9.4
Brockton	3,540	7.5

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Congress can and should act swiftly to alleviate this situation by early passage of two bills.

First. An increase in Federal support to State unemployment compensation programs so that unemployment benefits can be increased, and extended to persons whose State benefits have run out.

Second. An area redevelopment bill to allow communities to attract new industries, and allow workers to be retrained in occupations where job opportunity is expanding.

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Massachusetts Legislature recently adopted three resolutions concerning medical assistance to the aged, increasing the income tax exemption, and textile and fish imports. I feel that these resolutions should receive the attention of the Congress, and I ask that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PASS LEGISLATION GRANTING MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED UNDER THE FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AND ELIMINATING THE PAUPER'S OATH

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass legislation granting medical assistance to the aged, funds for such assistance to be raised under the Federal Social Security Act, and eliminating the pauper's oath; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION AND THE DEDUCTION FOR DEPENDENTS UNDER THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX LAW

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the personal exemption under the Federal income tax law from $600 to $1,000 for persons under the age of 65, and increasing the amount of deduction allowed for dependents of such persons from $600 to $1,000; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST GRANTING CONCESSIONS ON TEXTILE AND FISH IMPORTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass no legislation granting concessions on textile and fish imports from foreign countries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

FIVE CENTS SAVINGS BANK

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Massachusetts was the birthplace of the mutual savings bank, which is known in the Commonwealth as the 5-cents savings bank. Since 1854, it has been possible—and it is still possible—to begin a savings account in Massachusetts with a deposit as low as 5 cents.

The story of these banks is an important part of the story of American thrift—of people joining together to make their money work for them.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times of January 29, entitled "Five Cents Banks Thrive on Yankee Thrift," be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE CENTS BANKS THRIVE ON YANKEE THRIFT—PECULIAR TO MASSACHUSETTS, INSTITUTIONS HAVE GROWN WITH COMMON MAN

(By Victor H. Lawn)

SALEM, MASS., January 28.—Had there been nickels when Benjamin Franklin coined the maxim "many a little makes a mickle," he might have said "many a nickel makes a buck-el."

But the nickel piece was not minted until 1866, about 100 years after his pithy advice appeared in Poor Richard's Almanack and the dollar bill, or "buck," came even later.

Just how right he was is shown by the record of the Five Cents Savings Banks, found only in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. These institutions first appeared in 1854, with few assets. So skillfully have they parlayed the old half-dime and 5-cents deposits that they start 1961 with assets of about $1,500 million. Deposits aggregate some $1,250 million.

MUTUAL BANKS STARTED

Among the many things Massachusetts has given to the United States is the mutual savings bank. A few clever Bostonians figured out that something could be done by combining traditional New England thrift with Yankee skill in making money. So, in 1816, they formed the Provident Institution for Savings in the town of Boston and began the mutual savings bank movement in this country.

The new enterprise was called an institution because the work "bank" was in bad repute with the populace then. Big merchants and shipping interests controlled local banks to the exclusion of the farmer and laborer. Today, still operating under its original name, the Provident Institution for Savings has assets of almost $350 million. New York did not get its first mutual savings bank until 1819, 3 years later.

The Nation was growing rapidly in the 1850's. Workers and sailors, although paid small wages, were earning more than they could spend prudently. But they had no place in which to put anything they might save. Banks of those days could not be bothered with petty accounts, so the ordinary citizen had to keep the money he did not spend in a sock or a hole in the ground.

That was the situation that gave rise to a move for a bank for the little fellow. Within a matter of hours on April 7, 1854, the first Five Cents Savings Banks were chartered by the Massachusetts Legislature. Each charter had as its second clause:

"Said corporation shall receive, on deposit, sums as small as 5 cents."

EIGHTEEN UNITS CHARTERED

Eight such banks were chartered in 1854 and seven in 1855. From 1859 to 1870 five more were chartered, but since that date no new Five Cents Savings Banks have opened for business. The old ones, however, still "receive, on deposit, sums as small as 5 cents." Anyone who wants to open an account with a nickel can do so, and can do it by mail. Interest is not paid on amounts of less than $1.

When the Boston Five Cents Savings Bank opened for business on May 1, 1854, the Boston Herald said in an editorial headlined "A Bank for the Millions" that "Any poor man or poor woman—any poor boy or poor girl—anybody that can get 5 cents, can deposit in this bank and become a capitalist at once." The Boston Five, as it is generally called, is the largest mutual savings bank in Massachusetts, with deposits of about $375 million.

The Charlestown Five Cents Savings Bank adopted as its slogan "In the shadow of Bunker Hill." Its purpose was expressed as the "desire to have an institution established to encourage thrift through the acceptance of small savings." In 1949, the bank amended its charter by dropping the Five Cents from its name. Other municipalities that chartered banks of this sort in 1854 were Lowell, where the singular Five Cent was used instead of the plural Five Cents, Newburyport, Peabody—where the bank is called Warren—Springfield, Woburn, and Worcester.

The 1855 banks were at Fall River, Harwich—called the Cape Cod—Lynn, Plymouth, Salem, Stoneham, and New Bedford. Natick, Arlington, Brighton, Webster and the City Five Cents Savings Bank at Haverhill, were chartered from 1859 to 1870.

FIRST QUARTERS MODEST

All these banks started in modest quarters and many were open only an hour or two a week. The Woburn bank was in a store, the Arlington bank started in a corner of the railroad station. The first office of the Lynn bank was in the city clerk's room at the town hall. At Salem, the bank started in a room down an alley. Now all the banks have large, modern buildings and some have branches.

Franklin A. Hebard, president of the Salem Five Cents Savings Bank, says that the first depositor was a 14-year-old boy. Eighty-four persons on that first day deposited a total of $1,769.64 in amounts from 5 cents upward. First-year deposits amounted to $44,755.31. Deposits today total more than $70 million.

The latest variation of this movement that received its chief impetus from the Five Cent Savings Banks is the mutual fund, which directly invests the pooled funds of scattered individuals. Small savers, however, must first let their funds build up in savings banks before they can participate in mutual funds.

THE CONTEST BETWEEN LIBERTY AND SECURITY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the always difficult and always troublesome contest between liberty and security, with their deep and sometimes seemingly irreconcilable claims for our priority, has been raised again by a Supreme Court decision in the case of Times Film Corp. against Chicago. I have received—and I am sure many other Senators have also—much mail following that decision, and it seems to me that a comment in a weekly review of public affairs, which is edited by a group of Catholic laymen, known as "The Commonweal," is very much in point, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE SPEECH AND MOVIES

The problem of censorship is in the news again, this time by reason of a surprising decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. The Warren Court, which has made history with its numerous rulings in the direction of individual freedom from Government restraint, has now gone on record in quite the opposite direction.

In a split decision, the Court upheld by a vote of five to four the right of the city of Chicago to exercise prior censorship over movies to be exhibited within its jurisdiction. The case in question—*Times Film Corp.* v. *Chicago*—involved the right of the Chicago censors to refuse a license to exhibit a film when the would-be exhibitor declined to submit the film for the censors' examination. Actually, the film over which the case was fought was a perfectly harmless version of Mozart's "Don Giovanni," and there seems no doubt that it would have been approved if it had been submitted for inspection. The exhibitors refused to submit the film, it is clear, in order to manufacture a test case for the Supreme Court on the whole question of the constitutionality of movie censorship. Their plan succeeded to the extent of forcing the Court to rule on the issue, but the decision was obviously not what they had hoped for.

Writing for the majority, Justice Tom C. Clark said that the question before the Court was "whether the ambit of constitutional protection includes complete and absolute freedom to exhibit, at least once, any and every kind of motion picture." Since the film in the case had not been shown, no one could tell what was in it, Justice Clark continued. It might contain "the basest type of pornography, or incitement to riot, or forceful overthrow of government." "It is not for this Court," he went on, "to limit the State in its selection of the remedy it deems most effective to cope with such a problem" [the showing of obscene films] except when it could be demonstrated that there were "unreasonable strictures on individual liberty resulting from its application in particular circumstances."

Among the dissenters, Chief Justice Warren was joined by Justices Black, Douglas, and Brennan in questioning whether the logic of the majority decision could be confined to movies. "The Court in no way explains why moving pictures should be treated differently than any other form of expressions," said Chief Justice Warren, and its opinion "comes perilously close to holding that not only may motion pictures be censored but that a licensing scheme may also be applied to newspapers, books and periodicals, radio, television, public speeches and every other medium of expression."

Censorship is a very delicate and difficult business, and it is not helped by the extremists on both sides—those who think that every piece of obscenity published is a blow struck for freedom and the vigilantes who would ban first and ask questions afterward. As Justice Clark noted, every city has "the duty to protect its people against the dangers of obscenity in the public exhibition of motion pictures." But the steps taken to protect the people against the evil of obscenity must not bring about the danger of a worse evil—the loss of the precious and perishable commodity of free speech—and this is the danger which the dissenting opinion discusses. Weighing the evils and the dangers in the question of prior film censorship, we would have to aline ourselves with the dissenters.

We think Chief Justice Warren is on strong ground when he points out that the majority opinion gives no explanation for its special treatment of movies among all the various communications media. In 1952, it must be remembered, the Supreme Court ruled in the Miracle case that moving pictures were covered by the guarantees of free speech and free press in the 1st and 14th amendments.

The argument that movies are somehow specially censorable—even though prior censorship of all other media is unconstitutional—we find unconvincing. The mass audience, the vividness of the communication, the tender age of those exposed to movies—all these conditions are met, to a greater or lesser degree, by other forms of modern communication. As the minority opinion asked, Why should movies be singled out for Government censorship by a society which fears and abhors state-controlled press or radio or communications systems generally?

As for the danger of removing precensorship from movies altogether, we can only say that it is a danger to be faced. It might be, as Justice Clark charged, that without prior censorship any and every kind of film could be shown at least once. But if law-enforcement officials are prompt and conscientious in arresting and prosecuting those who exhibit obscene films, this danger is not likely to be great.

Even more important, such a procedure puts the burden of proof not on the individual, as does the system of prior licensing, but on the State, which is where this burden belongs. Any conflict between the State and a citizen is an unequal one by definition, since the State has virtually limitless resources of funds, personnel, and equipment in its police and legal agencies. Nowadays especially, one would think, our concern would not be to strengthen the already vast powers of government but to safeguard the rights of the individual citizen who for one reason or another arouses the displeasure of the governmental colossus.

It is, we think, unreasonable and unjust to put restraints on individual freedom because of what the individual might do, and particularly in the extrasensitive area of free speech and free communications. With Justice Warren and the other dissenters, we fear that the power to withhold a license from a film—or a book or anything else—without the necessity to show cause or even to give a reason, is not in the best interests of a healthy democracy. We are surprised at the inconsistency of the many avowed champions of individual rights who are hailing this latest Court decision. What they are now cheering, it seems to us, is tighter State control of the very lifeline of the democracy they cherish.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to join the many Senators urging the creation of a Special Committee on Aging. This I do not only because of the patent need for a clearinghouse and source of recommendations for the Senate's standing committees responsible for legislation that directly and indirectly might bear upon the conditions of our aging population; I do it because I am most familiar with the groundwork established by the senior Senator from my own State, PAT MCNAMARA, as chairman of the previous Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging. The people of Michigan, young and old alike, have come to know what is meant by the McNamara subcommittee, and I have been told that to a slightly lesser extent, the same is true around the entire country.

The various State conferences on aging held in 1960, and the 1961 White House Conference on Aging, have completed their work. This is well known and known, too, is the fact that such a special committee in the Senate would be the only continuing body concentrating on a full-time basis, and with a highly competent professional staff, on the magnitude and interrelationships of the problems of an increasing population of aged American citizens. The standing committees of the Senate will thus have more of its members involved in the problems of aging, and also a corps of experts at their disposal; and the country as a whole will be assured of a systematic body of recommendations affecting the dignity and well-being of its fellow citizens living in the so-called golden years.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the weekend the Secretary of Labor completed his on-the-spot survey of conditions in various industrial centers of the Nation which he visited at the direction of the President. The report which he brought back to Washington is not a pleasant one. It is one of serious unemployment, of little prospect of the alleviation of unemployment in the near future, of the beginnings of extensive human suffering resulting from that unemployment.

The Secretary of Labor only went as far as the Middle West. Had time permitted, had he gone further westward, to Butte, to Tacoma, to San Diego, he would have found more of the same. He has had the courage to use the word "recession," and I commend him for his candidness. We are in a recession and it is beginning to become nationwide.

It is easy enough to view the situation lightly from the virtually "depression-proof" city of Washington. But I am confident that this administration has no intention of fiddling while the fire goes out of the Nation's economy. I am confident that the Senate feels the same way.

Certainly some States have been hit harder by this recession than others. But let us make no mistake about it. We are—all 50 States—inseparable. None is insulated. And what one suffers today, others will suffer tomorrow unless we act promptly to root out this virus of recession. One can only say in this connection as John Donne said so well so many years ago:

Never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

The Senate's immediate responsibilities in the situation are clear. We have under consideration a bill (S. 895) on minimum wage legislation, introduced by the forthright Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. We know the content of this legislation from its consideration last year. It has a direct bearing on the recession-situation. I hope consideration will be given to the measure to bring it up to date promptly and that, then, we will act on it.

Just as immediately significant is a measure before the other House, H.R. 3646, which would extend unemployment benefits to the huge number of Americans who have exhausted them and have now to face the cruel prospect of becoming subjects of public or private relief. Here, the situation is one of urgency. I do not believe that any Member of this body will remain indifferent when there is gross human suffering or its threat abroad in the land.

This bill, as the Senate knows, must be acted upon first by the House. It would be my hope, however, that we shall complete all the necessary preliminary work in the Senate so that if and when the bill clears the House, we shall be prepared to act on it without delay.

I know that there are Members of the Senate who do not approve of either of these two emergency measures. But I also know that there is not a single Member of this body who approves of human suffering. These measures are designed in good faith to reduce human suffering in the Nation. The least we can do is to consider them in equal good faith and vote them or reject them as promptly as prudence permits. And may I add that it would be my hope that those who would reject them will be prepared to offer some alternative to meet the ugly recession which has appeared in key industrial areas and is beginning to spread its influence throughout the Nation.

CENSORSHIP IN ISRAEL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in recent weeks there have been numerous references in the press to censorship in Israel.

Last spring after I had visited in the Middle East I was taken severely to task by the Israeli Prime Minister because I referred to censorship in Israel. Correspondence on this subject was exchanged.

So that the record may speak for itself, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following documents into the RECORD at this point:

First. Letter of July 7, 1960, to Ambassador Harman from Senator FULBRIGHT.

Second. Letter of July 13, 1960, from Ambassador Harman to Senator FULBRIGHT.

Third. Enclosure to foregoing letter consisting of Prime Minister's remarks to the Knesset.

Fourth. Letter of August 9, 1960, to Ambassador Harmon from Senator FULBRIGHT.

Fifth. New York Times story of February 10, 1960.

Sixth. Washington Post story, January 17, 1961.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 9, 1960.

The Hon. AVRAHAM HARMAN,
The Ambassador of Israel,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I have been out of town during the congressional recess and, therefore, have not had opportunity to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of

July 13 enclosing a copy of the Prime Minister's remarks concerning my recent report on the Middle East. Thank you very much for your assistance.

I have studied the Prime Minister's remarks to the Knesset with great care. Needless to say his comment that "there were a number of points" in my report which "were not fully in accord with the real situation" disturbed me because I had done my utmost to be fair and judicious. I was also sorry to learn that the Prime Minister stated that he was "very sorry that a responsible public figure who heads the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate did not see his way to present the facts as they are, although we put these facts before him both in the United States and in the course of his visit here," and characterized what I said as "apt to be misleading."

So the record may be complete, I hope you will inform the Prime Minister on the following points:

1. The Prime Minister was critical of my statement that censorship exists in Israel as well as in the United Arab Republic, and stated: "In this country there is complete freedom of the press."

According to my information there are specific working arrangements for censorship of the domestic Israeli press embodied in what is known as a "Gentleman's Agreement" between the General Staff of the Israel Defense Forces and the Israel Newspaper Editors' Committee. So far as foreign dispatches are concerned, I have been informed that news and feature stories intended to be transmitted abroad must be submitted in duplicate to Government censors and that oral persuasion is utilized to get correspondents to rewrite and file stories that will not show they have been edited. I have also been informed that the Foreign Correspondents' Association recently passed a resolution condemning excessive press censorship in Israel.

2. The Prime Minister labeled as "not fully correct" my suggestion that Israel must accept the concept that her borders are not to be expanded by force. The Prime Minister stated that "Not a single responsible person in Israel has ever as much as hinted at such intentions" (i.e., that Israel would expand her borders by force).

In this connection, I would only refer to the invasion of the Sinai Peninsula, and to the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission on February 16, 1960. Those resolutions, as you will recall, contained such statements as: "The Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission condemns the Israel attack against the village of Khribet-Altawafiq; decides that the above mentioned Israeli action constitutes a flagrant violation of article 5(a); requests the Israeli authorities to destroy and abandon all positions of a military character in the demilitarized zone."

Another resolution adopted at the same time by this United Nations Commission referred to allegations of Israeli incursions into Syria by air and stated that the Commission "Decides that this action of the Israeli Air Force constitutes a flagrant violation of article III of the General Armistice Agreement; condemns Israel for this hostile act; requests the Israeli authorities to put an end immediately and definitely to such hostile acts."

3. Finally, the Prime Minister in referring to the number of Arab refugees from Palestine suggested that there are less than 500,000 such refugees and said that it is rather hard to arrive at the result that there are more than a million refugees, as the Senator maintains.

My estimate on the number of refugees was based on the "annual report of the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East; July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1959." That United Nations document indicates on page 9 that as of June 1959, there were registered a total of 1,087,628 refugees.

I know you will understand, Mr. Ambassador, that it is not my purpose to take sides on any of the grievous disputes which plague relationships among many of the states of the Middle East. I have tried to be scrupulously fair in understanding the many complex problems of the area and in suggesting courses of action which I believe may be of mutual benefit not only to the United States, but to the peoples and states of the Middle East. It has been my hope that the views and suggestions of a disinterested third party might be of interest and help to states in the immediate area of the Middle East.

Very truly yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

JULY 13, 1960.

Hon. J. M. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have now received the full text of the Prime Minister's remarks in the Parliament of Israel (Knesset) which you requested. I am forwarding you a copy herewith.

The Prime Minister's remarks were made in reply to a motion by Member of the Knesset Dr. Altman of the Herut Party for a Knesset debate on what he referred to as "the Fulbright report."

The Knesset's procedure in this matter is that a motion for the inscription of an item on the agenda can be made by any party. A reply is then made on behalf of the Government. In his reply the Government spokesman suggests one of three courses of action: the acceptance of the item on the Knesset agenda; the rejection of the item; or reference of the item to the relevant committee of the house. Speeches on these proposals are limited to one speech for and one speech against.

In the present case the Prime Minister replied to the motion on behalf of the Government. At his request, Dr. Altman's motion for a debate was rejected by the house.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

AVRAHAM HARMAN.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, Member of the Knesset, the contents of some of the things which have been said today in connection with this motion on the agenda surprise me. A number of things which the mover said are in contradiction to the platform which his party put forward before the elections. However, I have no intention to be drawn into this particular discussion. I merely wish to make some remarks with regard to that part of the mover's speech which dealt with what the American Senator recently said.

I would not say that there are many Americas; or more than one America; this leader's America or that leader's America. There is only one America. In this America there are people of different views, just as in Israel. There are not a number of Israels. There is one Israel, but within Israel there are many points of view. One of these has just been expressed by Member of the Knesset Dr. Altman—it is one of a not very substantial minority—and there are others. For this country is a democracy and different views exist, and that goes for the United States of America too.

I must tell the mover that, when speaking of an opponent in a friendly country, there is no need to speak in the style the mover used. Such ways of speaking do not befit our Knesset.

I had myself occasion to meet with Senator FULBRIGHT a number of times, twice in the United States and once here. We differed on a number of topics, not only on topics connected with Israel but also on general ones. I wish now to make some remarks with regard to what Senator FULBRIGHT recently said in the U.S. Senate about the situation in the Middle East. There were a number of points which were not fully in accordance with the real situation; I assume that this was a result of incomplete knowledge.

Senator FULBRIGHT spoke of censorship which exists in Israel and a censorship which exists in Egypt. This comparison is groundless. Egypt is ruled by a regime of military dictatorship and the entire press is subjected to the dictator. In this country there is complete freedom of the press. There was no basis for such talk by a responsible person who heads the Foreign Relations Committee of such an august institution as the U.S. Senate.

The second point which is not fully correct is the Senator's double and, as it were, balanced demand addressed to Israel and to the Arab rulers. Senator FULBRIGHT does say that the Arab rulers intend to destroy Israel and keep attacking and arraigning her in public, and he asks them to stop doing so. But at the same time he demands that Israel shall obligate herself to refrain from expanding her borders by force. Not a single responsible person in Israel has ever as much as hinted at such intentions. The juxtaposition of Nasser's declarations regarding the destruction of Israel with alleged Israeli declarations regarding the forcible expansion of her borders is bound to be misleading.

Senator FULBRIGHT apparently did this in order to balance up both sides but there is no justification for such a balance. And it is rather strange that Senator FULBRIGHT, whilst admitting that the Egyptian ruler keeps declaring his intention to destroy Israel, at the same time expresses regret that the United States does not provide Egypt with military aid. It would have been more logical if the Senator had expressed his regret that the U.S.S.R. gives military aid to this ruler who makes declarations of this kind.

Finally, a few words with regard to what the Senator had to say about the Arab refugees. He stated that there were over a million refugees. It is, however, well known—and anybody can verify this by examining the population statistics of the country before 1948—that there were somewhat less than 500,000 Arabs in the area which is now Israel. In 1948 after Israel was established there were in Israel about 120,000 Arabs. We later admitted about 30,000 refugees on the basis of the reunification of families. If you deduct from the 500,000 (in fact there were less than 500,000 in our area before 1948) 120,000 which were then in Israel and again 30,000 which we admitted later, it is rather hard to arrive at the result that there are more than a million refugees, as the Senator maintains.

On one important point the Senator did not lay sufficient emphasis though he mentions it by the way, namely, that the Arab rulers exploit the refugees as a political weapon in their endeavors to destroy Israel. This is perhaps the greatest crime that the Arab rulers are committing, this cruel exploitation of the refugees for whose being refugees they are themselves responsible and to blame. For the Arab rulers called upon these people to leave the country until such time as they would have invaded Israel and destroyed her. They could easily have prevented the suffering of the refugees just as we prevented the sufferings of hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from Arab countries by making tremendous efforts, efforts beyond our possibilities, to take them in and to settle them. The Arab rulers could much more easily have settled the Arab refugees where they are. But these refugees are weapons in their hands in their fight against Israel.

I am very sorry that a responsible public figure who heads the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee of the U.S. Senate did not see his way to present the facts as they are, although we put these facts before him both in the United States and in the course of his visit here. What he said is apt to be misleading. It is a pity that a serious, responsible, and prudent person as Senator FULBRIGHT is, should have done so.

As for member of Knesset Altman's motion, I did not understand what it was and what he proposed.

A MEMBER. The proposal is to debate the Fulbright report.

The PRIME MINISTER. If so, I propose not to debate the Fulbright report. The Senator is not responsible to us. I propose that the Knesset take no further action beyond hearing what I had to say about Senator FULBRIGHT's speech in the Senate.

JULY 7, 1960.

Hon. AVRAHAM HARMAN,
The Ambassador of Israel,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: According to a United Press International press report from Jerusalem dated July 6, 1960, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion was quoted as having said that I recently made "misleading" statements regarding the Palestine refugee problem and censorship in Israel.

It certainly has never been my intention to make any statement that might be misleading or "not in accordance with the truth" as the press dispatch stated.

I assume there must have been some error in the report. I should like very much to have a copy of the Prime Minister's remarks.

Very truly yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1961]

HISTADRUT VOTES TO ACCEPT LAVON RESIGNATION—ISRAELI LABOR GROUP OUSTS ITS SECRETARY GENERAL

(By Lawrence Fellows)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, February 9.—Pinhas Lavon resigned today as secretary general of Histadrut, the general labor federation of Israel.

The resignation was accepted at a boisterous meeting of Histadrut's 107-member executive committee. The 58 members of the Mapai, who with Mr. Lavon represent the party in the committee, voted for acceptance.

By removing Mr. Lavon from the Histadrut post, the party appeared to have resolved the struggle that had torn it for months. Its action met a condition set by David Ben-Gurion for his return to leadership of the party and of the Government. He resigned recently as Premier.

Forty-six members of the executive committee, representing all other parties but one, voted against accepting the resignation. Mr. Lavon appealed to them repeatedly in the meeting to argue their cases with dignity and restraint.

It appeared from today's action that Mr. Lavon had decided that, despite popular demonstration and support shown inside the party, there was no point in continuing his struggle at this stage.

BEN-GURION MAY GET CALL

If the matter has died, there is a good chance Mr. Ben-Gurion will be asked next week by President Itzhak Ben-Zvi to form a new Government. It is still possible that the larger council of Histadrut will reject Mr. Lavon's resignation.

Part of the interest of other parties in the affair is linked to Mr. Ben-Gurion's continuing fight to break the power of Histadrut which is concerned with health insurance, construction and many other activities. Although this struggle is not regarded as the core of the affair, Mr. Lavon said today:

"Responsibility for the affairs of state does not necessitate the removal of Histadrut from the centers of power and administration."

Mr. Lavon did not vote on his resignation and there were two other abstentions by members representing Oved Dati, the religious workers' party, which is close to the Mapai.

Yehoshua Voschcina, of Achdut Avodah, called the vote an immoral and unjust submission to dictatorship. "We cannot accept," he said, "that the secretary general should only be one who is acceptable to the Premier."

MANY IN MAPAI SHUN VOTE

An undetermined number of Mapai representatives did not participate in the vote to remove Mr. Lavon. Some left the meeting and were replaced by alternates. Some had apparently arranged before the meeting that their names would not be called out in the rollcall vote.

Mr. Lavon said that, in view of the support already shown him within the Mapai Party, he had won a moral victory in his long struggle with Mr. Ben-Gurion. He dwelt on the nature of the quarrel, which stems from 1954, when an Israeli security adventure went amiss and some of those involved eventually paid with their lives. Mr. Lavon was Minister of Defense at the time.

[Under Israel's censorship of foreign dispatches, the circumstances of the incident have not been disclosed officially. However, it is believed to have involved an Israeli spy ring that was broken up by the Egyptians.]

CLEARED BY CABINET

In December, seven Cabinet ministers by a unanimous decision found Mr. Lavon clear of all responsibility for the adventure. The Attorney General, Gideon Hausner, had in the meantime found conclusive evidence of forgeries as well as false testimony on an earlier inquiry.

BEN-GURION PARTY SUPPORTS ACTION UNANIMOUSLY

The Cabinet approved the Ministers' findings by a majority vote, but the Premier refused to accept them. He left for a vacation and let it be known that he was thinking about resigning. Instead of resigning he fought the ministerial committee and the Cabinet over the exoneration of Mr. Lavon.

In a letter to Justice Minister Pinhas Rosen, chairman of the committee, the Premier said:

"I cannot say that Lavon gave the order, for I did not hear it. But I read his statements to the Foreign Affairs and Security Committee in October and I found in them not only arrogance and insolence but falsehoods and slanders about the defense establishment in and before his time."

Then Mr. Ben-Gurion laid down an ultimatum to the party to remove Mr. Lavon from the Histadrut post, saying that he could no longer work with him. While the party struggled with the problem in January, the Premier resigned and the government fell.

Then the Mapai Central Committee adopted a resolution asserting that Mr. Lavon should be removed from Histadrut. The vote was 159 to 96.

While the committee met, crowds demonstrated outside for Mr. Lavon, but the police, swinging batons, dispersed them and arrested nine persons.

[From the Washington Post]

WEAKNESSES BARED IN ISRAEL BY FIGHT OVER LAVON AFFAIR

(By George Weller)

NICOSIA, CYPRUS, January 16.—The battle between Israel's elder and younger Moses, Premier David Ben-Gurion and labor boss Pinhas Lavon has revealed unexpected weaknesses in Israel's military and political posture.

The main pro-Western party, the Mapai, and the army are riven from top to bottom by the open name calling between the electric, unpredictable Ben-Gurion and the outwardly calm but implacable organization genius, Pinhas Lavon, Israel's Walter Reuther, who heads the labor colossus, a sort of subgovernment.

Muffled by Israeli censorship, which will allow the duel to be called only the affair, the struggle of giants has revealed a deep general cleavage on how 2 million Israelis should deal with the surrounding sea of 35 million largely hostile Arabs.

Ben-Gurion, with his hit-'em-first tactics exemplified in border raids against Egypt and Jordan and finally the Suez war, is being weighed against the more cautious Lavon, who wants his job.

Former War Minister Lavon believes with former Premier Moshe Sharett in preserving Israel's underdog status in the public eye by rarely topping Arab blows and by diligent diplomatic courtship.

The contradictory policies overlapped in 1954 and 1955, when Lavon was operating Israel's first big Egyptian intelligence ring against Gamal Abdel Nasser—it has had several since—and when Ben-Gurion's young officers impetuously launched a raid on Egypt's refugee city, Gaza.

Lavon, then Minister of Defense under Sharett, discovered that these "blunders"—still not allowed to be specified by Israel's censorship—were actually rigged by Ben-Gurion during visits to the Ministry of Defense in Tel Aviv while Lavon and Sharett were at Cabinet meetings in Jerusalem.

Two names most heard as so-called conspirators for Ben-Gurion are Lavon's former chief of staff, Gen. Moshe Dayan, and Shimon Peres, both members of Ben-Gurion's Cabinet today.

Ben-Gurion's wolves are against Lavon's foxes, with a former American, Foreign Minister Golda Meir, running with the foxes against her own superior, the Prime Minister.

The Gaza raid is now considered an error even though at the time it was justified as a reprisal raid against Nasser's camp of Palestinian terrorists engaged in sabotage and infiltration against Israel.

Israel's agonizing reappraisal of Gaza has taken place because humiliated young Egyptian officers presented Nasser with an ultimatum to get them arms or be replaced.

When Nasser failed to meet American terms for weapons, he turned to the Soviet Union.

Lavon was found guilty of responsibility 6 years ago. But he never possessed the means of vindication until this year, when on a trip to Europe he discovered four officers, including one army secretary in the Paris Embassy, willing to testify that his hearing was rigged by Ben-Gurion's firebrand officers.

Lavon won his exoneration from the Cabinet, which turned its back on its own Premier and plunged Ben-Gurion into humiliation.

The nettled Ben-Gurion issued a 5,000-word statement last Thursday calling Lavon "arrogant, insolent, and also a liar and slanderer."

THE MENACE OF THE WORLD OIL CARTEL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have risen many times in the Senate to speak on the need for a national fuels policy. On each occasion I have stated that the formulation of such a policy becomes more imperative with each passing year—imperative to

our economic well-being at home, and imperative to our defense capabilities in the event of war.

My concern over this Nation's lack of a fuels policy is poignantly echoed by Mr. Bushrod Howard, Jr., in the February 1, 1961, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal. In the first of two articles in the journal, Mr. Howard tells with facts and figures how the world oil cartel has been cheating on tanker freight rates, taking tax advantages, and resorting to other sleight-of-hand tricks not only to destroy our domestic fuels industry but to also jeopardize our foreign relations with oil-importing countries.

Because I feel that Mr. Howard's first article deserves universal attention and study, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS IN DEPTH: THE MENACE OF THE WORLD OIL CARTEL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—How the greed of the international oil cartel—including five U.S. companies—is aiding and abetting the Communists in the cold war against the United States and the rest of the free world and how the profiteering big oil companies are threatening the destruction of America's domestic fuels' industries is spelled out in this article. This is the first of two articles analyzing in depth the sinister international activities of the merchants of oil. The author is Bushrod Howard, a consultant on the Middle East and the international petroleum trade. His background qualifies him as an expert in these fields. He has been an attorney on the staff of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee. He also has served as a Government relations adviser to Socony Mobil Oil Co., with extensive experience in the Middle East. Howard also was Middle East legal adviser for the Iraq Petroleum Co.)

(By Bushrod Howard, Jr.)

The United States faces not only inevitable economic disaster at home but also certain defeat in the cold war as the direct result of the absence of any fuels policies—both national and international. For the past 5 years, I have watched the Government of the United States support, mainly by inaction, the international profiteering interests of "big oil" at the expense of the interests of the United States.

The United States, with virtually unlimited natural resources for its expanding population and with its ever-increasing need for energy per person, is undergoing an explosive increase in fuel demands. Yet, rather than developing its own resources, the United States relies increasingly and unnecessarily on foreign oil imports, notably residual oil which has been dumped on the U.S. market.

This reliance is not simply a question of the possible destruction of our domestic fuels industry, but also of dependence on a pattern of economic and political situations abroad that are certain not to continue.

In 1960, the United States imported 669 million barrels of oil with a landed value of $2.5 billion. This represented 25 percent of our domestic production. By 1968, with no change in present policies or prices, we will import twice this amount.

These massive imports into the United States are economically possible only because of the foreign profits of the big five American international oil companies in five major oil exporting countries. For it is only due to these immense profits that are returned, if untaxed, to the United States, that we do not have to pay in goods, services or gold for our oil. It is these profits alone that stop our oil imports from adding to our deficit in our balance of payments. Without the oil companies' foreign-produced profits, we would be in the same position as Italy, India or Japan, where oil imports are the major drain on foreign exchange.

The American oil import program accepts as a permanent international "fact of life" that the oil-producing States and the oil-importing States are going to agree forever to the present contractual rights of the oil cartel. These contracts permit the oil companies to obtain a dollar a barrel net profit on the oil they produce. This means a total of more than $200 billion after-tax profits based on the reserves they currently control.

The pricing policies in world oil trade place all the profit in the foreign producing countries. This means that the profits of the oil cartel depend on the continued ability of "big oil" to enforce their contracts with four Arab countries and Venezuela.

If the United States were unable to stop Castro from seizing the sugar companies—and they were far more established and accepted in Cuba than the oil cartel is in the Middle East and Venezuela—is it likely that the present pattern of control and price can be maintained by "big oil"? No objective observer, and I include my former industry colleagues, believes this to be so.

The reasons are clear and compelling:

Neither the consumer countries, such as the United States, nor the oil-exporting countries, such as Venezuela, accept what they consider as the exorbitant profits of the oil cartel as either justifiable or equitable.

The oil-exporting countries who gave "big oil" their concessions before the countries were independent and when they had no understanding of the facts, are now not only independent but more than aware of their sovereign right to control the price and to regulate the production of their basic natural resource: oil.

The power of the oil cartel is limited since the oilfields have been discovered and developed; and since the transportation facilities and refineries have been built and the markets established.

The nationals of both the consuming and the producing countries can rely in any fight with "big oil" on the technical, financial, and political support of the Russians.

This means that in any fundamental crisis, the oil cartel will lose unless it can involve the United States in a military adventure which is unthinkable, for apart from moral grounds, it would involve a military conflict with Russia.

The U.S. Senate report on the Suez crisis of 1956 made the following conclusions: "The United States has assumed responsibilities to its allies in Western Europe and in the Middle East as evidenced by NATO and the Middle East resolution. The Suez crisis calls for positive Government action to insure equity toward both the producing and consuming countries. The abdication of the obligation to meet these responsibilities to private corporations is inconsistent with the duty of the Executive under the Constitution to formulate and administer the foreign policy of the United States."

In the intervening 4 years, the major international oil companies have maintained high prices in the international oil trade despite an oversupply of low-cost foreign oil and an oversupply of tanker tonnage.

The consumer countries have suffered. But, because the international oil trade is monopolized and controlled by the seven major integrated international oil companies, five of them U.S. companies (Standard Oil of New Jersey, Texaco, Socony Mobil, Gulf, Standard Oil of California, Royal Dutch Shell, and British Petroleum), they have had no recourse but to continue to pay the excessive prices charged by the international oil cartel.

A consumer revolt has been long overdue. France, which has always (despite her 23¾-percent interest in the Iraq Petroleum Co. group) felt she was exploited by the oil cartel, made the first move.

In 1959, when it was clear that Algeria would have substantial quantities of oil to export, France demanded that refineries, including those owned by the American international companies, buy and refine all the oil available from Algeria before importing oil from any other area.

The next step, logically, would be to demand that all refineries within consuming countries import the cheapest crude oil available. This, due to the monopoly control of the international oil trade, was impossible. Oil prices, despite tremendous profits on production and tanker transportation, were maintained. Persian Gulf oil which cost from 7 to 24 cents to produce was sold at $1.90. A basing point system was maintained on U.S. Maritime Commission tanker rates although actual rates were 50 to 75 percent below USMC rates.

The United States, during the Eisenhower administration, continued to maintain that international oil was a matter for free enterprise despite the fact that the consequences of the excessive prices for oil was crippling the economy of the underdeveloped countries.

The Soviet Union does have an international oil policy as well as a vigorous national fuels policy. As a result of the bloated and excessive prices of the oil cartel, the Soviet Union has been able to use oil as a major economic and political weapon. Although Russia has a very small tanker fleet, they have been able to obtain the tanker tonnage they require at cut rates by chartering Western tankers.

The consequences of the Communist oil offenses are far reaching. Once Russia has established itself as the supplier of long-term contracts for the oil requirements of underdeveloped countries it will be most difficult to reverse the trend.

Had the oil cartel charged reasonable prices to the consumer countries, there would have been no demand for Soviet oil. Great damage has been done to the prestige and reputation of the United States in India, for example. In August of last year, the international oil companies led by Standard Vacuum finally offered to cut the price of oil to India, because and only because the Russians had offered India oil at prices substantially below those charged by the international oil companies.

Just as at the time of Suez, the Soviet Union received the credit for the withdrawal of Britain and France, so again today credit is given, and this case rightly, to the Soviet Union for India's victory over the oil cartel.

It is clear that our foreign aid program and our foreign policy will be useless and unsuccessful so long as the United States permits the ruthless exploitation of the consumer countries of the free world by a monopoly whose only interest is to grab all the immediate profits possible, regardless of the consequences.

The Soviet Union now uses oil exports as a major and effective weapon to penetrate the underdeveloped countries. At a time when there is a great surplus of oil and tankers in the free world, Russian oil is being offered to and accepted by not only Cuba, but also many other countries such as Brazil, India, Japan, Italy, West Germany, France, and Scandinavia. The reason is simple: Russian oil is cheaper.

Ironically, the Russian oil offensive is only possible because of the availability of free world tankers, in some cases tankers financed directly or indirectly by the American taxpayers.

The success of the Soviet oil offensive constitutes a major victory for the Communists in the cold war.

The plain facts are:

Despite an abundance of low cost oil and low tanker rates, the seven international companies have maintained excessive prices that have retarded, if not crippled, the economic progress and fiscal stability of many of the underdeveloped countries.

The Soviet oil offensive is credited by the underdeveloped countries as the only weapon that enables them to free themselves from submission to the ruthless power over price hitherto exerted by the international oil cartel.

The Soviet oil offensive has succeeded in obtaining, or is about to sign, long-term contracts to supply oil to Cuba, India, Brazil, Japan, Ceylon, Italy, West Germany, Morocco, the United Arab Republic, various newly independent African countries, and the Scandinavian countries.

The Soviet Union, which has only an insignificant tanker fleet of its own, has been able to obtain a very substantial fleet of the free world's tankers at cut rates.

The Soviet Union has developed substantial reserves which permit it to export increasing amounts of oil.

Soviet oil exports outside the Iron Curtain have increased from 1¾ million tons in 1953 to a present rate of more than 20 million tons a year. Under present commitments, it is estimated that this figure will increase to at least 30 million tons by 1962. Some estimates predict an actual export figure in 1962, if the present trend continues, of 40 million tons or 800,000 barrels per day.

While these figures may not seem large when contrasted with production and consumption figures of the free world—the Middle East produces over 2½ billion barrels a year—they demonstrate a major political and economic capacity to influence and penetrate the underdeveloped countries.

Take the case of Cuba. Castro's economy would collapse in a month without Russian oil. Yet the Communists could not transport oil to Cuba without using free world tankers. How did the Russians get, since July of 1960, 500,000 tons of tankers to carry oil to Cuba? The answer: Inaction and disinterest by the Eisenhower State Department and the tacit aid of British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell, who actually seek to have Russia join the oil cartel.

If it is so clear that the oil cartel will lose its producing profits and that if it maintains its producing profits it will lose our allies, one might well ask why Big Oil and the Eisenhower administration remained apparently unperturbed and continued to act as though there could never be a change in the pattern of price or control of foreign oil, or indeed there ever should be a change. The answer is as simple as it is shocking. The oil cartel is interested in profits and profits only. Their aim is to postpone the evil day when the profits will cease. Those in the State Department, the CIA, and other Government agencies responsible for the international oil were either oilmen (such as Herbert Hoover, Jr.), prospective employees of oil companies (such as Kermit Roosevelt of the CIA, now vice president in charge of Government relations of Gulf Oil Corp.), or men responsive to the oil lobby such as the Fuels Division of the State Department.

The result has been that international oil is off limits to the Government, or at least was off limits to the Government during the Eisenhower administration.

The Eisenhower administration—despite the clear warnings and the many crises of the past 4 years—continued to maintain that the international oil trade was of no concern to the Government but a matter for private enterprise. By this they meant the very private enterprise of the Big Five American international companies and their two European partners.

Such an abdication of responsibility for a major area of foreign policy and for a crucial sector of the domestic economy by Government to private companies has but one precedent in history: the grant of the subcontinent of India and its inhabitants to be exploited and ruled for the private profit of the honorable East India Co. This novel arrangement came to an end with the bloody Indian mutiny in 1857.

The oil cartel faces a mutiny of far greater proportions by the producer and consumer countries that it exploits. The damage to our present foreign policy and to our domestic fuels industry increases catastrophically by passage of time alone. A very real question is whether the new administration of President John F. Kennedy will recognize and be able to penetrate the oil curtain in the executive, particularly in the State Department in time to form a viable international and national fuels policy.

It is not pleasant to report that Khrushchev and the Russians are making great headway in convincing the world that, as Mr. K said in his speech in the U.N., speaking of oil: "The game from exploitation of colonies go not to the peoples but mainly to monopolies * * * monopolies are robbing the people twice—in the East when they buy and in the West when they sell * * *." This statement is, of course, not more than half truth, but it is very sweet to the ears of consumer countries and their representatives who have been told by the State Department that "your problems with the oil companies are matters in which the Government of the United States should not and will not interfere."

So much nonsense, so many half-truths, and plain lies have been propagated by the oil lobby and repeated as scientific fact by their stooges in and out of government that it is necessary to list the essential facts to find where we are today before we can suggest a course and a direction in which we should move.

The international oil business is quite simple. There are three essential facts that are important to keep in mind: its quantity and value, the concentration of oil production geographically, and the concentration of the corporations that exploit this business.

Oil is the most important raw material, both in quantity and in value, in world trade. This is seen by the fact that more than 40 percent of the world's oceangoing tonnage is made up of oil tankers. In 1960 more than 3.5 million barrels of oil and oil products were exported and reexported. The total landed value of this oil was about $15 billion. These figures will double by 1968.

The second characteristic of the international oil trade is the concentration geographically of oil available for export. Of course, there are great quantities of oil in the United States but this is all used within the United States. There are only five major exporting countries: four in the Persian Gulf area of the Middle East, and Venezuela. If the largely self-sufficient oil-consuming Western Hemisphere is excluded, the dominant force in the crude oil trade is the import trade of West Europe. This area's use of oil constitutes more than half the total crude imports of the world. These are now almost wholly from the Middle East, which, in turn, is by far the largest exporting area of the world. In short, world trade is made up essentially of intrahemisphere trade (rather than as in pre-1948 days when 80 percent of Europe's imports were supplied by the Western Hemisphere). The United States is, however, beginning to import significant amounts of Middle East oil, particularly on the west coast.

REFINERIES CAN BE ANYWHERE

World trade in refined products is considerably smaller than in crude oil. This reflects the fact that while crude oil is, of course, tied to the actual oilfields, refineries can be put almost anywhere. Much the largest flow of refined products is from refineries in Venezuela and the Dutch West Indies, largely to the United States, and much of this is residual oil that is sold at dump prices on the U.S. east coast. The reason for this is the original refineries were built for Europe and when after the war Europeans built their own refineries, the oil cartel had to find another use for the products of their own West Indian and Venezuelan refineries. Of political significance in the products trade is the fact that most of the smaller underdeveloped countries have no refineries at all, especially Africa. This opens the way to easy penetration by the Russians as either suppliers of oil products or builders of "uneconomic and prestige" refineries.

The third characteristic of the international oil trade is its concentration outside of the United States in the hands of seven integrated international oil companies. These companies presently control—except for spot-price cutting by the Russians and a few small independent oil companies—substantially all the oil moving in international trade. Eighty-five percent of refining and 90 percent of production outside of the United States and the Communist bloc is in their hands. Today, and certainly a year ago, if you wanted to exploit your oil you had to go to the cartel and accept its terms. If you wanted to buy oil, you had to buy it from the cartel at its price. So, it is clear that if the trade links between hemispheres are weak, the corporate links are very strong and solid. The Big Seven companies—five of which are American, two of which are European—are in all markets and producing areas either directly or through joint ventures. This, of course, does not mean that the U.S. oil industry is not highly concentrated, but only that while some 20 to 30 companies dominate the U.S. oil industry, only 5 of these American companies have any significant foreign interest.

Of the five major oil exporting countries, the four in the Persian Gulf area of the Middle East—Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, and Iran—export about 70 percent of oil in world trade. Venezuela, the remaining major exporter, supplies about 20 percent. The remaining 10 percent is exported by the Soviet Union, Qatar, and Bahrein in the Persian Gulf, Colombia and Trinidad in South America, and Indonesia and Borneo in Asia. A few countries such as Bolivia, Peru, Mexico, Austria, are self-sufficient.

There is no chance—at least over the next 20 years—that the major exporting countries' share of the world oil trade will be reduced below 80 percent. The reason is that proved oil reserves (oil that has been discovered but not produced) are even more concentrated. Outside of the United States (12 percent) and the Soviet bloc (5 percent), 80 percent of the total world proven oil reserves are in the Persian Gulf area (70 percent) and a further 10 percent in Venezuela.

This ratio of oil reserves will not change substantially, for the Persian Gulf area of the Middle East is geologically unique. There, immensely thick accumulations of oil at shallow depths are found in pools that measure up to 150 miles in length and 30 miles in width and that contain as much as 15 to 60 billion barrels of oil.

In the 20,000-square-mile Sheikdom of Kuwait (population 200,000), 150 shallow wells have discovered more than 60 billion barrels. In the United States, with 100 years of intensive exploration and the drilling of 1,750,000 wells, only 90 billion barrels have been discovered in the United States, of which two-thirds has been consumed.

These geologic facts have some economic consequences. The Middle East wells are immensely productive, averaging 5,000 barrels a day compared to 200 in Venezuela and 15 in the United States. The result of a low-discovery cost and high productivity is that production costs are very low. Loaded on a tanker the total cost of Persian Gulf oil before taxes and royalties is from 7 cents to a high of 24 cents in Saudi Arabia. In the United States the average price of oil at the well is $2.92 and the Bureau of Mines estimates that the 1960 discovery cost of a barrel of oil in the United States was $3.38, as compared to one-half a cent in the Middle East.

Of course, oil is and will be discovered elsewhere, but it is going to be discovered in comparable quantities or at comparable costs to replace or compete economically with Middle East oil. It is necessary to be very suspicious of the talk of great new discoveries that will replace the need for Middle East oil. Such statements are often made for a definite political purpose. The post-Suez propaganda about the oil of Algeria and Libya is typical. The most optimistic forecasts indicate that 20 percent of Western Europe's oil could be supplied from these sources when they reach their peak in 1968. Thereafter the percentage would fall. However, even to achieve this goal, unnatural pricing would be required as the discovery cost of Algerian oil is more than 100 times that of Middle East oil—54 cents a barrel as compared to one-half cent a barrel.

The reason for touting Algerian and Libyan oil is clear. France, particularly after Suez, wanted U.S. support for their stand against Algerian independence. Their argument was that the West could no longer rely on the Middle East and its oil, and, therefore, the United States should not stand with the Arabs but with France on Algeria, which if it was saved for the West could supply Europe's oil. When this argument was no longer needed, because De Gaulle now wants to grant Algeria independence, we find official and unofficial estimates of Algerian oil reduced dramatically. The big oil companies welcomed the French argument and extended it to Libya. Their purpose was to try and scare the Middle East governments so that they would modify their demands to increase their share of the revenues and their say in management. But public relations and wishful thinking do not change geologic and economic facts. The great bulk of the world's oil is in the Middle East, and this oil is by far the cheapest to produce. Countries in the Eastern Hemisphere that must import oil must draw their oil from the Middle East. It is, of course, true that the Middle East countries must sell their oil, but this does not mean that the oil cartel is either desired by or necessary to the consuming countries.

The history of the postwar period is less a story of a struggle between the United States and its Atlantic pact allies with the Russians and its Communist bloc than it is the story of a worldwide revolution of rising expectations. The hopes raised by the wartime slogans of the Atlantic Charter which promised not only freedom politically but freedom from want found a response throughout the world. The remotest and most backward colonial areas as well as Western Europe came to believe and demand decent and constantly improving standards of life as well as political freedom. One result, and the one of interest here, has been industrialization on a rapid scale, not only in the United States and Europe, but also in the underdeveloped countries. Combined with the constant increase in population, this has meant an explosive increase in energy demand. The formula is basic: more people—and more energy used per person—mean constantly increasing energy needs.

NUCLEAR POWER IS FOR THE FUTURE

Few countries can hope to be self-sufficient in meeting their energy requirements. This means that they must import increasing amounts of some source of primary energy. There are four principal sources—liquid petroleum, natural gas, coal, and waterpower. A potential fifth source, nuclear power, is presently only theoretical as the basic problems of cost, plant and above all disposal of radioactive wastes have not been solved. The most optimistic predictions see about 1 percent of U.S. requirements being met from this source in 10 years. A recent Chase Manhattan Bank study stated, "Until measurable volume (of nuclear power) of significance actually comes into existence, and trends can be determined with greater probability, we have elected to exclude atomic power from our calculations." There is no question that nuclear power, or some other new source, will, in time, be a significant factor as a primary source of energy; however, such time is too distant to be of interest to energy consumers of the 1960's or 1970's.

Let us examine the case of India, the most populous nation of the free world. India is an outstanding example of the absolute dependence of an oil importing country on the international oil cartel.

India depends on oil to power its transportation, agriculture, industry, and home fuel requirements. The alternative to oil is economic stagnation. Neither coal nor nuclear energy can presently be adapted to power road transportation or agricultural machinery, the two pressing needs for India's economic development.

While India—with Soviet and Rumanian technical help—has found oil within its boundaries, rapidly increasing demand requires increasing oil imports.

Three companies, representing five of the big seven, import, market and refine oil in India: Standard Vacuum (Standard Oil of New Jersey and Socony Mobil); Caltex (Standard Oil of California and Texaco); and Burmah Shell (Royal Dutch Shell).

Most of India's oil imports are from the Persian Gulf. The companies first make a profit of over $1.50 ($0.75 after taxes) on the production of this oil in the Persian Gulf. Next they are making a 100-percent tax-free profit on tanker transportation to India by paying current low rates and charging a landed price in India based on rates at par (the so-called U.S. Maritime Commission rates). Finally, in India they make a profit on both refining and marketing the imported oil.

India must pay not only the international oil companies these excessive prices but also pay the landed price in hard currencies. Thus, we have the anomaly of the American taxpayer contributing through our foreign aid program to help India's development while the international oil cartel, by its excessive price policies, retards India's development by levying an unreasonable and exorbitant price for the oil they sell to India.

INDIA'S OIL SHOULD COST LESS

If there had been competition in the international oil trade, India's oil bill would have been cut in half. India, however, was impotent in the face of the international oil cartel which, by default of any interest, let alone action, by the United States has been free to exploit its monopoly as ruthlessly and selfishly as the days of the old Standard Oil Trust.

Royal Dutch Shell which operates in India as Burmah Shell obtains its oil from this market from Gulf Oil Corp., at Kuwait in the Persian Gulf.

Shell and Gulf split the producing and transportation profit on this oil. Therefore, on crude oil at Kuwait, which costs less than $0.08 cents a barrel to produce and is sold at $1.68 f.o.b. Kuwait, Shell obtains a windfall profit of 40 cents. A further windfall of 20 cents a barrel is obtained by the fact that Shell pays for tanker transportation at the current low rates while the landed price includes a transportation charge of $2.75 a ton, the so-called USMC rate. To say India is dissatisfied with the oil cartel is not an overstatement and India is typical of consumer countries.

The next and final mystery that must be dispelled about the international oil trade is the method of pricing oil in the international oil trade by the cartel.

There are two markets for oil. The first is that which is completely controlled by the cartel and the second is that in which the cartel has to compete with other independent oil sellers including the Russians, and with alternate fuels.

The so-called world price with its talk of posted prices and discounts does not in fact exist. It is a mere theory of the cartel that they were able to persuade the producing countries to adopt. The cartel theory of oil prices is based in a way, that changes with time, on the price of oil in the U.S. gulf coast. Originally the U.S. gulf coast supplied all the markets of the world, at least marginally. Further, it was then the only market where crude oil was sold and bought in sufficient lots by a sufficient number of people to be able to call it a market. Foreign producers were few and generally did not sell any crude oil to third parties but used it in their own integrated markets. Then the crude oil was never sold as crude oil but sold only to consumers as finished products. Also, there was no compelling reason that the price of crude oil in a foreign field should be known. The foreign governments had universally exempted the companies from all taxes and all other payments except for a flat royalty per ton of oil exported. Therefore, whatever the price of oil, the government would always receive the same amount of money from the company per ton.

Nevertheless, there were reasons, even if only internal auditing ones, for a price to be established. A method of pricing foreign oil called the net-back price was adopted. The price of oil at any given market was calculated by adding the actual current tanker rate to the U.S. gulf price. The price of oil at any given exporting country was calculated by deducting the actual freight rate from the landed price of U.S. gulf oil plus the actual tanker rate from the U.S. gulf giving a so-called net back at the producing country. This meant, of course, that the f.o.b. price of foreign oil varied not only on the current tanker rate but also on its destination.

When the so-called 50–50 deals were made between the companies and the producing governments, these arrangements purported to split the producing profits between the countries and the governments. It was then, therefore, necessary to establish a price for oil in each producing country, and a price for oil that did not vary on its destination. With the net-back theory in mind it was decided to equalize the Venezuelan and U.S. gulf oil prices at New York and the Venezuelan and Middle East oil prices at a halfway point, which was Naples in the Mediterranean. Thus, despite the fact that the United States was no longer an exporter of oil, U.S. oil prices were still the theoretical basis of all posted prices. A major error in logic was made at that time. The formula and the posted prices were based on the then high current tanker rates and no provision was made to change posted prices when tanker rates changed. Tanker rates have, since Suez, dropped far below the theoretical rate of USMC flat. The result has been a phantom freight element that has been charged consumers but never credited to the posted price and thereby to the producer countries in their share of the profits. And this phantom freight has been pocketed by

the oil companies or used by them to dump oil in markets such as the United States.

TAX POLICIES UNFAIR TO COAL

The 50–50 deals, of course, really meant that the U.S. companies were permitted to pay their U.S. taxes to the producing governments. While it was physically logical and correct for the producing governments to get a larger income out of their own oil resources, the acquiescence of the U.S. Government in giving up their share of the taxes not only affected U.S. Government revenues but was the major step in making for unfair competition of international nontaxpaying oil with domestic U.S. fuel industries, such as coal.

The result of the present price structure has been not only to dissatisfy the foreign producing governments but also to create uneconomic conditions for the other segments of the oil industry and other fuel industries. The actual policy of the international oil companies has been to use their huge foreign producing profits to run other elements of their integrated business at a loss in order to drive out competition such as the coal industry in the United States or the independent refiners abroad or the independent U.S. tankers and the independent U.S. refiners. Two examples suffice. One was reported in Petroleum Week when Standard Oil, New Jersey's subsidiary in Venezuela, sold over two-thirds of the oil it produced at heavy discounts off posted prices. This is, in fact, the oil that is the source of much of the residual oil that is imported into the United States at dump prices. The reason Standard Oil of New Jersey sold their oil at discounts was to inject this oil into coal's natural market in the eastern United States.

Another example was found in the admission that certain segments of the integrated operations are run at a loss to obtain competitive advantages. Recently the representative of Socony Mobil Oil Co. stated at an official meeting in Beirut that his company had deliberately run their tanker operations at a loss of over $13 million in 1959 so as to be able to offer price inducements to customers.

These two examples show the danger and the unsatisfactory results of the present cartel policies. Socony imported oil into the United States taking a major loss on its tanker operations for that purpose. Standard Oil of New Jersey met this "competition" by importing oil from Venezuela at a major discount off posted prices.

Is this really good commercial practice? On Wall Street the future of oil rights of the major international companies abroad is discounted. And the prices of oil shares values proved reserves in the Middle East at less than 3 cents as compared to over $1 for U.S. reserves. Major blue chip shares such as those of Standard Oil of New Jersey sell for 13 times earnings whereas domestic oil producers sell for 23 times earnings.

In short Wall Street does not believe that the companies can continue their monopolistic control of foreign oil.

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there have been in recent months several reports dealing with the problems of the Nation's transportation system and suggestions for regulatory reform in order that the transportation plan of the country might better serve the national needs both for commerce and national defense.

A special study committee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has recently prepared a report on this matter, also, and members of the committee are now studying this matter.

As a member of the committee, I have been trying to read the many reports which have been made on this matter. The reports comprise thousands of pages, but I feel that the information contained in them are important. Since it is practically impossible for Members of the Senate to read all of these reports in their entirety, I feel that it would be helpful to them to have a summary.

Stanley Hamilton and R. Stanley Chapman, of Traffic World, recently wrote a summary of the reports. Because of the importance of them, I ask unanimous consent that the summary be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Traffic World Magazine—Jan. 21, 1961]

SEVEN REPORTS ON TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS AGREE AS TO ILLS BUT DIFFER ON SOLUTIONS

(Congress, new President have no shortage of diagnoses, suggestions as to Federal transport regulation. Reports have come from private and congressional units. Regulatory lag is generally attacked.)

(By Stanley Hamilton and R. Stanley Chapman)

What to do about problems confronting the Nation's transportation has been discussed extensively in seven controversial study reports (some recommending yet more study) issued since early in November and now being scrutinized, compared, and debated by regulatory agencies, carriers, and shippers.

Precise comparisons of the contents of the voluminous documents are not easily made, for they range widely, both in scope and purpose. Some concern themselves with the entire transportation industry or the entire regulatory scheme. Others deal with only the internal operating procedures of a single regulatory agency and the effect such procedures have on a single mode of transportation. Another concerns itself more with the general philosophy of transportation rather than with the specifics of the industry.

To be sure, these seven reports are by no means the first such analyses of transportation (two that come immediately to mind are the Weeks Report of 1955 and the report issued last March by the Department of Commerce). But there's good reason to believe that in no comparable period in the past have so many reports on transportation studies been issued as in the period since last November. They have been made public at a time when it has seemed almost fashionable to criticize the regulatory process. By their very nature, however, the 7 new reports—amounting to a total of more than 2,000 pages—demand comparison.

These are the recently issued reports, their sources, their respective purposes and the names by which they are most commonly known:

The Landis report—A general study of all regulatory agencies, initiated by President Kennedy and conducted by James M. Landis, a former Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. Landis, whose report proposes to streamline the agencies and their procedures, has been appointed a special Presidential assistant to deal with the regulatory problem.

The Doyle report—A general study of transportation and the governmental organization and policies affecting transportation, initiated by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and prepared by a special study unit under the direction of Maj. Gen. John P. Doyle (U.S. Air Force). The report, the most sweeping and voluminous of the seven, has as its purpose the identification of fundamental problems facing transportation and the recommendation of solutions.

The oversight report—The final report by the Legislative Oversight Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, dealing with the effectiveness of all regulatory agencies, particularly as ethics and standards of conduct are involved.

The practitioner report—An initial report dealing only with the Interstate Commerce Commission, prepared by the Special Advisory Committee on Commission Practices and Procedures of the Association of ICC Practitioners for the purpose of reviewing the functioning of the Commission objectively and in broad outline.

The "Booz, Allen report"—another report dealing only with the ICC, initiated by the Bureau of the Budget and made under direction of the firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton, management consultants, of Chicago, with the purpose of enabling the ICC to expedite its work "at the lowest possible costs."

The "McKinsey report"—a report dealing only with the CAB, also initiated by the Bureau of the Budget and made under direction of the management consulting firm of McKinsey & Co. with the purpose of recommending ways to reduce the CAB's workload.

The "Woods Hole report"—a report resulting from a transportation research conference convened last August at Woods Hole, Mass., by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. The purpose of the report is to provide "a constructive start toward resolving present difficulties" of the Nation's transportation system.

AREAS OF SIMILARITY

Although the reports range widely in scope and purpose, each contains a common thread. That thread is concern with the regulation of transportation and the effectiveness of regulation. It is in this area that comparison of similar or conflicting recommendations is most readily made.

In the field of the makeup of the regulatory agencies, the reports made the following major recommendations:

LANDIS REPORT

Establish in the executive branch of the Government an Office for the Coordination and Development of Transportation Policy.

Establish in the executive branch an Office for the Oversight of Regulatory Agencies.

Abolish the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, as well as the positions of special assistants to the President on regulatory and industry matters.

Provide for appointment of the ICC Chairman by the President.

DOYLE REPORT

Establish a Federal Transportation Commission to absorb the "major economic and related" functions of the ICC, CAB, and Federal Maritime Board.

Establish a Department of Transportation to absorb "certain executive-type functions" of the ICC, CAB, and FMB, and various executive functions and programs in the transportation field that are now controlled by other executive agencies.

Establish a Transportation Circuit Court of Appeals with exclusive appellate jurisdiction in the judicial review of decisions by the proposed new Commission.

Establish a joint congressional committee on transportation to undertake continuous studies and make recommendations, but without authority to report legislation to Congress.

OVERSIGHT REPORT

Establish a permanent congressional subcommittee on regulatory and administrative commissions.

PRACTITIONER REPORT

Establish an executive department (within the ICC) headed by an executive Commissioner.

Establish an Office of Management in the ICC headed by a General Manager.

Establish an Office of Regulation in the ICC to direct and coordinate all regulatory functions.

Establish an Office of Proceedings in the agency to direct all proceedings up to the time of submission to the Chairman for assignment.

BOOZ, ALLEN REPORT

Establish an Office of Administrator in the ICC, with responsibility for direction of the agency.

Abolish Division 3 (rates, safety, and services) and reconstitute the remaining Divisions as Division A (operating authorities), Division B (rates and practices), and Division C (finance and carrier reorganizations).

Establish four functional bureaus: (1) Applications and Inquiries, (2) Proceedings, (3) Safety and Compliance, (4) Enforcement.

Establish in the ICC a Division of General Appellate Matters, "pending the passage of urgently needed legislation to authorize appellate employee boards."

Establish an Office of Transportation Policy and Analysis in the ICC.

Establish an Office of Field Operations in the ICC.

Establish an Office of Public Information in the ICC.

Provide for election of the Chairman for a 3-year term, the Chairman being eligible for reelection.

Provide for the election of a Vice Chairman for a 1-year term, also being eligible for reelection.

M'KINSEY REPORT

Establish a position of Director of Policy and Planning in the CAB.

Increase the CAB membership from present five to seven members.

Increase the term of the Chairman from the present 1 to 3 years.

[The Woods Hole report made no specific recommendations in the area of makeup of regulatory agencies.]

Turning to the field of internal agency functions and procedures, the reports made the following major recommendations:

LANDIS REPORT

Issuance by the President of an Executive order concerning ethics of Government employees.

Promote greater interagency coordination.

Provide for reforms in ICC panel process of decision so the full Commission would not have to be called on as a body to determine a large number of issues.

Encourage better ICC opinions to eliminate "parsimony in discussing the applicable law in making a determination."

Eliminate the assigning of individual ICC Commissioners administrative duties as supervisors of various bureaus.

Make decisions of single ICC Commissioners, examiners or boards final subject to selective review by certiorari.

Speed up route proceedings at the CAB.

Develop a system at the CAB to eliminate the "hodge-podge" route structure.

Reorganize the CAB to make more overall planning possible, through more delegation of matters by board members.

Provide that the CAB as a whole should not participate in negotiations on international routes.

Provide an entertainment allowance for certain agency members, as well as an adequate retirement allowance, to make the positions more attractive.

DOYLE REPORT

Provide that examiners' decisions be final unless appealed by an adversely affected party or opened for review by the proposed new Federal Transportation Commission, which would operate under a procedural framework similar to that now used by the ICC, CAB and FMB.

Specify that there may be only one review of an examiner's decision within new Commission.

Divide the new Commission into panels to consider appeals from decisions, with the panel decision being final.

Assign directly to the full new Commission for final action appeals from examiners' decisions in "major cases."

Eliminate initial hearings by examiners in cases involving paramount issues of national transportation policy, which should be directly assigned to the full Commission.

Place responsibility for each report of the proposed Commission on an individual Commissioner in a manner similar to U.S. Supreme Court procedure.

Provide for development of an "adequate record" in major cases so that the new Commission's conclusions "will reflect the full implication of the issues raised."

OVERSIGHT REPORT

Establish a requirement in the ICC administrative policies to provide that all evidence in the possession of any Commission member or employee bearing on the fitness of an applicant be incorporated in the record of proceedings.

Establish in the ICC administrative policies a requirement to insure that any evidence of law violation brought out in any of its proceedings be reported to it and the Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance.

Grant the ICC authority to revoke or suspend carrier certificates on conviction in court of willful violations by carriers of the Interstate Commerce Act and regulations thereunder without further formal proceedings.

Amend the ICC rules to provide for inclusion in applications of "sufficient information" to enable disposition of the matter of the application itself if no protest is filed and the Commission has no evidence needing to be developed on the fitness issue.

Amend ICC rules to establish criteria for extending the use of nonhearing procedures in cases where "no seriously contested issue of fact" is likely to develop, even if the applicant does not request such procedure.

Eliminate, as factors contributing to "mounting administrative Commission backlogs," lack of planning for future technological developments, excessive interventions, cumbersome procedures, absence of incentives for speedy decisions, presence of incentives to "drag out" proceedings, and improper influence.

PRACTITIONER REPORT

Provide that the General Counsel of the ICC head a rules committee of staff officers and practitioners to recommend changes in rules of practice.

Charge the secretary of the ICC with executive responsibility for analysis and evaluation of economic research conducted by the proposed Office of Regulation.

Integrate ICC field offices under single regional managers.

Delegate more authority to employee boards.

Provide intensive training for hearing officers, supplemented throughout their tenure.

Assign individual Commissioners to prepare drafts of final reports in all proceedings.

Set up three standing divisions of three members each to decide initially proceedings of general transportation importance and to dispose of petitions for reconsideration of decisions of individual Commissioners and employee boards.

Reduce greatly en banc proceedings by the ICC.

Establish an ICC policy of speeding up the assignment of matters for consideration.

BOOZ, ALLEN

Increase the coordination of ICC field activities and delegation of authority on the field level.

Improve executive proceedings of the ICC.

Overhaul ICC data collection and utilization of the data.

Create the post of Chief Hearing Examiner for the ICC.

Strengthen personnel programs and activities at the ICC.

Base ICC budget and fiscal controls on a penetrating program analysis.

Establish broad policy criteria for decisions on each type of case coming within the purview of the ICC.

M'KINSEY REPORT

Provide full support for the suggested Director of Policy and Planning of the CAB.

Utilize to a fuller degree CAB's staff.

Lessen the CAB's emphasis on case-by-case adjudication.

Provide the board additional time to meet its total scope of responsibility.

Promote fuller board-staff communication.

WOODS HOLE REPORT

Aim Government policy at providing an environment that can nurture a healthy dynamic (transportation) system, responsive to challenging conditions and emerging technology.

View problems of urban mobility need in relation to community planning and development.

Bridge the chasm between transport operators and the regulatory agencies by research and education.

Minimize the compartmentalization of authority, decisionmaking, and operations.

Then, in the broad area of general transportation matters, the seven reports contain these recommendations:

LANDIS REPORT

Plan for the foreseeable future of transportation and undertake basic policy formulation within the agencies.

Overcome past solutions to specific problems which are piecemeal in character and lacking in bold and imaginative thinking.

Consider changing commodity tariff classifications which still reflect an economy whose changes have made many of them obsolete.

Reexamine subsidy policies in the maritime field which may be producing uneconomic competition on overexpanded trade routes.

Effect coordination with State and municipal agencies dealing with local and regional problems.

Increase the stature of regulatory agency positions in order to increase the caliber of personnel.

DOYLE REPORT

Consolidate all transportation laws into one Federal transportation act.

Promote the concept of user charges to be accepted for gradual application to air and waterway transportation over a period of years.

Permit equally the ownership of one mode by another (under a renewable license) when such ownership is clearly demonstrated to be in the public interest.

Strengthen the powers of regulatory agencies in regard to through routes and rates and allow users to initiate applications for combination service.

Develop promptly a policy on carrier consolidations.

Reinstate the long-and-short-haul provision of the Interstate Commerce Act as written prior to 1958 and provide that exceptions thereto be restricted to those cases in which it is clearly established that relief would result in a national benefit or is justified because of cost considerations.

Foster development of containerization through both governmental promotion and regulation.

End the general policy that Government should compete with private enterprise.

Repeal the provisions in section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which extend to Government agencies the right to obtain, beyond supervision of a neutral regulatory body, special reduced rates from carriers.

Enact legislation empowering and directing regulatory agencies to enforce the restrictions on private carriage.

Establish a category of for-hire water carriers licensed to transport bulk commodities only and require them to hold out that service to the general public and to file minimum rates subject to standard tariff-filing procedure and approval.

Gradually eliminate the present bulk exemptions in section 303 (b), (c), and (d) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Investigate the question of limitation of highway operating authorization and its effect upon national transportation costs.

OVERSIGHT REPORT

Prescribe ethical standards of conduct for agency proceedings and ex parte contacts.

Provide that the amended agency budget requests submitted to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget retain all original language and figures contained in the agency requests as submitted to the Bureau.

Determine the effects on the independent agencies of the requirement that all their legislative proposals must be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget in advance of presentation to Congress.

Gear aviation law and its administration to the advent of machines which will fly in excess of the speed of sound.

Seek coordination of the various regulatory, promotional, and subsidy powers of Government units dealing with transportation.

PRACTITIONER REPORT

Provide that the available time of each ICC member be employed in adjudicatory rather than managerial and regulatory matters.

Remedy the ICC's failure to enunciate policy by improving staff support, particularly in the field of transportation research and economics and a more intimate personal participation by the members in the decisional process itself.

Rotate more frequently the assignment of ICC Commissioners among the divisions, along with adding a system of special assignment of proceedings in certain instances.

Adopt an ICC policy to permit members to develop more expertise in all phases of the work.

BOOZ, ALLEN

Free the ICC for concentration of key regulatory issues.

Have the ICC give responsible consideration to the bulk of the decisional issues not reaching the Commission.

Have ICC management responsibilities carried out in an integrated and consistent manner.

Design ICC policies and programs to produce an acceptable level of compliance at a reasonable level of costs.

M'KINSEY REPORT

Consideration by the CAB of the potential effects on industry of mergers and of consolidations of segments.

Consideration by the CAB of a review of Board policies such as the use-it-or-lose-it policy or the newly established rate base.

Devote increased attention to identifying and meeting the overall, long-range policy needs of the CAB.

Reappraise the basic applicability of the formal processing procedures of each of the CAB's major docket types and initiate changes to reduce the use of the formal proceeding.

Reexamine the CAB's decisionmaking role.

WOODS HOLE REPORT

Initiate research as to possible changes in the factual basis of decisionmaking in the transportation field.

Attract competent people in the development of new talents and skills to further improved understanding of transport problems and development.

Stimulate the attention of institutions and individuals to needed research.

Organize, encourage and support successive pilot studies of the type that lead to actual plans and, cumulatively, add to our store of knowledge.

Identify specific requirements for accurate and adequate data needed for research and study.

Provide forums for the exchange of ideas and information by means of which the general improvement of knowledge and understanding may be accelerated.

Provide an organizational device to stimulate and provide a focus for stepped-up efforts in research and study of transport.

Direct a concerted national effort to evolving methods of traffic operation on the highways that will compare more favorably with progress in air traffic control.

Find means to describe the composite of U.S. transportation activity in such a way that it can be subjected to more rational analysis.

Give attention to threatened congestion of terminal facilities.

Focus on a need to reduce the suspected high cost of transportation.

Focus on a need to consider transportation in the full context in the society, the economy and the nation which it serves.

As could have been anticipated, the recommendations made in the various reports have resulted in both criticism and praise.

Already in the 87th Congress, bills have been introduced to implement some of the suggestions. President Eisenhower, in his final budget message to Congress, made specific recommendations which closely paralleled suggestions in some of the reports. One agency, the ICC, announced January 9 that it had taken two actions designed to improve its procedures, speed disposition of cases and give its members more time to act on cases of general transportation importance (Traffic World, Jan. 14, p. 81). The ICC said it had taken into account various studies, reports, and recommendations, including those of Congress, the Practitioner study and the Booz, Allen study.

In his budget message, President Eisenhower called for creation of a Department of Transportation and legislation to provide for Presidential appointment of the ICC Chairman as steps to strengthen transportation.

In Congress, Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas, has introduced an omnibus bill (H.R. 14) to prescribe standards of conduct for agency members and employees. Representative YOUNGER, of California, and Senator SMATHERS, of Florida, have proposed a Department of Transportation in the Cabinet. Various other bills touching on the problems covered in the reports have also been introduced.

In the Doyle, Woods Hole, and McKinsey reports, further study—to some degree or other—is called for. The Practitioner report is described as a first report. The oversight subcommittee, while it is going out of existence at the end of January, recommends establishment of a new, permanent subcommittee. The Doyle report calls for a joint congressional committee to make continuous studies.

Such recommendations for more study have been greeted in the past with what might be termed open derisiveness by at least two House Members. Representative BECKER, of New York, has expressed the view that he was a little bit tired of listening to studies and asked "When are we going to know some results?" Representative VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, told Traffic World recently that the time had come to halt the studies and get some action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STUDIES OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with an amendment on page 3, line 18, after "exceed" to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$80,000", and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment, so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government with particular reference to—

(1) the effectiveness of the present organizational structures and operational methods of agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government at all levels in the formulation, coordination, and execution of an integrated national policy for the solution of the problems of survival with which the free world is confronted in the contest with world communism;

(2) the capacity of such structures and methods to utilize with maximum effectiveness the skills, talents, and resources of the Nation in the solution of those problems; and

(3) development of whatever legislative and other proposals or means may be required whereby such structures and methods can be reorganized or otherwise improved to be more effective in formulating, coordinating, and executing an integrated national policy, and to make more effective use of the sustained, creative thinking of our ablest citizens for the solution of the full range of problems facing the free world in the contest with world communism.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized:

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one such person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and shall receive compensation at an annual gross rate not less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In reference to Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 20, to authorize the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of the Government, reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration on February 2, 1961, its purpose is to bring about the completion of the first review of national security policy machinery since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947.

The resolution was reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations on January 26 and by the Committee on Rules and Administration on February 2. Last year $125,000 was authorized for the use of this committee. Twelve thousand dollars was returned. This year $80,000 is being asked. It is a reduction of $45,000 from last year. If the resolution is approved, the subcommittee plans to finish a series of staff reports and also prepare appropriate recommendations and legislative proposals, conduct hearings as needed, and finish its work by September 1, 1961, or, at the latest, by January 31, 1962.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my understanding that the subcommittee to which the Senator has referred was formerly known and was organized as the Subcommittee on Government Organization in Contest With World Communism.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was approximately the title of the original resolution, but not of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the necessity of organizing or creating a new subcommittee? As the Senator has stated, there has been a reduction from the amount the subcommittee received last year. However, last year, it was styled under the name, as I said, of the Government Organization in Contest With World Communism. Two years ago we authorized the Foreign Relations Committee to expend $500,000 for a study of our foreign relations. Of that sum $366,000 was actually spent. As a matter of fact, the RECORD shows that the Brookings Institution did a small amount of the work and was paid for it. Why then should the Committee on Government Operations go into this field? Why does not the Committee on Foreign Relations handle this, as it has in the past?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The subcommittee, presided over by Senator JACKSON, has always been known as the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, better than anyone else in the Senate, the scope which lies within the prerogative of the Government Operations Committee is tremendous, probably more widespread than that of any other committee. I point out that the Jackson subcommittee was created with the approval of President Eisenhower, that it has conducted itself in a nonpartisan manner. Their studies have been both objective and scholarly.

Furthermore, this Senate subcommittee has undertaken a project which, I believe, the Brookings Institution would not be able to undertake, because the subcommittee has consulted and taken testimony from the best minds and the most experienced statesmen in the national security field, and has done this in a public manner. They have taken testimony in hearings from men like Robert A. Lovett, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Averell Harriman, Christian A. Herter, Thomas F. Gates, Paul Nitze, George Kennan, Roger Jones, and Robert Bowie.

I would also point out that the work has entered the recommendation phase just as a new administration is taking a fresh look at the machinery for national security policymaking. For example, President Kennedy has called the subcommittee's work a starting point for strengthening and simplifying the National Security Council. Several recommendations made by the Jackson subcommittee are already in effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. What subcommittee is that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, the committee for which funds are being requested.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I asked earlier, in what way does it differ from the Committee on Foreign Relations, which, according to the RECORD, spent $366,000 for a similar study? Why should the Committee on Government Operations expand into foreign matters?

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as foreign policy is concerned, it is my belief that that would be marginal, though important, in this study—in the sense of coordinating machinery in the defense and foreign policy field. What is sought to be done is to bring about a simplification in the procedural structure of the administration of national security policy at home, so that from an overall point of view, let us say, the National Security Council could be strengthened and could render better judgments. I myself think there is no overlap, or is very little overlap, between this committee and the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think that together they can make a great contribution to the betterment of our country's welfare.

Mr. ELLENDER. I still hold to the belief that once these subcommittees are created, there is no end to them. I was informed that this old subcommittee had completed its work. Now it is flying under a new banner. I believe that such work as is sought to be done by this subcommittee is within the province of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has had at its disposal quite a few thousand dollars in order to carry on this program. I am hopeful that there will be a limitation placed on the number of these subcommittees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. If all the resolutions pending today are agreed to—and I feel certain they will be—we will appropriate $1,474,500. I have been trying, to the best of my ability, to get some reduction in the amounts provided these subcommittees but somehow I am unable to do so. On the contrary, as I pointed out last week, and as I point out again this week, new subcommittees are being created. One resolution pending today provides for a new subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, namely, the Subcommittee on Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations. It is true, the amount sought is only $7,500. But the same subcommittees, which are before us now, last year obtained from Congress $1,393,120. This year an increase of $81,380 is sought for the same subcommittees.

It strikes me that we should put a stop to much of this activity. We should allow the committees which have real jurisdiction of these problems to handle them, and not have this increasing duplication.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My understanding of this committee comes from what I find in the report. In the letter of Senator JACKSON to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, he refers to the "concluding phases of the subcommittee's work." That is what I understand is the status of the committee now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. He says that in the concluding phases of the subcommittee's work the staff reports will be completed. He mentions a number of staff reports on which the committee is now working. As I understand, the committee expects to complete its work this year. If I am not mistaken, that is a correct statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. I understand that the committee contemplates finishing its work by September 1, 1961, or, at the latest, by January 31, 1962, less than a year from now.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that is true and the subcommittee is about to conclude its work, why spend more money this year than was spent last year, when all the work was done?

Mr. MANSFIELD. But they are spending less money this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year they obtained $75,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, no; they received $125,000 last year, and $12,000 of that was returned. This year the committee is asking for $80,000, a reduction of $45,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. From last year?

Mr. MANSFIELD. From last year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, the amount is to be reduced, and the committee will go out of business.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not look at the record of last year, but it was my understanding that the work was to be concluded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget of the subcommittee be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget, 1961

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$9,434.12
Counsel (minority)	1	8,040	16,173.19	1,347.76	9,434.12
Special counsel					
Assistant chief counsel					
Assistant counsel					
Consultants	(5–10)	(1)	(1)	(1)	6,000.00
Chief investigator					
Investigator					
Editorial and research:					
Editorial director					
Assistant director					
Research director					
Research assistant					
Staff members	3	20,460	42,087.27	3,507.26	30,850.07
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk					
Assistant chief clerk					
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)					
Assistant clerk (file)					
Assistant clerk (record)					
Assistant clerk (hearing)					
Stenographers	3	7,140	16,576.61	1,381.37	11,979.39
Accountant					
Assistant accountant					
Bookkeeper					
Total					67,697.70
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					200.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					2,000.00
Contribution to employees' Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					175.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies					1,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					
Stationery, office supplies					625.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					800.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					150.00
Contingent fund					1,352.30
Total					12,302.30
Grand total					80,000.00

[1] Temporary, as required, on a consultants' fee basis.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the work will be concluded this year. That is my understanding. As I recall, the subcommittee was not intended to be a permanent one. It had a job to do, and it is now in the process of concluding the work it was created to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Arkansas is correct. I hope that his assurance will carry great weight with the Senator from Louisiana.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the committee report, which reproduces a letter in explanation of Senate Resolution 20, received by me as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator JACKSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY,

January 26, 1961.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to Senate Resolution 20, 87th Congress, which was introduced in the Senate on January 6, 1961, requesting funds to continue studies concerning the effectiveness of present governmental organization and procedures for the development and execution of national policy in the contest with world communism. The requested funds would cover the period from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962. The resolution was reported favorably by the Government Operations Committee on January 26, 1961.

Accompanying this letter is an estimated budget for this period. The budget estimates that $80,000 will be required. This is a reduction of $45,000 from the expenditure of $125,000 authorized by Senate Resolution 248, agreed to February 8, 1960. Of this latter sum, we expect to return well in excess of $12,000 to the Senate contingent fund.

As you know, the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery has been making the first comprehensive review of the national security policy machinery of our Government undertaken since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947, toward the end of making recommendations for the more effective formulation and execution of national security policy.

The subcommittee began its nonpartisan inquiry in the summer of 1959 with a careful review and identification of the major problems of national security policymaking, to the end of laying a solid foundation for hearings, interviews, and studies.

After publication of an interim report (S. Rept. 1026) and carefully selected background materials, the subcommittee conducted extensive hearings, beginning February 17, 1960, with an executive session background briefing by Allen W. Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence. Thereafter, testimony was taken at 33 additional meetings divided into seven sets of hearings. These hearings began with the appearance of former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett on February 23, 1960, and ended with that of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on July 1, 1960.

The first set of hearings, "Part I: Organizing for National Security," saw several Americans of wide experience address themselves to the overall challenge confronting the Nation today and in the years ahead, as it relates to organizing for national security.

At the second set of hearings, "Part II: Science, Technology, and the Policy Process," seven distinguished authorities testified on the relation of science and technology to national security planning.

The third set of hearings, "Part III: Mobilizing Talent for Government Service," addressed itself to the problem of attracting and retaining outstanding officials in vital national security posts.

At the fourth set of hearings, "Part IV: The National Security Council," three former special assistants to the President for national security affairs gave their views on the effectiveness of the NSC.

The fifth set of hearings called upon five distinguished public servants, including the Secretaries of State and Defense and a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for their expert testimony on policymaking at the summit of the Government and coordination between the key national security departments, State and Defense, "Part V: The National Security Council and the Departments of State and Defense."

The subcommittee next took testimony from three former directors of the State Department's policy planning staff, "Part VI: The Department of State, the Policy Planning Staff, and the National Security Council."

The seventh set of hearings concerned public support of national security policy and the organization of the Executive Office of the President, "Part VII: The Executive Office and Public Support."

On June 14, 1960, on recommendation of the subcommittee the Committee on Government Operations unanimously reported to the Senate its views on the special problem of intelligence and national security (S. Rept. 1750).

As a result of evidence presented to the subcommittee that, independent of party or administration, the problem of rapid turnover of key national security officials was a critical one, on recommendation of the subcommittee the Committee on Government Operations unanimously reported out Senate Resolution 338 to the Senate, expressing the sense of the Senate that those appointed to key posts should serve for a reasonably substantial period of time and should indicate to Senate committees their willingness to serve as long as the President desires. The resolution was agreed to July 2, 1960, and was accompanied by a report (S. Rept. 1753).

The subcommittee staff has since devoted its attention to intensive study of the key problems developed in the testimony and is preparing a series of staff reports containing recommendations for corrective action. Two of these have been published: "Super-Cabinet Officers and Superstaffs" and "The National Security Council"; others are in advanced stages of preparation.

In the concluding phases of the subcommittee's work, the series of staff reports will be completed. Appropriate recommendations and legislative proposals based on the committee's studies will be made. Hearings will be undertaken as required.

The study is being made by the Government Operations Committee in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, providing that the committee shall have the duty of—

B. Studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

C. Evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative branches of the Government. * * *

Finally, I am pleased to note that our study has been characterized throughout by a spirit of objective, scholarly concern and nonpartisanship. We have had the most helpful cooperation from Senators on both sides of the aisle, the executive branch, the academic world, and the general public. We believe our study has already helped to produce a more sober awareness and informed concern for the critical problems of the national security policy process.

I shall be available to give the committee any further information desired.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Government Operations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 20), as amended, was agreed to.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 26, Senate Resolution 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 68) to print a committee report entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in support of the resolution, a letter dated February 10, 1961, from the Comptroller General of the United States, addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. In his letter, the Comptroller General strongly endorses the report.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a letter dated November 2, 1960, addressed to Mr. Walter L. Reynolds, staff director of the Committee on Government Operations, from George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American Government and Public Administration, Library of Congress.

I believe these letters speak more eloquently than I could on the reason, justification, and advisability of having this report published. I may say that the committee receives many requests from colleges, universities, and others engaged in making studies of government for this very splendid staff report.

There being no objection, the letter and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1961.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have read, with great interest your committee's report on "Financial Management in the Federal Government." This comprehensive analysis prepared by the committee's staff is a remarkable document to which all concerned can point with pride.

We have watched with admiration the painstaking, thorough, and workmanlike fashion with which the director of the staff, Mr. Walter Reynolds, proceeded about this complicated subject. It has been a privilege to ease a difficult task for him as best we could.

Not only will this historic work be of great value to congressional committees and Members of Congress, it also should be required reading and reference for anyone seriously concerned with financial management in Government For our part we are seeing to it that all of our professional staff will have the report in hand.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1960.

Mr. WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director,
Committee on Government Operations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: I have read with much interest the proofs of your proposed report on "Financial Management in the Federal Government," in accordance with your request of October 13. This report is, indeed, a monumental, historical, and analytical job. It is probably the most comprehensive and detailed review of the subject that has ever been compiled and contains a wealth of fresh data on financial administration, especially in parts V and VI. The report will long be an invaluable source book for the use of interested Members and committees of Congress and of students of public finance.

I find nothing in the report that deserves serious criticism. Every important aspect of the subject seems to be adequately covered.

* * * * *

With hearty congratulations upon your excellent report, I am, always with best regards,

Cordially yours,

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY,
Senior Specialist in American Government and Public Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I hope the resolution will be agreed to, and the committee authorized to procure additional copies of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government", issued by the Committee on Government Operations during the Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, be printed as a Senate document, and that three thousand two hundred additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 27, Senate Resolution 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 44) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate and make expenditures in connection with certain matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this is the customary resolution which has been agreed to by the Senate on a number of occasions to continue the additional investigating staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The amount sought is slightly more than that provided last year, but the resolution provides for no additional positions; it merely provides the additional pay which Congress voted last year for all Senate employees.

I am appreciative of the fact that the Committee on Rules and Administration reported the resolution unanimously.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand from the report, $14,949 has been returned from last year's appropriation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The chairman of the Committee on

Banking and Currency has in his veins a little Scotch blood. We do not spend anything which is not necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget for this subcommittee be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and legislative:					
Assistant counsel	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Assistant counsel	1	5,040	10,872.25	906.02	10,872.25
Assistant counsel	1	4,620	10,060.30	838.35	10,060.30
Editorial and research:					
Staff member	1	4,680	10,176.30	848.02	10,176.30
Economist	1	7,980	16,067.74	1,338.97	16,067.74
Administrative and clerical: Assistant clerk (record)	1	2,580	5,930.60	494.21	5,930.60
Total	6				69,210.09
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					486.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,498.66
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					226.80
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					500.00
Stationery, office supplies					150.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					175.00
Contingent fund					953.45
Total					10,789.91
Grand total					80,000.00

Funds requested, S. Res. 44, $80,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 44) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 28, Senate Resolution 70.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 70) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ temporarily an additional assistant chief clerk and additional staff and clerical personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the resolution was unanimously approved by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It has been favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It extends for 1 year the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ certain temporary additional professional staff members and clerical assistants.

The Senate has previously approved resolutions authorizing these positions, in the case of some of them every year since the beginning of the 83d Congress, some 8 years ago.

All the positions authorized under the pending resolution were authorized last year under Senate Resolution 265. No new positions are sought other than those previously approved by Senate action.

The committee is convinced that in order to permit it to carry out its work efficiently and effectively, it must have the additional temporary positions authorized by this resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it correct that these enumerated staff members—constituting one chief clerk, six professional staff members, and eight clerks—are to be in addition to the number provided under the Reorganization Act of 1946?

Mr. HILL. Yes. However, the first additional position called for is that of assistant chief clerk, not chief clerk.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator from Alabama give us an idea of what the cost will be? In other words, as I pointed out last year, this seems to be a new method of approach. Instead of organizing subcommittees, and requesting funds for them, the committee requests an increase in the size of its professional staff. Is it not correct that instead of having 4 professional staff members, as allowed under the Reorganization Act, the committee is requesting 6 additional ones, which would make a total of 10 professional staff members?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And in addition to the 6 clericals, as provided for under the Reorganization Act, the committee is requesting 8 more, which would make a total of 14 clericals?

Mr. HILL. No; the total would be 12.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; six clericals are provided for under the Reorganization Act, and the committee has a clerk and an assistant clerk——

Mr. HILL. Oh, including the clerk and the assistant clerk and then what we term the clerical assistants, the Senator from Louisiana is correct; that would be six.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have any figures in regard to the charge to the contingent fund last year?

Mr. HILL. Yes; the corresponding resolution last year cost the Senate $119,632.82. I would say to the Senator from Louisiana that because of the cost-of-living pay increase which was allowed last year, the amount this year would necessarily be somewhat larger than the $119,632.82.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether any other resolutions for his committee are in the offing, or whether some with which I am not familiar may have been adopted already?

From the resolutions the Senate will consider today, I notice that a brandnew special committee is to be formed to study aging. This is a subject which has been under the jurisdiction of the committee of which my good friend, the Senator from Alabama, is chairman. As I remember, last year that subcommittee had approximately $85,000 to spend.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. This subcommittee has held hearings for at least 2 years. As a result of those hearings, as I understand it, the committee reported a measure known as the McNamara bill for the aged, which we shall consider.

Mr. HILL. The McNamara bill was referred to the Finance Committee, of course, because it involved an amendment to the Social Security Act, and a tax.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. But that bill is a product of the subcommittee's work, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. While the Senator from Alabama is on his feet, I assume that he is going either to defend or to promote the proposal for the creation of the new special committee, which is proposed to be formed outside the jurisdiction of his own committee. In that connection, I should like to find out whether——

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that the new special committee—as proposed by a resolution reported by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and now on the calendar—will not be a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; neither will it have any direct connection with that committee. Instead, the special committee will be a separate one.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is here, and is the author of the resolution; and I am sure that when it comes before us, he will go into detail in regard to the reasons for establishing the special committee, which will have no direct connection with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, are we to understand that the only additional help to be provided the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which the Senator from Alabama is chairman, are the professional staff members and clerical assistants provided for in the pending resolution?

Mr. HILL. Except—and I wish to make this very clear—that we have a Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, headed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Last year that subcommittee had $50,000 for its operations. The Senator from New Jersey advises me that the subcommittee has not yet completed its work; and no doubt he will be here to request additional funds in order to permit the subcommittee to complete and conclude that work.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, we have not yet been asked to make that allowance, have we?

Mr. HILL. No; but the resolution covering that matter—it is Senate Resolution 86—is now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. ELLENDER. However, so far as the Senator knows——

Mr. HILL. So far as I know—and I think I know the situation rather well—that will be the only one from our committee which will call for additional funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Do I correctly understand that these additional funds will enable the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to make a more thorough study of the needs of the aged and elderly people?

Mr. HILL. No. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that now on the calendar is Senate Resolution 33, calendar 41, a separate resolution, which would set up a special committee on the aged. It would not be a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and it would have no direct connection with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Instead, it would be a separate special committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that a bill to provide hospital care for the aged was received this morning from the White House.

Mr. HILL. It came this morning?

Mr. AIKEN. I read about that just now on the news ticker. We usually read about such things on the ticker before they actually happen, of course.

Mr. HILL. I cannot say as to that; but judging from what I know from the press and generally, that bill will be an amendment to the Social Security Act; and therefore the bill will not be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; instead, inasmuch as the bill involves a tax, it will be referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I accept the explanation.

If the bill had been referred to the committee headed by the Senator from Alabama, I was going to point out that apparently the President now includes under the coverage of the bill retired railway workers who are organized, and retired Federal employees who are organized, and all other aged people who are organized; and I was going to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he would be sure that some study would be made of the plight of the 2 million or 3 million persons who are not organized, who do not belong to any organization, but who can suffer just as much as if they belonged to a high-powered organization which was in a position to wield influence at election times.

Mr. HILL. As I have previously stated, the resolution which calls for the establishment of a Special Committee on the Aging has not yet been adopted. If the resolution is adopted and if the special committee, called for by the resolution is established, it will not have any direct connection with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But I am sure the distinguished author of the resolution, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], will certainly do exactly what the Senator from Vermont has suggested; namely, go into the question of providing hospitalization for persons who are not organized, just as much as into the question of providing hospitalization for persons who may belong to organizations.

Mr. AIKEN. I express the hope that the Senator from Alabama will be a member of that special committee, because I know his heart is big enough so that he will wish to look after persons who are not in a position to hire a spokesman in Washington to look after their interests.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his compliment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 70.

The resolution (S. Res. 70) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, six additional professional staff members, and eight additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY—SELECTED MATERIALS"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution 71.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 71), to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Organizing for National Security—Selected Materials," which was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of the committee print entitled "Organizing for National Security—Selected Materials," issued by that committee during the Eighty-sixth Congress, second session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] urging the adoption of the resolution.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY,
January 27, 1961.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 26, 1961, Senate Resolution 71 authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to print 2,000 additional copies of the committee print, "Organizing for National Security—Selected Materials" was reported favorably by the committee to the Senate.

This publication is a part of the study of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. Our original allowance for these materials has been exhausted but the demand continues. Many college libraries, scholars, research organizations, and inter-

ested private citizens are finding these materials most useful. The subcommittee would like to be able to continue to provide copies to those who want them. The publication is attached.

We would be most grateful for your cooperation in obtaining authority for the printing of additional copies, as provided for in Senate Resolution 71.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1096, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 72) to print additional copies of Senate Report 1096, 86th Congress, entitled "National Policy Machinery in Communist China."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter in explanation of the resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY,
January 27, 1961.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 26, 1961, Senate Resolution 72 authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to print 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 1096, 86th Congress, "National Policy Machinery in Communist China" was reported favorably by the committee to the Senate.

This publication is a part of the study of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. Our original allowance for these materials has been exhausted but the demand continues. Many college libraries, scholars, research organizations, and interested private citizens are finding these materials most useful. The subcommittee would like to be able to continue to provide copies to those who want them. The publication is attached.

We would be most grateful for your cooperation in obtaining authority for the printing of additional copies, as provided for in Senate Resolution 72.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 72) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 1096, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "National Policy Machinery in Communist China".

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 73.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 73) to print additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Organizing for National Security."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter in explanation of the resolution.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY,
January 27, 1961.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 26, 1961, Senate Resolution 73 authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to print 2,500 additional copies of "Organizing for National Security—Part I, Hearings" was reported favorably by the committee to the Senate.

This publication is a part of the study of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. Our original allowance for these materials has been exhausted but the demand continues. Many college libraries, scholars, research organizations, and interested private citizens are finding these materials most useful. The subcommittee would like to be able to continue to provide copies to those who want them. The publication is attached.

We would be most grateful for your cooperation in obtaining authority for the printing of additional copies, as provided for in Senate Resolution 73.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 73) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand five hundred additional copies of part 1 of the hearings entitled "Organizing for National Security" which were held by that committee during the second session of the Eighty-sixth Congress.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 75) to investigate matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in explanation of the resolution I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 26, 1961.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing a copy of an original resolution for the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which has been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The number of legislative proposals referred to this standing subcommittee has become increasingly greater year after year to the extent that the activities of this subcommittee require the services of a clerical assistant for the subcommittee. The committee, therefore, approved the sum of $7,500 in order to afford one clerical assistant for this subcommittee.

I believe it most appropriate that this resolution to provide modest funds for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations should be approved by the Senate at an early date.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, this is one of the resolutions which would create a new subcommittee. It pertains to an investigation, or, may I say, consideration, before the Judiciary Committee, of Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations. The amount asked is $7,500.

I think a resolution of this kind is just driving matters into the ground, when we are asked to provide extra money for a committee to look into Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

As I pointed out last week, when quite a few resolutions were before the Senate, the Judiciary Committee already has 13 subcommittees. Here we are asked to create another one, making 14 subcommittees altogether.

I pointed out, further, that in addition to the regular amount of funds that

are given to the committee under the Reorganization Act, amounting to some $160,000, these subcommittees are organized, and they will spend an additional million and a half dollars.

It strikes me this subcommittee should not be created. The amount involved, although small, will entail work in respect to charters, holidays, and celebrations. That work could certainly be considered by one of the other existing subcommittees. For instance, there is the Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee. Second, there is the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Third, there is the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee.

It strikes me that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments is an appropriate one to make special studies of Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations, if such studies are in fact necessary. There are several other subcommittees where this work could be centered.

I repeat what I have often said—that once one of these subcommittees is created, it goes on and on and on. Every year, with very few exceptions, they all come back for either the same amount or, in most cases, more money. It strikes me that the Senate ought to put a stop to that procedure. I certainly believe the creation of another subcommittee in the Judiciary Committee is uncalled for and unwarranted, and I do hope the Senate agrees with me this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say, with regard to this subcommittee, that it is not a new subcommittee, but has been in operation for some years now. It is a subcommittee headed by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. There is a certain amount of clerical work connected with this subcommittee, relating to weekday holidays, and whatnot. Up to this time the Senator from Illinois has had to fall back on his own office force to do the work which was needed.

It was the contention of the Senator from Illinois, in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and also before that committee, and in a speech made in the Senate a week or 10 days ago, that he needed the clerical assistance; otherwise the burden would fall on his own office staff.

This is the first time the distinguished minority leader has asked for this kind of help, although he has been chairman of the subcommittee for several years. He has been able to carry out the clerical duties of that subcommittee by using members of his own office staff to make up the deficiency.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if he tried to get some of this work done by some of the 13 other subcommittees in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not ask him that.

Mr. ELLENDER. The place is running over with employees. It strikes me he ought to be able easily to get them to help. I contend this is a new subcommittee. I do not know of any time when any money was ever asked for by that subcommittee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but the work has been in existence.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, in my view, this is a new committee. The work may have been in existence. It strikes me that this is work that the regular committee could do. Under the Reorganization Act, the committee has four professional staff members, a clerk, an assistant clerk, and four clericals. It strikes me that the little work that may be entailed could be done by the committee, instead of creating a separate subcommittee in order to get $7,500 for it. In my view, the request is going far beyond what we should do. I wonder what the regular committee is going to do if the subcommittees do all the work. It is that simple.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may point out that this subcommittee was created with the approval of the full Judiciary Committee. This subcommittee has its approval.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not doubt such action is unanimous when the subcommittees bring up resolutions, even as to such requests before the committee of which the Senator from Montana is a member. It might be that a committee may reduce a request by $10,000 or $25,000 where the committee does not have the heart to request from the Senate the amount which the subcommittee has requested. But all these actions are taken unanimously. And, if I may say so, there is usually very little objection raised by any of the members of the committee. However, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I am chairman, and I think the Finance Committee as well, have no subcommittees that receive money. We do all the work with our own staffs. We are not only able to do the work with our own staff, but we send back to the Treasury a few dollars every year.

I think we are simply driving this procedure into the ground, and we ought to stop it in some way. I think it is shameful.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All I can say, in reply, is that the committee does the very best it can, within its limitations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, Senate Resolution 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 25) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters relating to public and private housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the word "than", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $107,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the funds requested in the resolution will be used by the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and

Currency to continue its study and investigation of matters relating to public and private housing.

It can be anticipated that the Senate will receive a comprehensive housing program from the President. This program must be studied from the standpoint of existing programs and other proposals and recommendations before action can be taken by the committee.

The subcommittee report on mortgage credit contains 10 recommendations as possible ways and means of providing a stable flow of mortgage credit with which to meet the minimum housing needs of the Nation during the 10-year period beginning January 1961. Three of these recommendations were incorporated in the Housing Act of 1960, which, as stated, was not acted upon by the House of Representatives. In addition, certain Federal agencies were requested to submit by January 1, 1961, supplemental reports on the subject of mortgage credit. Reports and recommendations have been received from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Federal Reserve Board on these four recommendations. These reports must be studied to determine whether it is feasible to incorporate the agencies' recommendations in 1961 housing legislation. It is the responsibility of the Housing Subcommittee to review and study these reports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks with respect to each of the resolutions previously agreed to today the budgets submitted by the respective committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget submitted for the study of Federal housing programs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Counsel	1	8,000	16,102.90	1,341.90	16,102.90
Counsel	1	6,000	12,587.99	1,048.99	12,587.99
Investigator	1	3,660	8,117.89	676.49	8,117.89
Editorial and research:					
Research director	1	6,000	12,587.99	1,048.99	12,587.99
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	3,060	6,902.74	575.22	6,902.74
Assistant clerk (secretary)	1	2,940	6,659.70	554.97	6,659.70
Staff assistant	1	6,000	12,587.99	1,048.99	12,587.99
Total	8				91,650.10
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					648.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,957.26
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					208.08
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					200.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					746.56
Total					15,349.90
Grand total					107,000.00

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the majority leader, the amount has been increased $7,000 to take care of the recent pay raise?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 34, Senate Resolution 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 26) to authorize a study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word 'than", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $75,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Senate Committee on Government Operations to continue, in effect, to conduct its study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

CONTINUATION OF PRESENT STUDY

This goal is identical to the goal of the present authority under which a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has been carrying out a study under Senate Resolution 255, sections 1 to 4, 86th Congress.

TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS LESS REQUIRED

So far as funds are concerned, Senate Resolution 26 proposes $75,000 for the continued study.

By contrast, Senate Resolution 255, sections 1 to 4 authorized $85,000 for the present study. Of this latter sum, approximately $23,500 will be returned.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF PRIOR STUDY

The report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Senate Report No. 36, cites on pages 5 and 6 a memorandum which it received on the substantial results of the work of the Committee on Government Operations to date.

The work has been performed by the Subcommitee on Reorganization and International Organizations of which the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is chairman.

THREE PHASES OF PRIOR STUDY

The work under Senate Resolution 255, sections 1 to 4 has been threefold:

First. Completion of an international health study.

Second. Study of coordination of Federal agencies' activities in biomedical research.

Third. Study of coordination of Federal agencies' activities in physical sciences research.

VAST SUMS OF MONEY INVOLVED

In effect, for an outlay in 1960 of $63,500, the Senate has benefited from a thorough review of how these infinitely larger totals of Federal money have been spent.

First. For international health, $130 million a year.

Second. For Federal biomedical research, $650 million a year.

Third. For physical sciences research, development, testing, and evaluation, $7½ billion a year.

The results of the subcommittee's past study are now at the Government Printing Office in a two-volume report.

VAST SCOPE OF TWO-VOLUME REPORT

The report brings together, I understand, information never before available, on the Federal Government's total research effort. This effort involves 160,000 research projects in all the sciences, 120,000 research scientists, 240,000 research engineers, and 7,000 facilities.

SEVEN TYPES OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The report contains numerous recommendations for: (a) reforms in budgeting and accounting, (b) improved research coordination, (c) review of certain existing Federal publications to determine whether they are necessary, (d) better use of existing Federal information systems, (e) strengthening of the science information exchange, (f) improved salvaging of information from hundreds of millions of dollars of canceled Defense Department projects, and (g) study of duplication of research projects in the Defense Department.

PROPOSED FUTURE REVIEW

Naturally, in studying an $8 billion research program, it could not be expected that the Committee on Government Operations could already have completed the review, in 1 year, and with but one full-time professional employee.

With the new authority under Senate Resolution 26, the past study can therefore be carried to a logical conclusion.

Useful leads which have been developed can be pursued. And the taxpayers' investment in Federal research can be further capitalized upon.

AVOIDING WASTEFUL DUPLICATION

The Reorganization Subcommittee has concentrated, in effect, on finding out about the dissemination of the results of research. It notes that it is of little value for scienists to discover new knowledge if it is not disseminated to other scientists efficiently and economically. If this does not occur, U.S. scientists may go on, wastefully repeating experiments which have been made years and years ago, but which have not been fully reported or reported at all.

NO DUPLICATION OF OTHER'S WORK

The Senior Senator from Minnesota has asked me to assure our colleagues that the study under his chairmanship in no way duplicates the work of (a) any other Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, or of (b) any other committee of the Senate.

WORK OF OTHER GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Thus, with regard to the Committee on Government Operations (a) the Reorganization Subcommittee does not review any problem of malfeasance or misfeasance such as the Subcommittee on Investigations investigates — Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 69—(b) the Reorganization Subcommittee does not explore issues essentially involving the President, the National Security Council and other top policy issues such as the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery takes up—Calendar No. 25, Senate Resolution 20.

All three subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations have as their common objective economy and efficiency. That is the parent committee's responsibility under rule XXV of the rules of the Senate.

But each subcommittee is exploring economy and efficiency in totally different areas.

NONDUPLICATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES

So far as other committees of the Senate are concerned, the subcommittee also carefully avoids duplication. The Reorganization Subcommittee looks at issues from a governmentwide standpoint; it looks at interagency, not intra-agency problems, and it concentrates on budgeting and accounting, economy and efficiency, as required under the legislative reorganization law.

EXTRA PERSONNEL NEEDED

It should be stressed that rule XXV confers upon the Committee on Government Operations responsibility for studies of economy and efficiency.

The committee cannot make these studies unless it has extra personnel, such as Senate Resolution 26 provides.

All regular professional staff members of the committee are engaged in legislative duties, so an additional modest-size staff is necessary.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT FOR INSERTION OF MEMORANDUM

Finally, by way of background, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum by the senior Senator from Minnesota elaborating on the work of his subcommittee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY—BACKGROUND ON THE MEDICAL WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

This memorandum bears upon one phase of our subcommittee's work—its study of Federal health activities, particularly biomedical research.

The subcommittee has been handling this problem, as delegated to us by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable JOHN J. MCCLELLAN, pursuant to Senate Resolution 347, 85th Congress, Senate Resolution 42, 86th Congress, and Senate Resolution 255, sections 1–4, 86th Congress.

Work performed under these various studies can be seen in numerous publications which have been issued by the subcommittee.

TWELVE PUBLICATIONS ISSUED TO DATE

As I have previously reported to the Senate on January 30, on pages 1410 and 1411 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10 committee prints and 2 hearing volumes have already been issued. Numerous other committee prints are in process.

All of the publications to date bear upon the life sciences; several future publications bear upon the physical sciences.

This memorandum relates to the examination of Federal work in life sciences.

FAVORABLE REACTIONS TO STUDIES

Hundreds of letters of commendation on the subcommittee's work have poured into our office.

These messages have come from men and women of great repute—from winners of the Nobel Prize, the Distinguished Service Medal, of the American Medical Association, the Lasker Award and other scientific honors.

The messages have come from voluntary health agencies, foundations, pharmaceutical companies, and many other sources, as well.

OUR FINDINGS HAVE LED TO ACTION

What is most important, however, is that findings in our various publications have already, we believe, contributed to thinking and action within the executive branch.

Let me cite but two instances on two different phases of the work under our medical research study alone.

OUR STUDY OF GOVERNMENT-WIDE RESEARCH

Under this study, we have been looking at Federal biomedical research as a whole. This research in the 1960 fiscal year adds up to around $650 million in direct and indirect outlay.

But we have asked the question: Is the research, as supported by 10 different Federal agencies as fully coordinated as it might be?

The preponderance of the research is, of course, carried out by the National Institutes of Health. It has been and is doing a great job. But in the 1960 fiscal year, other Federal agencies were also heavily engaged in biomedical research.

The overall figures which were compiled for the first time by our subcommittee showed those totals of U.S. Government-supported research: 22,924 projects, $455,101,592 direct outlay.

Of this total, NIH aggregated 12,065 projects, $260,685,770 direct outlay.

Agencies and divisions outside NIH, within the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and elsewhere, aggregated 10,859 projects, $194,415,822 direct outlay.

In our review, we have had fine cooperation from Dr. James Shannon, the able Director of the National Institutes of Health and from other Federal research administrators.

INTERAGENCY TEAMWORK

I am glad to report many gratifying evidences of cooperation, coordination, and collaboration between the various Federal agencies supporting biomedical research.

But science is developing so rapidly, the dimensions are expanding so fast, that, in-

evitably more can and should be done in interagency teamwork.

In our study, our subcommittee has been examining, therefore, ways and means by which there could be greater coordination.

This means: (a) at the level of top policy—in the White House and the Executive Office of the President, (b) at the interagency level on the part of administrators, and (c) at the working scientist level on the part of researchers.

Each of these levels involves different problems. Let me cite now two particular instances of an interagency challenge.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REFERENCES IN HEALTH MESSAGE

Both of these instances were referred to by President John F. Kennedy in his great message to the Congress on health and hospital care on February 9, 1961.

I refer to (a) child health, and (b) physical fitness.

In both of these instances, our subcommittee has long been exploring the Government-wide picture.

In his message, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 2002, President Kennedy proposed a new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development "which will include a center for research in child health, as well as other broad ranging health research activities, not now covered by specialized work of the existing Institutes."

In the same message, President Kennedy designated the Secretary of HEW as the Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Fitness. The President stated that he had asked the Secretary for a report on the adequacy of existing school health programs and what changes, if any, are needed in the Federal Government's role in the stimulation of such programs.

On both of these subjects, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations has, I am glad to state, now developed considerable information on opportunity for increased teamwork among Federal agencies.

It has been our feeling that it is not enough for a multitude of Federal agencies to perform work in child health or for a multitude to make small contributions to problems of physical fitness. What is needed is to mobilize the scattered Federal efforts on these fronts so that the whole becomes greater than the sum of the parts.

As we all know, a good football squad is more than a collection of individuals. It is a team which functions in unison.

Much has been accomplished along these lines, but much remains to be accomplished.

STUDY OF CONGENITAL MALFORMATIONS

Let me note specifically what the President stated at his press conference on Wednesday, February 8, as reported in the New York Times on page 18, the following day:

"Three, with the approval of Secretary Abraham A. Ribicoff (of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), I am directing the Surgeon General to organize and establish within the Public Health Service a child health center, to deal with the special health problems of children. This is a matter of particular interest to me.

"Some 400,000 babies are born each year with congenital malformations. I don't think as a country, nationally, and as a matter of fact I don't think probably, privately we have done enough on research into the causes of mental retardation.

"And while a good deal of effort is being expended in this country for the care of these children, I do think it is most important that we devote special effort in the coming months and years to research in the causes of it. And I am, therefore, delighted that we are going to proceed ahead with Governor Ribicoff's strong support."

The President's observations struck a particularly respondent chord.

As far back as November 1958, in Paris, it was my privilege to meet with French scientists in the first of a long series of reviews on the problem of strengthening international cooperation in research on congenital malformations. For a period of 2¼ years, our subcommittee has been studying perinatal research.

In this process, we have had outstanding cooperation from the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and its Director, Dr. Richard Masland, who developed an excellent report for us on this subject.

I could not agree more heartily, therefore, with President Kennedy in that we need more research into the causes of congenital defects.

This country is paying a staggering price; all countries are paying a staggering price—in both tangible and intangible losses—because of the blight of defects with which countless infants are ushered into life.

And so, since August 1960, our subcommittee has been working with the U.S. Children's Bureau in a Government-wide report on existing Federal research on child research problems.

What I am saying, therefore, is that the data which we have been developing has been contributing to the foundations for further action in the executive and legislative branches.

NEED FOR FITNESS EFFORT

On the issue of physical fitness, our subcommittee has been in close contact with the President's Council on Youth Fitness. The Council has done much good work as a catalyst among the Federal agencies and with a vast number of nongovernmental organizations interested in the well-being of our citizens, young and old.

As President Kennedy stated, however, in his hard-hitting article in the December 26, 1960, Sports Illustrated: "It is time for the United States to move forward with a national program to improve the fitness of all Americans."

It is clear that the President is going to see to it that this is exactly what occurs. The Nation will be indebted to him for his further leadership along this line.

And if I may speak for the six members of our own subcommittee, we will, I am sure, be glad to cooperate to the fullest, as will other committees of the Congress.

Because of our particular vantage point—in surveying the organization of the total Federal effort, not just the effort of one or two agencies—our subcommittee can, we feel, render particular service in assuring Federal coordination.

Our overall health study has been oriented to positive health, not just the study of disease and disability. Our interest is in full, wholesome lives for all 180 million Americans and for those who will follow after us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the proposal, the worldwide health and medical research subcommittee, created sometime ago, has finished its work and has made a report. This represents a continuation of the same subcommittee, but it was labeled "Reorganization and International Organizations." Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. It is the same subcommittee with a different emphasis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. I think the record shows that the subcommittee was to complete its work in regard to worldwide health and medical research.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the record shows. Now, is the subcommittee to be recreated and given a new name?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is to be given increased emphasis.

Mr. ELLENDER. What will this subcommittee do which was not done by the previous subcommittee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator will recall that only a few minutes ago I stated the threefold purposes of the subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These indicate the increased emphasis to be placed in an entirely new field.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, we should conclude this is really not a continuation of the work of a subcommittee but is the creation of a new subcommittee in that field?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I would say it is the old subcommittee with added emphasis.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the name has been changed. Why could not something like this be handled by the Committee on Foreign Relations? Why should the Committee on Government Operations handle matters of this character when, as a matter of fact, it strikes me, this is a field which should be handled by the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows, referring to the standing rules for the Senate, so far as the Committee on Government Operations is concerned its responsibility includes studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

The Senator from Louisiana knows better than I do how wide ranging the responsibility and authority of the Committee on Government Operations are. While this may come in conflict with the responsibility and authority of other committees, such as the Committee on Foreign Relations, nevertheless under the Reorganization Act the committee does have such authority.

It is to be hoped that if there is a possibility of conflict an accommodation can be arrived at which will recognize the legitimate territory to be covered by each committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have any idea as to how long the subcommittee will be in operation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. Unfortunately, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the life of the subcommittee is to be indefinite. I guess it will be in operation in perpetuity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the budget submitted, by the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative: General counsel or staff director	1	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$16,102.90
Editorial and research: Research assistant	2	4,380	9,576.07	798.00	19,152.14
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,900	8,603.95	716.99	8,603.95
Assistant clerk	1	2,880	6,538.19	544.84	6,538.19
Do	1	2,760	6,295.16	524.59	6,295.16
Typist	1	2,100	4,958.49	413.20	4,958.49
Subtotal, staff	7				61,650.83
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					323.65
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					2,855.28
Contribution to Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					237.24
Reimbursable payments to agencies					4,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					1,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					300.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					933.00
Subtotal, administrative					13,349.17
Total					75,000.00

Mr. ELLENDER. I note that under "Legal and investigative: General Counsel or Staff Director" there is listed one person. Under "Editorial and research: Research assistant" two people are listed. Under "Administrative and clerical" there are four employees listed. This make a total of seven jobs to be filled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 26) as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 69.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 69) to investigate the efficiency and economy of operations of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 5, line 10, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds, in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government, and that:

SEC. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof be further authorized from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner in and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1962, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the proper consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $390,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 8, it is proposed to insert the following immediately after the period:

Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of any power or the discharge by such committee of any duty conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to clarify and make certain that it is not the intent of the resolution in any way to deprive or to detract from the powers and authority now vested by the rules of the Senate in the regular standing Committee on the Judiciary, and also the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We have the same provision in the resolution with respect to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The purpose and the necessity for the amendment is brought about because the resolution has now been broadened, at the suggestion of the leadership and others, to include authority to follow up, whenever in the course of an investigation that we have been conducting, we discover organized or syndicated crime, when it affects or creates a burden upon, or interferes or hampers interstate commerce. It would be in that field only, I should think, in which the Federal Government would have such authority.

In a sense the resolution actually contains three authorities. It is a resolution that has been adopted from year to year for the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, known as the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Senators will recall that last year the authority under which the committee has operated in previous years was broadened to include the same functions and authority that had been vested in the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations. The added provision would give the committee authority, in instances in which the committee found it needed such authority, that it did not have previously. It would give it authority to pursue its investigations into organized or syndicated crime that would be a burden on interstate commerce. The purpose of the amendment is to state definitely, as we have with reference to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that the resolution does not take any authority away from those committees in their regular legislative fields. That is true, just as the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations did not report proposed legislation. It reported only recommendations.

The committee could, of course, introduce a bill, but any bill which that committee might introduce or any bill which this committee would introduce would have to be referred to the regular legislative committees. If the subject concerned labor, it would be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In this instance, if the subject were crime affecting interstate commerce, naturally, the bill would be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if either of those committees has jurisdiction of such proposed legislation.

This committee is purely an investigating committee. It makes its report on the findings and submits recommendations with respect to legislation.

Mr. President, since my good friend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is in the Chamber and probably will wish to interrogate me, I should like to add that last year the committee submitted two resolutions.

The first resolution would authorize the committee to carry out its functions under the regular rules of the Senate. Then, as Senators will recall, an additional resolution conferring the authority of the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Improper Practices in Labor-Management Relations was agreed to at the time the select committee expired. Additional funds were granted. Approximately $75,000 of additional funds were granted at that time, making a total of $350,000 that the committee was authorized to spend this last year. We did not spend all of that amount. We are returning some $60,000 of it. At that time we did not have this additional authority or the additional duty to perform.

The return of that money was due partially to the particular conditions that prevailed last year.

Members of the committee last year were not able to give as much time and effort to the work of the committee as they normally do, and as they expect to do this year.

For the RECORD I should like to say that in the past the committee has always returned money. It has never thrown any money away. It has a heavy task. Yet insofar as the work of the committee in either of these fields is concerned, there are unlimited opportunities, and it is only a question of how much time members of the committee can give to this work. As I have said repeatedly, the committee cannot carry on as extensive investigations as it did for 3 years in the labor-management field.

It is impossible for a committee to work that hard continuously and consistently in this investigative field without neglecting some of its other duties. Members of the committee have had to perform this work at times possibly to the neglect of other senatorial duties. Yet I think it wholly unnecessary for me to dwell on the importance of this work. Senators know what the work of this committee has been.

I am now happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Arkansas mentioned organized crime as the third category which he expects to look into. Could such investigation not have been accomplished under the regular resolution?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; it could not. The Senator has spoken about the authority of other committees. Proposed legislation affecting various agencies of Government would be referred to the various committees having jurisdiction. But the investigative power to investigate every dollar of expenditure made by Government, the investigative power to look into any agency or activity of Government to determine its economy or efficiency, is vested in this committee. That is one reason the select committee was established in the labor-management field. We got into that area and found that the Government was being imposed upon by racketeers. But when we went outside the Government itself to investigate and find out what was going on, we found that we did not have jurisdiction. The Senator from Louisiana will recall the circumstances under which the Senate select committee was established.

Mr. ELLENDER. A select committee was created.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Afterward; and then we transferred those powers back. In other words, those powers are now vested in the Committee on Government Operations. We gave full time to just one phase of the investigation and spent some $700,000 or $800,000 a year. That was a very great job. We propose not to work that hard. We cannot do that much, as I pointed out. The amount requested will enable us to pursue the cases that are most prominent or those that indicate the need for committee action and investigation. That is what we hope to do.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee of which the Senator is chairman is now embarking on a new phase of the investigation. What connection has that investigation with the statement made by the new Attorney General to the effect that he was going after organized crime in a big way?

Is it that the Senator is going to give the Attorney General assistance, or is there any such connection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would not say that there is any direct connection. I have advocated, as the Senator may know, and last year I joined in the introduction of a bill to carry out my advocacy, that there is a need for a national crime commission to investigate interstate and syndicated crime. However, there is no direct relationship.

I may say that, just as in connection with the select committee, and just as in connection with the Government Operation Committee's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, we make investigations which reveal information which is helpful to an agency of the Government, such as the Justice Department or the Internal Revenue Service, or the Department of the Treasury, or any other agency. When that happens we make the information available to the agency. Sometimes it is not made available immediately, and at other times it is made available as we go along. We work in a cooperative fashion. However, so far as any special significance is concerned, there is none.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that we are barging into an area belonging to the executive department in a situation like this. Why would it not be within the province of the Justice Department or grand juries throughout the United States to make these investigations and bring the culprits to justice? Why, for example, should Congress stir up the matter to obtain that information and in turn give it to the Justice Department? That is what is sought to be done here. It seems to me to be an encroachment on the executive department.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe it is any more than any investigation into fields of Government might be an encroachment on the province of an agency of the Government. I say that because the Department of Justice acts only on the basis of laws which Congress enacts. If present laws are inadequate, or if the Department is not able to deal effectively with organized crime, that fact might be developed and legislation to strengthen the existing laws could then be enacted. That is the theory behind all congressional investigations. It is to determine with respect to the administration of existing law and with respect to the effect of existing law the adequacy of existing law, and whether additional legislation is needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not opposing the proposal before the Senate. I am merely trying to find a reason for it. We are asked to create a committee with a great deal of power. It is power which I believe could be exercised by the Attorney General if only he attempted to do so. We have sufficient law on the statute books to punish those who commit crime. It strikes me that the type of investigation suggested by the resolution would be more or less for the purpose of obtaining facts that could readily be obtained by grand juries. If it is found that there is a violation by any group of criminals, it would be up to the Attorney General to proceed to prosecute them. That is what is in my mind in asking these questions. If the resolution were adopted we would have an arm of the legislative branch of the Government engaged in more or less doing work that should be within the province of grand juries and the Department of Justice, not the legislative department.

Mr. McCLELLAN. After all, there is a measure of economy involved here. The Senator will recall that particularly with respect to the Select Committee, we are now trying to reduce things. We have reduced it to the point where it will have authority in existence if it is necessary to employ that power. I believe that we had better do it this way than to have it suggested that another Select Committee be established. It is better to keep the power where we can use it when we need it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning the cost at all. It is simply the method that is sought to be applied. As I see it, we are barging into what should be within the province of the Justice Department. To follow through on and prosecute organized crime should be the work of the Department of Justice. Certainly there are laws against all the crimes that I know of. What will be the result if the committee finds out something that a grand jury already knows? Does the Senator believe it will be more effective with the Attorney General than if a grand jury exposes it and brings it to his attention?

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I have indicated the committee was not set up especially for the purpose of aiding the Department of Justice. The theory is to aid Congress, as well as the Department of Justice. Many times we have found conditions to exist which we have referred to the Department of Justice, and, I believe, with good results. This did not originate with organized crime as such, but I may point out in this respect an instance where we have uncovered a situation which called for the suspension of a high Government official. The Attorney General may have the authority, or a grand jury may have the authority. However, we alert agencies of the Government to conditions that prevail, and give the department an opportunity to bring about economy and efficiency by removing such officials where such things occur.

What I have cited is not directly related, but I may point out that in the course of the investigation into the labor-management field we found instances where there was organized crime, where we found a muscling in on legitimate business and legitimate labor in that field. However, we were not able to pursue it to the fullest extent, because when we went beyond the labor and management relations field, we had no authority to pursue the matter further.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that. However, it would be possible, with the creation of the committee, to take the place of grand juries and to make investigations. That is what I am contending.

Were the Department of Justice to do its duty as it should, prosecutions could be started now. I am sure the FBI furnishes a great deal of crime data to the Department of Justice, and I am sure prosecutions are carried out because of these exposures. It strikes me that the proposal before us is only another way of the legislative branch expanding, as it were, to assist the executive department. Whether that is good or bad, I do not know. However, it strikes me that it is going rather far.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations—Financial statement under authority of S. Res. 246 and sec. 5 of S. Res. 255

Authorization under S. Res. 246			$275,000.00
Authorization under sec. 5 of S. Res. 255			75,000.00
Total			350,000.00
	S. Res. 246 (Feb. 1–Dec. 31, 1960)	S. Res. 255 (sec. 5) (Apr. 1–Dec. 31, 1960)	
Expenditures:			
Salaries	$175,228.62	$40,352.87	
Contract (accounting)	2,804.62	6,000.00	
Per diem (investigators)	6,090.00	3,369.00	
Travel (investigators)	8,204.09	3,901.69	
Recording proceedings	606.60	663.00	
Witness fees	399.00	1,014.00	
Witness travel	174.16	2,041.08	
Office supplies	303.35	140.34	
Telephone and telegraph	1,259.45	3,287.28	
Postage	82.98	5.75	
Documents	254.14	49.24	
Miscellaneous	47.06	143.46	
Total	195,454.07	60,967.71	
Expenses for Jan. 1–31, 1960 (approximate)	23,000.00	11,000.00	
Total	218,454.07	71,967.71	
Total expenditures			290,421.78
Unexpended balance, S. Res. 246		56,545.93	
Unexpended balance, sec. 5 of S. Res. 255		3,032.29	
Total unexpended balance			59,578.22
Total			350,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, was the amendment I offered adopted? I believe it was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed to.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 69), as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to

investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 21, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;
(2) foreign commerce generally;
(3) maritime matters;
(4) interoceanic canals;
(5) transportation policy;
(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
(8) Federal power matters;
(9) civil aeronautics;
(10) fisheries and wildlife;
(11) marine sciences; and
(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $315,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the resolution authorizes the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

First. Interstate commerce generally.
Second. Foreign commerce generally.
Third. Maritime matters.
Fourth. Interoceanic canals.
Fifth. Transportation policy.
Sixth. Domestic surface transportation, including pipelines.
Seventh. Communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites.
Eighth. Federal power matters.
Ninth. Civil aeronautics.
Tenth. Fisheries and Wildlife.
Eleventh. Marine sciences.
Twelfth. Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

Under Senate Resolution 243, of the 86th Congress, 2d session, the committee was originally granted $291,595, but this amount was increased during the year to $303,120, in order to meet salary increases authorized and directed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts having to do with the responsibilities of the committee, including marine sciences, merchant marine and fisheries, communications, aviation, and surface transportation.

There being no objection, the excerpts from a letter, dated January 30, 1961, addressed to Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution would authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to expend not more than $315,000 between February 1, 1961, and January 31, 1962, upon studies and investigations of any and all matters within its jurisdiction. Under Senate Resolution 243, 86th Congress, 2d session, this committee was originally granted $291,595, but this amount was increased during the year to $303,120, in order to meet salary increases authorized and directed by the Senate.

It would appear, therefore, that we are requesting an increase in the amount of $11,880, and while this is a modest figure in itself, the facts are that our committee was authorized by the Senate to expend a total of $620,520 during 1960 (S. Res. 243, S. Res. 244, and S. Res. 305). This request then is actually lower by $305,000 than the funds available to us last year.

* * * * *

YEAR 1961

This committee is faced with a heavy program for the 1st session of the 87th Congress. A clue to our problem is obvious in the fact that the agencies of Government over which we have legislative oversight anticipate budgets totaling $1,846,966,000. In addition, we share responsibility for military air transportation, and military sea transportation, and the two would add almost a billion dollars to the budget figure. In other words, we have responsibility to oversee agencies of the Government spending almost $3 billion each year.

As your committee knows, we operated through standing and special subcommittees. As we see our program for 1961, and of course circumstances may change our plans, it appears as follows:

MARINE SCIENCES

Over and above the everyday problems of our marine industry, is our lag, and it is a real lag, behind some of the major nations of the world, in oceanography. We believe that the United States is lagging in this scientific field, due in part to absence of a national policy, in part to lack of coordination of efforts, activities, and data by Federal agencies engaged in marine research, biology, and surveys, or in providing facilities for such undertakings.

In the Department of Commerce, the U.S. Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Maritime Board are engaged to some degree in scientific and technological marine programs, while the National Bureau of Standards has perfected instruments to assist them.

In the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, and Bureau of Mines have direct interests in the resources of the oceans.

The Office of Education of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department has, or should have, concern for the training of marine scientists.

The Department of the Navy is vitally concerned with the problems presented by undersea operation and protection against enemy submarines in the event of emergency, and for that reason has been the major support for basic oceanographic research projects in many private institutions.

The Atomic Energy Commission has an important role in the design and operation of nuclear-powered ships, in nuclear tests in the marine environment, in ascertaining the effects of fallout on marine life, and in determining the feasibility or risk of disposal of atomic wastes.

The National Science Foundation is directed under the Foundation Act of 1950 to develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences, to initiate and support such research, to evaluate the research programs undertaken by Federal agencies, and to correlate its programs with those undertaken by public and private research groups.

On June 22, 1959, Senate Resolution 136, recommending long-range intensification of marine research, coordination of agency programs, and cooperation with foreign nations in such research on a reciprocal basis subject to approval by the President, was introduced and referred to this committee. The resolution was reported unanimously and, on July 15, was agreed to by the Senate.

On September 11, 1959, S. 2692, cited as the "Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1959," to effectuate through legislation the objectives of the aforementioned resolution, was introduced.

This measure was approved by the Senate on June 23, 1960, but failed in the House. We intend to hear this legislation again, and we are confident it will pass. It is most important to our Nation, but in considering our request for funds, it should be remembered that all this work must be done over, and it should be remembered that this committee was directed to look into this whole problem (S. Res. 136, 86th Cong.).

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

We are still faced with the enactment of permanent legislation to authorize the use of dual-rate contract systems or other exclusive patronage arrangements by common carriers in conferences, approved under section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916. It is of highest priority to U.S. vessel operators in the foreign trades. Current temporary authority for continuing such existing approved contracts (Public Law 542, 86th Cong.) will expire on June 30, 1961.

Extended hearings and a prompt and thorough study of this highly complex and controversial matter is deemed essential in the interests of the shipping conferences and

particularly of their member lines under U.S. registry.

Attention must be given to several phases of cargo preference legislation (Public Law 664, 83d Cong.), including the GAO ruling (temporarily in abeyance) regarding interpretation of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as to computation of 50-percent allocation of Government aid and financed cargoes "separately for dry-bulk carriers, dry-cargo liners, and tankers."

There are also problems of the ocean bulk carriers, inasmuch as bulk cargoes—grains, ores, coal, and petroleum—now constitute two-thirds to three-fourth of our country's total export and import trade.

Only cargo preference has made it possible to maintain a minimum fleet of old, uneconomic bulk vessels. And oil import restrictions have hit the independent tanker industry hard. Owners of both types of vessels are asking assistance of one kind or another from Congress. Without an adequate U.S.-flag tramp fleet, our steel and aluminum industries could suffer drastically in an emergency. Suez pointed up dramatically the need for an adequate tanker fleet.

Coastal and intercoastal shipping must be given consideration, also, if the pitifully small present fleets are to be preserved and strengthened. Recent Interstate Commerce Commission and court decisions on railroad rate cuts aimed at competing, coastal, and intercoastal shipping suggest the need for consideration of legislation to protect these vital links in our country's water transport system.

We know that your committee understands these problems are not new. Rather they are continuing ones, and while we have held hearings, more will be necessary. A continued watchfulness is necessary if we are to do the job the Senate has assigned to us.

We plan hearings to review our maritime program generally, looking toward a program to increase the use of our ships by our citizen shippers, a formula to spread ship construction over all our coastlines, and to improve our merchant marine so that it may regain its proper place in the world.

With respect to fisheries and wildlife, we will again consider legislation on research and studies on insecticides, the Bristol Bay salmon fisheries, bounties on fish predators, fish passage facilities over river dams, and many and varied problems pertaining to game fish, commercial fisheries, and wildfowl and wild animal life.

Certain segments of our fishing industry are in a depressed condition and we must consider legislation to provide a program of assistance to enable them to regain a favorable economic status.

During 1959 we saw an alien fishing fleet move into waters adjacent to Alaska. We must consider legislation to improve and modernize our fishing industry in order to meet our foreign competition. We must not lose our fishing resources to other nations.

Sport fishing continues to grow in popularity and it is apparent it will continue to grow during the foreseeable future. Estimates are that the American public will spend millions of man-days fishing and hunting this year, representing an increase of over 500 percent since 1950. We will have before us legislation to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of this natural resource. A review of the operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, is contemplated this session.

COMMUNICATIONS

Last year we held extensive hearings on legislation that proposed to amend section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, the equal time provisions with respect to political broadcasts. The result was legislation that exempted from that section for 1960 the candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. It was this legislation that enabled our broadcasting industry to present to the whole country what have become known as the great debates.

There is considerable support for legislation that would make the exemption permanent. We must review the effectiveness of our temporary exemption and hold hearings on S. 304, which would make it permanent.

The whole field of communications will be tremendously changed by the use of satellites, so dramatically demonstrated in the past few months. A policy for space communciations, probably via the use of satellites, must be established, and this, of course, will lead to a review of the use of the entire spectrum by both military and civilian users.

The foregoing could well tie into a review of the Weather Bureau, its operations and planning. Certainly this Bureau must consider the feasibility of establishing polar-orbiting weather satellites.

TV channel allocation is a continuing problem, and we are forced to continue to urge the FCC to act. A special ad hoc committee of outstanding experts appointed by this committee to study the allocation of TV channels has reported and more hearings will be necessary. Our aim in this respect is to provide for a nationwide competitive television service. To date, the Federal Communications Commission has failed to develop a specific policy that would assure such a service. The Commission has indicated there are five courses open to it, namely:

1. A 50-channel VHF system, retaining the present 12 VHF channels;

2. A contiguous 50-channel VHF system, retaining the present VHF channels 7 to 12 and withdrawing from television use channels 2 to 6;

3. A contiguous 25-channel VHF system, retaining channels 7 to 13;

4. The present 82-channel VHF–UHF system; and

5. A 70-channel all-UHF system.

The Commission has also advised that "before it can finally agree on one or another of these alternatives, it must ascertain whether a wholesale reallocation of VHF spectrum space would be feasible and in the public interest. In this connection, the Commission is currently exploring with the Government (OCDM) the possibility of reallocating the Government band above 216 megacycles to non-Government use." We are sure that a definite answer to these questions will be given within the next few months.

Subscription television is still a controversial issue, and the Commission has authorized limited tests.

Television network practices are under continued study. The television quiz scandals and payola practices necessitated a complete reappraisal of the adequacy of existing law. The public interest must be protected against fake, misleading, and deceptive practices in the broadcasting industry, but the industry must, in turn, be protected from what could become censorship. It is clear that continued hearings are essential.

We anticipate additional hearings on legislation concerning communications common carriers in the domestic and international fields. Over 17 years ago, Congress issued a mandate requiring Western Union to divest itself of its international operations. For a variety of reasons, this company is still unable to accomplish this divestiture and legislation may be necessary.

We are deeply concerned with the problems confronting educational television. We reported legislation on this subject last year, but the bill failed in the House. New developments and new legislation will necessitate additional hearings.

Extensive hearings were held by the committee on the community antenna and booster problems. The so-called booster bill passed the Congress and was signed by the President. The so-called community antenna bill was reported favorably by the committee but failed in the Senate. Further hearings were held on this entire subject during the adjournment period. This is an extremely controversial subject and will take up a great deal of the time of the committee.

AVIATION

We plan to continue our study of aviation safety, together with a study and review of the operations of the Federal Aviation Agency. While it is said that the air carrier industry has successfully made the transition from propeller to jet aircraft, the fact is that only one airline now is completely jet powered, and it is not a major trunkline. Further, we are faced with a recommendation to establish a program for the development of a supersonic transport aircraft, probably capable of speeds over 2,000 miles per hour, with the attendant changes in airfields and all other supporting equipment.

In this respect, the Federal Airport Act must be amended this year and extensive hearings will start in the very near future.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

We have our staff report on national transportation policy, which deals mostly with surface transport problems, and which raises very controversial questions. The Department of Commerce has also issued its report on this subject, neither of which will win any citation for brevity. They must be studied, hearings must be held, and possibly legislation prepared.

In addition, in the near future this committee will receive a report on the commuter problem. The study is of the New York-New Jersey area, and we can be sure that it will necessitate extensive hearings, some probably in the field.

The piggyback problem, truck versus rail, has become acute again, and we are being flooded with mail. The supply of freight cars, the discontinuance of passenger trains, railroad mergers, through and joint rates, the problem of Government ownership of the Alaska Railroad, all these problems merely highlight the workload we face in this field.

I have mentioned our transportation report. Our staff report on foreign trade will be in print soon, and this will lead to hearings and legislation. In fact the first of the hearings arising from this report are set for the first week in February, on S. 610, a bill to establish an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce. We can expect up to 100 bills from the executive departments, boards, and commissions over which we have jurisdiction, many of which will also require hearings so that proper information may be developed on them.

The workload of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is determined by our plans as highlighted above, together with whatever additional legislation is referred to us by the Senate. In view of our wide jurisdiction and the volume of work it covers, we believe you will agree with the unanimous views of our committee that this request is reasonable.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the budget of

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which was submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate certain matters under its jurisdiction pursuant to S. Res. 74, for the period of Feb. 1, 1961, through Jan. 31, 1962

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Professional staff members in following general fields: Aviation, communications, marine sciences, general transportation, merchant marine and Coast Guard, fisheries and wildlife, auto-marketing practices, foreign commerce, and regulatory agencies	5	$8,000	$16,102.90	$1,341.90	$68,437.32
	1	7,320	14,907.83	1,242.31	3,726.96
	1	7,080	14,486.03	1,207.16	3,621.51
	1	6,180	12,904.32	1,075.36	12,904.32
	[1] 4	6,000	12,587.99	1,048.99	50,351.96
	1	5,520	11,744.39	978.69	11,744.39
	1	5,280	11,322.60	943.55	11,322.60
	1	4,980	10,756.25	896.35	10,756.25
	1	4,680	10,176.30	848.02	10,176.30
	1	4,560	9,940.62	828.38	9,940.62
	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
	1	4,080	8,968.51	747.37	2,242.13
	1	2,880	6,538.19	544.84	6,538.19
Clerical staff: Clerical assistants and stenographers	1	4,200	9,211.53	767.62	9,211.53
	2	2,940	6,659.70	554.97	13,319.40
	2	2,640	6,052.11	504.34	3,026.06
	1	2,580	5,930.60	494.21	5,930.60
	1	2,520	5,809.07	484.08	5,809.07
	2	2,460	5,687.56	473.96	11,375.12
	2	2,220	5,201.49	433.45	10,402.98
Total	31				270,048.84
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries)					17,553.17
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)					2,514.72
Contribution to employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000)					1,088.64
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					14,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,300.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph, postage)					3,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					794.63
Total, administrative expense					44,951.16
Grand total, S. Res. 74					315,000.00

[1] Includes part-time consultants, 1 man-year.

Funds requested, S. Res. 74, $315,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 74), as amended, was agreed to.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 37, Senate Resolution 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The resolution (S. Res. 60) to examine and review the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "consultants", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross paid to any other employee"; and in line 16, after "January 31,", to strike out "1961" and insert "1962", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more, than $1,400 than the highest gross paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $45,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am chairman of the subcommittee which deals with matters relating to the resolution. Last year we received $65,000. We returned to the Government, unexpended, approximately $10,000. It will be noted that the resolution calls for $45,000, which is a cut of almost one-third from the amount provided last year.

The subcommittee is trying to conclude this work. It will be noticed that each year in the past we have either returned funds or reduced the amount of funds needed. It is our sincere hope that we will be able in the coming year, with the cooperation of the Department of Justice and the Department of State, to bring this matter to a successful ending. At least, that is our hope. I am working with and have been having conferences with the representatives of the Department of State and also the Department of Justice in this matter, and there is a strong possibility of our being able to conclude the work this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I say more power to the Senator.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the budget submitted by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19	$1,347.76	$16,173.19
Investigator	1	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	5,323.02

Budget—Continued

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF—continued					
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerk	1	3,420	7,631.82	635.98	7,631.82
Clerk-typist	1	2,280	5,323.02	443.58	5,323.02
Stenographer	1	2,040	4,836.96	403.08	4,836.96
Total	5				39,288.01
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)					140.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund					2,553.72
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance					132.84
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					300.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					300.00
Witness fees, expenses					50.00
Stationery					375.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					150.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					50.00
Contingent fund					1,660.43
Total					5,711.99
Grand total					45,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 60, $45,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement relating to the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON

Senate Resolution 60 provides the small sum of $45,000 for the Judiciary Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act. This is a reduction of $20,000 from the amount carried in last year's Resolution No. 236. Of the $65,000 authorized last year, by close economy, we were enabled to return an unexpended balance of approximately $10,000.

During the year 1960, besides reviewing and examining the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948, the subcommittee considered 17 separate and different bills. As a result of these studies, the Judiciary Committee favorably reported 7 bills to the Senate. These bills were pending for action by the Senate at the time of the adjournment last year.

From very recent press reports it would appear that executive negotiations are in process which may well lead to an agreeable legislative settlement of the vested assets problems. Upon the conclusion of the pending discussions, I feel legislation will be offered which, if enacted, will terminate one phase of the work of the subcommittee. The other phase relates to our war damage claims.

The previous administration submitted a war damage claims bill which was inadequate in some respects. I believe the new administration will recommend more comprehensive legislation which we will want the subcommittee to consider and act upon. Certainly this part of the twofold problem cannot be ignored or put off any longer.

While I would like to give assurance that the entire work of the subcommittee may be terminated this year, I cannot give this definite assurance until adequate war damage claims legislation has been formulated and enacted. The present administration must be given some time to formulate its recommendations and to submit the same for our consideration. I believe, however, that positive suggestions will be forthcoming and definite and final action is very much a possibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 60), as amended, was agreed to.

MAKING OF EXPENDITURES AND EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY PERSONNEL BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 38, Senate Resolution 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Calendar No. 38, Senate Resolution 81, is an original resolution requesting the sum of $100,000 for the use of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections for the fiscal year beginning February 1, 1961, and ending January 31, 1962.

The general election campaigns of 1960, the national publicity focused upon both campaigns for nomination, and election and the investigations conducted by the subcommittee following the receipt of complaints, all point to the real need for revision or replacement of laws pertaining to the overall elective process.

Obsolete or inadequate ceilings on campaign contributions and expenditures and the lack of full public disclosure of the sources of such money and the manner in which it is spent was clearly demonstrated during the course of last year's campaigns.

Absence of a uniform system of nominating and electing candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States resulted in tremendous expenses by candidates' political committees, and parties. Preference primaries were conducted in about 16 States, but not in others, and final selections were made only at the national conventions. Large numbers of voters feel that they have no real part to play in the selection of national candidates.

The vastly increased cost of radio and television broadcasts during political campaigns has raised the issue of granting some Federal assistance toward the payment of such broadcasts.

Thousands of voters, without fault on their part, have been deprived of the right to vote because of their failure to meet residence requirements due to removals from one State to another.

Many other issues were brought forth during 1960; some for the first time, and some for the third, fourth, or fifth time.

Mr. President, this year, in recognition of the election law problems which are in need of study and consideration, Members of the Senate have introduced a wide variety of legislative remedies.

S. 102, S. 228, and Senate Joint Resolution 10, introduced respectively by Senators ENGLE, MANSFIELD, and SMATHERS, propose studies and improvements in the existing methods of nominating and electing the President and Vice President.

S. 254 and S. 752, introduced by Senators BEALL, BYRD of Virginia, BUTLER, and CAPEHART, recommend broad changes in the Hatch Political Activities Act.

S. 165, introduced by Senators MORSE and HUMPHREY, would require detailed reports on all sources of income by certain Federal officers.

S. 604, introduced by Senator LONG of Missouri, calls for sweeping revision of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

S. 478, by Mr. JAVITS, would prohibit the payment of poll taxes.

Mr. President, all of those bills have been referred by the Committee on Rules and Administration to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections for consideration. They constitute a formidable array of legislative remedies ranging over the very comprehensive field of Federal election laws and related areas.

Adequate and painstaking study of those bills, as well as other matters chosen for research by the subcommittee, cannot be done overnight or on an inadequate budget. Studies, research, and public hearings must be scheduled, and an appropriation sufficient to meet that program must be commensurate with the value and importance of the work to be done.

The budget and report, as well as the resolution under consideration today, were approved first by the subcommittee and then unanimously by the full membership of the Rules Committee.

The staff consists at this time of three persons, and it will not be supplemented, except as needed, by competent personnel.

Mr. President, I request favorable approval of the resolution by the Senate.

Mr. President, I understand a number of other bills will be introduced, which will be referred to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

At the present time, the committee has requested in the resolution $100,000. This is $60,000 less than the amount requested last year by the same subcommittee.

The subcommittee believes it can hold hearings on the proposed legislation and accomplish some very direct and beneficial results if the Senate sees fit to approve the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the original purpose of the subcommittee was merely to hold hearings in case of disputed elections. Is it correct that the subcommittee is now burdened with the duty of studying bills affecting elections?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. The subcommittee is charged with investigating, examining, investigating, and making a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; and presidential succession.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago the Senator mentioned the figure of $60,000. My record shows that the entire amount asked for last year, for this committee, was $180,000. Am I correct or in error?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator has given an erroneous figure. The committee received an authorization last year for $160,000, and of that figure spent approximately $70,000. It is returning $90,000 from last year's operations.

Mr. ELLENDER. So the amount of $100,000 is $60,000 less than was asked for last year?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$16,173.19		$16,173.19
Assistant counsel	1	4,860	10,524.28		10,524.28
Minority counsel	1	6,840	14,064.24		14,064.24
Chief investigator	1	4,620	10,060.30		10,060.30
Editorial and research:					
Research director	1	4,620	10,060.30		10,060.30
Research assistant	1	3,600	7,996.37		7,996.37
Administrative and clerical: Stenographer	2	2,400	5,566.05		11,132.10
Total	8				80,010.78
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					648.96
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,200.70
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					275.40
Reimbursable payments to agencies					3,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					2,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					364.16
Total					19,989.22
Grand total					100,000.00

NOTE.—Funds requested, S. Res. 81, $100,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
(2) corrupt practices;
(3) contested elections;
(4) credentials and qualifications;
(5) Federal elections generally; and
(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill to implement the President's proposal to provide health insurance for the aged through our social security and railroad retirement systems, and to make a statement thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New Mexico may proceed with his statement.

The bill (S. 909) to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Senators DOUGLAS, HARTKE, MCCARTHY, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, LONG of Hawaii, RANDOLPH, ENGLE, MAGNUSON, PELL, and BURDICK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the President of the United States, in his special message on health and hospital care, has asked the Congress to take action to meet one of the most urgent challenges this country faces at home—action that will help the older generation of today and tomorrow, in your community and mine, meet a pressing problem that cannot be wished away. I know that the Congress will not turn aside from this challenge.

As a step toward the action that I believe the Senate will take to meet this great challenge, I am today introducing, for myself and other Senators, S. 909—a bill to implement the President's proposal to provide health insurance for the aged through our social security and railroad retirement systems. To say that this bill is very important to the millions of aged persons who sorely need help in meeting the costs of medical care is an understatement. The bill, which is a companion bill to H.R. 4222 already introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative CECIL R. KING of California, is vital to their welfare, to

the welfare of their families, and to the welfare of the Nation. I trust that we will soon have an opportunity to vote on it.

A SOUND APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM

My bill would finance the health care needs of the aged on a sound basis, without any drain on general revenues. It would do so through the tested mechanism of social insurance, making it possible for people to provide for their medical needs in old age during their working years as they do now for their income in old age. Like the present social security benefits, health insurance protection would be provided as a right that is earned through work and paid for out of earnings, and there would be no requirement that the aged persons or their relatives subject themselves to the humiliation of inquiry by the Government into their private affairs. Moreover, the health benefits would be provided without interfering with the patient's free choice of physician or facilities and without altering the present form or organization of medical practices.

The bill that we are introducing today has much similarity to the proposal that was cosponsored last session by our esteemed former colleague, President Kennedy, and received strong support in this body. At the same time, of course, there are differences between S. 909 and our proposal of last year. These differences make for a better program.

Like the earlier proposal, S. 909 would provide insurance to meet the cost of a wide range of services. It contains provisions designed to encourage the use of the most economical and most readily available type of service that will satisfactorily meet the need, rather than a more expensive type of service. Like the former proposal, the bill would require that the patient bear part of the cost of some of the services he gets, so that the cost of the program will be kept low, so that there will be safeguards against unnecessary use of health services, and so that the high administrative costs of handling small claims will be minimized. Finally, S. 909 again offers the all-important assurance that the Federal Government will not be supervising health care and health facilities. In short, the essential elements of the proposal of last year have been endorsed by the administration and are incorporated into S. 909.

IMPROVEMENTS OVER LAST YEAR'S PROPOSAL

While embodying the essentials of that proposal, the new plan in S. 909 includes substantial improvements. A great deal of study has been devoted to the subject of health care for the aged since the matter was considered in the Senate last August. The task force appointed by the President-elect soon after the November election has made significant contributions to the study of the problem. The distinguished specialists in the welfare and health fields who made up the task force reviewed the proposals for action relating to the health and welfare needs of the country, and formulated very helpful recommendations. The criticisms that were made of last year's proposal, including the objections that were raised during the debate in the Senate, have been examined and evaluated by experts in medical care, social insurance, welfare, and financing; and steps have been taken to meet those that were found to have validity. As a result of this intensive work, a distinctly improved plan has been developed. I am highly gratified that this is so.

One of the improvements is that S. 909 would provide protection not only for elderly persons who are social security beneficiaries, but also for elderly railroad retirement annuitants. Another improvement is that the age of eligibility for the health insurance benefits would be age 65, rather than age 68. Still another improvement is that the role of the States and professional organizations has been developed and spelled out in detail, to assure that to the greatest practical extent they will be used in administering the program.

A BALANCED PROGRAM OF SERVICES

My bill provides for payment of costs of inpatient hospital services, of subsequent skilled nursing-home care, of certain home health services, and of outpatient hospital diagnostic services. This group of services represents a balanced program for meeting basic health needs—a program that would promote the best interests of the beneficiary and of his community. The services provided would make possible a step-by-step progression of care as the patient's condition changes. A person who requires expensive diagnostic services that can be provided for him on an outpatient basis would not need to become a bed patient in a hospital, in order to have his expenses paid through the plan. On the other hand, an acutely ill person who needs intensive care could have much of his inpatient hospital care paid for; and when his condition is no longer so acute as to require general hospital care, if his physician finds that he still needs substantially full-time skilled nursing care, the program would help to pay the cost of the required care in a skilled nursing facility. Similarly, since home health services provided for in the bill consist of visiting nurse and similar care, a beneficiary who needs only part-time skilled nursing service at home would have protection against the costs of such medically necessary services.

Thus, unlike health-insurance policies covering only hospital care, the proposed program would not discourage the use of medical institutions other than hospitals, or of home health facilities, where medically indicated. By placing proper emphasis on early diagnosis and on care outside the hospital, my bill would release hospital beds for the care of the acutely ill who need the intensive care that only a hospital can furnish.

The availability of protection against the costs of outpatient hospital diagnostic services would tend to prevent the abuses that have occurred under some hospital insurance plans that pay for hospital services only if given on an inpatient basis. The availability of this protection would be a distinct advantage to the beneficiary, too. At present, fear of the high cost of diagnostic services is in many instances a barrier to the detection and early treatment of maladies that grow worse when treatment is delayed. As a result of earlier diagnosis and treatment and avoidance of unnecessary hospital admissions, payment of the cost of outpatient services would result in medical care that is not only effective but economical.

A SOUND AND CONSERVATIVE PROGRAM

In order to keep the program on a sound and conservative basis, the bill places certain limitations on the services provided. With respect to inpatient hospital services, only the costs of semiprivate accommodations would be paid, except for cases in which private accommodations are medically necessary. Private duty nursing services would not be covered; but all nursing services customarily provided by the hospital, including as intensive nursing care as might be necessary, would be paid for.

In order to assure a conservative program, first-dollar coverage would not be provided. There would be a deductible amount—to be paid by the patient—of $10 for each of the first 9 days of inpatient hospital care during a period of hospital illness, with a minimum deductible amount of $20. A deductible amount of $20 is provided for each diagnostic study that a beneficiary has as a hospital outpatient.

The desire for a prudent approach in a new area is the reason for the limitations on the number of days of hospital and skilled nursing-home care for which insurance benefits may be paid during an illness. These limitations are much less severe than those in the great majority of health plans available to the aged, and they would not prevent the plan from affording very substantial help to those who face the heavy costs of catastrophic illnesses.

For each illness, payment could be made for a combination of services, including up to 90 days of inpatient hospital care or 180 days of skilled nursing-home care. The total number of days for which payment could be made during a period of illness is 150 units; a unit equals 1 day of hospital inpatient care or 2 days of skilled nursing-home care. Under this provision, even if a person with a severe heart condition remained in a hospital for 90 days or more, he would be eligible for payment for 120 days of skilled nursing-home care after his hospitalization. If his condition permitted him to go to a nursing home after 60 or fewer days of hospitalization, he could have 180 days of nursing-home care paid for. Thus, there would be an incentive to use, where appropriate, nursing-home services, rather than hospital services. No more than 240 home health-care visits could be paid for in a calendar year.

Under my bill, providers of service who wish to participate in the plan would enter into agreements under which they would be paid for the reasonable cost of the services they furnish under the plan. The program would follow practices already well established and accepted by the hospitals in their relationships with Blue Cross, with States, and with other Federal programs. Thus, the program would tie in with the customary practices of hospitals. If a hospital custom-

arily provided a given service for its patients, that service would be paid for under the plan.

PARTICIPATION OF HEALTH CARE AGENCIES

General conditions for the participation of hospitals, skilled nursing homes, and agencies providing organized home health services are spelled out in the bill. In addition, in the interest of keeping the program in a close relationship with developments in the professions, the bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council. The Council would assist the Secretary in formulating general policy and in developing, for the health and safety of beneficiaries, conditions for participation by providers of services. The States would also play an important role; the Secretary would use appropriate State agencies in determining which providers of health services satisfy the conditions for participation. The State agencies would also have the authority to make recommendations for supplementing the conditions for participation in their respective States, where this is appropriate. Thus, the States would be encouraged in their efforts to improve the quality of care provided to their citizens.

FINANCING THE PLAN

The health insurance program provided for in my bill would be financed by adding one-fourth of 1 percent, each, to the employers' and the employees' social security tax rates, and by adding three-eighths of 1 percent to the tax rate for self-employed persons, effective in 1963. Also, the maximum on yearly taxable earnings would be increased from $4,800 to $5,000, beginning with 1962. Raising this base would improve the benefit structure of the social security program generally, and would also provide additional income, which, together with the income from the contribution rate increase, would fully meet all of the cost—six-tenths of 1 percent of covered payroll on a long-range basis—of the health insurance program.

UNFOUNDED OBJECTIONS TO THE PLAN

Last August, when the proposal for health insurance benefits for the aged under the social security system was debated here, one objection to it that evidently was taken very seriously was that the plan left out too many aged persons. It was said that if health insurance benefits were provided for people age 65 and over, through the social security system, 4 million of our senior citizens would be left without protection.

Mr. President, this is just not so. Actually, when the plan proposed in S. 909 goes into effect, all but half a million—not 4 million, but a half million—of our aged citizens will have health protection available to them under a public program. Less than 4 percent of the people aged 65 or over will lack such protection; and if they are medically indigent, this last half-million might be cared for under the Kerr-Mills bill passed by the last Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table giving projectures of coverage for people 65 and over.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Population age 65 and over: Estimates of eligibility for health protection under public programs[1] as of January 1963

	Age 65 and over, number (in millions)
Total aged persons	16¾
Entitled to benefits under OASI	13¾
Railroad retirement annuitants	½
Annuitants under Federal staff retirement systems	¼
Recipients under other Government systems:	
Veterans' programs	½
Old-age assistance[2]	1¼
Not under any Government program	½

[1] In this table persons eligible under old-age and survivors insurance or the railroad retirement system and also under some other public programs are shown only under OASI and railroad retirement.

[2] In some States the provisions for medical assistance under the old-age assistance program are quite limited; these limitations, generally speaking, do not result from any lack of provision in the Federal law but rather the fact that the State programs in question have not developed to the point where they utilize all the available Federal grants.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at the time when the health insurance provisions of my bill become effective, there will be about 16¾ million people age 65 and over in this country. Of these 16¾ million people, 14¼ million—all but 2½ million of the total—will be protected by the program because they are entitled to social security benefits or railroad retirement annuities.

Now let us take a look at these 2½ million people. About one-fourth million of them will be getting benefits under staff retirement programs of the Federal Government. Legislation enacted last year established a comprehensive health-insurance benefit program for already retired Federal employees, effective on July 1 of this year. Under the Government employees' health insurance program now in effect for active employees, Federal employees not already retired can carry their health insurance protection over into retirement—with the Federal Government, as their former employer, helping to pay the cost of the protection.

Among the remaining aged persons who would not be eligible under social security or railroad retirement, there will be about half a million getting veterans' compensation or veterans' pension. In addition to the cash benefits that they receive, these persons generally can obtain comprehensive health care under the veterans' program.

Over 1¼ million of the remaining aged elderly people who would not be covered under S. 909 will be on the old-age assistance rolls when the new program goes into effect. Having already met a test of need under the assistance programs, these people will be eligible, without undergoing a further test of need, for whatever medical assistance is provided by the States in which they live.

There remain, then, about half a million aged persons—not 4 million, but half a million—who may need help in order to meet their medical-care costs, and to whom such help would not be available under social security or some other public program. These people, as I have said, constitute less than 4 percent of the total number of aged persons. The group includes some who are institutionalized and who are receiving complete care at public expense.

Some others in the group will be able to qualify under the program of medical assistance to the aged enacted last year. No one can reasonably argue that we must deny the overwhelming majority of the aged the great advantages of health insurance protection under the social security program because there would still be a few people who are not eligible for health benefits under this or one of the other public programs.

Let me emphasize that the figures I have presented deal with the situation as it would be at the time when the new plan would go into effect. As time goes on, the percentage of people who reach retirement age without having protection under social insurance grows smaller. Within a comparatively short time, practically all of the aged will have social insurance protection. To suggest that more than 14¼ million of our senior citizens should be denied the advantage of health insurance benefits under the social insurance system because in the beginning there would be about one-half million of the aged who neither are under social security nor are assured of continuing protection against the cost of illness under some other public program—thus having to rely on the medical assistance program if the need arises—is to take a very short view, indeed.

In fact, the provision of health insurance benefits under social security and railroad retirement would greatly reduce the amount of State and local funds that will have to be raised if the State medical assistance programs, set up under the terms of the Kerr-Mills bill enacted last year, are to be effective. I favored the Kerr-Mills bill, and I recognize the necessity for the medical assistance program which it established. But I recognize, too, that in the health insurance area, just as in the area of income maintenance for the aged and for the disabled, the State assistance programs will be able to do a better job if basic needs are met through social insurance and if the States do not have to carry the burden of meeting these needs. When the old-age and survivors insurance program was expanded and liberalized in the early 1950's, the public assistance programs were enabled to do a better job in supplementing the basic social insurance program. The same kind of thing happened after the old-age and survivors insurance program was extended to provide disability benefits.

Here, again, in the field of benefits covering health costs, following the enactment of a program under social insurance the States would be able to liberalize their income tests and otherwise move in the direction of a meaningful and effective health care program for the few aged persons who still would need help in meeting their health-care

costs. As former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion Folsom said recently, "A nationwide system of social insurance against health costs of the aged is logical for the same reasons that the old-age retirement annuity system had to be financed on a nationwide, rather than a State, basis."

We are being urged, before proceeding with a health insurance plan under social security, to wait to see to what extent the States implement the 1960 legislation for the medically indigent. But the latter program is not a substitute for a social insurance program. The purpose of the assistance program is to help people after dependency has occurred. The purpose of social insurance is to enable people to remain independent.

Another thing that I want to make clear is that my bill is not a replacement for private insurance or employer plans for protection against health costs. My bill, by relieving employer plans and Blue Cross and other community health plans of the problem of providing for the aged who cannot pay their own way in health insurance today, would strengthen these plans, lowering their costs and permitting their expansion. Furthermore, my bill would provide basic protection, on which the aged would build insurance against physicians' and dentists' bills and drug costs. My bill is not a replacement for State programs or private insurance; there is, and will continue to be, a place for all of these.

TIME FOR ACTION NOW

Mr. President, I think that each of us here is aware of the gravity of the problem confronting our elderly people. We have seen the statistics showing the rapidly increasing costs of medical care. We have been told, and we know it is true, that older people do not have the resources with which to pay expensive medical bills, and that they cannot afford to pay for private insurance that would give them adequate protection against high medical-care costs. The need for action is clear.

The long-established and highly successful social security system is made to order as a method of financing medical care for our older people. And the same is true of our railroad retirement system. During the past quarter of a century we have seen demonstrated the soundness of the social insurance approach. Under our social insurance system, workers, employers, and the self-employed contribute during their working years to provide protection against the risk of loss of income due to old age, disability, or death. Workers and their families can now face the future with the knowledge that they will have income in the form of benefits earned through work and paid for out of earnings. Millions of our people are making plans for building a good life in retirement, by adding, through their savings, to what they can expect from the basic social insurance program. But their hopes for a secure life in retirement are dimmed by the realization that one expensive illness can wipe out the savings of a lifetime. Use of the contributory social insurance approach for financing medical care for the aged would provide assurance not only to the aged, but also to people who are currently working and to generations yet to come, that their medical needs in old age will be met without their facing the humiliation of having to prove that they cannot pay their own way.

We are a Nation on the move in a fast-moving world. No people can maintain its vigor, its spirit, and its ability to compete and win, if its vision of tomorrow is shadowed by the fear of insecurity caused by ill health. No people can maintain its unity, or indeed its self-respect, by turning away from those whose vigor is spent. No people can look to the future with confidence if the not-so-old foresee themselves in the predicament that those who were not-so-old yesterday are in. We must take steps to make sure that those who are old today, and those who will follow tomorrow, have health insurance protection in their later years, on a financially sound basis. The great need is clear. The right and well tested way is clear. The time for action is now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary explanation of the health insurance proposal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE PROPOSAL

PERSONS ENTITLED

Protection against the cost of inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, skilled nursing home, and home health services would be provided for persons who have reached age 65 and are entitled to monthly benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program or under the railroad retirement system.

SCOPE AND DURATION OF BENEFITS PROVIDED

The services for which payment would be made under the proposal would be:

1. Inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days. Hospital services would include all those customarily furnished by a hospital for its patients, and would be subject to a deductible amount (paid by the patient) of $10 a day for up to 9 days, with a minimum of $20;

2. skilled nursing home services, after the patient is transferred from a hospital, for up to 180 days;

3. outpatient hospital diagnostic services, as required, subject to a $20 deductible amount for each diagnostic study;

4. home health services for up to 240 visits during a calendar year. These services would include intermittent nursing care, therapy, and part-time homemaker services.

An individual could be eligible for up to 90 days of hospital services and 180 days of skilled nursing home services in each period of illness, but subject to a maximum of 150 units of service. A unit of service would be equal to: 1 day of inpatient hospital services or 2 days of skilled nursing home services. Thus, if during a period of illness a beneficiary transferred from a hospital to a skilled nursing home after 60 days, payment could be made for the 60 days of hospital care and for up to 180 days of his skilled nursing home care. If the beneficiary transferred after 95 days in the hospital, payment could be made for 90 days of hospital care and up to 120 days of his skilled nursing home care. A new period of illness would not begin until 90 days had elapsed in which the patient was neither in a hospital or a skilled nursing home.

BASIS OF REIMBURSEMENT

Payments to the providers of service would be made on the basis of the reasonable cost incurred in providing care for beneficiaries. The amount paid under the program would be payment in full for covered services, except, of course, that the provider could charge the patient the amounts of the deductibles and extra charges for a private room or private duty nursing.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

Responsibility for administration of the program for social security beneficiaries would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Considerable reliance would be placed upon the States to assure that local conditions would be taken into account. The Secretary would consult with appropriate State agencies and recognized national accrediting bodies in formulating the conditions of participation for providers of service. In addition, the Secretary would have the authority to utilize State agencies to perform the administrative functions of determining whether a provider meets the conditions for participation and to provide consultative services to providers. Provision would be made for the establishment of an advisory council which would advise the Secretary on policy matters in connection with administration.

In order to be eligible to participate in the program, providers of service would have to meet specified conditions to assure the health and safety of the beneficiaries. If it desired, a State could recommend that more strict conditions be applied with respect to providers of service within that State.

FINANCING

The program would cost 0.6 percent of covered payroll. In the early years of the program, benefit payments would amount to slightly more than $1 billion a year. The social security contribution rates would be increased one-fourth of 1 percent on employers and one-fourth of 1 percent on employees and three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed, effective in 1963. The taxable earnings base would be increased from $4,800 to $5,000 a year, beginning with 1962. Raising the earnings base would improve the benefit structure of the system generally and would also provide additional income which together with the income from the contribution rate increase would fully meet all health insurance costs.

EFFECTIVE DATES

Payments would be made with respect to inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, and home health services provided on or after October 1, 1962, and for skilled nursing home services furnished on or after July 1, 1963.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at this point I wish to refer to an article by Howard A. Rusk, a physician who writes a column in the New York Times. Dr. Rusk wrote yesterday:

The primary difference between President Kennedy's proposals and those advocated by others, particularly the American Medical Association, centers on the factor of compulsory participation versus voluntary participation.

Although Mr. Kennedy does not bring out the following point specifically, it is the crux of the question: The very groups of individuals who are economically most likely to need health insurance benefits in their old age are the least likely to take out voluntary health insurance during their working years.

As a result, they must depend upon public assistance provided by tax funds for medical care in their later years.

Consequently, the more prudent people who elect to take out health insurance un-

der a voluntary system end up not only paying for their own health insurance, but paying through taxes for the medical care of the less prudent who did not take out insurance.

For a variety of reasons, many groups and individuals will strongly oppose President Kennedy's proposals on health insurance for the aged. After a careful analysis of the proposed plan, this writer believes it to be the most logical and efficient approach to this critical problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1961]

ISSUES ON HEALTH—I: MEDICAL CARE PLAN FOR THE AGED STIRS DISAGREEMENT ON WAY TO FINANCE IT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

In his special message to Congress on Thursday on health and hospital care, President Kennedy summarized in the first sentence his philosophy on the Government's role in health.

He said, "The health of our Nation is a key to its future—to its economic vitality, to the morale and efficiency of its citizens, to our success in achieving our own goals, and demonstrating to others the benefits of a free society."

Under six major headings, the President made a series of specific recommendations, all of which would carry out pledges he made directly or indirectly during his campaign.

The headings were: health insurance for the aged, community health services and facilities, increasing health personnel, improving the health of children and youth, vocational rehabilitation and medical research.

DISPUTE ON METHODOLOGY

Although the President made specific recommendations for more Federal responsibility in all six of these fields, in two of the areas there has been sharp disagreement on methodology. These are health insurance for the aged and increasing health personnel.

Except for the recommendation for a new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development within the National Institutes of Health, recommendations under the four other headings were primarily to increase the size, scope, and effectiveness of existing programs.

The disagreements on health insurance for the aged and on increasing health personnel are not over the need for such programs. Everyone agrees that the ever-increasing numbers of older persons need health insurance protection. Similarly, with few exceptions, everyone recognizes the Nation's need for more physicians, dentists, public health specialists, nurses, and other medical personnel.

The issue is how to meet and finance these needs.

President Kennedy, as expected, proposed health insurance for the aged through the social security system. His plan would provide these things:

Inpatient hospital services up to 90 days for one illness, for all costs in excess of $10 a day for the first 9 days and full costs for the remaining 81 days.

Nursing home services up to 180 days immediately following discharge from a hospital.

Hospital outpatient clinic diagnostic services for all costs in excess of $20.

Community visiting nurse services and related home health services for a limited time.

The President proposes that these insurance benefits be available to all persons aged 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits.

The program would be financed by an increase in social security contributions of one-quarter of 1 percent each for employers and employees and by increasing from $4,800 to $5,000 a year the maximum base on which payments are made.

The President's arguments are convincing in favor of his proposal over the legislation enacted last year. The latter program provides Federal funds to assist the needy aged who are receiving welfare assistance to meet their medical bills. It is primarily a plan for Federal grants to the States, who must administer the program and help finance it; it is extremely cumbersome administratively.

DIGNITY OF INDIVIDUAL

Mr. Kennedy argues that his plan provides coverage for the great majority of older persons who do not seek medical care at the taxpayers' expense through welfare, but who lack the funds to pay for the care they need. He terms his proposals "consistent with the dignity of the individual."

He points out also that the self-supporting insurance method of financing the cost of such services should eventually reduce the number of persons requiring care under public assistance, and would thus leave State and local funds to provide services not included under his proposal and not covered by social security.

The plan, he stresses, is a modest proposal designed to meet absolutely essential needs and has sufficient deductible requirements to discourage abuses.

Mr. Kennedy also nailed down the oft-raised cry of socialized medicine. He pointed out there is absolute free choice of physician and hospital, and that no physicians' fees are involved, covered, or affected in any manner by the plan.

The primary difference between President Kennedy's proposals and those advocated by others, particularly the American Medical Association, centers on the factor of compulsory participation versus voluntary participation.

CRUX OF THE QUESTION

Although Mr. Kennedy does not bring out the following point specifically, it is the crux of the question: The very groups of individuals who are economically most likely to need health insurance benefits in their old age are the least likely to take out voluntary health insurance during their working years.

As a result, they must depend upon public assistance provided by tax funds for medical care in their later years.

Consequently, the more prudent people who elect to take out health insurance under a voluntary system end up not only paying for their own health insurance, but paying through taxes for the medical care of the less prudent who did not take out insurance.

For a variety of reasons, many groups and individuals will strongly oppose President Kennedy's proposals on health insurance for the aged. After a careful analysis of the proposed plan, this writer believes it to be the most logical and efficient approach to this critical problem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a New York Times editorial on February 10, 1961, made this comment on the President's proposal:

Such a program could be put into effect nationally at one and the same time and by an organization already trained and fitted for the task. It would put all States and beneficiaries on an equal basis. It would avoid any further use of the hated means test. And none of it would be financed from general tax revenue. Much of its cost would, in fact, be covered by those who would stand to benefit directly from it.

Another great advantage of this setup would be its avoidance of anything that could honestly be called socialized medicine. Every beneficiary would be free to choose his own doctor and hospital. And there would be no Government supervision or control of the practice of medicine or of the services of any hospital.

I ask that the complete editorial be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1969]

HEALTH GOALS FOR THE NATION

President Kennedy yesterday presented in his message to Congress a masterly overall view of the Nation's health problems and a challenging, if somewhat staggering, bill of particulars as to how he thinks the Federal Government ought to deal with them.

He laid special emphasis, as he should, on the health of both the oldest and the youngest of Americans. Their needs are the greatest, both in terms of their proportion of the total population and of the exceptional degree of protection they ought to have. All the proposals he has made, however, are designed to serve the welfare of the entire Nation—through more medical research, more and better trained personnel and hospital expansion and development.

But the President's bill of particulars for action carries no price tags—either in total or as to its various items. This is a baffling omission. The figures will have to come later—but the sooner the better. Meanwhile, it is well to remember that, as the President has said, "the health of our Nation is a key to its future * * * to our success in achieving our own goals and demonstrating to others the benefits of a free society." What is necessary to protect the Nation's health must be done—and paid for.

In the case of the elderly, the President has wisely proposed a health insurance program administered by the social security system and financed by an increase of one-quarter of 1 percent each in the contributions of employers and employees. It would provide hospital care up to 3 months (free of any charge after the first 9 days and of expenses over $10 a day before that), outpatient diagnostic services (free after $20 is paid), and nursing home care and visiting nurse services for a limited period.

Such a program could be put into effect nationally at one and the same time and by an organization already trained and fitted for the task. It would put all States and beneficiaries on an equal basis. It would avoid any further use of the hated means test. And none of it would be financed from general tax revenue. Much of its cost would, in fact, be covered by those who would stand to benefit directly from it.

Another great advantage of this setup would be its avoidance of anything that could honestly be called socialized medicine. Every beneficiary would be free to choose his own doctor and hospital. And there would be no Government supervision or control of the practice of medicine or of the services of any hospital.

Especially timely, and urgent also, is the President's plea for better community health services and facilities, especially through more and expanding nursing homes—which would take some of the patient load off hospitals—and through the improvement of their services. Even more urgent is the need—tragically shown right here in New York—for more well-trained doctors to be met through the expansion of existing medical and dental schools as well as new ones. And, in the case of new facilities, careful planning for them, which Mr. Kennedy has stressed, is an absolute essential.

More adequate Federal assistance in all these directions—within reasonable budgetary limits—is "unfinished business which affects every person and home and community in this land," as the President has said.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, today's Washington Post carried an editorial which seeks to wipe away some of the confusion in this country about the British national health service plan. I should like to read the last paragraph of that editorial:

The British and Canadian experiences may or may not appeal to Americans; the United States is in nowise bound to follow or copy them. All that is under discussion in this country is a limited plan of medical care for the aged to be financed through social security contributions and carried out by private doctors. The question, really, is what all the shouting is about.

I ask that the full editorial be included with my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1961]

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

In England's Parliament as well as in the Congress of the United States there is controversy over Government-sponsored medical care. The differences are instructive as well as interesting.

Here the argument is carried on to a large extent through the use of epithets such as "socialistic"; and governmental concern for the health, even of the aged, is denounced by spokesmen for the organized medical profession as somehow immoral. But in England the argument is entirely over the size of certain fees to be exacted for health services; the Labor opposition says that the Conservative government proposes to set these too high. Neither Conservatives nor Laborites appear to have the slightest inclination to do away with the program; instead, they vie with one another and with the Liberals in supporting it.

There has been so much misinformation in this country and there have been so many misleading charges about the British National Health Service that it is helpful to have some facts on the subject made available by the British Information Service. Far from being, as some American Medical Association rhetoricians assert, a Socialist scheme or a Communist coup, the health program was recommended by Lord Beveridge, an eminently respectable Liberal, and was accepted in principle in 1944 by the National Government under Sir Winston Churchill.

Participation in the program is wholly voluntary on the part of doctors and patients alike. Anyone is free to use the service or not as he prefers, to use it in part if he wishes to consult a private physician while availing himself at the same time of a service doctor, to go as he thinks best to a public or a private hospital. Doctors may participate or not as they desire; and they may, if they wish, keep a private practice alongside their service practice.

Moreover, a patient is free to choose any doctor and to change doctors when he desires to do so There appears to be no foundation whatever for the charge that the quality of British medicine has suffered from the scheme and even less substance to the charge that it is widely disliked in Britain. The fact is that 97 percent of the people in England and Wales have chosen a doctor within the service, that nearly all doctors, dentists, opticians, etc., have joined in, and, finally, that the general health of the British people seems very high.

One other foreign example should, perhaps, be put before the leaders of the AMA. The Canadian Medical Association has announced that 93 percent of its members are in favor of negotiating an acceptable plan for a national health service in Canada; 83 percent of the Canadian doctors said that they consider a tax-supported medical plan either probable, inevitable or imminent.

The British and Canadian experiences may or may not appeal to Americans; the United States is in nowise bound to follow or copy them. All that is under discussion in this country is a limited plan of medical care for the aged to be financed through social security contributions and carried out by private doctors. The question, really, is what all the shouting is about.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, finally, I also ask that the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on February 10, 1961, be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1961]

KEY TO THE FUTURE

President Kennedy's special message to the Congress on health and hospital care is, as he termed it, "a very modest proposal cut to meet absolutely essential needs." Its very moderation, although it may prove disappointing to some, should make it persuasive to the Congress. The clarity with which the President presents and documents the problem and its patent relation to the national welfare ought to move the Congress to speedy action.

The principal focus of the message is on health insurance for the aged. Without disparaging the measure adopted by the Congress last year to help meet the medical costs of the indigent aged, Mr. Kennedy argues that "now we must meet the needs of those millions who have no wish to receive care at the taxpayers' expense, but who are nevertheless staggered by the drain on their savings—or those of their children—caused by an extended hospital stay." The American Medical Association may be eager and willing, as its spokesmen so often assert, to furnish such care philanthropically. But it is not philanthropy that the aged seek.

The sensible and characteristically American way to provide for the contingencies of retirement years is to enable workers to pay for them while they are employed, through the mechanism of the social security system. American workers insure themselves through social security against the loss of income caused by retirement, death, unemployment, or disability. The President proposes simply that they insure themselves in the same way against the high cost of ill health in old age.

Two aspects of the President's recommendation, designed to reduce the program's cost, deserve careful scrutiny and reflection. The coverage, as he outlines it, would extend only to those eligible for social security; this means that a goodly number of the 16 million Americans over 65 would be unprotected. Second, the program would require elderly patients to pay the first $20 of the cost of hospital outpatient clinic diagnostic services. This might well discourage diagnosis when it is most needed and most likely to be effective—and most likely, also, to cut the cost of subsequent hospital care.

As the President says bluntly and simply, "This program is not a program of socialized medicine. It is a program of prepayment of health costs with absolute freedom of choice guaranteed. Every person will choose his own doctor and hospital." Let's hope that irrelevant nightmare visions of socialism can be kept out of the discussion.

The President's message presents, in addition, some admirable proposals for the enlargement of community health services, the expansion of health personnel and medical research and the improvement of health care for children and youth. "The health of our Nation," Mr. Kennedy says, "is a key to its future." A nation which does not take care of its aged will have no more than a sorry future; and a nation which does not take care of its youth is likely to have no future at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk for 1 week to allow other Senators who may wish to cosponsor it to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the same subject to which the junior Senator from New Mexico has just addressed himself, with the kind cooperation of the majority leader, who agrees that I be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators COOPER, of Kentucky, SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, AIKEN, of Vermont, FONG, of Hawaii, COTTON, of New Hampshire, KEATING, of New York, PROUTY, of Vermont, and SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a program of Federal matching grants to the States to enable the States to provide health insurance for individuals aged 65 or over at subscription charges such individuals can pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 937) to provide for a program of Federal matching grants to the States to enable the States to provide health insurance for individuals aged 65 or over at subscription charges such individuals can pay, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement with respect to the bill. It is a statement made by the nine Senators who have introduced this bill.

We are a group of Republicans who believe that there must be a Federal program for medical care for the aged, and in all our action when the matter was under consideration in 1960 we acted accordingly. We still feel that way. We have been waiting for the President's proposal to see if it met certain very serious objections to the plan for medical care for the aged, even if it took the social security tax method of financing, objections which the proposal

by the then Senator Kennedy, presented in August 1960, failed to meet.

An adequate program to meet the needs of our senior citizens should give top priority to preventive medical care, rather than hospitalization. Medical experts agree that adequate preventive medical care would result in a sharp reduction in the occurrence of chronic illness and long stays in the hospital. This can best be done by a first cost program, making physicians care readily available at home or in the office.

Our health proposal would thus provide a preventive care program to include physicians visits, diagnostic laboratory or X-ray services, and home nurse calls as prescribed. The senior citizen gets the benefit he needs at once and thus gets medical protection before chronic illness has set in.

Another criterion about which we feel strongly is that the many aging outside social security coverage must be included in any Federal health program. Provision should also be made for flexibility for States to improve on the benefit package while preserving the minimum as uniform in every State. There are substantial differences among our States, particularly with respect to medical facilities, costs, and care. Moreover there should be a voluntary cash option to enable the aging, at their option, to pay for their voluntary health plans that now cover an estimated 8 million of the 16 million citizens over 65 if they give at least the minimum care standard set under the Federal plan.

We feel, therefore, that no adequate accommodation has yet been made to important objections to the Kennedy-Anderson plan.

We are determined that there should be a Federal program for health care for the aged, and we will persevere in the effort to find a way in which this can be done and to develop a program that can pass and be enacted into law. Therefore, in carrying on this effort, we are introducing as a bill the plan for which we stood in August 1960. We are convinced that at this writing our plan, compared with the President's plan, is more liberal in coverage, more liberal in benefits, and more accurately reflects what needs to be done in a Federal program of medical care for the aged. We will continue to explore every avenue with reference to these elements of a medical care plan for the aging in the effort to arrive at an agreed plan.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the Health Insurance for the Aged Act be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE AGED ACT

DESCRIPTION

A voluntary, participating health benefits plan for persons 65 years old or over providing preventive, diagnostic, and short-term illness benefits, or long-term catastrophic or chronic illness benefits, or insurance benefits through contributions of State and Federal Governments.

PERSONS ELIGIBLE

All persons 65 years of age and over, who are not recipients of public assistance (and thus eligible for medical benefits under other provisions of the bill) whose income does not exceed $3,000 for an individual or $4,500 per couple. Eleven million persons would be eligible immediately, not including the 2.4 million receiving public assistance, taking in substantially all aged persons in need of assistance with their health care costs.

BENEFITS

The State plan must contain three options for the subscriber:

(a) Preventive, diagnostic, and short-term illness benefits with specified minimum services which may be increased to a maximum cost of $128 per year;

(b) Long-term illness benefits with specified minimum services which may be increased to a maximum cost of $128 per year;

(c) Private insurance benefits, under which 50 percent of the cost of a private insurance plan, up to a maximum of $60 per year, is paid for.

Minimum benefits specified per year under the preventive and short-term care plan must include: (a) 21 days of hospital care, or nursing home care at a ratio of 3 nursing home days per hospital day; (b) physicians services for 12 home or office visits; (c) first $100 of costs for ambulatory diagnostic laboratory and X-ray services; and (d) 24 days of visiting nurse or other home health care services.

Typical maximum benefits under the preventive care plan could include: (a) 45 days of hospital care or equivalent nursing home care; (b) physicians services for 12 home or office visits; (c) total costs for ambulatory diagnostic laboratory and X-ray services; and (d) 135 days of home health care services. It could also include any other type of medical services provided for by the State plan.

Minimum benefits specified per year under the long-term catastrophic or chronic illness plan must include 80 percent of the following costs, after payment of the first $250 of medical expenses: (a) 120 days of hospital care; (b) surgical service provided in a hospital; (c) full nursing home service; (d) full visiting nurse or other home health care services.

An individual State's typical maximum benefits under the long-term illness plan could include 80 percent of the following, after payment of the deductible amount: (a) 180 days of hospital care; (b) full nursing home care; (c) full home health care services; (d) surgical services anywhere; (e) first $200 laboratory and X-ray services; (f) first $350 of prescribed drugs; and (g) other physicians, major dental, and private duty nurse services. Benefits could also be improved by reducing the deductible amount.

ENROLLMENT FEE

To be determined by the State subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a minimum of 10 percent of per capital costs—generally $9 to $12.80 per year.

FINANCING

Cost above the amount realized from enrollment fees is shared between the State and Federal Governments. The maximum benefit package eligible for such sharing is $128 per capita per year. Federal participation is between 66⅔ and 33⅓ percent depending upon State per capita income, averaging nationally to 50 percent. The median cost to the Federal Government of the plan is estimated at about $450 million a year.

OTHER PROVISIONS

1. Grants to States for assistance in establishing these programs;

2. Establishment of an Advisory Council on Health Insurance;

3. Permission for enrollment fees to be paid by employers or pension funds, thus permitting collective bargaining or other arrangements during the working life for their payment;

4. Periodic opportunities to change between the different plans;

5. Hearings before a State agency on claims which have been denied.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to add, for myself, that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I stood on this floor in August 1960, and, as Senators, stated that we would seek every means open to us to ultimately bring a measure to the Senate which a great majority could agree upon as the right plan for the aged.

I should like to say to my colleague that I have not, and will not, deviate one iota from that intention, and that I very deeply feel the proposal of the nine Senators—and the Senator from New Mexico and every other Senator knows it is not easy to get a group of Senators together and with one mind—will really represent a constructive step toward our objective.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. First, in reply to my colleague from New York, I appreciate very much his statement that they are going to continue to explore every means to bring about the desired objective. As I said when we were on this floor at the close of the session in 1960, he has been a valiant fighter for many years. I hope to see him very actively continue in this challenge. I hope the coming months will bring us close together, at least close enough so we will look forward to the passage of a good bill.

DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 451, Calendar No. 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 451) to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, under the present law, the Public Printer is authorized to furnish gratuitous copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to various specified officials and agencies of the Government and also to each ex-President and ex-Vice President of the United States. Senate bill 451 would additionally authorize the distribution of such daily copies to those former Members of Congress, including Delegates from a territory and Commissioners from Puerto Rico, who so request.

The Senate has passed such a bill previously, and this is merely a reaffirmation of that desire, or a re-presentation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 451) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 73 of the Printing Act, approved January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C. 183), is amended by inserting after the paragraph relating to ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents a new paragraph as follows:

"To each former Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a territory, or Commissioner from Puerto Rico, upon request to the Public Printer, one copy of the daily."

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 16, Calendar No. 40.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 16) authorizing certain expenditures by the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "than", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$1,400", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, this is a resolution to authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $125,000 by the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, to employ on a temporary basis such additional personnel as the committee deems advisable to carry out its functions during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

In addition, the President in his budget message for fiscal year 1962 recommended certain legislation affecting the national highway program. It is necessary that there be a continuous study of the status and progress for financing and expediting completion of this huge program. These studies will require an annual review of the program and reports by the agencies, inspection of certain areas, investigation of any irregularities in prosecution of the program, conferences with highway officials and residents, study of the matter of reimbursement for cost of toll roads, study of safety problems, and consideration of any necessary amendments to the legislation in order to avoid delays in the procurement of necessary rights-of-way, equipment, material, and manpower needed for orderly prosecution of the program. During the present session of Congress, provision must be made for apportioning funds to the States for fiscal years 1963 through 1966 on the basis of the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System, as submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Commerce on January 11, 1961.

Legislation has been enacted authorizing the establishment of U.S. study commissions for river basins in the Southeastern States and in Texas. Bills passed the Senate during the 85th Congress authorizing similar commissions for Alaska and the Wabash River Basin.

Public Law 1018, 84th Congress, amended the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, to provide for its broader use in assisting local organizations in carrying out projects for flood control and water supply purposes. Approval of plans for certain projects under this act is the responsibility of the Committee on Public Works, and will require extensive studies and investigations. During the 86th Congress the committee approved plans for 31 projects having an estimated total cost of $96 million.

The Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1956 authorized Federal aid in the conduct and promotion of research, investigation, experiments, demonstrations, and study for eliminating and improving sanitary conditions of surface and underground waters of the United States. It also authorizes a 10-year program of Federal grants for construction of necessary treatment works for sewage or other wastes discharging into any stream. Constant review, study, and inspection of these matters by the committee will be necessary.

The Public Buildings Act of 1959 vests authority and responsibility in the Administrator of General Services for acquiring, constructing, altering, repairing, remodeling, improving, or extending public buildings and acquiring the necessary sites or additions to sites in connection therewith. Construction or acquisition of any building involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000, or alteration of an existing building which costs in excess of $200,000, must be approved by the committee. During the 86th Congress the committee approved 79 new projects with an estimated cost of $920 million, and 37 alterations and extensions with an estimated cost of $37 million. Close supervision of the program will be necessary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the budget submitted by the Committee on Public Works to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the budget was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative: Chief Investigator	2	$6,180	$12,904.32	$1,075.36	$25,808.64
Editorial and research: Staff member	1	4,980	10,756.25	896.35	10,756.25
Administrative and clerical:					
Assistant chief clerk	1	5,760	12,166.19	1,013.84	12,166.19
Assistant clerk (hearing)	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.61	8,239.40
Stenographer	1	3,720	8,239.40	686.61	8,239.40
Total	6				65,209.88
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					486.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,233.64
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					134.64
Reimbursable payments to agencies					4,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					30,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					14,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					2,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					3,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					1,935.84
Total					59,790.12
Grand total					125,000.00

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 16), as amended, was agreed to.

NEW YORK AND EXPORT AND IMPORT TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, an article by Brendan M. Jones published in the New York Times of February 12, 1961, and an excellent editorial entitled "Kennedy on Protectionism." Mr. Jones points out some of the problems inherent in the increasing pressures for protection against imports which both the Members of Congress and the administration are experiencing, and which are now even reaching over into the areas of business and of labor relations through threatened boycotts against foreign goods.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the National Import Policy Act of 1961, S. 851, which I introduced with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] last Thursday and which is lying on the table for additional sponsorship until the end of business today—along with the National Export Policy Act of 1961, S. 852, also cosponsored by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. These two bills offer a solution to the problems caused by the increase of concentrated imports competing with certain industries in the United States, while at the same time giving substance to the President's broadly outlined proposals of export expansion. The United States cannot expand its exports unless we deal with the import problem in a positive and nonrestrictive manner and unless we effectively coordinate and augment the export services of the Government.

Among my constituents there are workers and businessmen producing textiles, gloves, boys' and men's clothing, women's garments, industrial chemicals fabricated metal products, cord and twine, electronic and office machine equipment, sporting goods, and specialties, such as buttons and toys, all or part of whose industries are feeling the concentrated impact of foreign competition. Yet I also have among my constituents most of the 10 million people living in the great port of New York area, one fourth of whom depend on foreign trade for their livelihood; the 1 million people living in the area of the port of Buffalo, a large number of whom also earn their living from the foreign trade passing through there; as well as workers and owners in industries in which exports often mean the difference between profit and loss, work and unemployment. Their enterprises range from automobile manufacturing to steel, and they also are found in many of the industries, such as chemicals, metal products, electronics and even textiles, parts of which are adversely affected by concentrated imports. Furthermore, all of my constituents have a basic interest in a healthy economy and in the international position of the United States—both of which depend on an expansion of U.S. foreign trade.

It is most necessary to find a way of alleviating the serious problems of imports competition in such a way as not to seriously impede export expansion. The solution which is offered in S. 851 and S. 852 is not the result of abstract economic theory but of the practical consideration of local, statewide and national interest. I offer it for the consideration and the cosponsorship of my colleagues.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1961]

KENNEDY SEEKS TRADE EXPANSION AS PROTECTIONIST PRESSURES RISE

(By Brendan M. Jones)

President Kennedy made it clear last week that the international sector of his New Frontiers lies in the direction of expanded trade and economic progress by less fortunate nations. In asserting this positive approach to the problem of reversing the unfavorable balance in the United States foreign payments balance, he rejected the negative course of tariff protectionism.

Mr. Kennedy also handled his first Tariff Commission case on the liberal-trade side with a decision against increased import duties on binder twines and cordage.

The President's actions, however, are unlikely to deter the mounting pressures from various domestic industries for restriction of imports. This was demonstrated in hearings before a Senate subcommittee on textile imports opened on the same day that the President sent his message on the foreign payments problem to Congress.

TEXTILE CASE HEARD

The hearings before the Senate group, headed by Senator JOHN PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, were an updating of similar presentations before the group in 1958. Their main burden was the need for import quotas to check a flood of textile products from low-wage countries, chiefly in Asia.

As in the previous hearings, many of the complaints were directed against Japan, although India, Pakistan, and Hong Kong also were criticized for increasing competitive exports to this country.

The textile and other domestic industries are unquestionably entitled to present their views on import competition. The tariff issue, however, is one that inevitably becomes more emotional as the issue is aired, particularly in a period of serious recession and increased unemployment.

Over the last 10 years or so the tariff question, as presented almost yearly in congressional hearings, has tended to build up a picture of great menace from imports. Of late, emphasis has been put on low hourly wage rates abroad, which can be made to look quite unfavorable in comparison with American wages when converted at official exchange rates.

Japan recently has been made the main target by many domestic groups, although Hong Kong and other Asian countries such as India and Pakistan and all the West European countries are cited as low-wage competitors. Japan, however, is by far the favorite target, since the mere mention of this country seems to be considered enough to make out a case for import restriction.

At the moment, two labor unions, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and a Chicago local of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers are threatening boycotts of Japanese goods. Both have set May 1 as the date on which members will refuse to work on either fabrics or electronic parts from Japan and other low-wage countries.

LEGITIMATE TACTICS

Complaints to Congress or the Tariff Commission about imports are part of legitimate democratic procedures, although the repetition of some over a period of years seems to belie imminent ruin from foreign competition. The legitimacy of the union actions, however, has been seriously questioned in the affected trades, as has also the likelihood that they will be taken.

The heat and constancy of the tariff issue at its present juncture could well stand some cooling off by a few basic facts. Considering the difficulties of obtaining objectivity in such a controversy, these are not like to change views already fixed but for what they are worth in other respects they are cited here.

Comparison of total U.S. imports with this country's gross national product, which is the sum of all goods and services produced in a year, shows them to be quite a small part of the overall economy. In 1960 and in 1959 imports reached a high level of about $15 billion a year after being considerably less over a long period.

SMALL PERCENTAGE

About half of this $15 billion has consisted of raw or semiprocessed materials which this country does not produce or in which it is deficient. Almost all of these enter free of duty, or at low rates. The remaining dutiable imports, including some that are relatively uncompetitive, may be considered to be about $7,500 million, for the sake of illustration.

This part of the imports amounts to about 1½ percent of the U.S. gross national product of some $500 billion in 1960.

Consideration of the low-wage question in relation to high U.S. wages opens a complex area of controversy that commands little patience from partisans. Comparisons made on the basis of official exchange rates are on oversimplification. On this basis there is not a single country, including Canada, where wages are second only to this country's, which cannot be put in an unfavorable light.

The charge that wages in Japan are only 14 cents an hour has been made so often that it is now widely believed. Any fair search of the facts will show this charge to be grossly false.

Isolation of the hourly wage rate ignores many other factors. These range through worker benefits that in most industrialized countries cover a greater area than in the United States, including health benefits and vacations for workers' entire families, paid by employers. In addition, yearend bonuses which are not an optional matter, run to several months' wages, depending on an industry's profit gains.

In Japan, for example, where basic wages have been rising rapidly, yearend bonuses which really are incentive payments run as high as 7 months' wages. In that country also, welfare and other benefits extend to members of workers' families.

DISTANCES ADD TO COSTS

More fundamentally, the hourly wage gambit gives no consideration to variations in actual living costs or to other costs of exporting such as those entailed in long shipping distances. Again in Japan, because of its frequent mention in complaints against imports, $1 converted into yen will buy twice as much of a wide range of products as in the United States.

Still, prices of imported goods in many cases are unquestionably low. Apart from instances where import competition may be clearly unfair to individual domestic producers, differences in prices are the very foundation of foreign trade.

The issue of wage scales abroad also has an historical aspect of some importance. During this century, if not longer, American wages, with some possible exception of those in depression periods, have consistently been higher than those of any other country. Over most of this span also, the United States has been the world's leading exporter, although it is popularly thought that Britain held this position prior to World War II.

Finally, the broad issue of whether the United States can accept a relatively higher volume of imports than other countries turns on a number of factors. These include, in addition to the vital matter of world leadership stressed by President Kennedy, the comparative economic strength of the United States. Through industry, initiative, resources and the grace of God, the United States has become a fabulous economic giant whose strength may be more appreciated abroad than at home.

As a Senator, President Kennedy favored the import restriction he rejected last week on twine and cord and he rejected a return to protectionism as a solution to reviving the Nation's fiscal strength abroad.

In effect, he has indicated that from a standpoint of the whole Nation's interest, policies that build rather than restrict seem most likely to benefit all countries concerned.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 10, 1961]

KENNEDY ON PROTECTIONISM

As President Kennedy said in his balance-of-payments message to Congress earlier this week, "a return to protectionism is not a solution." It was of particular importance for him to make that statement at that time, both to put a damper on the superficial and specious arguments to the contrary, and to give needed reassurance on his own intentions in the light of protectionist remarks he himself had made during the campaign.

Of all the cures for the balance-of-payments position, an increase in tariffs and restoration of quotas would be the worst possible. Quite apart from its political effects, such action would obviously provoke retaliation against American exports, thereby undermining the very foundations of our dollar-earning capacity abroad. The President understands this elementary fact, and within a few hours of presenting the balance-of-payments message to Congress he was able to give proof of willingness to act upon it.

On that very day, in a case that was significant because of the principle involved, he rejected a proposal to employ the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to increase the duties on twines and cordage (imported mainly from Canada and Mexico). The Tariff Commission had split three ways: two for, two against, and two not voting. Although Mr. Kennedy had, as a Senator, supported the argument of a Massachusetts company to raise the tariffs, he now, as President, took the broader view in the national interest.

It is clear that as time goes on the President will have to resist mounting pressures to take trade-restrictive action for the benefit of this industry or that one facing competition from abroad. Much of this pressure is coming from the South, historic seat of free-trade policies, but now with its industrialization a hotbed of protectionism. The textile industry—both northern and southern—is only one of the loudest current voices demanding special governmental intervention in this direction. We hope and believe that the President will have the courage to stand firm against these pressures.

But his position need not be the negative one of merely resisting interested requests for protection. It can be the positive one of not only promoting American export trade, as he clearly plans to do, but also providing for governmental assistance to those industries, communities or areas that really are hit by specific foreign imports.

These are relatively few, but they do exist; and it is to meet the genuine hardships that occur in such cases that we for years have been advocating special Federal help to permit economic readjustments where indicated. Senator JAVITS introduced such a bill last year; he is proposing a similar one again. This is an infinitely better way to meet the import problem than a reactionary reversion to tariff walls and import quotas that in the long run would be self-defeating and basically injurious to the interests of both the United States and its friends throughout the world.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 41, Senate Resolution 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 33) creating the Special Committee on Aging.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments; on page 2, line 3, after the word "of", to insert "nine"; in line 5, after the word "resolution", to insert "Six members of the committee shall be appointed from the majority party and three members from the minority party."; on page 3, line 20, after the word "and", to strike out "consultants," and insert "consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee;", and on page 4, line 5, after the word "exceed", to insert "$150,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a special committee to be known as the Special Committee on Aging and to consist of nine Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution. Six members of the committee shall be appointed from the majority party and three members from the minority party.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

SEC. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis through January 31, 1962, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and, with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $150,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1962.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, for the past 2 years I have had the honor of being chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

Several weeks ago I submitted Senate Resolution 33, to create a Senate Special Committee on Aging.

The work of this subcommittee is one of the most important I have ever undertaken, and is certainly related to one of the major concerns facing the Senate and the Nation.

This is an area in which great contributions can be made to the health, happiness and productive growth of our aged population.

Today, there are 16 million over the age of 65, and in only 15 years this figure will rise to 22 million.

Increasingly, we are spending more years in retirement, years which should produce a golden harvest of experience and accumulated wisdom.

These should be years of respect, dignity, and useful contribution to neighbors and to the community.

However, for literally millions of senior citizens these years of retirement devolve into years of deprivation, dependency, and decay.

The blows of illness and disease, the insults of low income and charity, the discrimination in employment because of age, the unsuitable housing and the rejection from important functions become their life profiles.

These are the elements which make aging a problem, rather than one of the great social blessings of our civilization.

To reduce this problem, we must establish as quickly as possible the social and economic conditions upon which a life of dignity and productivity must be based.

Some advances were made last year.

The Congress amended the Social Security Act to broaden the public assistance approach to medical care, and this will be helpful to some.

The Congress considered, for the first time, and we almost approved in the Senate, a bill to extend our social security system to provide medical insurance to the aged.

As a first priority, I introduced this year S. 65, the retired persons' medical insurance bill, to provide for the financing of medical care through social security to all retired persons, whether they are eligible under the OASDI system or not.

The Congress approved a $20 million appropriation for direct loans to nonprofit groups to provide suitable housing for the elderly at rentals they can afford.

Senators have introduced bills to abolish discrimination in employment because of age; to establish a U.S. Office of Aging; to develop a senior citizens' service training program; and to protect savings by the authorization of a constant purchasing power bond.

This is simply a beginning. I need only list now some of the problems which we will study in depth this year:

Medical insurance through social security is now at the legislative stage. We hope it will be enacted soon.

But we require careful study on how to reduce excessive hospitalization and to increase the efficiency of medical organization.

A thorough study and evaluation of the condition of American nursing homes should be undertaken.

A comprehensive study of the kinds of housing best suited to the older person is needed, along with an evaluation of the trend toward using retirement hotels and retirement villages.

Other essential areas which need to be studied in depth include: continued use of productive ability; protection of income and pensions; preventing admissions to mental hospitals; expanding basic knowledge through research; and reducing the ravages of ill health and disability.

We have learned a crucial lesson as a subcommittee. The problems of older persons cut across all areas of governmental and legislative responsibility.

A number of committees of the Senate are concerned with portions of the problems, but there is no committee concerned with the relationships of these problems which can review them as a whole.

We need a committee in the Senate to study the problems of the aged on an overall basis, thus avoiding waste and duplication.

This special committee will not have legislative jurisdiction, but will provide information and services to the various standing committees as they consider proposed legislation in their respective jurisdictions.

I have gone over the proposed budget very carefully, and I assure Senators that it is a tight budget and represents the best estimate of expenditures for these important studies.

It means we will have a small staff, but I am convinced that we can do the job for the Senate.

I appreciate the careful attention and concern for this great and growing problem which the Senate of the United States is providing, and for the steps which are being taken to make the retirement years productive and satisfying.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like first to support the resolution of the Senator from Michigan, and I hope very much the Senate will approve it, because I think the Senator has put his finger on precisely the right point. We need a committee which will deal with all phases of the subject in one coordinated presentation.

I express the hope, too, to the Senator from Michigan that the Special Committee on Aging might make timely reports in such a way as to influence our action on legislative proposals. For example, on medical care for the aging there is a very strong difference between the proposal of the Senator from Michigan and that of the administration. I do not say that the Senator is opposing the administration. Of course, he is not. But there is a very important supplement in the proposal of the Senator that all the aging be covered and not merely those on social security. The Senator knows that this is a subject very close to my heart and that of the group of Republican Senators who are also very interested in enacting a bill. This is one of the main points which has been made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and a group which, in a sense, he leads.

Second, there is the problem of age discrimination in employment, which has also been a subject that the Senator's subcommittee has looked into, and a question of the greatest moment, again dealing with legislative questions which may come up in the Senate long before the committee might be inclined or ready to make an overall report. I mention those two examples, at the same time expressing my complete support of the subcommittee and what it is doing. I should like to know from the Senator whether, as chairman of the subcommittee, he contemplates that he will be able to give us interim reports on stated subjects, calculated to have some effect because they are timely in connection with the legislative action which is contemplated here.

Mr. McNAMARA. I assure the distinguished Senator from New York that we shall be in a position to do what he suggests. We already have a great mass of data on all the various aspects of the problem of the aged. The only question is when it is desirable to assemble the data and get them before the Senate. I shall be glad to do as the Senator suggests.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to urge, as a means of making the inquiries really pertinent, that the subcommittee should adopt that course as a calculated policy. It is a subcommittee of a committee on which I serve. I am not a member of that subcommittee at this time. Perhaps some day I shall be. But I do emphasize the need for such action, because so often we see wonderful work performed which comes to our attention when it is purely of academic interest. We shall actually be dealing with the subjects, we hope, on the floor of the Senate. The subcommittee will have a very great opportunity to get the necessary data, and I express to the chairman my expectation that we shall have the benefit of it.

Mr. McNAMARA. I assure the Senator from New York that we shall do everything we can to that end.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask my good friend from Michigan what additional studies are proposed to be made by this special committee that could not be made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. NcNAMARA. One of the first would be a follow-through on the recommendations of the White House Conference. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana recalls that there was a White House Conference on the Problem of the Aged and Aging, at which people from all over the country got together and thousands of them made recommendations. One of our first objectives would be to follow through on the great mass of recommendations that came from that committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not that work be done by a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. McNAMARA. The reason is that the questions and problems that were developed in the White House Conference cut across several of the committees of the Senate. The problems concern not alone the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They go into the question of housing, finance, and various other fields. They involve the work of various committees. For that reason there is justification for a special subcommittee.

Mr. ELLENDER. My reason for asking the question is that whenever a special committee of this character is created, I presume its findings would be filed with the Senate. Then when bills pursuant to the recommendations made are introduced, we would have to refer the bills to the regular committees before they are presented to the Senate for consideration.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not think it would be necessary to study the subject again, because the recommendations would have already been spelled out in some detail. However, such action would be up to the committee, of course. If the Senate were to accept the reports, we would be pleased to hand the committee the information that we had acquired. It would certainly greatly reduce the work of the full committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice in the last sentence of the resolution on page 4:

The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1962.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that language mean that the Senator contemplates completing the work of the committee within that time?

Mr. McNAMARA. It is a little difficult to say whether by that time the complete field will be totally explored and we will be through with the proposed legislation in that field. It certainly is the hope of the Senator from Michigan that that will be the course, and we would so aim.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Michigan give assurance that every effort will be made to conclude the hearings this year and let the committee expire at the end of the year?

Mr. McNAMARA. We shall make every effort to do all the work required this year, but whether we shall be able to complete the study, and whether, within that period, the Senate will be able through its various committees to complete the program, which at this time seems to be of great magnitude, I could not say. But I assure the Senator that I shall do everything I can to work toward that end.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have asked the same question of many Senators who have proposed the creation of new committees. For example, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency was created 8 years ago, and was supposed to complete its hearings in about 1 or 2 years at the most, with an expenditure of about $150,000 to $200,000. That subcommittee is still in operation and has spent over $1 million. I hope that we shall not have a repetition of that action in this new special committee.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging for the past 2 years, and under the leadership of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] I believe we have made a real beginning in meeting the needs of America's 16 million senior citizens. The Senator from Michigan has dedicated thought, time, and energy to improving the conditions of our aged, and I want to take this occasion formally to congratulate him on a set of accomplishments which will make American history.

We shall consider this year, and I am sure that we shall adopt adequate legislation to provide health insurance for the aged through social security, on a dignified, self-financing basis.

We appropriated last year funds for a $20 million program of direct loans to nonprofit groups to build low rental housing for the elderly. I hope and expect that we will increase the authorization to $100 million and appropriate this amount for the next fiscal year.

As a subcommittee, we have gathered considerable data through studies, hearings, and personal visits, and now have a picture of the outlines of this very complex and important set of problems. Through the creation of this special committee, we will be able to study in depth individual problems such as the condition of nursing homes, low incomes, decent housing, employment, and productive use of retirement time.

The concerns of our senior citizens are not only nationwide but touch each of us intimately in our home States and home communities.

There are 1,112,000 persons in Pennsylvania over the age of 65, and they represent 9.8 percent of the total population. Practically every 10th person in my Commonwealth is 65 years of age or over.

And ours is a growing State, Mr. President. We expect that by 1970 we will have a total population of 12.2 million people, and of these 1,314,000 will be over the age of 65—10.8 percent of the total population. This is a stark contrast with the situation which existed only 30 years ago—1930—when we had approximately 500,000 persons over 65, 5.3 percent of the total population.

Thus we will not only have more aged persons in absolute numbers but their proportion will be higher and they will be living a longer number of years in retirement.

These years of retirement should not be years of passive parasitism, years of rejection, and of the performance of a role which can only be described as roleless. The aged of this country who have devoted their lives to the amazing growth of the American economy deserve in their retirement years dignity, self-respect, recognition, and above all an opportunity to continue contributing of their abilities and experience.

The hearings of our subcommittee provided not only statistical but flesh and blood evidence of senior citizens in Pennsylvania, and throughout the country, living on old age pensions of $72 a month; aged couples unable to pay heavy medical bills; widows living alone in cold-water tenements; patients vegetating in nursing homes; older workers being discriminated against in employment.

We have made great advances in Pennsylvania under the past two administrations in improving the conditions of our senior citizens. For example, one of the great rehabilitation centers in the country, if not in the world, is the magnificent John J. Kane Hospital located and operated by Allegheny County. Every day of the week, brilliant physicians, nurses, and other personnel perform miracles in the rehabilitation of so-called hopeless cases. This hospital has a resident population of 2,000 people, 81 percent of whom are over 60. It has demonstrated that at least three-fourths of the totally disabled newly admitted patients can either be rehabilitated or restored to more independent living—including a substantial number who can return to comfortable private living. This fact becomes dramatic when we think of the hundreds of thousands of patients in nursing homes and county hospitals for whom no such treatment facilities are available, needlessly wasting their last years of living waiting for the end.

But even this great hospital has its problems and shortcomings. At the time of our visit, it was filled to capacity, and had a waiting list of 100 women in need of hospital care. Approximately 400 patients in the hospital could have been discharged if there was a place in the community to which they could be sent. I hope one of the major functions of this new special committee will be to study and make recommendations to this Senate for developing the necessary community facilities which can keep our aged citizens independent and self-reliant in their own homes, in their own communities with their friends.

We are fortunate in Pennsylvania that 88 percent of our chronic hospital beds are classified as acceptable by Hill-Burton standards. This is one of the highest percentages in the Nation. But I still have to admit that the Hill-Burton survey indicated that we only met about one-third of our hospital needs—that we require 7,280 additional beds to meet our minimum requirements.

I am proud to indicate that Pennsylvania ranks among the top five in designing and building houses for the elderly, and that Philadelphia specifically is in the vanguard of the Nation. We have built 930 units of public housing specifically for the aged in Pennsylvania and 7 housing authorities are now planning 1,000 dwelling units exclusively designed for elderly single persons. But the rapid growth of our elderly population with limited income will require greater expansion of low-rent public housing not only in Pennsylvania but in every State of the Union. The Special Committee on Aging, which we are creating today should be concerned not only with physical housing environments, but should study in depth the kinds of health, social, religious, and recreational services which must accompany suitable housing, to insure independent, fuller lives for the elderly.

The needs of the aged are varied and cut across the entire gamut of governmental responsibility. Thus far, their needs have been viewed in bits and pieces, by separate agencies and by different committees. The standing committees in the Senate such as Labor, Finance, Banking and Currency, and others, have major legislative responsibility in specific areas affecting the aged.

These committees will want to act not only on the basis of traditional assumptions or habitual ways of thinking framed with reference to the younger age groups, but rather with the information provided and kept current by a Senate committee devoting its full time and attention to the problems and prospects of our senior citizens. For the problems of older persons are all interrelated and must be viewed as a whole. No proper solution can be found that is not based on an understanding of the totality of the concerns that confront the senior citizens of today.

Mr. President, no committee that we have created has had the potential for contributing to the welfare of our Nation as the Special Committee on Aging that we will be creating today. We will have in the Senate one committee and one staff of specialists to which we can all look to for guidance in planning and formulating legislation to make aging in America a privilege to anticipate, rather than a burden to be feared.

These are exciting and winning times in the lengthening of meaningful human life, and I recall the beautiful prayer of the Navaho poet, who said:

In beauty I walk
With beauty before me, may I walk
With beauty all around me, may I walk
In old age, wandering on a trail of beauty, lively may I walk
In old age, wandering on a trail of beauty, living again may I walk;
It is finished in beauty, it is finished in beauty.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of Senate Resolution 33 to authorize a special Senate Committee on Aging. The problems of the aged and aging have been of deep concern to me for many years. Because of my concern with these problems, I have followed with great interest the work of the subcommittee on problems of the aged and aging headed by the distinguished Senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. That subcommittee has served effectively to focus national attention on the needs of the elderly and the urgency of programs which must be undertaken to meet the challenge those needs pose for our society.

The subcommittee, in the most comprehensive study of the subject ever undertaken, has shown that the problems of the elderly are more complex than we had previously thought and that the magnitude of the problem is increasing rapidly. There are now 16 million people in this country 65 years of age or older. And progress in medical science is continually extending our life expectancy.

The implications of this are far reaching. It has been forecast, for instance, that young families will soon face the prospect of housing and supporting not only one, but two—and in extreme cases even three—generations of retired elders.

In Hawaii, which has a youthful population in comparison with most other States, the number of persons over 65 is expected to increase by 70 percent in the next 10 years, from today's 29,000 to 49,000 by 1970. There was an increase of 38.8 percent between 1950 and 1958 in the population of persons over 65 in Hawaii. In 52 States and territories during that same period, the percentage of increase was exceeded only by Florida, Arizona, and New Mexico.

One conclusion which is obvious to me as a result of the fine work of the McNamara subcommittee is the variety of problems involved in our increasing population of persons over 65. Medical care and research, employment opportunities and retraining, maintenance of purchasing power for those depending on savings and retirement benefits, and housing, to name some of the more obvious ones, show how these problems cut across the jurisdictions of a number of legislative committees.

The McNamara subcommittee has served to show the magnitude and complexities of the problems; the necessity for the proposed special committee is obvious. The growing number of elderly citizens is one of the great challenges of our time. We have the resources, the brains, and the spirit to meet that challenge. Establishment of the special committee will show that Congress recognizes the challenge and is prepared to meet its responsibilities. I urge adoption of Senate Resolution 33.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to add my own comments on Senate Resolution 33, which would create a Senate Special Committee on Aging, for several reasons, not all of which can be gone into here. The first reason is related to the fact that my own State of Indiana now has about 450,000 senior citizens and their proportion of the total State population is higher than the national proportion. About 1 out of every 10 citizens in my State is at least 65 years old. If we add the numbers of women between 62 and 65, the ratio is even greater.

The report on the status of the aged in my State, which was prepared for the White House Conference on Aging, of last month, comprises more than 300 pages, and it provided me with more than enough grounds for supporting the resolution before us. It convinces me that the conditions of the older citizens in my State are typical of a situation that affects the entire Nation. The material on income, for example, and on employment problems, nursing homes, and retirement activities—all point to a need for concerted action on all levels—local, State, and Federal.

Another reason for my support of the resolution creating a Special Committee on Aging stems from my personal contact with the professional staff of the preexisting Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, Mr. Sidney Spector and Dr. Harold L. Sheppard. I assume these two experts in the field of aging will continue to serve on the special committee staff. Indeed, I sincerely hope that they do, since in the course of the past year I have received the utmost cooperation and skillful information from them on a wide number of items that have come to me in my activities as a Member of the Senate and of the Committee on Finance.

This experience has demonstrated to me and, I am sure, to many other Members of the Senate, not how indispensable these two particular professional experts on aging might be, but rather how important is the existence of a committee dealing full time with the subject of aging itself. It means, first, that the Senators who would be the members of such a committee would consider this area of public concern more than a sometimes thing. This would be the case if we act on the belief that the subject should be chopped up into little fragments and parceled out to the different standing committees which might conceivably have something to do, in a limited way, with a specified fragment of one particular problem of the aged.

But such an approach is unproductive for the Senate, and leads to nowhere. The existence of a Special Committee on Aging, on the other hand means the immediate availability of a clearinghouse for information and recommendations. It means that we would, in each of our standing committees, have the services of a full-time professional staff at our disposal, with wide experience and knowledge, and with national reputations, in the field of aging, as well as the recommendations that can be expected from the members of such a special committee.

Because of these and many other reasons, Mr. President, I urge the prompt approval of Senate Resolution 33. I look forward to greater accomplishments by the Senate and by the Nation as a result of the existence and work of this Special Committee on Aging.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in 1950 my State of California counted among its people some 500,000 who were 65 years of age or older. By 1960, Mr. President, just 20 years later, that number had grown to more than a million two hundred thousand.

These people, whom we are proud to list among our citizens—these men and women, so many of whom built the California which is today attracting such a great influx of young people—these more than a million older, more mature citizens are alert, they are intelligent, they are literate, they are vocal. We know the problems which confront them. We know the indignities to which they are so often exposed. We know their hopes, their aspirations, their all-too-justified expectations.

Mr. President, we in California know what usually happens to a man suddenly robbed of his job because the calendar says he has passed a certain birthday. We know what it means to a man to be suddenly torn from his familiar workday surroundings; robbed of the friends with whom he has talked daily for decades; told he is no longer needed or wanted. We know what a blow it is for those whose income is halved or cut to a third just at a time when their need for doctors, for nursing care, and for drugs begins to mount. We know of the difficulties of finding jobs or occupations, proper housing, proper food, proper care.

Yes, Mr. President, we know these things but we also know, in California, because so many of our older citizens were lucky enough to be able to plan ahead and to finance that planning, because our State and its local communities and its people planned with them, we know, too, that given certain things and certain attitudes the prospect of living into one's eighties and nineties can in fact be good and meaningful and desirable rather than ugly, drab and fearful.

We know these things. We know, too, that despite the most vigorous efforts of individuals, of local groups and communities, and of an intelligently run State government, solutions to the problems confronting our senior citizens must, of necessity and in many spheres, require action on the part of the Federal Government.

Let me say, in passing, that though we have been faced with the problems of an older society earlier and more intensely than have some other communities, these problems are less severe in California than they are becoming and will be in other States of the Union. Elsewhere the percentage of people over 65 is rising. In California, it is going down. Whereas

8 percent of our people were over 65 in 1940 compared to 6 percent in the Nation, today less than 8 percent of our people are over 65, whereas the average is almost 9 percent throughout the country. Because of the great influx of young people into California our numbers of older people have been going down proportionately, while in other States they are going up.

What this means is that the problems which were ours are now to be more than ever yours. That what we have learned may become increasingly of value to you.

One of the things we have learned is that the multitude of problems which have attended our success in prolonging life—social problems, economic problems, moral and philosophical problems—are of such nature that if they are to be resolved we must have the active, helpful cooperation of the Federal Government. If that cooperation is to be helpful and wise, it must be based on a real understanding of the problems, on accurate information, on truly knowledgeable insight.

It is to help us achieve these things, to enable us to properly discharge our obligations to the more than 16 million Americans who are over 65, that I support this resolution.

The Senate of the United States must create the means whereby it may ever keep itself informed as to the role in our society of this great group of our people. We need, and I trust we will today create, a Special Committee on Aging.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] could not be present in the Chamber today, and asked me to request unanimous consent to insert his remarks on Senate Resolution 33 in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RANDOLPH

FEBRUARY 11, 1961.

It is with a genuine feeling of concern that I support Senate Resolution 33, to establish a Senate Special Committee on Aging.

In the first place, my home State of West Virginia is one of the very small number of all the 50 States in which the population change has experienced a rather paradoxical shift. Although the total population of West Virginia has decreased over the past decade, the number of aged West Virginians has increased. Given the widely publicized conditions of economic distress in our State, such a population trend is an added danger signal—a signal of an underlying crisis which demands not only State action but Federal action as well.

There are two main conclusions to be drawn from an appraisal of West Virginia population figures in the context of our present economic conditions:

First, a disproportionately higher number of older workers are suffering from unemployment and underemployment.

Second, the State of West Virginia, by itself, is not in a position to provide the degree and kinds of normal—not to mention emergency—services to its older citizens which they need and deserve to have.

This is a problem which is not unique to West Virginia. It is a national phenomenon, and it requires remedial action on a national scale.

With the closing of the White House Conference on Aging, the Special Committee on Aging which would be established by the pending measure would thus be the only instrument of national scope which would be concentrating intensively, on a full-time basis, and in an unfragmented way, on the challenges of an aging population.

Another reason why I support Senate Resolution 33 is that for 2 years I was a member of the now expired Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

In my experience on that subcommittee, under your able and conscientious chairmanship, and with a small staff of reliable experts in aging, I was confronted with the myriad of serious consequences that have developed in our society as a result of America's strides in reducing mortality rates in the early years of life and in improving our living and working conditions in the middle range of life.

And I do not mean I was confronted merely by statistics and expert reports and testimony during hearings. I mean, also, that we of the subcommittee were presented with the living examples of older men and women with whom I met and talked—often in deplorable and dilapidated rooming houses in the decaying hearts of our cities, and often in nursing homes that are an affront to the conscience of a moral and civilized society.

I saw and talked with workers in their fifties, victimized by plant and mine shutdowns and penalized by an age discrimination which labels them as "too old to work and too young to retire."

Senator, you know of course that we also viewed some models—though too infrequently—of wonderful retirement villages and of rehabilitation centers that prove how restorative medicine can perform miracles in reducing the physical afflictions of the aging process. And I need not remind you that, given a natural span of life, none of us will remain completely immune to these afflictions.

Under your outstanding leadership, our subcommittee performed the service of surveying the range of problems before us. The Special Committee on Aging would, as a result, be in a position to launch a period of intensive investigation into each of the problems and the areas of opportunity that our increasing millions of senior citizens face today and will face in the decades ahead.

The standing committees of the Senate would, I am positive, benefit from this data and special committee recommendations—and the Nation as a whole would learn with gratification of the priority we place on the urgent necessity of making human life increasingly meaningful and rewarding during the 15 years of retirement that is given to the average American citizen.

Senate Resolution 33 is a vital measure and I applaud and support your leadership in forwarding its progress toward what I know will be acceptance and passage by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 33), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

ELIZABETH J. DOUGHTON

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 83.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 83) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth J. Doughton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth J. Doughton, widow of Walter L. Doughton, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

THELMA AUSTON BROWN

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 84.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 84) to pay a gratuity to Thelma Auston Brown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Thelma Auston Brown, widow of Coy Brown, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a unanimous-consent request to consider a nomination?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of considering a nomination.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Rowland Burnstan, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rowland Burnstan, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish, first, to apologize for presenting to the Senate such a long report. I have made many trips abroad since 1946. My usual procedure is to send questionnaires, far in advance of my arrival, to the various embassies or consulates which I intend to visit. Then the persons whom I expect to interrogate will know the subject matters upon which I expect to examine them.

Last year it was my privilege to visit 35 countries. In addition to what I shall say about those 35 countries, I have also included in my report the completed questionnaires from 11 other countries I was unable to visit.

Mr. President, this report is not the work of a committee. Ever since I have been in the Senate, I have tried to practice what I preach. The work entailed in the report which I shall present to the Senate today represents my own individual work together with the assistance of my staff. As I travel abroad, I make notes in my own handwriting and send those notes to my office, where they are transcribed. Those notes have formed the basis of the reports I have made in the past, just as they form the basis of the report I am about to make today. I do not expect to go into details in the report, but I hope to make general observations in respect to my travels.

Mr. President, when Congress recessed for the national conventions, last year, I made the first of two trips abroad that year, to inspect most of our foreign missions in certain countries. Following the presidential and congressional elections in November, I made a second trip, to complete my investigations, as I had planned. I undertook these studies under the auspices of the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member.

On most of my trips abroad made prior to 1952, I made verbal reports. Beginning with 1952, I have been making formal reports; and the committee print, a copy of which is on each Senator's desk, is my eighth written report.

Mr. President, this report contains 1,150 pages. I ask unanimous consent that copies of the report be sent by pages to the offices of all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during my first trip, last year, I visited most of the NATO countries of Western Europe, as well as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. On the second trip, my itinerary included 25 countries in the Middle East, Far East, and Africa, with visits to Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Greece.

Because of the grave conditions, both on the domestic and foreign scene, in which our country finds itself, I have attempted in this report to provide a general assessment of U.S. world operations during the past decade in the aid, military assistance, and other programs. In addition, I have attempted to gauge the effectiveness of such programs and the action which I feel is necessary if our country is to retain its position of world leadership.

I returned from these two trips abroad, much discouraged at the harvest our aid effort has reaped, alarmed at the future consequences in store for our Nation unless significant basic changes are made in our programs, and convinced that what began as a nourishing broth of "international cooperation for peace" has become a witches brew—a serious threat to our own economic stability and growth.

The danger signals resulting from 10 years of abuse of America's generous impulses, from a decade of many ill-conceived and loosely managed expenditures of America's wealth, have been apparent for quite some time, and, in fact, have often been brought to the attention of Congress. Today, the storm threatens to break upon us.

In 1948, the first year of the Marshall plan, the United States occupied an enviable position of economic and military strength. Today, after 13 years of unselfish effort to bolster the economic and military positions of less fortunate nations throughout the world, we have been reduced to the point of an all-out effort to maintain equality with the Soviet Union in the area of military power.

In 1950, the dollar was truly "as good as gold." Today, the dollar's strength is showing signs of weakness; our gold balances continue to decline; and a substantial segment of international banking circles believes that the United States must either pull in its belt, or devalue the dollar, or both.

Not all of these difficulties can be traced to the foreign-aid program, but many of them can. By early 1951, as Europe's agricultural and industrial production began to exceed prewar averages, as the task of reconstruction ended—since the proposed goals had been reached—an area of unprecedented European growth began. U.S. economic assistance should have been tapered off then.

It will be recalled that in 1951 I made such a recommendation, but the logic of this view was ignored, because at the time the Korean war had begun.

With the Red onslaught in Korea came another and vastly different kind of threat. Where once, in the late 1940's, Soviet aggression against the free world had taken the form of subversion and efforts to gain control of political processes by quasi-legal means, the threat of the 1950's was armed aggression. At least, this was the official U.S. evaluation of the situation, and our European allies agreed.

America's planners, both economic and military, were not able or willing to adapt programs to the changes made necessary by world events. The concepts exemplified by the Marshall plan and NATO—concepts which were, for a limited period, effective in Western Europe—were subsequently expanded to other areas of the globe.

Apparently it was believed—for the Congress was so informed—that the specter of "creeping communism" could be exorcised only through massive doses of economic aid to other countries, including the so-called underdeveloped countries, plus so-called collective security arrangements in areas other than NATO.

It should be remembered that at the time when these concepts were initially fostered, the United States was at war in Korea. World conditions of the moment required action; and, on representations of persons generally believed to be competent, the Congress acted quickly and forcefully.

It will be recalled that mine was one of the few voices lifted in opposition to these programs; but the cries of opponents were drowned out by the shouts of those in favor. As a result, America's aid burden grew.

The countries of Western Europe were kept on the United States aid list despite their achievement of full recovery; and America's treasure began to flow into a host of other areas. Economic and technical assistance agreements were negotiated with almost every country not behind the Iron Curtain; military assistance pacts were concluded with most of the same countries. Each pact bound the United States to defend the other contracting party, in case of attack; but few, if any, bound such other party to spring to our defense, in the event of an attack upon the United States.

In my inspections, one singularly amazing factor has consistently stood

forth: the unwillingness of American administrators to tailor assistance—both military and nonmilitary—to local conditions. This initial failure to adapt programs to meet the needs of a particular area has not been overcome during subsequent years of practical experience.

I have seen examples of this, time after time, year after year, in country after country.

Our failure generally to adapt to changing conditions has wreaked havoc with our NATO alliances. It will not, and cannot, be disputed that there are differences of opinion among the Western allies as to how best to deal with the Soviet Union. When these differences arise, American administrators, in order to procure the kind of program they feel necessary, are placed in the position of either obligating the total cost, or most of it, to the American taxpayers, or seeing their plans go by the board.

It is obvious that even where differences of opinion between the United States and the other Western allies are not so apparent our European allies are insistent upon "letting Uncle Sam do the work." Witness Korea, where the overwhelming majority of foreign troops consisted of American forces, and where even now the United States is in full charge of the aid program, both military and economic. It is a truism that should Red forces obtain dominion over the Korean peninsula the security of the entire free world would be threatened—the security of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, and other countries, as well as that of the United States. Yet at no time has the United States been able to prevail upon such other countries to effectively participate in the aid program in Korea.

The lessons of the past have apparently been wasted upon U.S. leadership, although there are hopeful signs that perhaps, at long last, the Department of State is learning that, in return for unstinting U.S. aid in the postwar years, our European neighbors are not above rewarding their benefactors with consummate ingratitude. I could not help but recall my first visit to Germany in 1946, shortly after World War II—the bombed-out buildings, the despair, the fear that before long what remained of German industry would be Russian operated. Today, Germany is in the throes of an economic boom. The mark is rock solid, Germany's budget is in balance, and, compared with ours, her tax rates are most favorable. In spite of all this, the German Government only this past fall refused to help pay the costs of U.S. troops in Germany—present, I might add, to defend Germany against possible Red aggression—in order to help overcome the drain on America's gold reserves.

At this point, I wish I could tell Senators, and other Americans in particular, what I found in Western Germany in respect to the assistance being rendered us by our so-called NATO allies. But I can say to any American father or mother who has a son tonight in Western Germany—that son would be in mortal danger, because of the lack of assistance to be given by our so-called allies if Russia were to attack—which I do not believe she will. I wish I could tell the public what I found. Somebody would want to use a shotgun or brickbat on somebody for permitting such a situation to exist as now exists. It is just shameful, Mr. President.

Far too long, the United States has turned the other cheek. Far too long, our leadership has submitted to demands on the part of Europe's leaders that all negotiations with the Soviet Union be cleared in advance with them. It is time for our Nation to recognize and insist that if the United States is going to carry the burdens of free world defense throughout the globe, then we are entitled to indulge in freedom of action vis-a-vis negotiations with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, if the leadership of Europe and other beneficiaries of U.S. largesse are to insist upon exercising control over such elements as disarmament, et cetera, then they should be willing to pay the price by way of increased domestic defense costs, as well as larger volumes of assistance to underdeveloped lands.

It is my view now, as it has been my view of almost a decade, that unless immediate and basic changes are made in our foreign policy, both in theory and in execution, the United States stands in grave danger.

We certainly cannot carry the free world's load alone; to do so invites economic disaster and the destruction of the West's greatest bastion of economic strength. Further, the present situation, where the United States has become the arsenal for the free world—a development which has come because of the unwillingness of our allies to provide material for their own defense—would invite disaster should war come. Logistics alone—the movement of men, weapons, food, and fiber—to allied armies would pose almost impossible problems.

For these reasons, I recommend that greater emphasis be given to the United Nations; wherever possible, any action taken, military or economic, should be funneled through the United Nations, be it in the Congo, Laos, the Middle East, or any other area, with each nation bearing its fair, pro rata share of the cost. The United Nations, as an organ for preserving and maintaining the peace, must be strengthened. That the United Nations has a multitude of faults is obvious, but the United States must take the lead in eliminating these faults, without impairing U.S. sovereignty.

It has finally been driven home to the American people that neither our economy nor our fiscal resources are in the best of condition. "Balance of payments," a term known only to economists a few short years ago, has become ominously familiar to the rank and file of our citizens.

In September 1959, in an address to the Senate in connection with debate on the mutual security appropriation bill, I again pointed out that more dollars were leaving America than were coming in, that these dollars were being converted into gold, and that our gold reserves were growing perilously low. I offered then, as I did in previous years, certain amendments which would have assisted in correcting this danger. While my amendments were shouted down, my remarks evidently caused some soul searching in the executive branch, because just a few months after my amendment of 1959, which would have required loan proceeds from the Development Loan Fund to be spent in the United States, was defeated, the Secretary of the Treasury endeavored to accomplish such a result by directive.

This matter of unfavorable balance of payments is, in my judgment, second only to the threat of domestic unemployment as the principal danger facing this country today.

When the deficit in our balance of payments approximated $2.6 billion in 1950, there was little reason for concern. The once prosperous countries of Western Europe and Japan had little or no gold reserves and the amount of short-term dollars held by them was negligible, when compared to their current holdings.

Prior to, and immediately after, World War II, the United States was able to maintain its creditor position in world finances to compete effectively on world markets, because despite higher labor costs here, American production facilities were more modern than those of our competitors, American technology was generally superior and, through the miracle of mass production, American goods were of a higher quality for the price paid.

With the advent of the Marshall plan, the United States began to share the fruits of its technology with other countries—to rebuild their devastated industrial complexes—to further reduce tariff barriers to permit the recipients of our aid to earn dollars, in order, we are told, to become better customers of the United States.

Unfortunately, the United States extracted no concessions in return for this aid, relying instead upon the theory that the countries of Western Europe, once restored to economic health, would "do unto Uncle Sam us Uncle Sam had done unto them."

That was the view of Mr. Paul Hoffman, the first Administrator of this program, when it was known as the European Cooperation Administration. He said, "Make Europe prosperous—the Europeans will buy more from us."

I shall not go into the details as to what is happening now, because everybody knows about it. Europe today is as prosperous, if not more prosperous than, it has ever been. Europe today is one of our chief competitors in world trade and is taking away from us millions of dollars worth of exports which we enjoyed in previous years.

This theory proved woefully false, and now we find ourselves in dire financial straits because of a decade of deficits in our balance of payments.

In this time of crisis, more than lipservice is necessary to solve the balance of payments dilemma. Our Government must take immediate steps to the end that the problem can be solved to-

day—not tomorrow. There is not a good, sound, or sufficient reason for us to delay.

Therefore, I believe that the following actions should be taken immediately:

First. Military grant assistance to the dollar surplus countries of Western Europe and Japan should be entirely eliminated and replaced by a military equipment sales program.

As I pointed out last year to the Senate, Western Europe is prosperous. When I say Western Europe I do not include Greece and Turkey, but only the countries of Western Europe from Italy westward. In the bill passed by the Senate last year there was $750 million of borrowed money made available to the countries of Western Europe, to buy equipment and aid them in their defenses.

As I pointed out in this report, many countries which are still receiving aid from us are spending from 3 to 4 percent of their gross national product on defense, as compared to the 11 percent we are spending of our gross national product for this purpose. One country, in particular, is spending less than 3 percent of its gross national product on defense. Unfortunately, these figures have been classified as secret.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, some of the countries to which we give assistance are better able than we to carry the burden which now faces us.

Second. All moneys appropriated to the Development Loan Fund and the International Cooperation Administration should be spent in the United States, without exception, unless it should be completely impractical.

Third. A study should be initiated immediately to determine the feasibility of reducing the manpower that the United States has deployed in NATO Europe, as well as in other parts of the world. Our NATO obligations should be reevaluated, to the end that each member nation will share its just proportion of military equipment and manpower.

Mr. President, I repeat: I wish I could tell the American people what I found in these NATO countries of Western Europe. It is shameful the way some countries have withdrawn their manpower from the joint effort and how they have failed to provide needed equipment.

Fourth. There should be imposed immediately tight restrictions on all offshore procurement carried on by the International Cooperation Administration, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, the General Services Administration, and all other agencies engaged in extensive buying from the hard currency countries.

Fifth. The disbursements of funds to promote travel of American tourists abroad should cease immediately, if it has not already been accomplished. Although I am not opposed to American tourism, I believe the dollars expended could be used to better advantage by promoting the travel of foreigners to America, in view of the alarming deficit in our balance of payments.

In any assessment of our foreign operations, we should not overlook the fact that as of today, notwithstanding the expenditure of over $86 billion, there has been a steady decline in our position as world leader. Our prestige has suffered immeasurably. During this same period Russia has gained new strength and is threatening to replace us in our position of world leadership.

When any attempt is made to assess what our future relationships with the Soviet bloc may hold, or what courses we should chart, it must be kept in mind that no longer do the Soviet Union and the United States alone stand preeminent in world affairs. The rubble of Western Europe and Japan has been transformed into a viable economic third force. The world's political atmosphere, only a decade ago consisting of a choice between Stalinist communism and American freedom, has been supplemented by an upsurge of such age-old philosophies as neutralism and nationalism, plus the virulence of the Red Chinese brand of totalitarianism.

Although once the Soviet Union and the United States offered two clear-cut and clear choices around which world sentiment and opinion could polarize, other energies have now entered the magnetic field of international relationships. Because of this, and for other reasons it is obvious that policies formulated in 1946, or even 1956 or 1959, are no longer necessarily valid today.

But the necessary changes have not been made.

To a large extent, U.S. policies vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in 1960 were contained within the same context originally developed in 1946. Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, too many policymakers operated on the theory that during that 14-year period no changes had taken place within the Soviet Union.

In formulating these policies, as well as in executing them, what may well prove to be the decisive element has gone largely ignored, and that is the opportunity to force a revision of both the Soviet Union's internal and external policies through the strength of our example.

It is necessary, of course, to maintain a position of relative, and preferably superior, military strength, insofar as our dealings with the Soviet Union are concerned, for to do otherwise would be to court disaster. But, at best, the maintenance of military strength as a deterrent is a negative force; it is simply a holding action, a development which is required pending the application of some other elements in the arena of international power.

It is apparent that the United States has so far succeeded in frustrating any direct and overt expansionist moves on the part of the Soviet Union, but what are we doing to dissolve and dissipate the desire to make such moves in the first place?

While halting a threat is one thing, and dissolving it is quite another, efforts tailored to achieve such dissolution must be based upon a realistic appraisal as to how best to move.

In the field of United States-Soviet relationships, the most potent offensive weapons we possess have gone largely unused—namely, the relative merits of our industrial and economic system, and the overwhelming superiority of our political and spiritual institutions.

A vastly enlarged exchange program—something I have been preaching for the past 7 or 8 years—and a broadening of cultural contacts between the East and the West offer the best and most fruitful approach. By every means at our disposal we should attempt to bring about such an expanded program. This poses difficulties, of course, not the least of which is the possibility of opening our border to other than bona fide Soviet students, scholars, farmers, and the ordinary run of tourists, but this contingency, too, can certainly be met, through tighter security efforts and a frank denial of the privilege of inspecting U.S. military and atomic installations. Within the limitations just outlined, I would advocate an exchange of persons not on a basis of 1 to 1 or 10 to 10, but on an unrestricted basis as to numbers.

The United States must not deny itself the use of an approach which offers the best possibility of easing East-West tensions, an approach which does not involve further accommodations of our own position to Soviet demands, but rather an approach based upon an effort to create within the Soviet people a desire for more economic, political and spiritual freedom.

Mr. President, based upon the data I accumulated during my two trips abroad I believe there is clear and convincing evidence which urgently calls upon the executive and legislative branches of our Government for immediate action.

We can no longer tolerate a deficit in our balance of payments.

We can no longer continue a foreign aid program based on the Marshall plan concept, which served well from its inception through fiscal year 1951, but which ceased to have application after that time.

We can no longer bear alone the burden of furnishing grant aid to the underdeveloped countries of the world.

We can no longer endure inefficiency and waste in our foreign operations.

We can no longer permit the loss of dollars through inept business dealings with foreign countries.

I would like to propound a series of general recommendations which, if properly carried into effect, can go a long way toward alleviating much of the difficulty in which this country finds itself today. Unless action is taken, the alternatives are not pleasant to visualize.

First. Any newly programed economic grant aid, with the possible exception of Latin American countries, should be advanced on a multilateral basis, through the United Nations, and the U.S. allotment should under no circumstances exceed 33⅓ percent.

Second. Existing bilateral economic grant aid—direct U.S. aid—programs should be tapered off, and at the earliest possible date, be placed on a multilateral basis, through the United Nations.

Third. All future bilateral economic aid—direct U.S. aid—should be placed on a loan basis through the Development Loan Fund, and to the extent possible, these loans should be repaid in dollars, with the option resting in the United States to accept some other mode of repayment.

Fourth. It is recommended that the arbitrary use of unrealistic foreign exchange rates, which result in huge unrecorded losses to the United States in connection with the sale of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, title 1, and in connection with Public Law 480 and other mutual security loan operations, be prohibited; and that the business transactions incident to our mutual security loan operations be placed on a businesslike basis, and not used as a cloak for charity. It is further recommended that Congress closely scrutinize the operation of such mutual security programs for administrative abuses and to assure that the programs are placed on a sound fiscal basis.

Fifth. The number of Americans serving abroad in a nonmilitary capacity should be reduced, and those who are sent to foreign stations should be submitted to a rigorous predeparture training.

Sixth. It is recommended that the exchange-of-persons program generally, be expanded. By every means at our disposal, an attempt should be made to bring about a vastly enlarged exchange program and a broadening of cultural contacts between the East and the West, as it is believed that this is the best means of promoting mutual understanding, the merits of the U.S. way of life, and the dissipation of the theory that communistic and free world countries cannot peacefully coexist.

Seventh. It is recommended that every effort be made to increase trade between the so-called Eastern bloc and the United States. We should not fear competition. In that connection, the Battle Act should be reevaluated.

With reference to the U.S. Information Agency, my recommendations are as follows:

First. It is recommended that much greater emphasis be placed upon expediting the construction of powerful radio transmitters in the United States capable of beaming an effective Voice of America to foreign countries; that the hours devoted to VOA activities be increased, particularly in the countries of Latin America; that the content of the programs be improved and made more objective; and further, that much greater effort be made to have VOA broadcasts rebroadcasted by the medium-waved stations in foreign countries, as well as by our own ships at sea, wherever feasible.

Second. On the basis of the record, I am convinced that the U.S. Information Agency, as now operated, has about served its purpose and that drastic changes as to its operations are in order.

Accordingly I strongly recommend that:

(a) We do away with all our information centers, for they are regarded in most countries as purely propaganda outlets for spreading imperialism.

(b) In all countries, particularly the underdeveloped nations, jointly supported binational centers, designed to truly depict life in America, be established. English, and so forth, could and should be taught in these centers. They should be regarded and administered as community centers, where the best aspects of Western, particularly American, culture and technology can be displayed.

(c) Existing USIS libraries should be placed under the supervision of these binational centers, with locals in charge.

(d) Libraries maintained at U.S. expense, in such countries as the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, and so forth, should be immediately turned over to either local organs for operation, or as an alternative, joint U.S.-local committees should be formed to take over their maintenance. There is no logical reason for the United States to continue to maintain libraries in such countries, and the practice should be terminated at once.

(e) Present USIS movie libraries and TV scripts could be made available through the binational centers to local users.

(f) Libraries for research should be made available at our Embassies and local personnel should be hired to operate these facilities.

(g) The press operation of USIA should be dispensed with and the Embassy should take over the duty of making available to the foreign country, newspapers and periodicals, important speeches, messages, and so forth, by American officials.

Wisely administered, a program of the type I have recommended, in addition to saving many millions of dollars, would be relatively free of the taint of propaganda which hangs over most of our information centers as presently operated. It would permit the United States to do a more effective job, vis-a-vis our own interest, and further, would prove of benefit to countries wherein the program operates. These functions, I wish to reemphasize, should be placed on a grassroots basis, if at all feasible. Our Embassies could and should offer encouragement and assistance where necessary, but to the maximum extent possible, the exchange program, binational centers, and so forth, should be closely identified with the local people.

In the field of Embassy operations of our Foreign Service, my recommendations are:

First. A vigorous effort should be made to streamline the operations of our Embassies. In this connection, our Ambassadors should be given greater authority over the retention and release of personnel, as I previously recommended. Furthermore, the Ambassador should be given some control over the kind, type, and quantity of reports prepared by the various sections of his office.

Second. The size of staffs in all sections of the Embassies should be reevaluated, with a view toward effecting either the reduction of U.S. personnel, or of substituting local employees, particularly in the economic-commercial and administrative sections.

In that connection, it requires much money to keep an American abroad. In many of the Western European countries local people could do the same work done by Americans for little more than one-third of the cost. To pay the local people, of course, we could use local currencies.

Third. The personnel of the political sections of the Embassies should be drastically reduced, if not eliminated, wherever possible, and the principal political reporting duties assigned to the chief of mission.

Fourth. A complete review should be made of the functions performed by the various attachés, because the work done by these individuals, in many instances, amounts to duplication. In this regard, most of our agricultural attaché missions could be abolished and the work handled by the Economic-commercial sections of the embassies.

Fifth. The establishment of a commercial attaché mission should not be permitted, notwithstanding the alleged justification that this will result in an increase of our exports. The creation of another foreign bureaucracy is not the means that should be used to increase our balance of trade, which is already favorable.

Sixth. The military service attaché functions should be closely scrutinized. Notwithstanding the implementation of pooling arrangements among the military services, little if any savings have been effected, and for this there appears to be neither rhyme nor reason.

My recommendations that deal with our Military Assistance Advisory Groups are as follows:

First. The MAAG's assigned to the countries of Western Europe should be withdrawn immediately, and those assigned to other countries, where needed, should be restricted to technicians.

Second. Since much harm and misunderstanding result from the presence of American uniformed personel in many of the underdeveloped countries, it is recommended that MAAG personnel be required to wear civilian garb.

Mr. President, I did not indulge in too many details, but I am hopeful that Members of Congress will take time out for a study of the data that I have attached to my country by country reports. I do believe that the subject matter is of great importance. In my humble judgment, unless steps are taken immediately to bring some form of sanity to our foreign aid operations, then the economic pillars upon which this great democracy rest will come crashing about us.

Mr. President, I repeat, I do hope that Senators and Congressmen, as well as representatives of the executive department will study my recommendations carefully and move to their adoption for the sake, not only of our country today, but for our grandchildren, and their grandchildren, in fact for the millions of Americans as yet unborn, who deserve the opportunity to live and harvest the fruits of freedom, as have we, in the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I wish to commend the senior Senator from Louisiana for the detailed care that has gone into the compilation of his report. This has become the kind of performance the Senate looks forward to every year. The Senator from Louisiana is totally unselfish with his time, and seems to have an unbelievable drive and energy for digging out these details. I am sure that this very extended report will become a mine of information for all Members of the Senate, as preceding reports have become.

I wish particularly to commend the Senator for his suggestion that perhaps the wrong profile of America has been getting out around the world, and his recommendation that we have an unlimited exchange of persons. It seems to me that one of the things which are obvious to people everywhere is that the Soviets have censorship, and have an Iron Curtain, because they are afraid of a comparison and a contrast, and what the reaction among their people might be. Our basic strength has been the kind of life that we have developed, with a give and take, with differences of opinion, and with the pursuit of truth in the public marketplace of ideas.

However, we ought to be confident in showing this off more freely than we have. I hope that we will make every effort to undertake such programs, and get the visitors out of New York and Washington and get them into Louisiana and Montana and Rhode Island——

Mr. ELLENDER. And Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. And Wyoming. That includes the State of Kansas also, which is so ably represented by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who is in the Chamber. Furthermore, I believe that one of the tragedies at the present time is that while we have made it clear to the world what it is that we are against, one of the best kept secrets of the last 10 years is what it is America is for. I think many of the suggestions which the Senator from Louisiana has contributed to the Senate today will help us to sharpen and to formulate a more constructive image of America oversea. Again, I commend the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have been privileged this afternoon to listen to the report given by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I know that on a number of other occasions when the Senator from Louisiana has made his reports to the Senate there have been many who, in one manner or another, have frowned upon the findings or the suggestions made by the Senator.

It has not been my privilege to travel to many places in the world; but through my acquaintanceship with persons who have been privileged to travel on official missions, or otherwise, I know that many of the details which the Senator from Louisiana has reported have been confirmed on many occasions.

I think it is about time that we seek to interest people to take these reports under active consideration and, in one way or another, to do something about them. The statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] are indeed well deserved. I hope the report, large as it may seem, will not appear forbidding to those who examine it and see the careful detail with which the Senator has prepared it.

I for one commend the Senator from Louisiana for his detailed reports—not only this one, but also the others he has made—because I have found them to be most interesting and profitable in my own investigations on many occasions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the Senator from Louisiana for making, once again, a report on the results of his travels overseas. In my opinion, no one works more seriously at the job of looking after the Nation's foreign affairs, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, than does the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

I assure him that I did not know he intended to make his report today until I returned to the States last night. I have not had a chance to examine the report, but the Senator may be certain that, as always, I shall read with great interest what he has said. I also express to him my appreciation for the time and energy he has expended in compiling the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Oil Men's Association, at its annual meeting at Wichita on Monday, January 23, 1961, adopted certain resolutions regarding national fuel policy, gasoline taxes, percentage depletion, a limitation on proposals in Congress in regard to the distribution of products which are sold by oil jobbers, and a divorcement of segments of integrated oil companies from other segments of the said oil companies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be made a part of my remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY KANSAS OIL MEN'S ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 23, 1961

RESOLUTION 1: NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

Whereas the coal industry, by legislative means, is attempting to dictate fuels usage by areas regardless of the public's desires or demands; and

Whereas this activity would in effect give the coal industry governmental protection against the rigors of competition; and

Whereas the present fuels policy, based on individual freedom of choice in selecting fuels to be used for whatever purpose desired, has proven to be most efficient and logical; therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention here assembled, That we oppose all attempts by Government agencies to regulate the usage or selection of fuels by geographical areas; and be it further

Resolved, That all fuels be permitted to compete for markets on the basis of free enterprise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Kansas congressional delegation in Washington, D.C.

RESOLUTION 2: GASOLINE TAXES

Whereas the present combined Federal 4-cent and State 5-cent gasoline tax in Kansas amounts to 9 cents per gallon, the equivalent of a 43-percent sales tax; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by law, has agreed to the expiration of the 1-cent Federal temporary gasoline tax. This tax increase went into effect October 1, 1959, and is due to expire on June 30, 1961; and

Whereas efforts may be made upon recommendations by the Eisenhower administration to not only continue the 1-cent temporary Federal tax, but also to increase the tax by another one-half cent per gallon; and

Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959 provides that, upon the expiration of the 1-cent Federal temporary gasoline tax, additional funds will be obtained for the highway trust fund by the dedication of one-half of the 10-percent Federal excise tax on the sale of new cars and five-eighths of the Federal excise tax on automobile parts and accessories; and

Whereas an adequate highway program can be maintained without further increase in Federal or State gasoline taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention here assembled, That the U.S. Congress be strongly urged to keep its promise and permit the 1-cent Federal temporary gasoline tax to expire on June 30, 1961; and be it further

Resolved, That every effort be made to refrain from increasing taxes on gasoline; and be it further

Resolved, That all automotive taxes collected by the Federal Government be earmarked for the highway trust fund; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Kansas congressional delegation in Washington, D.C.

RESOLUTION 4: PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

Whereas an adequate supply of oil and continuous oil exploration is essential to the national welfare and defense; and

Whereas Congress in 1926, recognizing the need for an incentive for oil exploration, enacted a provision for percentage depletion, allowing 27½ percent of gross income from an oil well as a tax deduction, limited in any one year to 50 percent of the taxable income from the well; and

Whereas attempts are being made to reduce this rate which, if carried out, would sharply reduce drilling activities; and

Whereas less drilling activity would soon cause shortages of domestic supplies, bringing about higher prices for gasoline and oil products, contributing to inflation, and accelerating the trend toward smaller cars, resulting in less tax revenue: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention here assembled, That we strongly oppose any effort to reduce, eliminate, or otherwise tamper with present percentage depletion for oil and natural gas; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Kansas congressional delegation in Washington, D.C.

RESOLUTION 8: T.B.A. LIMITATIONS

Whereas there have been various proposals in the Congress of the United States to bar petroleum jobbers and other wholesale distributors of petroleum products from dealing in tires, batteries, and accessories; and

Whereas any such legislation would constitute a serious infringement on the principles of competitive free enterprise; and

Whereas this restrictive legislation would, without cause, deprive jobbers and other wholesalers of a legitimate source of income essential to their continued operations; and

Whereas existing laws have proved entirely adequate to rule out such admittedly undesirable practices as would tend unduly to restrict trade or in any way promote monopoly in this area of sales: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention here assembled, That we actively oppose enactment of these proposed measures; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly endorsed, be transmitted to Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Petroleum Distribution Practices, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., as an expression of the will of this assembly.

RESOLUTION 10: DIVORCEMENT

Whereas recurrent proposals have been and are being made to divorce one or another segment of integrated oil companies from some or all other segments of said companies; and

Whereas any such artificial divorcement would seriously impair the national welfare by depriving the public of the results of economies achieved through proper integration; and

Whereas this divorcement would unduly restrict the natural development of the petroleum industry in accord with the basic principles of free enterprise, thereby endangering the dynamic growth of a domestic industry essential to the national security; and

Whereas such divorcement would place arbitrary, unwarranted limits on the opportunity of all within the petroleum industry, jobbers included, to expand their business to the full extent of their capabilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Kansas Oil Men's Association in convention here assembled, That we firmly oppose any and all moves to impose any measure of divorcement on the petroleum industry; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Kansas congressional delegation in Washington, D.C.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last week I had the opportunity to make a trip with the distinguished Secretary of Labor, Mr. Arthur Goldberg. We left Washington, to view the situation in regard to unemployment.

I think this much can be said: In the first place, the concern of the President about the existing unemployment is certainly commendable. The fact that he sent Secretary of Labor Goldberg on that particular mission, to see at first-hand the opportunities in which this administration can be of help to those who are unemployed, also demonstrates the depth of the thought by those in the administration about this situation.

For some time my own opinion has been that the unemployment problem in the United States is one of our greatest concerns. We know we have the problem of the fight with the Communist world. Anyone who is familiar with history knows that the height of Communist power in the United States was during the depth of the depression; we know that the Communist-led march on Washington, during the depression, was occasioned only by poverty and by unemployment. We also know that the international Communists call for unemployment today; we know that they feed on unemployment and on poverty and on despair and distress.

Now we see unemployment in the United States again rise to more than 5 million people. I think we need only look at history, and realize that in December 1930, after the great depression was over a year old, there were only approximately 4 million unemployed persons in our country. We know that since that time the labor force has increased; but 4 million people out of work are still 4 million individuals, not merely a statistic in connection with the labor force.

By March 1931 the 4 million unemployed of December 1930 had increased to 8 million. I hope nothing of that sort occurs again. But in December 1960 4 million of our people were out of work; and in January 1961 over 5 million of our people were out of work.

The economists tell us that they do not believe we have yet reached the bottom of the present recession. No indicator visible at the moment would show that we have yet reached the bottom of the recession. In fact, every indication, even including those which come to us today, is that times will get worse before they get better. Everyone in the administration, including the President, has tried to emphasize this fact, even though this situation was created by the preceding administration, not the present administration.

I think each one of us should give very deep consideration to whether a partisan or a nonpartisan approach should be taken to these matters. Secretary Goldberg stated, in the course of his trip in the Midwest, that we have a bipartisan foreign policy and that he hoped these problems at home would be met on a bipartisan basis.

On the trip, we went first to Chicago. I may say, in lighter vein, that when we left Washington the Secretary's coat disappeared, so he had at least the same exposure to the elements that is experienced by many of those who suffer from unemployment. He had to go coatless; and he had to arrange to have one of his relatives take care of him—by having his daughter bring to him a coat from his brother-in-law, in Chicago. However, the coat which was brought to him was designed for a person of rather portly size, whereas the Secretary of Labor is not of that build. So the coat which was brought to him fitted him about one and a half times around.

In Chicago we talked to some of those who are unemployed—as I have done during the field trips I have made for the Senate.

I think it appropriate to call attention to the fact that in the closing days of the first session of the last Congress, the majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, now Vice President of the United States, requested the creation of a special Senate committee to look into the question of unemployment problems. That committee was then created, and in serving on it, we conducted many field hearings. I personally made more field trips, I suppose, than did any of the other members of the committee. For instance, I had a chance to visit sections of the coal-mining area in which there is widespread unemployment, and at that time I had an opportunity to listen to the statements made by unemployed miners. One of them said he was looking for work, but that when he asked for a job, he would be asked, "What can you do?"

He would reply, "I can mine coal."

The reply to him would be, "We don't need a coal miner."

That was the extent of his opportunity to obtain employment. He had no opportunity to obtain retraining; he had no opportunity to be used in society.

Last year I told the Senate about a man in Pikeville, Ky., and I think to tell of his situation demonstrates better than anything else I could say the plight of a coal miner in that area who today is out of work. This story was told by the editor of the newspaper in Pikeville, Ky.: A coal miner who was out of work left his home and traveled about, in an effort to find work. He was gone for more than 2 years—visiting every region in the Ohio Valley that he could reach. He had a wife and a number of children, and he was terribly distressed because they lacked food and because he was unable to provide them with some of the necessities of life, including food. Of course, he was not able to provide them with any of the luxuries which some of us in America enjoy. He was also greatly distressed because of the fact that he could not send his children to school.

After seeking employment for more than 2 years, he finally returned to his

home—in December 1958—and wrote to his wife a note in which he said he could no longer stand seeing the despair of his wife and his children, and that he did not have anything to look forward to as Christmas approached, and that he was going to give them the best Christmas he knew how—that in the event of his death, they could have a better living on social security. So he took a shotgun and killed himself.

Some may say that such cases are the exception, not the rule; but, even so, I may point out that on our recent trip, when we reached Chicago, I heard what was said by the father of six children. I talked to him when he was standing in the unemployment line. Before the Secretary of Labor reached him, I asked him, "How do you get by"?

He just shrugged his shoulders.

Then I asked him, "How do you manage?"

He said, "I try to manage as best I can."

I said to him, "I suppose your wife is irritated by your inability to find work."

He said, "Oh, no. I have a fine wife. If I didn't, it would be unbearable."

I asked him, "How do your children get along?"

He replied, "The best they can."

He had been trying to get along with unemployment compensation and supplemental benefits, but those had been reduced to less than 50 percent of what they had been before.

Certainly that man was trying to do the best he could, in spite of everything else. He said what we hear repeated thousands of times by those who are in the unemployed lines: "I don't want benefits or food or charity. All I want is a job." But these people, through no fault of their own, are denied the right to work.

Again and again those who are unemployed complain to us about the money our Government sends to starving peoples overseas. They say, "Why doesn't our country keep that money here? We need it."

So. Mr. President, you can understand the opposition to some of our foreign-aid programs, and you can understand why it it hard for some of us in the Congress to see our Government really turn its back on the people here at home who need help.

Then we hear them asking, "What are they doing about automation?" What are they doing about plants that are modernizing and taking our jobs away? What are they doing about competition? People come into this country from overseas and take jobs away from Americans in the steel mills. Foreign countries are shipping into this country toys, bicycles, and automobiles."

All of these happenings are raising in the minds of those people a feeling of resentment toward our own people and our own Government, because we are doing things which they do not understand or which could, perhaps, in some way, be of benefit to them.

When surplus food is mentioned, they act as if it were almost a laugh, because the amounts and quality are not enough to keep them even alive, let alone to consider it a great act on the part of our country, which produces more food than we can use.

The fact of the matter is, I suppose, that unemployed people have a right to ask of those of us who are in government whether we take seriously the words uttered by Jesus, as quoted in the Bible, when he said it is a duty not alone of government, but of man to his fellow man, to do unto others as they would have done unto them.

I wonder how many of us, if we changed places with those people, would think this is what the richest country in the world should do for its people. Yet I know people in government are making desperate efforts to find answers to these questions, which would in some way explain what is being done and what is attempted to be done.

It is not enough to try to sell democracy, or a high standard of living, or freedom, because there is nothing which will destroy a man's desire for those things more than an empty stomach. I remember reading Schlesingers' description of the new era of life which was ushered in during the great depression, of hearing hungry babies cry, of mothers telling stories that their children could not eat decent or full meals, even if they had the opportunity to do so, because their stomachs had shrunken so much.

I remember we went into Gary and South Bend, Ind. These two cities were just recently put in the category of having over 9 percent of their working force unemployed. Gary and Lake County, Ind., were responsible for 20 percent of the steel production of this country. Yet, since the steel strike, we have not seen the steel mills operate at full capacity. Steel production has been going down and down.

I have in my hand today's Wall Street Journal. I read from some of the headlines which I find on only a cursory examination:

"Six Thousand Workers Were Laid Off Work During the Weekend." "Ford Abandons a Plant." Most of the sources blame a slowdown in business for their action. The Ford Motor Co. closed its Chester, Pa., assembly plant and put its property up for sale. About 1,500 persons are employed there.

The Plankinton Packing Co., a division of Swift & Co., plans to permanently close its Milwaukee meatpacking plant by early next year. About 900 employees will be affected.

Another Milwaukee firm, International Harvester Co., will discontinue forge operations, affecting about 160 of the plant's 2,800 workers.

Briggs & Stratton Corp. will close one of its three Milwaukee plants for 1 week starting today, laying off 1,800 workers.

A. O. Smith Corp. laid off 300 more employees in its automotive frame production operations in Milwaukee and plans to shut an auto frame plant in Granite City, Ill.

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Co. laid off 135 persons as it closed a potline at Mead, Wash.

These and other indications are that we have not reached the end of what are serious times for many people.

Before Secretary Goldberg went on his trip, I said to him, "I wish to goodness people in Washington could come out of their ivory palaces and see the people as they are living, and go over the country and view these 5 million people and see what it means, because these are human beings." These are people with families, who have a right to expect an opportunity to work, because this was guaranteed to them by the Full Employment Act of 1956, which designated it as the national policy.

The President himself has sent messages to Congress as to what should be done. I personally think we should do more, and do it now. I think the time to do it has long passed. As we all know, once a plant closes down, it is more difficult to get it going than it is to keep it operating in the meantime.

I think that one of the first things we could do is provide tax relief, so those who are working will increase their purchasing power.

I have introduced a measure which would increase from $600 to $1,000 the exemption for each dependent. It should put $200 million into the hands of those who are working. This money would go to the people who have families and children to support. The money would go to buy groceries and clothes, pay rent, pay the man for the goods in his little store down the street, and help to keep small businesses from going to the wall. It used to be only the small businesses that were yelling. Now even the larger ones are yelling. This measure would help all along the line, as far as people are concerned.

I believe we could accelerate the highway program of the United States. There are 41,000 miles of roadway which have been authorized by Congress. If we removed the amendment which prohibits the original purpose of the act itself, the plans are already in being, and we could start pouring the concrete and using the machinery. This activity would accelerate demand for additional plant operation, and additional people would go to work.

I think we could accelerate flood control and other authorized projects for the Army engineers, which projects could be undertaken without great hesitation.

These things could be given to the people at a time when they need it. In each case, it would be an investment in the future of America and would not, in any way, be something which would be lost.

We must remember that all these measures are only temporary operations to meet immediate situations; but if there was ever a challenge to this Nation, it is the challenge of determining whether or not it is going to be faithful and true to its own people, whether it is really going to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

These are high ideals for a nation, and high ideals for a government. If the Government is not willing to put into practical operation the means by which these ideals can be attained, then a lot of people are going to lose faith in the ideals themselves.

I think this is a real challenge. I would hope that those of us who are in Congress could really get down to the

Government's business, which is to look out for the future of its own citizens.

I suppose the rest of the world, in some way, and to some extent, is going to judge our real intentions to those overseas by how we treat ourselves, whether we are going to create a pool of so-called untouchables who are going to get only crumbs that are under the table, or whether we are going to give them an opportunity to have the full life and to have those things which a free society can best give them.

I again commend the Secretary for taking this step of dramatizing at least to parts of the Nation the seriousness of our situation.

I commend the President for the action he has taken in proposing programs to Congress to alleviate this problem. I, for myself, will try to do what I can to help him.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF ALOYSIUS CARDINAL STEPINAC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, February 10 marked the passing of 1 year since the death of Cardinal Stepinac of Croatia.

This man, in World War II, in the face of the Nazis and Communists, conducted himself in an heroic manner of intensity and richness which brought to him the admiration and respect of the people of the world.

He was born on May 8, 1898, in Krasic, a village approximately 40 miles from Zagreb, the capital of Croatia. He was the son of a pious peasant family. In his youth, living with his family and under the influence of his parents, he developed a character respecting individuality and human beings. From that humble life and background he rose to priesthood, and subsequently to be an archbishop. Finally he became a cardinal of the Catholic Church.

When the Nazis occupied his native land of Croatia, he protested against their abuses and spoke in behalf of the people who were exploited and oppressed. When the Nazis were driven out and the Communists took charge, he continued to speak the voice of a person who held all human beings in high respect.

While Tito was in charge, he found discomfort in the arguments which were made by Cardinal Stepinac and charged him with misconduct, with violating the laws of Yugoslavia, especially because of speaking in a manner which would weaken communism in the land of Yugoslavia.

He was brought to trial. It was a sham trial. He was accused of the violations of the laws of the Communist country, but, instead of being the accused, while the trial was going on he became the accuser. While the people's court was being conducted, Cardinal Stepinac, not knowing whether he was to be sentenced to death, to be imprisoned for life, or to be imprisoned for a shorter term, turned his pointer to those who accused him and proceeded to tell why he spoke up as an individual against the Communists who were in charge of his country. He told them about the destruction of the church, about the inculcation of atheism. He told them about the suppression of the newspapers, about the suppression of the right to free speech. He told them that they had sham courts for trying of individuals.

No person of whom I know, except perhaps Socrates, had the courage to stand up to face his accusers and, in effect, to say to them, "Do not accuse me, but accuse yourselves, because you are guilty of a violation of all the rights of man."

It is simply astounding to visualize the courage of this person. He spoke back to the tryers of his cause. He spoke to his accusers and, in effect, he invited them to sentence him to death.

On October 11, 1946, he was sentenced to imprisonment for 16 years. He died on February 10, 1960. As I said a moment ago, February 10 marked the passing of 1 year since he went away.

He was a hero. He believed in the truth. It is my belief that Cardinal Stepanic found the greatest joy in life in being able to declare what he believed ought to be done.

There are philosophers who argue what the true meaning of liberty is. Some of them argue that liberty exists with that man who has the ability to speak up and to demand that those things be done which his morality has taught him to be right. That is what Cardinal Stepanic did in the trial.

For 14 years he was either in prison or under house arrest. When he was made a cardinal it was thought that he would go to the Vatican, and it was suggested that he go to the Vatican and leave his prison. In effect he stated, "So long as my Croatian people are in prison, I shall remain with them." He never did leave Croatia. He never did go to the Vatican.

I wish to read one of his statements:

> For my convictions I am able to bear not only ridicule, hatred, humiliation, imprisonment—but because my conscience is clear, I am ready at any moment to die.

No person of whom we have heard since the intense movement of the Communists has had the courage to stand up the way this man did. He was a scholar. He was a religious person. He was an individual of character the like of which we would wish to find in more human beings than we do.

Mr. President, I gladly rise on the Senate floor today to pay my tribute to this man, and to express the view that as time passes on and the days of his life recede into the past the beauty and the richness of his life will grow ever more luminous.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13, 1961:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Isaac Davis White, O15080, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Francis Collins, O16819, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, O17681, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Paul Burgess Fay, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Najeeb E. Halaby, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Harlan Cleveland, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Stephen Ailes, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Frank J. Welch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Rowland Burnstan, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Robert E. Giles, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 13, 1961:

UNITED NATIONS

Charles W. Yost, of New York, to be a deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Carlisle Piehl Runge, of Wisconsin, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Charles C. Finucane, resigned.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1954.

Newton N. Minow, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1961.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, we, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia appoint the following-named person to the office indicated:

Neville Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, to fill the unexpired term of James E. Colliflower, resigned, whose term expires March 3, 1961.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Rowland Burnstan, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Samuel 23: 3: *He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.*

O Thou God who wert the God of our fathers, we thank Thee for days in the calendar and annals of our national history when we are privileged to call to mind the names and record of men and women whose life and character embodied and enshrined our country's noblest traditions and loftiest ideals.

On the 12th day of this month we pause to pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, that great American patriot, who stood like a giant among his contemporaries and whose heroic service has made an indelible impression upon all succeeding generations.

Grant that his supreme passion for the preservation of the Union may also inspire us with a longing to enlist in the crusade to preserve and promote the union of God-fearing men and nations in their search for freedom and peace for all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 9, 1961, was read and approved.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 160

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Page Belcher, Oklahoma; Clifford G. McIntire, Maine; Charles M. Teague, California; Albert H. Quie, Minnesota; Don L. Short, North Dakota; Catherine May, Washington; Delbert L. Latta, Ohio; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Paul Findley, Illinois; Robert Dole, Kansas; Ralph F. Beermann, Nebraska; Ben Reifel, South Dakota.

Committee on Appropriations: William H. Milliken, Jr., Pennsylvania; Earl Wilson, Indiana.

Committee on Armed Services: Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; William H. Bates, Massachusetts; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; William G. Bray, Indiana; Bob Wilson, California; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., New Jersey; Charles S. Gubser, California; Frank J. Becker, New York; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Alexander Pirnie, New York; Durward G. Hall, Missouri; Donald D. Clancy, Ohio; Robert T. Stafford, Vermont.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Gordon L. McDonough, California; William B. Widnall, New Jersey; Eugene Siler, Kentucky; Paul A. Fino, New York; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Edward J. Derwinski, Illinois; Seymour Halpern, New York; James Harvey, Michigan; Tom V. Moorehead, Ohio; John H. Rousselot, California; William W. Scranton, Pennsylvania.

Committee on District of Columbia: James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; William L. Springer, Illinois; Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Jessica McC. Weis, New York; William H. Harsha, Jr., Ohio; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland.

Committee on Education and Labor: Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; William H. Ayres, Ohio; Robert P. Griffin, Michigan; Edgar W. Hiestand, California; Albert H. Quie, Minnesota; Charles E. Goodell, New York; Peter A. Garland, Maine; Donald C. Bruce, Indiana; John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Dave Martin, Nebraska.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Marguerite Stitt Church, Illinois; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Laurence Curtis, Massachusetts; William S. Mailliard, California; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; William S. Broomfield, Michigan; Robert R. Barry, New York; J. Irving Whalley, Pennsylvania; Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., Connecticut.

Committee on Government Operations: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; George Meader, Michigan; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; Florence P. Dwyer, New Jersey; Robert P. Griffin, Michigan; George M. Wallhauser, New Jersey; Odin Langen, Minnesota; John B. Anderson, Illinois; Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania; F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts.

Committee on House Administration: Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; Charles E. Chamberlain, Michigan; Charles E. Goodell, New York; John Kyl, Iowa; Edgar W. Hiestand, California; John B. Anderson, Illinois; Walter L. McVey, Kansas.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; J. Ernest Wharton, New York; E. Y. Berry, South Dakota; Jack Westland, Washington; Craig Hosmer, California; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; Odin Langen, Minnesota; John Kyl, Iowa; William H. Harrison, Wyoming; Edwin R. Durno, Oregon; Peter H. Dominick, Colorado; Hjalmar C. Nygaard, North Dakota.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: John B. Bennett, Michigan; William L. Springer, Illinois; Paul F. Schenck, Ohio; J. Arthur Younger, California; William H. Avery, Kansas; Harold R. Collier, Illinois; Milton W. Glenn, New Jersey; Samuel L. Devine, Ohio; Ancher Nelsen, Minnesota; Hastings Keith, Massachusetts; Willard S. Curtin, Pennsylvania; Abner W. Sibal, Connecticut; Vernon W. Thomson, Wisconsin.

Committee on the Judiciary: William M. McCulloch, Ohio: William E. Miller, New York; Richard H. Poff, Virginia; William C. Cramer, Florida; Arch A. Moore, Jr., West Virginia; George Meader, Michigan; John V. Lindsay, New York; William T. Cahill, New Jersey; John H. Ray, New York; Garner E. Shriver, Kansas; Clark MacGregor, Minnesota; Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., Maryland; James F. Battin, Montana; James E. Bromwell, Iowa.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; William K. Van Pelt, Wisconsin; John H. Ray, New York; William S. Mailliard, California; Thomas M. Pelly, Washington; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Milton W. Glenn, New Jersey; Gordon L. McDonough, California; Robert F. Ellsworth, Kansas; F. Bradford Morse, Massachusetts; George A. Goodling, Pennsylvania; Stanley R. Tupper, Maine.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; H. R. Gross, Iowa; Joel T. Broyhill, Virginia; August E. Johansen, Michigan; Glenn Cunningham, Nebraska; George M. Wallhauser, New Jersey; Robert R. Barry, New York; Katharine St. George, New York; John H. Rousselot, California.

Committee on Public Works: James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio; William C. Cramer, Florida; John F. Baldwin, Jr., California; Fred Schwengel, Iowa; Edwin B. Dooley, New York; Howard W. Robison, New York; Herman T. Schneebeli, Pennsylvania; Perkins Bass, New Hampshire; Walter L. McVey, Kansas; Carleton J. King, New York; William H. Harsha, Jr., Ohio; James Harvey, Michigan.

Committee on Rules: Katharine St. George, New York; H. Allen Smith, California; Elmer J. Hoffman, Illinois.

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Massachusetts; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; J. Edgar Chenoweth, Colorado; William K. Van Pelt, Wisconsin; Perkins Bass, New Hampshire; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Jessica McC. Weis, New York; Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; Richard L. Roudebush, Indiana; Alphonzo E. Bell, Jr., California.

Committee on Un-American Activities: Gordon H. Scherer, Ohio; August E. Johansen, Michigan; Donald C. Bruce, Indiana; Henry C. Schadeberg, Wisconsin.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: William H. Ayres, Ohio; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Paul A. Fino, New York; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Charles M. Teague, California; Seymour Halpern, New York; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; William H. Harrison, Wyoming; Henry C. Schadeberg, Wisconsin; Robert F. Ellsworth, Kansas.

Committee on Ways and Means: Steven B. Derounian, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ONE-WAY STREET

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the U.S. Congress, today, with the help of many of my colleagues, I am starting a crusade, a crusade to really awaken the American people to

the deadly, serious dangers to our economy under the present method of dealing and trading with other nations.

To begin, let me make it clear that I personally, and I am sure most of my colleagues, believe in world trade when the trading is done in a businesslike and mutually beneficial manner.

For too long, too many of us have said too little. One of the reasons for this silence has been the fear of being called an isolationist, protectionist, or even worse—politically expedient.

The real trouble is that so many of us are so ignorant of the real workings of the trade agreements that we hide behind name calling, party labels, and political platforms.

The time has come and gone when we could afford the niceties of being real good boys and not bothering our heads about such matters that can be handled—so they have told us—by the super trained, career professionals and the political scientists. Our motto has been, "don't bother us with facts—our minds are made up."

If I can have 10 good conscientious men to join me week after week on this floor to give the facts of life to the American people, I have no doubt as to what will happen when the vote to renew the present Reciprocal Trades Act and the foreign aid bills come before the House.

This crusade is not aimed at stopping either aid or trade to and with our friends and world neighbors.

It is aimed at aiding and trading up to that perilous point where American jobs and American prosperity are endangered.

There is such a thing as a two-way street in trades agreements, but it seems that in the last decade we have been traveling only one way.

The one-way street we have been on has cost us millions of American jobs, billions of American taxes and business income while depleting our gold reserve to the point where the prince has become the pauper in the world market.

Never in our history have we had so much confusion and wild and unrelated action as we have had since the loss-of-gold panic started, strangely enough, right after the last election.

The outgoing President suddenly discovered the empty vaults at Fort Knox and started frantically calling on our friendly allies to please help us out, please stop calling our gold, please spend more money over here in America and above all—please don't sell us so much stuff, we cannot afford it any more.

Of course, we got the well-known horse laugh. We found out that our friends are playing for keeps. It is like lending money to a friend in a poker game—9 times out of 10 you will end up broke and he will not even pay back what you loaned him.

The next step was another wild shot in the dark. The President ordered the families of our soldiers back to the United States to save their allotment checks from becoming claims on our fast-disappearing gold reserve. Of course, the new President countermanded this order in short order. It was never meant to be enforced anyway, it was only a prod to make our friends come to their senses and stop taking all of our gold away from us. It worked, too. Italy ordered its dealers to cut down on their gold transactions, Germany and England have hinted closer cooperation with more financial help for underdeveloped countries, thereby easing our commitments.

Now comes another suggestion that is just about as foolish as the first two—we are going to stop our tourists abroad from making purchases abroad. Now is this not silly? They do not have to buy abroad, they can buy all the foreign goods they want at any store on any main street in the United States.

Now what is the difference in buying your $500 worth of foreign goods in Paris or buying it in New York?

Frankly, there is a whole lot of difference. If you spend $500 in Paris, you get more goods for your money, but if you spend it in the United States for foreign goods, the foreign country gets more of your $500.

It is as simple as that. Let me give you a little example: If you bought $500 worth of cigarette lighters in Japan, you would get 2,000 lighters at 25 cents each. If you bought 2,000 lighters f.o.b. dockside, New York, you would have to pay 35 cents each, which would give the Japanese $700 instead of $500.

In plain words, the cure offered by the President's advisers is worse than the disease.

Now do not think the above example on lighters is farfetched. For the record, let me give you the latest figures up to 1959 on the lighter import reciprocal trade deal this Government of ours has worked out for the Members of Congress to claim credit for—if they want it.

In 1948, we imported into the United States 460,000 lighters from all countries. Out of this total we bought 3,000 from Japan and 231,000 from Switzerland. In 1959, we imported 46,581,000. Out of this total, we bought 41,792,000 from Japan and only 18,000 from Switzerland.

Here is another fact that ought to be helpful in considering the dangers in the present trades agreements.

In 1958 Japan sold us 20,213,000 lighters and in 1 year jumped over 100 percent, to 41,792,000 lighters.

You will note that the Swiss, who were selling lighters in this country on quality and not on cheap-wage low-priced articles, are also suffering from our misguided policies.

The Swiss are getting some of their own medicine because their exports to the United States have practically killed all watchmaking in the United States.

At this point I include some correspondence with the Zippo Lighter Co.:

JEANNETTE, PA., *December 6, 1960.*
The PRESIDENT, ZIPPO LIGHTER CO.,
Bradford, Pa.

DEAR SIR: I have just received a Japanese-made lighter from a friend who obtained it as a premium with two packages of Chesterfield cigarettes for the total amount of $1. For many years I have consistently used Zippo lighters, and after careful examination and comparison I am convinced the Japanese lighter is not a copy, but is really a Zippo lighter from the same dies.

The questions now rise: Is it made by Royallight in Japan; is it made under a licensing agreement, or, is it a plain case of copy manufacturing by a competitive nation?

Since I have been elected to the Congress of the United States I have supported all legislation and moves to try to stem the tide of consumer goods imports, and I am vitally interested in your reply as to just how this product fits into your competitive picture here at home.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

ZIPPO MANUFACTURING CO.,
Bradford, Pa., December 16, 1960.
The Honorable JOHN H. DENT,
Jeannette, Pa.

DEAR MR. DENT: Your letter of December 6, addressed to our president, Mr. George Blaisdell, has been referred to my attention for acknowledgment and comment.

We appreciate your taking time from your busy schedule to write to us regarding the imitation Zippo purchased with two packages of Chesterfield cigarettes for the sum of $1. It is surprising to note the number of people who write to us asking whether we also have a plant located in Japan due to the similarity between the lighters we manufacture and lighters produced in Japan.

I can assure you, Mr. DENT, that we have no connection with any manufacturing concern outside of the United States with the exception of a few flints purchased from a manufacturer in Austria and our small subsidiary assembly plant located in Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada, nor have we made any licensing arrangement with other manufacturers.

It is strictly a case of foreigners, or in a few remote cases, American manufacturers, copying the Zippo lighter because of the fact that our original patents have expired.

The patent No. 2,517,191 which appears on all Zippo lighters presently being made applies only to a small hardened steel bushing located in the top of the brass flint tube. I am enclosing an advertising reprint which explains the function of this particular patent.

You will be interested in knowing that during the year 1959, 46 million lighters entered the United States, and I am taking the liberty of enclosing copies of these figures which were obtained from the Department of Commerce's report FT-110. This total, in excess of 46 million, is most startling and difficult to believe, especially when you consider the fact that this represents more than four times the number of cigarette lighters produced by all manufacturers of cigarette lighters located in the United States.

I also might mention that our chief domestic competitor, Ronson, has also been plagued by imitations of a number of their automatic lighters, and they have actually been more severely injured from a dollar standpoint than has Zippo.

On numerous occasions I have been in Washington and have talked with a number of people in Government regarding this matter; however, only recently with the passage of bill No. 10960 have we received any relief whatsoever.

I trust you are familiar with LEON H. GAVIN who is the Representative of the 23d District in which Bradford is located. He is quite well aware of our problem, and I am certain he is interested in doing anything in his power to obtain further relief for our industry.

Again, Mr. DENT, let me say how much we appreciate your writing to us, and I hope that one day I will have the opportunity and pleasure of meeting you personally.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. YATES,
Executive Vice President.

Lighters imported into the United States, 1948 through 1959

	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Japan	3,000	31,000	350,000	610,000	10,209,000	9,134,000	6,742,000	8,627,000	19,608,000	25,092,000	20,213,000	41,792,000
West Germany	500	500	3,000	28,000	1,835,000	2,414,000	113,000	549,000	577,000	579,000	673,000	905,000
Austria	71,000	500	22,000	66,000	733,000	1,306,000	1,916,000	1,527,000	1,922,000	1,235,000	1,406,000	1,612,000
United Kingdom	10,000		4,000	1,000	594,000	1,789,000	271,000	221,000	52,000	207,000	257,000	69,000
Switzerland	231,000	75,000	2,000	8,000	7,000	4,000	5,000	4,000	4,000	6,000	8,000	18,000
All other	145,000	20,000	80,000	16,000	87,000	105,000	58,000	109,000	160,000	567,000	1,468,000	2,186,000
Total	460,000	127,000	461,000	729,000	13,464,000	14,753,000	9,104,000	11,037,000	22,324,000	27,687,000	24,024,000	46,581,000

Total imported:
1948 460,000
1959 46,581,000

NOTE.—In 1959, all U.S. lighter manufacturers combined only produced a little over 9,000,000.

Let us look at the bicycle picture just to bring us up to date on our professional career and diplomatic handling of a problem.

Here is what happened recently before our Tariff Commission: American manufacturers of bicycles have been crying for relief under the escape clause of the Trade Act. They have shown with facts and figures their inability to compete with British, German, and other imported bicycles. They were given the usual negative treatment and the bicycle production in this country dropped almost out of existence.

Now comes the biggest giveaway in tariff history. Not too long ago Sweden started to unload bicycles into this country at prices below those of the English, German, Dutch, and others. These foreign manufacturers made a loud protest. The Tariff Commission issued an order calling upon the Treasury Department to increase the tariff on the Swedish bicycles so that the competition would be fair between the Swedes and all the others. Now, my friends, tell me honestly, is this the kind of government you want to administer trade deals? The American bicycles are still out in the cold. Who is this Tariff Commission working for anyway?

In this connection, however, let me give you a few victims of this kind of government. The aluminum workers in New Kensington, the steel tool manufacturers of Latrobe, the American Window Glass Co. of Jeannette and Arnold, the steel companies of Monessen, the flint glass works of Mount Pleasant and Grapeville, the coal mines of our county, the rubber producers at Jeannette, the toymakers and textile and clothing works of our area, all, each and every one, have protested the further lowering of tariffs, the further increase in quotas, and have not only petitioned, but in many cases practically begged for relief under the escape clause of the reciprocal trades agreements. What has happened? Nothing. Absolutely nothing, except to add insult to injury by decreasing the import duties, increasing the quotas and giving American business and American workers a lecture on communistic aggression.

The history of cases where American producers have petitioned for relief under the antidumping clause, OCDM, and the escape clause certainly shows the direction in which the winds have been blowing:

First. Dumping cases: From October 1954 to July 1960, 126 complaints from American industries have been received by Treasury Department over dumping of foreign goods in United States. Of these Treasury turned down 112, sent remaining 14 to Tariff Commission for injury finding. Commission rejected 11 of these, approved 1 with 2 pending.

Second. Escape clause cases: From 1948 to July 1960, 90 applications from domestic industries were investigated by Tariff Commission which rejected 57 of these. Remaining 33 were forwarded to President who turned down 20, with 1 pending. Of 12 successful cases, 5 did not receive full duty relief recommended by Tariff Commission.

Third. National security cases: From 1955 to July 1960, 22 applications were made to OCDM. Of these, eight were withdrawn or postponed, seven denied, five pending and two approved, both of which were from one industry—oil products/crude oil.

Our competitors are strong in every field and only because we made them strong. The sporting goods field has increased marketwise up to as much as a 48 percent expansion in badminton sets sold here in the United States.

The trouble with this growth is that the Americans bought these sets, but 92 percent of all sets sold here were imported.

Baseball gloves imports jumped 130 percent from 557,000 to 1,200,000 or 40 percent of our entire market.

Tennis racket imports have climbed to over 55 percent of our entire market.

These are just examples of how silly and plain stupid it is for high Government officials to say that the answer to our economic woes is to increase our exports. We cannot hold our own here at home—how can we sell in their markets abroad?

Besides, how can anyone be serious, when in one breath they call for Americans to invest in production facilities abroad so that they can come within the economic and trade competition abroad while in the next breath they advise these same Americans to produce more goods here to sell against themselves in the foreign markets? You figure it out—I cannot.

I never did know which came first—the hen or the egg, but now I am puzzled whether the nuts keep the squirrel till spring or does the squirrel keep the nuts till winter.

We keep talking about trade balances and gold reserves and close our eyes to closed down factories, filled warehouses, and millions of unemployed.

I believe in distressed area legislation and I will support it again. I believe in social security, unemployment compensation, Government public works and all of the other measures considered as necessary by the Democratic administration.

I sincerely believe all of these acts will help, but I believe just as sincerely that unless we reevaluate our policy and positions on foreign aid and foreign trade, we will not solve our growing problem of unemployment and industrial stagnation.

One thing I want to say at this time before closing this day's work in this all important field.

I am convinced now more than ever that one of the most serious aspects to our mistaken notion of foreign investments and American participation in foreign enterprise is the foolish concept of internationalism which scoffs at nationalism.

I have said on more than one occasion that one of the surest ways to lose friends is to lend them money and then brag about it.

As far back as I can remember, I have heard my elders talk about how the British were hated in Italy, Belgium, Turkey, and all over Europe simply because they were the absentee landlords of the domestic economy and were part of the exploitation which fed the people propaganda rather than payrolls.

We have taken the place of the British, and now it is "go home Yank." The only difference is that we cover more territory.

Recently, I read the following Canadian newspaper editorial:

IT WAS A STIGMA THEN

When British and other European investors held a majority interest in big U.S. enterprises, Americans regarded this foreign control as a stigma.

The story of the Illinois Central Railroad illustrates. It was told by George M. Growson, assistant to the president of the line.

Most of the money to build the Illinois had to be raised in London and other financial centers abroad.

It wasn't until 1901, when the company celebrated its 50th anniversary, that the president was able to announce the transfer of ownership to the United States. The Illinois Central, says Growson, then became "a truly home-ruled railroad * * * the stigma of foreign ownership was thus removed." The dictionary says that stigma means, among other things, disgrace, stain, mark of dishonor.

When Americans say it's only foolish nationalism that makes Canadians worry about foreign control of Canadian industries, they might remember their own feelings under similar—but never so severe—circumstances.

Maybe we ought to cut it out and send it to our policymakers who seem to be looking through the stained glass windows in their ivory towers instead of

through the cracked doors of the houses of the unemployed.

The funny thing to me is that if I buy a bottle of whiskey or a carton of cigarettes in another State and try to take it home to my State duty free, I can lose my car, pay a fine and go to jail.

We seem to have torn down the barriers for the Balkans and Balkanized the barrier here at home.

My State spends millions trying to entice industry to come into Pennsylvania so that we can create jobs and the business and professional man can have an income.

At the same time our glass plants, coal mines, ceramic, textile, rubber and steel plants are shutting down because our own State, Federal, and local governments and private enterprise buy foreign-made goods.

It has become so bad that our Governor, David L. Lawrence, protested plans of the U.S. Road Commission which called for the use of imported road materials, regardless of the costs to the State in employment, and so forth.

The following is a quote from the Pittsburgh Press:

IMPORTED HIGHWAYS

Governor Lawrence and other Pennsylvania officials continue to fight a proposed regulation of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads which they say would result in diversion to foreign mills of roadbuilding materials now produced in this State.

The regulation would authorize States to accept highway construction bids listing materials of foreign origin if the prices of such materials is 6 percent or more below the prices of U.S. materials, and would require acceptance of such bids where the price is 12 percent below U.S. prices.

Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller, the Cabinet officer responsible for the Bureau of Roads, deferred the effective date of the regulation from March 1 to May 1, but unless it is further delayed or revoked, it will take effect after the end of this month.

Pennsylvania is attacking the order on both legal and economic grounds in the belief that it would adversely affect three of the State's most important basic industries—coal, steel, and cement, all used in large amounts in highway work in this and other States.

Whatever the considerations of reciprocal trade which prompted the Bureau of Roads regulation, there seems no doubt that Pennsylvania needs to retain all of the jobs it possibly can in these industries.

Governor Lawrence spelled it out. In the 11 years since 1948 through 1959, this State alone lost 131,000 jobs in coal mining (this being the period of rapid mechanization of the mines). In the 6 years from 1953 through 1959, we lost 32,000 jobs in the steel industry (this also being a period of further mechanization). And in 3 years from 1956 through 1959, we lost 800 jobs in the cement industry. The State is the leading producer of steel and cement, the second highest producer of coal.

Additionally, Mr. Lawrence pointed out that because of these and other employment losses, Pennsylvania had suffered longtime chronic unemployment, with 21 officially classified areas of substantial labor surplus, six of them major metropolitan areas. We have, in fact, more such labor surplus areas than any other State. Our rate of unemployment in February was 7.9 percent of the civilian labor force.

These may be dry statistics to some, but they are grim facts to those involved. We can only hope that the Commerce Department considers all angles of its proposed regulation before taking final action.

We need more than a dollar volume analysis of our export-import balances. To get the truth of the danger to our economy, we must have the payroll, man-hour balances backed by the statistical date of the effect on the supplies of raw materials, component parts, transportation, sales agencies, Main Street, taxing authorities, professional services, and taking care of the unemployed.

We cannot continue building competitive enterprises abroad and hope to sell American products in competition abroad. We cannot finance our competition and then allow it to sell in our domestic market. You cannot sell $100 worth of raw cotton and come out even. The payroll purchasing power of the producer of $100 worth of cotton would not buy back the $100 worth of finished goods. In plain words, you cannot buy retail and sell wholesale and stay in business.

The American high wage is necessary if we are to buy American-made goods, but it is not necessary if we are to buy foreign cheap labor goods. It is simple, but true, if an American steelworker buys a foreign car he cuts a few hours from his paycheck because that is one car less the automobile workers will need steel to build. This is true in every item in every market and in every country. You cannot buy when you have a surplus.

Frankly, how do you trade with a nation which allows you to ship into the country duty-free, but whose wage standards are too low to permit the purchase of your product in competition with their own production; but in return gets the privilege of shipping their low-cost item into your high standard market. The answer, of course, is that we are the nation losing the gold reserve from just such deals.

Some of our planners are convinced that the only solution is to make every nation in the world a mechanized production shop, producing everything under the sun as cheap as possible to sell to every nation in the world which is already in the production race itself. No doubt that every nation can produce more than it needs if the people cannot afford to buy the production.

In the end, all nations will find themselves with surplus of both goods and labor. We are determined to make industrial workers out of farmers, fishermen, and miners, whether their economy can stand it or not.

I am for building production facilities and helping our neighbors and friends all over the world if they will use the products for the betterment of their own people. I am absolutely opposed to building glass works in Japan to sell glass in my hometown while we close our plants down. This is the whole crux of the matter. Even when the Japanese worker gets more money, will he buy our glass in preference to his own. If he does, you can bet your last dollar his Government will raise the tariff.

Just one example to prove my point. After the war, this Nation's coal miners produced coal for West Germany. We finally, with loans, equipment, and outright grants, put the German mines back into production. Immediately the West German Government slapped a tariff on American coal, equal to and above the cost of American coal in the marketplace. When we protested, the West German Government bluntly told us they had unemployed miners that had to go back to work. They were not impressed with our arguments about our unemployed miners, and the fact that we had paid to develop their distressed mines. Likewise, they were not impressed when we sent emissaries over to ask them to put up a little higher percentage in order to help develop underdeveloped countries. Why should they, they do not want to lose the markets we helped them take away from us.

When I left State government to enter Federal service, I was told by an oldtimer that the merry-go-round in Washington was the same, but parts of the horses on it were bigger. I see what he meant.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why do you keep facing us on the Republican side when your boys over there originated this situation?

Mr. DENT. I will tell you why; because you have been in power for 8 years, and that is when things really went down the hill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have been in power for 8 years? You have had a two-thirds majority over here. What is the matter with you?

Mr. DENT. I think you and I understand each other very well.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You bet we do.

Mr. DENT. I know exactly how much power we had over here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You had two-thirds.

Mr. DENT. We overrode one veto, I think, in all the time I have been here. If we had had two-thirds of the votes, we could have overridden them all, because we wanted to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, you could, if you wanted to. Why do you not discipline your own party? Why scold us?

Mr. DENT. If the gentleman will sit over here, I will probably look in his direction, because I do so like to talk to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman will probably have one vote for him, then.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I have been very much impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the subject of the gentleman's discussion and with his able handling of this important matter. I think this is something that concerns every Member of the Congress and concerns a number of us in a very important way. I listened to the exchange a moment or two ago about who is to blame for the present situation. I do not think there is any point in trying to

assess blame. The important thing is where we are and what we are going to do about it. There are enough of us who are directly affected, if we take this matter to heart and really go to work on it, to correct this situation. We have to make a start somewhere, and this is a good place to do it.

It should be clear enough that the loss of competitive position on the part of American producers and American workmen is one of the most serious matters that now confronts American industry and the American economy. Unfortunately, apparently very few people in the high places really comprehend the drastic effect of this situation on America's families. There has been talk about legislation to benefit depressed areas. Unless we begin to meet more realistically the problem which is now being discussed we shall have a lot more depressed areas to deal with. It is estimated that 750,000 American workmen—three-fourths of a million American workmen—have lost their jobs in the last 5 years because of increased foreign competition and because of the increasing flow of goods manufactured abroad which are now being sold on the American market. It is estimated that those 750,000 workmen have 1,500,000 dependents and to these dependents the loss of the benefit of a steady income has been highly demoralizing and highly injurious. Of course, each of you know what the problem is. This situation came about largely because of American generosity. For years the people of the United States have given of their substance to the people of the world. We have given them new machinery, American know-how, the American production methods. Now they know as much as we do about production. With the lower labor costs and lower living standards which exist in other countries, they are now able to undersell us on our own markets, to say nothing of the loss of the world market. This is a situation which is going to get worse as time goes on. There is no point in kidding ourselves. Foreign producers now have first class goods to sell. They have modern factories in which to produce their goods. They have a lean and hungry attitude about world trade. They are out to get the market wherever and however they can get it.

It is estimated that this situation has resulted in a loss of $4 billion to $5 billion in sales annually for American industry. It has resulted in serious dislocations of American workmen. It has brought about the loss of hundreds of millions of American tax dollars.

This is where we stand today. The question is: Are we going to ignore this problem insofar as effective efforts are concerned, as we have done for the last number of years, or are we going to start in earnest to do something to combat the situation? I think the latter is our responsibility and our duty.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The first extension of the reciprocal trade agreements was made in February 1937. It had operated for 3 years. There were 13 Members of the House in February of 1937 who voted "no" when the reciprocal trade agreements extension was brought out. I was one of the 13. Ever since then, yes, we have had 50 or 60 Members and the next time 100 or 150 Members.

As the problem came home to the American people of what these imports were doing to our workers—and the last time it took over a month to line up enough votes before they would bring it before the House—let us hope that more now have learned the lesson of what these tremendously growing imports are doing not only to our industry but also to our workers.

Mr. DENT. Thank you very kindly.

I want to suggest to all who hear me that if you have specific incidents where the application of the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Act has caused severe damage in a given industry, why not join me once a week on this floor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I will give you one right now if you want to have it.

Mr. DENT. I will be glad to have it at any time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Three hundred workers in Bangor, a little town in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, are being put out of their jobs by importations from Japan which your party permits to come in.

Mr. DENT. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I do not care whose party it is. When I was a little boy somebody poisoned my dog. My concern primarily was with my dog, not with who poisoned him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am glad the gentleman's party is repenting. You are hitting the sawdust trail, really; I know you are confessing. Now, if you follow it up it is all right with me.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for the presentation he is making here today. I think he is rendering a great public service in calling the attention of this House to this problem.

I remember 2 years ago when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], now in the well of the House, made a speech on this floor along similar lines. He was among the first to raise his voice to caution the Nation against what is happening. Those of us who joined him at that time were called protectionists and isolationists; we were called all sorts of things. Today, because of the severity and gravity of this problem, more and more voices are being heard and the crescendo of demand that some action be taken is becoming ever louder.

I have here a speech made the other day by Mr. Ross Siragusa, president of the Admiral Corp., one of the Nation's most distinguished industrialists. He joins those who demand that some action be taken to deal with the mounting problem of foreign competition and foreign imports. Mr. Siragusa says:

> I believe the motions that trigger a steady rise in our economy will soon be felt. It will not be a roller-coaster movement, but a slow steady improvement in sales and in general business activity.
>
> Yet, the opportunity present for our industry is being curtailed by an erosive, undermining force. It comes from across the seas, but it has strong support here at home. It is the force of decay found in cheap-labor foreign competition.

Further in his remarks Mr. Siragusa points out that it would be unfair to label him an isolationist because his company does business in 110 nations of the world. Certainly he is not an isolationist. He also points out, as has been pointed out by others here, the misleading nature of figures applied to any discussion of the trade balance. There are those who say that we still enjoy a favorable balance of trade, that we are exporting $14 billion and importing only $11 billion annually, so we have nothing to worry about at this time.

He applies the figures of the electronics industry to show how misleading this sort of conclusion can be when he points out this whole subject of imports-exports must be judged in the number of man-hours displaced in the country by consumer items being imported from abroad.

This is the fundamental issue, reducing this entire discussion to American man-hours displaced by foreign imports.

Mr. Siragusa points out:

> The apologists for our present international trade policies claim that Japan is our second best customer, importing $1.4 billion from us, and exporting $1.1 billion worth of goods to us.

One would presume this is a favorable balance of trade for the United States. Mr. Siragusa adds:

> However, while on the surface, this seems like a satisfactory arrangement, the figures do not tell the whole story. In fact, they mask a serious threat not only to your industry but to the entire economic system of this country.
>
> I want to pinpoint this situation now just as we have been attempting to do these past 2 years. Our exports to Japan are primarily in coal, cotton, wheat, soybeans, and the like. These are basic raw materials that help sustain only 100,000 American jobs. On the other hand, Japanese exports to this country are finished products and components that eliminated 600,000 American jobs.

In other words, Japanese imports are displacing 600,000 American jobs while creating work for only 100,000.

I think if the policymakers of our country will take this factor into consideration they will not resist us, they will not fight us; they will do what, for instance, has been suggested by Local 1031 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Incidentally, local 1031 is the largest local in the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

I want to show you the disparity of the situation and how and why 22 of the largest electrical producers in Chicago today are operating on a 4-day week, and probably will go down to 3 days a week.

Local 1031 is taking a very drastic step. On May 1, by unanimous consent of its membership, they have voted to refuse to handle any foreign component parts in the assembly lines on which they work. This is indeed a drastic step, perhaps too drastic; but the fact remains this merely dramatizes the situation. I like one idea local 1031 has suggested, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania may want to incorporate this in his remarks.

They have suggested two points: First, this country should impose a tariff on all foreign imports so computed as to compensate for the difference between the wage scale paid to the foreign workers as compared to the legal minimum wage paid in this country; and, second, to encourage the raising of wages and the improvement of working conditions in such foreign countries the foreign manufacturers or exporter would be allowed a credit against this tariff measured by his wage costs, including fringe benefits, as compared to the legal minimum wage in the United States. When such wage costs reached the American minimum, the foreign manufacturer could export his goods to this country free of all tariff or duty.

I believe this is an excellent suggestion and should be considered by our Tariff Commission.

We are not afraid that the American worker cannot compete with foreign products as far as quality of merchandise is concerned, or that the American industrialist cannot compete. We are concerned about the cheap foreign labor market.

I would like to join again in congratulating the gentleman from Pennsylvania for starting this series of discussions. If we continue to join him, perhaps we will be able to evolve a realistic program, not one that is going to set up protective barriers, not one that is going to drive our friends and allies in the markets of international commerce out, but an intelligent approach recognizing the fact that the fundamental of American foreign policy is to raise the standard of living throughout the world. We know that communism breeds on poverty. If we can help the world raise their standards, we are making a great contribution in preserving the world against communism.

The gentleman's remarks are most timely, and I hope he will continue in his efforts.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and for his effort to try to awaken the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more of the time to carry on, but I have a request from my friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for some time, and he certainly shall have it. I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, after 14 years of battling in the well of this House to bring about basic changes in our present trade policies, with only a minimum of success, I welcome the many new recruits to this rapidly growing group of Representatives banded together for the purpose of saving U.S. jobs.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just yielded to me is a two-fisted fighter whose hardnosed tactics can serve as a model to the newcomers to our ranks as we launch this drive to improve our basic national economy.

First and foremost is our serious unemployment situation. A job means more to the average American today than any other word in the English language. Today, I want to talk to you about how we might bolster our economy, reduce our unemployment rolls, and bring some gold back home.

The best approach to the situation is to call attention to what has happened to one of the Nation's major industries—coal—one of the Nation's basic fuels.

In 1946, at the close of World War II, the coal industry in West Virginia employed 123,000 miners. At the close of business on December 31, 1960, only 40,200 miners were employed. In the Nation as a whole, coal mine employment fell from 441,631 in 1948 to 171,000 in 1960. Most individuals, and particularly people in authority connected with our new administration want to explain away the loss of 83,000 miners' jobs in West Virginia and 271,000 jobs in the Nation by saying it is due largely to automation. The facts which I give you now are taken from the files of the U.S. Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

First. In 1946, at the close of World War II when 123,000 West Virginia miners were employed, residual oil imports replaced the equivalent of 10,714,000 tons of bituminous coal.

Second. In 1960, residual oil imports replaced the equivalent of 55,200,000 tons of bituminous coal, an increase of 500 percent.

Third. From 1946 to 1960, residual oil imports replaced the equivalent of 475,001,000 tons of bituminous coal.

Fourth. When translated into lost man-days, coal miners lost 4,277,000 days of wages in 1960, and over the past 14 years a cumulative total of 52,116,000 days due to loss of jobs. These figures are based upon 6.3 tons of coal mined per man-day in 1946, but 12.9 tons mined under automation in 1960. In other words, automation has doubled coal production per man at the same time that residual oil imports have displaced domestic coal markets.

Fifth. Translated into lost wages, coal miners lost $111,939,000 in 1960, and a cumulative total of $1,053,097,000 from 1946 to 1960, directly due to fuel oil imports.

Sixth. Translated into lost jobs, coal miners lost 22,056 jobs in 1960 alone. This is ascertained by dividing 194, the average number of days worked in 1960, into 4,279,000, the total number of days lost.

Seventh. Translated into lost bituminous coal revenue, mine operators lost $261,096,000 in 1960, and a cumulative total of $2,262,385,000 from 1946 to 1960.

In addition to these devastating facts concerning the coal industry itself, let us look for a minute at the effects this debacle in the coal industry has had on other industries. Most of the coal produced is transported by rail. Residual oil imports displaced coal shipments by rail totaling 40,186,000 tons in 1960. From 1946 to 1960, 367,908,000 tons were displaced from rail shipments. Are you surprised to learn why our major railroads in the eastern part of the United States are in financial difficulty; why roundhouses have been closed; railroad workers by the thousands furloughed?

Based upon a 1960 average revenue per ton of coal freight of $3.40, U.S. rails lost $136,633,000 in 1960 due to residual oil imports and a total of $1,208,340,000 from 1946 to 1960.

The greater part of coal shipments carried by the Nation's railroads go from the mouth of the mine to fuel powerplants that produce electricity. Most of these contracts have been lost to shipments of cheap residual oil. Our railroads, on a dollars-and-cents basis, have lost $65,583,000 in revenue in 1960, and $581,872,000 from 1946 to 1960.

The above facts are not just figures. Their source is the Federal Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Association of American Railroads.

Mr. Speaker, the George E. Sokolsky column published by the Washington Post on February 8 described a most amazing situation whereby Italian pharmaceutical houses actually pirate new products upon which our manufacturers have spent tremendous sums to develop. It is all done legally in Italy.

While I commend all of the article to the attention of Members, I cite one pertinent and significant paragraph:

> The other night, I asked Henry Hazlitt, a leading American economist and an exponent of the free market, where on earth there is a free market today. Quite truthfully, he had to say, "Nowhere." That makes all classical arguments about the free market futile because one deals with realities. While the United States removes protection for industry, every other country continues its protection against imports; quotas have been established, particularly against American products at the same time that the United States pours huge sums into these various countries in the form of economic and military aid.

Nothing could point up more effectively the aims of those of us who are making this fight. We do not oppose trade; we do not oppose reciprocity. In fact we seek true reciprocity. All we ask is that our negotiators and policymakers make policy and negotiate on the basis of facts as they exist, rather than on the basis of a theoretical free market which simply does not prevail. Permit me to cite several additional instances:

A dispatch from Tokyo by UPI relates Japanese reaction to our save-the-dollar program. Japanese business leaders were said to fear tougher competition and in the Finance Ministry they were expecting American pressure on Japan to speed up the liberalization of her import restrictions.

Recently Joseph E. Moody, speaking for the soft coal producers before a subcommittee of the other body, listed a number of obstacles standing in the way of expanded coal operations. One of these obstacles was restrictions placed upon American coal by a number of European countries. He said that "as

a result of unequal foreign trade restrictions, the oversea market for American coal has declined from a peak of 76½ million tons in 1957 to less than 36 million last year."

One such restriction was imposed by Germany, which now places a tariff of $4.76 a ton on American coal sufficiently high so as to make up for the difference in the cost of production between our coal and theirs. We lost on this deal 15 million tons.

All I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that we treat others as they treat us.

In connection with this coal situation, let me show you what is going on in the way of discrimination. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was right when he said it was a one-way street. It is no longer reciprocal.

Immediately following World War II when we began to pour millions of dollars of the American taxpayer's money into West Germany for the purpose of rehabilitating it, they had to have large shipments of American soft coal. Germany has coal deposits, but they are 2,500 to 3,000 feet underground. It is too costly for the German people to mine that coal, so they started buying it from us. American coal at that time was on the free list.

What happened? Three years ago we were sending 16 million tons of coal into West Germany annually. Like a bolt out of a blue sky, 2½ years ago the West German Government imposed an import duty on every ton of that American coal of $4.76 a ton, an amount equal to the difference between what they could buy it for from us and what it cost them to produce it in their outmoded and deep-shaft mines in Germany.

Do you know that today we are shipping less than 1 million tons into West Germany, and that because they were on a long-term contract which they did not violate. By the 1st of July of this year we will be shipping less than 100,000 tons of coal into West Germany.

This is discrimination pure and simple. I say to you that it might have been justified in 1934, but there have been basic changes in America since 1934 and basic changes in all the world.

It is high time that we quit living in the reflected glory of the author of the reciprocal trade agreements and get down to business and see to it that proper safeguards are thrown around the domestic industries of America; otherwise, I just tremble to think of what is going to happen to you when your economy sinks so low that you cannot raise $40 billion a year for a national defense program. That is exactly what old man Khrushchev wants. He wants to destroy our economy to the point where we cannot defend ourselves. Then, he will move in and take over. I say to you what is involved here is the safety of America because it means the safety of America's economy. Mr. Speaker, we in West Virginia do not want doles. We appreciate any help that might come to us through the so-called depressed areas program, but what we want is a restoration of our basic industries, five or six of which have been literally destroyed by our trade policies. We are not asking for favors. We were prosperous once in West Virginia until your trade agreements went into effect. Let our industry compete in the markets of the world and our people and we in West Virginia will not be asking for favors.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in what the gentleman said, particularly about unemployment. I wonder if the gentleman saw an article several days ago in the New York Times from the United Press where in Stuttgart, Germany, the President of the United States bought dinnerware in Stuttgart for the White House.

Mr. BAILEY. No, I did not; but I certainly will look it up.

Mr. BOW. It was a United Press news dispatch printed in the New York Times.

Mr. BAILEY. The time for that kind of thing has passed in America, but let me say to you, next Monday in a special order we are going to offer Members of the House an opportunity to express their opposition to the approval by the other body of this backdoor entrance to the general agreements on trade and tariffs, the so-called GATT. That is the old OCED proposal which was turned down twice. But they are back now a third time trying to take us through the back door into membership.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. DENT. I thank my colleague.

GOVERNMENT STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. Elihu M. Shepard, who is a certified public accountant in Norfolk, Va., who expresses his irritation and concern over the multiplicity of Federal reports and "voluntary" statistical data which he is required to file. The letter speaks of his frustration much more clearly than I can, and reads as follows:

To Bureau of Labor Statistics, Secretary of Commerce, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Representative Porter Hardy:

1. The Department of Commerce through the medium of its Bureau of Labor Statistics, makes monthly requests for information from employers on the employment situation throughout the United States. The purpose is to determine the status of employment in the various parts of the United States.

2. According to the heading on the stationery or forms issued by the Government agency, this is a voluntary project.

3. However, the parties responsible for gathering this information think that their Government position makes them czars in the sense that they believe that their information comes ahead of what the party furnishing the information has to do to make a living.

4. There is no Government contract between the Government and the party furnishing the information nor is any Federal appropriation established by Congress to reimburse the taxpayer or his employer for the time required to compile this data.

5. During the past few weeks, the writer has been snowed under preparing unemployment tax returns, business license forms, social security tax returns, State business licenses, and other tax forms for his various clients.

6. The purpose of this preparation is to enable the taxpayer involved to pay his voluntary taxes so the wages can be available in the congressional appropriation to pay the civil service salaries and pensions to the parties indicated in paragraph 3 supra.

7. We are doing our best to keep such people gainfully employed. However, the writer, and no other accountants are in a position to stop earning a living to take care of the most immediate demands of the civil service employees with IBM brains and equipment.

8. It is therefore requested that some suggestion be made to the human rather than mechanical brain that demands these reports to think about:

(a) The party who is supposed to voluntarily furnish the data to the occupation of the civil service employee involved be given a chance to not only earn a living but get those things done which enable him to voluntarily furnish the data.

(b) The Government appropriate such funds as are necessary to compensate the said voluntary taxpayer so he can drop all his means of livelihood and immediately comply with the Government agency request.

(c) And finally, stop giving out orders in a style that is reminiscent of the Army where you do what you are told and don't ask questions. In other words, use some sense and stop being mechanical in demanding things of the taxpayers without thinking that the taxpayer only has nothing to do but take care of answering statistical information for Government agencies.

ELIHU M. SHEPARD,
Certified Public Accountant.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO HELP ALLEVIATE HUMAN SUFFERING

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am heartened by the promptness with which the new administration is moving in the matter of unemployment, especially heartened by the fact that Secretary of Labor Goldberg, accompanied by Congressmen ROY MADDEN and ROMAN PUCINSKI, has visited Chicago and other points in the Middle West for a personal, firsthand view of a situation that is nothing short of tragic.

From the letters I have been receiving from Chicago, the number of which is daily increasing, it would seem that conditions rapidly are approaching the proportion of sheer hopelessness that prevailed in the developing years of the great depression.

Something must be done, and done quickly. In the name of humanity, as

well as in the national self-interest, the Congress must give full support to President Kennedy in his efforts immediately to alleviate human suffering and, while there yet is time, to stem the tide of unemployment that, permitted to run, will engulf us.

The letters I daily am receiving from both men and women who are going from place to place in vain quest for employment are heartrending.

Here are excerpts from one letter:

I braved a 39-mile-an-hour wind and 8 inches of snow to walk miles to answer the want ads. As I have found it for over a month of faithful searching, there was no job, and I was willing to accept anything. One place had advertised for general male factory help. I found a terrific mob, with no queue or system, and after an hour's milling around a door opened and a man shouted: "We haven't any jobs; that's all." The next place was no better—a long, long line, 2 hours of waiting, then told to make out an application and await notice if they needed help.

Another jobless constituent writes me:

I spent one entire morning at a hospital where they advertised for someone in the maintenance section at $1.45 an hour. The crowd of applicants made a line that seemed endless—young, old, poorly dressed, well dressed, white, Negro, Japanese, etc. After hours of waiting, the result was the same old story—file an application. I talked with a man while we stood in one of the lines, and he voiced the thought I have had so often: "Everywhere you go, just applications, and then never hear from them." Yet, perhaps a week later, the same ad will appear again. It gives me the thought that the personnel managers are perhaps just building up their own jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I passed through the years of the depression. In 1929 and 1930 I saw conditions of unemployment, with growing lines of men and women seeking jobs, and government did nothing about it, thinking things would right and jobs aplenty were just around the corner. Then came the dreadful years, with closed banks and idle factories, an entire nation economically prostrate. I am seeing the same signs today. For all that is decent, for all that is prudent and wise, for the sake of our country and for all its people, let us move into action now, let us do something and do it quickly and effectively, giving the full support of the Congress to President Kennedy as he proceeds by whatever steps are necessary to meet the challenge of an alarmingly growing army of the jobless crying out for an opportunity honestly to earn by toil their daily bread.

HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS ACT OF 1961—H.R. 4222

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, the President has transmitted to the Congress a proposal to provide health insurance benefits for persons aged 65 and over through the social insurance system. It is with a sense of urgency, and with satisfaction, that I am today introducing H.R. 4222, which embodies the proposal made by the President.

In his special message on health and hospital care on February 9, the President described several areas in which the Federal Government has an essential role in improving the Nation's health care. The most important of the health care proposals he made was the one for financing health insurance for the aged through the social security and railroad retirement systems. Because of the seriousness of the problems the aged face in meeting the costs of their health care, it is of the utmost urgency that we act on the President's request and move to meet the vital health needs of the aged.

As indicated above, I am very pleased to introduce this health insurance proposal at the request of the administration, and I will press for expeditious consideration of the bill in the Committee on Ways and Means.

I know that this proposal represents less than many individuals wish to have included, but, at the same time, it also represents far more than other individuals or interests may want. However, it is an effort and a practical approach to achieving progress in the neglected health care field for our senior citizens.

There follows a brief factual description of the provisions in this bill and the reasons for it:

SUMMARY OF BILL

Persons entitled

Protection against the cost of inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, skilled nursing home, and home health services would be provided for persons who have reached age 65 and are entitled to monthly benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program or under the railroad retirement system.

Scope and duration of benefits provided

The services for which payment would be made under the proposal would be:

(1) Inpatient hospital services for up to 90 days. Hospital services would include all those customarily furnished by a hospital for its patients, and would be subject to a deductible amount (paid by the patient) of $10 a day for up to 9 days, with a minimum of $20;

(2) Skilled nursing home services, after the patient is transferred from a hospital, for up to 180 days;

(3) Outpatient hospital diagnostic services, as required, subject to a $20 deductible amount for each diagnostic study;

(4) Home health services for up to 240 visits during a calendar year. These services would include intermittent nursing care, therapy, and part-time homemaker services.

An individual could be eligible for up to 90 days of hospital services and 180 days of skilled nursing home services in each period of illness, but subject to a maximum of 150 units of service. A unit of service would be equal to: 1 day of inpatient hospital services or 2 days of skilled nursing home services. Thus, if during a period of illness a beneficiary transferred from a hospital to a skilled nursing home after 60 days, payment could be made for the 60 days of hospital care and for up to 180 days of his skilled nursing home care. If the beneficiary transferred after 95 days in the hospital, payment could be made for 90 days of hospital care and up to 120 days of his skilled nursing home care. A new period of illness would not begin until 90 days had elapsed in which the patient was neither in a hospital or a skilled nursing home.

Basis of reimbursement

Payments to the providers of service would be made on the basis of the reasonable cost incurred in providing care for beneficiaries. The amount paid under the program would be payment in full for covered services, except, of course, that the provider could charge the patient the amounts of the deductibles and extra charges for a private room or private duty nursing.

Administrative aspects

Responsibility for administration of the program for social security beneficiaries would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Considerable reliance would be placed upon the States to assure that local conditions would be taken into account. The Secretary would consult with appropriate State agencies and recognized national accrediting bodies in formulating the conditions of participation for providers of service. In addition, the Secretary would have the authority to utilize State agencies to perform the administrative functions of determining whether a provider meets the conditions for participation and to provide consultative services to providers. Provision would be made for the establishment of an advisory council which would advise the Secretary on policy matters in connection with administration.

In order to be eligible to participate in the program, providers of service would have to meet specified conditions to assure the health and safety of the beneficiaries. If it desired a State could recommend that more strict conditions be applied with respect to providers of service within that State.

Financing

The program would cost 0.6 percent of covered payroll. In the early years of the program, benefit payments would amount to slightly more than $1 billion a year. The social security contribution rates would be increased one-fourth of 1 percent on employers and one-fourth of 1 percent on employees and three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed, effective in 1963. The taxable earnings base would be increased from $4,800 to $5,000 a year, beginning with 1962. Raising the earnings base would improve the benefit structure of the system generally and would also provide additional income which together with the income from the contribution rate increase would fully meet all health insurance costs.

Effective dates

Payments would be made with respect to inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, and home health services provided on or after October 1, 1962, and for skilled nursing home services furnished on or after July 1, 1963.

FACTS BEHIND THE HEALTH INSURANCE PROPOSAL

Need for protection

Older people in general have need for more medical care and less ability to pay for this care than is the case for younger persons. At least one member in every fifth aged

couple entitled to benefits was in a hospital sometime during a year, according to a recent survey of OASI beneficiaries. For half of these couples, the total medical bills incurred amounted to over $700—more than the cost of a modest food budget for the entire year. Only 57 percent of the couples having a hospital stay were able to meet all their medical bills by themselves.

Since 1957, the date of the survey, medical care prices have gone up by 14 percent, and hospital rates by 20 percent, so that total medical bills today for those requiring hospitalization would be noticeably higher, yet current income figures still show as many as 55 percent of the persons 65 and over having less than $1,000 cash income a year. Although many aged persons have savings, those with the lowest incomes are the least likely to have assets readily convertible into cash. In 1959 the Federal Reserve Board found that nearly one-half of the aged spending units with incomes under $3,000 had no money in savings funds or bank accounts, or had less than $200.

Aged people go to the hospital more often than younger people and stay longer. As a result, the number of days spent in a general hospital is between two and three times as large, on the average, for persons 65 and over as for younger persons (1,778 days per 1,000 as compared to 764). Yet only 46 percent of the aged have hospitalization insurance, as compared to about 70 percent of younger persons. In addition many of the insurance policies available to the aged offer small benefits under limited conditions.

Effects

The proposal, of course, would not cover all of the medical needs of older people, but it would take care of the most urgent needs and enable them to better finance their other medical care needs.

At the beginning of 1963, the first full calendar year of operation under the program, there will be about 16¾ million people aged 65 and over in this country. Of these 16¾ million people, 14¼ million will be protected by the program because they are entitled to social security or railroad retirement benefits. An additional one-fourth million—retirees under the Federal staff retirement systems—will be eligible for health benefits that are at least equivalent in value. About one-half million persons will be on the veterans' pension or compensation rolls, and generally these people can obtain comprehensive health care under the veterans' programs. Over 1¼ million of the remaining aged persons who are not covered under the social security and railroad retirement programs will be on the old-age assistance rolls when the new program goes into effect. Having already met a test of need under the assistance program, these people will be eligible, without undergoing a further test of need, for such medical assistance as is provided under the old-age assistance programs of the States in which they live.[1] In summary, all but about one-half million persons aged 65 and over would be eligible for some form of health protection under public programs.[2]

[1] In some States the provisions for medical assistance under the old-age assistance program are quite limited; these limitations, generally speaking, do not result from any lack of provision in the Federal law but rather the fact that the State programs in question have not developed to the point where they utilize all the available Federal grants.

[2] Even among the residual group of one-half million, some will be in public institutions, e.g., mental hospitals, and receive complete medical care at public expense.

Population age 65 and over: Estimates of eligibility for health protection under public programs[1] as of January 1963

	Age 65 and over number (in millions)
Total aged persons	16¾
Entitled to benefits under OASI	13¾
Railroad retirement annuitants	½
Annuitants under Federal staff retirement systems	¼
Recipients under other Government systems:	
Veterans' programs	½
Old-age assistance[2]	1¼
Not under any Government program	½

[1] In this table persons eligible under old-age and survivors insurance or the railroad retirement system and also under some other public program are shown only under OASI and railroad retirement.

[2] In some States the provisions for medical assistance under the old-age assistance program are quite limited; these limitations, generally speaking, do not result from any lack of provision in the Federal law but rather the fact that the State programs in question have not developed to the point where they utilize all the available Federal grants.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

NEED FOR HEALTH PROTECTION

The need to protect our senior citizens against the tragic hardships of expensive illness is a crying need through our Nation. No one can deny the very serious problem that older people face in meeting the cost of medical care. Older people have medical care costs twice those of younger persons, but their annual incomes are only half those of persons under 65. The number of days the aged spend in general hospitals is on the average between two and three times as great as for younger persons. Only 46 percent of the aged have hospitalization insurance, as compared with about 70 percent for younger persons. Moreover, many of the insurance policies available to the aged offer only very small benefits under limited conditions.

The high cost of medical care of the aged is not a problem of only the very poor. Almost all of our senior citizens have reason to fear that expensive illness may wipe out their lifetime savings, threaten their ownership of a home, force them to be dependent upon their children, or make it necessary, after a lifetime of independence, to submit to the humiliation of inquiry by the Government into their personal affairs.

A SOUND AND TESTED METHOD

A great deal of study has been devoted to determining the best way of meeting the problems of financing health care for the aged. The task force appointed by the President-elect soon after the election has made significant contributions to the study of the problem. Composed of distinguished specialists in the welfare and health fields, the task force reviewed the proposal for action relating to the health and welfare needs of the country and formulated very helpful recommendations.

The bill I am introducing would give protection against the health costs for the aged through the tested mechanism of social insurance. The bill would make it possible for people to provide during their working years for their health needs in old age, as they do now for their income in old age. Like the present social security benefits, health insurance protection would be provided as a right that is earned through work and paid for out of earnings. Under this plan, the health care needs of the aged would be financed on a sound basis without placing a drain on general revenues. Furthermore, this plan would provide basic protection, just as our old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program provides basic protection, on which the aged could build their own protection against physicians' and dentists' services and drug costs.

Those who would be protected under the provisions of this bill are persons who are entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits or are annuitants of the railroad retirement system and are age 65 or over. These people are in the age group whose incomes are lowest—these are the people least likely to have protection against the cost of illness—these are the people with the highest medical expenses.

A WELL-ROUNDED PROGRAM

The bill provides for payment of costs of inpatient hospital services, of subsequent skilled nursing home care, of certain home health services, and of outpatient hospital diagnostic services. This group of services represents a balanced program for meeting basic health needs—a program that would promote the best interests of the beneficiary and of his community. The services provided make possible a step-by-step progression of care as the patient's condition changes. The person who requires expensive diagnostic services that can be provided for him on an outpatient basis will not need to become a bed patient in a hospital to have his expenses paid through the plan. On the other hand, an acutely ill person who needs intensive care can have much of his inpatient hospital care paid for; and when his condition is no longer so acute as to require general hospital care, if his physician finds that he still needs substantially full-time skilled nursing care, the program would pay the cost of one-half a year of the required care in a skilled nursing facility. Similarly, since the home health services provided for in the bill consist of visiting nurse and similar care a beneficiary who needs only part-time skilled nursing service at home would have protection against the costs of such medically necessary services. Thus, unlike health insurance policies covering only hospital care, the proposed program would not discourage the use of medical facilities other than hospitals, where such use is medically indicated. By placing appropriate emphasis on early diagnosis and on care outside the hospital, the bill would release hospital beds for the care of the acutely ill who need the intensive care that only a hospital can furnish.

The availability of protection against the costs of outpatient hospital diagnostic services would tend to prevent the abuses that have occurred under some hospital insurance plans that pay for hospital services only if given on an inpatient basis. The availability of this protection would be a distinct advantage to the beneficiary, too. At present, fear of the high cost of diagnostic services is in many instances a barrier to the detection and early treatment of maladies that grow worse with delay. As a result of early diagnosis and treatment and avoidance of unnecessary hospital admissions, payment of the cost of outpatient services would result in health care that is not only effective but economical.

A PRUDENT PROGRAM

In line with the prudent approach that should be taken in a new field, the bill places various limitations on the services provided. These limitations are much less severe than those in the great majority of health plans available to the aged, and they will not prevent the plan from affording very substantial help to people who face the costs of catastrophic illnesses. With respect to inpatient hospital services, only the costs of semiprivate accommodations would be paid, except for cases in which private accommodations are medically necessary. Private duty nursing services would not be covered; but all nursing services customarily provided by the hospital, including as intensive nursing care as may be necessary, would be paid for.

For a single period of illness, payment could be made for 90 days of inpatient hospital care or 180 days of skilled nursing home care. The total number of days for which payment could be made during a period of illness is 150 units; a unit equals 1 day of hospital inpatient care or 2 days of skilled nursing home care. Under this provision, even if a person had to remain in a hospital for 90 days or more he would be eligible for payment for 120 days of skilled nursing home care after his hospitalization. If his condition permitted him to go to a nursing home after 60 or fewer days of hospitalization, he could have 180 days of nursing home care paid for. Thus an incentive would be provided for the use of nursing homes, where appropriate, rather than hospital services. No more than 240 home health care visits would be paid for in a calendar year.

First-dollar coverage would not be provided. Instead, there would be a deductible of $10 for each of the first 9 days of inpatient hospital care during a period of hospital illness, with a minimum deductible of $20. A deductible of $20 is provided for each diagnostic study that a beneficiary has as a hospital outpatient. The fact that the patient will have to bear part of the cost of some of the services he gets does have disadvantages, but I think that especially in a new program the net effect is advantageous. The cost of the program will be kept low, there will be safeguards against unnecessary use of health services, and the high administrative costs of handling small claims will generally be avoided.

PRESERVATION OF EXISTING MEDICAL PRACTICES

I want to make it very clear that there is nothing provided in this bill which would in any way conflict with the established practices for providing health care. The health benefits would be provided without interfering with the patient's free choice of physician or facilities and without altering the present form or organization of medical practice. The care that beneficiaries would receive, and the institution or facility providing such care, would be a matter strictly determined by the beneficiary, his physician, and the provider of services. The Government would provide no care; the Government would offer no services; the Government would only establish the means for paying for the health care of the aged. The medical profession will continue to be responsible for the quality of the care available to the people of the United States; the providers of service would still be responsible for determining what services they will make available. The process by which they would be paid for the services furnished will be much the same as that now used when they are paid by Blue Cross and other large purchasers of health services.

Providers of service who wish to participate in the plan would enter into agreements under which they would be paid for the reasonable cost of the services they furnish under the plan. The program would follow practices already well established and accepted by the hospitals, in their relationships with Blue Cross, the States, and with other Federal programs. Thus, the program would tie in with the customary practices of hospitals. If the hospital customarily provides a given service for its patients, that service would be paid for under the plan.

PARTICIPATION BY STATE AGENCIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

General condition for the participation of hospitals, skilled nursing homes, and agencies providing organized home health services are spelled out in the bill. In addition, in the interest of keeping the program in a close relationship with developments in the professions, the bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council. The Council would assist the Secretary in formulating general policy and in developing, for the health and safety of beneficiaries, conditions for participation by providers of services.

The States would also play an important role; the Secretary would use appropriate State agencies in determining which providers of health services satisfy the conditions for participation. If a State agency recommended additional or more strict conditions for participation in its State, the Secretary could modify the conditions in that State accordingly. Thus the States would be encouraged in their efforts to improve the quality of care provided to their citizens.

FINANCING

The health insurance benefits provided by the bill would be financed by adding—in 1963—one-fourth of 1 percent each to the employers' and the employees' social security tax rates, and by adding three-eighths of 1 percent to the tax rate for self-employed persons. Also, the maximum on yearly taxable earnings would be increased from $4,800 to $5,000 in 1962. Raising this base would improve the benefit structure of the social security program generally and would also provide additional income, which, together with the income from the contribution rate increase, would fully meet all of the costs—0.6 percent of covered payroll on a long-range basis—of the health insurance program.

PROTECTION FOR PRACTICALLY ALL THE AGED

One objection that has been made to providing health insurance to the aged beneficiaries under social security is that the plan leaves out too many aged persons. It has been said that if health insurance benefits were provided for people age 65 and over, under the social security system, 4 million of our senior citizens would be left without protection.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to such a statement. Actually, when the plan goes into effect, all but half a million—not 4 million, but half a million—of our aged citizens will have health protection available to them under a public program. Less than 4 percent of the people aged 65 or over will lack such protection.

At the time the health insurance provisions of the bill become effective, there will be about 16¾ million people age 65 and over in this country. Of these 16¾ million people, 14¼ million—all but 2½ million of the total—will be protected by the program because they are entitled to social security benefits or railroad retirement annuities.

Now let us take a look at these 2½ million people. About one-quarter million of them will be getting benefits under Federal staff retirement programs. Legislation enacted last year provides a comprehensive health insurance program, effective on July 1 of this year, for Federal employees already retired. Under the Government employees' health insurance program now in effect for active employees, Federal employees not already retired can carry their health insurance protection over into retirement—with the Federal Government, as their former employer, helping to pay the cost of the protection. Clearly, no problem results because retired Federal employees are not provided health benefit protection under the social security program.

Among the remaining aged persons who are not eligible for social security, there will be about one-half million getting veterans' compensation or veterans' pension. In addition to the cash benefits that they receive, these people generally can obtain comprehensive health care under the veterans' program.

Over 1¼ million of the remaining aged persons who are not covered under the social security health insurance program will be on the public assistance rolls when the new program goes into effect. Having already met a test of need under the assistance program, these people would be eligible for whatever medical assistance is provided by their State without undergoing a further test of need.

There remain then about half a million aged persons—not 4 million, but half a million—who may need help to meet their health care costs and to whom such help will not be available under social security or some other public program. These people, as I said, constitute less than 4 percent of the total number of aged persons.

The group includes some who are in public institutions and are receiving complete care at public expense. No one can reasonably argue that the overwhelming majority of the aged should be denied the great advantages of health insurance protection under the social security program simply because there will still be a few people who are not eligible for health benefits under a public program.

Moreover, the figures I have given deal with the situation as it will be when the new plan goes into effect. As time goes on, the percentage of people who reach retirement age without having protection under social security grows smaller. Within a comparatively short time practically all of the aged will have social security protection. To suggest that more than 14¼ million of our senior citizens should be denied the advantage of health insurance benefits under the social security system because in the beginning there will be about one-half million of the aged who are neither under social security nor assured of continuing protection against the cost of illness under some other public program—thus having to rely on the medical assistance program if the need arises—is to take a very short view indeed.

BENEFICIAL EFFECT ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The provision of health insurance benefits under social security would greatly reduce the amount of State and local funds that will have to be raised if the State medical assistance programs, set up under the terms of the Kerr-Mills bill enacted last year, are to be effective. I favored the Kerr-Mills bill, and I recognize the necessity for the medical assistance program which it established. But I recognize, too, that in the health insurance area, just as in the area of income maintenance for the aged and for the disabled, the State assistance programs will be able to do a better job if basic needs are met through social insurance and the States do not have to carry the burden of meeting these needs. When the old-age and survivors insurance program was expanded and liberalized in the early 1950's, the public assistance programs were enabled to do a better job in supplementing the basic social insurance program. The same kind of thing happened after the old-age and survivors insurance program was extended to provide disability benefits. Here again, in the field of benefits covering health costs, following the enactment of the social insurance program, the States would be able to liberalize their income tests and otherwise move in the direction of a meaningful and effective health care program for the few aged persons who would still need help in meeting their health care costs. As former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Marion Folsom said recently, "a nationwide system of social insurance against health costs of the aged is logical for the same reasons that the old-age retirement annuity system had to be financed on a nationwide rather than a State basis."

UNWARRANTED CRITICISM OF THE PLAN

A few people have said that the addition of health insurance benefits would violate the wage-related principle of the social insurance system, and they are worried about this. It is entirely reasonable to support health insurance benefits through contributions which vary with earnings. And since the costs of health care are the same for all, it is just as reasonable to provide the same health insurance benefits to all who are protected.

The health insurance under this plan does not replace private insurance. In fact, I believe private insurance would be benefited—just as the purchase of life insurance and annuities to supplement cash payments under social security has increased the field of activity for insurance companies. With basic protection assured, those who could afford to do so would buy private insurance to complement the health insurance that would be provided under the social insurance program.

There are others who say that there is no reason to add health insurance benefits to our social insurance system because no one in this country goes without the medical care he needs. I am sure that the people who say this believe it; but, I am just as sure that they are wrong. It is true that much medical care is provided free to those who need care for which they cannot pay. Public assistance agencies and private charitable organizations do a most commendable job. Many physicians and institutions are generous in reducing charges or providing care at no cost. Relatives and friends frequently pay medical expenses. All this is true. What is also true is that many older people who are sorely in need of medical care do not get it because they are too proud to accept charity. What is also true is that those whose care is paid for by assistance agencies, public or private, receive such care after the humilitating experience of proving they are in want. What is also true is that many of the expenses that are paid by relatives and friends are paid at great cost to the well-being of the children and grandchildren of the elderly ill. Do we want to go on permitting children to be denied the education they should have—or even to go without food and clothing they need—because grandfather must go to the hospital? I say "No." I say, we must prevent dependency—not just deal with it at the expense of families, friends, and the general taxpayer. We must prevent dependency and help make it possible for all our people to live in dignity and security.

FAVORABLE ACTION NEEDED NOW

I have been deeply concerned over the potentially disastrous effects of big hospital bills which our older citizens are only too often forced to bear. To my district and my State, health insurance benefits for the aged will be of great importance. California has long been a place to which many have gone to live out their years, and there are now over 1¼ million residents of the State who are age 65 or older. I am pleased that so many people have chosen my part of the country as the place to spend and enjoy the later years of their life, but I am distressed that so many of them do not have adequate protection against the costs of illness. For example, of Californians who are past 75, only about 1 in 7 has any type of health insurance—and much of this is so limited in scope as to provide little or no real protection.

I could not introduce this bill without paying tribute to a former colleague in the House and on the Ways and Means Committee. I refer, of course, to Aime Forand, who during the past several years made such diligent efforts to get health insurance benefits included under the social security system. In fact, because of his leadership in this field, proposals using the social security approach, such as the one I am introducing, are often called Forand-type. To Aime Forand we all owe a great debt.

I am proud to have the privilege of introducing the administration's bill. When enacted, this proposal will make it possible for those who are old today to get the medical care they need and will banish the fears of future unmet medical needs of those who are not yet old. I urge that you act favorably upon this measure when it comes before you for consideration.

NAMING OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS HAYS WINS ACCLAIM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot praise too highly President Kennedy's appointment of our former colleague, Brooks Hays, to the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations.

Those who have been privileged to serve with Brooks Hays or who have known him could not fail to feel respect and admiration for him. His is an ideal appointment. Not only is his knowledge and know-how of Government unusual, but also his comprehension of foreign issues is remarkably well founded. His maturity of mind coupled with humor, wisdom, and the highest possible integrity makes him almost a perfect choice for this important position and responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, Brooks Hays' appointment will be received with acclaim by all who know him. It augurs well for relations between the 87th Congress and the State Department.

WHAT CONGRESS SHOULD DO IF RED CHINA IS ELECTED TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, Britain's Foreign Secretary has told the British Parliament that the facts of international life demand that Red China be seated in the United Nations despite the fact that Communist China has none of the credentials of a peace-loving nation.

A few days ago, at the World Health Organization meeting in New Delhi, India, a move to seat Red China in that organization was barely defeated, and this only because 35 nations either deliberately abstained or absented themselves when the vote was taken.

Mr. Speaker, should the Chinese Communist government be seated in the United Nations without having atoned for its aggression on South Korea, and other crimes against humanity, two steps should be taken immediately:

First. Congress should promptly adopt the legislation necessary to withdraw the United States from the United Nations, and

Second. Congress should then recess and repair to Arlington Cemetery where lie buried hundreds of America's youth killed in Korea and humbly ask forgiveness for having sacrificed their lives so that their enemies might be set upon a pedestal, and so that the emblem of the British pound sterling could be raised on high.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S RIGHT TO PRIVACY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for something like 5 years the Committee on Government Operations has had a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] on this issue of the people's right to know, the theory being that, inasmuch as this was the people's Government, the people had the right to know everything that transpired in the executive departments and everything our executive officers, including the President, did and said, and who their friends were and what advice had been given and the reasons for it.

The subcommittee was giving the Eisenhower administration "heck," I guess you would call it, and doing it time and time again. Including the record of the last hearing held by the subcommittee on April 23, 1959, the pages to date number 4,260. This does not include reports nor answers to questionnaires.

Now, I notice that the present Democratic administration is closing up on us. The President told some reporters, according to yesterday's press, that he would not let the reporters in at Middleburg, to see and know everything he did at his private home there. Apparently, he intends to insist upon his right to wipe his nose when he gets ready, without telling us the kind of handkerchief he uses.

I want to go along with the President on this. He should have some private life and I hope he kicks those reporters out when they come around there interfering with his private life.

VICE ADM. HYMAN G. RICKOVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Secretary of the Navy, John Connally, Jr., in extending to 1964 the question of retirement of Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover is highly commendable. Admiral Rickover is profoundly respected both in and out of Congress. The action of Secretary Connally will receive widespread approval. By his decision the Navy Department and our country will continue to have Admiral Rickover's outstanding leadership in a field of great importance to our national interest.

In stating his reasons for his decision, Secretary Connally said in part:

> This action is taken in the best interests of the Navy and the Nation in view of Admiral Rickover's unique capabilities.

If no action had been taken by the Secretary, Admiral Rickover, because of age limitations, would have had to retire on February 1, 1962. The limit of the legal power to extend the active duty of Admiral Rickover is to age 64.

Secretary Connally has given Admiral Rickover the maximum extension possible, which shows vision, leadership, and judgment on his part.

In expressing my appreciation I congratulate Secretary Connally for his action.

THE NATION'S YOUTH AND ITS LAND NEED A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, more than a quarter of a century ago, an agency of government was established which contributed greatly to the good of the youth of the land and to the resources of the Nation. That organization was the Civilian Conservation Corps. It came at a time of actual hardship in the land. It provided a great morale boost to many thousands of young men and to their families. The training it gave was invaluable. I have watched the progress of many of the young men who were then enrolled and have since seen them become mayors, legislators, business and civic leaders leaders through the intervening years. I have also seen the good results of their work in the forests of the Nation.

There is distress in many areas in the land today. There is talk of legislation for distressed areas. There is a serious problem among young people who see no future because they can find no gainful employment in these areas. I find in the Nation's forests great areas which need conservation measures, or which need replanting, or both. In both our land and our youth we have an investment of great value. We should cultivate, develop, and encourage both.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the time is ripe for the reestablishment of a youth conservation corps, dedicated to the improvement of our youth and our lands. I have reintroduced a bill, which I introduced in previous Congresses for this purpose. Such a measure was passed by the Senate last year in somewhat different form but the House failed to act on it. I hope that it will receive early consideration and approval by the 87th Congress. I submit also as a part of this statement, the detailed statement which I made at the time of the introduction of my bill in the 86th Congress and ask for its reprinting. This appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1958.

It is estimated that the present total cost per man will be $2,500 to $3,000 per year. I consider that it will be money well and wisely spent.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 23, 1958]

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in America today great emphasis is being placed on exploration of outer space, on development of complex high-powered rockets, and on projected trips to the moon. Much concern has been expressed over the lack of qualified scientists and engineers and Congress is presently considering legislation which will provide scholarships for deserving young men and women who desire to pursue studies in these fields. I commend this program because, if we in America are to continue to lead the fight for freedom and democracy, we must have the necessary knowledge and trained manpower to meet and overcome the challenges we face.

Today our youth are thinking in terms of missiles, research, space travel, and other subjects which were unheard of a few years ago. Now, I realize this is a natural thing in keeping with the times. Yet, I am concerned that so much emphasis and thought is being directed along this one channel. There are many other important fields which should also command the attention of the youth of America. One of the most important of these is the conservation and development of our natural resources and this is just as essential to the longtime welfare of the United States.

This Nation has long been the dreamland of freedom for the individual and of an abundance of everything necessary to make life a pleasure. When our founders came to this country, they found forests abounding with timber—they found an abundance of fish and wildlife—they found rivers and lakes that were unspoiled. In other words, they found nature at its best. Since that time, however, modern progress, increased

population, human consumption, transportation needs, and urban development, have all contributed to the reduction and deterioration of our natural resources.

Our local, State, and National Governments, as well as many civic and fraternal organizations, are doing an outstanding service to the country through programs to promote the conservation and development of natural resources. However, I am firmly convinced that much more progress in this field is necessary if we are to insure for future generations the natural resources which are necessary for our own survival.

Mr. Speaker, as a step in this direction, I am today introducing a bill designed to establish a youth conservation organization to assist in the conservation and development of natural resources, provide employment and training for unemployed youthful citizens, and for other purposes.

This organization would be similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps, better known as the CCC, which was in existence from April 1933 to June 30, 1942.

The successful part this organization played in aiding the Nation's forests and implementing the national economy is still fresh in the minds of the people.

The magnitude of the contribution of the CCC to American forestry has been estimated at 730,000 man-years, valued at nearly a billion dollars. The details of lookout towers, cabins, storehouses, garages, bridges, and dams built; campgrounds and recreational sites improved; miles of telephone lines, roads, trails, and firebreaks constructed, areas of trees planted and forests thinned and improved; pounds of tree seed collected, cleaned, and planted in nursery beds; mandays spent in fighting forest fires, combating forest insects, guarding and policing public campgrounds, and so forth, are impressive and challenging.

Throughout the 9 years of its existence the Civilian Conservation Corps was largely concerned with forest conservation. At the beginning its work projects were almost entirely sponsored by the Forest Service. As the program broadened, the Forest Service retained responsibility for the work programs of Federal, State, and private forestry camps and for those assigned to the Tennessee Valley Authority. In Alaska and Puerto Rico the Forest Service was responsible for camp administration as well as for the work program.

Through purchases during CCC activities, Federal forests were increased by 7,725,000 acres from 1933 to 1937. Under the stimulus of this program the acreage of State forests also increased rapidly all over the United States. These new public forests were properly developed and improved by CCC manpower.

The CCC became the main line of defense against fires, not only on public forests, but also on most of the privately owned forest land that had been organized for protection under the Clarke-McNary Act.

Less tangible, but perhaps fully as significant, was the effectiveness of the CCC in popularizing forestry throughout the Nation. Thousands of young men who served in the CCC have gone forward in other fields imbued with a sense of understanding and pride in the Nation's natural resources, ready to exert their influence for forest conservation in whatever positions they may find themselves.

Now for some details: Under my bill a Youth Conservation Organization will be established to assist in the performance or acceleration of useful work in connection with the conservation and development of the natural resources of the United States, its territories, and insular possessions, and to provide an opportunity for development through healthful employment, general education, and vocational training for youthful citizens of the United States who are unemployed and in need of employment. At least 10 hours each week may be devoted to the general educational and vocational training phase of the program of the organization.

The bill provides for the appointment of an Administrator who is authorized to enroll no more than 300,000 enrollees at any one time. All such enrollees must be unmarried males between the ages of 17 and 23 years, both inclusive, and shall at the time of enrollment be unemployed and in need of employment.

The cost of such a program would be negligible when compared with the benefits to be derived. Enrollment will be for a period of not less than 6 months and not more than 2 years. The pay of enrollees shall be at a rate equal to that provided by law for the compensation of the lowest rank of enlisted personnel in the Army. Not more than 10 percent of the enrollees may be designated as assistant leaders or assistant foremen and shall receive pay equal to that provided by law for the lowest rank of noncommissioned officers in the Army. An additional limit of 6 percent of enrollees may be designated as leaders or foremen and shall receive not more than the compensation of the second lowest rank of noncommissioned officers in the Army.

The President of the United States will, under the provisions of my bill, be authorized to utilize the services and facilities of such departments or agencies of the Government as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act.

I call particular attention to the fact that under my bill both publicly owned and privately owned forest land may be improved. In addition to the provisions affecting publicly owned land, the measure would also permit the Administrator to undertake needed improvements on privately owned forest land provided that the cost of such work for private parties would be paid for by such parties at the rate established by the Administrator based on the cost and the value and to the extent that the Administrator determines the work does not have public benefit.

Mr. Speaker, time does not allow me to explain all phases of my bill. But, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that today we are constantly having called to our attention reports about crimes involving our young people. Many of the young men who might be involved in the years ahead in similar crimes would instead be given an opportunity to perform a useful service under the proposals of my bill. The Youth Conservation Organization, when established, will, I am confident, assist in decreasing the number of crimes. Many young men between the ages of 17 and 23 would be removed from the temptations which result from idleness and lack of responsibility. Educators and law enforcement officers have long contended that our youth are lacking in discipline, responsibility, and a feeling of security—all of which contribute to delinquency and crime. The bill which I am introducing today is a step forward in preparing our young men for their rightful places in society. It is also a step forward in promoting greater interest in the development and conservation of our natural resources and in providing personnel qualified to continue the programs which will assure adequate natural resources for our future generations. Of equal importance are the great contributions to be anticipated in the improvement of forests and woodlands, of natural resources, and of recreational facilities throughout the Nation. And, I have not even mentioned the economic value of useful employment to deserving young men from needy families.

In conclusion, I am confident that a thorough study of the provisions of this bill will leave no doubt whatsoever in the minds of my colleagues that we should make greater efforts to develop and conserve our natural resources and to maintain qualified personnel in the fields of forestry and conservation. My bill will accomplish these things, and will, at the same time, provide active training, useful employment, and proper physical development for many young men.

THE OCEANS—THE STOREHOUSE OF MANKIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a moment to address the Congress concerning a most vital matter to our very existence as a nation. This is the continuance of our position in mastery of the knowledge of the sea which has been our historical bulwark for freedom and our free world enterprise. To that end I should like to discuss briefly a subject of vital interest to our Nation; namely, "The Oceans—The Storehouse of Mankind."

The ocean contains great resources of plant and animal raw material, unknown mineral riches and colossal power reserves. The surface of the ocean, its depths and the airspace above it constitute the cheapest and shortest routes of travel. There is an interchange of moisture, heat, and carbon dioxide gas between the ocean and the atmosphere. All this has long attracted the steady attention of man. Interest in the seas and oceans is developing rapidly, at an ever-increasing rate.

It attracts investigators to the ocean bottom and to the secrets hidden on and below the bottom. If this is not a remarkable example of human love of knowledge and courage, then we have the dive made not long ago by J. Picard to the greatest depth, nearly 7 miles, in the Mariana Trench.

And I might add some noted Americans including Lt. Don Walsh should be recognized for their feats in this regard.

Many branches of science are interested in this entry into the ocean depths, including geology, geophysics, geography, biology, and geochemistry.

On the bottom lie miles-thick benthic deposits, accumulated during the entire history of the ocean. All the facts of this history are printed in the deposits as though in a great yearbook, still unread, and promising solution of many important problems.

Has the climate of the earth changed during the past billions of years of its history, or has it ever been thus? Have there been periods of uniformly warm climate on the earth, or have there always been climatic zones? Did the ocean always exist, or did it arise only during the latter periods of the life of our planet?

Did the positions of the earth's poles and of the earth's axis change, or have they always remained approximately in the same position where they are now? Are the sunken continents of Atlantis, Gondwana, and the Pacific hidden in the oceans' depths? Do continents move thousands of miles in a horizontal direction or do they always remain in exactly the same place? What is the structure of the earth's crust and its underlying layer, the mantle, which is molten?

There are serious reasons for believing that the ocean bottom may give the answers to all these questions.

Some initial data already are known. Application of the methods of seismic sounding and gravimetry have shown that the earth crust under the oceans is very thin. In the continents it is 18 to 25 miles thick, and below the oceans it is 3 to 5 miles thick.

Several years ago U.S. engineers worked out a plan for drilling through the entire thickness of deposit and through the earth's crust to the secret, molten magma. The plan, which is to be carried out within the next 4 years, provides for drilling from a large ship. Equipped with a special drilling derrick, this ship must be secured by thick cables between several anchors, placed at depths of 2½ to 3 miles.

It is very clear that the technical concept for mastering the ocean bottom runs along the lines of designing automatic drilling equipment which may be lowered to the bottom of the ocean and may be controlled from automatic, self-propelled bathyscopes.

One thing is clear: man very quickly will become master of the ocean floor, of its secrets and its resources.

Oceans cover three-fourths of the earth's surface. To the present time man has obtained all his mineral resources from one-fourth of the earth's crust. May we think that three-fourths of the earth's crust, covered by water, is bare of mineral deposits? No; we cannot. When man has conquered the ocean bottom it is possible that prospecting and working out minerals there will be easier than on dry land.

The mineral riches of the ocean may be searched on the very surface of the bottom. For a long time it has been known that so-called ferromanganese concretions may be found there. Large quantities of these concretions cover the bottom of the White, Baltic, and Caspian Seas. Photographs of the bottom of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans show that wide expanses also are almost completely covered with these concretions.

Their quantity sometimes reaches many tens of pounds per square yard. In the Pacific Ocean alone the area covered by concretions consists of several tens of millions of square miles and their total weight is several billion tons.

The origin of these concretions is tied to the vital activity of special types of bacteria which are able to concentrate minerals which are dissolved in insignificantly small amounts in sea water. In addition to iron and manganese, the concretions also contain nickel, cobalt, and copper.

Does man have the right to allow this really great quantity of valuable ores to lie waste, covering the floors of the oceans and seas? No; he does not. It may be stated with confidence that the coming century will be the century of the conquest and mastery of space, but also of the earth crust beneath the oceans.

These previous remarks are not mine, Mr. Speaker, but I agree with them wholeheartedly. They are an abstract of the April 10–16, 1960, issue of the Sunday Supplement to Izvestia and represent current Soviet thinking.

We, as a nation, should not be led in our thinking by the Soviet Government.

We have acquired vast knowledge of the sea but our efforts are lagging. We must realize the importance of our resources and not let the development of the sea be a secondary consideration in our economy.

The problem is urgent and the time is of the essence.

To that end I am introducing legislation to effect coordination of the various departments and agencies concerned with the problems and its resources.

I earnestly hope and pray that we shall not delay all possible affirmative action in this session of Congress.

PROPOSED WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON THE NARCOTICS PROBLEM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the narcotics problem in the United States and the threat it presents to the well-being and fulfillment of life to the youth of our country. Each of us has known, or read, of someone that has taken this singular and endless journey into drug addiction. Our newspapers, our magazines, are filled with unhappy ending stories from those whose friends or relatives have been stricken with the deadliness of this disease.

From October 1959 to June 1960 the total number of adults arrested in the State of California for narcotic violation was 12,064; of these, 8,108 took place in Los Angeles County. In California, more than 3,000 juveniles were arrested for narcotic violation during that same period of time. The Governor's special narcotics study commission found that at least 90 percent of all those convicted of selling narcotics are being released from prison in less than half the minimum term set by law, and that many of these individuals are serving time for their second conviction.

What can you do about their problem, or what can I do about their problem, when State and local agencies are working to the extent possible to lessen the depth and ramifications of the situation? One logical step is for local and State agencies to combine their efforts with Federal resources. Sixty members of the California State Assembly joined in a resolution to President Kennedy urging him to call a White House Conference on Narcotics where the matter can be fully and carefully considered on a Federal basis. In anticipation of the event, a resolution was introduced in the California State Senate to create a joint legislative committee to attend the conference.

Those who were present in the 86th Congress will remember that the House unanimously passed a resolution which I had the privilege of authoring, calling upon President Eisenhower to hold such a White House conference. The Executive took no action.

It is my understanding that the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, is presently taking the necessary planning steps toward such a proposed White House conference. It is hoped that it might be called for as early as the month of May.

My colleagues will, I am sure, join me in expressing to the Attorney General and President Kennedy our earnest hope that the plans will be successfully completed and the conference itself will make a long needed and extensive contribution to the solution of the narcotics problem.

EXPANDING AND STRENGTHENING NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to extend, expand and strengthen the National Defense Education Act of 1958. I urge early public hearings on this bill inasmuch as the present act expires next year and must be extended during the current session of Congress in order to avoid interruption of the program.

Failure to extend the act would be a mortal blow to our belated efforts to strengthen our educational posture in the fields of science, mathematics, and usage of modern foreign languages. We have to face the fact that until the National Defense Education Act came into being, this Nation literally was "asleep at the switch" in preparing ourselves adequately to deal with world developments.

We can no longer tolerate our inability to converse in the languages of the world while our adversaries are proficient in all of them.

I am hopeful for both Republican and Democratic support for the provisions of my bill because under the National Defense Education Act, the Federal Responsibility, in the interest of national defense, is clear cut. Under this act, the Nation is getting specific educational products for its money—products which are urgently required in the national interest—as distinct from so-called general Federal aid propositions, which merely would scatter money across the board without identifiable educational objectives geared to defense needs.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, background information on my bill and the National Defense Education Act.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE KEARNS EDUCATION BILL

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 expires June 30, 1962. All provisions of the act would be extended by the Kearns bill for an additional 5 years beyond the present expiration date. It is apparent that this extension is necessary if the act is to accomplish its basic objectives in the interests of national defense.

Following are some of the accomplishments under the act, together with a summary of the bill's provisions:

LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (TITLE II)

Accomplishments under the act

Since the first loan funds were established under the act in February 1959, both college and student participation in the program has far exceeded earlier expectations. The program has been widely welcomed and acclaimed by both the participating institutions and student loan recipients. The number of loans has increased from less than 25,000 in 1959 to an estimated 150,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. Thus, thousands of college and university students are being enabled to pursue their education through this program.

Proposed Amendments

1. The annual authorization for loans would be increased to $100 million. This compares with the estimate of funds to be loaned this year of $71 million and the maximum authorization of $90 million in the act.

2. The present annual limitation of $250,000 for loan funds for any one institution would be increased to $500,000. This change is necessary in order to enable the larger institutions to meet more of the demand.

3. The bill would extend the 50 percent loan forgiveness feature of the act to teachers in institutions of higher education, where under present law student loans are limited to individuals who become teachers in public elementary and secondary schools.

4. The recipients of loans, under the bill, would no longer be required to sign the anti-Communist affidavit requirement of the present act. Instead, the bill would provide criminal penalties for any recipient of a loan who subsequently is found to have been a Communist. As under present law, loan recipients would continue to be required to take the loyalty oath of allegiance to the United States. Precedent for this substitution of criminal penalties for the disclaimer affidavit is contained in provisions of the 1959 amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act and in a bill which passed the Senate in 1960, which would have amended the National Defense Education Act had it become law.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (TITLE III)

Accomplishments under the act

This basic provision of the act has proved to be increasingly effective in assisting elementary and secondary schools to improve instruction through the acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment and materials used in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. The act also has resulted in a very substantial improvement and expansion of State supervisory and related services in these basic fields of education.

During fiscal year 1959, more than 10,000 laboratory and other projects for improvement of instruction in these subjects were approved by 31 States. Preliminary figures for fiscal year 1960 indicate a fivefold increase in the number of such projects, with 45 States reporting nearly 47,000 projects. Some three-fourths of the expenditures are going directly into science projects.

Some States report as much as 50 to 100 percent gains in enrollment in science and mathematics courses. The act's stimulation of supervisory services at the State level is dramatically indicated by the fact that the number of specialists in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages had increased to 194 by December 1, 1960, as compared to only 33 such specialists in a handful of States prior to the act. This provision needs to be further strengthened.

Proposed Amendments

1. The bill would extend the provisions of this title to include instruction in English. Businessmen, government officials, college faculty, and others repeatedly have declared that our high school graduates are woefully weak in English, which is fundamental and basic to the learning process. In fact, our institutions of higher education have had to waste considerable time conducting refresher and beginner courses in English for college enrollees who were not equipped adequately to carry on a college course of study. Universal improvement in English instruction, therefore, is imperative to the objectives of the National Defense Education Act.

2. The authorization of funds for assisting in the development of State supervisory services would be increased from $5 to $6.5 million annually.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS (TITLE IV)

Accomplishments under the act

Under the act's provisions, fellowships were awarded to 1,000 graduate students for study in 1959–60 and an additional 1,500 students received fellowships in 1960–61. Altogether, 138 institutions of higher education, through 472 new and expanded graduate programs, participated. Next fall, a total of 4,000 students will be studying under the act, but unless the program is extended the number will taper off after expiration of the act and fall far short of the output needed to staff our colleges and universities.

The fundamental purpose of the graduate fellowship program is to meet the increasing need for college faculty in the years ahead and, at the same time, to encourage expansion and wider geographical distribution of graduate facilities. The act is achieving these objectives in three ways:

1. The provision of fellowships to graduate students preparing for college teaching.

2. Financial assistance to colleges and universities to enable them to expand and strengthen their graduate programs.

3. By planned geographic distribution of approved graduate programs throughout the Nation.

The basic importance of this program to the Nation is quite apparent when it is realized that college faculties probably must be doubled by 1970 if the institutions are to be expected to handle the influx of college enrollment which already is on the way. Not only must the graduate fellowship program be continued, but it should be substantially enlarged over the next 5 years.

Proposed Amendments

1. Under the bill the annual number of graduate fellowships authorized would be increased from 1,500 to 2,500. There is ample evidence that the Nation's colleges can effectively absorb this proposed increase.

2. The bill would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make a uniform payment of $2,500 per fellowship per year to each participating institution. This amendment would eliminate considerable procedural difficulty encountered under the present law which requires a determination of costs attributable to each fellow. The uniform payment proposed in the bill is a fair payment and adoption of this provision would eliminate the considerable administrative burden now imposed at both the Federal and the college and university levels.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING (TITLE V)

Accomplishments under the act

Fifty-four States and territories have State plans approved to carry out the provisions of this title of the act. More than 60 percent of the enrollment in secondary schools now have guidance and counseling programs approved by the States. Since the beginning of the program, there has been an estimated 50-percent increase in the number of full-time (equivalent) secondary school counselors. This is substantial progress toward the objectives of this title, which is designed to encourage the States to expand their own programs for identifying and encouraging able students to continue in school and to pursue courses of study best suited to equip them for higher education.

Proposed Amendments

Pending further inquiry and basic justification for change in the law, the bill makes no changes but would continue the existing program as presently authorized.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (TITLE VI)

Accomplishments under the act

This title of the act is fundamental to the Nation's future security and to attainment of the language competency required by American representatives throughout the world. Few of the languages spoken by more than three-fourths of the world's population were being taught in the schools and colleges of the United States prior to passage of the National Defense Education Act. Furthermore, teaching methods, equipment and curricula were largely unsuited to national needs of our times.

Under the act, a much belated start has been made to develop our proficiency in the uncommonly taught languages of such critical areas of the world as Africa, the Far East, southeast and south Asia, the Near and Middle East, and the Soviet area. Here, the provisions of the act for language and area centers, fellowships and research have been implemented in order to accomplish the objectives of the act.

During the first 2 years of operation, the conduct of 58 institutes for upgrading the modern language teaching abilities of 3,200 elementary and secondary school teachers has produced highly encouraging results. Also, as a beginning, 643 fellowships were awarded for graduate study in the uncommonly taught languages. There is strong justification for continuing and substantially expanding this program.

Proposed Amendments

1. The bill would increase the annual appropriation authorization for language and area centers and research from $8 million to $12 million.

2. The annual authorization for the operation of language institutes would be increased from $7.25 million to $10 million.

3. Teachers of modern foreign languages in institutions of higher education would be authorized to attend language institutes and the establishment of institutes for elementary and secondary teachers of English would be provided for. The inclusion of English is necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes of the act because, on the whole, our youth are generally deficient in this subject. This results in large measure from the present weak state of preparation among elementary and secondary schoolteachers of English. A 1960 survey revealed, for example, that only 40 to 60 percent of today's high school English teachers have majored in their subject in college.

EDUCATIONAL MEDIA (TITLE VII)

Accomplishments under the act

Since the beginning of the program the provisions of this title have provided grant support for 115 separate research projects dealing not only with educational use of television and motion pictures, but also with a wide range of new educational equipment and other media. The advance of this program under the act is basic to improving our educational processes at all levels of learning.

Proposed Amendments

The bill would increase the annual authorization for these purposes from $5 million to $6 million for the first 2 years of the

5-year extension of the act and to $7 million for the last 3 years. These additional funds would be provided for the conduct of demonstration projects which would show the uses and effectiveness of new techniques and new educational media. Funds granted under the present authorization have gone into the support of research and additional funds are needed if the results of the research are to be wisely effectuated.

AREA VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS (TITLE VIII)

Accomplishments under the act

Under the provisions of this title, which was an amendment to the Vocational Education Act, vocational programs to prepare technicians are offered in all the States. Due to the national need for technicians and supporting personnel in a variety of technical fields, this program should be continued.

Proposed Amendments

The bill would not change the existing law. The present act authorizes an annual appropriation for this purpose of $15 million. Thus far, however, annual appropriations have not exceeded $9 million. Therefore, at this time no change in the program or the authorization is recommended.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS (TITLE X)

Section 1009 of this title authorizes Federal assistance to the States for the improvement of statistical services of the State educational agencies. From the long-range point of view, this is one of the most important provisions of the act. Without strong support for statistical services, the States and local school boards, as well as the Congress and Federal executive agencies will continue to be without adequate facts upon which to base educational policy.

The collection of information about education is a task of enormous dimensions. Our State and private educational systems embrace approximately 50 million students enrolled in at least 36,000 operating school districts, in over 17,000 private and denominational schools and in about 2,000 institutions of higher education. These systems require over 1,600,000 teachers and spend annually a total of about $24 billion.

Because the operational responsibility for public education rests in the States, and because the Federal Government is dependent upon intermediate sources for most of its information, the State educational agency is the focal point in meeting local, State and national needs.

Accomplishments under the act

A total of 45 States were participating under this program in fiscal year 1960. However, encouraging though the start of the program has been, progress is not rapid enough to overcome continuing and serious deficiencies in the collection, tabulation, and reporting of basic educational information on a timely basis. Not only should this provision of the act be extended, but it should be substantially strengthened. In fact, it appears that accomplishment of truly modern and adequate State systems of educational information at the present rate of development may well require another 20 years or more.

Proposed Amendments

The bill would authorize the appropriation of $2.5 million annually for assistance to the States for the purposes of this program, to be allotted on the basis of relative school-age population and to be matched by a like amount of State funds. The bill provides, however, that the payment to any State under this allocation would not be less than $25,000. When a State has fully matched its total Federal payment, then it would be entitled to an additional Federal support grant of $50,000. Provision of this basic support grant is in recognition of the burdensome educational reporting requirements imposed on the States by the Federal Government under the provisions of existing law. Yet the bill would require the States to take concerted action in view of their own requirements for educational information and thereby sustain a minimum basic educational data system before being given the Federal support grant for further expansion. Enactment of this provision would greatly accelerate the completion and improvement of the State data systems, especially in numerous States that are far behind in the installation of modern methods and machines.

FEBRUARY 12: BIRTHDAY OF THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, was celebrated the birthday of a great Polish patriot, Thaddeus Kosciusko. Not only is his memory revered among the Polish people but we, too, join in this tribute to a man whose love for the cause of liberty spanned two continents.

His unshakable faith in the ideals of independence and his fervor in participating in its struggles, motivated this courageous man to come to our shores and give without reservation his soldierly services in our War of Independence.

Indeed, today it seems a travesty when you consider that the cause of freedom, the prime purpose and dedication of Kosciusko's life, in his native Poland for which he gave so much, should be under the rule of men whose professed political and philosophical principles are the very antithesis to those in which Kosciusko believed.

I am certain, however, that the identical spirit which moved him still lives among the great people of Poland and that his memory will sustain the hope and stoke the fire of freedom in his native land. For Kosciusko is not only a hero to his own people or to us, but is an example of strength, fearless courage, and patriotic love of liberty to men the world over who cherish the same ideals.

It was men of like spirit who conceived and fought to establish this great Nation of ours, and Thaddeus Kosciusko was among them in the forefront of the struggle because he believed in the ideals of our founders and saw that America was the hope of their eventual fruition.

He returned to Poland, after the success of our revolution, to give himself to the same cause for his people. Until the last day of life, he dedicated himself tirelessly to the struggle for independence.

We join with those who believe in liberty in paying our tribute to the memory of this great man, his dedication, faith, and accomplishments. We in America, especially, shall ever remain grateful for his contributions to our successful effort. Above all, in honor of this great man, we rededicate ourselves to the cause of liberty wherever men are struggling to achieve it, and with the great people of Poland we join their hopes for the day when they will be able to enjoy a total fulfillment of the ideal and faith of Thaddeus Kosciusko.

THERE IS A DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as we move into the 1960's with the New Frontier, I view the present international situation with great concern. And I am alarmed by the fact that many, in fact too many, people and nations still do not recognize the graveness of the threat of international communism to individual and national freedoms. The Soviet promises of coexistence and offers of economic and technical assistance are not consistent with deeds of the past and present. The Communist actions in Cuba and Laos are ample proof that the Soviet goal is still world domination by any means. For those who are willing to examine the facts the Red-written record is clear—and it has been starkly clear since the first unfurling of the Communist banner against God and man. Whether Red tactics change daily, monthly, yearly, or for each U.S. administration, I can assure you that the goal of world domination remains foremost.

Whether we want it or not, Christian civilization and communism are locked in a struggle to the finish. In this struggle there can be no status quo, and containment at best is only a temporary measure. Recorded history is replete with epitaphs of nations who were satisfied to bask in domestic prosperity and trust in a status quo. The periods of history that we all remember are those in which mankind exerted heroic efforts, usually with great sacrifices, to advance our civilization and the institutions of a free society.

As we move into the 1960's we must be alert to the changing tactics of communism which now run the gamut from the threat of general war to economic competition for world markets to psychological battle for control of men's minds and actions. If we are alert and strong economically, intellectually, morally, and militarily, we will continue to be the leader of the free world in this struggle to keep men, societies, and nations from becoming enslaved by Communist dictatorship. Communism is truly dictatorship by a small group of selfish individuals, and for the subjugated is as vicious as any dictatorship the world has known.

Whether the future brings general war, limited war, or only continuing international tension depends upon whether we, as a nation, face the facts now and are prepared to accept the challenges which are sure to continue. All new incidents initiated by the Soviet leaders occur only after exhaustive study and analysis of our political, economic, and military postures. The free world is constantly under close scrutiny for any weakness or soft spot that can be exploited. As a citizen of the United

States I am vitally interested in all aspects of this problem. But, because of my service on the Subcommittee for Defense of the Appropriations Committee, I will limit my remarks today to only the military aspects. However, before doing so, let me state that I recognize the political, economic, and military aspects of a sound foreign policy are linked. And that a chain is no stronger than the weakest link.

It is clear to me that Soviet military action, and I include in this category the actions of the satellites and other peoples in the Communist bloc, are based upon the answers to two very simple questions.

First, will the Communist attack be successful?

And, second, will the Communist losses in retaliation be prohibitive?

The Communist leaders, as with other dictators, can retain control of enslaved peoples only by avoiding defeat of their armed forces. They recognize, as well as you and I, that their regimes could not survive if the subjugated peoples had a free choice. Therefore, to perpetuate this godless monster, victories are needed, status quo for short periods is acceptable, and defeats must be avoided at all costs.

It is also clear to me that we have the opportunity, if we are willing to recognize it and to accept it, to insure peace for the future. I am convinced that if the Soviet leaders realize that their attacks, regardless of size or location, will fail, and their losses, even to satellites, will be prohibitive, then peace will continue. As the leader of the free world, it is our responsibility to insure that the capability to accomplish these actions are in being, and that the leaders of the Soviet-Sino bloc are fully aware of these capabilities.

Our means for retaliation, in the event of an all-out general war, obviously have been adequate for several years. The Polaris and nuclear-powered submarines and ICBM missiles have improved the versatility of these forces. Present plans for these forces appear to be adequate for the immediate future, so I will not comment on them further at this time.

Our capability for retaliation or intervention, in event of limited armed conflict for many areas of the world, has been less than adequate. The announced procurement of additional airlift is a welcomed improvement in this capability. Modernization of the equipment and materiel for these forces must be done also before we will have the capability that I think is required.

Today, I want to call your attention to one facet of the problem of general war that has been neglected too long.

From our previous experiences with dictatorships, we know that an attack on this country can be launched at any time and any place. In fact it could occur now. Under these conditions, in this era of ICBM's and submarine-launched ballistic missiles and shrinking distances, a defensive capability assumes the same importance as the ability to retaliate, if we are to survive. In fact, the nation that first develops and deploys an adequate defense against intercontinental or submarine-launched ballistic missiles will enjoy a significant strategic advantage. If such a defense is first developed by Russia, we can expect extensive offensive military action or ballistic blackmail. The Soviets will no longer depend upon economic, political, psychological, or limited war offensives to attain their goals.

The Soviets recognize the strategic advantage of such a defense, and I am sure have allocated a high priority to its development. With their demonstrated abilities, I am sure that in time they will develop such a system. The question is, Will they be first? The question becomes even more critical to us, when we consider the rapid spread of nuclear and missile knowledge to countries other than the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Today, Russia and the West are exploring all advances in technology for possible military application in the search for an advantage in military posture. With the masses of manpower available to the Soviet-Sino bloc, we cannot stumble in this race. There is no consolation prize. For the survival of humanity, we must exploit every possibility of maintaining peace in the years ahead.

For that reason, I feel strongly that our Nation needs and must have as soon as possible, an adequate defense against ballistic missiles. Anyone who is willing to review the facts will reach the same cold sobering conclusion.

My purpose is not to present only the problem. After extensive review, I feel that a solution is within our grasp. And, I know that you share with me the earnest desire to move ahead without delay. Because if we can improve our military posture we will automatically assist our diplomatic efforts.

May I remind you that the same Army-industry team which successfully developed the currently operational Army air defense weapons systems—the Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules—have not been sitting idly by.

Nike-Ajax was America's first guided missile system to defend key cities, defense installations, and our people from air attack. Next came the greatly improved version—Hercules—mighty master of the manned aircraft in any operational atmosphere—effective in its defensive capability above and beyond 100,000 feet. Hercules, you may recall, has also destroyed incoming Army missiles in test flight.

This same dependable team has, in an advanced stage of development, Nike-Zeus—a third generation of this family. The Nike-Zeus antimissile missile, is the only weapon system in the free world being designed specifically to counter the threat of a Red-triggered nuclear ICBM hailstorm. The best scientific and engineering talent of the Army, Western Electric Co., Bell Telephone Laboratories, Douglas Aircraft, Sperry Rand, and many other outstanding firms, have been allocated the development of this advanced weapons system. And from the many successful component tests today, it is evident that the concept has been proven, and the system is now ready for component production.

I am convinced that Nike-Zeus can provide the defense which we need to meet and defeat the intercontinental ballistic missile threat. Components of the Nike-Zeus system have been developed and tested in accordance with a schedule established about 3 years ago. Major elements including the missile itself have been tested successfully. The results are adequate testimonial to the competence of all participants.

The critical question now is, How soon can we get the Nike-Zeus into production and deployed to provide the defense that is mandatory? We have already lost valuable time by delaying component production, a risk we can no longer take.

You may well ask, Why should we start component production now? The answer is; it saves money and it saves time.

By spending money now to provide a capability for the production of components in quantity, we will save money in the long run. These components are expensive when only a few are made by hand. When produced in quantity, components cost is reduced and they are weapon and equipment programs.

The ballistic missile threat dictates that we reduce lead time to an irreducible minimum. The transition from development to deployment on the sites begins with component production. A delay in the decision for component production will make it more difficult to keep the Army-industry team and facilities together so that an operational system can be fielded, and it will greatly increase the time we will be without an adequate defense.

With authority and money, the Army can start component production without delay. The Army and industry have done a splendid job in developing this system, but its future now rests in our hands.

For those critics who would whisper caution until the complete system has been tested, I have this observation. We have many fine missile weapons in our arsenal, and we had them early because we did not wait for a complete test of each system. We had confidence in the men who said the systems would work. History has proven our confidence was not misplaced. These same scientists and engineers have the same high praise for the potential of Nike-Zeus. We should not question their ability now.

You may well ask, How much will Nike-Zeus cost? We can have Nike-Zeus protection for less than the cost of rebuilding a single city or industrial complex. The cost is comparable with the cost of other weapons systems developed in the past. These facts together with the human lives that may be spared leave no alternative. The answer is clear and emphatic, we must start production of the Nike-Zeus now.

I cannot urge this more strongly, as an individual American, as a citizen of this mightly Republic, as a Member of this Congress answerable to our people for the security of our Nation.

Reflecting the evidence of readiness to commence limited production of proven components in the Zeus system are the

words of the Army's great Chief of Research and Development, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau:

Progress in all phases of development has been achieved on schedule. The proved Zeus booster motor produces about a half million pounds of thrust. This is the most powerful, single, solid-propellant motor in existence in the free world today. With this initial thrust, the Zeus missile is able to reach extremely high altitudes in a matter of seconds.

Mr. Speaker, General Trudeau's statement appears in the current issue of one of American industry's outstanding publications, Sperryscope, the quarterly published by Sperry Rand Corp., a member of the fine Army-industry team which has created the Zeus antimissile missile.

Under unanimous consent I include the article, a short informative question-and-answer exchange between the editors and General Trudeau, at this point in the RECORD.

NIKE-ZEUS: ARMY'S MISSILE KILLER

Question. General Trudeau, can you provide us with some background information on the Zeus program? How did it get started?

Answer. As early as 1946, the Army recognized the requirement for a defensive system to cope with the arising ballistic missile threat. By 1955, the state of the art in defensive surface-to-air missile systems had advanced to the point where the feasibility of developing a ballistic missile defense system was indicated. In addition, advances in the development of the longer range ballistic missiles by now gave reality to the enemy missile threat; even the most skeptical were convinced. In light of these considerations, the Army, in 1955, initiated a study to determine the feasibility of developing an antimissile missile system capable of intercepting and neutralizing the spectrum of the ballistic missile threat. The study of considerable magnitude and detail was conducted by the Bell Telephone Laboratories, which utilized their previous experience in developing Nike surface-to-air missiles. The results of this study indicated that such a system development was feasible, and thus the Nike-Zeus project was initiated. Actual design of the system was begun in early 1957, and as a result of an orderly, high-priority program, the Nike-Zeus is today in the advanced stages of development.

Question. What is the basic concept of the Zeus system?

Answer. Like its predecessors in the Nike family, Zeus is designed to provide a defense of 360° and to extremely high altitudes. The system will utilize the command guidance system of operation, but with a greatly enhanced capability as compared with that of Nike-Ajax and Nike-Hercules. The Nike-Ajax and Hercules systems are designed primarilly to cope with the aerodynamically supported air and missile threats, while the Zeus has been designed to kill ballistic missiles, including the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), the submarine- or surface-launched intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM), and the air-launched ballistic missile.

To detect, acquire, and destroy a target as small and fast as the ICBM requires a great advance in the state of the radar art. To accomplish these jobs the Zeus employs several radars, including an acquisition radar, a target track radar, a discrimination radar, and a missile track radar. In addition to the radar equipment, there are a set of high-speed computers, the Zeus missile with its guidance package and warhead, and the necessary communication links to connect and control these items.

The Zeus acquisition radar is capable of automatically scanning the entire visible sky for ranges of several hundred miles. To reach out to these distances, new radar designs and power levels have been used. The acquisition radar receiver does not employ the familiar dish-type antenna but has adapted to radar certain optical principles that permit the focusing of radar signals from small, distant nose cones.

Once the acquisition radar has acquired the incoming ICBM warhead and established a course location, it transfers the incoming target to other, more precise, radars which refine the location of this small target. This refined target information is used in conjunction with information provided by the high-speed computers at the battery on the position of the Zeus missile as it travels along its course. The commands generated at the battery on the basis of this information are transmitted to the Zeus missile, by means of the missile-tracking radar, to direct the missile to intercept the enemy nose cone and to neutralize the enemy warhead at an extremely high altitude. The entire operation is continuous and automatic. A high degree of automaticity is required for the reason that the high velocity of the threats permits only a few minutes from acquisition to target kill.

Question. How will Zeus cope with the decoyed target, General?

Answer. It has been postulated that a potential enemy could use decoy devices to confuse the Zeus system. To do this, he must pay a price in complexity and weight, and he also is limited by certain other physical boundaries. To cope with this threat, the Zeus includes a discrimination system designed to filter the real warheads from the decoys. Zeus will then attack those targets identified as warheads and will not waste fire power on those targets identified as decoys.

Question. Where and how will the Zeus be tested?

Answer. Nike-Zeus will be field tested at four principal sites: Ascension Island in the Atlantic; White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.; Point Mugu, Calif.; and at Kwajalein Island in the Pacific. To distort an often-used phrase of another era, "The sun never sets on the Zeus test program." Testing over this wide geographic expanse of course necessitates an extensive and orderly program with complex delivery and construction schedules. Each of these test sites, however, plays a necessary, timely, and progressive role in both the test and development of the system.

At Ascension Island, the Zeus radars will be exercised against the real ICBM/IRBM targets launched from Cape Canaveral, Fla.

The White Sands Missile Range installation provides a domestic, full-system installation that will be used for the testing of all types and as a component proving ground. The size of this range, of course, limits the range and types of targets we can destroy with the Zeus. It's a paradox of this age of long-range missile artillery that we seem to be always short of terrestrial geography to accommodate our weapons.

Because of this shortage of space, the longer range Zeus tests will be conducted at Point Mugu, Calif., and at Kwajalein Island. An extensive firing program is scheduled from the Point Mugu installations to be conducted over the Pacific Missile Range. This program will permit the Zeus to simulate long-range ballistic missile engagements.

At Kwajalein, a complete Zeus system is under construction to be tested against Atlas ICBM's launched by the Air Force from Vandenberg Air Force Base. At this site, Zeus will engage these targets under the realistic conditions that would be encountered in an actual ICBM nuclear attack on this country.

This, then, is the Zeus test program.

Question. What is the status of the development of Zeus? Are the necessary advances in the state of the art being accomplished? Are you on schedule in its development?

Answer. The necessary advance in the state of the radar art required by the Zeus system is being accomplished. Most of the components of the system have been engineer tested, and most major subassemblies are undergoing test now. Progress in all phases of development has been achieved on schedule. Typical of the program's achievement to date is the progress in Nike-Zeus missile design. Each stage of the Nike-Zeus has been repeatedly and successfully static test fired. A preliminary firing program conducted at the White Sands Missile Range has been successfully completed. As a result of this firing program, and an associated engineering effort, it has been possible to improve the design of the Zeus missile to increase further its performance.

The proved Zeus booster motor produces about a half-million pounds of thrust. This is the most powerful single solid-propellant motor in existence in the free world today. With this initial thrust, the Zeus missile is able to reach extremely high altitudes in a matter of seconds. A firing test program for the improved missile design is currently in progress at White Sands.

Other major components such as the missile launchers, the acquisition radar facilities, and portions of the battery equipment have been installed at White Sands; and additional installations are proceeding on schedule that will permit subsequent tests at that site.

The tactical launcher is an underground silo. This launcher design has been proved by a successful firing test at White Sands.

The White Sands acquisition radar facility consists of a large, triangular transmitter antenna mounted on the roof of a one-story building and a separate plastic sphere receiver antenna approximately eight stories high. Tests of this radar are in progress.

Radar tests at Ascension Island and firing tests at Point Mugu will soon begin. Construction of the Kwajalein site is well advanced.

To summarize, we are on schedule. Although we have our problems, we are most pleased with our progress to date.

Question. Will the Zeus have a high order of reliability?

Answer. Yes, indeed. In addition to major operational advances, the Zeus system has made significant advances in the realm of reliability. The transistors employed in the various electronic components are an example of this reliability improvement. If the vacuum tubes in a television set were as reliable as these transistors, there would be no tube failure for a period of operation of 70 years. The reliability of the major components is characterized by that of the high-speed computers, which have an average failure-free operating period 10 times better than that of any other known computer, military or civilian, now in existence.

PANAMA INTRIGUE: STATE DEPARTMENT MISUSE OF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in addresses to the House on July 1 and September 1, 1960, also on January 6, 1961, about Panama intrigue, I included the texts of an exchange of letters with the Department of State concerning the raising of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone.

In this connection, I wish to remind the House, especially new Members who may not be familiar with the history of the disgraceful incident in the U.S. his-

tory, that this distinguished body, after a notable debate on February 2, 1960, passed by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, House Concurrent Resolution 459. The purpose of this resolution, adopted pursuant to recommendations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs after extensive hearings, was to prevent such display unless authorized by treaty. See House Report No. 2218, 86th Congress, August 31, 1960.

The House did not stop there. On February 9, 1960, it approved the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, which provision was embodied in the law. This amendment provided that no part of the Department of Commerce appropriations, which include the Panama Canal enterprise, should be "used to construct a flagpole, platform, or any other device for the purpose of displaying the flag of Panama in the Canal Zone, the sovereign control of which is vested in the U.S. Government by virtue of longstanding treaty." Could there be anything more definite than this law?

As I have previously pointed out on various occasions, the ill-advised order by the President on September 17, 1960, directing display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone territory was a contemptuous disregard of the specific intent of the Congress, raising constitutional issues of the gravest importance that should not be overlooked but met head on.

In view of the intended prohibition by the Congress against the use of Department of Commerce appropriations for such purpose, I wondered what source of funds covered the cost of constructing the flagpole in Shalu Triangle in the Canal Zone on which the Panama flag was hoisted, and found out.

Mr. Speaker, it was not the Panama Canal enterprise, the appropriations for which come under the Department of Commerce, but the Department of State. Moreover, the Department of State paid $1,533.24 to cover the cost of erecting that flagpole in the territory of the Canal Zone over which the United States exercises exclusive sovereignty in perpetuity pursuant to treaty.

That misapplication of Government funds was not only a violation of the specific intent of the Congress, but raises further questions as to the subversive influences in the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that those in the executive branch who were responsible for such use of Government funds to defray the expenses of displaying the Panama flag in the Canal Zone were guilty of trickery and subterfuge of the most pronounced character.

The action of the Congress in denying use by the cognizant agency directly involved, the Department of Commerce, for the indicated purpose was thus bypassed by the Department of State.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there could not be more flagrant departure from the constitutional separation of powers of the executive and legislative agencies of our Government than is involved in this incident. The action now complained of would, by every proper test, justify impeachment of the responsible parties.

In substance and effect, the action of the Department of State officials involved in the case are just as reprehensive as if the Panama flag were thus displayed by the use of directly appropriated funds for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal itself. I am sure that any informed court of our country, if the matter were brought before it, would so hold.

If the State Department officials are permitted to go unchallenged on this matter, the precedent they established may lead to a standard practice on their part to disregard the specific actions and policies of the Congress and the destruction of its constitutional powers. When the camel's nose gets into the tent, its body soon follows.

The letter referred to above follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Information has been received to the effect that the Department of State paid $1,533.24 to cover the cost of erecting the flagpole to display the Panama flag over the Canal Zone.

In view of the express intent of the Congress to deny such expenditure by passage of the Gross amendment to the last Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, it would seem that this incident is an appropriate subject for investigation in the current inquiry into subversive influences in the Department of State.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES for 20 minutes on Thursday, February 16.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) for 1 hour on Wednesday next.

Mr. FLOOD for 30 minutes today in two parts, in one to speak on the subject of "National Defense" and in the other on "Panama," and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WALTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include a speech by the Honorable Stewart Udall.

Mr. DORN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. PELLY.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

(At the request of Mr. LANGEN, the following Members were granted permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:)

Mr. HOSMER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 15, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

552. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to requesting the Attorney General to submit to the Congress legislation to create 59 additional Federal judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

553. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report by the Civil Service Commission relating to a review of progress in employee development activities entitled, "Training of Federal Employees, Fiscal Year 1960," pursuant to Public Law 85–507; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

554. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected insurance operations of the Veterans' Administration (VA) under the national service life insurance and U.S. Government life insurance programs for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

555. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the revolving fund, Small Business Administration (SBA), for the fiscal year 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

556. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

557. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting errata to the Annual Report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission for 1960, which was recorded as executive communication No. 503, dated January 30, 1961; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

558. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

559. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4222. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to

aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4223. A bill to provide for the construction of a permanent museum of science and industry at the New York World's Fair of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4224. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4225. A bill to prohibit discrimination because of age in the hiring and employment of persons by Government contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4226. A bill to assist in training an adequate number of physicians, osteopaths, and dentists to meet the health needs of this Nation by establishing a program of grants for the construction of medical and dental educational facilities and for scholarships for medical and dental students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4227. A bill to authorize hospitalization in civil hospitals for retired members of the armed services under group insurance sick and accident policies, based on specified payment of premiums from retired pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4228. A bill to provide a flexible rate of interest for Government financing under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4229. A bill to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H.R. 4230. A bill to provide for reimbursement of the Treasury by the Panama Canal Company for the annuities paid to the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 4231. A bill to promote the public interest by amending the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for regulation of national networks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4232. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to assure accurate presentation of views expressed in recorded interviews and discussions on issues of public importance by prohibiting the broadcast by radio or television of recordings of such interviews or discussions which have been altered without the consent of participants in such interviews or discussions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 4233. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 4234. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4235. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 4236. A bill to provide that amounts paid for music program services shall be exempt from the Federal excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4237. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase all benefits payable under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increased retirement benefits for certain individuals who have attained the age of 60 and who have completed 30 or more years of service creditable under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE (by request):

H.R. 4240. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4241. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4242. A bill to provide chiropractic treatment when requested for veterans eligible for outpatient medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4243. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service for postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 4244. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4245. A bill to impose additional duties on excess imports of certain live animals, meats, and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 4246. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 4247. A bill to establish an Armed Forces Medical, Dental and Allied Sciences Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits, and to reduce an individual's earnings for purposes of such deductions in any year by the amount of his medical expenses for such year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4249. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Jefferson County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of certain improvements on lands of the United States taken for rights-of-way on the Interstate System; to the Commitee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to provide for the preservation or restoration of housing and certain other structures in urban renewal project areas, where such housing or other structures are not substandard or can be restored to good condition; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4252. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation or restoration of housing and certain other structures in the District of Columbia, where such housing or other structures are not substandard or can be restored to good condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4253. A bill to extend for 5 years the educational programs provided for in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, with changes designed to expand and strengthen certain of such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4254. A bill to provide increased employment by stimulating a new industry of home improvement, to help cities combat blight and help the Federal Government gain more tax revenue, and to ease the tax burden on individual homeowners who renovate or rehabilitate their homes, by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence and to allow the owner of housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of its rehabilitation or restoration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4255. A bill to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on self-contained air-conditioning units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 4256. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4257. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4258. A bill to exempt regular and classified substitute employees in post offices of the first, second, and third classes from residence requirements governing appointment and service of postmasters at post offices to which such employees are assigned; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4259. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4260. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4261. A bill to provide a termination date for the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4262. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for local telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4263. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at or near Fort Hood, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4264. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps

to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that benefits payable under such act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of individuals for benefits from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4266. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 4267. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4268. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4269. A bill to establish the Youth Conservation Corps to assist in the conservation and development of natural resources, provide employment and training for unemployed youthful citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize for all taxpayers the amount which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4271. A bill to permit the deduction for Federal income tax purposes of certain amounts paid in connection with annuity contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4272. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that the provisions of section 4(1) thereof, relating to long and short haul charges, shall not apply to express companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4273. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide that disabled persons meeting certain requirements may not be prohibited from operating motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce under certain rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4274. A bill to create and prescribe the duties of a Commission To Investigate Electoral College Reform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4275. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game and food fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4276. A bill to expand and develop the aquatic resources of the United States including the oceans, estuaries and rivers, the Great Lakes and other inland waters, to enhance the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4277. A bill to provide for the erection at Stroudsburg, Pa., of a monument in honor of J. Summerfield Staples; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 4279. A bill to authorize the payment of per diem to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the same rate that is authorized for other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 215. Joint resolution designating the week of May 22–27, 1961, as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 216. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 217. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bedford, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to provide for planning for the conversion of the national economy to nonmilitary production in the event of reduced military spending; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 157. Concurrent resolution to recognize Samuel Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's national symbol "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 158. Concurrent resolution to recognize Samuel Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's national symbol "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Res. 161. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 162. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 161; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Joint Memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to adequate Federal appropriations for the control of noxious weeds on federally controlled lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to employment of persons over 40 years of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management, with reference to passing legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals, on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to balancing the expenditures and the income of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for Phoebe Apperson Hearst; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to recognition and development of the recreation potential in connection with Federal channel control works in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and along the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional control over our national monetary policies and restore the integrity of the dollar throughout the world by proceeding with all deliberate haste to enact necessary legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to develop and adopt a national minerals policy that will guarantee a strong and healthy domestic mining industry by assuring domestic producers a fair and equitable share of domestic metal markets; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the granting of representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the granting of representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that the 87th Congress immediately extend the present Sugar Act

of 1948 through December 31, 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to their House bill 587 entitled, "a bill to accept the cession by the State of Minnesota to the State of North Dakota of certain parcels of real property and declaring an emergency"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to granting of representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting legislation for the appropriation of funds for the control of noxious weeds on federally controlled lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the employment of persons over 40 years of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale of, or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals, on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4280. A bill for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 4281. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Delina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4282. A bill for the relief of Casimir Lazarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4283. A bill for the relief of Zofia Wodynska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Veda Alixia Bogle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4285. A bill for the relief of Dr. John M. Zytkiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4286. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie M. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4287. A bill authorizing the presentation of the Bronze Star Medal to Sidney Clinton Stern; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4288. A bill for the relief of Achille Alfano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 4289. A bill for the relief of Maria Cesta-Incani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4290. A bill for the relief of Luigi Mondin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4291. A bill for the relief of Edward T. How and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4292. A bill for the relief of Louie Jee Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4293. A bill for the relief of Sarah Elizabeth Facey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4294. A bill for the relief of Edney Roy Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4295. A bill for the relief of Moshe Nussbacher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 4296. A bill for the relief of Barbara Iris Patrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution relating to deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were held on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

58. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Insular Union of Construction Workers, Santurce, P.R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting legislation that will give an equitable minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

59. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Victor O. Wamsley and others, Duluth, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting initiation of a study to devise a new method of nominating and electing Presidents; to the Committee on House Administration.

60. Also, petition of the supreme recording secretary, Order Sons of Italy in America, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting amendment of the immigration and naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

What the New York Times Sees Fit To Print

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include first an editorial printed in the New York Times of February 2, 1961. The editorial reads as follows:

MR. WALTER ON REFUGEES

The callous comment of Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER—most hostile opponent of liberal refugee and immigration legislation since the late Senator Pat McCarran—was to be expected, ridiculing a proposal to admit to the United States in the next 2 years up to 40,000 nonquota refugee-escapees from Communist and other forms of persecution. "They couldn't get 40,000 refugees if they advertised in every newspaper in Europe," he said.

Under the United Nations High Commissioner's mandate alone there are at least 75,000 refugees in Europe and another 7,500 Europeans in Asia—not to mention the total of nearly a million and a half scattered throughout the globe who come within the restricted limitations of his responsibility. In addition, there are hundreds of thousands more in north Africa, in the Far East, and in many other parts of the world who are, in the common understanding of the term, refugees. The microscopic number of 20,000 a year provided for in the bill just introduced by Senator KEATING of New York and five other Senators, including Senators JAVITS and CASE, is hardly an exaggerated figure to meet the current emergency and any that may unexpectedly arise in the future—whether in Cuba, the Middle East or other areas.

In a companion bill introduced by Senator JAVITS and the same group of Senators, a revision and modernization of the present antiquated and inadequate immigration law is proposed. Principal features of the bill include readjustment of the national-quota system to reflect the 1960 instead of the 1920 census, and to permit pooling of unused quotas—two reforms long sought by many members of both parties, including former President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon and President Kennedy.

Last year Congress did enact a refugee-relief bill that one expert, Edward Corsi, has correctly described as "meager in scope * * * and niggardly in numbers." Last year—World Refugee Year—the United States did not add to its luster by what it did for the world refugee problem, or rather by what it didn't do. This year we can and ought to do better; and a good beginning would be for the President to push hard for the Javits-Keating bills or a reasonable facsimile thereof.

On February 11, 1961, the New York Times printed my letter, which reads as follows:

ADMITTING REFUGEES—LEGISLATION FACILITATING ENTRY OF DISPLACED IS UPHELD

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

I have consistently refrained from lodging objections to the New York Times' editorial comments on my activities in the Congress, although your newspaper has quite frequently seen fit to print gratuitously insulting opinions about me.

However, in the editorial of February 2 the Times has stated as a matter of fact—not opinion—that I am "the most hostile opponent of liberal refugee and immigration legislation." This statement is patently untrue. Facts and figures attest to the contrary.

Since the end of World War II all legislation under which displaced persons and refugees were admitted to the United States was either introduced in the Congress by myself or reported and piloted by myself through the Congress. Official U.S. and international statistics estimate the number of displaced persons and refugees admitted to the United States under this legislation at close to 850,000 persons.

INTERNATIONAL OPINION

The international community engaged in resettlement of refugees, similarly, appears

to disagree with your appraisal of my activities in that field.

In nominating me to the post of president of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), at a 29-nation meeting held at Naples, Italy, on May 5, 1960, the delegate of Italy, Ambassador Borga, has referred to me as the founding father of that organization, which in its 9 years of existence has resettled overseas 1,046,400 emigrants, 447,178 of whom were refugees.

Seconding my nomination, the delegate from Israel, Mr. Laor, has referred to me as the "warmhearted friend of all the emigrants and refugees in the world." Allowing for flattery and diplomatic courtesy, these expressions (concurred in by representatives of seven other nations and culminating in a unanimous election) certainly differ from what the Times had to say in its editorial.

As far as the current refugee situation is concerned, my bill, enacted in 1960, under which the United States is able to participate in the resettlement of refugees under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, served to open the doors of the United States to 5,141 refugees in the first 6-month period of operations authorized by my legislation.

According to a report submitted to the Congress by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, only 6,334 refugees had registered for entry to the United States, notwithstanding the fact that the voluntary agencies have made every possible effort to locate and register refugees who desire to come to the United States.

LACK OF INTEREST

In his report to the Congress the Commissioner further stresses that due to the vastly improved economic situation in Europe and abundant employment opportunities, refugees are "not anxious to embark upon an immigration venture and hence generally are not interested in registering." As an illustration, the Commissioner adds that during the past year West Germany, in addition to the placement of 200,000 refugees from the East, has imported 330,000 workers from other countries.

The law enacted in 1960 remains on the statute books together with the permanent features of the Walter-McCarran Act under which refugees, such as the Hungarians in 1956 and 1957 and the Cubans of the present time, could be admitted, in emergency situations.

Thus, the United States is fully equipped to accept its fair share of refugees.

FRANCIS E. WALTER.

WASHINGTON, *February 6, 1961.*

The New York Times has attached this comment to my letter:

Perhaps, in fairness, we ought to have said that Mr. WALTER is only one of the most hostile opponents of liberal refugee and immigration legislation—the key word, of course, being "liberal."—Editor, the Times.

What the New York Times has so far not printed is a telegram signed by the leaders of the voluntary agencies engaged in providing assistance and resettlement opportunities to refugees.

The telegram, as sent to me, reads as follows:

Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We have today dispatched the following telegram:

"EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES:

"Your editorial 'Mr. WALTER on Refugees' Thursday, February 2, 1961, calls him 'most hostile opponent of liberal refugee and immigration legislation since the late Senator Pat McCarran.'

"While we have consistently recorded our belief that major amendments to basic Immigration and Nationality Act would better represent our American concern for refugee homeless, we have not regarded and do not concur in naming Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER most hostile opponent liberal refugee and immigration legislation. Together with other congressional leaders he played vital role in securing entry refugee tuberculars, Hungarian freedom fighters, Dutch Indonesian refugees and secured recognition Middle East refugees under Public Law 86-316. Since its origin Mr. WALTER has provided constant leadership and encouragement Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration which has served so many thousands of migrants coming to our shores and other free lands.

"JAMES MACCRACKEN,
"Church World Service; Chairman, Refugee and Migration Problems Committee, American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.
"JAMES RICE,
"United HIAS Service; Vice Chairman.
"Rt. Rev. JOHN F. MCCARTHY,
"Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.
"VERNON BERGSTROM,
"Lutheran Immigration Service; Vice Chairman.
"Dr. JAN PAPANEK,
"American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Vice Chairman."

Abraham Lincoln—Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 12 we observe the birthdays of two great men who have played important roles in the history of our Nation—Abraham Lincoln, our 16th President, and Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a famous adopted son of our country and a hero of the Revolutionary War.

These two great men, living in different periods, with different backgrounds, shared the same respect for the dignity of man, and abiding love for our Nation. Each in his own way helped to make the United States what it is today.

General Kosciuszko was an outstanding military leader and his gallant participation in our Revolutionary War is impressive because of the fact that, in assisting our Nation's struggle for independence, he did not not hesitate to come to our shores and fight for the principles in which he believed. His devotion to the cause of freedom and liberty should be an inspiration to all of us.

President Lincoln's courageous stand for freedom and union is forever inscribed in the annals of our national history. He led our Nation through a critical and tragic period, preserving the Union and opening the doors to a great future for the United States.

Today we are involved in a great and terrible conflict, the conflict between the free world and communism. As we recall the achievements of these two men, we must reaffirm our determination to strive for freedom and justice for all. Let us express hope that the day will soon come when the people of Poland will regain their full independence. It is our responsibility to take a firm stand and be willing to sacrifice in order that we may preserve our heritage and, inspired by the example of Lincoln and Koscluszko, we pray that, with God's help, we may have the strength today and in the days to come to live up to that responsibility.

A Tribute to the Late Tom Waring of the Famed "Waring's Pennsylvanians"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 11, at Stroudsburg, Pa., the Monroe County Republican Committee sponsored their second annual Lincoln Day dinner, which several hundred persons attended.

Not only did the program observe the birthday of Abraham Lincoln but it included a tribute to the late Tom Waring of the famed "Waring's Pennsylvanians" who at the time of his death was serving as chairman of the committee on arrangements.

As the speaker of the evening it was my privilege to make the following remarks as a tribute of love and respect to the late Tom Waring:

As we assemble this evening to commemorate the 152d birthday of Abraham Lincoln and renew our pledge of allegiance to the enduring principles of the Republican Party we are mindful that the joy of this annual observance is dimmed by the absence of the late Thomas Lincoln Waring who not only began the plans for this evening's program but for years played a leading role in the success of this annual event.

Tonight his spirit and the spirit of the martyred Lincoln hover over this annual Lincoln Day dinner nurturing and sustaining us as we resolve to meet the challenges confronting the Republican Party and which are of equal importance to all Americans interested in good government.

Tom Waring, as he was affectionately known, was a native of Tyrone, Blair County, Pa., in my congressional district.

He was born there in 1902 on Lincoln's birthday.

When members of the Waring family left Tyrone through death or migration to other communities of the State or the Nation, Blair County's great loss was recognized and is still keenly felt.

When Tom Waring and his brother Fred settled here in Monroe County the residents of this area gained greatly by the presence of two adopted sons who paid this area a great compliment in their decision to henceforth call Shawnee on Delaware their future home community.

You responded with warmth and appreciation and thus the golden bonds of friendship were forged in mutual fashion.

It is deemed appropriate on this occasion to tender a tribute of love and respect to the late Tom Waring.

I have chosen to do so before indulging in the traditional Lincoln Day custom of discussing political affairs.

We treasure the memory of Tom Waring because during his short yet fruitful life, he so lived, that he left a legacy of love and devotion that may be summed up in the words of Byron:

"He kept the whiteness of his soul, and thus, men over him wept."

Tom's first love in life was music which has been described as the speech of angels, the poetry of the air—and the universal language of mankind.

Tom cofounded Waring's Pennsylvanians along with J. Roland McClintock.

They were later joined by Tom's brother Fred and the late Freddie Buck thus forming a quartet responsible for the widespread acclaim accorded Waring's Pennsylvanians.

Today Fred Waring is famed as the leader of a musical organization that has won world renown.

On their way to the pinnacle of success in the world of music and entertainment—Broadway production, movies, radio, and television triumphs—crowned the efforts of Waring's Pennsylvanians, enabling them to make an indelible imprint in the realm of American music.

Tom Waring, whose memory we revere and to whom tonight we tender a loving tribute, was a versatile American.

He was noted not only for his stellar contributions to the field of music but in the role of master of ceremonies he had no peer.

He was also interested in sports, painting, interior decorating, and in the business world.

The hallmark of Tom Waring's character was his abiding faith in God, his honesty, deep humility, and his jovial disposition.

Tom was endowed with a genius for understanding and generous friendship animated by Christian charity.

He had great concern for the welfare of his fellow man with the result that his civic pride knew no bounds.

The fact that Tom was the recipient in 1955 of the Golden Deeds awarded by the East Stroudsburg Exchange Club is only one instance where his civic mindedness and love for the community was publicly acknowledged.

His generosity and civic pride will long be remembered in the hearts of the residents of this area who knew and appreciated his efforts to advance the best interests of Monroe County.

The gratitude of this area has been well expressed in the naming of the new high school gym as the Tom Waring Memorial Gymnasium.

An ardent sports fan, Tom would have liked such recognition despite his gentle disposition and his reluctance to accept public acclaim for his golden deeds on behalf of the community.

He would have liked, too, the living memorial being created in his memory by the establishment of the Tom Waring Scholarship Foundation as a means of assisting deserving students in acquiring a higher education.

Tom Waring, whose death occurred in the prime of his life, enjoyed during his 58 years on earth the pleasure and the experience of probing every facet of American life.

He had the happy faculty of making friends among people in all walks of life.

In so doing, he was numbered among the personal friends of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and others prominent on the American political scene.

His profession enabled him to win fame as a leading composer in the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Thus he mingled with the great personages that have walked across the thresholds of the theater, motion pictures, radio and television.

Truly, it may be said of Tom Waring that "he walked with kings—yet never lost the common touch."

When you review the life of Tom Waring that is now closed you are reminded of the beautiful lines by Mrs. A. J. Stanley who in speaking of success in life said:

"He has achieved success who has lived well, laughed often, and loved much; who has gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children; who has filled his niche and accomplished his task; who has left the world better than he found it, whether by an improved poppy, a perfect poem, or a rescued soul; who has never lacked appreciation of earth's beauty, or failed to express it; who has always looked for the best in others and given the best he has; whose life was an inspiration—and whose memory is a benediction."

Such a man was Tom Waring and such was the measure of his success.

Truly, Tom's life may be described as a symphony of unselfish love and willing sacrifices for the common good.

Devoted to the principles of Abraham Lincoln whom he revered, Tom's life recalls that of the great emancipator of whom it was said at his death:

"The tall cedar fell
And left a lonely place
Against the sky."

While the body of Tom Waring has vanished from our view, and his soul has taken its homeward flight, yet his inspiring and vibrant spirit lives on in a devotion that shall never diminish in the hearts of those who revered and loved him.

In concluding this tribute to the late Tom Waring who was regarded as a great American—and one of God's noblemen—we can say in all sincerity and from the innermost recesses of our saddened hearts:

"A friend has passed across the bay
So wide and vast and put away,
The mortal form that held his breath
But through the mortal storm that men call death,
Erect and straight, unstained by years
At heaven's gate, a man appears."

World's Greatest Cranberry Merchant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is attempting to convince everybody it has grown up now and is a big, powerful, solid citizen of the world. Over the weekend it tossed several tons of highly publicized and high priced machinery out toward Venus trying to prove it. As commendable as this scientific endeavor may be, it should not be regarded out of context. A cranberry merchant on the international scale is no less subject to criticism than a cranberry merchant on an individual scale. A cranberry merchant is a flashy operator too cheap to pay his bills.

Here is a country operating flashy if there ever was one. This is so because if it really were a solid citizen type instead of trying to impress everybody including the Venusian, if there are any, it would be devoting its scientific attention to taking care of its people at home by efforts to overcome the tremendous lag in agricultural production.

Here is a country that is too cheap to pay its just bills. It pays only 5.45 percent of the U.N.'s costs while the United States pays 43.67 percent of those costs. In 1960 the U.S.S.R. contributed a paltry $18,245,000 to the U.N.'s total cost of $334,700,000 while the United States contributed a whopping $146,-182,000.

Now, in this light, if the cranberry merchant shoe fits, I hope the next time Mr. Khrushchev comes to the U.N. he will keep it under the table where it belongs and put his checkbook on top of the table where it belongs, instead of scrooged away on a space station.

Secretary Udall Assumes Role of Co-chairman of National Petroleum Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, is losing no time in getting a firm grasp of his new duties and responsibilities. His actions and decisions in the three weeks he has been Secretary have demonstrated the enthusiasm and energy with which he is approaching this new and challenging assignment. An example is Secretary Udall's assumption of the role of Co-chairman of the National Petroleum Council instead of appointing someone from his staff. In making this announcement at his first meeting with the Council, he stressed the important role of the National Petroleum Council as "an ideal bridge for the two-way traffic of ideas and information between government and industry." He indicated his intention to be active in the Council's activities. In this connection, I am including the Secretary's statement to the executive committee of the National Petroleum Council at its meeting here in Washington on February 7:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL TO MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 7, 1961

I come not as a stranger to this meeting or even as your guest. We are standing today on common ground and I am happy to be counted as one of you.

Some of us are friends; some of us had the pleasure of meeting for the first time last night, but all of us are bound together, by mutual responsibility for the social, the economic and the political impact of the petroleum industry on the affairs of our Nation—and the world. I trust we are here because we have accepted this responsibility, are prepared to meet it in common, and in doing so, are ready to make the fullest possible use of this Council. I am here to give you my word on this and to ask for yours.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy uttered these stirring words: "Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country." A few days later in his message on the state of the Union, the President said, "I here pledge myself and my colleagues in the Cabinet to a continuous encouragement of initiative, responsibility and energy in serving the national interests." Thus, in asking your help, I am acting on the direct counsel of a President who has solemnly committed me to an open mind and to an open door.

You may call this cooperation if you wish. I think it amounts to much more. These are times which demand much more than mere cooperation between the private and public sectors of American enterprise. Communism, if you recall, began as a demand for equality. It promised to "divide the wealth" and to give political power to the downtrodden. But to many of its early converts the appeal of communism lay in its promise to followers that they would take part in a selfless crusade for humanity. The promise was a false one and has been exposed by history time and again. That it succeeded so well and still persists is due largely to default by the defenders of free institutions. Nevertheless, I believe that communism is losing this ideological battle and that its appeal today is based largely on the ancient argument for tyranny—that it is more efficient than freedom in providing material benefits.

This too is a false argument, but no matter what price we place on freedom it is not an irrelevant argument, not to the great numbers of people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America who are now living at intolerable economic levels. The United States is perfectly capable of demonstrating to the world that our economic system is efficient, that it is unique, that it is flexible, and that it is a servant not a master of the open society we all cherish. Such a demonstration, however, calls for more than cooperation by business and Government. It demands a substantial identity of purpose and a zeal to weld together common interests.

The petroleum industry is part of the core of America's economic and military strength. It is pivotal to the welfare and cohesion of the free world. We in Government know its importance; we recognize its complexities; we respect those who direct it. I am confident that for your part, you appreciate the inescapable involvement of Government in the industry. We must have national policies on oil and gas and these policies must be determined by public bodies which weigh the public interest in the scales.

The Department of the Interior is the principal policymaking agent in this sphere. Its responsibilities will grow rather than diminish in the coming years. There are, I suppose, some who wish this were not so, who believe the industry can solve its own problems and that accepting any governmental association with the private sector of the economy is letting the camel's nose into the tent.

Despite what I have said about the Communist challenge, I appreciate this thinking and I regret that it has so little to do with reality. However, recent events demonstrate conclusively that there are simply no alternatives to government as an arbiter of the industry, as its shield in foreign affairs, and as guardian of the national interest.

The true problem for us is to develop the machinery that will permit Government to carry out effectively its balance wheel function without usurping those of business. The knowledge required by the Government for its regulatory role at home and its representative role abroad—this knowledge is, by the nature of our system, found in the private sector. This is as it should be. I feel, as you do, that Government should not, would not, and could not assume any function that is properly a business one. Yet, there are many occasions when substantial information and advice from the private sector must be available to Government for the interests of the Nation and, hence, for the interest of the industry. This need becomes critical in dealing with monolithic states that recognize no division between public and private sectors.

I believe that those who created this Council understood the problem well, for here in the National Petroleum Council we have an ideal bridge for the two-way traffic of ideas and information between Government and industry. The bridge may need a few improvements but it is structurally sound and is capable of carrying far more traffic than it does now. Our job is to improve its approaches—and work has already begun on the Government side.

I cannot promise that the Government will accept all recommendations put forward by the industry or that our views on a given subject will always coincide with yours. This is not what a Government department is for. But I can promise you that your views will always be welcome and your facts and figures put to use. Again, as President Kennedy said last week: "Let it be clear that this administration recognizes the value of daring and dissent—that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy challenge."

I opened these remarks by saying we are here on common ground. I am in earnest about that, and effective immediately, I am designating myself Cochairman of the National Petroleum Council.

I will look upon this as a challenge and an opportunity for achievement and responsible action as great as any duty I may perform as Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I will attend the meetings whenever possible, and in those cases (and I hope there will not be many) when I am unable to be present, my duties will be assumed by a senior official in the Department.

I trust the industry to show a concern with the Council equal to my own.

This is a time in America for great expectations. Let us share them.

Thank you.

Standby Plan To Meet Economic Impact of Reduced Military Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 219 calling for a federally developed plan to meet the economic impact of defense cutbacks. The idea back of this is to provide a study and standby preparedness program for peace. Under this proposal the Secretary of Commerce would develop a nationwide survey for conversion of industries and manpower from military to nonmilitary production in event of any U.S. internation agreements calling for curtailing of armaments.

Certainly, the President should have, and I am sure will have, the fullest support and cooperation of the Congress in his endeavor to find solutions to the most pressing problem of our times—peace among nations.

Especially, President Kennedy will carry the most fervent hopes and prayers of the American people into any Soviet-American talks. An end to the use of force as a means of settlement of international disputes is a national goal. By degrees at least it can be achieved.

However, in achieving or attempting to achieve that goal, no one believes there is any overnight answer. Notwithstanding delays, it only seems reasonable that the limitation of atomic power to peacetime uses might well be agreed to first under some mutually satisfactory system of control. If that hurdle is overcome it would be the major step toward gradual disarmament. Thereafter, the major military powers could find other areas whereby a reduction in defense spending would be accomplished.

In such an eventuality, it seems to me, democracy and our free economy would immediately come into stepped-up economic competition with the Communists. In any such competition, the system of state capitalism and control would seem to be far more susceptible than our free enterprise one to conversion of industry from military to nonmilitary production. Moreover, any obvious failure of independent private ownership under such conditions of transition would make the United States and its private ownership look bad and thereby in the struggle between the two ideologies on the economic battlefront our free way of life might receive quite a black eye before the rest of the world.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, a major cutback in defense expenditures in the United States will have a serious effect on our economy. Indeed, the question has been raised—Can we afford peace? Under our voluntary system, could we retain and relocate industry and workers following a disarmament agreement without resorting to nationalization, subsidization and much of the control and regimentation of the Communist system to which we object.

All of this points up the desirability of carefully preparing a standby program as called for in my joint resolution so the Government would be ready to implement immediately the conversion of adversely affected industries and employment to peacetime production.

At this very moment, Congress is being asked to assist distressed areas which have become pockets of unemployment through obsolescence and other causes of plant shutdowns.

In my State of Washington and especially in Seattle where the Boeing Airplane Co. employs such a high percentage of the total area work force, we are concerned. The management of Boeing has done a very creditable job of developing the production of peacetime commercial jet transport planes. It is constantly seeking to increase its nonmilitary business. But, missiles and other military contracts are responsible for thousands of Boeing jobs and the community employment is not diversified.

It seems to me the Federal Government either studies this overall transition problem now, giving a chance to industries and labor to work out programs that will preserve the free enterprise

system, or we wait and in the future risk the danger of a position of complete Federal responsibility that could easily lead to socialism and possibly the very conditions of State control that our armaments are maintained to protect ourselves from.

Furthermore, how much better to negotiate peace and disarmament from a position of strength. With a plan, the American people would avoid panic or fear of diminishing production of military arms. Also such a plan would show the good intentions of the United States in any international discussions. With all this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today House Joint Resolution 219 to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall carry out planning in anticipation of eventual success in endeavors to achieve world agreement of gradual disengagement from defense spending.

Under my resolution, the Secretary of Commerce would initiate a survey of the dependence of industrial economy on military contracts.

In turn, the defense industries that are vulnerable to diminishing military appropriations would be encouraged to plan for conversion of their plants to peacetime conditions and to offset reductions of military spending. Also, a program of retaining workers and relocating them if necessary would be developed.

Under the resolution as introduced a comprehensive industry transition plan would be ready and transmitted to the President of the United States not later than June 30, 1963.

In the meanwhile, I would expect, Mr. Speaker, while the surveys and studies are being developed that the very public knowledge that they are in preparation would strengthen the position of the President and those he entrusts with the responsibility of negotiating disarmament and peace just as it would solidify public opinion in support of the President's foreign policies and programs in any foreign peace discussions.

My resolution reads as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR PLANNING FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY TO NONMILITARY PRODUCTION IN THE EVENT OF REDUCED MILITARY SPENDING

Whereas the most pressing problem of our time is how to maintain peace among nations; and

Whereas more than 40 billions of dollars or approximately half of the budget of the Federal Government of the United States is for national defense resulting in a substantial percentage of the incomes of the American people being dependent on military expenditures; and

Whereas total disarmament is the goal of our National Government which if achieved would result in severe reduction of military spending throughout the United States; and

Whereas our National Government will be able to negotiate for disarmament from a greater position of strength if our Nation has planned how to make the transition from a militarily oriented economy to one based on production of civilian goods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce shall carry out comprehensive planning and educational programs necessary to prepare the Nation's economy for the gradual disengagement from military spending, including the following activities:

(1) Conducting continual surveys of the industry of the Nation to determine to what extent the national economy is dependent on military spending.

(2) Encouragement of industries which are dependent on military contracts to participate with the Department of Commerce in planning for conversion of their own plants to products needed in a peacetime economy.

(3) Development, in cooperation with other appropriate government agencies, of a plan of transition of industries from defense to nonmilitary production which can be initiated when required to offset reductions in military spending.

(4) Planning for the establishment of training programs, expense allotments, and loans to businesses or individuals who might have to relocate as a result of reduced defense spending.

(5) Determining the financial costs of conversion programs and making recommendations as to where assistance in meeting such costs might reasonably be obtained (i.e., from local organizations, industry, and local, State or National Government).

(6) Informing the public of the progress being made on plans for conversion of the Nation's industry to civilian goods production through news releases, pamphlets, reports, and other appropriate means.

(7) Establishment of an advisory committee of members from industry, labor and professional organizations, financial institutions and other organizations as deemed necessary from different economic and geographic areas of the United States, the members of which shall consult with and advise the Secretary of Commerce on matters pertaining to planning for conversion of the Nation's industry to nonmilitary production. The advisory committee shall assist in implementing plans of the Department which may require intensive coordination or planning on the part of organizations in their respective economic and geographic areas.

(8) Preparing a comprehensive plan of how the above items will be accomplished. Such plan shall be submitted to the President not later than June 30, 1962.

The Post Office Is a Vital Link in the Golden Chain of America's Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 12, at Pleasant Gap, Pa., the Post Office Department dedicated a new post office to the service of the people of that community.

As part of the dedication program it was my privilege to deliver the following speech on the subject "The Post Office Is a Vital Link in the Golden Chain of America's Progress":

THE POST OFFICE IS A VITAL LINK IN THE GOLDEN CHAIN OF AMERICA'S PROGRESS

(Speech by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the dedication of the Pleasant Gap Post Office, Pleasant Gap, Pa., February 12, 1961)

We are here today to dedicate a new post office building and to forge a new link in this vital chain of communications.

All of you can be proud of this new edifice which is much more than an attractive building of brick and mortar.

It is concrete evidence of the growth and progressive outlook of this community.

The post office has become such an integral part of our lives that most of us seldom give it a second thought.

Like so many other things in our lives today we tend to take its faithful service for granted.

But can you imagine what life would be like without these postal facilities.

We would be cut off from most of our written sources of news and contemporary thought if magazines and out-of-town newspapers could not be circulated.

Many of our personal messages and gifts to friends and loved ones could not be delivered except in person.

Without the post office our major source of contact with family and acquaintances who are often widely scattered over this vast country of ours as well as overseas would be lost.

Truly, the post office has become indispensable for most personal and business purposes.

Moreover, the post office offers us a variety of other related public services such as money orders, postal savings, c.o.d. delivery, registry, and a number of other services for other Government agencies.

The dedication of this new post office building here in Pleasant Gap, Pa., seems to me an opportune time to dwell briefly on the early development of the American postal system and the contributions to this great institution of a great American and native son of Pennsylvania—Benjamin Franklin.

During his tenure as postmaster and later as deputy postmaster general for the northern colonies from 1753 to 1774, Franklin's outstanding achievements as an international spokesman for the colonists and an inventor have caused most of us to forget his early connection with the colonial postal service.

As a result, we are apt to overlook the great service he rendered our country by molding the colonial post office into the vital public institution it has become.

When Franklin first assumed responsibility as postmaster of the post office in Philadelphia in 1737, the colonial postal system was far from efficient or complete.

It failed in many respects to meet the needs of the growing colonial settlements in North America.

Mail service was slow and undependable.

Little had been done to improve the postal facilities in their first 50 years of existence.

Mail service between the colonial centers south of Philadelphia had never been coordinated with service north of the city.

Post riders took as much as 4 weeks to carry mail from Boston to Williamsburg, Va.

Nor was there any assurance that letters would ever reach their destination.

In addition, the service, though poor, was very expensive.

Under Franklin's able administration, mail service was improved markedly.

By October 1754, weekly service between Philadelphia and New York was replaced by trips three times a week and the delivery time was shortened to 33 hours.

Delivery of mail between these two important centers of colonial life was further expedited by the inauguration of day and night post riding of this route.

Franklin was able to reduce the time required to transport mail from Philadelphia to Boston from 6 weeks to 3 by making the route more direct.

Benjamin Franklin pioneered a number of new postal services.

He introduced the first city delivery system in America while he was postmaster of Philadelphia.

This system—known as the penny post—furnished delivery of all unclaimed letters within the city limits for the additional charge of 1 penny.

By 1753 other large cities were adopting the penny post as the most effective means of distributing mail in urban centers.

In the smaller towns unclaimed letters were advertised in local newspapers with the notice that any letter not called for within 3 months would be forwarded to the central post office at Philadelphia.

Thus the American dead-letter office was born.

Franklin also inaugurated the use of postmarks to record the time a letter was received by the post office and set up a uniform and efficient accounting system to simplify the work of all the post offices.

After 4 years under his administration, the colonial American post office showed a profit for the first time since its founding a hundred years earlier.

Most of the early postmasters were printers who used their postoffices to circulate their publications.

They zealously prohibited the post riders in their area from carrying any rival publications.

Although Benjamin Franklin also was a newspaper publisher, he insisted from the first that rival newspapers be allowed to circulate.

By his action he became a Founding Father of our free press which is such an integral part of the American way of life.

Benjamin Franklin is considered the patron saint of the modern post office because of these and other valuable services he rendered while in charge of the colonial post.

He wast the first postmaster to regard the postal system as a necessary public facility rather than simply a business enterprise.

He laid the foundations for the high standards still maintained by postal employees today.

The official slogan for the post office "neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night, stays these couriers from swift completion of their appointed rounds," is still the creed of the modern mail service and is proof that Franklin's ideals have been emulated by succeeding postal administrators.

Historically, the post office has carried the major share of the burden of transmitting ideas and information.

As Benjamin Franklin foresaw, the post office has been a significant factor in our national development.

During the Revolutionary War period the rival postal system formed by the colonists after the British dismissed Franklin from the colonial post—greatly aided the cause of freedom by uniting the colonists.

The post office has been equally important in other periods in our national development such as the Civil War and the settlement of the West.

New means of mass communication have since been developed, but the Post Office continues to be as vital today as it was back in the colonial days for the bulk of correspondence.

In the last 10 years alone the volume of mail in the United States increased by some 18 billion pieces and is still growing.

The Post Office Department is currently engaged in a program of modernizing its mail handling facilities as well.

New electronic and mechanical devices are being installed in some of the larger city post offices to expedite sorting and distribution operations.

Although the speed of transporting mail has increased tremendously since the days of the post riders, many of our smaller post offices still use manual sorting and distribution methods which are virtually identical to those used in Benjamin Franklin's time.

The new post office we are dedicating here today is part of this same modernization program begun in 1953 by former Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield.

The many new post offices and improved handling facilities which have been added to our postal system since the inception of the program exemplify the way the Post Office is maintaining the fine traditions founded by Benjamin Franklin.

I wish to congratulate Postmaster Mrs. Grace E. Tressler and the employees of the Pleasant Gap Post Office on being able to perform their duties with modern postal equipment.

Likewise the patrons of the Pleasant Gap Post Office are to be congratulated on having such a fine new building in the community since it will provide modern postal facilities for this entire area.

In addition—the appearance of the community has been greatly improved.

Therefore, in dedicating this new post office building it is with great pleasure that I congratulate the residents of Pleasant Gap as they join with other American communities in keeping pace with American progress.

Thank you again, Mr. Fisher.

I should like to read to the audience a letter from Postmaster General J. Edward Day:

"GRACE E. TRESSLER,
"Postmaster,
"Pleasant Gap, Pa.

"DEAR POSTMASTER TRESSLER: The Post Office Department is pleased to dedicate a new post office to the service of the people of Pleasant Gap, Pa.

"We are also pleased that the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT of the 20th District, who has taken such a deep personal interest in this new post office, has made arrangements for the formal presentation of the 50-star American flag that will fly over the post office.

"This flag has been flown over the Post Office Department and the Nation's Capitol in Washington, D.C.

"In dedicating this new post office we pledge continuing concern for the postal needs of your community, and our sincere interest in continuing to work for steady improvement in your postal services.

"Sincerely,

"J. EDWARD DAY,
"Postmaster General."

With this flag—in the name of the U.S. Post Office Department—I hereby dedicate this new building—to be known as the Pleasant Gap Post Office—in the fine traditions of the postal system and to the service of the citizens of Pleasant Gap.

Postmaster Tressler, I charge you with these responsibilities.

Why Compulsory Health Insurance Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me last October 4 before a group of doctors, dentists, nurses, and civic leaders, along with members of a women's auxiliary of an eight-county medical society, in a meeting at San Angelo, Tex. The address follows:

WHY COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE IS NOT THE ANSWER

Madam Chairman, members of the women's auxiliary, distinguished guests, this is indeed an honor to me to have this privilege of attending this function this evening and of addressing you on this occasion.

The topic of "Medical Legislation" was assigned to me, and I welcome the opportunity to discuss it. Right now medical legislation—past, present, and future—is very much in the news. Because of its importance, and in view of implications implicit in certain facets of proposals that are now being discussed, I think the subject is a very timely one. Every American has an interest in the outcome of proposed legislation, which if enacted would bring about drastic changes in the system of medical and hospital care in this country as we have known it.

My approach this evening will be objective, factual, and will not be blurred by any emotional appeals.

The issue that has been bandied about in recent months concerns itself with the question of how do we meet the problem that our old people have in this field of hospital and medical care. It is a serious problem and it is an old one—one that in the past has been met chiefly by local and State aid, with some Federal grants to the States; by private charity, and by the various doctors and medical associations.

The Federal Government has in one form or another been in this field for a long time. Today, in addition to many grants-in-aid programs to the various States for medical purposes, the Federal Government provides governmentalized medical care in some form directly to approximately 35 million people, through some 35 Federal medical systems, operated by the armed services, the Veterans' Administration, the U.S. Public Health Service, Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor. And the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also gets into the act.

In addition, there are four joint Federal-State programs—old age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. The cost of these four programs in the fiscal year 1958 came to $2.9 billion, of which the Federal Government put up 60 percent.

But aside from these various forms of aid on medical services, in recent years there has developed a determined drive, stemming principally from the so-called liberals, calling for a more universal form of aid in the form of services—medical services—to the needy and the lower income groups. The liberals and social planners demand that this be done directly by the Federal Government, under Government supervision and control, and entirely at Federal expense. In recent years they have made several dramatic efforts to generalize the proposed services to include all the people—not just the elderly who are in need.

RECENT PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL AID

Perhaps it will be of interest for us to briefly recall some of the highlights of various proposals that have been advanced in recent years.

As far back as 1935 an attempt was made to get national compulsory health insurance included in the original Social Security Act of 1935. But that effort failed.

Then in 1939 the late Senator Robert F. Wagner, of New York, author of the old and later discredited Wagner Labor Relations Act and the socialized public housing program, offered a bill to assist States in experimenting with a joint compulsory health insurance program. But the issue failed.

Next, in 1943, Senators Murray, Wagner and Congressman Dingell offered the first bill which envisioned socialized medicine. It became known as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. The doctors all remember it. It called for a complete federally operated system of medical and hospital care insurance, to be financed by payroll taxes under social security. The bill died in committee, after its dire implications had been exposed to the public. The American people can thank the American Medical Association for helping expose that bill for what it was.

But the bill was reintroduced, with slight changes, and with President Truman's blessing, in 1945, but did not reach a vote. The same thing happened in 1947.

In 1950 the proponents tried a new approach, and a bill was enacted calling for a limited amount of medical care, for a limited number of needy and disabled, to be financed from social security funds.

Two years later Oscar Ewing, after a trip to England, came forward with an ambitious plan for a national compulsory health insurance program, but he got nowhere with it.

President Eisenhower proposed a non-social-security health reinsurance plan, which was defeated. It was too timid for the liberals and too costly and uncertain for the more conservative.

Then in 1957 the proponents of socialized medicine became bolder again, after several earlier setbacks, and the Forand bill was introduced for the first time.

Now let us see just what the problem is and then discuss the possible remedies, including the Forand bill. The current problem centers around those older people who have enough to live on as long as they are not faced with large medical bills.

There are approximately 16 million people in this country who are 65 or older. About 12 million of these come under the social security program. The remaining 4 million are not covered. In that latter group are many old age pensioners and others who from time to time find themselves desperately in need of some help in meeting their medical and hospital bills.

Much of this problem has been dealt with on a local level. By January of 1959, 40 States had provisions for the payment of medical care for people in that category. And I have already referred to the Federal assistance that applies to them.

MEDICAL CARE ACT WILL HELP

At the recent session of the Congress a law was enacted which is designed to meet that need, or at least help to do so. It is a joint Federal-State program, to be administered on a State and local level—as I think it should be.

Under this plan the Federal Government will offer medical help to the needy aged in every State that puts up money of its own to match the Federal grants.

It is estimated that about 12.4 million people, 65 and over, will qualify for these new benefits, as the States activate the program. The 2½ million on the old age assistance rolls will qualify automatically, and an additional 10 million, 65 and older, are to become eligible whenever they run up medical and dental bills they cannot pay, and after the States act.

Here is an illustration that has been given of how the plan can work when applied to the low-income people but not on relief. Take an example of a retired couple just managing to make ends meet on an income of $3,000 a year. Suppose the wife falls ill and finds an operation is necessary. As doctor, hospital, and drug bills pile up, they are paid slowly, more and more of them becoming delinquent until the couple is swamped by medical expenses.

At this point—and I should hope before it gets as serious as described—the husband takes his case to the local welfare office, which runs his State's public assistance programs. He discloses his income and his expenses, and proves he is simply unable to pay all his medical bills. The welfare office then pays—direct to doctors and hospitals—the medical bills he cannot pay for himself. The amount and conditions of payments will, of course, have to meet the laws enacted in the various States.

The cost of this new and expanded welfare program is estimated to run about a half billion dollars a year in addition to what is already being expended on medical aid to those on relief, with about two-thirds to be paid by the Federal Government.

It can be seen that this program is designed to reach the older needy people who cannot make their own way and need a helping hand. It is a sound approach because it keeps the Government out of the medical business.

But the social planners are not happy with this approach. It was condemned by the CIO as being worse than no bill at all. The CIO demands Federal control, under social security. And I think I can safely say that every liberal in the country was horrified by the failure of Congress to impose compulsory insurance and a completely federally directed and federally financed medical care program.

Actually, what practically every organized radical-liberal group in the country wants is socialized medicine—such as is proposed in the Forand bill, with more to come later.

Now, what is socialized medicine? It is a system of Government-operated medical care, where the Government, rather than the individual becomes the purchaser and dispenser of medical care. And that is precisely what the CIO's COPE wants, the Americans for Democratic Action want; and a good many politicians have joined in the clamor.

FORAND BILL

When we provide service benefits, irrespective of needs, to be financed by compulsory taxation, as is proposed in the Forand bill and by these various groups, we are pushing our cash welfare state in the direction of socialization—in this case, of medicine. Let's put it this way: When the Government attempts to provide not money, but rather a particular, definite service, it must of course, take responsibility for the quality of that service, and that places the Government squarely in the medical care business.

Indeed, Walter Reuther, one of the chief architects of socialized medicine, in his testimony in support of the Forand bill, testified:

"I would think that the Government agency that was responsible for administering the program would be obligated to see to it that people who get the benefits get high quality of medical care. I think that we would want that."

Now, the Forand bill is a dangerous departure from the American method of medical practice. But in the form proposed it would apply only to those over 65—whether needy or not needy, and would be paid for, at least in part, by an increase in payroll deductions under the social security program.

That is bad enough, but you can be assured that if enacted, it will be just the beginning. The next step would be to lower the age eligibility and broaden the field of coverage. This drive would continue in Congress, session after session, until every American had been placed under the compulsory, Government-operated health program. Indeed, sponsors have spoken of establishing what they call a precedent, and indicating that the Forand bill is but a tuning up exercise in a drive for bigger worlds to conquer.

The Forand bill would be a foot in the door. Mammoth drives for expansion would inevitably follow, if only because of its own inequities. The age of 65 would be removed. Everyone under social security would be included. After all, they would be helping pay the bill with every payroll deduction. And the fertile-minded politicians would have a field day out of expansion schemes until complete socialization of medicine would be achieved.

Now, certain people who support these socialized medicine schemes will tell you that I am unduly alarmed, that there would be no Federal control; that people would still select their doctors, and Uncle Sam would simply be paying the bills.

Well, let's see about that. I have already quoted from Walter Reuther who demands Federal responsibility for the quality of medical service the patient must get. When we allow the Federal Government to control the disbursement of funds under such proposals; allow the Government to determine the matter of benefits to be provided; allow a Government agency the right to fix the rate of compensation for hospitals, nursing homes, physicians, and dentists, with its own audit and control of expenditures to the hospitals, nursing homes, and patients; plus establishment and enforcement of standards of hospital and medical care, as would be necessary—then what do we have? We would inevitably have Government employees directing the doctors what drugs and treatment they could provide within the framework of the Government's program; and the hospitals and nursing homes would operate under the directing gaze of a Federal bureaucracy.

The Supreme Court in one of its decisions put it this way: "It is scarcely lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which is subsidized."

And make no mistake about it: There would not be a full freedom of choice by patients in the selection of their doctors. And the same is true of hospitals and nursing homes. The patient would only have a choice, at best, of those presented to him—those operating under contract with the Government.

Such a program would place the Government squarely in the role of interested third party in what is now a private contractual relationship between doctor and patient.

I am talking in terms of simple logic. It is important that we understand and recognize just what these programs would lead to—and then consider whether we want that sort of thing to happen in this country.

Personally, I am opposed to socialized medicine. I am opposed to compulsory health insurance because it means socialized medicine. And I am convinced such a program would very definitely lead to a deterioration of the quality of medical and hospital service which I believe free Americans have a right to expect.

But when one takes a position against socialized medicine in this country today he becomes a target of ridicule and derision by the leftwing do-gooders and free-spenders. CIO's COPE ranted editorially about what it called the parade of reactionary forces marching against passage of the Forand bill.

In fact, it is getting to the point in this country when if you oppose socialism in any form you are in the minds of some a conservative or a reactionary. In some circles the idea of simple economy in the operation of the Government is so old fashioned that one who advocates it is promptly berated as old fogey, out of step with progress—too conservative for his time.

Let us examine the effects of the Forand bill a little further. It would cost more than $2 billion a year to begin with, and it would substitute a compulsory system of health insurance for a successful voluntary system. By doing so we would be contributing to the demise of all forms of private health insurance. This would be done in the face of the fact that voluntary coverage of persons more

than 65 has been doubled in 8 years. And a compulsory Government insurance program would put the private medical insurance groups out of business. We can assume that those compelled by law to carry, at their own expense, the cost of compulsory health insurance will neither be able nor anxious to carry private health policies as well, because that would be buying double coverage.

PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE IS POPULAR AND SUCCESSFUL

Today we are told that 43 percent of the 16 million Americans who are 65 or over have some form of private health insurance. Much of this coverage has been achieved during the past 5 or 6 years. This rapid growth in voluntary insurance can be expected to continue so long as our senior citizens are free to choose the sort of health coverage best suited to their individual needs.

According to the Health Insurance Association of America, 65 percent of the aged needing and wanting protection will be insured by the end of this year; and will increase to 80 percent by the end of 1965; and 90 percent by 1970. Indeed, in America 70 percent of all the people are now covered by some form of health and medical insurance, and the number continues to grow by around a million a year; and it is significant that the amount of health insurance owned by aged people is growing at a rate faster than that of the population as a whole.

To summarize, less than 20 years ago health insurance was a whole new concept of paying medical bills. Today more than 120 million out of 180 million Americans are covered by some form of hospital, medical or other similar insurance.

Yet, despite this record of progress under our prized free enterprise system, this program would by the enactment of the Forand and other kindred bills become frozen in a vast and uniform governmental system, and the natural effect would be to foreclose future opportunity for the private insurance groups, nonprofit and commercial, to proceed with their own proven capacity to deal with the problem. It would be turning the clock of progress backward instead of forward.

POLITICS IN MEDICINE

After all, I do not go along with the politicians who would have us believe that America is a sickly nation and we must change our system of ministering to the ill and afflicted. The fact is that America is today the healthiest large nation in the world. Today we enjoy the highest standards of health care in the world.

I think that a nation that has added 23 years to the lifespan of the average person in the past 50 years, with a bright outlook for the future, isn't doing so badly. And for that we owe a debt of gratitude to the great American medical profession which has led the world in scientific breakthroughs that have astounded mankind. The doctors tell us they can do a better job under the present free system and that they would be handicapped tremendously under the compulsory regimented systems that are proposed. And I think the doctors and the dentists are in a far better position to speak with authority in that field than any of the social planners or the vote hungry politicians.

But these proposals have a wide appeal. Observing that sickness is unwanted and its cost equally distasteful, the politicians have suddenly sought to capitalize on this fact by dragging the cost of medicine into politics. They know there are millions of voters among the elderly who have reached the golden years. And they have a way of playing upon their emotions by lambasting what they like to term "money-hungry doctors," and promising to give the victims, the "poor people," as they call them, free medical care.

I am sure none of us likes to pay doctor bills. But you know I discovered recently that it costs me more for a house call by a TV repairman or a plumber than a house call by a doctor. In fact, data published by the Department of Commerce indicate that the average income of physicians has increased at almost the same rate as the average income of all gainfully employed people since 1929.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE IN BRITAIN

I do not think a discussion of this subject would be complete without a reference to some of the experiences of others where socialized medicine has been undertaken. Perhaps we can learn some lessons. They tell me that is a good way to make progress—to take advantage of mistakes made by others. I shall refer to but one country—Great Britain.

On July 5, 1948, the National Health Service Act of 1946 went into effect in Britain, one of the products of the Labor-Socialist government. It is a part of a social security scheme, and it covers just about everything and everybody. I will touch on a few high spots.

In that country the first full year of NHS the cost mounted to a billion and a quarter dollars—nearly triple the estimate of the men who originally sold the idea to the people there.

By 1958 the cost had doubled. By then free service was costing the British people—each British family, £50 a year, or $140, compared with about half that cost the first year. In fact, 12 percent of all British taxes go into the national health program.

During the period covered by the program there was a tremendous increase in requests for medical service, the public became greedy over drugs, and they were taken to hospitals for the slightest ailments. After all, it was free.

Each doctor can allow each patient an average of but 3 minutes for diagnosis, before the next in the queue line is reached. And it is reported that last year a half million Britishers were on the hospital admission waiting lists. And it was reported that only in the British Isles are women advised to apply 12 months in advance for a bed in a maternity ward.

It is not a coincidence that claims for benefits for loss of wages due to illness increased 50 percent in the first 6 years of NHS. Absenteeism in British plants jumped from 2.6 to 5.9 percent the first year of NHS.

The British take 3.6 percent of the worker's paycheck to help finance this program. In the United States a comparable percentage of deductions would amount to about $3.45 per week, or $15.52 a month.

The worker could take that money today and buy hospitalization and surgical benefits, including maternity benefits, polio insurance and similar benefits.

But even with free service, 4 million out of 50 million people in Britain now have acquired health insurance to assure them of private hospital care when they need it and a free choice of doctors. That is being done despite the fact that they are, through the Government and taxes, already fully covered.

The question recurs: "Can America learn a lesson from such experience in socialized medicine?" And another question has been asked: "Can tomorrow's citizens be perceptive enough to realize that evolution of a system, though a slower and less dramatic process than revolution, produces a sounder product? Will the next generation realize the fallacy in the thinking of those who call themselves liberals and see that change is not always progress?"

A prominent British doctor writes: "The overall care under NHS is probably better for those who couldn't previously afford any care, but every doctor admits that quality of his services has deteriorated under increased patient loads. Idealistically, it's fine," he states, "in practice it just doesn't work."

You know, when people are forced to pay for something whether they want it or not, they are inclined to use as much of it as they can in an effort to get their money's worth. And that is just one of the many headaches encountered in socialized medicine.

Moreover, there's the matter of staggering costs to think about. And here again we can learn a lesson. Today 1 out of every 100 Britishers (400,000) is employed by the Ministry of Health—2½ clerks for every doctor in the British Isles. A comparable system in this country would on that basis call for the additional employment of 1,740,000 clerks—and imagine the number of Pentagons it would take to house them. And it is estimated the British system would cost around $20 billion a year in this country. Of course, the cost factor is of no concern to the social planners and the doctors of politics who want to take over the medical profession.

I simply cannot understand how anyone can believe that a bureaucratic governmental operation can be as efficient and economical as that done by private enterprise. That assumption runs counter to every experience we ever had.

BIGGER QUESTIONS INVOLVED

But the question of state medicine instead of private medicine is but a part of a much bigger question to be decided by the American people. That involves the role of the individual. Is he, it is asked, willing to accept some responsibility for his future—for his own family? Can he strive to make a good system better, whether it is medicine or democracy—or is he willing to scrap it and substitute a system which submerges his own identity in an impersonal, faceless society of nonconformists?

Such a system might be good enough for the Britisher. But this is America in which we live. This is free-enterprise America. Let us not lose sight of that fact when we listen to the sugar-coated pills being prescribed by those who would promise the moon and its satellites for a batch of elderly votes.

Now, I have spoken of the socialist-liberal bloc which is sponsoring socialized medicine for America, and I have said that this issue is but a part of a much bigger question. That raises the question: Just how much socialism do we want in this country? How much can we afford?

I do recall that after the late Senator Wagner, of New York, spent a few weeks in Europe studying socialized housing, he returned to sell the idea to Congress in the late thirties. The social planners grabbed that one in a hurry. Beginning as a depression measure, then kept alive by the do-gooders in the forties, it blossomed forth as an innocuous means of meeting limited social needs for low-income people displaced by slum clearance projects. It sounded good and an expanded program squeezed through the House of Representatives by a 3-vote margin. I voted against it. But today—10 years later—it is a mammoth thing, unrelated to slum clearance and unrelated, in the main, to help for low-income families. And the American taxpayers are several billion dollars worse off—and the social planners warn that it is just the beginning.

So, where is the line, the welfare-state line, to be drawn? If I may divert for a moment, let us take a closer look at the modern-day liberal who plugs for socialized housing, socialized medicine, and brands all conservatives as the enemies of progress.

There is certainly nothing wrong about being a liberal, if you speak of a genuine liberal—one who is progressive, who is genuinely concerned about individual rights and liberties. But there are not many of that type today.

Looking back for a moment—Thomas Jefferson was undoubtedly a genuine liberal,

as were many of his confederates who drafted the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. But who can analyze the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and reconcile it with the modern-day, self-styled liberal—the spending, pump-priming, big government, social planning liberal—who thinks depression measures should be repeated and expanded in times of full employment and prosperity? It just can't be done.

"The liberals who wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and who fought in the Revolutionary War, said Bomar Jaymes, "had nothing in common with the liberals of today."

The liberal of today, he noted, talks big, loud, and long about his dedication to the protection and preservation of human rights and personal liberties.

And then he proceeds to advocate and support legislation that imposes upon the people regulations, restrictions, and controls which curb their rights and freedoms.

One of the earmarks of today's liberal is the unwavering dedication to the spending of other people's money, disguised as Federal funds. And the bigger the spending, the better he likes it.

That liberal, it is said, is dedicated to the principle that the Government has a right to take a portion of a person's income and freely hand it out to persons who did not earn it.

The liberal I am referring to long since has ceased to believe that thrift and economy in Government is a virtue to be practiced.

Mr. Jaymes says the liberal professes to have the interest of the people at heart. However, he has supported a policy of big Government spending which has stimulated an inflationary spiral that has destroyed half of the purchasing power of the dollar in the past 20 years.

Another attribute ascribed to the liberal is that he believes that wages should go up but that the prices of goods and services should go down, all at the same time. He believes that a business or industrial monopoly should be subject to the antitrust laws, and I think we all agree with that. But he believes that an equally big and powerful labor organization should not be subject to the antitrust laws.

Mr. Jaymes is right. The liberal of today believes in big government, big spending and big deficits, and in the philosophy that you can get something for nothing so long as you get it from the Government.

I have dwelt at some length upon the modern-day liberals, because in the processes of Government they must be reckoned with. They are well organized, well financed, and they are very vocal. Certain politicians go to them and their various groups with hat in hand, pleading for their support. As Americans they are entitled to their views. But unless those views are refined, diluted, and combated with effective enlightenment and countermeasures, I entertain grave fears for the future of our Republic.

Abraham Lincoln hit the nail on the head with this statement: "You cannot permanently help a man by doing for him that which he can and should do for himself."

To be sure, the situation is appalling, but it is not hopeless. The brakes can be applied if the people are awake to what is going on. There is an old saying, and a true one, that says, "for evil to exist it is only necessary for good men to do nothing." Let us not be taken in by the noiseless process of nibbling away at our liberties—and our pocketbooks. A great man once said that liberty is seldom lost all at one time. Let us guard against the dangers envisioned by the English poet who wrote:

"Vice is a monster of such frightful mien
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with its face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

In conclusion, let me say this: Surely the great medical profession in this country—the envy of the scientific world—should be allowed to proceed with its program of progress without interference by governmental harassment and bureaucratic regimentation. If medical and hospital costs are too high—let us tackle that problem. If any of our people need medical attention and cannot afford it, let us provide a way to meet that need. But let us do it within the framework of the time-tested American system of free enterprise.

Above all, let us not join with the liberal-social planners who would burn the house down to destroy their imaginary rat, and let us not throw the baby out with the wash.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 4:7: *Today if you will hear His voice, harden not your hearts.*

O Thou God of all majesty and mercy may this Lenten season upon which we have entered inspire us with a longing to hear Thy voice and achieve a larger measure and a finer degree of spiritual culture.

May each of its days be a veritable gateway through which we shall pass joyously into a deeper experience of the blessings of the more abundant life.

Cleanse us of all unrighteousness as we daily give ourselves to prayer and meditation in the spirit of contrition and confession, of humility and gratitude.

Grant that by self-examination, self-discipline, and self-denial, we may gain the mastery over those insurgent impulses and unworthy desires which are continually storming the citadel of our souls and seeking to undermine our characters.

Hear us, in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 13, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 451. An act to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 451. An act to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REQUEST TO ADJOURN FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I noticed in last night's Star an item that caused me some concern in the matter of the progress of work in the House of Representatives. I would like to read this——

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request. I am not going to get into any discussion. You either agree to it or you do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, February 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 87th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend sec-

tion 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Frank W. Boykin.
2. George Grant.
3. George Andrews.
4. Kenneth A. Roberts.
5. Albert Rains.
6. Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
7. Carl Elliott.
8. Robert E. (Bob) Jones, Jr.
9. George Huddleston, Jr.

ALASKA

At large

Ralph J. Rivers.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Stewart L. Udall.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. J. W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.
5. Dale Alford.
6. W. F. Norrell.

CALIFORNIA

1. Clement W. Miller.
2. Harold T. Bizz Johnson.
3. John E. Moss, Jr.
4. William S. Mailliard.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
7. Jeffery Cohelan.
8. George P. Miller.
9. J. Arthur Younger.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. John J. McFall.
12. B. F. Sisk.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. Harlan Hagen.
15. Gordon L. McDonough.
16. Alphonzo E. Bell, Jr.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Craig Hosmer.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Edgar W. Hiestand.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. John H. Rousselot.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Harry R. Sheppard.
28. James B. Utt.
29. D. S. (Judge) Saund.
30. Bob Wilson.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. Peter H. Dominick.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Emilio Q. Daddario.
2. Horace Seely-Brown, Jr.
3. Robert N. Giaimo.
4. Abner W. Sibal.
5. John S. Monagan.

At large

Frank Kowalski.

DELAWARE

At large

Harris B. McDowell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. William C. (Bill) Cramer.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Bob Sikes.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.
4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. James C. Davis.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. John W. Davis.
8. Iris Faircloth Blitch.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII

At large

Daniel K. Inouye.

IDAHO

1. Gracie Pfost.
2. Ralph R. Harding.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. William T. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. Roland Victor Libonati.
8. Daniel D. Rostenkowski.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Edward R. Finnegan.
13. Marguerite Stitt Church.
14. Elmer J. Hoffman.
15. Noah M. Mason.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Robert B. Chiperfield.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.
25. Kenneth J. Gray.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. John Brademas.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. _____
6. Richard L. Roudebush.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Donald C. Bruce.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. James E. Bromwell.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.
5. Neal Smith.
6. Merwin Coad.
7. Ben F. Jensen.
8. Charles B. Hoeven.

KANSAS

1. William H. Avery.
2. Robert F. Ellsworth.
3. Walter L. McVey.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. J. Floyd Breeding.
6. Robert (Bob) Dole.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. Frank W. Burke.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Brent Spence.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.
8. Gene Siler.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Overton Brooks.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. Harold B. McSween.

MAINE

1. Peter A. Garland.
2. Stanley R. Tupper.
3. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Thomas F. Johnson.
2. Daniel B. Brewster.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Thomas J. Lane.
8. Torbert H. Macdonald.
9. Hastings Keith.
10. Laurence Curtis.
11. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
12. John W. McCormack.
13. James A. Burke.
14. Joseph William Martin, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Clare E. Hoffman.
5. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. James G. O'Hara.
8. James Harvey.
9. Robert P. Griffin.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Louis C. Rabaut.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Clark MacGregor.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Walter H. Judd.
6. Fred Marshall.

7. H. Carl Andersen.
8. John A. Blatnik.
9. Odin Langen.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Frank E. Smith.
4. John Bell Williams.
5. Arthur Winstead.
6. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. William J. (Bill) Randall.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard (Dick) Ichord.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.
11. Morgan M. Moulder.

MONTANA

1. Arnold Olsen.
2. James F. Battin.

NEBRASKA

1. Phil Weaver.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Ralph F. Beermann.
4. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Chester E. Merrow.
2. Perkins Bass.

NEW JERSEY

1. William T. Cahill.
2. Milton W. Glenn.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Florence P. Dwyer.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Charles S. Joelson.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Hugh J. Addonizio.
12. George M. Wallhauser.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Joseph M. Montoya.
Thomas G. Morris.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. Steven B. Derounian.
3. Frank J. Becker.
4. Seymour Halpern.
5. Joseph P. Addabbo.
6. Lester Holtzman.
7. James J. Delaney.
8. Victor L. Anfuso.
9. Eugene J. Keogh.
10. Edna F. Kelly.
11. Emanuel Celler.
12. Hugh L. Carey.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. John H. Ray.
16. Adam C. Powell.
17. John V. Lindsay.
18. Alfred E. Santangelo.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. William F. Ryan.
21. Herbert Zelenko.
22. James C. Healey.
23. Jacob H. Gilbert.
24. Charles A. Buckley.
25. Paul A. Fino.
26. Edwin B. Dooley.
27. Robert R. Barry.
28. Katharine St. George.
29. J. Ernest Wharton.
30. Leo W. O'Brien.
31. Carleton J. King.
32. Samuel S. Stratton.
33. Clarence E. Kilburn.
34. Alexander Pirnie.
35. R. Walter Riehlman.
36. John Taber.
37. Howard W. Robison.
38. Jessica McC. Weis.
39. Harold C. Ostertag.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.
42. John R. Pillion.
43. Charles E. Goodell.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Ralph J. Scott.
6. Horace R. Kornegay.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. A. Paul Kitchin.
9. Hugh Q. Alexander.
10. Charles Raper Jonas.
11. Basil L. Whitener.
12. Roy A. Taylor.

NORTH DAKOTA

At large

Don L. Short.
Hjalmar Nygaard.

OHIO

1. Gordon H. Scherer.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha, Jr.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas Ludlow Ashley.
10. Walter H. Moeller.
11. Robert E. Cook.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Tom V. Moorehead.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall, Jr.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Victor Wickersham.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. Edwin R. Durno.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Kathryn E. Granahan.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Robert N. C. Nix, Sr.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. Herman Toll.
7. William H. Milliken, Jr.
8. Willard S. Curtin.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. William W. Scranton.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. Ivor D. Fenton.
13. Richard S. Schweiker.
14. George M. Rhodes.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. Walter M. Mumma.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. J. Irving Whalley.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. James E. Van Zandt.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. Carroll D. Kearns.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.
28. William S. Moorhead.
29. Robert J. Corbett.
30. Elmer J. Holland.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St. Germain.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. John J. Riley.
3. Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Robert W. Hemphill.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Ben Reifel.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. B. Carroll Reece.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. James B. Frazier, Jr.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. J. Carlton Loser.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Robert A. Everett.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Sam Rayburn.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Frank Ikard.
14. John Young.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. J. T. Rutherford.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Paul J. Kilday.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.

UTAH

1. M. Blaine Peterson.
2. David S. King.

VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. Burr P. Harrison.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Catherine May.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.
7. Don Magnuson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. Cleveland M. Bailey.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. Elizabeth (Mrs. John) Kee.
6. John M. Slack, Jr.

WISCONSIN

1. Henry C. Schadeberg.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

William Henry Harrison.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

560. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on Ways and Means.

561. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the 25th semiannual report on the educational exchange activities conducted under the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), from July 1 through December 31, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

562. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved August 7, 1959, entitled 'Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959'"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

563. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a followup review of Department of the Air Force practices with regard to fuel used by General Electric Co., Aircraft Gas Turbine Division, Evandale, Ohio, in the performance of aircraft engine development and production contracts, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

564. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract which authorizes the Virginia Sky-Line Co., Inc., to provide concession facilities and services in Shenandoah National Park, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

565. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report which states that the General Services Administration entered into no transactions under Public Law 85–804 during calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 85–804 and Executive Order 10789; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

566. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

567. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 6,125,082 additional pieces of partially processed quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

568. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, relative to an application for a loan relating to the Eastern Municipal Water District at Hemet, in Riverside County, Calif., pursuant to the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, as amended June 5, 1957 (71 Stat. 48); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

569. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report with respect to tort claims paid within the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituents for the calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4297. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4298. A bill to extend certain retirement benefits under section 11(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to employees who were separated from the service prior to July 12, 1960, but who continue in the service after July 12, 1960, without break in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4299. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4300. A bill to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 4301. A bill to provide increases in annuities of certain retired employees equivalent to the increases provided by the Federal Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1960; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4302. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that annuities shall be adjusted simultaneously with general adjustments in Federal employees' salaries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4303. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the compensation of Government employees in positions incorrectly classified under the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution controls; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code entitled "Highways" as revised, codified, and enacted by Public Law 85–767, so as to provide for effective competition in the construction of Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4306. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4307. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the benefits payable thereunder shall be exempt from all taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4308. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to increase the wages subject to the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4309. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 4310. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 4311. A bill to establish an equitable basis for application of the Federal income tax to mutual fire insurance companies which operate on the basis of perpetual policies or premium deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 4312. A bill to provide for the holding of a term of court for the Northeastern Division of the Northern District of Alabama at Decatur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 4313. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished

to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 4314. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4315. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4316. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 4318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 4320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 4321. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4322. A bill to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain U.S. nationals before foreign tribunals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4323. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4324. A bill to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4325. A bill to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4326. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4327. A bill to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4328. A bill to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4329. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4330. A bill to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995); to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4331. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4332. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make composting facilities eligible for assistance under the community facilities program with the same priority as that presently provided for waterworks, sewer facilities, and gas distribution systems; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4333. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4334. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4335. A bill to prohibit the discharge of members of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable except pursuant to the sentence of a court-martial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4336. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges, one for the northern district of Indiana, and one for the southern district of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4337. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the midstate reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 4338. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4339. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4340. A bill to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4341. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4342. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4343. A bill for the establishment of the U.S. Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4344. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the Buy American Act, with respect to determining when the cost of certain articles, materials, or supplies is unreasonable and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 4345. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4346. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4347. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on Fort Douglas Military Reservation in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4348. A bill to establish a Commission on the Cultural Resources in the Nation's Capital and to provide a comprehensive plan for the effective utilization of such resources without regard to race or color, a necessary step in view of the undemocratic hiring and employment policies persisted in by such cultural organizations as the National Symphony Orchestra despite the contribution of the American Negro to our Nation's culture; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4349. A bill to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates (Regulars) in a status comparable with U.S. Naval Academy graduates; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4350. A bill to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4351. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act to provide for the award of national defense scholarships for qualified college students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 4352. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4353. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4354. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4355. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of irrigation and other water district assessments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4356. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4357. A bill to increase certain compensation benefits payable pursuant to the War Hazards Compensation Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4358. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4359. A bill to amend section 4001 of title 38, United States Code, to prescribe qualifications for members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4360. A bill for the relief of Hood County, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 4361. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend its duration for a period of 4 years and to provide a program to assist certain public institutions of higher education to establish 2-year branch colleges and associate degree programs in the technologies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4362. A bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4363. A bill to amend Public Law 86-272 relating to State taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4364. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.J. Res. 221. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 223. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Presidential inability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626) providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 225. Joint resolution to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact and to enter into such compact on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 163. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TABER:

H. Res. 164. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 165. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H. Res. 166. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the problem of international fair labor standards; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 167. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal study of California fishing problems; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER and all members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for their determined fight to save America from being destroyed from within by the agents of a foreign power; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to follow established precedent by seating with full representation privileges the Fifth Indiana District Representative without prejudice to either contestant in accordance with the certificates of election as filed by the Indiana Secretary of State; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action on the Sugar Act to assure continuity of the U.S. sugar program and to recognize the need of reliance on the domestic sugar producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4365. A bill for the relief of Sp5c. Daniel J. Hawthorne, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Chin Kam Luen, also known as Chin Chi Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 4367. A bill for the relief of Sumpad Tavitian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4368. A bill for the relief of Guregh Tavitian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Henry James Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Aime and Stephania Gagne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Lester M. Sobeck, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. D. Hellmuth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4373. A bill for the incorporation of Military Survivors, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4374. A bill for the relief of James E. Phillips and Donald S. Eatough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Salt D. Ermete; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Haim Joseph Shwisha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4377. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vidrio-Fierro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Irene N. Halkias and Constantine N. Halkias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4379. A bill for the relief of Branko Vlasic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4380. A bill to quiet title and possession to an unconfirmed and located private land claim in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4381. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 4382. A bill for the relief of Joseph L. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Patrick Anthony Linnane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4384. A bill for the relief of Richard Fordham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.J. Res. 226. Joint resolution for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co., a Nevada corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Bernard J. Bartis, pastor, St. George's Lithuanian Church, Cleveland, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

O God, the Creator of all men, who lovest all and willest that neither individuals nor nations should perish, enlighten the minds of these servants of Thy servants, whom Thou hast selected in Thine ineffable wisdom, and upon whom in Thine inscrutable providence Thou hast conferred authority drawn from the consent of those whom they govern; show unto them and lead them down the path whereon they must guide our Nation; strengthen them, that they may not flinch in the face of difficult decisions, but may persevere in the patient possession of their souls unto the crown of righteous government.

O God, we ask this of Thee because we believe that Thou hast chosen this, our people, as a last bulwark against the tide of diabolical evil that wells up all over the world; we ask this of Thee because we have seen what this evil has done to poor Lithuania and her sad people; and, in our fumbling, we hope that Lithuania, after its Ash Wednesday and Good Friday, will know Easter and a second spring—if it be for Thy greater honor and glory.

Bless, O God, these legislators, our citizens, and our land, and let at least the crumbs of Thy bounty come to Lithuania and Lithuanians here and in their fatherland.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 13, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85-906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Second Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1961.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. W. F. NORRELL, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada;

William J. Crockett, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Harlan Cleveland, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the calendar will be stated.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul Burgess Fay, Jr., of California, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR THE LATE SENATOR HENNINGS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader, we wish to announce that—as everyone knows—a distinguished Member of the Senate, Thomas C. Hennings, died on September 13, 1960. His passing was deeply grieved by his colleagues; and it seems to me most fitting that we set aside a time during which to commemorate his memory.

After consultation with the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the two Senators from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. LONG], I announce that immediately after the morning hour on Friday, February 24, the Senate will receive such statements as Senators may desire to make with respect to our late colleague and friend, Senator Hennings, of Missouri.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR SENATOR-ELECT KEITH THOMSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it might be appropriate if, on the same occasion, I say a word or two in tribute to the late elected Senator from Wyoming, Keith Thomson, who passed away after election day and before he could take the oath of office.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be agreeable.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS ACT OF 1961

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ACT ENTITLED "NEMATOCIDE, PLANT REGULATOR, DEFOLIANT, AND DESICCANT AMENDMENT OF 1959"

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved August 7, 1959, entitled "Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CERTAIN CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, that no transactions had been conducted under Public Law 85-804, during calendar year 1960; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUARTZ CRYSTALS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register relating to the proposed disposition of approximately 6,125,082 additional pieces of partially processed quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the period from July 1 through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, November 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING UNDER DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE CONTRACTS WITH CONTINENTAL AVIATION & ENGINEERING CORP.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of spare parts for J-69 turbojet engines under Department of the Air Force negotiated contracts with Continental Aviation & Engineering Corp., Toledo, Ohio, dated February 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF TARGET PRICE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE CONTRACT WITH NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the target price of Department of the Air Force contract AF 04(647)-287 with North American Aviation, Inc., Rocketdyne Division, Canoga Park, Calif., dated February 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES RELATING TO PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF COAL IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities relating to the production and conservation of coal in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOAN APPLICATION OF EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, HEMET, CALIF.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting that the loan application of Eastern Municipal Water District, Hemet, Riverside County, Calif., under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, had been examined and that the action taken by the previous administration on this loan application was agreeable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION CONTRACT, SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK, VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract for the Virginia Sky-Line Co., Inc., to provide facilities and services in Shenandoah National Park, Va. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on the provision of Aviation War Risk Insurance, as of December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO COMMUNITY ANTENNA TELEVISION SYSTEMS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that no tort claims were paid by that agency during the calendar year 1960; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE FOR A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Martino Hroncich, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to said alien, and the reason for granting such application (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF SURGEON GENERAL, U.S. ARMY

A letter from the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to adequate Federal appropriations for the control of noxious weeds on federally controlled lands

"Whereas the United States of America owns over 50 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and there are many reclamation projects within the said State; and

"Whereas noxious weeds, in great abundance, grow many months of the year on the lands owned by the Federal Government or on lands where Federal reclamation projects are situated: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor legislation for the appropriation of funds for the control of noxious weeds on federally controlled lands; and also for Federal assistance through existing agencies in control of noxious weeds on reclamation projects when such local project or agency requests Federal participation on the lands within the project or agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator JOSEPH J. HICKEY, Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, and to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

"ALBERT C. HARDING,
"President of the Senate.
"JOSEPH L. BUDD,
"Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 9, 1961.

"JACK R. GAGE,
"Acting Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the sugar beet industry is a vital and integral part of the economy of the State of Idaho and of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the production of sugar beets in the continental United States, as well as in Idaho, is geared to the provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, and particularly to the stabilization of prices and control of imports from foreign countries which are affected by its provisions relating to the processing tax and Sugar Act compliance payments; and

"Whereas unless its effectiveness is extended, the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, will expire on March 31, 1961, thereby forthwith depriving the sugar industry and the consumers of the customary controls and supplies and necessitating drastic economic adjustments within the industry, the State of Idaho, and the Nation; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America, in order to avoid any lapse in the effectiveness of the provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act, as amended, to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation extending the effectiveness of this act to and including the 31st day of December 1961; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; to take action on the Sugar Act to assure continuity of the U.S. sugar program and to recognize the need of reliance on the domestic sugar producers

"Whereas the U.S. Sugar Act expires March 31, 1961; and

"Whereas an extension of the Sugar Act is vital to the welfare of the Nation in general, and the sugar industry in particular; and

"Whereas the domestic sugar industry has demonstrated its ability to expand and produce a greater share of the national sugar consumption; and

"Whereas sugar is one crop which is not in surplus and the domestic sugar industry is producing less than 25 percent of our national consumption; and

"Whereas the sugar beet industry contributes significantly to the economy and industrial payroll of 22 States from the Great Lakes to the Pacific; and

"Whereas irrigation development is essential to the future of the progress of South Dakota; and

"Whereas sugar beets will stimulate a rapid and sound irrigation development of South Dakota; and

"Whereas the Sugar Act protects the domestic sugar industry, stimulates vigorous competition, promotes orderly marketing, insures an adequate U.S. sugar supply, prevents runaway prices, creates no surpluses, plows under no acres, has been highly effective through two wars, two depressions, and one long-time national prosperity period, and has provided a handsome profit to the U.S. Treasury without a tax from the general public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to take favorable action on the Sugar Act at the earliest possible date to assure continuity of the U.S. sugar program and to recognize the need of the increased reliance on the domestic producers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to U.S. Senators KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE, and to Congressmen E. Y. BERRY and BEN REIFEL.

"Adopted by the senate February 1, 1961.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives February 7, 1961.

"JOE BOTTUM,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.

"CARL BEERGEN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution relative to Federal study of California fishing problems

"Whereas the Federal Government is closing an ever-increasing area of most productive fishing waters for security reasons and for training and practice areas for the Armed Forces which is creating a serious problem as to the use of California fishing waters; and

"Whereas California fishing is becoming more and more involved in interstate and international problems both as to California fisheries and as to other areas fished by California fishermen; and

"Whereas the solution of these problems and provision for the proper utilization and conservation of the fish resources can be achieved only through cooperative joint action by the Federal authorities having jurisdiction and the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Defense are requested to study these problems and join with the appropriate California authorities in attempting to bring about their solution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 63d General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein, That the members of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas respectfully request the Congress of the United States to propose to the people an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or to call a convention for such purpose, as provided by law, to add to said Constitution an article providing that:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Where the legislatures of over one-fourth of the several States conclude that a U.S. Supreme Court decision has transferred powers not authorized by the Constitution of the United States, and where said decision transfers powers from the several States to the Federal Government, said decision shall, upon the application and request of the legislatures of over one-fourth of the several States, be invalid until subsequently approved by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; *Provided, however,* That said application and request shall be made within 3 years after the date of said decision.

" 'SEC. 2. All provisions of article 3 of the Constitution of the United States that conflict with this amendment are hereby repealed.'

"Be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution shall be sent by the Secretary of State, to the Governors and members of the legislatures of the several States, the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member of the U.S. Congress.

"Approved February 2, 1961."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution relating to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for Phoebe Apperson Hearst

"Whereas Phoebe Apperson Hearst was a great American woman humanitarian and philanthropist who is noted as the cofounder of the parents-teachers association and the organizer of the Travelers Aid Society and as being instrumental in the restoring of Mount Vernon; and

"Whereas by her generosity and consciousness of the tremendous requirements of education today, Mrs. Hearst gave millions of dollars to education and has properly become known as the "greatest single benefactor" of the University of California; and

"Whereas it is only fitting and proper that recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp be given to Phoebe Apperson Hearst for her multitudinous projects and activities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring Phoebe Apperson Hearst; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent, at Miami, Fla., relating to freedom for Russian satellite countries, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Judge Advocates Association, Washington, D.C., relating to the continuance in office of Associate Judge George W. Latimer as a member of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island has passed a resolution opposing efforts to diminish services to veterans at the several U.S. Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the United States, memorializing Congress and other officials in authority asking that said services shall not be diminished. The resolution was approved by the Governor on February 8, 1961.

In keeping with the request of the Rhode Island General Assembly, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and myself, that this resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING EFFORTS TO DIMINISH SERVICES TO VETERANS AT THE SEVERAL U.S. VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES, MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND OTHER OFFICIALS IN AUTHORITY, ASKING THAT SAID SERVICES SHALL NOT BE DIMINISHED

Whereas the report of the Council on Federal Medical Services of the American Medical Association recommends the closing of U.S. Veterans' Administration hospitals and/or tightening of regulations governing admissions to the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospitals; and

Whereas the further pronouncement that the taxpayers are being victimized to pay for the care of war veterans who have nonservice-connected disabilities and that it would be cheaper for the Government to pay for the care of veterans in private hospitals is most unfair to the many veterans whose sacrifices in the services of their country should never be forgotten; and

Whereas it is obvious that once again the guiding men of the American Medical Association apparently lack sympathy and gratitude toward the veterans of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island respectfully gives assurance to all veterans that it will resist all efforts by the American Medical Association to effect the closing of the U.S. Veterans' Administration hospitals and/or diminishing of services to veterans as advocated by the American Medical Association by appealing directly to the 87th Congress now in session; and be it further

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States are now respectfully requested to take all steps to protect the veterans from the efforts of the Ameri-

can Medical Association to effect the closing of U.S. Veterans' Administration hospitals and/or diminishing of services to veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution, expressing the wishes of the general assembly be sent to the director of Veterans' Administration hospitals in Washington, the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, the state department of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Amvets, Italian-American Veterans, Franco-American War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Spanish-American War Veterans, and the Marine Corps League, said duly certified copies to be transmitted by the secretary of state immediately upon the passage of this resolution.

RESOLUTIONS OF GUAM LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on June 28, 1960, the Senate unanimously approved Senate Resolution 330, authorizing a study of political and economic developments in American Samoa by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof. Subsequently the full committee voted unanimously to broaden the scope of any inquiry made respecting Samoa to include Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific. These areas also are a part of the Interior Committee's responsibilities.

In accordance with the committee's action, two members of the committee, both "Pacific" Senators and both possessed of personal knowledge of problems connected with territorial administration, visited American Samoa, Guam, and the trust territory last fall.

They were Senators OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii, and ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska. Each of these distinguished and able Senators has firsthand experience of territorial problems gained when the present State he represents was a territory. The report of this special study group is in the process of preparation, but meanwhile the elected Legislature of Guam has officially and formally expressed the appreciation of the people of Guam for the visit of these two Senators.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Resolution 25 and Resolution 26 of the Sixth Guam Legislature be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter of transmittal of the resolutions to me from the Speaker of the Guam Legislature, the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat, and that the resolutions be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

SIXTH GUAM LEGISLATURE,
TERRITORY OF GUAM,
Agana, Guam, February 3, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I take great pleasure in transmitting herewith certified copies of Resolution Nos. 25 and 26, duly and regularly adopted by the Guam Legislature on January 16, 1961.

Very truly yours,

A. B. WON PAT,
Speaker.

RESOLUTION 25

Relative to expressing on behalf of the people of Guam deep appreciation to Senator OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii, for the interest he took in the problems of Guam during his tour here in 1960

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas Senator OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii, came to Guam as chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate to study the problems of this territory and to hear and judge the aspirations of our people; and

Whereas Senator LONG is thoroughly familiar with the problems of our island government, having served with distinction and honor over a long period of time in the government of the former territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas during his stay here on Guam, he clearly demonstrated to the people of Guam his warm and sympathetic understanding of our problems and also gave us assurances of his intention to help us obtain our goals, for which we are deeply and humbly grateful: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express to the Honorable OREN E. LONG, Senator from Hawaii and chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which visited Guam in 1960, deep appreciation and gratitude for his coming here and for the warm understanding and sympathy he demonstrated toward our problems and aspirations; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution do also serve as an acknowledgment by the people of Guam to Senator LONG for his many years of devoted service to the territorial government of Hawaii and for the splendid job he accomplished in such position, all of which has made him a Senator with true understanding and grasp of the problems of the Pacific Islands; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. Senate, to the Honorable OREN E. LONG, to the Governor of Hawaii, and to the Governor of Guam.

RESOLUTION 26

Relative to expressing to Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska the appreciation of the people of Guam for his trip here in 1960 and for the interested concern he evidenced in the problems of this territory

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas Senator ERNEST GRUENING, the senior Senator from Alaska, came to Guam as a member of a subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate to investigate and study on the scene the problems of this territory and the aspirations of our people; and

Whereas Senator GRUENING is more than expert in the area of territorial problems, having served with distinction not only as Director of the Office of Territories but also having been the Governor of Alaska during many of its crucial days prior to the extension of statehood to that vast northern territory; and

Whereas Senator GRUENING clearly demonstrated his mastery of the problems of territorial government during his stay in Guam and also evidenced a warm sympathy and understanding for the problems of the people of this territory and thereby set us all an example of a dedicated public servant with a place in his heart and mind not only for the problems of his own State but also for the similar problems of this newest American territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sixth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express to the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, the senior Senator from Alaska, deep appreciation for his trip to Guam in 1960 and for the interested concern he evidenced in the problems and aspirations of the citizens of this territory; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution do also serve as an acknowledgment and commendation by the people of Guam to Senator GRUENING for the many years of devoted public service he has given to the people of the United States and for his grasp and understanding of national affairs, particularly in the field of territories and insular possessions; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, to the Governor of Alaska, and to the Governor of Guam.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS IN COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN—ARTICLE AND RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON STATE SENATE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, an article published in the Tri-City Herald of Pasco, Wash., and a resolution adopted by the Washington State Senate, relating to irrigation projects in the Columbia River Basin. I ask unanimous consent that the article and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and resolution were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pasco (Wash.) Tri-City Herald, Jan. 15, 1961]

BASIC BASIN ISSUE IS HONOR

We've said it before but we'll say it again, lest the basic point in the Columbia Basin project dispute be forgotten:

The paramount issue is that of trust, of honor.

It is an easily verifiable fact most of the basin settlers who are here now were led to believe by agents of our Government that their repayment obligation would be $85 an acre on the average—or less.

It's true there are some ifs, ands, and buts in the written contract, but these were not emphasized, if they were mentioned at all, when our farmers—many of whom are war veterans—were making decisions to stake their lives and whatever money they had or could borrow in the hope of an independent and prosperous future.

We do not state this as an appeal to the emotions, but rather as an appeal to the sense of fairness and of decency which is so characteristic of individual Americans.

It is in our proud tradition that a man's word is as good as his bond. His word is his contract, and any man worth his salt will make great financial sacrifices to keep it.

Should our Government be any different? Should not the verbal promises of its agents be as binding, as sacred, as if they had been written and signed by the President himself?

There has been a wholly incomprehensible reluctance by many agents of our Government—both elected and appointed—to recognize this crucial fact in the basin case.

SENATE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
RESOLUTION

Whereas, the farmers of the Columbia Basin entered into a contract with the U.S. Department of the Interior in October 1945 providing for repayment for their land, for construction of irrigation canals, for the irrigation water they use, and for $8 million for installation of drainage facilities in the Columbia Basin; and

Whereas these farmers have honorably met all their obligations under the terms of this contract since its inception; and

Whereas recent studies indicate that the cost of completion of the drainage system for that portion of the Columbia Basin presently receiving water has been underestimated by $36 million; and

Whereas this gross miscalculation was not the fault of the farmers; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation during recent years, has proposed that the farmers of the Columbia Basin renegotiate this contract with the Department of the Interior to the end that these farmers would be required to pay the entire $36 million for this underestimated drainage system; and

Whereas these farmers are among Washington's finest citizens, laboring long hours daily and living on meager and uncertain incomes; and

Whereas, Gov. Albert D. Rosellini, Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson, and Conservation Director Earl Coe, as chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission, have all urged that a 2-year moratorium be declared on all charges against Columbia Basin farmers for drainage construction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington, That we join in requesting that President John F. Kennedy direct that this 2-year moratorium be now declared on all charges for drainage against the farmers of the Columbia Basin, thus allowing time for complete study of this problem by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and agencies under his direction; and be it further

Resolved, That we congratulate the farmers of the Columbia Basin not only for their labors and courage in converting the Columbia Basin from a desert to healthy productive farmland, but also for their calm persistence in the face of seemingly overwhelming obstacles, and for their faith in the ultimate fairness of the legal democratic processes under which we live; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 610. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board (Rept. No. 48).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 707. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation (Rept. No. 49); and

S. 804. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules (Rept. No. 50).

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, 11TH ANNUAL REPORT—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 51)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit the committee's 11th annual report, and ask that it be printed, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

S. 948. A bill for the relief of Jamil and Anwer Abdullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 949. A bill for the relief of John G. Tiedemann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 950. A bill to authorize the granting of mineral rights to certain homestead patentees who were wrongfully deprived of such rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 951. A bill relating to the gift and estate tax treatment of the relinquishment of certain powers in the case of reciprocal and other trusts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 952. A bill for the relief of Mijo (Mike) Sipusic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 953. A bill to exempt the manager-custodian of the Japan Locker Fund from certain dual-compensation restrictions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 954. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Aquarium in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 955. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act with respect to transfer of unused allotments; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 956. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 957. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to (1) assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, (2) provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and (3) clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review;

S. 958. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 959. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit certain practices regarding passenger ticket sales and reservations;

S. 960. A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents;

S. 961. A bill to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958;

S. 962. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes;

S. 963. A bill to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings;

S. 964. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes; and

S. 965. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 966. A bill to authorize the construction and equipping of three Coast Guard cutters designed for icebreaking in the Arctic and Antarctic regions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 967. A bill for the relief of Wong Gar Wah; and

S. 968. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Kavadias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 969. A bill to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 970. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 971. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Briganti;

S. 972. A bill for the relief of Cristina Franco;

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Liliana Grazyna Swiatkowska;

S. 974. A bill for the relief of Helena Palin Kalemba;

S. 975. A bill for the relief of Gina Mascia; and

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Marya Trela Terpak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLARK, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 977. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 2-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 978. A bill for the relief of citizens of the State of Illinois and of the State of New Jersey, organizers and owners of First, Second and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 979. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of North Dakota and Minnesota to enter into an agreement with respect to the boundary between such States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 980. A bill for the relief of Joseph Anthony Vettiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 981. A bill to extend certain authority of the Secretary of the Interior, exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, to areas outside the national domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (by request):

S. 982. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 983. A bill to include in gross income earned income of citizens of the United States residing in foreign countries; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 984. A bill to provide that Inauguration Day shall be a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution providing for the erection of an equestrian statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee on the grounds of the Custis-Lee mansion, Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HART, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to construct a modern stern ramp trawler to be used for research purposes and authorizing the appropriation of funds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON U.S. FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. ELLENDER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on February 1, 1961; and that 4,000 additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

DESIGNATION OF EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH AS A MAJOR FAITH IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Senators KEATING and PELL) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 88) declaring the Eastern Orthodox Church to be a major faith in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE W. F. NORRELL, OF ARKANSAS

Mr. DODD (for Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 89) relative to death of Representative W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DODD, which appears under a separate heading.)

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN WAR CLAIMS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the settlement of certain uncompensated World War II damage claims. This measure is an effort to get something done for the 50,000 or more Americans who suffered serious losses of life, limb, and property in World War II. The long delay in the settlement of these claims is intolerable. The claimants under my bill have been sitting on the sidelines for almost 16 years waiting for consideration. During all that time, the Congress has given them no relief.

Why this is so, staggers the imagination. We have, or shortly will have, the money to pay the claims. It was obtained from vested assets given to us by the postwar Governments of Germany and Japan in lieu of billions in reparations. We have used some of this money to pay a limited category of American war claims. Yet there has been a feeling in some quarters that the remainder is somehow sacrosanct; that it must be given back to our former enemy nationals and, presumably, that our uncompensated American war damage claimants either be paid out of the pay envelopes or pocketbooks of their fellow taxpayers or that their claims be abandoned. The former alternative simply means that the American taxpayer will be footing a substantial part of Germany's and Japan's reparations bill. The latter alternative would be a step reeking with injustice. Neither alternative, if taken, would be a credit to the Congress of the United States.

It is hoped that, while engaged in the balance of trade negotiations with West Germany, the administration will not lose sight of the 50,000 Americans who have not been compensated for war damage claims. The legitimate claims of these people should in no way be overshadowed by an attempt to effect a hurried settlement with the German Government on the gold flow problem.

In both the case of war claims and the international balance of trade situation, the legitimate interests of American citizens must be respected. Hopefully, the failure of the present administration to send up a measure similar to the one I propose today does not signify an indifference to the problem. Nothing should be agreed to in these negotiations which would imperil our American war claims program, and I hope the new administration will give its wholehearted support to this bill.

The major category of claims authorized under this bill would cover physical damage to or physical loss or destruction of property in most central European countries and in Japanese occupied territories as a result of military action or special measures taken against it because of the enemy or alleged enemy character of the owners. Claims also would be allowed for damage to or loss or destruction of ships or ship cargoes as a result of military action, certain net

losses of maritime insurance underwriters, claims by American civilian passengers—not crew members—aboard torpedoed passenger vessels in the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 11, 1941, and reparations and losses resulting from the removal of industrial or capital equipment in Germany.

Under the bill, payment of awards on these claims would be made from the net proceeds of assets formerly owned by German nationals and vested under the Trading With the Enemy Act, with the exception of claims arising in the Japanese-occupied territories, for which the value of Japanese vested assets is inadequate.

Some of the more important provisions of the bill, in addition to types of claims authorized, require, first, that all awards be paid in full up to $10,000 in equal installments with payments on awards in excess of $10,000 prorated on a percentage basis as funds become available for their payment; second, that awards be reduced by the amount the claimants have received from any other source on account of the same loss; third, that a period of 20 months shall be allowed within which claims may be filed; and fourth, that the entire program shall be completed within 5 years from the date of the bill's enactment into law.

One important provision of the bill with respect to eligibility of claimants would make eligible all persons who are citizens of the United States at the time the bill is enacted. I have opposed attempts which were made in the past to exclude from the benefits of war claims legislation Americans who became citizens after their losses were originally suffered. It is obvious that the former countries of these persons, some of which countries have fallen under Communist domination, will not make any compensation to them. In any event, we do not accept any concept of second-class or junior citizenship in the United States. It is very important that we not mar the just and equitable character of war claims legislation by discriminatory provisions against later nationals of our Nation.

With the exception of the Japanese claims, the entire program contemplated by this bill would be financed, as I have indicated, from the net proceeds of existing enemy vested assets now in hand which are not otherwise committed. These funds would be covered into the existing War Claims Fund created by the War Claims Act of 1948 and disbursed upon certification of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission by the Secretary of the Treasury in the payment of the Commission's awards.

Under the wartime vesting program authorized by the Trading With the Enemy Act, the United States, as a defense measure, vested many types of assets then owned by Germany and Japan or their respective nationals situated in the United States which came to have a value of approximately $694 million. These properties, consisting of real estate, interests in trusts or estates, securities, accounts and credits, going commercial enterprises, and a host of other types of funds or wealth, came under the exclusive control and management of our Government.

In appropriate cases, many of the items taken were liquidated or turned into cash. From time to time, since the end of World War II, the Congress has directed the return of certain properties or payment, out of cash balances to former owners, of the proceeds derived from the liquidation of their properties. The costs of administering this program have also been taken out of these proceeds. The great bulk of these assets, however, some $228,750,000, has been used in the payment of a wide variety of American war claims filed by former American prisoners of war, civilian internees, American religious organizations in the Philippines, American merchant seamen captured by the enemy and by owners of bank accounts, and other credits sequestered by the Japanese in the Philippines.

As a result, Mr. President, we have remaining in our hands, roughly $286 million of vested assets of German origin, most of which is subject to pending litigation, and a considerable portion of which has not as yet been reduced to cash. I am informed, however, that if this bill were enacted into law tomorrow, a substantial sum would be immediately available from this source, to get this war claims program underway. By the time the Commission could begin issuing awards, a year or so from now, this sum could be substantially increased to permit claimants eligible to receive awards ultimately to receive very adequate compensation for their losses.

Mr. President, I have been distressed at the hue and cry that has gone up in the past over the use of these vested assets for the payment of legitimate and as yet uncompensated American war claims. One would think, from listening to those who advocate their return, that we had no right to retain them or use them for this purpose. Nothing could be further from the truth. These misguided philanthropists turn their backs on the fact that the assets in question were given to the United States by Germany and Japan in solemn agreements and in the Japanese Peace Treaty, in lieu of billions in reparations. We could otherwise have exacted a staggering reparations burden many times in excess of the $694 million worth of properties we rightfully vested during the war. Our former enemies knew that, and they were only too glad to settle for this lesser amount, as they did with every other one of the Allied Powers.

I will not at this time consume the time of the Senate in documenting the history of our acquisition of these vested properties. It is all a matter of record. The facts are not disputed, although they are ignored by some. Germany and Japan are now among our allies. I have nothing but the warmest feeling toward their present governments and their people. I know that both these governments recognize their responsibilities under the agreements they have made with us respecting these vested assets, and will live up to them, and that they will compensate their own nationals for whatever losses they may have suffered through our wartime vesting program. I am happy to note that, as far as Germany is concerned, she has already taken initial steps in that direction.

Actually, all that is proposed in this bill is an extension of the program for using vested enemy assets for the relief of American war victims which began with the adoption of the War Claims Act of 1948. Under that act, we made many categories of claims from this source. In the enactment of that legislation we heard no wailing or moaning that the use of our vested assets for the payment of these claims constituted any violation on our part of accepted principles of either international or domestic laws; that our retention and use of these properties for that purpose was immoral. No, indeed. It was then agreed on all sides that these claims should be paid and that the vested assets of our wartime foes could reasonably be used to foot the bill for their payment. The bill I am introducing asks no more.

I hope that all Senators will give this subject their close study. But I also hope that there will be no unreasonable delay in taking action. These claims have gone unremedied for too long. It should be possible, before the end of the present session of the 87th Congress, to finally say the job has been done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 956) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is further amended by inserting after section 1 thereof the following:

"TITLE I"

SEC. 2. The word "Act" wherever it appears in title I in reference to the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read "title".

SEC. 3. The War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE II

"Definitions

"SEC. 201. As used in this title the term or terms—

"(a) 'Albania', 'Austria', 'Czechoslovakia', 'the Free Territory of Danzig', 'Estonia', 'Germany', 'Greece', 'Latvia', 'Lithuania', 'Poland', and 'Yugoslavia', when used in their respective geographical senses, mean the territorial limits of each such country or free territory, as the case may be, in continental Europe as such limits existed on December 1, 1937.

"(b) 'Commission' means the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States established pursuant to Reorganization Plan Number 1 of 1954 (68 Stat. 1279).

"(c) 'national of the United States' means (1) a natural person who is a citizen of the United States, (2) a natural person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States, and (3) a corporation, partnership, unincorporated body or other entity, organized under the laws of the United States, any State or Territory thereof, or the District of Columbia and in which at least 50 per centum of the outstanding capital stock or other proprietary or similar interest is owned, directly or indirectly, by nationals of the United States. It does not include aliens.

"(d) 'property' means real property and such items of tangible personalty as can be identified, evaluated and, as determined by the Commission, are normally owned by any person or entity in like circumstances as that of the owner or claimant at the time of loss, and items of personalty or movables held or used in carrying on a trade, business or profession at the time of such loss. It does not include intangible property.

"Amendment to Trading With the Enemy Act

"SEC. 202. Section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cover into the Treasury from time to time after the enactment of this subsection for deposit in the War Claims Fund for credit to the German Claims Account created therein pursuant to subsection (a) of section 203 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, such sums, from property vested in or transferred to him under this Act, as he shall determine in his discretion not to be required to fulfill obligations imposed under this Act or any other provision of law, and not to be the subject matter of any judicial action or proceeding.'"

"War Claims Fund accounts

"SEC. 203. (a) There are hereby created in the War Claims Fund established pursuant to subsection (a) of section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, two accounts to be known, respectively, as the German Claims Account and the Japanese Claims Account. The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit in the War Claims Fund for credit to the German Claims Account all amounts covered into the Treasury by the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (c) of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended. The Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit in the War Claims Fund for credit to the Japanese Claims Account all amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. There shall be deducted from each such deposit for credit to the German Claims Account and from each such deposit for credit to the Japanese Claims Account 5 per centum thereof for expenses incurred by the Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of this title. Such deductions shall be made before any payment is made pursuant to section 214 of this title, out of either such accounts. All amounts so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 which shall be deposited in the War Claims Fund for credit to the Japanese Claims Account created pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Commission and the Treasury Department to pay their administrative expenses in carrying out their respective functions under this title.

"Claims authorized

"SEC. 204. This Commission is directed to receive and to determine according to the provisions of this title the validity and amount of claims of nationals of the United States for—

"(a) physical damage to, or physical loss or destruction of property located in Albania, Austria, Czechoslovakia, the Free City of Danzig, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, or Yugoslavia, or in territory which was part of Hungary or Rumania on December 1, 1937, but which was not included in such countries on September 15, 1947, which occurred during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending May 8, 1945, or which occurred in the period beginning July 1, 1937, and ending September 2, 1945, to property in territory occupied or attacked by the Imperial Japanese military forces (including territory to which Japan has renounced all right, title and claim under Article 2 of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied Powers and Japan, except the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the island of Guam); such loss, damage or destruction must have occurred, as a direct consequence of (1) military operations of war or (2) special measures directed against property in such countries or territories, during the respective periods specified, because of the enemy or alleged enemy character of the owner, which property was owned, directly or indirectly, by a national of the United States at the time of such loss, damage or destruction;

"(b) damage to, or loss or destruction of, ships or ship cargoes directly or indirectly owned by a national of the United States at the time such damage, loss, or destruction occurred, which was a direct consequence of military action by Germany or Japan during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending September 2, 1945; no award shall be made under this subsection in favor of any insurer or reinsurer as assignee or otherwise as successor in interest to the right of the insured;

"(c) net losses under war-risk insurance or reinsurance policies or contracts, incurred in the settlement of claims for insured losses of ships owned by nationals of the United States at the time of the loss, damage, or destruction of such ships and at the time of the settlement of such claims, which insured losses were a direct consequence of military action by Germany or Japan during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending September 2, 1945; such net losses shall be determined by deducting from the aggregate of all payments made in the settlement of such insured losses the aggregate of the net amounts received by any such insurance companies on all policies or contracts of war-risk insurance or reinsurance on ships under which the insured was a national of the United States, after deducting expenses;

"(d) loss or damage on account of—

"(1) the death of any person who, being then a civilian national of the United States and a passenger on any vessel engaged in commerce on the high seas, died or was killed as a result of miltary action by Germany or Japan which occurred during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 11, 1941; awards under this paragraph shall be made only to or for the benefit of the following persons in the order of priority named:

"(A) widow or husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

"(B) widow or husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares;

"(C) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or husband; and

"(D) parents of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow, husband, or child;

"(2) injury or permanent disability sustained by any person, who being then a civilian national of the United States and a passenger on any vessel engaged in commerce on the high seas, was injured or permanently disabled as a result of military action by Germany or Japan which occurred during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 11, 1941; awards under this paragraph shall be payable solely to the person so injured or disabled;

"(3) the loss or destruction, as a result of such action, of property on such vessel, as determined by the Commission to be reasonable, useful, necessary or proper under the circumstances, which property was owned by any civilian national of the United States who was then a passenger on such vessel; and in the case of the death of any person suffering such loss, awards under this paragraph shall be made only to or for the benefit of the persons designated in paragraph (1) of this subsection and in the order of priority named therein; and

"(e) losses resulting from the removal of industrial or other capital equipment in Germany owned directly or indirectly by a national of the United States on the date of removal and removed for the purpose of reparations including losses from any destruction of property incident to such removal.

"Transfers and assignments

"SEC. 205. The transfer or assignment for value of any property forming the subject matter of a claim under subsections (a) or (b) of section 204 subsequent to its damage, loss or destruction shall not operate to extinguish any claim of the transferor otherwise compensable under either of such subsections. If a claim which could otherwise be allowed under subsections (a), (b) or (e) of section 204 has been assigned for value prior to the enactment of this title, the assignee shall be the party entitled to claim thereunder.

"Nationality of claimants

"SEC. 206. No claim shall be allowed under this title unless (1) the claimant and all predecessors in interest in the claim were, on the date of loss, damage, destruction, or removal and continuously thereafter until the date of filing claim with the Commission pursuant to this title, nationals of the United States, including any person, who having lost United States citizenship solely by reason of marriage to a citizen or subject of a foreign country, reacquired such citizenship prior to the date of enactment of this title if such individual, but for such marriage, would have been a national of the United States at all times on and after the date of such loss, damage, destruction, or removal until the filing of his claim; or (2) in the case of an individual who personally suffered the loss, damage, destruction or removal for which the claim is filed is a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this title.

"Claims of stockholders

"SEC. 207. (a) A claim under section 202 of this title based upon an ownership interest in any corporation, association, or other entity which is a national of the United States shall be denied.

"(b) A claim under section 202 of this title, based upon a direct ownership interest in a corporation, association, or other entity which suffered a loss within the meaning of said section, shall be allowed, subject to other provisions of this title, if such corporation, association, or other entity on the date of the loss was not a national of the United States, without regard to the per centum of ownership vested in the claimant in any such claim.

"(c) A claim under section 202 of this title, based upon an indirect ownership interest in a corporation, association, or other entity which suffered a loss within the meaning of said section, shall be allowed, subject

to other provisions of this title, only if at least 25 per centum of the entire ownership interest thereof at the time of such loss was vested in nationals of the United States.

"(d) Any award on a claim under subsection (b) or (c) of this section shall be calculated on the basis of the total loss suffered by such corporation, association, or other entity, and shall bear the same proportion to such loss as the ownership interest of the claimant bears to the entire ownership interest thereof.

"Deductions in making awards

"SEC. 208. In determining the amount of any award there shall be deducted all amounts the claimant has received on account of the same loss or losses with respect to which an award is made under this title.

"Consolidated awards

"SEC. 209. With respect to any claim which, at the time of the award, is vested in persons other than the person by whom the loss was sustained, the Commission may issue a consolidated award in favor of all claimants then entitled thereto, which award shall indicate the respective interests of such claimant therein; and all such claimants shall participate, in proportion to their indicated interests, in the payments authorized by this title in all respects as if the award had been in favor of a single person.

"Certain awards prohibited

"SEC. 210. No award shall be made under this title to or for the benefit of any person who has been convicted of a violation of any provision of chapter 115, title 18, of the United States Code, or of any other crime involving disloyalty to the United States.

"Certification of awards

"SEC. 211. The Commission shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, in terms of United States currency, each award made pursuant to section 204 as follows:

"(1) Any award for losses arising in the countries named in subsection (a) of section 204, or attributable to military action by Germany under subsections (b), (c) or (d) of such section, or for reparation removals under subsection (e) thereof, shall be certified for payment from the German Claims Account.

"(2) Any award for losses arising in territory occupied or attacked by Imperial Japanese military forces, or attributable to military action by Japan under subsections (b), (c) or (d) of such section, shall be certified for payment from the Japanese Claims Account.

"Claim filing period

"SEC. 212. Within sixty days after the enactment of this title or of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title, whichever date is later, the Commission shall give public notice by publication in the Federal Register of the time when, and the limit of time within which claims may be filed, which limit shall not be more than eighteen months after such publication.

"Claims settlement period

"SEC. 213. The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to this title not later than five years following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under this title. Nothing in this provision shall be construed to limit the life of the Commission.

"Payment of awards; priorities; limitations

"SEC. 214. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is directed, out of the sums deposited in the War Claims Fund for credit to the German Claims Account pursuant to subsection (c) of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, and out of sums deposited in the War Claims Fund for credit to the Japanese Claims Account pursuant to subsection (b) of section 203 of this title, to make payments on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title as follows and in the following order of priority:

"(1) Payment in full of awards made pursuant to section 204(d) (1) and (2).

"(2) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the other awards made pursuant to section 204 in an amount which shall be the same for each award or in the amount of the award whichever is less. The total payment made pursuant to this paragraph on account of any award shall not exceed $10,000.

"(3) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid balance of each remaining award made pursuant to section 204 which shall bear to such unpaid balance the same proportion as the total amount in the German or Japanese Claims Account respectively, and available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid balances of all such awards. No payment made pursuant to this paragraph on account of any award shall exceed the unpaid balance of such award.

"(b) Such payments, and applications for such payments, shall be made in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

"(c) For the purpose of making any such payments, other than under section 214(a) (1), an 'award' shall be deemed to mean the aggregate of all awards certified for payment from any one account in favor of the same claimant.

"(d) If any person to whom any payment is to be made pursuant to this title is deceased or is under legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if any payment to be made is not over $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates.

"(e) Payment on account of any award pursuant to this title shall not, unless such payment is for the full amount of the award, extinguish any rights against any foreign government for the unpaid balance of the award.

"Fees of attorneys and agents

"SEC. 215. No remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this title shall exceed 10 per centum of the total amount paid pursuant to any award certified under the provisions of this title on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both.

"Application of other laws

"SEC. 216. To the extent they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, the following provisions of title I of this Act and title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, shall apply to this title: The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 2, all of subsection (c) of section 2 and section 11 of title I of this Act, and subsections (c), (d), (e) and (f) of section 7 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

"Transfer of records

"SEC. 217. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to transfer or otherwise make available to the Commission such records and documents relating to claims authorized by this title as may be required by the Commission in carrying out its functions under this title."

SEC. 4. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO COURT PROCEDURES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to: first, assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings; second, provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals; and third, clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 957) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to first, assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings; second, provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and third, clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to correct demonstrated deficiencies in the judicial review provisions governing the Board, to clarify them in certain respects, and to bring them into harmony with the statutory scheme for review applicable to most other comparable agencies.

1. Existing law is susceptible to the interpretation that the Board's right of participation and of independent representation through its own counsel in court proceedings involving the validity of its own orders is dependent upon the consent and acquiescence of the Attorney General.[1] The working relationship between the Board and the Department of Justice in litigation matters generally has been satisfactory, so that practical problems rarely arise. However, in some instances there have been conflicts of opinion on matters pertinent to pending Board litigation, with the result that the Board has been deprived of the opportunity

[1] Sec. 1006 of the act provides: "Upon request of the Attorney General, the Board or Administrator, as the case may be, shall have the right to participate in any proceeding in court under the provisions of this act."

in such situations of making its views known to the court.

The proposed amendment would resolve difficulties of this nature by providing for participation as of right by both the Attorney General and the Board where it may become necessary because of differences in position.

The Board's proposal for independent participation and representation is no more than a reflection of the situation as it exists today with respect to comparable Government agencies. Some agencies defend their orders in Federal courts other than the Supreme Court without any control by the Attorney General;[2] others, which are covered by the provisions of the Hobbs Act (5 U.S.C. 1031 et seq.), continue under the general control of the Attorney General, but have the statutory right to appear and be represented as a separate party in the manner which the Board advocates.[3] It is the Board's opinion that the existence of a similar right in the Board is essential to a proper recognition of its status as an independent regulatory agency, and to assure that the Board at all times will be free to express its position in court concerning the proper interpretation of the statute which it administers.

The foregoing reasons also support the Board's proposal that existing law be amended to make clear that the Board may, on its own initiative, institute and fully prosecute all necessary court proceedings to compel compliance with the act and the Board's actions taken thereunder, for it is of equal importance that independence of action on the part of the Board be assured in enforcement matters. The proposed amendment permits the Board to proceed independently or through the Attorney General in such cases, and provides that the Attorney General may, in any event, participate as of right.

2. The review provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act, now incorporated in the Federal Aviation Act, have been judicially interpreted to the effect that certain Board actions taken without an evidentiary record, such as regulations promulgated without evidentiary hearings, are directly reviewable, if at all, in the Federal district courts.[4] Since determinations of the Board are normally reviewable as orders by the courts of appeals, this interpretation has led to some uncertainty and confusion, which should be corrected. Appropriate corrective action has been taken with respect to similar problems of other agencies and departments within the coverage of the Hobbs Act, which act specifically provides that nonhearing determinations shall be reviewable in the courts of appeals (5 U.S.C. 1037).

The Board's proposal is to substantially incorporate in relevant part provisions of the Hobbs Act on this point into the review provisions of the Federal Aviation Act. The Board believes that the proposed amendment will not only alleviate the confusion and uncertainty as to the proper forum for review in these cases, but will also provide for more effective and expeditious review. The courts of appeals generally are more familiar with the Board's functions, and cases before such courts generally are processed more quickly than those in the district courts. Since, under the Hobbs Act procedure, nonhearing cases are transferred to the district courts only in those instances where there is a genuine issue of material fact, delays incurred in the course of completing the review process should be minimized.

This particular part of the amendment is specifically designed to cure the problem raised in the Arrow case, supra, where the court of appeals declined to review as "orders" Board regulations which were of general applicability and prospective effect. Under the amendment, regulations of this type which have immediate impact would be reviewable in a court of appeals. It is not designed to change or alter the existing situation with respect to rules or regulations having no immediate application, as to which a person affected may, for example, raise the question of invalidity of such rules by way of a defense in an action brought to enforce them, nor is it designed to make any orders reviewable that are not subject to review under existing law.

3. The law pertaining to the proper computation of the 60-day period for seeking judicial review of Board orders is unclear. In *Consolidated Flower Shipments* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board* (205 F. 2d 449 (1953)), the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit held that the 60-day period is not extended by the filing of a timely petition for reconsideration with the Board although the Board's procedural rules permit such petitions. Although the Supreme Court has never passed on the question, there is authority for the position that, contrary to the Ninth Circuit's view, the filing of such a petition tolls the time for seeking judicial review, so that the 60-day period is to be computed from the date of entry of the order denying reconsideration rather than from the date of entry of the initial order. The Board has always supported the latter position, on the ground, inter alia, that the legislation evidences no intention to deprive a private party of the opportunity of first seeking, at his election, reconsideration from the Board where its rules permit petitions for reconsideration, and then resorting to court review. The proposed amendment eliminates the present uncertainty concerning the properly applicable rule under the Federal Aviation Act by specifically recognizing that such an election is available to substantially interested persons.

It should be emphasized that no attempt has been made to affect existing law otherwise than in the specific respects noted in paragraphs 1 through 3 hereof. To that end, the language of the statute remains substantially in its present form. It may be noted that the sections of the act proposed to be amended apply generally both to the Civil Aeronautics Board and to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. To the extent that actions of the Administrator may be reviewable under section 1006(a), and insofar as the Administrator may be empowered to institute enforcement proceedings pursuant to section 1007(a), the proposed amendment effects no change in those respects.

The amendment as proposed by the Board incorporates changes, deletions, and additions in sections 1006 and 1008 of the act, many of which are minor in nature. The differences, which are shown graphically in the attached "Comparison With Existing Act," are briefly described below:

(a) The word "circuit" has been added after the words "U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia" in sections 1006(a) and 1006(b) in order to accurately reflect that court's present status.

(b) Section 1006(a): Three additional changes have been made:

1. For a description of the type of orders subject to review, the amendment substitutes the words "any final order" for the phrase "any order, affirmative or negative" now in the statute. This change embodies the judicial interpretation of the present language (*Chicago & Southern Airlines* v. *Waterman Steamship Corp.*, 333 U.S. 103 (1948)) and accords with the phraseology used in the Hobbs Act (5 U.S.C. 1032).

2. The sentence dealing with late filed petitions for review has been deleted as unnecessary.

3. The sentence added at the end of the section makes clear the option in a petitioner to seek judicial review either within 60 days after the entry of the order complained of or within 60 days after disposition has been made of a petition for reconsideration timely filed pursuant to an applicable rule of the Board or Administrator.

(c) Section 1006(d): The section has been amended by adding, after its present provisions, additional provisions concerning the procedure to be followed with respect to hearing and nonhearing determinations. The language employed follows closely that used in section 7 of the Hobbs Act (5 U.S.C. 1037).

(d) Section 1006(f): The principal change made here is the addition of language to assure that the Board and any aggrieved party, as well as the Solicitor General, may file a petition for writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court. The same general purpose has been achieved with respect to other agencies and departments by section 10 of the Hobbs Act (5 U.S.C. 1040).

(e) Section 1008: A new subsection (b) has been added. The net effect of this particular portion of the proposed amendment is to provide (1) that the Board may, on its own responsibility, institute and prosecute enforcement proceedings brought under section 1004(c) or section 1007(a), with full rights in the Attorney General to participate in such proceedings; and (2) that in other than section 1007(a) proceedings, the Attorney General will have general supervisory direction and control of Board litigation, but with a statutory right in the Board itself to independent participation and representation (except in criminal proceedings).

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

Judicial review of orders

Orders of Board and Administrator Subject to Review

SEC. 1006. (a) Any final order issued by the Board or Administrator under this act, except any order in respect of any foreign air carrier subject to the approval of the President as provided in section 801 of this act, shall be subject to review by the courts of appeals of the United States or the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upon petition, filed within 60 days after the entry of such order, by any person disclosing a substantial interest in such order. The time within which a petition for review is to be filed shall be computed from the entry of the order complained against or, if one or more persons timely petitions the Board or Administrator for reconsideration of such order in accordance with rules of the Board or Administrator, as the case may be, permitting petitions for reconsideration, from the entry of the order disposing of the petition for reconsideration.

Venue

(b) A petition under this section shall be filed in the court for the circuit wherein the

---

[2] Agencies of this type are the Federal Trade Commission (15 U.S.C. 45(c)); the Federal Power Commission (15 U.S.C. 717r, 717s; 16 U.S.C. 825, 825m(c)); the National Labor Relations Board (29 U.S.C. 160(e), 160(f)); and the Securities and Exchange Commission (15 U.S.C. 77i(a), 77vvv, 78y(a), 79(x)). The Federal Communications Commission is in the same category with respect to actions for review of its orders brought under sec. 402(b) of the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 402(b)).

[3] The Federal Communications Commission, where review is sought under sec. 402(a) of the Communications Act (15 U.S.C. 402(a)); the Secretary of Agriculture; the U.S. Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Board; and the Atomic Energy Commission (see 5 U.S.C. 1032, 1038). The Interstate Commerce Commission long has had similar independence of participation and representation (28 U.S.C. 2322, 2323).

[4] See *Arrow Airways, Inc.* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board* (782 F. 2d 705 (1950)).

petitioner resides or has his principal place of business or in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Notice to Board or Administrator; Filing of Transcript

(c) A copy of the petition shall, upon filing, be forthwith transmitted to the Board or Administrator by the clerk of the court, and the Board or Administrator shall thereupon file in the court the record, if any, upon which the order complained of was entered, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

Power of Court

(d) (1) Upon transmittal of the petition to the Board or Administrator, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside the order complained of, in whole or in part, and if need be, to order further proceedings by the Board or Administrator. Upon good cause shown, interlocutory relief may be granted by stay of the order or by such mandatory or other relief as may be appropriate: *Provided*, That no interlocutory relief may be granted except upon at least 5 days' notice to the Board or Administrator.

(2) Petitions to review orders of the Board reviewable under this section, unless determined on a motion to dismiss the petition, shall be heard in the Court of Appeals upon the record of the pleadings, evidence adduced, and proceedings before the Board when the Board has in fact held a hearing whether or not required to do so by law. Where the Board has held no hearing prior to the taking of the action of which review is sought by the petition, the Court of Appeals shall determine whether a hearing is required by law. After such determination, the Court shall (i) where a hearing is required by law, remand the proceedings to the Board for the purpose of holding a hearing; (ii) where a hearing is not required by law, pass upon the issues presented when it appears from the proceedings before the Board and the pleadings and affidavits filed by the parties that no genuine issue of material fact is presented; and (iii) where a hearing is not required by law, and a genuine issue of material fact is presented, transfer the proceedings to a U.S. district court for the district where the petitioner or any petitioner resides or has its principal office for hearing and determination as if such proceedings were originally initiated in the district court. The procedure in such cases in the U.S. district courts shall be governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Findings of Facts Conclusive

(e) The findings of facts by the Board or Administrator, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. No objection to an order of the Board or Administrator shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the Board or Administrator or, if it was not so urged, unless there were reasonable grounds for failure to do so.

Certification or Certiorari

(f) The judgment and decree of the court affirming, modifying, or setting aside any such order of the Board or Administrator shall be subject only to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certification or certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. Either the Solicitor General or, in cases involving its orders, the Board, or a party to the review proceeding in the court of appeals may file a petition for writ of certiorari.

Judicial enforcement

Jurisdiction of Court

SEC. 1007. (a) If any person violates any provision of this act or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, or any term, condition, or limitation of any certificate or permit issued under this act, the Board or Administrator, as the case may be, their duly authorized agents, or, in the case of a violation of section 401(a) of this act, any party in interest, may apply to the district court of the United States, for any district wherein such person carries on his business or wherein the violation occurred, for the enforcement of such provision of this act, or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, condition, or limitation; and such court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience thereto by a writ of injunction or other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining such person, his officers, agents, employees, and representatives, from further violation of such provision of this act or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, condition, or limitation, and requiring their obedience thereto.

Application for Enforcement

(b) Upon the request of the Board or Administrator, any district attorney of the United States to whom the Board or Administrator may apply is authorized to institute in the proper court and to prosecute under the direction of the Attorney General all necessary proceedings for the enforcement of the provisions of this act or any rule, regulation, requirement, or order thereunder, or any term, condition, or limitation of any certificate or permit, and for the punishment of all violations thereof, and the costs and expenses of such prosecutions shall be paid out of the appropriations for the expenses of the courts of the United States.

Participation in Court Proceedings

SEC. 1008. (a) Upon request of the Attorney General, the Administrator shall have the right to participate in any proceeding in court under the provisions of this act.

(b) Proceedings instituted by the Board pursuant to sections 1004 and 1007(a) of this act shall be conducted under the direction, control, and responsibility of the Board, with the right in the Board to request and obtain, if desired, the assistance of the appropriate district attorney of the United States as provided in section 1007(b). The Board shall have the authority to appeal all decisions rendered in such proceedings, including the right to seek review by the Supreme Court of the United States in the same manner as provided by section 1006(f) of this act in cases involving review of the Board's orders, and the Attorney General may participate as of right in all such proceedings with the same rights of appeal. In all other court proceedings instituted by or against the Board, the Attorney General shall be responsible for and have charge and control of the interest of the Government. In such court proceedings, other than criminal proceedings, the Board may appear of right as a party thereto and be represented by its own counsel. The Attorney General shall not dispose of any noncriminal proceeding over the objection of the Board or of any other person granted leave to intervene therein, but said Board or intervenor or intervenors may prosecute, defend, appeal, or otherwise continue said proceeding unaffected by the action or nonaction of the Attorney General.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO REGULATION OF RATES OF CERTAIN AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 958) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would grant to the Board regulatory authority over passenger and property rates and practices in foreign air transportation which it now lacks.

Title IV of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (formerly the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938) imposes upon every air carrier the duty of providing interstate and overseas air transportation at reasonable rates. Title X of the act authorizes the Board under certain circumstances to prescribe the rates for interstate air transportation, to prescribe maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum rates for overseas air transportation, and to suspend operation of new tariffs for interstate or overseas air transportation pending determination of the lawfulness of such tariffs. But the act gives the Board practically no direct authority over the rates and practices of either U.S. or foreign air carriers engaged in foreign air transportation. The sole power now possessed by the Board (apart from the Board's power to disapprove agreements among air carriers and foreign air carriers fixing rates and practices in foreign air transportation) is that of ordering a carrier in foreign air transportation to remove a discrimination in its rate structure if, after notice and hearing, such a discrimination is found to exist. Thus, the Board has no summary power to stop any carrier in foreign air transportation from placing into effect any rate, fare, or practice it elects; and even after full hearing, its power to order any change is restricted to the limited area of removing discrimination.

Over the years, the United States together with other nations has participated in conferences and negotiations seeking the orderly development of international air services. However, in negotiations in which efforts have been made to improve the position of the United States in meeting foreign air transportation competition, this Government has found on numerous occasions that its international bargaining power has been restricted by the limited authority over rates and practices in foreign air transportation which is now possessed by the Board.

The increased necessity for vesting in the Civil Aeronautics Board the power to regulate rates and practices in foreign air transportation arises in part from a course that the bilateral air transport agreements with foreign countries have taken in recent years. Foreign countries, like the United States, assert complete national sovereignty in respect of the air space overlying their respective territories. Such claims have been internationally recognized in the Convention on International Civil Aviation drawn up at Chicago in December 1944. Under the provisions of that convention, each contracting

country retains complete freedom of action with respect to the admission into its territory of foreign flag scheduled air lines.

One of the conditions which many of the countries have placed on the entry into their territories of American flag carriers is that passenger and cargo rates must be fixed at fair and reasonable levels. The United States has found itself handicapped in the past in entering into negotiations with foreign governments because of the lack of statutory power in the Civil Aeronautics Board to require that United States air carriers operating into foreign countries establish just and reasonable rates and practices. If the act is amended as proposed, the United States could fully undertake the obligation to see to it that its carriers adhere to a reasonable rate structure.

In the absence of such power in the Board, foreign countries have insisted on retaining the summary right to prevent U.S. carriers from operating into their territory at any rate which they deem to be unfair or unreasonable. While provision is made in the various agreements to which the United States has become a party for the review of such a decision on the part of a foreign country by an arbitral tribunal or by the International Civil Aviation Organization, the foreign country has uniformly retained the right to prevent operations at the disputed rate pending such review. If the act were amended as proposed so as to give the Board the power to prescribe the rates and practices of air carriers in foreign air transportation, it is believed that foreign countries would be willing to permit the continued operation of an American carrier at the rates determined by the Board, even where such rates were thought by the foreign country to be unreasonably high or low, pending final review by an arbitral tribunal or by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The consequence of the Board's lack of authority under present law is that U.S. air carriers, far from being independent to fix whatever rates they choose, are subject to almost complete rate control by the foreign countries to which they operate. The enactment of rate control legislation would bring into force benefits in the negotiating of bilateral agreements by placing such control in large part in the hands of the U.S. Government. In effect, passage of this legislation would give the United States control over the rates and practices of our carriers which is now in foreign hands.

Likewise, passage of this legislation would give the United States the same degree of control over the rates and practices of foreign air carriers operating into the U.S. territory as the foreign countries now have in respect of the rates and practices of U.S. air carriers which fly into their territories, namely, the right to insist that the passenger and cargo rates of such foreign air carriers operating into U.S. territory be fixed at fair and reasonable levels and that the practices or conditions of carriage which are embodied in the tariffs, waybills, and tickets of such foreign air carriers be free from objectionable provisions.

The Board believes that there is no basis for a contention that bringing the Board's statutory authority over international rates and practices on a par with that of other governments will derogate or be in variance from this country's support of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) as the primary instrument for establishing and maintaining a sound and fair rate structure for international air services. On the contrary, the Board believes that the possession of effective regulatory power over international air rates and practices by the respective governments is the only proper basis for the delegation of initial ratemaking powers to an organization of international air carriers and that neither the United States nor any other government should delegate or has delegated to IATA the governmental responsibility of insuring that the international rate structure is fair to the traveling and shipping public and in other respects is in the public interest. In summary, the Board believes that effective government control over the international rate structure, rather than being an obstacle to multilateral air carrier action through IATA, is essential to the proper and successful operation of the carriers' multilateral rate machinery. In this connection, it is pointed out that need for Board regulatory action might arise from failure of IATA to achieve agreement in respect of certain rates and practices, from governmental disapproval of IATA agreements, and also from rate actions by air carriers not members of IATA.

For the reasons outlined above the Board believes that it should be given authority over rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation. However, while under section 1002(d) the Board's function to determine and prescribe rates and practices in interstate and oversea air transportation is mandatory in that it must be exercised if on the basis of a record made in a quasi-judicial proceeding the Board is of the opinion that a rate or practice is contrary to statutory standard, greater flexibility is required in the national interest in the field of international air transportation. Such additional flexibility is assured by stating the Board's rate-fixing powers in foreign air transportation in a separate subsection which uses discretionary rather than mandatory terms.

The Board should also be given the same discretionary power to suspend the rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation pending hearing as it now has in respect of domestic transportation. Most foreign governments have the power to suspend U.S. air carrier rates, and the United States should not voluntarily continue to tie its own hands so as to prevent it from taking like action where it is needed in the public interest.

In addition to giving the Board discretionary power to control the rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, the proposed bill makes other changes affecting the duties and obligations of air carriers and affecting the Board's regulatory authority in respect of such duties and obligations. Specifically, the provisions of subsection 1002(i) of the act, giving the Board power to prescribe through services and joint rates, are made applicable to air carriers in interstate, oversea, and foreign air transportation. These changes, affecting air carriers but not foreign air carriers, are considered desirable by the Board for the reason that the Board believes that air carriers should be subject to the same duties and obligations and regulatory control in respect of services, rates, and divisions in foreign air transportation as in interstate and oversea air transportation.

There is attached a section-by-section analysis of the proposed bill and a comparison with existing law.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

1. Section 1 of the bill amends subsection (d) of section 1002 of the act, which gives the Board authority to prescribe rates and practices of air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation, with a proviso that as to oversea air transportation the Board may prescribe only a "just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum rate, fare, or charge," by changing by the colon following the word "effective" to a period and striking out the following: "Provided, That as to rates, fares, and charges for overseas transportation, the Board shall determine and prescribe only a just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum rate, fare or charge." The effect of the above changes is to give the Board the same authority to prescribe the rates and practices of air carriers in oversea transportation as the Board now has in respect of interstate transportation. The elimination of the proviso is necessary to prevent the anomaly of the Board's having less authority over rates and practices in oversea air transportation than in foreign air transportation.

2. Section 2 of the bill amends subsection (e) of section 1002 by inserting the words "foreign air carrier" and "foreign air carriers" after the words "air carrier" and "air carriers" where they appear in the subsection. Section 1002(e) constitutes the rule of ratemaking and sets forth various criteria for the determination, inter alia, of the justness and reasonableness of rates and fares for the transportation by air of persons and property.

Since other sections of the bill confer upon the Board the power to pass upon the justness and reasonableness of foreign air carrier rates, it is appropriate to make the standards of section 1002(e) applicable to foreign air carriers as well as U.S. flag carriers. This is accomplished by section 3 of the bill. In this connection it may be noted that under section 1102 of the act, the Board is directed to exercise and perform its powers and duties consistently with any obligation assumed by the United States in any treaty, convention, or agreement, and to take into consideration any applicable laws and requirements of foreign countries.

3. Section 3 of the bill amends subsection (*l*) of section 1002 of the act. This subsection now permits the Board to exercise the limited power of ordering an air carrier or a foreign air carrier to remove a discrimination, preference or prejudice in its foreign air transportation rate structure if, after notice and hearing, such a discrimination, preference or prejudice is found to exist. It is predicated upon the fact that the Board does not now have the power to otherwise regulate the rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation. It therefore has been rewritten to grant the Board the power to hold a hearing in respect to the question whether a rate or practice in foreign air transportation is unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory or preferential. In case upon such a hearing the Board is of the opinion that the rate or practice is contrary to statutory standards, the Board is given discretionary authority to alter the rate or practice to the extent necessary to correct unreasonableness or discrimination, and to order discontinuation thereof by the carrier. The Board also has further discretion to prescribe the lawful practice or rate, or the maximum and/or minimum of the rate.

4. Section 4 of the bill amends subsection (g) of section 1002 of the act, which gives the Board power to suspend the rates and practices of air carriers in interstate and oversea air transportation pending hearing, (1) by striking out the words "interstate or overseas," (2) by changing the parenthetical phrase following the word "joint" to read "(between air carriers, between foreign air carriers, or between air carriers and foreign air carriers)," and (3) by inserting following the words "air carrier" wherever they appear in the subsection the words "or foreign air carrier." The effect of the above changes is to give the Board the same authority to suspend the rates and practices of an air carrier or foreign air carrier in foreign air transportation pending hearing as the Board now has in interstate and oversea air transportation. By striking the words "interstate and overseas" the Board is given authority to suspend pending hearing the operation of

any tariff filed by an air carrier, and this would include tariffs to be effective in foreign as well as in interstate and oversea air transportation. The change in the parenthetical phrase is necessary to give the Board suspension authority in respect of joint rates between air carriers and foreign air carriers and between foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation as well as between air carriers. By inserting the words "or foreign air carrier" following the words "air carrier" wherever they appear in the subsection, the Board is given the authority to suspend the rates and practices of foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation pending hearing.

5. Section 5 of the bill amends subsection (i) of section 1002 of the act, which gives the Board power to prescribe through services and joint rates, by inserting the words "for air carriers" after the word "establish," by striking out the words "interstate or overseas," and by changing the colon following the word "operated" to a period and striking out the following: *"Provided,* That as to joint rates, fares, and charges for overseas transportation the Board shall determine and prescribe only just and reasonable maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum joint rates, fares, or charges." The effect of inserting the words "for air carriers" and of striking the words "interstate or overseas" is to make the provisions of the subsection applicable to air carriers in interstate, oversea, and foreign air transportation but not to foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation. The elimination of the proviso is necessary to prevent the anomaly of the Board's having less authority to establish through service and joint rates in oversea air transportation than in foreign air transportation.

6. Section 6 of the bill provides that the changes made in the act shall take effect 90 days after enactment of the legislation.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO CERTAIN PRACTICES REGARDING PASSENGER TICKET SALES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit certain practices regarding passenger ticket sales and reservations. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 959) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit certain practices regarding passenger ticket sales and reservations, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to protect the right of the public to purchase airline tickets at the lawful tariff rates and to prevent the purchase of tickets by brokers or other persons with the intent of selling the tickets to travelers at a premium.

Section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act prohibits carriers from charging more or less than the effective tariff rate. This provision is supplemented by section 902(d) specifically penalizing ticket agents as well as carriers, or the personnel or representatives thereof, for rebating or charging less. There is no parallel penalty against ticket agents or persons other than carriers for scalping—charging more. To deter scalping effectively, passage of such a penalty provision is necessary.

The practice of ticket scalping, so called, has grown to such an extent as to constitute a substantial burden on the orderly development of interstate air transportation. The adverse effects of the practice are particularly evident on the most heavily traveled routes, such as that between New York and Miami. However, with the increasing demand for air transportation throughout the country, it may be expected that these practices will increase, to the expense and annoyance of the traveling public, unless effective measures are taken to put a stop to them.

A common pattern of ticket scalping, as revealed by investigations conducted by the Board's Bureau of Enforcement, is for an individual to make ticket reservations in anticipation of heavy travel demand. As it is required that the prospective passengers' names be given, the tickets are reserved in the name of a person not intending to use the space. Upon being approached for assistance in obtaining travel accommodations by a bona fide prospective passenger, the individual picks up one of the tickets he has received, and delivers it to the prospective passenger, charging a substantial premium or gratuity, commonly ranging from $5 to $50. The purchaser is advised, of course, that he must travel under the name of a person who did not intend to use the space which appears on the ticket. The individuals engaging in these ticket selling practices are frequently hotel employees and others similarly situated to come in frequent contact with travelers.

Certain travel agencies themselves may knowingly issue tickets to persons with names other than those in which the space was previously reserved, not necessarily to extract a premium price from the purchaser, but to get the commissions paid them by carriers for the ticket sales. The space reservations may actually have been made in fictitious names or may have been made for people later deciding not to buy the space reserved.

It is also essential that the above amendment be supplemented by a prohibition against purposely making reservations in the name of a person not intending to use the space or selling tickets knowing that they were issued for the use of a person other than the buyer or were issued pursuant to a reservation made for the use of a person other than the buyer. This prohibition, coupled with a penalty, would further deter scalping schemes at inception and prevent a few unscrupulous individuals from monopolizing unsold space which should always be available through any legitimate agency or the carrier to those seeking accommodations.

There would seem to be no doubt that the recommended provisions would go far to prevent scalping and the usurpation of space which causes an undue burden on an anxious public seeking to obtain air travel accommodations. Federal legislation is needed to provide an effective remedy for a general situation which cannot be adequately corrected by the carriers, by local enforcement of such State statutes or ordinances as are in effect, or by the Board under its present authority.

USE OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD RECORDS, RELATING TO AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 960) relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Pursuant to sections 701 and 702 of the Federal Aviation Act, the Civil Aeronautics Board is charged with the responsibility for investigating and determining the probable cause of accidents involving civil aircraft and making reports concerning such accidents. This function is discharged in large measure by expert accident investigators employed by the Board's Bureau of Safety. Written reports are prepared by these investigators on all accidents investigated by them, which embody their factual observations as well as their conclusions and these reports are submitted to the Board. The accident investigators also testify in the Board's accident investigation hearings.

The purposes of the proposed amendment to the Federal Aviation Act are (1) to preserve the integrity of the Board's function to determine the probable cause of accidents involving aircraft; (2) to this end, to prevent the kind of involvement of the Board and its personnel in litigation arising from such accidents which would result from their testifying as expert witnesses or from the use in such litigation of Board reports or records; and (3) to make factual information pertaining to accidents developed by Board personnel, available to litigants to the extent it is not reasonably available elsewhere and in the manner which reduces to a minimum the time Board personnel are kept away from their regular duties.

These purposes are fully consistent with established public policy and with the underlying intent of the enabling statute. Undesirable involvement of the Board or its personnel in the issues arising in litigation would result from their giving expert or opinion testimony. The opinions of these experts, upon which the Board relies heavily in making its findings as to probable cause and recommendations in accident reports, are so inextricably entwined with the report that this basic purpose would be defeated were such opinion testimony permitted. Furthermore, the use of Board investigators as experts to give opinion testimony in civil suits between private parties would impose a serious burden on the Board's investigative staff, and would seriously interfere with the functioning of the Board's investigative processes. The proposed amendment would not impinge upon the policy of the law to make factual information and proof available to litigants who need it, but would reconcile that policy with the interest of the Government not to have the time and efforts of persons on the public payroll unnecessarily diverted from their tasks. The Board and its personnel would be assured of uniform rules and procedures governing their testimonial duties in accident litigation, which would enable

the Board to more reliably plan the use of its limited staff of accident investigation experts.

The need for this legislation is shown by experience. Present section 701(e), continued without change from section 701(e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, does not explicitly prohibit expert testimony by Board personnel and does not regulate the taking of their factual testimony. The Board has promulgated regulations which express the principles of the proposed legislation in this respect, 14 CFR 331.3, but they have not always proved effective.

It should be pointed out that the proposed legislation constitutes a minimum program. Thus this legislation would not overrule those court decisions which have permitted use of the transcript of testimony in the Board's accident investigation hearings for purposes of cross-examination in private litigation, nor those which have held that accident reports made to the Board by operators of aircraft are not privileged. The Board at this time is limiting its legislative proposal to the areas of the most pressing need.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

TITLE VII—AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION; ACCIDENTS INVOLVING CIVIL AIRCRAFT

Use of Board records and testimony of Board personnel as evidence

SEC. 701. (e) [No part of any report or reports of the Board relating to any accident or the investigation thereof, shall be admitted as evidence or used in any suit or action for damages growing out of any matter mentioned in such report or reports.] "Those portions of accident investigation records, reports or notes of the Board or its personnel which contain expressions of opinion or expert evaluation of the facts, shall not be admitted as evidence or used in any action or other proceeding growing out of any such accident. Members or employees of the Board shall not give expert or opinion testimony concerning such accidents in any such action or proceeding. Factual testimony of Board personnel on matters observed in accident investigation shall be required only where the Board, or the court before which an action or proceeding is pending, determines that the evidence is not reasonably available by other means. If required, such testimony shall be taken by deposition upon oral examination or written interrogatories pursuant to regulations issued by the Board. Subpenas for personal appearance of such personnel at a trial shall be served on them only upon leave granted by the court." (Old matter to be deleted in black brackets, new matter in quotes.)

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 407 OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 961) to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act provides that the Board shall have access to all accounts, records, and memoranda kept by air carriers and may inspect and examine the same. However, under the language of the section as written there is doubt as to the authority of the Board to examine the books and records of persons controlled by an air carrier, under common control with an air carrier, or of service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers. The activities of such persons and organizations are known to the Board in varying degrees from information presented at hearings and common carrier pooling agreements relating thereto submitted to the Board for approval. The Board has no means of determining the accuracy of financial data relating to such persons included in submissions to it, and, specifically, of compliance with the terms of agreements and the equity of formulae included therein.

The legislation herein proposed would implement the recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States contained on pages 3 and 91 of his "Audit Report to the Congress of the United States, Civil Aeronautics Board, October 1955."

Accordingly, the Board believes that section 407(e) should be amended to make it clear that the Board's authority under section 407 embraces persons controlled by an air carrier, under common control with an air carrier, and service organizations controlled by groups of air carriers.

There is attached a detailed analysis of the proposed amendments and a comparison with existing law.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 407 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act provides for the filing of reports, the prescription by the Board of the forms of accounts, and for the inspection of accounts and other records of air carriers by the Board. In addition, section 407(e) provides that "the provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5 (8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended."

Thus the provisions of this sections are limited in application to (1) air carriers, (2) persons having control over an air carrier, and (3) persons affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section 5(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act. "Affiliates," as defined in "section 5(8)," now section 5(6), of the Interstate Commerce Act does not specifically make reference to persons controlled by an air carrier, persons under common control with an air carrier, or to associations controlled by groups of air carriers. Consequently, there is doubt as to whether the provisions of section 407(e) extend to such persons or associations.

It is proposed to clarify this matter by amending the last sentence of section 407(e) of the Federal Aviation Act as heretofore indicated.

Precedent for the enactment of legislation along the lines here recommended may be found in the action taken by Congress relative to the auditing and inspection powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Originally, the accounting and inspection provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to regulation of railroads extended only to rail carriers. In November 1938 the Interstate Commerce Commission recommended to the Congress that noncarrier railroad subsidiaries be brought within its jurisdiction with respect to accounting. See the 52d Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, page 121. In 1940 and 1949 the Interstate Commerce Act was amended so as to greatly enlarge the scope of section 20(5) relating to the keeping of accounts and their inspection. The Commission was given authority to inspect the accounts of "carriers, lessors, and associations," and to inspect the accounts of "any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any such carrier." Further, "association" was defined in section 20(8) to mean "an association or organization maintained by or in the interest of any group of carriers subject to this part which performs any service, or engages in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act."

These changes were brought about, in part, at least, as a consequence of the decision of the Commission in *Refrigeration Charges on Fruits, etc., from the South* (151 ICC Reports, pp. 649, 651, 693 (1929)). That case involved the Fruit Growers' Express Co., which was not a common carrier, but all of its stock was owned by 18 railroads. The Commission stated that the express company was not subject to its jurisdiction, and further stated on page 693:

"We are further of the opinion that when the carriers perform a part of their transportation service through a separate agency having a monopoly and not subject to the restraint of competition, they should, as they do here, control that agency, but its accounts and the contracts which it makes with the carriers should be subject to our jurisdiction. The investigation which we have made in this proceeding is essential to the determination of reasonable charges for a special service which by statute has been included in the transportation duties of respondents. Yet this investigation, so far as it involves the accounts and records of the express company, has been made as a matter of favor. Under the present law, we have no access to the records of that company which we could have enforced as a matter of legal right. Plainly, this is an indefensible situation which ought not to be permitted to continue."

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

TITLE IV—AIR CARRIER ECONOMIC REGULATION

Accounts, records, and reports

Inspection of Accounts and Property

SEC. 407(e). The Board shall at all times have access to all lands, buildings, and equipment of any carrier and to all accounts, records, and memoranda, including all documents, papers, and correspondence, now or hereafter existing, and kept or required to be kept by air carrier; and it may employ special agents or auditors, who shall have authority under the orders of the Board to inspect and examine any and all such lands, buildings, equipment, accounts, records, and memoranda. The provisions of this section shall apply, to the extent found by the Board to be reasonably necessary for the administration of this act, to persons having control over any air carrier, or affiliated with any air carrier within the meaning of section [5(8)] "5(6)" of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, "to persons controlled by, or under common control with, any air carrier, and to associations or organizations maintained by or in the interest of any group of air carriers which perform any service, or engage in any activities, in connection with any traffic, transportation, or facilities subject to this act." (Old matter to be deleted in black brackets; new matter in quotes.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO AID FOR CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD IN INVESTIGATION OF AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 962) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation would amend the Federal Aviation Act to facilitate the investigation of aircraft accidents by providing express statutory authority in the act, authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Board to (1) examine and test to the extent necessary all component parts of the aircraft and property aboard the aircraft, (2) examine and conduct autopsies or such other tests as may be necessary in the case of any fatal accident, (3) request assistance of any medical agency of the United States in the conduct of medical examinations and tests necessary to the investigation of the accident, and (4) request assistance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any investigatory agency of the United States with respect to an investigation of the activities of any person in connection with the accident. It would also (5) provide criminal penalties for removing, concealing, or withholding any part of a civil aircraft involved in an accident, or any property aboard the aircraft, and (6) authorize the Board, on behalf of the United States, where appropriate, to accept gifts of money, other personal property, and services in connection with the investigation of any accident.

Section 701(a) of the Federal Aviation Act states that it shall be the duty of the Board to investigate aircraft accidents involving civil aircraft and report the facts, conditions and circumstances relating to each accident and the probable cause thereof. In order to carry out this duty, the above mentioned and other essential accident investigation activities are conducted under the authority of this section in conjunction with the general grant of authority contained in section 204 of the act which provides that the Board is empowered to perform such acts and to conduct such investigations as it shall deem necessary to perform its duties under the act. In the opinion of the Board, the investigation of aircraft accidents would be facilitated if the activities referred to above were expressly authorized in the act. It should be noted that there already is some express authority in section 701 (b) and (d) of the act with regard to engaging persons for temporary service without regard to civil service laws, and power to prevent disturbance of civil aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, or appliances affected or involved in an accident in air commerce.

In conducting an investigation to determine the probable cause of an aircraft accident, it sometimes is necessary to examine and test the property of passengers and crew members, as well as the remains of any persons who may have died in the accident.

For example, when the preliminary investigation of an accident indicates that an explosion may have taken place within the aircraft prior to ground impact, it may be necessary to make certain examinations and tests of property and the remains of persons aboard the aircraft for substances which would indicate an explosion not connected with the operation of the aircraft.

With regard to post mortem examinations, another such instance occurs when there are early indications that crew members were incapacitated at the time of the accident. Such examinations may be necessary to determine whether excessive amounts of carbon monoxide are present in the bodies of the occupants of the aircraft. A positive finding could indicate a malfunctioning heater or some other mechanical failure which would allow poisonous carbon monoxide from the engines to enter the passenger compartment and the cockpit of the aircraft. Inasmuch as such examinations and tests may require temporary possession of private property, destruction of private property, and temporary retention of the remains of deceased persons involved in aircraft accidents, the Board believes that it would be helpful to have these activities conducted under express authority in the act. In connection with post mortem examinations, the Board should also be authorized to request any medical agency of the United States to examine and conduct such tests of the remains of persons killed in aircraft accidents as may be necessary to aid the Board since it does not have its own qualified personnel or facilities to make such examinations and tests.

With respect to requesting the assistance of Federal investigatory agencies, the Board requests statutory clarification by the Congress of the Board's power to request the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any investigatory or intelligence agency of the United States to conduct an investigation of the activities of any person in connection with an accident upon the request of the Board, although at the time of the request there may be no evidence to indicate that a crime has been committed. For example, in the case of midair destruction of an aircraft, the Board may suspect that explosives caused the aircraft to disintegrate and desire certain investigations to be made long before any tangible evidence is found during the course of the investigation that this may have been the case and that a crime has been committed. The Board believes that it would be helpful if the relationship and the authority to request this type of investigation of any investigatory or intelligence agency of the United States were to be expressly provided for by statute.

Souvenir hunters often carry off parts of the aircraft wreckage which may be vital to the investigation. Although such persons are now subject to civil penalties pursuant to section 901 of the Federal Aviation Act for violation of the provisions of part 320 of the Board's Safety Investigation Regulations, the Board believes that the act should be amended to provide criminal penalties in order to deter any person from removing, concealing, or withholding without authority any part of any aircraft which is involved in an accident, or any property which may have been aboard the aircraft, including the belongings of the passengers and crew members. In the opinion of the Board, the enactment of such legislation would enable the Board to more effectively cope with this troublesome problem which it encounters in nearly every accident investigation.

The Board believes that it should also be given the express power to accept gifts of money, other personal property, or of services, in connection with accident investigations where the Board now receives assistance by way of services freely given and other forms of aid.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

SECTIONS 203, 701, 902, AND 1105 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Authorization of expenditures and travel

General Authority

SEC. 203. (a) * * *

* * * * *

Acceptance of Donations

(c) The Board, on behalf of the United States, is authorized, where appropriate, to accept any conditional or unconditional gift or donation of money or personal property, or of services for the purposes of its functions under title VII of this act.

Accidents involving civil aircraft

General Duties

SEC. 701. (a) * * *

* * * * *

Conduct of Investigations

(c) In conducting any hearing or investigation, any member of the Board or any officer or employee of the Board or any person engaged or secured under subsection (b) shall have the same powers as the Board has with respect to hearings or investigations conducted by it. In carrying out its duties under this title, the Board is authorized to examine and test to the extent necessary any civil aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, or property aboard an aircraft, affected by, or involved in, an accident in air commerce. In the case of any fatal accident, the Board is authorized to examine the remains of any deceased person aboard the aircraft and to conduct autopsies or such other tests thereof as may be necessary to the investigation of the accident.

Aircraft

(d) Any civil aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, or property aboard an aircraft, affected by, or involved in, an accident in air commerce, shall be preserved in accordance with, and shall not be moved except in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Board.

Criminal penalties

General

SEC. 902. (a) * * *

* * * * *

Interference With Aircraft Accident Investigation: (i) Any person who knowingly and without authority removes, conceals, or withholds any part of a civil aircraft involved in an accident, or any property which is aboard such aircraft at the time of the accident, shall be subject to a fine of no less than $100 nor more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

Cooperation with Government agencies

SEC. 1105. The Board and the Administrator may avail themselves of the assistance of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and any research or technical agency of the United States on matters relating to aircraft fuel and oil and to the design, materials, workmanship, construction, performance, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, and air navigation facilities. The Board may avail itself of the assistance of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of any investigatory or intelligence agency of the United States in the investigation of

the activities of any person in connection with an aircraft accident. The Board may avail itself of the assistance of any medical agency of the United States in the conduct of such autopsies or tests on the remains of deceased persons aboard the aircraft as may be necessary to aid the Board in the investigation of an aircraft accident.

CLARIFICATION OF POWERS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD IN CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect to consolidation of certain proceedings. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 963) to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

One of the most persistent problems the Board has encountered, particularly in large area route proceedings, has been the contention of applicants at the consolidation stage, based on the doctrine of *Ashbacker Radio Corp.* v. *F.C.C.* (326 U.S. 327 (1945)) that they are entitled as a matter of legal right to consolidation of particular applications. Such an applicant usually asserts that the grant of an application which the Board proposes to hear will preclude a subsequent grant of its own application, and that the Board therefore must also hear its application in the proceeding and accord it comparative consideration. In many instances in the past, a refusal by the Board to consolidate has resulted in an appeal to the courts from the consolidation order, with a request that the court stay further procedural steps in the Board proceeding pending disposition of the petition for review.

The Board recognizes that essential fairness sometimes requires contemporaneous consideration of applications and that consolidation for hearing is often the most expedient means for achieving this end. We have, however, taken the position that failure to consolidate applications for hearing does not in and of itself result in any deprivation of right, and that, in any event, legal error in consolidation, like any other that may be committed in the course of a particular case, is not judicially reviewable except as an incident to judicial review of the Board's final order entered at the conclusion of the proceeding.

It is believed that legislation is needed which will (1) recognize the Board's right, in its sound discretion, to hear particular applications individually or in conjunction with others, (2) provide that any judicial review of alleged efforts in consolidation can be obtained only at the conclusion of a proceeding, (3) provide that the Board shall not be required to hold, prior to a hearing on the merits, a preliminary hearing on consolidation, and (4) provide that the burden of establishing that applications should be consolidated for hearing or given contemporaneous consideration shall be on the person making request therefor.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO SEPARATION OF SUBSIDY AND AIRMAIL RATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 964) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to eliminate the confusion which still arises in the public mind as to the difference between subsidy and service mail pay and to create greater administrative flexibility and other technical advantages in the administration of the Federal Aviation Act.

Under existing law the establishment and payment of compensatory rates for the carriage of airmail are merged in section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act with the establishment and payment of subsidy to air carriers operating under certificates authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft. Although Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953 (67 Stat. 644, effective Oct. 1, 1953) and the incorporation of the substance thereof in section 406(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 accomplished a major part of the objectives of subsidy separation, by placing responsibility for subsidy payment in the agency which determines the subsidies and by enabling Congress and the President to maintain effective review of the subsidy program, there still exists some misapprehension in the mind of the general public as to the distinction between payment in compensation for the service of transporting the mail and payment in support of the development of air transportation. Legislative separation will help to eliminate this misunderstanding. Under the proposed legislation, in place of fixing, determining, and publishing a single rate which includes an element to be paid by the Postmaster General as service pay and an element to be paid by the Board as subsidy, a separate subsidy rate exclusive of the compensatory pay element would be fixed, determined, and published by the Board for payment by the Board.[1]

It should be noted that the proposed legislation does not alter the basic national policy of promoting the sound development of air transportation through Federal aid, nor does the legislation change the aggregate amount of revenue for which any airline is eligible. Moreover, the legislation enhances the opportunity for congressional and public review both of subsidy rates and of service rates. See message from the President of the United States transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953, House Document No. 160, 83d Congress, 1st session.

To be emphasized is the fact that no attempt has been made to affect existing law otherwise than in the specific respects stated above. To that end, the language of the new statutory provision closely parallels the language of section 406 of the act. However, it has been deemed desirable to make a clarifying change by substituting for the words "each holder of a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by air" in section 406(a) the words "air carrier authorized to transport mail by air." Inasmuch as the Board has construed the present provision of section 406(a) authorizing it to fix service rates for the transportation of mail to include carriers not holders of certificates, the language of the section has been amended to clarify this point. In the Board's opinion this will not add to the Board's powers but will recognize the practice which prevails under this section.

By retaining the present pattern of section 406 the interpretation and standards which have governed the old section 406 will continue to be generally applicable to the amended provision.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 406 OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT

1. Present section 406(a): This is the basic provision authorizing the Board to fix reasonable rates of compensation for the transportation of mail by aircraft. The Board has construed this provision as authorizing it to fix such rates for carriers authorized to transport mail by exemption order as well as carriers holding certificates. The only change proposed in this subsection is to delete the words "holder of a certificate authorizing the transportation of" and inserting in lieu thereof "air carrier authorized to transport." The purpose of this amendment is not to enlarge the Board's powers but to give recognition to the practice which prevails under this section. In addition, language from present subsection (b) is added to make subsection (a) complete in itself as the provision under which service mail pay is to be determined and paid.

2. Present section 406(b): This is the provision under which subsidy is now paid to the air carriers. It also specifies certain factors which the Board shall take into consideration in fixing the service mail rate as well. Under this provision the Board has applied the so-called "cost standard." That part of section 406(b) which provides for subsidy compensation in addition to the service rate has in substance been transferred to the proposed new section 406(b) entitled "Subsidy for Essential Aircraft Operation." This new section provides for determination of subsidy as a separate matter. It empowers the Board to fix reasonable rates providing subsidy for any air carrier operating under a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft. To the extent applicable, provisions of present sections 406 (a), (b), and (c) have been incorporated. Thus existing standards, interpretations and practices in determining "need" under present section 406(b) will continue to be applicable.

The "need" clause in the present section 406(b) is broken into two parts. The first part provides for the consideration of "need" for compensation for the transportation of mail sufficient to insure the performance of such service. This provision is similar to the normal ratemaking standard found in public utility statutes and, standing alone, would not authorize the inclusion of a subsidy element in mail rates. (See the Board's

[1] Under existing law, the Board now fixes separate compensatory rates for payment by the Postmaster General, but, in order to arrive at the amount of the subsidy payments, the Board must fix, determine, and publish a single, inclusive rate and deduct the amounts paid by the Postmaster General.

decision in Pan American Airways Co. (of Delaware)—Mail Rates, 1 C.A.A. 220, 252 (1939).) However, if this part of the "need" clause were included in the new section 406(a) as a ratemaking standard, it is conceivable that the language could be construed as granting the Board authority to include subsidy support in service mail rates. In order to clarify the intention not to grant such authority and inasmuch as the provision is not applicable to subsidy, it has been deleted. The second part of the "need" clause, under which subsidy is paid is continued in the new section 406(b) without change.

3. Present section 406(c): The provisions of this section have been incorporated in new sections 406(a) and 406(b).

4. Present section 406(d): This has been carried over substantially unchanged, but has been renumbered section 406(c).

5. Present section 406(e): This has been carried over substantially unchanged, but has been renumbered section 406(d).

6. New section 406(e): This provides that the amendments shall become effective 60 days after enactment, but only with respect to services rendered on and after such date. Provision is made for carrying over pending rates until superseded by new rates under the amended provisions.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

TITLE IV—AIR CARRIER ECONOMIC REGULATION

Rates for transportation of mail and subsidy for essential aircraft operation

Authority to Fix Compensatory Mail Rates

SEC. 406. (a) The Board is empowered and directed, upon its own initiative or upon petition of the Postmaster General or an air carrier, (1) to fix and determine from time to time, after notice and hearing, the fair and reasonable rates of compensation for the transportation of mail by aircraft, the facilities used and useful therefor, and the services connected therewith (including the transportation of mail by an air carrier by other means than aircraft whenever such transportation is incidental to the transportation of mail by aircraft or is made necessary by conditions of emergency arising from aircraft operation), by each [holder of a certificate authorizing the transportation of] "air carrier authorized to transport" mail by aircraft, and to make such rates effective from such date as it shall determine to be proper; (2) to prescribe the method or methods, by aircraft-mile, pound-mile, weight, space, or any combination thereof, or otherwise, for ascertaining such rates of compensation for each air carrier or class of air carriers; and (3) to publish the same[.] "; and the rates so fixed and determined shall be paid by the Postmaster General from appropriations for the transportation of mail by aircraft. In fixing and determining fair and reasonable rates of compensation under this subsection, the Board, considering the conditions peculiar to transportation by aircraft and to the particular air carrier or class of air carriers, may fix different rates for different air carriers or classes of air carriers, and different classes of service. In determining the rate in each case, the Board shall take into consideration, among other factors, (1) the condition that such air carriers may hold and operate under certificates authorizing the carriage of mail only by providing necessary and adequate facilities and services for the transportation of mail, and (2) such standards respecting the character and quality of service to be rendered by air carriers as may be prescribed by or pursuant to law."

[Ratemaking Elements]

Subsidy for Essential Aircraft Operation

(b) "The Board is empowered and directed, upon its own initiative, or upon the petition of any air carrier holding and operating under a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft (1) to fix and determine from time to time, after notice and hearing, the fair and reasonable rates providing subsidy for such carrier, and to make such rates effective from such date as it shall determine to be proper; (2) to prescribe the method or methods, by aircraft-mile, pound-mile, weight, space, or any combination thereof or otherwise, for ascertaining such rates of subsidy for each air carrier or class of air carriers; and (3) to publish the same; and the rates so fixed and determined shall be paid by the Board from funds appropriated to the Board for this purpose." In fixing and determining fair and reasonable rates [of compensation] "providing subsidy" under this "sub"section, the Board, considering the conditions peculiar to transportation by aircraft and to the particular air carrier or class of air carriers, may fix different rates for different air carriers or classes of air carriers, and different classes of service: [In determining the rate in each case, the Board] "and" shall take into consideration, among other factors, [(1) the condition that such air carriers may hold and operate under certificates authorizing the carriage of mail only by providing necessary and adequate facilities and service for the transportation of mail; (2)] such standards respecting the character and quality of service to be rendered by air carriers as may be prescribed by or pursuant to law [;] "," and the need for each [such] air carrier for subsidy" compensation [for the transportation of mail] sufficient "," [to insure the performance of such service, and] together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense.

[Payment]

[(e) The Postmaster General shall make payments out of appropriations for the transportation of mail by aircraft of so much of the total compensation as is fixed and determined by the Board under this section without regard to clause (3) of subsection (b) of this section. The Board shall make payments of the remainder of the total compensation payable under this section out of appropriations made to the Board for that purpose.]

Treatment of "the" Proceeds of [Disposition] "Sale" of Certain Property

[d] "(c)" In determining the need of an air carrier for "subsidy" compensation, [for the transportation of mail,] and such carrier's other revenue for the purpose of [this] section "406(b)," the Board shall not take into account—

(1) gains derived from the sale or other disposition of flight equipment if (A) the carrier notifies the Board in writing that it has invested or intends to reinvest the gains (less applicable expenses and taxes) derived from such sale or other disposition in flight equipment, and (B) submits evidence in the manner prescribed by the Board that an amount equal to such gains (less applicable expenses and taxes) has been expended for purchase of flight equipment or has been deposited in a special reequipment fund, or (2) losses sustained from the sale or other disposition of flight equipment.

Any amounts so deposited in a reequipment fund as above provided shall be used solely for investment in flight equipment either through payments on account of the purchase price or construction of flight equipment or in retirement of debt contracted for the purchase or construction of flight equipment, and unless so reinvested within such reasonable time as the Board may prescribe, the carrier shall not have the benefit of this [paragraph] "subsection." Amounts so deposited in the reequipment fund shall not be included as part of the carrier's used and useful investment for purposes of section 406(b) until expended as provided above: *Provided*, That the flight equipment in which said gains may be invested shall not include equipment delivered to the carrier prior to April 6, 1956. [*Provided further*, That] The provisions of this subsection shall be effective as to all capital gains or losses realized on and after April 6, 1956, with respect to the sale or other disposition of flight equipment whether or not the Board shall have entered a final order taking account thereof indetermining all other revenue of the air carrier.

Statement of Postmaster General and Carrier

[(e)] "(d)" Any petition for the fixing of fair and reasonable rates [of compensation] under this section shall include a statement of the rate the petitioner believes to be fair and reasonable. The Postmaster General shall introduce as part of the record in all proceedings under [this section] "subsection (a)" a comprehensive statement of all service to be required of the air carrier and such other information in his possession as may be deemed by the Board to be material to the inquiry.

"Effective date

"(e) The provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 406, as amended by the Air Mail Subsidy Separation Act of 1961, shall become effective 60 days after enactment of said Act and shall be applicable only with respect to services rendered on and after such effective date. Each rate fixed and determined pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953 or section 406(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as the fair and reasonable rate to be paid by the Postmaster General which was in force immediately prior to such effective date shall remain in effect on and after such effective date as the rate payable by the Postmaster General under section 406(a), as amended, until superseded by a new rate fixed and determined in accordance with section 406(a), as amended. So much of each rate fixed and determined pursuant to section 406 as is payable by the Board under Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953 or section 406(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in accordance with an order in force immediately prior to the effective date of this Act shall be the rate payable by the Board under section 406(b), as amended, on and after such effective date until superseded by a new rate fixed and determined in accordance with section 406(b), as amended." (Old matter to be deleted in black brackets, new matter in quotes.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 965) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in cer-

tain cases, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The purpose of that part of the proposed amendment which authorizes the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases is to provide a statutory tool for the more effective enforcement of the provisions of title IV of the Federal Aviation Act and of the Board's economic orders and regulations issued thereunder and under section 1002(i) of the act. At the present time violations of these provisions are subject to criminal prosecution under section 902(a) of the act. This sanction is an effective deterrent in serious cases involving knowing and willful violations. With respect to many cases of minor infractions, violations of a less serious nature, and actions falling short of knowing and willful misconduct, the conventional criminal proceedings are either too drastic, too cumbersome, or altogether inappropriate. It is in acting upon these less serious but more numerous violations that the Board believes it could avail itself of the remedy of civil penalty in a constructive manner toward improving the enforcement program.

The availability of the remedy of civil penalty would enable the Board to attack violations speedily and avoid situations such as have existed in the past where offenders have been able to persist in violations during the time required to prosecute a formal proceeding or court action.

The availability of the remedy of civil penalty would afford an adequate remedy as a substitute for criminal action except in serious cases where willful and knowing violations involving the necessary degree of criminal responsibility may be established. Moreover, the imposition of civil penalty would, in many cases, have a salutary effect comparable to that of criminal penalties without subjecting the offender to the serious stigma which follows imposition of criminal penalties.

The modifications proposed in existing section 901(a) of the act have been drafted primarily for the purpose of making available this additional sanction. In regard to section 902(a), such changes have been made to preserve the effectiveness and applicability of the criminal penalties as are made necessary in view of the amendment of section 901(a).

It is also proposed to add to section 901(a) a provision that in the case of a violation of titles IV or VII or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or under section 1002(i), or any term, condition, or limitation of any permit or certificate issued under title IV, if such violation is a continuing one, each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense. This amendment is believed desirable in the interest of effective enforcement of the civil penalty procedure. Section 902(a) already contains such a provision with regard to criminal violations.

There is attached an analysis of the proposed amendments and a comparison of the proposed amendments with existing law.

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 901(A)(1) AND 902(A) OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

The Federal Aviation Act as now written authorizes the imposition of a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000 or each violation of—

1. Any provision of Title III: Powers and Duties of Administrator.

2. Any provision of Title V: Nationality and Ownership of Aircraft.

3. Any provision of Title VI: Safety Regulation.

4. Any provision of Title VII: Aircraft Accident Investigation.

5. Any provision of Title XII: Security Provisions.

6. Any rule, regulation, or order issued under titles III, V, VI, VII, and XII.

7. Any rule or regulation issued by the Postmaster General under the act.

The act further provides that any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Administrator in the case of violations of titles III, V, VI, or XII, or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, and by the Board in the case of violations of title VII, or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or by the Postmaster General in the case of regulations issued by him.

There has been added, and this is the principal purpose of the bill, language to make persons violating the provisions of title IV (Air Carrier Economic Regulation) of the act, and orders, rules, and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board issued thereunder, or violating any term, condition, or limitation of any permit or certificate issued under title IV, subject to a civil penalty of not to exceed $1,000. Air carriers violating Civil Aeronautics Board orders under section 1002(i) of the act will likewise be subject to such civil penalty. The power to compromise such penalties is also included in the proposed bill. In addition, a provision has been added to section 901(a), similar to that already contained in section 902(a), that if such violation is a continuing one, each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense.

The amendment to section 902 is for the purpose of preserving the criminal penalties in section 902 for knowing and willful violations of the economic provisions of the act. Section 902 contains an exception clause which excepts violations for which a penalty "is otherwise herein provided." Economic violations would now also be subject to civil penalties provided for in section 901. If "otherwise herein provided" is interpreted to mean otherwise provided for in the act rather than in the section, the establishment of civil penalties for economic violations in section 901 would place such violations within the exception clause of section 902. To prevent the possibility of such an interpretation, the language in the exception clause has been changed to read "for which no penalty is otherwise provided in this section."

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

TITLE IX—PENALTIES

Civil penalties

Safety, Economic, and Postal Offenses

SEC. 901. (a)(1) Any person who violates (A) any provision of title III, IV, V, VI, VII, or XII of this act, or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or under section 1002(i), or any term, condition, or limitation of any permit or certificate issued under title IV, or (B) any rule or regulation issued by the Postmaster General under this act, shall be subject to a civil penalty of not to exceed $1,000 for each such violation. In the case of a violation of a provision of titles IV or VII or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or under section 1002(i), or any term, condition, or limitation, or any permit or certificate issued under title IV, if such violation is a continuing one, each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to members of the Armed Forces of the United States, or those civilian employees of the Department of Defense who are subject to the provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, while engaged in the performance of their official duties; and the appropriate military authorities shall be responsible for taking any necessary disciplinary action with respect thereto and for making to the Administrator or Board, as appropriate, a timely report of any such action taken.

(2) Any such civil penalty may be compromised by the Administrator in the case of violations of title II, V, VI, or XII, or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, and by the Board in the case of violations of titles IV and VII, or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, or under section 1002(i), or any term, condition, or limitation of any permit or certificate issued under title IV, or the Postmaster General in the case of regulations issued by him. The amount of such penalty, when finally determined, or the amount agreed upon in compromise, may be deducted from any sums owing by the United States to the person charged.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

General

SEC. 902. (a) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any provisions of this act (except titles III, V, VI, VII, and XII), or any order, rule, or regulation issued under any such provisions, or any term, condition, or limitation of any certificate or permit issued under title IV, for which no penalty is otherwise herein provided in this section, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject for the first offense to a fine of not more than $500, and for any subsequent offense to a fine of not more than $2,000. If such violation is a continuing one, each day of such violation shall constitute a separate offense.

PERMISSIBLE WRITING AND PRINTING ON THIRD- AND FOURTH-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing proposed legislation, introduced in the 86th Congress, for the purpose of avoiding the charge of first-class rates for prescriptions affixed to medicines which are sent to patients by U.S. mail. This is a simple bill, designed to meet an acute situation, and is one which will be of great benefit to people who need regular medical care. It will particularly help older persons who regularly take medicines prescribed for them.

In my State of Nebraska, many residents live in the country or in a community separate from their doctors. They do not call for each prescription made by their doctors—the common practice is for the doctor to have it mailed by the local druggist. Once the druggist writes and affixes directions to the prescription, he must mail the package at a first-class rate. Often this rate equals or exceeds the cost of the medicine. This I have been told repeatedly by druggists in my State. Now, if this were a patent medicine, with printed instructions on the package, the parcel would be sent at a fourth-class rate.

When I first became interested in this matter, I endeavored to see whether it could be cured administratively and was advised it would require legislation. My legislation was resisted, originally, on the grounds that to permit it would invite others to seek lesser rates for mailings. This, I submit, is specious reasoning at its zenith.

As I recall, law students are told that a law is a rule of reason promulgated by society for its common good. If that be true, we are as obligated to repeal bad

law as we are to enact good law. Here we have a brilliant opportunity to repeal a bad law. Last year, the Senate adopted this provision as an amendment to other legislation. This year, the Congress must send this repealer to the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 969) to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class matter, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CURTIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TWO-YEAR PERIOD IN WHICH TO REINSTATE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 29 other Senators, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a 2-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance.

Four times in the past 5 years the Senate has passed a measure to allow veterans another opportunity to apply for national service life insurance. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a legislative history of this measure, showing how it has fared in the past.

There being no objection, the legislative history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF PROPOSAL TO ALLOW CERTAIN VETERANS TIME IN WHICH TO APPLY FOR NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

S. 1088 (introduced February 7, 1957, by Senator LONG for himself and 52 others): Adopted as Finance Committee amendment to H.R. 7089 which was reported favorably to Senate, as amended, on June 27, 1956. Senate Report No. 2380.

July 2, 1956: Passed Senate. Rejected in conference.

Conference Report No. 2718.

July 17, 1956: Conference report adopted in House.

July 18, 1956: Conference report adopted in Senate.

H.R. 7089 without Long amendment signed by President on August 1, 1956, and became Public Law 84-881.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

S. 1088 (Introduced February 7, 1957, by Senator LONG for himself and 50 others): Adopted as Finance Committee amendment to H.R. 11382, which was reported favorably to Senate, as amended, on August 4, 1958. Senate Report No. 2170.

August 11, 1958: Passed Senate (without discussion).

August 23, 1958: House accepted Senate amendments with an amendment striking LONG's Senate amendment.

August 23, 1958: Senate concurred in House amendments.

H.R. 11382 without Long amendment signed by President on September 2, 1958, and became Public Law 85-896.

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

S. 1113 (introduced February 18, 1959, by Senator LONG for himself and 55 others); Adopted as Finance Committee amendment to H.R. 7650, which was reported favorably to Senate, as amended, on August 12, 1959. Senate Report No. 666.

August 13, 1959: Passed Senate.

August 14, 1959: House agreed to Senate amendments with an amendment striking LONG's Senate amendment.

August 18, 1959: Senate receded on its Long amendment after statement by Senator LONG withdrawing the amendment with intention of proposing it to another bill for subsequent approval by the House.

H.R. 7650 without Long amendment signed by President on August 28, 1959, and became Public Law 86-211.

S. 2675 (introduced September 10, 1959, by Senator LONG for himself and 55 others): Adopted as Finance Committee amendment to H.R. 11045, which was reported favorably to Senate, as amended, on May 26, 1960. Senate Report No. 1485.

June 2, 1960: Passed Senate by record vote of 75-0.

June 29, 1960: Unanimous consent request to bring bill, as amended by Senate, before House denied because of objection and returned to Speaker's table to await a rule.

Bill died with end of session, no rule having been granted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, with the bill's history before us and an awareness of the change in administrations and in committee membership, my confidence is buoyed that the long-sought proposal will finally become a law. On the previous occasions when the bill passed the Senate, it did so in spite of an adverse recommendation by the Eisenhower administration. The only record vote was taken last year. There were 75 yeas and no nays, with 24 absent Senators on record in favor of the bill, and 1 absent Senator undeclared.

This year, I feel confident that the Kennedy administration will favor the proposed legislation, just as President Kennedy himself favored it when he was a Member of the Senate, having joined as a cosponsor in support of the bill.

In addition, I am hopeful that the enlargement of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives will work in the bill's favor. In every instance, the House of Representatives has stymied action on this measure either because of opposition within the House Veterans' Affairs Committee or the House Rules Committee. The full House membership has never been afforded the chance to vote on the bill. The national service life insurance measure, after it had been passed by the 75-0 record vote in 1960, remained on the Speaker's table when no rule was granted by the House Rules Committee. An increase in the membership of the Rules Committee, I feel, will allow the airing of such matters as national service life insurance before the whole House.

The measure has been opposed consistently by various insurance underwriters. They have maintained that the Government should not get into the insurance business. Contrary to this view, the Government by the terms of the bill introduced today would not undertake any new insurance program that it is not already conducting. On the other hand, as a number of underwriters have pointed out in support of the bill and against the official sentiments of their organizations, such a chance to again subscribe to Government-sponsored insurance might well provide a substantial stimulant to the purchasing of insurance from private companies.

This legislation is favored by millions of veterans who failed initially to take advantage of their national service life insurance opportunities, some because they did not realize its value, others because they did not have the means or the pressing family responsibilities which they have today.

Legislation of this type is strongly supported by the large veterans' organizations; such as, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The bill, as it is being introduced today, is identical to the one passed last year as an amendment to H.R. 11045, with one modification. That modification is to extend from 1 year to 2 the period during which the veterans can take out their insurance. This extension in time is made in answer to numerous requests that I have had, stating that a longer period should be given in order to adequately inform the veterans of their newly acquired eligibility.

Just as in last year's bill, the cost of administering the proposal and of taking any physical examinations necessary will be borne by the veterans, not by the Government. Thus, there will be no cost whatsoever to the Federal Government.

This bill does not make any persons eligible for the insurance who were not at one time eligible. It merely provides another period for eligibility for those who originally qualified and passed up the opportunity or who have permitted their policies to lapse.

Estimates forecast that more than a million veterans' families would be benefited by this legislation. It is my hope that the Senate will once again see fit to act favorably upon this measure and, therefore, grant the benefit to all those families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk 1 week to permit additional cosponsors who may wish to join in the introduction of the measure to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 977) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 2-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove present statutory limitations on the U.S. Geological Survey and permit it to conduct mineral investigations outside the national domain.

Except for special enactments such as the act of August 23, 1958 (5 U.S.C. 485), authorizing participation in scientific ventures in Antarctica and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, authorizations for conducting the work of the Geological Survey generally have been construed to restrict activities of the Bureau to the confines of U.S. territories.

These limitations obviously are unrealistic.

As a result the Geological Survey has been able to participate in oceanographic research only to the extent by which it has been able to draw on authorities and funds of other agencies and such opportunities have been few.

The oceans, it is now known, contain a wealth of mineral resources. The floors of some areas of the ocean are rich in manganese nodules which also contain varying amounts of cobalt, nickel, and other strategic metals.

Many of the major faults which are a cause of earthquakes extend far into the ocean and deserve scientific study by the Geological Survey outside the continental confines of the United States.

Similarly, many beneficial geological features, including potential petroleum fields, extend from the continental United States far into the Continental Shelf.

In order to understand these features it is imperative, it seems to me, that scientific geological studies encompass marine geology as well as terrestrial formation.

There is another aspect to the present statutory limitations on the Geological Survey. Ultimately we expect to reach the moon with a manned space vehicle, and, in the more distant future, we hope also to reach other planets.

Who will be better equipped, in these eventualities, to study and interpret the geological features of these distant bodies than the Geological Survey? Yet today their activities are restricted, with the few exceptions I have designated above, to the national domain.

The Geological Survey has a long history of significant and respected scientific accomplishments in geology. To continue in this fine tradition and to assume its rightful place in the developing national programs in both marine and space sciences, the survey must have the authority to conduct scientific investigations without regard to arbitrary geographical limitations.

This brief bill I am introducing today on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], is only six lines long and will accomplish that purpose. I urge its enactment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 981) to extend certain authority of the Secretary of the Interior, exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, to areas outside the national domain, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF FARES FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I propose to introduce a bill, at the request of D.C. Transit, which has for its objective the elimination of losses suffered by D.C. Transit in the services provided schoolchildren. Legislation having a similar object was considered favorably by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in the 85th Congress, and was so reported to the Senate in Report No. 2333 which accompanied S. 4091 to the floor on August 11, 1958. The legislation, however, failed of enactment at that time. Again in the 86th Congress legislation was introduced to accomplish this purpose through S. 801 and S. 803, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. When it became apparent in the latter days of the second session of the 86th Congress that the proposed legislation would not be able to receive consideration by the other body, these bills were indefinitely postponed by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

I have sketched briefly the history on this legislation for the purpose of showing that the bill I introduce presents no new departure. It is rather an effort to meet a problem which has been recognized for some time.

Briefly, if enacted, the bill would amend existing law by adding a new section, laying upon the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission the duty of making two certifications to the District Commissioners each year. The first such certification would be an amount which is the difference between the total of all reduced fares paid by schoolchildren in a year's time and the amount which would have been paid at regular adult fare rates.

The second such certification would be an amount which is the amount by which a carrier's net operating income is less than 6½ percent of its net return on gross operating revenues, after giving effect to the various tax exemptions contained in existing law. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon receipt of these certifications, are directed to pay to the carriers the amount specified in the first certification up to the amounts specified in the second certification. The money so paid would be free of Federal income taxes and District corporate income taxes.

What is proposed here, in effect, is that the subsidy involved in carrying schoolchildren shall be paid by all the residents of the District, rather than being borne by the D.C. Transit system, as at present.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the bill to which I have spoken, and I ask for its appropriate reference. I also ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 982) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia", approved August 9, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 44–214a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2. If, after giving effect to any and all motor vehicle fuel tax and real estate tax exemptions, the net operating income of any common carrier required to furnish transportation to schoolchildren at a reduced fare under this Act for any twelve-month period ending on August 31 is less than a 6½ per centum rate of return, net after all taxes properly chargeable to transportation operations, including but not limited to income taxes, on its gross operating revenues, then the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission shall, as soon as practicable after such August 31, certify to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent with respect to such twelve-month period: (1) an amount which is the difference between the total of all reduced fares paid to each such carrier by school children in accordance with this Act and the amount which would have been paid to each such carrier if such fares had been paid at the cash fare established by the Commission for regular route transportation; and (2) an amount which is the amount by which each such carrier's net operating income is less than such 6½ per centum rate of return, after giving effect to the aforesaid tax exemptions. Upon such certification, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall pay to each such carrier an amount equal to the amount certified pursuant to clause (1) hereof; except that in no event shall such amount exceed the amount certified pursuant to clause (2) hereof. Any amount so received by each such carrier shall not be subject to the imposition of Federal income taxes or District of Columbia franchise taxes levied upon corporate income."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be applicable with respect to the twelve-month period ending on August 31 next following the date of enactment of this Act, and to each twelve-month period thereafter.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say it simply is not fair and equitable, in my opinion, either to ask the transit company to pay for the carrying of children to school, or to ask the riders on their streetcar and buses to pay for such a subsidy. It is an expense which ought to be borne by the entire District of Columbia. May I add that it is another proof of the fact that Congress should stop being as parsimonious as it has been in regard to the amount of money it appropriates for District of Columbia expenditures.

IMPROVEMENT OF TAX LAWS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, attempts to improve and make more equitable our tax laws is a never-ending process. Often it appears to those of us who are interested in tax equity that new loopholes appear, or are discovered, in the Internal Revenue Code faster than old ones can be closed.

Recently I have had occasion to take another close look at the code in connection with foreign operations, and I have once more been reminded of many shortcomings in the law, some of immediate importance, and others potentially so. In some cases the code is deficient because it is out of date. Provisions have been carried forward from year to year and from revision to revision with little apparent consideration of their current effect. In other cases, a change in the code might have been appropriate at the time it was enacted, but the law remains in effect after conditions have changed so as to make the provision meaningless or worse. If we are to avoid abuses, we must be vigilant in making changes in our tax laws appropriate to the times and circumstances, including the remarkable talent and diligence of some to devise tax avoidance schemes.

I now send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which would close a loophole which is now fairly large and growing. This provision of the law which I would change allows a bona fide resident of a foreign country to escape U.S. income taxes altogether on his earned income, and allows one who temporarily resides and works abroad for 17 out of 18 months to escape U.S. income taxes on $20,000 of his earned income. This particular provision appears to be particularly beneficial to movie stars. In the event a nonresident's income is from a business in which both personal effort and capital play a part, he can escape U.S. taxation on up to 30 percent of the profits of that enterprise.

In my opinion, any citizen of the United States owes certain duties to his country, not the least of which is the payment of taxes for national defense and the support of other programs necessary for survival and progress. In my view, there is no reason for those Americans residing abroad, whether on a semipermanent or more temporary basis, to avoid or seek to avoid payment of U.S. taxes.

It is always interesting to know how these loopholes in the tax laws have come about. In this case, the trouble started back in 1926. In that year the Congress enacted a provision which excluded from taxable income the earned income received from sources outside the United States by a U.S. citizen, provided that citizen was a bona fide nonresident for more than 6 months during the taxable year.

In 1932 this provision was amended to exclude amounts paid by the U.S. Government, thus giving a tax advantage to those who were employed by private concerns of one kind or another as against those employed by Government agencies. Interestingly enough the Senate Finance Committee at that time proposed the closing of this loophole altogether.

It seems that the Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee have had trouble getting together on this provision. Following the attack on the provision by the Finance Committee in 1932, the Ways and Means Committee, 10 years later, decided it should be repealed so as to remove "existing unjust discrimination favoring individuals receiving their compensation for services abroad from nongovernmental sources." The Senate did, at this time, go along with a change which limited this exemption to citizens who were bona fide residents of a foreign country for the entire taxable year.

Since 1942, the attitude of the Congress toward this, and many other loopholes, seems to have changed. It would appear that in many instances ways are constantly being sought to broaden loopholes instead of closing them.

In 1951, for instance, this original provision was broadened and another one was added. It was at that time provided that persons physically present in a foreign country for 17 months in a period of 18 consecutive months could take advantage of this exclusion from taxable income just as though they were bona fide residents of the foreign country.

This latter provision was almost immediately the subject of flagrant abuse, so much so that the Ways and Means Committee in 1953 proposed the deletion of this new provision. The Senate, however, refused to close the loophole completely, but did limit the exclusion to $20,000.

This $20,000 limit, of course, applies only to the person who is temporarily out of the country, and not to the bona fide nonresident. There is still no limit whatsoever on the exclusion for the bona fide nonresident.

Another aspect of this loophole which I think could well be emphasized is the provision for deciding what part of the profits of a trade or business can be adjudged to be earned income. Section 911 of the code, which spells out this loophole, and which my bill would repeal, provides that earned income may be as much as 30 percent of the profit of a trade or business where both personal service and capital investment figure in the individual's income. This means that a U.S. citizen operating a business abroad could get a tremendous advantage over his competitor in the United States by virtue of this 30 percent tax-free increment of his profits. Of course, he also has the advantage of the foreign tax credit.

Loopholes of this sort have the effect of creating obvious inequities among taxpayers and tend to diminish the effect of the rate progression which I consider to be most important. The tax burden is thereby maldistributed.

I hope my colleagues will study this measure and be prepared to consider it on its merits at such time as there may be an opportunity to call it up and seek its adoption as an amendment to some revenue measure which may come to us from the other body.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 983) to include in gross income earned income of citizens of the United States residing in foreign countries, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

STATUE OF ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would authorize the erection of a statue of Robert E. Lee on the grounds of the Custis-Lee Mansion, Arlington National Cemetery.

The year 1961 seems an appropriate time to consider such a joint resolution. This is the centennial of the beginning of the War Between the States. The hundred years that have elapsed since the opening of that tragic event in the history of our Nation have healed the wounds caused by 4 years of anger, destruction, and bloodshed.

Our reaction today is one of poignant regret. It is a matter of record that the participants—North and South—although torn asunder by issues that seemed insurmountable to them, were unable to understand why it was happening.

This thought bore heavily on the mind and heart of President Lincoln. He believed the bitterness would pass away; he prayed that "the Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom"; and that the Nation would endure. The tragedy is that the great President did not live to give leadership in the efforts to heal the wounds of the Nation—a shepherd to lead the people back to a life of unity.

But unity has long since been achieved—without vengeance, with moderation, and most of all with a willingness to "bind up the wounds" and get on with the paramount matters of national destiny.

Few persons saw this more clearly than did General Lee. To former Governor Letcher of Virginia he once wrote:

> The interests of the State are therefore the same as those of the United States. Its prosperity will rise or fall with the welfare of the country. The duty of its citizens, then, appears to me too plain to admit of doubt. All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of war, and to restore the blessings of peace.

Nor did General Lee's dedication to the principles of peace and unity stop with mere statements of policy. Within 6 months after Appomattox, he was serving his people again, this time as the inspirational leader and administrative head of what was then a small, unheralded, and well-nigh bankrupt college—Washington College in Lexington, Va.

Here his example, his vision, his dedication to the future without loss of time in grieving for the past, set his institution and his State well on the road to the distinction that both now have in such profusion.

For these and other reasons, I believe the time has come for General Lee to come home to the mansion in Arlington. Always, he has been there in spirit, and I suggest that that spirit is one which all Americans revere and from which all Americans have profited in their quest for national greatness.

It has long been my dream that the Nation, through Congress, would take action to recognize the greatness of this man. It is in this spirit that I offer this

joint resolution with the hope that it will result in a well deserved tribute to Robert E. Lee—soldier, educator, American.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 50) providing for the erection of an equestrian statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee on the grounds of the Custis-Lee Mansion, Arlington National Cemetery, Va., introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, BYRD of Virginia, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, ERVIN, FULBRIGHT, HART, HILL, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JOHNSTON, KEFAUVER, KERR, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Louisiana, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MCCARTHY, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, ROBERTSON, SPARKMAN, SYMINGTON, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk through February 23 so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor it may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 51) authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the contruction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Woodrow Wilson, as twenty-eighth President of the United States, won the enduring gratitude of the people of the United States and throughout the world for his farsighted and tireless efforts to achieve a lasting peace, with justice and freedom for all; and

Whereas he so eloquently phrased the principles for which this country stands and provided, with his own high standards of integrity, vision, and compassionate good will an inspiration for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a Commission, to be known as the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson in Washington, District of Columbia, or in its immediate environs. The Commission shall, in general, decide on the advisability of one of two kinds of memorials: One which would be a monument similar to those which honor Presidents Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln; or one which will serve as a building of a functional nature, or, as it is often called, a "living memorial." The Commission shall study, among others, proposals to associate the memorial with the Washington International Center program for international visitors.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) Former Presidents of the United States, at their pleasure;

(2) Two persons to be appointed by the President of the United States;

(3) Two Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(4) Two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(5) Three members to be appointed by the President of the United States, one from each of the following:

(A) The Woodrow Wilson Foundation;

(B) The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission (now discharged); and

(C) One member of the Department of the Interior, who shall be the Director of the National Park Service, or his representative.

(c) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members. Vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filed in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(e) The Commission shall report such plans, together with its recommendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual reports of its progress to the President and Congress.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—

(a) make such expenditures for personal services and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such purpose;

(b) accept gifts to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction or other expenses of such memorial;

(c) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into contracts for personal services and otherwise, and do such other things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution; and

(d) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and such Commissions and Council shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $10,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this joint resolution is identical with Senate Joint Resolution 152, introduced last year, passed by the Senate, and considered by House Committee on Administration. The interest shown by the cosponsors today is heartening; I believe that we should work as early as possible in 1961 to make this project come into being.

The purpose of the resolution can be expressed in a very few words: it would establish a commission, including former Presidents of the United States if they wish to participate, to consider the many suggestions for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson in Washington, D.C. Two general alternatives would be considered: the so-called nonfunctional monument and the functional, "Woodrow Wilson House" type of memorial building or structure.

One strong declaration for a nonfunctional monument was expressed forcefully by the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission in its final report of 1957. After noting that a Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge across the Potomac was to be constructed, the report added:

> But the Commission, feeling that one important thing still remains to be done to make the tribute to Wilson complete, recommends that Congress take such action as may be necessary to assure the erection in Washington of a permanent memorial structure to Woodrow Wilson comparable in beauty, sweep, and grandeur to those already dedicated to Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. This recommendation is a product of careful consideration on the part of the Commission. It stems from an abiding conviction that Wilson's eminence as a scholar, educator, statesman, and world leader, and especially his contribution to the Presidency itself as an institution, place him high on the list of great American Presidents.

I have also received many other suggestions for a completely different kind of monument, one which would serve a special purpose the year round. Mr. President, at the time of introduction last year, I introduced lengthy quotations from letters and statements giving ideas for such a functional memorial and for other types as well. I ask unanimous consent to have a résumé of those remarks printed at the end of my remarks here today.

One of the most interesting suggestions calls for a Wilson International Center in Washington, one which might well be coordinated with the activities of the Washington International Center of the American Council on Education. Visitors from abroad are introduced to American life at the center; they participate in lectures, group discussion, and other activities. Dr. Francis Sayre, son-in-law of President Wilson, is particularly interested in this approach.

Mr. President, the Commission will have the difficult but very challenging task of deciding the form that the memorial could take, and Congress will then act on its recommendations. The point of today's discussion is not the form of the memorial, but the need for it.

In our Capital City today, the visitor may see the Star-Spangled Banner in a huge glass case at the Smithsonian Institution or the Declaration of Independence at the Archives Building. Within a 10-minute automobile ride he can see the memorials to Washington,

Jefferson, and Lincoln. Soon, other memorials will honor more recent Presidents.

But, with the exception of his quiet resting place at the Washington National Cathedral, we have no similarly accessible monument to the greatness of Woodrow Wilson. He is remembered in our hearts and minds, and in the hearts and minds of millions throughout the world. But we need more than memory; we need a symbol, too.

To satisfy this need, we should have a memorial to Wilson, and we should have it in the very near future, because Wilson's words and wisdom are particularly important to us and to the world during this troubled decade.

Woodrow Wilson was more than an inspiring college president, a reform Governor of New Jersey, and a courageous President. He was an authentic 20th century voice for this Nation; we have yet to match our deeds to his vision.

Today, we wish to let the world know that we seek peace; that we understand the "revolution of rising expectations" in underdeveloped nations; and that we have, in Wilson's words, "a great commitment of America to the service of humanity."

Unless we can persuade great numbers of persons throughout the world that such goals are our goals, we shall fail in one of our most important duties; we will fail to inspire; we will fail to express our faith in the basic strength of the democratic idea.

It seems obvious that a memorial to Wilson would help dramatize our dedication to Wilson's principles. It seems equally obvious that the time for that project is now. In fact, it seems little short of incredible that we do not already have a memorial to the great man who served as our 28th President.

Difficult as it is to describe the full range of Wilson's contribution to our thinking and our ultimate goals I would like to close this brief discussion with two quotations which give several clues to his greatness.

The first statement is from his message to Congress asking for a declaration of war in 1917. Even in such a declaration, Wilson saw that lasting peace could follow conflict. We know the famous first sentence of the following excerpt, but perhaps in 1961 we should give renewed thought to the other concepts expressed in the following passage:

> The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them. * * *
>
> It is a distressing and oppressive duty, gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed and in thus addressing you. There are, it may be, many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

Mr. President, the second quotation comes from "Woodrow Wilson, World Prophet," a book by Mr. Arthur Walworth. Mr. Walworth, in his closing lines, gives a summary which, though brief, manages to sum up much of Wilson's contribution to the world:

> Great universities are acting on Woodrow Wilson's concept of preceptorial teaching and democratic living in residential colleges; citizens intent on good government pursue his ideals, timbers of law with which he bulwarked American society against eroding currents are still sound after dire stresses, and the nations of the world have come closer to his envisioned parliament of man.
>
> Jan Christian Smuts thought that at Paris the people had failed their prophets. But Woodrow Wilson took a more compassionate view. "The people were not ready," he said, "and perhaps they were right in thinking that the hour had not come."
>
> Yet, he never doubted that it would come. On a fragment of paper, unsigned and undated, the biographer finds written in the firm, familiar hand this favorite verse from the Habakkuk:
>
> "The vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry."
>
> It is upon the validity of this faith that the measure of Woodrow Wilson's greatness depends.

DESIGNATION OF EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH AS A MAJOR FAITH IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators KEATING of New York and PELL of Rhode Island, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to designate the Eastern Orthodox churches as a major faith in the United States.

Modern communications brought the inauguration of President Kennedy to the homes of millions of Americans, but comparatively few among our people appreciated the fact that even as Archbishop Iakovos prayed for the President, the church which His Eminence represents had no official standing before the Government of the United States.

The designation of Archbishop Iakovos, the Eastern Orthodox primate of North and South America, as a participant in the inauguration proceedings was a partial recognition of his church as a major American faith. Our bill would make this recognition complete.

The Eastern Orthodox churches, by universal agreement, constitute one of the major divisions of worldwide Christianity. The Eastern Orthodox family is surpassed in membership by only four great non-Christian religions of the world—Moslem, Hindu, Confucian, and Buddhist. Among the world's Christian faiths, it is third in membership.

In the United States, Eastern Orthodoxy ranks fourth in membership among religious groups, surpassed only by the Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish faiths.

Last year, membership in the various Eastern Orthodox churches in this country was conservatively estimated by the National Council of Churches at 2,545,318.

The latest figures available to me indicate that membership has now increased to at least 2,807,000.

To those who may fear that the precedent here set may open the door to similar claims by numerous other faiths, it may be pointed out that none of the faiths not now designated by our Government has a comparable membership in the United States.

There are other reasons why the Eastern Orthodox Church ought to be designated a major faith in the United States.

Several Federal agencies have omitted Eastern Orthodoxy in projects in which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths have been invited to participate. The legislatures of more than half the States in the Union have passed resolutions recognizing Eastern Orthodoxy as a major religious faith.

The proposed resolution does not envisage any expenditure of money, or any action in support or preference of the Eastern Orthodox faith. It is intended as public recognition of the fact that the American citizens of Eastern Orthodox faith constitute a substantial segment of our community, separate from the three major faiths already designated, and justly entitled to consideration in any Federal action or statement related to religious matters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 88) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

> Whereas the Eastern (Greek) Orthodox Church is a major faith in the United States and throughout the world; and
>
> Whereas Senate bill 106, Eighty-fourth Congress, led to the designation of the Eastern Orthodox faith as a separate religious faith in the Armed Forces of the United States; and
>
> Whereas several Federal agencies have omitted Eastern Orthodoxy in projects which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths have been invited to participate; and
>
> Whereas more than half of the States in the United States through their legislators have passed resolutions recognizing Eastern Orthodoxy as a major religious faith; and
>
> Whereas the Eastern Orthodox faith has millions of communicants throughout the world including several million in the United States; and
>
> Whereas where anything is said concerning the major faiths, usually the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths are referred to; and
>
> Whereas it therefore follows that a religious distinction is being made in omitting the Eastern Orthodox Church, which is contrary to the prevailing principle of democracy and freedom of religion in this country: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Eastern Orthodox Church is a major faith in this country; and that all references by Federal agencies to major faiths now limited to Protestants, Catholics, and Jews include the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted today to join with Senator CASE in sponsoring the resolution which he has championed for several years to give official recognition to the Eastern Orthodox churches as a major religion. I have talked with a number of leading clerics of the Eastern Orthodoxy and I am quite familiar with the deep interest they have in this measure and also with the major reasons which they give in support of this legislation. I am fully satisfied that the position of members of the Eastern Orthodox Church in the United States and the situations which have given rise to this proposal justify its passage.

It is, in my mind, entirely fitting that the Government should accord, under the law, the same treatment to this important group of Americans that it does to the major recognized religions in the United States today.

I commend my colleague and thank him for giving me the opportunity to join with him in this important endeavor.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New York.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at the next printing of the bill (S. 454) to extend the National Wool Act, that the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO DETERMINATIONS AND DECISIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on February 2, 1961, on behalf of myself and other Senators, I introduced the bill (S. 769) to amend section 2310 of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to determinations and decisions. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] desires that his name also be added as a cosponsor. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 769, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I ask unanimous consent that his name be included as one of the cosponsors of Senate bill 937, to provide for a program of Federal matching grants to the States to enable the States to provide health insurance for individuals aged 65 or over at subscription charges such individuals can pay, introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] (for himself and other Senators) on February 13, 1961.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM COMMISSION AND FREEDOM ACADEMY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1961, the names of Senators FONG, BUTLER, HICKENLOOPER, MILLER, and KEATING were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 822) to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy to research and develop an integrated, operational science to win the nonmilitary part of the global struggle between freedom and communism and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators) on February 9, 1961.

AMENDMENT OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1961, the names of Senators MOSS, NEUBERGER, CLARK, LONG of Missouri, and MORSE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 861) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY) on February 9, 1961.

ADMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 9, 1961, the name of Mr. SMATHERS was added as an additional cosponsor of the following bills, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and other Senators) on February 9, 1961:

S. 902. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; and

S. 903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL—WITHDRAWAL OF COSPONSORSHIP

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on January 5, 1961, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], introduced two bills, S. 120 and S. 121. Both measures were allowed to lie on the table, for the addition of the names of other sponsors.

When I expressed a desire to be a cosponsor of S. 121, a measure adding recreation to the interests to be considered by the Corps of Engineers in determining the value of its water projects, my name was inadvertently listed as a cosponsor of S. 120. When I discovered the mistake, I asked that my name be removed from S. 120 and be added to S. 121.

When the bills were printed, I found my name on both of them. However, S. 120 is a water pollution control bill which differs considerably from the water pollution measure passed by the Senate last year with my vote and my support.

Since I am a cosponsor of the water pollution control bill introduced last week by the Senators from Minnesota, I wish the RECORD to show that I was inadvertently listed as a cosponsor of the earlier bill.

I ask unanimous consent that if in the future it happens that Senate bill 120 is reprinted, my name be eliminated therefrom.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE AGED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of the report of the Subcommittee on the Aged, under Senate Resolution 266, be extended to Monday, February 20.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it it so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DR. GLENN T. SEABORG, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, February 23, 1961, at 10 a.m. in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, room P–63 of the Capitol, to consider the nomination of Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring June 30, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a biographical summary of Dr. Seaborg as furnished by the President of the United States in connection with this nomination.

There being no objection, the biographical summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY OF GLENN T. SEABORG

Born: April 19, 1912, Ishpeming, Mich.

Marital status: Married, 1942; six children.

Residence: 1154 Glen Road, Lafayette, Calif.

Education: A.B., University of California at Los Angeles, 1934; Ph. D., University of California, Berkeley, 1937.

Experience: University of California, Berkeley, 1937–present; chancellor, 1958–61; associate director, radiation laboratory, 1954–61; professor, department of chemistry, 1945–present (on leave); section chief, metallurgical laboratory, University of Chicago, 1942–46. University of California: assistant professor, department of chemistry, 1941–45; instructor, department of chemistry, 1939–41; research associate in chemistry, 1937–39.

AFFILIATIONS

Business: Member, board of directors, Nuclear Science and Engineering Corp., Pittsburgh, 1954–61; former consultant, U.S. Rubber Co.; former consultant, Bell Telephone Laboratories.

Scientific: President's Science Advisory Committee, 1959–61; General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, 1946–50; member, National Academy of Sciences, 1948–present; member, Joint Commission on Radioactivity, International Council of Scientific Unions, 1946–56; member, Committee on Standards and Units of Radioactivity, National Research Council, 1947–51; member, advisory board, Chemical and Engineering News, 1957–59; member, advisory board, Journal of Inorganic and Nuclear Chemistry, 1957–present; member, editorial board, Journal of American Chemical Society, 1950–59.

Scientific specialty: Research in transuranium elements, nuclear chemistry and physics, and artificial radioactivity.

SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTIONS

Codiscoverer of element 94 (plutonium), 1940; isotope Pu^{239}, 1941; isotope U^{233}, 1942; element 95 (americium) and element 96 (curium), 1944; element 97 (berkelium), 1949; element 98 (californium), 1950; element 99 (einsteinium), 1952; element 100 (fermium), 1953; element 101 (medelevium), 1955; element 102, 1958.

Author of the actinide concept of heavy element electronic structure.

Directed development of the plutonium chemical separations process.

Also codiscoverer of other radioisotopes, some of practical use, such as, iodine 131 and iron 55 and 59.

PUBLICATIONS

About 200 scientific papers, including comprehensive reviews and compilations in "Reviews of Modern Physics" and "Chemical Reviews."

Coauthor, volume I, "Comprehensive Inorganic Chemistry," D. Van Nostrand Co.

Coauthor, "The Chemistry of the Actinide Elements," 1957, Methuen Co., London.

Author, "The Transuranium Elements," 1958, Yale University Press.

Coauthor, "Elements of the Universe," 1958, E. P. Dutton & Co. (winner of the Fourth Annual Thomas Edison Foundation Award, 1958).

And others.

HONORS AND AWARDS

Nobel Prize in chemistry (with E. M. McMillan), 1951.

Enrico Fermi Award, 1959.

Phi Beta Kappa.

Award in pure chemistry, American Chemical Society, 1947.

John Scott Award and Medal of City of Philadelphia, 1953.

Perkin Medal, American section, Society of Chemical Industry, 1957.

Junior chamber of commerce, Ten Outstanding Young Men in America Award, 1947.

Silliman Lecturer, Yale University, 1957.

Nichols Medal of the New York section of the American Chemical Society, 1948.

Honorary fellow of the Chemical Society, London, 1959.

Honorary doctor of science, University of Denver, 1951.

Honorary doctor of science, Gustavus Adolphus College, 1954.

Honorary doctor of science, Northwestern University, 1954.

Honorary doctor of laws, University of Michigan, 1958.

MEMBERSHIPS

American Physical Society, fellow.
American Chemical Society.
American Nuclear Society.
New York Academy of Sciences.
American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
American Association for the Advancement of Science.
American Philosophical Society.
Royal Swedish Academy of Engineering Sciences.
American Institute of Chemists, fellow.
Royal Society of Arts (England).
American Scandinavian Foundation.
Sigma Xi.

Political affiliation

Democrat.

TRIBUTE TO THE WASHINGTON, D.C., POLICE FORCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the police force of the District of Columbia, under the able leadership of Chief Robert V. Murray, has shown that it is composed of an outstanding group of men. They have performed well during strike periods; they have performed well in times of sleet, snow, and storm. I wish to commend them for what they have done for the District of Columbia during this most severe winter, and for the good humor, the tolerance, and the understanding they have maintained throughout.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, excerpts from various newspapers published in the District of Columbia: A letter entitled "Salutes Police," published in the Washington Star; an editorial entitled "Pressuring the Police," published in the Washington Post of February 13; and an editorial entitled "Chief Murray's 10 Years," published in the Washington Post of February 10.

There being no objection, the letter and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1961]

SALUTES POLICE

It is indeed a shame that the courage and unselfish deeds of our police are so often overlooked, or taken for granted, until a tragedy or crisis arises such as that which occurred February 2, claiming the lives of seven elderly people. The heroism displayed that day by a metropolitan detective, in the course of duty, evoked the admiration of our citizens, but this admiration is so often only transitory, and will in a short span of time turn to indifference as this man's deed fades into the obscure past. We often tend to overlook or discredit their devotion, and when one is accused of malfeasance or negligence in the line of duty, our apathy soon turns to antipathy and resentment. We forget that the job of a police officer is an exacting one, calling for intelligence, stamina and devotion to the cause of justice.

Perhaps it is an idealistic concept, but the devoted officers who fulfill these ideals represent the heart of an efficient police department. We must not forget that they are citizens, like us all, who bear equally the responsibilities and duties of American citizenship. But in addition to these obligations, they also carry, as policemen, the extremely onerous ones of the safety, welfare, and order of the community at large. Theirs is a job that takes them around the clock, into all environments, upholding law and order, when conditions are at their best, and when they are, more than likely, at their worst. There is no guarantee of personal safety, for they are a potential target for any trigger-happy gunman. There is no assurance that their hours at home will not be interrupted by the sudden call to duty—a call which often represents long, grueling hours of overtime work. These are the things which we should all remember when we are ready to criticize their job, for this is the easy thing to do, but difficult indeed is it to praise, and what is more important, to support with our active cooperation.

In their constant and never-ending battle against crime and corruption, these dedicated public servants require our assistance and interest, for only then can they truly serve the public, whose interests they all should represent. Let us not forget these men then, lest in doing so we forget that an efficient and well-trained police department is the first step, and often need be the only one, in the administration of justice.

ROGER M. WHELAN.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1961]

CHIEF MURRAY'S 10 YEARS

Chief of Police Robert V. Murray has well earned the tributes that were paid to him last night by a group of community leaders attending the testimonial dinner in recognition of his completion of a decade in his difficult office. Washingtonians have only to remember the condition of the police department 10 years ago to appreciate the enlightened, honest, and broadly constructive administration that Chief Murray has provided. In recognition of the present standing of the Washington police in the law-enforcement field, Mr. Murray is now serving as the head of the International Chiefs of Police.

Specific improvements over the last decade are numerous, and the most important is the restoration of confidence in the integrity of law enforcement. The police force has been increased from 1,800 men to nearly 2,500. Shortwave radio has been provided for men on the beat. The number of cruisers on the street has been doubled. The Canine Corps has been introduced, with generally good results, and a Youth Aid Division established. Some big-shot gamblers have been put out of business, and gambling in general has been held in check.

The police still have numerous unsolved problems, but they are now working with far more trust and cooperation from the community than they had a decade ago. Much of this improved performance and atmosphere is traceable to the leadership of Chief Murray. He is entitled to the warm commendation of the city he serves.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1961]

PRESSURING THE POLICE

There have been ugly reports of attempts by Congressmen to treat the local police force as if it were another trough of patronage. Fortunately, Police Chief Robert V. Murray has stoutly resisted these attempts at congressional meddling. Recently, one Member of Congress sought to pressure Mr. Murray into promoting a well-connected lieutenant to the rank of captain—although the officer held an efficiency rating inferior to other lieutenants. The man was not promoted, but it is understood that further attempts may be made to tell Chief Murray how to run his department.

We are certain that Mr. Murray will firmly but politely resist this and all other attempts by Congress to give an odor of favoritism to departmental promotions. There is no surer way of destroying the morale and effectiveness of our local police than to let Congress poke its fingers into the promotion lists. Chief Murray can count on wholehearted support in his effort to maintain the integrity of his force.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For 16 years I served as a member of the House of Representatives Committee on the District of Columbia, and I also served as the chairman of that committee. In the Senate, I served on the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. In those days, I maintained rather close familiarity with the operations of the police department of the District of Columbia. I know something about the handicaps and difficulties under which they labor. So I certainly concur in the tributes which have been expressed to Chief Murray, because he and his force have truly performed notable service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I am sure the Congress appreciates the vitality, the energy, and the integrity of Chief Murray, and that the Congress is delighted that he has no intention of retiring or resigning, but intends to stay on the job. In my opinion, he has under his leadership one of the finest police forces in the country, one which has, in the Capital of the Nation, one of the most difficult jobs to perform.

THE MISSILE GAP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week I referred to the question of the missile gap.

Incidentally, let me say that I trust that the reporters will take good account of the fact that I pronounce the word "missile" as it is written—with two "s's," not as if it were spelled with the letter "z." I say this because, this week, Time magazine has stated that I pronounced the word as if it were spelled with a "z." I was not aware of that, but perhaps it is due to my ear training that I should seemingly place a "z" where a double "s" really belongs.

At any rate, we discussed the missile gap at considerable length. At that time I inserted in the RECORD a number of accounts and reports; and I indicated then that I had sent to the Secretary of Defense a letter in which I requested a response to certain questions. On February 15, the Secretary of Defense did respond, and sent me with his letter some enclosures.

Mr. President, in order to round out the story, I first submit, for inclusion, in the body of the RECORD with my remarks, the letter I addressed to the Secretary on February 9; and I also submit, for printing in the RECORD, the Secretary's reply, dated February 15, together with certain newspaper articles which comment on this matter—so that all the comments will be placed in completely fair context.

There being no objection, the letters and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1961.

The Honorable ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
The Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The press has carried a substantial number of reports on the so-called missile gap problem and, generally speaking, these reports were more or less identic in character. The White House press secretary is reported to have said that all of these were wrong, and I am of the opinion that the matter requires immediate clarification. May I, therefore, have an early response to the following questions:

1. Was there a briefing session with members of the press by you any time during the first week in February?

2. If such a meeting was held was the matter of relative missile and deterrent strengths between the United States and the U.S.S.R. discussed?

3. Did you see the New York Times article in the February 7, 1961, issue by Mr. Jack Raymond, in which he reported, "Studies made since Inauguration Day indicate that the predicted missile gap has not yet developed." Is the statement correct as it relates to studies on this subject made by the Department since you became Secretary?

4. Mr. Raymond also reported that "the Kennedy administration in studying the country's defense posture also is understood to have come to the conclusion that the Soviets did not engage in a crash program to build intercontinental ballistic missiles. It appeared from early conclusions that the Soviet Union did not produce as many such missiles as it could have." Is Mr. Raymond's statement incorrect, and if so, in what respect?

5. John G. Norris in the Washington Post on February 7, stated that "current defense studies by the Kennedy administration indicate that President Eisenhower's downgrading of the dangers of the Soviet missile lead was largely correct, although some step-up in the U.S. program is essential." Is this statement correct, and if not, in what respect is it in error?

6. In the same Norris article appears the statement, "Conclusions are now that there is no evidence that Russia has embarked on a crash program of building of intercontinental ballistic missiles or that any missile gap exists today." Is this correct?

7. How would Mr. Norris and Mr. Raymond have arrived at virtually the same conclusion unless the matter was discussed at the briefing?

8. Mr. Salinger, White House press secretary, was reported by Mr. Raymond in the New York Times of February 8 to have said, "At his news conference Mr. Salinger was asked why four published articles should all say the same thing on the missile gap. His reply was that 'I can only tell you they are absolutely wrong. These studies are not anywhere near completed. Therefore, no conclusions could have been drawn. The stories do not represent the facts.'" Is that true? Does Mr. Salinger's statement apply to the Raymond and Norris articles mentioned above?

I trust we can get this confusion dispelled at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 15, 1961.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of February 9 about recent news reports on the relative strength of the United States and the Soviet Union in missiles and otherwise. During the past month I have met on a background basis with reporters, individually and in groups, as well as in open press conference. These meetings were held in accordance with the administration's policy of keeping the working press as fully informed as possible on the development of the President's program.

The emphasis in these discussions was not on our present defense posture, which is the result of the previous administration's program, but rather on the process that we are now going through in the Department to formulate new plans to provide for the defense needs of the Nation over the months and years to come. In the course of discussion I stressed the complex nature of the problem, involving, as it does, a variety of weapons systems, both offensive and defensive. The discussion ranged well beyond the subject of our missile capabilities. As you know, some of the steps we have already taken, such as the planned increase in our airlift capacity, are not in the missile field at all.

I have not said with respect to missile power that the United States is either in a superior or inferior position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. I have stated that a survey of our defense posture is currently underway, including our missile capacity, and it would be premature for me to draw definite conclusions on any of these matters until the studies, which are now underway, have been completed.

I have tried to make it clear that the important consideration is that there must be no "destruction gap" or "deterrent gap" between the United States and Russia. I have emphasized that, acting on the President's instructions, we have already begun to move so that there will be no such gap in the months and years ahead.

A number of news stories correctly emphasized the points that I have tried to make in my discussions with newsmen. I enclose such stories by Mark Watson in the Baltimore Sun of February 8 and 10, in the Wall Street Journal on February 9, and by R. H. Shackford in the Scripps-Howard papers of February 9.

Let me reiterate my intention to keep the press and the public abreast of our progress in building and safeguarding the strength of our Nation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

THE MISSILE GAP CONTROVERSY

(By R. H. Shackford)

There is a missile gap. There isn't a missile gap.

But if there is a missile gap there isn't a deterrent gap.

This kind of doubletalk has plagued public opinion for nearly 5 years. The outlook is for another round of confusion.

Few subjects of this missile age are more bedeviled with contradictory statements, undefined terms, incomprehensible slogans, and just plain ignorance. It is an extremely complex subject.

Much of the trouble stems from those who insist upon a numerical count of Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) and U.S. ICBM's as the only meaningful yardstick. Numbers are important—and will be more so when the ICBM comes of age in a few years. But only in relation to countless other missile-age factors. And some of the other factors are more important than the numbers.

Today the United States-U.S.S.R. missile equation must also take into account missile dispersal, mobility, base hardening, warning times, target intelligence, other means of delivering nuclear weapons such as intermediate range ballistic missiles (IRBM's), aircraft, etc., accuracy, technological progress, production rates, lead-times, etc.

If only the ICBM's on the launching pad ready to fire today are counted, there probably is a missile gap in favor of the Russians. On IRBM's the gap is wider.

No one has denied this, although the serious gap in this transition period from aircraft to missiles always has been the early-to-middle sixties—from about 1962 through 1965.

In his final state of the Union message, President Eisenhower said:

"The bomber gap of several years ago was always a fiction, and the missile gap shows every sign of being the same."

Mr. Eisenhower did not define what he meant by "missile gap" and therein is the essence of the confusion. The last testimony before Congress by Eisenhower administration officials conceded a missile gap in numbers of missiles but denied there was a deterrence gap.

Testifying on the 1961 defense budget, Mr. Eisenhower's Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., said:

"The question is not whether we have more missiles than they have, but whether our own strategic deterrent can or cannot survive the first attack. If it cannot, then you would speak of that as being a deterrent gap. If it can, then there is no deterrent gap * * * whether there is or is not a missile gap, there is not a deterrent gap."

Both Mr. Gates and Herbert F. York, Director of Research and Development, who is remaining in the Kennedy administration, admitted that "in terms of numbers of missiles only" the Soviets had superiority.

The last of the Eisenhower administration evaluations given Congress by Mr. Gates was that "the Soviets may enjoy a moderate numerical superiority [in ICBM's] during the next 3 years" and that the difference in numbers "appears to peak during the 1962 period."

No one discounts the importance of numbers of ICBM's in the years ahead. But today neither side has enough to be decisive—the United States less than a dozen and the Soviets probably much less than 50.

However, even if by some miracle the United States acquired 100 times as many ICBM's overnight, they wouldn't add much to our striking power because of the lack of trained crews, hardened bases, etc., all of which have long lead times.

MISSILE GAP ISSUE

(By John G. Norris)

President Kennedy yesterday cautiously skirted the first political flap of his administration—a new controversy over whether there is a missile gap.

He told a news conference that he does not know yet whether or not there is such a gap and won't until an overall Pentagon reappraisal is complete.

For several years the new President and other Democrats have charged that President Eisenhower's emphasis on budget balancing had given Russia a potentially dangerous lead in intercontinental ballistic missiles. Republicans denied that any gap did or would exist.

On Tuesday many newspapers carried stories declaring that the Kennedy administration's military strategy reappraisers had tentatively concluded that there was no missile gap now and that it would not occur in the future.

Despite a White House statement that the stories were inaccurate, Republicans gleefully seized on the situation. They said that it proved Ike was right and that the missile gap was now shown to be "nothing more than the yap-gap of political oratory."

When asked about the stories—which some newspapers suggested had originated with Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara—the President said that McNamara had told him the new Pentagon leaders had not reached "any conclusion at this time as to whether there is a missile gap or not."

Newsmen reminded him that he had charged during the campaign that a missile gap did exist and asked if he still felt strongly on this point.

In reply, Mr. Kennedy avoided any repetition of his statements. He said he had charged the Defense Department with reviewing the military position and said it would be premature for him to pass judgment now on whether there is such a gap.

"Of course, it is my hope that the United States is fully secure," the President said. "I will be pleased if that is the result.

"If it is not, I think it is important that we know about it * * *. I will then take on responsibility of passing on to the Congress this collective judgment as to our position, and what needs to be done."

DANGEROUS YEARS

In backing away from any repetition of the missile gap statements, however, the President said he still believes the Nation is approaching the years of its maximum danger.

He said there are many complicated problems involved in the Pentagon studies, one being "the realization that the United States will not strike first" and that therefore we must consider what would remain in missiles and other weapons for retaliation if the United States is struck first.

He seemingly went out of his way to reaffirm the U.S. traditional position that it would not strike the first blow, perhaps because of another recent newspaper story that the new Pentagon officials had rejected this concept.

LITTLE CLARIFICATION

The President's comments did little to clear up the confusion over Tuesday's news stories and the White House statement that they were inaccurate because the White House said, no conclusions had been reached at the Pentagon.

Nor was the source of the information fully explained. In asking the President about the articles, a reporter noted that some indicated that Secretary McNamara had made the statements at a background conference. Mr. Kennedy did not directly confirm this assertion.

But when asked about the wisdom of Government officials holding such briefings for newsmen—where the facts disclosed but not the source can be identified to the public, the President seemed to accept that the Defense Secretary had met with newsmen.

He said such sessions were "hazardous" as "Mr. McNamara might agree," but he hoped they could be continued to explain complicated matters.

In an attempt to set the record straight, a highly reliable source said that the following is the way the new Pentagon defense team is thinking:

It has reached no conclusions yet in the defense reappraisal which started January 20 and which must produce a preliminary report to the President later this month.

However, the preliminary impression gained by the new official is that there is no meaningful "missile gap" at the present time in the narrow sense of the term. That is, neither Russia nor the United States has enough long range missiles ready to be of great consequence in any exchange of blows. Manned bombers still predominate as the major nuclear weapon.

Whether Russia has more ICBM's now than the United States is of little importance compared to the relative number in 2 or 3 years when both sides get the research and development bugs in their missiles ironed out and have them in sizable numbers.

The new Pentagon regime is convinced that there will be no missile gap ahead because they intend to see to it that there is none—by accelerating and adding to the missile programs if necessary.

It feels that its approach differs from that of the Eisenhower administration in that everything will be done that is necessary to assure there will be no gap, without so much attention paid to its cost.

DIFFERENT VIEWS

The above is described as the actual thinking of the new Defense Department leaders even though it may not have been fully spelled out at the original background briefing.

However, it is necessary to add that there is no such thing as composite thinking and there are strong differences of view within the Pentagon as to how much is necessary to avoid any missile gap.

McNamara may be leaning toward the majority view within the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is that of the Eisenhower administration. At any rate that was the impression definitely given the newsmen at the briefing.

NO CONCLUSIONS

He has not reached any definite conclusion, however, the administration stresses. At any rate, there can be no conclusions reached as yet by the Kennedy administration—as some of the stories indicated—because the President has not yet received even a preliminary report from the Pentagon.

There is no indication of any substantial changes in intelligence estimates of the status of Russian missile readiness from those furnished Congress last year, beyond the fact that there is little positive evidence of any sizable gain in the number of U.S.S.R. rockets on launchers. But then there have also been no U–2 flights in nearly a year.

REPUBLICANS REACT

Why the information about the tentative findings of the Pentagon studies was put out was not apparent, but the Republican reaction to it was loud and clear.

Senate Republican leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said the stories proved that Ike was right and that the Kennedy administration had just discovered it. Senate GOP leaders planned to discuss the matter this morning and take the Senate floor to speak about it.

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, the Republican National Chairman, sent telegrams to all GOP State Chairmen urging them to talk about the issue. Battle Line, the GOP National Committee periodical, put out an issue entitled "Missile Gap Bared as Democratic Campaign Fraud."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, charged that Mr. Kennedy, having used the missile gap as a campaign weapon, was now reversing his field in touch football style.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican of Connecticut, called for a full investigation by the Senate Armed Services Committee of the matter. Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat of Georgia, said the group will start an inquiry February 20 into all phases of the defense posture. This is the committee's regular annual interrogation of Pentagon chiefs.

MISSILE GAP?—KENNEDY SAYS HE AWAITS COMPLETION OF STUDIES BY THE PENTAGON

WASHINGTON.—Question: What is the real explanation to the current missile gap flap in Washington? Answer: A casual and carefully qualified remark by a top Kennedy defense adviser at a confidential meeting with reporters was raced into print without qualification or full explanation.

Tuesday morning papers carried stories that Kennedy defense advisers had tentatively concluded there was no missile gap between the United States and Russia, a complete reversal of a major Kennedy campaign theme. Tuesday afternoon, the White House angrily condemned these stories as inaccurate and without foundation. And at his news conference yesterday the President himself said there could be no such conclusions because Pentagon studies by the new administration were far from completed.

So far, no one has conceded who held the well publicized background briefing late Monday—though Mr. Kennedy himself strongly implied that it was no one less than Defense Secretary McNamara. A news conference questioner asked the President's version of "what Secretary McNamara said."

The President replied that he did not know "if such a meeting took place" between Mr. McNamara and the press. But then, at a later point, the Chief Executive declared that background briefings were "hazardous in many cases—and I believe Mr. McNamara might agree with that."

WHAT HAPPENED AT THE BRIEFING

According to those who attended the "not-for-quotation-or-attribution" briefing, here's what took place:

Reporters asked for an early impression of whether the Soviet Union has more combat-ready missiles than this country. The answer was that officials had not yet been fully briefed on this situation and that in a month-long review of defense strategy, they hoped to look into this point more closely. Reporters pressed further for at least some appraisal. The answer was that there appeared at this time no signs of a Soviet crash effort to build intercontinental missiles, though overall Russian military preparations were continuing at a rapid pace.

In addition, the answer was that there was no "destruction gap" between the United States and Russia, nor was one foreseen in the immediate future. Besides, it was said, counting missiles alone is not a useful way to consider overall U.S. military strength. It was stressed that these were early and concededly incomplete impressions.

MEANING OF "MISSILE GAP"

The "missile gap" phrase refers to a fear, often expressed by Democratic critics of the Eisenhower administration's defense programs, that Russia would have combat ready between 1961 and 1963 more long-range missiles than the United States would.

The news accounts of the briefing emphasized the supposed finding of no missile gap without explaining that this appraisal was an offhand impression. And these accounts centered only on the missile situation today, not on the outlook during the potential missile gap period 1961 to 1963.

After the news stories appeared, President Kennedy called his defense team to the White House to find out what really was said. Yesterday he told his news conference his Defense Secretary reported that no Pentagon study has been concluded that would indicate now "whether there is a missile gap or not."

"As of today," the President said, Mr. McNamara "is not prepared to make a judgment as to our capacity in strategic weapons." Because the studies are not complete, "it would be premature to reach a judgment as to whether there is a missile gap or not."

The President's weapons and strategy appraisals are due to be completed by the end of the month. They represent the new administration's first effort to work out a well-defined military policy. Their conclusions will largely influence what further changes, if any, Mr. Kennedy will propose in defense plans. Already, the Pentagon has accelerated construction of 5 Polaris missile-firing submarines and disclosed plans to buy 53 additional planes for hauling troops and equipment.

Concluded the President: "I hope it will be possible for the responsible officials and the reporters who are particularly concerned * * * to work out ground rules" so that background briefings can be continued.

CHANGES SEEN IN DEFENSE THINKING POLICYMAKING

(By Mark S. Watson)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The new administration's considerable infusion of new persons in the Pentagon's study groups appears to promise some marked departures in defense thinking, and hence in high-level policymaking.

It still is too early to predict the changes with any attempt at precision, and for a manifest reason: The study groups' first function is to reappraise completely the several areas of defense planning, on the basis of the newest information.

Only when the reappraisal is complete can there be an intelligent new estimate of requirements. And only when the new requirements are reasonably clear can there be a competent planning of new defense measures to match the requirements.

One of the first acts of the new Defense Secretary, Robert S. McNamara, was the designation of four study groups to make an entirely new appraisal of four broad areas of defense policy and practice.

Significantly three of the four groups are headed by appointees new to the Pentagon. Significantly, too, the membership of each group is a mingling of long-term professional planners from within the Pentagon and of entirely new men, some of them talented civilians from the Rand Corp. and some of them equally talented military professionals from outside the existing joint staff.

STUDIES OUTLINED

The infusion includes a number of experts who are believed to be in disagreement with earlier estimates, and who in any case are known for their boldness of thinking as well as for their acquaintance with defense specialties.

The aim has been to get a happy mingling of this new thinking with the experience and broad knowledge of the joint staff planners.

The four groups are assigned to these studies:

1. On strategic weapons systems, which includes the long-range and medium-range missiles and all means of deploying them. Chairman Charles J. Hitch, Defense Comptroller, lately with Rand.

2. On limited-war requirements, notably those calling for the conventional weapons of newest, lightest, and most efficient design, for extreme flexibility, for the high mobility by land and air that the Army in particular has long sought. Chairman Paul Nitze, Assistant Defense Secretary for International Security Affairs.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

3. On research and development—the first step toward all new weapons. Chairman Herbert F. York, continuing in office as director of defense research and engineering.

4. On bases and installations, one of the main areas for implementing defense measures. Chairman Thomas Morris, Assistant Secretary of Logistics and Installations, a new man in a newly enlarged office.

In each study group are representatives from every element of the defense establishment concerned with the stated area, including each of the armed services.

Hence there is not a controversial step which is not fully exposed to current scrutiny by each chief as well as by the joint staff and by the civilian experts.

CONTINUING CHECKS

This is expected to provide continuing checks against errors which are not readily discerned save by detailed professional examination, and to be of immeasurable value in the massive reappraisals which, by President Kennedy's direction, are to be pushed to rapid conclusion.

The study groups will in fact finish their preliminary reports in another fortnight. On these reports McNamara, with the aid of his deputy, Roswell Gilpatric, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, expects to make his own consolidated report to the President either at the end of February (as requested by Mr. Kennedy) or very soon afterward.

The immensity of the areas to be covered by the study groups in this short time suggests how very exacting is the task imposed on them, the difficulty of a wholly accurate reappraisal, and the burden of selecting remedial measures.

FORM OF PUBLIC MESSAGE

Neither reappraisal nor report will be public, but on them President Kennedy expects to base his own recommendations to Congress, which of course will be in the form of a public message.

The implementing of his recommendations will necessarily call for revisions in the existing defense budget which was sent to Congress by Mr. Eisenhower on the eve of his retirement.

Major revisions are inevitable. The budget itself is started each year fully 11 months before it is to become operative, so labored and prolonged is the task of service estimates and recommendations, secretarial revision, Budget Bureau amendments, Presidential alterations, and final approval.

Hence, to speak plainly, the existing budget before Congress is based very largely on a world situation as it existed in July 1960, with its original terms modified only in degree by such world-situation changes as took place through early December.

To seek no revisions now would be to suggest that there has been no change at all in the world situation.

But to guess at the exact nature of budget revisions (beyond those already indicated for increased airlift and a suitable pushing of Polaris submarines) would be to anticipate the results of the four study groups' huge work.

LIMITED-WAR POTENTIAL

One is fairly safe in predicting a much greater attention to limited-war preparations, largely because of the widespread protests against Mr. Eisenhower's thrift in this respect, and designation of Nitze's special study group for that specific purpose.

Certainly there no longer will be such intense concentration upon massive weapons alone.

And it is wholly safe to predict a far tighter integration of defense planning procurement, and direction than in the past. That is, hereafter the three services will certainly start work on their budgets only when there is far better recognition of them as parts of a prestated whole, rather than as separate enterprises to be welded together by compromise and "trading" among the services.

FOR ECONOMY, EFFICIENCY

Upon such integration much work was done by Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Mr. Eisenhower's last Defense Secretary, during his relatively short but very fruitful term in office.

McNamara certainly can be expected to push much further toward integration, for economy's sake in part, but far more for the sake of efficiency in getting maximum use from the Nation's defense resources, directed toward a much more fully grasped purpose.

The fact is that the labors of these 3 weeks to come should provide the basis for very large changes in Pentagon thinking, planning, and performing, which will become manifest by midyear.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today, February 16, the Lithuanian people celebrate the 43d anniversary of their own declaration of independence.

On this day in 1918, toward the close of World War I, the Lithuanian people, after centuries of Czarist subjugation, established their own government and proclaimed their independence. The Bolsheviks invaded the newly established state, in an effort to resubjugate it. There were many bitter battles, but

finally the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. On July 19, 1920, the Soviet Government signed a treaty of peace. It declared in this treaty—mark these words well—that it "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

Lithuanian freedom was, unfortunately, short-lived. Twenty-one years ago this June, the brave and peaceful country of Lithuania was perfidiously invaded by the Red Army, and was brought under Soviet rule.

For almost two decades the Bolsheviks surrounded their regime in Lithuania with an iron curtain inside an iron curtain. Scores of thousands of intellectuals were executed or deported to Siberia. The resistance movement was crushed, through the application of unlimited terror. Russian settlers by the thousands were brought in, to help consolidate Soviet control and to supplant the ancient Lithuanian culture and civilization, with a Russified totalitarian culture.

The celebration of Lithuanian independence has significance for all of us. No people in the world has fought more heroically for freedom, or suffered more cruelly under tyranny, or clung more tenaciously to their national identity, their cultural and spiritual heritage, their faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom.

This great nation, this nation of heroes and martyrs, has, in its suffering, become a symbol for freemen everywhere.

On the one hand, the agony of the Lithuanian people serves as a constant reminder to us of the ignorance and cynicism and lack of foresight and courage that resulted in the abandonment of the captive peoples of Europe at the close of World War II.

On the other hand, by their obstinate refusal to reconcile themselves to tyranny, either under the czars or under the Bolsheviks, the Lithuanian people have inspired all of us to fight harder and work harder for the eternal cause of freedom.

This celebration of Lithuanian independence takes on added significance precisely because of the fact that Lithuania is no longer independent, and that its people now suffer under the cruelest yoke in their history.

In celebrating the independence which they no longer enjoy, the Lithuanian people are performing an act of dedication to the future, an act of enduring faith in the ultimate triumph of good over evil.

In this act, the Americans of Lithuanian descent join with their brethren in their motherland and throughout the free world. In this country and in other countries of the free world, the celebration takes place in public. In Lithuania, the celebration takes place in secret, in the privacy of men's homes and of their hearts. The little flames that burn in the hearts of all Lithuanian patriots can never be extinguished by the despots of the Kremlin unless they are prepared to extinguish the Lithuanian people.

I venture a prophecy, of whose truth I am certain: The little flames in the hearts of the Lithuanian people, and of all the other peoples oppressed by communism, will continue to burn until, one day, with God's help and with the help of the free world, they will unite into one large, consuming flame of freedom—a flame that will utterly destroy the godless tyranny of communism, will burn away all the evil it has created, and will restore society to God, and man to his God-given rights.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the history of freedom, February 16 is a date that will live in the hearts of all free men. Especially will it live in the hearts of the great Lithuanian people, for this date commemorates the independence of Lithuania. That noble land no longer stands in the sun of liberty. It stands in the shadow of Communist tyranny. It stands there despite the indomitable courage of its people, a victim of raw, brutal Communist aggression. Lithuania had the heart, the resolve to resist tyranny, to preserve its cherished freedom, but it did not have the strength of arms. It was literally overpowered and struck down by the godless, heartless hordes of freedom's sworn enemy, the Communist system. But the freedom of this proud people has never been wrested from their spirit. The tyrant can imprison the body, but there is no Siberia to which he can send the souls of freemen. There is no way he can extinguish the light that burns on through the darkness of enslavement, because that light is not manmade, and no man can put it out.

Freedom weeps over the fate of captive nations such as Lithuania. And how right, how proper are its tears. These nations are our blood brothers in liberty. Their silence behind the wall of their prison is a silence we can almost hear—the moving, eloquent silence of those who love freedom no less than we, of those who stand as a challenge to us, the free, to help them find their way back up the dark stairs of their servitude—out of bondage into their true and cherished home.

This is a challenge we must meet. We must keep faith with our brothers in captivity. It is good to pray for them. It is good to hope for them. But, above all, we must dedicate ourselves to doing all that lies within our power to return to them the keys of their lost freedom. We best serve their cause, as freemen, when we marshal the forces of all free societies on this earth, not merely our own, to stand against the red tide of conquest, to stop its onrush, to turn that tide by the force of the dynamic counteraction of governments and citizens whose eyes are open to the danger, whose minds and hearts are joined in a mass defense of the things we hold dearer than life itself.

Lithuanian Independence Day is not only a reminder of the fight for freedom. Above all, it is a symbol of the love of freedom. Let us make it a day that does not die—but a day that lives on in our hearts. Behind the Iron Curtain, brave men and women keep the candle of hope ever burning. Let us, the free, keep the fire of our devotion to their cause ever burning as well. They are brothers to us. Let us be brothers to them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to join today with millions of Americans of Lithuanian extraction to commemorate the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

On this solemn occasion, we in the free world should reflect upon the sufferings sustained by those courageous Lithuanians now enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. Their relentless quest for freedom and penchant for independence enabled Lithuania to free herself from Russian autocracy in 1917 and on February 16, 1918, to found the Lithuanian Republic.

For two decades the Lithuanian people made great strides in land reform, education, commerce, agriculture, and industry. However, this happy period was sadly brought to an abrupt end on June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union once again invaded and forcefully took control of this freedom-loving country.

Since then, these stout-hearted people have never known freedom. We are certain, however, that its spark has not been extinguished from their hearts. They still cling to the hope that their sacrifices will not be in vain and that someday they will regain their liberty.

Let us extend our deepest sympathy and friendship to these brave Lithuanians, whose cultural attainments, energies, and skills have added so much to the richness of our own Nation, and let us pray that her democratic ideals and memories endure, that her courage and hope never fail, and that the dawn of a new day of liberty and justice will soon be forthcoming in which Lithuania will once more take her proud place in the family of free nations.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Second World War spelled misery and misfortune to all nations involved in it. But to some nations the war meant the greatest of all disasters—the loss of their freedom and national independence. Lithuania was one of those countries caught in this tragedy. Lithuania had had a brief taste of freedom when it won its independence in 1918 from autocratic Russia—only to lose it at the end of World War II to the even more oppressive rule of Communist Russia.

Today in Lithuania freedom of speech, of assembly, and of movement is rigidly controlled. Despite these bitter conditions, the indominable spirit of the men and women of Lithuania has not flagged. Today, on the 43d anniversary of its independence, the people of Lithuania cannot publicly sing their national anthem. But they have never in their hearts stopped singing the song—just as they have never in their hearts submitted to the Soviet tyranny.

All Americans, not just Lithuanian-Americans, today reaffirm their support of Lithuania's fight for freedom. Our hopes are high that the resolute people of Lithuania will surely one day return their country to independence and to its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania expressed their newly won independence and freedom by adopting an inspiring democratic constitution.

For more than 120 years, this land had been subjugated under the iron fist of its powerful neighbor to the east, Russia. Five times the Lithuanian people rose in rebellion, only to be crushed.

Finally, 43 years ago, Lithuania won its freedom and established a flowering democracy along the Baltic Sea. A sweeping land reform program was effected. Great progress was made in industry, education and social welfare.

For only 22 years, this young democracy was able to live in peace. Then Lithuania was victimized by infiltration and invasion, first by the brutal legions of Adolph Hitler, then by Soviet armies.

But neither the tryanny of Hitler nor the oppression of the Soviet Union has dimmed the bright hope of freedom nurtured by the Lithuanian people.

All tyrants ultimately learn that physical and political suppression of a people cannot accomplish suppression of an idea, cannot erase the faith or hope that freedom someday will return.

It has been the history of tyrants that the freedom which they brutally suppress rises again to topple them, for its spirit never dies.

This spirit is rooted firmly in the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. No Iron Curtain will smother their hopes and prayers for a return to liberty.

Mr. President, I number among my friends and acquaintances many Americans of Lithuanian descent. To them, the great idea of freedom for Lithuania has not faded under the grim oppression of 20 years of Soviet rule.

Today, we join these people and their friends throughout the world in commemorating the day in 1918 when this courageous nation established its independence, which lasted so brief a time but which saw great economic, social, and cultural progress.

This is indeed a solemn day, for it reminds us that our own liberties are precious beyond estimation.

It reminds us, too, that millions in this world still suffer under despotic rule, and that slavery anywhere diminishes the degree of our own freedom.

It is fitting that Senators of this greatest free Nation on earth commemorate a day that was filled with hope and express their hope that the bright light of liberty will return to shine across that land which knew its warmth for so short a time before the despair of tyranny again descended.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 43 years ago today the people of Lithuania declared their independence—a freedom they were able to keep only 22 years. During those few years Lithuania grew industrially and agriculturally; her national anthem was sung by a happy people, her writers were free to express their love of their native land and their new-found liberty.

Today, and for the past 2 years, communism has dropped the Iron Curtain which silences all voices in Lithuania. While independent, she was a prosperous country, exporting food, even to America. Her goods are now sold under the name of Soviet goods. Today the only foodstuff in abundance consists of bread, potatoes, and vodka. Very little is imported. Her schoolchildren are brainwashed by the Communists from the first grade. Her creative writers and thinkers are expressionless; only when they serve to praise the present regime may they be heard.

The voice of a brave, freedom loving people has been stifled for many years, but the ideal of human liberty still burns brightly for Lithuania. Americans must never forget the struggle of these people. As the torchbearer of freedom in the world, we must continue to do everything we can to follow the command of Isaiah—to "undo the heavy burdens and to let the oppressed go free."

If the means to liberate this country, held in the firm grasp of communism, are not immediately visible, we must continually search and hope that one day soon we may be instrumental in aid to the Lithuanians.

If we for a moment forget that they yearn for liberty, then a part of the cause of freedom around the world will be forgotten. We dedicate ourselves anew on this 16th day of February 1961, to the proposition that all men are created equal, that no man shall be held under the iron thumb of communism, and that soon through good will and peace these will be free people once again.

I have something more than a passing interest in this subject, due to the fact that in 1921 and 1922 I was attending school in central Europe. The places at which I attended school during that year are now likewise behind the Iron Curtain. At that time they were not, but Lithuania was.

In 1921 there were many refugees from Lithuania in the part of central Europe where I was, and I heard with my own ears those recent refugees tell of the oppressions that existed when the Communist regime took over. The Communists had then been in control of Lithuania for only 2 or 3 years. So I salute Lithuania on their Independence Day.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today, in a great nation which has enjoyed the fullest fruition of freedom ever known to man, we herald the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence. We do this with the deepest significance, for our freedom is not a static thing. We have labored, we have fought, so many of our noble sons have made the greatest of human sacrifice to defend and preserve it.

There is a bond between all who revere and love freedom. It will not be severed by time or by condition. As freemen, our hopes are always that others might achieve this blessedness. We have, again and again, demonstrated our willingness, to assume the most tremendous burdens to protect not only our freedom, but that of others.

As we approach the new frontier to which we are being directed, we must preserve our true posture—it is a source of daily inspiration to our beleaguered friends—it is the ultimate source of that strength which can nourish freedom whenever it exists. It follows that our economy must flourish—it must not be fettered by statism which stultifies individual dignity and individual initiative.

The technique of tearing down our image of military might for political gain must cease. I am happy that the use of this technique subsided early in November, and that a member of the new administration, who can speak with authority, acknowledges our position of leadership. This revelation will rekindle the light of hope in many dark corners of the world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26, page 1295, one will find the resolution submitted by the American Lithuanian Lawyers of Illinois and the Lithuanian Jurists in Chicago in which they urge that the Government of the United States and the government of other countries, through their delegations to the United Nations, declare the Soviet Union an aggressor and demand the withdrawal of its military forces and various agents from Lithuania, and to liberate the Lithuanian people from the Soviet Union's subjugation. In their resolution they set forth facts upon which to support that request.

Mr. President, February 16 is the 43d anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania, ancient state but a new Republic. Lithuania, along with Latvia and Estonia, the two other countries which were the first victims of Soviet Russia, have suffered greatly under subjugation by the Soviet Union. Since that time there have been other countries in Europe which have been brought under the power and domination of Soviet Union.

Recently, we have heard statements by Senators and Congressmen extolling the courage and dedication of the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain who are forever hopeful of someday regaining the independence they enjoyed in 1253 and which they regained 43 years ago. Recently, my colleague, the distinguished minority whip, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], introduced a Senate concurrent resolution asking the President of the United States "to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask that the United Nations request the Soviets first, to withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; second, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps; and finally, that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia under its supervision."

I hope that the Foreign Relations Committee and the Congress of the United States will act promptly on this resolution.

Mr. President, the peoples in Lithuania, and other countries in Europe which have been brought under the yoke of the Soviet Union, cannot observe Lithuania's Independence Day, but the Lithuanians and their friends in this country and throughout the free world

can commemorate and speak for these subjugated people. It is hard for us in this great country, with its many freedoms—where even the most renowned Communists or hardened criminals are given full protection under the Constitution and our laws—to visualize, to understand the struggles, the oppressions, the deprivations that are inflicted upon the people who were once a part of proud nations but are now under the heel of a Communist dictator. This is all the more reason why we should glory in our own freedom and at the same time give courage to all the people throughout the world who desire to enjoy the freedoms that we have.

I hope the day will come soon when these people in Lithuania, and other such countries, will again have their freedom, their rights, and dignities restored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by Albert L. Zakarka, 6958 South Rockwell, Chicago 29, Ill., dated February 12, 1961, be placed in the RECORD at this point, in which he concisely and clearly states how an American of Lithuanian descent feels about the plight of those people who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, and two resolutions from Racine, Wis., and East St. Louis, Ill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 12, 1961.*

Hon. EVERETT DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As you may recall from past years, February 16 is a day set aside by the Lithuanians as Lithuanian Independence Day.

I realize that the people of Lithuania are by no means independent but, rather, are controlled tightly as a slave colony by the most imperialistic nation on earth, the Communist Soviet Government. We feel that the people in the United States and, more important, the people of the world, must be made to realize that it is the Soviet Government that has practiced and is still practicing forced colonization. We dare not allow their propaganda of friend of the enslaved and oppressed to win out. The people of Lithuania have not, nor ever will, succumb to the thought of voluntary association with the Soviet Government or so-called Soviet Republic.

Consequently, if it is possible, I would like to urge you to give public moral support to the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Sincerely,

ALBERT L. ZAKARKA.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Lithuania's prosperous independence of only two short decades was erased physically by the rise of totalitarian dictatorships, it still lives on in the hearts of our brothers and sisters who toil under oppression of Communist tyranny; and

Whereas this stubborn spirit of freedom being manifested by the people behind the Iron Curtain today is a deterrent factor in retaining world peace by virtue of the fact that any full scale war would find political upheaval in the Soviet "incorporated" nations; and

Whereas they cannot speak for themselves and look to free nations to make their plight known: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States, by its words and actions continue to give hope to these valiant people that they may again enjoy that freedom which is so close to their hearts; and be it further

Resolved, That the Racine branch of the Lithuanian American Council express its gratitude to the President in telling Congress during his state of the Union address that the United States must never forget its hopes for ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States, through the United Nations expand the scope of the "Colonialism" resolution to include those nations of Eastern Europe under yoke of Soviet colonialism; and be it further

Resolved, That the leaders of the free world must never be maneuvered into a position where they will be accessories to the crime of Russian enslavement; and be it finally

Resolved, That the United States adhere to its position of refusing to recognize the alien rule of Lithuania and other captive nations, for such an agreement would be a defeat far greater than battles in actual war and the loss of at least 100 million persons behind the Iron Curtain who despise communism and who hate their Soviet overlords.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
East St. Louis, Ill., February 12, 1961.

Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: On the occasion of the celebration of the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by the peoples of Lithuania, the following resolution was adopted on this 12th day of February 1961 by the citizens of Lithuanian descent residing in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.:

"*Resolved*, That this meeting express its belief, on behalf of all Lithuanian American citizens, in the ideals of the United States and accordingly pledge support in the defense of the Baltic nations in all movements to combat communistic aggression."

Yours truly,

ANTHONY L. DEKSNYS,
Chairman.
JEANETTE M. MILLER,
Secretary.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, today is the 43d anniversary of the day on which the Republic of Lithuania was declared a free and independent state.

The Lithuanian people united in the common cause of their independence in 1918, and the young nation, in its flourishing growth, showed its natural aptitude for independent statehood. Unfortunately, that independence was short-lived, lasting only a little more than 20 years. In the early part of World War II, Lithuania was invaded, first by Nazi Germany and later by Soviet Russia; and we are poignantly reminded on this 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence that independence has yet to become a reality for the Lithuanian people.

Probably no people in history has suffered greater oppression than the Lithuanians. Only this month the last of the Catholic bishops in this overwhelmingly Catholic land disappeared, all others having fled or been removed before him.

The U.S. Government has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania and the other Baltic States by the Soviet Union, and all friends of freedom today join in the fervent hope for a better future for this brave little land and its people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted on February 5, 1961, by the Lithuanian Americans of Linden, N.J., gathered under the auspices of Lithuanian American Council, Linden Branch, for the commemoration of the 43d anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 5, 1961, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J.

Whereas on February 16, 1918, 43 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was declared a free and independent state by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius; and

Whereas in commemoration of this 43d anniversary, Americans of Lithuanian descent rededicate themselves to the cause of Lithuania's independence, which in 1940 was brutally invaded by the Communist government of Soviet Russia in violation of its treaty obligations, imposing to date upon the people of Lithuania a most ruthless regime of Communist dictatorship and colonialism and reducing the people to the status of colonial slaves; and

Whereas the anticolonialist resolution introduced by the Soviet Union delegation to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations proposing complete independence and freedom to all colonial countries, to which resolution the American delegation submitted an amendment urging to expand the meaning of said Soviet resolution to include the colonial countries held by the Soviet Russia: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this meeting express gratitude to the U.S. Government for the consistently demonstrated favorable attitude toward Lithuania's independence and that the representatives of the U.S. Government firmly maintain this policy at any future deliberation regarding the status of the enslaved nations; and

Resolved, That the Soviet policy of national genocide and unmerciful exploitation of Lithuania and her people be condemned; and

Resolved, It be demanded that the Soviet Union withdraw from the territory of Lithuania and that the people of Lithuania be allowed to elect their government in conformity with their freely expressed will and desire. * * *

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
Honorable President.
V. TURSA, *Secretary.*

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the history of Lithuania is one of almost constant struggle to attain freedom.

The largest and most populated of the three Baltic States, it was first independent in the 11th century A.D. The nation was deprived of its independence in 1795 through a partition between Russia and Prussia. Although Russian domination lasted 120 years, it was challenged by armed insurrectionists by almost every generation. Finally in 1918, after great bloodshed, the people of Lithuania attained their independence.

Today we commemorate the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

For the next two decades, despite economic hardships in the wake of war, the Lithuanian people showed great vitality and outstanding ability in self-government and economic development.

But World War II overwhelmed this struggling nation. In 1944 Red Army troops invaded the country and established Russian authority in an unbridled orgy of terrorism. Now this land is a

captive of the Reds and has had to withstand purges, deportations, and forced labor imposed by the Russian masters.

But the struggle continues. The people, under a repressive police state second to none, harbor within themselves the love of freedom and the readiness to strike out for liberty when the opportunity shall present itself.

This opportunity must come again as it has come in the past and we must continue to speak out and encourage the Lithuanian people who must someday rejoin us in the family of free and sovereign nations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Second World War took a terrible toll both in terms of human casualties and in material losses. Appalling and staggering though these losses were, perhaps they were no more shocking than the spiritual losses caused by that war. In this respect Europe's losses loom enormous, and as they seem now, some of them at least were irretrievable losses. There a large number of people who lived under their own sovereign governments and were free, suffered the loss of both their individual freedom and national independence. Among the three Baltic nationality groups which lost their freedom are the Lithuanians.

The Lithuanian people are proud of their long and glorious history, and also of their ceaseless struggle for freedom against their oppressors. Since their subjugation to the czarist Russian regime late in the 18th century they had lost their independence, but not their desire to be free. During their years of trial they learned that in order to enjoy the fruits of their labor they must first be masters of their own destiny. They united and worked together for the realization of their most cherished dream, for their independence. They fought their oppressors, staging open rebellion more than once, but they had to wait until World War I for the attainment of their goal. Finally on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence.

Then for about two decades the Lithuanians lived and worked in freedom. Soon after the outbreak of the Second World War, however, they were fated to lose all their worldly possessions and their independence. Hemmed in between two aggressive dictatorships, and without the chance of obtaining any effective aid from its friends in the West, the little Lithuanian Republic was robbed of its very existence. Early in 1940 Stalin ordered the Red army into that country, it was occupied, and then made part of the Soviet Union.

Since those tragic days unfortunate Lithuanians have been living under the worst tyrannies known to man. For a short time during the last war they suffered under the Nazis. Toward the end of that war, these were evicted from the country and their place taken once more by the heartless minions of the Kremlin. The Red regime has been there ever since with all its attendant evils: its commissars and spy rings, its informers and executioners, and it has succeeded in changing the life in Lithuania to one of regimented horrors. The people live there in abject misery, but fortunately even under such dismal and disheartening conditions the Lithuanians have not given up their love for freedom, their cherished dream for independence.

Unfortunately, there is the sad fact that while these stanch champions of freedom carry on the struggle against totalitarian dictatorship in Lithuania the friends of freedom and democracy in the West are not able to be of assistance to them in any effective way. All efforts through the United Nations and through direct approaches to the men in the Kremlin have proved fruitless. Let us hope that under the vigorous leadership of the new administration, and with the wholehearted cooperation of other governments, some way may be found to better the lot of the liberty-loving Lithuanians in their historic homeland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following resolutions printed in the RECORD. The resolutions express, I believe, the dedication of one group of Americans to this cause.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 5, 1961, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J.

Whereas on February 16, 1918, 43 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was declared a free and independent state by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius; and

Whereas, in commemoration of this 43d anniversary, Americans of Lithuanian descent rededicate themselves to the cause of Lithuania's independence, which in 1940 was brutally invaded by the Communist government of Soviet Russia in violation of its treaty obligations, imposing to date upon the people of Lithuania a most ruthless regime of Communist dictatorship and colonialism and reducing the people to the status of colonial slaves; and

Whereas the anticolonialist resolution introduced by the Soviet Union delegation to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations proposing complete independence and freedom to all colonial countries, to which resolution the American delegation submitted an amendment urging to expand the meaning of said Soviet resolution to include the colonial countries held by the Soviet Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting express gratitude to the U.S. Government for the consistently demonstrated favorable attitude toward Lithuania's independence and that the representatives of our Government firmly maintain this policy at any future deliberation regarding the status of the enslaved nations; and

Resolved, That the Soviet policy of national genocide and unmerciful exploitation of Lithuania and her people be condemned; and

Resolved, It be demanded that the Soviet Union withdraw from the territory of Lithuania and that the people of Lithuania be allowed to elect their government in conformity with their freely expressed will and desire.

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
Honorable President.
V. TURSA, *Secretary.*

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement discussing the commemoration of the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIAN LIBERTY

Today marks the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. It was in 1918 that the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence of Russia and in 1920 a treaty was signed between the Soviet Union and Lithuania by which Lithuania's complete independent sovereignty was recognized. By this treaty Soviet Russia renounced forever all sovereign rights over the Baltic peoples.

Then for two decades the people of Lithuania enjoyed the blessings of freedom and liberty. Following the traditions established in the 11th century, Lithuania contributed generously of its culture, science, and art to modern European civilization. Its national culture was permeated with the love of freedom and with a high standard of scholastic learning.

However, in 1940 the Soviet Union cruelly tore up in treaty obligation and once again imposed by force its will upon the small nations of the Baltic.

The tragic story of Lithuania's relations with the Soviet Union presents an object lesson to those who believe that perplexing world problems can be solved by signing treaties of nonaggression and coexistence with the Soviet dictatorship.

Today, Lithuanians are forbidden to even sing their national anthem. However, the inspiring words of this great national hymn written by Dr. Vincas Kudirka, are engraved in the hearts of Lithuanians everywhere.

LITHUANIAN NATIONAL ANTHEM

"Hail Lithuania triumphant
Land of heroes' story,
From the past thy sons may ever
Draw their strength and glory.
May thy children ever follow
Their undaunted fathers,
In devotion to their country
And good will to others.
May the sun of our loved shore
Shine upon us evermore,
May our Faith and the Truth
Keep our pathway lighted,
May the love of Fatherland
Make us strong of heart and hand,
May our Land, ever stand
Peaceful and united."

We take this occasion to point out our hopes that the hopes of these freedom loving people will come to fruition and Lithuania will take its rightful place in the world community of nations.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in October of 1940 said: "It is stated that Lithuania has lost her independence. It is a mistake to say so. Lithuania has not lost her independence. Lithuania's independence has only temporarily been put aside. Time will come and Lithuania will be free again. This will happen much sooner than you may expect."

All Americans join with our Lithuanian friends, both here in America and those behind the Iron Curtain, in affirming their belief that President Roosevelt's words are prophetic and that liberty will come again to those now held in captivity.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Communists—while two-facedly berating colonialism—today possess the largest colonial empire in the world. As a result, millions of people now face a future of enslavement—not freedom.

Fortunately, the will for freedom—and the undying desire for recognition of human dignity, keeps alive the frame of hope in the hearts of many of these behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In our own country—historically the citadel of freedom—a great many patriotic Americans continue—and rightly so—to remind us that despite the omnipresent hammer-and-sickle, the will of the people in their ancestral homeland has not been broken; rather it is still very much alive—in the hope of ultimate liberty.

As a matter of policy, we cannot—and must not—write off these nations to communism. To the contrary, we must utilize by all possible means—short of provoking armed conflict—to insure the ultimate freedom of the enslaved people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Today, I received a letter from Peter Petrusaitis, secretary of the Lithuanian-American Council of Racine, Wis., forwarding a resolution endorsing the need for continued efforts to bring ultimate liberty of the people of Lithuania. Commemorating the 43d anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas Lithuania's prosperous independence of only two short decades was erased physically by the rise of totalitarian dictatorships, it still lives on in the hearts of our brothers and sisters who toil under oppression of Communist tyranny; and

Whereas this stubborn spirit of freedom being manifested by the people behind the Iron Curtain today is a deterrent factor in retaining world peace by virtue of the fact that any full scale war would find political upheaval in the Soviet "incorporated" nations; and

Whereas they cannot speak for themselves and look to free nations to make their plight known: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States, by its words and actions continue to give hope to these valiant people that they may again enjoy that freedom which is so close to their hearts; and be it further

Resolved, That the Racine Branch of the Lithuanian American Council express its gratitude to the President in telling Congress during his state of the Union address that the United States must never forget its hopes for ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States, through the United Nations expand the scope of the "colonialism" resolution to include those nations of Eastern Europe under yoke of Soviet colonialism; and be it further

Resolved, That the leaders of the free world must never be maneuvered into a position where they will be accessories to the crime of Russian enslavement; and be it finally

Resolved, That the United States adhere to its position of refusing to recognize the alien rule of Lithuania and other captive nations, for such an agreement would be a defeat far greater than battles in actual war and the loss of at least 100 million persons behind the Iron Curtain who despise communism and who hate their Soviet overlords.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL.
MARTIN KASPARAITIS, *Chairman*.
PETER PETRUSAITIS, *Secretary*.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in this month of February our country finds sacred days of special reverence—days of grateful dedication to men who created these United States, men who preserved these United States. We observe the birthdays of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln with all the fervor of patriots who cherish freedom for themselves and for all.

It seems altogether fitting that another date of freedom falls midway between these American days of destiny. It is the birthday of a people, the regeneration of a nation. It is February 16, and this year it marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

On this date we join with the sons and daughters of Lithuania—in their homeland and throughout the world—to dwell on the glories of the past, as we dare hope for the freedoms of the future.

We recall that February day of 1918, when the shackles of serfdom were stricken from Lithuania; and she lived again in the sunlight of the centuries of her national power, which of old defeated the Teutonic knights of Germany and defied the armies of the czars.

But Russia and Germany were to join once more to defeat and divide Lithuania, and, in 1940, to place her under the galling yoke of communism.

But no alien ideology can destroy the character of a people—their ideals, their faith, their culture, their courage.

And no plight of the Lithuanian present can make us forget their contributions to our country—what America has gained from the character of its citizens who look back to Lithuania as their homeland. Each of us in our States and communities places the highest value on our Lithuanian neighbors.

We of America gain from the example and inspiration of the Lithuanian homeland itself, where the desire and determination for liberty has never died. That spirit has survived through the score of years of its new slavery under Soviet godlessness.

There can be no slavery of the soul; and a determined and dedicated people will once again possess the freedom they deserve. There is no truth deeper than the promise that history will repeat itself—for people make history, and liberty-loving people generate liberty.

We pledge the people of Lithuania and we pledge the people of the world that we of America will retain our own soul of freedom. And we will maintain the means—our own power of purpose and our purpose of power.

We will have the strength to safeguard and we will have the spirit to spread the blessings of liberty and peace to all men of good will, to all lands of lasting faith—hoping and working for the day when nations realize that love of neighbors must be the common cause of all.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as a former Baltic desk officer in the Department of State, I rise to commemorate the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We mark this day filled with affection for the brave Lithuanian people who are suffering under Soviet colonialism. We take this occasion to reiterate our heartfelt identification with the freedom loving Lithuanian people.

The alien rulers of Lithuania are accepted by the American people. We have rightly refused to recognize the propriety of Soviet control over Lithuania. We note with regret, despite Russia's promise in 1939 to "renounce all rights of sovereignty in the Baltic States," that Lithuania remains enslaved today.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence we pay tribute to the courageous Lithuanians who continue the valiant struggle for independence. Today Lithuania's enslavement stands as an example of Soviet duplicity and as a symbol of the plight of all the captive nations.

We share in the hope that Lithuania will one day be given her rightful place alongside the free and independent nations of the world.

WILL AFRICA GO COMMUNIST?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of the Members of the Senate to an article which appears in the February 25 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. It is entitled "Will Africa Go Communist?" and it is written by one of this country's ablest political analysts, Mr. Stewart Alsop.

It is an article which has a critical bearing on decisions that we must make within the coming months. There is no soothing sirup in this article, no soporific cliches about the U.N. and coexistence. It is composed, instead, of hard political wisdom and naked political truths. If we ignore these truths—indeed, I might say, if we ignore this article—we do so at our own peril.

Mr. Alsop points out that in the Congo, U.N. forces maintained largely with American funds have been used to prevent a moderate, pro-Western, anti-Communist regime, headed by a chief of state who has been recognized by the U.N. General Assembly, from consolidating its power. To compound this preposterous situation, the same U.N. force did nothing to prevent the establishment of the insurrectionary pro-Communist regime of Gizenga, and is doing nothing to prevent it from extending its power.

Mr. Alsop quoted a Western Ambassador in Leopoldville as saying:

I honestly don't understand you Americans. Here you are paying the piper, and you let Nehru call the tune.

The Ambassador whom Mr. Alsop quoted was not simply referring to the fact that the U.N. operation in the Congo is under the direction of the Indian diplomat, Rajeshwar Dayal. In itself, there would be nothing wrong with this. What the Ambassador had in mind was that we have permitted the policy of India and Nehru to prevail in the direction of the U.N. efforts in the Congo.

Mr. Alsop says that we ought to recognize frankly what the U.N. can do and what it cannot do. Where there is a danger of a clash, he says, the U.N. can sometimes freeze the situation until the danger subsides. But it cannot resolve the situation. In a situation where the U.N. is so sharply divided and incapable of decisive action, a policy that limits itself to wholehearted support for the U.N. is no policy at all. The beginning of a sensible policy in the Congo, Mr.

Alsop concludes, is the acceptance of certain harsh realities.

If we are to meet the challenge in Africa successfully, says Mr. Alsop, we must see it as it is, rather than in terms of our own familiar cliches. If we insist on prating about democracy where there is none, if we shirk the responsibility for an effective American policy and seek shelter in high-sounding phrases about supporting the United Nations, if we attempt to convince the African people that our intentions are noble by kicking our European allies in the teeth, then we certainly will not meet the challenge.

With these thoughts, which Mr. Alsop has so ably expressed, I am in wholehearted accord.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point Mr. Stewart Alsop's article, "Will Africa Go Communist?" I would urge all the Members of the Senate to place this item at the top of their reading list. I consider this an article of such exceptional quality that I have recommended that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee call upon Mr. Alsop to testify in executive session on what he saw and learned in Africa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL AFRICA GO COMMUNIST?

(By Stewart Alsop)

It is tempting to start this report on a long journey of inquiry through Africa by recalling some of the more startling and bizarre sidelights on African politics which were encountered along the way.

For example, the last chief of state I met on my travels was the president of one of the little countries which have emerged from former French West Africa. When his country was under French rule, the distinguished president of this now sovereign nation spent a stretch in jail for selling his mother-in-law into slavery. Or there was the high official of the Katanga Government, who was impeccably dressed, spoke elegant French, and hated all white men. The reason, I was told, was that a couple of years ago his aged father had got into trouble with the Belgians for eating a small child in a vain attempt to regain his youth.

Aside from being startling, such episodes have a perfectly serious meaning. For it is easy for Americans to forget that Africa south of the Sahara is only a generation or so removed from the prehistoric past—literally prehistoric, since there was no writing and thus no written history. The witchcraft, slavery, cannibalism, and tribalism which marked that recent, unrecorded past still strongly color the political present. Thus the worst mistake we in the West can make is to see Africa through Western eyes, to judge Africa by Western standards.

There are other ways in which a report on Africa might well begin. For example, there is the unforgettable contrast between Lagos, capital city of Nigeria, the biggest black African state, and Johannesburg, chief city of the white-dominated Union of South Africa. Johannesburg is a prosperous city, blessed with a climate to make a Californian green with envy. Lagos is a hideously ugly city, filled with bad smells, and not long ago it was known as "the white man's grave," since white men rarely survived there more than 6 months. But Lagos today is a city of hope. Johannesburg is a city of hate and fear, and it may one day prove the grave of many more white men than ever died in Lagos. This contrast also has a serious meaning.

But I think instead that I shall begin this report on a trip of more than 19,000 miles unconventionally—and against all the best rules of reporting—by listing certain conclusions I reached during my African travels. They are:

First, the talk we heard a little while ago about "keeping the cold war out of Africa" is blithering nonsense. The Communist bloc is now making a determined, carefully planned play for power throughout Africa. The only real question is whether we should let the Communists win the African cold war by default, or whether we should try seriously to meet the Communist challenge in Africa.

Second, if we are to meet the challenge successfully, we must try to see Africa as it is, rather than in terms of time-hallowed clichés and liberal slogans. If we insist on maundering on about democracy where there is none, if we try to substitute noble phrases about supporting the United Nations for an effective American policy, and if we attempt to convince the Africans of our noble intentions by kicking our European allies in the teeth, then we certainly will not meet the challenge.

Finally if we base our policies on the realities instead of on noble cliches, the position of the United States and of the West in Africa south of the Sahara is very far from hopeless. Indeed, throughout most of Africa, if we of the West have any sense and any guts, the odds are all in our favor. That is true even in the Congo.

As for the first of these three conclusions, surely no sensible man doubts that the cold war has come to Africa. Last November, in my first week in Africa, to cite one example, no less than six distinct Communist-bloc missions descended on Bamako, capital of the Mali Republic. (Interestingly enough, the Russians and the Chinese Communists, although crowded into the same small hotel, never exchanged a word or a nod.) Low-interest loans, guns, and planes, heavy equipment, sports stadiums, jet runways, scholarships, "dash" (African for bribes) for important politicians and jewels for their mistresses—these are a few of the weapons with which the Communist bloc is fighting the African cold war.

The Congo is, of course, the heart of the African cold war. That is one reason why this first report on Africa will center on the Congo. Another reason is that I found in the Congo one of those queer, unexpected, little-understood situations which a wandering reporter comes across once in a blue moon. The moral to be drawn from this odd situation was once neatly summed up by Mr. Leo Durocher: "Nice guys finish last."

Those who hoped to keep the cold war out of Africa pinned their hopes on the UN force which was sent to the Congo after the Congolese army revolted. But the Soviets very quickly made it clear that they had no intention at all of being nice guys about the Congo. They bypassed the U.N. to send in relays of Ilyushin planes, filled with materiel and with more than 400 technical advisers for the paranoiac pro-Communist premier, Patrice Lumumba.

Then, when things began to go wrong for them, and especially after Lumumba was first neutralized and then arrested by anti-Communist Joseph Mobutu, Soviet Premier Khrushchev demanded the scalp of U.N. chief Dag Hammarskjold and threatened to destroy the U.N. itself if he did not get his way. The "positive neutralists" who follow the Soviet lead, including the Egyptians, the Guineans, and the Ghanaians, threatened to withdraw their troops from the U.N. command in the Congo. With Communist help and advice—and no interference whatsoever from the U.N.—a rump pro-Lumumba regime under Communist-lining Antoine Gizenga, was established in Stanleyville, in the Congo's Oriental Province. All this hardly sounds like an attempt to keep the cold war out of Africa.

While the Soviets and their friends have been busy playing the bad guys in the Congo, we have been dutifully playing the good guys. Last September James Wadsworth, then U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. summarized the policy laid down by former President Eisenhower: "U.S. policy in the Congo is simple. We support the U.N. wholeheartedly." In accord with this simple policy, when the Soviets refused to contribute a ruble to the expensive U.N. operation in the Congo, the American taxpayer dutifully picked up most of the tab.

The result, perhaps inevitably, is that the bad guys seem to have a lot more influence with the U.N. command in the Congo than the good guys. As one Western Ambassador in Léopoldville remarked in honest bewilderment. "I just don't understand you Americans. Here you are paying the piper. And yet you let Nehru call the tune."

The man who has been calling the U.N. tune in the Congo, as of this writing, is a pipe-smoking Indian intellectual-aristocrat named Rajeshwar Dayal, who was chosen by Hammarskjold to run the U.N. operation in the Congo. An able and highly articulate man, Dayal is a follower of India's Prime Minister Nehru, and shares Nehru's leanings toward positive neutralism.

In Dayal's eyes, his chief antagonist is not Gizenga or Lumumba or the Communist or neutralist politicians who have bitterly attacked his U.N. command. Dayal's enemy is—as of this writing—young General Mobutu, recently appointed commander in chief of the Congolese army by President Joseph Kasavubu, U.N. recognized chief of state of the Congo. It is not too much to say that Dayal and Mobutu hate each other's guts, as both instantly made clear when I talked to them.

I saw Mobutu in a big white house on the banks of the Congo, which he had taken over as his command post after his anti-Lumumba coup. By the time this is published, Mobutu may be out of his big white house, since his position gets shakier every day—thanks largely to Dayal.

It is fashionable among reporters in Léopoldville to write about Mobutu in deprecatory quotes as "the so-called Congo strongman." When I met him, he seemed to me, in a quiet way, a strong man. He is nervous, and very thin, but he seemed to have a certain inner force. He was only 29 when he marched into the Léopoldville radio station last September and announced that the army was taking over from Lumumba. He had discovered, he said, that the Russian technicians sent to Lumumba were really "Russian officers disguised as civilians." He added, "I have expelled them all." This hardly seems the action of a weak man.

Strong or weak, Mobutu was certainly a sad and harried man when I saw him. If the U.N. under Dayal had not actively obstructed every move he made, he said, he could have dealt in fairly short order with the Stanleyville dissidents. After that it would have been possible to come to some sort of accommodation with the other two secessionist regimes. Tshombe's in Katanga and Kalonji's in the Kasai. But, he said, as long as the United Nations pursued "la politique Nehru"—meaning the Dayal policy—nothing could be done in the Congo.

Dayal was just as unhappy as his enemy Mobutu, when I saw him in his air-conditioned office in the junior skyscraper the U.N. had taken over in Leopoldville. The trouble was, he said, that "you people don't really believe in democracy." If certain Western embassies (meaning the able American Ambassador, Clare Timberlake) had not had an obsession about Lumumba, a legitimate democratic government could have

been established (meaning almost certainly a government headed by pro-Communist Lumumba). Now, instead, Mobutu's army of rapists was completely unleashed. The situation was, therefore, totally out of control, and chaos threatened.

This extremely somber estimate of the situation surprised me. Some reporters have the luck to resemble Joe Btfsplk, the small man in "L'il Abner" who is accompanied by a permanent black cloud and whose every step is dogged by disaster. This makes for vivid reporting. Alas, wherever I go, a great calm descends. It would make better copy if I could write—as others have written—that the jungle is rapidly taking over Leopoldville and Elisabethville, that the people are reverting to savagery and that the Congolese army is using visiting journalists as human pincushions. Instead, I found the two big Congo cities the handsomest and best kept in Africa—and with the best restaurants. And I found the Congolese people, in uniform and out, in the Katanga bush country and in Leopoldville's African cité, unfailingly courteous and even jolly.

No doubt these impressions were onesided. Some very ugly things have certainly happened in the Congo. But the fact is that Dayal, both as a Nehru neutralist and as the U.N. chief in the Congo, has had an understandable impulse to portray the situation in lurid terms. Since three-quarters of the news from the Congo emanates from the U.N. command, Dayal's views have also had a considerable influence on the press.

Dayal has described the Mobutu army as a disorderly rabble and accused it in an official report of acts of lawlessness. Actually, in the view of qualified observers, in his first few weeks in power Mobutu did a rather remarkable job of bringing the army in the Leopoldville area under control. But to Dayal, the Congolese army is and always will be a disorderly rabble. If it were not a rabble, it might be difficult to justify certain of the policies laid down by Dayal as U.N. chief in the Congo.

For the U.N. policy has been, in essence, to immobilize the forces controlled by the Kasavubu-Mobutu regime, in the name of preventing violence and maintaining law and order. Dayal has ruled that Mobutu's army should be permitted to make only "minor troop movements." Otherwise the "rabble" might get out of hand, and bloodshed might result.

With the Kasavubu-Mobutu forces thus effectively hamstrung, and with help from the Egyptians and Iron Curtain money and technicians, Gizenga's rump pro-Communist regime quickly consolidated its position in Oriental Province. Gizenga's forces then began moving on neighboring Kivu and Katanga Provinces. The troop movements were by no means minor by Congolese standards, but the U.N. did nothing, or nothing much. Immobilized by the U.N., Mobutu could do nothing, or nothing much. Being powerless to act, Mobutu's prestige has been eaten away, which is why he may be out of the picture even before these words are printed—and why the Communist-lining Lumumba may be back in the picture.

Surely this is a very queer business. U.N. forces largely subsidized by the United States have been used to prevent a moderate, pro-Western anti-Communist regime, headed by the U.N.-recognized chief of state, from consolidating its position in the heart of Africa. Meanwhile, a pro-Communist regime has been established and allowed to extend its power in the heart of Africa without effective opposition from those forces. How did we get into this odd situation?

Part of the answer, to be candid about it, is that when our simple policy was first conceived, the U.N. looked like the best bet for preventing Lumumba from consolidating his position. Another part of the answer is that the U.N. troops are largely concentrated near Leopoldville, and it is thus physically easier to control the Leopoldville regime than the Stanleyville regime. But another part of the answer surely derives from our tendency to be carried away by noble-sounding phrases.

The U.N. in the Congo is widely advertised as being neutral and above politics, for example. It is neither. There is no such thing as neutrality in a situation like that in the Congo, if only because, if you prevent A from shooting at B, you are obviously helping B. Moreover, because they are working for the U.N., people are not mysteriously transmuted into supranational beings without political views of national allegiance. Being both an Indian and a subordinate of Nehru, Dayal is quite naturally responsible to la politique Nehru. By the same token, the commanders of the Egyptian or Ghanaian or Guinean forces in the Congo quite naturally have an ear cocked to the ambitions and desires of Nasser or Nkrumah or Sékou Touré.

All this may be quite natural and understandable, but from the point of view of American and Western interests, the present situation is an impossible one. For why should we subsidize the U.N. in the Congo, while the U.N. in turn engages in a continual vendetta with the pro-Western regime which we recognize and support? Kasavubu has demanded that Dayal be replaced. That demand certainly deserves the quiet support of the new administration. And if quiet support is not enough, then Adlai Stevenson, our new Ambassador to the U.N., must bring himself to bang his shoe on his desk, at least figuratively. We who pay the piper ought to begin to do a little tunecalling.

We ought also now to recognize, once and for all, what the U.N. can and cannot do. Where there is danger of a great power clash, the U.N. can usefully freeze a situation until tempers cool. But to freeze a situation is not to resolve it, as the Congo has abundantly proved. That is why the simple policy of wholehearted support for the U.N. is really no policy at all. The beginning of a sensible policy in the Congo, and indeed in black Africa as a whole, is to recognize the realities, to see things as they are and not as they ought to be.

The first reality to recognize is very simple—Africa is not America. Every time an American uses American standards to judge an African situation, he falls flat on his face. Consider, for example, the way a shrewd American public relations man came a cropper in Nigeria.

The public relations expert was hired for the Nigerian elections by Chief Awolowo, the big chief of the western region of Nigeria. Awolowo hoped his party, the Action Group, would score sufficient gains, especially in the largely Moslem northern region, to make him the obvious choice for prime minister of the federal government. The public relations man had a bright idea. He persuaded Awolowo to get himself a helicopter for pamphlet dropping and campaigning purposes—in the United States, after all, helicopters have been used most effectively in political campaigns. But the emirs in the north put out the word: "The sky belongs to Allah, and the droppings of the great bird are poison," and Awolowo ended up low man on the Nigerian political totem pole.

The second reality we must recognize if we are not to end up low man on the African totem pole is that countries are not countries in Africa—not by American or European standards. Countries aren't real in Africa. Tribes are real.

Take the Congo. Like every other country in Black Africa, the Congo is a geographical accident. Its frontiers are simply lines drawn on a map by white men in the bad old days when the Europeans were slicing up Africa like a juicy pie. These lines are not real or meaningful to the African who lives in the bush or the rain forest, or even—except for a thin layer of detribalized évolués—to the African who lives in the crowded African quarters of the European-built cities. What is real and meaningful to the African is his tribe.

It is quite impossible to make head or tail of what is going on in the Congo unless you understand the power of tribalism in African politics. A few examples:

The Baluba tribesmen in Northern Katanga have made all sorts of bloody trouble for Moise Tshombe, the moonfaced Belgian-backed president of copper-rich Katanga, in the southeastern Congo. The Katanga Balubas are allied to the pro-Communist, pro-Lumumba forces in Stanleyville. But this is not because the Balubas are close and approving students of the doctrines of Karl Marx. It is because Tshombe is a Balunda, and so are most of the members of his government. The Balubas and the Balundas are ancient enemies.

The Balubas of South Kasai, on the other hand, are fiercely anti-Lumumba. But this is not because they find communism abhorrent, but because their ancient enemies, the Luluas, are pro-Lumumba. Or consider the triumph enjoyed by President Kasavubu last December, in New York, when the U.N. Assembly voted to seat his delegation, which was a big setback for Lumumba and his Soviet friends. Kasavubu owed his triumph to small, smiling President Fulbert Youlou of the neighboring former French Congo, who rallied the other former French territories to back Kasavubu. The reason: Youlou and Kasavubu are both members of the Bakongo tribe.

Tribalism is the main reason—though not the only one—why the fragmentation of Africa has proceeded at such a pace. When the French ruled French West Africa, for example, the area consisted of two huge administrative districts. These two districts have now become twelve nations, some so small or so economically unviable as to be geographical bad jokes. The same fragmentation is going on in the Congo, and for the same reasons. Aside from the U.N.-recognized Kasavubu regime in Leopoldville, there are the three secessionist regimes, and there may well be more to come.

This may be very deplorable. But it is silly to talk about our objective in the Congo being unity, when in fact real unity could only be imposed by an iron Communist regime. The best we can hope for in the Congo is a loose federation of tribal satraples; and, since that is the best we can hope for, that is what we ought to aim for.

The third reality we must recognize in Africa is that, although within the tribal system there is democracy of a peculiar sort, it has very little in common with our kind of democracy. Philip Crowe, American Ambassador to the Union of South Africa, found out something about the African version of democracy when he paid an official call on the paramount chief of Barotseland, a vast British-administered enclave in southern Africa.

The conversation touched on political matters, and the paramount chief volunteered that he was a strong believer in democracy. For example, he said, he regularly consulted with his six counselors, who were the voice of the people. "I will show you," he said, and clapped his hands. Immediately six men crawled in on their bellies and prostrated themselves before the paramount chief and the startled Ambassador. "Are my people happy?" asked the paramount chief. The six counselors, grinning fiercely, vied with each other in protestations of popular content. "You see," said the paramount chief, and clapped his hands again. The six counselors crawled out backward on their bellies, still grinning fiercely.

The kind of democracy practiced elsewhere in Africa is not fundamentally very different

from the Barotseland version. Everywhere you find the same pattern—one big chief, one monolithic party without serious opposition. The pattern derives from the tribal system, and it is a natural reflection of the African realities. It is silly in any case to suppose that our kind of democracy could flourish in countries in which 90 percent of the people are illiterate and live in mud or palm huts in the bush or the jungle. It is especially silly to look for our kind of democracy in the harried Congo.

Much has been made by the Communists, the neutralists and some plain fatheads of the fact that Lumumba is the "democratically elected" premier of the Congo. It is quite true that the Congolese Parliament voted to make Lumumba premier. But this triumph of parliamentary democracy was achieved by a judicious mixture of threats and bribery. In Lumumba's heyday he bought members of the Congolese Parliament at the going rate of $2,000 a head. There was never much of a secret about where this money came from either. The Russians, the Czechs, the Chinese Communists, the Ghanaians, the Egyptians and both the Belgian bankers and the Belgian Communists all bought a slice of Lumumba preferred on the Lumumba bull market.

This, then, is how Lumumba became the democratically elected premier of the Congo. And this suggests how meaningless high-sounding words are likely to be, measured against the African realities. There is not going to be any democracy in the Congo, not our kind of democracy. The best we can hope for is the kind of regime that will at least keep things ticking in a loose federation, and again, because this is the best we can hope for, it is what we ought to aim for.

This suggests the fourth reality which we must recognize in Africa—that the people who are most experienced at keeping things ticking in tropical Africa are those horrid people, the former colonial powers. The British, the French, and even the unpopular Belgians have forgotten more about Africa than we Americans are ever likely to learn. Moreover, their knowledge of Africa and their continuing influence there are among the central assets of the West in the struggle for Africa which has now been joined.

This is not to suggest that we must defend the colonialism of the distant past—although it does happen to be true that the cities and industries of tropical Africa were all built with European money and European skills. Even in the very recent past the European powers have certainly done some stupid things in Africa, as when the French in a fit of pique threw Guinea to the Communist wolves, or when the Belgians cast the Congo loose with totally inadequate preparation.

But the British and French are now doing a remarkable job in West Africa, which is kept ticking largely thanks to British and French advisers and technical experts, and money from the pockets of British and French taxpayers. And it is also largely thanks to the Belgians that much of the Congo, including the big cities of Leopoldville and Elisabethville, are kept ticking today. It is because of the Belgians that the light goes on in your hotel room; that the government finances are kept in some kind of working order; that the Katanga mines, on which the livelihood of many thousands of Africans depends, are still functioning efficiently.

The Belgians are no doubt difficult people. But would it be a good thing if the thousands of Belgian technicians in the Congo were replaced by Russians or Czechs or Chinese Communists? For that matter, would it be a good thing if they were replaced by Americans?

We Americans must get over the notion that we necessarily do everything better than anybody else. As one knowledgeable American official remarked in Brazzaville, "The French are shelling out around half a billion dollars a year in this part of Africa. If we ever had to take over from them, it would cost about six times as much, and we'd do about half as good a job."

Africa is no vacation wonderland. It is hot and smelly, and an American, limply wandering about in Africa, is likely to have the tempting thought, Why not just let the Europeans handle the job here, and keep our noses out of it? Alas, although we should certainly encourage the British, the French and the Belgians to handle that part of the job they are already handling, we Americans cannot keep our noses entirely out of Africa.

The immense African Continent is the world's greatest reservoir of untapped resources. That is the main reason why the Soviets are now making a carefully planned power play, the purpose of which is to make the Soviet bloc the dominant power in Africa. By the inexorable laws of power politics, the Soviet power play will succeed, unless American power is introduced as a counterweight. For in Africa, as in other parts of the world, power is the key factor in the equation. And if the struggle for Africa comes to a showdown in the Congo, the United States and its allies hold for once the high cards in terms of available military power—and the other side must know that this is so.

Look at the map, and you will see why it is so. In Korea, and in almost every other major Communist expansionist drive in the last 15 years, the Communist bloc supported an established Communist regime with direct supply routes from contiguous territory. (Cuba is the exception, but one suspects that the Communist triumph in Cuba surprised the Kremlin.) In the Congo the undependable pro-Communist Stanleyville regime is a long, long way from its Communist base. To supply it in case of a showdown, the Soviets would have to mount a massive airlift, overflying such pro-western countries as Greece, Turkey and Iran. Both the United Arab Republic and the Sudan would have to take the risk of playing the Soviet game to the hilt.

By contrast, to supply both Léopoldville and Elisabethville from the West is no problem, while a Soviet airlift to the Congo would be easily subject to an effective air blockade. Suppose Kasavubu, as recognized chief of state of the Congo, asked for such an air blockade. Would it not be imposed, in one form or another? That is a question that the Soviet planners must be asking themselves. It may suggest why, as of this writing, the Soviets have not officially recognized the Stanleyville regime, and why their aid has been limited to technicians, advisers and counterfeit Congolese francs.

In short, if it came to a showdown in the Congo, with the Soviets supporting and supplying Stanleyville while the West supported and supplied Léopoldville and Elisabethville, the military and logistic high cards would be in our hands. Essentially the same military-logistic equation holds true elsewhere in Africa. Showdowns are dangerous in the nuclear age, and must be avoided if possible. But the best way to avoid a showdown is to let the other side know you will play your high cards if you must. And the fact that those high cards exist is a main reason why the position of the West in Africa south of the Sahara is very far from hopeless.

Mind you, everything is not going to be jim-dandy in the Congo, or elsewhere in Africa—not in our lifetimes. All Soviet and Communist influence cannot possibly be excluded from the Congo. But we can prevent the establishment in the Congo of a totally disciplined, unitary, Communist satellite state, which could only come into being as a result of civil war and which would be like a cancer in Africa's belly.

By the same token, Soviet-Communist influence is now paramount in three very small, very noisy states in Black Africa—Ghana, Guinea and Mali. We cannot hope to prevent such Communist infections from developing from time to time—and indeed, for reasons to be discussed in another report, we must be prepared sometimes to let them develop, rather than to submit to blackmail. But we and our European allies do have the means—military, political and economic—to prevent the Soviet bloc from becoming the dominant power throughout Black Africa. That is what we can do, and that is what we must do.

NEW YORK STATE PROCLAIMS SUSAN B. ANTHONY DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, by proclamation of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, yesterday, February 15, was proclaimed Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State. Because the Senate was not in session, it was impossible to pay tribute on this occasion to the great American, a citizen of Rochester, N.Y., who did more than anyone else to win the right to vote for women.

Mr. President, I am delighted today to call attention to this event. I ask unanimous consent to have Gov. Rockefeller's Susan B. Anthony Day proclamation appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N.Y.

The rights which the women of our country enjoy today as American citizens are due in large measure to the stanch and untiring efforts of a native of the Empire State, a resident of Rochester, Susan B. Anthony.

One hundred and twelve years ago an event destined to be of worldwide importance took place at Seneca Falls, New York: the first women's rights convention. Those who took part were in the position of being nominally citizens but actually deprived of a citizen's right to vote and share in the government of their community, their State and their Nation. Susan B. Anthony was a leader of this band of brave and intelligent women. She, and others with her, persevered in the face of prejudice, abuse and ridicule. In the end, their courage and tenacity prevailed. What they achieved is part of the goal for which we are today striving—equality of opportunity for all.

The right of women to take part in government is today recognized as beyond dispute. The State of New York extended this principle when its Legislature was the first to pass a law providing that women workers must be paid on an equal basis with men for equal work. This was one consequence of the movement that Susan B. Anthony led so valiantly.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 15, 1961, as Susan B. Anthony Day in the State of New York, and I urge the men and women of the State to join in paying tribute to that distinguished American.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 25th day of January in the year of our Lord 1961.

By the Governor:

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

THE GOLD ISSUE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., in its newsletter published February 8, contains an editorial concerning gold which offers proposals for increasing our domestic supply of gold which are worthy of consideration and ought to receive the attention of those who guide our money policies.

It will be noted—

The editorial states—

that lately there has been a scarcity of gold. This has been brought about because of the inflationary effect of two wars and a vast increase in supplies of goods.

It is suggested that almost a half billion dollars worth of gold could be produced annually on this continent if steps were taken to stimulate gold mining.

I know the distinguished Senator from California, who was on the floor until a moment ago, will have a great interest in this matter, because only recently he introduced a bill the purpose of which is to stimulate gold mining.

The Members of Congress from the gold-mining States of the West are naturally, and perhaps even selfishly, concerned with the alarming decline in gold production in the period since the beginning of World War II. Less gold is produced every year. It is inevitable that this decline will continue unless action is taken to cause the gold mining industry to flourish again. Aside from monetary considerations, the gold miner is entitled to sympathetic and affirmative attention. After all, he is the only member of our entire free enterprise system who is required to sell his product at a price fixed in 1934. He has no option. Gold must be sold to the U.S. Treasury for $35 an ounce. That was an attractive figure in the depression days of 1934, when labor was cheap, when equipment could be bought at bargain rates, and when the industry was prospering from a price increase from $20.67 an ounce. Even so, many mines which went into operation then were decidely marginal. They could not have been operated under the old price of gold, and they were forced to shut down not only by command of the Government during World War II, but because mounting costs put them out of business.

Through long experience, I know that, whatever the logic of the case may be, the gold miner will not be helped because of the above-mentioned circumstances or others which have combined to cause his place in the American economy to be of less and less consequence.

However, the case which the Independent Editorial Services makes is not in behalf of the gold miner as such. It is in behalf of the Nation, and from that standpoint alone should be examined by all of us. The proposal that we relieve the scarcity of gold by increasing production on this continent makes good common sense.

I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOLD ISSUE

Neither by official ukase nor fiat can the fundamental problem of gold be settled.

Gold, in human affairs for lo, these many, many centuries has been the final and irrevocable standard of value of all transactions. In its finality as a standard of value is its strength and nothing either in the past or present has served to diminish its usefulness.

It will be noted that lately there has been a scarcity of gold. This has been brought about because of the inflationary effect of two wars and a vast increase in supplies of goods. While it is natural for money to be tied to gold as a sound and fundamental backing for paper currency, the fact that the world cannot produce gold fast enough to give a decent backing for paper money, makes it imperative for a reevaluation of the whole subject.

Why the nations of the Western bloc are so slow about tackling it, seems a puzzle. It is in the interests of the West to get about solving it so that there will be no trouble in the future and more than that, so that there will be no trouble among ourselves.

The first question to be faced is to get more gold. Gold is the backing for free enterprise and thus it is to the advantage of the West, not the Communist bloc, to get a greater supply. How do we do that? We either raise the price of monetary gold or we stimulate production by special bonuses or subsidies.

The North American continent has a potential of nearly $500 million a year if we restore to productive capacity the mines of this country and Canada. This figure includes a potential in new discoveries in Canada which is regarded as a very valuable asset.

This country could not lose much, and that in paper money, by putting on a crash program of gold mining, search and discovery. Two States, California and Alaska, could very well benefit greatly, even from the beginning. By making this start, we could at least be doing something to increase the supply of gold. This production would just about match that of Russia. It must be realized that gold is very valuable in case of a war and assuming we are cut off from the supply in South Africa, it would be vital. Gold is also an asset in the space age, for gold has qualities that no other metal possesses for the use in the high reaches of space exploration.

Gold production everywhere in the free world could well be stimulated without inflating the dollar by an agreement with all the nations of the free world now linked to the dollar for an advance in the price of gold simultaneously in all currencies. Inflation is a relative term, and with all the nations with whom we trade acting simultaneously no special advantage would be given any of them in dealing in the dollar.

The real gold issue is that gold is the only bargain in the world today. Its price has been fixed by fiat on a depression standard of 1934. Since then the price of everything has beeen advanced. Obviously if we are to have any kind of a free society, speculators and people desperately looking for something that will not lose its value, will invest in gold. Up to now there has been only a small black market in gold and that only in Communist or Socialist states such as China or India. But with gold becoming more and more in demand as a protector of the sum of human labor, there is no question that with every restriction placed on it in order to justify a low price, there will be more speculation. Just like prohibition, the more you hold it down, the more the speculation will increase.

The answers therefore seem to be (1) an agreement on gold among the leading powers, and (2) production of more gold.

MOTION PICTURES MAKE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO BETTER INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL AND UNDERSTANDING

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, motion pictures have undoubtedly been one of the most important and influential media promoting international good will, and diffusing the customs and cultures of various peoples among the nations of the whole world.

Certain it is that many in foreign countries feel they know America, by what they have seen of us on the cinema screen. Some of our finer films have indeed been inspiration to those in other lands, to attain our high standards of material well-being, our philosophy of free enterprise, and our goals of democratic government.

While motion pictures have been produced primarily for entertainment, they have achieved a worthy secondary purpose in nurturing a better understanding among peoples of different languages, different backgrounds, and diverse aspirations.

Techniques of American motion picture production have been adopted by the film industry throughout the world. Now our theaters show many foreign films, and the business has truly become one of great international dimensions.

One aspect of this worldwide enterprise relates to the exchange of screen artists between our own and other countries. They create a significant person-to-person relationship in interchange of their working locales. The impact of their contribution to better understanding among free peoples of the earth is the reason I am calling their efforts to your attention. We should have a profound appreciation for their endeavors.

I have just seen a new American-made motion picture, produced by International-Posa Films of Mexico, for release by Columbia Pictures, which emphasizes the points I have been making in these comments. The picture is entitled "Pepe," and is a kind of a three-ring circus of pageantry, spectacle, and variety.

Many of "Pepe's" beautiful settings were photographed in the land of our neighbor to the south, the Republic of Mexico. People who see the film will thrill to the camera treatment given the enchantment of that country's always exciting scenery.

Heading a superlative cast of players, which reads like a who's who of the entertainment world, is the famed Mexican star, Cantinflas.

His true name is Mario Mareno. He is not only one of the highest paid entertainers in the world, but also one of the most active philanthropists among the acting fraternity, contributing to many charitable causes among the needy of his land.

If he had not become an actor, Cantinflas could have become a matador. He begun his career in a wandering tent

show as a singer, dancer, acrobat, prizefighter, and clown. His first salary was a dollar a day.

In 1940, Cantinflas—a professional name which he plucked for himself from the air—had become an outstandingly popular comic in the eyes of his compatriots throughout Mexico. In the years to follow he produced and acted in numerous motion pictures. Five years ago he first appeared in an American-made film, "Around the World in 80 Days." In this, he won the applause of a vast audience in this, and many other countries all over the globe.

"Pepe" personifies Cantinflas as his admirers know him—the poor man who succeeds in spite of difficulties—rising above frustrations, emerging cheerfully triumphant.

"Pepe," I am sure, will carry its subtle but poignant message of triumphant emergence, through the medium of engrossing entertainment, to people in every walk of life, in every part of the world.

I think you will enjoy this picture as much as I have. I think, too, you will agree that it is another example of the cinema industry's contribution to better understanding among humans everywhere.

KENNEDY EXPECTED TO BACK FARM PLAN NIXON SPELLED OUT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Dickson Preston in the Pittsburgh Press, Wednesday, February 1, 1961, commenting that the Kennedy farm program appears more Republican than Democratic and echoes Benson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT LEAST FOR YEAR—KENNEDY EXPECTED TO BACK FARM PLAN NIXON SPELLED OUT—PROGRAM APPEARS MORE REPUBLICAN THAN DEMOCRATIC AND ECHOES BENSON

(By Dickson Preston)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—President Kennedy appears ready to support—for this year at least—a moderate and largely voluntary farm program not too unlike the one spelled out last fall by his Republican adversary, Vice President Nixon.

Recommendations he's just received from key advisers even contains echoes of that arch bogeyman of the Democrats, Ezra Taft Benson.

The reason is that no drastic change in the farm program can be pushed through Congress without a long, bitter fight. And experts in the field believe the build-up of grain surpluses is so alarming that some legislation, even if only a stop-gap, must be passed quickly.

For the long haul, the President and Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman may still plump for the parity of income proposal with strong production controls which Mr. Kennedy advocated last fall.

But, of four farm task force reports handed the President yesterday, only one urges anything like the Kennedy plan. That is the report on wheat—and its authors admit it could not be effective before 1962 at the earliest.

By contrast, recommendations of the group covering key elements of the agricultural situation sound remarkably like Republican, rather than Democratic, doctrine.

The group was comprised of Dean J. N. Efferson of Louisiana State University; Lauren K. Soth of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, and Jesse W. Tapp, executive vice president of the Bank of America.

They warn Mr. Kennedy bluntly that farmers would be unlikely to support rigid supply control programs of the type he sought last fall.

Instead, they urge reliance on a greatly expanded land retirement program (soil bank) to cut down the vast overproduction of corn, wheat and other grains. This was advocated by Mr. Nixon, Mr. Benson and New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller.

The task force departs sharply from orthodox Democratic theory by suggesting that it would be unwise to raise price supports for wheat and corn. (The Democratic platform called for higher price supports).

The report echoes another Benson line in its concluding paragraph.

"We repeat," it says, "that long-term agricultural adjustment depends largely on * * * the availability of non-farm jobs."

This is saying in reverse that the farm problem won't be solved until a lot more farmers get off the land. When Mr. Benson said it, he was accused of trying to destroy farming as a way of life.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MILLER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, we in Pennsylvania are grateful to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] for the speech he delivered before the Germantown Republican Club in Philadelphia on the occasion of that organization's Lincoln Day ceremonies.

The Senator from Iowa spoke eloquently of the attributes of Abraham Lincoln—attributes which we seek today in our public officials.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY JACK MILLER, U.S. SENATOR FROM IOWA, BEFORE THE GERMANTOWN REPUBLICAN CLUB, PHILADELPHIA, PA., FEBRUARY 13, 1961

We are here this evening to commemorate one of the greatest Americans who ever lived—the father of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln. You have had so many distinguished speakers at previous Lincoln Day dinners here that I accepted your invitation with some misgivings over being able to maintain the pace of those who have come before me. These, of course, include your own very capable Senator HUGH SCOTT, who recently took a different seat in the Senate Chamber and whose old desk I now have the honor to occupy.

However, I am delighted to be here nevertheless. I feel very much at home in Pennsylvania, you know. This is the home State of my sweet and charming wife; and my grandfather, John Miller, was born and raised in western Pennsylvania, where numerous members of the Miller family still reside.

There are so many virtues to be found in the life of Abraham Lincoln that there is no lack of subject matter for speechmaking. However, in these days of the so-called New Frontier, it seems particularly appropriate to look to the pioneering spirit of this outstanding American, son of a pioneering farm family which crossed the new frontiers into Illinois, a true frontiersman himself, for inspiration and guidance in crossing the new frontiers of the sixties which lie before us today. He, more than anyone else, epitomizes the hardships, the sacrifices, the virtues, the individual initiative, and finally the success of the pioneers from which our country drew the character that enabled it to become the greatest nation on earth.

We are, of course, proud of the material accomplishments of our Nation. But we are prouder still of our character—the determination, the drive, and the zeal which enabled us to achieve them. If the day ever comes when we lose that character, we will no longer be living in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Like all typical pioneers, Lincoln was fiercely self-reliant. His early life would be considered by many as a classical reason for enactment of every conceivable type of legislation aimed at relieving human suffering and privation. Nevertheless, in this spirit of self-reliance, he became an educated man, a self-respecting person who paid off his debts, a true champion of the right and freedom to self-determination.

How different this prescription for success is from the welfare state approach, which seeks to provide everything for everybody even at the sacrifice of loss of character of our people. Granted that welfare state objectives are good, there is still a basic principle which distinguishes our way of life from that of the welfare state. The principle is that "The end does not justify the means." Lincoln said: "You will never get me to support a measure which I believe to be wrong, although by doing so I may accomplish that which I believe to be right."

In his recent state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy referred to this as an hour of national peril. He said that we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed as ours can endure; and he wondered whether our form of government can meet the test when he said: "The outcome is by no means certain." However, he said we should not be panicky. Present was a call for sacrifice, but absent was a call for the spirit of self-reliance. In its place was assurance that the Government will take the action needed to cross the New Frontier.

If it is to be Government action, rather than individual initiative, which is the prescription for crossing the uncertain frontiers of the sixties, we will never make it—as America. We cannot undergo a further series of freewheeling, big-spending, inflationary Democratic administrations and meet the Soviet challenge. There is a limit to the tax burden which can be borne by a free society. In this setting, the recent statement by one of the President's top appointees, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., that "a welfare state is the best defense against communism" is particularly ominous.

The spirit of self-reliance is tied inseparably to a nation's will to resist. To the extent that this spirit is undermined by government policies and programs, the danger of falling from within becomes greater. This is what Lincoln warned of 124 years ago, when he said: "At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reach us it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live for all time or die by suicide."

The Soviets are as confident that America will fall from within someday and go Communist as you and I are that the sun will come up tomorrow morning. The reason they are confident is that they have been reading their history books and have come upon the famous historical cycle through which so many of the great civilizations of

the world (such as the Roman Empire) have passed. That cycle bears repeating today, more than ever before. It goes like this: From bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to courage; from courage to freedom; from freedom to abundance; and then, from abundance to selfishness; from selfishness to apathy; from apathy to dependence; and from dependence back to bondage. And they are not without some reason for counting as they do. You and I know there is too much selfishness and apathy in our country today, and an ever-increasing dependence by our people upon their Government.

Selfishness? How many of us in Congress receive letters from people back home which, in effect, say, What more can my Government do for me, rather than what more can I do for my Government. The platform of the Democratic Party was calculated to appeal to the selfish tendencies of the people, and it worked. As the Philadelphia Inquirer pointed out last July 13:

"The platform brought before the Democratic national convention on Tuesday night is chock full of extravagant promises of spending for this and that special interest. No similar party document could come close to outpromising or outspending the one which the Democratic candidates from President on down are supposed to carry with them into the November campaign. * * * Missing from this remarkable compendium is any hint as to how the incoming administration, should it be Democratic and should it decide to live up to the party platform, could possibly carry out all the pledges without mortgaging the White House and Fort Knox."

Now we are faced with so-called task force reports, based on findings of committees largely composed of individuals sympathetic to this platform, which are seeking to stampede the Congress into spending programs to put the platform into effect. This in the face of administration estimates that even under the budget of President Eisenhower there will be a deficit of $1 billion for the current fiscal year.

We know that the President is proposing to cover his proposed extension of unemployment compensation through additional payroll taxes, costing industry around $300 million a year; that he proposes to cover his proposed program of medical care for the aging with a slight increase in social security taxes paid by both employees and employers. To the extent that this would insure a balanced budget, we have no quarrel. But this is not the way to encourage industry to grow, when it has already been discouraged from growing by high taxes.

They answer by saying that this will pump more money into the economy, thus stimulating business. The rebuttal is that this approach doesn't work (for more than a temporary period, at least). It didn't work for President Roosevelt; and it didn't work for President Truman, under whose administration the percentage of the labor force unemployed was considerably higher than it now is, until the Korean war bailed him out.

What about public apathy? J. Edgar Hoover had this to say a year and a half ago:

"Public apathy is the surest way to national suicide—to death of individual freedom. It enabled the Communists to penetrate and make satellites of once free countries, and it is presently enabling them to honeycomb and weaken the structure of the remaining countries. There is today a terrifying apathy of Americans toward the deadliest danger this country has ever faced. Some of that apathy is deliberately induced. Those who try to minimize its danger are either uninformed or they have a deadly axe to grind."

And so, my friends, the question of the hour is which way does the character of America go? We don't have to follow the historical cycle and go from abundance to selfishness, apathy, and dependence. We can, instead, go from abundance to the fulfillment of our national purpose—which is a strong, free, and a virtuous America in a world where there is a just and lasting peace and where there are freedom and respect for the integrity of the individual.

You and I, as Republicans, firmly believe that the achievement of this national purpose can only be brought about by adhering to the principles of Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party. That is why it is so terribly important today to not only pay homage to this great patriot, but to regroup our forces and to rededicate ourselves to the task of proving that the principles of Abraham Lincoln still live in the hearts of the American people.

REPLY FROM DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON TREATMENT OF TOURISTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there has been some considerable criticism lately about the treatment received by foreign visitors to our shores.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be inserted into the RECORD an exchange of letters between myself, Mr. Robert F. Hale, Director, Visa Office, Department of State, and Mr. Phillip Price, of Philadelphia, Pa.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 23, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT F. HALE,
Director, Visa Office, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALE: The attached letter enclosing Time magazine article of December 19 is sent for your consideration. I will appreciate knowing what is being done to encourage tourism by making the procedures more pleasant and what thought has been given this matter in relation to the gold situation.

Thanking you in advance for your reply, I am

Sincerely,

HUGH SCOTT.

P.S.—Please return the enclosures with your reply to me.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 10, 1961.

Hon. HUGH SCOTT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: I regret the delay in answering your letter of January 23, 1961 (acknowledged on January 27) with which you transmitted the enclosed communication from Mr. P. Price concerning the recent article in Time magazine.

I share your concern at the unwarranted criticism of our oversea nonimmigrant visa operations contained in the article. We in the Visa Office have been very much aware of the importance of the tourist trade in relation to the overall problem of the balance of payments and have placed great emphasis upon accelerating and facilitating visa services so as to attract bona fide visitors to the United States.

As you know, the fingerprint requirement for nonimmigrants has been removed. In addition, the vast majority of foreign tourists now have their applications recorded in single copy on a simple form measuring only 3 by 5 inches accompanied by a passport and one photograph. Only in exceptional situations is the applicant required to file a longer application form containing 12 questions essential to the resolution of a more complex case. At the Department's request, the Internal Revenue Service has now amended its regulations so that approximately 95 percent of temporary visitors to the United States will be excused from calling personally at an Internal Revenue Service office before being allowed to leave the country.

We are continually attempting to improve our operations. I do not believe our efforts have been in vain. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, a recordbreaking 670,833 visitors' visas were issued at posts abroad representing a 13-percent increase over the previous year.

The question why we require visas and Western European countries do not is one of a fundamental difference in the restrictions placed upon individual aliens within the national borders and of geographic reality. If we applied to aliens the tight internal controls prevailing in many European countries, we might be able to follow the Western European pattern.

Many persons who desperately want to live in the United States, but who were born in countries with oversubscribed immigration quotas, try to enter the United States posing as tourists. Under the law, our consular officers are responsible for properly classifying applicants for visas as immigrants or nonimmigrants. It is important that they do so, not only to carry out the law, but also to maintain the reputation of the United States for fairness and equity in our administration of law in the eyes of all the other intending immigrants who are properly awaiting their turn under the quota.

The Time article implies that only the lucky foreign traveler will avoid filling out the long application form (FS–257AF). In fact, visa officers use this form only in cases where they must resolve a question under the law before issuing a visa.

As for the length of time required to obtain a visa, I can tell you that the average length of time for issuance of a visa to a bona fide nonimmigrant visitor at offices where we have been able to obtain proper equipment and adequate staff (such as Paris, Mexico City, and London) is approximately 30 minutes.

I hope I have been able to dispel some of the doubts which must have arisen in your mind after reading the Time article. The Department and its visa officers are aware of the need for fomenting travel of bona fide visitors to the United States and are taking all steps commensurate with the terms of the Immigration and Nationality Act to bring this about.

If I can be of further service to you, do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. HALE,
Director, Visa Office.

FEBRUARY 13, 1961.

PHILLIP PRICE, Esq.
Barnes, Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoads, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR PHIL: Enclosed is the letter which I have received today from the Director of the Visa Office, Department of State, in reply to my conversation and your letter and article enclosed on the subject of encouraging tourism.

In addition to this information, I know you will be interested in seeing the enclosed bill, S. 610, which I have joined in sponsoring. We held 2 days of hearings on this bill in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am a member of this committee and I enclose copies of two newspaper clippings containing quotes of some of my remarks.

West best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

HUGH SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate the problems of the Department and also the fact that some of the ex-

amples of poor treatment of visitors may be the exception rather than the rule. However, I do believe that enactment of S. 610, a bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, would help considerably in encouraging more visitors to the United States at a time when Americans traveling abroad exceeds the tourist travel into this country.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I was returning to Washington on the plane yesterday, there was handed to me an open letter to the President of the United States, which was published in the Wall Street Journal under date of Wednesday, February 15, 1961.

Among other things, the letter speaks of the President's book "Profiles in Courage." It calls attention to the fact that, as was the situation in 1873, the United States was "beginning to experience the aftermath of prolonged inflation begun in time of depression, greatly augmented during World War II, and continued in postwar years," and so forth.

This letter presents what to me is a very challenging issue. It shows how the great economists of this country disagree; and, in my opinion, every American should read the letter. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 15, 1961]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your book, "Profiles in Courage," you reveal admiration of Senator Lamar's political courage. As one example you cite his stand in the mid-1870's on the question of more inflation as a supposed remedy for a depression versus deflation and restoration of a currency redeemable in gold. By an interesting coincidence, unless we are seriously mistaken, you are or soon will be in a situation similar to that in which Senator Lamar found himself.

Your fellow citizens, especially the 15 million of us who participated as you did in World War II, have the greatest respect for your physical courage. The fact that you also have revealed intellectual appreciation of political courage fortifies the hope that you are the right man in the right place at this critical period.

As was the situation in 1873, the United States is beginning to experience the aftermath of prolonged inflation begun in time of depression, greatly augmented during World War II, and continued in postwar years. In Senator Lamar's day the proponents of still more inflation were clamoring for the easy money way out of depression problems. Today the Keynesian economists are providing the rationalization for similar pleas that the Government attempt to restore prosperity by still more inflating.

The panacea proposed by the Keynesians is a continuation of policies followed for two decades, policies directly responsible for the situation in which we now find ourselves. The monetizing of Government debt during World War II created a huge amount of inflationary purchasing media, much of which was hoarded at first by the early recipients, because the things they wanted to buy were not available.

During the postwar years, the inflationary purchasing media have been dishoarded gradually, and some of the increasing private noncommercial debt has been monetized, thereby creating more inflationary purchasing media. Each successive postwar recession has been cut short by the continued dishoarding of inflationary purchasing media created during World War II and by further inflation derived from monetizing Treasury deficits and increasing private noncommercial debt.

In each instance, the short-run consequence, quick recovery to boom levels, has been what the Keynesians and many of the Nation's best-informed economists have expected. However, the Keynesians have been blind to the longer run consequences, whereas many leading money-credit economists and our own organization have correctly foreseen those consequences, which now confront the Nation.

The great inflation of the past two decades has shifted about $200 billion worth of assets from the Nation's thrifty citizens and from endowed institutions in addition to an incalculable but perhaps even larger amount from all whose incomes have been relatively fixed (such as retired individuals and teachers) to those who have benefited from inflation's progress. One of the chief beneficiaries has been the Government, whose tax revenues have increased greatly; other beneficiaries have been the holders of monopoly privileges, including some elements of organized labor as well as numerous others.

Thus have been fostered dreams of an affluent society able to afford global foreign aid, costly Government intervention in agriculture with accompanying waste of resources, and expansion of business enterprises without sufficient consideration of costs here compared with those abroad. By economically downgrading the Nation's educators, in relation to unionized labor for example, many of those most needed to instruct the Nation's youth have been forced out of the teaching profession. By cutting in half the buying power of elderly retired persons, they have been stripped of the means to provide for illness and other economic burdens of old age. In these and other ways too numerous to list here, economic growth has been retarded and the Nation's economy has been seriously distorted.

Now, the consequences of past money-credit follies confront us.

Some Keynesian economists urge that the disciplinary warnings of the gold outflow be disregarded; a few even urge that gold be discarded from the Nation's money-credit system. They recommend more inflation by monetizing more Government debt. Although some Keynesians favor more spending, others favor tax reductions; but the basic notion is the same, i.e., that Government deficits should be monetized to restore prosperity.

For the educated person who has not been trained as an economic scientist, the situation must, indeed, be puzzling. Among the Keynesians are some of the Nation's best known economists whose academic positions and professional offices seem almost to be a guarantee of their competence. How is one to decide when the doctors disagree, especially when one finds on the side of the inflationists several economists in one of the Nation's most venerable and respected universities as well as others in a leading scientific institution?

Primarily for the benefit of others who may read this letter we have added below an extended discussion of the situation. At this point, we simply assert that modern economic scientists, as well as many economists in the older classical tradition, agree that the conclusions of the Keynesians are not scientifically warranted.

No doubt, you will be subjected to great pressure to foster more inflation. In addition to the dedicated Keynesians, convinced that their nostrum is a useful remedy, various pressure groups will clamor for what they think will promote their interests. Labor leaders who can see only the short run benefits of more increases in wages instead of decreased wage rates in some industries, speculators in real estate and stocks (especially those speculating on thin margins), bankers whose investment-type assets are excessive and largely frozen, and others who hope to gain from more inflation or fear to lose if deflation occurs will join in the clamor. And adding their not inconsiderable bit will be many intellectuals whose education in verbal facility failed to make them wary of perpetual motion schemes such as those proposed by the Keynesian inflationists.

To resist the pressures that will be brought to bear on you will require political courage of a high order. We do not imply that on you rests the sole responsibility for choosing a wise course of action. Congress has a responsibility even greater than yours, because Congress makes the laws you are to enforce. And in the background, carrying the final and inescapable responsibility, stand the independent, informed minority of citizens who constitute the balance of political power in a republic such as the United States.

In view of the outcome last November, there is no need to emphasize for you or your political advisers the power of the independent minority in the United States. In their hands rests the future of our Nation. No professional politician will know in what direction to lead until he knows the direction chosen by the independent balance-of-power minority.

The institute's responsibility is to continue research such as that which has provided the scientific warranty for the assertions herein and to inform every citizen who will trouble to read what we publish. We propose to increase the number thus educated as rapidly as possible beyond the half-million present readers of our principal publications. Research and the widest possible dissemination of the results thereof comprise the extent of our responsibility. On thoughtful, informed citizens will rest the responsibility for indicating to professional politicians the direction chosen by the Nation's independent balance-of-power minority.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH,
E. C. HARWOOD, *Director*.

TRIBUTE TO WATSON B. MILLER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that we learned of the death of a man who was my good friend and who for many years was one of our Nation's finest civil administrators and most devoted public servants. I speak of Watson B. Miller, who died on last Saturday after a long and useful life of dedicated service to our country and to his fellow man. Through the years Watson Miller served ably and well in some of the highest and most responsible administrative positions in our Government.

Before entering Government service in 1941 as Assistant Administrator, and then Administrator of the Federal Security Agency—which later became the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare—Watson Miller had served for nearly two decades as a national official of the American Legion.

Throughout his career, Watson Miller was an energetic leader and eloquent spokesman for rehabilitation, hospital aid, disability payments, widow insurance, and many other programs which today justly benefit the veterans of our country.

The distinguished service which Watson Miller rendered to the American veteran in particular and to the American people in general will live as a constant reminder and as a challenging example to all of us.

In Watson Miller and the example of his life, we may see the nobility of friendship, the strength of character, the spirit of humility, the gospel of humanity, and the love of God.

Mr. President, may I say to Mr. Miller's devoted wife, to his fine son, to his lovely daughter, and to his family that we share their deep sense of sorrow and of loss. I hope that the memory of the many outstanding accomplishments of a truly dedicated man will help assuage their grief.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the article about Mr. Miller which appeared in Tuesday's Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATSON B. MILLER DIES; HEADED U.S. AGENCIES

Watson B. Miller, 62, a longtime American Legion official and a former head of the Federal Security Agency and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, died Saturday night, after a long illness.

Born in Rensselaer, Ind., Mr. Miller had lived in the Washington area since 1890. His home was at 4704 Yuma Street NW.

A former furniture merchant, rug importer, and sightseeing service operator, he left business after World War I Army service to become head of the American Legion's rehabilitation commission.

He entered Government service in 1941 as Assistant Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, which later became the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CHIEF OF IMMIGRATION

After succeeding Paul V. McNutt as FSA Administrator in 1945, Mr. Miller became head of the Justice Department's Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1947. He left this post in 1950 and returned to the American Legion as a consultant, but went back to Government service in 1952 for a 3-year term on the Subversive Activities Control Board.

A captain in the Army Motor Transport Corps during World War I, Mr. Miller was motor transport officer for the 9th Division and later the 37th Division.

He first tried to enlist in the Army when the Spanish-American War broke out in 1898. His father, a civil engineer in Lanham, Md., vetoed this idea. Instead, Mr. Miller joined his father in engineering projects here and in several other areas of the world.

Before World War I, Mr. Miller was a partner in the Derby Equipment Co., an office furniture outlet here; spent a few years in the oriental rug business, and then helped form the Red Star Sightseeing Line, one of the first motorized sightseeing services in Washington.

WORK WITH LEGION

Upon his return to Washington from military service, he became active in American Legion affairs and in 1923 was elected national vice commander of the Legion.

When he volunteered to assist in setting up the Legion's program of rehabilitation services, he was named head of the rehabilitation commission. In this post he helped veterans obtain such Government benefits as vocational and hospital aid, disability compensation and war widow insurance.

He also was influential in winning congressional approval of the War Veterans Act, the Emergency Officers Retirement Act of 1928, and the veterans hospital system.

The rehabilitation service won him national renown. President Hoover had Mr. Miller survey the damage and distress in areas of Florida hard hit by a hurricane.

After 18 years with the American Legion, Mr. Miller moved to the expanding Federal Security Agency. As Assistant Administrator and later Administrator, he directed the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps, the Food and Drug Administration, National Youth Administration, Office of Education, Public Health Service, Social Security Board, and several other service agencies.

President Truman named him head of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1947. During 3 years in this position, Mr. Miller supervised the admittance into this country of large numbers of displaced persons and war brides. He was a strong supporter of Mr. Truman's efforts to obtain legislation authorizing larger immigrant quotas.

ILLNESS FORCED RETIREMENT

Mr. Miller was active as a consultant to the Legion until last November, when illness forced his retirement.

His long Legion and Government service won for him the U.S. Medal of Merit, the Order of the Crown of Italy, France's Medal of Liberation, and an honorary LL.D. degree from Dickens College.

He was a charter member of the Henry C. Spengler and National Press Club Posts of the American Legion and a past commander of the District Legion and a member of the Army and Navy Club and several professional organizations.

He leaves his wife, Inez Hempill Miller, of the home address; a son, Watson B., Jr., 3620 39th Street NW.; a daughter, Mrs. Kenneth M. Beyer, 507 LaMarre Drive, Fairfax, Va.; and two grandchildren.

He also leaves a brother, Lee S., of East Lansing, Mich. Two other brothers died within a few weeks of each other in 1954. They were Col. Dan B. Miller and Kirk C. Miller, who for 20 years was a sportswriter for the Star and the old Washington Times and sports editor of the old Washington Times-Herald.

Services will be at 11 a.m., Wednesday, at Fort Myer Chapel, with burial in Arlington Cemetery.

EASTER HOLIDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the Easter recess, in view of the fact that there have been quite a number of inquiries.

Easter falls on the 2d of April. The custom heretofore has been, I think, to recess from the Thursday before Good Friday until the following Monday. I should like to make an inquiry now, in the hope that perhaps the majority leader can give some information which will be useful to Members in making their plans.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the usual practice in the House of Representatives, I believe, to have a 10-day recess at Eastertime. It is unusual for the Senate to have that much time away from the Chamber. It is my belief as of the moment, and speaking tentatively, that the best we can expect at present is a carryover from Thursday evening to the following Monday, and I would not anticipate at this time any more of a recess than that. The reason is that it is possible proposed legislation will be reported by the committees at a more rapid rate then than is the case now, and of course our responsibility is to attend to the Nation's business. If proposed legislation is ready for consideration we should be prepared to be in attendance to consider it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

EXPENDITURES OF TAX MONEY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at this season of the year citizens become tax conscious, as we approach April 15. We ask ourselves, "After all, what is our tax money being used for? How much am I paying for national security? How much for mutual aid? In fact, what is my tax dollar used for?"

Yesterday Sylvia Porter, one of our outstanding financial writers, broke down the amount of the Federal tax paid by a married man with two dependents, whose income is $5,000. It is a most interesting analysis, and we find from the statement that the $5,000-a-year man owes a tax of $420. In addition to that, he is paying directly or indirectly a tax equal to 82 percent of that income tax through corporation and excise taxes. This amounts to an additional $344. Therefore, the $5,000-a-year man is paying a tax of $764.

Miss Porter breaks down this $764 tax take by the Federal Government into categories for which the tax money is used by the Federal Government. For instance, $435, or 57 percent, of his tax take is for national security, which is over one-half of his Federal tax. The next highest item is debt interest of $84, or 11 percent. Veterans' services, agriculture, and labor and welfare each get 6 percent, or $46. Commerce, housing, and space technology receive $31, or 4 percent. International affairs and natural resources receive 3 percent each, or $23 each. General Government expenditures and debt retirement are 2 percent each, or $15 each.

This analysis is interesting from many standpoints, but particularly so as it relates to our international affairs. We generally hear the statement that if it were not for the great cost of mutual aid and our international problems, taxes would not be so high, and of course that is true, but it is interesting to note that of the taxes paid by a $5,000-a-year man, only 3 percent, or $23 is for mutual aid, et cetera.

Mr. President, this is a most interesting article and table, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S GETTING WHAT TAXES?

(By Sylvia Porter)

If, as you fill out your income tax return, you mutter, "I wonder just where all my tax dollars are going and who's getting what," I suspect you'll be interested in the following answers.

When the Budget Bureau submitted the record peacetime budget of almost $81 billion for the year to begin July 1, it tucked into the back of the book a table which shows how to calculate where tax dollars go. All you need do is glance at the percentages and, after you've figured out your total tax, apply them against it. The results will reveal exactly the part your tax payments are playing in financing the Federal budget.

The tax foundation has helped me to work out the statistics for a married man with two children, earning $5,000 a year. Here goes.

First, calculate your total Federal income tax. For the $5,000-a-year man, this comes to $420.

ADDITIONAL 82 PERCENT

Then take 82 percent of that total tax—for the excise, corporation, and other taxes you pay directly or indirectly average 82 percent of your income tax. For my sample taxpayer, this 82 percent comes to $344.

Add the two totals to get your total tax payment over the year. For the $5,000-a-year man, this total is $764.

Now:

For the $5,000 taxpayer

The tax you pay for—	*Percent*	*Total*
National security	57	$435
Debt interest	11	84
Veterans' services	6	46
Agriculture	6	46
Labor, welfare	6	46
Commerce, housing, space technology	4	31
International affairs	3	23
Natural resources	3	23
General government	2	15
Debt retirement	2	15
	100	764

No matter whether you're in the $5,000 or $50,000 income bracket, these percentages will apply and you can use this simple do-it-yourself tax calculator to place the huge Federal budget in terms of yourself. What are some of the implications?

Clearly, some spending items which arouse the most controversy take only a minor amount of tax dollars. If Congress wiped out all spending on international affairs, you would have only an additional 3 percent left.

INTEREST RISE CITED

Clearly, too, there would be substantial room left for other spending or tax reduction under the present tax structure if the chunk going for interest on the national debt could be slashed. The reason interest now takes 11 percent of tax dollars is not that the debt itself has been skyrocketing, though. Quite the contrary. The reason for the size of this item is that the level of interest rates has climbed sharply in recent years and the Treasury has been financing the debt at record high rates. Incidentally, that 2 percent for debt retirement is in the new budget as submitted by former President Eisenhower. It won't be in the budget as it actually works out under President Kennedy in the next fiscal year.

But the most significant figure is, of course, the 57 percent going to national defense. And the odds are this figure will rise before it falls.

None of this will help you fill out form 1040, of course. But at least when you do get through the form and settle your bill, you'll know who's getting what of your dollars.

CIVIL DEFENSE AGAIN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it was recently proposed by the civil defense director of Cuyahoga County, in which the city of Cleveland is located, that $90,000 of taxpayers' money be used to hire 12 additional full-time employees.

Half of this money was to come from the Federal Government under a matching grant program, and the other $45,000 from the city of Cleveland. Fortunately for the taxpayers, Cleveland's outstanding and extremely capable mayor, Anthony Celebrezze, refused to allocate money to hire these needless additional employees. His action made Cleveland the first city in the Nation to reject the subsidy which is an outrageous throw away of Federal funds.

It is my fervent hope that mayors and municipal officials in other American cities will follow Mayor Celebrezze's lead in saving taxpayers' money.

Mrs. Dorothy Koller, the local civil defense director in Akron, Ohio, also exhibited good sense in refusing to take the same position as her colleague 25 miles away in Cleveland, Ohio. In turning down the $8,250 allocated for Akron, she announced that she was doing so because she did not want money to hire more help she did not need.

It is ridiculous to even consider hiring more useless civil defense employees to sit around and do nothing waiting for the bomb to fall. We have too many boondogglers doing this at the present time. We should be more concerned with getting rid of them and thereby saving taxpayers' money, than with hiring people to waste money and confuse the public with their silly schemes.

Mr. President, throughout Inaugural Day from morning on, callers at the Washington, D.C., Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization could not get an answer. Travel was difficult. Much snow had fallen. Then, on January 27, there was a 4-inch snowfall and at 3:45 p.m. callers found that paid civil defense personnel in the District of Columbia had closed that office and all had gone home because of the snowfall.

Mr. President, in my home city of Cleveland our service department within 2 hours would have cleaned up snowfalls such as prevailed in Washington, D.C., on the day before the inauguration and on January 27. Despite the money the Congress has bestowed on the officials and the government of the District of Columbia, they neglect such matters.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be giving a tip to the leaders of the Soviet Union, but it seems that in times of bad weather in Washington, D.C., the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is closed. In other words, these paid officials sitting around at their desks waiting for the bomb to fall scurry home when the emergency of bad weather occurs. If they cannot cope with their duties in a minor snowfall, how can we expect them to do so in a nuclear holocaust?

Mr. President, an excellent editorial, "Civil Defense Again," was published in the Springfield Daily News, an outstanding Ohio newspaper on February 9, 1961. Bert Teeters, the editor of this newspaper, has again shown his keen awareness of the civil defense fiasco.

I believe this editorial convincingly points out the absurdity of the matching grant program for additional employees and the need for spending funds more wisely. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE AGAIN

The Akron Beacon-Journal "let the cat out of the bag," although that was not its intention.

In an editorial page article by a Beacon-Journal staffer, Ray C. Sutliff, the other day, appeared this information:

"In one of his continuing attacks on Federal expenditures for civil defense, U.S. Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, of Cleveland, cited Mrs. Dorothy Koller, Akron's civil defense director, as being 'fed up with the silly schemes and needless spending of tax dollars.' YOUNG commended Mrs. Koller for rejecting $8,250 of Federal funds which had been allocated to Akron.

"Since December 7, there has been snow on the ground continuously except for a 6-hour period on January 18."

The conclusion one obviously must reach is that the Akron newspaper and perhaps some of its citizens are not so much concerned with defense protection in case of war as they are to get Federal funds to clear snow off the city streets. And that is also the attitude of a great many other communities which thereby help the present civil defense bureaucracy to grow and grow and spend and spend.

MR. NEIL STAEBLER, CHAIRMAN OF MICHIGAN DEMOCRATS

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, at a recent convention in Grand Rapids, Mich., the Democratic Party of Michigan said goodby to the chairman who had guided it for 11 years.

Neil Staebler, of Ann Arbor, is generally recognized in national political circles as one of the finest, most effective leaders in either of our great parties.

In stepping down as chairman of the Michigan Democrats, Neil Staebler made it plain that he was not leaving the political arena for good and that he will continue to take an active interest. For this we are grateful.

At a convention dinner honoring him on his retirement as chairman, Mr. Staebler delivered an address which he said contained his recipe for a two-party system.

I think that, no matter which party one belongs to, we all would agree that Mr. Staebler's recipe makes for better politics and a stronger Nation.

At the risk of revealing to the opposition the secrets of how the Democrats win in Michigan, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RECIPE FOR A TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

(Remarks by Neil Staebler, chairman, Democratic State Central Committee, at keynote dinner, Democratic State Convention, February 3, 1961)

Michigan has been a State for roughly 130 years. For most of that time it has not had a two-party political system. True, there have been several parties in existence at any given time, but for most of the period one party has been preeminent and the others have not given it real competition.

For example: Since 1854, one party has controlled both houses of the legislature for every term except three (1891–92, 1933–34, and 1937–38). During many of those years, other parties had no more than a handful of legislators in Lansing, and on three occasions the blackout was complete: no opposition disturbed the hallowed halls of the capitol (1905–06, 1921–22, and 1925–26). On the executive side, it is well known that until the coming of Mennen Williams, only the dominant party ever re-elected a Governor in Michigan, with the single exception of Woodbridge Ferris in 1914.

You will notice that the continuing party during all this period has been the Republican Party. The Democratic Party has generally been the challenger, the "out" party. There is good reason for this. In every community there is the tendency toward the status quo, toward conservatism, toward "right thinking," toward the retention of the powers that be. The Republican Party has for a long time appealed to its constituents with the assurance that there would be as little change as possible.

Even when the Republican Party is stupidly run or subject to great schisms, it survives. There will always be room for a go-slow party, a do-nothing party. But in recent years the Republican Party has not been stupidly run. It has had brilliant leadership that has taken the maximum possible advantage of its situation. In the recent national election, the Republican Party came within an eyelash of capturing the majority of the vote—even though an overwhelming majority of the people in the country describe themselves as Democrats. Moreover, many future trends favor the Republican Party, or at least the forces of conservatism which tend to dominate it. As the average age of the population increases, as the average income rises, there is a strong trend toward conservatism. The Republican Party does not have to worry whether it will have a future. The people who don't want change, don't want to pay taxes, who want to leave well enough alone will always be with us.

But what about the Democrats? We rise to great heights. We sink to great depths. What holds us together? What gives us our reason for being?

We are the inquiring party. We want to change things. We're the party that is more responsive to problems, to needs. We're the party that cares.

We generally describe ourselves as "liberals"—a term sometimes labeled empty in newspaper editorials. Well, it's not empty for Democrats. We mean by a liberal a person with an open mind, with a greater freedom from prejudice, from frozen ideas, and a willingness to consider the merits of the case, to listen to facts, to respond to problems.

But because we are the party of change and responsiveness, we have no fixed constituency. True, at the moment, 45 percent of the American people call themselves Democrats and only a little over 30 percent call themselves Republicans. But in 1952 and 1956 a quarter of the Eisenhower votes came from people who called themselves Democrats, and in 1960 15 percent of the Nixon votes came from the same source. This type of crossover is not common among Republicans—only 1 or 2 percent of the Republicans cross over in any election. We are clearly the party with looser political ties, with a more shifting, mobile, volatile membership.

If you stop to think for a moment, you can see one of the reasons why. Republicans are always talking about keeping taxes down. This has a very strong appeal to part of the population. It's very tangible. It's a good clear motive for voting. Democrats, on the other hand, are always talking about some program for the general public good. The programs are generally more difficult to relate to the individual. They have little personal allure. The motivation is vaguer. We may deal with lots of problems but it is pretty difficult for most Democrats to discern any individual benefit they will obtain from them. In other words, the Republicans are a kind of party of special interests, and Democrats are a party of broad, diffuse, and general interests.

These are quick generalizations and I sketch them in here only to make one point: In a two-party system, the conservative, the status-quo party has a built-in constituency and an assured vote. The party of change always lives precariously.

But I don't think the Democratic Party as the party-of-change has to live quite as liberals have learned something. This hope precariously as it has in the past. Maybe is the source of the title of my remarks tonight. Conservatives don't need a recipe for survival. Liberals do and my recipe for the two-party system is therefore confined to a recipe for the survival of the Democratic Party.

* * * * *

In the next few minutes, I'd like to talk about some of the ingredients, the methods, and the basic know-how that are the indispensable elements of a successful Democratic Party.

The first ingredient is integrity. No party can long stay in power or command the respect and support of the public if it is not honest in every way. A party must be dollar-honest: that means it must be ready to chop off the head of any member who betrays the public interest; and it should be able to judge when a proffered contribution might impose on the general purposes of the party. A party must be honest in its ideas: it must never sacrifice real meaning and the sincerity of its pronouncements to the expedient demands of empty campaign sloganing.

The second ingredient is a sense of purpose. This is sometimes very difficult for a liberal party. While the Republicans can always talk about taxes and the good old days, we liberals must constantly discover and champion the new causes, the new problems, and convey to the voters our sense of urgency about them. During the New Deal, Democrats achieved so many of their objectives that by 1952 many people felt that all our basic problems were solved and the Nation could coast. Eight years later, a lot of people know better. It is one of the accomplishments of President Kennedy that he has already reestablished, in the face of a very confusing situation, a new sense of purpose around which the party can rally. In Michigan affairs, it is a tribute to Mennen Williams and John Swainson that they never let the minutiae of repetitive State "housekeeping" problems obscure the larger needs they have seen in the State.

Third, our party needs a corps of workers and leaders who subordinate their personal ambitions to the larger purposes of the party. Personal ambition is a fine thing. Properly channeled, it contributes an important dynamic quality to party operation. But we have all seen examples where personal ambition has wrecked the effectiveness of a political party. Our party needs in its leadership ambition blended with a public purpose that rings out loud and clear over and above the voice of personal preferment.

No one can offer a fixed rule for identifying the margin between a proper and an improper degree of ambition; but the overall climate of the party, the mix of people and ideas, the internal discussion of people and issues within the party, are the best sources of judgment on the balance between a person's ambition and his dedication to purpose. This is why nomination by convention for some offices, for example the Presidency, is more effective than national primaries would be. Within the party we can get some discernment and understanding of the character of the candidates. Our choice in the last national convention is a splendid example. Within a State, where a primary is used, a party can produce the same effect by making its weight felt.

These three ingredients are basic to our party; integrity, a sense of purpose, workers and leaders who temper ambition with that sense of purpose.

Next let us look at some of the methods by which our party can survive and grow. Here is a list of 10 important things to do:

1. The open door: At the heart of politics there is a core of power. Many people are so intent on hanging on to their little bit of power that they will not enlarge the group that would share it. This procedure sets in motion the processes of dry rot which have corrupted many a party organization. A healthy party is one which opens its doors and shares its work and its power with all qualified people who seek to join the effort.

2. Fundamental tasks: We must have a healthy regard for the time-honored jobs that spell political success: registration, person-to-person contact, telephone squads, committee organization, careful planning. In Michigan we have learned that vigorous precinct work is more important than dazzling showmanship. We know that good leadership in the party must extend all the way from the candidate for Governor down to the precinct leader who talks to a single voter. And we know that there is no hierarchy of importance in the party—that the precinct worker is as necessary to the work of the party as the State party chairman, and as deserving of recognition.

3. New ideas: We must welcome new ideas, new techniques. One of the glories of our party in Michigan has been its inventiveness. From every corner of the State have come ideas which have been adopted in other areas. In fact, we have always thought of each campaign as a new model of automobile and have prided ourselves on keeping one model-year ahead of the opposition.

4. Communication: A successful Democratic Party must have successful communication between the party and public, and within the party itself.

There is a theory in some political circles in the country that it is better to keep the public mystified. Politicians ought to be remote. Actions ought to come startlingly out of the blue. The public ought to be made conscious of power and to be moved somewhat by awe and fear. Here in Michigan we have repudiated this idea. We believe in the goldfish bowl, in participation, in understanding. We believe that the party has an obligation to inform and to listen, that it is good politics to trust the public and expect to be trusted in return.

Communication within the party itself is of equal importance. Like the circulatory system in the human body, healthy intra-party communication prevents the building up in the political body of poisonous suspicions, clashes of opinion based on ignorance, and other obstructions. It brings together ideas and people in productive working rela-

tionships. It serves to unite party workers with their leaders and with each other and make them feel a significant part of a working whole. Party bulletins, periodicals, broadcasts, meetings, and news releases all serve to bind the party together. Even more important is the meticulous answering of all letters, the conscientious response to every phone call.

As the party grows, communication becomes more difficult and new ways must be devised to keep in meaningful touch with all party workers and adherents. Elected officials and party officers can be both helped and helpful here in preserving channels of personal communication which can be used when genuinely needed for the transmission of ideas and information in both directions.

5. Leadership: We must work constantly to develop responsible leadership at every level. A vigorous liberal party with an open-door policy draws into it a steady stream of potential leaders; there must be ample opportunity for them to be tested, developed and constructively used. Good workers in the party who are unaware of their capacities for leadership should be encouraged to develop their talents; starting with modest party tasks, they can grow in confidence and experience at working well with people and carrying responsibility. Other people with soaring ambitions who have entered party work with little realistic conception of its nature should be given an opportunity to test their ideas and methods alongside those of the party, in order to see whether the political field is what they are seeking. In both cases party work provides a splendid opportunity to explore and to test the relation of the individual to other people.

The process of training and testing is often confused with the idea that people should be rewarded for party service by promotion to higher positions of leadership. While sometimes this reward theory coincides with the needs of the party, promotion for the development of leadership is more important than promotion just to give a deserving worker a title.

Those who have worked extensively in the party know how important party work is for an understanding of the whole process of politics and government. This is one reason party people instinctively favor the selection of candidates for its higher positions from among people with party experience.

6. Money: A successful Democratic Party must find workable, ethical solutions to its money problems. A political party is always plagued by this problem, especially a growing party and especially an honest party. Needs rise faster than contributions.

The greatest financial problem is the well-known reluctance of people to give until they are asked. This means that many thousands of people in the party need to be enlisted to do the asking. The number has been increasing every year, but we need many, many more.

It is happily true that the curve of fundraising and the number of contributors is steadily rising. Today 2 to 3 percent of the people who vote for us contribute. When this can be raised to a point between 5 and 10 percent, the party will be able to keep abreast of the demands that are placed upon it.

I repeat the words, "demands that are placed upon the party." Every one of the million and a half people in the State who vote Democratic and many people who don't, expect us to present our case to them in each election—by printed word, by broadcast, by personal meeting. Though we enlist an army of volunteers and though we operate with great frugality, we are not able to keep up with the service that is demanded of the party by its members and by the public.

7. Staff: At the staff level a successful party must have a competent, properly paid permanent staff. This is an area where we should not attempt to be frugal. Our host of volunteers needs the strong central support of a skilled staff to make their work effective and to provide continuity and a basis for the development and growth of successful party operations.

Today we have only a handful of employees and we make great demands upon them. But let us not hesitate to pay them adequately. We cannot meet the salaries offered by the opposition or by industry, but we can offer them at least some degree of security and an approximation of the rewards commensurate with their professional qualifications. These standards of employment are most important to the successful ongoing of party work.

8. Participation: As individual Democrats we need to build into our own lives the theme of participation in politics. This means first that we give what we reasonably can of our time and energy and money to public service through our party. It also means that we work to encourage others to participate, and that we give them ample opportunity to do so on terms that are possible and inviting to them. The need for more people to give more time to the stupendous tasks of the political process is enormous; we must work to fill that need by better recruitment and better job planning within the party.

An encouraging sign today is the number of young people who are talking about going into politics as a career. I find myself telling them to be sure to mention your ambition to your girl before you propose to her. Either as a profession or as an avocation, politics has to be built into one's life on a long-term basis.

Above all, since politics is in competition with other activities for people's time, we must find ways to make it attractive and rewarding as an activity, so that we can encourage in others the enthusiasm for participation that we ourselves feel.

9. Patience: Again as individual Democrats, we need to acquire and use the virtue of patience. Many people drift into politics and out in a single campaign. Liberals especially are noted for the volatility of their interest. One campaign may elect a candidate; but ideas, programs and policies of officeholders and parties alike require long-term commitment. In many communities the task of bringing the Democratic Party into competitive range of the Republicans is a 20-year operation. In politics we need not just the courage but the persistence of our convictions.

10. Party cohesion: Our party needs that quality of thoughtful cooperation of leaders and members that some people call party discipline, but that might more accurately be called party cohesion.

There is, indeed, a need for discipline in a party—for sanctions against people who willfully damage the party for their own advantage. There is, indeed, the need for the observance of party platforms and policies. But these bear only the same relationship to party behavior that disciplinary measures do to the upbringing of a child. There are other important elements that overshadow discipline.

It is the sense of purpose and the devotion of party members which create a party and preserve it. Party principles, party participation must be strong and vigorous. If a party ever begins to depend upon discipline to enforce its sense of purpose, disintegration has already set in.

Party cohesion is difficult to maintain for many reasons—the normal and healthy clash of ideas, unexpected political events, the emergence of party leaders, and the shifting tactics of the opposition. If a party allows itself to become too rigid, too dependent upon the maintenance of a single point of view, it quickly finds itself outmaneuvered by the opposition. But when it has to change position, a party is saved schism and disintegration by the strength of its basic principles, the devotion of its members and leaders, by a spirit of tolerance and respect for differing points of view and for the internal party processes for discussing them. A sense of humor is not the least of the assets party people may possess.

It follows, then, that if a party has good leaders, vigorous principles, furnishes opportunities for friendly discussion, preserves confidence between its parts by good communication, it will establish a basis for cohesion. These can all be summed up in a single word: party morale.

Our tested ingredients and methods for insuring the survival and growth of the Democratic Party need one more dimension of basic know-how: a set of guidelines familiar to us all, but which can never be repeated too often. They can be stated this way:

1. Good government is the best politics.

2. The dignity of the individual is paramount.

3. Our party must be a party of all the people.

There are times when in a decision there is a balance to be struck between advantage to the public and advantage to the party. In the last 12 years we have never had any doubt in Michigan as to how the balance has been weighed. Public considerations have come first.

The dignity of the individual is a phrase we use often, but we need to employ it, day by day, in all of our relations—with the public as a whole, with the public as individuals, with people in trouble, with humble people as well as powerful. We need to employ it within the party—most especially when we are engaged in the inevitable but sometimes dangerous party function of discussing individuals, weighing their merits as candidates and leaders. The great antiseptic in these discussions is respect for the individual.

The party of all the people—this too is easy to say and difficult to carry out. The constant need to organize caucuses and factions in order to implement an idea offers a great temptation to huddle together on some basis of profession, color, religion, or special idea. Let every member vigorously resist mental segregation just as we fight against segregation in physical attributes.

A political party is the most astonishing inclusive organization in existence—broader than any church, lodge, profession, or social group. If any one group were ever to dominate our party, the party would be destroyed. Our great strength lies in our diversity and our representativeness of all the people.

In looking ahead to the future of the Democratic Party in Michigan, we should take a careful look at the slogan used by the opposition with increasing frequency: "Time for a change." There is a theory in politics that there ought to be change from time to time; that no matter how good a set of ideas may be or how well a political party may perform, the other party should inevitably be returned to power after a certain time.

There is sound instinct in this feeling for change. No party has all the answers. Our two-party system thrives on change and the prospect for change. The competition between the parties is a healthy stimulant to the development of each and the realization of the public good.

Let us approach the problem of change competitively, not as a mechanical necessity. Every election provides an equal opportunity for success or defeat, or partial success and partial defeat. Our ideas and our positions will not always be the best and will not always prevail, but if we always strive to improve them and strive to win with them we can be satisfied as a party. By doing our very best, we make the opposition improve.

If the opposition improves more than we or enjoys some break of the game, well and good. They deserve to win.

But if we constantly improve—and there is no evidence in the field of human experience that improvements ever need stop—we can continue to make our competitive position stronger and more attractive to the public. Thus the purposes of public and party are both well served.

In the anticipation that we will go on to ever greater achievements, let me join with you all, party workers and citizens of Michigan, in a toast to the future of our great Democratic Party.

RALPH J. FOREMAN, GENERAL MANAGER, NEBRASKA ELECTRIC GENERATION & TRANSMISSION COOPERATIVE, INC.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the appointment of Ralph J. Foreman to be general manager of the Nebraska Electric Generation & Transmission Cooperative, Inc., is an act of great interest and importance to a vast segment of Nebraskans.

Mr. Foreman, who resigned as Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration to accept the appointment, brings to his new post many years of active experience in the electrification field—much of it with REA.

He began his career with REA 12 years ago, working as a field representative with REA electric borrowers in Nebraska. He quickly rose to positions of increasing responsibility in the agency, and was serving as special assistant to the REA administrator for power supply upon being appointed Deputy Administrator in 1958.

During this period he gave generously of his energies and skills in developing electric facilities needed to meet the requirements of farm and rural people in Nebraska and elsewhere. Additions to the rural electrification march of progress in Nebraska were many. High among them are the Canaday steam generating plant near Lexington, and the transmission system of the Nebraska G. & T. Cooperative. The Canaday plant, with a capacity of 100,000 kilowatts, is the largest single-unit steam generating plant ever financed by REA. The 230,000-kilovolt transmission system of the Nebraska G. & T. Co-op is the highest capacity ever to be built with REA financing.

I have worked with Ralph Foreman on many occasions in behalf of the REA-financed electric systems in Nebraska, and the 98,000 farmers and other rural consumers they serve. He knows the power problems in our State. He has worked on them; he has helped solve them. More important, he is aware of what yet needs to be done. Mr. Foreman possesses the know-how and the energy to help keep rural electrification on the move in our State. We welcome him.

Mr. President, I should like to include at this point in my remarks a statement by my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] concerning the employment of Mr. Foreman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA

It is a pleasure to wholeheartedly endorse the sentiments just voiced by my colleague, Senator CURTIS, on behalf of Mr. Ralph J. Foreman.

Mr. Foreman's record during his tenure with the Rural Electrification Administration is an enviable one. His enthusiasm and competence were always in evidence whenever we had occasion to call on his office. I am confident his splendid record will reflect itself in his new position as general manager of the Nebraska Electric Generation & Transmission Cooperative, Inc.

We heartily welcome Mr. Foreman as a new citizen to our State.

MARYMOUNT COLLEGE, ARLINGTON, HONORS MRS. ROBERT F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly about the Christian Excellence Medal, awarded in the name of the president, professors, and students of Marymount College, Arlington, Va., to Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy. Mother M. Majella, R.S.H.M., president of the college, will make the presentation on March 14, 1961, because Mrs. Kennedy, the devoted, charming wife of the Attorney General of the United States of America, exemplifies Christian excellence, in the eyes of the students.

Marymount College, Arlington, Va., is a 2-year liberal arts college conducted by the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, an international community devoted to the promotion of Christian love and education.

One may note that an entire week, March 12–18, at Marymount College will be dedicated to fulfillment of President John F. Kennedy's inaugural address. The official program carries the title: "So let us begin anew." Aim of the Christian excellence seminar is to prepare youthful Americans to accept the challenge placed before them by the President.

A key quotation from the President's address is reproduced in the aforementioned program:

> We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of the first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place * * * that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans * * * unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

Other features of the Christian excellence seminar will include the following subjects and speakers:

March 12: "To Convert Our Good Words Into Good Deeds," Father James Keller, M.M., founder of the Christophers, 8 p.m.

March 13: "Here on Earth God's Work Must Truly Be Our Own," Father Francis M. Keating, S.J., St. Peter's College, New Jersey, 7:30 p.m.

March 14: Award of Christian Excellence Medal by Mother M. Majella, R.S.H.M., president of Marymount College, to Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy and an address, "Let Us Go Forth to Lead the Land We Love," by Lt. Comdr. James J. Killeen, ChC, USN, leadership staff of Chief of Naval Personnel, 4:30 p.m.

March 15: "Ask Not What Your Country Can Do for You, Ask What You Can Do for Your Country," Professor and Mrs. Louis F. Budenz, 8 p.m.

March 16: "Rejoicing in Hope, Patient in Tribulation," Father Kenneth Moore, instructor in theology, Marymount College, Arlington, 7:30 p.m. Also Dr. Charles Crotty, marriage counselor, on "Married Life," and Father Victor Fernandez, S.J., Georgetown University, on "A Year for God."

March 17: "All This Will Not Be Finished in the First 100 Days," Father James J. Killeen, communion breakfast, 8 a.m. Student group discussions will follow each presentation.

I am happy to relate that this important program was brought to my attention by my friend, "The Padre of the Americas," the Very Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., professor of Latin American history, Marymount College, Arlington, Va.

THE PARTICIPATION OF THE SECRETARY OF LABOR IN THE TELEVISION PROGRAM "WASHINGTON CONVERSATION"

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, President Kennedy deliberated long before making his appointments to the Cabinet and to other high-level positions. He was searching for fresh ideas, for men of strong character (and strong constitutions, too), and for men who could make important concepts interesting to our citizens.

One of his choices, Arthur L. Goldberg, has already demonstrated his ability to focus national attention on important issues. To help introduce him and his ideas to the Nation, CBS News asked him to be the first guest on a new CBS television network show called "Washington Conversation."

On this program last Sunday, the Secretary discussed a wide range of subjects and gave much information about himself and his approach to problems of basic importance to the Nation. Mr. President, I believe that the transcript of that program has much information of great interest to many Americans. I ask unanimous consent to have it reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CONVERSATION

(As broadcast over the CBS television network, February 12, 1961, 12 noon to 12:30 p.m.)

Guest: The Honorable Arthur L. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.

Host: Paul Niven.

Producer: Michael J. Marlow.

Director: Bill Linden.

ANNOUNCER. This is a member of President Kennedy's Cabinet, who this week was asked to make an on-the-spot study of several areas in the country where thousands of people are out of work, and where, according to the President, there is economic trouble.

Arthur L. Goldberg, the Secretary of Labor, is our guest from one of these distressed areas, Pittsburgh, Pa., as the CBS television network presents live "Washington Conversation."

Your host for this informal unrehearsed conversation is CBS News Washington Correspondent Paul Niven.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, you knew the figures on unemployment and its geography before you set out on this trip. Did anything surprise you?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, Paul, I was surprised by the human impact of the figures we have in Washington. The unemployment situation is not only a statistical problem. It's primarily a human problem. And when I went out, I knew in general what the state of affairs was, but I have had the impact of meeting with many, many people, and I think I have a better understanding of the values that are involved insofar as they affect countless people in our country.

Mr. NIVEN. Sir, you grew up in very humble circumstances, yourself, and you worked with labor during the depression. Is there any difference now between the mood of the unemployed than there was?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Yes, there is. During the depression years there was a feeling of despair. Now, as I have said, President Kennedy has manifested his concern about the particular situation, but concern is not equivalent to despair. On the contrary, the President and I as the Cabinet member who is charged with the responsibility of administering the Department of Labor, in addition to being concerned about the problem we have confidence that the problems that face the people—and when I say the people, I mean the business community, labor community, and the public at large—that these problems can be met.

Mr. NIVEN. How about the unemployed people themselves? Do you think that the change of administration, by itself, is giving them hope that an early change will occur in their fortunes?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Yes, I've noticed that. I've talked to, I suppose, a hundred or a hundred and fifty people on this trip. Now, that isn't a sufficient number for me to form overall judgments. I hope in succeeding trips to talk to many more people. But the people uniformly reflect confidence that we have a new administration headed by a dynamic President, who is going to do something about their problems. We are going to have a do-something government. And this is what the people are looking forward to.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, you have been quoted as saying that the trip was not political or politically motivated or a publicity stunt. That statement was greeted with some skepticism in the press, as you may have seen here in Pittsburgh.

Would you deny that such a trip is helpful to the administration politically?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I'm not really concerned about whether it is helpful to the administration politically. The President told me, and I have felt as a matter of basic conviction, that politics do not enter in this trip at all. He asked me to go on this trip to show the people of the country and to show the people in the territories and States that I have visited that he is concerned about their problems. I hope that my trip will have bipartisan support. I hope that the President's program will have bipartisan support. We are not intending to make political capital out of the difficulties and the trouble that many Americans find themselves in today. And when I say many Americans, I don't only mean the unemployed. Business is in trouble, and we—in order to find the solution to our problems we have to have good business opportunities and we have to have jobs for the people who are unemployed.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, you talked with some business people on your trip. Do you see that some of—think that some of them are going to be more sympathetic to the President's antirecession measures than they might otherwise have been?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I don't know whether they will be sympathetic because of my trip, Mr. Niven. This is asking too much. But I think there is a broad basis of support for the President's program on the part of all of the people of the country, business, labor, and the public at large.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, is it possible that by focusing attention on the problem your trip has increased the likely support in Congress for the President's program?

Secretary GOLDBERG. This was not my intention. In fact, I have said on my trip that my testimony on the measures entrusted to me is already prepared. What I hope to do is demonstrate to the people of the country, and it is the President's hope that he, and I acting for him can demonstrate, that this is a government with a head, this is a government which knows the relevant economic data, and this is a government also with a heart, because we cannot deal with these problems on a figure basis alone. Statistics do not provide all of the answers. We want to deal with the problems of people, our businessmen, our labor people, from the heart, as well as the head.

Mr. NIVEN. Is it fair to say that your predecessor in the Eisenhower administration, Secretary Mitchell, had much the same feeling and approach?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I have great respect for Secretary Mitchell. I think he performed a great public service.

Well, I hope we can do better. This is why it is healthy in the American scene to change administrations periodically because it permits a new look at the problems of the country and I hope that we will give these problems a new look.

Mr. NIVEN. Do you and the President feel, Mr. Secretary, that the unemployment situation is going to pick up fairly soon under your program, or do you think it has got to get worse before it gets better?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, we hope that it will pick up. We don't know the exact date, but you remember what the President said in his inaugural address? And what the President said in his state of the Union message.

Things may get worse before they get better. But the fact that we are concerned about the problem doesn't mean that we despair about the problem.

The President is fully confident that given strong and effective leadership, given the cooperation of our State and local governments, given the cooperation of our business and labor communities and the public at large we can make our economic situation substantially better than it is today.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, you said on taking office that while you couldn't and didn't intend to brainwash yourself for—to part from all the convictions you'd had all your life, that you would seek as Secretary of Labor to perform your duties as objectively and fairly as you could.

How are you making out? Is it difficult or is it fairly easy?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I don't find it difficult, to tell you the truth. I, of course, have had an association with the labor movement that stretches back over 23 years. I am proud of that association, but I have entered upon a public office without abandoning many of the views that I had all of these years because I have thought they are proper views.

I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution. And to enforce the laws of the country and I intend to abide by that oath. And also I am part of President Kennedy's administration.

I shall attempt to execute the policies of the Chief of State loyally and effectively and therefore I don't find very great difficulty in transporting myself from counsel for the labor movement to counsel for the public interest.

I regard myself to operate now in that particular capacity.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, of course, you will be called upon now to administer some laws to which you have expressed opposition in the past. The Landrum-Griffin Act and the feature of Federal law which allows the States to pass right-to-work laws.

Are you sure you will be able to do that?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Oh, I have no doubt about that. As long as the laws remain on the books, regardless of my ideas about their change or their origins, as long as we have a law which is the law of our country, I intend to enforce that law and all other laws entrusted to me, fairly, vigorously and with commonsense, that should characterize all law enforcement.

Mr. NIVEN. Feeling free, at the same time, to recommend changes where you think the law is wrong.

Secretary GOLDBERG. Yes. Part of the obligation of an administration is to offer proposals to the Congress. I am sure the President, who determines priorities, will have a program in many areas. I intend insofar as it falls within my capacity and jurisdiction to appear before the Congress and to express the President's viewpoint.

Mr. NIVEN. Haven't all Secretaries of Labor, I think we've had about a half century of them, even, in both Republican and Democratic administrations, haven't they always been advocates of labor's point of view more or less? Isn't that inevitable?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well sometimes they have, but I do not agree with this philosophy.

The Department of Labor is a department of our Government along with many other departments. And as a department of our Government I am charged as the one who is head of a department of the Government, I am charged with administering the laws and enforcing the policies of our Government for all of the groups in our population. Businessmen have a very important stake in the operations of the Labor Department. I hope that they will give me support. I hope that they will give really good participation. I hope that on occasion they will give me vigorous criticism.

This is part of the leavening process which makes a democracy what a democracy ought to be.

Mr. NIVEN. One of the most striking innovations which you have recommended is your National Council of Labor Advisors which the President is going to appoint members to. How do you envisage the functions of this body?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, the President has said in his economic message a good deal about this agency that he is about to create. This is going to be a tripartite body; it is going to draw from the public, from labor people, and from management people. It is his view, which I fully share, that a group broadly representative of all elements of our population can offer advice, can make studies, can make recommendations that will transcend narrow private interest and reflect a consensus that will be in the interests of all of the people of our great country.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, how do the recommendations of such a council work when you get labor and management down at a bargaining table? Doesn't the union, at any bargaining session, have a vested interest in getting as big a share of the pie as possible? Doesn't management have an interest in keeping that share as small as possible?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, Mr. Niven, it is too late when you go to the bargaining table to arrive at this type of consensus. I am hopeful that we will be able to create an

environment and a climate before collective bargaining actually takes place, that will make for good bargaining, free bargaining and responsible bargaining. I am hopeful that this committee advising the President will discuss matters of great interest to labor and management and the public in the broad context of what is the public interest. And I am confident that they will do so.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, President Eisenhower tried a conference of this kind; it didn't have much result, did it?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, unfortunately it did not, as you say. But President Kennedy has visualized and I visualize a broader scope for this group. It is not designed to be a group of men sitting privately by themselves, representing their respective constituencies that deals with a limited range of problems. This is designed to be a group working in cooperation with government, with labor, with management and with the public at large to create the same sense of mutual purpose that we had during the war years and which unfortunately we seem to have lost in the years that have succeeded since the war years.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, will it seek to persuade business and labor privately or will it take its recommendations to the court of public opinion and try to apply pressure that way?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I hope it will establish communications between labor and management. It is not the desire of the President or my desire as the first Chairman of this group to hector the labor and management communities. Issue platitudes about their particular situation. It is the desire of the President that this group explore the problems that relate to them and relate to the whole community. Now by exploring these problems, by studying them in depth, by getting the assistance of the public, by getting the assistance of a staff which will be provided by getting the help of all elements in our population that we will do better than the attempt that was made in the last months of the last administration to cope with the problems.

Mr. NIVEN. Management has sometimes resisted tripartite groups of this kind on the ground that their responsibility to their stockholders compel them to keep exclusive control over their end of bargaining. Do you think business' attitude has changed a little bit?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all, I think business has unnecessary fears in this particular direction. First of all, I want to emphasize this group is not designed to impose a point of view on management or on labor. We want free and responsible collective bargaining. We don't intend to interfere with free and responsible collective bargaining. We do not seek to take advantage of any particular element in our society. We don't intend to impose a set of controls upon them. What we hope to do is reestablish a free flow of ideas between labor and management and the public to the President. After all, they are going to advise the President. So that the President gets a point of view from these important elements in our population, and so that they get a point of view from the President.

Mr. NIVEN. You have said that the Council would become operational, as you put it, in national emergency strikes. When you said "operational," do you mean that they would actually do something like compulsory arbitration or mediation?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all, Mr. Niven, you must distinguish between what I said when I was a private citizen and what I say now. Not that I have changed my views essentially, but programs that I espoused as a private person necessarily are not accepted by the administration. This is understandable.

Mr. NIVEN. This happens to politicans, too.

Secretary GOLDBERG. Yes, it does.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator Kennedy's views on protectionism, as a Senator from Massachusetts, were a little different from his views——

Secretary GOLDBERG. We have to exercise an independent judgment representing all the people. It is not the purpose of the President that this particular agency be made a dispute-settling agency. It is, rather, the purpose of the President that this group deal with the broad policies that will promote industrial peace and will promote sound wage policies, sound price policies, and will help foster industrial peace, that will increase our productivity, that will retain our position of being competitive in the world markets and that will help with the very great problems involved in automating our economy. On one hand, to see to it that we get the benefits of automation, and on the other hand, to see to it that the burdens of automation do not fall too heavily upon human beings.

Mr. NIVEN. When you talk of a sound wage and price policy, are you hopeful that an end can come to the spiral, the annual increases in both wages and prices that have wrought so much havoc with the economy?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No. What I was hopeful about was not that we stop our progress to a higher standard of living in our country. We all want that. The great feature of the American economy is that we have enjoyed a good standard of living, and we hope to improve that standard of living. What my hope is that both management and labor and government will exchange views as to how we achieve our objectives, which is a better life for all our people, and at the same time measure up to our responsibilities abroad, and at the same time provide the means to do this. The best means to do it is to step up our production, to enhance our productivity, so that we can afford to improve our standards of living, and at the same time carry on our proper burden in the world.

Mr. NIVEN. Your colleague, Secretary of Commerce Hodges, said a week ago today that many recent wage increases, or at least some of them, have come not because of increased labor productivity but because of powerful union pressure.

Would you agree with that?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I've talked to Governor Hodges and we have many points of view in common, but just as I have not brainwashed myself when I entered this high office, just as I have a set of convictions deeply held throughout the years, I'm sure that Governor Hodges has the same or a different set of convictions. It is not good in government to have a common unanimity of viewpoint.

Mr. NIVEN. Do you expect to have some stimulating discussions with him over the next 4 years?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Yes, I do. On the other hand, in the conversations that I have had with the Governor, he and I have seen—have measured our views in more areas of common agreement than in the small areas of disagreement.

Mr. NIVEN. In reference to the problem of the wage-price spiral, do you think it's possible to mitigate this spiral without getting into a planned economy?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I hope we will be able to avoid a planned economy, because our country is a free country, we have a free enterprise system, we have a free labor movement, and it is terribly important that we maintain the freedom of our—of our agencies, our private groups, that deal with this.

Now, we must see to it that the price structure of the country has reasonable stability. And there are many ways to do this, and some of the ways the President has proposed. And, parenthetically, it's interesting to note that the recent pressures of our price index do not come out of the industrial economy. We have had a push on the index because of the increase in the cost of medical care, for example, because of the increase in certain service occupations——

Mr. NIVEN. But, sir, aren't your increases in the cost of services sometimes the deflection of previous increases in the cost of basic goods?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Not always so. In very many cases that due to the fact that this segment of our society has in a sense been a low-wage depressed part of our economy, and ordinary human considerations as well as manpower considerations enter into this fact.

Mr. NIVEN. Remember when Britain in the late forties and early fifties had a balance of payments situation which was much, much worse than ours?

The late Sir Stafford Cripps, by making a strong moral appeal for restraint on both management's and labor's side, had a good deal of success. Do you think that any administration in this country can have a similar success?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, of course, the Britain situation was far different from ours. On the other hand, we do have a grave balance of payments problem. The President has said, and I reiterate his convictions, we must see to it that the integrity of the dollar is preserved. And he is determined to do this and I, as one of his advisers, share his determination. Now to cope with the problem of rising prices and inflation, we must develop policies that are responsible and we can do this if we step up our productivity, this is the key to this aspect of the problem.

We can retain our position in the world markets, we can protect our balance of payments situation and we can afford to improve standards to our workers without jeopardizing the price structure of the country.

Mr. NIVEN. Do you think it is possible our present situation calls, for a time, at least, for a situation in which productivity goes up but wages, prices, and profits do not increase proportionately?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I think that we share the benefits of productivity between all of the elements in the business community concerned, business, labor, and the community at large, that productivity increases on wage increase and they afford the means to see to it that our price structure becomes stabilized.

Mr. NIVEN. Sir, I wanted to talk a little bit about labor's future in this country.

Is it fair to say that labor has stood still as far as organizing goes for the last few years? That it has had little success in the South, that its total membership in the federation has not increased?

Secretary GOLDBERG. That is true in a sense. The figures do not indicate the great rise in the amount of organized labor in the country. On the other hand, this is offset by the fact that the traditional reservoir of people from which the organized labor movement draws have been declining in number. Factory employment and the fact that the labor movement has been able to maintain its position means that the movement has been doing considerable organizing, otherwise they would slip backward and have a smaller labor movement than we had some years ago.

Mr. NIVEN. You mean that the labor movement has got to attract more white-collar workers, its got to get away from its proletarian emphasis though it has always had less than European labor movements?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well first of all, you know, Mr. Niven, that the labor movement of the country is not a class movement, just as the Labor Department is not a class department.

Mr. NIVEN. Do you feel that it might have got farther if it were?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I do not. I am firmly committed to the type of free enterprise economy we have and the type of free labor movement we have. It is true as you mentioned, that the working force is changing. Many blue collar workers are becoming white collar workers. I feel that this is not a bad development. If we can take off the burden of human beings, some of the great labors they have had in the past, this is a desirable development. I think the labor movement in the country will have to adjust itself to this particular change in the complexion of our working force.

Mr. NIVEN. You, of course, yourself, sir, personally are a professional man, a suburbanite and art collector, do you think your own status, your own career reflects the change in the character of labor a little bit?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I think it reflects not only that but it reflects the great opportunities that are available in our great country to advance yourself. It is true I came out of the background that you describe and yet I was able to get an education and become a professional person. The one thing I find in every family of workers, of people who work, and that is the overriding desire to see to it that their children are educated. We have to meet that desire. Part of the test of our democracy is to see to it that educational opportunity is offered to all qualified people.

Mr. NIVEN. When you were getting your own education, I believe you went to two colleges at the same time with full courses at each, didn't you?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Yes, I did. Some of my friends have said I was moonrising(?) in the educational field.

Mr. NIVEN. In those early days, sir, did you envisage that you would end up as a labor man, or as a management man, or perhaps in government work as you have in fact ended up?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I did not envision any of those possibilities.

I got my law degree in 1929, and I thought I would make my career in the private practice of law.

Mr. NIVEN. Mrs. Goldberg is an artist of some repute and I understand that you have in your office two pictures, one of which symbolizes the Taft-Hartley Act and one of which symbolizes the merger of the AFL and CIO. Would you tell us how those two phenomena could possibly be represented on canvas?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I ought to have the pictures here to do that. My wife, you know, is a modern painter and that Taft-Hartley picture which I have as a treasured possession, I think it is a great picture, if I may use the commercial, it's not on the market, so I guess I can use it. She uses words and paintings and in her Taft-Hartley picture she took this statute which has become very complicated and she worked in the sections of the statute in a painting and if you will look closely at the picture which hung in my office for many years you will see that she referred to 8b–1, 8b–2, 8b–4, 8b–3, (?) sections which sometimes I think I ought to know, sometimes it has got so complicated that I myself——

Mr. NIVEN. I would like to see it sometime.

Secretary GOLDBERG. I hope to invite you to do that.

Mr. NIVEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, for being our first guest on "Washington Conversation."

This is Paul Niven inviting you to be with us next week at this same time.

ANNOUNCER. This has been the first in a new series of informal and unrehearsed programs with a prominent national figure, "Washington Conversation."

Our guest today was a member of President Kennedy's Cabinet, the Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg.

This program, originally scheduled for Washington, D.C., was changed to originate live from Pittsburgh, Pa., so that we might talk with Mr. Goldberg at the end of his recently arranged trip to a number of the country's distressed areas.

"Washington Conversation" is produced by Michael J. Marlow, directed by Bill Linden. Reeves Cortage speaking.

"Washington Conversation" is a public affairs presentation of CBS News.

THE CONGO CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement made by me yesterday on the Congo crisis and its complications and implications.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGO CRISIS

The situation in the Congo is nearing the point of no return, if it has not, indeed, already passed it. The time left for constructive action is not a matter of months or weeks but a matter of days or hours. Unless the present trend is checked and reversed, the United Nations—the one possible force for peace and stability in the region—will be overwhelmed by a combination of the inner schisms in the Congo and the outward pressures of the forces of the cold war. The prospect is one of bloody strife and chaos for the Congo and, probably, for the surrounding African States as well. For other nations of the world, the United States, the Soviet Union, and Western Europe in particular, the prospect will be one of ever-deepening and costly involvement on the side of Congolese and African factions of one kind or another, and in the end, the beginning of world war III.

This dangerous trend will not be reversed by the recriminations of outside nations. It will not be reversed by outside nations climbing on one African bandwagon or another. It will not be reversed by the character-assassination of the Secretary General of the U.N. who has done his best in spite of the under-the-table maneuverings of international power politics and little clear-cut practical direction from either the Security Council or the General Assembly.

If there is any chance to reverse the trend toward chaos and strife in the Congo first and, probably, in all of Africa afterwards, it lies in the first instance with the new African States which have not yet been visited by the plague of civil violence—States which clearly have the largest and the most immediate interest in the outcome of the situation in the Congo. It lies in the second place, in a recognition by the non-African States that they will all lose unless the situation in the Congo is insulated from the cold war. It lies in the third place, in a universal recognition that while the Congo must be loosened from the lingering strands of an old colonialism as quickly as possible, it must not become enmeshed in new strands regardless of what name may be given to them.

I would urge, therefore, that serious consideration be given in our policies to bringing about in the United Nations, the following new approach to the Congo—and I have no hesitancy in expressing the belief that it is a last-ditch approach:

1. That these Subsaharan African members of the United Nations, Liberia, Ghana, Guinea, the Cameroun, Togo, Malagasy, Somalia, Dahomey, Niger, Upper Volta, Ivory Coast, Chad, the Congo (Brazzaville), Gabon, the Central African Republic, Nigeria, Mali, and Senegal, meet in caucus and present to the Security Council an agreed upon resolution outlining a specific course of action which the United Nations should now pursue in dealing with the critical situation in the Congo.

2. That the Security Council, if it adopts this resolution, require its acceptance as the sole course of international action in dealing with the Congolese problem and that all nations be governed and held accountable to the United Nations in accord with its terms.

3. That the costs of carrying out the resolution be divided on the basis of four quarters—one-quarter by the United States, one-quarter by the United Kingdom and by Western Europe, one-quarter by the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and one-quarter by the rest of the members of the United Nations.

4. That the present Secretary General be directed to carry out the resolution but without prejudice to the consideration of any proposals which any member state would be at liberty to make regarding a reordering of the Secretariat of the U.N., when the General Assembly convenes in regular session next September.

THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Tuesday, February 14, 23 Members of the House and Senate had the privilege and honor of meeting in the White House with the President of the United States and the Ambassador from the Republic of Mexico, the Honorable Antonio Carillo Flores.

At that time, on behalf of the Governor of the State of Jalisco, the Honorable Juan Gil Preciado and Mrs. Preciado, collectively we presented to President Kennedy a silver platter.

I though this was a momentous occasion, because of the fact that it demonstrated anew the real and great friendship which exists between our two great countries, living side by side.

I wish to state for the RECORD that I was never more proud in my life than I was of the North American delegation which attended the first Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference at Guadalajara, Jalisco, during that 4-day period. Every member of the delegation and the wives who accompanied us comported themselves extremely well and made outstanding and worthwhile contributions. The members were at their desks every morning. They showed a degree of understanding, interest, and tolerance which I believe was outstanding.

So far as our Mexican colleagues were concerned, they likewise showed understanding and courtesy and recognized the fact that it was not only one country that had difficulties, but that both of our countries had problems, and that sometimes those difficulties were very similar.

When we arrived in Mexico we were greeted with a handshake. When we left we were embraced. They call it an abrazo. We believe we laid a foundation for better understanding and mutual tolerance, thanks to our Mexican colleagues. There was recognition that at this first meeting there was much ground to be explored, and that the exploration would continue between now and next year, when the second Mexican-United States Interparliamentary

Conference will be held in the city of Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made at the time of the presentation of the platter from the Governor of Jalisco and his lovely wife to the President of the United States be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF A SILVER TRAY TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY FROM THE GOVERNOR OF JALISCO

Mr. President, the U.S. delegation gathered here today returned Sunday from a week in Mexico where we attended the first meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

From our point of view, and I think also from that of our Mexican hosts, the meeting was an unqualified success. Our agenda covered the topics of foreign investment, foreign trade, border affairs, and cultural interchange. On all of these subjects, our discussions were conducted with frankness in an atmosphere of cordiality.

It was not the intention of the group to come to specific agreements or to make joint recommendations. I think delegates on each side did, however, come away with a better understanding of the problems confronting delegates on the other side.

In due course, the U.S. delegation will make its own report to the U.S. Congress, and at that time these matters will be discussed in greater detail.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the extent of the hospitality extended to us by our Mexican hosts. Nothing was too much for them to do; no detail was too small to be overlooked. For this, as well as for the substance of our discussions, we shall always be grateful.

As we were leaving the lovely city of Guadalajara, the Governor of the State of Jalisco, the Honorable Juan Gil Preciado, and Mrs. Gil Preciado entrusted us with the mission of presenting to you, Mr. President, this beautiful silver tray, engraved with the initials J.F.K., as a token of friendship and esteem to you from the people of his state and, I am sure, from the people of Mexico as a whole. On behalf of the U.S. delegation, I now take great pleasure in performing that mission and in expressing the hope that, throughout your administration, relations between the United States and Mexico will continue to prosper on the basis of equality and fraternity, mutual understanding, mutual trust, and mutual respect.

A RECESSION CURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a pointed editorial appeared in the Chicago Daily News on February 3 with respect to the administration program and how it points up the spending issue all over again. It is still timely, and I therefore request consent that it be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY'S RECESSION CURE IS OLD, FAMILIAR SPENDING

As the billowing rhetoric subsides, the outline of President Kennedy's New Frontier begins to take shape. It can be described in one word: Spending—with the customary pledge that the debts incurred will be retired in more prosperous times.

The President was mildly indignant at his press conference that anyone should suspect him of deliberately painting the economic picture blacker than the reality in order to claim credit for quick improvement. There is no evidence to support such a suspicion, except that President Eisenhower's quite respectable economic advisers forecast an early upturn in the economy without the stimulants that Mr. Kennedy now proposes.

It is further true that an atmosphere of emergency is almost a necessity for prodding Congress into quick action on the list of spending measures and welfare benefits which the President presented in his economic message. The "urgency" of most of these was foreseen in the Democratic platform last July.

As Mr. Kennedy said, however, "* * * the expectation of minor improvements in business conditions during the next year provides no basis for complacency, no excuse for inaction." The question is whether his prescription is effective against the symptoms he describes, or whether they are merely an extension of the welfarism that is so large a part of his party's appeal to voters.

His five proposed increases in social security benefits, for example, would be simple gifts from the Treasury. The proposals should bring blushes to those who contend that social security is a form of "insurance," with specific benefits bought and paid for. It proves once more that social security taxes are just like any other taxes, to be dispensed at the will of Congress.

President Kennedy ordered the Federal Housing Administration to reduce the maximum interest rate on FHA-insured loans from 5¾ to 5½ percent. This is an example of an order that will be most helpful only if conditions prove such that the order was unnecessary.

In Chicago, which is fairly typical, some 70 percent of mortgage loans are made by the conventional institutions. Any arbitrary limit on interest rates would merely result in discounts that brought the effective rate into line with the going rate. The statutory limit of 4½ percent for GI loans, for instance, merely dried up the sources of such mortgage money; it did not produce the hoped-for building.

The distressed areas program is a hardy perennial that even the Eisenhower administration accepted in part. The struggle will come over the total of funds to be allotted to it. In any case the redevelopment of whole districts is a very long-term project.

Some of the President's quick-cure recipes will run into delays in State legislatures. Examples are the stamp plan for distributing surplus foods to the unemployed, and extension of unemployment insurance benefits. Both require State cooperation and financing.

Some of the President's ideas that seem most promising await explanation in future messages. He speaks of tax incentives to promote investment in plant and equipment. Presumably he means liberalized depreciation allowances. Constructive action on this would be a major assist.

Other generalities, we suspect, will leave the economists cold. An instance is the promise to "emphasize strongly programs to raise the productivity of our growing population by strengthening the education, health, research and training activities."

The objective is completely laudable. Its inclusion in an economic message aimed at the recession, however, is something like saying that you intend to fight the forest fire by planting some redwood trees.

The President reveals himself as eager and determined—and surrounded by wordsmiths as talented as himself. We find little in his message, however, that the average Congressman would not have thought of as he mounted the stump to make a campaign speech.

RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF METEOROLOGY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 44, S. 681, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 681) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to clarify the authority of the Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau, to enter into research contracts in the various meteorological fields and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

A similar bill was passed by the Senate last year, but failed of passage in the House.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a general statement on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An identical bill (S. 1235) was introduced in the last Congress and hearings were held. The bill was reported favorably from the committee and passed the Senate, but died in the House.

At present the only specific authority for entering into research contracts in the meteorological field is contained in section 803, Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 783), which authorizes the Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau, to enter into research contracts with public and private agencies for the purpose of increasing the safety and efficiency of air navigation. A strict interpretation of section 803 of the Federal Aviation Act tends to restrict the awarding of research contracts to research projects showing a direct relationship or benefit to safety and efficiency of air navigation. Although the Weather Bureau in its testimony to your committee last Congress indicated that most of its proposals for research contracts can be shown to have a direct or indirect bearing on some branch of aeronautics, this relationship is not always apparent and, consequently, questions as to statutory authority may arise. This is significant, because the Weather Bureau has found that in many cases the most efficient method of accomplishing its research in a particular area of meteorological science is to have all or part of the project contracted out to private agencies such as universities, in order that their highly specialized and research facilities be utilized. In this way the desired facilities and experienced personnel are made available to the Government at far less cost than if the Weather Bureau were to attempt to perform all such research at its own facilities with its own personnel.

Your committee agrees with the Weather Bureau that the limitation which requires such contracts to be related to civil aviation could raise possible questions which would create a reluctance on the part of contractors to undertake such projects. Therefore, the elimination of this limitation would serve to remove any possible reluctance on the part of contractors to undertake projects not obviously related to aviation meteorology and would also stimulate the interests of private organizations in securing such contracts. Your committee feels that it is desirable to give this flexibility to the Weather Bureau so that it can cover research in the entire field of meteorology.

In addition, S. 681 would authorize the expenditure of public money for telephone services installed in private residences, for use as the Chief of Bureau may direct, in carrying into effect the basic enabling laws authorizing collection and distribution of information on weather conditions throughout the United States, its territories and possessions. The telephone installations will be made in cases where frequent need can be shown to exist, or where isolated location prevents use of public utility communication facilities to contact meteorological personnel for reports of severe storms, floods, etc., and the dissemination of emergency weather warnings, etc.

At many semi-isolated or isolated locations, Weather Bureau field facilities are not open 24 hours daily, and at these locations field employees have little or no requirements for private telephones in their residences, which are often Government owned. In cases where special weather observations are urgently needed from these stations after normal office hours, or it is urgent that storm warning or advice be disseminated, there are no telephone facilities now available by which field personnel can be contacted and required reports obtained or warnings issued. The installation of telephone services in private residences in these instances will insure that emergency meteorological services are available at all locations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the bill has been cleared with the minority. There is no objection to it. The minority Senators favor it. As the majority leader has pointed out, the bill passed the Senate last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, is this a research bill? Are there any patent sections in the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. None at all. As the Senator from Lousiana may recall, the bill pased the Senate last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Are there any provisions which would permit the making of contracts for research or would make it possible for a contractor to retain patent rights?

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge, the answer is that the bill contains no such provisions and does not affect such situations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 681) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to improve the meteorological services of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce may enter into contracts with private or governmental facilities to conduct research in meteorology, including agricultural meteorology, hydrology, climatology, and closely related geophysical fields, and provide for the publication of results of such research contracts unless such publication would be contrary to the public interest.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 7 of the Act of August 23, 1912 (ch. 350, 37 Stat. 414), as amended, appropriations for the Weather Bureau shall be available to pay for telephone service installed in private residences when such installation is determined by the Secretary of Commerce to be needed in carrying out the provisions of law authorizing the collection and distribution of data relating to information on weather conditions in the United States, its territories and possessions: *Provided,* That, in addition to the monthly local service charge, the Government may pay only such tolls or other charges as are required strictly for the public business.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 45, Senate bill 683.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 683) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a similar bill passed the Senate last year, but was not taken up in the House.

The purpose of S. 683 is to amend sections 219, 308, and 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to said sections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a general statement relating to the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce at the request of the Federal Communications Commission. Full and complete hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Communications on an identical bill (S. 1736) in the 86th Congress at which all interested parties were afforded an opportunity to present their views. S. 1736 was favorably reported and passed the Senate but died in the House.

The requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain reports and application forms submitted to the Commission imposes a burden on the public and also on the Commission in those instances where the applicant omits the required oath or affirmation. In such cases the workload of the Commission is increased to the extent necessary to return reports or application forms for the required verification. This slows up the consideration by the Commission of the matters involved and the processing of applications. Inconvenience and delay to the public result.

As a substitute for the oath or affirmation on Commission forms, where presently required, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to provide on the forms a warning similar to the following:

Willful false statements on this form can be punished by fine or imprisonment (18 U.S.C. 1001).

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By way of comment on the bill, the existing law requires that the Commission may require annual reports from all carriers, under oath or affirmation. It appears that that is an undue burden and is not necessary. I think the Senate saw the wisdom last year of amending the existing law, so the bill is not controversial at all, and should be approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In order to amplify what the distinguished minority leader has said, I point out that the general statement in the report reads, in part:

As a substitute for the oath or affirmation on Commission forms, where presently required, the Federal Communications Commission proposes to provide on the forms a warning similar to the following:

Willful false statements on this form can be punished by fine or imprisonment (18 U.S.C. 1001).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 683) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 219 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219(a)), is amended by striking out from the first sentence thereof the words "under oath".

SEC. 2. That subsection (b) of section 219 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219(b)), is amended by striking out from the penultimate sentence thereof after the word "Act" the semicolon, adding a period thereafter and striking out the following: "and such periodical or special reports shall be under oath whenever the Commission so requires".

SEC. 3. That subsection (b) of section 308 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 308(a)), is amended by striking out from the last sentence thereof the words "under oath or affirmation".

SEC. 4. That subsection (a) of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 319(a)), is amended by striking out from the last sentence thereof the words "under oath or affirmation".

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR MONDAY NEXT—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate will take up S. 610, a bill to provide for an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce. The bill was reported today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill to be called up on Monday is the one to create a new Office of International Travel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume there will be much discussion of the bill. There were a good many cosponsors of the measure. I hope they will take notice of the fact that the bill will be taken up for consideration on Monday next.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S STATEMENT ON THE CONGO AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, President Kennedy's statement regarding the Congo has, I am sure, the full support of Congress and the people of our country. While it deals directly with the Congo, it has much wider implications. It is a declaration of firm support for the United Nations. For if the United Nations is not supported in the Congo, and if its organization should be broken up by the threats of the Soviet Union, by the removal of Mr. Hammarskjold and a change in the status of the Secretary General, its effectiveness to prevent war in the Congo, and in other situations that may arise, would be nullified.

This is undoubtedly one of the purposes of the Soviet Union. The President was correct in pointing out that members of the United Nations—those who are not military powers, who are neutralist, and particularly those who are now emerging into independence—have the greatest stake in the maintenance of the United Nations in the Congo, and in its integrity as a world body for peace.

I note with great interest the statement of Prime Minister Nehru of India supporting the continued functioning of the United Nations in the Congo, and his offer to send some combat troops to the Congo in its support. We hope that the position of India will be followed by like action on the part of many nations in Asia and particularly of nations in Africa.

The President was correct also in making clear to the Soviet Union that the United States will support the United Nations against the unilateral intervention of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of the Republic of the Congo. The declaration of the Communist Party meeting in Moscow in December, and the speech of Mr. Khrushchev at a later date elaborating the meaning of the Communist Party declaration in the context of its policy of "coexistence," clearly committed the Soviet Union and other countries controlled by the Communist Party to intervention in every situation in Africa, Asia, and even Latin America when it would be to their advantage to impose the rule of communism.

President Kennedy, in his statements, has made it clear that the United States is prepared to negotiate seriously with Russia the issues which divide the world, and particularly, disarmament. Mr. Khrushchev has said that Soviet Russia would like to see a solution of disarmament and other issues which, unresolved, continue the danger of war. The action of the Soviet Union and other Communist countries regarding the Congo and the maintenance of the United Nations will provide for our country and the world a test of the good faith of the Soviet Union toward negotiation.

Proposals for the resolution of the difficult questions of the Congo, are for the President and State Department to consider, in their careful negotiations within the United Nations and with other countries. We should keep in mind that it is doubtful that the United States can secure or maintain the support of countries of Asia and, particularly, Africa unless the plans we submit point to the reconvening of the Parliament which was elected by the people of the Congo, or to a new Parliament to be elected by the people.

This carries with it the proposition that forces in the Congo must be there only under the auspices of the United Nations. This means that Belgium should agree to the early removal of its military advisers or forces under such an agreement.

For at last the decision for the government of the Congo must be made by the people of the Congo and not by outsiders. As a practical matter it would be difficult for any newly independent country, in Africa or elsewhere, to accept the decisions of outsiders as to the ultimate character of its government. For if they accept such a proposal for the Congo, they could consider that some day they might be required to accept it for themselves.

And it is by our willingness to stand by the decisions of the people of these new States that we can support our own principle of self-government and secure the confidence of the people of these newly independent countries.

Mr. President, I say this is a time in which our country and the members of both parties should give without question the fullest support to President Kennedy in his very clear statement regarding U.S. policy.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his very wise contributions in regard to one of the most troublesome questions facing us today. His long experience, his great prestige in the areas to which he refers, and, notably, his service as U.S. Ambassador to India entitle him to speak with very great authority, on the basis of his wise judgment.

I hasten to add that I am eager to identify myself with the burden of his statements, as they relate to the crisis in the Congo. In fact, I shall address myself to those points, and my views in regard to them are very closely parallel to his.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I know that only recently he visited Africa, particularly the Congo, and that his advice and judgment will be valuable to both the Senate and the country.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

THE SITUATION IN THE CONGO

Mr. President, I rise today to speak for a few minutes about the Congo. One does this with considerable hesitation. It has been necessary to read the cables very closely and to read the ticker tapes constantly in order to try to keep abreast of the changing events in that area.

Many have spoken. In the last few days, both wise words and hot words have been uttered. Most of the latter have been triggered by the unfortunate and regrettable circumstances surrounding the death of Patrice Lumumba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks today an editorial entitled "The Lumumba Aftermath," published in the Washington Post of yesterday; an article entitled "Crisis in the Congo," written by Walter Lippmann, and published today in the Washington Post; and the latest item from the ticker tape in regard to a proposal, expected today by certain countries of Africa and Asia, that aims at a solution of the Congolese crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, from a quick glance at the news ticker item on the solution proposed by these Asian and African nations, I note that it closely parallels some recommendations I have prepared.

The fact that the emotions of the world have been stirred by the unfortunate death of Lumumba is to be regretted by peace-loving people everywhere. When we were in the Congo a little over a month ago, it was my impression that Lumumba, a very exciting personality, was much more important outside the Congo than he was inside it. I suspect that as events unfold before us, right now, considerably more will be made of his death in other capitals of the world than in his own land. Whatever the case there, however, his passing demands that the United States, in particular, and the United Nations, in general, take a fresh look at the Congo.

The U.S. policy in regard to the Congo has seemed, in recent months, to be altogether too much warped by the personality of Lumumba; and altogether too much of what we have done in central Africa—or, at least, too much of what we have said we intended to do there—has been triggered by fear of this one man. As a consequence, his presence there and this fear have tended to straitjacket both our thinking and our freedom of action.

Mr. President, this is not an unusual circumstance in history. In fact, an American historian, Earl Johnson, has developed what he calls the "devil"

thesis of history: that, often, peoples—including ourselves—are tempted to try to simplify the complications of the world by focusing their attention on a "devil."

Thus, at the time of our troubles with Nazi Germany, we tended to focus our attention on Hitler. During the postwar period we tended to focus our attention on Stalin. So it is that more recently we have tried to apply the same formula to the problems which have developed in central Africa. In that connection, we have tended to focus our attention on Lumumba.

Although no one would ever suggest that a member of the human race be destroyed, I can see one beneficial consequence to be derived from freeing the public mind from fear of this one man. This opportunity to take a fresh look is what prompted me to speak rather informally today about what might be done in the Congo.

What I shall have to say will be little more than personal opinion—a reflection of the views of only one man—but some of what I shall say has been derived from many, many conversations, in the Congo, with members of the Kasavubu government, with members of the opposition groups there, and with both groups of Belgians on the scene. The Belgians there refer to the "good Belgians" and the "bad Belgians." We talked with all those groups, and also to members of other embassies, to private citizens of the surrounding countries in Africa, and to the international press from Asia, from Africa, from Europe, and from our own country. Some of the very finest minds and most gifted pens of the fourth estate in the United States have long been in the Congo, and we have benefited from the articles they have been sending home.

So my remarks will constitute somewhat of a distillation—a substantive attempt to judge, on balance, what the Congo crisis comes down to—as a result of all the crosscurrents and the differing ideas at work at the moment on this particular issue.

Let me suggest that the problem of the Congo is complicated by the heritage of the past. It would be convenient if we could avoid that harsh fact, but it remains with us. The factors of the past that still influence the present of the Congo are of both African origin and colonial Belgian origin.

Sheer size, physical isolation, vastness, and yet emptiness are words that come to mind when one attempts to describe this great land, the Congo. It is one of the largest countries in the world, and potentially it is one of the richest. If the map of Congo were superimposed on a map of the United States, for example, it would stretch from the eastern borders of Kansas, northward into Canada, eastward into the Atlantic, and southward into Florida. The Congo is a tremendously large country. Yet, distributed throughout that vast area are but 14 million people. I cannot help but think—as others have—of the contrast with parts of Asia. The Belgian Congo is not smaller in area than India and India has 400 million people. Indeed, the sense of emptiness strikes one when he arrives there.

In addition to its vastness, many parts of the Congo are isolated, because of the difficulty of communication.

There are not as many miles of railroads in the Congo, for example, as there are in the State of Wyoming, and the railroads that are there are on three different gages. It is practically impossible to travel uninterrupted from a city like Leopoldville to Stanleyville or Elisabethville. While this condition adds complications, it also does some good. It makes it difficult for brush-fire conflicts to spread and increase with speed. It becomes increasingly difficult for divisive forces to get at each other in large numbers. It provides time for the consideration of the solutions that are being contributed in these very stormy days.

There is no common language to tie this vast area together. There are more than 70 major ethnic groups in the Congo, 400 dialects, 38 major languages. Half of them are not even written languages.

Thus, the lack of cohesive factors will probably forever be a complicating condition in the Congo's internal relations.

Aside from the geography and the vastness and the emptiness, there is another factor to be considered, namely, the tribal organization. Tribal organization is still paramount in the Congo.

This organization is not without some democratic features, I hasten to add. Most of the tribal chieftains have means of checking and being checked by members of their tribes, but this has also created a sort of paternalism—that of actual dependence on the tribal chief by the members of the tribe. Now, when thousands of Congolese have been uprooted, when they have been removed as refugees into Elisabethville or Leopoldville, they are no longer under tribal discipline. They are naive. They are babes in the political woods. They lack any measure of political sophistication.

This is a fact of life, again, to which we must accommodate our thinking in trying to arrive at whatever solution reasonable men may work out in the Congo.

But if the difficulty is due to that African heritage, then at least equal difficulties, come from the European past of the Congo and the colonialism which existed under the Belgian Government. Whatever one might wish to say for the second expansion of Europe in the late 19th century, however one would like to put it in terms of a quest for new capital, for exploitation of resources among backward people, the harsh fact remains that people were overlooked, that people were used and exploited and destroyed. This was more true in the Congo, perhaps, than in any other colonial part of the exploited parts of the globe.

Yet the Belgian occupation of the Congo was not all on the loss side of the ledger, for much good was contributed. Belgium raised the standard of living conspicuously in many areas. It contributed to social progress. There was relatively less racial discrimination there, for example, than there was in other similar areas of the globe. The Belgians even started, on a very modest scale, and with great timidity, in the field of limited education. Very late in the existence of the Belgian occupation, the Belgian Government instituted a primary school program; but it stopped at the primary level. The net effect has not been a laudable one in terms of preparation for freedom. Scarcely half the people, after 80 years of Belgian occupation, can read or write. There has been no progress at all in higher education. Even today there are only two colleges in all of the Congo, and they have more teachers than students. The University of Louvain is situated in Leopoldville, and there is a small college at Elisabethville.

There were only 16 college graduates in the Congo at the time of independence last June.

Perhaps worse still, the Belgian Government never permitted a Congolese to have an assignment with administrative authority in the affairs of government; and, at most, one has to scrape hard to find a Congolese with even minor administrative experience in civil government.

This policy made it obvious that they were unready for independence; unprepared and untrained.

There was no effort to train technicians. There is not a single doctor of Congolese origin, not a single engineer, not a single lawyer. There is one Congolese lawyer there now. This may be one of the bright hopes on the horizon—to start a new government with only one lawyer. But the absence of professionally equipped leadership, with trained technicians, only expands this vast gap in the Congo as it struggles for status and independence.

The combination of African heritage and the European colonial heritage blend into some simple truths. However else one wishes to describe it, it is overwhelmingly a black man's world—over 100 to 1 in proportion. But it is likewise a world that is in contradiction. One lands at the airport in Leopoldville on one of the longest jet airstrips in the world. Yet, across the road, one sees some of the dirtiest, most rundown grass shacks he has ever seen anywhere in the world. They are side by side.

We stood on a hill south of Leopoldville with a group of half-naked tribesmen, looking across a valley, perhaps 300 yards wide, at Louvain University, with its nuclear reactor that is the pride of the campus. Again one finds the remote past and the future, standing on two sides of the valley, contending for the hopes, aspirations, and minds of these men.

The people of the Congo, my friends, are caught up in the winds of the past and the winds of the future at one and the same moment. I sometimes think of the Congolese as trying hard to hold onto the witch doctor with one hand and the tail of a rocket in the other, and being pulled apart by these contradictory forces.

It does not do us much good to suggest that things have gone too fast in the last

few months. Indeed, they are moving very fast not alone in the Congo—but all over this earth.

I remember a colleague of mine, a friend, who visited the Congo in 1954. He said:

> You know, I am confident, in my travels around the world, that these Congolese are the happiest people in all the world.

That was 6 years ago. And the Belgian Government was saying then:

> As things go now, perhaps in another 25 or 30 years they may be ready for self-government and independence.

Six years ago that was the conviction. Even after the Leopoldville riots of 1959 there were those Belgians who, though alerted and warned, were still saying, "Well, we have to trim our sails. We must get them ready in 5 or 6 years. The time is running out." The truth was that time had already run out, and it exploded into these forces which produced independence on June 30 of last year.

Of course the people of the Congo were not ready for independence. It does no one in the world good, and it does not help to resolve the problem, to lecture the African people about how they ought to wait until they are ready for independence. Who would have said the Americans were ready for independence in 1776? We were blessed with a lot of good luck, a happy choice of some brilliant leaders, and the breaks in the game, which enabled us to play one great power, the British, off against another great power, the French; and to run between them.

We heard many stories of the baffilements of independence for the man in the street in the Congo. There were those Congolese who asked, "How do we get independence? Will it come to us wrapped in paper? Do we go to the bank to get it?" There were those who really believed that all the graves of their ancestors would open, and that their ancestors would return to the Congo to preside over this great moment of freedom. There were those, it was said, who ran out into the streets and merely waved their arms and said, "I is free as a bird."

But the fact of independence is what we must content ourselves with, rather than deploring the unreadiness for it. Thus, it requires that we ask, "Where do we go from here?"

First, we view the beliefs of the people of the Congo, the heritage they have from those African fetishes and traditions, and its vastness, as well as the mistakes made by the Belgians and the good done by the Belgians. All of this is now catapulted into the crosscurrents of the present, into the contending world of which we are very much a part.

The nub of the crisis, in this context, is the vacuum of political power which exists there. This is the heart of the problem, and the contest is among the diverse forces of movement which seek to operate within that political vacuum. Those forces are five in number.

The first of them—and the force most commonly overlooked in the concern of the rest of the world, in my judgment—is the Congolese themselves. Let us not forget that there are 14 million Congolese people. How many people are asking today, "What is best for them? What do they want? What do they need?" Those questions are rarely raised, and certainly their emphasis does not match the tempers which have been raised in recent days.

The Congo is divided into six large provinces. There is Leopoldville in the southwest; Equator Province in the northwest; Kasai Province in the center; Oriental Province, where Stanleyville is, to the northeast; Kivu Province in the central northeast; and Katanga Province in the southeast.

Katanga is the richest province, where most of the ores are to be found. A substantial portion of the industrial diamonds of the world come from Katanga Province. Much of the copper of the world and most of the cobalt of the world comes from Katanga Province.

Thus, there is an imbalance economically, which only serves to complicate the situation.

Out of this maze of provincial segregation has emerged no national profile, no single political personality who can draw all segments of the Congo behind a single program.

One of the striking things which one notes in Africa—at least, which I noted, and with which I was impressed—is the emergence, in so many countries there, of a strong, powerful, and very able political leadership.

Whether one goes to the east, into Kenya or Tanganyika territory; to the north, into Tunisia; or to the west, to Nigeria, Ghana, Guinea, or Liberia; or to the French Entente, in part of which Mr. Huphonet-Boigny is a distinguished leader of his little republic, the Ivory Coast—as is Mr. Olympio of Togo—one is struck with the brilliance of the leadership which has emerged.

But in the Congo that is not the case. Thus, we have seen contention between Mr. Kasavubu, a very quiet, mild-mannered, soft-spoken man, with an image which travels not very far beyond the confines of the Leopoldville area, and the exciting and excitable personality of Mr. Lumumba, who had a great capacity for spellbinding—who could sway an audience in the flesh, but who lost it in absentia.

Mr. Lumumba, by all judgments in the Congo, had long since lost public esteem. But his was still a magic name elsewhere.

There is also Mr. Kalangi, in the central province of Kasai; Mr. Tshombe, in the southeastern province of Katanga; and Mr. Gizenga, who seeks to replace Lumumba. None of them is of national stature.

This is the problem with which the Congolese themselves have to contend, among themselves. It does not help us to a ready solution.

In addition to the Congolese, there is the force of the other African States. This is a serious and yet a hopeful and powerful force in the solution, ultimately, to the problem. I say it is serious because we found in the Congo that what the other African States thought about Lumumba, or thought about the Belgians in the Congo, or thought about the Congo, was sometimes more important than what the Congolese thought. It was the case, in other words, of a people themselves being submerged by the wishes and the desires and the judgments of outside forces.

It is imperative, it seems to me, that all these factors be kept in balance, rather than being permitted to run away with a people whose destiny ought, if possible, to be shaped by their own judgment.

A third of the five forces seeking to operate within the giant political vacuum of the Congo is the Belgians. The Belgians, after 80 years, fled in panic. By the time we were there, in December, the Belgians were flooding back in by the tens and by the hundreds. Every plane was loaded almost solidly with Belgians. They were coming back to reclaim their jobs, and to reopen their businesses. There were those in the Congo who charged that many Belgians were also coming back to infiltrate and to regain a position of control. How much of that may have been true no one can say. All that can be said is that this return and these inroads were made outside the pattern of the United Nations; outside the framework of the world body which was the only official delegation supposed to be in the Congo.

Thus, rightly or wrongly, the mere mention of the word "Belgium," stirred up excitements and images of hate which were distorted in the extreme, and only evoked emotional outbursts that served to make a rational solution increasingly difficult.

The fourth of the forces at work in that political vacuum is the United States-Soviet rivalry. I think it is a source of deep regret that the cold war ever got into the Congo. One of the refreshing prospects in a good part of Africa is the absence of excessive militarism, and an excess of expenditures for military purposes. This situation means that a little money goes much further there than it does in other parts of the world, where we have had to deal realistically with great power political struggles that have become military contests. Men of good will and right meaning desperately hoped that the cold war might have been kept out. But it is in. Our concern should be how to roll it back out of the Congo, if that is at all possible. Too many of the judgments that have been accorded the figures in the Congo have been accorded in terms of the cold war rather than the Congolese. Russia has chosen up sides; we have chosen up sides; others have made their decisions—not in terms of what ought to be done for the Congo, but on the basis of who is most opposed to the United States or who is most opposed to the Russians.

I submit that this is hardly the way to build a sound, balanced stability upon which a newly independent people can form a new government.

What has evoked these comments has been the suggestion that these are the power forces within the vacuum in the Congo. The American-Soviet rivalry, combined with the United Nations, making the fourth and fifth of the five forces to which I have already alluded.

But this is not enough. It is sadly short to talk about what we did wrong in the Congo, about what the Russians have done which was wrong, about how the United Nations failed by not disarming the Force Publique last August, or how it made a mistake in taking a stand on the well-known incident in Leopoldville last October. Those are incidents which are now behind us. It is no longer any contribution to talk about the misjudgments of the Belgians. What we must ask in this moment is: Where can we go from here? By what road can we approach the Congolese? Now is the time for a concerted effort to be made in order to gain for the Congolese both the time and experience needed to enable them to put their fragmented political groups together. Whether it be by a loose federation or whether it be merely by means of some plan which will ultimately flower from the conferences now being held there, we cannot say at this time. But the Congolese need both time and experience. They need guarantees that they will have no interference from the outside, so that they may rest assured that there shall be stability within. Whatever else we have learned in recent weeks, it is certain that a volcanic Congo, a Congo torn to bits, is only a fertile breeding ground for cold war shenanigans. This will disturb not only Africa; but it can turn the whole world into the kind of open conflict it seeks to avoid. A united Congo, in whatever form, offers the best chance for rolling back the cold war efforts already made there. Yet the Congolese are far from such unity at the present time.

The American objectives in the Congo, in my judgment, ought to include at least these three concepts: That of a United Congo rather than a divided one; that of a stronger United Nations force in the Congo; and that of a positive posture for the Congo. We have been against Lumumba. We are not totally without sin. We have been against Russia. We have been against the position of the United Arab Republic and others in the Congo, and rightly so, in our judgment. We have been so emphatic in our emphasis on being against something when we ought to have been for something. We have lost a little of the momentum and the command we might otherwise have been in a position to exercise in the Congo. If I may suggest it, we have been caught with our emphasis down.

I suggest the following four steps which, in my judgment, would help to create a chance for the kind of Congo settlement which all the people of the world would like to see. First of all, a strong United Nations force in the Congo. This means new troops and more troops. If more troops are still to be withdrawn by the governments participating there, let the contributions by governments already there be increased. I know from personal conversations with the heads of other African States that there are those governments which are willing to increase immeasurably their present manpower in the Congo. But standing United Nations troops in the Congo, no matter how numerous, are powerless if they cannot act with force. It is necessary to have a larger army, and they must be empowered to enforce the principles for which they are sent to the Congo. This is an important "must," it is the first important "must," in the ultimate settlement that might be possible in the Congo.

The second step is the creation, as soon as feasible, under whatever process seems best and legitimate, of a government in the Congo. It appears to be agreed that the present government is not officially recognized within the Congo. It has not been legitimized by an act of parliament. It has not been ratified in any sense by the people. There are many reasons why it could not be. But the sooner there can be a legitimate government in the Congo, the sooner can the edge be taken off the recurring suspicion and uncertainty which prevails and stirs the muddy waters into more troubled times.

A useful step was taken not long ago when the president of the Congo, Mr. Kasavubu, removed from the position of dominance Colonel Mobutu, of the Army, and restored the operations of the government to political hands. I think this was an important small step.

Whether out of the roundtable discussions which are to continue it will be possible to work out an approach between the widely separated capitals and personalities of the Congo still remains to be seen; but it must be given a complete "old college try." Ultimately, in whatever solution is reached an effort should be made to include free elections; elections guaranteed by United Nations troops with no interference from the outside and no terrorism from the inside.

I suggest, third, that within—and I stress "within"—the framework of the United Nations, Belgian technicians need to be employed in the Congo in greater numbers. This is a sensitive matter. Much of the Congo has stopped turning any wheels, because the Congolese do not know how to turn the wheels; nobody knows where the switches are. Understandably, suspicion of the Belgians, and the distorted, overstated hatred of many of the Belgians, has prevented the utilization of the technical know-how and training opportunities for the Congolese themselves. The Belgians need not and should not be put into policymaking roles, but only into technical, constructive, operating roles in order to help close the time gap and so that the Congo may move ahead more rapidly.

I return to my belief that whatever action is taken in the Congo must be through the United Nations. At the time I was there in December, a little war was going on between the Belgians and the United Nations, as if there were not enough wars going on in that part of the world.

It is time that the Belgians, through whatever confidence we can command and other nations can command, be persuaded to channel whatever they do in the Congo through the United Nations, rather than outside the United Nations. The return of the Belgian technicians only would be a very useful contribution to the development of the Congo.

Finally, I suggest that the posture of looking at the Congo become a positive policy for Africa and for the Congo. If we want to think of the Congo as a tool that we can use constructively and basically against something we may fear in the world, let us convince the Congolese that we are for them because we are for their cause and for their people.

Our position in the Congo, as in much of Africa, has that fundamental weakness to which I referred a moment ago. Any group which emerged there which was less than openly hostile to Moscow we viewed with suspicion.

As a consequence of this kind of policy, all the world knows what we are against; but I submit that one of the best kept secrets of these times is that we are for the Congo even more than we are against the position of some competing powers in that part of the world.

The adoption of the steps to which I have just alluded might, I think, do much to allay some of the tensions which exist in the Congo, and permit a considerably freer atmosphere for a positive, constructive approach to a settlement of what is an extremely difficult, complicated situation. It means that we need to reorient ourselves a little on the word "neutralism," for, in my judgment, a united, stable, independent African nationalism could easily be a neutral Africa, as well. It is this kind of Africa that is the strongest force we could have any right to hope for, in terms of maintaining a posture of decency and helpfulness in all the rest of the world.

Our concern should not be that we have them as our allies, so much as that they be strong enough to look after their own business in their own way. This we must be willing to acknowledge. We have stressed too much the stopping of the Russians or the stopping of expansionism. I think it is time we began to stress Africa, and that we start with the Congo.

I ask our friends in Africa to join us in this kind of pledge: that they commit themselves to constructive, rather than negative, programs of action. Let them search their souls, let them search their policy positions, let them search their goals, to see if they are not the same as ours. Let us start moving in the same direction. As the demonstrations continue around us, as the tensions mount and the crisis deepens, I would only call to mind, as I complete these remarks, a very famous prayer by one of the most distinguished chaplains the U.S. Senate ever had, the Reverend Peter Marshall, when he prayed:

> O God, save us from hot heads, that may lead us to act foolishly; and, God, save us from cold feet, that may keep us from acting at all.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 15, 1961]

THE LUMUMBA AFTERMATH

The blizzard of hate, threats, and wild charges that blew out of Moscow yesterday is a measure of the gravity of the crisis resulting from the murder of Patrice Lumumba and two of his associates in Katanga Province.

Shocking as these crimes are, the reaction in other countries ought to be moderated by the recollection that such violence has

taken place in the past in many states that call themselves most civilized. Few modern national societies have emerged into maturity without intervals of turbulence. It is especially to be noted that the governing party of Soviet Russia, now so excited by violence in the Congo, itself gained power by political murders and brutalities besides which the crimes in the Congo seem relatively insignificant.

The fact remains, however, that the crime is revolting to all decent people and that it ignites new fires in the Congo powder pit. Apparently assuming that other states handle such affairs in the typical Communist fashion, Moscow charges that the crime was methodically planned and sanctioned in the capitals of what it calls the colonialist states. From this wild assumption, the Kremlin leaps to a violent attack upon Secretary General Hammarskjold of the United Nations and to absurd demands for U.N. support for the Soviet policy of communizing the Congo.

The inconsistencies in the Soviet's position are glaring. It ridicules Mr. Hammarskjold's appeal for a thorough investigation of the Lumumba slaying. Yet, without any investigation, it blatantly charges that the blood of Patrice Lumumba is on the Secretary General's hands. At one point the Moscow statement demanded the arrest of President Tshombe of Katanga and the so-called strong man of the Congo army, Joseph Mobutu, but also demanded that the "so-called United Nations operation" quit the Congo within a month and that all foreign troops be withdrawn. Meanwhile, Moscow would have the U.N. punish the "aggressors" and friendly states send aid to the Communist leader of Kivu Province, Antoine Gizenga, whom the Soviet seems to regard as the legitimate head of the Congolese Government.

Well, it must be admitted that this is a rather formidable propaganda push, but it is fraught with the gravest dangers. If the Soviet Union insists upon using the Lumumba tragedy as an excuse for breaking up the U.N. operations in the Congo and establishment of a Communist regime there, the year ahead will be perilous for the entire world. But Moscow may be only trying out its mischief-making potential. It is most unfortunate that this crime occurred while the U.N. was trying to restore order in the Congo, but even the most rabid partisan in Russia could scarely believe that the U.N. is responsible for these murders.

In any event, Moscow's hysteria needs to be met with calm reason and persistence in the restoration of order in the Congo. This latest outbreak of violence is no excuse for a general surrender to violence or to the kind of despair that makes communism seem tolerable. The grave task in the Congo still requires a builder—not a wrecker. Whatever the mistakes that may have been made, they will not be corrected either by crippling the U.N. or by forcing it to withdraw before the Congo has a stable and legitimate government of its own.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1961]

CRISIS IN THE CONGO

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the Congo, the U.N. and the United States of America now find themselves in the middle. They have tried and failed to pacify the irreconcilables on the left and on the right. On the left are the Lumumbists in Oriental Province, now led by an authentic Communist, Gizenga, and openly supported by the U.S.S.R.. On the right is the Province of Katanga led by Tshombe, and supported by Belgium.

The two warring extremes have several things in common. Both are opposed to the U.N. and both are demanding that the U.N. troops be withdrawn. They want a free field to fight their civil war. Both are opposed to conciliation and each believes that in a civil war it has the most to gain. Both hate the peacemakers.

Presumably the left believes that with the help of the U.S.S.R. and of the United Arab Republic and the other Casablanca nations it can conquer the whole Congo. Presumably the right believes that with Belgian support it can at least hold the rich and crucial Province of Katanga, and in the course of time draw the West, including the United States, into more and more active support of its cause.

The grim fact is that among the Congolese factions which have arms and some authority there is none that looks to the U.N. for a solution. This is true of the Communist Gizenga in Stanleyville, of the Belgian Tshombe in Elisabethville, and of our somnolent Kasavubu in Leopoldville.

There is indeed reason to suspect, in view of the sequence of events, that the murder of Lumumba was perpetrated when it began to appear that the Western powers were agreed on proposals for the pacification of the Congo including the release of Lumumba. The men who murdered him wanted not only to do away with Lumumba, whose hold on the masses was growing while he was in prison. They wanted to establish the idea that the only way to deal with the Congo is to fight out the civil war.

As against this, there is the fact that a collapse into international civil war in the Congo will involve most of Africa in the cold war. If that happens, it will be a lethal blow to the hopes of the new African States for peaceable development.

Even if these states are not involved in the fighting, the big powers both East and West will have little time, energy, or money for assisting their development. For this reason the vital interest of the new African States lies in preserving the United Nations.

Our best hope in Africa is staked on this also. For many reasons, including our own Negro problem at home, the United States can make no military intervention in Africa without pushing popular sentiment toward the Soviet Union. Only if our actions in Africa are not military, are technical and humanitarian, can we expect our influence to be accepted.

The bold spirits among us who think otherwise, and would like us to intervene in the primitive States of Africa, will have to learn that Rudyard Kipling and Queen Victoria are dead, besides which they were not Americans.

[From the United Press International News ticker]

UNITED NATIONS.—The Security Council's Congo debate proceeded today under heavy police guard while three Afro-Asian countries prepared a resolution seeking to settle East-West differences over U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

The public was barred from the 400-seat gallery where some 60 to 75 screaming, fist-swinging Negroes and some whites staged a near riot yesterday in a protest over the slaying of Congolese leader Patrice Lumumba.

Heavy New York police contingents patroled the street outside U.N. headquarters which was closed to the public except for previously booked guided tours.

In contrast to yesterday's steady march of pickets which spread out across New York for demonstrations through the evening, no marchers were on hand when the Council convened.

Ecuador led off today's debate by expressing support for Hammarskjold but declaring that the slaying of Lumumba changed the situation.

Following the Ecuadorean Ambassador Leopold Benites, delegates of Guinea, Madagascar, Poland, the Central African Republic, Upper Volta, Congo (Brazzaville), Gabon, Senegal, Cameroun, and Sudan were scheduled to speak.

The United Arab Republic, Ceylon, and Liberia were expected to submit a resolution containing three main points:

A call for the immediate withdrawal of all Belgian military forces and advisers from the Congo.

A demand for denunciation of Lumumba's killing and support for the international investigation of the incident proposed by Hammarskjold.

Authorization for the multi-nation U.N. force to use arms, if necessary, to avert civil war in the Congo.

Mr. McGEE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the previous discussion of the points at issue, which occurred about two-thirds of the way along in my remarks, be printed in the RECORD immediately following the last of my remarks, so there may be continuity of presentation of the points I was making, and still preserve the contribution which was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The discussion is as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have been following the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming with a great deal of interest, and I have been struck at this point, and as I take in other aspects, at other points, by what he said about the penetration of the cold war into the Congo. I believe he is absolutely correct, and I agree with him when he says, or at least intimates, that it might have been possible at an earlier time to insulate the Congo, and perhaps the rest of Africa, from the cold war; but that perhaps now at this late moment it may well be too late to change the picture.

The Senator is aware, I am sure, that so far as our own country is concerned, we have been carrying by far the greater share of the financial burden incurred by the dispatch of the United Nations forces to that so-called republic.

Mr. McGEE. Indeed, I am, and I think this is commendable. I trust that no one will seek to limit it by formula in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is commendable, but I do not think it shows good policy, because I believe that in carrying 95 percent of the cost of the air transport into the Congo, and carrying far more than our traditional share of subsidizing or financing the United Nations army in the Congo, we are going entirely too far and becoming too much involved.

What I would like to see, instead of a generation of the cold war in the Congo—a generation of what the distinguished Senator refers to as an anti-United States or anti-Soviet Union feeling—is that we try to get together on a four-quarter basis, with our own country for example, putting up 25 percent of the total cost, rather than over 50 percent; with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe putting up 25 percent of the cost; with Great Britain and Western Europe

putting up 25 percent of the cost; and the rest of the membership of the U.N. putting up another 25 percent.

Why should we always carry most of the burden? Why must we always get the blame? I ask that question because mobs in various foreign capitals are attacking not only Belgian embassies and consulates, but they are also attacking U.S. installations. Is that the payment we should receive for trying to keep a hands-off attitude, for supporting the United Nations, and for getting behind Dag Hammarskjold, who has done a good job? I think it is poor payment for a basically good policy that has been conducted in the Congo, by the Eisenhower administration and now by the Kennedy administration. I hope—as the Senator is doing, and doing well—that all the facts will be laid on the table so we will know where we stand and be prepared to do what we must do to achieve the right kind of result. That is not a bellicose statement.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator for his comments.

I hasten to add that I am commending the American position for contributing what it has in support of the Congo in the U.N. I think such action was inescapable. It is a position from which we dare not retreat. I have only one reservation about attempting to formalize the amount of our contribution, and that is that I think it is more important that the U.N. remain in the Congo than that we contribute any fixed amount to the expenses. I would say our priorities, if we keep them in order, should then be put in operation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in accord with what the Senator has just said and so understood his position when he first yielded to me. I agree that such action should be undertaken through the United Nations. Let the Soviet Union practice some of the things it preaches, instead of stirring up dissension, discord and trouble all the time.

Furthermore, I say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, that in my opinion the newly independent African nations south of the Sahara also have a great responsibility, because if the U.N. fails in this area they are going to be the chief sufferers as a result.

So I hope that, inexperienced though they may be, overenthusiastic though they may be, they will recognize that together they should shoulder a common responsibility, because what is happening in the Congo, if not checked, and checked in the right manner, could well happen among the other African States as well.

So I hope that the African States live up to the responsibility which is theirs, because one thing they must always remember is that in the U.N. General Assembly the smallest and the newest nations have just as much power and authority as either the Soviet Union or the United States of America; and in no place else do they have that kind of consideration or authority.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator. He is correct. I agree with him completely. I think a great deal more must be expected from the new African States themselves. In fact, one of the points of my brief here today is that when we talk about doing something for the Congo, rather than a cold war maneuver, it should be a mandate that should apply not only to the United States, the Soviet Union, and the U.N., but to the other African States as well. So often they have been anti-Belgium, anti-West, anti-something else; and they, too, must strive to help the Congo for the Congo's sake. Their future rests on what happens there and what happens through the U.N. The Senator could not have put it better than he did today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make two or three brief comments. First, I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming not only for the speech that he is making today, but for the report which he and his colleagues, who took the recent African trip, have prepared for the Senate. I had the pleasure of receiving an early copy of that report, and I spent part of last Sunday evening reading it from cover to cover.

I should like to say for the record today that in my opinion not only each Senator, but each Representative owes it to himself to read that report. I think the report will help give a perspective in regard to some of our African problems that I do not think will be readily available to any Member of Congress in a more precise and well-written form than the report submitted by those Senators who went there. I have not had an opportunity to see the Senator from Wyoming personally since I read the report. I have spoken with some of his colleagues. I wish to extend to the Senator from Wyoming now, as I have to them, my enthusiastic congratulations for the service he has rendered to the Senate.

Next I wish to say that I join my majority leader in everything that he has said in regard to the U.S. relationship to the United Nations. The Senator's point of view needs to be recognized much more than it has been recognized to date. I say that because for 3 months the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I were up against the same situation that the Senator from Montana has referred to. I do not believe it is fully appreciated that because of the fact that we pay for such a large share of the cost of the United Nations, the very fact of our large payments works against us among not only the Communist segment of the world but also the noncommitted segment of the world.

Because of the fact that we pay so much of the United Nations bill, the Communists are succeeding, unfortunately, in their propaganda of creating the impression that the United Nations is a tool of the United States; that since the United Nations is financed in such a large measure by the United States, it is therefore inclined to do the bidding of the United States. It is such a false charge that is made by the Communists. In other words the propaganda line is that because we pay for so much of the operation of the United Nations we are therefore "paid off" by what the United Nations does. We know how that propaganda goes: Yankee imperialism buys the votes in the United Nations. We know it is false. However, being false does not mean that it is not accepted by many people in the world.

So when the Senator from Montana suggests that we come to grips and come to grips quickly with the need of formalizing, the costs of the United Nations, the sooner an agreement is reached within the United Nations for a new financial formula for sharing the costs among all the nations the better it will be for the United Nations, and the better it will be for the United States.

In view of the fact that both the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Montana are making reference to the Congo situation, I should like to add this additional observation.

In my opinion, the sooner we get the General Assembly back into session, the better. I do not believe we should wait until March. I do not believe that the Congo situation can be resolved in the Security Council at this stage. We might as well face the fact that the attitude Russia has taken in the Security Council makes the Security Council at this particular moment rather impotent in the handling of the Congo situation.

Instead of having representatives of nonmembers of the Security Council issue press releases from various capitals in the world, it would be much better to have those recommendations made from the rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly. We hear much said about the fact that the General Assembly is pretty much a debating society. It is more than a debating society but its platform of debate is a powerful force in the world today in the cause of peace. In my judgment the place for the debate on the Congo to go on now is in the General Assembly hall of the United Nations in New York City.

I should like to hear Prime Minister Nehru speak on the Congo crisis from the rostrum of the General Assembly in New York. I would be very much more interested in that than I am in a press release from him in New Delhi, India, today.

If we could get the Communist bloc seated in the General Assembly, to listen to what I am satisfied the representatives of the uncommitted, neutral, free nations of the world would say about the Congo crisis, we might find a considerable modification in the course of action of the Communist countries.

In the few months that I was at the United Nations, I listened to the Communist representatives on many occasions. They would send up a trial balloon on some proposal which was aimed at weakening the United Nations and it would be pierced by one spokesman after another from the small uncommitted, neutral nations. Then we would begin to see a shift in the Communist position.

I believe—and I am no alarmist—that the Congo situation could very well spell the difference between war and peace. I believe that it is no longer a problem

of major concern for only the members of the Security Council. I believe that the Congo has become a major concern of all mankind. Every member of the United Nations ought to be moved into a position where it can be heard, and heard quickly on the Congo crisis. The General Assembly of the United Nations is the proper forum for an immediate debate of the Congo crisis. The procedure is laid down in the charter of the United Nations for the calling of an extraordinary session of the General Assembly.

I know that the argument will be made against my suggestion that it is only a few days before the General Assembly will be in session anyway. However, time is of the essence. Furthermore, if we do not wait for those few days to pass we will help call more emphatic attention to the critical nature of the Congo situation.

I am sorry that I took so much time in my interruption of the Senator from Wyoming's presentation. However, it is so pertinent that I thought I should join in the remarks he is making, because based upon my 3 months' experience in the United Nations, I felt I should at least carry out my duty to the Senate to say to the Nation from this desk today that I do not think any time should be lost in getting the General Assembly back into session. It is the best forum in which to take up the Congo matter, better than in the Security Council in view of recent developments. I think it is the best forum in which to focus the spotlight of world attention on the Communists and to make perfectly clear that the chips are down and we want to know whether they are going to proceed to live up to their clear obligations under the United Nations Charter. The world needs to know if it is true, as Adlai Stevenson said so brilliantly and magnificently yesterday, that the Russians seem to have placed themselves in a position of declaring war against the United Nations itself. I believe that the best place to give them the opportunity to make clear their position, once they have heard from the world, is in an extraordinary session of the General Assembly, which I believe ought to be called immediately.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the senior Senator from Oregon for his very fine comment. I associate myself with it. It has brought into proper focus the sense of urgency that all the rest of the world feels, and one of the most constructive steps that can be taken at this time is the reconvening of the General Assembly for this purpose.

The Senator from Oregon speaks from firsthand experience with the subject as a member of the American delegation to the United Nations. His contribution adds to the total exchange of views that must go on at this very critical moment without delay. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. President, I should like to add, for the RECORD, so it may be straight, that I appreciate very much the mention made by the Senator from Oregon of the report on Africa which my colleagues and I brought back from that continent. But I should like to make clear that the report has not yet been formally submitted, and that the remarks I have made today are not to be considered a submission of the report. The report will be dwelt upon at some length by the chairman of our group, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. That will be done at a subsequent date. So I do not wish these remarks by me to be considered in any way as constituting a report on the total mission to Africa on which we served.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his discussion of this particular subject at this time. He has stated that in his opinion it would be better for us and for the rest of the world if the Congo, for example, were to become a neutralist state, rather than to become allied to either one side or the other. I agree completely with him. I think the world would be better off if all of Africa, all of these new nations, did not become involved in the cold war now underway, by being forced to take sides or by having to take sides with either one side or the other.

I noted with interest what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said about his proposal that they call the General Assembly of the United Nations into session immediately.

I am not an alarmist—at least, I do not think I ever have been—but I agree with the Senator when he says it is not a matter of weeks or months, but that it may well be a matter of hours or days, and that the sooner we face up to this, the better off all of us will be.

Let me express the hope—this thought occurred to me while the Senator from Wyoming was speaking—that instead of Joseph Kasavubu's looking toward the United Nations, or instead of Antoine Gizenga's looking toward Moscow, or instead of Kalangi's looking toward I-don't-know-where, or instead of Moise Tshombe's looking toward Brussels, these leaders in the Congo look inward a little bit, look toward one another, so that out of the confusion and chaos which now exist there, which are rapidly impelling forces from all directions to move into the Congo, these people get together and try to do something—perhaps on a Federal basis—to bring about cohesion among the five or six provinces the Senator has mentioned, so these people will bring themselves to work collectively for the betterment of the country which supposedly was given its independence last July 1.

To repeat, I hope the newly created states of the sub-Sahara area will get together, will live up to their responsibilities, and will bear their proportionate share of the burdens, because the primary responsibility is neither that of the United States nor that of the Soviet Union; basically, the responsibility is theirs, and they will either survive as decent, reasonable, independent nations, or, if anything happens in the Congo, they can expect the results to affect them as well.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

A WAY EVERY SHIPPER AND IMPORTER CAN HELP PROTECT THE VALUE OF HIS DOLLAR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in a special message sent to Congress last Monday, President John F. Kennedy discussed ways in which our Nation can deal with the problems created by the dwindling gold reserve.

The following day, Tuesday, February 7, an aspect of that problem was dealt with in an advertisement by the United States Lines, published in the New York Times.

The message given in the advertisement is so important that I ask permission to have it reproduced in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 1961]

A WAY EVERY SHIPPER AND IMPORTER CAN HELP PROTECT THE VALUE OF HIS DOLLAR

America's ships carry only a small percentage of our foreign trade.

A way to raise this percentage and improve our balance of payments follows in this timely suggestion by John M. Franklin, chairman of the board, United States Lines.

Recently we have been hearing a great deal about how our gold reserve has dwindled, and how gold is still flowing out of this country. We have heard concern expressed about our balance of payments and its effect on America's own "dollar gap." Economists evaluate the immediate severity of this situation in varying degrees but generally agree that such a trend could adversely affect the value of our dollar.

Our Government has already taken steps to reduce the spending of dollars abroad. And in the last few months our exports have again begun to exceed our imports. Both of these developments are in the right direction and will contribute toward bringing about a more favorable balance of payments and a sounder fiscal climate in which to do international business.

MR. FRANKLIN'S SUGGESTION

There is another way in which this situation can be improved, a way in which every American shipper and importer can share—a way of helping to restore a better monetary situation virtually without cost or effort—in fact, with definite advantages to the merchant himself.

This is simply by designating vessels of American registry when there are shipments to be made.

LET'S START CALLING THE SIGNALS

Buying foreign transportation and paying American dollars for it is the same as buying any other foreign commodity. It is literally exporting dollars. Unfortunately, the tendency is for American shippers to accept terms of sale or purchase under which they lose control of routing. This leaves the choice of vessel largely in the foreign buyer's or foreign seller's hands.

The foreign buyer in most cases specifies a foreign-flag line, usually his own. The result has been that British ships now carry 70 percent of Great Britain's trade. Japanese ships carry 57 percent of that nation's overseas shipping. But at the present time American ships are carrying only a small percentage of our total foreign trade.

EVERY INCREASE IMPORTANT

Even at this very small percentage the use of American-flag ships now contributes almost $1 billion annually to the U.S. balance of payments. So it is easy to see how, simply by specifying shipment by our American ships, a shipper or importer can make an im-

portant contribution to improving America's dollar gap.

At the same time, shippers and importers get the most for their money on American ships. Consider the facts:

American and foreign freight rates are virtually identical on regular liner vessels.

American ships are held to the highest safety standards by strict Government requirements.

American ships are modern and well equipped—must be replaced on a regular schedule.

Sailings by American ships are frequent and dependable. American lines serve 400 major world ports on 37 essential U.S. trade routes.

Officers and, with minor exceptions, all crewmen on American ships are American citizens and trained to American standards.

Toward continuing to provide this superior service, America's steamship operators right now are working on a program of replacement and improvement. Already 11 new cargo ships and 4 new combination passenger and cargo vessels constructed. Fifty-seven cargo ships and 3 combos are now building or have been contracted for, and another 16 cargo ships are expected to be authorized this year. These 91 ships will cost $1 billion, all of it to be expended in this country for materials and wages, and will provide 280 million man-hours of work. United States Lines' share in this program will amount to $450 million.

Don't you agree that all this adds up to one thing—that it makes good sense for every shipper to look first into shipping by an American ship? It helps maintain the security of our dollar. It helps maintain a vigorous, healthy, growing merchant marine for America's foreign trade. It helps provide for America's security.

SOVIET EXPANSION IN FISHERIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "Soviet Expansion in Fisheries," which was delivered on December 7, 1960, at the Northwest Canners Association, by Donald E. Bevan, of the Fisheries Research Institute of the College of Fisheries, at the University of Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET EXPANSION IN FISHERIES

(By Donald E. Bevan)

During the past year I was studying and working in a university, but my address has been a different one. It was Lenin Hills, Moscow. In addition to my work at Moscow University, I was able to travel quite widely throughout the Soviet Union. I visited most of the important fisheries research establishments and several of the important fisheries. My biggest disappointment was being refused permission to visit the Far Eastern areas of Kamchatka and the Sakhalin Islands. As you know from my experience and work in Alaska, these areas could have been the most interesting to me. But these areas are completely closed to foreigners, even those whose interests are as unmilitary as fisheries research. The most rewarding experience of last year was the opportunity to meet many Soviet scientists to find that we could talk about common interests and exchange useful information, and that we could have a mutual respect for each other's work.

Living for over a year with people whom we think are wrong politically has been quite an experience. Some of the experiences I have had left quite strong impressions on me and I should like to share some of them with you.

We read and hear a lot these days about the competition with the Soviet Union, particularly with regard to space and military hardware. These are not the only areas where the competitive battle lines are being drawn. The economic front is also attracting their attention. They are interested in economics because they feel that this is the best way for them to win the competition, a competition to show that their way of life is a preferred successor to ours. A part of their economic development is the expansion of their fishing operations. It is important for us to talk about fisheries, not only because of our personal interest in the matter but because this is an important part of the Russian economy. I should like to discuss two things. First, what can we expect from the Soviets, and second, what we should be prepared to do about it.

The Russians are aiming for a tremendous expansion in their fisheries. Their target is 10 billion pounds by 1965. This is an increase of over 60 percent from the 1958 figure of a little over 6 billion pounds. If this increase is obtained, the Soviets will be close to Japan as a leader in world production. They have finished 2 years of their 7-year plan and the indications are that so far they are attaining their target catches although the final figures for 1960 are not yet in.

We may ask two questions here. The first question is how can they expand to this extent? We can divide their fisheries into fresh water and salt water. The Soviet Union's fresh water fisheries are substantial. They are surpassed in the world only by the production of Red China, but they comprise only a little over 18 percent of their total fisheries catch. Obviously, even with tremendous expansion of fresh water fisheries, they cannot achieve their aim in this domain alone. In the salt water area we can talk about the inland seas, or the open ocean. Of the salt water fisheries, about one-third comes from the inland seas. Almost half of this comes from the Caspian, and the rest is divided between the Baltic and the Black Seas. Two-thirds of their salt water catch is from the open ocean, about equally divided between the Atlantic and the Pacific with a small amount from the Antarctic. The open ocean is the area in which we can expect the expansion. If we look at the past 10 years of Soviet operations, we can make some educated guesses as to what will happen. In recent years the increases in catch came chiefly from herring and bottom fish. We can expect this trend to continue. It would be foolish, of course, to ignore the fact that they are developing a tuna fleet or that they are converting their salmon operations to floating ones. But, in the near future we should expect to see the Soviets concentrate on the species that I previously mentioned. We have to remember that they are committed to approximately a quarter of a million metric tons of increase each year. This is roughly the level of what they are taking out of the Bering Sea this year. But in order to achieve their goal, they have to add this in terms of a new fishery every year. We might look at the herring fishery in the North Atlantic to see what they have accomplished. Prior to 1948 they caught less than 1 percent of the North Atlantic herring. Now they are up to 15 percent. This is nearly a billion pounds.

The second question is: Why are they expanding? First, fish is a large part of their diet. The Soviet Union freezes over one-third of the world total of frozen fish; more than Japan and the United States combined. There is a great variety of fish and fish products of all kinds in their markets.

Their importation of fish is substantial and they wish to replace this with their own production. They are a little different from us in this respect. They are unwilling to put a large part of their requirements of fish into the hands of others when they can harvest them with their own men and equipment. Since fish are so important to the economy of many nations in the world, fisheries products can be used as an important lever in trade. There is no question about the importance of fish simply for food. Human populations have grown a great deal and in some places in the world have increased more rapidly than their ability to provide food. John Galbraith in his book, "The Affluent Society," reminds us that more people in our country die from too much food rather than from too little. This is not the problem in many countries of the world, and the use of food as a major part of international trade is in the minds of the people who are running the Soviet Union.

The most important question for us is: How are we going to meet the challenge? There is only one answer and that is to increase our knowledge of the resources of the sea. I think it is important to recognize that we are not farmers on the sea, we are hunters, and present international law does not give us any protection except for purposes of conservation. Conservation has been defined by the International Conference on the Law of the Sea as: "The aggregate of the measures rendering possible the optimum sustainable yield." The point I wish to emphasize is that this information is going to be needed in any negotiations, not if the Russians engage in fishing in areas we have considered our own backyard but when they engage in these fisheries.

As an example, we can mention that even in the fishery as well managed as the halibut, we do not have all the information we need. I think there is no question that this is one of our best managed fisheries—a fishery whose direction is in the hands of able scientists who base their decisions on scientific facts. But what would happen, for example, if the Soviets, through their experimental trawling in the Bering Sea, indicate to us that they should trawl for halibut because this is the most efficient means to maximize the catch of halibut in that region. What do we know about the relative efficiencies of long-line and trawl gear of different meshes with respect to halibut or of the mortalities to young or any of the other important comparisons between these two types of gear?

I am not pessimistic about our capabilities to do the job that is needed to obtain the necessary facts. I think we have the equipment and the people that are necessary. In the year that I have been away we seem to be making good progress in providing the tools to do the work. There have been new sources of funds for support for the study of the seas such as those of the National Science Foundation, the pending Magnuson bill, and others. The people and the tools to do the job are not enough. What is required is direction and public support. This is your responsibility. This is particularly true when a program is as large as this one will be and if the work will be distributed among the many research organizations on our coast.

Another question certainly exists. Even if we have a sound basis of scientific knowledge, can we successfully negotiate with the Soviet Union? I should like to quote from the statement of Mr. Boris Kulikov given at the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission meeting last month in Vancouver.

"The Soviet fishing industry is interested in the development and exploitation of all marine resources of the North Pacific."

* * * * *

"We do not specially fish for halibut in this area and halibut occurs in our catches only as individual specimens and serves as

a sort of bonus for fishermen. I shall make no attempt, however, to hide our growing interest in this particular fish, or to rule out the possibility of starting experimental fishing for halibut in the near future for exploring the existing situation.

"The Soviet fishing industry is certainly interested in the expansion of fishing in the Pacific Ocean. We cannot separate our interests, however, from those of other countries and are always ready to cooperate."

* * * * *

"In developing our sea fisheries we should bear in mind both the interests of our country and the necessity of maintaining the rational utilization of marine resources with due consideration of the interests of other countries concerned.

"Our fishing industry people have no idea of developing sea fisheries other than in close cooperation with other countries in the field of rational exploitation of marine resources, such cooperation being duly based on the respect for each other's rights and interests.

"Successful expansion of sea fisheries requires much care about the future of the resources in the ocean. The more developed the means of production, the higher is the rate of exploitation of natural resources and, consequently, the more attention should be devoted to the reproduction aspect."

These are fine sounding words and although they might be looked upon by some of us as a hopeful first step, we need more than words in order to successfully manage any oceanic fishery.

We need some agreement between the nations that will exploit any common fishery. The negotiation necessary for agreement must be based upon sound scientific knowledge. Increased scientific knowledge is necessary if we are to develop the ocean fisheries to their maximum with or without agreement.

This past year of living in the Soviet Union has impressed me with the fact that these people are dead serious about what they are doing and that we are up against strong competition. We believe that their form of society is wrong but this should not blind us to the fact that they are strong and able competitors. We shouldn't forget that it is possible to have good science and strong economic potential regardless of ideology.

We can be sure that we have increased competition coming our way. We have the facilities and people to meet this competition. I believe that we are going to provide the support and direction that is necessary, but you are going to have to take your part in the direction of this work.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, it is now nearly a month since President Eisenhower gave his farewell address, a radio-television speech to the Nation on January 18. I expected to find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but not having found it during the nearly 4 weeks since, I inquired of the index clerk. He informed me that no Member of Congress, and no member of the President's own party, to his knowledge, had inserted that address in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I consider this last public address of Mr. Eisenhower as President of the United States to be one of the most thoughtful and important speeches of his career. It should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only as his farewell address, but because of the importance of a number of ideas which he expressed in that message. I would point especially to the observation and warning regarding what he considered as the power and the potential danger of a great military-industrial complex. I quote just one brief paragraph from that message:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense without peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

The address ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1961]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S FAREWELL ADDRESS TO THE NATION

My fellow Americans, 3 days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leavetaking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a Member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate postwar period, and, finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past 8 years.

HIS RELATIONSHIP GOOD

In this final relationship, the Congress and the administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

We now stand 10 years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this preeminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches, and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

Throughout America's adventure in free government our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity, and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehensive or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily, the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

BALANCE HELD ESSENTIAL

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: The need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped-for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the Nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their Government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degree, constantly arise. I mention two only.

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvision of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions.

Added to this, 3½ million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all U.S. corporations.

NEW TO AMERICA

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office of the Federal Government.

We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to com-

prehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources, and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense without peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal Government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research.

Partly because of the huge costs involved, a Government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the Nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new, and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our Government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the previous resources of tomorrow.

We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud consideration of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

THE NEED FOR DISARMAMENT

Disarmament with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment.

As one who has witnessed the horror and lingering sadness of war—as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years—I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—my fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

PRAYER FOR PEACE

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease, and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

DOCUMENTARY FILM, "HARVEST OF SHAME"

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 6, my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] discussed the documentary film, "Harvest of Shame," which was nationally televised by the Columbia Broadcasting Co. on November 25, 1960. The film pictorially described the problems of migratory farm workers and their families as they travel throughout the Nation harvesting our crops. On January 23, 1961, the transcript of the telecast was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. The film, as nationally telecast on November 25, was exhibited in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building on Monday, January 30, 1961.

I was especially interested in this film. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I have become familiar with the facts which the film presented, and with the many, many facts which the film did not and could not present in a 1-hour program.

The facts most vivid in my mind have been revealed in public hearings and field trips conducted by the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor in 1959 and 1960. We went into Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, California, and Florida. We were there to get local views on legislation introduced earlier in the 86th Congress. The subjects of our legislative inquiry were crew leader registration, agricultural minimum wage, child labor, child and adult education, and housing. During these trips we gained much valuable information which enabled us to improve the bills and formulate additional legislation which will be introduced in the Senate very soon.

I, therefore, welcome the opportunity to discuss this critical problem. In initiating this discussion and affording the opportunity to air the serious, complex nature of the problem the senior Senator from Florida has performed a valuable service to this body and to the entire Nation. I commend him for doing so, and since the Congress must soon decide on several of these issues, I hope there will also be further opportunity for discussion of those matters.

The remarks of the senior Senator from Florida were to the general effect that the method of presentation used in the film lacked objectivity in certain respects. The questions raised by this, Mr. President, obviously call for a full, fair record of the background facts showing the pros and cons concerning the differences of opinion that have been expressed about the film. These pros and cons, as I know them, are found in:

First. An analysis of "Harvest of Shame" prepared by the American Farm Bureau Federation;

Second. A resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, on January 4, 1961;

Third. A January 23, 1961, letter of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. responding to the "analysis" of the American Farm Bureau Federation; and

Fourth. An invitation to attend a showing of the film, addressed to the Members of Congress from the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor dated January 23, 1961.

Sponsors of the showing were first, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; second, the National Board of the YWCA; third, the Bishops Committee for Migrant Workers; fourth, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; fifth the National Child Labor Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that these documents be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks so that Senators may have all of the available evidence before them in evaluating this matter. So far as the controversy on the film itself is concerned, I believe all of the specific pros and cons will be found in these documents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1).

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I believe it is most unfortunate that "Harvest of Shame" has given rise to such a difference of opinion about some of the facts cited in the film. My own reaction is that the program served a definite purpose. It helped many Americans to realize that there are serious problems in this area and that something should be done about them. If

there is disagreement about the method of presentation used in "Harvest of Same," I can only hope that this disagreement will not cause us to forget the problems and concentrate on the disagreement. The important fact is that approximately 2 million of our fellow citizens are faced with critical problems which call for action by all levels of government. Growers, workers, and the public have a common interest in helping to solve these problems.

MIGRANT CHILDREN

One of the most serious parts of this problem, perhaps the most serious of all in the long run, concerns the children of migratory workers. Their education opportunities are grossly inadequate. Health services and other welfare aids are available to them only in isolated cases.

Since the question of education of migrant children has already been mentioned in this discussion, let us turn to that first. The problem here, as stated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a May 6, 1960, legislative report to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is this:

> Unquestionably, the children of migrant agricultural workers, as a group, have fewer educational opportunities than any other group of children in our society. There are many factors contributing to this situation, including the need for school-age children to tend younger children, the employment of very young children in migratory families, and the disruptive effects of a migratory life. Of lesser importance, generally, is the resistance by communities to school attendance of the migrants. Despite growing concern and action, on the part of State and local educational agencies and both private and public organizations, to improve the educational opportunities of these children, the education of most migrant children does not meet even minimum requirements for effective citizenship.

Unfortunately, the report then went on to say that the Federal Government had no direct part to play in this matter. May I add, though, Mr. President, that the bill opposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in May 1960 will be reintroduced next week, and I am hopeful that the concluding paragraph of the report will recognize the Federal role when it is submitted this year. So much for what has been done, or rather what has not been done at the Federal level.

Let us look now at the situation at the State and local level, as described by the school administrators and teachers who have to face this problem each year. Here is what we heard from witnesses in the Florida hearings.

Miss Elizabeth Sutton, speaking, on behalf of the Palm Beach County school system, in our hearings at Clewiston, Fla., in May, 1960, told us about two children who, at 7 and 8 years of age had just enrolled in school for the first time. They were starting their school careers already 1 and 2 years behind their normal age group, with very little chance of ever catching up. Miss Sutton also said that it was not unusual to find a 13- or 14-year-old boy who cannot read at a first grade level.

Another Florida educator, Mr. Frank Warriner, supervising principal of the Immokalee Schools, gave strong support to the education bills then under consideration. He testified that the seasonal labor needs of his area resulted in the enrollment of about 500 migrant children each year. This amounted to a 100-percent increase in enrollment in that particular school while the migrants were there.

Mr. Emmett Roberts, a member of the Florida House of Representatives, testified to like effect. Mr. Roberts is known to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I am sure, not only as an outstanding member of the Florida House of Representatives, but also as the chairman of Florida's Interagency Committee on Migratory Agricultural Labor. Mr. Roberts said this:

> I also support the bills on educational aid to the migrants. I support our State department of education's recommendations in this field. Much good can be accomplished in the adult program if directed to educating the head of the family to have a better appreciation and responsibility toward his family and employer. I do know, and it has been remarked to me, that very few places in the country have indicated the interest in the migrant child as has this area.
>
> I am particularly interested in the adult vocational education bill. I see tremendous benefits coming from that, particularly if directed toward teaching the adult more appreciation and responsibility toward his employer and family, as I stated before.

The evidence given by our Florida witnesses is typical of what we have heard throughout the country. People who know and understand this problem—that is, those who are working and struggling with it year in and year out—tell us that the State and local effort, as great as it has been in some respects, cannot begin to make a dent in the overall problem.

Mr. Roberts, Miss Sutton, Mr. Warriner, and others like them in Florida, are the persons I had in mind when I said in a May 1960, address in Boston:

> In Florida, to even a greater degree than we had found in many other States, we found many people who do not believe in limiting their vision. They are concerned.

The Roberts, Suttons, and Warriners that we have visited in other parts of the country are concerned also, for the problem is big enough for all of us to be concerned.

There is room for concern about such basic matters as the health and safety of migrant children. Anyone who cares to take a trip down a side road during harvesttime can find children being taken to the fields with their parents. They remain there all day. Sometimes they are left in cars or trucks for considerable periods of time. We have found them playing and sleeping in or near these vehicles.

These conditions persist despite the remarkable efforts made by growers, national voluntary organizations, and some State welfare or health agencies. A Department of Health, Education, and Welfare study, released less than 2 months ago, took note of these efforts and also noted that there is an increasing public awareness and concern about this general problem. But the report then went on to say:

> Nevertheless, much too little has yet been done. The plight of migrant families as a whole is one of endless and, for far too many, hopeless struggle against insurmountable odds. Year after year, they are unable to achieve even the bare minimum income, housing, education, and health and welfare services necessary for wholesome family life. As a result, the childern are trapped in a vicious circle of unending poverty and rootlessness which prevent their having or taking advantage of opportunities for a better way of life.
>
> The conditions under which migrants and their families live are conditions which we as a Nation must take steps to improve.

The study from which I have quoted was prepared in response to a request by the Senate Appropriations Committee during the 86th Congress. The study's recommendations for action on these problems will, I am sure, receive careful, sympathetic consideration from the committee.

I am happy to yield to my friend, the senior Senator from Florida, before developing aspects of the health problems of the migrant farmer and his family.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from New Jersey. First, I wish to compliment him upon his restraint and the factual way in which he is dealing with this subject. The Senator from New Jersey realizes, of course, that the Senator from Florida, in his earlier appearance on this subject, dealt with specific statements, which he felt were clear misrepresentations, which were contained within the wording and the substance of the telecast "Harvest of Shame."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would not say at this point that I have dealt particularly with the pros and cons of the film "Harvest of Shame." I thought the record would pretty much speak for itself, and I put the analysis of the Farm Bureau, together with a reply of the CBS, in the RECORD, and it will follow our colloquy and my remarks here today.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that is exceedingly fair, and I compliment the distinguished Senator upon his doing so. I also appreciate his reading into the RECORD what I had stated in the RECORD heretofore about the compliment which he had paid to our State with reference to its approach to the migrant labor problem in his speech at Boston, Mass. I believe he had made similar statements at Fresno, Calif., and at other points. I think I mentioned three in my speech, and I had in mind two others. One of my purposes in quoting them was to show that I recognize that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey has been fair in his approach and restraint. I believe he is now continuing in that path, upon which I compliment him, and, of course, I appreciate his kind comment with reference to me.

I should like, however, to draw his attention to the fact that the things I complained about were, I felt, distinct

misrepresentations applicable to my State, reflecting discreditably upon a wonderful people in my State. Upon this question of education I would like to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, issue of February 6, 1961, at page 1756, my first quoted misrepresentation from the telecast:

> Approximately 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant laborers, finishes grade school. Approximately, 1 of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma.

I wish to ask my distinguished friend if he regards that statement as a friendly, factual, restrained statement of the kind which he has been making in his able presentation or, instead, as an extravagant overstatement of what is admittedly a serious problem in the field of education?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The statement which appeared in the telecast was that there was no record of college graduates of migrant farm families. CBS did not have a record of such. We do have information with respect to young people from migrant farm families who have been graduates of colleges.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. May I ask if my friend has read my statement to which I have alluded?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have read it.

Mr. HOLLAND. If he has, he has noted, upon the finest kind of authority, that of Mrs. Ruth Wedgworth of Belle Glade, Fla., herself a highly educated woman originally from Michigan, that I gave the names of 11 college graduates in that small area of our State alone who were children of migrants.

The Senator found such to be the case, did he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think that reflects in any way creditably upon those who authored the telecast in view of their statement:

> And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have indicated that, having searched for evidence, we have found some. The point is, of course, that in relative or proportionate terms, the proportions run overwhelmingly against the youngsters of migrant farmworkers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. In other words, if I may make my own interpretation, which may be erroneous, I think my distinguished friend has indicated that he could not at all approve the extravagant propaganda which was used in the telecast from which I quoted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say to my friend from Florida that it is my purpose here to deal with the substance of problems facing the migrant farm family, and not to engage in an adjectival contest with respect to the CBS film, which I am not here to applaud or defend particularly. I see great benefit in the film. I believe unfortunately it has gotten us into too much tension, too, through its lack of objectivity, and has gotten us away from the substance of the problem of dealing with health, education, and welfare. I know my friend from Florida will agree with me that migratory farmworkers are pretty much at the bottom of the social and economic ladder in our country. I indicated in my prepared remarks that I had found considerable benefit from the film, from the viewpoint of awakening the conscience of people who did not even know that the fruits and vegetables that they consumed were picked by migrant farm families. They had never even heard of a migrant farm family.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, if I heard his statement of a moment ago correctly, he indicated that almost 2 million people were involved in this problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is the figure I stated. The figure, of course, cannot be precise. I tried to be conservative in the statistical elements in this field.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call his attention to the reprint from the document issued by the U.S. Department of Labor under the title "Farm Labor Market Developments," under which it appears that the largest number of migrant domestic workers in agriculture in any part of the year covered by that compilation, which was the 12-month period November 1959 through October 1960, was 293,000 and not 2 million, and that appears in the last column of the compilation taken from the Department of Labor's report on this subject.

More than a million seasonal farmworkers are shown to have served in the months of largest employment, which I think would fairly reflect the 2 million or more total farmworkers and their families. But as the Senator will observe, the larger portion of them were not migrants; the larger portion were settled people, and the two columns that might come under the head of "Migrants" are, first, the column of domestic migrants, which is the last column in the compilation from which I have just read the figure, and migrants who are not domestic workers, which would include both Mexicans and offshore laborers, and some from Canada, I believe, along the Canadian border, which are included in the second column.

So the Senator from Florida is simply trying to deal with complete accuracy, if he can, and to invite his friend to explore from the same point of view the bulletin listing and compiling the numbers of farmworkers throughout the year from November 1, 1959, through October 31, 1960, and breaking them down into the various classifications, of which only the domestic migrants and the nondomestic migrants are the actual workers who would come within the group covered by the present discussion, if the Senator from Florida correctly understands the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The junior Senator from New Jersey will always stand corrected if, after further analysis, a correction should be made. If after such further analysis we find that our working figure is not accurate, I shall be the first to correct it. I would say that in the big growing season in my State of New Jersey there are 25,000 workers engaged in that labor. That is 10 percent of the figure that the Senator from Florida has stated. We are not precise in that figure. We cannot be. If an error appears in this figure we will be the first to correct the error.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that that is exactly true. I have always found the distinguished Senator from New Jersey not only completely fair, completely factual, and completely proper in his approach, but also generous in this matter that we have had up for discussion.

The point I wished to bring out at this stage is that the Department of Labor, charged with the duty of exploring this question and furnishing figures, had furnished the compilation to which I have referred and from which I have read into the RECORD. It shows the largest number of domestic workers to be employed by agriculture in any 1 month to have been July 1960. I believe it would be fair to comment at this point that the Department of Labor, which has not shown any overly friendly feeling toward agriculture throughout the whole handling of the question, can be relied upon not to have understated the size of this question in listing the number of migratory workers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to make this comment I should like to say that with respect to the reliability of the figures in this field, I am sure the Department of Labor would not report migrant workers who are working illegally, because they would not allow them to work. In our limited hearings and field trips we found illegal workers. Those workers certainly would not be included in the figures. We also found that social security is one bit of our social protection that is afforded to working people who work as migrant workers. However, we looked and looked to find workers who actually had a withholding under social security.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that there is a possibility of error. However, I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from New Jersey to explore again his figures and to explore also the figures listed by the Department of Agriculture and the sources from which they were compiled, so that we may come nearer to a common viewpoint in this matter.

So far as the question of illegal migrants is concerned, I assume the Senator is referring there to the so-called braceros.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. No. I was referring to young people who are working during school periods.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the State of Florida we do not avail ourselves of Mexican workers, as the Senator knows. Rather, we avail ourselves of workers who come from the British West Indies and the Bahamas, so far as workers from outside the United States are concerned. These workers come into our country under a very strict arrangement that has been worked out. I have been to Nassau, as I said to the distinguished Senator, and there noted the means of selection employed to select the group of proposed workers from whom the employers on the mainland can select the men whom they wish to hire.

The distinguished Governor of the Bahamas has told me that the matter was of very great importance to them. At that time he said that the number of American dollars available to the Bahamas coming from the employment of some thousands of their people who were sent to Florida and later to other areas up the coast comprised the biggest source of American dollars available to them except the dollars that are made available to them through tourism. To them it was a very vital matter.

If there has been illegality in connection with that whole group, the Senator from Florida is unaware of it, because he has noted the interest of the colonial government both at the time of the selection, before the workers are allowed to come over, and during the time they are here. The colonial government has sent inspectors over to the mainland to check on the housing, to check on the food, to check on the medical expenses, and to check on the rate of pay, and on all the other things which would be of importance to them. The Senator from Florida has not heard of any difficulty in that field.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I had no reference to offshore labor at all. I referred purely to American families and their children. The illegality I referred to was the illegal use of children in the fields during school periods, and the failure to withhold under social security.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. I wish to call his attention to the fact that the script of the telecast was not as careful on this subject, because Mr. Murrow, at page 1147 of the RECORD of January 23, is quoted as saying:

> Hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros and thousands of offshore laborers from the Caribbean area, hired by contract, depress the wage scale of the domestic migrant.

I know that the workers who come from the Caribbean areas have come in under contract and are paid as much as the domestic workers are paid, whether migrant or resident workers. Does the Senator from New Jersey know that from his own knowledge?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I appreciate that these workers do come in under strict contract, in an orderly manner. However, I would say to the senior Senator from Florida that he was most gracious at the end of the last session, when the question of the importation of offshore labor came up on the floor of the Senate, in connection with an extension of Public Law 78, to assure the Senate that there would be complete consideration of all the facts and aspects of importing offshore labor, and we look forward to those considerations in the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. We will be very happy to have that looked into, because I am very frank to say that I believe the colonial authorities in the British West Indies and in the Bahamas do a very splendid job in making sure that their people, when selected to do a good job, also receive the top price, receive the best quality of housing and food and medical attention. There is no question of education, of course, as the Senator knows.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I recognize that fact. Every day that I eat celery I think with gratitude of the Bahamans who chopped and cut the celery in the Okeechobee area of Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We were treated with the utmost graciousness and friendship by the people who helped us in Florida. They made us feel at home, and their cooperation was complete.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. Mr. Roberts, to whom the Senator has referred, Mrs. Wedgworth, to whom I have referred before, and others in the Belle Glade area have told me of the very kind comments of the Senator from New Jersey while he was in Florida, and of the exceedingly fine attitude which he manifested toward everything he saw there. As I recall, they told me that some excellent pictures had been taken, pictures which they wished had been included in the "Harvest of Shame" telecast, when the distinguished Senator visited some really good housing in the neighborhood of Canal Point, Belle Glade, South Bay, and Pahokee, and showed his fondness for some of the children who were there, and also some of the children attending school at the time.

From everything I have heard, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey was a splendid representative of the U.S. Senate when he visited Florida. I hope he will come back often.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am grateful to the Senator for his gracious remarks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe those are the comments I wished to make with reference to education. I hope I may have the Senator's gracious indulgence again, if the occasion should arise, as he proceeds to the next part of his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I shall welcome further discussion on the part of my friend from Florida. I am grateful for his participation in this discussion.

HEALTH

In health, too, we find an equally serious situation, again because the constant interstate movement of these migrant families places them outside of those services available to other citizens. Even though the conditions under which they work and live are such that their needs for medical care are generally greater than normal, and even though their poor health conditions frequently pose a real health hazard to communities through which they travel, their health needs are far from being met.

In Hale County, Tex., a vast immunization program is currently in progress to bring under control an epidemic of diphtheria which was set off by seven cases among families identified as migrants. A February 1961 report to the Public Health Service indicated that the number of cases has now risen to 72, of which 29 are among families in migrant labor housing, and 43 are among permanent residents. As we discuss this matter on the Senate floor today, the 37,000 residents of Hale County are fighting an expensive battle against this contagious disease—a disease to which they were needlessly and unnecessarily exposed.

Similar situations have occurred in the past and will continue to occur until we make available to migrant farmworkers the simple type of preventive medical care considered standard and necessary for most of our other citizens. We know they will continue to occur, but the fact of the matter is that recent studies show no increase in preventive health treatment for migrants. A 1957 report of the health of migrants in Idaho indicated that "practically none" of the children had received any immunization against diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. Similar findings are reported from Texas, Illinois, and California.

These poor health conditions among migrant families produce not only physical pain for themselves; they produce fiscal pain, too—fiscal pain and damage to the communities which they visit.

In May of 1960, John M. Shaw, administrator of the Naples Community Hospital in Naples, Fla., testified before our subcommittee. He stated that his hospital's income is primarily dependent on payments of bills by patients. Its deficits are made up by donations from interested citizens within the community. The extent of the burden which is therefore placed on those citizens is made clear in the summary of his report on page 996 of the hearings. Let me quote from that report:

> The migrants represent 2 percent of total admissions. Migrants represent 21 percent of the total writeoff of Naples Community Hospital. The collection rate for physicians of the Naples area from inpatient migrants is 0.039 percent.

In conclusion he states:

> Since Naples Community Hospital is the only hospital in the county and already has a terrific problem with the resident indigents of Collier County, the added burden of the migrant is becoming too much of a burden for this small hospital to bear. It is conceivable that should this problem continue to intensify, Naples Community Hospital may be forced to close its doors.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for the leadership which he has taken in the field of protecting migratory labor from the grave abuses which it now suffers. During the period since he came to the Senate early in 1959, the interest of the Senator from New Jersey in this area has been an inspiration to me and, I feel certain, to many more Senators.

I should like to ask him if he will permit me to request unanimous consent to have printed at the end of his remarks a letter directed to me by William L. Batt, Jr., chairman of the committee on migratory labor created by Gov. David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, and a speech made by Mr. Batt at the National Study Conference on the Church and Migratory Labor, sponsored by the National Council of the Churches of Christ, Division of Home Missions, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on November 17, 1960. The letter and speech indicate the grave concern felt by the administration of Governor Lawrence for this problem which the Senator from New Jersey has brought to the attention of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to reiterate my strong support for the efforts being made by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am grateful for the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and grateful, too, for his support and help in this effort. I may say, too, that Governor Lawrence and Commissioner Batt have been very helpful to us on our visits to Pennsylvania, and have been quite pioneering in certain efforts to improve the lot of migrant families.

Another striking example of this fiscal pain was documented by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], during his remarks on February 6. The example, found at page 1757 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows that—

> In 1958, the county welfare agency in West Palm Beach paid $943.80 to St. Mary's Hospital for the care of Katherine King, still living; and, additionally, over $1,000 in hospital and medical bills has been written off by the local hospital and doctors at Belle Glade, in connection with medical treatment afforded the King family over the last several years.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator from New Jersey pointed out that fact, because it seems to the Senator from Florida that it rather conclusively showed that instead of any inhuman or unsympathetic attitude on the part of the people of Florida toward the very large migrant families, of which the one mentioned by the Senator was one, they were paying rather generously to make certain that the migrant families received medical aid. I thank the distinguished Senator also for placing in the RECORD what he has just submitted with reference to the little hospital at Naples, because it indicates rather clearly that the citizens there were underwriting the deficit caused, a large part of it, by ministering to the ailments and illnesses of migrants or their children; and it indicated that the migrants were freely accepted and shown every consideration. At least, there was nothing which would tend to show to the contrary. I believe that has been the fact in all Florida communities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That has been the fact. Unfortunately, it has brought the Naples Hospital to an acute fiscal situation. It is our feeling that if the regular health activities at governmental level are supplied to migrant families up and down the streams of travel, there will be more opportunity to prevent the kinds of illnesses which will cause fiscal pain to the communities I have referred to. I indicated that the migrants are not getting immunization treatment. We say they are not getting much of the other general health services which might make it easier for the communities to assist them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suspect, with reference to Idaho, that when the Senator quoted the figure covering those not receiving immunization, he was probably talking about Mexican children. In the case of our own migrants, children are generally accepted in all schools of which I have any knowledge. None are turned away. Thousands of them receive schooling every year. One of the conditions is the very immunization to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I certainly hope that the picture is as hopeful in Florida as the Senator from Florida indicates. I know from personal experience that in other States it is not at all hopeful to that degree.

It is our hope that we will, as a matter of fact, have suggestions for help in migrant health problems within the very near future. Our studies show that the existing facilities of the public health service are adequate to do what is needed here. With slightly better planning and modest amounts in Federal grants, these conditions can be greatly improved.

LOW INCOME

The low income of migrant adults is, of course, one of the major factors underlying all other problems of the migrant-worker families. While the question of income involves many complex questions—too many, indeed, for complete discussion here, today—I wish to cite some of the most pertinent facts. In 1959, the average migrant farm worker had only 119 days of farm employment. For these 119 days of farm work he received $719 of farm wages. For his entire work year—that is, for all work performed, including nonfarm work—his annual income was only $911.

While it is true that many farm workers are housewives or children, it is still true that the combined income of husbands, housewives, and children is not sufficient to support most of these families at a level of health, comfort, and decency. And while it is true that the overall problems of agriculture are many, complex, and not easy to solve, we must, nevertheless, find ways and means to provide to our farm workers an adequate, living wage.

HOUSING

The farmer also has serious difficulties which arise from his seasonal needs for agricultural workers. I am referring now to the farmer's problem in providing short term, temporary housing for his workers. His farming situation requires housing during his harvest period, which sometimes means housing for 50 to 100 people for only 4 to 6 weeks.

Obviously, housing of this kind is not an attractive risk for private lending institutions. Therefore, the farmer must finance this housing out of his profits, or else mortgage his entire farm and equipment for a minor part of his overall operation.

Why cannot Federal housing aids be made applicable to this problem? We of the subcommittee think they can. In fact, we have taken evidence on a bill which would provide Government guarantees for commercial loans and low-interest direct loans where commercial loans are not feasible. The value and the need for this kind of legislation are recognized, I believe, by the vast majority of farmers involved in this problem. Mr. Abney Cox, a prominent Florida grower, had this to say about such housing legislation:

> We, in Dade County, feel that we have some of the best camps in the United States and that Florida, generally, is well above average for camps. But to keep pace with this progress we continually have to spend money to keep these camps up to date as far as the code is concerned, and that is where this type bill will materially help the farmer, particularly in years such as we have experienced during the last four.

I believe that Mr. Cox was referring there to the hardships caused by the freezing weather and the other difficulties they have experienced.

He continued, as follows:

> You will notice that Mr. Frederick and I are the only people who have testified so far that have no coat and tie on. We have not only lost our shirts, we have lost our coats and ties, as well.

Mr. Cox, I may note in passing, also gave strong support to the education bills for migrant workers and their children. I may say this is one area in the entire country that has failed to receive some attention under the whole, massive tent of a Federal program to suport private housing in the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New Jersey has referred to the testimony given by Mr. Cox, who, in turn, stated that his buildings had to be kept up in accordance with the code. Of course

the Senator from New Jersey understands that Mr. Cox was referring to the code provided by the laws of the State of Florida, does he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I certainly do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under that code, the board of health has to certify as to the adequacy of all housing, before migrant families can be placed in it.

Although I did not attend that hearing, I am sure that Mr. Cox was referring to that requirement, when he referred to the necessity of keeping up this housing in accordance with the code.

Of course the Senator from New Jersey is familiar with the fact that Florida has rather rigid housing requirements, as a matter of State law, is he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes, I am. I believe there is some problem with enforcing the code, because of inadequacy of staff with which to enforce it.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is not subject to the agriculturists, but is placed under the State board of health, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I believe so.

Mr. HOLLAND. The quarters for occupancy by the migrants have to be certified as adequate by the State board of health, before they can be so used. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes, I so understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New Jersey favors legislation of that type, does he not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I certainly do. I know that in New Jersey we are pursuing a similar program of State regulation, and I hope we shall continue our efforts to have a proper code of enforcement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

CONCLUSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, our hearings have proven to me two things: that many persons in many States are keenly aware of the difficulties and occasional injustices faced by the migrant; and that, despite very sincere efforts made by those individuals, the problems will persist unless Federal action is fashioned to supplement local action.

It is unfortunate, therefore, that some individuals and groups feel that they have been singled out for special criticism or blame. They are, after all, faced with a seasonal, imported problem which is not completely of their making. When a school administrator in Florida does his level best to adjust his school schedules so that visiting youngsters can receive some education, at least, for a few weeks or so, he is going out of his way to help solve a problem that is interstate in scope. When a welfare director in California or Michigan or New York puts in extra hours to help prevent hardship or illness in the camp that houses migratory workers for a month or more, out of the 12 months in the year, he, too, is making his contribution to a solution of a national problem. And when, in New Jersey, State officials work closely, each year, with the migratory worker and the grower, to improve their statewide program, we can expect significant progress.

In short, many persons are working overtime; many persons are expressing their compassion through deeds; many meetings are held and many speeches are made. But the time for eloquent commiseration has passed. The time for a national program, for a national effort, is here. In this story, there are no villains, although there are many unsung workers and occasional heroes. As I have said before, our problem is mutual. Why not take mutual steps to deal with it?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

ANALYSIS OF "THE HARVEST OF SHAME"

(A CBS TV production by Ed Murrow and Fred Friendly, broadcast November 25, 1960)

1. Throughout the Murrow-Friendly production, the term "migratory labor" is used as though it included local labor, or that the term was synonymous with total farm labor. Actually domestic migratory labor is only about one-ninth of the total hired farm labor force. An additional one-ninth consists of Mexican and other foreign workers.

2. The television production fails to give credit for the progress that has been made in recent years, the improvement in housing, the enactment of State legislation of various kinds, the efforts of local authorities, the upward trend in farm wage rates, and other factors. To fail to recognize these improvements gives a distorted picture.

3. The opening scene is of a shape up for migrant workers in Florida, with the comment that "This is the way the humans who harvest the food for the best fed people in the world get hired. One farmer looked at this and said, 'We used to own our slaves. Now we just rent them.'"

In the first place, only a very small percentage of the people engaged in harvest farmwork are hired through this procedure, so this is not a typical situation.

In the second place, how else can people be hired under the circumstances involved in this particular situation; that is, where many farmers need workers for a few days, and many workers are looking for such employment. A more common and less prejudicial term for this procedure is day haul. The U.S. Employment Service, cooperating with State employment services, have promoted this means of employing farm labor in many areas. In fact, the Department of Labor requires farmers to cooperate in day haul programs, wherever they are feasible, as a condition of eligibility for interstate recruitment of domestic workers and/or the employment of Mexican nationals.

If this is a slave labor practice, it is one that has been promoted for many years by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Quoting an unnamed person is a common propaganda trick used by persons who want to leave an inference, but want to avoid personal responsibility for its accuracy.

4. Early in the script appears the sentence, "It is the 1960 Grapes of Wrath that begins at the Mexican border in California and ends in Oregon and Washington."

The introduction of the "Grapes of Wrath" idea is obviously designed to create an unfavorable impression. The people depicted in "Grapes of Wrath" were homeless people from the Dust Bowl area seeking work of any kind at the bottom of the depression when there was no work available. Today's west coast migrant workers, on the other hand, are seeking work and finding it if they want to. The average wages paid farmworkers in the three States mentioned as of July 1, 1960, as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Farm Labor (LA 1(7–60)), are as follows:

Basis for wage payments	California	Oregon	Washington
Per month with house	$295.00	$246.00	$264.00
Per month with board and room	215.00	189.00	206.00
Per hour with house	1.14	1.15	1.21
Per hour without board and room	1.22	1.21	1.26
Composite rate per hour	1.182	1.162	1.213

These figures substantially understate real earnings for two principal reasons: (1) they are cash wages received only and do not include any valuation for perquisites provided, such as housing, meals, transportation, water, electricity, fuel, etc., and (2) no estimates are included of piece-rate earnings, although workers paid on a piecework basis commonly earn more than workers paid on an hourly basis.

5. The next sentence in the script reads, "It is the story of men and women and children who worked 136 days of the year and averaged $900 a year."

The statistics cited are from an annual report issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. If improperly used without explanation, as in this instance, they are grossly misleading. The total hired farm labor force varies from 900,000 in winter months to 2,800,000 during the late summer harvest season. The harvest labor force includes hundreds of thousands of local people, children, high school students, retired people, housewives, and others, who work a few weeks at harvest period, but who are not a permanent part of the farm labor force, and in most cases are only interested in temporary local employment. A substantial portion of the farm labor harvest force consists of small farmers who leave their farms for short periods to work in orchards or fields in nearby areas but who have no wish to work for extended periods. To lump all these various groups together and report the average number of days worked and money earned by such various categories of employees as though this was significant statistical information, without explanatory comment, is not honest reporting.

6. Part way through the script the narrator says, "From towns like this throughout Florida and throughout the South, the 2 to 3 millions move out on their annual migration which ends in late November. They carry with them whatever little they possess. * * *" And again near the end of the script Mr. Murrow asks: "* * * must the 2 to 3 million migrants who help feed their fellow Americans."

Not only is this grossly inaccurate, but the producers of the television program knew it was inaccurate. A CBS press release dated October 19, 1960, announcing the broadcast, made reference to "the estimated 3 million workers who migrate with America's ripening crops." On October 20, 1960, the press relations director of the American Farm Bureau Federation wrote Mr. David Lowe (who actually filmed the production and who had previously contacted us) to advise him that the number of migratory workers was far less than 3 million and provided him a reference for the factual situation.

Page 111 of the "Farm Labor Fact Book," published by the Department of Labor over the signature of Secretary of Labor Mitchell reports:

"Approximately 400,000 different individuals at some time of the year engage in migratory farmwork. This figure excludes some 150,000 migrants who travel with the migrant workers, and a roughly equivalent number who remain in the home base areas."

More recent and detailed data is reported monthly by the U.S. Department of Labor in "Farm Labor Market Developments," in which monthly estimates of the estimated employment and origin of seasonal hired agricultural workers are reported. Data for the latest 12-month period are as follows:

Employment of seasonal farm workers

[In thousands]

	Total seasonal farm labor employment	Foreign (mostly Mexican workers)	Domestic workers		
			Total	Local	Migrant
1959					
November	823	185	638	493	145
December	399	97	302	248	54
1960					
January	343	77	265	233	42
February	328	72	256	218	38
March	309	71	238	205	34
April	417	81	336	284	52
May	766	109	657	543	114
June	1,225	137	1,089	867	222
July	1,200	123	1,077	784	293
August	1,112	133	979	716	263
September	1,282	184	1,099	848	251
October	1,316	236	1,079	823	256

Thus, as shown in the final column, the highest number of domestic migratory workers employed in any month during this 12-month period was 293,000 in July 1960. At that time there may have been a few thousand more looking for work, but not more than that, because July is a peak harvest month in most areas during which almost all farmers growing crops with a high labor requirement are looking for workers.

This is a far cry from the "2 to 3 millions" reported by Mr. Murrow.

Our letter to Mr. Lowe calling his attention to the error was acknowledged by telephone with a promise they would check their statistical data. The only apparent result of this protest was that the number was scaled down from "3 million" in the press release, to "2 to 3 millions" in the Murrow-Friendly television production.

This is not honest reporting. The facts are available. The error was pointed out.

7. At one point the narrator questions a migrant: "How much did you earn?" The reply was $1. The presumption, although not clearly stated was that this was what the migrant had earned for a full day's work. Certainly, the uninformed viewer could reasonably suppose this was a normal situation. And in the opening scene a man seeking to get a crew of workers together is quoted as saying: "Over here—70 cents a day. We're paying today * * *."

The facts are quite different and are readily available. Farm labor wage data are reported in great detail by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This data, for July 1, 1960 (presumably about the date when most of the pictures in "Harvest of Shame" were filmed) are as follows (from "Farm Labor": USDA, July 11, 1960):

U.S. average wage rates paid by farmers as of July 1, 1960

Basis on which wages are paid:	
Per month with house	$200.00
Per month with board and room	149.00
Per week with board and room	36.75
Per week without board and room	47.50
Per day with house	5.30
Per day with board and room	6.90
Per day without board and room	6.50
Per hour with house	.92
Per hour without room or board	1.02
Composite rate per hour (calculated from above data)	.812

As indicated above in a different connection, the wage data shown are cash wages only, and are substantially understated because (1) they include no valuation for housing, room and board, meals, food, transportation, water electricity, fuel and other perquisites provided farm workers and (2) these official estimates do not include earnings of piece-rate workers who commonly earn more per hour or day than workers employed on a time basis.

It certainly is misleading, and grossly so, to present what one woman said she made, and to fail to balance this with readily available average wage data from official sources.

Some of these wage rates may not be high compared with wages paid skilled industrial workers. But they are high in relation to what the farmer earns from employing them; accounting for the rapid adaptation by farmers of new technology which is reducing migratory labor employment at a rapid rate.

It is also inadequate reporting to fail to note, whatever the situation relative to farm wage rates may be, that it is improving. Between 1950 and 1960 farm wage rates increased 47 percent according to reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, despite declining farm prices and incomes.

8. The woman worker who was presumed to earn $1 a day (as set forth in previous section) was apparently not working very hard. The minimum rate for picking beans (the work she was engaged in) in the area is 60 cents a hamper. Most workers will have little difficulty picking two hampers or more an hour.

The Murrow-Friendly production questioned the worker about her children, which she said she had not left in the nursery, because it would have cost her 85 cents and she said she, "Don't make enough to pay for it."

The picture failed to note that this worker's husband has a full-time permanent job and earns $83.50 a week (as reported by the Tampa Tribune of December 7, 1960).

9. The Murrow-Friendly production makes reference to the regulation of transportation of produce and cattle, and then goes on to say that "only six States have laws providing for the safe transportation of migrants within their borders." Secretary of Labor Mitchell comments on the number of serious accidents where "people have been killed purely because there is no interstate standard with regard to safety."

It is perhaps understandable that Secretary Mitchell should be misinformed in this respect, but it is inconceivable that the producers of "Harvest of Shame," having devoted 9 months to this subject, would not know of the existing regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission relative to the transportation of workers by motor vehicle. This was authorized by legislation in 1956, and fairly comprehensive ICC regulations have been in effect for several years. To fail to mention this cardinal fact is certainly error by omission, and gives a distorted untrue picture of the situation. Incidentally, no agricultural organizations opposed the enactment of the legislation authorizing the issuance of such regulations.

10. The film shows overloaded trucks filled with farm workers. It fails to note that these are trucks hauling workers to nearby fields, leaving the viewer to suppose they are trucks heading for distant points. The trucks pictured would not be in compliance with ICC regulations for interstate travel.

11. At one point the film pictures an accident involving a truck in which 21 migrants were killed. This was an accident that occurred 3 years ago. Every form of transportation is subject to accidents. There is no evidence that injuries to migrant workers per mile traveled runs any higher than for other groups of travelers.

12. At various points in the script, the narrator interviews workers. These invariably turn out to be workers with large families. One has 9 children, one 14, another 5, another 8 or 9 girls, another 9.

It is a little hard to understand how it is possible to avoid a social problem when people who do not own their homes or have a permanent job have families as large as these. In any event it is a little hard to understand why some people think farmers are to blame for this situation—yet that is the implied inference running throughout Mr. Murrow's production.

13. In discussing the education of children of migrant workers, Mr. Murrow said, "There are 600,000 of them."

In testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee on May 2, 1960, Mr. Ralph C. M. Flynt, Assistant Commissioner of the Office of Education said: "No accurate national figure of the total number of migrant children exists, but estimates range from 350,000 to 500,000."

A lower figure is indicated in the following quotation from Farm Labor Fact Book (p. 111) by the U.S. Department of Labor: "Approximately 400,000 different individuals at some time of the year engage in migratory farm work. This figure excludes some 150,000 dependents who travel with the migrant workers."

In a paper dated September 4, 1959, entitled "Employment and Child Labor of Migrant Children" furnished us by the Office of Education, appears the following: "The Department of Agriculture estimates that in 1954 there were about 320,000 children under 18, dependent upon the earnings of migrant farm workers. Nearly half of these migrated with their families including about 100,000 children under 14."

Recognizing that a serious problem of education of migrant children exists, we see no valid purpose in exaggerating the size of the problem.

Incidentally, these official estimates relative to the number of migrant children, compared with correct data relative to the number of migrants, disclose that the film's portrayal of large migrant families is another factual distortion. Some migrant families may be large; but obviously most are not.

14. Mr. Murrow says that "The U.S. Office of Education reports that the migratory workers have the highest rate of illiteracy in this country. Approximately 1 out of every 500 children whose parents are still migrant workers finishes grade school. Approximately 1 out of every 5,000 ever finishes high school. And there is no case upon the record of the child of a migrant laborer ever receiving a college diploma." We have inquired of the Department of Education concerning the source of this information, without being able to find it. We have read a mass of reports furnished us by the Office of Education without finding anything to support these estimates. The Secretary of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor and the staff of the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee cannot advise us of the source of this information.

It should further be noted that the Murrow-Friendly production fails, as usual, to reflect the major progress that has been made in this respect in recent years. Thus the "Report to the President on Domestic Migratory Farm Labor" of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor says (pp. 17–18): "There is a definite trend, particularly since 1954, of increased and sustained interest on the part of State departments of education, local school districts and communities, and private organizations to provide for the educational needs of migrants."

15. The script shows a number of views of derelict housing occupied by migrants.

The producers must have sought far and wide to discover the most dilapidated housing they could find. The television production does not balance this showing of the worst housing with comparable presentation of relatively good housing provided farm workers in many areas; nor does it adequately reflect the fact that the provision of good housing for a period of a few weeks is a tremendous financial burden that farmers have sought to meet as best they can, and are meeting to an extent not made clear by the picture.

The improvements in migratory labor housing which have been and are being made are recognized by anyone at all close to the situation. To quote from one of numerous sources: The U.S. Department of Labor, in a publication entitled "This Is How 12 Camps for Migratory Workers in Agriculture are Operated" (BES No. I'-171) comments in the preface, "The responsibility (for providing adequate housing) is being met with steady and progressive improvement in housing for migratory workers."

16. At one point, Mr. Murrow says that some migrants "have tried to leave the endless migratory stream. Wherever this happens, the local slum areas expand."

Actually, a substantial number of migratory workers settle down every year and become permanent residents of many communities, sometimes it is true, resulting in the creation of slum areas, but in most cases without adverse effect on the community. Migrants commonly become permanent farm employees, supervisors, and in many instances farmers, or find jobs outside agriculture.

The idea that the migrant is caught in a trap from which he cannot extricate himself successfully is fallacious. This may be true with some workers of limited capacity—but in general, the door is open and many use it. So far as finding permanent farm jobs, about the only absolute prerequisite, other than physical, is willingness.

17. The narrator asserts that the employment of Mexican and other foreign workers "depresses the wage scale of the domestic migrant." The use of the word "depresses" leaves the inference that farm wages are being driven down by the presence of these workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Farm wages, between 1950 and 1960 increased 47 percent, according to official reports of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and farm wages in all areas increased by approximately the same percentage. This was during a period in which farm prices and farm incomes were declining.

18. At one point the narrator questions a minister about crew leaders. The minister said that the "grower pays them 45 cents to pick a crate of tomatoes and then they go around and pay the laborer 12 cents at the most."

Now it is quite true there are crew leaders who do not treat their workers fairly. It is also quite true that many farmers get blamed for the practices of crew leaders.

However, the facts stated are so wildly improbable, and even if true in a particular case so untypical, as to give credence to what we are confident is the case—that the producers of the show questioned many people, and carefully selected the most extreme adverse reactions and situations, and reported them in such manner as to mislead the viewer to suppose this was the usual situation.

19. Toward the end of the program the film portrayed a breadline scene, with the comment that "this happened in the United States in 1960, a line of humans waiting for a ration of canned goods, milk, and bread."

But Sam Mase, writing in the Tampa Tribune, said that two representatives of the sponsors, Philip Morris, Inc., sent to Florida to investigate complaints about the Murrow-Friendly production, "learned that the breadline of hungry migrants which appeared in the documentary was not a current situation, but represented instead a period several years ago when a big freeze destroyed most Florida vegetable crops, leaving migrants unemployed."

SUMMARY

In any television production proclaimed as a documentary, the public is entitled to expect the producers will set forth an unbiased factual presentation of the issue. In this case the producers failed to perform their elementary responsibility of honest reporting. This was a highly colored propaganda job. The public was misled as to the situation, and the public relations of farmers were irreparably damaged. The public and farmers have a right to expect of our television broadcasting companies a more objective presentation of any factual situation than was portrayed in "Harvest of Shame."

ACTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, JANUARY 4, 1961

The broadcasting by the Columbia Broadcasting Corp. on November 25, 1960, of the Murrow-Friendly production "Harvest of Shame" constitutes a major failure of this network to exercise its responsibility for honest and factual reporting.

The Murrow-Friendly production contained numerous errors of fact and omission, and erroneous inferences based upon inaccurate and incomplete factual data.

Such highly colored propaganda is to be particularly condemned when it is billed as a "documentary," as in this instance. The public has a right to expect any television program so billed to be objective and factual.

The selection of extreme situations and reactions to support a point of view, culled from a large volume of pictures and interviews over a period of many months, is not a procedure consistent with the responsibility of the television industry to the public.

In a society in which television plays such a major role in creating public opinion and in influencing legislative action, honest and fair reporting by such media is imperative.

Rigged documentaries are a much more serious abuse of responsibility than rigged quiz programs, because of the important effect they may have on public opinion and legislative action.

We therefore wish to express our concern in this respect by transmittal of this resolution, together with a copy of a detailed analysis of the factual errors in the Murrow-Friendly production to the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the president of the Columbia Broadcasting Corp., the Philip Morris Co. (sponsor of the program), the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and to other interested parties.

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 23, 1961.

MR. CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. SHUMAN: This is in response to your two communications to CBS regarding the program, "Harvest of Shame," broadcast over the CBS Television Network on November 25, 1960. Your first letter of December 6, 1960, alleged that false statements were made in the program, two of which you cited, and requested that equal and corresponding time be afforded to reply to the false statements and to present the opposing point of view of the federation to the controversial legislative proposals set forth in the program. Your second letter, January 10, 1960, enclosed a copy of a resolution of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, dated January 4, 1961, together with a so-called analysis which sets forth in greater detail the alleged factual inaccuracies in the program. (On December 29, 1960, CBS sent to your general counsel, at his request, a transcript of "Harvest of Shame," and offered to provide facilities in Chicago for viewing by him of a recording of the program.)

Your two letters, together with other letters received which are critical of the program, have been forwarded by management to the law department of the CBS Television Network for appraisal. This letter constitutes our review and appraisal of the criticisms voiced against "Harvest of Shame."

We had assumed from your December letter, in view of the express statement therein to that effect, that you desired to resolve the issues between us without attendant publication of the controversy. We find, however, from your January communication that this is no longer the case. We note that the January resolution and analysis have been transmitted to the chairmen of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the House Committee on Agriculture, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Federal Communications Commission, and to other interested parties. In view of this changed course of action on your part, we are sending a copy of this letter to the same chairmen of the six Federal bodies. We should appreciate being advised the names of the other interested parties to whom you sent your January resolution and analysis so that we can forward copies of this letter to them. In addition, we shall send copies of this letter to others who wrote us and were critical of the program. Their objections, by and large, are the same as those voiced by you and are, accordingly, responded to in this letter.

As a further preliminary comment, we should like to note that CBS has received approximately 2,700 communications regarding "Harvest of Shame." Of these, approximately 160 are critical of the program. The remaining communications are all highly laudatory.

I

"Harvest of Shame" was a 1-hour news documentary produced under the sole supervision and control of CBS News. The sponsor of the program, Philip Morris, Inc., had no control over and, in fact, had nothing whatever to do with the content of the program. Indeed, the sponsor did not see the program before it went on the air. "Harvest of Shame" was one in the CBS News series entitled "CBS Reports," dealing with leading national and international issues and broadcast over the CBS Television Network. We do not need to belabor the point that "Harvest of Shame" addressed itself to a bona fide problem, national in scope. You are familiar, we are sure, with the multitude of articles on and surveys and studies of migratory farm labor and their families which have come from numerous State, Federal, and private organizations, extending over a period of many years. In your December letter you concede, as do almost all who have written us in a critical vein, that you "do not contend the migrant labor picture is entirely as we would like to see it." We, accordingly, can turn to the several points raised in your letter and the analysis confident that you and your board of directors, upon further reflection, will not believe "Harvest of

Shame" was a "rigged documentary," creating a problem where one did not exist or was motivated by evil purposes.

II

We shall now consider the several items raised in your December letter and in the analysis in connection with the fairness of "Harvest of Shame."

1. THE "BREADLINE" EPISODE

In the analysis it is charged, by referencing an article allegedly appearing in a Florida newspaper, that the breadline of hungry migrants which was presented in the program as occurring in 1960 did not take place as represented "but represented instead a period several years ago when a big freeze destroyed most Florida vegetable crops, leaving migrants unemployed." This is a most serious charge, for if true, it would demonstrate that the integrity of the program was subject to the gravest question. The program spoke in terms of the present, and the legislative proposals referred to at the close of the program were purportedly for the amelioration of current distressed situations in which migratory farm laboring families find themselves. Your charge is also a serious charge if not true, for that would demonstrate not only the carelessness of those who make the charge but also subject their own allegations of unfairness to the gravest doubt of reliability.

What are the facts?

In the program Edward R. Murrow stated: "The migrant is at the mercy of the weather. This year in Florida there was a freeze, killing beans, tomatoes, celery, corn. Its byproduct was a breadline. Migratory farmworkers are not eligible for unemployment insurance. This happened in the United States in 1960, a line of humans waiting for a ration of tinned goods, milk and bread." (Picture of migrants in line waiting for rations.)

These are the facts: On January 29, 30, 31, and February 1, 1960, David Lowe, producer of "Harvest of Shame," and Peter Gabarini, his cameraman, were at Homestead, Fla., and shot the pictures of the migrant breadline at the National Guard Armory. Freezing weather in late January 1960 did substantial damage to the crops in south Florida. (Such freeze is not to be confused with the freeze winter of 1957–58.) Appeals for money, food, and clothing were made by several of the State and welfare bodies at this time. The breadlines continued for several weeks.

We have in hand newspaper articles appearing in the Miami News for the period in question which cover the plight of migrant families during this January-February 1960 period, including a news photograph published in that paper under date of February 8, 1960, which is substantially the same as appeared in one of the scenes on "Harvest of Shame." If you are interested in reading these articles, we shall be pleased to forward them to you so that you may be apprised of the 1960 freeze in Florida.

This charge in the analysis is without any foundation and is contrary to fact.

2. THE LARGE FAMILIES OF MIGRANTS

The analysis notes that the interviews with migrant workers are of those that "invariably turn out to be workers with large families"—one has 9 children, one 14, another 8 or 9 girls, another 9. The analysis then states it is a little hard to understand how a social problem can be avoided when people who do not own their homes or have a permanent job have families as large as these. "In any event," it continues, "it is a little hard to understand why some people think farmers are to blame for this situation—yet that is the implied inference running through Mr. Murrow's production."

This is a somewhat startling charge. Nowhere in the program, expressedly or impliedly, was the large number of children in migrant families blamed on farmers. Nowhere in the program was it suggested, expressedly or impliedly, that farmers want large size migratory farm labor families because that assures a continuous supply of migrant laborers.

We reject this charge as completely unfounded.

3. THE $1-A-DAY EPISODE AND WAGES IN GENERAL

In your December letter you mentioned, as one of two cited instances of misrepresentation in "Harvest of Shame," the scene in which a woman migrant worker is interviewed. You said that Mr. Lowe questioned this worker who replied that she had earned $1 that day. That is true.

Your letter then alleged: "Never again is the subject of wages mentioned. The producers wanted to leave the $1-a-day impression—and they did." That is not true.

You will recall that the program opens with four hawkers chanting:

"FIRST HAWKER. Seventy over here. Over here—70 cents. All day talkin'.

"SECOND HAWKER. Over here—70 cents a day. We're paying today. We'll pay more and the longest hours. Seventy cents. Here we is today.

"THIRD HAWKER. Seventy cents today. Seventy cents—all day jumping. All you have to do is——

"FOURTH HAWKER. Eight cents a box and we guarantee you if you pull today and we pull what we got to pull today, you'll have $11 in your pocket."

Mr. Murrow then explains that this is a shapeup for migrant workers and that the hawkers are chanting the going piece rate at the various fields. The "70 cents" refers, as you must know, to the wage rate per hamper of beans. The "8 cents," of course, refers to the wage rate per box of corn. This scene does not leave, but rather negates, an impression of $1 a day.

Immediately following your first appearance on the program, Mr. Murrow introduces the scope of the program: "This is an American story that begins in Florida and ends in New Jersey and New York State with the harvest. It is a 1960 grapes of wrath, that begins at the Mexican border in California and ends in Oregon and Washington. It is the story of men and women and children who work 136 days of the year, and average $900 a year. They travel in buses. They ride trucks. They follow the sun."

The figures given—136 days, $900 a year—do not leave, but rather negate, an impression of $1 a day. Further, as was stated, these are average figures; there are some higher, there are some lower.

When we come to the episode involved, you fail to note the other questions on the program bearing on the $1-a-day matter:

"LOWE. How much did you earn?

"Mrs. KING. A dollar.

"LOWE. One dollar?

"Mrs. KING. That's right—$1.

"LOWE. Is that because the beans were of poor quality?

"Mrs. KING. That's right.

"LOWE. Has this happened before?

"Mrs. KING. That's right."

That does not leave a $1-a-day impression. Surely our viewers are aware that beans at other times and other places are of good quality, and that the migrant can, therefore, earn more than $1 a day.

Later, the scene shifts to an area near Kitty Hawk, N.C. Mr. Murrow comments that the workers pick beans there at the prevailing rate of 50 cents a hamper. That does not leave, but rather negates, a $1-a-day impression.

Later, in Reverend Cassidy's interview, he states that "the grower pays them 45 cents to pick a crate of tomatoes" and that the crew leader of whom he was speaking turned over to the migrant only 12 cents. That does not leave, but rather negates, an impression that the farmers pay $1 a day.

Later, in the scene of the strike meeting of cherry pickers, one of the migrants says: "You make $5 or $10 today and tomorrow you just alooking for a job and you stand on the street looking for a job."

That does not leave, but rather negates, an impression that the growers pay $1 a day.

The monthly wage figures quoted in the analysis for the three States of California, Oregon, and Washington, and for the U.S. average, as of July 1, 1960, are irrelevant. They are cited to counter the "Grapes of Wrath" characterization of the flow of migrants from the Mexican border to the three named States, and to counter, as the analysis states, the impression the uninformed viewer could reasonably suppose that $1 a day was a normal situation. The figures given are irrelevant for two reasons: First, the program did not state $1 a day was the normal situation (this we have shown above); second, the figures quoted in the analysis are on bases of per month, per week, per day, per hour, but do not suggest how many months or weeks or days or hours an average migrant works per year. The figure used on "Harvest of Shame" was an average of $900 a year. (See p. 4, "Report to the President on Domestic Migratory Farm Labor (1960)": "* * * the migrant earns an average of about $900 per year and lives a life that is characterized by exclusion.")

In short, your letter of December and the analysis seek to create a "strawman" issue of $1 a day. There is no $1 a day implication such as you and the analysis have suggested.

Finally, with respect to the $1 a day issue, the analysis notes that the woman interviewed had stated she had not put her four children in a nursery (she had left them at the Okeechobee labor camp) because she didn't make enough to pay the 85 cents (per day) charge for the nursery. The analysis then states the program failed to note her husband has a full-time permanent job and earns $83.50 a week—as alleged in a Florida newspaper.

The analysis fails to point out whether the husband had the permanent job at the time of the interview with the wife, whether, if he did, his employment record was such that each week he earned $83.50, whether he took home his net pay or spent it otherwise, and whether, indeed, the total family net pay was sufficient to pay 85 cents per day for care of their 4 children, all under the age of 10, while the mother was gone during the day.

4. HOW MANY MIGRANTS WAS "HARVEST OF SHAME" CONSIDERING?

In your December letter, as well as in the analysis, the accuracy of the "2 to 3 million" figure used on the program is questioned.

Your letter also states: "The same book 'Farm Labor Fact Book' also reports there are 450,000 foreign agricultural workers, but the CBS show made no pretense of covering that situation."

This assertion is squarely contradicted by the readily ascertainable facts. About halfway through the program, Mr. Murrow states: "Another complication of the migrant stream is the constant flow of foreign workers into the available pool of domestic workers. Hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros and thousands of offshore laborers from the Caribbean area, hired by contract, depress the wage scale of the domestic migrant. This controversy is most bitter on the west coast."

There follows an interview with Mr. Woods, a marine combat veteran of the Pacific, who competes with the Mexican braceros. Yours is the only letter we have received which asserts "Harvest of Shame" did not include the foreign workers. Those who watched the program on the west coast did not miss our inclusion of foreign workers: several of them have taken issue with us regarding the

statement that these foreign workers depress the wage scale of the domestic migrant.

In the "2 to 3 million" figure we included the migrant workers, domestic and foreign, their wives, their children. The program showed, among other things, families on buses, individual migrants with their families, migrant children at home and in a summer school.

The "2 to 3 million" figure was the result of Mr. Lowe's informed estimate as to the total number, based on a reading of numerous reports and discussions with educators and officials. It is an estimate, as is every comparable figure we have seen from other reliable sources.

At the time of the January 1960 freeze in south Florida, the area chief of farm labor recruiting for the Florida Employment Service, Mr. Bryant Page, is quoted as stating that there are some 3 million migrant workers and their dependents, divided into three main streams: one operates out of Texas, another from southern California and the third from south Florida.

Published reports we have examined and estimates from several groups, give totals for the number of domestic migrant workers, foreign migratory workers, dependent wives, and dependent children, ranging from approximately 1,725,000 to 1,975,000, plus unspecified numbers of wetbacks, intrastate workers, and day hand workers.

It seems to us in view of the varying estimates we have found as to the total number of migrant workers, their wives and their children, and in view of the recognition that estimates are on the minimum side due to difficulties in securing an accurate census of these people, that the figure "2 or 3 million" was a reasonable one.

5. THE MEXICAN BRACERO PROGRAM

Exception is taken in a number of communications we have received from the west coast, as well as in the analysis, to the statement on the program that "hundreds of thousands of Mexican braceros and thousands of offshore laborers from the Caribbean area, hired by contract, depress the wage scale of the domestic migrant." (We note, in this connection, an inconsistency between the allegation in your December 1960 letter that the program made no pretense of covering foreign migratory labor, and the instant allegation regarding the effect of such foreign labor on the wage scale of domestic migrants.)

What seems to be overlooked in all the criticisms of this statement is that the law of supply and demand is at work in this area as well as in other sectors of the economy. It is estimated there are some 455,000 foreign workers brought into the United States each year (plus 20,000 from Puerto Rico) to supplement the Nation's seasonal farm labor force. The ratio of these to the variously estimated number of domestic migratory workers is extremely high. Surely, it stands to reason that the wage scale of the domestic migrant would rise substantially if the nondomestic pool of workers was not longer available to fill the demand for migratory labor on the part of farmers and growers. We recognize that Public Law 78 provides that the Mexican nationals must be paid the prevailing wage rates for domestic workers doing the same type of work. But that the availability of such a large force of foreign workers has a depressing effect upon existing—and hence prevailing—wage rates cannot be controverted, for those rates are the result of the interplay of the existing demand for, and the existing supply of, laborers.

6. THE CREW LEADERS

The National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor states in a recent publication:

"Nearly everyone who has looked deeply into the migrant situation has found abuses by crew leaders whose job control and other powers were made even greater by the comparative ignorance of the workers. The latest of many reports is contained in a survey made by the Oregon Bureau of Labor for its legislative committee, though not done by the committee itself. In Malheur County, examples that were not merely isolated instances included: Payment of per capita travel expense by the employers' association with duplicate collection from migrants; arrangement for credit for the individual migrant on a percentage fee basis in handling contract for an independent farmer; as much as 50 percent markup in housing rental on the farmer's property; arrangements for tavern credit on a percentage fee basis from the proprietor who increases prices to pay the fee; use of the contractor's vehicles in the daily transportation of the workers at about $2.50 per capita weekly.

"The Pennsylvania annual report on migrant labor referred to problems engendered by the crew-leader system as a thing so well known as not to need amplification. New York found problems intensified by a one-third turnover from year to year in crew leaders, a proportion which, in other areas, is sometimes even greater."

The "Report to the President on Domestic Migratory Farm Labor" states: "Each year thousands of migrants, most of them in family units, secure their jobs and travel under the crew-leader system. While the system contributes significantly to our present-day agricultural economy, studies of migrant problems have indicated numerous forms of abuse by crew leaders, such as misrepresentation of wages and working conditions, excessive charges for services and commissionary items, collecting a percentage of the employees' earnings from both the farmers and the workers for the same services, etc. Further, some crew leaders, as employers under the Social Security Act, have failed to report and pay social security taxes on the covered wages of their employees. Because crew leaders often have no fixed places of business or residence, it is extremely difficult to remedy this situation."

In spite of what is a well recognized problem in the migratory labor picture, the analysis appears to contend that the crew leader problem is of small consequence. The analysis objects to that portion of "Harvest of Shame" in which a minister says, among other things, that the grower pays 45 cents to pick a crate of tomatoes and the crew leader turns around and pays the laborer only 12 cents. The analysis goes on to state:

"Now it is quite true there are crew leaders who do not treat their workers fairly. It is also quite true that many farmers get blamed for the practice of crew leaders. (No blame was placed on the farmers for the practices of crew leaders in "Harvest of Shame.") However, the facts stated are so wildly improbable, and even if true in a particular case so untypical, as to give credence to what we are confident is the case—that the producers of the show questioned many people, and carefully selected the most extreme adverse reactions and situations, and reported them in such manner as to mislead the viewer to suppose this was the usual situation."

From the two publications quoted above, it is quite clear there are many abuses indulged in by crew leaders which were not referred to on the program. The program referred to only one. It seems to us, contrary to the assertion of the analysis, that "Harvest of Shame" used considerable restraint in portraying the crew leader problem in view of the recognized abuses in the crew leader system.

7. TRANSPORTATION

The analysis finds fault in the presentation of the accident that occurred near Fayetteville, N.C., on June 6, 1957. The analysis states the accident occurred 3 years ago, that every form of transportation is subject to accidents, and there is no evidence that injuries to migratory workers runs higher than in any other group of travelers. The analysis seems to assume the accident near Fayetteville was almost routine and there is no cause for concern.

The writers of the analysis are in a minority in this matter. As the "Report to the President on Domestic Migratory Farm Labor" states, the Nation has been shocked for years by reports of accidents in which traveling migrants have lost their lives. "Public concern," the report continues, "reached its peak on June 6, 1957, when one of the worst such traffic accidents in the history of the Nation took place." This is a reference to the accident near Fayetteville. It was not until the same year that the Interstate Commerce Commission issued safety regulations governing the transportation of agricultural workers in privately owned trucks and buses. But the mere enactment of a law or a regulation accomplishes little unless that law or regulation is adequately enforced. Such regulations have not been adequately enforced. Enforcement of the regulations, the "Report to the President on Domestic Migratory Farm Labor" points out, has been and still is a problem because the Commission is not staffed adequately to make as many inspections of trucks carrying migratory workers as is necessary to insure compliance with the regulations. The producer of "Harvest of Shame" did know of the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but in light of the enforcement problems thereunder, it hardly seemed reasonable that the existence of such regulations was a cardinal fact, as suggested in the analysis, in the presentation of the migratory farm labor picture.

8. ILLITERACY OF MIGRATORY WORKERS

The analysis questions the source of the statements on "Harvest of Shame" that the migratory workers have the highest rate of illiteracy in the country; that approximately 1 out of every 500, whose parents are still migratory workers, finishes grade school; that approximately 1 out of every 5,000 ever finishes high school; and that there is no case on the record of a child of a migratory laborer ever receiving a college diploma.

The U.S. Office of Education "Report of Regional Conferences on Education of Migrant Children" (July 1952) states: "The migrant children have the lowest educational attainments of any group in the Nation. They enter school later, attend fewer days, show greatest retardation, achieve the least progress, drop out of school earliest, and constitute the largest single reservoir of illiterates."

Mr. Lowe's studies revealed no evidence of any change in the conclusions reached in the report since the date thereof. The figures given on the program are the result of research by Mr. Lowe and interviews with educators. Mr. Lowe was advised on January 19, 1961, that the U.S. Department of Labor has knowledge of two children of migrant workers who have received a college diploma.

If the American Farm Bureau Federation has other information relative to the state of illiteracy of migratory workers and their children which are not in accord with those presented, we shall be happy to receive and consider such evidence.

Contrary to the assertion in the analysis that the program failed to reflect the major progress that has been made with respect to education of migratory laborers' children, the program did note that six States have summer schools for migrants. A scene of the New Jersey School Center at Cranbury, N.J., was also shown. An interview is presented on the program between the teacher and the producer of the program. Furthermore, Sen-

ator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., in his interview presented on the show, stated: "And we see in education some States who have taken great strides."

Although it is open to serious question whether the results of efforts by States in this matter constitute "major progress," as asserted in the analysis, the program explicitly acknowledges that some progress is being made.

9. THE OVERALL FAIRNESS OF THE PROGRAM

The analysis, as well as a number of critical letters received, attack the fairness of the program in its presentation of housing, wages and education of migrants. It is claimed that the program failed to note the progress that has been made. It is claimed that the producers of the program picked out only the worst examples and generalized therefrom.

The facts are that the progress which has been made has been relatively minimal. Mr. Lowe spent over 9 months studying the migratory labor problems and preparing the program. He visited a number of the States. He read numerous reports which have been issued on the migratory farm labor situation. He interviewed countless people. He visited many labor camps in the States in which he traveled. His conclusion was that what progress has been made in this area has been small, that much remains to be done. His conclusion corresponds, we note, with that of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor which comments that modest progress has been made toward improving conditions for migratory workers but that much remains to be accomplished before the job is completed.

In "Harvest of Shame":

In discussing highway accidents, it is stated that six States have laws providing for the safe transportation of migrants within their borders.

In discussing education of the migrants' children, it is stated that most (not all) State child labor laws ignore farm children.

It is stated that six States have summer schools for migrants. The episode which follows is the scene of the New Jersey School Center, Cranbury, N.J., and this episode shows a good example of educational help for these children.

Senator WILLIAMS states: "And we see in education some States who have taken great strides."

Murrow states: "But the real problem is that there are many kinds of farmers and many kinds of crops. The big, mechanized grain and dairy farmers use little or no migrant labor. Some of the major canneries do pay fair wages and provide adequate housing. However, it must be stated that most of the fruit and vegetable farmers find it economically impossible to build good housing, like this (picture of good housing shown) to be used only 6 weeks a year."

Murrow states that the Sunshine State welcomes the migrants back: "Homestead, Immokalee, Pahokee, Belle Glade, and hundreds of other communities. This is home. New housing is available. (Picture shown.) The rent, $15 per room, per week."

"Harvest of Shame" was not a program devoted to migratory farm labor in a single State: California or New York or Idaho or Michigan or Florida or New Jersey or Texas. Rather, it was a bona fide endeavor to portray the situation on a national basis. On the basis of this broad scope of the program, its presentation was fair and balanced.

10. RESPONSIBILITY FOR PLIGHT OF THE MIGRANTS

A number of the communications we received complain that the program places responsibility for the plight of the migrant laborers upon the farmers. At several points in the program, persons interviewed do place, or appear to place, responsibility for the migrant laborer situation upon farmers. What has been failed to be noted by the writers of such letters, however, are the following items on the program, which place the responsibility elsewhere:

Mr. Shuman presents the argument (as many of the complaining letters do) that it is better to have the migrants, who are practically unemployable because of their capacity, earning some money, doing some productive work.

Migrant Roach's interview is noncomplaining of farmers; he states he has always worked and he has never been anywhere where he could not get a little something to do.

Farmer Jones, in addition to saying that the migrants have a little gypsy in their blood, that they are happier than we are, that they are the happiest race of people on earth, goes on to say: "In other words, sometimes just like the farmer. Sometimes when things are good, when the yields are good and they can make good money, they make a good living, but take year in and year out from different seasons, different sections of the country, I'd say no, that they make a poor living."

There is implicit criticisms of the States, except for six States, in not providing for safe transpotraton of migrants within their borders.

Mr. Shuman points out that farmers are the only group of people who furnish housing for workers, that it is almost impossible to calculate the value of these added benefits and that at the same time the farmers don't condone inadequate housing. Mr. Shuman goes on to say that he thinks there would be more rapid progress with State legislation than with Federal.

The crew leaders are castigated by Reverend Cassidy. He notes that the growers pay 45 cents to pick a crate of tomatoes and the crew leader turns over only 12 cents to the migrant worker.

There is implicit condemnation of the States for failing to make adequate provision for the education of the children with only six States having summer schools.

There is criticism of the Congress in failing to appropriate $3½ million to educate migratory children.

Senator WILLIAMS points out that many aspects of the problem can only be dealt with on a national level because States are in a competitive position. He notes that States are reluctant to raise wages through legislation because their farmers are competing with farmers in other States. He says we cannot expect States to do it alone when they know their neighboring State with whom their farmers compete are not doing anything.

Murrow states that most of the fruit and vegetable farmers find it economically impossible to build good housing to be used only 6 weeks a year. Murrow says the farmer claims he is trapped between what society expects and his market demands. Farmer Jones was asked whether he knew what his beans would bring in the market and Jones replies that he cannot tell from one day to the next. One day it will be $5 and the next day $1.50. Jones says that he does not know the answer to who sets the price, but the chains seem to have more to do with setting the prices than anyone else. He said the farmers tried to get Washington to investigate the chains, but the farmers' representatives got a runaround by the Department of Agriculture. The chains have lobbyists in Washington. Murrow implicitly condemns the exclusion of farm labor from Federal legislation designed to protect those engaged in interstate commerce to organize and bargain collectively.

Many of the letters of complaint state that the migrant problem is society's problem and that society, as a whole, must be held responsible. In the criticisms of the States for failing to pass protective legislation, in failing to adequately provide educational and welfare benefits, and of the Federal Government for its legislative failings, there is recognition in "Harvest of Shame" that the problem is one for society to meet through its legislative bodies.

III

We turn to your request that equal and corresponding time be afforded to reply to the alleged false statements and to present the opposing point of view of the federation to the controversial legislative proposals set forth in the program.

We should first point out that the concept of equal time is inapplicable. You are, perhaps, confusing the equal opportunities provision of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (concerning political candidates), with the obligation of broadcast licensees to broadcast opposing views on public issues of substantial interest and importance. It is the responsibility of the broadcast licensee to select those representing the opposing view and to select the format for the presentation of the opposing viewpoint.

A review of the charges made by you, by the analysis, and by others critical of the program, fails to show that "Harvest of Shame" misrepresented or was unfair in the presentation of the facts. We are, accordingly, denying your request for time to reply to the alleged false statements.

As to your request for time to present the opposing point of view to the controversial legislative proposals set forth in the program, we have this comment: At the close of the program Mr. Murrow, in effect, suggested that the viewers do something about the plight of the migrants and their families, that maybe the viewers have the strength to influence legislation. Mr. Murrow had referred to the legislative recommendations recently made by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. He referred to some of them on the program.

The full recommendations of the President's committee for action by the States are as follows:

1. Extension of State workmen's compensation laws to agricultural workers.

2. Creation of State safety regulations for the transportation of agricultural workers.

3. Extension of State child labor legislation to hired agricultural workers.

4. Adoption and enforcement of housing regulations which apply to seasonal farm labor housing in those States that do not already have such regulations.

5. Reimbursement to local school boards for education of migrant children.

6. Reimbursement of funds to local health agencies to assist them in extending public health services to migrant workers and their families.

7. Provision for adult education classes for migrants, including vocational education.

8. Extension of child welfare services, including day care facilities, to migrant children.

9. Elimination of residence requirements in all State health, education, rehabilitation, and welfare programs.

10. Employer education on worker training, employer-employee relationships, and community relations.

The full recommendations by the President's committee for action by the Federal Government are as follows:

1. The passage of crew leader registration legislation to protect migrants from the unscrupulous practices of some crew leaders and labor contractors.

2. Adequate staffing of the Interstate Commerce Commission to insure proper enforcement of the regulations governing the interstate transportation of migratory workers in privately owned trucks and buses.

3. More positive leadership and guidance of State extension programs for education and service to migrants.

4. Continuing review of all foreign labor import programs to make certain that the importation of foreign workers does not have an adverse effect on the employment opportunities, wages, and working conditions of domestic farmworkers.

5. Elimination of residence requirements as a condition for receipt of Federal funds.

6. Continued and strengthened emphasis and encouragement of action to assure the provision of needed health services to migrant families and adequate housing whether that housing is in camps, isolated units or farms, or fringe areas of towns.

From your statement on the program, "I think there'd be more rapid progress with State regulation than there would be with Federal regulation," we had been led to believe that you, in behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, were not opposed to all State action but, rather, that your opposition was to Federal legislation.

Recognizing that at the close of the program CBS could be considered to have taken a position favoring legislative action along the lines suggested by the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, CBS has been making arrangements for the broadcast of another program sometime in February of this year in which varying points of view concerning the legislative proposals might be presented. As we have stated above, the format of that program and the selection of persons participating therein, are the responsibility of CBS. It may well be that in addition to the opposition of the Federation to Federal legislation, the Federation may oppose some of the recommendations for action by States. Accordingly, Mr. Lowe, as you know, has been in touch with the Federation attempting to make arrangements for your appearance on the February program. We are hopeful that you will be able to appear.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS K. FISHER,
Vice President and General Attorney.

AN INVITATION TO THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Members of Congress are cordially invited to attend a special showing of the film, "Harvest of Shame," a production of "CBS Reports."

The invitation is extended to Senators, Representatives, and members of their staffs by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the national board of the YWCA, the Bishops' Committee for Migrant Workers, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the National Child Labor Committee.

"Harvest of Shame" will be shown on Monday, January 30, at 4:30 p.m. in the auditorium (room G 308) on the ground floor of the New Senate Office Building.

In "Harvest of Shame," the cameras of "CBS Reports" show how migratory workers live, travel, and labor in America's fields and orchards. Workers are shown in the fields and on the highways at Homestead, Fla.; Kingsland, Ga.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Norfolk, Va.; Cranberry, N.J.; and Norwich, N.Y. Other workers appear in their temporary shacks, or living in the fields of Stockton, Calif., and Holland, Mich.

Edward R. Murrow, narrator; David Lowe, producer; and Fred W. Friendly, executive producer of "CBS Reports" have created a great film about a major American problem.

Additional information available from the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, 1751 N Street NW., Washington 6, D.C. Telephone, NOrth 7-3979.

EXHIBIT 2

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE
ON MIGRATORY LABOR,
Harrisburg, Pa., December 12, 1960.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: As Gov. David L. Lawrence pointed out in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Migrant Labor, there are few areas with a more pressing need for Federal legislative remedial action than the migrant labor field. At the request of the National Council of Churches, I prepared a paper recently on what Congress could do to help. Here is a copy as of possible interest to you in your work in the upcoming session.

As outlined on page 3, the following can only be done most effectively and equitably through our Federal Government:

1. Protect children from exploitation in commercial agriculture, just as they now are in mines and factories;

2. See that schooling and child care are provided for children of migrant workers;

3. See that decent minimum wages are established for farm workers in industry and commerce;

4. Help finance decent housing for migrant workers and their families;

5. Protect migrants and their families from exploitation by crew leaders;

6. End the undercutting of American labor standards by the mass importation of low-wage foreign labor.

From our State's standpoint, besides the obvious humanitarian aspects of this complex problem, one of our prime motives for taking this position is the fact that we must continue to help maintain the competitive position of Pennsylvania's agricultural enterprises where higher employment standards already prevail. Certainly, we should strive to protect our State's farmers from the undercutting competition from other sections of the Nation where standards are much lower, but where fruit and vegetables are grown that compete in the same markets, including our own local markets.

I urge you to support these proposals when they are again introduced in the 87th Congress. The agricultural industry, both locally and nationally, and farm workers and their families, can only benefit from passage of this needed legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. BATT, JR.,
Chairman.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY WILLIAM L. BATT, JR., AT THE NATIONAL STUDY CONFERENCE ON THE CHURCH AND MIGRATORY LABOR, SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST, DIVISION OF HOME MISSIONS, AT THE SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 17, 1960

New Orleans is very much in the news today. New Orleans was the city where young Abraham Lincoln first saw slavery. You remember the story—how he'd come down the Mississippi on a flatboat loaded with hogs from the Sangamon River—how, his business completed, he was looking the town over and came upon a slave auction—and how he remarked in righteous wrath to his friend, "If I ever get a chance to hit that thing, I'll hit it hard."

If Abraham Lincoln were a young man today, and he happened upon a Negro child of 8, working hard on hands and knees 12 hours a day picking snap beans in the hot midsummer sun, he might well cry out, "If I ever get a chance to hit child labor, I'll hit it hard."

In the next few months, you and I have perhaps the best chance in our lifetime to hit child labor, to hit inadequate schooling, to hit starvation wages, to hit rural slum housing, to hit exploitation by crew leaders, to hit second-class citizenship and the many other ills that plague migrant farmworkers and their families, and to hit them hard.

Why? Because we have just elected a President who pledged in his campaign to move America forward in a war on poverty. The Democratic platform on which he ran pledged specifically that "We shall seek to bring the 2 million men, women, and children who work for wages on the farms of the United States under the protection of existing labor and social legislation; and to assure migrant labor, perhaps the most underprivileged of all, of a comprehensive program to bring them not only decent wages but also an adequate standard of health, housing, social security protection, education, and welfare services." The Democratic Party which adopted that platform controls both Houses of Congress by generous majorities. The Republican platform also takes note of the problem by listing in its list of objectives for labor, this particular goal: "* * * improvements of job opportunities and working conditions of migratory workers."

President-elect Kennedy has made crystal clear that he could not and cannot do it alone, that he needs the help of all of us. This is no time to sit back and "let Jack do it." If you and I and enough of our neighbors and friends and parishioners are really serious, if we are as ready and willing to fight for what we believe among the unconverted in Congress and back home, as we are to talk about it here in this comfortable hotel among the converted, then the next 6 months can prove indeed fruitful. Under President Kennedy's leadership and with both the executive and legislative branches controlled by the same party, we can begin to discover and apply solutions to a score of America's appalling backlog of unsolved economic and social problems. In this field and others, we may be able to accomplish more in the next 6 months than we have in the last generation.

Because of this enormous opportunity on our doorstep, I plan to concentrate on how the Federal Government can best contribute toward solutions of the migrant labor problem in the United States. I do not underestimate the contributions that have been and must be made in the future by States, by communities, by the churches, by other agencies public and private. But they have been far ahead of the Federal Government in this field, and the Federal Government has been desperately far behind in acknowledging, assuming, and discharging its responsibility.

What can the Federal Government do better than we can do in the States, or you can do in the churches? Or, since the Federal Government is after all no impersonal entity floating in space, but something that we maintain to serve our needs, what can we do more effectively and more equitably through our Federal Government than through any other institution? It can do these six things:

1. Protect children from exploitation in commercial agriculture, just as they now are in mines and factories;

2. See that schooling and child care are provided for children of migrant workers;

3. See that decent minimum wages are established for farmworkers, just as they are for workers in industry and commerce;

4. Help finance decent housing for migrant workers and their families;

5. Protect migrants and their families from exploitation by crew leaders;

6. End the undercutting of American labor standards by the mass importation of low-wage foreign labor.

First and most urgently in need of protection are the children. "The children, the children, you can't forget the children," as the late great Oscar Hammerstein had Gertrude Lawrence sing so unforgettably. Is it not high time we ended child labor in these United States, once and for all?

We got our children out of the coal mines and out of the textile mills through Federal action 23 years back, in 1937, with the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act under President Roosevelt. But thousands upon thousands of American children are still working for hire in commercial agriculture, not just doing the chores around father's farm. Federal law does protect children when school is in session, but not during the summertime's peak labor demand in agriculture.

I'm sure you have all read the militant article, "End Child Labor Now," in that most unmilitant periodical Good Housekeeping. This is an excellent summary of the problem facing us nationally. We have cases of migrant children coming north without their mother or father, in the dubious care of a crew leader's wife, to work all summer picking beans. Because of rurally dominated State legislatures, only a handful of States have succeeded in ending child labor. This is clearly a responsibility the Federal Government will have to assume, or it just won't get done.

Barring migrant children from working in the fields is not enough by itself. Leaving them back at the camp without any care or supervision creates new problems. The tested and proven answer is adequate child care centers for infants and preschool children, together with summer schools for school age children. More than just a device for keeping youngsters out of trouble, these schools have helped migrant children make up their average 1- to 3-year lag in educational achievement. They have helped these youngsters adjust more successfully to regular community schools in the fall. Undertaken with continuity and on a national basis, they should help us correct the tragic waste of human resources reflected in this stark statistic: 99 out of every 100 migrant children never finish high school.

We need not only schools for the school age children, but far more adequate child care facilities for the preschool youngsters. All we need here is the addition of one word, "migrant" to section 521 of the Social Security Act, which already provides for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children, and we need more adequate appropriations to the Children's Bureau to help States organize such facilities. Five already have done so. If a humanitarian Congress and administration were to provide real leadership, we could have them in every State where the numbers of migrant children require them.

This is a field where the migrant ministry has shown the way for the whole country, and where you know the need and the potential good that can be done better than anyone.

What is the root cause of migrant child labor? Certainly migrant workers love their youngsters no less than you do yours, or I do mine. The compelling reason is economic necessity. One family I talked to about it—their 6- and 8-year-old boys were picking beans with their mother and father when both the parents and children would have preferred them to be in school—explained that they had run up a $100 debt at the local hospital shortly before when the mother was having a new baby, and they were anxious to pay it off.

As you know, migrants are the lowest paid workers in our society—averaging $850 a year in wages from all sources. Twenty-three years ago, we covered most other workers in interstate commerce under minimum wage protection. Agricultural workers, underpaid, not unionized, needing such protection as much or more than any workers anywhere, are still left high and dry, 23 years later, without any protection at all. Only small progressive Hawaii and Puerto Rico have provided it.

But minimum wages in agriculture are clearly a Federal responsibility. The produce picked by migrants is shipped in interstate commerce to national markets. If you stand in an apple packing shed near Gettysburg while migrants are loading a refrigerated truck with crates of delicious apples, the packer won't decide whether to ship that truckload to St. Louis, Boston, or some market in between, until his broker advises him of the latest prevailing purchase prices by long-distance phone.

This job not only belongs to the Federal Government by right, but by necessity. Let's face it. We'll never get minimum wage protection for migrants any other way.

One proviso about extending minimum wage protection to agricultural workers—employers should not be penalized by the imposition of time and half rates for overtime work, as they are in industry. Workers lose so much working time because of bad weather, crops not being ready for harvest and other unpredictable idiosyncrasies of farming, that they want and need all the overtime possible. The Puerto Rican contract provides not only an hourly minimum wage, 80 cents last season, but also 160 hours a month guaranteed work—in effect a monthly minimum wage. This is the direction in which we should move.

For any of you who have spent any time in farm labor camps, I do not have to tell you about the appalling character of some of the housing. When I took on this job, this was the first thing that hit me, and it hit me not only between the eyes but in the nose as well. We had had regulations on the books for 30 years, but they had been honored more in the breach than in the observance. I recall one, a barn with the roof half gone which had been crudely divided into cubicles with beaver board and doors cut in the side. Obviously unfit for storing hay or animals, it had been converted for the use of farmworkers. We closed that in a hurry. I revisited that same barn this past summer and noticed that the owner had repaired the roof to make it weathertight, they had taken out the partitions and were storing hay in it again.

With the help of Dr. Jesse Reber, general secretary of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches, who has been a tower of strength throughout our battle for migrant labor in Pennsylvania, we revised our antiquated regulations and they have been enforced with increasing effectiveness.

The Federal Government has made a contribution in this field by working out and passing along to the States a set of standards for migrant labor housing from the President's Committee on Migrant Labor.

Farmers still complain of the lack of adequate funds to build adequate migrant housing, with hot and cold running water, screen doors, decent sanitary facilities, and heat for cold weather. Theoretically, loans are available from the Farmers Home Administration. But practically, this machinery does not seem to be working. Several bills in Congress would make loan funds available to farmers, farm cooperatives, communities, and community groups to build such housing, and require that the standards of the President's Committee be met. This is certainly one approach that ought to be tried. Many of us would also like to see in these housing bills, financial help for the migrant worker who wants to settle down and build a house for himself and his family, something like the self-help housing program in Puerto Rico. There, the labor is provided by the farmworkers with professional assistance on the tough parts and the materials are provided at low cost by the State.

Another area where Federal Government has a great contribution to make is in the regulation of crew leaders. Exploitation of migrant workers by their own crew leaders is easy to document. While most crew leaders are responsible citizens and perform a useful function, a few unprincipled ones supplement their incomes by overcharging in the camps' commissaries, illegally trading in liquor, in gambling, in prostitution, and the Oregon study showed up cases of trading in marihuana. Because of their multistate operations, it is most difficult to catch up with them in any one State and when you do, they only have to transfer their operation to a neighboring State without any crew leader regulations. We badly need Federal legislation to curb this kind of worker exploitation.

The sixth area where only the Federal Government can provide the necessary leadership is in controlling the importation of farm labor in order not to undercut American labor standards. Secretary of Labor James Mitchell has provided real leadership in this area and several bills in Congress would help bring the flood of 50 cents an hour farm labor under control.

Bills to cover all six of these areas, child labor, education and child care for migrant children, decent minimum wages, housing loans, crew leader regulation, importation of farm labor, were all introduced in the last Congress and I am sure will be reintroduced into the Congress convening in January. Leading the list of sponsors are Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, who has really been charting a new frontier with his special Senate Subcommittee on Migrant Labor; Senator MCNAMARA; Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Senator JAVITS, of New York; and in the House, Congressmen WALTER O'HARA, GREEN, of Oregon; BAILEY, MCGOVERN, MOORHEAD, DENT, and ROOSEVELT. Several of these bills I hold in my hand. Senator WILLIAMS, I understand, is scheduled to talk to us tomorrow about the bills studied by his Senate subcommittee.

In the interest of uniting all the friends of migrant labor around a single bill, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, had introduced an Omnibus Farm Labor Act. Its number in the last session was H.R. 11547. It includes almost all the points I have discussed here today plus several others of real importance, like removing the 1-year residence limitation for qualifying for public assistance, the establishment of an interstate system of migrant rest stops, the setting up of a Bureau of Migrant Labor in the U.S. Department of Labor, and the extension of welfare and health services to migrants and their families.

Congressman WALTER tells me he has been assured by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman MILLS, of Arkansas, that this bill will receive public hearings early in the next session of Congress. You and I can help mightily in assuring a favorable report by that powerful committee by testifying before it, or by writing to the chairman or by visiting with our own Congressmen between now and the convening of Congress in January.

Despite the undeniable progress made to date, the way we treat our migrant farmworkers is still an ugly scar across America from coast to coast and from border to border. Senator WILLIAMS, Congressman WALTER, and other leaders in the Congress have hoisted a standard to which men of good will can repair. Let each of us who considers himself a man of good will rally around that standard and do our part to assure every migrant worker in America the

same opportunity every other worker has to carve out a decent life for himself and his children.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, Mr. President, let me say that I have enjoyed very much the eloquent address which has been delivered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I think he has been eminently fair. I commend him; and I am willing to help him on some aspects of his work, particularly those dealing with health.

As to housing, as to the education of migrants, as to the statement in the telecast that there was no regulation of interstate transportation by agencies hauling these migrants, as to the scale of rents that was cited in the telecast, and as to many of the other details of the telecast, the Senator from New Jersey has been, of course, mercifully silent, because I do not see how anyone can justify or defend many of the statements made in the telecast. I do not believe anyone has taken issue with any one of the seven statements of misrepresentation in the telecast covered by my remarks.

I do not believe that the distinguished Senator has really taken issue with a single one of the seven statements of misrepresentation in the telecast which are included in my remarks.

Before he leaves the floor, however, I wish that he would allow me to state briefly, if I may, the situation in my State, which I know pretty well. I am a native. My father and mother were both migrants, having both come into our State, one from Virginia, and one from Georgia. They found a home there. However, they did not happen to be agricultural migrant workers.

It happens that the greater part of the people who employ migrant agricultural workers are themselves people who have come from other States, who have migrated into our State, people who know something of the aches and pains of displacement, as well as having tried hard over a period of years to establish themselves on a substantial basis.

May I say that around the Lake many of the people who have been there any period of time are ones who were affected by great hurricanes, one of them in 1926, that took 300 human lives, and another one, in 1928, that took 2,200 human lives. The people who stayed were hardy souls. Many of them can count missing places in their own family groups still, as a result of those hurricanes.

They stayed and fought inadequate drainage which had taken place up to that time, a lack of knowledge of the quality of the soil, or muck, as the case might be, and the other difficulties of combating the weather and finding crops which could be successful.

They have made good, after terrific strain and effort; and I think they are kindly people, who know something of the difficulties facing the migrants.

In our citrus industry, may I say, much the same situation exists. That industry was wiped out in the 1890's, and then again almost wiped out later, in this century; and many fainthearted people left their investments of a lifetime and went to other places. The people who stayed there and created paying grove properties are sturdy people who know the value of fair treatment, and they have tried to give fair treatment to those who work for them.

Both of those industries, vegetable and fruit, as the Senator knows, are seasonal. No such number of workers is required during the production months as is required at the time of harvesting, and sometimes the periods of harvesting are very short. They know they have to have these migrant workers. They have had to rely for a period of years upon migrant workers from the Caribbean area, because they could not secure migrant workers from this country. They have recruited them from as far away as Missouri and Arkansas, in an effort to get domestic workers. They are required to show a record of a strong effort to get domestic workers before the Department of Labor will certify that they are entitled to have people come from offshore lands, as the Senator knows.

As has been stated, so far as the migrant workers from offshore are concerned, they are well selected, law-abiding, sober people, who will do a good job; and yet our domestic migrant workers must be treated at least as generously as those who come from offshore, or our own consciences could not approve what was being done.

During the late fall, winter, and early spring, such workers are competing with workers in the great tourist industry, which includes visits from about 9 million people a year, and the scale of wages has to be such as to keep people employed in the necessitous work that they are doing if the crops are to be harvested.

All of these factors, and others which I could mention, have been added to the consciences of our own people that they have a job to do. And I think they are doing a good job.

I thank the Senator for his five different comments, and he may have made more—he has made more off the floor, but five in print—indicating the civic and humanitarian conscience and efforts which he has found in my State.

We do not claim we are doing a perfect job. We are perfectly willing to have our attention called to matters which should be corrected. We would much prefer, when we can correct those conditions, to do so through the industries which are involved or at our local or State level. We have made a great showing of serious interest at both levels, in the local or community level and at the State level.

While the Senator from Florida sympathizes with and appreciates the humanitarian attitude expressed and shown so ably by his distinguished friend from New Jersey, the Senator from Florida hopes the Senator from New Jersey will recall these problems are different in different parts of the Nation, and that, by reason of various facts, some of which I have set forth, we have a distinctly different problem in Florida from that which prevails in that large part of the country which has to depend upon the so-called "braceros" from Mexico or those who depend on other laborers from elsewhere.

We think we are doing a good job. We want always to do a better job. We welcome the kind approach which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey makes today, which so greatly differs from the approach made in the film, for which I can say nothing kind—a film which bore as its name "Harvest of Shame," which is an affront to every producer of perishable fruits and vegetables, who has given of his time, efforts, and best years to produce growing crops to be sold elsewhere. The name "Harvest of Shame" is almost the ultimate in insults to our fine people. And I am sure the Senator from New Jersey, who knows those people to be fine and honest people, knows they are trying to carry out the dictates of their consciences.

The Senator from New Jersey has not sought to defend the misrepresentations given in the film under that title, and for that I thank him. The film sought to create the impression that a grown woman could earn only $1 a day. It created the impression that help was being solicited at 70 cents a day. The Senator will remember that part of the analysis. The film tried to create the impression that there was no case of a college degree having been received by a child of migrant workers. If the Senator will read that statement in context he will agree that a casual hearer would have to ascribe that statement to the Department of Education, because it came immediately after the reference to what the Department of Education had said.

All those things were extremely unfair to a great people and a good people who have been supplying the winter vegetables and fruits, in large measure, for a great part of this Nation, and who depend upon the good will of the high-minded people of this Nation. It was an affront which cannot be overstated. It was an affront which our people will long recall.

I am glad the distinguished Senator, in making the summary of his own observations in this matter, has been content to adopt the restrained, splendid, and fair attitude he has adopted, upon which I commend him. I hope he will not think ill of our people, who feel they have been given every cause for anger and affront in this unbridled action of the CBS, which, knowing in some detail that the things they were about to put upon the air and to put in millions of homes were false, nevertheless permitted it to be done.

I thank my distinguished friend, who has spoken with great restraint. I commend him upon his fine humanitarian attitude.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I again express my thanks to my friend from Florida for his contribution to the RECORD. I am most encouraged by his suggestion of support for some strong measure which will at last show Federal concern for the migrant farm families.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Jersey for his continuing interest in this problem. It is a most serious problem. As the Senator has said, it is a problem which deserves national attention. It has not only national significance but also international significance.

Mr. President, I was a member of the Senate delegation which last week participated in a United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference at Guadalajara, Mexico.

One of the points under discussion, which was not put on the agenda by the U.S. delegation but instead was included by the Mexican delegation, was the Mexican farm labor program. Under Public Law 78 more than 430,000 Mexican nationals were brought in each year, 1957 through 1959, as migratory farmworkers. There was a slight decline last year, but it is clear that this program has an effect on wages and working conditions of domestic workers.

Within the past few weeks the newspapers of the country have carried stories out of southern California that a charge is being made that Mexican nationals are being used as strikebreakers, in an attempt to keep down the wages being paid in the truck-farming areas of that State.

The summary of the meetings with the Mexican legislators has not yet been prepared for publication, but I can say as a general conclusion that the questions raised by the Mexican delegates demonstrates the need for a careful review of Public Law 78 and for continuing attention to this problem.

Among the topics discussed were salaries and working conditions, insurance programs, food, and the manner of contracting for Mexican workers.

Some spokesmen for Mexico claimed that there was exaggerated contracting of workers in order to effect rapid harvesting, whereas with fewer workers the work could be spread to provide more stable employment.

Obviously, if there is overcontracting for Mexican nationals, the result is that the labor market, which is in part supplied by domestic workers, will be oversupplied.

Of course, these items could not be resolved by an interparliamentary conference. It is a matter for the Congress to clarify and to set proper regulations and safeguards—both for the protection of Mexican nationals and also to make certain that the Mexican farm labor program is not misused to the detriment of domestic workers and domestic agriculture.

I again commend the Senator from New Jersey for his efforts in this field.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am grateful to my friend from the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very brief but sincere remarks I shall now make be printed in the RECORD at an appropriate place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a genuine privilege for me to commend the services which have been given to the Senate and to the Congress, as well as to the country, by our esteemed colleague from New Jersey, the gentleman who has spoken this afternoon with such knowledge and such appreciation of the human elements which are and must be involved in the very complex problem of migratory labor.

It was necessary for me to leave the Chamber temporarily, or I would have spoken these words while the Senator from New Jersey held the floor. With his characteristic generosity, he has remained so that I might express these thoughts.

This is not in anywise a pleasantry to embellish the RECORD. I wish, only, to indicate my own personal appreciation, as a member of his subcommittee within the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of the very diligent, and devoted and practical attention which the Senator from New Jersey has given to a challenge which is national and international in scope. His efforts are in the public interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am profoundly grateful for the warmth and friendship in the remarks of my friend from West Virginia. I wish to say he has been a tower of strength and compassion in our work in the subcommittee on the problem I discussed.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S POWER POLICIES ARE SET FORTH BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as one who enthusiastically supported the election of the Kennedy and Johnson ticket, because I was confident it would bring new vigor to the Nation and to the free world, I am delighted to note yet another action of this administration which will increase the prosperity of our citizens at home and contribute to our strength as a defender of democratic government.

I refer to the policy statement of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, on the development of energy resources in the United States.

In refreshing contrast to the days now past when we were confronted with resistance and obstruction by the Republican administration to any proposal to develop the resources of this country for the maximum benefit of the American people, Mr. Udall has announced a power policy with which I agree wholeheartedly when he says:

> The furnishing of an adequate supply of low-cost power for the homes, farms, and industry sufficient to service a dynamic economy is a matter of basic importance to the economic growth and defense of the Nation and is, therefore, a matter of governmental concern.
>
> Utility systems of all kinds—Federal, State, municipal, private, cooperative—must carry out their responsibilities to the public welfare.

One of the locations in which this policy will certainly be put into effect with beneficial results is the State of Alaska, at the Snettisham project near Juneau. I have recently introduced, with the cosponsorship of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], legislation to authorize the construction of the Crater-Long Lakes power project, which would supply the area with badly needed low-cost power. This is a project recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation and which was endorsed by the outgoing administration. The construction of this project would bring new vitality to the Juneau-Douglas area by providing the power needed for industrial development of rich natural resources of the area, as well as supply power needed in increasing quantities for the citizens of the area. I look forward with anticipation to the cooperation of the Department of the Interior in obtaining speedy action on this proposal.

Another project—the grandest of all in the United States—where a dynamic policy of resource development will have far-reaching constructive results is the Rampart Canyon Dam on the Yukon River.

This is probably the greatest dam site in the free world. The Corps of Engineers estimates that a hydroelectric power installation here would have a capacity of over 4,500,000 kilowatts of power which could be sold at the bus bar for 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is a quantity of power greater than all the hydropower installations at TVA combined and over 2½ times that produced at Grand Coulee.

The construction of this mighty dam would show the world the United States is still a vigorous Nation with a strong economy and with vision to take action to maintain our position in the competition we face with the Soviet Union.

At this time, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a resolution of the Senate of Alaska urging speedy action to make this great hydroelectric power project a reality.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 11

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska in second legislature, first session assembled:

Whereas it is known that the primary and pressing need of Alaska is economic development; and

Whereas Alaska's economy is now in a period of transition from one based on construction to one based on the full development of natural resources; and

Whereas every means available for the economic development of Alaska must be utilized; and

Whereas the economic development of every country, including the United States, has inevitably and rapidly followed the creation of hydroelectric facilities and surplus electric power; and

Whereas one of the greatest, if not the greatest, potential hydroelectric sites in the world is located in Rampart, Alaska, on the Yukon River; and

Whereas the development of power facilities at Rampart would greatly enhance the future economy of Alaska, and the well-being and comfort of its population by providing extremely low-cost power to most of the State; and

Whereas the construction of power facilities at Rampart would not only guarantee

the economic development of Alaska and the comfort of its population, but it would act as a dynamic torch to the entire world to affirm the fact that the American democratic and free enterprise systems are the most vigorous and efficient forces existing in the world, and it would further provide other underdeveloped areas in the world a living guide for their own progress; be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska in second legislature, first session assembled, That the Government of the United States is respectfully urged to plan and construct, as soon as possible, the proposed Rampart Dam; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; the chairman, Senate Public Works Committee; the chairman, House Public Works Committee; the chairman, Senate Finance Committee; the chairman, House Ways and Means Committee; the chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; the chairman, House Appropriations Committee; the chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Mr. GRUENING. Likewise, Mr. President, on the same theme, yesterday I addressed in Dallas the 19th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

It was an impressive event, with nearly 8,000 delegates from all parts of the Union attending. The meetings were held in the fine Dallas Civic Auditorium, and, of course, the hospitality of the city authorities and of the officialdom of the NRECA left nothing to be desired.

Although I had been assigned the topic of "Resources Development," the declarations of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall on the administration's power policies struck me as being so pertinent and so appropriate for that enlightened audience that I could not refrain from making them the lead of my address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association annual meeting be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT—SECRETARY UDALL'S POWER POLICY

(By Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator from Alaska)

Friends of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association assembled for your 19th annual meeting.

Yesterday an important event took place which should be of great interest to your membership and to all the American people.

The event consists of a declaration of power policy by Stewart Udall, the dynamic and able Secretary of the Interior.

Secretary Udall at a press conference in Washington declared: "The Eisenhower administration regarded public power as something of a necessary evil. We regard it as a necessary good."

This, my friends, is a clarion call to progress. It is a summons to start marching to the New Frontiers which President Kennedy visualizes as essential for us to attain.

The Department of the Interior is the Federal agency which makes and carries out the power policies of a national administration.

The Department of the Interior is the Federal agency responsible for such resource development as is undertaken by or supported by the National Government.

This declaration by the newly presidentially appointed and senatorially confirmed Secretary of the Interior comes in less than a month after his assumption of office. It is a nice St. Valentine's Day remembrance.

It means that from now on the maximum and optimum use of the flowing water of our Nation's rivers will be sought and secured for the benefit of the American people.

It means the determination to supply at the lowest possible rates low-cost electric current for our homes, our farms, our industries.

It means that henceforth under these newly declared constructive policies of the Kennedy administration the tempo of our Nation's economic progress will be accelerated.

It means that new life, new vigor, new energy will be infused into the slowing pace which the American people have been held to under the shortsighted, unimaginative, retrogressive policies pursued in the last 8 years under the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

It means that the sound power policies of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry Truman by which the great Tennessee Valley development was conceived and carried out and the great dams of the West—Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and the rest built—will be resumed.

When in the closing days of his administration President Truman dedicated the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana, he said:

"Take a good look at it, boys; it's the last one of these you'll see for a long time."

He was right. His prophecy was accurate.

Instead, under the Eisenhower policies the greatest remaining power site in the 48—older—States, on the Snake River in Idaho, was turned over to a private power company. Instead of one great high dam which the Federal Government should have built and would have built, the people of the Northwest got three small dams, with the result that they will get one-half the power, at twice the cost, and no flood control and no irrigation. They will be forevermore burdened with the costs of that betrayal of the public interest.

This was the so-called partnership policy proclaimed by the late Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

This was the policy under which the public was and would be eternally saddled with the higher costs of a commodity essential to modern life and progress, second only in its essentiality to the air we breathe and the water we drink.

The newly declared power policy of Secretary Udall is likewise a prompt and vigorous move to check our Nation's mounting unemployment—now in excess of 5½ million Americans out of work. This recession is also a legacy of the shortsighted and unimaginative policies of the late, departed administration.

Not only is the newly declared policy of the Kennedy administration essential to the individual welfare of millions of Americans but it is indispensable to reestablish the Nation's strength in the cosmic conflict with the forces of totalitarianism that would destroy liberty on earth and establish everywhere the tyranny of a police state.

For as President Kennedy has made unmistakably clear, if we would be strong abroad we must be strong at home. If we are to carry on the leadership of the free world which, unasked for, has been thrust upon us, we must build up our own economy, our industry, our material and human resources. We must accelerate the annual growth of our gross national product which in the last 8 years has lagged behind the rate of growth of those nations which seek to bury us.

For, as President Kennedy pointed out while still a Member of the U.S. Senate, that with the exception of one previously planned project—the Colorado River storage project—there has been not one single multipurpose, basinwide project in our country in the past 8 years.

This refusal to develop our most basic natural resources, to provide, as President Kennedy put it the "material base" for the America of today and tomorrow has been justified in the name of economy. Actually, as we here all know, these great public power projects are not expenditures, but investments. Not only is the cost of construction repaid, capital and interest, to the Federal Treasury, but the development, the industry, the livelihoods generated return into the Treasury and into the national economy many times the original investment.

And so President Kennedy was quite right in stating of the previous administration's resource policies:

"The harsh fact is that they have been the most wasteful, extravagant, spendthrift programs since the great giveaways that followed the Civil War. We have recklessly dissipated the resources on which our strength depends. We have thrown away—heedless of our growing needs—opportunity after opportunity to insure that future generations of America will have the water, the power, the timber and the fertile land on which their prosperity will depend."

It is natural that I should make reference to the great and almost totally undeveloped power potentials of my State, the State of Alaska. It contains the greatest untapped hydropower resources on the North American Continent. Less than one-quarter of 1 percent of this potential has been developed. The only Federal power project in Alaska was initiated by the Truman administration. This one—at Lake Eklutna—supplies the power for the city of Anchorage, Alaska's metropolis, and for two adjacent REA cooperatives, the Matanuska and the Chugach, which like all the REA cooperatives within Alaska and the other States are the legacies of the foresight and action 22 years ago of the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt which established the policies and programs which we here celebrate this week.

But, our cities in Alaska, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, and others and our REA cooperatives will shortly be out of power to care for our growing population and our corresponding economic needs. These needs are recognized—now—as they have not been for the last 8 years, by the Kennedy administration.

"We must," said Senator Kennedy, "move rapidly to insure the proper development of the new American continent—the State of Alaska."

It was a happy term—"continent"—and a justified one. For Alaska is not merely a State; it is a vast region; the "last frontier," we Alaskans call it affectionately, and really one of the great New Frontiers to which President Kennedy beckons us. It is indeed a continent. It is a continent awaiting development, settlement, the extension to it of all that is best in the American way of life. Its development is not merely desirable for Alaska and for us Alaskans but for all the American people.

"We must," said Senator Kennedy, "meet the challenge of Alaska—the challenge to reap its abundance, build its strength, and provide a reservoir of natural wealth for a growing America. We must, of course, press forward with bold, vitally needed projects such as the Rampart Canyon Dam."

The Rampart Canyon Dam, the construction of which President Kennedy urges, is the greatest potential power project on the North American Continent, the greatest, probably, in the whole Western World. It will be located in almost the geographic center of Alaska, in the 10-mile-long canyon through which flows the mighty Yukon

River famed in the verse of Robert W. Service, the poet of the Klondike gold rush of the late 1890's, and in the short stories of Jack London. It now flows from its source just across the boundary in Yukon Territory, Canada, for almost its entire length of 2,200 miles across Alaska and empties into the Bering Sea.

The Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army, which is now engaged in preliminary studies, estimates the installed capacity at Rampart Canyon at over 4,500,000—possibly 5 million—kilowatts. Its generating capacity would be 2½ times that of Grand Coulee, and greater than that of all the hydropower installations of TVA. It would supply power at the bus bar at the rate of only 2 mills per kilowatt hour and could be supplied to users at tidewater at no more than 3 mills.

The area and capacity of the reservoir which would be created is of special interest—and as fabulous as the other facts about Rampart. An enormous manmade lake, 10,000 square miles in area, and larger than Lake Erie, would be created. The storage volume would be 1,300 million acre-feet, sufficient water, if distributed evenly to cover the land area of Alaska to a depth of 3½ feet, or all of Texas to 7½ feet (of course, we wouldn't want to see that done, for not all Texans are over 7½ feet tall).

Climatologists have indicated that this great lake would change the climate of interior Alaska by raising the temperature and thus lengthening the growing season for agricultural products.

Finally, the Rampart Dam would rival in capacity the great dams that Soviet Russia is building in European Russia and Siberia which a group of U.S. Senators, of which I was one, and your own Clyde Ellis and Alex Radin and other experts had the opportunity of seeing in the fall of 1959.

If the necessary appropriations to complete the engineering, economic, and social studies are forthcoming, construction of Rampart could begin in 2 to 3 years and completion take place by the end of this decade.

Meanwhile other power projects of lesser size, but needed before the completion of Rampart, are ready for action by the Congress. One of these is the Long Lake-Crater Lake-Snettisham project in southeastern Alaska to supply power to the capital city of Juneau and its surrounding area, and, we hope, to generate power for a newsprint mill to utilize the virgin timber resources of the Tongass National Forest.

At Lake Bradley at the southern end of the Kenai Peninsula, and the project to supply power to Anchorage and the three REA co-ops is almost ready for action, though it may find competition in the three great natural gas fields which have recently been discovered there and whose thermal plants might meet the area's needs as quickly and as economically. And other Alaska hydroprojects await further study and action.

It should not surprise many of you that the private utilities have already included Rampart Canyon Dam in their nationwide propaganda campaign against public power—against the policies which Secretary of the Interior Udall proclaimed yesterday and which are basic to the forward looking and forward moving purposes of the Kennedy administration.

Indeed Rampart Canyon Dam was denounced in one of the pieces of literature distributed to its stockholders by one of the private utilities which formed part of the now notorious Dixon-Yates combine, whose claim for indemnization from the Federal Government for the necessarily abrogated contract was recently rejected by the U.S. Supreme Court because of the conflict of interest and collusion which characterized its inception.

This nationwide propaganda campaign of the privately owned utilities is a reincarnation of one begun in the 1920's under the aegis of the late Samuel Insull, of Chicago, whose utilities empire top heavy with holding companies on top of holding companies collapsed along with similarly inflated corporate monstrosities in 1929, wiping out the savings of millions of American investors who has mistakenly placed their faith in this power propaganda.

"Never mind the expense," declared one of the utilities public relations men to an assembly of his fellow propagandists in that halcyon era, "the public pays the expense of this advertising."

And indeed the public did pay the costs of this brainwashing, for the farflung advertising was charged as an operational cost and was reflected in the higher rates levied upon the consuming public.

A thorough investigation by the Federal Trade Commission in the early thirties published in over 80 printed volumes recorded how the private utilities had engaged in a mammoth campaign, through press, radio, motion picture, in schools and colleges to pervert public opinion to their ends. Textbooks were rewritten and those which could not be removed or suppressed placed on a sort of "Index Expurgatorius Electricus."

"Is there any form of advertising, publicity and propaganda which you have not used?" one of the utility executives was asked.

"Only one, and that's skywriting," was the reply.

"What would you do," one of the neophytes in this propaganda training course asked one of the experts, "if someone presented the arguments for municipal ownership of a utility or for public power." The reply was:

"I wouldn't attempt to argue or reason with him, I'd merely pin the Bolshevik tag on him," was the reply.

That was the policy then. It is again the policy now. It was buried temporarily when an administration responsive to the public interest, that of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, came into office in 1933, and the privately owned utilities were trying to live down their disastrous course of action which resulted in the financial ruin of so many Americans—who had been investors in good faith.

But the policy is back now. Hardly an issue of a national magazine appears without a full page advertisement aspersing public power, proclaiming it to be socialism and falsely claiming that its cost is a heavy and unfair burden borne by the American public.

These advertisements make fascinating reading. I have a collection of them. There is one which pictures a small boy looking at four articles on a table. They are a Bible, a key, a pencil, and a ballot.

The advertisement asks: "Will you leave these to your children?" And it continues, "Men have died to leave you those four symbols of freedom," and then it goes into detail about them.

"A Holy Bible: Symbol of your right to worship as you wish." (First amendment, U.S. Constitution.)

"A door key: Your right to lock your door against illegal Government force and prying." (Fourth amendment, U.S. Constitution.)

"A pencil: Freedom to speak or write what you think, whether you agree with the Government or not." (First amendment, U.S. Constitution.)

"A free ballot: Your right to choose the people who represent you in Government—your protection against Government tyranny." (Art. I, U.S. Constitution.)

And then the advertisement draws the following conclusion:

"Half the world is trying to destroy these symbols and what they stand for.

"Even in this country, there are people who attack our freedoms, by trying to give the Government more and more control over American life.

" 'The Government should take over the doctors,' they say, 'and run the railroads, and the electric companies.' But what they mean is, 'Let's have socialized medicine, socialized railroads, socialized electricity.'

"Even though socialism is one thing most Americans don't want.

"It is wise for us to question and weigh the forces that influence our Government. It's up to us all whether we'll leave our children freedom—or socialism.

"Socialized electric light and power is one of the first goals of the people who want to push America down the hill to socialism. They've made headway and are working for more. Each step they gain is a serious threat to every home and farm and business—and everybody's freedom. That's why this message is brought to you by America's electric light and power companies."

Well we didn't lose our Bible, the key to our home, our pencil, and our ballot when TVA was built. We didn't lose our freedom of worship, freedom from search and seizure, freedom to write and speak as we please, and freedom to vote, even when Grand Coulee was built. And I suspect that if we build a few more such dams and get moving again our children will still be in possession of these constitutional liberties, the electric light and power companies to the contrary notwithstanding.

As I have pointed out the cost of this propaganda, running into millions of dollars, is charged back to the light and power consumers in their monthly electricity bills.

Recently, however, on last August 17, 1960, the Federal Power Commission issued a ruling disallowing the expenditures as part of the rate base for eight of these propaganda ads. The companies have appealed this ruling to the U.S. Federal Court for the Fifth Judicial Circuit.

Pending the appeal the advertising and the whole propaganda campaign continues. It is time for another investigation as far searching as the one conducted by the Federal Trade Commission 30 years ago.

Meanwhile let us be happy that we are now marching toward New Frontiers.

What President Franklin Delano Roosevelt said nearly 30 years ago in urging construction of the great Tennessee Valley Authority is pertinent today. Said he:

"This, in a true sense, is a return to the spirit and vision of the pioneer."

That spirit and vision, reincarnated by President Kennedy and expressed in yesterday's declaration by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, is with us again today.

Let us therefore rejoice that needed resource development is again on its way and march together toward the New Frontiers.

FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, subversive organizations have a remarkable way of burgeoning forth in some highly laudatory guise calculated to seduce unwary Americans. True to this deceptive pattern, there suddenly appeared in the New York Times of April 6, 1960, a three-quarter-page advertisement in the name of an organization which calls itself the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Appealing in the name of the "American tradition of fair play," sundry intellectuals, professionals, clergymen and businessmen are listed as supporting this ad designed allegedly to tell the truth about revolutionary Cuba. Indications now are that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is primarily dedicated to the task of maligning the United States in support of a hostile government 90 miles from our shores, a government working hand in hand with

the Soviet Union and its satellites. In other words, the committee is apparently interested in fair play for everyone but the United States.

The Fair Play for Cuba Committee publishes a bulletin called Fair Play edited by Robert Taber, one of the committee's founders. This publication has maintained a vituperative barrage against the American Government and the American press coupled with a consistent defense of the ruthless Castro dictatorship. In its issue of May 6, 1960, the publication apologized for Castro's failure to hold Cuban elections with the cry "What is the big hurry about elections in Cuba now?" It condemned the smokescreen set up around revolutionary Cuba by the press and other instruments of the Washington and Miami propaganda mills. In its issue of June 3, 1960, it denounced the thoroughly hypocritical policy our State Department has been pursuing. On July 22, 1960, the publication condemned "the reduction of the Cuban sugar quota by President Eisenhower," hailed "the announcement that the Soviet Union will purchase the surplus" and boasted that "the Cubans can themselves refine the Soviet crude oil" furnished to them. The Monroe Doctrine was vilified as a hoary document. In the same issue the Castro regime was glorified as being on the side of freedom and the worldwide revolution against colonial and semicolonial domination. Meanwhile the publication charged that there are "wild and irresponsible elements in the Pentagon," and "dehumanized cold war fanatics in the CIA and FBI."

Speaking of President Eisenhower's proposals for $500 million social and economic aid to Latin America, Fair Play for September 16, 1960, declared:

> It does not require any great study of the program to understand why the Cubans at Bogotá rejected it.

The same issue featured a statement by Dr. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, president of the National Bank of Cuba, in support of the principles of Marxism. In its issue of October 7, 1960, Fair Play railed at the State Department for urging Americans in Cuba to return home after they had been detained and harassed at different times and for various reasons by Cuban police. According to Fair Play for October 25, 1960:

> The two presidential candidates have contributed their bit to the mounting wave of anti-Cuban hysteria.

Again Fair Play for December 2, 1960, devotes itself to an attack upon U.S. intervention in Cuba, the presence of U.S. warships in the Caribbean. In protest against alleged American intervention the committee organized a picket line at the United Nations headquarters in New York on November 26, 1960.

During the recent anniversary celebration of the Castro dictatorship, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee organized a tour to Cuba in which 350 college students participated. The New York Times of January 2, 1961, quoted Robert Taber as stating that 100 members of this group had given blood donations for Cuban victims of dynamite bombs allegedly supplied by Washington. The next day the New York Times reported that members of the Fair Play delegation watched the parade highlighted by weapons purchased during recent months from the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc nations.

The Fair Play for Cuba Committtee appears before the American public in the guise of a strictly American organization independent of any foreign government. In fact, when Mr. Taber appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on May 5, 1960, and was asked about the financing of the $4,725 advertisement in the New York Times of April 6, 1960, which kicked off the activity of his committee, he specifically stated in sworn testimony:

> I think that I can assure the committee, to my knowledge, none of the money which was paid into this ad came from any foreign government or agent of any foreign government. We made no secret of the matter at the time.

The degree to which Mr. Taber and his committee are playing fair with the American people can be judged by the subsequent testimony of Dr. Charles A. Santos-Buch, a native Cuban and assistant pathologist at the Cornell Medical Center in New York City, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on January 10, 1961. Dr. Santos-Buch, with Robert Taber, was one of the founders of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In his appearance before the Internal Security Subcommittee he described fully the circumstances under which funds were obtained by the Cuban Fair Play Committee for the New York Times ad.

It seems that the members of the committee had succeeded in raising only $1,100 from private persons toward the $4,725 fee for the New York Times advertisement. Dr. Santos-Buch's testimony indicated that the balance of the money for the ad came directly from Cuban Government sources and that this was known to Taber. In fact, according to Dr. Santos-Buch, Taber made the arrangements and actually obtained the funds from Dr. Raulito Roa, a member of the Cuban mission to the U.N. and son of the Cuban Foreign Minister, and Professor Bisbé, the chief permanent delegate of the Cuban mission to the U.N.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any committee of the Congress should go about putting people on trial. However, the investigation of subversive or foreign intervention in pressure groups operating in this country is entirely proper and necessary to protect our internal security.

I am not interested in Taber as such. If he has broken any laws, that is for the courts to decide. But I am interested in protecting the investigative processes of the Congress. Here, there has been a direct conflict in testimony on a very material fact at issue in the subcommittee's hearings. I believe it is essential that every effort be made to bring Mr. Taber back before the subcommittee and confront him in open session with the allegations which have been made by Dr. Santos-Buch.

I am advised that the subcommittee has issued a subpena for Mr. Taber's reappearance before the subcommittee. The U.S. marshal, after three unsuccessful attempts to serve Taber, has returned the subpena with the notation:

> Unable to find the within named witness.

There have been press reports that Taber is now in Cuba and has abandoned the United States, but these have not been definitely verified. In the meantime, the U.S. marshall has been instructed to continue his efforts to properly serve Taber.

Mr. Taber has a distinguished background as a newspaper and radio-TV writer. It is hard to understand why anyone in his position would flee our country and give such undeserved support to its avowed enemies in Cuba. Nevertheless, the only inference that could reasonably be drawn from his continued failure to return would be that he lied during his previous appearance before our subcommittee and that he functioned as a foreign agent for Cuba in a betrayal of his Nation's interests.

Robert Taber, where are you? Why do you not return to America and clear your name? Your reputation for truthfulness—in fact—your loyalty may be at stake. I hope that you will reconsider your position and submit yourself to service by the U.S. marshal, or agree to voluntarily appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. This is the only way in which you can clear the record.

Mr. President, the Internal Security Subcommittee's investigation has revealed that the most significant activity of the Cuban Fair Play Committee to date was secretly financed by the Government of Cuba. It has also raised a very serious question as to the activities in this country of the Cuban delegation to the U.N., which warrants further exploration. And finally, it indicates some possible inadequacies in the enforcement of the Foreign Agents Registration Act if activities such as were disclosed can go unpunished.

I hope that these hearings have alerted the American people to these problems and that the subcommittee will persist in its investigation until all these issues are more fully resolved.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am glad that the distinguished Senator from New York has made his statement to the Senate. He has made a valuable contribution to the end that all may know the actual history of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. The operation of this group has been largely a deception on the American people, and a first-class fraud.

As the Senator will recall, when we first became involved in the subject in the Internal Security Subcommittee and heard witnesses in executive session, we were greeted with a most irresponsible kind of attack printed in a magazine of national reputation, without its editors having made any effort at all to ascertain the facts from the subcommittee.

This libelous article was published and all of us who are members of that committee were held up to ridicule. The article actually accused us, if not directly, certainly by inference, of having conducted an outrageously stupid inquiry involving a British drama critic. It accused us of conducting an inquiry without basis or without any jurisdiction or authority from the Senate. In my judgment this attack did great harm, in the sense that it must have confused a great many of our fellow citizens, and, of course, it brought the Senate into disrepute, in the minds of those whom the article misled.

As the Senator from New York has so well pointed out, the facts are now pretty well known. They could have been known so far as the magazine article was concerned at the time of its publication. The magazine charged the committee with having asked outrageously stupid questions. All the magazine editors had to do was to call up and ask, "What about these questions? Were any such questions asked?"

We would have told them, "No; no such questions were ever asked."

I commend the Senator from New York. It is a fine thing he has done. His statement will help the American people better to understand why this inquiry was conducted and what we tried to do. One result is that the American people will see that there is a reason for constantly being on guard and that we must look behind many of these fronts and organizations with high-sounding titles that appear on the surface to be all right. I believe this is particularly a matter of concern with respect to the young people of America, for this organization, as the Senator has told us, recruited young people from our colleges and paid their way to Cuba, to deceive them and mislead them, and then send them home to peddle lies and falsehoods to their young friends. That is reprehensible. It is almost unforgivable.

So I commend the Senator for his excellent statement and I thank him for making it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my friend from Connecticut for his remarks. He has been even more deeply involved in these hearings than have I. He has at all times maintained a dignified position. I read with shock the magazine article to which he referred. It was as if the writer had dreamed up something, it was so far from reality.

As Senator DODD pointed out, questions and answers were put in quotation marks in the article even though those questions and answers do not appear in the transcript of the hearings.

It seems to me that the merest inquiry would have disclosed the inaccuracy of the article. It was full of venom against the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. We who serve with him know, even though we do not always find ourselves in agreement with him on every issue, that he is a man of character and responsibility. I commend him for the leadership he has shown with reference to this subject. I know of his fine address some days ago. I feel strongly that the committee cannot complete its work in this field until we are able to question Mr. Taber, who was such a key figure in this whole picture.

I am informed that his wife is still living in New York and has greeted the marshal, but has told him she did not know the whereabouts of her husband.

I hope the marshal will continue his efforts until Mr. Taber can be brought before us.

RECONSIDERATION OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ACTION IN REVERSING ORDER OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD FOR CERTIFICATION OF A GREAT CIRCLE ROUTE TO TOKYO VIA FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a memorial passed by the State Legislature of Alaska which expresses the hope of Alaskans that President Kennedy will take immediate action to reverse a last-minute action of his predecessor at the White House which has had a disastrous effect on the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and, indeed, on the entire State.

On January 18, immediately preceding his departure from office, President Eisenhower saw fit to disapprove an order of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Trans-Pacific Route case which, among other effects, resulted in the disapproval of a long-hoped-for route from our Atlantic coast to Tokyo via Fairbanks, Alaska.

The overriding importance of establishing Fairbanks as an intermediate point for transpacific traffic, both as a service to travelers and as a boost to the economy of Alaska, leads Alaskans to urge that the new President reconsider the action of his predecessor as soon as possible. The expansion of international air routes to include Fairbanks provides the city with an important source of income and opportunities for employment which are vital to the economic health of the community. At this time, when the Nation is faced with an economic recession—nowhere more severe than in Alaska—it is our responsibility to utilize every opportunity which comes to us to establish new wealth-producing industry. The utilization of the Fairbanks Airport for this purpose is an obvious means of increasing the prosperity of the citizens of the area while providing better service than before for travelers to the Orient.

It is my hope that President Kennedy will recognize the crucial importance of this case and that he will immediately order the Civil Aeronautics Board to reopen the matter. The Alaska congressional delegation is urging him to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that this memorial of the Alaska Legislature be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable Members of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and the Members of the Alaska Delegation in Congress:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Alaska in second legislature, first session assembled, respectfully submits that:

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board recently recommended that Pan American World Airways be allowed to fly from New York through Alaska to Tokyo on the Great Circle Route; and

Whereas despite the recommendations of the Board and its examiners, the former President of the United States did on January 19, 1961, disapprove of this request for a new route; and

Whereas the approval of this new route would have a favorable impact on the economy of Alaska and would link two major population centers of the world by the shortest possible route; and

Whereas only 20 days is allowed for appeal from the decision of the former President:

Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges that the appeal and the request for certification of Pan American World Airways be favorably considered by the new administration and approval given to fly the Great Circle Route from New York by way of Alaska to Tokyo.

THE SITUATION IN THE CONGO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, already it is evident that the Communists are far more concerned with making political capital out of the unfortunate death of former Congo Premier Lumumba than they are with finding a satisfactory solution for the people of the Congo. Already the differences are obvious between those who really care for the welfare of the Congolese and those who only want to create further discord and trouble in Africa.

The contrast is painfully clear between, on the one hand, the Communist pretense of breast-beating and lamenting over the death of one man and, on the other hand, their policy of deliberately encouraging a civil war in the Congo so that not one but thousands of people can be killed. The Soviet Union and some of its friends have specifically recognized the regime of Antoine Gizenga in Stanleyville; the Soviet Union has called for the withdrawal of United Nations forces from the whole Congo; and it has promised to send all aid and assistance to Gizenga in his efforts to overturn the legitimate government of President Kasavubu and Prime Minister Ileo.

Mr. President, this is a blatant call to civil war. It is a deliberate and ruthless program to incite civil war. It is an attempt to drive out the peacemaking forces of the United Nations and to replace them by the murderous Communist forces who have apparently not tasted enough blood to satisfy them since the brutal massacres in Tibet and the repression of Hungary.

Mr. President, I believe the whole United States stands behind President Kennedy when he declares that unilateral interference in the Congo would be disastrous for the free nations of Africa, and for the whole world. What is needed now is strong support for the United Nations and for Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

It is indeed ironic that those nations which were most responsible for weakening the mandate of the United Nations, those nations which withdrew their own soldiers from the U.N. force, are now the loudest in blaming the United Nations for not being stronger and more effective in the Congo. Their very inconsistency should be a warning to us that their motives are not to seek peace but to stir up turmoil.

In short, Mr. President, there is no doubt that the great majority of the people of the United States are prepared to stand up for the United Nations and to take any and all steps that may be necessary to prevent large-scale unilateral Communist intervention in the political troubles of the Congo. They stand solidly and overwhelmingly behind President Kennedy on this issue.

PROPOSALS ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on January 31, I introduced with Senators FULBRIGHT and ANDERSON, of the majority party, and with Senators JAVITS, AIKEN, KUCHEL, FONG, and WILEY, my Republican colleagues, a bill to provide Federal support to the States for their educational needs.

I did so, as did my colleagues, believing that the scope and quality of education in the United States is the greatest long-range imperative of our country, and is today a necessity for our security, particularly in the fields of science and technology.

In introducing the bill, I said in the Senate that of course the new administration will introduce its own bill and urge its passage. Nevertheless, because we know the passage of any bill to provide Federal aid to the States for education will be difficult, I urge the administration to study the bill I have introduced for myself and my colleagues as a nonpartisan bill.

I believe that our bill would accomplish the basic objectives of a sound Federal aid to education bill and, among other things, would meet objections already raised that any such bill would lead to Federal control.

These are its chief points:

First. It would best meet the issue of Federal control, in that it would provide that the funds could be used for any expenditure for elementary or secondary school purposes for which educational revenues derived from State or local sources may legally and constitutionally be expended by such State.

As in the case of the bills introduced in 1947 and 1948 by the Republican Party, and by the Democratic Party in 1949, the purpose of the bill is to make certain that Congress will not attempt to dictate to the States the way in which the funds allocated to them should be used; it simply provides that the States may use the funds for any purposes which are legal and constitutional.

Second. It would provide funds to the States equivalent to $20 per public school child to (a) raise the quality of education in every State, rich or poor, and (b) enable the richer States to provide greater assistance for substandard, or needy, districts within such States—districts which exist in every State.

Third. It is based on the proposition that the quality of education in the neediest and substandard district must be of first concern. In addition to the $20-per-child amounts, the bill would provide graduated amounts to those States having the greatest need, based directly upon the "education gap" between State resources and a desirable minimum level of education.

Fourth. My second and third points carry out the equalization principle which grows from a basic ideal of our free system—equality of opportunity. It is designed to provide funds for substandard school districts first—in order of their needs—both between the States and within all the States. This objective of providing a minimum standard of quality of education, which is known in many States as a minimum foundation program, is understood and accepted by the States.

Fifth. Its cost is reasonable. Yet it would make it possible for all the States—by allocating 4 percent of their income to current educational costs, and by sharing equally with the Federal Government the remaining cost of adequate public education—to assure by 1965 public school education in every State and district averaging $400 per child, approximately the present national average.

Sixth. Because it is based on a 4-year period, our bill would provide a testing period for the Congress to observe the effectiveness of such a minimum foundation program, without interfering in any way with the State's choice of applying the funds to the needs it sees as most imperative. It would, I believe, stimulate the initiative of the States to meet the objectives of the bill—which are the State's objectives—that is, to raise the standards of education in the neediest school districts.

I note the administration has postponed the introduction of its own bill until next week. I have asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, to consider the provisions of our bill, with the hope that it may be helpful to the Department in the preparation of its bill.

As I have said, we have introduced this bill as a nonpartisan measure. I am glad that Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, have joined in its introduction, because our purpose is to secure the best bill possible and to assure the passage of a bill at this session.

Finally, I might say that our bill, while not similar in every respect, is based to a large degree on the principles of the bill introduced in 1947 by Senator Taft, of which I was a cosponsor. Members of the Democratic Party joined in introduction of that bill. It was truly a bipartisan bill, and it received the widest support from both parties, and in all sections of the country, of any bill that has been before the Senate.

Mr. President, since its introduction, the bill has been circulated to educators and school boards throughout the country, particularly to State boards of education. We have received a very favorable response from the educators who have read and studied the bill.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO APPOINT SENATORS TO ATTEND UNITED STATES-CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE AT OTTAWA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to name, during the adjournment of the Senate, the Senators to attend the official meeting of the United States-Canadian Parliamentary Conference, to be held in Ottawa, and that the Senators so appointed be granted leave of absence of the Senate from February 22 to February 27, in order to attend the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE W. F. NORRELL, OF ARKANSAS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate House Resolution 168, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable W. F. NORRELL, a Representative from the State of Arkansas.

Resolved, That a committee of nine Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT], I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 89) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. W. F. NORRELL, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of

the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with deep personal feeling that I express grief over the passing of Representative NORRELL, and I am certain I speak on behalf of all Senators on the Republican side of the aisle.

I served with Representative NORRELL during all the time I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I know of no Member who was more respected or admired than was he. He was always a courteous, gentle, and thoughtful Member, to whom one could go with his problems and get a respectful, thoughtful hearing.

He was not a shouter. He was a very quiet man and a very deep student of the problems allotted to him. He rarely spoke on the floor, except with regard to the matters which came under his competence in his work on the important Appropriations Committee. When he did speak, it was with knowledge and real insight into the problem he was considering.

His loss will be a severe one to his State and to the body in which he served.

On behalf of myself and all Senators on this side of the aisle who could not be here today, I desire to extend to his wife and to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], in his expression of sympathy and regret at the death of Representative NORRELL, of Arkansas.

I, too, was privileged to serve with him in the House of Representatives. Everything the Senator from New York has said about him is so true, as is known by all who knew him, and is particularly well known by those who served with him in the other body.

Above all else, he was a very kind man. He was a real gentleman, in the true sense of that word. He was always considerate of others. He was always just in his decisions, and he always spoke kindly.

He has left a mark that will not be forgotten by those who survive him.

On behalf of all Senators on this side of the aisle who are not able to be present at this time, I express our sympathy to the Norrell family at the death of this very remarkable man, a great American.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative W. F. NORRELL, I move that the Senate now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, to Monday, February 20, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16, 1961:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Jackson Graham, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642), vice Brig. Gen. William W. Lapsley to be reassigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Harold E. McCall

To be ensigns

Donald B. Beach
Richard B. Fallgren
David A. Field
Donald J. Florwick
Gerald Fussell
Ronald K. Hanson
Dee E. Kimbell
David L. Osier
Charles K. Paul
Frederick W. Pierce
John D. Reagan
Neil H. Woodley

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Henry R. Labouise, of Connecticut, to be Director of the International Coooperation Administration, in the Department of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Malaya.

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

George F. Kennan, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

David K. E. Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

Bernard Gufler, of Washington, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army, retired, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

IN THE ARMY

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Harvey Browne, Jr., O387461.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Alvin Daugherty, O337212.

Brig. Gen. Charles Adam Ott, Jr., O428375.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Alfred Smith, O189961.

Brig Gen. Collin P. Williams, O305510.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arthur Disbrow Bertolett, O296749, artillery.

Col. Thomas Sams Bishop, O403542, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. William Robards Buster, O947289, artillery.

Col. Lincoln Maupin Cummings, A292152, artillery.

Col. Chester Clarence Dawson, O319742, armor.

Col. Angus Ellington Irey, O358192, artillery.

Col. Ivan Edward Jackson, O289886, artillery.

Col. Joseph Nicholas Langan, O387953, infantry.

Col. Robert Francis Murphy, O369851, artillery.

Col. Ralph Sheldon Phelps, O370892, infantry.

Col. Francis Frederick Schweinler, O279772, infantry.

Col. Cecil Lee Simmons, O360399, infantry.

Col. Archibald Alexander Sproul, O406823, infantry.

Col. Herbert Alpress Vernet, Jr., O953606, infantry.

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Francis Halsey Boland, Jr., O233853.

Brig. Gen. Louis Dalhoff Burkhalter, Jr., O280416.

Brig. Gen. Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304.

Brig. Gen. Harold Friend Harding, O263728.

Brig. Gen. William James Sutton, O263659.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John George Cassidy, O309923, infantry.

Col. Stanley Warren Connelly, O4046538, Ordnance Corps.

Col. Ian MacLeod Davidson, O317046, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Theran Mc Davis, O283688, artillery.

Col. Shelden Douglas Elliott, O519660, Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Col. Robert Morse Ewing, O307711, artillery.

Col. James Deming Hewett, O910307, infantry.

Col. Harrie Stanley Keck, O340748, infantry.

Col. Robert Paul Schulz, O330078, artillery.

Col. Clifford Max Simmang, O342139, artillery.

Col. Willard Webb, O341298, armor.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provision of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Paull R. Hanson, AO3077196.
Donald H. Keller, AO3090543.
Richard N. Prater, AO3004221.
Page Sharp, Jr., AO3044722.
Eugene J. Yanity, AO3076726.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

William B. Akerly, AO3074908.
Duane D. Backhaus, AO3077477.

Henry R. Beckcom, AO2239840.
Robert C. Clark, AO3092241.
Clifford E. Loper, AO1906543.
William M. Rose, AO2274492.
James M. Terry, AO3074982.

To be captains, USAF (Medical Service)

Paul A. Albert, AO860752.
Warren F. Pippin, AO857469.

To be captains, USAF (Veterinary)

William E. Pace, AO2240693.
Jerry L. Welbourn, AO3045744.

To be captains, USAF (nurse)

Isabella S. Morris, AN2242042.
Lois J. Norris, AN2241897.
Ethel Stone, AN1912783.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Robert J. Brandt, AO3075306.
Robert S. Gordon, AO3075601.
Joseph R. Govi, AO3089884.
Frederick M. Key, Jr., AO3075092.
Jerome E. Sheiffer, AO3091121.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Dental)

Carroll G. Taylor, AO3089002.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Willard H. Bauman, AO3075416.
Johan E. Bayer, AO3073749.
James O. Bowen, AO3075583.
Dewey F. Brown, AO3045306.
Jerry L. Durr, AO3078283.
David S. Fairless, AO3078581.
Hubert E. Herrod, AO3079097.
Roger M. Kilton, AO3002402.
Robert V. Marraro, AO3043672.
Leland R. McGinness, AO3078719.
Dana F. McKinney, AO3076984.
Richard V. Middleton, AO3076899.
Herman L. Mullins, AO3076992.
Robert F. Nikolewski, AO3071689.
James M. Pence, AO2232668.
Norman R. Penner, AO3075415.
Frank J. Perri, AO3075504.
Arthur M. Silfen, AO3043731.
Roy K. Smith, AO3078989.
Stanley N. Yamamoto, AO3075684.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Veterinary)

Frank L. Black, AO3091476.
Roland C. Olson, AO3089657.
Norbert P. Page, AO3045739.
Harold G. Temple, AO3089123.
Judson D. Todd, AO3078458.
Walter W. Williams, AO3089274.
William G. Wisecup, AO3010738.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Leila F. Betts, AN3075557.
Patricia A. Corkhill, AN3074890.
Charlene R. Dean, AN3044963.
Reita B. Geiger, AN3044703.
Billie G. Matheson, AN1906629.

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Clayton A. Ainsworth III, AO3084242.
Richard W. Ayars, AO3094903.
Bruce E. Bassett, AO3083825.
Roger K. Brown, AO3082583.
Brady K. Fowler, AO3089486.
Victor C. Furtado, AO3085465.
David J. Giron, AO3090035.
Theodore E. Greiner, AO3089590.
Edward T. Hall, Jr., AO3088839.
Marian J. Humerickhouse, AO3055725.
Theodore H. Kittell, AO3088838.
George S. Kush, AO3086427.
James E. McWilliams, AO3085574.
William C. Nantz, AO3094897.
Phillip E. Smead, AO3093644.
William J. Walker, Jr., AO3086268.
James A. Wassmund, AO3073823.

To be second lieutenant, USAF (nurse)

Elizabeth A. Harbell, AN3090639.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major

Orville H. Daniel, AO590081.

To be captains

Maurice J. Beaucond, AO700893.
Richard F. Blakeslee, AO711113.
Shelby M. Corman, AO1910713.
Frederick Corning, Jr., AO742294.
Donald L. Fischer, AO2001400.
Lester A. Fowler, AO586097.
Jerry G. Garner, AO3025101.
Walter R. Geyer, AO2082424.
Charles H. Given, AO2222777.
Richard W. Harmes, AO2002034.
Arthur E. Herman, AO813699.
Joseph G. Herron, AO1903880.
Harlan C. Hobbs, AO2074218.
William H. Howard, AO1910386.
Glenn F. Howerton, AO782746.
Frank T. Hughes, AO752676.
Nick Kantar, AO825896.
John H. Kerfoot, AO583879.
Frank E. Kruse, AO842422.
Patrick J. Mango, AO746735.
James C. McCausland, Jr., AO871366.
Dennis E. McClendon, AO2046673.
Charles S. McCloskey, Jr., AO3014731.
Francis T. McCormack, Jr., AO1910628.
Eugene C. McKeever, Jr., AO2086992.
Milton S. Mitchell, AO2063926.
Richard F. Montgomery, AO2094551.
Henry W. Moos, AO2073192.
Harry A. Morris, AO2226713.
Samuel A. Myers, AO680683.
Donald R. Nicholas, AO1855900.
Jesse J. Perry, AO1858357.
Billy M. Poston, AO3016015.
John J. Powers, AO1910183.
Robert P. Reynolds, AO722614.
Roy W. Riehl, AO3018381.
David Rinzler, AO772884.
James E. Sanford, AO3015967.
Frederic E. Savage, AO745846.
Frank Schmidt, AO1651793.
Homer M. Simmons, Jr., AO3016716.
Peter Y. Stanton, AO3016892.
Kenneth H. Stevens, AO925905.
Leonard V. Sullivan, AO775639.
Henry J. Sydloski, AO587503.
Clifford V. Taylor, AO690605.
Warren M. Walker, AO863830.
John M. Weeks, Jr., AO696182.
Bernard B. Weinberg, AO692101.
Harland D. Williams, AO832531.
Leon A. Wilson, AO739878.
Sam H. Wilson, AO557997.
Robert C. Winters, AO3009448.
Leonard L. Wolfer, AO798934.
Frederick E. Wolfert, AO2070201.
Rex E. Wood, AO1795027.
Thomas B. Wright, AO776844.

To be first lieutenants

Harry S. Albert, AO3069273.
Hyman H. Album, AO3067967.
Merlin E. Armitage, AO3056615.
Curtis P. Balko, AO3070052.
Paul W. Bannon, AO3055303.
Philip J. Barger, AO3066034.
John C. Barrett, AO3071722.
Paul A. Baumann, AO3066310.
Jerry S. Beckley, AO3069109.
Rodney E. Bentson, AO3053987.
Don L. F. Bice, AO3056586.
Alfred E. Bills, AO3053922.
Tommy R. Binkley, AO3054643.
Loren F. Bjornson, AO3067897.
Virgil L. Blackwell, AO3053961.
Joseph J. Blum, AO3055575.
Lowren A. Bock, AO3027043.
Harold T. Boe, AO3055486.
Olin H. Bradley, AO3054427.
Harlan E. Branby, AO3056004.
Stephen E. Brannan, AO3054269.
Roger M. Briggs, AO3057514.
Clarence E. Brown, Jr., AO3054204.
Bryan R. Burnthorne, AO3070759.
Bryce R. Burrows, AO3067544.
Edward F. Campbell, AO3055920.
George A. Canterbury, Jr., AO3068968.
Richard J. Cappel, AO3054437.
Bobby J. Cardwell, AO3054093.
John B. Carson, AO3054984.
Jack R. Cassell, AO3064531.
Allan R. Castleberry, AO3027860.
William D. Castleman, AO3054608.
Donald E. Cavanaugh, AO3066967.
Norman Y. S. Ching, AO3066690.
Lowell H. Christensen, AO3067702.
Archie D. Christopher, AO3068525.
Larry D. Church, AO3066718.
Leonard F. Ciemniecki, AO3055407.
Raymond F. Clapp, AO3070671.
Charles R. Clark, AO3071778.
Margie M. Clark, AL3056492.
Richard H. Clark, AO3067076.
Robert N. Clark, AO3054988.
Richard B. Close, AO3069604.
Earl G. Cobell, AO3067659.
Jack C. Coleman, AO3070964.
James M. Conry, AO3054274.
Leslie H. Coody, Jr., AO3054224.
Gary D. Cool, AO3071790.
Donald E. Copeman, AO3066031.
Johnny E. Cormier, AO3056599.
Franklin H. Coursen, AO3055922.
David W. Coville, AO3056031.
John H. Cowles, AO3068684.
Harry R. Critchley, Jr., AO3070472.
Lowell J. K. Davis, AO3054098.
Robert W. Davis, AO3071073.
Peter J. Dawson, AO3067780.
Kenneth L. Deal, AO3066719.
Manuel A. Del Llano, AO3068511.
Lino F. DeMichieli, AO3070841.
Joseph K. Dennis, AO3071993.
Win E. DePoorter, AO3071940.
Elbert D. Derrick, Jr., AO3068722.
Frederic A. Devoe, Jr., AO3066896.
Christopher Dotterweich, Jr., AO3068119.
James S. Douglass, AO3049003.
Joseph J. Dubiel, AO3056032.
Robert L. Dunham, AO3054129.
Claude G. Dunn, AO3068402.
James M. Easthom, AO3006613.
Lester E. Easton, AO3068976.
Charles F. Eaton, AO3071091.
Robert E. Edgell, AO3055837.
John K. Edstrom, AO3068090.
Arthur L. Edwards, AO3066968.
Jerome E. Eller, AO3069426.
George E. Eldridge, AO3055283.
George J. Ellis, Jr., AO3066993.
Gerald S. Evelan, AO2210643.
Constantine N. Evgenides, AO3068610
Robert G. Ewing, AO3037562.
Neil R. Falk, AO3068091.
Fred G. Farthing, Jr., AO3069933.
Louis F. Feddern, AO3054167.
James E. Ferrier, AO3070816.
Robert W. Fields, AO3070776.
Lawrence E. Finch, AO3070603.
Wayne R. Fischer, AO3070346.
Edward J. Fisher, AO3056034.
Richard A. Flagg, Jr., AO3067058.
Earl L. Flora, AO3071995.
Douglas J. Ford, AO3036009.
Wyndell F. Fordham, AO3058055.
Eugene T. Fortson, AO3070692.
David R. Forward, AO3068224.
Charles E. Foster, Jr., AO3067170.
Joe C. Fouts, AO3056078.
Joseph E. Franell, Jr., AO3056607.
Harry R. Frantz, AO3068807.
Thomas E. Franz, AO3056035.
Benjamin F. Fruehauf, Jr., AO3056119.
Roy C. Gage, AO3054455.
James L. Galbraith, AO3068750.
Ronald E. Gardner, AO3071934.
William L. Garner III, AO3071066.
Oswald T. Geiger, Jr., AO3053971.
Jack H. Geist, AO3050629.
Ignatius J. Gennaci, AO3067866.
Gary H. Gerlitz, AO3083473.
Lee W. Gholson, AO3052670.
Ivan J. Gift, AO3071359.
Bill C. Gilbert, Jr., AO3054459.
David W. Gillespie, AO3068014.
James N. Gilliland, AO3070039.

John A. Glover, AO3054169.
James R. Gooderham, AO3056611.
Bruce A. Gosnell, AO3055593.
Joseph A. Gray, AO3087560.
James T. Greshel, AO3068985.
Donald G. Griffin, AO3087561.
William J. Griffin, AO3071981.
David I. Gross, AO3023543.
Maurice L. Gross, AO3068986.
Richard A. Grotte, AO3068566.
James T. Groves III, AO3054723.
Albert C. Guidotti, AO3069238.
Mark M. Guillory, AO3054326.
Freddie A. Gustafson, AO3069539.
Keith N. Hall, AO3068567.
John T. Halley, AO3055099.
Bobby F. Hammett, AO3054233.
Gerald J. Hannah, AO3065809.
Donald W. Harclerode, AO3026503.
Bernard D. Hartman, AO3055343.
Dwight D. Hartzell, AO3069113.
Reginald H. Hathorn, Jr., AO3054036.
Karl F. Hebenstreit, AO3068179.
John C. Herring, AO3069246.
Jack M. Hershey, AO3054134.
Karl D. Hezel, AO3066862.
Edward L. Hickey, AO3070415.
Thomas J. Hickey, AO3055598.
Lisle O. Hicks, AO3066728.
David B. Hightower, AO3070880.
Jane H. Hightower, AL3059972.
Henry C. Hill, AO3054469.
Donald W. Hillman, AO3068350.
George W. Hillyer III, AO3070607.
Stephen B. Hinderliter, AO3067669.
Roy C. Hinkle, AO3067377.
Robert R. Hippler III, AO3028233.
Richard L. Holdeman, AO3055100.
Alfred T. R. Holderbach, AO3059505.
Marcus M. Holmgren, AO3069715.
Donald C. Houldsworth, AO3067061.
Garnet R. Howard, AO3018407.
Thomas H. Howshar, Jr., AO3053964.
Robert L. Hruby, AO2211545.
Jack Hudspeth, AO3055037.
Richard M. Huff, AO3069508.
Stephen L. Huffaker, AO3069896.
Dick T. Hunt, AO3066863.
Webb H. Huss, Jr., AO3055065.
Richard J. Indelicato, AO3067062.
Charles M. Iott, AO3066821.
Forrest E. Jackson, AO3068840.
Ronald M. Jackson, AO3070334.
Richard L. Jacobson, AO3070421.
Fredrick B. Jaicks, AO3053972.
Robert N. James, AO3055727.
John A. Jankowski, AO3067118.
Darvin D. Johnson, AO3067931.
Gary L. Johnson, AO3068724.
Stewart W. Johnson, AO3069429.
Gerald L. Jones, AO3068725.
Norman B. Kamhoot, AO3067739.
Hubert T. Kean, Jr., AO3056521.
David S. Kelsey, AO3067939.
Lloyd N. Kenagy, AO3069321.
Jerome A. Kippenberger, AO3068068.
Richard H. Klodnicki, AO3070073.
Richard L. Kohlhaas, AO3071848.
Kenneth W. Kreger, AO3055602.
Norman Kristic, AO3068656.
William D. Laemmel, AO3067184.
Wayne O. Landen, AO3004634.
Zane L. Lantz, AO3068996.
Martin F. Lapp, AO3067551.
Patricia D. Latham, AL3056639.
Michael B. Latus, AO3069410.
Charles W. Lawson, AO3055844.
Ivins N. Lawton, AO3068790.
Thair D. Layne, AO3054858.
Harry E. Lee, AO3050984.
Charles A. Lehman, AO3068101.
Carl R. Leonard, AO3071763.
John Lesser, Jr., AO3055244.
Robert R. Leverette, AO3054962.
William H. Lilliedahl, AO3067236.
Donald P. Litke, AO3055246.
Joseph P. Loftus, Jr., AO3051518.
Howard B. Long, AO3056418.
Dorman H. Lott, AO2245884.
William F. Loveland, AO3068925.
Edward S. Lucas, AO3055927.
Charles G. Luse, AO3055845.
Daniel R. Luthringshauser, AO3053323.
Billy S. Lyons, AO3055958.
Alan R. MacLaren, AO3067035.
Gerald E. Mansell, AO3069964.
Charles R. Mansfield, AO3054008.
John H. Martin, AO3056421.
John E. Mattiucci, AO3037265.
Frank D. Mayberry, AO3055847.
Edward M. McCartney, AO3068927.
Russell J. McClintock, AO3054680.
Charles C. McDonald, AO3070340.
Robert B. McEwen, AO3068482.
Larry E. McGovern, AO3069116.
William D. McGuth, AO3067481.
James T. McKenzie, AO3068238.
Jerrold L. McKenzie, AO3068447.
Edward A. McLaughlin, Jr., AO3067244.
Eugene A. Meiler, AO3069386.
William L. Mellon, Jr., AO3066537.
Clayton L. Menefee, AO3068417.
Richard O. Meyer, AO3068104.
George D. Midgley, AO3069002.
Juan H. Migia, AO3053968.
Jerry D. Miller, AO3054140.
Lewis L. Miller, AO3055139.
Robert C. Miller, AO3070044.
Stanley J. Miller, AO3069389.
Henry K. Mills, Jr., AO3069815.
Bruce K. Mitchell, AO3069726.
Leonard A. Montague, AO3068136.
Richard A. Moore, AO3068449.
Arvel R. Morgan, AO3070520.
Gerald L. Mouton, AO3054343.
Robert R. Muckelbauer, AO3067596.
Dean M. Murphy, AO3069646.
Gerald E. Murphy, AO3054207.
Harold G. Murphy, AO3056543.
Reginald A. Murray, AO3067410.
Carl W. Myers, AO3055550.
George F. Myers, AO3070985.
Jay I. Nathan, AO3070065.
Robert E. Nay, AO3070290.
Donald W. Neal, AO3069006.
Joseph J. Neff, AO3069392.
Jerry D. Neiswanger, AO3055349.
Harold Nelson, Jr., AO3068105.
Minor W. Nelson, AO3054773.
Jerome L. Newton, AO3055227.
Clayton S. Nichols, Jr. AO3068767.
Richard R. Nixon, AO3068541.
Rex P. Ohlemeier, AO3066977.
Terry F. Olmsted, AO3055291.
Thomas R. Olsen, AO3054506.
Thomas E. O'Malley, AO3069393.
Charles A. Osinski, Jr., AO3070062.
Ronald C. Overby, AO3069459.
Robert L. Padgett, AO3065918.
Forrest W. Paige, AO3049086.
Herbert D. Paul, AO3055461.
Robert G. Penley, AO3054208.
Donald A. Pierce, AO3068729.
Lee R. Pitzer, AO3049041.
Auguste J. Planchon, AO3068489.
Walter T. Pokorny, AO3067962.
Albert F. Porta, AO936852.
John M. Porter, AO3046843.
James K. Potts, AO3055252.
John W. Powell, AO3055352.
Jerry O. Price, AO3066678.
Robert L. Ransom, AO3069552.
Johnnie R. Reeder, AO3070211.
John M. Relic, AO3069966.
Paul E. Rentner, AO3055755.
James D. Reynolds, AO3069950.
George P. Rice, AO2210156.
Owen W. Riddle, AO3071651.
Ralph O. Riojas, AO3054775.
Andrew S. Ritchie, AO3054051.
Richard D. Robbins, AO3069871.
Richard M. Roberds, AO3066832.
Bernard J. Rodden, AO3069396.
Robert M. Rodriguez, AO3069090.
Glen H. Rudy, AO3068034.
Marion T. Ruple, Jr., AO3071992.
Robert M. Russ, AO3071097.
Menno J. Sahm, AO3068795.
Peter H. Sammet, AO3055831.
Walter R. Samson, AO3070995.
Einar J. Samuelsen, AO3065865.
Earl E. Sands, AO3054698.
Lloyd G. Sawyers, AO3027979.
Arthur W. Saylor, AO3069265.
Peter T. Sayre, AO3070573.
Gary L. Scarboro, AO3054211.
Paul H. Scheerer, Jr., AO3067098.
Stanley P. Schneider, AO3068452.
George D. Schreiner, AO3069479.
Gilbert C. Schutza, AO3070160.
Charles W. Seck, AO3068375.
Richard L. Shelton, AO3071434.
Ralph V. Shepherd, AO3066552.
Thomas M. Sherrill, AO3056576.
Norman R. Shirley, AO3056567.
Paul L. Shockley, AO3070182.
John W. Silvis, AO2221862.
George W. Simpson, AO3069350.
Janet R. Simpson, AL3059992.
Barry J. Smith, AO3054633.
Gary G. Smith, AO3056568.
Jay W. Smith, AO3067156.
John L. Smith, AO3054212.
Lawrence E. Smith, AO3056570.
Scott W. Smith III, AO3055230.
Rex K. Snider, AO3070030.
Charles A. Spellman III, AO3068797.
James E. Spencer, AO3054876.
James P. Springs, Jr., AO3055087.
Hanns M. Stabenau, AO3067352.
Anton J. Stankowski, Jr., AO3055673.
William T. Stanley, AO3055026.
William D. Staton, AO3054307.
John R. Stevenson, AO3070380.
Phillip R. Stiles, AO3054018.
Kenneth E. Stockard, AO2223200.
Charles J. Stockstill, AO1864275.
Loue A. Stockwell, AO3068680.
John J. Stratford, Jr., AO3087503.
Neil J. Sullivan, AO3067011.
William A. Swann, Jr., AO3077245.
David F. Sweeney, AO3065632.
Morris D. Swensen, AO3069914.
William A. Swenson, AO3069915.
Richard M. Tachibana, AO3054532.
Wendell L. Tackett, AO3055853.
Russell J. Tagliareni, AO3067828.
George R. Taylor, AO3065271.
William F. Tesmer, AO3069099.
Anthony J. Thomas, AO3027699.
Edgar A. Thomas, AO3069024.
Andrew C. Thompson, Jr., AO3087510.
Kenneth W. Thomson, AO3066059.
John R. Thurston, AO3068278.
Donald N. Torbert, AO3070005.
Richard W. Towne, AO3069766.
Clifford J. Trimble, AO3087514.
Joseph F. Tuso, AO3080121.
Ted D. Tyus, AO3055328.
Ralph J. Urevich, AO3067966.
Edwin S. Usui, AO3066709.
Doyle L. Van Arsdale, AO3070360.
Wilson R. Vance, AO3054117.
Richard T. Van Slambrook, AO3070654.
Jan M. Van Weele, AO3067359.
Ronald L. Vargo, AO3052990.
Paul E. Vining, AO3069833.
Conrad L. Wade, AO3054706.
Richard N. Wagner, AO3027407.
William C. Warren, AO3087517.
Theodore W. Weber, AO3069361.
Nancy E. Weidenmiller, AL3059892.
William E. Wells, AO3071682.
Gregory R. West, AO3069565.
Edward C. Westwood, AO3069835.
Ralph F. Wetzl, AO3071283.
Joseph T. White, AO3068554.
Paul S. Whitehead, AO3087632.
Frederick R. Williams, AO3055279.
Hugh P. Williams, AO3067954.
LeRoy S. Williams, AO3005430.
Thomas N. Williams, AO3070169.
Alan R. Williamson, AO3069920.
Edward A. Willming, AO2204416.
Duane R. Wilson, AO3055854.
Sam R. Winborn, Jr., AO3071133.
Robert J. Wise, AO3055999.
Gayland B. Witherspoon, AO3055969.
Duane M. Witte, AO3070753.
Travis Wofford, AO3054156.
John W. Wolfe, AO3055566.
John S. Yankey III, AO3055378.
Robert G. Zimmerman, AO2224645.

To be second lieutenants

William B. Adams, Jr., AO3086524.
James W. Allison, AO3085760.
George B. Ames, Jr., AO3098468.
Dennis L. Anderson, AO3085671.
Henry J. Anderson, AO3093620.
Nicholas J. Angelides, AO3086815.
Kenneth L. Atkins, AO3094334.
John C. Atkinson, Jr., AO3094314.
Bruce H. Baker, Jr., AO3086237.
William D. Ball, AO3094742.
Wade L. Barghausen, AO3094767.
William J. Barthelmas, Jr., AO3093138.
Loren E. Bartley, AO3094367.
Ronald L. Barton, AO3086075.
John K. D. Berry, AO3094252.
Wylie E. Berry, AO3093051.
Lawrence F. Beyer, AO3085978.
James L. Biggs, AO3093184.
Samuel A. Blank, AO3093647.
Stanley A. Bohinc, AO3084569.
Robert V. Brack, AO3073988.
Foster C. Bradley, AO3086204.
Ernie D. Braunschweig, AO3094100.
Quentin R. Broeren, AO3094898.
Dwight Brown, Jr., AO3074235.
Howard L. Brown, Jr., AO3085545.
Kevin Brown, AO3095503.
Willard B. Brown, Jr., AO3087355.
Peter S. Browne, AO3081912.
Philip R. Burger, Jr., AO3086768.
Harold L. Caddell, AO3073341.
James M. Caldwell, Jr., AO3086713.
Michael R. Carlson, AO3093427.
Charles K. Carter, AO3095204.
Eugene C. Ceglowski, AO3093089.
Phillip D. Chadsey, AO3095239.
Jack W. Christensen, AO3085520.
Ray F. Clifton, AO3093762.
Louis L. Clipp, AO3083500.
James T. Cooper, AO3094122.
Marinda J. Coultas, AL3060742.
James W. Cowan, AO3086246.
Carrol P. Crombie, AO3086716.
Graham P. Crow, AO3083891.
Jon D. Crowley, AO3086137.
Derald L. Cruse, AO3085590.
George A. Cude, AO3094910.
Harold Cummings, AO3086223.
Leland J. Cupples, AO3093651.
Brian H. Currie, AO3093735.
Walter J. Czagas, AO3085461.
Anthony F. Czajkowski, AO3094089.
Ford G. Daab, AO3087423.
Louis E. Daharb, AO3093601.
Denny F. d'Lelio, AO3094692.
Charles D. Davis, AO3087293.
LeRoy L. Davis, AO3085947.
James E. Dearman, Jr., AO3094419.
Donald R. De Laney, AO3094134.
Michael W. DeNicola, AO3094439.
Robert G. Denison, AO3087226.
Frank R. Denton, Jr., AO3101211.
Lee G. Dickinson, AO3073670.
Richard D. Dickover, Jr., AO3094191.
James M. Diehl, AO3086701.
Donald W. Dill, AO3082458.
Kenneth E. Dillner, AO3086464.
Stephen G. Dizek, AO3093628.
Charles L. Dodds, Jr., AO3095147.
Duncan E. Dodds, AO3053994.
Thomas Domingues, Jr., AO3082159.
Donald A. Doran, AO3055712.
John R. Doughty, AO3093219.
Leslie R. Drane, Jr., AO3086276.
Kenneth J. Drye, AO3082620.
Roderick M. Duncan, AO3081996.
Donnie R. Duplissey, AO3098871.
Michael W. Easley, AO3094330.
Robert C. Ehrenstrom, AO3085739.
John H. Ellerman, AO3087332.
Robert J. Ellinger, AO3094242.
Charles D. Elliott, AO3084186.
Robert B. Elliott, AO3094634.
Donald S. Engle, AO3083015.
Richard W. Enz, AO3085549.
Don R. Ervin, AO3094841.
Robert C. Evans, AO3085674.
James G. Fagnant, AO3095189.
Thomas H. Fatheree, AO3086166.
Barry E. Feinberg, AO3085662.
Barry L. Feldpausch, AO3094021.
Sigmund Fensel, AO3093230.
Roger G. Ferguson, AO3085834.
Thomas R. Ferguson, Jr., AO3083257.
Ernest R. A. Flemig, AO3085523.
Roger A. Flocken, AO3093434.
Gordon E. Fornell, AO3093809.
Gale E. Fosse, AO3085868.
Jac L. Fowler, AO3087055.
Robert D. Fox, AO3072503.
Donald R. Franks, AO3087228.
Claude R. Frazer, AO3086953.
Edward D. Frease, AO3094664.
James E. Funk, AO3086076.
Kenneth L. Furbush, AO3093768.
Marvin D. Ganote, AO3094160.
Gerald L. Gardner, AO3087229.
Robert H. Gardner, AO3087230.
Douglas N. Gerbaz, AO3086467.
John A. Giessman, AO3094392.
Ronald G. Gilbert, AO3093581.
William W. Gilmer, AO3085861.
John G. Girod, AO3070442.
Clarence B. Givens, AO3094061.
David S. Glick, AO3093149.
Jacob F. Goble, AO3093602.
Henry W. Goetz, AO3086779.
Robert M. Gogal, AO3085468.
Linwood O. Grant, AO3081777.
Jerry E. Gray, AO3095205.
Donald C. Green, AO3086341.
John H. Green, Jr., AO3101235.
Terry C. Green, AO3093320.
Danny L. Greenman, AO3072506.
John P. Greenwalt, AO3087439.
Robert W. Greer, AO3093811.
James H. Grey, AO3086822.
Cleon H. Gunderson, AO3072581.
Thomas R. Hadfield, AO3086318.
Charles H. Hadley, AO3093301.
George D. Hagans, Jr., AO3093067.
Mickey O. Hagg, AO3094116.
George A. Hall, AO3093190.
Kenneth J. Hamrick, AO3093034.
John K. Hane III, AO3085862.
Jack R. Harrington, AO3093604.
Timothy J. Harrington, AO3086436.
John C. Hartney, AO3094407.
James G. Harvey, AO3067030.
Robert L. Hary, AO3086976.
Robert P. Hastings, AO3086661.
Paul A. Haugen, AO3085329.
Max L. Hearn, AO3094238.
Harold J. Hebert, AO3093814.
Howard H. Heckes, Jr., AO3093504.
Henry L. Heimendinger, AO3085702.
Robert W. Heller, AO3086077.
Leroy H. Hellman, AO3094659.
Alan E. Hendrickson, AO3082000.
Theron A. Henry, Jr., AO3086255.
Samuel C. Herrin, Jr., AO3101080.
LeRoy J. Hershberger, Jr., AO3094682.
Robert M. Hess, AO3074519.
Joseph M. Hitzell III, AO3087115.
Robert P. Hohlstein, AO3086998.
Jerry D. Holmes, AO3085114.
Paul R. Holmes, AO3087444.
Ralph B. Holtmann, AO3087194.
Robert L. Hoover, Jr., AO3093081.
Richard M. Horning, AO3098159.
Marvin T. Howell, AO3094079.
Paul D. Hunter, AO8081947.
Thomas L. Hurd, AO3094668.
Robert D. Husemoller, AO3093505.
William H. Hyde, AO3094688.
Howard B. Iversen, AO3087384.
Edward F. Jaekle, Jr., AO3085510.
Alan J. Jankowski, AO3093234.
John E. Jaques, Jr., AO3095207.
David F. Jaquish, AO3086727.
Jerry J. Jenkinson, AO3094525.
Donald L. Jensen, AO3093676.
Maurice S. Jo, AO3093677.
Robert L. Johns, AO3086601.
Donnelly J. Johnson, AO3073259.
Franklin D. Johnson, AO3086978.
Jerry M. Johnson, AO3093438.
John O. Johnson, AO3094304.
Raymond A. Johnson, Jr., AO3094877.
Richard A. Johnson, AO3094570.
Richard G. Johnson, AO3093350.
Robert M. Johnson, AO3086230.
Jerry P. Joiner, AO3086177.
Harry A. Jones, AO3086728.
Wilford J. Jones, AO3087343.
John E. Jordan, AO3093746.
LaVerne G. Junkmann, AO3093899.
Edwin S. Kahn, AO3094050.
Royce F. Kapeller, AO3094915.
Max J. Katz, AO3082054.
Gordon C. Kearl, AO3083731.
Robert P. Kellar, AO3086666.
Robert J. Kellogg, AO3085495.
Vincent T. Kelty, Jr., AO3094261.
Stevenson E. Kemp, AO3094152.
Virgil D. Kempton, AO3094774.
James S. Kennedy, AO3094044.
Kenneth J. Kennedy, Jr., AO3086847.
Edward A. Kern, AO3067708.
Donald E. Kernutt, AO3086941.
Raymond C. Kerr, AO3082893.
David A. Kerzie, AO3095099.
David C. Kessler, AO3086582.
William P. Ketchum, AO3085743.
Jerald C. Kindred, AO3095246.
Richard C. Kirk, Jr., AO3093843.
Donald D. Kirkwood, AO3087260.
Robert L. Kline, AO3094166.
Karl E. Klute, AO3098222.
Orin I. Knutson, AO3094240.
William G. Koch, AO3093486.
Charles T. Kochi, AO3085600.
Henry C. Kohl, AO2220211.
Edward C. Kraft, Jr., AO3087214.
Karl K. Kramer, AO3085722.
Wayne A. Kromi, AO3094034.
William J. Krouse, AO3085472.
David H. Kuebler, AO3096253.
Gerald J. Kurowski, AO3093235.
William E. Lacy, AO3087368.
David O. Ladley. AO3094294.
Richard H. Lady, Jr., AO3086603.
Paul D. Langston, AO3086488.
Kenneth P. LaRonde, AO3094817.
Warren A. Larson, AO3074419.
Robert F. Latham, AO3085840.
John R. Laurence, AO3086690.
Dymus N. Lawrence, AO3086839.
Raleigh E. Lawrence, AO3087463.
Phillip W. Lazier, AO3082470.
William J. Leeper, AO3073914.
David K. Lehnertz, AO3085556.
Gary P. Lemmon, AO3087465.
Harry G. Leonard, AO3094065.
David W. Lester, Jr., AO3085981.
Robert H. Lilac, AO3085781.
James Lilly, AO3094562.
Norman R. Lindsay, AO3093224.
Nicholas J. Locascio, AO3095113.
Edgar W. Lorson, AO3093532.
Max H. Lovingood, AO3095084.
Melvin R. Lucht, AO3082430.
Roger J. Lueschow, AO3085557.
James A. Luisi, AO3073484.
William C. Lunden, AO3085476.
William A. Luther, AO3086380.
Richard G. Luttrell, AO3094099.
Orlando W. Lyle, Jr., AO3085829.
Paul D. Lynch, AO3093700.
David MacIsaac, AO3083923.
Vernon C. Madsen, AO3094700.
Clyde R. Magill, Jr., AO3085676.
Larry C. Mahaffey, AO3087302.
William M. Mahaffey, AO3082030.
Thomas R. Maher, AO3087236.
Ronald D. Maleika, AO3086049.
Walter A. Malkiewicz, AO3093937.
Richard S. Marks, AO3087117.
William D. Marohn, AO3086119.
Rolland S. Marsh, AO3086880.
Darrell C. Marshall, AO3087471.
Lloyd C. Marshall, AO3094612.
Robert A. Marshall, AO3087358.
Charles L. Marsters, AO3087056.
Howard L. Martin, AO3074294.
George D. Matzke, AO3093328.
Richard A. Maxwell, AO3086350.
Robert H. McCamish, AO3094825.
John T. McCauley, AO3086827.
Robert T. McClure, AO3093551.
Frederick W. McCullough, AO3087199.
John E. McGonigle, AO3085376.

Billy J. McKibben, AO3094172.
Richard K. McMillan, AO3086926.
Patrick R. McNeil, AO3086291.
Charles W. McNeill, AO3086567.
James C. McSherry, AO3087237.
Richard A. Medenwaldt, AO3085635.
David C. Melroy, AO3093940.
Bobby J. Melson, AO3092974.
Ross L. Meyer, AO3094797.
William C. Meyer, AO3095197.
Aloysius L. Mikolanis, AO3093239.
Vincent J. Mikus, AO3085426.
Arthur R. Miller, AO3094120.
Walter L. Miller, AO3092975.
Thomas O. Millett, AO3095096.
John M. Mimnaugh, AO3087120.
Robert N. Miner, AO3085559.
Richard A. Mirth, AO3086735.
Lowell L. Mittelstadt, AO3086390.
Stuart N. Mitts, AO3086852.
Donald A. Moor, AO3093610.
Eugene A. Moore, AO3093567.
Jack C. Moore, AO3095162.
Wylie Moore, Jr., AO3101444.
Sam P. Morgan, Jr., AO3086028.
Charles R. Munger, AO3094312.
John D. Munson, AO3093680.
Vincent A. Murdico, AO3086323.
Robert G. Myers, AO3087294.
Richard E. Nadig, AO3085730.
Albert H. Neubauer, Jr., AO3073490.
Kenneth G. Neumann, AO3085560.
Paul E. Nikulla, AO3085592.
Colin J. Nisbet, AO3087391.
Larry A. Nitz, AO3087093.
Luther L. Nolen, AO3054083.
David W. Noones, AO3085479.
Edward D. Nowokunski, AO3086324.
Edward R. Nungent, AO3083118.
Harlan C. Nupen, AO3086811.
Charles A. Nycum, AO3086737.
Tim Z. Ogle, AO3086082.
Thomas M. O'Hara, AO3082033.
William M. O'Neal, AO3094225.
Robert J. Owens, AO3087175.
John R. Papp, AO3094170.
William E. Parrett, AO3085821.
Frederic J. Parsons, AO3094266.
Robert L. Paulson, AO3094787.
Roger W. Pearce, AO3094933.
Louis V. Pelini, AO3093446.
Charles E. Penland, AO3093204.
David S. Penniman, AO3086884.
Edward P. Pensock, AO3094869.
Gerard R. Pepin, AO3086885.
Ronald L. Perry, AO3086593.
Richard A. Peterson, Jr., AO3087393.
Charles L. Pfeiffer, AO3086417.
Robert I. Pianalto, AO3093731.
John C. Pierce, AO3084523.
Hollis D. Posey, AO3087402.
Mauri E. Pouttu, AO3081989.
James W. Prescott, Jr., AO3094843.
James E. Price, AO3094939.
Ralph B. Proffitt, Jr., AO3072563.
Charles N. Prosch, Sr., AO3095112.
Melvin C. Pump, AO3086594.
Janice F. Raby, AL3060757.
Larry D. Rambo, AO3093057.
Allan C. Ramsay, AO3085536.
Irving B. Ramsower II, AO3092998.
Holt J. Rasmussen, AO3094707.
Walter L. Raynaud, AO3093000.
Clifford H. Rees, Jr., AO3086438.
Richard W. Reese, AO3093308.
Paul J. Reinders, AO3085904.
Raymond G. Richards, AO3093949.
William A. Richardson, AO3085759.
Guido S. Rinaldi, Jr., AO3094804.
Paul T. Ringenbach, AO3074623.
Kenneth H. Ringle, AO3094295.
Robert R. Robinson, AO3094408.
Allan D. Rodberg, AO3066872.
Gerald P. Rooney, AO3093641.
John M. Root, AO3094285.
Carl E. Rose, AO3071432.
Girard F. Rose, AO3095118.
Samuel R. Ross, AO3094262.
Bruce C. Roth, AO3095044.
George P. Roys, AO3073343.
John H. Ruble, AO3087037.

CVII——142

Larry J. Runge, AO3085823.
Peter P. Ruselowski, AO3086009.
Winfield R. Rushnell, AO3084550.
Richard A. Russell, AO3093852.
John J. Ruzicka, AO3086181.
Edward L. Sabo, AO3086622.
Paul E. Samulski, AO3086853.
Norman D. Sauvage, AO3093519.
Joseph D. Scanlan, AO3093951.
Thomas D. Scanlon, AO3086358.
Robert W. Schaefer, AO3082149.
Waldron A. Schanz, AO3094947.
David G. Scheatzle, AO3095083.
James E. Schlender, AO3085801.
Wayne E. Schramm, AO3086813.
Richard L. Schroeder, AO3086624.
Ronald L. Schultz, AO3082649.
Don F. Schutt, AO3093708.
Richard E. Schwall, AO3085565.
Lawrence Schwartz, AO3085539.
George R. Schweers, AO3087266.
Taylor G. Scott, AO3098954.
George H. Sewell, Jr., AO3081902.
Kenneth R. Shatzer, AO3095268.
Thomas R. Shaw, AO3093908.
Hubert R. Shell, AO3101302.
James R. Sherburn, AO3094481.
Richard A. Shropshire, AO3095222.
Robert J. Shutak, AO3082037.
Paul A. Signet, AO3093643.
Charles P. Sikes, AO3094675.
Jackson S. Simpson, AO3073438.
Jerry L. Sinclair, AO3086545.
Bernard W. Smith, AO3093421.
Charles S. Smith, AO3086100.
Jerry J. Smith, AO3094114.
Josh M. Smith, Jr., AO3094632.
Larry L. Smith, AO3086702.
Paul L. Smith, AO3093006.
Lee A. Snowberger, AO3094434.
Earl J. Snyder, AO3081766.
Edward C. Solomon, AO3072219.
Neal G. Sorensen, AO3087374.
Thomas J. Speed III, AO3093007.
William E. Speed, AO3086101.
Joseph K. Spiers, AO3097921.
William D. Spillane, AO3093854.
Maynard E. Spotts, AO3093824.
Terry M. Stark, AO3086109.
Charles E. Statzer, Jr., AO3093789.
Arthur F. Steczkowski, AO3094087.
Glenn L. Stewart, AO3086626.
Bob L. Sturm, AO3071130.
John J. Sullivan, AO3073730.
Jerry M. Swain, AO3085936.
Alan C. Swanson, AO3095130.
David L. Swindler, AO3093242.
Allan A. Taylor, AO3094783.
Robert L. Tedrick, AO3095085.
Frederick G. Ten Hoor, AO3102183.
Alvin R. Theiss, AO3085750.
Wayne M. Thomas, AO3086751.
William D. Thomas, AO3094127.
Donald M. Thompson, AO3086675.
Edwin H. Thorpe, Jr., AO3094209.
John B. Tiberi III, AO3093711.
Claude H. Tinsley III, AO3095045.
Richard J. Tompkins, AO3086697.
Johnnie S. Toniolli, AO3086472.
Francisco E. Torregrosa, AO3086833.
Jimmy N. Towery, AO3094137.
Robert W. Towle, Jr., AO3094310.
Donald F. Treps, AO3087246.
William A. Treu, AO3093497.
Raymond B. Tucker, AO3081950.
Frank W. Turner, AO3087326.
Herbert C. Tygett, AO3093600.
William H. Unsderfer, Jr., AO3093912.
James Valeri, AO3082724.
Ronald E. Van Putte, AO3084612.
Timothy J. Villiger, AO3093453.
Vernon V. Vinzant, AO3085681.
Richard K. Vogel, AO3094648.
Hal F. Waggoner, AO3086183.
Richard K. Walker, AO3086235.
John M. Walsh, AO3095030.
James M. Warren, AO3094205.
Richard C. Watkins, AO3083330.
James L. Weaver, AO3087268.
Calvin G. Weeks, AO3093498.
David A. Weihe, AO3085589.
Alan D. Weisman, AO3094961.
Larry N. Wellman, AO3093046.
Richard W. Wells, AO3087322.
John H. Wendell, Jr., AO3094839.
Don M. Whiteside, AO3094618.
James D. Whitford, AO3094614.
Thomas J. Wilkinson, AO3093015.
Billy G. Williams, AO3093211.
Clyde S. Williams, Jr., AO3084565.
David B. Williams, AO3085593.
Gerald D. Williams, AO3082363.
Haven A. Williams, AO3093379.
Ivey E. Williamson, AO3094092.
Larry G. Williamson, AO3086185.
James L. Willis, AO3082524.
Charles W. Wilson, AO3094756.
Lary W. Wilson, AO3094610.
Phillip D. Wilson, AO3070723.
Richard R. Wilson, AO3085340.
Richard W. Wilson, AO3098540.
John D. Wingfield, AO3073853.
Gerald V. Wingo, AO3081915.
Norman H. Wissing, AO3082310.
Ralph P. Witherspoon, AO3093257.
Fred D. Wolf, AO3094666.
Richard L. Wolgamott, AO3084164.
Stephen F. Worden, AO3082039.
George H. Worley, AO3093574.
Donald E. Yoakam, AO3087107.
David G. Young, AO3093858.
Martin L. Young, AO3084893.
Andris Zalmanis, AO3093859.

Distinguished aviation cadet graduates to be second lieutenants

Frank E. Cheshire, Jr., AO3104491.
Thomas A. Dwelle, AO3104493.
Herbert L. Entrekin, Jr., AO3104494.
Phillip M. Gist, AO3104496.
James H. Havey, Jr., AO3104481.
James H. Mali, AO3104505.
James F. Whelan III, AO3104520.
Donald E. Young, AO3104487.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduate, the following distinguished military student of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Orley L. Lake

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 16, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Paul Burgess Fay, Jr., of California; to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Deuteronomy 7: 21: *Thou shalt not be afraid, for the Lord thy God is among you.*

Almighty God, in whom we find life's significance and satisfaction, may we daily share in the great enterprise of bringing mankind into a closer and happier fellowship.

We penitently confess that so frequently we place too much stress upon the distinctions and differences which separate and divide us.

Show us how we may help to ease world tensions and be united in our thoughts and efforts to make real unto

ourselves and our generation the high ideals of peace and brotherhood.

Grant that we may hasten the dawning of that better day when in all human relations, at the national and international levels, life shall be fraternally cooperative rather than fiercely competitive.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servant, our beloved colleague, who now dwells with Thee in heavenly blessedness having received the reward of his faith, even the salvation of his soul. May the members of his bereaved family be given the consolations of Thy grace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Second Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1961.*

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDERS FROM FEBRUARY 16 TO FEBRUARY 17

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that special orders for today be transferred to tomorrow and be placed at the top of the list of special orders for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without this being considered a precedent, that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM F. NORRELL

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound feeling of deep sadness and great loss that I announce the passing from this life and this great body of our esteemed and beloved colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM F. NORRELL, whose death occurred last evening.

The sudden and untimely passing of my close friend and colleague of many years, WILLIAM F. NORRELL, has ended a long and distinguished career in the service of his district, his State, and his Nation.

We came to Congress in 1939. We developed a warm personal friendship which has continued over the years as we have been associated together in this body and in endeavors of mutual interest for our State, districts, and Nation. He will be sorely missed by his many friends here and elsewhere.

Our departed colleague was a statesman at all times and a distinguished public servant. He had a keen and analytical mind, and was a highly able and talented lawyer. His great moral and physical courage was known to all. His distinguished service in the public interest included many years in the Arkansas Legislature as well as his years of service in this House. Before that he served his country in World War I.

It is with a sense of humility that I refer to those great Christian virtues and personal characteristics, which BILL NORRELL possessed. BILL NORRELL was a Christian gentleman whose word was his bond. I have never known BILL NORRELL to fail to do what he said he would do. He was a devoted family man. He was a man of great dignity, courtesy, and sincerity. He not only stood for those fine, deep, and noble things admired by all men of character and integrity but they were an innate part of his being. He was beloved, respected, and admired by his colleagues, and indeed by all who had the privilege of coming into contact with him. He was dedicated to helping everyone in his day-to-day activities here and throughout life.

I extend to his wife and daughter my sincerest and deepest sympathy in the hour of their grief, and I join with his host of friends throughout his district, the State of Arkansas, and the Nation in paying tribute to his life.

The fact of knowing him, working with him, being in his counsel and confidence will forever preserve his memory and cause us to desire, to an ever greater extent, to attain his high degree of great moral and physical courage.

Mr. Speaker, services will be held at 2 p.m. on tomorrow, Friday, February 17, at Gawler's Funeral Home, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW. Then on Monday, services and interment at his home, Monticello, Ark., at 3 p.m.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard and difficult to say farewell to a friend of many years. Especially is it true in the passing of W. F. NORRELL. I first knew him in 1935 when we served together in the Arkansas State Senate. He was an experienced legislator then, having represented his district in that body since 1931. He was ever ready to offer helpful suggestions to new members. His colleagues bestowed upon him a great honor and distinction by selecting him as president pro tempore of the senate, a position he filled with dignity and fairness. He served as acting Governor many times during the absence of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor from the State.

During the 1937 session he served as chairman of the committee on Federal relations and steered through the senate all of the legislation requiring State laws to make the provisions of Federal statutes applicable to the State. He must have had in mind serving his people in the Congress by and through his efforts in dealing with Federal problems. In 1938 he sought election to the Congress since our colleague, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, who was serving that district in the House sought election to the U.S. Senate. He was successful in his race for Representative from the Sixth Congressional District and has served here since that time. In the many years he has been in the service of his people he never lost an election. While his constituents honored him with their approval of his work in their interest, he zealously and earnestly fulfilled the responsibilities which were his. He was a dedicated and devoted public servant.

He was a real patriot, a great statesman, a loyal friend, honest, great of mind, warm of heart, always modest and humble. He won an undying and imperishable place in the hearts of his colleagues. He possessed sympathy, understanding, and forgiveness. Never once in all the years of our close association have I heard him use vulgarity or profanity. Never did I hear him speak harshly of anyone. He possessed those traits of kindness and consideration which made it a genuine pleasure to be in his presence. He fulfilled as he went about his work the mandate of our Lord's commandment that we love one another.

W. F. NORRELL was a Christian gentleman without hypocrisy. He was a lifelong member of the Baptist church. He served for many years as a deacon of the First Baptist Church in his home city of Monticello, Ark.

I would like to quote a portion of a poem by Josiah Gilbert Holland that is fitting and proper:

God give us men.
A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands,
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinions and a will,
Men who have honor.
Men who will not lie.

W. F. NORRELL was such a man. I shall miss his ever-ready smile and his warm friendship. We are better men for having known him. I join with his many friends in extending to his beloved widow, Catherine, and lovely daughter, Judy, our deepest sympathy.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, we are all saddened by the passing of our beloved colleague, BILL NORRELL. In times like this it is difficult for us to express adequately our minds and hearts over the loss of our friend and colleague.

In these days, when we are trying through research to reveal the mysteries of the universe, with all of the efforts and brilliance of mankind, we know it is impossible for us to reveal the deep mysteries of life itself. Just why the Grim Reaper takes his reward, the time and in what manner, is something the human mind cannot understand and never will.

But, we do have hope and faith through our belief in God and in immortality that beyond this life there is a better life; that when we leave this old world, full of suffering and tragedy and sin, there is a reward that comes to one who has lived a fine and Christian life on earth; a better life in eternity for those such as our beloved colleague, BILL NORRELL.

We knew him as an individual and we knew him as a colleague. I have known him for many, many years personally, before he came to the Congress. He was born and reared in my district. His old home place is in Ashley County, Ark. His relatives live there now. It has been my privilege to be acquainted with them during the more than 20 years that I have had the opportunity to serve in this Congress. He comes from a good family. They are good people, real Americans. So our late colleague had that family background and he could not be anything else except the kind of man he was.

From our intimate association with him here in the Congress we know what kind of man he was. BILL NORRELL was a good man. He was the kind of man we all like to emulate. He was known for his character, personality, perseverance, patience, and tolerance.

BILL NORRELL was a good citizen. I do not think there is anyone I have ever known who had a greater desire to live as a good American and to contribute to the welfare of his county, his State, and his community, as a citizen.

BILL NORRELL was a good public servant. His friends who knew him best and his constituents who had known him a lifetime had confidence in him. The fact that he was elected and reelected time after time over the years is strong proof that the people who knew him best throughout his lifetime were the people who had the greatest confidence in him.

I know that the Members of this House, his colleagues who served with him, realize that he never disappointed his constituents because he was always devoted to the service of his constituents. He was attentive, he was honest, and sincere with it. Yes, he possessed the character and the reputation that we all approve and love.

BILL NORRELL did not have an enemy. Everybody loved him. He was that kind of man. That is the way we knew him, and that is the way we shall cherish his memory. His devotion to his family, and his Christian life is something that will live with all of us.

Mrs. Harris and I join my colleagues in extending to his lovely wife and daughter, Judy, our deepest sympathy in these trying moments, and it is our prayer that the love of God will sustain them in their great loss.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, even in sadness it is easy to talk about BILL NORRELL. In the affairs of men, he was a sturdy oak in whose shadow those who knew him drew comfort and strength. He lived a fine and useful life and the world is the better for his having lived in it. His integrity was golden. We were all shocked to hear of his death. I join my colleagues in extending sincere sympathy to the members of his family in this their hour of great sorrow. All of us will miss BILL NORRELL so very, very much. He was a great American, a true friend, a devoted husband and parent.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the kindly, gracious, generous, companionable, lovable BILL NORRELL has left us. He has passed on to vastly larger chambers and to immeasurably broader horizons.

But he has left rich legacies here. No one has left more friends. And no one has left behind more treasured memories of fellowship and shared tasks and mutual achievements.

He served as one of the earliest members of the Committee on Appropriations as now constituted. He ranked high on the roll, and in the inner councils of the committee and the House.

He served as subcommittee chairman, as a member of some of the most important subcommittees, and in positions which required concentration and hard work, calm statesmanship, sober judgment and seasoned experience. He did his part well here and in this life.

He died, as I am certain he would have preferred to die, at his post of duty, here in the House, at his office, in touch with friends at home, in full harness. And driving hard ahead.

He has left behind him with each of us—with all who knew him—something that cannot die. Something that will never fade. So let us—

> Think of him faring on, as dear,
> In the love of There as the love of Here,
> Think of him still as the same, I say,
> He is not dead—he is just away.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have known BILL NORRELL very well ever since he came on the Committee on Appropriations almost 20 years ago. He was a man of sterling character and deep convictions. He gave of himself his very best in discharging the responsibility that came to him on the committee and in the House. Few men have made a better record than he of standing up for the things he thought were the right things to do. He was attentive to his duties always, always available for the work of the committee of which he was a member, and he felt a real responsibility for carrying out those duties.

I extend to his widow and to his daughter my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of one of our Members always leaves a strong feeling of sorrow and regret in the minds of all of us, but this is particularly so in the case of the passing of our dear friend, BILL NORRELL. BILL NORRELL possessed unusual qualities that attracted the attention and respect not only of his colleagues, but of all who knew him. He impressed everybody with his love of God and love of neighbor, and he did that not only by his words but by his actions. His love of country was evidenced on so many occasions during his lifetime. The goodness of BILL NORRELL, which my colleagues have referred to, was also prominently evidenced by his many acts of kindness and his many acts of consideration and charity. BILL NORRELL was also a dedicated legislator. I think the best evidence of that is that you and I, and all of our colleagues knew that for the past several years he was laboring under great physical difficulty. Yet, we saw him in committee working long hours during the day. We saw him constantly on the floor of the House during the deliberations of the legislative business of this body. We knew he was performing his duties under such difficult physical conditions when he should have been taking rest and care of himself and following the advice of his doctors. BILL NORRELL during his several years of physical disability evidenced the highest type of legislator humanly possible, when with determination he carried on the duties of his office and position. His conduct in this body always reflected credit upon the people of his district. It means an awful lot to the people of a district to know that the person they have elected to represent them in this body is conducting himself as a good legislator and participating in the work of this body in a manner that reflects credit upon the people of his district. BILL NORRELL is gone, but his spirit will always remain with those of us who had the pleasure of knowing him. I join with my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Norrell and her daughter my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in this deserved tribute to our beloved colleague, W. F. NORRELL.

Having visited in the Sixth District of Arkansas on many occasions, I know something of the esteem in which he was held by the people he served for so many years.

The broad knowledge of public affairs and the understanding of the legislative

process he had gained as a member of the Arkansas State Legislature were evident in his early days here in the Congress.

His abilities were put to good use during his distinguished service with the great Committee on Appropriations to which he made many substantial contributions.

All of us will remember our colleague as a man of dignified bearing, always honorable and forthright in manner, and above all, a Christian gentleman in the fullest meaning of the term.

His record here in the Congress demonstrated a devotion to country and principle that transcended any purely partisan considerations.

It was a mark of his courage that he continued his labors here in the House without sparing himself in spite of an illness of some years ago that might well have marked the end of a career for one less determined to remain active and useful to his fellow men.

It is a matter of deep regret to me that he did not survive a recurrence of the illness which struck him down before. To his widow and daughter I offer my heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my very good friend, the Honorable WILLIAM NORRELL, of Arkansas, who came to Congress the same time I did.

I have served on the same Subcommittee on Appropriations with BILL NORRELL for the past 18 sessions of Congress. I learned to know his heartbeats. I learned to hold him in the highest esteem, as a man who believed in all that was good. He radiated in his daily life that fine noble attitude toward everyone with whom he came in contact. BILL NORRELL was indeed one of God's noblemen; honest in his dealings; with great courage and deep convictions. He voted as he felt on every occasion, the way he was sure was the best for the people of his district, his State and his Nation, not only for the day but for generations yet unborn.

I will really miss BILL NORRELL. Every Member of this House will miss BILL NORRELL. Especially will we miss him on the Appropriations Committee, where he served so ably and so well and honorably.

May the same God who called this great and good man to his heavenly home give strength to his dear wife and daughter to bear the great loss they have sustained. God rest his soul.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee with BILL NORRELL. No one ever served with him who did not love him and who was not impressed with his dedication to duty. He rendered outstanding service to his district, his State and the Nation. He will be greatly missed in the Appropriations Committee room and in the Halls of the Congress.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great Congressman, and extend to his family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, my life has been a fuller one by having had the counsel and friendship of BILL NORRELL. Certainly this world is a better place in which to live for BILL NORRELL's having lived in it. He was a great man, a good father, and a good husband. He possessed unimpeachable integrity. He was a man of great devotion to his country and to his constituency, and a man of deep conviction who could not be swayed from his high ideals.

I join with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to this great legislator and in extending sympathy to Mrs. Norrell and his daughter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened to hear of the passing of my good friend and colleague, BILL NORRELL. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee and I learned to know him very intimately. To know BILL NORRELL was to love him.

He was a kind, considerate, Christian gentleman. I have the greatest admiration for his courage. He was always willing to stand up and be counted.

BILL NORRELL was a man of high integrity, deep devotion to his family, and grave concern for his constituents. He was never too busy to help a friend in need.

He was a student of government and always thought in terms of what was best for all the people. He worked hard, was always on the job, and never considered his own personal welfare.

It has been a great honor to serve in the Congress with this great American. His counsel has been wise and his profound interest in the welfare of all the people has been an inspiration. To have served with him is to know greatness.

His passing means a great loss to the Congress, the State, and the Nation. I express to his wife and daughter my deep sorrow in their great loss.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to have him serve intimately with me on committee work for nearly 18 years. I sat next to him for 18 years. I never knew a better loved man than WILLIAM NORRELL, nor one who was more bound by principle. I never knew him to change his mind after he once told you he would be with you or for you.

He will always be remembered for the great interest he took in the conservation of our great natural resources—our public lands, our forests, our parks, and our fish and wildlife—during his many years of able service on the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior.

There is not a Member of this body who will not regret his passing. I hope and pray that not only will God be very kind to the wife and daughter of our dear friend but that he will also have mercy on one of the finest men who was ever a Member of this Congress.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our colleague, WILLIAM F. NORRELL, of Arkansas, comes as a distinct shock to those of us who have served with him since the 76th Congress, over 22 years.

While we knew that he had been in poor health for a long time, yet death, when it comes to a friend of long standing, is a shock. BILL NORRELL was a wonderful man, a conscientious and fine legislator. It was my privilege to serve with him on the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Interior Department for many years. We shall miss him. I and my family extend our sympathy to his beloved wife and daughter.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with those colleagues who today have expressed their shock and grief at the passing of our friend, BILL NORRELL.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, a giant in the forest of men has fallen. BILL NORRELL has joined his ancestors who have preceded him to the grave.

As I listened to the tributes that have been paid to his memory today I have been impressed, as we all must have been, with the fact that throughout all of the tributes runs the line of his devotion to duty, of courage, of his convictions.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that nature is a great equalizer of persons. She does not give any one of us all of the virtues.

She gives one one talent, one virtue, another another; in the instant case of BILL NORRELL nature in addition to his other virtues has emphasized that all-too-rare quality of men in public life—political courage. One never had to question where this Congressman stood. He never wavered or vacillated. He chose the side dictated by his conscience and no amount of political pressure could shake him.

I should like to join with others in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and his many friends in the passing of this giant of the forest.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to place a flower upon the bier of our departed colleague, BILL NORRELL.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first Members in the Congress it was my privilege to meet after coming here years ago was BILL NORRELL from Arkansas. I feel a natural kinship to this great public servant who has just left us. He had in the great Southwest a district neighboring to my district in northwest Louisiana, and he had many similar problems. I early found that he approached those problems in such a sensible, careful, and

profound way that his judgment of the needs of his community at times seemed to be almost infallible.

He was a man who could walk with kings, yet not lose the common touch. At no time have I known of his action in approaching a problem presented to him here in this Congress of a public nature save from the interest of his own people and country.

Chance, Mr. Speaker, brought BILL NORRELL and me closer together, perhaps, than the average Member of Congress who is busied with so many problems affecting the Nation, and his district. He obtained an office in the House Office Building adjoining mine. Daily it was my pleasure and privilege to be able to visit with this beloved man, especially during the latter stages of his life, and to counsel with him and talk with him. At all times, regardless of the physical disabilities that came to him in recent years, he was a man dependable and courageous, yet not ostentatious, always prepared to look forthrightly at those problems which came to him and to his people and to attempt in a vigorous way to alleviate some of the sufferings which naturally fall to our people throughout the country.

So today I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep and profound sorrow at the loss of a sincere man, a great public servant, a man who is going to be missed in his community and in this Congress.

My very deep and abiding sympathy goes out to his widow and his daughter who remain with us.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked this morning to learn of the passing last night of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM F. NORRELL who has represented the Sixth District of the State of Arkansas for many years.

Sixteen years ago last month I was privileged to become a member of the House Committee on Appropriations and immediately assigned by Chairman CANNON to the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of the Interior. On that subcommittee and day in and day out thereafter the previous speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] sat on one side of BILL NORRELL and I sat on the other. He was a fine looking, distinguished gentleman. He was a very capable lawyer, well grounded not only in the law but in the work with which he was confronted as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. He was indeed a hard-working member of that committee. Since then, and over the years, I came to respect BILL for his forthrightness, his ability, his integrity, and the faithful pursuit of his duties as a member not only of the committee but of the House of Representatives. Yes, BILL unfortunately suffered illness some few years back, but he always stayed on the job and took care of his responsibilities as the Representative of his district in this House of Representatives. During this period, and as she always had been, his dear wife was his great helpmate. I extend to her and to their daughter, Judy, the profound sympathies of the Rooney family in the loss of a fine husband, a fine father, a great and distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, a great American, BILL NORRELL.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many friends of W. F. NORRELL in expressing my sorrow at his untimely passing.

It has been a pleasure serving with him on the Committee on Appropriations. Representative NORRELL represented the finest as a gentleman and as a true statesman. He was kind, considerate, industrious, sincere, and courageous. The State of Arkansas has suffered a great loss in the death of this outstanding Representative.

I join in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family and his many friends.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is on such sad occasions as this that we have an opportunity to appraise the qualities that have endeared Members of this body to us, their colleagues. It has been my privilege, of course, as it has been to many of you, to have known this fine family over the years that I have served in this body. It so happens that the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. NORRELL was a schoolmate of a daughter of mine, and we got to know each other rather intimately. Ir looking back over my acquaintance with Mr. NORRELL, I think he had those sterling qualities that all of us admire. He was a man who was not only capable as a legislator but a man of deep convictions and one who felt his responsibility. As has been mentioned here today, he had been suffering for some time under a physical disability that would have discouraged many people and which might have caused them to avail themselves of the opportunity to retire from such responsibility.

But I think that the circumstances under which I learned this morning of BILL NORRELL's death is symbolic of the esteem in which he was held not only by the Members of the House but all others who knew him. I came to the Capitol rather early this morning. I had left home before I had the opportunity to read the newspapers or hear any of the radio reports of his death. As I entered the House restaurant, on my way to another breakfast, one of the employees said to me, "Isn't it too bad about Mr. NORRELL?" She said, "That man, to me, was a man of great courage. He has been a brave man over all these years as he has gone about his duties serving his country."

I know it was in that spirit of dedication to the people who were his friends and who had been his constituents over the years that he and Mrs. Norrell remained here in Washington to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to what has been said by my colleagues here this morning. I do want to say most sincerely that my wife and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Norrell and to their daughter Judy. We have to accept those things that happen, but we can always cherish the memory of an acquaintanceship with such a fine man as was BILL NORRELL.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, all too often in the Congress we do not become well acquainted with our colleagues, especially when they are not on the same side of the aisle or members of the same committee. That might have applied to my relationship with BILL NORRELL, but something like 5 or 6 years ago I had occasion to be on a night's cruise on the submarine *Nautilus* and he was there also. We stayed up most of the night and I had the opportunity to become acquainted with him far more closely than one would in a casual relationship of a lifetime.

I found that he was a man of very deep convictions. I always had known that he was a man of great physical and moral courage. I found that he was a great humanitarian, a brilliant man. From that time on I prized BILL NORRELL as a very dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, we all deeply regret BILL NORRELL's death. He will be missed here for a long, long time. I want to express my deep sympathy to his lovely family.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and this House has suffered another irreparable loss in the passing of WILLIAM F. NORRELL, who earned and enjoyed the respect and high regard of all who knew him and especially his colleagues in this body.

It was my privilege to break bread with him almost every day and in the intimacy of that association I came to enjoy his confidence and unhesitatingly took him into mine. Mr. NORRELL was a man of simple dignity and also one who accepted this assignment as one of great trust and responsibility. A conservative in his outlook, he and I found much in common in our belief that a government that lives beyond its means or ignores the perils of inflation is sowing the seeds of its own destruction.

Our late colleague and I were of different political faiths but our outlook was the same and we were united in a common pride in the privilege of serving in this greatest of all legislative bodies. Our frequent conversations also revealed that BILL NORRELL was a great family man and he never tired of mentioning the brilliant accomplishments of his daughter in the field of education as well as the encouragement and inspiration he received from Mrs. Norrell's activities on the national scene.

Our hearts go out to the members of his family who are left to mourn his untimely departure from our midst and it is our prayerful hope that they will be strengthened and comforted by that invisible Presence in whose care their loved one now rests.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the Arkansas delegation in the feeling of great sadness over the loss of the Honorable BILL NORRELL. This old friend of

mine was one with whom I enjoyed most complete and harmonious understanding.

I learned many years ago that from him I could always receive sound and thoughtful advice. Our points of view very rarely differed; and when they did, it was generally not so much because of our personal feelings as because of our desire to follow the wishes of our respective constituencies.

BILL was a very brave man. He had successfully fought off the effects of serious illness and he did it without a word of complaint and with a determination which will always be an inspiration to those of us who knew him.

My deep sympathy goes to Mrs. Norrell and her daughter, to the countless friends who have kept him in Congress for these many years, and to the members of the Arkansas delegation who were so close to BILL's heart.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, we are saddened by the death of our good friend and colleague, BILL NORRELL, and join in offering our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and daughter.

It was a privilege to be associated with him in our work on the Committee on Appropriations. He will be remembered as an able and fair minded legislator who served well the interests of the people of his district.

He also served well the interests of his colleagues as chairman of the legislative appropriations subcommittee, a sometimes thankless task of housekeeping which is essential to the operations of the House. This service to his colleagues earned him our gratitude and respect.

While no words of mine are adequate at a time like this, his family can rightfully take comfort in his proud record of public service as a Christian gentleman and a distinguished American.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my good friend and great Congressman, W. F. NORRELL, of the Sixth District of Arkansas.

Judge NORRELL was highly regarded by his colleagues and by reason of the great respect that his colleagues had for him, he was successful as a Member of Congress.

He was very faithful to his own constituents—the people of Arkansas—and to the entire Nation. He always placed first in his consideration of any subject the people's interest.

Judge NORRELL had a long and distinguished career, including president of the senate in his home State for 8 successive years, during which time he had the privilege on many occasions of serving as Acting Governor of the great State of Arkansas.

The people of this Nation and his district in particular have lost a very fine, devoted and dedicated public servant.

Mrs. Patman joins me in extending sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our good friend WILLIAM NORRELL takes from these Halls one of the finest men I have ever known.

It was my privilege to serve on the legislative subcommittee on appropriations of which Mr. NORRELL was chairman. He was fair, patient and understanding. He always insisted on courteous treatment of witnesses appearing before the committee. To the members of the committee, regardless of party affiliation, he extended full rights and privileges.

His district has been well represented, his State honored by his service, and the Nation now loses a statesman of great stature and patriotism.

These are sad days when we lose these towers of strength from our ranks, but our loss does not compare with the loss suffered by Mrs. Norrell. To Mrs. Norrell, Mrs. Bow and I extend our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden passing of WILLIAM F. NORRELL, the distinguished Representative from Arkansas, the House has lost one of its most able Members, the Nation one of its most patriotic citizens, and I, personally one of my most treasured friends.

BILL NORRELL was a courteous dignified and Christian southern gentleman. Both gentle of nature and courageous of character, he always did only that which his conscience and great intelligence told him to be in the best interest of the people he represented and the country he loved.

The world is a better place for WILLIAM F. NORRELL having lived. To his family he leaves the priceless heritage of a good name, and to us who knew and loved him, as a friend, many precious memories.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this word of tribute to a great man and distinguished Member of the House. I am personally grateful for the many kindnesses he has done me during my service here. He made my life better for having known him. His death has left a great vacancy in this House. He was a good and noble man.

Mrs. Albert and I join in extending to Mrs. Norrell and their daughter our deepest sympathy in this hour of their sorrow.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there was a vacant chair on this morning at the meeting of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. BILL NORRELL was not in his accustomed place. He has gone from us to claim his eternal reward for a life well spent. It was a sad occasion for all of us who were present. Most of us had served with him for many years. We knew him so very well and appreciated and admired him for the sound, and kindly, and helpful man we knew him to be.

BILL NORRELL was a beloved Member of the Congress. He came here as a strong young leader from his native State of Arkansas with promise of strong leadership in the Congress. He quickly justified that early promise through his actions in this body.

In later years, he fought off and overcame illness which would have taken most men out of active service and continued to give yeoman service to the Nation.

Because of his fine service, because of all his sterling qualities, because we long ago learned to love BILL NORRELL, we grieve at the news of his death.

I join my colleagues in expressing deep sympathy for his wonderful helpmate, Mrs. Norrell and to their daughter.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of WILLIAM F. NORRELL we have all lost a good friend. He was a friendly man, a generous man, and a patriotic outstanding American. He had a high sense of duty and with it a burning desire to be of service to his day and generation. To his family I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathy.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Mr. W. F. NORRELL, our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, saddens me greatly.

I would like to say that in the 9 years I have served with him in the House of Representatives, I have found him to be a devoted public servant, one who was dedicated to his tasks and efficient in his performance. He extended kindness to all those with whom he was associated, and he was, undeniably, a Christian gentleman in every respect.

In the course of my congressional service, my wife had the opportunity of effecting a friendship with our late colleague's lovely wife Catherine. This friendship flourished against the background of a common interest in the activities of the Congressional Club, with Mrs. McIntire becoming extremely fond of Mrs. Norrell.

The memory of Mrs. McIntire's and my friendship with Congressman NORRELL will always be something treasured and together we join in extending to Mrs. Norrell and her family our expression of deep sympathy in this period of their great sadness.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad moment for us all as we pause to pay tribute to one of the finest gentlemen who has ever served in the House of Representatives. BILL NORRELL was a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and he and I had worked together closely in defense matters for 15 years. We sat at the same table and weighed together the same problems.

His consecration to his job was outstanding. He was devoted to the public interest. He was loyal to his constituency.

When the time came to stand up and be counted BILL NORRELL could always be depended upon. I feel a sense of personal loss at his passing. Words seem somewhat futile at a time like this, and I shall not extend these remarks further. I do want to express sympathy to the lovely wife and daughter of our departed friend.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, we know that in keeping with the divine plan death must come to everyone. Yet each time the angel of death strikes it seems we find ourselves unprepared. It was with great sadness that I learned yesterday of the passing of our beloved colleague, and my warm personal friend, Congressman NORRELL.

It does not take long for a newcomer to Congress to evaluate those with whom he is privileged to serve here. As time passes, in some instances first impressions are changed. In others, first impressions are strengthened.

In the case of BILL NORRELL, my first impression of him was that he was a man of kindly heart, who loved his fellow man, a man of ability, of high prin-

ciples, of devotion to duty, and who had the courage to support his convictions regardless of consequences.

During the 14 years I have known him I have never had any doubt that BILL NORRELL measured up to those standards in every respect. He was the kind of man who grows upon you, and my friendship for him was strengthened with the years of our acquaintance and association in the House. He was never a man to dodge an issue.

During the 22 years of his service in Congress many important issues have arisen to affect the security and well-being of our country. Our Nation is stronger today because of his presence here and his participation in the solution of the problems our Government has been called upon to face.

He leaves a record upon which his relatives, friends, colleagues, and constituents can look with pride and satisfaction.

He will be missed, indeed, as a wise, courageous, and able legislator. I shall miss him greatly as a warm personal friend.

I extend deepest sympathy to his wife, daughter, and other relatives.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of the House, I was deeply distressed at the news of the passing of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas. I learned to know him well during the period of time we served together on the House Committee on Appropriations and particularly on the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations.

As a newcomer to the House 6 years ago, I was struck by his unfailing courtesy and willingness to share his knowledge with others. He showed that same courtesy and willingness to share this considerable knowledge during discussions on our national defense problems. BILL NORRELL possessed many fine qualities and was keenly admired and respected by the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. He was a man of ability, who was sincere in all of his endeavors. BILL NORRELL had the courage of his convictions. His dedication was to the people of his State and Nation.

The House has lost one of its finest Members and the Nation one of its most valuable public servants.

Mrs. Weaver joins me in extending to Mrs. Norrell and the family our deepest sympathy and condolences on this sad occasion.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying my sincere respects to the memory of BILL NORRELL.

He was my friend. I had the honor and the privilege of serving with him on the Appropriations Committee. He was diligent in his work on that committee and we will miss his counsel and sound thinking.

BILL NORRELL loved his country and placed its welfare above all other considerations. He loved his State and passed up no constructive action that would better it. He loved the people whom he so ably represented. BILL NORRELL was a God-fearing man and we cannot help but mourn the loss of so fine a man.

Mrs. Horan joins me in sending our sincere sympathies to his wife Catherine and their daughter Judy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grieved by the death of my good friend, the Honorable W. F. NORRELL.

He was a man of high principle and dedicated purpose, who never swerved from what he was convinced was his duty.

A case in point was the recent vote in the House of Representatives on the packing of the Committee on Rules. Although strong efforts were made to enlist his vote in favor of that action, Mr. NORRELL never wavered in his opposition.

His death is a distinct loss to the district he has so ably represented; to the State of Arkansas, and the Nation. He will be greatly missed on the House floor in the days that lie ahead.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending our utmost sympathy to Mrs. Norrell and their family in this time of sorrow.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in my 12 years in the Congress, I have never known a more considerate, kindly gentleman than BILL NORRELL. He was humble, unassuming, and radiated an inner warmth of character and integrity.

BILL NORRELL was a Christian, practicing toward others the ideals and great principles of his religion.

The South and the Nation lost another of their distinguished sons. BILL NORRELL was forthright, courageous, and dedicated to constitutional government. He was a great leader in the cause of States' rights, local self-government, and individual freedom.

Like a true soldier, he dedicated his life to his country. He gave his life for our country. Those of us who served with BILL NORRELL will be better Congressmen through having known and associated with him.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in extending to Mrs. Norrell, his daughter, and sovereign constituents our most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our gentle colleague, Representative W. F. NORRELL, died last night in Walter Reed Hospital. He had suffered a stroke on February 13 in his office.

NORRELL represented the Sixth District of Arkansas for 22 years. He had served 8 years in the Arkansas Legislature.

Congressman NORRELL was loved by everyone. He had a benevolent soul and sparkled with a generous attitude that personified Christian kindness of heart.

He served in important positions on the various committees of the House and enjoyed the profound respect and admiration of everyone associated with him. In his seasoned statesmanship, as chairman at hearings on other activities, he was heeded and admired.

He suffered death's heavy hand of warning in the very room of his labors. God was good to him, to summon him at his happiest chores and tasks.

No one can deny that BILL NORRELL was one of the finest examples of a true public servant. We will cherish his every word and anecdote. His interest in living humans ingratiated everyone to his side of any question. We, the Congressmen from Illinois, are in great sadness at his demise, and extend to his lovely wife, Catherine, and sweet daughter, Judy, our sincere condolences.

The State of Arkansas, the Nation, and the Congress have lost a distinguished public servant whose colleagues, in great sadness, pray for his immortal soul, that God reward him for his great stewardship to his people.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to meet BILL NORRELL shortly after I became a Member of Congress in January 1945. As time went on we became fast friends, and I learned to hold him in the highest esteem.

He was a good example for a freshman Congressman to emulate. He was devoted to his work, sound in his conclusions, and had the courage of his convictions.

Although for some years he was not in the best of health, he came to his office every day, attended to his correspondence, met all of his appointments, and was regular in attendance on the floor of the House. He ably and courageously carried out his assignments, and was beloved by all who knew him. Those of us who were permitted to serve with him from day to day will miss his companionship and his thoughtful approach to problems before the Congress.

His devotion to duty will be an inspiration to those of us who are carrying on in the Congress.

I want Mrs. Norrell and Miss Judy to know that they have my heartfelt sympathy in the loss of their husband and father.

The whole Nation, in my opinion, has suffered a great loss in the passing of this true statesman.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I mourn with the lovely widow and with the family of the late Congressman W. F. NORRELL. I also mourn with my neighboring State, his own great State of Arkansas. The people of this beautiful State have lost a man of great courage and conviction; a strong Democrat, a man who believed in fairness, who tried to do right, who fought for justice and hated intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that have been so eloquently stated by those who have preceded me in eulogizing our beloved late colleague, the Honorable W. F. NORRELL, of Monticello, are indeed deserved tributes to a great American and I believe demonstrate, in part, at least, the extent to which he will be sorely missed by those of us who remain to carry on the responsibilities of Government affairs. I have been privileged to know and to serve with BILL NORRELL since the day I came to Congress. During this period I have valued his friendship and admired his professional ability as a legislator and as a leader. The rich memories that both Mrs. Belcher and I have for our friend, the late BILL NORRELL, and his lovely widow, will always be cherished by us.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened beyond measure when I learned of the untimely passing of our beloved colleague, Congressman W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas.

The suddenness of his passing was a shock for many, because Congressman NORRELL always had about him a quality of stout, healthy, rural individualism. His name for many years was linked with his native Arkansas, for his contributions to its progress were indeed notable. He was a "joiner" in the best aspects of the word, having been a member of dozens of organizations and groups whose efforts cut a wide swath through work of the bench and bar, the State legislature and senate, in addition to many religious, charitable, and civic organizations. Congressman NORRELL truly loved people, and his monument is firm in the hearts of those for whom he worked and aided through many years.

He came to the Congress exceedingly well equipped to represent his State and his people and grew in wisdom and stature during his tenure here.

Congressman NORRELL will be missed by his State and its people and among his colleagues in Congress. His fine spirit will be remembered through the years.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the many expressions of deep regret on the passing of W. F. NORRELL. He represented a district in eastern Arkansas adjacent to much of my district in northwestern Mississippi. We worked on many common problems. I will always remember the kindnesses and courtesies he showed me when I came here as a new Member. In keeping with his true spirit, he was always cooperative and friendly, but never interfering.

BILL NORRELL was an outstanding Member of the House, both in service to his district and service to the Nation. We have lost an outstanding Member whom we all loved.

My wife joins me in deepest sympathy to Mrs. Norrell and their lovely daughter, Judy.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened when I learned of the passing of our colleague, BILL NORRELL.

I want to join in extending sympathy to our colleagues from Arkansas in this great loss which they have sustained.

It was a privilege to serve in this House with BILL NORRELL, and I greatly enjoyed my association with him. We enjoyed many visits and I greatly valued his friendship.

The passing of BILL NORRELL is not only an irreparable loss to this House, and to the State of Arkansas, but to the entire Nation. He was an outstanding public servant, and gave his best in the service of his country. His memory will remain with us as an inspiration and a challenge.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Norrell and the other members of the family.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have just come from one of the saddest occasions of my life—the burial of my great and good friend and our gallant colleague, the Honorable W. F. NORRELL. My heart is heavy as the realization finally dawns that no more shall we see him in this Hall; no more shall we have the untold benefit of his wise and quiet counsel; no more shall we have him as a stanch pillar on which to lean in times of need.

Yes; I have lost a great and good friend, and my State and Nation have lost a truly outstanding statesman.

It was characteristic of Mr. NORRELL, through the more than 25 years I had known him, to be on the side of the little man. He gave untiringly of himself to this end, and his untimely passing will stand as an everlasting monument to the service and devotion he gave to his friends and constituents.

It seems as though only days ago that I first walked upon this floor, about to become a Member of the 86th Congress. As many of you will recall, after all other Members had taken the oath, I was summoned to the well by our Speaker. As I started out alone, Mr. NORRELL fell into step beside me and stood stanchly behind me as I was administered the oath. A photograph of this ceremony is one of the most prized mementos of my service in this House, and occupies a treasured spot on my office wall.

Yes; the House will sorely miss this champion of honesty and fairplay whose greatest characteristic was his unyielding dedication to his high principles.

I join with all of my colleagues in extending the deepest, prayerful sympathy to the family of this departed leader of men.

His task in this life has been very well done.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of an active colleague is always shocking but the untimely death of BILL NORRELL came as more than the usual shock to me because of our close association in the Committee on Appropriations and elsewhere. As we all know, Members are not assigned to specific tables in the House restaurant but habits are easily formed and for many years now BILL NORRELL and I have lunched together at the same table. We usually spent a pleasant half hour over luncheon and in conversation about matters of mutual interest. These conversations did not often include a discussion of legislative problems but items of personal interest outside the field of legislation.

During these half hours over a period of years, I came to esteem BILL NORRELL as an individual just as I had learned to respect him over the years as an effective and industrious member of the Committee on Appropriations. His untimely death last evening, following a stroke during the afternoon, came as more than an ordinary shock to me because I had spent one of those pleasant half hours at lunch with him on the day he was stricken.

BILL NORRELL was always a quiet and unassuming person but, as I look back now to our midday conversation at lunch, I recall that he seemed to be preoccupied and was not as communicative as usual. We exchanged words of greeting and commented briefly on incidental and unimportant things, and then he paid his check and departed. Early in the evening when I heard the report that he had been stricken in his office that afternoon, I immediately recalled our conversation at the table that noon and that he seemed not as cheerful as usual but could not say that he gave any appearance of being unwell or in distress.

My impression of BILL NORRELL is that he was a kind and gentle individual. I feel sure that he never had an enemy. Never during our associations, which as I have previously stated were quite intimate and extended over a number of years, did I hear him give voice to an angry expression or utter an unkind word about anyone. He did, however, have strong convictions and always had the courage to express them by voice and vote. Our country can ill afford to lose statesmen of his stature. Not only has our country lost such a statesman but the people of his district in Arkansas have lost a good and faithful servant, his wife and daughter a devoted husband and father, and I a personal friend. I join his many other friends in this body in extending profound sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, by your appointment I served as a member of the funeral committee to attend the services of our late colleague and friend, Congressman W. F. NORRELL, of Arkansas.

Along with the Senators and the members of the Arkansas delegation, Congressman KIRWAN, of Ohio; Congressman FENTON, of Pennsylvania; Congressman JONES, of Missouri; members of the Committee on Appropriations who served with Congressman NORRELL, we flew to Arkansas to attend the last services in his memory. The large host of friends and beautiful flowers attested to the warm and sincere regard in which he was held by his neighbors, constituents, homefolks, and many friends.

The beautiful tributes paid to the life and public service of BILL NORRELL by the minister of his home church, the First Baptist Church, of Monticello, Ark., was certainly appropriate and befitting the life, character, and public service of our colleague. I merely wish to convey an expression of my own sympathy to Mrs. Norrell, her daughter, and the members of their family.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our gentle colleague, Representative W. F. NORRELL, on February 15, came to me as a great shock. BILL NORRELL and I served together on the House Appropriations Committee for many years. During that time, I learned to know him not only as a friend, but as a good Christian and a man of conscience.

This country can little afford to lose a man so dedicated to the public interest as Congressman NORRELL. The years of our association has brought home to me the thought that of my many congressional associates, he was the man to be respected because of his wisdom, admired because of his strength, and loved because of his devotion to God and America.

To his family goes my heartfelt sympathy; to the Nation he so notably served, my prayers.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most respected Members of this body has been called to his reward. BILL

NORRELL was a man of principle who could always be counted upon to act with courage and wisdom. He disdained the petty things, and always voted and acted in terms of what was best for the country. The country needs more men of that caliber today.

This great American will be missed. His wise counsel and his sober judgment will no longer be available. But his principles and his philosophy will be remembered, and they will continue for a long time to inspire many of us.

I join with BILL NORRELL'S many friends in extending to the family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and accomplishments of W. F. NORRELL.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 168

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable W. F. NORRELL, a Representative from the State of Arkansas.

Resolved, That a committee of nine Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deecased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. MILLS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TRIMBLE, Mr. ALFORD, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. EVINS, and Mr. JONES of Missouri.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 17, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

570. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the target price of Department of the Air Force contract AF O4(647)-287 with North American Aviation, Inc., Rocketdyne Division, Canoga Park, Calif., was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4385. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require the suspension or revocation of airman certificates in connection with the imposition of civil penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 4386. A bill to promote the welfare of the people by authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4387. A bill to provide that flood control, navigation, or other related projects in the delta area and drainage basin of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, Calif., shall be constructed, maintained, and repaired so as to preserve and protect the scenic and recreational values and to enhance the recreational and conservation potential of the project area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4388. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Armed Forces Medical Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4389. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, for purposes of disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze, quarters of coverage may be determined on the basis of the period during which wages were earned rather than the period during which paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 4390. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish and confirm the seaward boundaries of the coastal States, as a line 3 marine leagues distant from the coastline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4392. A bill to grant civil service employees retirement after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to establish certain qualifications for persons to be appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4394. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H.R. 4395. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4396. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4397. A bill to transfer to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 book bindings or covers imported by certain institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 4398. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of dividends paid by certain corporations which hold obligations of States and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4400. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4401. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for expenses paid by a taxpayer in obtaining a higher education or in providing a higher education for his spouse or children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4403. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4404. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Vanderburgh County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4405. A bill to provide for the expansion of the national cemetery at New Albany, Ind.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4406. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges, one for the northern district of Indiana and one for the southern district of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4407. A bill to terminate the White County Bridge Commission, to transfer its assets, liabilities, functions, and authority to the Commissioner of Public Roads, and to authorize the transfer of the bridge operated by the commission to certain State agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4408. A bill to provide for an annual audit of the accounts of the White County Bridge Commission, to provide a new method of appointment for the commissioners and for staggered terms of office, to exempt the income of the commission from Federal taxation, and to clarify the authority of the commission to transfer all its assets to certain public agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4409. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pensions for permanently and totally disabled wartime veterans, and for the widows and children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4410. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $200,000 for use toward the construction of a U.S.S. *Arizona* memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4411. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens and permanent residents of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4412. A bill to provide for the transfer of income taxes to the States for use for educational and other purposes without

Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4413. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4414. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to wife's insurance benefits or widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4415. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relates to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4416. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 4417. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4418. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4419. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 4420. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4421. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4422. A bill to amend section 2(a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increased retirement benefits for certain individuals who have attained the age of 60 and who have completed 30 or more years of service creditable under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 4423. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit loss of goodwill to be taken into account in computing the amount of the relocation payment which may be made to a business concern displaced by an urban renewal project, and to increase the maximum amount of such payment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 4424. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4425. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4426. A bill to extend for 5 years the period within which World War II and Korean conflict veterans shall have a preferred right of application under the homestead or desert land laws or the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4427. A bill to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 4428. A bill to authorize civil actions for the review of administrative determinations as to the use of lands of the United States for grazing purposes to be instituted in judicial districts in which such lands are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4430. A bill to authorize the adjustment of rates of duty and the establishment of import quotas to stabilize imports under conditions of fair competition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 4431. A bill to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4432. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4433. A bill to provide a termination date for the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications as of June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ICHORD of Missouri:

H.R. 4435. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of certain calcines and matte proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4436. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4437. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4438. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4439. A bill to promote the welfare of the people by authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist the States and territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 4440. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4441. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4442. A bill to provide for the rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing delivery of mail and certain other postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 4443. A bill to amend section 1552 of title 10 of the United States Code so as to define more clearly the jurisdiction of boards for correction of military records; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 4444. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act to extend Federal supervision of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and provide necessary assistance, to enable such tribe to make an orderly transition to its status after such supervision ends; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4445. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the prevention of pernicious political activities (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to make them inapplicable to State and municipal officers and employees, to permit limited partisan political activities by Federal officers and employees in certain designated localities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4446. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act of $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4447. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVEY:

H.R. 4448. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 4449. A bill to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 4450. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide sufficient appropriations to the Veterans' Administration to allow for remodeling, installing of modern equipment, and the supplying of sufficient personnel adequately to operate the Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries and outpatient dispensary facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4451. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4452. A bill for the relief of the city of Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 4453. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other educational expenses paid by him for his education or the education of any other individual at a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4454. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815

and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 4455. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4456. A bill to extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4457. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 4458. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace lateral pipelines, line discharge pipelines, and to do other work he determines to be required for the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake Irrigation Districts in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 4459. A bill to authorize the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to approve a financial contribution for civil defense purposes to the State of New York; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RILEY:

H.R. 4460. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4461. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4462. A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of United States Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4463. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, so as to provide a spouse a full annuity regardless of age under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 4464. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act of $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 4466. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946 with respect to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4467. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4468. A bill to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide that no individual who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to subversive activities, when summoned to appear before certain Federal agencies, shall be employed on any merchant vessel of the United States or within certain waterfront facilities in the United States; to the Commitee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide that no individual who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to subversive activities, when summoned to appear before certain Federal agencies, shall be employed on any merchant vessel of the United States or within certain waterfront facilities in the United States; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4471. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 4472. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4474. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 4475. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 227. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the tenure of Senators and Representatives in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.J. Res. 229. Joint resolution placing certain individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, and in the islands of Leyte and Samar after July 4, 1902, and their survivors, in the same status as those who served in the Armed Forces during the Philippine Insurrection and their survivors; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 231. Joint resolution to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact, and to enter into such compact on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.J. Res. 233. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to construct a modern stern ramp trawler to be used for research purposes and authorizing the appropriation of funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 237. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent Woodrow Wilson Memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 238. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent Woodrow Wilson Memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 239. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 240. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to be known as the Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study, to study the available fuel and reserves of the United States and the present and future rates of consumption thereof; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania,

Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. Res. 169. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the effects of automation on employment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. Res. 170. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of the Export Control Act of 1949 and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Res. 171. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of Federal Milk Marketing Order No. 27; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 4476. A bill for the relief of Cato Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 4477. A bill for the relief of Donald M. Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 4478. A bill for the relief of Aldo Francesco Carbone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4479. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Kavadias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4480. A bill for the relief of Jeffrey J. Powder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4481. A bill for the relief of George Vargha (known as George Gracza) and his wife Joyce Mary Vargha (known as Joyce Mary Gracza); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4482. A bill for the relief of Urszula Sikora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4483. A bill for the relief of Simon Karasick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Miss Liu Lai Ching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4485. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Cancelliere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4486. A bill for the relief of Radoslav Vulin and Desanka Vulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 4487. A bill for the relief of Lee Kwai Sim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4488. A bill for the relief of Lee Haw Sim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4489. A bill for the relief of Fook Q. Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 4490. A bill for the relief of Federico Maizumi Najera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 4491. A bill for the relief of Ahmad Nikbakht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Constantin Zarna and his wife, Eva Zarna, and their two sons, Pavel Zarna and Constantin Zarna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4493. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Spatafora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Concetta Casola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 4495. A bill for the relief of Yu Liao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Henriette Bela Wolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4497. A bill for the relief of George W. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4498. A bill for the relief of Maryellen Boone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 4499. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Ruda Daniel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 4500. A bill to donate to the heirs of Anthony Bourbonnais approximately thirty-six one-hundredths acre of land in Pottawatomie County, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Margarete Zgodda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of the Plattsmouth, Nebr., Women's Club that legislation be passed granting the State Department authority to refuse passports to known Communists and other legislation for the protection of national security against communism in the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

62. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of the Greater Newburgh Chamber of Commerce, Newburgh, N.Y., approving the location of a major airport in Orange County, N.Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac—Defender of Western Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year ago, on February 10, 1960, Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac, a stanch and unremitting defender of his Roman Catholic faith, the freedom and independence of the people of Croatia, and the Christian values of the West, died in bondage in his native village of Krasic, now controlled by Yugoslavia. In his life, and in his death, there is a message of courage and steadfastness which ought never to be forgotten by any of us who still cherish those things for which Stepinac lived and died.

At the age of 36 Aloysius Stepinac became the youngest archbishop in the world, and from that time until his death the world came to know him as an heroic crusader in the cause of human freedom and the brotherhood of man. By his sermons, by his pastoral letters, by his whole life and saintly death, Cardinal Stepinac showed the way out of the crisis and wreckage in which the world lives.

Stepinac stood for the Christian values of Western man in countless ways. He defended the freedom and worth of the individual as an independent entity; the freedom and respect for religion; the freedom and respect for all races and nations; the freedom and respect for private property as the basis of the freedom of the individual and the family; and the freedom and respect for the rights of every nation to its full development and independence in its national life. He was one of very few men in Europe who zealously and openly defended these religious and civil rights of man before, during, and after the tumultuous period of World War II.

Cardinal Stepinac set an example of courage that will live for ages to come not only in his native Croatia, but throughout the world. He scorned totalitarianism, materialism, racism, and atheism, and protected the wartime victims of these philosophies irrespective of race, religion, or political background.

Along with Pope Pius XII, Cardinal Stepinac was the greatest defender of the persecuted Jews in Europe. At the time of his Communist-held trial in 1946 the evaluation of Stepinac by the American Jewish Committee was that:

> This man, now the victim of a sham trial, all during the Nazi regime spoke out openly, unafraid against the dreadful Nürnberg laws and his opposition to the Nazi terrorism was never relaxed. He also cried out against the infamous "yellow tag" system, contending that it violated the dignity of man and he is credited with being the main force of having it abandoned.

Because of the diametrically opposite aims of Christianity and communism it was inevitable that Stepinac, by expounding Christian teachings and the rights of the church, clashed head on with Tito's communism. On October 11, 1946, after a typical Communist-type trial, Archbishop Stepinac was sentenced to 16 years of imprisonment, and he spent the remaining years of his life in prison in Lepoglava and later under house arrest in his native village of Krasic.

Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac has now been dead for a few days more than a year, but I have no doubt that his spirit continues to live on in the hearts and minds of all of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe, and I am certain that

the memory of his heroic struggle against tyranny in all of its heinous forms will forever serve as an inspiration to decent, freedom-loving people everywhere.

The Sinking of the U.S.S. "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in 1895 the revolt in Cuba had flared up again after more than a decade of relative tranquillity. During the winter of 1897–98, mobs of Spanish loyalists, resentful of the well-known sympathy of the American people for the Cubans, became formidable. Fitzhugh Lee, the American Consul General at Havana, appealed to his Government for support in the form of a naval force in Cuban waters. On January 24, 1898, the *Maine*, a second-class battleship, was ordered to Havana.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the Spanish authorities having been notified of her advent, the *Maine*, Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, steamed into Havana Harbor and was moored to a buoy 500 yards off the arsenal. The Spanish officials acted with punctilious courtesy and the social amenities between American and Spanish authorities proceeded according to naval protocol. No untoward incident took place until 9:40 p.m., on the night of February 15, when two terrific explosions threw parts of the *Maine* 200 feet in the air. The forward half of the ship was reduced to a mass of twisted steel; the after part slowly sank. Two officers and 250 men were killed at once and 8 men died afterward.

Separate investigations of the tragedy were made by the American and Spanish authorities. The Spaniards reported that an internal explosion, perhaps spontaneous combustion in the coal bunkers, had been the cause; the Americans that the original cause had been an external explosion which in turn had set off the forward magazines.

Later events are admirably summarized by William B. Norris in his article "The Destruction of the *Maine*," which appears in the Dictionary of American History:

> News of the disaster produced great excitement in the United States, and accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed by certain newspapers. Without doubt the catastrophe stirred up national feeling over the difficulties in Cuba, crystallized in the slogan "Remember the *Maine*." The wreck remained in Havana Harbor until 1911, when U.S. Army engineers built a cofferdam about the wreck, sealed the after hull of the ship, the only part still intact, and floated it out to sea. There, on March 16, 1912, appropriate minute guns boomed as it sank with its flag flying. The remains of 66 of the crew which were found during the raising were buried in the National Cemetery, Arlington.
>
> During the removal of the wreck a board of officers of the Navy made a further investigation. Their report, published in 1912, stated that a low form of explosive exterior to the ship caused the first explosion. European experts, perhaps influenced by several internal explosions in warships in the intervening years, still, however, maintained the theory of an internal explosion. No further evidence has ever been found to solve the mystery.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 708th anniversary of the founding of the independent Lithuanian Kingdom by King Mindaugas, and the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania. At a time when so many millions of freedom-loving peoples of the world are forced to live under the yoke of totalitarianism, it is appropriate that tribute be paid to Lithuanians all over the world and particularly to those whose voices are silenced because they are still living under Soviet enslavement.

The Lithuanian people enjoyed their independence from 1918 until June 1940, when the nation was overrun by the Communist hordes, who needed no provocation, as they have shown in so many other cases around the world. The Lithuanian people were deprived of their right of self-determination; they were deprived of their national identity.

At the outset of the Second World War, Lithuania declared its neutrality. Despite this declaration, Lithuania was forced to admit immediately units of the Red army to strategic locations of Lithuania and sign a mutual assistance treaty in which Russia once more promised to respect Lithuania's sovereignty. Notwithstanding four treaties of friendship and nonaggression pacts—1920, 1926, 1934, and 1939—in June of 1940 Communist Russian hordes invaded Lithuania and forcibly incorporated it into the U.S.S.R. This act of aggression was never recognized by the free world. As recently as in February of last year the United States reaffirmed its policy of nonrecognition of the Russian annexation of Lithuania.

Lithuania found itself in the throes of unprecedented terror. Soviet rule lasted just over 1 year, but its consequences were appalling. Arrests, tortures, imprisonments, and executions became an everyday occurrence. Finally came the mass deportations of Lithuanians and their dispersal in the remote regions of Siberia, where death was a slow, but the only sure, means of delivery from inhuman conditions imposed by the Communists.

On June 22, 1941, Germany attacked Russia. Disregarding everything else, the Lithuanian people saw but one thing, a chance to overthrow the hated Soviet yoke and to regain their freedom and independence. The insurgents succeeded in taking control of Vilnius and Kaunas, as well as postprovincial towns and proclaimed a provisional national government even before a single German soldier arrived.

After a few weeks, however, this provisional government was suppressed by the Germans, some of its members were arrested and deported to Germany as hostages. One occupation replaced another. During the second half of 1944, the Germans were driven out by the Russians, and once more Lithuania came under the Soviet yoke. Lithuanians formed an active underground force to resist the Communist occupation. Soviets pledged themselves in 1945 to liquidate Lithuanian partisans; however, as late as February 19, 1949, Antanas Snieckus, first secretary of the Communist Party, speaking before the party congress, admitted that although 12,000 resistance fighters had been killed, the struggle was still continuing. It was believed that as many as 100,000 patriots were massacred before active resistance was finally suppressed.

Years of terror and agony are passing and the dawn of freedom seems far away for the Lithuanian people, but their spirit and desire for freedom never die.

On this day, as we pay tribute to the Lithuanians all over the world, let us pledge not to forget the treachery of the Soviet tyrants who have enslaved this country. Let us rededicate ourselves with renewed vigor to the protection of the liberties which we all cherish.

It is a privilege for me to join with citizens of Lithuanian descent everywhere in observing this anniversary. I fervently hope and pray that the day is not too distant when their homeland will again enjoy true and lasting independence.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the people of Lithuania and to all Americans of Lithuanian descent who today commemorate the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

History has imposed harsh and bitter trials on the Lithuanian nation. The freedom from tsarist tyranny which was won in 1918 was destroyed by the new Soviet tyranny. During those 22 years of liberty, the Lithuanian people achieved exemplary economic, political, social, and cultural advances and Lithuania demonstrated her right to a proud place within the family of free nations. In 1940 the Soviet Union occupied and annexed Lithuania despite solemn treaty obligations to respect the independence of the reborn nation. Thereafter many Lithuanians were forcibly removed from their homes to meet the harsh requirements of manpower for the Soviet labor camps.

No observance of this anniversary of freedom is permitted in Lithuania but it is fitting that Lithuanians abroad, and freemen all over the world, speak out for the silenced people. It is for us to direct the conscience of the world on this occasion to the plight of a people whose liberty has been unjustly wrested from them but whose longing for freedom remains and must not be forgotten.

In this spirit, Mr. Speaker, it is wholly appropriate that we remind the people of Lithuania that we have not forgotten them, or any of the captive peoples, and that we, like they, look hopefully forward to the day when the yoke of tyranny will be taken from their shoulders and they return to their rightful place in the world community of freemen.

Garnishment of Salaries of Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced a measure which would provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of the civil officers and employees of the U.S. Government. Garnishment and the associated processes which are mentioned in this bill have long been features of the credit system of nongovernmental employees in this country. These procedures offer sound advantages to all parties concerned and I urge that they be opened for use in connection with our civil officers and employees.

The primary purpose of this measure is to benefit the individual Federal employee. The garnishment process would adversely affect only a small minority of Federal employees and it would provide real gains for them all. The absence of this process in cases involving Federal workers has resulted in lowered credit ratings for these individuals; permission for its use in connection with Federal workers, as it is permitted for workers in private industry, would improve these ratings.

There has been some misunderstanding of this proposal by Federal employees. This is a protection for them in the important field of credit standing; the alternative, continued exemption from these processes, is of benefit only to those who are in default on payments. For this benefit of only a few, many lose.

It is also misunderstood, I believe, by certain of our Government bureaus. They feel that the garnishment procedure would add to the administrative burden which they now have; rather, they prefer to discipline their employees within the organization, the ultimate punishment being dismissal. The disciplinary problem in this field is an administrative burden. By the establishment of the garnishment process, and the related processes, the incidence of defaulting payments would be decreased by the very healthy self-discipline of the employees themselves. Whatever inconvenience might be temporarily felt would, in the long run, be eliminated by this self-discipline, relieving the bureau of any administrative burden in this matter. Also it would, by giving a creditor direct access to the debtor's paycheck, give a meaningful alternative to the harsh punishment of dismissal, which is now the really practical means of compulsion open to the bureaus.

I believe that garnishment has proved sound in the private sector of our society. I would urge that we extend it to cover the civil employees of our Government.

The Casey Bill on the U.S. Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB CASEY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a serious situation when a Member of this House is deluged with mail urging that he bring impeachment against a Member of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I have received hundreds of such letters—not from cranks or crackpots—but from honest, patriotic citizens of my district who are deeply concerned for the future of our Nation because of recent decisions rendered by the Supreme Court. They are disillusioned with what hitherto has been the unimpeachable integrity of decisions by this Court. Their faith in the solid foundations of our Government has been shaken.

I can understand, and I share, the concern they have expressed to me. I, too, have taken issue and disagreed with recent decisions of the Supreme Court.

But I do not believe impeachment is the answer. In fact, such procedure would do much to accomplish the aim of international communism, and that is to completely undermine the faith of our citizens in our Government.

Two years ago, I introduced my first bill in Congress which I strongly believed would lead to a restoration of confidence in our Supreme Court. My bill died in committee.

Today, it is again my privilege to reintroduce this bill which would establish professional as well as geographical qualifications for future appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Again, I urge my colleagues to study this measure closely. If they agree that it is meritorious, I earnestly solicit their support and invite them to join with me as coauthor.

This bill will require that future appointees to the U.S. Supreme Court must have had not less than 8 years' judicial service as a justice, a judge of a court of appeals, or a district court of the United States, or a judge of a State court of last resort having jurisdiction to interpret the State's constitution.

In addition, the bill would prohibit the appointment of more than 1 Associate Justice of the Supreme Court from any of the 10 judicial circuits of the U.S. court of appeals which geographically divide up the Nation.

One important effect of this bill will be to lift the appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court from the realm of politics.

Since the President can only serve 8 years, this bill would prevent him from naming and advancing a political appointee through the Federal courts to the U.S. Supreme Court within the President's tenure of office.

Again, I must point out that three of the present members of the Supreme Court were named to judgeships of lower Federal courts by former President Eisenhower—then advanced to the Supreme Court by former President Eisenhower from 1 to 4 years later.

I have noted with approval the statements by President Kennedy that only the most qualified men will be sought to fill positions in Government. But the need for passage of this bill still exists, for we may not always have a President so dedicated to the public good.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to emphatically point out that this bill is not an attempt to hamstring or curtail the power of the Supreme Court.

I will bitterly oppose any attempt to tamper with or destroy the delicate balance of power written into our Constitution by our Founding Fathers.

But I must point out that under the law, there are absolutely no qualifications set forth for appointment to the Supreme Court. It is not even specified under existing law that a member of the Supreme Court must have a legal background—much less judicial experience.

It is inconceivable to me that a person without substantial prior judicial experience and proven judicial temperament can be expected to ably dispense justice in interpreting the laws of our land in our Court of last resort.

Mr. Speaker, justice is not merely the application of textbook interpretation of the body of the law by legal theorists. Justice is the reaching of tempered decision that comes from equally weighing the law and the evidence, and knowing the full import of such decision on the parties involved. This ability is acquired only through years of experience.

The American people have the right to demand that only the finest legal minds in the Nation be chosen to sit on our highest Court. Such appointees should have proven judicial backgrounds, and should geographically represent the broad stream of customs and culture that flows through our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the framers of our Constitution could not envision a Nation of 50 States spreading from the coast of New England to the far reaches of the Pacific Ocean. Nor could they envision the growth of our laws and judicial system into a massive complex which requires years of study and actual practice to understand. If they had, I am certain they would have made such provi-

sions requiring both judicial experience and geographic representation.

Legal authorities and associations, as well as laymen, have openly quarreled with decisions reached by the Supreme Court.

I strongly believe such questionable decisions are rendered primarily because of a lack of judicial experience on the part of the present members of the Supreme Court.

Of the nine members of the Court, five had no judicial experience prior to appointment to the highest Court in our land.

Like many Americans, I strongly feel that the Supreme Court of our Nation is decidedly not the place for "on-the-job training" for men who have never served as a judge or justice.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is divided into 10 judicial circuits. Of the 8 Associate Justices now serving, 4 were appointed from the 1st, 2d, and 3d circuits composed of 10 New England and Middle Atlantic States; 2 from the 5th circuit, and 1 each from the 6th and 8th circuits. There is no Associate Justice on the Court appointed from the 23 States comprising the 4th, 7th, 9th, and 10th circuits.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, communism and nazism have been the twin curses of democracy and freedom in this century. We have succeeded in eliminating nazism at a terrible cost, but unfortunately communism is still with us enslaving hundreds of millions of freedom-loving peoples over a good part of the globe. The 3 million Lithuanians are among those who have been suffering under Communist totalitarianism in their homeland.

These stout-hearted people had regained their freedom at the end of the First World War, proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918, and then lived happily for about two decades. They were on friendly terms with their neighbors and bore no grudge even against their former oppressors; as events elsewhere in Europe became increasingly ominous, they only hoped that they would be spared by their implacable enemies, the Nazis in the south and the Communists in the east. But the evolving pattern of international politics late in the 1930's marked them as a ready victim. Soon after the outbreak of the last war, in 1940, the country was overrun by the Red army. The Lithuanians were robbed of their freedom and brought under the oppressive yoke of the Kremlin.

Today these courageous people live under oppressive Communist totalitarianism. They endure all the hardships and sufferings imposed upon them by that regime, but they also live with the hope that eventually they will again be free in their beloved homeland. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day I share their genuine sentiments and hope that they will have their reward of freedom and peace.

General Kosciuszko—Symbol of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join millions of other grateful Americans in paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko on the 215th anniversary of his birth, which was observed Sunday.

It is indeed fitting that we in America pause in the hasty pace of our daily existence to pay tribute to the illustrious heroes of the many nations in the world who joined in a common cause during America's Revolutionary War so that freedom could establish a beachhead on this continent.

General Kosciuszko today symbolizes, not only in America but throughout the world, the spirit of the indomitable Poles who for 1,000 years have toiled in defense of freedom. We can find no better example of the Polish spirit and dedication to freedom than by studying the history of this great general. The example which he established in his gallant struggle for American independence is being today emulated by Polish people not only in their native land but also scattered throughout the world.

To those who might be tempted to believe that the Polish Nation ultimately will accept the tyranny of communism, we need only point to the spirit of Kosciuszko. When he saw that the struggle for freedom for Poland was interrupted by overwhelming odds, Kosciuszko came to America to join the revolutionary forces to fight for freedom on this continent. And when the battle was concluded here, and the forces of right and dignity won out over tyranny in our country, Kosciuszko returned to his native land, hoping that he might repeat victory for his own people.

Today millions of Polish emigrants who cannot return to their native land because of Communist domination in Poland carry on the struggle for ultimate liberation of that country, and within Poland itself the spirit of freedom continues to flourish, even though Poland's present Communist rulers have resorted to every means to force upon her people the dogma of communism.

In paying tribute to Kosciuszko on the 215th anniversary of his birth, we are in fact paying tribute to a gallant people who have for 10 centuries inspired the world in the firm belief that man was created to be free and that dignity of the individual is the greatest force on earth.

I believe it is fitting that at this time, when we pay tribute to General Kosciuszko, I should include in the RECORD a letter I have sent to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, urging him that when the present U.S. courthouse in Chicago is demolished to make room for a new Federal building, the artistic plaque dedicated to General Kosciuszko, which at present reposes in the main lobby of the building along with plaques of other American Revolutionary War heroes, be preserved and be relocated in the same position of prominence in the new building.

We Americans can learn a great deal during these critical times from the heroic exploits of men like General Kosciuszko. Long may his spirit serve as a symbol to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my letter to the General Services Administrator follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN MOORE,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: As you undoubtedly know, the General Services Administration is now in the process of building a new Federal building in Chicago. Presumably, the existing U.S. courthouse will ultimately be demolished.

I should like to take this opportunity to urge you to take the necessary steps for the preservation of the historic plaques dedicated to several American Revolutionary War heroes which now adorn the main lobby of the present building. I strongly urge that arrangements be made to advise the architects of the new building to make provisions for transferring these historic plaques to the main lobby of the new Federal building.

Last Monday we Americans paid tribute to the memory of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko on the 215th anniversary of his birth. General Kosciuszko's bust is included in the historic series of plaques in the Chicago U.S. courthouse. This plaque has served as an inspiration to Americans of all nationalities for many years because of General Kosciuszko's profound contribution toward winning freedom and independence for America in the Revolutionary War.

I hope you will make every endeavor to make sure that this inspiring plaque and the other plaques continue in a position of prominence in the new building.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI.

Lithuania Remains Free in the Hearts of All People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, after more than a century of Russian occupation and three unsuccessful attempts at insurrection, the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence at Vilna on February 16, 1918—43 short years ago.

The life of Lithuania as a free Republic was uncommonly short. In the wake

of the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, Lithuania was engulfed by the Red tide of Communist Russia. Though the Lithuanian people have not known freedom for 21 years, their claim to independence has never been broken by the Russian yoke.

On this, the anniversary of their independence, let us remind the world that the United States continues to regard Lithuania as a sovereign nation and is looking to the day when the Lithuanian people will again breathe free.

Extension and Expansion of the Special Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to extend and expand the special milk program for a 2-year period under a continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation authorization. My bill provides for the annual use of up to $105 million in CCC funds for the milk-for-schoolchildren program for fiscal 1962 and 1963. The present program, which authorizes an expenditure of up to $95 million for fiscal 1961, is due to expire at the close of the current school year.

I would like to include in the RECORD the reasons why I feel it is imperative for speedy action to be taken on this measure.

In 1954, the special milk program was originated by the House Agriculture Committee in the belief that it would be far better to get more fluid milk to our nation's children than to move that same milk into Government storage in the form of surplus manufactured dairy products. Since that time, this program has been doing a tremendous job of improving the diet of our schoolchildren while providing an additional market for our dairy farmers. The special milk program is a striking example of the way our food abundances can be used to promote better nutrition in this country, which is certainly what we need and want to do.

From the time this program got underway, the response from school officials and students has been most encouraging. Last year, over 80,000 schools and child-care institutions participated, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that about 22 million young people are now drinking milk during school hours. This figure represents more than half of the schoolchildren of the Nation. During the past year, they drank 2.4 billion half-pints of milk under the program. That amount represents more than 2 percent of the annual nonfarm consumption of milk.

Mr. Speaker, just to give one illustration of the impact of the special milk program, I would like to cite the experience of a school in my home district of Wisconsin. The students of the Greenwood School District of Clark County are now drinking enough milk at school to keep 17 cows busy every day of the school year.

All of this adds up to an excellent record for the special milk program. However, we cannot afford to rest on our laurels so long as more can be done to reach additional schools, camps, and other institutions caring for our children. But if State and local school officials are to undertake additional special milk program promotional efforts during the coming school year, they must be assured that the program will be continued and that adequate funds will be made available to cover its growth.

For these reasons, I feel that my 2-year extension of the special milk program should be enacted into law without delay so the Department of Agriculture, school officials, and the dairy industry can get on with the job of seeing to it that our schoolchildren have the milk they need to grow into strong and healthy adults.

Federally Sponsored State Aid to the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I have reintroduced a bill, H.R. 3729, to abolish residence as an eligibility requirement in federally sponsored State aid to the blind programs.

Support of these programs at Federal level is evidenced by the substantial financial contributions made by the Federal Government each year. I believe, it is of equal concern to the Nation that blind persons who are able bodied and employable be given such help and encouragement as they may need to enable them to provide a living for themselves and their families.

In the nature of things the population of the United States is constantly on the move to improve individuals' economic opportunities. However, those who are blind and are now on public assistance are restricted from seeking opportunities in areas where such opportunities may exist, because by so doing blind individuals realize that their benefits would be cut off, because of residence requirements imposed under federally sponsored State aid to the blind programs. This is a limitation on the complete rehabilitation of many employable and able-bodied blind persons. To restrict blind people from moving from one State to another is to stave off initiative, suppress incentive and frustrate desire for self-improvement and the achievement of economic independence.

My bill would lend support to previous actions of Congress directed toward making federally sponsored State aid to the blind programs a means by which needy blind people could be helped to obtain rehabilitation and economic independence.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people regained their freedom 43 years ago from czarist Russia. Today they find themselves enslaved in their homeland by Communist Russia. Since they are not allowed to observe their independence day there, it is only fitting and proper that the observance of that day be celebrated by their friends and sympathizers in the free world.

The 3 million Lithuanians constitute the largest of the three ethnic groups in the Baltics. From time immemorial they have played an important part in the history of that region. Late in the Middle Ages they formed a powerful kingdom and for centuries remained a principal force in northeastern Europe. Early in the 16th century their kingdom joined Poland and thus formed the Lithuanian-Polish dual kingdom. They remained united until late in the 18th century when Poland was partitioned and most of it fell to Russia. In that partition Lithuania also came under czarist Russia, and from then until 1918 the Lithuanians lived under Russian autocracy. During that time they were oppressed by the heavy yoke of the czarist government, but they kept alive their patriotism and love of freedom. During the First World War they were ready to seize upon the first chance offered them to regain their freedom. In 1917 when the czarist regime was overthrown, the Lithuanians were presented with the long-sought opportunity. They at once asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918.

That day has become a national holiday for the Lithuanian people, for that inaugurated a new era for them. They founded the Lithuanian Republic, they succeeded in strengthening it, and lived in it happily for two decades. They were perfectly content with their lot in their free country, and they were friends of their neighbors. But Communist Russia always looked upon Lithuania's democratic freedom as a menace, and seemed anxious to eliminate it at the first opportune moment. That was done very early in World War II. The Red army invaded and occupied Lithuania, putting an abrupt end to the Lithuanian Republic. Soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and its citizens enslaved by Communist tyranny.

Since those fateful days of 1940 the unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom. They have been suffering hardships, deprivations, imprisonments, and even death in the hands of their oppressors. But even under such un-

bearable conditions they have not given up their love of freedom, their goal of national independence. On the observance of their independence day, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, let us all hope and pray that they will have their reward in freedom in their beloved homeland.

A Bill To Amend Title II of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitations upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder.

When the social security admendments of 1960 were under consideration last year it was my hope that the Congress would enact a provision removing all limitations upon the amount of outside income which a social security beneficiary could earn. The social security law as amended, however, by the social security amendments of 1960, provides that a beneficiary who earns $1,200 or less will receive his benefit payments for all 12 months of the year. A person who earns more than $1,200 in a year will have $1 of his benefits withheld for each $2 that he earns from $1,200 up to $1,500, and for every $1 that his earnings go above $1,500, $1 of the beneficiary's benefits will be withheld.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the limitations imposed on outside income under the social security amendments of 1960 should be removed. While the amendments to some extent permit our social security beneficiaries to earn a greater amount of outside income than was the case under the old law, the fact remains, nevertheless, that our elderly people who are in receipt of social security benefits are greatly in need of increased earning power. The higher cost of food, clothing, housing, and medical care is working a severe hardship on thousands of our older citizens.

My bill would permit social security beneficiaries to earn as much outside income as possible without jeopardizing their right to social security benefits. The enactment of my bill would permit many of our elderly people, who now find it impossible to maintain a decent standard of living on their social security payments, to increase their income from outside sources to a level adequate for their proper maintenance. Due to the age of our social security beneficiaries and the limited job opportunities they have, my measure would not decrease the job opportunities for younger people. On the contrary, it would offer a measure of hope and assistance to thousands of our older citizens who must now supplement their meager social security payments through assistance from their relatives or other sources.

The Congress will be considering at this session a number of proposals which, if enacted, will directly and indirectly benefit many social security beneficiaries. I know of no proposal which will be of more help to our older citizens in their efforts to supplement their social security payments than the measure I have introduced. I certainly hope that my colleagues will join with me in working for the enactment of my bill.

The Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation Project Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the mid-State reclamation project is important to our State. It provides for irrigation, flood control, fish and wildlife conservation and development, and minimum recreation facilities. The area involved is from 10 to 20 miles wide and about 100 miles long. The project would have as its principal purposes the furnishing of a surface irrigation water supply for approximately 140,000 acres of land, aiding in the replenishment of the ground-water supply of the area for domestic and agricultural use, controlling floods, conserving and developing fish and wildlife, and producing hydroelectric power.

The Nebraska mid-State reclamation district, organized under the Nebraska Reclamation Act, tried as an independent reclamation district to get the project rolling. In 1958, one of my predecessors, A. L. Miller, introduced legislation providing for Federal participation, but the measure failed of enactment. My immediate predecessor from the Fourth District of Nebraska introduced similar legislation in the 86th Congress, but it was not acted upon, although the measure received favorable attention from many sources.

I have today introduced a slightly amended version of the legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the mid-State reclamation project. My colleagues from the State in the House of Representatives are introducing identical bills, and Senators CURTIS and HRUSKA will introduce the legislation in the Senate. Most of the old difficulties have been ironed out in this new legislation, through discussions with responsible individuals in the Department of the Interior, and other Members of Congress, including the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, WAYNE ASPINALL. The Bureau of Reclamation is working with the mid-State reclamation district.

I will not, at this time, go into the many aspects of the project. The benefits and potential value of the project are incalculable. It is a long-range plan which will benefit our citizens in the mid-State area, and I feel that it has real merit.

The proposed authority will be contingent upon appropriations. The project will be a unit of the Missouri River basin project, under the comprehensive plans approved by section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented.

During hearings on the legislation in previous years, testimony as to the feasibility and benefits of the Nebraska mid-State reclamation project have been thoroughly reviewed by those who have studied it carefully. R. W. Beck & Associates made a feasibility report reflecting the engineering investigations, surveys and plans developed over the past 15 years.

I feel that favorable consideration of this legislation will meet with widespread approval. I am very hopeful that the House of Representatives and the Senate will see fit to support this view and pass this legislation.

Constitutional Amendment To Limit Tenure of Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the terms of which there would be required a 2-year sabbatical leave for Senators and U.S. Representatives after they had served 12 consecutive years in office. During this leave period, the officeholder would not be eligible for election to the position which he had held. This would mean that Representatives after serving all or the major portion of six consecutive terms and Senators after serving all or the major part of two consecutive 6-year terms would not be eligible to succeed themselves.

There are two sound bases for this proposal. One deals with the operation of the National Legislature itself, the other with the qualifications of the individual Members.

The former refers to the seniority system. There is much of value in the seniority system and there are some real drawbacks to it. Many critics have called for the elimination of this system for setting congressional heirarchy but none, apparently, have offered an alternative that has proven workable. This amendment would have the effect of breaking the chain of seniority from time to time and would add a flexibility to the committee processes of Congress.

The second basis deals with the ability of the individual Representative or Senator. Because of the complexity of legislative business and the demands

upon Members of both the House and the Senate, there is a tendency of National Legislators to lose touch with the people they represent. Too often the Member of Congress becomes a resident of Washington and loses his place as a member of the community which elected him. By requiring a period of leave, as this amendment would, the individual Member of Congress would have the chance to reacquaint himself with those he represents and take a fresh look at the problems he must face if, after his leave period, his constituency chooses to return him to office.

I believe that this amendment would serve the best interests of the country.

Surplus Labor Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, unemployment among automobile workers in Michigan becomes more acute every day. This is an extremely serious problem in Flint, designated last week by the U.S. Department of Labor as an area of substantial and persistent labor surplus. As it has sought means to alleviate this unemployment, the Flint City Commission endorsed my proposal to repeal the discriminatory automobile excise tax, which would stimulate sales and production of cars, and adopted unanimously, on February 13, the following resolution requesting the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee to hold hearings:

Whereas one in every six business firms in the United States is engaged in the automotive field; and

Whereas one of every seven employed persons in the United States works in a highway transport industry; and

Whereas many other business enterprises are dependent on the manufacture, distribution, use, and servicing of motor vehicles; and

Whereas the automobile industry, directly and indirectly, is the most vital force in the American economy; and

Whereas, exclusive of the present Federal excise tax, the automobile industry contributes substantial tax revenues to the Government of the United States; and

Whereas a repeal of the excise tax upon the manufacture of motor vehicles would stimulate sale of such vehicles and would thereby immeasurably stimulate the economy of the United States, of the State of Michigan and of the city of Flint: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Commission of the City of Flint does hereby express its unqualified support of House bill 3647, a bill now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives which would repeal said excise tax; be it further

Resolved, That this city commission does hereby request the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, to hold public hearings upon House bill 3647 in order that interested parties may testify as to the necessity for passage of said bill; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, to the Honorable CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN, Representative of the Sixth District of Michigan; to the Honorable PHILIP A. HART, and PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, Senators from the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, hearings on the question of extending the temporary wartime tax have not been held since 1953. Therefore, I, too, urged Chairman MILLS to give serious consideration to scheduling such hearings at an early date. Under previous unanimous consent, I include the remarks in my communication to him on February 10:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 10, 1961.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLS: Recently I introduced in the House H.R. 3647, a bill to repeal the excise tax on automobiles and trucks—a proposal that I made in the 85th and 86th Congresses.

You know from our past correspondence how strongly I feel that this tax discriminates against the automobile industry and its workers. However, I would like to reiterate my reasons:

1. It is discriminatory because it levies a tax on automobile manufacturing that is not levied on other general manufacturing. While I recognize the need for Federal revenue, and that the automobile should pay its share, I contend that the excise tax burden should be more equitably distributed.

2. The excise tax was levied as a temporary measure during the Korean war to put the brake on automobile production and utilization. The situation is now completely changed and several of the automobile plants in my district are temporarily closed and their employees are out of work. It is time we take the brake off and take action to increase automobile production.

3. The automobile industry is one of the cornerstones of our economy. Economists universally recognize the direct effect of this key industry on our Nation's economic well-being.

4. The automotive industry is vitally related to many other industries such as steel, glass, rubber, leather, cotton, and turpentine, to mention but a few. One out of every six business firms in the United States is in the automotive field—one out of every seven employed person works in a highway transport industry—a total of 10.4 million automotive jobs. Three-fourths of all automobile trips are connected with people's jobs or business and professional work.

5. The automotive tax represents multiple taxation at its worst.

6. During the past few years it has been increasingly difficult for the American automobile to compete with foreign-made cars. The excise tax aggravates this situation.

7. The excise tax has been removed or reduced with respect to most articles during the years since the war, but the automotive excises have been extended annually at their wartime rate for the past 9 years.

8. We are now hearing many suggestions about possible solutions for unemployment and aid to depressed areas. We should not wait for our automotive areas to become further depressed when affirmative and remedial action would correct a longstanding inequity and also supply the necessary stimulus to increase production.

To my mind there is no doubt that this tax should be repealed. Further, as no hearings have been held on the question of extending this temporary wartime tax since 1953, I feel that your committee should permit hearings on this critical issue at an early date. Each year since 1953 this tax has been extended without an opportunity for any public expression of the impact of such action on our total economy and the issue has been presented to the House under a closed rule that would not permit the consideration of any amendments.

Thus, with many, many suggestions being advanced to stimulate our economy, I submit that the request for the public to be heard on this vital issue is most reasonable and would provide your committee with much valuable and essential thought on the intervening economic developments during this 8-year period. I most respectfully request that this matter be given your thoughtful consideration.

With my kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of Pennsylvania's 10th District—an area of the United States which has been particularly blessed by its large Lithuanian heritage—I am most privileged to add my voice to those who will today salute Lithuanian Independence Day.

Perhaps this day has no significance more important than that it also gives us pause to remember that Lithuanian independence is a past victory, long since warped by Soviet enslavement. The Lithuanian people struggled bitterly for many years to gain their independence, only to have it shut off behind the Iron Curtain.

Americans, whatever their national origins, ought to join Lithuanian Americans today in a double pledge.

First, we must resolve that what the Communist system has done to Lithuania must never happen here in America. Second, we must remember always that Lithuania is not an integral part of the Soviet Union, but rather is a captive nation. Friendship between our peoples must forever be kept warm, and our hand must go out in sympathy to the brave Lithuanian people in their understandable and very human desire to once again be free.

Coming as it does so close to the sudden and untimely death earlier this week of Thomas F. Connor, a 10th District native who was the executive director of the Captive Nations Week Committee, Lithuanian Independence Day has extraordinary significance for my constituents this year.

Mr. Connor had dedicated himself and his considerable talents to the cause of putting the spotlight of world public opinion on the plight of the Lithuanian and the other captive peoples of the world.

Americans from the 10th Congressional District intend to carry on Mr. Connor's work. We urge all of our countrymen to join with us.

New Life for Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our New England States are among the hardest hit by unemployment. In a recent speech, our distinguished colleague from Maine, Congressman PETER A. GARLAND, gave thoughtful voice to the problems confronting our own and other distressed areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to insert Congressman GARLAND'S address:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE PETER A. GARLAND, REPUBLICAN OF MAINE, BEFORE THE BIDDEFORD-SACO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE INDUSTRIAL BANQUET, WONDERBAR STEAK HOUSE, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1961

Perhaps the most pressing domestic problem facing our Nation today is the large number of chronically distressed communities which suffer from acute and persistent unemployment. We all know from our first-hand experience the devastating effect on the economy of an area and the human suffering that results from persistent unemployment. Because of the closing down or transfer of industries, we have experienced right here in Maine severe problems in many of our industrial communities. We have, in fact, faced many challenging years during the transition created by the exodus of many of our once prosperous textile plants.

I know, too, of the frustrations that develop as effort after effort to bring in new industry to a depressed community fail, and I know of the rebirth of hope that permeates all phases of community life when an industry does locate in an area and people once again have an opportunity to earn their own livelihood.

Clearly, Government has assumed a more prominent role in recent years in creating opportunities for economic expansion. Activities of the Government affect almost every segment of our Nation's economy. It is my conviction, therefore, that the Federal Government has a responsibility and an obligation to assist chronically depressed industrial areas—to afford an opportunity for the citizens in those areas to regain economic security and opportunity.

I think we can all be proud of the pioneer efforts of the State of Maine to assist its own depressed areas. Some 10 years ago, the legislature created the Development Credit Corporation of Maine, through which banks and other lending institutions have pooled funds for use by new and growing industries, otherwise unable to obtain necessary capital. Considering the financial resources available, our Maine corporation has been doing a highly effective job, providing 74 individual business loans for a total of $2,186,283. In Cumberland County, we have received 18 loans totaling over one-third of a million dollars, and in York County we have received 9 loans for $138,000.

Maine also was among the first of the States to form an industrial building authority and thus provide a State guarantee for construction mortgages provided by regular lending institutions. Up to 90 percent of the cost of construction can be covered, and the remainder of the cost can be provided by community development foundations, another vehicle for local action fostered in Maine and in the other New England States. The principal advantage of this guarantee program is that a company need not put its own capital funds into bricks and mortar. This program also has aided in bringing into Maine a number of new industrial firms.

In spite of the availability of money at reasonable rates, the promotional work of our State's department of economic development, the efforts of our railroads and utilities, and the direct interest of a number of industrial realtors, in State and out, we still have vacant buildings and too high a rate of unemployment. It is in the hope that the added stimulant of a Federal effort will produce even better results that I favor a national area assistance program.

I am hopeful that Congress will act promptly on area assistance legislation. The legislation we enact should include a program of loans for new industrial development, for the construction of new factory buildings, or for the rehabilitation of existing industrial sites. It should also include authority for loans for needed public facilities. Authority should be granted, moreover, for the Federal Government to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas so that local businessmen and community leaders may properly direct their efforts to acquire new business and new industry.

Several of the bills before Congress provide in addition preferential assistance in obtaining Government contracts and in receiving industrial aid under the urban renewal program. Several of the bills provide also for vocational retraining so that, for example, skilled textile workers can become proficient in the new skills required by new industries. This would have a particularly strong application right here in our Biddeford-Saco area.

These are all desirable provisions. I hope and expect that Congress will include all of them in the bill it finally enacts, for together these proposals will provide an effective means for the Federal Government to stimulate economic growth and expansion, and thus to help create jobs in areas of chronic unemployment. According to the provisions of the bills, three communities in our own State would be immediately eligible for assistance. These are, of course, the Biddeford-Saco area, the Sanford area, and the Lewiston-Auburn area.

Combined with the effective services already available at the State level, this Federal program could be of immense benefit in all of these areas. The legislation offered by some of my colleagues, however, contains certain proposals which are of deep concern to those of us from New England. The so-called Douglas bill, which has received administration backing, offers no protection against federally subsidized pirating of our industries, and secondly, it calls for substantial amounts of assistance to rural areas, the vast majority of which are located in the South and none of which are located in Maine or New England.

Accordingly, I would like to see the use of the loans for industrial redevelopment forbidden in connection with the relocation of industry, regardless of the effect of such a move on the employment situation in the firm's original location. Very little, if anything, is gained for the national economy in the mere relocation of an industry. If a company is strong, and a change in markets or raw material sources dictates the necessity of a relocation, it can usually make the move on its own. If it needs assistance, there are plenty of facilities at State and local levels available to it.

The real gain to the national economy will come only from the encouragement of growth. For this reason, I believe that Federal area assistance should be limited to newly formed companies looking for a location and to the establishment of branch locations of existing companies. Speaking for you people, I know that we would prefer to have a branch of a strong company than the main plant of a company that was having difficulty staying in business in its original location.

I also believe that my fellow Congressmen from the great industrial States of New England and the Northeast will agree with me, in that they do not wish to see the Federal Government become a partner in the removal of industry which is now providing jobs for their people.

I am concerned also over the possible dissipation of considerable Federal funds and energy in a vague program to bring industry to poorly defined, underdeveloped rural areas. I recognize the fact that there are rural areas in which people do not have sufficient income by today's standards. But I am not convinced that they are all suitable for industry. Nor am I convinced that there is to be such a sudden outburst of industrial activity that these new areas, as well as the older ones, will be readily filled with branch plants and new companies.

These two provisions contained in the proposals currently offered by and supported by the Kennedy administration signal real danger for Maine and New England. New England already faces severe competition from other areas of the country. Our transportation costs are high. We depend on other areas of the country for the raw materials needed in manufacturing. We are dependent wholly for our fuel supply on other areas of the country and abroad.

Moreover, we know from bitter experience how the South was able to attract our textile industry away from us. I consider it, therefore, of vital importance that we eliminate from the final bill the provisions granting aid to rural areas, none of which by the bill's definition would be in New England and the vast majority of which would be in the South, and that we include protection against the use of Federal money to attract industry away from New England.

While I strongly favor depressed area legislation, I will fight any bill which contains these hazards to our economic welfare here in Maine.

A Federal program for area assistance which is designed to encourage and aid State and local effort can be one of the most important contributions this Congress can make to the economy of our Nation—and particularly to the economy of older industrialized areas like we have in our State. Such a program, too, will help to revive hope in many communities now affected by heavy unemployment. To rebuild these communities, to provide new economic opportunities for their citizens and to relieve personal hardship and suffering should be a prime objective of the 87th Congress.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence is being commemorated today.

It is regrettable that this cannot be a happy occasion and that, instead, there is sorrow in our hearts for the courageous people of Lithuania who are now enslaved by Soviet rule.

In 1918, after more than 100 years of oppression under Russian rule, the people of Lithuania declared their independence and established their Republic. During the few years of freedom which followed, they proved their capacity for wise self-rule, their industry and their willingness to make great sacrifices to maintain their freedom. However, this period of liberty was brought to a tragic end in 1940 when the Soviet Union brought the Lithuanians under its domination. Since then, they have been deprived of their personal liberties and they have suffered cruel deprivations and unbearable hardships.

It is to be hoped that the brave people of Lithuania will take comfort in the fact that our hopes and prayers are with them and that Americans and freedom-loving people everywhere look forward to the day when freedom will again be theirs.

Tribute to Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746–1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a large number of volunteer fighters from Europe took part in our War of Independence, and many of them not only distinguished themselves but rendered signal services for our cause. Among these soldiers of freedom, Tadeusz Kosciuszko occupies a place of honor and distinction.

This gallant and gifted son of Poland was born into a middle-class family on February 12, 1746. In his youth he showed exceptional abilities, and particular liking for books. His parents did all in their power to gratify their promising son and gave him the best education they could afford. Upon the completion of his courses at the Royal School in Warsaw, he was awarded a scholarship for study in France. He went to France and entered the famous Mesieres school of military studies, specializing in artillery and engineering.

In 1776 while in Paris, Kosciuszko heard of the American Revolution; at once he saw his chance to fight for a great cause. He gathered sufficient money through his friends there and sailed for America, arriving in Philadelphia in August. Immediately he applied for military service, of course was admitted and then charged with drawing up plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission, and in 1783 he was made a brigadier general. After having fought for our cause, and thus after seeing the successful completion of his mission here, he returned to Poland, hoping to carry on the fight for Poland's freedom. But his efforts in behalf of his countrymen were unsuccessful, and he ended his career in exile in Switzerland. We solemnly honor the memory of this great son of Poland, this gallant and gifted soldier for freedom.

Legislative Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my legislative report of February 15, 1961. It follows:

We have intentionally delayed our first congressional report for this session because of the slow pace of the new Congress. This is a normal situation because it requires time for a new administration to organize and take over the reins of Government.

The administration's program is beginning to unfold and much of its content was covered in generalities in the state of the Union message. It is apparent that massive new spending proposals will be presented in the domestic as well as in the foreign fields.

The President has stated that he plans to confine his program within the framework of the budget presented by President Eisenhower. This, in my opinion, will not be possible. There is every indication that we can look forward to budget deficits for the years ahead.

With increasing rapidity, task force reports on various issues are being presented. Almost every one of these reports requires additional Federal expenditures. What we need is a task force to study means of saving tax dollars.

I am convinced that the best long-term solution to our economic problem is tax reduction, so that individuals can spend their own dollars for consumer items, thus creating more jobs. The automobile excise tax is an example of a reduction that I feel would be helpful to Michigan.

We must also become more competitive in world markets. Only by keeping the unit cost of production as low as possible can this be done. It will require vigilance and sacrifice by both labor and management.

I expect to oppose now, as I have in the past, new large spending programs financed by deficit spending. There is ample evidence from the past that massive Government spending is no long-term economic solution. There are some areas where already planned Government projects can be expedited; this has merit and should be done.

At this writing, it appears that within the framework of the above comments I may find it necessary to oppose, in whole or in part, many of the proposals of the new administration. I am convinced programs from the Federal level requiring new or higher taxes or increased deficits are not in the long-term best interests of our country. I will, of course, support some programs that I deem to be a Federal responsibility and urgent in nature.

There has been considerable talk about closing tax loopholes. There is no doubt that a general tax revision is necessary. I believe it only fair to point out that since 1932 the Democrats have been in control of Congress for 24 of those 28 years. No serious attempt was made during those 24 years to revise the tax structure.

The cold facts are that any new and large spending programs will have to be paid for by the average taxpayer. If the Government were to confiscate all personal income over $10,000 (taxing that income 100 percent) it would provide the U.S. Treasury with $4.5 billion, or only enough to run the Federal Government for 3 weeks at the present spending rates. Or, if all income over $25,000 were confiscated by a 100 percent tax, the additional revenue would be $700 million or only enough to run the Federal Government for 3 days. These facts should make it obvious that future increased tax revenues must be borne mostly by individuals of average income.

As the various issues come before Congress, I will welcome your opinions.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

This bill is similar in all respects to H.R. 3935, the minimum wage bill sponsored by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, except that it eliminates the exemption from the Fair Labor Standards Act of hotel, motel, and restaurant employees employed in enterprises grossing $1 million annually as described in the bill. Consequently, coverage of minimum wage would be extended to hotel, motel, and restaurant employees.

The reasons for extending the coverage of the act follow:

First. This class of employees is the lowest paid in the country and is a depressed area in that respect.

Second. The bulk of hotel, motel, and restaurant workers are workers who do not receive tips. They are maids, housemen, elevator operators, telephone operators, maintenance men, front office clerks, cooks, dishwashers, pantry girls, checkers, and cashiers. This class of employees, as well as tip workers, was originally covered when the act was first passed and was excluded in 1949 in order to get the 75-cent rate for other employees. They have not been covered since and their state has grown increasingly worse.

Third. The tips of the so-called tip workers, though subject to income tax, are not computed as wages for social security purposes. This creates an impoverished group at the time of retirement because of old age, for their social security benefits are based on their low wages, far below the minimum wage set for other workers under the law. There-

fore, they require protection and should come under the act.

There is a great need for a minimum wage law increase from $1 to $1.25 and the extension of coverage. The State governments in the main have failed to act; consequently, our Federal Government must cure the evil. What is the present situation with respect to the minimum wage law?

Approximately 20 million American workers are denied the protection of the minimum wage law in any respect. On a State level, we find 19 States have no minimum wages whatsoever.

Five States have provisions for wage boards, but they have not acted. Arkansas, whose legislators inspired the Landrum-Griffin bill, has a minimum wage law for skilled labor of 16 cents an hour. Kentucky has a minimum wage law of 40 to 50 cents per hour. Ohio, which people believe is a progressive State, has a minimum wage of 70 cents per hour for hotels and restaurants, and 27½ cents an hour for laundries, and $11 to $15 per week for beauty parlors. Only 11 States have minimum wage laws equal to Federal standards. Therefore 39 States of our Union have substandard wage provisions. The States have failed to act in this area and it behooves us on a Federal level to fill the vacuum.

Excluded from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act are all our domestic workers, the employees in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; 97 percent of employees in the retail trades; 80 percent in the services as in hotels, restaurants, and laundries; 56 percent in construction, although by bargaining arrangements, they can take care of themselves; 34 percent in finance, insurance, and real estate; 30 percent in wholesale trade.

The objections to the minimum wage law are based upon the mistaken belief that an increase in the minimum wage will bring about inflation, cause unemployment, bankrupt industry. History of previous increases in the minimum wage law and the experience in the administration belie these objections.

A study of the Department of Labor made in 1954 showed that the increase of minimum wage to 75 cents in 1950 did not cause unemployment. Rather it retarded it. It demonstrated that the increase to 75 cents per hour from 1938 to 1951 brought about an increease in the level of wages by 171 percent; whereas in high wage employment, the increase was 121 percent, and the increase in manufacturing wages increased by 148 percent. This report showed no loss of employment and very few bankruptcies, even in the South. The U.S. Department of Labor reported that the rise from 75 cents to $1 per hour did not result in an increase in the consumer price level, nor the wholesale price level. A study at Cornell showed that the increase to $1 per hour did not contribute to price inflation.

Another objection raised against the extension of minimum wage to hotel, motel, and restaurant workers is that these employees are not engaged in interstate commerce. The volume of business conducted by these motels, hotels, and restaurants indicates that much of their operations are involved with interstate purchases and services. In addition people forget, when this argument is raised, that these workers were covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act in the first instance and they were exempted from the provisions when the minimum wage law was increased. A restoration of their prior position would be equitable and in view of the low standards of earning power, Federal action with regard to these workers should be taken.

Today, there are 7.6 million families and single individuals earning under $2,000 a year. The Labor Department estimates that a family of four requires $4,680 per year to have a modest, but adequate standard of living. This group of employees does not make such a sum and their earnings in many cases are supplemented by welfare payment or governmental assistance. It would be better to raise the minimum wage so that they can be self-sufficient rather than receive the assistance of Federal welfare.

A longstanding inequity is corrected by this bill.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1961, marks the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. This is a day that should be honored by every American who holds sacred the ideals upon which our liberty and independence were established.

This day is to serve as a reminder to us of the events of February 16, 1918, when a significant chapter was written in the age-old story of man's searches and struggles for freedom and justice. No finer example exists, of a people valiantly pursuing this search, than the Lithuanians. Foremost in their minds and hearts is the goal of national independence.

It was on this day, 43 years ago, that the Republic of Lithuania, following the example of Latvia, and preceding Estonia by only a few days, declared herself to be free of the ancient Russian tyranny; 22 years later this freedom was brutally betrayed by a new tyrant, the late Josef Stalin.

But the memory of freedom continues. Subjected to savage persecution under the iron heel of Communist tryanny and terrorism, Lithuanians have never lost hope of ultimate victory. The spirit of independence has not been crushed, but lives on to inspire new hope that the day of liberation is near.

And so on this day, it is fitting that we join with all friends of Lithuania and of other oppressed nations in solemn recognition of the noble cause of liberty, and for the spread of truth and freedom everywhere.

Markets for State and Local Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, within our Federal system of government the Constitution divides the responsibility for providing the services of government between the levels of government. Looking at the position of the State and local governments in this country, I believe we can see growing burdens on these governmental units in meeting the responsibilities which are properly theirs. I am sure that all the Members of this body have received letters which indicate that this is a serious problem.

This growing responsibility and the means to meet it must be the concern of this body just as it is the concern of the legisiative bodies of our States, counties, and municipalities. In recognition of this responsibility and of our concern for it, I have today reintroduced a bill which I believe will be of substantial benefit to our State and local governments in finding the means by which they may meet their responsibility. This bill would broaden the market for the bonds of these governmental units by attracting the investable funds of the country's investment trusts into the market for them.

These investment trusts of which I speak are those in which a number of relatively small investors join, giving them the capital as a group to acquire a strong and well-rounded investment portfolio. Together with this opportunity to diversify the shareholders' investments, these investment trusts also allow the individual investor with only moderate amounts to invest to go into fields normally open only to the very large investors. One of these areas in which large investors dominate the field is that of State and local bonds.

At present there is little incentive for the investment trusts to be represented in the demand for State and local governments' bonds. While the interest from these bonds is tax exempt to individual purchasers, this attractive feature is not passed through the investment company to its stockholders, however. They must pay the full tax rate on income which comes to them from the investment trust whether the pool from which this income is drawn comes to the investment company from tax exempt sources or others. The company itself does have the benefit of this tax exemption but, because there is no provision for passing this benefit along, these bonds do not attract investment trust funds.

The bill which I introduced today would provide this passthrough feature and would improve the market for State and local bonds. This would not be the enactment of a new tax exemption, but rather it would make the existing exemption more effective in accomplishing the purpose for which it was created.

Nor would this measure result in any substantial loss to the Federal Government; little tax revenue is now realized from the requirement that stockholders in investment trusts pay taxes on the portion of their dividend income derived from investment of trust funds in State and local bonds because these organizations have not, for the reasons stated, invested in them. The effect of this bill would be to make these securities attractive to these pooled investment funds and provide a market for the State and local bonds without substantial detriment to the Federal Government.

Capital improvements by the State and local governments are usually financed through borrowing, through the use of bonds such as those to which this bill would apply. We can foresee an increase in the need for these capital improvements as the proper responsibilities of the local and State governments grow. By opening these channels of financing there is a great benefit to the governmental units concerned, and to the citizens of the country.

During the years in which I have been interested in this proposal and have sponsored it in the Congress, I have been contacted by a wide range of individuals and organizations which recognize its merits. These include organizations in the municipal and county government and educational fields, economists interested in the problems of State and municipal finance, and other groups—such as the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

In view of the important job which our State and local governments have to do in providing for the needs of our citizens and the problem which exists in financing their activities, I urge consideration of this bill.

National Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews to Radio Station WNEW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it has just come to my attention that radio station WNEW in New York City, for the second consecutive year, has been awarded the National Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. No other radio or TV station has been so honored.

When WNEW received this same award in 1960, I mentioned it to the House by an insertion in the RECORD and am pleased to do so again on this occasion.

This station has consistently and conspicuously set the highest standards of morality and decency in an extremely important field of endeavor.

We in New York are proud of WNEW, its management and its staff. The National Conference of Christians and Jews is also to be congratulated for the recognition that it has given to a job well done.

Lincoln's Moral Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not common practice to make public the proceedings of the House prayer breakfast group. However, this week, in honoring the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, a special message on "Lincoln's Moral Strength" was given us by our colleague, FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, and I am sure all of you would want to share these thoughts. I am, therefore, including it as a part of my extension:

LINCOLN'S MORAL STRENGTH
(By Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL)

On the left portico as you enter the Archives Building here in Washington, D.C., you read: "The heritage of the past is the seed that brings forth the harvest of the future." We, in America, have a great heritage from which to draw inspiration and which needs cultivation by all of us, but none that is better or can be more fruitful than the heritage we have in Lincoln.

Lincoln once said, "All that I am or ever hope to be I owe to my angel mother." Rosemary Benet has written some interesting lines that introduce both this angel mother and her illustrious son, with some questions that are moving and have great appeal:

"NANCY HANKS

"If Nancy Hanks
Came back as a ghost,
Seeking news
Of what she loved most,
She'd ask first
Where's my son?
What's happened to Abe?
What's he done?

Poor little Abe,
Left all alone
Except for Tom,
Who's a rolling stone;
He was only nine
The year I died.
I remember still
How hard he cried.

Scraping along
In a little shack,
With hardly a shirt
To cover his back,
And a prairie wind
To blow him down,
Or pinching times
If he went to town.

You wouldn't know
About my son?
Did he grow tall?
Did he have fun?
Did he learn to read?
Did he get to town?
Do you know his name?
Did he get on?"

In answer to these suggestions we might say: yes, Nancy, he learned to read. He read what you would have wanted him to read—the Bible, history, biographies, good literature. He learned well from the examples and great lessons found there. Most importantly he learned how to apply these lessons in the public domain. For the people—all the people everywhere.

"Do we know his name?" Well, we could note the tribute in the report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission published recently. It has 193 pages. In the introduction we read, "February 12, 1960, marked the conclusion of one of the most extraordinary tributes to an American leader ever undertaken by the people of this Nation and our neighbors throughout the world."

We could tell about the hundreds of statues and monuments built to his memory and found all over the world where people love liberty. The one in our Capital City is visited by more people than any other shrine in the world; last year over 3 million people were given some kind of political and spiritual lift as they entered that classical temple you can see here in the District of Columbia. It seems, in a mysterious way, to preserve some of the noble spirit of this humanitarian.

In addition, we could point out that there have been trillions of postage stamps printed with his picture on them and used to carry messages of love and other communications all over this world. Over 6,000 books and periodicals have been written about him.

Why do so many millions from everywhere show so much interest in him and take him now as a personal treasure?

It is, I believe, because they feel that he had a philosophy and ideals that should be placed everywhere in the world. They admired how he led a nation which held out so much hope for so many through its most difficult and challenging time. They approved the firmness with which he contended with secession and the political and spiritual clashes in a civil war. A war that produced a valor and sacrifice that has never been equaled in the history of mankind.

They are moved by his almost unbelievable patience in dealing with the vicious and conflicting attitudes of people about slavery.

After reading and learning about the birth of a nation, the great foundations upon which liberty is built, and convinced that our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, gave us a system and an ideal that must be preserved and promoted, he concluded that the situation demanded that reason and commonsense must prevail. It dictated clearly that saving the Nation must be his first goal, and if need be his sole objective; correcting the errors and mistakes in law by the people at that time, in part or in whole, should be his second objective.

Clinching his argument with the observation that you don't take the body to save the arm.

With his country in the desperate struggle for survival, with a new political party which had not yet been tried, a party that still lacked deep convictions and unity of purpose, with the demands of abolitionists on one hand and the problems of the border States on the other, this man assumed the most demanding and awful responsibilities ever placed on the mind and conscience of any political leader in the history of the human family.

As we look back now to that tragic experience in our history we wonder:

How he could resist the clamor to let the erring brothers go;

With all that was said and done by respectable people, how he could continue to have faith;

And, from whence came the will to resist the terrible temptation to be vindictive?

How and where did he get such abiding faith in the people?

Where did he get the keen and invincible conviction about the last best hope of earth?

Where did he find the idea that "right makes might"?

Where did he develop the patience that was necessary to deal with the shortcomings of strong and important men, the understanding to direct a political party and to control his opposition?

How did he get to know the validity of the Christian virtue to be charitable to one's enemies?

Where did he learn about the simple eloquence he used to sway people?

In answer to all these questions, we should point out that his two mothers must receive much credit. The record reveals and confirms that he inherited from Nancy, his mother, his ability and his great heart. His education was initiated by her and his angel stepmother helped him so much in so many ways. From both he learned to love mercy, do justly, and walk humbly.

From the reading and thinking that they inspired and encouraged he developed a great moral strength, a faith, and devotion to ideals, without which, as he once indicated, he would fail, and with which he could not fail.

Many books have been written about the many other early associations and influences in his life that helped him grow mentally and spiritually.

In the record are accusations about his being a nonconformist. In many ways he was that. For instance, he didn't belong to a church, but this did not indicate immaturity and spiritual poverty. What he said and did shows him to have been a man who had a trusting, deep, religious faith—a faith that had content—a sturdy, religious content.

Historians have estimated that his spoken and written record adds up to over a million words. It seems to me that in his own record we find revealed best his humanity, his greatness, and his moral strength. What he was and believed is better expressed by himself than by someone else trying to tell about it.

When asked about belonging to a church, he replied, "When any church will inscribe over its altar, as its sole qualification for membership, the Saviour's condensed statement of the substance of both Law and Gospel, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor, as thyself,' that church will I join with all my heart and all my soul."

Having said that he, through word, deed, and example, set about to show his approval of the church's activities. He attended church regularly. He paid $150 to join the Methodist Missionary Society in Washington, D.C., and spoke kindly and often about the great and good influences of the church.

His simple statement of faith and assurance that solemn day in Springfield, February 11, 1861, when he was bidding his neighbors and friends goodby bears repeating. Recognizing the load he was to assume as greater than that of George Washington he said:

"Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail."

While he was yet a candidate the first time, in 1860, he let himself be used as a prophet and expressed his complete willingness to be used as God's servant in government, saying:

"I know there is a God and He hates injustice and slavery. I see a storm coming. I know His hand is in it. If He has a place and work for me, and I think He has, I believe I am ready. I am nothing, but truth is everything—I know I am right because I know that liberty is right, for Christ teaches it and Christ is God."

This became his acceptance speech for the office of President. He made it before he was even nominated. So, none was needed after the nomination. Has anyone or could anyone make a better one?

On his trip to Washington, stopping often en route to address the people, he felt the need to testify to his faith in a way that would help his people understand the gravity of the situation and to prepare them, with him, to carry the ship of state through some perilous times. At Cincinnati he gave this needed quote, "Under the providence of God, who has never deserted us, we shall be brothers again."

In Columbus, expressing his faith in the people, he said, "I look to the American people and to that God who has never forsaken them."

With an admonition to the people at Buffalo, he said, "One must trust in that Supreme Being who has never forsaken this favored land through the instrumentality of this great and intelligent people."

At Trenton, catching the spirit of his patron saint, George Washington, he pledged that, "I shall be most happy indeed if I shall be a humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty and of His almost chosen people for the perpetuating of the object of the great struggle."

At Philadelphia, that city of brotherly love and the cradle of liberty, sensing a need for supreme sacrifices, he offered what an assassin's bullet was to take on that fateful day in April 1865, when he told those people, "I have said nothing but that I am willing to live by and, if it be the pleasure of God, to die by."

We know the circumstances under which Lincoln had to travel on the last leg of his trip to Washington.

Having arrived on the scene and taken the oath of office, it then became his obligation to apply his convictions about things that dealt with morality and to take command of a tragic situation in Government, and to put things in proper perspective for himself and for the Nation.

In the ensuing 4 years, he did this magnificently—applying the admonition of him who preached a gospel of love. He demonstrated throughout this whole period that true humility is a great virtue in adversity.

Knowing that no doctrine, faith or knowledge is of value to man except as it bears fruit in action, he kept pressing toward his goal, of union and liberty—revealing always a rare kind of courage, wisdom, and goodness.

There are so many evidences of his great understanding of the other man's problems, his willingness to go the extra mile, to turn the other cheek and to be a friend to man; but none better, it seems to me, than when he went to call on Gen. George Pickett in Richmond to renew an old friendship, dating back to when George Pickett lived in Quincy, Ill., and Mrs. Pickett was to remember always that afternoon at the war's end when she answered a knock at the door of her home. She opened it to find a tall stranger standing there in the shadow of the porch, asking her if George were at home, ma'am?

She replied that George wasn't and wouldn't be for some time, but might she ask who the visitor was. The tall man in the frock coat, stovepipe hat in hand said simply, "Just an old friend of George's ma'am; just an old friend from before the war." With that he turned and stepped out into the sunlight and walked slowly down that Richmond street, leaving Mrs. Pickett to the startled realization that the President of the United States had come to call.

The President of the United States. Abraham Lincoln was that, of course, he was, but really a great deal more than that. For this was a man of many parts, all of them human and most of them great.

Arguing and making decisions with a firmness in the right as God gave him to see the right, he made many difficult and right decisions. And, if he stated a reason, he did it clearly, using effectively the art of friendly persuasion.

Because we know it is worth while to give attention to his homelife, we might say that this, too, was the husband and father whose homelife was torn by strife and dissension and the tragic death of two children.

Yet, it is not for us, now or ever, to judge Mary Todd Lincoln. The heart of a wife and the heart of a husband can best be known only to themselves, and what a woman says to a man or what a man says to a woman should often, as the ancients knew, be written on the wind. It will become us better to remember that Mary Todd and Abraham Lincoln sat fondly holding hands in a darkened box in Ford's Theater on the night of Good Friday, 1865.

But this, too, was the President—the President and Commander in Chief—devoted above all else to preserving the Union "with the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired." So he said; so he did.

And in so doing, he brought freedom to the enslaved. As he wrote in his Annual Message, following the Emancipation Proclamation: "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom for the free, honorable alike in what we give and in what we preserve."

Supported in this objective by the abolitionists, yes, but fought by them every step of the way, for moderation was a word they never knew. He counseled with them patiently when he could; he blocked them ruthlessly when he must, fondly hoping that in time they'd learn, fervently praying that they'd learn in time.

While agreeing with Grant in his objective in the closing days, he sometimes questioned the method but he had learned when he was a boy that you "never cuss a good ax." He tried to keep up with Grant, studying tactics late into the night but night and day studying human nature as well; taking time out for needed laughter and humor; writing with a wry smile to a woman who had asked him for a sentiment and his autograph:

"DEAR MADAM: When you write to a stranger for something which is of interest only to yourself, always enclose a stamp. There's your sentiment and here's your autograph.

A. LINCOLN."

And, finally, most Americans will recognize this was the martyr, the martyr to the Union, to freedom and to peace. Lincoln had a presentiment of death all his life, but never more strongly or clearly than on the morning of April 14. Yet he knew that death was not the worst of life, that defeat was not the worst of failure, that not to have tried to do his best was failure and in his relentless trying to preserve this Union, for us and forever, he achieved one of the greatest successes in all recorded time.

It was America's darkest hour since Valley Forge when they carried him out of Ford's Theater and into the little Petersen House across 10th Street and Dr. Charles Leale, 23 years old, assistant surgeon, U.S. Volunteers, who had been the first to attend him when he fell, sat through those long, black night hours and the long, gray morning ones that followed holding tightly to the President's hand, knowing, as he was to write later, that reason and recognition occasionally returned to the afflicted at the moment of departure and wanting the President to understand in his blindness that he was in touch with humanity and had a friend.

So it was that George Pickett's old friend from before the war himself had a friend at hand when the long war years were over.

This was Abraham Lincoln, politician, husband and father, President and Commander in Chief, martyr for all mankind. He was a man of such dimensions that he made all others seem small, though he would have been the very last to wish to do so. Those dimensions were not merely physical, not

just the 6 feet 4 of him or the gaunt, bony frame of him, but the great soul and heart of him as well.

For this was the Bible-reading, pondering, praying lad come out of the wilderness, following a prairie star, filled with wonder at the world and its Maker, who all his life, boy and man, not only knew the 23d Psalm but, more importantly, knew the Shepherd.

Now, in 1961, it seems possible that we shall never see his like again. This is a sobering thought, but it should be a kindling one, for upon us now, as a people, has been laid perhaps the greatest responsibility any nation was ever asked to shoulder, yet certainly not greater than we can bear. Our days are no longer than were Lincoln's, our nights are no darker, and if there is any difference between his time and this, it lies in the tremendous advantage that is ours, that he stood so tall before us.

And, if there is need for more evidence that he understood the Sermon on the Mount, that he had great moral convictions to guide and inspire us today, it can be found in that second inaugural address. There we find at least 18 references to the moral lessons found in the Good Book, ending with just 72 words in the last paragraph. They are an eloquent, elevating, and an everlasting reminder of what should be our national and international goal and policy.

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

Seventy-two words; fifty-nine of them one syllable words; twelve of them two syllable words and one three syllable word—its name is charity.

With these few words he testified to his love for mercy and to his trusting belief in the Beatitudes. Charity seems to be the central theme—Is there anything that America and the world needs more today?

Clearly, with this utterance, he reached the summit of forbearance and love. It may be true that not all of us have or can reach the genius of his devotion and humanity, but we can try. Nothing could give us better assurance for the attainment of a grander national purpose for ourselves and for the world.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 19th century, for more than 100 years, some 3 million devout and patriotic Lithuanians worked and prayed for the day of their deliverance from czarist oppression. At last they saw their cherished dream come true in 1918. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, the Lithuanians saw their chance for freedom and proclaimed their national independence on February 16 of that year.

For about two decades they enjoyed their newly won independence. They formed a democratic form of government, rebuilt their war-ravaged country, revived their national institutions, introduced many progressive social and economic legislative measures, and in a short time Lithuania became a respected member in the family of nations. Unfortunately, however, the new state was not in position to weather a major international crisis, for in the ensuing world turmoil of the late 1930's its independence was seriously endangered. In the fall of 1939, it was forced into a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union, and in the summer of 1940 it was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since then Lithuanians have not known freedom. Today they remain imprisoned in their homeland, behind the Iron Curtain imposed by the Kremlin. They are thus cut off from the outside world, and they are forbidden to move out of the country. There they are forced to work for their heartless taskmasters, the agents of the Soviet Union, and they continue to pray for their freedom. We in the free world observe the celebration of their independence day and hope that they attain their cherished national goals of freedom and independence.

Lithuanian Endurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania. Today's celebration of this 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence is indicative of the spirit of Lithuania throughout its long history. The joy of the occasion, though veiled in sadness, is a joy deep and abiding. It is the more triumphant because of this very sadness. We are celebrating the endurance of a people despite all vicissitudes.

Today Lithuania is named among the captive nations of the Soviet Union. But this superimposed blanket of Soviet authority only thinly veils the independent spirit of Lithuania which refuses to be smothered. This spirit of Lithuania has endured despite all efforts at domination.

Nor is this true only of the Lithuania of 43 years ago. There is a centuries-old record of Lithuanian resistance to subjugation. The Lithuanian people have remained an entity for more than 1,500 years, and this in the face of centuries of onslaught from east, west, and south.

Forty-three years ago Lithuania emerged as an independent "democratic republic." The Lithuanian nation of the 20th century, which had burst the bonds of tyranny from without, was determined to admit no tyranny from within. The Constitution of 1922, which followed the liberation of 1918, guaranteed to the Lithuanian people freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of communication.

Such was the evidence of the spirit of the Lithuanians which has persisted through the ages. Independent minded, freedom loving, they have maintained their traditions and their ideals despite all repression. Their belief in the inalienable rights of men to national independence and individual freedom has endured.

Lithuanians the world over, I am sure, look to the peoples of the free world to share in their effort to realize again their ideals. We in the United States are proud to cheer this spirit, this hope, this determination. Lithuanian endurance is inexorably grounded in the hearts of her people, and holds the promise of recapturing her rights and freedom. May her endurance be rewarded and her hopes fulfilled.

Presidential Prayer Breakfast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Vice President, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, made a superb address to those gathered for the Presidential Prayer Breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel, Thursday, February 9. It will be remembered in history as truly a classic:

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

To this generation of public men, God has entrusted the care of great powers. With those powers, we can do God's work on this earth. Or we can put asunder all that God has wrought.

Such alternatives demand of us the highest order of responsibility. We can have no real sense of responsibility in our public lives until we have a very real spirit of reverence in our private lives.

These times often require responsible public men to forget their politics—but never permit them to forsake their prayers. Every public servant is tallest on his knees.

It is appropriate that we remind ourselves of this as we do today.

In recent months, our Nation has reexamined and reaffirmed the principle of separation of church and state. We cherish that principle and the protection it affords for the integrity of each man's soul. I am sure the principle has no stronger defender than the man who sits with us as President of the United States.

But we need to remember that the separation of church and state must never mean the separation of religious values from the lives of public servants. In our Nation's early years, William Penn warned that, "If we will not be governed by God, we must be governed by tyrants." If we who serve free men today are to differ from the tyrants of this age, we must balance the powers in our hands with God in our hearts.

America need fear no man who fears God—and the nation that fears God need fear no man. The man who first held the office I now hold—John Adams—put it this way: "Ask me not, whether I am a Catholic or Protestant, Calvinist, or Arminian. As far as they are Christians, I wish to be a fellow disciple with them all."

We live in a world where free men worship in many different ways. But insofar as they worship a power greater than the state, we wish to be fellow disciples with them all—upholding together the cause of freedom on this earth.

It is for the ultimate triumph of this high calling and joint labor that we "pray without ceasing." In our prayers, as public men, let us follow the injunction of the early American clergyman who told his flock:

"Do not pray for easy lives. Pray to be stronger men. Do not pray for tasks equal to your powers. Pray for powers equal to your tasks."

Secretary of Labor Goldberg Urges Prompt Action To Extend Unemployment Benefit Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, testified before the Committee on Ways and Means Wednesday, February 15, on the administration's proposal for immediate enactment of legislation providing a temporary extension of unemployment benefit payments. The Secretary very effectively presented the case for immediate action on this legislation.

I was also very pleased to note that the Secretary plans to submit in the very near future proposals to strengthen our permanent unemployment insurance system.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the full text of Secretary Goldberg's statement on this legislation:

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON H.R. 3864, THE "TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1961," FEBRUARY 15, 1961

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee to urge prompt and favorable consideration of a proposal, H.R. 3864, that would carry out a part of the program recommended by the President earlier this month to alleviate the distress arising from unsatisfactory performance of our economy and to stimulate economic recovery and growth.

The legislation embodied in H.R. 3864 was more specifically recommended by the President to the Congress in letters of February 6 transmitting the bill to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. It would establish a temporary Federal program that would operate during the present recession period to provide extended unemployment benefits for workers who have exhausted their rights under State laws and to assist the States in meeting the exceptional problems currently posed by the rapid rise in the number of long term unemployed.

While H.R. 3864 is of course only a part of a broader program, it is a very crucial part of this program. In fact, I believe that I can scarcely overstate its importance in meeting the needs of the unemployed and providing purchasing power to those who will use it. This program will quickly put into circulation almost a billion dollars of purchasing power to buy the necessities of life. And this purchasing power would be paid out to the largest number, and therefore at its highest rate, during the early months of the program, when it will be most beneficial to our economy.

The President recognized the importance of this program in his February 6 letters when he stated: "* * * The costs and effects of mass unemployment arising from a national recession clearly reach across State lines. The problem is national in scope, and the Federal Government has the responsibility for taking action as soon as possible to meet it. That is why I propose this temporary program as a first step. The extension of the unemployment compensation program will permit 3 million workers to receive benefits totaling about $950 million."

It is unnecessary, I am sure, for me to belabor the need for this program.

As we all know, unemployment in this country has assumed serious dimensions. We are experiencing high levels of unemployment not only because we are now in a recession, but because we have had a gradual rise in unemployment, apart from recessions over the last decade. Our recovery from the 1958 recession was anemic and incomplete. As a matter of fact, each of the last three recessions began with a volume and rate of unemployment higher than at the outset of the preceding recession. This is shown by a few comparisons of present unemployment and exhaustion figures with those of recession year 1958.

There were almost a million more persons unemployed in January 1961 than there were in January 1958. In January 1961, 5.4 million workers were without jobs; at about the same time in 1958 about 4.5 million were unemployed. Even more serious is the fact that about one-half million of today's insured unemployed have already exhausted their rights to unemployment compensation, and we estimate that by April 1, 600,000 workers will have exhausted their compensation and will still be unemployed. This is more than the entire population of Seattle, Buffalo, or Memphis. In the 12 months following April 1 at least another 3 million workers are expected to exhaust benefits before they get jobs, of which about 2.4 millions are expected to draw extended benefits under this program. For the same months in 1959–59 there were only 2.7 million exhaustees, of which on the basis of the 1958 experience about 75 percent, or over 2 million workers, would have drawn TUC benefits if the program had been in effect in all States for this period.

The latest statistics with respect to claims for unemployment insurance attest to the growing seriousness of the problem. During the week ending February 4, 496,000 initial claims were filed, and during the week of January 28 insured unemployment reached 3.4 million, 1.1 million higher than for the same period last year.

Clearly the current situation is grave enough to warrant immediate attention. Unemployment statistics are a measure of personal hardship as well as economic cost. Unemployment in our modern industrial society has a direct and immediate impact on the worker affected and his family. It undermines the spirit of the worker. It destroys his ability to maintain a decent standard of living for his family. Equally important are the destructive effects of unemployment on the economic health of our communities and the Nation. Workers suffering a wage loss due to unemployment cannot sustain demand for goods and services produced by our economy.

This I have seen at firsthand. As you know, at the direction of the President, I took very recently a trip to several States with heavy unemployment, and everywhere I saw its impact on workers and their families. We cannot ignore their plight.

The need to minimize the harmful effects of unemployment led Congress to establish an unemployment insurance system 25 years ago. By that action, Congress recognized that there is a national interest in providing adequate income maintenance for the unemployed. The Employment Act of 1946 further established the responsibility of the Federal Government in assuring high levels of employment and the adoption of policies making for greater stability in the economy.

I am convinced that the enactment of H.R. 3864 would be an important step in the right direction; it would on the one hand meet the needs of the workers and their families, and, on the other, would help to create and sustain a demand for the goods and services available under our economy.

Briefly, H.R. 3864 provides for federally financed additional unemployment compensation to each unemployed worker who has exhausted his rights, equal to 50 percent of the benefits provided him by State law, up to a maximum of 13 times his weekly benefit amount, that is, 13 weeks for total unemployment. Where a State after the effective date of this program has paid unemployment benefits to the individual under its law in excess of 26 weeks for total unemployment, the Federal Government will reimburse the State. Whether by reimbursement to the State or by the payment of Federal benefits to the individual, the total payable out of Federal funds may not exceed a maximum of 13 times his weekly benefit amount for the duration of this program. Nor will Federal funds be used for payments with respect to an individual if any such payment would bring his total benefits (Federal and State) with respect to a benefit year, including extended duration, to more than 39 times his weekly benefit amount.

The provision for reimbursement is included in recognition of the action taken by some States in providing more than 26 weeks of normal or extended duration to some or all workers. Without such a provision, these States would be placed at a disadvantage, since they would have assumed the cost burden of long-term unemployment that would in other States be met from Federal funds. In addition, reimbursement would help replenish the reserves of those States which have had heavy compensable unemployment.

The Federal extended benefits under the bill would be payable promptly; that is, for weeks of unemployment beginning as soon as 15 days after enactment of the legislation. Workers who had exhausted their benefit rights after October 31, 1960, and are still unemployed would be entitled to the temporary benefits. The program would remain in full effect for approximately a year, that is, until the end of March 1962. Individuals who had filed a claim and who had been found entitled to extended benefits by that date, however, could draw their benefits for weeks of unemployment beginning after April 1 but before July 1, 1962.

Benefits and reimbursement would be paid only in States which enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Labor. The State may choose to enter an agreement only to act as agent for the United States in the payment of the emergency Federal benefits; it may enter into an agreement providing only for reimbursement to the State for benefits paid by it in excess of 26 weeks; or it may enter into an agreement providing for both. The agreement will be very simple, designed to assure that the statute is complied with and that the Federal funds are safeguarded. It will, in fact, be very much like the agreements now in effect between the State employment security agencies and the Department of Labor under which Federal benefits are paid to Federal employees and ex-servicemen.

If all the States enter into agreements, the costs of this program, it is estimated, would be about $950 million. These costs would be financed initially out of general funds of the Treasury. Ultimately, however, they would be financed out of proceeds of the Federal unemployment tax, which would be returned to the general funds of the Treasury. Thus, the cost of financing the program would be spread among employers in all the States. Since no State is a self-contained economic unit, we should not except a State to carry alone the crushing burden of long-duration unemployment. This is especially so when the causes of prolonged unemployment cross State lines. The proposed financing would pool the risk and costs of recessionary unemployment, which is more a National than a State problem.

There is another advantage to financing the program in the manner proposed by the bill; namely, that Federal benefits can be paid promptly in all States, since no State legislative action would be necessary in order to do so. Speed in putting the money made available by the program into the hands of the unemployed is a significant factor in the program's value as an emergency anti-recession measure.

The cost of the program proposed by the bill would be substantially met out of the increased revenues resulting from the proposed increase in the wages taxable under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. At present the taxable wage base under this act is $3,000. It is proposed to increase it to $4,800, effective January 1, 1962. This would produce additional Federal revenues through fiscal year 1966 of about $695 million, or an annual average approximating $172 million. These receipts, combined with the additional revenues resulting from the recent 0.1 percent increase in the Federal unemployment tax will make it possible to cover the cost of the program proposed by H.R. 3864 by the end of fiscal year 1966. The total Federal unemployment tax income, after paying all employment security administrative costs, Federal and State, including the costs of the proposed program, would be sufficient also to build up a balance in the Federal unemployment account for advances under title XII to States which are in financial difficulty. The balance would be increased by the $225 million of outstanding title XII advances to the States which will have been repaid by then.

Apart from its role in financing the emergency program, an increase in the taxable wage base has the further advantage of being a long overdue improvement that would assist in augmenting the capacity of our present unemployment insurance system to do a better job. Only about 60 percent of covered wages are now being taxed. Compare this with the 100 percent subject to tax when the system was established, and the 97 percent subject to tax when the $3,000 limit was established in 1939 for the purpose of achieving the technical advantages of conforming the wage base of the Federal unemployment tax to the wage base of the old-age and survivors' insurance tax.

The Federal unemployment tax has a function in the Federal-State system aside from raising Federal revenues. It was this tax and the credit allowed against it that overcame the States' original reluctance to pass unemployment compensation legislation, out of fear primarily of interstate competition.

The States generally have been just as reluctant—and largely for the same reason—to increase the taxable wage base above $3,000. In New Jersey, for example, the State legislature has not enacted a necessary increase in the tax base although the State advisory council and the Governor have for 4 years recommended such an increase. Moreover, the benefit financing committee of the Interstate Conference of State Employment Security Agencies in its 1960 report recommended that States increase their tax base, but recognized that a number of States will not do so due to economic competition between States and the awaiting of Federal action for a uniform base and rate for all States. In this circumstance it is again fitting for the Federal Government—this Congress—to take the initiative in raising the taxable wage base so as to enable the unemployment compensation system more effectively to achieve its objectives.

The financing problems encountered by many States even before 1958 have been accentuated by the brief interval between the 1958 and 1961 recessions, as well as by the fact that unusually high benefit costs due to heavy unemployment have tended in recent years to become normal in some States. The continued existence of an obsolete $3,000 limitation, by limiting the resources of the system, has contributed substantially to these problems. Let us take Michigan for example. It received a title XII advance from the Federal unemployment account in 1958. In 1960 it had an average State contribution rate of 2.9 percent with a maximum rate of 4.5 percent. Yet, it was able to increase its reserve by only $15 million, while its benefit costs exceeded $147 million. What happened in Pennsylvania is also enlightening in this regard. Pennsylvania received a title XII advance in 1959. Although its average State contribution rate for 1960 was about 3.1 percent, with a maximum rate of 4 percent, its reserve declined by $7.6 million, while its benefit costs exceeded $265 million.

If there had been a $4,800 taxable wage base in each of these States, in Michigan about 42 percent, and in Pennsylvania about 32 percent, more wages would have been subject to taxation. This would have enabled them with the same rates to have substantially increased their reserves.

A State confronted by mounting benefit costs can, of course, raise its rate, even beyond the common 2.7 percent maximum rate. A State may also, on its own, increase its tax base, or combine an increase in the base with an increase in rates. It is important, however, that these alternatives be considered realistically. When State reserves have gone down, the pressure has generally been for an increase in maximum rates, rather than for an increase in the tax base. This has been based on the false assumption that unstable, high-benefit-cost employers are also low-wage employers. To the contrary, I need only mention such industries as construction, steel, automobiles, as examples of high-wage industries whose benefit costs are high. But there is a practical limit to how far such increases may go. To the extent that a State cannot, or will not, raise the maximum rate beyond this limit, the burden must be shared by all employers, including those who would otherwise be entitled to lower rates. This could result in the suspension of experience rating, as it has in four States, or even a uniform rate above 2.7 percent. Thus, when the problem is met face to face, increasing tax rates will affect all employers just as will increasing the tax base.

An increase in the tax base, however, has proved a particularly difficult step for the States to take. Although the $3,000 limitation has long since lost the original reason for its existence, and bears no logical relationship to anything in particular, it has become institutionalized by inaction. Partly because of its long continuation, partly because an increase in the tax base potentially at least touches all employers, partly because of the haphazard advantages and disadvantages, real or supposed, which have grown up on both sides of the arbitrary $3,000 figure, and partly because of the operation of these very same considerations in inhibiting changes in other States, very few States have seen their way clear to make any modification in the $3,000 limitation. Only six States have done so, and, with one exception, they have acted only in a very modest manner. Four of the six have a taxable wage base of $3,600, one of $3,800, and one of $7,200.

It seems clear that faced by this kind of hard choice in maintaining even the present largely inadequate benefit levels, States have little opportunity to rebuild reserves or improve their benefits. Benefits remain inadequate and reserves depleted and declining, even while a diminishing percentage of payrolls is subject to tax. An increase in the Federal base would afford the States an opportunity to approach the problems of inadequate reserves and benefits in a more realistic manner. While it is true that the States could, in fact, offset the increase by adjusting their tax rates, it is highly unlikely that the financial capacity added to the permanent Federal-State unemployment insurance system would go unused in most States. Adjustments will be made, in varying degrees in different States. But the States have long recognized the possibility, if not the probability, of action by the Federal Government in this area, as is evidenced by the provisions in 27 State laws providing for automatic adjustment of the State wage base to conform to any change made under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

It has been suggested that raising the tax base would destroy experience rating. In my opinion, increasing the tax base will preserve and make experience rating more effective. With a higher tax base, it is possible to have a wider range of tax rates for individual employers to more adequately reflect their individual cost experience. In this way, experience rating with the higher tax base can yield the same income and, at the same time, more realistically reflect costs of individual employers to the system.

As wages have continued to increase unevenly among employers in the States and taxable wages have been frozen at the $3,000 ceiling, inequities have grown up. There has been much discussion—and great confusion—with respect to whether these inequities would be decreased or increased by raising the tax base as this would affect low wage paying, high wage paying, stable and unstable employers. We believe that these inequities would be reduced.

Since the Federal tax is at a flat rate, the inequity that would be created by a further increase in the tax, without an increase in the tax base, is clear. This inequity can be simply illustrated. For example, employer A pays $3,000 to each of his employees and employer B pays $4,800 to each of his employees. Each has 100 employees, so that employer A's payroll is $300,000 and employer B's is $480,000. If the tax rate were increased to, say 3.3 percent instead of the present 3.1 percent, the new increase of 0.2 percent ($600 for both employers A and B) would mean that the rate of increase in the taxes on employer A's total payroll would be 0.2 percent, while the rate of increase on employer B's total payroll would be only 0.125 percent. In other words, an increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, whatever it may be, will fall more heavily on industries paying $3,000 or less than on industries paying more than $3,000, if the tax base is left at $3,000.

Before concluding, I should like to stress the fact that over the years the unemployment insurance program has made a great contribution to the country. Four out of five wage and salary workers are now protected by the system. It has poured billions of dollars into the economy, when consumer purchasing power has been threatened by loss of wages during periods of heavy unemployment. During the postwar period, an average of $1.5 billion per year has been paid out in benefits to over 5 million unemployed workers. In 1958 alone, 8 million

workers received $4 billion through unemployment insurance. Nevertheless, it is necessary at this time that a temporary Federal program be enacted. Temporary Federal programs do not constitute either an adequate or desirable approach to the long-term needs of our Federal-State unemployment insurance system. The very necessity for such temporary programs merely serves to highlight the fact that our Federal-State system is not doing the job that it was designed to do and that it must do in the future. As the President pointed out in his message of February 2:

"It would be a tragic mistake to embark upon a Federal supplemental program geared to the present emergency without strengthening the underlying system. A mere stopgap approach ignores the role our permanent unemployment insurance system was designed to play, and establishes instead a precedent for falling back on temporary remedies whenever the system is really needed."

Pursuant to the President's recommendations, we are presently engaged in working out details of proposals that will strengthen our permanent unemployment insurance system. I hope to have an opportunity to discuss these proposals with the committee in the very near future.

With the committee's permission, I would like to submit a set of tables giving pertinent data on unemployment insurance.

The other measure before the committee, H.R. 3865, which will provide aid to children who are in need in families where a parent is unemployed, will be discussed later today by Secretary Ribicoff. This measure as well as H.R. 3864 will be of great assistance to the unemployed. I hope you will give both of them favorable consideration.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, it has been 21 years since the Soviets first occupied Lithuania. We in the United States, who have enjoyed freedom, can sympathize more than any other people with the Lithuanian people because we can recognize better the tremendous and brave struggle they have maintained throughout the years against the tyranny of the Soviet Union.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian people. Each year the Congress of the United States pays tribute to the bravery, courage, faith, and patriotism of the Lithuanians.

We note this important day as a commemoration of the steadfastness of the Lithuanian people throughout the world and encourage them to continue their fight against the Communist philosophy. We recognize the admirable struggle which has been carried on and sympathize more than any other peoples with the courage of these people.

This ceremony in the Congress of the United States serves as a useful weapon in bringing to the attention of the world the struggles of the Lithuanians and will, I hope, continue to be a symbol in their hearts of the worthwhile efforts they have made and will continue to make in their fight for freedom.

I join with all the Members of this House in honoring those who strive for freedom and fervently hope the day will soon come when Lithuania will have true independence.

Address on Government Patent Policies by Congressman Bernard F. Sisk, of California, Presented to the Federal Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman BERNARD F. SISK, presented to a conference of the Federal Bar Association in Philadelphia on February 9 an outstanding statement on the subject of the ownership of patents arising out of Government-financed research.

Congressman SISK's views on this matter are important because as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics and before it, the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, he has given much study and thought to the patent policies of the Federal agencies.

I believe his remarks to be so important that I request they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that we all may have the benefit of them.

The remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN BERNARD F. SISK

Members of the Federal Bar Association and guests, it is a pleasure for me to appear before such a distinguished audience. I do so with the hope that I will not wear out my welcome before I am through.

For a layman to address himself on Government patent policies before an audience such as this, including as it does attorneys, especially patent attorneys, and contractors, is a somewhat hazardous undertaking, I have been told. It is especially hazardous, I was advised by colleagues in Washington, when the position taken favors the Government claiming title to all inventions resulting from Government-financed research.

Some of my colleagues went so far as to urge me not to appear before your group. They remarked, "Their minds are all set. You're not going to change their views one iota. You'll just be wasting your time."

Well, I don't think I'll be wasting my time and if you're willing to listen to me, I'm glad to have this opportunity of talking to you and explaining my views on this very thorny problem. I told my colleagues in Washington: "The people I'll be addressing are all practical men. They're accustomed to straight-from-the-shoulder talk, so I'm sure they won't be offended, or surprised, if I give it to them straight with both barrels." And that's just what I intend to do.

I think it's a public scandal the way the Department of Defense, through its patent policies, gives away property rights which belong to the Government and, through it, to the American public. One authority on the subject has estimated that this giveaway program, and I call it that advisedly, could well cost the American consumer more than $100 billion over a 20-year period. This is the estimate of a man who has given considerable time and thought to this matter. I refer to Senator RUSSELL B. LONG of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Monopoly.[1]

I think that those who favor having private concerns acquire the patent rights to inventions and discoveries resulting from the expenditure of public funds for research and development have adopted a "public-be-damned" attitude.

The Government has not taken a consistent position on this matter. Some departments and agencies follow one policy, others follow another. The Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, and the National Science Foundation give away all commercial rights to the firm doing research for the Government. A contrary policy is followed by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Federal Aviation Agency.

There are those who say that as between the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission, two of the Government's greatest spenders of public funds, the patent policies followed by DOD are the correct ones from the standpoint of the national interest and the national economy.

There is a man who is well acquainted with the procurement practices of both agencies. He is Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the "father of the nuclear submarine." What does this man have to say about it?

He says, "When the Government bears all or nearly all of the cost, where the facilities belong to the Government, and where the Government bears all the risk, the people should own the patents. The American people are spending their money for the research and development. Therefore, the patents should belong to them."[2]

I have heard it said by those who favor an opposite policy that many contractors won't do business with Government agencies which insist on retaining title to inventions and discoveries resulting from Government-financed R. & D. contracts. Frankly, gentlemen, I think that's a lot of hogwash.

The Federal Space Agency is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on research and development. Soon this investment will grow to billions. I've still to hear that the Nation's space program is being hampered by inability to obtain suitable contractors to do the work. On the contrary. When the Space Agency recently held a briefing for prospective bidders for study contracts on Project Apollo, 88 firms attended the conference. They all knew what NASA's patent policies were. They all know that the Government would probably retain title to inventions and discoveries resulting from the Apollo project. Did that scare them off? It did not.

Ernest W. Brackett, NASA's procurement chief, had this to say: "Some companies have objected to NASA's patent policies and one large concern, General Electric, provided that no contract would be accepted unless it was approved by the president of the company and possibly some other officials." "But," he added, "I have just approved two contracts with GE, so I gather they're not refusing to do business with us."

Similarly, the AEC is spending tremendous sums in the field of atomic energy. Its

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 7, pp. 9215–9228.

[2] Patent Policies of Government Department and Agencies, 1960: Conference on Federal Patent Policies, Senate Small Business Committee, Apr. 8, 1960, p. 2.

patent policies are similar to those of NASA. Have these policies hampered the AEC in its work?

Admiral Rickover says flatly: "I have never had a single case where the patent provision of the Atomic Energy Act influenced a company not to undertake Government R. & D. work. * * * We have had no difficulty in the Atomic Energy Commission getting contractors, large and small, to do research and development work. In fact, many of them are constantly urging us to give them such work." [2]

Now, we cannot expect everyone to agree with us, but we can at least hope that those who are opposed to our views are at least consistent in the position they take.

Are those private concerns which favor retaining title to inventions and discoveries resulting from Government-financed research and development following a consistent position in the policies they endorse? Or, to put it another way, what happens when they spend their own money on research and development instead of the Government's money?

Well, now, that's an interesting question which you and I might profitably look into. Let's rephrase the question so we'll all be clear as to what we're talking about. When a private concern subcontracts some of its own research and development on which it is spending its own money, does it permit the subcontractor to retain title to inventions and discoveries resulting from such work?

A well-known former official of General Motors Corp. was once reputed to have stated that what is good for General Motors is good for the Government. But it would appear that this does not necessarily follow in the field of patents.

The general counsel of GM informed the Defense Department on January 21, 1960, that—and I quote—"When the corporation finances research and development work to be performed by others in connection with its commercial operations, it ordinarily expects to get rights with respect to any inventions made in the course of the work." [4]

Could this so-called double-standard policy be widespread in industry? From what I have been able to gather, it is.

Many companies apparently believe that when they invent something with Government money, they (the companies) should retain title to the invention, but they do not hew to this policy when the shoe is on the other foot. When subcontractors make new discoveries while performing research and development programs for the prime contractors, with the prime contractors' funds, many of these companies will not permit their subcontractors to retain title.

Another example of adherence to this double-standard policy is the Martin Company. When the Martin Co. obtains an R. & D. contract from the Defense Department, the company can retain all commercial rights to inventions and discoveries resulting from the contract. But what happens when the Martin Co. gives a subcontractor an R. & D. contract to be paid for out of its own funds? Does the subcontractor retain commercial rights to inventions and discoveries resulting from such a contract? It does not.

On December 31, 1959, the Martin Co., in response to a request for information from the Department of Defense, wrote Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Philip LeBoutillier, Jr., as follows:

"When the Martin Co.'s own funds are involved, title to inventions conceived or reduced to practice by subcontractors vests in the company." [5]

Is that being consistent?

The Boeing Airplane Co. has a similar policy. Frank L. Dobbins, director of materiel, told the Senate Small Business Committee April 24, 1959, that the company receives royalties on developments resulting from the use of Boeing funds.

He stated: "We have gotten out and gotten other people to develop something and then claimed a royalty on that, or claimed a patent on that * * *" [6]

The same is true of Western Electric. This firm informed the Defense Department on February 16, 1960, that while the Bell Telephone Laboratories do most of the research, developmental, and experimental work of the Bell System, where it is necessary to subcontract, title is requested of the subcontractor.

President H. I. Romnes stated:

"Western Electric, in the course of its manufacturing and supply activity, has occasion to procure some incidental research, developmental, or experimental work from outside companies. Its policy is to acquire title to resulting inventions." [7]

Still another concern, this time the giant General Dynamics Corp., advised the Defense Department on February 12, 1960, as follows:

"With respect to the matter of contractors' inventions under nondefense research, development, and experimental contracts financed by this corporation from its own funds, it is the policy of our operating divisions to seek to acquire title to these inventions." [8]

General Dynamics' vice president and chief counsel, Roger I. Harris, disclosed that this policy was followed by its Convair, Electric Boat, Stromberg-Carlson, and General Atomic Divisions.

David F. Doody, patent counsel for the Hughes Aircraft Co., which also hews to this double-standard policy, informed the Defense Department on January 27, 1960, as follows:

"It is the policy of this company to acquire title to inventions conceived or first reduced to practice by a contractor or his employees in the performance of any work under our own nondefense contracts supported by company funds involving research, development, or experimentation."

I could cite other instances, but it would serve no useful purpose. It is apparent that many contractors feel that what is sauce for the gander is not necessarily sauce for the gander.

Now, the law holds that when an employee of the Government invents something while working for the Government, his invention becomes the property of his employer, the Government. The law also holds that a similar master-servant relationship apparently exists when a contractor handles an R. & D. program for the Government.

This master-servant, or employer-employee relationship goes back to common law. The common law in this respect has been strengthened by the Peck and other cases.

In 1926, in *Standard Parts Co.* v. *Peck* (246 U.S. 59) the court held:

"By the contract Peck engaged to 'devote his time to the development of a process and machinery' and was to receive therefor a stated compensation. Whose property was the 'process and machinery' to be when developed? The answer would seem to be inevitable and resistless—of him who engaged the services and paid for them, they being his inducement and compensation, they being not for temporary use but perpetual use, a provision for a business, a facility in it, and an asset of it, therefore contributing to it whether retained or sold."

In 1927 a U.S. district court held that where an employee of the Public Health Service made a discovery or invention while employed to conduct experiments for the purpose of making it, his invention was the property of his employer, the United States. This was the decision in the case of the *United States* v. *Houghton* (D.C. Md., 1927, 20 F. 2d 434), affirmed in 1928 by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals (23 F. 2d 385).

The following year, in 1929, the courts pinned the matter down still further. In *Ordnance Engineering Corp.* v. *U.S.*, the court held that a Government contractor may occupy the same position as a Government employee with respect to rights in an invention made at the Government's direction and expense. The U.S. Supreme Court in effect sustained the lower court's ruling by refusing to review the decision. (67 C. Cls. 301, cert. denied, 302 U.S. 708.)

Now it is true that while private industry has not been consistent in its approach to this problem, neither has the Federal Government. The Federal Government has no overall policy on patents and various agencies have differing policies.

But what is significant, to my point of view, is this: Where the Government has taken a definite stand and legislation has been enacted, the Congress has provided that the Government shall own the patents resulting from work it has financed.

The trend on Capitol Hill has been in that direction. As recently as July 7 of last year, President Eisenhower signed into law an act "to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development." This act prohibits, with one exception, participation in research unless all patents, information, and developments resulting from it are available to the public. The only permissible exception is in cases in which the Secretary of the Interior finds that imposition of the public availability requirement would be inconsistent with national defense.[9]

I, therefore, believe that the patent policies of the Atomic Energy Commission, the space agency, etc., are in accordance with the policy established by the Congress and not in accordance with the patent policies adopted by the Department of Defense, which has been left free to set its own rules.

Although the Government has not established an overall patent policy, both Democratic and Republican administrations have recognized the need for some affirmative action.

In 1947, Attorney General Tom Clark submitted a report in which he recommended that "where patentable inventions are made in the course of performing a Government-financed contract for research and development, the public interest requires that all rights to such inventions be assigned to the Government and not left to the private ownership of the contractor." [10]

Clark cited some of the advantages that would accrue to American industry and the public from Government ownership of patents, as well as some of the disadvantages that would be avoided by such a policy.

---

[2] Patent Policies of Government Departments and Agencies; 1960: Conference on Federal Patent Policies, Senate Small Business Committee, Apr. 8, 1960, p. 4.

[4] Files of the Senate Small Business Committee.

[5] Hearings of the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Monopoly, "Patent Policies of Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government—1959," p. 448.

[6] Hearings of the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Monopoly, "Small Business Participation in Defense Contracting," 1959, p. 170.

[7] Files of the Senate Small Business Committee.

[8] Files of the Senate Small Business Committee.

[9] H. Rept. 1241, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

[10] U.S. Department of Justice: Investigation of Government Patent Practices and Policies. Report and Recommendations of Attorney General to the President, vol. 1, p. 4.

I would like to list them for you.

1. "Public control will assure free and equal availability of the inventions to American industry and science."

2. It "will eliminate any competitive advantage to a contractor chosen to perform research work."

3. It "will avoid undue concentration of economic power in the hands of a few large corporations."

4. It "will tend to increase and diversify available research facilities within the United States to the advantage of the Government and of the national economy and will thus strengthen our American system of free competitive enterprise." [10]

In 1956 Attorney General Herbert Brownell also expressed concern over the concentration of economic power in the national economy. He warned that, and I quote, "Present patent policy may well be one of the major factors tending to concentrate economic power." [11]

The Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, has also stated the case for Government ownership of patents. In a letter March 10, 1960, he advised Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee as follows:

"The circumstances that the work was sponsored and financed by the Government and performed for the express purpose of accomplishing research and development in the particular field seems to afford persuasive reasons for urging that, in addition to the right to the free use of any inventions, improvements, or discoveries resulting therefrom, the Government should retain the property rights thereto, including any patents that might be granted therefor." [12]

Various arguments have been raised by opponents of Government control of patents. Let us analyze a few of them to determine whether they have merit.

One argument has been that the Government doesn't pay enough profit to companies performing research and development work and it is therefore unprofitable for them to accept Government contracts unless patent rights to new discoveries can be held by the contractor.

Admiral Rickover has pointed out, however, that Government contracts provide concerns with large additional sums of money for R. & D. work.

"In essence," he stated, "Government-financed research and development subsidizes and augments their own research and development efforts, and so enhances their competitive position. These companies realize that in order to stay in business, to be healthy, to prosper, they must do research and development work. The very fact they constantly keep urging the Government to give them more research and development contracts despite the supposedly low profit rate is ample proof of the great value they attach to obtaining such contracts. Our large corporations are more aware of the desirability of doing Government research and development than the small companies." [13]

Rickover commented also that companies should spend more of their own money and in this way build up their position through their own efforts. In that case, he added, the patents would belong to them without question.

The value of Government R. & D. contracts in building up a company's know-how, with resulting profit to it in the future, is well illustrated by what happened during the war when Raytheon developed radar for the Navy.

A Raytheon official was quoted in the Wall Street Journal of June 10, 1959, with making this frank acknowledgment: "Today we're a leading producer of commercial ship radar, the basic know-how for which we gained from the Navy work."

He further stated: "We always benefit from military R. & D. inasmuch as it permits us to maintain a large, well-rounded scientific and engineering staff. From their research efforts, we derive a breadth and depth of technical knowledge that we would not be able to achieve solely from commercial R. & D." [14]

Similarly, A. E. Raymond, senior vice president of the Douglas Aircraft Co., gave Government R. & D. work the credit for furnishing Douglas with the know-how that made it possible later for the company to build the DC–8. He stated: "If we hadn't had the military experience, we couldn't have built it at all." [15]

Another argument made in opposition to having the Government retain control of patent rights to inventions perfected with public funds is that the Government will not exploit the patent and it will therefore serve no useful purpose, whereas, on the other hand, if title is left in private hands, the invention will be used for the advancement of American industry.

Well, that sounds convincing if you assume the premises are correct, which they are not. In the first place, if title to an invention or discovery rests with the Government, then it is open to use by any American businessman, large or small, who wishes to avail himself of its benefits.

On the other hand, there is no assurance that if the patent rights are left in private hands it will be exploited at all. In fact, warns Senator LONG, the contractor may suppress the invention.

He states:

"There is no obligation on the part of the contractor to exploit the patent or to make the invention available for use by others. He may even suppress the invention if this would serve his economic interests, with the result that technological improvements financed with public funds would be denied to the public to serve a private interest." [16]

In conclusion, it is my strong belief that the Government should (1) establish an overall policy on patents resulting from research and development work financed with public funds and (2) that policy should provide for Government ownership of such patents.

The patent policies of all Government agencies, especially the Department of Defense, should be brought in line with such a policy. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the military departments made a practice before World War II of retaining title to inventions and discoveries resulting from R. & D. contracts financed with public funds.

Will Government control of patents have an adverse effect on industry? It has not in such a highly industrialized country as Great Britain, where the patent rights for work financed by the Government belong entirely to the Government. There, the Government licenses industry and even shares in the royalties which industry receives from non-Government applications.

Representative Harris B. McDowell, Jr., of Delaware, told the House March 15, 1960, that the British Government has been doing this for over 50 years. He added:

"The Vickers Viscount, developed under Government contract, has returned enough to the British treasury to pay off the original research cost and yield a profit. Jet engines have proved to be a profitable investment for the British Government." [17]

I am confident that Government ownership of patents would rebound to the advantage of both industry and the public.

Now, the question is raised, if the Government takes title to thousands of patents resulting from federally-financed R. & D. work, what will it do with all the patents? I have touched upon this briefly already.

I would like to say further, however, that there are various courses that could be adopted to insure exploitation of the patents for the benefit of the national economy. I am not prepared at this time to express an opinion on any of them, but I would like to note in concluding that Senator LONG is advancing an interesting solution to this problem.

He plans to introduce soon in the Senate a Federal Inventions Act which will provide, among other things, that the Government acquire title to all inventions and scientific and technical information resulting from public-financed R. & D. programs.

Senator LONG's bill would establish a Federal Inventions Authority to administer Government-owned patents.

In closing, may I be frank with you. I see very little chance that Congress will take any affirmative action this year on revision of the patent policies of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In fact, I question whether any such legislation will even be approved by the committees which have jurisdiction.

The trend in Congress is toward enactment of legislation requiring Government ownership of patents resulting from Government-financed R. & D. work. And that is the way it should be.

Thank you for listening.

[11] Report of the Attorney General on Research and Development, pursuant to sec. 708(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, Nov. 9, 1956, p. 42.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 15, 1960, p. A2320.

[13] Patent Policies of Government Departments and Agencies, 1960: Conference on Federal Patent Policies, Senate Small Business Committee, Apr. 8, 1960, p. 3.

[14] Wall Street Journal, June 10, 1959. Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 19, 1959, pp. A5307–A5309.

[15] Wall Street Journal, June 10, 1959. Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 19, 1959, pp. A5307–9.

[16] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, pp. 11450–11459.

[17] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 5, p. 5689.

Recognition for Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which would confer on General of the Army Douglas MacArthur the rank of General of the Armies. I would like at this time to join my voice to those that have been calling for this recognition of America's foremost military leader of recent years.

This does no discredit to the other leaders whom our Nation has honored with the five-star rank of General of the Army or Admiral of the Fleet. It singles out General MacArthur as the most outstanding military genius of the galaxy of fine military and naval leaders which this country produced to lead her forces. I shall not trace the meteoric rise of MacArthur in his military career nor his

military successes; these are well known to a grateful Nation.

It gives me great pleasure to join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in calling for the elevation of Douglas MacArthur to the rank of General of the Armies.

H.R. 4442

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, "neither rain nor snow, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." But, the Postmaster General's order does.

The continuing storm of protests I have received from residents of my district, added to my own personal analysis concerning the Post Office Department's order of curtailing mail deliveries to one a day, prompted my introducing H.R. 4442 directing that this order be rescinded and directing also that the Post Office maintain such services as existed prior to the issuance of this order.

The Department tells us that they are in agreement with the activities of the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress in their laudable efforts to reduce the expense of the Government. I want to go on record, emphatically, as one Member of Congress who cannot find after careful study, any saving by this order.

A great many of my colleagues evidently are of the same opinion, judging by the number of similar bills that have been introduced in an effort to restore our postal service as we knew it before the curtailing order was issued. I will support any bill or resolution to have this controversial order argued on the floor of the House. Once and for all, a definite policy must be established toward the Post Office Department. It is the one Department of the Government that truly represents a service department.

I have devoted a great deal of time to an analysis of this order particularly as it actually affects my congressional district. I am sure I can prove that my 10th Congressional District of New York is an area most seriously affected. This is a residential district. What business houses we have in it are the neighborhood stores. They, too, receive but one mail delivery a day. Definitely, this will affect the purchasing power in the community. Their dependence on mail deliveries and on pickup service is very important. Distances from carrier stations and transportation services vary. From my own home, using transit service at a cost of 30-cent carfare, to and from the post office would consume 1 hour's time. Waiting in line at the post office would add to this amount of time. This situation applies also in other metropolitan areas. Rural localities have but one delivery each day. They do not need any more. I have lived in a rural district where there is no delivery and where the people do not want one. "Going for the mail" is the most enjoyable of daily rituals. But, it is in the cities that our former service must be restored.

A breakdown of the Department's curtailment order will show too many changes that would prove damaging to the finest postal system in the world. Bear in mind that this system has been in existence as long as our Government and that it has improved with the years and with the progress of our Nation. Too many of these changes seem to me, to be based on opinions of the Post Office Department. In its instructions to postmasters, it orders a readjustment of city delivery routes so as to provide one delivery a day. It orders collection of mail from street letter boxes to be scheduled for a minimum number of collections to provide for the essential needs of the community. It states that it should be understood that neighborhood stores and professional offices do not require more than one delivery each day. Now that is a restricted opinion—restricted entirely to the Post Office Department. It goes on further to order deliveries of parcel post restricted to one delivery each weekday except in business areas in those instances where the volume of parcel post mail is so great that it exceeds the storage capacity of the post office. In other words, the number of parcel post deliveries will depend on the size of the post office in the community and not on the needs of the community.

Here is the trip schedule of a carrier on the two-trip assignment under the order: He reports for work at 6 a.m. Leaves his station at 8:10 a.m. He returns at 12:20 p.m. and leaves at 1:05 p.m. Returns to his station at 2:20 p.m. and his day ends at 2:30 p.m. Now analyze this. His first trip takes at least 3 hours in the morning, but the second trip—over the same route—must be covered in 1 hour and 15 minutes. That time must include his trip to and from his station. How much can be accomplished in this time? It is ridiculous to consider. In other words, there will be but one delivery a day even in business areas.

Here is the one-trip schedule. The carrier reports at his station at 6:10 a.m. He leaves his station at 8:30 a.m. Returns at 2:15 p.m. and quits for the day at 2:30 p.m. All carriers must bring along their lunches or find restaurants en route. They must lunch from 11 to 11:30 a.m. My own letter carrier would not be within six city blocks of a restaurant at that time. Does the Post Office Department suggest that the carrier sit on the curbstone and unpack his lunch? And another thing—naturally, on the one-trip schedule, the sack of mail is heavier. We can break the mailman's back carrying it or we can allow him to deposit it en route. Where? In some unguarded hallway or on someone's front porch? Postal laws and regulations have always prohibited the mailman from leaving his sack out of sight. Great stress was laid on the necessity for such laws and regulations. Now, under the order, postmasters are authorized to make relays to business places or well protected porches of residences.

In the entire Brooklyn, N.Y., post office which is a $21 million office showing every indication of reaching the $40 million mark, there is a total of 35 carrier stations. In my district, there are exactly eight of these stations. In the 35 carrier stations in the Brooklyn post office there were, prior to the Department's order, 1,745 carrier delivery routes. As a result of its order, every fourth route must be absorbed. All of these have been absorbed. The carriers for these 411 routes are actually our own displaced persons right here in America.

Let us take the entire picture of the delivery personnel. We have regular carriers, auxiliary carriers, and substitute carriers. These are civil service personnel. The regulars are those with regular, assigned routes; the auxiliaries are regular carriers without any assigned routes; and the substitutes are those who are used to fill vacancies caused by sickness, vacations and compensatory leaves for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday performance of service. But, under this new order, the regular carrier is absorbed into other carrier stations. He will be a floater. He will report to his newly assigned carrier assignment and fill in where needed. Some of these men have 25 years of service. Is this the treatment we should give them after those long, faithful years of hard work? They will not know where they will be assigned until they report each day. Is this efficiency? What confusion can result. The auxiliary carrier is one who must be given 8 hours' work a day. Many of them are being assigned clerical duties at the general post office. Approximately 300 substitute carriers have also been ordered to report to the general post office and, together with substitute clerks, will share the allotted substitute time.

They must be given 3 hours' work a day. Most of the substitutes—at least 90 to 95 percent—are veterans with families. Eventually, they can face extended leaves and complete dismissal as a result of these transfers to the city division.

Now let us get on to this Post Office Department deficit, which, we are led to believe, has created the necessity for this curtailment in services and the resulting confusion. It tells us the Post Office Department, like all other Government agencies, operates under appropriations allowed by the Congress. Congress actually fixes the amounts that may be expended for postal services. This Department, being a revenue producing agency, is authorized by law to pay its expenses from its revenues. When the revenues are insufficient to meet the expenses, Congress authorizes the withdrawal of the necessary money from the general funds of the Treasury.

This is a businesslike arrangement, as it enables the Department quickly to liquidate its obligations throughout the

country from the money it takes in and to supplement the income with funds withdrawn from the Treasury, which obviously are secured from general taxation. The amount by which the postal revenues are insufficient to cover the expenditures for the maintenance of the service represents the postal deficit.

Is this a deficit or does it represent the cost to the taxpayer for the services of the Post Office Department? The Department has referred to a business-like arrangement. Does this look like a businesslike arrangement?

I do not believe in deficit spending any more than anyone else. And, I do not believe you can reduce expenditures by reducing efficiency. Why must the American public be penalized for this deficit by the reduction in delivery and other postal services? Since the enactment of the order and shortly prior thereto the Congress authorized an increase in postal rates. How can we now, in good conscience, ask the American public to pay higher postage rates for reduced services?

The Congress of the United States has a duty to the American public. It is time for a congressional board of inquiry to look into this situation and to report the facts to the public. I want to know these facts and judging by the mail I have received on this subject during the past years, so does every other taxpayer in my district.

A Call to Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a notable address given by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, at the annual luncheon of the Fordham Law Alumni Association in New York on February 11.

Senator DODD spelled out the sacrifices that will be required of all groups of Americans if we are to survive in our struggle with the Communist world.

The address follows:

A CALL TO DUTY—REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD BEFORE THE FORDHAM LAW ALUMNI ASSOCIATION WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK, N.Y., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1961

It is a coincidence which I should like to note, that we are meeting on the eve of the birthday of the most famous and beloved of all lawyers, Abraham Lincoln.

Once, during a placid afternoon in the Springfield law office that he loved so well, Lincoln remarked, "Everyone feels compelled to remind me of my great mission but nobody will tell me what that mission is."

The American people have often been in much the same position. Everyone reminds them of the great duty before them; everyone challenges them to sacrifice for the good cause; but few seem willing to spell out just how all this should apply to ordinary people.

This is a great pity. For many of us know that we are in a mortal struggle against a remorseless and implacable enemy. Many of us feel that we are losing this struggle, losing it to a foe who is far inferior in all the basic material and spiritual sources of strength, losing because we do not work the will to win.

There is a need for sacrifice. There is a need for painful exertion. We all know this in our hearts. Yet for too long our people have been left only to cheer the call to arms, and never assigned a place in the battle lines.

On January 20, the 35th President of the United States was inaugurated. A new era of history began. Upon the shoulders of this remarkable man at once descended a grim catalog of awesome problems. He has responded with candor and with action. His first messages have sought to imprint deeply in the minds of the American people the grave crisis confronting us all around the globe.

He has called forth the spirit of self-denial and patriotism that has lain dormant, waiting to be summoned. He has told us that time and tide are running against us. He has challenged us: "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

The world watches the words and actions of this man hopefully and prayerfully. But one man, even though he is President, cannot lead where the people refuse to follow.

All of us in public life must help in the task of laying the cards on the table. All of us must aid in preparing the people to respond to the demands that must be made of them if our country is to survive. It is in this spirit that I speak to you today.

We are all in this cold war.

We are all partners in the most significant and crucial enterprise of our long and momentous history: the task of throwing back the advancing wave of Communist tyranny and sowing the seeds of freedom and social justice throughout the earth.

Every man, woman and child in this country, young or old, highly or humbly placed, has a part to play if we are to rebuild the ramparts of Western civilization, now rocked to their foundations.

In the end, success or failure will depend not only on great plans and deeds, but upon whether or not the small task is done, the individual sacrifice is made, the humble role is acted well.

What, then, must we do?

First of all, we must try to reestablish in men's minds the overriding concept of the national interest in a land that so often seems divided into a thousand special interest groups.

In the absence of a commonly shared dedication to the national welfare, a host of individual groups, organized to gain new benefits from the Government or to preserve and enlarge old benefits, perpetually sounds the call of self-interest.

Groups of manufacturers skirt the antitrust laws and combine to eliminate competition, and to fix prices at unjustified levels, adding to the speed with which American industry is pricing itself out of the world market. This must stop.

Groups of unions combine to force employers to grant wage increases that cannot be justified by increased output, and to maintain unnecessary jobs and outmoded work rules that should be scrapped in the name of efficiency. This must stop.

Groups of farmers, unable to agree on a common farm policy but unwilling to surrender the benefits of a failing policy, have successfully blocked any rational solution of the farm problem based on smaller Government payments to farmers. Our Nation can no longer afford to spend billions annually on products for which there is no demand. This must stop.

Groups of professional men are not to be outdone in their efforts to enthrone the special interest in place of the public good.

The American Medical Association, for instance, continues to mount a losing but formidable rearguard action against successive attempts by the Federal and State Governments to do needed things in the field of health and medical care.

And what of the legal profession?

We bear heavy responsibility for the sad condition of justice and law enforcement in this country, and I say it is time to rethink our roles.

We must ask ourselves how much and how often we have placed our own advantage above the cause of justice to which we are pledged. How often are our skills hired out to those who seek deliberately to circumvent the law?

How many of us subscribe to the code of Abraham Lincoln, who would not take a case he did not believe in, who would not accept a fee for a task that involved no effort, who would not refuse a case from those who could not pay?

Our sacrifice must take the form of selfless effort to strengthen inadequate laws, not to find loopholes in them; to turn down wrong cases from rich men, and to accept right cases from poor men; and by our conduct to make our American system of justice something that people everywhere look up to and trust.

The number of government employees of all descriptions—local, State, and Federal—has reached 11,500,000.

One out of every six employed persons is on a government payroll somewhere, and if current plans to increase public service and public benefits are carried into effect, this number will rapidly increase.

I think we have reached the point where we have so many people on the public payroll that the burden is sapping the national strength. True enough, many of these employees are underpaid. Yet most are under various forms of civil service tenure that make it impossible to establish those efficient procedures and rigid standards of performance that ought to prevail.

Public employees are so numerous that they constitute a tremendous political force. They can use their power to delay the establishment of new standards of vigor and competence in the public service. The national interest asks them to use this power to advance these causes.

For American consumers, who compose 7 percent of the population of the non-Communist world but who consume 50 percent of its annual production of raw materials, national survival requires that we put an end to extravagant and frivolous use of irreplaceable resources. It is for prudent Government to assess the need and prescribe the remedy, and for the public to respond willingly.

For the underprivileged, who have long waited for various forms of needed Government assistance, the national interest asks that they wait longer. We must delay worthy programs that increase comfort and well-being until we have accomplished those tasks which directly and immediately build national strength.

For those among the privileged who are not making that contribution to the public good which their station in life requires, the Nation asks that idleness and self-indulgence be put aside, and that the qualities and talents which wealth and leisure time have made possible be devoted to the public welfare.

For all those who indulge in racial discrimination, whether out of sincere conviction or selfish pride, out of respect for old traditions or out of contempt for other men, out of fear or out of avarice; the national interest asks that they sacrifice what they claim to be their personal good for the clear good of the Nation.

The United States can no longer afford the cost of racial prejudice. We cannot afford

the loss of manpower, intellect, and inventiveness which discrimination entails. Our system cannot endure this corroding enshrinement of pride, this rejection of charity and humility which poisons us and mocks our words with our deeds.

To the Americans in uniform, sacrifice means a longer period of military service, a tougher course of training, a more demanding regimen of discipline, if our servicemen are to become the indomitable, skilled defenders of freedom that the continuing crisis requires them to be.

To the average American youth, who is unable to pass basic physical and scholastic tests that his contemporaries in Europe pass easily, sacrifice takes on a special meaning, for the strength of the Nation is directly involved. We have got to do something about the shameful fact that one out of every two American boys is physically or mentally unfit to serve in the Armed Forces of this country.

Our society must demand and get from its young people higher standards of strength and scholarship. On the part of the Nation, this means an organized drive to raise standards all along the line. On the part of the individual youth, it means more physical exertion, longer hours of study, an end of self-indulgence, and a beginning of self-discipline.

To the person of advanced years, whose productive life has been extended by the progress of science, sacrifice means a reversal of the trend toward earlier retirement, and commonsense requires an end of those obstacles to the employment of older persons which have been set up by employers and encouraged by Government.

While we live and work in different walks of life, we all share one thing in common. We are all taxpayers. The cost of the cold war is going up, and we are ready to pay it, and to go on paying it, this year, next year, and every year until freedom is secure.

None of these things can be achieved by laws alone. But few of them can be achieved without some Government action.

Which brings us to the politician. Where does he fit into the picture?

For the politician the most painful form of sacrifice will be a willingness to support the kind of action that I have suggested, a readiness to ask for higher effort and lower benefits, a determination to tell the truth, a willingness to do the job that must be done and to accept the damage that may come to his popularity and his career.

The most difficult form of self-discipline is that which the pursuit of truth demands. Few things are more painful than the forsaking of old and familiar misconceptions. But the crisis requires such a reappraisal, for all of the efforts of our people will be futile unless made in support of sound national policies and attitudes.

I fear that the predominant intellectual thought in this country does not regard the conflict between freedom and communism as a mortal struggle between two utterly irreconcilable systems; and so long as our opinion shapers reject this view, I see little hope that the American people can be united and inspired to any great and continuing effort.

The need for constant vigilance, arising from the ceaseless though often hidden aggressions of the Communists, is continually obscured by talk of negotiations, conciliations, eras of good feeling, spirits of Camp David.

The need for armament is constantly obscured by futile talk about disarmament. The spirit of unyielding opposition to world communism and all of its works, which must be the foundation of any sustained total national effort, is subtly undermined in a hundred small ways by cultural exchanges, by state visits of smiling tyrants, by trade and aid to Communist regimes.

What ought to be a sure and guiding principle of conduct—the firm refusal to yield ground to the Communists anywhere in the world—is recurrently smothered over by enlightened talk about partitions, disengagements, neutralizations, all of which are the dread harbingers of Red triumph.

This attitude disarms us in a way that espionage could never do.

It has succeeded, for instance, in causing us to abandon nuclear experiments for 2 years, tests that our military leaders insist are vitally needed for the development of badly needed nuclear weapons, large and small.

I take the view that the basic causes of conflict between Western civilization and communism are irreconcilable. There is no common ground, save the common instinct for survival. This sole meeting ground will occasionally make it possible to reach agreement on some aspects of the cold war. We should therefore be willing to negotiate when there is even the dimmest hope of success, so long as we can do so with honor. Those who lead the cause of peace and justice in the world can do no less. We should sit down around the conference table with them to see if they have changed in any way, to ask them to withdraw their preposterous claims, to give them fresh evidence that we are on to them, that we are strong and growing stronger, that we will never be deterred from our resolve to preserve our freedom.

I support this kind of negotiation. But we should never fool ourselves or our people or our friends into believing that there can be any progress toward resolving the basic causes of the cold war so long as Communists remain Communists.

If negotiations some day bear fruit, it will not be because of words spoken at the conference table. It will be because of deeds done over a period of years, deeds which shift the balance of power decisively in our favor.

For the present, the gulf between East and West, based upon the most profound moral and philosophic differences, is unbridgeable. Either they or we must change fundamentally if there is to be any agreement.

Communism, stripped of its dialectical jargon, says to the people of America and the free world: "You belong to me. You are my tool. I will destroy your government, your religion, your family life, your culture, your freedom. I intend to transform you into a Communist slave, by force if I must, by other means if I can. And if you resist, sooner or later I will kill you."

This is the basic Communist message. This is the core reality, of which the events in Budapest or Berlin or Quemoy or Tibet or Laos or Cuba are just local manifestations.

None of these Communist pretensions is admissible or negotiable.

Not one.

Does the nature of the struggle change because the Soviets release two fliers from prison, or because the Chinese Reds forbear temporarily from committing some expected outrage? Of course not.

When they have released two nations from their prison house, then we can hope that negotiations may achieve something.

Does this mean that there must be a hot war? Not at all.

The criminal will not strike if he knows he is certain to be caught. The sane murderer will not kill if he fears he will be killed in the act.

Only when the outcome is in doubt, only when the risk seems acceptable will the Communists launch all-out war against us.

Our task is to make it clearer each day to the Communists that the risk will never be acceptable.

If we continue to disarm ourselves materially and morally and intellectually, we are done for. If we rearm materially and morally and intellectually, we can prevail forever in justice. For ours is the system that is in harmony with the nature of man.

In the summer of 1863, decisive victories at Vicksburg and Gettysburg turned the tide at last to the Union cause after years of mortal peril.

President Lincoln, his heart almost broken with grief over the dread cost of war, his mystical intellect perceiving the eternal significance of what had been won, his eye encompassing the broad range of sacrifice, large and small, which had made the triumph possible, expressed his gratitude to those who had saved the Union in simple yet sublime words.

"Thanks to all—for the great Republic, for the principles it lives by and keeps alive, for the vast future of man—thanks to all."

I believe, my friends, that most of us will live long enough to witness the climactic turning point of the cold war toward one side or the other. Let us hope and pray that our descendants, as heirs of continuing freedom, will be able to look back upon those who fought the good fight in this decade and say, "Thanks to all."

Disability Insurance for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my conviction that the disability cash benefits provisions of the Social Security Act are inadequate to provide protection against the worst economic consequences of blindness.

In the last Congress I introduced a bill (H.R. 8218) designed to correct these deficiencies. This bill sought to amend title II of the Social Security Act so that the disability insurance program would provide a greater measure of minimum financial security to America's sightless citizens.

The last Congress took no action on my bill, so I am introducing it again with a renewed hope that this Congress will enact its provisions into law; with a renewed determination to work for its enactment into law.

Mr. Speaker, blindness is no longer the scourge and curse it once was.

Blindness is no longer a term synonymous with helplessness, hopelessness, and lifelong dependency.

Methods and techniques, tools and equipment have been devised and developed to enable blind persons to function successfully as full and participating members of our sighted society.

Today there is scarcely a business or industry, trade or profession—there is scarcely any form of economic enterprise or endeavor that does not have its blind proprietor or practitioner, employee or craftsman.

But, although blind people can and some do function successfully in all activities of our national life, equality of opportunity is still, even today, denied to blind persons because they are blind—equality of opportunity for jobs, for the

chance to earn a living, for the chance to support themselves and their families.

Equality of opportunity for profitable, constructive employment is denied to those who are blind, not because they lack talents and aptitudes, but because they are blind; not because they lack education and training, but because they are blind.

These employable, able-bodied men and women are denied the chance to work because even today the sighted persist in their belief—or rather, their misbelief—that blindness is a condition of helplessness, and they continue not only to refuse to hire blind persons for jobs they are well qualified to do, they continue to refuse to even give these people the opportunity to demonstrate their qualifications and their capabilities.

It is true that some blind people are hired, but too often these fortunate few are given work of the simplest kind—repetitive assembling, inspecting, packing—work oftentimes far below the capacity of the blind persons hired, work which falls far short of the productive contribution such people could make.

Too often the jobs available to blind persons are at the very bottom of the pay scale and are jobs with the least security in duration.

The bill I have introduced would assist blind persons in their courageous struggle to function and to compete successfully in the common currents of community life.

This bill recognizes the economic results which follow the occurrence of blindness.

But, my bill does more than recognize these economic consequences; it seeks to alleviate the hardships resulting from them; it seeks to lessen the worst aspects of these hardships in the lives of those who are blind, of those who will become blind in the future.

The bill I have introduced has three provisions:

First. It would incorporate in the disability insurance cash benefits provisions of the Social Security Act the definition of blindness which is generally accepted and used throughout the country. This definition, already included in other Federal laws, would provide an ophthalmological standard for determining blindness; that is, blindness is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees.

A person who qualifies as blind under this definition and who is otherwise eligible, would be entitled to receive disability payments under the disability insurance program so long as the disability of blindness lasts.

Mr. Speaker, this provision, which would condition the entitlement to benefits upon the existence and the continuing existence of the disability of blindness would make the disability insurance program truly an insurance program for those who are blind, for those who become blind.

They need the protection this provision would provide for them, not because of the nature of blindness, but because of the devastating economic losses resulting from blindness.

It is not my intention to establish a pension for the blind.

It is my intention to give realistic recognition to the financial problems created upon the onset of blindness—not only in the life of the newly blind person himself, but in the lives of those who depend upon him for support.

It is my intention to provide continuing minimum financial protection for the person who loses his sight that he may not be deterred from the job of rebuilding his life by the deprivations of his wife and children.

It is my intention to give this person, when he has finally returned to work, a floor of financial security, a source of funds to meet the extra cost of functioning, blind, in a sighted world.

It is my intention to provide help for the employed blind person who will work in poorly paid jobs, not because he is unskilled or incompetent, but because he is blind.

It is my intention to provide minimum financial security to the employed blind person who knows, from bitter, frustrating experience, that once he loses his job, that once the work has run out, he will wait months or years before he works again.

Second. Another provision of my bill would abolish the present requirement in the disability insurance law that a person must accept vocational rehabilitation services in order to qualify to receive payments or to continue to receive payments under the disability cash benefits program.

To condition the right to receive disability payments upon a factor other than the existence of a disability is to reject and negate the very nature of the program as a disability insurance program. It is to repudiate the very basis upon which the program rests.

Nor can vocational rehabilitation be successful when it is forced upon those who are disabled. It must, to serve best those who have need for it, be a help to reconstruct lives, an encouragement and a stimulus to try again to live, work, and function under strange, difficult, and adverse circumstances.

Third. Finally, my bill would change the length of time that blind persons must be engaged in covered work to establish entitlement to disability payments from the present requirement of 20 quarters to 6 quarters.

The occurrence of blindness is an economic calamity to a workingman and to his family. He needs the help of disability payments at the time blindness occurs or as soon thereafter as possible. He needs income to which he is entitled by right, not as a matter of charity. He needs the assurance that the disability program to which he has contributed will be available to him in his gravest need, at the time when he loses his sight.

The blind, who too often are the victims of the employment practice of "last in and first out," need the opportunity to draw disability payments—not after 5 years of employment, but after a much lesser period of time if the disability program is to offer protection to those who are blind, to those who become blind.

To refuse to reduce the quarters required for benefits entitlement is to deny the benefits of the program to the overwhelming majority of blind persons—not because they are blind, but because of the kinds of work they are offered, the length of time they are permitted to work at all.

Mr. Speaker, our blind fellow citizens are waging a valiant battle to live, to work, and to function as others do. They do not seek charity; they plead for work. They do not seek our praise; they seek our help that they may better and more fully assume their responsibilities as American citizens.

My bill, enacted into law, will give blind people no bonanza; it will help to offset the economic disadvantages of blindness; it will help to diminish the economic hardships resulting from blindness.

My bill would give those who are blind the minimum financial security they must have if they are to function successfully without their sight in a sighted world.

A Summary of Questions and Answers on House Resolution 115 To Lock the Back Door of the Federal Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of questions and answers which may be raised regarding House Resolution 115, to change House rule XXI (4) to lock the back door of the Federal Treasury so as to restore to Congress a check by the Appropriations Committee on the spending of billions of taxpayers' dollars that are siphoned off without congressional scrutiny:

A SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS AND ANSWERS TO THE PRINCIPLE INVOLVED IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 115 TO STOP BACK-DOOR SPENDING

I

Arguments and the answers to them can be summarized as follows:

It has been argued that adoption of a resolution such as House Resolution 115 would thwart orderly, long-range planning and cost money and that such programs as urban renewal, airport aid, veterans' housing, etc., cannot be operated on a year-to-year or fiscal-year basis.

House Resolution 115 would not thwart orderly, long-range planning and thus cost more money because—

(a) House Resolution 115 does not require programs to be financed on an annual, year-to-year, or fiscal-year basis.

House Resolution 115 merely requires that all authorizations to spend Federal money or to create legal obligations which would subsequently require expenditures (e.g., contract

authority) be subject to the normal budget controls of the House of Representatives.

Normal budget controls require spending authorizations to be subject to review and modification by the Appropriations Committee as part of its annual budget review.

(b) Normal budget procedures in Congress permit the use of no year or multiple year appropriations where orderly, long-range planning is required to accomplish a particular program. No year funds are available until expended; multiple year appropriations provide funds for a specified period in excess of 1 year.

The obvious fallacy in this argument is found by examining the financing of the Defense Department programs for research and development and for the procurement of weapons. Both of these programs are infinitely more complex than any domestic program, and require a high degree of orderly, long-range planning. For example, in weapons development, the Army estimates the average leadtime to be 8 to 10 years. These programs are financed by no year appropriations and are subject to review and modification annually by the Appropriations Committee of the House. These programs involve expenditures of about $17 billion annually. Furthermore, this arrangement has been extremely satisfactory to all concerned. It has been of particular benefit to the taxpayer, since it has provided for a comprehensive annual review and adjustment of these important and intricate programs without any important disruption to them.

II

It has been argued that opposition to a back-door spending curb is justified on the basis of the programs themselves. It is argued that no action should be taken which would in any way delay the provision of needed public housing, safety aspects of airport aid, savings in human lives, or need for direct loans to veterans for housing purposes, etc.

There is no doubt that each of the programs considered or approved by Congress can be justified from one standpoint or another—particularly when justified without regard to other demands for scarce and limited fiscal resources.

House Resolution 115 merely provides for orderly procedures (closing existing loopholes) for evaluating the distribution of Federal tax moneys among the various programs approved by Congress. It provides a balance-wheel effect in which the Congress is asked to take a second look at each policy or program it has authorized in terms of total demands and the financial condition of the Federal Government.

III

It is argued that the requirement that programs such as housing if subject to review by the Appropriations Committee would cause delay in individual projects and programs.

No more delay would be involved for these programs than currently exists for all but a few programs which have resorted to the back-door technique. The requirement of an annual budget review has not handicapped the defense, international and other programs of the Federal Government.

IV

It might be argued that (1) this whole attempt to pass House Resolution 115 or similar proposals involves nothing more than a struggle of power within Congress or that (2) House Resolution 115 would make a super committee out of the Appropriations Committee and would leave programs at the mercy of one man, one committee, or a few men or that, (3) it would reduce existing committees to an inferior position and involve the transfer of wholesale power to the Appropriations Committee.

To the extent that this legislation attempts to change House rules to prevent legislative committees from bypassing normal budget controls, there is a struggle of power within Congress involved. However, it would not make a super committee out of the Appropriations Committee nor leave programs at the mercy of one man, one committee, or a few men. The House as a whole would still vote on each spending measure and, if it should choose, could completely ignore the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee, its chairman, or any of its members.

House Resolution 115 merely seeks to close existing procedural loopholes and establish an orderly procedure for evaluating all Federal expenditures—something which most people in the country erroneously believe actually exists at the present time. Contrary to general belief, not all spending authorizations are considered by the Appropriations Committees and subject to the usual budgetary controls. Because of parliamentary rulings, ways have been developed to bypass the usual scrutiny given authorizations to expend Treasury funds by the Appropriations Committees. The use of this more direct route to the Treasury by special interest groups has been particularly significant in recent years and there are indications it will continue until House Resolution 115 or a similar measure is passed. This would not reduce existing committees to an inferior position but would prevent them from exploiting loopholes which permit the authorization of spending for special interests without the necessary controls.

V

It is argued that the House, not the Appropriations Committee, regardless of House Resolution 115, would control the expenditures.

This is a specious argument. Of course, the House in all cases handles both substantive policy legislation and appropriations. The Appropriations Committee merely recommends to the House appropriate authorizations to spend based upon current economic conditions and the financial condition of the Federal Government.

VI

It is argued that the actions of Congress through the back-door approach are not inflationary.

Although there has been no substantial rise in the price index during the last year, the threat of inflation is a major national problem. The inflationary problem must be viewed in broader perspective than 1 year. The impact of actions taken today upon the future value of the dollar also must be considered. For example, since 1939 the Government has engaged in deficit spending in all but 4 fiscal years. During this same period, the value of the dollar has depreciated over 50 percent. Since 1949 the value of the dollar has depreciated about 22 percent, and since 1952, 9 percent.

The spending programs which use the back-door approach commit the Government for long periods of time without regard to their impact upon the economy. They are not subject to an annual review and evaluated in terms of economic and fiscal requirements. They build into the annual budget excessive rigidity which can have a serious inflationary impact should the economy continue to boom, as is forecast for the next 3 or 4 years.

VII

It has been argued that the House has an opportunity to vote only once on the defense bill, and it has no second opportunity to make changes in the appropriations given the Defense Department. On the other hand, it is claimed that on legislation of the back-door type, such as the airport construction bill, the House is given two opportunities to vote upon the spending program.

This also involves specious reasoning. Actually, defense appropriations are evaluated annually, both for the appropriations made on a 1-year basis in that Department, as well as for no-year or multiple-year appropriations. Revisions and adjustments are made as required.

In the case of the airport construction bill, the second vote of the House, cited as an example, was a completely nondiscretionary vote. All the House did on this second vote was to authorize the Treasury to issue checks to pay for the Government's legal obligations which have been incurred as a result of the House's first vote giving contract authority.

A Big City Congressman's Views of the Mutual Interests Between Farmers and City Dwellers in the REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1961, I had the privilege of attending the 19th annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which was attended by approximately 8,000 members from all over the United States. My colleague, WALT HORAN from Washington, and I, together with several U.S. Senators, addressed the convention in the beautiful coliseum in Dallas, Tex. I met many of the managers and directors of the various cooperatives and enjoyed exchanging our views before and after the panel discussion. I submit herewith the text of my address delivered before the association which I feel the readers might find of interest. The subject was "The Urban Viewpoint of the Cooperative Image in America":

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clapp, Mr. Hedman, my colleague Congressman Horan, Mr. Clyde Ellis, members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to participate in the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's 19th annual meeting and visit with you in this great State of Texas. I have a fond affection for the State of Texas. I appreciate three great contributions which Texas has made—SAM RAYBURN, the coauthor of the Rural Electrification Act, LYNDON JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, and my mother-in-law, who was born in Beaumont, Tex. This gathering demonstrates the success of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Your success which has been helped by financial loans from the Federal Government is a Horatio Alger—not a BRUCE ALGER story of accomplishment.

Several people during the past day have approached me and asked me how it was that I have interested myself in the problems of the farmer, and why I am particularly interested in the REA. It has not always been thus. When I was assigned to the Appropriation Subcommittee on Agriculture, I disliked the assignment and expressed my dislike in the first speech that I made in the full committee. I stated at that time to the chairman that I appreciated the significance of this appointment and I knew that the farmers in my area, with their tremendous plantations and farm lands in the rear of a tenant house, amounting to 18 feet by 12 feet, and with their truck gardens on

the fire escapes and the window sills, would also appreciate the significance and importance of this assignment.

However, in studying this problem, my dislike has turned to like and I am very happy in the assignment because of the opportunity it affords me to understand the rural problems and the opportunity to protect the consumer interests.

It is fitting that on this Valentine Day that I, as Mr. New Yorker, should express my love and affection for the farm group which husbands our natural resources.

On January 20 of this year our Nation was deeply stirred by the inaugural address of our new President, John F. Kennedy. This address, in my opinion, was a new catechism for America. It was a call for sacrifice and cooperation. It was a call for joint action, a call for common action, a call for cooperatives.

I have been asked to speak to you on the subject of the urban viewpoint and the cooperative image in America. When a city dweller from New York, such as I, thinks of the term "cooperatives," he thinks of a bulldozer operation, dislocated tenants, with thousands of families uprooted and scattered around the countryside. He thinks of the construction of a walled city within a city. He thinks of a manorial city with a wealthy population, plunking down thousands of dollars for an apartment and for the right to live in luxury, paying a monthly sum for carrying charges and amortization equivalent to a monthly rental to a landlord. Certainly he never contemplates a farmer group which assembles its food supplies and its grains to market them in an expeditious and inexpensive manner. Seldom does the term conjure up the thought of a group to sell insurance to its members and to spread the risk of accident and loss among its members and its policyholders. He rarely thinks of a cooperative, like the REA, or the electric cooperatives, to harness our natural resources, to bring light and communication to the rural people. These thoughts are remotely associated with the idea of cooperatives by a city dweller.

Before I came to Congress I had not been aware of the REA. I had never heard nor appreciated the program of buying electricity and telephone service on systems financed through Government loans. In my section of the country in New York, we have obtained our electricity and telephonic service from utility companies which are regulated by governmental agencies, but whose rates seem continually to rise. Since 1952 consumer prices have risen by $1.3 billion.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, I have sat through hearings, listened, read, and inquired. I have been compelled to think about our soil, the trees, our streams, our electric power—their uses, their development, their preservation. I have become extremely interested in these resources because I have come to realize that they affect my way of life, my constituency, and my Nation. As a consequence, I have visited sections of our country where these programs are in effect and are still expanding, and I marveled at what I saw.

A Latin would exclaim "marabile visu et marabile dictu"—marvels to see and to talk about.

As a human being and as a Catholic, I believe in the dignity of the individual and in his inherent worth. Just as I believe governments are created for the protection of the individual and the development of a spiritual, economic, and political being, so do I believe that our natural resources have been placed on earth for the benefit of all peoples, all human beings, and not for the aggrandizement of power of a state or the financial benefit of a select few.

I am not a Hedonist who believes that pleasure is the primary objective of life, nor do I believe in the mammalian philosophy—live for today for there is no tomorrow. We review the events of the past to act today so as to provide for the future.

Recently, the former Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, submitted his 1960 agricultural report to the former President of the United States. In it, he uttered many self-serving declarations on the progress of the farmer during the past 8 years and the prosperity which he presently enjoys. Sitting through the many hearings, I have listened to the moans of farm representatives when measures and programs were being considered. I have heard that net farm income is down 35 percent from 1947. Commodities that farmers sell have edged up $3.5 billion in price in the past 12 years while the cost of supplies that farmers buy has jumped $9.2 billion. Nearly every one agrees that the farmer who has nearly tripled his output per man-hour in the past 20 years deserves more for his efficiency than the 60 or 70 cents an hour he is now averaging. As a result of the divergence of viewpoints—prosperity on the one hand, declining income on the other—one becomes a little confused and seeks the light of understanding.

This recent agricultural report by Mr. Benson detailed the blessings of the rural electrification and telephone program. The report was a good one insofar as it went, but in my opinion, it failed to include and encompass the broader benefits generated by these programs. It failed to describe the mutual benefits which the city resident derives from the blessings to the rural people by REA. If we in the cities feel that we paid taxes to underwrite and finance the original REA funds and loans, history has demonstrated that because of this program that we, in the cities, have been repaid manyfold by increased business, by better food and by increased employment. The Secretary's agricultural report described the benefits to the farmers in terms of human needs, but it omitted to set forth the benefits which are correlative and which have been and are being generated by the increased use and consumption of electrical power. I believe that these benefits and the relationship between the rural resident and the city dweller are interdependent and go hand in glove. They should not be overlooked but should be emphasized.

To the farmer and his family, rural electrification means many things and has provided many advantages. To the farmer, rural electrification has meant a radio and television set, warning of an oncoming frost in Georgia or a late market report in Iowa or the price of cotton futures to the Texans. It means a pleasant evening at home, a political debate between candidates or educational programs for the family. In 1959 the farmers' new gadgets benefited the city man by opening up a market for the sale of 3,200,000 television sets with the attendant employment for the tradesman, the electricians, the mechanics, the Charlie Chaplin type automatons. It means advertising fees for the merchants of discontent and Madison Avenue advertisers, a market for the television broadcasters and their networks which span the Nation. It means the illegal loot for quiz showmen, diskjockeys, and quack pundits answering the $64,000 question.

The rural electrification program means now that the farmer has light to read by on a dark night. On the other hand, the farmer's enjoyment in reading gives a reciprocal benefit to a city person and businessman. It means a sale of books and magazines, book-of-the-month club, and the production of electric bulbs. It means greater circulation for Time, Look, Life, Reader's Digest, Atlantic Monthly as well as the Sears, Roebuck catalog.

Rural electrification to the rural housewife means ironing without stoking a range red hot to heat a flatiron. This benefit to the rural woman means sales by the city merchant, increased production, and, consequently, increased employment.

To a rural youth, the benefits of rural electrification means changing his mind about seeking his fortune in the city and making plans to stay on the ranch after graduation. To the city folk, administrators and officials, it means that the boy who stays on the farm, represents one less misguided juvenile delinquent in the city streets, and one less person congesting youth houses and living in our overcrowded cities.

To the rural farmer, rural electrification means refrigeration—modern freezers and refrigerators—without the inconvenience of lugging ice into the icebox or the tedious chores of preserving ice in an icehouse covered with sawdust. To both the cityfolk and the rural farmer, refrigeration means better food all year round, less harmful bacteria in the food supply, in milk, and less contamination, and potentially lower consumer prices of milk, meat, and Mozzorelle (cheese). To the city manufacturer in the year 1959, refrigeration meant the sale of 2,030,000 electric freezers, 3,780,000 electric refrigerators, with the concomitant employment in production and in trade. To the housewife, electric washing machines and electric dishwashers mean less drudgery, cleaner garments, and more leisure time. To the city people, it means employment, sales, of numerous detergents, such as Fab, Comet, Ajax, Tide, Clean, Lux, and Duz, with their TV-doggerels and limericks. Summed up, it means that rural electrification has brought about a greater self-respect for millions of American families. It means comfort in the home, greater efficiency on the farm, and dignity to the individual, and a train of benefits to its fellow urbanites.

Two years ago, during the House appropriation hearings on agriculture, I inquired as to the extent of the purchases of appliances which farm people made as a result of the electrification of farms. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association responded to my inquiry and made a survey of rural electric appliances as to 20 appliances which are operated with electricity. The results are fantastic. It shows that the REA has generated 1,000 million, or a billion-dollar business, annually in appliance sales. It has brought about the sale of electric ranges, electric refrigerators, electric freezers, water heaters, electric washing machines, electric dryers, electric dish washers, air conditioning, electric heating, electric vacuum cleaners, electric sewing machines, electric frying pans, electric deep-fat fryers, TV's, electric mixers, electric toasters, electric blankets, electric coffee makers, electric drills, and electric saws. (For those who seek the extent of such sales and detailed facts and figures, they can find this information in part IV of the 1960 hearings before the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, p. 98.)

Over 4,200,000 farmers have purchased the aforesaid 20 appliances. If we consider other appliances operated by electricity which have been purchased and concerning which a survey has not been made, we can readily see that many more people are involved and much more business has been generated. Other areas exist in which common interest between the rural communities and the city sections could be spelled out. In the garment and textile industry, I believe a survey would be informative to see how much of an increase in the sale of clothing has been brought about as a result of the raising of the standards of living of people residing in the rural communities. If these relationships, the interdependency between the city and the farm people, are fully developed and explored, and the results publicized, I am confident that rural folks would not feel antagonistic, estranged, or indifferent to city

problems, and we who live in the city and read about soil-bank payments and farm subsidies might be more sympathetic to the rural problems and farm programs.

The full impact of REA upon the daily lives of people was not made upon me until I visited Puerto Rico 2 years ago, where I met Clyde Ellis and participated in a week's seminar conducted by the Puerto Rican Water Resources Authority. Our Government, through the REA, has made available loans to the Puerto Rican Water Resources Authority at 2 percent interest. I traveled into the hills and inspected the powerplants and saw with my own eyes the wires leading to the shacks and hovels which some of the Puerto Ricans call home. In some instances the cost of the installation of the electricity was greater than the value of these homes. At that time more than 50,000 families enjoyed for the first time the use of electricity and the darkness of the hills was illuminated. Up-to-date information discloses that this program has been further expanded so that today 70,000 families are benefiting by this electricity.

It is noteworthy that since the advent of electricity and the elimination of darkness along the mountainside and in the hills that the population has decreased. I have seen the planting on the unreachable mountaintops of electric and telephone poles with the aid of Sikorsky helicopters. I encountered several of my constituents who returned to their native city and were operating small businesses where they could sell soda contained in electrical machines and operated jukeboxes and grocery shops. They advised me that with the convenience of electricity, they preferred the beautiful weather in the hills of Puerto Rico rather than living in the dank apartments in the tenement houses of New York. The refrigeration, the preservation of food, the electrical appliances and the modern conveniences have come to their homes giving them a little comfort, a little more happiness, and a greater will to live. These have been brought about by reason of the ability to receive funds and loans at a 2 percent interest. Otherwise, without these funds, these people would have remained in darkness, relegated to misery and consigned to a more burdensome way of life. In our struggles to gain the friendship of South American countries, Puerto Rico, because of REA, has become a lodestone, drawing South American countries to our side. If a similar program by REA had been initiated in Cuba, perhaps the mattress salesman, Fidel Castro, might not have ranted, raved, or roared against Yankee imperialism, and the Cuban people would feel grateful to the United States today.

Last year the Republican administration sought to raise the interest rates from 2 percent to the going rate of interest paid by Government bonds. At the time of the proposal, the going rate of interest on Government bonds was 5 percent and higher. This would have granted to financial institutions an additional 3½ percent interest to the detriment of the people and to the destruction of the REA, one of the greatest programs our Nation has adopted. I am proud to say I opposed that increase in the rate of interest.

Criticism was raised and it was vehement that the cooperatives were borrowing money from the Government at 2 percent interest and reinvesting their surplus funds in Government bonds, which paid 4 and 5 percent interest. In other words, it was charged that the cooperatives in their greed were killing the goose that laid the golden egg. I am happy to note that the REA announced on June 30, 1960, a new series of Treasury bonds bearing 2 percent interest per annum and that the electrical cooperatives throughout the country have invested $10 million of their surplus funds in these Treasury bonds. I commend the cooperatives for not taking advantage of their Government and for their graphic demonstration of unselfish Americanism.

The financial history of the cooperatives is a glorious page in the history of our country. It shows the wisdom of public officials who felt a concern for the people on the farms. It demonstrates an appreciation and a gratitude by rural people for the generosity of our Government. As of June 30, 1960, the 989 REA electric borrowers paid close to $1.3 billion to the Federal Government. This included a repayment of $714.3 million on principal and $422 million in interest, and a balance of $160.3 million repaid in advance of due date as a cushion of credit. Only one REA electric borrower of the 989 was behind in payments. This is a demonstration of cooperation, appreciation and good business.

We are all aware that much of this electrical power is derived from the use of water. Certain elementary facts must be recognized. Water is vital to every form of life. We have a fixed or finite quantity of water in this world. Some potable, but much unusable for consumption. Some countries have too much for their needs, such as Siam and Panama; and others have too little, such as Hong Kong or in southern Italy, which suffers from the lack of water. Desert areas of California by intelligent use have transformed deserts into fertile paradises. Certain areas which have sufficient for their needs do not have it at the time when they need it, so for them, it is a problem of storage and use in time of need. Then it becomes a matter of distribution. Sixty-four percent of our farms have piped-in water. We have seen conservation in the Tennessee Valley, in the Far West at the Columbia River, or at the Wilson Dam. I was very pleased to see that within the last 2 weeks, Canada and the United States entered into a treaty agreement for the development of water power on the Columbia River so that these areas could enjoy the benefits of electricity.

I was also pleased to note that the recommendation made by President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON to set up a 200-member committee to coordinate our natural resources submitted their comprehensive report. This report, in essence, recommends the expansion of Federal flood control, antipollution, public power reclamation, forestry and waterway development programs.

Our country has been fortunate in the blessings of nature bestowed upon it in the shape of all varieties of natural resources. We have attained our preeminent position in the world today because we have had the energy, the ingenuity, and the purpose with which to convert natural resources in their many aspects to useful products. In the process, we have been shamefully prodigal as well as admirably efficient. We no longer can afford to be wasteful. Some nations have not been blessed with nature's bounty, and consequently look to us with pitiful glances for help or with green eyes in envy.

I, for one, have supported those programs which preserve our resources, and which are designed to bring the blessings to the residents of those areas in which the projects are constructed. Colleagues of mine, such as Representative JAMES WRIGHT, of Texas, and JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi, have been most helpful to me in explaining the intricate details and benefits of these programs. I have supported the electrification program with vigor, because I have seen its tangible benefits, and I can envision its potential. I also recognize that all people in our country, whether it be on the farm or in the city, have common interests if we but recognize them. I have supported with pleasure the expansion of the TVA's jurisdiction, because I believe that the people of that area are entitled to cheap power and a right to receive the benefits which hydroelectric power provides for the residents of that area. I have supported appropriations for the rural electric and telephone programs because I believe that it contributes to the dignity of my fellow man and my fellow citizens. If we in the city support programs which farmers feel are their private domain, we do so because we recognize their intimate relationship with us and that we are part of a great freedom loving Nation. We, on the other hand, have high hopes and confidence that the farmer become aware of and sympathetic to the various problems which we cliffdwellers face in our urban centers. Newspaper reporters call this mutual assistance—"I scratch your back; you scratch my back theory of politics."

Our problems in the city are legion. We desperately need decent housing. We escape from the hot and humid cities in the summertime to capture a breath of fresh air, or in the country or at the seashore. We would like to enjoy on occasion the fresh air which the farmers receive in their daily lives. We clamor for an increase in minimum wages because we feel that we should have the wherewithal to purchase the necessities of life and to obtain the food supply which are the farmers for digging and which we cannot abstract from the soil. We need improved mass transportation systems and highways to earn and receive our daily bread. If we recognize that we are truly our brothers' keepers and that no class warfare exists between the farmer and the city dweller and that we have mutual interests, if we appreciate that education is the common concern of all, that decent housing, good health and medical care in time of illness, are rights of mankind, then we have recognized the truth which has come down from all religions. When we recognize that truth, that nature's bounty was planned for the benefit of mankind, and that we are but instruments of His will, then we can live as human beings, we can be proud of our way of life, and we can proudly shout from the top of a silo or from the housetops "We are Americans all."

The 43d Anniversary of the Proclamation of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, to the Lithuanian people throughout the world and especially, to those behind the Iron Curtain, go messages of hope and encouragement on the occasion of the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence.

I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in commemorating this day—February 16—and in paying tribute to the qualities and aspirations of the Lithuanian people. In the face of adversity, those behind the Iron Curtain have kept in their hearts the resolve to celebrate this day in true freedom and independence.

We cannot forget that tyranny tolerated is tyranny embraced.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Joseph Gedra, pastor, St. Paul's Church, Damascus, Md., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O Heavenly Father, in behalf of many of Thy faithful people, living in our own and in other free lands, who are sadly commemorating the independence of their small nation, Lithuania, which by Thy grace, it regained 43 years ago, only to lose it later to an aggressive and atheistic neighbor. Together with them, we humbly and reverently beseech Thee to be mindful of the plight of those who are at this moment bravely enduring the hardships of enslavement at the hands of Thy enemies; and we implore Thee to keep alive in their hearts the hope that Thou wilt not abandon them who remain loyal to Thee.

Assure them, O Lord, that their struggle to glorify and worship Thee in private and in public; to live decently according to Thy laws and principles; to associate freely and honorably and peaceably with other nations, will not be in vain.

And we pray Thee also, inspire us with Thy heavenly wisdom and courage to assist Lithuania, her Baltic neighbors and other persecuted peoples, to realize their national aspirations and to take their rightful place in the society of free and godly nations, so that it may not be said of us, who are so richly blessed by Thee, that the children of darkness are wiser than the children of light. Through Jesus Christ Thy beloved Son and our Divine Mediator with Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

S. RES. 89

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable W. F. Norrell, late a Representative from the State of Arkansas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 681. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 46, 87th Congress, the Chair appoints as additional members of the Select Committee To Conduct Studies and Investigations of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House:

Mr. MCCULLOCH, Ohio; Mr. MOORE, West Virginia; Mr. AVERY, Kansas; Mr. SMITH, California; Mr. ROBISON, New York; and Mr. DERWINSKI, Illinois.

U.S. DELEGATION OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 22 to February 26, 1961, the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. GALLAGHER, New Jersey, chairman; Mrs. KELLY, New York; Mr. YATES, Illinois; Mr. IKARD, Texas; Mr. DULSKI, New York; Mr. PHILBIN, Massachusetts; Mr. STRATTON, New York; Mr. CURTIS, Massachusetts; Mr. BROOMFIELD, Michigan; Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska; Mr. HARVEY, Michigan; and Mr. TUPPER, Maine.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 22, 1961, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 22, 1961.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Roosevelt subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit this afternoon during the special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

IDEOLOGICAL FALLACIES OF COMMUNISM

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram sent to me as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald magazine. Dr. Poling appeared before the committee in 1957 as one of three prominent clergymen of the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths, respectively, who took part in a consultation on the subject "Ideological Fallacies of Communism." Along with Rabbi A. Andhill Fineberg and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, Dr. Poling proved himself a formidable adversary of the Communist conspiracy in a trenchant exposé of its philosophy of universal regimentation and enslavement of the individual and complete denial of God. Dr. Poling has never ceased in his efforts toward alerting our citizenry to the tactics of the Communist forces and to the urgency for meeting them head on.

Dr. Poling's telegram is as follows:

A petition to the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress to eliminate the Committee on Un-American Activities carries some 400 signatures. Among these are 62 Protestant clergymen and 18 Jewish rabbis. I dissent. Also, I find no Roman Catholic bishops or priests included among these 400. And in sharp contrast with the petition was the speech of Frederick H. Boland, President of the United Nations General Assembly, received with enthusiasm by more than 1,200 Roman Catholic high school teachers, calling upon religious educators to take the "offensive against atheistic communism." President Boland's address was carried by the same press that printed the paid advertisement of the 400. I believe that these 400 do not represent but that they do misrepresent the vast majority of their fellow Protestants and Jews, indeed the vast majority of their fellow Americans. Few, if any, of these 400 have ever signed petitions against subversion or have ever identified themselves against un-American activities. Few, if any, of these 400 have ever engaged in an unequivocal campaign against atheistic communism. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, warns the Nation that communism was never more alert and never more dangerous to American freedom than right now. Whatever the mistakes of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this committee has never made

the fatal mistake of being soft to communism. To discontinue or discredit it now would be a disservice to America and to the free world. The committee should be continued and constructively strengthened.

DANIEL A. POLING,
Editor, Christian Herald Magazine.

A SENSIBLE PROGRAM FOR AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues facing this Congress has been the need to provide assistance for education. We passed a bill on this subject last year, and it is my understanding that the President is sending up a message on Monday with somewhat similar recommendations for this year. This assistance is important and certainly desperately needed. Yet in our effort to improve our elementary and secondary education let us not forget the importance of higher education as well, and the need to recognize our obligation to provide assistance to it, too.

One of the doubts raised by those opposing aid to education has been the charge that such assistance might lead to Federal control. I do not favor Federal control of education, and I would oppose legislation which I felt might lead to that kind of situation. When it comes to higher education there is, in fact, a very simple remedy which completely avoids any possibility of Federal control. This is to supply assistance through the parents or guardians who have made this education possible, namely by tax relief for the funds expended on this highly useful purpose.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4171, to extend to the parents of college students a special tax credit for funds spent toward their higher education. Under the terms of my bill parents or guardians would be allowed to claim as a credit on their Federal income tax 30 percent of the amount paid out during the year to institutions of higher education as tuition or fees for the education of any person at a level above the 12th grade.

In introducing this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I am carrying out a pledge I made during my recent campaign. At that time I considered introducing legislation to permit taxpayers to deduct the total of educational payments from their taxable income. On closer examination, however, it became clear that such a program would be of much greater benefit to those in the higher tax brackets for whom a deduction in taxable income would mean a proportionately greater reduction in the tax to be paid. By authorizing a tax credit of 30 percent in place of a deduction, however, the advantage accrues instead to those in the lower income brackets who will actually need this kind of assistance most anyway.

Mr. Speaker, education is one of our most important problems today. We need to encourage higher education. We need to make higher education available to those who might not otherwise secure it because of their financial situation, and we need in particular to encourage those institutions which continue to operate as private centers of American higher education. The bill I have introduced, H.R. 4171, would not only give them a real assist from the Federal Government by providing this help indirectly through our tax laws, but would also insure that there would be no possible question as to Federal intervention or control of education itself.

PROBLEM OF STEAMSHIP CONFERENCES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this week for appropriate reference the bill, H.R. 4299, to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences.

This bill represents an attempt to meet most of the major complaints made by interested witnesses during the course of the 2-year study of the problem of steamship conferences by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I think this bill, in its present form, will provide the mechanism needed to maintain stability in the waterborne foreign commerce of the United States and thereby protect the legitimate interests of both shipper and carrier. By bringing together in legislative form the principal points and issues raised in the record of our extensive hearings, I believe this bill provides a reasonable basis from which we may hope to produce much needed corrective legislation in this session of Congress.

Full scale hearings held by the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, as well as the Merchant Marine Committee hearings, strongly indicated that additional regulatory power should be given to the Federal Maritime Board. We have made no attempt to cover this aspect of the problem in the current bill, but in all probability it will come up for active consideration in the course of hearings on this bill. Moreover, it is believed that much benefit can be gained by considering the matter of regulatory powers in the light of the Judiciary subcommittee's hearings and findings. Much valuable material has been developed by that subcommittee in its extensive investigations.

The Subcommittee on Steamship Conferences has scheduled hearings to begin on this bill on March 7.

DOPE—RED CHINA'S SECRET WEAPON

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the very dangerous elements in the Chinese cold war is the spreading of the use of narcotics. In the old days, imperial China became convinced that poppy cultivation was destructive to the nation, and made it illegal. It appears that the Communist Chinese are encouraging not only the growing of poppies on a large scale, but the exportation of dope in all forms. In various ways and sometimes actually by force, narcotics are forced upon a victim until he becomes an addict and must have the drug.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, together with these remarks, an article which is a reprint from Christian Economics of December 13, 1960. I hope that those who are interested in these matters will be made more knowledgeable of this very serious problem by reading the article, which is as follows:

DOPE—RED CHINA'S SECRET WEAPON

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

Communist China, the world's biggest dope peddler today, has launched a new world-wide drive for admission into the United Nations.

She needs this new badge of prestige badly if she is to protect and expand her $1-billion-a-year traffic in narcotics.

For the first time in human history, the systematic production and distribution of narcotic drugs has become an organized government monopoly in Red China. In 10 years, Mao Tse-tung has built up a virtual world monopoly in opium, heroin, and morphine.

Membership in the U.N. would give the Chinese Communists lawful and open access, through pro forma trade missions, to every major city in the United States of America, Latin America, and Western Europe. At present, all these dope outlets are maintained through illicit underground connections, at great cost to the narcotics trust in Peiping.

Details of the flourishing Chinese drug traffic came to light in a recent report from the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Harry J. Anslinger, Chief of the Narcotics Bureau, U.S. Treasury Department, was the U.S. delegate to the special U.N. conference on the rapidly expanding narcotics trade.

Anslinger named Fang Jung Ho as China's chief of special trade. He is the cabinet officer in charge of dope operations the world around.

"Spreading narcotic addiction and obtaining funds for political purposes through the sale of heroin and opium is not just the policy of one man in the Communist regime. It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China," Anslinger told the U.N. Commission. "There is a close relation with the People's Bank of China, both of which have local branches throughout the country, with special counters to handle loans, credits, and mortgages for opium. The transportation of opium shipments is guarded by the armed forces."

Incoming shipments of raw opium from the countryside are analyzed and graded by the Shanghai hygienic department, just as eggs are candled and graded in New York or Chicago before shipment.

When an international narcotics contract is signed, through the Red China tobacco monopoly, the papers are turned over to the

regional army commander. The army arranges the landing at the specified foreign port.

Narcotics experts attached to the Commission estimate that more than 5 million acres of land in starving China are now devoted exclusively to intensive cultivation of narcotic poppies.

Everyone connected with the Communist dope traffic is charged with the daily responsibility and duty of recruiting new addicts to chase the dragon, as the habit is described throughout the Orient.

Anslinger documented for the U.N. Commission the case of a young Japanese seaman, Saito, who signed on one of the ships in the Chinese dope fleet from Yokohama.

During his first voyage Saito, who was not an addict, was tied hand and foot and forcibly given heroin injections until he manifested a craving for the drug. He becomes a confirmed addict.

Youngsters thus forced to chase the dragon become ready servants of the Chinese dope mobsters, eager for any criminal assignment or violence which will assure their daily narcotic requirements. By this technique, Communist China has built up a ready army of fiendish criminals in all the principal port cities of the world.

Despite intensified police work throughout the United States, new addicts are cultivated daily in every major city, chiefly because Communist sources send in a constant dope supply for their pushers.

"All the documents examined by the United Nations coming from all governments in that area point to the fact that Communist China is the major source of supply of narcotics for the entire world," Anslinger reported.

New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., Illinois, and all of California were cited by Anslinger as the principal retail dope markets in the United States.

"In California, after months of intensive investigation, which took a lot of money and very dangerous undercover work, we came up with a group of Chinese who had been smuggling from Communist China. They had a direct connection with Hong Kong. A fellow in Hong Kong by the name of Judah Isaac Ezra, whom we had sent to the penitentiary years ago, had the connections inside China, and was taking care of most of the traffic into the United States.

"For several years I have presented documented facts which establish that narcotic trafficking from the Chinese mainland is an insidious, calculated scheme of the Chinese Communist regime to obtain operating funds and, at the same time, spread the debauchery of narcotic addiction among the free nations," Anslinger's report to the U.N. continued.

"In most instances the heroin was brought into the country concealed on the persons of seamen. Ornately carved camphorwood chests with specially built compartments were also used for the smuggling operations."

Opium poppies are bid in by the Bank of China at $72 per pound, American, and refined heroin at $500 per pound.

"In Kwangtung Province the opium poppy planting is about three times what it was in 1951. The yield must be sold to the Communist cooperatives."

In one recent year Los Angeles accounted for 7,000 narcotics arrests, out of a total of 24,000 for the entire United States.

New York City now has increased its police narcotics squad to 200 men.

"The teenage problem is still with us," Anslinger told the House Appropriations Committee, "but that is spotty. It certainly is not general. You will not find it, say, through the South, or even in Pittsburgh, and there are very few teenage cases in Philadelphia. The real teenage problem is in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles. In relation to schools, the only problem we have is in New York City. The city and State of New York jointly set up a special hospital for adolescent drug addicts. They have had a daily population, roughly, between 60 and 100 patients."

The narcotics traffic serves international communism in two very practical ways. It provides tremendous dollar and sterling exchange pools all around the world; secondly, the traffic is a fiendish weapon of sabotage against the free world, for every new addict impairs and undermines in some degree the total productive power of the victim nation.

Should the United Nations vote to admit the world's foremost dope mobster?

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a measure already sponsored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and more than 30 Members of the other body, and by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, and 5 other colleagues in this body, which is known as the cold war GI bill.

This legislation would provide educational and vocational benefits for more than 4 million GI's who have served our country in the post-Korean war period.

The benefits provided in this bill are not so great as those provided in the World War II and Korean war GI bills, but they do provide genuine incentives to military service and to make provision for the saving of the benefits until the time for retirement from the service, on completion of 20 years in uniform.

In the final analysis, there is no question about who is the chief beneficiary of legislation of this kind. It was demonstrated conclusively in both the World War II and Korean war programs. That beneficiary is Uncle Sam himself—the Nation at large—which is much stronger and better equipped today by reason of these highly successful programs.

I hope and trust the Congress will soon act to place this much needed and well proved program in operation for the veterans of today.

SMALL PRODUCERS BILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, has today announced that hearings will begin on March 9, before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on the measure known to this body as the small lead and zinc producers bill.

This measure, which passed both Houses of Congress in 1960 only to be vetoed, has been reintroduced in the 87th Congress by the Honorable WALTER BARING, of Nevada; the Honorable GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho; the Honorable WALTER MCVEY, of Kansas; the Honorable JOSEPH MONTOYA, of New Mexico; the Honorable VERNON W. THOMSON, of Wisconsin; and by myself.

Conditions in the lead and zinc mining area of the country are much more serious today than they were in 1960, when this body recognized the need for this legislation after careful consideration on the floor.

I trust the hearings beginning on March 9 may be speedily concluded and the Members of Congress will soon have an opportunity to vote once again on this measure of vital importance to our depressed lead and zinc mining districts.

THE LATE MR. PAUL WOOTON

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that other Members of this body were as greatly shocked and saddened as I this morning to learn of the sudden tragic passing of one of America's greatest American newspapermen, Mr. Paul Wooton. He was for many years head of the New Orleans Times-Picayune Bureau in Washington, and was known as the dean of the Washington press corps. I am certain no newspaperman in America was better loved than he.

It was my privilege to have known Mr. Wooton rather intimately during the 14 years I have been in Washington, and I can say with complete sincerity that he was one of the finest men I have ever known. Indeed, he had received virtually every honor that could come to a man of his profession, and was perhaps Washington's most honored and most distinguished newsman.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following account of Mr. Wooton's passing which appears in today's Washington Star, which outlines briefly some of Mr. Wooton's accomplishments and which gives a brief account of his career:

PAUL WOOTON DIES AT 79; DEAN OF PRESS CORPS

Paul Wooton, 79, Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune since 1914 and known as "dean of the Washington press corps," died yesterday in a District taxicab.

Mr. Wooton, who was stricken after covering a meeting of the National Labor Relations Board, was taken by the cab driver to Doctors Hospital where he was pronounced dead. He lived at 3016 Tilden Street NW.

The veteran reporter had headed practically all the important press organizations in Washington and was an intimate friend of six Presidents during his long career. President Kennedy yesterday said he was "extremely saddened" to learn of the death of Mr. Wooton. He described Mr. Wooton as "a distinguished journalist and a man who has contributed much to his profession and his country."

KIND TO MARGARET

Mr. Wooton was particularly close to former President Truman, who as a Senator

lived in the same apartment building with the newsman in the 1930s. "And he was as kind to Margaret as anybody can be," the former President once said of Mr. Wooton's friendship to his daughter, adding, "and when anybody is kind to Margaret, I never forget it."

Mr. Wooton, recognized as an authority on politics, business, and trade, had served as president of the White House Correspondents Association, the Overseas Writers, the National Press Club, Business Papers Correspondents and the National Conference of Business Editors. He also was a member of the Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity.

Mr. Wooton also had been president of the Gridiron Club, the Louisiana State Society, and the Washington Society of Engineers, and a member of the Cosmos Club, the Metropolitan Club, and the Chevy Chase Club.

ARRANGING DINNER

At the time of his death he was making arrangements for the annual White House correspondents' dinner for the President on February 25 in the Sheraton-Park.

Mr. Wooton, as an official of the various press groups, had acted as chief press host to dignitaries visiting this country. They included Queen Elizabeth II, Queen Juliana of the Netherlands, and former Prime Minister Churchill.

Queen Elizabeth was so impressed with Mr. Wooton's handling of her meeting with the press here in 1951 as a princess that she gave him the title of Officer of the Order of the British Empire. He also had been made a member of the Order of St. Olav by King Haakon of Norway in recognition of articles he wrote about the Norwegian resistance during World War II.

His influence with Presidents was famous. He persuaded President Coolidge to start the annual Christmas tree ceremony at the White House. He also played a role in President Eisenhower's becoming a Presbyterian. Mr. Wooton held the font when Mr. Eisenhower was baptized at the National Presbyterian Church, of which the reporter was an elder.

On his 75th birthday, 500 persons crowded the auditorium of the Press Club to participate in the celebration. Among those present were Vice President Nixon, Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court, and Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey.

WITH M'GRAW-HILL

Besides his Washington post with the New Orleans paper, Mr. Wooton worked nearly 40 years in building up the Washington bureau of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. He also greatly increased the prestige of the business reporters, who for a long time did not share the same esteem as political journalists in Washington.

Mr. Wooton also was a regular contributor to Dun's Review and the Business Press News Bureau. He was on the editorial board of Chilton Publications.

A native of Indiana, Mr. Wooton began his career as cub reporter in Mexico for the Mexican Herald. He joined the Times-Picayune in 1911. His wife, the former Jewell Monday, died here in 1946.

He leaves three sisters, Miss Margaret Wooton, of Muskegon, Mich.; Mrs. Walter B. Roberts, of Rock Hill, S.C., and Mrs. Florence Nicholas, of 1330 Irving Street NW.

In addition to the honors mentioned in this article, Mr. Wooton served, also, as president of the Mississippi State Society.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Wooton was literally one who "walked with kings" but never lost the common touch. The newspaper world mourns the passing of a giant of its profession, and all of us here have lost a great friend.

The following editorial, which appears also in today's Washington Star, speaks the sentiments of all of us, I am sure, who had the pleasure and privilege of knowing Mr. Wooton during his lifetime:

PAUL WOOTON

Paul Wooton's sudden death yesterday at the age of 79 is in the nature of a closely personal loss to literally scores of newspapermen in Washington. In his long career here, dating from the Wilson administration back in the teens, he did many things for them collectively and individually. He had served as president of most of their organizations. His office had become the busy center of the detailed arrangements for many of their organizational enterprises. He was the natural choice when it came to the selection of someone to represent them in the semi-official or purely social gatherings of the press—including its various components.

Yet his self-imposed and extracurricular activities for his own brethren, and in other unrelated fields, never overshadowed his own professional standing as a competent Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and the dean of business publication representatives in the Capital. He did many useful things. Yet he will be remembered more by those who knew him for what he was than for the many things he did. He was an unusual gentleman in this thoughtful kindness to others, in his unselfish interest in those who needed help, in his adoption of a code of living which came as near to being the practical application of the Golden Rule as mortal man can achieve. The sudden termination of Paul Wooton's various activities will leave a void. But it is Paul Wooton himself who will be missed.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to place a little verbal flower upon the bier of Paul Wooton. I, along with his thousands of other friends, was shocked to learn of his sudden passing. Paul Wooton was one of the most highly respected and greatly beloved members of the large fraternity of newspaper men in this Capital City of the world.

He came to Washington in 1940 as a representative of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, one of the most outstanding newspapers in this country. In later years he was joined by another beloved character, Edgar Poe, who has worked in close and harmonious cooperation with Paul Wooton for the past 20 years. They have worked as a team and rendered splendid service to this great newspaper. Paul also served some of the leading trade publications of the Nation. For years he was the Washington representative of the McGraw-Hill Publications and for the past several years he has served in a similar capacity the Chilton Publications. Several years ago his devotion to duty, his outstanding qualities, and above all, his high character, were recognized by his fellow newspaper men when he was elected to the presidency of the National Press Club. Here, as elsewhere, he did a splendid job in that role.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, to know him was to love him. I join with his many friends in extending to his bereaved family my sincerest regret at his passing. However, they, as well as the rest of us, can find comfort in the knowledge that he lived a useful life and died as he would have wished—in harness.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks which the gentleman has made on the life of a truly great correspondent, Paul Wooton—every inch a gentleman; a man whose word was his bond; whose integrity was never questioned; whose ability was transcendent in the field that he represented.

He served as a correspondent to the press with an efficiency and an accuracy seldom achieved by the great writers and, at the same time, maintained in the high offices in the Congress and in the executive branch of Government a host of friends that share with us today his tragic passing.

Mr. Speaker, almost the first correspondent I met when I came to this Congress almost 25 years ago was Paul Wooton, dean of the White House correspondents. Mr. Wooton had been born in Clinton County, Ind., the son of a circuit-riding Methodist minister. His career as telegrapher, reporter, and sometime schoolteacher took him to Mexico for several years; and then he joined the Times-Picayune Publishing Co. in New Orleans in 1911. He remained with the Times-Picayune until the very day of his death.

Because of his representation of this great southern newspaper I had occasion to meet with Mr. Paul Wooton very often. Typical of him was his attitude of fairness in approaching even the most controversial matter. He had the ability to sit down and talk to those with whom he might strongly disagree on some phase of a national program or on some national program. But, regardless of this, Paul Wooton never failed in his writings to fairly present the views of those he contacted, with accuracy and with a wealth of experience.

For many years I lived in Washington in an apartment immediately across the street from the home of Mr. and Mrs. Wooton at 3016 Tilden Street NW. Mrs. Wooton died in 1946. Often it was my pleasure to visit with him after he returned from a long and arduous day's work. He had the ability to throw off the travail of the day and the problems of the hour and enter wholeheartedly into the levity of our meetings. Only about 2 weeks ago, at his request, I spoke to a group of editors from throughout the United States. Although he had reached the age of 79, Mr. Paul Wooton showed on that occasion a brilliance of intellect and a physical stamina that had carried him through the activities of this convention of editors until the very close of the session.

I do not know that we in Louisiana can claim this distinguished correspondent who has now gone on to his reward. I, for one, however would like to do so. His long years of service with the Times-Picayune in New Orleans gives me some semblance of right in this direction but, in a larger sense, Paul Wooton as a correspondent and as a representative of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., belongs to

the entire Nation. His works on industrial problems and on financial conditions were outstanding and received the praise and approval of the millions who read his forceful articles.

I have no misgivings regarding the future of the press of our Nation as long as men with the caliber, abilities, and integrity of Paul Wooton remain in positions of prominence. He has left to the Capital press and to the Nation a rich heritage of honor, integrity, and fair dealing which those of us who follow may well emulate.

Mr. Wooton is survived by three sisters, Florence Nicholas, 1330 Irving Street NW.; Georgiana Roberts, of Rock Hill, S.C.; and Margaret Wooton, of Muskegon, Mich. To all of them, in this dark hour, goes our deep and abiding sympathy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time this year, as we have for many years in this House, in order to pay tribute to a freedom-loving nation, now a captive country of the Soviets. This ceremony is in commemoration and in tribute of the independence of Lithuania. February 16 is the day set aside for this ceremony, but because of the passing of our beloved late colleague Mr. Norrell, of Arkansas, we were set over until today.

Further, Mr. Speaker, on this day, the world day of prayer, it is fitting and proper that I begin my tribute to Lithuania with a prayer, and to speak for the American citizens in whose veins flows the proud blood of Lithuanian ancestors, a great religious, Christian organization for centuries.

On this world day of prayer I would offer the following supplication:

Eternal God, Maker and Master of the universe, look kindly upon Your children of all races and nations. Forgive us our selfishness and anger and teach us to live at peace with one another. Forgive us our foolish pride in the little knowledge we have gained in Your vast universe, and in the fumbling attempts we are making to use the power, and to explore the space, that are Your gift. Grant us the grace to be kind, a good sense to be humble, a practical wisdom to be at one with our fellow men as we prepare for earth's greatest adventure, the voyaging to other realms in space.

Help each one of us to see his duty and to do it, and to walk a straight path of virtue in daily labor and business dealings, in relations with family and friends, in all that we may do to affect neighborhood and national and international conditions. Help us in our endeavor to attain honesty, and a clear view of ourselves in our relationships with the world around us, so that each one of us may strive effectively toward making the world a better place for all of us to live in.

Mr. Speaker, today when we think of wars, we all have in mind the death and destruction they bring in their train, and we rightly shudder at the mere thought of another war. But in the past there has been no easy way to break the chain which held down helpless nations under tyrannical regimes except through wars and revolutions. The war of 1914–18 was such a war: when it was over many oppressed nationalities regained their freedom and attained national independence. Lithuania, whose independence day is being celebrated today, is one of the countries which attained its independence in the course of that war.

The Lithuanians are justly proud of their long and glorious history, as they are of their ceaseless struggle against their oppressors for freedom. Late in middle ages and early in modern times theirs was a powerful kingdom, one of the largest in Eastern Europe. For centuries they not only succeeded in repelling some of the incursions of ferocious barbarian invaders coming from the east into northeastern Europe, but they were also gallant champions of Christianity and formed its advance guard in that part of Europe. Then late in the 16th century they united with the Poles and formed a dual monarchy. This voluntary union lasted 200 years. In late 18th century when Poland was partitioned and most of it fell to Russia, Lithuania was incorporated into the Russian Empire.

That marked the loss of freedom for the Lithuanian people, but the loss of national independence did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian spirit of freedom. Throughout their trying years, for more than a century, under czarist domination the Lithuanians learned that individual or group well-being could not be fully achieved or enjoyed without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the fruits of their labor, they must have freedom in their homeland, be masters of their own destiny. Consequently, they united and worked ceaselessly for the realization of their most cherished dream, for the independence of Lithuania. None of the repressive measures of the Russian Government, none of its harsh brutality, nor its proscription of the Lithuanian language and culture, none of these could prevent the patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians from striving for the realization of their national goal. They fought for it openly as well as clandestinely. They staged open rebellion against their oppressors more than once, but they had to await until World War I for the actual achievement of their national independence. Finally on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence.

Thereafter for more than two decades the Lithuanians lived in freedom and enjoyed it to the full. Then early in the Second World War came the rude shock from the sudden unleashing of evil international forces. Hemmed in between two totalitarian dictatorships, and without the effective aid of her friends in the West, little Lithuania could not hope to ward off the dangers to her very existence from either tyrannies. Actually communism proved to be the more deadly; early in 1940 the country was overrun by the Red army, and in July it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus ended two decades of glad tidings for Lithuanians and thus vanished the independent and sovereign state of Lithuania.

Since those fateful days unfortunate Lithuanians have been living under the worst tyrannies known in modern history. For a short time during the last war they suffered under the Nazis. Toward the end of that war, when the Nazis were evicted, their place was taken by the equally cruel and heartless minions of the Kremlin. The Communist regime has been there ever since with all its attendant evils, its commissars and spy rings, its informers and executioners, and it has succeeded in changing the life in Lithuania to one of regimented horrors. They owe their success in this respect to their deadly efficiency, but fortunately for the Lithuanians, and also for their friends and sympathizers, these cruel taskmasters have not been able to subdue and suppress the native spirit of freedom and independence of the Lithuanian people. That is the one bright aspect of their miserable and unenviable existence.

Unfortunately, also, there is the fact that while these champions of freedom in that borderland of totalitarian darkness and democratic light have been suffering, during all these years the free world has not been able to help them in any effective way. Thus far no matter how hard the leaders of the West have tried to better the lot of these unfortunate people, it has not been possible to work out a way whereby Lithuanians could regain some of their lost freedom and enjoy some of the fruits of their hard labor in their beloved homeland. However, we pray and hope on this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day that soon the people of Lithuania will have freedom to enjoy life in their historic homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the world arena of great power politics the fate of small nations is usually decided by forces over which they have no control. They are often the victims of events originating beyond their geographic boundaries, in the chancelleries of certain great powers. This is particularly true today, but it was hardly less so in recent past. The tragedy of the Lithuanian people is a case in point.

These sturdy and stouthearted people had lived in freedom for centuries and had their glory, but since the early 16th century their country had united with Poland and formed a dual monarchy. Late in the 18th century when Russia appropriated most of Poland, Lithuania, too, was absorbed. Thus, freedom had vanished for the Lithuanian people for some 100 years before they regained it in 1918.

During the First World War when czarist Russia was overthrown, the Lithuanians felt free, and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 43 years ago. At that time they rejoiced over

their success, as did all their friends everywhere, and it was hoped that in time they would be enabled to safeguard their richly deserved freedom. This they did for two decades. During those anxious interwar years they worked hard to make Lithuania a happy place for its people. They were justly proud of their splendid record of performance. Then at the approach of the Second World War all their achievements, even their independence, seemed to be in jeopardy. They were one of the first victims of that war. As the Red army moved into the Baltic countries as a scourge and terror, independent Lithuania vanished, its inhabitants became prisoners behind the extending net of the Red army, and the country became part of the Soviet Union.

The conclusion of the war in 1945 did not bring about any change in Lithuania. The Communist hold over the country was tightened, and its helpless inhabitants were imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. Today the country is practically closed to the outside world. No Lithuanian is allowed to leave it, and no one except a very few with special guides and permits are allowed to enter it. We have some disheartening news about Lithuanians: thousands of them were uprooted from their homes and people from Asiatic areas were brought in to take their place. All Lithuanians living on the seashore were forced to move to the interior, and they have been forced to work on collective farms. They have lost their personal possessions, and all are in the employ of the state. It is unthinkable that they should have freedom under such a system: freedom of speech, of assembly, and of movement is forbidden. The activities of individuals and groups are closely watched, as everyone lives in constant fear of arrest and imprisonment. Under such conditions it is hardly expected that these people are able to rebel against their ruthless oppressors. At the same time there is no question that they are keeping up their love for freedom and are striving for its attainment. On the 43d anniversary of their independence day though we cannot be of real positive assistance to them, we fervently pray that some day and soon they attain their goal, their freedom, and independence in their homeland.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian nation which day will always stand out as one of the memorable events in the long battle for freedom by the Lithuanian people.

No nation over the centuries can boost of a more valiant struggle to win self-government and maintain national freedom than Lithuania. The powerful Russian Government under the czar, for long years at different intervals of time, imposed its tyrannical rule upon this nation. During five different periods of its long history, the Lithuanian people rose in open rebellion against terrific odds in opposition to Russian domination of its country by the tyrannical czars. In each rebellion, the Lithuanian people fought against terrific odds in numbers, armament, and power, but never at any time gave up their battle for freedom and independence.

During recent years, the Communist tyranny has practically isolated the Lithuanian people. The Iron Curtain has been lowered further on this nation than the average satellite nation by the Communists. The Lithuanian people have suffered by reason of the rigid regulations, prison camps, and other crimes inflicted on helpless people in order to subjugate them under Soviet enslavement. The Lithuanian people will continue their struggle for independence and freedom until self-government is restored to these valiant and heroic people. The Communist tyranny is today exerting every effort to discredit and defeat the purposes of the United Nations organization. The demonstration which took place in the United Nations yesterday when U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson was speaking on freedom for all nations in Africa to avoid communistic colonialism, was another evidence that the Communist leaders have not given up their fight for world domination.

I know the people of Lithuania, and all satellite nations now under the Communist heel, will support every effort being made by our Government as the leader of the free world, to continue the fight against Communist expansion and to aid all enslaved nations in their battle to regain freedom. World history reveals that no tyrant or group of tyrants through the force of prison camps, massacres, tortures, and so forth, can permanently enslave human beings. The spirit for human freedom burns in the hearts of all mankind and cannot be destroyed by tyrants, regardless of their force and power. Someday the enslaved nations will gain self-government and freedom and Lithuania will continue its valiant fight for freedom until victory is won.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. I might say that these words said here today by the Members of this great forum of liberty will go out through the Voice of America, will go out through the facilities of Radio Free Europe, behind the Iron Curtain, to all of these captive nations, including Lithuania, where there are millions, as the gentleman from Indiana well knows, waiting to be reassured and to hear these voices spoken here by the Representatives of the people of this great country, that they are not forgotten here and will not be forgotten here. That is why I am so pleased that my colleagues are saying these words.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for reserving this time and handling this hour. He has handled this hour for many years.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the First World War all submerged and suppressed national groups in Europe regained their independence. Among these were the Lithuanian people who, having suffered under Russian autocracy for more than 100 years, proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918.

Lithuanians have a distinct place in the turbulent history of northern Europe. They have the most numerous of the three Baltic national groups—about 3 million in all—and they have always been stout defenders of liberty. During their subjection to Russian regime, they managed to keep their love of liberty and their patriotic sentiments alive. Their sturdy and unyielding spirit, fortified by their firm belief in Christian principles, served them well. Throughout their eventful history they have clung to Christianity with the same fervor and tenacity as they have to their historic homeland. There they waited for the opportune moment to assert their freedom, and that moment came soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, during the First World War. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and established the Lithuanian Republic.

The next two decades were the happiest years in the modern history of the Lithuanian people. Under their chosen form of democratic government, they made remarkable strides in many walks of life, and their little country became a model democracy in that part of the world. There they were contented and happy in perfect freedom. But the rise of aggressive dictatorships in Germany and Russia and the strengthening of implacable communism in Russia caused serious apprehensions.

Then with the outbreak of the last war, the worst apprehensions of the Lithuanian people were confirmed. The presence of greedy Soviet forces on Lithuania's borders almost terrorized its inhabitants. Early in 1940 the country was invaded and occupied by the Red army, and then it was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thus vanished the Lithuanian Republic and also the freedom of its people.

During the war the country changed its master, for about 2 years it was held and occupied by the Nazis, but of course, that was no better as far as the people were concerned, they suffered much under Nazi occupation. In 1944 victorious Communists returned and since then they have been there. They have robbed the Lithuanians of all their worldly possessions, and they have also deprived them of all forms of freedom. And they are forbidden to leave the country. Under these depressing, almost disheartening conditions, unhappy Lithuanians carry on, and cling to the conviction that in the end their righteous cause will triumph, they will regain their freedom and live in peace in their beloved homeland.

On the 43d anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, the free world should meditate upon the hardships of the Lithuanian people and that of her sister nations. The free nations should consider what we can do to encourage them as to what can be done to bring about their eventual lib-

eration. I wish them power and fortitude in their struggle against Communist tyranny.

The spirit of freedom is rooted deeply in the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. No communistic country will ever gag their hopes and prayers for freedom. The Lithuanians stand firmly in their love for national liberty. I can wholeheartedly state that we in America are bound in bonds of unity to the people of Lithuania, and our effort continues to be for the restoration of national sovereignty and the return of freedom and liberty.

May this commemoration also serve to tell the people of Lithuania that we in America will never relax our efforts to help them secure their freedom and independence.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, who has always been with us in this program. He gives clear evidence of his interest in the Lithuanian people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his forthright statement with regard to the Lithuanian people and our enthusiastic dedication to the ultimate freedom of Lithuania. I should like to join with him and other Members not only to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania on the 43d anniversary of their freedom but also to express the hope that the day will not be too far away when Lithuania will again be free.

Today we pay tribute not only to the people of Lithuania who are living behind the Iron Curtain, holding together their national spirit in spite of Communist oppression, but we pay tribute as well to the fine Americans of Lithuanian descent who have contributed to our national life so much of the same burning ideals of freedom and patriotism which made their homeland so great.

Mr. Speaker, the fine people must gain hope not merely from any words that are spoken here on the floor of Congress today, but from the sentiments that were so eloquently expressed by our great President in his state of the Union message when he made it clear that regardless of the efforts that may be made to preserve the peace and freedom of the world and achieve some sort of working relationship with the Soviet Union, we have not by any means forgotten our friends in Lithuania and other countries that the Soviets today hold captive. I for one am proud that our President has pledged his administration, as we here on the floor of the Congress have pledged ourselves so many times before, to the cause of freedom in the not too distant future for all these brave people who are today held in oppression by their Soviet captors.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the honor of celebrating the 43d anniversary of the independence of the brave Lithuanian nation. Throughout the free world this is an occasion which we celebrate not only for ourselves but also for a people who cannot at the moment celebrate a freedom that once was their own.

In Lithuania today brave people are forced to lead a life which is as foreign to their character as the Russian oppressors should be to their country.

Since the 13th century Lithuania has enjoyed its freedom only for brief intervals between the conquests of power-hungry neighbors. Their years of struggle against the czarist regime finally regained for them their independence. This independence lasted less than a generation. In this generation a greater oppressor, with a more terrible power, grew in the East. And in 1940 the ugly head of tyranny, this time in the person of Joseph Stalin, once again cast its shadow over this noble country. The Lithuanian people again lost their independence.

The face of the tyrant has changed since 1940, but the lot of the Lithuanian people remains unimproved. They are still denied their freedom and independence.

But while the Kremlin can deny the freedom to work, talk, or travel as they please, the Lithuanian people still remain the masters of their own hopes; their own minds and souls. And within the Lithuanian people the passionate desire for freedom remains. This desire, that is a common heritage of the people of Lithuania and the people of the United States, forms a bond no Iron Curtain can break.

And, therefore, the privilege we have today of celebrating the Lithuanian independence, like all privileges, carries with it a responsibility. We here today, and the entire free world, have the heavy responsibility and the awesome challenge to be sure that someday Lithuania again will be free. We have this responsibility not only because Lithuania deserves her freedom, but also because the free world will not long remain free, if those who are free forget those who are not.

It is on this anniversary that the American people take the opportunity to tell the people of Lithuania that their plight is not forgotten and their hopes are also our hopes. This is an opportunity too to give notice to the Soviet jailers that we have not forgotten the brave people of Lithuania they hold as prisoners. The Kremlin may have released the RB–47 fliers. But we can let them know today that the people of the free world will continue to insist that they also free the enslaved people of Lithuania.

And so today is primarily a day to rededicate ourselves to the age-old struggle for freedom that has characterized the history of both the United States and of Lithuania, a struggle for the dignity of man, a struggle to free him from oppression of all kinds, a struggle full of hope for the coming day of deliverance.

Edward Markham once wrote in a poem dedicated to Abraham Lincoln whose birthdate we celebrated earlier this week:

And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

The end of Lithuanian independence back in 1940 left the same kind of empty void. Until the day when Lithuania once again is free, we shall hold a place for her in the family of all free nations. And until that place is filled, our important member of the family of free nations is missing and the dignity of man suffers to that extent.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the statements that are made today and hereafter in connection with the Lithuanian Day program will be reprinted in pamphlet form by the Lithuanian Information Center in New York City at a future date, and if there are any Members who do not wish to have their remarks and statements reprinted, they should so state during the course of today's program.

The Public Printer, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk, the Committee on Printing, and the Lithuanian American Information Center will, by such an announcement as this, have the necessary authorization to have the reprints made in accordance with the rules and regulations on printing.

This will save a tremendous amount of time for the Members who are participating in today's program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the remarks of my colleagues on this subject be inserted as follows—the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the blessing of liberty which we enjoy in this country should not blind us to the fact that oppression still exists in many parts of the world. We should be particularly mindful of this fact on February 16, the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence.

One of the first nations to be overwhelmed by Soviet power, Lithuania today stands as a reminder that the struggle for freedom will not be wholly won until this small, brave land is free of foreign domination.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the struggle of the Lithuanian peoples to achieve their independence is recalled to our minds with great vividness. Remembering the courage of the

Lithuanian peoples who live today under Communist domination, I wish particularly to praise the efforts of the Lithuanian-Americans who keep the memory of the independence of their fatherland before us. We owe much to those who remind us that many peoples of the world are not as lucky as we, but live under the domination of hostile rulers. Although the Lithuanian-Americans had to leave their country in time of stress, we rejoice that they selected the United States in which to live. They have enriched our culture with their artistic and intellectual talents, as well as with the work of their skilled hands and strong bodies. Through their Lithuanian groups and national organizations, they keep alive the spirit of Lithuanian independence from their adopted land, reminding us always of the oppression that exists in the world today. Let us celebrate this anniversary in the profound hope it will not always be so.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ideals are important in the life of nations, and sometimes they are rated higher than mere material gains.

Individuals as well as nations do not live on bread alone; for their spiritual sustenance they cling to ideals. Freedom and independence are among the most cherished of these ideals. National independence is a condition under which group freedom may be attained, since it is difficult to conceive of freedom in a land where the people are subjected to a stern alien regime.

Late in the 18th century when Lithuanians lost their national independence and were brought under the czarist regime of Russia, they lost much of their individual freedoms. For more than a century these stalwart and stout-hearted Lithuanians suffered under the brutalities of czarist agents. During that unhappy period they did not lose sight of their objective: the attainment of their independence.

In 1918, that detested regime was overthrown. On February 16, 1918, Lithuanians proclaimed their independence. That day marked a turning point in their national history, for from then on a new day had dawned for them. The next two decades were to become a kind of golden age in Lithuania's modern history. The Lithuanians were justly proud of their splendid record of performance during those 2 peaceful decades in every walk of their national life. Unfortunately that happy interlude did not last long.

The Second World War proved to be a national tragedy for the Lithuanians. They were one of the first victims of that war. Communist dictators of Russia robbed them of their independence and of their freedom. During that war they suffered much and lost nearly all their worldly possessions, but they still had the hope of regaining their freedom after that war. In that expectation they were sadly disappointed. Even before the end of that war, the Red army made sure that Lithuania would remain part of the Soviet Union.

The unhappy upshot is that since 1945 Lithuania has become a prison camp for its helpless inhabitants. The country is almost completely sealed from the outside. No one except a few favored persons from the free world are allowed to enter, and of course no one is permitted to leave the country. There is no doubt that these years have been trying years for the people of Lithuania. They have lost all their worldly possessions, and they all are in the employ of the state, for the state owns and operates everything in that part of the Communist "paradise." It is unthinkable under such circumstances and under such a system to enjoy any freedom: freedom of speech, of assembly, and of movement is rigidly controlled. All activities of groups and individuals are closely watched, and everyone lives in constant fear of arrest and imprisonment. There is nothing for poor Lithuanians to do except work and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

In voicing their genuine sentiments on the anniversary celebration of their independence day, I devoutly hope that freedom may again be theirs and that it will come in the near future.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was exactly 708 years ago that Lithuania first became a nation. Although it was a small country, the hopes, dreams, and ambitions of its courageous people more than made up for its size. For more than 540 years these people worked hard to develop Lithuania, and they succeeded. For out of their hopes, dreams, and ambitions was born peace and progress.

We all know what has happened to this once peaceful little country through the years. In the 18th century it was incorporated as part of czarist Russia. Its people were suppressed, held down for generations—and freedom became only a word without meaning. The Russian Revolution in 1918 made Lithuania free again. The nation proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918, and there was peace once more. Unfortunately, it was short lived. Early in World War II Lithuania was again absorbed by the Russians. In time, the Red army was driven out by a then more powerful, equally tyrannical force—a Nazi army. Eventually, the Nazis, too, withdrew—and Russia was again firmly entrenched in Lithuania.

Through it all, the unquenchable spirit of the Lithuanian people has been kept alive by those same hopes, dreams, and ambitions that enabled them to build a flourishing, prosperous, and progressive nation many years ago.

On this February 16, the 43d aniversary of the independence of Lithuania, we in the United States join our prayers, our hopes, and our dreams with those of the Lithuanian people for peace and freedom in their proud little country. And with our prayers, our hopes, and our dreams, we include our profound respect and admiration for the courageous spirit of these people.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is one of the homelands presently dominated by a foreign conqueror. This situation is in direct violation of the principle of the "self-determination of peoples" which all of us in the free world value. We sympathize with the Lithuanian people wherever they are and we want them to know that neither they nor their unfortunate political situation has been forgotten.

Today marks the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania achieved after World War I. This tiny country of noble people experienced two decades of freedom and liberty. Only when World War II came along was this nation with others the object of foreign conquest.

It is the sincere desire of all Americans and of freedom-loving people everywhere that the future may again see an independent Lithuania. Our efforts in the United Nations as in all our international endeavors must be directed to the achievement of freedom for all peoples everywhere.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, mankind's greatest menace, communism, rules one-fourth of the world's surface and one-third of the people. Amongst these people is the small nation of Lithuania, who today celebrate their 43d anniversary of their declaration of independence—in spite of the slave rule imposed upon them by communism. The celebration of this anniversary is the spark that is needed to fire up their ambitions to continue to work toward the day when they can again enjoy national independence with political and social justice.

We, in America, as the great symbol of democracy, must convey every word of encouragement to these brave people, to continue with vigor their quest for the God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom. Let it be known today that the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Illinois are shouting to the brave Lithuanians to carry on their fight with renewed vitality. For in the end justice will prevail and they will once again join us as an independent nation opposed to any form of tyrant rule.

We, in America, have embarked on a new frontier, to advance our way of life to a level of great self-respect for all classes. This goal, that we are working for, will eventually lead to the destruction of all slave rule—set by good example and not forceful means. For no minority group possesses the power to enslave, when the full force of the majority works as a unit to rid the world of these sadistic principles. Only in a free world can we enjoy peace, prosperity, and full happiness.

I salute the inspiring example of resistance and determination shown by the Lithuanian people, and other captive nations behind the iron curtain, and denounce the Soviet Union for its brutality and imperialism.

The soul of Lithuania will never die, and it is my hope to see the day when these fine people again join the ranks of free nations.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year over a dozen countries in Africa were given their independence, among them the Congo. The tragic events that followed are only too well known to us all to recall here the slaying of Patrice

Lumumba by his rival forces, which may still have much deeper repercussions and consequences. I believe that the manner in which he and his two colleagues were killed is contrary to the concepts of our American democracy. However, the history of the independent Congo, its violence, and its present most complicated situation should be a lesson to all of us who help to gain liberty, independence, and justice for those who have never experienced it. There are those who believe that most of these newly born nations received their independence too soon. They say that one has to first educate them so that in the future they will be able to operate and administrate their own government. We know that these backward countries cannot cope with their daily problems inside and abroad without the proper assistance. Yet it is the Soviet Government that exercises all the pressure upon us to back their demand for independence. Undoubtedly the Soviets are good salesmen in this respect and their propaganda has, psychologically speaking, had a tremendous effect on all those who have little knowledge of how the Soviet operates. The recent history of the Congo serves as a typical example. Lumumba, the Premier was released of his duties by his superior, the President. When violence broke out—instigated by Moscow—Lumumba was thrown in jail by his own people and the Soviets really screamed.

The Soviets blamed the United Nations for the events that have followed and they demanded that Dag Hammarskjold be relieved of his duties as Secretary General of the United Nations, something which in itself is contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. On this occasion, however, I would like to point out the Soviet Union's own record going back as far as 1939. Here are just some examples of the cynicism and treachery of that Government that calls itself the foremost frontline soldier in the battle for other oppressed nations.

First. On September 17, 1939, Stalin joined hands with Hitler in the name of mutual socialism by dividing Poland. As a result 1½ million Poles were deported deep into the Soviet Union's slave labor camps.

Second. Some 14,000 Polish officers—previously all mobilized to fight the German invaders—were coldbloodedly murdered by their Soviet captors in the Katyn Forest.

Third. Sixteen Polish underground leaders headed by General Okolnicki were lured into a plane under the pretext of being flown to London for a bipartisan meeting. Instead they all found themselves in the Lubianka Prison and were later court-martialed for anti-Soviet activities. Most of them were executed.

Fourth. The Hungarian revolution topped everything. Soviet tanks rolling over Hungarian soil squelched the uprising, which the Soviet henchmen called an internal affair of the Hungarian people.

This is only a small part of the Soviet deeds.

As today we are celebrating the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, our thoughts go back to this brave and wonderful nation, which became one of the many Soviet Republics. Most of its population, since the Soviets have occupied it, have been deported and there is still no end in sight to this tragedy. That is why I would suggest, for perhaps the hundredth time, why don't we ask the Khrushchevs, Zorins, and Gromykos, to lay off their hands in the Congo and grant liberty and independence to those non-Russian nations that have known and experienced independence for ages.

On this day when our Lithuanian people, outside that country, are able to celebrate their 43d anniversary of independence, this occasion would be most proper. Mr. Khrushchev, how long will you keep Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia enslaved.

As long as you are unable to answer that question, isn't it futile for you to talk about the Congo?

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the First World War and soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, Lithuanians were among the first of many subject nationality groups to proclaim their national independence. That historic event of 43 years ago marked the culmination of their long-cherished dream, the regaining of their freedom, and ushered in a new era for them.

The Lithuanian people had lost their independence in the 18th century, but their real suffering under foreign domination began late in that century, when they were brought under the autocratic regime of Russia. Their country then became part of the Russian Empire, and they had to submit to the detested alien rule. Under the autocratic czarist regime they suffered materially and physically, but in all the subsequent misery and misfortune they were spiritually unscathed. The inefficient and unwieldy government of the czars could not stamp out Lithuanian national traits and feelings; autocratic and callous agents could not eliminate the Lithuanian spirit of freedom and independence. Stoutly and courageously these few million people held their own against the overwhelming power of the czars, and repeatedly defied Russian authorities whenever attempts were made to Russianize them, and thus submerge them in the one big Russian maelstrom. They were ready to sacrifice their all worldly possessions and, if necessary, submit to imprisonment and exile, but were unwilling to give up their beliefs and their national ideals. They clung to these tenaciously and steadfastly, and when the time came in 1918 to assert their independence, they seized upon the occasion and proclaimed the birth of the Lithuanian Republic. That was done on February 16, 43 years ago today.

Thenceforth for several years the people went through great difficulties. The war-ravaged country had to be built, the hungry had to be fed, the needy had to be cared for, and the governmental machinery just instituted had to be put into efficient working order. Perhaps the most important and crucial of all was the organization of the country's defense forces for the maintenance of its newly won freedom. In time, however, these difficulties were overcome, many problems were solved, and Lithuania's independence safeguarded. In due time Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations, and played her part in world affairs. In the course of two decades, during the interwar years, it was regarded as a prosperous and progressive country. Unfortunately this happy situation did not last long; Lithuania's powerful and aggressive neighbors did not want it to last. Then as now, the deadliest and the most implacable of Lithuania's enemies was the Soviet Union, and the masters of the Kremlin saw to it that democratic Lithuania did not remain free and independent. The outbreak of the Second World War foreshadowed the doom, in the first instance, of all three Baltic Republics. Early in 1940, under a flimsy and outrageous pretext, Stalin's forces invaded and occupied the country, and in July of that year it was annexed to the Soviet Union.

During the war years Lithuanians suffered under both the Soviet regime and under the Nazis. While the Soviets were in occupation of the country many thousands of Lithuanians were exiled to distant parts of the Soviet Union, and those allowed to remain in their homeland were forced to work as slaves for their Communist overlords. Then for about 2 years the country was taken over by the Nazis, but this change hardly improved the lot of the Lithuanian people; they were compelled to work in Hitler's labor force to keep his fighting machinery going. Toward the end of the war the Communists returned once more, this time with more fury and ferocity. Since then the fate of Lithuania has been in the hands of the ruthless men in the Kremlin.

Today Lithuania is one large prison camp in which some 3 million helpless but courageous people are driven to work under wretched and miserable conditions for their Communist masters. All their worldly possessions are owned and operated by the state. They are the slaves of the most totalitarian dictatorship known to man. There they are deprived of all forms of freedom, and since they are practically sealed off from the outside world, we in the free world hear little of their actual status. Of one thing we can fortunately be certain: They have not given up their traditional and national ideals of freedom, and they cherish the hope that they will regain their national independence and be free of Communist totalitarianism. I join in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day and echo their genuine patriotic sentiment, their love of freedom and independence.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on this 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, February 16, 1961, we once again hail Lithuanians the world over. Alas, we must again commiserate with them over the plight of their country. But, if the past points

the way, as we believe it does, we can hope with some confidence that this is a temporary plight. Lithuania has been a captive nation more than once. Each time she has wrenched free. We believe she will again.

The present domination of this doughty little country dates from June 1940, when the Soviet regime was ruthlessly imposed upon her people. The U.S.S.R., with all of its anticolonial talk, perpetuates a domination far more heavy handed, far more restrictive, and far more distasteful to the native populace than any form of colonialism throughout the world. The colonies born to other countries in another era are fast being liberated or assisted toward self-government. The Soviet satellites, on the other hand, have in this generation had their fully developed independence and self-government taken from them.

There have been pretexts on the part of the Soviet Union that Communist domination has been adopted by choice in these countries. What a mockery of the freedom of choice for which these captive nations yearn. Their desire is to exercise their God-given right to enjoy self-determination. Their choice would be one of true freedom of liberty such as they have known and cherished in the past, of national independence with political and social justice.

When Lithuania gained that freedom and the birth of the nation which we now celebrate, it was a rebirth for that country. The name of Lithuania is centuries old. It was an entity old in the annals of Europe as no other name in the history of that continent save only the Basques. It was a country centuries before the powers of Europe that were to swallow it up had even come into being.

Russians, Poles, Germans have, through hundreds of years, overrun Lithuania. Politically it has been tossed about among them, fought over, conquered. But Lithuania has endured. Its identity has never been destroyed. Its soul has survived all misery and all subjugation. It must be reborn in the current movement of the entire human race toward liberation from evil.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, independence day is the most cherished holiday in the calendar of any free people. We Americans may sometimes seem to take for granted the freedom and independence we are privileged to continue to enjoy, but on the Fourth of July we take pause to give serious and grateful thought to the benisons of liberty. It is an occasion for rejoicing and thanksgiving. Today is the 43d anniversary of the attainment of liberty by Lithuania, but unlike our own celebration of Independence Day, the observance of this day by patriotic Lithuanians in their native land and here in the United States is blunted by the sad plight of their beloved country. There is no rejoicing or thanksgiving today in Lithuania. The independence that they achieved during World War I after years of subjugation under the Russian czars was short lived and was again lost to an even crueler domination by the Russian dictators. Their annexation and incorporation into the Soviet Union has deprived them of any semblance of independence—for unlike Poland and other countries upon whom the Communists inflicted their peculiar form of "liberation" the Lithuanians do not even have a puppet government of their own.

The valiant Lithuanian people who during a century of Rusian dominance dreamed of freedom still foster that dream. Along with their aspirations for liberty they have continued to adhere to their native culture despite the Russian attempts to impose foreign ideologies and customs upon them. When they again attain their longed-for independence, they will have intact their eternal love of country, customs, and freedom. Despite the practice of brainwashing which may temporarily deprive an individual of the use of his God-given free will and intellect, it is virtually impossible to control the minds of an entire people, and the brave Lithuanian people will not permit themselves to be bereft of their intellectual and cultural heritage. The renowned poet has said, "Hope springs eternal in the human breast," and in the people of Lithuania hope triumphs over their tragic experience.

Today, we in the United States should also give pause and extend to the brave Lithuanians our own heartfelt wishes that the day will come when they again can experience the blessings of independence. Let them know that their tragic plight is not forgotten by us while we enjoy our own liberty, for we know that while tyranny exists any place in the world our freedom is threatened. We bid them never to surrender hope and always to cling to their beloved culture.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this February 16, 1961, we once again celebrate, rather ironically, another anniversary of the Declaration of Independence that created the free State of Lithuania. It is now 43 years since the Lithuanians availed themselves of the privilege of a free people to control their own destinies and established the Lithuanian Republic.

For a number of years thereafter Lithuania held its rightful place and added its contribution to the free nations of the world. All this has passed since that fateful month of June 1940, when Red communism and Soviet tyranny ruthlessly and viciously swept over Lithuania and blanketed this land with the dark blight of Soviet aggression.

Since that time Lithuania and the Lithuanian people have been held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain, suffering untold miseries under their despotic rulers. Their Soviet masters would have us believe that Lithuania freely accepted communism. We here who are privileged to have the right to raise our voice in the free assemblies of this earth know differently. We know that Lithuania and the Lithuanians along with millions of others in the enslaved nations in both the eastern and western sections of our world are awaiting anxiously the day when there will be a rebirth of freedom in their lands and they once again may have the privilege and right to control their own destinies.

It is to the credit of our Government and the American people that never once have we waivered in our policy of supporting the principle of freedom for all captive nations. We rightfully continue to refuse to recognize "dejure" the invalid and unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet.

May we on this 43d anniversary once again reaffirm our belief in the rights of freedom that we cherish so dearly under our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution and may we hope that in the inexorable movement of time once again Lithuania and the Lithuanian people will be their own masters in their own house.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence occurs at a time when our Nation is embarking on a new era and under a new leadership. Let us hope it will prove to be an era of freedom for all peace-loving nations, including the captive and enslaved nations suffering under the yoke of communism.

I hope and trust that in the near future the United States and the free world will regain the initiative in world affairs and that they will once again play a leading role in shaping those affairs in the best interests of all mankind. It is of utmost importance that in the developing concept of the New Frontier we should not forget the captive nations of Eastern Europe, who have been the first and greatest victims of international communism.

The people of Lithuania are today a silenced people, unable to speak their mind, unable to practice their religious beliefs, unable to celebrate their anniversary, unable to live as a free and independent nation. Their indomitable will for freedom, however, has not been crushed. They are waiting silently and grimly, yet patiently and hopefully for the future.

This indomitable will, this grim patience and hope, must be kept alive under all circumstances. To give up, to lose courage, means to lose all hope. This would constitute national suicide. Its effect would be felt not only by the people of Lithuania, but it would affect free people everywhere. Lithuania thus is a symbol of the struggle against mankind's greatest and most ruthless enemy. We must encourage this nation, and all other nations similarly situated, to maintain their hope, and to continue their gallant struggle. In this way, they are rendering a great and lasting service to humanity and civilization.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania. Over the years it has been my custom to speak here in the House of Representatives on this historic occasion and to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to the courageous founders of that republic.

Any attempt to recite in detail the many highlights of Lithuania's great history would certainly be beyond my ability. The story has been told and retold. The valiant deeds of Lithuanian

men and women of the past have been repeated over and over again—particularly those deeds of fathers and mothers who have kept alive the fire of freedom which was Lithuania's first love. So also the deeds of children who refused to let Lithuania die in spite of the most concerted efforts in history to destroy all trace of a nation and a people.

The contribution of the Lithuanians in America and their descendants gives us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that confidence and faith in Lithuania's future is well placed. The distinctive culture, the deep-rooted traditions, and the rich folklore of the Lithuanian people have greatly enriched our own country. Their contribution has been magnificent and I am proud that so many of them are citizens of my State of Rhode Island.

To the many persons of Lithuanian descent and origin I extend my congratulations on this—the anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. On this day, of so much significance to all Lithuanians, I join my hopes with theirs that their mother country may soon be delivered from its present domination and become again a free and independent nation.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's independence, the day on which oppressed Lithuanians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence. Today, though the freedom they regained and the independence they proclaimed are no more, and the Republic they founded in their historic homeland was smothered by the Red army more than 20 years ago, yet that historic date is not without significance. That memorable day became a great turning point in Lithuania's national history, ushered in a new and better era for the Lithuanian people, and has become their national holiday.

It is with fervent yearning that all freedom-loving Lithuanians who are permitted to celebrate the anniversary of this day, observe it annually with due solemnity wherever they may be. They devoutly hope that their kinsmen imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain in Lithuania and suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny, will again have the freedom to do the same there. In the expression of this genuine patriotic sentiment I gladly join all loyal Americans of Lithuanian ancestry and hope that soon Lithuanians regain their freedom in their beloved homeland and there enjoy the blessings of peace.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians constitute one of the small nations in Europe, but they have their distinct place in Europe's history. For centuries their little country in the Baltic area formed a powerful kingdom. Late in the 18th century their country was brought under the Russian czar, and they were subjected to his autocratic regime. For more than 100 years they lived under this detested alien rule, and during all that time they worked for their freedom. Their efforts and sacrifices had their reward in 1918. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, there was nothing to prevent the Lithuanians from regaining their freedom. This they did early in 1918. They proclaimed their independence on February 16 and founded the Lithuanian Republic.

During the next two decades, a happy interlude of interwar years, they enjoyed their freedom and worked hard to safeguard it against all threatening dangers. But when that danger came, early in the last war, they were not in a position to cope with it. The powerful and aggressive Red army overran Lithuania, and robbed its people of their freedom. Since those fateful days these stanch fighters for freedom have been suffering under the tyrannical regimes of dictators. Today they are practically imprisoned in their historic homeland, and are deprived of all freedoms. They do not have the freedom to observe their national holiday, their independence day. As friends of Lithuania, we in the free world commemorate this great national holiday and express the hope that soon they will once more regain their freedom.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, freedom and independence, democracy, and popular government were the goals for which the First World War was waged. And as far as small and oppressed peoples were concerned, some of these goals were attained. When that war ended, autocracies in Europe were overthrown and long oppressed nationality groups attained their independence. The Lithuanians were one of these.

When the detested and decrepit czarist regime, under which they had suffered for more than a century, was shattered by the Russian Revolution, they felt free and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. Then they established the Lithuanian Republic, rebuilt their war-torn country, strengthened democratic institutions, made progress in nearly every walk of life and proved themselves fully worthy of their freedom. In due time Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations, and in that world organization its spokesmen always advocated peace.

Thus the Lithuanians were quite content with their lot and lived in friendship with their neighbors; they were on good terms even with their implacable enemy, the Communist Russians. This happy period came to an abrupt end by the outbreak of the last war. Early in 1940, when all friends of Lithuania were involved in that war, the Red army invaded Lithuania, occupied it, and later it became part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the independent Lithuanian Republic, and then began the enslavement of the Lithuanian people.

Since those fateful days, for more than 20 years, Lithuanians have not known freedom. During the war they had hoped that after that war they would be given their freedom. But they were rudely shocked when, in the end instead of being free and independent, they found themselves behind the then shaping Iron Curtain. There in their historic homeland they are held today a satellite of a foreign power, dominated by a Communist totalitarianism. During all these years they have been hoping and praying for their deliverance. They have not given up hope for their eventual independence and freedom, and they still continue to pray to that end. In joining them in this prayer on the 43d anniversary of their independence day, I wish these stouthearted people fortitude, patience, and power.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, again we gather in this historic Chamber to pledge our hearts and our unceasing efforts to the cause of a free and independent Lithuania.

Men and women of Lithuanian blood have made a mighty contribution in our own United States in literature, in music, in art, in education, in religion, in the trades and in the professions, in the living of good lives filled with good deeds. They have enriched the United States of which they are an inseparable part.

It would be strange if on this anniversary day the thought of all Americans were not focused on the brave land of Lithuania. Today we, the Representatives of the American people, meet in this Chamber again to send to the enslaved men, women, and children a message of hope and of the assurance of a true friend that we shall not cease in the struggle until again Lithuania is free.

The 43d anniversary celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day marks hope for the dawn of a new day for all oppressed peoples in Eastern Europe. For the Lithuanian people this day commemorates February 16, 1918, when they asserted their freedom, proclaimed their independence of Russia, and set up the Lithuanian Republic. Then struggling against economic and financial hardships and faced with diplomatic difficulties, they made the best of a very precarious situation and succeeded in pulling themselves up by their bootstraps, establishing stability, and bringing about prosperity. They were happy in freedom, and all worked hard to continue to improve their democratic Republic.

This happy interlude lasted for two decades, but then the forces of evil over which they had no control stared them in the face. Their implacable enemy and the deadliest danger to their independence, the Soviet Red Army, overran Lithuania early in 1940, robbed the people of their freedom, and the country became part of the Soviet Union.

Since those fateful days the history of the Lithuanian people has been marked by tragic events. While expecting suffering during the war, they had hoped that with the end of that war their misery and suffering would also come to an end. But even before the termination of the war the Soviet Union's unrelenting hold over Lithuania was tightened. And so it is today; some 3 million Lithuanians are still groaning under Communist totalitarian tyranny in their homeland.

Recently, there has been some talk about the relaxation of Soviet controls over Lithuania. There have even been occasional reports emanating from Soviet sources that there has actually

been a considerable degree of freedom given to Lithuania and surrounding lands in the Baltics. Unfortunately, however, these unfounded reports tend to cover up the sad facts that these stout-hearted lovers of freedom are still subjected to alien rule, still held down by the agents of the Kremlin in their historic homeland. Let us all express the hope that soon they will really attain liberty and celebrate their independence day freely in their beloved Lithuania.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, was the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania—a small but noble Baltic nation that was set free from foreign domination in the earthquake changes marking the closing months of the First World War. Many millions of people here and in other lands think that this is an anniversary that free nations everywhere should observe with appropriate ceremonials.

The freedom that the Lithuanian people gained in 1918 has now been taken from them again. Along with the other Baltic States, they were forcibly embodied into the Soviet Union following military occupation under the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

There was the farce of so-called elections following the occupation, but the presence of the Soviet military was the proof that the Kremlin did not dare allow elections and plebiscites that were truly free.

Americans of Lithuanian descent find great gratification, I am sure, in the steadfast refusal of the United States to acknowledge the control of Lithuania by the Soviet Union as a lawful and legally constituted regime.

Lithuanians, like other captive peoples, still yearn for national independence under a government that seeks social and political justice. Lithuanians wish to enjoy the God-given right of all men to liberty and freedom. And their desire poses a very simple question: If the Soviet Union is sincere about opposition to colonialism, why does it not permit Lithuania and other captive nations of the Baltic and of Eastern Europe freedom from Soviet rule?

Many Members of this House, I am certain, join in the celebration of this day that lives in the memory of the Lithuanian people. Many share the hope that in the developments of time, the citizens of this brave country will once again breathe the heady air of freedom and feel the sense of exaltation that arises from self-rule, self-government, and national self-determination.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the brave and suffering people of Lithuania are marking the 43d anniversary of their declaration of independence today.

February 16, 1917, is just as significant to Lithuanians as July 4, 1776, is to every American. It was February 16, 1917, that the rebirth of that small and gallant Baltic state took place.

Today the anniversary serves again to point up the terrible sufferings which Lithuanians have undergone since 1940 when that country was occupied and taken over by the Communists.

While we here in America continue to enjoy our priceless freedom, communistic treachery has deprived Lithuanians of their independence and has subjugated this Baltic country to a state of slavery.

But even though a large part of the Lithuanian population has been deported to slave camps in Siberia to die of starvation, these wonderful freedom-loving people still carry on resistance to their oppressors.

Their martyrdom only serves to keep patriotism alive.

Year after year Members of Congress honor this brave country on this date. This date, however, also should serve for each one of us in Government as a day for us to renew our pledge to be increasingly insistent in demands on Russia that she restore liberty to Lithuania and other oppressed countries under the yoke of communism as proof of her intentions to cooperate for worldwide peace.

The persecutions and atrocities inflicted on the people of Lithuania must never be ignored. The United States must continue to refuse to grant diplomatic recognition to the government of the so-called Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. Not only today, but every day throughout the year Lithuanians look to the United States as a citadel of human freedom and for leadership in bringing about their liberation and a permanent independence.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, out of the ruins and destruction caused by the First World War rose the three independent and sovereign Baltic Republics, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The peoples of these three countries had been groaning for more than a century under Russian autocracy. That autocracy was overthrown in 1917, and early in 1918 these peoples proclaimed their independence. The Lithuanians did so on February 16, founded their Republic based on democratic institutions, and then did their utmost to strengthen their newly born state. For two decades, while there seemed no imminent danger from foreign enemies, they fared extremely well. They lived in peace with their neighbors and, though apprehensive of Communist Russia's evil designs against their country, they were content with their lot. Then came World War II, and with it the end of their independence and freedom.

Early in 1940 the Red army overran Lithuania, just as it did Estonia and Latvia, and by the middle of the year it became part of the Soviet Union. Since then the unfortunate Lithuanians have not known freedom. They themselves have not been able to win it back, and their friends in the free world, much against their wish, have not been able to help them directly to regain their freedom. Though they are suffering under the Kremlin's totalitarianism, the Lithuanians have not given up hope for their eventual freedom. For their steadfastness and stolidity we admire these stalwart champions of freedom, and on the 43d anniversary of their independence day which was celebrated yesterday we hope that they eventually secure liberty and peace in their homeland.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. For centuries the unhappy Lithuanians did not have the good fortune to enjoy freedom in their homeland. During most of their modern history they have been subjected to unwanted and detested alien rulers, and their valiant attempts to cast off foreign regimes were of no avail until 1918. Then in the overthrow of the decrepit czarist regime they saw their chance, seized upon it, and proclaimed their independence on February 16 of that year. Thus was founded the Lithuanian Republic.

Thenceforth, for about two decades the Lithuanians lived in freedom, worked hard, and succeded in making their little country in the Baltic a happy home. Mostly through their own efforts they overcame acute economic difficulties; domestic social problems were solved, and even with their implacable enemies they lived in peace. Then came the Second World War, which not only threatened their sovereignty but also put an end to their freedom. Early in 1940 the country was overrun by the Red army; it was then made part of the Soviet Union and its inhabitants became subject to its tyranny. The course of the war did not alter their status, and by 1945 Communist totalitarianism was tightly fastened upon them by the tyrants of the Kremlin. Today that is their unenviable lot: to suffer and work under Communist tyranny in their homeland, and cherish the hope of liberation in the not too distant future. We share their genuine sentiments and wish to see them attain their goal, freedom from tyranny.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, was the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of independence and I rise to reaffirm my deep and warm friendship for the gallant people of Lithuania as we observe this most solemn occasion.

It is a solemn occasion, rather than a jubilant celebration, because of the tyrants who rule Soviet Russia. It has become traditional in this body that we pay tribute to the freedom-loving people of Lithuania on their Independence Day. And it also must be traditional that we repeat and repeat the story of how the Lithuanians lost their independence so that people throughout the world never will forget the aims and actions of the Communists.

The story of Lithuania and the throttling of its independence is a tragic one. It should be a lesson to all nations of the world, both large and small, which flirt with the ideology of communism, and which consider entering into pacts, treaties, or agreements with them.

It was with great dreams that Lithuania proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918, to bring to an end 123 years of servitude to imperialistic Russia. It was then that the light of liberty was rekindled in Lithuania. Its people were free. They could now bring about the realizations of their dreams, hopes, and ambitions.

However, freedom was short lived for the Lithuanians. On the dark day of June 15, 1940, the Soviet Russian Army marched into Lithuania, bringing a new Russian imperialism and Communist tyranny to the struggling nation.

The Russian action was in complete violation of all treaties, including its own mutual assistance pact with Lithuania that guaranteed Lithuania independence and of Russian noninterference in the domestic, social, and economic order of that nation. This, of course, is typical of the masters of the Kremlin—both past and present. Treaties, pacts, and agreements have meant nothing to them. The seizure of Lithuania should forever be a lesson, a tragic one, to the world of the intent and purposes of the Communists.

Yet, despite all their trials and tribulations under the Communist yoke, the Lithuanian love for liberty has not died. They wait patiently and with determination for the day when they will be free again; when again Lithuania will be able to take its place with the free nations of the world.

Thus, today may we all join in extending our sympathy and friendship to these brave people, who had made such magnificent strides as a free nation. May we also join in prayer with these courageous people that the day of deliverance for Lithuania soon will be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over their land.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania is celebrated on February 16, but the ruthless Soviet regime still is imposed upon this country, depriving its people of their freedom. However, such oppression will never deprive Lithuania of its exalted spirit of liberty. As time passes the free world more and more appreciates the devotion that Lithuanians in exile have for their native land, and by their persistent and continued efforts their flame of independence is kept bright and is a shining example to all nations that love their freedom.

On their anniversary date the Lithuanians who are in this country once again reaffirm that Lithuania wants its national independence with political and social justice; she wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom, and I am convinced that the people of America are inspired and thrilled at such patriotic devotion. May we Americans rededicate ourselves at this time to the preservation of independence, not only for ourselves but for all nations everywhere, to the end that equal justice and self-government may be recaptured once again by the enslaved peoples of the world. By so doing we will not only strengthen ourselves, but will add hope and courage to those who are oppressed.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, drowned in the rabid and noisy shouts from the Kremlin about alleged imperialism in Africa are the cries of the millions of formerly free peoples Russia herself has enslaved. Nikita Khrushchev's histrionic demands for the self-determination of all people are but empty attempts to hide from the world the slaughter of those in his own colonies.

All of us can recall the savage Soviet assault on Hungary when that hapless country attempted to throw off the Red yoke, but few remember that there are behind the Iron Curtain other lands whose people cry out for freedom.

Among these, Mr. Speaker, is the tiny Baltic state of Lithuania, a nation half the size and containing less than one-fifth the population of my own State of New York.

Because Lithuanian culture is deeply rooted in Christian principle and freedom, the shackles of Soviet serfdom cut deep. I believe I can speak for Americans everywhere when I say we look with unyielding hope to the day when the Lithuanian people will be freed of their bonds and may again breathe the clean, pure air of independence.

Although Lithuania was an independent state as early as the 13th century, it later became a Grand Duchy of czarist Russia. Just 43 years ago, it proclaimed its independence and was recognized as a free nation by most of the world's great powers. In 1920, its capital city, Vilna, and more than 10,000 square miles of its territory were occupied by the Poles.

The return of most of this territory in 1939, however, signaled only short-lived joy, for a year later Russian armies occupied Lithuania and annexed it to the Soviet Union.

Thus, for more than 20 years, Lithuania has been nothing more than a colony of Communist Russia.

Throughout the world, on this date Lithuanians who fled before the Red terror and nationals of Lithuanian descent have joined the captive people in their fatherland in a prayer for liberation. In this country, observance of independence will be led by a committee of Lithuanian-Americans organized for the purpose.

I consider it highly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this body take part today in this silent prayer for Lithuanian independence and freedom.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, 1961, was the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania and on this memorable occasion I pay tribute to all the people of Lithuania and all Americans of Lithuanian descent.

It is said that the Lithuanians guard three things in their lives most preciously: First, their beautiful language; second, their love of a closeness to nature; and third, their appreciation of the beauty in everyday life. But appreciation of these things comes with more difficulty when a people have been deprived of freedom of expression, of self-determination, and of the right to enjoy those three things. In 1940, after 20 years of self-won independence, Lithuania was overrun by the Russian Communists. Since World War II Lithuanians have been living under their domination.

Lithuania today is more than just one of the Eastern European countries that has been overrun by the Communists. It has become a symbol of all those countries and its people a symbol for all the people whose love of independence and individuality has been subjugated to tyranny. What is even more important, the Lithuanian people represent a spirit of independence that can be kept alive in the face of such tyranny. In their love of beauty, nature, and simplicity they represent all the good that can come out of the filth of oppression.

One of the underlying strengths of the Lithuanian people is the land itself. Like the people, it has sustained numerous invasions without ever losing its basic beauty, strength, or vitality. In a land that never changes, that is always a sustaining factor in their lives, the Lithuanians are able to maintain their heritage and their independence of thought, in spite of political domination.

I am told that Lithuania is a surprisingly beautiful land, of flat grain-covered plains and hills rolling away into the distance. For a land that has felt the alien feet of so many conquering soldiers it has worn well and carries its beauty with grace. The lake regions, totaling over 150,000 acres of water surface, frequently occur unexpectedly in the gently rolling plains. The swift rivers flow throughout the country, carrying its produce and prosperity. The forests, thick and deep, are the backbone of the flat land of patchwork farms. The farm houses are of traditional wood with ornamentation and embellishments. Along the country roads are scattered beautifully carved wooden crosses and wayside shrines.

A modern poet has written about Lithuania:

Who does not remember his boyhood, gun on shoulder
Whistling through unobstructed fields?
Overstepping the bounds, yet offending no leaseholder
Of Lithuania, where the chase was free?

This seems to express the spirit that was Lithuania's between the First and Second World Wars. Those were joyous years for the little independent country. It was a time when they were building a small nation among a league of helpful and friendly powers. But it was also a prophetic time; after so long it was almost too good to be true. Nevertheless, during that period the Lithuanian people realized that independence they had sought so long.

That independence, lost in 1940, is kept alive by Lithuanians living throughout the free world. They keep alive the language, the love of nature, and the love of beauty in life's daily rewards. If the Lithuanian-Americans cannot return to their native land, they enrich our culture with the benefits of that small and tranquil country. They reward us with the work of their hands, as artisans and workers. They teach of the folklore and folkways of Lithuania. They lift their voices in praise of their land and of ours. It is not surprising that they cry out:

When will the Lord God give us return, inhabit
Ancestral fields, bear arms
Against the birds, and only to ride down the rabbit
Muster our horse?

On this day of their independence, let them cry more loudly. Let all the world hear the anguished cries of the captive people. And let them all know the name of their country, Lithuania, with pride and compassion and hope.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the three nationality groups in the Baltic countries. Numbering 3 million in all they are the most populous of the three Baltic peoples. Partly for that reason they have played a very important part in the history of northeastern Europe. For centuries their kingdom was a powerful force in the whole Eastern Europe. At times they not only successfully repelled some of the incursions of barbarian invaders from the East, but they also were champions and formed a formidable advance guard of Christianity in that outpost of Europe. Late in the 16th century the Lithuanian kingdom was united with that of Poland, thus forming a dual monarchy. In this union Lithuania was the junior partner; it lasted for more than two centuries, and during that time the destiny of the two countries were one. Near the end of the 18th century when Poland was partitioned, Lithuania became part of the Russian Empire. That was the end of the Lithuanian kingdom, the end of freedom for the Lithuanian people.

This loss of national independence did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian desire for freedom and independence. For more than 100 years under czarist domination they struggled for their national goal. They combatted czarist oppression with the means at their disposal, and they succeeded in keeping alive the national spirit among the mass of the people. They fought the Russian regime covertly and sometimes openly. At times they organized popular uprising and revolts against their oppressors, but they had to wait until the First World War for the actual achievement of their independence. Soon after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, they proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918, and founded the Lithuanian Republic.

Under their democratic government they enjoyed freedom for two decades and lived happily in their free and rebuilt country. In the 1930's when the dictators in Europe started saber rattling, all small countries became apprehensive. Since none of these relatively weak countries could defend itself against powerful Nazis or aggressive Communist Russians, they all were in fear of their independent existence. Unfortunately their apprehensions proved justified. Soon after the outbreak of the last war all these small and helpless countries became easy victims of unbridled aggression. Lithuania was invaded by the Red army early in 1940, Lithuanians lost their freedom and their country became part of the Soviet Union. Lithuanians were not in position to resist their implacable enemies and none of Lithuania's friends was in position to be of any assistance. During the war they endured the oppressive rule of both the Communists and the Nazis, but they hoped that at the end of the war their ordeal should come to an end. Unfortunately, instead of regaining their freedom, the chain which held them in bondage during the war years was tightened, and they were brought once more under the unrelenting rule of Communist totalitarianism.

Today these helpless people live under Soviet tyranny. They are robbed of their lands, and much of their worldly possessions; there they work under oppression for their taskmasters and pray for their deliverance. Such is their unenviable lot. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day let us hope for their delivery from Soviet totalitarian oppression.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the birth of the Lithuanian Republic in 1918 represented the culmination of a century-old dream. For more than 100 years the stalwart and stouthearted people of Lithuania, while suffering under Russian autocracy had worked for this goal. When the dreaded czarist regime in Russia collapsed Lithuanians were prepared to assert their freedom and proclaim their independence. This they did on February 16, 1918. That was a turning point in Lithuania's modern history, one that ushered in a new day for the Lithuanian people.

The Lithuanian Republic thus founded was strengthened by the unstinting labors and untold sacrifices of the people. They all were proud of their freedom, ready to defend it at all costs and against all comers. But it did not occur to them that when the evil day fell upon them, they would be totally incapable of saving themselves from the clutches of their implacable enemy, the Soviet Union. Unfortunately that day came very early in the last war, and with it began their national tragedy. In 1940 they were robbed of their independence and their fate was placed in the hands of Communist bosses in the Kremlin.

That has been, and unfortunately still is, the sad lot of the Lithuanian people. In that unhappy situation their one sustaining hope is freedom from their heartless oppressors. On the celebration of their independence day I wish them more power and share in their hope for freedom from Communist tyranny.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, of the many striking and heartrending facts of the two World Wars, two stand out: at the end of the first millions of people who were held down under autocracies for centuries regained their freedom, but at the conclusion of the last war nearly all of those who had thus gained freedom in 1918–19 lost it and much else. That is a sad commentary on the last and greatest of wars.

The Lithuanians had regained their freedom from the czarist regime after Russian autocracy was overthrown by the Bolsheviks. They had proclaimed their independence, had instituted their own democratic government, and there they were working and living happily. They were allowed tc enjoy their freedom for about two decades, then came the Second World War, and with it the end of their independence. All this was done by their implacable enemy the Communist bosses in the Kremlin. Early in 1940 the Red army occupied Lithuania, suppressed all freedom there, and then the country became part of the Soviet Union, a province of that sprawling empire. Since then unhappy Lithuanians have been living under the yoke of Communist totalitarian dictatorship. These some 3 million stouthearted lovers of freedom are driven to work for their taskmasters. Grudgingly and unwillingly they perform their imposed duty, and devoutly pray for their deliverance from Soviet tyranny. Under the uncertainty of prevailing international situation unfortunately the friends of Lithuanians could do very little to help the unfree people of Soviet-dominated Lithuania. We ardently hope that they will soon regain their freedom and celebrate their independence day in their historic homeland.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the independence of Lithuania restored. I do not believe in efforts by some people who think we can coexist with Soviet Russia. Once we, or the free world, accept that philosophy then it is certain Lithuania, and other countries which have been incorporated into the Soviet Union, will never become free nations again.

I feel the time is long since past when the United States, and our allies, must let Soviet Russia know that in any dealings or negotiations that take place, it must be borne in mind that our objective is to have free elections in each one of the countries, such as Lithuania, to reestablish a government by the Lithuanian people and that they have a free government.

Lithuania and other countries have suffered too much and we cannot settle for halfway measures. I do not see how any summit conference, or negotiations leading up to one, can compromise the freedom of the people of Lithuania. Let us hope that action will be had and that our prayers will help bring this about at an early time.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, nearly 21 years have passed since the forces of Soviet Russia swept through the land of the Lithuanian people and incorporated that nation into the Soviet empire. Since the 13th century, this small but hardy land has enjoyed alternating periods of liberty with self-government and oppressive subjugation. Yet the bright spark of freedom which even today keeps alive the spirit of the Lithuanian people, despite a new Soviet occupation, has never died within their hearts.

It was on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian domination, that the Lithuanian people once again proclaimed their independence and proceeded with vigor and renewed faith to attain notable progress in all spheres of national activity. This vital, liberty-loving people worked hard to raise the standard of their well-being. Under self-government and freedom, they contributed much to the social, economic, cultural, and scientific progress of Europe. The Lithuanian Republic became a respected member of the family of free nations.

When 21 years ago the Soviets broke their pledge to respect the independence of Lithuania, and used military force once more to suppress these people, the free world was shocked. I am happy to

say that the Government of the United States quickly denounced this action.

Today the voices of the people of Lithuania are silenced, but we know that their historic battle for liberty continues despite the oppression and tyranny which prevails throughout their land. The flame of national pride and determination to regain independence as a nation will not quickly die in the hearts of these people. In truth, such emotions can never die among those who once anywhere have tasted and enjoyed the fruits of freedom.

It is our privilege today to honor the Lithuanians in our own free land, as well as those in their native country. Great, too, has been their contribution to our own knowledge of freedom: great their contribution to the development and progress of our economy and our culture.

In commemorating this happy day in the history of Lithuania, we hail again the courage and conviction of a freedom-loving people. We pray with them that their freedom will be regained and that the Republic of Lithuania will once again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, marked the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

This Republic's life was short lived for barely had 20 years of freedom and independence passed when the dark shadow of Communist tyranny was cast over Lithuania.

The peace-loving people of Lithuania were and are presently subjugated to a philosophy which denies the dignity of man and deprives him of his freedom. However, the brave people of Lithuania have never lost sight of their fierce desire for liberty and are working relentlessly to lift the yoke of Communist oppression from their land. Other captive nations can take great courage from the example given by this nation's will and determination to regain national independence.

It gives me great pride to join today with my colleagues in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania who have suffered under Communist tyranny since 1940. Let us hope that the sympathy and understanding of the free world is of some comfort to them.

We of the free world must reaffirm our wholehearted interest and support to the aspirations of these suffering people so that they might once again attain and enjoy freedom.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the 43d anniversary celebration of the restoration of an independent Lithuania was highly significant to all of us. Not only because we are a people who celebrate all occasions of freedom, wherever they may occur in the world, but because we are forced to see in yesterday's celebration a powerful contrast of moving importance.

There was no open celebration in Lithuania yesterday. Their conquerors saw to that. No bells rang, no bands played, and no one dared march in a parade. The only celebration in Lithuania was in the hearts and upon the hearths. In the hearts of all who go on hoping for a new freedom, and upon the hearths as religious men and women knelt to pray that God once again will lift the Iron Curtain of their bondage. All of this they are forced to do silently.

Our country is alive with controversy as well as celebration. But one thing is certain: there will be no silence. Across our land, the oppressed rise up in Congress, in the streets, on our pulpits and in the press to cry out against their oppressors. Humble citizens shout their criticisms against us in Congress, against the President of the United States, against our captains of industry and labor, and against leadership wherever citizens believe it to be failing. They are free to do so.

Next Fourth of July, our bands will play, our bells will ring and our people will march in celebration of the freedom we still possess. There will be no silence.

This is the compelling contrast for us in America, as we salute a freedom lost to the Lithuanians. At the same time, the irony of yesterday's celebration should make us ever more zestful in the premise that we shall prosper in the strength of our own freedom only so long as we make it indestructible for all our citizens; that we shall be safe in our own freedom, only so long as we are willing to secure it for the people of Lithuania and all the world.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Again we are reminded that Lithuania is not free but still a captive nation subjugated to the tyrannical rule of Russia.

Of those 43 years Lithuania has passed 20 under Communist domination. Prior to its achievement of independence in 1918, Lithuania had been under czarist rule since 1795. Twenty years of free government out of more than 200 years of Russian rule is not a very great space of time. However, that those few years could generate such a nationalistic fervor and could delineate such an individual culture is significant.

Throughout the various alien rules, Lithuania has been able to preserve its own heritage and its will for freedom. It has never succumbed to anything but the militarily enforced political domination of the alien rulers. Its folk music and folk art, its literature and history have all been preserved, as are those of any free nation. Today Lithuanian-Americans do much to keep these elements of their homeland intact. While we celebrate the anniversary of Lithuanian political independence, we also celebrate the continuing contributions of Lithuanians throughout the world to the free world. In that, there is a certain independence of mind and spirit that transcends political subjugation.

It is a pleasure to join the many friends of Lithuania in the House today in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania, and to reaffirm as strongly as it is possible for me to do so my position that Lithuania be aided in her just cause for freedom.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity once again to pay tribute to the people of Lithuania, enslaved behind the Iron Curtain for these many years.

On February 16, 1918, 43 years ago yesterday, Lithuania proclaimed her independence after years of Russian domination. This independence lasted only a little over 20 years, when the country was again seized by Soviet Russia in 1940.

On this anniversary date we must renew our pledge to work tirelessly and endlessly toward the goal of freedom for all the victims of Communist tyranny. We must encourage these peoples to keep the torch of liberty burning brightly so that one day they may again take their place among the free nations of the world. That is why it is so important for us here in Congress to express our sentiments against such godless dictatorship, and to celebrate for the Lithuanians in their homeland this important anniversary.

I pray that this independence can be regained for them in the not too distant future.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania, one of the Baltic States, declared her independence. Communist Russia, with traditional disregard for the rights of national self-determination, seized the territory and institutions of Lithuania in June 1940.

Lithuania now stands as abiding testimony against those who would have us believe that the world's problems can be erased by simply signing one nonaggression or peaceful coexistence pact after another with the Soviets. The Lithuanians were the first to suffer the results of Stalin's infamous pact with Hitler which erupted into the holocaust of World War II.

The Lithuanians' undiminished refusal to conform to evil and their hope for eventual deliverance are an inspiration to oppressed people and an incentive for free nations to protect their liberties all the more strongly. The Russians cannot quench the traditional Lithuanian pride of country and faith in self which have made her tragic struggle so heroic.

The history of Lithuania is a history of moral dedication to right, to spiritual principles, to liberty and true freedom of body and spirit. These professions of faith in the future overflow her borders and flood the world.

Russia will never extinguish the idealism of this great little nation, nor her right to be free. As long as America stands as the bulwark of national independence, Lithuania's cause will be our cause and her faith now and forever will remain our sacred trust.

We salute Lithuania on this 43d anniversary of her independence.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let February 16, 1961, the day of the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, pass by without paying my tribute, and that of the people of North Dakota whom I represent, to a wonderful and courageous people. These Lithuanian people have refused to buckle down under Russia's communistic yoke. They have fought dauntlessly and bravely for their freedom.

This state, which is the largest and most highly populated of the three Baltic States, first achieved independence in the 11th century, A.D. In 1775, when Russia and Prussia were partitioned, it lost its independence. This Russian domination carried through for 120 years. Every generation had its fighters who rose up in arms against this tyrannical rule, and these brave people finally attained independence in 1918, after suffering great losses. The people worked heroically to become economically independent, and to put its government on a stable basis. Had it not been for the intervention of World War II, and the Red army which terrorized their countryside, these people would have succeeded in putting their house in order. Russia took this country over under the guise of holding fixed Communist elections, which were invalid in any court of human justice.

Russia has this country tightly under their thumb, but the fight is not over. It will not be over until once again these hardy people become self-governing. As long as freedom reigns in their hearts and minds, let us encourage, at least morally if nothing else, their fight to restore their country's freedom. This country has a God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom, and should certainly have the free exercise of this right. The committee of Lithuanians and their friends formed for the celebration of the 43d anniversary puts it very aptly when they say:

> If Khrushchev is sincere in his statement calling for the abolishment of all colonialism, let him manifest it by freeing Lithuania and the other nations now under his rule.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in my district, where we have as fellow citizens many Americans of Lithuanian descent, the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, has a meaning that is perhaps more real than it is in some other parts, where the people have had less opportunity to know the virtues and the attractive traits of the Lithuanian people and something about their homeland.

It is a disgrace in a world where Soviet Russia talks peace and plays the part of the big bully, that Lithuania is a captive nation, since June 1940, when by subversion and by force ruthlessly "integrated" a nation of 3 million people in the Soviet Union and continues to brazen out the fiction that the Baltic country is a Republic in that Union.

The rulers of the Kremlin, the architects of Communist imperialism, would have the free world believe that the people of Lithuania voluntarily chose communism. But the free world knows very well that the Communist elections which took place there were invalid and that it was by brute force and force alone that Lithuania was subjugated to the tyrannical rule of Russia.

The United States of America, believing as always that the captive nations, as we said concerning ourselves in our own Declaration of Independence "are and of right ought to be free," continues to refuse to recognize, de facto or de jure, the illegal and cruel annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union.

Here in the House of Representatives, where for as many years as I have been a Member, it has been the custom for many Members to commemorate the anniversary of Lithuanian independence, we are moved today to reaffirm, as strongly as it is possible for us to do so, that Lithuania, like all other captive nations, wants independence with political and social justice.

Lithuania wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom. If Khrushchev is sincere in his call for the end of colonialism everywhere, it is his move that is called for now, to free Lithuania and the other Soviet colonial nations.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I wish to join the many Members of the House in paying tribute to the 43d anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence which occurred on February 16, 1918. Lithuania is a small country and certainly its lack of size has encouraged the Soviets in their ruthless disregard for the human rights of the brave Lithuanian people. These Lithuanian people, by the way, are scattered throughout the vast Soviet slave empire and those still in their native land are under an extremely harsh Soviet yoke. We are all aware also of the fact that the two other Baltic countries, Estonia and Latvia, share the same fate as their Lithuanian neighbors.

As we pay tribute to the heroic Lithuanian people, it is our obligation to reemphasize that the future must once again provide them with true freedom and independence. This freedom and independence is rightfully the heritage of the Lithuanian and all other peoples now held captive beyond the Iron Curtain in the vast bloody Soviet empire.

There is no point this afternoon to repeat the tragic history of the Yalta Conference which doomed these brave peoples to modern slavery. It is to the future we look with hope that the free nations of the world, led by the United States, do recognize the true nature of the Communist empire and will never be lured by the transparent dogma of peaceful coexistence to adopt a policy of appeasing the Reds whose one desire is world conquest.

Lithuania will someday in the future be free. Certainly a brave Christian nation which has suffered terrible oppression under the Soviets in the last 21 years will once again receive its rightful position among the free nations of the world.

I am honored in joining my colleagues this afternoon in reiterating our constant interest and firm conviction to wage a relentless struggle against worldwide communism and eventually restore true freedom to Lithuania and all the other captive nations.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the 43d anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, I am privileged to join with so many of my colleagues in a tribute to the gallant people of this historic country. I yield to no one in my admiration for the people of Lithuania and their courageous struggle for freedom.

In my district there are many Americans of Lithuanian descent and I count many of them as warm, personal friends, and associates. You will find them in all walks of life—lawyers, factory workers, doctors, merchants, businessmen, and women of all types—a sturdy, self-reliant race in whose hearts burns the flame of dedication to the highest ideals of true democracy. Their contributions to my home city and district in fields of industry, politics, science, and culture have been, and continue to be, among the finest of any group in our area.

No one can look at the desperate situation which prevails in their native land without a deep sense of outrage and shame. Ground between the upper and nether millstones of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia, thousands of Lithuanian families have been broken up and members deported under the most revolting conditions and assigned to slave labor in coal mines and forests. Completely subjugated by the ruthless hordes from the East, no words of mine could adequately describe the harshness of this tyranny. Countless hundreds have died at the hands of their conquerors while those who may have survived this brutality have only prospects of a living death.

Encouragement and hope for their eventual freedom is fanned each year in these memorial addresses—encouragement and hope born of the fact that the flickering lamp of freedom still burns in little Lithuania. The people seek only the restoration of law and morality, their hopes based on the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations. They look to the United States for encouragement and aid. At the moment, we can give only encouragement—the kind of encouragement our forefathers in this great land looked for in their fight for independence nearly 200 years ago. May the day soon come when something more tangible can be done to make their dreams come to reality.

Let us all hope, pray, and work for the end of their temporary enslavement. Let us by word and deed do everything within our power to restore freedom to the people of Lithuania—freedom from the oppressing yoke of imperialist domination. Let no rash promises of early assistance be made these great people, but let them know that we are on their side—as we know God is also. We know that He moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform. Let us hope and pray that His wonder of deliverance may be close at hand.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to pay tribute to the freedom-loving Lithuanians throughout the world, who on February 16, 1961, will observe the 43d anniversary of their national independence.

Since the late 18th century, the Lithuanians have enjoyed freedom and independence for only a brief period. Only during the years between the two World Wars were they allowed to live in happiness in their historic homeland. After having endured the oppressive rule of Russian autocracy for more than a full century, they regained their freedom and established the Lithuanian Republic on February 16, 1918.

At the end of the First World War the Lithuanians were aided by friends and

sympathizers abroad in their effort to put their ravaged country in order. They pulled themselves together and succeeded in making Lithuania a prosperous and progressive country. They were justly proud of their accomplishments and were happy. But the turn of international events was to cause endless unhappiness to them.

Lithuania was one of the early victims of the last war. By mid-1940 the country was occupied by the Red army and had become part of the Soviet Union. Since those unhappy days its misery and misfortune have multiplied. However, although there seems to be no end to their misfortune, the Lithuanian people still cherish their memories of liberty.

Today, when the Lithuanian people suffer under Soviet tyranny more than did their fathers under czarist autocracy, they have our wholehearted sympathy. We are one in echoing their genuine sentiments for freedom and independence on the 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people are among the most stalwart and brave fighters for freedom and independence. But freedom and independence have been denied to them for centuries. Except for the brief period of the interwar years, for almost two centuries they have had the misfortune to suffer under an oppressive and at times almost unbearable alien yoke in their homeland. Then toward the end of the First World War they saw their chance for freedom, seized upon it, and on February 16, 1918, proclaimed their independence.

That historic day marked a new day for the Lithuanian people. It ushered in a new era for them, one full of joy and happiness. Thenceforth they joined hands and worked cheerfully in the tasks of rebuilding their devastated country, reestablishing democratic institutions there, and safeguarding their newly won freedom. In all these difficult tasks they made great progress, and they were both proud and happy with their achievements. For two decades they enjoyed the fruits of their labor in freedom.

Then came the last war. That war swept away all the achievements of the Lithuanians and robbed them of their freedom. Their country was made part of the Soviet Union in 1940, and they became unwilling servants of that monolithic empire.

At the end of the war the Lithuanian people were denied their freedom. Instead, the chain of Communist totalitarian dictatorship was tightened over them. Today they are prisoners behind the Iron Curtain. There they work under the watchful eye of their taskmasters and pray for the end of their misery and servitude. We in the free world join them in their prayer for freedom on the 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence from Russia and established a Republic. This was the end of a long struggle that began several centuries ago and lasted throughout all the years the little country was besieged by greedy tyrants of Europe who bartered her back and forth among themselves for their own selfish ends. However, the joys of freedom and independence were short lived in the new Republic. Now she is a captive nation once again, subject to the infamy of Soviet imperialism. But despite the hardships, privations, and indescribable misery inflicted on her people, their spirit and hopes have remained strong and steadfast. We see these qualities today in those who have settled here. It is this spirit that has made them such patriotic citizens of their adopted country, dedicated to the principles of democracy we follow and enjoy, but too often fail to appreciate.

The free people of the world are bound together in a desire to release those citizens of Lithuania who are forcibly held in bondage by the Russian regime. Let us renew our pledge of friendship and support expressed in the captive nations' resolution passed by the Congress a year ago. As we observe this solemn occasion of Lithuania's independence, may we let those people who are again enslaved know that we are constantly concerned for their plight and may we pray for their liberation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on this date 43 years ago, the proud and sovereign little nation of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. Because of the tragic events 20 years ago, this is a day of solemn commemoration and tribute rather than one of joyful celebration. Our thoughts continue to be solemn as we contemplate the fate of this once-free nation. We commemorate and pay tribute to the courage and determination of the Lithuanian people who have been enslaved against their will—a will which is determined to maintain the spirit of liberty despite the most heinous of police state mechanisms dedicated to its extirpation.

Among the nations of our time, Lithuania's existence was short lived. In 1940 without any cause or provocation the Communist giant invaded and, as a national entity on the maps of the world, Lithuania ceased to exist. Such an act of rapacity and barbarism by the Soviets bespeaks their true intentions toward free peoples and reveals their designs for the world. Indeed, events since that early date have proved again and again beyond a doubt that communism and its peace overtures is, and always will be, the antithesis of freedom.

It is well for us to recall the plight of Lithuania lest time make us forget. What happened to this little nation can and may happen again to other states, unless we maintain the true image of communism which such examples constantly recall in our minds.

The Lithuanian people have spent over 20 years in Soviet bondage. Because of clearly defined differences to Russia, in their history, culture, religion, and language, their brutal masters have had to employ a special type of fiendish suppression to eradicate the deep roots of a people which go back over a thousand years. Yet, there are strong indications that despite a ceaseless campaign, calculated in its ferocity, the people of Lithuania have continued to maintain their national identity. Most important of all, they have retained their hopes and aspirations for eventual freedom, against odds too great to compute. This is again a positive example that communism may enslave the body, but that when it is faced by a determined people who firmly believe in liberty, it cannot enslave nor capture the mind.

So today, we pay tribute to the people of Lithuania, enslaved though they are, because we admire their fortitude and their ideals—ideals which are the same for free men everywhere. Let us hope that the future will bring a fruition of their burning desire to be rightfully free and independent. To the end that the entire captive world be again free, let us rededicate ourselves. To the brave people of Lithuania, to those Americans of Lithuanian extraction, we hold forth the pledge that this nation and others who are enslaved have not been forgotten and that this Government of free men stands ready to assist and defend the cause of freedom and liberty.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today is the 43d anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. It was an independence that was destined to be short lived, due to the oppressive Russian Communist invasion in 1940.

The Lithuanian people have a strong belief in freedom, and their hopes remain high for the liberation of their country from the iron rule imposed by the Red leaders of the Kremlin.

Their spirit of resistance is not broken, and I pray it shall never be broken. We all look forward with the people of this Baltic nation to the day when they will be free again.

I do not know when this day will come, but it is inevitable that it will come. Never in history has a people been subjugated forever. The people of Lithuania will again have freedom and a new independence day.

Let those of us in the free world constantly remind Premier Khrushchev that he must set his own house in order before he talks of liberation of colonies in other parts of the world. Let us constantly remind the world of the Russian "colonies," the nations such as Lithuania which are ruled by Russian military force and made a temporary part of the Soviet Union.

Let us remind the boastful Khrushchev of the tens of thousands of Lithuanians shipped from their homes in cattle cars and never heard from again. Let us pay tribute to these people who died as slaves to the Russian Communists.

And finally, let us join with the Lithuanian people in this country and elsewhere in the free world of this independence day and look always forward to the eventual freedom of Lithuania.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, a prominent constituent of mine wrote to me recently and called my attention to the fact that today marks the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the Republic of Lithuania.

In his letter, he summarized in a very pointed way the importance of this commemoration. He wrote:

This 43d anniversary is an occasion of deep significance to all who hope Lithuania will again be free and independent—the

cause of Lithuania is the cause of all captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain who have not surrendered their desire for freedom and liberty to the tyranny of communism.

It is most appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress of the United States take time out today to commemorate this occasion formally and to reassert our dedication to the historic American policy of encouraging freedom and independence and opportunity for nations and peoples throughout the world. This purpose is the cornerstone of American foreign policy, and when we speak today to the freedom-loving people of Lithuania, wherever they may be, we speak to and for freedom-loving people everywhere.

As we commemorate Lithuanian independence, we must never forget how the people of that small but noble nation lost their independence. Twenty years of freedom came to an end on August 23, 1939, when Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany signed their infamous pact of friendship and nonaggression, a pact which freed Hitler to attack the West and which—by virtue of a secret protocol to the agreement—placed Lithuania and her sister Baltic States in the Soviet Russian sphere of influence.

On June 15, 1940, the Soviet armies invaded Lithuania. Since that time the world has been forced to watch one of the most horrible examples of ethnic genocide and forced colonialism in history. In the most coldblooded possible fashion, Soviet invaders set about systematically to liquidate the Lithuanian social and cultural elite, to destroy the Roman Catholic Church and the faith of the Lithuanian people, and forcibly to colonize Lithuania by means of mass immigration of peoples from within the Soviet Union.

In the 20 years from 1939 to 1959 it is conservatively estimated that 1,239,000 Lithuanians were forcibly deported, repatriated, or otherwise liquidated by Nazi and Soviet forces. Among them were about 240,000 Lithuanian Jews who perished in Nazi concentration camps during World War II and about 750,000 ethnic Lithuanians who were wiped out as a result of Soviet terrorism and genocide. This figure is based on Soviet census statistics and represents about 25 percent of what the population of ethnic Lithuanians should have been in 1959, estimated on a conservative basis of a 1-percent annual natural increase of population.

This tremendous loss of Lithuania's population through Nazi and Soviet genocide provided Russia with an excuse to colonize Lithuania with Russians. Whereas in 1940 the Russian population of the country amounted to only 65,000—most of whom were unsympathetic to communism—the Soviets subsequently brought into Lithuania about 214,000 well-indoctrinated Soviet citizens in order to exercise effective control over every detail of the political, cultural, and economic life of the country.

The pattern of forcible incorporation of whole countries into the Soviet Union since 1939, including Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, subjugated 22 million people in 6 countries. In addition, the Soviet Union has exercised economic, political, and military domination over many millions of men and women in other neighboring countries. Together, this ugly record of human oppression constitutes the most terrible example of brutal colonialism in the modern history of mankind.

Yet, as the example of Lithuania demonstrates—to the extent we are able to document it—the people of Eastern Europe are still courageously resisting the pressures of Soviet domination, bravely asserting their individuality, outspokenly defending their religion. To be a Christian today in Lithuania is to invite martyrdom, yet hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians are daily accepting that risk. Evidence reported in both the American and Soviet press prove impressively that the people of Lithuania have relentlessly held on to their traditional love of freedom, have determinedly defended their faith, and have resolutely retained their sense of identity as free Lithuanians.

On this occasion, therefore, let the Congress of the United States send its greetings to the oppressed people of Lithuania, and assure them they have not been forgotten. Let us renew our determination never to recognize the Soviet domination of Lithuania. And let us proclaim once more to the world our country's heritage of freedom and our people's support of freedom and independence for everyone, everywhere.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the text of resolutions unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian Americans of Linden, N.J., in commemoration of the 43d anniversary of the declaration of Lithuania's independence:

Whereas on February 16, 1918, 43 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was declared a free and independent state by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius; and

Whereas in commemoration of this 43d anniversary, Americans of Lithuanian descent rededicate themselves to the cause of Lithuania's independence, which in 1940 was brutally invaded by the Communist government of Soviet Russia in violation of its treaty obligations, imposing to date upon the people of Lithuania a most ruthless regime of Communist dictatorship and colonialism and reducing the people to the status of colonial slaves; and

Whereas the anticolonialist resolution introduced by the Soviet Union delegation to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations proposing complete independence and freedom to all colonial countries, to which resolution the American delegation submitted an amendment urging to expand the meaning of said Soviet resolution to include the colonial countries held by the Soviet Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting express gratitude to the U.S. Government for the consistently demonstrated favorable attitude toward Lithuania's independence and that the representatives of our Government firmly maintain this policy at any future deliberations regarding the status of the enslaved nations; and

Resolved, That the Soviet policy of national genocide and unmerciful exploitation of Lithuania and her people be condemned; and

Resolved, It be demanded that the Soviet Union withdraw from the territory of Lithuania and that the people of Lithuania be allowed to elect their government in conformity with their freely expressed will and desire; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency John F. Kennedy; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer; and to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Robert B. Meyner.

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
President.
V. TURSA,
Secretary.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 12, it was my pleasure to participate, along with the Lithuanian-American community of my home city of Rochester, N.Y., in the celebration of the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD the brief remarks which I made on this occasion:

I am so happy that I am able to join you today in celebrating the 43d anniversary of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. It took a bit of doing as the weather and the Capital Airlines conspired against me, but I made an especial effort as I have had such bad luck in attending several of your functions. I have enjoyed so much the personal contacts with so many of your members, that I wanted particularly to be with you today.

These are hazardous and dangerous days in which we live. But then, many of you and your countrymen are not strangers to danger and hardship. For centuries you have heard the sounds of the conquerors' boots marching across your land with the ultimate rape of your freedom and independence in 1940 when Lithuania was virtually yanked behind the Iron Curtain. But despite the use of every device known to man to destroy the passion for freedom, the deep-rooted national consciousness, and the religious fervor of the people of Lithuania, the love of God, of country, and of liberty continues to burn as brightly as ever.

Many times, I feel that those of us whose roots have been buried deep in this country for many years do not appreciate our freedoms as do you who have known from personal experience or that of your loved ones just what it means not to enjoy—as a matter of course—the privileges and satisfactions of living in a free society.

A new element has entered the international picture in these past months which must make your indignation and frustration more complete. And that is the sanctimonious and hypocritical attack by the Communist complex on what they chose to call Western imperialism while they practice colonialism of the worst sort in the virtual enslavement of the peoples of Eastern Europe and bend every effort by propaganda and infiltration to add to their colonial empire the newly emerging nations of Africa.

The responsibilities of the West are very clear and most urgent. We must continue our efforts to let the peoples not only of Lithuania—but of Albania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and Rumania—know that we have not forgotten them, that we are their friends and that their ultimate freedom is one of our most important goals.

We have a new administration in Washington and it is devoutly to be hoped that it is one that will remain strong and firm in the face of the constant Communist threat and not one that will tend toward accommodation and compromise. It is very true that the world cannot continue indefinitely with two colossi dividing the world. But, in finding a solution to this power struggle there are certain principles from which we cannot retreat. And turning our backs on our friends is one of them.

I can assure you that the Congress will continue its support of your cause as expressed in the solemn resolution in 1959 on Captive Nations Week. We shall work and pray for the liberation of your homeland with the hope that the unquenchable spark of liberty burning in your hearts will one day soon burst into a high, clear flame.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the heartfelt struggle goes on—yet the people prodded by strong religious precepts and undying love for liberty persevere against the common enemy, Communists.

This is the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Even the Iron Curtain has not destroyed the furor of the Lithuanian spirit to overcome their aggressors. Lithuanians will fight for liberty until it is won. Its noble people will ultimately throw off the Soviet yoke. The prayers and heartfelt devotion of their compatriots in the United States will give the stimulation, spirit, and fortitude to continue the struggle until final victory is theirs.

In spirit Lithuania is much alive and today her hearts, with the beseeching eyes of her subjects, look up to Heaven in this great day of prayer. This bravery, cultured in the struggle of their great tradition of freedom, dating before the Christian era, steeled to tolerance and suffering, in sincere prayer, kneeling before her religious altars, look to the day ending Soviet slavery, tyranny, and domination.

The great problem today confronting the United States is, what can we do to liberate these small nations, throughout Europe and the Baltic area, who are now enslaved under the Russian power? How can we, with these nations in enslavement, consider our liberty secure, while countries like Lithuania suffer inhuman bondage? Certainly the continuous use of pugnacious words will not be the solution and certainly not wishes and prayers alone will free these faithful patriots, who patiently wait for the day of liberation. Certainly education of the enemy will not secure their freedom. It is written in the blood of nations that rescue from enslavement by forceful repudiation will only come through internal eruption and revolt against their despotic control by the tyrants of our time.

If violence be necessary, then, in that event, our Government must stand by these captured nations, who have struggled for freedoms as we honor them. Lithuania must be free and we must further every endeavor toward the realization of this freedom. We can only protect our freedom by protecting and recovering for freedom-loving nations their freedoms.

If we are a strong nation with a gun in one hand and a Bible in the other, no one will dare oppose our right to defend a righteous cause. With God and preparedness on our side and the great leadership of the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy—being dominant in his desire for uncontested supremacy in preparedness, to settle any dispute at the conference table or otherwise—we cannot fail doing something about gaining Lithuania her independence. It is God's will that it shall so be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday millions of men and women—some existing under the surveillance of their Communist masters, others entombed in Soviet prisons and slave labor camps—held silent observance of the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

These Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain remembered, too, that February 16 marked the 708th anniversary of the founding of their proud kingdom, in 1253.

For them it was a grim celebration, but hope, like a candle, flickers in their hearts. More than 20 years under the heel of Communist despotism have not extinguished that flame.

I was proud to join the effort to free these enslaved people when I yesterday introduced House Concurrent Resolution 163, which calls upon the President of the United States to ask the United Nations to request that the U.S.S.R., first, withdraw all troops from Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; second, to return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, slave labor camps, and prisons, and, finally, to conduct free elections in the Baltic countries.

In doing so, it is my prayerful hope that it will play some part in fulfilling the objectives of my good American-Lithuanian friends who have written me as follows:

COMMITTEE FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY,
Worcester, Mass., February 4, 1961.

Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: February 16, 1961, the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, once again reminds us that Lithuania is not free. Since June 1940 when the Soviet regime was ruthlessly imposed upon her, Lithuania has been a captive nation under Russia. The Soviets would have the free world believe that Lithuania voluntarily chose communism, but the free world knows very well that the Communist elections which took place there were invalid and that it was the brute force of the Soviet military which subjugated the country to the tyrannical rule of Russia.

We, American-Lithuanians, are deeply gratified that our Government, never for once abandoning the principle of freedom for all captive nations, continues to refuse to recognize de jure the invalid and unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet. For this our Government will ever merit our sincerest and profoundest gratitude.

The coming anniversary moves us to reaffirm, as strongly as it is possible for us to do so, that Lithuania, like all other captive nations, wants national independence with political and social justice. She wants the free exercise of her God-given right to enjoy liberty and freedom. If Khrushchev is sincere in his statement calling for the abolishment of all colonialism, let him manifest it by freeing Lithuania and the other nations now under his rule.

May we on this occasion ask you to use the influence of your high position in aiding the just cause of Lithuania. Your efforts joined with ours will, we pray God, bring about the restoration of Lithuania's freedom and will do much to prevent the mastery of the entire human race by Soviet communism.

Thanking you for your invaluable cooperation, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH W. GLAVICKAS,
Chairman.
MARY T. KLIMKASITIS,
Secretary.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues today in commemorating the 43d anniversary of the restoration of independence to Lithuania. While 20 years have passed since their brave nation was swallowed up behind the Iron Curtain, we can know that the spirit of liberty lives on in the hearts of her indomitable people.

Lithuania achieved the status of an independent democratic republic on February 16, 1918. Subsequently, Russia signed an agreement with Lithuania, renouncing forever all claims to sovereignty over her, and Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations in 1921.

During their 22 years of independence, the Lithuanian people made significant contributions to the political and cultural life of Western Europe. Land reforms were instituted, industrial growth was fostered, and guarantees extended to the freedoms of speech, assembly, and religion.

The infamous nonaggression pact between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany opened the way for Lithuania's occupation by the Germans, giving way to the Communists when the Russians began their offensive in 1944. Despite solemn treaty assurances to "renounce all rights of sovereignty in the Baltic States," the Soviet Union proceeded to incorporate Lithuania into the U.S.S.R. The U.S. Government has consistently refused to recognize de jure this annexation, and deplores the continued suppression of human rights in Lithuania.

On this 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is appropriate that the Congress should honor a valiant people. Even in the face of Communist tyranny, their resolute faith in Almighty God has never wavered. With freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, we lift our hearts in prayer that independence may soon again be restored to Lithuania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, soon after the overthrow of the detested czarist regime in Russia during the First World War, many oppressed nationalities asserted their freedom and proclaimed their political independence. The three Baltic peoples which had been held under Russian autocracy for more than 100 years did this early in 1918. The Lithuanians proclaimed their independence on February 16 and founded the Lithuanian Republic.

For about two decades these freedom-hungry people enjoyed their richly deserved independence. They rebuilt their war-ravaged country, strengthened their democratic institutions, revived their venerated national traditions, and were content with the progressive course in which things were moving. But the outbreak of the Second World War put a stop to all this and brought tragedy to

the Lithuanians. Lithuania was invaded and occupied by the Red army in 1940, and its inhabitants completely sealed off behind the Soviet borders.

Since then unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom. Today the country is ruled by the Communist totalitarian dictatorship imposed by the Kremlin. There people are compelled to work for the omnipotent state, and are not free to leave the country under any circumstances. In a word, they are imprisoned in their homeland, and pray for their deliverance. On this 43d anniversary celebration of their independence day I devoutly hope that they will have a quick response to their earnest prayer.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, before World War II a Lithuanian-American went back to his native land for a brief visit. It had been many years since he had left; he had been only a small boy. He visited Kaunas and Panevezys and his own small village. There he met many people, all of whom were very interested in him because he came from America. They all had friends and relatives in America whom they asked after. Among them he met a woman who showed him a picture of her business and her sons. She ran a food store of some size. She said, we do not need to go to America. Our America is right here. We prosper and are happy.

I doubt that Lithuanian villagers are as contented or prosperous today as they were then. Following World War II and Nazi occupation, Lithuanian independence was replaced by Communist domination. That villager can no longer say that Lithuania is her America. No longer is she able to participate in private enterprise, to work hard and reap the benefits of her work. No longer is it possible for her to elect the people she wants to run her government and her society. No longer is it possible for her to lead the kind of life she desires away from the watchful eye of the governing power.

Today we cannot go to war over Lithuania, but we can support her exiled people and do all in our power to make Lithuanians both here and in their own country as prosperous and happy as possible. Perhaps with prayer and determination Lithuania will once again be free. The activity and interest of Lithuanian national groups throughout the world is most helpful. By telling of the oppressive Communist measures and keeping the knowledge of the fate of that little country always before us, we are only that much more aware of the results of oppression and that much more moved to keep alive the spirit of independence and self-determination in the world today.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for obtaining this time today to celebrate the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the spirit of freedom held in the hearts of Lithuanian people everywhere.

The history of the Lithuanian people is an unusual story of heroism and suffering and of man's constant efforts to assert his God-given human rights. After suffering under the autocratic czarist regime of Russia for over 100 years, Lithuanians regained their freedom toward the end of the First World War, and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. For two decades they lived and enjoyed their life in happiness. In that relatively short time, they rebuilt their ravaged country, set up their own democratic form of government, and reestablished many of the old Lithuanian customs and traditional institutions.

Storm clouds appeared in 1939 and cast a menacing shadow over Lithuania which proved fatal to the freedom of the people of this brave country. Early in 1940, the Kremlin imposed upon the helpless Lithuanians a so-called mutual assistance pact and later that same year the country was occupied by Soviet troops and incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since then these brave people have been enduring dictatorial tyrannies of totalitarian regimes, both Nazi and Communist version. For years they have endured indescribable hardships and despite such despairing conditions these stouthearted people have not given up their hope to secure freedom.

I feel we should join with them on this historic day and with Americans of Lithuanian descent express our fervent hope that the cause of freedom and independence will soon prevail.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, recent and current international events have brought in their train tragic consequences. The last World War has, instead of freeing oppressed peoples, actually caused the eradication of freedom in many lands, and has extended the reign of terror over many former free countries, thus depriving tens of millions of peoples of their freedom and independence. Three million Lithuanians were among these peoples.

These stalwart and stouthearted people who had regained their independence in the First World War, were one of the first victims of the last war. After regaining freedom in 1918, and after enjoying it for a brief period of two decades, they were robbed of it by the Communist Russians. While democratic Lithuania was enjoying freedom Communist bosses of the Kremlin were jealous of Lithuania's democratic "luxury," freedom, and independence. Soon after the outbreak of the last war, while the democracies of the West were involved in a life-and-death struggle, the Red army conquered Lithuania and put an end to the Lithuanian Republic. Soon the country became part of the Soviet Union, and its helpless inhabitants mere slaves in Communist labor camps. During the course of the war their condition grew from bad to worse, but at least they had the hope of earning their freedom at the end of that war. Then when the end came they found that there was no freedom for them. The war thus proved to be their national tragedy.

Today these unfortunate people, brave and stouthearted as ever, still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. I am glad to join loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day and with them hope for the freedom of the Lithuanian people in their homeland.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, Lithuanians were living under Russian autocracy. That had been their lot for more than a century. During all that time they wanted to regain their freedom, and to that end they organized revolts and uprisings against the czarist regime, but all these attempts failed because Russia was always able to overpower the Lithuanians. In 1917 the decrepit czarist regime crumbled, and then the Lithuanians had their chance. They naturally seized upon it, proclaimed their independence, and established the Lithuanian Republic.

In the course of the next two decades the Republic grew in strength and democratic institutions under it served the Lithuanians well. The result was that in the relatively short time, during the interwar years, Lithuania became a prosperous and progressive country. Lithuanians were happy and enjoying their freedom to the full. Then came the Second World War. First they became apprehensive of their involvement, and even of their safety. Unfortunately their worst fears proved justified. In 1940 Stalin's Red army invaded and occupied the country, put an end to the Lithuanian Republic and thus robbed the Lithuanian people of their freedom. Soon the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and since then freedom and independence, joy, and happiness have been banished from Lithuania. Instead today we find there these stanch and freedom-hungry 3 million yearning and praying for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny. Let us hope that they will soon have their reward in freedom and live in peace in their homeland.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, when the Lithuanian people asserted their independence from Imperial Russia, they cast off the yoke of over a century of adversity. But this dearly won freedom was not to last. In 1939, Lithuania was subjected to the terrors of Communist domination when Soviet Russia, without provocation, seized the country by force. The proud Lithuanian people continue to suffer terrible oppressions at the hands of the godless Communist dictators. They share the fate of millions in the captive European nations.

And so it is with a mixed feeling of sadness and of pride that we gather 43 years after the restoration of independence on that day in 1918 to pay tribute to that memorable event and to the Lithuanian people the world over who have fought so gallantly in behalf of freedom, and in whom the flame of liberty still burns brightly.

We recall the heroism of the Lithuanian people and their courageous determination to keep uppermost in their hearts and minds their goal of national independence. Lithuania has indeed set a lasting example of strength and courage for the free world.

I am proud to join with my colleagues and with freedom-loving persons everywhere in reaffirming our dedication to the cause of Lithuanian independence.

We salute the Lithuanian people, whose spirits remain unbroken, and we pray that we will one day be able to observe this anniversary with the knowledge that Lithuania has once again taken its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in March 1917 the tyrannical czarist regime in Russia was overthrown by the people of Russia and the 123-year-old rule of the czars over Lithuania was ended. Shortly thereafter, on February 16, 1917, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence and established a democratic republic.

The year 1917, however, brought to the Lithuanians not only the fulfillment of their dreams of freedom, but also the seeds of the destruction of this freedom. The Bolsheviks in Russia, after subverting the democratic revolution of March to their own ends, seized the reins of government and proclaimed Russia a Communist state.

For the next 20 years the Communists, beset by internal strife, consolidated their rule within the Soviet Union. With the advent of the Second World War, however, they saw the opportunity to take advantage of the chaotic international situation and extend their influence beyond the borders of Russia. Thus, the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939 declared Lithuania within the Soviet sphere of influence and Red army troops invaded the country. Then, on July 21, 1940, the Lithuanian Republic was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the brief span of freedom for the Lithuanians was ended.

On this the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence I join all Americans and freedom-loving people throughout the world in thoughts of sympathy and hope for the hapless people of that small country. We can only stand fast in our adherence to the principles of liberty and democracy and, continuing the battle against the Communist dictatorship, await the day when all people everywhere will be free.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, all of us must experience sorrow that liberty, no matter how strong its partisans, has often suffered at the hands of tyranny. The Lithuanian people have suffered greatly since that day two decades ago when the forces of communism marched in to snuff out forces opposed to them, and to wipe out a stanch republic.

The record of what happened was documented some years back by a select committee of this House. In company with her sister republics, Lithuania was subjected to mass deportations and genocide as the Soviet Union ruthlessly moved to stamp out the spark of resistance. Despite the harsh methods employed, that effort has not been totally successful, as we know from evidence that seeps through the Iron Curtain.

Meanwhile, the spirit of Lithuanian independence has been kept stanchly alive in America by descendants of that brave people. They have worked hard, and their work, mindful of the hardships their forebears were undergoing, has inspired others to recognize the cruel aspects of the fate of the Lithuanian Republic.

Lithuania, like all captive republics, wants the free exercise of the right to enjoy liberty and freedom. Lithuania wants national independence with political and social justice. The free world ought to keep constantly fresh the reminder that Khrushchev can make a solid demonstration of his disbelief in colonialism at any time by freeing the states which the Soviet Union keeps under its colonial yoke.

Not long ago, the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania reported that the 20 years of indoctrination to which Lithuanian youth has been subjected is producing a generation which disbelieves in what it is being forced to learn. We know that the so-called superior Soviet education is creating difficulties for the Soviet Government, by permitting them a level of education at which it is natural to doubt how superior that system is. The same effect which has been voted in the Soviet Union is abroad in Lithuania.

The bright flame of Lithuanian independence is being kept alive, and the future will bring justice. We in the United States can help by pledging again our eternal faith in the principle of freedom for all captive nations.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, today, February 17, we celebrate the 43d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. It should indeed be a day of great joy to all Lithuanians, but, because of the shroud of the Iron Curtain, this day is celebrated throughout the world with emotions of joy and sorrow—joy in remembering the independence won 43 years ago by the freedom-loving people of Lithuania, and sorrow in remembering these great people who on June 15, 1940, lost that independence to the Soviet Union and had their lives darkened by the Iron Curtain.

We must, in celebrating this day, again rededicate ourselves feverently to the task of raising the Iron Curtain so that the sunshine of freedom can once again shine on them and the world again enjoy with them their wonderful culture and achievements.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the advent of Lithuanian Independence Day this month serves to remind us of the fate of that little but valiant country that has been under Communist domination for most of the last two decades. Particularly, as we see many peoples elsewhere in the world finally realize their national aspirations and begin to build self-sufficient countries of their own will, it is painful to be reminded that Lithuania, as well as many other Eastern European countries, is not independent. We celebrate this anniversary, however, in the hope that in the near future Lithuania will once again be able to select its own form of government and control its own national destiny. We celebrate in the remembrance that for 20 years, between 1918 and 1940, Lithuania knew the contentment of free government. To deprive people that have once known freedom is perhaps more cruel than domination of people that have never known anything but that. To these people I extend my sincerest sympathy and understanding. Yet it is not good to live only in the reflection of that past liberty without facing the present situation. Rather let us take courage and strengthen our resolve to work toward the future freedom of Lithuania in this celebration of its former independence.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that freedom-loving people should pause and pay homage to Lithuanians on this anniversary of their independence. Lithuania enjoyed independence from 1918 until 1940 and in that short period of time held a notable and respected place among the free nations.

When we consider the fate of many millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, it seems almost intolerable that so many have been deprived of the freedom to govern themselves. Today as we celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day, we are again reminded of the struggles of the Lithuanian people to assert themselves as an independent state. They are a courageous and spirited people, who deserve better than domination and tyrannical government at the hands of the Russians.

As Americans opposed to all forms of such flagrant enslavement, we will never approve of the present Lithuanian Government. We will always believe that the rightful government must be formed at the will of the Lithuanian people. I am glad today to be among my colleagues in the House of Representatives as we join our Americans of Lithuanian descent in echoing their patriot sentiments and renewing their faith and hope that Lithuania again will be a free and independent country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, when the First World War sounded the death knell for autocracies in Russia and in east-central Europe, all oppressed peoples in these lands were overjoyed, for in the overthrow of these autocracies they hoped to find their freedom. When that war brought liberation to a large number of oppressed rationalities, the Lithuanians were among them.

The history of the Lithuanian people goes back to early Middle Ages, but the turbulent period of their modern history started in the 16th century by the union of Lithuania with Poland as a dual kingdom. Late in the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence and became part of czarist Russia, Lithuania also came under the czarist regime. For more than 100 years the Lithuanians suffered under the unrelenting autocracy of Russia. During that period they sacrificed much of their worldly possessions, but they did not lose sight of their common national ideal, the attainment of their national political independence.

In 1917 the decrepit czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, and soon after, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence. They then set up their own democratic form of government, and did well by themselves for two decades. In all walks of life they made significant progress, making their little country a model in that part of the world, content in their freedom.

Then came the rude shock of the last war. It seemed that everything the Lithuanian people had regained, including their independence, was under serious threat. Their worst apprehensions proved true. While Lithuania's friends and sympathizers in the West were preoccupied with the prosecution of that war, the Soviet Union set out to carry out its evil designs against the helpless state. First Soviet forces were stationed in all strategic parts of the country. Then in mid-1940, the Red army overran the country and established a puppet regime there. Soon at the "request" of this regime Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union. That was done on July 21, 1940, and thus vanished the independent Lithuanian Republic.

Since those dark days Lithuanians have been suffering under tyrannies, first under the Communists, then during the war for about 2 years under the Nazis, and then under the Communists again. The second time, late in 1944, the Communists came to stay, and there they have been ever since. They have been ruling over the country with an iron hand, and Lithuania's helpless people are constantly victimized by the ruthless agents of the Kremlin. But neither their suffering nor their oppressors have subdued them spiritually. They still cling to their ideals: freedom and independence. I join all Americans of Lithuanian descent in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day, and thus echo the genuine sentiments of their kinsmen in Communist-dominated Lithuania.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fitting that the Members of this House who are well aware of the great contributions and sacrifices of the Lithuanian nation in the cause of liberty and justice pause today on the 43d anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania.

While we pay tribute to the gallant spirit of free Lithuania and to the noble heritage of our citizens of Lithuanian descent who have contributed so much to this country, let us not forget the cruel fate which has come upon and still afflicts this unhappy land under the yoke of tyranny and oppression.

This oppression touches not only Lithuania but encompasses many formerly free lands and many noble peoples who have become the victims of confiscation, aggression, exploitation, and brutal tyranny. On this day commemorating Lithuanian independence, let the American people pledge anew their belief in and determination to fight for international order, honor, and decency while the world ponders the callous brutality and monstrous inequities which communism has perpetrated on free peoples in many parts of the globe.

These crimes have been committed against mankind, against free peoples, against civilization itself to the point that the whole world knows that peace can never be achieved on the basis of aggression and tyranny over helpless peoples. Lasting peace can never be achieved by force, by the denial of human rights, by the ruthless extermination of free institutions.

Instead, let it be known on this day of Lithuanian independence, which we commemorate here today, the American Congress, reflecting the wishes and sentiments of the American people, reaffirms principles of liberty, justice, freedom, human honor, and decency.

The people of Lithuania have a noble heritage and their struggle for freedom has furnished hope and inspiration to the democratic aspirations of many small nations. The sons and daughters of Lithuania have furnished our own great Nation with an inspiring story of freedom-loving immigrants who came to America seeking opportunity and the chance to grow in the new world.

They came with little earthly possessions to find here in America work, happiness, and the chance to raise their families under privileges which they had never before dreamed. These citizens of humble Lithuanian heritage and their descendants in little time have risen to places of leadership and great influence in the professions, in the public service, in religious and business life, and in all the callings of the American people—so much so that they are today among the most highly respected and best in the country in outstanding contributions to the social, economic, and political institutions of this great land of ours.

Thus, in acknowledging the great contributions of our citizens of Lithuanian origin, let it be known in this House on this day of the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence, that this Nation serves notice to the whole world that we stand firm and resolute on the adoption of an affirmative policy to discharge in full measure our obligation to stand by and sustain the Lithuanian people and oppressed peoples everywhere in their hopes for liberation and deliverance from tyranny.

Long live free Lithuania and may that great land and inspired peoples soon regain fullest measure the great liberties they cherish.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the case of Lithuania stands as a symbol of the right of every nation, large or small, to be free and independent. It also carries with it a great human story of a heroic people who struggled over the centuries for their independence—a struggle carried on by an entire nation against the Russian despots. The Lithuanian nation, after winning its independence, demonstrated its real friendship for the United States and its unfaltering allegiance to the same free institutions which we so cherish. We Americans have always been proud of the support we gave to the Lithuanian nation in its struggle against the Russians and in building their democratic way of life which characterized Lithuania during the period between the Great Wars.

There is an unbreakable bond between the United States and Lithuania which has been solidly forged upon the anvil of time and experience.

All men of good will are saddened by the plight of Lithuania today, as it stands occupied by the Russian despots. Lithuania has an alien government imposed by the Kremlin which has proclaimed its bitter enmity for the United States and our free way of life, but the Lithuanian people have kept faith with us in their determined adherence to the cause of human freedom—despite the terrible penalties they must continue to pay for that position.

Lithuania, like the other non-Russian nations occupied by the Kremlin, sees in the United States the last great hope for civilization. We as a Nation stand as a bright symbol to the certainty that Lithuania will once again be free and independent.

There are strange voices in the world today calling for a recognition of the status quo, a deal with the Russians whereby Russia would keep intact its vast empire of slavery in exchange for which we would be spared the Russian hatchet for a few fleeting, humiliating years.

The modern day Russian czar, Khrushchev, stated that the only problems to be negotiated between the Russians and the free world was acceptance of a status quo. He stated in unmistakable words that unless the United States and our allies are prepared to accept this first condition, negotiation of such other problems as there might be would not be considered by the Russians. In other words, Khrushchev told the world that the Russians were prepared to grant a temporary peace if the free world would recognize the present-day Russian Empire and undertake a nonaggression pact which would announce to the world that all the people behind the Iron Curtain were doomed to everlasting slavery.

There is greater need today than ever before in our history for the American people to be vigilant in the defense of our individual liberties and the advocacy of the right of every nation to be free and independent. We know that the best guarantee for our own liberty and safety is a world in which every nation is free and all empires are dissolved.

On this 43d anniversary of Lithuanian national independence, I urge that the foreign policy of the United States be brought under critical review by the American people. In this respect the Congress of the United States can and will perform its part.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as liberty-loving Americans, we here in the Congress of the United States take note that though today marks the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, that hapless country is not free but is still one of the captive nations under Communist Russia.

The world will always remember with horror the year 1940 when the Soviets invaded peaceful Lithuania, suppressed its freedom, liquidated its national independence, and incorporated its territory within the Soviet Union. This brutal seizure of the country, the ruthless suppression of religious, human, and political rights, and the very vicious policies practiced against the people by the Communists, cry out as crimes against humanity. Our hearts are deeply touched by the plight in which the people of Lithuania find themselves.

It is a remarkable coincidence that between the birthdays of America's two outstanding national heroes, Abraham Lincoln and George Washington, brave Lithuania declared its independence and celebrated its own birthday as a nation. Forty-three years ago, we of the United States welcomed with joy and satisfaction the attainment of independence by Lithuania, for we treasure and value freedom and liberty. These Lithuanians who came and settled in America have enriched our country and have contributed immeasurably to its culture and we, therefore, appreciate the sterling qualities of these fine men and women. We unite with them and with other Americans who have relatives in Lithuania in the fervent hope that all peoples in the captive countries will once again know freedom.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States and as a human being, I shall always support the proper and legitimate aims and worthy desires of the Lithuanian people that their native land shall have an early liberation from their cruel taskmasters and that, in the end, right, justice, and equity shall prevail.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to be one of those Americans commemorating this day in hopes that Lithuanian independence will soon be the reality that so many have fought, died, and lived for.

The significance of Lithuania to those of us of Western culture is this: From a glorious and ancient past in which the Duchy of Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea the Lithuanian people have again and again been bled by richer and more powerful neighbors. From 1385 until the end of the 18th century Lithuania was part of Poland; then when Poland was annexed by czarist Russia in 1795 Lithuania shared the same fate. Finally, in 1918, taking dual advantage of President Wilson's 14 points and the Russian revolution, the Lithuanian people declared their independence. This was their first taste of freedom since the 14th century; it lasted 22 years. In June 1940 Soviet troops took over the country. Then almost immediately the land was overrun by the German Army. German occupation lasted from 1941 until 1944, when it was displaced once again by the death grip of the Russian Bear.

I give this thumbnail sketch of the woes of Lithuania not to prove that history can be cruel but, rather, to point a meaningful moral. The Lithuanian people have been relentlessly submerged by force. They are now the unwilling victims of a political religion that seeks converts by every means known. The people of Lithuania in their present political dilemma represent the very thing that America fights against in word and in deed the world over. As such, we honor the people of Lithuania and their friends, relatives, and countrymen that live in the United States as men who have upheld the tenets of Western political culture. These men and women believe in the highest ideals of freedom, justice, and right. They have not been corrupted by Russian words but have seen and felt the sword of social and political tyranny beneath the phrases.

We in the United States have never known the haunting fear of having our independence physically threatened, let alone the reality of foreign occupation. We can speak of the plight and the bravery of the Lithuanian people, but for most of us we understand their plight only through our imagination. But, nevertheless, here are people—almost 3 million people—that are realistic symbols of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, 43 years ago, the people of Lithuania proclaimed their national independence in their historic homeland and instituted their own democratic Republic. It was a momentous day for the Lithuanians as they embarked on a new course in their history. A new beginning which would erase the memory of a past that had been dominated by the oppressive rule of the czars.

In the course of just two decades, the people worked hard and accomplished near miracles. The war-ravaged country was rebuilt and the democratic regime took root. But it was at this moment that another event occurred over which they had no control. The clouds of the Second World War had begun to form and, unfortunately, the threat became a full-fledged storm which surpassed the Lithuanians' fears and forebodings.

Stalin's forces invaded and occupied the country and in July of 1940 Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union, thus marking an end to the Lithuanian Republic that had been born on February 16, 1918.

Today the national ideals of freedom, liberty, and independence that the Lithuanians cherished so deeply are virtually nonexistent in their country. An area so completely under the control of Moscow can never fully realize these aims. In order to have real meaning, they must be exercised in an atmosphere free from the threat of reprisal or suppression. Lithuania as a part of the Soviet Union constitutionally is an equal partner, but in reality Moscow maintains a tight control on all aspects of Lithuanian life—social, political, and educational.

Needless to say the people themselves have not forgotten the original ideals that led to their 1918 proclamation. On this anniversary of their independence, if not permitted to do so publicly, at least within their hearts they again renew their allegiance to a free Lithuania. We in turn join with them in celebrating this day and applaud the valor and unconquerable spirit of a people who have and will continue to strive for complete freedom, liberty, and independence.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 43d anniversary of Lithuanian independence. It is customary for the House to join with our Lithuanian friends around the world in commemorating this date. It is most fitting that we do so for this day should be remembered by all peoples who enjoy the blessings of liberty. February 16 should remind all of us of the courage of the Lithuanian people who have valiantly sought freedom through decades of cruel oppression.

The courageous struggle of the Lithuanian people to secure freedom and independence spans centuries. Four hundred years before the discovery of America, Lithuania succeeded in establishing an independent and free state. Then in the late 18th century, the Lithuanian people were forcefully absorbed into the old Russian Empire. Suffering under the heel of the czarist domination for the next 123 years, these brave people succeeded in transmitting from generation to generation their love of liberty and their tradition and ideal of national freedom. Forty-three years ago today they won and proclaimed their independence and were welcomed into the community of free nations.

Lithuania enjoyed her precious prize of freedom, but a short while before it was once again forcefully snatched away at the point of a foreign bayonet. In 1940, the Soviet Union dispatched the Red army into this small nation. Since then the Kremlin has deliberately set out to stamp out Lithuanian culture and to exterminate the spirit of independence. They continue to this day to terrorize the Lithuanian people by oppression, persecution, and mass deportation.

We in America are moved with compassion by the suffering our Lithuanian friends have borne over the years. Anniversaries are, for most of us joyous occasions which call for celebration. But to the people of Lithuania there is little cause for joy. They must commemorate this day in mute if defiant silence. Rather than a moment of celebration today is for them a time of solemn reconsecration to an ideal of freedom which continues to live in the hearts and minds of a people long enslaved.

We who are more fortunate can take inspiration from the fact that through long periods of bondage the Lithuanian people have unswervingly maintained the spirit of freedom and the ideal of national independence. We are confident that in this tragic hour of their national life, these brave people will not fail in their fidelity to the noble traditions and determined faith which have always sustained the human spirit in the midst of misery and tragedy. We to whom history has been more benign are steadfast in the hope and prayer that the human birthright of individual liberty and national self-determination will be restored to the Lithuanian people. And we are confident in the hope that the suffering of yesterday's and today's generation will assume meaning through the lives of a generation blessed with a liberty made possible by decades of faith in freedom and justice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, today Estonians the world over are commemorating the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia.

However, since World War II, this wonderful little Baltic country, with individual culture and a fervent love of independence, has been incorporated into the Soviet colonial empire.

Estonia, whose heritage dates back to 3300 B.C., had struggled for years and successfully established its complete independence on February 24, 1918.

As of that date, Estonia had gained national independence and freedom. But it was short lived. With World War II, Estonia again was placed under totalitarian tyranny when it was forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union.

Despite the continued efforts of the Soviet Union to destroy Estonia as a national entity, the Estonians have not ceased fighting for the right of independence.

There can be no doubt that the Soviet Union has inflicted the full force of brutality on Estonia to achieve its goal. Mass deportation of population, the transfer of large groups to remote sections of the Soviet Union as forced labor plus individual persecutions still have not dimmed the flame of liberty in the hearts of Estonians.

This anniversary must be a symbol for all of us to continue our fight to have Estonia, and the other countries enslaved by the Soviet Union, free and independent once again.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in commemoration of Lithuanian independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MISSING—ONE ARMY DIVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, an entire Army division is missing from the Nation's defense complex. This is a key division and an integral part of the free world's defense program. This is the Army's 15th Division—lost when the strength of the Army was reduced from 900,000 to 870,000 men. Because of the lack of a 15th Division, a serious weakness exists. It reduces the effectiveness of America's military posture and reduces our ability to speedily and capably reinforce our allies. It should be replaced and the strength of the Army should be increased. Ask any Army man. He can give you the cold, hard facts.

No one can predict with certainty how the United States may be called upon to use its military power. Our land, sea, and air forces may well be engaged in a spectrum of nonnuclear operations, from a small-scale expedition, through multiple actions, to a large-scale war. They may be required to fight in one or more limited nuclear engagements or they may even find themselves in the holocaust of a general nuclear war. For the United States, particularly as a member of a collective security system, these potential uses of military power generate many obligations. It requires that a large quantity of our forces be constantly stationed overseas; it inevitably influences our selection of courses of action in war; and it means that we must be ready to fight alongside allied forces, who will often need considerable support from the United States in the form of troops, logistics, and military know-how. In areas such as the Middle East and in southeast Asia, where few if any U.S. bases exist, the problem of support is extremely complicated and requires an unusual capability in the U.S. forces which might be employed there to be able to engage in sustained combat.

Under the current situation that has evolved in which both the United States and the U.S.S.R. maintain comparable strategic nuclear attack forces, neither having the capability of destroying enough of the other's nuclear strike to prevent receiving unacceptable damage, the result may well be that the long-range nuclear capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R. will in effect counterbalance each other. It already is the stated policy of the United States to use nuclear weapons only in retaliation. This philosophy and its consequent supporting military structure is based on the assumption that the Soviets would initiate nuclear war. However, if the Soviets elect not to start a nuclear war, and reject the use of nuclear weapons—an equally logical and probable choice, to say the least—the position of the United States and the free world in other existing elements of military power vis-a-vis the Soviets is not favorable.

Thus, the problem becomes one in which the operative element of military power is now integrated land, sea, and air forces capable of conducting military operations with or without nuclear weapons, but as nuclear capabilities become balanced there is necessity for placing increasing reliance on nonnuclear weapons to halt or defeat aggressions short of nuclear war.

This places renewed emphasis on numbers of men; an emphasis particularly felt by the land forces, which alone can control the land masses of the world and the people who inhabit them. With an adequate number of men, there of course must be the most modern weapons and equipment available in order to exploit to the fullest the dual nuclear or nonnuclear capability of the Army forces. Yet these modern weapons and the new equipment do not replace manpower. This is a fact which unfortunately is seldom understood. The requirement for men in numbers exists irrespective of the marvels of machinery. In fact, complicated and highly technical weapons and equipment require for operation and maintenance more rather than fewer men.

In light of the framework just mentioned, the Congress and the executive branch are faced with complex and difficult decisions on how the Nation's resources can best be allocated to its defense. The Army has the same problem. Its size and resources have been contracted, while the requirements which national security and the emerging condition of nuclear parity place upon it have increased.

The fundamental role of the Army, as the Nation's land force, is to defeat enemy forces in land combat and to gain control of the land and its people. The Army is organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land. Within these roles the basic responsibilities of the U.S. Army are:

First. To maintain forces in readiness. This involves the development and maintenance in the United States and overseas of continually modernized operating forces, including combat and supporting components, together with the continental base necessary to sustain and when required, to reinforce these forces. These forces include elements for land combat and for continental air defense.

Second. To provide for expansion of the Army upon mobilization. This involves the maintenance of readily mobilizable reserve components, and the mobilization base, comprising training and logistic elements, for their support. These forces must be prepared to reinforce active Army forces in conditions short of war and in limited and general war. Today, with the disappearance of the advantage of time and space offered the United States in the past, this capability assumes even greater importance.

Third. To provide support to allied, national, defense establishments and interservice activities in furtherance of national policies and objectives.

This involves a large segment of the Army which as a result is not available to the Army for all practicable purposes for assignment to units of its forces in combat readiness. These include personnel performing tasks supporting the United Nations, allied nations, U.S. Government agencies, joint military tasks, activities of other U.S. armed services, and other types of functions. The Army is called upon to perform these tasks because of its capabilities and assigned functions. Performance of these tasks contribute substantially to the total U.S. defense effort.

The concept of land combat includes:

The development and maintenance in the United States and overseas of modernized balanced field forces both combat and support elements.

Forces capable of combat in conjunction with air and sea forces and the armed forces of our allies over extended distances and possibly for extended periods of time.

The administration and logistic support necessary to sustain these forces under any commitment.

Within this concept, U.S. Army land forces must be ready for any mission, anywhere, anytime. The current U.S. Army forces are constituted and deployed worldwide with definitive vital roles to carry out in each case. For example:

EUROPE

The U.S. Army forces in Europe constitute the major segment of strength of the ground element of the NATO shield forces. This forward shield of a five division force must be capable of dealing with a wide range of situations. In general war it will immediately enter into sustained land combat in defense of Western Europe. This force continues

to be tangible evidence of the U.S. ability to execute its commitments to the security and freedom of the people of Western Europe. These forces are also required to be prepared for limited war situations, including operations in contiguous areas. For the magnitude of the task facing NATO forces, five U.S. divisions even with other allied forces are marginally adequate. In fact, greater ground force strength is an urgent requirement for NATO.

PACIFIC

U.S. Army forces in the Pacific, in conjunction with other U.S. forces, maintain U.S. interests in the Pacific Ocean, the Asian littoral, and the mainland of Asia. These forces support U.S. commitments in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—and the Anzus Pact, and with Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and Taiwan.

In Korea, U.S. Army forces include two infantry divisions, artillery and missile units, and provide tangible evidence of U.S. determination to meet its commitments to the U.N. Here again is a marginal situation which in the event of an emergency will require an increase in U.S. Army strength.

In Hawaii, there is an infantry division with one of its airborne battle groups on Okinawa, prepared for use at any point from Korea around the 4,000-mile arc to southeast Asia. Other Army combat and support forces are in Okinawa and Japan to support U.S. Army, Marine Corps, and allied forces in land combat in the Pacific area.

Army forces in the Pacific are perforce maintained at austere levels in relation to assigned responsibilities. Thus, in the event of hostilities, they must rely upon immediate reinforcement from the United States.

ALASKA AND CARIBBEAN

U.S. Army forces are also deployed in the Western Hemisphere. In both the Caribbean and Alaska we have a "two battle group force" and air defense elements. Additional tasks of these Army forces include operation of the Cold Weather and Mountain School in Alaska, the Jungle Warfare Training Center in Panama, and the maintenance of facilities and stocks for deployment as required of additional Army forces from the strategic reserve, and of course, such contingency plans that pertain to their geographical areas.

Not mentioned in the tasks and responsibilities of the above worldwide deployed U.S. Army forces is their inestimable contribution to our nonmilitary cold war program. By their presence, their posture in being, a definitive contribution to stabilization, law, and order is effected amongst our allies. Their effect on the Communists has been that since World War II there has been on armed Communist aggression initiated within range of U.S. Army weapons other than in Korea.

STRATEGIC RESERVE

The U.S. Army forces in the Continental United States are, as you know, known as the strategic reserve. The Army's strategic reserve backs our cold war efforts in those countries where we maintain no permanent forces. This force can inhibit violence from a distance particularly if its capabilities are kept fresh in friendly, neutral, and enemy minds through joint training exercises. It must be prepared and capable of quick deployment to one or even more than one location simultaneously. This six-division strategic army force—Straf—is divided into two components.

First. One component is the strategic army corps, commonly referred to as Strac, which is an austere, currently three-division force immediately ready for deployment in either limited or general war. This force is designed to reinforce repidly the already deployed U.S. Army forces in fulfilling NATO, SEATO, CENTO, and as well as for employment to other commitments. Currently, this force includes one infantry division, two airborne divisions, and other combat and combat supporting units.

Second. The remainder of the strategic army force consists of two infantry divisions, one armored division, and other combat and combat supporting units. These elements of Straf are at present used for training of recruits and as a source of personnel with appropriate combat skills to support oversea rotation in peacetime and as a base for deployment shortly after mobilization.

The Army is fully aware of the need to provide that combination of combat and support units which insures the most effective forces in readiness to meet assigned responsibilities and for this reason and in the framework of the responsibilities herein outlined has constantly strived to maintain a 15-division balanced Army force structure. It is impossible to do the job properly with fewer than 15. Notwithstanding, in the spring of 1959, the Army was forced because of decreasing budgetary and personnel authorizations to reduce Strac from a four-division force to a three-division force. Currently, the U.S. Army stands with eight divisions deployed overseas, supported by six divisions in continental United States, of which but three divisions are immediately capable of instantaneous deployment for reinforcement overseas or for direct employment in other contingency operations.

It has become increasingly evident in the light of recent and current international situations, that definite requirement exists to restore Strac to its previous four-division status. The expansive commitment of our already deployed oversea forces, and their austere quantity preclude their removal for any appropriate period of time, for other contingencies that may occur without the ability for their quick replacement "in the line" by equivalent elements from the only available source, Strac. Thus the U.S. Army, with its austere organization and large commitments, is constantly faced with a "rob Peter to pay Paul" situation. This situation is felt to be beyond the acceptable risk status as pertains to the national security of the United States and the free world. The rapid response of an airborne division, using strategic airlift, can do much to bolster a deteriorating situation. This airborne division in many situations would be followed and relieved by an infantry division. Under the present Strac organization, when two simultaneous military situations occur in widespread areas, the two airborne divisions could respond. However, one of these airborne divisions could not be reinforced or relieved by an infantry division. The capability to respond to a subsequent crisis would be expended. This inflexibility should not be tolerated under current and foreseeable world conditions. The addition of one infantry division to Strac to supplement the current two airborne and one infantry divisions would reconstitute a force that could place the United States in a far, far better position to respond to varying types of military situations.

Increasing awareness has been given to the probability of simultaneous involvement of our forces in more than one geographical location of the world. The U.S. Army with Strac consisting as it does of but a three-division force, would be hard pressed to cover such situations. The recoupment of the 4th Division in Strac would put the United States in a generally acceptable position to respond to more than one contingency operation, should such occur simultaneously. Another benefit which would be derived from an additional infantry division, by returning the previously removed division to the Army in Conus, is badly needed augmentation of the Conus training base which supports the eight divisions deployed overseas.

Mr. Speaker, there are many problems which confront us in the military arena. The first and foremost is for the United States to be able to respond to the entire spectrum of the military threat. We can help toward solving this problem by returning the Army the strength it needs to add a minimum of another division—its 15th division. That means increasing the strength of the Army to a minimum of 900,000 men. With this additional force, the Army would be far better fitted to respond to the many crises which face us today in the world.

J. EDWARD ROUSH ELECTED IN FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two articles from the Indianapolis Times and an affidavit from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana has been without representation during the 87th session of Congress.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives has not received a legal certificate based on the official vote returns to seat a Member of Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

Two purported certificates of election were issued to George O. Chambers. The first of these alleged certificates of election was illegal and spurious because it was signed by the Governor 7 days after the election held on November 8, 1960. The Indiana statutes specifically provides that 10 days must intervene after the election for the county clerks to correct possible errors in the voting before the results can be certified to the secretary of state by the county clerks.

For some mysterious reason, the former Governor, Harold Handley, issued this unlawful certificate to the Republican candidate, George O. Chambers, in the Fifth Congressional District before the statutory vote-correction period had elapsed. Also, for some mysterious reason, other Congressmen elected in the State of Indiana did not receive a certification of the election until several weeks after the 10-day statutory period had elapsed. In other words, the unlawful first certification of election issued to George O. Chambers was in brazen violation of law and as phony as a $3 bill.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

On December 16, the Congressional Committee on Elections under Congressman CLIFFORD DAVIS as chairman held hearings in Washington, D.C., on the congressional elections contest in the Fifth District of Indiana. At this hearing a transcript signed by the Honorable Charles O. Hendricks, secretary of state of Indiana, was recorded as part of the testimony. This transcript set out the official vote of all the 10 counties in the Indiana Fifth Congressional District. This official vote and transcript is now on record in the office of Ralph Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and also part of the record of the above-named congressional committee.

The Indiana secretary of state's transcript officially recorded the vote for J. Edward Roush as 106,874, and George O. Chambers as 106,872.

The only official record of total votes for Congress recorded in the office of Indiana's secretary of state and also in the Clerk of the House of Representatives records J. Edward Roush as elected by a majority of two votes.

SECOND ALLEGED CERTIFICATE

Evidently the Republic leadership in Indiana realized that the alleged first certificate of the Governor was illegal because within 24 hours before the convening of Congress on January 3 they dispatched another certificate of election for George O. Chambers to Washington, D.C. This alleged certificate was sent by "moonlight" and arrived at the Clerk's office a few hours before Congress convened at 12 noon on January 3, 1961. This second certificate is prima facie illegal and not based on recorded vote results. It unlawfully disregards the certification transcript of the Indiana secretary of state, Hon. Charles O. Hendricks, on file in the Clerk's office and also with the House Elections Committee. That transcript sets out the official vote from the 10 counties, county clerks in the fifth Congressional District of Indiana. It records J. Edward Roush was elected over George O. Chambers by a majority of two votes.

Almost 7 weeks have passed since the 87th Congress convened. The Fifth District of Indiana should have representation in the National House of Representatives. I respectfully ask the chairman of the House Administration Committee to immediately hold hearings and review the official vote recorded and on file in the office of the Indiana secretary of state, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the testimony and decision of the House Congressional Committee on Elections. The records of these three governmental units, without any remote question of doubt reveal that J. Edward Roush was elected to the House of Representatives by a majority of two votes.

J. Edward Roush should immediately be seated after the House Administration Committee has examined the official recorded vote from the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point the affidavit of Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, setting out the official vote by county for U.S. Representatives in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, which when added up gave J. Edward Roush a majority of two votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The affidavit referred to follows:)

I, Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct excerpt from the certificate of the Honorable Charles O. Hendricks, secretary of state of the State of Indiana, as submitted under his signature and the seal of that State, December 7, 1960, to the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, U.S. House of Representatives, pursuant to the request of said committee, the original of which certificate is in the files of the U.S. House of Representatives:

"Copies, as amended, of certified statement of the clerks of the circuit courts of the following counties: Miami, Wabash, Huntington, Grant, Howard, Tipton, Clinton, Madison, Blackford, and Jay, of the general election held on November 8, 1960. I further certify that the above-named counties comprise the Fifth Indiana Congressional District, as the same appears on file, as the law directs, in this office."

I further certify that these certificates reflect the following vote by counties:

County:	J. Edward Roush	George O. Chambers
Miami	7,297	7,568
Wabash	6,091	9,050
Huntington	10,386	7,505
Grant	15,652	17,027
Howard	16,335	14,752
Tipton	3,998	4,283
Clinton	7,565	8,554
Madison	30,156	29,231
Blackford	3,620	3,311
Jay	5,774	5,591
Totals	106,874	106,872

In witness whereof I hereunto affix my name and the seal of the House of Representatives, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, this 13th day of December, anno Domini, 1960.

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

INDIANAPOLIS TIMES INVESTIGATION

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Indianapolis Times for the great service the newspaper is rendering in exposing fraud in the Republican election machinery in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana. To quote the Indianapolis Times, a Republican newspaper, in an article Sunday, February 5, 1961, relating to the casting of absentee ballots in Anderson, Ind.:

Veteran Republican State Election Commissioner Edwin M. S. Steer said he never heard of anything like it, "it opens the way to fraud."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a news story by Ted Knap on the front page of the Sunday, February 5, 1961, Indianapolis Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

PROBE 45 ABSENTEE BALLOTS TO ONE GOP WORKER—SUSPECTED VOTES CAN MAKE ED ROUSH CONGRESSMAN IN FIFTH

(By Ted Knap)

Forty-five absentee election ballots were mailed to the home of a Republican precinct committeeman in Anderson, the Indianapolis Times learned last night.

The FBI has been notified and has reported to the Justice Department in Washington.

Veteran Republican State Election Commissioner Edwin M. S. Steers said he never heard of anything like it, and said "it opens the way to fraud."

If fraud is found, it virtually would guarantee the election of Democrat J. Edward Roush as the Fifth District Congressman.

The congressional seat at present is vacant because the Chambers-Roush election is in dispute. A congressional committee in Washington, trying to determine who won the election, is checking into it.

Republican George Chambers, Anderson, claims he won the November 8 election by 12 votes. Democrat Roush, Huntington, claims victory by two votes.

On voting machines, Anderson's precinct 4 of ward 3 went to Roush, 595 to 310.

On the absentee ballots, that precinct went to Chambers 41 to 21.

Of the 71 absentee ballots requested from that precinct, 45 were mailed to 809 West 14th, home of Mr. and Mrs. Harold Doyle.

They are the only registered voters living there. Doyle is Republican precinct committeeman and she is vice committeeman. At the time Doyle was the GOP-appointed watchman at the State highway garage in Anderson.

Doyle said he did it that way to "protect the voters" and "keep the Democrats from stealing it."

Doyle said he (or his wife) went to the 45 voters, most of them Negroes, and had them sign applications for absentee ballots.

"They were sick or working at jobs that wouldn't give them time to go to the polls," he explained.

The absentee voter application says "Mail to (address)." Instead of having them mailed to the voter, Doyle had his own address filled in.

County Clerk Eugene Creagmile, a Democrat, said the clerk who mailed the ballots thought nothing of it because she figured 809 West 14th was a nursing home.

When Doyle got the blank ballots, he said he or his wife took them to the voters, waited for them to be filled out, then notarized the sealed envelopes in which he said they were placed. The Doyles mailed about half the

ballots, while others were mailed by the voters, he said.

Steers at first said it was illegal. In rechecking the State election law—much of which he authored—he determined it was a legal loophole. The law says the absentee ballot shall be mailed to the address named in the application.

"But it's not proper," Steers declared. "He could vote every one of them." Steers added that the "whole absentee ballot system is so full of crookedness that it ought to be repealed."

"Neither my wife or I filled any ballot," Doyle told the Times.

Amos Jackson, Democratic committeeman in that precinct, said he checked with one of the 45 voters. "He told me he did not fill out a ballot or sign anything," Jackson said.

One of the 45 votes was rejected at the poll because Jackson found it was purportedly cast by a man committed to an insane asylum in another city. Insane persons are disqualified from voting.

Two others were rejected, but 42 of the 45 absentee ballots handled by the Doyles were counted.

Marked ballots were handed to the Doyles, not placed in envelopes and sealed.

Voters did not sign sealed envelopes, as required by law.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to incorporate a story by Ted Knap on Sunday, February 12, 1961, in the Indianapolis Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

HERE'S PROOF OF ELECTION VIOLATIONS—FIND ILLEGAL VOTES AMONG 45 MAILED TO GOP WORKER

(By Ted Knap)

The 45 absentee ballots mailed to a Republican precinct committeeman in Anderson are riddled with election law violations, investigation by the Times showed today.

Some of the absentee voters were exploited and deceived.

Some said they did not fill out the ballots cast in their name.

At least one signature was falsely notarized by a GOP committeewoman.

Records indicate one woman voted twice, without knowing it.

At least 10 separate sections of the election law appear to have been violated, and sometimes several per ballot.

Official investigation of those 45 ballots was undertaken by Madison County Prosecutor Melvin Thornburg after the Times uncovered them last Sunday.

It may decide the disputed Fifth District congressional election. Republican George Chambers claims victory by 12 votes and Democrat J. Edward Roush by 2.

The investigation centers around Mr. and Mrs. Harold Doyle, the Republican committeeman and committeewoman of Anderson's precinct 4 of ward 3. They had the 45 ballots mailed to their home, 809 West 14th.

Most of the 45 absentee voters are Negroes. Many are uneducated. Some can't read or write.

On voting machines, Roush won that precinct about 2 to 1. On absentee ballots, he lost about 2 to 1.

Fourteen of those absentee voters were interviewed this week by the Times. Their stories indicated these violations:

The Doyles solicited them to vote absentee.

The voters didn't know the blank ballots would be mailed to the Doyles.

They voted absentee even though able to go to the polls.

Doctor's certificates were obtained without examination.

The Doyles saw for whom some voted.

In some instances, the Doyles pointed to where the voter's "x" mark should go.

Mrs. Doyle herself filled out some ballots.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I want to congratulate my colleague from Indiana for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The fact remains that the election certificate from the secretary of state of Indiana to the Clerk of the House of Representatives indicating the official vote showed that Mr. Roush won by a majority of two votes. Two other certificates were issued, but as the gentleman from Indiana pointed out, one of them was issued prematurely—why, I do not know; and the other was issued within 24 hours of the time the House of Representatives convened.

As I remember, they met on a holiday, drew up the certificate and sent it down here by airmail. Why that was done I do not know. But the fact does remain that a committee of the House of Representatives investigated this matter and they, like the record in the office of the secretary of state and the record in the office of the Clerk of the House, show that Roush won by a majority of two votes.

On the evidence I think Mr. Roush should be seated and Chambers be left to contest the election. However, the Committee on Elections of the House of Representatives recommended that neither man be seated, and that the votes be rechecked. I think that was extremely fair. In the meantime, I, like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] hope the House Committee on Administration will conduct a speedy recount of the vote, and if that is done that Roush will be seated.

I also want to commend the Indianapolis Times and my good friend Ted Knap for the investigation they made showing fraud on the part of the election officials in one of the counties in the Fifth District. I think they have rendered a great service to the people of Indiana and to the Nation in bringing this to public attention.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I do not wish to interfere in the affairs of another State but I do want to say that I think a determination should be made as rapidly as possible so that the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana will not be denied the representation to which they are entitled here in this House of Representatives. I think justice demands that someone be seated.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] for his remarks, also the gentleman from Florida for his remarks. I entirely agree that the Fifth District should have immediate representation on the floor of this House. Considering the hocuspocus that has been carried on through the secretary of state or the Governor's office in issuing two illegal, spurious certificates in face of the official recorded returns, I firmly believe it is within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Administration to meet and review the official vote from Indiana and to seat J. Edward Roush as a Member of the House.

OUR DYNAMIC ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 30, 1961, President Kennedy delivered a state of the Union address to the Congress. On Thursday, February 2, 1961, he sent to the Congress a message entitled "Program for Economic Recovery and Growth."

Both messages were shocking in their disregard for honest scholarship in the field of economics. There is plenty of room for a disagreement between the two political parties on the proposals necessary to move our country forward in meeting the problems we face in our times. However, there should be no room for unfair and unscholarly presentations of the issues. Such a course will bring the minimum response from those Members of Congress and the people who are already unsympathetic to many of Mr. Kennedy's proposals.

It is a shame that the President saw fit to disregard the temperate and scholarly economic appraisal prepared at his request by Roy Blough, Paul W. McCracken, and Allan Sproul, chairman, submitted January 18, 1961. The following quotations from the report bring our economy into better perspective:

The evidence available to us in January suggests two conclusions as bases for economic policy in the months ahead. First, the current contraction still appears to be in the family of the relatively mild recessions that have characterized the postwar period. It does not yet look like a cumulative, severe recession. Second, we must assume that the decline in business activity has further to run, though the bottom of the recession could turn out to be not very far below the current level of business activity.

Even if the force of the upturn, this time, should turn out to be somewhat less than in these earlier periods, and there is as yet no certainty about this, our output of goods and services by the end of this year should be measurably above that of the final quarter in 1960.

Would this be a good performance for the economy in 1961? In a very real sense, this question must be answered in the affirmative.

The Sproul report sets out no such one-sided statements of alarm about our economy as appear in the President's messages, albeit it poses some problems which face our economy, and with which we must grapple.

Both of the two Presidential messages are rehashes of the unfair presentation of the state of our economy which Mr. Kennedy made throughout his campaign for the Presidency.

Is President Kennedy so unsure of himself that he feels he must falsify the essential strength and goodness of our economy in order to have a ready excuse

if he fails to provide the proper political climate so our society may move forward, as everyone anticipates it will move unless throttled? Or is his purpose to set up a benchmark of poor achievement so he might show remarkable achievement, when nothing more than the anticipated economic growth has come about under his administration? Whichever his purpose may be, it is a poor herald of a new frontier.

This process of downgrading America not only misdirects us in meeting our domestic problems, it undermines American foreign policy which depends upon our friends and enemies understanding the strength of America.

THE GROWTH RATE HAS BEEN 4.8 PERCENT

The President stated:

Our Nation has been falling further and further short of its economic capabilities. In the past 7 years our rate of growth has slowed down disturbingly. In the past 3½ years, the gap between what we can produce and what we do produce has threatened to become chronic.

The President makes the following statement to support these conclusions:

But in recent years the economy has not realized even its present possible growth, from the peak of the business cycle in the second quarter of 1953 to the top of the anemic recovery 7 years later, gross national product grew only at an annual rate of 2.5.

Here are the figures. The gross national product of 1953 was $365.4 billion, the gross national product for 1960 was $503.2 billion. The annual rate of increase is 4.6 percent, not 2.5 percent. Furthermore, the first two quarters of 1953 were Korean war periods and 1960 was a year of peace. It should be common knowledge that the rate of economic growth measured in gross national product can be stimulated by war and that it will relapse in peacetime. The Democratic leaders and their political economists have shown a blind spot over a period of years, dangerous to our country, in failing to distinguish between a war and a peacetime economy.

Has the President chosen the second quarter of 1953, the last quarter of war, as the date from which to start measuring to contrast war economy with peacetime economy? The last point of measurement of our economy under a Democrat administration, Mr. Truman's, was 1952; 1953 is an Eisenhower year. So let's take the gross national product for the year 1952, $347 billion, as a starting point. The first Eisenhower year showed an increase from $347 billion gross national product to $365.4 billion gross national product, an increase of 5.3 percent, which betters the other 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, which averages over 4.5 percent annual growth. To compare peace years with peace years we can take the gross national product of 1949, the last year of peace under Mr. Truman, and compare it with the gross national product of 1960, a peacetime year. Gross national product of 1949 was $258.1 billion—that of 1960 was $503.2 billion, a rise of $245.1 billion, or an average of almost 7 percent a year growth.

In 3 years of war under Mr. Truman the gross national product went from $258.1 billion—1949—to $347 billion—1952—a rise of $88.9 billion or $29.6 billion a year, a growth rate of almost 10 percent a year.

In 8 years, 7½ years being years of peace, under Mr. Eisenhower the gross national product went from $347 billion—1952—to $503.2 billion—1960—a rise of $156.2 billion, or $19.5 billion a year, a growth rate of 4.8 percent a year.

There was a slowdown in growth under peacetime conditions, all right, but let us compare Truman's peacetime years to get the matter in balance. Truman had 4 years of peace, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949. The gross national product was at $213.6 million in 1945 when World War II ended. In 1949, the gross national product was $258.1 billion, an increase of $44.5, or a $11.0 billion-a-year increase compared to the $19.5 billion-a-year increase under the peacetime years of Eisenhower, a growth rate of 4.4 percent a year compared to 4.8 percent a year.

Let us see what the World War II growth was compared to the Korean war. The gross national product in 1941, the last year of peace, was $81.9 billion. In 1945, the last year of the war, it was $213.7, an increase of $131.8, or $32.9 billion a year compared to the $29.6 billion a year of the Korean war, a 22.3-percent growth rate per year compared to 10 percent per year.

All of this proves only two things. First, war stimulates economic growth measured by the gross national product indicator. Second, peace slows down economic growth as measured by the gross national product indicator.

Surely the Kennedy administration is not suggesting a war to stimulate our economy and, therefore, it should cease playing this dangerous game of comparing economics based upon war with economics based upon peace.

The people who presented to Mr. Kennedy the economic figures used in his message to show a growth rate of only 2.5 percent for the last 7 years of the Eisenhower administration of course have adjusted the gross national product figures by what is called the implicit price deflator for total gross national product. In addition to the misrepresentation they engage in by their deliberate disregard of war and peace and the excising one-quarter from a particular year, 1953, so they could take the most favorable starting point to emphasize this falsification of the true economic picture, they are guilty of using two different methods of measuring without pointing up the significance of the difference.

ECONOMIC GROWTH MEASURED IN GNP VALUABLE ONLY LONG RANGE

It is a very proper process for long-range use of gross national product figures to adjust the gross national product figures for the various years to the most current dollar value, 1959. However, if we apply this same type long-range adjustment to an evaluation of the Truman peace years, 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, the results will show a minus rate of economic growth. Here are the figures: Gross national product for 1945 in 1959 prices, the takeoff point for Truman's peacetime years, was $359.9 billion. In 1949, the last peacetime year of the Truman administration, the gross national product was $328.2 billion, a loss of $31.7 billion in 4 years, $8 billion a year—a minus growth rate of 2.5 percent a year. Comparing apples with apples, Truman's peacetime years showed a minus growth rate of 2.5 percent, while Eisenhower's peacetime years showed a plus growth rate of 2.5 percent. However, this kind of exercise is as unfair to the Truman peacetime years as it is to the Eisenhower years. I point all this out in the form of a plea to the honest economists, particularly those who are Democrats, to speak out now and call a halt to this prostitution of their science. This is no small matter, both to the future of our country and to the future of honest scholarship.

Is the Kennedy administration taking over the Lysenko theories of botanical growth and applying them to economic growth? Surely the sad experience of the Russians in their lack of advancement in agriculture and botanical science in recent years is directly attributable to the process of making a science subservient to political theories. We want none of that in America.

AS IN BOTANY

We can get as far behind in economics as in botany if we permit Lysenkoism or Galbraithism to take over.

If the President wants to direct the attention of the people and the Congress to the true economic picture, he should point out that economic growth measured by gross national product is meaningful only for rather lengthy periods of time and that our national average of growth over the past hundred years when we were growing more rapidly and solidly than perhaps any nation in history was around 3 percent or, if computed on a different basis, as some scholars do, about 2.3 percent. Whichever computation is used, however, the United States annual growth rate during the past 100 years is substantially greater than that of any other nation; and the post-World War II growth rates exceed this long-range average.

Furthermore, as economists have been trying to point out to the people and the Congress for some time, gross national product, though a very valuable series of economic statistics, indeed, one of our most valuable, has serious limitations in measuring true economic growth and this is particularly true for short periods of time—even as short a period as a decade.

Gross national product does not measure economic capacity, but rather, what actually is produced in goods and services in a given year. It includes economic mistakes, that is, unused surpluses, bad planning, poor distribution, faulty production, and so forth, equally with what in the long run proves out to be real economic growth. Much of the growth during periods of war is not real growth or sustainable. Expenditures in capital plant and equipment have a multiplier effect in gross national product while expenditures in research and development and education, which are the most crucial areas for sustained

economic growth, appear relatively small in the gross national product indication.

We do not need more capacity right now to produce steel or agricultural produce, and yet development in those areas would undoubtedly make a great showing in gross national product. We do need more investment in vocational education, research and development, in general education and basic research, and these expenditures make a relatively poor showing in the gross national product indicator.

Some very fine studies were made by eminent scholars of the limitations of the gross national product indicator in measuring growth in the recent studies conducted by the Joint Economic Committee into Russian economy vis-a-vis the U.S. economy. A study of the limitations of the gross national product indicator as a measure of economic growth brings out forcefully the reason why Germany, Great Britain, France, Japan, Russia, and the Benelux had such great gross national product growth rates in post-World War II years, all of which are tapering off. These countries had one thing in common; they were all industrial nations rebuilding their productive capacities destroyed in the war.

OUR GREATEST YEAR

The Presidential message "Program for Economic Recovery and Growth" is replete with comparative words such as "expand," "growth," "recovery," "higher," "more," without any reference to the base to which perforce these words must relate if they are to have any real meaning. It is understandable only on a narrow partisan basis why President Kennedy chose not to set forth what the Nation's investments in physical and human resources were from which he wants us to expand because these investments are the highest in our history and are testimony to the remarkable dynamism and achievements of our private enterprise system.

It is understandable only on a narrow partisan basis why President Kennedy chose not to emphasize the base from which he would have us grow, $503 billion gross national product for the year 1960, because this is the highest in our history and the highest in the history of any society at any time.

It is similarly understandable why President Kennedy chose not to relate the base from which he says there was an "anemic recovery" because the base from which it rose was the highest up to that time and war swollen. The recovery, far from being anemic, bettered our longtime average national growth rate, whichever honest measuring stick one cares to use.

It is similarly understandable why he chose not to relate the base from which he says output could have been 8 percent higher than it was in 1960, because again, 1959 was the point of highest output our economy had ever reached. Only 1960 exceeded it, as 1961 should exceed 1960 if the Kennedy axmen do not get to the golden goose.

It is similarly understandable why, when he keeps asking for "more," he does not choose to say "more" than what, because the amount our Nation and our people have in every area, whether it is in per capita gross national product, number of jobs, take-home pay, national income, purchasing power, homes, electricity, education, leisure time, health facilities, insurance, savings; whether it is quantity or quality, we have set new American records and a new American record in economics is always a new world record.

I want to illustrate this point of calling for more without saying more than what. President Kennedy has said we must spend twice the amount we are spending on education within the next 10 years. Let us look at our expenditure increase in the last 8 years from 1952 to 1960.

In 1952 we spent $313 per pupil in average daily attendance in public and elementary and secondary schools; in 1958 $446 per pupil. The figures for 1959 and 1960 not available are even greater. This means that in 1952 about $8,138 billion was spent for education here compared to about $15,510 billion in 1959—number of pupils in 1952 was 26 million; in 1959 the number was 33 million. The 1960 figure will be close to $17 billion.

A request that we double the expenditure in the next 10 years asks for a showdown in the rate of expenditures in education—not a new frontier we are rushing to at all—a slowdown, all disguised in clever but false semantics by the President and his advisers.

Inaccurate appraisals of our situation can lose what we have, instead of gain that which we wish, and that is exactly what many of the Kennedy administration economic proposals would do. In seeking for the bigger bone we may lose the bone we have, whose reflection in the water has excited us.

THE COST OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

A few things about economic growth should be pointed up. Growing is not easy and the term of growing pains applies to the economy, just as it does to the human body.

First. Rapid technological growth, and that is the economic growth we seek, brings in its wake increased technological unemployment. By the very definition of the process, more skills become obsolete and higher and different kinds of skills are demanded. Need for unskilled and semiskilled labor diminishes. People with no skills or obsolete skills either learn the new skills, and this takes time and money, or they engage in featherbedding or they become unemployed. The more rapid the technological growth, the greater is the incident of frictional unemployment and the greater is the unfilled demand by employers for employees with new and higher skills.

The unemployment that President Kennedy directs attention to is the result essentially of the very growth that he says we want more of. When he states:

> More than a million and a half unemployed—over one-third of all unemployed could have had jobs. Twenty billion dollars more personal income could have been earned in 1960.

He is confused about the nature of today's unemployment. The great body of our unemployed today are unskilled and semiskilled workers, and workers whose skills are obsolete. What jobs would he have them work at in our technologically advanced society—raking leaves or picking cotton? Before they can work usefully, they must be trained. This takes time, money, planning, and organization. Our job is to provide the opportunities for them to become skilled so that they can be useful and so that they can have the dignity that social usefulness brings to all human beings. We do not want to keep them unskilled and we do not want to undermine their desire and incentive to improve themselves to become skilled workers by appealing to their grosser selves by proposing bigger doles. Yet, President Kennedy's proposals are little more than larger doles. This is degrading, not upgrading our people.

Technological advancement—economic growth is good, not bad. Technological growth creates more new jobs than it displaces, but the people must become skilled in order to take on these jobs. That is the reason that in every labor market in the country today, even in the so-called depressed areas, at the same time there is unemployment there are jobs available going unfilled. We talk about needing more teachers, more doctors, more engineers, more nurses, and indeed we do, but the need and demand for skills is hardly limited to the high skills of the professions; it goes right down through the technician rank to all of what we term the skilled labor groups.

The way to grapple with the problem is through vocational education, industrial training, an improved unemployment insurance program which relates itself to the task of retraining. We can get on top of it. Furthermore, we can pay for it out of the increased productivity that technological advancement brings.

But Mr. Kennedy's recommendations are directed to tinkering with our economic successes, real and rapid technological growth, relative price stability, and a rather broad spreading of the wealth, not the failures, technological unemployment, and high costs in the economic growth areas. If we pursue this course, we will make failures out of these successes and by neglect make the damage from the failures worse. I recall Vice President JOHNSON's address to the jobless who rode to Washington in pullman cars 3 years ago. He said he was going right back to the Senate and put in a resolution to create a committee to go around the country to the depressed areas and come back with proposals for positive action to help them. I suggested that if such a committee were created, it go to the undepressed areas, not the depressed areas for ideas. I think we should study success, not failure, and apply the lessons we learn from these successes in our attempts to eliminate failures. Fortunately, the economy had recovered before Senator JOHNSON was able to put what he termed his positive plan for action into effect. Now we have the Secretary of Labor visiting the areas of failure for ideas of success.

Rapid economic growth means increased costs as well as increased frictional or technological employment. Machines as well as skills become obsolete and have to be junked and new ones procured, just as the obsolete skills are no longer used and the cost of training for new skills must be assumed. Rapid and technological growth depends upon moneys expended in research and development. All these expenditures and costs must be recouped in the price the consumer pays for the goods or services if we are to have a sound system. Properly handled, these costs can be recouped in the productivity gains resulting from the innovations.

The Consumer Price Index which is the basic economic statistical series we use to measure price does not take account of increased quality sufficiently to make it a thoroughly reliable series. Furthermore, increased choice or variety of products and services available to the consumer is a basic factor in increased standard of living for our people and increased flexibility and strength in our economy. Increased choice is by no means free; it, too, requires added expenditures which must be recouped in the price of the goods and services charged the consumer. The Consumer Price Index does not reflect the increased economic advantage to the consumer that this flexibility brings. Accordingly, a great deal of what has been referred to loosely as creeping inflation is not inflation at all, but the inadequacy of our economic measuring sticks.

By the same token, much of the implicit price deflation for total gross national product, based as it is to a great degree on the Consumer Price Index, is inaccurate and the growth ratios measured in unadjusted dollars are more real than they have been credited to be.

The productivity gains more than balance the costs of technological advancement. However, these lower costs are frequently hidden in the increased costs that arise from improved quality and increased variety. The consumer as well as the Consumer Price Index tend to ignore this important aspect of increased standard of living and increased strength and flexibility of the overall economy.

RAPID ADVANCEMENT IN AGRICULTURE AND HEALTH

In two major areas in our society, our technological growth has been so rapid that we have created difficult and, in a certain sense, new problems.

The first area I refer to is agriculture. Here the technological advancement has been so great and so rapid that millions of people who had skills of a sort in agriculture find that the skills are now obsolete, are no longer needed. The agricultural work which was rather plentiful 14 years ago and required little and sometimes practically no skill is now being performed by machines. This is success in the field of agriculture, not failure. Commercial agriculture is doing all right. If anything, it might be well if it slowed down a bit so we could get on top of the technological unemployment and cost problems that its very rapid growth has produced. We have a technological unemployment problem, not an agricultural problem. Until we understand this fact and face up to this cost item of success and take advantage of the released manpower, we are going to continue to slow the progress to all three of our goals.

First, better agriculture; second, better utilization of displaced manpower; and third, an economy assisted instead of hampered by the manner in which we meet goals No. 1 and No. 2.

The second area is in the field of health. So rapid has been our progress in this field that people are living on the average of 10 more years than ever anticipated. Absenteeism from work for health reasons is the lowest in our history. Worker productivity has increased greatly because of good health. Orphanages have closed their doors because parents do not die in epidemics any more. This real advancement in health has produced real costs. Yet, look how the leaders in this new administration approach this problem. By condemning the very professions which have brought this about, by suggesting that the increased costs that this advancement has required are somehow or other not true costs. That the public is being gouged, that the doctors or drug companies are not concerned about spreading the benefit of the advancements in health to all our people. The President's answer to the health problem of the aged, largely created by these recent great advancements, is to undermine the system which has produced the progress. Slowing or eliminating progress certainly will solve the cost of the health problem of the aged, and the rest of us, but not the way any one of us would want it. With no progress, we will not have to pay for the cost of new research and development, the cost of junking obsolete equipment and replacing it with new and better equipment and the cost of eliminating obsolete skills and bringing in and training new skills. We will not even need more doctors, nurses, or hospitals. The skills will remain the same, the equipment will remain the same, the techniques remain the same. The drugs will be the same. We will be stagnant.

CYBERNETICS

Another problem which rapid technological growth has presented to us is just beginning to be evaluated. The new science of cybernetics, the science of thinking machines. Business computers are revolutionizing the science of inventory control. There have been white-collar workers being displaced by these monsters. Let us relax and analyze the problem. There is no question that technological unemployment will be increased somewhat because of machines. Fortunately, as is usually the case in America, the private enterprise system is away ahead of the political government. Retraining programs have been in effect for some time to take the people whose skills are made obsolete by these computing machines and retrain them in new skills that are now needed. The political government could be working with this process, however, rather than by hindering it, as it is presently doing. Good sense suggests that no State in its unemployment compensation program under the Federal-State system should take a person who is technologically unemployed off unemployment compensation when he or she starts to go to school to get retraining in a new skill. Yet five States have statutes which make such backward provisions, and practically none encourage the reverse process. We should amend the unemployment insurance program so that in addition to taking a person off unemployment compensation for failure to accept a job commensurate with his or her skills, that person should also be removed if he fails, if his skill is obsolete or diminishing in demand, to go to school to learn a new skill among the many new ones now in demand because of the very technological advancements which produced the unemployment. I see no reason why the Federal-State unemployment insurance program should not absorb the cost of people with obsolete skills learning new skills either through giving a credit, possibly through a lower experience rating in its unemployment tax, to the industry that undertakes the retraining, or directly to the person who takes the training or to the school that teaches it. This is a proper cost to be borne by business generally. This cost of retraining will be more than recouped by the removal of some of the incentive for featherbedding that fear of technological unemployment creates in the minds of the employee and in the lowering of the number of long-term unemployed persons. The program would require the Department of Labor to do a much more extensive job than it presently is doing in the identification of skills by nomenclature, by geography, and by employer, in keeping the list up to date as technological advancement drops some skills out, alters others, and creates new ones.

DEPRESSED INDUSTRIES IN AN AREA

Furthermore, this is the proper approach to solving what has been called the depressed-area problem. The mistake in approaching the problem is in identifying it as a geographical problem rather than an industry problem. No area is depressed. It is simply an area where an industry important to the area has become depressed. Within the same area other industries are booming. The problem must be tackled on an industry basis, not a geographic basis. I believe that an improved unemployment insurance program along the lines I have suggested would adequately handle the depressed-area problem, although the failure to analyze the problem in the past has permitted the matter to get out of hand in certain spots, so there may be some additional efforts needed on a temporary basis to make up for the past neglect.

The recent or present recession has had as a substantial part of its cause a cutback in inventories. One very definite benefit of the tabulating machines now available is to permit inventories to be kept at more efficient levels. I believe some of the inventory cutbacks reflects this efficiency. This is good in the long run for our economy, but its short-run impact on production has had a slowing down effect. Stable wholesale

and raw material prices over a period of the past few years also have contributed to inventory cutback or keeping inventories at lower levels than during the periods of post-World War II inflation. If this is so, the prospect of more inflation, which the Kennedy programs would encourage if adopted en bloc, is having a countercyclical effect. It is an ill wind that blows no good. I hope this is not taken as encouragement to people to whistle for this ill wind, however.

TAX REFORM TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION

There is an important area where the Federal Government could help the long-run cause of economic growth and relieve the present recession. Yet the President is dramatic in his ambiguity in referring to it. I refer to liberalization of the tax laws in respect to allowances for recouping the cost of capital goods so their replacement may be financed. Today, because of the vast sums we have been spending in research and development, and the innovation that has resulted, one-third of our plant is obsolete. Good economics call for its replacement with the more efficient machines which have been developed. Yet our tax laws are geared to the economics of yesterday. We permit industry only to recoup the capital invested in a piece of equipment on the basis of when the equipment will wear out. Today equipment does not wear out as much as it becomes obsolete. We must adjust our tax laws to this new economic factor, if we are going to promote growth, not throttle it.

The President in his message talks about the performance of the economy in 1960 as being well below its capacity. What capacity? The truth is, we have very inadequate economic statistics to estimate industrial capacity. What figures we have include obsolete equipment, along with efficient equipment, simply because the obsolete is still on the books. Industry is certainly going to use its most efficient machinery first and let its obsolete machinery remain idle if there is any slack at all. Most of this unused capacity, I am afraid, is capacity that ought not to be used at all because of its obsolescence and inefficiency. This capacity should be junked and replaced with equipment of greater efficiency and capacity. This is the best way to solve our unused capacity. This unused capacity is the result of rapid economic growth, of dynamism. Yet it is referred to by the President's advisers of proof of the opposite—a sluggish and tired economy. A sluggish and tired economism has little or no obsolescence because there has been no innovation. Again we can solve the problem that economic growth creates by going backward. Is that where the new frontier is?

Yet, Mr. Kennedy wary of the views of Walter Reuther and other shortsighted labor leaders, I suspect, fails to come out clearly and openly for liberalized depreciation schedules. It is encouraging that he has not followed Mr. Reuther's lead as yet to the extent that he calls liberalized depreciation schedules an example of the "trickle down" theory of taxation. I hope the ambiguity which has led some people to believe that the President will recommend liberalized depreciation schedules will be clarified in that direction soon. Our economy needs this reform badly.

As to Mr. Reuther and those who follow his theme, I would challenge them to answer this question: Is not fighting liberalized depreciation schedules an undercover way of fighting automation; of fighting progress?

Mr. Kennedy says:

> Both full recovery and economic growth require expansion—for State and local government facilities.

The expansion of expenditures for State and local government facilities in the past few years has been astounding. Mr. Kennedy's message apparently has no concept of this expansion. Let me quote from a speech of Dr. Roger Freeman, "Are Bigger and Better Taxes Ahead?" which I placed in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 24, 1961, pages A445–A446; to place this matter in context:

> So if we are to use a meaningful past rate of governmental expansion we should choose a year when the buildup of our national defense reached a stable level and the shrinkage in the value of the dollar came to a crawl. Nineteen hundred and fifty-two is such a year. Military outlays have since risen little and the dollar lost only 10 percent of its value.
>
> This is what happened in the last 7 years (1952–59); public expenditures for war-connected purposes climbed from $58.3 to $59.8 billion (plus 3 percent); public expenditures for all other purposes climbed from $41.5 to $86.4 billion (plus 103 percent).
>
> Let us view this in its proper perspective. Between 1952 and 1959 population expanded 13 percent; gross national product, national income, personal income increased about 40 percent; personal consumption increased 42 percent; governmental expenditures for civilian purposes grew 108 percent.
>
> Never before in American history, not during the preceding 7 years, nor in the 1930's, did expenditures for public services expand so fast, absolutely or relatively. The past 7 years are without parallel in governmental growth in the United States.
>
> This fact is sufficiently well known, for several reasons:
>
> (a) Expenditures within the U.S. budget grew only 23 percent between 1952 and 1959 but Federal payments to the public outside the budget jumped 452 percent.
>
> (b) War-collected outlays remained relatively stable.
>
> (c) State and local finances grew much more rapidly than Federal finances but received less publicity.
>
> The fact is that during the past 7 years expenditures for the major public services such as education, welfare and pensions, highways, natural resources, parks, etc., doubled or more than doubled. Yet, we are told that they have grown too slowly and that the rate ought to be sharply stepped up.
>
> The historian Henry Steele Commager said a few months ago: "For who can doubt that—whether we like it or not—the welfare state is with us and is going to grow more rapidly in the next generation than it grew in the last."
>
> If public services were simply to maintain, in the next 11 years, the annual rate of growth which they showed in the past 7, they would in 1970 cost considerably more than $200 billion. Adding defense, foreign aid, veterans, and interest on the national debt, Government would be spending close to $300 billion a year.
>
> This could happen. But I doubt that it will. It is hard to conceive that the cost of public services can keep doubling every 7 years.
>
> For example, between 1922 and 1940 Federal revenues grew 64 percent, State-local revenues 113 percent; between 1944 and 1959 Federal revenues grew 68 percent, State-local revenues a spectacular 259 percent. During the last-mentioned period (1944–59) national income expanded 118 percent.

Does Mr. Kennedy really want this rate of expenditure expanded? I think he will do well, under the policies he is proposing, to maintain even a good percentage of the rate he has inherited.

ECONOMIC SHIFT FROM MANUFACTURING TO SERVICES

There is another basic economic phenomena which President Kennedy's economic messages ignore to which I would like to call attention. As a society's economy matures and technological advancement moves forward rapidly, the manufacturing sector begins to lose out, not in absolute figures or in productive capacity but in ratio to the fields of distribution and service. This natural process produces a stronger and more flexible economy. Yet this kind of a switch shows up poorly in the GNP indicator and, indeed, by itself, probably would reflect a decline. The shift which our society has been experiencing in post World War II years has brought better living through a better spread or distribution of the goods manufactured, more and better goods and services. It also has made our society economically stronger and more capable. This shift hopefully will continue. These are not essentially luxuries. Of the items listed under "services," of course, is education and training; also medical health. Good health means less absenteeism and better productivity; so does better housing mean better productivity; so do more leisure time and better recreation; so do more telephones; more electricity; more automobiles even if they do have tailfins; and more highways; and all the services that go with these items. To illustrate the point, I wish to quote from a speech I made on the floor of the House entitled "Red Growth Rate Found Lagging," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 5, pages 5790–5791:

> The people who come to Washington to promote Federal aid for health and housing do so partly on the plea that this is good economics. Bad housing makes for bad health, which promotes low productivity of the worker, including greater absenteeism.
>
> Does not poor housing and poor health facilities produce low productivity in Russia? The answer is that, of course, it does, and Russia, which has very poor housing, has a very low rate of productivity compared to the United States. For example, in urban areas Russia has 79 square feet of living space per person. The equivalent figure in the United States is 370 square feet per person. In Russia's new housing units in Moscow residents have 400 square feet per family of four. Each family shares a kitchen and bathroom with at least one other family. In 1959 in the United States in contrast, 61 percent of our nonfarm dwellers and 70 percent of farm dwellers owned their own homes and in standard metropolitan areas 93 percent of the owner-occupied units have full plumbing facilities and are classified as "not dilapidated."
>
> One way of testing a nation's economic capabilities is through the electric power available to the nation.

In 1958 Russia had a total generating capacity of 53 million kilowatts. The same year the United States had a capability of over 167 million kilowatts.

In 1959 Russia jumped to 59 million kilowatts.

During the same period the United States jumped to 183 million kilowatts.

Russia's announced goal for 1965 is 110–112 million kilowatts.

The United States is expected to have about 245 million kilowatts in 1965.

One of the important aspects of power is its usability and this depends to a large degree upon transmission lines.

At the end of 1957 the total length of transmission on lines of 35,000 volts and above in Russia was about 46,485 miles.

In the United States the same year the total length of lines, 35,000 volts and above, was 240,000 miles.

I need not dwell on the fact that Russia has at least three times the distances to be covered as the United States.

In 1958, 80 percent of the power generated in Russia was devoted to industry and construction. Only about 16 percent went for rural and residential use.

In 1959 Russia produced 1,161 kilowatt-hours per capita.

In 1959 the United States produced 4,481 kilowatt-hours per capita.

The average home use of electricity in Russia is about 400 kilowatt-hours a year.

In the United States the average home use of power in 1959 was about 3,550 kilowatt-hours per year.

Just imagine how this affects productivity per worker. Just imagine how this relates to education, and home study entirely apart from the well-being of the people.

Incidentally there is practically no rural electrification in Russia and Russia's farm production utilizing half her population shows it.

But even in the area of utilization of personnel in the power industry itself which Russia has upgraded well ahead of almost any other industry we find some startling contrasts—as we should expect when we analyze the health, housing, and educational standards of Russia. Russia has shown remarkable progress for Russia, however. From 1950 to 1957 the number of personnel per megawatt of installed capacity was reduced from 9.6 to 5.6 persons. By 1958 in the larger power stations with a capacity of 500,000 kilowatts or over, the number of personnel was 2 to 2.5 persons per megawatt of installed capacity. In the United States, according to the Federal Power Commission, the large coal-burning plants built during the last decade require from 0.2 to 0.5 employees per megawatt of plant capacity.

Improvement in the somewhat intangible economic fields of service and distribution strengthens a society for both peace and war and the statements made by some of the President's advisers that these items are luxuries, thereby implying that they do not increase our economic capabilities and capacity are untrue.

OUR FUTURE

A lack of understanding of our successes as well as our problems may easily destroy that which has produced the progress. Much can be done and should be done to improve our economic picture. In certain areas healthy progress requires some basic legislation such as coping with technological unemployment through, as I have suggested, a basic addition to the unemployment insurance program. We also might increase our rate of expenditures in vocational education. This is truly a bold proposal because Federal expenditures for vocational education have almost been tripled in the past 8 years.

The vitality of our economy is the private enterprise system. The key to this system is the free marketplace. Government's primary function is to keep the marketplace free so that the individual person can make his economic decisions. Just as in political science government's primary function is to keep the ballot box free so that the individual person can make his political decisions.

No economic oligarchy, or political bureaucracy, can over a period of time exceed the collective wisdom of the people in a society, either in the field of economics or in the field of political science. This can be a matter of faith; certainly the United States was established upon this belief. However, what knowledge is available to us through history and our own experiences should also convince us of it.

Today we are at our highest economic peak. The economy is dynamic, not sluggish and tired, and the problems that face us are those resulting from this dynamism. The New Frontier seeks to persuade us that we are tired and, to solve the problems that face us, we should go to a paternalistic state. This will undermine the incentive of our people which is the wellspring of progress. This will solve the problems of economic growth by eliminating economic growth. It is a course I trust we as a nation will refuse to follow.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that housing construction is one of the proven stimulants to our entire economy. But there is much more to the problem of increasing this construction than just decreasing the interest rates on FHA insured mortgage loans.

One of the best articles on this housing subject for 1961 which it has been my privilege to read was by Prof. Fred E. Case of the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California at Los Angeles, prepared for the Savings and Loan Journal, official publication of the California Savings and Loan League.

His prediction on what is ahead for housing in 1961 reads as follows:

Unlike many previous years, housing has not helped bolster the economy in 1960 but has been suffering something of a decline. Only in the last quarter has housing construction increased sufficiently to keep 1960 from being one of the low construction years. Approximately 1,260,000 housing units will be started (using the new Bureau of the Census) and the dollar volume of private nonfarm residential construction will equal approximately $21.3 billion.

SOME QUESTIONS

What will happen in 1961 depends upon the answers to a number of questions:

1. Is there a significant and permanent adjustment between the demand for and the supply of housing?

Although vacancy rates in single-family homes for sale continues to hover around 1 percent, those in residential rental units have been climbing steadily and are now fluctuating between 7 and 8 percent.

2. Must depreciation or loss of capital now be included as a cost of property ownership or investing?

Depreciation has been treated for so long as a form of tax-free income that investors forget that real estate is basically a wasting asset. The slight inflationary bias of the economy will probably make this less important in new properties, but the increasing balance between supply and demand undoubtedly presages the incidence of real depreciation charges in older properties.

3. Will recentralization accelerate?

The costs of extending sewage lines, utilities, roads, and other facilities to the extreme suburbs has now reached a point of marginal returns for both builders and local governments so that recentralization is becoming increasingly attractive. Moreover, an increasing proportion of the population is being made up of young married couples and retired persons, both seeking the cheaper, more easily maintained apartments found in central districts. Undoubtedly the massive urban redevelopment programs being promised as antirecession measures will hasten this trend.

4. What of the impact of rapidly rising property taxes?

As local governments face rising demands for varieties of public services they are shifting the costs increasingly to property tax rolls. Sales and payroll taxes are constantly being threatened, but property taxes continue to rise. Under such conditions, renters are a little better off because rental levels and rental competition may not permit the landlord to shift all of the rising tax burden to his tenants.

5. What about the role of income tax advantages?

As the new administration seeks ways of closing loopholes in the Federal income tax law, there is increasing evidence that mortgage interest and property taxes may be eliminated as deductions for property owners. While no such drastic measures would probably be taken, nevertheless, there is a good possibility that these advantages could be modified in some degree.

6. Will there be an increase in "social investments" by the present administration?

Another promise of the new administration has been more social investments will be undertaken. Included in such investments would be programs of public housing, veterans' housing, housing for the aged and low cost housing. Such investments would obviously stimulate the construction industry and bolster sagging prices in some areas. For example, outstanding credit commitments of the Federal Government are now in the neighborhood of $60 billion.

7. What about the increases in nondiscrimination housing legislation?

A surprising large potential market for medium price housing exists among all minority groups who have enjoyed above average income increases in many areas. As these groups find new markets open to them, they could generate a relatively modest but important supplementary housing demand.

8. Will land costs continue to rise?

The shift to multifamily construction has been occasioned in many cases by the high costs of residential lots. The high rate of urbanization offers little hope of reduced

land costs unless new methods can be devised for manufacturing land cheaply.

There are some events in the marketplace about which questions need to be raised, at least in 1961. The overall effect of these events, about which only hypotheses can be raised at the present time, is generally to act as a brake on any extensive increasing in either housing sales or construction:

(a) In spite of the population explosion which is being cited as a cause for business optimism, families usually do not enter the housing market until the head of the household is in his late thirties. This particular age group will not cause an appreciable impact on housing demand until 1963 or later.

(b) The gap between rental costs and home ownership costs is narrowing rapidly in favor of renting primarily because of high property taxes, interest rates, building and maintenance costs. The rapid increase in apartments is also keeping rents within reasonable ranges. For example, in 1955, 102,000 new apartments were built as compared to 257,000 in 1959.

(c) The changing age structure previously alluded to, will create a demand for smaller units as more and more households come to be made up of single persons, retired couples, young couples, all of whom will have relatively limited incomes.

(d) The change from the fabulous fifties to the soaring sixties is still primarily only a change of numbers. Often overlooked is the fact that numerous economic indicators show there are some knotty problems which must be worked out in the early part of this decade if the promises of the decade are to be realized.

(e) One of the real obstacles to home ownership and construction is the consistently high level of mortgage interest rates. A modicum of relief is in sight but will probably have only slight impact because of the high costs of lending operations faced by institutional lenders, who supply 90 percent or more of the mortgage money. In addition, there is little likelihood that demands for funds from other parts of the economy will be diminished to any extent nor does there appear to be much chance for a significant increase in personal savings which form the base for much mortgage lending.

(f) In many ways 1959 and 1960 were unusually poor years and were running counter to secular movements. It is highly unlikely that 1961 could go any lower.

THE PROMISE OF 1961

Perhaps the previous observation is the best clue as to what can be expected in 1961. Housing can't go any lower, but there are too many depressants to keep it from rising too high. Most prognosticators predict between a 3 and 5 percent overall increase in all aspects of the housing and construction markets. The results need to be compared with what have been accepted as average annual needs of the sixties because of the promises this generated for better markets in the late sixties. Private and public new construction in 1960 will equal approximately $55.4 billion as compared to an annual decade average need of between $58 and $60 billion. Nineteen hundred and sixty-one will probably produce a total of $57.6 billion. Private nonfarm residential construction has been estimated at $21.3 billion for 1960, at an annual needed rate of $20 to $23 billion for the decade and will probably equal $22.2 billion for 1961 or 53 percent of total new construction by private investors. Housing starts for 1960 have been estimated at 1,299,000 of which 1,268,000 were private starts. The annual needs for the decade have been placed at between 1.5 and 1.7 million. Housing starts for 1961 will probably equal 1,315,000 for the private sector and 35,000 for the public sector for a total of 1,350,000.

In California residential construction will probably equal approximately 12 percent of the national total which would mean approximately 155,000 units or expenditures of $2.5 to $3 billion.

NEEDED: NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the President, in his state of the Union address, has stressed the great importance of higher education to our Nation and to our national future. Education has rightly been called our first line of defense. The challenge of the Soviet Union, which is graduating more scientists, professionals and engineers every year makes it imperative that we redouble our own efforts in this supremely vital field.

And yet, it has been estimated that over half of our qualified high school graduates do not attend college. To say that this is an appalling waste of our greatest national resource is, at best, an understatement. Every one of these young people represents a frightening loss to our future potential.

A major reason, of course, is the financial one. At least 100,000 qualified graduates do not go on to college each year simply because they cannot afford it.

This is not merely a personal problem, or a local problem: it is national in scope and implication. It has become a national obligation to provide the educational opportunity which is so clearly in the national interest.

Some progress, of course, was made through the National Defense Education Act, which initiated a program of loans and fellowships in 1958. Through the provisions of this act a number of young people who otherwise might not have been able to attend college have been enabled to do so. But if anything is clear from the implementation of this act, it is that we have made only a bare beginning.

In order to expand the scope of this act, I suggest that we initiate a program of scholarships, in addition to loans, on the undergraduate level. Many of us will recall that this was part of the original concept of the 1958 act, which, however, did not survive the conference.

I have introduced a bill for this purpose, and I urge that it be given careful consideration along with the other proposals for expanding the National Defense Education Act to meet the urgently critical and pressing needs of our prospective college applicants.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION THROUGH THE OECD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the convention establishing the OECD has been sent to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is now considering the convention and has heard witnesses from the executive branch and private organizations.

It is essential that the United States become a member of the OECD. Both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs have said that failure of the United States to approve this convention and join the Organization would be a lethal blow to economic cooperation between North America and Western Europe.

There are many difficult problems facing the United States today which cannot be solved without the cooperation of our friends in Canada and Western Europe. The proposed OECD would provide an excellent means for regular consultation on these problems among the 20 countries who will be members of the Organization.

The United States is concerned with measures to invigorate our economy while also improving our balance-of-payments position. As Secretary Dillon said in his presentation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the effectiveness of such measures will depend in part on the extent to which the major Western European countries pursue compatible policies. The days are gone when we could take measures to stimulate our economy without regard to their international repercussions and without considering the impact on the U.S. economy of measures taken by the major Western European countries. The OECD will be an extremely useful mechanism for coordinating the economic policies of the members.

The other major economic problem facing us is the determination of the less-developed countries rapidly to increase the standard of living of their peoples. The OECD Convention recognizes that the member countries must act together to help the less-developed countries help themselves by increasing the assistance made available to them by the major industrialized countries of the Atlantic area.

As Secretary Ball pointed out in his presentation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the objectives of stimulating economic growth among the OECD members and of providing increased assistance to the less-developed countries cannot be dealt with in an international context without considering broad trade policies. Accordingly, the OECD also has as an aim the promotion of policies by the member countries to contribute to the expansion of world trade. However, this does not mean, as some of the opponents of the OECD have claimed, that the OECD will administer the GATT or engage in tariff negotiations.

We have been assured by the Secretary of State, by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the Under Secretary

of State for Economic Affairs that the OECD will not be a trade organization, and will neither establish nor administer trade rules. Nor will the OECD conduct tariff negotiations.

Thus, both for the positive things the OECD will be and for the negative things the OECD will not be, the United States should join the OECD.

The new Organization for Economic Cooperation can be of great usefulness to the United States. I am convinced that the fears which have been expressed are completely without basis and I earnestly hope that there will be no delay in our acceptance of the convention and that the Organization will come into being at the earliest possible date.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today is commemorated the 141st anniversary of the birth of a great American citizen and woman, Susan B. Anthony.

Her life was dedicated to the noble purpose of achieving equality for women. Today the women of America are indebted to her not only because of legal recognition for their status, but more important, because of the opportunities afforded them to contribute to the cultural, intellectual, and professional activities of our great Nation. Thus, a new source of strength and energy was infused into our national life by this recognition.

Susan B. Anthony was a native of Massachusetts. But her cause for woman suffrage affected not only the entire United States but the influence of her movement extended far beyond our shores. To women everywhere, she will always remain the symbol for a cause which is not only noble, but which is grounded in the very fundamentals of right. Her influence has given hope to women who are still under laws of inequality.

Her native State has honored her memory by celebrating a day in her honor on August 26, the day that equal suffrage became law as an amendment to the Constitution. On this, her birthday, we join with our colleagues in paying tribute to her memory and with women everywhere who are grateful for her having lived a life of dedication to their cause.

EXPORTS OF MACHINE TOOLS TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California. [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I view with serious concern the reports in the press yesterday, February 16, 1961, that the Department of Commerce has just indicated it has authorized shipment to the U.S.S.R. of $1,500,000 worth of precision machinery. According to the accounts these machines could, and presumably would, be put to military use by the Russians.

Involved is a shipment of some 45 precision grinding machines. They are one of a number of components in the making of small ballbearings.

Authority for this transaction, it is reported, was first approved last year but approval was suspended due to objections by the Department of Defense on the grounds that the equipment could have only military use. It appears from these reports that the Department of Defense still objects to this shipment but that the Department of Commerce has, in effect, overruled these objections.

In this connection, I believe that the Congress and the public would be interested in knowing of other authorizations granted by the Department of Commerce last year for the export of $6,110,000 worth of machines, described as being for the manufacture of automobile parts.

One of these authorizations was for the export of a multistation machine for machining V–8 cylinder blocks, of a value of $3,400,000, and for a multistation machine for machining V–8 cylinder heads, of a value of $1,900,000.

Briefly these machines can mill, drill, bore, ream, tap, etc., aluminum castings for V–8 cylinder blocks and heads. Machines of this type can be used in the mass production of all metal manufactures, such as refrigerators, tractors, electrical motors, etc.

The other authorization was for the export to the U.S.S.R. of six 8-spindle gear hobbing machines, with a total value of $810,000. These machines can be used in plants which manufacture gears for automobiles, trucks, tractors, and farm implements. They are a mass production machine for gears of wide application. Both spiral and straight tooth gears can be cut on these machines.

The purchaser in the U.S.S.R. for the gear hobbing and the multistation machines is the Soviet organization Stankoimport, which is the central Soviet organization for importing metalworking machinery. The exact location of where these machines will be used is not known to the Department of Commerce. Presumably the exact use to which they will be put is not known to the Department either, although it is stated that they are to be used for the manufacture of automobile parts.

My information is that these machines, for which the export licenses will expire on June 1, 1961—for the multistation machine tools—and July 22, 1961—for the gear hobbing machines—had not been shipped as of several days ago.

Because in my view exports of this type involve questions of extreme importance, which should be looked into thoroughly by Congress, I have introduced House Resolution 170 to authorize and direct a full and complete investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949.

I feel there exists a pressing need to evaluate the Export Control Act and its administration by the Department of Commerce to determine the effect on our national security of the decisions made and policies established in carrying out the act. It is my further belief that the Congress needs to look closely into the manner in which the Department of Commerce performs its duty, as required under the act, of consulting with other departments of Government interested in the export policies established under the Export Control Act.

A basic question that must be faced, of course, is in regard to what type of trade should be authorized with the Soviet bloc. Obviously, for example, in the case of the precision machine tools to manufacture ballbearings, there is a serious difference of opinion as to whether export of such machines should be allowed. The policies established under the act are of vital significance, for their possible effect in contributing to both Soviet military and economic and trade warfare potential, and, in my view, we must exercise utmost caution.

I believe strongly in American industry and know full well that we must do business to operate. Furthermore, we need to maintain employment in every way reasonably possible. But at the same time I believe that we must evaluate these matters very thoroughly on the basis of their effect on national security. Let us not be lulled into falling for short-term, illusory gains such as might result from the sale of such machinery if at the same time such a transaction could adversely affect our entire national security and thus prove to be to the detriment of all of us. I firmly hope that action may be taken immediately on this resolution.

BRUSSELS PLANE DISASTER

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is stunned by the plane disaster near Brussels yesterday which wiped out 73 lives, including 17 members of our U.S. figure skating team.

Only a few Sundays ago, millions of us sat enchanted before our television sets watching the dazzling skill of these youngsters competing at Colorado Springs. It is especially poignant to recall the excitement in their voices as they told of their forthcoming trip to Prague for the international contest.

Three of the victims of the crash were from Winchester, in the Fifth District of Massachusetts, Mrs. Maribel Vinson Owen and her two daughters, Laurence and Maribel. Mrs. Owen, a great champion in her own right, held nine national championships. Both her lovely daughters were following in the tracks of their mother's silver skates. Laurence

at 16 was North American figure skating champion; Maribel held the U.S. pairs championship with Dudley Richards, of Boston, another casualty of the crash.

Words are insufficient when tragedy such as this strikes. My heartfelt sympathy goes to the families of all the victims of this shocking accident.

TELEVISING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives so as to authorize committees in their discretion to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of their proceedings by radio and television and the dissemination of news of committee proceedings through all media of communication.

The text of this resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 173

That rule XI 26(g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(g)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Each committee may, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its proceedings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of its proceedings by such methods and by other methods and media of communication."

Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the House rules is urgently needed.

In the 82d Congress the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, in answer to a parliamentary inquiry propounded by the then minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, ruled that committees had no power to authorize telecasting or broadcasting of their public hearings on the grounds that the rules of the House, which are expressly made the rules of its committees, are silent and do not expressly authorize committees to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their hearings.

The parliamentary inquiry and the ruling on it were prompted by hearings being held at that time by the House Un-American Activities Committee in the city of Detroit. Until the Speaker's ruling was made, that committee had permitted its proceedings to be televised and broadcast—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, pages 1334–1335.

In the 83d Congress under Speaker MARTIN, of Massachusetts, without any formal ruling, House committees were authorized to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their proceedings and did, in fact, allow such broadcasting and telecasting and other reporting of their proceedings by photography, moving pictures, and so forth.

In the 84th Congress—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 628—I propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, as the result of which the Speaker ruled that committees were not authorized to permit telecasting or broadcasting or photographic coverage of their committee proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I interpret the rules as they now stand as containing authority for the Speaker to permit broadcasting, telecasting, and photography of proceedings in the Chamber of the House of Representatives in the Speaker's discretion and, accordingly, as authorizing committees to do the same. Apparently this was the interpretation that Speaker MARTIN also placed on the rules.

To resolve all doubt, however, I believe the rules should be amended as I am now proposing in the resolution I introduced today. This, or a similar resolution, has been introduced by me in each Congress commencing with the 84th, as follows:

Eighty-fourth Congress, House Resolution 99, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 1, page 494.

Eighty-fifth Congress, House Resolution 285, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 8, pages 10025–10026.

Eighty-sixth Congress, House Resolution 64, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 1, page 62.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the House of Representatives should have the right to make a determination on this most basic matter of House policy. Although I have consistently pressed for action on this resolution in previous Congresses, no action was taken nor were hearings held.

I commend the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] for having set hearings to commence next Tuesday, February 21, on this subject. Action is long overdue and the House should no longer be prevented from expressing its views on this most important subject of interest not only to each Member, but to the power, prestige, and welfare of the House of Representatives itself.

Mr. Speaker, in a government such as ours, where the people are sovereign, the electorate should have the fullest information possible about the public business, the manner in which elected and appointed officials are discharging the responsibilities which they hold in trust for the American people, and so that the decisions which the electorate itself makes from time to time can be founded upon the most complete and most accurate information possible.

In obtaining this information the public ought to be permitted full use of all the media of communication, including the recent history-making advances in radio and television. At public hearings of committees anyone is entitled to attend as a spectator. Is it not rank discrimination against those who have neither the time nor the money to travel to the seat of government to be excluded as witnesses to public hearings of committees by denying to them the use of television and radio and still and moving photography to enable them to learn about the public business?

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has no prohibition against telecasting its committee hearings and we all recall how many Senate committees have become familiar in every household in the United States through the telecasting and broadcasting of their proceedings. You will remember the Kefauver investigation of interstate crime, the Army-McCarthy hearings, and the McClellan committee hearings on labor racketeering.

Beginning with President Eisenhower the President's press conferences have been telecast. Thus, the public becomes familiar with the President and his views and the Senators and their views and activities. But there is a blackout on House committees and the public has no direct access to these committees except as they may appear in person as spectators. They obtain their knowledge only from newspaper accounts of hearings and such television, radio, and photographic coverage as can be obtained outside the committee room. Thus, the people are less aware of the activities of House committees and are less well informed on the subjects of national interest with which those committees deal, and naturally have a tendency to downgrade the House and its contribution to our national policies. This tends to impair the prestige and the influence on public opinion of the House of Representatives and its Members and thus weakens what has been called the greatest parliamentary body in the world instead of strengthening it.

I sincerely hope that the hearings of the Rules Committee will show the desirability of this reform in House procedure and that the newly constituted House Rules Committee will not bottle up this salutary measure but will permit the House of Representatives to work its will on this basic procedural reform.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CORMAN, for the period February 17 through February 24, on account of official business in his district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today, and on Monday, February 20, 1961.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS, for 1 hour, on February 23 and February 24.

Mr. MADDEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN), today, for 1 hour.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. LANGEN), for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 20, 1961.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, February 21, 1961, to speak on the anniversary of the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine*.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. INOUYE to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILBERT.
Mr. FRIEDEL.
Mr. SANTANGELO.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. FALLON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY.
Mrs. DWYER.
Mr. MATHIAS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 681. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 20, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	$8,772.00
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	8,051.46
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	7,612.08
Hyde H. Murray	Assistant clerk	6,613.22
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	4,727.28
Betty M. Prezioso	do	4,727.28
Pauline E. Graves	do	4,484.28
Gladys N. Ondarcho	do	3,998.22
Judith Phillips	Staff assistant (July 1 to Oct. 1, 1960).	1,290.27
Peggy Jean Lamm	Staff assistant (Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1960).	2,597.96
Joan M. Lemense	Staff assistant (Sept. 1 to 10, 1960).	160.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,098.30
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 1, 1960	4,152.47
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 1, 1960	12,250.77
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 1, 1960	37,749.23

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Kenneth Sprankle	Clerk and staff director.	$8,824.74
Paul M. Wilson	do	8,824.74
Carson W. Culp	Staff assistant	8,754.48
Samuel W. Crosby	do	8,754.48
Jay B. Howe	do	8,578.68
Ross P. Pope	do	8,578.68
Robert M. Moyer	do	8,578.68
Frank Sanders	do	8,051.46
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	8,051.46
Robert P. Williams	Editor	7,260.60
Aubrey A. Gunnels	Staff assistant	6,909.12
Robert L. Michaels	do	6,733.38
Kelly Campbell	do	6,294.00
G. Homer Skarin	do	5,942.52
Earl C. Silsby	do	5,634.96
Francis G. Merrill	do	5,634.96
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	4,605.78
Ralph Preston	Staff assistant	4,217.62
Donald F. Berens	Clerical assistant	3,395.70
Kenneth A. Meade	do	3,294.42
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	2,124.84
George S. Green	Clerk to the minority.	8,051.46
Nancie Hammack	Clerk-stenographer	2,150.45
Gloria Jean Kilgore	do	1,817.79
Viola W. Grubbs	do	3,086.82
Rose Marie Kline	do	3,086.82
Jeanne C. Smith	do	3,086.82
Rosalind E. McGovern.	do	3,086.82
June R. Austin	do	3,086.82
Patrick M. Hayes	do	3,086.82
Catherine D. Norrell	do	3,086.82
Donald L. Bernard	do	3,086.82
Phyllis N. Troy	do	3,086.82
William J. Neary	do	3,086.82
George C. Drescher, Jr.	do	2,884.32
Ruth R. Hollowell	do	2,783.04
Silas Taber	do	3,086.82
Elinor L. Malaney	do	3,086.82
Alice Beach	do	3,086.82
Robert Dunkel	do	3,086.82
Josephine Birdsall	do	3,086.82
David R. Hansen	do	3,086.82
Margie H. Trew	do	3,086.82
Ruth Mahder	do	2,884.32
Anne Ryall Sylvester	do	2,884.32
John Henry Murphy	do	2,884.32
Esther T. Purser	do	787.80
Alfred E. Andersen	do	1,028.94
Patricia Ann Greaver	do	826.42
Mary Lucy Walker	do	1,269.03
James D. Burris	Staff assistant	1,495.57
Eleanor G. Barnes	Clerk-stenographer	514.47
Alexander J. Smith	do	758.90
Lucille K. Brand	do	514.47
Barbara A. Prah	do	514.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	$225,571.33
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	225,571.33
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961	

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
(INVESTIGATIONS STAFF)

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Joseph K. Ponder	Director, surveys and investigations staff.	$7,281.12
Kenneth T. Delavigne	Assistant director, surveys and investigations staff.	7,084.86
William B. Soyars	do	7,104.63
Lillian M. Mackie	Stenographer	3,289.38
Helen C. Parrish	do	2,985.60
John J. Donnelly	Consultant	7,500.00
George Y. Harvey	do	50.00
REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES		
Agriculture, Department of:		
Magee, Leroy F	Investigator	$755.90
Struttmann, Ernest L.	do	3,309.25
Army, Department of:		
Cranks, Joseph R	do	4,773.00
Atomic Energy Commission:		
Ohnstad, Lawrence R.	do	3,735.95
Civil Service Commission:		
McQuoid, George J	do	4,974.47
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, Carl L	do	6,487.44
Bolz, Charles	do	6,633.20
Brent, Aubrey S	do	4,968.00
Chisholm, Leslie B., Jr.	do	6,084.96
Crowley, Theodore P.	do	5,435.52
Durland, Peter R	do	3,814.40
Giovannetti, Carlton.	do	6,487.44
Grealy, Francis P	do	5,315.76
Haebel, James C	do	4,477.92
Hayden, Albert C., Jr.	do	6,622.72
Hayes, Edward Joseph.	do	6,633.20
Health benefits fund.		867.28
Leen, Maurice P	Investigator	5,279.36
Life insurance fund		421.50
Love, Warren L	Investigator	6,487.44
Martinson, Walter C.	do	4,968.00
Murphy, Peter J., Jr.	do	5,830.60
McElece, Richard F.	do	3,577.60
Oldham, David W	do	3,194.88
Reamy, W. Wallace	do	5,663.52
Retirement fund		8,508.94
Ruhl, John A	Investigator	5,713.20
Tucker, George R	do	6,487.44
Vahey, Eugene W	do	5,663.52
Vericker, William A	do	5,009.20
Walters, Leonard M	do	5,663.52
Wood, H. Branch	do	6,487.44
Woolf, Richard M	do	5,940.40
Young, Roger	do	3,165.36
General Services Administration:		
Chapman, Howard K., Jr.	do	4,175.14
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Monahan, John F	do	2,283.00
Interior, Department of the:		
Rice, Harry W	do	3,629.64
Navy, Department of the:		
Williams, Ben M	do	5,321.28
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		56,830.32
Transfer to fiscal year 1960 account.		23,500.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	----------
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	300,482.30
Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	300,482.30
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	199,517.70

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to January 1, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$8,824.74
John R. Blandford	Counsel	8,798.40
Philip W. Kelleher	do	8,798.40
Frank M. Slatinshek	do	7,796.64
Oneta L. Stockstill	Committee secretary.	4,676.70
Berniece Kalinowski	Secretary	4,676.70
L. Louise Ellis	do	4,676.70
Marie M. Abbott	do	3,861.48
M. Jane Binger	do	3,547.56
James A. Deakins	Bill clerk	3,547.56

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL OPERATING PURSUANT TO H. RES. 19 AND 20, 86TH CONG.

John J. Courtney	Special counsel	$8,824.74
William H. Sandweg	Assistant counsel	6,975.00
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	4,403.28
Jane Wheelahan	do	3,456.42
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	3,248.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	91,850.02
Amount expended from July 1, 1960, to Jan. 1, 1961	28,102.42
Total amount expended from January 1959 to January 1961	119,952.44
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1961	30,047.56

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 1, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon	Clerk and general counsel.	$8,824.74
John E. Barriere	Majority staff member.	8,824.74
Orman S. Fink	Minority staff member.	$8,824.74
Robert R. Poston	Counsel	8,824.74
Helen L. Rogers (nee Helen E. Long).	Deputy clerk	5,204.16
Mary W. Layton	Assistant clerk	5,204.16
John M. Devlin	Editor (terminated Sept. 30, 1960).	3,586.38
Marguerite Bean	Secretary to chairman.	6,030.36
Alicia F. Shoemaker	Secretary to minority.	4,838.70
Roger J. Brown	Editor (began service Oct. 1, 1960).	3,002.01

EMPLOYEES PURSUANT TO H. RES. 81 SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Kenneth W. Burrows	Economist	$7,796.64
Eleanor N. Hamilton	Research assistant	3,547.56
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Assistant staff director.	8,824.74
Grady Perry, Jr.	Clerk	5,397.48
Margaret E. Tucker	Secretary	4,307.04
Frances Yeakle	do	3,491.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$205,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	103,701.35
Amount expended from June 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	38,818.09
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	142,519.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	62,480.56

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$8,824.74
William R. Foley	General counsel	8,824.74
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant.	8,824.74
Murray Drabkin	Counsel	6,733.38
Herbert N. Maletz	Counsel (from Dec. 1, 1960).	1,429.78
William H. Crabtree	Associate counsel	7,245.98
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	3,795.66
Anne J. Berger	do	5,397.48
Jane Caldwell	Clerical staff (from Oct. 1, 1960).	1,644.69
Frances F. Christy	Clerical staff	5,204.16
James G. Cline	Assistant counsel	5,397.48
Helen Goldsmith	Clerical staff	4,842.06
Velma Smedley	do	5,397.48

SALARIES PAID JULY 1, 1960, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1960, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 27, H. RES. 92, AND H. RES. 425, 86TH CONG.

Employee	Profession	Salary
Appel, Leonard	Assistant counsel	$6,733.38
Beland, Lorraine W.	Clerk-stenographer	143.36
Burak, Gertrude C.	Clerk-typist	4,504.50
Caldwell, Jane C.	Clerk-typist (to Oct. 1, 1960).	1,644.69
Dunn, Dorothy H.	Clerk-stenographer	865.80
Eisenberg, Roberta E.	do	3,795.66

SALARIES PAID JULY 1, 1960, THROUGH DEC. 31, 1960, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 27, H. RES. 92, AND H. RES. 425, 86TH CONG.—continued

Employee	Profession	Salary
Finger, Alexander E.	Assistant counsel	$6,381.90
Flynn, Catherine M.	Clerk-stenographer	556.61
Fuchs, Herbert	Assistant counsel	6,733.38
Jett, R. Frederick	do	6,645.48
Kelen onick Michael	Clerk	3,593.16
Maletz, Herbert N.	Chief counsel, antitrust (to Dec. 1, 1960).	7,148.90
Meekins, Elizabeth G.	Clerk-stenographer	3,759.66
Peet, Richard C.	Assistant counsel	4,112.79
Robin, Stephen	Clerical staff assistant.	714.23
Rubenstein, Howard J.	Assistant counsel	1,799.16
Sanders, Marleah	Clerk-stenographer	229.38
Shea, Mary Pat	do	2,884.32
Signman, Julian H.	Associate chief counsel, antitrust.	7,348.50
Sky, Theodore	Assistant counsel	3,776.10
Walden, Jerrold L.	do	3,383.15
Williams, Stephen L.	Messenger	2,377.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$425,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	252,522.24
Amount expended from July 1, 1960, through Dec. 31, 1960	95,534.40
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, through Dec. 31, 1960	348,056.64
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	76,943.36
Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws:	
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1960	83,505.77
Expended June 30–Dec. 31, 1960	21,895.56
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960	61,610.21
B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1960	85,313.84
Expended June 30–Dec. 31, 1960	8,617.93
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960	76,695.91
C. Revision of the laws, 1960:	
Unexpended balance June 30, 1960	1,677.94
Expended June 30–Dec. 31, 1960	1,635.63
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960 (to be returned to Treasury)	42.31
D. Revision of the laws, 1961:	
Received from Legislative Appropriation Act, 1961	18,150.00
Expended June 30–Dec. 31, 1960	8,873.24
Balance, Dec. 31, 1960	9,276.76

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	$8,051.46
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	5,942.52
W. N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	8,557.99
Dixon D. Davis	Assistant clerk	3,537.42
Donald J. Tubridy	Minority clerk	5,397.48
Ruth Butterworth	Secretary	4,767.78
Ann L. Puryear	Assistant clerk	4,065.74
Lillian B. Hamilton	do	3,390.60
Ellen M. Coxeter	do	3,188.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 143, Feb. 24, 1959)	$10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,833.26
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	1,033.10
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	6,166.74

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

STANDING COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	$8,772.00
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel	8,772.00
Melvin W. Snead	Minority clerk	8,772.00
Charles T. Lane	Assistant clerk	8,772.00
Levi K. Alderman, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,772.00
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk	3,917.22
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	3,917.22
Gladys M. Rafter	do	3,917.22
Ida S. Miller	do	3,917.22
James B. Wells	do	4,118.82
Olive M. Gibbons	Stenographer (July 1 to 10, inclusive).	130.54
Colie V. Williamson	Field investigator (July 1 to 10, inclusive).	185.39
Elizabeth W. Adams	Stenographer (through Sept. 10).	1,009.04
Harry V. Barnard	Research assistant (through Aug. 31).	1,612.90
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel	6,733.38
Mary M. Callaway	Stenographer	2,601.84
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	1,347.66
Mary Sue Leonard	Secretary	3,301.17
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	5,325.00
John D. Messick	Assistant to director	6,982.20
J. Noble Richards	Staff assistant (minority).	5,378.16
Russell H. Riggs	Clerk (through Sept. 15).	1,578.92
W. Wilson Young	Counsel	6,733.38
Jane L. Wilson	Stenographer (effective Aug. 22).	2,115.37
Charles E. Wilson	Clerk (effective Sept. 1).	2,668.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$328,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	219,362.03
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31	74,238.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31	293,600.05
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	44,080.82

———,
Chairman.

JANUARY 5, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator	$8,824.74
Roy J. Bullock	Senior staff consultant.	8,723.70
Albert C. F. Westphal	Staff consultant	8,723.70
Franklin J. Schupp	do	8,644.62
Henry E. Billingsley	Consultant	8,600.70
Harry C. Cromer	Investigator-consultant.	7,528.62
June Nigh	Senior staff assistant	6,294.00
Winifred G. Osborne	Staff assistant	5,942.52
Helen C. Mattas	do	5,527.98
Myrtle M. Melvin	do	5,397.48
Helen L. Hashagen	do	5,397.48
Mary Louise O'Brien	do	5,300.82
Ann L. Clark	do	3,228.60
Robert J. Bowen	Clerical assistant	3,937.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	50,747.29
Amount expended from July 1, to December 31, 1960	$39,804.74
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959 to June 30, 1960	99,552.03
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	50,447.97

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1960, to January 3, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses, July 1, 1960, through Jan. 3, 1961:	
Full committee (expenses)	$2,471.97
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	45,592.01
Military Operations Subcommittee	35,506.49
Government Activities Subcommittee	25,667.84
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee	24,440.06
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	36,858.09
Special Donable Property Subcommittee	17,594.45
Special Government Information Subcommittee	33,165.29
Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems	11,942.22
Special Subcommittee on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board	711.30
Salaries, full committee, July 1–Dec. 31, 1960:	
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	8,824.74
Orville S. Poland, general counsel	8,224.74
James A. Lanigan, associate general counsel	8,824.74
Earle J. Wade, staff member	5,378.16
J. Robert Brown, staff member	6,733.38
Dolores Fel'Dotto, staff member	4,727.28
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	4,281.72
Patricia Maheux, staff member	3,998.22
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff	8,051.46
J. P. Carlson, minority counsel	7,401.18
Full committee, travel, publications, telephone, stationery, and supplies (full committee and subcommittees), total	2,471.97

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman:

Elmer W. Henderson, counsel	7,872.96
Phineas Indritz, counsel	7,872.96
Orville J. Montgomery, associate counsel	7,216.36
Arthur Periman, investigator	7,216.36
David Glick, associate counsel	5,952.20
Lawrence P. Redmond, clerk	5,467.80
Irene Manning, stenographer	3,704.53
Expenses	288.84
Total	45,592.01

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:

Herbert Roback, staff administrator	$8,971.82
Earl J. Morgan, chief investigator (July 1–Sept. 20, 1960)	2,992.61
John Paul Ridgely, investigator	5,862.89
Douglas G. Dahlin, staff attorney	4,785.51
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	4,579.58
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	4,064.86
Catherine L. Koeberlein, clerk-stenographer	4,064.86
Expenses	184.36
Total	35,506.49

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman:

Edward C. Brooks, Jr., staff administrator	7,828.31
James McInnes Henderson, counsel (July 1–Aug. 15, 1960)	1,794.29
John E. Moore, investigator	6,014.78
L. Russell Harding II, investigator	4,646.49
Irma Reel, clerk	3,606.60
Expenses	1,777.28
Total	25,667.84

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman:

James R. Naughton, counsel	7,872.96
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member	7,872.96
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	4,064.86
Bebe B. Terry, clerk-stenographer	3,653.05
Expenses	976.23
Total	24,440.06

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman:

John T. M. Reddan, chief counsel	7,600.00
Richard P. Bray, counsel	7,515.63
Walton Woods, investigator	6,756.24
Miles Q. Romney, counsel	6,398.90
Phyllis Seymour, clerk	4,064.86
Yvonne J. Kurtak, stenographer	3,447.11
Expenses	1,075.35
Total	36,858.09

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman:

Ray Ward, staff administrator	8,185.65
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer	3,653.05
Barbara McLaughlin, clerk-typist (July 1–Sept. 30, 1960)	1,028.94
Clara K. Armstrong, minority clerk-stenographer	3,668.48
Expenses	1,058.33
Total	17,594.45

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:

Samuel J. Archibald, staff administrator	8,185.65
Jacob Scher, counsel	4,354.97
Harry S. Weldberg, assistant counsel	5,742.30
Jack Howard, professional staff member	6,014.78
Catherine Hartke, stenographer	4,064.86
Helen Beasley, stenographer	4,064.86
Expenses	737.87
Total	33,165.29

Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:

Sidney McClellan, professional staff member	6,559.70
Francis J. Schwoerer, Staff member (Dec. 22, 1960–Jan. 3, 1961)	333.37
Martin McDonough, consultant	936.87
Edward P. Eardley, consultant	150.00
Expenses	3,962.28
Total	11,942.22

Special Subcommittee on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman:

Expenses	711.30
Total	711.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	1,040,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	701,670.38
Amount expended from July 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961	233,949.72
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Jan. 3, 1961	935,620.10
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961	104,379.90

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	$8,824.74
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	7,612.08
John F. Haley	do	6,294.00
Mary F. Stolle	do	3,896.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$20,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	18,062.88
Amount expended from June 30 to Dec. 12, 1960	742.31
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	18,805.19
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	1,194.81

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Engineering consultant and professional staff director.	$8,095.38
T. Richard Witmer	Counsel	7,787.82
John L. Taylor	Territorial and Indian consultant.	7,787.82
Karl S. Landstrom	Minerals and lands consultant.	7,787.82
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	6,909.12
Laura A. Moran	Assistant chief clerk	4,555.14
Dixie S. Duncan	Clerk	3,745.02
Virginia E. Bedsole	do	3,522.24
Penelope P. Harvison.	do	3,522.24
Marion Jo Gummelt.	do	3,522.24

Paid from funds appropriated for committee expenses:	
Paul D. Shriver, special consultant on territories, balance due under contract approved Feb. 22, 1960	$1,159.67
Stephen A. Langone, Indian affairs analyst, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, reimbursement for salary	755.81
Edward J. Fanflik, special research assistant, paid under contract approved Nov. 29, 1960	1,667.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	51,756.55
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	9,262.02
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	61,018.57
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	13,981.43

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	$8,772.00
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	7,322.10
Marcella Fenci	Assistant clerk	4,575.42
Glenn L. Johnson	Printing editor	6,206.10
Joanne Neuland	Clerical assistant	3,643.80
Mildred H. Lang	do	3,643.80
Mary Ryan	do	3,643.80
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	3,593.16
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	8,772.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	8,772.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	8,772.00
Martin W. Cunningham.	Aviation consultant	8,772.00
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 56 and H. Res. 136, amended:		
Gladys Johnson	Clerical assistant	3,542.52
Margaret J. Robinson.	Staff assistant	7,796.64
Elsie M. Karpowich.	Clerical assistant	3,643.80
Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight (to Jan. 3, 1961, inclusive):		
Robert W. Lishman	Chief counsel	8,918.22
Beverly M. Coleman.	Principal attorney	8,199.05
Oliver Eastland	Attorney	8,199.05
Julius Eanet	do	7,761.29
Mary Louise Ramsey.	do	7,515.61
Harold Ranstad	do	7,104.67
Charles P. Howze, Jr.	do	6,559.71
George Perry	do	5,773.54
Henry Hoye, Jr.	Attorney (to July 15, 1960).	416.73
William A. Brewer	Attorney	6,559.71
Stuart C. Ross	Consultant	8,199.05
Hugh M. Hall	Research specialist (to Sept. 30, 1960).	3,226.08
Raymond W. Martin.	Special Assistant	4,476.64
Edward M. Jones	Investigator (to July 15, 1960).	537.68
Raymond C. Cole	Investigator	5,773.54
Lurlene Wilbert	Executive secretary	4,512.67
Dolores E. Dougherty.	File clerk-stenographer.	3,930.99
Blanche Plant	Stenographer-clerk	3,601.56
Elizabeth Paola	do	3,601.56
Catherine McLees	do	3,601.56
Herman Clay Beasley.	Chief clerk	7,283.34
Rex Sparger	Clerical assistant	5,192.61
Jean Mockbee	Clerical assistant (to Nov. 20, 1960).	2,137.00
Rowena Chinn	Clerical assistant (to July 15, 1960).	201.97
Pamela Caldwell	Clerical assistant	1,970.53
Jack Marshall Stark	Minority counsel	8,199.05
Mary Belle Osborn	Secretary to minority counsel.	3,601.56

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$750,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	419,600.40
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	173,628.95
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	593,229.35
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	156,770.65

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 31, 1960.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	Chief counsel	$8,772.00
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	8,227.20
Robert H. Cowen	do	8,227.20
William B. Winfield	Chief clerk	7,612.08
Frances Still	Assistant clerk	5,030.16
Ruth E. Brookshire	do	3,998.22
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	3,998.22
Edith W. Gordon	do	3,998.22
E. M. Tollefson	Minority clerk	4,808.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	47,553.50
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	13,477.23
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	61,030.73
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	13,969.27

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	$8,824.74
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	8,446.92
Bun Benton Bray, Jr.	Professional staff member.	7,634.04
Clarence R. Jauchem.	Professional staff member (2 months).	2,544.68
John H. Martiny	Attorney	7,216.68
John B. Price	Assistant clerk	4,504.50
Lillian L. Hopkins	do	4,403.28
Lucy K. Daley	do	4,200.72
Elsie E. Thornton	Secretary	3,795.66
Blanche M. Simons	do	3,339.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	52,513.62
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	16,188.39
Total amount expended from Jan. 29, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	68,702.01
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	6,297.99

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 12, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Margaret R. Beiter	Staff director	$8,824.74
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	8,824.74
Robert F. McConnell.	Minority counsel	8,772.02
Joseph R. Brennan	Engineer-consultant	8,824.74
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	6,294.00
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	7,172.76
Helen A. Thompson	do	5,854.62
Dorothy A. Beam	do	5,204.16
S. Philip Cohen	do	4,504.50
Ester M. Saunders	Clerk-messenger	2,631.12
Investigating staff:		
Durward G. Evans	Subcommittee clerk	4,909.56
John A. O'Connor, Jr.	do	4,909.56
William B. Short	do	4,909.56
Jerome N. Sonosky	do	4,909.56
Agnes M. GaNun	Staff assistant	3,876.66
Mary W. Porter	Minority staff assistant.	3,908.42
Sterlyn B. Carroll	Clerk-messenger	2,631.12
Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	8,824.74
Robert E. Manuel	Minority counsel	7,809.84
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel.	7,612.08
James J. Fitzpatrick	Associate counsel	6,996.96
Robert A. McElligott.	do	6,996.96
Robert E. Vaughan	do	6,030.36
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	7,502.28
George M. Martin	Administrative assistant.	7,243.02
Baron L. Shacklette	Investigator	6,996.96
James P. Kelly	do	6,469.74
John N. Dinsmore	do	6,346.74
Sherman S. Willse	do	6,030.36
Kathryn M. Keeney.	Chief clerk	3,876.66
Mildred E. Rupert	Staff assistant	3,491.88
Jean N. Cameron	do	3,491.88
Erla S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant.	3,339.96
Sara L. Vollett	Clerical assistant	2,818.50
Michael J. McInerney.	Research assistant	2,702.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$475,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	188,007.52
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	183,331.14
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	371,338.66
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	103,661.38

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carruthers, T. M	Clerk	$6,733.38
Forrest, Mary S	Assistant clerk	4,200.72
Graves, Joan I	Minority clerk	2,684.97

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

JANUARY 10, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel.	$8,824.74
Charles S. Sheldon II	Technical director	8,824.74
Philip B. Yeager	Special consultant	8,824.74
Spencer M. Beresford	Special counsel	8,824.74
Emily Dodson	Secretary	3,658.98
Eva F. Lopez	do	3,089.81
Jane J. Zetty	do	3,633.66
Mary Ann Robert	do	3,253.92
Mary L. Myron	do	3,122.28
Raymond Wilcove	Staff consultant	8,293.14
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,293.14
C. Otis Finch	Assistant clerk	4,570.32
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	7,163.94
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	Counsel	7,269.42
Mary Ann Temple	Secretary	2,985.60
Eunice A. Walker	do	3,253.92
Mabel McLaughlin	Stenographer	828.11

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	140,173.27
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	66,599.27
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	206,772.54
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	93,227.46

OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	$7,260.60
Richard Arens	Staff director (resigned Aug. 31, 1960).	2,941.58
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk	5,678.88
Thelma S. Michalowski.	Secretary to investigators.	4,680.78
Isabel B. Nagel	Secretary to counsel	3,896.94
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to director.	4,686.78
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Director	8,824.74
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section.	5,722.80
Lorraine N. Veley	Secretary	3,694.44
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	7,084.86
Investigating committee:		
Beatrice P. Baldwin	Clerk-typist	2,681.76
Barbara Bannister	Clerk-typist (June 23 through Sept. 9, 1960).	923.87
Daniel Butler	Clerk-typist (appointed June 27, 1960).	2,220.45
Charlotte B. Carlson.	Research analyst	3,213.42
Raymond T. Collins.	Investigator	5,010.84
Regina Marie Crissy.	Clerk-typist (June 27 through Sept. 9, 1960).	878.90
Anniel Cunningham	Information analyst	3,719.70
Rosalyn B. DuVal	do	2,691.84
Barbara H. Edelschein.	Editor	3,188.10
Elizabeth L. Edinger	do	3,694.44
Emily R. Francis	Information analyst	2,479.26
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	4,605.78
Robert Henry Goldsborough.	Investigator	3,238.74
Patricia R. Greeves	Research clerk (resigned Nov. 30, 1960.)	1,880.40
Kathleen L. Hagenbuch.	Secretary	3,559.40
Lillian E. Howard	Research analyst (resigned Oct. 31, 1960).	2,901.76
Walter B. Huber	Consultant	7,172.76
M. Patricia Kelley	Research analyst	2,965.32
Olive M. King	Editor	4,453.86
Stephen V. Kopunek	Clerk of publications (resigned Oct. 31, 1960).	1,852.00
Fulton Lewis III	Research analyst	3,122.28
Gwendolyn L. Lewis	Administrative assistant.	5,678.88
William Margetich	Investigator	3,562.80
Carolyn T. McGiffert	Clerk-typist (July 1 through Sept. 9, 1960).	833.93
Francis J. McNamara	Research consultant	6,557.64
Vincent Messina	Research analyst (appointed July 18, 1960).	2,153.39
Jane S. Muller	Information analyst	2,702.04
Alfred M. Nittle	Counsel (appointed Aug. 23, 1960).	4,978.77
Maureen P. Ontrich	Information analyst	3,026.10
Alma T. Pfaff	Research clerk	2,479.26
Katherine Phillips	Switchboard operator.	2,555.22
Josephine S. Randolph.	Research clerk	2,884.32
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	5,854.62
Hilda C. Schoenek	Secretary	1,475.40
Doris P. Shaw	Information analyst	2,702.04
Lela Mae Stiles	do	3,026.10
Joseph T. Timony	Clerk-typist	2,302.03
Consuelo Thompson.	Secretary (appointed Oct. 5, 1960).	1,336.93
Geraldine M. Unangst.	Clerk-stenographer	2,175.48
Mary Myers Valente.	Secretary	2,798.22
John C. Walsh	Cocounsel	5,378.16
Vera L. Watts	Clerk-stenographer	3,431.10
Nell Wetterman	Investigator (appointed Dec. 5, 1960).	636.03
Billie Wheeler	Secretary	1,984.26
Regina M. Wilt	Clerk-typist	2,127.14

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$654,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	439,790.46
Amount expended from July 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961	176,331.32
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Jan. 3, 1961	616,121.78
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961	37,878.22

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 13, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director (P)	$8,824.74
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel (P)	8,824.74
Harold A. L. Lawrence.	Professional aid to minority (P).	8,089.34
J. Buford Jenkins	Professional aid (P).	7,699.98
George W. Fisher	Clerk	8,824.74
Ida Rowan	Administrative aid (minority).	8,051.46
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	6,294.00
Helen A. Biondi	do	5,160.66
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	4,302.00
George J. Turner	Assistant clerk	4,302.00
Investigative staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	6,720.18
Mark L. Davis	Clerk-messenger	905.04
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer	3,496.98
Jean Johnson	do	1,748.49
Audrey June Lyle	Secretary	1,452.27
Paul H. Smiley	Investigator	3,980.76
John Billie Smith	do	5,397.48
Glyndon M. Hague, Jr.	do	5,338.81
Margaret J. Bales	Clerk-stenographer	1,847.22
Billy E. Kirby	Investigator	3,554.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$160,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	83,453.97
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	46,432.01
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	129,885.98
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	30,114.02

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 7, 1961.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Leo H. Irwin	Chief counsel (C)	$8,824.74
Thomas A. Martin	Minority counsel (P).	8,824.74
John M. Martin, Jr.	Assistant chief counsel (P).	8,666.58
Gerard M. Brannon	Professional assistant (P).	8,666.58
Raymond F. Conkling.	do	7,638.48
Alfred R. McCauley.	Professional assistant (P) (from Dec. 10, 1960).	951.94
Virginia Baker	Staff assistant (C)	4,276.68
Virginia Butler	do	4,383.00
Frances E. Donovan.	do	4,276.68
Grace Kagan	do	4,383.00
June Kendall	do	4,453.86
Margaretta G. Pestell.	do	3,375.42
Elizabeth L. Ruth	do	4,150.08
Susan Taylor	do	5,300.82
Irene Wade	do	4,383.00
Hughlon Greene	Document clerk	2,894.40
Walter B. Little	do	2,894.40
Expenses		2,123.52
Subcommittee on Administration of Foreign Trade Laws and Policy, Hon. HALE BOGGS (Democrat, Louisiana), chairman:		
Mildred Akins	Staff assistant (C)	3,755.16
Myer Rashish	Economist	7,984.10
Expenses		97.25
Total		11,836.51
Subcommittee on Administration of Internal Revenue Laws, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS (Democrat, Arkansas), chairman:		
Sybil D. Burd	Staff assistant (C)	4,276.68
Frances Russell	do	5,527.98
Eileen Sonnett	do	3,289.38
William E. Wells	do	2,702.04
Expenses		1.50
Total		15,797.58
Subcommittee on Administration of Social Security Laws, Hon. BURR P. HARRISON (Democrat, Virginia), chairman:		
Jacqueline McKenna.	Staff assistant (C) (to Oct. 10, 1960).	1,827.39
Expenses		28.28
Total		1,855.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	106,341.45
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	31,613.28
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	137,954.73
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	162,045.27

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 15, 1961.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1960, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	$8,754.45
Everette MacIntyre	General counsel	8,754.45
William Summers Johnson.	Chief economist	8,051.47
Victor P. Dalmas	Adviser to minority members.	8,051.47
Irving Maness	Assistant counsel	8,051.47
Justinus Gould	do	7,216.67
Richard L. Mitchell	do	6,557.62
W. N. Peach	Special consultant	4,377.24
Frederick A. Spinelli	Assistant counsel	5,378.14
Philip C. Newman	Staff economist	1,450.29
John Bryan	Business analyst	3,871.63
Brooks Robertson	Analyst	5,378.14
Charles F. Peake	Economist	1,806.76
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	4,418.45
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant.	4,418.45
James M. Lyday	Economist	305.92
Katherine C. Blackburn.	Research analyst	4,048.83
Margaret Fallon Palmer.	do	3,896.94
Geraldine Louise Leshin.	do	1,012.21
Robert Rota	Investigator	2,955.19
Carolyn A. Latimer	Research analyst	674.81
Helen E. Steady	Secretary for the minority.	400.60
Dorothy F. Councill	Stenographer	3,674.16
Bessie C. Harding	do	3,674.16
Barbara W. McConnell.	do	3,289.38
Olga E. Schreiber	do	3,228.59
Anna A. Holovach	Secretary-stenographer.	1,022.39
Frances C. Crane	do	3,228.59
Jean Williams Fender	Stenographer	2,823.54
Margaret C. Stalcup	do	1,864.52
Marcia G. Rucker	do	2,691.86
Jo Ann Jeffries	do	2,109.51

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$520,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	337,233.20
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960	139,820.39
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	477,053.59
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1960	42,946.41

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JANUARY 25, 1961.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1960

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from August 1 to January 3, 1961, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gillis W. Long	Chief counsel	$7,000.00
Richard C. O'Hare	Counsel	4,000.00
Robert F. Nunez	do	4,500.00
Robert S. Smith	do	950.00
Ruth M. Heritage	Clerk	5,573.99
Elizabeth H. Feltman	Secretary	1,401.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended from Aug. 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961	27,228.40
Total amount expended from Aug. 1, 1960, to Jan. 3, 1961	27,228.40
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 3, 1961	7,771.60

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

571. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

572. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the activities relating to providing aviation war risk insurance as of December 31, 1960, pursuant to title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

573. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

574. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $33 million for the Department of Labor, a proposed increase in limitation in the amount of $10 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a reduction of $12 million in a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Post Office Department, all for the fiscal year 1961 (H. Doc. No. 91); and ordered to be printed; to the Committee on Appropriations.

575. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for "Education and welfare services," for the fiscal year 1961, has been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

576. A letter from the Director, Office of Administrative Operations, U.S. Department of Commerce, transmitting a report of foreign excess property disposed of during calendar year 1959 by the U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4502. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to make it unlawful for the licensee of any radio or television broadcasting station to consistently or systematically portray, in the programs broadcast by such station, any religious group, race, or nationality in a degrading or criminal manner; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4503. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 4504. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4505. A bill to provide that States and political subdivisions which operate liquor stores shall not be required to pay more than one tax as a retail dealer in liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4506. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from a point near Moorcroft, Wyo., to a point on the Canadian boundary near the city of Raymond, Mont., as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4507. A bill vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima Volcanic Islands, Pacific Ocean area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4508. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Bushy Run Battlefield Park in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4509. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4510. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 4511. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 4512. A bill to amend section 405(a) of the National Housing Act to increase to $20,000 the maximum insurance with respect to any member or investor of a savings and loan association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 4513. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the county of De Soto, State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 4514. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated annually to carry out the program for the conservation and restoration of the Hawaiian Nene goose, and to extend such program for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to make certain benefits under that act available to teachers in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4516. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit laboratory schools operated by public institutions of higher education to participate in certain programs under that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4517. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4520. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the maximum benefits which may be paid thereunder for any month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of an insured individual where such individual has a disabled child over age 18 entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend section 902(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation 20 percent or more of the voting stock of which is owned by another foreign corporation in which a domestic corporation has a substantial stock interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend section 4242 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4524. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4525. A bill to require the Postmaster General to adjust the compensation of star route, panel body, and mail messenger contractors, by reason of added costs imposed upon them by statute, and to modernize the law relating to contracts for the transportation of mail and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4526. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4527. A bill to extend to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 the benefits of salary increases in connection with the protection of basic compensation rates from the effects of downgrading actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4528. A bill for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4529. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes approved October 15, 1914, as

amended (U.S.C. title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4530. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to make the educational benefits provided for therein available to all veterans whether or not they serve during a period of war or of armed hostilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4531. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4532. A bill to relieve hardship for displaced families and businesses by assisting in their relocation and by providing them with mortgage financing under a new low-rent private housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 4533. A bill to provide for the establishment of an effective Federal aid program to assist States in the development of certain outdoor recreational resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4534. A bill to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4535. A bill to grant a deduction, for income tax purposes, to handicapped individuals, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer supporting dependents who are so handicapped as to be unable to care for themselves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4536. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4537. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that in determining eligibility of a member of an armed force for retirement, the Secretary concerned shall credit service performed before the attainment of 18 years of age; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4538. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1958 with respect to certain reservoir projects in Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend section 723 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for immediate payment of dividends on insurance heretofore issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 which has been converted or exchanged for new insurance under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4540. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal payments for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled shall be $50 per recipient per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers to deduct such expenses, to arrive at their adjusted gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4543. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4544. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits payable under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4545. A bill to amend section 117 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain educational leave allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4546. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 4547. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4548. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1930, in order to increase the authorization for funds for the extension of certain projects from the District of Columbia into the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KYL:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution to clarify the intent of Congress regarding the extension of rural mail deliveries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 172. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should call a White House Conference on Highway Safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 173. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 174. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness areas in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Susumu Mori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 4550. A bill for the relief of Shafiq (Shalom) Kassab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4551. A bill for the relief of Delio D'Alfonso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 4552. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Paca; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4553. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Ryba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Annunziata Sabatini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4555. A bill for the relief of Miss Giuliana Vardeu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4556. A bill for the relief of Edward Gruszka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4557. A bill for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 4558. A bill for the relief of Otis D. Shreves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4559. A bill for the relief of Francisco Silveira Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 4560. A bill for the relief of the estate of Walter Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4561. A bill for the relief of Jack Mishanieh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 4562. A bill for the relief of Flora T. Lomboy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 4563. A bill for the relief of Abraham Gelb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:
H.R. 4564. A bill for the relief of Matheos Matheopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:
H.R. 4565. A bill for the relief of Nora M. Hammond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:
H.R. 4566. A bill for the relief of Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:
H.R. 4567. A bill for the relief of John Korenda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H.R. 4568. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. and Mrs. James H. McIntosh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Millard E. Tydings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, courage is a precious commodity in this world. But there are some precious few to whom the Creator of us all has, in His wisdom, allotted the courage of 10. Millard E. Tydings was such a man, and the State of Maryland and the United States of America are diminished by his passing.

It was courage that drew him as a young man into local politics and it was that courage combined with outstanding ability that enabled him to win in the face of great obstacles. Another man might have been content to enjoy in peace the fruits of political victory, but not Millard Tydings. A stronger trumpet blew in his ears, sounding the call to arms and the defense of his country.

With such a man there could be but one answer to that trumpet call. Even before World War I he served in the Mexican border campaign. He entered the Army a private, served in the World War, and 3 years later emerged a lieutenant colonel. He was awarded a Distinguished Service Medal, a Distinguished Service Cross, and three citations.

His foreign wars fought, he returned to political combat. He was elected to the Maryland house of delegates, where he served ably as speaker, and then to the State senate. In 1924 he was sent to the House of Representatives. And 2 years later the free State proudly elected him, at the age of 36, to the U.S. Senate.

Senators who served with Mr. Tydings have eloquently testified to the magnificent work he performed during his 24 years' service in the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee he was acknowledged to be one of this country's experts on military affairs. He also served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. In all his duties he was conscientious, willing, courageous and intelligent, so that his reputation spread throughout the land, and over the seas as well. On learning of Senator Tydings' death, the President of the Philippines expressed his country's gratitude to the man who coauthored the measure providing for Philippine independence in 1946.

It was courage again that persuaded the Senator to oppose President Roosevelt's Supreme Court plan in 1937. It was courage that drove him to stand up against hysteria and vilification whatever the political cost. If the lives of great men are their monuments, Millard E. Tydings' monument will tower over our land until the end of time.

Last Tribute to a Great Statesman—Millard E. Tydings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, recently one of Maryland's beloved and respected sons passed from our midst. Formerly a Member of this body, he later gained national renown as a U.S. Senator.

I am sure that you all know that I speak of Millard E. Tydings.

It is not necessary for me to recite his life history, though inspirational in itself; and indeed it lends itself to book form. Rather, I would prefer to pay tribute to Millard Tydings, the personality. Men are not often cast in the mold from which he was made. His was an independence and strength of character which could only evoke admiration and emulation.

During one of his early campaigns for election, Millard Tydings said: "If I am elected, I shall vote for those measures I believe to be right and oppose those I believe to be wrong, no matter who advocates or opposes them, and when I can no longer do that I care no longer to represent this State in any public body."

Many high-sounding statements and promises are made during political campaigns, only to be lost sight of in the dazzling brilliance of victory. But Millard Tydings never lost sight of that statement. He never forgot it. He lived by it.

Even when he stood alone, being attacked from all sides, condemned and vilified, he never flinched, because he believed that what he was doing was right. And time has proven him so. Though you may not have always agreed with him, you had to respect him.

Millard E. Tydings has carved for himself a respected place in the history of our country and he will be long remembered and sorely missed by his fellow Marylanders. I believe that no more appropriate epitaph could be found for this courageous man than those words he lived by:

"I shall vote for those measures I believe to be right and oppose those I believe to be wrong, no matter who advocates or opposes them."

Lifting Ban on Russian Canned Crab

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the Russian political offensive to spread its Communist ideology and control throughout the world is being matched by its economic offensive which is becoming of increasing concern to all of us. From its rapid construction of vast hydroelectric projects and reportedly accelerated gold mining to increase the monetary impact of the ruble, to intensive exploration and exploitation of the resources of the seven seas, the Russians are forging ahead.

In speaking of the resources of the ocean I refer to a subject which has come uncomfortably close to home. Because the Russians have for 2 years now operated a massive trawling fleet in the Bering Sea, capturing bottom fish on a large scale, which they have a right to do in the international waters involved, those of us interested in the great wealth of the North Pacific fisheries have developed a mounting and frustrating concern. This concern became enhanced when the Russians last year expanded their activities to the taking of king crab from the Bering Sea and processing the crabmeat on mother ships. Russian ocean exploration was also expanded. The Russians have now stated that their next move will be exploration of the Gulf of Alaska, the site of halibut banks long fished almost exclusively by United States and Canadian fishermen.

It has been bad enough to watch these developments backed by the Russian Government as against the feeble efforts of privately owned and operated fishing vessels of the United States, but the worst recent development is the declared intention of the Department of the Treasury to lift the ban on Russian canned crabmeat. This ban was effectuated 10 years ago because Russian-caught crab was being canned by

convict labor. Now that this practice has been reportedly discontinued, the Treasury Department is all set to lift the ban. Presumably, of course, the consideration for such a step was weighed against the impact upon our own crabmeat industry which produces about 29 percent of crabmeat consumed in the United States. Perhaps also our own producers, who are expanding their crabmeat enterprises, can be protected by realistic quotas, but on this score I have been given no assurance whatsoever. Even if such assurance were given, I feel that this latest concession to Russia is not warranted, if only for the following reason: The North Pacific Fisheries Convention between the United States, Canada, and Japan will expire in 2 years. Under this convention the Japanese have limited their high seas salmon fishery to an area of the North Pacific west of a provisional line set at 175 degrees west longitude. Through tagging and other research, it has been determined that many salmon caught by the Japanese in their presently prescribed area are spawned in Alaskan streams. It has also been established that many are spawned in Russian streams and that the Japanese North Pacific fishery has a considerable impact upon the Russian coastal salmon fishery as great, if not greater, than the impact of such Japanese fishing upon Alaska's Bristol Bay red salmon runs. It is my considered opinion that about 2 years hence, when United States negotiators will be working with the Japanese toward revision and extension of the North Pacific Fishery Convention, they will have to reckon with the Russians one way or the other and that a reappraisal of the whole subject will have to be brought to bear. Therefore, I strongly oppose the Treasury Department's proposal to lift the ban on Russian-caught crabmeat at this time, which will not only encourage Russian exploitation of the great king crab resource of the Bering Sea off the coast of Alaska, but weaken the bargaining position of the United States in the approaching clash of interests with the Russians in regard to the utilization and conservation of the fisheries of the North Pacific.

Gen. Isaac David White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, America's top soldier in the Pacific theater, 59-year-old Gen. I. D. White, announced on January 29, 1961, that he currently planned to retire on April 1, 1961, after more than 38 years of active military service.

As commander in chief, U.S. Army, Pacific, General White heads the largest geographical U.S. Army command in the world, covering some 12 million square miles of land area, embracing 21 countries, and comprised of 5 major subordinate commands where U.S. troops are stationed in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, and Hawaii.

General White's Army career began in 1923 when he was commissioned a second lieutenant of cavalry. In the days when cavalry meant horses, he served successively with the 14th, 3d, and 7th Cavalry Regiments. He became an expert rider, played on Army polo teams, and as recently as 1948 managed the Army's equestrian team that competed in the world Olympic games in London. While on his first assignment with the 14th Cavalry at Fort Des Moines, Iowa, he first met and in 1928 married Miss Julia Eleanor Cotton, his constant partner these past 31 years.

Though first making his mark as a "horse soldier," he really won his spurs in the mechanized cavalry as a tank commander. He was among the vanguard of farsighted officers who in the early 1930's pioneered the transition from horses to armor.

He was assigned to the 2d Armored Division being organized at Fort Benning, Ga., in 1940, with the rank of major, and remained with that division throughout World War II, participating in eight major campaigns in Africa, Sicily, and Europe. Before the war's end, he had served the 2d Armored Division in every grade from major to major general, and was division commander when the "hell on wheels" division gained the distinction of being the first American force to reach and cross the Elbe River in Germany.

Between World War II and the Korean conflict, General White had three major assignments. He headed the Cavalry School (later, the Ground General School) at Fort Riley, Kans.; commanded the crack U.S. Constabulary in Germany for 3 years where he developed it into a hard hitting armored fighting force; and returned to become commanding general of the Armored Center and commandant of the Armored School at Fort Knox, Ky.

While head of the two service schools, General White revised the curriculums in the light of World War II experience and the advent of nuclear weapons, and was instrumental in effecting the reorganization of American Armor into its present pentomic concept. In Europe he set up a Noncommissioned Officers Academy for the Constabulary which became a model for similar schools throughout the armed services; sponsored the first of the Army's NCO Advisory Councils; and created a tank training center at Vilseck, Germany, which has become a model for Armor training around the world.

General White has spent 7 of the past 9 years in the Pacific area. He first went to Korea in 1952 to command the X Corps through three mountain campaigns, directed the training of four Republic of Korea Army divisions and the organization of a ROK corps headquarters. For outstanding success in these assignments, General White was awarded an oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Medal and the Korean Order of Military Merit Taeguk. President Rhee, in presenting the Korean award, stated:

> General White, with brilliant tactical perception, coordinated the deployment of 8th Army and Republic of Korea Army units in a manner which abruptly halted the onslaught of the enemy and subsequently forced their disorderly retreat.

After the Korean truce, General White returned to command the 4th U.S. Army at Fort Sam Houston, Tex., and in 1955 again crossed the Pacific, this time as a four-star general, to command Army Forces Far East and 8th U.S. Army.

When the U.S. military forces in the Pacific and Far East were reorganized in 1957, he moved to Fort Shafter to begin his present assignment, as first commander in chief of the greatly expanded U.S. Army Pacific and the first four-star general to serve in Hawaii. In the past 3 years he has logged well over 1,800 flying hours and covered almost a half of a million miles in visiting the various elements of his farflung command.

General White holds 12 U.S. and 14 foreign decorations. His alma mater, Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., has awarded him a master of military science degree and an honorary doctorate of laws, and the University of Maryland recognized his achievements with the degree of doctor of military science.

He has the unique distinction among general officers in the Army today of having spent almost his entire career as a troop commander—compiling an impressive record of tactical command from platoon leader to theater Army commander.

General White is the last officer on active duty of that distinguished group, including Generals Van Voorhis, Chafee, Patton, and Scott, which played such a key role in developing the fledgling armored force into the most powerful armored formations ever employed in combat.

During the past 6 years in the Far East and Hawaii, General White recognized and became keenly aware of the increasing interdependence of political, economic, cultural, and military efforts to the overall objectives of the free democratic peoples of the world. He constituted his staff so as to be continually advised of the trends of the governments in his field of interest, and throughout the world, and evaluated the changing political and economic postures of the nations of the Far East and southeast Asia in the light of their military requirements. He was unique in laying great stress on the value of mutual understanding and good will within the areas wherein his troops were positioned. His activities in this respect have been noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by resolutions of the House and Senate of the State of Hawaii, and by numerous personal commendations. He conceived, implemented, and developed brotherhood programs among the various ethnic groups in Hawaii with the peoples of the lands of their ancestors in the Far East. His programs, as an East-West concept, have done much to create and further the now existing good relationships with

the peoples of the countries within the USARPAC area of responsibilities.

His wide, personal acquaintanceship with heads of state, as well as the military leaders of the Far East and southeast Asia, and his untiring efforts in the all encompassing fields of political, economic, cultural, and military endeavors mark him as an outstanding soldier-diplomat in the truest sense of the word.

The people of Hawaii are saddened over the retirement of this outstanding soldier-diplomat. However, we are joyous over his decision to reside in Honolulu, Hawaii. We extend to him our fondest aloha.

Amerigo Vespucci

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think it safe to assume that when the name of Christopher Columbus is mentioned most of us have a fairly clear idea of the identity of the individual referred to. But I am bold enough to hazard the guess that when we refer to the official name of our country, the United States of America, some of us might be a little vague concerning the derivation of the last word, as applied to the two western continents. At any rate, I feel it will do no harm to refresh our memories as to why we are called the United States of America and hence are Americans and not Columbians.

Amerigo Vespucci was born, probably on March 9, 1451, or 1452, the son of a Florentine notary. A clerk in the commercial office of the Medici, the great banking family of Florence, Vespucci seems generally to have resided in Spain, especially in Cadiz and Seville, no doubt as an agent of the Medici. It is recorded that he acquired "an excellent practical knowledge of astronomy" and was the greatest expert of his day in the calculation of latitude and longitude, and made an avocation of geography and the collection of globes, charts, and maps. As contractor to the Spanish crown for the fitting out of vessels, it is probable that Vespucci participated in the organization of Columbus' second voyage in 1493.

Our knowledge of Vespucci's voyages are based on his own letters, which are sketchy and generally believed to be unreliable, as they are in part contradictory. All the originals have been lost. Despite his reputation as the greatest expert of his day in the calculation of latitude and longitude, his accounts of all of his four voyages to the New World, beginning with the first one in 1497, are hopelessly confused and there is no telling just what landfalls he made. His letters, it should be added, are cursory and informal and not in the nature of official reports. In a letter written probably to one Pietro Soderini, chief magistrate of Florence, dated September 4, 1504, he gives an account of the four voyages he says he made; in the first, that of 1497, he says that after running to the Canaries, the expedition made land 1,000 leagues to the southwestward from those islands and then proceeded to coast for 870 leagues along a shore so extensive that it was thought to be a continent; passed 37 days in a fine harbor and then returned to Spain. It has been surmised that Vespucci possibly might have sailed from Cape Honduras to a point not far from Cape Canaveral, Fla. If this is so, then he did indeed touch the continent which, however, like Columbus a year later, he thought to be that of Asia.

From this letter, supposedly to the Florentine magistrate, of which four printed copies exist, without place or date, but probably written before 1507, a French version was made, and from this one in Latin, printed in Lorraine in April 1507, which was immediately made use of by Martin Waldseemüller, professor of cosmography in St. Dié University. Because in some of the earlier reprints of Vespucci's letters the title, or introduction, bore the words "Mundus Novus"—New World, Waldseemüller made the first suggestion in a printed book that the newly discovered fourth part of the world "should be called America, because Americus discovered it."

But this is by no means certain; in fact, since Alexander von Humboldt, founder of the science of physical geography (for whom the Humboldt Current is named) published his great work in 1837, scientific and scholarly opinion has generally inclined to the belief, according to Sir Charles Raymond Beazley, contributor to the article on Vespucci in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, that the Florentine had no part at all in the discovery of the continents and the isthmus which now bear his name.

Be that as it may, our Republic remains the United States of America—and may the name long figure on the maps and in the histories of this, our world.

We Must Take Prompt Action on the President's Minimum Wage Increase Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of my statement to the House Committee on Education and Labor on the important subject of minimum wage increase:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, your committee has before it for consideration today H.R. 3935, which embodies the administration's wage-hour proposals. The amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act would lift the minimum wage to $1.25 hourly in three annual installments. Another chief purpose would be to extend the coverage of the act to 4.3 million additional workers. I am pleased that in addition to other important changes, the bill would provide a three-step increase in existing wage orders in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I wish to express my hearty support of this bill, to which President Kennedy has requested Congress to give prompt consideration. On January 3, 1961, I reintroduced my bill to increase the minimum hourly wage to $1.25, for the millions of underpaid workers in our country have needed this assistance for a long time.

Lengthy hearings and debate on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act during the 86th Congress proved the merits of the legislation now before you and pointed up the hardships of underpaid workers and those not now receiving protection under the law, who can barely exist on their low earnings and whose living conditions are woefully substandard. We know that wage increases have not been commensurate with skyrocketing living costs—the Consumer Price Index has reached an alltime high. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that you have indicated that extensive hearings on this subject will not be necessary now.

The bill under consideration is moderate and the proposed benefits are the very least we should provide at this time.

I urge your committee to take favorable action without delay, and I trust that the Congress will pass this important bill at its earliest opportunity.

Alaska and New Federal Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement, which I submitted last week to Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in support of H.R. 2226, the so-called omnibus judgeship bill, to provide for the appointment of 63 additional district court judges. This statement highlighted the need for an additional district court judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH J. RIVERS, OF ALASKA, ON MARCH 1, 1961, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON H.R. 2226

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of being heard on the matter of H.R. 2226, the so-called omnibus judgeship bill, to provide for the appointment of 9 additional circuit court judges and 63 additional district court judges. I speak in support of this measure, but shall confine my comments to the need for an additional district court judge for Alaska, as is provided for in this bill.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska came into existence on February 20, 1960, pursuant to Alaska's becoming a State. Prior to that time, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, which was composed of four divisions, served as the only judicial establishment in Alaska. According to a report prepared by the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, 3,048 civil cases were pending on the date that the district court

for the territory ceased to exist. As might be expected, a large percentage of these cases were of a local nature and as a result were transferred to the new State courts. The remainder, totaling 214 civil cases, were transferred to the newly created U.S. district court. Between February 20, 1960, and December 31, 1960, a total of 101 cases were commenced and a total of 111 cases were terminated by the court. Therefore, at the start of 1961, a total of 204 civil cases were still pending before the court. To be sure, this figure is below the national average of backlogged cases pending before other U.S. district courts, and might not be considered impressive except for the unusual conditions prevailing in Alaska.

To vividly illustrate these unusual conditions I would like to quote several paragraphs from the statement of the Honorable Walter H. Hodge, U.S. district judge for the District of Alaska, before the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference of the United States, at Seattle, Wash., August 16, 1960. At that time, Judge Hodge stated:

"First there was the problem of the very considerable backlog which faced the former U.S. district court at the time of the transition. At this time there was pending in the third division at Anchorage some 2,200 cases and in the fourth division at Fairbanks some 900 cases. The criminal cases had been kept fairly current but the civil cases were far behind, having been pending between the date of issue and possible date of trial for as long as 5 years and a great majority of them over 3 years.

"Facing this problem we attempted first to hold pretrial conferences in all civil cases throughout the circuit so far as we could reach them, covering the cases pending at Anchorage up through 1957 and those at Fairbanks through 1958. We were amazed to find that out of 54 such conferences held only 2 cases were immediately disposed of, one by confession of judgment and the other by order of the court, which of course is far below the national average.

"Travel involved is the next most serious problem. Alaska is by far the largest district in the Union, being approximately 2½ times the size of the State of Texas. The distance between Ketchikan, farthest point southeast where the judge is required to hold court, and Nome, the farthest point northwest, is slightly over 1,300 air miles. More appropriately, the distance from our headquarters at Anchorage to the four places where we are required to hold court, as given by the airlines, is as follows: Ketchikan, 768 miles; Juneau, 578 miles; Fairbanks, 263 miles; and Nome, 535 miles.

"The cost of travel is also significant, where we find that our cost as extending through September 30, 1960, is $10,839. These costs would not be eliminated by the addition of a second judge but would be substantially reduced. In this connection we find it necessary to take with us our clerk or deputy clerk as an in-court deputy for the reason that at the four places other than Anchorage we have the assistance of the State superior court clerks who also serve as deputy clerks of our court without compensation, and we find that we cannot justly require them to appear in court. We also need the services of a reporter, my secretary, and a law clerk, whose services I find invaluable in doing research work.

"It is my firm belief that the task cannot be adequately accomplished by one judge. I am not thinking so much of the burden upon the judge as the burden upon litigants who have been so long awaiting disposition of their cases."

By now, I have the latest figure showing that by December 31, 1960, the total cost for travel, including subsistence expenses, has risen to $18,859.13. Furthermore, the travel by air has frequently been delayed by bad weather, resulting in delays in court schedules, and increased travel expenses. It should also be mentioned that Alaska is growing rapidly so that the volume of business will increase apace.

Inasmuch as the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska is not as yet a year old, no record of cases filed or terminated, or of the time required to dispose of cases covering a full year has been compiled. However, attached to this prepared statement is a copy of the statistical study and general information summary prepared by Judge Hodge covering the first three quarters of operation of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. These statistics demonstrate the need for an additional district judge.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that the existence of the need for additional judgeships throughout the United States in the Federal courts, both district and appellate, has been amply proven and documented both in the records of previous congressional hearings and in the press of the Nation. We all know that the existence of court congestion and consequent delay in the disposition of cases causes serious hardship to the litigants. It also places heavy burdens on the judges so serious in nature as to impede the efficient performance of judicial functions. This is so in Alaska and in every other Federal district. Therefore, I respectfully urge that the committee report H.R. 2226.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee.

Statement Supporting Adequate Funds for House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have ever requested an opportunity to appear in person before the Committee on House Administration in support of a committee obtaining funds necessary to carry out its jurisdictional responsibilities.

Also it may be somewhat unusual for someone like myself to actively support a committee's request for adequate funds when, as in this instance, the person is not a member of that committee.

There are several reasons why I support investigations and so forth of un-American propaganda activities and the obtaining of information about subversive propaganda attacking our constitutional form of government.

First. Let me explain that I strongly support the purposes for which the Committee on Un-American Activities was established in 1945.

Second. I believe the record of the accomplishments of this committee is such as to fully justify its continuance.

Third. I am convinced that it is important at this time, as I shall explain hereinafter, for the American people and especially its youth to learn the goals, methods and treachery of imperialistic communism and to dedicate their opposition to the spread of Communist ideology.

Fourth. I am disturbed at recent statements minimizing the achievements of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I oppose the move to reduce its effectiveness by curtailing its funds. Furthermore, I feel it proper, since the recent vote to continue the committee was unanimous, without one single dissenting vote, for the House to recognize its moral obligation to provide necessary funds for its work.

Fifth. I have had occasions to call on this committee for printed material and information to meet the requests of my constituents. The chairman of the committee and staff have been extremely helpful.

Sixth. From firsthand knowledge I know the workload of the committee is heavy. I understand there was a 27-percent increase in inquiries in 1960 over the previous years. I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about a month ago, in a Senate report on Senate Resolution 49, that the Senate committee to service the needs of 100 Members of the other body as reflected by the Senate resolution for funds was $300,000. If the 437 Members of the House call on our committee to the extent I do, I do not quite see how $331,000 which I understand the House committee has asked would be adequate.

In urging adequate funds, I want to say that I think the constituents whom I have the honor to represent are not for unnecessary expenditures. They are strongly against waste and unneeded expenditure of their tax money. In 1959, I received 33,000 signatures on a petition to reduce Government expenses, and thousands of letters, too. Nevertheless the people of the First Congressional District of Washington State are strongly against curtailment of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I sent out 30,000 questionnaires last April. In it I asked the question: "Do you believe the House of Representatives should continue the Un-American Activities Committee?" A tabulation of replies showed 3,652 or 83.4 percent in favor of continuation; and only 728 or 16.6 percent against continuation.

However, Mr. Speaker, something has occurred which has kindled anew public interest in seeing the committee continue its function. I have been deluged with hundreds and hundreds of individually written letters and postal cards supporting the committee.

This surge of mail followed FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's recent warning regarding a drive to form a new Socialist-oriented youth group. Mr. Hoover called it a "sinister and determined movement to communize the college campuses of the United States." He added, "While parading as a movement to popularize progressive ideas among youth, it is in back a coldly calculated Communist maneuver to envelop thousands of unsuspecting young Americans into the subversive fold."

In connection with the drive to establish Marxist youth groups on American campuses, I refer to an article by Edward J. Mowery which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on January 29, 1961. It was entitled "Reds Setting Up Cells on

College Campuses" and described demonstrations in various colleges including a youth rally in my congressional district.

I quote now from this newspaper article:

Emboldened by student demonstrations here and abroad, the drive to enlist unwary students has two immediate aims.

To establish a Communist Party youth front in lieu of the ill-fated Labor Youth League and American Youth for Democracy.

To have on instant call an organized student group for tactics of incitation, disruption, and agitation.

"This is not a casual Red-sponsored youth maneuver," one official declared. "The movement is gaining momentum from Portland, Oreg., to Madison, Wis., and it's deadly. These people are seeking recruits even among theological students."

The campaign with little fanfare last March 7 when Mortimer Daniel Rubin toured college campuses in the South.

He appeared before southern student groups as a youth leader. (He is national youth director of the Communist Party.) And he solicited the support of white students for sit-in demonstrations.

On March 28 at the University of Wisconsin, Rubin relinquished the main speaking role at a youth forum in favor of Herbert Aptheker, known to his youthful audience as editor of Political Affairs.

(Political Affairs is the notorious "theoretical" magazine of the Communist Party.)

Rubin's barnstorming grand tour included appearances at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill,; Duke University, Durham, N.C.; and Union Theological Seminary, attached to the University of Virginia.

With the groundwork well laid in parts of the South and Midwest, the Communist functionary swung to the west coast. On October 28 he met with an assembly of students at Reed College, Portland, Oreg., and on November 1 at the University of Washington, Seattle, the youth leader unveiled a new come-on.

SUPERB SALESMAN

He distributed copies of New Horizons for Youth, a monthly Marxist publication edited by Mortimer Daniel Rubin.

On the following day the editor addressed a youth rally at Seattle's Wilsonian Hotel.

Throughout his tour of campuses, Rubin urged students to participate in the national organizing conference of progressive youth to be held in Chicago starting December 30.

Rubin proved to be a superb salesman. No less than 86 delegates appeared at the 3-day meeting held in Chicago's Albany Park Cultural Center.

AVERAGE AGE 22

Their average age was 22 and they registered from these States: California, 3; Washington, 4; Pennsylvania, 21; Ohio, 5; New York, 19; Minnesota, 2; Illinois, 29, and 1 each from Oregon, Michigan, and Iowa.

Rubin and two other group leaders conducted a preconference press interview to deny all Communist Party connections with the meeting. At his side were Alva Buxembaum, 24, teacher in a Philadelphia suburb, and Milton Anthopoulos, who identified himself as being from the College of the City of New York.

While conference sessions were barred to the press, here's what transpired:

Miss Buxenbaum lauded the technical advances and increasing strength of the U.S.S.R. and her satellites, and said this constitutes a challenge to the United States. With youth demanding a brighter future, there is need for a new youth organization to uproot racial inequality, to fight for better schools and erase witch hunting.

HITS HOUSE COMMITTEE

The new group would exploit the evaluation of scientific socialism, which, of course, is communism.

Another speaker launched a bitter attack on the House Un-American Activities Committee and the FBI. Pearl Hart, president of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild, received a standing ovation after her talk.

(The National Lawyers' Guild has been cited as a Communist front, "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party.")

Conference leaders beat down a delegate's suggestion that the new youth group should employ the word "socialism." They described as more acceptable a "broad leftwing student, teenage and working youth organization."

On February 17, 1961, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which, as I said, pointed up the need to inform fully our university students about communism and Communist tactics. It was by L. Jack Allen, Nebraska, chairman, Young Americans for Freedom, and discussed the danger of communism with special references to Nebraska University.

Anyone who reads these and other articles will only ask one question. That question is: "Why is Congress not doing more?"

The Washington Post and some other newspapers say the student riots at the San Francisco committee hearings last May were not Communist inspired.

As long as such publications close their eyes to what is going on the public interest requires that Congress investigate and inform the American people about communism and Communist tactics. University students and the public must obtain the facts.

Mr. Walter and the other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities have given patriotic and dedicated service. I cannot praise them too highly. Public apathy, not opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee is the only weapon the Communists can use which could be fatal.

Would that the committee had available twice as much money and a much larger staff. I would favor increased funds also to print more reports as to the menace of communism.

The answer to Communist propaganda and tactics in our country is an informed public and laws to punish traitors within the framework of the Constitution.

In conclusion, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge an adequate appropriation for the expenses of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Future of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the speech delivered by HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS, Republican, of New York, on February 2, 1961, before the District of Columbia Republican Central Committee:

THE FUTURE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

As a member of the House District Committee in Congress, I am very properly concerned about the future of the Nation's Capital. Too few of our citizens across this great country really appreciate the difficulties we Members of Congress have in dealing with the affairs of what has now become the capital of the free world. How many people know that the District of Columbia was established solely for the purpose of becoming the permanent seat of Government of the United States? (So declared in the act of July 16, 1790.) How many Americans understand why the Federal Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over the District of Columbia? While the Continental Congress was meeting in Philadelphia on June 20, 1783, veterans of the Revolutionary War arrived to obtain a settlement of accounts. The harrassment by the soldiers continued for several days until Congress, abandoning hope that State authorities would disperse the soldiers, removed itself from Philadelphia. It met thereafter in Princeton and Trenton, N.J., Annapolis, Md., and New York City. The Continental Congress did not lightly dismiss this Philadelphia incident, and later that year adopted a resolution providing for buildings and land to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. When our present Constitution was being debated in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, it was urged that provision be made for a permanent seat of Government under exclusive Federal control, away from any State capital so as to avoid similar incidents, and because the intermixture of the State and Federal Legislatures would tend to give a provincial tincture to the national deliberations. And that is how the District of Columbia achieved its unique status in our Federal Constitution.

As you know, the original District of Columbia passed under Federal control in 1800, consisting of an area 10 miles square, the portion north of the Potomac River having been ceded by Maryland, and that south of the Potomac River having been ceded by Virginia. In 1846 Congress retroceded to Virginia that portion of the District of Columbia in that State, during the administration of President Polk. The present District contains approximately 68 square miles (43,677 acres), of which 4,404 acres are water and 39,283 are land. Streets and alleys, etc., comprise 8,711 acres. The land area exclusive of streets (30,562 acres) is divided as follows: Taxable, 14,380 acres, or 47.1 percent; United States and District Governments, 14,256 acres, or 46.6 percent; other exempt (privately owned or foreign government), 1,926 acres, or 6.3 percent.

Up until the Civil War the population of the Nation's Capital was so small it didn't seem to make any difference what kind of community it was. There were few municipal improvements and the seat of Government had the appearance of a frontier town and was an international joke.

The population growth during and after the Civil War made Congress conscious that the District of Columbia no longer was a village, and in 1871 the independent municipal corporations of Georgetown and Washington City were abolished and a territorial government for the District was established. A successful effort was made literally to lift Washington out of the mud. Since that time, our Nation's Capital has developed, not only as the seat of Government, but as a center of culture with a great symphony

orchestra and other performing arts and several universities of international renown. It has become a symbol of hope and inspiration to all who love freedom around the world.

However, it would be less than candid for a Member of Congress charged with responsibility as a member of the House District Committee, to fail to recognize that behind the facade of beautiful tree-shaded boulevards, majestic Government buildings, beautiful residences, and spacious park areas filled with monuments of our Nation's heroes, there is another Washington whose future is uncertain.

This situation is not unique, for Washington is plagued by the same problems that are afflicting most of our large cities. My own home, the city of Rochester, has been wrestling with these serious developments for some time. There is the alarming flight to the suburbs of taxpaying families, causing a population drop from 803,000 in 1950 to 764,000 in 1960. There is an alarming budget increase from about $140 million to $286 million in the same period. Taxes on the local residents have been multiplied and multiplied again, until they are higher than the taxes of all but a handful of comparable cities in the United States. Crimes of violence and juvenile delinquency have increased from 25 percent to 30 percent since 1958 alone, despite one of the most comprehensive law-enforcement programs in the United States. There is a consistent increase in the welfare and health demands upon the District Government, with the number of persons receiving public assistance increasing at the rate of about 20 percent per year. The traffic problem—so vividly illustrated by the infamous storm of 2 weeks ago—and the problem of urban renewal seem to become more aggravated each month; and there is a serious question whether the District of Columbia is not losing the battle against the forces of decay.

In addition to all these problems, there are two major shifts in population underway. The first is in the age grouping of the population. There are relatively more persons in the District of Columbia in the very young and the very old groups, and comparatively fewer persons in the 18- to 44-year age group. Thus, there is a decrease among the taxpaying age group, but an increase in those groups that are heavy users of tax dollars through schools, health, welfare, and related services.

The second major population shift is racial. Each year the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia reports a change in the percentage ratio of white to nonwhite residents, with the white population having decreased now to about 45 percent. Moreover, the whites increasingly represent primarily the older population segment, and the nonwhite the younger. The implications of these trends are clear. The Nation's Capital will require more schools and welfare services, while at the same time the decline in the 18- to 44-year-old wage-earning, taxpaying group means less and less revenue potential. Revenue needs are increasing while the tax base grows smaller. All responsible citizens, regardless of race or creed, must feel a grave concern about the future of the District of Columbia in the light of these facts.

Members of Congress charged by the Federal Constitution with exclusive legislative responsibility for the Nation's Capital, must take more resolute steps to protect the interest of all of the people in their Nation's Capital City. We must not impose property, income and other taxes on local residents above the level of Maryland and Virginia, or we simply aggravate the flight of taxpayers to the suburbs. Sufficient Federal funds should be appropriated each year to carry forward public works, school construction, urban renewal, and maintenance of the city so that it continues to be an attractive and desirable place to live for all Americans, regardless of race or creed. Furthermore, with regard to the population trends I mentioned earlier, the changing racial character of the District population, with all of its resultant economic and social challenges, must be squarely faced. And efforts must be made to encourage the educated, productive, working-age population to remain in the District. There has been too long a delay and indifference with respect to these matters, and Congress should discharge its constitutional responsibility to the Nation before it is too late.

The future of the District of Columbia ought to hold in prospect what a joint committee of Congress in 1915 once termed "the splendid and beautiful central residence of this great Nation, to become and be forever maintained as a model for all the cities of the world." This vision cannot be fulfilled unless the present trends are brought to a sharp and permanent halt and charted in a new and more favorable course.

Responsibility in Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 17, 1961

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, when it was announced that our colleague from New York, Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, was to be the principal speaker at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republican County Committee of Union County, N.J., the affair quickly became a sellout.

The presence of some 500 Republican men and women in Watchung, N.J., on February 13, was testimony of the high regard in which our vigorous and able young colleague is held by those who have watched his brief but impressive career in the Congress.

JOHN LINDSAY'S remarks on this occasion were, I am delighted to report, equal to his reputation. In a most interesting and original way, he developed the most important theme concerning the Republican Party today, "Effectiveness in Power; Responsibility in Opposition." He did this through a series of incisive word pictures of some of the men who have helped most to shape the Republican tradition and who themselves, under difficult circumstances, demonstrated the degree to which the national interest relies on a responsible and constructive opposition.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. LINDSAY'S Union County speech, and I urge our colleagues to give it the attention it deserves. The speech follows:

A REPUBLICAN TRADITION: EFFECTIVENESS IN POWER; RESPONSIBILITY IN OPPOSITION

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, Senator CASE and Congressman FLORENCE DWYER, and your honored guest, former Secretary of Labor Mitchell, it is flattering and reassuring to have been asked to be with you here tonight—because New Yorkers are not necessarily prophets with honor outside of their homes; or always even welcomed in the great stretches west of the Empire State.

When FLORENCE DWYER invited me to be with you tonight, it was an invitation that I accepted without hesitation, for my admiration and respect for FLORENCE as a legislator and a public officer is limitless. Her district has been receiving and will continue to receive intelligent and brave representation. And of course CLIFFORD CASE is a Republican whom I regard as being among the first in the Grand Old Party. He leads in our party and suggests new and constructive directions for its growth and welfare. I only wish that our party more often had the wisdom to learn and apply the lessons that he teaches.

Certainly New Jersey has distinguished itself in the quality and effectiveness of the leadership that it has contributed in the last 8 years both to the Eisenhower administration and to the Congress. Former Secretary of Labor James Mitchell is one of your native sons with whom I had the pleasure of sharing executive branch responsibilities for a period—I in a very small way in the Department of Justice, he in a very large way in the Cabinet. And Douglas Dillon is a man who commands the respect and admiration of the country, and of two administrations in office.

I want to talk tonight about some of the men who have made the Republican Party a great party, and who have given it inspiration and guidance, and chiefly about men who nobly and effectively filled the role of the opposition. The men that I will talk about tonight represent a pattern of fidelity to our historic institutions, coupled with insight and sensitivity to the problems of the future, that wove the strongest and most durable strands in the evolution of the Republican Party. The Republican tradition that I invoke is that which links the past to the future with indissoluble bonds without ever forgetting the requirements of either. We might call this the tradition of realism with vision.

I hasten to add at this point that I always hesitate to get into definitions about Republicans. I am reminded of the story about the famous geneticist who was asked for a definition of heredity. He thought for a moment and said, "Well, if your parents didn't have any children, the probability is that you won't, either." Nevertheless, happily risking the grunting reproof of those who say they can't abide hyphenated Republicans, let me say that men and women like CLIFFORD CASE and FLORENCE DWYER can be classified as prudent progressives, or, if you will, as enlightened conservatives, and that in them lies the strength of our party. They stand in the tradition of some of the great men of the Republican Party whose credo can be summed up as follows: wisdom and effectiveness in power; responsibility in opposition. Men cast in this mold, whether in power or in opposition, have always been distinguished by fidelity to our heritage, a vibrant awareness of public needs and public interests, and a strong sense of the movement of history. Such men, when entrusted with office, have exercised power with wisdom and effectiveness, while in opposition they have fulfilled their twofold obligation of constructive criticism and responsibility to the Nation.

History has a way of putting things in perspective. Thus when we meet to do honor to the memory of the first and the greatest Republican of them all, we do so in the assurance that our tributes are stamped with unchallengeable validity by the stern judgments of history. On February 12, 1923, a Congressman from Kansas, Homer Koch, addressed the House of Representatives with these words on Lincoln:

"There is no new thing to be said about Lincoln. There is no new thing to be said of the mountains, or of the sea, or of the stars. The years go their way, but the same old mountains lift their granite shoulders

above the drifting clouds; the same mysterious sea beats upon the shore; the same silent stars keep holy vigil above a tired world. But to the mountains and sea and stars men turn forever in unwearied homage. And thus with Lincoln. For he was a mountain in grandeur of soul, he was a sea in deep undervoice of mystic loneliness, he was a star in steadfast purity of purpose and service. And he abides."

Encomiums such as this, let us remember, were not tributes that Lincoln heard in his lifetime. Lincoln had to run uphill—he was forever standing up against a barrage of kicks, not a few of them delivered by members of his own party. You will recall that when he came up for a second term in office after 3 years of the "grinding drama of drums, blood, and agony," to borrow from Sandburg, there was hardly a Member of Congress who dared speak out to advocate a second term for the President. Sandburg points out that in early 1864 only one Congressman in the House of Representatives was definitely committed. He was Isaac Arnold of Illinois—49 years old, once a country schoolteacher in my own State of New York. "The opposition to Mr. Lincoln," wrote Indiana Republican Congressman George W. Julian, "was secretly cherished by many of the ablest and most patriotic men of the day. * * * Of the more earnest and thoroughgoing Republicans in both Houses of Congress probably not 1 in 10 really favored it (his renomination)." A committee of prominent Senators and Representatives issued a confidential circular bitterly attacking Lincoln and urging the nomination of Chase. Naturally the press printed the secret document in full. "Go on, gentlemen. Wash your dirty linen in public," jibed the Democratic New York World.

Lincoln was renominated and went on to fight a fierce and blistering campaign. On election night the reelected President spoke from the White House by torchlight: "It has long been a grave question," Lincoln said, "whether any government, not too strong for the liberties of its people, can be strong enough to maintain its own existence, in great emergencies." And he went on: "So long as I have been here I have not willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom." As Sandburg has pointed out in his book, the outlook that Lincoln was here voicing was "toward conciliation—no retaliation, no reprisals, no thorns knowingly planted in the bosoms of others."

This is what I mean by wisdom and effectiveness in power.

Let us now look at some of the other men whom history has elevated to heights they never knew in their lifetimes, and some whom even history has overlooked.

William Howard Taft, he deserved greater tribute than he received in his lifetime, and in my judgment, he merits a kinder verdict than history has accorded him. He was bitterly attacked during his tenure of office because of his rigorously constitutional view of the powers of the Presidency—a view that advocates of strong leadership have always hastened to decry, but one which, by any fair standard of judgment, must be respected as an important strand in our national development.

But the reason I call up Taft's name is not so much what he did in office, but after. He became the unofficial leader of the movement for a league of nations. As the leading figure in an organization of distinguished citizens known as the League to Enforce Peace, he worked tirelessly for a world body with enforcement powers. He gave wise counsel and faithful support to President Wilson—a distinguished effort that was little appreciated either by Wilson or by the public as a whole. He received no reward, except the personal satisfaction that he was responsible in opposition.

Taft was never quite partisan enough to please his Republican colleagues. Speaker of the House Joe Cannon said of him, "The trouble with Taft is that if he were Pope he would find it necessary to appoint a few Protestant cardinals." Taft himself said:

"Political considerations have never weighed heavily with me. I have tried to do in each case what seemed to me the wisest thing, regardless of its effect upon my own future. Indeed, in more than one case I have been perfectly conscious bad blood would be stirred by some act of mine or some refusal to act. The circumstance that the same persons who hail me, after one application of equal justice, as a far-seeing, conservative patriot, denounce me after the next as an unreasoning radical, does not greatly disturb my equanimity. I set that down as all in a day's work."

I am sure that this comment of Taft's will strike a sympathetic chord with many of you who are here tonight. Every man and woman in elective office has felt the shifting barbs of public reproach from those who think of liberal versus conservative attitudes as so many pigeonholes, each carefully labeled—black or white, God or Devil.

There is a wonderful passage from Stephen Vincent Benet's "John Brown's Body" in which Lincoln soliloquizes:

"Bull Run—the 7 days—Bull Run again—and 18 months of war—and still no end to it."

"WHAT IS GOD'S WILL?

"They come to me and talk about God's will
In righteous deputations and platoons,
Day after day, laymen and ministers.
They write me prayers from 20 million souls
Defining me God's will and Horace Greeley's.
God's will is General this and Senator that,
God's will is those poor colored fellows' will,
It is the will of the Chicago churches,
It is this man's and his worst enemy's.
But all of them are sure they know God's will.
I am the only man who does not know it."

Responsibility in oppostion was the credo of a latter day Taft, whose work is more familiar to you. Robert A. Taft was in the mainstream of the great Republican tradition I have been discussing.

Now let me talk for a moment about another but lesser known figure in the Republican tradition of effectiveness in power and responsibility in opposition—Henry L. Stimson. Stimson is best described as a progressive conservative—the term which he applied to himself. As Secretary of State in the Hoover administration, he gave unwavering support to the beleaguered President in domestic affairs while in foreign affairs he struck the first small breach in the wall of an isolationism that during the interwar years gripped both parties and virtually all of the American people.

Stimson's credo as a progressive conservative was built on two basic convictions: First, that the primary and overriding requirement of all government was that it should not infringe the essential liberties of the individual, and second, that within this limitation government could and must be made a powerful instrument of positive action.

It seemed absurd to Stimson that a profound respect for human freedom should be construed into an assertion that all government was evil. Stimson's political philosophy was in its essence a belief in the possibility of combining democracy with leadership. The democrats of the 19th century had feared government as the tool of despotism and had deliberately made it weak. Stimson and those of like mind feared weak government as an open invitation to private despotism, and they sought to restore its strength. To make the government weak because all government seemed dangerous was in Stimson's view a plain abdication of responsibility and an open confession that democracy and effective government could not be combined.

When the Japanese made the first major assault on the peace system of 1919 by their aggression in Manchuria in 1931, the League of Nations looked for the United States to take the lead in an area of traditional American responsibility. In the face of an overwhelmingly isolationist public opinion, the Secretary of State enunciated the "Stimson Doctrine": the United States would not recognize the fruits of aggression. A moral embargo was imposed against Japan by the United States, and the League adopted the same posture. The Stimson doctrine, of course, did not thwart the Japanese aggression, but it expressed the conscience of the United States at a time when that conscience seemed to be frozen solid under the glacier of isolationism. Stimson went as far as he could go—that he could go only a pitifully short distance was a factor of his times and not of his desires and convictions. In the days of deep isolationism, Stimson, virtually alone, exemplified realism with vision.

Stimson fought hard for President Hoover's reelection in 1932. He believed in Hoover and he disapproved of Franklin Roosevelt's policies as they were set forth in the campaign. Stimson accepted the defeat gracefully and eased the transition for his successor. He then withdrew to retirement.

On June 19, 1940, Stimson, at work in his New York law office, received a telephone call from the White House. The President whom he had opposed now called on him to serve as Secretary of War. Roosevelt confessed that the war emergency in Washington was running at loose ends and that Stimson's steady hand was needed. Stimson laid down conditions, which were accepted, and with another distinguished Republican, Frank Knox, accepted the call to serve in what was soon to become Roosevelt's national war Cabinet. Stimson was widely attacked by Republicans for his decision to accept a major post in the Democratic administration. The Republican Convention was coming up and it was generally considered that the President had stolen a political march and that Mr. Stimson had made it possible for him to do so. Interestingly enough, the partisan outcry backfired, because the country approved of Stimson's decision. Stimson was in any case unmoved by the hue and cry. In a time of national and world crisis, he set partisanship aside without hesitation and turned over to the Nation's service all of his formidable capacities of wisdom and statesmanship. In due course, he was given recognition for what he was—a man of enormous integrity who was eminently responsible in opposition.

Throughout the war, Stimson ran the War Department with energy, dedication, and decisiveness, culminating his career with the awesome task of guiding a new and unprepared President in the climatic final days of the war. It was Stimson who briefed President Truman on the existence of the Manhattan project which was soon to produce the world's first atomic bomb, and it was Stimson who served as the President's most intimate adviser in the agonizing process which led to the decision to use the new weapon against Japan.

Stimson's role in the decision to use the atomic bomb was the ultimate manifestation of his qualities as a statesman guided by realism with vision. This is what he wrote about this epochal event:

"The decision to use the atomic bomb was a decision that brought death to over a 100,000 Japanese. No explanation can change that fact and I do not wish to gloss it over. But this deliberate, premeditated destruction was our least abhorrent choice.

The destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki put an end to the Japanese war."

Stimson looked far beyond the immediate act, perceiving the horrendous implications for the future. He continued with these words:

"In this last great action of the Second World War we were given final proof that war is death. War in the 20th century has grown steadily more barbarous, more destructive, more debased in all its aspects. Now, with the release of atomic energy, man's ability to destroy himself is very nearly complete. The bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki ended a war. They also made it wholly clear that we must never have another war. This is the lesson men and leaders everywhere must learn, and I believe that when they learn it they will find a way to lasting peace. There is no other choice."

Next let me talk about another great Republican, cut from the same mold—Wendell Willkie. Here was a man who rose far above personal ambition to espouse a responsible opposition that in the final countdown became the price of political victory. His concern with America's future and the cause of freedom, at great personal sacrifice, astonished his most vociferous adversaries. In the campaign of 1940, the New York Times declared: "Even such professional cynics as newsmen knew that no mere love of office or appetite for acclaim could drive a man to the punishment Willkie was taking daily."

Taking up the work begun by Stimson, Willkie was one of the first Americans of either party to see that America, whether it wished to or not, was bound to live in an interdependent world—"one world," as he called it—and that America's survival was indissolubly linked to the survival of all free peoples. He saw the close relationship between foreign and domestic policy, and he laid foundations upon which such men as Arthur Vandenberg could build even more, moving toward the now commonly accepted idea of bipartisanship in foreign policy. Willkie persuaded others of the importance of international responsibility and he recharged the Republican Party with vibrant progressivism, internal and domestic, that had sagged to levels which never were intended for the party of Lincoln. "A political party," declared Willkie, "can never stand still. * * * Those leaders of a party who insist on applying old formulas to present problems merely because those formulas worked in the past are damaging the party and will eventually destroy it. For these are standing still, whereas the world around them moves."

Willkie was to some extent a visionary. He wanted to exchange a small measure of sovereignty for the surpassing goal of achieving man's age-old aspiration toward "one world"—an established system of world peace under world law. War to Willkie was intolerable, but peace without justice was worse.

Willkie's conduct of the 1940 presidential campaign was nothing less than a towering demonstration of responsible opposition. Although it might conceivably have won the election for him, Willkie refused to make a campaign issue out of the destroyer deal with Great Britain, even though there was serious question as to the constitutionality of the arrangement by which 50 World War I destroyers were transferred to war-torn Britain by an executive agreement that bypassed the treaty powers of the Senate. Britain was undergoing the awful trials of her "finest hour" and invasion by the victorious German armies seemed imminent. If Britain were defeated and her fleet fell into German hands, America would stand alone and exposed, an isolated fortress in a hostile world.

Undoubtedly burdened and torn by the politics of the question in his own mind, Willkie perceived that his country was confronted, not with a theory but with a condition of cataclysmic potentialities. In the interests of the free world, Willkie set aside an explosive partisan issue, and perhaps it cost him the election, but it may also have saved the world from the advent of a new Dark Age. Here was responsibility of heroic proportions. I like to think that in the long run this was also the best politics.

One cannot discuss Willkie's role in international affairs without logically moving to another Republican in this great tradition—Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan. Throughout the 1930's Vandenberg was as stout an opponent of the New Deal as could be found. He was also an aggressive isolationist. During the war he underwent something resembling an agonizing reappraisal, and a man of his integrity had no inclination to conceal the total reversal of his convictions behind a cloud of platitudes and sophistries. Vandenberg became as articulate and effective an internationalist as has appeared in the last generation.

An eminent place in our history is assured to Vandenberg by reason of his role as the preeminent statesman in the forging of a bipartisan foreign policy for the postwar era. The Marshall plan probably would have been impossible without his powerful advocacy in a Republican Congress of this blueprint of a Democratic administration for saving free Europe.

As a delegate to the San Francisco conference, Vandenberg successfully resisted Soviet efforts to emasculate the United Nations Charter and was largely responsible for some of the most constructive and foresighted provisions of the Charter. He successfully fought down the Soviet effort to hobble the General Assembly with restrictions on the scope of its deliberations, and largely at Vandenberg's tenacious insistence the Soviets yielded on their demand for an absolute veto in the Security Council, one that would encompass even procedural questions and recommendations for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In his diary, Vandenberg wrote these words of the total veto, which our own State Department had accepted as authorized by the Yalta agreements:

"It means, in plain language, that the Russians can raise hell all over the world, through satellites and fifth columns, and stop the new league from even inquiring into it. It is the worst of our legacies from Roosevelt."

Largely because of Vandenberg's efforts this legacy was overcome. The substantive veto, of course, remained, and Vandenberg was in favor of it, but the added veto that would have all but denuded the U.N. of its basic freedom of inquiry was most fortunately prevented.

Vandenberg was also largely responsible for article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which is the legal basis of NATO, indeed of our entire collective security system. Here was extraordinary foresight, for it was the famous Vandenberg resolution of 1948 which gave President Truman the mandate of the Republican-controlled Senate for the negotiation of the North Atlantic Treaty. The Vandenberg resolution gave the sanction of the Senate to American participation in military and political alliances for the defense of the free world. It is thus a major state paper in our diplomatic history, the ultimate reversal of the dictum of Washington's Farewell Address, which, though admirably conceived for the problems of the 18th century, was bound to give way to a dynamic new doctrine for the 20th century. It was Vandenberg who provided this doctrine.

Vandenberg, as loyal a Republican as one can find in our history, must have known that Harry Truman would claim partisan credit for accomplishments which he, Vandenberg, had made possible. It was perhaps an unpleasant price to pay for the rewards of responsible opposition, but Vandenberg paid it gladly, knowing that the stakes of history far exceeded personal vanities and partisan predilections.

This brings us down to Eisenhower, whose place in this noble tradition is beyond question. It fell to Eisenhower, whose renown was established as a statesman-general under Democratic Presidents, to heal the ugly schisms that had developed within our own body politic during the closing years of the long Democratic era. He gave a new and urgently needed unity to the Nation and always placed the preservation of the peace and defense of the free world above considerations of partisan advantage.

In the closing days of his administration, President Eisenhower pointed the way for the Republican Party as it goes into opposition. No effort was spared in his determination to insure continuity through the change of administrations and to protect the Nation from the dangers, foreign and domestic, of a stagnant interregnum. Setting aside the bitter criticisms that were leveled against his stewardship during the campaign, President Eisenhower presided over the transition with dignity and generosity, for these, as no one knows better than he, are dangerous days, when the dubious satisfactions of partisan recrimination must be subordinated to the overriding requirements of American unity in a perilous world.

In this talk I have not mentioned some other Republicans who were effective progressives, and who were immensely important Republican keynoters—Theodore Roosevelt, for example, who gave luster and vitality to the Republican tradition; Richard Nixon, who elevated the Vice Presidency to unprecedented heights. My purpose here has been rather to talk about men who, by the turn of history, found themselves in opposition, and who met that responsibility with courage and sacrifice in the interest of America.

Now with the loss of Executive power we Republicans are again confronted with the democratic responsibility of providing vigilant but constructive opposition. This responsibility lies chiefly with those of us in the Congress. It is a difficult and often thankless task, indeed far more difficult, I think, in many respects than being in the majority. But in exercising the responsibilities of democratic opposition, we can do no better than to apply the lessons taught by those eminent Republicans of whom I have spoken this evening.

Here then is the task that confronts us—to confront the Democratic administration with support where it is warranted, but with articulate and coherent opposition when that administration, in our judgment, presses unwise or ill-conceived policies or flaunts the public interest. I do not propose the initiation of a false "era of good feeling," for without opposition there is no democracy. Were we to offer this administration nothing but passive and amiable consent to all that it proposes, we would be derelict in our duties and we would be doing a grave disservice to ourselves and, above all, to the American people—for it is the function of the opposition to oppose. We must scrutinize all that the majority proposes and resist with all our resources when we think they are wrong. But we must also support them when they are right, and when the national interest is at stake, we—and they—must set aside our partisan interests and work for the good of the Nation.

Let us follow the example of those great Republicans whom I have invoked tonight. We have been wise and effective in power; let us now be responsible and constructive in opposition.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength: In the midst of the pressures of another week, as Thy servants here face its vast concerns, with bowed heads and hearts we pause at this shrine of our spirits.

Without Thee, even our wistful hopes for humanity are like withered leaves—once verdant and bright, but now brown and crumbled ruins blown upon a bitter wind.

Join us, we pray Thee, in kinship to those who, in other times that tried men's souls, went on believing in beauty and love and God, in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror.

As with deep craving for reality we turn now to Thee, we remember that we date this day's deliberations from the lowly cradle of One who died on the gallows of His day—mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged. Yet that torturing cross of defeat sways the future.

By its crimson sign which towers o'er the wrecks of time, may we conquer—in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Thursday, February 16, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, Mrs. KELLY, of New York, Mr. YATES, of Illinois, Mr. IKARD, of Texas, Mr. DULSKI, of New York, Mr. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, Mr. STRATTON, of New York, Mr. CURTIS, of Massachusetts, Mr. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, Mr. HARVEY, of Michigan, and Mr. TUPPER, of Maine, as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Federal aid for education, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President on education, received by the Senate today, which, I am informed, has been read in the House, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare without its having been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS BY VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 16, 1961, the Vice President had appointed on February 17, 1961, the following as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held at Ottawa, Canada, on February 22–25, 1961: Senators LONG of Louisiana, DODD, JORDAN, METCALF, HARTKE, YARBOROUGH, CAPEHART, AIKEN, ALLOTT, DWORSHAK, BOGGS, and SMITH of Maine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Vice President has also aksed the Presiding Officer to announce the following to be members of the Special Committee on the Aging, pursuant to Senate resolution 33: Senators MCNAMARA (chairman), SMATHERS, ENGLE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Hawaii, NEUBERGER, DIRKSEN, GOLDWATER, and COTTON.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR HAYDEN COMPLETES 49 YEARS OF CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 19, CARL HAYDEN celebrated the completion of his 49th year of congressional service to his State and Nation. The distinguished record of achievement so firmly established by our beloved President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Arizona, has no parallel in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

Senator HAYDEN has served in the Congress longer than anyone else in the history of the Nation. His service has been continuous. He arrived in Washington, as the first elected Representative of the State of Arizona, on February 19, 1912, four days after Arizona was declared a State. Senator HAYDEN served in the House of Representatives until March of 1927, when he came to the Senate. He has been devoted to the cause of the West and the development of his State. The life of CARL HAYDEN is synonymous with the history of the State of Arizona.

In the Senate, CARL HAYDEN has become the mentor of us all. A man of simplicity, intellect, and always available to his colleagues for advice and consultation, he has served the Senate well in his capacity as chairman of the Rules Committee, and now as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, where he guides consideration of the Nation's fiscal affairs. He has also served, and continues to serve, with vigor and distinction in various party and congressional capacities.

I have come to know CARL HAYDEN as a true friend in the years that I have been in the Congress. This association has meant a great deal. Senator HAYDEN is the best friend the West has ever had on Capitol Hill, and is a friend that I hope we shall have in this body for many more years to come.

Mrs. Mansfield and I wish to extend our very best wishes to Senator HAYDEN and Mrs. Hayden, and to express the hope that we shall continue to share their friendship in the future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the distinguished Senator from Montana for his generous comments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to the majority leader that one of the many qualities that have endeared our very distinguished President pro tempore to all other Members of the Senate and to the country is his grace of spirit. I have never seen him out of sorts. I have never seen him angry. I have never seen him deeply partisan. On occasions when I was still serving on the Appropriations Committee, I noticed that on a good many of the issues which presented themselves, he inclined toward our side, rather than toward his own party's side. That is the hallmark of statesmanship, after all—to see clearly and in perspective the needs of the country, regardless of partisanship, and to follow that kind of a course. That is courage, indeed.

So I salute his grace, his amiability, and his even temper; and I also salute him for the fact that at all times he is so easy to get along with. The mark of a great committee chairman is that all the members find it so easy to get along with him and find it a real labor of love to work under his chairmanship. I believe that everyone who ever served on the Appropriations Committee will say that of our very distinguished President pro tempore.

So I join the majority leader in saluting the distinguished senior Senator from

Arizona, and in wishing him well, long life, and, above all, the thing that I think he captured a long time ago. If time will permit, I should like to recall the fact that once I heard a young rabbi offer the invocation in the House of Representatives; his name was Joshua Liebman, and it is said that on Sundays he had a television and radio audience of some 5 million or 6 million people. Strangely enough, a week after I heard that invocation from his eloquent lips, I was coursing down the street in Chicago and I aimlessly looked in a bookshop window. There I saw a book written by the same young rabbi, Joshua Liebman. He is now gone; he died when he was but 44 years of age. The title of the book was "Peace of Mind." I went into the store and purchased a copy of the book; and I look at it ever so often, because I find it a great tonic. It is the story of an old rabbi to whom a young man went for advice. The young man had, I suppose, all the inclinations of youth—to seek money, to seek fame, to seek glory, to seek reputation. He laid his problem in the lap of the old rabbi, who took the list the young man had prepared, scratched out everything that was on it, and at the bottom put, as the great objective and goal of life, peace of mind.

I think our President pro tempore has achieved peace of mind and it is reflected in his constant grace and his constant kindliness and the affable and genial way in which he deals with his colleagues and with the problems of state.

So on this occasion I warmly salute our President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that he has peace of mind. The Senator from Illinois may never have seen the Chair angry, but there are occasions when the Chair boils within. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority and minority leaders in paying honor and respect to the distinguished occupant of the chair. It is because of his personality and his consideration and fairness in so many of our activities that he has endeared himself, not only to the Members of the U.S. Senate, but to thousands of people throughout the Nation. And I wish for the distinguished occupant of the chair many, many more happy years of being with us.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the majority and minority leaders and those of other Senators who have congratulated our Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, on his many years of service. Those of us who are younger in service in the Senate have found it a great encouragement and an inspiration to know a man who has served all these years in this body and to know that after we have met with him he has helped us. We in the Midwest are indebted to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, not only for his service to the country, but for his interest in our problems in particular. The Nation and Congress have been fortunate in having his services; and I personally have very much appreciated them.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the words of commendation on the anniversary of the service of the Senator from Arizona.

When my husband was a Member of this body, he loved to tell the tales of the early West he heard from Senator HAYDEN, and he never failed to regale our friends in Oregon with the account that we have a Senator who has been in Congress ever since his State was admitted to the Union. I think this is a remarkable achievement, and it also attests to the comparative youthfulness of our country.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no one more deserves the high accolades of his colleagues in the Senate, which have been paid and which are being paid to him, than the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, the beloved CARL HAYDEN.

I wish to reecho the heartfelt sentiments which have prompted the majority leader and the minority leader and other Senators on both sides of the aisle this morning, as the Senator reaches another impressive milestone in his constructive, devoted, and unselfish service to the Nation and to his own State.

One of my responsibilities in the Senate, Mr. President, is to sit as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have seen the careful and painstaking manner in which CARL HAYDEN has conducted faithfully, efficiently, and vigorously the discharge of what in truth is one of the most monumental and arduous chores confronting the Senate of the United States. The Committee on Appropriations is an important committee. It deals with the expenditure of every single penny of the public moneys, as this Congress continues to cope with problems abroad and at home.

The fairness with which he has conducted hearings and the intense desire he has constantly demonstrated to do that which ought to be done for the Nation only further prove that CARL HAYDEN deserves the tributes which are paid to him.

Mr. President, as a Senator who comes from a neighboring State of his, California, I am most grateful once again to acknowledge the sympathetic interest he has motivated in the problems of my State as they have come before his committee.

In a larger sense, it is the people of the country who owe CARL HAYDEN a debt of gratitude.

I join my colleagues most eagerly in wishing for him many, many more years of happy, constructive service in the Senate, where all of us call him our dear friend.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last fall prior to the election I was in the State of Arizona doing my duty as I saw it at the time. I was invited to a dinner at which our distinguished colleague was the guest. I shall never forget the introduction given to Senator HAYDEN by the chairman.

The chairman said that he was a comparative newcomer in Arizona, for he had resided there only about 22 years. He said he was not essentially a very studiously religious man, but he had read the Bible. He said further that after coming to Arizona and talking to all the good people there, both old and new residents, he had come to the conclusion that the Bible should be revised.

He said, "The man I am about to introduce is the reason I say this. I understand from the Bible that God created earth, and then in 8 days created man. Then, I understand from high sources, 8 days later Mr. HAYDEN created Arizona."

I think that is the way the people of Arizona feel about CARL HAYDEN.

I, of course, have been his friend for many, many years, ever since I first came to Congress some 24 years ago. He has been my neighbor in the Old Senate Office Building. I do not know how many times I have gone down the hall to chat with him and to get his good advice.

I do not say this in any joking way, because all Senators have their influence. They work on problems and try to represent their States the best they know how, and they do it well. However, if someone should ask me who is the most influential man in the U.S. Senate, I would have to say, "CARL HAYDEN." I would say that because I do not think there is a Senator in the U.S. Senate who has not had the benefit of his good advice and of his energy, activities, and wisdom in the fields not only of appropriations but also of rules and other matters.

I do not think there is a Senator in the U.S. Senate for whom CARL HAYDEN would not do those things.

CARL HAYDEN is also the most influential because of the manner in which he does his job.

Mr. President, I join with all other Senators in offering commendations and felicitations to my good old friend, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am most happy to join with Senators on both sides of the aisle who speak with such appreciation of the services, the character, and the warm personality of our distinguished senior colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Senator HAYDEN].

It has been my pleasure to serve with him as one of his subalterns in the Appropriations Committee, over which he presides not only with dignity but also with very great efficiency.

I do not believe I have ever seen any other one person do such a thorough job of organizing and turning out work as Senator HAYDEN does as chairman of that committee, which has such manifold responsibilities.

He is a great and efficient Senator.

I wish to say a word about his sense of humor. For years he has told us stories of his early days as a sheriff in a rather difficult county in Arizona, and later in other official positions. But I think the choice story in my recollection is one of his visit to the Panama

Canal during the first year he was a Congressman, 49 years ago, when the canal was being dug. He got to the Canal Zone and found there had existed serious trouble between the Jamaican workmen, persons of color, who did not understand how to work with our American mules, or perhaps the American mules did not know how to work with them. The mules probably did not understand the English language as it was spoken, with Oxford accent, by the Jamaicans.

A suggestion was made that the way to solve the difficulty was to import to handle the mules some colored workmen from the Mobile area, which was done by a ship which suffered from heavy weather, eventually arriving at the foot of the hill below the compound where the mules were quartered. The colored folks who were on the ship enjoyed greatly the opportunity to get their feet on terra firma again. As they started up the hill singing, laughing, and joshing each other, an enormous noise was heard at the top of the hill. The mules had their heads over the compound, braying and hee-hawing vociferously, because at once they understood the friendly language of the people who had come to work with them, and the trouble ceased at once to exist. Senator HAYDEN assured us that that is a truthful story.

I wish to point out also Senator HAYDEN'S zealous devotion to the cause of unlimited debate growing out of the fact—very often reported by him—that he does not think he could ever have come to the U.S. Senate if advocates of unlimited debate had not protested vigorously and effectively against the bringing in of New Mexico and Arizona as a single State. I deeply appreciate and honor our distinguished senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have known CARL HAYDEN for a great many years. I have had wonderful opportunities to become acquainted with him. He did a great deal for Senators by giving them good advice. I asked the Senator how he accounted for the fact that he had steadily represented his State for almost a half century, and he said, "I never make any speeches. People will forgive a vote. They will say, 'Oh, he got mixed up and just happened to vote the wrong way.' But if a Senator delivers a speech, which is written down in black and white, he can never erase it and may be 'hung' for it."

I think that is excellent advice which he himself has followed to his great profit and he has helped many of us to follow it.

Those of us who have worked with Senator HAYDEN and have watched the Hayden family in Arizona, starting with the first construction of Hayden's Mill, know the contribution that the family has made. I know I have profited by my acquaintance with him. I know the Senate has profited by his skill and his wise counsel. I know that he is establishing a great record of things he has done, not only for his State, but also for all States similarly situated.

Year after year, when the House of Representatives would strike from appropriation bills all the reclamation items, people would say, "What until the bill gets over to CARL HAYDEN. He will restore those items."

Somehow or other the bills have always come back in good shape. He succeeded in restoring the appropriations, because he had established for himself and for the causes that he represented a high and pervading position. I congratulate Senator HAYDEN and the people of our country on his long service in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I join my colleague in commending the great Senator from the State of Arizona. It has been my privilege to serve with the senior Senator from Arizona in the years I have been in the Senate, and I have never known a more able, more understanding, more kind and gracious public servant than the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show my great esteem for the distinguished Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN. Such a speech would occupy a great deal of space, and could not add luster to his outstanding career. I wish to pay tribute to him for his ability to serve, for his success in getting things done, for his grasp of problems, both large and small. He, indeed, is a great public servant, and while I would not ever be guilty of intimating that he was an aged man, I say that his life certainly should be and is an inspiration to many people who think they might be growing old.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to unite with my colleagues in commending the outstanding record of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator CARL HAYDEN. On a previous occasion I referred to the fact that the Senator from Virginia whom I was privileged to succeed, Carter Glass, who had been chairman of the Appropriations Committee and who had served for 30 some years with Senator HAYDEN, once said that if the Constitution were ever changed and each State were entitled to three Senators, he hoped that Virginia could get CARL HAYDEN as the third.

Mr. President, it is not only a remarkable tribute to have served in the Congress longer than anyone else in the history of our Nation—he is beginning his 50th year—but it is also a remarkable accomplishment to be known as the man who gave water and life to a large desert area of our Nation.

During the past weekend I was privileged to fly over some of the desert areas of California, Arizona, and Nevada, and to my fishing friends I wish to say I took advantage of 1 day of fishing in Lake Mead. It was a little windy and a little cold for that salubrious climate. We went up about 10 miles from the landing at Boulder Canyon. We went out from Boulder City to get a little better water. Lake Mead is a grand lake, as clear and blue as any we have in Virginia, incidentally. I was told that it was quite full of good bass and perhaps some other species. Our fishing was not done under the most favorable circumstances, but it did my heart good to know that it was CARL HAYDEN who was the principal sponsor of what was at one time called Boulder Dam, and is now known as the Hoover Dam, and that throughout the years, in power projects and in reclamation projects, he has given water and life to what now has become a great part of our Nation.

Mr. President, when I looked down on that land and compared it with the blue-grass fields of my native State, particularly of the valley, I could not help wonder how anything could survive down there. However, as I looked down from the plane I could see little towns and ranchhouses. I could not understand how anything could possibly grow down there, but evidently something must be growing. As one flies over the great area of California, one cannot help be surprised at the way the State has developed. No wonder it is the most rapidly growing State in the Nation.

There just could not be any State of Arizona or State of Nevada if it were not for water. CARL HAYDEN is the man who gave them water. So I would say that the States of Arizona and Nevada and California should erect a heroic monument to CARL HAYDEN. I hope he will live to be a hundred.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes being paid to our distinguished President pro tempore. He has not only had a long and honorable career representing his State and his Nation, but we who serve with him also know of his many kindnesses and considerate acts toward all of us.

I have had the privilege of working closely with Senator HAYDEN as a fellow member of the Senate Rules Committee. His sharp mind and ability to deal intelligently with a wide range of subjects has impressed me greatly.

As I look forward 47 years from now to the time when I shall have had as much experience in this august body as has the distinguished Senior Senator from Arizona, I doubt very much that I shall even begin to match the talents and energies of our distinguished President pro tempore.

His 49 years have stood him in good stead. I have many times seen him walking down Constitution Avenue at 8:30 in the morning. His arms full of papers he has reviewed the night before, his eyes fired with the energy he will exert on the matters that require his attention in the day ahead.

I salute our beloved colleague and express the hope that he will enjoy good health and happiness and many more years of distinguished service.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] for his kind remarks about the great State of Nevada and for elucidating on the wonders of Boulder Dam and Lake Mead. Whenever he comes back to Nevada I shall see to it that he gets his appropriate reward from fishing in the

great Lake Mead back of what we still call Boulder Dam.

I wish to join in the tributes which have been paid to the great Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN. I became acquainted with Senator HAYDEN some 20 years ago when he ran for reelection to his second term in the U.S. Senate. At the time I was taking undergraduate studies in the State of Arizona. I have followed with interest his career from that time, both as an undergraduate and as a graduate student at the University of Arizona's College of Law, and have always found him to be highly thought of by the people of his own State as well as by the people of the entire Nation.

Little did I think at that time that I would have the opportunity at some time in the future to stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate and pay my respects to him. I have served with him on the Committee on Rules and Administration for a period of approximately 2 years. I have found him to be an outstanding and great gentleman. Certainly all the laudatory remarks which have been stated in his behalf have been, in my opinion, understated.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Senators in paying tribute to the great Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Out in what was, until very recently, the Territory of Hawaii, we found through long years of experience that if we had a problem to present to this body, the senior Senator from Arizona was always willing to listen and to extend his assistance.

We hope that he will continue to serve for a long time in the Senate; but if ever he should retire, we should like to have him as a native and a friend in Hawaii.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in joining with great pleasure in the tributes which are being paid to our distinguished President pro tempore, I note with interest the comment of my good friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that there is probably no Member of the Senate who has not at some time or other been the beneficiary of the interst, of the advice, and of the assistance of CARL HAYDEN. I should like to add that even those who were not Members, but Members-to-be, of the Senate, have been the beneficiary of CARL HAYDEN's helpfulness.

I remember, back about 10 years ago, that when as Governor of Alaska I would come to Washington to present the case for statehood for Alaska, I always found CARL HAYDEN very understanding. He recalled the days of Arizona's territorial status, which he had considered highly disadvantageous to its people. He was clearly sympathetic to the aspirations of Alaska and Hawaii for statehood.

However, on one occasion, he said to me with a quizzical smile: "The difficulty about allowing you to come in, is that we do not have any room for you. The Senate Office Building is filled to overflowing; where would we put two or four more Senators and their staffs?"

I remember saying: "Why don't you build another Senate Office Building?"

He said, "That is precisely what we are planning to do." And as we all know that happened and there was room for both Alaska and Hawaii. Senator HAYDEN played a large part in it.

That is the kind of constructive aid which will make CARL HAYDEN's service long remembered. The people of Alaska and the people of Hawaii owe him a great debt of gratitude. We might have been admitted even if a new Senate Office Building had not been built, but it certainly helped.

Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute to a great statesman whose outstanding record of nearly 60 years of public service encompasses the greatest development of any Nation in history. To that development he has greatly contributed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as one who has known CARL HAYDEN longer as a Member of the Senate than any other Senator who has spoken, I wish to join in all the fine things which are being said about him.

I became acquainted with him years ago. I learned that one thing he liked was a good cigar. So this morning, when I found that he was to celebrate his 49th anniversary of service in Congress, I took to his desk a good cigar. That has been my habit for many years, although I myself have not smoked for a matter of 10 years.

The Senator from Arizona is a real gentleman. He does not spend his time talking on the Senate floor. He spends his time working in committee. I suppose there is not a Member of the Senate who talks less than he does, and probably not one who performs as much. So I return to the old saying: It is not words that count; it is work. CARL HAYDEN is one Senator who has lived up to that saying.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to those already heard in paying tribute to one of America's most distinguished statesmen and one of America's most faithful public servants, our President pro tempore, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I have known Senator HAYDEN for some 30 years. I first met him in connection with the legislation which led to the creation of the then so-called Boulder Dam, now known as Hoover Dam; and over a period of a number of years, both in connection with my work as attorney general of the State of Nevada and, more recently, as a member of this great deliberative body, I have come to know Senator HAYDEN even better.

During the past 2 years I have been privileged to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. One has to serve on that committee to know of his diligence and his hard work day after day, from early in the morning until late at night, in carrying out his arduous tasks, chores, and duties as chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

All of the things said about him today certainly are well deserved. His record of serving continuously, in either one House of the Congress or the other, for 49 years has never been surpassed in the history of our country, and is in itself a tribute to his greatness.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who today have paid their tributes to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

When I first came to the Senate, Senator HAYDEN was one of the first Members I met. He gave me advice which was valuable to me at that time. I still remember it, and have often had reason to be thankful to him.

Senator HAYDEN is a wonderful U.S. Senator. He is a great credit to the great State of Arizona; and he is an inspiration to all of us, as from time to time we come in contact with him, because of his integrity and his devotion to duty.

No Member of the Senate whom I have known during my service here has been as completely devoted as Senator HAYDEN has been to the performance of his duty in the discharge of his very heavy responsibilties.

I am glad to join in the tributes paid to him this day.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR FEED GRAINS FOR 1961—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961. I urgently recommend to the Congress the enactment of this emergency program so that it can cover the 1961 crop.

The existing program has failed. It has resulted in the accumulation of a burdensome and dangerous surplus, mainly of commodities for which there is no adequate outlet even under our expanded programs of providing food for those in need. At the same time, it has failed to protect farm income, and it is threatening to drive down the prices farmers receive for hogs, cattle, poultry and eggs, and milk to disastrous levels. If this program is allowed to continue in effect for this year's crop, the stocks in Government hands will reach even more alarming proportions, a virtually unmanageable storage problem will be created, farm income will continue to suffer, and large amounts of Government funds will be needlessly expended. Immediate action is required to prevent further deterioration of this situation. In order to be effective with respect to this year's

crops, a new program should be authorized by March 1.

I believe that any legislation enacted should fit our overall goal to use our agricultural abundance to meet the needs of our people, and at the same time provide a fair income for those who produce that abundance. We need to shift our production from commodities of which there is an unmanageable surplus to commodities for which there is a need, even as we curtail our production of those surplus commodities. The Secretary of Agriculture already has authority to take steps toward these goals with regard to some commodities, such as milk, soybeans and cottonseed, pork, poultry, and eggs. However, new legislation is needed for effective action with respect to corn and other feed grains. The legislation I am now recommending will fill this gap with the authority needed to round out an emergency program for this year in the feed grain sector of our farm economy.

Although this is an emergency program, it is consistent with our long-range objectives and would accomplish the following: (1) a moderate increase in farm income; (2) a saving of several hundred million dollars of Government funds; and (3) a holding down or reduction of surplus stocks to more manageable proportions. This will be done without any material effect upon consumer prices.

The Government now holds 2.7 billion bushels of feed grains. The investment in feed grains stands at the alltime high of nearly $4 billion. The 1961 crop will soon be planted. By this fall, the Nation will be confronted once again with a shortage of space in which to store grain. The shortage may amount to the off-farm space required for as much as 200 to 250 million bushels if we fail to take any preventive action now. The storage problem will be further accentuated in 1962.

The legislative proposals submitted herewith (1) would provide that cooperators would receive a support price of $1.20 a bushel for corn for 1961, and would receive supports for other feed grains in relation to those for corn; and (2) would authorize a special agricultural conservation program under which acreage previously planted to feed grains would be diverted from production for 1961. Unlike the present program under which a support price of $1.06 a bushel is paid to all producers without regard to any limit on production, producers will not be eligible for price supports under this new program unless they cooperate in the special agricultural conservation program.

This emergency program covers only the 1961 crop. I intend to recommend to the Congress other legislation covering both wheat and feed grain crops for subsequent years.

There is attached hereto a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture setting forth the details of the program. It is important that it be accorded the prompt consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program through increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1961.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a bill to make five needed improvements in the social security program.

They will not only help to meet pressing social needs, but if promptly enacted these improvements will give our economic recovery program needed impetus. They will result in placing increased purchasing power in the hands of almost 5 million people. These people are among the lowest income groups in the country.

In addition, the legislation will improve the flexibility and effectiveness of our social security program over the long run and make it better able to contribute to the economic strength of the Nation and the welfare and security of our people.

The enclosed letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare describes the legislation in more detail.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for "Education and welfare services," for the fiscal year 1961, had beeen reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUARTZ CRYSTALS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 100,000 pounds of subgrade crude quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF FOREIGN EXCESS PROPERTY

A letter from the Director, Office of Administrative Operations, U.S. Department of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, on foreign excess property disposed of by that Department during the calendar year 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY OR DISPOSED OF TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property received by or disposed of to public health and educational institutions, for the calendar quarter, October 1 through December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas Washington State is presently suffering from extensive unemployment in many areas causing distress to families of low income; and

"Whereas President Kennedy has greatly expanded the surplus food program as an aid to low-income families as well as a factor in the solution of the farm surplus problem; and

"Whereas certain Democratic legislators of this State have worked for a number of years in an effort to obtain surplus foods for the needy and the unemployed, and on February 2, 1961, the director of agriculture was directed by the Governor to select a community within the State for one of the pilot programs for distribution of surplus foods through a food stamp plan, pointing out that recent reports of the employment security department showed Washington State third highest in unemployment of covered workers, with several counties showing rates from 25 to 33 percent unemployed of all covered workers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Washington, do hereby urge the extension of the stamp plan pilot projects to include the State of Washington; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state immediately to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Orval Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representa-

tives, and to Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Senator Henry M. Jackson, and to each Member of the U.S. Congress from the State of Washington.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States to restore gold and silver to their time-honored position as basic monetary metals not only for international exchange but also for the proper conduct of business transactions within the United States; to restore rights of the American people to acquire, possess and dispose of gold within and without the United States and to discontinue the sale and distribution of both the precious metals at less than present-day costs of production for uses other than monetary and to encourage, by immediate congressional action, the production of both these metals within the United States

"Whereas the international situation has created problems which have placed the United States in a real dilemma as far as our international, economic, financial, and other relationships are concerned; and

"Whereas we have a dollar of two standards: One in which the American citizen cannot demand gold for his paper dollars and the other in which the foreigner can demand gold for his paper dollars and other obligations; and

"Whereas the heavy international drain on our gold supply, coupled with the recent increase in speculative buying in world markets, suggests a growing lack of confidence in the stability of the dollar both at home and abroad; and

"Whereas the price of gold has been artificially fixed at $35 per ounce since 1935, and continued at that price since that date, although costs of mining and all other items, including taxes, have greatly increased since that time; and

"Whereas the drop in gold reserves has been accompanied by a steady dissipation of treasury 'free' silver supplies through sales to industrial users of the metal at prices below those prevailing in world markets; and

"Whereas the sale to industrial users of gold and treasury free silver has been continued to the detriment of the best interests of the American people and has accentuated the problem of monetary policy and also effectively maintained an artificial ceiling on the production of both precious metals to the disadvantage of domestic producers who have in the main been forced out of business by reason of this unfortunate policy on the part of the United States Government in its treatment of domestic producers of gold and silver; and

"Whereas the worldwide responsibilities which this Nation has assumed require that we not only adhere to a sound hard-money policy and maintain a currency which is virtually impregnable to the continuing stresses of current international unrest and dissension: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That it respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional control over our international monetary policies and restore the American dollar to its historic place among the currencies of the world by proceeding at the earliest possible date to enact legislation that will:

"1. Reaffirm the historical and traditional American dollar to its historical place by proper recognition of realistic prices for gold and silver as monetary metals and fixing a current ratio at which the dollar and gold will be made fully convertible and establishing the procedures for orderly restoration of the gold standard.

"2. Abolish all restrictions on the purchase, sale, and ownership of gold by citizens of the United States.

"3. Terminate at the earliest possible date all sales of gold and silver to industrial and commercial users and require the Treasury of the United States to retain all of its monetary stocks of both precious metals exclusively for monetary purposes for the proper protection of the American people.

"4. Amend the act of July 31, 1946, to eliminate the seigniorage charge of 30 percent on purchases of silver and help stimulate production of this precious metal, thus assuring a continued domestic supply for our Nation.

"5. Give proper recognition to the increased costs involved in the production of gold in this country by agreeing on a price which should be paid to domestic producers for newly mined gold on a realistic basis.

"6. Assist in executive action to encourage and stimulate other governments to restore gold and silver coinage and discontinue the shackles of licensing requirements for the exchange of gold and silver on the world markets and as part of our foreign policy, to encourage the utilization of these time-honored precious metals as circulating mediums and standards of value; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States.

"ALBERT S. TOMSIE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"GENE MANZANARES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"ROBERT L. KNOWS,
"President of the Senate.
"LUCILLE L. SHUSTER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 6

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the economy of the State of Idaho is based upon its agriculture, lumber, mining, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas approximately two-thirds of the land area of the State of Idaho is federally owned and contains approximately 3 million acres set aside for primitive and wilderness areas; and

"Whereas these designations are restrictive to full utilization and deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Idaho the right to wisely develop the natural resources contained in these large primitive and wilderness areas of the State and further deny ready access to these areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State Idaho is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we are most respectfully opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness areas in the State of Idaho and respectfully request that all primitive and wilderness areas in the State of Idaho be reviewed and studied with the view of eliminating all lands which have a higher or greater multiple use potential than that of single use dedication as primitive or wilderness; and be it further

"Resolved, That we oppose Federal enactment of future wilderness legislation embodying the principle of locked-up areas for single purpose use which would deny to the natural resources industries the right to wisely develop such natural resources and would also be to the detriment of said industries and to the people of the State of Idaho; and be it further

"Resolved, That the present agencies administering all Federal lands do so with the view of developing the full multiple use of the lands to further the general welfare and the economy of the State of Idaho; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the speaker of the house and to the president of the senate of the following States: Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and that these States are hereby urged to take similar action in their respective legislative bodies."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas both Houses of the 86th Congress of the United States of America by a constitutional majority of two-thirds of each House thereof, made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words and figures, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"' 'ARTICLE —

"' 'SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"' 'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform

such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

"' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."'

"Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

"SECTION 1. That said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, ratified by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this preamble and joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State to the Secretary of State at Washington, to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the creating of representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"' "ARTICLE

"' "SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"' "A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."'

"Be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United State of America, be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 36th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas we believe that all moneys which may in the future be paid by the Federal Government to the State of Idaho for the increase of teacher salaries should be disbursed under the State's educational or distribution formula, and

"Whereas we believe moneys paid by the Federal Government for increases in teacher salaries should be in addition to moneys provided by the State for the educational or distribution formula: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 36th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned and the request made that all moneys paid by the Federal Government to the State of Idaho for the improvement of teachers' salaries, be paid to the Idaho State treasurer and that such funds be deposited for distribution to public schools by using the educational or distribution formula in effect at the time such funds are received; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Washington, D.C., the State superintendent of public instruction, Boise, Idaho, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

The petition of Clare F. Bodman, of Washington, D.C., relating to memorials to Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Ponce, P.R., favoring the administration's proposed bill to provide medical care for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point House Joint Memorial 4 adopted by the 25th Legislature of the State of New Mexico petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

A joint memorial petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

Whereas there is now pending before the District Court of the State of New Mexico certain litigation questioning the right to vote of residents of certain areas within the State of New Mexico, to wit: residents on certain military reservations and residents on the Navajo Indian Reservation, all within the State of New Mexico; and

Whereas our great country was founded upon the principle that all men are entitled to equal protection, benefit and rights afforded under the laws of the United States, its States and territories, and that there be no discrimination concerning such protection, benefits, rights or duties, and that each and every citizen shall be entitled to equal rights and should assume equal responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That should it become finally determined that any citizen of the State of New Mexico, otherwise qualified to vote, be denied such right by reason of his residence on certain Federal reservations including the Navajo Indian Reservation lying within the State of New Mexico, then and in that event, that the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to introduce and to enact such legislation as will enable and permit such citizens to be entitled to vote; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial shall be sent to each the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Senators and Representatives representing the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRESENTATION IN ELECTORAL COLLEGE—JOINT RESOLUTION OF ALASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD House Joint Resolution 1 of the Alaska State Legislature now in session ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia.

I know it was with great pleasure that the legislature acted unanimously in joining those States which have already acted. The people of Alaska, who were not able to vote in the national election until last fall, have been particularly sympathetic with the voteless residents of the Nation's Capital and their representatives in the State legislature were gratified to be able to vote those feelings in passing House Joint Resolution 1.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska in second legislature, first session, assembled:

That the following article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Congress of the United States through the adoption of Senate Joint

Resolution 39, 86th Congress, 2d session, is ratified:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the 12th article of amendment.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Alaska shall duly certify the necessary number of copies of this resolution and transmit them pursuant to law to the Administrator, General Services Administration, and direct facsimile copies to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the State of Alaska identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

TEXAS LEGISLATURE COMMENDS FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION FOR HOLDING AREA PREHEARING CONFERENCES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Texas has passed a house concurrent resolution commending the Federal Power Commission for setting prehearing conferences in Midland, Tex., on March 6, 1961.

Purpose of the prehearing conference is to give interested persons in the area the opportunity to conveniently present data to be considered by the FPC in reviewing prices for natural gas moving in interstate commerce.

In keeping with the request of the legislature, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has published its Statement of General Policy No. 61–1, whereby it proposes to establish and periodically review area prices for natural gas moving in interstate commerce; and

Whereas under this policy statement the Federal Power Commission has called for appearances in a prehearing conference on March 6, 1961, in Midland, Tex., to review the area prices established for the Permian Basin; and

Whereas all producers of gas in this area, which includes Texas Railroad Commission Districts 7–C and 8, have been notified to appear at this hearing if they presently have natural gas contracts under suspension by the Federal Power Commission, or if they desire to present evidence bearing on the justness and reasonableness of the area prices presently established by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the need for additional exploration and drilling for natural gas is critical because of the need to develop more natural gas reserves to satisfy an ever-expanding demand, and to be available in time of national emergency, and such exploration and drilling is a hazardous undertaking with uncertain and unpredictable results which therefore requires understanding and recognition of those problems by the entire public, including consumers, and a reasonable recognition of such hazards and uncertainties on the part of those who administer any laws or regulations pertaining thereto; and

Whereas the State of Texas, as well as its citizens, has a direct and immediate interest in this proceeding because the establishment of these prices on an irreplaceable natural resource affects a substantial portion of the State's economy and because the State collects a tax on all natural gas produced in this State; and

Whereas, the length of time and the expense necessary for a hearing in Washington on prices to be allowed producers has made such procedures prohibitive in the case of many independent producers; and

Whereas, the State officials of Texas have previously indicated their concern over the importance of this hearing and the necessity that the interest of the State be presented, preserved and protected; and

Whereas this resolution shall not be construed as indicating that this Legislature of the State of Texas concedes any power, jurisdiction, or the necessity for Federal regulation of wellhead prices of independent producers of natural gas which may later be transported in interstate commerce, but rather it acknowledges that the Federal Power Commission, having had that duty thrust on it by the courts, despite contrary congressional intent, is to be commended for accommodating producers by holding consolidated hearings in the areas where the natural gas is to be produced; and

Whereas, the interests of those municipalities, localities, and States who are net consumers of natural gas transported in interstate commerce have been and are fully and adequately represented by intervention at Federal Power Commission rate proceedings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate of Texas concurring), That the Federal Power Commission be commended for its proposed plan to hold a consolidated prehearing conference in Midland, Tex., rather than in Washington, District of Columbia, for the purpose of determining the just and reasonable price of natural gas produced in the Permian Basin of Texas and New Mexico, and transported in interstate commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That the public officials of Texas be commended for their proposal to participate in this hearing; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be distributed to Members of Congress, to the officials and staff of the Federal Power Commission, and to the public officials of Texas.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF COLORADO LEGISLATURE

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, last week I was pleased to present to the Senate a memorial from the Colorado Legislature requesting the inclusion of Huerfano and Las Animas Counties within the provisions of area redevelopment legislation.

I am now happy to present the Senate with a memorial on behalf of Costilla County.

Costilla County is an area of severe and persistent economic distress. The severity of this distress is no better illustrated than by the fact that of a population of 4,217, 570 persons are receiving assistance from the Colorado State Public Welfare Department. In December, 711 of these 4,000 received surplus food rations. In the last 10 years the county has lost 30.5 percent of its population; in the 10 years previous to that it lost 19.5 percent.

Suffering and hardship, of course, cannot be measured by statistics alone. The story of the depressed areas in our rich country is one of human tragedy and misery.

I am gratified to present this joint memorial of the Colorado Legislature to the Senate as a sign of the concern felt by all of Colorado for the distress of one of its counties.

I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Whereas the President of the United States and Members of the Congress of the United States have indicated a desire to assist areas of the United States which are experiencing a decline in their business growth as compared to other areas of the United States; and

Whereas the presence of a depressed area in any section of the United States represents a source of danger to the continued growth of the United States in an historical period of competition with other great powers of the world; and

Whereas the county of Costilla in the State of Colorado has in recent years experienced a serious decline in its business growth and must be considered a depressed area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 43d General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein) That it respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to include Costilla County of the State of Colorado in any provisions to be made by Congress or the President for aid to depressed areas of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Colorado who are urgently requested to introduce and sponsor such legislation as is necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution dealing with location of interstate highways adopted by the New Hampshire Legislature.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas New Hampshire has spent substantial sums for the construction of Interstate Highways 93 and 89 in the vicinity of the Vermont border; and

Whereas for purposes of self-aggrandizement, certain groups in the State of Vermont wish Interstate Highway 91 within the State of Vermont located farther from the New Hampshire-Vermont border than originally proposed; and

Whereas such relocation would reduce substantially the benefits to be derived from the sums already spent by New Hampshire; and

Whereas the future economic development of the Connecticut Valley depends heavily on retention of the location originally proposed for Interstate Highway 91 within the State of Vermont; and

Whereas His Excellency, Governor Powell, and Commissioner Morton of the New Hampshire Department of Public Works and Highways have publicly denounced such proposed relocation of Interstate Highway 91: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Court of the State of New Hampshire is unalterably opposed to such proposed relocation of Interstate Highway 91 within the State of Vermont; be it further

Resolved, That the members of the New Hampshire delegation in the Congress of the United States be requested to oppose such proposed relocation of Interstate Highway 91; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States and to each of the members of the New Hampshire delegation in Congress.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact remedial legislation immediately setting quotas for the importation of textile products in order to save the cotton textile industry of the United States, and ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas since the culmination of hostilities in World War II, the United States of America has poured millions of dollars into foreign countries which has resulted in the development of a highly competitive textile industry beyond the seas, which has grown to gigantic proportions and seriously threatens the existence of the cotton textile industry in the United States; and

Whereas with this ever-increasing competition, where fair labor standards are low and compensation is meager, and with no restriction on amounts of textile products imported, foreign industries have been able to deliver cotton textile products for sale in the United States at prices far below the reasonable selling prices of the same products manufactured in the United States; and

Whereas this state of affairs has reached a point where the very existence of the cotton textile industry in the entire United States is seriously threatened; and

Whereas it is estimated by competent statisticians that unless quotas are established which drastically reduce the importation of foreign textile products, the cotton textile industry will disappear in the United States within five years; and

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina believes that importation quotas should be established immediately drastically reducing the importation of cotton textile products in the United States; Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation immediately drastically reducing the importation quotas of cotton textile products; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from South Carolina in the Senate of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the House of Representatives of the Congress.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is undisputed that the Communists and similar groups are seeking to undermine and destroy our American form of government; and

Whereas these subversive groups are often aided and abetted by persons and organizations ignorant of their true purpose; and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee have rendered our country a service of inestimable value in detecting and curtailing these subversive activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator from South Carolina in the Senate of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the House of Representatives of the Congress.

WOODBINE DAM ON LYON CREEK, KANS.—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received resolutions from the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Herington, Kans., the president of the chamber of commerce and the chairman of the agriculture committee of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, urging that authorization of the Woodbine Dam on Lyon Creek be deferred until plans and construction of the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 are in operation.

The city of Herington has for many years been cooperating with the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41, with the view of securing control of water runoff on that stream through impoundment of water and other water retarding programs.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved by the board of directors of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, Inc., That it is the studied opinion of this body that the authorization of the Woodbine Dam at this time would be premature and would work irrevocable harm to the city of Herington and its surrounding territory:

That authorization of said dam should be deferred until the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 and the city of Herington working in cooperation shall have had time to plan and construct impoundments and other works as provided by the provisions of Public Laws 566 and 1018 (Hope-Aikens Act) to the end that the best interest of the city of Herington, the citizens of the Lyon Creek Valley and the citizens of the State of Kansas particularly those residing in the Kansas River basin be equally protected; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to: John Anderson, Jr., the Governor of the State of Kansas; Mark Gordon, senator, 20th district; William H. Ward, senator, 21st district; Howard W. Harper, senator, 19th district; Homer Hoffman, representative, Dickinson County; J. J. Moxley, representative, Morris County; Lawrence D. Slocombe, representative, Marion County; Ed. L. Kessinger, representative, Geary County; secretary, Kansas Water Resources Board, Topeka; chief engineer division of water resources State board of agriculture, Topeka; secretary, Governor's watershed review committee, Topeka; Andrew Schoeppel, U.S. Senator for Kansas; Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator for Kansas; William Avery, Representative, U.S. Congress, First District; Robert F. Ellsworth, Representative, U.S. Congress, Second District; Walter McVey, Representative, U.S. Congress, Third District; Garner E. Shriver, Representative, U.S. Congress, Fourth District; J. Floyd Breeding, Representative, U.S. Congress, Fifth District; Robert A. Dole, Representative, U.S. Congress, Sixth District; Office of U.S. Engineers, Federal Building, Kansas City, Mo., and that sufficient other copies be made available that copies of same may be made available to other interested parties.

Whereas the city of Herington is a city located on the flood plain of Lyon Creek, a tributary of the Smoky Hill River, a part of the Kansas River basin, and

Whereas Lime Creek, a tributary of said Lyon Creek, flows directly through said city; and

Whereas said city of Herington has in the past 60 or more years suffered from flood loss and damage due to the flooding of said Lime Creek and Lyon Creek; and

Whereas the city water supply reservoir of the city of Herington is located on Kohl Creek which is a tributary to said Lyon Creek, said impoundment having been constructed beginning in the year 1923; and

Whereas said water supply reservoir due to lack of land treatment practices above said water supply reservoir has filled with silt to a result that the capacity of said reservoir has been greatly reduced; and

Whereas the city of Herington has for many years and is now working with the

Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 to the end that there be constructed on said watershed, particularly on Lyon Creek and Lime Creek, structures for the purpose of flood control and water supply impoundment all under the provisions of the Watershed Districts Act of the State of Kansas and the provisions of Public Law 566 and Public Law 1018 (Hope-Aiken Act); and

Whereas the construction of the Woodbine Dam on Lyon Creek as proposed by the U.S. Army Engineers will give to the city of Herington no flood protection; and

Whereas the cost of bringing water from said impoundment to Herington for public use would be prohibitive on account of the location for said structure; and

Whereas the authorization of said structure by the Congress of the United States at this time would have the practical result of depriving the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 of basic credits necessary for its justification, for the reason that credit for flood control once taken cannot be also taken by a similar or supporting project; and

Whereas the authorization of this structure at this time so far ahead of actual construction would result in the economic depression of the Lyon Creek watershed area in general and particularly that part thereof as located within the area of the Woodbine Dam and its highwater flood pool; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, Inc., did on the 30th day of January 1961 pass by unanimous vote a resolution requesting deferment of authorization of the Woodbine Dam on Lyon Creek in Dickinson County, until such time as the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41 had time in which to plan and construct works in said watershed district under the provisions of Public Laws 566 and 1018 (Hope-Aiken Act); and

Whereas the accomplishment of such work is of vital interest to the city of Herington; and

Whereas the city of Herington is vitally in need of flood protection and an additional water supply impoundment; and

Whereas the said city of Herington has been for more than 5 years working with and cooperating with the landowners in the Lyon Creek watershed and the steering committee of the Lyon Creek Watershed District No. 41, for the mutual benefit of both parties, and for the specific purpose of securing for the city of Herington necessary flood protection, additional impoundment of water supplies, and the protection of the existing water supply impoundment of the city of Herington by proper land treatment above said structure so as to prevent further siltation; and

Whereas, said watershed district is now a duly incorporated organization under the provisions of the Watershed Act of the State of Kansas; and

Whereas the deferment of authorization of the Woodbine Dam is of vital interest to the city of Herington: Now, therefore,

We the undersigned, being the City Commission of the City of Herington, Kans., a municipal corporation, do endorse and adopt by reference the provisions of the resolution of January 30, 1961 as adopted by the board of directors of the Herington Chamber of Commerce, Inc., and direct that the city clerk of this city send copies of this resolution to the persons named in such resolution.

Passed by the unanimous vote of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Herington, this 13th day of February 1961.

MARTIN T. KLEINSCHMIDT,
Mayor.

JOHN D. KIRKLAND,
Commissioner of Finance.

F. EDWARD KOEHLER,
Commissioner of Streets and Utilities.

RESOLUTIONS ON SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT AGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions which I have received urging the lowering of the social security retirement age limit for men to 60 years of age.

The first resolution was received from Mr. John Szydlowski of Buffalo on behalf of the Board of Fire Commissioners of Doyle Fire District No. 1.

The second was received from Mr. Joseph Ranalli, president of Local 12623, United Mine Workers of America on behalf of the employees of Church & Dwight Co., Inc., of Syracuse. This petition is signed by approximately 100 employees of local 12623.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONORABLE SENATOR: At the last meeting of the board of fire commissioners the following resolution has been adopted:

"*Resolved*, That we are in favor of the bill being introduced lowering the age limit of men to 60 years of age on social security."

We hope that you will vote in favor of this bill as it will give the younger men an opportunity to secure work.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN SZYDLOWSKI,
Secretary.

We, the undersigned, employees of Church & Dwight Co., Inc., and members of Local 12623, District 50, United Mine Workers of America located at Syracuse, N.Y., request that the social security age of 65 years be lowered to 60 years of age to counteract the many employment problems, etc. that this country is faced with. We will be greatly indebted to you if this is brought to the Senate floor.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S FEDERATED CLUBS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference two resolutions adopted by the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire, adopted at the annual meeting of the group recently.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas, the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the Congress of the United States has won wide acclaim for its outstanding work in bringing out into the open the activities of certain individuals and organizations which are contrary to our republican form of government and which are against the principles of freedom set forth in our Constitution; and

"Whereas, there are widespread efforts to discredit the accomplishments of this committee: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire*, That we commend the work of said House Committee on Un-American Activities and urge our U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress to support the work of said committee and to take whatever steps they may consider necessary to insure the continuance of said committee; further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON, and to Representatives CHESTER MERROW and PERKINS BASS."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas in these difficult and troublesome times for our country the American ideals are often forgotten; and

"Whereas the Communist menace does not appear to be recognized for what it is, particularly among the youth of our country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire, urge the New Hampshire Department of Education to require all schools to devote more time to instruction in our Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States of America, and also that in said course or courses greater effort be made to impress upon our youth the fact that communism is a form of government which is a menace to all freedom-loving Americans.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the New Hampshire commissioner of education and the State board of education."

RESOLUTION OF TOWN COUNCIL, GROTON, CONN.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Town Council of the Town of Groton, Conn., relating to a reduction of personnel and equipment of the Coast Guard involved in search and rescue operations in the waters between Watch Hill, R.I., and Milford, Conn. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REGARDING CUT IN PERSONNEL OF U.S. COAST GUARD MOORINGS AT FORT TRUMBULL

Whereas the press and other sources of public information have announced that action has been initiated to drastically reduce the personnel and equipment of the U.S. Coast Guard involved in search and rescue operations in the waters between Watch Hill, R.I., and Milford, Conn.; and

Whereas in the past this service has been most effective in providing safety for many thousands of boaters from this and several other States; and

Whereas in the last year this service answered 320 distress calls involving the lives of 850 persons and over $8 million in property; and

Whereas the suggested reduction would result in the service no longer being effective and operational and leaving many disaster calls unanswered; and

Whereas beside the potential future loss of life and property, the security which the boating public now enjoys would be eliminated: Be it

Resolved, That the Town Council of the Town of Groton hereby urges that a copy of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the proper Representatives in Congress with the hope that they will take whatever steps necessary to insure the continuance of adequate personnel and equipment to maintain the past services of the U.S. Coast Guard at the aforesaid location.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RAILWAY MAIL PAY ACT OF 1916

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I was pleased to receive a resolution adopted by the Milwaukee Association of Commerce.

The resolution urges repeal of certain provisions of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916.

The message from Lester W. Brann, Jr., executive vice president of the association, points out that the following agencies support the repeal: The Railway Express Agency, Air Transport Association, Association of American Railroads, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Transportation Association of America, Central Western Shippers Advisory Board, Midwest Shippers Advisory Board, Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, and subcommittee of House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The topic of the resolution—reflecting the views of such broad segments of the economy—deserves the consideration of Congress. I request unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 5 OF THE RAILWAY MAIL PAY ACT OF 1916

Whereas certain provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1961 provide that the Postmaster General shall obtain information from the Interstate Commerce Commission on revenues received by railroad companies from express companies and may, at his discretion, arrange for the transportation of mail matter other than the first class at rates not exceeding those reported to him; and

Whereas the repeal of such provisions has been a part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission and its recommendation for repeal was drafted as proposed legislation and introduced in the 86th Congress as H.R. 7055 and S. 1810; and

Whereas a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee held full hearings during June 1960 and unanimously recommended that H.R. 7055 be favorably reported without amendment; and

Whereas aforesaid provisions are not required to insure reasonable railroad rates for the transportation of mail, and, have never been applied in 44 years and undoubtedly never will be applied as a practical matter for the reason that the railroads can never permit express rates to provide an excuse for reducing mail rates below the compensatory levels fixed by the ICC after full public hearings; and

Whereas the retention of these certain provisions will be of no benefit to anyone, but will seriously threaten the continued existence of the Railway Express Agency; and

Whereas it is definitely in the public interest to keep a nationwide express company, handling 70 million transactions annually and employing some 33,000 persons, operating as a successful private enterprise transportation company; and

Whereas to do this it is imperative that legislation similar to that proposed by H.R. 7055 and S. 1810 in the 86th Congress be passed by the 87th Congress, and,

Whereas the Industrial Transportation Committee of the Milwaukee Association of Commerce believes that best interest of shippers and receivers of both express matter and mail in the metropolitan area of Milwaukee, as well as the entire United States, would best be served by the repeal of the aforesaid provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Milwaukee Association of Commerce supports and urges the repeal of the aforesaid provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the respective Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives with a request that this resolution be incorporated in the official record for the repeal of the aforesaid provisions of section 5 of the Mail Pay Act of 1916.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of December 1960. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, DECEMBER 1960

INTRODUCTION

This is the 13th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is for the month of December 1960.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The four agencies reported that as of December 1, 1960, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $16,183,501,000 and as of December 31, 1960, they totaled $16,067,197,000, a net decrease of $116,304,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month Dec. 1, 1960	End of month Dec. 31, 1960	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture: Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$7,441,730	$7,313,683	−$128,047
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	72,125	85,870	+13,745
Total, Department of Agriculture	7,513,855	7,399,553	−114,302
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,132,492	6,130,245	−2,247
Federal Facilities Corporation: Tin inventory	9,519	9,519	
Defense Production Act program	1,464,171	1,460,667	−3,504
Supplemental stockpile	838,128	839,999	+1,871
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	44,974	44,974	
Total, General Services Administration	8,489,285	8,485,404	−3,881
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: Civil defense stockpile	16,413	17,225	+812
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Civil defense medical stockpile	163,948	165,015	+1,067
Grand total	16,183,501	16,067,197	−116,304

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detail is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1960: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, December 1960.

Table 4: Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1960: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists when extended support, and in some instances in a form to which the supported commodity is processed or converted to increase marketability. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: All inventories are recorded in the accounts at cost. "Cost value" is comprised of the initial cost of the commodity plus storage, handling, transportation, and accessorial expenses paid or accrued up to the date of reporting. The initial cost of inventories acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans is the unpaid balance of the notes plus storage and other charges advanced, any equities due or paid to producers on warehouse-stored collateral (by Public Law 85-835, and beginning with 1959 crop production, the Corporation will not make equity payments to borrowers on unredeemed price support loan collateral, title to which it acquires on or after maturity of the loans), and the net value of any quantity or quality differences determined upon delivery of farm-stored collateral. Amounts paid to lending agencies participating in the loan program for crop years prior to 1958 were recorded as a part of inventory cost.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition: Total costs of storage, handling, transportation, and other accessorial expenses incurred during the month.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition value plus applicable amount of carrying charges. The amount of cost allocated to commodities removed from inventory is determined with the view of retaining in the inventory accounts the cost of commodities remaining on hand. The cost allocated to commodities removed from price support inventory is generally computed on the basis of average unit cost of the commodity reflected in the inventory accounts for the applicable crop year and general storage location. In the case of commodities generally stored commingled (e.g., bulk grains and bulk oils) the crop year is determined on the first-in, first-out basis. In the case of commodities stored in identified lots, the crop year is determined by lot identification.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month								Inventory, end of the month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities:													
Basic commodities:													
Corn	Bushel	1,472,039	$2,443,539	−160	−$271	9,281	$11,028	$12,293	$933	9,874	$22,806	1,471,277	$2,444,716
Cornmeal	Pound					40,243	1,586	(1)	1	40,243	1,587		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	61	17,285					9	(1)	2	570	59	16,724
Cotton, upland	do	5,437	924,068			1,311	192,044	991	−1	1,779	280,257	4,969	836,845
Peanut butter	Pound			(1)	(1)					(1)	(1)		
Peanuts, farmers' stock	do	106	11			18,753	1,742	80		3,413	314	15,446	1,519
Peanuts, shelled	do	85,904	14,347	(1)	(1)	7,305	1,008	65	29	31,275	5,017	61,934	10,432
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	1,423	13,366	(1)	−1	127	1,089	53	79	88	920	1,462	13,660
Rice, rough	do	1,393	7,546	−1	−20		(1)	35	−2	704	3,791	668	3,768
Tobacco	Pound					2,188	1,398			2,188	1,398		
Wheat	Bushel	1,145,777	2,973,498	−226	−909	49	98	13,377	6,346	12,639	44,100	1,132,961	2,948,310
Wheat flour	Pound					157,962	8,163	(1)	3	157,922	8,164	40	2
Total, basic commodities			6,393,660		−1,201		218,156	26,903	7,388		368,930		6,275,976
Designated nonbasic commodities:													
Barley	Bushel	59,646	73,241	−92	−82	−14	−9	809	587	3,522	5,637	56,018	68,900
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	312,444	851,546	−13	−123	1	3	6,702	1,690	467	1,462	311,965	858,356
Milk and butterfat:													
Butter	Pound	73,129	43,513			2,696	1,629	114	164	9,530	5,816	66,295	39,604
Cheese	do	99	35					(1)	(1)	99	35		
Milk, dried	do	307,525	43,358			35,242	5,298	146	522	62,931	9,804	279,836	39,520
Milk, fluid	do					81,280	3,333			81,280	3,333		
Oats	Bushel	11,510	9,292	+3	+1	20	12	97	6	173	151	11,360	9,257
Rye	do	4,317	6,248	−2	−2	(1)	−2	43	3	47	62	4,268	6,228
Tung oil	Pound	24,326	5,183					7	15	176	39	24,150	5,166
Total, designated nonbasic commodities.			1,032,416		−206		10,264	7,909	2,987		26,339		1,027,031
Other nonbasic commodities:													
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	6	34					(1)	4		4	6	34
Flaxseed	Bushel	(1)	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)		(1)	1	(1)	(1)
Soybeans	do	7,017	15,564	+1	+4	2	3	90	1	2,527	5,061	4,493	10,601
Turpentine	Gallon	102	55					(1)		26	14	76	41
Total, other nonbasic commodities			15,654		+4		3	90	5		5,090		10,676
Total, agricultural commodities			7,441,730		−1,403		228,423	34,902	10,380		400,349		7,313,683
Exchange commodities: [2]													
Strategic and critical materials:													
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, crude	Pound	37,490	2,108			16,307	891	(1)	49	−1	19	53,796	3,029
Antimony, metal	do	2,231	573			983	253	(1)	6		2	3,214	830
Asbestos, amosite	do	3,613	393			1,873	156	−1	(1)		(1)	5,486	548
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	3,945	606			3,050	348	13	4		2	6,995	969
Bauxite	do	2,844,713	17,748			348,948	1,906	14	30	−55	14	3,193,716	19,684
Beryl ore	do	1,895	404					(1)	(1)			1,895	404
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	569	1,163			121	242	1	1		1	690	1,406
Bismuth	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Boart	Carat	1,949	5,085			500	1,379					2,449	6,464
Cadmium	Pound							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	159,203	1,574				4	16	1		13	159,203	1,582
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do							1	(1)		1		
Chrome ore, Turkish, metallurgical	do							(1)			(1)		
Chromium metal	do	124	120									124	120
Colemanite, Turkish boron minerals	do					9,969	247	5	(1)		5	9,969	247
Columbite	do					111	88	(1)	(1)		(1)	111	88
Ferrochrome, high carbon	do	8,765	1,511			8,274	1,362	3	−4		−1	17,039	2,873
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do					1,788	374	2	(1)		2	1,788	374

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, December 1960: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month								Inventory, end of the month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Exchange commodities—Continued													
Strategic and critical materials:													
Ferromanganese	do	56,812	$5,571			23,777	$2,145	$23	$51		$40	80,580	$7,760
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	18,091	340			15,268	278	1	3		3	33,359	619
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do							(1)	13		13		
Lead	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	32,854	1,306				−293	1	(1)		(1)	32,854	1,074
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	959,187	21,145			100,720	2,020	18	97		27	1,059,907	23,253
Manganese ore, natural battery grade	do	76,390	3,889			4,406	239	(1)	12			80,796	4,140
Mica	do	178	665			22	67	1	1		(1)	200	734
Quartz crystals	do	123	1,847			7	75	(1)	(1)			130	1,922
Raw silk	do					37	179			37	179		
Rutile	do	13,349	1,342			3,993	381	7	25			17,342	1,755
Silicon carbide	do	11,697	1,155			8,879	834	4	52		36	20,579	2,009
Thorium nitrate	do	50	115					(1)				50	115
Tin	do					1	1	(1)	(1)		(1)	1	1
Titanium sponge	do	2,600	3,405			400	480	(1)	−5			3,000	3,880
Zinc	do							−26	(1)		−26		
Total, strategic and critical materials			72,125				13,656	83	336		330		85,870
Total, Department of Agriculture			7,513,855		$1,403		242,079	34,985	10,716		400,679		7,399,553

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 17, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage location; and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile: Total (classified detail omitted)			$6,132,492		−$122		$4,199		$6,324		$6,130,245
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	4	9,519							4	9,519
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	750	380,340			4	1,981			754	382,321
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry tons	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry tons	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	1,081			(1)	19			2	1,100
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	882	32,013			9	328			891	32,341
Cobalt	Pound	25,187	52,063							25,187	52,063
Columbite	do	10,618	51,736							10,618	51,736
Copper	Short ton	132	73,514			2	1,031	(1)	641	133	73,904
Cryolite	do	38	10,607					(1)	32	38	10,575
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Graphite, lubricating	Short ton	(1)	89					(1)	8	(1)	81
Lead	do	8	3,036							8	3,036
Manganese battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3,031	175,407							3,031	175,407
Mica, muscovite block and film	Pound	6,136	34,672			22	333			6,158	35,005
Nickel	do	133,649	115,345	[2] −3,378	[2] −1,875			4,906	4,126	125,365	109,344
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,086	658					(1)	(1)	6,086	658
Rutile	Short dry ton	9	1,725							9	1,725
Thorium	Pound	849	42							849	42
Tantalite	do	1,529	9,734							1,529	9,734
Tin	Long ton	(1)	372					(1)	372		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, December 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Defense Production Act—Continued											
Titanium	Short ton	22	$167,648							22	$167,648
Tungsten	Pound	79,809	325,459							79,809	325,459
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,459,957		−$1,875		$3,693		$5,179		1,456,595
Machine tool inventory:											
In storage	Tool	(1)	219					(1)	143	(1)	76
On lease	do	(1)	3,966							(1)	3,966
On loan	do	(1)	29							(1)	29
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			4,214						143		4,072
Total, Defense Production Act			1,464,171		−1,875		3,693		5,322		1,460,667
Supplemental stockpile:											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	131	16,699		+119					131	16,818
Antimony	do	9	4,892		+4					9	4,897
Asbestos, amosite	do	3	759		−4					3	755
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,499							5	3,499
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton	2	847		+42					2	889
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	2,139	32,886		−57					2,139	32,829
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	683	10,505							683	10,505
Beryl	Short ton	8	17,930		+28					8	17,958
Bismuth	Pound	1,146	2,579							1,146	2,579
Cadmium	do	6,332	10,586							6,332	10,586
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	47	9,750		+60					47	9,810
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,295	202,998		+1,249					1,295	204,246
Chromite, refractory grade	do	165	4,680		+2					165	4,683
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	51	2,165		−113					51	2,052
Columbite	Pound	153	402							153	402
Copper	Short ton	10	6,598							10	6,598
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	111	258		+7					111	265
Diamond, industrial stones	do	10,199	131,641		+227					10,199	131,868
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	492	26,468		(1)					492	26,468
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	2	67							2	67
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	222	58,647		+34					222	58,681
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	35	3,334							35	3,334
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	do	18	1,436		−21					18	1,415
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	1,071	101,705		+10					1,071	101,714
Mercury	Flask	16	3,446							16	3,446
Mica, muscovite block, stained and better	Pound	263	698							263	698
Mica, muscovite film	do	27	212							27	212
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,826	6,226							4,826	6,226
Mica, phlogopite splittings	Pound	231	228		+1					231	$229
Palladium	Troy ounce	548	9,872							548	9,872
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	560							15	560
Selenium	Pound	157	1,071							157	1,071
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	77	15,011		+103					77	15,114
Tantalite	Pound	8	21							8	21
Thorium	do	4,030	9,544		+245					4,030	9,789
Tin	Long ton	7	15,265		−319					7	14,946
Titanium	Short ton	6	23,152		+250					6	23,401
Tungsten	Pound	4,485	15,627							4,485	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	324	79,600		+6					324	79,606
Total, supplemental stockpile			838,128		+1,871						839,999
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit: [2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	12	1,565							12	1,565
Antimony, metal	do	(1)	196							(1)	196
Asbestos, amosite	do	2	415							2	415
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	(1)	115							(1)	115
Bauxite	Long ton	551	9,213							551	9,213
Beryllium copper master alloy	Pound	799	1,620							799	1,620
Bismuth	do	350	736							350	736
Cadmium	do	277	352							277	352
Chromite, chemical grade	Short ton	(1)	1,786							(1)	1,786
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	(1)	153							(1)	153
Chromite, refractory	do	4	103							4	103
Colemanite	Long ton	12	791							12	791
Columbite	Pound	85	94							85	94
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	450	1,240							450	1,240
Diamond, industrial, stones	do	326	4,370							326	4,370
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short ton	4	1,757							4	1,757
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	1	729							1	729
Ferromanganese	do	34	6,785							34	6,78
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	11	469							11	46
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	41	1,274							41	1,27
Manganese, chemical grade	do	23	1,988							23	1,988
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3	5,826							3	5,826
Mica	Pound	21	14							21	14
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	10	1,902							10	1,902
Tin	Long ton	1	1,483							1	1,483
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit			44,974								44,974
Total, General Services Administration			8,489,285		−126		7,892		11,646		8,485,40

[1] Less than 500.

[2] Loss of nickel inventory at Nicaro, Cuba, through forced expropriation by the Cuban Government.

[3] See appendix p. 17, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, December 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity.—Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure.—Shown only for engineering supply units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity.—Shown only for one item, namely, engineering supply units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list numerous different items.

Inventory-cost value.—Dollar value figures on commodities in the stockpile inventory essentially reflect their actual cost. The stockpile inventory is generally augmented by acquisition of Government excess property without reimbursement to the several holding agencies. The value assigned to these materials is (1) original acquisition cost if known, (2) estimated current market value of items in similar condition, or (3) average unit cost of identical or similar items purchased in the open market for stockpiling. Government excess property acquired by reimbursement is assigned a value equal to the amount of the fair-value reimbursement required.

Adjustments.—Represent inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions.—Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals.—Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Values shown are based on average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month.—Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpiles (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings)	10 mile units	(1)	$8,247		[2] −$9		$324				$8,562
Chemical and biological equipment			776		[2] −1		33		[3] $1		807
Radiological equipment			7,391		(1)		532		[4] 68		7,855
Total, civil defense stockpile, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization			16,413		−9		890		69		17,225

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Accounting adjustments.
[3] Granted to other Federal agencies and to States.
[4] Consists of $67,110 granted to other Federal agencies and to States, and $875 inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, December 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare defines content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for hospital functional units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory cost value: The dollar value figures in the civil defense medical stockpile inventory reflect essentially the average acquisition costs per unit of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in commodity groups other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Normally these transactions result from inventory pricing adjustments due to recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, removal of material for sampling during testing or reworking, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during month, including new procurement and acquisition of Government excess property.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month. Costs of disposals are calculated on a basis of the average unit price of items in inventory at the time of removal. Disposals consist principally of items no longer suitable for stockpiling due to deterioration and of samples consumed through testing.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory end of month, Dec. 31, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses			$105,726		[1] −$493		[2] $1,091		[3] $7		$106,317
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations			4,117								4,117
Civil defense emergency hospitals	Each	2	38,504							2	38,504
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals)			15,601		+476						16,076
Total, civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare			163,948		−18		1,091		7		165,015

[1] Consists of $273 adjustment resulting from utilization of bulk stocks, and $17,341 accountability for experimental medical items in administration use to be retained by OCDM.
[2] Serum albumin returned from manufacturer resulting from reworking blood plasma.
[3] Inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans.

With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with section 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales to livestock feed in emergency areas.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Strategic and critical materials stockpiling and related programs

1. National Stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OCDM. In addition, GSA is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OCDM determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin received from Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

4. Supplemental stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OCDM (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Civil defense stockpile program

This stockpiling program, conducted pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended, is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Civil defense medical stockpile program

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OCDM stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OCDM warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriation reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Agriculture Department, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on December 31, 1960, totaled $16,067,197,000. December activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net decrease of $116,304,000.

Net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. December activity and end-of-the-month totals are summarized:

[In thousands]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, December 1960	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture: Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−$128,047	$7,313,683
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	+13,745	85,870
Total, Department of Agriculture	−114,302	7,399,553
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials:		
3. National stockpile	−2,247	6,130,245
4. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory		9,519
5. Defense Production Act program	−3,504	1,460,667
6. Supplemental stockpile	+1,871	839,999
7. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit		44,974
Total, General Services Administration	−3,881	8,485,404
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
8. Civil defense stockpile	+812	17,225
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
9. Civil defense medical stockpile	+1,067	165,015
Grand total	−116,304	16,067,197

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

STORAGE AND HANDLING

The report shows storage and handling costs for Commodity Credit's price support inventory totaled $34,985,000 for the month of December. It should be noted these storage costs are for only two of the nine stockpiles covered by the report.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

The major net decreases in cost value during December were $88 million in cotton, $25 million in wheat, and $8 million in milk and butterfat. This was partially offset by net increases including $7 million in grain sorghum and $5 million in aluminum and bauxite.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 20 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $7.4 billion price support inventory on December 31, 1960, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.9 billion;

Corn, with 1.5 billion bushels at a cost of $2.4 billion; and

Grain sorghum with 312 million hundredweight at a cost of $858 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.6 billion, including the $6.1 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 7.3 million tons at a cost of $494 million;

Tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million; and

Manganese (and ores), with 4.8 million tons at a cost of $335 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Supplies and equipment in two civil defense stockpile inventories total $182 million. More than 90 percent is in the medical stockpile valued at $165 million.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations to be included in gross income for the taxable years to which the dues relate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. PELL):

S. 986. A bill to assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HART, and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 987. A bill to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 988. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefits payable thereunder shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 989. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that benefits payable under such act or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 990. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide that benefits payable thereunder shall not be considered as income in determining eligibility of veterans for non-service-connected disability pensions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 991. A bill to promote education in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 992. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. ELLENDER) (by request):

S. 993. A bill to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 994. A bill to provide that Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; and

S. 995. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of eastern Samoa shall be represented in Congress by a Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 996. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to provide additional public relief from repetitive criminal violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 997. A bill to extend the program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 998. A bill for the relief of Francis Zerjav; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 999. A bill for the relief of Katherine Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1000. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances;

S. 1001. A bill to provide offstreet automobile parking for patrons of the postal service and postal employees at certain postal installations; and

S. 1002. A bill to prohibit the use of timing or measuring devices in the distribution of mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON) (by request):

S. 1003. A bill to establish a national cemetery at Spokane, Wash., on lands which formerly constituted George Wright Air Force Base; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1004. A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1005. A bill to amend section 10 and section 3 of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 1006. A bill for the relief of Ratko (Felix) Herskovic;

S. 1007. A bill for the relief of Sara Mishan;

S. 1008. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Viva; and

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Tai Lam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1010. A bill to provide for adjustments in certain widows' annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, and for other purposes; and

S. 1011. A bill to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1012. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of certain tracts of land in Marengo County, Ala., to the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1013. A bill to establish in the General Services Administration a service to disseminate general information concerning the organization of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1014. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of 300 years of operation of hotels in America, and the 50th annual convention of the American Hotel Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1015. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee to the Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky, and the Natchez Trace Parkway in Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1016. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force; and

S. 1017. A bill for the relief of Luis Gertrudes Goncalves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. MORTON, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. GORE, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1018. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 9 acres of land for addition to Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 1019. A bill to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the value of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD of Virginia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1020. A bill to establish a Commission on the Cultural Resources in the Nation's Capital, and to provide a comprehensive plan for the effective utilization of such resources in carrying out a long-range program to make the Nation's Capital equal in cultural matters to the capital cities of other nations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1021. A bill to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1022. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Chinn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1023. A bill to amend the act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 752), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional features of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1024. A bill for the relief of Katherine Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1025. A bill to provide for the increase, modernization, and stockpiling of railroad equipment in order to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense; to create and establish a public agency with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. BENNETT), submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) providing for one general expenditure authorization act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BYRD of Virginia, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

SORENSEN FISH CO.—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1004) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Company," now pending in the Senate together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amounts, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

CERTAIN WORKS OF ART IN SUBWAY TO NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CURTIS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 91) to provide for works of art depicting the scenic beauties and historical sites of the several States in the subway from the Capitol Building to the New Senate Office Building; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CURTIS, which appears under a separate heading.)

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1961

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been requested by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to introduce a bill for appropriate reference, entitled "Educational Opportunities Act of 1961." He has requested that the bill may lie on the table for additional cosponsors through Friday, February 24. I also ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him with reference to the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and will lie on the desk as requested, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 991) to promote education in the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. GOLDWATER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement of Mr. GOLDWATER, presented by Mr. DIRKSEN, is as follows:

A STATEMENT OF PROPOSED REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES, PROGRAMS, AND OBJECTIVES, BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

PART II—EDUCATION

Several weeks ago I released part I of this statement dealing with proposed Republican positions on inflation, labor, electoral college reform, social welfare, foreign policy, and briefly, on one aspect of education. In this second part, I shall set forth a program dealing with the proper role of the Federal Government with respect to education at all levels—elementary school, high school, and college, university, and other institutions of higher learning.

This is a role which must be directed toward helping our people to help themselves without the direct intervention of the Federal Government. It must recognize first and foremost the danger of centralized control over the vitally important area of life encompassed by the education of our children. Then, it must take account of the actual need which exists for expanding and augmenting the facilities which we now have for meeting the Nation's educational needs. Finally, it should use the power of the Federal Government to place at the disposal of the people and the States and local governments the means to handle the needs that may exist or arise.

The problem is one of letting the people decide, in their own communities where that decision can best be made, just what are their educational needs. After that, it is one of equipping them to handle their needs locally, through their own school boards and without the direction of Washington bureaucracy.

As we pointed out in part I, the major domestic problem facing the Nation is the threat of inflation with its disastrous impact on private savings, insurance, pension funds, and social security. This threat has enormous ramifications when applied to our educational problems.

This is true because an increasingly larger share of these funds is being accumulated by parents for the purpose of providing for the higher education of their children, the costs of which are outstripping the ability of many people to keep pace. And for that reason, a specific proposal was set forth in part I for dealing with that aspect of the appropriate role of the Federal Government.

I. Financing college education

As the costs of college education continue to rise, it becomes imperative to provide relief to the taxpaying parents of college students, and to do so not in the form of Federal handouts but by narrowing the far-reaching scope of the Federal taxing power.

Providing an education for their children is traditionally the responsibility of the American family and not of the Government. The vast accumulations of private savings and insurance bear witness that most of our people still believe in this principle. Hence, a Federal program to aid our children to secure a college education should be directed toward helping their parents to do the job. It should avoid the form of Federal grants with their accompanying expansion of Federal bureaucracy and Federal supervision which not only wastes funds through unproductive administrative costs, but creates a risk as well of Federal controls over public education.

The Republican Party therefore proposes a program of tax relief for most families with children at college. Such families will be given a substantial additional Federal income tax reduction for each dependent attending college. The specific details of this proposal, as spelled out in legislation, are set forth at the end of this statement.

II. The decay of American precollege education

The Republican Party believes, and its opinion is shared by many outside the party, that what is primarily wrong with American precollege education is not lack of money but lack of quality. The deterioration in the standards of the American elementary and secondary school has been recognized not only by leading scholars in and out of the academic community but, finally, by the vast majority of the long-suffering American people as well. It seems obvious that huge sums of additional money should not be spent in perpetuating and aggravating our educational shortcomings. Any program which makes additional funds available for use by our elementary and secondary school systems should be accompanied simultaneously by a program designed to induce improvements in the quality of education.

Speaking before the American Society of Civil Engineers in February 1958, Dean Martin Mason, of the George Washington University School of Engineering, stated bluntly:

"Our schools are not fulfilling what should be their main function—basic education and the stimulation of minds. Pupils spend half their time learning social graces, automobile driving, and in building their bodies."

Mortimer Smith, director of the Council for Basic Education, in his recent book "A Citizen's Manual for Public Schools," writes:

"To sum up, this should be the bare minimum expected of a normal child finishing the elementary school: he should be able to read and write with some fluency, and spell, add, subtract, multiply, and divide with accuracy; he should know the basic geographic facts of his country and the world; have a knowledge of elementary science; know something of the culture and history of other peoples and much of his own. And above all, his schooling should have taught him the difference between aimless mental activity and orderly thought.

"There is a strange quirk in modern educational thinking which produces pessimism about the school's ability to teach such tangibles as geography, spelling, and reading, but optimism about the ability of the school to teach such intangibles as good citizenship and wise use of leisure time and to produce tolerant, well-rounded personalities."

The Republican Party, therefore, as a step in its program to aid and improve precollege education in the United States, proposes a measure to help achieve these goals which will invoke the most limited participation by the Federal Government but which will be wholly voluntary in character, completely free from any compulsion, either through law or otherwise, and which will be based entirely on the principles of emulation and inspiration.

The proposed measure will establish a national merit scholarship program to make it possible for the most promising students to obtain college and undergraduate university educations, but primarily designed to establish a set of voluntary secondary school scholastic standards which can serve as a guide and a beacon both for the high schools of the Nation and for the parents of America.

These national scholarships will require only a tiny expenditure of Federal funds. They will be severely limited in number but generous in amount so as to be attractive to students and parents alike. They will be administered by a board appointed by the President, and consisting of scholars and authorities in the humanities, literature, foreign languages, science, mathematics, history, philosophy, sociology, economics, etc.

This Board will implement the basic scholastic requirements for eligibility to compete for these scholarships as set forth in the law itself. These requirements, as a minimum, will include the study in high school of English, foreign languages, science, mathematics and history (emphasizing American history). The examinations conducted by the Board will require the student to achieve an absolute passing mark. If more students pass than the number of scholarships available, only that number, in order of performance, will receive the scholarship awards. If fewer than this number manage to get the passing grade, then only they will be selected and the rest of the scholarships will remain unused. The examinations will be conducted on a nationwide basis with no geographic restrictions or limitations on the number of students from any State or community who participate or who secure the scholarships. If all of them go to the students of a single State, community or even school, unlikely as that may be, then the rest of the Nation's school systems would do well to reexamine their own educational establishments.

There are several beneficial effects which are to be hoped for from this proposal. First, it will encourage a healthy spirit of academic rivalry among the secondary schools of the Nation, similar to that which now exists in athletics and debating. Second, it will spur scholastic competition among individual students. And last, but most important, it will expose the weaknesses in some of our secondary schools while at the same time revealing the strength in others.

The American public will assess the results of these examinations. A school which consistently fails to qualify its students for participation in the examination, or whose students consistently fail to secure any of the scholarships will come under intensive critical scrutiny. The parents and the community will want to know why their children are not eligible to compete; they will ask why their school lags behind while the school in the neighboring county or adjoining State can boast of producing national scholars. Where these seriously inadequate educational standards exist, we are confident that the American people, with their customary diligence, will ferret out the evils which have brought about the deterioration and provide the necessary corrective.

III. Financing precollege education

The third step in the proposed program to aid and improve education in the United States, is a measure, which if adopted, makes all the alternative plans for Federal aid to education which are currently under serious consideration, irrelevant and unnecessary.

Since the end of World War II, we have witnessed the greatest school building program ever conducted in this country. In the past 10 years alone, over 500,000 classrooms have been built, and based on the sale of school bonds for the past several years, there is every reason to believe that this high rate of classroom construction will continue.

In spite of the tremendous job which the States and local communities have done during the past 15 years to overcome the backlog of school facilities needed in some areas, a backlog brought on by the depression, World War II, and Korea, the proponents of direct Federal aid to education are nevertheless absolutely insistent that the only way to reduce the backlog is by way of a massive infusion of Federal grants into the States. In recent years, these same proponents have added to their propaganda the claim that teachers are not paid enough by the local school districts and, therefore, that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to correct that situation as well.

It is interesting and significant that the demands for Federal aid to education have grown louder and more insistent as the need for expanding our school facilities diminishes. It is fully apparent that many of those promoting the idea of Federal aid to education are interested only in the element of centralized control and, consequently, refuse to recognize that the States and local communities have been rapidly solving the backlog problem. They have seen their "crisis" selling point melt away in the face of determined local responsibility and are attempting to cover it up by adding new items to their list of needs and more power to their propaganda efforts. The present offensive for Federal aid to and control of the Nation's education is the heaviest ever mounted and it must be met with a courageously sound proposal incorporating the principles of individual freedom and personal responsibility.

The Republican Party is fully aware that a growing student enrollment has made it difficult for some localities completely to overcome classroom shortages despite the expenditure of considerable amounts of money and effort. We are also conscious of the fact that teachers' salaries have lagged behind those of other professions and vocations, causing some qualified instructors to resign from teaching and enter more highly paid occupations and making it difficult to attract qualified replacements.

However, recently published school statistics dealing with pupil, population, enrollment, teachers, and public school expenditures are most revealing. Between 1950 and 1960, public school enrollment increased by 44.4 percent; during this same period, the number of teachers in elementary and secondary schools increased by 51.9 percent, thus reducing the pupil-teacher ratio to 26.4 to 1 as compared to 27.8 to 1 in 1950. But while pupil enrollment and number of teachers are increasing in these ratios, total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools rose by more than 150 percent.

It is quite obvious from these figures that the States and local communities have been making enormous and effective efforts to meet their school needs. Wherever the problem of the need for additional classrooms has not been solved, it has not been due to any reluctance on the part of the local community or the State to find and expend the necessary funds.

In view of the willingness of the State and local communities to keep pace with growing educational needs, the Republican Party rejects the wasteful and undemocratic measures to appropriate for school aid, billions of Federal dollars extracted from the States only to be partially funneled back to them again with strict limitations on the use to which these funds may be put.

We believe that the alleged evil plight of our schools has been grossly exaggerated and that the magnificent efforts of our State and local governments to find the money to meet school needs has been largely and purposely ignored.

These efforts represented the quiet response of millions of "Forgotten Americans" to the educational problems arising in their communities. The job was done without fanfare by the people who meet their responsibilities on a day-to-day basis without the benefit of prodding by nationwide pressure group organizations. We say that it represents a monument to the efforts of a free people, working with initiative and enterprise in their own communities to meet the problems of those communities as they arose. This is where the big job of meeting the Nation's educational problems has been accomplished up until now and this is where the job, rightfully, should be finished.

Our proposal will provide the means for solving additional school problems, if they really exist, but it will leave the determination of this highly debatable question where it properly belongs—with the State and local communities and not with the Federal Government. The basic problem, if there is one, is financial. If State and local governments in some parts of the country are unable to keep pace with their school needs it is because the Federal taxing power has preempted State and local sources of revenue. Hence, the proper approach is to compel the Federal Government to restore to the States and localities at least a portion of the tax resources which it has taken away. This is precisely what our measure will do.

The proposal is a simple one. Every homeowner, every owner of real estate in the United States pays a real property tax to his local community government. In most cases, a substantial part of this tax is used to meet the primary and secondary school needs of the community whether for new construction or for maintenance, teachers' salaries or other past or current school costs. We would merely provide that every taxpayer who pays a school tax on his real property or as part of his real estate tax shall after having calculated the amount of Federal income tax which he must pay Uncle Sam be permitted to subtract from the Federal income tax which he owes the full amount of such school property tax or such proportion of it as will result in a total additional tax benefit to these taxpayers of between $3 and $4 billion.

Under existing Federal income tax law, State and local school taxes are deductible from gross income but the amount actually saved by the taxpayer depends on his Federal income tax bracket. Thus, for example, a taxpayer who has paid $200 in school taxes as part of the local real property tax on his home, and is in the 20-percent Federal income tax bracket, realizes a saving of $40. Our proposal would retain this present practice, but in addition would permit him to take a $100 credit against what he owes Uncle Sam, i.e., against his net Federal income tax. Hence, instead of a saving of $40, the homeowner under our proposal would save $140 of the $200 he paid in school taxes on his home. Of course, if the taxpayer's school tax were less than $100, he would be permitted to save in toto no more than the actual amount of his school tax.

This tax credit would be available to real property-school taxpayers whether they itemize their Federal income tax returns or take the standard deduction.

The concrete advantages of this approach are overwhelming, as will be shown in the following:

1. The tax benefits provided would go directly to approximately 40 million taxpayers,

including about 34 million homeowners, who with their families constitute almost 90 percent of our population, and who, in large part, are the "Forgotten Americans" for whom only the Republican Party speaks today.

2. With the Federal Government completely excluded from the program, there would be no danger of Federal control over education. Depending on State law, each community itself, or the State, would be the final judge of how much more it would like to spend on its educational needs than it is currently spending.

3. The funds made available to the taxpayers are greater than the sums contemplated under any of the other Federal aid to education measures which are seriously being considered; greater even than the sums recently recommended by President Kennedy's task force headed by President Hovde of Purdue University.

4. Because of the complete exclusion of the Federal Government, there would be no expanded bureaucracy, no Federal administrative costs, and every dollar of tax money thus made available would purchase a full dollar's worth of school aid if the community decided to expand its expenditures for education.

5. Inasmuch as the tax resources of every State and locality would be substantially increased under this proposal, each would have ample funds to provide for its own school needs as it chooses, for none know better what these needs are than the citizens of the States and localities themselves.

6. The so-called richer States would not be required to help finance the school needs of the allegedly poorer States, for under our proposal every State would have sufficient funds to meet its school needs out of its own resources. Rich State A would not be required to pay to the Federal Government in taxes twice or three times as much as it gets back in Federal school aid while poor State B was receiving back in Federal aid two or three times the amount of tax money it paid to the Federal Government as its share of financing the Federal school aid program.

7. Under any of the other proposed Federal school aid measures, those States which have fully met their school needs and would not, if given a free choice, expand their school facilities during the next few years, would nevertheless be compelled to pay their share in Federal taxes to finance the program. The only way these States could recover any of the money thus extracted from them under these various proposals would be to accept the Federal grants and use them to expand their school facilities. The result would be the highly uneconomic and wasteful extension of school facilities in many areas where such extension is unnecessary and where other more urgent needs exist and must perforce remain unsatisfied. Under our proposal, the use made of their tax money is not dictated to the taxpayer by the bureaucrats in Washington—it is determined by the taxpayers themselves; i.e., by the parent, the citizen, the local school board, and the community.

8. Any objection to our proposal based on the assertion that it would bite into the Federal Treasury is equally applicable to any of the other measures presently under consideration. We believe that ours would lead to a good look at the Federal budget and the discovery of many items of less importance, or even of no importance, which could be readily eliminated with no ill effects for the public welfare.

9. If unemployment does not decrease and business continues to falter because of the lack of confidence engendered by the spendthrift promises of the Democratic platform, our proposal will provide the necessary tax relief which some of the proponents of expanded Federal aid programs assert to be necessary to stimulate the economy.

10. The preemption of State and local tax resources by the Federal Government would be diminished, and thus an important step would be taken in contracting big central government and strengthening State and local government.

To implement this program to aid and improve education in our country, a bill is being introduced which contains the necessary legislative provisions for achieving our goal. The bill consists of two titles, the first dealing with the establishment of the program for national merit scholarships, and the second providing for Federal income tax credits for homeowners and other owners of real estate in order to provide funds for aid to primary and secondary schools where such aid is needed and for Federal income tax deductions for parents with dependents at college. The bill is called the Educational Opportunities Act of 1961 and in specific detail it provides as follows:

1. A PROGRAM PROVIDING FOR THE AWARD OF NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIPS

A. Establishes a National Scholarship Board, appointed by the President, consisting of 13 members who are recognized scholars in the fields of engineering, science, mathematics, languages (including classical), the humanities, and the arts. The duties and responsibilities of the Board shall be to set forth the policies and principles for selection of individuals for scholarships which shall be known as national scholarships. As part of the examination, designed to measure achievement, the Board shall require each competing individual to submit an original theme or composition written in English as well as a written translation of such theme or composition from English into a foreign language.

B. In order to compete for these scholarships, an individual must meet the following requirements:

1. Must be in his last academic year or must hold a certificate of graduation from a secondary school;

2. Must have completed at least 4 years of English, 4 years of history, 3 years of mathematics, 3 years of a foreign language, 3 years of science or, in lieu thereof, 3 years of Latin or Greek.

3. Must be or have been in the upper 15 percent of his class.

C. Each scholarship awarded by the Board shall be for 4 years or such longer period of time necessary to complete the course which the student is pursuing. The amount of the scholarship shall be based on the estimated expenses of the recipient but in no event shall the amount exceed $3,000 for any academic year. The recipients of these scholarships shall be designated "National Scholar."

D. The Board would be authorized to award every year a maximum of 1,000 scholarships. The Board shall establish a minimum attainment grade for such examinations and, notwithstanding the number of scholarships authorized, a scholarship shall not be awarded to any individual unless he equals or exceeds such minimum grade. Thus, if only 700 of the applicants receive such a grade, only that number will be awarded and the remaining 300 will not be used. If more than a thousand applicants receive a passing grade, the scholarships will be awarded in accordance with the principles and policies established by the Board.

E. The examinations conducted by the Board will be on a nationwide basis with no geographic restrictions or limitations on the number of participants from any State or community. This same condition will also apply with respect to the award of these scholarships.

2. TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN ATTENDING COLLEGE

A. The taxpayer is granted an additional deduction from his taxable income for the expenses incurred by him, his spouse, or his dependent or dependents, while attending college.

B. Expenses shall include tuition and fees charged by the college for a course of instruction and attendance at such college; books, supplies, and equipment; room and board, whether the student is living on or off the campus. The amount the taxpayer may deduct shall be the actual amount of expenses paid but not to exceed $2,000 for each child attending college. Of this amount, the cost of room and board may not exceed $90 a month while the student is in attendance at college ($45 in the case of a student living at home).

C. In addition to his child or children, the taxpayer may also deduct such expenses which he incurs as a student as well as those of his wife and anyone else whom the taxpayer can lawfully claim as a dependent.

D. The deduction is available to a taxpayer whose dependent is attending a college, university, or other institution of higher learning, such as medical school, dental school, law school, or other graduate school. This deduction is not available to a taxpayer whose dependent is attending a trade or vocational school or any other school which does not award a baccalaureate or higher degree.

E. The amount of expenses which the taxpayer may deduct from his taxable income shall be reduced by the amount by which the taxable income of the taxpayer exceeds $10,000 if the taxpayer is unmarried or if married, files a separate return or, $20,000 if the taxpayer is married and files a joint return or is a head of a household or a surviving spouse. Thus, if a taxpayer has $2,000 in educational expenses and a taxable income of $20,800, he would be entitled to a deduction of $1,200 ($2,000 less $800, the amount in excess of $20,000). The taxpayer thereby reduces his taxable income from $20,800 to $19,600. If the taxpayer is in the 50 percent bracket, he would thereby reduce his tax by $600 (50 percent of $1,200).

3. TAX CREDIT TO HOMEOWNERS FOR THAT PORTION OF THEIR REAL PROPERTY TAX WHICH IS USED FOR THE MAINTENANCE, OPERATION, AND CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A. The taxpayer would continue to deduct the amount of his real property tax from his gross taxable income; after he determines what his tax will be, he then credits against his final tax that amount of his real property tax which is used for the maintenance, operation, and construction of public elementary and secondary schools.

B. Tax credit would be the amount actually paid by the taxpayer or $100 whichever is less. To illustrate, a taxpayer pays a real property tax of $600, of which $350 is used for public school purposes. As he does at present, the taxpayer would be able to deduct from his taxable income $600, and assuming that he is in the 20 percent bracket, this would result in a tax saving to him of $120 (20 percent of $600). After determining his final tax, for example, $500, the taxpayer would be able to take a credit of $100 against his net tax, thus, instead of paying a tax of $500, he would pay only $400.

C. The taxpayer who takes a standard deduction would also benefit since the credit granted is taken against the final tax after all exemptions and deductions have been made.

D. The deduction together with the tax credit cannot result in a saving to the taxpayer of more than the actual amount of that portion of the real property tax devoted to public school needs. For example, the taxpayer pays a real property tax of $100, of which $60 is used for public school purposes. Assuming the taxpayer is in the 20 percent bracket, he would be able to reduce his tax by $20 (20 percent of $100), $12 of which is attributable to the tax for school purposes.

Giving such a taxpayer a $60 credit—the actual amount paid for school purposes—would return a saving to the taxpayer of $72 or $12 more than the tax he paid for support of the public schools. Thus, the tax credit in this case would be limited to $48.

THE OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATION AREA

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we cannot legislate an awe-inspiring natural wonder into existence, but we can give protection to unique and majestic works of nature. This is the purpose of the bill which I am introducing today to authorize establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area.

By the year 2000 the population of the United States is expected to reach 300 million. We must look and plan ahead if future generations are to enjoy the natural resource heritage now in our custody. There are, however, other reasons of greater immediacy for establishing the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Area as part of the national park system. After lengthy study, four areas along the entire coastline of the United States were selected as having special national significance as seashore parks. One of these was the area of about 35,000 acres on Oregon's seacoast.

OREGON DUNES UNIQUE

The Oregon coastal dunes are unique among America's scenic areas. Geographic changes and influences of time and the elements have shaped an unusual combination of coastline, rolling and precipitous dunes, and forested fresh-water lakes. These values were recognized by the former Secretary of the Interior in a report sent last year to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He described the Oregon Dunes as "an area of the most spectacular sand dunes in North America."

I concur in this judgment.

Aside from its scientific and scenic significance nationally, the Oregon Dunes are of vast importance to the economy of my State. This area has great recreation potential. Present and future generations need expanded outdoor facilities for relaxation and enjoyment of nature. Through Federal park development, Oregon would have another magnet for bringing tourist dollars to our economy, thereby creating new payrolls and income. An economic study by Dr. Granville Jensen, chairman of the department of natural resources at Oregon State College, shows that tourist business in the Oregon coast area alone would increase $18 million annually in the years after an Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park is developed.

Similar views have been expressed by others interested in Oregon's development. An editoiral by Mr. William M. Tugman, until recently the editor of the Port Umpqua Courier at Reedsport, stated:

> There is every reason to believe that the Oregon sand dunes, with its infinite variety of all-year-round attractions, would soon become one of the most heavily attended parks in the entire national system.

PROTECTION OF HERITAGE

Some individuals have the view that the Oregon Dunes area does not need national park status because of existing public land ownerships in the vicinity. But recent events tend to refute this belief. Proposals have been made for utilization of this section of Oregon's unique coastline for other purposes, including oil and gas exploration. Establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area would assure that this part of the coastline would not meet the fate of Atlantic seaboard areas which have been exploited or liquidated so that their scenic and recreational value is permanently impaired.

The new Oregon Dunes Seashore authorization bill which I am introducing today was before the 86th Congress in a substantially different form, and was the subject of both House and Senate hearings. As a result of these hearings there have been further consultations with the Governor of my State, Mark Hatfield; with the Park Service; and with other persons interested in conservation and wise land use.

In addition, I have given this subject long consideration and in that process have made further modifications which, I am hopeful, will assure proper local control and adequate Federal supervision.

LOCAL CONTROL STRENGTHENED

The bill I am introducing has one major technical change. The lengthy descriptions of the land involved have been placed at the end of the bill. I have done this so that those concerned with the substance of the bill will find it easier to study the policies involved.

There are a number of other revisions, but I should like to call attention to two major revisions:

First. Creation of a five-member Oregon Dunes Advisory Board to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on management policies and zoning standards.

Second. Mechanism for local zoning of private property within boundaries of the seashore.

The purpose of these two changes is to provide maximum local influence on matters relating to development of the seashore, and to minimize the need for the Secretary to acquire privately owned property in the area.

The new section which creates the Oregon Dunes Advisory Board is patterned after provisions in legislation introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore. The board which I have proposed is a smaller board, but I think that it will just as capably represent the local interests, the State interest, and the National interest as would a much larger group. We in Oregon have had long experience with advisory boards, such as that on the Oregon and California lands which are within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. I am confident that an advisory board such as this will prove most beneficial and will aid measurably in proper development of the scenic and recreational facilities of the Oregon Dunes.

Two new sections deal with land use and occupancy and provide the mechanism for local zoning. The purpose of these sections is to assure that the Secretary will make the minimum use of his powers to acquire private property and that, to the extent that private ownership of land and water areas within the park are consistent with park purposes. Such ownership will be permitted. In any such provision it is essential to provide a decisionmaking mechanism; and, since the Secretary of the Interior is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the purpose of the act, he must, in the final analysis, concur in the sufficiency of the zoning bylaws adopted by the counties.

It was interesting to me in preparing this bill to discover that in some 33 cases—including the beautiful seashore at Cape Hatteras and Oregon's historic Fort Clatsop National Memorial, which was established through legislation sponsored by my late husband and my senior colleague from Oregon, Mr. MORSE—the Park Service has unencumbered rights to acquire property through condemnation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table listing park areas where authority to acquire private property through condemnation is permitted by statute.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National parks, monuments, and military parks where power of condemnation to acquire land is authorized

Unit	Year	Authority
1. Colonial National Historical Park, Va	1930	16 U.S.C. 81e.
2. Chalmette National Historical Park, La	1930	16 U.S.C. 231b.
3. Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak	1947	16 U.S.C. 242.
4. Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, Ky., Va., Tenn	1940	16 U.S.C. 263.
5. Hawaii National Park, Hawaii	1920	16 U.S.C. 392.
6. Great Smoky National Park, N.C., Tenn	1938	16 U.S.C. 403i.
7. Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky	1942	16 U.S.C. 404c-11.
8. Richmond National Military Park, Va	1936	16 U.S.C. 423k.
9. Eutaw Spring National Military Park, S.C	1936	16 U.S.C. 423n.
10. Fredericksburg National Military Park, Va	1927	16 U.S.C. 425a.
11. Spotsylvania National Military Park, Va	1927	16 U.S.C. 425a.
12. Stones River National Military Park, Tenn	1927	16 U.S.C. 426a.
13. Sioux Indian National Military Park, Mont	1926	16 U.S.C. 427.
14. Fort Donelson National Military Park, Tenn	1928	16 U.S.C. 428d.
15. Kings Mountain National Military Park, S.C	1931	16 U.S.C. 430a.
16. Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa	1895	16 U.S.C. 430g.
17. Vicksburg National Military Park, Miss	1899	16 U.S.C. 430h.
18. Monocacy National Military Park, Md	1934	16 U.S.C. 430k.
19. Kennesaw National Military Park, Ga	1935	16 U.S.C. 430u.

National parks, monuments, and military parks where power of condemnation to acquire land is authorized—Continued

Unit	Year	Authority
20. Perry's Victory International Peace Monument, Ohio	1936	16 U.S.C. 433c.
21. Fort Frederica National Monument, Ga	1936	16 U.S.C. 433h.
22. Ocmulgee National Monument, Ga	1934	16 U.S.C. 447b.
23. Pioneer National Monument, Ky	1934	16 U.S.C. 449.
24. Fort Stanwix National Monument, N.Y	1935	16 U.S.C. 450m.
25. Andrew Johnson Homestead National Monument, Tenn	1935	16 U.S.C. 450p.
26. Ackie Battleground National Monument, Miss	1935	16 U.S.C. 450r.
27. Homestead National Monument, Nebr	1936	16 U.S.C. 450u.
28. George Washington Carver National Monument, Mo	1943	16 U.S.C. 450 aa.
29. De Soto National Monument, Fla	1948	16 U.S.C. 450dd.
30. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area, N.C	1940	16 U.S.C. 459a.
31. Booker T. Washington National Monument, Va	1956	16 U.S.C. 450ll.
32. Yosemite National Park, Calif	1937	16 U.S.C. 47e.
33. Fort Clatsop National Memorial, Oreg	1958	16 U.S.C. 450mm–2.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that in the case of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, the Secretary's ability to utilize condemnation will be circumscribed by the degree to which the counties wish to use their own authorities for land use zoning.

The view that there should be a national seashore recreation area on the Oregon coast is one which, in my opinion, is widely held. Our shoreline is a vanishing natural resource, not because our boundaries are shrinking, but rather because we have not made adequate provision to preserve this beautiful scenery in a way which permits the best public use and enjoyment.

In redrafting this legislation, I have endeavored to meet all of the various points of view that have been expressed and, in the process, to make certain that we will protect an important scenic and recreational resource, while at the same time promoting both economic growth and stability in this important area along the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area, and ask unanimous consent that it be allowed to lie on the desk for 3 days to allow other Senators who may wish to cosponsor it to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk for 3 days, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 992) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall be happy and proud to be a cosponsor of this most worthwhile bill.

I followed the efforts of my friend, and a great Senator, the late Richard Neuberger, to set aside areas of immense natural beauty and value for the future benefit of our people. Of these none not yet so reserved is probably more important than this, as we seek to safeguard our rapidly dwindling seacoast areas. The Oregon Dunes are unique and superb beyond comparison. Dick wanted coming generations to share his enjoyment of them.

I am very hopeful that this seashore recreation area may be named after Richard Neuberger, and I shall make that proposal at the proper time. No one deserves such appropriate recognition better than he. Future generations of American citizens should learn thereby to appreciate the great service Richard Neuberger rendered with respect to the preservation of our natural heritage and his increasing dedication to that end.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

PROPOSED REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS OF EASTERN SAMOA AND GUAM

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the basic strength of Congress is the extent to which it represents the people of the United States—all the people. With the growth of our Nation, each successive expansion of Congress has permitted a greater representation of the infinite variety of men and women who comprise our adult population.

During the interim between the closing of the 86th Congress and the opening of the 87th Congress, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I investigated conditions in Guam and eastern Samoa. I now introduce on behalf of both of us, for appropriate reference, two measures which would enlarge the idea of congressional representation to encompass those two offshore areas. The bills would enable each of these areas to elect a deputy who would serve in the House of Representatives, without vote but with the right to engage in debate.

This arrangement proved most beneficial to Congress for obtaining the participation in national legislation of the several organized territories, most recently Alaska and Hawaii. Essentially the same arrangement is made for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, through the office of the Resident Commissioner. I suggest that we would also benefit from the counsel which could be contributed by deputies from Samoa and Guam. Both territories are experienced in self-government. They have a great deal to contribute to our National Assembly. We should avail ourselves of their knowledge and experience.

During the course of our visit, we were impressed by the growing degree of political maturity which the people of eastern Samoa and Guam now display. We were fortunate to be in Samoa following the first election of the Samoan Legislature under the new constitution, adopted in April of last year.

I believe that Congress would benefit by adding to the House of Representatives the voice and the wisdom of nonvoting delegates from eastern Samoa and Guam. Through these delegates, we could learn much of the needs and the potential of the South and Central Pacific. Through their counsel, our legislative decisions affecting that large part of the world could be more securely based on knowledge and understanding.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, for myself and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], bills to provide that eastern Samoa and Guam be represented in Congress by nonvoting delegates.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 994. A bill to provide that Guam shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; and

S. 995. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territory of eastern Samoa shall be represented in Congress by a Deputy to the House of Representatives.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I desire to commend the Senator from Hawaii for the great interest which he has taken in our remaining Pacific territories, Guam and Samoa, and in the trust territories which come under the jurisdiction of the United Nations and are being administered, and administered very ably, by the United States.

I feel that the bills which he has introduced, and which I have been happy to cosponsor, to provide for a deputy from Guam and a deputy from Samoa in the House of Representatives constitute a step forward toward achieving the basic principle of extending the maximum self-government to all the American people.

Mr. President, I feel that these bills propose an important step in what should be the enlightened policy of the United States in moving as rapidly as consistent with wisdom to give the maximum of self-government to our outlying areas.

The United States is not a colonial power. Its brief excursion into colonialism, dating from the Spanish-American War, or perhaps a little earlier than that, has been effectively liquidated.

Alaska and Hawaii have been granted statehood.

Puerto Rico has become in accord with its people's wishes a self-governing commonwealth associated with the United States.

We now have left as outlying possessions only Guam, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

The proposed elections of a deputy to serve in the House of Representatives to represent the Island of Guam, and also a deputy to represent eastern Samoa—steps similar to those taken for Hawaii and Alaska in the days of their territorial status—are clearly desirable. It is my understanding that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate will soon visit the Virgin Islands and will study the problems which exist there. In the meanwhile I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the two bills which seek to extend representation—which they have not had thus far—to our Pacific possessions, Guam and Samoa.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alaska, for his statement about the importance of these two bills.

ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR PERSONS CONVICTED OF VIOLATING THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act, to provide additional penalties for persons convicted of violating the antitrust laws.

The conviction of 29 manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment and 45 company officials in one of the most gigantic antitrust conspiracies in our history is only one of a series of incidents indicating widespread violation of antitrust laws. The literally thousands of identical "competitive" bids on file in the office of the Attorney General speak even more eloquently. Violation is widespread. This is common knowledge.

Antitrust laws have been on the books in the United States since 1890; and many distinguished names are connected with the attempts to enforce these laws, so as to prevent the growth of monopoly and economic concentration. From the days of Theodore Roosevelt to the efforts of Assistant Attorney General Robert Bicks, who prepared the case against the electrical machinery producers, some dramatic chapters have been written in the fight to keep our business competitive.

I believe in vigorous antitrust law enforcement, because I think it necessary to preserve our free enterprise system. Nothing could so quickly bring about demands for Government control or ownership of business in the United States as could an unchecked development of giant cartels and monopolies, such as have grown up in some countries to the point where they rival the power of the state itself and destroy the competition which is vital to a healthy economy and the protection of the consuming public.

In this day and age the American people rightly fear—not only as consumers, but also as taxpayers—collusion and conspiracy among giant corporations. The Federal Government and many State and local governments were cheated out of millions of dollars by the price-fixing agreements of the electrical equipment manufacturers. This is another way of saying that both Federal and State and local taxpayers were defrauded by the collusion of these manufacturers.

Small business is hit even harder than the taxpayer. As chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking Committee, I have become convinced that small business in this country can survive and prosper only if the antitrust laws are vigorously enforced.

The overwhelming dominance of many fields of business by one, two, three, six, or a dozen giant firms poses a daily threat to the existence of smaller firms. What is more, actions of the very kind for which the electrical equipment companies were convicted deprive small businesses of a chance to sell to the Government.

This is one of the reasons why I am so anxious that the Department of Defense award more contracts on a competitive basis. Thus, small business has a better chance to make bids, and savings to the Government are always greater. This is also why I have introduced Senate bill 836, which will give small business a more equal opportunity to compete for subcontracts in connection with defense procurements.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, the antitrust activities of the Federal Government have had two major weaknesses. The first has been a lack of vigorous enforcement; the second is the ineffectiveness of the penalties.

During too many of the 70 years since the first antitrust law was passed, its halfhearted enforcement has been no deterrent to continued practices which stifle competition. In the 1920's there was a lack of interest in enforcement on the part of the administration in power. In the 1930's, the great depression so overshadowed all other economic problems that the Government actually encouraged questionable cooperation among businesses, in an effort to stimulate economic recovery. During the Second World War, as during the first, the emergency necessity of obtaining sufficient production of war materiel led to a neglect of antitrust law enforcement.

Fortunately, the record has improved in recent years. The work of Assistant Attorney General Robert Bicks deserves special praise. We hope the new administration and Mr. Lee Loevinger will carry on that record.

The prosecution and convictions in the electrical equipment manufacturers' case constitute a good precedent. Fines were imposed. Seven executives were given jail sentences. Two of these were suspended. But five will go to jail for 30-day periods. Jail sentences have so rarely been imposed that a corporation official who contemplates violation knows that the odds are 100 to 1 that in the unlikely event that he ever is caught, the worst that could happen would be a fine which would be only "a drop in the bucket" compared to the extra profits his company would make by violating the law—profits that would insure his lush salary.

Labor union officials convicted of almost any offense worse than speeding are absolutely prohibited from holding union office for 5 years, but corporation executives convicted under the antitrust laws cannot be suspended from their positions, except by action of the firm itself.

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 goes much farther in imposing disabilities on convicted union officials than the bill I am introducing today would go in imposing disabilities on corporation executives. Under that law, any union official convicted of violating the act or convicted of any one of a number of other crimes or misdemeanors is mandatorily barred from serving, "(1) as an officer, director, trustee, member of any executive board or similar governing body, business agent, manager, organizer, or other employee (other than as an employee performing exclusively clerical or custodial duties) of any labor organization, or (2) as a labor consultant to a person engaged in an industry or activity affecting commerce, or as an officer, director, agent, or employee of any group or association of employers dealing with any labor organization," during, or for 5 years after, his conviction.

The bill I am introducing provides that—

> The United States district courts—upon application made by the Attorney General and a showing of probable cause for belief that such individual may engage in additional criminal antitrust violations if retained in the service of any such corporation, may enter an order—
>
> (1) restraining any such individual from (A) rendering service for any corporation convicted of any such violation in that action, or for any related corporation for a period not exceeding 1 year beginning on the date of execution of judgment upon his conviction, or (B) at any time receiving directly or indirectly from any corporation so convicted in that action, or any related corporation, any compensation or gratuity for service rendered by him during that period, or any indemnity of any kind in lieu of compensation with respect to that period and
>
> (2) restraining any corporation convicted of any such violation in that action, or any related corporation, from (A) retaining in service at any time during the period specified (1) any individual convicted of any criminal antitrust violation in that action, or (B) at any time promising, offering, or giving directly or indirectly to any individual convicted of any criminal antitrust violation in that action any compensation or gratuity for service rendered by him during that period, or any indemnity of any kind in lieu of compensation for service with respect to that period."

It will be noted that this is an optional penalty. It is a civil, rather than a criminal, penalty. It can be used in conjunction with, or as an alternative to, fines or a jail sentence.

A jail sentence is a very serious social penalty, but may not impose any financial hardship if the convicted person continues to hold his office and draw his salary. A 1-year suspension from office without pay is a much more serious financial penalty.

As Judge J. Cullen Ganey, who tried the recent case in Philadelphia, has said:

Here we have the nonfictional case of the organization man and the question of conformity to the corporate line. As an executive he goes along with a way of doing business. Consider his stake in this—large salary, high position, seniority. He may realize it's risky; but he must either violate the law or give up his seniority and excellent remuneration.

This bill would arm the judge with an additional weapon to use where it is the best way to provide an effective punishment of violators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held open for cosponsorship for a period of 2 weeks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 996) to amend the Sherman Act, to provide additional public relief from repetitive criminal violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF HAWAIIAN NENE GEESE

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator FONG and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase and extend the authorization for protection of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose. The Hawaii Wildlife Federation has reported that progress on this program has been very satisfactory and that the first release of pen-reared birds was made last spring above Hawaii National Park near Kilauea. Wildlife experts inform me that the program should be expanded. The project of restoring Hawaii's official bird to self-sustaining numbers in wild habitat is considered of international significance and a challenge equal to that of restoring the trumpeter swan in North America.

The present program which authorizes an appropriation of $15,000 a year will expire in fiscal year 1963. My bill would extend the program another 5 years to fiscal 1968 and authorize an increase in appropriation to $25,000 a year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 997) to extend the program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

KNOW YOUR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Know Your Government Service to disseminate information about our Federal Government to students and interested citizens throughout the Nation.

This bill is similar, but not identical, to a measure which I introduced last year. It is cosponsored by Senators CASE of New Jersey, FONG, JAVITS, and SCOTT, all of whom were cosponsors last year.

Briefly, the function of the Know Your Government Service would be:

First. The dissemination of general information about the functions of the major departments and agencies of the Federal Government to those who request such information;

Second. A special promotional program to provide students and teachers with similar information;

Third. Answering specific inquiries as to the agencies or departments which should be contacted on particular matters affecting the Federal Government.

The Service would be established in the General Services Administration under the National Archives and Records Service. As I envision it, the Service would be a limited staff and mailing operation located entirely in Washington.

Mr. President, an office such as I propose would play a very real and important function in making it easier for citizens to understand and keep in touch with the Federal Government. Too many Americans are frightened off by visions of redtape and hopelessly unfathomable rows of offices and office buildings. It is unfortunate that there exists this lack of knowledge as to how our Federal Government operates and as to the types of assistance and information which all citizens can and certainly should obtain.

Under my bill, a person who did not know where to write about a particular matter could find out very easily by contacting an office in Washington with an easily remembered title and function. Persons desiring information about the overall structure of the Federal Government could also obtain this information from the Know Your Government Service. In the case of students, the Know Your Government Service would have an additional promotional function of making available to schools and teachers general information which they could use in conjunction with their studies.

I want to make it clear that the Know Your Government Service would not and should not involve any great cost to the taxpayer. It would serve to coordinate existing functions in some cases; and, where it provides for new functions, these functions are well worth the effort and certainly could be carried out on a limited budget.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate Government Operations Committee will devote some time during the 87th Congress to the consideration of my proposal. I shall be happy to cooperate with the committee in any way I can.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1013) to establish in the General Services Administration a service to disseminate general information concerning the organization of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to achieve a better public understanding of the organization of the Federal Government, and the operation of its various agencies, the Administrator of General Services shall establish in the National Archives and Records Service a service to be located in Washington, District of Columbia, and to be known as Know Your Government Service (hereinafter referred to as the Service).

(b) The functions of the Service shall include—

(1) the dissemination of general information concerning the functions of the various departments and agencies of the Government;

(2) providing students and teachers with information concerning the organization of the Government; and

(3) the furnishing of information upon request concerning the officer or agency to be contacted for specific inquiries bearing upon the activities of a particular agency of the Government.

SEC. 2. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

RECOVERY FROM TORTIOUSLY LIABLE THIRD PERSONS OF VALUE OF CERTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the value of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States.

In connection with this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the following explanatory statement be published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1019) to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the value of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States, introduced by Mr. BYRD of Virginia, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell, has found at least several million dollars a year slipping through legal loopholes which prevent the Government from recovering costs in accident cases involving thousands of persons receiving Federal hospitalization, medical treatment, etc.

I concur in the Comptroller General's conclusions that Government medical care in these cases is not intended to relieve any one of any accident liability, and that the

right of recovery should be uniform throughout the Government. I am introducing a bill to this effect.

The Comptroller General's findings were made in a "Review of the Government's Rights and Practice Concerning Recovery of Cost of Hospital and Medical Services in Negligent Third-Party Cases," which was forwarded to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The review developed that while provision is made for recovery of these costs in other areas, the law without apparent reason is silent or insufficient with respect to accident cases involving injury to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, the Coast Guard, merchant seamen, veterans, and others for whom Government medical care is furnished.

The magnitude of these errors of omission is shown by the Comptroller General's examination of Department of Defense records which reveal that in the 3-year period ending December 31, 1959, there were 39,700 accidents involving privately owned automobiles in which military personnel were injured.

The Comptroller General estimated that costs of Federal medical and related services in these cases averaged $10.3 million a year, or more than $30 million for the 3-year period; but lacking specific authority, and under a 1947 Supreme Court decision, the Defense Department made no effort to recover any of these costs.

The Comptroller General found so-called third-party negligence reasonable to assume in 15,900 of the 39,000 accident cases because the injured military personnel were passengers or pedestrians. The unrecovered costs of medical and hospital services in these cases were estimated at an average of $4.1 million a year.

The military peronnel injured in the other 23,800 accident cases were drivers of vehicles involved, and the Comptroller General said while incidence of "third-party liability in these cases is not known, it is reasonable to assume that it was present in a significant number of instances."

In the same review the Comptroller General found that the U.S. Public Health Service does not recover from negligent third parties the costs incurred by the Government in the treatment of injured Coast Guard personnel, merchant seamen, and others who are entitled to care in PHS hospitals at Government expense.

He found further that the Veterans' Administration, while successful in some degree in proceedings under general provisions of the Veterans Benefits Act, also lacks specific authority to recover medical costs from negligent third parties for accident cases treated through VA facilities.

The review found in some cases injured personnel may recover from negligent parties, but the Government cannot recover from either party in the absence of specific legal authority. In other cases injured parties, having received medical care at Government expense, do not include such costs in their claims.

The right of recovery in accident cases is already provided under the Federal Employees Compensation Act, and under Federal law relating to railroad employees, longshoremen and harbor workers. The Department of Defense and other agencies involved have concurred in the Comptroller's recommendations and they have assisted in drafting the bill I am introducing.

GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to provide for the general expenditure authorization bill.

In connection with this resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the following explanatory statement be published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), submitted by Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. BENNETT), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, effective on the first day of the ——— regular session of the Eighty ——— Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c)(1) All new expenditure authorizations for each fiscal year shall be contained in one general expenditure authorization bill to be known as the General Expenditure Authorization Act of (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The general expenditure authorization bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorizations, expenditure authorizations under private Acts of Congress, or rescissions of expenditure authorizations.

"(2) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization made therein; and the general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year shall contain provisions limiting the total net expenditures during such fiscal year against each expenditure authorization available from prior years. In each case in which an expenditure authorization for any fiscal year for any purpose is provided in any such bill and any other expenditure authorization or authorizations for the same general purpose are available during such fiscal year, the limitation shall be against total expenditures from all expenditure authorizations available for the same general purpose during such fiscal year. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to expenditure authorizations made solely for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States or of judgments, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the inclusion in any general expenditure authorization bill or in any deficiency or supplemental expenditure authorization bill of such provisions as may be deemed appropriate with respect to transfer of expenditure authorizations or expenditure limitations.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each general expenditure authorization bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each new expenditure authorization available for expenditure in the fiscal year;

"(B) estimates of the balances of expenditure authorizations as of the beginning of the fiscal year;

"(C) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from each expenditure authorization referred to in clause (A), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(D) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from the balances of expenditure authorizations, referred to in clause (B), except expenditures from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(E) estimates of the net expenditures in the fiscal year from intragovernmental revolving and management funds;

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the expenditure authorizations referred to in clauses (A) and (B).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each expenditure authorization rescission bill, and the statement of managers accompanying any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on intragovernmental revolving and management funds and public enterprise funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) No general expenditure authorization bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(6) For the purposes of this subsection, the amount of expenditures shall be determined upon a checks-issued basis.

"(7) As used in this subsection (c), the term 'expenditure authorization' shall apply to all current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States. The term 'expenditure authorization' shall not apply to appropriations of trust funds, deposit funds, transactions involving public debt retirement, or appropriations made solely for payment of refunds and drawbacks.

"(8) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general expenditure authorization bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The general expenditure authorization bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general expenditure authorization bill containing expenditure authorizations available for expenditure during such fiscal year shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in the preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem

appropriate, a current estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate, recognizing the necessity for an amendment to its Standing Rules in order to make effective the amendment to the joint rule made by the first section of this resolution, hereby adopts the provisions of subsection (b) of this section as an exercise of its rulemaking power.

(b) Effective on the first day of the —— regular session of the Eighty —— Congress, but only if prior thereto this resolution is adopted by both Houses of Congress, subsection (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Committee on Appropriations, to consist of twenty-seven Senators, to which Committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Expenditure authorizations. As used in this paragraph, the term 'expenditure authorizations' means current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States except authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States for the payment of private claims."

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Congress has lost control over Federal expenditures, and it acts on spending legislation without providing itself with means of knowing whether it is creating deficit or surplus.

Under present legislative procedures vast backdoor spending is authorized outside of the appropriation process; consideration of spending authorizations which do go through the appropriation process is splintered in a dozen separate bills; and Congress does not effectively control the annual rate of expenditures.

In order to recapture congressional control over Federal expenditures I am introducing a concurrent resolution to provide for a general expenditure authorization bill. The resolution would require: (1) Action on the Federal expenditure budget as a whole, as well as in segments; (2) control of expenditures as well as appropriations; and (3) enactment of the spending side of the budget in full view of latest revenue estimates revised at each stage of the legislative process.

Under terms of the resolution this would be accomplished by (a) bringing all spending authorizations under jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees; (b) acting on all new and additional spending authority in one bill (with provision, of course, for necessary supplemental and deficiency bills); (c) requiring annual expenditures limitation on each item in the bill; (d) providing that committee reports carry tabular presentation of both expenditures, and expenditure authorizations allowed under the bill; and (e) requiring the latest revenue estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury at each stage of the legislative procedure on the bill.

These are simple fundamental requirements for orderly and intelligent action on fiscal legislation. They are not met by current procedures which were established before the days of multibillion dollar budgets and multiyear appropriations and other expenditure authorizations.

The Federal debt is now $290 billion. We have been on a deficit financing basis for 24 of the past 30 years. We are certain to be on a deficit financing basis in the current year and next fiscal year. Need for major reform in congressional procedures for enactment of spending legislation is obvious.

CERTAIN WORKS OF ART IN SUBWAY TO NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the imbalance in trade is the result of many factors. Some of them are within the jurisdiction of this body. Others relate to a rising economy and an advancing technology in many nations of the free world. Several things need to be done in this area within the control of the Congress. No one simple solution can, like the wave of a magic wand, solve the total problem. But, diligence does require that we overlook no facet of the problem which can contribute to its ultimate solution.

I applaud the bipartisan effort which has brought to the floor this bill to strengthen our foreign and domestic commerce by encouraging foreign tourists to visit the United States. Any increase in these visitations will narrow the dollar gap. First hand knowledge of our attainments, our bountiful life, and our tremendous enterprise will serve to strengthen bonds of friendship and to elevate the prestige of this Nation. You will recall that, a few months ago, our prestige was alleged to be slipping among people of Western Europe who have never seen our great land. We take note of the fact that prestige flourishes in a moral climate—we have learned, in the past 15 years, that apparently prestige is not bought by shipping billions abroad.

The State of Nebraska has inaugurated a program to stimulate travel into Nebraska by foreign tourists. We have much, in Nebraska, to demonstrate that which makes America great. Our office of tourism, if I may call it that, will be guided by John Kelley, a native Nebraskan and public relations expert who worked in the House of Representatives as administrative assistant to former Congressman Don McGinley. The facilities of our State will be available to entertain and comfort travelers from foreign lands.

On this occasion I will take the opportunity to submit a resolution which will authorize the several States to fashion works of art for the millions of visitors who explore Capitol Hill each year. My proposal affords to the 50 States an opportunity to create works of art depicting scenic beauty or historical sites in the several States along the well-illuminated and spacious walls of the 1,400-foot subway between the New Senate Office Building and the Capitol Building. These objects of art will be done at the expense of each contributing State, and space will be allocated by the Architect of the Capitol, with the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

The most recent estimate indicates that 5 million persons visit the Capitol Building each year. We can conjecture the numbers visiting the Senate buildings—certainly we would be amazed at an accurate tabulation of the persons traveling each year through this 1,400-foot tunnel. The completion of this project would be an invitation to these 5 million to visit the States of our Union. With the cooperation of each State, this rather drab corridor can become a "subway of the States." Its beauty could enhance the utilitarian purpose of this corridor, and make it another delight for those who come to see our National Capitol. Many of us who depart this Chamber frayed after a trying day might rekindle a zest for comradeship, and be helped in leaving behind our lesser natures in this Chamber of contention.

I am in hopes that the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which it is my privilege to serve, can present to this body under this resolution a splendid opportunity to give even more charm and graciousness to our beloved and beautiful National Capitol.

Mr. President, my resolution is very short. It provides as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol, with the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration, is authorized (1) to allocate among the several States the available wall space in the subway between the New Senate Office Building and the Capitol, (2) to invite each State to furnish without cost to the United States one or more paintings depicting its scenic beauties or historical sites to be placed in the space so allocated to it, and (3) to accept and cause to be placed in such space any painting or paintings so furnished which he determines to be suitable for such purpose.

I send this resolution to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 836) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, which I introduced—for myself, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. CAPEHART—on February 9, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 13, 1961, the names of Senators NEUBERGER, MORSE, LONG of Missouri, MOSS, and PASTORE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 909) to provide for payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health services furnished to aged beneficiaries under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators) on February 13, 1961.

PRINTING OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FEED GRAINS AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 12)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message on feed grains be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports pursuant to Senate Resolution 226, and Senate Resolutions 231 through 241, of the 86th Congress, be extended to March 31, 1961. This request concerns annual reports of certain subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I merely wish to state that approximately 12 reports are involved. Some of them are very substantial and rather lengthy; and it does take time for both the majority reports and the minority views to be presented adequately. That is the real reason for the requested extension of time. So I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], I ask unanimous consent that the filing of the report by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare called for in Senate Resolution 267, 86th Congress, 2d session, be extended from February 21, 1961, to March 15, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ASSISTANT-ATTORNEYS-GENERAL-DESIGNATE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Monday, February 27, 1961, at 2:30 p.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on the following:

Ramsey Clark, of Texas, an Assistant-Attorney-General-designate.

Herbert J. Miller, Jr., of Maryland, an Assistant-Attorney-General-designate.

Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, an Assistant-Attorney-General-designate.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BURKE MARSHALL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 1, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Burke Marshall, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Harold R. Tyler, Jr., resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Speech entitled "Political Lag—Enemy of Freedom," delivered by Senator CLARK at Therese M. Loeb Memorial lecture, February 15, 1961.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Civil War Centennial address by Senator BYRD of Virginia, together with excerpts from the booklet entitled "Virginia's Opportunity," expressing reasons for and the purpose of the Civil War Centennial.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address by him delivered over Wisconsin radio stations concerning economic problems.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement by him at public hearing on residual fuel oil conducted by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Department of the Interior auditorium, on February 20, 1961.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "Higher Education Is a National Problem," written by Senator CLARK and published in current issue of the Saturday Review.

THE FIRST 30 DAYS OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized for 3 minutes; and when those 3 minutes have elapsed I wish to be called to account, so that later I can complete, in my regular turn, what I have to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is now 1 month since Mr. Kennedy took office as President of the United States. As the affairs of this Government go, a month is neither a long time nor a short time. It is a period of 30 days, which we hope, and I know the people of the United States hope, has been used with good sense by the leadership of the Government in trying to ameliorate the state of the Nation at home and abroad.

I believe that any objective judgment would indicate that the Kennedy administration has used these 30 days in precisely that fashion. It has wielded existing authority—moral and legal—of the executive branch of the Government to get more surplus food to those in need; to help to settle the serious threat of a strike in the railroads; to pump more life into the economy, in an effort to prevent the sag from spreading into a depression; and in many other significant ways.

In the field of foreign policy, the new administration has taken steps to keep the highest civilian and military officials of this Government from speaking at cross-purposes and, hence, exacerbating all our difficulties. In so doing and by speeding up the accumulation of certain key defense tools, such as the Polaris submarines, it has made a significant beginning on the formidable task of reestablishing the classic dictum of President Theodore Roosevelt to speak softly, but carry a big stick.

In Laos, there has appeared the outlines of a new policy designed to win sound progress for peace rather than the empty and costly triumphs of propaganda. And toward Latin America this administration has taken the first steps toward a tangible reaffirmation of an intimate inter-Americanism by offering bread where it is needed to feed the hungry and by bringing into the direction of these affairs new men with deep understanding of Latin America.

In the critical situation in the Congo, this Government, from the President on down, has demonstrated a coordinated and quiet determination to do what must be done—no more, no less—to keep open the prospect for a decent peace in that region and the hope for the peaceful progress in independence of the entire new Africa. Peace cannot be guaranteed in that region, but its prospects are increased by the course we are now following—the course of close attention to the voices of Africa and firm support for the United Nations in the Congo situation.

Finally, by obtaining the release of the RB–47 fliers, one more obstacle has been cleared away for a significant reduction in the tensions between Russia and the United States and the opening of better cooperation on the common problems of humanity if the Russians so desire.

At home, the program of the Kennedy administration, beyond immediate emergency measures, has begun to move through the mill of the legislative process. Today's splendid Presidential message calling for action in education constitutes one more block in the edifice of a revitalized America, an America of hope and purpose which this administration is determined to lead in building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this subject may be printed consecutively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President. Congress has its part to play in this great effort. As far as the leadership on this side of the aisle is concerned, it is determined to do whatever it is able to do with respect to the Kennedy program to see to it that its legislation needs receive adequate and prompt consideration in the Senate of the United States.

In that effort, this is where the Senate stands at this moment:

We have passed a bill to reinstate and extend the President's authority to reorganize the executive branch, a key power which the President must have if he is to bring order out of the bureaucratic chaos into which we have drifted.

We have scheduled for action on the floor today a bill to establish an Office of International Travel with a view to bringing about some reverse action in the outflow of tourist dollars.

I am confident that the Finance Committee will act promptly on the President's recommendation for a temporary program to extend unemployment benefits and to aid the children of the unemployed once the House has completed its consideration of this measure, since the House must act first under the Constitution.

Hearings on the question of raising minimum wages and extending coverage have begun in the Senate, and it is anticipated that a decisive step toward floor action will be taken when the Subcommittee on Labor meets tomorrow.

The Foreign Relations Committee has completed hearings on the President's request for early approval of U.S. membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Within the next 2 weeks this measure should be before the Senate.

Proposed legislation has been introduced for a program of health insurance for the aged, clothed with the dignity and decency of the social security system. As noted, the message on a program for education has just been received. On these and on other major measures, I would hope that we can move promptly and expeditiously to Senate consideration.

It is my intention to meet tomorrow with the chairman of all the committees which have or will have under consideration proposed legislation pertaining to the President's program. Together with the majority whip and the secretary of the conference, I shall seek the counsel of these outstanding Senate leaders with a view to bringing these bills and whatever subsequent major proposed legislation is sought by the administration to trial on the floor of the Senate as promptly as prudence permits.

While the major legislative acts of the administration are only now entering into the legislative channels, I wish, nevertheless, to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished minority leader, to the majority whips, to the secretaries of the conferences, to the chairmen of committees, and to every Member of this body for the outstanding cooperation which has enabled us to set a pattern of moving such business as we have had quickly and smoothly and with a minimum of fanfare. Appointments have constituted our principal preoccupation to date, and we have disposed of 13,731. In addition, we have passed 63 measures. When the administration last changed party hands in 1953, the comparable figures as of this date were 354 appointments cleared and 45 measures passed. These figures in themselves, of course, are not of any great significance, for obviously the quality of effort is far more significant than the quantity. I merely state the figures for the record.

And I may say that while we have kept the calendars clear, we have still been able to get home for supper at a reasonable hour most of the time. As we move now into the heart of the legislative program for this session, I am confident that the distinguished minority leader joins with me in soliciting a continuance of the effective cooperation which we have had to date, to the end that we may not only discharge our responsibilities in the Senate, but also continue to maintain a measure of good will in the Senate Wives' Club.

PAUL WOOTON

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week, in the death of Paul Wooton, I lost one of my choice and close friends of many years.

He was a perfect gentleman. Those who had the privilege of knowing him will never forget his interest in and his unselfish service to his fellow man. He truly practiced and lived by the Golden Rule as near as any mortal man could.

Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church, of which he was an outstanding and devoted member, stated as follows regarding Paul Wooton:

> The memory of what he was to each of us will speak with an eloquence neither written nor spoken words can convey.
>
> Few men have worked so hard, few men have seen their labors produce more good in this world. * * *
>
> He was what you would like to become if you were a journalist.

Mr. President, to know Paul Wooton was to love him. He set for us an example of honor, integrity, and fair dealing which we might well emulate.

To his family and relatives, I extend my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

ENRICHMENT OF CEREAL PRODUCTS—COMMEMORATIVE RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate the observance during 1961 of what is appropriately called the quiet miracle. I refer to the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the enrichment of bread and flour and other cereal products.

Unfortunately, too few of us are aware of the accomplishments of enrichment—beriberi, pellagra, and other dietary deficiency diseases have almost disappeared and iron-deficiency anemia has been lessened without adding calories or cost to some of our most important food products. This quiet miracle—the addition of thiamine, niacin, riboflavin, and food iron—has made our bread and other cereal products nutritionally the best in history.

Those of us from the great wheat-producing areas of our country are joining other millers and bakers and all others associated with enriched food products, to remind the American public of the tremendous benefits we have reaped from the quiet miracle.

The National Association of Wheat Growers at its annual meeting in Enid, Okla., in December, adopted a commemorative resolution which I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD following my remarks. Also, I ask to have inserted a brief statement on the history, philosophy, and public health benefits of the enrichment program.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At their meeting December 6, 1960, in Enid, Okla., the members of the National Association of Wheat Growers adopted a resolution observing 1961 as the 20th anniversary of enrichment, as follows:

"Whereas, since 1941 the bread, flour and other products of wheat, as well as certain other cereals in the United States diet, have been enriched with specified amounts of the B-vitamins—thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin—and the mineral, iron; and

"Whereas, since 1941 even clinical signs of deficiency diseases caused mainly by inadequate supplies of thiamine, niacine, riboflavin, and iron in the national dietary have all but disappeared, while at the same time general standards of public health have been raised; and

"Whereas, the contribution of the enrichment program to personal and public health goes largely unrecognized and unappreciated in the public mind and professional consciousness: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Association of Wheat Growers join together and strongly urge others to join with all wheat producer groups, flour millers, bakers, and the producers, processors and manufacturers associated with enriched food products to campaign vigorously during the year 1961 to commemorate the 20th anniversary of enrichment as the 'quiet miracle' to the end that physicians, nurses, health workers, teachers, and community leaders as well as the public at large become aware and appreciative of the immense contribution of enrichment to the health and welfare of the United States and its people."

THE 2-MINUTE STORY OF THE QUIET MIRACLE AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO YOUR HEALTH

A QUIET MIRACLE?

Since 1941, practically all cereal foods in U.S. diet have been enriched. B-vitamins—thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin—as well as food iron have been added to bread, flour, processed cereals, white rice, corn meal and macaroni foods without changing taste or color, without adding calories or cost.

Since 1941, deficiency diseases caused by diet inadequate in thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin have all but disappeared. The occurrence of iron deficiency anemia has been materially reduced. Enrichment accomplished a quiet kind of miracle—to bring better health to all through better nutrition for all. In the American tradition, enrichment was voluntary—the combined work of science, medicine, government, and industry.

PHILOSOPHY OF ENRICHMENT

In 1939, the American Medical Association recommended adding synthetic nutrients to general purpose foods to make up deficiencies in popular diet. By that time, scientific and industrial research made enrichment not only possible but commercially practical. Nutritionists were alarmed by surveys showing great public need for certain nutrients.

The fortification of margarine with vitamin A; milk with vitamin D; table salt with

iodine; the restoration of breakfast cereals; and enrichment of bread, flour and similar food have since resulted. The addition of these needed vitamins, minerals and other dietary essentials to general purpose foods was urged in the interest of public health.

HISTORY OF ENRICHMENT

Even in 1939, some bakers and millers were adding B-vitamins, nonfat dry milk and sometimes vitamin D to improve their products nutritionally. But definition and agreement were needed.

After many hearings, the term "enriched" was adopted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to describe the addition of specified amounts of thiamine, niacin, riboflavin and iron to popular cereal-based products. Enrichment standards were issued May 27, 1941, and later amended as enrichment was made mandatory for the duration of the war. Since 1946, enrichment laws have been adopted by more than half the States. Today it is estimated that 80 to 90 percent of all breadstuffs, family flour and macaroni foods are enriched.

PUBLIC HEALTH BENEFITS

Beriberi, pellagra and ariboflavinosis are related diseases caused by diet deficient in thiamine, niacin, and riboflavin. Once common ailments, they affect heart, mind, skin, and nervous system. Since enrichment, they have almost disappeared. Physicians now rarely find evidence of beriberi, pellagra or riboflavin deficiency, even in chronic alcoholics among whom these diseases were formerly prevalent. The occurrence of iron deficiency anemia has also been lessened.

Credit for this revolutionary achievement—this quiet miracle in public health, in nutrition—has been given the enrichment program and those who made it possible.

BENEFITS TO YOU AND YOUR FAMILY

Improved public health means better family and personal health. Through enrichment—bread and other products of flour and wheat have been made so nutritious that they can improve any normal diet—even those designed for weight reduction. Low in fat and not excessive in calories, enriched products contribute generous supplies of thiamine, niacin, riboflavin, and iron to our national food supply. Enrichment makes U.S. bread nutritionally the best in history—one of the best breads in the world today. Always look for the word "enriched" on the label of the bread, flour, cornmeal, rice, macaroni or other cereal products you buy.

(The nutritional statements made above have been reviewed by the Council on Foods and Nutrition of the American Medical Association and found consistent with current, authoritative medical opinion.)

INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO. CALLS BACK WORKERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, many years ago a New York newspaper carried this rather unexpected headline in huge black letters: "No Bad News Today."

That is a great headline, and I trust there will be occasions when it can appear again.

In the welter of stuff setting forth how bad everything is supposed to be, it is rather refreshing to take note of an article in the February 14, 1961, issue of the Chicago Daily News. In brief, it recites that for the second month the International Harvester Co. has called back workers, and now has a payroll which is the highest since July 1960. There is a little sunshine, after all; and I ask unanimous consent that the news article be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVESTER SPURT BRINGS BACK MEN

A business pickup, the manufacture of farm and construction equipment, and trucks for the spring trade resulted in a recall of 3,442 laid off workers at International Harvester Co. last month.

Harvester said Tuesday that its employment of production and maintenance workers February 1 totaled 39,112 workers, highest since last July.

The company added that January was the second consecutive month its payrolls have increased. Some 2,338 workers were added in December, making the total 5,780 recalled since December 1.

Harvester said that the 4,000 workers laid off in November for 5 weeks at its Springfield (Ohio) truck plant now are back at work.

THE MISSILE CONTROVERSY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the Sunday, February 12, 1961, edition of the London Observer appeared a comment on the missile—I repeat "missile"—controversy. Since "Comment" is a regular feature in the Observer, the point of view expressed might be of interest, and so I submit it for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have it printed therein.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT

President Kennedy has said that until he has completed his study of the American defense program he cannot be sure that the so-called missile gap between the United States and Russia has been closed. But even discounting various leaks from the Pentagon, it is already fairly clear that this gap, which was always exaggerated by the more warlike Democrats, has been closed by the brilliant work done by American scientists in developing, first, the Polaris submarine, and now the long-range Minuteman missile, which uses solid fuel and can therefore be fired from mobile bases such as railway trucks and surface ships.

It is no doubt politically embarrassing for Mr. Kennedy to have to admit so early that some of his severest criticisms of the Eisenhower administration were unfounded; but so far as defense and foreign policy are concerned it is pure gain. Confident that the United States really has at last an invulnerable deterrent within her own control, the President should be less dependent on America's allies for overseas bases. He should, therefore, be able to tackle more boldly questions of disarmament and disengagement.

He may even find that this improves Russia's attitude. Having lost some of the advantages of her own closed society secrecy—hitherto American missile bases have been public knowledge whereas Soviet ones are a genuine secret (except to the now defunct U–2 flights)—Russia may begin to appreciate the need for some form of inspection and control.

COSPONSORSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the sands of time have not run out for me, I wish to reaffirm my interest in the resolution I introduced for a modification of the Senate rules, to put an end to dual or multiple sponsorship. I hope I may have the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration to bring that about.

I have become more alarmed than ever, because I noticed in the Sunday press a statement to the effect that the House of Representatives is now considering multiple sponsorship. We can imagine what will happen when there are bills with 200 or 300 names on them in the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall belabor the matter later, Mr. President.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS FOOD TO AMERICANS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the first act of the new administration on taking office last month was to increase the distribution of surplus food to Americans who have been hit by the current recession. There is a serious need for such food in many parts of our country, and the President is to be commended and supported in his efforts to assist those in need.

St. Louis, Mo., has been badly hit by the recession. The plight of many citizens was recently well described by Arthur K. Atkinson, chairman of the St. Louis Advisory Board of the Salvation Army and former able president of the Wabash Railroad. As Mr. Atkinson states:

It is almost incredible that in one of the largest cities in the richest country in the world, hundreds of people are literally starving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, "Urgent Plea for Food Made Here," dated February 11, 1961, which describes conditions in the city of St. Louis, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

URGENT PLEA FOR FOOD MADE HERE—ATKINSON SAYS NEEDY LITERALLY ARE STARVING

"It's almost incredible that in one of the largest cities in the richest country in the world, hundreds of people are literally starving."

That was the statement Friday of Arthur K. Atkinson, chairman of the St. Louis Advisory Board of the Salvation Army.

He said that, since January 26, the Salvation Army—the last resort for those who need help immediately—has had to turn down 315 of 631 families who need food.

Meanwhile new figures from the Missouri Division of Employment Security showed that unemployment in St. Louis and St. Louis County is increasing.

And—as Mr. Atkinson was issuing a public plea for a State emergency appropriation to finance distribution of Federal surplus food—the city Aldermanic Surplus Food Committee was meeting to discuss the problem.

City Comptroller John H. Poelker told the committee details of a city distribution program can be worked out in a week.

Mr. Atkinson made his plea in a press conference in the Boatmen's Bank Building.

At the conference Mrs. Joyce Smith, director of the Salvation Army's family service department, said, "I cry myself to sleep every night."

The reason: because she has to say "No" to so many whom she knows need help and have nowhere else to go.

The 1961 breadline at the Salvation Army headquarters in the Fullerton Building at Seventh and Pine Streets has upward of 100 people waiting most of the time, Mr. Atkinson said.

In the recent bad weather, many of them were soaked to the skin, wet and cold and literally famished, Mr. Atkinson said.

One woman in the last few days fainted as she waited in line, he added. She was taken to City Hospital, where she was diagnosed as suffering from malnutrition.

The Salvation Army sent workers to her home, found five small children there—and they too were suffering from malnutrition. All six wound up in City Hospital.

He said that Salvation Army funds have allowed "taking care" of only 316 of the 631 families which had applied for help since January 26. All of those had been checked and found to be in real need, he added.

By "taking care" he said he meant giving them a week's food orders, which they can present at a grocery store. The Salvation Army has not been giving them cash.

The United Fund is considering the army's request for more funds, he said.

And on January 26 Mr. Atkinson wrote Governor Dalton, asking the Governor to request an emergency appropriation from the State legislature to pay the costs of distributing Federal surplus foods.

He pointed out that only State, municipal or Federal agencies can distribute Federal surplus food in this country—though church organizations and others may do so abroad—and do do so.

Mr. Atkinson's letter to Governor Dalton also asked legislative change in the State welfare law, which would allow the State to give direct relief to families in which there are employable persons.

PREPARING BILL

In the aldermanic meeting at city hall, State Senator Sorkis J. Webbe, fourth district Democrat, said he is preparing a bill calling for the State and the city of St. Louis to split the surplus food distribution program's cost on a 50-50 basis.

He said he hopes to introduce it into the house Tuesday.

Comptroller Poelker has estimated that the cost in the city would be $25,000 to $30,000 a month.

He said that if persons already getting monthly checks from the State division of welfare are certified by that office as eligible for surplus food too, it would save about $10,000 of that estimated cost.

PROPOSAL APPROVED

His proposal for such certification was approved Friday by Proctor N. Carter, director of the State division of welfare, and Dennis M. Doyle of Chicago, area field supervisor of the Food Distribution Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Jack Doussard, administrative assistant to Mr. Poelker, said two-thirds of the 30,000 families expected to apply for the food could be certified through the State welfare division. He directed the city's surplus food program in 1958 and 1959.

Biggest obstacles in the path of the program now, the Aldermanic Committee was told, is finding warehouse space for storage and distribution of the food.

The ideal warehouse, the committee was told, would have 60,000 to 70,000 square feet of storage space, would be on a railroad siding, have ample parking space and be centrally located.

Suggestions made to the committee included the old I.G.A. warehouse in the 2200 block of North Second Street, the old J. C. Penney warehouse, Fourteenth and Spruce Streets, and space in Union Station.

Alderman Joseph P. Roddy, Seventeenth Ward Democrat, and committee chairman, said his group will meet again when Mr. Poelker has prepared more detailed information on the program.

Representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown St. Louis, Inc., and Civic Progress, Inc., attended the meeting, as did Mayor Tucker, A. J. Cervantes, president of the board of aldermen and Frank Hewey, administrative assistant to Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN.

FILING CLAIMS

Meanwhile, figures released by Charles DeLargy, metropolitan manager of the Missouri Division of Employment Security, showed that a total of 25,541 St. Louis and St. Louis County residents were still filing claims for unemployment insurance in the week ending Friday.

That was the highest continued-claim total since the peak week of the 1958 recession.

In addition, 5,329 St. Louis and St. Louis County residents filed their first claims for unemployment insurance in the week ending Friday.

Those initial claims which reflect new layoffs, were 999 above the preceding week, 3,458 above the comparable week last year and 1,832 above the comparable week of 1958.

The continued claims, which in some measure reflect the difficulty of finding new jobs, included 1,730 by automobile plant workers who are on short-duration layoffs.

The continued-claim total of 25,541, highest since the week ending May 9, 1958, was 2,657 above the preceding week, 12,497 above the comparable week of 1960 and 7,500 above the comparable week of 1958. It was 1,413 less than the peak 1958 week, however.

PAUL WOOTON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Nation has lost one of its finest newspapermen in the death of Paul Wooton. He was from my area of the country, and represented the Times Picayune of New Orleans; but he belonged to the entire country.

Mr. Wooton never held any political office of any kind. He never headed any corporation or business firm with vast industrial power. He never had any power to hire many people. He never had any power to bestow great favors upon friends or associates. He never accumulated a major fortune. He was never associated with any position that is ordinarily considered one of vast power.

However, on Saturday afternoon last, in the midst of a rain and also slush of what remained of the snow, 900 people in blase Washington trudged through the rain to attend Mr. Wooton's funeral at the National Presbyterian Church.

I was very much impressed by this honest, sincere show of respect and admiration by this vast throng, which included some of the topmost and ablest thinkers, both men and women, in our Nation. They attended because they respected him and because he represented the very best in his profession here since 1914.

Further, in spite of great success, Mr. Wooton never became so big that he was not deeply concerned and interested in the individual and in the welfare of his Nation and in the welfare of his church. Truly, I cannot think of anyone who rose higher in his profession, in his citizenship, in his church stewardship than the late Paul Wooton. We are all better persons, and the world is a better place, because of him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial which was published in the Washington Star of February 17.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL WOOTON

Paul Wooton's sudden death yesterday at the age of 79 is in the nature of a closely personal loss to literally scores of newspapermen in Washington. In his long career here, dating from the Wilson administration back in the teens, he did many things for them collectively and individually. He had served as president of most of their organizations. His office had become the busy center of the detailed arrangements for many of their organizational enterprises. He was the natural choice when it came to the selection of someone to represent them in the semiofficial or purely social gatherings of "the press"—including its various components.

Yet his self-imposed and extracurricular activities for his own brethren, and in other unrelated fields, never overshadowed his own professional standing as a competent Washington correspondent of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and the dean of business publication representatives in the Capital. He did many useful things. Yet he will be remembered more by those who knew him for what he was than for the many things he did. He was an unusual gentleman in his thoughtful kindness to others, in his unselfish interest in those who needed help, in his adoption of a code of living which came as near to being the practical application of the Golden Rule as mortal man can achieve. The sudden termination of Paul Wooton's various activities will leave a void. But it is Paul Wooton himself who will be missed.

PAWLEY TESTIMONY SHOWS NEED FOR FURTHER HEARINGS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee today released the transcript of the testimony of former Ambassador William D. Pawley. This testimony is a shocking commentary on the conduct of U.S. foreign relations in Latin America and elsewhere during the last two decades. It implicates many high ranking Government officials, some of whom are still serving in Government posts.

The testimony is significant, and as a member of the subcommittee, I approve of its release. The testimony must be read with some caution, however, until all the principals involved have had an opportunity, in public session, to state their side of the case. It should be understood, moreover, that the subcommittee already has heard other testimony on some of the issues covered by the Pawley hearings. It would be most unfortunate if final conclusions were drawn by the public before all of this testimony was released and public hearings are held.

Mr. President, the hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee

on the Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean, have been extremely useful. The subcommittee should continue its study of this subject until the full story of the Castro rise to power has been documented. In this connection, it is very important that the persons named by Pawley, such as William Wieland, Spruille Braden, Roy R. Rubottom, and James E. Webb, be called before the subcommittee in public session to explain their side of the case. I hope this will be done in the very near future.

Mr. President, I believe that Castro's days are numbered. I intend later this week to speak at length on this subject. But we can learn a great deal about how to avoid another Castro or Batista for that matter in Cuba or any place else in this hemisphere, by preparing a full case history on Castro's rise to power.

THE RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC TO SERVICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning I received a letter which asked, in effect, "When are you folks in Congress going to do something about the rights of us, the public? We have been thinking that perhaps we could witness a repetition of what took place when the Secretary of Labor went up to New York. Millions of us up there were inconvenienced. Now a strike is in effect in another branch of the public service"—the air lines.

Mr. President, when will this administration take hold of this problem and meet it head on in these perilous times, when war may be our lot at any moment? Is not the right of the public the most significant right there is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if my colleagues will indulge me, I should like to have the Senate act on the Executive Calendar at this time. I believe it will take only a minute or so.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] I ask that a statement prepared by him concerning the nomination of Brooks Hays to be Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

I am very much pleased that the President has appointed Brooks Hays to be Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations.

Brooks Hays has been a personal friend of mine for many years. He has an enviable record of service both to the people of Arkansas and the Nation. He is well known to most Members of this body and of the House of Representatives. As a member of the Arkansas delegation from the 78th Congress through the 85th Congress he continuously showed a keen insight into the intricacies of foreign affairs problems. He served for 8 years on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and contributed immeasurably to the deliberations of that committee on important problems in the foreign field.

He is a man of integrity and ability, and I know that he will serve the country with distinction in the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. I think his appointment augurs well for the future relationship between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government on foreign affairs problems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

AMBASSADOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert J. Burkhardt, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SECRETARY FREEMAN CHAMPIONS THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the new Secretary of Agriculture appeared on a network television broadcast.

I had no opportunity to see the broadcast; but I read about it this morning and became so deeply interested in it that I then called CBS for a transcript.

Mr. President, it is great to have, at long last, a Secretary of Agriculture who believes in going to bat for the American farmer. In Orville Freeman we have exactly that kind of man.

Secretary Freeman not only spoke out for the farmer, but he did so in a convincing and persuasive way that is going to mark a real turning point on the farms throughout America.

In the course of his half-hour interview, Secretary Freeman said:

We see the magnificent unbelievable success of American agriculture and the tremendous contribution of the American farmer.

Now, we tend to overlook this. In agriculture the two words we hear about are "surplus" and "subsidy." We don't stop to think, for example, that the average industrial worker works only 1 day a week in this United States of America to eat better than anyone in the history of the world. The next best countries are probably Italy and Japan, where they work 2 days. In Russia they work 3 or 3½ days to eat.

The net result is that here in this country we work less and less and less to eat better and better and better, and the most dramatic success story of the American economy and its productivity, the genius of organization and production, agriculture is No. 1, and yet somehow we have drifted off where we consider this a great problem. It is a great success.

Some figures that I have reviewed from time to time which show that if the cost of food had risen as much as the cost of other things that we all use, in the last 8 years it would have cost the American consumer $70 billion more to eat than he has had to pay.

Now if you take what you call subsidies to the farmer, and might I make a plea here also that a great many things are lumped in the budget of Agriculture that should not be charged against the farmer, but at the most, subsidy to the farmer would be during these years $35 billion, and so there has been a net gain to the consumer, a subsidy from the farmer, of $35 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full transcript of the CBS broadcast featuring the Secretary of Agriculture be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CONVERSATION

(Broadcast over the CBS television network February 19, 1961; guest, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; host, Paul Niven; producer, Michael J. Marlow; director, Bill Linden.)

ANNOUNCER. The CBS television network welcomes you to a new program with a different approach to prominent man's private mind and public philosophy. During

the course of the next half hour you will be present for a live "Washington Conversation" with the man charged with trying to solve what President Kennedy has termed "the No. 1 domestic problem."

He is Orville L. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Your host for this informal, unrehearsed conversation in our studio conference room is CBS News Washington correspondent, Paul Niven.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, when President Kennedy was elected, a lot of people said he was going to have an awful time getting anybody to take your job. His predecessor, who was I think by general agreement a well-intentioned and sincere man, ended up without the support of Congress, with a Presidential candidate of his own party disowning him.

What persuaded you to take the job? And is it true you didn't want it?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, it isn't true that I didn't want it. I did have some hesitation in connection with it, but when I had thought the matter over thoroughly, and incidentally discussed it with my family and my wife, because it is a trying job, why, I was anxious to have the opportunity.

It is a difficult job. Agriculture throughout history has presented very grave and difficult problems. It affects everybody, because everybody wants food and fiber. Everybody needs it, and of course millions and millions of people here and around the world are involved in growing it and processing it, in selling it, in using it, and so it comes right down to the nub of human life itself.

Mr NIVEN. I read somewhere that when you went home and told your family that you had taken the job, your daughter Connie, age 15, said "Daddy, I will try to be brave about it."

Is that true?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, that is about right. Connie may be listening now, I hope she is, and Mike and my wife. Neither of the children, of course, were very anxious to leave Minneapolis, where they are going to school and enjoy their home community, school and church, but they are good sports, and have been throughout the time I have been in public life, and are going to make the best of it, and I think they will enjoy Washington.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, isn't this job so difficult some people have said it can't be solved? Isn't it likely to swallow up the reputation of anybody who tackles it?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I really never quite thought about it in those terms. If you can make some progress really—and I don't want to sound dramatic or like a martyr or anything; why, that is relatively unimportant—if we can make progress—now, I don't think we can talk in terms of solutions. This world is changing so fast, the technology of agriculture is more explosive than any other, so there isn't any solution where you could say at a set point we have solved the problem. I doubt if there ever will be.

But the main point is that we move in the right direction of getting food and fiber to people who need it, and also of getting a fair, equitable return to the farmer who produces it.

Mr. NIVEN. Did your predecessor make any progress or did things go in the opposite direction?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I don't want to pass any kind of harsh judgments, but in relation, for example, to the present so-called stocks of food that are called surpluses, why, they climbed about from a billion and a half to eight and a half billion dollars, our present stocks. Farm income dropped sharply, in the nature of 25 percent in terms of net income to the farmer, and I would say that that is hardly progress.

Mr. NIVEN. And the cost of subsidy to the taxpayer grew and grew, didn't it?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, the costs of the program grew commensurate to the storage on hand, but I would emphasize this is in a sense the essence of the problem, Paul, because we tend to produce the things that are difficult to use that we have enough of.

What we really need to do is to produce more of the things that we want and that we need.

Now, almost all of the so-called surplus today is in wheat or in feed grains, primarily corn. Outside of this there isn't a surplus problem in agriculture.

And one of the things that we are trying to do is to move in the direction of converting these things into vegetable oils desperately needed here and around the world, and into proteins, into poultry, into turkeys, into eggs, into beef, into hogs, into the kind of thing—into dairy—the kind of thing that people need and want.

Mr. NIVEN. Do we need more of all those things that we are producing now?

Secretary FREEEMAN. If you want to state the need in terms of what people need and what would make for better living, why, we need more of all of them.

Recent analyses, for example, made show that in our country itself 31 percent of our people have a calcium deficient diet, and of course right now in our direct feeding program we will be reaching in the neighborhood of five and a half million people, and may I say that this, I think, is progress, and I am thrilled with it, and the President, who had seen this in the campaign at first hand, the first Executive Order, everyone in the Department of Agriculture thrilled to it, and I think the American people, was "Let's put some of this food to work."

Mr. NIVEN. Is this calcium deficiency the result of poverty, unemployment, or is it a carelessness in diet?

Secretary FREEMAN. Both. It would be the result of both. There is poverty and unemployment. The first thing that a family that goes out of work will stop buying will be beef and pork and cheese and butter will come very quickly, and after a bit the milk. These are the things that are very important to the diet.

Mr. NIVEN. But even if the surplus problem is confined to feed grains and corn, it is a big problem, and the President has just sent a bill down to discourage the aim of cutting production in those fields.

Now, a couple of days later, Mr. Khrushchev came out with new incentives for the Russians to grow more. Now, if Mr. Kennedy keeps on trying to curtail production here, and Khrushchev keeps on trying to increase production there, isn't Khrushchev inevitably going to fulfill his boast and overtake and surpass us?

Secretary FREEMAN. That is a very interesting question.

The answer is "No."

Let me answer it directly, because Mr. Kennedy isn't concerned in curtailing production, as such. He is concerned in channeling it into the right things, as I said earlier.

But it dramatizes the point, Paul, but I would like to make here, and to make for all the viewers in this program all over America, that by the very definition of this fact of production, we see the magnificent unbelievable success of American agriculture and the tremendous contribution of the American farmer.

Now, we tend to overlook this. In agriculture the two words we hear about are surplus and subsidy. We don't stop to think, for example, that the average industrial worker works only 1 day a week in this United States of America to eat better than anyone in the history of the world. The next best countries are probably Italy and Japan, where they work 2 days. In Russia they work 3 or 3½ days to eat.

The net result is that here in this country we work less and less and less to eat better and better and better, and the most dramatic success story of the American economy and its productivity, the genius of organization and production, agriculture is No. 1, and yet somehow we have drifted off where we consider this a great problem. It is a great success.

Mr. NIVEN. But I don't see why our advances and our high standard of living should necessarily imply that the urban dweller, the consumer, is subsidizing the farmer. Where do you get that?

Secretary FREEMAN. You get that—you put these words, I didn't use them exactly, but I think maybe when you say subsidizing——

Mr. NIVEN. You have said it I think.

Secretary FREEMAN. On occasion. Well, I just say this: that some figures that I have reviewed from time to time which show that if the cost of food had risen as much as the cost of other things that we all use, in the last 8 years it would have cost the American consumer $70 billion more to eat than he has had to pay.

Now if you take what you call subsidies to the farmer, and might I make a plea here also that a great many things are lumped in the budget of agriculture that should not be charged against the farmer, but at the most the subsidy to the farmer would be during these years $35 billion, and so there has been a net gain to the consumer, a subsidy from the farmer, of $35 billion.

Mr. NIVEN. Put it another way. The President pointed out recently that Detroit has a million cars in inventory. There have been layoffs in the auto industry. All right, now why shouldn't the Government on the same principle start paying the industry not to produce cars, pay subsidies, establish support prices? Why isn't the same principle applied?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, in the first place it has been a matter of the decision of a handful of men that they would lay off people who, incidentally, then go on unemployment insurance or on relief, and have a lot of facilities to help them in making the adjustment, a half-dozen remedies, and all they have to do really—of course, this oversimplifies it a bit—is to close the doors. But in agriculture you have 3 to 4 million individual producers. Once you put a crop in the ground, once you have farrowed some pigs, once you have brought in some cows and you are milking them, you just don't close the door. This keeps right on going. And so it requires a kind of coordination, programing, and planning on a much longer basis than is true in the case of industry.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes. In industry in the same field somebody could invest a lot of money in a plant, and if they were producing too much or too much was being produced all over the country of that particular product, by the law of supply and demand and the invisible hand, the plant will be forced out of business. If it should happen to people in business, why shouldn't it happen to farmers?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, it has in part as agriculture adjusts itself, and there are fewer farmers. And technological changes are as a matter of fact taking place rather rapidly. But the transition is a much more difficult one.

The movement of capital in and out, the movement of people in and out, is an extremely complex one which involves millions and millions of producers, not just a few producers.

Mr. NIVEN. But you and many people in politics in both parties have been especially zealous in guarding, in preserving the small family farm. I believe in Minnesota your

policies were designed to help them rather than to be corporate farms. Again in the analogy with business, if the small firm can't compete with the big firms, it is usually forced out of business.

Secretary FREEMAN. The answer to that is that the small farm more than competes in the majority of instances with what we will call corporate farming. We have had in the United States of America a family farm structure, and the great success to which you referred a moment ago in talking about United States versus Russia, Russia's plea for more production and our efforts to adjust it attest very dramatically, if I may say so to you, taking the words out of your mouth, to the overwhelming success and efficiency of the American family farm.

Mr. NIVEN. I remember going to a collective farm in Russia, and incidentally over every cow was a document, and I asked my guide what it was, and he said "That is a plan; every cow has a plan from the government." Is this the logical extension of government intervention in agriculture?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, it is not, and the purpose here generally is to try and bring about a kind of working partnership to synthesize these forces in a sensible way.

Now the plan you have mentioned, which was the feed grain program, was designed to meet an emergency in effect. We already have in storage 2.7-plus billion bushels of feed grains. Now the best estimates we can make that this is a reasonable crop year is that at the end of this crop year that there will be added to that in excess of our 600 million bushels more of feed grains.

It will cost the Government, that means all of us, the taxpayers, $1.5-plus billion, and this is a conservative figure, to handle 600 million bushels of feed grains when we already have 2.7 billion.

So the whole purpose of this is to adjust this and try and move some of this feed grain into other areas, and to bring about the same kind of balance between consumption and demand that is brought about when the steel industry shuts down to 50 percent, as they are now, when the automobile industry shuts down with, as they have now, a million cars in inventory. Only in agriculture with its tremendous productivity and with millions of individual producers, it is much more difficult and complicated.

Mr. NIVEN. And the President wants to turn some of the land into soybean production, doesn't he?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. The suggestion was made, the program as outlined would call for strengthening the support prices on soybeans, with the thought that several million acres of corn land and feed grain land would move into soybeans, because the price and demand for soybeans is very strong, and the need for vegetable oil from all indications will continue to grow stronger and stronger.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Schuman of the Farm Bureau Federation has said that farmers will now be encouraged, if this plan goes through, farmers will be encouraged to move land into soybean, and their total production will go up while they are going to be paid for reducing the total acreage devoted to grains.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, there is a certain element of truth in Mr. Schuman's statement. The answer is that you don't push the button with millions of producers and get the result overnight.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes.

Secretary FREEMAN. The alternatives that we are faced with in this situation, none of them are ideal, and so we deal with the very practical realities of a situation where, in a couple of weeks, we will start a crop under way in feed grains which will produce substantially more than we need of that crop at this time, and which will be enormously expensive to purchase, to move, to store, to hold, and finally to distribute.

As a matter of fact, if you bought this corn at $1.06 it would cost in the neighborhood of $1.50 more, almost 25 percent more than it would cost for the Government to buy it before we could handle it and eventually use it.

Mr. NIVEN. This is going to be a voluntary program?

Secretary FREEMAN. This is a voluntary program.

Mr. NIVEN. Have you any means of seeing that the farmers who don't cooperate won't make more money than those who do?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, this is a very good question, and we do have, and there is an effort in this bill that I hope that Congress will examine and give careful and thoughtful consideration to, and that is to provide the Secretary with the discretionary authority so if a farmer should say, "Well, I am not going to take some acres out of production even though it is going to be a pretty good arrangement, I am going to go ahead and plant as much as I can, and if there is a $1.20 support price, why then I will be able to go to the market and I will do much better," if this happens, we hope to have the power to release into the market a given amount of the 2.7 billion bushels we have now so it won't be a $1.20 price, it will be a price where that farmer will not be permitted to take advantage of his neighbors.

Mr. NIVEN. I see. Mr. Secretary, during the campaign the Democrats talked a lot about Bensonism, and certainly the Republican Members of Congress from your area and even the Vice President made considerable efforts to disassociate themselves from Mr. Benson, but why if Benson was so unpopular and President Eisenhower backed him all the way, why did the Farm Belt go Republican in the election?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I don't think that the overwhelming issue in these areas was particularly agriculture in the cities. The fact remains that the farmers in the Farm Belt voted much more strongly for President Kennedy than they had in the two previous elections.

Mr. NIVEN. Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, yes, in all of these States you would find if you checked the figures that the farm vote—you are getting down now into Nebraska and Kansas. I am getting on shaky grounds. But you get up into Iowa, into Minnesota, into North Dakota, into Wisconsin—South Dakota is an exception to the rule—there is the feeling, and it has been said by the Republicans, that the farmers voted against President Kennedy. This simply is not true.

The people in the small towns in the Midwest and in the cities did not run as strongly as we had hoped that they would, and the election in the so-called Farm Belt was not won by Mr. Nixon in those particular States and lost by the President in terms of the farmer. It was in terms of the small town and the city.

Conversely might I add, Paul, that in the South, in the South the cities voted for Mr. Nixon, but the farmers, the farmers in the South, in the Carolinas, in Alabama and Georgia, they voted for the President.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, Mr. Truman was wrong then after the election when he said he thought the farmers ought to be told where to go.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I have the greatest affection and respect for Mr. Truman. I didn't see that statement, Paul, and I certainly wouldn't comment on it.

Mr. NIVEN. I think he said they ought to be told where to go, and he named the place, which is not normally mentioned on Sunday morning on television, so we will leave that.

Governor, I wonder if we could get into your personal life a little more. I understand one of the books you are reading these days is "Machiavelli the Prince," and I have read that several members of the Kennedy administration are reading it.

Do you read Machiavelli in order to be better acquainted with the Devil, or do you think it has some useful illumination of politics?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I think that Machiavelli has been much maligned over history as a writer and as a philosopher and as a political scientist. As a matter of fact, his writings are very interesting as they analyze the relationships of power and motivations in the process of government, and I find it very stimulating and useful. It is relaxation, not going to school actually.

Mr. NIVEN. Power and motivations I think Machiavelli would have been right at home in the recent controversy over the Rules Committee in the House. He would probably have been on the side of the Speaker and the Administration, but I think he would have probably thought that Judge Smith would have been a pretty good prince for him. Did you call any Members of Congress and pressure them to support that?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, I didn't pressure anybody, Paul, and I don't think anybody was pressured.

Mr. NIVEN. Haven't some of your Cabinet colleagues admitted that they made a few phone calls?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I haven't discussed that with them.

Mr. NIVEN. Don't you think it is necessary and proper, wouldn't it be reasonable for a Government or an Administration, caught in the act of pressuring Congress in an instance like this, to say, "Look, this Administration has sent a program to Congress which we feel is essential for the Nation's survival. We will use every ounce of political strength we can mobilize to get it through"?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I speak now personally, and I am sure that the President will use—he believes in his program and hopes to have it through Congress. Speaking now as an individual and as one who has served as a Governor for 6 years, and 3 terms in the legislature, I just believe that our system of Government works the best and doesn't work properly unless there is a strong executive who works to develop the program that he thinks is best, who presents them affirmatively to the legislature or to the Congress, and then proceeds to fight for those programs.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes, and when you say fight, don't you mean calling committee chairmen, calling members, using the carrot and the stick, threatening them to cut off patronage or other favors or promising favors if they do support you? Isn't that all part of Government as it must be?

Secretary FREEMAN. You are drawing word pictures here that emphasize the stick and forget about the carrot.

Mr. NIVEN. Yes, the carrot——

Secretary FREEMAN. I believe in a—I won't comment on the stick, but I would certainly say that I spent, oh, I spent a great deal of time since I have been here talking to people in both the House and the Senate, both Republican and Democrats, about agriculture.

I have learned a good deal. And I hope that they know me a little better and know these programs a little better. And the real thing is a matter of persuasion in connection with the program.

There are then some other elements that you could say are properly within the rules of the game, but it doesn't mean shaking your finger at somebody's nose threatening him that he won't have any patronage, and the rest of it.

Mr. NIVEN. It can be done politely?

Secretary FREEMAN. You are just like all the newspapers and the TV and the radio and

the—you would like to emphasize the stick. I mean I like to emphasize the carrot.

Mr. NIVEN. I am just wondering if politicians aren't less than frank with the people if they don't pretend that this pressure and threatening doesn't go on and if they might not serve their own ends best if they would be more frank and say, "Sure we do this, we have to. We can't compete with the monolithic totalitarian adversary if we don't."

Secretary FREEMAN. This is a serious question, and let me give it a serious answer. I have been a little facetious about it to this point.

Of course this goes on, but it is a very practical day-to-day business. For one thing, you don't threaten a man of integrity and ability in the Congress and say, "You vote for that or else I am going to go out and lick you." In the first place, if you do that, he would go home and tell his people that, and the next election why you will take the big licking. I mean it is the relationship here.

It may very well be that in a marginal case on a matter of an appointment where there were two good people and he was particularly anxious that one should be appointed, that conceivably you might go the other way, and I think the reason is a hesitation to discuss this in the sharp outline frankness that you talk about is that once you do, you see, it becomes overemphasized in terms of its meaning and its application, because you tend to deal in black and white and extremes. There is a deal of gray here. If I may repeat, I would never dream of threatening and saying, "You do this or just look out."

Mr. NIVEN. But you wouldn't mind letting the man know that if he behaved in a certain way, you would be more benevolent to him in the future?

Secretary FREEMAN. I would assume that anyone who was in politics or in any branch of human life who had an intelligence quotient of 75 at least would understand that that is going to be the case.

Mr. NIVEN. So threats don't have to be spelled out.

Secretary FREEMAN. Correct. Now you have put your finger on it.

Mr. NIVEN. Mr. Secretary, a week ago you appeared on that very unusual television program which is run by two Senators from Pennsylvania. Senator CLARK is a very partisan member of your party, Senator SCOTT is a very partisan Republican, and at one point I believe you said you were in an uncomfortable position. If you were running for office you would know how to handle yourself, but you didn't know how to handle yourself as a Cabinet officer. What restraints or inhibitions do you feel you have?

Secretary FREEMAN. I have no restraints or inhibitions except a desire to work on a basis with the President of the United States who I feel a warm affection for as a person, and admiration for as a leader.

Having just begun here, exactly the form of this is going to have to develop itself.

If your question is have I been directed what to say and what to do and what not to say and do, the answer is absolutely "No." This hasn't even been suggested. In fact, I am on this program and I was on Mr. Garroway's program. No one in the White House said to me what I should or shouldn't say.

Mr. NIVEN. I can tell you you shouldn't mention Mr. Garroway, but still——

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, on this program, I beg your pardon. I ought to know better than that, hadn't I?

Mr. NIVEN. Seriously, sir, some of your friends in Minnesota used to say that you were a very able politician, but you were also a very stubborn man, and there have been some predictions that you might even end up as a sort of Democratic Ezra Benson. What do you think about that?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, again, it is hard to say. I guess maybe I am stubborn. When I believe in something and when I have made a decision on it, and when I have listened to all sides of it, why, then I try to carry it out.

I think perhaps I have learned from the past. I think I may be a little bit more flexible in that regard. One learns as he gets on. But I would hope, and I don't intend to lose the orientation that when I have a strong conviction I am prepared to fight for it. Otherwise there is no reason for being in this business. Public life is not an easy one. It is a challenging and a wonderful life, and this isn't a complaint, but it takes a lot out of you, and it takes a lot out of your family, and the reason for being in it is because you think you can do something worth while. Then if you don't do it, you believe in and fight for it, what is the sense of being in it?

Mr. NIVEN. That is what I was going to ask you.

During the campaign especially millions of Americans wondered why do people subject themselves to this sort of thing.

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I must say to you, and this is Sunday morning, and one time a clergyman who is a good friend of mine came to me and asked me that question, and I asked him, I said, "Why are you a man of the cloth, and why do you preach the Lord's word, and why are you a clergyman?"

And he looked at me, and he said, "I never thought about it that way."

I hope this isn't sacrilegious, but in a very real sense most of the real leaders in political and public life in both parties that I know are in it because they feel a sense of mission, dedication and purpose.

Mr. NIVEN. You were a marine platoon leader during the war, I believe.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes.

Mr. NIVEN. And you were wounded in combat.

Do you feel that that experience gave you any benefit as far as politics was concerned? I don't mean veterans' votes. I mean do you feel that you learned to understand people in a way that has helped you since.

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes. There is something about the experience of living with men under circumstances of life and death that gives you an understanding and a feeling for people that I think you could get no other way. And of course the experience in organization and finally at times in public life when it goes a little rough and the criticisms are pretty sharp and you just wonder if it is all worth it.

I can think back to the many times when life and death were hanging in the balance, and really and truly the problems day to day in public life seemed rather small compared to that.

Mr. NIVEN. I have read somewhere that you used to have a terrible temper, that you have learned to control.

Did you learn that in the Marine Corps?

Secretary FREEMAN. I learned it in part. I got dressed down awful hard sometimes and had to learn that I couldn't talk back. I did have a temper as a boy, but I think since the war and during the war that as I grew to be a man that I have learned to control my temper, and to my best knowledge at no time when I was Governor of the State of Minnesota, or since I have been in public life, have I lost my temper.

Mr. NIVEN. Well, now, I will call you up on that. I don't know that you lost your temper, but during the Los Angeles Convention I happened to be staying on the same floor of the hotel that the Minnesota delegation was staying on, and about 4 o'clock one morning I was returning to my room and I heard a couple of loud voices in high argument, and I listened for a moment, and it was Senator HUMPHREY and yourself, and I tried to eavesdrop, but unfortunately there was another man in the corridor, and I still don't know if it was another reporter or some sort of guard that you had put out there, but anyway, I was embarrassed, so I went in my room.

Can you tell me now what you and Mr. HUMPHREY were arguing about?

Secretary FREEMAN. Well, I don't even remember. There were a number of differences of opinion at the convention in Los Angeles, and Senator HUMPHREY and I have been very dear and warm personal friends for many, many years, and we have not hesitated to speak with abandon and frankness and sharpness to one another on occasion, and it is usually inside a room, and in the future we are going to post a guard outside the door.

Mr. NIVEN. I know I did hear enough so I can press you a little more, but I think I will stop.

How did two such strong personalities as you and Senator HUMPHREY manage to get along in a State political party? You have done it for quite a while.

Secretary FREEMAN. I think you will have to ask him that question. As far as I am concerned, why, I have a great admiration. I think he is an extraordinarily able and competent person, gifted with a brilliant mind, with an effectiveness of analyzing and presenting materials, of reaching people, that is quite extraordinary, and also I feel a real affection for him as a person. Having this kind of a guy, why, it isn't very hard to get along.

Mr. NIVEN. I don't know anybody who knows Senator HUMPHREY who doesn't like him, but when you are arguing don't you find it hard to get a word in?

Secretary FREEMAN. No. I must say that when HUBERT HUMPHREY and I have our discussions, why, he listens, and I listen.

Mr. NIVEN. One final question, Mr. Secretary:

What do you plan to do at the end of 4 or 8 years as Secretary of Agriculture?

Secretary FREEMAN. I haven't got the slightest idea. I haven't thought. You live day by day, kind of fatalistic, you know, as they say in the Marine Corps, and during the war, "If there is a bullet with your name on it, it will find you."

Mr. NIVEN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

That is all the time we have right now.

This is Paul Niven, inviting you to be with us next week at this same time, when our guest will be the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

ANNOUNCER. This has been another informal, unrehearsed "Washington Conversation" with a prominent national figure, a different approach to a prominent man's private mind and public philosophy.

Our guest today was the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman.

Next week don't miss our "Washington Conversation" with a man who rarely grants a television interview, the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, the victor in the recent controversy to change the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. Be sure you are with us for this "Washington Conversation" that promises to be a program of insight into SAM RAYBURN, one of the great men of our time.

MENOMINEE TERMINATION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 9 I introduced two bills, S. 369 and S. 870, at the request of the Menominee Indian Tribe, to amend their Termination Act, which is scheduled to take effect April 30, 1961. I was joined in sponsorship of this legislation by my senior colleague, Mr. WILEY.

In the past few weeks the Menominee tribal delegates, Mr. Jerry Grignon and

Mr. Al Dodge, have been here in Washington to discuss the many difficulties that the tribe has run up against in working out its termination program. Speaking on behalf of the tribe, the delegates have stated that some adjustments and financial aids will be necessary, to make termination successful. Their statements are supported by a resolution of the tribe, adopted unanimously by the Menominee General Council. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at the end of my remarks.

One subject that has an important bearing on the tribe's ability to become self-supporting is the possible development of the recreation potential of its land. Recently the chief of State cooperation, region V of the National Park Service, submitted a preliminary report on these possibilities, which states that a full survey by a competent recreation resource planning group is needed. The report submits other suggestions of similar importance, and I ask unanimous consent that it, too, be printed at the end of my remarks.

On February 15, I wrote to the new Secretary of the Interior, enclosing copies of the two bills, and asking that he see to it that a sympathetic review of the tribe's many difficulties be undertaken immediately. I expressed the tribe's belief that an adequate financial base must be available if termination is to work without causing serious hardship.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution, report, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas:

1. The Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin, within its financial, and training and experience, ability, has in good faith tried to meet the requirements of the Menominee Termination Act, as amended from time to time, and has perfected a plan of organization for the administration of its varied business and governmental affairs required by the Termination Act;

2. The Menominee Termination Act and the organizational plans, so carefully worked out by State and tribal agencies, are at best a grand experiment, and neither the economic nor the human factors necessary to success have been tried or tested;

3. The success of the Termination Act and the termination plans, in their entirety, depend upon the successful management, operation, and redevelopment of the now very limited and nonmodern industrial affairs of the tribe, which have not kept apace with the business world during the last 50 years, resulting in limited employment opportunity and a low living wage standard;

4. The health and welfare of tribal members, and their dependents, are seriously at stake because of the forced closure of the Menominee hospital, the delimiting of medical services, and the questionable ability of the municipality to care for its needy;

5. The plans for redevelopment, improvement, and expansion of the industrial plant have only recently been completed and necessitate substantial restudy and capital investment now not available from tribal funds or sources;

6. The State of Wisconson, after long and careful examination, study and negotiation, has providently seen fit only to establish a provisional form of government for the reservation area, reviewable and reversible by the legislature during the next 8 years through 1969;

7. Many of the people most drastically to be affected by termination effects will have passed on: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved by the Menominee General Council in a regularly convened session at Keshena, Wis., this 9th day of January 1961, That we do hereby and respectfully, in all good faith, request that the Congress of the United States, through the guidance and assistance of the Secretary of the Interior, amend the Menominee Termination Act to:

1. Provide not less than an 8-year period, similar to that enacted by the State of Wisconsin in 1959, for readjustment of business and governmental affairs to the end that the trials and errors of industrial expansion, improvement, and redevelopment are given a reasonable period for resolution;

2. Provide exemption from Federal and State income and State direct property taxes for a similar period;

3. Provide that the plan of organization for business and governmental services, as now incorporated in the Menominee termination plan, shall proceed as now intended, the business organization to be incorporated as a Federal chartered corporation and the governmental affairs to be conducted according to the forms of State law as required by the Menominee County law, but not as a totally integrated part of State government;

4. Provide for establishment of a separate stumpage account administered as before 1955, such funds to be used to defray administrative and other governmental expenses and to develop a reserve fund;

5. Provide authority for the Menominee Tribe to borrow Federal funds at reasonable terms and amounts necessary to expand, improve, and redevelop business operations; and be it further.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Wisconsin delegation in Congress, namely, Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of the Interior.

DECEMBER 8, 1960.

To: Menominee Indian Advisory Council.
From: Peter DeGelleke, chief of State cooperation, region V, National Park Service.
Subject: Proper development of reservation's recreational resources.

In accordance with arrangements made by Assistant Secretary of the Interior George W. Abbott's letter of November 25, I am glad to submit the following observations and suggestions concerning the natural recreational resources of your reservation.

1. Based upon the information of previous reports, the location of the reservation in relation to population concentrates and transportation facilities and personal field observation of portions of the reservation, it is considered that the potential value to the tribe of the recreational resources is sufficient to warrant immediate full scale evaluation and planning.

2. As soon as possible, the services of a competent recreation resource planning organization should be engaged to prepare a report defining the recreational resources and a plan for their most beneficial long-range utilization.

3. The report should include:

(a) An orderly inventory of the existing natural recreational resources and those that it is possible to restore or create by proper management of natural factors such as forest, fish, wildlife, water, etc.

(b) An estimate of the potential visitation by recreationists and vacationists and its potential economic value to the tribe providing proper management is exercised.

(c) A recreation master plan for the reservation designating by types of use the areas to be primarily used for recreation and those to be used secondarily for recreation or scenically controlled and establishing the location of required roads, trails, etc.

(d) A development program establishing a schedule and sequence for executing the master plan by phases including estimates of cost.

(e) Development plan studies for sites to be included in an initial economically feasible phase of the development program.

4. The following items are suggested for incorporation into the master plan or other use as may be considered appropriate:

(a) Ownership of the land should remain with the tribe. Leases to individuals or corporations should be only for such period as is necessary to economically justify the construction of required recreation facilities and should incorporate all restrictions or controls necessary to carry out the principles established by the master plan.

(b) Provision for arrangements with the Wisconsin Department of Conservation for the preservation of such outstanding scenic features as the Dells and certain other falls of the Wolf River and virgin pines which are determined to be of statewide significance as State parks and their development by the State to provide interpretive and day use facilities to preserve and present the natural and historic features of the sites for the general public enjoyment.

(d) Establishment of a scenic zone to preserve and restore the natural condition along the highways providing access through the reservation which will be principally used by recreationists and the access roads to sites and areas to be preserved or developed for recreation.

(e) Establishment of a style and type of architecture that will be followed in all structures and that will utilize items produced by the Menominee mill and consider the feasibility of establishing specially fabricated construction housing units to be used throughout the reservation as individual vacation cottages and residences.

(f) Establishment of a tribal recreation authority with a professionally competent director to carry out the provisions of the master plan and to establish a uniform quality for all facilities and services offered to recreationists on the reservation. Through the use of a system of standards, licenses, and inspections to guide individual enterprise so that the public can use any and all services offered on the reservation with full confidence.

PETER DEGELLEKE.

FEBRUARY 13, 1961.

The Honorable STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On February 9 I sponsored two bills to amend the Menominee Termination Act. I am now writing to urge that you immediately undertake a sympathetic review of the many difficulties that have arisen in connection with the Menominee Indian Tribe's termination program. The matter is urgent, because termination is scheduled to take effect on April 30, about 10 weeks from now.

Self-government will impose a heavy financial burden of providing essential health, education, and other welfare services on the Menominee community. Medical services available to members of the tribe have already been sharply reduced by the closing of the Menominee tribal hospital on January 1, 1961. Due to lack of funds and physicians' services, the nuns who had run the hospital could no longer continue. One consequence of the decline in medical services has been a sharp rise in the number of tuberculosis cases among the tribe.

Termination will be successful only if the tribe is supported by an adequate return

from its enterprises and industry. The termination plan agreed upon by the tribe and your Department was based on the harvesting and marketing of 29 million board feet of timber. The amount of timber sold in the past 6 months was less than 5 million board feet, about one-sixth of the volume specified in the termination plan. The management and technology of the tribe's industry must be greatly developed and modernized if adequate revenues are to be available.

After careful study of the tribe's situation, the State of Wisconsin established a provisional form of local government for the reservation area, which is to be reviewable by the State legislature through 1969. I consider it extremely important that Wisconsin and Federal authorities work together very closely to insure that the tribe's transition is accomplished with an absolute minimum of hardship.

I hope that your Department and the Bureau of Indian Affairs will act quickly to report to the Senate on the bills I have introduced. From your own experience in the legislative branch, you know the importance of these departmental comments on legislation affecting Indians. If the specific proposals in these two bills could be improved upon, I hope that your comments will suggest useful and beneficial alternatives.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL RANKED FOURTH IN UNITED STATES BY CRITERIA OF PAPERS RANKED FIRST AND SECOND

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, American publishers were recently asked to judge the quality of American newspapers by the criteria of three famous statements of what a newspaper should be. The statements are the creeds of three great newspapermen: Joseph Pulitzer, Adolph S. Ochs, and Thomas Gibson, and they provide widely recognized standards of news coverage, independence, impartiality, courage, and attractiveness. They are also the creeds of two great newspapers, the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In this nationwide poll the Milwaukee Journal was ranked fourth. Last year, in a similar survey, the Journal ranked sixth, and in 1958 it ranked 10th. This march up the rankings attests to the rising esteem in which the Journal is held by those crustiest of critics, the publishers of its fellow newspapers.

The top-ranked newspapers, the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, have occupied those positions since the surveys were first conducted. These two papers live under the inspiration of the famous editors whose mottoes served as criteria for the evaluation, and their high rank reflects a long-established tradition of excellence. The third-ranked paper, the Christian Science Monitor, is a national newspaper in a class by itself. The fourth-place ranking of the Journal is, therefore, all the more remarkable, since it has no direct connection with the authors of the well-known newspaper creeds, and is not principally a national newspaper.

The reputation of the Journal has not been carved out by flamboyance. It is not a crusading newspaper in the usual sense. Dedicated to fairness and justice, it seeks to expose wrongdoings, waste, and any attempt to cover up the truth. The Journal is a family newspaper, remarkable equally for its sense of proportion, the wisdom of its comments, the thoroughness of its news coverage, and the excellence of its writing, editing, and production. The record of its contributions to its community is long and honorable. In Milwaukee, the Journal is a trusted newspaper.

I would add—and this is not intended as a comment on the Journal's wisdom—that at no time has the Milwaukee Journal supported me in its editorial columns.

The poll was conducted by Mr. Edward L. Bernays, an advertising executive in New York City, and states that such ratings "encourage the practice of high standards and provide newspapers themselves with yardsticks of performance."

The basis for judgment in the poll are these famous newspapermen's statements:

Joseph Pulitzer, in a statement of principle of the New York World, May 10, 1883:

An institution that should always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice and corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

Adolph S. Ochs, on assuming control of the New York Times, August 8, 1896:

It will be my earnest aim that the New York Times give the news, all the news, in concise and attractive form, in language that is permissible in good society, and give it early, if not earlier, than it can be learned through any other medium. To give the news impartially, without fear or favor, regardless of party, sect, or interest involved; to make the columns of the New York Times a forum for the consideration of all public questions of public importance, and to that end, to invite intelligent discussion from all shades of opinion.

Thomas Gibson, in a statement of principle of the Rocky Mountain Herald, Denver, Colo., May 1, 1860:

A newspaper untrammeled by sinister influence from any quarter—the advocate of the right and the denouncer of the wrong—an independent vehicle for the free expression of opinions of all candid, honest, and intelligent minds—a medium of free discussion, moral, religious, social, and scientific.

The top-ranked 10 newspapers, based on the survey of the Nation's publishers, are first, the New York Times; second, Post-Dispatch; third, Christian Science Monitor; fourth, Milwaukee-Journal; fifth, Louisville Courier-Journal; sixth, New York Herald Tribune; seventh, Washington Post and Times Herald; eighth, Los Angeles Times; ninth, Chicago Tribune; and 10th, Kansas City Star.

TADEUSZ KOSCIUSZKO (1746–1817)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in our great American Revolution our people fought bravely for freedom and independence. In that fight they were aided by a number of distinguished freedom fighters from Europe. The gallant son of Poland, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, was one of these soldiers of freedom.

Kosciuszko was born into a middle-class family on February 12, 215 years ago. In his early youth he showed an unusual liking for books and study, and his parents did everything in their power to educate him. After he had finished the Royal School in Warsaw, he earned a scholarship to study in France. There he entered the famous Mezieres School, and specialized in artillery and engineering.

While in Paris, Kosciuszko was told of the American Revolution; immediately he resolved to fight for a good cause. He borrowed money from friends, sailed for America, and arrived in Philadelphia in August of 1776. There he applied for military service; he was admitted and charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission.

From then on, a high place in our Revolutionary War was assured for him. In October of 1783 he was made a brigadier general. Having fought for our cause, he returned to Poland, hoping to carry on the fight for Polish freedom.

Unfortunately all his efforts in behalf of his countrymen were unsuccessful and he ended his gallant career in exile in Switzerland, on October 15, 1817. On the observance of his birthday we honor his memory as a gallant soldier of freedom.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, February 16 was the 43d anniversary of Lithuania's independence, an independence that was lost to Russia in 1940. In Lithuania, this day of independence cannot be observed and it becomes the somber obligation of other freedom-loving people to let their voices be heard; to remind ourselves and the world that the job of obtaining freedom is not complete, nor is the job of retaining freedom ever ended.

On Sunday, yesterday, this 43d anniversary was commemorated in Detroit at a ceremony which served well this purpose. The leading figures in the Lithuanian community of Michigan and Ontario, Canada, organized a well-supported public program which spoke clearly the continuing concern of those Americans for their kin in Lithuania and their devotion to the America which has given opportunity to all of us from every point of the compass.

We must continue to work for, to hope for and to pray that one day the freedom-desiring people of Lithuania will once again join the free world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, more than 700 years ago the Lithuanian people founded an independent state in northeastern Europe, and for centuries they enjoyed freedom, grandeur, and glory. However, at the end of the 18th century they came under Russian subjugation. But even under the czarist

oppression they did not lose sight of their goals: freedom and independence.

For more than 100 years the Lithuanians waited for the opportunity to regain their liberty. It came with the overthrow of the czarist autocracy in Russia in 1918. On February 16 of that year the Lithuanians proclaimed their national independence and set up their own government. Soon that government was recognized by other sovereign states, and in due time Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations. For two decades the industrious Lithuanians worked hard to build their war-ravaged country, enjoying the precious freedom that had been denied to them for more than a century.

Unfortunately the last war was the beginning of new misery and misfortune for the Lithuanians. In 1940 their country was annexed to the Soviet Union, and their independence vanished. From then on for over 20 years the unhappy Lithuanians have been suffering under tyrannies, first under Communists, then under the Nazis, and, for the last 17 years, again under the Communists. They have been not only cut off from the free world, but all forms of freedom have been denied to them. While thus driven to work for their taskmasters the Lithuanians are, one and all, devoutly hoping and praying for their delivery from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On the 43d anniversary celebration of their Independence Day I gladly echo their genuine sentiments for freedom and hope that they will soon attain their goal.

COMMEMORATION OF BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Brotherhood Week, which has been commemorated during the past week throughout our Nation, stands as a living reminder of the eternal truth that all men are brothers, and that their true destiny is to dwell with one another in the spirit of fraternity and of harmony. Too often, throughout the history of our Nation, the differing views, attitudes, and practices of men have become walls which isolate and divide. Only by a dynamic and continuing effort to break down those walls of distrust and misunderstanding do we foster the harmony of mind and heart which is the essence of true brotherhood.

In a world where viciously divisive forces would set friend against friend and neighbor against neighbor, to create the enmity on which tyranny breeds, it becomes ever more urgent and vital that we strengthen and expand the great counterforce of the spirit of brotherhood throughout America and the world.

To be our brother's friend is the way of peace. To be our brother's keeper—when he cries to us for help—is the way of charity and of love. These are the directions men must take if they are to walk toward the true meaning of life.

The road to brotherhood is the road to international understanding, and ultimately to the peace for which all peoples yearn.

SURPLUS FOOD FOR STARVING WILDLIFE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an editorial from the Poughkeepsie Journal calls attention to the serious hardship recent snows have caused to wildlife all over the country. Along the Hudson River this hardship has appeared the more poignant because surplus grain belonging to the Commodity Credit Corporation is stored in vessels nearby on the river. Just a little of this grain could save many starving birds and other wildlife in the Hudson Valley. I am sure the same is true in other parts of the country.

Mr. President, a resolution has been introduced to permit the Secretary of the Interior to authorize the use of some of this grain on the appeal of the Governors of the States involved. The House resolution has been offered by Representative J. ERNEST WHARTON, of New York. A Senate version was offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. It was be an act of justice and mercy for the Congress to consider and approve these resolutions promptly so that this grain can be made available while the need still exists this year. But in any case, these resolutions should be approved in time to do some good for the storms of next winter. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point the editorial from the Poughkeepsie Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL VIEWPOINT—TONS OF WHEAT GOING TO WASTE, SOME COULD BE USED TO FEED PHEASANTS

Good morning, Sheriff Quinlan. Happy days. Now we're going to suggest a little work for you to do. You'll recall that 3 weeks ago we had a heavy snowstorm. A few days later we had rain, leaving the snow a soggy mass. Then we had severe cold which left the snow almost a solid mass of ice. The earth is really covered with a hard shell which is almost impregnable to the hungry birds.

And they are hungry, too, especially the pheasants, which do not fly long distances in search of food but must depend on picking up small seeds from a limited range. These seeds are now locked up beneath the snow and the pheasants are starving. We've seen more in the last 3 weeks than we saw in all the fall, mostly hens, because the cocks were largely killed during the hunting season. They seem to have been made bold by hunger and are coming out into the open in search of food. A half dozen come into our garden every day to search the sweet corn stalks for the few nubbins which may have been left from the picking. If relief does not come at once we are afraid that they will die in large numbers

Downriver, only some 50 miles away, we are holding a million bushels, more or less, of surplus wheat, scores of ships loaded to the utmost limit with it. This wheat belongs to all of us. We don't want it. We can't use it. Neither have we been able to sell it. We are holding it, together with other surplus food, at an expense which is said to amount to $1 million per day. Let's go to work on it. Let's get some of this wheat released to responsible officials like yourself to be shipped all over the East wherever the need is great. Let us make it available to the hungry birds, and we wouldn't overlook the deer if their need is also great. If this wheat is not used in some way, and it is not being used, the day will surely come when we will dump it into the sea. We cannot hold it forever. It would not remain good forever. It's probably already on the way out insofar as human use is concerned. We hope it won't require a constitutional amendment to break the redtape and make this food available to the only ones which can use it in their present critical emergency, the wild things of the field and forest.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS FOR PENNSYLVANIA—RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution unanimously adopted at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Bar Association held in Philadelphia on January 26–28, 1961. This resolution relates to the need for the creation of additional judgeships for the U.S. district courts of Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, as you know, I am a cosponsor of S. 403, which was introduced by Senator CLARK on January 13, 1961. This bill—S. 403—would create seven additional Federal judgeships in Pennsylvania to cope with the heavy load of additional cases now being brought before the Federal courts. In spite of heroic efforts by judges now sitting in those courts, there is a 3-to-4-year backlog of untried cases. For many a plaintiff this means justice denied because of justice delayed.

Repeatedly, in the past 6 years the Eisenhower administration urged Congress to enact legislation to increase the number of Federal judges. The nonpartisan Judicial Conference has recommended similar action, but the Democratic Party leadership which controlled Congress refused to act.

I do hope that the leadership will now recognize the necessity to create the much-needed judgeships and that the administration will adopt the "fair deal" proposed by the Eisenhower administration for equal political distribution of appointments.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a desperate and mounting need for additional judgeships in the U.S. District Courts for the Eastern and the Western Districts of Pennsylvania, respectively, created by the quantity and the complexity of litigation in those courts; and

Whereas special conditions existing in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania create the need for an additional judgeship in that court at this time; and

Whereas the consequent delay in bringing cases to trial in these courts is causing serious hardships to litigants in cases pending therein; and

Whereas critical conditions of court congestion in these courts have placed such burdens on judges now serving, as seriously to impede the efficient performance of the judicial function: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Bar Association strongly endorses legislation in the Congress of the United States sponsored by the Judicial Conference of the United

States, providing for the creation of three additional judgeships for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; one temporary judgeship for the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and two additional judgeships of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, with the existing temporary judgeship in that court being converted to a permanent judgeship; and be it further

Resolved, That the judiciary committee of the association shall cooperate with the standing committee on Federal judiciary of the American Bar Association in support of such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the respective chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the U.S. Senate and of the House of Representatives, to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the United States from Pennsylvania, and to the chairman of the standing committee on Federal judiciary of the American Bar Association.

DEATH OF MEMBERS OF AMERICAN FIGURE SKATING TEAM

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, American figure skating as an organized sport originated in the Greater Boston area nearly 50 years ago. Many of the great stars of this beautiful sport have come from my home State of Massachusetts and its capital.

Last week a plane crash near Brussels, Belgium, took the lives of 73 persons including the 17 members of the American figure-skating team. Six of them were from the Greater Boston area.

In particular the crash killed three American skating stars who had entertained New Englanders for two generations. They were Maribel Vinson Owen, nine times national champion; her older daughter Maribel; and younger daughter Laurence, recent winner of the national championship title who was hoping to gain the world title at Prague.

I know of few disasters as tragic as this involving the death of an entire family, on top of the loss of a nation's entire representation in one sport. The sympathies of the country, I know, are with the relatives and survivors of those lost in this terrible accident.

I think that many of our feelings concerning this terrible crash were well expressed in the editorial "Boston's Loss at Brussels," which appeared in the Boston Globe on February 16 and the editorial "A Tragic Loss," which appeared in the New York Times the same day. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 16, 1961]

BOSTON'S LOSS AT BRUSSELS

The blow to Greater Boston from the air catastrophe near Brussels, Belgium, cannot be exaggerated. Of the 73 who lost their lives, 54 of them Americans, 7 were from this metropolitan area. Since organized American figure skating originated here nearly a half century ago and was long dominated by 2 Bostonians, Mrs. Theresa Weld Blanchard and Nat Niles, it is not surprising that the team of 17 wiped out by this disaster included 6 from Greater Boston.

Appalling is the blow suffered by a distinguished family associated with figure skating for generations. Among the lost were Mrs. Maribel Vinson Owen, nine times national champion; her older daughter Maribel, a member of the team; and her younger daughter, 16-year-old Laurence, who had just won the national championship and hoped to gain at Prague the world title her mother never attained.

These, and the others who died are people the community will miss. Every sympathy is extended their relatives.

Air travel is of much assistance to sport; it enables east and west coast clubs to play in the same leagues. Statistics show it to be safer than automobile travel, but its accidents sometimes produce stupefying results. A failure on takeoff wiped out the California Polytechnic Institute football team last fall, but the plane involved had been chartered. Since the aircraft in the Brussels disaster was Belgian, the record of this country's scheduled air lines in the safe handling of sport travel remains intact.

The catastrophe near Brussels will spur already intense efforts to bring ground and traffic control abreast of the jet age, now in only its third year on commercial lines. This country has made greater progress than European nations in meeting this problem, but the need for further improvement here is widely recognized. The record indicates that such new needs are quickly filled.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1961]

A TRAGIC LOSS

The death of 73 persons in an airplane crash at Brussels has shocked the world. Every person who died left a void in hearts somewhere. There is a special feeling of loss and grief over the young athletes, and at the New York Times because of the death of Mrs. Maribel Vinson Owen, former writer of women's sports for the Times. Mrs. Owen and her two daughters and the other members of the U.S. figure-skating team who perished were all skaters in the championship class. There is no sport more graceful, and the thousands who have been thrilled by such skill can only pause in sadness to think of such beauty brought to a sudden stop.

THE YEAR OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the Honolulu Advertiser, in its issue of January 31, included its fifth annual progress edition, detailing the progress made by the Nation's 50th and newest State during the past year. As Hawaii enters this promising new year, the newspaper has very appropriately named 1961 the Year of the Pacific.

The Advertiser has very thoughtfully sent me extra copies of this issue which I plan to send to the office of each of my colleagues. I hope you will find it interesting and encouraging reading.

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION URGED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY SHOULD BE ENACTED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who has had the privilege of giving detailed study to the need for strengthening our national education effort, I urge strong support of the basic aid to education program outlined by President Kennedy in his message to Congress today.

President Kennedy said:

The human mind is our fundamental resource.

We might correctly add that the brainpower of Americans that is not developed to full potential constitutes a tragic waste of our Nation's, and each individual's most valuable natural resource.

In patterning his public school assistance program after S. 8, the bill which passed the Senate last year, the President has followed a sound approach which will be fair to schoolchildren in all the 50 States. It is noteworthy that the proposal retains the stipulation that State or local school boards have an option on whether the national funds will be utilized for classroom construction or teacher pay increases, or both.

Under the proposed formula, a total of $142 million in national assistance would be extended to improving educational opportunities of Texas schoolchildren over the next 3 years. It provides $21.40 per student in average daily attendance for a total of $40.2 million the first year; $24.38 per student for a total of $47.3 million the second year, and $27.19 per student for a total of $54.4 million the third year.

A key point of the President's message, which the legislature of my own State of Texas and all other legislatures should heed was:

Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

Any areas of difference of opinion that I find with the President's program principally stem from my belief that an even greater effort of national assistance is required. Where the President called for a study of the National Vocational Education Act with a view toward its modernization, I believe it is evident that enactment of a cold-war veterans GI education bill would be a strong, sound step toward meeting the tremendous and growing needs for vocational training for millions of young Americans. All of us may have some different or additional ideas on how or where our educational effort must be strengthened.

But surely none of us can be in disagreement with the candid, powerful, 14-word opening sentence of President Kennedy's message:

Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.

We must work together at local, State, and National levels with that knowledge foremost in our minds.

LAWFUL EXPENDITURES FOR LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES TO BE ALLOWED AS LEGITIMATE BUSINESS EXPENSE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 17, I introduced a bill providing that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as legitimate business expense.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has joined me in the sponsorship of this measure.

Legislation identical to this was introduced in the House of Representatives last year by Congressman HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. The House Committee on Ways and Means, after consideration of this, reported a bill which varied somewhat from the original bill. Because of adjournment last year, no final action was taken on this measure.

This year Congressman BOGGS and I have introduced legislation in the House and Senate to again permit freedom of petition by various groups with an interest in legislation coming before Congress.

Congressman BOGGS' bill was identical to the bill reported last year by the House Committee on Ways and Means. My bill was identical to the bill I introduced last year and the bill originally considered by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Although the two bills before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee are different, I would like to stress that this should indicate no disagreement as to the necessity for legislative action. The bill which I have introduced indicates that there is a real interest in the Senate in getting action on this matter this year.

I am hopeful that the House will act on this early. I want to assure all of those interested in this legislation that the difference in the House and Senate bills in no way affects my support of any measure which the House may approve. I know that the House and Senate will be able to resolve any differences which may arise.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS IN ALASKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consulting with the minority leader and other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 47, Senate bill 707.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 707) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that none of the three bills on the calendar are controversial, but there are a number of Members of the Senate who wish to comment on S. 610, the bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board.

That bill will be brought up at the conclusion of the morning hour and will be made the pending business.

Does the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, wish to make any statement on Senate bill 707?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will put into the RECORD extracts from the report on both bills. The bills were reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an explanation of the bill from the report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would permit Canadian vessels to provide passenger service between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passenger and freight service between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska and in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of such transportation, until such time as the Secretary of Commerce determines that U.S.-flag service, presently lacking, is available to provide such transportation.

Under statutes of long standing only vessels of U.S. registry are permitted to engage in the coastal and intercoastal trades.

However, in recent years, because of increased vessel operating costs, and because of the small and seasonally fluctuating population in the area in question, U.S.-flag vessels have found such service uneconomic to the point where there is now no regular U.S.-flag service provided, and none in prospect. Without the modicum of service provided by the Canadian vessels, many of the ports thus served would be almost completely isolated.

For the past decade or more, exemption from the coastwise restrictions for service in this area of Alaska by Canadian vessels has been provided on an annual basis, to meet objections raised by shipping groups. However, inasmuch as the Secretary of Commerce would be empowered by the bill to stay the exemption at any time if he should find that U.S.-flag service is available, your committee feels that the protection historically given U.S.-flag vessels in the domestic trades is fully retained, and that there no longer is a necessity for placing a definite time limit on the authority for service to the area by Canadian vessels. Concurrence in this position has been announced by one of the major shipping groups which formerly insisted upon the annual exemption, and by the Comptroller General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 707) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation until the Secretary of Commerce determines that United States-flag service is available to provide such transportation.

SUSPENSION OF TARIFF SCHEDULES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 48, Senate bill 804.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 804) to amend the act of March 3, 1933, relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the committee will put in the RECORD the purpose of the bill as stated in the report. I think the bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an extract from the report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Section 3 of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), provides that—

"Whenever there shall be filed with the board any schedule stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge, or any new individual or joint classification, or any new individual or joint regulation or practice affecting any rate, fare, or charge, the board shall have * * * authority * * * to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice * * *. Pending such hearing and the decision thereon the board * * * may * * * suspend the operation of such schedule and defer the use of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than four months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect."

This bill would extend to 7 months the period of time during which the Board may order suspension, and may defer the use of the proposed rate, fare, etc., on the ground that such tariffs and other considerations are of such complexity as to make it impossible at times to consider fully and to render a considered decision on the matter or matters involved, within the 4-month period presently established. Enactment would put the permitted suspension period in the maritime field on the same time basis as is now established by statute for the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to proposed water, rail, and truck rates, etc., and for the Federal Aviation Agency in similar proceedings affecting regulation of air transport.

No objection to the bill has been received by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 804) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "The Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933," approved March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), as amended by the Act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 965) and the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1182), is amended by striking out "four" where it appears in the third section and by inserting "seven" in lieu thereof.

TALKING THE COUNTRY INTO A RECESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the President of the United States delivered his state of the Union message and his economic message, I indicated at the time that I thought the case was rather overstated and overdrawn. Since that time there has been a good deal of talk with respect to the so-called recession in the country, and I made the observation last week that there is such a thing as talking the country into a state of recession.

I noted, therefore, on February 17, in the Washington Post, an article on the financial page written by Mr. A. J. Livingston. I have followed his statements and articles for quite some time, and I must say that he writes in a reasoned way and a very objective manner. The title of the article is "Kennedy's Crying Towel Can Impair Confidence."

The first line of the article states:

I never dreamed till now that it might be possible to talk a great nation, such as the United States, into a depression.

I will let the rest of the article speak for itself, and also an article by Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter, "First Hints That Slump Has Hit Bottom Appear."

In connection therewith, I have asked the Library of Congress to assemble figures from 1939 to 1960, and partially 1961, on gross national product, civilian employment, Government purchases of goods and services, individual income-tax receipts, median family income, labor income, average gross hourly earnings in all manufacturing, business expenditures for new plant and equipment, and per capita consumer expenditures.

Mr. President, I think this table will prove very interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that both articles and the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY'S CRYING TOWEL CAN IMPAIR CONFIDENCE

(By J. A. Livingston)

I never dreamed till now that it might be possible to talk a great nation, such as the United States, into a depression.

Even now, I don't really think it. But I never reckoned with President Kennedy's crying towel.

I have always considered Americans too sensible, too observant, and too aware of their own well-being to be upset or panicked by public pronouncements, whether they came from: 1. Big men of big business. 2. Big men of big unions. 3. Big men of big government, including Senators, Congressmen, and members of the Cabinet.

I know you can't talk people out of bad times. President Hoover, leading Wall Street bankers, and John D. Rockefeller, Sr., tried that during the 1929 crash. To no avail.

HUMPHREY WARNING

Nor is it easy to talk prosperity down the drain. When George M. Humphrey was Secretary of the Treasury under President Eisenhower, he issued this warning during the Fulbright committee stock market inquiry in 1955:

"There is one word of caution that I want to leave with [the committee]. Confidence or lack of it has more to do with the conduct of investors, businessmen, and the great mass of people generally than any single thing * * *

"Confidence is a subtle thing. It is built slowly and can be easily and quickly shaken. A crowd leaving a theater at the close of a play will walk out in an orderly fashion, but if as the curtain goes down someone calls "Fire" terror can reign and great injury can result.

Confidence was not disturbed by the Fulbright hearings. Business was too good. People were too well off. Confidence was too deeply set in the economy.

NO ORDINARY MAN

But when confidence stops growing, when an economic uptrend turns into a downtrend, as at present, confidence can be seriously impaired—and with it, business—by a President who hammers away in headlines and over TV and radio on the sad state of the economy.

The President is not a businessman with autos or appliances to sell, not a labor leader with higher wages or unemployment benefits to get, not a tradesman with bills to pay. He's above the petty, parochial, and partisan. What he says is accepted by millions of Americans at face value. He's no ordinary man.

Surely, if President Kennedy wants to mobilize public opinion to force Congress to act, he can find some other method than by crying, "Crisis!" He has said twice that this is a time for "concern but not for panic." Why not let it go at that?

In his state of the Union message, he said conditions would get worse before they got better. In a special message on the economy, he set forth a detailed program.

RANK MORBIDITY

Since, at every press conference and in speeches, he has emphasized how bad conditions are. Disarming candor can become rank morbidity.

The President wisely accelerated road-building spending. He has speeded up defense and other orders. He has asked Congress for extended unemployment benefits. He has spurred food relief. He has encouraged low interest rates to stimulate State and local government public works projects. He promises tax incentives. All to the good.

He's caught, we're all of us caught, in the dreary months of January, February, March. The economy is in winter dormancy. We won't know till April (and President Kennedy has so said himself) how bad or unbad conditions are. We won't know till then how much recuperative power the economy has.

AGAINST ANY GAG

I've always disputed businessmen who said that publication of bad news—layoffs, lower profits, unemployment statistics—hurt business. I always argued that people are too sensible to be fooled by news that doesn't apply to them. They rely on their own judgment. They can't be talked into despair.

I'm not suggesting that we push unemployment under the bed, merely that the President stop making a career of it.

I've been optimistic on an early economic recovery. I still am. But I must confess the President's iteration is getting me down.

FIRST HINTS THAT SLUMP HAS HIT BOTTOM APPEAR

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

The first faint signs that the recession may be hitting bottom have begun to appear. New Government figures issued yesterday showed the economy was still slipping, but at a somewhat slower pace.

Such key measures as industrial production and incomes both fell again last month. But the drop was smaller than in December and November.

At the same time, the Kennedy administration announced several small steps to pump funds into the economy faster.

The President wired the 50 State Governors that he had freed $1.1 billion for highways and schools that normally would not be released until April. Mr. Kennedy urged the Governors to speed up projects using these funds as well as their own local public works programs. The funds released include $734 million for the Federal-State highway system and $350 million largely for schools that are overcrowded because they serve Government installations.

The Veterans' Administration said it would mail out $258.5 million in GI life insurance dividends by the end of March. Earlier, the VA had aimed at distributing the checks by June 30.

The Small Business Administration liberalized its standards so that more small firms in areas of high unemployment could get preference on Government contracts.

The President also set up a Cabinet committee headed by Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges to study how the chronically troubled textile industry can meet competition of imports from Japan and other countries.

HARBINGER OF UPTURN

Economists are reluctant to read much significance in 1 month's statistics, but several thought the newest measurements were a harbinger of the slump's bottom. Typically, when a complex economy changes direction, the rate of decline (or advance) is first slowed. Some experts predicted flatly that February would mark the low point of the latest recession. Even if they are right, business could bump along in this valley for months. Unemployment will certainly remain high for more months after the recovery actually begins.

Here's what the latest measurements showed:

Industrial production: Output of mills, mines and utilities fell 1.1 points in January on the Federal Reserve Board's index. The decline in November was 1.7 and in December, 1.4. After rounding, the index for January was 102 which means production was only 2 percent above the 1957 level.

Industrial production has now fallen for 6 straight months. But it has dropped only about 7 percent during this stretch, much less than in the 1958 slump.

A reduction of 20 percent in auto production was the biggest drag in January. There were small cutbacks in most soft goods industries, but a few hard goods lines, notably steel, increased production slightly. The steel advance has continued into February.

Since sales to retail customers have continued to fall, what all this may add up to is a change in business inventory policy.

The corporations may be reducing or even ending the cuts in their goods on hand.

If this is so, it would fit the estimates of some of the most important economists in the Government.

Personal income: Incomes in January were earned at a yearly rate of $406.3 billion, down only $600 million. The December drop was $2.1 billion and in November, $900 million.

The relatively small drop in January wouldn't mean much if incomes had been bolstered by a large increase in unemployment benefits. But these payments apparently had little to do with the results.

The key portion of incomes—wage and salary payments—fell only $400 million last month to a yearly rate of $271 billion. And this drop was considerably smaller than the $2.2 billion drop in December and that of $1.2 billion in November.

Other new figures on housing and freight movements also showed the recession wasn't worsening. Applications last month for Veterans' Administration mortgage guarantees on new homes—a clue of sorts to new building—fell about as much as they usually do in January. The number of freight cars loaded in the week ended February 11 were a sixth less than in the same week last year. But this lag has been about the same for the 4 earlier weeks.

All these less unpleasant results were foreshadowed in the job figures issued last week. The excitement over the big unemployment total of 5.4 million for January obscured the key data. After allowing for the usual seasonal changes, employment actually improved. The number of persons on payrolls outside of farming increased by 120,000 to 52.6 million. However, no one is throwing his hat in the air over this because it was due to an inexplicable strengthening in retail jobs.

Certain specified economic statistics, 1939–60

	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
(1) Total gross national product (billions of dollars)	$91.1	$100.6	$125.8	$159.1	$192.5	$211.4	$213.6	$210.7	$234.3	$259.4	$258.1	$284.6	$329.0
(2) Civilian employment (millions of persons)	53.2	55.6	55.9	56.4	55.5	54.6	53.9	57.5	60.2	61.4	62.1	63.1	62.9
(3) Government purchases of goods and services (billions of dollars)	$12.3	$14.1	$24.8	$59.7	$88.6	$96.5	$82.9	$30.5	$28.4	$34.5	$40.2	$39.0	$60.5
(4) Individual income tax receipts (billions of dollars)	$0.89	$1.4	$3.8	$8.8	$14.4	$16.2	$17.0	$16.2	$17.8	$19.3	$15.5	$15.7	$21.6
(5) Median family income						$2,533	$2,621		$3,033	$3,190	$3,107	$3,319	$3,774
(6) Labor income (billions of dollars)	$72.9	$78.7	$97.3	$123.5	$151.4	$165.7	$171.2	$179.3	$191.6	$210.4	$209.3	$228.5	$256.7
(7) Average gross hourly earnings in all manufacturing	$0.63	$0.66	$0.73	$0.85	$0.96	$1.02	$1.02	$1.09	$1.24	$1.35	$1.40	$1.46	$1.59
(8) Business expenditures for new plant and equipment (billions of dollars)	$5.5						$8.7	$14.8	$20.6	$22.1	$19.3	$20.6	$25.6
(9) Per capita consumer expenditures	$516	$544	$614	$665	$735	$793	$870	$1,040	$1,148	$1,216	$1,214	$1,286	$1,359

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
(1) Total gross national product (billions of dollars)	$347.0	$365.4	$363.1	$397.5	$419.2	$442.8	$444.2	$482.1	[1] $503.1		
(2) Civilian employment (millions of persons)	63.0	63.8	64.5	65.8	67.5	67.9	68.6	69.4	70.6		
(3) Government purchases of goods and services (billions of dollars)	$76.0	$82.8	$75.3	$75.6	$79.0	$86.5	$93.5	$97.1	$99.6		
(4) Individual income tax receipts (billions of dollars)	$27.9	$30.1	$29.5	$28.7	$32.2	$35.6	$34.7	$36.7	$40.7	[2] $43.3	[2] $45.5
(5) Median family income	$3,889	$4,233	$4,167	$4,420	$4,787	$4,978	$5,095	$5,417			
(6) Labor income (billions of dollars)	$273.1	$288.3	$280.8	$310.2	$332.9	$351.4	$360.3	$383.3	$404.2		
(7) Average gross hourly earnings in all manufacturing	$1.67	$1.77	$1.81	$1.88	$1.98	$2.07	$2.13	$2.22	[1] $2.29		
(8) Business expenditures for new plant and equipment (billions of dollars)	$26.5	$28.3	$26.8	$28.7	$35.1	$37.0	$30.5	$32.5	$35.7		
(9) Per capita consumer expenditures	$1,400	$1,457	$1,391	$1,555	$1,605	$1,663	$1,683	$1,772			

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Estimated.

Sources: U.S. Departments of Commerce, Labor, and Treasury, Bureau of the Budget, Securities and Exchange Commission.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT HEARINGS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this morning the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, opened hearings on the principal purpose of our policy with regard to residual fuel imports.

I compliment the Secretary because the timeliness of the hearing reflects the desire of this administration to thoroughly explore the pros and cons of this problem, which so vitally concerns our well-being.

I appeared at the hearing at the request of and as the spokesman for all of our New England Senators, and presented a statement in our behalf, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE BEFORE THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT HEARINGS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. Secretary, we in New England deeply appreciate the opportunity which you have afforded us to present to you our arguments with respect to mandatory quotas on the imports of residual fuel oil.

I am here today to speak for the consumer. New England produces no fuel supply of its own. It is entirely dependent on fuel from other regions of the country and from abroad. As a heavy manufacturing area and as a densely populated region, we require vast quantities of fuel—to power our industries and to heat our homes.

Thus, you can understand, Mr. Secretary, our immense concern with Government policies as they affect the supply and price of this most basic element of our economy.

Fuel costs are already higher in New England than in any other region in the United States—over 50 percent in excess of the national average. These higher costs are borne by the New England consumer and by New England manufacturers who must compete in national markets.

The New England Senators have been deeply concerned with the effect of residual oil import restrictions.

Just a few weeks ago we expressed our grave concern in a joint letter to the President, a copy of which I ask be introduced into the record.

At this point, Mr. Secretary, permit me to express my deep appreciation of the heartwarming response, the salutary though temporary relief granted in your order of last Friday by expanding the quota by 100,000 barrels of oil per day. The severity of our New England winter has added urgency to what we consider to be a continuing emergency. The respite for this quarter—and indeed it is only for this quarter—merely emphasizes our permanent problem. It points up very graphically this artificial, arbitrary imposition of quotas on a necessity of life, an essential of community well-being, and an absolute must of industrial existence in our New England area.

It is not enough in urgent emergency to adjust these restrictions; it is imperative in equity and in the public interest to remove them entirely.

Let me point out, Mr. Secretary, what the effect of these residual import restrictions has been on New England. It has been estimated that price increases caused by these restrictions cost the New England States last year over $10 million.

We know of specific instances where major electric utilities have had to pay millions of dollars in increased costs, passing these along to the consumer by way of increased rates.

We know of industries which have absorbed huge increases in their annual fuel bills which have increased the cost of their end product to the consumer. We know of many public institutions—hospitals and schools—which have been burdened with substantial cost increases. It is the consumer who is thus paying for these restrictions.

Now let us examine the justification for these quota restrictions. Unlike almost any other trade restriction, say, for example, on textiles or fisheries, these quotas are not designed to help the domestic oil producing industry. These are not quotas to eliminate low cost foreign competition since, as a matter of fact, the domestic oil producers are unable to supply the domestic demand for residual fuel oil.

The yield of domestic residual fuel oil per barrel of refined domestic crude oil has been steadily declining. In 1930 it amounted to 31 percent of total refinery output; in 1950, 20 percent, and currently it stands at approximately 10 percent.

Domestic production of residual fuel oil is 26 percent less today than it was 10 years ago, but this is not because of competition from imported residual fuel oil.

Every single producer of fuel oil and every single major fuel oil company agrees that imports of residual are no threat to the domestic residual fuel oil industry.

The reason for the decline in domestic residual production is the improvement in domestic refining facilities. As the refining process becomes more efficient and domestic refineries are able to produce more gasoline, kerosene, diesel, and light, heating oils from each barrel of crude their output of residual declines, and it is in the economic interest of domestic producers to continue to produce greater quantities of higher cost products from every barrel of crude. There is every economic incentive, therefore, to reduce the output of domestic residual oil.

The demand domestically for residual fuel, therefore, has little if any effect upon domestic production. Domestic supply is determined by the market for other products rather than by the market for residual fuel.

Imports, therefore, of residual fuel only fill the gap—a growing gap—between domestic demand and available domestic supply.

So, it is perfectly clear that residual import restrictions are not calculated to help domestic oil producers. And if all imports of residual oil were eliminated tomorrow, the domestic production of residual fuel oil would increase not one whit.

It might be thought that restrictive quotas on residual oil imports would boost employment in our coal mining areas. It is a myth to look to this source for more coal mining jobs. If coal were to take over all the markets now being supplied by imported residual fuel, the increase would be absorbed mechanically by new automatic equipment. Technological advances in coal production have been tremendous. Manpowerwise, no more than a handful of miners would be put to work. We are deeply and sincerely concerned with the unemployment plight of the mining areas—just as we are deeply concerned with our own. We desire that a healthy economy be restored everywhere. But the restoration must be practical, plausible, and equitable, and cannot be accomplished by forcing the oil users of New England to convert to coal.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I maintain that these quotas do more harm than they do good. They are arbitrary and discriminatory, and have no economic justification. They can help neither the oil producer nor the coal miner, and are grossly discriminatory in that the entire burden is borne on the east coast and most heavily in New England.

Practically all residual oil imports consumed in the United States are consumed on the east coast. Our consumers suffer the full share of this burden.

I have said that it is the consumer who pays the bill. This is true, but it also over-simplifies the problem. For, in addition, these quotas destroy any opportunity for economic growth in the industrial areas of New England.

We have many chronically distressed communities with a severe and persistent labor surplus in New England. Here we are fighting now to enact a depressed areas bill whereby the Government will assist us in spurring new industrial growth in these communities. What justification can there be for the Government to expend vast sums of money on the one hand to create jobs in these distressed areas and, in the same breath, perpetuate a program which effectively stifles economic growth and denies new job opportunities in these same distressed areas?

These import quotas make it impossible for any new industry or any existing industry that wishes to expand to predict with any assurance a readily available supply of residual oil at competitive prices. Industry in New England requires vast quantities of residual oil for industrial heating and power. How can we expect any new industry to locate in New England or to expand in New England without the assurance that not only will this basic commodity be available, but that it will be available at a reasonable cost?

The way the quota system has worked out, certain distributors and jobbers are allocated the entire supply of residual fuel oil. They must protect and supply first their present customers. And it is difficult—well nigh impossible—for them to make any commitments to a new customer.

Lacking available residual fuel oil, an industry planning to locate or expand in New England must, therefore, look to another source of energy and heat. If it chooses coal, certainly it will not locate in New England. Such a substantial proportion of the cost of coal in New England is attributable to freight costs that any manufacturer would be foolish to adopt coal for his operations in New England. He would locate rather in a region close to the coal producing areas. We don't mind this kind of competition and we expect it, but we want it to be fair competition.

Manufacturers in other areas have advantages in being located near the source of supply in the case of coal. If residual imports were eliminated in New England the competition would be grossly unfair.

We ask only this, Mr. Secretary: That we not be discriminated against by a quota system, the entire burden of which is borne on the east coast and for which the heaviest price is paid in our New England region.

We ask only that we be given an opportunity to compete fairly and openly and that our Government, by its policies, does not prevent us from receiving an adequate supply of fuel energy which we need at reasonable cost.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 7, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Knowing of your deep and longstanding interest in the question of mandatory oil imports restrictions, we wish to bring to your attention certain facts about the effect of this program of grave concern to New England.

As you well know, New England is a fuel-consuming region, producing no fuel supply of its own. The availability of adequate supplies of fuel at reasonable prices from a competitive market is thus of immense importance, not only to the New England consumer, but to our substantial manufacturing industry—indeed to our entire industrial complex.

The restrictions imposed in 1959 have in effect curtailed the supply of residual oil into the New England States with severe economic consequences. The added cost to New England during this year has been conservatively estimated at $10 million. Our electric utility industry demands huge quantities of residual fuel; increased costs to them are reflected in increased electric rates. Increased costs to the manufacturer, moreover, weaken our competitive position.

We firmly believe that the mandatory quotas are not only unjustified from a regional point of view, but cannot be justified from a national point of view. Domestic refineries each year become more efficient and, as a result, yield a smaller percentage of residual. Domestic refineries simply cannot meet the demand for residual oil in New England nor would it be economical for them to do so, since residual oil is not an end product in itself. Domestic supply is governed not by the demand for residual, but rather by the market and demand for other products, notably refined fuels. Thus, the restrictions on residual oil do not aid the domestic oil-producing industries which is the sole announced objective of the import restrictions.

The only effect of the residual restrictions is to reduce the overall supply available and hence to inflate its cost to the user. These restrictions have, moreover, created an unfortunate marketing situation whereby certain importers in effect control the distribution. It is impossible under these circumstances to obtain open competition.

We are aware that proponents of the mandatory restrictions argue that this program is necessary from a national security viewpoint—that the restrictions in effect encourage the domestic oil-producing industry to continue necessary exploration. Whether or not this argument is sustainable with respect to crude oil restrictions, it is certainly not applicable to residual oil restrictions. It is difficult for us to understand how the national security interest is served by a program which in effect requires us to exhaust our own supply, thereby hastening the day when we are even more dependent on foreign sources.

We appreciate that you are familiar with this problem and with the effect of this program on the American consumer. We appreciate that you are particularly aware of the impact of this program on regions like New England, wholly dependent on an adequate supply of fuel from abroad or from other areas of the country.

We therefore urge you to reevaluate the mandatory oil import quota program—to consider its effect upon our region—to consider its effect on competition in the supply and distribution of fuel—to consider its wisdom as a national security measure. We sincerely hope that you will agree with us that restrictions should be removed—or at least liberalized—with respect to residual oil imports.

Respectfully yours,

STYLES BRIDGES, GEORGE D. AIKEN, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, JOHN O. PASTORE, PRESCOTT BUSH, NORRIS COTTON, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, WINSTON L. PROUTY, THOMAS J. DODD, BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, CLAIBORNE PELL.

COURT SYSTEM ADOPTS SOUND RECORDING

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, today marks the first anniversary of the court system of the State of Alaska.

The supreme court of the new State came into being in the autumn of 1959, but it was not until February 20, 1960, that the superior courts were set up and began to operate.

Before statehood, the Alaska judicial system was altogether unique in American history. There were four Federal judges, one for each of the judicial divisions. The district court of Alaska was not a Federal constitutional court. The judges served for 4 years under appointment of the President. By act of Congress, the Federal courts were empowered to hear and decide cases originating under Federal law. There was no subordinate court system at all, except that supplied by U.S. commissioners and magistrates in the incorporated municipalities. The Alaska constitution provided for establishment of a State supreme court and a superior court.

When Chief Justice Buell A. Nesbett, newly appointed to the Alaska Supreme Court, began to make the complex administrative arrangements necessary before a very considerable judicial establishment could be created, he was confronted by a shortage of trained court

reporters in Alaska. This shortage had been apparent even under the old system, and the problem seemed almost incapable of solution, except possibly at a cost which would have been almost astronomical. Even before territorial days had ended, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, at the direction of the Judicial Conference, had been making inquiries into the feasibility of installing electronic sound recording devices in the district courts throughout the Nation. Their studies were reasonably far advanced. When Chief Justice Nesbett came to Washington to consult with officials of the Administrative Office he consulted with Mr. Olney and others, and as a result of those consultations and by reason later of approval by a majority of the Alaska Supreme Court, it was decided to test out the electronic system for recording in the new courts.

How that has worked out, its advantages and its drawbacks, are set forth in a report issued this very day by Mr. Warren Olney III, Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. That report, in my opinion, has more than local interest. Mr. Olney traveled to Alaska last fall and during his stay there made it his business to conduct a thorough-going inquiry into the electronic operation. What he discovered, what others have found, is objectively set forth in this report, and I ask unanimous consent to include it with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING IN THE TRIAL COURTS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

GENERAL

The equipment being used in the Alaska court system was developed by the Soundscriber Co. of New Haven, Conn., based upon studies and experiments made at the request of and in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. In this activity the Administrative Office was acting at the direction of the Judicial Conference of the United States and under the supervision of a subcommittee of the Judicial Conference Committees on Court Administration and Supporting Personnel, of which subcommittee U.S. District Judge William C. Mathes is Chairman. The subcommittee was appointed in January 1958, in response to the chronic complaints of representatives of the Federal Court Reporters Association, and was directed to study:

1. The practicality of continuing the use of shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional systems of reporting with only those changes required to improve its efficiency and adequacy, and to provide fair and equitable compensation for the reporters.

2. The practicality of continuing the use of shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional systems of reporting, but eliminating fees as a basis of compensation, and making reporters full-time, salaried Government employees with transcript fees covered into the Treasury to defray the cost of the system at least in part.

3. The practicality of electronic recording of court proceedings by salaried Government employees in the clerk's office.

The subcommittee caused extensive studies to be made and has submitted detailed reports on all three assignments.

Even prior to the appointment of the subcommittee in 1958, there had been some studies and experiments with electronic recording of court proceedings carried on at the instigation of the Judicial Conference, and these were reviewed by Judge Mathes' subcommittee. With respect to the experiments, it was ascertained that none had been successful up to that time. But it appeared that all of these earlier experiments had had the same basic weaknesses:

1. The machine used in each experiment was one or another of the makes of standard office dictating equipment used singly or in combination.

2. The microphones used were of the comparatively inefficient type used for office dictating equipment.

3. The experimental equipment was assembled and tested without modification and without the advice and assistance of professional electronics and acoustics engineers.

In view of this past experience, the administrative office of the U.S. courts, at the request of the subcommittee, made inquiry from as many manufacturers as possible to ascertain whether any of them were already manufacturing a machine which with competent advice might be modified to meet the special requirements of recording court proceedings.

The Soundscriber Co. of New Haven, Conn., responded that it was already manufacturing an electronic magnetic recorder with a 24-hour tape for use in airport control towers and in airplanes of the Strategic Air Command which, in the opinion of their engineers, was capable of modification for court use. Soundscriber was the only company willing to employ its engineers in making modifications and experiments to develop a machine for court reporting.

After many modifications in the equipment and a number of experiments, the members of the subcommittee came to the unanimous conclusion that electronic recording of court proceedings was feasible and practical and that accurate transcripts could be produced more promptly and with far less cost to the litigants than by any other system yet devised. Consequently, in August 1959, the subcommittee recommended quite independently of its conclusions with respect to the compensation of the court reporters then in Federal service, "that the Administrative Office be instructed, wherever possible and agreeable to the judges concerned, to supply electronic recording systems for use in the U.S. district courts whenever a vacancy occurs in the office of the existing court reporter."

The subcommittee's recommendation received the unanimous endorsement of the Judicial Conference Committees on Supporting Personnel and Court Administration and the recommendation was adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its meeting in September 1959.

In July 1960, upon instructions from the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts distributed to all judges, clerks, and court reporters in the Federal system a report, entitled "The Court Reporting System in the U.S. District Courts—1960." This report had not been adopted by the Judicial Conference or the Administrative Office, but was a report of a survey of the court reporting system in the Federal courts made by two management analysts of the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the Director of the Administrative Office. It was distributed primarily for the information and consideration of all of those concerned with reporting in the Federal judicial system.

In part II of their report, which is headed "Conclusions and Recommendations," Mr. Charles Parker, Jr., and Mr. Norman R. Tharp, the authors of the report, included a discussion of electronic sound recording which they recommended for eventual and gradual adoption in the Federal trial courts (pp. 63–73 of the report). The report described how an electronic sound recording system might be installed and might be operated. It included a discussion of such matters as identification of speakers, conduct of the proceedings, daily copy, reading back from the record, supervision by the clerk, preparation of transcript for appeal, charges for transcript, and other practical aspects of the proposed system.

The discussion and, indeed, the conclusions and recommendations of the authors with respect to electronic sound recording were based entirely on the brief and fragmentary experiments conducted by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts under the aegis of Judge Mathes' subcommittee. At the time of preparing their report the authors were not able to point to any trial court where electronic sound recoording was in regular use. The court system of the State of Alaska was not established until after Messrs. Parker and Tharp had completed their survey and Alaska was not one of the States included in their studies.

The adoption by the Judicial Conference of the United States of the resolution instructing the Administrative Office to supply electronic recording systems for judges who desired them and the distribution of the Parker-Tharp report has brought response from court reporters, Federal judges, and others. Much of this response consists of rather heatedly expressed arguments as to why electronic sound recording of court proceedings is impractical and undesirable. While most of the judges were careful to limit themselves in their letters to discussing the problems of their own courts, the arguments which they advanced as to why sound recording would not work would clearly apply to electronic sound recording in any court. Of course the authors of these communications, like Messrs. Barker and Tharp, did not have the benefit of knowing what actual experience would show in a court system which relies exclusively on electronic sound recording.

While these discussions, which were necessarily hypothetical in nature, were going on, an important body of actual experience in electronic sound recording was accumulating in the Alaska court system.

The Alaska court system became operative following Presidential proclamation on February 20, 1960. From the beginning, it relied exclusively upon electronic sound recording for reporting trial proceedings. By October 1960 the total experience of the Alaskan courts seemed sufficiently large and long to warrant observing it in operation and evaluating the accumulated experience.

For this purpose the author of this report went to Alaska to see the system of court reporting in operation and to learn as much as possible from the judges, clerks, and members of the bar as to how the system was working out.

WHY THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM ADOPTED ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURTS

The Alaska court system did not adopt electronic sound recording because it was novel, progressive, or because its judges were gadget-minded. Electronic sound recording was adopted because there was no other satisfactory alternative.

During the territorial regime, Alaska was served with a U.S. district court with four judges and divisions. Each judge held court mostly in the principal city of his division, that is, Juneau, Nome, Anchorage, and Fairbanks. Proceedings in these courts were reported by court reporters using shorthand, stenotype, and other common and conventional systems of court reporting. The results were extraordinarily unsatisfactory. Delays on appeal due to the inability of court

reporters to get out the transcript were immense. Even in criminal cases it was not unusual for 1, 2, or even 3 years to elapse between the time of trial and the time of filing the transcript on appeal. Complaints from the bar and the public were constant.

The cause of the difficulty was neither incompetence or lack of diligence on the part of the court reporters. It was due almost wholly to the shortage of trained court reporters and transcribers in the territory. The delays in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals of Alaskan cases because of the failure to get the transcript on file became so bad that at one time the chief judge of the circuit attempted to interest the Department of Justice in a program to recruit reporters for emigration to Alaska.

Whereas there were only four trial courts under the territorial regime in Alaska, the new Alaska court system created by statehood provided eight superior court judges—one each at Juneau, Ketchikan, and Nome, two in Fairbanks, and three in Anchorage, as well as a number of district magistrate courts.

The chief justice of the new Supreme Court of Alaska, who under the State constitution is the administrative head of the judicial system, the Honorable Buell A. Nesbett, had been prior to appointment an active member of the practicing bar of Alaska and as such was fully familiar with the delays attendant upon reporting in the old U.S. district court. To Chief Justice Nesbett it seemed perfectly apparent that, if the conventional shorthand reporters available in Alaska had been unable to provide satisfactory service for only four courts, it was hopeless to expect them to be able to serve as well or even at all more than twice as many courts under the State system. These circumstances left the chief justice with little choice.

In September 1959, shortly after taking office, Chief Justice Nesbett visited the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in Washington where he was given access to the studies, information, and experiments with electronic court reporting above mentioned, and also obtained full information about the equipment, including its cost from the manufacturers. The decision to use electronic recording exclusively in the Alaska court system was made by a majority of the justices of the supreme court. According to the chief justice, the decision was originally unanimous although, after some $27,000 worth of equipment had been ordered, one of the justices changed his mind and wrote a dissent which was filed with the clerk of the supreme court.[1]

The chief justice has stated that the court decided to use electronic equipment because: First, the sound of the recording on the tape is the closest one can come to determining the truth as to what actually was said in a given instance. In a dispute over the wording in a transcript prepared from shorthand or other notes there is no possibility of reference to the source. The court, counsel, and litigants are limited and bound by the notes, no matter how fragmentary or incorrect they may be. Second, sound recording represented a tremendous financial saving to the Alaska court system. The total cost of all of the equipment for all of the courts of the State of Alaska, including a reasonable allowance for maintenance, was only one-half of the expense of employing court reporters for a single year. The total saving over the 5 years of useful life for the equipment is estimated at close to a quarter of a million dollars. Third, the conventional methods of reporting had proven to be impractical in Alaska because of the chronic shortage of court reporters.

[1] The dissenting justice was the Honorable Walter H. Hodge, who is now U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska.

THE SYSTEM OF ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING PRESENTLY IN USE IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM

The system of sound recording adopted by Alaska and presently in use in the State courts there is very like the system of sound recording recommended in the Parker-Tharp report.

Alaska uses the Soundscriber electronic recording equipment developed by the Soundscriber Co. and modified for court use by experiments made in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. This is the equipment described in the Parker-Tharp report. Alaska also operates the equipment with personnel from the clerk's office, logs the proceedings, and prepares and charges for transcript, as recommended in the Parker-Tharp report. However, Alaska has worked out appropriate procedures for supervision by the clerk, logging of the proceedings, and fixing the charges, in far greater detail than set out in the Parker-Tharp report. These details are numerous but are by no means unimportant. In fact, most of them are absolutely vital to the successful operation of the system.

* * * * *

The chief justice and the administrative director of the Alaska court system did not have and had never seen a copy of the Parker-Tharp report when they prepared instructions to court clerks and set up rules and regulations. The reason for the resemblance is that the same tests and experiments conducted by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts were the basis of the system worked out in Alaska as well as the conclusions reached by Messrs. Parker and Tharp.

PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS OF ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING IN THE ALASKAN COURTS

On October 17, 1960, commencing at 2 p.m., the author observed the proceedings in department A of the Superior Court of the State of Alaska, at Anchorage, presided over by Judge Edward V. Davis. These observations were made without prior announcement of the author's presence or identity.

* * *

The courtroom was the conventional wood-paneled room, somewhat smaller than ordinary size. The court personnel consisted only of the judge and a deputy clerk, who was a woman. No bailiff or other officer was in attendance. The deputy clerk sat in the usual place, below and directly in front of the judge's bench, with a Soundscriber recording machine in plain view. The installation included five microphones, one on the judge's desk, one on the clerk's desk, one in front of the witness box, one on the counsel table at plaintiff's end and one at the defendant's end. The deputy clerk wore around her neck, like a necklace, small earphones which she could use from time to time without having to pick them up or put them down.

The deputy clerk preceded the judge into court, turned on the Soundscriber machine, examined its lights, made notations on a pad, which was later ascertained to be the log, put on her earphones and tested the machine by speaking into a microphone in front of her to make sure the machine was recording. When the judge appeared, the deputy clerk started the machine recording. The jury was polled and all answered present. This was followed by the opening statement of the plaintiff's counsel.

The deputy clerk had her earphones in use at the beginning and made a series of entries in the log. After about 10 minutes she took off the earphones while counsel concluded his statement. This was followed by an opening statement from defense counsel, at which time the deputy clerk again put her earphones on and made entries in the log.

When defendant's counsel came to make his opening statement it was observed that he did not stand anywhere near the microphones on the counsel table, or the one near the witness stand, but stood in front of the jury box. Considerable doubt arose in the author's mind as to whether the microphones could pick up defense counsel from this distance, and the deputy clerk was observed to keep her earphones on watching counsel and the machine but without interrupting.

Next, the plaintiff's counsel called as the first witness the plaintiff herself. When the witness took the stand Judge Davis explained to her that it was necessary to have an accurate record of all the proceedings, including the questions asked her and her answers and that a tape recording was being made on the Soundscriber machine for this purpose. He told her that she should answer questions audibly and not with nods of the head and that she should try to keep her voice up but that the deputy clerk would tell her if she was not speaking loud enough. The direct and cross-examination then followed.

In the course of the cross-examination, notwithstanding the judge's instructions, the witness responded to a question with a shake of the head. The judge observed this and asked her to answer audibly.

When court was over the author introduced himself to Judge Davis and to his deputy clerk, Mrs. Edna Stradley. Mrs. Stradley was asked if she was sure that defendant's opening statement had been recorded. She said that she had noticed how far away from the microphone counsel was and for that reason had kept the earphones on to make certain that it was all on the tape. She said she was certain it had been properly recorded.

At the author's request, the portion of the proceedings in the case, which had been observed, were transcribed from the tape and the transcript forwarded to Washington. The transcript corresponds exactly in all particulars to the author's notes and to the best of his recollection as to what he heard and saw. It differs from the usual transcript only in that the transcriber put in most, if not all, of the "ah's" and "uh's" uttered by counsel, noises that most transcribers leave out. The opening statement of defense counsel had been recorded completely and accurately notwithstanding the fact, as before mentioned, that during delivery he faced the jury box and was not near a microphone. A copy of the transcript is attached as appendix 3.

On the same day the author also observed proceedings in department B presided over by visiting Judge Hubert A. Gilbert from Nome. A jury in a criminal case was in the process of selection. Here again the court personnel consisted only of the judge and the deputy clerk, who again was a woman. The courtroom was very large, being at least double the size of Judge Davis' courtroom, and the acoustics were not good. The recording installation and the microphone equipment was the same as described in Judge Davis' court. The prospective jurors were seated in the box and were being questioned without moving from their chairs. The deputy clerk had her earphones on most of the time. There was no interruption from the deputy clerk while the prosecutor, who was closest to the jury box, was asking questions. But when defense counsel arose from his chair while speaking, the deputy clerk interrupted and told him his voice was not being recorded. One of the table microphones was then moved closer to him. He repeated what he said and went on with his questioning while continuing to move around the room. His words were recorded notwithstanding his movements.

In talking with Judge Davis about recording the examination of jurors, he told the author that he had adopted a practice of

putting the jurors in the witness box when they were to be questioned one by one, and that he did this partly to avoid any difficulty in recording their answers and partly because he felt it made the jurors more serious about their answers.

On October 20, 1960, the author observed the proceedings in the Superior Court of the State of Alaska in Fairbanks, presided over by Judge Jay A. Rabinowitz. The court personnel again was only the judge and the deputy clerk, Miss Grace Decker. The installation was like that in the other courts.

On this occasion, as on the others, the author's presence and identity was not announced. The case on trial was a suit for personal injuries, and at the time of observation a doctor was testifying as a medical expert. The proceedings were being logged and monitored by the deputy clerk as previously described.

During the examination of the doctor, plaintiff's counsel propounded a rather long hypothetical question, loaded with medical terms. Objection was made to the question, which was sustained. Plaintiff's counsel attempted to reframe the question, with another objection which was sustained. This happened two or three more times. * * * The court then instructed the doctor to answer, and the doctor understandably said "Which question?" After discussion between counsel and the court the doctor was told to answer the question as first put to him.

The judge then directed the deputy clerk to play back the question as first asked. This was done with precision and speed. The deputy clerk first made a notation on her log as to the reading on the tape when the recording was stopped. She then referred to her log to locate as near as possible the tape reading when the first question had been asked. The tape was turned back and when the replay commenced it was evident that the deputy clerk had located the question almost exactly. After the question was replayed, the witness was cautioned by the judge not to answer yet. The deputy clerk then turned the tape to the reading she had noted when she first stopped the machine, let the tape revolve without recording for a few seconds, and then indicated to the judge that it was ready to record. The judge then directed the doctor to give his answer, which he did.

The time taken by the deputy clerk in locating the question that the judge directed be played back was certainly no longer, if as long, as it would take a shorthand reporter, or stenotype operator, to find the question in his notes.

INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY DEPUTY CLERKS AND TRANSCRIBERS OF THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM CONCERNING THEIR EXPERIENCES WITH ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURTS

While in Anchorage, the author of this report had an interview of more than 2 hours with Mrs. Thelma Dome, Judge Davis' in-court deputy clerk, about her experiences with sound recording. The author also had a very much shorter conversation with the in-court deputy clerk who had recorded the selection of the jury in Judge Gilbert's court, as above described. At Fairbanks the author had similar, although briefer, discussions with Miss Olga Steger, chief transcript secretary in that court, and with Miss Judy Aaron, a transcriber. He also interviewed at greater length in Fairbanks Miss Marian Dellage, an in-court deputy clerk with extensive experience in transcribing.

The purpose of these interviews was to ascertain the degree of training necessary to produce competent operators of the recording machine, to learn what training or special qualities were essential for a competent transcriber, to probe for failures and weaknesses in the system and the machines, and to get as much additional information as possible as to whether electronic sound recording was in fact proving to be practical.

None of the in-court deputy clerks who were operating Soundscriber recorders had received any training, excepting basic instruction in the purpose of the dials, the meaning of the lights and signals, the installation and removal of the tape, the significance of the numbers on the tape, and the details of logging. Each had been allowed to run the machine making practice recordings. None of them seemed to consider that any additional training was necessary to produce a competent operator. Experience demonstrated very early, however, that at least this much instruction is necessary.

In one of the very first trials recorded in Fairbanks the machine was operated by a veteran deputy clerk of more than 70 years of age who insisted that he could operate so simple a machine without any instruction. The result was a tape which was described as virtually unintelligible. Great concern was expressed by the clerk if an appeal should be taken and a transcript required. This fiasco is well known in Alaska, and it seems to be regarded by the deputy clerks and transcribers as the horrible example of what not to do.

In Fairbanks the cause of this failure is attributed to three factors: First, the installation of the microphones was defective in that they were set on steel tables without insulation. The tables picked up an undue amount of vibration and noise. Second, there were jackhammers working on the outside of the building at the time the trial was going on. Third, the deputy clerk did not monitor the proceedings properly, and consequently failed to detect that they were not being properly recorded. No one interviewed thought that this failure was due to any weakness in the system or defect in the machine. The opinion was expressed that the failure would have been avoided if the deputy clerk had known how to operate the machine. This case is the only one reported to the author where the record made by the Soundscriber machine proved to be inadequate for the preparation of a proper transcript.

Although there appears to have been only one major failure, the in-court deputies and transcribers have experienced quite a number of less serious problems in the operation of the machines. The office of the administrative director of the Alaska court system requires monthly reports on the operation of the sound equipment from all clerks of the superior court. These reports are in the form of printed questionnaires designed to bring out difficulties with the equipment or its operation, with transcription or tapes, and general comments, including information or criticism which would merit consideration in improving recording procedures. Most of the questionnaires report no difficulties with the equipment or its operation. The most critical monthly report which the author examined contains the following complaints with respect to equipment:

Question. Have you had any difficulty with any of the equipment? If so, set forth details.

Answer. Tape doesn't back up far enough when transcribing. Has been set a couple of times but evidently slips out before long. Could use some regular servicing on the machines.

With respect to operations:

Question. How often are you operating your equipment?

Answer. Every day.

Question. Are you having any difficulty in maintaining strict discipline in court?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Set forth details.

Answer. You can't control rattling of papers at all times nor keep coughing down, which will cut out what is being said.

With respect to transcribing:

Question. List any difficulties on transcribing.

Answer. Tape doesn't back up far enough. Some attorneys drop their voices so often it is very hard to make out what they say at times.

Answering the request for general comments, it is said: "Either more microphones are needed or they need to be placed away from the noises of papers and banging against the tables. In transcribing, if the speed could be slowed, one could type more steadily and at times make out words that otherwise are impossible. It takes hours and hours longer to transcribe than the time the original recording takes."

The comments of Mr. David L. Luce, administrative director of the Alaska court system, on these complaints are of interest:

1. If the tape doesn't back up far enough it can be corrected with a comparatively simple mechanical adjustment.

2. Large part of the extraneous noise that gets on the tape and concerning which complaint is made comes from vibrations of metal standards of the microphones, which would be eliminated if the microphones were suspended without being attached to rigid stands.

3. The mumbling of an inaudible lawyer or witness should be corrected by interruption from the monitoring clerk just as a shorthand reporter would ask to have the words repeated.

4. The time it takes to make a transcription from a recorded court proceeding is undoubtedly much greater than it would take the same transcriber to transcribe stenographic notes or to transcribe the dictation of a court reporter, although if a shorthand reporter dictates his notes onto a record for the benefit of a transcriber, which he often does, and that time is added to the time it takes the transcriber to write up what the court reporter has dictated, the total is not much less than the time it takes to transcribe direct from the tape.

Nearly every one of the deputy clerks and transcribers interviewed commented on how long it took to make a transcript from a recorded tape.

The interviews with the deputy clerks and transcribers disclosed quite a difference of opinion as to whether there was any advantage in having the transcription made by the deputy clerk who was personally present at the time of the proceedings. Most of the deputy clerks and transcribers seemed to think it was an advantage. This is the conclusion reached by Mr. Luce, the administrative director of the Alaska court system. However, Miss Marian Dellage, at Fairbanks, who has probably has as much experience as anyone in both recording and transcribing, stated that she had found it just as easy to transcribe a proceeding recorded by someone else as one which she had recorded herself. Regardless of this difference of opinion, no one doubted that it is perfectly practical for a transcriber to make an accurate transcript of a record of proceedings at which he had not been personally present.

According to the statements of the in-court deputy clerks and to the author's personal observation, the logging of the reporting machine does not interfere with the performance of the clerk's regular courtroom duties. The deputy clerks were observed administering oaths and marking exhibits without any complications being added by the sound recording process. All of the in-court deputy clerks had been trained to keep the usual clerks' minutes and they still do. When they first started to use the sound recording machines they attempted to keep minutes separately and in addition to logging the recorder. However, they quickly found that the log contains all information necessary for the preparation of minutes,

that there is no necessity for keeping notes for the minutes separate from the log and they no longer do so. The minutes are made up from the log at the conclusion of each day in court.

INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY JUDGES OF THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM CONCERNING THEIR EXPERIENCE WITH ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS OF TRIAL COURTS

In Anchorage the author interviewed Judge Edward V. Davis, of the superior court, for over an hour, and in Fairbanks, Judge Jay A. Rabinowitz, of the superior court, for a lesser time, concerning their experiences with and evaluation of the recording of court proceedings by electronic sound recording equipment. The author also had somewhat longer interviews on this subject with Chief Justice Buell A. Nesbett, of the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska, and with Mr. David L. Luce, the administrative director of the Alaska court system. They were unanimous in the conclusion and opinion that the court reporting services based upon the electronic sound recording is infinitely superior to the reporting in the district court of territorial days and equally superior to what the Alaskan courts would have if they relied upon court reporters using shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional means of note taking. All of them said they had experienced no major problem with the system of sound recording, but they were of the opinion that the machine needed improvement and that the whole system would operate better when the transcribers in the clerks' office had gained more experience.

The judges pointed out that in some, not too obvious, particulars, sound recording had very distinct advantages. Judge Davis stated that when jurors wanted to have an instruction repeated, something that happens fairly frequently, instead of having the court reporter stumble through his notes on what the judge had said he was able to have the Soundscriber play back his instructions exactly as he had given them in the first place.

Mr. Luce pointed out that the sound recorder provides a check on the accuracy of interpretations which simply does not exist with the ordinary system of court reporting. When a witness speaking a foreign language is on the stand, all that a shorthand or stenotype reporter ever gets are the words of the interpreter. He cannot record the actual words of the witness. With sound recording, however, the tape records the actual words of the witness, no matter what language he may be using, just as accurately as it picks up the interpretation. The accuracy or inaccuracy of the interpretation can always be determined at a later date by having someone else with an adequate knowledge of the language listen to the recording. This is a matter of no small importance in a State like Alaska where skilled interpreters are hard to find and where the population includes peoples speaking Aleut, Athabascan, Tlingit, Eskimo, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese, as well as a number of western European languages other than English.

Judge Rabinowitz stated that he had found that recording the pretrial conference was a great timesaver in the preparation of pretrial orders.

Chief Justice Buell A. Nesbett stated that in his opinion the electronic sound recording of proceedings in the trial courts of Alaska is, in general, highly successful. The transcripts made from recordings that have been filed in the Supreme Court of Alaska have been accurate, as has been evident upon comparing them with the original tape. While there was one serious failure to obtain an intelligible record with the sound recording machine at Fairbanks, as previously related, this has been an isolated incident and the real cause of the failure in his opinion did not lie with the system or the machine.

The chief justice also stated that the system had eliminated the excessive delays in the preparation and filing of transcripts experienced by the district court during the territorial regime and that, with few exceptions, the transcripts from the tape recordings had been filed in the supreme court within the 30 days allowed by rule 48 of the rules of administration.

The chief justice pointed out that there were on file in the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska a number of cases in which the appeal had been noticed before the Supreme Court of Alaska became organized and which were transferred to the supreme court when it became operative, and which still remain unheard because of the inability of the court reporters of the former district court to complete and file the reporters' transcript. The chief justice stated that while be believed the recording equipment was capable of improvement, in general it was doing its job very well. He emphasized, however, that the key to the successful operation of the system of electronic sound recording was the attitude and cooperation of the judges and clerks. In the opinion of the chief justice, this had made the difference between success and failure. The chief justice stated that he believed the judges and clerks in the Alaska court system were almost unanimous in preferring electronic sound recording to a return to the court reporting service provided in the U.S. district court during territorial days.

COMMENTS IN THE PRESS AND FROM THE BAR OF ALASKA CONCERNING ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL COURTS

The author obtained very little information from members of the bar as to their views of the practicality of electronic sound recording of court proceedings. This was because no member of the bar had had extensive experience with transcripts on appeal because the time since the system was inaugurated was too short for any firm to have had occasion to take more than one or two appeals. However, of the members of the bar interviewed who had actually tried cases where the proceedings were recorded, none of them voiced doubt about the ability of the recorder to accurately record the proceedings or the ability of the transcribers to produce an accurate transcript. A number of them commended the new system because it eliminated the unbearable delay of the old court reporting service. They also commended the saving in the cost of transcript and also other major reductions in the costs of appeal which have been achieved by the Alaska court system.

* * * * *

The Alaska court system has received a large amount of mail from outside the State criticizing the adoption of electronic sound recording in the trial courts, some of which is highly vituperative. Most of it comes from officers or members of various shorthand reporters' associations. There are few, if any, helpful ideas or comments in these letters. None of them are based on observation or experience with the system.

THE PERPETUATION OF RECORDS OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM

The basic purpose of any court reporting system is to make an official record of the court proceedings for subsequent use on appeal or otherwise. It is especially important in criminal cases that the official record of the proceedings in the trial court be complete, and also that it be preserved, even though no appeal may be taken. Questions about the legality of the proceedings are raised with increasing frequency at dates long subsequent to the time of conviction. In habeas corpus proceedings and petitions filed under section 2255 of title 28 of the United States Code the proceedings in the trial courts must be examined on the record of what happened, oftentimes, years before.

Congress has recognized and attempted to meet this need by providing in section 753 of title 28 of the United States Code that the court reporter in a U.S. district court must "report all proceedings in criminal cases had in open court" and must also "transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal cases," regardless of whether an appeal is taken or any request is made for the transcript. The purpose of the statute is to insure perpetuity of the record.

The system of electronic sound recording presently in use in the Alaska court system meets this need for perpetuating the record of what happened in the trial court perfectly and completely, whereas the system of conventional court reporting in current use in the U.S. district courts fails lamentably.

Rule 47 of the "Rules Governing the Administration of All Courts of the Alaska Court System" provides that it is the electronic recording, not the transcript, that constitutes the official court record. To preserve the record indefinitely all that is necessary is to store it properly. Under this system there is a complete original record to which reference can be made at any time in the future, regardless of whether a transcript has or has not been made from the tape. Transcripts when made are certified under the Alaskan court rules as true and correct copies of the official record and never of themselves constitute the official record. (See App. 2, p. 3, "Transcript Fees and Rules Relating to Monitoring, Transcription, and Storage," Bulletin 60–9, Supreme Court of Alaska, office of the administrative director). Under this system there is no need to transcribe any part of the court proceedings merely to perpetuate the record.

With the conventional methods of court reporting in current use in the Federal courts, on the other hand, experience has shown that it is necessary to transcribe the proceedings if the record is to be preserved. Recognition of this fact by the Congress is of course the reason for the enactment of 28 U.S.C. 753. The superiority in this particular of a system of electronic sound recording becomes apparent when it is contrasted with the admitted failure and inability of the Federal court reporters to meet the need for preserving and perpetuating court proceedings where no appeal is taken. Although it is a duty imposed on court reporters by Congress to transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentences in criminal cases, regardless of whether an appeal is taken, the Parker-Tharp report states (p. 34) that in only two districts visited by the survey team was this statute being complied with and that less than 25 percent of the Federal district courts are achieving anything approaching compliance.

In June 1959, the Administrative Office requested the clerks of all of the district courts to report the number of cases of criminal defendants convicted and sentenced during the fiscal year 1958 in which the typed and certified transcripts of the proceedings on plea and sentence had not been filed and to ascertain from the court reporters their best estimate of the number of man-hours that would be required to transcribe and certify the proceedings in conformity with the statute. The replies showed that in 64 percent of the criminal cases in that 1 year typed transcripts had not been made and filed, and that the efforts of the court reporters in the other 36 percent of the cases in complying with the law had resulted in the production of over 55,000 pages

of typing to be placed in storage indefinitely. The answers also showed that the court reporters estimated that it would require 41,444 hours to make the transcripts necessary to comply with the law for that 1 year.

It is abundantly clear that it is physically impossible for the present Federal court reporters to make the necessary transcriptions to meet the need for preservation and perpetuation of the proceedings on sentence in all criminal cases. Such a goal could only be achieved by a very great increase in the total number of reporters and with huge increase in cost to the United States. This is demonstrated by experience in the District of Columbia. Prior to 1957 the court reporters in that District did not transcribe proceedings on plea and sentence, excepting where an appeal was had or a request for a transcript was made, it being their practice merely to file their shorthand or stenotype notes for preservation. Because of a number of instances where a complete record of proceedings on pleas and sentences was not available when needed, an order was issued at the prodding of the court of appeals (*Poole* v. *United States*, U.S.C.A.D.C., 1957, 250 Fed. 2d 396) requiring the reporters to comply with the statute and transcribe all pleas and sentence proceedings. When the effort was made to prepare transcripts from the court reporters' notes on file, it was found in a number of the older cases, where the original reporter was no longer available, that the notes on file could not be deciphered. In order to permit the reporters for the District of Columbia to comply with the law just in future cases it was necessary for the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to employ five additional reporters at a cost to the United States, which is continuing, of $35,000 per year. Compliance with the law in other districts would undoubtedly result in similar and proportional increases in cost. The electronic sound recording system used in Alaska provides a permanent official record without any cost of transcription whatever.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT DELAY IN FILING OF TRANSCRIPTS IN CASES ON APPEAL IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM AND THE FEDERAL COURTS

The Supreme Court of Alaska became operative on October 5, 1959. The remainder of the Alaska court system, including the superior courts, became operative on February 20, 1960. On the latter date the former U.S. district court of four divisions went out of existence and was succeeded by the present U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska. This change resulted in a transfer to the State courts of about 90 percent of the cases originally filed in the old district court, including cases on appeal. One year later, there are still pending in the Alaska Supreme Court a number of cases appealed from the old district court which remain unheard because of the failure of the court reporters to complete and file the transcript.

On the other hand, while there have been a considerable number of appeals from the new superior courts during the same year, in no instance has the delay in filing the transcript exceeded 90 days and, in the majority of cases, the transcripts have been filed without any extension of the 30 days provided by court rule. The information supplied by the administrative director concerning appeals from the superior court to the Supreme Court of the State of Alaska, as of February 16, 1961, is to the effect that there has been one appeal from Juneau in which the completed transcript was filed within less than 30 days, 1 appeal from Nome in which the transcript was filed within less than 30 days, 1 appeal from Ketchikan in which the transcript was filed in less than 50 days, 12 appeals from Anchorage in which 6 transcripts were filed within less than 30 days, 3 within less than 60 but more than 30 days, and 3 within less than 90 but more than 60 days. The breakdown of the appeals from Fairbanks is not presently available, but the administrative director has stated that there has been no greater delay in the preparation of transcripts on appeal in Fairbanks than in Anchorage, and that in no instance has it been necessary to extend the time for completion and filing beyond 90 days.

The situation in the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska, where the conventional method of reporting is still in use, is in marked contrast. On December 13, 1960, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts inquired of the Department of Justice as to whether delay was being experienced in the appeal of criminal cases from the new U.S. District Court in Alaska to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals by reason of the inability of the court reporter to prepare a transcript on time. Assistant Deputy Attorney General Howard A. Heffron responded on January 5, 1961:

"This is to reply particularly to the question in your letter about any delays experienced in criminal appeals from the district of Alaska.

"At present the Government is involved in three criminal appeals. In one of these, a bank robbery case tried in June of 1960, we are told that the reporter is just now beginning to transcribe the record, and the other two transcripts will still remain to be done. The U.S. Attorney informs us that the court reporter has been laboring under a backlog of work because it was necessary for her to transcribe certain appeals from the predecessor court to the Alaska Supreme Court."

The situation in the Federal court in Alaska gained very unpleasant notoriety with the arrest of one Frank Marrone in Los Angeles, Calif., in November 1960, on a charge of kidnaping perpetrated in San Diego, Calif. At the time of his arrest for kidnaping, Marrone was out on bail pending appeal from a conviction of second degree murder in the U.S. district court at Anchorage, Alaska, which judgment was rendered as long ago as May 1, 1959. The appeal had been taken and Marrone had been released on bail shortly after the pronouncement of judgment. The appeal was still pending when the supreme court of Alaska became operative on October 5, 1959, and the appeal, although originally noticed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, was transferred to the supreme court of Alaska since Marrone had been prosecuted for violating a section of the Alaska Compiled Laws and not with violating the laws of the United States. The files of the case show the entry of a number of orders extending the time for filing the transcript of record and docketing the cause "for the reason that the court reporter is, as of this date, unable to prepare a transcript of the evidence within the time granted by the court." The transcript was not filed with the supreme court of the State of Alaska until February 18, 1960. The delay after this date was occasioned in the most part by the need for extending the time for the preparation of briefs to enable the new State district attorney's office to familiarize itself with and brief the conviction which had been had in the Federal court.

Of course the transcript in the murder case was actually on file before Marrone was arrested for kidnaping. However, if the transcript had been filed within approximately 30 days after notice of appeal, as appears to be the present practice in the State courts in Alaska, it seems reasonably certain that Marrone's case would have been decided in the supreme court prior to the conviction of the kidnaping in San Diego for which he was arrested.

Some of the special difficulties under which the court reporter for the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska presently labors should be mentioned. Upon his appointment in February 1960 to the newly created U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska, Judge Walter H. Hodge found pending on the court docket a considerable number of cases in Juneau, a few in Ketchikan, and a much larger number in Fairbanks, most of which were quite old and needed to be brought to trial. By far the greatest number of cases, however, were pending in Anchorage. Realizing that the accumulation in Anchorage could not be attacked with much prospect of progress unless court was held in Anchorage steadily and for a rather prolonged period, Judge Hodge decided to clean up the dockets in the other towns and cities before making a start in Anchorage.

Pursuant to this plan and beginning with his appointment, Judge Hodge held court in Juneau, then in Ketchikan, and had progressed to Fairbanks by October. He did not begin to hold court in Anchorage until November 1960. He was, of course, accompanied on these peregrinations by his court reporter, who was under duty although traveling to report all the proceedings in court, to transcribe all pleas and sentences in criminal cases, to prepare transcripts in all appeal cases, and, in addition, was obliged to prepare transcripts in cases reported by her in the predecessor court of territorial days where she had formerly been employed. The delays in the preparation and filing of transcripts above described cannot with any fairness be considered as reflecting on the ability or diligence of the court reporter. The truth is that she is being required to do the impossible.

It should also be pointed out, however, that no such difficulties would have been encountered if the new Federal court upon becoming operative in February 1960 had adopted the same system of electronic sound recording used in the Alaska court system. In such case the proceedings in each place where Federal Court is held would be recorded by a different in-court deputy clerk on a Soundscriber machine. There would be no need to make any transcript except in cases which are appealed. The needed transcripts would be produced where recorded without their being any interruption caused by the Judge's departure. Indeed, simultaneous transcription in different places, with a very great saving in time, would often occur.

Such a procedure is more practical in Alaska than anywhere else because in that State the Federal and State courts are using the same courthouses, the same clerks' offices and, in certain instances, the same deputy clerks, each government making an appropriate contribution to the cost adjusted according to the appropriate proportion of the volume of work, and this arrangement will be continued for an indefinite period. Transcripts in Federal cases could be produced by the same transcribers now making transcripts for the Alaska court system, with such additions to the staff as the amount of business might require. The delays on appeals to the Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit would be eliminated, just as they have been on appeals to the Supreme Court of Alaska.

COMPARISON OF THE COSTS OF TRANSCRIPTS IN CASES ON APPEAL IN THE ALASKA COURT SYSTEM AND THE FEDERAL COURT

Although the costs for services are in general far higher in the State of Alaska than in any other State in the Union, the Alaska court system is providing transcripts to litigants at a cost far less than that charged in any court in the Federal system.

The schedule of charges for transcripts in the Alaska court system is as follows:

Record on appeal:

Original, 50 cents per page; first copy, 10 cents per page; each additional copy, 10 cents per page.

Trial or proceedings (not daily):

Original, 50 cents per page; each additional copy, 10 cents per page.

Daily transcript:

Original, 85 cents per page; each additional copy, 10 cents per page.

Judge's request. No charge.

The schedule of charges for transcripts in the U.S. district courts, including Alaska, authorized by the Judicial Conference of the United States, is as follows:

Regular transcript	Rate per page		Total charge
	Original	Each copy	
Original and each copy	$0.65	$0.30	
Daily transcript:			
Original only	1.30	0	$1.30
Original plus 1 copy	1.25	.50	1.75
Original plus 2 copies	1.20	.45	2.10
Original plus 3 copies	1.15	.40	2.35
Original plus 4 copies	1.10	.35	2.50
Original plus 5 copies	1.05	.35	2.80
Original plus 6 copies	1.00	.35	3.10

For an original and more than 6 copies: $1 for original and $0.35 for each copy.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The experience of the Alaska court system with electronic sound recording over a period of nearly a year in eight superior courts and additional district magistrate courts offers persuasive evidence in substantiation of the conclusion of the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees, that electronic recording of court proceedings is feasible and practical.

2. The doubts and fears expressed by numerous court reporters, judges, and others as to the practicality of electronic sound recording of proceedings in trial courts have proved to be illusory and without substance.

3. A comparison of the electronic sound recording used in the State courts in Alaska with the conventional shorthand reporting system presently being used in the Federal courts including Alaska discloses: (a) electronic sound recording produces an original record of trial proceedings which is more accurate and more complete than shorthand or stenotype notes; (b) electronic sound recording preserves and perpetuates a complete original record of all court proceedings without the waste of time and money in making transcripts of proceedings which are not appealed; (c) electronic sound recording reduces enormously the delay in the preparation and filing of transcripts in cases appealed; (d) electronic sound recording is less costly to the Government (State or Federal) than court reporters; (e) the system of electronic sound recording has reduced the costs of transcripts to the litigants; (f) the system of sound recording has a number of important advantages over shorthand, stenotype, and other conventional methods of reporting, such as providing a complete record of interpretations of foreign languages, permitting the repetition of instructions to the jury in the exact language as originally given.

4. When the service provided by conventional shorthand reporters is inadequate, overly expensive or otherwise unsatisfactory, electronic sound recording is a practical alternative from every point of view.

PROGRESS REPORT ON SOCIAL SECURITY POLL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, over many months there has been intense debate on the subject of medical care for the older people in our communities.

Over the weekend, I was given by a physician from Detroit the latest report on a poll which is being conducted by the Medical Society of Wayne County, Mich. It is most interesting, because it is a report from the profession itself in respect to its idea of its role under social security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this progress report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Progress report on social security poll (as of Feb. 9, 1961)

In favor of compulsory social security	501
Opposed	107
Undecided	16
Total	624
Age groups:	
28 to 40	104
40 to 50	143
50 to 60	121
60 to 70	103
70 to 80	32
Age not given	118
Type of practice:	
Surgery	111
Medicine	103
General practice	127
Other	176
Unspecified	107

Employment status: employed, 86; self-employed, 538. Those presently on social security, 100.

MEDICAL AID TO THE AGED

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Detroit News of Wednesday, February 15, 1961, on medical aid to the aged, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL AID TO THE AGED: A QUESTION OF METHODS

With an administration bill and two others now before it, Congress is fairly launched on study and discussion of the problem of supplying some form of financial assistance to retirees confronted with medical expenses.

It should be beyond dispute that this class of citizens (women 62 or over, men 65 or over) receives lower income and suffers more ill health than younger age groups and that hardship results. True, the American Medical Association dissents from time to time, its literature partially basing its case on a survey of the aged which has been attacked as unprofessional by several sociologists. Physicians representing local medical groups frequently concede that a problem exists, but they say it can be solved by the doctors themselves in voluntary care of their patients regardless of ability to pay.

Those assuming—rightly, we think—that the Federal Government has a proper interest in the retired ill, disagree as to the method to be used and the means of paying for it. Their attitudes have hardened over the past several months and it will be the job of congressional committees to settle the issue.

One school firmly asserts that medical care should be put under the social security program, the present tax being increased to cover the cost of the care. Opponents criticize this proposal because it is "involuntary" and advance alternatives which are "voluntary" and which would be financed out of the general funds of the Treasury. Thus the application for assistance would be by choice, but the contributions would be involuntary, in a sense, since everybody supports the Treasury.

A more recent criticism of the social security method brings up the question as to the added cost to employers through the increased tax. Employers may be unwilling to hire additional workers when they will thereby add to the cost of the jobs to themselves. It is pointed out that the social security tax has been steadily increased and is scheduled to increase further in the years to come. The question is whether the social security system can stand additional burdens.

That problem would be avoided in a proposal that the Government pay a portion of the premiums on health care policies issued to retirees by commercial insurance companies and nonprofit organizations such as Blue Cross-Blue Shield. The form that criticism of this proposal takes is exemplified by a Princeton economist who said that under it "the Government would pay more, the beneficiaries would get less, and private carriers would trade freedom for little profit and thankless regulation."

The subject thus is complex, despite the efforts of partisans of one scheme or another to simplify it and to claim perfection for their point of view. It will be and should be well chewed over in committee and, the AMA to the contrary, it is inevitable that a solution will issue. The form that the legislation should take should be decided when all of the agreed upon evidence is in the record.

Our chief hope is that the AMA, the one group with specialized knowledge of the problem, will recognize that a solution of some sort is sure to come out of Washington and will make a positive—rather than obstructionist—contribution to arriving at the solution.

EXPERIMENTAL FOOD PROGRAMS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, since the President's announcement designating certain areas as areas for conducting experimental food programs, interest in this program in Michigan has been widespread.

Letters and resolutions I have received from Michigan express interest in this pilot program. This is a small indication of the interest I have found in getting this food program underway.

It is unfortunate that the previous administration did not see fit to follow the suggestions of some of us in the Congress who proposed that such programs be made available in areas of critical unemployment.

I have been assured that the Department of Agriculture is doing all possible to formulate its program to comply with the President's order.

We in Michigan are proud that Detroit has been selected as a test area, and I have been assured that the State, city, and local retailers will make every effort to cooperate with the Department in a way to make the test program a success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters and resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUSKEGON, MICH.,
February 2, 1961.

Senator PHILIP HART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please suggest Muskegon County as an addition to pilot group of areas under the surplus food stamp program now being put in effect by administration.

JAMES KOBZA,
Muskegon County Chairman.

CITY OF FLINT, MICH.,
February 7, 1961

HON. PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted at the Flint City Commission meeting held February 6, 1961, and directed to your attention.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD S. HENDON,
City Clerk.

Whereas unemployment in the Flint area has increased steadily since the beginning of 1961; and

Whereas prospects of additional factory layoffs already have been publicly announced which will increase materially the number of jobless and provoke more acute economic distress; and

Whereas many workers affected by layoffs and continuing unemployment, either have not earned or have exhausted unemployment compensation and supplemental unemployment benefits, and are becoming an increasingly heavier burden upon the direct relief roles of the county; and

Whereas local physical facilities available for the direct distribution program of surplus foods administered by the Department of Agriculture do not lend themselves to the efficient administration of relief to current growing numbers of needy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Flint city commission does hereby petition the President of the United States, and the administrators of the departments affected, to consider the county of Genesee and the city of Flint as an economically depressed area, according to the percentages of the unemployed work force available through the Michigan Unemployment Security Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That said Federal officials be petitioned to consider the city of Flint and Genesee County for inclusion in the pilot food stamp plan for distribution of surplus foodstuffs to the needy.

BAY CITY MILLING & GROCER CO.,
February 7, 1961.

Senator PHILIP HART,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I see by the news that Detroit has been chosen as the pilot area for testing the new stamp plan. Bay City is in the same condition as Detroit. We have the Chevrolet plant here and several other plants here that are down. We have industry like the Industrial Brownhoist and the Bay City Shovels that have gone out of business and there is an awful lot of unemployment here. How about trying to get this part of the country on this plan as well as Detroit.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN KOFFMAN.

NEW INDUSTRY SOUGHT FOR HUERFANO COUNTY, COLO.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, there are two areas of my State which are chronically in an economically depressed condition. They are the cities of Walsenburg and Trinidad, Colo.

These two cities have lost employment and lost population steadily for 20 years.

Their history has been largely tied to the coal-mining industry and as it declined so did the economic health of the two cities.

A dramatic story of the plight of the city of Walsenburg has been published in the Pueblo Star-Journal of February 5, 1961.

It was written by Mrs. Betty Kalmes, who is the energetic secretary of the Walsenburg Industrial Development Corp., a nonprofit citizens organization which is diligently pledged to the objective of bringing new industry and new economic life to Walsenburg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Pueblo Star-Journal and Sunday Chieftain on February 5, 1961, entitled "New Industry Sought To Ease Huerfano County Job Scarcity," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW INDUSTRY SOUGHT TO EASE HUERFANO COUNTY JOB SECURITY

(By Betty Kalmes)

WALSENBURG.—Bulging welfare rolls and vast unemployment among miners in Huerfano County is typical of what is happening to coal mining communities all over the Nation.

Walsenburg, the county seat of Huerfano County, was the center of 20 coal mines back in the 1920's. The peak of the mining industry was reached between 1923 and 1925.

There were 3,000 coal miners employed here at that time.

The first decline in the coal industry started in 1929 during the depression. It continued to decline for 10 years. In 1939, the mines started to pick up and the peak was reached in 1942. At the end of 1946 a second decline started.

By 1952 there were only 75 miners employed in the mines. That number has held steady. Work in the few privately owned mines is not steady—these mines produce domestic coal and the miners are out of work 3 to 4 months each year.

Welfare rolls in Huerfano County have swollen. The monthly average payroll is $95,000. The number of persons receiving commodities has risen from 913 in December of 1957 to 1,502 persons in December of 1960. Mrs. Harry Haines, welfare director, says, "We have a good rehabilitation program but there is no particular employment for them here and they don't like to leave home."

OVERALL PICTURE

The overall employment picture in Huerfano County looks like this: 1,575 persons employed in nonagricultural work; 500 persons employed in agricultural work; 325 persons unemployed.

John George, local manager of Colorado Employment Office, puts it this way.

"A lot of people don't bother to register at the employment office because they know that there aren't any jobs available. In the event that an industry moved to Walsenburg and jobs were available, we could muster a nonagricultural labor force that would probably reach 2,500 people. If an industry that would employ women came, our female labor force would be triple what it is at present," he said.

More than 200 of Huerfano County's employed commute as far as 170 miles round trip.

Unemployment claims have increased from 4,896 in 1959 to 5,150 in 1960.

POPULATION DECLINE

With the decline in the coal industry, the population in Huerfano County has declined.

In 1940 the population was 16,088 but by 1960 the population had dropped to 7,771.

With few jobs in Huerfano County, many miners have left to seek other employment. The mining camps have all closed. The gaping foundations of the houses stand as a reminder of a once vigorous coal industry. Most of the remaining miners moved to Walsenburg. Most of them bought homes or built them; they are not lazy people, but men who want to work to earn a living.

Fifty of Huerfano County's coal miners are working out of the county. Unless Walsenburg is able to attract industry that will employ these men, they face the same fate as the miners before them—they will have to look for employment elsewhere or go on the welfare rolls. The average age of today's miners is against them.

They are not old enough for a pension and not young enough to be desirable in most industries.

PUBLIC OPINION

Pete Pavlick, 44, has a wife and two children. He worked in the mines for 22 years, but has been unemployed since the middle of December.

"I think that we should forget about coal around here and get something else to employ people. As far as this coal research is concerned, it's too slow. The coal around here is mostly owned by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. Unless C.F. & I. opens up something, we may as well forget coal in Huerfano County.

"I think that all of the miners voted for Kennedy hoping that he would do something for these depressed areas. I hope that they will help us to attract an industry, a broom factory, a shoe factory—most anything where we could have a steady payroll."

Mike Morrelli, 62, worked in the mines 46 years but has been unemployed since May 1960.

"I would like to go back to work. If I don't go back by March, then I don't think that I will get to go back to work. I was in a worse spot in 1927 to 1932. The only hope for coal is that they stop importing the cheap oil. There are some 2,000 items that can be produced from coal. I am going to stick it out in Walsenburg. If we had a good commercial mine in Huerfano County with 300 miners employed, we would be in good condition.

"I just hope someone will help us bring some work. It is my judgment that with all the money that is being spent by the State and Federal Government that we have been forgotten. Huerfano County doesn't belong on the U.S. map or on the Colorado map. I don't think that anyone will help us, except for relief. We want decent jobs so that we can work for what we earn. We don't want something for nothing."

John Conder, 56, worked in the mines 40 years, but has been unemployed since December.

"We are supposed to go back to work, but I don't know when. At my age, I'm too old to learn something else. When you pass 45 they don't hire you. I'll stay in Walsenburg, because there is no place else to go, but we need industry for the young people. When they get out of high school, there is nothing for them."

John Hayden, 52, worked in the mines 35 years, has been unemployed since December.

"I think they should open some mines or put people over 50 on a pension. I think that the new administration may help us. Colorado Springs is pretty well to do, and they keep putting Government installations there. They ought to put a few here."

Adolph Sanich, 49, worked in mines 25 years, unemployed since May 1960.

"When I was laid off it was supposed to be temporary. I'm going to sweat it out in Walsenburg; if I hear it is definite that we aren't going back to work, then I will have to look for something else. The administration should help us get industry. More relief isn't the answer; I don't think that the people like to go on relief. Also, unemployment payments should be extended. When that check runs out, a lot of guys are going to be out of luck."

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

Walsenburg is trying to pull itself up by its bootstraps.

The Walsenburg Industrial Development Corp. was formed to induce industry. The city council has appointed a city planning commission. The Walsenburg Housing Authority was formed, and a survey is being made to establish the number of houses that will be built.

They are trying to make Walsenburg a better place in which to live and to bring jobs.

Will the construction of the houses or the coming of an industry be soon enough to help these pople? Will the administration help? Can it?

These questions are being asked in coal mining communities all over the Nation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if there is no further morning business——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have further morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the inaugural message of the President of the United States he used the rather captivating sentence, which was rather roundly applauded:

> And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what the country can do for you: ask what you can do for your country. [Applause.]

That is the way it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Today the President sent us a special message on education. First, I think it would be appropriate to read one or two paragraphs from the Republican platform on the question of aid to education:

> Toward the goal of fullest possible educational opportunity for every American, we pledge these actions:
>
> Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid for school construction—pacing it to the real needs of individual school districts in States and territories, and requiring State approval and participation.
>
> We are aware of the fact that there is a temporary shortage of classrooms for our elementary and secondary schools in a limited number of States. But this shortage, due to the vigilant action of State legislatures and local school boards, is not increasing, but is decreasing.
>
> We believe moreover that any large plan of Federal aid to education, such as direct contributions to or grants for teachers salaries can only lead ultimately to Federal domination and control of our schools to which we are unalterably opposed.

I note in the President's message this morning that the "gap" recurs. We have heard about gaps before, and I have had occasion to talk about gaps. On page 4 of the message I note this sentence:

> Even with increased contributions from State, local and private sources, a gap of $2.9 billion between aggregate needs and expenditures is anticipated by 1965, and a gap of $5.2 billion by 1970.

Mr. President, I took the sacrificial spirit on the state of the Union message as uttered even before it was uttered, in presenting a school bill as early as January 17. I go in for simplification and for the necessity of establishing a demonstrated need.

The bill was introduced on the 17th of January. It is Senate bill 433. Briefly, it would provide $250 million a year for a period of 4 years, which is a total of $1 billion of available Federal authorized funds. Secondly, the need for the money must be shown before it can be obtained and before it can be expended.

The bill provides for no "frills." I think, on the New Frontier, the emphasis ought to be on reading, writing, and arithmetic, American history, and perhaps some science, but I like to be solid about it. When I think of the New Frontier I think of solid knowledge rather than culture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Does the Senator care to ask unanimous consent to proceed further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall renew my remarks directly, and will ask unanimous consent to have them printed together.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there was objection to my proceeding the other day, for the same reason.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is all right. The rule is the rule.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in order to keep within the 3-minute rule I think it is about time that I "spell" the distinguished minority leader, so long as he is speaking about education.

I point out that in contrast to the Republican proposal, which was introduced earlier and I am sure in anticipation of today's message and the measure which will be introduced today, the President's proposal includes this statement:

> Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice.

I hope that those who have a phobia against Federal aid to education because of their alleged fear of Federal intervention and control will look over the history of Federal aid to education, which goes back many, many decades. We find that under the Morrill Act land grant colleges received assistance for a good many years, and with that Federal assistance they have been conducting their own affairs quite free of Federal control.

We also have such acts as the Smith-Hughes Act, applicable to agricultural classes in high school, many of them in my State of Montana. They have been operating successfully for many years. Part of the funds are appropriated by the Federal Government to make better farmers out of youngsters from farms and ranches. There has been no indication of Federal control in that respect.

Then, of course, there is the George-Barden Act, which is likewise of benefit to our school systems, and which also has never imposed Federal control on the schools.

It appears to me on the basis of the message sent down by the President that this is a reasonable proposal, one which is necessary if our undereducated children and, in all too many instances, our undereducated teachers, are to be given the incentives and the facilities which they must have. We need better teachers. We need to get away from the crowding of classrooms. We need to make an investment in the youth of this country, because they are the ones who, in the not too distant future, will be required to take the reins and guide the Nation.

So I know that this year, as last year, the Senate will give every consideration to the proposal of the President of the United States; and, I am certain, at the same time it will give consideration to the proposals advanced by the distinguished minority leader and his colleagues in the field of education.

I make my statement on the basis of need. I do not know why a burden should be imposed upon all the taxpayers of the country for a school district or for a State unless the need is clearly shown.

Second, we should see the burden be not imposed for frills. The whole school case was built up in the first instance because of the emphasis on classroom shortage. I was willing to take that thesis at face value, and so I am willing now to see a program that addresses itself to the classroom shortage, exactly where this problem started in the first instance.

The formula is very simple. I take the 1960 census and the proportion of youngsters of school age, not between 5 and 17, as has been proposed, but between 5 and 14 because we are building for the future, not necessarily for the present school population, because it would take some time to get the proposed facilities built, and several years would have elapsed.

I take the proportion of the number of youngsters from 5 to 14 in the State to the whole number in the country, derive a very simple factor, and then take that proportion of $250 million and say, "This much is available to Connecticut. This much is available to Illinois."

There are no fancy indices in this bill, there is no index of per capita school income, no index of State effort or individual effort. We do not need an engineer's slide rule, a book of logarithms, a book of squares and fourth dimensions, to solve this very simple bill, because the proportion is there. It deals fairly and equitably with every State on the basis of the number of youngsters of school age. In addition, it calls for half the cost, or matching in an equal amount by the States.

Finally, there is a provision that a facility that is built in part with Federal funds shall admit all students and provide an equal oportunity for education. I do not know of a simpler way to draw a bill. I know of no simpler way to set up the criteria and make it easy of administration.

So the bill will be before the Subcommittee on Education. I have forgotten, but I think I am on the subcommittee, and I presume in due course I shall have an apportunity to hear the testimony not only on the administration bill but on my own bill and any

other bills on the subject of Federal aid to education that may be presented.

So there is the story. This is a simple bill, involving a reasonable request, and it does not propose to go off into the blue. As I evaluate the President's bill, the cost would run into billions before we got through. Obviously, with a $660 million authorization requested for the first year, I can see a great nuclear hole in the 1961 budget, and probably a hydronuclear hole in the 1962 budget. So for the moment we will let the case stand there. However, I felt that the remarks which I made were in order, in view of the fact that the President's school message came to Congress today.

FEED GRAINS BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had hoped to express myself on the feed grains bill which was sent to Congress. The message came up last week. I have gone through the message and the bill pretty carefully, and I note some rather interesting items in the bill. I believe the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will probably hear the Secretary of Agriculture on Thursday of this week. I will forebear on that matter as of this moment, but some time later in the day, or tomorrow, I shall undertake, if the Senate is in session, to say a few words about the new feed grains bill.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the morning hour I sent to the desk, for appropriate reference, two bills to deal with two aspects of our most urgent domestic problem—unemployment.

More men and women are now out of work in this country than at any time in 20 years. The latest figures, those for January, show 5,400,000 workers unemployed, and indications are that the situation may be even worse in February. Especially serious is the problem of the long-term unemployed, because these are families whose unemployment compensation benefits and private resources have become exhausted. In January, 1,300,000 workers had been unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, and half of that number had been out of work for 6 months or more.

Of course, the burden and the tragedy of unemployment do not fall evenly across the country. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, being a State of concentrated heavy industry, has been particularly hard hit. In our Commonwealth alone, 504,000 persons are unemployed—or 11.3 percent of the labor force. All but 3 of our 12 major labor market areas are listed as having substantial unemployment.

In my Commonwealth, because of the low rate of operation of the steel industry, there are thousands upon thousands of underemployed workers who are working less than half time. Also in my Commonwealth, because of the steel industry in part and because of other situations affecting the marketing of coal, there are tens of thousands of coal miners who are working hardly as much as part time.

The suggestion has been made in some quarters that it is unwise to admit we are in a recession, or to call it by that name, because that might impair confidence in the economy and thus make matters worse. My own view is just the opposite. American businessmen certainly know the state of the economy; they have access to all the figures put out by the Departments of Commerce and Labor and by private sources. What will inspire confidence is a clear indication from the Government that it does not intend to permit the recession to continue and to deepen. What destroys confidence is any suggestion that the Government is going to permit matters simply to take their course.

I believe, therefore, that President Kennedy has acted wisely in telling the people the facts of economic life, no matter how harsh those facts may be.

I believe the President has inspired confidence by taking Executive action to speed up Federal public works and by proposing for quick action on a series of major measures which will alleviate the effects of the recession and help to check any further decline. I agree that we should act promptly, and I believe that the Ways and Means Committee of the other body in particular deserves commendation for the speed and dispatch with which it is considering the extension of unemployment compensation benefits.

One of the measures which I have introduced today, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would authorize an emergency program of State and local public works.

The President has said that we should take a careful look at the economy in April and decide whether additional measures, beside those he has already taken and proposed, are needed in order to bring the recession to a rapid end.

My bill of today is designed to put the Congress into a position to act in April if the President and his economic advisers conclude, and if the Congress concludes, that further action is needed.

Those of us who served in the Congress during the 1958 recession will remember the amount of time that was lost in debating whether we really were in a recession; whether, if so, it would cure itself without the need for legislation; and, if not, what form the legislation should take. The result of all the delay was that our actions were, for the most part, too little and too late. The exception was the Emergency Housing Act, which many economists believe had an important effect in stimulating recovery, but for the rest the recession was virtually allowed to run its course—and one result was a deficit in the Federal Treasury of over $12 billion in a single fiscal year. The potential antirecession effect of State and local public works was not utilized at all on a nationwide basis.

For three decades, economists have advocated public works as a countercyclical device. We should accelerate them in recessionary periods; curtail them in inflationary periods. Yet, once a recession begins, we tend to be too slow in getting the acceleration underway.

I take it there is no longer any Member of the Senate who denies that we are in a recession. This President Kennedy has made abundantly clear since he took office. If we are in a recession, let us do something about it, and do it now, while it will help.

Accordingly, the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems of the Senate, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], in its report a year ago recommended that standby legislation be enacted so that at the outset of a recession the President would have available the authority needed to expedite public works—State and local as well as Federal—without the need for further congressional action. With the cosponsorship of several of my colleagues, I introduced legislation to provide the President with the necessary standby authority to accelerate Federal and federally aided construction programs, to provide emergency stimulation to homebuilding, and to assist State and local governments to accelerate public works of all kinds.

Mr. President, if this legislation were on the statute books, the President would have all the authority needed to move rapidly if the decision is made in April to stimulate the economy through acceleration of public works expenditures.

However, the legislation was not passed, and we now face the prospect of lost time in getting laws drafted, considered, and enacted, if it appears clear in the spring that additional legislation is essential.

I urge that the Congress not wait until April to get started. I urge that during the next 6 weeks we proceed through the early stages of the legislative process, so that bills will be ready to be laid on the President's desk for his signature in April if it is clear then that we should go ahead.

I introduce my bill today for that purpose. I would hope that hearings could be held, that the potential antirecession impact of State and local public works could be measured, and that a consensus could be reached on the administrative arrangements and other details of a Federally-aided construction program. At best, to proceed through these steps in both Houses will take until the end of March. By that time, the administration and the Congress will be in a position to decide as to whether such a measure as this is needed to help bring us out of the recession. If the conclusion is negative, which all of us hope it will be, then I shall propose that the measure be converted into a standby act and passed to give the administration an important weapon in its arsenal for use the next time we enter the recessionary phase of the economic cycle.

Briefly, this is what the bill would do:

It would authorize the President, through any Federal agency which he may designate, to contract for $500

million in grants to States, their subdivisions, and other public bodies to increase their levels of capital expenditures.

The Federal share of the State and local projects would be 45 percent. The $500 million would thus make possible $1.1 billion in additional construction. When the first $500 million has been committed, the President after consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers may commit another $500 million if he concludes it is necessary to bring an end to the recession. The authority would end at such time as unemployment falls below 4 percent of the labor force.

I wish to emphasize that point. This is not merely an across-the-board spending project. It is to utilize public works construction to terminate unemployment or to bring it within acceptable limits. Our national rate of unemployment is presently well in excess of 7 percent of the labor force. If we get it down to under 4 percent, then we ought to eliminate further progress on these construction measures, because we will not need them purely as antiunemployment measures.

The bill specifies that aid will be given to projects which amount to a net increase in the level of capital expenditures of the public body receiving the grant. The object is to increase total construction, and Federal money could not be used merely to substitute for funds that would otherwise be provided locally.

Let me point out that this is not a depressed areas bill. The bill would provide for accomplishing a public service across the board everywhere in our country in order to eliminate unemployment everywhere in our country.

The 45 percent Federal share is adapted from the matching ratio that was in effect for the Public Works Administration program of the 1930's. I believe there is general agreement that the PWA, which was administered by Secretary Ickes, was one of the most effective and respected of all the New Deal agencies. Its projects made a permanent contribution to public wealth throughout the country.

It has been national policy for a decade to assist States and local communities to plan ahead with a "shelf" of public works, for just such a contingency. Planning funds under section 702 of the Housing Act of 1949 have been provided for the purpose. Communities which have been alert and enterprising enough to proceed under that act, and who have thus sought to further a declared national policy, will probably be in an advantageous position to make early application for aid under the bill.

I do not know which communities have projects which are on the shelf and ready for execution, and would thus be able to proceed. I understand the Community Facilities Administration has undertaken a survey to obtain this information; and I have asked for a tabulation of the results. When it is available, I will ask permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that each Senator can see how his State might be affected.

The bill specifies that the projects must be of a type that can be started and completed within a reasonable time. To such end, priority is to be given those projects on which construction contracts can be let within 90 days and which can be completed within 12 months thereafter. Projects which would be aided under existing acts, such as the Hill-Burton Hospital Program Act, or the airport program, or the aid to education program, when we enact such a program, would be ineligible.

Mr. President, I am in complete sympathy with President Kennedy's proposal to extend unemployment compensation benefits and to improve public assistance. They are urgently necessary. Yet I submit that it is far preferable, to the extent possible, to put people to work building badly needed public structures, to improve the roads, streets, water and sewer systems, police and fire buildings, schools, libraries, to catch up on our needs for public facilities of all kinds and thus to improve our public services.

If Federal money is going to be spent, I urge that we put our emphasis on buying things of lasting value, as we did through the PWA, rather than pay it out in the form of a dole which brings no tangible public benefit of any kind.

There is hardly a community in the country that does not have a backlog of needed public works. When the private economy is sagging, that is the time to move ahead on needed public expenditures—expenditures which must be made, sooner or later, in any case.

The second bill which I have introduced, on behalf of myself and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], would provide a cooperative Federal-State program for the retraining of unemployed workers whose skills have become obsolete as the result of automation or other technological development, foreign competition, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy.

This is intended not as an emergency measure but as permanent legislation.

The retraining bill is also an outgrowth of the work of the McCarthy Committee on Unemployment Problems. We found that throughout the country, even in prosperous times, thousands of workers cannot be employed because they do not have the skills that are needed in our modern economy.

In my own State, automation in the coal industry and the loss of markets has wiped out tens of thousands of coal-mining jobs. But when a worker knocks at the door of a modern factory and is asked the question, "What can you do?" and he says, "I can mine coal," he never gets through the door.

Mr. President, in my Commonwealth we have also a large-scale movement of textile industry to the South, leaving unemployed many textile workers who can do nothing else and who also will require retraining.

In my Commonwealth there has been a drastic falling off in railroad employment, particularly in the maintenance and repair shops. Those skilled men can repair locomotives and freight cars, but they are not trained for anything else. With a little retraining, they could be made available for other types of work.

These are a few of the areas where the retraining of competent, able workers will be effective in stimulating reemployment and also building up production. This is particularly true of older workers, those over 40 or even 35. Unless they acquire a new skill, one that is needed in the economy, many of them will never work again.

The bill provides for organization of training courses under the present cooperative Federal-State vocational education program initiated by the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. It provides, however, that the employment service, acting under criteria set forth by the Secretary of Labor, shall determine what skills are needed in the economy and shall make sure that opportunities exist for the employment of persons retrained. Then it shall certify persons from those registered for employment with the employment service, giving preference to those who are over 30, those who are heads of families, and those who have at least 5 years work experience. The younger, single people are more mobile and better able to obtain their own retraining opportunities, and for them the existing vocational education program is well adapted.

Let me stress the importance of having manpower planning, so that we will know where job availabilities are. There is no sense in retraining an unemployed worker for a job opportunity which will never arise. The States, the Department of Labor, and, indeed, the Council of Economic Advisers, have an important function to perform in continually studying the economy and prognosticating where the opportunities for retrained workers will be, and then to see to it that those persons who are out of jobs are retrained in skills which will enable them to become employable as a practical matter.

I note with interest that in the education bill which has just come to the Senate, the President suggests that the whole vocational training setup should be restudied, so that we can be certain that vocational and technical retraining will be for skills which have employment opportunities attached to them.

I stress again the fact that the bill I am introducing contains a requirement that in a retraining program there shall be a certification that the skill in which the retraining is given is a skill for which employment opportunities exist.

Unemployed workers certified for retraining would be eligible for transportation and subsistence allowances in cases where the course was set up at a location requiring the worker's travel. In addition, payments equal to unemployment insurance benefits would be continued for the period of the retraining, but not in excess of 52 weeks, to enable the worker to remain in the course until the training was complete.

Experience has shown that retraining programs are of limited effect unless the worker can pay such transportation expenses as may be necessary, and has a small living allowance.

After all, the men being retrained are out of work. Their unemployment compensation, in many cases, has been exhausted. They have to support their families. They have no reserves with which to pay for their subsistence while retraining is taking place.

If the worker can be made employable and productive, of course, the ultimate cost of the training expenditures is more than repaid and the expenses are offset by the reduction in public assistance and unemployment compensation costs. This has been proved in the vocational rehabilitation program, which proceeds on a similar principle.

Almost every employed worker pays an income tax. An unemployed worker does not. It is simply a matter of hard, fiscal commonsense to get people who are not unemployed back on the payrolls, so that they, in turn, can contribute the Federal taxes which are necessary to keep our economy going.

This bill, while it may in the first instance call for the expenditure of some Federal money, will, in my judgment, in the long run, more than repay the Treasury for the moneys it is putting out, through the taxes which will come back from the men and women who will have jobs which they are not now qualified to fill, but would be qualified to fill after their retraining had been completed.

Mr. President, these are two measures to deal with only two aspects of the complex and many-sided problem of unemployment. The Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be chairman in this Congress, and which was created to follow up on those aspects of the work of the McCarthy committee which fall within the jurisdiction of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, will hold hearings in the coming weeks on the unemployment problem in general and on many of its specific aspects.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg will be our first witness when hearings open on Wednesday, February 22. On the following day, we will hold a hearing in Pittsburgh in conjunction with a special joint committee of the Pennsylvania Legislature.

Additional hearings will be held in Washington; in Chester, Pa.; in Trenton, N.J.; and elsewhere throughout the country. I should be happy to have Senators suggest where they think hearings could profitably be held in the interest of getting testimony we need in support of the proposed legislation or in favor of its modification. I hope that we may arrive promptly at recommendations for constructive legislation to be presented to the full committee and by that committee to the Senate for early consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the two bills be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 986. A bill to assist in the reduction of unemployment through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local public bodies.

S. 986

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Employment Acceleration Act of 1961".

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that unemployment in the United States has reached an intolerable level, and that emergency measures to increase employment opportunities are necessary in the interest of the public welfare. The Congress further finds that a quick and effective means of increasing employment is through the acceleration of capital expenditure programs of State and local governmental bodies, particularly through smaller projects which can be initiated promptly and completed by the time the private sector of the economy has recovered from the recession. Virtually every community in the Nation has a backlog of needed public projects, and an emergency acceleration of these projects now will not only increase employment at a time when jobs are most urgently required, but will also meet long-standing public needs, improve community services, and enhance the health and welfare of the citizens of the Nation.

The purpose of this Act is to provide an incentive, through Federal grants, for State and local governmental bodies to accelerate their capital expenditure programs through the initiation of projects which can be begun promptly and completed over a reasonably short period of time, such assistance to be automatically terminated when the rate of unemployment falls below the level of 4 per centum of the civilian labor force after adjustment for seasonal variation.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territorial possessions of the United States;

(2) the term "public works and facilities" includes the construction, repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other public transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals, rehabilitation and health centers; public refuse and garbage disposal facilities, water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; civil defense facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public schools, libraries, museums, offices, and other public buildings; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

GRANTS

SEC. 4. (a) The President may, upon application and under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe, make grants to States, municipalities, and local public bodies, to finance the construction of specific public works and facilities under State, municipal, or other applicable law; but no such grant shall be made for the payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating or maintenance expenses.

(b) The authority conferred by this section shall be subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) No grant shall be made with respect to any project unless such project results in a net increase in the current annual level of capital expenditures of the applicant.

(2) The amount of any grant with respect to any project shall not exceed 45 per centum of (A) the cost (as determined by the President) of undertaking and completing the project, exclusive of any costs attributable to land acquisition, or (B) the amount of the net increase in the current annual level of capital expenditures of the applicant attributable to such project, whichever is the lesser.

(3) No grant shall be made in the case of any project, if a grant or a commitment for a grant has been made with respect to such project under any other Act of Congress.

(4) No grant shall be made with respect to any project the construction of which cannot be commenced and completed within a reasonably short period of time. In entering into contracts for grants under this section, the President shall accord priority to projects which he determines can (A) be commenced by the letting of construction contracts within ninety days after a contract under this section is entered into, and (B) be completed within twelve months after construction is commenced.

(c) The President may contract to make grants under this section aggregating not to exceed $500,000,000. Such limit may be increased at such time and in such amount, not exceeding $500,000,000, as the President determines, after consultation with the Council of Economic Advisers, is necessary to fully accomplish the objectives of this Act.

(d) The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all grants contracted for under this section, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

(e) The authority to enter into contracts for grants under this section shall terminate whenever the President determines, upon the basis of statistical data compiled and published by the Department of Labor, that the national unemployment rate, adjusted for seasonal variations, is not in excess of 4 per centum of the civilian labor force of the Nation; but nothing herein shall affect the validity of any contract entered into under this section prior to any such determination.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 5. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5), and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary shall not approve any project involving the contribution of Federal funds without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Number 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267, 5 U.S.C. 133z–15),

and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the powers vested in him by this Act, the President shall maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office, and no other audit shall be required.

(b) In the performance of, and with respect to, the powers vested in him by this Act, the President may—

(1) sue and be sued;

(2) commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by law, contract, or other agreement;

(3) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this Act such covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this Act will be achieved; and

(4) make advance or progress payments on account of any grant contracted to be made pursuant to this Act, notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT

SEC. 7. Section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the provision of any public improvement or facility with respect to which assistance has been extended under the Emergency Employment Acceleration Act of 1961 shall not be considered a local grant-in-aid within the purview of this subsection."

DELEGATION OF POWERS

SEC. 8. The President may delegate any function, power, or authority conferred upon him by this Act to such departments, agencies, or offices of the Government as he deems appropriate; but nothing herein shall authorize the delegation of the power conferred upon the President by the second sentence of section 4(c).

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HART, and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

S. 987. A bill to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy.

S. 987

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Vocational Retraining Act of 1961".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the skills of many persons have been rendered obsolete by dislocations in the economy arising from automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, and other changes in the structure of the economy; that many such persons, in order to become qualified for reemployment, must be provided the opportunity for retraining in skills which are or will be in demand in the labor market; that it is in the national interest that such opportunities be provided in order to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, increase the Nation's productivity, and reduce the costs of unemployment compensation, public assistance, and other forms of relief. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide financial assistance to States for the purpose of enabling them to modify and expand existing State programs of vocational education so as to provide for the retraining of unemployed workers.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) There is authorized to be included within the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for each succeeding fiscal year, the sum of $30,000,000 to be apportioned among the States to carry out retraining programs in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this Act.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 4. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 3(a), each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the total number of long-term unemployed individuals in such State during the last full calendar year for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Labor bears to the sum of long-term unemployed individuals in all the States during such year.

(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Commissioner of Education will not be required for carrying out vocational retraining programs under this Act shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year.

AMENDMENT OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. To be eligibile to participate in the benefits of this Act, a State must—

(a) have in effect a State plan established pursuant to, and approved under, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended; and a State plan established pursuant to the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 115; 29 U.S.C. 492) relating to the United States Employment Service.

(b) submit amendments to each such State plan creating a new part of such plan to administer vocational retraining programs assisted under this Act. Such amendments shall set forth the plans, policies, and methods under which the State proposes to administer such retraining programs, which plans, policies, and methods shall—

(1) provide for a determination by the State employment service of the existing or potential shortages of persons with particular skills, and the opportunities which may exist for employment in the State of persons currently unemployed, if such persons are retrained in the skills needed within such State under the provisions of this Act;

(2) provide for the organization, by the State board of vocational education or under its direction, of retraining courses to equip unemployed persons with needed skills;

(3) provide for the selection of eligible unemployed individuals, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of Labor under section 7 of this Act, and certification for retraining of, payment or reimbursement of transportation costs to, and subsistence payments for, such individuals, as authorized in section 8 of this Act;

(4) provide such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of funds paid to the State under this Act;

(5) provide that the State board of vocational education will make such reports to the Commissioner of Education, and the State employment service will make such reports to the Secretary of Labor, as are reasonably necessary to enable them to perform their respective functions under this Act; and

(6) provide, to the extent possible under State law, that individuals shall not be disqualified from receiving unemployment compensation benefits while receiving retraining provided pursuant to this Act.

(c) Amendments made pursuant to this Act to a State plan shall be approved in the same manner as the State plan being amended, and any findings of noncompliance with such amendments shall have the same effect as that, and be subject to the same rights of appeal and review as those, provided with respect to the State plan being amended.

PAYMENTS TO THE STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 4 for any fiscal year shall be paid on condition that—

(1) such State pay 25 per centum of the costs of carrying out its vocational retraining program established pursuant to this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and 50 per centum of such costs in each succeeding fiscal year;

(2) funds appropriated under this Act will not be used to reduce the amount of State or local funds, or both, being spent for vocational education programs operated under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and reported to the Commissioner, but such State or local funds, or both, in excess of the amount necessary for dollar for dollar matching of funds allotted to a State under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I, II, and III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 may be used to match funds appropriated under this Act;

(3) funds appropriated under this Act shall be used by the State for the retraining of unemployed persons certified as eligible for retraining in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 7; and

(4) no funds appropriated under the authority of this Act shall be expended in industrial-plant-training programs, unless such programs constitute bona fide vocational retraining and are not used as a device for the utilization of the services of vocational retrainees for private profit.

(b) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State for vocational retraining programs under this Act for such period; and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this subsection) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period for such purpose under this Act was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this Act for such purpose. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

ELIGIBILITY FOR RETRAINING

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Labor shall establish criteria for determining the eligibility of unemployed workers for vocational retraining under State programs established pursuant to this Act. Such criteria shall limit eligibility to individuals who, on the date of application for such retraining, are (1) unemployed or underemployed, because of change in the structure of the economy, (2) cannot reasonably be expected to secure

full-time employment without retraining, and (3) can, upon completion of retraining, reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in work relating to such retraining. Such criteria shall provide priority for otherwise eligible individuals who are thirty or more years of age, otherwise eligible individuals who are heads of families, and otherwise eligible individuals who have had not less than five years experience in gainful employment.

USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 8. (a) Funds paid to a State under this Act may be used, in carrying out programs of vocational retraining under the vocational education plan of the State, as amended pursuant to section 5, for—

(1) conducting retraining courses; paying salaries and travel expenses of State and local school personnel (including teachers, supervisors, and administrators); purchase, rental, maintenance, and installation of instructional equipment; and purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids;

(2) payments in lieu of unemployment compensation to individuals who are undergoing retraining under the State vocational education program assisted under this Act and who have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation benefits under provisions of State and Federal law; except that (A) no such payments shall be made to any individual for a period in excess of fifty-two weeks, and (B) no such payment shall be made to any individual who fails to apply for retraining under such State vocational education program prior to the expiration of ten weeks after the date he last became entitled to such unemployment compensation benefits, or the date retraining (upon the making of timely application therefor) first became available to him in the State of his residence, whichever is the later; and

(3) transportation and necessary subsistence expenses for workers engaged in retraining under this Act when such retraining is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of their regular places of residence.

(b) Funds paid to a State under this Act shall not be used to defray any portion of the cost of the purchase, preservation, erection, repair, or rental, of any building, or the purchase or rental of any land.

(c) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased by a State with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act shall become the property of the State.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

SEC. 9. Effective on and after July 1, 1963, no funds appropriated under this Act shall be paid to any State the law of which disqualifies individuals otherwise entitled to unemployment compensation benefits under State law from receiving such benefits while undergoing retraining under State programs of vocational education assisted under this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. For purposes of this Act—

(a) the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

(b) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education; and

(c) the term "long-term unemployed" means persons who have been unemployed continuously for a period of fifteen or more weeks and have, during such period, registered with the employment service of the State in which they reside as available for, and seeking, employment.

(d) the term "State board of vocational education" refers to a State board created or designated by a State pursuant to the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act; and

(e) the term "Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act" means the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TRAVEL ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 610.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "is authorized and directed to" and insert "shall"; on page 3, line 11, after the word "businesses", to strike out "and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including" and insert "private organizations, and"; in line 14, after the word "agencies", to insert "engaged in or concerned with international travel;"; at the beginning of line 19, to insert "travel,"; on page 4, line 10, after the word "Commerce", to strike out "an Office of International Travel" and insert "a United States Travel Service"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "the Office" and insert "the Travel Service"; in line 13, after "(b)", to strike out "The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $17,500 per annum." and insert "The Travel Service shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel (hereinafter referred to as the "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall be in addition to the other Assistant Secretaries provided by law for the Department of Commerce."; in line 24, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "The Director shall have authority to appoint and fix the compensation of such subordinate personnel as he deems to be required in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."; on page 5, line 4, after "(c)", to strike out "The Director" and insert "In the absence of the Secretary the Assistant Secretary"; in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "twelve" and insert "twenty"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "six" and insert "ten"; on page 6, line 1, after "(d)", to strike out "Seven" and insert "Twelve"; after line 2, to strike out:

(c) The Board shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems to be required in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

At the beginning of line 7, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)"; after line 13, to strike out:

(g) Service of any individual as a member of the Board shall not constitute service or employment of such individual within the purview of sections 281, 283, 284, and 434 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99); however, such individual shall be subject to the aforesaid provisions for the purpose of prohibiting them from acting as an agent, attorney, officer, or otherwise, contrary to the interest of the United States, and such individuals shall be subject also to the aforesaid provisions so as to preclude them from receiving certain compensation as indicated in the aforesaid provisions.

After line 24, to insert:

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board or as an expert or consultant under section 2(b)(3) of this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, or of section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service.

On page 7, line 15, after the word "the" to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "Office," and insert "Travel Service"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; in line 23, after the word "the", to strike out "Office" and insert "Travel Service"; on page 8, line 1, after the word "the", to strike out "Director" and insert "Assistant Secretary"; after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 408, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after such subsection a new subsection as follows:

"(s) For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.".

At the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "6" to "7", and after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "International Travel Act of 1961".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce, improve the foreign payments position of the United States, and promote international understanding and appreciation of the United States of America by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program, utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication, designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by the residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities conducive to better international understanding of the people and institutions of the United States;

(2) encourage the strengthening of tourist facilities, programs, and other arrangements within the United States for assuring a friendly welcome and meeting the special requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) coordinate all travel facilitation activities of the United States Government, and actively encourage progressive elimination, reduction, or simplification of barriers to travel;

(4) assist in the implementation of foreign technical assistance and economic development projects in the travel industry field; and

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information relating to international travel and tourism.

(b) In performing the duties set forth in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) utilize the facilities of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible;

(2) consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, private organizations, and local, State, Federal, foreign government, and international agencies engaged in or concerned with international travel;

(3) obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified and experienced professional agencies, consultants, and specialists in the field of travel, advertising, public information, and mass communication;

(4) establish such travel offices in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable;

(5) refrain from conducting any activity or furnishing any service which might result in adverse economic competition to persons engaged in the business of providing transportation, accommodations, or other facilities to persons traveling between the United States and foreign countries.

(c) The Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a United States Travel Service (hereinafter referred to as "the Travel Service").

(b) The Travel Service shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel (hereinafter referred to as the "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall be in addition to the other Assistant Secretaries provided by law for the Department of Commerce. All duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in section 2 of this Act shall be exercised through the Assistant Secretary.

(c) In the absence of the Secretary the Assistant Secretary shall represent the Secretary on any interagency committee, board, or other organization established within the executive branch to deal with travel matters.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Travel Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") which shall be composed of twenty members who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall serve for such terms as may be designated by the Secretary. Such members shall not be officers or employees of the Federal Government and shall be individuals who, by reason of interest, training, or experience, are qualified to carry out the duties provided for in section 5 of this Act. At least ten of the members of the Board shall be representatives of the travel and related industries.

(b) The Board shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Twelve members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Each member of the Board shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of his duties; and, while away from his home or regular place of business and engaged in the actual performance of his duties, he shall also receive travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board or as an expert or consultant under section 2(b)(3) of this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, or of section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service.

SEC. 5 The Board shall—

(1) advise and consult with the Assistant Secretary with respect to the activities of the Travel Service and from time to time shall submit to the Assistant Secretary recommendations for programs and policies to be adopted; and

(2) submit to the Secretary and the Congress from time to time, but not less than once a year, reports containing appraisals of the effectiveness of the programs and activities being carried on by the Travel Service and setting forth recommendations the Board has made to the Assistant Secretary and such other matters as it may consider pertinent.

SEC. 6. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 408, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after such subsection a new subsection as follows:

"(s) For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.".

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "International Travel Act of 1961".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this measure provides for a major new effort to attract foreign visitors to the United States, as called for by President Kennedy in his messages to Congress on the state of the Union and the balance-of-payments problem. The bill is identical in most respects to S. 3102, of last year, which was introduced by me, and was passed without objection by the Senate, in June, but died in the House in the closing days of last session. It has enjoyed the support of both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, the support of all segments of the travel industry, and of business, banking, farm, and labor leaders. I am unaware of any serious opposition to this measure.

As set forth on page 3 of the report on Senate bill 610, favorable testimony on it was received, at the committee hearings on February 2 and 3, from a number of outstanding persons, including the Secretary of Commerce, several Members of the Senate, and representatives of outstanding business organizations, publications, and transportation companies. The support of the bill by all those persons, including many of the Members of the Senate who have joined in the sponsorship of the bill, testifies to the widespread support this measure has received. They testified wholeheartedly in favor of it.

As a matter of fact, as will be seen from reading page 4 of the report, after the hearings—and there was much publicity in regard to the fact that the hearings would be held—we received only one statement unfavorable to the bill; it came from the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies.

On many occasions it has been pointed out that today the United States is almost the only nation in the world which has no active travel promotion and tourist hospitality program. As a result, we are losing more and more dollars to travel-conscious foreign countries—money which is not made up by tourist spending here. Our travel deficit is growing at the rate of $150 million every year. In 1960 it reached nearly $1,200 million, or the equivalent of about one-third of our entire balance-of-payments deficit, which this year will, according to a study made by my committee, amount to approximately $3,500 million. This deficit accounts for approximately 30 or 40 percent of our entire balance-of-payments deficit, and, of course, accounts, in turn, for our serious problem in respect to the withdrawal of gold from our country.

The pending bill will go a long way, we hope, toward correcting this unhappy state of affairs, by establishing a U.S. Travel Service, headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. The Assistant Secretary would be directed to carry out a national travel program built around these three points:

First. A comprehensive promotional and information campaign overseas directed toward encouraging tourists to visit America's scenic attractions, cities, and national shrines, and toward dispelling the exaggerated but common notion of many foreign residents on the high costs of traveling in the United States—which, of course, is not a correct notion. Such a campaign would include the use of paid advertising and the setting up of Government travel offices in selected foreign countries.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that our country spends very large sums of money to encourage the bringing of students to this country, to study in our institutions and to see and become acquainted with our kind of life?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. That program is not as large as I should like it to be; but we have a student exchange program of modest size, and I believe it has done more good in creating the good will which exists for our country than has anything else we have done.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington about the great value of the student exchange program, which I—along with the Senator from Washington and other Senators—have always strongly supported.

I wish to ask the Senator from Washington if it is true that it is just as desirable, and probably would be just as useful, to assist in encouraging travel in the United States by foreigners, whether adults or children, who wish to travel in our country and enjoy the various parts of the United States in which they may be interested?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, indeed. Certainly the great, intangible value of this program is to be found in what we call person-to-person contacts. Whenever we travel abroad, we find widespread interest in visiting the United States. Americans are very much interested in traveling in other countries; for instance, the Senator from Florida may wish to visit Italy; I may wish to visit Spain; others may wish to visit Japan. American tourists spend, annually, $2 billion or $2½ billion on foreign travel, and that is why the gap to which I have referred is so glaring.

As I have said, almost all the people of other countries wish to visit the United States. Therefore, this program would be a "sell America program," right at the grassroots.

I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Florida has said; and this program should have been instituted 2 years ago, when I first supported it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I represent a State which enjoys a great amount of travel by citizens from other States; the same is true of the great State of Washington.

Last year more than 9 million Americans from other parts of the country visited Florida. In addition to the money they spend when they visit our State, we value their visits because they result in much greater knowledge of the industries and products of Florida; and we believe that as a result we benefit by means of increased sale of Florida products.

Does not the Senator from Washington think there would be a similar result from increased visits to the United States by foreigners, in addition to the money they would spend within our borders?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course. In fact, I am sure the Senator from Florida realizes—because the tourist trade is probably as important to Florida as any other activity there—that every dollar spent by tourists creates more actual employment than a dollar spent in connection with any other form of economic activity. Certainly I have discovered that is true. That results from the fact that so many personal services in restaurants and elsewhere are involved in taking care of travelers. We need to think more about that aspect of the situation. That is why our travel deficit, in 1960, of nearly $1,200 million is so important.

Our country spends less on encouraging travel by foreigners—and I have checked on these figures—than does the Belgian Congo or the Isle of Cyprus. We have had a small office for this purpose in the Department of Commerce, but it has had very little money to spend. We have not engaged in any advertising campaign at all. On the other hand, one has only to pick up a copy of almost any American magazine in order to find beautiful advertisements by other countries which welcome visits by Americans. But the United States has no similar program.

The pending bill calls for the making of a beginning, by means of a modest appropriation of $5 million. I believe that the Senator from Florida and other Senators discussed this aspect of the matter, last year. Most other countries have a rule of thumb which they use in connection with expenditures to encourage travel by foreigners; they spend for that purpose from 5 percent to 10 percent of the expenditures for travel within their borders by foreigners.

The pending bill calls for far less than that, but it would be a beginning. We also wish to advertise our country, in a sense, because of another erroneous impression that foreigners have. They know about the New York skyline and our large industries and factories, about which we like to brag; but very few of them know that we also have beautiful parks, marvelous roads, a great culture, the best theater in the world, outstanding education, and outstanding music. I venture to assert that more concerts are given at any given time during the summer in the United States than in all the countries in Europe combined. That is because of the fact that our country is so very large.

These are matters about which the people like to know. I suppose some persons would like to see cowboys and Indians, too, and some will want to try Florida fishing. We do not make any attempt to attract such tourist. Such touring would not only help reduce the large gap in the balance of payments, but think of the value of people coming to this country. We have told them about our country; now we say, "Come and see it." All of the travel agents have joined in this effort. If the tourists could use small cars, with lower prices, travel in this country would be just as cheap as travel in Europe if not cheaper. I point out that the motels would receive many benefits from that kind of travel. We cannot help but be understood better if people from foreign countries travel in our country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot begin to say with sufficient vigor how strongly I support the Senator in this action. In my own State the counties and the progressive communities advertise in greater or less degree to attract tourists. As a result, we have, as has already been stated, about 9 million tourists a year. The State chamber of commerce, in evaluating the worth of that great group of visitors to our State, has placed a dollar-and-cents value on it of between $1½ and $2 billion.

The Senator has ably pointed out the manifold beauties in all 50 of the States and I wish we had him to speak for us in the older communities of the world, because undoubtedly he would attract many, many people to this country by the colorful way in which he would describe the beauty of our country. I would be greatly disappointed if it would not result in a value as great as the value of our tourist trade in Florida, which itself is more than enough to offset the unfavorable balance of payments which the Senator from Washington has just mentioned. I find as many beautiful places and as many intriguing sights that many of us like to see in almost every other State I have visited as I find in my own. Surely, by uniting in a movement of the kind proposed not only can we make hundreds of thousands and millions of friends that we do not have now, but we can, as the Senator has so ably pointed out, by one stroke offset the large factor in our unfavorable balance of payments.

I congratulate the Senator, and I will help him in every way I can.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. I should like to add one matter. I have discussed the subject with President Kennedy. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] also discussed this matter with me. Some of the aspects of the bill must be done by law; other aspects can be accomplished by Executive order. The purpose is to eliminate some of the redtape—I do not know what else it can be called except redtape—and make it easier for bona fide tourists to visit the United States. I have stated before that it is harder for tourists to get into the United States than it is to break into jail.

If one wants to travel to the United States, he must go to some functionary in an embassy, and then he receives a long form. I wish I had a form with me to put into the RECORD. The distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], knows about this. Some of the questions that are asked are so embarrassing that one does not know whether he wants to come to the United States after all. If the person is an unmarried woman, the first question she is asked is, "Are you coming to the United States for immoral purposes?" They ask you, "Have you got a return ticket?" "Have you a good friend"—like the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], for example, who is present on the floor—"who is going to support you while you are in the United States, if you are fortunate enough to know him?" [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me complete my statement first. That person is required to know someone in the United States who can take care of him, if necessary.

Most of our immigration laws were based on the idea of protection, so that people would not come to this country in droves and take away jobs from Americans. The whole attitude has been that that is what would happen with regard to persons coming into the United States.

We have not made any attempt to make it easier for bona fide tourists to come to the United States, just as Americans visit foreign countries. It is something the executive department can do something about, and I know it will.

I envision the day when the Immigration Service, the Customs Bureau, the State Department, and the Commerce Department, under the new Assistant Secretary, will sit down and say, "Let us see if we cannot simplify it and make it easier, so that someone who wants to tour the United States can feel that he is welcome."

Frances Knight, in the passport department, has done an excellent job in the last 18 months, since this effort was started, in trying to simplify the procedure. There could be established pilot branch offices in Paris, Rome, London, Tokyo, New Delhi, Sydney, Rio, and other cities in South America, and so forth. Those would be places where persons who wanted to tour the United States could get the necessary information on making a tour to this country.

The day may come, although it may be a little difficult for me to realize at this time, when all a tourist will need will be a white or blue card in order to visit our country, converse with us, communicate with us, and see the many things we have.

Other countries do this, and rightly so. I suppose if one stopped long enough in front of the window of the Italian Tourist Bureau on Fifth Avenue in New York City, he would soon go inside and find he was on his way to Italy, merely as a result of looking at the window.

We have no such establishments. I have no criticism of the State Department or the consuls as individuals, because that is the practice that has grown up under the law. The average person who wants to travel does not understand as much as the businessman or world traveler does about such matters. He is scared to death when he gets into an embassy and obtains the form. He practically gives up. It takes weeks to get anywhere.

I think we can do something about the situation.

In the field of advertising, when England wants travelers to come to the British festival, for example, or France wants visitors to visit its country, or Italy wants visitors to visit that country, they do some good, solid advertising to the Americans in English.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I certainly support what the Senator says. I ask the Senator if it is not true that with respect to the countries overseas, within the United States a number of individual States do a lot better job of inviting tourists into those States than the United States does?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course they do. I think pretty nearly every State in the Union does a little of this, and much more than the Federal Government has done, or could do, overseas.

Mr. BUSH. And the States have demonstrated by their promotional campaigns that within the United States the campaigns are effective.

I certainly congratulate the Senator for what he is saying and for the bill he is pressing upon the Senate, because I believe we have been very cold about this situation.

As I have traveled about the world I have observed the absence of any invitational organization of any kind with respect to having people visit the United States. When one walks along one of the main streets in the capital of a foreign country one finds a travel bureau of Italy, a travel bureau of Britain, a travel bureau of Switzerland, or of some other country, but never a travel bureau of the United States.

I think it is high time that we got down to business, as the bill will permit us to do. We should organize a welcome and invitation to people to visit the United States. Not only is this the proper thing to do in this time of tension, to make it possible for more people to better understand us, but also as the Secretary of the Treasury says in his report, it is important in connection with the balance-of-payments problem.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield to the Senator in a few minutes. I should like to finish my remarks. This will only require a few minutes.

Mr. President, the bill also provides for:

Second. Cooperation with private industry for improving tourist facilities within the United States, and for meeting the special requirements of foreign guests.

A Travel Advisory Board, which will represent transportation and tourist interests, for all the people involved, is to be created to assist in this effort.

Third. A coordinated attempt by all Government agencies concerned to ease barriers to travel and to assure that prompt and courteous treatment is given to persons seeking to visit this country.

This bill authorizes an initial appropriation of $5 million for this program. This is at least $3 million less than what foreign governments spend here to promote travel abroad by Americans. It is considerably less, per capita, than the amounts allotted every year by all but two of our own States to promote travel within the United States.

President Kennedy has asked the Departments of Commerce, State, and Treasury to report by April 1 on details for conducting the program authorized in this measure. I urge immediate passage by the Senate in order to permit enactment of S. 610 prior to that date.

I am much pleased that the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and so many members of my committee, have jointly sponsored the bill. We are moving the bill along as speedily as we can.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the White House in regard to the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1961.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will recall that in my message to the Congress on the state of the Union I stressed the importance of action to ease the balance of payments deficit, including measures to attract foreign travel to this country. I, therefore, appreciate your prompt introduction and consideration of the bill (S. 610) which will help greatly in achieving this objective.

As the program outlined in S. 610 will open up a long-neglected channel for improving international understanding of the United States, as well as help our payments problem, the proposed U.S. Travel Service should be allowed to attract personnel of superior caliber. For this reason, it is my thought that the Director's salary and status might well be elevated from the relatively low level now indicated in the bill to the rank of an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in regard to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS REGARDING S. 610

Adoption of S. 610, which would establish a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, is the culmination of many years of legislative effort. My own long period of work on the new means for greatly increasing tourist travel to the United States dates back to the 83d Congress when I conducted the first hearing on this effort as chairman of the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and subsequently brought in a bill. It was also evident by my amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1957 which resulted in the selection of the Honorable Clarence Randall by President Eisenhower to make a special study and to bring in recommendations for increasing foreign tourist travel. His report led to legislation which I introduced in the 85th Congress to effectuate the recommendations of his Commission. Subsequently, I have worked on this effort with the chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senator MAGNUSON, who took a great interest in this matter and has made a great contribution to the Nation in respect of our contemplated action today.

In the last Congress, Senator MAGNUSON and I cosponsored S. 3102 which contained the same provisions as the present bill and which was adopted by the Senate but failed of action in the House.

The encouragement of foreign tourism is also of critical importance to my own State of New York. New York is a tremendous attraction for foreign tourists—600,000 visitors from abroad come to New York City

every year and those who remain there spend on an average of $300 each during their stay.

We are the only major free world power that makes no special effort to develop tourism as a matter of national policy, and one of the consequences of this failure is the ever-widening gap between what American tourists spend abroad and the relatively modest expenditures of foreign visitors here. Currently that deficit, or gap, is close to $1.2 billion a year, and that is the largest single element in our overall balance of payments deficit—our major international economic problem right now.

The potential tourist flow from overseas to our shores could result in a substantial and favorable impact on our economy. The bill provides for a program costing about $5 million annually, which is just about half of the sum expended by foreign nations in the United States through U.S. agencies and offices to exploit their tourist attractions. It would include the establishment of tourist centers abroad in selected countries and expenditures for advertising—but would not do any business done by U.S. private travel or tourist agencies. There is a tremendous need for brochures, pamphlets, and other promotional materials of all kinds on U.S. travel for distribution in foreign countries. Very little is available today to the foreign traveler who wants to visit the United States.

Moreover, we do very little to make it easy for the foreign travelers to take a short vacation in the United States. We still require them to obtain a visa, often causing several weeks delay, and with much trouble filling forms, producing letters and documents, and so on. On the other hand, most Western European countries waive the visa requirement for visitors.

Except in a few European capitals, however, redtape, extra expense, and aggravating requirements more often discourage the prospective visitor from even trying to get here. Some progress has been made in waiving fingerprinting and other requirements, but much more streamlining remains to be done if we are to make tourism as attractive as possible.

We have been very tardy in our efforts to arouse the interest of the foreign tourist in visiting the United States. We can transform the appeal of the United States for the tourist into active participation with consequent benefits to our economy as well as to the dissemination of our ideals by making the practical effort now even in the minimal terms represented by this bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the discussions on S. 610 a statement by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] enthusiastically supports this measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GALE W. McGEE ON SENATE BILL 610

As one of its cosponsors I am happy to express my enthusiastic support for S. 610 which our colleague, Senator KEATING, has aptly described as the "sell America bill." I should also like to compliment our chairman, Senator MAGNUSON, who is the principal author of this legislation, for his leadership in bringing it out of committee and to a vote without unnecessary delay. Virtually this same bill was passed without opposition by the Senate last June, but because there was not enough time remaining for adequate consideration by the House we lost 1 valuable year in getting a travel program underway. This must not be allowed to happen again.

My only misgiving is that inspiration for this measure had to await the advent of a major balance of payments crisis—and that so much of the justification given for S. 610 is still clothed in terms of "closing the travel gap." I would contend that America's real investment in foreign visitors is not something we can measure by import and export statistics, or by the state of accounts at Fort Knox. I would support this legislation just as strongly if the U.S. international fiscal position were the reverse of what it is today.

My own State of Wyoming—which has no balance of payments—has appreciated the real value of tourist promotion for years. Today we spend nearly $400,000 annually for this purpose, about 16 times as much per capita as the extremely modest amount which this bill authorizes for a national program. We do this, not just because it is good business and helps to bring millions of dollars of new money into our State each year. We do it because it is the best way we know of making friends for Wyoming. Every person who visits our State, whether he stops at Yellowstone, the Tetons and our other more spectacular scenic attractions, or just drives through the awe-inspiring desolation of our mountains and prairies, takes away with him a finer and fuller appreciation of the kind of people we are, an understanding never achieved in a whole lifetime of seeing cowboy movies or reading western novels. In other words, Wyoming—and every other State for that matter—has based its public relations program upon the benefits of first-hand acquaintance.

Our national public relations policy, however, has been built almost entirely around second-hand representations of America and Americans. The Federal Government spends over $100 million every year on the Voice of America and on USIA films, pictorial displays, libraries, and so forth. Our only attention to presenting the United States at firsthand has been through the relatively costly vehicle of Government-sponsored exchange-of-persons programs. The passage of S. 610 will finally mark our recognition that travel promotion on the national level is the most direct, economical and efficient way of winning friends for America.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I should like to make it clear, or have the distinguished Senator from Washington make it clear, that an affidavit of support from the Senator from Nevada is not required as a condition precedent in respect to passage of this bill. I am sure the Senator will agree.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I intended to say that it is necessary for a tourist to have someone who will be responsible for him in this country. That perhaps would take weeks. Sometimes it is felt necessary to have a Dun & Bradstreet report, or something else. This frightens people, including those who have mothers or fathers or other relatives who have been in the "old country," who may wish to come to the United States to see their children before they pass on.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The distinguished Senator from Washington has made some very, very important points. I represent in part a State in which the percentage of business relating to this one industry is higher than the percentage relating to any other industry. We have learned from experience in our State that advertising what we have, to display to people who may be interested in coming to see us, is a most important key to getting visitors to come to the State.

Over and above the advertising itself, visits by people who come to see our State result in a much better understanding between those people and the people in our State.

As a result of having people come to see our country, we may well develop a much closer relationship, a much more friendly feeling, and a better understanding between the peoples of foreign countries and the people of our own country.

I know from personal experience, as well as from observations in the Senate, that when distinguished Members of this body visit abroad in foreign countries, remaining there perhaps 2 or 3 days—and, as some say, thus becoming experts—after they return they make speeches before the Senate about the things they have learned, some of which they did not know existed. As a result there is a better relationship. People learn to become better acquainted, and they enjoy better relationships with each other as a result of visits to different countries, even though the visits are brief.

I am sure this is a very important point we shall be able to develop once the bill is passed and becomes a law.

A third item is that I think this is extremely important in connection with the flow of gold, which the Senator from Washington so eloquently covered. This is a very important method which can be used to reverse the so-called flow of gold, about which we are so much concerned.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington. I support the bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank my friend from Nevada.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill I wish to join my colleague in stressing the importance of favorable consideration of this bill.

In my mind this proposed legislation is an important step in the right direction not only to promote tourism in the United States for its economic value but also to promote the many wonderful things this country as the leader of the free world has to offer.

There is no better way to get to know your neighbor than to visit his house, and some of the misconceptions of the American way of life can best be clarified by visits of our neighbors from across the sea.

As Mr. Raymond Hering of the American Society of Travel Agents pointed out at the time of his appearance before our committee "increased international travel leads to international understanding."

I believe that subsection 3 of section 2 is one of the most important provisions of this legislation. That provision directs the Secretary of Commerce to "actively encourage progressive elimination, reduction or simplification of bar-

riers to travel." As I pointed out in the course of the hearings one of the great barriers a citizen of another country meets is the restrictive regulations and redtape when applying for a visa. Although Executive order can correct this impediment to increased travel within the United States, I feel the above section will do much to create a favorable atmosphere.

The State of Pennsylvania has much to offer to the foreign tourist.

Historic sites so closely associated with the birth of our Nation; a battlefield which is significant in the growth of our Nation and industrial areas which represent the strength of our Nation. All of these along with the many wonders which the other 49 States have to offer cannot fail to bring out the real beauty and greatness of our country.

Economically increased foreign travel will benefit many if not all segments of our business community.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I give my complete support to this legislation.

Mr. President, all of us who have been abroad have had the experience of speaking to people who have said, "I should like to visit the United States if it were not so much trouble."

The purpose of the bill is to reduce the feeling which our friends in foreign countries have that they are surrounded by difficulties, to make it as easy to travel to the United States as it is to travel from one part of Western Europe to another, as well as to recognize the shrunken size of the world, the lowered cost of travel as compared to travel of a similar distance over the years, and the decrease in the time involved.

We wish to bring to all the peoples of the world not only an understanding of the United States but also a realization that we do indeed share common problems.

This will have, of course, economic advantages as well. I commend the purposes of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, some committee members, including the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Texas are present in the Chamber. I am happy to say that the committee is in almost unanimous agreement on the bill.

We have discussed this subject on many occasions, and I am sure that those who operate the airlines, the railroads, the bus lines, the hotels, and the motels in instances where people travel by car, will voluntarily work out procedures so that one may travel in the United States as cheaply as anywhere else in the world.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with great pleasure I support the passage of this forward-looking measure, whose principal sponsor is the distinguished Senator from Washington. We all owe him a great deal for his leadership in this field.

This bill surely provides the most agreeable way of attacking our balance-of-payments problem and easing our gold drain. Last year the United States had an unfavorable balance of trade on tourist expenses with other countries of over $1 billion. Certainly we do not wish to curb the tourism of our own citizens, if at all possible. How much better it is to encourage our friends abroad to visit us and enjoy our great natural beauties and the excitement of our cities.

I recently talked with some Australian students. Despite the great areas of their country and the relatively wide expanses of open space in comparison with ours, they paid tribute to the national park system of the United States as the greatest thing they had seen in their travels around the world, to give relief and relaxation to our own people and to encourage tourists. They said they were going to return to Australia and encourage the people of Australia to create something like our national park system out of their remaining natural beauties.

So the people of other countries can come here and enjoy not only the greatness of our cities, but also the great natural beauties and wonders that have no counterpart in the limited-space areas in the entire world.

The bill contemplates setting up an office in the Department of Commerce which would provide leadership and inspiration in increasing the flow of tourists to this country both through encouraging efforts in this direction by the other branches of the Government, and by telling the facts about the pleasures and benefits of American travel to those abroad who are interested. For example, one notion widely heard abroad is that travel in the United States is very much more expensive than in other areas of the world. On the contrary, competent studies have shown that there is no great disproportion between travel costs in this country and those abroad, hence more tourists should investigate the facts and come to America.

They need encouragement to investigate these facts. We can hardly expect them to investigate them if we discourage the investigation.

We may find it hard to believe that there are those who have not heard of the great scenic areas and natural wonders to be found in America or the great cultural and artistic activities which take place here, but it is evident that further advertisement of these attractions abroad will result in an increased tourist flow in this country.

In that regard I am reminded of a statement I recently heard made by a young man who had been to Washington and then went on military duty overseas to Europe. When he returned he said he was enchanted by the beauty of Washington that he had never seen before. He said he had never been enchanted with its beauty prior to his foreign service. He said it was amazing to him to look at the most beautiful city he had ever seen and to realize that our people had built all this in less than 200 years, when Rome and Paris had been been in process of being built for more than 2,000 years. Nevertheless, he thought Washington was the most beautiful city of them all. That is an example of the benefit of having our people travel.

Furthermore, Mr. President, one way to stop the gold flow is by encouraging foreign people to come here to see the beauties of our country. Many people in the Old World think of us as a country of frontiers and of skyscrapers, and they think that we build skyscrapers like shoeboxes, to serve only commercial interests. We want them to see what this country really looks like.

Aside from the encouragement of tourist travel, the new Office of International Travel could do much toward providing leadership and coordination within the executive branch to reduce policies which in the past have sometimes discouraged tourists from coming to this country.

On that point, the distinguished Senator from Washington, in his presentation of the bill, alluded to the procedure involved in the issuance of visas and the long questionnaires which the procedure involves. All of that discourages people from coming here. I recall one instance of an around-the-world cruise ship which touched at Miami as one port of call on its visits to many cities around the world. Of the 400 passengers on that around-the-world cruising ship, only 2 passengers got off the ship when it touched Miami, because of the great difficulty involved in getting an American visa.

Our procedure for issuing visas is surely one of the most difficult and cumbersome in the world for a potential tourist to surmount. Our committee in the hearings on this bill heard testimony that in some cases the operations of our representatives abroad discouraged potential tourists from visiting our country because the difficulty of obtaining the visa would not be worth the trouble to them.

Travel agencies in foreign countries discourage tourists from coming to the United States because it is necessary for these potential tourists to wait too long to get visas. The travel agents tell people overseas, "We cannot book you if you are going to include America in your tour, because of the difficulty of getting a visa."

It is to be hoped that the new Office will take the lead in eradicating this type of thinking abroad and return our posture to our traditional one of encouraging all to come and visit our great democratic Republic. How much better it is than spending millions on telling our story overseas, to encourage those people to come to America and see for themselves what a free society is like.

The authors and sponsors of this measure can take great pride in this work and I am sure that it will again be passed by the Senate by a vote of confidence such as it received last year.

I hope that the House of Representatives will concur in the action of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I must confess that I was shocked to learn of the disproportionate difference between what American tourists spend abroad and what foreign visitors spend in this country. Last year the difference amounted to over $1 billion and accounted for a considerable part of the imbalance of payments which currently afflicts the American economy.

One effective and even obvious way to eliminate this difference is to encourage more foreign travelers to come to the United States through a systematic program directed by that Federal agency concerned with the problem—the Department of Commerce.

With that solution in mind, I join with the distinguished and knowledgeable Senator from Washington in asking that the Senate support S. 610.

As I understand its provisions, the bill will concentrate its promotion program on Europe with the Middle East and the Far East close behind. At present approximately 70 percent of the foreign travel expenditures in the United States is accounted for by visitors from Canada and Mexico. The rapid and dramatic recovery of the European nations, with generous assistance on our part, makes them excellent prospects for trips to the United States if they are encouraged and attracted properly.

Furthermore, the great majority of the visitors to this country are not tourists in the ordinary sense, but businessmen, government officials, exchange students, and so forth. We must draw the true tourists to the United States, which is fortunately blessed with nearly every natural and manmade splendor the world knows.

Many of them, I must add with justifiable pride, are contained within the borders of Maryland, often described as America in miniature. In western Maryland, there is a mountaintop playground with facilities for hunting, skiing, camping, golfing, fishing, and swimming.

In that same region can be found historic Fort Frederick, built during the French and Indian War and the Antietam battlefield, scene of the Civil War's bloodiest battle.

On the outskirts of the city of Baltimore is Fort McHenry, the birthplace of the Star Spangled Banner and within the city such famous institutions as Johns Hopkins University and the Peabody Institute of Music.

On the Eastern Shore are some of the finest duck blinds in the Nation as well as hundreds of miles of stream and rivers for fishing. Colonial homes centuries old dot the landscape of the shore and its mode of living charms every visitor, particularly those who have wearied of the hurly-burly of our modern metropolises.

And of course on the Atlantic shore at Ocean City there are beaches, sand, and sun for bathers and beachcombers alike.

Mr. President, Maryland is indeed America in miniature.

I anticipate that this bill would bring about an increase in the number of visitors to Maryland and a corresponding rise in profits for the State's parks, monuments, and related businesses.

Evidence that the travel gap is rapidly widening makes action imperative. For example, in 1949, American tourists spent $805 million abroad while foreign visitors to this country were spending $445 million. In 1959 the figures were $2 billion and $970 million. If the present pattern were maintained, the United States would accumulate a foreign travel deficit of over $20 billion during the next decade. This must not be allowed to happen.

I believe that with proper implementation and administration, the bill with its proposed Office of International Travel will help to close the travel gap. That gap, Mr. President, will not close itself. But it can be significantly narrowed by a comprehensive program utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication to encourage people of other lands to learn what we already know—that the United States is a wonderful place to live, play, and do business in.

President Eisenhower last year, and President Kennedy this year, have indicated their approval of such a program, which is, after all, a comparatively simple one of selling a most attractive product—the United States. I hope that the Congress will approve this bill before the end of the current session.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues to urge enactment of the pending bill creating a U.S. Travel Service. It is my privilege to be a cosponsor of S. 610 along with the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and many other of my Senate colleagues who believe as I do in the solid merit and attainable purpose of this bill.

S. 610 has as its central purpose the closing of the existing tourist gap, which is now amounting to $1.2 billion. This sum now represents nearly one-third of our balance of payments deficit.

Of all the gaps we have discussed, the tourist gap is the most readily identifiable, the most commonly agreed upon, and the easiest to close.

In this single measure, the Senate of the United States has a unique opportunity to serve the American people simultaneously in several salutary respects: by providing a positive means to create more jobs for American workers, by helping to remedy the present adverse differential in American tourist dollars spent abroad and foreign tourist dollars spent here, and by building good will for America among other peoples of the world.

By attracting more travelers from abroad to partake of our Nation's scenic and manmade wonders, of our diverse climate and geography, and of our summer and winter playgrounds, America will receive a much-needed injection of tourist dollars into our economy.

Tourist dollars work hard in a community, for they represent new money—not just existing dollars changing hands—but new money which will find its way quickly into pay envelopes and ultimately into Government coffers.

Dollars spent by more and more foreign tourists here would increase the demand for American goods and services and would create more and more jobs for Americans. Transportation facilities, tourist agencies, hostelries, restaurants, places of entertainment, and recreation—these and many more related industries would benefit.

For the nominal sum of $5 million, the U.S. Travel Service provided in S. 610 would, through offices overseas, promote America as a tourist mecca. Compared with an annual 2 billion tourist-dollar potential market that exists, according to testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, the $5 million authorized by S. 610 for the first year is minimal.

In these days when the Federal budget is in such precarious balance, Members of Congress very understandably may hesitate to establish a new Federal agency, fearing it may only consume an ever-increasing number of tax dollars. The travel agency provided under this bill, however, will create revenue—not only for American workers and business but also for the U.S. Treasury.

As stated in the Commerce Committee report:

> A conservative estimate is that 1 out of every 10 tourist dollars spent finds its way into the Public Treasury.

There is indeed every evidence that tourist promotion generally earns much more than its costs. We demonstrate this every year in my own State of Hawaii, where we have had considerable experience with tourism.

At the outset, our tourist agency, Hawaii Visitors Bureau, received an appropriation of about $500,000 for every 2 years. This was later increased to $1 million, with half a million dollars additional provided by private sources. Currently, the biennial expenditure on the tourist business is $1½ million—$1 million appropriated by the State legislature and the other one-half million dollars from private sources.

And what a return we get on that investment.

In 1960, Hawaii was host to 296,517 overnight and longer visitors—this was an increase of 21.9 percent over 1959.

These visitors spent $131 million in Hawaii, an increase of 20.2 percent over 1959.

In Hawaii, tourism is our No. 2 private industry, exceeding pineapple and surpassed only by sugar. Tourism is not only big business in Hawaii, it is good business as well. But it could be much better if America would only make a determined, organized, worldwide effort to attract foreign visitors.

Today there are 29 States, including Hawaii, that rank tourism as one of their three most important industries. These and the remaining 21 States all would unquestionably benefit by an influx of foreign visitors into America.

Whereas 15 years ago, most foreigners did not have the wherewithal to travel, today millions of people in foreign lands have the leisure, the means, and the desire to travel. Other nations have been quick to tap this market and have well-established government travel promotion bureaus luring visitors to their borders.

On page 94 of the Senate Commerce Committee hearings on S. 610 is a table showing Great Britain spends $2.8 million to attract foreign visitors; France, $2.6 million; India, $2.5 million; and the Bahamas, $1.3 million. It may come as a surprise to some to learn that the Philippine Islands spends $400,000, Haiti, $200,000, and Puerto Rico, $3.5 million—

compared with the U.S. figure of $75,000. Even the Belgian Congo and Cyprus spend more for tourist promotion than we do.

As a Nation, we have been asleep at the switch, failing to recognize tourism as a substantial source of jobs and income for our people. Let us today make up for lost time and take steps to close the tourist gap.

Last year, the Senate approved a bill similar to S. 610. This year, with the committee amendments, the Senate has before it an even better bill. The need today is even more urgent, for the travel deficit has increased by nearly $150 million.

President Kennedy has already taken commendable action to encourage foreign travel in the United States. On February 6, he announced the Secretary of Commerce would report, by April 1, on a new travel program to include establishment of travel offices abroad; new advertising campaigns, action to simplify visa and entry procedures for temporary visitors, and efforts to relax foreign restrictions on travel to the United States.

The President acted in anticipation of favorable congressional action on measures authorizing a travel program. Congress would be remiss in its duty if it failed to approve S. 610, which will create jobs for Americans, strengthen the American dollar, and make friends for America.

Mr. President, April 1 is only a few weeks away. I urge the Senate to enact S. 610 and send it to the House for approval, which I trust will soon be forthcoming, so that a U.S. Travel Service may quickly get down to the immediate business of closing the tourist gap and the long-range business of building a thriving tourist industry for all America.

Mr. President, up to now I have talked about the tangible benefits we can expect from increased foreign travel in America. Before I conclude, I should like to emphasize one of the intangible benefits: the stimulation of greater understanding of ourselves among peoples of other lands.

This may well prove the most important gain from the work of the U.S. Travel Service. Tourism would become another of our arsenal of peaceful weapons employed in the battle for men's minds.

Since World War II, we have initiated many programs, both Government and private, to assist other peoples to foster greater understanding. The Federal Government has extended a strong hand of friendship to some 80 countries of the world, providing more than $75 billion—a story of generosity without parallel in history.

Time after time, America has rushed to aid millions of distressed people in far-distant lands—unfortunate victims of flood, famine, earthquake, and all manner of disaster.

We have both Government-sponsored and privately sponsored cultural exchange programs, athletic exchange programs, and teacher and student exchange programs. Only last year, Congress authorized a new program to help bridge the gap between America and her neighbors in Asia and the Pacific which is now underway in Hawaii. I refer to the East-West Center, where almost 100 students from Asia will be in residency in Hawaii this month.

Yet, despite our truly massive efforts, peoples in some other lands still regard us with mistrust and suspicion.

For the past 15 years, Americans have traveled all over the globe, both as Government employees on official duty and as tourists. So far as the local populace was concerned, the image of America created by these Americans was their only image of America. Sometimes it was a good image, sometimes it was not so good.

It is, therefore, timely to initiate a new phase of our relations with other peoples. Let us entice more and more tourists from around the globe to our home territory, where they can observe for themselves the face, the heart, and the spirit of America.

Organization at the national level, coupled with realism and fired with imagination, could do a selling job for America that badly needs doing. Today's trickle of foreign visitors would become tomorrow's steady stream of travelers watching America at work, at play, and at worship.

The greater the interchange of people, the greater the opportunity for building friendship and good will.

Viewed in this context, the pending proposal for a U.S. Travel Service becomes a down-to-earth, practical, attainable, low-cost, people-to-people program. I hope the Senate will promptly approve S. 610 and that the House will follow suit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I overlooked mentioning in my general statement on the bill a point which I believe will interest the Senator from Hawaii. The bill also provides that the proposed Travel Service can use counterpart funds.

Mr. FONG. That is an excellent provision in the bill. I think that with the use of counterpart funds a number of tourists from foreign lands can be induced to come to the United States.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I am honored to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and other distinguished Senators in the sponsorship of S. 610. There is no doubt about the need for the enactment of the bill we are now considering.

I hope the Senate will approve the bill without opposition, and I also hope the House of Representatives will act on the measure without delay.

It is most appropriate that the Office of International Travel, as proposed in this measure, be made a part of the Department of Commerce. Secretary of Commerce Hodges is unusually well qualified to take full advantage of the opportunities such an Office would offer to expand the tourist industry in America.

During the time he was Governor of North Carolina, Secretary Hodges gained worldwide recognition for his promotional work in behalf of North Carolina. As a result of his unusually effective work, hundreds and hundreds of new industrial plants were located in North Carolina, and the tourist industry—which is now our third largest industry—enjoyed unprecedented growth.

There is no doubt that the pending proposed legislation would offer ways and means of helping correct our serious balance-of-payments problem. There is no doubt that we can get dollars-and-cents results from encouraging foreigners to visit and vacation in America.

But far beyond the tangible, measurable results, we have a tremendous opportunity to make travel in America one of the greatest and most effective weapons for freedom in the cold war.

We need to let the people of Europe, the Middle East, and Asia see the beaches, the fishing villages, and the beauty of our vast shorelines along the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific coast.

We need to let those same people see and know the people—as they live—in the mountain regions of the Appalachians and the Rockies.

We need to let the people of the world see firsthand for themselves how we in America live and work as free people in North Carolina, in California, in New York, in Arizona, and in all the other States.

To be sure, expanded travel by foreigners in the United States will help bring dollars back home, but such travel will also bring a new understanding of America and our people.

I am particularly glad that one provision of the bill authorizes the use of counterpart funds derived from sales under Public Law 480 for the purpose of promoting travel in the United States. In many cases, we have seen where promotional campaigns financed in part with Public Law 480 funds have created new and increased demand for American farm products in foreign nations. I think it is wise also to use some of the same funds to encourage people to visit the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, S. 610 is a measure which does credit to the knowledge and craftsmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. It is my privilege to be joined with the Senator from Washington and other Senators, on both sides of the aisle, in the sponsorship of this legislation, and I think that had a similar bill which was sponsored by the Senator from Washington during the 86th Congress become law, we would have found beneficial results flowing from it even now.

There are few educated Americans today who remain unaware of the existence of our balance of payments deficit. But I wonder how many of them are aware of what proportion of this is due to the so-called travel dollar deficit. Our able colleague from the State of Washington first brought this to the attention of the Senate nearly a year ago when he pointed out that the travel dollar deficit accounted for nearly one-fourth of our total balance of payments deficit.

Since that time it has assumed even greater significance, in 1960, amounting to a deficit of $1.15 billion, or nearly one-third of our total deficits in foreign payments, and more than the cost of maintaining all of our service dependents overseas.

As was also pointed out before this body not long ago, spending by American tourists abroad has exactly doubled since 1953—with no corresponding increase in the spending of foreign visitors in the United States. This disparity is not accounted for by any equivalent rise in our population, our disposable income or our economic development. It is accounted for largely by the massive program of travel promotion and market development engaged in by foreign tourist and transportation industries under the creative leadership of their respective governments. To illustrate, in the current issue of a weekly magazine devoted to general cultural affairs—and one which takes comparatively little advertising—I noted 7⅔ pages of advertising devoted to travel abroad, much of it sponsored by national governments, and one strikingly effective 2-page advertisement carried by the European Travel Commission for 21 participating countries.

It is my hope that the present administration and the Congress are determined to take more than merely restrictive action on the travel dollar deficit. Rather than make it more difficult for Americans to travel abroad—which is one approach to the problem—we must work to make it easier and more appealing for other nationals to visit the United States. It is my belief that S. 610 is a step in this direction.

It is paradoxical, to say the least, that the United States, which desires so to be understood and appreciated by other peoples of the world, has done so little officially to foster travel and tourism in this country by foreign visitors. Indeed, some of our practices in admitting foreign visitors seem calculated to turn many of the less persistent and more sensitive ones away.

Yet no other nation in the world can offer, unhampered by internal customs and travel restrictions, virtually an entire continent to the tourist. And no other nation of the Western World can offer our scope and variety of scenic beauty and the multiplicity of our cultural patterns.

My own State of West Virginia—which is indeed a land overlooked—offers a quality of rugged and unspoiled natural beauty which is unexcelled by any land in the world. Our fine system of State parks and forests, as well as the Monongahela National Forest, offer a wide variety of inducements to those who would walk with nature. The Monongahela National Forest alone, in 1959, received a total of almost 1 million visits to its 50 special recreational facilities.

Second only to the appeal of the natural and scenic values of West Virginia is the rich historical lore of our State. American history was formed in large measure by the Appalachian Mountains as the route of southward migration of the Scotch-Irish and German settlers, and the Ohio River as the gateway to the West. At a time when we are reexamining our own cultural roots in order to clarify our sense of national purpose and destiny, and when we are striving to communicate this sense to the peoples of the world, American history as it was lived in West Virginia has much to contribute.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that West Virginia would be one of the States to benefit from a stimulation of foreign tourism in the United States. For this reason, among the others I have cited, I am happy that during the hearings on S. 610 and also in my brief remarks here on the Senate floor I have been privileged to include my strong endorsement of the pending measure.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak in behalf of S. 610. I am also delighted to be a cosponsor of the bill.

The chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], wrought well when he proposed the bill and brought it before the Senate, because the bill can be very meaningful in many ways.

I am concerned, first, with the relation of S. 610 to the problem of increasing foreign travel to the United States as a whole and, second, with the relation of S. 610 to the specific problems of Alaska.

It has been said that, properly implemented, legislation of this kind can have a bearing upon the balance-of-payments situation.

That is doubtless true; but perhaps it will take some little time for that phase of the bill to become completely effective. In the meantime, and immediately, it will have a real consequence, I should think, in the respect mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina and other Senators—namely, in enabling people from other parts of the world to come to know better the United States and its citizens. That is vitally important, these days.

So I believe it highly important that this bill become law at the earliest possible moment.

Only next year, Mr. President, Century 21 is to open at Seattle, in the State of Washington. It will be the first international fair to be held since 1939. I commend to the reading of my colleagues an article on Century 21 which appears in the current issue of the Rotarian, the publication of the Rotary International. It is a thrilling account.

It is no wonder that it is anticipated that 10 million people will visit Century 21 during the few months it will be open; and when some of those 10 million desire to travel farther, to explore the scenic wonderland which Alaska is, we of the 49th State will welcome them. The scenic values there are so magnificent that they do not need to be detailed here.

The problem of improving our balance of payments through increasing foreign travel to the United States has been intensively treated at the hearings. Moreover, President Kennedy in his February 6, 1961, message on the balance of payments and gold outflow has stressed the large and insufficiently tapped potential of the foreign travel market as a powerful means for achieving long-term equilibrium in our balance of payments.

To point out the importance of S. 610, let me cite several crucial facts which were brought out in the hearings: First, in 1958, earnings from foreign residents visiting the United States ranked fourth among U.S. commodity exports; second, expenditures by U.S. residents for foreign travel in 1958 exceeded those for any other U.S. commodity import; third, in 1958, as measured by comparative government budgets, the United States ranked above Cyprus, but below Singapore, the Philippines, the Belgian Congo, and Czechoslovakia, in government spending for official travel offices.

It seems to me that whatever actions we take to reduce the travel gap, each action is based, either implicitly or explicitly, on a theory concerning such questions as why there is a travel gap, what are the barriers to foreign travel, and what are the best means for reducing the gap and removing the barriers.

As I see it, the barriers to foreign tourism in the United States include lack of information, visa and currency restrictions, and the cost differential.

The enactment of S. 610 should help to reduce each type of barrier. For example, the publicity program which S. 610 proposes can help to remove the information barrier; it can remove some of the mistaken ideas of how expensive it is to travel in the United States, and it can inflame the foreign tourist's already existing desire to visit the United States. The Office of International Travel can, in conjunction with other Government agencies, work to make what visa and currency barriers exist more favorable for foreign travel in the United States.

Of the various causes for the lack of foreign travel in the United States, I feel that the cost-differential factor is probably the most important and perhaps the most difficult barrier to remove or to lower. However, the information program proposed by S. 610 can serve to puncture some of the exaggerated ideas of how much it really costs—at given levels of luxury—to sightsee in the United States. In addition to the information programs to create a favorable and realistic image of the United States, to spur the desire to travel in the United States, and to disseminate correct cost information, we shall also have to do something about the costs themselves. We should make it possible for the average middle-income foreign tourist to travel and sightsee on a large scale and within his budget. This middle-income person is perhaps a person who would like to tour the United States, but when vacation time comes he chooses to travel and spend his time and money where he thinks his vacation budget will go further.

It seems to me that accurate cost information about alternative U.S. vacations, plus the stimulation of his desire to travel in the United States, could cause him to choose a U.S. vacation. Accurate information in combination

with a program for enabling the foreign tourist to sightsee and travel cheaply—for instance, via model tours and charter groups—combined with publicity designed to stimulate his preexisting desire to visit the United States, would practically make it inevitable that this person and many like him would visit the United States.

Alaska's needs for, and potential benefits from, S. 610 are great. Many studies of the economy of Alaska have pointed out that tourism is an insufficiently tapped resource which Alaska has yet to develop fully. To remedy this situation, the State of Alaska is engaging in expanded programs encouraging travel.

From the point of view of foreign travel, Alaska is in a unique and strategic position. On the polar route between European countries and the Orient, Alaska is a natural and proper stopping place. In fact, the only first-hand impression which some transpolar foreign tourists ever have of the United States is that which they receive when their planes stop to refuel in Alaska.

The pity of the present situation is that the only view many of these foreign tourists receive of the United States is at the airport, during the refueling stop. This is because of our present policies concerning stopover privileges on transpolar flights.

Whereas we should be encouraging these foreign tourists to stay and to see Alaska and the United States, while on their way to Europe or the Orient, we tell many, instead, in effect, "Your plane can stop, to refuel; but we do not want you to leave the airport or see the rest of Alaska if you are to continue your journey on the same airline ticket." As a result, ticket agents in Europe tend to discourage transpolar travelers from sightseeing in Alaska, since they would have to change airlines.

It seems to me that this view and this condition contravene the purposes and intent of encouraging foreign travel to this country.

From the point of view of national policy, we want these foreign transpolar travelers to stop over for longer than it takes to serve them a meal and to refuel their planes.

It is anomalous that this great opportunity to encourage foreign tourism in the United States is thwarted by a "no stopover policy." Is it not a shame that the foreign transpolar traveler is not given an opportunity and encouragement to sightsee in the one and only part of the United States which he may visit, a part that is one-fifth as large as all the rest of the United States?

We Alaskans want to extend a hearty welcome to these transpolar travelers, in behalf of the United States as a whole. We want them to stay, to look around Alaska. And, who knows, they may even be enticed into taking a look at the other States, before traveling on to their original destinations in Europe or in the Orient. We should encourage them to stop over. We should welcome them, and we should make it possible for European ticket agents to encourage these tourists to stop over and visit the United States, and then continue on the same airline. Since that will be for many travelers the first, and perhaps the only, contact with the United States, we want their impressions to be favorable and lasting. Under the present conditions, I can imagine that for the foreign transpolar tourist who is not allowed to stop over, even though his plane is allowed to refuel, the impressions are lasting, but not favorable.

It is my hope that the proposed Office of International Travel and the Travel Advisory Board will look into situations such as those we find involved in the stopover problem in Alaska, and that some means will be created to encourage these transpolar foreign travelers to stop and to visit us, and that we shall be allowed to give them a hearty Alaskan welcome on behalf of the United States as a whole.

All in all, Mr. President, I think this is an appropriate major piece of legislation to come before the Senate so early in the session, and I trust that the vote in favor of the passage of this bill will be a unanimous one.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on February 2, I testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in support of S. 610, of which I am a cosponsor. I am delighted that the committee has acted so promptly on this very important piece of legislation, and that it is today before the Senate.

In the Congress, we have been used for some time to talking about the Buy America Act. I regard the bill before us today—the bill to set up an International Travel Office—as the Sell America Act.

We hope under this bill to sell America to millions of people all over the world. We want them to come here, to see our country, to meet us, and to acquire a feeling for the spirit of democracy, which is of such fundamental importance to every American. As an added dividend, these efforts should have a highly favorable effect upon our international balance of payments.

Mr. President, I attended a considerable portion of the hearings on S. 610, held under the chairmanship of Senator MAGNUSON. I was very much impressed by the active interest which the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee took in this proposal. I was also very much impressed by the concern which the committee demonstrated in regard to the need to reduce redtape barriers, which so often discourage people from overseas from visiting our Nation.

It was pointed out by several witnesses, as well as by members of the committee, that some of our consuls overseas have been all too zealous in checking visas when what they actually seek, and should seek, is to keep out of the country burglars, felons, pickpockets, and eligible daughters. In the energetic pursuit of this objective, they have often discouraged interested and solid citizens of the countries in which they are stationed from visiting America. This situation can, and should be, remedied.

Every other country of the world encourages tourism and welcomes travelers with open arms. Why should the United States submit them to the "third degree" before they can, on their own initiative, visit our great land?

Reducing visa redtape is not the primary function of the International Travel Office; but it is clear that much of its orientation would be, and should be, to put out the welcome mat, and to put away the unwelcome mat.

Mr. President, this is an extremely serious question. Underlying the suspicion with which we regard those who apply for visas is the present unfortunate and outdated structure of our immigration policies. The prejudices which are reflected in these policies are also reflected in the attitude we often take toward visitors.

I hope the very worthwhile discussions the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee had on this subject indicate that in the Congress there is a growing sentiment in favor of revising, bringing up to date, and making more equitable our country's overall immigration policies.

Mr. President, America is a great land of opportunity, of freedom, and of natural beauty. It is a great attraction to peoples of every land.

While we are on the subject of our natural attractions, I want to say as I look around the Chamber that New York State certainly should not take second position to the great States of West Virginia, Washington, Alaska, Montana, Illinois, Oregon, and the many other fine States which are so ably represented in this body. I want visitors to our shores to know that from the great cultural-financial-industrial center which is New York City to the Niagara frontier, they will find some of the greatest sights and pleasure spots in the world. And, in all the area in between those two points, are the beautiful valleys and hills of New York as well as many other very worthwhile sights to be seen and enjoyed.

We must do everything we can to make it easier for people from overseas to visit us, and we must encourage them to do so. The establishment of an International Travel Office definitely would be a long step in the right direction. It would be more than just an office. It represents a spirit of friendship and freedom, a spirit in which we enthusiastically welcome all people to our land. This spirit and the implementation of it through active promotional campaigns and cutting down barriers of redtape are urgently needed.

I agree fully with those who initiated this measure, and I want to mention particularly the fine leadership in this area taken by the Senator from Washington. I could not agree more fully with those who initiated this measure, and I have been happy to support and to cosponsor it in the Senate.

I urge the speedy, wholehearted enactment of this worthwhile and far-reaching program to sell America.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must courteously, but firmly, protest the discrimination of my distinguished friend, the Senator from New York, because he failed to include the great Common-

wealth of Rhode Island, the State so ably represented by the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. PELL].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, that was a great oversight. I also failed to include the States—including Nevada and other fine States—of many of our colleagues who are here today. I was referring to only a few States as an illustration of my point, that the beauties of New York are at least equal—and those of us who live there think they exceed—those to be found in any other State. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the potential travelers under the provisions of this bill will wish to visit the great Commonwealth of Rhode Island.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure they will, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Because much of interest is to be seen there. I trust it will come up to the expectation of those who have sponsored the bill. In measuring the purchasing power and the money other people can expend in coming to America. I am never very sanguine when I think back to some journeys over the world. Whether or not the number can be increased over and above the number that go from here to other countries remains to be seen. I only hope this expectation will materialize.

I point out only one other thing: If we want people to come, we must be ready for them. There is a good deal of organizational work to be done. If we do not do it, I am afraid that after they come to the State represented by my distinguished friend the Senator from New York, they will then go back, having seen only the Empire State Building, the Statue of Liberty, 42d Street, and Broadway. I think the bill would miss its mark. After all, we would want them to absorb some of the culture of the country. I would like to see them come to the Middle West. I think the distinguished chairman of the committee would like them to come to the Far West and enjoy the beauties and delights of the Pacific seaboard.

I trust that, along with the functions and duties that are imposed upon the Director, there will be a little coordination of the facilities to lure people here.

I was about to make a suggestion to the chairman of the committee. I hope that, on page 4, line 7 of the bill, where an annual report is provided for, we may require a quarterly report.

After all, this is a new venture, and there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5 million. I do not know whether the plan will succeed. Whether it will become just another bureaucratic venture, remains to be seen. The only way of keeping abreast of the progress that is to be made, since many facilities are to be established abroad, is for the Congress to be reasonably well informed on the progress that is being made.

Instead of waiting for an annual report, I think, we could very well require a quarterly report. In addition, there is this to commend the proposal. We must not forget that the Immigration and Naturalization Service obviously has an interest in the people who come here. I hope we can gather figures week by week and carefully check them; but I would be willing to accept provision for a quarterly report, if the chairman would accept an amendment on page 4, line 7.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The chairman of the committee has no objection. Perhaps it might provide for beginning August 1; although it does not make any difference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We could start with the fiscal year, and make it July 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the committee amendments have not yet been agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not offered an amendment yet. I am first talking informally with the chairman, to see whether he would be agreeable to that kind of amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is suggesting that on page 4, line 6, we should provide that the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Start the sentence with:

Beginning with the fiscal year 1962, the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report on his activities under this act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask that the bill be modified in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not yet acted on the committee amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Have not the committee amendments been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, as suggested by the Senator from Illinois, on page 4, line 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, beginning on line 6, page 4, the amendment will read as follows:

Beginning with the fiscal year 1962, the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report on his activities under this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one further point to make. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] submitted an amendment to the bill which I think is a very wise amendment. It provides that local currencies now in the Treasury may be used to establish travel agencies abroad, and the language appears in two places, but particularly on page 8 of the bill, where the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act is modified to read:

For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.

It keeps a check in the Appropriations Committee. The committee will then be able to see that allocations of local currencies are made which can be used in every country where a travel office is established. It is a prudent way, I think, to use local currencies.

In connection therewith, I submit for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to have printed, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is not present, a statement which he has prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

I want to express my support for S. 610. The function of the International Travel Office would be to promote by all reasonable means travel in the United States by citizens of other countries. This country is at present losing over a billion dollars a year to foreign countries because American tourists spend that much more on their trips abroad than do foreign tourists traveling in the United States.

The International Travel Office would seek to correct this disparity by attracting more foreign tourists to the United States. It would advertise such travel, it would provide trip-planning assistance to prospective tourists, it would cooperate with travel agencies and transportation companies, it would do all things reasonably conceived to promote greater foreign travel in the United States.

The sponsors of this bill have adopted an amendment which I suggested to allow use by the International Travel Office of moneys accumulated to the U.S. Government through the workings of Public Law 480.

By utilizing Public Law 480 moneys, acquired through the sale of our agricultural surpluses, the International Travel Office would demand fewer taxpayers' dollars in performing its functions. It would also impose a lesser burden on the U.S. balance of payments.

There are, in many countries of the world, large sums of money idle in accounts of the U.S. Government. This money is not to be taken out of the countries where it is located because such withdrawal would pose a threat to the local currency and to the balance of payments position of the host country. Most particularly, this money is not to be converted into dollars.

These funds could easily and without damaging the balance of payments of the countries in which they are located be utilized for promoting within these countries travel to the United States.

Perhaps more important, these funds could be used in one country, where the United States holds large reserves of the local currency, for preparing advertising copy or travel literature to be distributed in another country where the United States holds less or no local currency resulting from the workings of Public Law 480.

For example, the United States has accumulated billions of rupees in India. This money should not be removed from India. Part of this money could be spent in India to prepare there materials which would be used in Western Europe to promote touring by Europeans in the United States.

In an effort to better our own balance of payments position and in an effort to stimulate the touring service segment of our own economy, this bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, my own State is suffering more than most from the unemployment and the economic malaise which has been affecting our country. Therefore, I welcome the imaginative proposals which President Kennedy has been submitting to the Congress. I also welcome the introduction of S. 610 by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which would encourage more visitors from abroad to visit our country.

Rhode Island, with its lovely Narragansett Bay and South County woods and beaches, is particularly proud of its tourist facilities. Tourism is one of our major industries, and we would warmly welcome more visitors from other countries. In addition, we are particularly lucky in our State in that many of our people whose families have come from Europe, have preserved original language skills and cultural habits, which would tend to make our visitors from abroad particularly welcome.

The city in which I live, our former capital, Newport, is often called the Queen of Seaside Resorts. Not only did President Eisenhower speak very highly of Newport as a resort, but we in Newport hope that President Kennedy will come to our fair city, too.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that increased tourism would promote a better understanding of our country and help to close the balance-of-payments gap.

For all the reasons I have outlined, I hope that the Senate will take quick action on S. 610.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the establishment of an Office of International Travel in the Government would be of great benefit in improving our fiscal position and our foreign relations. By bringing more tourists to America, it would help stop the outflow of gold. But even more important, by exposing those from other lands to America's scenery, history, and people it will increase the outflow of good will and friendship.

The Office of International Travel would establish tourist offices abroad, and use posters, movies, and other advertisements to present a realistic picture of America. It would also work to reduce the visa restrictions and other hindrances which confuse and discourage potential visitors.

My own State of Massachusetts would be a mecca for tourists the world over. Tourism is already our third largest industry. People abroad, as well as people from other States, would be interested in enjoying the golden beaches of Cape Cod and the fishing towns of the north shore; in skiing in the Berkshires or fishing in our mountain streams.

If they have a mind for history they will want to visit Plymouth Rock, Boston, the battlefields of the Revolution and the Mohawk Trail, where they can follow in the footsteps of the Indians. If they love music they can hear the Boston Symphony, which is the equal of any orchestra in Europe. They can hear it in Symphony Hall or under the shade of the green trees at Tanglewood.

Most of our tourism would be, at first, with the people of Europe. As a State settled by 300 years of European migration, we in Massachusetts could give them a welcome second to none. They would find many people who could speak their native tongue, giving them a feeling of a home away from home.

Mr. President, I hope this bill will become law. If it does, my own State will cooperate in every way with the Office of International Travel to make America the No. 1 tourist attraction in the world.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, as a sponsor of S. 610, I would like to discuss briefly my reasons for supporting it.

I feel that it is important to improve international understanding. One of the best ways to do this is by encouraging foreigners to visit the United States and to get a first-hand glimpse of what America is like.

Through such visits foreign guests will be assured that Americans and America desire to live in peace. This is one of the greatest weapons we can use against the misleading statements made about our country by Khrushchev and the other leaders of communism. They can see at first hand what we are like and they can arrive at their own conclusions. I am confident that their judgment will bear out what our leaders say about the United States.

The second reason why this legislation should be approved is because it is one answer to our gold problem. We have witnessed in recent years a heavy outflow of U.S. gold. One-third of our total balance of payments deficit, $1.2 billion, is caused by foreign travel. Americans spent over $2 billion last year for foreign travel while foreigners spent only $1 billion for travel in the United States. We cannot afford to permit this to continue.

The United States is the only major nation of the world with no office to encourage travel. The amount of money necessary for such an office is modest, but the work it would be capable of doing is limitless. I earnestly hope the Senate will approve this legislation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in S. 610, which I was happy to cosponsor this year after wholeheartedly supporting S. 3102, its predecessor, in 1960.

This measure gives hope of offsetting a major part of our serious gold and dollar drain. It also appears to be an important step in the direction of worldwide understanding of our great country and people. As the noted commentator Eric Sevareid remarked in a column published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 12:

The more I have investigated anti-Americanism in Europe, the clearer it has become that those who are most virulently anti-American are nearly always people who have never seen America, and that the most pro-American Europeans are those who have visited or lived in America.

More than this, S. 610 also promises to be a boon to businesses large and small in the entire Nation. In my own State of Colorado, where tourism is the third ranking industry, it is often said that tourist money is new money. That is, it comes from outside and does not deplete any natural resource in the process. Needless to say, it passes through many hands as well. It helps the filling station operator, the small motel and guest ranch, the cafe owner, the cleaning and laundry establishments, the sporting goods stores, even the bootblack on the corner, just as it helps the big airline, the railroad, and the famous hotel.

There are other aspects to the phenomenon of the tourist dollar which bear examination. The staff of the Senate Commerce Committee estimated last year that 10 cents out of every tourist dollar entering this country eventually finds its way into Federal, State, or local treasuries, through payment of excise and other taxes.

It is well known that State and local governments in the United States are hard pressed for revenues because of the upsurge of population and rising demands for services. They need every dime they can get.

Unfortunately, accurate figures on the benefits of tourist spending to local government treasuries are scarce, but it certainly is safe to say that my home city of Denver, for example, derives hundreds of thousands of dollars annually from tourists through its 1 percent municipal sales tax and its cigarette tax. Recognizing this fact, Denver for years has contributed tax funds to the budget of the Denver Convention and Visitors' Bureau. This privately managed organization gets most of its money from realistic businessmen who likewise know the value of the tourist dollar.

The most recent figures available to me from the Colorado Yearbook—the official publication of the State planning division—indicate that tourists pay considerably more than $8 million a year to the State treasury alone. This represents more than 6 percent of all State gasoline taxes collected; about 6 percent of all State sales taxes; nearly 7.5 percent of all State beer, wine, and liquor taxes; nearly 20 percent of all parimutuel racing taxes, and more than 35 percent of all State game and fish license fees.

Realizing this, the State of Colorado for years has maintained a tax-supported State advertising and publicity department to spur tourism.

Every State in the Union derives some financial benefit from the tourist trade. Yet, because we have neglected fully to develop the potential of international tourism, we have been taking in each other's washing. The tourist dollar in Colorado comes largely from residents of Kansas, Iowa, Illinois, California, and other States. This is not fully in line with the "new dollar" concept on a national basis. Developing a tourist market among residents of other nations would do the job.

Sylvia Porter, in a column published in the Washington Evening Star 1 week ago, observed:

Most authorities expect only minor help from changes in what U.S. tourists spend on foreign travel and duty-free imports and what foreign tourists spend on U.S. travel and goods. I think they'll be astounded at how major the help can be if we only apply our genius for salesmanship and we wake up to how much we alone can achieve.

As Miss Porter says, this country has no shortage of top flight salesmen. For an example of what can be done with a little planning, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I recently received from Mr. William C. Mueller, a well-known Denver travel agent with many contacts in the German-speaking countries of Europe.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article in the Denver Post of February 12 by Bruce Hamby, travel editor of that newspaper, entitled "Overseas Travel: A One-Way Street."

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY PARK TRAVEL CENTER,
Denver, Colo., February 11, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: For some time I have been watching the efforts made to encourage Europeans to visit the United States of America. The time is ready now to sell the United States of America abroad and I would like to do my share in this plan.

Looking over critically the efforts made in the past, I would like to make the following suggestions, especially for German-speaking countries:

1. Determine which parts of America would attract Europeans the most.
2. What would they like to see when they are over here.
3. Arrange certain package tours sold overseas.
4. Person-to-person contact with leading travel agents in Europe.

The following program was worked out by a foreign airline in cooperation with domestic air carriers: "This type of package is suggested: New York City, Washington, D.C., Niagara Falls, Las Vegas, Grand Canyon, California." What about Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico? I am often in contact with Europeans coming over here through the International Institute of Education. When asked what interests them most, they say they have always heard of the Rocky Mountains and the Grand Canyon. A visit to a real working or dude ranch and a chance to observe American Indians as one sees them in New Mexico pueblo life makes a European feel he is really seeing America. The average European travel agent knows nothing about our West. Here are some suggestions:

Arrange meetings with leading travel agents and representatives of airlines in the following cities: Duesseldorf, Cologne, Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Munich, Zurich, and Vienna. Show short movies of the West; have an exhibit of good photographs and travel folders; give a short lecture in German about our West. Have several all-inclusive package tours ready (in German) to distribute like: Denver, Rocky Mountain Park, 2 days at a ranch in Middle Park, Aspen, Mesa Verde, Taos, and back to Denver. Or: Denver, Rocky Mountain Park, 2 days at a ranch in Middle Park, Jackson Hole, Teton, and Yellowstone Park, continue to California.

As I have had quite a few years experience in selling tours for Americans to take abroad I believe I might be helpful in laying out plans to help promote the United States of America in Europe.

Most sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. MUELLER.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 12, 1961]

OVERSEA TRAVEL: ONE-WAY STREET

(By Bruce Hamby)

The magic lure of oversea travel apparently has no limit for the American tourist.

Each year for the past 10, American citizens have been taking off in ever-increasing numbers to travel abroad to Europe, South and Central America, the Caribbean, the Far East, and the Pacific.

In 1950 the grand total of Americans visiting foreign lands—excluding Canada and Mexico—was 676,000. Figures for the year just ended show a record 1,934,953 went abroad.

There is every indication the total will easily surpass 2 million this year.

Add to this the 5 million Americans who will cross the border into Canada and 750,000 more who will visit Mexico and the impact of foreign travel on the U.S. way of life and economy assumes major proportions.

Normally this tourist flood beyond our borders would be little more than an interesting statistic. But in view of the present concern over the imbalance of gold, it has become a matter of vital importance to both Government and responsible citizens.

For it so happens that spending by Americans on foreign travel accounts for nearly one-third of our international payments deficit.

Last year, for example, while 1,934,953 Americans went abroad, only 455,457 foreign visitors came to the United States. And while our citizens were spending a whopping $2.2 billion for their travels, our visitors spent only $1.1 billion.

This $1 billion deficit poses some questions: (1) Why do more Americans travel abroad every year and (2) why does the total of Americans going overseas so greatly exceed the number of foreign visitors to our shores?

A few years ago the answer to both questions was simple: Americans had both the desire and the income to travel while few foreigners could afford the cost of a ticket overseas.

This answer no longer holds good since many nations of the world are as economically stable—some more stable—as the United States.

The answer still is a simple one: Americans travel abroad because they not only have the disposable income but are lured by the extensive promotional campaigns waged by foreign nations and by the absence of travel barriers, such as complicated visa and customs procedures.

Foreigners, on the other hand, are given little if any incentive to visit the United States. And those who do come often do so in the face of time-consuming, often embarrassing U.S. redtape.

For the United States in the only major nation that does not spend a single penny, as a government, to attract tourists. The only oversea promotion is carried on by U.S. airlines and steamship lines. European travel agents, eager to gain the commissions on sale of trips and tours to the United States complain that little if any tourist or resort literature is available. They further point out that our visa and customs procedures are highly discouraging to prospective visitors.

While we do nothing as a government to promote tourism, foreign governments spend millions in the United States to entice Americans to their countries. Great Britain alone spends more than $1 million annually on tourist advertising in U.S. newspapers and magazines. France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, Israel, Japan, India, Australia and other countries annually spend amounts in six figures in behalf of tourism.

So it comes as a pleasure to learn the United States at long last appears to be waking up to the possibilities of such promotion.

President Kennedy reportedly is highly sympathetic to a proposal the United States start an international travel office which would seek to increase the flow of tourists by advertising the wonders of our land.

This program has been spelled out in a bill just introduced in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, who claims his bill could cut the $1 billion gap by half.

MAGNUSON'S bill would provide for establishment of a high-level Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce. The Office would be authorized to spend up to $5 million a year in travel advertising and other promotion and to set up travel information offices abroad.

At the same time President Kennedy has been quoted as favoring Presidential encouragement to lower legal and other barriers to foreign visitors. The word would go to consuls and the immigration service to be more courteous and reduce redtape.

Such moves, together with President Kennedy's proposal of last week to lower duty-free limits on foreign purchases by Americans, would go a long way to ease the tension caused by the precarious imbalance of international payments.

And it certainly would meet wide approval in the travel industry which has long advocated such a move. As a matter of fact, one such program is already underway, sponsored by a foreign airline.

Scandinavian Airlines System, with the cooperation of five U.S. travel firms—American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Western Airlines, Sheraton Hotels, and Greyhound Bus Lines—has its own visit-U.S.A. program already underway. A team of U.S. domestic travel specialists are in Europe conducting training workshops, with the objective of explaining U.S. attractions and suggesting itineraries, shattering the misconception travel in the United States is too expensive for Europeans and supplying much-needed travel and resort literature.

Meanwhile, gold imbalance or no, the oversea rush by Americans is well underway The low-cost, 17-day economy fares helped keep off-season travel up and by the middle of June the oversea movement will become a flood.

This year it appears there will be little if any shortage of tourist space on airlines, steamships and, in most countries, of hotel rooms.

For this summer the jet age will be in full bloom, with nearly every international airline offering pure jet service. In the 6-week period starting June 1 there will be more jet seats available across the Atlantic than during all of 1960. On any given day in that period between 60 and 70 big jetliners, capable of carrying 125 to 150 passengers, will leave New York's Idlewild Airport for European destinations.

In addition there will be scores of other jet flights leaving other east and west coast gateway cities, for Europe via the polar route, for South America, the Caribbean, the Orient, and the Pacific.

In the meantime, those of us staying nearer home might find it beneficial to brush up on our French, Spanish, and German in anticipation of the hoped for rush of foreign visitors to our shores.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 610) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce, improve the foreign payments position of the United States, and promote international understanding and appreciation of the United States of America by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program, utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication, designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by the residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities conducive to better international understanding of the people and institutions of the United States;

(2) encourage the strengthening of tourist facilities, programs, and other arrangements within the United States for assuring a friendly welcome and meeting the special requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) coordinate all travel facilitation activities of the United States Government, and actively encourage progressive elimination, reduction, or simplification of barriers to travel;

(4) assist in the implementation of foreign technical assistance and economic development projects in the travel industry field; and

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information relating to international travel and tourism.

(b) In performing the duties set forth in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) utilize the facilities of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible;

(2) consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, private organizations, and local, State, Federal, foreign government, and international agencies engaged in or concerned with international travel;

(3) obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified and experienced professional agencies, consultants, and specialists in the fields of travel, advertising, public information, and mass communication;

(4) establish such travel offices in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable;

(5) refrain from conducting any activity or furnishing any service which might result in adverse economic competition to persons engaged in the business of providing transportation, accommodations, or other facilities to persons traveling between the United States and foreign countries.

(c) Beginning with the fiscal year 1962, the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a United States Travel Service (hereinafter referred to as "the Travel Service").

(b) The Travel Service shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel (hereinafter referred to as the "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall be in addition to the other Assistant Secretaries provided by law for the Department of Commerce. All duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in section 2 of this Act shall be exercised through the Assistant Secretary.

(c) In the absence of the Secretary the Assistant Secretary shall represent the Secretary on any interagency committee, board or other organization established within the executive branch to deal with travel matters.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Travel Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") which shall be composed of twenty members who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall serve for such terms as may be designated by the Secretary. Such members shall not be officers or employees of the Federal Government and shall be individuals who, by reason of interest, training, or experience, are qualified to carry out the duties provided for in section 5 of this Act. At least ten of the members of the Board shall be representatives of the travel and related industries.

(b) The Board shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Twelve members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Each member of the Board shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of his duties; and, while away from his home or regular place of business and engaged in the actual performance of his duties, he shall also receive travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board or as an expert or consultant under section 2(b)(3) of this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, or of section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service.

SEC. 5. The Board shall—

(1) advise and consult with the Assistant Secretary with respect to the activities of the Travel Service and from time to time shall submit to the Assistant Secretary recommendations for programs and policies to be adopted; and

(2) submit to the Secretary and the Congress from time to time, but not less than once a year, reports containing appraisals of the effectiveness of the programs and activities being carried on by the Travel Service and setting forth recommendations the Board has made to the Assistant Secretary and such other matters as it may consider pertinent.

SEC. 6. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 408, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after such subsection a new subsection as follows:

"(s) For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts.".

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "International Travel Act of 1961".

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a United States Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the majority leader is not present. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the time he has permitted us to proceed in getting this very important bill acted upon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon if he is to speak at length, and if he proposes something that might call for a record vote of some kind that I do not foresee?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak at some length, but I shall not ask for any action this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So Senators may assume that there will be no record votes.

Mr. MORSE. As soon as I complete my statement I shall move to adjourn or recess in accordance with whatever previous order was entered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Senator will make a very inspiring speech, and I hope I shall be present to hear all of it.

Mr. MORSE. I am always pleased to have the Senator from Illinois present, but I assure him that his reading ability will make it possible for him to grasp everything I have to say from a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I was pleased to cooperate with the leadership of the Senate and withhold my remarks until this time, because I have certain statements to make, for the RECORD; and because I have withheld my remarks so long, and because the administration has asked me to attend a very important conference at 5 o'clock, I will not be able to yield for any purpose between now and the time I finish my speech.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise first in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to make a few comments on the President's special message on education today, and to announce the procedural course of action of my subcommittee. I shall make the latter comment first.

Because I will make so many specific references to the message, I should like to incorporate the message as part of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the message be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes

for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.

The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment. It must include equally determined measures to invest in human beings—both in their basic education and training and in their more advanced preparation for professional work. Without such measures, the Federal Government will not be carrying out its responsibilities for expanding the base of our economic and military strength.

Our progress in education over the last generation has been substantial. We are educating a greater proportion of our youth to a higher degree of competency than any other country on earth. One-fourth of our total population is enrolled in our schools and colleges. This year $26 billion will be spent on education alone.

But the needs of the next generation—the needs of the next decade and the next school year—will not be met at this level of effort. More effort will be required—on the part of students, teachers, schools, colleges, and all 50 States—and on the part of the Federal Government.

Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice. But education is increasingly expensive. Too many State and local governments lack the resources to assure an adequate education for every child. Too many classrooms are overcrowded. Too many teachers are underpaid. Too many talented individuals cannot afford the benefits of higher education. Too many academic institutions cannot afford the cost of, or find room for, the growing numbers of students seeking admission in the sixties.

Our twin goals must be: A new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A successful educational system requires the proper balance, in terms of both quality and quantity, of three elements: Students, teachers, and facilities. The quality of the students depends in large measure on both the quality and the relative quantity of teachers and facilities.

Throughout the 1960's there will be no lack in the quantity of students. An average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already strained by well over a half-million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions, a school system financed largely by a property tax incapable of bearing such an increased load in most communities.

But providing the quality and quantity of teachers and facilities to meet this demand will be major problems. Even today, there are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldy size because there are insufficient teachers available.

We cannot obtain more and better teachers—and our children should have the best—unless steps are taken to increase teachers' salaries. At present salary levels, the classroom cannot compete in financial rewards with other professional work that requires similar academic background.

It is equally clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years.

These problems are common to all States. They are particularly severe in those States which lack the financial resources to provide a better education, regardless of their own efforts. Additional difficulties, too often overlooked, are encountered in areas of special educational need, where economic or social circumstances impose special burdens and opportunities on the public school. These areas of special educational need include our depressed areas of chronic unemployment and the slum neighborhoods of our larger cities, where underprivileged children are overcrowded into substandard housing. A recent survey of a very large elementary school in one of our major cities, for example, found 91 percent of the children coming to class with poor diets, 87 percent in need of dental care, 21 percent in need of visual correction and 19 percent with speech disorders. In some depressed areas roughly one-third of the children must rely on surplus foods for their basic sustenance. Older pupils in these schools lack proper recreational and job guidance. The proportion of dropouts, delinquency, and classroom disorders in such areas is alarmingly high.

I recommend to the Congress a 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

Based essentially on the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 8), although beginning at a more modest level of expenditures, this program would assure every State of no less than $15 for every public school student in average daily attendance, with the total amount appropriated ($666 million being authorized in the first year, rising to $866 million over a 3-year period) distributed according to the equalization formula contained in the last year's Senate bill, and already familiar to the Congress by virtue of its similarity to the formulas contained in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction and other acts. Ten percent of the funds allocated to each State in the first year, and an equal amount thereafter, is to be used to help meet the unique problems of each State's areas of special educational need—depressed areas, slum neighborhoods, and others.

This is a modest program with ambitious goals. The sums involved are relatively small when we think in terms of more than 36 million public school children, and the billions of dollars necessary to educate them properly. Nevertheless, a limited beginning now—consistent with our obligations in other areas of responsibility—will encourage all States to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand and enrich the quality of education offered, and gradually assist our relatively low-income States in the elevation of their educational standards to a national level.

The bill which will follow this message has been carefully drawn to eliminate disproportionately large or small inequities, and to make the maximum use of a limited number of dollars. In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries; and thus non-public-school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools. Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

This investment will pay rich dividends in the years ahead—in increased economic growth, in enlightened citizens, in national excellence. For some 40 years, the Congress has wrestled with this problem and searched for a workable solution. I believe that we now have such a solution; and that this Congress in this year will make a landmark contribution to American education.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

Our colleges and universities represent our ultimate educational resource. In these institutions are produced the leaders and other trained persons whom we need to carry forward our highly developed civilization. If the colleges and universities fail to do their job, there is no substitute to fulfill their responsibility. The threat of opposing military and ideological forces in the world lends urgency to their task. But that task would exist in any case.

The burden of increased enrollments—imposed upon our elementary and secondary schools already in the fifties—will fall heavily upon our colleges and universities during the sixties. By the autumn of 1966, an estimated 1 million more students will be in attendance at institutions of higher learning than enrolled last fall—for a total more than twice as high as the total college enrollment of 1950. Our colleges, already hard pressed to meet rising enrollments since 1950 during a period of rising costs, will be in critical straits merely to provide the necessary facilities, much less the cost of quality education.

The country as a whole is already spending nearly $1 billion a year on academic and residential facilities for higher education—some 20 percent of the total spent for higher education. Even with increased contributions from State, local, and private sources, a gap of $2.9 billion between aggregate needs and expenditures is anticipated by 1965, and a gap of $5.2 billion by 1970.

The national interest requires an educational system on the college level sufficiently financed and equipped to provide every student with adequate physical facilities to meet his instructional, research, and residential needs.

I therefore recommend legislation which will—

(1) Extend the current college housing loan program with a 5-year, $250-million-a-year program designed to meet the Federal Government's appropriate share of residential housing for students and faculty. As a start, additional lending authority is necessary to speed action during fiscal 1961 on approvable loan applications already at hand.

(2) Establish a new, though similar, long-term, low-interest-rate loan program for academic facilities, authorizing $300 million in loans each year for 5 years to assist in the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related structures sufficient to enable public and private higher institutions to accommodate the expanding enrollments they anticipate over the next 5 years; and also to assist in the renovation, rehabilitation, and modernization of such facilities.

III. ASSISTANCE TO COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

This Nation a century or so ago established as a basic objective the provision of a good elementary and secondary school education to every child, regardless of means. In 1961, patterns of occupation, citizenship and world affairs have so changed that we must set a higher goal. We must assure ourselves that every talented young person who has the ability to pursue a program of higher education will be able to do so if he chooses, regardless of his financial means.

Today private and public scholarship and loan programs established by numerous States, private sources, and the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act are making substantial contributions to the financial needs of many who attend our colleges. But they still fall

short of doing the job that must be done. An estimated one-third of our brightest high school graduates are unable to go on to college principally for financial reasons.

While I shall subsequently ask the Congress to amend and extend the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act, it is clear that even with this program many talented but needy students are unable to assume further indebtedness in order to continue their education.

I therefore recommend the establishment of a 5-year program with an initial authorization of $26,250,000 of State-administered scholarships for talented and needy young people which will supplement but not supplant those programs of financial assistance to students which are now in operation.

Funds would be allocated to the States during the first year for a total of 25,000 scholarships averaging $700 each, 37,500 scholarships the second year, and 50,000 for each succeeding year thereafter. These scholarships, which would range according to need up to a maximum stipend of $1,000, would be open to all young persons, without regard to sex, race, creed, or color, solely on the basis of their ability—as determined on a competitive basis—and their financial need. They would be permitted to attend the college of their choice, and free to select their own program of study. Inasmuch as tuition and fees do not normally cover the institution's actual expenses in educating the student, additional allowances to the college or university attended should accompany each scholarship to enable these institutions to accept the additional students without charging an undue increase in fees or suffering an undue financial loss.

IV. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The National Vocational Education Acts, first enacted by the Congress in 1917 and subsequently amended, have provided a program of training for industry, agriculture, and other occupational areas. The basic purpose of our vocational education effort is sound and sufficiently broad to provide a basis for meeting future needs. However, the technological changes which have occurred in all occupations call for a review and reevaluation of these acts, with a view toward their modernization.

To that end, I am requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an advisory body drawn from the educational profession, labor-industry, and agriculture as well as the lay public, together with representation from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the current National Vocational Education Acts, and making recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

CONCLUSION

These stimulatory measures represent an essential though modest contribution which the Federal Government must make to American education at every level. One-sided aid is not enough. We must give attention to both teachers' salaries and classrooms, both college academic facilities and dormitories, both scholarships and loans, both vocational and general education.

We do not undertake to meet our growing educational problems merely to compare our achievements with those of our adversaries. These measures are justified on their own merits—in times of peace as well as peril, to educate better citizens as well as better scientists and soldiers. The Federal Government's responsibility in this area has been established since the earliest days of the Republic—it is time now to act decisively to fulfill that responsibility for the sixties.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the administration has honored me by an invitation to introduce the legislation and to serve as its floor leader in the Senate and as its leader in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, I shall speak at length today only because of the fact that I shall not be present after today for the rest of the week. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance at the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week, because the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate is sending me as one of the delegates to the Parliamentary Conference which will be held at Bermuda starting on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after consultation with the Parliamentarian, I ask unanimous consent that an education bill be introduced today in behalf of the administration and lie on the desk until 5 p.m., Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in regard to the President's message, I wish to congratulate the President of the United States for the statesmanship portrayed by his special message on education sent to both Houses of the Congress today.

There will always be those who may think the President's message and the bill which will shortly accompany the message do not go far enough or go too far.

As one who is very happy to assume the responsibility of doing what I can in my humble, inadequate way, to seek to carry the administration's bill through the committee and through the Senate, I wish to stress that, in my judgment, the bill represents a fine start in the development of a Federal aid to education program.

We have fought on this battleground in the Senate every year of my membership in the Senate, which is now going on 17, and the struggle for some Federal aid to education predated my coming to the Senate. The need in the educational crisis has intensified every year, due in large part to congressional inaction to meet the crisis.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, Mr. President, I believe this has ceased to be solely a domestic issue. This issue now takes on some very serious international implications, because there is a very important race going on in the world for the minds of men. The contestants in that race are the free nations of the world running against the Communist nations of the world.

Mr. President, the enlightenment of the human brain does not exclude the Communists. The evidence and the data presented to our committee last year—in fact, in the last several years—leave no room for doubt about the fact that the Communist segment of the world considers the bringing of educational enlightenment to the young of the countries of the world to be one of its major foreign policies.

NATIONAL INTEREST IN EDUCATION

I do not think we are going in any way to help in this debate by spending much time on a comparison of education in the United States with education in the Soviet Union. I simply want the RECORD to note that we cannot afford, in my judgment, to permit the educational processes of Russia to surpass those of the United States.

There is an emergency need, Mr. President, for us to recognize that the problem of raising educational standards in the United States is a national problem as well as a State problem. There is a national responsibility for this problem, and one cannot read the President's message without being impressed with his recognition that the Federal Government should be willing to assume its fair share of that responsibility, making clear at all times that the safeguards and local control of the educational processes must be protected and must continue to be guaranteed to the States and to the local school districts.

At the very outset of his message the President said, in the first sentence:

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.

That is a statement of truth. That has been stated in various language forms throughout our history, starting with Thomas Jefferson, who put the same principle and thought in these words:

> Democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people.

So when President Kennedy said:

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education—

He, in other language, has stated the unanswerable truism which Thomas Jefferson laid down at the very beginning of the life of this Republic.

President Kennedy today called to the attention of the Nation another thought that needs to be emphasized:

> The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment. It must include equally determined measures to invest in human beings—both in their basic education and training and in their more advanced preparation for professional work. Without such measures, the Federal Government will not be carrying out its responsibilities for expanding the base of our economic and military strength.

I am very happy that President Kennedy started early in his message to lay the foundation for that emphasis, because when we talk about education, we are also talking about the security of this country, both its economic and military security.

The President has referred to human resources. I think one of the saddest things in the American scene today is the great waste of our human resources, and we find that waste really at its height in connection with our educational processes.

We are sending tens of thousands of American boys and girls to elementary and secondary schools whose standards of education are so low that we in effect deny a college education to those who graduate from such secondary schools, because they do not maintain a standard of education sufficient to qualify their graduates even for admittance to college.

It is interesting, when we take a look at the so-called academic casualty list of colleges in this country, as many of our educators have done—and they have supplied our congressional committees with their research findings—to note that those casualty lists bear a direct relationship to the academic standards of the high schools from which the students came. So President Kennedy is to be commended and praised, in my opinion, for calling the attention of the American people in his statesmanlike message today to the need to conserve our human resources and to develop the educational potential of the young men and women of our Nation.

NEED FOR LOCAL CONTROL

Also, at almost the beginning of his message—in fact, in the fifth paragraph of the message—President Kennedy once again stated, as he used to state on the floor of the Senate, and as he stated over and over again in his historic campaign for the Presidency, that the control of education must remain in the States and the school districts. It continues to be his view that the Federal Government's part in the educational process of our country is to aid the States in their financial assistance to local school boards. The Federal aid would pay the costs that can be fairly attributed to the Federal Government as its share because of the Federal interest in guaranteeing to every boy and girl in this country, regardless of where he or she happens to be born, the minimum standards of education necessary to give assurance that that boy or girl will have an opportunity to develop to the maximum of his ability.

In the fifth paragraph of his message the President said:

> Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice. But education is increasingly expensive. Too many State and local governments lack the resources to assure an adequate education for every child. Too many classrooms are overcrowded. Too many teachers are underpaid. Too many talented individuals cannot afford the benefits of higher education. Too many academic institutions cannot afford the cost of, or find room for, the growing numbers of students seeking admission in the sixties.

It might very well be said that in that well-written paragraph the President has submitted his bill of particulars in advocating passage by this session of Congress of what I consider to be the very modest educational program he has offered in his message. I can assure the Senate that it will be offered within a few hours in a bill that the White House itself will sponsor. The President said in his message:

> Our twin goals must be: a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

The President has spoken about the need for classrooms, improvement in teachers' salaries, better teachers, scholarships, and assistance to institutions.

He further said:

> But providing the quality and quantity of teachers and facilities to meet this demand will be major problems. Even today, there are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldy size because there are insufficient teachers available.

Let me make very clear—because we shall drive this point home time and time again in the days immediately ahead—that the decision as to how much of the Federal allocation to a State shall go to teachers' salaries is to be left to the States. If the State decides that it wants all the Federal allocation to go to school construction, that is its business, and there will be nothing in the bill that will prevent a State from making that choice. If, on the other hand, a major problem confronting any State is the problem of teachers' salaries, if its problem is the problem of an inadequate supply of teachers because of inadequate pay, the State should have the right to use all or most of the money allocated to that State from the Federal Government for teachers' salaries, so far as our elementary and secondary schools are concerned.

I surmise what will happen in most instances is that the State will weigh its relative needs as to physical facilities and teachers' salaries, and that part of the money will be used for teachers' salaries and part of it for school construction.

SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION BILL

There are sections of the bill that may result in some difference of opinion both in committee and within the Senate. However, I wish to make clear what the position of the senior Senator from Oregon will be on the President's bill. I will support the major provisions of the President's bill. As chairman of the subcommittee, I shall owe to the President the duty, as legislative counsel, so to speak, to do everything I can to secure approval of the President's bill in committee and passage of it on the floor of the Senate.

The President understands, as I am sure all of my colleagues in the Senate understand, that of course I reserve the right to support any amendment in my capacity as a Senator, representing the people of Oregon, that I believe to be appropriate to the bill.

I shall not offer any major amendments to the President's bill, because, disagree as anyone may with me, if I am going to serve to the best of my capacity as the floor leader of the bill, then I owe it to the President to try to get his bill through in the form in which he proposes it, subject always, of course, to further instructions from the President in case he should at any time see fit to advise us that he finds a particular amendment acceptable.

Of course, I take this position only because I have long favored and worked for the objectives of the President's message. If I opposed any major measure under the jurisdiction of my subcommittee, I would not undertake to serve as floor manager for it.

I shall have something more to say about my position as legislative counsel in regard to the bill in just a moment. However, I wish to call attention now to the part of the President's message that reads as follows:

> Based essentially on the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 8), although beginning at a more modest level of expenditures, this program would assure every State of no less than $15 for every public school student in average daily attendance, with the total amount appropriated ($666 million being authorized in the first year, rising to $866 million over a 3-year period) distributed according to the equalization formula contained in the last year's Senate bill, and already familiar to the Congress by virtue of its similarity to the formulas contained in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction and other acts. Ten percent of the funds allocated to each State in the first year, and an equal amount thereafter, is to be used to help meet the unique problems of each State's areas of special educational need—depressed areas, slum neighborhoods and others.

FORMULA FOR AID DISTRIBUTION

This raises the formula debate. We always have considerable difference of opinion among us as to what formula should be applied in any Federal aid to education bill. In my consultations with spokesmen for the administration in regard to the bill, I have come to the conclusion that the President in his recommendation on formula, which I have read to the Senate, is offering a formula which in my judgment is good ground for agreement.

I will not quarrel with the right of Senators, in committee or in the Senate, to suggest a change in the formula. However, I will constantly put this question to them: "Do you really want a bill?" I believe that when we come to grips with the formula we come to grips with the most important question as to whether we are going to have a bill enacted at all.

Here is a formula fair to all the States concerned. I do not believe it can be used by any State as a reason for opposing the bill. Here is a formula that is workable. It is entitled to a trial.

I say it most respectfully to any Senator who disagrees with me that support of this formula is a test as to whether we want to join the President and give him the support to which I believe he is entitled for the trial period proposed in the bill.

That causes me to point out that the President is not asking for permanent legislation in the bill. He is offering a bill for a trial period. Members of the press said to me in the pressroom a few minutes ago, "Senator, you know we need Federal aid to education on a permanent basis. Why is the administration sending up a bill that is not on a permanent basis, but proposes a 2- to 5-year program?"

Mr. President, this proposal commends itself to the Senate, because the bill offers a ground for common agreement among us for the trial period for which

the President offers it. Therefore, I make a plea now, in advance of our hearings, and in advance of our debate in the Senate, for the maximum of unity and the maximum of agreement among us in the Senate—yes, for a maximum of waiving of individual Senator's personal preferences in regard to what the formula should be, to the end that we can get started this year with a Federal aid to education bill for the trial period asked for by the President.

I do not speak for the President when I put it this way, but I certainly speak for myself. Let us give the President's proposal a trial, reserving to future sessions of Congress the responsibility and the duty, on the basis of what the results of that trial period show, a perfecting of the bill, if it is discovered that imperfections are, in fact, contained within it.

So much of our debate on Federal aid to education has to be in the realm of speculation anyway. Therefore, I wish to make the plea to Democrats and the Republicans alike in the Senate, to recognize that this is a reasonable proposal on the part of the President.

The President says:

> This is a modest program with ambitious goals. The sums involved are relatively small when we think in terms of more than 36 million public school children, and the billions of dollars necessary to educate them properly. Nevertheless, a limited beginning now—consistent with our obligations in other areas of responsibility—will encourage all States to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand and enrich the quality of education offered, and gradually assist our relatively low-income States in the elevation of their educational standards to a national level.

I stress the President's comment that this is a modest proposal. In fact, there are those in the Senate who have said to me, since the message came to the Senate, that it does not go far enough. They have indicated that they think it is too modest. I think it is modest, too, in terms of the total need. But it is a good bill in terms of a measure which we have a real prospect of enacting into law.

In offering the modest bill, the President is offering a bill which is a good start. Once it is put on the statute books, it will soon prove to the American people the legislative soundness of the philosophy that is involved in the bill.

START IN MEETING FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY MUST BE MADE

That is what is needed, perhaps more than anything else in regard to a Federal aid to education bill today. What is needed is an education bill which will help to educate the American people as to the soundness of the legislative philosophy behind a Federal aid to education bill. The bill proposed by the administration is a great educational instrument for that purpose, too.

It is rather paradoxical for me to be saying this on the floor of the Senate, because all one has to do is to turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of years gone by and read that the senior Senator from Oregon has always offered and advocated a bill which provides more than this bill will provide. Many Senators have supported me in that effort and I think that our efforts can be seen in this measure. However, I am satisfied that the President is more right than we would be if we took the position we have taken in the past, and asked for what might be considered to be a more perfect program from the standpoint of providing all the aid that we really ought to provide to the schools of America. I also point out that with steadfast support from the administration, we may be able to wind up with a better bill than by starting with a more far reaching one.

This bill is a good beginning. I make my plea for it because it is a good beginning and because we ought to make a start now. With the agreement on the part of Senators who wish to go further that they will accept this much for this year, we can give reasonable assurance not only to the President but also to the country that we can pass this year a Federal aid to education bill which the President can sign.

ROLE OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS IMPORTANT

Mr. President, I now turn to a paragraph in the President's message which will elicit some controversy in our committee hearings and in our debate. Undoubtedly, it will elicit opposition from some groups in our country. It is a paragraph which in the past has found me on the other side of the issue from the President of the United States when he was a Senator from Massachusetts.

However, let me make it very clear now that I stand with the President in this session of Congress in support of his immediate recommendation. As I have in the past, I shall not offer amendments on this particular subject matter, because I shall practice what I preach when I urge Senators to be willing to set aside some of their favorite proposals of the past, sincerely offered, as I have always offered my own, because they thought their proposals were in the interest of strengthening the Federal aid to education bill. In asking them to set their proposals aside in order to make a start this year, I shall practice that policy myself in respect to the subject matter to which I now turn.

The President says in the paragraph to which I refer:

> The bill which will follow this message has been carefully drawn to eliminate disproportionately large or small inequities, and to make the maximum use of a limited number of dollars. In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries; and thus nonpublic school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools. Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

This paragraph involves two subjects of controversy in the Senate, based upon our past debates on Federal aid to education. It involves, first, the question as to whether any Federal funds should ever go to the benefit of a child who is being educated in a private school. It should be noted that the President has made very clear in the language of this paragraph that he is talking about grants, because he says:

> In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated—

That is, on a grant basis—

> for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries.

I completely agree with the President. I have taken the position consistently in the Senate that under the doctrine of the separation of church and state, grant money should not be made available to private schools.

My difference in the past with the President of the United States, when he was a Senator from Massachusetts, was in connection with loans, for which interest is paid, to a private school, for the construction of school facilities. I have argued before—and if I were to offer my amendment this year, which I shall not do, I would argue again—that the private schools of this country perform a very important public service to all the taxpayers.

If anyone has any question about that, he has only to look at the hypothetical I always raise in debate on this subject matter: Suppose that today it were decided to close every private elementary and secondary school in America, and the children now attending those schools appeared tomorrow morning at all the public schools in the United States. Then I think all the taxpayers of the country, probably for the first time, would have a clear understanding of the public service which is rendered the taxpayers by the private schools of the United States, because those private schools, in fact—and the parents who support those private schools—reduce considerably the school tax burden of all the parents of America who send their children to the public schools.

So I never lose sight of two things in the debate on this matter: First, the public service which is rendered by the private schools; and second, the child. Too often in our debate on this subject we lose sight of the beneficiaries of the program we seek to enact—the children themselves. I am interested in making certain that the child who goes to a private school also has the advantage of those minimum standards of education which will make it possible for that child in the private school to develop his intellectual potential to the maximum extent possible.

We do not serve the cause of education well by practicing a discriminatory policy against the child in a private school by denying that child the maximum development of his intellectual potential.

However, no Member of this body is a more ardent defender of the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state than the senior Senator from Oregon. I did not teach that doctrine for years and years in the law school only to walk out on it simply because I entered politics.

However, the doctrine has nothing to do with a loan program, so far as constitutional law is concerned. If the Federal Government makes a loan to a private school, whether it be a Catholic school, a Baptist school, a Presbyterian school, or a nonsectarian school, it is not a financial grant to an institution for religious purposes. To the contrary, it is a loan to an institution which is performing a very worthwhile educational function in this Republic.

Whenever we grapple with this problem in debate the precedents are on my side, because Congress has followed a loan policy in regard to many private institutions in this country. We have provided for loans which bear interest and, therefore, do not cost the taxpayers a red cent. We have recognized the right of the Government to be of assistance to institutions which perform a great service in keeping this democracy strong.

We make loans to Baptist hospitals, for example. We make loans to other hospitals which are sponsored and supported by church denominations. We make loans under the National Defense Education Act to provide loans to high schools, universities, and colleges which are church schools. We have heretofore debated this constitutional question.

So I repeat today, simply for the record, my challenge to anyone to establish by legal argument any violation of the Constitution of the United States in providing a policy of lending to private institutions in this country, whether they are private schools or other private institutions.

Then, of course, there is another phase of this argument. We should not lose sight of what the separation of state and church doctrine really means in our constitutional history. When our Republic was born, 9 of the 13 Colonies had State churches or Colony churches; a church had been designated as the church of the particular Colony. The so-called separation of state and church doctrine was written into the Constitution in order to make clear that there was a prohibition against setting up a national church. That is the meaning of the separation of state and church doctrine.

It never was contemplated that it should be broadened to include denial by the Federal Government of the making to a private institution of an interest-bearing loan to be of assistance to that institution in carrying out a secular purpose.

Mr. President, when we are dealing with the educational function of a private school, we are dealing with small children. I do not propose ever to lose sight of them when I am talking about seeing to it that the children of America—irrespective of the religion of the families into which they are born, irrespective of the happenstance of birth—are never denied the right to have a chance for the maximum development of their intellectual potential.

We know the kind of old, bewhiskered argument that is used; it is said that there is nothing to stop their parents from sending them to public schools. But, Mr. President, liberty and freedom also encompass, in my judgment, the matter of parental choice in regard to the precious, sacred right of parenthood to judge, as parents, according to their sights, the environment in which they wish their children to be brought up. The state should not lose sight of the state interest in seeing to it that the mental resources of our country are not wasted by denying to children who attend private schools the maximum opportunity for the development of their intellectual potential.

So, I make this statement because I want the RECORD to show clearly that in no way have I retreated from my belief and my conviction that it falls within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and in no way is a violation of the separation of state and church doctrine, to have a program of loans to private schools, with the money to be spent solely in connection with the educational processes of those schools.

But it is well known that when the President of the United States was a Senator from Massachusetts, he opposed my amendment. He opposed it as a candidate for the Presidency. I respect his point of view. I call attention to the fact that my amendment is not a part of his message, and his message makes very clear that he is opposed to any grants to private schools. And so am I; and I made that very clear, last year.

But this afternoon the press—always looking, you see, for some basis for saying that a conflict exists between Members of Congress and members of the administration, and, may I say—and I do not think I am unduly sensitive about it—particularly looking, always, for a chance to show the existence of some conflict between the senior Senator from Oregon and either his colleagues in the Senate or the administration—wanted to know what I was going to do about the Morse amendment I offered last year for construction loans to private schools. I announced to the press, and I repeat now, that I am just not going to offer the amendment. I am going to keep faith with the plea I made a few moments ago to my colleagues in the Senate, when I asked them to resolve their differences of the past in regard to Federal aid to education, and to recognize that the President has offered a modest but sound program, a program that gives us the greatest chance of any we have had in years to establish in the legislative policy of this country a Federal aid to education bill. This will not be, and should not be, the last word on the subject. The fact that it is only of 3 years' duration assures us of an early review of it.

In that spirit of complete cooperation with the President of the United States, and in keeping, I believe, with the soundest legislative policy we can follow at this session of Congress, I announce, Mr. President, that I will not offer my amendment of the past, which sought to establish a loan program for private elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon on education.

Eight years ago, when I came to the House of Representatives, my first committee meeting attendance was as a member of a special subcommittee headed by Representative KEARNS, of Pennsylvania; and we came in—in a Republican Congress—with a recommendation that Federal aid and Federal support of education be provided. In all the 8 years since then, I have worked for some sort of Federal aid to education, in order to carry out the declaration made by that committee. The distinguished Senator from Montana, whose seat I now occupy, Senator Murray, and I introduced what we believed to be a minimum bill. In fact, many schoolteachers throughout the Nation think my first name is Murray, because of the Murray-Metcalf bill. We wanted to have $25 a pupil provided as a minimum program, to start with, and going up to $100 in the fourth year.

The program the President sent to Congress calls for less than that. However, I agree with the Senator from Oregon. Let us begin. Let us have a minimum program, to start with.

I am going to support the President's bill, just as the Senator from Oregon has said he is going to support it, because this is a way to get Federal aid to education "on the road," and because the educational crisis we now face is our gravest domestic crisis.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that 24 years ago I served as a member of the House of Representatives of the Montana State Legislature, and at that time I voted for a transportation bill to permit school buses to pick up the Catholic boys and girls and the Baptist boys and girls who were attending parochial schools. I voted for that bill because I saw no reason why the school buses should leave those children standing beside the roads, without any further cost to the State of Montana.

I would support the Senator's amendment as submitted last year; but again I think it is wise to start with a minimum program, and see where we are going, and reevaluate it 3 years from now.

I listened with a great deal of pleasure when I heard the Senator from Oregon state that this is a basic program. It is not enough, in my opinion. It is not enough in the opinion of the great Senator who preceded me. But this is a beginning in an effort to solve a grave domestic problem, and we must start.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Montana, and to pay tribute to him today in the RECORD. In the Subcommittee on Education, the Democratic side of the committee has thought so highly of the views of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] on education and has been so well aware of the many years of devoted service he has rendered to the cause of education in the House, that we have taken him with us in all our conferences with spokesmen for the administration.

Mr. METCALF. I have been very grateful to the chairman of the sub-

committee for allowing me to participate in the conferences and discussions. It has been a real pleasure to work with the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a great deal of education must be done in the country with respect to my amendment of last year. There is a great deal of opposition to it in many parts of the country based on a misunderstanding and a failure to appreciate the philosophy behind it. I do not want to jeopardize this bill by getting involved in any controversy we do not need to get involved in. I make this plea to my colleagues to follow the example that I seek to set, myself, as the leader who has the responsibility to do what I can to get this bill through the Senate.

Furthermore, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] just spoke about legislation which was passed 24 years ago in the Montana Legislature. Such legislative power vests in all the legislatures of the country. After all, if it is believed in any State that there is any public interest in the proposal I have made in the past in regard to loans to private schools, there is nothing that can stop a State legislature from following such a policy in its own State.

INCONSISTENT OPPOSITION TO PRIVATE EDUCATION AID

This amendment always stirs up highly emotional reactions in various parts of the country, although I want to say, in passing, that I have never been able to see the consistency in the position taken by some of my colleagues that they are against interest-bearing loans to private secondary and elementary schools, but vote for loans to private higher educational institutions that function under a denominational sponsorship.

Nor do I see very much consistency in that position when it also holds that it is all right, in the granting of a scholarship program, to permit the student to select a school—and it may be a private denominational school—and then, have an additional payment made to that college or university for the cost of educating the student over and above the cost covered by the tuition.

However, in order to protect my own record, and to avoid the charge that I am following an inconsistent course of action in regard to this bill, I have made this statement in regard to my stand concerning loans to private schools.

I repeat, first, in my judgment, they are clearly constitutional.

Second, I think they would be in the public interest.

Third, I shall refrain from offering any amendment now because I think we ought to make a start this year with this bill and we ought to seek to eliminate from our discussion every controversial proposal that we can which would in any way jeopardize the objectives of the administration bill.

Without taking the time to read it all, I ask unanimous consent that paragraphs of the message containing the President's recommendations in regard to the current college housing loan program and a low interest rate loan program for academic facilities be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Extend the current college housing loan program with a 5-year, $250 million-a-year program designed to meet the Federal Government's appropriate share of residential housing for students and faculty. As a start, additional lending authority is necessary to speed action during fiscal 1961 on approvable loan applications already at hand.

2. Establish a new, though similar, long-term, low-interest rate loan program for academic facilities, authorizing $300 million in loans each year for 5 years to assist in the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related structures—sufficient to enable public and private higher institutions to accommodate the expanding enrollments they anticipate over the next 5 years; and also to assist in the renovation, rehabilitation, and modernization of such facilities.

Mr. MORSE. Here again I think the President has proposed a modest program, a program we ought to readily accept and put through the Senate.

Now I come to the matter of scholarships.

There always seems to be greater support of and interest in the Senate in a scholarship program than in almost any other phase of an education bill.

In his message, the President says:

Today private and public scholarship and loan programs established by numerous States, private sources, and the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act are making substantial contributions to the financial needs of many who attend our colleges.

While I shall subsequently ask the Congress to amend and extend the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act, it is clear that even with this program many talented but needy students are unable to assume further indebtedness in order to continue their education.

I have in my hand a letter written by the president of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. The president of this group points out that the student loan fund at the University of Oregon is completely depleted and that there is great need for a deficiency loan, so that National Defense Education Act funds can be matched. I completely support the position of the president of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., February 8, 1961.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A crisis situation has recently come to our attention concerning student loan funds at the university. It seems that borrowing has been so heavy in the last few months on our student loan program that the fund is depleted and if all of the present loans are established, the fund will be reduced to only $488 and at the time that this was written, the controlling accountant for the university had 10 applications for loans on his desk.

As a result of this general loan fund depletion, it is impossible for the university to match national defense loan funds, even though we still have some credit available in national defense loans before reaching our maximum.

This deficiency of loan funds may mean that students who are operating on a restricted budget will be unable to finish out the term or attend next term because there are no emergency funds available in our own general loan fund to tide them over.

Our emergency funds can come only from endowments and gifts.

I know you will recognize the situation that this puts many students in. Is there any possibility of emergency legislation to help avert this situation? Any action you can take would be greatly appreciated.

We sincerely thank you for your presentation of the myrtlewood gavel to President Boland and are anticipating your attendance at the Model United Nations in April.

Enclosed you will find a statement of our loan situatfon.

Sincerely yours,

STEVEN R. SCHELL.

Mr. MORSE. The President of the United States talks about the need for scholarships and the need for offering some assistance to the institutions that are selected by the winners of scholarships to pay for part of the cost of educating these students over and above the tuition costs. In his message, he says the scholars "would be permitted to attend the college of their choice, and free to select their own program of study. Inasmuch as tuition and fees do not normally cover the institution's actual expenses in educating the student, additional allowances to the college or university attended should accompany each scholarship to enable these institutions to accept the additional students without charging an undue increase in fees or suffering an undue financial loss."

It is a very good proposal. It is identical with the proposal I offered as an amendment to the National Defense Education Act when it was first before the Senate; and I am sure the President of the United States will enjoy my good-natured comment when I say that at the time I offered it, he, as a Senator from Massachusetts, as I recollect, opposed my amendment.

Although none of the scholarship features of that bill became law, a similar grant to the institution is provided for fellowship awards for postgraduate study.

The President has demonstrated, as he does so frequently, that he believes in following where the facts lead. I judge from this recommendation that he has come to understand the soundness of the position many of us took in the Senate when, at the time the National Defense Education Act was before us, we offered as an amendment the very same recommendation he now offers in his message to the Senate. The President may be sure that he will have our wholehearted cooperation in doing what we can to see that the bill which is passed will contain that proposal.

HEARINGS PLANNED NEXT WEEK

Mr. President, I shall close my comments on the President's message as I turn to another subject by announcing

that, subject to the approval of my subcommittee, I hope hearings may be begun by Wednesday of next week on the administration's bill. It may be, because of a conflict in schedule within the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that we cannot start Wednesday of next week, because we may not at that time have completed certain hearings which have already been arranged on other subject matters. I hope that if we cannot start on Wednesday of next week we shall be able to start on either Thursday or Friday of that week.

I think that will give the Senate ample opportunity to consider the bill. It will give interested groups, which may wish to send witnesses to the committee, adequate time to prepare for the hearing. The hearing should be held at the earliest possible date. We should get the bill from the committee to the Senate. I am going to strive to get a bill to the Senate not later than March 20, and I hope I can do so at an earlier date.

I close this part of my speech this afternoon by congratulating the President again on the great message he has sent to us and on the statesmanship portrayed by his proposal on a Federal aid-to-education bill.

FEDERAL ACTION TO STRENGTHEN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the American Council on Education has recently released what it calls a proposed program of Federal action to strengthen higher education.

The American Council on Education includes, in its membership of 1,209, more than a thousand educational institutions and 144 educational organizations. It includes approved universities, colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, technological schools, and certain private secondary schools, State departments of education, city school systems, private school systems, selected educational departments of business and industrial companies, voluntary associations of higher education in the States, and large public libraries.

Because the needs of higher education will constitute an important subject for the 87th Congress to consider, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this program be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROPOSED PROGRAM OF FEDERAL ACTION TO STRENGTHEN HIGHER EDUCATION

The magnitude and chief characteristics of the crisis facing higher education in the next decade have been documented through numerous studies by Federal agencies, State planning commissions, and independent groups. There is general agreement that enrollment is in the process of doubling, with an anticipated increase of at least a million full-time students between 1958 and 1965 and another million between 1965 and 1970. There is also agreement that colleges and universities, in the next 10 years, must nearly double both the number of qualified faculty members and the salaries paid them. Furthermore, it is clear that the proportion of research and instruction at advanced levels will become greater and that consequently the cost of necessary buildings and equipment will increase at a higher rate than that caused by expanding enrollment alone, with a corresponding increase in general operating expenses.

A recent comprehensive study by the U.S. Office of Education [1] states that by 1965 the colleges and universities of this country will have to spend $9 billion on physical facilities, and that an additional $10 billion will be needed between 1965 and 1970. Several leading economists have estimated that between 1959 and 1970 general expenditures, excluding those for capital outlays, will mount from $3.7 billion to more than $9 billion a year.

All the major studies show that after traditional sources of income, including student tuition and fees, have been stretched to the limit, there will still be a large gap that can be filled only by greater support from the Federal Government.

The American Council on Education, in consultation with its 1,200 institutional and organizational members, has been developing a general policy toward Federal support of higher education for many years. The situation is complicated for at least three important reasons. First, more than 40 agencies of the executive branch of the Government have programs that directly affect higher education. Second, at least a dozen congressional committees have authority to act on one or more of these programs. Third, these Federal programs differ not only in magnitude and scope, but also in kind and effect.

The last point is of special significance, because many Federal programs use colleges and universities merely to provide services required by the Government. Whether provision of those services depletes or augments the resources of these institutions to perform their central function of education is of no particular concern to the Federal agency. For example, the armed services have admitted for 15 years that ROTC programs constitute a drain on the resources of participating institutions, but have as yet offered no relief. Again, several of the programs in which colleges and universities participate under the National Defense Education Act have the purpose of strengthening secondary education rather than higher education. It seems clear that institutions of higher learning cannot continue indefinitely to undertake such service functions unless they receive additional support to strengthen their basic resources of staff, facilities, and general income.

It is the purpose of this statement to focus attention on proposed congressional actions that will strengthen the basic functions of the institutions. This approach does not imply lack of interest in other types of programs, a partial list of which appears hereafter.

In determining what kinds of support can appropriately be requested from the Federal Government, the character of the existing system of higher education suggests important limitations. More than half the colleges and universities, enrolling nearly 45 percent of the students, are privately supported. All types of institutions must be expanded and improved if the essential national goal of providing for future students is to be met. Hence the American Council on Education, representing higher education as a whole, does not ask general assistance from the Federal Government in paying faculty salaries.[2] Nor does it ask direct assistance from the Federal Government in meeting general operating expenses.[3] The basic recommendations presented below deal with assistance (1) in providing housing and academic facilities, (2) in augmenting the number and improving the quality of teachers and research workers, and (3) in offering able students with limited means the opportunity of a college education.

There are priorities even among these three major types of assistance. Additional financial aid to students is advocated only as a supplement to adequate support for new buildings and augmented staff. Helping more students to demand admission to college without at the same time supplying buildings to accommodate them and faculty to teach them would merely make more serious a problem already acute.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Federal Government can and should provide greater financial assistance to approved institutions of higher learning for expansion and improvement of facilities

1. The college housing loan program, which has proved extraordinarily effective during the past 10 years, not only should be continued, but also expanded on a basis that will permit institutions to plan further ahead. The funds authorized last summer will almost certainly be allocated early in 1961, and applications are being received by the Housing and Home Finance Agency at the rate of approximately $350 million a year.

An additional $150 million should be authorized as soon as possible to keep the program moving forward through June 1961.

A further authorization of $1.4 billion should be made for a 4-year period, beginning July 1, 1961, with equal allocations for the 4 fiscal years.

Adequate funds should be appropriated to administer the augmented program effectively and promptly.

2. A new program of federally administered assistance to institutions of higher learning, for construction of academic facilities of the kinds they require to meet their needs in improvement of quality as well as expansion of enrollment, should be established, offering each institution the following options on each separate project: (a) a grant to defray up to 50 percent of the cost of construction, or (b) a low interest 40-year loan to finance such construction, the interest rate to be determined under the same formula approved for the college housing loan program.

A long-range program is recommended, with initial authorization for 4 years and with funds supplied at the average rate of $1 billion a year. A survey of member institutions by the American Council on Education indicates that of its annual amount approximately 70 percent should be appropriated for matching grants and 30 percent authorized for loans.

It is in the national interest that the building program of each institution reflect with integrity its educational goals and ob-

[1] U.S. Office of Education, "Ten-Year Objectives in Education: Higher Education Staffing and Physical Facilities, 1960–61 through 1969–70" (Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1961).

[2] The council considers it entirely appropriate, however, for the Federal Government to pay the full cost of the portions of faculty time devoted to federally financed programs of instruction and research and to continue the existing type of support to the land-grant institutions.

[3] The council considers it entirely appropriate, however, for the Federal Government to pay that portion of general operating expenses allocable to federally financed programs of instruction and research, and to continue the existing type of support to the land-grant institutions.

jectives. This principle should determine the criteria for eligibility set by the Government.

3. The existing program of matching grants for construction of research facilities in the health fields should be continued and expanded, and similar grants to support allied teaching facilities in these fields should be authorized.

4. The National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Department, and other Federal agencies that sponsor and support research in colleges and universities should be authorized and encouraged to increase provision for the physical facilities and equipment required for such research; and additional appropriations should be made to them for this purpose.

II. The Federal Government can and should provide greater assistance in increasing the supply and improving the quality of college teachers

1. Such programs as the graduate, postdoctoral, and faculty fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation should be expanded as rapidly as qualified candidates can be discovered.

2. The graduate fellowship program under the National Defense Education Act should be extended for at least 4 more years, with immediate provision for awarding fellowships to alternates if the original recipients withdraw. Each institution should receive a grant of $3,000 a year for each graduate student enrolled under this program.

3. According to reliable estimates by those who have administered the present NDEA fellowship program, at least 1,500 more doctoral candidates could be accommodated in programs of instruction now offered by graduate schools. Consequently, a new fellowship program for these candidates should be established under the NDEA, in which there is no requirement that an institution have a "new or expanded program" of graduate instruction.

4. To improve faculty competence, another program should be established under the NDEA which would provide 1-year fellowships for college teachers who are within 1 year of completing the requirements for the doctorate. An experimental program of 500 such fellowships a year would be a significant beginning.

5. There should be a substantial increase in funds appropriated for exchanges of faculty members with foreign countries and for grants to actual and prospective college teachers to study abroad. Such exchanges help American institutions to solve one of their major academic problems—broadening their instruction to include the cultures of the entire world.

III. The Federal Government can and should provide greater assistance in removing financial barriers to higher education for qualified students

American colleges and universities have traditionally assumed, as part of their service to the people, heavy financial burdens in order to offer educational opportunities to students from families with low incomes. In addition to the very large benefits conferred by public institutions through low tuition and fees, the colleges and universities constitute the largest single source of undergraduate scholarships. This burden will obviously be greatly magnified by the needs of the additional 2 million students in the next decade. It is already increasing because of the necessary rise in student charges. One of the council's own surveys shows that charges for tuition, fees, room, and board, at both public and private institutions, have risen as much in the past 4 years as in the preceding 8 years or in the 20 before that.

Scholarships and loans offered by the institutions themselves and by other agencies have not kept pace, and the participation of the Federal Government has been declining as educational benefits under the World War II and Korean GI bills draw to an end. The loan program under the NDEA has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, but qualified students at the very low income levels are finding college entrance more and more difficult. The institutions need substantial assistance if equality of opportunity in the future is to be more than an abstract slogan.

1. The student loan program under the National Defense Education Act should be continued, with certain modifications, through its fourth year. At that time, funds in hand or on loan by educational institutions should be granted to them as permanent revolving loan funds. Additional appropriations should be made each year for grants to reimburse institutions for portions of loans forgiven under the law to meet the needs of increasing enrollments, and to establish loan funds for institutions new to the program.

2. Recognizing the priorities indicated above, and assuming the continuance of the student loan program, a new program of 4-year undergraduate scholarships should be established, with the objective of seeking out and assisting students of high academic promise in greatest financial need.

Stipends should be variable, according to need, with a maximum of $1,000 a year.

The scholarships should be awarded by the institutions themselves, using funds allocated in approximately the same manner as Federal student loan funds.

There should be an appropriation of $25 million for scholarships the first year, with the annual total rising to $100 million in the fourth year. These sums would provide a minimum of 25,000 new scholarships each year.

Each scholarship should be accompanied by a grant to the institution which the scholarship holder attends. A reasonable amount to defray part of the educational costs beyond tuition and fees would be half the amount of the scholarship. Additional appropriations will be needed for this purpose and for the expenses of administration.

3. Funds for undergraduate and graduate student exchanges with foreign countries should be increased. More care should be taken to insure that each foreign student has adequate funds for his educational expenses. Furthermore, the institutions should be reimbursed by the Federal Government for an equitable portion of the costs of special services needed to make the visitors' experience fully effective. One university has estimated that it spends an average of $200 each year on every foreign student beyond the normal expense of educating an American student—for special admissions procedures, help in finding appropriate housing, academic counseling, and, often, instruction in English.

IV. Additional approved proposals

As foreshadowed in the introduction, the program outlined above is deliberately restricted to major projects that will add to the basic strength of institutions of higher learning and that call for congressional action. These items by no means exhaust the list of Federal activities, current and proposed, in which the council's membership is interested.

For example, 50 universities are deeply involved in institutional projects abroad under the International Cooperation Administration. They have faced serious problems, but the solutions lie primarily with ICA rather than with Congress. Similarly, even more colleges and universities have large programs of federally sponsored research. Since Federal support of on-campus research reached $462 million in fiscal 1960, the amounts involved are important to the financial soundness of these institutions. But the effort to secure full payment for their services, which has been underway for more than a decade, will succeed or fail because of action by the Bureau of the Budget supported by research-financing agencies of the executive branch. The only congressional action needed is the deletion from future bills appropriating funds for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the legislative rider limiting payment of indirect costs to an arbitrary 15 percent.

A partial list of additional proposals calling for congressional action is presented below. Higher education, as represented by the American Council on Education, is interested in all of them. But highest priority should be given to the basic program, which will help colleges and universities to construct needed buildings, recruit essential faculty, and serve the increasing numbers of young Americans who need and deserve higher education.

The American Council on Education is ready to provide educational representatives who will testify in support of the following additional proposals, as well as those described above, before appropriate congressional committees, when invited to do so. This list is not complete but is meant to suggest areas of special interest. Included are recommendations of the commission on education and international affairs, the committee on television, the special committee on urban renewal, and the special committee on sponsored research, as well as those of the committee on relationships of higher education to the Federal Government.

1. Extend, expand, and strengthen the counseling and guidance program under NDEA by including personnel from 2-year and 4-year colleges in the institutes, providing stipends to enrollees from private as well as from public schools, inaugurating a program of graduate fellowships, and making funds available for research.

2. Extend, expand, and strengthen the foreign language development program under NDEA by including teachers from 2-year and 4-year colleges, providing stipends for enrollees from private as well as from public institutions, and establishing institutes for rare languages at the undergraduate level.

3. Maintain the present level of support for research and experimentation in the use of the mass media for instruction, under title VII of the NDEA.

4. Eliminate the NDEA requirement of a disclaimer affidavit for those receiving fellowships or loans.

5. Determine a formula for reimbursing colleges and universities for some of the expenses incurred in providing facilities for and operating ROTC units.

6. Establish on a permanent basis a senior office in the U.S. Department of State to coordinate international cultural activities.

7. Pass enabling legislation to make effective the Florence agreement relating to tariffs on books, scientific apparatus, and other cultural materials.

8. Add technical amendments to the Housing Act to make it more advantageous for urban institutions to participate in the Federal urban renewal program.

9. Authorize a program of grants to the several States in support of educational television.

10. Establish a permanent Council of Educational Advisers to the President of the United States to coordinate policies and procedures of the educational programs in the various Federal agencies and to plan on an overall, long-range basis a proper role for the Government in support of education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the publication School Management for February 1961, carries an article entitled "Can Our States Support Good Schools?"

It is an excellent summary of the problem of financial support of our educational system. An editor's note accompanying the article states:

The issue of Federal aid to education has already been raised in this session of Congress, and there is little doubt that it will be a major question for many months. More than that, no matter what action our representatives take this year, it is destined to remain a major issue on our political scene for some time to come.

The following article is based on a speech prepared by Sam Lambert, research director of the National Education Association. Although Mr. Lambert's position is obviously a partisan one (the NEA has been a leader in the fight for greater Federal aid to education), it is not our intention in presenting this material to take sides in the matter. We do, however, hope to present some facts and figures on past, present, and future support of the public schools that will serve as the basis for constructive discussion of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of this survey of financial support of education be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN ALL OF OUR STATES SUPPORT GOOD SCHOOLS?

More money is spent on public education each year than on any other single public activity other than national defense. And, within a decade or two, spending for education may actually outstrip spending for defense.

In 1949–50, it cost $5.8 billion to keep our elementary and secondary schools running. Last year, expenditures almost tripled to an estimated $15.5 billion. It has been estimated by many economists and statisticians that, at the present rate of growth and expansion, the public schools will probably cost $31 or $32 billion each year by 1970.

Where is this extra $15 billion to come from?

Some of it is going to come from increased revenues from present taxes. Our gross national product (the value of all goods and services produced in the United States in a single year) is increasing rapidly. At present about 3 percent of the GNP is captured for public education. Assuming that this percentage remains constant, that alone would account for almost one-half of the extra $15 billion in 1970. What about the rest of the money needed for education?

PROPERTY TAXES

The greatest part of school revenue today is raised on the basis of property taxes. These taxes amounted to $129 per person in New Jersey in 1959. In California, $130 per person was being spent on property taxes and in Massachusetts the figure was $133. In 1959, property taxes exceeded $100 per capita in 15 States. For the country as a whole, property taxes now amount to almost 4 percent of personal income.

It is doubtful if these taxes can be raised much higher than they stand now without overcoming tremendous resistance.

STATE TAXES

In recent years, the States have been carrying about 40 percent of the cost of the public schools. Can the growing variety of State taxes continue to carry two-fifths of the cost of public education?

Unfortunately, where local taxes are low, State taxes are usually correspondingly high. This is not always true, but an examination of the levels of State and local taxes will reveal a large degree of inverse relationship. In 1959, State taxes in the State of Washington amounted to $148 per capita, in Delaware $149 and in Hawaii $170. Even in the relatively poor State of Louisiana, State taxes amounted to $137 per capita. In the fiscal year 1959, State taxes amounted to over $100 per capita in 15 States. According to the Bureau of Census, the national average that year was $91 per capita.

State taxes in 1959 amounted to $8.64 per $100 of personal income in Hawaii. In the States of Louisiana and Mississippi, State taxes amounted to $8.37 and $7.24 per $100 of personal income. For the country as a whole, these taxes require 4.2 percent of personal income. These figures are for fiscal 1959. They have gone up since then.

PROPERTY AND STATE TAXES

Since the support of public education is a cooperative enterprise of local and State governments, the only way to make sense out of this picture is to put all State and local taxes together and see how the overall problem looks. For example, State and local taxes combined, for the year 1959, amounted to $265 per capita in California, $253 in New York, and $245 in Nevada. There are 13 States where the combined State and local tax load amounts to over $200 per person in the population. Looking at this another way, in South Dakota, State and local taxes in 1959 amounted to $12.28 per $100 of personal income. There were eight other States where State and local taxes amounted to over 10 percent of personal income (see following statistics):

Total of State and local tax collections per $100 of personal income, 1959

U.S. average	$8.49
Alabama	7.71
Alaska	6.08
Arizona	9.62
Arkansas	8.98
California	9.50
Colorado	9.99
Connecticut	7.06
Delaware	6.45
Florida	9.04
Georgia	8.42
Idaho	9.65
Illinois	6.98
Indiana	8.05
Iowa	9.80
Kansas	10.68
Kentucky	7.59
Louisiana	11.24
Maine	9.48
Maryland	7.87
Massachusetts	9.31
Michigan	8.95
Minnesota	10.32
Mississippi	10.57
Missouri	6.60
Montana	10.90
Nebraska	8.20
Nevada	9.11
New Hampshire	8.28
New Jersey	7.67
New Mexico	9.09
New York	9.24
North Carolina	8.16
North Dakota	12.01
Ohio	7.09
Oklahoma	9.28
Oregon	9.40
Pennsylvania	7.25
Rhode Island	8.50
South Carolina	8.37
South Dakota	12.28
Tennessee	8.17
Texas	7.76
Utah	9.39
Vermont	11.31
Virginia	6.97
Washington	9.51
West Virginia	7.83
Wisconsin	9.54
Wyoming	10.10

"State and local tax revenues combined, doubled between the years 1950 and 1958 and the total has gone much higher since 1958. State and local tax collections per $100 of personal income are beginning to look more like the bite of a Federal income tax than like that of the traditional modest State and local taxes. It should be noted that some of the States putting forth the greatest tax effort at State and local levels still have the most inadequate schools in the country.

The problem of supporting education is not wealth; it is a problem of tax machinery. A property tax, in supporting our country's second largest enterprise, has certain weaknesses. Its growth is slow and not in proportion to productivity and wealth. There are also problems in enacting further increase in State taxes. Many Governors and legislative bodies are worried about competition for business and industry.

IS FEDERAL AID THE ANSWER?

There are certain misconceptions and misunderstandings in the great debate over Federal support of education. The first of these relates to the size of the national debt.

The national debt is high but it actually has decreased from 93 percent of the gross national product in 1949 to 62 percent in 1959. In relation to assets, the Federal debt is not nearly as large as it was 10 years ago. It has gone up only 8 to 10 percent in the past 10 years, whereas State-local debt has gone up almost 200 percent.

Another misconception relates to the "freight charge" on the Federal tax dollar. The common statement is, "Why send a tax dollar to Washington when by the time it gets back to the local government, it has shrunk to 60 cents?" Actually, the Federal tax collection machinery is by far the most efficient we have ever devised. The cost of collecting local taxes is far higher. Experts have estimated that the collection and administration of local taxes cost as much as $10 per $100 collected. The cost of collecting State taxes is estimated on the average in excess of $1 per $100. Federal taxes are collected at the rate of 44 cents for every $100.

A third issue in the great debate involves the charge of Federal control. There have been many Federal grants in past years. Some have involved control and some have not. But the most dangerous control in existence is that exerted by poverty. The thing that really controls important decisions on education at the local level is the lack of money. Suppose a school district decides it wants a summer program in remedial reading. No one makes the decision for that district; it's entirely a matter of whether it can find the money to support such a program.

The same is true of a district that wants to add a third year of mathematics to its high school curriculum. The problem here is whether it can find a qualified teacher to employ at the going salary rate. Again, it is a matter of money.

Some people believe there is something inherently wrong with using Federal money for education. Why? Federal money is used for practically every other purpose.

Look how much Federal money already goes to the States. Over the country as a whole, Federal money flowing into the States in various types of aid equals 47 percent of the total of State tax collections. State and local governments would find it exceedingly difficult to operate without the assistance now received from the Federal Government.

Farmers, doctors, nurses, highway users, and highway builders, retired persons, the physically handicapped, veterans, widows, the unemployed—all derive some benefit from Federal money. Why not the youth of this Nation?

PROBLEMS WHICH CONFRONT THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks I am about to make in respect to some questions of American foreign policy a part of Mr. Drew Pearson's column, appearing in "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," published this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss now some of the problems which confront the United States in the United Nations, a discussion based upon my experience as a delegate to the United Nations from September 20 to December 20, 1960.

I had the great privilege of serving on that delegation with a wonderful colleague in the Senate, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. In a report which I submitted to the Senate I paid tribute to the service of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and that tribute will be found on pages 2 and 3 of the report. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GEORGE AIKEN SERVED WITH DISTINCTION

My Senate colleague on the delegation was the distinguished and very able liberal Republican Senator from Vermont, GEORGE AIKEN. He served our country with great distinction. He was particularly adept in puncturing fallacious Russian arguments in the debates in the Fifth Committee on which Senator AIKEN was the U.S. delegate. The major concern of the Fifth Committee involved the matter of financing the manifold activities and operations of the United Nations. Over the years, it has become too much of a habit in the United Nations for the member nations in an almost take-it-for-granted attitude to look to the United States to foot most of the financial bill when some new emergency or important world need arises.

Many of the countries of Europe, as well as Russia, have not paid their just and fair share of the financial expenses and costs of the United Nations. Russia, along with her Communist bloc allies, has adopted a very recalcitrant attitude and parsimonious policy in respect to supporting financially the United Nations.

Time and time again, Senator AIKEN focused the attention of the Fifth Committee on the extent to which the United States has been carrying the financial burden of the United Nations. He made clear that we are perfectly willing to pay our fair share of the costs but that the time has come when other member nations who are now in good economic condition, comparatively, should be expected to increase their payments to the United Nations. He drove home the point that Russia and her Communist associates seem to have made their deliberate, inadequate financial support of the United Nations a definite part of their cold war tactics. He also called attention to the fact that there is a growing concern among the American taxpayers over the fact that the United States large contributions appear to be out of proportion to those made by many other countries.

He tactfully but effectively pointed out that if the inequitable disparity in payments among the nations continued, it would become increasingly difficult in the U.S. Congress to secure approval for United Nations appropriations in the amounts now granted. At the same time, Senator AIKEN made perfectly clear that the United States is a stanch supporter of the United Nations and always can be counted upon to help finance United Nations programs based upon a fair and equitable distribution of the costs among all the member nations in accordance with their ability to pay.

Senator AIKEN was a source of great strength to the U.S. delegation, not only on the Fifth Committee but also in connection with all the other phases of the delegation's work. He happens to be a member of the Senate's Subcommittee on Latin America, of which I have the honor of serving as chairman. Many matters and issues arose during the 15th General Assembly session that called for consultations, negotiations, and very important diplomatic discussions with delegations from Latin America. The Cuban crisis, for example, required our constant attention and called for hours of time day after day in conference with delegates, not only from Latin America, but from all over the world. The false charges of Castro and his Cuban delegation required calm, objective, and persuasive presentation of rebuttal facts and evidence. Senator AIKEN was of great help because of his expert knowledge of Latin American affairs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also paid tribute in the report to the statesmanship of former Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, who was the head of the American delegation in the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent that my comments upon his dedicated service be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO U.S. DELEGATION—AMBASSADOR WADSWORTH

However, first I wish to pay high tribute to the fine dedicated service which all of my colleagues on the U.S. delegation rendered to our country during the 3 months' session of the General Assembly, lasting between the dates of September 20 to December 20, 1960.

The head of our delegation was Ambassador James J. Wadsworth. For the 2 years previous to his United Nations assignment, Ambassador Wadsworth was our Ambassador at Geneva in charge of the long and trying negotiations with the Russians in an attempt to reach a satisfactory agreement on ending nuclear tests. Although the Russians finally broke up those negotiations by walking out on them, history will record that Ambassador Wadsworth distinguished himself as a very able negotiator and diplomat throughout those 2 years of difficult conferences with the Russians.

In fact, it is to the everlasting credit of our Ambassador that he was able to reduce substantially the areas of disagreement between the United States and Russia concerning the much-to-be-desired ending of nuclear testing. When a new United States mission comes to renew negotiations with the Russians over the issue of nuclear testing and the even broader issue of controlled total disarmament, it will be the beneficiary of the spade work and fertile seeding which Ambassador Wadsworth did at the 1958 to 1960 Geneva Conferences on Nuclear Testing.

It was with the same qualities of nonpartisan statesmanship that Jerry Wadsworth (as he became affectionately known by us) guided and directed the work of our U.S. delegation at the General Assembly. Whenever some of us or all of us on the delegation believed that the instructions we received from the State Department on some issue were not in the best interests of our country, Ambassador Wadsworth saw to it that there was thorough discussion of the matter at a delegation meeting. If such a discussion did not resolve the differences, Ambassador Wadsworth, irrespective of whether he agreed or disagreed with the State Department instructions, saw to it that the views of the members of the delegation were made known through appropriate channels to the responsible officials in the State Department.

Ambassador Wadsworth and all of us on the U.S. delegation were on the firing line, so to speak, at the General Assembly. Every statement we made, every vote we cast, every policy we proposed or opposed added to or detracted from the standing of the United States at the United Nations. Probably more than at any other session in the history of the General Assembly the policies, alinements and votes of the U.S. delegation were bound to be closely scrutinized and coldly appraised by many delegations, including the large number from the new member nations.

However, we served our country as ambassadors bound by the instructions sent to us from the White House or from the State Department. We, in turn, owed a duty to the State Department and, through it, to the White House, to register our respectful dissents, reservations, and suggestions for changes in our instructions whenever we became convinced that the realities and facts which we faced on the United Nations firing line could not be squared with the instructions which Washington had sent us. Surprisingly enough, this happened rather frequently.

Thanks to the leadership and diplomatic qualities of Ambassador Wadsworth, his interventions in behalf of the delegation succeeded in some instances in obtaining either reversals or modifications of some of the particularly unfortunate original instructions. When we had to live with a bad instruction, Ambassador Wadsworth earned our great admiration by making the best possible case out of a bad U.S. position when he came to explain the U.S. vote to the General Assembly. In politics, he is a Republican. In foreign policy, he is a nonpartisan just as we all should be. On the basis of his record of public service, he should not be lost to the diplomatic service of our country in this time of international crisis.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, beginning on page 3 of the report and going over to page 6, I called special attention to the fine service rendered by the other delegates on the U.S. delegation to the United Nations last fall. It is important that my evaluation of them—which I can assure the Senate is shared by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]—be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so I ask unanimous consent that it be done.

There being no objection, the evaluation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION WERE GREAT CREDIT TO THE UNITED STATES

If the people of the United States could have heard the many fine things repeatedly said throughout the 3 months' session about all of my colleagues on the U.S. delegation by delegate after delegate from all over the world, they would be just as proud as I am of the delegation. I'm sure the American people also would agree that I should record in

this report in these few words an expression of thanks and appreciation for their fine public service.

FRANCIS WILCOX

Each one of my colleagues on the delegation is a distinguished American in his or her own right. The Honorable Francis Wilcox, until recently an Assistant Secretary of State and now dean of the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, is a recognized authority on the United Nations. Without his keen insight and foresight, the work of the delegation would have been greatly impaired. He was the U.S. delegate on the First Committee. He handled with great tact and diplomacy the U.S. position on several very delicate and touchy problems such as the Arab refugee problem.

MRS. MARY LORD

Mrs. Mary Lord has served for 8 years on the Third Committee dealing with human rights. She is beloved throughout the United Nations headquarters. Her long record of dedicated public service has made her not only one of the most popular ambassadors at the United Nations but a very effective one for the United States.

AMBASSADOR FRANCES WILLIS

Ambassador Frances Willis is our U.S. Ambassador to Norway. She has been in the Foreign Service of the United States for 33 years. She served as the U.S. delegate on the Special Political Committee. My admiration for her ability is unlimited. Her wise counsel and diplomatic ability was of great help to Ambassador Wadsworth and the entire delegation.

DR. ZELMA GEORGE

Dr. Zelma George, of Cleveland, Ohio, was our delegate assigned to help on the Second Committee which has jurisdiction over economic and financial matters. She is one of the great Negro women of America. Her brilliant record in education, the arts, and on the lecture platform brought a background of training to our delegation that stood us in very good stead throughout the session. Her scholarly and objective approach to all of the racial and human rights problems which are of such great concern, not only in our own country but within many member nations, made her an invaluable member of the delegation. Dr. George's work among the African nations made available to us information which I am sure we never would have been able to obtain from any other source at our command. Very early in the session, she won the confidence and respect of many of the members of the African delegations. We learned through her about some of the problems and misunderstandings concerning the United States which developed within some of the African delegations. Again, with her help, we were able to clear up many of those misunderstandings.

It was Dr. George who provided the General Assembly with one of its most dramatic and heart-touching incidents during the closing days of the session. On December 14, when the colonial resolution calling for early independence for all colonial people who wanted it was voted upon, there were 89 nations voting for it, none against it, and 9 abstaining. The United States, unfortunately, was among the nine abstentions, along with Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic, France, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. The U.S. vote was a very unpopular vote. It did us great damage. It was a White House instructed vote.

Immediately upon the announcement of the results of the vote, Dr. George arose at her desk within the U.S. delegation and started an applause which broke into an ovation. I sat beside her and vigorously joined her in the applause. Her dramatic expression of deep feeling and enthusiastic approval over the passage of the resolution by such an overwhelming vote caused almost every eye in the huge assembly hall to be focused upon her. I felt that the thunderous applause which broke forth was more of an ovation for Mrs. George than for anything else. It was quickly recognized that her demonstration symbolized one of the great strengths of personal freedom in a democracy. She stood there, living proof of the fact that although our Government on the vote just cast had unfortunately allied itself with the colonial powers, she, as an individual, was free to applaud the passage of a resolution which, in essence, rejected colonialism.

A very humorous incident occurred within our delegation immediately thereafter. The Communist head of the Rumanian delegation walked over to us and said laughingly to Ambassador Wadsworth, "I see you have a couple of rebels in your delegation." Quick as a flash, Wadsworth replied, "Yes, we have and we are proud of them. Of course, in your country they would be shot." Needless to say, all of us who heard the colloquy, including the Rumanian, enjoyed a good laugh, but the moral of Ambassador Wadsworth's comment is worth remembering.

FREDERICK PAYNE

One of the sources of strength of the U.S. delegation was its cross section representation of American life and interests. Thus, Mr. Frederick Payne, a New York City financier, brought to the work of the delegation the expert knowledge of an exceptionally able business leader. His understanding of world trade problems, international finance, and foreign economic trends and conditions in many parts of the world made him a most valuable member of our delegation. His extensive travels abroad enabled him to give us firsthand information on many problems which confronted us. He served as a delegate on Committee Two. His desire to know the facts about any problem and then follow where the facts lead won my admiration for him very early in the session. I felt that every conference with him was an educational seminar on whatever problem we discussed. The services of business leaders such as Mr. Payne are very much needed in government and in the work of the United Nations.

ARTHUR LAMEY

Mr. Arthur Lamey, of Billings, Mont., is a very able lawyer who brought to the work of the delegation a fine mind, a judicious temperament, and a heart full of understanding and sympathy for the myriad of human problems which are enmeshed in the complex international affairs of the underdeveloped areas of the world. He served as one of our delegates on the Third Committee. Mr. Lamey also was of great help to Ambassador Wadsworth in the plenary sessions of the General Assembly, as well as in the general administrative work of the delegation. His analyses of some of the Russian proposals were of great help to the delegation, and his effective committee work in handling the Russians was superb.

JUDGE CHARLES ROSENBAUM

Judge Charles Rosenbaum, of Denver, Colo., was a tireless delegate who championed our country's cause whenever and wherever he met up with a delegate from any foreign country who seemed to be puzzled, or critical, or just seeking information about the position of our delegation on some issue. He was a very effective ambassador of the United States at the United Nations. His discussions at the meetings of the U.S. delegation many times caused us to scrutinize very carefully a proposed policy action. On several occasions, his recommendations helped avoid what I think would have been serious mistakes in the work of the delegation. He served on Committee Six, which considered legal questions, and brought to that Committee the contributions of his fine legal mind.

For many years, Judge Rosenbaum has been a very active supporter of public information programs about the United Nations. He recognizes that an informed American public opinion about the work of the United Nations is essential to continued U.S. support of the United Nations. With his background of knowledge of the United Nations and his keen interest in the legal and judicial institutions of the United Nations as instruments for promoting peaceful settlement of international disputes, Judge Rosenbaum was a very effective member of our delegation.

At the risk of seeming to blow a horn of fulsome praise about the work of my colleagues on the U.S. delegation at the 15th General Assembly, I have made the foregoing remarks about them because I know them to be deserved. Furthermore, I wanted to leave this record of my appreciation of their splendid service to their country and of my indebtedness to them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn to the reports which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I have made. The joint report was issued to the press last Friday, accompanied by the excellent supplementary views of the Senator from Vermont, and an appropriate press release. The supplemental views of the senior Senator from Oregon were sent to the press last Saturday, for release today with, I hope, an appropriate press release.

I wish to say goodnaturedly that a reading of the press would cause one to wonder when the Senator from Vermont and I were going to release our reports, because such releases have been treated, as the press has a perfect right to treat them, with thunders of silence, for the most part.

But the American people are entitled to know some of the conclusions that were reached by designated delegates of the Senate of the United States in respect to the functioning of the United Nations, and therefore I shall take some time, for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to call attention to some of the major recommendations that the Senator from Vermont and I have submitted to the Senate, and, through the Senate, to the Government of the United States, and through the Government of the United States, to the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the press release which I issued last Saturday in regard to my supplementary views, taking the form of a report on my service in the General Assembly.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE SAYS UNITED STATES MUST STOP SUPPORTING COLONIALISM

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, today filed with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a supplemental report on his work as a U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In it, MORSE described in detail his assignment to the fourth, or trusteeship, committee of the assembly. The joint report by Senators AIKEN and MORSE, and Senator AIKEN's supplemental report on his committee assignment, were filed last week.

The Morse report condemned the policy followed by the United States at the U.N. last fall in support of continued colonialism by some of America's allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He also urged that differences of opinion between the U.S. delegation at the U.N. and the State Department be settled by the President. He said in summary:

"I regret to report that on the major issues before the committee and the full Assembly involving colonialism, the U.S. delegation was directed by our State Department to side with the colonial powers, and against the proposals offered to end colonialism. This opposition customarily took the form of an abstention from voting, which on these issues still amounts to placing the United States on the side of the colonial powers.

"Because of this unfortunate voting record on the colonial issues in the 15th General Assembly, the United States branded itself as a supporter of colonialism.

"This was very costly to the standing and prestige of the United States within the United Nations, and it must be changed starting in the renewed session of the General Assembly in March if we are to have any hope of winning the confidence and good will of the many non-Communist, neutral, and uncommitted nations in the world whose delegates frankly state that they are at a complete loss to understand the voting record of the United States. * * * This record was especially unfortunate because it contrasted sharply with our opposition to the Communist brand of colonialism."

"Because of this position," MORSE said, "we rejected our own history, and allowed the Communist bloc to champion the cause of those millions of people who are trying to gain independence."

He pointed out that the United States is historically in the best possible position to champion the cause of those people seeking independence:

"Historic American sympathy for and actions in support of independence movements constitute one of the strongest reasons for the leadership of the United States in the free world today. We are fortunate that this push of U.S. idealism coincides with the trend of political events. Independence movements are succeeding. Nothing can stop this process; people everywhere want governments of their own choosing, and the colonial powers know or should know that the end of colonialism is near."

He attributed this American position to Pentagon interests, and to our membership in NATO, whose success is very important to us.

"It is my opinion that our policymakers in the Pentago Building are not sufficiently sensitive about the policies and practices of some of the colonial powers in respect to human rights of the indigenous people whom they rule and dominate. In the name of military defense, the United States has spent huge sums of money for bases and military installations in dictator countries, resulting in great economic benefit to colonial powers and dictatorships. It is very doubtful that the overall effect of any of these military installations has been to strengthen the security of the United States.

"If one scratches deeply enough into the mistaken U.S. positions on colonial issues, one will probably find a U.S. military influence. The Department of State has seemed to lack the necessary disposition either to question the military need for such requirements or to balance their importance properly against other policy objectives. Once the Joint Chiefs of Staff have spoken, that tends to end the discussion."

Referring to NATO in particular, he said that recent history has changed its relative importance.

"The purposes of NATO are specific and limited; it was designed to forestall possible Soviet aggression across Europe with large masses of troops. But that was 10 to 12 years ago. The Russians have plainly found it much easier to go around NATO than to go through it, and they are doing so by seizing on the hopes and aspirations of people in former colonies or in so-called underdeveloped countries all over the world.

"It is simply folly for America to throw away all the natural and historic advantage we have with these people by siding with a few NATO powers who are also the powers seeking to prolong colonialism."

He was especially critical of the extent to which we have been guided by Great Britain on colonial issues.

"In my opinion, we have for too long allowed the British to influence us unduly on colonial questions. United States positions in the United Nations on this subject have served British interests better than American interests. It is time to put a stop to this. I place this topic high on the list of urgent foreign policy questions for the new administration."

He said that the delegates of the former British colonies believe that the United States gives Britain more credit than is due her for her colonial policies.

"They charge that the condition of the British exchequer has exercised a much greater influence on British colonial policy than any sense of justice toward indigenous people. They call attention to the fact that the United Kingdom is still the largest colonial power in the world, and that her position on the colonial resolution in the 15th General Assembly was motivated more by her economic advantage in delaying independence than her desire to prepare colonies for independence.

"They also state with obvious intense feeling that in almost every instance they were not granted their independence—but in fact won it—from a reluctant Britain."

MORSE listed each issue involving colonialism at the U.N. last fall, and the position taken on it by the United States. He also described several discussions within the delegation and with State Department officials regarding the position to be taken by this country. On target dates for independence:

"The instructions of the Department of State to the U.S. delegation have been to vote 'no' on a resolution inviting administering authorities to set up independence target dates. If we are to match our deeds with our words, the United States should cosponsor such a resoltuion, or at least vote 'yes.'"

On urging Portugal to report to the U.N. on her oversea territories:

"Such a resolution was adopted by a vote of 45–6–24, but instead of voting 'yes' on the question the U.S. delegation was instructed by the State Department to abstain. The vote was very costly to U.S. prestige in both the Fourth Committee and the General Assembly.

"It is common knowledge in the United Nations that Portugal has threatened the United States with the loss of the use of the Azores as an airline landing base if we join other nations in rejecting Portugal's absurd claim that she does not have foreign territories, but only oversea metropolitan provinces.

"It is to be hoped that the U.S. delegation will not again be instructed to abstain on the Portugal colonial issue and thereby seem to support the legal fiction advanced by Portugal that she has no territories."

On sending an observation team to South-West Africa, a mandate of the Union of South Africa, which he said the State Department "fumbled and bungled":

"The proposal to have a committee go into South-West Africa embodied the same principle as that embodied in the Hungarian question. We have sought for several years to have the U.N. committee go into Hungary and make observations and report back to the U.N. The final resolution on South-West Africa passed the Fourth Committee by a vote of 65 to 0, with 15 nations abstaining, including the United States. The resolution was clearly within the jurisdiction of the U.N. Charter, and was salutary in its objectives. The U.S. delegation should have voted for it. The U.S. vote of abstention on this resolution was very harmful because once again, we appeared to be sustaining policies of a colonial power whose policy in South-West Africa has aroused deep resentment among many African nations."

The Ambassador from the Union had previously gone to the State Department to protest a MORSE speech in the Fourth Committee, and had declared that if the U.S. position continued, there might have to be a suspension of further discussions for location of a U.S. missile-track station in the Union of South Africa.

"I would not mention these negotiations if they were in fact a secret," MORSE said, "but U.S. plans to establish a missile track station in the Union of South Africa were told to me by African delegates before I even knew about them from my own Government."

He quoted from a wire he had sent to Secretary Herter at the time, stating: "Any threat from Union of South Africa to delay negotiations on a military tracking station should be repudiated by State Department by making clear to Ambassador of Union of South Africa that U.S. support of human rights will not be traded for tracking stations." However, MORSE was unable to gain State Department support for the resolution.

On the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and people:

"This resolution was sponsored by 43 Asian and African States. It was not referred to the Fourth Committee, but was put directly on the agenda of the full assembly for debate and decision. The United States should have voted in favor of the resolution. Instead, we abstained. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 89 to 0, with 9 abstentions."

MORSE described the discussions over the American position in some detail, because it was on this vote, that, upon pressure from Great Britain, President Eisenhower made the decision to abstain. Said MORSE: "But for this pressure from the British Government, the United States would have voted in favor of the resolution."

On Algeria:

"The General Assembly approved a resolution which recognized the right of self-determination by the people of Algeria, recognized the need for guarantees of that right, and recognized a responsibility on the part of the United Nations for implementing this right of self-determination. But the United States abstained."

Senator MORSE was also highly critical of State Department procedures for handling the U.S. activities at the United Nations. He said that major policy decisions were too often made at a very low level in the State Department, even in overruling the opinion of the delegation at the United Nations. Occasionally, he said the U.S. delegates "knew that although the overruling instructions were signed nominally by the Secretary, the decision behind the instruction had actually been made by an Assistant Secretary of State, or even lower level in the Department of State. This, it seems to me, is very bad practice. It is even worse when such decisions are made by a desk officer, and transmitted orally.

"Calling signals from the bench may be an acceptable way of running a football team; calling signals from an Assistant Secretary's desk in the State Department in Washington on diplomatic plays to be run by the U.S. delegation at the United Nations in New York City is no way to run American foreign policy. It resulted in our being thrown for a great loss within the United Nations on the South-West African issue.

"It is my opinion that the permanent U.S. representative to the U.N. should not be overruled by anybody having a lower position of responsibility in the Department of State. This means that overruling instructions should originate with someone who is senior to an Assistant Secretary of State. In view of the higher responsibility, and the special knowledge of events and opinions in the United Nations forum which are possessed by the permanent representative, his judgment should prevail over that of an Assistant Secretary of State, or any official or group of officials of lesser responsibility in Washington.

"There is no responsibility of the President and the Secretary of State more important from the standpoint of the very survival of our country in the years immediately ahead than the questions of foreign policy which become involved in the functioning of the United Nations. The line of command, reaching U.S. decisions and determining U.S. policy at the United Nations, should be a direct one from the President to the Secretary of State to the U.S. Ambassador at the United Nations.

"It should be understood that the President will be advised in the event the Secretary of State or the Ambassador at the United Nations, or both, believe that some issue involving a choice of policy is of such importance to the interests of the United States at the United Nations, that the President should be consulted about it. I am not moved by any argument that the President should not be asked to intervene in such matters. The policies which our country follows in the United Nations in the next few years in respect to a considerable number of major issues may very well spell the difference between war or peace for the world."

MORSE had high praise for the American delegates with whom he served last fall. In particular, he said of former Ambassador Wadsworth that "on the basis of his record of public service, he should not be lost to the diplomatic service of our country in this time of international crisis."

The appendix to the report gives the text of the speeches made by Senator MORSE for the United States, and texts of the resolutions involving colonialism.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the press release that was submitted to the press dealing with the joint report of the Senator from Vermont and myself, together with the press release and the supplementary views of the Senator from Vermont.

There being no objection, the press releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE AIKEN-MORSE REPORT ON FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, members of the delegation of the United States to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, today released their report to the Committee on Foreign Relations containing their observations on problems facing the United States in the United Nations.

The two Senators summarized their conclusions in the report as follows:

"1. Owing to the present discrepancy between the great hopes placed on the United Nations Organization and the resources and power which members have been willing to place at its disposal, the Organization has reached a critical stage in its development.

"2. The objectives of most nations, except the Communist countries, would be served by the strengthening of the United Nations. Since the underdeveloped, uncommitted nations perceive that they have the most to gain from the United Nations, and since the political direction of these countries may be decisive in the struggle for survival, neither the Communist countries nor the United States and its friends are likely from preference to withdraw from the United Nations.

"3. It seems certain that if something like the present political composition of the General Assembly continues, increasing responsibilities, both in security cases and in economic and social fields are going be vested in the Secretary-General and in the United Nations agencies. It will continue to be in the best interest of the United States, for the reasons and within the limits discussed in this report, to support, financially and otherwise, such an improvement in United Nations activities. The burden and inhibitions of being host to the United Nations are substantially counterbalanced by the benefits and opportunities thus afforded.

"4. Among the problems which require special policy attention by the U.S. Government, along the lines suggested in this report, are: The continuing efforts of the Communist countries to undermine the effectiveness of the United Nations; the chance that Communist China will soon be represented, with or without the agreement of the United States; the strong drives for the ending of the remaining colonial relationships; and the financial and administrative strains resulting from the response of the United Nations to emergency situations."

The report lays heavy stress on the need for the United States to face up to the issue of Chinese representation and to the inadequacy of past policies on colonial issues. Equal emphasis is given to the necessity for countries believing in the worth of the United Nations to match their words with financial support.

The Senators reached these conclusions on Chinese representation:

"The question of Chinese representation in the United Nations will be dealt with first in the General Assembly where there is no veto and where the question of seating Red Chinese representatives will probably be decided by a majority vote.

"In the Security Council the question of representation would likely be deemed a procedural matter and therefore not subject to a veto by the United States. An attempt by the United States to use a veto to prevent the Council from concluding that the question is procedural (that is, to attempt a double veto) would probably fail.

"It seems reasonable to conclude that future U.S. policy must be based upon the assumption that Red China could be seated in the United Nations as early as the 16th General Assembly session, whether we agree or not. How high a price would the United States have to pay to defeat the next effort to seat representatives of Communist China? Does the United States have sufficient bargaining power left to insure representation for Formosa? If so, should we attempt to negotiate an arrangement whereby 'two Chinas' might be represented or would it be better to continue present policy, come what may? These questions ought to be the subject of urgent policy studies."

On colonial questions the report stated: "The bitter irony of the situation is that the Soviet Union, which has enslaved more alien people than any nation in history, is succeeding in posing as the great champion of people in colonies and the implacable foe of colonial powers."

"The third reason for Soviet success is that the United States has too often been found voting on colonial issues in the company of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Spain, Union of South Africa, Portugal, and other colonial powers. It is the conclusion of this report that such an attitude has weakened the real anticolonial position of the United States."

Senator MORSE will shortly release a supplemental report spelling out in considerable detail the background of several unwise votes by the United States in the General Assembly on colonial issues.

With respect to the current financial crisis in the United Nations, Senators AIKEN and MORSE said:

"It would be invidious to list here friendly countries which have been in arrears on their payments toward the regular United Nations budget and toward the UNEF operation in Gaza or have been vague as to what they are prepared to do toward meeting the costs of the Congo operation. It is to be hoped that United Nations members will see their true interest in the survival of the United Nations and will not permit failure for lack of funds.

"The need for the United Nations to take on important additional tasks will probably continue to grow. The willingness of United Nations members to face the financial consequences of their decisions is unfortunately now in doubt. The United Nations must urgently explore ways and means of adding the necessary financial resources and flexibility in the administration of United Nations emergency activities."

Senator AIKEN is releasing simultaneously with this joint report of the two Senators his own supplementary observations dealing largely with financial problems. That supplementary report concludes as follows:

"Efforts to enforce peace, however, will not be decisive until the member nations both great and small are willing to support such efforts. According to Secretary General Hammarskjold's estimates, the current costs of world armament amount to $320 million a day. If each nation would contribute only 1 day's cost to an international police force each year, it is possible that all expenses in this field could be met.

"It will take more than money alone to enforce peace in the world. It will take the desire for peace and the willingness to meet equitable demands and to accept the verdict. We are still far from reaching that goal. The road toward it is exasperating and frustrating, but we cannot give up."

Senators AIKEN and MORSE believe the advantages and opportunities which come with the holding of United Nations meetings in New York are much more significant than the burdens.

On the question of the Communists taking over the United Nations the Senators stated: "It seems proper to conclude that if the day comes when the United States is faced with a hostile majority that situation will be a reflection of a deteriorating world order so serious as to make an adverse U.N. vote seem a minor matter."

The Senators are critical of the so-called Connally reservation (p. 4). They call for financial aid to the New York police on account of the high cost of protecting certain U.N. delegates (p. 6). They urge a real effort on the part of the United States to negotiate an international covenant on human rights (p. 12). They call for a reexamination of the various points of view with respect to the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund (SUNFED) (p. 23) and they urge serious study of a U.N. peace and security fund to pay for emergency U.N. interventions (p. 26).

VIEWS IN UNITED STATES ABOUT UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MORSE. My views can be summarized by repeating my conviction, after serving 3 months as a member of the U.S. delegation at the United Nations, that the best hope for peace in the world is to be found in strengthening,

preserving, and perpetuating the United Nations. I am concerned about the number of references, even including some editorials, that one finds in the press these days, raising questions as to the value of the United Nations as a preserver of the peace of the world.

There are anti-United Nations forces at work in our country, and if they should ever prevail, in my opinion mankind would lose one of its best hopes for establishing a system of international justice through law for the settlement of issues that threaten the peace of the world.

Sometimes in recent weeks I have suspected that what appears to be a new wave of opposition to the United Nations in some parts of our land is due to the fact that it is increasingly recognized that the United States has lost an automatic majority vote in the United Nations. And so we have. But we do not need an automatic vote to prove the soundness of our case. All we need is a forum where we can present to responsible delegates from the nations of the world the merits of our case, and we will win.

I am convinced of one thing, among many, as a result of my 3 months at the United Nations, and that is that when the merits are on our side we will win a majority vote, and when a majority of the nations of this world in their opinion find us not right on an issue, in keeping with their obligations to their governments we must expect them to vote against us.

One parliamentary tactic of the past that has characterized some of the U.S. operation in the United Nations, namely, the pressure tactic, has lost most of its influence and impact, and I am convinced also that the American dollar sign no longer will produce votes in the United Nations for U.S. course of action. And I think that is all to the good, because if we are to maintain a leadership in the world, in the interest of promoting peace, we must do so on the merits of our case.

Even in the last session of the United Nations there lingered some influence of the United States, in my judgment, connected with our foreign aid program, or the promises of a foreign aid program, or the fear of not offending Uncle Sam, with resulting negative effects upon the aid program that caused us on some issues to receive a few votes contrary to the convictions of the delegates casting the votes. But I am pleased to report to the Senate that those votes were rare, and I think they were fewer toward the end of the session than they were at the beginning.

I wish it were possible to submit to the Senate a report on the operations of the United Nations in the last session, as far as U.S. participation is concerned, that was completely favorable to American policy. But I cannot do so, any more than the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], in connection with some of the operations of the Fifth Committee, which was the Committee on so-called fiscal matters of the United Nations on which he was the U.S. delegate, could make a report to the Senate completely favorable to the policy of the United States.

It was the policy of Ambassador Wadsworth to assign each delegate to one of the standing committees of the General Assembly with the full responsibility—in consultation, of course, with the delegation and the Ambassador, and, when necessary, the State Department—of representing our Government in the work on the Committee.

The Senator from Vermont represented the United States on the Fifth Committee. I represented the United States on the Fourth Committee, which is the Committee that has jurisdiction over all questions involving those areas of the world where the indigenous population is still non-self-governing. In other words, the Committee had jurisdiction over all colonial issues, save and except the Algerian issue, which was referred to the First, or Political, Committee, and the overall colonial resolution, which was considered by the General Assembly itself in plenary session.

My criticism of U.S. foreign policy in relation to the United Nations as set forth in my report goes primarily to the U.S. position on colonial policies; second, to what I consider to be the undue influence of the Pentagon in the promotion of American foreign policy with special reference to colonial policies; third, the existing procedures in regard to the line of command between the White House, the State Department, and the U.S. delegation at the United Nations in New York.

GENERAL POLICY ON COLONIALISM BAD

In my judgment, if the United States continues to support the colonial policies it has supported in the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, we will continue to lose the support of an overwhelming majority of the nations of Africa, an overwhelming majority of the nations of southeast Asia, and an overwhelming majority of the nations of Latin America. We have already lost much of their support and confidence.

Time and time again on colonial issues in the 15th General Assembly we voted against them. They voted against us with some understanding, in the sense that they appreciated the fact that the United States was seeking to be of assistance to colonial powers, particularly NATO powers, in the hope that those allies, of their own will, would see the handwriting on the wall and change their policies, so that at another General Assembly the United States would not be in a position of seeming to be saving the face of our allies by smudging our own face.

As I point out in my report, the historic policy of the United States is to support independence of indigenous people. One of the reasons that we have been admired around the world has been our historic stand for the self-determination of people and allowing people to be independent of foreign masters. We put that principle into practice in our own Declaration of Independence against the British Crown.

However, the undeniable fact is that in our votes in the United Nations we have been voting in support of colonial powers who are practicing upon millions of people around the world such atrocious acts of inhumanity to man that the United States cannot justify on any moral grounds being associated with those colonial powers in any votes which aid and abet their colonial practices.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA ISSUE

There are many examples which I cite in my report. However, in the brief time I wish to take this afternoon, I shall limit my comments to two examples. The first is South-West Africa. The people of South-West Africa comprise about 11 million blacks, indigenous Negroes, and 3 million whites, living there under an old League of Nations mandate growing out of World War I, a mandate which was granted to the British Crown; the British Crown in turn delegated the administrative functions under the mandate to the Government of the Union of South Africa.

The Union of South Africa, in keeping with its apartheid policy of race separation and atrocious conduct toward the Negroes of South-West Africa, in proven instance after instance, obviously is seeking to make South-West Africa a part of the Union of South Africa.

I speak solemnly, I speak advisedly—yes, I speak cautiously—when I say that my observations at the United Nations thus far convince me that if the Union of South Africa continues its inhumane policy in South-West Africa, as soon as the other African nations become strong enough to come to the assistance of South-West Africa, and the United Nations does not adopt a course of action that will prevent such a catastrophe, the rivers of South Africa and South-West Africa will run red with the blood of the whites. There is no doubt in my mind that South-West Africa has the making of a major war in Africa, unless the 11 million colored people of South-West Africa are given protection from the repressive policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa in South-West Africa.

We sat, as the Fourth Committee in the United Nations has sat now for 14 years, and listened to petitioners who were smuggled out of South-West Africa. Let us remember that the Union of South Africa will not even let a United Nations observing committee go into South-West Africa. The Presiding Officer of the Senate could not get into South-West Africa. Conditions in South-West Africa are such that the Union of South Africa has sought to seal it off from the rest of the world, because what a person would see in South-West Africa would raise a storm of protest wherever the observer thereafter went. We listened again this year to petitioners from South-West Africa cite incident after incident of the brutality and exploitation that prevails in South-West Africa, practiced upon that population by the Government of the Union of South Africa.

Of course every time the subject matter is raised in the Fourth Committee, the delegation from the Union of

South Africa stalks out of the Committee. His Government refuses to listen to the petitioners, and refuses to reply to the documentation that is presented to the Committee. This year we became involved in very serious conflict on the South-West African resolution, which ended up in a conflict between a majority of the U.S. delegation and the State Department itself.

There was first proposed a resolution by Guinea, sponsored by four or five other nations. In my opinion it was a very unsound resolution on South-West Africa, because the effect of the resolution sought an end to the League of Nations mandate.

The question of the application of the League of Nations mandate, the jurisdiction of the Union of South Africa under the mandate—yes, the limits of the jurisdiction of the United Nations involving questions of international law—should be settled by judicial processes, and not by resolutions passed through the Fourth Committee and subsequently through the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The subject involved a procedural debate, and it was within my jurisdiction and prerogative and duty to participate in that procedural debate. So I protested the Guinean resolution. I pointed out that the effect of the Guinean resolution was to bring to an end the League of Nations mandate while there was pending before the World Court a contentious case filed by Ethiopia and Liberia, seeking to have the World Court rule on the respective rights of the Government of the Union of South Africa and the indigenous population of South-West Africa and the U.N.

In keeping with a system of international justice through law, the U.N., through the Fourth Committee, should not seek to exercise jurisdiction to the extent of bringing the mandate to an end until the World Court had handed down its decision. Of course, it could take from 2 to 3 years to get that decision; and when one deals with a situation so volatile and so highly charged with emotion as the issue of South-West Africa, it is rather difficult to get people to wait 2 or 3 years for a determination of what they consider to be their legal rights—rights which they believe have long been denied.

I presented a series of objections to the resolutions and closed that speech with the suggestion that a new resolution be offered which in essence would provide that the Government of South-West Africa be asked to invite the United Nations Subcommittee on South-West Africa to visit South-West Africa and make a survey and inspection of conditions in South-West Africa, and report both to the Union of South Africa Government and to the United Nations. My speech appears in the appendix to the report.

I pointed out, in making that recommendation, that the delegates of the Union of South Africa out in the lounges, in the corridors, and in the cloakrooms told us that the information we were receiving, both from the petitioners and from our own Subcommittee on South-West Africa, the chairman of which was a great delegate from Uruguay, contained misrepresentations, falsehoods, and a very slanted opinion as to conditions in South-West Africa. My reply was:

> Why don't you come in and say it on the record? Why don't you present your rebuttal on the record?

The delegates from the Union of South Africa hid behind their own fallacious contention that the Committee does not have jurisdiction. So far as I know, there are not more than three members of the United Nations, who really believe that the United Nations does not have jurisdiction over conditions existing in South-West Africa to the extent, at least, of seeking to make recommendations to the Union of South Africa Government concerning the steps which need to be taken to bring to an end the tensions existing there, tensions which, in turn, raise a very serious threat to the peace in Africa.

As the result of some negotiations which followed my speech, a new resolution was offered. The new resolution adopted every criticism which the U.S. delegation had made to the original Guinean resolution. It included a section which provided for the suggestion I had offered, namely, to invite the Union Government to ask the United Nations own Subcommittee on South-West Africa to make an inspection of conditions in South-West Africa, and report its finding to the Union Government and to the United Nations.

The proposal I made and the resolution which resulted therefrom were discussed, as was the proposal of Ambassador Wadsworth, at a meeting of the U.S. delegation, and it met with complete approval. We made that recommendation to the State Department.

It is necessary to keep in mind that those of us who sit on delegations to the United Nations do so as Ambassadors. We have the obligation of voting in accordance with the instructions which come from our Government. To our complete surprise, we received instructions from the State Department, at an assistant secretary's level, that we should abstain from voting on a resolution which was in no small measure the product of the intercession and intervention of the U.S. delegation. To say that we were shocked is to put it mildly.

There then followed a series of conversations with the Assistant Secretary of State concerned. It became perfectly clear to me at the beginning of those conversations that he was surprisingly unaware and wholly unappreciative of the symbolic importance of the resolution to the prestige and standing of the United States, not only in the Fourth Committee but in the General Assembly, as well.

Aside from its merits, it was the same proposal we were seeking to have passed regarding Hungary.

There is no question about what happened. The Government of the Union of South Africa protested to the State Department. The Ambassador from the Union of South Africa registered a strong protest. It was perfectly obvious that the Government of the Union of South Africa did not want any sightseers within South-West Africa. I am satisfied that I know why. The sights would not be sights which they would want to have reported to the world.

MILITARY INTEREST

Moreover, at this point we came in contact with the Pentagon on this issue. As I state in the report, the information about a proposed U.S. missile tracking station in the Union of South Africa came to us from a considerable number of African delegations who reported to us in great criticism their knowledge that negotiations were proceeding for the establishment of a tracking station in the Union of South Africa.

They raised two serious objections, and I agree with both of them. First, they questioned whether there should be a tracking station there at all. They pointed out that a tracking station would only intensify the cold war in Africa, and would only serve as an invitation to Russia to make a countermove.

In the second place, they pointed out that it would be a concealed form of economic subsidy to the Union of South Africa. Every Member of the Senate knows the difficulty any administration would have in seeking to have Congress pass a foreign aid bill which sought directly to provide economic aid to the Union of South Africa, in view of the inhumane apartheid policy of that country. They pointed out that a good many millions of dollars would be spent in this kind of project, and that what it would amount to would be an economic subsidy to the Union of South Africa to strengthen the economy of that country, and subsidize the shocking, inhumane territorial policy which it exercises over 11 million colored people in its own country, and in South-West Africa.

Bear in mind that the people of South-West Africa are often kept in compounds, are not allowed free movement in their own territory, that tribes are prohibited from intermingling with each other; and in some instances man and wife are separated for periods of time, allegedly for the reason that it might help keep down the population of the colored people in South-West Africa.

Mr. President, all I wish to say is that here is a human volcano, and it is bound to erupt. But I pray that my country will cease being an aider and abetter of the inhuman policies that prevail in South-West Africa.

Therefore, Mr. President, we protested rather vigorously in opposition to the instructions we received. I wrote a letter to Ambassador Wadsworth about the matter, and sent a telegram to Secretary Herter. Both documents appear in my report.

When it became clear that the instructions had to stand, I exercised, on that occasion—the only time in a 3-month period that I did so—the right of personal privilege, and advised the State Department that a Foreign Service officer would have to sit in my seat and cast that vote, because I would never lend my lips, even in an ambassadorial capacity, to casting a vote that I knew was as

unconscionable, unjustifiable, and contrary to the best future interests of my country as that vote of abstention on the South-West Africa issue.

Mr. President, an overwhelming majority of the members of the Committee and, later, an overwhelming majority of the members of the Assembly, voted—and voted rightly—against the policy of the United States in regard to that great colonial issue.

There were other colonial issues on which we voted unwisely, Mr. President. In fact, as I point out in my report—and it is interesting that the press does not see fit to call the attention of the American people to the point of view taken on this issue by the official delegate of the United States at the United Nations—for 3 months the United States did not vote correctly in the United Nations on a single colonial issue of any major importance. The result was that on December 20, when the General Assembly adjourned, our prestige and our influence in the United Nations, as regards the whole colonial issue, were just about nil. Bad as the South-West African position was, our position on the general colonial resolution was even worse, because it has broader implications, and its effects are more worldwide.

U.S. ABSTENTION ON GENERAL QUESTION OF COLONIALISM

Khrushchev's strategy at the early part of the General Assembly session was to "drop in the hopper," as we say, a typical Communist propaganda resolution. With it, he took on the role of being "the great defender" of the indigenous people of the world under foreign domination, by proposing immediate independence for every area of the world now ruled by any foreign power. That was a typical Communist grandstand play. To the everlasting credit of the neutral and the uncommitted nations of the world, they saw through it immediately. What happened? We were able to beat the Khrushchev resolution.

Then 43 nations cosponsored the so-called general resolution on colonialism. Our country should have been one of the cosponsors of that resolution. It was bad enough that we were not one of the cosponsors. But it was inexcusable for us to receive official instructions to abstain from voting on the resolution. But 43 cosponsors introduced the general resolution on colonialism. In essence—and I have made the resolution a part of the appendix to my report—the resolution simply stated that immediate steps should be taken toward the granting of independence to remaining nonself-governing territories.

Of course, Mr. President, it is impossible ever to draft a resolution in such a way that every delegate is able to agree with every word contained in it, or, at least, in such a way that no delegate will prefer to have some other word substituted for some word in it. But that resolution was so well drafted that it was acceptable to an overwhelming majority of the member nations of the United Nations. The U.S. delegation was unanimous in support of the resolution.

In a delegation meeting, we talked about the resolution. Yes, we wished to change a phrase here or there. But let me say that, once again, with the diplomatic brilliance of Ambassador Wadsworth, we were able to obtain some modifications of the so-called general resolution. A considerable amount of perfecting occurred. We were aghast, however, when, the day before the vote on the resolution was to occur, we received from the White House instructions to abstain on the resolution.

Mr. President, it is well understood that the British Prime Minister made very clear to the White House that, as an ally, Britain would appreciate a vote of abstention on the resolution. And the United States abstained. Mr. President, that will cost us dearly for a long time, in that great council of the world, because when we abstained on that vote, we abstained on a vote on a resolution which was voted for by 89 of the members of United Nations. Not a single one of them voted against it. Our fellow abstainers, Mr. President, were the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, the Union of South Africa, the Dominican Republic, and Australia.

Mr. President, that is really all one needs to say, in order to point out the inexcusability of the U.S. vote. When we cast that vote, we served notice on the world that we do not mean it when we use these fine sounding phrases—as did the President of the United States, in his speech before the United Nations. So far as that speech is concerned, let me say it was one of the greatest speeches given at the United Nations.

The sad thing is that the instructions on the colonial resolution cannot be squared with his speech. If we take the language of the President's speech before the United Nations, then it follows, as night follows day, that our instructions should have been to vote for the resolution.

In fact, if we were to keep faith with the President's own language before the United Nations in our support of freedom, we should have been a cosponsor of the resolution.

When the U.S. vote of abstention was announced in answer to the rollcall, a rumble—an audible rumble—passed through the hall, and it was not a rumble of confidence. In fact, I think it was only a split second that determined whether that rumble would be turned into jeers and hisses.

To the everlasting credit of a great delegate, a great colored woman, a great Republican, a Ph. D. from the University of Chicago, an educator of distinction, an ex-opera singer of note, one of the leaders, may I say, in America in connection with this whole delicate problem of race relations, Dr. Zelma George, stood at her desk, at the announcement of the 89 to 0 vote, and started the applause that produced an ovation which lasted at least 2 minutes. It was an ovation in support of the passage of the resolution by a vote of 89 to 0, with only 9 nations, the United States, to its discredit, being among them, abstaining.

Sitting beside Dr. George, I did my best to cooperate with her in helping with the applause. The Senate may enjoy a humorous incident that occurred in connection with it. When the ovation subsided, the Communist leader of the Rumanian delegation walked over to Ambassador Wadsworth and, laughingly tapping him on the shoulder, said:

> I see you have a couple of rebels in your delegation.

To which Ambassador Wadsworth quickly replied:

> Of course, we have, and we are proud of them. Of course, in your country they would be shot.

And the Rumanian representative and others enjoyed the quick repartee of our Ambassador.

Yet I believe that Dr. Zelma George deserves credit for saving the face of the United States in the General Assembly of the United Nations by the dramatic move she made in order to demonstrate to the General Assembly that, although under instructions that the U.S. delegation abstain, the delegation, or at least some on the delegation, wanted the General Assembly to know that we did not agree with such unsound instructions.

CHANGES IN PROCEDURE NEEDED

There are other votes that were cast which I could deprecate as well, but I have said enough to lead me to the next to the last point on the report we have filed with the Senate. This shows, in my judgment, the need for some changes in procedure in respect to the relationships between the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and the State Department and the White House.

I discuss these changes in my report. I point out that the Ambassador at the United Nations is the ambassador of the President of the United States. That fact seems to be lost sight of by many persons who are inclined to talk about the relationships between the U.S. delegation to the United Nations and the Government of the United States. Ambassadors have the duty of seeing to it that the President of the United States is informed on problems which arise in their jurisdiction.

But the ambassadorship at the United Nations, Mr. President, differs in many respects, from the standpoint of responsibilities and obligations, from any other ambassadorship we have anywhere else in the world, because we cannot have the U.S. delegation at the United Nations going one way and the U.S. State Department going another way. No one recognizes that fact more than I do.

There is need for the closest coordination and correlation between the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. delegation at the United Nations, and also between the Secretary of State and the permanent Ambassador at the United Nations, on the one hand, and the President of the United States, on the other. Some people seem to be very much concerned about the formalizing of the procedure with respect to these relationships. Yet it is said, "Well, Senator, if you formalize it, it is likely to result either in upgrading the Ambassador at the United Nations, or downgrading the Secretary of State."

I deny it. I think that is purely an objection of form, without any substance in it. Why? Because, in my judgment, any Secretary of State and any Ambassador at the United Nations will recognize that each has the mutual obligation of seeing to it that he thoroughly discusses major issues which involve U.S. policy at the United Nations, and, if they have any variance in point of view, they have a mutual obligation to see to it that the President is aware of any differences over what the U.S. policy should be at the United Nations.

If there were a formalization of procedure, my judgment is that seldom would we have a difference. The differences would be ironed out between the Ambassador and the Secretary of State. But, in all probability, there would be some sincere, good-faith difference of opinion or question as to whether policy A, or policy B, or some other policy, should be followed. In that instance, I think it is pretty clear that both public servants have the duty to see to it that the President of the United States is informed of the problem.

Oh, but, it will be asked, Should the President of the United States be bothered with those matters? My answer is unequivocally yes. I do not know of anything the President of the United States could possibly be called upon to do that would be more vital to the interests of our country than to see to it that he keeps fully informed as to policies in the United Nations, particularly when alternative policies may be followed, and particularly when there is a possibility that the Secretary of State and the Ambassador at the United Nations may have variances in point of view.

Here again, in my judgment, a conference between them would not only resolve, in most instances, the differences, but would result in a unanimity of opinion as to the course of action which should be followed.

So I make this recommendation in my report, cognizant of the fact that some bureaucrats who want to hold onto long-established, but undesirable, policies will try to find sophistic reasons for opposing such a recommendation.

My confidence in this administration is such that I am inclined to believe the administration will take judicial notice of the commonsense of the recommendation and will have the good sense to practice the recommendation which I have suggested.

I have also talked to many people with experience in the State Department and in the United Nations about it, and it was my pleasant surprise to find remarkable agreement between them and me in regard to the recommendation.

What happens now, Mr. President? I am satisfied, as I say in the report, that we frequently receive instructions from the State Department purportedly signed by the Secretary of State which have never seen the desk of the Secretary of State. They are signed by officers at a lower echelon level in the State Department, particularly by Assistant Secretaries of State.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that for a long time the Department of State has been European oriented. That is natural. That is understandable. Our major problems for a long time have been European.

Some of the most delicate problems which confront the peace of the world today arise in areas outside Europe and, in my judgment, the European slant needs to be removed from them. Therefore, I hope this administration will make it very clear that the next delegation to the United Nations representing the United States will get its instructions on any major matter after personal attention has been given to it by the Secretary of State and, if necessary, by the President of the United States himself.

I am convinced that procedurally, this is one of the great defects in American foreign policy and one of the reasons why American foreign policy has taken a toboggan ride in recent years to the point that we now occupy a new low position so far as prestige in the United Nations is concerned—or at least we did on December 20, 1960.

The remarkably fine leadership which Governor Stevenson has already given to the U.S. mission at the United Nations, greatly buttressed by that brilliant speech he made in opposition to the Russians in the Security Council the other day with respect to the Congo issue, has done much to raise the standing of the United States in the United Nations. But we can lose standing again quickly unless the new administration pays some attention to the need for improvement of procedure so far as the line of command between the White House, the office of the Secretary of State, and the office of the Ambassador of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations is concerned.

UNDUE PENTAGON INFLUENCE ON U.S. POLICY

Let me turn now to what I consider to be the undue influence of the Pentagon on U.S. foreign policy, including U.S. policy in the United Nations.

In my opinion one cannot scratch the surface of any issue involving colonialism without running into Pentagon policy. As I point out in my report, it is regrettable that the Pentagon has not shown the sensitivity and understanding it ought to show in respect to the problems affecting the indigenous people of the world now living under foreign rule.

The Pentagon has not for a long time past been duly appreciative of the colonial problems confronting the United States and the world. I think also the Pentagon has been permitted to unduly influence American foreign policy because of the military obligations which we have assumed in connection with NATO.

The time has come when it ought to be made clear to our allies in NATO that NATO is a mutual defense organization, that NATO was agreed to not only for the defense of the United States but also for the defense of every member of NATO.

When we enter into a mutual defense treaty we do not enter into any obligation to support or defend the policies of any member of NATO with respect to their practices in those parts of the world where they exercise domination and control—yes, subjugation of millions of indigenous people.

One cannot explain, Mr. President, the instructions which we received from the State Department in regard to the Portugal resolution without running directly into the attitude of the Pentagon in relation to Portugal. As I say in the report, it is well known that Portugal in the past—and in the recent past—has threatened the United States with the loss of landing rights in the Azores if we oppose Portuguese colonial policy.

In the United Nations these days, a U.S. delegate is instructed by the State Department to abstain on a vote which involves really, if it were not so serious, a humorous legal fiction that Portugal seeks to defend in the United Nations. What is the fiction? Portugal pretends it has no territory subject to jurisdiction under section 73 and section 74 of the United Nations Charter.

Why? Because Portugal, by its own legislative processes, has defined its oversea areas as Portuguese provinces; therefore, they are provinces and no one can question them because the Portuguese say they are provinces.

Try to sell that argument to the United Nations. Try to sell it to the millions of people subjugated by Portugal, which is, again, maintaining colonial policies to which we should give no support.

This came up in the Fourth Committee, as we listened to a long legal argument by the Portuguese delegate seeking to defend the legal fiction that Portugal had no territories, but only provinces. It was said that Goa, in India, is no territory but is a Portuguese province; that Angola, in Africa, is no territory, but is a Portuguese province.

Such an argument produced a mixed reaction in the Fourth Committee. For a time delegates smiled and laughed, and then when they realized that the Portuguese delegate really proposed to get by with that legal fiction the feeling turned to resentment.

This involved a procedural debate, because it involved the question of jurisdiction of the Fourth Committee.

The Portuguese took the position that we had no jurisdiction to pass a resolution which merely proposed that the colonial powers, including the United States—and we happen to have a few colonies of our own, by definition—should voluntarily submit information once a year to the United Nations as to political activities within their territories.

Portugal does not want to submit such information voluntarily. The United Kingdom would prefer that it would not have to, although it does. So we received instructions to abstain on that resolution.

We discussed the subject at a delegation meeting. There was no question as to where the delegation stood. Again we wanted to take our country out from under the kind of attack we would get if we carried out an instruction to abstain, because the charge was, "You are doing it because Portugal is a NATO member. You are doing it also because the Pentagon wants the use of the Azores."

Such statement is denied by the State Department, but let me say for the record again, as I said in my report, that I found the State Department completely unconvincing on this subject. I say as a Senator and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that I am satisfied that the Pentagon exercises undue influence on the State Department in respect to colonial policies and our position on the colonial policies of our NATO allies.

UNDUE INFLUENCE OF BRITAIN

That subject causes me to comment on British policy. There is a tendency in the Senate and in many places to seek to exclude Great Britain from criticism when we deal with colonial problems. The argument runs in this manner: "Great Britain is the one country that has trained people within the indigenous population to become civil servants. Great Britain has trained the doctors and the lawyers in civil service." That is true. In fairness I wish to say Great Britain has the best record.

But listen for a moment to what the people and the representatives of the countries that were once British colonies have to say about British policy. Listen to what delegations from many other countries in the United Nations say about British policy.

They point out that Great Britain has never granted independence to a single colony until years after independence should have been granted. Great Britain has never granted independence to a single colony until many years after the so-called training of civil servants, the training of leaders in the indigenous population, had been completed. They pointed out that if one really wished to evaluate British colonial policy, he would need to take a look at the policies of the British Exchequer.

That is the dominating influence in British colonial policy. Time and time again U.S. delegates to the United Nations were instructed, as we were, to vote to support British colonial policy, something which the Canadian delegation did not do.

We were asked, "When is the United States going to declare its new declaration of independence of the British Crown?"

There is some merit in the suggestion because I regret to inform the Senate of the United States that in my judgment Great Britain has exercised entirely too much influence on the U.S. State Department in respect to our votes on colonial issues.

I would have the record show that Great Britain is, of course, the largest of the remaining colonial powers in the world. In Africa alone, she still has the British territory of the Federation of Rhodesia, involving southern Rhodesia, at the present time a self-governing colony; northern Rhodesia, a protectorate; and Nyasaland, a protectorate.

In the High Commission Territories she has Basutoland, Swaziland, and Bechuanaland. She has a United Nations trusteeship in Tanganyika; a protectorate in Zanzibar; she has Kenya, a colony; Uganda, a protectorate; Gambia, a protectorate; Sierra Leone, a protectorate, scheduled for independence this year; and the British Cameroons, a United Nations trusteeship, about to be given independence.

Some of these British areas are troubled areas. As I said in my reply to the Portuguese delegate, if one wishes to test whether or not Portugal or any other of the remaining colonial powers has colonies and territories, there are a few questions that one might ask and then take judicial notice as to the answers.

First, in these areas do they exercise dominion, control, and rule over a large majority of a population which is an indigenous population? The answer is "Yes" in all the Portuguese territories; the answer is "Yes" in all the British territories; the answer is "Yes" in the territories of France, Belgium, and Spain, and the Union of South Africa. The answer is "Yes" in regard to every remaining colonial power in the world.

Second, are these areas, areas of high human tension? One takes judicial notice that the answer is "Yes."

The next question is this: Does this high human tension in these areas threaten the peace of the area? One takes judicial notice that the answer is "Yes."

When one takes judicial notice of the answers to those three questions, he must admit the jurisdictional rights of the United Nations, because all of these colonial powers are signatories to the charter, and they have pledged themselves to accept jurisdiction in connection with those issues that threaten the peace.

There is no doubt about the fact the peace is threatened in those areas. Therefore, I am not very much moved by the legalisms of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, the Union of South Africa, or any other colonial power.

I should prefer to take my stand with the Canadians who, more recently than the United States, were a British possession. I quoted at length in my report, and I recommend to the Senate a reading of the argument of the delegate from Canada in support of the colonial resolution. Great Britain was not able to get Canada to sustain the position of Great Britain on the colonial issue.

I have mentioned these subjects with my reference to the Pentagon because it is my hope that the new administration will make perfectly clear to the Pentagon that the job of the military is to carry out and administer a foreign affairs policy and a military policy determined by the civilian heads of this Government and not by the military. It is my hope that this administration will make it clear to the Pentagon that after it has received its advice and its opinion in regard to the effects of a foreign policy upon America's military commitments, it will understand that when the final decision is made, the Pentagon will carry out the decision.

It is my hope that this administration will make it clear to the Pentagon that we have heard for the last time of the brass in the Pentagon notifying the United States and the world what the U.S. Navy is going to do in the Formosa Straits or in the Caribbean or in the Mediterranean or anywhere else in the world, but that such notification will come from the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States; that any military officer who does not see fit to carry out these instructions will have the privilege of wearing civilian clothes shortly after he interferes with the formation of American foreign policy.

Furthermore, I hope that the new administration will give serious consideration to these procedural reforms which I believe are necessary in order that we can make a better substantial record than we have been making at the United Nations. Under the new administration we have a President of the United States who recognizes the direct relationship between procedural practices and the protection of substantive rights. That is true in the field of foreign policy as well as in the field of domestic policy.

I close by saying that we have offered these reports on some matters of great importance to American foreign policy. I shall from time to time, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, discuss various other phases of them. Because the General Assembly of the United Nations will convene within the next few days, I thought it important to call the attention of the Senate to at least some of the conclusions I reached and set forth in my supplementary reports, and some of the conclusions the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] reached which he has set forth in his supplemental report on his work on the Fifth Committee, and some of the conclusions both of us reached jointly and which we set forth in our joint report to the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1961]

KENNEDY GOES ALL OUT FOR U.N.

(By Drew Pearson)

President Kennedy has taken a long gamble on the United Nations which, if it pays off, should pay off big. If it doesn't pay off, the alternative will be eventual war.

Last fall, after Khrushchev finished his attacks on Dag Hammarskjold at the U.N., the British quietly proposed to Mr. Eisenhower that the West set up a separate organization of free nations. They argued that the U.N. was being more and more dominated by Africa and Asia, would degenerate into a propaganda sounding board for Soviet spokesmen.

Mr. Kennedy, when he entered office, considered the British proposal but turned it down. He decided to go all out in supporting the U.N. This was one reason he sold Adlai Stevenson on becoming Ambassador to the U.N.

The President figured that the U.N. had become the symbol of small nations, that foreign ministers and visiting prime ministers appreciated the fact that here was one place where they could meet the great leaders of the world on equal terms. He decided that the more the United States supported the U.N. the better would become our position in the eyes of the world.

He dropped some hints along this line in his press conference last week. But in private talks he has spelled it out in greater detail.

Since the Lumumba crisis in the Congo, Adlai Stevenson has reported back to Mr. Kennedy that he is confident the smaller African-Asian nations will rally around the

U.N. and even around Dag Hammarskjold, despite Russia's attacks. Another healthy development has been the ire of neutralist Premier Nehru of India, who is now willing to send Indian combat troops to the Congo. Hitherto he wasn't.

All this adds up to a probable diplomatic victory over the long haul. Nobody inside the State Department or the White House thinks it's going to be easy. But in the end, Mr. Kennedy hopes to make the Statue of Liberty, not Stalin's tomb in Red Square, the symbol of the world—even in Darkest Africa.

CANADA'S FARM PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. L. E. McDonald of Oregon City, Oreg., has brought to my attention a most interesting article which appeared in the October 6, 1960, issue of the Oregon Farmer. The article is entitled "Canada's Farm Program." It was written by the Honorable Douglas S. Harkness, Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada. Because of the widespread interest of Senators in our neighbors to the north, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I allude be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA'S FARM PROGRAM

(By Douglas S. Harkness, Minister of Agriculture, Dominion of Canada)

Agricultural policies followed in our respective countries are bound to have effects on both sides of the border and, in many cases, on our mutual markets or possible markets in other countries. For example, the parity system of price support which you have had in effect for many years in the United States has had a very powerful influence on the thinking and the demands of our Canadian farmers and farm organizations.

This has been particularly true in regard to wheat. Our prairie wheatgrowers have for many years been complaining about the fact that whilst they were receiving from $1.25 to $1.50 a bushel for wheat, depending on the grade, their neighbors across the border in Minnesota, North Dakota, and Montana were receiving upward of $2 a bushel or more. Naturally their demands have been very strong that Canada should adopt the same kind of parity price method of support which you have had here.

In fact the word "parity" has come to have a sort of mystic significance and, in the eyes of most of our western farmers, as well as large numbers in other parts of Canada, parity or a parity price has come to represent to them the solution of all their problems. When asked to define what they mean by parity, most, I find, will reply "a price which will give us a good standard of living."

During the Second World War agricultural production and prices were controlled in various ways in Canada in order to meet the emergency situation which existed. With the end of the war, these controls and supports were removed and there naturally ensued a strong demand for a peacetime system of price support.

To meet this demand an Agriculture Price Support Act was put into effect in 1946, which gave the Government the power to support prices of agricultural products, as the Government might decide was necessary from time to time. Under this act a very limited number of products were supported; they were chiefly dairy products, eggs and hogs. The only other products which were supported prior to my becoming Minister of Agriculture were: potatoes, apples, dried white beans, honey, and cattle.

All were supported for limited periods to meet emergency situations such as the foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in 1952 as far as cattle were concerned.

The pressure for a more adequate system of price supports continued to mount and, when the present Government was effected some 3 years ago, we introduced a new bill, which became law in the form of the present Agricultural Stabilization Act.

As the Minister responsible for the drafting and subsequent administration of this measure, I made a careful study of the price support system in effect in the United States and of those in several other countries. This study convinced me that any rigid system of support was bound to become unmanageable and lead to a piling up of unsalable surpluses.

As a result, in our Stabilization Act, I attempted to maintain as much flexibility as possible, but at the same time provide some of the basic definite guarantees which were almost universally being demanded by our farmers.

The main features of our Stabilization Act are as follows:

First. Any agricultural product is eligible for support. The decision as to which products will be supported from time to time is the responsibility of the Government.

Second. Nine basic commodities are, by the act, under support at all times. These commodities are: cattle, hogs, sheep, butter, cheese, eggs and, except in the three prairie Provinces, wheat, oats, and barley.

The reason for this exception is that these three cereal grains, produced in the prairie, are marketed by another Government Board—the Canadian Wheat Board—which provides a type of floor price by the initial payment which it makes on each of the three grains as they are delivered each year. To have had two Government boards attempting to handle the same products would, of course, inevitably have resulted in confusion and difficulty.

The support provided to the nine mandatory commodities is, by law, at a minimum of 80 percent of the average price of these commodities, at selected markets across Canada, during the previous 10 years. In other words, what is known as the base price, is the 10-year moving average of the previous 10 years, and the mandatory support price for the nine commodities mentioned is 80 percent of this base price.

The support actually provided for these nine key commodities has, in most cases, been above the mandatory level of 80 percent since the act has been in effect. For example, butter has been supported at 107 percent of the base price.

Third. All other agricultural products can be supported at any level which the Government decides is justified. During the past 2 years some 12 to 13 of these commodities have been under support at one time or another, at levels ranging from 54 percent of the base price for turkeys, to 113 percent for wool.

Fourth. The Stabilization Act provides for three general methods of support: (1) By the purchase method, with which you are all very familiar here; (2) by means of deficiency payments—that is, the difference between the average price which the producers of the commodity have received during the year and the support price which was set for the commodity; and (3) any other method, such as flat payments, which the Stabilization Board may consider most appropriate to meet the need.

Fifth. A revolving fund is provided for out of which the Stabilization Board can draw money to make purchases, deficiency payments, etc. This fund is replenished at the end of each fiscal year.

Sixth. The act provides for a stabilization Board to administer the operations under the act. It consists of three members of the Canadian Department of Agriculture. There is also an advisory committee of 10, consisting of farmers and representatives of farm organizations, who are appointed by myself as minister of agriculture.

You can see from this brief outline that the two basic concepts in our price support legislation are the provision of minimum support prices, in effect at all times, on nine basic commodities, in order to give a certain guarantee of stability of income to the bulk of our farmers; and, apart from this as much flexibility as possible, both as far as support of other commodities is concerned, and the actual level of support which will be provided for the basic commodities at most periods.

I should perhaps add that our Stabilization Act laid down, in respect to setting the support prices "that these shall bear a fair relationship to the cost of production of such commodities." This has resulted in considerable argument and complaint, because cost of production statistics are not very good, and those which exist show considerable variations from one part of the country to another and from farm to farm. However, every effort has been made to set prices which would meet this requirement as far as it is possible to do so.

When our Stabilization Act was passed, a little over 2 years ago, dairy products, hogs, and eggs had been supported by the method of purchase for some years past, and this was continued under the new act, although the level of support was varied somewhat. At that time we were already in difficulties with skim milk powder, of which there was a big surplus—practically all of it being held by the stabilization board. At the same time production was continuing to increase very rapidly. To meet this situation we reduced the support price for spray-process skim milk powder to 10 cents a pound, and for roller-process to 8 cents, and announced a definite cutoff date, of September 30, 1959, when support would be withdrawn altogether. This resulted in ending the expansion of the previous 2 years in the installation of dried skim milk plants, but not a reduction in the amount being produced. The dry summer in Europe last year and the strengthening in the prices of dried skim milk, together with extensive gifts to international relief organizations, enabled us to dispose of most of our heavy stock.

For some years past, production of eggs and hogs increased considerably under the dual impetus of abundant supplies of feed grain at cheap prices, and a support price by means of purchase, which meant that the Government would buy all that was produced. We were, in fact, being required to purchase constantly increasing amounts of both pork and eggs, which it became more and more difficult to find markets for, even at heavily subsidized prices. Under these circumstances, it became apparent that we would have to abandon support of these commodities by means of purchase, and, to meet the situation, we devised the method of deficiency payments on a limited amount of production per farm unit for both hogs and eggs.

Reviewing the statistics for these products, it was discovered that some 90 percent of Canadian hog producers in a year marketed fewer than 100 A and B hogs each—our two top grades. We therefore set a limit of 100 A and B hogs which could qualify for deficiency payments, per producer. The arithmetical calculations showed that the minimum support price allowed under the act for hogs, of 80 percent, would give a national weighted average support price of $22.65 per hundredweight, warm dressed weight for grade A carcasses. For the year 1960 has been set as the support price. If the national weighted average price received by producers is under this amount, each producer will be paid the difference between the national weighted average price actually received and

the support price, up to the limit of 100 A and B hogs. This means, of course, that no support is provided for lower quality hogs, and serves as a strong incentive to quality improvement.

A misconception in regard to this method of support existed on the part of many of our farmers and, from what I have been led to believe, was almost universal in the United States.

That is, it was thought that if, for example, the support price for a 200-pound hog was $30, and a farmer sold his hog for $20, the Government would pay him the other $10; or, if he sold it for $15, the Government would pay the other $15. As a result of this idea, I understand that a large number of American farmers were under the impression that, with the deficiency payment method of support, hog producers in Canada would not care how much they sold their hogs for and, as a result, very low priced Canadian hogs would flood the American market. The actual fact is that, if a farmer sells his hog for a low price, he is just out that much money, because the deficiency payment which he will receive is the difference between the average price received by producers across Canada and the support price. A system such as many believed this to be—of making a deficiency payment on each individual sale—would be uneconomic and wasteful of the taxpayers' money, as it would mean the individual farmer would have no incentive to get the best price possible for his product. In addition to that, of course, it would be administratively very expensive.

In order to insure that no subsidized pork enters the U.S. market, we have put into effect a system of export licenses, under which permits to export are only given for pork purchased at our support price. This means that the exports which have taken place in the past few years, at prices several cents a pound in excess of your prices, will continue on the same basis. This is possible because of a limited demand here, at a premium price, for our lean bacon and hams. Since the new method of support came into effect on January 11, until about a month ago, prices in Canada were generally lower than the support price and exporters were required to pay an export license fee, which brought the price of the pork up to the support level, and thus insured that there was no subsidized export to your market. In recent weeks our prices have moved up to and above the support price so that no export fee is required at the moment.

With eggs, the system is exactly the same as for hogs. In this case 4,000 dozen grade A large eggs—our top quality—is the maximum amount of production on which the producer can receive deficiency payments. This is the production of a good laying flock of 450 to 500 hens, and our surveys showed that some 85 percent of all egg producers have flocks of 500 or fewer hens. They represent, however, only something over 40 percent of the total production of eggs and, on the other hand, approximately 5 percent of the producers account for approximately 40 percent of the total production.

It is this latter small group, in the terms of total producers, who have been chiefly responsible for the rapid increase in egg production, and for the resulting surplus. It was my view that this was the group who should be called upon to cut their production, as a reduction here would have the least unfavorable effect on the general farm economy and the prosperity of the average farmer.

This method of supporting the price of farm commodities by means of deficiency payments on a limited amount of production, I believe, holds the greatest hope of producing the two results which one must look for in any price support policy or method. That is, first, to provide some reasonable measure of income guarantee and stability to the average farmer; and, second, to prevent the piling up of unsalable and unmanageable surpluses.

Another advantage of this type of support is that the consumer gets the benefit of the tax money used, in the form of lower prices for the food he has to buy, whereas under the method of purchase, the consumer really has to pay twice; first, in the relatively high prices which are maintained for the food products concerned; and, secondly, to subsidize the sale of the surplus at very low prices abroad, or its disposal as gifts.

The introduction of the deficiency payment method of support for hogs and eggs has not, as you may imagine, met with universal acclaim in Canada. The large producers have opposed it very vigorously, on the grounds that it is discriminatory against the most efficient producers. Some marketing organizations have opposed it on the stated grounds that it would completely disrupt markets, but actually, I believe because it places on their shoulders once more the task of selling the products. Many of the small producers have complained because their immediate returns are. They are not familiar with the system, and by no means feel sure that they will eventually receive a deficiency payment, because of the possibility of increased prices later in the year. I have had a very large number of representations, and have been under great pressure to return to the method of support by purchase. However, I have every hope that the deficiency payment method will prove itself during this year and, as a result, will win widespread acceptance by the bulk of our farmers.

The results to date of the introduction of support by means of deficiency payments on a limited amount of production per farmer, for hogs and eggs, have been interesting. The production of eggs, from January 1 of this year to the middle of June, shows a reduction of 9.3 percent from the corresponding period of 1959. During the same period, hog production is down 13.5 percent this year as compared with 1959.

It is thus evident that the method has been successful in bringing production down into line with what can be marketed. This has had, as you would expect, the beneficial effect of improving prices. The weighted average price received for eggs during the March–April period was above that received in the corresponding period in 1959 when support by purchase was in effect. During May and June egg prices have been below those of a year ago due to the heavy deliveries in this period, but it is generally expected that they will improve and be at considerably higher levels for the last 6 months of this year than prevailed in 1959.

In the case of hogs, for the first few months prices declined, but as deliveries eased, the prices gradually came up and are now considerably above the support level.

We are making some surveys to attempt to determine the size of operation in which the decline in production has taken place, but these have not yet progressed far enough to enable any definite statements to be made.

One thing we do know is that the change to the method of support has had a very important effect in reducing contract farming and vertical integration in hog raising. Most of the feed and other companies which were carrying on these operations served notice last fall, following my announcement that the new method of support would be put into effect, that they would not renew their contracts. I believe this method of support will go a long way to prevent the bona fide farmer, who operates an average-sized farm, being driven out of production by large commercial companies.

On the subject of agricultural price supports generally, my experience and investigations have led me to a few general conclusions. The first is that no one method of support is best in all circumstances. In any workable program I think that one must employ several different methods. The method best adapted for use for a particular commodity depends on a considerable number of factors, some of the more important of which are: supply of the product; distance from market; availability of market outlets; perishability of products; basic cause of price and income decline; storage and disposal problems; and long-term market outlook.

Second, the method of support by means of purchase is almost bound to produce surpluses if the support price is set at a level acceptable to producers. The reasons for this are obvious. The farmer has not only a guaranteed price, but a guaranteed market—the Government. In my opinion the latter has been more instrumental than the former, in many cases, in producing surpluses, because of the fact that it is not possible to set a low-enough price to discourage the more efficient producers and at the same time provide a level of support which will protect the average producer. A situation in which there is no worry about selling everything produced inevitably leads to all producers attempting to produce the maximum amount possible.

Third, it should be recognized that support prices are a form of crutch, and should not be necessary except in periods of emergency, when prices for any reason are unnaturally low in relation to the cost of production. If the farm economy of a country is on a healthy basis, price supports should not be necessary, and the aim should be by other means to produce conditions in which an unsupported agriculture can be carried on profitably.

During the past 20 to 30 years a great technological revolution in agriculture has coincided with very unsettled world conditions and markets. The result has been unstable conditions in the industry, caused by a greatly increased ability to produce with surpluses and consequent low prices, whilst at the same time the farmers' costs of production have been rapidly going up. We are in the midst of a period of adjustment to these new conditions, and until we reach a more stable era, there will undoubtedly be a need for price support measures. Our agricultural productive capacity is now so great on this continent that, if our farmers are to receive adequate prices for their products, production must be curtailed to what can be marketed at reasonable prices on this continent and in other countries. Any system of price support which encourages increased production for products now in surplus supply, must be judged a failure.

The present Canadian Government, during the past 3 years, has been attempting to put into effect a long-range policy for agriculture, designed to bring health and prosperity to the industry. The program has six main prongs:

1. The Stabilization Act, designed to give a certain amount of stability of prices and income to the majority of our farmers without, at the same time, piling up surpluses.
2. A drive for increased markets, both at home and abroad, on the basis of improved quality and more intensive selling.
3. Considerably improved and expanded credit facilities for farmers.
4. Crop insurance to remove at least a considerable proportion of the weather risk, which is very considerable in our climatic conditions.
5. A soil and water conservation program.
6. A rural development, or redevelopment program somewhat similar to the one you are carrying on in the United States, designed particularly to deal with the many problems associated with the rural population on small, uneconomic units.

I have already dealt with the Stabilization Act, and indicated what we are trying to accomplish under it. It is, of course, too

soon as yet to say how successful our efforts will be, but the scheme is in full operation.

The second of our objectives—to increase markets—we are working toward by offering incentives of various kinds to our farmers to continually improve the quality of their products. For example, premium payments on top-quality hogs; price support for only the top grades of any commodity; continual improvement in stricter control of grading and marketing of products, etc. We have attempted to increase sales by various promotional campaigns, extending financial assistance to commodity groups in advertising; by the making of trial shipments to other countries which have not been buyers of our products, and so forth.

During recent years our farmers have increasingly complained that the amount of credit available to them, from mortgage companies, banks, etc., has been decreasing whilst at the same time their needs for credit have greatly increased. To meet this situation, we have three forms of Government sponsored, or guaranteed, credit available to agriculture. Some years ago a Government agency—the Farm Loan Board—was set up to make long-term mortgage loans to farmers. At the last session of Parliament we established the Farm Credit Corporation, which absorbed the previous Farm Loan Board, and is empowered to grant mortgages up to $27,500, on the basis of 75 percent of the appraised value of the land, buildings, and chattels on any individual farm enterprise. Supervision and farm management counseling is provided for, along with a low rate of interest and long repayment period. The basic consideration for the granting of a loan is that it will result in an economic farm unit.

Under the Veterans' Land Act somewhat similar assistance is provided to veterans who wish to go into agriculture and they are, in addition, entitled to certain grants. Short-term credit is provided by the Farm Improvement Loans Act, under which the Government guarantees loans by the chartered banks to farmers.

At the last session of Parliament we passed a Crop Insurance Act, under which the Federal Government will put up 50 percent of the administration costs and 20 percent of the premiums, for any approved provincial crop insurance scheme. In addition the Dominion Government will make loans to any province, covering approximately 75 percent of the deficit, which may result in the early years of any crop insurance scheme in spite of the fact that it may be on a sound actuarial basis.

Conditions vary so much from Province to Province that it was left no Dominion scheme, which must of necessity provide the same conditions for all parts of the country, would be workable. Thus we decided to encourage crop insurance by this assistance to provincial schemes. Under the provisions of our act, any crop may be insured, but the decision as to which crops will be insured is the responsibility of the Province, which will administer the scheme within its own borders.

The Province of Manitoba has already set up three test areas, each covering a considerable acreage, in which crop insurance will be tried out this year. There is a strong possibility that Saskatchewan will do the same thing in 1961, and several other Provinces are studying the matter. If, as we hope, crop insurance schemes are put into effect in all the Provinces in the course of the next few years, a great deal of the weather risk, and thus instability of farm income in individual cases, will be removed.

The soil and water conservation projects are handled in Canada chiefly by the department of agriculture. The long drought period of the 1930's, during which there was a great loss of fertile soil by wind and, at the same time, a great shortage of water for both livestock and irrigation, led to the passing of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, under which many thousands of farm dugouts have been constructed and large numbers of small and large irrigation projects have been developed. The biggest of these is the South Saskatchewan River Dam, which is now under construction. This is an earth-filled dam 210 feet high (or equivalent in height to a 17-story office building) and almost 3 miles long, which is being constructed at an estimated cost of $100 million, and will create a lake 140 miles long. It will make possible the irrigation of 500,000 acres of land and will be a great step forward in aiding the diversification of agriculture in Saskatchewan, and particularly provide the basis for a greatly expanded livestock industry.

Under the act, my department operates a large number of community pastures and has carried out numerous drainage schemes in low-lying areas, et cetera.

A similar organization, under the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act, has been carrying on diking and drainage operations in the Atlantic seacoast Provinces. A Dominion-Provincial coservation conference is now being organized, as a result of which it is hoped a national soil and water program can be evolved.

Up to date very little has been done, in a practical way, on rural redevelopment. During the past 2 years we have had a considerable number of people making studies of the problem. As a part of this work we had a group of our agricultural economists and sociologists down here studying what you have been doing along this line. The situation in Canada is that just over one-third of what were listed as farms in the 1951 census showed a cash income of less than $1,200 a year. The aim of our rural development scheme is to consolidate as many of these as possible into a greatly reduced number of economic farm units, and to provide alternative employment for the remainder of the people affected, by retraining, decentralization of industry, etc. This, of necessity, is a lengthy program and it will be many years before the problem is effectively dealt with.

The agricultural problems which face us in Canada are, by and large, the same ones which concern you in the United States. Our economies are so closely connected that any solution and improvements which are effected in one country will have beneficial effects in the other. As agriculturists, we have the greatest possible interest in seeing our industry in a strong position in each other's countries. If you produce a surplus in any commodity and the price is depressed as a result, the same low price will inevitably follow in Canada. If we produce a surplus with low prices, although the effect on you will not be as extreme, nevertheless it will bring prices down to some extent in your country.

The effect of geography is such that the price of an agricultural product in British Columbia is much more affected by the price in Washington than it is by the price of the same commodity in Quebec, and in many cases the reverse is true. For example, the price of potatoes in Maine is influenced to a greater extent by the prices in our Maritime Provinces, than it is by the Washington price. These facts being apparent, it is readily understandable why we, in Canada, take such an interest in agricultural developments and prices in the United States, and vice versa. This is, naturally, more so in our case than in yours. Because of your population being 10 times that of Canada's your prices and policies, of course, affect us a great deal more than ours do you.

PROBLEMS OF OREGON LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, increasingly my mail indicates to me the difficulties faced by Oregon farmers. One such letter, under date of January 23, 1961, from Mr. Don Ollivant, president of the Douglas County Livestock Association, sets forth in clear detail the situation directly experienced by livestock producers in the Douglas County area of southwestern Oregon.

On behalf of the Douglas County Livestock Association, Mr. Ollivant closes his letter with the request that careful consideration be given to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative O. C. FISHER, of Texas. In my judgment, a factual review such as is contained in Mr. Ollivant's letter will be most helpful to the Members of the Senate in the consideration of farm legislation, especially that concerning itself with our domestic sheep industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUGLAS COUNTY
LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Roseburg, Oreg., January 23, 1961.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Douglas County Livestock Association wishes to bring to your attention some critical items affecting the sheep industry. Most important to the sheep producer, is the importation of live and dressed lamb products. Lamb imports have increased from less than a million pounds in 1956 to over 9½ million pounds in 1960.

We cannot agree with the Tariff Commission findings that dressed lamb imports are not in direct competition with the product we produce. A survey conducted by Drs. Burton Wood and S. Kent Christensen of Oregon State College and presented to the Tariff Commission does indicate a direct depressing effect on our prices. A survey conducted by our livestock association of 125 sheepmen in the area is summarized as follows:

Number of lambs raised for market in 1959	21,121
Number of lambs raised for market in 1960	21,551
Number of lambs usually on hand August 1	2,015
Number of lambs on hand on August 1, 1960	11,360
Average price received for fat lambs in 1959, per hundredweight	$18.67
Average price received for fat lambs in 1960, per hundredweight	15.59
Average price received for feeder lambs in 1959, per hundredweight	16.89
Average price received for feeder lambs in 1960, per hundredweight	13.35

The average date sold in 1960 was about July 15, and many people had not sold at the time the survey was taken in the middle of August. In this survey, two items stand out. First the number of lambs unsold on August 1 of this year and the prices received for fat and feeder lambs.

We still believe that we are being sacrificed to further free trade in subsidized manufactured goods and crops. A bill is to be introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman O. C. FISHER of Texas. This bill, H.R. 13208, is designed to establish quotas on live sheep and dressed lamb imports.

We ask that you study and consider supporting this bill.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS COUNTY LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
DON OLLIVANT, *President.*

MOBILE HOMES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States which I have received from the Oregon Trailer Park Association.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION BY OREGON TRAILER PARK ASSOCIATION

PORTLAND, OREG.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas it is the desire of the Government of the United States and of all local governmental authorities to increase and improve the low-cost housing in this country; and

Whereas thousands of citizens live in mobile homes located in communities generally designated as mobile home parks, and that many such parks, because of age, are in need of improvement, and in many cases funds are not available for such improvements; and

Whereas home improvement loans are presently available at low interest rates to owners of private residences, hotels, apartment houses, and practically all housing projects except mobile home parks; and

Whereas such exception appears to be discriminatory and not in the best interests of the country as a whole: Now be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make the necessary amendments to present laws which will allow the Federal Housing Authority to make title I loans to owners of mobile home parks.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN PRINEVILLE, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the city of Prineville, located in the center of the State of Oregon, has been recently hard hit by the growing economic recession in the country.

The Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce advises me that in the past 2 years a major sawmill and two molding plants have closed permanently in the Prineville area, and that another mill may close soon. As a consequence of this loss of basic economic industry, several commercial establishments are also closing their doors. I am advised that in the last week of January alone, four commercial establishments went out of business.

This situation is especially unfortunate because, like so many other areas of our State, Prineville has so many other advantages to offer for business locations. The Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce has prepared and published a booklet entitled "Economic Survey," outlining the economic and social resources of the area. In forwarding this booklet to me, the Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce pointed out:

We discovered in gathering the data for this that Crook County has many advantages in raw resources needed to attract new industries to our area. Among the raw resources it was determined that there was a need to utilize our byproducts of lumber, such as chips for hardboard plants, pulp mills, etc. We are one of the major producers of an exceptionally fine grade of potatoes, suitable for processing—yet we do not have a processing plant.

Prineville is located at the geographical center of Oregon and is also the center of a vast Oregon cattle industry. We do not and should have a meatpacking plant. We have set aside for industrial usage 15,000 acre-feet of water from the new Crooked River Dam, for which you worked so hard in securing for this area. This alone should be an attraction for various industries.

Now, for the other advantages as shown in the brochure, our climate is the finest in Oregon. Our taxes are the lowest in the State. Our recreational facilities are unsurpassed. We are located in the exact center of the State of Oregon. We have available an abundance of good sites for industry, stores, and homes.

To any business, group, or individual who is interested in the commercial attractions available in this part of my State, I would suggest that he obtain a copy of this pamphlet from the Prineville-Crook County Chamber of Commerce, Post Office Box 546, Prineville, Oreg. In it he will find a summary of the geography, climate, population, income, housing, recreation, civic, transportation, and other factors of interest to business enterprise.

CHALLENGE OF NEW FRONTIER IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night I had the pleasure of addressing an audience of more than 4,500 people at the Miami Beach Civic Auditorium, at a meeting sponsored by the Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association of Miami Beach. It was an open forum meeting. The subject of my speech was, "Meeting the Challenge of New Frontiers in Latin America." I ask unanimous consent that my speech may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF NEW FRONTIERS IN LATIN AMERICA

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Miami Beach Civic Forum, Miami Beach, Fla., sponsored by Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association of Miami Beach, February 19, 1961)

Few occasions have afforded me more personal pleasure and enjoyment than the occasion of this visit to Miami Beach at the invitation of the Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association.

Arthur Courshon and Jack Gordon are long-time acquaintances and, indeed, personal friends of mine. Their work in the area of savings and loan associations is matched by their interest in the foreign policy problems of the United States with the other nations of our hemisphere and, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have known for a long time of their interest in Latin America.

If it can be said that Americans decided last fall that a new frontier attitude was required to reinvigorate our country, the new frontier spirit is really rampant in the countries of the Caribbean and of South and Central America.

The new frontier in Latin America really bears little resemblance to our own. It is not a spirit that seeks to give fresh impetus to past policies; it is a spirit that seeks to change some of the basic living habits and basic economies of Latin America.

I also think it is safe to say that great numbers of the people in those countries are so determined to change these social and economic structures that they are not particularly concerned right now with how they do it. The Castro revolution probably looks better from far off than up close, but to millions of people in Latin America it remains as one way of achieving social and economic reform, if more peaceful and transitionary means fail.

To borrow from another famous American political slogan, many people in this hemisphere are determined to have a new deal for themselves, and they don't care much how they get it.

This was the overwhelming impression I brought back with me in December of 1959, after touring six countries in South America. Particularly in Brazil, but in each country I visited, I was told that great masses of people there were tired of being told that it was uneconomic for them to push the great public works programs for homes, schools, hospitals, roads, and so forth, at the rate on which they were insisting. Their people were demanding these programs, and there was much fear that if they could not be started under a democratic regime, the masses of the people were willing to consider some other kind of regime. It was President Kubischek of Brazil who initiated the Operation Pan American dedicated to finding the ways and means of providing these things throughout Latin America.

We must remember that for generations, words like "democracy," "free enterprise," "personal liberty," and the like, have been just words for the great majority of people in Latin American countries. Too often, the words that we live by in the United States have been empty slogans to poverty-ridden masses not only in Latin America, but in Asia and Africa, too.

Fortunately, there has in recent months been a growing understanding in America of just what is motivating the revolutions which have occurred in the hemisphere in the last 2 to 5 years. It is a sad thing that it took stones thrown at our Vice President in Caracas, and a Fidel Castro in Cuba, to arouse our interest and understanding.

It was due to such efforts as that of Arthur Courshon and David Krooth in 1958 that Americans began to improve their appreciation of events in Latin America. One of the ablest surveys of living conditions in a South American country was the report by these two gentlemen done for the U.S. Operations Mission to Chile, on the housing problem in Chile and some recommendations for coping with it.

One of the great obstacles to a better understanding within the hemisphere has been the economic theories about land reform, government-owned business, housing, education, medical care, and what might generally be lumped together as welfare programs, which have prevailed among responsible Government officials in the United States. This prevailing thinking was a great roadblock to the kind of program which Arthur Courshon and David Krooth proposed.

These prevailing theories have held that land reform, for example, is not something that the United States should include in its economic loan programs in Latin America. I do not know just what the basis for that theory is. We have had the institution of eminent domain in this country dating back to our earliest colonies. Perhaps there is something that smacks of property confiscation about a land reform program which requires that parts of large estates be purchased by the government and made available on long-term payment terms to the families which will work them.

But the land reform programs we had refused to assist were accompanied by proper payment to the former owners. I was told in several countries that land reform was the really basic issue. The existence of large landholders amid great masses of landless people was rapidly becoming intolerable.

Redistribution was essential, and they preferred that it be done by due process of law, with suitable compensation.

I think we should have been willing right from the start to extend loans for soundly conceived land reform operations in these countries. In my report of a year ago, I urged that the lending policies of the U.S. Development Loan Fund be revised to permit the lending of the initial capital for land reform, and agricultural and housing credit.

Another area which needs urgent attention in Latin America is that of education. It is not only high illiteracy rates which need to be overcome in Latin America; their people are in great need of agricultural training and vocational education, too. The only way any people can raise themselves from poverty is to learn to produce more. An educated upper and middle class is needed, but Latin America already has that. What she does not have in too many places is a trained labor force and productive farm operators.

I do not know of any amount of capital that can overcome these deficiencies in any country. So we cannot exclude education from our consideration when it comes to formulating assistance programs in Latin America.

A third major area where change and progress are needed in Latin America is in housing. The objections among American foreign aid and foreign policy officials to any help from this country in the housing field has been based on age-old economic theories which really do not stand the test of investigation.

It has been held by classical economists that good housing is a reward for the achievement of high living standards, not a component in reaching a high living standard. People were, in effect, not expected to have decent homes until after they had formed an industrial economy.

I want to mention in this connection the work which Mr. Stanley Baruch, of the Housing Division of the International Cooperation Administration, did in demolishing this contention. Mr. Baruch decided it was time someone analyzed the analysis. He found that home construction had been a major element in the development of an industrial economy in this country.

Largely as a result of his efforts, there has been some new thinking in the ICA about the importance of housing, not just because of the social need, but because of the contribution it can make to economic development.

The Courshon-Krooth report of July 1958 has this to say about housing needs in just one country—Chile:

"Housing should be the backbone of the economy of a nation, as it provides a market for raw materials and manufactured products and provides employment. This is true of the housing industry in the United States, where in a peak year 1,500,000 homes are constructed and in recent 'poor' years, 1 million homes have been produced. In Chile, we do not have an adequate and healthy housing industry which can make its necessary contribution to the economy and provide a large market for Chilean products, increased employment, and national income.

"There is a need for a large volume of housing construction in Chile. To build enough homes just to keep up with the increase in the population, a total of 30,000 homes are required each year. If, in addition, proper and adequate housing is to replace the substandard housing, Chile should work toward a goal of 50,000 homes a year."

I might point out that this report was prior to the earthquake disaster in Chile, which rendered homeless many thousands more.

Last year, these cumulative efforts to change official American policies on social development in Latin America began to get some results. It was due in no small part to the efforts of the then Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, who gave great backing to the $500 million fund which Congress passed last year to assist in this social and economic reform.

This fund was our contribution to Operation Pan America. It is intended to assist in establishing those essential services of roads, schools, hospitals, and housing, too, which are not always revenue producing in themselves, but without which large-scale business and industrial investment is impossible.

It was my privilege to have gone down to Bogotá, Colombia, last fall, when under the leadership of Under Secretary Dillon, we joined representatives from the other members of the Organization of American States in implementing Operation Pan America.

What emerged from that conference was the Act of Bogotá, a hemispherewide program of social reform to accompany the existing programs of economic development. The act consists of four parts—measures for social improvement, creation of a special fund for social development, measures for economic development, and multilateral cooperation for social and economic progress.

The measures for social improvement are listed under general headings relating to improvement of conditions of rural living and land use, improvement of housing and community facilities, improvement of educational systems and training facilities, improvement of public health, and the mobilization of domestic resources.

The special fund for social development is to be administered through the Inter-American Development Bank, as a revolving fund.

Another instance of the change in the American attitude was the amendment in 1960 of the Mutual Security Act to permit the Development Loan Fund to make loans for certain types of housing activities. This amendment makes it possible for the Development Loan Fund to participate in so-called self-help housing projects in the countries of the hemisphere. Peru was the first country to take advantage of this provision, and negotiations are going on with several other Latin American countries.

Still another measure is one offered by myself and Senator SMATHERS last year, to make it possible for American savings and loans institutions to invest a small portion of their capital in mutual savings associations for home construction in other countries. Hearings were held last year by the Senate's Housing Subcommittee. It gave friendly consideration to the proposal, and asked for a report on it from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Unfortunately, the housing bill in which this request of the committee was formally put was among the many housing bills which did not complete the legislative process.

However, a considerably revised version has already been introduced, and I look forward to its reconsideration this year. The measure limits the amount which any one American savings association can invest abroad to a tiny fraction of its assets—one-hundredth of those assets.

I have dwelt here on the belated recognition of the part which the United States can and should play in promoting reform in Latin America. But we would make a great mistake to delude ourselves, or the people of the hemisphere who are looking to us for help, by thinking that American capital can do all, or even much, of the job.

The capital needs of Latin America are far in excess of what any one country of the world could possibly furnish. Moreover, unless the small contribution we do make is accompanied by extensive economic reform and self-help within the recipient country, American financial help will make no dent at all on their backlog of needs.

The real obstacle which the Nations of Latin America must overcome is not simply one of apathy and disinterest in the United States; it is the obstacle of their own stratified social and economic structures. It is this stratification that has left them so far behind the countries of North America and Europe in the march toward better living conditions.

This was a major point we made at the Bogotá Conference. We made clear that we were ready to enter into a partnership with them, but that implied that they must do their share, too.

As I told the Conference myself on September 8, 1960; concerning congressional approval of the special fund:

"Of all the elements, I think the one which loomed biggest in the congressional view was the emphasis upon self-help. This, in turn, was based upon the concept for which history provides ample support, that the basic, the most important factor in development is people who really want development, and who want it badly enough not only to work for it but make their own substantial economic contributions as well as give up certain traditional customs in order to get it. Unless this basic urge is present, no amount of outside assistance will be effective.

"Real development means adjusting the social, economic, and political institutions of a country so that the poor do not stay poor while the rich get richer * * *. It is a factor which undoubtedly will be taken into account in further congressional implementation of this program."

It is a sad fact that the countries of Latin America, while there are notable exceptions, are typically characterized by oligarchic economies, the absence of any real middle class, a concentration of land holdings in a few large and unproductive holdings, a regressive tax structure and poor enforcement of what income taxes do exist, education largely confined to the aristocracy, and luxury housing for the few surrounded by appalling slums for the masses.

Unless and until these elite upper classes are willing to relax their grip on the economic and social institutions of their countries, American capital and investment will not reach the people who want it. What is likely to happen in such instances is what happened in Cuba.

There is simply no possibility that the United States can "buy up" these countries from communism, even if we wanted to. We can urge, persuade, instruct, and plant some so-called seed capital, but we are not omnipotent.

The future of Latin America lies with the people of Latin America, not with us. I hope we will continue to do everything possible to cooperate with those elements in each country who recognize that what they hope for must essentially come from within their countries, not from without.

I hope we will be able to impress upon them that the living standards to which they aspire have been made possible in America only by such sound institutions as a progressive tax system, antitrust laws, farm cooperatives, competitive civil service, and the concept of equal justice for all regardless of economic condition.

Perhaps the most effective proposal yet made in this area of housing in Latin America, is that of the Courshon-Krooth report, recommending the establishment of mutual savings institutions in Chile, and in other countries with a similar housing problem. One of the problems they face is the devastating effect of inflation upon savings of any kind. Inflation in Chile and elsewhere in South America has prevented either the wealthy or the small saver from ever getting

the habit of investing savings in his own country. The wealthy commonly bank their money abroad, and generally invest it in the United States or Western Europe, but not at home.

Here again, they cannot expect American capital to take the place of their own wealth, when it comes to reinvestment of savings.

But some techniques have been worked out to minimize the effects of inflation upon the small savings account. As recommended by Mr. Courshon, Chile adopted such a system in an effort to provide the long term mortgage loan money essential to large-scale home construction and family ownership.

This system provided that money accumulated in a newly established savings department in the state bank would be earmarked for housing construction. It was turned over to a special corporation called Corvi. When a savings account reached a fixed level, the saver was eligible for a mortgage loan, according to the amount the saver had accumulated and according to the savings plan he had selected.

The mortgage amount was made adjustable. The amount of principal of the contract would be increased by the amount of the inflation that might have occurred between the date of the contract and the time the saver received his funds. Similarly, the mortgage and the savings would be repaid on a readjusted basis.

The plan went into operation a year ago. Last April, the Government of Chile also set up an independent savings and loan system, again with savings and mortgages insured and adjustable to the inflation.

I have taken this description of what has been done in Chile from Mr. Courshon's report of December 1960. In it, he also makes some additional suggestions for the operation of these savings and loan programs in Chile. He points out that some American investment in the Chilean associations would be helpful in getting them started, and while he mentions development loan funds for this purpose, some investments by our independent savings associations could also be helpful in indicating the personal interest we have in showing others in the hemisphere just how it was that America was able to make so much progress toward family homeownership.

So far, such programs as this have been slow in getting started in Latin America. Pilot housing programs, either through the savings and loan system, or cooperative housing, are still few and far between. There is not much yet that the DLF or our local associations can contribute to, because the initiative for them must come from the country involved.

I hope this program, along with that of land reform and education, can be stepped up because we—and the hemisphere itself—are in a race against time.

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER AT INTER-AMERICAN BAR CONFERENCE, BOGOTÁ

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the former distinguished Members of this body, one of the great constructive liberals of America, in my opinion, former Senator Claude Pepper, of Florida, spoke recently at a luncheon of the Inter-American Bar Conference in Bogotá on February 3, 1961. He was one of the delegates of the bar association who attended that convention of lawyers in Bogotá. He made, as usual, a very able and thoughtful speech, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, OF FLORIDA, AT A LUNCHEON OF THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR CONFERENCE IN BOGOTÁ, FEBRUARY 3, 1961

To come here again to beautiful and hospitable Bogotá vividly reminds Mrs. Pepper and me of our last visit here in December of 1944 with our dear friend Col. James W. Flanagan, as guests of Colombia's president, Alfonso López, who like Colombia's distinguished President Lleras Camargo, will be remembered as one of the great men of our time. I also happily recall that I had the honor to address the Senate and House of Colombia upon that visit.

Then my country and Colombia and many other sister nations were engaged in the greatest of world wars in which millions had died and were to die before we had stopped wars of aggression and conquest and brought peace to mankind.

You remember how we all prayed for that peace and determined that we would set up organizations to keep the peace of the future.

You remember how we determined that we would all work together to preserve freedom and to promote the well-being of all peoples everywhere in the world.

Now nearly 16 years after the end of that war we are in a state of tension and fear of another war which with the terrible weapons of today would destroy civilization and perhaps every living creature upon the earth.

Now we know that hundreds of millions of human beings, made in the image of God, born with the right to be free, are in the bonds of tyranny and slavery.

Now we know that much more than half of the human race is, as President Roosevelt once said about some of his fellow countrymen, "ill fed, ill clothed and ill housed."

All over the world people pray for peace, cry out for freedom, beg for a better life.

What can we lawyers do to preserve the peace, assure the freedom and promote the welfare of people everywhere in the world?

The lawyer by his training and experience is, we believe, the best fitted of all the professions to formulate and to advocate the ways and means, by which peace, freedom and progress may be attained.

Our first concern must be to set up the courts and develop the law, by which disputes among nations will be settled by law and not by force, and persuade governments and people everywhere to accept and support this rule of law.

We have made a beginning with the establishment of the International Court of Justice, under the Charter of the United Nations and the development of a substantial body of recognized international law. But the Court must be strengthened; its jurisdiction must be accepted by the nations of the world, especially the most powerful nations, and the law which such Court shall administer must be developed and recognized throughout the world. We must, as Dean Roscoe Pound of Harvard Law School has recommended, also develop and administer international law in the courts of our respective countries where its enforcement shall be the same as the domestic or municipal law and shall not be dependent upon some international enforcement machinery. This is the task of the lawyer, trained in the law, experienced in the establishment and administration of institutions by which men are wisely and justly governed, and their lives, their liberties, and their properties protected.

It is also the task of the lawyer, the greatest advocate among men, to show the people of the world that the rule of law is the only way the human race under the dangers of today's weapons, can survive and that in a world of law alone can mankind have freedom and the good life he deserves.

In the United States, for example, we are spending over 40 billions of dollars every year upon the defense and security of our country against the danger of war. If the threat of war could be removed from us and we could reduce by even one-half these expenses, we could increase by ten times the aid we could give to other nations as to help their people to own their homes and their farms and to enjoy better health and education. If we could assure peace through law in the world, we could make over the earth and lift men everywhere to heights of happiness for which they have dreamed and fought throughout the ages.

World peace through law have now become the great aim of the inter-American bar and the associations of lawyers all over the world.

Our committees are planning to meet in every continent and in many countries; and finally we are soon to have a great world conference of lawyers to further this noble dream and to arouse people everywhere to its support. And we must be not only defenders but the bold champions of the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

It is also the task of the lawyer to help men to be free, for he knows the constant threat to freedom and that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." He knows that freedom for mankind is found only when there is equal justice under law. He knows that equal justice under law lives only where there are competent, independent, and fearless courts and able and courageous lawyers dedicated to freedom and justice.

He knows when the freedom of the people is being threatened by deception and he must unmask such deception and show the people how it may be thwarted. For example, if a foreign power were to land troops in any nation of our hemisphere today we would all spring to the defense of that nation under the solemn agreements we have reached with one another for common defense against such aggressions. Yet, if a group of men should in any nation come to power and then invite a foreign, Communist, imperialistic power to come into such country and dominate it and from it further its designs against the freedom of other republics in our hemisphere, is it not the task of the lawyer to establish judicial institutions by which such aggressions may be adjudged and effectively resisted by the other republics without violating any of our irrevocable agreements against intervention in the internal affairs of any American Republic?

And it must be the courageous lawyer, the able and eloquent advocate, who will show the people and their governments the wisdom, the right and, indeed, the necessity of such a course if their precious freedom fought for by Bolivar, San Martin, Santander, José Marti, and many other great liberators, is not to be lost to a tyranny far more despotic than that against which they fought. Yes, as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, we shall show the world, we in the Americas "are the masters of our own house."

And the lawyer must find ways and means to show all people today that they do not have to sell their freedom for a mess of pottage. They can now have bread and freedom; they can have health and education and freedom. They can now have their homes and farms and freedom; they can have these blessing in the democratic way without the price of their freedom when all nations and people work together under democracy and law and in peace to provide them.

The lawyer, of course, must be the able advocate and defender of such cooperation among all nations and especially the nations of the Americas.

I know, we lawyers of my country believe, that a new Good Neighbor Policy between the United States and our sister republics is coming to birth and soon to a gratifying maturity and meaning under our great new President, John F. Kennedy, and we are going to support such a policy with all our hearts.

Indeed, we believe a new era is opening for all the Americas, our country as well as our sister republics, as democracy throughout our hemisphere takes on new life and vitality under dynamic, courageous leaders whom the people are raising up to lead them to a better life under law and in peace.

Let us lawyers, in these critical days, rise to our historic role as the leaders of men, as the architects of their worthy institutions, as the advocates of their causes, the defenders of their rights and their freedom, as the designers of their progress and their happiness.

And let us work and pray above all else for the happy day of which Tennyson dreamed:

"When the war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled,
In the parliament of men, the federation of the world,
There the commonsense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

FUNERAL SERMON FOR PATRICE LUMUMBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a sermon which was delivered last Sunday night, February 19, 1961, by Bishop Smallwood E. Williams of Washington, D.C., of the Bible Way Church, with respect to the death of Mr. Lumumba of the Congo, during the course of which sermon Bishop Williams, in my judgment, called attention to some very important matters we ought to consider relative to American foreign policy.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNERAL SERMON FOR PATRICE LUMUMBA

(An address delivered by Bishop Smallwood E. Williams at the Bible Way Church on Sunday, February 19, 1961)

The murder of Patrice Lumumba was an international political tragedy which might have been avoided were it not for five important mistakes. These five mistakes are the basic elements of the compounded confusion which now reigns in the Congo. Let us review what these mistakes were and who made them.

First, Belgian colonial policy was mistaken in not having governed their colony with the view of preparing the Congolese for the inevitable day when they must rule themselves and control the vast expanse of that mineral-rich country.

Secondly, Patrice Lumumba was mistaken in not clearly recognizing that the salvation of his country and the future of all the emerging nations of Africa was dependent upon the preservation of a stable world order and that, at this moment in history, all hope is placed in the United Nations to accomplish this task.

Thirdly, the Western Powers of the United Nations were mistaken in not foreseeing the questions and doubts in the minds of African nationalists who were understandably cautious about placing all of their trust in an organization where their former colonial masters played such a prominent part. It is difficult for these new nations to believe that those who were so recently on African soil as colonizers and exploiters will have fundamentally changed their motives just because they happen to be dressed in United Nations blue.

Fourthly, along with the Western Powers, the Soviet Union was mistaken in not limiting its U.N. role to constructive criticism aimed at checking the West, while, at the same time making some positive contribution to a collective effort to settle conditions in the Congo. It seems that, on the international scene, the concept of responsible opposition is a difficult one for nations to learn and practice. Both East and West, motivated by the terms of the cold war, focus their efforts on preserving their own positions and not on creating and preserving peace for all.

Lastly, the United States was mistaken and has been persistently mistaken in not having a more imaginative and perceptive vision of African nationalist ambitions. They have thought as they have been conditioned to think—literally and figuratively—in terms of black and white. In the literal sense, they have allowed segments of our population to continue in immoral and outdated practices of discrimination in such a manner that it has cost us the respect and good will of peoples of color all over the world. In the figurative sense, they have failed to see the difference between nationalism and neutralism, on the one hand, and communism, on the other. They have taken similarities of African policy statements with Russian policy statements automatically to mean Communist influence on the Africans and never vice versa. Our policymakers have failed to see that Russia has often pushed forward African policy lines because they saw the propaganda value of doing so. Our policymakers have rushed headlong into statements placing one or another African nation "very definitely in the Communist bloc." Our policymakers have allowed their NATO link with the colonial powers to determine their positions on some of the most important moral and political issues of our times, such as our hesitancy to aid Guinea at the moment of her independence, our abstention on important U.N. votes on the South African situation, and our more recent abstention on the U.N. vote on colonialism.

Lumumba's death represents the compounded effects of all of this—of a Belgian colonial policy which thrust an ill-prepared patriot into an international scene dominated by the cold war between two powerful blocs which have not yet found the way to subordinate their own private interests to the cause of peace and a better life for all men.

PROBLEMS OF THE UNEMPLOYED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am always pleased when it is possible for me to give deserved praise to the press, especially when it appears to me that a newspaper is performing its major public function of educating the responsible citizens of the community through news stories and editorials highlighting matters of grave concern locally.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, in my judgment, has performed a distinct and needed public service in the past weeks through the able reporting of Miss Eve Edstrom and Mr. Luther Jackson and through an editorial entitled "Hungry Children," which appeared on February 17, 1961. Illustrative of the excellent reporting are two articles, the first headed "Jobless Parents' Families Need Aid" by Miss Edstrom and the second, captioned "Bricklayer's Family of 13 is Now Destitute" written by Mr. Jackson.

There also appeared in the Sunday, February 19, 1961, issue an article signed by Mr. Bernard W. Scholz, Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the District Department of Public Welfare, under the headline "Life on Dole No Joy in Nation's Capital." Mr. Scholz presented an expanded version of the printed story earlier in the year before the District League of Women Voters.

Publication of the articles and the editorial support given them by the newspaper should do much to dispel popular myths concerning public assistance in the District. An unemployed man who is able to work, even though he cannot find work, and even though he may have exhausted his unemployment benefits, cannot at present be given public assistance to feed and house his family.

There is obviously something wrong with a policy based upon regulation which permits such a shocking situation to exist. I have asked the Department of Public Welfare what steps are necessary to change the regulation which has such tragic consequences to our fellow human beings caught in an economic vise here in the District.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum replying to my request be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 20, 1961.

In response to your telephone request of this morning we wish to state that our general public assistance program is being operated solely under the language of the Appropriation Act (Federal Payment to District of Columbia, Public Law 86-412, 86th Cong., H.R. 10233, Apr. 8, 1960). There is no statute specifically authorizing a general public assistance program in the District. The language authorizing our current program will be found in the Appropriation Act under the heading "Department of Public Welfare" and reads as follows:

"Department of Public Welfare, including relief and rehabilitation of indigent residents, maintenance, pending transportation of indigent persons, burial of indigent residents of the District of Columbia, * * *".

It would be our opinion, which of course would need to be confirmed by the Office of the Corporation Counsel, that, provided necessary funds are available, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia could authorize the initiation of a program of unemployment relief under this broad appropriation language. If this action should be taken, the cost of needed staff and equipment would be chargeable entirely against District government funds as no Federal matching of such expenditures would be available.

We hope that this is the information you wanted.

Sincerely yours,

GERARD M. SHEA,
Director of Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me quite clear that the Department of Public Welfare, its advisory body, and

the Commissioners of the District of Columbia should review most carefully existing regulations and policy with a view to modification in order that the public responsibility in this area can be met. We cannot afford, in my judgment, the human attrition and waste, especially as it affects children, caused by unemployment to erode further the families of decent hardworking citizens of the District. It is a shocking reflection upon our institutions when in the Capital of the United States, an administrative remedy to alleviate hardship is not used.

The President of the United States has moved swiftly through an expansion of the surplus food program to take the necessary steps on a national level through strong executive action to alleviate economic hardship. In the District we can take administrative action in a parallel fashion and by changing our regulations governing the granting of general assistance meet, in good measure, the local problem.

It will be objected that the District does not have the money. My answer to this plea, always raised when programs designed to assist people are proposed, is that there are supplementary appropriation bills being considered through which funds can be sought. There are other programs for which money has been appropriated from which, temporarily, money can be diverted. If there is a will to do something about the problem, the technique to do it can be found easily and speedily.

In this connection, Mr. Scholz has hit the nail on the head in his article to which I earlier referred. He put it thus:

Where is the money coming from? is the question always raised when these proposals are brought up in the meetings of the mighty. The money is there, I assure you; the real problem is only a matter of choice. This whole discussion reminds me of my own situation. Although my wife and I are working and earn good salaries, we were "too poor" this past Christmas to give ourselves a color TV set—because we had just bought a new hi-fi and a Volkswagen as a second car.

The District is in the same deplorable condition. It is building a beautiful "depressed" 12th Street under the Mall and is planning to dig a tunnel under the Lincoln Memorial; it has just spent $1 million to pave over the Wisconsin Avenue streetcar tracks which have not bothered anyone for the past 50 years, and it is therefore unable to raise $800,000 to meet its relief payroll.

Clearly the money is there, the challenge is there, the experts, the blueprints, the solutions are available. It is only a matter of choice, a matter of conscience, a matter of farsightedness as to what action we choose.

Mr. President, the problem has been posed, the solutions have been offered, the challenge can be met—only the decision to do, the decision to act, is lacking.

For my part, in this session of the Congress, as in the sessions of the 85th and 86th Congresses, I shall give early and careful attention to the legislative proposals contained in the united public assistance bill presented by the Commissioners. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia has twice reported similar legislation to the Senate, and the Senate has twice passed the reported bill. In view of this, I would anticipate that an acceptable measure would again pass in this session. But what I am strongly suggesting today needs no legislative actions; it demands, instead, administrative action and appropriations. I hope, most sincerely, that a quick response will be made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles and editorial to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks, and I again extend to the Washington Post and Times Herald my congratulations upon the leadership it has shown in underlining this deplorable situation.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1961]

HUNGRY CHILDREN

It is a disfigurement of America that any child should suffer hunger in this land of bursting granaries and comfortable living. Yet all about us this bitter winter there have been families feeling the pinch of want—because their breadwinners could not find jobs, because the country in its complacency closed its eyes to the spreading and continuing joblessness, because our laws, in many places, make no provision for helping those capable of working.

The stark, terrible truth is that some 600,000 Americans, able and willing to work, have been out of jobs for so long that they have exhausted the unemployment benefits which are their due under the social security program. In some States, as in the District of Columbia, no direct relief assistance is provided for such employable persons. In short, their families are left to freeze or starve. There exists, in consequence, the tragic anomaly that, although the children of the incapacitated and even the children whose fathers have deserted them receive relief, the children of those who want to work are ignored.

It is heartening that the President and the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have looked at this situation realistically and with an appropriate sense of urgency. It would be unconscionable for Congress to delay action on the remedial measures they have requested—an extension of unemployment compensation benefits by a maximum of 13 weeks and the provision of public relief for the children of unemployed parents.

To speak of Federal aid in this connection—Federal aid to keep children from starvation—as usurping the prerogatives of the States is to betray an indifference to human life. This is America. No child should go hungry here.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 7, 1961]

WHY FORCE FATHER TO DESERT?—JOBLESS PARENT'S FAMILIES NEED AID

(By Eve Edstrom)

A major breakthrough in establishing a national relief program based on family need and not on the absence of fathers will be achieved if Congress enacts President Kennedy's proposal to aid children of unemployed parents.

This has not been done before because it shatters an American dream.

That dream holds that only special categories of people are in need in this country. Therefore, you can receive Federal relief payments if you are blind, disabled, old, or the child of a father who is dead, incapacitated, or has deserted.

But if you are the child of an unemployed father you cannot receive Federal relief. This is because any able-bodied man worth his salt is supposed to be able to provide for his family.

The facts, however, don't support that dream.

ABOVE 5 MILLION

Nationally, unemployment last month climbed above 5 million to the second highest level since the start of World War II. Of that number 1.3 million had been jobless for 15 weeks or more.

In the Washington area, unemployment was placed at 23,600, in Virginia at 63,350, and in Maryland 75,000. In the 3 jurisdictions, 8,002 have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

These workers are not ne'er-do-wells. They are like the father of eight who showed up at the Salvation Army here last week.

He had never appealed for help before in his life, he had tried to find all sorts of odd jobs to support his family but he just couldn't make it, Salvation Army workers reported.

Agencies like the Salvation Army do not have the wherewithal to help families for weeks on end. They can give an emergency food order, they can help pay a light or rent bill in a time of crisis but they cannot give extended aid to maintain families.

JOB FOR PUBLIC AGENCIES

That is a job for public agencies. But except for a short time in the 1930's prior to the establishment of the WPA, the Federal Government has not provided funds for needy children of unemployed parents.

Some States have provided for these children through local and State general assistance funds. But usually such programs fall far short of need and are below the Federal-State grants given to children whose fathers have deserted them.

In Maryland, for example, only a handful of counties has elected to participate with the State in a relief program for the unemployed and payments are so restricted that no family—no matter how large—can receive more than $100 a month. In Virginia payments cannot be made to such families for more than 3 months in any given year.

But many States and the District of Columbia do not even have these limited programs. The hardship that this imposes on families was pointed up forcefully by Bernard W. Scholz, head of the District's public assistance program, last month when he told the League of Women Voters that there was "no freedom from want" in the Nation's Capital.

UTTER DISTRESS FOR MANY

"We hear so much about people who are chiselers and who are enjoying a life of ease and comfort on the dole yet many people fail to realize that there are large segments of the population who are in utter distress and for whom there is no public relief available at all," he said.

"There is no unemployment relief in the Nation's Capital. No matter how urgent the need, no matter how hungry the children, no matter how cold the home, no matter how sick the mother: If the man is employable but is out of a job and has used up his unemployment benefits, there is no public relief whatsoever available to him in the city of Washington."

The shortsightedness of this policy was pointed up more than a year ago by Junior Village Project Committee. The committee's study showed that when unemployed fathers remained in the home, children frequently became public charges at the District Junior Village at a cost to taxpayer 10 times greater than that of maintaining them on relief.

Even more tragically, the committee cited case after case in which families were split up because fathers had deserted to qualify their families for the Federal-local relief program.

That fact was well recognized by former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Arthur S. Flemming who, in 1959, said that, in many instances, the present Federal law "makes it necessary for a father to desert his family in order to have that family obtain public assistance."

Therefore, Flemming said, the aid to dependent children's law should be amended to authorize dependent children's grants based "strictly on need" and "not on the presence or absence of the father."

ARE IN ACCORD

On that point, Flemming and the new Kennedy administration are in accord.

A first step in that direction is the President's proposal to amend the law to permit grant to dependent children of unemployed parents beginning April 1 and continuing through June 30, 1962. For that period, the program is expected to aid 750,000 children at a cost of $305 million. Hearings on the measure begin Wednesday before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Prior to the expiration date of this program, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff expects to have ready for Congress a family and child welfare services plan which would bring together all Federal relief programs and social services aimed at helping needy families.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1961]

AFTER 2 MONTHS OF SNOW—BRICKLAYER'S FAMILY OF 13 IS NOW DESTITUTE

(By Luther P. Jackson)

Before the first snowfall in December, the Washington bricklayer was living with his wife and 11 children in a 6-room apartment. Six snowfalls later, the family is rooming with his wife's 70-year-old grandmother in her one-room basement flat.

The grandmother sleeps in a bed; the family of 13 sleeps on the basement floor.

The 33-year-old bricklayer, who shall be called Louis Wilson, is one of about 20,000 Washington area construction workers who have been idled by the severe weather. Most of these workers have drawn on their savings, or turned to relatives and friends. The United Givers Fund is trying to help such families in a limited emergency appeal for $58,000.

While the Wilsons were evicted for not paying rent for January and December they could turn only to the grandmother who lives on the $57.47 a month that she receives from the Department of Public Welfare under the old-age assistance program.

But when Wilson applied for public assistance, he was told there is no public program which could help his family. As long as he kept his health and remained at home, he was ineligible under the special welfare programs for the elderly, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children. He was told to try the Salvation Army.

So Wilson took his place yesterday in a line of silent men wearing heavy work clothes. None could draw unemployment benefits. They are paid by the hour, and get nothing when they do not work.

Most of the men were construction laborers—the men who mix concrete, haul bricks and lumber, grade streets and highways. Wilson had once been a laborer himself, but he soon advanced to bricklayer's helper, and finally he became a bricklayer.

Before the snow came, Wilson was earning $130 a week; not bad for a high school graduate, but not good enough to permit a man with 11 children, aged 2 to 15, to put anything aside. But Wilson had kept his growing family together and the rent, $60, was reasonable. Wilson's children attended Sunday school and two of his boys were Boy Scouts.

But after he was idled by the snow, Wilson rented a cab, but had to quit driving it when he could not meet his payments. He got a warning from his landlord on the December rent. At the end of January, he came home one day from job hunting to find his furniture and household goods out in the snow. His belongings had been looted by his neighbors.

"They even took my trowels, my levels, and joiners," the bricklayer recalls.

So Wilson picked up his family and moved in with his wife's grandmother, a matriarch who is known in her building for her kindnesses to neighbors and friends.

Yesterday her little room was spilling over with the 5 of 11 children, an aged, shriveled man with a cane, and her son. The five preschool children were seated in quiet bewilderment in a row on the only bed.

Wilson came home last night with a bag of food from the Salvation Army. He also will get clothes and a month's rent, if he can find another place to live.

The UGF special appeal is designed to shore up the dwindling cash reserves and supplies for the Salvation Army and six other agencies who serve the poor and the temporarily poor. Those seeking to contribute to the appeal may address their checks or money orders to the United Givers Fund Emergency Appeal, 1101 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Help will have to come soon to help the Wilson family. Wilson is bitter because he could get no help for his family from the welfare department "after I had worked all my life, only to have everything wiped out in 2 months."

Unless help comes, Wilson says there is only one way out. He said he would leave his wife and 11 children so that they would be eligible for public assistance under the program of aid to dependent children.

"I'll leave my family so they can get some help," he said. "My kids will have to get up off that basement floor. That's all there is to it."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1961]

LIFE ON DOLE NO JOY IN NATION'S CAPITAL

(By Bernard W. Scholz)

We hear so much about people who are chiselers and who are enjoying a life of ease and comfort on the dole, yet many people apparently fail to realize that there are large segments of the population which are in utter distress and for which there is no public relief available at all.

There is no unemployment relief in the Nation's Capital. No matter how urgent the need, no matter how hungry the children, no matter how cold the home, no matter how sick the mother, if the man is employable but is out of a job and has used up his unemployment benefits, there is no public relief whatsoever available to him in the city of Washington.

Similarly, there is no public aid for the underemployed. When a man's earning power is inadequate to support his growing family, when he falls behind in his rental payments, when his lights are turned off, when the car in which he drives to work is repossessed, when he can't pay his doctor bills, when his children are missing school because they have no shoes or warm clothes, there is no public aid available in the District of Columbia. As long as he is employable, no matter how inadequate his wages, the Department of Public Welfare cannot touch him.

And, finally, there is no supplementation from public funds in cases of sudden emergency. If a husband and wife have both been working and have been providing adequately, but in a marginal way, for their family, and the mother has to go to the hospital on account of a new pregnancy, there is no agency that can use public funds to substitute for the mother's missing wages. As long as the head of the household is able to work, whether he does work or not, whether his earnings are adequate or not, the doors to public aid are closed.

NO PRIVATE RECOURSE

According to a recent estimate, there are twice as many families living below assistance standards in Washington as there are actually on assistance. And the fact that the public agency is not able to help does not mean that one of the red-feather agencies will pick up the tab.

There is not one private agency in town that is prepared financially or programwise to give long-range economic support to low-income families. That is expected to be the public agency's prerogative.

Family and child service, Catholic charities, Jewish social service or the Salvation Army will come to the rescue with an individual payment. When a family has been evicted, they may pay 1 month's rent. When the wage earner's check has been lost or stolen, they may be able to replace it in part as a one-shot action. But not one agency in town would be able to assume financial responsibility for a family week in and week out, month in and month out, possibly for years, as does the department of public welfare in the cases which it does accept.

TRANSFERABLE BURDEN

But even those families of which the community thinks as theoretically eligible for assistance face any number of restrictions that may bar them from badly needed aid. A mother whose husband is in an institution or has deserted automatically becomes the head of the household, and the same criteria that applied to the man in the examples mentioned above now suddenly apply to her. If her children are in school so that she is not needed to care for them during the day, and if she is physically well, then she is an employable head of the household and not eligible for aid.

When a woman and her children are receiving assistance and an employable boy friend moves into the home, not only she but all of her children become ineligible for assistance, although the man has not the slightest legal or other responsibility for them.

When a child becomes 18 or drops out of school at 16, he becomes ineligible for assistance regardless of whether he has a job or is equipped to look for a job. Unless he is physically or mentally handicapped and, therefore, eligible for assistance in his own right, he will be cut off and become a burden to the rest of the family.

If a man has had an accident and can no longer do the type of work he did before, but is still employable for some kind of work, no matter how much diminished his earning power may be, he is considered as again available for work on the competitive labor market and he and his family are ineligible for assistance.

When an aged woman can no longer support herself but has a grandchild living in Washington who has managed to pull himself up by the bootstraps and find a good job, then the grandmother suddenly becomes a millstone around the neck of the grandchild, who under the law becomes responsible for her support no matter how completely family ties may have been severed in the intervening generation.

So you can see that it is very much a matter like the Biblical camel passing through the needle's eye to become a relief recipient in Washington. And still the relief load is steadily increasing.

No matter how much prosperity the country as a whole enjoys, no matter how steady employment in the Nation's Capital may be, the number of welfare cases keeps going up, month after month and year after year, much to the consternation of those who have to approve the public welfare budget and those who foot the bill. What is the reason for this?

The fact is that, from a social and economic standpoint, there is no such thing as a District of Columbia. There is only a large metropolitan area centered around the old city of Washington and extending in sprawling suburbs into the Maryland and Virginia countryside.

What makes this picture so unbalanced is the ugly and painful truth that segregation and discrimination have set up an iron curtain along the District line and along the Potomac. Young people may grow up within the confines of the District of Columbia, but when they come of age, when they marry, when their earning power increases and they are ready to raise a family, then they move out into the suburbs to own what one city planner called a play yard with a house on it and become citizens of suburbia if they are white.

If they are Negroes, they are not welcome in Maryland or Virginia and have to stay in the District, but even in the District they are facing job discrimination. High school graduates and even graduates of teachers colleges and Howard University find that jobs as busboys, charwomen, maids, taxi drivers, janitors, or typists are open to them, but when it comes to the better paying jobs, discrimination begins. The jobs of waitresses in the better restaurants and hotels, or of saleslaadies in the better stores, are still reserved for white applicants.

We recently read that one Negro has finally been admitted as an electrician on a federally financed project, and at long last we have a few Negro streetcar conductors and bus drivers. But just as we still have to see the first Negro play in the National Symphony, so we find that throughout the city the better paying jobs are firmly held in white hands.

And thus the Negro population, whose birth rate is higher than that of its white fellow citizens, is artificially held down to a lower economic level where it is less prepared to meet old age, sickness, and other emergencies.

And where this low-income Negro population is kept from enjoying the benefits of suburban living and equal job opportunities, life is made more and more complex and expensive in the confines of the city, where large-scale slum clearance projects are fast eliminating the residual low-cost private housing, driving rents up to ever higher levels, causing ever-increasing overcrowding, forcing refugees from renewal areas into formerly thinly populated sections of the city and spreading the blight that of necessity goes with unhealthy housing conditions, because public housing fails to make up for the loss of wrecked low-cost dwellings.

Thus it comes about that while the District is actually losing population, it is forced by the noose of segregation to contain the entire low-income population of the whole metropolitan area, and that it creates by its own discriminatory practices social conditions which perpetuate marginal existence, dependency, delinquency and the high cost of social services.

As was pointed out before: In order to be eligible at all for relief in the District of Columbia, one has to be aged, totally disabled, blind, or a dependent child whose mother conducts herself in a way that raises no question of eligibility. But let no one tell you that life on the dole is a joy in Washington.

The rent paid to a single person is $36 a month, and you can well imagine what kind of housing is available at that price level. Small allowances for heat, utilities, and refrigeration bring the total shelter allowance up to $47 monthly, to which is added $25 for food and $11 for clothing, personal incidentals, and household needs, resulting in a monthly relief payment of $83.

Just to explain to you why I am so exercised about our public assistance situation, let me remind you that public assistance expenditures have been higher this year than the official forecasts. As a result, our agency has at this point spent $800,000 more than was anticipated, and unless Congress comes through with a deficiency appropriation, we will have to do the unthinkable, scandalous thing of cutting these starvation allowances by 20 or more percent for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Engineer Commissioner Welling, shortly before he left the city, became very much concerned about the progressive deterioration of the second precinct, and as his swan song, as it were, he initiated a project aimed at the social and spiritual rehabilitation of the area, urging that ways be found to instill in the inhabitants of the second precinct a sense of pride in their community and a feeling of belonging.

I have been wondering ever since what it would feel like to be a resident of the second precinct: to see the hordes of clerks and officials of my local government swarm in from their suburban homes in Maryland and Virginia in the morning, tell me how to spend my money, how to run my life, and leave again in the evening to their "play yard with a house on it" in the suburbs, where they vote, go to church, send their children to school, and hold office in civic organizations.

And left behind in the night are the people of the second precinct, without vote, without representation, whose public health clinic was taken away when the old Polk School was razed, whose public welfare offices were removed when the old Business High School was torn down, whose trees were chopped down and whose front yards were taken away when New York and Rhode Island Avenues were widened so people could pass the second precinct faster and in whose midst was planted a huge dump of police-impounded wrecked automobiles as a monument to civic pride and "a sense of belonging."

Obviously, the problems facing Washington are not problems the Department of Public Welfare can solve; they are problems pervading every facet of community life and requiring the imagination, effort and cooperation of every community agency for their solution.

But let no one think that much research, study, and planning are needed before the attack on these problems can begin. Studies have been made, research has been done, plans have been outlined, blueprints have been drawn; all we need to do is to follow them.

Where is the money coming from? is the question always raised when these proposals are brought up in the meeting of the mighty. The money is there, I assure you; the real problem is only a matter of choice.

This whole discussion reminds me of my own situation: Although my wife and I are working and earn good salaries, we were "too poor" this past Christmas to give ourselves a color TV set—because we had just bought a new hi-fi and a Volkswagen as a second car.

The District is in the same deplorable condition. It is building a beautiful depressed 12th Street under the Mall and is planning to dig a tunnel under the Lincoln Memorial; it has just spent $1 million to pave over the Wisconsin Avenue streetcar tracks which have not bothered anybody for the past 50 years, and it is therefore unable to raise $800,000 to meet its relief payroll.

Clearly, the money is there, the challenge is there, the experts, the blueprints, the solutions are available. It is only a matter of choice, a matter of conscience, a matter of farsightedness as to what action we choose.

Family of Four Needs $84 a Week Minimum

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—By their own appraisal of living costs, Americans figure that it requires almost three times as much money to get along today as it did 24 years ago.

For nearly a quarter-century, the Gallup poll has maintained an index of the minimum amount which the public believes a family of four needs each week. In 1937—when this index was started—$30 a week was the average amount named.

Today, the median average figure cited is $84 a week.

The Federal Government maintains an index of consumer prices for urban families. Admittedly, however, this does not measure the standard of living or the many other things that go today to make up the cost of living.

To establish the public's own cost of living index, the Gallup poll has regularly asked this question of a cross-section of persons from all regions of the country:

"What is the smallest amount of money a family of four (husband, wife, and two children) needs each week to get along on in this community?"

The median average of replies (meaning half named a higher sum, half a lower one) is $84. Two years ago, the minimum amount that was felt to be needed averaged at $79—or an increase of $5 since 1959.

Following is the trend since 1937:

Week:	
1937	$30
1947	43
1948	50
1950	50
1952	60
1954	60
1957	72
1959	79
Today	84

The minimum amount of money varies among regions of the country to a substantial degree. The sum is highest in the fast-growing Far West, where the average of replies was $104 per week.

Here are the results by regions:

Week:	
East	$95
Midwest	84
South	66
Far West	104

Poverty, Dependency: Can a Community Organize To Solve These Problems?

(By Bernard W. Scholz)

(SPEAKER'S NOTE.—The following address was delivered on January 11, 1961, before the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia, following a paper by John W. Limbert of the U.S. Employment Service, in which he showed how in Utica, N.Y., an aroused community, through concentrated effort of its coordinated services and facilities, constructively dealt with even those of its multiproblem cases which had hitherto resisted all efforts at rehabilitation while absorbing almost all of the community's welfare services. Without any intent of minimizing the tremendous progress made in Washington over the past 10 years in such areas as school integration, construction of model welfare institutions, or rehabilitation of its public hospital facilities, this paper is trying to alert the community to the threat posed to its future development by unmet critical social needs.)

To assure that we are all clear about the magnitude and the nature of the problems facing the District of Columbia, permit me to begin by sketching out, in broad strokes, the social situation as we face it today:

NO FREEDOM FROM WANT

We hear so much about people who are chiselers and who are enjoying a life of ease and comfort on the dole, yet many people apparently fail to realize that there are large segments of the population who are in utter distress and for whom there is no public relief available at all.

There is no unemployment relief in the Nation's Capital. No matter how urgent the need, no matter how hungry the children, no matter how cold the home, no matter how sick the mother: If the man is employable, but is out of a job and has used up his unemployment benefits, there is no public relief whatsoever available to him in the city of Washington.

Similarly, there is no public aid for the underemployed: When a man's earning power is inadequate to support his growing family, when he falls behind in his rental payments, when his lights are turned off, when the car in which he drives to work is repossessed, when he can't pay his doctor bills, when his children are missing school because they have no shoes or warm clothes, there is no public aid available in the District of Columbia. As long as he is employable, no matter how inadequate his wages, the department of public welfare cannot touch him.

And finally, there is no supplementation from public funds in cases of sudden emergency: If a husband and wife have both been working and have been providing adequately, but in a marginal way, for their family, and the mother has to go to the hospital on account of a new pregnancy, there is no agency that can use public funds to substitute for the mother's missing wages. As long as the head of the household is able to work, whether he does work or not, whether his earnings are adequate or not, the doors to public aid are closed.

According to a recent estimate, there are twice as many families living below assistance standards in Washington as there are actually on assistance. And don't misunderstand me: The fact that the public agency is not able to help, does not mean that one of the red-feather agencies will pick up the tab. There is not one agency in town that is prepared financially or programwise to give long-range economic support to low-income families. That is expected to be the public agency's prerogative.

Family and Child Service, Catholic Charities, Jewish Social Service, or the Salvation Army will come to the rescue with an individual payment: When a family has been evicted, they may pay 1 month's rent: When the wage earner's check has been lost or stolen, they may be able to replace it in part as a one-shot action. But not one agency in town would be able to assume financial responsibility for a family week in and week out, month in and month out, possibly for years, as does the Department of Public Welfare in the cases which it does accept.

CHARITY FOR FEW

But even those families of whom the community thinks as theoretically eligible for assistance, face any number of restrictions that may bar them from badly needed aid. A mother whose husband is in an institution or has deserted, automatically becomes the head of the household and the same criteria that applied to the man in the examples mentioned before, now suddenly apply to her: If her children are in school so that she is not needed to care for them during the day, and if she is physically well, then she is an employable head of the household and not eligible for aid.

When a woman and her children are receiving assistance and an employable boyfriend moves into the home, not only she, but all of her children become ineligible for assistance, although the man has not the slightest legal or other responsibility for them.

When a child becomes 18 years old or drops out of school at age 16, he becomes ineligible for assistance regardless of whether he has a job or is equipped to look for a job. Unless he is physically or mentally handicapped and therefore eligible for assistance in his own right, he will be cut off and become a burden to the rest of the family.

If a man has had an accident and can no longer do the type of work he did before, but is still employable for some kind of work, no matter how much diminished his earning power may be, he is considered as again available for work on the competitive labor market, and he and his family are ineligible for assistance.

When an aged person can no longer support herself but has a grandchild living in Washington who has managed to pull himself up by the bootstraps and find a good job, then the grandmother suddenly becomes a millstone around the grandchild's neck who under the law become responsible for her support no matter how completely family ties may have been severed in the intervening generation.

So you can see that actually it is very much a matter like the biblical camel passing through the needle's eye to become a relief recipient in Washington.

A GROWING RELIEF LOAD IN A PROSPEROUS CITY

And still the relief load is steadily increasing. No matter how much prosperity the country as a whole enjoys, no matter how steady employment in the Nation's Capital may be, the number of welfare cases keeps going up, month after month and year after year, much to the consternation of those who have to approve the public welfare budget and foot the bill. What is the reason for this?

The fact of the matter is that from a social and economic standpoint, there is no such thing as a District of Columbia. There is only a large metropolitan area, centered around the old city of Washington, and extending in sprawling suburbs into the Maryland and Virginia countryside. What makes this picture so unbalanced, is the ugly and painful truth that segregation and discrimination have set up an iron curtain along the District line and along the Potomac. Young people may grow up within the confines of the District of Columbia, but when they come of age, when they marry, when their earning power increases and they are ready to raise a family, then they move out into the suburbs, to own what one city planner called "a play yard with a house on it" and become citizens of suburbia—if they are white. If they are colored, they are not welcome in Maryland or Virginia and have to stay in the District, but even in the District, they are facing job discrimination: High school graduates and even graduates of teachers' colleges and of Howard University find that jobs as busboys, charwomen, maids, taxi drivers, janitors or typists are open to them, but when it comes to the better paying jobs, discrimination begins. The jobs of waitresses in the better restaurants and hotels, as saleslades in the better stores, are still reserved for white applicants. We recently read that one Negro has finally been admitted as an electrician on a federally financed project, and at long last we have a few Negro streetcar conductors and bus drivers. But just as we still have to see the first Negro play in the National Symphony, so we find that throughout the city the better paying jobs are firmly held in white hands. And thus the Negro population, whose birth rate is higher than that of their white fellow citizens, is artificially held down to a lower economic level where they are less prepared to meet old age, sickness, and other emergencies.

And just as this colored low-income population is kept from enjoying the benefits of suburban living and of equal job opportunities, so life is made more and more complex and expensive for them in the confines of the city where large-scale slum clearance projects are fast eliminating the residual low-cost private housing, driving rents up to ever higher levels, causing ever increasing overcrowding, forcing refugees from renewal areas into formerly thinly populated sections of the city, and spreading the blight that of necessity goes with unhealthy housing conditions, because public housing fails to make up for the loss of wrecked low-cost dwellings.

Thus it comes that while the District is actually losing population, it is forced by the noose of segregation to contain the entire low-income population of the whole metropolitan area, and that it creates by its own discriminatory practices social conditions which perpetuate marginal existence, dependency, delinquency, and the high cost of social services.

DISTRESS ON THE DOLE

As was pointed out before: In order to be eligible at all for relief in the District of Columbia, one has to be aged, totally disabled, blind, or a dependent child whose mother conducts herself in a way that raises no question of eligibility. But let no one tell you that life on the dole is a joy in Washington.

The rent paid to a single person is $36 a month, and you can well imagine what kind of housing is available at that price level. Small allowances for heat, utilities, and refrigeration bring the total shelter allowance up to $47 monthly, to which is added $25 for food, $11 for clothing, personal incidentals, and household needs, resulting in a monthly relief payment of $83.

You may wonder where this munificent sum of $25 monthly for food comes from. Well, it is what used to be the "low-low" food budget of the Department of Agriculture, which was recommended for brief emergency periods, and was not considered adequate to sustain what is called a sense of health and well-being. The Department of Agriculture has ceased quoting this "low-low" figure, because too much mischief was done with it, and uses only the low income budget today. But we in the District continue to use the "low-low" figures of April 1957—and as you know there has been a steady increase in the cost of food, clothing, and shelter ever since that time.

Just to give you a few other figures: $33 a month is the average allowance for a child in aid to dependent children, $110 is what is supposed to pay for room, board, and nursing care; and any other income a family may have, be it from survivors insurance, from a veterans pension, from workmens compensation, or from a legally responsible relative, has to be deducted from these meager figures.

Just to explain to you why I am so exercised about our public assistance situation, let me remind you that public assistance expenditures have been higher this year than the official forecasts of the District of Columbia. Budget Office would admit; that as a result our agency has at this point spent $800,000 more than had been anticipated and that, unless Congress comes through with a deficiency appropriation, we will have to do the unthinkable, scandalous thing of cutting these starvation allowances by 20 or more percent for the remainder of the fiscal year because there is no money from any other source with which we could make up the deficit.

To me, this calamity overshadows everything else we have today been talking and thinking about: That it should be possible in the capital of the richest nation of the world to take an appropriation deficit out of the hide of the most impoverished, the most defenseless, the disfranchised poor of the community. In Belgium, as you know, there have been street riots, because the Premier's austerity program threatened the pensions of the aged, the widows, the orphans and the disabled. But here in Washington there has been no public outcry,

there have been no newspaper headlines, there have been no protest meetings, there has not been any evidence at all of an uneasy stirring of the social conscience of the community at the spectre of taking the bread from those who are already hungry, of taking the clothes from those who are already inadequately clothed, and of impairing the health and happiness of 18,000 dependent children whom on the Fourth of July we proudly refer to as the future citizens of the community.

THE COMMUNITY'S UNEASY CONSCIENCE

Of course, deep down, the community's conscience is uneasy, and measures are therefore taken to serve as tranquilizers. Nothing is being done, to be sure, to attack the core of the problem, to take real constructive and preventive measures and to spend real money. Instead, little fringe benefit programs have been established that have reassuring names, that can be pointed to as taking care of what the broad programs are not providing for. Surplus food is being distributed to thousands of families at a rate of $7.11 per head per month, a school lunch program provides free lunches to hungry children during 180 of the year's 365 days, a displaced families unit gives counsel and consolation to large families who have been displaced by District government action and for whom adequate lodging is simply not available, and finally a new project has just been authorized for the upgrading and social rehabilitation of the shameless second precinct, the well-known area between Massachusetts and Florida Avenue, 14th and North Capitol Streets, the area with the city's highest delinquency rate, highest illegitimacy rate and highest density of relief recipients.

Let us be clear about this: The community conscience has not been stirred enough to create any preventive program. The department of public welfare may only step in after the breakdown has occurred, when a family has fallen apart, when a man is in the hospital, when sickness or old age have taken their toll to the point of unemployability: Then the public assistance division is there to lend a helping hand; when children have been abandoned, mistreated, or neglected into delinquency, then the juvenile court and the child welfare division leap into the breach with receiving home, Junior Village, foster home placements and the magnificent children's center at Laurel. But there is no money, no staff, no facility and no program for the prevention of social breakdown.

The fire department has its fire prevention bureau, the health department its division of preventable diseases and its director of health education, the police department has its traffic school and learns through its accident investigation division the lessons necessary for accident prevention, but there is no counterpart to any of these organizational units in the department of public welfare. We are nothing but a wrecking crew, an ambulance, or a grave digger. You may have seen that splendid British movie, "Sapphire," where at the end the young detective proudly says, "Well, we finally solved this one," and the old inspector wryly says, "We didn't solve a thing—we merely picked up the pieces," and that is what our department is largely restrained to do at the present time.

THE FEELING OF BELONGING

Engineer Commissioner Welling, shortly before he left the city, became very much concerned about the progressive deterioration of the second precinct, and as his swan song, as it were, he initiated a project aimed at the social and spiritual rehabilitation and restoration of the area, urging that ways be found to instill in the inhabitants of the second precinct a sense of pride in their community and a feeling of belonging.

I have been wondering ever since, what it would feel like to be a citizen of the second precinct: To see the hordes of clerks and officials of their local government swarm in from their suburban homes in Maryland and Virginia in the morning, tell them how to spend their money, how to run their lives, and leave again in the evening to their play yards with a house on it in the suburbs where they voted, went to church, sent their children to school, and held office in civic organizations.

And left behind, in the dark of night, would be the people of the second precinct, without vote, without representation, whose public health clinic was taken away when the old Polk School was razed, whose public welfare officers were removed when the old Business High School was torn down, whose trees were chopped down and whose front yards were taken away when New York and Rhode Island Avenues were widened so people could pass the second precinct faster, and in whose midst was planted a huge dump of police-impounded wrecked automobiles as a monument to civic pride and a sense of belonging.

TOTAL WAR ON POVERTY AND DECAY

Obviously, from what we have seen, the problems facing Washington are not problems the Department of Public Welfare can solve—they are problems pervading every facet of community life, and requiring the imagination, effort, and cooperation of every community agency for their solution.

But let no one think that much research, study, and planning are needed before the attack on these problems can begin, before total war on poverty and decay in the District can be waged. Studies have been made, research has been done, plans have been outlined, blueprints have been drawn, all we need is to follow them.

The study undertaken by the Health and Welfare Council under the title "What Price Dependency?" and the report prepared by our Department at the request of Commissioner Karrick in October 1959 on "Public Assistance in the District of Columbia" which became known as the Karrick report, are full of 92 concrete proposals that only need to be picked up and carried out. The only obstacle so far has been the unwillingness of the community to do so.

"Where is the money coming from?" is the question always raised when these proposals are brought up in the meetings of the mighty. The money is there, I assure you; the real problem is only a matter of choices. This whole discussion reminds me of my own situation: Although my wife and I are working and earn good salaries, we were "too poor" this past Christmas to give ourselves a color TV set—because we had just bought a new hi-fi and a Volkswagen as a second car. The District is in the same deplorable condition: It is building a beautiful "depressed" 12th Street under the Mall and is planning to dig a tunnel under the Lincoln Memorial; it has just spent $1 million to pave over the streetcar tracks on Wisconsin Avenue which have not bothered anybody for the past 50 years, and it is therefore unable to raise $800,000 to meet its relief payroll. Clearly, the money is there, the challenge is there, the experts, the blueprints, the solutions are available. It is only a matter of choice, a matter of conscience, a matter of farsightedness as to what action we choose.

Congress has found itself unable to appropriate the $7 million which would make the difference between the $32 million promised Federal payment and the $25 million we actually received. Yet every time one of those $5 million shots at Cape Canaveral misfires, these same legislators just shrug their shoulders: Just one of these things. Not that this $7 million payment would make the difference. We could still spend it for any number of worthwhile civic projects, and still not have the money to meet the social crisis of our community. The real trouble is our failure to recognize that to safeguard the future of the 18,000 children now on relief is the most important long-range investment we could make.

This is where the League of Women Voters could do its most valuable job: Not by looking at poverty, delinquency, dependency and decay as problems that had best be swept under the rug by an increased welfare appropriation, but by a conscious campaign for better housing, better clinics, better recreation facilities, better job opportunities for young colored boys and girls, and a clearer recognition of the fact that the future of a community is as bright as the future it offers its children.

NEGLIGENCE IN THE MANAGEMENT OF THE INVENTORY OF THE U.S. ARMY JAPAN DEPOT-COMPLEX

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a situation involving inexcusable negligence in the management of the inventory of the U.S. Army Japan Depot-Complex.

The Comptroller General has recently submitted a report to the Congress calling our attention to the inexcusable failure to catalog the inventories at this depot, with the result that they were turning down orders for supplies on the basis that the material was not in inventory when in reality had their records been up to date they not only had the material but in many instances had an oversupply. In fact, in one 5-month period the warehouse refusal rate averaged 22 percent; however, with the inventories' readjustment following the Comptroller General's audit approximately 3,000 line items which had been determined as not being available were released to fill customer requisitions.

These unsatisfactory inventory stock records resulted in the overstocking of many items. For example:

First. At the Yokohama Commissary they had enough insecticide in their inventories to fill their requirements for over 60 years.

Second. They had enough furniture wax to last almost 10 years.

Third. They had more than a full year's requirement of spices.

Fourth. They had enough seasoning in inventory to last them approximately 7 years.

Many other items found in their inventories were sufficient to fulfill their maximum requirements for more than the next 10 years.

At some of the depots, their inventory records were so loose that they were selling as surplus certain materials while at the same time they were buying the same products in the front office. For example:

At one property disposal yard they sold 25 new generators for $3,400 and 1 reconditioned maintenance truck for $405. The record shows that requisition orders were on hand at the same time for this same type of equipment with valuations of $31,200 and $12,000, respectively.

In addition, tires valued at $89,000 were found in the property disposal yard about to be sold as surplus although their records showed that these tires were needed to fill MAP and Army requirements in Japan and Korea.

On July 15, 1959, the MAOT–C reported that rework of certain vehicles was being performed at an additional cost to MAP of $159,630 although the vehicles were reported acceptable without the rework. Members of the Military Assistance Observation Team C, MAOT–C, which was established to insure worldwide uniformity in the application of MAP standards, accompanied the Comptroller General's audit team on its tour of the depot-complex reconditioning line, and those qualified inspectors agreed that this unnecessary work was being performed.

The Comptroller General said that the failure to use such assets to fill their requirements occurred because in most instances stocks which were declared surplus had not been screened against requirements for over a year.

Altogether, this report of the Comptroller General is a shocking indictment of mismanagement of the procurement policies of the U.S. Army at this depot.

The Comptroller General specifically charged that the supply management of the transportation ordnance, and quartermaster's stocks at the depot complex was not being performed in an effective manner. A summary of their review disclosed that requirements had been overstated by approximately $2.2 million and stock valued at $775,000 was being reserved or retained to fill requirements which no longer existed.

As the result of the Comptroller General's report calling these matters to their attention the depot officials canceled orders on continental U.S. sources for supplies valued at approximately $1.7 million, and they released for use in other areas material in the amount of $775,000 which was being reserved for equipment rebuild programs that had since been completed.

As the result of the new warehouse inventory which was completed following the Comptroller General's criticism, material valued at $27.8 million was added to the stock records, and material valued at $19.3 million was deleted.

The time is long past due when we can be satisfied with mere promises by these services that they will make corrections and do better the next time.

In private industry such loose management would not be condoned and those responsible would be fired, with competent men selected to take their place. These Government agencies should be conducted on the same businesslike basis. This is taxpayers' money.

Over a period of the past several years the Comptroller General's office has done an excellent job in calling our attention to these examples of inefficiency. At a time when our budget is already overstrained, certainly more affirmative action is needed.

What puzzles me is, if these agencies do not know within millions how much inventory they have on hand, how do they balance their books?

RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF METEOROLOGY—MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE ON THE PASSAGE OF A BILL AND REQUEST FOR HOUSE TO RETURN PAPERS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on Thursday, February 16, under the heading "Research in the Field of Meteorology," at page 2200 of the RECORD, the RECORD shows that the Senate passed Calendar No. 44, S. 681, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

The RECORD at that page shows that I inquired of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], whether it would be possible under the proposed legislation for contracts to be made under which a contractor would be permitted to retain patent rights.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] advised:

> To the best of my knowledge, the answer is that the bill contains no such provision and does not affect such situations.

Actually, the bill broadens somewhat the power presently available to the Secretary of Commerce to let contracts to private parties for research in the field of meteorology and it does permit the result which the Senator from Montana did not think the bill would permit.

That being the case, I would have been compelled to object to the bill had I fully understood what was in the measure. Accordingly, I discussed the subject with the majority leader, and he agrees with me that the measure should be and could be properly reconsidered.

Therefore, I enter a motion that the vote by which Calendar No. 44, S. 681, was passed be reconsidered, and I move that the House be requested to return the papers on that measure to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, February 22, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Roger W. Tubby, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

John H. Leddy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Newell A. George, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas for a term of 4 years, vice Wilbur G. Leonard.

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice Frederick W. Kaess, resigned.

James P. O'Brien, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Robert Tieken, term expired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

William A. McRae, Jr., of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida, vice William J. Barker, retired.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Richard S. Morse, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

William F. Schaub, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice George Holmes Roderick, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE RESERVE

The following named officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35, title 10 of the United States Code and sections 8373 and 8376, title 10 of the United States Code, as amended by Public Law 559–86th Congress:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. William P. Farnsworth, AO922626 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Meiling, AO370824, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John H. Foster, AO284572, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. McCoy, Jr., AO310412, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Jay G. Brown, AO289764, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Jess Larson, AO190462, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., AO431039, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Andrew B. Cannon, AO383870 (colonel, Air Force Reserve) U.S. Air Force.

Col. William R. Lovelace, AO337848, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Benjamin W. Fridge, AO365107, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Nicholas E. Allen, AO373452, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John W. Richardson, AO290829, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Robert W. Smart, AO1178629, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Thomas H. King, AO919798, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph T. Benedict, AO317956, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Wilbur A. Smith, AO230815, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Howard W. Cannon, AO383170, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Alexander B. Andrews, AO900076, Air Force Reserve.

Col. William C. Lewis, Jr., AO944440, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John I. Lerom, AO532225, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Russell F. Gustke, AO659814, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Edward J. Haseltine, AO287957, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Asa W. Candler, AO341742, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Roger L. Zeller, AO659439, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, 23161A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Richard T. Colner, Jr., 619A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Troup Miller, Jr., 559A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman, 1034A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Stevenson, 1320A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry R. Spicer, 1487A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Wendell W. Bowman, 596A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harold C. Donnelly, 647A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arno H. Luehman, 1080A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Stanley J. Donovan, 1089A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dolf E. Muehleisen, 1144A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles M. McCorkle, 1224A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lloyd P. Hopwood, 1261A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Don O. Darrow, 1270A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Victor R. Haugen, 1292A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst, 1350A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles B. Westover, 1351A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Ben I. Funk, 1500A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Marvin C. Demler, 1550A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William E. Eubank, Jr., 1741A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. William C. Kingsbury, 923A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank P. Corbin, Jr., 929A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Bell, 930A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jermain P. Rodenhauser, 933A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Allen W. Rigsby, 943A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Gill, 2071A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Rogers, 1060A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Dany, 1061A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Wise, 1083A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Albert T. Wilson, Jr., 1086A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. White, 1087A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Gent, Jr., 1130A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Cecil E. Combs, 1203A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Dwight O. Monteith, 1205A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Conrad F. Necrason, 1246A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles B. Root, 1258A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Homer A. Boushey, 1269A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester W. Cecil, 1298A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Augustus M. Minton, 1301A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack N. Donohew, 1319A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Nils O. Ohman, 1321A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Taylor, 3d, 1347A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Curtis R. Low, 1349A (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Henry G. Thorne, Jr., 1514A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William B. Keese, 1531A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Avelin P. Tacon, Jr., 1566A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Delmar E. Wilson, 1587A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Carpenter, 3d, 1647A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig Gen. James B. Knapp, 1668A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle, 1721A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. McGehee, 1746A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr., 1759A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, 1801A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, 1804A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James E. Roberts, 1846A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Horace M. Wade, 1872A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Austin J. Russell, 1980A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Warren, 1987A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Francis C. Gideon, 1993A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore R. Milton, 2026A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Wilson, 1711A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. L. Render Braswell, 19065A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert S. Brua, 19063A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Aubrey L. Jennings, 19073A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, 19067A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Clifford H. Rees, 630A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William J. Bell, 930A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Allen W. Rigsby, 943A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Gill, 2071A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John M. Breit, 1016A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Rogers, 1060A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Wise, 1083A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. L. Render Braswell, 19065A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Cecil E. Combs, 1203A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Nils O. Ohman, 1321A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Avelin P. Tacon, Jr., 1566A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Delmar E. Wilson, 1587A (colonel Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Carpenter, III, 1647A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Knapp, 1668A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert E. Greer, 1672A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. Bestic, 1682A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A (colonel Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington, II, 1694A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle, 1721A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul S. Emrick, 1801A (colonel Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, 1804A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Austin J. Russell, 1980A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert H. Warren, 1987A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Francis C. Gideon, 1993A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Theodore R. Milton, 2026A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Stewart S. Maxey, 913A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John M. Hutchison, 1079A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John R. McGraw, 19123A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Willis F. Chapman, 1121A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jack E. Thomas, 1187A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Wilbur W. Aring, 1265A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Douglas E. Williams, 1285A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Boyd Hubbard, Jr., 1290A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Linscott A. Hall, 1342A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jack A. Gibbs, 1384A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Baskin R. Lawrence, Jr., 1515A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Murray A. Bywater, 1586A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John H. Chick, 1607A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Kenneth R. Powell, 1614A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Kyle L. Riddle, 1617A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William S. Rader, 1636A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas B. Whitehouse, 1677A, Regular Air Force.

Col. George M. Higginson, 1686A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William T. Smith, 1689A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert R. Rowland, 1806A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James W. Chapman, Jr., 1810A, Regular Air Force.

Col. David M. Jones, 1811A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John T. Fitzwater, 1827A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Pinkham Smith, 1859A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William W. Veal, 1902A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Tarleton H. Watkins, 1910A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Adriel N. Williams, 1970A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Alvan C. Gillem, II, 2025A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Rollen H. Anthis, 2053A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Horace A. Hanes, 2060A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Paul W. Norton, 2679A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Marion C. Smith, 2751A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Arthur W. Kellond, 1832A, Regular Air Force.
Col. George H. Krieger, 2953A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Oran O. Price, 3563A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Benjamin G. Willis, 3815A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Gerald F. Keeling, 3827A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Fred J. Ascani, 4036A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Gordon T. Gould, Jr., 4040A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Lewis E. Lyle, 4115A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Harry J. Sands, Jr., 4145A, Regular Air Force.
Col. John W. O'Neill, 4155A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Charles H. Roadman, 3379A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
Col. John H. Bell, 4185A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Arthur G. Salisbury, 4224A, Regular Air Force.
Col. John A. Roberts, 4380A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Donald E. Hillman, 4885A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Abe J. Beck, 5831A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

CAPTAIN TO MAJOR

Line of the Air Force

Abrams, Edwards, Jr., 38122A.
Abramson, Emanuel M., 37586A.
Adair, Toby W., Jr., 38044A.
Adams, Michael E., 37342A.
Adams, Roy W., 37346A.
Ainsley, Edward J., 37912A.
Akers, Charles H., 38023A.
Albright, Mack E., 37258A.
Alexander, Jack D., 38465A.
Alexander, William J., 38299A.
Alford, Frank B., Jr., 37300A.
Algeo, John B., 23925A.
Algorri, Antolin, Jr., 37621A.
Allan, James B., 37393A.
Allbright, William F., 37927A.
Alldritt, Roy J., 38297A.
Allen, Bert P., 38393A.
Allen, Bryant R., 38095A.
Allen, Guy T., 38319A.
Allgood, Vernon L., 37783A.
Along, Joseph D., 38401A.
Alton, Noel S., 37792A.
Amato, Charles, 37448A.
Amend, Billy T., 37472A.
Ames, Douglas M., 22584A.
Andersen, Howard J., 37148A.
Anderson, Guveren M., 37150A.
Anderson, Hugh B., Jr., 37999A.
Anderson, James R., 37707A.
Anderson, John D., 38196A.
Anderson, Philip B., Jr., 52332A.
Anderson, Stanley L., 25532A.
Andrews, Charles P., Jr., 38145A.
Anken, Ross J., 38199A.
Armen, Leslie H., 52466A.
Armistead, Victor, 37546A.
Armstrong, Donald N., 37449A.
Arney, Cloyd L., 37866A.
Arnold, Howard B., Jr., 17651A.
Arpke, Charles K., 23834A.
Arriaga, Eusebio, 38463A.
Arrington, Harry B., 38414A.
Ash, William O., 38118A.
Ashland, Maurice I., 37856A.
Atterbury, Wilferd R., 37700A.
Aubel, Clark L., 37498A.
Aulbach, Charles E., 37386A.
Ault, Clyde E., 37806A.
Auser, Cortland P., 37465A.
Averett, John B., 38374A.
Avery, Sherwood T., 38285A.
Babits, George F., 37299A.
Bachman, Jay G., 20752A.
Bachtelle, Stewart M., 38024A.
Bacon, Thomas R., 38054A.
Bacon, William P., 38200A.
Badger, Paul R., 37769A.
Bagnard, Richard W., 37225A.
Bailey, Cecil D., 38407A.
Bailey, Myrl K., 37901A.
Bailey, William K., 37316A.
Baird, Jack R., Jr., 52480A.
Baker, Bert L., 37384A.
Baker, Charles E., 38146A.
Baker, Dwight R., Jr., 37201A.
Balch, Clayton L., Jr., 23734A.
Baldwin, Ernest A., 37653A.
Ballew, Monte, Jr., 37155A.
Ballweg, James E., 38316A.
Bamber, Edward A., 37594A.
Barfield, Herman E., 38462A.
Barger, Richard D., 38303A.
Barker, Clyde E., 38471A.
Barker, William R., 23880A.
Barnard, John R., 17920A.
Barnes, George W., Jr., 21467A.
Barnes, Levi A., 37143A.
Barnes, William B., 52378A.
Barnhill, Charles E., 37514A.
Barnhill, James W., 37863A.
Barrett, Alfred E., 37730A.
Bartell, Stephen D., 37622A.
Bartenstein, Edwin, 37367A.
Barth, Jack E., 37676A.
Barthel, George J., Jr., 38419A.
Bartlett, William H., Jr., 37212A.
Barton, Hugh H., 37612A.
Barton, James R., 38087A.
Basco, Johnnie M., 37493A.
Basler, Sterling A., 52529A.
Bastek, Edmond W., 37876A.
Bateman, Cecil E., 38131A.
Batson, Gerald W., 24365A.
Bauer, James H., 38420A.
Baumgartner, Jack E., 37482A.
Bavuso, Joseph K., 52488A.
Baylor, Melvin W., 38138A.
Beal, Frederick R., 37717A.
Bean, William S., 37197A.
Beardsley, Leonard N., 25514A.
Beatie, Charles F., Jr., 38143A.
Beaumont, Lee C., Jr., 37685A.
Beaver, Robert R., 52527A.
Becker, Clarence E., 37356A.
Becker, Jack K., 37422A.
Beckett, James V., 36430A.
Bedell, Charles H., 37948A.
Beese, Kenneth W., 37815A.
Beeson, William W., Jr., 37656A.
Bell, John C., Jr., 37611A.
Bell, William I., 37345A.
Bellovin, Milton, 17686A.
Bengston, Dean F., 37162A.
Bennert, Raymond T., 37375A.
Bennett, Gayle M., 38034A.
Bennett, Wesley E., 52435A.
Bennett, William A., 38016A.
Berbec, Cornelius P., 37741A.
Berggreen, Cole J., 23941A.
Berkovitz, Martin, 37347A.
Berman, John J., 37284A.
Berner, Lawrence E., 52402A.
Bernier, Joseph P. L., 37264A.
Berry, Charles H., 37956A.
Beseler, Eldon S., 38193A.
Bessler, Joseph F., 38176A.
Bianco, Frank J., Jr., 37755A.
Bigelow, Ralph J., 37495A.
Biggs, Buford B., 17679A.
Bijold, Eugene J., 38329A.
Birkhead, Herbert C., 52380A.
Bishop, Russell, 27678A.
Bissell, Eugene P., 37229A.
Bixler, Kenneth, 37914A.
Black, William E., 38282A.
Blackburn, William R., 38403A.
Blair, Emerson B., 37246A.
Blanchard, Felix A., Jr., 17692A.
Blanchard, Lionel D., 37667A.
Blandin, Robert W., 23735A.
Blythe, E. C., 37631A.
Blythe, John J., 37788A.
Bock, Leonard R., 37713A.
Bocken, Richard C., 25612A.
Bogusz, Leonard E., 37894A.
Bohne, Robert E., 38018A.
Bold, John E., 52407A.
Bolstridge, Leslie J., 37719A.
Bond, Joseph C., 38076A.
Bone, Vernon F., 37861A.
BonTempo, John C., 37280A.
Booth, Joseph B., 37723A.
Boots, Maurice J., 24392A.
Borini, John N., 38159A.
Borresen, Edward W., 25786A.
Boster, Charles F., 37552A.
Bouldin, Richard J., 38338A.
Bourke, Donald W., 38055A.
Bourque, Arthur D., 38328A.
Bouvier, Arthur O., Jr., 38012A.
Bowen, Robert W., 37743A.
Bower, John A. B., 37630A.
Boyce, James T., 37626A.
Boyd, John H., 38015A.
Boyd, William C., 28319A.
Boyle, Joseph M., 37731A.
Boynton, John B., 37826A.
Brady, Francis R., 37620A.
Brady, Joseph C., 48803A.
Brady, William A., 37446A.
Brashear, Wesley C., 37818A.
Braun, James A., 37978A.
Braun, Leo M., 52423A.
Breding, Robert H., 52344A.
Breedlove, James M., 17671A.
Breehl, John W., 37617A.
Brennan, Herbert O., 17653A.
Breslauer, Irving H., 37525A.
Brewer, James L., 52489A.
Brewer, William M., 37917A.
Brickates, Robert E., 55744A.
Bridges, Benjamin E., 38111A.
Bridges, Wilbur A., 36980A.
Bright, Bruce B., 38312A.
Bright, William A., Jr., 37591A.
Brisick, Edward J., 21480A.
Brittain, Joseph F., 38421A.
Brochmann, Michael J., 38074A.
Brooks, Joseph E., 37600A.
Brooks, William L., 38186A.
Broshek, John A., 37406A.
Brothers, Walter F., 37592A.
Brower, Walter L., 37526A.
Brown, Edward G., Jr., 52416A.
Brown, Francis O., 52342A.
Brown, John I., 3d, 37196A.
Brown, Lewis E., 37549A.
Brown, Walter A., Jr., 52419A.
Brown, William Y., 37149A.
Bruner, Evan R., 37359A.
Bryant, Charles S., 37722A.
Bryant, Robert L., Jr., 38270A.
Bryant, William A., 17271A.
Buckland, Richard K., 37159A.
Bueker, Frederick L., 37786A.
Bulger, Arthur R., 52439A.
Bullard, Thomas L., 52403A.
Bulow, Charles W., 37957A.
Bunch, Charles L., 37857A.
Burchfield, James E., 37858A.
Burckle, Alton G., Jr., 24267A.
Burgenheim, Miles E., 37829A.
Burgnon, Eugene L., 52464A.
Burke, Wesley A., 37444A.
Burkett, Homer H., 52413A.
Burlington, Donald R., 48800A.
Burnett, William R., 25798A.
Burney, Morris, 37852A.
Burns, Erit L., 37590A.
Burns, Warren L., 38237A.
Burry, Frank J., Jr., 52338A.

Burton, James E., 37657A.
Burton, Roy J., 37989A.
Butcher, Budd H., 37241A.
Butler, Eugene H., 38135A.
Butler, Kerwin O., 38058A.
Butz, Roy E., 38373A.
Byrne, Joseph K., 37294A.
Cahall, Donald R., 52376A.
Cain, Earl W., 37838A.
Cairl, Earl R., 37648A.
Caldwell, Charles E., 37994A.
Callahan, Joseph H., 37425A.
Callanan, William E., 38100A.
Cameron, Robert J., 37941A.
Campbell, Jack O., 38349A.
Campbell, Oliver F., 37698A.
Cann, James P., 37438A.
Cann, Robert E., 37810A.
Cannop, Carl R., 37599A.
Card, Edward R., Jr., 38347A.
Carey, Woodrow T., 52382A.
Carleton, Raymond E., 37721A.
Carley, Joseph G., Jr., 37461A.
Carlisle, Joe L., 37728A.
Carlson, Donald D., 17916A.
Caroom, Hiram C., 37370A.
Carothers, Earle T., Jr., 37817A.
Carpenter, William S., Jr., 17667A.
Carr, Charles C., 38365A.
Carson, Anthony H., 38386A.
Carson, Robert K., 37410A.
Carter, Braxton, 23726A.
Cartwright, Lewis E., 38052A.
Case, Richmond B., 38371A.
Caselman, Everett, Jr., 32406A.
Cassil, John F., 38056A.
Castillo, Bennie, 52507A.
Castleberry, Woodie O., 37361A.
Caswell, Roger W., 37538A.
Cattrell, Harry R., 24358A.
Caughron, Kenneth D., 38038A.
Cecil, Floyd M., 37799A.
Chalker, Albert E., Jr., 37629A.
Chamberlin, Lloyd W., Jr., 38246A.
Chandler, Charles B., Jr., 37341A.
Chapman, Jack W., 38228A.
Chapman, Kenneth E., 52331A.
Chapman, Lewis T., 37331A.
Chase, Fred C., 38072A.
Chase, Levi R., 37352A.
Chason, Robert L., 27680A.
Chernis, Philip B., 52526A.
Chiba, Milan A., 52346A.
Childers, David C., 37828A.
Christian, Harold K., 37908A.
Christian, William S., Jr., 38269A.
Church, Frank C., 37759A.
Ciccolella, John E., 38197A.
Clark, Allen C., 37250A.
Clark, Donald M., 38355A.
Clark, Frederick W., 38443A.
Clark, Howard W., 38309A.
Clark, Jack W., 37378A.
Clark, Leonard H., 38289A.
Clark, Reese W., 37407A.
Clees, Robert J., 38162A.
Clement, Leonard L., 37496A.
Clemovitz, Fred, 37938A.
Clinger, Bordean W., 23878A.
Clough, Leland U., 38070A.
Coapman, A. Lincoln, 52503A.
Cochran, Robert W., 38233A.
Cochran, William F., 38302A.
Cockman, Chester W., 37639A.
Coffin, Orman M., 37764A.
Cogan, Eugene J., 37770A.
Cohn, Murray E., 37932A.
Cole, John S., Jr., 37763A.
Coleman, James W., 37702A.
Coleman, Robert D., 37257A.
Collins, John R., Jr., 37942A.
Collins, John W., 37455A.
Collins, Robert W., 37907A.
Comstock, William P., 37182A.
Conklin, Theodore H., 38382A.
Conn, Richard D., 52462A.
Connor, James J., Jr., 38413A.
Connors, Arthur F., 37157A.
Connors, John A., 38105A.
Conrey, Robert L., 37355A.
Consta, Arthur L., 23718A.
Coon, William R., Jr., 37762A.
Cooper, Robert W., 37171A.
Cooper, W. Lee, Jr., 22999A.
Cooper, William E., 52496A.
Copeland, Bert F., 38459A.
Corbin, William D., 38164A.
Cornett, Edgar L., 52365A.
Costenbader, Ralph K., 38293A.
Cottongim, John E., 17626A.
Coulter, John M., 37454A.
Coulter, Richard R., 38096A.
Coumbs, Thomas J., 52427A.
Cousins, Richard D., 37961A.
Covarrubias, Robert W., 37705A.
Covi, Angelo G., 38475A.
Cowan, William M., 38318A.
Coyne, John M., Jr., 17688A.
Craft, Lee J., 37732A.
Cramer, Clyde C., 37420A.
Crawford, Milton N., 38241A.
Crawford, William A., Jr., 21797A.
Critchlow, Howard T., Jr., 37411A.
Crook, Frank D., 37545A.
Crook, Lonnie H., 37251A.
Cross, Cecil J., 52457A.
Croucher, William R., 37140A.
Crowder, Jess W., 37292A.
Crozier, Harry J., 37357A.
Crumley, James R., 38376A.
Crumpler, John R., 37189A.
Cullen, Ray W., 38379A.
Cumberledge, Robert S., 37867A.
Cummins, Charles O., 52393A.
Cunningham, William A., 38294A.
Custer, Samuel A., 37711A.
Czekaj, Walter A., 24356A.
Daggett, Stanley A., 37439A.
Dahl, John C., Jr., 37980A.
Dailey, Warren, 37849A.
Dakan, Spencer G., 52522A.
Daniels, William L., 38357A.
D'Arcy, Edward J., 38022A.
Daries, Stanton G., 25779A.
Darilek, Allen H., 52472A.
David, Lester T., 37832A.
Davis, Benjamin W., 37892A.
Davis, Frank R., 37809A.
Davis, Howard S., 21521A.
Davis, John G., 37254A.
Davis, Robert J., 38125A.
Davis, Shadrach E., 38046A.
Davison, Fred, 37219A.
Dean, John C., 38225A.
DeBellefeuille, Jean O. W., 38422A.
Deegan, Thomas J., 28320A.
Degraw, Ernest G., 37972A.
DeJonghe, Joseph J., 38009A.
Delaney, Louis A., Jr., 38405A.
Delaune, Herman L., 17915A.
Dempsey, William E., 37190A.
Desens, Sherwin G., 38449A.
Desmond, James A., 38244A.
Detrick, William R., 23733A.
Devitt, John R., 37811A.
DeWitt, John E., 52442A.
Dewland, John J., 52432A.
Dey, Howard E., 52506A.
Dicker, Gordon K., 17612A.
Dicks, Norman R., 37610A.
Dickson, Harry H., 37929A.
diDonato, Louis V., 28031A.
Diehl, Carl W., Jr., 37397A.
Dilley, Riley N., 37757A.
Dixon, Jack C., Jr., 24263A.
Dixon, Joseph P., 52401A.
Dombrowski, Joseph A., 37616A.
Donnell, Woodrow W., 37358A.
Donnelly, John R., 48809A.
Dooley, Paul D., 38104A.
Dorfman, Herman, 37511A.
Dorries, Garland W., 38252A.
Doty, John C., Jr., 52362A.
Doughty, David H., 20722A.
Dowd, Robert H., 37207A.
Dowd, William H., 52366A.
Downey, William J., 52421A.
Downhill, Jack E., 24587A.
Drake, Flavious F., 26773A.
Drake, Marvin E., 52406A.
Driskill, Sanford G., 52458A.
Druary, John W., 38222A.
Drumm, William H., Jr., 28224A.
Duame, Donald D., 37925A.
Dubisher, Francis E., 38396A.
Duesberry, Philip T., 37222A.
Dukes, Sterling W., 24420A.
Dulin, John W., 37312A.
Dunham, David M., 17663A.
Dunlap, Jack R., 37153A.
Dunn, Edward W., 37327A.
Dunn, James M., 25800A.
Dunn, Roscoe B., 52490A.
Dunning, Hal H., 37575A.
Dunstan, Albert J., 52434A.
Dutton, Dutton C., 38126A.
Dye, William H., Jr., 38136A.
Earle, Guy C., 37025A.
Early, James W., 38342A.
Easley, Richard K., 52347A.
Eastman, Burns R., 22782A.
Eatman, Jack B., 38108A.
Eaton, Alfred F., 37683A.
Eberle, Harold J., 17628A.
Eccles, Clifton W., 52356A.
Eckenroth, Philip L., 38351A.
Eckerlin, Robert C., 17917A.
Eddy, Egbert B., 23728A.
Edmisten, Stamy E., Jr., 52470A.
Edwards, Harry L., 37962A.
Ehrlich, Robert M., 17697A.
Ellet, Marshall J., 37701A.
Elliott, Robert A., 37333A.
Ellis, Leonard L., Jr., 37240A.
Ellis, Stanley H., 37812A.
Ellison, William E., 38247A.
Ells, David E., 48812A.
Elmendorf, Harry H., 38291A.
Elvin, Bruce M., 37969A.
Elwood, John E., 52351A.
Emminger, Robert M., 37430A.
Engel, Henry J., 38305A.
Engelhardt, Raymond E., 52474A.
Ennis, Richard, 52388A.
Enos, James W., 17645A.
Entwistle, Harry G., 37194A.
Enyeart, Robert E., 52377A.
Erickson, Robert E., 38658A.
Ervin, Delbert J., 37255A.
Erwin, Otis H., 37185A.
Evans, Carl V., 52519A.
Evans, James D., 37221A.
Ewan, Ernest O., 37213A.
Fabiani, Henry L., 37297A.
Fagan, James B., 22834A.
Fahrney, John W., 25608A.
Faour, George F., 37268A.
Farar, Marvin B. D., 37951A.
Farnham, Arthur E., Jr., 38178A.
Feeley, Thomas A., 26463A.
Feeney, Vincent G., 38017A.
Feezel, Ralph S., 37585A.
Fels, Edward T., Jr., 37551A.
Fennell, William E., Jr., 37733A.
Fenton, John S., 52397A.
Fenton, Melvyn, 38179A.
Fergerson, Jack B., 37796A.
Ferguson, George W., 52345A.
Fernandez, Gonzalo, 17577A.
Ferranti, Anthony J., 38412A.
Ferraris, Robert E., 52452A.
Fields, Edward R., 52411A.
Finn, Lawrence R., 37890A.
Fioretti, Edward A., 52521A.
Fiorillo, John A., 37252A.
Fisher, James B., 37481A.
Fisher, James L., 52473A.
Fithian, Ben L., 38256A.
Flaherty, Leo F., 24711A.
Flanders, Donald V., 37244A.
Fleckenstein, George J., 52483A.
Fleischer, Herbert L., 37536A.
Fleming, Glenn E., 37335A.
Fleming, Paul F., 37475A.
Floto, Carl T., Jr., 38216A.
Floyd, Donald S., 22812A.
Flusche, Raymond P., 37509A.
Folmar, William E., 37414A.
Fontanella, Charles E., 37530A.
Ford, James J., 24350A.
Foster, Charles T., 38148A.
Foster, D. B., 52479A.
Fouts, Sidney L., 37158A.

Fowkes, William, 37870A.
Fowler, Norman J., Jr., 23730A.
Fox, Cecil E., 17600A.
Fox, Morris B., 48011A.
Franklin, Earl N., 52449A.
Frasier, Foster F., Jr., 38288A.
Frazer, Paul V., 20654A.
Frederick, James A., Jr., 52361A.
Frederick, Lowell W., 21507A.
Freeman, Melvin B., 52440A.
French, A. Lee, Jr., 37141A.
French, Charles E., 54924A.
French, Fay E., 23716A.
Frey, Raymond E., 52381A.
Friend, Robert W., 37875A.
Fries, Edward F., 37823A.
Fry, James H., 52513A.
Fry, Kenneth L., 38192A.
Fuerst, Milton, 38051A.
Funk, Dale R., 52477A.
Gaffney, Joseph H., 37844A.
Gafford, William F., 37443A.
Gagnier, James L., 37382A.
Gahagan, James D., 37734A.
Galgan, John C., Jr., 37724A.
Gall, Joseph A., 52441A.
Gallagher, Raymond T., 38400A.
Galyean, Marcus W., 38415A.
Gambel, Burrel B., 37195A.
Gannon, William J., 37542A.
Garcia, Jan, 38383A.
Gard, Samuel A., 38001A.
Gardner, John F., 23784A.
Gardner, Richard B., 38049A.
Gardner, Robert G., 37893A.
Garland, Jack C., 37833A.
Garrabrants, Edson L., 17622A.
Garrett, Charles A., 52355A.
Garrison, Edward L., 37953A.
Garvin, John G., 38260A.
Garwood, David E., 52415A.
Gaumond, George W., 37309A.
Gausche, Dean S., 17655A.
Gautschi, Frederick H., Jr., 21490A.
Gayle, Benjamin B., Jr., 37992A.
Gemmell, Charles J., 37981A.
Genung, Garold, 37660A.
Gerhart, Paul E., 38026A.
Gerwig, John W., 37703A.
Giannarelli, Errico G., 37680A.
Gibson, Fred W., 37778A.
Giel, William G., 37154A.
Gieseman, Earl R., Jr., 38275A.
Gilbert, Reginald G. M., 37200A.
Gilchrist, Guy G., Jr., 38234A.
Giles, Garland E., 37281A.
Gilligan, Thomas C., 37146A.
Gillis, Mailon A., 38364A.
Gilmer, Harold P., 37557A.
Gingland, Richard P., 38163A.
Glauch, Alden G., 37574A.
Glesener, Cletus E., 52350A.
Goddard, George J., 37615A.
Godsey, John C., Jr., 37554A.
Gohsler, Harry R., 38171A.
Goldberg, Lester B., 37715A.
Goldberg, Oscar, 48806A.
Goldman, Sidney A., 37584A.
Good, James O., Jr., 37987A.
Goodale, George G., 37581A.
Goodson, Howard P., 37478A.
Goodwin, Norman E., 38248A.
Goot, Albert H., 38327A.
Gordon, Lawrence T., 37548A.
Gosser, Delbert L., 52509A.
Gouchoe, Maurice W., 38020A.
Graham, Monroe W., 37243A.
Graves, James M., 38092A.
Gray, Edmond D., 22746A.
Gray, William W., 17589A.
Green, Milton A., 37669A.
Green, Roger N., 37263A.
Green, William M., 37839A.
Greene, Edgar M., Jr., 37328A.
Greene, John K., 37727A.
Greenhorn, Alvin E., 37655A.
Greer, Orson P., Jr., 37152A.
Gregory, George T., 37872A.
Gregory, Newman S., 37735A.
Gremillion, William N., 37598A.
Griffin, Arthur W., 37253A.
Griffin, David H., 38460A.
Griffin, Frederick J., 37879A.
Griffith, James M., 38061A.
Griffith, Robert B., 17602A.
Griffith, Wallace H., 17586A.
Grindstaff, Ernest W., 37773A.
Grits, George H., 37661A.
Grossman, Harold W., 38215A.
Groves, Alonzo W., 38243A.
Gruye, Curtiss H., 37704A.
Guisinger, Ralph C., 38441A.
Gunderson, Herbert L., 37432A.
Gunn, William E., 38306A.
Gutches, William H., 37453A.
Guyote, Tarlton A., 38423A.
Gwinnett, Allen F., 38165A.
Haberman, Dale F., 37710A.
Haek, Jack J., 37911A.
Haesecke, Herbert L., 37679A.
Hagen, Earle Q., 37249A.
Hagerstrom, James P., 37787A.
Haggstrom, Robert J., 37237A.
Hagin, Elbert J., 38133A.
Haines, Franklyn W., 37484A.
Hales, Ermine L., 22826A.
Hall, Billy J., 37419A.
Hall, James M., Jr., 37963A.
Hall, Robert W., 52485A.
Hall, William W., 50435A.
Halstead, Warren W., 38155A.
Hamant, Vincent F., 21484A.
Hamel, Robert B., 38286A.
Hamilton, Jack M., 37217A.
Hamilton, Ralph W., 38004A.
Hamlin, Horace C., 38411A.
Hamm, William A., 37193A.
Hamner, Winford E., 37855A.
Hand, Clarence B., 37555A.
Hanna, Theodore M., 37970A.
Hansen, Richard J., 37541A.
Hanson, Quentin D., 52409A.
Harbst, Kenneth E., 37304A.
Harker, Douglas C., Jr., 52348A.
Harlan, Henry H., 37898A.
Harley, Ernest G., Jr., 38078A.
Harmon, Frank F., Jr., 37973A.
Harriger, Russell E., 38152A.
Harrington, George F., 17620A.
Harrington, Henry A., 38134A.
Harrington, William J., 38185A.
Harris, Robert G., 37247A.
Harrison, Philip P., 37636A.
Harrison, William B., 38350A.
Harrop, John V., 37851A.
Harry, Arthur S., 38062A.
Hart, Allen C., 24418A.
Hart, Gene, 37891A.
Hart, Max E., Jr., 37934A.
Hartman, Dwight W., 37223A.
Hartwell, Norris E., Jr., 38065A.
Harvey, Edward S., Jr., 37160A.
Haskins, William A., 37164A.
Hastings, Brian T., 21486A.
Hasty, William L., 37291A.
Hatcher, William D., 38258A.
Haugen, Warren G., 26786A.
Hauk, Arthur H., 38141A.
Hayden, Harold T., 52433A.
Haymond, Richard, 37637A.
Haynes, Albert L., 38278A.
Heard, Lyman B., Jr., 37513A.
Heard, Malcolm W., 38113A.
Hearn, Johnnie L., 37758A.
Heath, John G., 37175A.
Heath, Marvin W., 37936A.
Heath, Paul, 38006A.
Heckman, Edward C., Jr., 37913A.
Hedblom, George G., 37897A.
Hedges, Walter N., 38308A.
Heflin, Felder F., 38097A.
Heiser, William J., 37749A.
Heller, Emerson E., 23678A.
Helling, Donald C., 17632A.
Helms, Carl E., 38348A.
Hemm, Robert V., 37363A.
Henderson, Jack B., 52370A.
Henderson, Robert A., 37374A.
Hendricks, Ernest L., Jr., 37462A.
Hendricks, Junior, 37651A.
Henehan, Alva D., 37945A.
Henley, Frank O., 38424A.
Hennessy, Donald G., 52424A.
Hennings, Merwin D., 37882A
Hensel, Leon A., 37984A.
Heppler, Harold S., 38326A.
Herbst, Clay E., Jr., 38339A.
Hermann, Oscar H., 37275A.
Hernandez, Mario M., 38410A.
Herndon, Burkhead M., 37571A.
Herren, Blaine A., 37840A.
Herrera, Rudolfo L., 37329A.
Hess, Alfred S., 24353A.
Hexberg, Caspar J., 37779A.
Hezlep, William H., Jr., 38213A.
Hickman, Ivan L., 38147A.
Hickson, John H., 37226A.
Highfill, Thompson N., 37573A.
Hightower, Edwin C., Jr., 17619A.
Hill, Alvis B., 38066A.
Hill, Charles J., 38195A.
Hill, John C., Jr., 38085A.
Hillis, Dwight N., 38366A.
Hills, Arville W., 37290A.
Hine, Leonard D., 38068A.
Hinerman, Joseph W., 22769A.
Hines, Larry A., 38457A.
Hirr, Herbert, 38425A.
Hitchens, Harold L., 37391A.
Hixson, Jack L., 37868A.
Hobson, Claude I., 38404A.
Hoelscher, William B., 37767A.
Hoffman, John N., Jr., 37881A.
Hoffman, Robert W., 26840A.
Hofman, Dick M., 38340A.
Holland, Ralph T., 37362A.
Hollingworth, George K., Jr., 38343A.
Hollis, Raymond H., 38290A.
Hollowell, John D., 20751A.
Holman, William S., 21487A.
Holt, Hardy L., 37142A.
Holton, Arthur E., 37351A.
Holtzhauser, Robert J., 38322A.
Hooker, Walter P., Jr., 38335A.
Hoppe, George W., 38083A.
Hopple, Victor H., 26839A.
Hoptay, Michael L., 38115A.
Horn, Robert P., 17743A.
Horne, Wickliff H., 37523A.
Hosford, Bowen I., 38377A.
Houchin, Bobbie E., 38207A.
Houck, Warren P., 17232A.
Houston, Carl L., 37211A.
Howard, Murray, 38033A.
Howell, Martin L., Jr., 38025A.
Hower, Doyle D., 38464A.
Howk, Elmer D., 38201A.
Hubbard, Carl J., Jr., 37307A.
Huckabay, James T., 37400A.
Hudgins, Andrew L., 17672A.
Hudgins, Harold, Jr., 37315A.
Huson, Eugene L., 23770A.
Huet, Allan W., 37924A.
Huffman, Robert D., 23761A.
Hug, John H., 38036A.
Hughes, Arthur L., 25780A.
Hughes, Louis T., 52334A.
Hull, Harry E., 37800A.
Humiston, Ray S., 38097A.
Hunt, Bruce E., 37408A.
Hunter, Charles M., Jr., 37165A.
Hurley, Joseph W., 37588A.
Hurley, William T., 37822A.
Hurst, William G., 37186A.
Hushbeck, Elgin L., 37172A.
Hutchins, Hartley F., 37365A.
Hutto, Robert A., 37322A.
Hyde, Bayard W., 37647A.
Hynan, Gerald E., 37689A.
Idtse, Robert P., 38028A.
Ihrig, Maxwell J., 20719A.
Imbornone, Vincent J., 38206A.
Intermont, Robert J., 37965A.
Irving, John C., 38367A.
Isenhower, George G., 37921A.
Isley, Thomas H., 38090A.
Iverson, Martin, 37401A.
Jack, Charles D., 37569A.
Jack, Eugene B., 38438A.
Jackson, Alvin J., 37301A.
Jackson, Donald H., 38283A.
Jackson, Eugene M., 38045A.

Jackson, James L., 37168A.
Jackson, Ottie B., 36246A.
Jackson, Robert L., 38280A.
Jackson, Robert T., 37736A.
Jackson, Urban B., 37428A.
Jacob, Ervin W., 38344A.
Jacobsen, Robert T., 38043A.
Jacoby, Frederick W., 17681A.
James, Harold L., 38356A.
James, Harry E., 37147A.
Jaquez, Arthur A., 37527A.
Jarrell, James R., 3d, 37744A.
Jarvis, David, 17610A.
Jenkins, Robert L., 37434A.
Jenkins, William D., 37395A.
Jennings, George H., Jr., 37486A.
Jennison, John C., Jr., 37458A.
Jensen, Nils B., 38168A.
Jensen, Robert F., 38388A.
Jesperson, Max O., 38473A.
Jewett, Eugene F., 38300A.
Johanson, Alf H., 38129A.
Johnson, Charles R., 37859A.
Johnson, Cordell E., 52475A.
Johnson, Earl E., 38249A.
Johnson, Henry L., 37379A.
Johnson, Leroy H., 52374A.
Johnson, Luverne S., 38447A.
Johnson, Melvin E., Jr., 22741A.
Johnson, Olin H., 37775A.
Johnson, Ralph E., 37919A.
Johnson, Ralph H., 37931A.
Johnson, Raymond A., 37954A.
Johnson, Roger F., 38161A.
Johnson, Thomas R., Jr., 38013A.
Johnson, Walter S., 38032A.
Johnson, Wendell C., 37634A.
Johnson, William C., 37918A.
Johnston, Joe D., 17646A.
Jones, Charles D., Jr., 24359A.
Jones, Dale L., 37563A.
Jones, Finch M., 38360A.
Jones, Howard W., 37916A.
Jones, James T., 21481A.
Jones, John S., Jr., 37539A.
Jones, Joseph L., 24730A.
Jones, Ralph W., 38272A.
Jones, Richard W., 22766A.
Jones, William T., 37847A.
Jordan, Vincent A., 26676A.
Jorgensen, Elmer A., 38456A.
Jory, Francis L., 38214A.
Jowdy, Frank J., 25531A.
Jowers, Joseph J., 37596A.
Joyce, Robert A., 38259A.
Joyner, William R., 37413A.
Judge, James A., Jr., 37350A.
Justinak, Charles A., 37566A.
Kaden, George, 37896A.
Kaericher, Kermit C., 17608A.
Kahn, Frederic J., 37231A.
Kain, Harry R., 17677A.
Kaiser, Charles, Jr., 22786A.
Kalebaugh, George C., 38304A.
Kappe, Ernest J., 37215A.
Kay, Avery, 37824A.
Kaye, Ted, 37677A.
Keheley, Thomas L., 37516A.
Kehl, Raymond H., 37937A.
Kehrer, Richard C., 37922A.
Keiser, Leslie D., 37270A.
Keith, Herbert W., 37543A.
Kellan, Victor, 37900A.
Kelleher, Gerard F., 38390A.
Keller, George R., 37857A.
Kelley, Dwayne E., 38461A.
Kelliher, Joseph R., 37480A.
Kelly, Michael J., Jr., 37904A.
Kelly, Robert H., 37662A.
Kelly, William J., 23183A.
Kenna, James H., 37663A.
Kennedy, Donald E., 38102A.
Kennedy, William E., 37789A.
Kenny, Richard M., 38099A.
Kent, James D., 37816A.
Kentroti, Theodore A., 38188A.
Keplinger, Donald L., 37607A.
Kerr, Charles A., 37670A.
Kerr, Robert C., 38470A.
Keutzer, Eugene F., 38080A.
Keyt, Harold R., 37825A.
Keyte, Kenneth N., 37674A.
Kiernan, John W., 28212A.
Kilby, Robert H., 37795A.
Kilgore, Donald K., 37814A.
Kilpatrick, Albert R., 20720A.
Kilpatrick, Lewelr L., 37210A.
Kimball, Richard D., 38307A.
Kimerer, Perry E., 37383A.
Kimsey, Clinton L., 37949A.
Kinevan, Marcos E., 17625A.
King, Tommy O., 37742A.
Kirby, Robert M., 38128A.
Kirk, Thomas M., 37618A.
Kiser, Oscar J., 38048A.
Klein, Carl P., Jr., 38149A.
Knapp, William A., 38098A.
Knauss, Frederick J., 17585A.
Knight, Artemus R., 37996A.
Knipscher, William C., 38000A.
Knowlton, Robert D., 52445A.
Koehler, Walter C., 48802A.
Kondall, Albert R., 21497A.
Konvalinka, Harold F., 36940A.
Koral, Walter J., 37167A.
Korbitz, Fredrick W., Jr., 37748A.
Krahn, Herman J., 52471A.
Kreps, William C., 37173A.
Kress, Lester F., 52469A.
Kretzer, Ralph I., 38361A.
Krick, Arthur W., 37737A.
Krig, Kenneth A., 37138A.
Krom, Frederick B., Jr., 38218A.
Kruse, Kenneth, 38029A.
Kubler, Charles A., 37399A.
Kuder, Wesley L., 37178A.
Kuehn, Robert J., 37533A.
Kuhn, Byron G., 38426A.
Kuykendall, William T., 17636A.
Kuzma, Myron L., 26822A.
Kvamme, Orville J., 17918A.
Laffler, Frank P., 38084A.
Lajeunesse, Conrad N., 17694A.
Lally, Robert W., 37803A.
Lamattina, Frank J., 17642A.
Lamb, George M., 37192A.
Lamborn, Frank P., 37310A.
Lamper, Joseph F., 37947A.
Lane, Gerald R., 23903A.
Langan, John M., 38267A.
Lappo, John S., 37694A.
Larivee, Roger P., 25529A.
Larner, Edward L., 38198A.
Laroche, James N., 38238A.
Larson, James D., 37808A.
Larsson, Campbell E., 38094A.
Laski, Joseph S., 23869A.
Lateano, Guy J., 37888A.
Lawson, Francis R., 20606A.
Layman, Archie H., 37488A.
Layne, Otis L., 38427A.
Leadingham, Joseph E., 38271A.
Learmonth, Allen F., 17682A.
Leavitt, Max V., 37460A.
Lee, James M., 37179A.
Lefler, Harlan E., 52353A.
Lehman, William P., 37134A.
Lehrman, Arthur C., 52494A.
Leland, Harvey K., 38354A.
Lenhoff, Clement J., 37860A.
Lennon, Edward F., 37136A.
Leon, Lawrence L., 37423A.
Leonard, Raymond K., 52512A.
Leone, William E., 37791A.
Lerohl, John K., 17582A.
Letts, Ned M., 37296A.
Levine, Arnold F., 38352A.
Levings, Frank L., 38418A.
Levisen, Martin C., 37471A.
Levy, Joseph E., 37836A.
Lewallen, Charles E., 37388A.
Lewis, Eugene B., 26424A.
Lewis, Francis E., 2d, 37583A.
Lewis, Walter L., 26754A.
Libuse, Frank C., 37556A.
Lilley, J. Robert, 17689A.
Limbacher, Philip C., 37915A.
Lindberg, Earl L., 38239A.
Lindberg, William E., 28308A.
Lindsay, Keith J., 37940A.
Lingel, Lyle E., 23745A.
Lipsey, Alfred E., 38250A.
Lipton, Jules M., 48808A.
Livingstone, Charles D., 37985A.
Logan, James H., Jr., 38253A.
Loisel, Cyriaque J., 38408A.
Long, Atwood E., Jr., 38224A.
Long, Byron E., 38227A.
Long, Chester H., 37986A.
Long, Mahlon H., Jr., 37227A.
Long, William F., 37649A.
Loomis, Donald O., 38089A.
Lovelace, William P., 52417A.
Lovingfoss, Robert B., 37326A.
Lowe, Charles S., 52385A.
Lowry, Edward C., 37841A.
Lucas, Rio G., 37170A.
Ludden, John C., 24360A.
Lupton, Frederick A., Jr., 37277A.
Luthy, Lloyd C., 37751A.
Luttmann, Roger F., 38093A.
Maas, Robert R., 52408A.
MacDonald, Tom S., 23768A.
Mackie, John V., 17298A.
Madden, George W., 37739A.
Madden, Joseph M., 38451A.
Mael, Francis B., 38372A.
Mahan, John V., 37368A.
Maher, Thomas E., 48813A.
Mahoney, Francis R., 38442A.
Mallory, John S., Jr., 17691A.
Malone, Roy W., 38325A.
Mandaleris, Manuel P., 38077A.
Manes, Charles V., 38476A.
Mann, Howard P., 26480A.
Mann, John H., 37349A.
Mann, Lyle E., 24357A.
Marcus, Woodrow C., 37935A.
Marks, Murray, 52504A.
Marsh, Donald C., 37440A.
Marsh, Robert D., 37902A.
Marsh, William A., 38429A.
Martin, Donald E., 38333A.
Martin, James C., Jr., 17909A.
Martin, John M., 52460A.
Martin, Lee R., 37958A.
Martin, Whitfield A., 37266A.
Martin, William M., 38091A.
Marvin, George C., 38226A.
Mason, Floyd H., 37325A.
Mason, Stephen F., 52343A.
Massie, Jack K., 52392A.
Masterson, James M., 37696A.
Mathews, Donell, 37846A.
Mattes, George J., 52379A.
Mau, Jerome R., 37137A.
Maxey, Arthur B., Jr., 37790A.
Maxfield, Arthur, 38430A.
Maxwell, Dewayne J., 37271A.
Maxwell, James E., 37625A.
Maxwell, John W., 24355A.
May, John C., 37807A.
McAnallen, Heyward M., 52437A.
McArdle, Thomas J., 34993A.
McBride, Charles C., Jr., 38231A.
McCabe, John T., 37939A.
McCauley, Robert A., 37489A.
McClain, Clyde F., 37427A.
McCloy, Earl M., 38041A.
McClure, Richard A., 17658A.
McCluskey, John A., 52395A.
McCoy, Franklin E., 38139A.
McCurdy, Arthur, 37288A.
McDaniel, Howard H., 52410A.
McDonagh, John A., 52500A.
McDonald, William L., 24369A.
McDowell, Eurfryn W., 37853A.
McDowell, Robert E., 38416A.
McFadden, John A., Jr., 37605A.
McGraw, Clinton C., 38332A.
McGrew, Gale I., 56541A.
McGuffey, Darrell E., 37718A.
McGuire, Charles S., 52429A.
McHale, Joseph M., 37418A.
McHugh, Aloysius P., 37487A.
McKee, Morris, Jr., 37801A.
McKinney, Ewing, J. W., 37777A.
McKinnon, John P., 37283A.
McLaughlin, Eugene C., 38208A.
McMillan, William E., Jr., 37524A.
McNeil, James E., 52364A.
McPhee, Charles E., 38088A.
McQuown, John R., 23722A.

McVicar, Daniel J., 37977A.
Meade, Walter R., 37459A.
Mehlhoff, Clarence V., 37650A.
Meiklejohn, Milton A., 37959A.
Mercer, Donald J., 37699A.
Merriman, John E., 38466A.
Metivier, Joseph R., 37837A.
Metts, Howard W., 52420A.
Meyen, Herman J., 38394A.
Meyer, Joel L., 37995A.
Meyer, Phil H., 37752A.
Meyers, Harold B., 35750A.
Midkiff, Kenneth A., 38265A.
Miller, David E., 38314A.
Miller, George L., 25508A.
Miller, John P., 38059A.
Miller, Martin L., 37456A.
Miller, Max R., 37712A.
Miller, Noel F., Jr., 38050A.
Miller, Ollie D., 24715A.
Miller, Robert E., 38109A.
Miller, William P., Jr., 21491A.
Miller, William S., 22854A.
Miner, William D., 38184A.
Minner, Connally W., 37336A.
Minow, Thomas G., 37311A.
Misenko, Joseph F., 37746A.
Mishler, Donald W., 38358A.
Mistrot, Ralph W., 37821A.
Mitchell, Ross H., 37261A.
Mix, Robert W., 55742A.
Mock, John E., 17576A.
Modica, Edward S., 38071A.
Modisette, James O., Jr., 23849A.
Moe, Walter S., Jr., 22762A.
Molett, William E., 37976A.
Monday, William W., 52476A.
Moody, Hall A., Jr., 37780A.
Moomaw, Hollis R., 37805A.
Moon, Wilner P., 22760A.
Moore, Charles D., 52498A.
Moore, Charles P., 38174A.
Moore, Forrest N., Jr., 37521A.
Moore, Homer L., 37850A.
Moore, Rexford L., 37714A.
Moore, Robert B., 17664A.
Morgan, Thomas J., 38311A.
Morgan, Tilford H., 37318A.
Morris, Frank W., Jr., 52336A.
Morris, Thomas L., 37267A.
Morrison, Edwin, 52451A.
Morrison, John C., 37380A.
Morrison, Merle E., 37716A.
Morrissey, Joseph M., 24377A.
Morrow, Bernard G., 38170A.
Morrow, Robert W., 52447A.
Morse, John H. I., 37646A.
Morton, Noble L., Jr., 37608A.
Mosher, John F., 37161A.
Mosier, Andrew P., 37782A.
Moss, Charles L., 38158A.
Moulder, James H., 37979A.
Mozley, Curtis N., 37814A.
Mueller, Frederick W., 38019A.
Mueller, Norman F., 18308A.
Mulanax, Arthur G., 37966A.
Mumma, Jack L., 38395A.
Munday, Herbert A., 37426A.
Murphy, Miles J., 38011A.
Murphy, Robert J., 38035A.
Murphy, William J., 52357A.
Myers, Luther R., Jr., 37708A.
Myers, Raleigh B., Jr., 37497A.
Myers, Roy E. R., 37909A.
Myers, William D., 28323A.
Nahodil, Roy F., 37216A.
Namur, Howard M., 37848A.
Nash, Vincent E., 37457A.
Naylor, Joe M., 37433A.
Naylor, William C., 37372A.
Nelson, Allen S., 37492A.
Nelson, Edward D., 37604A.
Nelson, Eugene A., 52367A.
Nelson, Stanley A., 37285A.
Neuwirth, Irving, 37760A.
Neville, Thomas J., 28336A.
Newville, Van H., 52405A.
Nichols, Irwin A., 37169A.
Nichols, Merle B., 38103A.
Nicholson, Benjamin W., 52467A.
Nicholson, Robert W., 37654A.
Nicol, Robert A., 36375A.
Nicoll, Robert W., 38030A.
Nocera, Frank M., 37695A.
Northcott, Clyde A., Jr., 22739A.
Norton, James A., Jr., 52486A.
Nosek, Henry 52524A.
Novak, Eugene A., 21514A.
Novotny, Edmund E., 38455A.
Nowak, Francis V., 52372A.
Nunn, Donald G., 38154A.
Nyland, Edward S., 37515A.
Oates, Elmer R., 37431A.
Oberschmid, Robert E., 37287A.
O'Connor, Frederick M., 37652A.
Odell, David A., 17621A.
Odell, Paul H., 37843A.
Odor, David D., 38042A.
O'Dorisio, Camillo C., 38153A.
Offerman, Donald H., 38389A.
Olfiesh, Gabriel D., 37570A.
Ohnemus, Roman H., 37245A.
Oldham, Richard T., 37889A.
Olinger, Harold R., 38119A.
Oliphint, John H., 25520A.
O'Malley, Patrick J., 38334A.
O'Neil, Robert, 38116A.
Oostdyke, Robert J., 38431A.
Opdahl, Owen R., 37166A.
Osak, Joseph S., 52394A.
Osborne, James W., 37467A.
O'Shea, Timothy G., 22761A.
O'Shields, Hurl E., 52450A.
O'Toole, Joseph P., 38110A.
Ott, Forrest E., 36208A.
Overmoe, Ralph W., 37709A.
Owens, Jack C., 52363A.
Owens, Laurence E., 38323A.
Owens, Raymond E., 37974A.
Oxley, Dan D., 38187A.
Page, Charles C., 37262A.
Pagliuso, Lester C., 37236A.
Pallister, David S., 37750A.
Pallone, Donald O., 38402A.
Palmer, Gordon B., 37990A.
Palmer, Richard W., 52399A.
Palumbo, Rocco, 52539A.
Paquin, Howard M., 37385A.
Paris, George E., Jr., 38175A.
Parker, James A., Sr., 52502A.
Parrish, Henry G., Jr., 22839A.
Paschall, Lee M., 38002A.
Pasho, Robert E., 37688A.
Paterson, David, Jr., 37991A.
Pattenaude, Louis I., 37394A.
Patterson, Ralph O., 52359A.
Pattillo, Charles C., 23720A.
Pattillo, Cuthbert A., 22715A.
Patton, Clifford P., 38391A.
Paulisick, John G., 38189A.
Paxton, Wilmot E. Y., 37274A.
Payne, Earl S., 38346A.
Payne, William G., 38150A.
Paynter, Henry A., 21469A.
Pea, Max A., 38398A.
Pearce, Jack V., 17588A.
Pelszynski, John J., 37139A.
Peltier, Paul J., Jr., 52358A.
Pennington, Harry E., Jr., 52349A.
Penzien, William R., 38142A.
Perry, Aubrey S., 38378A.
Perry, Francis R., 17696A.
Peters, George A., 52481A.
Peters, John L., 37409A.
Petersen, Albert C., 37376A.
Peterson, Harry E., 37886A.
Peterson, Warren H., 37756A.
Pfiegl, Robert A., 37128A.
Pfrang, Richard J., 25821A.
Phelps, Ralph E., 37337A.
Phillips, Eugene F., 52339A.
Phillips, Howard R., 37181A.
Phillips, Robert S., 52465A.
Phinisey, Claude W., 37354A.
Phipps, Charles S., 52398A.
Pickard, Walter M., 37819A.
Pickett, Maurice W., 37416A.
Picone, Gregory D., 52456A.
Pierce, Glenn H., 21485A.
Pierce, Heywood W., 37684A.
Pierce, Jack F., 17641A.
Pinkerton, Herbert C., Jr., 17593A.
Pitner, Jean B., 37483A.
Pitsch, Richard E., 38251A.
Pittman, Don D., 37369A.
Plunkett, Sterling L., 52505A.
Police, John L., 52518A.
Poliner, Saul, 37317A.
Poole, James I., 52499A.
Porter, Paul V., 377725A.
Post, Edwin A., 37877A.
Postelnek, William, 52443A.
Potter, William C., 52455A.
Pottorff, Wayne H., 37771A.
Poulos, Theodore, 52383A.
Pound, Alan G., 25526A.
Powell, Harold L., 37404A.
Powell, Kenneth V., 37421A.
Powell, Lucion N., 38166A.
Preston, Ernest A., 38047R.
Proctor, Robert F., 52514A.
Prout, Leslie R., Jr., 37933A.
Prussing, George A., 37532A.
Pugh, Homer H., 38385A.
Putnam, Harry H., Jr., 37230A.
Pyle, William R., 38210A.
Quick, Wade S., Jr., 38204A.
Quintana, Joe R., 25815A.
Quirk, Daniel H., 38031A.
Quirk, William T., 27698A.
Rabourn, Clarence W., 37464A.
Raby, Billy M., 38432A.
Radzinski, John J., 52426A.
Ragan, Harry W., 52337A.
Randel, John W., 26435A.
Rash, Thomas W., 38298A.
Rasmussen, Kenneth C., 37238A.
Ratcliffe, William C., 37502A.
Ratliff, Robert S., 37885A.
Rauch, Richard W., 38485A.
Read, Charles M., 37202A.
Reames, Charles E., 37802A.
Reat, Grover O., 38203A.
Reavell, George E., 37587A.
Reck, William T., 38014A.
Redd, Leonard B., 38137A.
Redmon, William K., Jr., 52390A.
Reed, Robert L., 51690A.
Reed, Walter D., 28021A.
Reeder, Herbert B., 38160A.
Reedy, Walton B., 38172A.
Reeves, Philip N., 52492A.
Reichenbach, Henry J., 37960A.
Reichenberg, Harold E., 37183A.
Reid, William E., 38486A.
Reinsmith, Leonard L., Jr., 38075A.
Reiser, Matt H., 38183A.
Reisner, Horace J., 18271A.
Rennhack, William O., 38127A.
Reynolds, Clyde C., 17630A.
Reynolds, John R., 24710A.
Rhode, Harry T., 38219A.
Rhodes, John R., Jr., 38112A.
Rice, Paul B., 22751A.
Rich, Robert G., 54861A.
Richards, Charles L., 38433A.
Richardson, William G., 37534A.
Rickelman, Thomas E., 52508A.
Rico, Manuel S., 38191A.
Riepma, Marjorie L., 22808W.
Riggle, Lewis E., 38336A.
Riopelle, Warren J., 37259A.
Risher, Thomas R., 3d, 37479A.
Ritchard, Leonard H., 38106A.
Ritchie, Richard L., 52478A.
Ritchie, William A., 37691A.
Rizer, Virgil H., 23736A.
Roark, Bob, 23794A.
Robb, Donald O., 17579A.
Robbins, Tom W., 52368A.
Roberts, Lawrence E., 52422A.
Roberts, Raynor H., 37595A.
Robertson, Alexander, 38273A.
Robertson, Edwin W., 2d, 17580A.
Robertson, Howard N., 37804A.
Robinson, Leroy B., 17573A.
Robinson, Richard E., 52510A.
Rockafellow, John W., Jr., 38301A.
Rodewald, Warren A., 22679A.
Roehm, John F., 52335A.
Rogers, Dow A., Jr., 28214A.
Rogers, Evan Y., 52404A.
Rogers, Norman C., 37278A.

Roper, Willard L., 37424A.
Ropp, George H., Jr., 38317A.
Rose, Boone, Jr., 38060A.
Rose, John S., 37344A.
Ross, Joseph G., 37452A.
Ross, Lawrence S., 38399A.
Ross, Walter F., Jr., 37766A.
Rothery, William J., Jr., 23721A.
Rotter. Gerald D., 38073A.
Rouse, Richard R., 37332A.
Rowe, Calvin S., 52484A.
Rowley, Robert U., 52443A.
Rubin, David S., 52517A.
Ruckman, Joe B., 37845A.
Rudkins, Raymond E., 52352A.
Rush, Willard W., 37869A.
Russey, Richard B., 37339A.
Ryan, James E., 17676A.
Ryan, Thomas P., Jr., 24717A.
Sabourin, Roland E., 37580A.
Sager, William F., 38310A.
Sander, Michael, 37286A.
Sanders, Donald W., 38205A.
Sanders, Lowell L., 37470A.
Sanders, Russell P., Jr., 37926A.
Sanders, Stephen J., 17535A.
Sara, Joseph, 38202A.
Satriano, Joseph, 37830A.
Sattem, Robert, 17633A.
Sautter, Albert L., 52516A.
Savage, George J., 23747A.
Sawin, Robert D., 47519A.
Scanlon. James J., 37248A.
Schauer, Roy E., 38121A.
Schauwecker, Paul G., 21466A.
Scheinkman, Martin, 38381A.
Schestopol, Abe, 37562A.
Scheuring, Francis J., 38081A.
Schlogl, John G., 38086A.
Schneider, Albert G., Jr., 37928A.
Schoppe, John C., 23858A.
Schreiber, Frank, 38330A.
Schwab, Jack C., 22716A.
Schwarzrock, James A., 38362A.
Schwellenbach, Charles B., 52386A.
Scoggin, Lockwood B., 52446A.
Scott, Roy G., 37865A.
Scoville, Winston O., 17640A.
Scowcroft, Brent, 17607A.
Scroggins, William W., Jr., 38167A.
Seaberg, John D., 37184A.
Seabolt, Robert H., 37151A.
Secrest, James K., 26791A.
Self, Melvin L., 38296A.
Selin, Fredrick P., 37381A.
Sellers, Cloyd W., 37658A.
Sellers, Ronald E., Jr., 37343A.
Selsor, William C., 3d, 38211A.
Sencer, Henry J., 38387A.
Senft, Oscar L., 37726A.
Servocky, Charles J., 37577A.
Shank, Robert E., 48804A.
Shaw, Donald N., 37436A.
Sheaffer, Abram B., 52511A.
Shelton, Joseph L., Jr., 52438A.
Sherman, Fred M., 24409A.
Sherrill, Herbert L., 37834A.
Shields, Charles E., 17678A.
Shore, Marshall B., 37761A.
Showalter, Robert E., 37176A.
Shuman. Bradford P., 37560A.
Sibley, Jimmie L., 38240A.
Siegrist, Frederick G., Jr., 37798A.
Simon, King D., 17597A.
Sims, Dorman W., 37561A.
Sims, Joe, 37862A.
Skaggs, John E., Jr., 37645A.
Skartvedt, Paul S., 23782A.
Skipper, Francis H., 23945A.
Skipper, Roy B., 52428A.
Slacum, Donald S., 37520A.
Sleeper, Warren C., 37565A.
Slessman, Dale E., 37690A.
Sletten, Robert P. O., 37205A.
Sloan, Roy O., Jr., 36179A.
Sloop, Everett E., 25610A.
Smedberg, Renwick W., 37156A.
Smejkal, Joseph F., 37214A.
Smith, Bernard M., 52371A.
Smith, Daniel C., 38235A.
Smith, Francis E., 37494A.
Smith, Francis P., Jr., 37233A.
Smith, Grant R., 37305A.
Smith, James E., 37706A.
Smith, James E., 38434A.
Smith, Kenneth S., 38062A.
Smith, Leo E., 38156A.
Smith, Lloyd, 52391A.
Smith, Lloyd D., 22585A.
Smith, Luther E., Jr., 37476A.
Smith, Norman S., 24346A.
Smith, Richard W., 22583A.
Smith, Robert E., 37501A.
Smith, Winston S., 37441A.
Smithcors, Harris E., 38182A.
Snook, Robert R., 37174A.
Snow, Harry E., 37899A.
Sofaly, Raymond A., 38456A.
Sohle, Frederick V., Jr., 37203A.
Sonnenberg, Eugene P., 37988A.
Sonnenschein, Gerald, 37681A.
Sooy, Floyd A., 37451A.
Sorensen, Robert F., 38257A.
Spaduzzi, Robert F., 38008A.
Spann, Walter D., 37567A.
Spalding, John P., 37692A.
Speicher, Henry O., 38444A.
Speiser, Martin A., 37306A.
Spellman, Edward V., 37975A.
Sperber, Harold H., 38217A.
Spicer, Laurence S., 37797A.
Spring, Jesse W., 37272A.
Staats, Aaron C., 37619A.
Stahl, Roy D., Jr., 38380A.
Staley, Raymond M., 38324A.
Stallings, Herbert D., Jr., 38005A.
Stamatis, Milton, Jr., 24727A.
Stanley, James W., 37473A.
Stanley, Paul P., 37348A.
Starke, Robert T., 37518A.
Starling, Andrew L., 52491A.
Starr, Fred W., 37835A.
Staszak, Leonard A., 17605A.
Staver, Arie, 52436A.
Steele, Donald F., 17966A.
Stephan, Leonard P., 38177A.
Stephanidis, James G., 37466A.
Sterling, Eugene B., 37442A.
Stevens, Leslie R., 17599A.
Stewart, Charles C., 17643A.
Stewart, Ernest, 37402A.
Stewart, James C., 37445A.
Stewart, John W., 37228A.
Stewart, Loyal P., 37682A.
Stewart, Roy H., 24726A.
Stewart, Wesley T., 22788A.
Stidd, Cyril C., 38370A.
St. John, Drew T., Jr., 37720A.
Stoddard, Moreau E., 38236A.
Stokes, Jone C., 37589A.
Stolz, John J., 38276A.
Stoneberger, Harold W., 23699A.
Stover, Lawrence P., 37550A.
Strada, Raymond A., 37697A.
Strahan, Hubert W., 37854A.
Strand, John H., 22858A.
Strom, Francis E., 37540A.
Stryker, Jackson R., 37403A.
Stuckey, Daryle R., 55084A.
Stueck, Walter E., 38181A.
Stuk, Martin, 38452A.
Sturtevant, Robert H., 52497A.
Stutzer, Norman H., 38254A.
Suber, Clarence H., Jr., 37187A.
Sugrue, Francis J., 25790A.
Sullivan, James F., 38190A.
Sundborg, Andrew T., Jr., 38123A.
Sundstrom, Oscar J., 37564A.
Surprise, John W., Jr., 38369A.
Surratt, Maurice D., 37390A.
Sussmann, Philip B., 37693A.
Sutterly, Robert A., 38435A.
Sutton, James O., Jr., 37740A.
Sutton, John H., 38468A.
Swain, Charles A., 38173A.
Swant, Gene R., 37781A.
Swanton, Robert T., 37686A.
Sweitzer, Ned N., 37578A.
Swift, Lowell J., 37668A.
Sybenga, Philip M., 37673A.
Sydlowski, Eugene, 38321A.
Taff, Harold A., 37188A.
Tager, Thomas E., 37450A.
Talbot, Louis L., 38445A.
Tappen, Alfred A., 37968A.
Tate, Lawrence H., 38359A.
Taylor, Jack H., 37279A.
Taylor, Mervin M., 17938A.
Taylor, Richard J., 37477A.
Taylor, Robert C., 37628A.
Taylor, William J. D., 38274A.
Teachnor, James J., 38279A.
Teague, Charles E., 22728A.
Tempest, Rone B., Jr., 38313A.
Templin, Albert E., 38439A.
Thacker, Elmer C., 52461A.
Thacker, Jack H., 37895A.
Thalken, Lawrence, 37643A.
Thames, Barney H., Jr., 37273A.
Thaxton, William F., 38384A.
Thiaville, Joseph E., 37323A.
Thomas, Glenn V., 37623A.
Thomas, Ned, 37293A.
Thomas, Richard F., 37435A.
Thompson, Albert L., 37964A.
Thompson, Dennis H., 37463A.
Thompson, George R., Jr., 38027A.
Thompson, Jack H., 37784A.
Thompson, John D., 37360A.
Thompson, Robert W., 37687A.
Thompson, Templeton A., 37559A.
Thompson, Warren C., 38010A.
Thornton, Billie E., 38436A.
Tice, Jack E., 38478A.
Tiernan, Harry J., 38067A.
Tillapaugh, Clayton E., 37504A.
Timmins, Jack L., 38157A.
Tinney, Frank, 37512A.
Tippin, Don A., 37506A.
Titus, Frank A., 17741A.
Titus, Jay D., 37582A.
Titus, Lowell E., 37412A.
Tolbert, Dalphy E., 37499A.
Tolhurst, Robert A., 38169A.
Toombs, Robert H., 37239A.
Torres, Victor, 37997A.
Townsend, Elbert T., 38454A.
Tracey, Ford P., 52375A.
Trachsel, Norman D., 38223A.
Traendly, Eugene W., 24578A.
Trapp, Lansford E., 37366A.
Traylor, Robert S., 37338A.
Trevarthen, Harry A., 38229A.
Triwush, Henry, 37206A.
Tromblay, Clemment W., 49302A.
Troup, Duane H., 37827A.
Truett, Herbert W., 24446A.
Tuck, Elmer L., 37644A.
Tuck, John R., 37260A.
Tuck, Sterling L., 36183A.
Tucker, Carl E., 37568A.
Tucker, Leland C., 37303A.
Tucker, Riggs M., 37671A.
Tucker, Young A., 17670A.
Turcotte, Wilfred N., 37537A.
Turner, Leonard F., 38194A.
Turner, William J., 37982A.
Turner, William L., 37842A.
Tutsock, John J., 38440A.
Tway, Duane C., 37508A.
Tyree, Guy, 37298A.
Udick, Earl W., 37198A.
Ulbricht, Walter E., 37983A.
Ulrich, William A., 37601A.
Upchurch, James H., 52454A.
Vaden, Joe C., 37874A.
Vanderhoek, Paul C., 37289A.
Vandiver, Everett B., 37613A.
Vanek, Gerald J., 37930A.
Van Epps, James S., 38337A.
Vanhorn, Ben A., 38284A.
Vanzee, Glen V., 38375A.
Vaughan, Harry B., 37774A.
Veiluva, Edward F., 37320A.
Velders, Merwin G., 38040A.
Vengelen, Ray F., 52531A.
Verhusen, Ben L., 38180A.
Vetter, Emerson W., 38281A.
Vickers, A. J., 38474A.
Victor, David W., 37392A.
Virgin, Benjamin T., 52444A.
Vogle, George W., 37377A.

Vornbrock, Walter G., Jr., 37675A.
Voss, William R., 38268A.
Vrilakas, Robert A., 37364A.
Wadlington, Irving L., 37276A.
Wagner, Isaac C., 37389A.
Wagner, Michael, 38079A.
Wahl, Eugene A., 37635A.
Waid, Charles L., 25507A.
Walker, John A., Jr., 37884A.
Walker, Lyle H., 37199A.
Walker, Van S., 37265A.
Wall, Frank A., 38230A.
Walter, Harvey P., 18296A.
Walters, Robert E., 37905A.
Walton, Robert W., 37768A.
Warden, Arthur F., 38220A.
Ware, Joseph C., Jr., 36229A.
Warlick, J. D., 38063A.
Warren, Frank H., 37468A.
Washburn, Benjamin M., 51689A.
Washmon, Douzer E., 37602A.
Waski, Raymond, 37324A.
Watkins, James R., 37224A.
Watson, Lewis E., 52431A.
Watts, Blanchard K., 37776A.
Wautelet, Raymond J., 37920A.
Weatherwax, Kenneth C., 52515A.
Weaver, Alvin D., 38107A.
Weaver, Douglas C., Jr., 17583A.
Weaver, Richard E., 38255A.
Weaver, Wilton G., 38437A.
Wegener, Willis B., 37490A.
Weir, Richard H., 37220A.
Welch, James P., 37998A.
Welch, Stanley H., 37485A.
Wells, Harold G., Jr., 52414A.
Wells, Norman M., Jr., 37820A.
Wendell, Harold G., 37633A.
Werdung, Romeyne M., 52387A.
West, Leroy, 37641A.
Westbrook, Luther J., 38242A.
Weydert, Charles F., 37405A.
Whaley, Cecil H., 38315A.
Wheelhouse, Henry L., 37319A.
Whistler, Charles F., 37235A.
Whitaker, Raymond N., 37144A.
White, Alton E., 37558A.
White, Charles J., 37753A.
White, David B., 37572A.
White, Dean R., 38467A.
White, Lee W., 24696A.
White, Robert W., 17618A.
White, Roy J., 52384A.
White, Thomas S., 37665A.
White, Walter A., 37522A.
White, William B., 38037A.
White, Zane W., 38353A.
Wickman, Russel A., 37666A.
Widman, Walter F., 37505A.
Wigley, Erskine, 37794A.
Wilcox, George W., 52333A.
Wilder, Thomas L., 37535A.
Wiley, Thomas J., Jr., 38341A.
Wilkes, Harry T., 37544A.
Wilkinson, William A., 37507A.
Williams, Harry J., 37813A.
Williams, Leonard E., 37371A.
Williams, Marshall G., 22763A.
Williams, Richard M., 37321A.
Williams, William A., Jr., 38261A.
Williams, William F., 38472A.
Willing, Thomas P., 37517A.
Willis, J. Vern, 37417A.
Willsie, Richard E., 38266A.
Wilson, George S., 37491A.
Wilson, Kieth G., 38021A.
Wilson, Samuel G., 37793A.
Wilson, Thomas E., 38245A.
Wimer, Alvin L., 22752A.
Windoffer, Robert A., 38130A.
Wing, Robert L., 37880A.
Winner, Alan M., 37967A.
Winters, Earl E., 37597A.
Wise, Harold C., 37944A.
Wise, William H., 52360A.
Witchey, Francis M., 37729A.
Witt, Harry A., 37429A.
Wittneban, Henry F., 37971A.
Woirol, Warren S., 21506A.
Wojciehoski, Gerald J., 17609A.
Wolbrette, David J., 38392A.
Wolf, Paul J., 52369A.
Wolfe, Ernest R., 37993A.
Wolfgong, William H., Jr., 37547A.
Wood, Crispin M., 38363A.
Wood, James W., 28202A.
Wood, Rodney J., 37883A.
Wood, William L., Jr., 37373A.
Wood, William R., 37295A.
Woodcock, James W., 48805A.
Woods, Gilbert N., 37878A.
Woods, Harold B., 37609A.
Woods, Leo T., 37500A.
Woodson, Frederick P., 37204A.
Wooten, Clyde W., 38003A.
Worth, Willis R., 37398A.
Wray, John D., 25793A.
Wren, Donald B., 37678A.
Wright, Devere M., 37745A.
Wright, Louis A., 37208A.
Wulff, Earl G., Jr., 38417A.
Wynecoop, Joseph A., 37627A.
Wyrosdick, Charles R., 37234A.
Yahle, Joseph G., 38232A.
Yarbrough, John F., Jr., 37946A.
Yeaman, Donald R., 37469A.
Yon, Verus A., 37313A.
Yost, Warren C., 38263A.
Young, Charles G., Jr., 37528A.
Young, Jack A., 24731A.
Young, James A., 38101A.
Young, John M., 17629A.
Young, Lawrence J., 38287A.
Young, William H., 22743A.
Young, William R., 38057A.
Younger, Dale J., 37232A.
Zahn, George A., 37135A.
Zanolli, Louis W., 37437A.
Zartman, Monroe D., 52463A.
Zerbe, Franklin E., 52400A.
Zielke, Richard L., 37955A.
Zorich, Sam, 37903A.
Zwartjes, William J., 37906A.

Medical Corps

Anderson, Claude T., 26701A.
Armour, Thomas D., Jr., 27594A.
Bagli, Vincent J., 24215A.
Billet, Sanford L., 24672A.
Bratt, Harry R., 26354A.
Burwell, Robert R., 26738A.
Cappelluzzo, Vincent P., 24213A.
Cooner, William H., 27604A.
Davidson, Wallace N., Jr., 27602A.
Davis, Gerald, 29622A.
Dunnagan, William A., 29621A.
Griffin, Francis G., 29275A.
Haworth, Wallace G., 27585A.
Jacobs, Paul H., 26697A.
Johnson, Howard H., Jr., 25637A.
Kable, Kelvin D., 26368A.
Koehn, Robert C., Jr., 25732A.
Lancaster, James M., Sr., 26737A.
Mann, Harold J., 32022A.
McCann, Robert J., 24216A.
Metcalf, John S., Jr., 26632A.
Miller, Perry B., 24139A.
Nilan, John E., 27601A.
Odland, Lawrence T., 24135A.
Olson, Robert O., 55852A.
Pierard, Albert A., 27611A.
Randolph, Charles L., Jr., 24217A.
Shea, William H. H., 29771A.
Silvernail, William I., Jr., 26714A.
Spivey, Charles G., Jr., 29772A.
Steck, Willard D., 27626A.
Stone, John H., 32312A.
Stuteville, James H., 27589A.
Thompson, James M., 26364A.
Tredici, Thomas J., 25656A.
Vasnunes, Edward H., 27595A.
Whittaker, Richard L., 29407A.
Wiese, Frederick W., 26383A.
Woosley, Homer E., Jr., 24137A.

Dental Corps

Adams, William C., 23214A.
Adkisson, Sam R., 26749A.
Beidelman, Edward R., 28126A.
Brest, Harold C., 32026A.
Clower, James C., 59484A.
Coons, George F., 23177A.
Cowe, Donald W., 51569A.
Crosby, James F., Jr., 28129A.
Devlyn, John E., 29415A.
Everett, Richard H., Jr., 32572A.
Hicks, Rodeheaver H., 25703A.
Jenkins, Charles A., Jr., 26388A.
Kobler, Milton J., 29653A.
Lindenmuth, James E., 32356A.
Mellow, Emil A., 32571A.
Ridgley, Charles D., 23215A.
Samaha, Francis J., 27496A.
Schutt, Harold E., 51005A.
Seamands, Charles W., 29279A.
Shannon, Ira L., 29300A.
Signorella, Arthur, 49700A.
Slack, Wesley G., 55871A.
Sloan, Roy S., 29865A.
Stansbury, Bruce E., 27525A.
Stewart, Kenneth L., 24679A.
Stewart, Lule D., 25485A.
Tanquist, Robert A., 56157A.
Trovillion, Howard M., 27979A.
Vernino, Daniel M., 25668A.

Veterinary Corps

Barnes, Charles M., 23218A.
Benson, Richard E., 24226A.
Bilderback, William R., 23216A.
Clayton, Frederick W., 23219A.
Davis, Harold C., 23075A.
Garner, Howard S., 25669A.
Moe, Douglas F., 26645A.
Reeves, Johnie L., 23220A.
Ringley, Donald W., 24225A.
Seigneur, Leslie J., 27499A.

Medical Service Corps

Beisner, Arthur T., 48960A.
Broadway, Charles B., 48966A.
Bundrick, George B., Jr., 48952A.
Callaghan, Donald E., 19848A.
Christiansen, Frank R., 48978A.
Cocheres, Thomas L., 48975A.
Colon, Howard, 25337A.
Dillehay, Joseph R., 48957A.
Galati, Ralph H., 48962A.
Gilbert, George E., 48977A.
Hannah, Ernest A., 48974A.
Hobson, Robert W., 48967A.
Kennedy, James M., 48968A.
Krause, Richard E., 48980A.
Loebig, Gordon F., 48971A.
Long, Kenneth H., 48972A.
Morris, Floyd M., 21645A.
Naylor, David B. S., 48973A.
Nichols, Glendal D., 48965A.
Nowell, Wesley R., 25737A.
Patrick, John H., Jr., 48979A.
Preston, Robert J., 48970A.
Prigmore, John R., 55332A.
Quenk, Joseph J., 23230A.
Rhodes, Stanley, 21646A.
Rogers, Georges H., 48961A.
Spaur, Carl L., 23228A.
Stauch, John E., 23079A.
Thacker, Bob B., 48964A.
Thompson, Ralph F., 48958A.
Wolff, Francis E., 48963A.
Worley, Tracy W., Jr., 48969A.

Nurse Corps

Chandler, Glenna L., 21884W.
Holt, Virginia J., 59730W.
Hunt, Eileen M., 55383W.
Peden, Louise S., 25747W.
Porter, Nan L., 25755W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Hayton, Marian J., 29352 W.

Chaplains

Bird, Dallas A., 23206A.
Boardman, William A., 25631A.
Buck, Wesley J., 48610A.
Denhey, John F., 24683A.
Harms, Sudderth A., 32421A.
Huber, Walter H., 48609A.
Meerdink, Vernon J., 48608A.
Ray, Erwin R., 56411A.
Sandrock, Hans E., 27998A.
Schmidt, Hugo G., Jr., 48607A.
Schroeder, Victor H., 23207A.
Schuck, David B., 24682A.
Tollett, Vaughn H., 55115A.

Trapp, Richard D., 55117A.
Waugh, Earl E., 23208A.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frederick C. Belen, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, vice Samuel C. Waugh.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a civil service commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring March 1, 1965, vice Roger W. Jones.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Aubrey J. Wagner, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring May 18, 1969, vice Brooks Hays.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 20, 1961.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William J. Crockett of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Harlan Cleveland, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Brooks Hays, of Arkansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassador

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Robert J. Burkhardt, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 4:34: *Jesus said, My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work.*

Eternal God, who art standing at the door of our hearts waiting to be welcomed, may we now worship and adore Thee as the light of all who receive Thee and the joy of all who love Thee.

May our thoughts and desires always be attuned to the rhythm of a great longing to have Thy divine purposes mediated unto us and through us.

Grant that our lives may be rich in faith and radiant in hope as we pray and labor to bring ourselves and all mankind into complete obedience to Thy holy will.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 17, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EDUCATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Our progress as a Nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.

The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment. It must include equally determined measures to invest in human beings—both in their basic education and training and in their more advanced preparation for professional work. Without such measures, the Federal Government will not be carrying out its responsibilities for expanding the base of our economic and military strength.

Our progress in education over the last generation has been substantial. We are educating a greater proportion of our youth to a higher degree of competency than any other country on earth. One-fourth of our total population is enrolled in our schools and colleges. This year $26 billion will be spent on education alone.

But the needs of the next generation—the needs of the next decade and the next school year—will not be met at this level of effort. More effort will be required—on the part of students, teachers, schools, colleges, and all 50 States, and on the part of the Federal Government.

Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice. But education is increasingly expensive. Too many State and local governments lack the resources to assure an adequate education for every child. Too many classrooms are overcrowded. Too many teachers are underpaid. Too many talented individuals cannot afford the benefits of higher education. Too many academic institutions cannot afford the cost of, or find room for, the growing numbers of students seeking admission in the sixties.

Our twin goals must be: A new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

I. ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A successful educational system requires the proper balance, in terms of both quality and quantity, of three elements: Students, teachers, and facilities. The quality of the students depends in large measure on both the quality and the relative quantity of teachers and facilities.

Throughout the 1960's there will be no lack in the quantity of students. An average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already strained by well over a half-million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions, a school system financed largely by a property tax incapable of bearing such an increased load in most communities.

But providing the quality and quantity of teachers and facilities to meet this demand will be major problems. Even today, there are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldly size because there are insufficient teachers available.

We cannot obtain more and better teachers—and our children should have the best—unless steps are taken to increase teachers' salaries. At present salary levels, the classroom cannot compete in financial rewards with other professional work that requires similar academic background.

It is equally clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years.

These problems are common to all States. They are particularly severe in those States which lack the financial resources to provide a better education, regardless of their own efforts. Additional difficulties, too often overlooked, are encountered in areas of special educational need, where economic or social circumstances impose special burdens and opportunities on the public school. These areas of special educational need include our depressed areas of chronic unemployment and the slum neighborhoods of our larger cities, where underprivileged children are overcrowded into substandard housing. A recent survey of a very large elementary school in one of our major cities, for example, found 91 percent of the children coming to class with poor diets, 87 percent in need of dental care, 21 percent in need of visual correction, and 19 percent with speech disorders. In some depressed areas roughly one-third of the children must rely on surplus foods for their basic sustenance. Older pupils in these schools lack proper recreational and job guidance. The proportion of dropouts, delinquency, and classroom disorders in such areas is alarmingly high.

I recommend to the Congress a 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

Based essentially on the bill which passed the Senate last year (S. 8), although beginning at a more modest level of expenditures, this program would assure every State of no less than $15 for every public school student in average

daily attendance, with the total amount appropriated ($666 million being authorized in the first year, rising to $866 million over a 3-year period) distributed according to the equalization formula contained in the last year's Senate bill, and already familiar to the Congress by virtue of its similarity to the formulas contained in the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction and other acts. Ten percent of the funds allocated to each State in the first year, and an equal amount thereafter, is to be used to help meet the unique problems of each State's "areas of special educational need"—depressed areas, slum neighborhoods, and others.

This is a modest program with ambitious goals. The sums involved are relatively small when we think in terms of more than 36 million public schoolchildren, and the billions of dollars necessary to educate them properly. Nevertheless, a limited beginning now—consistent with our obligations in other areas of responsibility—will encourage all States to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand and enrich the quality of education offered, and gradually assist our relatively low-income States in the elevation of their educational standards to a national level.

The bill which will follow this message has been carefully drawn to eliminate disproportionately large or small inequities, and to make the maximum use of a limited number of dollars. In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church schoolteachers' salaries; and thus non-public-school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools. Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

This investment will pay rich dividends in the years ahead—in increased economic growth, in enlightened citizens, in national excellence. For some 40 years, the Congress has wrestled with this problem and searched for a workable solution. I believe that we now have such a solution; and that this Congress in this year will make a landmark contribution to American education.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES

Our colleges and universities represent our ultimate educational resources. In these institutions are produced the leaders and other trained persons whom we need to carry forward our highly developed civilization. If the colleges and universities fail to do their job, there is no substitute to fulfill their responsibility. The threat of opposing military and ideological forces in the world lends urgency to their task. But that task would exist in any case.

The burden of increased enrollments—imposed upon our elementary and secondary schools already in the fifties—will fall heavily upon our colleges and universities during the sixties. By the autumn of 1966, an estimated 1 million more students will be in attendance at institutions of higher learning than enrolled last fall—for a total more than twice as high as the total college enrollment of 1950. Our colleges, already hard pressed to meet rising enrollments since 1950 during a period of rising costs, will be in critical straits merely to provide the necessary facilities, much less the cost of quality education.

The country as a whole is already spending nearly $1 billion a year on academic and residential facilities for higher education—some 20 percent of the total spent for higher education. Even with increased contributions from State, local, and private sources, a gap of $2.9 billion between aggregate needs and expenditures is anticipated by 1965, and a gap of $5.2 billion by 1970.

The national interest requires an educational system on the college level sufficiently financed and equipped to provide every student with adequate physical facilities to meet his instructional, research, and residential needs.

I therefore recommend legislation which will:

(1) Extend the current college housing loan program with a 5-year $250 million a year program designed to meet the Federal Government's appropriate share of residential housing for students and faculty. As a start, additional lending authority is necessary to speed action during fiscal 1961 on approvable loan applications already at hand.

(2) Establish a new, though similar, long-term, low-interest rate loan program for academic facilities, authorizing $300 million in loans each year for 5 years to assist in the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related structures—sufficient to enable public and private higher institutions to accommodate the expanding enrollments they anticipate over the next 5 years; and also to assist in the renovation, rehabilitation, and modernization of such facilities.

III. ASSISTANCE TO COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

This Nation a century or so ago established as a basic objective the provision of a good elementary and secondary school education to every child, regardless of means. In 1961, patterns of occupation, citizenship, and world affairs have so changed that we must set a higher goal. We must assure ourselves that every talented young person who has the ability to pursue a program of higher education will be able to do so if he chooses, regardless of his financial means.

Today private and public scholarship and loan programs established by numerous States, private sources, and the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act are making substantial contributions to the financial needs of many who attend our colleges. But they still fall short of doing the job that must be done. An estimated one-third of our brightest high school graduates are unable to go on to college principally for financial reasons.

While I shall subsequently ask the Congress to amend and expand the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act, it is clear that even with this program many talented but needy students are unable to assume further indebtedness in order to continue their education.

I therefore recommend the establishment of a 5-year program with an initial authorization of $26,250,000 of State-administered scholarships for talented and needy young people which will supplement but not supplant those programs of financial assistance to students which are now in operation.

Funds would be allocated to the States during the first year for a total of 25,000 scholarships averaging $700 each, 37,500 scholarships the second year, and 50,000 for each succeeding year thereafter. These scholarships, which would range according to need up to a maximum stipend of $1,000, would be open to all young persons, without regard to sex, race, creed, or color, solely on the basis of their ability—as determined on a competitive basis—and their financial need. They would be permitted to attend the college of their choice, and free to select their own program of study. Inasmuch as tuition and fees do not normally cover the institution's actual expense in educating the student, additional allowances to the college or university attended should accompany each scholarship to enable these institutions to accept the additional students without charging an undue increase in fees or suffering an undue financial loss.

IV. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The National Vocational Education Acts, first enacted by the Congress in 1917 and subsequently amended, have provided a program of training for industry, agriculture, and other occupational areas. The basic purpose of our vocational education effort is sound and sufficiently broad to provide a basis for meeting future needs. However, the technological changes which have occurred in all occupations call for a review and reevaluation of these acts, with a view toward their modernization.

To that end, I am requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an advisory body drawn from the educational profession, labor-industry, and agriculture as well as the lay public, together with representation from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, to be charged with the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the current National Vocational Education Acts, and making recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

CONCLUSION

These stimulatory measures represent an essential though modest contribution which the Federal Government must make to American education at every level. One-sided aid is not enough. We must give attention to both teachers' salaries and classrooms, both college academic facilities and dormitories, both scholarships and loans, both vocational and general education.

We do not undertake to meet our growing educational problems merely to compare our achievements with those of our adversaries. These measures are justi-

fied on their own merits—in times of peace as well as peril, to educate better citizens as well as better scientists and soldiers. The Federal Government's responsibility in this area has been established since the earliest days of the Republic—it is time now to act decisively to fulfill that responsibility for the sixties.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *February 20, 1961.*

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this message from the President represents a dynamic thrust in an area that has long been neglected. We of the Committee on Education and Labor have geared ourselves to go to work immediately on this subject. We expect the bills themselves to come to us this Wednesday, and the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the general Subcommittee on Education, will immediately start hearings; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] will introduce one phase and the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], chairman of the Select Committee on Education, will also immediately start hearings on her phase—scholarships. We expect to move ahead with a minimum of delay in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress will be an exhilarating experience for us all. It will be especially so, I believe, for those of us who have been involved in the continuing and frustrating efforts to secure the enactment of legislation embodying the principle of Federal aid for education.

It will be an experience to serve under the leadership of the distinguished and able gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. To the chairmanship of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. POWELL brings an understanding of the problems of our schools, and a sympathy for those problems which is equaled by few and surpassed by none.

Those of us who have suffered the frustrations of the past 6 or 8 years in this legislative area will appreciate, too, the opportunity to have the kind of Presidential leadership which John F. Kennedy offers in his message of today to the Congress. President Kennedy's devotion to the cause of education has been demonstrated in the other body, and, if further proof of his commitment to the needs of our schools were needed, today's incisive and persuasive message would provide it.

President Kennedy, in his message has correctly stated that "the human mind is our fundamental resource." In conformity with this principle, it is my hope that we can go forward in the 87th Congress, with a program of comprehensive development of our intellectual resources, similar in spirit to the program of comprehensive development of our natural resources, which has been the keynote of our policies in that field.

The principle of comprehensive development, Mr. Speaker, involves the concept that resources, of all kinds, should be utilized in such a way as to make possible their greatest use for the greatest number, and for the widest cross section of our people. Comprehensive development rejects alike the notion that power alone or navigation alone or fishing alone or recreation alone is the sole criterion for development of a great river. Instead we seek to find that plan which will meet as many of the problems as possible, for the benefit of the entire public.

Such a program is necessarily complex. No one bill, no single proposal, no legislation limited to the solution of one problem, will serve our duty of making America's schools equal to the task which history has thrust upon them. Schoolrooms are not enough, teachers' salaries are not enough, college classrooms alone are not the shortage, scholarships alone will not close the education gap which separates our intellectual resources from our Nation's needs.

President Kennedy's package represents a comprehensive approach to the fundamental problems confronting our schools. Some of these bills will go, when introduced, to the Education and Labor Committee. Some of these will, I am given to understand, go to my own Select Subcommittee on Education. I am sure that the majority of the members of the full committee will give early and favorable consideration to these bills, and I can definitely state that the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on the bills referred to us, before another month is out. With the active support of the President, which has for so many frustrating years, been the vital missing ingredient, it is my expectation that we can have a bill on the House floor—and on the statute books—before the next academic year begins.

The President's proposals, Mr. Speaker, are the cornerstone upon which we can build the kind of educational system that a 20th-century America needs. With these proposals a part of the declared public policy of this Nation, the States, the local governments, the public and private institutions of higher learning can, working together, offer to the young men and women who will be tomorrow's leaders the kind of educational opportunity that a free people must have if they are to remain free.

I do not think I am an alarmist when I state that America's survival as a free nation is at stake in the present struggle for adequate schools.

If we continue to sit idly by while our schools bulge at their seams, while young Americans find no way to use their talents and their energies, because our colleges are overcrowded, then we will soon find a generation of Americans ill equipped to deal with the complex and fundamental questions that a free people must be able to decide.

Our schools hold more than the key to the space race. They are vital to more than our immediate defense needs. They are the one set of institutions upon which tomorrow already rests. It is in our hands to decide whether that foundation is adequate.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special Subcommittee on Labor may sit this afternoon while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take it that generally these requests are limited to the time when the House is engaged in general debate, and I assume in all probability that that is what the arrangement will be this afternoon.

Mr. POWELL. It is the understanding, as I am informed by our majority leader, that there will be no legislation this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]?

There was no objection.

MRS. WILLA B. ESLICK

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it saddens me greatly to inform the Members of the House of the death of a former Member of Congress from my hometown of Pulaski, Tenn.—Mrs. Willa B. Eslick. Mrs. Eslick was elected to fill the unexpired term of her husband, the late Edward E. Eslick, who died on the floor of the House while speaking on behalf of a veterans bonus bill, thus being especially remembered by veterans of World War I.

Having been elected on August 4, 1932, Mrs. Eslick served during the 72d Congress, until March 3, 1933. She represented the district in Tennessee which I now have the privilege of representing; and it gave me great pleasure to have her sit on the platform when I opened my race for Congress in 1954. She maintained an active interest in politics throughout her life; and, only last October, Mrs. Eslick sat on the platform when the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, came to Pulaski to speak in behalf of the Democratic candidates in the past election.

Mrs. Eslick was born in Fayetteville, Lincoln County, Tenn., attended private schools, Dick White College and Milton College, Fayetteville, Tenn., Winthrop Model School and Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn., and Metropolitan College of Music and Synthetic School of Music, New York City, N.Y.; during the

First World War, she served as chairman of the Giles County Council of National Defense; and was a member of the State Democratic Committee.

In the passing of our beloved friend, Willa Eslick, the State of Tennessee has lost one of her most distinguished daughters. I shall miss her particularly, for I valued her counsel and advice and, above all, her warm friendship. Her memory will live on in the highest traditions in the history of her district, State, and Nation—and in the hearts of her many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of our late former colleague, Mrs. Willa B. Eslick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of a former Member, the late Mrs. Willa B. Eslick, of Tennessee.

Mrs. Eslick was the first woman to serve in the House from Tennessee, and she was an outstanding and beloved Congresswoman.

She was a native of Fayetteville, Lincoln County, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. She resided in Pulaski, Giles County, Tenn., which formerly was in the district I represented. She was a member of a most distinguished family of my State and was a grand lady of Tennessee and the Southland. She was a fine example of the greatness of a noble woman with ability to endure crises and still carry on nobly.

After the late Honorable Edward E. Eslick, her husband, died on the floor of the House while speaking on behalf of veteran legislation, Mrs. Eslick had the courage, ability, and determination to carry on and was elected to succeed him for his term of office and serve in the finest tradition.

Mrs. Eslick was a most charming and engaging woman, greatly interested in the public affairs of this Nation, and lent her presence to public gatherings and political meetings in our State in the advancement of the Democratic candidates and the philosophy of the Democratic Party. She was considered one of the grand ladies of my State, and I wish to convey an expression of sympathy to the members of her family in Tennessee.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 175) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That EDWARD J. DERWINSKI of Illinois be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the bill approved by the administration, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain areas of the United States. This is a bill in which many of my colleagues are deeply interested.

It will be known as the Area Redevelopment Act. There are many areas of the country deeply distressed today by reason of persistent and substantial unemployment. In some areas this has existed for years. It is time the Federal Government took some action to help these people who are in such distress. It is not only a condition of supreme importance to the people of these areas but it is also a matter of grave concern to the Nation. We cannot attain full economic growth until these conditions are alleviated. To do so would give us strength at home and add to our prestige abroad.

The bill will be set for hearing at the earliest practicable date. Mr. PATMAN is the chairman of the subcommittee to which the bill will be referred.

UNEMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party suffers from a strange blindness when human problems are concerned.

An excellent example of this sight difficulty is provided in the current discussion of our economic and employment problems.

Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK, the congressional leaders, cannot see any economic cloud on the horizon. All is fair and bright. In fact, they prefer not to talk about the jobs and hours of work. They even warn us ominously about the danger of talking ourselves into a recession.

Well, for the information of the gentlemen, we are in a recession right now.

In the three major areas of my district, Torrington, Ansonia-Derby, and Waterbury, the amounts of unemployed of the total working force are, respectively, 12.2, 12.3, and 10.8 percent.

In these same areas, unemployment compensation claims are 2,331, 1,658, and 6,144.

Of course, these figures do not take into consideration reduced hours of work of those who are still technically employed. The average week worked in Connecticut declined from 40 hours to 38 from November through December.

These figures can be matched in many, if not most, areas of the Nation. The least the Republican Party can do is take notice of the problem. It is this lack of interest in the welfare of the average person on the part of its leaders which has caused the Republican Party to become the minority party in the Nation.

Now, I will admit that the question of what to do about the recession is a difficult one. President Kennedy has made certain recommendations to Congress and he has taken certain steps by Executive order to speed up procurement and hasten contract-letting in order to stimulate the economy. On the other hand, a respectable school of economists believes that we are now over the hump and that the economy will revive by its own momentum from this point on.

My own approach is to support the middle-of-the-road course of the President which prescribes short-range stimulation but also adopts a wait-and-see attitude on extreme remedies such as a general tax cut.

It is apparent that Messrs. DIRKSEN and HALLECK are committing the Republican minority in the Senate and the House to a hopeless course. Failing even to admit that a recession exists prevents taking adequate steps to cure it. Of course, the answer is that the Republican leadership is afraid to admit that we are in an economic pause because then people will realize that this recession began under the auspices of the late administration.

Well, the people of this country are too intelligent to be hoodwinked. They know when business is good and jobs are plentiful. And they know the opposite as well.

They also know that leadership—such as that of Messrs. DIRKSEN and HALLECK—which is the accepted and overwhelmingly supported leadership of the Republican Party in Congress will not and should not have the support of the Nation.

WASTE OF MILITARY MANPOWER

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have high hopes that the new Secretary of Defense—an able man with a great record of achievement in both academic and business fields—will move swiftly and effectively to end the colossal waste of our precious treasure of military manpower that has prevailed.

With our armed services needing every available man for defense duties, I am sure that Secretary McNamara will act to reverse the old policies under which men trained at great expense in military specialties have been assigned to nonmilitary duties which are either unnecessary or could better be performed by civilians.

I believe the Secretary of Defense will be as shocked as I was to learn of two recent memorandums issued at Fort Monmouth, N.J.

After the furor over training manuals last year, it would appear that the military might have learned a lesson. But no—one of these memorandums is entitled "Grocery Bagging" and consists of a page of detailed instructions on how to fill bags of groceries in the commissaries.

The other memorandum is a welcome to the men assigned to the commissary. It makes a statement that will startle our millions of unemployed, namely, that the soldiers were assigned there because civilians could not be found to fill the jobs. This, of course, is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, if there has to be a choice, we can afford a grocery bag lag more than a missile lag.

We need our trained fighting men in units where they can contribute significantly to our national defense. We need them in the jobs for which they entered the service, not as grocery baggers.

And we need a better and greater sense of responsibility in the services than one which not only has so little regard for the proper use of trained military men, but which then compounds its offense by wasting time and money in the issuance of a training manual on how to put groceries properly into a paper bag.

The soldiers who brought these memorandums to my attention told me of their various military skills, of their desire to be on truly military assignment, and also of their disillusionment with a system that relegated them to grocery bagging.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting copies of these two memorandums to the attention of the House. I hope they will be read not only here but in the Pentagon, and that action will follow to end this utterly fantastic waste of men not only at Fort Monmouth but at every post in all the services.

The job of our military services is to defend America, not to fill grocery bags.

Here are the texts of the memorandums:

GROCERY BAGGING

Nothing irks a customer more than a poorly packed bag of groceries. If packed in lopsided fashion, it can become an awful burden. If packed in unbalanced style, it can become an awful mess. If packed in a loose manner, it can become an awful waste. Conversely, packing a customer's grocery bag properly builds good will and increases your service. The bagger, whether bag boy or checker, sells no groceries, just courtesy and efficiency. On this page are a few suggestions for good bagging.

1. Plan the packing: Open the bag fully; a partially opened bag can be easily torn. If more than one bag must be used, pack them with equal weight for easy carrying.

2. Get the right start: Make a solid base by putting the heavy packages and cans at the bottom. They pack solidly.

3. Use extra care: To prevent soaked bags and bag breakage, use waxed bags for wet vegetables, frozen foods, and ice cream (aluminum foil bags are also good for packing ice cream).

4. Watch the perishables: Pack eggs, berries, bread, tomatoes, and other crushable items near the top of the bag. (Inept baggers generally fail in this and cause untold customers' complaints.)

5. Use small items: These, such as candy and cigarettes, should be used to fill up the empty spaces and "holes" in the bag.

6. The finale: Put the cash register receipt in the bag, hand the bag to the customer (making sure she has a firm hold on it), smile, and say pleasantly, "Thank you!"

Thank you for your cooperation and support of the Army team.

———— ————,
Commissary Officer.

To All Details:

Welcome to the commissary, gentlemen, you are detailed here today, and your services are greatly appreciated by the quartermaster and the commanding general. Your work here is necessary because of our inability to secure needed civilian employees.

Commissary privileges are a benefit to you and other eligible military personnel. Please be very courteous to all customers, and above all, do not engage in any argument with them.

Thank you for your cooperation and support of the Army team.

———— ————,
Commissary Officer.

THE INDICTMENT OF EICHMANN BY ISRAEL FOR MASS MURDER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Chelsea Zionist District of Massachusetts, held its installation ceremonies at the Shurtleff Street Synagogue in Chelsea, on Sunday, February 12, 1961.

As principal speaker, I took for my subject: "The Eichmann Case." Adolph Eichmann will be tried by the Republic of Israel next month, as one of the major Nazi criminals who were responsible for the murder of over 6 million Jewish civilians, men, women, and children.

All humanity will read the day-to-day reports of this trial which involves a Nazi accused of the appalling crime of genocide; the cruel and methodical attempt to exterminate a whole people. The evidence against Eichmann is overwhelming. The world will wait to see if the rule of law will prevail to establish a precedent that will deter future aggressors from committing similar crimes against innocent peoples.

At the breakfast meeting of the Chelsea Zionist District it was my humble honor to be presented with an engraved citation on a plaque for outstanding service to the Zionist cause and to the welfare of the Jewish people.

The address that I delivered at the installation is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, at the very outset let me applaud the outgoing administration and congratulate the incoming officers for work well done and for confidence well placed. The Chelsea Zionist district has long been active in supporting the cause of Israel and urging its support by others. That its efforts have been rewarded is obvious. That its continued efforts are necessary is certain.

In 1947, on a very grim occasion, I visited this wonderful city of Chelsea. I was your speaker at the high school auditorium. The occasion was a welcome-home and a well-done to a brave Chelsea lad who was wounded by a pistol shot while resisting a boarding party from a British gunboat that intercepted a vessel running displaced Jews into Palestine past the British blockade. His name was William Millman, and he was a member of that gallant crew bringing a precious cargo of human souls to Palestine.

I told you then, in those horrible days, when the land of Israel was barred to the children of Israel, not to be dismayed, there will be a State of Israel. There was.

I told you that President Truman will speedily recognize that state. He did.

I also told you that the State of Israel will be readily admitted to the United Nations. It was.

I did not then, as I do not now, lay any claim to powers of prophecy. My predictions of things to come was based solely on things that went before. I knew then, as I know now, that a people who refused to perish through 2,000 years of travail and exile and the indescribable horrors of Hitler will not perish; that the spirit of faith and devotion to the moral principles of their forefathers, having been so tried, must eventually serve the purpose for which it was being tested.

I can now proudly state that my reasoning was correct. What I anticipated would happen, did happen. I also knew that a State of Israel will be a shining light in the gloomy world that followed World War II, because I knew it would be a democratic government in an area that was ruled by despots, backward and illiterate, and thus bring light where light was badly needed.

I am not disappointed. The State of Israel, founded on those virtues of liberty, equality, and faith, democratic and free, is not only an outpost for democratic institutions but is an example for all new nations, now appearing, to consider and emulate. The State of Israel is the strongest rebuff the reactionary, enslaving, soul-crushing doctrines of communism have so far received. It is no wonder that Russia wants to see Israel obliterated because the forces of darkness must always flee before the power of light.

Let the new nations of the world compare. Compare a new state, founded on democratic principles, the State of Israel, with other states weighted down under the despotism of communism. I ask, where do you find greater freedom of expression, thought, and soul; greater opportunity for spiritual expression, cultural development, and economic progress—in the democratically governed State of Israel or in Communist dominated Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and even Russia itself.

By example alone, the State of Israel has demonstrated the simple and eternal truth that he who lives by the sword shall perish by the sword and that it is not by might and not by strength but by spirit that man endures.

Therefore, when United States marine shipping was barred from the international Suez Canal because of having been used in trade with Israel; when foreign powers dared to dictate to us and classify our citizens and insist on which of our citizens they will allow in their countries and which they will not, and we submitted; when they professed to be peace loving yet refused to sit down and discuss peace terms with Israel, the nation which defeated them; when they asserted a serious refugee problem but did nothing to help their own for admittedly political reasons; when they caused our Navy Department to insert cancellation clauses in all its contracts with its suppliers whose supply ships are blacklisted by the U.A.R.; and, when in the face of all this, the State Department permitted the U.S. executive director of the World Bank to vote for a $56 million loan to the U.A.R. for widening the Suez Canal, I brought this to the attention of Congress on February 4, 1960.

I informed Congress that this affront to the United States, this insult to our people, to our principles, and to our professed sense of morality, was induced only because our Government, at that time, resorted to the use of platitudes and the comfort of temporary expediency for positive action. True facts and moral realities were swept under the rug.

I warned the administration that the pile of sweepings was so great that the administration itself would trip over it. The recent election proved how correct I was. I said that the debris must be cleaned out without delay or else in the eyes of the nations of the world we shall be considered not only weak in arms and technology but also in enforcing moral issues. You who have heard or read the inaugural address of President Kennedy know that you can expect the debris to be cleaned out without much delay.

A few weeks from today, a great and wonderful event will take place in Jerusalem.

Just as thousands of years ago there was brought down from Mount Sinai and given to the children of Israel a new moral code for all men to heed and use as a guide for civilized living (we call it the 10 Commandments), so in a few weeks, in Jerusalem, the State of Israel will open the eyes of the world to the realization that there can be no exceptions to the commandment "Thou shall not kill." I refer to the Eichmann case.

Rarely, since the framing of our Constitution and the writing of the Declaration of Independence has the concept of natural law been raised, as it will be raised in the coming trial of Adolph Eichmann.

As a lawyer, lawmaker, and human being the issues of jurisdiction and venue greatly interest me. We are aware of the accusations against Eichmann, his apprehension, his delivery to the State of Israel, and the diplomatic hauling and pulling that ensued.

There are many pros and cons offered relative to the trial of Eichmann in Israel. The arguments range all the way from those induced by anger to those advanced by thinkers, philosophers, and would-be philosophers and some not worthy of classifying.

During the course of argument the State of Israel will be the target of hatemongers, Communists, and assorted cranks.

There will also be true students of jurisprudence, dispassionate thinkers, and analysts who will dissent from what I am about to say by reason of their sincere beliefs. For such I have sincerest respect because our common purpose is to see justice done. We may merely differ as to the means of accomplishing that purpose.

I make no brief for the State of Israel, it certainly needs none from me. I advance no arguments for the prosecution for it will certainly prove its competence without my assistance. My remarks are intended to let the Israeli Government know that there are non-Jews who can find nothing wrong, morally or legally, in bringing before the bar of justice an accused who, if those who oppose my views were to prevail, would never be brought to trial. Eichmann would never have been brought to trial because no government went to seek him out. In fact there is a question whether or not he was given shelter from apprehension. Except for those who spent 15 years searching for him no individual or private group went to search for him. Now, however, the cry is over the right to try him.

Let us proceed to ask a few questions and offer a few answers.

The crime of murder is reprehensible. The sanctity of human life must never be violated. These are premises and assumptions to which all will agree. Now why do we agree to these simple assertions? Because there is a law on the books? Because the state will punish for such crime? Is that why we agree? Let us look closer. Assume there were no laws against murder or punishment for murder on the books, would the crime be less reprehensible? The answer of course is "No."

Therefore, whence comes this knowledge that murder is wrong, even without a law on the books saying so? It comes from the existence in man of a capacity to know some things with certainty, a God-given endowment. Such origin of law is commonly referred to as natural law and because of it we can assert certain truths such as described in the Declaration of Independence that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

There are some legal philosophers who do not subscribe to that school of thought. They hold that the real source of law springs from reason alone and not from any divine source. Parenthetically, may I ask, whence comes reason?

However, it is not my purpose to give a dissertation on legal philosophy. It is my purpose to state my view, with the concept of natural law always in mind, dealing as we are with a case where there are no precedents, because never have been similar facts and situations.

The question is asked whether the Eichmann trial, held in Israel, will contribute to the growth of international law and justice. The answer is comparatively simple. Where is the international tribunal to try this man? The International Court of Justice has no jurisdiction over the trial of individuals. The Nuremburg tribunal is no longer in existence. At best it was an imperfect court because in the words of Justice Robert H. Jackson "We cannot await a perfect international tribunal or legislature." Down through the years there is still no perfect international tribunal for handling cases such as Eichmann; there are no officers of the law, policemen if you prefer, to ferret out other Eichmanns and bring them before the court. What court is there to handle this case? Another imperfect international tribunal? Eichmann will be safer before an Israeli court which is determined to do impartial justice, and stand forever on its record, rather than before a temporary body convened to dispose of him and then disband.

It is argued that he should be returned to the scene of his crime on the general principle of law that a man is entitled to be tried where his offense is charged to have been committed. The short answer is that the crime charged against Eichmann is murder, not of an individual as an individual, but of individuals as belonging to a common foe, the Jew. Viewed in that light I see no difference in bringing Eichmann to stand trial in the land of the foe than it was to return Ezra Pound to the United States to stand trial in this country for acts of treason committed overseas in Germany, except possibly the fact that Ezra Pound was a U.S. citizen.

It is argued that when a crime is committed it is not against the individual who suffered the wrong, but against the community. To that I agree, and that is why I assert that the community of Jews against whom the crime was committed is now in Israel, and there is where Eichmann should be tried.

It is argued that Eichmann is charged with crimes against the Jewish people. How else should he be charged? In this State a criminal charge is the Commonwealth against defendant; in some States it is the State against defendant; in other States it is people against defendant. This is no great issue, because in law it is always substance and intent that is important rather than form.

It is argued that Eichmann will be tried before a hostile court, or at least a court that will be subject to criticism for lacking impartiality, and that no Israeli lawyer was willing to undertake his defense. I will point out that Israel has already indicated its tendency toward impartial justice. Witness the temperament of a people who would spend 15 years unceasingly scouring the corners of the earth to apprehend an accused charged with such a shocking, revolting crime, and when they found him did not kill him on the spot. The accused is entitled to a lawyer of his own selection. He has that lawyer, and Israel is paying him a much larger sum than our own courts customarily pay appointed counsel. The fact that no Israeli lawyer is defending the accused is good, because then it can never be said that the defense was not whole, complete, and diligent. The full glare of publicity will permit no deviation from fairness both to the defendant and to the people whom he offended.

It is argued that the trial should be held in Germany for the opportunity it would give to enlighten the public and especially the postwar generation. It is also argued in the same breath that he should not be tried in Israel because the trial would be merely a spectacle. Justice Jackson said that he was preparing a record of the Nuremberg trial—a record on which the defendants were being judged and on which history will judge us tomorrow. He made a vast record, volume after volume, depicting and describing the most horrifying activities of depraved men ever known in the annals of a sordid world. The record contains the names of Goering, Goebbels, Hitler, and the rest of that ignoble assembly of humanity's curse. The record is still there—gathering dust—a collector's item, while swastikas are being painted on walls and anti-Semitic outbursts appear from time to time in Germany.

If it is truly enlightenment that is sought for postwar Germany, and for that matter the rest of the world, then the Eichmann trial in Israel will highlight the workings of history and morality. It will cause everyone to wonder how, from the remnants of a defenseless people, who were to be obliterated, arose a free and proud nation; where crime will not go unpunished; where the guilty will not go free; and, where God is still the judge, the father, and the protector. It is His will that must be served, and not the will of the depraved and the powerful.

I must refute the argument that the State of Israel has no jurisdiction in the Eichmann case because it was not a State at the time of the alleged crime. I declare that the State of Israel never ceased being a State from the time its people were exiled by Rome in the year 70 A.D. All through the ages Palestine was merely a possession of different temporary conquerors who held the land, but not the people. The people of Israel never surrendered. They were exiled from it but never surrendered their claim to it, their hope and dream of returning to it. They preserved and studied, and observed wherever possible, its laws, its customs, its traditions, and its history. There was a land that mourned for its people even as its people mourned for it. The land refused to bear fruit, it became waste and dry and desert and nobody could make it bloom. Only upon the return of its people did the desert begin to bloom, and the groves begin to blossom and bear fruit. Never, since and during the exile, has Palestine shone with intellect, sang with freedom, and hummed with industry as it has since the State of Israel once again returned to her bosom, 12 years ago.

The legalist, however, may not care to view it from this historical and sentimental light. He will insist on more proof.

Hitler waged war against Jews not as French Jews, or Dutch Jews, or Polish Jews, or Hungarian Jews, but simply as Jews. Hitler did not recognize them as citizens of the countries he invaded. He recognized

them only as a people separate, distinct, and apart from all other nations and for whom he had a special plan—extinction. Hitler himself laid the ground rules for Eichmann's trial in Israel and as lawyers would say: "This is now the law of the case." He formed and grouped the Jews as a distinct people, and his crimes were committed against the Jewish people and were aimed and intended for the Jewish people wherever they were—including Great Britain and the United States should he have gotten over here.

Still more proof is asked? The Balfour Declaration asserted, long before Hitler, a recognition of Palestine as a homeland for Jews. After World War I, Palestine was mandated to Great Britain to be held in trust by her, and not to be annexed or to make its inhabitants her citizens. The Balfour Declaration was still in effect and force. After World War II the State of Israel received de-jure recognition.

During the time of Eichmann's alleged misdeeds there were governments in exile which we recognized, and who fought beside us. There was the French Government in exile, the Polish Government in exile, and the Dutch Government in exile, to name just a few, and they placed their forces in the field. The Jews of Palestine did likewise. The gallantry of her troops in Italy and north Africa, in Syria and wherever the enemy could be found is a thrilling story of bravery and glory.

Therefore, I conclude with the thought that it is not Eichmann alone who is to stand trial, but all mankind and its juridical system. If nature abhors a vacuum then why should it be in the nature of things that a crime go unpunished; that an accused go untried? If that be so, then we have discovered a vacuum in morality which must be abhorred and eliminated or else mankind perishes.

So I return to my earlier reference to natural law, first conceived by Socrates, elaborated upon by Aristotle, explained by St. Thomas Aquinas, and appearing in our own Declaration of Independence asserting the unalienable rights of man.

Upon that law, if there be no other, I support those who insist that the Eichmann case be tried in Israel. Maybe new law will be written because the old law did not hold, and if new law is to be written based on the principles of natural law then let it be written in Israel because the prophet Isaiah said "From out of Zion shall go forth law," so, from out of Zion shall go forth new law to be an example and a guide for all men, for all nations, for all time.

NATIONAL CLEAN-UP, PAINT-UP, FIX-UP CONTEST

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I take this means to call to the attention of the Congress an extremely worthwhile program that is in progress in this Nation. It is called the national clean-up, paint-up, fix-up contest and is sponsored by the National Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Bureau in Washington, D.C.

My home city of Bedford, Ind., entered into this program last year and to its great credit won recognition as being the second cleanest city in the United States in its class. I am proud of my home city and of the people who live there.

I am grateful to those mentioned in this article appearing in the Bedford Daily Times-Mail on February 16, 1961, for having the interest and for taking the initiative to participate in this program. Their efforts not only won an award for their home city. They also made Bedford one of the two cleanest cities in the Nation. The entire program gave my home city a goal for which to strive and resulted in a spirit of teamwork, cooperation, and togetherness that has meant much to the people and will mean more in the future.

Bedford, Ind., is a wonderful city in which to live and to rear a family. We have many things to offer which are normally limited to cities many times the size of Bedford. Programs such as the clean-up, paint-up, fix-up contest, and the way in which Bedford endorses, supports, and works on such projects, are typical of the friendly atmosphere of self-improvement which characterizes my home city.

The article follows:

OFFICIALS HAVE HIGHEST PRAISE FOR EFFORT; URGE BEDFORD TO TRY FOR FIRST

Bedford has been named the second cleanest city in the United States for its size. Morristown, Tenn., won first place for the sixth straight year, and already plans are underway to take the title away from that city.

For the first time in its history, Bedford was entered in the national clean-up, paint-up, fix-up contest sponsored by the National Clean-Up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Bureau in Washington, D.C.

"I think it's wonderful Bedford was able to win second place, considering this was the first time the city had ever entered the contest. You can't keep Bedford down," said Joe Beecher, president of the Bedford Chamber of Commerce, which sponsored the project.

"The thing to do now is to go after that No. 1 spot," Beecher said with enthusiasm. He said he understands that during the past 5 years that Morristown has won the award, it has gained approximately 600 new jobs for its people.

Mayor Lee Quackenbush, too, said, "I think we should be proud of winning second."

"We have the debris out of the way now, and the next step is to polish up the city and go for first place," Mayor Quackenbush added.

* * * * * *

Mrs. Agnes McGillvra served as chairman of the City Beautification Subcommittee of the Chamber of Commerec Civic Activities Committee headed by John Fancher.

Mrs. McGillvra was out of the city today, and consequently she could not be reached for a statement.

However, the notice of the contest winners was verified by Anna Gaines, business manager of the Bedford Chamber. Miss Gaines, who served as secretary of the beautification subcommittee, phoned Washington for verification.

RECEIVES TELEGRAM

Mayor Quackenbush, too, received a telegram from the national sponsor saying:

"Congratulations. In the final judging of the 1960 National Cleanest Town Contest, your city has been awarded second place in its population category.

"Please extend this good news to everyone who had a part in your program. Your engraved trophy will soon be shipped."

Bedford was judged in the 10,000 to 25,000 population category.

Other members of the City Beautification Subcommittee who promoted the gigantic cleanup campaign last year were Mrs. A. C. Voris, Sr., Horace Richardson, Jerry Allen, Mary Jo Bolton, Mrs. Paul Chase, Mrs. J. Robert Edwards, Ed Grogan, Mrs. Howard T. Hammel, Wayne Hirscher, Mrs. Edward "Ted" Jones, Mrs. Robert Leahy, Mrs. S. E. Osborne, Mrs. L. C. Smith, Jr., Mayor Quackenbush, Mrs. John D. Walls, Mrs. Darrell E. Zink, Mrs. Horace Richardson, Mrs. Clarence Donovan, Mrs. William E. Jenner, Mrs. J. E. Kenworthy, Mrs. J. B. Wohlfeld, Mrs. Lois Wray, Wayne Hammond, Omar Jewell, Dr. K. T. Edmonds, and Mrs. C. L. Athey.

ALLOCATION OF IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL OIL FOR USE AS FUEL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point in the RECORD a statement I made today at a public hearing called by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, in connection with a review now underway into the matter of allocating imports of residual oil for use as fuel. This hearing was held in the Department of the Interior Auditorium, in Washington.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT PUBLIC HEARING CALLED BY SECRETARY OF INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL, IN CONNECTION WITH REVIEW NOW UNDERWAY INTO THE MATTER OF ALLOCATING IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL OIL FOR USE AS FUEL—DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 20, 1961

Mr. Secretary, Members of Congress, and others who have come to this hearing to testify on the issue of mandatory restrictions on the import of residual fuel oil, I congratulate the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, for his understanding of the emergency, and for his realistic action in authorizing an increase of 100,000 barrels daily in the import of residual fuel oil through March 31.

The Secretary's purpose was to protect the consumers. He was right in stating that the increase was needed because severe weather has reduced east coast stocks and users of the fuel might face short supplies and rising prices.

The Government's residual oil import restriction program, in effect for 2 years, has hindered the economic growth of New York and New England. All of our industrial fuel—oil, gas, and coal—must be imported from other States and other countries because we have no commercial deposits of our own. As a result, fuel costs in New England are 50 percent higher than in the country as a whole. These higher costs not only place an unfair burden on the individual consumer, but on industry as well.

In our situation, we must have an adequate supply of fuel from a competitive market, free from outside monopolistic pressures that would force us to pay even higher prices for essential fuel, or turn back the clock to unreliable and uneconomic sources of supply.

Remember that a number of our communities are classified as "distressed areas" or "areas of substantial labor surplus," and have been in this predicament for 7 years. We have not sought a solution to our problems by forcing other sections of

the country, through direct or indirect action by the Federal Government, to maintain our once dominant textile industry. We faced up to the inescapable fact that we could only retain a part of our textile industry, and would have to compensate for the loss, by making the transition to other forms of economic enterprise. That we are doing, but in the process we cannot afford to be handicapped by artificial restrictions designed to give favored treatment to other regions, or other industries.

We from the east coast appear before this hearing not only to ask for a further increase in residual fuel import quotas, but to plead for the elimination of these controls.

We maintain that there was no justification for this program in the first place. It should be noted that domestic refiners have been primarily concerned with crude oil imports and have never considered residual oil imports a real threat because residual oil is what's left after gasoline and othef products have been refined from crude oil. Residual is, therefore, not an important domestic product.

A declaration that the national security was endangered by the rising level of oil imports was the basis for prohibiting the free import of residual oil. On the contrary, imports should be encouraged in order to halt the downward trend in domestic reserves and production capacity, so that, in the event of a national emergency, the deficit in domestic petroleum supplies would be minimized.

Domestic production of residual oil is not enough to meet the Nation's needs. It is significant that even those who advocate import restrictions admit that imports are necessary to supplement domestic production.

The entire oil import restrictions program was based on the opinion of the OCDM that these imports threatened the domestic oil industry. But domestic oil has little interest in its "stepchild"—residual oil. Restricting imports of residual might bring minor benefits to the domestic coal industry, but the Government's concern for the coal industry was to protect it from foreign competition. The case for import restrictions on residual is weak. The effort to switch users back to coal would be self-defeating, because most of them, if subjected to this coercion, would turn to natural gas instead.

If the Government continues restrictive policies in order to find additional markets for coal, it would have to impose end-use control on all competitive fuels.

Such Federal controls would replace the normal competition among all fuels used by consumers, and would raise a roadblock in the path of economic growth.

As the residual fuel oil import quotas imposed on the east coast are simply a screen to conceal a step backward, we ask for the elimination of this unworkable policy. It has artificially forced up prices of residual fuel oil for consumers in New York and New England.

As long as it continues to limit the availability of a basic fuel, it will cripple the potentiality of these important industrial areas to participate in the progress of the Nation.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 the Geneva nuclear-test ban talks will resume. It is a critical date for the country and for the world. Unless at this juncture when a change in administration makes it possible these talks are put on a realistic basis, it is unlikely that negotiation and agreement as an instrument for reducing international hazards can be employed for several years to come. It is vital that the principle be nailed down that international agreements in which the United States participates shall, in fact, command compliance from the parties. This means negotiating only on controllable subjects and then writing inspection and violations detection machinery into the agreement posing enough risk of cheaters being caught to deter violations.

Specifically in connection with the test-ban talks, this means limiting their scope to atmospheric tests and large yield underground tests. These only are controllable under present circumstances. It also means lifting the self-imposed U.S. moratorium on nuclear weapons tests. Under date of February 16, I recommended these steps to the President in the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to know you are devoting personal attention to the problem of the Geneva nuclear test ban negotiations scheduled for resumption March 21. This letter is written to urge upon you two basic recommendations relating to these negotiations which, in my mind, are fundamental to the security of the United States and the pursuit of safe and sane arms control in the interests of all humanity.

These recommendations are the following:

First, that you bring to an end the voluntary, self-imposed moratorium on nuclear testing by the United States which was established by your predecessor and has been continued by you. Continuance of the moratorium, as the negotiations have been prolonged, has raised a serious collateral issue regarding its wisdom or unwisdom in terms of U.S. security. This collateral issue has confused the basic issues of the negotiations themselves and has become an impediment to them. It has become a further impediment in that it has established an uncontrolled test ban which may, in fact, be more desired by the U.S.S.R. than a controlled one. Thus it takes away from one side any urgency to complete formal negotiations.

Second, that the scope of negotiations be henceforth limited to the kinds of testing reasonably subject to inspection and control, namely, atmospheric testing and underground testing about 20-kiloton yields. This would exclude from negotiations the following:

1. Testing in space which competent authorities have told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy cannot be detected.

2. Testing underground of devices yielding less than 20 and more than 5 kilotons, which our best authorities tell us can be picked up by the 21-station long and medium seismic wave detection system agreeable to the U.S.S.R., but which cannot be reliably distinguished from earth tremors.

3. Testing underground of devices yielding less than 5 kilotons which the same authorities declare could not be detected at all by the 21-station network and would require some 200 additional short seismic wave detection stations to which the U.S.S.R. undoubtedly will not agree.

I make these recommendations without reliance on the substantial arguments presented by those who see a basic need for nuclear testing to improve the Nation's security. I urge them without reference to the arguments presented by others who claim there is substantial advantage in banning tests, irrespective of whether the ban can be policed.

For whatever may be the advantages of either course, they are inconsequential compared to the advantage to be gained by quickly establishing the principle that henceforth the scope and terms of international agreements in which the United States participates shall, in fact, command compliance by the parties.

By reopening the test ban negotiations in the manner I am urging, Mr. President, you have the opportunity to establish that principle.

Until it is established, confidence cannot be engendered that agreement will accomplish their intended purposes. Without such confidence, power will continue to control international relationships and the inherent hazards of constantly developing armaments will remain.

If you take that opportunity, a beginning will be made toward substituting for power in the relationships between East and West the process of realistic negotiation and meaningful agreement.

If you reject the opportunity by permitting negotiation toward an all-inclusive "paper agreement" which fails to command compliance with many of its provisions, hopes for enhancement of the world's security from armed conflict by meaningful agreements regarding controllable hazards could be dashed for as long as you occupy the White House.

Your choice will be indicated by whether you act to restore urgency to the negotiations and limit their scope to areas where risk of discovery of noncompliance is reasonably high and, therefore, compliance reasonably commanded, or you permit them also to encompass areas where risk of discovery is small and, therefore, a premium placed on noncompliance.

Your choice will either commit the Nation to a principle offering real promise for further arms control and hazards reduction or embark you and your administration on the slippery course of agreement for agreement's sake. Today's facts of international life being uniquely what they are, should you choose the second course it is unlikely any subsequent opportunity would be presented you to return to the first one.

I am attaching additional material in support of the recommendations I have made and close by again urging them upon you.

Very sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

The additional material mentioned in the last paragraph of the letter pertained to the problems of arms control relating to the nuclear test ban negotiations and constitutes the subject of my discussion here today.

Arms control involves a multilateral approach to armament policy, including not only the amount and kinds of weapons and forces in being, but also their development, deployment, and utilization in periods of relaxation, tension, or war. It aims at the reduction of international hazards below levels existing without agreement rather than at armaments per se.

Arms control may be accomplished by formal agreement such as that concerning Anarctica or by tacit agreement such as that which limited the scope and intensity of the Korean war. It is to be

distinguished from disarmament which connotes a general reduction of armaments to minimum levels prescribed by some authority.

To be negotiable a specific arms control proposal must offer a reduction of hazards to all the parties involved. It is naive to expect one power to negotiate a proposal reducing the hazards facing another, but which does little to reduce its own.

To be realistic a specific arms control proposal must in fact reduce hazards. If its short- or long-range effect so weakens one side that an inviting opportunity for successful armed aggression is presented to the other, it is defective because it increases rather than reduces hazards.

Basically, armaments are servants of the national purposes, one of which is survival. Minimum armaments necessary for survival are difficult to assess since the word, in this context, means more than just physical survival of individual persons. It also encompasses survival as a nation, survival of standards of living, and survival of the society or civilization of which the Nation is part.

Abstract questions have been raised as to the morality of certain armaments, particularly nuclear weapons. However, from the standpoint of arms control, the question is not so much the morality of particular weapons stocked in defense arsenals to guarantee survival as the immorality either of failing to make the guarantee or using more violence than needed to meet it.

As to national purposes over and above survival, the extent to which particular nations are willing to employ armaments to achieve them is a matter of individual policy. Brief consideration of these particulars is essential in achieving an intelligent military posture and engaging on safe and sane courses of arms control.

Often we regard our own national purposes only in the restricted scope of defense and survival. Actually, and more apparent to others than ourselves, they are wider in scope. The United States was born in revolution against the older orders of tyranny. Always it has stood for the right of all people to national and individual freedom. In this regard the United States today remains as truly a revolutionary force in the world as it was in 1776. As such we pose a steady threat to societies rejecting the principles of freedom. Its significance from the Sino-Soviet bloc's viewpoint is emphasized by De Tocqueville's still valid observation made over a century ago, "The principal instrument of America is freedom, of Russia, servitude."

The American threat is generally regarded as moral, not military, in nature since rather consistently we have reserved the use of arms for defensive security purposes and employed nonmilitary means to implement our external goals. But to the Sino-Soviet bloc this amounts only to a difference in the nature of the threat. It does not diminish its magnitude. To the non-Communist world U.S. armaments in and of themselves are not seriously regarded as threats to world peace. But U.S. goals, laudable though they may be, are regarded by many as possibly dangerous enough in Communist eyes to provoke an attack, to which U.S. armaments, having failed to deter, would respond. That is the fear.

The fear is heightened because the Sino-Soviet bloc consistently has made clear its purpose that the world shall be communized. It views itself locked in total conflict with all that is non-Communist for as long as needed to achieve this end. Further, its philosophers view the conflict extending across the full spectrum of human activity—from the least violent to the most violent actions in which man can indulge. Communist dogma insists that the degree of violence employed at a particular time shall be fixed by historical circumstances. It is that degree which best advances Communist goals. Thus, to the Communists cold war and hot war are but the two sides of the same strategic coin, conflict, to be rotated as needed best to reflect circumstances of the moment.

With the possibility of war above zero, the basic goals of East and West in conflict and mutual distrust high, discussion of arms control may seem academic. It is not because there are hazards and costs of mutual advantage to all to reduce. Accidental war is an example. Spiraling costs of competition in weapons technology is another. However, the difficulties of going about it are immense.

Basically involved is determining what is to be controlled, how to control it, the consequences of violation to innocent parties, and the penalties for violation upon guilty parties. Each is interdependent with the other.

What is agreed to be controlled must be inherently controllable, otherwise means for control cannot be devised. Actual control of even inherently controllable subjects will not be achieved in fact unless the control system confronts a potential violator with more than a nominal risk of getting caught. The consequences of violation must not be so disastrous to one party that noncompliance by another is encouraged. Nor can the penalty facing a would-be violator be too insignificant to create a reasonable deterrent to violation.

It is obviously unwise to negotiate on arms control proposals that fail to meet these criteria. At most only an illusion of hazards reduction can be achieved. At best only time and opportunity for meaningful negotiation are lost. At worst, whole nations could be entrapped and perish.

How to approach arms control proposals to meet these criteria is more difficult to assess than how not to. But at least, risk of entrapment can be lessened and meaningful avenues spotlighted by discussing and eliminating past failures. Amongst these are:

First. Unilateral disarmament: Admitting its patent inadequacies, unilateral disarmament is nevertheless urged by some on the theory that nuclear war would destroy the human race and life, even in slavery, is preferable to extinction. The theory is defective in that as terrible as the consequences of nuclear war may be, and thus vital the need to reduce its possibility, they do not include extinction of the human race and to most people they are preferable to the consequences of surrender to communism.

Independent studies by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Dr. Herman Kahn of a hypothetical 1,500 megaton surprise nuclear attack on the United States indicated the following:

Genetic effects: An increase in children born seriously defective of about 25 percent from the current level of 4 per 100 of all births to 5 per 100. This is a large penalty since it would have to be paid through 30 to 40 generations. But it is far from annihilation of the human race.

Medical effects: Bone cancer, leukemia, and other life-shortening effects of radiation would amount to 1 to 2 years for lighter exposures and 5 to 10 years for heavier exposures. In any case, life will go on.

Economic effects: Assessing casualties in the 60 million range and semitotal destruction of the 53 standard metropolitan areas, expect full recuperation, that is, restoration of immediate preattack living standards, within 5 to 10 years. This is far from national suicide.

By way of contrast, my own research on the consequences of a hypothetical surrender and Communist takeover of the United States indicates complete destruction of Western society as we know it, reduction of living standards to bare subsistence levels, and the elimination of the United States as a nation. This study also shows that between 60 million and 100 million of the country's 180 million Americans would face extermination if genocide patterns consistently employed following Communist takeovers elsewhere were pursued.

Second. Uncontrolled disarmament: The idea of reducing tensions by progressive arms reduction, eventually to police force levels, was popular in the period between the World Wars. Controls in the nature of self-enforcing mechanisms were not common in the many proposals suggested. However, establishment of some kind of an international security system of mutual guarantees and pledges of assistance were conditions precedent in many of them. Uncontrolled disarmament proved infeasible because even amongst Western nations the problem of treaty violation proved insurmountable. Vis-a-vis the Communists who actively have utilized treaty violation as an instrument of policy, this approach is even more naive.

Third. Supranational authority: Article VIII of the League of Nations Covenant and chapter VII of the United Nations Charter envisioned a supranational authority to spike aggression, otherwise police international friction, and thereby sharply diminish the necessity for large national arms establishments. In both cases implementation foundered upon the troublesome matter of persuading nations to surrender up any of their sovereignty. A more basic weakness of this approach is that should

international amity reach the point where surrender of sovereignty could be negotiated, it would already have passed the point where the less complicated job of negotiating out troubles calling for a supranationed authority could be accomplished.

Fourth. Supranational technology trust: This approach was conceived by the Baruch plan freely offering up the U.S. nuclear technology monopoly to internationalization. Unfortunately this historic magnanimity failed to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons. Even though the United States agreed to destroy its nuclear stockpile, erasing the technology from the minds of our scientists was impossible and the Soviets were unwilling to forgo acquiring it for themselves. Apart from this circumstance, a general handicap to establishing international technology trusts is that weapons develop so swiftly and negotiations proceed so slowly that new systems become entrenched in military strategy before agreement to keep them out can be consummated.

Fifth. Prevention of surprise attack: Exemplified by the Soviet ground observer and Eisenhower "Open Skies" proposals, this approach to hazards reduction proved nonnegotiable because of the large gap between the value assigned to internal privacy by the Communist world's closed society and the free world's open society. Its feasibility is somewhat doubtful anyway due to the indistinguishability of training alert sorties by manned aircraft from a surprise attack sortie; and, the unlikelihood of a missile attack warning arriving before the maximum 30 minutes intercontinental flight time elapses. A unilateral approach to the problem is being taken by the United States in developing its Samos "spy in the sky" orbital surveillance system.

These various approaches having insufficiently satisfied the realistic criteria for hazards reduction in the nuclear era, and the need for it mounting, the United States proceeded to the Geneva test ban negotiations in 1958 with a fresh and promising new idea. It involves writing into formal agreement, along with the promises, so-called self-enforcing mechanisms to make more certain they are kept. Essentially this amounts to inspection and violations detection machinery aimed not at 100 percent efficiency, but posing enough risks of cheating being detected to deter it.

Unfortunately application at Geneva of the self-enforcing mechanisms principle has been clouded by the extension of negotiations into areas where it cannot be applied. This occurred because scientific data available at the beginning of the negotiations was inadequate to assess what testing can, and what testing cannot, be policed, either at all within the limits of present technology, or, within the limits of acceptability of available system to closed societies.

Further confusion has resulted from injection of the legitimate side issue of the wisdom or unwisdom of the United States continuing its self-imposed weapons test moratorium while negotiations drag on. It also undoubtedly has delayed negotiation in good faith since to the Soviets nontesting by the United States without controls on themselves undoubtedly appears preferable to concluding any agreement containing them. This obstacle can and should be removed promptly by ending the moratorium. Ending the moratorium could not result in withdrawal from the talks by the U.S.S.R. unless it has no real self-interest in continuing them. If this is the case, the talks will fail anyway and it is best to ascertain it sooner than later.

Scientific studies since 1958 adequately show that specifically uncontrollable without at least another 5 to 10 years, research are tests in outer space; that specifically uncontrollable are underground tests below 5 kilotons yield without the addition of some 200 short seismic wave detection stations in the U.S.S.R. and this is patently unacceptable to it; and, that only very qestionable control can be achieved by the 21-station medium and long seismic wave detection network acceptable to the U.S.S.R. because nuclear tests underground in the 5- to 20-kiloton range cannot reliably be distinguished from natural earth tremors.

All this means that only tests in the atmosphere and large-yield underground tests can be banned under controllable conditions, that is, either within scientific capabilities in existence or within the acceptable limits of intrusion upon national privacy of closed societies.

It also means that further negotiations at Geneva must be confined to controllable types of testing. If negotiations are continued toward inclusion of uncontrollable bans when the Geneva negotiations resume March 21, it will signal surrender of the one real hope the world now has to achieve a meaningful beginning on reducing its hazards. This is because it will signal abandonment by the United States of the last remaining approach on which safe and sane arms control can be based.

Those who emotionally and altruistically call for a first step at Geneva irrespective of the demands of U.S.S.R. negotiators do a disservice to all who realistically seek to make the world a safer place in which to live. For, unless the first step is toward nailing down the principle that parties to arms control agreement shall, in fact, observe what they promise, it is not a first step at all. It is two steps backward: first, to illusion, and second, to disillusion. Any such weakness would be relentlessly pursued to force our retreat many more steps on a journey of no return.

CIVIL REMEDIES PROVIDED TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. This bill is similar to one which I introduced in the 86th Congress which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

My bill is designed to introduce order into a body of Federal and State law that is now in confusion. The relief provided for by the act would be in addition to those rights and remedies otherwise available. In other words State jurisdiction over activities wholly intrastate in character will remain as it should, for if State remedies were entirely preempted, the result would be a no man's land, where neither State nor Federal law applied.

The bill I introduced in the 86th Congress was recently the subject of a favorable article in the January 1961 issue of the Yale Law Journal, by Thomas B. Bracken, entitled "Misrepresentation and the Lindsay Bill: A Stab at Uniformity in the Law of Unfair Competition." The article reviews the complex and confused state of the law on this subject and points up the need for reform.

The Lindsay bill is the work product of a distinguished group of lawyer members of the Committee on Trade Regulation of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. I have had the pleasure of working with this committee, which has rendered an extremely important public service. The committee has drafted an explanatory statement, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point. I think it desirable also, Mr. Speaker, to spread the bill out in full length in the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD immediately after the explanatory statement.

AN EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The Lindsay bill is designed "to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce." If enacted, it would create a new Federal statute dealing with unfair competition. The text of the bill itself is relatively simple, but the need for such a statute and the reasons for some of its provisions may require explanation.

The fundamental purpose of the bill is to provide a basis for the development of a uniform body of Federal law in the field of unfair competition. In the years prior to 1938, great progress had been made in this direction by the decisions of the Federal courts. Then the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Erie* v. *Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64 (1938)), denied the existence of a Federal common law and required instead that the Federal judiciary apply State law. There is obvious logical justification for this rule, because it prevents the accidental availability of Federal jurisdiction from affecting the law applicable to a given controversy. It is generally agreed, however, that this checkerboard approach is inappropriate for dealing with unfair competition. Modern business activities so frequently are national in scope that there is no serious dissent from the view that uniformity throughout the country in the law of unfair competition would be desirable.

Some commentators believed the problem had been solved by the passage of the Lanham Act in 1946. In particular, section

44 provides protection for foreign nationals against unfair competition, and also provides that citizens of the United States shall have all the benefits conferred by the act upon foreign citizens. It was thought that this would be the basis for Federal jurisdiction over unfair competition causes. The statute has been so construed only in the Ninth Circuit, however, so it is fairly clear that section 44 will not serve as the route to nationwide uniformity.

There is less doubt about the availability of Federal jurisdiction under section 43(a) of the Lanham Act. But that section has proved to have little practical significance. It is invoked only rarely; and, in any event, it is limited by its terms to false descriptions and false representations of origin.

The Lindsay bill attacks the problem directly by creating a new cause of action and giving exclusive jurisdiction over it to the Federal district courts, without regard to the amount in controversy or the diversity or lack of diversity of citizenship of the parties (sec. 8). The availability of this new cause of action does not diminish existing rights to proceed under State or other Federal law; it is specifically provided that relief pursuant to the proposed new statute shall be in addition to those rights and remedies otherwise available (sec. 4).

The heart of the bill is section 2, which lists the "unfair commercial activities" that are made actionable. The expression "unfair commercial activities" was selected deliberately because it was felt that "unfair competition" might be construed as a limitation. As additional assurance of a broad construction, section 3 provides that absence of competition between the parties shall not be a defense to an action brought under the statute.

The list of unfair commercial activities in section 2 represents a carefully chosen compromise between the futility of attempting to define every type of conduct intended to be prohibited, and the equal futility of simply stating that unfair acts shall be deemed unlawful. The former alternative, apart from its practical impossibility, would have created an environment in which defendants constantly could have sought justification for their acts under the expressio unius rule; while the latter would not have been sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for the desired uniformity of decision throughout the Federal judicial system.

There are just four subparagraphs in section 2. Although most of these are self-explanatory, a few comments may be helpful. Section 2(a)(3), in effect, is a Federal anti-dilution statute. Section 2(b) covers false or misleading statements "of fact" in order to avoid prohibiting anyone from stating his opinion. Since section 2(b) applies to statements about the goods or services of "either party," it includes trade libel as well as false advertising and thus removes any doubt about the availability of injunctive relief for this type of defamation. Section 2(c) is a deliberate catchall; in particular, the use of the expression "reasonable standards of commercial ethics" is intended to provide Federal judges with the opportunity to apply the liberal standards of such New York State decisions as *Dior* v. *Milton* and *Miller* v. *Universal*, free from the hampering effect of any archaic rulings in the States where they sit, or in their Federal circuits. The purpose of section 2 is to establish guideposts for the Federal courts that are definite enough to identify the principal types of unlawful activity and yet allow the flexibility that is essential in a field where rapid technological advances in business and communications constantly create new opportunities for exploitation by the unscrupulous few.

Patent and copyright infringement are excluded from the scope of "unfair commercial activities" by section 7. This was done to meet possible criticism that the new statute might otherwise be used to extend the scope or duration of a patent or copyright monopoly. It was not considered feasible or proper to exclude trademark infringement, because many forms of unfair commercial activities affect trademark rights, and also because the objection about extending duration does not apply to trademarks since they may continue in perpetuity.

The right of action against unlawful commercial activities is created by section 1 of the bill. The action is for an injunction; no damages may be recovered. There are several reasons for this. Plaintiffs in most cases of this nature are interested primarily in bringing about the cessation of the unlawful acts rather than collecting damages, which may be difficult to prove even in the best of circumstances. The elimination of any provision for damages should prevent the use of the new cause of action as the basis for strike suits. At the same time, it was felt that a party with a genuine claim should not be deterred from bringing an action because of its expense; accordingly, the bill provides that a judgment for costs, reasonable attorneys' fees and disbursements may be granted to a successful plaintiff in addition to injunctive relief.

Any person damaged or likely to be damaged by unfair commercial activities is entitled to sue under section 1. The phrase "likely to be damaged" is borrowed from section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (similar language will be found in sections 13 and 14, dealing with opposition and cancellation) while the troublesome concept "believes that he is" has not been carried over from the Lanham Act. The words "damaged or" were inserted to avoid any possible argument that the statute applied only where no damage had yet occurred. On the other hand, section 3 makes it clear that actual damage is not required as a prerequisite to suit.

The right of action under section 1 is available against unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce and the term "commerce" is defined in section 9 as "all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress." This makes it clear that the broadest possible scope is intended; specifically, intrastate acts that affect interstate commerce are covered. In addition, section 9 contains a statement of the intent of the statute, which includes the protection of any person engaged in interstate commerce against unfair commercial activities whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce.

Innocent publishers and broadcasters are protected by section 5, which not only makes the absence of knowledge or intent a defense in an action against a publisher or broadcaster, but provides specifically that the burden of proving knowledge or intent is on the plaintiff. Furthermore, in order to avoid unnecessarily severe economic consequences to media of communication, section 6 provides that relief under the statute shall not be available when the injunction would delay the dissemination of a particular issue of a periodical, broadcast of a radio or television program, or showing of a motion picture after the scheduled time, when the delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice, as distinguished from a device to evade the statute. A single false advertisement in a magazine, for example, would not hold up distribution of the entire issue even if the publisher did have knowledge; but the use of the same or similar advertisements in future issues could be enjoined.

The active support of this bill by all interested parties is urgently required.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person damaged or likely to be damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce shall be entitled to an injunction and a judgment for costs, reasonable attorney's fees, and disbursements in a civil action brought by that person against any person who has engaged in such activities.

SEC. 2. Unfair commercial activities under this Act shall be—

(a) the commission of any act or practice or the use of any statement which is likely (1) to cause confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the person charged therewith or (2) to cause confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of such person or (3) to dilute the distinctive quality of a trademark or trade name of another;

(b) the use for purposes of profit of any statement of fact as to the goods or services of either party which is false or misleading by reason either of misstatement or omission of a material fact;

(c) the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics; or

(d) the institution of an action under this Act in bad faith.

SEC. 3. Absence of competition between the parties, of actual damage to the person seeking protection, or of a public interest in such unfair commercial activities shall not be a defense to an action brought under this Act.

SEC. 4. The relief provided for by this Act shall be in addition to those rights and remedies otherwise available.

SEC. 5. Absence of knowledge or intent shall be a defense to any action brought under this Act against a publisher or broadcaster in respect of any contents of any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium and the person instituting the action shall have the burden of proving knowledge and intent in any action brought against such a publisher or broadcaster.

SEC. 6. Relief shall not be available under this Act in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical, the broadcast of any radio or television program, or the showing of any motion picture when restraining the appearance or performance of any particular issue of such periodical, program, or picture would delay its dissemination after the regular time therefor, and such delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of this Act or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order.

SEC. 7. This Act shall not apply to patent or copyright infringement.

SEC. 8. The district and Territorial courts of the United States shall have sole original jurisdiction and the circuit courts of appeal of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have sole appellate jurisdiction, of all actions whatsoever under this Act without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this Act .

SEC. 9. The intent of this Act is to regulate all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress by making actionable solely in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth herein thereby to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against such unfair commercial activities

whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce. In the construction of this Act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

1. The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, union, or other organization capable of suing or being sued in a court of law.

2. The term "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

3. Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

4. The term "trademark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others, any mark used in the sale or advertising of services to identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others, including without limitation the marks, names, symbols, titles, designations, slogans, character names, and distinctive features of radio or other advertising used in commerce, any mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization or any mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association or other collective group or organization, including marks used to indicate membership in a union, an association, or other organization.

5. The term "trade name" includes individual names and surnames, firm names and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations or the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial, agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. This Act shall be in force and take effect immediately upon its enactment but shall not affect any suit, proceeding or appeal then pending.

SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the "Unfair Commercial Activities Act".

FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE PROGRESS REPORT

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 4 years, it has been my great privilege to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee to the Foreign Service Institute. In that capacity I have had opportunity to see heartening progress made toward the goal of improved foreign language and career training for members of the Foreign Service.

As a result of expanded efforts by the Institute over the past 5 years, more than 1,000 officers, mainly class 8, have received both basic career and language training. An additional 600 officers, classes 4, 5, and 6, have had midcareer or specialized language or area training, while upwards of 200 senior officers, classes 1, 2, and 3, have been given special language, war college, or senior seminar training. While some of the benefits of this training will not be fully felt for perhaps another decade or until the junior officers attain higher positions, the training already received is a built-in asset for the Department and the Foreign Service which should prove invaluable in the future.

By providing our Foreign Service officers with the specialized knowledge essential to effective discharge of their varied international responsibilities, the Foreign Service Institute fulfills a vital function. In a report to the Secretary of State last October, the Advisory Committee commented upon the work of the Institute as follows:

While the Institute is comparatively new and is still in the process of building a recognized tradition, substantial progress and improvement are being aggressively sought. This committee expresses the considered view that the Foreign Service Institute is well staffed, operates at a reasonable cost, and effectively performs its work as a professional educational institution serving the special needs of the Government.

Certainly the Director of the Institute, Mr. Harold B. Hoskins, and his dedicated staff are to be commended for their unselfish efforts toward meeting the educational needs of the Foreign Service.

Since 1955, the rate of training for the entire Foreign Service has increased from 47 full-time man-years to an estimated 300.4 in fiscal year 1961. The estimated cost of training for this year is $4.7 million, of which approximately two-thirds is required to meet the salaries, travel, and per diem of the students, leaving approximately one-third for administration and teaching.

So that a clearer picture may be given of the training provided by the Institute, I am attaching two charts: one, a summary of training at the Foreign Service Institute, and two, languages taught under Foreign Service Institute direction in Washington or abroad, fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1960. Perhaps most striking about these statistics is the fact that 50 foreign languages are currently being taught under Foreign Service Institute auspices.

As the United States assumes ever greater international responsibilities, the need for properly trained diplomatic representatives will become more and more important. The Foreign Service Institute may be expected to play a key role in preparing members of the Foreign Service for their varied assignments.

Under leave to extend, I include the attached charts together with my remarks:

Foreign Service Institute—Summary of training

	Results, fiscal year 1960	Objectives, fiscal year 1961	Training plans, fiscal year 1962
I. LANGUAGE TRAINING			
A. Full time:			
FSI	327	265	339
Universities	2	2	3
Field schools	119	65	59
Other field locations	15	5	10
Total, full time	463	337	411
B. Part time:			
FSI:			
During working hours	70	70	70
Before working hours	249	249	249
Total, FSI	319	319	319
Oversea posts	2,723	3,210	3,210
Total, part time	3,042	3,529	3,529
Total, language training	3,505	3,866	3,940
II. FUNCTIONAL TRAINING			
A. Full time:			
FSI:			
Career training:			
Basic officers	179	220	264
Midcareer	70	60	80
Senior seminar	11	12	12
Subtotal	260	292	356
A. Full time—Continued			
FSI.—Continued			
Special functional training	388	427	452
Orientation	1,724	1,724	1,724
Seminars	84	102	95
Total, FSI	2,456	2,545	2,627
Universities	54	48	51
Armed services colleges	30	33	33
Rotational training	17	27	34
Total, full time	2,557	2,653	2,745
B. Part time			
FSI:			
Special functional training	100	100	100
Seminars	178	373	373
Correspondence courses	700	700	700
Total, FSI	978	1,173	1,173
Universities:			
Local	192	192	192
Overseas	5	5	5
Correspondence courses	23	23	23
Total, part time	1,198	1,393	1,393
Total, functional training	3,755	4,046	4,138
Grand total	7,260	7,912	8,078

Languages taught under FSI direction in Washington or abroad, fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1960

	FSO's with S–2 or above
Afrikaans	7
Amharic	2
Arabic	69
Bengali	1
Bulgarian	8
Burmese	3
Cambodian	3
Chinese	75
Amoy	----
Cantonese	----
Mandarin	----
Creole	1
Czech	29
Danish	51
Dutch	50
Finnish	19
Flemish	----
French	1,784
German	1,091
Greek	42
Hausa	----
Hebrew	13
Hindustani & Urdu	28
Hungarian	21
Icelandic	4
Indonesian	33
Italian	457
Japanese	57
Korean	7
Kurdish	----
Laotian	1
Malayalam	----
Malayan	14
Norwegian	69
Papiamento	----
Persian	19
Polish	43
Portuguese	204
Pushtu	----
Rumanian	11
Russian	166
Serbo-Croatian	45
Singhalese	----
Spanish	1,188
Swahili	2
Swedish	63
Tagalog	----
Tamil	2
Thai	11
Turki	----
Turkish	29
Urdu (see Hindustani)	----
Vietnamese	9
Visayan	----

NOTE.—With the exception of Flemish, Pushtu, and Rumanian, all of the above languages are currently being taught at FSI/Washington or at oversea posts.

DO NOT CUT THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, President Kennedy told the Congress and the people of the United States something of what he called "the harsh enormity of the trials through which we must pass in the next 4 years."

In the preparation for exercise of his leadership as Commander in Chief to meet worldwide challenges to our freedom and our way of life, the President said:

I have, therefore, instructed the Secretary of Defense to reappraise our entire strategy—our ability to fulfill our commitments—the effectiveness, vulnerability, and dispersal of our strategic bases, forces, and warning systems—the efficiency and economy of our operation and organization—the elimination of obsolete bases and installations—and the adequacy, modernization, and mobility of our present conventional and nuclear forces and weapons systems in the light of present and future dangers. I have asked for preliminary conclusions by the end of February—and I shall then recommend whatever legislative, budgetary, or executive action is needed in the light of these conclusions.

Two days prior to President Kennedy's address to this body, the then President Eisenhower in his farewell message said:

A vital element in keeping peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

In his budget message to the Congress, Mr. Eisenhower said further:

To carry out basic military missions, this budget provides for a total strength in our Active Forces of 2,492,900 men and women on June 30, 1962, the same as now estimated for the end of fiscal year 1961 and 4,000 over the yearend strength originally planned for this year. A supplemental appropriation is being requested to provide for this 1961 increase.

Of the Nation's Reserve forces, General Eisenhower said:

If the Reserve components of our Armed Forces are to serve effectively in time of war, their basic organization and objectives must conform to the changing character and missions of the Active Forces. Under modern conditions the quality and combat readiness of the Reserve forces are more important than numbers. The nature of warfare has changed so drastically during the last decade that the whole concept of the roles and the missions of the Reserve forces must be reevaluated.

Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been directed to make a new study of the Reserve missions and requirements. This should be aimed at the objectives of efficiency, economy, and promoting administrative effectiveness. As a first step toward a more fundamental revision, this budget provides for a reduction in the number of Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

I think it is unnecessary to tell this body that this proposed budget cut—the proposal which is now being studied by your Appropriations Committee—was for a flat, across-the-board 10-percent cut. The Congress has had to deal with this proposal for the past several years.

We recognize this for what it is—a bookkeeping cut and not a reduction based upon military estimates. Nor is it consistent with the statements made either by the immediate past Commander in Chief, or our present Commander in Chief.

Both have stated that studies are being made of present requirements. Yet, the Eisenhower budget, even while stating that studies are to be made of the missions and roles of the Reserves, has prejudged this study, and has recommended the answer even before consideration could be given to the question. I hope that the present administration will withdraw this recommendation. As a member of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with this question, it has been my responsibility during the past several years—and even today with regard to the current budget—to deal with this inconsistency.

The Members of this body know that for the past several years military leaders generally and we in the Congress have considered it unwise to weaken our Reserve Forces, and we have resisted the persistent effort to enforce a dollarwise and defense-foolish policy of applying an across-the-board reduction of our fairly modest Reserve Forces.

It has been my privilege during the past 2 years, as a member of the Army Reserve, to serve as chairman of the legislative advisory committee of the Reserve Officers Association. This organization for 39 years has been devoted to the cause of adequate national defense, and has worked unselfishly in support of the Congress in its efforts to carry out its constitutional obligations to provide for the common defense.

In that role, I have talked with Secretary McNamara and the service Secretaries about this basic concept of Reserve strength. I have urged that the new Defense team cooperate with the Congress in keeping our modest Reserve Forces at the present level. The so-called saving from the 10-percent cut is so relatively insignificant that it cannot affect the Nation's overall economy. It would be my hope that the new administration would recommend a strengthening of the Reserve program, and a substantial increase of the financial support therefor. We know that the Reserve Forces are maintained at a cost of about one-tenth of the cost of the Active Forces.

This country was founded on the principle that the security of the country should be based on a relatively small Regular force and a large citizen force.

Throughout the history of our country both the legislative and executive branches of the Government have carried out this concept.

In the serious time in which we are living, it seems to me that any departure from this principle would be harmful to the security of our Nation.

In 1955 when the Armed Forces Act of 1955 was under consideration, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of each of the services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Air Force, and the Chief of Naval Operations all testified before the House Armed Services Committee. At that time each and every one of these individuals stated "that as the strength of the Regular service diminishes the strength of the Reserve should be increased."

Approximately 2 years later the Defense Department began enunciating a strange new principle, and that was, "as the strength of the Regular service diminishes the strength of the Reserve should be decreased."

It has been very difficult for me to understand this radical change in thinking and planning within a period of approximately 2 years. We recognize great

changes in weaponry, techniques, and challenges, but the need for manpower is constant.

We have seen develop in this country the philosophy which more or less states, "that inasmuch as the next war will not last a week, and since we could not mobilize our Reserve in that length of time, then why have the Reserve?"

To me, this is a defeatism at its worst. God forbid that another World War should happen, but should it come, and assuming that atomic or hydrogen bombs should be used, we fully realize we would receive some terrific blows. However, I know that the spirit and willpower of our Americans are such that instead of throwing up our hands and quitting, we would respond and fight our way back in spite of all difficulties that must be overcome.

The Army Reserve and our National Guard troops are the only Army military forces that have a built-in dispersion factor. Their distribution in small units all over the United States would insure a large proportion of survival which possibly would not be true of our heavily concentrated Regular Army forces, whose locations may well be known by the enemy in meticulous detail.

If there should be the holocaust of nuclear war, dispersed Reserve units, and even individual reservists, will be of inestimable value in providing leadership, courage, and example to demoralized, frightened, and leaderless civilians.

While recognizing the possibility of a nuclear holocaust, we should, however, also remember that nuclear deterrence can result in a nuclear stalemate. Under such awful prospects the most probable course of military conquest by an enemy so minded would follow strictly conventional methods. Under this premise the availability of our Reserve components could spell the difference between victory or defeat for our country.

The Active Army is now extended in its worldwide commitments to the degree that it would not be effective in a major conventional action without its Reserve. In our system the Army Reserve components are the very key to successful conventional warfare.

The budget now before us again includes a 10 percent cut in the proposed budget for the coming fiscal year for the Army Reserve and National Guard forces. It seems to me that Congress should follow the same procedure it has done for the past 2 years and restore this 10 percent cut for these forces and if necessary include language that will insure that the will of Congress prevails.

In the past the Naval Reserve budget, while extremely austere, has not been the subject of a bald and open cut. This year, however, it too has had its Reserve personnel budget drastically cut.

The Secretary of Defense has authorized a selective Naval Reserve strength of 135,000. This is a rockbottom figure that is necessary for D-day requirements.

The current fiscal year budget provides sufficient funds to keep an average drill pay strength of 127,000. The proposed 1962 Naval Reserve personnel budget will cut the funds so that the average drill pay strength will be 124,330, with an end of 125,105.

It should be borne in mind that the Navy's selected Reserve is a D-day organization. Its members already have their mobilization orders in their hands. They are part of the force in being. The day following D-day they will add jet fighter squadrons, trained antisubmarine aircraft squadrons, 50 antisubmarine-warfare ships of destroyer types to the fleet and also provide the trained personnel to bring fleet ships to their full war complement. The manning level at present is only 81 percent, which precludes sustained combat capability.

Additional funds are needed for those Navy reservists who come in the category D classification. These are reservists who are in the Ready Reserve who are willing to train four times a month without training pay, and for whom a limited number are entitled to receive 15 days' active duty training. Funds for the 15 days' active duty training for these reservists have been radically reduced. In the fiscal year 1960, funds provided for the training of 12,500 Naval Reserve officers. The proposed 1962 budget reduces this number to only 4,700.

For the Navy training program to be maintained on the same status as the current 1961 budget provides will require that the proposed budget for the Navy Reserve of $84,600,000 be increased to the current 1961 budget of $88 million.

Frankly, I think the funds should be provided to permit the Navy to build the authorized strength of 135,000. This would require an additional appropriation of $2 million.

I would also like to point out that under "Operations and maintenance"—O. & M.N.—in the current 1961 budget the amount of money for oil and gasoline for Naval Reserve aircraft was reduced $2 million. This was a $3 million reduction over the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1959.

This money was requested by the Navy but was arbitrarily removed from the defense budget prior to its being presented to Congress.

This will mean a 20-percent reduction for flight training for Naval Air Reserve pilots and plane crews.

We hope that the proposed budget for this item will be increased in order to provide the oil and gasoline to meet all of the training requirements.

The proposed Air Force Reserve personnel budget amounts to a reduction of about $2 million. This is in the face of increased responsibilities given to the Air Force Reserve with the formation of their new base support and recovery units. These units do not replace the flying units that are being maintained in the force. Instead they are an added responsibility. The word "recovery" is the key to their responsibility. They add to the built-in dispersion I discussed before and may be the sole haven for our aircrews returning from an initial strike in an all-out nuclear war.

For this reason, it appears that an increase, rather than a decrease, in Air Force personnel funds is in order.

I understand that in that portion of the Air Force operations and maintenance which provides flying hours for Reserve aircrews, the amount asked this year remains about the same as last year. Under last year's budget our Reserve flying units were so restricted in their flying hours that they could not perform the optimum in training missions.

Now this year a number of these units are having their obsolescent C–119 aircraft replaced by the bigger and longer range C–124's. These aircraft cost twice as much to operate each flying hour. Thus, the moneys asked for flying operations for our Reserves amount to a reduction in what was, at best, a minimal flying program.

If an increase in flying hour funds is not provided for the Air Force Reserve there is grave danger of a serious setback in their training status.

On the 20th of January, President Kennedy, in his inaugural address, said to every citizen in this country:

> Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

The Nation's dedicated reservists are willing and anxious to do what they can. They should be encouraged through recognition by our country of the services they have rendered in the past, the services they are rendering now, and the service they will render should our country once more become involved in an armed conflict.

I think it well to take a look at history and see what happened to some of the great empires in the world. Take Carthage, Greece, and the Roman Empires. When these great empires were at the height of their strength they were leaders in every phase of human endeavor. They had the greatest commerce, the greatest industry in their time, and the greatest educational systems then known. Then their citizens became fat and complacent. They lost sight of the obligation of every citizen to his country, including a military obligation. More and more, these countries placed their security exclusively in professional forces. This may have contributed to the fact that these empires faded, one by one, into oblivion.

Our Reserves today, in addition to being available for any emergency that may require their services in the military force, are unquestionably performing a service that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Each reservist, when he changes into a military uniform for his drill, is pointing out to the youth of this country that every citizen has a military obligation and that the reservists are carrying out this obligation. He is providing an example in patriotism.

I cannot too strongly urge that the importance of the organized Reserves be emphasized over and over again to our citizens and that Congress do its duty in seeing that sufficient funds are appropriated in order that this concept on which this country was founded is carried out.

I sincerely feel that if this is done, that we in this country will have a powerful additional bulwark of defense. Then truly we need not fear a threat from any Communist power. These dedicated citi-

zens, through their patriotism and their service and by bolstering and strengthening the regular services, can insure that our form of government and our way of life will continue.

A BILL FOR INCREASED PUBLIC PROTECTION AGAINST PRICE FIXING BY PROVIDING FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION AND PUBLICITY CONCERNING IDENTICAL BIDS SUBMITTED TO PUBLIC AGENCIES IN RESPONSE TO INVITATIONS FOR ADVERTISED COMPETITIVE BIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the monstrous conspiracy which the manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment have been operating, and for so many years, has been a shocking thing to many people. Certainly the facts revealed in this case make it clear that the public ought to have increased protection against such price fixing and bid rigging.

Obviously, the possibility, or the probability, of being caught, prosecuted under the Sherman Act, and paying the fines and penalties which might be imposed have not been of a sufficient threat to prevent executives of some of the biggest corporations in the land from doing things that everybody knows to be illegal. The possibility of fines and exposure appear to have been small, in the thinking of these people, as compared to the volume of business—amounting to some $8 billion per year—being done in the products for which prices have been fixed and markets divided.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill which I believe will add much to the public protection. The purpose of the bill is simply to provide for public information and publicity every time two or more competitors submit identical bids to a public agency. The effectiveness of the bill would depend solely upon the public's being informed and forewarned—but I am confident that public opinion in such matters can be quite persuasive and will help bring about voluntary compliance with the antitrust laws. To borrow a couple of lines from Alexander Pope—

> Vice is a monster of so frightful mien.
> As to be hated needs but to be seen.

Furthermore, such public reports as would be required by the bill should prove extremely helpful to the directors and top officials of the corporations. There seems to have been some confusion and misunderstanding within the corporations involved in the electrical manufacturers case as to whether some of the big corporations had a policy of violating the antitrust laws or a policy against violating these laws. Some of the company officials who were fined or sent to jail for 30 days made a plea that they were merely cogs in the corporate wheels, carrying out their corporation's policy. On the other hand, some of the heads of these corporations have declared that these violations of the antitrust laws by their vice presidents and junior executives were contrary to the corporation's policy, and, furthermore, that these activities had been concealed from the directors and other top executives of the corporation. Thus a published statement by the General Electric Co., appearing in the New York Times of February 8, says this:

> The improper acts of a few General Electric employees were a deliberate violation of the company's directive policy 20.5, and were carefully hidden from those in the company charged with assuring compliance with the policy.
>
> It should be noted that of the thousands of individual employees invested with management authority and responsibility at General Electric, only a very few acted irresponsibly.

The kind of public reports which the bill would require will bring to the attention of the corporation heads instances of identical bids submitted by their employees and employees of their competitors. These reports will thus help the top corporate executives to know what is going on in their own corporations and give them notice of things which may warrant investigation.

The bill in no way changes the present antitrust laws. And it does not provide for any increased fines or penalties for violating these laws.

In a nutshell, this is what the bill would do:

First, it would require the Federal agencies to make a report to the Attorney General giving all the details each time one of these agencies receives bids in response to advertised invitations for competitive bids for any item, supplies, or services and two or more of the bids are identical as to price.

Second, the bill invites the State and local governments to submit similar information to the Attorney General whenever these governments or their purchasing departments receive such identical bids.

Third, the Attorney General would then be required to make a consolidated report to Congress every 3 months, setting out in some systematic way the pertinent information concerning all these instances of identical bidding. This report would then be published as a House document and thus be available for all interested persons to see.

REPORTS ARE NOW BURIED AWAY IN FILES

What is the background for the bill?

Since 1949 the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act has required the various Federal agencies to make a report to the Attorney General, giving the details of bids received under the advertised competitive bid procedure where in the opinion of the head of the agency there may have been a violation of the Federal antitrust laws. The Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947 places a similar requirement on the heads of the defense agencies. But, of course, in practice purchases and contracts to purchase made by the defense agencies are made largely on the basis of negotiation, rather than on the basis of advertised competitive bidding.

Leaving the question of reporting or not reporting up to the various agencies, depending upon whether the department head thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated, naturally produces a law with some deficiencies. We may assume, I imagine, that only a fraction of the identical bids being received by the Federal agencies are ever reported to the Attorney General. In fact, I am told that in the first months after the law was passed, the various Federal departments flooded the Department of Justice with reports of identical bids. But as time went on and very little resulted, the departments largely quit making the reports.

Even so, according to a study made by a university professor who is a noted expert in this field, the Department of Justice had received, by mid-1959, a total of no less than 10,000 reports on instances of identical bidding. This information comes from a paper by Prof. Vernon A. Mund of the University of Washington, published in the Journal of Political Economy in April of 1960. I will insert Professor Mund's article at the end of my remarks, because it is most enlightening in several respects.

First, it contains a table No. 1 which provides illustrations of identical bids received by the Federal departments. Second, and what is perhaps more useful, Professor Mund has also provided a table No. 2 which gives similar information on competitive bids which are not identical.

So much has been said in recent times in defense of identical bidding that some of us may have overlooked the point that many business competitors still manage to submit different bids in pursuit of a given piece of business, and give the public agencies an opportunity to purchase needed supplies and equipment at a low cost to the taxpayers.

Finally, Professor Mund's article should prove useful to the public procurement and antitrust enforcement agencies, as well as to the Federal courts. It provides some enlightened guidance on how to tell the difference between prices in a competitive market and prices which are artificially fixed or rigged.

I might add that Professor Mund's article was called to the attention of the Joint Economic Committee last Friday by a representative of the Farmers Union, Mr. Angus McDonald, who is one of the most astute and effective fighters for the American farms it has ever been my pleasure to know.

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS OF THE BILL

Now let me describe the requirements of the bill more specifically.

First. It requires the Federal agencies to report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bidding—not just those instances where the head of the agency or his subordinate thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated.

Second. The bill would require the Attorney General to institute a procedure whereby it is made known to the State and local governments that they are invited to make similar reports to the Attorney General.

Third. The bill would require the Attorney General to make a consolidated

report of all of these instances of identical bidding, and to submit such report quarterly to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The bill specifies the items of information to be reported.

First. It should be noted that when a public agency receives a batch of bids in which two or more of the bids are identical, it will then make a report giving the pertinent information for all the bids, not just those which are identical. It is well known that in some industries various firms submit bids to public agencies which are habitually and so inevitably identical in all details that the public agencies have set up lottery systems, such as putting the bidders' names in a rotary barrel, or into a hat, and drawing one at random. On the other hand, the competitors in the electric equipment manufacturers' case followed the not unusual practice of rotating the privilege of being low bidder, on a particular bid, while the others all submitted identical bids.

Information which is to be reported includes, among other things, the names of the companies submitting the bids, the kind of equipment or supply for which the bid is submitted, the bid prices, and so on. The bill does not specify any date or any elapsed time within which the agencies must make their reports to the Attorney General. It is expected, of course, that these reports would be made promptly; and should some of the agencies become unreasonably laggard in submitting their reports, this fact will soon be revealed by the public report made by the Attorney General. Among the items to be reported are the date when the bids were opened and the name of the agency or bureau opening the bids.

The bill does not specify the form in which the Attorney General is to present his quarterly report. Rather, it leaves it up to the Attorney General to adopt a form which will present the information in a most orderly and useful way. I would imagine that the information would be arranged in such a way that all of the bids pertaining to a particular industry, or to a particular kind of commodity, would appear together in one section of the report. Further, I would hope that the report would be indexed to contain the names of all of the companies involved in the competitive bidding so that the reader can find from the index each and all of the instances in which a particular company has been involved in an identical bid situation.

Let me emphasize again that the bill does not amend any of the other antitrust laws. It does not provide any penalty for identical bids or make any presumption that such bids are illegal. It merely provides the public with information about the conduct of public business. In fact, the bill will require making public certain details about identical bidding which the public actually has a right to have in the case of all bids submitted to public agencies in pursuit of public business.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES AMOUNT TO $100 BILLION A YEAR

TRADITIONAL PUBLIC POLICY IS TO PUBLISH BIDS

It is traditional public policy in the United States, at all levels of government, to publish the bids received by public agencies.

Public business is now tremendous business. Government purchases of goods and services amount to well over one-fifth of all the goods and services produced in this country. According to official reports of the Department of Commerce, purchases made by the State and local governments last year were in the neighborhood of $47 billion.

Similarly, purchases by the Federal Government were in the neighborhood of $53 billion, making a total, roughly, of $100 billion of government purchases—Federal, State, and local. I am basing these estimates on the official figures for the first three quarters of 1960, because data for the final quarter of the year are not as yet available.

Officials who make purchases for State, county, and municipal governments over the country would at least be put on guard. By reference to the Attorney General's reports they would be able to tell for what kinds of supplies and equipment they may expect to receive identical bids. Thus, in time, the local governments might hit upon ways of protecting themselves and the taxpayers. They might adopt different practices for dealing with identical bids, such as, for example, making it a practice to give the business each time to the smallest firm making a bid, or to give the business, uniformly, to the bidder whose name stands lowest in the alphabet. Any such practice, if widely adopted, would quickly result in the disappearance of identical bids and, no doubt, in more genuine competition for public business.

True, the point could be made that to expose identical bidding would merely drive some conspirators to other devices for allocating the market, while agreeing to submit a range of bids in each case. Exposure would still be wholesome. At least the conspirators would be driven into fresh overt actions of conspiracy—in which case the business executives would be pointedly conscious of illegal conduct. They would not be able merely to perpetuate practices begun in conspiracy by their predecessors, comfortable in the belief that they themselves are doing nothing illegal.

Furthermore, to carry on a conspiracy to rotate bids in a seemingly random fashion, requires, it seems, more or less continuous meetings, correspondence, or other direct communication between the supposed competitors, and such overt communications are likely to leave tracks. In other words, if frequent meetings and so on are required to keep a system going, these should make detection easier, both by the law enforcement agencies and the top corporate executives who really wish to keep the corporations clean.

Let us keep this point in mind, too. Under the competitive bid procedure, each bidder learns automatically what prices its competitors have bid. The bidders have a right to this information under the law. I can think of no harm that would be done by letting the general public know.

ALSO APPLIES TO SALES OF PUBLIC PROPERTY

I should point out particularly that section 2 of the bill, paragraph (G), requires the Federal agencies to report the method by which the purchase or sale, or the contract to purchase, was actually awarded. In other words, the reporting requirement refers in the first instance to bids received in response to advertised invitations for competitive bids. The supplies or equipment which the Government intended to purchase may, following receipt of identical bids, have been awarded to one particular bidder on the basis of some kind of lottery, such as drawing the name from a hat, an established rotation system, and so on. Where this is the case, the report would specify the method by which the award was made.

On the other hand, after receipt of the bids, the public agency may have refused to accept the bids and thereupon either issued a call for new bids or made the award on the basis of negotiations. In this case, the report would so specify.

Two other points to note:

First, the bill would make a similar amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to require similar reporting of identical bids received in respect to the sale of surplus Federal property.

Second, information may be withheld from the Attorney General's report when in the opinion of the head of the department or agency public information should be withheld by reason of the national security.

With respect to the practices with which the bill is concerned, the Sherman Act, it seems to me, needs no further clarification. The Sherman Antitrust Act has now been the law of the land for 70 years. I doubt if there is any businessman in the country who does not know that it is illegal for competitors to conspire to fix prices or allocate markets. Yet, in the 70 years the Sherman Act has been on the books, the electrical equipment manufacturers suit marks the first time that any big businessman was ever sent to jail for violating the law. About 2 years ago a Federal judge imposed jail sentences on three small businessmen for violating the law, and if my history is correct, that marked the first time any businessman—big or small—ever went to jail for violating the antitrust laws.

I wish we could believe that these were the only instances of violations deserving such penalties. I wish we could believe that such practices as the electrical equipment manufacturers have engaged in are the rare and exceptional practice, rather than that it is rare and exceptional for such practices to be exposed.

A copy of the bill H.R. 45–70 will appear below, after which I will insert the journal article by Prof. Vernon Mund.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to provide for reports of State, local, and Federal procurement officers to the Attorney General in instances where identical bids are made by competing bidders on contracts for purchases or sales by public agencies, in order to provide public information and publicity concerning such bids.

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Where two or more bids received after advertising are identical as to price, the head of the agency shall make a report to the Attorney General setting out the following—

"(A) the name and location of the agency and bureau which issued the invitation to bid;

"(B) a description of the item, commodity, or service for which bids were received;

"(C) quantities of such item, commodity, or service for which invitations to bid were issued;

"(D) the date of opening of bids;

"(E) the proposed delivery date of the item, commodity, or service specified in the invitation to bid, or, if more than one date is involved, the beginning date and the completion date;

"(F) the name and location of each bidder who submitted a bid in response to the invitation to bid, and with respect to each bidder the following:

"(i) the unit price bid and the applicable unit of measure;

"(ii) the point to which the item, commodity, or service is to be delivered, and whether or not freight costs are to be at the expense of the seller;

"(iii) whether or not the bid price is freight on board, and if so the point of origin;

"(iv) whether or not the bid price includes delivery cost;

"(v) the terms of discount, if any; and

"(vi) where the bidders are not the manufacturers of the item, commodity, or service, the names of the actual manufacturers; and

"(G) Whether or not the bids were accepted, and—

"(i) if accepted, a reference indicating which bid, or bids, was successful and the method by which the successful bidder, or bidders, was chosen, such as 'low bid', lottery, allocation of orders, rotation of orders, or other method; or

"(ii) if bids were rejected, whether—

"(a) an invitation for new bids was issued; or

"(b) a purchase of, or contract to purchase, the items, commodities, or services in question was made by negotiation; or

"(c) the proposal to purchase the items, commodities, or services in question was abandoned.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (2), in determining whether two or more bids are identical as to price, the head of the agency shall take into account the net cost to the agency considering discounts and other differences entering into the net cost to the agency."

SEC. 3. Section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (which relates to disposal of surplus property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(8) The Administrator shall report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bids received by him after public advertising for bids under paragraph (1) of this subsection. Each such report shall contain with respect to bidders the information called for in section 302(d)(2) (except subparagraph (D)(vi)) of this Act."

SEC. 4. The Attorney General shall formulate and put into effect a procedure whereby State and local governments are encouraged to make reports to him corresponding to the reports provided for in section 302(d)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, in instances where identical bids are received by State and local governments.

SEC. 5. The Attorney General shall report each calendar quarter to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, on a consolidated basis, with respect to all reports made to him during the preceding calendar quarter pursuant to sections 302(d)(2) and 203(e)(8) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and section 2305(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, and all similar instances of identical bids made to procurement officers of States and of local governments, where such procurement officers have reported such instances to the Attorney General. No information shall be contained in such quarterly reports, however, which in the opinion of the department or agency head should be withheld from publication for reasons of national security, or which, in the case of information received from State or local governments, would in the opinion of the State or local official providing the information, adversely affect the State or local government. Each report of the Attorney General under this section shall be printed as a House document.

SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 2305 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Where two or more bids received after advertising are identical as to price, the head of the agency shall make a report to the Attorney General setting out the information required to be reported to him by section 302(d)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949."

The article by Prof. Vernon A. Mund published in the Journal of Political Economy for April 1960, appears, without footnotes, as follows:

IDENTICAL BID PRICES

(By Vernon A. Mund, University of Washington)

It is frequently stated that, assuming a standardized product, identity of bids and prices among sellers is as consistent with competition as it is with the lack of competition. The antitrust agencies themselves use this generalization as a working rule. In defense briefs, respondents go further and confidently affirm that identical bids and prices inevitably result from competition.

This study will present empirical data on identical bidding and explore the conditions under which it arises. Price relationships in markets generally accepted as being genuinely competitive will also be examined. From these data generalizations will be inferred that appear to hold true with respect to identical bid prices.

DATA ON IDENTICAL BIDDING

There are many sources of data on identical bidding, including the purchasing departments of large industrial firms (such as the aircraft companies), State and local purchasing agencies, and the various purchasing departments of the Federal Government. Inasmuch as public calls for bids are usually open, it is possible to find a rich source of examples in the purchasing activities of State and Federal agencies.

According to section 2(d) of Public Law 413 (Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947) and section 302(d) of Public Law 152 (Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949), identical bids received by a department of the Federal Government which, in the opinion of the head of such department, evidence a possible violation of the antitrust laws, shall be referred to the Attorney General for appropriate action. Since the enactment of this legislation, more than 10,000 references have been recorded with respect to identical bids on Government procurement. Actually, however, the number of such references is but a partial indicator of the extent of identical bidding, for references are submitted to the Attorney General only when a department head believes that a possible violation may exist.

SOME FEATURES OF IDENTICAL BIDDING

Government procurement agencies report that identical bidding usually occurs in the same commodities each year or at successive purchase periods. It is typically a regular, constant, and continuous phenomenon—not sporadic or transitory.

Usually all the bids are identical. However, in some instances—as in the sale of typewriters—only the large producers (i.e, the Big Four) generally submit identical bids. Variations in the degree of identity may reflect independent action by some sellers in not following a pricing formula, mistakes in caculating bid estimates, or deliberate action in staggering, or rotating bids. As a general rule, when competitive bids cannot be received, the contracting agency makes the award by some lottery or drawing procedure.

Procurement agencies usually purchase according to detailed specifications, or by designating a specific product "or its equal." When a specific product is listed—such as a branded microscope—distributors, and sometimes the manufacturer himself may submit identical bids. Typically, the various products are "standardized," and sellers frequently declare that no differences exist in quality or usefulness.

In the case of products produced locally by a number of firms—such as milk or bread—delivery costs per unit are uniform, and no freight formula is involved. In all other cases, some form of basing-point, zone, or freight-equalization system is employed to translate the identical mill, base, zone, catalog, or list prices of geographically scattered producers into identical delivered bids.

SOME EXAMPLES OF REPRESENTATIVE IDENTICAL BIDS

As a basis for considering the various situations in which identical bidding occurs, representative examples of identical bidding are presented in table 1, listing the product, the agency calling for the bids, the delivery point, and the date on which the bids were opened.

SOME EXAMPLES OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING

Calling for bids (or tenders) has long been regarded as sound public policy designed to secure competitive bidding and provide the buyer with a price advantage arising in the more favorable market position of some supplier, or from lower costs, more efficient methods, lower profit markups, or a more urgent need for sales. All bids submitted are sealed, and the buyer takes precautions to insure that suppliers will not learn what any competitor has bid. When there are identical bids, the purchaser is denied any price advantage that would result from genuine competitive bidding. In effect, he is given one bid and one price even though a dozen firms are actively soliciting his order.

In submitting sealed bids, it is possible that bidders may use some focal point, such

as their current price, in making their bid price. But since bids are typically called for opening at some future date and for delivery at or during some future period of time, sellers are faced with considering market trends and supply expectations as well as estimates of what competitors will ask. Under conditions of effective competition these elements typically give rise to a range of valuations in which a buyer can find and secure a price advantage.

Table 2 presents representative examples of competitive bidding and shows a range of sellers' valuations. The products listed in table 2 are as standardized as the products in table 1—if anything, more so. In most cases they are offered in accordance with precise specifications. The procurement agencies may request a delivered or destination price so that the freight is included in the bid price. Variations in delivered costs may reflect not only differing shipping-point prices but also variation in actual freight costs from different shipping points.

TABLE 1.—*Representative examples of identical bidding*

POTENTIAL TRANSFORMER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, JAN. 16, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$2,695	Coulee Dam, Wash.	Westinghouse Electric Corp., Sharon, Pa.	Net.
2,695		General Electric Corp., Holyoke, Mass.	Do.
2,695		Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh	Do.

ROCK SALT, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, JULY 23, 1954

Unit price (per 100 pounds)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1.19	Atlanta, Ga.	Carey Salt Co., Atlanta	Net.
1.19		International Salt Co., Atlanta	Do.
1.19		Morton Salt Co., Chicago	Do.
1.19		Pioneer Salt Co., Philadelphia	Do.

ROCK SALT, COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA., AUG. 5, 1958

Unit price (per ton)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$22.40	Allegheny County, Pa.	E. J. Fedigan, Pittsburgh	Net.
22.40		International Salt Co., Pittsburgh	Do.
22.40		Morton Salt Co., Wadsworth, Ohio	Do.

SOIL STERILANT,[1] DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, MAR. 6, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$3.00	Auburn, Wash.	Associated Sales Supply, St. Louis	2 percent, 20 days.
3.00		Van Waters & Rogers, Seattle	Do.
3.00		Arizona Fertilizers, Phoenix	Do.
3.00		Steve Regan Co., Salt Lake City	Do.
3.00		E. C. Olson Co., Ogden, Utah	Do.

YEAST, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, NOV. 17, 1954

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.1450	Richmond, Va.	Anheuser-Busch, St. Louis	Net.
.1450		Standard Brands, Richmond, Va.	Do.
.1450		Red Star Yeast Corp., Milwaukee	Do.
.1450		Federal Yeast Corp., Philadelphia	Do.

MASONRY CEMENT,[2] DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUG. 1, 1956

Unit price (per sack)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.9875	Warehouse, Washington, D.C., or Lorton, Va.	United Clay Products, Washington, D.C.	2 percent, 30 days.
.9875		Cushwa Building Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
.9875		Eckington Bldg. Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
.9875		Hudson Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
.9875		A. P. Woodson Co., Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025	Any point, Washington, D.C.	United Clay Products, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		Cushwa Building Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		Eckington Bldg., Supply Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		Hudson Supply, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.025		A. P. Woodson Co., Washington, D.C.	Do.

PORTLAND CEMENT, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, OCT. 23, 1957

Unit price (896 barrels)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$3,888.64	Friant, Calif.	Monolight Portland Cement, Los Angeles	Net.
3,888.64		Pacific Cement, San Francisco	Do.
3,888.64		Permanente Cement, Oakland	Do.
3,888.64		California Portland Cement, Los Angeles	Do.
3,888.64		Calaveras Cement, San Francisco	Do.

[1] Telvar W (or equal)—a patented product manufactured by Du Pont.
[2] To be supplied during the period Sept. 1, 1956, to Feb. 28, 1957.

TABLE 1.—*Representative examples of identical bidding*—Continued

TYPEWRITERS (11-INCH STANDARD), COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY, PA., SEPT. 30, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$193.50	Allegheny County, Pa.	Royal-McBee Corp., Pittsburgh	Net.
193.50		Underwood Corp., Pittsburgh	Do.
193.50		Smith-Corona-Marchant, Pittsburgh	Do.
193.50		Remington Rand, Pittsburgh	Do.

CALCIUM CHLORIDE: FLAKES, CITY OF NEW YORK, SEPT. 9, 1958

Unit price (per ton)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$31.00	New York City	Robinson Bros. Chemicals, Barberton, Ohio	Net.
31.00		Allied Chemical Corp., Solvay, N.Y.	Do.
31.00		Thompson Materials Corp., Midland, Mich.	Do.

POTENTIAL TRANSFORMER, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, MAY 2, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$585.00	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Standard Transformer Co., Warren, Ohio	Net.
600.60		General Electric Co., Holyoke, Mass.	Do.
600.60		Westinghouse Electric, Sharon, Pa.	Do.
600.00		Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh	Do.

SODIUM FLUORIDE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SEPT. 24, 1957

Unit price (carload)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$4,290	Grand Rapids, Mich.	Blackson Chemical Co.	Net, 30 days.
4,290		Arthur S. Lapine Co.	Do.
4,290		Allied Chemical Corp.	Do.
4,290		Seebee Paint Chemical Corp.	Do.
4,290		American Agricultural Chemical Corp.	Do.

GRAPHITE,[3] AEC OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, OCT. 1, 1958

Unit price (per 100 pounds)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$30.25	Oak Ridge, Tenn.	Speer Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N.Y.	Net, 30 days.
30.25		National Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N.Y., Columbia, Tenn., Clarksburg, W. Va.	Do.
30.25		Great Lakes Carbon Co., Niagara Falls, N.Y.	Do.

TETRACYCLINE,[4] DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SEPT. 13, 1958

Unit price (per 100 capsules)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$19.188	Perry Point, Md.	Pfizer	Net.
19.58		Squibb	2 percent, 30 days.
19.58		Upjohn	Do.
19.58		Bristol	Do.
19.58		Lederle	Do.

LIGHTNING ARRESTORS, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, SEPT. 26, 1955

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1,103.64	Yankton, S. Dak.	Graybar Electric, Denver, Colo.	Net.
1,103.64		Ohio Brass Co., Mansfield, Ohio	Do.
1,103.64		Westinghouse Electric, Denver, Colo.	Do.
1,103.64		General Electric, Denver, Colo.	Do.

MAGNESIUM ALLOY SHEETS, DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE, MAY 13, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1.191	Tinker Air Force Base, Okla.	Continental Metals, Los Angeles	Net.
1.191		Dow Chemical, Midland, Mich.	Do.
1.191		Brooks & Perkins, Detroit	Do.

[3] All bidders agreed to equalize freight.
[4] All prices are identical, discount considered.

TABLE 1.—*Representative examples of identical bidding*—Continued

LIQUID CHLORINE, BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, JUNE 19, 1958

Unit price (6,480 pounds)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$810	Boulder City, Colo.	Pacific Engineering Co., Henderson, Nev.	Net.
810		Tops Chemical Co., Duarte, Calif.	Do.
810		Van Waters & Rogers, Los Angeles	Do.
810		McKesson & Robbins, Los Angeles	Do.

CARBON DIOXIDE[1] (DRY ICE), GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, NOV. 29, 1957

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.035	Washington, D.C.	Cardox Corp., Chicago	Net.
.035		Liquid Carbonic, Chicago	Do.
.035		Olin Mathieson, Baltimore	2 percent, 30 days.
.035		Pure Carbonic, New York City	Net.

ZINC OXIDE, U.S. NAVY, APR. 29, 1954

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.1336	Norfolk, Va.	American Zinc Sales Co., Columbus, Ohio	Net.
.1336		New Jersey Zinc Sales Co., New York City	Do.
.1336		Eagle Picher Sales Co., Philadelphia	Do.

N—155 ALLOY SHEETS,[2] AEC OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, OCT. 28, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$2.67	Oak Ridge, Tenn.	Universal Cyclops Steel Corp., Bridgeville, Pa.	2 percent, 10 days; net 30.
2.67		Haynes-Stellite Co. (Division of Union Carbide), Kokomo, Ind.	½ percent, 10 days; net 30.

STRANDED CONDUCTOR PAPER AND LEAF, CITY OF CLEVELAND, SEPT. 18, 1958

Unit price (per 100 feet)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$119.10	Cleveland, Ohio	General Cable Corp., Cleveland	½ percent. 10 days.
119.10		American Steel & Wire Co., Cleveland	Do.
119.10		Okonite Company, Passaic, N.J.	Do.
119.10		Phelps Dodge Copper Products Co., New York City	Do.
119.10		John A. Roebling Son's, Trenton, N.J.	Do.

NETWORK TRANSFORMERS, CITY OF AUSTIN, TEX., MAR. 24, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$7,464	Austin, Tex.	Walter Tips (Westinghouse)[7]	Net.
7,464		Sterett Supply Co. (Kuhlman Electric)[7]	Do.
7,464		Priester Supply Co. (Maloney Electric)[7]	Do.
7,464		General Electric Co. (General Electric)[7]	Do.
7,464		Southern Electric Supply Co. (Allis-Chalmers)[7]	Do.

PAPER CUPS (9 OUNCES), STATE OF VIRGINIA, NOV. 13, 1958

Unit price (per thousand)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
[3] $6.18	Blacksburg, Va.	Consolidated Paper & Box	2 percent, 10 days.
6.18		Hamilton Paper Corp.	Do.
6.18		Frank G. Ennis Paper Co.	Do.
[4] 6.18		Dillard Paper Co.	Do.
6.18		Epes Fitzgerald Paper Co.	Do.
6.18		Hampton Roads Paper Co.	Do.
6.18		Southern Paper Supply	Do.
6.18		Dettor Edwards & Morris	Do.

POLIO VACCINE, CITY OF NEW BRITAIN, CONN., OCT. 6, 1958

Unit price (vial)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$3.9592	New Britain, Conn.	Pitman-Moore Co.	Net.
3.9592		Eli Lilly & Co.	Do.
3.9592		Merck, Sharp & Dohme	Do.
3.9592		Parke, Davis & Co.	Do.
3.9592		Sisson Drug Co.	Do.

[1] The award was made to Olin Mathieson because of the more favorable discount.
[2] This award was made to Universal Cyclops.
[3] Lilly No. 957.
[4] Dixie No. 185.
[7] Suppliers.

BIDDING AND PRICE MAKING IN ORGANIZED MARKETS

In studying prices and price relationships, economists frequently take as a norm or standard the features of bids, offers, and prices in principal central markets, such as the organized commodity exchanges. These markets are not models of "perfect competition." However, they present conditions—price publicity, freedom of entry, independent action in making bids, numerous buyers and sellers, and standardized products—that are practically attainable as features of a price-making mechanism.

Market price in a central market results from a given state of demand and supply. Expectations concerning changes in conditions aside, there are in a market at any given time numerous traders with a range of reserve (latent) valuations. The maximum prices that buyers are willing to bid vary from one buyer to another; the asking prices that sellers have in mind also vary. A central market brings together expressions of opinion from many areas and from diverse trade interests. It is not likely that the bids of various buyers or the offers of various sellers will be identical at any given time. It would be miraculous if they were.

Given stability of expectations, an equilibrium price develops in the making of numerous transactions. Demand and supply become equalized through the making of higher bids or lower offers. After a number of preliminary transactions, there is no continuing competition among buyers to raise the price or among sellers to lower it.

TABLE 2.—*Representative examples of competitive bidding*

BEDSPREADS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, SEPT. 26, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$4.9994	Bethesda, Md	Geo. D. Brandt Co., New York City	1 percent, 20 days.
5.33		Kuttnauer Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich	Do.
5.18		Guy Curran & Co., Washington, D.C	2 percent, 20 days.

HYDROCHLORIC ACID, AEC, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, JULY 31, 1958

Unit price (tank-car lots, per ton)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$18.00	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville	Net, 30 days.
26.49		Monsanto Chemical, St. Louis	Do.
30.10		Columbia Southern Chemical, Charlotte, N.C	Do.
26.34		Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich	Do.
26.53		E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Wilmington, Del	Do.

ARGON GAS, AEC, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, AUG. 5, 1958

Unit price (240-cubic-foot cylinders, per 100 cubic feet)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$11.00	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Alabama Oxygen Co., Birmingham	Net, 30 days.
6.20		Southern Oxygen Co., Kingsport, Tenn	Do.
6.50		Air Reduction Sales Co., Houston	Do.
5.50		National Cylinder Gas, Knoxville, Tenn	Do.
6.15		Marks Oxygen Co., Augusta, Ga	Do.
10.00		Welding Gas Products, Chattanooga	Do.
4.50		Linde Co. (division of Union Carbide & Carbon Co.), Knoxville, Tenn	Net, 10 days.

ACETONE, AEC, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS, AUG. 12, 1958

Unit price (tank-car lots; per gallon)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.56	Oak Ridge, Tenn	Enjoy Co., New York City	Net, 10 days.
.559		Octagon Process, Staten Island	Net, 30 days.
.561		C. P. Chemical Solvents, New York City	Do.
.561		Shell Chemical Corp.; New York City	Do.
.50369		Phipps Products Corp., Boston	5 percent, 10 days.
.478		Union Carbide Chemicals Co., New York City	Net, 30 days.
.495		Eastman Chemicals Products, Kingsport, Tenn	Do.
.477		Allied Chemical Corp., New York City	Do.
.559		Chemical Compounding Corp., Perth Amboy, N.J	Do.

TRAFFIC CONES, CITY OF AUSTIN, TEX., NOV. 28, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$1.55	Austin, Tex	Interstate Rubber Co., Los Angeles	2 percent, 10 days.
1.69		Sargent & Ewell, Grand Prairie, Tex	Do.
1.59		Robbins Tire Co., Tuscumbia, Ala	Do.
2.29		Rohan Co., Waco, Tex	Do.

RECORDING WATTMETERS,[1] BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, FEB. 3, 1958

Unit price	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$895.36	Palisades, Idaho	Electro-Technical Equipment Co., New York City	Net.
907.60		Instrument Laboratory, Seattle	Do.
963.00		Esterline-Angus Co., Indianapolis	Do.
972.40		Westinghouse Electric, Denver	Do.
972.40		General Electric, Denver	Do.
1,625.00		Phillips & Edwards, San Francisco	Do.

[1] Frequently, large firms match prices, but there is variation in the extent to which the small firms follow.

TABLE 2.—*Representative examples of competitive bidding*—Continued

BACON, SLAB, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, MAR. 26, 1958

Unit price (per pound)	Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
$0.4972	San Diego, Calif.	Zest Provision Co., Los Angeles	Net.
.61		Oscar Mayer Co., Los Angeles	Do.
.82		George Hormel & Co., Los Angeles	Do.
.4490		Swift & Co., San Diego	Do.

TIRES, NYLON TUBELESS (4-PLY)—CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.—OCT. 15, 1958

Unit price		Delivery point	Bidder	Manufacturer	Terms
Size 750×14	Size 670×15				
$19.24	$17.49	Miami, Fla.	Norton Tire Co., Miami	B. F. Goodrich	Net.
19.24	17.49		General Tire Co., Miami	General Tire	2 percent, 10 days.
19.24	17.49		Aeroland Oil Co., Miami	do	Do.
19.24	16.34		Firestone Stores, Miami	Firestone	Net.
18.86	17.14		Goodyear Service, Miami	Goodyear	2 percent, 10 days.
16.92	15.30		Waldron Tire Co., Miami	Pennsylvania	Do.
16.90	14.90		Tire King, Miami	Vanderbilt or Cooper	Net.
14.59	13.00		Eagle Tire Co., Miami	Mohawk	Do.
13.95	13.95		Major Oil Co., Miami	National	Do.
13.40	12.90		Southeastern Tire Co., Miami	Armstrong	Do.

PADLOCKS,[3] U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, OCT. 9, 1958

Unit price		Delivery point	Bidder	Terms
Without keys	With keys			
$1.775	$1.818	Silver Spring, Md.	Atlantic Hardware & Supply Corp., New York City	2 percent, 30 days.
1.80	1.85		Whitlock Corp., Yonkers, N.Y.	Do.
1.83	1.87		Frederick Trading Co., Frederick, Md.	Do.
2.06	2.11		Wm. H. Cole & Sons, Baltimore, Md.	Do.
1.88	1.93		Rudolph & West, Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.82	1.86		May Hardware Co., Washington, D.C.	Do.
1.856	1.90		W. T. Weaver & Sons; Washington, D.C.	1 percent, 30 days.
1.81	1.855		Fries, Beall & Sharp Co., Washington, D.C.	2 percent, 30 days.
1.78	1.93		Specialty Auto Fabrics Corp., New York City	Net.

[3] Master Lock Co., Milwaukee, Wis., was the common supplier of all bidders.

In an open market at a given moment of time, with competition working effectively in the sale of a standardized product, all buyers tend to pay the same price. This tendency toward uniformity results from publicity on prices and the fact that buyers turn to other sellers when prices appear out of line. This order in price formation is the basis for the doctrine: "There can be but one price in a market."

Since transactions are made openly in a market, no buyer will pay a given seller more than other buyers are paying. A seller, moreover, will have no reason to ask less from one buyer than from another. The price of each seller is thus uniform to all buyers at a given time. A given seller does not sell to various buyers at the same time at different prices net to him. Each seller gets the same net realized price on all transactions currently being made. The "law of one price" applies to the prices net to a given seller.

The concept of a uniform price is applicable to a particular moment or brief period of time. With the passage of time, changes in conditions, opinions, and interpretations occur. These changes operate to raise or lower buyers' or sellers' schedules and to bring about changes in price. Successive transactions may be effected at differing levels so quickly that price uniformity vanishes. It is not likely that the actual prices paid in a series of transactions by a number of buyers to various sellers, from moment to moment, will be identical.

THE INDUSTRY VIEW THAT IDENTICAL BIDDING IS COMPETITIVE

Whenever identical bid prices (and identical delivered prices) are questioned, the industry concerned invariably offers in defense some version of the classical economic law that, "under competitive conditions, the price of a homogeneous product in a market at any one time will be a uniform price; that there cannot be two prices at the same time and place for the same commodity." The basic elements making for identical prices, it is stated, are (1) a homogeneous product and (2) well-informed buyers—a buyer will not pay more for one product than another.

The doctrine that "price uniformity," in the absence of evidence of collusion, is an indicator of effective competition has found its way to the Supreme Court and has been used as a foundation stone in numerous decisions. In the Cement case (1925), for example, the Court declared:

"A great volume of testimony was also given by distinguished economists in support of the thesis that, in the case of a standardized product sold wholesale to fully informed professional buyers, as were the dealers in cement, uniformity of price will inevitably result from active, free, and unrestrained competition."

The view that identical bid and asking prices and identical delivered prices exemplify the "uniformity of price" found in competitive markets involves several basic errors. First, in economic literature the principle of uniformity is made applicable only to prices (actual prices) eventuating out of transactions in a market. It has no application to bids or offers.

Second, there is error in applying the conventional uniform-price theory to delivered prices (mill price plus freight). The doctrine of uniformity is applicable to prices in a market center or at a shipping point without an inclusion of freight to particular destinations. At a given time, there is approximate price uniformity to buyers, and delivered prices to various destinations vary with the actual freight. Sellers at a particular shipping point tend to receive the same f.o.b. prices, even when shipments are being made to widely scattered destinations.

Third, there is error in failing to apply uniform-price theory to prices net to a seller. Usually in identical bidding some system is used which involves phantom freight or freight absorption. In allowing or paying freight, a seller usually receives different prices net to him. This is not consistent with market competition, where a producer or dealer typically sells at the highest net price, not at widely divergent net prices.

Finally, in using competitive-price theory, it may be noted that the doctrine of price uniformity applies to a static equilibrium. True market price is an equilibrium price in a given state of demand and supply. The doctrine of uniformity does not apply to the dynamic process of trial and error in adjustment to changes in market conditions, opinions, and interpretations.

IDENTICAL BIDDING AS A PRODUCT OF COLLUSIVE RESTRAINT

There is substantial evidence showing that when governmental attitudes toward business accept or tolerate concerted action, sellers quote identical bids by deliberate, purposeful agreement, without relying upon the operation of the law of supply and demand. In testifying before a Senate committee in 1936 on steel bids for Government procurement, Mr. Eugene G. Grace, then president of Bethlehem Steel, stated, "During the code period they were identical, as you would expect them to be." Even after the period of antitrust exemption under the NRA, identical bids continued to be made in many industries by agreement because of a lax antitrust policy.

In Canada action taken to provide an effective enforcement of the anticombines laws has provided abundant evidence relating identical bidding to collusion. In a study on wire fencing in Canada, for example, the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission found that identical tenders (bids) on chainlink fencing were made by the common use of uniform list prices and a system of recording all quotations (on amounts of $200 or more) with the trade association secretary, who checked for possible arithmetical errors and for any possible variations from the master copy of the price list. In other instances the Commission found, a trade association secretary received and coordinated tentative bids before they were actually made.

Similarly, a special combines commissioner found that the Canadian producers of electrical wire and cable products submitted identical bids through agreement or arrangement. His report stated:

"The evidence establishes that before submitting tenders the manufacturers have usually advised each other by memorandum or by telephone of the prices they propose to quote. Where differences were found to exist, further discussion by an exchange of memorandums or otherwise has taken place, prices were checked, and differences were reconciled in order to insure that the prices quoted by each manufacturer would be identical."

Further, in 1953 the Combines Commission found that for many years paper distributors in British Columbia had agreed on tenders for use when potential buyers called for competitive bids. The basic policy followed by the association was stated in its records: "The understanding was and the procedure should be that any tenders made ought to be the schedule price unless notified to the contrary. * * *" In implementing this policy, trade members were advised that "it must also be distinctly understood that quotations direct to school boards or municipalities must adhere strictly to list prices."

As a general rule, conspiracies to fix prices center on the quoting of identical bid prices. This is shown clearly by the records in the Cement case (1948), Rigid Steel Conduit case (1948), Malt case (1945), Milk Can case (1946), Crepe Paper case (1946), and related basing-point cases. Hearings conducted in Canada under the Combines Investigation Act (covering many industries) revealed that the primary purpose of concerted action is to obtain uniformity of price. The argument that identical bidding comes about spontaneously as a natural result of competition must find an explanation for the fact that participants in collusive arrangements have set up costly and extraordinary procedures for bringing about this natural and spontaneous result.

In some instances product differentiation makes identical bidding impractical. Some salable products, for example, are installations consisting of many components. Engineers and estimators for different companies may employ numerous variations and alternative combinations of machinery parts. In such situations the evidence indicates that concerted activity centers not on price identity but rather on the use of common unit prices and uniform cost schedules designed to maintain prices at desirable levels.

CIRCULATION OF PRICELISTS AND CATALOGS

Uniform pricelists and price catalogs circulated among trade members frequently form a basis for identical bidding. The prices themselves may be arrived at by agreement, price leadership and price following, or local competitive forces. When list prices and terms are the same and when sellers take the further step of adding identical factors for freight costs and of keeping collateral services, such as standard packaging, the same bids are necessarily identical.

It is sometimes said that it is only natural that identical list prices and bids develop in industries using printed cards or catalogs. However, this view fails to consider that each seller in using a list or card price may, and frequently does, adjust his selling price to competitive conditions by granting current discounts from the list, so that competitive bids can and do develop.

When sellers are few and centrally located, it may be possible for identical pricelists to come into use in a given locality without collusion. Prevailing prices for a small volume of business may be at a level which provides a selling outlet and which reflects an equilibrium of demand and supply. The quantities of products involved in a call for bids, moreover, may not be sufficiently great to tempt sellers to depart from their ordinary pricelists. In such a situation it may be possible for identical bids to occur without agreement.

As a general rule, however, identical bidding is practiced by geographically separate suppliers. In this case, if identical list prices are to result in identical destination bids, it is necessary for sellers to join in the concerted or concurrent use of a basing-point, zone, or freight-equalization system. As will be shown, such methods of pricing are not in harmony with effective market competition.

Studies made by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (Canada) of the asphalt- and tar-roofing industry show that uniform list prices in that industry were arrived at by continuous collusion among trade members. In a carefully documented study, the Commission reports that identical list prices quoted by the Barrett Co., Canadian Johns-Manville, and other asphalt-roofing firms had their origin in a master plan developed by the central industry office. In order to translate these identical list prices into identical bid prices at all points of delivery, the industry developed a common basis for transportation charges. By this plan, transportation costs on shipments by a given seller were equalized with those on shipments from any other manufacturing point having a lower freight rate to the destination point. The Commission found, also, that manufacturers of metal culverts quoted identical bids for many years as a result of meetings, discussions, agreements, and the use of uniform list prices made and distributed by a leading producer.

BID COORDINATION AND ROTATION

When the sale of a standardized product involves installation according to plans, specifications, and designs, arrangements to effect identical bids typically involve more than unit-price agreements. In a study of the Canadian flat-glass trade, the Combines Investigation Commisson found that tenders for the supply and installation of flat glass were brought into identity by a price registration system. Under this system a member gave the association details of the specifications, the materials used, and the estimated price of the job. If, later, another member prepared bids using the same plans, he also submitted them to the office, and the various firms consulted and arrived at uniform tenders.

Concert of action on installation and engineering jobs may also take the form of arrangements to allocate tenders among trade members. For example, the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission (Canada) showed that internal office correspondence between two officers of Forano, Ltd., a producer of transmission and conveyor equipment involved systematic rotation of contracts. The examples serve also to show that nonidentity of prices cannot be taken as proof of competition.

"Following your recent suggestion, we submit below a report on a few contracts wherein our competitors were favoured as per agreement passed by you at an association meeting, in Toronto, a few months ago.

"Last September, Jeffrey Manufacturing Co. received priority with regard to a power conveyor requested by James MacLaren Co. Ltd., of Buckingham, when our normal price should have been $12,859.25, while that of Jeffrey was $18,700 and our first quotation was revised to $18,839.25.

"January last, with the same customer involved again, we submitted a price of $32,622 on a conveyor, while Jeffrey's price was $36,300. After an agreement, our price was revised to $39,511.

"In October, a request from the Department of Public Works was received by us for coal conveyor equipment for the Port Arthur Hospital. In order to favour Stephens-Adamson, we did not quote on this equipment.

"Last October, we received a request from Canadian Commercial Corp. for conveyor equipment for the Marine School H.M.C.S. Shearwater, Dartmouth, N.S. Our price was around $68,000 as figured out by Lalonde's department in the Montreal office. After an understanding with United Steel Corp., we quoted a price of $82,340, while the latter company's quotation had been fixed at $80,997.

"We recently quoted on grain elevator equipment to Commonwealth Construction. According to our estimates, the price of this equipment should have been approximately $32,000. At the request of the United Steel Corp., we quoted a $42,000 price in order to favour the latter company."

Likewise, in a report on the retail distribution and sale of coal in Winnipeg (1956), the Commission found that sales of coal to large consumers who called for tenders were allotted among dealers on a quota basis. Upon securing his allotted contract, a dealer computed the price he planned to quote and informed the pool manager. This price was communicated to other dealers, who were then expected either not to tender at all or to tender at higher prices.

Sometimes bids are deliberately staggered by collusive action in order to mislead governmental authorities. In a special study on identical bidding in the electrical wire and cable products industry in Canada for example, correspondence in which an official of the Automatic Electric Co. wrote to an officer in the Phillips Electrical Works is cited:

"It has been suggested by our friends that in view of the fact that the Purchase Board in Ottawa may become too inquisitive in respect to agreed prices being quoted for the Department of National Defense, prices should be staggered. In other words, the business should be allocated. This suggestion is made for quotations valued at $1,000 and over."

PATENT LICENSING AND PRICE CONTROL

In some instances identical bidding may reflect price control based upon patent licensing. The U.S. Navy, for example, received identical bids on January 1, 1958, on "Miltown" tranquilizer tablets (Wallace Laboratories) and on "Equanil" tablets (Wyeth Laboratories). It appears that this product (meprobamate) is manufactured by Wyeth under license from Carter Products Co. (the parent company of Wallace Laboratories), whose patent expires in 1972.

IDENTICAL BIDDING AND THE MAINTENANCE OF RESALE PRICES

Manufacturers who require all outlets to quote the same unit price to all purchasers, including State and Federal agencies, frequently provide a basis for identical bidding. Sales to State and Federal agencies are not subject to or bound by State fair-trade laws. Manufacturers accordingly act

to maintain resale prices either by outright agreement or by some form of refusal to sell.

To maintain resale prices, a manufacturer may join with his distributors in submitting identical bids, or he may consistently refrain from bidding on Government requirements. An example of identical bidding by two manufacturers and their distributors is shown in table 3. American Optical and Bausch & Lomb are the two manufacturers; the other firms are their distributors. An example of identical bidding by the distributors of a single manufacturer is shown in table 4.

IDENTICAL BIDDING AS A NONCOLLUSIVE PRACTICE

In the United States it is exceedingly difficult to secure evidence on overt activities underlying restraints on competition, for conspiracy on price is illegal per se. Antitrust agencies observe identical bidding in many industries—steel and typewriters, for example—but their investigations have not so far developed proof of unlawful agreement. Industry members deny collusion and declare that identical bidding should be permitted (a) because it is not arrived at by collusion or conspiracy and (b) because one cannot draw from it the inference of collusion.

At the present time, neither the Department of Justice nor the Federal Trade Commission appears to be willing to prosecute identical bidding in the absence of actual evidence of agreement (conspiracy). The basis for this position is found in the *Theater Enterprises* case, 346 U.S. 537, 540–41 (1954), in which the Court declared:

"The crucial question is whether respondent's conduct toward petitioner stemmed from independent decision or from an agreement, tacit or express. To be sure, business behavior is admissible circumstantial evidence from which the fact finder may infer agreement (citing cases). But this Court has never held that proof of parallel business behavior conclusively establishes agreement or, phrased differently, that such behavior itself constitutes a Sherman Act offense. Circumstantial evidence of consciously parallel behavior may have made heavy inroads into the traditional judicial attitude toward conspiracy; but 'conscious parallelism' has not yet read conspiracy out of the Sherman Act entirely."

If, in fact, identical bidding and the economic effects of identical bidding flow from business conduct which is not collusive, from what mechanism or rationale do they develop? Is the practice, in fact, a competitive one outside the purview of the law? These questions were faced squarely by the legal staff of the Federal Trade Commission in the Cement and Conduit cases. The complaint in the Cement case was framed in terms of the concerted use and maintenance of basing-point pricing. The staff soon recognized that a cease-and-desist order, if secured, would accordingly have to be limited to one denying the concerted sale of cement at basing-point prices. Such an order would not curb the use of the basing-point system as such in situations in which agreement could not be found.

TABLE 3.—*Example of identical bidding on microscopes, Department of Agriculture, Apr. 29, 1958* [1]

Unit price	Bidder	Address	Terms
$519	Williams, Brown & Earle	Philadelphia	Net.
519	A. S. Aloe Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	American Hospital Supply Corp	do	Do.
519	American Optical Co	Buffalo	Do.
519	Bausch & Lomb Optical Co	Rochester	Do.
519	Boder Scientific Co	Pittsburgh	Do.
519	Cardinal Products, Inc	Durham	Do.
519	Chemical Rubber Co	Cleveland	Do.
519	Chicago Apparatus Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	Federal Scientific Co	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
519	Fisher Scientific Co	do	Do.
519	Emil Greiner	New York City	Do.
519	Kinsman Optical Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	Arthur S. LaPine	do	Do.
519	Macalaster Bicknell Co	Cambridge	Do.
519	New York Lab. Supply, Inc	New York City	Do.
519	Phipps & Bird, Inc	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
519	E. H. Sargent & Co	Washington, D.C	Do.
519	Scientific Glass Appliance Co., Inc	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
519	Standard Scientific Supply	New York City	Do.
519	Arthur H. Thomas Co	Philadelphia	Do.
519	August Waeldin, Inc	New York City	Do.
519	Will Corp. of Maryland	Baltimore	Do.

[1] Delivery point in all instances was Beltsville, Md.

TABLE 4.—*Example of identical bidding on spectrophotometers, city of Miami, Fla., Sept. 4, 1957* [1]

Unit price	Bidder	Address	Terms
$7,975	W. H. Curtin Co	Jacksonville, Fla	Net.
7,975	Will Corp. of Georgia	Atlanta, Ga	Do.
7,975	Dade Reagents	Miami, Fla	Do.
7,975	Fisher Scientific Co	Silver Spring, Md	Do.
7,975	Scientific Products	Chamblee, Ga	Do.

[1] Delivery point in all instances was Miami, Fla.

NOTE.—Beckman Instruments, Fullerton, Calif., was the common supplier.

In the Conduit case (count II) the legal staff therefore sought to attack the concurrent use of the basing-point system as such, on the grounds that its use by individual trade members resulted in denying customers the benefits of price competition. This approach was based on the legal concept of the law against wrongs (torts). At common law it is a tort—a wrong—for one to act when the natural and foreseeable consequences of the action will be to damage others. It is recognized that action which "has a dangerous tendency unduly to hinder competition" is contrary to public policy. Also it is recognized that action having the effect of substantially lessening competition is harmful to the public interest. Therefore it is clear that the taking of action, the results of which are foreseeable—as involving the lessening of competition—adds up to a wrong (a tort) against members of the purchasing public.

The principal industry witness called upon to testify in the Conduit case on bid identity was Mr. H. S. Walker, head of one of the prominent conduit manufacturing firms and president of the Rigid Steel Conduit Association. From the testimony of Mr. Walker it was developed by counsel for the Commission that there are three underlying bases of identical bidding (including "administered prices" and price leadership). First, there invariably is the use of some system or method of behavior by which "uniform prices can be put together." This may consist of a basing-point, zone, or freight-equalization system, or of the outright quotation of another's mill price, with actual freight payable by the buyer. In the Conduit case the method used was the multiple basing-point system, with bases at Pittsburgh and Chicago.

Second, there is the action of each seller in making bids according to the system, knowing that others are doing the same, and knowing also that the natural and foreseeable consequences of this action will be matched bids. Thus, Mr. Walker was asked: "Well, when you use that method and you know that your competitors are using the same kind of method in figuring their prices, even though you and they submit your quotations under seal, you can anticipate what their prices are going to be as submitted in bids, can't you?" He replied, "If they stick to the method which they publish we can tell what the price is going to be because it is all published."

Third, there is the knowledge beforehand, or at least the expectation, that all sellers will follow the given system or method of pricing, so that agreement is not needed to use the system or to get the results of identical bids. Mr. Walker was specifically queried on this point by the trial examiner: "Are you able to continue this method without any express agreements with your competitors?" The witness replied: "If I must answer, I will say 'Yes, of course.' We never had any agreements with them."

So it is that (1) with a given method of pricing, (2) with its concurrent use by industry members, and (3) with the knowledge beforehand of its use by others, sellers can act without agreement to get the foreseeable results of identical bids.

The court of appeals sustained the finding that the concurrent use of the basing-point system in the conduit industry was in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act because it was shown to have been used with trade-restraining results. In affirming the Commission's order in count II, the court declared: "Each conduit seller knows that each of the other sellers is using the basing-point formula; each knows that by using it he will be able to quote identical delivered prices and thus present a condition of matched prices under which purchasers are isolated and deprived of choice among sellers so far as price advantage is concerned."

In a true competitive market sellers act independently in quoting their own shipping-point prices. Each is trying to secure the business of a third party. In order to be able to deal, some offer more favorable terms. No competitor knows, for sure, what others are doing, and no one knows beforehand what all of his competitors will do.

POSSIBLE REMEDIES FOR THE PRACTICE OF IDENTICAL BIDDING

1. Concurrent action that lessens competition: The present-day policy of the antitrust agencies to prosecute identical bidding only when there is evidence of collusive

agreement is exempting a large area from the antitrust laws. Identical bidding, the evidence shows, is not a sporadic or intermittent phenomenon. Rather, in many industries it is a regular, normal procedure which continues over extended periods of time. As we have seen, identical bids on public contracts are arrived at (1) by means of collusive agreements, (2) by the refusal of a manufacturer to sell to distributors who compete on price, and (3) by the uniform use of a certain method of pricing with the knowledge beforehand that others are doing likewise, so that the natural and foreseeable result is a matching of bids.

As a basic first step in curbing the practice of identical bidding, it is suggested that it will be necessary for the antitrust agencies to restudy the economics of the practice. The doctrine that identical bid prices and identical delivered prices may be an indication of either effective competition or collusive restraint is a generalization not in accord with the features of a truly competitive price.

In the case of collusive (concerted) action, the Sherman Act clearly provides an adequate remedy. When specific evidence on collusion is not available, however, it appears that the Federal Trade Commission Act (section 5) can provide a practical remedy for concurrent action that lessens competition. To act in such a way that the natural and foreseeable consequences of the action involve the lessening of competition is the commission of a wrong (a tort), and contrary to public policy. It is clear that the Federal Trade Commission legislation, in particular, was enacted by Congress to enjoin any act or practice which lessens competition regardless of combination, agreement, or conspiracy among sellers.

In the Conduit case, prosecuted under the Federal Trade Commission Act, counsel for the Commission developed a rationale explaining identical bidding not based upon collusion. It was shown in count II that identical bidding is not an innocent, inevitable, competitive practice which defies all human and legal regulation. It is the result of a deliberate, purposeful, mechanism used concurrently by industry members, with the knowledge beforehand that others are doing likewise, so that matched bids arise automatically as a natural result. Upon the basis of the Conduit decision (count II), it would appear that the Federal Trade Commission could bring action against such methods of pricing—and thus identical bidding—on the grounds that they have trade-restraining effects which make them illegal under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

2. The problem of identical bidding effected by refusal to sell: Refusals to sell, and threats of refusal to sell, are also used as a device for achieving resale-price maintenance and identical bidding. Federal courts have condemned refusals to sell to price cutters when there is evidence of some form of agreement. But in many situations refusal to sell or a threat thereof is, and can be, used in subtle ways to maintain prices within the law. Thus in *Adams-Mitchell Co.* v. *Cambridge Distributing Co.* (189 F. (2d) 913 (1950)), a seller of Scotch whiskies demanded that jobbers buying his products must observe stipulated resale prices under threat of refusal to sell. The majority of the court held that this form of price fixing did not violate the antitrust laws.

It is possible that the courts might change their construction of the law on refusal to sell as a mechanism in resale-price maintenance if it can be shown that competitive bidding to public agencies is being restrained. The legislatures and the courts, for example, have so far been unwilling to make fair-trade legislation, with its restraint on price competition, applicable to sales to State or Federal agencies. However, if such a change in judicial construction cannot be made, it will be necessary for the State and Federal Governments to adopt legislation making it illegal (a) to recommend minimum resale prices and (b) to refuse to sell, to withdraw a franchise, or to use related means, to enforce minimum resale price.

3. The problem of patent licensing and price control: The General Electric case (1926), holding that a patent owner may control the price at which his licensee sells patented products, has provided various industry groups over the years with a certain privilege to practice identical bidding with impunity. In subsequent cases, the General Electric decision has been whittled down and held not to exempt price-fixing agreements when made with more than one licensee.

If the use of patents as a basis for identical bidding is to be curbed, it will be necessary for the courts to overrule completely the General Electric decision on the ground that all price-fixing agreements are illegal per se under the Sherman Act.

4. Modifying the first preference to small business rule: In an effort to cope with the problem of identical bidding in military procurement, it has been provided in the Armed Services Procurement Regulations, section 2-406.4 (1958), that in case of tie bids, award shall be made to the small business concern. If there are two or more small business concerns in the tie bidding, it is further provided that the award shall be made by a drawing by lot limited to the small business concerns. A small business concern is considered to be one with 500 or fewer employees.

Investigation shows that in many instances of tie bids there is no bid from a small business firm. In other instances where there are small business concerns selling the product in question, there are several small business bids, in which case the award is made by lottery.

As an alternative procedure, it has been proposed that in the case of tie bids the award should go to the smallest firm bidding, measuring size on the basis of the firm's total assets, without regard to any absolute definition of what is small business. This might mean that in some cases Studebaker-Packard would be the smallest firm. Such a rule, it is evident, would give a quite different result from the rule in the present regulations. It could prove to be something of a boon to small business in the broader sense of the term; it would also operate to break up quickly the practice of making tie bids to governmental agencies on products which those agencies purchase in important quantities.

5. Public discussion, negotiation, and publicity: A somewhat novel, though quite effective, remedy for identical bidding has been developed by Mr. Joseph W. Nicholson, city purchasing agent for Milwaukee, Wis. In an effort to meet this "serious problem," he reports:

"It has been our policy to discuss these situations at open meetings of our purchasing board with bidders present, questioning their representatives as to why bids are identical. We point out the necessity of obtaining sealed competitive bids in order to protect the taxpayer's interest and to obtain the lowest prices possible.

"If time permits, we readvertise for bids after a public discussion of this type. Frequently this results in the receipt of competitive bids and lower prices."

In addition, Milwaukee sends data on the identical bids to the Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice, and congressional representatives.

As a further technique to break identical bidding, the city of Milwaukee asks when possible for an allowance on used equipment. In one instance the city readvertised for competitive bids on air compressors, also requesting an allowance for some used compressor equipment. The city again received the same identical bids, but received offers on the used equipment ranging from $250 to $2,000 as a trade-in credit. As a last resort, when all other efforts fail, the city uses a public lottery, with drawing confined to local bidders.

SUMMARY

The general doctrine that identical bidding is as consistent with effective competition as it is with monopolistic restraint is without supporting empirical data and should accordingly be set aside. The uniform price theory is applicable only to actual prices—not bids—eventuating out of transactions in a market. Moreover, the prime feature of uniformity in real markets is the uniformity in net realized prices that a given seller receives on all sales made at the same time. In a competitive market a given seller does not sell simultaneously to various buyers at different net prices.

On the basis of empirical evidence and economic analysis, the legal doctrine that identical bidding is consistent with effective competition should be replaced with a working rule making identical bidding a presumption of illegal conduct lessening competition and restraining trade. It should be a presumption which can be rebutted by appropriate evidence. The presumption should also be extended to bids with slight and studied variations in delivered quotations or in terms and to instances where only one or two bids are out of line.

The present policy of antitrust agencies to prosecute identical bidding only when there is proof of collusion means that a considerable area of exemption from the antitrust laws is being granted by administrative action. Conspirators have become exceedingly sophisticated in leaving no record of their activities, and a requirement of proof of conspiracy places an undue limitation upon our antitrust policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman for any question on this subject; yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is rendering a very, very helpful service. Many of us were shocked, we just could not and many cannot now understand how these gentlemen who are otherwise law-abiding and honest, patriotic and doing the right thing, got into this kind of a mess. In the gentleman's bill does he have anything which would help on the other side of the picture, where the labor racketeers join with these employers in conspiracies to shoot prices up? One objective, of course, is increased wages and the other increased profits. But then the consumer pays the whole bill, an exorbitant one.

Mr. PATMAN. If workers are involved they would be covered in this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but they are expressly exempt from the antitrust laws—that is, labor is.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about something entirely different now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; I am talking about a conspiracy.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but if they are guilty of what the gentleman says they are guilty of, they are not excluded under this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Labor unions are expressly excluded under our present statutes from antitrust laws. Are they under the gentleman's bill?

Mr. PATMAN. They are not under this bill; no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then the gentleman includes them?

Mr. PATMAN. If labor unions conspire with management or others to fix prices, allocate markets or otherwise restrain trade, they may be punished under the antitrust laws, just as anybody else. This bill does not change the antitrust laws. And it does not make any presumption as to how identical bills come to be identical. That is for the public to question and for the antitrust enforcement agencies to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The evil is in this industry-wide bargaining.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, his argument is a little farfetched. In any case, it is not related to the subject of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right; I usually am a little confused.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman. He is a good, forthright Member of this House and a very able Member. But I respectfully suggest that his comments are a little bit off the subject of this particular bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean that labor organizations will not be touched by this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Labor would be touched the same as anybody else, if it is guilty, just the same as the biggest corporation in the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What about the exemption given by our present statutes on labor?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about something else now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am talking about conspiracies.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can have his day in court on that. If he would like to pursue that, he can introduce a bill to change it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to see all of them covered, not just one segment.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is a Member of the House and he can introduce a bill. I am not telling him anything he does not already know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but the gentleman has so much more ability——

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wait a minute; the gentleman has more knowledge on this subject of antitrust laws than I have. I dropped a bill in this morning to prevent strikes by unions which tie up transportation as do the engineers of the air lines.

Mr. PATMAN. In any event, I assure the gentleman that no one is exempted under the provisions of this bill; everyone is covered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope that is true, but I shall wait and see what the Court says.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may discuss another subject?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall be glad to yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House and individuals and groups interested throughout the country to the fact that in the very near future the perennial attempt to put a check on progressive legislation will be made again, to try to prevent the regular standing committees from reporting out important legislation to provide that certain projects can be operated and function through public debt transactions or contract authority or both.

The opponents have created a very sinister slogan, "Back-door appropriations," or "The back-door approach," just as in connection with increasing the membership of the Committee on Rules from 12 to 15 they coined the word "gag," and others.

If that resolution which is pending before the Committee on Rules, and I understand that the hearing will be held next Wednesday, should be reported out and adopted, it would be one of the most serious blows this body could direct against progressive legislation.

For example, if a similar resolution had been in effect at the time the law establishing the Commodity Credit Corporation was enacted, compelling them to come before the Committee on Appropriations at a later date for their appropriations, the very purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its successful functioning would have been sharply impaired if not defeated.

The same thing applies to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and to the Rural Electrification Administration, and many programs of great importance to the farming community of our country. Anyone who votes for this resolution is not voting in the best interest of the farmer. As far as those bills are concerned, they would be voting against the best interest of the farmer.

For example, this resolution changing the rules of the House if adopted would seriously interfere with the Housing Authority, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was in existence for so many years, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation, the Defense Production Act, the Civil Defense Act, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, for example, the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation, the direct loan program of the Veterans Administration, the Defense Material Service, the information media guarantee authority of the USIA, the natural fibers fund of the Department of the Army, the Small Business Administration, the Maritime Service of the Department of Commerce, the public debt borrowing authority in connection with housing, with regard to college loans and public facility loans, and the Highway Act, as well as others.

All of this important, progressive legislation is successful in operation only by reason of the public debt transaction policy and the contract authority being granted.

The opponents of progressive legislation are trying to get the rules amended in order to control the active operation of progressive regulation and to diminish the effect of such progressive legislation.

This resolution, as I understand it, is coming before the Committee on Rules. I expect that it will be on Wednesday at the latest, from information that I have received. I am alerting the Members of the dangers of such a resolution in connection with the programs that I have mentioned and other progressive programs as well. They want to take away the authority from the standing committee, and by doing that to prevent the effective operation of progressive legislation. Not only Members who stand for progressive legislation and for these programs should oppose it, but individuals and groups throughout the country who are also interested in these programs should be advised of the dangerous results that will flow from the reporting out of this resolution by the Committee on Rules and its adoption by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question. Is the distinguished majority leader saying that none of these agencies would have been financed had they gone through the regular appropriations procedures?

Mr. McCORMACK. These programs would have been seriously impeded, if the public debt transaction was not granted to them or the contract authority or both, and the gentleman from Iowa knows that just as well as I do.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not know that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I respect my friend's views, but I disagree with him. The gentleman from Iowa knows that having to come up for yearly appropriations would impair and prevent the effective operation of these great programs.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not know that at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Consider the farm loans, for example, to the farmers of the country. I cannot understand how anybody representing a farming community would vote for the resolution to amend the rules that would seriously interfere with the effective and maximum operation of these programs.

Mr. GROSS. Because I am sure that the farmers of the State of Iowa would want the money to be appropriated by going through the regular procedures and being scrutinized by the committee of the Congress that is established to scrutinize appropriations for the purposes for which the gentleman from Massachusetts has enumerated.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the view of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it is my view.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the view of the gentleman from Iowa, but if those

resolutions are ever adopted, then the farmers of Iowa would realize that the position of the gentleman from Iowa, while in good faith, is not for their best interests.

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Iowa has been talking with the majority leader here—do not the farmers out in Iowa and from your district especially know what you have been up to?

Mr. GROSS. I think they have a real sense of financial responsibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that, and I would like to know now while we are on this subject, just how much did you increase your majority the last time they found out what you were up to?

Mr. GROSS. Well, substantially.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well—substantially—I want to know—I have been trying for 2 weeks to get you to tell me, but you have not told me. How much was it?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that that is important to this issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, it is, because the gentleman from Massachusetts thinks that the farmers in Iowa do not know what you have been doing and I think they do, and apparently they approve of it. Now by how much did you increase your majority percentagewise?

Mr. GROSS. It was more than double.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, got that. They know what the gentleman from Iowa has been doing, and they like it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

A TIME OF TROUBLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the daring venture on which the new administration has set out has been outlined in bold strokes of the pen for an inquisitive world to view and to speculate upon. In a series of vigorous speeches, beginning with the inaugural address, and continuing with addresses to Congress and with his news conferences, President Kennedy has stated in no uncertain terms what needs to be done in general. He has promised to follow these general proposals up swiftly with the specifics required to put progress into motion. These are proposals, as he says, "symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning—signifying renewal, as well as change."

The negative aspect of his pronouncements has so far received the greater attention. Critics have suggested that the picture he paints is far too gloomy, that the world—the United States—is not really beset by troubles:

> Thick as the leaves that strow
> The brooks of Vallombrosa.
> —*Milton's* "Paradise Lost."

But this is the end of which he speaks, the end of a period of stagnation, indecision, inaction. It is not necessarily a criticism of what is past. Western civilization is staggering under the effects of a half century of titanic wars which few people could foresee, and which none could prevent. At the same time, a maldistribution of the physical wealth which Western societies have learned to produce in such abundance has called into action social forces disruptive of internal peace and order. And now the rest of the underdeveloped world, plagued by centuries of poverty, disease, and ignorance, has plunged into insane revolutions themselves destructive of any attempts to relieve their miseries. This is the negative aspect of the situation. But it is not a condemnation of the efforts of sincere and conscientious men who have expended their best energies to righten wrongs. We have done the best we could, so far as light has been given us to see the right.

But now it is time for us to start anew, for a revival of hope, constructiveness, courage, and determination. For the one negative word, "end," there are three positive words, "beginning," "renewal," "change." These make up the constructive side of the venture on which Mr. Kennedy has embarked, and which a weary world has as yet scarcely started to interpret or to weigh.

The President has also picked up the gauntlet of inaction and answered the call for leadership. He has pledged his body, politically, in testimony of the sincerity of his principles. He has gathered around him a number of lieutenants who, in the opinion of most observers, are of like mind, and of each of whom it might be said, in the words of Matthew Arnold:

> Languor is not in your heart,
> Weakness is not in your word
> Weariness is not on your brow!

The editor of Atlantic characterizes the new phalanx thus:

> Intelligence, energy, enthusiasm are the key qualities with which the new administration begins. Free government cannot exist and prosper on these qualities alone, but

Especially enthusiasm, which by derivation means being filled with the spirit of God. Successful leaders, successful causes, successful societies in all history have been marked by overpowering enthusiasm, and it is the quality which is most conspicuously lacking in our present day outlook.

Three considerations may determine the fate of the new Presidential venture. These are:

First. Has the new administration the innate integrity, the utter dedication to the public good necessary to achieve its goals, and will it retain those qualities unwaveringly through the years?

Second. Has it the intelligence, the resourcefulness, and the vigor to analyze difficulties and to propound appropriate remedies, and push them relentlessly against the opposition of "those that are at ease in Zion" as well as the mountainous mass of inertia which binds our civilization to the wornout habits and customs of the past?

Third. Does it possess that divine spark which alone can kindle the awareness of a somnolent citizenry and inspire them to activity even at the sacrifice of present day advantage?

The consensus of opinion seems to be that the new administration meets the requirements of the first two considerations in quite satisfactory measure. Even in the campaign last summer and fall, the President was described as intelligent, resourceful, tough minded, relentless. It is the last consideration that gives most concern at the present time. Mr. Kennedy himself has reiterated his own concern over that consideration:

> In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. * * * Now the trumpet calls us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are; but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

Arnold Toynbee insists that "growth is the work of creative personalities and minorities; they can not go on moving forward themselves unless they can contrive to carry their fellows with them in their advance. The leader's task is to make his fellows his followers."

The difficulty of enlisting followers for the long twilight struggle is pointed up by the closeness of last fall's election. A vociferous minority which is only a bare minority cautions that the new administration carries "no mandate"—no mandate to do anything. What was good enough for our fathers is good enough for us. The purposes and methods pursued successfully in the past are tried and true. They will ultimately work out for the good of all. This is their position, and on it they will stand until the heavens shall be no more. These are infected with the pessimism and determinism of St. Cyprian, writing some 500 years ago:

> You ought to know that the age is now senile. It has not now the stamina that used to make it upstanding, nor the vigor and robustness that used to make it strong. * * * This is the sentence that has been passed upon the world; this is the law of God; that what has been must die, and what has grown up must grow old.

The Halls of Congress itself are crowded with well-intended Members who cling to this futile philosophy. To them we must say: "The good intentions of democracy have no magic power to perform the miracle of the loaves and fishes." In place of a spirit little suited to the time and its conditions, we must ask them to substitute the thinking of Sir James Jeans:

> Taking a very gloomy view of the future of the human race, let us suppose that it can only expect to survive for 2,000 million years longer, a period about equal to the

past age of the earth. Then, regarded as a being destined to live for three-score years and 10, humanity, although it has been born in a house only 70 years old, is itself only 3 days old. * * * Utterly inexperienced beings, we are standing at the first flush of the dawn of civilization. * * * In time the glory of the morning must fade into the light of common day, and this, in some far distant age, will give place to evening twilight, presaging the final eternal night. But we children of the dawn need give but little thought to the far-off sunset.

And further we must point out, with Toynbee, that—

Certainly, in the movement of all these forces that weave the web of human history, there is an obvious element of recurrence. Yet the shuttle which shoots backward and forward across the loom of Time in a perpetual to-and-fro is all the time bringing into existence a tapestry in which there is a developing design and not simply an endless repetition of the same pattern. * * * This is a message of encouragement for us children of the Western civilization as we drift today alone, with none but stricken civilizations around us. It may be that Death the Leveler will lay his icy hand on our civilization also. But we are not confronted with any stern necessity. The dead civilizations are not dead by fate, or in the course of nature, and therefore our living civilization is not doomed inexorably in advance to join the majority of its species. * * * We are not compelled to submit the riddle of our fate to the blind arbitrament of statistics. The divine spark of creative power is still alive in us, and, if we have the grace to kindle it into flame, then the stars in their courses cannot defeat our efforts to attain the goal of human happiness.

These are words alone, and words are not deeds. But words create ideas, and ideas guide conduct. They set up a sort of pep-rally, which has won many an athletic game in the school and college playground, and which has been equally efficacious in gathering vast forces in favor of religious or economic or social reform. It needs to begin with the conservatives in Congress, and through them spread to industry, to labor, to civic leaders, and to all those who find prestige and favor on their side and who delight to live in a world from which all discordant elements are shut out. For—

A fatuous passivity toward the present springs from an infatuation with the past, and this infatuation is the sin of idolatry. For idolatry may be defined as an intellectually and morally blind worship of the creature instead of the Creator. If it is indeed the truth—

"That men may rise on stepping-stones
Of their dead selves to higher things."

then the idolator who commits the error of treating one dead self not as a stepping-stone but as a pedestal will be alienating himself from life.

It is true that a careless and casual survey of the contemporary scene does not indicate that we are confronted with any stern necessity. Some 66 millions of our fellow Americans are employed at the highest wage in human history. We enjoy the highest standard of living ever known to man—at least, some of us do. Our output of goods and services is measured only by astronomical figures. Our weapons for defensive, or offensive, war exceed in destructive force the lightning bolts of Jove himself. Only two cities in Japan have personal knowledge of just how devastating the smallest of them really is. The urgency of the situation has not come home to most of us yet. There is now no complete collapse of the economic system in the United States, as there was in 1931 and 1932. The tumescence and subsidence of one crisis after another in Europe, in the Near East, and in the Far East, has dulled our senses to the imminence of violent explosion. The chaos in Africa which wrecks any prospects for a peaceful, productive, and orderly life in that continent is far away and hardly comprehensible, or credible. After all, the United States has been uniformly successful over a wide range of activity—political, economic, social, religious, educational, and whatnot. We seem to be perfectly adapted to our environment, and the environment seems favorable. That is the underlying cause of our complaisance, and also the underlying cause of our danger.

A creature which has become perfectly adapted to its environment, an animal whose whole capacity and vital force is concentrated and expended in succeeding here and now, has nothing left over with which to respond to any radical change. Age by age, it becomes more perfectly economical in the way its entire resources meet exactly its current and customary opportunities. In the end it can do all that is necessary to survive without any conscious striving or unadapted movement. It can, therefore, beat all competitors in the special field; but equally, on the other hand, should that field change, it must become extinct.

The condition which is required for the maintenance of growth is a perpetual flexibility and spontaneity.

And this is the condition which the conservatives fail to meet, and which the new administration proposes to change into an actuality. It sees clearly that "whenever the existing institutional structure of a society is challenged by a new social force, three alternative outcomes are possible: either a harmonious adjustment of structure to force, or a revolution—which is a delayed and discordant adjustment—or an enormity. If harmonious adjustments predominate, the society will continue to grow; if revolutions, its growth will become increasingly hazardous; if enormities, we may diagnose a breakdown." Harmonious adjustments are what we seek, both in internal economic structure and in our relations with those peoples which have developed other cultures. To the extent to which we can induce our fellow citizens, both in and out of Congress, to cooperate in making necessary adjustments, we can adapt our society to the changes which can in no wise be fended off, and our society will continue to grow.

This then is the first and vital task of the Kennedy administration, to change an imperceptible political majority into an omnipotent working majority of individuals dedicated to the common good and accepting change as a necessary characteristic of every living organism.

With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

THE ONE-WAY STREET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the U.S. Congress, last week I started on what some have called a crusade. The crusade is a fight for a principle and one that is necessary because of circumstances surrounding the issue of world trade whereby the people have for too long been fed some truth, half-truths, and absolute untruths.

I called attention to the section 5 in H.R. 5—the so-called depressed area redevelopment bill which will be before us before too long.

I hasten to say publicly that I have supported this legislation in the past and in all probability will again.

However, I would be something less than dishonest legislatively if I did not admit that this bill is the clearest cut confession of the failure of our present reciprocal trades and aid laws.

Never in history have a group of Representatives of the people been called on to spend money to correct a serious economic situation and still leave the door wide open for the reoccurrence of the same trade practices that caused the economic breakdown in the first place.

This depressed area bill calls for the spending of public funds at all levels of government for the industrial redevelopment and rehabilitation of any area that has had and still has serious unemployment.

Top priority is given to those areas which have become depressed because of the adverse effect of imported goods under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act.

This is the plainest admission of the failure of our trades agreements ever put in print.

The claims of injury by those adversely affected by these trades deals have fallen on deaf ears and yet the Congress is called upon to admit the damage by a provision of law setting up a relief program for such injured areas.

I cannot see the logic of helping an area to get well only to become distressed again unless we enact some protective measure against the conditions that made it depressed in the first place.

This reminds me of a story:

They tell of the young colored boy who got a job working in a box factory feeding a machine with narrow strips of wood to be cut to certain lengths.

He accidentally cut off one of his fingers and sued for compensation. In those days a worker had to prove negligence on the part of the employer since the law assumed negligence on the part of the worker in all accident cases.

When the inspector for the insurance company came out he questioned the boy about the use of the saw guard, speed, and so forth.

The boy protested that he had performed the job as always—in fact he said, "I will show you. I always puts my hands and fingers just like this—oops there goes another one."

That is the point I am trying to make on the question of redevelopment of depressed areas. The sponsors of this legislation admit that the cause of depression and the need for redevelopment stems from the loss in employment to the area by the adverse effect of the reciprocal trades.

In their own words, this is what H.R. 5, section 5, page 5, says:

> Any area in which a substantial part of the employment is or most recently was in an industry adversely affected by the reduction of trade barriers under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, with respect to which the President has reported to the Administrator under subsection (f) of this section, and meeting the standards of unemployment set forth in this section shall be entitled on application to a priority of consideration by the Administrator for designation as a redevelopment area.

Now I ask you if plain commonsense does not dictate that it is the duty of the Congress to protect this area against a recurrence of the same conditions that made the area depressed in the first place.

What would you think of a man who was suffering a severe allergy and went to the clinic to find out what was causing his miseries?

After an extensive and painful period of time he is discharged on the way to complete recovery and is warned against fried mushrooms and lemon pie because that is what caused his trouble.

With the doctor's admonition in his mind and the hospital bill in his pocket, would you consider him smart or stupid if he stopped in a restaurant on his way home and ordered fried mushrooms and lemon pie?

Is that not what we are doing in this section of the depressed-area bill? We are admitting that this depressed area and its economy has an allergy caused by an overdose of imports from cheap-labor countries and, yet, we refuse to protect this community against another attack which in all probability can prove fatal.

Amongst us always there are those who seem to wear blinders and refuse to look at both sides of a question for fear they will not be able to explain why they have changed their course.

Believe me, those of us joined in this crusade are just as disturbed by world poverty as the highest rated humanitarian amongst us. We too feel the need for friends and allies. However, we subscribe to the sound principle that in order to help our needy neighbors we have to be healthy ourselves.

On the 14th of March a group of representatives of the glass industry from my district and elsewhere, including myself, will appear before the Tariff Commission begging for relief under the escape clause for our dying window-glass and plate-glass industry.

Now those of you who have no such problem can join the anvil chorus and shout your condemnation of these men, including me, who feel that this is our duty not alone to our communities, but in fact to all of your communities as well.

Let us take a fast glance at the results of our trade policies on this industry in just one plant.

In my hometown of Jeannette, Pa., we had, not too long ago, the largest window-glass factory in the world. Today, that plant is idle, its fires are out, its thousands of employees unemployed, and some about my age who will never again be able to get a full-time job in industry.

What caused this situation, and what are we doing about it?

It was caused, as any one of the workers knows, by the importation of window glass from overseas.

In a period of less than 10 years the window glass imports jumped from less than 100,000 boxes to over 1 million boxes, or enough windows to build 1,200,000 six-room houses.

It does not take a Harvard graduate to make two and two equal four in this instance.

Now, here is what we are doing about it. We are going to increase unemployment benefits for a period of about 13 weeks, we are going to spend $371 million to rehabilitate this community, dress up its factory sites, widen the streets to make it more attractive to new industry, we are going to keep a heavy personal and business tax program for public works, and other incentives to building up our economy.

These are not new moves, they are just old remedies dusted off for immediate relief like a hypodermic to a person with a broken leg. It will not cure it, but it will ease the pain.

One thing sure—eventually the broken leg, like our broken economy, has to be operated on or the patient will be crippled for life.

I am for these temporary relief shots into the economic body, but by the same token I am not being lulled into a false sense of security.

Revamping our aid and trade programs will not be the full answer, but it certainly has to be done if we are to achieve a full recovery for our ailing economy.

Last week when I said that millions of Americans have lost their jobs because of the adverse effects of our trade agreements, many of my colleagues questioned the figures.

Steel Magazine, in a story published September 5, 1960, had this to say and I quote:

> OUR FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL IN NEW WORLD MARKET
>
> Two million Americans have lost their livelihood since 1956 because of foreign trade changes.
>
> We're losing the fight for survival in the new world market.
>
> Pierre Hans Ubishi is after the excellent job you've held for years. He's smart, ambitious, and gaining momentum.
>
> Volkswagens on the streets and Japanese radios in homes are ample proof the foreign invasion is here. Not so self-evident is the decline in our industrial exports. But it's clear to Americans who have lost their jobs since 1956 directly as a result of drooping shipments abroad. Statistically, here's what the import-export shift is doing to U.S. industry:

[In billions of dollars]

1956 imports	12.6
1959 imports	15.2
Import rise	2.6
1956 exports	17.3
1959 exports	16.3
Export decline	1.0
Total loss to United States	3.6

You get the full impact of the $2.6 billion rise in imports by computing what that amount of business would mean to U.S. firms: It would generate sales of more than $3 billion because our prices average 20 percent higher than those of our foreign competitors. That $3 billion, plus the $1 billion loss in exports, adds up to $4 billion loss in sales to U.S. industry since 1956.

Added to this, we have another serious problem which is tied directly into the adverse picture on foreign trade.

This is the climbing statistic on foreign investment. As of the moment, the investment in foreign production facilities is increasing while investment in this country is decreasing—percentage-wise.

This is even more serious than casual examination might reveal for the simple reason that the oversea investments by Americans is in the area where American exports are the heaviest.

Business Week, September 10, 1960, gives these two lists, one showing our American investments abroad, the other showing our American exports abroad:

> U.S. investment abroad: Primary metals, machinery (including electrical), transportation equipment (including autos), other metalworking; chemicals, paper, rubber, stone, clay, and glass; food and beverages; miscellaneous manufacturing (including textiles); petroleum industry, manufacturing and petroleum.
>
> U.S. exports: Primary metals, machinery, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, including autos; other metalworking, chemicals, paper, rubber; stone, clay, and glass, petroleum, food and beverages; miscellaneous manufacturing, including textiles.

You will note that we are spending our investment dollars in the production lines that make up our heaviest exports. Americans are taking the advice of our Government to compete in the inner-six and outer-seven market by building plants within these areas to escape their tariff and quota restrictions and to use their cheap labor available in abundance.

The experts see no conflict in our program of foreign investment and our efforts to increase exports. I do, very frankly—I cannot see how we can sell to a market overseas after we create production facilities to produce the goods we sell them from home.

For a few more years the demand for equipment and raw materials and food will give us a trade balance but the end must come whether it is tomorrow or the day afterward because, with our know-how, automation, and our investments abroad we will soon be able to supply any given market with any given product.

You will note if you take the time to examine the records that every other

nation immediately increases protective quotas or tariffs when any product from abroad threatens their domestic industries and jobs.

The case of Germany and its coal tariff, Japan and its automobile embargoes, the proposed increase of $300 per auto in Canada, the restrictions in Mexico and the demand that plants be built in Mexico to replace imported products, are examples in point.

These are just samples of worldwide awareness of the simple facts of life.

The history of the watch industry is being repeated in binoculars, cameras, electronics, radios, automobiles, toys—in fact, almost every consumer item is being pushed off of American production lines and the only lines that are growing are the lines of the unemployed.

Next week I hope to again be given the privilege of the House to try to show the advantages to be gained by the exporting nations in curtailing their exports by self-restraint and to increase their imports in order to put Congress to sleep long enough to again reenact the present trades agreements without reevaluation and revision.

All of us have a stake in this world game of trade, but you cannot play unless you have chips, and ours are running out.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BILL TO PLACE LABOR UNIONS UNDER ANTITRUST LAW

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would place labor unions under antitrust law. This is the same legislation I introduced in the last Congress in cooperation with other Members of the House.

My bill is not punitive, it is not antilabor. It merely makes unions subject to the same rules which now apply to business and industry, rather than leaving unions and their leaders above and beyond the law, as now is the situation.

As I pointed out 2 years ago, union monopoly power manifests itself in two separate and distinct ways: First, restrictive trade practices such as price fixing, restrictions on use of new processes and technological improvements, exclusion of products for the market, and so forth; and, second, enforcement of wage demands through industrywide and pattern bargaining practices with no regard for the economic problems of individual business firms or the impact upon the industry or area affected. This bill deals directly with both of these aspects of union monopoly power. In limiting the almost dictatorial power of the national labor leaders, the control of union affairs will be returned to the hands of the local unions and workers and their elected officials.

THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF UPSTATE NEW YORK

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, twice in recent days the House of Representatives served as a forum for an attack on a report entitled "The Economic Status of Upstate New York," prepared by the Business Research Center of Syracuse University for the temporary State commission on economic expansion.

The attack did not go unnoticed, nor did the motives for the attack remain unquestioned. A February 11 editorial in the Syracuse Herald-Journal provides some interesting background data and attempts to place the controversy in its proper perspective. I include that editorial at this point:

REASONS IDENTIFIED FOR SPARKING SQUABBLE

Why should Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, whose home base is Schenectady, pick on a study report written by the Syracuse University Business Research Center for the temporary State commission on economic expansion?

He first commented on the report without having read it.

He next asserted he wouldn't change his remarks after reading it * * * although the tenor of his remarks indicated some misplacement of understanding.

Mr. STRATTON is anxious to attract upstate attention for two reasons.

First, he is a Democrat whose district, ordinarily Republican, may be resting on a foundation of sand. New York State faces a loss in representation because of the recent census and Mr. STRATTON's district might be gerrymandered out of existence.

That is considered a prospect since the task of redistricting is in the hands of a committee named by our Republican-dominated legislature.

Next, Mr. STRATTON has been tantalized, as well, by this newspaper's canvass of Democratic county chairmen. We were wondering if they had been thinking about an opponent for Governor Rockefeller and a few, noting Mr. STRATTON's success in a normally Republican district, mentioned the Congressman as a third-man prospect.

So, that is what lurks in the background of the current controversy over New York State jobless figures and whether development corporations are worth their community salt.

BILL TO ASSIST REHABILITATION OF BLIND

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced today is another effort on my part to resolve permanently the perennial Missouri-Pennsylvania problem existing in title X, the aid to the blind title of the Social Security Act.

My bill—and I have introduced other similar bills in previous Congresses—would amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that, without an increase in Federal participating funds, a State plan for aid to the blind may utilize a more liberal needs test than that presently specified in such act.

Time and time again by its enactments Congress has indicated its belief that our blind citizens should be aided and encouraged in their magnificent struggle to resume normal life, to function as full participants in the normal pursuits of the community.

Time and time again Congress has enacted rehabilitatively oriented legislation in aid to the blind; but repeatedly and consistently it has neglected or refused to solve for all time the constantly recurring Missouri-Pennsylvania problem in aid to the blind.

What is the Missouri-Pennsylvania problem? What has Congress done to solve it?

The States of Missouri and Pennsylvania maintain aid to the blind programs, entirely financed by State funds which are more liberal in their eligibility requirements than those allowable under Federal law and regulation; these same States also maintain aid to the blind programs in accordance with the provisions of title X of the Social Security Act, which are financed jointly from Federal-State funds. These latter programs are operated in compliance with the very stringent eligibility standards set forth in the Federal law and regulations.

For more than 10 years the completely State-financed aid to the blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania have been threatened with extinction; for more than 10 years Federal authorities have threatened to withhold Federal participating funds from the Federal-State aid to the blind programs in those States unless they agreed to conform to the eligibility standards required by Federal law and regulations for their blind aid recipients. In other words, these States were expected to maintain Federal standards in programs which did not receive one single Federal dollar to meet operating or program costs.

For more than 10 years the States of Missouri and Pennsylvania have met this challenge, this unreasonable Federal challenge to their right to spend their own funds in a manner determined by themselves, by refusing to abandon their totally State-financed aid to the blind programs. The Congress has abetted these States by enacting stopgap legislation. There have been five such actions, the most recent of which was included in the Social Security Amendments of 1960, extending the cutoff date to June 30, 1964.

Enactment of this stopgap legislation has not solved the Missouri-Pennsylvania problem; it has only postponed a solution to the problem.

It is my hope that this the 87th Congress will cease evading the issue; will enact my bill into law—and will finally and unequivocally solve this prepetual and perplexing Missouri-Pennsylvania problem.

It is my conviction that the more liberal eligibility requirements which prevail in the State-financed aid to the blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania have made it possible for many blind men and women to work their way from dependence upon public assistance to economic self-sufficiency; to liberation from a lifetime of dependence upon public assistance.

I believe that these programs, rehabilitatively organized and administered, have served as a bridge across which have traveled many blind persons as they successfully battled to rebuild their lives from the ruins resulting from the loss of sight.

Not only do I believe that these fine aid to the blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania should be permanently secured in their right to continue to operate; I also believe that any other State should be granted the right, if it wishes; and with the use of its own funds, to establish and maintain a similar program for the benefit of its blind citizens.

Enactment of my bill would finally resolve the following issues which have been raised—and would continue to be raised—in title X of the Social Security Act:

First. It would secure the States in their right to use their own funds in the establishment and maintenance of improved and enlightened social welfare programs for their blind citizens.

Second. It would protect Missouri and Pennsylvania in their right to continue to maintain permanently their rehabilitatively directed, solely State-financed aid to the blind programs free from further Federal interference and it would allow other States wishing to do so to establish similar programs with the unique features of the Missouri and Pennsylvania State plans for aid to the blind.

Third. The amount of each State's Federal grant for its federally supported aid to the blind programs would continue to be measured by the present Federal standards and on like terms to all States. The means test that is contained in clause (8) of section 1002(a) as amended would apply to all States for the purpose of determining the part of any State's expenditures that would be covered by the Federal grant.

Fourth. No limitation or requirement on the allowance exceptions from the means test in the direction of greater liberality would be imposed upon any State plan in order to retain a title X Federal grant for federally eligible cases.

In order to prevent the States from circumventing the minimum standards of the Federal program by transferring blind aid recipients to a drastically less adequate State program, the States would be permitted to increase but not decrease the extent to which the recipients' earnings, income, or other resources might be excepted from the means test.

Fifth. It would certainly serve to encourage other States to develop their plans of aid to the blind toward the high goal of rehabilitation, rather than the static goal of providing for the barest minimum physical needs of blind persons.

In 1950 Congress incorporated the rehabilitation concept into the provisions of title X of the Social Security Act—by requiring that the first $50 of the monthly earned income of blind aid recipients be exempt from meeting their needs. In the 86th Congress this exemption was increased to $85 plus 50 percent of monthly earned income.

In 1956 Congress proclaimed self-care and self-support to be among the purposes of the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act.

These congressional actions were taken to convert the Federal-State aid to the blind programs into programs which not only gave a person in need minimum food, shelter and clothing; but, and this is of very great importance, it offered those who must apply for help the opportunity gradually to work their way from reliance upon public funds to self-reliance; from demeaning economic dependence to satisfyingly self-achieved economic independence.

Sixth. My bill, if adopted by Congress would restore to the States their right to establish, if they wished to do so, aid to the blind programs with standards more liberal than those allowable under present Federal law and regulations. It would restore to the States their right to spend their own money as they choose in such programs. All this could be done without any cost to the Federal Government. This would be so, since the provisions of my bill specify that the Federal Government would only make available participating funds for those cases which would qualify under the present stringent Federal definition of need.

Not only would the enactment of my bill not cost additional Federal dollars—very much the contrary would happen.

I believe that, by assisting blind persons in need to return to work, to resume economically productive lives, by making aid to the blind programs a means of achieving rehabilitation; by operating such programs in accordance with a philosophy of hope and help—then, I think, and only then—will the many able bodied, employable blind persons be rescued from perpetual dependence upon public support—a drain upon the resources of the Nation; a loss to the economy, to the total life of the Nation.

The experience of the more liberal blind aid programs in my State of Missouri and in the State of Pennsylvania, I believe, fully justifies my conviction and my contention—that when programs providing public assistance to the blind are operated as a force for rehabilitation, then a substantial number of rehabilitated and restored lives results.

I do not believe that men and women who are able to work, who have many years of working life remaining to them should remain upon public assistance for the rest of their lives. Nor do I believe they want to remain there.

My bill, enacted into law would give to these people the opportunity they want, the opportunity they need—and the opportunity they deserve—to regain their lost dignity, their lost independence—for this will come to them only when they again earn their own daily bread, when they can again provide for the needs of their family.

CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES OF THE FLATHEAD RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this day a bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation.

The same measure was introduced late in the last Congress with the support of the entire Montana delegation—S. 3004 and H.R. 10208, 86th Congress.

This bill will restore to tribal ownership of the Confederated Tribes between 500 and 600 acres of former tribal lands now in Government ownership but not used by or useful to the Federal Government. These lands are needed by the Confederated Tribes for tribal use in the land-use program.

The lands were acquired from the Confederated Tribes under an act of 1904 opening the reservation to settlement which provided payment to the tribes at only the statutory minimum of $1.25 per acre. The lands have fulfilled the purpose for which they were originally taken—which was for Indian administration—and are surplus to the Department's needs.

The fact that such lands could not be integrated into the tribal land-use program became pointedly apparent 2 or 3 years ago when the lack of tribal title to some of the lands hindered and delayed for nearly a year the establishment of a needed Indian clinic at St. Ignatius, Mont. It was this situation which led the Department of the Interior to suggest that the tribes seek legislative restoration. In connection with the proposed clinic it was learned that the tribes did not own the former agency-reserve land or building which the Public Health Service desired to use. Under existing law the Department of the Interior could not promptly make it available to the Public Health Service without payment of its value. Since that situation came up the matter has been solved by means of a permit arrangement.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey the beneficial title of lands to the tribes which in the future may be declared surplus to the needs of the Department of the Interior. This provision would avoid the necessity of additional legislation for future conveyances of surplus lands.

When the United States acquired these for agency purpose in the first place, there was no appraisal to determine if the statutory minimum of $1.25 per acre was a fair price, nor were the tribes given any option to accept or reject the statutory remuneration. As a result, the Government paid only some $958.75, according to a Department of the Interior study, for lands

which today are worth nearly 40 times as much. In order that the Government shall not profit at the expense of its wards and in order that lands formerly taken for merely nominal consideration for the benefit of the Indians shall actually inure to their benefit, the bill makes a provision against offsets in any claims against the United States.

The enactment of this bill will materially assist in putting these lands to productive use.

THE ROUSH-CHAMBERS ELECTION CONTEST IN INDIANA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the minority leader, Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, along with a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly. The resolution reiterates belief in the principle of "no taxation without representation" and it urges the seating in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress the duly elected Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Indiana.

It would appear, however, that Mr. HALLECK inadvertently misinterpreted the resolution passed by the Indiana General Assembly. The resolution asked that the contestant be seated "in accordance with the certificates of election as filed by the Indiana secretary of state." The Indiana secretary of state certified the election of J. Edward Roush by a majority of 2 votes. Mr. HALLECK, in his letter, would lead you to believe that George O. Chambers is the duly elected contestant. So each of my colleagues may personally examine these documents, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

I concur with the request of the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly in Resolution 19, and I join my honorable colleague, Mr. RAY J. MADDEN, in asking this House to take immediate action and seat J. Edward Roush, whose election from the Fifth District of Indiana has been so certified by the secretary of that State.

OFFICE OF THE MINORITY LEADER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, February 15, 1961.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Enclosed herewith is a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly to end taxation without representation in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana by seating George O. Chambers "without prejudice to either contestant in accordance with the certificates of election as filed by the Indiana secretary of state."

Also enclosed is an editorial on this subject from the Anderson (Ind.) Herald, of February 11, 1961.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. HALLECK.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 19

Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and move its adoption:

"Whereas a resolution has been submitted to permit the residents of the District of Columbia to vote for the President and the Vice President of the United States; and

"Whereas we sincerely do not believe in the principle of taxation without representation whether it be in the District of Columbia or in the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana; and

"Whereas the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana has been denied the right of representation in the U.S. Congress: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Indiana General Assembly memorialize the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress to follow established precedent by seating with full representation privileges the Fifth Indiana District Representative without prejudice to either contestant in accordance with the certificates of election as filed by the Indiana secretary of state; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That support be given to the principle of representation with taxation to the citizens of our Nation's Capital in the expectation that the same privilege be accorded to all of the citizens of Indiana."

Adopted February 9, 1961.

KERMIT O. BURROWS,
Representative.

Attest:

FRANCIS GAYLORD,
Clerk of the House.

SOME FACTS OF THE RECESSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues are concerned that the administration is going to talk the country into a recession. The facts, gentlemen, speak for themselves.

In California, the jobless total is 517,000—higher than it has been in 10 years. Currently, 8 percent of our work force, compared with 5.9 percent for January 1960, are the victims of this talk.

While employment decreases, there is an increase in the number of shutoff utilities, refinancing, repossession of automobiles, and household furniture. In Los Angeles County foreclosures and bankruptcies are on the rise—90 percent of the bankruptcies are individual wage earners.

The New York Times of February 17, 1961, presented an editorial which favored facing reality when an economy is confronted with a recession. This is hardly an apt recommendation for those who consider unemployment figures are created by talk.

The editorial follows:

IT'S A REAL RECESSION

Few current phenomena are as astonishing as the effort in some quarters to deny that our economy is now passing through a recession. President Kennedy presented the facts simply and convincingly at his Wednesday press conference. Unemployment has now risen to 5,500,000; the steel industry is operating now and has been operating for many months at a level of only about half its capacity; stocks of automobiles are around the million mark and automobile production has been slowed down considerably in consequence. In the face of these and other facts it is incomprehensible how even the most partisan opponent of the administration can deny that the economy has receded substantially from anything approaching full employment of resources.

Much more than semantics is involved in this argument. Those who deny we are in a recession are in effect denying that there is anything about which we need be concerned or that there are any special measures which need to be taken. They fail, consequently, to appraise properly the great costs we are paying during this economic downturn. Domestically we are wasting a significant percentage of our human and material resources which are now idle, with consequent diminution of the flow of wages, profits, and tax revenues. Even more important, in millions of homes where the breadwinner is unemployed an atmosphere of anxiety and worry reigns, creating psychological costs which are not negligible. Abroad the evident facts about our economic ills raise questions about our Nation's future even among our friends, while they give valuable propaganda material for our enemies.

President Kennedy is doing no more than his duty in stating the facts bluntly and in outlining measures needed to improve the situation. The fact that he is moving to increase the flow of purchasing power and to get legislation which will ameliorate hardships resulting from unemployment gives reason to hope that the current downturn will be arrested before it has run its full course. It is the obligation of the leader of a democratic society to tell his people the truth, and this obligation President Kennedy is fulfilling well on this major issue.

CALIFORNIA AREAS HIT BY RECESSION—GOVERNOR BROWN GETS A REPORT—CALLS SITUATION SERIOUS—JOBLESS TOTAL RISES

(By Bill Becker)

LOS ANGELES, February 17.—With more than 500,000 unemployed, California faced conditions comparable, in some counties, to the depression days of the 1930's.

That was the low point of a week by John M. Wedemeyer, director of the State department of social welfare.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown, terming the recession serious, today called a conference in Sacramento for March 13 to combat the problem.

"We don't intend to let anyone starve," the Governor said. The welfare report stated that "there is currently little testimony that people are starving, although there are some indications of some malnutrition." A decided increase was found in the number of calls on public health agencies.

Department investigators found conditions in 13 representative counties checked substantially worse than a year ago. These included such big counties as Los Angeles, San Diego, and Alameda, and smaller counties, both rural and semirural.

The jobless total in January rose to 517,000 statewide, the highest total in 10 years. The unemployment rate of 8 percent compared with 6.9 percent in December and 5.9 percent in January 1960.

In their survey during the week of February 5 to 11, the State social workers found unemployment spreading to skilled laboring groups for the first time in years. Main industries affected were construction, aircraft, steel, and lumber.

The reports showed unemployment benefits were being depleted at a rate that could

bring about a potentially critical condition in several counties in the next 2 or 3 months.

In San Diego County alone, nearly 1,200 workers a month are exhausting benefits. One building trades union reported 500 unemployed of a total membership of 1,500.

Much of the unemployment, investigators found, is among persons under 25 years of age, many of them with families. Negroes and Mexican-Americans have been especially hard hit, the report added.

Increased shutoff of utilities, refinancing of contracts and repossession of cars and furniture were noted. Foreclosures and bankruptcies were reported steadily rising, especially in populous Los Angeles County. Ninety percent of the bankrupt were individual wage earners who overused their credit.

The county's bureau of public assistance went on an emergency 48-hour workweek to cope with mounting relief requests. The bureau handled 10,687 relief applications during January and expected more this month.

The bureau director, Leland C. Carter, said: "It's the heaviest I've seen since I started here in the middle of the depression." Voluntary agencies are helping somewhat, but the State workers found that these groups have limited funds.

Governor Brown, meanwhile, requested President Kennedy to include California in the proposed Federal food stamp plan to help feed the unemployed.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that Members of the House have been appearing or will appear before the Committee on House Administration in opposition to the request for funds made by the Committee on Un-American Activities. In that connection permit me to call attention to this editorial from this morning's Chicago Tribune. The very distinguished majority leader was one of the first to hold a hearing on the Communist menace in this country. The present committee's request is for funds for continuation of that good work. The editorial reads:

THE RED HERRING'S RETURN

The testimony of William D. Pawley released today by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security has some of the hottest information on the perversities of State Department personalities and method since the exposure of Alger Hiss. Mr. Pawley's statement should be thoroughly examined and discussed in Congress, for, if what he says is correct, the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy didn't know the half of it.

Mr. Pawley's experience with Latin America covers more than half a century, and he had a deep familiarity with the Orient. He was the man who established the Flying Tigers air operation which assisted the Nationalist Government to help defend China before the United States was at war with Japan. He served as President Truman's Ambassador to Peru and Brazil.

Because he insisted that China could be saved from the Communists, and proposed measures toward that end, Pawley testified that he was treated as a leper when he was serving as a special assistant to the Secretary of State Dean Acheson. He related that the Under Secretary, James E. Webb, called him in to notify him that "it has been decided that you are to see no document dealing with the Far East, you are to participate in no conference that is held in the Department of State or anywhere else in Government dealing with this matter, and, as a favor to the Secretary, just don't discuss Far East matters."

Pawley asked, "Am I considered a subversive?"

"No," Webb replied. "Let's say reactionary."

Webb is now President Kennedy's Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In Latin America, Pawley testified that ambassadorial appointments and even high assignments within the State Department were virtually dictated by George Michanowsky, a Russian-born naturalized citizen, who ran a committee on Latin affairs for the CIO. When Michanowsky told Pawley to play along and he would go places, Pawley asked what made Michanowsky think the CIO could elevate him to Assistant Secretary or Under Secretary of State.

"We have 8 million votes," was the reply, "and we are quite a power in Government."

"You are a Communist agent," Pawley told his caller, "and I know it."

"Michanowsky," Pawley said, "planted Gustavo Duran, a onetime lieutenant colonel in the Spanish Republican army denounced on the floor of Congress as an agent of the Soviet secret police, on the staff of Spruille Braden, former Ambassador to Argentina and later Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs." Although Braden now is a vocal anti-Communist, Pawley testified that a document exposing Braden's helpfulness to Communists led to his being fired from the State Department, but that, as a sop to Michanowsky and the CIO, President Truman at the same time removed George Messersmith, Ambassador to Argentina, whose loyalty was beyond question.

Pawley testified that the State Department had every reason to know that, long before he grabbed power in Cuba, Fidel Castro was a Communist. When Communists organized riotous demonstrations against the conference of the Organization of American States at Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948, Pawley said he heard Castro broadcast over the Bogotá radio, "This is Fidel Castro from Cuba. This is a Communist revolution. The President has been killed, all of the military establishments in Colombia are now in our hands. The navy has capitulated to us, and this revolution has been a success."

While these events trace back to President Truman's administration, they also stretch into President Kennedy's. Truman dismissed Communist infiltration of his administration as "a red herring." At his press conference last week, Mr. Kennedy said that he had no evidence that anyone in the State Department advanced the Communist foothold in Cuba.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 30 minutes, on Thursday next, February 23, 1961.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 1 hour today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 1 hour on Thursday next, February 23, 1961, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 30 minutes on Thursday, February 23, 1961.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TOLL and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. BOLAND and include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 days after receipt. Accordingly, there is submitted herewith, within the prescribed time limit, the consolidated report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS—COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES

Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
England	pounds	82.11.0	$231.14	69.24.0	$196.56	16.19.4	$47.51	20.29.0	$66.06	191.3.4	$535.27
Denmark	kroner	675	97.80	667	96.66	140	20.28	145	20.95	1,627	235.69
Germany	deutsche mark	310.50	73.80	476	113.30	15,954	3,801.00	106.15	25.30	16,856.65	4,013.40
Austria	schillings	2,968	114.20	4,802	184.60	650	24.90	1,514	58.30	7,023	382.00
Switzerland	franc	304	70.62	334	77.59	80	6.27	53	26.71	780	181.19
France	do	427	86.48	787	159.41	157.50	31.88	231.50	46.90	1,603	324.67
Mexico	pesos	2,542.47	203.50	1,676.34	134.17	1,241.09	99.34	336.23	26.91	5,796.13	463.92
Brazil	cruzeiro	44,157	227.61	28,563.94	147.23	492,176.85	2,585.46	1,580.21	38.55	572,378	2,998.85
Argentina	Argentine pesos	20,661.37	249.12	18,960.45	228.63	3,784.80	45.60	2,470.08	29.77	45,876.70	553.12
Chili	Escuda	144.92	137.88	84.59	80.48	3.85	3.65	6.30	6.00	239.64	228.01
Peru	soles	3,397.68	119.07	5,081.67	189.30	1,799.30	67.00	485.96	18.10	10,564.61	393.47
Guatemala [1]			210.40		24.50		16.00		13.00		263.90
El Salvador [1]	colon	375.85	150.34	90	36.00	72.50	29.00	105	42.00	643.35	257.34
Costa Rica [1]	do	234.95	36.95	61.80	9.27		7.00		11.00	296.75	64.22
Panama [1]			123.75		33.00		14.00		21.05		191.80
Nassau [1]			628.05		12.00		87.67		31.25		758.97
Total			2,780.71		1,722.70		6,886.56		475.85		11,845.82

[1] Total foreign currency was converted from Mexican pesos.

BRENT SPENCE, *Chairman.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

577. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 100,000 pounds of subgrade crude quartz crystals now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

578. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission (Commission was established September 2, 1957, and was terminated June 30, 1960); to the Committee on Government Operations.

579. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the pricing of spare parts for J–69 turbojet engines under Department of the Air Force negotiated contracts with Continental Aviation & Engineering Corp., Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

580. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

581. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

582. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first comprehensive report concerning activities relating to the production and conservation of coal in the United States, pursuant to section 7 of Publaw Law 86–599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

583. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, relative to requesting that the bill H.R. 7727 of the 86th Congress, be reintroduced in the present 87th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

584. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order granting the application for permanent residence filed by Martino Hroncich, A10255933, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

585. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

586. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program through increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

587. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

588. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; to the Committee on House Administration.

589. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, relative to requesting that the bill H.R. 4850 of the 86th Congress, be reintroduced in the present 87th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 4569. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4570. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for public information and publicity concerning instances where competitors submit identical bids to public agencies for the sale or purchase of supplies, equipment, or services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4571. A bill to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 4572. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 4573. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H.R. 4574. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4575. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4576. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4577. A bill to extend and increase the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 4578. A bill to amend the act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 752), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional features of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4579. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the inclusion of housing designed for middle income groups when rental or cooperative housing

is constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4580. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that, without an increase of Federal participating funds, a State plan for aid to the blind may utilize a more liberal needs test than that presently specified in such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 4581. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to provide that, without an increase of Federal participating funds, a State plan for aid to the blind may utilize a more liberal needs test than that presently specified in such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 4582. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4583. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide medical treatment and outpatient medical services to widows of deceased honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4584. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the same rights to non-service-connected veterans of World War I as are granted to service-connected veterans of such World War I in reference to medical treatment and outpatient medical services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 4585. A bill to provide a termination date for the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4586. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 4587. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, to make it unlawful for any individual employed by a public utility to participate in a strike against that utility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4588. A bill to amend chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code, so as to further the development and maintenance of an adequate fleet of American jet cargo aircraft, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H.R. 4589. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4590. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H.R. 4591. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1962, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 4592. A bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4593. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands belonging to the United States to the County of Pima, State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4594. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCRANTON:

H.R. 4595. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 4596. A bill to provide for the encouragement of economic redevelopment in communities depressed by chronic unemployment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the manufacturers excise tax on business machines in the case of articles purchased for the exclusive use of a church or a convention or association of churches; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 4598. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4599. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946 with respect to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4600. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 4601. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of owners and tenants of land acquired by the Federal Aviation Agency for their moving expenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4602. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more liberal definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability-insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4603. A bill to provide for the acceleration of the land-acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 4604. A bill to provide for the transfer to Indian tribes of certain tracts of land owned by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4605. A bill to provide for the use of certain moneys deposited in the Treasury to the credit of Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4606. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and certain provisions of title 28, United States Code, relating to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4607. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall not be less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4608. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 4609. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 469 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4610. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 4611. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to widows and children of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 4612. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game and food fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4613. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 4614. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4615. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4616. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4617. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4618. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the admission of New Mexico to statehood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4619. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4620. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4621. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4622. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4623. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for

veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4624. A bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4625. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4626. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Commitee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 4627. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that Congress shall have power to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 248. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.J. Res. 249. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress on the use of a Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. Res. 176. Resolution to provide for the unity of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska relative to support of a legislative program to alleviate the critical situation with regard to overproduction of feed grains and decreasing farm income; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948 in such a manner as to encourage the domestic production of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reassert its constitutional control over our international monetary policies and restore the American dollar to its historic place among the currencies of the world by proceeding at the earliest possible date to enact necessary legislation to take care of the situation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that all moneys paid by the Federal Government to the State of Idaho for the improvement of teachers' salaries, be paid to the Idaho State treasurer and that such funds be deposited for distribution to public schools by using the educational or distribution formula in effect at the time such funds are received; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to representation in the electoral college for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact enabling legislation permitting residents of certain Federal and Indian reservations to vote in the event such legislation should become necessary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4628. A bill for the relief of Fotios Sakelaropoulos Kaplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4629. A bill for the relief of Persephoni (Laoutaze) Sekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4630. A bill for the relief of Marten Kucukmorel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 4631. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lopinto Arzaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4632. A bill for the relief of Natividad M. Obienda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4633. A bill for the relief of Estrellita Tongco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Rita Theresa Morris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4635. A bill for the relief of Hattie and Joseph Patrick, Sr., and for the legal guardian of Betty Ann Smith and the legal guardian of Stanley Smith, and for the legal guardian of James E. Harris, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 4636. A bill for the relief of Ralph B. Cleveland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 4637. A bill for the relief of Pfc. Rodolfo L. Feliciano and his wife, Carmelita M. Feliciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4638. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Vern D. Calloway, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 4639. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 4640. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles H. Biederman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 4641. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William N. T. Zee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4642. A bill for the relief of Ahmed Soussi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 4643. A bill for the relief of Chul Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 4644. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Arnon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 4645. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hilda Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4646. A bill to provide for the advancement of Rear Adm. Bartholomew W. Hogan, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy (retired), to the grade of vice admiral on the Navy retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4647. A bill for the relief of Lilian E. Gonzalez (Reyes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4648. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aliza Shammash Shaby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4649. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lourdes Ocampo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4650. A bill for the relief of Matthew Daly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4651. A bill for the relief of Helena R. Teichner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4652. A bill for the relief of Vera and Alfonsina Rosignuolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4653. A bill for the relief of Chao Chiung Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4654. A bill for the relief of Akiva Ziv (also known as Kenneth Finkelman); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4655. A bill for the relief of Adell Anis Mansour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4656. A bill for the relief of Vito Sproviero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 4657. A bill for the relief of Georges A. Reuter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

63. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the president, Wyoming (Pa.) Borough Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to giving approval to and endorsement of the depressed area bill introduced by Congressman WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, and urging that it be passed, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 103d Anniversary Banquet of Clearfield, Pa., Lodge No. 314, Free and Accepted Masons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 18, the Clearfield, Pa., Lodge No. 314, Free and Accepted Masons observed its 103d anniversary with a banquet which was attended by several hundred of its members.

As the speaker of the evening it was my pleasure to deliver the following address:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 103D ANNIVERSARY BANQUET, CLEARFIELD LODGE NO. 314, FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS, CLEARFIELD, PA., FEBRUARY 18, 1961

In all the fraternal organizations of man since tribal times, probably none has had a greater influence on the progress of the human race as the Masons. This is a proud statement of self-appraisal.

It is good to bear this proud feeling in mind as you celebrate tonight the more-than-century-old record of this Clearfield Lodge No. 314, of the Free and Accepted Masons.

The Masonic influence has been dynamic and it has been benevolent. It is an influence for good that has integrated itself sometimes quietly, sometimes boldly, sometimes through struggle and opposition into the most advanced forms of freedom that invest civilized government in our time.

In matters pertaining to the dignity of man and his rights as an individual it has often been militant and mightily effective.

These are some of the reasons why this honor in addressing you tonight fills me with a certain sense of mission.

My purpose is to make my message to you about our ancient and honorable order bear some relevance to affairs of the present hour that engage and disturb mankind.

I believe that it is the moral groundwork of Masonry as an institution that explains in part its rugged origins—certainly its growth—and most of all, its considerable influence as a body today.

The great men who have made the most striking impression on history have invariably been men of extraordinary moral stature.

I can mention the great religionists.

In our country's history we have the monumental example of Abraham Lincoln.

He was, it seems to me, above all and in the last analysis a great moral teacher for mankind. Without that he might still be a great figure in history as so many others are. But with it—this moral force—he is an immortal among the greatest immortals of all time.

Lincoln was not a Mason, but his philosophy is the very heart of Masonry.

In the long story of human endeavor this moral might is precisely true of the Masons.

Man has a tremendous hunger for comradeship. But there is comradeship among all sorts of people—among gangsters, for instance, and conspirators, fanatics, crackpots, and bigots.

What makes the Masons strong and enduring is the foundation of moral precepts that govern the organization and inspire it and give it its reason for being.

The basis of existing for human rights, for the dignity of man, for the freedom on the individual under law, for tolerance and for charity, this overall sense of responsibility is the bone and the sinew of Masonry.

This moral basis for its origin, its existence, its activities, explain why it has lived and prospered and sometimes endured and surmounted misfortune down through the ages from probably the 10th century.

It is, of course, a remarkable history for a fraternal order conceived in a noble origin and dedicated to high purpose.

This Clearfield lodge constitutes a living fragment of this great tradition.

The Masonic fraternity since its founding has been composed of the rich and the poor, the great and the near great, industrialists and workers—in short, men from all walks of life. In the lodge room they are all equal.

It is recorded that when President Theodore Roosevelt became a Master Mason at Oyster Bay, N.Y., the master of the lodge was Roosevelt's gardener, and "Teddy" was called "Brother Roosevelt" just like the other members of the lodge.

The history of lodge No. 314 is replete with the names of brethren of various occupations many of them prominent in the business—industrial and professional life of Clearfield County—over a span of 103 years.

The membership since 1858 has embraced generations of men of noble character and lofty ideals, from all walks of life, whose dedication to the principles of Freemasonry never faltered or grew lukewarm.

The result has been that under the strong and effective leadership of right worshipful grand masters—your membership has increased in the past 50 years from 164 in 1908 to your present membership of over 500.

The progress achieved merits the warmest commendation—for it reveals the vital force lodge No. 314 is, and has been, in the 21st Masonic district and in the grand jurisdiction.

It is pleasing to be with you on this occasion and share in this 103d anniversary of your founding.

For the history we are now in the process of making in Washington, and the history of the Masons, and the history of your particular order, have an association with each other; a covenant, I would call it, that binds us together, so to speak, in a single force.

As a result Masonry lives in you and in me and in 5 million other Americans because its teachings strike fire in the noblest regions of the human soul.

Of course it is a society with secrets for that is inherent in the nature of a fraternal comradeship.

The Masons, however, are not to be classified as a secret society with all the evil implications that the term implies. Masonry has its own rituals which belong to it as a matter of custom and tradition and may be called secret.

But I can imagine no group—civic or fraternal, patriotic or religious—whose activities and whose quarters, whose doings and festivities are as wide open to the world's sunlight as that of this Clearfield lodge or any other lodge of Masons.

Masonry, as you all know, from its inception proclaimed the dignity of labor. We have since those early Masonic beginnings achieved goals undreamed of by the founders of our order. But they, among others, sowed the seeds of this amazing progress in the life of the workingman.

It is in this same spirit of participation in events, in the life of the Nation, in the problems domestic and international, that beset us that I am pleading for today.

Every American is a link in the chain of America's strength.

If this lodge, this group of men, joined with other groups contribute individually and as a body in advancing our country's progress then by that much our country is stronger.

I suppose it is harping on an old theme to remind you that of the 55 delegates who attended the Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 that created the Constitution of the United States, 20 at some time in their lives became Masons, or were Masons when the Constitution was formed.

I recall with pride that George Washington had been a Mason since 1752 and in the year of his inauguration—1789—was worshipful master of Alexandria lodge in Virginia.

It is good to know that these 20 Masons participated in creating the Constitution of the United States, a document that has been called by Gladstone, the "most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Who will say how much the ideals and the disciplines of Masonry influenced this the basic law of the land.

It is this influence—benevolent and patriotic, spiritual and moral—that I plead for today in the determination of our destiny.

When we are concerned with the national defense, what should it be that determines decision? Is it our personal interest or the interest of the country?

When we help to make the decision on taxes, what is it that is uppermost in our minds?

Is it the education of our youth or is it some less noble consideration?

When we speak of alleviating conditions in depressed areas, what do we think of as most important?

Is it the diffusion of America's enormous prosperity among all our countrymen or is it the hoarding of the prosperity for the privileged few or a fortunate group or area?

It is to these problems that I would like to see the morals of Masonry applied.

We may differ honestly on the approach to a problem. But if we are dedicated in our basic principles the future of our country will be secure.

If we look upon this Nation and its destiny as that great Mason George Washington looked upon it and the other Masons active in the founding of this Government then we shall build for our posterity as they built for us. George Washington was eminently tolerant and had no use for bigotry. In this, it seems to me, he applied the teachings of Masonry. In his will he freed the slaves of his estate at Mount Vernon.

He was perhaps the foremost American of his time and of all time.

And humbly I ask tonight from you what precisely he asked of his own generation, that we conduct ourselves as good citizens in giving our Government on all occasions our effectual support. This is the burden of my message to you.

It is that we apply the teachings of Masonry to the crises of the hour.

It is not only that we passively remain free ourselves from bigotry and racialism and the little but acute injustices of social insult,

but that we denounce these evils whenever and wherever they raise their ugly heads.

For in this form of division among us is the poison of disunion and the corruption-breeding seeds of national weakness and conflict.

If modern Masonry has not taught us this lesson right out of its heart of hearts, it has taught us nothing and we do not deserve to associate ourselves with Masonry.

We should in that case leave Masonry and find more congenial associations perhaps in any of the many fringe hate organizations that come and go like national aches and pains and the more profound miseries of the human soul.

Masonry has no place for the kind of exclusiveness that destroys the dignity or the character or the standing or the freedoms of any man. That for me is one of the arch stones of our faith as Masons.

For our overall problem today is worldwide.

Indeed, as I speak, more than one-fourth of the earth's surface is controlled by communism. The slavery epidemic is spreading. It is banging with its fist right at our own doors.

It is up to us from within our own country to present a united front against communism. Where the Communists have suppression we offer freedom. Where they force upon a people base servitude we offer freedom to the individual and an opportunity for the human soul to grow and expand and be itself. Where they have goverment by men we have government by law.

We have to ask ourselves how well and how thoroughly and with what flame and conviction and power can we spread these ideas of a free republic and the dignity of the individual? For unless we stand up and fight for what we believe—what hope is there?

When I say fight, I mean fight with our zeal as Masons and as Americans and as patriots. I mean fight as our order fought throughout history.

We face the awful threat of nuclear world suicide. This is the new element in the old crisis of freedom versus slavery.

It is up to the American people to decide how this unbelievable weapon is to be employed from our side of civilization.

We know that the other side will have no compunction about using nuclear warfare if ever it can see great ultimate advantage for itself and near or total destruction for us.

Thus we are obliged to concentrate upon defense in such a pronounced and obvious and formidable and terrible posture as to deter the enemy.

We must in effect frighten him from ever letting loose on this country the desolation which in any conflict we must be able to afflict doubly upon him.

Thus the American idea, the Masonic idea, is not only to speak for peace, but to work for peace where possible without tension.

We must fight for peace through budgets that make our strength a terrifying expression of our military might. For we deal with enemies who today or tomorrow or at some time and some place may be maniacs, as some of them are now neurotics, and we must so pose our strength as to deter and contain and halt even the madmen.

Beneath this outstanding, ever-present and obviously all-powerful military machine we must with equal diligence pursue the paths to peace by negotiation, by publicity, by plans, by honorable concession that exact a just and equally honorable settlement of differences.

We must pursue this peace by taking the initiative and not waiting for the enemy to push us off balance or take us when our guard is down.

We have great veterans organizations of proud and experienced soldiers whose dedication to their country has been proved in tests of fire.

It is a vast strengthening of the strains of our population through these groups and yours and through all our people that the national unity can be achieved upon which our security must rest.

We have just awakened to a moral breakthrough in our country of the first magnitude. This is the election of a Catholic to the Presidency.

It is a moral national experience that attests to our basic unity as a people and that affirms the solidarity we all feel to each other.

But here we have it in a demonstrated form and on a plane of the highest significance.

This is a breakthrough that should be made to do heavy duty for us and for the sincerity of our position as a free republic everywhere in the world including, and particularly, the Soviet Union.

The election of a Catholic President refutes the oft-repeated charge against us that this is a country where all men are equal except Negroes or Catholics or Jews or Mormons.

Politically many of us would have wished the election result otherwise but that does not alter the moral impact of the fact.

Brethren, we are in the midst of one of the great movements of history. This hour is perhaps the greatest and the most crucial of them all since the dawn and the decline of a score or more of great civilizations. For what has never happened before and what is now happening is that this movement and all concerned in it is world-engirdling.

All peoples everywhere are involved.

No nation and no man is any longer an island to himself. All of us, as the poet says, are a part of mankind and any man's death diminishes me.

The role that we have to play is for each of us an individual one. But it is for us, as groups, a role calling for the concerted interplay of our abilities and our talents and energies.

What I see before me in this 103d anniversary of the Clearfield Lodge No. 314 of the Free and Accepted Masons is a potential, however small in itself, of the implementation of those principles of Masonry that give moral and spiritual meaning to the aspirations of mankind.

If the Clearfield Lodge and all other lodges of Masons and other groups and associations of patriotic Americans live up to their respective standards this Nation will have little to fear.

For our greatest strength is our moral strength and once having that we shall not fail to keep ourselves and the free world safe and secure and prosperous and in peace.

Government by Task Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the new President has appointed numerous task forces to delve into matters vitally affecting the Nation. It is well that the President have good and expert counsel in carrying out the duties of his high office. But it must be realized that in the context of the Founding Fathers' notions of representative Government such groups are in no manner responsible to the people. They are not elected; they cannot be impeached. The public has no opportunity to appear before them to state citizen's views and voice desires concerning the manner in which it is to be governed. It has no privilege to evaluate task force recommendations before they are made. In many cases the recommendations may never be communicated directly to those they will govern, nor even the Congress. It is possible that only long after they have, in fact, commenced to govern 180 million supposedly self-governing Americans that they will be discernible. It is possible they may be formulated into rigid Presidential legislative programs coming to Congress nominally as legislative recommendations but actually as Executive demands to which the people's representatives will be expected to accede without exercising the independence of judgment contemplated by the Constitution. If this comes to pass we will hardly enjoy Government by the people about which former President Lincoln spoke so eloquently at Gettysburg. It seems to me the duty of the people's elected representatives to speak out publicly on grave issues facing the Nation notwithstanding creation of semi-anonymous task forces to deal with them behind closed doors and without the enlightenment of public discussion. Only in this manner can the proliferation of Government by task force be blocked effectively.

In closing I invite attention to one such vital issue, the forthcoming resumption of Geneva nuclear test ban talks, which I have discussed during today's proceedings in the House.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 18, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

FEBRUARY 18, 1961.

Abe Lincon's birthday is the occasion for reflection for many over the course of our society, mainly, the role of Government in our lives. Republican Congressmen fan out over the Nation extolling Lincoln's virtues and precepts. Later Democrats do similarly celebrating a Jefferson-Jackson Day. It is wise, no doubt, for men and women thoughtfully to review history's lessons, better to conquer future problems. Surely our best thinking should be brought to bear today on the role that Government plays and should play in our lives.

The individual's place in society was paramount in Lincoln's observations, since he believed that the Government existed only to serve people. While almost everything

he said or wrote carries a lesson, some of his thoughts seem particularly appropriate today:

Freedom—"If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Individualism—"I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruits of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other men's rights."

Opportunity—"That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interests should after a while accumulate property and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right."

There can be little contest today over the abuse of this philosophy by our ever-growing concept of centralized Federal Government. The welfare state, socialism, or communism—all basically the same economic system—are not compatible with Lincoln's concept of limited government, a constitutional republic in a democracy, which is our traditional constitutional form of government of checks and balances. Today's struggle at home and abroad is between free or private enterprise and government or public enterprise. Stated another way, the argument revolves around the right to own property. Do we have that right, free from government control, or not? Traditionally Americans believed it to be a God-given right which the Declaration of Independence stated would be protected by government. Today the legislative embodiment of the destruction of private property and private ownership can further be seen in the Kennedy program. Taxes, that is, money, which is property, are taken to satisfy a variety of Federal programs adjudged needed by Government planners such as Federal aid to alleged depressed areas, aid for education, aid to the unemployed, wage-setting, and Federal medical care, plus many others.

Contrasted to that is a variety of legislation to stem the tide toward further Federal encroachment, including a forced balanced budget, reduced debt, tax reduction and reform, labor placed under antitrust, and government taken out of business enterprise. Freedom will only be safeguarded when Congress returns the God-given rights to the individuals, local, and State governments, when all legislation is reviewed and evaluated in the light of the 9th and 10th amendments: amendment IX—"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." Amendment X—"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

How far these are from the Kennedy program that states that school children shall be provided lunch by the Federal Government regardless of their economic need because their nutrition is the proper concern of Federal Government. How far from the Presidential adviser's view (Schlesinger) that a welfare state is needed as a bulwark against communism. The radicals' or liberals' shared characteristics can be summarized by observing that they always propose bigger government and spending, not the contrary. Apparently they distrust the people's judgment. Instead, Federal judgment of both needs and programs to provide the needs are stipulated and all paid for by the individual through taxes. Human happiness as a goal can only result in a society where government lets people be people; that means freedom of choice and as little government as possible, freedom for the millions of personal decisions and actions by millions of people every day, free to come and go, to work, to play, to be sensible or foolish—so long as no one violates another's equal freedom.

Perhaps the limitations on government which foster a society of happy human beings are best summarized in 10 cannots: You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift; you cannot help small men by tearing down big men; you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot lift the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer; you cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich; you cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income; you cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred; you cannot establish security on borrowed money; you cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence; you cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Paul Wooton: A Tribute to a Dedicated Newspaperman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last Friday on the floor of this House three of my esteemed colleagues spoke out in tribute to Mr. Paul Wooton, Washington correspondent of the Times-Picayune of New Orleans. As you know, Mr. Wooton died Thursday, writing "30" to a distinguished career in journalism at the age of 79.

I rise now to add my own remarks and to join in the deeply sincere tributes paid this dean of the Washington press corps by Members of this body as well as by the press itself. Over the last 3 days I have had time to reflect on the great void that is left in the passing of Mr. Wooton and it is with sadness that I tell of the profound personal loss I feel, for I had the honor and the privilege to be not only an ardent admirer of Paul Wooton but also to be his colleague in journalism.

In July of this year Mr. Wooton would have completed half a century of distinguished reporting for the Times-Picayune and it was less than a decade after he launched his career in 1911 that I had the good fortune to become his colleague on that same newspaper. Thus I came to know Paul Wooton as a fellow newspaperman and this, I think, was the way to know him best.

Many years later I would come to know him in a different capacity but the relationship between a Member of Congress and representative of the press was never to transcend that earlier camaraderie that existed then, as it does now, between members of the working press. Newspapermen, as we all know, are given to confining their eloquence to the typewriter and it would be an unthinkable breach of conduct for one reporter to tell another of his friendship and admiration for that colleague. But death, too, transcends this code of conduct and thus I am freed of that bond when I voice my feelings about this former colleague of mine.

It was his own newspaper that fittingly paid Mr. Wooton the tribute I think he would have liked best when it wrote editorially that he "died covering a story." This, said the Times-Picayune, "is the epitaph fitting and sufficient." I agree as will, I think, most newspapermen past or present.

In reflecting on the many and splendid contributions Mr. Wooton made to his craft, I am not unmindful of the unique role he also played as a sort of ambassador between the fourth estate and the officialdom of the Nation's Capital. For example, the many honors bestowed upon him by grateful foreign governments is, I believe, without precedence for a member of the working press. To know personally every President from Woodrow Wilson to John F. Kennedy, and to know many of them on a first-name basis, is unparalleled as far as I know for a working reporter.

However, it is Mr. Wooton the reporter whom I mourn most. For Mr. Wooton always seemed to me to epitomize the American newspaperman, and I speak now as a former city editor who is painfully aware that the public image of a newspaper reporter is frequently at odds with the true nature of the man. Actually there is little room in journalism for the flamboyant, devil-may-care reporter so cherished in film and fiction. He is, rather, by and large a modest sort of man, who pads between public offices and public officials with pencil and paper in search of often elusive truth. He is aware that his is the work of the day-to-day historian, but because he is essentially a modest man he is not given to public pronouncement of this fact.

The many who came to know Paul Wooton would agree that this was certainly one image of this reporter. And they know, too, that there were other images. He was, for example, a kind man, a man of humility, and a man of charity. He was also a gentleman and he was a fair man and an unselfish one. But I somehow think the eulogy he would most appreciate, as would his colleagues of the working press past and present, would be simply: He was a good reporter.

Civil War Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks and portions of the booklet "Virginia's Opportunity," as an expression of the reasons for and the purpose of the Civil War Centennial.

In my opinion the Civil War Centennial offers us a chance to set before the country the example of men of character

like Robert E. Lee. It is an object lesson to us of the tragedy which results when men seek to use force to solve their problems. In the struggle with international communism in which we are engaged, the American people must be willing to display the same spirit of sacrifice which they showed in the Civil War.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 8, 1961, the Civil War Centennial officially began. As we enter upon this momentous commemoration of our Nation's most tragic era, it is well that we reflect upon the purposes of this 100th anniversary observance of America's Civil War.

It is all too clear that, improperly handled, the centennial could become a divisive factor in our midst. It is to the credit of the American people that no official agency concerned with the centennial has determined to refight this war. All have seen the centennial as an opportunity to derive inspiration from the deeds of the heroic men and women of both North and South, in order, as President Eisenhower said on July 6, 1959, "to renew our dedication to the task which yet confronts us—the furtherance, together with other free nations of the world, of the freedom and dignity of man and the building of a just and lasting peace."

My State, Virginia, was the scene of perhaps 60 percent of the fighting that took place during the Civil War. Therefore a heavy responsibility developed upon Virginia to plan a centennial program in keeping with the great events that occurred within its borders. I am proud to say that the Virginia Civil War Commission, created by our general assembly, has met that responsibility.

The commission has been active in almost every field. A $500,000 Civil War Centennial Center is building in Richmond, former capitol of the Confederacy, to open next July. Almost every county and city in the Commonwealth has its centennial committees planning its participation. I cordially invite you to come to Virginia during the centennial.

Virginia has given the clearest statement of any State of its aims and purposes in this centennial. On Veterans Day, November 11, 1959, the Virginia Civil War Commission adopted the following "Purposes of the Civil War Centennial in Virginia":

1. To honor the courage and devotion of the unnumbered thousands of men and women who fought so valiantly and endured so bravely during the Civil War.

2. To stimulate interest in this period and to encourage further study of the Civil War, believing that honest research will heal old wounds rather than reopen them.

3. To educate the public concerning the campaigns, the shrines, the personalities, and the human story of the war in Virginia in the faith that knowledge of truth will lead to understanding and not resentment.

4. To preserve the monuments, the graves, the relics, and the ruins of the wartime past to remind this and future generations of their link with history.

5. To proclaim Virginia's true role in the historic struggle emphasizing the following points:

(a) Virginia, through its call for the peace convention in early 1861 and through other efforts at reconciliation, stood for peace;

(b) Virginians believed they fought for freedom as Gen. Robert E. Lee declared, "Soldiers, you tread with no unequal step the road by which your fathers marched through sufferings, privation, and blood to independence."

(c) Virginia rose from the depths of defeat, following again the example of that same leader, who called for an end of bitterness, the restoration of the country, and the reestablishment of peace.

6. To encourage the American people to rededicate themselves to the observance of the highest moral standards and to the service of their country to no less an extent than our fathers dedicated themselves to their causes.

7. To inspire all people to follow the guidance of God in the spiritual crises of life as did some of the greatest heroes of that day.

8. To point out the common heritage and to emphasize the unity of this nation which has developed since the dreadful conflict.

Early in 1960 it published a manual for the use of Virginia's county and city committees and its schoolteachers in planning their observance of the Civil War Centennial. This manual, entitled "Virginia's Opportunity," has served as the basis for similar booklets in a number of other States. The Civil War Centennial was seen in this manual as an opportunity for all Virginians—

To honor our heroes.

To promote Virginia as the place to come during the Civil War Centennial.

To tell the true story of Virginia's people—peacemakers, warriors, restorers, and rebuilders.

To dramatize the great ideas that are the basis of our freedom and tradition—individual responsibility, faith in God, and service to country.

FOREWORD

This manual has been prepared primarily for the use of Civil War Centennial committees in planning their participation in the centennial. It is hoped it will also be useful to teachers who are trying to interpret the meaning of this momentous era to the youth of Virginia. Within the covers of this booklet are practical suggestions for projects and some warnings. There has also been an attempt to afford a glimpse of the meaning and purpose behind the centennial in Virginia.

The commission hopes that through the centennial Virginia's true role in the War Between the States can be made known. The peace convention of 1861 was the most dramatic note in Virginia's efforts to preserve the Union which it had helped create. When war came, most Virginians felt that they fought only to defend their land against invasion. The conduct of many of our people after the war, as they rebuilt a land destroyed, can be an inspiration to us all. These things should be known.

But the centennial is no time for finding fault or placing blame or fighting the issues all over again. Americans from every section produced the division which led to war. These divisions grew out of hate, greed and fear, ignorance and apathy, selfishness and emotionalism—evils from which this generation is not free.

This is the time to recognize these divisive forces; but this is also the time to pay tribute to dedication and devotion, courage and honor, integrity and faith—qualities plentifully demonstrated in the war of 1861 to 1865—and needed for our survival in the years to come.

Virginia hopes to present a positive program based on the lofty principles for which great Virginians and great Americans have lived and died. This is the only method by which we have a chance to capture the attention and imagination of the country.

THE VIRGINIA CIVIL WAR COMMISSION.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR, 1961–65

The national centennial of the American Civil War is scheduled to begin January 8, 1961, with a proclamation from President Eisenhower. All 50 States have been asked to appoint centennial commissions and the Virginia Civil War Commission was created by the General Assembly of Virginia at its 1958 session.

The opening day, Sunday, January 8, 1961, has been designated as an official day of prayer by the National Commission and special services will be encouraged in churches of all faiths in Virginia and throughout the Nation. This places the emphasis during the centennial upon spiritual qualities. Our churches have the opportunity of using the centennial to promote an understanding of the causes of division and disagreement among men and to call for a rededication to the fundamental ideals of a free society.

Virginia plans a commemoration of the peace convention, which was called by the Virginia General Assembly on January 19, 1861, in an effort to restore the Union and prevent the Civil War. This is another occasion for focusing attention on values and ideals.

The official opening date of the centennial in Virginia is April 23, 1961, the anniversary day of the acceptance by Robert E. Lee of the command of the Virginia armed forces.

The proposed reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas, which took place on July 21, 1861, has attracted interest and attention across the country and will be followed by many other events and spectacles. After the commemoration of the Appomattox surrender, it is hoped that a way will be found to emphasize the recovery of the State from defeat and Reconstruction and its emergence to its present position of prosperity and influence. The duties and responsibilities of the Virginia Civil War Commission will cease on December 31, 1965.

WHY COMMEMORATE THE CIVIL WAR?

The Civil War, like any other war, was a tragedy. Therefore its 100th anniversary, the Civil War Centennial, is not a celebration. It is a commemoration.

The chief purpose of the centennial is to strengthen the unity of the country through mutual understanding—an understanding derived from the realization that there was dedication and devotion on both sides. North and South, there were those who gave all they had in support of what they sincerely believed was right.

In the centennial the spotlight will be on character in men—for war is the ultimate test of character. The stories of the Civil War are full of lessons for present-day living. By these examples we can teach children and adults the moral values so needed in America today.

The centennial, of course, is not a commercial venture; but it is an opportunity to sell Virginia and Virginia's story to our countrymen.

The Centennial of the American Civil War is a turning back to the past in which we hope to clarify for ourselves the concepts upon which our democratic freedom depends for its existence—individual responsibility based on faith in God and service to country.

THE CENTENNIAL PROGRAM IN THE SCHOOLS

This is the greatest opportunity of the centennial—a chance to channel the natural interest of the young in the Civil War into an understanding of the philosophy and ideas of American democracy. The key to the centennial program in the schools is the history teacher. It may be appropriate for the local centennial committee to contact all of the American history teachers in the locality and put them on a subcommittee or advisory group, along with other persons interested in interpreting the Civil War to the young people of the community.

It is hoped that a certain amount of information on the Civil War Centennial program in the schools and material for classroom use can be furnished to these teachers during the centennial by the department of education and the Virginia Civil War Com-

mission, but there is an opportunity for the local committees to provide much necessary material.

The local committees, the professors at our colleges, and the teachers in our schools can work together to see that the centennial story reaches our schoolchildren and college students.

WHAT IS IT THAT WE WANT TO PUT ACROSS TO OUR STUDENTS DURING THE CENTENNIAL?

These are some of the things that our young people can be taught, through their study of the Civil War, to value and appreciate:

1. The importance, the fascination, and the drama of history. The students do not want a drybones recital of dates and events. They want to know the human story of the war. They want to feel what the solder on the battlefield experienced. They want to know why people acted the way they did; what choices they had. Our goal is to present history as exciting, moving, and relevant.

2. The qualities of life that are needed for a worthwhile and meaningful existence and the preservation of our society. These qualities are especially dramatized against the background of war. Examples of bravery, of course, are myriad. There is Dick Kirkland, Confederate soldier, known to history as the "Angel of Marye's Heights" who ventured into a hail of bullets at Fredericksburg to care for the Federal wounded. In addition to spectacular bravery, there are stories of the quiet courage of those who did the unrewarded or the unpopular thing. There is General Lee, who prayed for his enemies and whose example led the South to bury much of its resentment and to train a new generation of leaders to do their duty.

3. Heroes and patriotism. There is an opportunity in the centennial for our young people to learn the respect for patriotism and great men which used to be such a large part of the fabric of American life. To do this we must make our heroes understandable and present their lives and principles in present day terms. Lee's words should have as much meaning to Virginianse today as they did in Reconstruction times—"You can work for Virginia, to build her up again, to make her great again. You can teach your children to love and cherish her."

4. Understanding. The student can be led to see that dissensions between people are caused by ordinary human emotions and desires, by selfishness, hate, and pride, that the divisions that led to this awful war were created by people in all parts of the country and that the diseases of mistrust, hatred and war can be cured only by uniting behind a bigger idea or a bigger goal than the ones that divide us.

5. Mission and destiny. The teacher of Civil War history can highlight those instances where a few men turned the tide of history (for good or ill); for example, the single vote that killed the Crittenden compromise and the minority of states that prevented the success of the peace convention, the iron will of "Stonewall" Jackson that made supermen of ordinary mortals, the devotion engendered by the character of Lee, the dramatic arrival of Sheridan to rally his forces at Cedar Creek. By comparing these situations to present day problems, the teacher can get across to the student the importance of his own life and its possible effect on the history books his children may read.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL REDEDICATION DAY AND OTHER SPECIAL EVENTS

(The purpose of rededication day—Rededication to our fundamental ideals—to the faith that built America)

Rededication means that we find again the faith in God our fathers knew and that we recognize that our homes, schools, farms, and businesses must be centers of strength and learning and that our lives must be based on the concepts of unity, integrity, and service.

The Confederate monument. Most of the counties or cities in the Commonwealth have a monument to their Confederate soldiers and sailors. If you have such a monument the commission hopes that it will be rededicated during the centennial.

Suggestions:

1. Find out when the monument was originally dedicated and, if possible, collect newspaper stories, pictures, programs, and reminiscences concerning the original dedication. These items could be the basis of a good newspaper story and would be an interesting feature of a centennial exhibit.

2. Choose a date for the rededication of the monument now. The anniversary date of the original dedication is suggested, if this falls on a suitable date. Memorial services in the local churches or a special religious program might logically follow on Sunday.

3. Begin making plans now for this occasion. It is an opportunity to bring the people of the locality together and to set the unifying tone for the observance of the centennial in your area.

4. Try to get the widest type of participation and the most extensive publicity possible—so that the ceremony will have meaning for the whole community.

5. There follows a sample program for Rededication Day. Each county or city committee will, however, design its own program as suits its best judgment.

6. It is suggested that a copy of this manual be furnished in advance to the speakers who will appear on the program.

Caution:

1. The entire program must be dignified. We must avoid any display of bad taste or any actions that will cheapen the National flag or the Confederate flag or the purpose of the observance.

2. One of the reasons behind the centennial is a desire for a unity based on mutual understanding. Everyone in the community should be invited as the observance is intended to bring all the people closer together.

3. The positive aims of the ceremony are to encourage a greater appreciation of courage and a firmer dedication to high ideals, to remind ourselves of the mutual sacrifices made all over the Nation, and to bring a deeper understanding of the causes of division and war.

Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the city of St. Louis was honored last week to have the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] deliver the Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture at Washington University.

The lecture is sponsored by the St. Louis League of Women Voters to honor the memory of one of the truly outstanding citizens of St. Louis, Therese M. Loeb. Mrs. Loeb, who died in 1959, was a leader in the civic, cultural, and political affairs of her city. Her efforts helped to make her city and State a better place to live, and she is sorely missed by her countless friends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful address of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], "Political Lag—Enemy of Freedom," delivered at the Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture at Graham Chapel, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., on February 15, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL LAG—ENEMY OF FREEDOM

(Speech delivered at Therese M. Loeb Memorial Lecture, Wednesday, February 15, 1961, Graham Chapel, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania)

I

When President Kennedy stood for the first time before the Congress of the United States, he said: "I speak today in an hour of national peril and national opportunity. Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed such as ours can endure. The outcome is by no means certain. The answers are by no means clear. All of us together—this administration, this Congress, this Nation—must forge those answers."

This is the same test which Abraham Lincoln enunciated almost a century ago at Gettysburg: Whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal can long endure—whether government of the people, by the people, for the people shall perish from the earth.

In Lincoln's day the peril was obvious. In our time the peril is no less real, but it is more subtle, less visible. And because many people either cannot see it or will not admit that it exists, it is therefore more difficult to counter.

Today I would like to discuss with you some of the obstacles we have placed in our own way, obstacles which make it difficult to forge satisfactory answers to the problems of 1961.

One of the traits of the American character has been a streak of easy optimism—a confidence that the future is bound to be better than the past and that what is right will inevitably triumph in the end.

Our optimism has been a source of inspiration. The men and women who settled our shores, crossed the continent, conquered the wilderness, and created the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world, had to believe in the future. Otherwise, they could not have endured the hardships which confronted them and still pressed forward to success. And we must believe in the future, too. For if we lose faith in America, and indeed in the world, we will assuredly let fall the torch they lighted.

Yet optimism can be fatuous as well as inspiring; and I fear that during much of our history Americans took far too much for granted their country's happy future.

Consider the national temper of a generation ago. In the 1920's most of us assumed as a matter of course that the more abundant life was just around the corner, that equal justice under law would soon become a reality for all, that freedom arrived at through, and protected by, democracy, was on its inevitable way to sweep the world. God, having inspired the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, could be relied upon to preserve them both. All we had to do was to let things alone and the future would take care of itself.

But the events of our lifetime have given our national psyche a permanent shock.

The great depression, Hitler, Stalin, World War II, nuclear weapons, Khrushchev, the sputnik, inflation, recession, Lumumba, Castro, the rise of Communist China, the unexpected strength of the Russian economy, the uncertain future of the United Nations, have changed the world and—I believe—the way in which Americans see the world and our place in it.

The old comforting philosophy of easy optimism has disappeared. All but the last few political practitioners of that happy creed have retired to private life.

And what is the new philosophy that has risen in its place? I submit it is the conviction that we must rely, for our salvation, not on our manifest destiny but on the minds and souls of men. This, I suggest, is a definition of the political creed that today is loosely referred to as liberalism.

It is the belief that change and progress are not necessarily synonomous—that change can enrich our civilization or destroy it, and which it will do depends on us. We must understand the forces of change, guide them, influence them, master them. And to do so will require the mobilization of human intelligence and human compassion on a scale never before attempted.

Thus I come to my thesis, which is this: Our forms of government and our governmental procedures—local, State, National, and international—have built-in rigidities which stand in the way of the systematic application of human intelligence and human compassion to the problems which we must solve to survive in freedom and well-being. We must make far-reaching changes if we are to so survive. We must provide, seek out, and follow leadership which is prepared to act. We must recognize that the principal instrument at our disposal is government—and, once and for all, realize that that government does not govern best which governs least.

It is a law of biology that a species must adapt or die. So it is with nations and their political systems. Our problem is to adapt the American forms of government at all levels to the strains which are being put upon them in the last half of the 20th century. The lethargy with which we have regarded this imperative task I call political lag.

This is surely what President Kennedy meant when he said we would be tested anew. This is why the outcome is far from certain, the answers by no means clear. As a nation we are far from prepared to overcome the lag between what we have and what we need, between where we are and where we should be.

II

Consider first the city and ask the question: Does the governmental structure in our urban areas facilitate or hinder the mobilization of human intelligence and human compassion for the solution of urban problems?

In medieval times the city was a community within a wall. Today, in America and abroad, few can tell where it begins and where it ends. The metropolitan area of which it is a part may spread over many counties and several States. Area problems of shelter, industrial and commercial redevelopment, transportation of goods and people, water supply, sewage disposal, education, police and fire protection, recreational facilities, public health, the administration of justice, delinquency, and racial tensions have overwhelmed outmoded local and municipal units of government created centuries ago.

In some of the larger cities strong mayors, and in the smaller cities city managers, have succeeded in recent years in modernizing city government. But the incredibly inefficient commission form of local government lingers on in many a city and almost all counties. And in many large cities, of which New York is a conspicuous example, obsolete charters are an impediment to successful self-government.

There is hardly a major metropolitan area in the country which has not had a comprehensive metropolitan study. But only Miami and Atlanta have done anything significant about it. The reports on the other areas form a library of frustration. You in St. Louis tried to do something constructive a few years ago and failed. So did Pittsburgh. We in Philadelphia brought our city government up to date in 1951 with a new charter, but Mayor Dilworth today is still struggling to persuade unwilling and uncoordinated units of suburban government located in eight counties and three States that their economic, social, and political future is tied to the core city from which they spring—so far with little success.

Our local governmental structures, survivals of the 18th century, are just not suited for the decisionmaking processes involved in solving metropolitan area difficulties in the 20th century. The structure of local government in America tends to inhibit rather than facilitate the application of intelligence to the solution of human problems. And yet, not enough people are prepared for the drastic changes that are needed. This is political lag, in opinion and in organization, and it must be eliminated before we can succeed.

In my judgment, strong political executive leadership at the municipal and Federal levels is the indispensable element in a successful approach. Planners, civic groups, political parties, local legislative bodies, or county commissioners, organizations representing business and labor can all help. But it takes a strong mayor to rally them behind an action program. And an action program will have to attack at once or very soon the structure of metropolitan area government. A Federal Department of Metropolitan Affairs with Cabinet status can assist enormously in providing guidance, coordination, and research. But in the end, the decisions will have to be made at the local level in response to local leadership that is ready to tear down the political walls that fragment our metropolitan communities.

III

Consider next the States and ask the same question: Are our States, at present, efficient instrumentalities for the application of human intelligence and compassion to human problems? The answer is that they are not. For this there are many reasons.

The first is boundaries. Except for Hawaii, Alaska, and California, there is hardly a State whose political boundaries coincide with natural economic, social, and cultural areas. And even California might do better if it were chopped in half to end the continuous struggle between Los Angeles and San Francisco.

The Founding Fathers could not foresee that New York City would become a metropolitan complex of some 15 million people, spilling over into New Jersey and Connecticut, while the Delaware Valley comprising parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and New York would become, for many purposes, a unified economic region.

In Missouri, you know the problems which arise from river boundaries which slice through the hearts of metropolitan communities and disrupt the geographical unity of two great river basins.

Next, in economic matters, our modern industrial Nation has become economically one community with whose problems 50 federated States cannot deal effectively. Competition among States for industry tends to defeat the adoption of desirable social legislation, penalizing progressive States and rewarding backward ones.

Compounding the problems arising from geography and economics, political lag has come close to reducing State governments to impotency. Most State constitutions are obsolete, their tax systems are narrow and regressive. Many States are still cursed with the spoils system, few can recruit really competent personnel. Governors who understand these problems are thwarted by State legislators who do not.

Last and perhaps most important is the failure to reapportion State legislatures—most important because this failure prevents the correction of other aspects of political lag. Malapportionment is a denial of democracy and the right of self-government. Rural communities whose population is declining and whose problems are relatively simple control the destinies of huge metropolitan areas whose problems are complex and growing.

In short, the structure of State government is such that the intelligence and compassion which exist in metropolitan areas can be applied neither to eliminate the misery nor to develop adequately the area of which they are a part.

One result has been the transfer of metropolitan area problems from State capitols to Washington. This trend, so vigorous in the 1930's, still continues. Direct relationships have been established between the cities and the National Government, bypassing the States. Housing and urban renewal are perhaps the most conspicuous examples.

But the nostalgia for States rights, fostered by those who hope that if a governmental service which might cost them money is kept at the State level it won't be rendered at all, severely limits what, from the standpoint of political feasibility, can be brought to Washington. And the problem of workload alone puts a limit on what, from the standpoint of efficiency, should be brought there.

We are going to have to make drastic changes in the structure and programs of State governments if they are to carry their share of the burden of building a prosperous America. They are not presently effective tools for the application of human intelligence and human compassion to human problems.

IV

We come now to the National Government. Under our system of checks and balances, power at the national level is divided among executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Many believe this cumbersome scheme is less effective than the unity of power in parliamentary government as practiced in Great Britain. But this argument is largely academic, for there is not the slightest possibility that within the foreseeable future we are going to rewrite the Constitution of the United States.

Moreover, it is not necessary. The institution of the Presidency is well organized to apply intelligence and compassion to the solution of human problems. Whatever political lag exists in the executive branch—and there is some—comes from the varying philosophies and administrative abilities of those we elect to the Presidency. The tools to eliminate the lag lie at hand ready for use. I hope you will not think me unduly partisan if I give it as my opinion that rarely in our history have we seen a President as superbly equipped to use those tools as the present occupant of the White House.

The same comment applies to the present Supreme Court of the United States. It was not so long ago that the so-called "nine old men," unconscious of their times, were digging in their heels to preserve an outworn and rigid view of our essentially flexible Constitution. But that time has passed. Today nine extremely able Justices, coming fortunately from varying backgrounds and representing, again fortunately, varying legal philosophies are each day applying a high level of human intelligence to the solution of a wide variety of difficult human

problems. If they disagree, it is because the problems are tough—not because the Justices are either uninformed or perverse.

It is when we turn to the Congress that we find ourselves once more confronted with entrenched and powerful political lag.

Congress, like the State legislatures, is not truly representative of its constituents. Only the politics of 1787 can explain why in 1961 a citizen of Wilmington, Del., has 25 times as much voting representation in the U.S. Senate as his neighbor in Chester, Pa., a few miles up the Delaware River. Pennsylvania has 2 Senators for its 11 million people and Delaware 2 for its less than half a million. When we move west across the Dakotas and the Mountain States the inequities are even worse, though the historical justification no longer exists. California has more population than all the 12 other Western States plus the two Dakotas and Nebraska put together, but has only 2 Senators against 30 for the same number of people in the other States.

In the House of Representatives, despite the requirement for decennial reapportionment according to population, there is sometimes a lag of as much as 50 years between the growth of a metropolitan area and fair recognition in its congressional representation. It all depends on how much the rural-dominated State legislature in any particular State is willing to cheat.

Both Houses of Congress are plagued with ancient rules, practices, and traditions which enshrine age rather than wisdom in seats of power and, therefore, frequently, though not always, the social and economic views of the past generation rather than the present one.

The scandal of the House Rules Committee has recently been terminated by a vote of 217 to 212. But the equally scandalous Senate filibuster was at least tentatively given a new lease on life by a vote of 50 to 46 last month.

It would be difficult to deny that Congress and particularly the committee structure of both Houses, is the seat of substantial political lag which makes it difficult to apply human intelligence and compassion, objectively and fairly, to the solution of human problems.

V

Finally, in our consideration of political institutions and political lag, let us turn to the international scene.

It is now 20 years since Wendell Wilkie wrote, "One World." Yet despite the earnest efforts of countless men of good will, we still live in a condition of international chaos. Great hopes were held for the United Nations. It has justified many of those hopes. Yet its most ardent defender would have to admit that the United States from 1783–87 under the Articles of Confederation was a strong Central Government compared to the United Nations today.

If there was ever a need to eliminate political lag, to create a mechanism whereby the best brains of the world can be set free to prevent the destruction of the human race, it is in the U.N. today.

The men who framed the U.N. Charter in the preatomic age labored hard and well. They believed the people of the world were not ready for that surrender of sovereignty in the limited field of disarmament and world law which is essential to the maintenance of peace. And they were right.

But now engines of destruction succeed each other in geometrical progression of lethal effect—as the hydrogen bomb, the intercontinental ballistic missile, the Polaris submarine, earth, moon, solar, and planetary satellites follow each other in frightening array. A score and more of newly independent nations with little experience in Government of any sort are accepted as United Nations members. A menacing Communist China of 600 million people rears itself outside the doors of civilized international institutions. Surely, human intelligence has never faced so perilous a challenge since history began.

Yet who is there among us who can confidently predict that international institutions which will make possible the successful application of human intelligence to the solution of the problem of survival can be created in time to prevent the destruction of the human race?

The political lag in metropolitan affairs may be inconvenient. But the political lag in world affairs menaces the very survival of our species.

VI

There is, to summarize, an alarming political lag at all levels of government, local, State, National, and international—a lag between what needs to be done to assure freedom, peace, and well-being and what we seem presently capable of doing.

This lag between our needs and our apparent capabilities arises from two sources: first, the failure of our leadership to bring to our people and, indeed, to the people of the world the need for drastic action; and second, the obsolesence of our political institutions and procedures. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with our political institutions. But they badly need renovating and updating.

My plea to you today is therefore twofold. First, respond to the leadership you are getting right now from the White House in national and international affairs. Do not accept it slavishly and without critical analysis; but approach it with recognition that it embodies the one indispensable element of leadership in 1961—a determination to bring to bear upon our human problems the best of human intelligence and the warmest of human compassion.

Seek out similar leadership at the local and State level and give it your support on the same basis.

Second, concern yourself with the forms and procedures of our Government at all levels, to eliminate rigidities, to root out the stubborn ancient ways of doing things where these ways frustrate the application of our best brains and hearts to our most serious problems.

We have been from the beginning a very fortunate people. We were given more time, more opportunity, and more space in which to make mistakes than any other nation. We had a fresh start and a new world. But time has run out on us. We can no longer rely on our luck, on our manifest destiny, on the chance that a great national leader will emerge every generation or so who will make up for the wasted decades, the lost opportunities. God helps those who help themselves, and we will either help ourselves now or perish. With us would perish not just the American dream, but the last possibility of proving that men can rule themselves as well as the world. I am not at all sure that we can; but I am certain that we must try.

Higher Education Is a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in the current issue of the Saturday Review a particularly timely article by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] entitled "Higher Education Is a National Problem."

With his customarily trenchant logic Senator CLARK has indicated quite clearly the need for Federal aid to higher education, and he has indicated with equal clarity that the only alternative is to suffer a less than adequate program of advanced learning in America.

Senator CLARK'S article, however, raises more questions than it answers—as was his intention. I believe it is especially important—at this time when the Senate has just been presented with the administration proposals for aid to education—that we attend to the questions raised by Senator CLARK.

Without having had, as yet, the opportunity to study the President's suggestions in this field, I would hazard a guess that Senator CLARK'S thinking is somewhat in advance of that which the administration at this time will propose. But we all know that this Congress will not, in this session nor in the next, find all the answer to the complex and proliferating problems of education that are confronting us. Therefore, I think that Senator CLARK'S article serves a most valuable function in drawing our attention to further issues that must be faced—if not in the present session, then in the near future.

I believe Senator CLARK would concur with the dictum of Alfred North Whitehead that "the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgement which will then be pronounced on the uneducated." If not with these words in mind, it was certainly in the spirit of Professor Whitehead that Senator CLARK addressed himself most cogently to the problem of Federal aid to higher education. Therefore, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION IS A NATIONAL PROBLEM

(By JOSEPH S. CLARK)

(In this article, U.S. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, states the case for increased Federal aid to higher education.)

Reasonable men cannot study American higher education in any depth without concluding that drastic steps must be taken immediately to improve our colleges and universities. These steps must include provision for a much larger and better-trained corps of professors and instructors, a very large expansion of physical facilities, and provision for the admission into college and the retention through graduate school of all high school graduates who have the intellectual capacity and the character necessary to assimilate college and graduate work.

While money alone will not solve these problems it is obvious that they are not going to be solved without a lot more money than is now available. Where is the money to come from? Some will come from the annual gifts of graduates and friends of the colleges, some from bequests of the wealthy, some from tuition paid by students, some from corporate giving, some from private

foundations, and some from State taxation. But in a decade in which college enrollments will double, all this will not be nearly enough. So what have we left? Only the Federal Government.

Government is the agency which, Lincoln said, exists to do for people that which they cannot do or do as well for themselves. The national government is the usual means by which a free people tackle a problem which is public in its character and national in its scope. We use our Federal Government to wage war, to conduct diplomacy, to guide the national economy in a score of areas. We use it to operate a nationwide system of social security, to construct great public works, and to support our industry and commerce in many different fields. It operates our post offices and our national parks. It helps build houses and clear slums. It helps build hospitals and engages in extensive welfare operations. Without it, most of the progress we have made in this country during the twentieth century would have been quite impossible.

Yet whenever the suggestion arises that we use our Federal Government to tackle a new problem—any new problem—a cry of horror arises. When Federal action is proposed to help solve the crisis in higher education, the outcry comes from many sides, including such strange allies as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and certain of the more lush groves of academe.

This stereotyped reaction deserves some basic attention. Why are we Americans, perhaps alone among the civilized peoples of the earth, so reluctant to use this great instrument which we control and which lies at our disposal?

Surely democratic government is a tool to be used by the people to solve their collective problems and to improve their collective lot. Yet a multitude of influential Americans regard their national Government with suspicion and hostility. One would think, to hear the talk, that to turn to Washington in a time of need would be more like surrendering to a foreign power than utilizing one's own resources. The "conventional wisdom" in America still agrees with Jefferson that "that government is best which governs least." If chaos results and problems are swept under the rug, never mind; we are the same free people who drove the minions of George III into the Atlantic.

This inbred and deep-seated distrust of government may have had sound historical roots in the eighteenth century, but it is dangerous indeed in the twentieth. For it is only our National Government that can mobilize and direct the resources of our society when they must be mobilized. And we should all ponder whether the United States as an unmobilized society can long compete with the determined, mobilized, aggressive society that confronts us today from the other side of the iron curtain.

This distrust of government, which has always been present in American thought, goes back to our unfortunate experiences with King George III. It was strengthened by the physical distance between the frontier and Washington, D.C. But the distrust did not break out into open warfare until the days of Franklin Roosevelt. Being unable to prevent the enactment, or later to repeal, many of the specific provisions of the New Deal, its powerful opponents set out to discredit government itself. In the publications they controlled, the fine old term "public servant" disappeared from the lexicon and the derogatory word "bureaucrat" took its place. "Citizens" became "taxpayers"—usually depicted by cartoonists as clad only in a barrel. The word "taxes" was rarely seen without the prefixed adjective "confiscatory" or "crippling" or the synonym "burden." Public spending was referred to always as a "cost," never as a benefit, and normally with the prefix "wasteful."

We have recovered a bit from the worst of the antigovernment crusade. Today thoughtful and sensitive men, such as Walter Lippmann and Adlai Stevenson and Senator Fulbright, suggest that the fiscal starvation of public services such as education is a matter for national shame rather than national pride. Yet the conventional wisdom has not been greatly modified. I speak with assurance because the propaganda output flows across a Senator's desk by the ream.

To support the thesis that the Federal Government is essentially evil and should be dismantled, a whole school of economics has grown up. We are told that the oppressive weight of Federal taxation is destroying enterprise and stifling investment, that the Federal debt is climbing out of control, and that the soundness of the dollar is threatened. We are told that the Federal Government is costly and inefficient and therefore the States should do the job—when every objective test shows that Federal employees are better selected, better trained, and better supervised on the average than State employees, and that the Federal tax system is more equitable and more efficient than State tax systems.

Since the facts lead us toward the Federal Government, let us be calm. Let us keep our heads and repeat together: "The Federal Government is not our enemy, it is our friend. It is not an alien power, it is the creature of the American people. It will do what they want it to. It is not a monster that can ignore their will."

I will not dwell at length on the objection that Federal aid will lead to Federal control of the colleges and universities. I will say only that, in my opinion, it is a myth. Surely we are wise enough to legislate and to administer so as to prevent a result we don't desire. To those who oppose Federal assistance I ask: What is your alternative? Is it not clear that the only real alternative is a second-class system of higher education?

Let us turn to the question of how Federal aid can best be provided for higher education. The absence of any widely accepted plan, up to this very moment, is to a great extent the fault of those engaged in higher education. They have made the mistake of leaving legislating to the legislators. But Government programs do not ordinarily spring full grown from the brows of Senators or Congressmen. A public need must be established. So must public awareness of that need and public support for its satisfaction. Leadership must come from people who are determined and informed. Politicians should be out in front of the people, I agree. We have a duty of leadership, but we cannot afford to get too far ahead of the people we lead, for, if we do, there is a great risk we shall be shot down from behind on election day.

I wonder whether existing organizations in the field of higher education are set up to do the needed job of working out a proper plan for Federal aid—in concert with the new administration—and then lobbying vigorously for it? In the past, they have been immobilized to some extent by internal divisions on the basic questions, first, of whether Federal aid in any form is desirable and, second, of who, if it is desirable, should get it.

Let us remember that most educators are not monks who take a vow of poverty, both for themselves and for the institutions they serve. They, too, are American citizens with the right, indeed the duty, to petition for redress of grievances and to indicate to their elected representatives how they would like those grievances redressed.

Perhaps the leadership of a new administration, committed to lifting a nation's head out of the sand, will make the difference. Surely Abraham Ribicoff, the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will give higher education priority attention.

To those who finally tackle this problem in earnest, I offer a few timid suggestions:

First, the proposal for a semiautonomous "educational foundation" patterned after that in Great Britain, with wide latitude for distributing Federal money, deserves careful and detailed exploration. So does the view that allocations by such a foundation should include both operating and facilities moneys paid directly to recipient institutions. Faculty salaries should, in my judgment, have the highest priority, academic facilities the next. When these problems are reasonably well solved it will be time to turn our attention to further scholarships and loans to students. There isn't much to be gained in substituting a slightly brighter boy or girl for one who now wins admission to college if, when the bright student arrives on the campus, there is no place for him to sit or lie down, no books or laboratories available, and not enough professors really qualified to teach him what he needs to know.

Secondly, the hardest thinking must be done in the field of who gets how much aid. The situation in Pennsylvania is a good illustration of the difficulty.

My State has 109 different institutions of higher education, but those 109 include no public community college, no public liberal arts college, and only one State university—Penn State. State aid goes principally to Penn State, which is also a land-grant college receiving Federal aid, and to three private universities, Temple, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Pennsylvania, which is a reasonably well-endowed Ivy League institution with Federal Government research contracts in substantial amounts.

The 14 teachers colleges, however, are supported entirely by the State. Tuitions and faculty salaries are low, curriculum necessarily limited. Between these extremes are 91 private institutions that defy classification. Some are rich; most are poor. Some are widely renowned; others are so small that they cannot support a strong faculty or a broad curriculum. They are Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, Catholic, Quaker, and nonsectarian.

Frankly, I haven't the faintest idea how public aid should be distributed among such a complex variety of institutions, although I am presently serving on a Governor's commission charged with the duty of finding out. All I know is that if Pennsylvania does not substantially increase its State aid to higher education and get substantial additional help from the Federal Government, we are headed straight for trouble.

Third, Federal aid should not be limited to special projects or research, or science, or defense-related subjects. It should be across the board. It should go to the heart of the university, not just to the periphery. In the civilization of the future the natural sciences may well predominate pragmatically, as C. P. Snow has recently suggested, but the social sciences and the humanities are of equal importance, remote though the latter are sometimes thought to be from practical applications to the modern world. Assuredly, man does not live by bread alone.

We have not yet solved the problem of the Federal Government and higher education but I hope we have at least answered one question: Is Federal aid to higher education necessary? For the clear answer is: "Yes."

There are other urgent questions ahead. They are the question of how much, how, to whom, and what for. I am confident

that they too can be answered. In fact, we must answer them, for the purpose of higher education in America is the staffing of freedom. If we cannot staff freedom adequately, history will again take note before the end of this century, as it has before, that an unmobilized society cannot compete successfully with one that is fully mobilized. This is a conclusion which no free American, living in the richest country the world has ever known, in a society founded on Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States, can willingly accept.

A Study of the Fuels and the Need of a National Fuels Policy Are Imperative in the Interest of Our Economy in Peace or in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the sponsors and supporters of a fuels study by a joint congressional committee have been criticized by spokesmen of the oil and gas industries for not having spelled out more clearly what will be accomplished by such a fuels study.

It has been repeatedly said by such opponents that this Nation has a national fuels policy, and therefore such a fuels study is unnecessary.

This statement is not in keeping with the facts for the Paley Commission in its report to President Eisenhower said:

> But on one point, the Commission is very clear; the hydra heads of energy policy must be reined together.
>
> This can be accomplished only if all parties concerned—the President and the Congress, the State and Federal agencies, and the energy industries—work for a common base of understanding of the total energy outlook, the interrelations within the energy field and of the relations between energy and the rest of the economy.

Further a member of the Federal Power Commission said in 1959:

> The need for a national energy policy seems so patently obvious that I am simply unable to understand how thoughtful people concerned with this business can overlook it.

There are so many facets of the fuels industry that should be studied that it is important everyone concerned be in complete accord as to such a study by a joint congressional committee.

To charge that such a study looking toward recommendations to the appropriate committees of the Congress would lead to bureaucratic control of the fuels industry is entirely erroneous.

What has any of the fossil fuels to fear from such a study? This Congress must develop a positive approach to this important problem.

Making a study of the fuels and the need of a national fuels policy is quite different from specifically calling for a national fuels policy itself.

It is now necessary to relate the supply to the fuel requirements in the foreseeable future, and in terms of kinds of geographical origin to determine the nature and the extent of supply problems to be encountered.

The various fuel and energy segments with transportation and manpower requirements must be studied to give rational direction to the Government and to industry in order to give them the information so vital to the very existence of our Nation.

Such a fuels study will make available the analytical tools necessary to anticipate longer range problems. It will also insure that the facilities and resources needed in our economy are available in peace or in war.

A More Vigorous Space Age Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, delivered this speech at the Aircraft Luncheon Club meeting in Washington on February 14. I think it deserves the attention of the House:

A MORE VIGOROUS SPACE AGE PROGRAM

(Speech by Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, First District, Connecticut, at the Aircraft Luncheon Club meeting, Hotel Burlington, Washington, D.C., February 14, 1961)

On this anniversary of St. Valentine's Day, it is appropriate that we take note of the Soviet Union's interest in Venus. The remarkable launching of a second heavy satellite within several days, the subsequent launching of a rocket from that satellite toward a point in space where it will impact on a distant planet—give or take a probable error of 6,000 miles in the location of the target—is a substantial reminder of the capabilities of the Soviet Union.

I need not linger on the military implications of the ability to launch a rocket and then separate a payload aimed at a distant point. Nor will I review again, as many of my colleagues will hasten to do, the cold statistics of how many American vehicles are successfully in space compared to the Russian total. I do want to look at the state of the American space effort at the present time, some of the things we ought to be doing, and some that we will be doing.

It has always been my conviction that the major problem is the absence of a sense of urgency. When I first examined the 10-year program of goals outlined by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to our committee last year, I did not believe it reflected the critical urgency of our needs. Yet since that time, the NASA Administrator has revised his estimates downward. Five major programs have been rescheduled, including the 1962 Venus reconnaissance mission, now put off until 1964.

It does us little good to speak of the technological sophistication of American satellites, compared with those of the Soviet Union. Granted, we may be launching highly effective small packages. But when it comes to the eventual dispatch of man into space, so that the human brain may be applied to the problems we encounter there, it cannot be part of our program to design it entirely for 26-pound men.

We need a new sense of dedication to the goal of being first in space. It was no secret that January 13, 1961, would be a favorable time to try to hit Venus, nor that the shot was feasible with only a slight penalty in extra speed demanded within a month either way. I refer you to the Space Handbook issued by the predecessor of my committee on December 29, 1958. On page 170 of that handbook, you will find the most favorable launching dates for missions from Earth to Mars or Earth to Venus. Not since June 8, 1959, was there an occasion so favorable to a Venus probe as January 13 of this year, and not until August 16, 1962, will there be another occasion on which the two planets are in such a relationship.

The question then is where we stand with respect to such probes. Obviously we need bigger and strong boosters as soon as possible, if we are to push aggressively out into space. Yet here, too, at least one target date has been moved backward—the qualifying tests of the Rocketdyne F–1, 1,500,000-pound thrust liquid rocket have been put off from 1963 to 1965. I was glad to see certain static tests being carried out in recent days, but unless we move along on boosters, we will continue to make progress only at a slow pace.

The truth is that we have been painfully slow in decision-making on the national booster program. Almost 2 years have passed since my committee first held hearings on space propulsion. Many of the basic decisions needed to give this program impetus and direction have yet to be made. Both NASA and the Department of Defense have booster development programs that can contribute to each other without being competitive in terms of industrial and scientific facilities.

President Kennedy has indicated that he wants Vice President JOHNSON to take a personal hand in the direction of the space program. As you know, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 places personal direction of the space effort in the President and gives him a space council to advise him in that effort. President Eisenhower did not make use of this machinery, but rather left it largely to the head of the Space Administration. This has contributed, I believe, to some of the unhealthy competition and maneuvering among agencies which in itself is a severe drag on progress.

When I first analyzed the President's suggestion that Mr. JOHNSON take control of the space program, it seemed to me an excellent choice. We in Washington know LYNDON JOHNSON as a man who gets things done. We know his familiarity with our national military potential and with the space program. I, therefore, introduced legislation which I believed necessary to amend the Space Act and permit Mr. JOHNSON to assume command.

Since that time, I have been in touch with the White House regarding this legislation, and I have been advised that a full-scale review of necessary legislation is underway. The Administrator of NASA has been asked to submit a program. I believe we should act speedily to coordinate the direction of this program as the new Executive wishes, and at the same time I believe Congress was wise and will be wise to insist on major responsibility at the top.

I cannot argue with the administration's first concern about people at home—with its moves to alleviate economic distress. But I am in hopes that we will soon see the gantries being rolled away from a new and reinvigorated space effort.

I do not think we can afford to greet each new Russian effort with a quiet hope that they will share what they learn. I was amazed when I heard Dr. Dryden, who has been the acting administrator, say that we had known of their capability for the Venus probe for some time, that the technique of launching from a parking orbit has often been discussed, and that he hoped the scientific data obtained will be made available promptly to the scientific community. I do not think we can count on the charitable benevolence of Soviet scientists. Perhaps some day a unified effort will be achieved, but it is scarcely likely to happen tomorrow. The Russians, I suspect, will not be quick to share their knowledge of propulsion.

How, then, can we improve our own efforts? We must look, I think, at the way in which we have organized our space program. Are we making the full use of our technological skills and know-how? Are we putting the full energy of our industrial capacity into this effort? Can we do better? I doubt if anyone in this room thinks we can't make better use of our potential than we are now doing.

Our Nation has excelled over all other nations in this industrial age because we have been able, through our vast industrial energies and resources, to produce results faster and better than any other people. The concentrated, vigorous application of our national talents and abilities can not only overcome the Russian space lead, but can also surpass it. We have accomplished this fusion of effort readily in wartime. Industry has been asked, and has always complied, in time of emergency, to coodinate its activities closely in the Nation's interests. This is one of those times when we must take steps to enlist the coordinated abilities of the best of our talent.

We know that a major effort will be expensive. Consider the problem of Saturn and Centaur. Right now Saturn is a research and development project only, with a goal of developing a space booster vehicle of large payload capability. Some figures developed by the staff of the Committee on Science and Astronautics show each Saturn we fire will cost the Nation $17,300,000—exclusive of the research and development involved. The first flight test of a Saturn vehicle is scheduled for this year, but the date could slip into 1962.

Centaur, which is the second generation upper stage vehicle, is estimated to have a lower cost per launch—$9,100,000—although increased costs in development. Whatever the actual figures may turn out to be, it is apparent that this is an expensive business, and it demands the best efforts of all of us to keep the costs down.

"Let me suggest one approach that might help in this effort. I have been disturbed, as I know many of you have, by the increasing costs of proposals. Each represents considerable skill and know-how, as well as management ability. But the increasing demands on contractors seeking to put their abilities to work for the Government is having an opposite effect from that we all desire—it is discouraging concerns from entering in competitive bidding where preparation of a proposal is inordinately expensive.

Thus while it may be said that the only thing worse than having a Government contract is not having one, I think we should review the cumbersome procedures that require a massive and expensive effort to convince the Government where it can buy the best product. The work necessary to establish a proper bid becomes as expensive as production itself, and they spur competition that needs to be subjected to close scrutiny. If these competitions result in fruitful savings to the taxpayer, if they produce a far better product, then they can certainly be justified. But if they only harass experienced and qualified industrial teams, and if they forestall the use of ideas, imagination, and initiative, then they may be a needless waste of national resources. Proposals, procurement of contracts, negotiations, renegotiation—the whole machinery of Government-industry relations has grown cumbersome and needs to be adjusted.

The administration has chosen a proven Administrator to head the national Aeronautics and Space Administration in the years ahead. Perhaps Mr. Webb can bring some desirable changes in this system, out of the years of his own experience in Government, and a proven record of imaginative public service.

I have talked on a number of other occasions about some specific measures I think we need to help spur this effort. I think we need a revision of the patent provision of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, along the lines of that which a subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee recommended and the House approved last year. We can't continue to move toward a broad patent policy inimical to the American free enterprise system without slowing down the force and drive of that system—upon which we depend more than ever today for help in assuring our national survival.

Any such revision should encourage wider participation in the space effort. We ought to reinforce the patent system that has worked well for 160 years, and has provided jobs and whole new industries to this country.

I think we need a new attention to duplication of effort in the space program. I would call your attention to a statement issued by our chairman, Congressman OVERTON BROOKS, earlier this year, in which he warned that the large booster program, by its very nature, invited waste in expenditures unless it was carefully planned and programed. He was especially concerned by the assignment of clear-cut responsibilities in the civilian and military areas. It is not difficult to see that the planning and management of large scale facilities for development and testing offer another problem area.

I myself have been looking into another phase of our space effort which has troubled me. I refer to the development of a capacity for biomedical research by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. A year ago, NASA outlined its plans to set up a fifth functional division of its management structure to monitor and coordinate the work it believes necessary in space medicine in conjunction with the man-in-space program. We were assured that this was not intended to duplicate work already being done, and that it would cover a biomedicine gap which the military services could not fill.

Subsequently I had a chance to look further at existing work being done in the military services in this area. This has aroused new questions in my mind, and I expect to ask them. I am now completing a report to the House committee in which I examine aspects of the problem. Unless we insure that we can justify the work in the space program that must be done, we run the risk of having it all classed as unnecessary.

Nuclear propulsion for space travel has also reached a point where NASA and the AEC are ready to move into more intensive research. A study is currently underway regarding necessary facilities. Here, too, there are existing facilities which can be used or which may be available for this work. Again it is necessary to plan carefully to avoid duplication, as these programs expand.

If we are to have a more vigorous space age program, therefore, the place to start is at the top, with the direction and management. Washington has complained for many years about the lag in decisionmaking in all areas of government; let NASA, as the proponent of our future in space, move to cut out its own lag in decisionmaking. Let it review its goals, reevaluate the national objectives, and move toward greater urgency in bringing our program abreast and ahead of the Russians.

One place to start would be the plans for lunar probes and a manned landing on the moon. NASA's original timetable indicated that we would not be looking forward to a manned landing on the moon until the 1970's.

It is my opinion that this timetable is much too slow. Even if there were no slippage, we would be missing an obvious bet. For that same space guide I mentioned before, issued in 1959, made this statement in unequivocal terms: "The moon will be at its best inclination in 1969."

This is an optimum for a shoot at the moon—but the Russian thrust capability permits them to pick their own time. In 1967, it will be the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution. Here they have a clear choice between a calm, scientific appraisal of the best time, and the practical prospect of pragmatic propaganda. They have already said they'll be shooting for the earlier date.

I see no reason for us to wait upon events. I will continue to analyze our national program and to make every attempt to convey my own sense of urgency in seeking to develop a national sense of urgency that will push the American timetable ahead.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Concerning Economic Problems

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic problems confronting the country require consideration and action by Congress.

We face the task not only of finding a quick answer to our immediate dilemma, but also of finding more effective machinery to minimize the up-and-down fluctuations—particularly the "down"—of the economic cycles.

Recently, I was privileged to comment on some aspects of these problems in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS ON EXCESSIVE SPEND-AND-TAX PROGRAMS

Currently, the Nation is deeply preoccupied with finding a solution to our economic difficulties. Looking briefly at the national economic picture, the facts are as follows:

We have a gross national product of $503 billion;

A national income of $418 billion;

According to the latest figures available, employment is between 64 and 65 million;

Unemployment, regrettably, is up to about 5½ million; this includes—according to latest figures available—about 80,000 unemployed in Wisconsin.

By experience, we have learned that spend-and-tax programs, alone, are not successful, long-range solutions to unemployment and economic setbacks.

However, federally sponsored efforts to strengthen the economy can be of some immediate stimulus to the economy.

Recently, the administration made a series of proposals in the following fields:

Providing Federal aid for chronically depressed areas;

Stepping up Government procurement;

Extending time in which the unemployed are eligible for compensation;

Stimulating homebuilding, urban renewal and highway construction;

Expedite Federal building projects of various kinds;

Although this is still being held in abeyance, the possibility of tax revision also may ultimately be considered to stimulate the economy—if other measures are not adopted successfully.

Other recommendations—relating not just to the economy but to other interests of our citizens, include:

Liberalizing social security;

Improving health aid programs for the aging;

Increasing the minimum wage and extending coverage to more workers;

Expanding Federal aid to education;

Expanding the distribution of surplus foods to needy folks, including families of the unemployed.

We recognize, of course, that in attempting to spur recovery, we must be careful not to encourage greater inflation.

In dealing with economic difficulties, also, we must not become so preoccupied with our internal problems to forget that—in the world at large—we are in a struggle for survival. Whatever our problems at home, we must remember that the Communists are working on a 24-hour day, 365-days-a-year basis to conquer the world. The long, Red tentacles reach out for the jugular vein of every people and country. At the Reds' command, are almost a billion people, vast natural resources, mighty and powerful military establishments, and a growing skill and dexterity in science and technology.

A strong defense—supported by a forward-moving economy—of course, is fundamental to our success in meeting the challenge of communism.

Our task, then, is to pursue a two-course road: (1) toward further strengthening the economy and meeting the peacetime needs of our citizens; and (2) toward successfully resisting the Communist effort to conquer the world; and alternatively, to establish peace.

Now, let's look closely at some of the major challenges. First the Federal budget:

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The Kennedy administration has made relatively little change in the $80.9 billion budget proposed by the previous Eisenhower administration—drawn up with an anticipated $1.5 billion surplus to help promote economic growth without spurring inflation.

However, proposed expenditures, if approved, as well as diminished revenue resulting from lags in the economy—may well upset the budgetary applecart.

MAINTAINING A STRONG DEFENSE

What about defense? The United States has a strong—and growing—jet-missile-nuclear-space defense. Over $47 billion are earmarked in the 1962 budget for national security. As of now, our Armed Forces—together with those of our allies—are serving as an effective deterrent to massive military attack by the Communists.

Interestingly, preelection estimates of Soviet superiority in missiles are now being modified. After a more realistic look at the strategic facts of life, it appears that the United States, after all, may not be a second-class world power—an allegation which many of us have consistently refuted.

For the future, however, defense will require further strengthening of our air, sea, land, space forces on a balanced front, to deal with either brushfire or large-scale attacks by the enemies of freedom.

PROGRESS IN SPACE

Our progress in space, too, is of paramount significance—domestically and internationally.

Defensewise, space offers new opportunities and dangers. Domestically, space promises advances in communications, transportation, weather reporting; and other areas. Internationally, the space race—whether we like it or not—continues to symoblize the scientific advancement of a Nation.

Now, what about the comparative progress of the United States and the Soviet Union—the two major contenders in the race for space? A comparative evaluation boils down to this: The Reds have developed greater rocket power; the U.S. program, however, is far more advanced and polished technically and scientifically. Today, we have many more satellites in orbit, and the cumulative value of scientific knowledge obtained from space exploration far exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

NEED FOR TAX REFORM

As I mentioned, tax reform may often be considered—as an extreme alternative—if the economy fails to recover quickly and rapidly enough.

Frankly, I feel that the reform of our tax system has long been overdue. Recently, I proposed a Hoover-type Commission to carry out such a job. The current economic difficulties, too, require that we take another look at the tax structure to determine (a) that it is not unduly stunting the economy; and (b) that loopholes be plugged to assure more equitable distribution of the tax burden. A new look would, in all likelihood, include:

The 27½-percent depreciation allowance on oil, gas, and other minerals;

Tightening up on expense accounts;

Simplifying the tax system of reporting and payment;

Excise taxes;

Relative rates of income and corporate taxes;

Depreciation allowances for private enterprises.

Current Proposals for Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia chapter of the Federal Bar Association held its monthly luncheon meeting on Friday, February 17, 1961, at the Adelphia Hotel. At that time it was my privilege, as president of the chapter, to introduce the distinguished guest speaker of the day, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. CELLER spoke on "Current Proposals for Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation." His talk was so timely and so enthusiastically received by the members and guests, that I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of others interested in this important subject:

CURRENT PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST LEGISLATION

(Remarks of Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, before the Federal Bar Association, Philadelphia chapter, Adelphia Hotel, February 17, 1961)

Your distinguished president—my good friend and colleague, HERMAN TOLL—has suggested that I spend a few minutes with you today in discussing the problems of conflict of interest in Federal employment—a subject that has become increasingly elusive and troublesome over the years. What is more, it is a subject that vitally affects lawyers. In their private practice, they must be in a position to advise clients of the pitfalls in sharp dealing with the Government. As practitioners before the agencies, they need to know their duties and obligations and have a direct interest in seeing that those duties and obligations are impartially imposed also on their adversaries. Should they enter Federal employment, they are directly subject to the conflict of interest statutes and rules, and when they resign, those statutes and rules affect their right to practice before the Government. Should they be called to advise the Government on a part-time basis, they must weigh the consequences for their other Government business and that of their partners and associates. Finally, the subject deserves the attention of lawyers working through bar associations such as yours to improve the quality of government.

During last year's presidential campaign, Senator John F. Kennedy declared: "The essence of any government that belongs to the people must lie in the Biblical injunction: 'No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other.' All America seeks a government where no man holds to his own interest and despises the public interest—and where all men serve only the public—and love that master well."

In these apt words, the new President has summarized the aspirations of legislators, political scientists, lawyers, and citizens generally, with respect to the problem of conflict of interest in Government employment. Just what do we mean by the term "conflict of interest?" I should say we mean those activities and interests of Government employees, falling short of outright bribery and graft, that are simply inconsistent with holding a Government job. They are inconsistent because they tend to impair the integrity of the service and to deprive the Government of the full performance for which it has bargained. These include adversaries of the Government in matters in which the employee performs Government service; representing the Government in transactions in which the employee has a private adverse interest; and taking advantage of information, prestige, or influence which he holds in trust. They include switching sides, that is, representing the Government in a matter one day and then resigning from Government and representing a private person against the Government the next day in the same matter. In addition, most would agree, the importance of public confidence in the Federal service requires the Government employee to avoid the appearance of evil, as well as evil itself.

To effectuate these principles, Congress, over the past century has enacted, piecemeal, a number of criminal prohibitions. These

laws, however, have been repeatedly criticized in recent years as confused and inadequate—as unequal in application and sometimes contradictory. Many Federal agencies also, have issued diverse regulations on conflicts of interest for guidance of their own employees—but these, too, often fall short of comprehensive treatment of this vital subject. With respect to Government attorneys, it should also be noted, a further source of law is provided by the Canons of Ethics of the American Bar Association, which have been incorporated in the rules of a number of Federal district courts.

Testimony taken during the 84th Congress by Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, indicated an urgent need for a reappraisal of existing Federal legislation prohibiting conflicts of interest. I therefore requested the staff of the subcommittee to prepare a report on such legislation. When that report had been received, I introduced two bills in Congress in the hope that their introduction would stimulate study leading to more effective prevention of unethical practices without impairing the attractiveness of Government service to competent men and women. The first bill (H.R. 12547, 85th Cong., reintroduced as H.R. 2156, 86th Cong.) would strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft and conflict of interest by revising, coordinating and simplifying them. The second bill (H.R. 2157, 86th Cong.) would implement those laws with a comprehensive code of ethical conduct for Government employment.

During 1960, Subcommittee No. 5 held 10 days of hearings on H.R. 2156 and H.R. 2157, as well as a number of related measures which had been assigned to the subcommittee. Testimony addressed to the shortcomings of existing law and to proposed amendments was received from Members of Congress and from representatives of 13 Government agencies and four bar associations, including your own.

At the hearings, a substantial number of witnesses opposed the enactment of a code of ethics with primary resort to administrative sanctions such as was proposed by H.R. 2157. On the other hand, H.R. 10575, 86th Congress, reintroduced in the 87th Congress as H.R. 3050, one of the measures under consideration by the subcommittee, proposed to place summary emphasis upon an administrative approach and much less emphasis than at present upon criminal sanctions. H.R. 10575 was introduced by Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York. It is the product of several years of study by a special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, of which Mr. LINDSAY is a member. Testimony concerning this bill focused attention on two major questions of policy. The first involves the degree to which Congress ought to spell out the details of the program seeking to eliminate conflicts of interest or ought, instead, to place primary responsibility in this area upon the Chief Executive. H.R. 10575 selects the latter approach. It resorts to criminal sanctions only in cases of willful violations, relying heavily on Executive regulation to fill out and define the bounds of its prohibitions.

In evaluating this approach, it should be borne in mind that for the past several years the administration and the Department of Justice have not taken the initiative to improve existing conflict-of-interest laws. Indeed, the Justice Department witness before the subcommittee conceded that although the Budget Director had in 1955 requested the Department to prepare a general consolidation and revision of the conflict-of-interest statutes, it has failed to do so.

The other policy question highlighted by the subcommittee's consideration of H.R. 10575 involves the treatment of so-called intermittent, as distinguished from regular Government employees. The tendency of existing law and of my bills, H.R. 2156 and H.R. 2157, is to treat the two groups identically, with legislative exemption being created on an ad hoc basis where deemed appropriate. The bar association's bill, H.R. 10575, however, treats the two groups very differently. Enactment of this bill would mean substantially more rigid regulation than at present for career employees and substantially less rigid regulation of persons classed as "intermittent." The Justice Department witness told the subcommittee that the Department is very much concerned over the proposed double standard of H.R. 10575 for dealing with intermittent and regular employees of the Government, stating that its adoption would represent "quite a drastic and radical departure from existing standards."

The 86th Congress expired before the subcommittee could complete its study, and the task of revising the conflict of interest laws remains to be completed. To that end, last month, Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, ranking Republican member of the committee and the subcommittee, and I, introduced identical bills (H.R. 3412 and H.R. 3411, 87th Cong.), representing our best present thinking as the result of nearly 4 years of study by the subcommittee and its staff. Principal provisions of these twin measures include: (1) A lifetime prohibition of breaches of confidence in matters formerly worked on by employees who leave the Government; (2) prohibition of payments to (as well as receipts by) Government officials of compensation for services rendered before Federal agencies; (3) uniform provisions prohibiting bribery of officials, and extension of bribery provisions to witnesses before committees of Congress and before Federal agencies; and (4) cancellation of Government contracts, licenses, and grants consummated in violation of the conflict of interest and bribery laws.

Representative MCCULLOCH and I are not committed to any particular language. Indeed, many sections of our bill reflect drafting suggestions made by witnesses, including language found in last year's H.R. 10575. We are, however, committed to getting this important job done.

One significant development will facilitate this task. The new President has spoken out. In his address at Wittenberg College last October, Mr. Kennedy stated that it would be his intention "at the earliest opportunity, to submit to the Congress a single, comprehensive code on conflicts of interest—aimed at eliminating duplications, inadvertencies and gaps—at drawing a clearer line between propriety and impropriety—at protecting the public against unethical behavior without making it impossible for able and conscientious citizens to accept public service."

Further, Mr. Kennedy declared as one of the basic principles which he intended to use as guidelines in appointments, that "Preference in appointments will be given to those willing to commit themselves to stay on the job long enough to apply what they learn. The goal is a full-time effort for the full tenure of the Presidential term, without regard to any prior affiliation or prospective employment."

In light of the new administration's declared policy, proposals to establish one set of ethical standards for intermittent employees and another for regulars may well become academic. Certainly, the need for accommodating the rigor of ethical imperatives in Government employment to the needs of part-time participants in Government will decline if the emphasis in recruiting is laid on securing more full-time careerists.

Promptly after taking office, the Chief Executive appointed a committee of experts on conflicts of interest which is due to report its recommendations by March 15. A thorough overhauling of existing conflict of interest laws and regulations is long overdue, and the subcommittee will note with interest the new administration's legislative proposals in this important area.

Armed Services Medical Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, for some 12 years I have been sowing the seed in what I hoped would be a fertile soil for the growth of an Armed Services Medical Academy.

The time now appears to be ripe for full examination of the entire field.

It is most encouraging to note that the need of such an academy has been recognized by some of our distinguished colleagues.

Early this year the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS E. WALTER, who has introduced so much constructive legislation during his years in Congress, introduced legislation providing for such an academy. His recognition of this problem and his action in introducing legislation provides one of the strongest voices in the Congress in support of such action.

Recently another colleague of mine on the Armed Services Committee again introduced a similar bill. This one is sponsored by CHARLES E. BENNETT of Florida, who for the past several Congresses has introduced such legislation.

After my years of study of this situation which began with the introduction of the first bill authorizing extra pay for doctors in the service, I decided it was time for me to finally introduce a similar bill which I did several weeks ago.

Before introducing my bill I conferred with my old friend and benefactor, CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

This illustrious and respected Member of the House unhesitatingly promised his full support and cooperation. His support is most welcomed and most needed for such an ambitious program of so great a magnitude.

The national response to the proposal has been greater than I ever anticipated. I have received editorials from newspapers throughout the Nation. From these I have selected an editorial from my own New Orleans newspaper, the States-Item, which I refer to you, as well as an editorial which appeared in all the Scripps-Howard newspapers in the Nation.

The record of hearings before the Armed Services Committees in other years, will reveal that I have already on record the advisability of examining such a proposal from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, when he was Chief of Staff of the Army, James For-

restal, when he was Secretary of the Navy, and Judge Robert Patterson, when he was Secretary of War. Throughout the years I have been careful to build up the record before stepping into the legislative water.

We must now sell the American public on the idea of the necessity of such an academy, which should also merit the support of the doctors and the dentists in this country. This is neither socialized, nor federalized medicine, to which I am unalterably opposed. It is a plan which will relieve the draft of civilian doctors and dentists, and which will provide more of both.

There is a shortage of doctors in the country today. There is only one way in which to supply more doctors and that is to educate more. Private schools now in existence cannot do the job unless facilities are enlarged. An armed services medical school would provide at least 1 of the 22 new medical schools which President Kennedy says are needed if we are to accept the challenge of supplying more doctors for the exploding population which we face tomorrow.

Those of us in the House who believe in such action can accomplish our objective through united effort and cooperation.

I propose that this Armed Services Medical Academy be built in the Washington area where it is possible to draw on Walter Reed General Hospital, Bethesda Medical Center, and the National Health Institutes for clinical services.

I also propose that the academy should be staffed by competent civilian professors, thus eliminating any objection to so-called inbreeding by the military.

This is a large and broad subject. It is a great problem. This proposed Armed Services Medical Academy is not the complete answer, but it is a step in the right direction.

The language of the present bills introduced by my distinguished colleagues and myself will not be the final language of the legislation. The final bill will be written only after the entire subject matter has been thoroughly explored and ventilated.

In the meantime I submit these two editorials to which I referred and which give you an insight as to how this proposal is being accepted in the Nation at large.

[From the New Orleans States-Item]

MEDICAL ACADEMY

U.S. armed services in peacetime have always had trouble filling their medical and dental personnel billets.

Toward alleviating the shortage of such professionals in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT proposes establishment of an Armed Forces Medical Academy in the Washington, D.C., area.

This bill, which has been referred to the House Armed Services Committee, of which he is a ranking member, calls for an initial appropriation of $50 million.

The academy would accommodate up to 500 medical students and 250 students of dentistry. Upon graduation, they would serve under direction of the Secretary of Defense for a minimum of 7 years.

We believe Representative HÉBERT's bill is worthy of serious consideration.

Anticipated need for the training by 1975 of 50 percent more physicians to serve the civilian population will only aggravate the armed services' medical personnel problems.

[From the Washington News and allied Scripps-Howard newspapers]

MEDICAL ACADEMY

The plan for an Armed Forces Medical Academy as advanced by Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT of Louisiana, deserves serious attention.

It would serve two important purposes: ending the need to draft doctors and dentists and adding to the scant supply of medical practitioners. It is preferable to straight scholarship grants in that it would provide new training facilities and give students a chance to repay the Government. This they would do by agreeing to serve at least 7 years, after graduation, in the military services, the Public Health Service, or the Veterans' Administration.

Representative HÉBERT specifies the new academy should be in the neighborhood of Washington, so that it could use Army and Navy hospitals and the National Institutes of Health, both for facilities and for faculty.

Since this plan involves no socialized medicine it seems to us something that the American Medical Association could support, or at least investigate carefully. In Congress it should have prompt committee hearings.

Hope Increases for Cape Cod National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as one who, back in the 85th Congress, introduced one of the first bills to authorize a national seashore park on Cape Cod, I wish to express my gratitude to my colleagues in this 87th Congress, and particularly to the members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for the sense of urgency as well as the earnestness with which they are considering this nationally important conservation measure.

The National Parks Subcommittee last week held hearings on the Cape Cod National Seashore legislation, which has the full support of President Kennedy. It is clear that we all agree with the President, with Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, with other sponsors of this legislation and with the committee members who have heard testimony in the past, that Cape Cod has top priority among conservation measures now before the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced my first Cape Cod National Seashore bill in 1958, basing it upon the findings of the National Park Service studies of the cape and of the Atlantic coast, I was deeply impressed by two things. One was the truly terrifying speed at which our superb natural shorelines were being preempted for developments of all kinds which would destroy their beauty and remove forever the opportunities which future generations might have to know and enjoy this aspect of their national heritage. Within the past 20 years whole stretches of natural seashore have vanished completely under developments or have become priced out of the reach even of Government.

But an equally impressive fact, and one which fills us all with a great hope, is that one of the finest seashore areas of the entire Atlantic seaboard yet remains largely unspoiled and constitutes a major conservation opportunity.

This is Cape Cod, an area so close to the country's largest centers of population that one marvels at how its unspoiled character has survived for so long. Here is not only a spectacular shoreline, beloved and written about for generations, but also inland areas of surpassing charm, scientific values of extraordinary significance, and evidences and traditions of an inspiring history.

Since establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park will affect the lives and interests of many private citizens and their town and State governments, it is evident that great care must be taken to reconcile national and local interest in this conservation legislation. The recommendations of the National Park Service already had done much in this direction. However, more was needed, and we of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress are proud to sponsor legislation, unique and unprecedented in its scope and purpose, which we believe will be successful in protecting individual rights and interests within the larger framework of the national purpose.

But working out such complex protective and reconciling provisions, based on further studies of the economic and other consequences of park establishment on the cape, have taken time, and time is running out. Since I introduced my first Cape Cod Park bill, new roads have been cleared, new subdivisions staked out, and the blight of honky-tonk development has crept further up the peninsula.

And the delay is costly in dollars as well as beauty. Seashore land prices have in some places risen as much as a thousand percent in the last 20 years. Each passing year sees conservation of Cape Cod growing more costly, with less and less to conserve.

I recommend to the Congress that prompt and effective action in conservation matters carry through all the legislative process, reconciling remaining differences with dispatch so that a nationally significant Cape Cod National Seashore can become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Springfield, Mass., Union of March 11, 1961, concerning the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park:

HOPE INCREASES FOR CAPE COD PARK

Chairman ALAN BIBLE of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee, said Thursday that he sensed an atmosphere of give and take between Cape Cod town officials and the National Park Service on the reduction of boundaries in the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. The chief stumbling block to establishment of the great park is the reluctance of towns in the area to relinquish taxable property for the project in

the face of the National Park Service's decision that it can reduce the acreage no further.

The Park Service already has substantially cut its original request for land in order to placate local objectors. But the objections still continue, though an adjustment at last appears hopeful. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL holds that Cape Cod officials are unduly upset over the boundary problem and that they serve "only to frustrate both national and local interests in an irresponsible manner."

They also appear to be using their piecemeal demands for excluding more land from the park to mask their aim of killing the whole idea. Great areas of the proposed park have lain undeveloped through all the years of Massachusetts history and have produced little tax revenue for the towns in which they are located. The fact that the developers now have their eyes on these areas and, in fact, are eating away at them, accounts for the immediate crisis. Underlying the whole plan for the park is the desire to conserve the tract in its natural state for posterity and to stem the tide of commercial development before it engulfs the land. In view of the park's importance as a magnificent tourist attraction and an asset to the whole State, the objectors appear woefully shortsighted in their efforts to discourage the plan and, in effect, kill it by shrinking the land available for it to an acreage so small as to force the National Park Service to abandon the project.

Secretary of the Interior Udall, whose appearances at the hearing he admits indicate President Kennedy's deep interest in the proposal, tersely and accurately analyzed the issue recently when he said:

"Unless action is taken in the near or immediate future to acquire and preserve lands at Cape Cod for public enjoyment, it seems quite evident that the Cape's traditional atmosphere and character will vanish under construction activity now under way there."

Statement by Hon. Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia, at Public Hearing on Residual Fuel Oil, Department of the Interior Auditorium, Monday, February 20, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement I made this morning at the public hearing on residual fuel oil conducted by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Secretary, the mining of coal in my State of West Virginia is an industry which has invested billions of dollars in plants and facilities to mine and market coal. It is an industry which in the last few years has been buffeted and battered by unfair marketing prices from competing oils—principally imports of foreign residual fuel oil at dump prices. Such imports, which began to swell soon after World War II, primarily from the Caribbean area, zoomed from 53 million barrels in 1948 to 129 million barrels in 1954.

In February 1955, there was issued a report on energy supplies and resources policy. The report was prepared by an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy, established by the President on July 30, 1954. In part, the report contained the following:

"An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in free countries which help to supply the U.S. market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary."

In that year, residual imports amounted to 152 million barrels.

In October 1956, the Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy reaffirmed its earlier finding. In that year residual oil imports amounted to 163 million barrels.

In April 1957, Mr. Gordon Gray, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, made a finding to the effect that crude oil was being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security. The special committee's findings in July 1957 supported Mr. Gray's certification and indicated that a limitation on imports was required. The committee recommended a voluntary import limitation plan, which did not include residual, and it was put into effect. In 1957, a total of 173 million barrels of residual oil were imported.

The voluntary control program was only partially successful, as was indicated by a letter from Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, issued on September 7, 1956, to the oil importing companies. He called attention to previous letters he had written asking for voluntary compliance with such reduction of the level of oil imports, and in referring to the cooperation received, he commented, "I would be less than frank if I did not say that this is a disappointing result."

In 1958, residual oil imports rose to 182 million barrels, and it was not until March of 1959, that mandatory controls were finally imposed. In imposing the mandatory residual import controls, the Government selected 1957 as its base year. In that year, residual imports totaled 173 million barrels. The proclamation by the President of the United States stated, with reference to residual oil, as follows:

"In districts I to IV, the imports of residual fuel oil to be used as fuel shall not exceed the level of imports of that product into these districts during the calendar year 1957."

But the import quotas which the Government piously placed on foreign residual fuel oil proved to be only theoretical in nature, for by 1960, even under mandatory import controls, residual oil imports amounted to 230 million barrels—57 million barrels above the 1957 levels, or the equivalent of approximately 14 million tons of coal. The 1960 imports of residual oil—230 million barrels—were the equivalent of approximately 55 million tons of bituminous coal.

About 75 percent of the oil which is imported is competitive with coal. Therefore, this competitive element displaced 41,250,000 tons of coal.

The average value per ton of bituminous coal, f.o.b. mines, in 1958 was $4.86. This is the last date for which I have figures. Using this figure, the loss of a market for 41¼ million tons of coal meant a loss of $200,475,000 in gross revenue for coal producers.

I am advised that wages constitute from 50 to 60 percent, depending upon whether or not vacation pay, welfare fund contributions, social security payments, unemployment compensation tax, and other factors are included, of the price per ton of coal, f.o.b. mines. Taking a conservative figure of 50 percent, one can readily see that there was a loss of $100 million in miners' wages, or a year's work for 18,500 men, plus a loss of $100 million in new equipment, taxes, development of new mines, and return on investment. The loss of 41¼ million tons of coal freight meant well over $100 million in lost freight revenue for the railroads, to say nothing of the wages lost to railroad workers.

Mr. Secretary, this is but a portion of the loss. One could cite the loss in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. One could also cite the multiplier effect upon the economy of service jobs lost when industrial employment drops.

What has been the trend in coal production while residual imports have been mounting? Coal production in 1947 amounted to 631 million tons. Last year it totaled only 413 million tons. What are some of the resultant effects upon the coal industry? Coal mines cannot be put in mothballs. When they are not in operation, they soon become flooded with water. The roofs fall. The machinery deteriorates. Unemployed miners walk the streets, and their families exist on meager surplus commodities. (There are 300,000 such recipients in West Virginia eligible for commodities today.) Further exploration for new coal reserves is discouraged.

With reduced coal freight tonnage, the railroads feel the pinch and their profits are siphoned away. I was in Baltimore on Saturday, where I talked with a high official of the B. & O. Railroad. He told me that 20,000 units, or 25 percent of the rolling stock, are presently in need of repairs. One hundred B. & O. freight cars constitute a train one mile in length. Consequently, 20,000 units represent, for the B. & O. 200 miles of inoperable railroad cars and locomotives. The situation is equally bad with other railroads.

On January 1, 1959, there were stored in class I railroad yards 54,494 hoppers which required major and extensive repair work. This compared with a total of 19,150 bad order hoppers in existence on January 1, 1957. In 1955, the average open top hopper cars had an age of 20 years. Twenty-nine percent of the open top hoppers were more than 30 years old. It is easy to see, therefore, how depressed economic conditions in the coal industry make themselves felt on the railroads' economy.

A March 16, 1959, article in the Wall Street Journal stated, in referring to the freight-car pinch: "Part of the decline in the car fleet has occurred because railroads are not buying new cars as fast as old ones are headed for the scrap heap."

In 1958 the carriers ordered only 17,546 new cars—just a fraction of the record 162,352 ordered in 1955—while at the same time some 41,000 cars were being retired.

The opponents of the mandatory oil import program contended that it was discriminatory to a populous region of the United States. I maintain that the Government discriminates against the depressed coal-producing areas if quotas are upwardly revised.

The opponents contended that such quotas constituted a major contribution to inflation. Yet coal prices, f.o.b. mines, in 1958 averaged for the entire country $4.86, whereas 10 years before, in 1948, coal sold at $4.99 per ton. The average price of coal at the mine today is actually less than it was 10 years earlier despite rising costs and a $10 per day increase in wages.

The opponents contended that import quotas produce unemployment. Yet, residual oil imported from foreign countries con-

tributes only insignificantly to employment in the consuming areas. However, it throws thousands of coal miners and railroad workers out of their jobs.

The opponents feared that import controls would weaken our national security, saying that they would tend to exhaust the American oil supply at a faster rate. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our domestic oil industry has suffered as a result of increased foreign imports because domestic exploration and production are discouraged.

The opponents contended that quotas on residual imports would precipitate price and wage controls for everyone. The prophesied results have not materialized.

More recently, opponents of the program have contended that import quotas on residual fuel oil have forced up the price of the oil and are costing New England consumers anywhere from $10 to $20 million a year. It is not clear on just what they base such a claim. If they contend that it results from a 15-cents-per-barrel increase in the cargo price of residual last July, they conveniently ignore the fact that the price of residual had been decreased 15 cents a barrel the previous January, and that it is now selling for considerably less than in the base year of 1957.

I understand that they also claim that higher residual oil prices have cost homeowners money by forcing up electric rates. However, the Federal Power Commission reports that there have been no increases in New England electric utility rates since last summer and, if anything, they tend to be lower.

Mr. Secretary, aside from the economic problems created by increasing residual imports, we cannot hide our heads in the sand and refuse to admit the accompanying danger to our national security. In the event of another national emergency, the coal industry will again be called upon to supply the fuel needs and power requirements of our country. Can this economically unhealthy industry respond as it must?

The continuing trend toward greater mechanization, together with the rising price level of mining machinery, has greatly increased the capital investment required for profitable coal mining operation. Coal operators cannot be expected to purchase high priced equipment for use in a highly competitive fuels field and maintain the cost upkeep of machinery and operative mines ready to expand production in a moment of emergency.

Moreover, with the coming of an emergency, wornout mining machinery would become difficult to replace with new equipment. A modern deep mine may take an investment of $6 to $10 per ton of annual capacity. The development of new mines in the older mining regions now requires about 2 years. Development of new mines in new areas requires an estimated 4 years. Expensive machinery requires materials which may not be available in time of war. The average life of plant and equipment is calculated to be 10 to 12 years.

Can an ailing coal industry afford new equipment and the costs of new exploration? If anyone questions the precarious financial position of the coal industry, he need only take a look at page 33 of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, House Report No. 1263, 85th Congress, 1st session. The Special Subcommittee on Coal Research noted that from 1925 to 1953, inclusive,

"The bituminous coal mining industry experienced a net loss in 13 of the 27 years for which data are available and in only 2 of the 27 years were fairly good profits obtained. It also is noted that the 1,572 corporations engaged in bituminous coal mining in 1953 earned an average profit after Federal taxes of a little less than 3¾ cents per ton on the 350 million tons of coal which they produced. Viewing industry's earnings from another angle, it is found that the value, f.o.b., mines, of the total production of bituminous coal in 1953 was on the order of $2,247 million, from which the incorporated producers, who accounted for 80 percent of the production realized a profit after Federal taxes of less than $13 million—or a calculated net profit of less than three-quarters of 1 percent on the gross value of the coal produced."

The subcommittee went on to state: "It is doubtful that any other major industry vital to the economy of the Nation has experienced anything approaching the depressed financial condition of the coal mining industry over the past 20 years."

Moreover, Mr. Secretary, an industry plagued by declining employment for a generation cannot raise a new generation of skilled and experienced coal miners in a day of peril. As the number of personnel regularly employed in the mines has been sharply reduced, there has been a steady reduction in the relative number of younger men employed in the coal industry. In 1951, the percentage of miners under 30 years of age was 18.6. In 1957, it had fallen to 6.5 percent. This alarming trend emphasizes the importance of retaining young workers in the bituminous coal industry in order to assure an adequate supply of experienced and skilled workers in the years ahead.

In its report in February 1955, the President's Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources stated its belief that "If the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oil bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuel situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial strength which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense."

Mr. Secretary, as I have already shown, the domestic fuel situation, particularly with reference to coal, is becoming seriously impaired to the point that it could not cope with the sudden and stepped up needs of a grave national emergency.

We are playing with fire if we permit the important east coast segment of our whole industrial complex to become increasingly dependent upon a source of foreign fuel oil which may be entirely cut off in a national emergency. It may be noted that the foreign sources, which supplied but 26 percent of the east coast residual oil requirements in 1940, now account for something in excess of 70 percent of the residual oil requirements of the same area.

A depressed coal industry could not possibly respond to the accelerated needs of war. Coal mining is increasingly becoming a highly skilled operation. Whereas in 1934, the year of my graduation from high school, only 12 percent of the coal was loaded by machinery, almost 86 percent of the coal produced in 1959 was machine loaded. It is apparent, therefore, that skilled personnel could not be secured overnight. Whereas in that same year of 1934 there were 458,000 miners in the United States, there were only 174,100 in 1959. Just as "the wine of life is oozing drop by drop," employment in the coal mines is dropping one by one.

The coal industry's expansibility declines as its rate of production decreases. This is true because its excess capacity is but a percentage of its current production. The common measure of annual mining capacity is the average number of employees times output per man-day times the number of working days per year. Using our pencil, therefore, 174,100 miners producing the current national average of 12 tons per day would produce 2,089,200 tons daily. Two hundred and sixty working days is about the maximum that can be worked per year in the deep mines. Taking the most liberal figure of working days per year in World War II—278 days in 1948—and proceeding with our process of multiplication, we find that the capacity production that could be reached would be 580,797,600 tons—a figure that falls below the tonnage produced in the World War II years of 1942, 1943, and 1944.

Mr. Secretary, if there is any doubt that foreign sources of residual are vulnerable to interruptions by enemy action, that doubt can be readily removed by reading pages 87–88 of the Interior Department's "History of the Petroleum Administration for War, 1941–1945." Referring to the sinking of 50 tankers along the east coast in 1942 and the resulting fuel supply situation, the document has this to say:

"Although the boats had to keep running to supply military requirements, no one could doubt the decline of tanker shipments for civilian needs in the face of these 50 sinkings. From then on, until the last year of the war, tanker deliveries were an insignificant factor in supplying the oil needs of the east coast.

"Tanker deliveries to the east coast reacted quickly to the submarine blockade. Shipments started to dive in February 1942, and by May they amounted to only 173,000 barrels daily, or about 18 percent of the December 1941 total. The low point of the war was reached in April and May 1943—63,000 barrels a day. From May 1942 to the end of 1943, east coast tanker deliveries averaged only a little more than 121,000 barrels daily.

"Even this small movement was on an uncertain, sporadic, undependable basis.

"One of the most crippling effects of the transportation shortage was the decline, below safe levels, of petroleum inventories on the east coast for the duration of the war. Never, throughout the war, was it possible to rebuild stocks on the east coast to safe operating levels, even after the transportation bottleneck was broken, although strenuous efforts were made to do so. This shrinkage of inventory was the major cause of one of the worst headaches of the war—the spot shortages which would result from failure of a scheduled shipment to arrive when storage tanks were empty."

Mr. Secretary, I am not like the lad in the fable who yelled "Wolf, wolf!" to the shepherds in a nearby field when there was no wolf. We are confronted with a real wolf, and I have a sample of it here. This is the thick, tarry substance known as residual oil, and it is not to be confused with home heating oils. There has been a lot of misrepresentation on this point. The ordinary house does not use residual oil at all, because special equipment is required for preheating purposes, and most of it goes to industry. Some residual is used for apartment buildings, hospitals, hotels, and so forth, where there are central heating units.

Residual is a derivative and product of crude oil and is left as a residuum in the distillation of petroleum products. While U.S. refineries are very advanced and efficient, the residual fuel oil yield in South American refineries may be as high as 60 percent. In order to dispose of residual oil, the oil companies are willing to sell it at almost any price, and it is dumped on utility and large steam plants that have multiple burning equipment. They provide the focal point for the residual-coal competition when there are excess supplies of residual oil caused by imports.

Residual has but limited storage and it has to be forced into the coal markets once the storage tanks begin to bulge. Consequently, there is no stability of price, and the objective is to undersell coal at any price.

To illustrate the fluctuation in price of this "dump" product, one has only to look

at the year 1958 when residual stocks continued to mount as imports increased. Residual went from $2.95 per barrel in January to $2.37 by late summer—a drop of 58 cents, equivalent to $2.44 per ton in terms of coal. Actually, a great deal of residual was sold under the list—as low or even lower than $2 per barrel ($8.40 coal equivalent).

I am informed that users of coal are often lured into converting to residual oil by cut-throat prices which will offset the cost of conversion, and I am also advised that the oil companies will not enter into contracts to deliver oil at a definite and stable price but, instead, promise to meet and undersell the price of coal. This type of competition is unconscionable and it simply cannot be met.

Mr. Secretary, I do not ask for complete elimination of residual fuel oil imports. I do ask for a substantial reduction. I maintain that the quotas on residual oil imports should be so designed to permit the coal industry, the domestic oil industry, and the transportation industry to meet the needs of exploration and research, repair and replace damaged and obsolete equipment, recoup employment losses, and maintain a capability to meet the expanded needs of a national emergency. I ask nothing more. One could expect nothing less.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 133: 1: *Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

O Thou, who art the God and Father of us all, grant that in this Brotherhood Week men and nations may be lifted, by the mighty tide of Thy grace and love, into a more fraternal relationship.

We pray that we may never harbor within our minds and hearts those thoughts and feelings which were alien to the Master's spirit of compassion and consideration, of patience and kindness.

Inspire us with a clearer vision of the many noble and helpful things which we are daily privileged to do together for the health and happiness of mankind everywhere.

Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to a joyous and victorious fulfillment those capacities and lofty aspirations with which Thou didst endow the soul of man, created in Thine own image and for Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 610. An act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board;

S. 707. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

S. 804. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules.

The message also announced that the Secretary had been directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 681) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 38, 75th Congress, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, and the Senator from Kansas, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the Senator from California, Mr. ENGLE, and the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE, were appointed members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD; the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN; the Senator from Montana, Mr. METCALF; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. HARTKE; the Senator from Texas, Mr. YARBOROUGH; the Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART; the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN; the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLOTT; the Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BOGGS; and the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH, to attend the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group meeting to be held in Ottawa February 22 to 25, inclusive.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST HARVEY O'CONNOR

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been served with a subpena duces tecum which directs me to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey to testify in the case of the United States of America against Harvey O'Connor.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES *v.* HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232–59

TO FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey at Federal courthouse in the city of Newark on the 31st day of May 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Harvey O'Connor* and bring with you the documents and objects listed in the schedule attached hereto and made a part hereof.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

MICHAEL KELLER, JR.,
Clerk.

By MARY BRADBURY,
Deputy Clerk.

John O. Bigelow, Leonard B. Boudin, and Morton Stavis, attorneys for defendant.

MAY 19, 1960.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232–59.

SCHEDULE—TO SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT

(a) The original minute book of the House Un-American Activities Committee and of the subcommittee of the Un-American Activities Committee, which held hearings in Newark in 1958, and if there be no original minute book, the minutes of all meetings of the Un-American Activities Committee or the said subcommittee authorizing the 1958 Newark hearings, authorizing the issuance of subpenas in connection therewith, and recommending proceedings by contempt against Harvey O'Connor.

(b) All material in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee relating to Harvey O'Connor, including but not limited to staff memoranda, reports of other Government agencies in the committee's files, reports of interviews, statements, affidavits, recordings, correspondence, press releases, and proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee in the questioning of Harvey O'Connor.

(c) All material in the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee relating to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, including but not limited to staff memoranda, reports of other Government agencies in the committee's files, reports of interviews, statements, affidavits, recordings, correspondence, press releases, and proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee during the questioning of any witness in Newark, N.J., in 1958 in relation to the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

(d) All records and logbooks kept by the House Un-American Activities Committee in respect to the issuance of subpenas in June, July, August, and September 1958 and the carbon copies of all subpenas issued in that period in respect to hearings relating to the Newark area.

(e) All memoranda of the staff of the House Un-American Activities Committee, minutes of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, reports by the committee staff or reports of any other Government agency in the files of the committee, summaries of interviews, affidavits, statements, recordings, correspondence, press releases, proposed lists of questions or memoranda to be used by counsel or the committee during the questioning of any witness, or any other material prepared for or used (relating to

the subject of any of the hearings in respect to Newark in 1958).

(f) Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held in 1958 in respect to Newark, by the House Un-American Activities Committee or any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 177

Whereas in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor* (criminal case No. 232–59), pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Member of this House, directing him to appear as a witness at the Federal Courthouse in the city of Newark, N.J., on the 31st day of May 1960, and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor* is now scheduled to begin on the 11th day of April 1961; and

Whereas by the privileges of this House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice, or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpena duces tecum of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor*, but he shall not take with him the papers and records requested in said subpena; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers, and the Clerk of the House is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of the House of Representatives that the court has found to be material and relevant (except that in no circumstances shall any minutes or transcripts of executive sessions, or any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto, be disclosed or copied) and which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said papers, documents, and records by the House of Representatives shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under any Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST PETER SEEGER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to testify in the case of the United States of America against Peter Seeger.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* PETER SEEGER, DEFENDANT, No. C152–240, CR. 800

To FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York at the district courthouse, Foley Square, room 318 in the city of New York on the 25th day of January 1960 at 10:30 o'clock a.m. to testify in the above-entitled case.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HERBERT A. CHARLSON,
Clerk.

By JOHN S. MAURIELLO,
Deputy Clerk.

Wolf, Popper, Ross, Wolf & Jones, attorneys for defendant.

JANUARY 13, 1960.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 178) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, to testify at the District Courthouse, Foley Square, in the city of New York, N.Y., on the 25th day of January 1960, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Peter Seeger* (criminal case No. C152–240); and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York in the case of *United States of America* v. *Peter Seeger;* and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST HARVEY O'CONNOR

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey to testify in the case of the United States of America against Harvey O'Connor.

Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232–59

To GORDON H. SCHERER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey at Federal courthouse in the city of Newark on the 1st day of June 1960 at 10 o'clock a.m. to testify in the above-entitled case.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

MICHAEL KELLER, Jr.,
Clerk.

By MARY BRADBURY,
Deputy Clerk.

John O. Bigelow, Leonard B. Boudin, and Morton Stavis, attorneys for defendant.

MAY 19, 1960.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 179) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, a Member of this House, was served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, to testify at the Federal Courthouse in the city of Newark, N.J., on the 1st day of June 1960, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor;* and

Whereas the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor* is now scheduled for trial on the 11th day of April 1961; and

Whereas by the privileges of this House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative GORDON H. SCHERER is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor;* and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND T. COLLINS—UNITED STATES AGAINST HARVEY O'CONNOR

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 20, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Raymond T. Collins, an employee of the House, while serving at my direction as an investigator on the Committee on Un-American Activities, received a subpena directing him to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor* (No. 232–59). The return date of the subpena has been extended by the court to April 11, 1961.

The subpena in question is transmitted herewith and the matter is presented for such action as the House, in its wisdom, may see fit to take.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* HARVEY O'CONNOR, No. 232–59

To RAYMOND T. COLLINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey at Federal courthouse in the city of Newark on the 1st day of June 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m. to testify in the above-entitled case.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

MICHAEL KELLER, Jr.
Clerk.

H. MARY BRADBURY,
Deputy Clerk.

John O. Bigelow, Leonard B. Boudin, and Morton Stavis, attorneys for defendant.

MAY 19, 1960.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 180

Whereas Raymond T. Collins, investigator, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, was served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey, to testify at the Federal courthouse, in the city of Newark, N.J., on the 1st day of June 1960, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor* (criminal case No. 232–59); and

Whereas the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor* is now scheduled for trial on the 11th day of April 1961: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Raymond T. Collins, investigator, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Harvey O'Connor*; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 20, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., an employee of the House, while serving at my direction as counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities, received a subpena duces tecum directing him to appear as a witness before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Martin Popper* (No. 1053–59). The return date of the subpena has been extended to April 15, 1961.

The portion of the subpena duces tecum requiring the production of documents was, on the 3d day of February 1961, quashed by Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran.

The subpena in question is transmitted herewith and the matter is presented for such action as the House, in its wisdom, may see fit to take.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* MARTIN POPPER, DEFENDENT, No. 1053–59

SUBPENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT

To FRANK S. TAVENNER, Jr.,
Counsel, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington on the 7th day of March 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Martin Popper* and bring with you (1) all memoranda in the possession of the said Frank S. Tavenner on June 5, 1959, with respect to the defendant herein, and (2) all communications between the defendant herein and his attorneys on the one hand and the House Committee on Un-American Activities (herein referred to as the committee) and its counsel, staff director and other agents on the other hand, between March 26, 1959, and June 5, 1959, on the subject of the defendant's appearance before the committee and adjournments requested on behalf of the defendant; memoranda made with respect to such communications.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.

By CLARICE FULGHUSEN,
Deputy Clerk.

FEBRUARY 26, 1960.

LEONARD B. BOUDIN,
Attorney for defendant.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 181

Whereas Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Counsel, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, was served with a subpena duces tecum to appear as a witness before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, District of Columbia, on the seventh day of March, 1960, in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper, criminal case number 1053–59; and

Whereas the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper is now scheduled for trial on the fifteenth day of April, 1961; and

Whereas Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran did, on the third day of February 1961, quash that portion of the subpena requiring the production of documents enumerated therein: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Counsel, Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, is authorized to appear in response to the subpena duces tecum of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of the United States of America against Martin Popper, as modified by the order of Mr. Justice Edward M. Curran issued on the third day of February, 1961; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of these resolutions be submitted to said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during the session of the House today during general debate or any special orders, and that the same permission be granted to the Select Subcommittee on Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HON. CARL VINSON

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, America has had her great men—she has had her John C. Calhoun, Henry Clay, George Washington, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Daniel Webster, Jefferson Davis, Stephen Decatur, John Paul Jones, Thomas Edison, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, John Pershing, William Halsey, and George Marshall—to name but a few.

It is not often that men and women of a living generation can observe, in action, truly great Americans who have become a part of our American heritage long before they are ready to become a part of American history.

But here in the House of Representatives there are two great Americans who are now a part of our national heritage and who will also one day be a part of our history for generations yet unborn to honor and revere.

Those two great Americans are SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, and CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

Very recently the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal published an article entitled "Backstage Boss of the Penta-

gon." It is an article written by a very keen, astute author, Louis Stockstill, who, as a result of his efforts in this remarkable story has earned himself a place of honor among American biographers.

It is not easy to capture the image of CARL VINSON, and it is almost impossible on paper. One must see CARL VINSON in action to understand why he is the most beloved chairman of any committee in the Congress. One must hear CARL VINSON to understand why he is considered to be the most brilliant chairman of any committee in Congress. One must understand CARL VINSON to realize why the legislative proposals that come from the House Armed Services Committee are devoid of political partisanship, blessed almost inevitably with unanimity, and invariably have as their one and only objective, the security of the Nation.

But Lou Stockstill has captured in his article the true character of this truly remarkable man, CARL VINSON. He has been able to put down on paper a closer approximation of the greatness, and also the humbleness of this inimitable American, than has ever heretofore been done.

Mr. Speaker, for 47 years the people of America have been fortunate in having as their representative in the Congress of the United States, CARL VINSON, of Georgia. And I choose my words carefully, "the people of America have as their representative in the Congress" for CARL VINSON represents not just the Sixth District of Georgia, not just the State of Georgia, but the United States of America and all for which she stands.

And the military prowess of this Nation; the aircraft carriers and submarines that sail our seas; the missiles that enter the stratosphere and streak down our ranges; the tanks that roll over the training grounds in Europe and in America; the bombers that constantly guard us in the skies above; and the men and women who operate all of these weapons of war, can look back upon the foresight and wisdom of CARL VINSON and recognize that he, more than any other single person in the world, is responsible for our security, our military might, and our ability to lead the free world.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I wholeheartedly agree with what the gentleman from South Carolina has said. I had the opportunity and privilege of reading this article carefully. I commend it to the reading of each and every Member of this House because it is most interesting, enlightening, and informative, and a deserved tribute to the great chairman of the finest committee in the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with humbleness, but with pride, because I have been privileged to serve and work closely with CARL VINSON, that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time this fine article about a magnificent American, CARL VINSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, 1961]

"UNCLE CARL" VINSON—BACKSTAGE BOSS OF THE PENTAGON

(By Louis R. Stockstill)

When Robert S. McNamara, 44, was named Secretary of Defense, one of his first moves—a month before he was sworn into office—was to go to Capitol Hill and call on a man who entered Congress 19 months before McNamara was born.

One year earlier, a startled secretary in the U.S. House of Representatives looked up from her desk at 8 o'clock one morning to find McNamara's predecessor standing in the doorway. Former Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., then newly appointed, explained that he had merely stopped by to pay his respects to the young lady's boss. "This is the one place in Washington," Gates said, "where I know I will always get a warm welcome, a good cup of coffee and sound advice."

Such visitors come often to the office of a 77-year-old Georgia farmer, "Uncle CARL" VINSON, ruler of the vital House Armed Services Committee and mastermind of U.S. defense policies since the days of Calvin Coolidge. Top military leaders have always courted his favor with unabashed ardor. For VINSON is the acknowledged backstage boss of the Pentagon.

When President John F. Kennedy lays out his plan for overhauling the Nation's military machine—now eating its way through $41 billion a year—he too will have to woo this tobacco-chewing teetotaler.

For years I have watched "Uncle Carl" trying to fathom the mysterious magnetism with which he dominates and directs the complicated mass of legislation that determines our military strength. Unquestionably one of the most powerful men in the country, he shuns publicity with toe-in-the-dirt humility. A personality of fascinating contradictions, he can fight furiously for the Armed Forces, but is equally adept at whittling pompous admirals and generals down to size.

Behind an outward gruffness that terrifies the uninitiated and cuts through soft soap, I have discovered a rare public servant of unsuspected warmth and humility, a man of the soil who has stayed with his fundamental, time-tested beliefs, never allowing himself to be swayed by each shifting political wind. He has been called a dictator. He is not always right. But over the years he has steered the country through a maze of complexities, conflicts and rivalries to give it what it needs—an adequate defense.

Before the Second World War, he forged a series of giant naval construction programs which brought America eventual world leadership on the seas. Almost 2 years before Pearl Harbor, he battled for funds to train pilots, buy planes and construct airbases for the war to come. In the post-World War II period he demanded a major buildup of strategic bombers and rammed his views through the Congress over the objections of the President. Today, he is fighting for better trained, better equipped troops and increased ballistic missile production to combat communism.

Uncle CARL has tangled with Presidents, Cabinet members and the country's top military brass. One of his hottest fights was with Dwight D. Eisenhower.

When Ike asked Congress for a full-scale reorganization of the Pentagon in 1958, Uncle CARL approved most of the new ground rules, but charged that key provisions of the plan would create a "Prussian general staff." Ike, his blood pressure up, ridiculed this as "nonsense," but VINSON, supported by both Republicans and Democrats on his committee, stripped the proposal of its "Prussian" features and the House backed him up.

Under White House pressure, the Senate restored some of the authority the President desired, and conferees from the two Armed Services Committees had to meet to decide between the House and Senate versions. The day of the closed-door meeting, VINSON, with members of his committee in tow, arrived at the conference room a few minutes early. When the Senators arrived, led by their chairman, another Georgian, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, VINSON didn't wait for them to find seats. "Well, now, weah all heah," he announced in his cottony Georgia burr. "Now Senatuh RUSSELL will be chai'man of this confe'ence. You sit heah, Senatuh."

He motioned RUSSELL to a seat and kept talking. "Now, heah's what weah gonna do," Uncle CARL told the group, quickly outlining how the main Senate proposals were to be eliminated.

"Aren't you even going to let us discuss it, CARL?" chuckled Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts.

"Well, now, weah all busy men. We haven't got time fo' a lot of talk," VINSON replied. The discussion lasted about 15 minutes, and Uncle CARL pulled out an already prepared statement explaining what the conference group had done and turned to his chief committee counsel, Robert W. Smart. "Bob," he said, "put Chairman RUSSELL's name on the statement with mine, and eve'ywheah it says 'I,' take out 'I' and put in 'We'."

Senator RUSSELL changed only one word.

VINSON's colleagues and the press have seen him conduct similar operations time and again.

In another conference session, when Senator HENRY JACKSON of Washington got up to leave before the meeting ended, Uncle CARL fixed him with a penetrating stare. "Where are you going, HENRY?" he asked.

JACKSON explained that some constituents were waiting in his office. "Now, HENRY," Uncle CARL said, in his best father-to-son voice, "nothing is more important than this meeting. You can't go anywhere until we're finished. You sit back down." JACKSON's constituents had to wait.

VINSON gets away with such tactics because of his towering seniority and the vast knowledge and experience he has gained in dealing with the country's military problems through three major wars. He has served in the House 46 years—longer than any man in history except his friend Speaker SAM RAYBURN. For the incredible period of 37 years, he has been the senior Democrat on either the old Naval Affairs Committee or its successor, the Armed Services Committee, and, since 1931, except for two brief periods when Republicans controlled the House, he has been committee chairman. He has sharpened his legislative skills in countless committee sessions and floor fights. He knows instinctively when to press his demands, give ground, or stand firm.

When Presidential defense plans or Pentagon policies fail to meet Uncle CARL's approval, he hauls their advocates before his committee, tears the plans down into their component parts, and rebuilds them with his own do-it-yourself kit. The taxpayer gets a front-line seat to watch the show. One of VINSON's watchwords is "The public has a right to know."

Top Government officials responsible for winning congressional approval of new Armed Forces programs have learned from experience not to wrap their plans in fancy, bureaucratic language for presentation to Uncle CARL. He strips away the frills. "Cut out the hemmin' and hawin'," he tells them, "and get to the point."

Once when the Navy was trying to work out a new pay system, he told the late Fleet

Adm. William D. Leahy (World War II adviser to President Roosevelt) to "keep it all on the back of an envelope so the average layman can understand it."

Although the Senate Armed Services Committee is coequal in every respect with the House group, Uncle CARL'S committee takes the lead on defense legislation. The practice stems partly from the fact that Senators serve on a number of committees and can devote less time than VINSON to the exclusive consideration of military matters, and partly from the fact that the House, because it initiates all money bills, has traditionally moved first on most legislation, but Uncle CARL'S committee also edges out the Senate group in terms of seniority and experience.

VINSON and the two senior members on his committee (Democrat PAUL KILDAY, of Texas, and House GOP whip LES ARENDS, of Illinois) have completed a combined total of 94 years' congressional service. Uncle CARL was a committee chairman before any of the 17 members of the Senate committee arrived on Capitol Hill. Some Senators who started their service in the House, proudly boast they are "graduates of Vinson College."

On the surface, Uncle CARL looks more like a farmer than a formidable legislator, but the 6-foot Georgian's rustic appearance, slurring accent and occasional mispronunciations (the most famous of which is "Indigo China") mislead inexperienced witnesses who appear before his committee. They learn quickly that VINSON'S country-bumpkin guise only thinly camouflages the cunning political acumen which has earned him another nickname—"the Old Fox."

He is a dominating, hard-hitting leader who directs the operations of his 37-member legislative committee (largest on Capitol Hill) under a rigid "no politics" rule. He blasts Republicans or members of his own Democratic Party with equally intense shellfire if he thinks either group is championing unwise defense policies. He fights zealously for the admirals and generals but keeps them constantly off balance by slamming the door shut on many of their plans. He refuses to give up a proven weapon until he has been shown conclusively that its blueprint replacement will work.

When he says, "Heah's what le's do, and I'll he'p ya," the Pentagon girds for action. If he tells the top brass to hold their "hosses," they pull up short.

Yet, VINSON is not a man who blows his own bugle. Twice the House has attempted to honor him with a special "day on the floor"—a ceremony in which House Members pay tribute to one of their colleagues who has compiled an outstanding record. It is accorded to few, but each time Uncle CARL has been approached on the idea he has flatly rejected it. "I want no day on the floor with kind colleagues making laudatory remarks about me," he says. "My deeds and my actions will have to speak for themselves."

His achievements are indeed awesome, and have earned him such titles as "father of the two-ocean Navy" and "elder statesman of aviation," but his actions sometimes are subject to misinterpretation. When he is called a dictator or the press labels him as "the crusty old Georgian," neither characterization is wholly accurate.

Uncle CARL is a man of contradictions. Some know him as a stern taskmaster, abrupt, demanding, often unapproachable. Others know him as kind, gentle and unassuming; as a playmate for his 10-year-old grandson; as a matchmaker for his employees.

Although he has been a principal architect of American defense policies for 35 years, he ignores the fringe benefits his position offers. He has been in an airplane only three times. He has seldom boarded a Navy warship. Except for a single nearby excursion, he has never been outside the United States.

He is entitled to an $18,000 retirement salary, but he continues to work, worry and fret over the Nation's military posture.

Some of his most vocal critics charge he gives the Armed Forces everything they want. Many Pentagon officials who see the backstage maneuvering in his office know otherwise.

The late Adm. Ernest J. King once said "Mr. VINSON seems to have a sixth sense which tells him when to support the proposals made to him and when to give us a sound spanking and send us back to the Navy Department." Such spankings are common occurrences.

During the last Congress, a top Defense Department official who had incurred Uncle CARL'S displeasure (and that of numerous other congressional leaders) resigned his high-ranking post after VINSON bluntly told the Secretary of Defense: "We can't work with him. Don't send him back over here again."

The President appointed a new man to the job. Pentagon leaders waited anxiously to see if he would be more acceptable. In his first get together with Uncle CARL—who has no use for the ambiguous language and circumlocutions which are the trademark of politics—the newcomer was told: "Now, I don't want to say anything derogatory about your predecessor, but I just want to say that no matter what kind of job you do, it will be a better job than your predecessor did."

Uncle CARL often kills off Pentagon plans before they can get up a full head of steam. Even personal friendships are not permitted to stand in the way of his conscience.

When Eisenhower named Adm. Arthur W. Radford to the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, VINSON sent Radford a rare congratulatory message. Radford telegraphed back to say he would "continue to count heavily" on Uncle CARL'S "advice and guidance." He noted that without VINSON'S "friendship, counsel and advice over these many years, yesterday's announcement would never have been made."

Four years later, when the Defense Department sent up a trial balloon on an unprecedented third term for Radford to see how VINSON would react, he told them, "I see no reason to perpetuate any individual in the office."

Although the Senate has exclusive power to confirm or deny Presidential appointments, Uncle CARL'S statement foreclosed any further consideration for his old friend; Air Force Gen. Nathan F. Twining was nominated instead.

When the Army decided, as an economy measure, to substitute motorized hearses for the 17 horses used in military funerals at Arlington National Cemetery, VINSON reared up in instant protest.

"If we can afford State dinners and the expenses always associated with the visits of foreign dignitaries," he declared, "we can afford to retain some small semblance of the respect this Nation still possesses for the few military personnel who are carried to their last resting place on a caisson."

Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker abruptly withdrew the plan.

Another official who stumbled and fell in a row with Uncle CARL was former Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson. Without consulting Congress, Wilson decided to transfer all officers of the Veterinary Corps to the Department of Agriculture. Uncle CARL reminded Wilson that no service function can be shifted or altered without approval of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees (a law which VINSON wrote). And, he added, approval in this case was not likely in view of the valuable work being done by veterinarians in military research.

Wilson refused to back down but was afraid to go ahead. He let the matter hang fire until he was ready to resign his Pentagon post and go back to private industry. Then, as one of his last official acts, he signed the transfer order and scuttled out of Washington. His successor, Neil H. McElroy, immediately delayed the order, and killed it a few days later.

In recent months, the Army, alarmed over ramifications of a Defense Department order drastically curtailing one of its essential training programs, turned to Uncle CARL for help. A ranking Army official explained that the action was taken without Army approval, although his was the only service seriously affected. VINSON called in Pentagon chiefs and asked, "Why?" This brought a peeved reaction from one official that the Army was trying to undercut him by going to VINSON.

Not one to split hairs, Uncle CARL replied, "Well, now, that's right. The Army is trying to undercut you. And the Defense Department, of course, is trying to undercut the Army. And now," he added without further ado, "I'm undercutting the Defense Department."

When he was chairman of the old Naval Affairs Committee, every time a Secretary of the Navy retired, resigned, or died, Uncle CARL'S name popped into the news as a probable successor. He said repeatedly he didn't aspire to this honor. Once he remarked, "I've got more than I can say grace over right here."

Old-timers on Capitol Hill remember when VINSON used to refer to Cabinet members as "the best (or worst) Secretary of the Navy I ever had."

Although he has spurned such honors, himself, Uncle CARL has had a hand in the selection of many Defense Department leaders. Admiral Leahy, in his book, "I Was There," recalls that he was with President Roosevelt in South Carolina when word came on April 28, 1944, of the death of Navy Secretary Frank Knox. "Among the first callers after my return to Washington," he said, "was Representative CARL VINSON, who recommended that I urge the President to appoint the Under Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, to the Cabinet post." Forrestal's nomination went to the Senate in May. Later he became the first Secretary of Defense.

Following creation of the Defense Department, VINSON also has been rumored under consideration for appointment as Defense Secretary. At the beginning of the Eisenhower administration, reporters asked if he would accept the appointment. "Of course not," he said, "I'd rather run the Pentagon from up here."

Laws VINSON writes for the armed services consistently win quick endorsement. In 29 years he has lost only three floor fights on bills reported by his committee.

The first defeat was on a pre-Pearl Harbor proposal to fortify Guam. Those who voted against Uncle CARL do not brag about their Pyrrhic victory.

The only other defeats were on bills to raise military pay (later approved) and to establish universal military training.

Veteran Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, says it is treason to vote against anything VINSON proposes. While not comparing VINSON'S operations "with those carried on in Russia," he says "they are just about as effective."

Uncle CARL'S power is pointed up, too, in numerous White House communiques in which ex-Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower have wooed his support, sought his advice, or praised him for unsolicited assistance.

While most Congressmen have difficulty wangling a White House appointment, one of the Roosevelt letters (April 29, 1939) clearly shows the type of entree enjoyed by VINSON. F.D.R., discussing a prospective Navy law with Uncle CARL, ended his letter by

penning an appeal in longhand: "Do please come talk over with me this personnel problem—I get back May 2."

F.D.R. and VINSON were members of a mutual admiration society, each praising the other's role in the growth of the Navy. Nevertheless, Uncle CARL once overruled Roosevelt during a critical period of history.

When VINSON became a member of the old Naval Affairs Committee, F.D.R. was Assistant Secretary of the Navy (then the second-ranking civilian slot), and the two had an early opportunity to assess each other's capabilities. As a result, they later formed a close working relationship in matters of national defense.

When Roosevelt was elevated to the White House, Uncle CARL conferred with him at Warm Springs before his inauguration. He told reporters F.D.R. knew more about the Navy and its needs than any man who had entered the White House since Teddy Roosevelt. When one newsman asked, "What makes you think so?" Uncle CARL replied: "I don't think so. Because I know it."

When President Truman ousted Gen. Douglas MacArthur, VINSON, never afraid to wade into the middle of a controversy, applauded the action even though the tide of public sentiment was running heavily against the Chief Executive. VINSON said MacArthur's policies, if carried out, would have involved the United States in full-scale war in the Orient. He softened his criticism by noting that it was only human that a person who remained for so long a time in one area of the world would come to the conclusion that that area outweighs in importance all other regions of the world. MacArthur had been in the Pacific for 14 years.

The day after Uncle CARL's statement (April 12, 1951), Truman wrote, "I can't tell you how very much I appreciate your wholehearted support. I, of course, had counted on the fact that you would understand that the policy at stake is civilian control of the military."

The quick official notice of VINSON's action shows how important it was to the Chief Executive to have Uncle CARL in his corner. Earlier VINSON had tangled with Truman over military budget cuts which preceded the Korean war and had played an important role in forcing the resignation of Truman's Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

Although Uncle CARL has no official part in writing the big appropriations bills for the Armed Forces, his actions often ward off increases or reductions in the defense budget as well as other important money measures. As Eisenhower was preparing to leave for the summit conference in May 1960, he asked VINSON to keep him posted if the mutual security appropriations bill became imperiled. "If in your judgment this situation is beginning to go badly during my attendance at the summit meetings," he wrote, "I hope you will send me any suggestions you might have as to what I could additionally do to be helpful."

The letter, like many others from Eisenhower to VINSON, begins, "Dear Uncle CARL" and is signed "D.E."

During the earlier Pentagon reorganization fight, however, Ike became coldly formal. When VINSON's bill was reported out of committee, the President, in a letter beginning, "My Dear Mr. Chairman" and signed "Dwight D. Eisenhower," complimented VINSON on his work but suggested some changes in the bill.

When the fight was over—possibly to save face, and possibly to restore peace with Uncle CARL, Ike announced that the final measure adequately met all of his recommendations. Off went another "Dear Uncle CARL" letter in which the President said he hoped VINSON was "proud of the end result; you have every right to be, in my opinion, and I am greatly appreciative to you for all that you did to make possible the desired result." This time the letter was signed, "With warm regard, sincerely, D.D.E."

During VINSON's congressional service, eight presidents have resided in the White House, Uncle CARL has said goodbye to 18 Secretaries of War and Defense, 24 Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force, three Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (a relatively new post) and 52 admirals and generals who have headed the land, sea and ground forces. A battalion of sub-secretaries and senior officers in other major assignments also have passed in and out of defense planning posts.

This is one of Uncle CARL's great strengths. He has been in the forefront of national defense planning far longer than his closest rival. He was a towering figure on the national scene when most of today's senior officers still were worrying about promotion in the junior ranks.

Not one of the Navy's present four-star admirals had entered the Naval Academy when Uncle CARL came to Washington. All seven—including the Navy's highest ranking officer—were lieutenants (some junior grade) when VINSON became chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

When VINSON was elected to Congress in 1914, the JCS Chairman, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, was 15; Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Thomas D. White, and Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, were 13; Army Chief of Staff, Gen. George Decker, was 12, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, was only 9.

VINSON has watched thousands of young men enter the Military and Naval Academies, rise through the ranks and retire. Some of his own appointees have spanned two generations. Midshipman Charles Leighton Moore III, a current Annapolis plebe, and his father, Capt. C. I. Moore, commanding officer of the Barbers Point Naval Air Station in Hawaii, both entered the Naval Academy under VINSON's banner.

Uncle CARL's own preeminent role in defense planning began before America entered the First World War (for which he voted), and before his appointment to Naval Affairs.

On May 27, 1916, the House was angrily fighting over the Navy budget, which included a $160 million shipbuilding program. This amount, which would not buy half a nuclear carrier today, was at that time the largest such program ever proposed by the Government.

Some House Members thought it was not enough. Others thought it was too much. Democrats charged that Republicans had sent the Navy into stormy seas. Republicans said the Navy's plight was the fault of the Democrats.

In the midst of the tumult, VINSON, then 32, arose to make his first speech on the subject of military preparedness. Swiftly, he hammered out the two basic philosophies which have guided him throughout his almost half a century of congressional service: A nation can maintain peace only if its defenses are strong, and preparedness "is a nonpartisan question." He said "my country and its safety comes ahead of any party."

These views are now espoused by all politicians, regardless of party, but VINSON, unlike some others, has given them deeper meaning by never deviating from either concept in the fights he has waged to strengthen America throughout his 46 years in the Congress. He has unhesitatingly cut down any and all who have attempted to bar or weaken U.S. military progress.

Today, the Nation is spending $41 billion of its $75 billion budget for military preparedness and another $3.7 billion for mutual security. About $20 billion of next year's military outlay will require specific authorizing legislation from VINSON's committee. The biggest remaining chunk will go to programs already authorized by his committee, which, together with its Senate counterpart, writes all major laws affecting the organization of the Armed Forces, as well as pay, promotion, retirement, medical care, and countless other aspects of service life.

VINSON's committee carries the most impressive workload on Capitol Hill, completing action annually on recordbreaking numbers of bills, some of which the Senate never finds time to consider. In the last 4 years alone, 198 bills have been approved by the VINSON group. Of these, 194 have passed the House and 149 have been approved by the Senate and signed into law.

Uncle CARL's driving force is largely responsible for the enormous output, but it also contributes to the often repeated charge that he is a dictator. He allows for no nonsense in getting his work behind him. He loads his subcommittee chairmen with major projects and constantly prods them to greater and greater efforts, pushing himself equally as hard.

His fellow workers do not deny that he sometimes ramrods his views through the committee, but they insist (and his record verifies) that he is a master of compromise and not a dictator. He seems to sense opposition before it develops, and moves to break it up before it gathers momentum. If the outcry flames to high, he quickly concedes just enough to bring the fire under control.

VINSON readily admits he does not always give the committee unlimited time for the consideration of every problem, but maintains that to do so would hopelessly ensnarl the group in consideration of minutiae more properly left up to the officials who must enforce the laws.

"Why, if you wanted to," he contends, "you could spend hours discussing the extension of an aircraft runway. You have to have some faith in the people who propose these things. They are trying to achieve the same result for America which we are trying to achieve. If a runway has to be a hundred feet longer, it has to be."

Once, when the Air Force thought it had just about convinced VINSON of the necessity for extending a runway at a Georgia airbase, an official disclosed that a Negro cemetery would have to be moved to make way for the project. VINSON turned thumbs down. "We already have enough trouble with civil rights," he said, "without going around moving the dead."

Runway extensions are only one of thousands of items which VINSON's committee must consider annually in a single bill—the military construction program. Even without devoting hours of study to an isolated project, this one measure requires several weeks of hearings.

Those who watch VINSON rushing a bill through the committee often overlook, or are unaware of the fact, that most of the major legislation previously has been farmed out to a subcommittee which has examined the subject in great detail over a period of days, weeks, or months. Once the subcommittee has completed its work, VINSON normally accepts its recommendations with few questions. He expects the same of others. If the subject is reopened to prolonged debate, he believes members of the full committee are certain to waste valuable time retracing the same circuitous route followed by the subcommittee.

Uncle CARL impatiently declines to replow the same ground whenever he can avoid it. This has made him a master of the bum's rush in dealing with witnesses before his committee. If testimony proves unproductive, or unnecessarily repetitious, the "old fox" empties the witness chair in a hurry.

When Senator CLAIR ENGLE of California was a House Member, he appeared to testify before VINSON's committee and made the

mistake of remarking that a previous witness had covered the subject matter so thoroughly, he doubted there was much he could add. Unwittingly, he had opened a wedge for Uncle CARL.

"Thank you very much, Congressman, for being so considerate of the committee's time," VINSON cracked. He banged his gavel and ordered, "Next witness."

Ability to control testimony is one of the most essential assets of a congressional chairman. One reason is that Capitol Hill is overrun with professional witnesses, who spend their days trying to tell Congress how to run the country.

One lady—who is in and out of the Capitol as often as House Doorkeeper "Fishbait" Miller—persuaded VINSON to give her 10 minutes to talk to the committee about the Draft Act. When her turn came, she unfolded an impressive sheaf of notes, and began a rapid-fire recitation. Five minutes elapsed and VINSON banged his gavel. "Your time has run out," he said.

The lady was indignant. "I was supposed to talk 10 minutes," she protested.

Uncle CARL peered down at the witness from his lofty seat. "You talk so fast," he said, "You put an awful heap in the 5 minutes."

Tourists who prowl through the Halls of Congress at the rate of 18,000 a day are attracted to other big, klieg-lighted hearings which are beamed to TV audiences, but seldom visit Uncle CARL's magnificent chambers. Those who do stray in are often treated to one of the best shows on Capitol Hill. The press laughingly maintain that "someone should sell tickets."

VINSON operates almost in anonymity as far as the general public is concerned. Although the Armed Forces would fight each other for the privilege of transporting him to any of the Nation's farflung bases, he seldom ventures more than a few hundred miles from Washington or Georgia.

During the Roosevelt administration, F.D.R. occasionally persuaded Uncle CARL to join him on an inspection trip—provided it was not too far away. But, except for a quick official visit to naval installations in the Caribbean early in his career, he has never been outside the United States. His longest trip was a 1919 visit to the west coast.

The most recent one was in June 1957 when he went to Norfolk, Va., to observe the first international naval review to be held in American waters in 50 years. With typical disdain for the honors which the services are eager to accord him, he gave no official notice that he was coming. He took an unimportant seat far from the other dignitaries, and, to the chagrin of Navy brass, ate with the enlisted men.

Beneath his gruff exterior, VINSON is basically shy and retiring. He is intensely discomfited when anyone pays him too much attention. He shuns the public spotlight and turns down all invitations except those to White House functions (he looks on these as command performances).

A witness before his committee once suggested he had met Uncle CARL at a cocktail party. "I haven't been to one in 10 years," VINSON said, "I am too wise a bird to be going to cocktail parties." That was 11 years ago. His record is still intact.

A man of frugal habits and moderate tastes, he prefers plain to fancy food, chews 15-cent plug tobacco (in the privacy of his spittoon-equipped office), and smokes mild, 10-cent cigars. When a Macon friend, W. T. Anderson, once offered him a more expensive cigar, he declined. Friends would not always be around to keep him supplied, he said, and he did not want to cultivate a taste for something he could not afford.

While Congress is in session, he lives a life of quiet seclusion in a Washington suburb, Chevy Chase, Md. His home (a political foe once told Georgians it was "a magnificent Maryland mansion") is a modest, six-room bungalow purchased in 1922 soon after his marriage.

He shares it with "Till" and Mollie Snead and their two sons, Tillman, 10, and Carl, 5 months. Mrs. Vinson died in 1950. They had no children.

Till, an assistant in VINSON's congressional office for almost 25 years, met Mollie, formerly a professional nurse, while she was caring for Mrs. Vinson. Although their new son is VINSON's namesake, 10-year-old Tillman, who had a big head start, is Uncle CARL's pride and joy. He calls VINSON "grandpa." Devoted CARL calls him "my partner."

The two share a lively interest in sports, hold heated debates about athletic records, go to movies together (Tillman's choice), watch TV shoot-'em-ups, and sometimes charge through the house in a wild game of cops and robbers.

Tillman follows Uncle CARL's congressional activities with keen interest. When VINSON hits the headlines, Tillman grabs the newspapers and rushes out to show his friends "what my grandpa did." If some official becomes entangled in a knotty problem, Tillman wants to know why it hasn't been turned over to "grandpa" to solve.

Uncle CARL often takes the boy to his office on a quiet afternoon or Saturday morning when there is no urgent House or committee business. When Tillman was younger, the two sometimes spent hours in the imposing two-story committee chambers (empty except for them) and the lad, occupying VINSON's high, throne-like seat, backed by colorful flags and flowing draperies, gaveled imaginery meetings into order. VINSON, sitting attentively below in the big witness chair where such men as Nimitz and Eisenhower have listened to his own sage council, answered questions put to him by "Chairman Snead."

When the boy was 8, VINSON made an appointment with the Secretary of Defense, completely forgetting his promise to watch Tillman in a Christmas school play the same day. When he remembered at the last moment, an aide hurriedly telephoned the Pentagon to call off the meeting with the Cabinet member. No one ever told the Secretary of Defense he had been outranked by a third-grader.

When his leisure time in Washington is not occupied with Tillman, Uncle CARL keeps busy in numerous other ways. An early riser (5 to 6 a.m.), he is seated in his front-porch rocker when the carrier boy arrives with the Washington Post. If the boy oversleeps or is delayed, Uncle CARL wants to know what kept him.

He escapes the rush-hour traffic by leaving home in his second-hand, 1952 Ford, with his assistant, Till, at the wheel (he has never learned to drive), in time to arrive at his office by 7:30 each weekday. He frequently also goes to his office on Sunday.

He spends at least 9 hours at his desk, in committee meetings and on the House floor (longer if necessary) and returns to Chevy Chase around 5 p.m., for his usual evening at home. When Till is away and there is no one to drive the car, he climbs aboard a streetcar or bus packed with Government clerks and secretaries. He seldom uses a taxi.

An omnivorous reader, he wades through three daily newspapers (the Post, the Washington Evening Star, and the New York Times; or, in Georgia, the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta Journal, and Macon Telegraph), the weekly news magazines, biographies, histories, murder mysteries, "just about anything I get my hands on." He reads the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal as soon as it reaches his desk each week, and has said: "There are other service publications, but the Journal is the one everyone reads."

At home, he also devotes many of his evening hours to careful study of committee reports and other official documents. "I have to read every report," he says, "and cut out some of the material, just like an editor. Certain things weaken reports. We are not in the business of selling headlines. We are trying to write legislation that will benefit the Nation."

When he makes one of his rare public speeches (perhaps four in the past 5 years), he closets himself in his room (furnished with spartan simplicity; bed, chest of drawers, night table, and rocker) to practice its delivery on young Tillman.

He takes daily walks to keep in trim. Often he ranges as much as 2 miles, stopping to chat with neighbors and offer friendly (not always effectual) advice on gardening problems. If he encounters a house for sale, he ducks in, makes a quick inspection, finds out the asking price, if possible, and decides on the spot if it is "wo'th" the money.

If one of his employees buys a new home, Uncle CARL frequently makes an unannounced visit to look it over and give his appraisal. He believes one of the few ways a man on a salary can get ahead in life is to obligate himself to buy either property or securities, preferably both. If a staffer is not a homeowner, VINSON constantly prods him in that direction.

He takes lively interest in his employees, talks to them about their families, and after-work diversions, and tells them newsy tidbits about his own activities. If illness keeps a staff member at home, Uncle CARL institutes an immediate investigation. Has the staffer been to see a doctor? What did the doctor say? What medicines did he prescribe? One of the staff tracks down the information. If the illness is prolonged, the inquiries continue daily.

Most of VINSON's employees (3 in his congressional office; 15 on the committee staff) have been with him for more than 5 years, a number for 10 or more, and some for periods ranging as high as 20 or 25 years. His present secretary, Mrs. Marguerite Maddux Phillips, has completed 20 years in Uncle CARL's office. His former secretary, Miss Edna L. Lytle, was there for 30 years before she retired.

Although he can be abrupt and demanding, when the workload is heavy, he is more often warm and friendly in his relationship with his staff. He detours through their offices to talk with them, and to listen to and advise them on their personal problems. At the beginning of each Congress he herds the committee staff into the first meeting and introduces them to new committee members as the best staff on Capitol Hill.

He has even acted as "matchmaker" on a few occasions.

In 1955, he decided that an attractive secretary in his congressional office (Mary Ellen Williams) and one of the lawyers on his committee staff (Charles F. (Duke) Ducander, now chief counsel of the House Space Committee) would make a good pair. He launched a campaign to throw them together. After weeks of thwarted attempts to interest the couple in each other, he took dramatic action. Calling both of them into his office, he arranged, over their amused but embarrassed objections, for Mary Ellen to invite Duke to her home for dinner. He set a specific date. Before the dinner took place, he gave Mary Ellen detailed instructions about what to serve: "Now you're a southern girl and Duke's a southern boy. You just fix him some fried chicken, and make him some biscuits." The first dinner was launched in an uneasy atmosphere, but the couple soon found they were genuinely attracted to each other. In 8 months, they were married.

Summers, after Congress adjourns, Uncle CARL escapes to the open air and sunshine. When his colleagues head for Paris or Tokyo

at the end of a tiring session, he goes back to Milledgeville, Ga. (population 11,107), and his farm.

Asked why he hasn't traveled more, he replies, "I don't have time to travel. I have plenty of business to tend to on my farm and in my district. The best vacation I can get is right here on the farm. I need no days free of responsibility."

Even in Washington, VINSON "runs" the farm. At the beginning of each week he dictates a letter to his "overseer," Barney Collins, instructing him what to do for the next 7 days. A weekly reply from Barney tells Uncle CARL what has been accomplished or what, because of inclement weather or other unforeseen problems, has had to be postponed.

The farm—River Ridge Plantation, located on Vinson Highway about a 2-minute drive from Milledgeville's city limits—covers 601.1 acres of rolling, gracefully cultivated land. Once, together with an adjoining tract owned by VINSON'S father, it comprised more than 1,500 acres and was the top cotton producer in the county. He bought the farm in 1926 "because my district is a farming district and I decided I ought to learn something about agriculture." Today, after an unsuccessful fight with the boll weevil, the cotton has been replaced by white-faced cattle and feed crops.

VINSON has neither a secretary nor an office in his home district ("My office is under my hat"). When he is at the farm he keeps up a heavy load of paperwork at a roll-top desk on his back porch. Correspondence which requires his personal attention is dispatched from Capitol Hill daily, both by his office and committee staffs. After he has read and studied it, he scribbles his instructions in the margin and sends it back.

This work, combined with his supervision of the farm, is dovetailed into the many hours he devotes each week to constituents who come to the farm to discuss problems. One Milledgeville resident says, "Some of the local people think if they lose a cow, CARL can find it for them."

Not typical of the problems, but amusing in its resolution, is a request made by Jere Moore, editor of the Milledgeville Union Recorder. Searching for a speaker for the annual chamber of commerce banquet, Moore called Uncle CARL and suggested the commander of the Navy's atomic submarine, *Nautilus*. Uncle CARL flatly said, "Why you can't get him."

"I told him," Moore says, "the officer had been to Savannah to speak and it was a pretty pass if the chairman of the Armed Services Committee couldn't get him for his own hometown." Uncle CARL said, "He'll be there." He was.

VINSON has lived at the farm (in a spacious, white-frame farmhouse he originally built for his overseer) only for the past 10 years. He also owns a historic, 128-year-old Milledgeville "town house." Its handsomely furnished rooms have stood unused (but carefully maintained) since Mrs. Vinson's death in 1950.

Very little has ever been disclosed about VINSON'S boyhood, youth, and early manhood. To him, these are "unimportant" phases of his life, in which "no one is interested."

For years, the editors of Who's Who have had to write their sketchy biographies about him from other sources. When he receives a questionnaire he tosses it into the wastebasket.

If an interviewer insists on talking about his early life, he admonishes, "Well, now, you'll ruin your story if you clutter it up with all of that. Why don't you just stick to the record in Congress."

Justifiably proud of his record in the Congress, he would prefer to forget the 6-year-old who liked to tell Bible stories, the teenager who sold newspapers and jerked sodas to earn money for his education, and the young State legislator who planned "the battle of the Bloody Tenth."

VINSON was born November 18, 1883, on a farm in Baldwin County, Ga., 3 miles south of Milledgeville, the former State capital (1807–1868).

Before he reached school age, his parents, Edward Story and Annie Morris Vinson, moved into town so CARL and their seven other children could attend the Middle Georgia Military and Agricultural College. The school (now Georgia Military College) was located in the old State capitol building. It taught both sexes and all grades, beginning with the first.

CARL'S sister, Leila (Mrs. M. J. Guyton, of Dublin, Ga.), says CARL made an early impression at the college. "Every night after supper Papa would call all of us around the fireplace and tell Bible stories. After awhile, CARL got to the point where he would plead, 'Papa, let me tell. Let me tell.' CARL was a great storyteller. By the time he entered GMC, he knew many Bible stories by heart." When his first-grade teacher at GMC, Miss Carrie Fair, learned about CARL'S precocity, she insisted on giving him prominent billing in the chapel programs.

The chapel, prophetically, was the old legislative assembly hall of the former State capitol building. As a part of his public speaking, CARL recalls that he later "had to speak there every Friday afternoon." (A great-uncle had preceded him in the historic chamber as a representative of the Georgia Legislature.)

Although the Vinsons lived in town from the time of CARL'S earliest memories, his father continued to operate the farm. As the children grew, Papa Vinson, a firm disciplinarian who believed success is achieved only through toil, gave his sons a choice—they could help him on the farm or they could find summer jobs in Milledgeville. CARL elected to stay in town.

For a time he jerked sodas in the Culver & Kidd drugstore. Leila says the drugstore "didn't pay him much but CARL liked the job because he got to eat all of the ice cream and drink all of the sodawater he wanted."

Later, he obtained the newspaper agency for the Atlanta Journal. "I had all of Milledgeville—about 300 papers. They came in on the 8 o'clock train from Atlanta, and I had other boys, sometimes my brothers, who helped out. The paper cost 10 cents a week. I got 5 cents for delivering it and had to give the Journal 5 cents."

He also worked in two local department stores: P. J. Cline's and Joseph's. At Joseph's (now the Union Department Store), he earned $5 a month as cash boy. When sales were completed, saleslades turned over the customer's money to CARL who sprinted to the cash desk and brought back the receipt and change. Later, he was promoted to bundle wrapper at $15 a month. In his free time at the department store, his friend Judge Erwin Sibley recalls, "CARL cornered the other boys in the cellar and made speeches to them."

After school, and on weekends, the Vinson home at the corner of Montgomery and Clark Streets was the gathering place for many of the town's young people.

"CARL was the ringleader," Leila says. "We had to do what he said. He was the boss."

The young friends played croquet and baseball and other games. Sometimes, the Vinson's had watermelon cuttings with as many as 15 to 25 guests in an afternoon.

Leila says, "We had a big yard, which was one reason our home was a gathering place, but another was that Papa would bring fruit home from the farm—watermelon, canteloup, peaches, apples—and Mama baked cakes. She always had lots of cakes and cookies for us to serve."

By some standards, the Vinsons might have been considered poor, Leila says, "but none of us ever knew it. We always seemed to have so much of everything, and Papa saw to it that we all got good educations."

Leila remembers that "CARL was always popular, but he was never a ladies man. He was so busy studying and working and trying to make money that he never had time for anything else."

By 1900 CARL had saved enough, together with help from his father, to enroll at the Mercer University law school in Macon. He doesn't recall what attracted him to the legal profession. "I just decided, like most boys do, that I wanted to be a lawyer."

One day he went to see County Judge Edward R. Hines, junior partner in a local law firm. "I just went up there, and told him I wanted to study law." Judge Hines owned a substantial law library. He agreed to let CARL use his books. Sometimes CARL read at the office, other times he took books home.

The reading eased his initial studies at Mercer when he began the serious task of earning his law degree. In 1902 he was graduated (29th in a class of 50) and simultaneously admitted to the bar. One of his classmates was the late E. E. COX, also destined to be a U.S. Representative from Georgia, and, eventually, the ranking Democrat on the House Rules Committee. His niece, Mildred COX, works in VINSON'S office.

Returning to Milledgeville, 18-year-old CARL learned that Judge Hines' law partner had died. He stepped into the firm as junior member, and a new shingle—"Hines and Vinson"—went on display.

The practice of law in Milledgeville, then a town of about 4,000, was not a booming enterprise. The new partners devoted much of their time to the preparation of deeds and wills, drawing contracts, and similar routine. CARL recalls, "We took anything that came along. Just as a country doctor accepts any patient who comes in, country lawyers don't specialize. If they did, they wouldn't have much business."

Always one to keep busy ("Man is made to wear out, not rust out," he says), CARL soon found his law practice didn't give him enough to do. In 1904, he won appointment as Baldwin County court solicitor. When he was reappointed to a second term, the Milledgeville Union Recorder (August 5, 1907) complimented him on his great success as a prosecuting attorney. Four years in the post pointed the way to his first venture into politics.

At 25, he ran for and was elected to the Georgia General Assembly. While the legislature was in session—50 days out of each year—he lived at the old Kimball House in Atlanta and drew a salary of $7 a day, most of which was eaten up by living expenses.

But while the financial reward was nonexistent, service in the legislature broadened his knowledge of practical politics and soon earned him a reputation as a hard-working, bright young man. In his second term, at the age of 27, the assembly recognized his abilities by making him speaker pro tempore. An old newspaper relates that "Whenever he presided, this Apollo Belvedere presented an imposing and impressive presence."

Additionally, and even more important to his career, the 1911–12 term of the Georgia General Assembly enabled CARL to draw up an intricate battle plan which was to catapult him into the U.S. Congress and eventual national prominence.

Following the 1910 census, the assembly faced the difficult task of redistricting. The young lawyer from Milledgeville had definite ideas about his own Baldwin County. He wangled an appointment on the reapportionment committee and did some fast talking. When the redistricting dust settled, surprised Baldwinites found they had been chopped from the Sixth District and dumped into

one of the hottest battlegrounds in the State—"the Bloody Tenth."

The old Sixth District, of which Baldwin County had been a part, had for many years been dominated by Bibb County, which held the district's largest city—Macon—and a goodly share of the total district population. Bibb was only one county removed from Baldwin, and CARL, who already had his eye on Washington, doubted that he would be able to penetrate very deeply into Bibb's heavy fortifications in a bid for the Sixth District congressional seat.

The 10th District presented at least a fighting chance, he reasoned. It, too, was dominated by a heavily populated county (Richmond, with the city of Augusta), and had been the scene of some of the State's bloodiest battles. But it offered one advantage. Baldwin was at the far end of the district from Richmond and it might be possible to convince some of Baldwin's neighboring counties to dig out from under the shadow of Augusta.

CARL's hope was that he could win his own county, the three neighboring counties, and, perhaps, a majority of four others not bordering on Richmond. It was a long shot, but he was convinced the odds were less heavily weighted than they would have been in a fight with Bibb.

Only one factor had been overlooked. Baldwinites, perhaps angered by being shifted to the Bloody Tenth, refused to send CARL back to the general assembly for a third term. He lost his reelection bid (the only political defeat he has ever suffered at the hands of the voters) by five ballots.

Undismayed, he turned to the Governor and obtained an appointment as judge of the Baldwin County court. Meanwhile, he watched developments in his new congressional district, hopeful that he could soon test his carefully drawn battle plan. The wait was shorter than expected.

On February 14, 1914, Georgia's senior Senator, Augustus Octavius Bacon, died. Representative Thomas W. Hardwick, of the 10th District, made a bid for the vacant Senate seat. The scramble was on for a successor to Hardwick.

CARL announced his candidacy for the U.S. House of Representatives, and in a rented model-T Ford, with a hired driver at the wheel, set out to stump the district.

Miss Martha Thomas, then a stenographer at Hines & Vinson and later CARL's first secretary in Washington, says "Most people didn't think he had a chance of being elected. He had three opponents, all wealthy men."

VINSON had little money with which to wage his campaign. His staff totaled three people: Miss Thomas, a campaign manager (the late Dave Howard), and the driver of the model-T. What he lacked in funds and assistants had to be compensated for with a whirlwind of energy. On the campaign trail as much as 20 hours a day, he soon was a familiar figure at every district schoolhouse or crossroads where he could pull together a handful of people to listen to his views.

By the time the campaign was drawing to a close, he was in debt. He owed the bank and he owed his printers. But when the polls closed and the votes were counted, all but 4 of the district's 12 counties were in the Vinson column.

CARL's father, who had always said his son "inherited his brains from his mother and his brawn from me," looked back on the long, hard campaign trail and told CARL, "this time it was your brawn that paid off."

As a result of the immediate House vacancy created by Hardwick's elevation to the Senate, CARL was elected to both the unexpired term in the 63d Congress and to the new term in the 64th. On November 3, 1914, 15 days before his 31st birthday, he walked onto the House floor and was sworn in as the country's youngest Congressman.

Miss Thomas recalls that he was "not at all excited" about his new post and settled into it without fanfare. "We moved into former Congressman Hardwick's office," she says, "and got right down to work."

During the 4 years she spent in Washington, Miss Thomas "never caught up with the work." The 10th District's new Representative opened his office early and closed it late. Miss Thomas remembers "one night another Congressman came by our door, looked in, and said, 'You mean to tell me you are still working? When are you going to go home?' Mr. VINSON's reply was, 'When we get through.'"

Letters leaving the office had to be as nearly perfect as possible, and they had to clearly reflect CARL's views. This is a requirement he still demands today. If one of his letters is read 40 or 50 years after it is written, he hopes no one will have to be ashamed of what it says.

When Miss Thomas took her first paid Government vacation from the Congressman's office, after obtaining a replacement stenographer, she went to visit friends who lived in the country near Washington. At the end of 3 days "A hack came driving up and the driver told me Mr. VINSON had sent for me. He said it was urgent."

Her first thought was that perhaps CARL was sick. She packed quickly, climbed into the hack and rushed back to the city. In the office, she found the Congressman looking as healthy as ever, but unhappy. "What's wrong?" she asked.

CARL pointed to a stack of unsigned letters. "I've had three stenographers since you left," he said. "Look at those letters. There's not a letter there I could send out."

Miss Thomas took off her coat and went to work. It was the last she ever heard of her vacation.

Not long after his arrival in the Capital, an influential constituent sent CARL drafts of a number of bills he wanted introduced. Most Members of Congress honor such requests with alacrity. CARL, with equal alacrity, sent the proposals back to their author, Miss Thomas recalls. When he was warned he might be creating a powerful enemy, his reply was characteristic. "I wear no man's collar," he said.

In his new office, CARL found only small initial improvement in his finances. Out of his salary (Congressmen received $625 a month in 1914), he had to pay Miss Thomas, take care of the postage expenses of his office, start settling his campaign debts, spend $90 a month for a room (at the Burlington Hotel) and buy all of his meals.

When congressional salaries were boosted to $22,500, 42 years later, he ad libbed to friends, "Well, if they are going to pay that kind of money in Congress, I think I'll make a career out of it." Today, entitled to an $18,000 retirement salary any time he wants to take advantage of it, he actually works for several thousand dollars less than he earned in 1914. A replacement would cost the taxpayers $40,500.

The folks back home soon began to voice pride in CARL's work. When he had been in Congress only 13 months, the Marietta Courier (many miles outside VINSON's district) urged its readers to keep their eyes on the gifted statesman from the 10th. CARL, the Courier reported, "is working like a farmer * * * determined to reflect credit upon his section of the country. * * * People outside Georgia already are asking about him."

A year later, a 1917 Georgia newspaper relates, a Russian "with outrageous whiskers and large clumping feet" appeared in one of the 10th District courts to seek his U.S. citizenship papers. When the judge asked him, "How is the President of the United States elected?" the Russian's reply threw the court into a paroxysm of laughter. "By the Democratic Party," he said. The answer probably erased all doubts about the immigrant's eligibility for citizenship, but if any remained they soon were dispelled. The next question, who is "the greatest man in the country?" brought the immediate reply: "The Honorable CARL VINSON, Representative from this district."

As his popularity grew at home, VINSON soon began waging another popularity contest in Washington. This time it was not aimed at the voters, but at a young lady from New Philadelphia, Ohio—Mary Green MacGregor. On April 6, 1921, they were married at Washington's Foundry Methodist Church.

Capitol Hill newsmen have claimed that CARL, before his marriage, was president of the Congressional Bachelor's Club. He denies that any such organization ever existed. "They just made that up," he asserts.

Like many bachelors, CARL had been waiting for the right woman. When he met Mary, the search ended. He quickly succumbed to her charm, intelligence and captivating wit. Mrs. Vinson's photographs, on prominent display in all three of Uncle CARL's residences, attest to her beauty.

Just as some Milledgeville citizens think CARL "hung the moon," others agree the task was made easier for him with Mary at his side. Their romance lasted until her death, almost 30 years after their marriage.

During his first term on Capitol Hill, CARL drew two committee assignments, neither of which particularly inspired him. One was on the old Pension Committee, now defunct, and the other was on the Committee for the District of Columbia. He worked industriously on both, but kept his eyes open for something better.

In 1917, the opportunity presented itself. Vacancies opened up on a few choice committees. He picked Naval Affairs. Why, has always been a mystery to those who look at his landlocked district. The only body of water near Milledgeville at the time (the city now has manmade Lake Sinclair) was the Oconee River, a sluggish red-brown stream about a third as wide as Washington's Potomac.

There was no mystery on CARL's part. He was concerned about the Nation's defenses. He already had started urging increased spending for national security, declaring that peace can be guaranteed only if a nation is prepared to defend itself. He believed the new committee assignment would provide a needed arena in which to fight for his views.

He also foresaw a growing role for seapower. Europe was embroiled in World War I and CARL accurately predicted in 1916 that participants in the conflict would emerge "with larger navies than at the beginning." This, too, influenced his choice.

Aside from the practical reasons for seeking a seat on Naval Affairs, CARL also had a personal motive: "I wanted to serve on a committee where I could see the results of my labors. When you authorize the construction of a military base or a big carrier you can see the results."

His choice proved fortunate. During the next 7 years, eight Democratic members of the committee were defeated, died, or resigned. By 1923, VINSON was the ranking Democrat.

The same time period brought two rugged contests for his House seat. One opponent, Tom Watson (later a U.S. Senator), was the man whose collar VINSON had refused to wear. The other was Sam Olive, president of the Georgia Senate. Both were strong men in Georgia politics. Both lost their fights with VINSON.

In 1931, Georgia again redistricted and Baldwin County was restored to the Sixth District where VINSON found himself pitted against two incumbent Congressmen. He talked one into retiring. The other, whom

he was preparing to face in the primaries, died before the campaign got underway. A third opponent, Judge R. Earl Camp, stepped into the breach. In an open letter, he promised VINSON, "I am going to give you hell, and when I say hell, I mean nothing but merry hell, and I don't mean maybe. I am going to take the flesh, bone, marrow, hide and hair off of you."

The threat was more colorful than accurate. Years later when VINSON was officially nominated for his 18th consecutive term, Judge Camp seconded the nomination with the comment, "I'm glad he defeated me."

Other opposition has been sporadic and equally unsuccessful. In some campaigns, VINSON has not even bothered to make speeches. His last opponent (Carter Shepard Baldwin, in 1956) lost by a lopsided vote of almost 4 to 1.

During his 46 years in Congress, VINSON has played a predominant role in the growth of American military power.

One of his earliest contributions to national security came in 1925 when President Calvin Coolidge appointed a nine-member group (the Morrow Board) to make a sweeping inquiry into the state of the Nation's air defense. Three of those appointed by the President were Members of Congress. VINSON was the lone Democrat.

The probe—touched off by Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell's sensational charges against the administration of the air arms of both the Army and Navy—was set up to look into "the best means of developing and applying aircraft in national defense." In addition to Mitchell, some of the other witnesses were Orville Wright, Herbert Hoover (then Secretary of Commerce), Maj. H. H. Arnold (later head of the Air Force) and Lt. F. P. Sherman (later Chief of Naval Operations).

The Board, after extensive hearings, recommended numerous changes in laws affecting aviation. VINSON authored many of the proposals. All were enacted. Assistant secretaries for aeronautics were established in the War, Navy, and Commerce Departments. Five-year aircraft procurement programs were approved for the services. The Army Air Corps was created. The principle of flight pay was permanently sanctioned. New emphasis was given to the procurement of aviators and improved aircraft. The Air Commerce Act—legislative cornerstone for the development of U.S. civil and commercial aviation—was adopted.

VINSON has been cited by the National Aeronautic Association as an "Elder Statesman of Aviation" for his role in this and subsequent developments in the field of aviation.

Before America's entry into World War II, as chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, he fought for a big build-up of the Navy's air arm. Later, both as ranking Democrat and as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he battled for the Air Force.

How he backstaged the post-World War II increase in naval aviation is recorded in an official Pentagon paper.

Twenty months before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, VINSON called Adm. Harold Stark, then Chief of Naval Operations, to his office. The late Forrest P. Sherman (then a captain) accompained the CNO to take notes. Here is part of what Sherman recorded about the conference:

"Mr. VINSON desires to have a program prepared for the further expansion of naval aviation. * * * The program as he describes it, involves 10,000 to 15,000 pilots. * * * Mr. VINSON indicated positively his opinion that an additional training establishment should be established now, that adequate bases should be built now for coastal patrol and protection of vital coastal traffic, and that our construction and training programs should be greatly expanded. * * * Admiral Stark asked if this program were for the next session of Congress. Mr. VINSON indicated that he would initiate action at this session."

Shortly thereafter, Uncle CARL sent two bills to the floor. One to expand naval aviation to 10,000 planes, train 16,000 pilots and establish 20 air bases; the other to speed naval construction and ease labor restrictions in the shipbuilding industry. Passage of both bills was "preceded by a mere whisper of debate," one newspaper related.

In 1948, VINSON engineered an increase in appropriations to boost the Air Force to 70 groups. He told the House, "We must recognize that Russia has not traditionally been a naval power. * * * In the air we are capable of competing with the Russians and they are capable of competing with us. * * * As I have studied the military situation of this country I am driven again and again to the conclusion * * * that we will be gambling with our national existence if we do not provide the funds for a great Air Force." The House approved the increase by a vote of 343–3; the Senate by a vote of 74–2.

When he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the following year, he immediately introduced legislation to give added teeth to the Armed Services Unification Act. Among other things, his plan set up authority for guided missile work. He said, "The Air Force is not now directed by law to concentrate on the development of guided missiles which in time may become exceedingly important to our national defense. My bill deals expressly with this important matter by enjoining the Air Force to work actively in the development of these weapons."

In April 1950, shortly before the Korean war, he took to the House floor to blast the administration's failure to build the 70-group Air Force. He attacked defense reductions asked by President Truman and his Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson. He charged that Johnson, in slashing at service "fat," had cut into the "sinew and muscle" of the fighting forces. Johnson subsequently resigned.

With the eruption of the Korean conflict, Truman had to seek $10 billion in emergency funds. VINSON proposed a number of bills to restore the Armed Forces to fighting trim. In the floor debate, Republicans and Democrats attacked each other for inadequate preparedness. Uncle CARL ended the argument and won a standing ovation when he declared: "Our great need right now is to get the ox out of the ditch—not to spend a lot of time and effort trying to find out who pushed him in."

VINSON's role in the growth of U.S. seapower is spectacular. Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz has said, "I do not know where this country would have been after December 7, 1941, if it had not had the ships and the know-how to build more ships fast, for which one Vinson bill after another was responsible."

Although the First World War had brought a temporary build-up of the fleet, many warships were sunk under the postwar treaty agreements, and the Navy was forced to limp along on skimpy rations for a long period of time. Only a fortuitous combination of circumstances saved it.

When he became chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in 1931, VINSON immediately set out to restore the fleet to what he believed was its rightful place on the seas. "I favor a Navy for our country second to none," he declared. To enforce his views, he quickly introduced a ship construction program to bring the fleet up to treaty strength. The appeal was doomed. Needed White House support failed to materialize. "Not one ship was authorized during the Hoover administration," he recalls.

In the strange ways of history, however, VINSON soon found a powerful ally—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Their friendship and mutual respect had been solidly cemented when F.D.R. was Assistant Secretary of the Navy. In the famous "first 100 days" of the Roosevelt administration, the National Industrial Recovery Act was signed into law. VINSON convinced the President that if industry was to be revitalized, the Navy might as well be one of the benefactors. The act gave the President authority to allot money for the construction of naval vessels within the terms and limits of the London Naval Treaty.

The following year (1934), Uncle CARL won approval for two more bills to further expand the shipbuilding program. One was the historic Vinson-Trammel Act which provided long-range ship tonnage authority for the Navy. The immediate goal was 102 new ships by 1942. The act also limited the profits of contractors and expanded the naval aviation program.

Additional shipbuilding programs sponsored by VINSON and backed by F.D.R. were approved in 1938, 1939, and 1940. Three days after the last of the measures had cleared Congress (and 4 days after the fall of Paris), Uncle CARL went to the White House to win Presidential backing for still more tonnage.

This time, F.D.R. suggested he wait. VINSON disregarded the advice, returned to Capitol Hill, introduced the bill and set hearings for the following day. "F.D.R. called me on the 'phone the next morning," he recalls, "and asked me why I had gone ahead when he had told me it was not a good idea. I told him 'I disagree with you, Mr. President. There is not time to wait.'" Five days later, he rushed the measure through the House on a voice vote. It provided for 1,250,000 tons of new ships—birth of the two-ocean Navy.

The late Senator David Walsh, VINSON's counterpart in the Senate at the time, later said he wanted "the RECORD" to clearly show that the movement for the two-ocean Navy began in Congress, was approved by Congress and was "largely due to the foresight, ability and judgment of the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee."

VINSON's battles for the Navy during his 15-year tenure as Naval Affairs chairman earned him a reputation as a Navy partisan. Some of his colleagues still call him the admiral.

Neither then, nor since, however, has he blindly done the bidding of the admirals. When some of the Navy's battleship officers doggedly held on to the giant vessels after World War II, he finally told them to get a beautiful picture of one of the warships, "bring it up and we will hang it on the wall—the day of the battleship is over."

When the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs were merged into the Armed Services Committee in 1947, he made it clear that he would devote his future efforts not only to the problems of the Navy and Marine Corps, but those of the Army and Air Force, as well.

In 1949, when the Navy and Air Force tangled in an ugly dispute over the respective merits of the B–36 bomber and the aircraft carrier—in what came to be known as the admiral's revolt—VINSON ordered and presided over a full-scale investigation of the controversy. He eventually broadened the hearings into a sweeping study of service unification and strategy which culminated in a 56-page report. More than any other, that document, written in large part by Committee Counsel Bryce Harlow (later a top Eisenhower aid at the White House), set the stage for the present defense organization.

Many of its recommendations and conclusions still make sense today. The report states that "Prudent administration of unification, sensitive to the many imponderables of spirit and emotion and service loyalties, can greatly ease service tensions and difficulties over the years that must pass before cross education of the services will truly produce the one-armed-force concept. Hasty

decisions and brusque dismissals of honestly held service views will aggravate these tensions and difficulties. Cross education of the services holds the ultimate key to the perplexing problems of interservice relations. A much greater concentration of effort is needed in this field.

VINSON made it clear in the report that Congress will never tolerate being shunted to the sidelines or barred from the fulfillment of its constitutional role to raise and equip armies.

The report states that civilian control of the Armed Forces is an integral part of the democratic process and tradition, but this "does not mean (1) preventing free testimony before congressional committees by members of the Armed Forces, or (2) the relegation of the U.S. Congress to a bystander role in issues pertaining to the national defense."

Over the past 14 years, some of the most important legislation ever enacted for the Armed Forces has been shaped by VINSON'S committee. Included in the vast array of laws are measures which have preserved the Marine Corps, established a separate Air Force with its own Academy, provided for continued growth of the Navy, set standard procurement practices and consolidated military purchasing. The Pentagon has been organized and reorganized. Field commands have been unified. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been given broader authorities. Service housing, pay, promotion, medical care, and survivor benefits have been enormously improved to assure a career military force.

For the past several years, Uncle CARL has been waging a vigorous fight for the Army. He wants more modern weapons and equipment for the ground forces. He has even taken the unusual step (for him) of personally appealing to the Appropriations Committee to give the Army additional modernization funds. The funds (millions of dollars above what President Eisenhower requested) have been approved by both the House and Senate, but not all of the money was released by the previous administration. Unless the trend is reversed by President Kennedy, the battle is likely to pick up speed.

Uncle CARL also is getting worried about the Navy's aging ships and the growing Russian missile capability. He is impatiently waiting to learn what President Kennedy has in mind for the Armed Forces. Whatever the plan—if it is to win VINSON'S approval—it will have to meet certain rigid tests which have evolved out of his basic philosophies concerning military preparedness:

The Nation must be adequately armed to prevent aggression or, if it comes, to defeat it on either a big or little battlefield. "The most expensive thing in the world is a cheap army and navy. History has clearly shown that weakness invites attack."

The size of the fighting forces must be geared to the strategic plans laid down by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and not to political considerations or arbitrary dollar limitations. "Our national defense problems must always be resolved with complete freedom from partisan bias or favor. If it is a question of choosing between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Budget Bureau, I will place my confidence in the Joint Chiefs."

Existing weapons must not be scrapped in favor of plans still on the drawing boards. "Blueprints may be cheap, but they cannot defend the rights of the Nation."

The specialized functions of the individual services must not be impaired or destroyed. "War is three dimensional (land, sea, and air) and the four services exist for the simple reason that there are four separate and distinct missions which are assigned to them."

Merger of the services would spell disaster. "It would not save the taxpayer one thin dime, and would provide a one-way ticket to defeat. Competition is the heart and soul of American industry and the American people, why should it be denied to the Armed Forces?"

President Kennedy, who served in the House from 1947–52, has seen Uncle CARL'S operations up close. He knows what has happened to those in both parties who have attempted to buck the Vinson formula for sound national security. If the Chief Executive's new plans for the Armed Forces fail to win Uncle CARL'S backing, the country may witness the battle of the century.

VINSON, as he approaches the 50-year mark in his long congressional service, shows no sign that he is willing to compromise his basic beliefs as they relate to the Nation's security, or that he has lost any of the legislative skill which has enabled him to bring them to full fruition.

Although he has sometimes talked about retiring, his colleagues in the Congress doubt that such an event ever will take place.

When Uncle CARL last mentioned the subject to Speaker RAYBURN, "Mr. SAM" told him, "NOW, CARL, your're not going to do any such thing. We're both going to stay right here until we die."

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills H.R. 845, H.R. 856, H.R. 858, H.R. 860, H.R. 861, H.R. 866, H.R. 2953, and H.R. 3587.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ENCOURAGING FOREIGN TRAVEL TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill that would permit the Department of Commerce to expand its program for encouraging foreign travel to the United States.

Tourism is one way to decrease our international payments deficit. In 1959 American tourists spent nearly $2 billion abroad, while foreign tourists spent about $970 million in the United States, leaving a deficit of about $1 billion.

Studies made by our committee show that the United States is doing little or nothing to encourage citizens of other countries to travel in the United States, whereas other countries are carrying on elaborate and well-financed programs to encourage Americans to tour abroad.

Approximately 70 percent of the tourist spending in the United States is by visitors from our immediate neighbors, Canada and Mexico. If we exclude spending by visitors from these two countries, expenditures of foreign visitors in the United States are less than a third of what American travelers spend overseas. Furthermore, a great majority of these foreign visitors in the United States are actually not tourists, but businessmen, government officials, and exchange students.

At least 22 nations currently maintain tourist offices in the United States. It is estimated that at least $20 million is spent annually by foreign nations to attract U.S. visitors. Probably the most effective of these activities are the large-scale radio, newspaper, and magazine advertising campaigns carried on by foreign tourist agencies and carriers.

The United States needs to give more attention to furnishing foreign nationals information regarding tourist attractions in the United States.

To do this the bill sets up an Office of International Travel and Tourism in the Department of Commerce. It is the duty of this office to encourage travel by foreign residents to the United States so as to provide a more friendly understanding of our peoples and our institutions, and to stimulate facilities and arrangements within the United States for taking care of the requirements of these foreign visitors.

One of the important objectives would be to dispel the idea held by many foreigners regarding the cost of visiting this country. The agency would cooperate with other Government agencies and private industry.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the following feature editorial appeared in the Los Angeles Times for Friday morning, January 20, 1961:

CRITICISM AND THE COMMITTEE

The Congress is again being deluged by demands that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished, that a halt be called to this controversial legislative inquiry into the shape and extent of the Communist threat.

It has been suggested by the committee's defenders that all of its critics are subversives or dupes. They are not. There has been responsible and justified criticism of both the personnel and procedures of the committee.

The issue, however, is not whether the performance of the committee has been ideal, but whether its imperfections justify its elimination. We think not.

No thoughtful person would seriously state that the danger of Soviet subversion has ended, or even lessened. It is a constant aim and continuous effort of the Communists to try to undermine this Nation by any means possible.

If the threat then persists, it is surely the obligation of the Congress to concern itself with the problem, and to seek information and remedies.

Many opponents of the Committee on Un-American Activities would say that the combating of subversion should be left entirely to the FBI and Central Intelligence Agency, and similar bodies. Does this mean that they want their elected representatives to abandon any direct interest in the matter?

We would not argue that the committee has fulfilled its difficult task perfectly—any more than we would claim this for any other

congressional group. HCUA members have demonstrated overzealousness and an overconcern for the publicity value of their hearings and findings. Yet, this is hardly something unique in a committee of the Congress.

Nor should this committee, in the final analysis, be judged solely according to some arbitrary formula that states that X number of hearings should produce Y number of proposed bills. The function of legislative inquiry is too vital to be circumscribed by such specious criteria.

To concede the committee's faults is not to condone them. They should be corrected, but not by abolishing the committee. The potential usefulness of the Committee on Un-American Activities outweighs, we feel, any responsible argument for its elimination.

FROM AN ADDRESS BY ABRAHAM LINCOLN AT WASHINGTON MEMORIAL CEREMONY, INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, 100 YEARS AGO

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago tomorrow, Abraham Lincoln, in a Washington memorial ceremony raised a flag at Independence Hall in Philadelphia and, in the course of his brief and extemporaneous remarks on that occasion, uttered words which exemplify the high ideals of our country and which, if possible, would have more meaning and wider application, but no less validity, than when he spoke them. He said:

> All the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn, so far as I have been able to draw them, from the sentiments which originated and were given to the world from this hall in which we stand. * * * I have often pondered over the dangers incurred by the men who assembled here and adopted that Declaration of Independence. * * * I have often inquired of myself what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together, it was not the mere matter of separation of the Colonies from the mother land; but something in that Declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance.

Thus were the sentiments of three of our greatest Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln joined in one ceremonial expression. And today, with our strivings to create a better life for all our citizens and for oppressed peoples throughout the world, we could not do better than to adopt them as our own.

The principles which Lincoln described are above section, above race, above creed, and above party.

Expressed in the stirring language which he could command as no other American could, Lincoln's peroration should move us today to the great exertions which our national future and the fate of the world require.

One hundred years ago he stated our goals better than we could state them today. At this anniversary of the birth of the Father of our country, let us determine to make these goals into realities.

THE LATE DR. TOM DOOLEY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill requesting the striking of a gold medal with proper wording thereon to be given posthumously to Dr. Tom Dooley. When the medal called for in the bill is struck, it will be presented to his mother, Mrs. Agnes Dooley.

I trust when the bill comes to the floor, it will be considered promptly and will be passed unanimously.

UTILIZING THE FACILITIES OF PRIVATE COMMERCIAL SHIP REPAIR YARDS

Mr. SEELEY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to require the expenditure of at least 75 percent of the funds expended for naval alteration, conversion or repair of vessels with private commercial ship repair yards.

This bill is a companion to one introduced in the Senate on January 31 by Senator BUTLER, of Maryland. Both bills have the same objective.

The objective, Mr. Speaker, is the strengthening of our economy by utilizing the facilities of private enterprise to the greatest degree possible, and in so doing, to provide employment for a maximum number of workers of all degrees of skill, to provide earnings for the private owners of shipyards on their capital, for which they expect to and will pay the Government substantial amounts in taxes.

Although the present administration has professed to be as strongly in favor of the elimination or minimizing of Government competition with private industry as the administration that preceded it, the fact is that the tendency of the Navy to concentrate in its shipyards all of the conversion, alteration and repair work, has increased year by year for a considerable period. The point has been reached today, where 80 percent of all such work is now being done in the Navy's own shipyards.

The result of this policy is that employment in private shipyards is so low that there is grave danger of the dissolution and removal or abandonment of the very facilities of the private shipbuilding industry upon which our country, and our allies depend so heavily in time of need.

There is an additional reason, it seems to me, for acting favorably upon this bill with promptness, and that is the contribution which the provisions of this bill will make to immediate stimulating of employment and to combating the recession in business.

Under the provisions of this bill, 75 percent of the Navy's repair and alteration work would be done, on a competitive basis, in privately owned shipyards. The Government will get more for its money, and will help to relieve both temporary and chronic unemployment.

The objectives of this bill are of economic as well as patriotic interest in my State, and in my district. In the Senate, my colleague from Connecticut, Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, has joined Senator BUTLER in cosponsoring the bill which has been introduced there.

I urge the Members of the House of Representatives to give early consideration to the bill which I have introduced or to its companion, so that the worthy objectives may be promptly achieved.

FEDERALIZED EDUCATION

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the White House education message we received yesterday is self-contradictory. It says:

> Education must remain a matter of State and local control.

In the next paragraph it says:

> Our twin goals must be: a new standard of excellence—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

Obviously the new standard of excellence will be the Federal, not the existing State and school district standard.

Federal funds may be exacted from our citizens only for a Federal purpose.

When dispensed to States and local governments, Federal funds are inevitably and properly stamped with the criteria and standards necessary to accomplish the Federal purpose. In these standards and criteria reside Federal control which in turn must necessarily supplant the control of the State and local recipients of Federal aid money. Thereby States and school districts lose their autonomy and independence in deciding what kind of education our children should be given.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

FEBRUARY 20, 1961.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954,

the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means have been designated as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Hon. CECIL R. KING, Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Hon. NOAH M. MASON, Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INCONSISTENCY OF EFFORTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION IN CONNECTION WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the administration is making a vigorous drive to lessen and, if possible, to end what it calls a depression. Others refer to it as a recession.

We all go along with the objective, but sometimes we wonder if the efforts are consistent, if the administration is getting its efforts coordinated.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Yesterday, an order came down from an administrative department cutting off from their present employment several thousand Federal employees, the only known reason being that those employees were Republicans.

I do not know whether that issue of how to lessen unemployment ought to come up under the civil rights bill and we should then add a provision providing against discrimination because an employee is a Republican, or whether we should bring it up when these various proposals come before us. When this administration throws all these people, to whom reference has just been made, out of a job and they do not get on the unemployment list, you can see that the 17 million, to whom the President referred during the campaign as going to bed hungry, will have an additional number of unemployed added to their ranks. One suggested action defeats another proposal.

What is gained by an increase in the minimum wage, extending the coverage, and then cutting off all the Federal employees who happen to be Republicans—cut their salaries in two? So they will quit—quit because they cannot exist on what is left. It simply will not work out.

Permit a repetition. The administration fights for and insists upon an increase in the minimum wage, an extension in coverage, bringing in, under the law, several million more workers.

The administration insists upon an extended coverage and perhaps some increase in unemployment compensation.

The administration insists that several other legislative programs be adopted, all giving to members of one group or another additional Federal money, all of which, as in the programs just mentioned, must come from taxpayers who have or expect to have an income earned by their own efforts.

The necessity for legislation which will, to at least some extent, lessen unemployment which grows out of strikes and, in particular, strikes in public utilities where the income of the employer is limited by a governmental agency, has long been evident, and bills to assist in the solution of the problem have time and again been introduced by me. However, the committee having jurisdiction—the Committee on Education and Labor—has neglected and refused to give consideration to any of those bills. Yesterday, another bill, H.R. 4587, was dropped in the hopper, but if it meets the fate of previous ones, it, too, will be ignored.

The need for that type of legislation is shown by the pending strike in the aircraft industry. An editorial bearing upon that situation comes from this morning's Chicago Tribune, and reads:

STRIKES IN CONTEMPT OF EVERYBODY

It is hard to think of a strike meriting less popular support than that of the flight engineers' union, which has crippled six major airlines. The walkout is in violation of Federal court orders in three cities. It defies a Presidential order creating a fact-finding board, which legally requires postponement of a strike for 60 days.

The strikers also rejected an appeal by Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg that they go back to work while he makes an investigation.

The basic issue in the dispute is whether flight engineers qualified as pilots should be represented by the engineers' union or the larger Air Line Pilots Association. Recently the National Mediation Board directed pilots and engineers employed by United Air Lines to form a single bargaining unit. The engineers fear their union will be swallowed up by the pilots' group.

The dispute is reminiscent of several recent strikes in the railroad industry. Last fall a jurisdictional dispute involving maintenance workers shut down the entire Pennsylvania Railroad system, causing revenue losses estimated at $40 million. Early this year several eastern railroads were tied up and thousands of New York commuters inconvenienced by a strike of a few tugboat men.

Credit for ending the tugboat walkout was given to Secretary Goldberg, although in fact the dispute was not settled; it was referred to the Commission named by former President Eisenhower to study featherbedding in the railroad industry. Goldberg's intervention in what should have been a minor dispute had the bad effect of inviting all unions to look to the White House, instead of using the normal machinery for settling disagreements.

Time and again a handful of workers has knocked out a large part of the Nation's transportation industry by calling a strike in violation of Government mediation boards. The flight engineers have compounded their injury to the public by defying the national courts of law.

The officers of the union seek to evade responsibility by saying that the walkout was unauthorized. From time to time other unions have used the same excuse to avoid contempt of court proceedings. A strike is rarely spontaneous; it is nearly always the result of a well-organized plan or conspiracy. An organization and its individual members engaging in such a conspiracy in violation of court orders ought to be punishable, and it is time that some judge took appropriate action.

Until an overwhelming majority of the voters who are adversely affected by these reprehensible strikes grow angry enough to force the Congress to act, no action will be taken.

During the war when the railroad employees went on strike and tied up transportation, an angry House overnight passed a draft bill.

The Taft-Hartley bill was forced through this House by an outraged public when and only when the voters made it clear that, unless legislation of that type was enacted many of the Members would not be reelected.

The legislation was passed over President Truman's veto.

A similar situation forced the House to accept the Landrum-Griffin bill even though many of the House Members, according to the report on file with the Clerk of the House, had received campaign contributions from the UAW–CIO which bitterly fought the acceptance of the bill.

Why is it that we cannot, without being prodded, adopt legislation which we know is in the interests of the people as a whole, which will promote the general welfare.

APPOINTMENT OF EARL E. T. SMITH AS U.S. AMBASSADOR TO SWITZERLAND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of the appointment of the Honorable Earl E. T. Smith as U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland was very pleasing to me. This sense of pleasure resulted from my strong feeling that Mr. Smith would do an outstanding job for our country as its envoy to one of the countries with which we have enjoyed the warmest relations throughout our history.

Since that time I have been distressed to read in some of our newspapers that the President's designation of Mr. Smith was being opposed in certain quarters. I am sure that some of this opposition is conscientious, but I am certain that this type of objection is based upon misinformation and lack of knowledge of the true merits of this great American.

Mr. Smith has a record of accomplishment in business life which indicates without question that he is a man of tremendous ability. Those of us who have been privileged to know him personally are certain that he possesses the

traits of character and personality which eminently qualify him for an ambassadorial post.

I first met this gentleman during his service as our Ambassador to the Republic of Cuba. It was during a visit to that country which Mrs. Whitener and I and some of our friends made in September before the Castro coup in early 1959. During that visit to Cuba I had the privilege of conferring with Ambassador Smith on several occasions in private about our situation in Cuba. These conferences were held at the request of Mr. Smith and were on a confidential basis. The desire of Mr. Smith that our conferences be treated confidentially has been scrupulously honored by me since that time.

It is my present feeling that in view of some of the erroneous criticism that I have read of Mr. Smith's services in Cuba that I should try to set the record straight insofar as the accusation of his alleged pro-Batista leanings are concerned. Nothing that he said to me during my contact with him indicated that there were any such leanings on his part. On the contrary, I have the firm conviction that Ambassador Smith was taking a realistic view of the situation then prevailing in Cuba in that he felt that a change in the Cuban Government for the sake merely of making a change was not necessarily desirable. He knew better than any person with whom I have come into contact what could be expected if the Castro revolution prevailed. It was in the light of this knowledge that Ambassador Smith operated in a way which, in my judgment, was to the best interests of the United States and the people of Cuba.

It has been the source of considerable amazement to me to note how accurately Ambassador Smith predicted the course of Cuba's future under Castro as we talked privately in Havana, Cuba, in late 1958. He had a much greater understanding of the then present and the now accomplished future of Cuba than any man in my acquaintanceship.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the life, character, and services of Earl E. T. Smith do not necessitate any defense by me or any other person. His record as a great American is available to all who desire to appraise it. In my considered opinion an honest appraisal of that record will lead any reasonable person to the inescapable conclusion that Mr. Smith would make an outstanding Ambassador to Switzerland or to any other country to which he might be named by the President of the United States.

I express the hope that the rumblings that have appeared on the surface in recent days will soon pass away and that the appointment of Mr. Smith as Ambassador to Switzerland will become an accomplished fact. When this is done, I predict that the people of this Nation, as well as the great people of Switzerland, will have a sense of deep appreciation for the wisdom of our President in naming him and the willingness of Mr. Smith to assume this important role in our foreign affairs.

RECENT SURVEY DOUBTFUL DISTRESSED AREAS CAN ATTRACT NEW INDUSTRY

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania's Department of Commerce secured new industry for Pennsylvania but here is an angle we have to consider too. We cannot just put up money and hope to grab industries away because all localities are seeking new industries, whether it be New York, New England, and even down South. The following article from the Juniata Sentinel, that is published in my district, is most interesting in this respect:

[From the Juniata Sentinel, Jan. 11, 1961]

RECENT SURVEY DOUBTFUL DISTRESSED AREAS CAN ATTRACT NEW INDUSTRY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The State of Pennsylvania, Altoona Enterprises, and many other community industrial development groups have worked hard in recent years to secure new industry in depressed areas. Much has been said for and against the goals of these groups. An article on the subject appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, December 25. The article, written by A. H. Raskin, states that a survey of New York and New England has raised doubts that distressed areas can fully regain loss of jobs. The article is reprinted here.)

Doubt that distressed areas can be restored to economic health by efforts to attract new industry has been expressed in a special State study.

The survey of local and regional development corporations in areas of high unemployment in New York and New England concludes that community campaigns to bring in new business have generally failed to offset the job losses caused by the decline of old industries.

The study is certain to stir debate because it runs counter to the philosophy of the redevelopment program being drafted by President-elect John F. Kennedy's advisory committee on depressed areas. A key element in the Kennedy program is the supplying of Federal funds to help localities finance construction of new plants and facilities as a means of attracting new enterprises.

The analysis was prepared by a faculty team at the business research center of Syracuse University for the temporary State commission on economic expansion, headed by Devereux C. Josephs. It may be part of the basic data for the final report the commission submitted to Governor Rockefeller and the legislature last Wednesday.

In its own conclusions the commission expressed reserve about how much good the projected Federal program would do. It warned that large-scale aid to areas with chronic labor surplus might injure the total State economy.

"This belief is based on the fear that more or much of the industry and jobs which will be channeled into economically stranded or underdeveloped areas will inevitably be drawn from other industrial States, including New York," the Josephs group said.

Even apart from this reservation, the commission reacted coldly to the probability of Federal action. It said it was not altogether convinced that Government assistance, unless of a more drastic type than anything now contemplated, will prove to be the magic by which a local area will take its forward leap.

"A primary responsibility for finding adaptation to excess unemployment or low income will, in our view, always rest with the community," the report declared. "For in the final analysis, the rate at which the needy areas of New York or other States recover or grow will depend on their ability to supply private industry with a profitable location."

The commission's two labor members, Jacob S. Potofsky and Harold C. Hanover, who dissented from the report's key recommendations on how to speed economic expansion, did not file a specific dissent on this section; however, Mr. Potofsky emphasized that the unionists were in total disagreement with the implied criticism of the Kennedy program.

The Syracuse University study avoided any direct comment on the possible impact of Federal activity. However, it was blunt in evaluating the attempts already undertaken by most distressed areas to induce new employers to move in. It said:

"There is no evidence that community or regional development corporations and activities have been successful in New York or New England. This is a flat statement, but one which we think is justified."

The report noted Amsterdam, N.Y., as a city that had made heroic efforts to heal the wounds inflicted on its economy by the departure of its carpet industry without any substantial measure of success.

Burlington, Vt., was cited as the sole clear exception to a declaration that the number of jobs brought in by induced industry rarely equaled the number lost by migration. Even this observation was qualified by a note that Burlington had started from a relatively high base in its march toward economic recovery.

The university study did not dispute the desirability of attempts by communities with chronic idleness to seek new industry but it warned that such moves were not likely to restore their old economic position and insure growth.

It suggested as an alternative the use of public funds to assist in training people for work in more prosperous communities. The report said the facts supported the wisdom of assisting people to move rather than putting all the eggs of public policy in the basket of attracting industry.

Another device recommended in the study was a conscious policy of giving industrially weak communities preference in the location of colleges, hospitals, and other large public or private institutions. Where the cost disadvantages of such a policy are not too great, it can help expand job opportunities and prevent migration of young workers, the report declared.

The general economic health of the State was pronounced good. The study urged that continued stress be put on making the business climate as attractive as possible and on advertising the State's advantages in markets, money, and manpower.

Both the State and its areas of high unemployment will do best, the report said, if economic developments are not distorted by attempts to influence industrial location in an uneconomic fashion.

The authors of the study were Sidney C. Sufrin, John H. Thompson, Marion A. Buck, and Arland E. Charlton, all attached to the staff of the business research center.

THE "SANTA MARIA" AFFAIR AND OUR AMERICAN-FLAG SHIPS IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE PLANNING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent *Santa Maria* affair further highlights the fact that we should only consider our own American-flag ships in our national defense planning.

There is at present a large number of American-owned ships registered under the flags of Panama, Liberia, and Honduras that are referred to as escape-flag ships. They are referred to as escape-flag ships because some years ago a group of Wall Street lawyers created this transfer foreign gimmick so that the American international oil companies could avoid and eventually destroy the existing wage and working standards of American seamen and, at the same time, avoid U.S. taxes.

Because of a shirking of responsibility, coupled with the desire of some people in the past administration to show favor to certain major oil and steel trusts, our American-flag merchant marine is deficient in capability to meet national wartime requirements for merchant-type ocean shipping.

We are told that we should not be alarmed by this deficiency because there is a sufficient number of these escape-flag ships that could be counted upon in time of a national emergency because they are under effective control. A ship is considered by the Department of Defense to be under effective control when the following situations exist: Contractual or voluntary agreements between the owners of the ships and the government making the ships available to the U.S. Government in the event of a national emergency; when the countries in which these ships are registered do not at present impose restrictions on the operational control of the ships registered under their flag; and, when these countries in which the ships are registered have limited requirements.

The contractual arrangements are worth less than the paper they are written on, because the owners that have signed the voluntary agreements could transfer their ships to some other country that would not relinquish control or the countries in which these ships are registered could change their laws, thereby preventing them from coming under U.S. control.

The contractual arrangements mean even less when we realize the basic fact that the seamen that man these escape-flag ships are the ones, and the only ones, that really have control.

As to whether or not we could rely upon these ships hinges upon whether or not these seamen, who do not owe allegiance to the United States, but instead to some other country, whose ideological and political philosophies are frequently and most usually different from ours, would turn the ships over to us.

This basic fact is ignored by these advocates of the effective-control theory who have continually maintained that the basic underlying reason that these ships are under effective control is that our Navy could and would seize these ships, regardless of the desires of the crew, when they were directed to do so. The recent incident involving the Portuguese liner, the *Santa Maria*, demonstrates how imposible it would be to corral several hundred ships that are trying to avoid seizure.

The fact that the *Santa Maria* could avoid detection by the U.S. Navy while in our own hemisphere, further highlights the fakery and idiotic logic behind the effective-control concept.

HE DOESN'T LIKE "JACK"

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, brief but to the point, is from the Lebanon Daily News and if it portends the Federal spending spree indicated by current Federal action, we are going to need a lot of "jack" which is the expression for greenbacks:

HE DOESN'T LIKE "JACK"

Newspapers in 1932 found the word "Roosevelt" nigh on to impossible to fit into small headlines. The substitute, of course, was F.D.R.

That familiarity granted public acceptance, it was perfectly natural that when Harry Truman ascended to the Presidency, newspapers should adopt his initials for identification purposes, even though "Truman" was a far less unwieldy word than "Roosevelt."

Eisenhower was long and difficult to fit into flexible type and Ike proved ideal.

Now it is logical that instead of Kennedy, J.F.K. should be permitted as a tool for headline writers. This does not especially please the President-elect, however. He told the Associated Press he preferred Kennedy, although he would not object to J.F.K. But he made it very clear that he would be opposed to use of Jack in the headlines.

If one reflects upon the connotation of Jack as it applies to that commodity with which Mr. Kennedy is so richly endowed, his attitude is understandable.

SIXTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 15 was the 63d anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana Harbor, the tragedy that triggered the war with Spain. It is an anniversary always observed by the veterans of that war and never has it gone unnoticed. In every city and every hamlet in America, while still there are camps of the United Spanish War Veterans, it will continue to be observed with services of loving tribute to the memory of the 260 American sailors who perished with the *Maine* and by the sacrifice of their lives started our country on its road to world destiny.

Ninety-three veterans of that war of long ago served in this historic Chamber. The gentleman from Illinois alone remains. With him it is a solemn obligation in comradeship with those with whom he served in youth, most of whom are gone, to keep aflame in a modern world the spirit of 1898.

In the early weeks of the war, training at Camp Alger near Falls Church for later participation in the siege of Santiago in Cuba, the gentleman from Illinois was an infantryman in Company I of the 33d Michigan, a company recruited from the youth of Berrien County in the district now represented by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], my warm personal friend. In the same brigade and accompanying the 33d Michigan to Cuba was the 9th Massachusetts, largely recruited from the youth in the district now represented by our beloved majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the organization you speak of the one in which our former distinguished colleagues, Mr. Mapes and Mr. Michener, both of Michigan, served?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Both served in the 33d Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Both Republicans.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. When it comes to patriotism I do not draw any party lines.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Nor do I.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. And I may say to the gentleman from Michigan the reason I left Michigan as a boy was that I could see no chance for a Democrat. When I was a boy we had one Democrat in the general assembly at Lansing, but since then the people of Michigan have improved in their wisdom.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And suffered in their pocketbooks.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Permit me to say on behalf of the citizens of the county of Berrien, of the Fourth District, and those living in the Third and the Fifth Districts, that they are very, very happy to pay tribute to the gentleman for the wonderful ability and service he has given to the citizens of Chicago. The gentleman has served them for many years—ably and with patriotism, and I think they have profited by the transplanted wisdom you carried to them.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am sure that in my district the words of my good friend from Michigan will be warmly received.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The people of Chicago are to be congratulated upon their selection and retention of the gentleman as their representative.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the majority whip.

Mr. ALBERT. It is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] on this occasion. I congratulate the gentleman for taking the time for this purpose. The House is honored in having among its membership a distinguished Member who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War.

I believe since the gentleman last discussed this subject in the House, those who served in the Spanish-American War have become the senior veterans of our country. Not long ago with the passing of the last Confederate veteran, the final rollcall of those who served in the Civil War was answered. The Blue and the Gray have faded into history, and now the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is one of the illustrious group who are the deans of all living men who have had the honor of fighting for their country during time of war.

A number of Spanish-American War veterans live in my congressional district. Many years ago, they established a colony in the beautiful mountain country of southeastern Oklahoma. With the depletion of their number, they have opened the community to veterans of all wars. It has been my privilege on many occasions to visit this community and to address its members.

One of the issues between Spain and the United States which precipitated the war was the situation in Cuba, then a Spanish possession. Crushed by oppression, the Cuban people had attempted many unsuccessful revolutions. Their struggle for liberty captured the hearts of their northern neighbors and many American soldiers once more gave their lives that freedom might live.

Today, Cuba once again lies under the dictator's heel. I know I speak for the veterans of the war that brought freedom to Cuba when I extend sympathy to her people and the heartfelt wish that it will not be long before they once again join the ranks of the free nations of the world.

Sixty-three years ago today, 266 officers and men died on the *Maine*. Let us hope that another year will not pass without recognition by Cuba of the place these men earned for her in the family of nations. Let us hope that a year from now we will congratulate, not only our war veterans, but a free and democratic neighbor, as well.

Again let me congratulate my illustrious and beloved colleague for the fine presentation he is making to the House at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I might tell him that whenever the Spanish War Veterans meet in their national encampments the lads from Oklahoma always mention with affection the gentleman from Oklahoma, the majority whip of this House.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I want to pay high compliment to the gentleman from Illinois for bringing to the attention of this House the incident that brought about active hostilities in the Spanish-American War, and I want to recount to the House his valiant service in that war as a soldier. This was not a great war as we measure the last two wars; there were not millions of people engaged; you did not have pushbutton communications; logistics as we know them were unknown. But the suffering and the sacrifices made by the men who fought the Spanish-American War were as deep as any in any war that has ever been fought in this world. The food was bad, it was rotten. In many cases they had to fight cholera, typhoid, and other epidemics with which they did not know how to cope in that day. So I am happy to join with the gentleman in honoring the valiant men who fought that war. I know some of the difficulties they must have encountered and the sufferings they must have endured, for I served in World War I. I will not presume to speak of World War II but will let my distinguished leader, the Democratic whip, do that. I do, however, compliment the gentleman and want to pay my respects through him to the veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, when the House met on February 15 a parliamentary situation unexpectedly developed that resulted in the adjournment of the House within a matter of minutes after its convening and the special order of the gentleman from Illinois, as well as other special orders of that day, could not be called. This explains why on February 21, instead of February 15, we are observing the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*.

Mr. Speaker, as appropriate to this occasion I would now address myself to the subject of hemispheric solidarity. President Kennedy has reasserted what President Monroe said in his day and President Cleveland said years later when European powers were threatening in Venezuela, Nicaragua, and elsewhere by indirection to violate the letter and the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine. In the affairs of this hemisphere the United States and her sister American Republics will brook no interference by any European power or by any nation whatsoever outside the American Hemisphere. I am heartened that the generation of the New Frontier of the 1960's is seeing eye to eye with the generation of the New Frontier of Monroe's time and the generation of the New Frontier of 1898.

The deep significance of the war with Spain, triggered by the sinking of the battleship *Maine* 63 years ago, was that it marked the end of European dominion on American shores. It was the answer to the prayers of countless thousands of Cuban men and women, many of whom had died as martyrs, that their beautiful island should be freed of European coils and under government of, for, and by the people take her place among the soverign nations of the world. The intervention of the United States on the side of Cuba was a manifestation of hemispheric solidarity. It pinpointed the legitimate interest of one member of the American hemispheric community in the struggles of another member to escape into the sunshine of freedom from the darkness of foreign exploitation and of designs alien to the American concept of free and independent government, of the dignity of man, and of his brotherhood under God.

It would be strange and unnatural if the gentleman from Illinois did not have an interest in Cuba and an affection for her people second only to his interest in his own country and his affection for his own countrymen. One in his age does not discard as an outmoded garment that which was woven from the warm sentiments and deep emotions of his youth. As a boy just turned 16 the cry of "Cuba libre" was as sweet and sacred in my ears as in the ears of my comrades of Cuban blood and in the Cuban uniform with whom I served in the hills around Santiago more than six decades ago.

In those hills died the boys from Michigan, from Massachusetts, from Illinois and other States and the boys from Cuba, died as comrades in a common cause, that Cuba might be free from European dominion, free from any rule save that of her own people.

Mr. Speaker, I have abiding faith that always there will be an enduring bond of friendship between the people of my own United States and the people of the land of my second affection. It could not be otherwise. So many men and women of Cuban birth and blood have contributed so much to our country that the bonds that united us in 1898 have been tightened with each passing generation. Forgetting for the moment those in the field of politics, of the arts, and the professions, and turning to the field of sports, where all meet on the line of merit, with the sole measure that of manly sportsmanship, I might mention that the baseball players and boxers of Cuba have received acclaim from American sporting crowds second to that given to the athletes of no other nation.

Hemispheric solidarity is the shield of all the American Republics against the designs of those outside our hemisphere and whose interest in our hemispheric community is akin to that of a stranger in a neighbor's home.

Hemispheric solidarity is the shield of greatest protection to the smallest of the American Republics.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this opportunity to speak with frankness both to the people of my own United States and to the people of Cuba, with whom I am bound in the deep affection springing from the associations of my youth.

The fact is that in the new frontier of 1898 there was the same idealism that I envision in the new frontier of the 1960's. In rescuing Cuba from the coils of European domination there was no desire to annex a foot of Cuban soil to the territory of the United States. Although the beautiful island of Cuba was but a few miles from our mainland shores, there was no thought of any American mind to take possession of Cuba as the legitimate spoils of war.

It is true there was a brief period of American occupation while the people of Cuba were preparing to take over the management of their own affairs. But

what is overlooked by both American and Cuban historians is that at the very beginning of the brief period of occupation the United States, then a relatively poor country in material measure, gave its moneys to enable the Cuban soldiers who had fought valiantly for Cuba libre and thus had separated themselves from the ordinary means of sustenance, money with which to buy land and thus reestablish themselves on an economic basis.

Meanwhile, the peoples of Puerto Rico, at long last freed of a cruel European dominion, were facing a devastating famine. The United States, then as I have said relatively poor, gave of its means until it hurt to the relief of a famine that threatened the wiping out of thousands of the men, women, and children of Puerto Rico.

These are the facts of history, discernible by anyone who takes the time and has the inclination to delve in the records for them. I regret that modern American historians, too much concerned with the exciting events of the 20th century into which they were born, at times have seemed to lack both understanding and sympathy with the idealism that marked the closing years of the 19th century.

If American historians, born in the 20th century and often seeming as blind as bats in their interpretations of what happened in the period of the dying 19th century, have not stressed these facts of history, one can scarcely wonder at the confusion in the minds of the people of Cuba.

What we gave from our slender means to rehabilitate the brave and patriotic soldiers of Cuba and to relieve the famine-stricken Puerto Ricans, we did not extract from prostrate and poverty-stricken Spain, whom we had beaten quickly and decisively in the Atlantic and the Pacific and who was at our complete mercy. Even to Spain we forgave the war debts and indemnities, assumed for ourselves the expense of Cuban rehabilitation and Puerto Rican escape from famine, and were satisfied that through our joint efforts with the soldiers and patriots of Cuba and Puerto Rico we had ended the reign of European dominion on American shores.

That dominion never will return as long as wisdom reigns and red blood courses in the veins of the peoples of the American hemisphere, whether they live in our own United States, in Cuba, or any of the other sister republics of America. We have had our experience, and for all time we have ended the interference in the affairs of this hemisphere by any European power or by any power whatsoever outside of our own American hemisphere.

Together, as friends and neighbors in a hemispheric democratic society, we will work out our problems. Social justice must be extended in all the countries in our hemisphere. There must be a stabilization of the markets for the products of our neighbors, the economies of which rise and fall with the buying market in our own United States. There must be a lifting of the fog of poverty and a raising of the horizons of life for every man, woman, and child on this, our own American hemisphere. Working together, we will attain our objective, a free and abundant life for every man, woman, and child on the American hemisphere, but never, never again will we be enmeshed in the coils of European dominion which were broken once and for all by the war with Spain, triggered by the sinking of the battleship *Maine* 63 years ago.

As the last veteran of the Spanish-American War in this body I salute the President of the United States, himself a combat veteran of World War II, and say to him that in his reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine he has spoken not only for the new frontier of the 1960's but as well as for the new frontier and the spirit of 1898.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my dear and distinguished friend from Illinois for the remarks he has made today and for similar remarks he has made during past years since he has been a Member of this body. He is the only Member of the Congress of the United States who served in the Spanish-American War. He not only honors the memory of his comrades with whom he served by having the House pause while he makes these remarks, but he honors each and every one of the Members of this body.

The fact that he salutes the memory of those who served with him in the Spanish-American War illustrates one of the traits of character that has endeared my friend from Illinois to all of us, to the people of his district, to everyone who knows him. It goes with the sweetness of his character and with his courage and determination in the performance of his public duties.

Mr. Speaker, my friend has referred to the 9th Massachusetts Regiment, the old "Fighting 9th of Massachusetts," which has a great record in the military history of our country going back to the Civil War; and later in World War II as one of the regiments that constituted the 101st Infantry Division.

Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate my friend on the remarks he has made today. I know that his comrades who are in the Great Beyond are smiling down upon him with pleasure.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, from the bottom of my heart, I thank our beloved majority leader.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, it is a privilege to join in what has been said and to commend the gentleman not only for the service that he rendered during the war but since as a servant of the people of Chicago.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], twice the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join my colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, in his remarks on the anniversary of the sinking of the U.S.S. *Maine* in the Havana Harbor 63 years ago.

In 1895 the revolt in Cuba had flared up again, after more than a decade of relative tranquillity. During the winter of 1897–98, mobs of Spanish loyalists, resentful of the well-known sympathy of the American people for the Cubans, became formidable. Fitzhugh Lee, the American consul general at Havana, appealed to his Government for support in the form of a naval force in Cuban waters. On January 24, 1898, the *Maine*, a second-class battleship, was ordered to Havana.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the Spanish authorities having been notified of her advent, the *Maine*, Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, steamed into Havana Harbor and was moored to a buoy 500 yards off the arsenal. The Spanish officials acted with punctilious courtesy, and the social amenities between American and Spanish authorities proceeded according to naval protocol. No untoward incident took place until 9:40 p.m. on the night of February 15, when two terrific explosions threw parts of the *Maine* 200 feet in the air. The forward half of the ship was reduced to a mass of twisted steel; the afterpart slowly sank. Two officers and 250 men were killed at once and 8 men died afterward.

Separate investigations of the tragedy were made by the American and Spanish authorities. The Spaniards reported that an internal explosion, perhaps spontaneous combustion in the coal bunkers, had been the cause; the Americans that the original cause had been an external explosion which in turn had set off the forward magazines.

Later events are admirably summarized by William B. Norris in his article, "The Destruction of the *Maine*," which appears in the Dictionary of American History:

> News of the disaster produced great excitement in the United States, and accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed by certain newspapers. Without doubt, the catastrophe stirred up national feeling over the difficulties in Cuba, crystallized in the slogan, "Remember the *Maine*." The wreck remained in Havana Harbor until 1911, when U.S. Army engineers built a cofferdam about the wreck, sealed the afterhull of the ship, the only part still intact, and floated it out to sea. There, on March 16, 1912, appropriate minute guns boomed as it sank with its flag flying. The remains of 66 of the crew which were found during the raising were buried in the National Cemetery, Arlington.
>
> During the removal of the wreck, a board of officers of the Navy made a further investigation. Their report, published in 1912,

stated that a low form of explosive exterior to the ship caused the first explosion. European experts, perhaps influenced by several internal explosions in warships in the intervening years, still, however, maintained the theory of an internal explosion. No further evidence has ever been found to solve the mystery.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, 63 years ago, on the night of February 15, 1898, the U.S. battleship *Maine* exploded and sank in Spanish-held Havana Harbor, and furnished the Nation with a battle cry for the war that followed: "Remember the *Maine*."

The *Maine*, a second-class battleship built at the New York Navy Yard, was launched on November 18, 1890, and commissioned on September 17, 1895. Although she would be dwarfed by modern warships, in her day the *Maine* was formidable. She was 324 feet long and 27 feet at the beam, and had a displacement of 6,650 tons. She carried four 10-inch guns, six 6-inch breech-loading rifles, seven 6-pounder rapid-fire guns, eight 1-pounders, and four Gatling machineguns. In addition she had tubes for four torpedoes.

If the bright sunshine on the morning of launching day was a good omen, it was to be a short-lived one. The *Maine*, in her 2½-year commissioned history, came to be considered an unlucky ship.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the *Maine* arrived in Havana Harbor, ostensibly "to resume the friendly naval visits at Cuban ports," according to the State Department. Actually the purpose was to protect U.S. citizens, supposedly endangered by the increasing friction between the United States and Spain. The *Maine* was moored to a buoy 500 yards off the arsenal and the amenities between American and Spanish officials proceeded according to protocol. For 3 weeks no unusual incident took place.

When the *Maine* exploded, accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed by certain American newspapers. Most Americans held Spain responsible, although the evidence was never sufficient to fix blame officially. Some 2 months later came the Spanish-American War, which was to mark the final collapse of the Spanish Empire and the emergence of the United States as a world power.

In the explosion on the *Maine* 2 officers and 258 men were killed at once or died soon afterward as a result of the disaster. One of those who lost their lives was John J. McManus, fireman second class, of Davenport, Iowa.

Regarding the motto, "Remember the *Maine*," Captain Sigsbee, commander of the ship, had this to say:

> Therefore I conceive the motto, "Remember the *Maine*," used as a war cry would not have been justifiable. Improperly applied, the motto * * * savors too much of revenge * * * but it may be used in an entirely worthy sense.
>
> During the recent war with Spain about 75 men were killed and wounded in the U.S. Navy. Only 17 were killed. On board the *Maine* 252 men were killed outright and 8 died later—nearly 15 times as many as were killed in the U.S. Navy by the Spanish land and naval forces during the entire war. In the way that the men of the *Maine* died and suffered there was enough of the heroic to provide a sound foundation for the motto, "Remember the *Maine*."

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for his interesting statements relative to his experiences in the Spanish-American War. Certainly the Cubans of that period appreciated the contributions that the United States made in securing their freedom. But today, at this particular time, it seems that we have not learned very much since the Spanish-American War. At least, our failure to hold the friendship of the Cuban people strongly indicates that we failed somewhere to determine new values in friendship necessary to cement the friendly relations of nations.

It is with a deep sense of love of freedoms for the American hemispheres that we were brought into the Spanish-American War. Certainly, our national policy as to Latin America was based upon the Monroe Doctrine. Today we have abrogated the Monroe Doctrine by agreeing to a hands-off policy on changes in internal government of our South American neighbors even though inimical to the very existence of our form of government. It is sad commentary to look back over the many years and consider the loss of time, money, and effort spent in coveting the friendship of certain Latin American nations.

Many great men developed to American leadership through their activities in the Spanish-American War. I doubt whether President Theodore Roosevelt would have been so readily selected by political leaders as a candidate for public office had it not been for his popular appeal for a peculiar type of character appeal developed during his experiences in the Spanish-American War. I know this, that our distinguished colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, who has all his life fought for the interest of the Spanish-American War veterans, widows, and orphans, deserves high commendation for his invaluable services to God and country in behalf of all veterans during his long period of public life, as a Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and as an outstanding citizen and Representative of that State. We thank him for his contribution this day on the sinking of the *Maine* and, as his colleagues from Illinois, we appreciate the distinguished way in which he has served his State.

We pray that the great President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, will look into the conditions that influence the feelings of the people in their antagonism toward the American people and that after this study is made, he will ask this Congress for corrective legislation to direct and control American capital invested in foreign countries so that these interests contribute to the local and national economy of those countries. It would be much better for maintaining friendly relations with our neighbors if we prevent the investment of American dollars in foreign enterprises. It would be far better if, under the present conditions, we are reaping a harvest of vicious feeling against ourselves because of the penurious practices of our American-supported industries in foreign countries. The sad circle of the U.S. Government buying friendship with investment dollars in foreign countries and our capitalists destroying the friendships by proselyting the workers.

I congratulate the gentleman on his patriotic presentation to his appreciative colleagues.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my colleague from Illinois.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that no one in Illinois is more beloved by the veterans of all wars than my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI]. Everyone in Illinois is tremendously happy that he is to serve them in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of this House.

Mr. LIBONATI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BARRATT O'HARA has generously invited me to join in remarks commemorating the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine* in the harbor at Havana on February 15, 1898.

As we know, this tragic demolition of an American battleship cost the lives of 266 Americans, and formed one of the direct causes of the war with Spain.

Sixty-six members of that gallant crew are buried nearby in the national cemetery, Arlington.

We, as Members of Congress, by paying homage to the memory of the heroes of 1898, have the opportunity of focusing public attention on the patriotic deeds of those men who made up the most colorful army in the history of the world—every man a volunteer—the AEF of 1898.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 10 minutes, on Thursday, February 23, 1961.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN (at the request of Mr. LOSER).

Mr. MORRISON and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $303.75.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEVINE) were given permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. NYGAARD.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. KING of Utah.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 610. An act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 707. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 804. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think there could be no more appropriate act I could do on this day that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has made such a dramatic and eloquent speech about the Spanish-American War and the veterans of that war than to ask my distinguished friend, as a mark of respect to their memory, to make the motion that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a motion to adjourn was never made with such emotion as is this one.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 22, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

590. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Aviation Agency prepared by Administrator E. R. Quesada for calendar year 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

591. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated February 4, 1961, covering refunds and credits of internal revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 6405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

592. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide an increase of $2 billion in the authority of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) for calendar year 1961"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

593. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

594. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation to the Congress concerning the claims of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex., pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 413; 31 U.S.C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 845. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of special pension payable to certain persons awarded the Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 856. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 858. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers and directors of professional services of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 860. A bill to repeal certain obsolete provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to unemployment compensation for Korean conflict veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 861. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 866. A bill to amend section 4004 of title 38, United States Code, to require that the Board of Veterans' Appeals render findings of fact and conclusions of law in the opinions setting forth its decisions on appeals; with amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2953. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that certain service shall be creditable for pension purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3587. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to provide outpatient medical and dental treatment for veterans of the Indian wars on the same basis as such treatment is furnished to veterans of the Spanish-American War; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 4658. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 4659. A bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4660. A bill to authorize modification of the project Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., damage to levee and drainage districts, with particular reference to the Kings Lake Drainage District, Missouri; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 4661. A bill designating the first Monday in Fire Prevention Week as National Firemen's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4662. A bill to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved August 7, 1959, entitled "Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4663. A bill to amend section 545 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the income limitations applicable to the payment of pension to widows of World War I veterans shall be increased to $1,800 without dependents and $3,600 with dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the cost of all medicine and drugs for the taxpayer and his spouse, rather than only the excess over 1 percent of adjusted gross income as otherwise provided, may be included in computing the medical expense deduction where such taxpayer or spouse is 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4665. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted from $1,200 to $1,800 yearly without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4666. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which beneficiaries are no longer subject to restrictions on outside earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS (by request):

H.R. 4667. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for the substitution of truck vehicles for highway post office transportation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4668. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4669. A bill to amend the law relating to gambling in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4670. A bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of

Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4671. A bill to provide for the establishment of national cemeteries in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4672. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4673. A bill to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 4674. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the amount of a deposit which may be insured under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4675. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4676. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4678. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase from $1 to $1.25 the minimum hourly wage prescribed by section 6(a)(1) of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4679. A bill to amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of expenses for the care of certain dependents); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4680. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4681. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4682. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa to the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4683. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4684. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 4685. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal of the financial statement, now required by the Veterans' Administration for admittance to Veterans' Administration hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4686. A bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4687. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4688. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for a more equitable distribution of the funds available under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4689. A bill to amend section 709 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the effective date of national service life insurance applied for by members of the Armed Forces on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 4690. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 4691. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private shiprepair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4692. A bill to permit the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with the meat inspection services of the various States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4693. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the persons for whose benefit imported articles must be marked with the country of origin; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the persons for whose benefit imported articles made of cotton fiber must be marked with the country of origin; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4695. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4696. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, including those who served during peacetime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 4697. A bill to provide that the Channel Islands off the coast of southern California shall be referred to as the Juan Rodrigues Cabrillo Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4698. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal chords, with resulting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4700. A bill to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4701. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide appeal rights to employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4702. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4703. A bill to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 168. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 182. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the State of Wyoming relating to the control, development, appropriation, and use of waters within the State's boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursable to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 36th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish

the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to pear decline; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the State of Wyoming relating to the control, development, appropriation, and use of waters within the State's boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 4704. A bill for the relief of Nick and Diana Papadopolous; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4705. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 4706. A bill providing that the President shall award posthumously in the name of the people of the United States a gold medal to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4707. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pierina Di Ciuccio De Cola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4708. A bill for the relief of Humbert A. Lie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4709. A bill for the relief of James L. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 4710. A bill for the relief of Masumi (Theresa Ann) Morishita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4711. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jyotirmay Mitra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4712. A bill for the relief of Daniel Rountree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4713. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4714. A bill for the relief of Nora E. Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4715. A bill for the relief of Helena Jasinska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 4716. A bill for the relief of Manuel C. and Catalina L. Tampoya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4717. A bill for the relief of Athena Nicholas Euteriadou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H.R. 4718. A bill for the relief of Bogdan Kusulja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4719. A bill for the relief of Edward and Betty Daror; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4720. A bill for the relief of Dr. Henry L. Salvacion, his wife, Herminia Sabello Salvacion, and their minor children, Julius, Myrna, and Sheila Salvacion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

64. The SPEAKER presented a petition of William Netscert, Daytona Beach, Fla., relative to requesting that no bill be passed which violates the principles of equity originally intended to tie together annuity contributions and subsequent benefit allowances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Impeachment of Our Chief Justice: An Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, letters are coming in, advocating the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren.

Sometimes accompanying these suggestions are Supreme Court decisions which, in the view of those urging the impeachment of the Chief Justice, tend to make rather than interpret the laws as written by the Congress or the legislative bodies of the States. That is the charge—that the Supreme Court has usurped the functions of the Congress.

Whatever may be our views as to the correctness of the Court's reasoning and final decisions—and I disagree with several of the Court's decisions—at the present time there appears to be no charge which would result in a conviction if Warren were impeached.

REMOVAL FROM OFFICE

Article II, section 4, of the Constitution states that—

The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.[1]

POWER TO IMPEACH—CONSTITUTION

Article I, section 2, clause 5, states:

The House of Representatives * * * shall have the sole power of impeachment.

TRIAL ON IMPEACHMENT

Article I, section 2, clause 6, of the Constitution provides:

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments.

Whatever may be the reasoning behind this present drive for the impeachment of the Chief Justice, in my humble judgment, not even a majority, much less two-thirds, of the membership of the Senate would vote for a conviction.

However meritorious the criticism of Justice Warren, it would seem to be a waste of time to file impeachment charges with the Clerk of the House.

It is possible that, if those instigating this drive to impeach the Chief Justice would direct their efforts toward some other method of bringing about the desired result, as, for example, remedial legislation, much time and effort would be saved, something accomplished.

Just what has the Chief Justice done that would justify a conviction if he was tried by the Senate?

Several of the decisions made by Chief Justice Warren and concurred in by other members of the Court are, in my humble judgment, completely wrong; in the end will cause us to lose much of the freedom which we heretofore have enjoyed. A real service can be rendered by those who desire the Chief Justice's impeachment by showing to those in local communities the unsoundness of his conclusions.

[1] Madison, whose objection lead to the insertion of the more definite phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors," was the strongest advocate of a broad construction of the impeachment power. He argued that incapacity, negligence, or perfidy of the Chief Magistrate should be ground for impeachment. He also contended that the wanton removal from office of meritorious officers would be an act of maladministration.

However, when Justice Chase was on trial, Senator Giles of Virginia said:

"Impeachment is nothing more than an inquiry, by the two Houses of Congress, whether the office of any public man might not be better filled by another * * *."

"We want your offices, for the purpose of giving them to men who will fill them better." *

*John Quincy Adams, Memoirs, I, 321, 322 (1874).

The Race in Space—A Communications Satellite in Orbit Proposed by the Bell Telephone System To Improve Our Communications System on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Project Echo which was used to bounce the voice of President Eisenhower across the Nation in a matter of seconds demonstrated the practical use of a communications satellite which could be placed in orbit and used as a relay for voice communication to all parts of the earth by radio bounce.

The proposal by the Bell System to finance the building of their own communications satellite and to obtain permission for its use through the Federal Communications Commission for voice transmission indicates the rapid progress we are making in the use of outer space for practical purposes.

In order to make this possible, it will require the cooperation of the Federal Government to fire the Bell System satellite into orbit and to grant them permission to use our tracking stations in order to prove that this system of voice communication is possible and may become an everyday operation for voice communication to all parts of the earth.

Public interest requires development of a satellite communications system as rapidly as possible.

Heavy use of present oversea cable and radio circuits reflects the rapidly growing need for an expanded and more flexible oversea communications system. Satellites are ideally suited to supplement existing facilities. They offer the most practical means of providing oversea television service and would afford highly desirable alternate routes for other oversea services, many of which are extremely important to our national security.

Project Echo, one of our Nation's most dramatic space achievements, demonstrated our leadership in satellite communications. In an age when national prestige is so important, we should keep that leadership.

Privately owned common carrier industry should do this job.

The usefulness of any space communications system will depend upon the extent to which it can be integrated into existing domestic and international common carrier networks. The Bell System already has a vast domestic network with worldwide links to communications systems abroad. Placing a satellite system in operation would simply be adding another important group of international communications channels through what amounts to microwave towers in the sky.

Furthermore, the Bell System has an unmatched fund of experience in communications research, in systems engineering, and in working agreements with other American international carriers and foreign telecommunications administrations.

The Bell System hopes to move forward with an active satellite trial in about a year.

Following the highly successful Echo experiment, the Bell System proceeded at its own expense with development and construction of experimental active satellites. These satellites are designed with repeaters to amplify and relay radio signals with power generated from solar energy. They utilize broadband microwave techniques and are of the type ultimately required to provide commercial telephone, television, data, and global communications of all types. The Bell System has been assigned frequencies for experimental use. It has also asked for launching facilities so the trial can get underway within a year.

It has offered to pay for satellite, for launching it, for building ground stations in the United States, and is confident that the communications agencies of other countries will cooperate by providing ground stations abroad.

It will make the satellite facilities available to NASA and U.S. international telegraph common carriers for experimental use.

Bell System space program is in line with national communications policy and with the aims and purposes of NASA.

Long-standing U.S. national policy places the responsibility for efficient public communication, both domestic and international, on the common carrier industry. Throughout its existence the Bell System has accepted this responsibility and has pioneered in all phases of communications research and development.

NASA has broad responsibilities to advance peaceful use of space, making most effective use of scientific and engineering resources of the United States to avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts. Its emphasis should be on research and development. Combination of Bell System communications experience and NASA space technology can avoid duplication of effort and result in fastest possible development.

Bell System efforts and plans are, in all major respects, in accord with the views expressed in the December 4, 1960, staff report of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Bell System is prepared to move rapidly, shortening the span between experiment and the goal of a fully operative commercial system of satellite communications.

In October 1960, the Bell System applied to the FCC for an experimental grant for conduct of this trial. Frequencies were assigned in January 1961.

The Bell System has discussed with NASA the provision of launching facilities at Bell expense. Launching date of the first Bell satellite will be determined by the availability of suitable rocket vehicles.

NASA has taken the position that the Bell System satellite trial should wait until after experiments with a proposed new NASA active satellite.

It has called for bids on this satellite, expected to be launched as Project Relay in mid-1962. The first launching vehicles available to NASA for space communications tests will be used in this project.

The Bell System position is clear: We are ready to proceed with trial of an active satellite at our own expense at the earliest possible launching date.

Provision of satellite communications by common carriers is in line with U.S. national policy and does not conflict with the aims and responsibilities of NASA to foster rapid development.

Unnecessary delay could be harmful to our national security, to U.S. prestige, and would postpone international television and other forms of communications not feasible today. Furthermore, the results of trials pointed as directly as possible toward a commercial satellite system are urgently needed to prepare the U.S. position for international space conferences in 1962 and 1963.

Only the cooperation of our Government—by making available launching and tracking services—is needed to get the trial underway.

To Amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 To Provide That the Cost of All Medicine and Drugs for the Taxpayer and His Spouse, Rather Than Only the Excess Over 1 Percent of Adjusted Gross Income as Otherwise Provided, May Be Included in Computing the Medical Expense Deduction Where Such Taxpayer or Spouse Is 65 or Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that will assist our senior citizens in meeting the high cost of medical, hospital, and drug expenses by permitting taxpayers 65 or over to deduct the cost of all medicines and drugs, rather than only the excess over 1 percent of adjusted gross income as otherwise provided, when computing the medical expense deduction in their income tax returns.

No similar legislation was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means during the past Congress, although three similar bills were introduced by Members of Congress. The only liberalization enacted during the past Congress removed the 3 percent of adjusted gross income limitation in the case of medical expenses incurred by a taxpayer for a dependent father or mother who was of the age of 65 or over. As under prior law, however, this 1 percent limitation rule continues to be applicable to all taxpayers regardless of their age.

I have been concerned about this for some time, and ever since I have been in Congress have tried to find solutions to this problem. I strongly urge that serious consideration be given to my bill during this session of Congress to alleviate this particular problem.

Government Patent Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a special subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics looked into the question of whether the present patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 have been hobbling our space effort. That committee reported to the 86th Congress that these provisions should be modified.

Our colleague, Congressman EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, was one of the members of that subcommittee. He participated actively in its work and he spoke on the floor of the House when we passed the bill. Recently, he was asked to talk on the general subject of Government patent policy at the Government contracts briefing conference of the Federal Bar Association in Philadelphia.

I believe his speech sets out a distinct viewpoint of what that policy should be. I recognize that a strong controversy exists in this area, and that others hold opposing theories. I believe we will be hearing more of this subject in the coming session and I strongly recommend attention to this statement which I offer for the RECORD:

GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

(Remarks by Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, of Connecticut, at the Government contracts briefing conference, Federal Bar Association and National Bureau of Standards, Philadelphia, Pa., February 10, 1961)

The theme of this discussion is "What the Government Patent Policy Should Be." That is a broad topic these days. Certainly I am neither knowledgeable enough nor rash enough to make any positive prediction on the precise question.

But I will make several preliminary observations in regard to (1) the extent of Government interest in patents in the future; (2) what future policy will not be, and (3) something it should not be.

As to the extent of Government interest—you can be sure this will become increasingly high. For one thing, research and development in itself is now one of the Nation's leading industries—a fact deftly emphasized by the late economist Sumner Slichther when he said: "The discovery that an enormous amount of research can be carried on for profit is surely one of the most revolutionary economic discoveries of the last century."

Another reason is that the Federal Government is putting up better than half of all the research and development funds spent in the United States—$8 billion or more annually—and any time Federal money of this magnitude is involved, considerable attention is going to be paid to policies governing its use.

In regard to what Government policy will not be, I think it highly unlikely—no matter how much study and effort is made—that we will ever have a uniform, across-the-board patent policy followed by all agencies of government. I know there has been much sentiment for a uniform policy, but I am inclined to go along with the Comptroller General of the United States. Last year Mr. Campbell told our Committee on Science and Astronautics that any overall patent policy will nonetheless have to give "recognition to the functions and problems peculiar to the activities of individual agencies, as well as the differences in the types of research and development being contracted for by the Government." So while we may see the emergence of broad policies and guidelines, I think we delude ourselves if we anticipate the coming of a truly uniform Federal patent policy in the foreseeable future.

Finally, in connection with what should not be done, let me here state my personal conviction that Federal patent policy must not derogate from or be inimical to the American free enterprise system. Anything which tends to alter that system without a substantial compensating public benefit should be shunned. To my mind, the trend toward sweeping Federal ownership of ideas and inventions as promoted by the National Aeronautics and Space Act does not, in practice, qualify as beneficial either to free enterprise or to the public at large. It should be reversed.

I think it will be reversed. And here let me back up a bit in order to indicate why I think so.

As some of you are aware, the Space Act patent section—which is patterned after the Atomic Energy Act and generally places title to inventions made under research and development contracts in the Government—was written into law in Senate-House conferences without being subjected to hearings.

Ever since the National Aeronautics and Space Act was put into effect, its so-called patent section, section 305, has been subjected to criticism from industry and the professions. Critics have regarded the provision as a step away from those constitutional requirements which are designed to protect the interests of the inventor as well as foster the open publication of inventions. They have expressed particular concern inasmuch as the National Aeronautics and Space Act patent provision is the third major instance since World War II in which Government ownership of inventions has been dealt with by statute. The other instances were the enactment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, under which the Government asserts ownership of inventions, and the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, which, gives discretion to its Director as to the disposition of rights in inventions and patents.

It was largely for these reasons—plus the fact that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had by then had some experience with the practical application of the provision—that the matter was reviewed under the aegis of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

In August 1959, Representative OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana, chairman of the committee, appointed a special seven-man Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions. He appointed Representative Erwin Mitchell, of Georgia, as chairman, and I had the privilege of serving on that subcommittee.

The new subcommittee undertook initial background hearings immediately. Representatives from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration appeared that month in order to brief the subcommittee and advise it on the effect of the patent provision of the Space Act as it now stands. During these hearings Space Administration officials disclosed that they planned to ask for a change in the provision as part of their 1960 legislative program. For this reason, more extensive hearings were scheduled at a later date in order to give the Space Administration an opportunity to finalize its planned revision and have it cleared by proper authorities.

On November 30, 1959, the subcommittee met to consider the problem in detail. In the course of 12 sessions, running from November 30 through December 5, the subcommittee endeavored to hear all competent Government witnesses as well as all private witnesses who wished to appear.

NASA's recommendations for change approximated the approach of the National Science Foundation—that is, to leave the question of invention ownership to the discretion of the Administrator, who should act "in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the contractor."

On this proposal, the subcommittee received testimony from some 60 witnesses from throughout the Nation and sought to obtain all possible points of view in order to assure a complete record on the subject. The subcommittee agreed to leave the record open for an additional 2 weeks in order to accommodate those who could not appear but who might wish to file statements.

In deciding to recommend a change in the law, the subcommittee recognized that research and development is the heart and soul of the space program and promises to remain so. It recognized that the current law places an unnecessary burden on NASA because, first, it forces NASA to deal with contractors on a different basis from the Defense Department, which normally requires only a royalty-free license to inventions produced under its contracts—although both agencies often contract with the same contractors on similar work. Secondly, the law makes it difficult for NASA to secure the best research for lowest cost and in the shortest time.

We actually found some instances in which the contractors refused to take NASA contracts, but far more important was the obvious fact that contractors who are required to surrender commercial rights to their inventions just do not give NASA their best efforts.

Please note that in more than 2 years of NASA operations involving close to a thousand research contracts, each of which required full disclosure of technical information, only about 50 disclosures of possible patentable inventions or processes were made. This strikes me as rather eloquent proof that the Space Act patent section is not doing what its proponents claim for it. One must conclude, I think, that in its relationships with NASA, industry is careful to utilize almost exclusively developments already under patent or patent application.

In any case, our patent subcommittee approved the change in the NASA Act, but modified it by requiring that in all instances NASA secure from its contracts not less than a royalty-free, irrevocable license. We also stipulated that such license should be sufficient unless greater rights are required under other Federal laws or are deemed necessary by the Administrator in the interest of the national security or welfare. Finally we added, as part of the legislative history, a statement of intent designed to guide the Administrator in determining whether or not to take title to inventions.

This approach was approved by the full committee and passed the House of Representatives last June by a vote of 269 to 120 on a motion to recommit and 235 to 31 on passage of the bill.

The Senate, however, did not take up the bill, so the original patent provision remains in force.

In response to some of the criticism which industry has suffered because of its insistence on patent rights, let me inject a bit of personal philosophy.

I am well aware that some segments of American business have been frowned on as unpatriotic when they drag their feet about doing research work for the Government under contracts which require them to surrender commercial rights in inventions. Perhaps there are instances where this is justified.

But I want to quote this bit from our subcommittee report:

"There are hard reasons why individual contractors do not wish to be classified as ones holding out on research efforts so vital to the Nation. To do so places management officials between the devil and the deep. They are responsible under the private enterprise system for operating a profitable business, yet if they decline Government business because it is unprofitable, they become vulnerable to charges of lack of patriotism. American industry should not be placed in this awkward, often injurious, position."

I subscribe to that position wholeheartedly.

It also seems pertinent to ask what happens when the Government does take title to inventions produced under its research contracts.

If Federal ownership gave the Government an advantage it does not receive from an irrevocable royalty-free license, if it normally enhanced the public interest, if it actually stimulated commercial use of the invention—then the Government pays—Government must own concept would indeed be valid. Inquiry, however, shows that in a heavy majority of cases Government ownership accomplishes none of these things.

The Government does not make, and never has made, any significant effort to protect its patents, or see that they are worked. It does not sue infringers. Neither does it grant exclusive licenses, without which the invention is generally ignored by private industry. Moreover, expert testimony indicates that if the Government did these things on a large scale, it would be competing with private enterprise to the serious detriment of the latter.

This being the situation, there is little apparent value to the Government in claiming title to such inventions. The license which it receives is a broad one. It not only permits complete Government use of the invention with no payment of royalties, but it allows the invented article to be produced by any contractor chosen. The Government has statutory authority to make, or have made, for Government purposes, any patented product without being subject to injunction, and without subjecting its product supplier to suit. In these cases the only remedy is a suit against the Government for reasonable royalties in the Court of Claims (28 U.S.C. 1498).

Fundamentally, we need to take another look at the Constitution, which gives Congress power to "promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their writings and discoveries."

Under this provision and the patent laws promulgated under it, we have done pretty well for 160 years in fostering technical ingenuity and disseminating scientific information. Nor should we forget that the Government exacts a quid pro quo for its patent protection—and that is to make public complete information concerning the patented invention or process.

Using such a system, we have seen entire firms, companies, corporations—even industries—arise from the willingness of private capital to exploit protected inventions. This has meant more and better jobs, improved standards of living, and a continuing flow of opportunity for the imaginative and the industrious. It is the only part of our economical concept designed to promote monopoly. But the patent monopoly, also by design, is temporary. And as a matter of fact it rarely lasts the full 17 years; in today's world of rapid communications and technological improvement, the effective life of a patent is usually cut short by marked improvements.

The extreme importance of the patent to private initiative, however, is well illustrated by business in my own Connecticut district of Hartford County.

For example, the Kamman Aircraft Co., which produces vertical-lift aircraft and employs more than 5,000 people, owes its entire existence to one or two patents. In addition, the United Aircraft Co., which is the largest single employer in the State, began its present corporate life in 1925 on the strength of a few internal combustion patents.

Of course there is nothing unique about this. It has happened all across the country. I recall that in testimony before our committee last year, officers of Raytheon Manufacturing Co., in Waltham, Mass., reported that Raytheon's phenomenal post-World War II growth emanated from several basic patents held on the magnetron tube.

This bring me back to the question of why I think the recent trend toward Government ownership of patents arising from Federal research and development contracts will be, if not revised, at least modified.

When our patent subcommittee began work on this problem in 1959, it soon became apparent that while we were concerned primarily with the national space program—that program actually spread across the entire industrial spectrum: electronics, metals, fuels, ceramics, machinery, plastics, instruments, textiles, thermals, cryogenics, and a hundred other areas. Consequently we received a comprehensive picture of professional thinking on the research problem—from large and small business, from Government, from the legal profession, and from educators. There was nothing provincial about it.

From our study we concluded that a compromise position was both possible and desirable.

We could not concur with the theory that the Government should own every invention produced, in whole or in part, with Government research money. This was because—in addition to the practical reasons I have already mentioned—legal reasons also dictate against it. In most instances the Government receives the consideration it bargains for when it receives free use of all developments resulting from its contracts.

On the other hand, we could not go along with those who argue that there are never any circumstances under which the Government should obtain title. We felt that there were some—such as those involving the public health and safety, unjust enrichment, technology without commercial significance, technology developed entirely at Government instance and expense, etc.

So we sought a middle way and expressed it in our Statement of Intent designed to guide the NASA Administrator in his determination of patent ownership.

I believe these efforts have borne fruit, for they appear to be at least partly responsible for moves on the part of the two big research agencies who are at opposite poles of the patent question—the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission—to modify their positions toward the center.

On February 2 this year, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Mr. Bannerman) wrote a letter to Chairman BROOKS, of our committee, in which he stated that a new armed services procurement regulation—to become effective February 15—would recognize instances where it may be desirable to secure title to inventions made under military research contracts. "This recognition," it was stated, "can in large measure be attributed to the work of your committee in endorsing the work of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions."

At the same time, it is interesting to note that subsequent to the work of our committee, the Atomic Energy Commission has issued a regulation permitting private contractors to secure greater rights in nuclear inventions for production abroad. In fact, the new regulation, effective January 11 this year, leaves the title in the contractor for purposes of foreign patents—subject to a free Government license and certain other licensing conditions. I am not suggesting that the AEC action resulted from our efforts, but I do believe that the light thrown on the subject by the proposed NASA patent amendments served to stimulate the review process.

Thus, there may be a gradual converging of the extreme positions on this problem into a workable and enduring middleway.

This is my hope at any rate, for I believe that a big part of our Nation's future welfare depends on it.

Inventors' Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, one of the many ways in which the people of North Dakota have sought to encourage inventive genius and new industry has been through the sponsorship and support of an annual Inventors' Congress.

The North Dakota Inventors' Congress was first suggested by Andrew Freeman of Grand Forks, N. Dak., to the Greater North Dakota Association which joined with the Inventors Industry Association of America, the industrial committee of the Devils Lake Chamber of Commerce and the North Dakota Junior Chamber of Commerce in sponsoring the first Inventors' Congress.

This first Inventors' Congress was held in Devils Lake, N. Dak., January 20–21, 1957, and as an outgrowth of this congress, the North Dakota Inventors' Association was organized. The original board of directors of this association consisted of Carl F. Smith, president; Milton Ekron, secretary-treasurer; Homer Ludwick, Otis Bryant, L. A. Joyce, Leo Steinman, and C. E. Martin.

The stated purposes of this organization are to "promote and encourage inventions and scientific research, to conduct tests and work to establish standards and codes, to encourage the scientific advancement of its members, to assist each other in protecting and promoting patentable ideas, and to help promote the North Dakota Inventors' Congress."

This year's report on the annual congress lists 687 inventions which have been displayed during the 5 years the Inventors' Congress has been held.

It represents an outstanding effort on the part of the people of North Dakota to show appreciation of inventiveness and a fine contribution to the industrial development of North Dakota.

The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Receives 1960 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the 10th annual state of the Nation dinner of National Business Publications, Inc., at the Sheraton-Park in Washington, D.C., on January 27, 1961, at which the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, presented the 1960 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications, Inc.—highest tribute of the specialized business press—to Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, for "distinguished statesmanship in behalf of freedom, service, and industry."

This annual Washington dinner traditionally features a question-and-answer period participated in by Cabinet officers, industry and labor leaders, and ambassadors, operating under a tight 2-minute rule for answers. All questions and answers were in keeping with the theme of dinner—"New Frontiers for Business Communication"—and were designed to measure the economic future of America as the state of the Nation was weighed and balanced on the scales of the business community.

Presentation was made before an overflow audience of 1,700 top-management leaders from most of the best-known identifications throughout the sciences, professions, and industries of America at the specialized business press event which remains one of the most notable yearly occasions in this Capital which is accustomed to the best of brilliant banquets.

National Business Publications, sponsors of the award and dinner, is the international association of publishers of over 200 technical, professional, industrial, scientific, merchandising, and marketing magazines in this country and Canada, all independently owned, audited and published. Among the association's principles of practice, all important is the one which pledges active allegiance to the American economic system of free competition. Therein lies the reason for the state of the Nation dinner.

Sound business decisions are essential to continued prosperity in this enlightened economy. Business Publications are dedicated to the proposition of providing a continuing flow of knowledge specific to such determinations. Reason enough why NBP seeks each year to present the Silver Quill Award to that person who has best epitomized those principles for which it stands and through which it serves. The Silver Quill, like the organization which awards it, is synonymous with consecrated service to business and industry and to the Government which guarantees our freedom of enterprise and its interpretation.

Past recipients of the Silver Quill Award and the year for which each was so honored are: 1959, Gen. James H. Doolittle, chairman of the board, Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.; 1958, Sam Rayburn, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Joseph W. Martin, Jr., former Speaker of the House of Representatives; 1957, Benjamin F. Fairless, president, American Iron & Steel Institute and longtime former head of United States Steel Corp.; 1956, Harry F. Byrd, chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate; 1955, Charles F. Kettering, deceased, former director and research consultant, General Motors Corp.; 1954, Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States and Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; 1953, Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States; 1952, Bernard C. Duffy, vice chairman of the board, Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn; 1951, Paul Wooton, chairman, executive committee, Society of Business Magazine Editors.

The excerpts from the dinner program follow:

STATE OF THE NATION DINNER AND SILVER QUILL AWARD PRESENTATION, 1961

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES LOUIS J. PERROTTET, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., AND VICE PRESIDENT, CONOVER-MAST PUBLICATIONS, INC.

Ladies and gentlemen, as always, it is our sincerest hope that the state of the Nation dinner will continue its prophecy of ever better times to come. Here—at our head table—are leaders from the free world of Government and industry. Here are the men who will carve out the new frontiers of our free enterprise. They have graciously consented to answer one specific question related to our dinner theme: "New Frontiers for Business Communication." All have agreed to abide by our custom of a tight 2-minute rule. We are also privileged by the presence at our podium of a world-renowned news analyst, commentator, and correspondent. And, to you who number among his millions of Sunday night enthusiasts, he is the moderator of "What's My Line?" He is to be our moderator tonight, asking the program questions. It is my extreme pleasure to present to you Mr. John Daly.

REMARKS BY JOHN CHARLES DALY, DISTINGUISHED NEWS ANALYST AND COMMENTATOR

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Vice President, Admiral Burke, and other members of this distinguished company, I am indeed honored to be a part of this highly respected occasion. I am indebted to my neighbors and friends, who are members of your fraternity, for making it possible. Answers to our questions follow in the order listed in your program. I will initiate each question by simply announcing the name of the speaker. And, now—if the panel is ready—and in keeping with our theme, "New Frontiers for Business Communication," we begin with Mr. Ambassador Muller.

Questions and answers

Walter Muller, the Ambassador of Chile

Mr. DALY. Mr. Ambassador Muller, if we would increase the economic force of our hemisphere, how do you envision the future role of the specialized business press in channeling the communication of ideas instrumental to an adequate exchange of trade and to the advancement of all of the American Republics?

Mr. MULLER. A fast increase of the economic forces of our hemisphere is an absolute necessity to solve the increasing pressure for higher standards of life in our Latin American countries.

The press, in general, has been called the fourth unofficial power of any free state.

Economic development implies higher production, improved quality, and intensified interchange of commodities and finished goods.

The specialized business press is the most adequate way to convey ideas and methods toward those aims. It bridges the necessary contacts between available capital on one end with development possibilities and lack of resources on the other.

Modern industry requires ever increasing specialization and machinery to produce quality goods at convenient prices. The business press keeps the information channels open to supply the knowledge of those improved methods.

Production without markets is a waste of capitals and efforts. Markets without goods represent an unfortunate loss of possibilities. I am sure that the specialized business press will face the challenge of faster economic development and improve its methods to fulfill this important task.

George Meany, President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations

Mr. DALY. Mr. Meany, reliable researchers substantiate the contention that advertising as well as the editorial content of specialized business publications is read for information and instruction—which would seemingly provide a distinct difference between business-press advertising and that carried by general interest publications. Since criticism in some quarters labels all advertising as simply an additional cost to the consumer, would you be good enough to give us your reactions to the economic force of business communication as represented by the specialized business press which must, characteristically, encompass only advertising of a technical or know-how nature?

Mr. MEANY. It is obvious that advertising of any kind should represent something more than merely an additional cost to the consumer.

Technical information, new processes, new products can be advertised skillfully and usefully in the specialized business press.

It is important that information about the many advances in technology, science, and industrial know-how receive as wide distribution as possible. Progress and competition can best be served by a wide knowledge of the different developments in the different fields of endeavor in American life.

To the extent that specialized advertising can promote competition and can lead to greater efficiency in production and distribution, it can, of course, aid the consumer. We certainly hope that such advertising will consistently be used to serve that end. This requires, however, that the advertising include detailed information, accurate description, and careful analyses concerning the product or process involved.

From my point of view, as a trade unionist, I am hopeful that the interest of competition

and greater efficiency could be served by specialized advertising, so that the consumer will really benefit from the variety of products and ideas that are developing every day in the industrial and agricultural world. Of equal importance, of course, is the necessity that the machines and processes and chemicals produced by those who advertise them are made under the most favorable working conditions in America—conditions that insure adequate labor standards. As you know, one form of advertising the labor movement has consistently supported is the advertising of the union label as a mark of decent working conditions.

* * * * *

John B. Connally, Jr., the Secretary of the Navy

Mr. DALY. Mr. Secretary Connally, the ships of our Navy not only serve as emissaries of good will wherever they sail; they also communicate the image of U.S. strength and security. In supporting that image—in reciprocating the good will it engenders—do you consider it imperative that we utilize our channels of business communication to share the fruits of our technology, and thus encourage the economic growth of other members of our family of free nations?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Daly, my answer to that, very simply, is "Yes." In my opinion, international relations should be everyone's business. Those relatively few Americans—and I assume that there is a large percentage of them here tonight—who are privileged to visit, to do business with, to have contacts with our neighbors throughout the free world should always be aware of the role that they play in these contacts and in these relations.

The Navy, Mr. Daly, as your question implies, has always taken a great deal of interest in this very thing. It's easy for us. The very nature of the naval operations makes the whole of the free world our close neighbors. People-to-people activities have long been a Navy tradition and a proud heritage of the Navy. Businesses—foreign and domestic—are no different. They are made up and run by and for people.

Now, the idea of using your channels of business communication—to foster a new business-to-business program—should provide an important new channel of communication between this Nation and other nations and peoples of the free world. Certainly, if it is an effective program, it will do much to engender, to foster and insure mutual understanding which is so vital and necessary now among all the peoples of the free world.

Raymond E. Olson, President, Taylor Instrument Cos.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Olson, in the area of communication relating to results from research and development which are customarily made available to industry via the specialized business press—do you experience any detriment to your production and distribution which could be attributed to the classification of technical material? Of course—my question is in no way meant to refer to the declassifying of any material which might endanger the national security.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Daly, ladies and gentlemen, we in industry, of course, do not know what we have missed. In the first place, I would like to say that we in industry do not advocate releasing classified research data which, if released, would endanger our national security.

It is possible, however, that certain of our agencies in the Government have information which might be helpful to the industry. For example, the Navy might have information on ultrasonics which would be helpful to industry if released. That may apply, also, to unusual high-temperature materials. Still another example might be in the field of computors, where the Pentagon must have a wealth of data which could be immediately useful to manufacturers.

The Research Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers has, I believe, recommended that such data be automatically released after a 2- or 3-year period. It should, of course, be carefully screened before release. It so happens that the Atomic Energy Commission has a very active program to systematically declassify material which is very useful to industry. We do not know of any other Government agency which is operating accordingly.

To us, unnecessary withholding of potentially useful material derived from many of Uncle Sam's programs, imposes a triple penalty—the individual company, the industry involved and our position in international trade are handicapped possibly by duplicated expense and unusual and unnecessary delay.

To us, the specialized business press—represented by this occasion tonight—is a logical medium for communicating declassified material in keeping with its role of supplying useful information to business and industry.

Koichiro Asakai, the Ambassador of Japan

Mr. DALY. Mr. Ambassador Asakai, in your country—as in ours—business communication is recognized as the lifeline of industrial and commercial progress. In the dissemination of technical and professional information through both its advertising and editorial pages—how do you estimate the strategic importance of your own specialized business press in stimulating productivity and the expansion of international trade?

Mr. ASAKAI. One of the dividends enjoyed by a nation with a high literacy rate is the great respect accorded to the written word. Despite the great expansion of the radio and television media in Japan in recent years, books, magazines, and newspapers have one of the largest and most appreciative body of consumers in the world. For example, daily newspaper circulation per capita of total population is one of the highest in the world.

Similarly, business, professional, and technical journals abound, and there is scarcely an industry in Japan, even quite narrowly defined, which does not have a trade publication or journal. Many in this audience know that these technical and business publications are full of reports on the latest worldwide developments in technology, management, marketing, and other matters of direct and practical concern to operating businesses.

One index of the importance accorded advertising, for example, is that the leading advertising firm in Japan ranks fifth in the world after the four leading firms in the United States.

In direct reply to your question, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the business press in Japan is as important as it is in the United States in stimulating productivity and in increasing domestic and international trade. I might also add that precisely because the press is important, any adverse trade news or even rumors, emanating from abroad, is widely and quickly disseminated in Japan. This shows how sensitive Japan is to trade problems and developments and explains her great dependence on foreign trade for her national survival.

Russell DeYoung, President, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

Mr. DALY. Mr. DeYoung, business communication—as evidenced by the special-interest advertising and editorial material found in business publications—cuts across all other boundaries, in providing our free world business communities with unmatched approaches to mutual respect and cooperation. Since your operations are worldwide and so closely related to the export potential of American-made products, what is your concept of the specialized business press as an international marketing medium?

Mr. DEYOUNG. Mr. Daly, advertising and other forms of business communication can gain new stature in these troubled times by assuming the role of ambassador, as well as salesman, in the international field.

We, as a nation, can do much to neutralize other political beliefs by effectively communicating the philosophy of American business life to the citizens of other countries.

After World War II, communism flourished openly in many European lands. The Reds brought Rome, Paris, and other capitals almost to their knees with general strikes. A creeping socialism threatened England. There was little industry and few markets for products.

But, as the economic picture strengthened, the Reds and their allies declined in popularity. The Communist threat to take over governments by electoral victories weakened.

Can the specialized business press help keep this victory for democracy won? It can—by proclaiming the advantages of a system that rewards individual initiative.

Operating for a profit is not an international disgrace. Because America has operated on this philosophy since 1776, there is a strong Western Europe today and a healthy economic revival in Japan.

In many U.S. industries—including ours—the international field is the fastest growing market. Distances are shrinking daily. But shortening these lifelines is of little value to the world economy, if the peace is constantly threatened.

It would seem that communications in Business Publications could well serve a dual role by selling the concept of free enterprise, as well as our products, in foreign lands.

Call it what you will, patriotism or self-preservation, we of the free world are all seeking the same end.

J. Edward Day, the Postmaster General

Mr. DALY. Mr. Postmaster General—until just a week ago—you were a senior officer with the third largest corporation in the world. Tonight, you are the chief executive of the biggest business of its kind, reaching out into every community at every level of national activity. As such—do you think, in your new assignment, you will apply the principles you followed in a private business enterprise?

Mr. DAY. Let me say that, while I do not believe the Post Office Department is completely like a private business, we intend to run it in a most businesslike way.

The question from your chairman gives me an opportunity to express publicly, for the first time, some of the basic ideas which we bring to this Department. In the first place, the Post Office has the primary responsibility of providing a real service to the people of this country. As part of that service, the Department performs functions far removed from the normal transmission of communications—even to the registration of 3 million aliens a year and even selling migratory bird stamps.

While we aim at increased efficiency, lower cost, and better service, we fully realize that the post office today must fulfill many roles that are far broader than mere communications.

We feel that the most efficient and economical movement of the mails is our No. 1 objective. We further feel that the new administration can and will make new and immediate economies in its management and publicity functions.

We will now be able to study at firsthand the manifold opportunities for long-range cost-cutting programs, elimination of frills and our own opportunities to create a realistic budget. This budget will be based on a

thorough appraisal of the relationship between our cost, the huge deficit we have inherited and the functions which the post office performs, which are comparable to private business versus those which are of a unique public service character.

Frank Pace, Jr., Chairman of the Board, General Dynamics Corp.

Mr. DALY. Mr. Pace, the vast undersea area of the globe began to be exploited last year for the first time for strategic missile deterrence by the Polaris system. Major upcoming advances in knowledge and use of the seas include an attempt to punch a hole through the hard crust of the earth, known as "Mohole"; increased missile activity on the surface and below the seas; achievement of economical desalinization of sea water. Can you comment on those developments; can you offer suggestions which will enable the business press of the Nation to keep on top of such developments?

Mr. PACE. John Daly, I ponder deeply on this question. The next 40 years for America is going to be a period of crisis. Winston Churchill described a crisis as a dangerous opportunity. In America, we came to think that when we conquered the West that we might have reached the ultimate in achievement. And yet, it's well to remember that two-thirds of the world's surface is submerged under water. And that world is still quite unknown to us. We haven't reached it, we haven't conquered it, we haven't even understood it. We have made the start.

Today, one of the great strengths of the free world lies in the Polaris launching submarine which lends itself to our philosophy of defense through strength. As we probe our way into the ocean's depths, we find not only new phenomena, but new sources of food and new sources of mineral.

As we reach for desalinization of sea water, we find a solution to the great problem of our times—hunger. Communism feeds on the hungry. When we reach out with our competence—our urge for the future to solve that problem—we are realizing the quality of democracy.

And, if we are going to do it, we're going to do it through the system that has taken us where we are today—the free enterprise system. The free enterprise system functions only when it is challenged as well as understood.

The function of the business press is not just to praise it or to make it understood, but to challenge it and to criticize it. If this is done, then this system that has served us so well in the past will be a means of carrying us down the high road of the future to leadership of the free world.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES LOUIS J. PERROTTET

Ladies and gentlemen—we come now to the climax of our evening and that ever proud moment for the specialized business press—the presentation of its Silver Quill Award. You may be sure that there were numerous candidates recommended to the selection committee—all outstanding; all deserving. However, none sparkled with such brilliance as the naval hero who is to receive our highest tribute tonight.

We are greatly favored by the presence of another great man of far-reaching leadership throughout the free world. A statesman of no small stature—a Senator and majority leader of unprecedented accomplishment—and now the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Vice President—the Business Press of America is and always will be honored by its association with you and your momentous endeavor. We are delighted to have you here—not only in your newest capacity, but as a distinguished naval officer and flyer—to present the Silver Quill Award for 1960.

REMARKS OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, IN PRESENTING THE 1960 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman, Lieutenant Daly, most distinguished guests, my friends and sponsors of the Silver Quill—20 years ago this month, I was a shipmate in the Navy with two of your most distinguished guests this evening—Ensign Connally, who is now your Secretary, and Lieutenant Commander Burke, who is now the Chief of Naval Operations. And I am the oldest commander, in grade, in the history of the U.S. Navy.

My memory goes back to the closing of the Texas Legislature some 30 years ago, in the middle of the depression, when the Texas senator who had authored the Economy Act called up a friend of his who was a judge in his hometown, and said, "Judge, I just wanted to tell you that we passed the economy bill tonight and abolished your court." The judge said, "You didn't do it without a hearing did you?" He said, "No, we had a hearing." "Well," he said, "who testified that my court ought to be abolished?" The senator said, "Well, the mayor testified." The judge said, "Well, let me tell you about that mayor. We had to burn up several ballot boxes in every county to elect the man the first time." "Well," the senator said, "he wasn't the only one that testified. The president of the bar association testified that we didn't need two courts." "Well," he said, "let me tell you about the president of the bar association. He represents the criminal element in our section." "Well," he said, "the banker testified that we could do without your court." "Well," he said, "let me tell you about that banker and all of his family. They have been charging usurers rates ever since that bank got its first charter." "Well," he said, "Judge, I think I ought to tell you that I was just kidding you after all. A motion was made to abolish your court, but I fought that motion and I won. The bill has gone to your Governor and your court is still intact." The judge sighed a sigh of relief and said, "Senator, why did you call me up and make me say some ugly things about three of the most beloved friends any man ever had?"

Now, I shall not transgress on your time to talk to you about my beloved shipmates—some of the best friends any man ever had—but I do ask your indulgence for a moment while I speak of one.

All of us, as freedom-loving men and women, are heavily dependent upon dedicated citizens who devote their lives to standing between us and those who are out to destroy the freedoms that we cherish so much. Throughout history, every nation has been deeply indebted to such men, but there has probably never before, in all the history of this Nation, been a time when our debt was deeper.

Tonight, as we meet here, we have reached a stage where total tyranny has become a physical possibility. And we know it would not only be a possibility but a reality, unless we had the capacity to fight back against aggression.

We have come here tonight to honor a man who has devoted his entire life to the defense of our freedom. This is a man whose name has become legendary in his own lifetime and who will certainly be remembered as one of the most outstanding military figures in the history of the world. He has fought for us in time of war; he has fought to prepare us in time of peace.

I cherish this privilege and I am proud of the distinct honor that is given to me tonight to present the Silver Quill Award to an old friend, to a fighting sailor, but, most of all, to a great American—Arleigh A. Burke.

REMARKS OF ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE, THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, IN RECEIVING THE 1960 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 27, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, an honor such as this can only be accepted with great pride. But it is pride tempered with humility.

To live up to the principles inherent in this award will indeed be a high goal. But the obligation to make the endeavor will always be with me.

These state of the Nation dinners, however, are far more than occasions to honor individuals. These meetings held by the National Business Publications perform outstanding service for our country.

This annual forum brings together the leaders of government and industry to discuss and develop solutions to our national problems. And throughout the year, the business press continues to help solve those problems. It provides a main channel of information—of technical knowledge and professional experience—that is essential in maintaining the world leadership of the United States in the years ahead.

Today the United States is the strongest nation in the world—politically, economically and militarily. As a nation, we have the power to overcome the perils of the future and still further we have the wisdom and the ability to exploit the opportunities of the future.

Our goals are not easy ones. We face a great many problems and underlying most of our problems is the Communist ambition to dominate the world.

In preparing for the uncertainties of the future, we can, however, make plans and in making these plans we do have certain beacons which can guide us safely through treacherous waters.

Our basic national policy is stated simply and directly in the preamble to the Constitution. To perfect our Union, to establish justice and order, to provide for our security, and most of all, to preserve the blessings and responsibilities of liberty for ourselves and for future generations.

These same precepts—these same fundamental concepts—determine the kind of military power we need to safeguard and preserve our precious freedom. For it has become apparent that neither we, nor our freedom, could long exist as an island of liberty, in a world engulfed by communism.

Today our Nation is an integral part of a free world community. And the fortunes of that community bear directly upon the United States.

We are a charter member of the United Nations and a permanent member of its Security Council. We have joined in treaties and coalitions with over 40 other free countries. We are bound by declaration and alliance with NATO, SEATO, and the Organization of American States. We share in the hopes, in the aspirations, and in the efforts of free people all over the world.

This free world unity is of tremendous importance to the United States. Not only in military terms—but in political and economic terms as well. For, as important as military ties—as military alliances may be—the foundation of real military strength is economic productivity and political stability.

The citizens of our great country have willingly supported a very sizable Military Establishment in order to maintain this strength. We have a powerful Air Force, a magnificent Army, a Marine Corps without equal anywhere in the world. And we have the strongest, most effective Navy in history.

The importance of naval power—the importance of control of the seas—is increasing. And this means control not in some vague undefined future but now, today, and every day thereafter. The Navy must main-

tain a position of strength—demonstrable strength—so great as to leave no doubt that we can and will maintain the freedom of the seas.

A look at a globe shows clearly that there is a significant characteristic common to most of the nations of the free world. They border on the sea.

The free world is actually a maritime confederation. This confederation depends for its very existence upon the sea communications which bind it together. Cut off these communications and many countries of the free world would find themselves isolated without help, without supplies, without reinforcements, and at the mercy of some totalitarian aggressor.

From Scandinavia, all the way around to Japan, members of this maritime confederation depend on free world control of the sea for their support. And that is why our Navy's responsibility to control the seas has never been greater than it is today.

Our fleets are guarding the interests of the United States in the principal trouble spots of the world. A few weeks ago they were off the coast of Guatemala and Nicaragua. Today, trouble appears in southeast Asia. Tomorrow, the trouble areas may shift elsewhere.

But wherever trouble is brewing, the U.S. Navy will be first at the scene, ready for action. Our ships will stand guard in troubled waters, as long as it is in the interests of the United States to do so.

Our Navy can move on the oceans wherever it is needed. Our ships can operate on the high seas without raising any problems of foreign sovereignty. They carry the most powerful weapons, but in a quiet unprovoking manner. Our deployed fleets play a dual role. They offer assurance to friends and a warning to aggressors.

The U.S. Navy is ready today. It must be ready to fight and win, today or tomorrow, whenever it is called upon.

Keeping our Navy ready, keeping our Navy supreme on the seas, is everyone's job. Everyone in the U.S. Navy, from seaman to admiral, is working hard at the task of making a better, more effective Navy.

We also need the help of every citizen in the United States. We need their understanding of the tremendous problems we face. We need continued, enthusiastic support in our efforts, from all segments and sections of our Nation.

Many of you here tonight have already contributed tremendously to this task. That is why I welcome this occasion to express my personal and official appreciation to the National Business Press—and to industry which it serves so well—for all that they have contributed to the betterment of the Navy.

Scientists and engineers have helped us simplify the design of our weapons. They have helped us to eliminate unnecessary gadgets, to reduce costs, without sacrificing combat effectiveness.

Such contributions as these are particularly important, because weapons and weapons systems are getting more and more expensive and complex. Savings must be made in every way possible and simplicity in design and operation is vital because our new weapons are not going to be operated by scientists but by the same Navy men who have served their country so well in the past.

The technological progress that is being made today would not be possible without the active and enthusiastic support of manufacturers. The Navy will need that support to conduct research—to close the time-gap between ideas and actual hardware—to speed up our progress and our deliveries of weapons to the fleet—to stay at maximum readiness.

But readiness is not alone a matter of material. Readiness cannot be bought with money—for readiness is also a state of mind: It is the diligence and zeal of the scientist; it is the enthusiasm and wisdom of the teacher; it is the will and determination of all our citizens.

A sense of pride in one's work, a sense of urgency in personal accomplishment, the qualities of alertness, imagination, and competitive enterprise—these are the vital ingredients of national readiness.

These are the qualities which our Nation must have in the critical times ahead. I am confident that the people of the United States have these qualities in abundance, and that they will use them wisely and well.

Once again, thank you for the great honor which you have bestowed upon me. The Silver Quill is an honor that I will always cherish and tonight is an evening that I will never forget.

Mr. Paul Wooton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1961

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when Mr. Paul Wooton, the distinguished senior Washington correspondent for the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune and the beloved and respected dean of the press corps in our Nation's Capital, passed to the other side of eternity, our country and my State lost a most valuable human asset.

During a full and fruitful lifespan of 79 years, Paul Wooton left his mark upon the times in which he lived. A gentleman in the fullest sense of the meaning of the word, he was an outstanding member of the Fourth Estate, respected and loved by his colleagues and close associates and sincerely admired by all who knew him well, and he was the personification of good citizenship at its best.

At funeral rites on Saturday, Mr. Wooton's minister paid tribute to his life and his work in this manner:

If you were a journalist he was what you would want to be, and as a man he was what you would want your son to become.

It was a great honor and privilege for me to have known Paul Wooton as a man and friend and newspaperman. And now, with a deep sense of personal loss, I join in extending my sympathy to his three surviving sisters and to his close associates and coworkers.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we come before Thee on this anniversary of the birthday of the founder of this Nation, to participate in a traditional ceremony that has been observed in the Senate for many years since his death. In honoring him today, we honor ourselves; and, through honoring him, we honor Thee for the blessings which Thou didst bestow on him in the days of his service to this Nation.

The problems he faced were much the same as the ones we face today; only the circumstances are different. These problems grow essentially out of the weakness of man; and their solution must be found in the strength that man can draw from the inspiration received from Thee and received from men such as George Washington.

As we face our responsibilities, we ask that Thou wilt bless us, in our turn, as he was blessed. Bless us, we pray, that we may draw inspiration from his example, and may draw strength from the record of his strength. We realize that, essentially, all his strength came from Thee; and we seek Thee as our source of strength in our time of need.

Bless us, we pray, that we may be able to preserve the haven of peace and liberty which he helped to create.

We ask these blessings in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 20, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee had appointed Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas, Mr. KING, of California, Mr. O'BRIEN, of Illinois, Mr. MASON, of Illinois, and Mr. BYRNES, of Wisconsin as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, and Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois, as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, vice Mr. YATES and Mr. IKARD of Texas, excused.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the reading of the Farewell Address by our first President, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY AND THEN TO TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the session on Friday, the Senate adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON FRIDAY FOR SENATOR HENNINGS AND SENATOR-ELECT THOMSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the Senate has entered into an agreement that on Friday next, memorial addresses for the late Senator Thomas Hennings and the late Senator-elect Keith Thomson will be delivered in this Chamber.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the agreement previously entered into, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] will now proceed to the rostrum, to read the Farewell Address delivered by the first President of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER advanced to the desk, and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium

of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering, and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. That *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic and western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calulated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government. But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying

afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame lest instead of warming it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time

and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment and commend the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] for the inspiring rendition he gave of the Farewell Address by George Washington, the first President of our country. I think the reading of the address was timely, because it contains much wisdom and counsel. I am delighted that we have had this opportunity to listen to so eloquent a speaker deliver Washington's Farewell Address on this occasion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to commend my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], upon his very superb presentation of the Farewell Address by George Washington.

A little of the history involved should be known to us: First of all, the address was presented to the people of the United States on the ninth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution, in Philadelphia. The address came on September 17, 1796; and the Constitution was uttered on September 17, 1787.

The great State of Maryland, from which comes our distinguished compatriot, was one of the original colonies and was one of the Original States; and its distinguished representatives at the Constitutional Convention were there to help utter this great document, the framework of liberty, to which the Father of our Country so generously alluded in his Farewell Address.

So, coming, as he does, from one of the Original Colonies and one of the Original States, and inasmuch as the Farewell Address came to the people of the country in the form of an admonition of conduct, on the ninth anniversary of the Constitution, I did not want that fact to go unnoticed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. Let me say to him that I enjoyed very much the privilege and the opportunity of uttering the noble words of our first President. It was really a very exhilarating and thrilling experience.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to share in the expression of appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Maryland. After searching all over the Capitol for a bust of George Washington, in order that the photographer might make a picture of the Senator from Maryland standing by a bust of Washington, I am glad the Senator finally found one in the office of the junior Senator from Virginia. I was glad to make that contribution to the proper publicity to which the Senator is entitled.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I am informed that there is on the Vice President's desk a brief communication from the President of the United States. I ask that it be laid before the Senate and read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1961.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the state of the Union address I asked the Congress for increased discretion to use economic tools as an aid in reestablishing our historic ties of friendship with the people of Eastern Europe.

I urge the Congress to take early action on legislation to accomplish this purpose. Such legislation—along the lines of the amendment to the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, which was passed by the Senate on September 12, 1959—accompanies this letter.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Resolution relating to pear decline

"Whereas a disorder of pear trees called pear decline disease has, since first reported in California in May of 1959, destroyed or seriously affected over 110,000 pear trees; and

"Whereas this disease during 1959 and 1960 swept rampant, particularly through pear groves in El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento and Solano Counties; is a serious problem in Santa Clara, Lake and Yuba Counties, and has been reported from all major pear producing areas in the State; and

"Whereas apparently all commercial varieties of pear trees are affected by the disease; and

"Whereas research to date has so far failed to determine the cause of the disease; and

"Whereas unless action is taken immediately, the State's pear industry, producing an approximate average annual crop valued at $26 million, will be in serious jeopardy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to take such steps as may be necessary to make immediately available sufficient funds to conduct a comprehensive basic research program on the pear decline disease; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1

"A joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas both Houses of the 86th Congress of the United States of America, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the granting of representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia, which proposal is in the following words; namely:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'ARTICLE—

"'SECTION 1. The District constitution the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"SECTION 1. That the said above proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of the joint resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State at Washington, D.C., to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"JOINT MEMORIAL No. 8

"A joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the State of Wyoming relating to the control, development, appropriation, and use of waters within the State's boundaries

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the recognition by the Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the States relating to control, development, appropriation, and use of waters within the States' boundaries is one of the fundamental concepts of Wyoming law and of the reclamation law as stated in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902; and

"Whereas the welfare and interest of the citizens of the State of Wyoming demand the recognition by said Federal agencies of the rights and laws of this State, since waters in this State constitute an important and vital part of the life and economy of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas at the present time there is particular need to reassert and safeguard this fundamental concept of State and Federal law: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor legislation providing for recognition of the rights of the State of Wyoming to regulate and control the appropriation, distribution, and use of waters within this State, and to require compliance with such laws by the Federal agencies and their licensees; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator J. J. Hickey, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation Floyd Dominy."

"JOINT MEMORIAL No. 9

"A joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the costs allocated to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits are now authorized by law as nonreimbursables; and

"Whereas many water development and reclamation projects provide recreational facilities, salinity control, sediment control, public transportation, protection of public health, and protection of national defense benefits which are of more value to a river basin and to the Nation as a whole than they are to the irrigation water users under the projects; and

"Whereas it is no more logical to make the local irrigation water users pay for these benefits to the region and to the Nation than it would be to make them pay for flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits which are now nonreimbursables; and

"Whereas this area of reclamation is one which is of great interest to the citizens of the State of Wyoming: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such legislature concurring), that the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor legislation which would authorize (1) recreational, (2) general salinity control, (3) sediment control, (4) public transportation, (5) protection of public health, (6) promotion of national defense, and (7) fulfillment of international obligation benefits; to be nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator J. J. Hickey, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Floyd Dominy."

JOINT MEMORIAL 10

"A joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small project loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas it has been the experience in the State of Wyoming that the detailed feasibility reports required in connection with the application for a Federal small projects loan are such that the cost of such feasibility reports are clearly out of proportion to the cost of many small supplemental water supply projects in Wyoming that could benefit from such a loan program; and

"Whereas for small supplemental water supply projects for entities within a growing and established agricultural economy, the detailed and costly feasibility studies which are necessary for large new projects are not needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of the 36th Legislature of the State of Wyoming, (the Senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary so that the feasibility reports required in connection with an application for a Federal small project loan for a small supplemental water supply project be required only when such are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator J. J. Hickey, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman and Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, Floyd Dominy."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

"A joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia

"Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States of America, at the 2d session, duly adopted Senate Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment has been submitted to the several States for ratification, and said proposed amendment

to the Constitution of the United States is in the following words, to wit:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as the Congress may direct:

"'A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia be, and the same is, hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of New Mexico, under the great seal, to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Administrator of General Services."

A resolution adopted by the chamber of commerce of Tuolumne County, Calif., relating to an increase in the price of newly mined domestic gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas, commending the Federal Power Commission for holding area prehearing conferences, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH on February 20, 1961, p. 2329, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

ALLEVIATION OF THE FEED-GRAIN SITUATION—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska. The resolution has to do with the consideration the Congress is now giving to farm legislation.

After making a number of recitals which pertain to the situation with which the Nation is faced in connection with its agricultural activities, the resolution provides, in part—

That Congress take immediate steps to alleviate this critical situation with proper legislation.

Mr. President, I must say that the legislature of my State acted with a great deal of restraint. It did not purport to have ready, at hand, any complete panacea or complete solution of the problem. The members of the legislature are experienced legislators, and they know that the processes of enacting into law a bill are many and varied, and that in order to work out a final product, there is required a combination of a great many views and a reconciliation of conflicting views.

However, the problem is a grave and a serious one; and I wish to say that I join in the thinking of the members of the Nebraska unicameral legislature in expressing the hope and giving voice to the prayer that something effective and something that will serve well the purpose will soon be done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal, which I have received from Hugo F. Srb, clerk of the Nebraska State Legislature, and the text of the resolution itself be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBRASKA STATE LEGISLATURE,
February 16, 1961.

Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROMAN: I am enclosing herewith a copy of Legislative Resolution 8 which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 72d regular session on the 13th day of February 1961.

Very truly yours,

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 8

Whereas unrealistic farm programs have resulted in steadily decreasing farm prices and income at the same time that farm costs have continued to mount; and

Whereas the Nation is faced with a critical problem in the extreme overproduction of feed grains because of the maintenance of price supports with no attendant limitations on production, which, unless soon checked, may have disastrous effects on livestock prices; and

Whereas stocks of feed grains have risen at an alarming rate necessitating the spending of huge sums by the Federal Government for storage, which accumulation should be stopped through the gradual reduction of existing stocks to realistic reserve levels outside the domestic commercial market and the development of a program for balancing annual production with market needs while assuring customers of abundant food supplies at prices reasonable to both consumer and farmer; and

Whereas numerous large and powerful farm groups have expressed concern about the accumulation of feed grains as a threat to the family farm, to the consumer, and to all segments of the American economy; and

Whereas a specially constituted Feed-Grain Study Committee, created to recommend action to be taken to cope with the problem of overproduction of feed grains, has made recommendations which have been submitted to the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. Senate which has the apparent approval of major farm groups: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 72d session assembled:

1. That Congress take immediate steps to alleviate this critical situation with proper legislation.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, to the chairmen of the Committees on Agriculture of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and to each Member from Nebraska in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.

I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 8, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 72d regular session on the 13th day of February 1961.

HUGO F. SRB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, over 43 years ago, on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian occupation, the Council of Lithuania proclaimed the country's independence. Two years later, in the Treaty of Moscow, Russia recognized that independence and forever renounced all sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people.

The Russians kept their word for exactly 20 years. Then in 1940, they reoccupied Lithuania, and the country returned to 21 more years of Communist, Nazi, and again Communist, repression, which has continued to this day.

The United States condemned the Soviet aggression in 1940, and refused to recognize the Russian occupation of the country. The sympathies of all Americans are, I am sure, with the enslaved people of this nation, many of whose friends and relatives live in the United States.

I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to place in the RECORD two resolutions adopted by Lithuanian groups in Massachusetts which express their sentiments toward the enslavement of their homeland.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a mass meeting of Lithuanians of Greater Boston held under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Boston in the auditorium of South Boston High School, South Boston, Mass., on February 19, 1961, and attended by more than 1,200 persons with Hon. Edward F. McLaughlin, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts, Hon. Edward J. McCormack, Jr., attorney general of Massachusetts, Hon. John E. Powers, president of Massachusetts Senate, and representatives of the enslaved nations of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Ukraine, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Council of Lithuania, elected by the great Congress of Lithuania in 1917, proclaimed the independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian occupation; and

"Whereas by the Treaty of Moscow of 1920 Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and forever renounced all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and its territory; and

"Whereas the guaranteed liberty of Lithuania was forcibly violated and suppressed by Soviet Russia in 1940 notwithstanding its solemn treaties; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize Soviet occupation of Lithuania; and

"Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims of that area does not and will bear the slightest effect on the leaders of the Soviet Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we express our faith and loyalty in our newly elected President of these United States of America, John F. Kennedy, and to all the forces opposing totalitarian rule and oppression.

"*Resolved,* That we unite in appealing to our representatives in government to exert all their efforts to adopt a clear and firm foreign policy such as America's leadership in world affairs necessitates.

"*Resolved,* That the foreign policy of the United States shall include the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet enslaved nations as an integral and inseparable part of its program.

"*Resolved,* That the United States present to the United Nations General Assembly an amendment to the colonialization resolution so as to effect the freedom of Soviet colonies in eastern and central Europe.

"*Resolved,* That the continued aggression of Soviet Russia in Lithuania, its merciless acts of race extermination, its enslavement of the peoples and confiscation of their property be condemned.

"*Resolved,* That all political and economic pressures be brought to bear on Soviet officials to withdraw its military control of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and other enslaved nations in Europe and to return to those nations their right of self-determination to govern themselves in conformity with democratic principles of freedom and justice.

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be forwarded this day to President John F. Kennedy; Secretary of State Dean Rusk; Senator Leverett Saltonstall; Senator Benjamin Smith; United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson; Congressman and Majority Leader John W. McCormack; Hon. John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Hon. Edward J. McCormack, Jr., attorney general; Hon. John F. Collins, mayor of Boston; to all our Representatives in Congress and to the press."

AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL
OF BOSTON,
JACKUS SONDA, *President.*
ANTHONY J. YOUNG,
Resolutions Chairman.

February 16, 1961, marked the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence by Lithuania to the entire world. For the proper observance of this anniversary, the committee duly elected for this purpose and officially representing 68 organizations from the 2 Lithuanian parishes in Worcester, Mass., St. Casimir's and Our Lady of Vilna, from the Lithuanian Aid Association, and from the Worcester branch of the Lithuanian Community of the United States in America, arranged an appropriate celebration, which took place Sunday, February 19, 1961, at 4 p.m., in Our Lady of Vilna Parish Hall. During this celebration, the official delegates and the more than 1,600 people present unanimously adopted and passed the following resolution:

"Whereas the democratic policy of the Government of the United States has always been never to abandon the principle of freedom for all nations, both large and small, and never to acquiesce in the subjugation of captive nations by ruthless, despotic powers; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a neutral nation, has ever expressed, and continues to express, her determination to be free and independent as is her God-given right; and

"Whereas since June 1940, when her military forces overran the country of Lithuania against the wishes of Lithuanian people, Soviet Russia persists in its policy to deprive Lithuania of her freedom and to subject her people to a most vicious type of persecution, as witness the recent arrest of the Lithuanian bishop, the Most Reverend Julian Steponavicius, for his refusal to ordain to the holy priesthood Soviet spies thoroughly unworthy of ordination; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has rightly refused to recognize de jure the unjust seizure of Lithuania by the Soviet: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Government of the United States, a bulwark of hope and courage to those who champion the God-given rights of man to freedom, continue without ceasing in its policy to refuse to recognize de jure the unjust annexation of Lithuania effected by the brute power of the Soviet military forces; be it further

"*Resolved,* That, in accordance with the principles of political and social justice, Soviet Russia be compelled to leave Lithuania and to arrange for the immediate return to Lithuania all Lithuanians, now forcibly exiled in the barren wastes of Siberia and elsewhere; be it further

"*Resolved,* That, if he be sincere in his recent statement calling for the abolishment of colonialism, the Russian dictator, Khrushchev, permit Lithuania and the other satellite nations in Eastern Europe to hold a free plebiscite with a secret ballot supervised by the United Nations to determine for themselves their own form of government; be it further

"*Resolved,* That all free nations realize that no true peace can exist if nations like Lithuania are to be subjugated to a communistic regime, for Soviet communism is guided by one main principle, the mastery of the entire human race by the Soviet proletariat; be it further

"*Resolved,* That Lithuania, because she has a right to have her case heard by the entire world, be admitted and approved as a member of the United Nations organization; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency the Honorable John F. Kennedy; to the Secretary of State the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. representative to the United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable Leverett Saltonstall and the Honorable Benjamin A. Smith II; to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Harold D. Donohue; and to the press."

JOSEPH W. GLAVICKAS,
Chairman.
MARY T. KLIMKAITIS,
Secretary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOHN G. BONOMI TO TESTIFY FOR THE GOVERNMENT IN THE CASE OF UNITED STATES AGAINST PAUL JOHN CARBO ET AL.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 93) authorizing John G. Bonomi, Assistant Counsel of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary to appear and testify in the case of the United States against Paul John Carbo and others.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, John G. Bonomi, assistant counsel to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, has been requested by Mr. Alvin H. Goldstein, special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, to appear and testify for the Government in the case of United States against Paul John Carbo and others in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Mr. Bonomi was counsel at the hearings which were held by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly when inquiry was made into professional boxing.

The resolution has the approval of the Committee on the Judiciary. It would authorize Mr. Bonomi to attend the mentioned trial and give testimony respecting matters documentary or otherwise which may be deemed material or relevant by the court.

Mr. President, this matter has been discussed with me by the distinguished minority leader, and I have no objection to the consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 93):

Whereas in the case of the United States against Paul John Carbo et al., pending in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, docket number 27973–CD, a written request was made by Alvin H. Goldstein, special assistant to the Attorney General, addressed to John G. Bonomi, assistant counsel of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, requesting that John G. Bonomi appear as a witness before said court to give testimony which may relate to matters which are in the possession and under the control of the Senate; and

Whereas Truman Gibson is a codefendant in the said trial of the United States against Paul John Carbo et al., and

Whereas said Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly held hearings in Washington, District of Columbia, on December 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 14, 1960, concerning the monopoly aspects of professional boxing and has in its possession certain records pertaining to the testimony of the said Truman Gibson before the said subcommittee on December 5 and 6, 1960: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of the Senate no evidence under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States (which possession and control extends to evidence in the possession or under the control of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate) can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession except by its permission; and be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order or process of a court or of a judge thereof or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders or processes of such court or judge that testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or any legal officer for the promotion of justice and further, when it appears that such testimony may involve matters under the control of or in the possession of the Senate, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That John G. Bonomi be, and he hereby is, authorized, in response to the aforementioned request, to attend at the trial of said case, and to testify and to answer such questions as may be put to him, and in the giving of his testimony he be, and he hereby is, specifically authorized to testify concerning matters (documentary or otherwise) which are or have been under the control of, or in the possession of, the

Senate of the United States and which are deemed by the court to be material and relevant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the resolution springs from a rather extensive investigation made by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is the chairman. The subcommittee had before it a great many witnesses, and the name of Mr. Carbo appeared very frequently in his relation to the whole boxing fraternity and in connection with certain activities which seemed to merit real investigation. Mr. Carbo is now summoned by the U.S. attorney in California.

Since Mr. Bonomi, of New York, conducted the investigation at the request of the subcommittee, certain documents and also Mr. Bonomi's personal testimony appear to be necessary. That is the reason for the resolution which comes before the Senate for consideration today. I trust the resolution will merit the approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1026. A bill to establish a National Economic Council for Security and Progress to provide planning and to coordinate programs to meet the Communist challenge in the economic sphere; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1027. A bill to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; and

S. 1028. A bill to amend the transitional provisions of the act approved August 7, 1959, entitled "Nematocide, Plant Regulator, Defoliant, and Desiccant Amendment of 1959"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1029. A bill authorizing certain construction for the protection of the Mystic, Conn., area against hurricane tidal flooding; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 1030. A bill to provide for the relocation of the Fort Peck-Great Falls transmission line in the vicinity of the city of Glasgow, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1031. A bill for the relief of the city of Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1032. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day on the estate known as Terra Rubra, the birthplace of Francis Scott Key, in Carroll County, Md., and at the grave of Key in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Milanne Popovics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. HART, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 1034. A bill relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1035. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to prescribe conditions under which certain periods of employment shall be considered creditable service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1036. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1037. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1038. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Missouri; and

S. 1039. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the western district of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1040. A bill to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1041. A bill to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for Mr. MAGNUSON) (by request):

S. 1042. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1043. A bill to amend section 222(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the service of process in enforcement proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for Mr. MAGNUSON) (by request):

S. 1044. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1045. A bill for the relief of Alvaro Rodriguez Jimenez;

S. 1046. A bill for the relief of Roger Robert Baudry; and

S. 1047. A bill for the relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. CARLSON):

S. 1048. A bill to amend section 9(d)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1049. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to require the disposal of certain surplus land for use in the production of crops through the operation of family-type farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SALUTE TO "UNCLE SAM" WILSON, OF TROY, N.Y., AS AMERICA'S NATIONAL SYMBOL OF "UNCLE SAM"

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas in a world largely hostile to the idea of freedom we must keep alive the cherished values of our way of life; and

Whereas at a moment in our history when we need all our sense of purpose and capability to match the challenge of disciplined communism some say that our national symbol of "Uncle Sam" is archaic and should be disowned; and

Whereas the symbol of "Uncle Sam" was evoked out of the needs of a young nation, and is linked to a grass roots character, Samuel Wilson, of Troy, New York, who still represents the strength and idealism that made up the greatest nation in the world; and

Whereas the story of Samuel Wilson's life, from his early colonial beginnings in Old Menotomy (later West Cambridge, now Arlington, Massachusetts), to his rise to prominence and great public affection and esteem in Troy, New York, where the sobriquet of "Uncle Sam" was given him, is an abridged story of America; and

Whereas the years 1766 to 1854, the years in which Samuel Wilson lived, witnessed the birth and glorious progress of the United States, spanning as they did the period before the Declaration of Independence to the emergence of the United States as a world power; and

Whereas no congressional action has ever been taken to make the symbol of that American tradition, the symbol of "Uncle Sam" official and permanent: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress salutes "Uncle Sam" Wilson, of Troy, New

York, as the progenitor of America's national symbol of "Uncle Sam," and also recognizes Arlington, Massachusetts, famed in the history of America's dawning years, as the birthplace of the said Samuel Wilson.

RESOLUTIONS

PERMANENT FORCE IN THE UNITED NATIONS TO AID IN MAINTAINING PEACE AMONG NATIONS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. JAVITS) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 92) establishing a permanent force in the United Nations to aid in maintaining peace among nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOHN G. BONOMI TO TESTIFY FOR THE GOVERNMENT IN THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST PAUL JOHN CARBO ET AL.

Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 93) authorizing John G. Bonomi, assistant counsel of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary to appear and testify in the case of the United States against Paul John Carbo et al. which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL FOR SECURITY AND PROGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a National Economic Council for Security and Progress. The purpose of the Council—similar to the National Security Council—would be to:

First. Carry out top-level, long-range planning of economic policies and programs;

Second. Dedicate its efforts to maintain a balanced economy—minimizing the up-and-down fluctuations—particularly the down—of the economic cycles;

Third. Provide guidance for—but not control of—our free enterprise system to meet the challenges at home and abroad;

Fourth. Better coordinate activities of Federal departments and agencies relating to national economic policy and development;

Fifth. And, generally, sharpen up policymaking and planning to better enable the United States to play its economic role in the world economy.

I request unanimous consent to have the bill itself and a brief supplemental statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and supplemental statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1026) to establish a National Economic Council for Security and Progress to provide planning and to coordinate programs to meet the Communist challenge in the economic sphere, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the economic challenge posed to the free world by international communism is one of the most serious aspects of the "cold war". That war may well be won or lost in the markets of the world and on the production line. Increased production and expanding markets, however, can only be achieved in an economy which is not crippled by inflation.

To this economic struggle the Communist nations are openly committed and fully mobilized. On its outcome rests the survival of the democratic way of life. It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the top-level Government planning and for the coordination of programs and policies necessary to meet the challenge.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a council to be known as the National Economic Council for Security and Progress (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(b) The Council shall be composed of—

(1) the President;

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury;

(3) the Secretary of Commerce;

(4) the Secretary of Labor;

(5) the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

(6) the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers;

(7) the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and

(8) such other officers of the Government as the President shall from time to time designate.

(c) The President shall preside over meetings of the Council; except that in his absence he may designate a member of the Council to preside in his place.

(d) The Council shall have a staff to be headed by a civilian executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 a year. The Executive Secretary subject to the direction of the Council, may, in accordance with the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out such duties as may be prescribed by the Council.

SEC. 3. The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of policies relating to national and international economic development so that the departments and agencies of the Government may cooperate more effectively in matters involving both the economic development of the United States and the role of the United States in the world economy. The duties of the Council in carrying out its function, shall include, without being limited to, the following:

(1) the development of recommendations for improving national economic policies and programs at home and abroad after careful review and analysis thereof;

(2) the reevaluation of, and the making of recommendations with respect to, specific trade situations, including—

(a) developing new commodities and finding new markets for an expanding national production,

(b) determining the effect of automation on employment, industry, and economic progress,

(c) ascertaining the impact of imports on the domestic economy, and

(d) coping with the growing volume of Communist-produced goods on the world market;

(3) the development of recommendations for coordinating more effectively the economic policies of nations of the free world for the purpose of assuring maximum opposition to Communist economic expansion; and

(4) the development of recommendations for fostering and promoting greater cooperation between the Government and private enterprise to improve markets, stop inflation, expand trade, and meet the needs of consumers at home and abroad.

SEC. 4. The Council shall, from time to time, make such reports to the President as it deems appropriate, or as the President may require.

SEC. 5. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

The supplemental statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT

Economywise, our country, today, is faced with challenges and opportunity.

At home, we are experiencing too much unemployment—estimated at about 5½ million—and business and industrial lags.

The outflow of U.S. dollars is threatening our gold reserve.

A production-consumption imbalance exists—with some folks not sharing proportionately in our production of the good things of life.

Segments of the domestic economy are suffering the impact of imported foreign goods.

Barriers abroad still impede the flow of U.S. commodities in international trade.

Over two-thirds of the nearly 3 billion people in the world—a great untapped potential market—exist on tragically low standards of living, needing literally everything.

Our great agricultural and industrial production plants—with ever-increasing capacity resulting from greater worker efficiency and automation—must find new markets.

Globally, we are in a battle with the Communists for our economic life.

To meet these, and other challenges, we must design more effective economic policies. Our defense—our economic stability and progress—the welfare of our people: All of these depend upon the maintenance of a strong, sound economy.

In a forward-moving world, policies of a crisis-to-crisis, opportunity-to-opportunity nature are inadequate to the times. Specific steps that can, and should, be taken, I believe, include a comprehensive study of the following:

A global survey for markets for United States-produced products.

Analysis of world needs for new, or different, products that can be produced by our farms and factories.

Renewed efforts to tear down the barriers that now prevent the flow of goods—many of which are in surplus—to potential consumers elsewhere in the world.

Reassessing the impact of the growing competition from the Communist bloc.

Survey of fundamental shipping problems, including trade routes, subsidization of shipping, development of adequate port and harbor cargo-handling facilities, further revision of tariffs, quotas, and other barriers to U.S. products in international competition.

To help accomplish these objectives, I am introducing legislation to create a National Economic Council. If established, the agency could help to:

Maintain a balanced Federal budget.

Minimize the up-and-down—particularly the down—fluctuations of the economic cycles.

Reverse the slowdowns in business and industrial activities, and deal more effectively with large-scale unemployment and recessions.

Generally help the United States to prosper economically and to play a proportionate role in the world economy.

During the 86th Congress, I introduced a bill, S. 2080, for such a council. Unfortunately, no final action was taken by the Congress. The magnitude of our current economic problems, however, provides new evidence on the need for such a top-level agency to guide U.S. economy.

The establishment of the Council would, I believe, enable the United States to meet its obligations and responsibilities—and take better advantage of the opportunities—to pave the way for a brighter economic future for our people and the country.

IMPROVEMENT OF HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS IN CERTAIN MINES AND QUARRIES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CARROLL, HART, MCCARTHY, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MOSS, and PROXMIRE, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve health and safety conditions in metal and nonmetallic mines and quarries, products from which enter or affect commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, during the 84th Congress, I headed the Subcommittee on Mine Safety and Health Inspections and Investigations of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Following is the unanimous report of that subcommittee, dated December 11, 1956, and printed as part of voluminous hearings, which included testimony from mine workers, operators, and owners, and experts from the U.S. Bureau of Mines and the Public Health Service:

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINE SAFETY—(METALLIC AND NONMETALLIC MINES)

The Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on Mine Safety in Metallic and Nonmetallic Mines has studied safety conditions in those mines by field inspections and observations in Virginia, Hibbing, and Duluth, Minn., in Butte, Mont., and Ouray, Colo., and has held 3 days' hearings in Washington, where witnesses from the mining industry, labor, the U.S. Bureau of Mines and the U.S. Public Health Service were heard.

Based upon these on-the-spot investigations and observations by the subcommittee members and upon the formal hearings, the subcommittee is of the unanimous opinion that the overall subject of safety in the Nation's metallic and nonmetallic mines should be given further study, and that additional investigations should be made in Michigan, Alabama, Colorado, the tristate area of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri, and such other places as a subsequent committee might find necessary.

The subcommittee recommends to the chairman and to the full Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives that a new subcommittee be appointed in the 85th Congress, and that the hearings mentioned above, plus such other hearings as may be indicated, be held to the end that the subject of safety in metallic and nonmetallic mines be thoroughly explored.

Respectfully submitted.

LEE METCALF, *Chairman.*
CARL ELLIOTT.
PHIL M. LANDRUM.
JOHN J. RHODES.
ORVIN B. FJARE.

DECEMBER 11, 1956.

Mr. President, the bill we had before us then was the legislation we are introducing today. It would empower the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to inspect and investigate metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries, products of which regularly enter or substantially affect commerce, to get information on health and safety conditions, causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life, and causes of occupational diseases.

This information would be a basis for determining the most effective use of public funds for the protection or advancement of public health and safety, preparation and dissemination of educational materials in the interest of health and safety. It also would be the basis for reports to Congress for our consideration.

The Secretary of the Interior would report to the Congress annually the findings of the Bureau of Mines inspections, together with his comments and recommendations for such legislative action as he may deem proper.

The bill would also promote cooperation between Federal and State agencies in improving mine safety, and authorizes establishment of a six-member advisory committee, composed of representatives of metallic and nonmetallic mine and quarry owners and workers. The advisory committee, working with the Bureau of Mines, would be charged with developing a code of reasonable standards and rules pertaining to safety and health conditions and practices in metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries to serve as a guide for making recommendations under this act.

Testimony before my subcommittee brought out that mining is unusually hazardous. It is especially so in underground mining, where the workers are exposed to all the common hazards endured by workers in manufacturing plants, plus a large number of uncommon hazards peculiar to mining—dusts, gases, sudden and extreme changes in temperatures, and the possibility of suffering injury from falling ground, haulage equipment, falls, and explosions, to name a few.

This is further complicated by the changing character of the industry. Mechanization brings additional health and safety risks, which apparently are not being met by older remedies. In underground mining, for example, we now have greater use of block-caving, faster drilling machines, automatic conveyor belts, and much faster handling of ore and materials.

Mechanization means more ore and production—and also more and greater hazards—including dust. The most serious hazard facing workers in hard-rock mining and milling—and this Nation's major occupational disease—is silicosis, caused by the inhalation of excessive amounts of silica dust.

Silicosis is of immediate importance—in the number of persons with the disease, its effects, and the staggering cost of disability. There is no known cure for silicosis. No one knows for sure how many workers are infected.

Public Health Service statistics, showing 10,362 cases compensated in 22 States from 1950 through 1954, are virtually meaningless. Vital statistics records show more than 10,000 deaths from occupational chest diseases in the United States during the same period. According to the Public Health Service, 2,000 of the silicotics reported in its survey were dead. So if the total number of cases is actually five times the number compensated—as the number of deaths is five times the figure recorded by the Public Health Service survey—we are dealing with a disease that has disabled 40,000 men, and many thousands more are in the earlier stages.

In Montana, the Public Health Service survey lists 588 cases. In Montana, we compensate only those persons totally disabled by silicosis. So the Montana report lists only those in the third, or disabling, stage. No one knows how many are in the earlier stages.

The survey shows 81 cases of silicosis in Idaho. Workmen's compensation in Idaho is handled by private insurance companies, or by the employer. So the State workmen's compensation division receives a report only of those cases which are contested.

To summarize the record on silicosis presented to my subcommittee, more than 10,000 deaths from occupational chest diseases in the 5 years, 1950 through 1954; 10,362 cases of silicosis compensated, or reported in one form or another, in 22 States during those same 5 years; and an estimated annual compensation cost of more than $6 million in only 14 States.

In order to fight silicosis, we must know more about where, when, and under what conditions it occurs. We must know how many people have it. Only with this knowledge can we effectively direct our efforts to its control and eventual prevention.

During the course of our hearings, in 1956, we became aware of another acute problem in the mine safety field—the almost complete absence of up-to-date information on mine accidents. For example, late in 1956 we were still using figures as much as 6 years old for accidents in the metallic and nonmetallic mines. This was a matter of concern, not only to the members of the subcommittee, but also to management and labor. The witnesses who appeared before us disagreed on many things. They agreed on one—the need for the expansion of research, and health, and safety education, to improve techniques in mine accident prevention.

I presented this testimony to subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations in 1957. There were in-

creases voted for these information programs. They were a step in the right direction. Others must be taken. We are concerned here with human lives. We share a common purpose of seeking to save, and to prolong the lives of present, and future, generations of men who work in this basic domestic industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1034) relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made annual or necessary inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce—

(a) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life therein, or the causes of occupational diseases originating therein, whenever such health or safety conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases burden or obstruct commerce or threaten to burden or obstruct commerce;

(b) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life therein, or the causes of occupational diseases originating therein, as a basis for determining the most effective manner in which the public funds made available for the protection or advancement of health or safety in metallic and nonmetallic mines, and for the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases therein, may be expended for the accomplishment of such objects;

(c) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life therein, or the causes of occupational diseases originating therein, as a basis for the preparation and dissemination of reports, studies, statistics, and other educational materials pertaining to the protection or advancement of health or safety in metallic and nonmetallic mines and to the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases therein;

(d) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life in such mines, or relating to occupational diseases originating therein, to be transmitted to the Bureau of the Census for use in connection with the preparation and compilation of the various census reports; and

(e) for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions in such mines, the causes of accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life therein, or the causes of occupational diseases originating therein, to be transmitted to the Congress for its consideration in connection with legislative matters involving health and safety conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases in metallic and nonmetallic mines.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is further authorized and empowered to make or cause to be made the inspections and investigations provided for in the first section of this Act at other than annual intervals at any time in his discretion when the making of such inspections or investigations in the mine concerned will be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau, shall be entitled to admission to any metallic and nonmetallic mine, the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, for the purpose of making any inspection or investigation authorized under the preceding sections of this Act.

SEC. 4. Any owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person having control or supervision of any metallic and nonmetallic mine subject to the provisions of section 1 or section 2 of this Act who refuses to admit the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, or any duly authorized representative of such Bureau, to such mine, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding sixty days, or by both.

SEC. 5. Every owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person having control or supervision of any metallic and nonmetallic mine, the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, shall furnish to the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, or to any duly authorized representative of such Bureau, upon request, complete and correct information to the best of his knowledge concerning any or all accidents involving bodily injury or loss of life which occurred in such mine during the calendar year in which the request is made or during the preceding calendar year.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized and directed—

(a) to report annually to the Congress, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this Act, together with such findings and comments thereon and such recommendations for legislative action as he may deem proper.

(b) to compile, analyze, and publish, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this Act, together with such findings concerning the causes of unhealthy or unsafe conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases in metallic and nonmetallic mines, and such recommendations for the prevention or amelioration of unhealthy or unsafe conditions, accidents, or occupational diseases therein as he may deem proper;

(c) to prepare and disseminate reports, studies, statistics, and other educational materials pertaining to the protection or advancement of health or safety in metallic and nonmetallic mines and to the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases therein;

(d) to expend the funds made available to him for the protection or advancement of health or safety in metallic and nonmetallic mines, and for the prevention or relief of accidents or occupational diseases therein, in such lawful manner as he may deem most effective in the light of the information obtained under this Act to promote the accomplishment of the objectives for which such funds are granted;

(e) to transmit to the Director of the Census, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this Act, for use in connection with the preparation and compilation of the various Census reports; and

(f) to make available for public inspection either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained under this Act, as soon as practicable after the acquisition of such information.

SEC. 7. The execution of the provisions of this Act shall devolve upon the United States Bureau of Mines and the Secretary of the Interior may designate other bureaus or offices in the Department of the Interior to cooperate with the United States Bureau of Mines for such purpose. In order to promote sound and effective coordination of Federal and local activities within the field covered by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, and the several bureaus and offices under his jurisdiction, shall cooperate with the official mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States and Territories, and, with the consent of the proper authorities thereof, may utilize the services of such agencies in connection with the administration of this Act. Copies of all findings, recommendations, reports, studies, statistics, and information made public under the authority of clauses (b), (c), and (f) of section 6 of this Act shall, whenever practicable, be furnished any cooperating State or Territorial agency which may request the same.

SEC. 8. (a) The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall create and establish an advisory committee composed of not more than six members to exercise consultative function in connection with the administration of this Act. Such committee shall be composed of representatives of metallic and nonmetallic mine owners and of representatives of metallic and nonmetallic mine workers in equal number. The members of such committee shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the civil-service laws.

(b) The advisory committee in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines shall promulgate a code of reasonable standards and rules pertaining to safety and health conditions and practices in metallic and nonmetallic mines to serve as a guide for making recommendations under this Act.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Bureau of Mines, shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such officers and employees as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and to prescribe the powers, duties, and responsibilities of such officers and employees.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 11. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communications between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any other State, Territory, possession of the United States, or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any foreign country, or wholly within any Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, or between points in the same State if passing through any other State or through any Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia or through any foreign country.

(2) The term "metallic and nonmetallic mines" includes all types of mines and mining operations, except that it shall not be deemed to include coal and lignite mines.

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

CIVIL REDRESS TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN OR AFFECTING COMMERCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide civil redress to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. This is a bill recommended by a committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. It is a bill of the greatest importance with respect to fair competition in trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations of the committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York and an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the recommendations and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1036) to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The recommendations and statement presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, COMMITTEE ON TRADEMARKS AND UNFAIR COMPETITION, PROPOSED FEDERAL UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES ACT

If there is one matter on which members of the bar familiar therewith are in accord, it is the need for a Federal law giving relief to private parties against unfair competition.[1] For that reason, this report will be concise. The fact that there is a wealth of statutes granting remedies against false advertising, for instance, available to the Federal and State Governments[2] does not in the least detract from the fact that additional remedies are needed in order effectively to protect private parties who cannot commercially depend in this area upon slow, cumbersome, and often ineffective, governmental action limited to matters of general public interest.

Initially, the need for a uniform Federal law was fulfilled, at least partially, by the creation of a Federal common law which, commencing with the landmark decision by Judge Learned Hand in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1928 in *Yale Electric Corporation* v. *Robertson* (26 F. 2d 972), in part overcame the anachronisms apparent in prior Federal and State decisions on the subject[3] and gave those engaged in interstate commerce some protection. However, the Supreme Court of the United States in 1938 in *Erie Railroad Company* v. *Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64), held that the Federal courts could not create a Federal common law but that each court must follow the common law of the State in which it sits.

The chaos created in the unfair competition field by the Erie Railroad decision was thought to have been partially cured by the enactment of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C., secs. 1051–1127) in 1946. That hope, however, proved ill-founded for the Federal courts of this country are squarely split as to whether sections 43 and 44 of that act create a Federal law partially covering the unfair competition field.[4] The Supreme Court has refused to review that disagreement. Present Federal relief for unfair competition is thus, at best, tenuous.

The net result of Erie Railroad plus divergent interpretations of the Lanham Act is to leave those engaged in interstate commerce at best in an uncertain position subject to varying State laws and courts. Yet many of the State courts have never had any experience with unfair competition problems and, in addition, those courts are reluctant to impose standards upon the conduct of business outside their particular State. But if a product is to be merchandised and sold from Maine to California, it is imperative that protection be equally accorded throughout the country.

We do not dwell further on the need for this legislation—that fact is self-evident. In order to meet that need, the committee on trademarks and unfair competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York has studied the problem during the last 3 years and has attempted to draft a proposed statute.

However, these efforts have led to the conclusion by the committee that reconciliation of the many diverse views of Federal and State courts as to the precise nature of unfair competition and its inherently nebulous nature is an impracticable task in that any precisely definitive statute could and probably would have a stultifying effect on the courts and thus lead to more rather than less confusion in the future. Notwithstanding that basic problem, we propose favorable consideration to a relatively broad statute so phrased that it will give the courts direction in a general way and still afford sufficient freedom of judgment to accommodate the facts and circumstances that are peculiar to each of the myriad of unfair competition situations that come before the courts. With such general direction afforded by the proposed statute, the Federal jurisdictions may be expected eventually to establish a workable national business morals substantive law which will be interpretive of the relatively broad statute that we propose.[5]

Because of the aforementioned confusion created by *Erie* v. *Tompkins*, we deem it imperative that to be workable any unfair competition statute must unshackle the Federal courts from the overpowering local State law to which they are now fettered. Inasmuch as that can be done only by statute, the proposed unfair competition statute should contain a provision to that effect.

A copy of the proposed statute is attached hereto as exhibit A and is self-explanatory. It has the approval of our committee and merits favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

Harold R. Medina, Jr., Chairman; Stuart H. Aarons, Rynn Berry, George M. Chapman, John H. Cleary, Jr., John J. Cooke, John N. Cooper, Sidney A. Diamond, Walter H. Free, Werner Janssen, Jr., Louis Kunin, Harry R. Olsson, Jr., E. Gabriel Perle, Robert D. Rickert, Alfred H. Wasserstrom, John A. Wortmann.

MARCH 18, 1959.

H.R. 7833—AN EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

H.R. 7833 is the Lindsay bill "to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce." If enacted, it would create a new Federal statute dealing with unfair competition. The text of the bill itself is relatively simple, but the need for such a statute and the reasons for some of its provisions may require explanation.

The fundamental purpose of the bill is to provide a basis for the development of a uniform body of Federal law in the field of unfair competition. In the years prior to 1938, great progress had been made in this direc-

[1] For a more complete survey of the law, see: Lunsford, "Unfair Competition: Uniform State Act Needed," 44 Va. L. Rev. 583 (1958); Derenberg, "Federal Unfair Competition Law at the End of the First Decade of the Lanham Act: Prologue or Epilogue?" 32 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1029 (1957); Weil, "Protectability of Trade Mark Values Against False Competitive Advertising," 44 Calif. L. Rev. 527 (1956); Callman, "False Advertising as a Competitive Tort," 48 Col. L. Rev. 876 (1948); Bunn, "The National Law of Unfair Competition," 62 Harv. L. Rev. 987 (1949).

[2] Illustrative of statutes on the Federal level are sec. 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C.A. 45 and the Postal Fraud Order Statutes, 39 U.S.C.A. 259, 732. A complete list of Federal statutes on this subject is set out in appendix VI A to note, "The Regulation of Advertising," 56 Col. L. Rev. 1019, 1097–1098. Most States have what are commonly known as Printers' Ink statutes. An exhaustive list of State statutes on this subject is set out in appendix VI B, op. cit., supra, 1098–1111.

[3] Illustrative of those decisions are *New York & R. Cement Co.* v. *Coplay Cement Co.*, 44 Fed. 277 (E.D. Pa. 1890); *American Washboard Co.* v. *Saginaw Mfg. Co.*, 103 Fed. 281 (6th Cir. 1900); *Borden Ice Cream Co.* v. *Borden's Condensed Milk Co.*, 201 Fed. 510 (7th Cir. 1912); *Borden's Condensed Milk Co.* v. *Horlick's M. M. Co.*, 206 Fed. 949 (E.D. Wis. 1913); *Armstrong Cork Co.* v. *Ringwalt Linoleum Works*, 235 Fed. 458 (D.N.J. 1916); *Mosler Safe Co.* v. *Ely-Norris Safe Co.*, 273 U.S. 132 (1927).

[4] The 3d and 9th circuits interpret sec. 43 as creating such a cause of action but the 2d circuit apparently disagrees. The 9th circuit and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals interpret sec. 44 as creating such a cause of action but the 2d, 3d, 5th, and 7th circuits disagree. See also 28 U.S.C.A. sec. 1338b.

[5] This suggestion finds analogy in a recent (1957) admonition by the Supreme Court in *Textile Workers Union of America* v. *Lincoln Mills of Alabama* (353 U.S. 448) involving a dispute as to the proper interpretation of sec. 301 of Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 156, 29 U.S.C. 185), particularly subdivision (a) thereof, which broadly prescribes:

"Suit for violation of contracts between an employer and a labor organization representing employees in an industry affecting commerce as defined in this chapter, or between any such labor organizations, may be brought in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without respect to the amount in controversy or without regard to the citizenship of the parties."

The majority opinion by Mr. Justice Douglas (Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissenting) reviewed the two different constructions placed on sec. 301(a) by the lower courts, one concluding, in effect, that this section would not be the source of substantive law, and the other (which the majority adopted) "that it authorizes Federal courts to fashion a body of Federal law for the enforcement of these collective-bargaining agreements and includes within that Federal law specific performance of promises to arbitrate grievances under collective-bargaining agreements." (Citing Judge Wyzanski's opinion in *Textile Workers Union* v. *American Thread Co.* at 113 F. Supp. 137.)

tion by the decisions of the Federal courts. Then the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Erie* v. *Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64 (1938)), denied the existence of a Federal common law and required instead that the Federal judiciary apply State law. There is obvious logical justification for this rule, because it prevents the accidental availability of Federal jurisdiction from affecting the law applicable to a given controversy. It is generally agreed, however, that this checkerboard approach is inappropriate for dealing with unfair competition. Modern business activities so frequently are national in scope that there is no serious dissent from the view that uniformity throughout the country in the law of unfair competition would be desirable.

Some commentators believed the problem had been solved by the passage of the Lanham Act in 1946. In particular, section 44 provides protection for foreign nationals against unfair competition, and also provides that citizens of the United States shall have all the benefits conferred by the act upon foreign citizens. It was thought that this would be the basis for Federal jurisdiction over unfair competition causes. The statute has been so construed only in the ninth circuit, however, so it is fairly clear that section 44 will not serve as the route to nationwide uniformity.

There is less doubt about the availability of Federal jurisdiction under section 43(a) of the Lanham Act. But that section has proved to have little practical significance. It is invoked only rarely; and, in any event, it is limited by its terms to false descriptions and false representations of origin.

H.R. 7833 attacks the problem directly by creating a new cause of action and giving exclusive jurisdiction over it to the Federal district courts, without regard to the amount in controversy or the diversity or lack of diversity of citizenship of the parties (sec. 8). The availability of this new cause of action does not diminish existing rights to proceed under State or other Federal law; it is specifically provided that relief pursuant to the proposed new statute shall be in addition to those rights and remedies otherwise available (sec. 4).

The heart of H.R. 7833 is section 2, which lists the "unfair commercial activities" that are made actionable. The expression "unfair commercial activities" was selected deliberately because it was felt that "unfair competition" might be construed as a limitation. As additional assurance of a broad construction, section 3 provides that absence of competition between the parties shall not be a defense to an action brought under the statute.

The list of unfair commercial activities in section 2 represents a carefully chosen compromise between the futility of attempting to define every type of conduct intended to be prohibited, and the equal futility of simply stating that unfair acts shall be deemed unlawful. The former alternative, apart from its practical impossibility, would have created an environment in which defendants constantly could have sought justification for their acts under the expressio unius rule; while the latter would not have been sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for the desired uniformity of decisions throughout the Federal judicial system.

There are just four subparagraphs in section 3. Although most of these are self-explanatory, a few comments may be helpful. Section 2(a)(3), in effect, is a Federal anti-dilution statute. Section 2(b) covers false or misleading statements of fact in order to avoid prohibiting anyone from stating his opinion. Since section 2(b) applies to statements about the goods or services of either party, it includes trade libel as well as false advertising and thus removes any doubt about the availability of injunctive relief for this type of defamation. Section 2(c) is a deliberate catchall; in particular, the use of the expression "reasonable standards of commercial ethics" is intended to provide Federal judges with the opportunity to apply the liberal standards of such New York State decisions as *Dior* v. *Milton* (9 Misc. 2d 425, affd., 2 App. Div. 2d 878 (1st Dept. 1956)), and *Miller* v. *Universal Pictures Company* (188 N.Y.S. 2d 386, 121 U.S.P.Q. 475 (Sup. Ct. 1959)), free from the hampering effect of any archaic rulings in the States where they sit, or in their Federal circuits. The purpose of section 2 is to establish guideposts for the Federal courts that are definite enough to identify the principal types of unlawful activity and yet allow the flexibility that is essential in a field where rapid technological advances in business and communications constantly create new opportunities for exploitation by the unscrupulous few.

Patent and copyright infringement are excluded from the scope of "unfair commercial activities" by section 7. This was done to meet possible criticism that the new statute might otherwise be used to extend the scope or duration of a patent or copyright monopoly. It was not considered feasible or proper to exclude trademark infringement, because many forms of unfair commercial activities affect trademark rights, and also because the objection about extending duration does not apply to trademarks since they may continue in perpetuity.

The right of action against unlawful commercial activities is created by section 1 of the bill. The action is for an injunction; no damages may be recovered. There are several reasons for this. Plaintiffs in most cases of this nature are interested primarily in bringing about the cessation of the unlawful acts rather than collecting damages, which may be difficult to prove even in the best of circumstances. The elimination of any provision for damages should prevent the use of the new cause of action as the basis for strike suits. At the same time, it was felt that a party with a genuine claim should not be deterred from bringing an action because of its expense; accordingly, the bill provides that a judgment for costs, reasonable attorneys' fees and disbursements may be granted to a successful plaintiff in addition to injunctive relief.

Any person "damaged or likely to be damaged" by unfair commercial activities is entitled to sue under section 1. The phrase "likely to be damaged" is borrowed from section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (similar language will be found in secs. 13 and 14, dealing with opposition and cancellation) while the troublesome concept "believes that he is" has not been carried over from the Lanham Act. The words "damaged or" were inserted to avoid any possible argument that the statute applied only where no damage had yet occurred. On the other hand, section 3 makes it clear that actual damage is not required as a prerequisite to suit.

The right of action under section 1 is available against unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce and the term "commerce" is defined in section 9 as "all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress." This makes it clear that the broadest possible scope is intended; specifically, intrastate acts that affect interstate commerce are covered. In addition, section 9 contains a statement of the intent of the statute, which includes the protection of "any person engaged in interstate commerce" against unfair commercial activities "whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce."

Innocent publishers and broadcasters are protected by section 5, which not only makes the absence of knowledge or intent a defense in an action against a publisher or broadcaster, but provides specifically that the burden of proving knowledge or intent is on the plaintiff. Furthermore, in order to avoid unnecessarily severe economic consequences to media of communication, section 6 provides that relief under the statute shall not be available when the injunction would delay the dissemination of a particular issue of a periodical, broadcast of a radio or television program, or showing of a motion picture after the scheduled time, when the delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice, as distinguished from a device to evade the statute. A single false advertisement in a magazine, for example, would not hold up distribution of the entire issue even if the publisher did have knowledge; but the use of the same or similar advertisements in future issues could be enjoined.

H.R. 7833 has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The active support of all interested parties is urgently required.

ABOLITION OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill, the purpose of which is to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Last year I made an unsuccessful attempt to abolish this agency which everyone admitted had outlived its useful purpose.

Today I am making another attempt to abolish this depression-born agency whose services have not been used during the past 15 years. This agency, however, while presently dormant, still retains all of its previously conferred powers, including the power to borrow up to $2 billion and to pledge the credit of the U.S. Government for payment.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation was establish by an act of Congress on January 31, 1934, primarily for the purpose of enabling the Land Bank Commissioner to make mortgage loans on farm properties on which the then existing lending authority of the Federal land banks had been restricted.

The Government held all the capital stock in this Corporation. It was authorized, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue and have outstanding at any one time $2 billion in federally guaranteed bonds, and it could make collateral loans to the Federal land banks as well as purchase the bonds of those banks.

This Corporation did serve a necessary function during the depression years, but with the outbreak of World War II and the accompanying appreciation in Federal income and property values, the services of this agency were no longer necessary, and since the end of World War II it has not functioned as a lending agency.

In fact, the authority of the Commissioner to make mortgage loans expired on July 1, 1947, except for refinancing existing loans and no extension has been asked.

On June 30, 1955, all remaining outstanding loans and certain other assets of the Corporation were sold by the Corporation to the Federal land banks.

On September 7, 1957, all their mineral reservations remaining unsold were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with provisions of legislation enacted in September 1950.

In September 1957 the Government's investment in the capital stock of the Corporation was fully retired.

The Corporation, however, was not abolished; it still retains its authority—subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury—to issue and have outstanding at any one time $2 billion in federally guaranteed bonds. They still have authority to make collateral loans to the Federal land banks and to purchase their bonds. This authority is not being used, but it is still there.

The Comptroller General in his annual audits of the Farm Credit Administration for the past several years, has strongly recommended that Congress take action to terminate the existence of the Corporation.

As of June 30, 1960, the only assets of the Corporation were certain notes receivable from Federal land banks in the amount of $3,933,116. These notes represent the balance due from the sale of the loans and other assets of the Corporation to these banks, and they are payable by the representative banks in annual installments.

Collecting these annual payments on notes from the Federal land banks and then transferring the proceeds to the Federal Treasury are the only duties left for this Corporation to perform. These payments could just as easily be made direct to the Treasury.

I repeat, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation during the depression served a useful function. It was started at a time when the Federal land banks were not in a strong financial position, and its purpose was to support these banks by providing additional capital for loans to the farmers during the depression of the 1930's. The Federal land banks are now, however, all in a strong financial position, and everyone agrees that there is no need for any funds, or any support, from this Corporation.

Although this agency has not made any loans since the depression years, and even though the authority of the Commissioner to make mortgage loans expired on July 1, 1947, except for refinancing existing loans, we find that since 1950 over $4 million has been appropriated to cover their administration expenses.

Direct appropriations were suspended in 1955, during which year all loans and other assets of the Corporation were sold to the Federal land banks; however, during each of the ensuing years authority has been extended in the annual appropriation bills for the Corporation to make such expenditures from collected funds as were necessary to continue the liquidation of its assets. These expenditures, however, have been systematically reduced, and last year they were reduced to about $5,000.

But why any expenditure? Why keep a useless agency alive when it is not needed? No agency of the Government having the power to borrow and pledge the credit of the U.S. Government in the amount of $2 billion should be allowed to lie around waiting until some bureaucrat with a fanciful imagination decides to revive it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1040) to abolish the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM TO COMBAT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a 5-year crash program to combat juvenile delinquency. The measure is cosponsored by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The evidence mounts that youth crime is continuing to rise at an alarming rate. It is causing deep anxiety to authorities throughout the country. And unless an imaginative effort is made now to combat it, the crime picture will grow more bleak when these young offenders become hardened criminals.

My bill would:

First. Assist States in setting up and operating major juvenile delinquency control programs by making available Federal funds to the States on a matching basis.

Second. Provide grants or fellowships to municipalities, colleges, and other private agencies for the much-needed training of social workers and other persons engaged in juvenile work.

Third. Encourage the research, development, and demonstration of new techniques to deal with behavior problems by providing Federal grants to States, and other public and nonprofit institutions, on a matching basis.

Fourth. Expand the technical assistance program now provided by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Fifth. Establish a National Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency consisting of public officials, professional experts, and community leaders.

The cost of this program for the first year would be $7 million; and for the remaining 4 years, $10 million each year.

I introduced a similar bill last year, major provisions of which were part of a bill reported by a Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, of which I was a member. The bill was approved by the Senate but died in the House Rules Committee. I am more hopeful of passage this year because of the recent action liberalizing the Rules Committee.

Youth crime is continuing to rise, according to many indications, including last week's report by New York City Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy disclosing that crimes in that city by youths under 16 years of age increased by 6.7 percent in 1960; and crimes by those 16 to 20 rose by 8.9 percent. Other crime statistics available for 1960 in both rural, suburban, and metropolitan areas, show that the New York City situation reflects a nationwide trend. New Jersey juvenile crime cases jumped 14 percent over 1959. In California, youth crime increased by 13 percent. I also invite attention to testimony by prison authorities that at least 60 percent of adult criminals in the United States have records of juvenile delinquency.

I wish to emphasize that Government action by itself cannot solve the growing juvenile delinquency problem. We need to strengthen the sense of social responsibility of all our people. Neither church, school, parent, policeman, nor psychiatrist, judge, jailer, and government can provide the whole answer. But all of them together, and many others, can help us toward a solution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1041) to strengthen and improve State and local programs to combat and control juvenile delinquency, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills proposing to amend the Interstate Commerce Act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the justifications accompanying the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the justifications will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for Mr. MAGNUSON), by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1042. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The justification accompanying Senate bill 1042 is as follows:

JUSTIFICATION FOR S. 1042

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to subject motor carrier operating authorities to suspension, change, or revocation for willful failure to comply with any rule or regulation lawfully prescribed by the Commission and to provide uniformity between parts II and IV of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to revocation procedure. It is also designed to permit suspension of motor carrier operating rights, upon notice, for failure to comply with the Commission's insurance regulations.

As section 212(a) of the act now reads the Commission cannot suspend or revoke a certificate except for failure to comply with the provisions of part II "or with any * * * regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder * * *." The Commission has found this language to be unduly restrictive upon its enforcement powers. For example, regulations prescribed under the Transportation of Explosives Act do not come within the category of regulations promulgated under any provision of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act. The Commission is, therefore, powerless to suspend or revoke

the certificate of any carrier for violations of the Explosives Act, or any regulations prescribed thereunder, irrespective of how willful such violations may have been. However, by simply changing the words "of the Commission promulgated thereunder" to "promulgated by the Commission," as proposed in the attached draft bill, the Commission would be able to revoke or suspend certificates for willful or continued noncompliance with any of its lawful rules and regulations. Enactment of this recommended amendment would thus enable the Commission to cope more effectively, in the public interest, with serious violations of any of its applicable rules or regulations and not only those promulgated under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under the first proviso of section 410(f) of the act, a freight forwarder's permit may be revoked if the holder thereof fails to comply with an order of the Commission commanding compliance with the provisions of part IV, a rule or regulation issued by the Commission thereunder, or the terms, conditions, or limitations of the permit. The failure of a motor carrier to obey such compliance order under the corresponding provisions in section 212(a), however, must be shown to have been willful before its certificate or permit may be revoked. In motor carrier revocation proceedings, then, two hearings are necessary, one to establish that a willful violation has occurred, after which a compliance order is entered, and a second to establish willful disobedience of the compliance order. Once disobedience of a compliance order is established, a further showing of willfulness should not be required. Proof of disobedience should be sufficient. This proposed change would not eliminate a second hearing, but would merely change the quantum of proof required.

The second proviso in section 212(a) provides for the suspension, upon notice, but without hearing, of motor carriers' and brokers' operating authorities for failure to comply with brokerage bond regulations and tariff publishing rules. It does not, however, provide for suspension on short notice for failure to maintain proof of cargo, public liability, and property-damage insurance under section 215. As previously indicated, section 410(f) is a counterpart of section 212(a) and contains a provision similar to the second proviso of section 212(a). The second proviso in section 410(f), however, provides for suspension on short notice of freight forwarder permits for failure to comply with the cargo insurance provisions under section 403(c) and the public-liability and property-damage insurance provisions under section 403(d).

From the standpoint of the traveling and shipping public there is more reason to require motor carriers to keep their cargo and public-liability and property-damage insurance in force than there is to require freight forwarders to keep their insurance alive. It is therefore desirable in the public interest that the Commission have the authority to suspend motor carrier rights, on short notice, when insurance lapses, or is canceled without replacement, until compliance is effected. The prospect of such action by the Commission should act as a deterrent to violations of this nature. An investigation under section 204(c) is not a satisfactory answer to the problem since such a proceeding may be somewhat lengthy and the public may be adversely affected should losses occur while it is pending.

The proposed change in section 204(c), which relates to investigations and the issuance of compliance orders, would bring that section into conformity with the suggested amendment to section 212(a) by similarly removing the restrictive nature of the present wording.

The amendments proposed in this draft bill would enable the Commission to administer the enforcement provisions of part II of the act more effectively.

S. 1043. A bill to amend section 222(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the service of process in enforcement proceedings, and for other purposes.

The justification accompanying Senate bill 1043 is as follows:

JUSTIFICATION FOR S. 1043

The attached draft bill would provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with a more effective means of enforcing the motor carrier provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under section 222(b) of the act the Commission is authorized to institute proceedings to enjoin unlawful motor carrier or broker operations or practices in the U.S. district court of any district in which the carrier or broker operates. Rule 4(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, however, limits the service of process in such proceedings to the territorial limits of the State in which the court sits.

In many instances the carriers against whom it is necessary to seek injunctions do not hold operating authority from the Commission and they have not, of course, designated an agent for the service of process as provided in section 221(c) of the act. The operations of such carriers are frequently widespread and it is often desirable to institute the court action in the State where most of their services are performed. This is usually the most convenient place for the majority of persons involved, including necessary witnesses. The illegal operator, himself, however, may avoid service of process by remaining outside of the State and by not stationing within its borders anyone qualified to receive service on his behalf.

Coping with the problem of unlawful operations is further complicated when a large shipper is involved. An injunction against one or several relatively small carriers without the shipper being named permits the shipper to continue his unlawful activities by using individual truckers or small carriers against whom no previous action has been taken. It is therefore frequently desirable and often critically important, that such shipper, as well as the carriers, be enjoined from participating in further violation of the law or the Commission's rules and regulations thereunder. In some instances, however, the Commission has been unable to obtain service of process upon both the carriers and the shipper because they were not located within the territorial limits of the same State.

The decision of the court in *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Blue Diamond Products Co.*, 192 F. 2d 43, precludes the Commission from proceeding against a shipper without proceeding against the carrier. The Commission does not disagree with the principle of that case. However, it is of the view, and the draft bill would so provide, that it should be able to institute a civil action against a carrier in any State in which the carrier operates and to join in such action any shipper, or any other person participating in the violation, without regard to where the carrier or the shipper or such other person may be served.

The problem presented has been particularly troublesome in the efforts of the Commission to control so-called pseudo private carriage, i.e., for-hire carriers claiming, without basis, to be engaged in private transportation for the purpose of evading the economic regulation to which common and contract carriers are subject. The seriousness of these unlawful operations was recognized by the Congress when, as a part of the Transportation Act of 1958, it amended section 203(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to more clearly define what constitutes bona fide private carriage. However, because of the inability of the Commission, under present law, to get both the responsible shipper and the carrier before the court, its efforts at effective enforcement is, in many cases, thwarted.

The proposed amendment would make more effective the original intent of the Congress in enacting section 222(b) and would aid the Commission substantially in its efforts to administer and enforce the act.

In order to make the provisions of section 222(b) harmonize with changes recommended by the Commission in section 212(a) of the act (see legislative recommendation No. 3, 74th annual report), the draft bill further provides that section 222(b) shall apply to any lawful rule, regulation, requirement, or order promulgated by the Commission, instead of, as it does at present, to only those promulgated under part II of the act.

RULES AND REGULATIONS WITH RESPECT TO COMMUNITY ANTENNA AND TELEVISION SYSTEMS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by request of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications, relating to the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1044) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for Mr. MAGNUSON), by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. ENGLE is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 16, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress, a proposal to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems. (47 U.S.C. 153.)

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by the Budget Bureau that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill on this subject and six copies of an explanatory statement with reference thereto.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK W. FORD,
Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTIONS 3 AND 303 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED

The advent of community antenna television systems in recent years, together with their increasing use of microwave radio facilities, has not only provided multiple television services to many areas which were previously without any service, but also has created certain problem situations insofar as local television broadcast stations are concerned. A community antenna television system either directly or through a microwave facility intercepts television programs which have been broadcast to the general public and carries them through cables or wires to individual subscribing members of the public who pay a charge for this service. While, originally, such systems directly intercepted programs of not too distant stations, more recently microwave radio facilities have been utilized to obtain programs which have been broadcast by stations far removed from the site of the community antenna television system. Although these systems may be generally considered in the category of repeater television services, they do not engage directly in radio transmission of electric energy by radio, as do translator stations, and hence are not within the licensing jurisdiction of the Commission under section 301 of the Communications Act.

The Commission's early examination of television repeater services, including community antenna television systems, is reflected in its report and order in docket No. 12443, which was adopted on April 13, 1959. In that document the Commission recognized that some adjustment of the unfair competitive situation of local television stations as against community antenna television systems, would be in the public interest. In an attempt to reach this end, the Commission recommended certain measures to the 86th Congress which were embodied in H.R. 6748 and S. 1801. In examining into this matter the Congress considered numerous legislative proposals and held hearings thereon. Two of these proposals, S. 2653 and H.R. 11041, would have established a broad-scale and mandatory licensing scheme for the some 500–700 community antenna television systems which are already in existence, as well as those proposed to be established in the future. While the Commission was in accord with the general objective of these bills, it expressed the view that they were unnecessarily comprehensive in scope; would reach into situations which did not affect local television stations; and would unnecessarily add to the already large licensing functions of the Commission.

In contrast to the unduly widespread scope of these bills, the instant proposal is designed to vest in the Commission authority to act in those situations where local television stations are operating under inequitable disadvantages in competition with community antenna television systems. The Commission would thereby be enabled to address itself to the problem situations in the CATV-local station areas under a general power to make appropriate adjustments through the issuance of appropriate rules, regulations, and orders. The Commission would not, however, be encumbered by the administration of a mandatory licensing scheme for community antenna television systems, including the large number of such systems which are providing the only television service to sparsely settled areas.

This proposal would define community antenna television systems in a new subsection 3(hh) of the Communications Act in substantially the same manner as the Commission's previous legislative proposal and as was included in S. 2653, H.R. 11041, and in other related bills which were considered by the 86th Congress. This definition would exclude community antenna television systems which served less than 50 subscribers or which consisted primarily of a master antenna system for the residents of a single or a group of related apartment houses. The definition would also expressly exclude community antenna television systems which carry only subscription television or other closed circuit programs. The proposal would also amend section 3(h) of the Communications Act so as to make clear that jurisdiction over community antenna television systems is not to include regulation as a common carrier. This limitation was also included in S. 2653 and H.R. 11041 of the 86th Congress.

Anther new subsection—303(s)—would empower the Commission to issue orders, rules, and regulations with respect to community antenna television system operations in situations where an area is served by both the CATV system and a local television broadcast station. It should be noted that despite the numerous CATV systems throughout the country, the problems that have arisen concern the comparatively few areas where a CATV system competes with a local station. Although authorizing the Commission to impose restrictions on CATV operation so as to promote a more equitable balance with a local station, the Commission would be required to give due consideration to the public interest in the multiple television services provided by the CATV, and therefore its jurisdiction is keyed to the making of reasonable adjustments in the competitive situation rather than to the elimination of CATV systems.

For example, in an appropriate situation the Commission might require the CATV system to carry the program of the local station as part of its regular service, and to assure that reception of the local program by CATV subscribers is reasonably comparable in technical quality to the programs provided by the CATV from other sources. Such requirements have been strongly urged by broadcasters whose ability to provide a local television service is said to be adversely affected by the CATV operations. Apart from the fact that CATV systems are able to bring in multiple services which are beyond the capacity of the local station, it appears that direct reception of local stations by CATV subscribers is made more difficult in the usual case by the necessity of an additional switching operation to receive local broadcast signals.

Another instance of the way in which the Commission's jurisdiction might be exercised in appropriate situations lies in the field of duplication by CATV systems of programs being carried by the local station. The Commission would be empowered under the proposed legislation to order such adjustments as would, on an appropriate basis, permit the CATV system to continue to provide multiple television services, and at the same time afford to the local station some protection in its program offerings.

Since this legislative proposal looks to a limited jurisdiction over CATV's under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, the enforcement and review provisions in section 312(b) and titles 4 and 5 of the act would be available in connection with rules, regulations, and orders issued by the Commission with respect to CATV operations.

AMENDMENT OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend development periods under repayment contracts for reclamation projects.

The Commissioner of Reclamation, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, is responsible for administering nearly 1,900 repayment contracts with various water users' organizations throughout the West; more are being negotiated and executed all the time as our western water resource development program is carried forward.

In establishing terms of a repayment contract, the Secretary is authorized by reclamation law to establish a so-called development period of not to exceed 10 years, which period precedes the project repayment period. Purpose of the development period is to allow a reasonable length of time for farmers to prepare their lands for irrigation, establish suitable crops, and accomplish reasonably full farm productivity before beginning repayment of project construction costs to the United States. Once a development period is fixed by contract for a period of less than 10 years, the Secretary is not privileged to lengthen it even if conditions subsequently develop which would have justified a longer development period in the first place.

Under the present law, if the repayment period is waived for more than 1 year it must be done by making a supplemental contract to the existing contract. This is not a satisfactory procedure. There is need to authorize the Secretary under certain conditions to extend the development period without the necessity of entering into a new contract.

Conditions of below normal precipitation just prior to irrigation development, higher farm development costs than anticipated, higher equipment costs, and the generally prevailing agricultural cost-price squeeze have created the need for extended development periods in Kansas and Nebraska where short development periods were fixed in a number of cases. As a consequence my colleagues, Senator CURTIS, Senator SCHOEPPEL, and Senator CARLSON have discussed this amendment. It is possible there are similar cases in other reclamation States. Thus, there is a need now to authorize the Secretary, where conditions justify it and where proper, satisfactory showing is made, to extend existing development periods as necessary within the maximum permissible limit of 10 years permitted by the law.

The action provided for by the bill I introduce today would in no way allow the water users and privileges or rights to which they are not now entitled under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939—act of August 4, 1939, 53 Stat. 1187.

As a matter of fact, approval of this bill into law could result in a net shorter development period overall, for this reason: The inflexibility of the present

statute makes for a tendency to prescribe a longer development period than would be granted if a ready discretionary power existed to extend such period. There is a tendency to allow for occurrence of unknown contingencies, over and beyond the justification made for the period in the first place. When allowance for such contingencies is made, and they do not actually occur, the development period is longer than actually necessary. Such allowance would not be needed if there is a readily available remedy in the event of unanticipated events occurring.

Enactment of this bill will result in better, businesslike administration of the subject matter with which the bill deals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1048) to amend section 9(d)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485), introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to require the disposal of certain surplus land for agricultural use in family-type farm units.

A similar bill, S. 1630, was introduced in the 86th Congress on April 8, 1959. At that time, nine of my colleagues joined in its sponsorship. All of those cosponsors who are still Members of the Senate again join in sponsoring the bill being introduced today.

The instant bill has been changed somewhat, to meet certain objections voiced by the Bureau of the Budget to S. 1630. The Bureau expressed the view that surplus property covered by the bill might be more suited to uses other than agricultural at the time of its disposition. If the tract were located near a city or new highway, for example, its current or very early use might be commercial, industrial, or even residential, rather than agricultural.

The Bureau felt it would be inadvisable to require purchasers to use the property only for crop raising, if other uses would be more siutable. The point is well taken. Accordingly, the instant bill has been changed, so as not to include any land unless the Administrator of General Services Administration has determined that its most suitable use as of that time is for the production of crops. If such determination is made, the portion of the premises involved which is found to be more suitable for other purposes, rather than for the growing of crops, would be excluded from the provisions of the measure at hand.

Mr. President, at the time when the former bill was introduced, I made a statement explaining in detail the need for this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remarks which I made at the time of the introduction of the original bill and the text of the bill I have introduced today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and remarks will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1049) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to require the disposal of certain surplus land for use in the production of crops through the operation of family-type farms, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 203 of the Federal Property and Administratives Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) (1) Any tract of land exceeding two thousand acres in area which has been determined to be surplus property may be disposed of only in conformity with the requirements of this subsection if the major portion of such tract (A) had been devoted to the production of crops before its acquisition, or during its ownership or control, by any executive agency, and (B) the most suitable use for which is for the production of crops at the time the land is declared surplus, and as determined by the Administrator of General Services Administration.

"(2) Before disposal, any such tract shall be divided into separate parcels, no one of which may exceed three hundred and twenty acres in area, in such manner as to provide the maximum practicable number of parcels suitable for use in the production of crops through the operation of family-type farms.

"(3) Whenever any such tract includes land acquired by an executive agency after January 1, 1940, from one or more private owners who, before such acquisition, used that land chiefly for the production of crops in the operation of family-type farms, the boundaries of the separate parcels of land into which such tract is divided pursuant to paragraph (2) shall conform to the greatest practicable extent to the boundaries of the farms which existed at the time of their acquisition by such executive agency. In the disposal of any parcel of land the boundaries of which are so determined, appropriate notice of the proposed disposal thereof shall be given by publication made pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Administrator. The former owner of the major portion of any such parcel shall be entitled to purchase that parcel, at any time within ninety days after publication of such notice, upon the payment of the fair market value thereof for use in the production of crops, as determined by appraisal made in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Administrator. As used in this paragraph, the term 'former owner' means the person or persons from whom the major portion of any parcel of land, or any interest therein, was acquired by an executive agency; or if any such person is deceased, his spouse, if living; or if such spouse is also deceased, one or more of his natural or adopted children. If no former owner purchases any such parcel within the prescribed period of time, that parcel may be disposed of pursuant to paragraph (4).

"(4) Any parcel of land contained in any such tract which is not subject to, or disposed of pursuant to, the provisions of paragraph (3) may be disposed of by sale, after advertisement for bids, to any one individual, or to a husband and wife, or to a parent and one or more natural or adopted children.

"(5) No individual who has acquired by any means an interest in any parcel of land which has been disposed of pursuant to subsection (4) hereof shall be eligible to acquire through any transfer made under this subsection any interest in any other such parcel contained in any tract of land if that other parcel is situated less than three miles from any such parcel in which that individual previously has acquired an interest.

"(6) Each instrument executed for the transfer of any parcel of land pursuant to this subsection shall contain such provisions as the Administrator shall determine to be effective to insure that for a period of not less than five years after the execution of that instrument that parcel will not be used for purposes other than the production of crops and uses incidental thereto."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The remarks presented by Mr. HRUSKA are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA UPON INTRODUCTION OF BILL, S. 1630, ON APRIL 8, 1959, REGARDING SALE OF SURPLUS LANDS

Mr. President, one of the most contentious and controversial legislative subjects is that of agriculture—with its almost limitless areas and varieties of activities and aspects.

Yet there is one feature of it upon which there is general agreement: the desirability of the family-type and operated farm.

Its place and importance in the building of America was first realized and established in colonial times. The sources of strength which it creates were in the mind of Lincoln when he strongly advocated and later signed into law the far-reaching National Homestead Act of 1862, which authorized freehold farm tracts of 160 acres to citizens agreeing to make their homes on them for not less than 5 years.

My native State of Nebraska has participated in this tradition. The first homestead application under the act of 1862 was filed in Brownsville, Nebr., on January 1, 1863. A national monument marks the 160-acre tract near Beatrice in Gage County, where Daniel Freeman lived and farmed after his filing.

HIGH PLACE OF FAMILY-TYPE FARM IN AMERICA

By tradition over decades and decades, the family-type and operated farms come honestly and firmly to high place and estimate.

They spell the difference between the life of a tenant or laborer on the one hand and an independent operator on the other hand. They determine so much the character of the neighborhood in which he will raise his family.

Not only is the farmowner in charge of his own destiny to the maximum one may be these days, but he has a chance to get ahead, and to rear a family in one of the most wholesome of circumstances.

Where smaller, owner-operated farms exist, there will be good, progressive schools, hospitals, churches, and various community enterprises that make for useful citizenship and enjoyable, healthful living.

Such things are possible because of the number of people which many small farms can support. The farmer's family in the first place. The grocer from whom they buy food; the clothing merchant; the farm implement dealer; the lumber yard; the dealer in autos and trucks, and the gas, oil, and repairs to run them; the neighbor from whom they buy their seed, feed, and fertilizer; the man who supplies wells and irrigation equipment; the doctor, dentist, lawyer, the builder, and so on and so on.

It is such as these that Senators Hans O. Jensen (25th district) and Richard Marvel (31st district) had in mind when they proposed in the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature a resolution, reading in part: "Whereas the family-sized farm remains the backbone of American agriculture."

But such things do not come about, Mr. President, if the prairies are changed into farms so large that a man standing at one end of a furrow cannot see its other end because of sheer distance—a furrow so long and a field so wide that only the largest, most specialized, and most expensive farm machinery can successfully cultivate it.

Too many forces which we cannot control are driving our farms into the automation which comes with large operations.

But when we encounter a situation arising where such trend can be stopped, we surely should take vigorous, courageous action.

ANNOUNCEMENT TO CLOSE HASTINGS NAVAL DEPOT

Mr. President, this surely was done by Nebraskans of Adams and Clay Counties when announcement was made last December by the Navy Department of plans to discontinue and dispose of the 53,000 acre Navy Ammunition Depot, located near Hastings, and in the two counties named.

This installation, which proved to be a defense bulwark in World War II and in the Korean war, was formed at heavy cost, not only in dollars, but in eliminating scores upon scores of family-operated farm units.

With announcement of impending sale of this land as surplus, came the dread fear to the many fine folk of that area, that large land investors, either individual or corporation, would come into the scene to buy the land in a single or large tracts, and thus hasten the many other factors which are working so relentlessly toward further defeat of the family-type farm tradition.

TWO PROBLEMS ARE PRESENT

Situations of this kind, which exist the Nation over as I shall show presently, really bring two problems because while the land on which the depot is located is in large part suitable for farming, parts of it have been improved by the erection of buildings of various kinds. In each instance, the highest possible use should be made of both. The problems, then, are these:

1. To put to full and beneficial use that part of the improvements which lend themselves to industrial, commercial, or even residential purposes. The desirability of establishing payrolls in farming States and areas is well known. Full advantage should be taken of such opportunities.

2. The sale and operation of the agricultural land in question in family type and size farms—the backbone of rural farming America.

FEARS ARE JUSTIFIED UNDER PRESENT LAWS

As to the second of these goals, research of statutes shows that the expressed fears of citizens of Adams and Clay Counties are justified. Family type and operated farms are not favored by the laws under which surplus lands of this kind are sold. They do not provide any preference or priority to former owners.

In an effort to enable these former owners to bid for the property as effectively as possible under present laws, the General Services Administration which is in charge of the sale tried to offer the property in separate tracts as much as practicable, and then offers them for sale at public auction.

The result of the public auction, however, is a dismal one for the normal individual farmer who seeks to bid. The competition of the large, well-capitalized investor—whether personal or corporation—is too strong and weighted against the man who seeks to acquire the land for the purpose of tilling it himself.

CORRECTIVE BILL IS PROPOSED

Mr. President, to overcome these difficulties and to be of as much help as possible to reach the desired goals, I have prepared and am sending to the desk a bill which is designed to insure the disposal of this and similar surplus tracts of land in family-type farm units. The bill is proposed as an amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Act of 1949, under which surplus property is disposed of.

It provides that any tract of surplus land exceeding 2,000 acres in area which has been devoted to the production of crops and is immediately suitable for agricultural uses, shall be disposed of in parcels of not more than 320 acres to any one individual or family group, as specified in the bill.

These limitations would not apply to any such surplus land upon which there are buildings or improvements if they are still in usable condition for industrial, commercial, or residential purposes. The present law would remain effective in such instances, since every encouragement should be given to induce proper persons or companies to locate upon and activate buildings and areas suitable to their uses.

The bill contains provision for preference to former owners. It is realized that the Surplus Property Act of 1944 did contain such a provision for former owners, and 5 years later the experience was so unfavorable that it was left out when the 1949 act was passed.

It is my plan, Mr. President, to make further inquiry into the reasons for the omission of the former owner preference from the 1949 act, when the hearings are held on this bill. If the reasons for such omission no longer exist and if some practical way can be worked out to reinstate it into law, I would strongly advocate that such preference be accorded. In this way, some equity will be done in favor of owners who were forced to part with the land for defense purposes which have now been served.

THE BILL IS GENERAL LEGISLATION

While the introduction of this bill is brought about because of a situation arising near Hastings, Nebr., it is designed to deal with a problem which has or shortly will exist in several of the 50 States.

The Navy Department recently announced that several such depots in various States, including the Hastings Depot, are no longer needed and will be disestablished as soon as it is feasible to do so. This may take several years to accomplish. In the meantime, the operations will be continued at reduced levels, and as soon as any portions of a given depot no longer serve any purpose, it is planned to declare it excess land, and prepare it, through proper departmental procedures, for disposition by the General Services Administration as surplus land.

The Navy's decision to close such depots is based upon radical and vast changes in weapons and methods of modern warfare and defense needs.

In addition to the several Navy depots to be disposed of, there will undoubtedly be other tracts of land which the Government will relinquish from time to time.

Insofar as such land was taken from family operated farm units and insofar as it can be returned to that use, it should be made possible to get that job done. The proposed bill enables this to be done.

THE WILL AND DETERMINATION OF PEOPLE INVOLVED

What has happened in Nebraska when this situation was presented will no doubt happen in other areas when their time comes. It was heartening to see how these ideas which are so elementary, yet so fundamental, took quick, wide, and enthusiastic hold.

The Blue Hill (Nebr.) Leader, of which Byron Vaughan is editor, put it this way:

"The thousands of acres of farmland comprising the Hastings Naval Ammunition Depot was purchased from farmers. * * * Today there is no longer need for the depot and the land will be returned to the farmers * * * that is, to those who are able to buy. * * *

"Since the depot is apparently situated over the best irrigation water supply in Nebraska, an ideal situation would result if the return to the farmers were handled with care.

"What a farming area it could be if the depot could be divided into small farms, well irrigated and highly tilled. To gain that end, it seems to us that farmers with limited financial means should be permitted to buy this land."

The Clay County News (Mr. King, editor) of January 29, carried an account of one of the mass meetings held in the community to discuss this subject. In part, this news story stated:

"As expressed at the meeting, sentiment is overwhelming for family size farms; not more than a half section at the most—preferably quarter section farms—Clay County, with more than 42,000 acres of its area seized by the Government, was dealt a hard blow by this seizure. Now Federal authorities and the Navy Department in particular have an opportunity to make amends. All that is asked is that the sales of NAD lands be restricted to individual buyers; no buyer be permitted to buy more than 320 acres—directly or indirectly.

"If possible, original owners from whom the land was seized be permitted to bid in former holdings; next veterans be given preference."

POSITIVELY NO AUCTION SALE OF THE LANDS IN A SINGLE UNIT

The Nebraska Unicameral Legislature debated and adopted a resolution which was proposed by Senator Hans O. Jensen (25th district) and Senator Richard Marvel (31st district). The sense of the resolution is pretty well stated in these of its words:

"Whereas the family sized farm remains the backbone of American agriculture * * * this legislature respectfully requests the General Services Administration offer the Hastings Naval Depot for sale in separate tracts of such size as to be economically feasible family sized farm units."

While I have received many, many letters from many fine folks on the subject, I would like to refer to the one written by S. W. Moger, who was for many years County Attorney of Clay County. He is a good lawyer, and a sound citizen; I am proud to have had him for a personal friend for many years. He has been very active in the drive to make suitable progress on the matter of eventual sale of the depot lands.

HOW THE LAND BECOMES SURPLUS

When the Navy will have no further use for the land, it will declare same to be excess land. Thereupon the Secretary of Defense will inquire as to whether any other agency of the Department of Defense has any use for it. If not, it will be certified to the General Services Administration, which will make inquiry if there is any other public use to which it can be put within the provisions of the 1949 act. If no such other use is found, then the land is ready for advertising and sale.

It will take the Navy several years to disestablish the depot, and be ready to move off of the place. The handling of ammunition is expensive. It should be done not only in an economical way, but also in a safe way.

But surely as time goes on, the Navy will be ready to release tracts of land of substantial size for which they do not have any use. An example of that is to be found in the

sections at the eastern portion of the depot. Such areas should not be leased out again, when their present leases expire. They should be offered for sale, so as to get them back into private ownership, and preferably into individual owners' hands.

CONCLUSION

It is my earnest hope, Mr. President, that the bill which I hereby introduce will be promptly and favorably considered, so that it will be operative by the time such sales will be made.

It should be repeated that this is not legislation for a special project. It will be of wide application. It will be wholesome and is much needed. I request that it be appropriately referred, and urge that it be processed as speedily as possible by the committee to which it is sent.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT UNITED NATIONS FORCE

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution supporting the establishment of a permanent United Nations Force.

The experience of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East, established in 1956, and the United Nations Force in the Congo, established last July, have more than adequately demonstrated the usefulness of emergency forces under United Nations command. We are today deeply concerned by the shocking events which have transpired in the Congo, but I believe it is highly significant that the United Nations Security Council, early yesterday morning, acted to strengthen rather than to diminish the United Nations' role in the Congo.

Operative paragraph 1 of the Security Council's resolution urges "that the United Nations take immediately all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence of civil war in the Congo, including arrangements for cease-fire, the halting of all military operations, the prevention of clashes, and the use of force, if necessary, in the last resort."

Despite all the difficulties which the United Nations has encountered in the Congo, one of the chief purposes of the United Nations' action there has thus far been achieved, however precariously. The United Nations Force has at least partly filled a dangerous power vacuum in the Congo. Thus far, none of the great powers has itself intervened in force, thereby risking the intervention of other powers, with all the attendant dangers of precipitating a global conflagration. The United Nations Force in the Congo has well served the cause of what Secretary General Hammarskjold terms "preventive diplomacy" by the United Nations.

Mr. President, I believe we must all admire the skill with which the Secretary General of the United Nations organized these forces and the great service which he has already rendered to the cause of world peace with their assistance. But we must ask ourselves whether the brilliant improvisations of the Secretary General would be possible in somewhat altered circumstances. Some of the initial troops and officers for the Congo operation last July were drawn from the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. Had the Middle Eastern mission of the United Nations not been in existence, these initial troops would not have been instantly available.

The United Nations Force in the Congo reached its greatest strength of slightly over 20,000 men only after a build-up requiring several months. A larger initial force, more quickly available, would doubtless have been even more effective in the Congo and, in other circumstances, might well be crucial.

Much of the United Nations Force in the Congo was transported to the scene through the assistance of the United States, and much of its supplies and equipment were furnished by the United States. If this country had happened to have other pressing military commitments at the time, this assistance might not have been available.

Considerations such as these suggest the importance of a permanent United Nations Force, with at least some of its units fully trained, accustomed to United Nations' command, and with assured transport to any trouble area of the globe on short notice.

We are all aware of the financial objections which many members of the United Nations have raised to the establishment of a permanent United Nations Force. The report of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on his service in the U.S. delegation to the last session of the U.N. General Assembly includes this succinct statement of the broad issue applicable here:

Efforts to enforce peace, however, will not be decisive until the member nations both great and small are willing to support such efforts. According to Secretary General Hammarskjold's estimates, the current costs of world armament amount to $320 million a day. If each nation would contribute only 1 day's cost to an international police force each year, it is possible that all expenses in this field could be met.

It will take more than money alone to enforce peace in the world. It will take the desire for peace and the willingness to meet equitable demands and to accept the verdict. We are still far from reaching that goal. The road toward it is exasperating and frustrating, but we cannot give up.

This explains, in part I believe, our slow and halting progress toward the goal of a permanent United Nations Force for use in emergencies, enunciated by the Senate of the United States in a similar resolution as early as 1957. I believe it is largely this attitude among many member states which caused the Secretary General of the United Nations to limit his recommendations in this field to such steps as the provision of more top-level military personnel in the U.N. Secretariat and the designation in advance of military units for service with the United Nations by member states.

It is precisely because the attitude of member governments and of the people they represent is the determining factor that I believe it would be useful for the U.S. Senate now to reiterate its support for the creation of a permanent United Nations Force. Such an expression by this body may help to build the international consensus needed to facilitate the achievement of the improvements which the Secretary General has already advocated and, beyond that, to advocate the actual establishment of the United Nations Force on a permanent basis.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas twice in recent years, an emergency force of the United Nations has demonstrated its usefulness as an instrument for international order and security, and

Whereas an emergency United Nations force can make an important contribution to the maintenance of conditions of peace and stability among nations, and

Whereas such a United Nations force organized on a permanent basis, with advance provision for its transport and supply, could be made quickly available at troubled points throughout the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) a United Nations force of a similar character to the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East and the United Nations military force in the Congo should be made a permanent arm of the United Nations;

(b) such a force should be composed of units made available by members of the United Nations: *Provided*, That no such units should be accepted from permanent members of the Security Council;

(c) consideration should be given to arrangements whereby individuals would be allowed to volunteer for service with such a force: *Provided*, That individuals who are nationals of permanent members of the Security Council should not be acceptable;

(d) equipment and expenses of such a force should be provided by the United Nations out of its regular budget.

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF EXPORT LICENSE FOR SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, February 16, 1961, there appeared an article entitled "Ball Bearing Machine Sale to Russia Is Approved."

This order involved a $1,500,000 shipment of 45 precision grinding machines, one of a number of components in the making of small ball bearings.

The export license for this shipment was first approved last summer by the Department of Commerce, but the Defense Department, upon learning of the proposed transaction, entered vigorous objections on the basis that these tools could have only military use.

Accordingly, the Commerce Department suspended the approval of the shipment pending further investigation.

Last Thursday Secretary Hodges overruled the Defense Department and approved the sale on the basis that the Russians could buy the same machines in Europe anyway.

If these are the criteria which are to be used in determining the eligibility for the resumption of trade with Russia, then let us recognize the fact that all bars are down. For example:

Why withhold shipments of wheat? It could be bought from Australia or Canada.

Why withhold the shipments of corn? It could be bought from Argentina.

Why withhold the shipments of any agriculture products? They can be bought elsewhere.

Why withhold the shipments of steel, tanks, guns, or other type of military equipment? This equipment is manufactured in other countries as well.

I think the Congress and the country should be well aware of the significance of the approval behind the shipment of these machine tools.

It is not just the $1,500,000 shipment. We are establishing a precedent that the Defense Department recommendations on the shipment of military equipment to Russia and the Communist bloc is no longer being considered.

At a time when we are spending billions annually for the defense of America it is absurd to launch a counteraction of boosting the defense capabilities of our enemies.

In order that the Defense Department may know the position of the U.S. Senate in this connection, I submit and send to the desk a resolution, the purpose of which is to call upon the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, to suspend the export license.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of February 16, 1961, commenting on this shipment, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALL BEARING MACHINE SALE TO RUSSIA IS APPROVED

WASHINGTON.—The Commerce Department has decided to go through with its approval of a shipment to the Soviet Union of grinding machines to make ball bearings, despite Defense Department objections.

The Senate Internal Security Committee had also questioned the transaction, originally approved last summer by the Eisenhower administration.

Involved is a $1,500,000 shipment of some 45 precision grinding machines, one of a number of components in the making of small ball bearings.

Bryant Chucking Grinder Co. will ship the machines. A. E. Stubbs, vice president and general sales manager of the Springfield, Vt., concern, said that while Bryant has shipped no machines to Russia, it was allowed to send some to Poland under an Export-Import Bank loan "a year or two ago."

The Pentagon argued against the current transaction on the ground the equipment could only have military use, and the Commerce Department suspended its approval pending a further look at the issue.

Now Commerce Department officials have decided to lift the suspension. Secretary Hodges takes the position, it was explained, that the same machines are readily available in Europe, so that blocking their export from the United States to Russia would only deprive American firms of the business without denying the machinery to the Russians.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I next ask unanimous consent that the resolution, being submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, be presented at the desk and be placed directly on the calendar for consideration at an early date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The resolution submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware is as follows:

Whereas the Department of Commerce has approved the exportation to the Soviet Union of a $1,500,000 shipment of machine tools designed for use in making small ball bearings;

Whereas the granting of approval of such shipment has been objected to by officials of the Department of Defense on the ground that such tools may be used for military purposes;

Whereas the growth of the military power of the Soviet Union constitutes a serious and continuing threat to the peace and security of the nations of the free world; and

Whereas no action should be taken by the Government of the United States, or by any department or agency thereof, which might in any way aid or enhance such growth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the exportation to the Soviet Union of machine tools for the making of ball bearings which may be used for military purposes is inadvisable, and that the approval heretofore granted by the Department of Commerce of a shipment of such tools should be withdrawn.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ALLOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 174) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EXPANSION OF DOMESTIC EXPORTS IN WORLD MARKETS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 852) to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets, which I introduced for myself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey on February 9, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT A SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF SPEECH BY SOVIET PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV (S. DOC. NO. 14)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, historically, nonaggressive nations, all too often, have disregarded or "written off" as insignificant, the declarations of Hitlers, Lenins, Khrushchevs, et al., even though these declarations may have "spelled out" real threats to peace in the world.

What has happened? Time after time, there have been inadequate efforts to cope with the uprising and aggressiveness of totalitarianism.

In the jet-missile-nuclear-space age, however, the world cannot afford the repetition of such mistakes.

On January 6, 1961, Soviet Premier Khrushchev made a major, 20,000-word speech on Communist policy, entitled, "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement."

The speech outlined tactical ways by which the Soviets propose to advance the cause of communism toward its ultimate goals of world conquest.

Among other things, Khrushchev again endorsed the "tactics for conquest" established by the 20th Communist Party Congress in 1956. These included the following:

1. A proletarian revolution and establishment of a dictatorship were central requirements in transforming society from capitalism to communism.

2. Owing to diversity in national situations, transition to communism everywhere did not have to occur through armed uprising and civil war.

3. Peaceful transition was possible, providing the "ruling classes" submitted willingly. Otherwise, force and civil war were essential.

4. The growing strength of the "world socialist system" and improvements in the organizations of workers in capitalist countries enhanced conditions for Communist revolution.

5. Use of parliamentary institutions, and other governmental institutions, in an era of transition was permissible, providing the majority membership in parliament represented all revolutionary forces under the political leadership of the Communist Party. Under these conditions the bourgeois bureaucracy could be overthrown, and a new proletarian state system, parliamentary in form, could be created.

6. The problem of determining the proper forms and methods of seizure of power was the task of the proletariat in each country and its Communist Party.

Realistically, this is a "declaration of unrelenting warfare" against freedom and should serve to realert the free world.

As a leader of the free world, we could not, in my judgment, ignore the significance of such major statements of policy by the No. 1 leader of communism—the major threat to world peace.

Consequently, I requested an interpretive analysis by the Library of Congress. The analysis—now complete—will—I strongly feel—usefully serve Members of Congress, policy planners and makers in the executive branch, and others involved in dealing with the Communist menace to freedom.

I request unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object. I would suggest to the Senator that the matter be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, where all such matters are considered. I assure the Senator that, if he will do that, we will give it speedy and, I am sure, the kind of consideration he wants.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the matter be referred as the majority leader has suggested. I might say that the Foreign Relations Committee looked into the whole matter, and it was at its suggestion that I made the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, a short while ago I raised an objection to a unanimous-consent re-

quest by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. After talking to the Parliamentarian, I find that it is not unusual for requests of that kind, provided they comprise less than 50 pages, to be made and granted. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, that his request be reconsidered and that he be allowed once again to suggest what he did in the beginning.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator mean my request or his objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The request of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that 7,500 copies of the address be published as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SURVEY OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION WITH STUDY PROGRAMS PREPARING STUDENTS FOR WORK ABROAD (S. DOC. NO. 13)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate that I have had prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service a very important document which relates to a general survey through the country of educational programs which are now in effect in many institutions in the country which particularly train young people for service overseas, for work both in Government and in private enterprises.

This is an important basis of fact upon which we can come to some judgment, for example, with respect to the proposed Youth Corps, upon the sufficiency or insufficiency of our ability to carry on an important technical assistance program and it also has great bearing upon the American economic machine to invest abroad.

I believe it is important enough to deserve a much wider distribution than would be given to it by its insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In view of the fact that it originates with such a reputable body as the Legislative Reference Service, and also because the majority leader is on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as a Senate document the study prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service on educational programs for oversea service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the second such request made this afternoon. The request is made within the rules of the Senate, because, as I understand, after discussing it with the Parliamentarian, any matter of this nature which consists of less than 50 pages can be printed under a unanimous-consent request.

However, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to express the hope to all Senators that there will be no further requests of this kind made on the floor of the Senate, but that these matters will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration, so that we can follow proper procedure.

If that is done, I assure all Senators that their requests will be given speedy consideration. I would appreciate it very much if they will accede to my request.

However, I do not feel that I can object to the request of the Senator from New York, or that I should do so, but I believe that I should serve notice as to what I hope will be the procedure that will be followed from now on. If I am on the floor at the time, I will enter an objection to such unanimous-consent request. I do not object to the request.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader. I know the spirit in which he has spoken. I shall certainly be the first to honor his desire. However, when he sees in detail the document to which I have referred, I believe he will agree with me that it is tremendously useful and will be very helpful to all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have no doubt that it will be useful and very much worthwhile. All I am thinking of is the regular procedure. Inasmuch as the Senate has a Committee on Rules and Administration which passes on such matters, I feel that in the best interests of all, it would be a better policy to pursue if such matters were referred to that committee.

However I know this is an excellent document, because the Senator from New York never does anything in this particular line of endeavor which is not always worthy of reading and worthy of attention by all Senators.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE NOMINATION OF JOHN WILLIAMS MACY, JR., TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing will be held on Tuesday, February, 28, 1961, at 10 a.m., on the nomination of John Williams Macy, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

The hearing will be held in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

Persons wishing to testify at the hearing may arrange to do so by calling the committee office, Capitol 4–3121, extension 5451.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 8, 1961, at 10 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, on the treaty between the United States and Canada concerning the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. The treaty was signed at Washington on January 17, 1961. It is designated as Executive E, 87–1.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release which I have issued on this matter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Committee on Foreign Relations, announced today that the committee will hold a public hearing on the treaty between the United States and Canada concerning the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. The treaty was signed at Washington, January 17, 1961, and is designated as Executive C, 87–1.

The hearing will be held on March 8, 1961, at 10 a.m. in room 4221 of the New Senate Office Building.

The treaty, which is for a 60-year period, is an arrangement under which Canada will provide controlled flows of water in the U.S. portion of the Columbia River system through the construction of dams in the Canadian section of Columbia River. These dams would be operated in accordance with an agreed plan which would be designed to insure maximum hydroelectric and flood control benefits in the Pacific Northwest of the United States. In return, the United States would pay Canada for these benefits in the form of energy for power benefits and money for flood control benefits.

The treaty envisages the construction in the Columbia River Basin in Canada within a 9-year period, of reservoirs providing 15.5 million acre-feet of storage. The treaty also clears the way for construction by the United States, at its option, of the Libby Dam on the Kootenay River in northern Montana, which was authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1950. The reservoir area for this project extends into the Canadian Province of British Columbia.

The principal Government witnesses will be: Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Ivan B. White; Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall; Lt. Gen. Emerson C. Itschner, Army Corps of Engineers. A number of private citizens have asked to be heard.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators interested in this year's proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, I announce that Senate Labor Subcommittee will begin hearings on this subject next Tuesday, February 28, at 9:30 a.m.

We are reserving as much of that first day as is necessary to accommodate Members of the Senate who wish to present their views to the subcommittee. I hope that all interested will inform me of their desire to testify, so that we can work out a schedule convenient to all.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM A. McRAE, JR., TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give

notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William A. McRae, Jr., of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida, vice William J. Barker, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], as chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Address by Senator JAVITS, entitled "Needed: A New Bipartisanship," published in the New Republic of January 23, 1961.

MONTANAN RECEIVES AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned of the citation and award of the Air Force Commendation Medal to another Montanan who has distinguished himself in the Armed Forces. Lt. Col. Joseph C. Walters has been cited for his outstanding ability to formulate plans and invoke action based on exceptionally mature judgment and a keen analysis of all factors.

Colonel Walters was instrumental in bringing into combat readiness some 92 flying bases of the Air National Guard, and, I understand, at a considerable saving of Federal funds. I wish to join in this commendation, for he is a credit not only to the Air Force, but also to his home State of Montana. His parents still live in Whitefish, and I know that they are justly proud of their son.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the text of the citation accompanying the award, and a newspaper article which appeared in the February 9, 1961, issue of the Whitefish Pilot.

There being no objection, the citation and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL TO JOSEPH C. WALTERS

Lt. Col. Joseph C. Walters distinguished himself by meritorious service while assigned as Deputy Chief and Chief, Air Civil Engineering Division, National Guard Bureau from February 1, 1957, to January 31, 1961. Throughout this period, Colonel Walters demonstrated an outstanding ability to formulate plans and invoke action based on exceptionally mature judgment and a keen analysis of all factors. This capability, during a period when the Air National Guard maintenance and rehabilitation program was expanding rapidly, was instrumental in bringing into combat readiness the 92 flying bases of the Air National Guard and at the same time creating a savings of millions of dollars of Federal funds. Through his outstanding ability, tact and diplomacy, he guided the transfer of Air Force and Navy bases to the Air National Guard, effecting to the fullest extent, joint utilization of resources in the Military Establishment of the United States. The distinctive accomplishments of Colonel Walters reflect credit upon himself and the U.S. Air Force.

[From the Whitefish (Mont.) Pilot, Feb. 9, 1961]

COLONEL WALTERS GETS AWARD

Lt. Col. Joseph C. Walters, Air Force officer who is ending a tour of duty in the National Guard Bureau, has been awarded the Air Force Commendation Ribbon for exceptionally meritorious service.

He is a former Whitefish resident and graduate of Montana State College.

For the past 4 years, Walters has served as deputy chief of the Air Civil Engineering Division. Services credited to him include:

Being instrumental in bringing into combat readiness the 92 flying bases of the Air National Guard.

Planning and coordinating an expanded construction program.

Modifying existing structures at Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash., resulting in a $2 million saving.

Being instrumental in designing and perfecting a preengineered building which was subsequently adopted for use throughout the Air National Guard and which resulted in major savings in construction of these facilities.

Walters is being transferred to San Antonio air material area, Kelly Air Force Base, Tex., where as chief of civil engineering, he will be in charge of more than 1,000 employees.

THE RANGE CONSERVATION STAMP AND CHARLIE RUSSELL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on February 2 of this year a new U.S. postage stamp, commemorating range conservation, was issued at Salt Lake City by the U.S. Post Office. This 4-cent stamp is part of a series telling of our natural resources. I am especially pleased to see the recognition given the vitally important subject of range conservation. I am even more delighted because our Post Office Department utilized for half of this stamp the wonderful, historic painting by Montana's first citizen, Charlie Russell. The picture selected for the stamp was "The Trail Boss," and it is one of Charlie's finest works.

It was on March 19, 1959, that Montana placed in Statuary Hall its first statue to a leading citizen. Montana selected Charles M. Russell; and, in selecting him, we recognized that he was not only a great citizen of Montana, but also a citizen of the West. He was a man with tremendous insight and humility; and, above all, he was an artist who recorded on canvas the vanishing of the Old West and the era of the cowboy and the Indian.

Charlie Russell was born in St. Louis, Mo., in 1864; and he came to Helena in 1880. He lived out his life in Montana; but he gave his entire life to recording, with fidelity, the West as it was in that historic era.

The importance of rangeland to our great Nation is large. Almost 700 million acres of our country, nearly 40 percent, are in pasture or range. The West still has almost 200 million acres of rangeland that are not in farms. We have in the West two Federal agencies, the U.S. Forest Service, in the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Land Management, in the Department of the Interior, which manage a great part of the open range that remains. Special credit should go to these two agencies and also to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in the Department of the Interior, the Soil Conservation Service, in the Department of Agriculture, and the American Society of Range Management, for their efforts in securing recognition of range conservation, by means of this stamp.

Mr. Rudolph Wendelin, in the Department of Agriculture, deserve special credit for his role as the designer of the format for this well-composed stamp. On the right-hand side is an open range scene, with cattle pasturing, and the mountains behind. On the left-hand side is a cut of "The Trail Boss," Charlie Russell's wonderful painting.

If it were not for the fact that I consider Charlie Russell to be a citizen of the West, I might question why a stamp utilizing one of his famous paintings was not issued in Montana. I think it is altogether fitting, however, that Salt Lake City, Utah, have the honor, for it is the home of one of the foremost conservationists in the Senate, the junior Senator from Utah, FRANK E. MOSS. In the short period that TED MOSS has been in the Senate, he has served with distinction on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and he has been closely associated with many of the problems of wise use of our range and other natural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Postmaster General Day on the occasion of the issuance of the range conservation stamp be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This new U.S. postage stamp commemorating range conservation is the first in history devoted to this great natural resource. We hope it will help call attention to the importance of the protection and improvement of our Nation's grasslands and to the blessings they provide mankind.

Gun battles once were waged over the right to graze choice areas of rangeland. Fortunately, this phase of range life survives only in our colorful heritage of western legend and literature. Today the tremendous pressures on our range resources are countered instead by scientific grassland management that serves the needs of water and soil conservation, livestock production, and wildlife.

Management of our grasslands has come a long way since the days of the open range and the "Trail Boss," which Charles Russell saw and painted in the West. The Post Office Department is proud to salute the practice of range conservation for it maintains a resource that has played a dramatic role in America's history.

MAYOR RAYMOND TELLES, OF EL PASO, IS OUTSTANDING CHOICE AS AMBASSADOR TO COSTA RICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, no matter where or how long he might have searched, President Kennedy could not have made a better selection than his choice of Mayor Raymond Telles, of El Paso, as Ambassador to Costa Rica.

Mayor Telles and I have been friends for many years; and I know him to be a man of exceptional ability, powerful personality, and deep dedication to the ideal of human liberty.

My prediction is that not only will he make an outstanding record of service in Costa Rica, but this will prove only the beginning step toward even bigger assignments in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Man in the News feature from the New York Times of Thursday, February 16, 1961, entitled "A Friend of Latins: Raymond Lawrence Telles."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 16, 1961]

A FRIEND OF LATINS: RAYMOND LAWRENCE TELLES

President Kennedy's choice as Ambassador to Costa Rica is a Spanish-speaking Texan of Mexican ancestry who has had wide experience in dealing with Latin Americans. Mayor Raymond Lawrence Telles, of El Paso, said yesterday that as Ambassador his main job would be to let the Costa Ricans know: "We are their friends; we are all partners in the promotion of security for the entire hemisphere. We want to help them, but as partners. After all, we need their help as much as they need ours, if we're going to be successful in preventing the advance of communism."

HAS MET PRESIDENT

Mayor Telles is a fourth-generation U.S. resident whose father, also named Raymond, was in the construction and transportation business in El Paso.

Unlike several other Kennedy appointees, he has met the President. On the telephone yesterday, he said he met Mr. Kennedy the first time in 1956 when the then Senator was campaigning in Texas for Adlai E. Stevenson, the Democratic presidential candidate.

"I met the President again during his own campaign last year," he recalled. "I've also known Vice President JOHNSON for many years."

As mayor of a border city, Mr. Telles says he is "very close to the people of Mexico," and not simply by geography. Of the 277,000 El Paso residents, he says, at least 40 percent are Mexican or of Mexican ancestry. "I have daily opportunities to work with Mexicans," he notes.

During World War II, he was a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force with the job of administering aviation lend-lease supplies to Mexico and Central and South America. Besides the Bronze Star and a commendation ribbon from his country, he holds decorations from Mexico, Nicaragua, Colombia, Brazil, and Peru.

STUDIED BUSINESS

Mr. Telles attended International Business College and Texas Western College in El Paso. Afterward he got a job as an administrator and cost accountant for the Bureau of Prisons in the Justice Department.

He entered the Army in 1941 as a private in the 36th Division. He went to the Air Force Officer Candidate School in Miami and emerged a second lieutenant.

Just after the war, Mr. Telles served as an aid to General Eisenhower and President Truman on visits to Mexico. In 1954 he was sent to Mexico as a liaison officer and adviser to the chief of the Mexican Air Force.

"In 1948, I decided to get into politics," he said. "I ran for county clerk and defeated the incumbent, who had been in office 10 years. I think my success was due to hard work and personally contacting as many people as I could."

He was reelected twice, without opposition, the second time while serving in Korea in 1952. He ran for mayor in 1957 and won by several thousand votes. He ran unopposed for a second term.

Mr. Telles is 6 feet tall and weighs 165 pounds. He is clean shaven and has brown hair. He likes tennis, football, handball, and baseball, "but I'm not a very good participant."

His wife, the former Delfina Navarro, is also a native of El Paso. They have two daughters, Cynthia Ann, 8, and Patricia Eugenia, 5.

"All of my family speak both English and Spanish," Mr. Telles said. "I have made it a point that they stay with both languages."

A TIME FOR RIGHT DECISION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, last Friday evening the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] delivered an important and timely address in New York City. Speaking before an audience of more than 200 members of the Chinese community in New York, he rightly cautioned against pessimism, secrecy, predilection for change, fatalism, and defeatism in America's domestic and foreign policies. He also recalled some lessons of history to guide our U.S. diplomats as they cope with the Congo, Red China, and Laos.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Hawaii on his clear analysis and lucid observations, and I join him in the hope that the decisions the new administration makes will be the right decisions for America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the address delivered by the Senator from Hawaii.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TIME FOR RIGHT DECISION

(Address by Senator FONG to the Chinese Community, at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, N.Y., February 17, 1961)

Mr. Toastmaster, Mayor Wagner, distinguished guests, members of the Chinese community, ladies and gentlemen, "Kung Hee Fat Choy," "Hauoli Makahiki Hou"—Happy New Year. It is a distinct pleasure for my wife, Ellyn, and me to be here with you to mark the beginning of this Chinese Lunar Year of the Ox. Some prefer to call it the Year of the Bull, others, the Year of the Cow.

In Hawaii, the Chinese New Year celebration is now a State of Hawaii celebration. Everyone joins in its festivities. It is now known as the Narcissus Festival. Its duration is about 10 days with many preliminaries leading up to the general celebration. The Narcissus Festival is a tremendous tourist attraction in Hawaii. Tourism is now our second principal industry and will soon be our first industry.

In each January, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce and its junior chamber conduct a preliminary beauty contest to select a queen to reign over the Narcissus Festival. This year's queen is Miss Stephanie Loo, a 19-year-old beauty who is a sophomore at the University of Hawaii. Besides having the honor of participating in many of the activities of the community, Miss Loo won a trip to the mainland United States as well as an all-expense-paid trip to Asia and southeast Asia, and will be visiting places as far as Singapore and Bangkok. Like the trips of previous queens, her trip, on which she will be accompanied by 30 to 40 people from Hawaii, will do much to create good will for America in the many nations she will visit.

To begin the New Year festivities in Hawaii, last Friday three dancing lions followed by a Chinese band led the parade in Honolulu's China Town. The next evening, the streets of China Town were closed to traffic where a Mardi Gras-type festival was held.

Among the other events which were separately given and which attracted large crowds were: a long-rehearsed Chinese drama in English, a well-planned tour of homes decorated in the Chinese motif, a symphony concert with guest singers, an artists-in-action program, a tea and fashion show of depicting modern as well as ancient Chinese gowns, a floral show of great beauty, a fireworks display, and a grand nine-course banquet as a climax. Competitions in calligraphy, photography, and poetry were also held.

The Narcissus Festival has been celebrated for more than a decade in Hawaii and each year it has grown bigger and bigger and more successful. It has provided a training ground for many of our youngsters to participate in community activities. For example, many who took part in the dramas have become active in our Community Theater, and many successful musicians and artists had their start in the festival.

Following the lead of the Narcissus Festival, the Japanese Junior Chamber of Commerce now sponsors annually a Cherry Blossom Festival in the spring. This festival has also met with great success and, like the Narcissus Festival, has added much to the cultural enrichment of Hawaii. In the fall, under the auspices of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, the people of Hawaii celebrate Aloha Week when the cultures, customs, and traditions of Hawaii and Polynesia, including Samoa and Tahiti, are portrayed. Because of our success in Hawaii, I would like to commend to you the idea of a Narcissus Festival here in New York City. I am quite sure it will be well received and besides adding much to the enrichment of the culture of New York, it will give to young and old of the Chinese community an opportunity for expression and an initiation into public service.

New Year's time is always resolutions time. With the passing of the old year, we always note with regret that the year is gone and we have not kept the resolutions we made, reminding me of the story of the bull and the honey bee.

* * * * *

From that homely little story we humans can take our cue. When the time for decision arrives, we should make our decisions promptly and intelligently, without vacillation or procrastination. Especially at the start of a new year are we cognizant of the need to take inventory, to strike a balance sheet, to make plans, resolutions and decisions for the coming year.

As with each of us, so it is with our Nation, now that one administration has departed its office and a new administration has entered upon its responsibilities. For the new team which is now deep in the process of formulating domestic and foreign policies, it is indeed a time of decision.

But, more than that, it is a time for right decision.

If we the people are to exert any influence toward right decisions, now is the time for us to make our views known—before policies are formulated and before decisions, which may prove irrevocable, are made.

As enlightened and interested citizens, we have a duty to warn our public officials against what we consider unwise action.

The fledgling administration has been in power less than 1 month. But already there are to me some very disquieting signs on the horizon—signs that portend stormy weather ahead for America.

The first foreboding sign appeared with the state of the Union message followed by the Economic Report of President Kennedy, in which there is a distinct tendency to overemphasize the negative.

This may have been good politics for a campaigning candidate for President, but it is bad statesmanship for our country.

Statements made by any President of the United States always command attention around the world. From President Kennedy's overly pessimistic picture of America, other peoples may readily believe ours is a tottering, faltering economy on its last legs.

To leave such an impression when actually we are very strong, both militarily and economically, is extremely dangerous. It can only dilute our influence in world councils. It can only lend credence to Communist propaganda that capitalism is on the decline and their Communist system is the wave of the future. No longer need the Communist propaganda machines fabricate fables about America, they need only quote the President of the United States.

Should that growing list of uncommitted or neutral nations, who are now sitting on the fence in the cold war struggle, become convinced America is slipping, there is real danger they may choose to cast their lot with our opponents—and that signifies serious trouble.

In addition to a persistent pessimism, there are other disturbing omens on the New Frontier, particularly regarding foreign affairs.

One is an alarming tendency toward secrecy, which began with the release of two RB–47 fliers who were shot down in cold blood and imprisoned last summer by the Soviets. The American people have not yet been told the concessions or agreements made by the Kennedy administration to Mr. Khrushchev to obtain their release. The President himself imposed silence on the flyers after their return and still refuses to permit the press to question them so that the American people can learn more about the Russians' act of piracy over the high seas.

Are we entering upon another era of secret agreements such as we had in the 1940's which proved so disadvantageous to America? Have we forgotten so soon the treaties approved by former Presidents at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam—agreements whose terms, such as the partition of Germany, plague us to this day?

Another facet of the ominous trend to secrecy is the tendency to suppress criticism of the Communists. It began with censorship of public speeches of our top military advisers. References to communism and Russia in a speech draft of Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, were stricken by censors at the White House who were reported "appalled" at his statements that the Russians cannot be trusted.

Following on the heels of the silence imposed upon our RB–47 fliers and censorship of Admiral Burke's speech, one of our television networks canceled without explanation a scheduled drama dealing with Communist subversion in the United States. Immediately in the Congress cries of protest were raised and, I am glad to report, the dramatization of Soviet spy cases was subsequently televised.

Nevertheless, these several incidents lead one to wonder whether another period of suppressing facts on communism and glossing over Communist activities and intentions is dawning for the American people.

It was this same euphemistic attitude in the White House in the 1930's and 1940's that blinded millions of Americans to the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion at home and that misled many Americans on Communist aggression abroad.

Along with such incredible unrealism, there appears to be a disconcerting eagerness on the part of some administration lieutenants to "change" foreign policy for the sake of change. Not too long ago, when a hue and cry for "change" arose because of a stalemate in negotiations between the United States and Russia, an eminent American Secretary of State reminded us:

"There are occasions when others, and not we, should provide the change. Nothing could be more dangerous than for the United States to operate on the theory that, if hostile and evil forces do not quickly or readily change, then it is we who must change to meet them."

That was good advice then—and it is good advice now.

Impatient Americans must understand that Communist intransigence is deliberate strategy. They may smile one day and frown the next, but they do not budge from their position. They are geared to the long, long pull, not at all expecting to attain their goals overnight but comfortable in their conviction that, sooner or later, we will come to terms with them.

United States-Soviet disarmament conferences provide a classic example. Countless meetings have been held over the years, each leading only to deadlock. When, at last, the weary diplomats give up in despair, the pressure turns on our U.S. diplomats to contrive a "fresh, imaginative" plan more likely to be accepted.

Meantime, the Soviets bide their time, return to the conference table with their same old disarmament schemes, reject our new plans, and in due course return to Moscow while our diplomats further revamp our disarmament proposals.

This is the Communist technique of planned erosion—of diplomatic attrition—of talking out, wearing out, and waiting out. As anxious as our present administration is to achieve a disarmament pact, will it be strong enough to resist the pressures for compromise until such day as the Communists agree to enforceable and safeguarded disarmament?

Doubt creeps into our minds, for, more and more, a distressing fatalism, an alarming defeatism permeates the utterances of our top foreign policy advisers. Increasingly, is voiced the opinion that Red China will soon win enough votes in the United Nations to secure a seat on the Security Council and that America had better face up to that inevitable defeat.

Professor Schlesinger of the White House staff has spoken of admitting the Peiping regime to the United Nations as "a reasonable price to pay" in order to get Red China and the Soviet Union into a "system of reliable arms control."

Both Mr. Adlai Stevenson, new American Ambassador to the United Nations, and Mr. Chester Bowles, our new Under Secretary of State, have indicated their belief that Red China will eventually be admitted to the United Nations.

How can we expect to win this issue if we announce in advance that our defeat is inevitable?

Such official views already have set in motion a chain reaction in countries that heretofore have joined America in opposing U.N. membership for Red China. A few days ago, the Foreign Secretary of Britain told the House of Lords, "The facts of international life require that Communist China should be seated in the U.N." Canada, too, which up to now opposed seating Red China, is reported to be "shaping a new China policy of its own less rigid than the U.S. position it has hithereto supported."

Fatalistic sentiments also emanate from high administration sources regarding U.S. recognition of Red China. The American people are told we can no longer ignore the existence of this land of 700 million souls—that we must "deal" with the Peiping Government whose growing military power and aggressiveness pose a threat to world peace.

United Nations admission and U.S. recognition of Red China are inevitable only if the administration abandons the fight.

No team ever went into a game conceding defeat before the opening whistle.

The good and sufficient reasons we have advanced in the past to deny recognition of Red China and to bar her membership in the United Nations are as valid as ever. Red China has never purged herself of her inequities. Indeed, with every passing year, the Peiping Government proves itself less worthy to participate in the family of nations.

Once America abandons the fight for right and the struggle against wrong, and that is the bedrock basis for U.S. opposition to Red China, we will have renounced any claim we now have to moral leadership in the free world. Our role as keeper of the world's conscience will become untenable, for we will have lost one of our most powerful instruments for justice and peace, namely, moral suasion. Our friends and supporters, who look to us for protection against marauders, would no longer trust us. And the Communists would despise us all the more for our weakness.

But pessimism, secrecy, predilection for change, fatalism, defeatism are not the only disturbing attitudes evidenced in official quarters during the brief tenure of the new administration. There are indications the lessons of history are being ignored.

In the Congo situation, for example, our Ambassador to the United Nations has been pressing for a coalition government which would include representatives of the major factions. One powerful faction is led by men whose orientation toward communism is a matter of incontrovertible record.

Similarly for war-torn Laos there are suggestions in America for a coalition government, which would necessarily include pro-Communist representatives, or for an International Armistice Commission, which would include a Communist Commissioner.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson in 1951 publicly admitted that, once in a government, the Communist objective is to take complete control. He told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that such "captures" had, in fact, occurred in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

To forestall repetition of the same error in Laos and in the Congo, we the people should remind the Kennedy administration of the lessons of history.

There can be no doubt that, in Laos and in the Congo, the setting up of coalition governments to include Communists would be tantamount to surrender by installments.

In all fairness, the Congo problem is one not alone for America to resolve, but for every member of the United Nations which desires to remain outside the Communist orbit.

If the Congo is a crucial test for the new administration, it is likewise a crucial test for the United Nations.

When trouble began in the Congo, the Big Powers—Britain, France, the United States, and Soviet Russia—did not supply troops to

restore law and order. Very correctly, the United Nations force consisted of troops volunteered from small nations nearer the Congo in distance and in culture.

On them fell the very difficult, delicate, and trying task of maintaining peace without taking political sides with the clashing factions in the Congo. Today the job is far from being done. The conflict continues fluid and extremely flammatory. Yet, bit by bit, the small nations are pulling their forces out of the Congo, decimating the strength of the United Nations and abrogating their own moral obligation to help keep the peace.

There was a time when the Big Powers alone were regarded as guardians of the peace, but now it is plain the question of war or peace rests equally on the small nations.

On them depends success or failure of the United Nations in the Congo, and on the Congo outcome hinges the future of the United Nations as an effective instrument for peace.

It is indeed D-day—decision day—for the United Nations, as Mr. Khrushchev forces a showdown with his resolution demanding the withdrawal of United Nations troops and operations in the Congo and demanding the dismissal of United Nations Secretary General Hammarskjold.

What Mr. Khrushchev proposes is the freezing out of the United Nations in the Congo, leaving that war-torn land ripe for plucking by a pro-Communist regime.

If the United Nations is frozen out of the Congo, how then can it ever again serve effectively in other trouble spots of the world? Withdrawal of the United Nations troops is tantamount to a sad admission that the United Nations no longer is an effective force for peace and order and that the nations of the world have agreed to return to the jungle law of world politics—to survival of the fittest, the biggest, and the strongest.

The time has come when all nations, big or small, must stand up and be counted, for this issue spells life or death for the instrumentality designed to protect them all.

Clearly this is as much a testing time for all nations as it is for our new administration—a time to decide whether the moral backbone of non-Communist nations is strong enough to make the right decisions.

The late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles once said: "Moral power can be a powerful force in the world. That is not a pious hope. It is the judgment of every realist throughout history. It was Napoleon who said that 'in war, moral considerations make up three-fourths of the game.' It was Admiral Mahan who said that physical force was useful only 'to give moral ideas time to take root.' The need is for more effective political use of moral power."

Every nation, whether large or small, has a bounden duty to take a strong stand for the morally right and to oppose the morally wrong.

Whether our own administration will make more effective use of moral power remains to be seen. In the meantime, those of us distressed by some of the moral pathways the administration appears ready to travel should make our objections known. Even in this space age the weight of public opinion is a mighty force and the pen a mighty instrument.

Although each of us is a minority of 1 of 180 million in America, our opinion counts—just as our lone vote counts. Certainly, the election of last November dramatized the importance of every vote cast.

So close was the presidential election in this country that a shift of 11,874 votes, distributed as follows, would have put Mr. Nixon in the White House: 58 in Hawaii, 4,430 in Illinois, 4,991 in Missouri, 1,148 in New Mexico, and 1,247 in Nevada.

Here is fresh proof that every vote, every person, every group—no matter how small—counts in America. Neither as individuals nor as a member of minority groups need we feel too insignificant to exert influence for every one of us is a member of a minority group—be it economic, social, political, religious, or racial. You and I who are of Chinese ancestry happen to belong to a very small racial minority in the United States, so small that by no stretch of the imagination do we wield any balance of power in America. Yet, as Americans, each of us has an equal vote, an equal opportunity to pursue our endeavors, equal rights under the law, and an equal voice in our Government.

Lincoln said, "Our Government rests in public opinion. Whoever can change public opinion, can change the Government."

You and I today, as individuals, can as in Lincoln's day bring the weight of our opinion to bear on our Government. It is still Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, a wonderful fact which gives constant hope to our hearts, everlasting faith to our minds and abiding strength to our spirits, that our Nation will make the right decisions.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD CONCERNING MRS. BARBARA COLLINS' ASYLUM IN CUBA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared, together with news items from the Miami Herald of February 17 and February 19, 1961.

There being no objection, the statement and news items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD

Many Senators will recall the discussion in the Senate last Thursday about Robert Taber, the executive secretary of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, who is unavailable for the service of a subpena to appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee because he has left his home in New York and is staying indefinitely in Cuba.

The Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING, made a fine statement about this matter on Thursday, and I added a few remarks of my own.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to another witness desired by the Internal Security Subcommittee, also connected with the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and who also has fled to Cuba, apparently to escape service.

This time the prospective witness is a woman, Mrs. Barbara Collins of Miami, Fla., whose address in Miami was 1015 Northwest 112th Street. The Internal Security Subcommittee has been trying since the second week in January to get Mrs. Collins as a witness.

A subpena calling for Mrs. Collins' appearance before the committee on January 14, 1961, was taken to Mrs. Collins' home on the preceding day, January 13, 1961, by a deputy U.S. marshal. This marshal talked with Mrs. Collins through the closed door at her residence. He identified himself, but she said she would not talk to him or accept the subpena, stating she had talked to her attorney and that it would not be a good service unless the marshal touched her. The marshal put the subpena through the door, told Mrs. Collins the district attorney would have to rule on whether the service was good, and went back to his office. Mrs. Collins did not appear in response to the subpena.

On the evening of January 18, the committee received a telegram which had been filed in New York City earlier that day. The text of this telegram was as follows:

"SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,

"Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

"I have been advised by my client, Barbara Collins, that a subpena has been issued for her appearance in Florida. She is ready to appear upon proper service.

"STANLEY FAULKNER."

But the following week, when a U.S. marshal again went to the address Mrs. Collins had occupied, he was told she had left Miami. So far as the committee has been able to ascertain, she has not returned.

On February 17, 1961, the Miami Herald carried a news story stating that Prensa Libre, Cuban Government newspaper, had claimed on the previous day (Thursday, February 16) that Mrs. Barbara Collins was "the first American granted political asylum by the Castro regime."

The Miami Herald article, which carried a United Press International, Havana dateline, said:

"Prensa Libre quoted Mrs. Collins as saying she was persecuted by the FBI and other U.S. agencies because she belonged to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee."

The Miami news article declared:

"Mrs. Barbara Collins is most active and is one of the leading figures, if not the leading figure, in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee in Miami."

It is interesting that as late as January 10, 1961, in an interview with investigators, Mrs. Collins would not answer questions about the activities of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and insisted that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee did not have either a local headquarters or a meeting place in Miami.

The facts are that Mrs. Collins joined the Fair Play for Cuba Committee early in 1960, after reading an ad which the committee had placed in the New York Times, which was paid for in large part by Castro money.

Later, according to a report which has come to the Internal Security Subcommittee, Mrs. Collins developed her own contact with the Castro government, using another resident of Miami as go-between.

Information in possession of the Internal Security Subcommittee indicates Mrs. Barbara Collins had numerous associations with pro-Castro Cubans, and even with members of Castro's underground in this country. She was also closely associated with various members and functionaries of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. During last December and January, she shared her home on several different occasions with various members or functionaries of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and during the first week of January entertained in her home an identified Communist who had gone to Miami on the business of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, according to information received by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Whether a witness who flees the country to escape testifying before a Senate committee can be said to be seeking political asylum is a matter on which Senators will have their own opinions.

It would be interesting to know whether Mrs. Collins had already left Miami at the time Stanley Faulkner sent his telegram to the Internal Security Subcommittee, calling her his client and declaring that she is ready to appear upon proper service.

According to the UPI story in the Miami Herald, Mrs. Collins said that in leaving the United States she went first to Fort Lauderdale, Fla., and from there to New York, where she took a boat going to Veracruz, Mexico, with a stop in Havana.

If Mrs. Collins had already left Florida, and was, perhaps, in New York when Mr.

Faulkner's telegram was sent to the committee, then it would seem the good faith of the telegram may be open to question, since the telegram on its face might be taken as an indication that Mrs. Collins was available to be subpenaed at her Florida home.

Certainly the telegram does not purport to be an offer to produce Mrs. Collins; and in fact, implicit in this telegram is a denial that Barbara Collins has been properly served to appear before the committee.

Whether service actually was had upon Mrs. Collins on January 13 may be open to argument. But I think it is beyond question that she was in fact summoned to appear before the Internal Security Subcommittee and that she was aware of this summons. If I am correct about this, then her failure to appear constituted a contempt of the Senate, if the committee and the Senate should wish to press that charge.

There is no magic about subpenas. A subpena, in the case of a witness summoned to appear before a congressional committee, is simply a notice of the summons. It is the summons itself, and not formal notice of the summons, which is important. If the summoned witness receives the information that the committee has called him or her to appear, and knows or has reason to believe that this information comes from an official source, then the witness must appear upon pain of contempt.

I do not know what further action the committee may take in this case. Certainly the committee's jurisdiction does not extend to Cuba and while she remains there Mrs. Collins, like Robert Taber, is beyond the reach of a committee subpena.

While it might be possible to cite Mrs. Collins for contempt even though she is now in Cuba, I would see little point to such action without being sure that she would return to the United States, where she might be prosecuted for the contempt.

Such matters are, of course, for the committee in the first instance, and the Senate finally, to decide. But I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to this situation, now that a second Fair Play for Cuba Committee witness has fled the country rather than testify. I want to say to my colleagues that no matter how many witnesses may flee the country, I intend to urge that the Internal Security Subcommittee continue its investigation of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and I feel confident the committee will do so.

It may be that we shall have other instances of flight to avoid testifying. But I am not concerned about that. If every member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee who is directly connected with communism or Castro should flee the country, I would not be upset about it; for without its Communist-connected and Castro-connected leadership, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee would very soon cease to exist.

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 19, 1961]

SHE'S IN HAVANA NOW—DEFECTOR IS KNOWN FIDELISTA

(By Arthur Johnsey)

A Miami woman who became the first American to seek political asylum in Cuba was revealed by police here Saturday to be an old hand at propaganda.

She is Mrs. Barbara Collins, formerly of 1015 Northwest 112th Street, once employed by a tire company here.

According to Cuba's Government newspaper, Prensa Libre, she turned up in Havana with her 3-year-old daughter and a second Miami woman, Mrs. Lillian Clott.

Metro's intelligence division revealed Friday that Mrs. Collins came to Miami last July and Mrs. Clott last March, from the New Jersey area.

"They came for a definite purpose—making propaganda that will aid the Castro cause," said metro intelligence division.

Mrs. Clott was quoted as saying to investigators here that she sat on the reviewing stand in Havana during a Castro tirade against the United States last May 1.

"The woman said she went up there to ask Castro a question," the investigator declared.

Mrs. Clott was known as a "close friend" of Barbara Collins.

Mrs. Collins, as a member of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, visited Havana last Thanksgiving.

While there she asked to wear the uniform of Castro's militia, metro officers said she told them.

Mrs. Collins was fired from her secretarial job here when her propaganda activities were disclosed to company officials.

Mrs. Clott was asked to resign from a job with a restaurant supply house here the same day that an apartment owner asked her to vacate an apartment at 530 Northeast 29th Street.

Earlier she had worked for a Coral Gables dentist.

An account of alleged anti-Castro terrorism in Miami, published in a pamphlet of the Fair Play Committee, is attributed to Mrs. Collins.

[From the Miami Herald, Feb. 17, 1961]

GRANTED ASYLUM BY CASTRO?—MIAMIAN DEFECTS, CUBA PAPER SAYS

Cuba's Government newspaper, Prensa Libre, claimed Thursday that a Miami woman is the first American granted political asylum by the Castro regime, a United Press International dispatch from Havana reported.

The Cuban newspaper identified her as Mrs. Barbara Collins, who was subpenaed to appear before a U.S. Senate subcommittee hearing in Miami in January.

A Mrs. Barbara Collins, a tire company employee who lived at 1015 Northwest 112th Street, was summoned to appear before the subcommittee here last month. Attempts to reach her in Miami Thursday were unsuccessful.

Prensa Libre said that Mrs. Collins was in Havana with her 2-year-old daughter, Debra.

Prensa Libre quoted Mrs. Collins as saying she was persecuted by the FBI and other U.S. agencies because she belonged to the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the UPI dispatch said.

Mrs. Collins was quoted as saying that after she denounced the existence of training camps for anti-Castro "mercenaries" near Miami, she was subpenaed by the subcommittee.

After that, the Cuban newspaper said, Mrs. Collins was asked to leave her apartment by her landlady, and was trailed in Miami by followers of former Cuban Dictator Fulgencio Batista.

Prensa Libre said Mrs. Collins described her "escape" from the United States this way:

"I went to Fort Lauderdale and from there to New York, where I took a boat going to Vera Cruz, Mexico, with a stop in Havana.

"Even so, I had to swear I would not disembark in Cuba," the UPI dispatch asserted.

REJECTION OF BID BY TOLEDO METAL FURNITURE CO.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise to present to the Senate a complaint which I believe has justifiably been made by the Toledo Metal Furniture Co. The complaint is with respect to the processing of bids under an invitation identified as "FN-IS-26334-A-1-18-61."

The Toledo Metal Furniture Co. is a small business concern, and it employs approximately 60 men. In response to the invitation to bid, it submitted, before January 18, 1961, a bid to the General Services Administration, in conjunction with the Small Business Administration.

The invitation to bid stated that the bids would be opened on January 18. However, on January 18 the invitors issued a public statement that the bids would not be opened until January 26. No explanation was given for delaying the opening of the bids.

On January 26, the bids were opened; and the low bidder was found to be the Toledo Metal Furniture Co.

However, neither on January 26 nor until this day has an award been made on the bids.

On January 26, when the bids were opened, it was found that there was a bid by the Chrome Craft Co., of St. Louis, Mo. That company admittedly is a big business. It was admittedly disqualified from being considered as one of the bidders on this small contract, which involves approximately $40,000 or $60,000.

I repeat that the bids were to be opened on January 18. But on that date it was declared that the bids would not be opened until January 26. However, until this day no award has been made.

Later there developed a rather inexplicable condition: I can understand why this small firm is complaining: On February 18, the Small Business Administration changed the definition of what constitutes a small business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The time available to the Senator from Ohio, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 3 minutes more, by unanimous consent?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I must object; but I do so only for the RECORD, because I believe we should observe the procedure which has been outlined.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, until February 18, the applicable definition was that the term "small business" comprehends any enterprise which employs less than 500 men. But on February 18, the definition was changed; in other words, in the middle of the game, when the bids were in, the definition was changed. It was changed in such a way as to qualify the St. Louis, Mo., firm.

I call the especial attention of these agencies to what is happening; and at this time I should like to read some of the words which, a few moments ago, were read to the Senate by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], from Washington's Farewell Address:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports.

And a little later:

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government.

And a little later:

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations.

Mr. President, in paraphrasing that, I would say: Observe good faith and justice toward all citizens.

Those words of President George Washington, in his Farewell Address, have a very effective application to what has happened under the bids to which I have referred. The rules were changed in the middle of the game, so as to knock out the bid by the small Toledo company.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Let me say that today my colleague has rendered a real and needful service by calling attention to an act of discrimination in Government bidding procedures, an obvious changing of the rules in the middle of a contest. The changing of the definition of what constitutes a small business so as, apparently, to favor big business, as against a small firm in our State of Ohio, which had complied with all the rules, makes a farce of Federal Government bidding procedures.

I hope that what my colleague has done today will result in the taking of action in behalf of the Toledo Metal Furniture Co. I wish to associate myself completely with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank my colleague.

CBS TELEVISION BROADCAST HIGHLIGHTS MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, whenever a major question of public affairs divides opinion in our country, television can bring home to millions of viewers in a way that will win their attention the nature of the issues involved. An outstanding recent example of this was the "great debates," in which the two presidential candidates engaged in face-to-face verbal combat, like knights of old jousting for the Nation's favor. The consequences, variously interpreted, are now a matter of history. It is plain that this unprecedented opportunity in public affairs television raised interest in the subject matter of politics to new peaks.

A much-debated subject today is the question of providing a federally financed program of medical care for old people. In the coming months we here in the Senate will be devoting many hours to analyzing and disputing the several proposals that have been advanced. There was a time when we would have carried on our discussions largely insulated from the consciousness of the great mass of the general public. But, thanks to television, that is much less the case today.

The Columbia Broadcasting System recently presented a program on this subject, entitled "The Business of Health: Medicine, Money, and Politics." It was an informative presentation of the urgent problem of financing adequate medical care for our senior citizens. Documentary film excerpts were combined with intelligent discussion of the programs that have been advanced so as to make the salient facts and figures of the problem dramatically understandable to every viewer. From the clash of opposing opinions, those who witnessed the program were able to judge for themselves the pros and cons of the various proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of this CBS program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CBS REPORTS—"THE BUSINESS OF HEALTH: MEDICINE, MONEY, AND POLITICS"

(Reporter: Howard K. Smith; producer: Stephen Fleischman; executive producer: Fred W. Friendly)

Mr. SMITH. A cold war of medicine is being waged across the country—the forces in the conflict polarizing around organized medicine and organized labor.

Mr. SARLES. They speak of the labor movement taking advantage of their authority and control. But yet, again, I can't say without maybe not hurting someone's feelings, that I think the medical association, they ought to wake up and they ought to start acting like the educated men that they are.

Dr. EMERSON. Well, we're not necessarily on the defensive for medicine, but we're on the defensive for the public. This is not necessarily the doctor's battle—this is the battle in America. And I'm reminded of a remark that Stalin is supposed to have said—in that the medical profession is the keystone of free enterprise in America. In order to socialize America, you must destroy the freedom of the medical profession. Once you destroy the freedom of the medical profession, you will find that the other professions, and a number of the businesses, will fall by the wayside.

Dr. BENEDICT DUFFY. Socialized medicine is a whipping boy word and it's come to mean by official propaganda of the American Medical Association the denial of free choice by the patient of his physician or of the type of medical care, and a heavy hand of Government on all aspects of patient care. Well, the fact is, there is a great deal of Government influence in patient care already. And if it weren't for Government support of our medical schools, they wouldn't be in existence.

Mr. SMITH. The battleground is not the operating room or the diagnostic laboratory—but the union hall and the medical society meeting room. The issue: What kind of medical system shall we have? Can private, voluntary health insurance be made to work effectively? Where the fever of the speeches runs higher than the fever of their patients, doctors pick up the jargon of collective bargaining, and labor leaders become expert in medical care standards and hospital costs. Each side in this battle of the scalpel and the dollar disavows the objective of socialized medicine—yet its specter hangs heavy over every debate.

Mr. LEHMAN. In 1949, when I first ran for the Senate, I said, in the course of my campaign, that I was opposed to compulsory national health insurance. I said that other methods of meeting the problem must be explored and followed. Eleven years have come to pass since then. I must tell you today—and this is the first time I have ever said this publicly—that if I had known in 1949 what I know today, I would not have made these campaign speeches against national health insurance in 1949.

ANNOUNCER. Tonight and every Thursday night at this time—the world of reality—"CBS Reports" alternating with "Face the Nation" debates.

Tonight—"The Business of Health": The $18 billion Americans spend each year for medical care. What has become one of America's largest industries is now explored by CBS News Correspondent Howard K. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. We're caught in a medical revolution that is producing an explosion of technical and scientific techniques. In the span of a few short years, we have advanced from the country doctor to the specialist—from the horse and buggy to the betatron. It produces radioactive beta rays for the treatment of cancer—and perhaps it best illustrates one reason for the mounting costs of medical treatment. The same medical revolution that produced the betatron is causing another kind of explosion, an explosion in economics, for the central question is: How are you going to pay your medical bills? Can we afford the miracles in medicine we are creating? Today, if you should be unfortunate enough to have a serious illness, or need a major operation, this is what you're most likely to encounter. Visits to your family doctor—four or five perhaps—$25. He sends you to a specialist to confirm the diagnosis—$25.

SPECIALIST. OK, take down a small sip.

Mr. SMITH. X-rays, no doubt, are required—if a gastrointestinal series is needed—that's $150. Blood tests, $50; other miscellaneous tests and laboratory work, $25. If the operation is necessary, it means a hospital room (semiprivate), 17 days, $510. Operating room fee, $75; and anesthetist, another $75. Your surgeon, into whose hands you put yourself with confidence, his customary fee for this procedure, $550. A transfusion may be required. That means blood, $200. There undoubtedly will be drugs and medicines, $45; and perhaps special nursing during the recovery period, $280. The operation is a success. You're feeling better. And if you can walk out of the hospital, your only expense now is a taxi home. Your total bill, $2,010. The quality of medical care you received—excellent. Your recovery assured. But if every cent had to be paid out of your own pocket, who could afford it?

To protect ourselves from the financial distress that can come with heavy medical bills, 123 million Americans today have bought some form of health insurance coverage. However, a recent analysis by the Health Information Foundation has revealed that the average insured American family has only 24 percent of all its medical bills covered. This woman's husband died of cancer after a 2-year illness.

Mrs. WAGNER. I paid over $11,000. That was with doctors and hospitals and medicines and all different things like that. I'd get a bill from a doctor for $460—you know that the Blue Shield'd pay, and then they'd send me another one for $260. So, in all, I was paying doctor bills every time they submitted one to Blue Shield, I got one, too. I had some nice doctors that was willing to take what they got from Blue Shield and Blue Cross. But I had one doctor—and he told me what it was going to

cost over what they were paying, and I cried. I told him I couldn't pay it, which was the truth—I didn't have it. So he says to me, don't worry, you'll pay it. So I didn't pay it and he put it in the hands of a payment agency. And I just settled with them. They wanted more than I gave them. I didn't have it.

Mr. SMITH. What about this gap in medical protection? We sought an answer to this question from the national heads of the blue plans. James E. Stuart, president of the Blue Cross Association. And Mr. Castellucci, executive vice president of the Blue Shield medical care plans.

Now, let's assume that I'm a patient and I've just had an illness requiring both hospitalization and surgery, and assume that my bill has come to $2,000. That would mean that you would pay $500 of my $2,000 bill, and I would have to pay the other $1,500. Now, is it your purpose to extend coverage beyond that in the future, Mr. Stuart?

Mr. STUART. Mr. Smith, if you had gone to the hospital and had the $2,000 bill and you had the best available Blue Cross plan and the best available Blue Shield plan in a service area, you would have had no bill to pay except personal convenience items on your hospital charges. Now, if you had what you call a standard contract, and if you ran over the 20 days, you would have a partial payment toward your bill—one-half, probably, and you would have to pay the balance.

Mr. CASTELLUCCI. As far as Blue Shield is concerned, the fee paid for surgery, or whatever service may be involved, would be paid in full, if the patient was in the under income bracket and going to a participating physician in the service plan area.

Mr. SMITH. Well, what about the patient whose income level is annually above that basic level of $4,000 or $6,000? He has to pay more. Blue Shield does not cover all of his costs. Is that not a system of discrimination against people with higher incomes?

Mr. CASTELLUCCI. I wouldn't call it discrimination. In those cases, the doctor is privileged to charge his customary fee. The contract that he has with Blue Shield is to accept less than his customary fee for those people under income. Actually, the same fee is paid by Blue Shield, so it's not discrimination as far as money is concerned—only giving the doctor the privilege of making this additional charge, if there is one.

Mr. SMITH. A president of a local union registers a complaint of his members.

Mr. SARLES. These are reports that we receive from the 7,000 members that I represent—that doctors—the first question they ask you, whether it's in a hospital or in his office, is what type of coverage you have. I'm starting to wonder if it's better to tell the doctor you don't have any insurance and maybe he'll take pity on you and charge you according to what he thinks you can afford. But knowing that you have Blue Cross or Blue Shield, or any of the other programs that are supposed to be comprehensive, and they are not, he ends up getting $2 or $300 from Blue Cross and hitting you with another $2 or $300 bill.

Mr. SMITH. For organized medicine—Dr. Leonard Larson, president-elect, American Medical Association.

Dr. LARSON. I understand that there have been instances where patients have been asked whether or not they're on—whether or not they have insurance. Second, that the bill has been padded, so-called. But I am sure that through the efforts of organized medicine on the local level, State, and county, that those objections are certainly being reduced to a minimum. And I hope they're eliminated entirely. I don't approve of a physician asking a patient whether or not he has insurance, just because he wants to find out how much money the patient is going to get on his insurance. I don't believe in that.

Mr. SMITH. With the spiraling costs of medical care after World War II, organized labor started a drive for new forms of health insurance that would cover more of the union members' medical bills. It set off a controversy with the medical profession that is only now reaching a climax. Labor found champions in their medical care fight in three dynamic and colorful personalities of the day.

The flamboyant mayor of New York, Fiorello H. La Guardia, took up the fight for broader health insurance coverage when he discovered that many city employees were in deep trouble because of burdensome medical costs.

JOHN L. LEWIS. The United Mine Workers of America has again accomplished the impossible.

Mr. SMITH. The flinty John L. Lewis, curmudgeon of the coalfields, lifetime president of the United Mine Workers of America and onetime organizer of the CIO. He became a prime target of medical societies in a dozen States for his union-controlled medical and hospital program.

At the opposite end of the labor-industry axis, the rugged individualist, Henry J. Kaiser. He started a medical care program for his workers in steel, shipyards, and construction on the West Coast during World War II, later expanded and opened to the general public as the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan. Each threw a bombshell into the ranks of organized medicine. They set up health plans that took doctors out of private practice, put them on salary or in partnership arrangements in clinics, medical centers and hospitals to provide total care for the plan members. The plan has been accused of practicing "assembly line" medicine. This charge is answered by Henry Kaiser.

Mr. KAISER. Well, I feel that the American Medical Association is frightened of anything that they think is a foot in the door which would affect it, their business. And, naturally, they'd be frightened. But they've been frightened of all these various plans, ours in particular. They've never been happy about ours and they've never been happy about any plan, except those doctors who participated in it, and who had the joy of serving the people and feel human needs and had no concern with how it was paid for.

Mr. SMITH. Today, on the west coast, the Kaiser plan serves nearly 1 million members in major metropolitan areas from Los Angeles, Calif., to Portland, Oreg., with a heavy concentration in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay area. It operates 14 accredited hospitals in key population areas. It operates over 40 medical centers in neighborhood communities, where groups of doctors are available to members for both home and office visits. It employs 700 full-time physicians and specialists to staff its hospitals and medical centers. For a monthly payment of $7 per person, $20 for a family, members get complete medical and hospital coverage. It includes preventive health checkups and treatment of everyday minor ills as well as any major problem. This method violated a long-standing tradition in the medical profession—the payment of money by the patient to the doctor—the fee-for-service rendered. Here, there is no financial relationship between patient and doctor. Payment is made through the health plan.

RECEPTIONIST. Is there any special doctor you wish to see?

Mr. SMITH. The patient no longer has to worry about unexpected or catastrophic medical bills in case of serious illness. Effect of the plan? Nearly a million people on the west coast withdrawn from the market of private fee-for-service practice in the community. Many people object to closed-panel health plans, such as the Kaiser plan, because they allow only a limited choice of doctors—a selection from among those doctors working within the plan. Free choice of doctor is a basic principle of organized medicine. Among patients, this is a commonly held opinion.

JOE HORAN. I like to choose a doctor that I have confidence in. My family has had a family doctor and we continue to go to him. Now, if all of a sudden I had to go to a different doctor, I don't believe I'd have the confidence of a different doctor that I didn't know to take care of my family and myself. I wouldn't know his reputation or his background; whereas, if I can choose my own doctor, I can ask around, and ask other people what type success they had with certain physicians—and how they've made out.

WOMAN. Open and close your fist several times, please.

Mr. SMITH. In New York City, the La Guardia-inspired Health Insurance Plan—or HIP as it is called—was launched in 1947 as a medical care program for city employees. Today, HIP has 32 medical centers in neighborhoods throughout the city. All New York City employees are eligible for membership.

WOMAN. Do you have the HIP card?

Mr. SMITH. Enrollment has also been opened to other employee and labor groups.

MAN. This is an 8-year-old child who——

Mr. SMITH. The plan has a staff of 1,000 physicians and specialists, providing complete medical services for a fixed charge per month.

Effect of the plan? Half a million New Yorkers—members of HIP—have been withdrawn from the market of private fee-for-service medicine in the city. Doctors in private practice have reacted sharply to this type of plan because it limits the patient's free choice of doctor. Some feel it is a step toward socialized medicine in America. At a county medical society discussion, Dr. Ralph S. Emerson speaks on the subject.

Dr. EMERSON. And that is that we have the best hospitals in the world—we have the best medical care in the world—and we are one of the few remaining countries who have free enterprise in medicine—and this we dearly cherish—and we also have free enterprise in our businesses. Now, if you look to the other countries, and see how they have fallen by the wayside—and those countries which have socialized, Uncle Sam has had to pick up the tab. If we socialize, who's going to pick up the tab for us? There isn't any one. And then we are going to be in competition with the Communist world, on the basis of one socialism against another—whether you call it socialism or communism, it's practically one and the same. We are fighting for the preservation of free enterprise, not only in medicine but free enterprise in America.

Mr. SMITH. An opposite viewpoint is held by Dr. Henry N. Pratt, director of the New York hospital, the distinguished teaching hospital of Cornell University Medical College.

Dr. PRATT. There's a great deal of misunderstanding about this term, "socialized medicine." In effect, it means Government taking over all the health services and operating them, and the doctors of the country becoming employees of the Government as is true in most other countries in the world. Now, a "closed-panel plan," or any other type of insurance mechanism, which will provide adequate health services for the population through voluntary effort, these to me, are the very programs that are a bulwark against the socialization of medicine through governmental interference, and I would heartily endorse them and would hope that we could continue to experiment with many types of practice of medicine, in order

to provide the public with the sort of care it needs without Government having to play a role.

Mr. SMITH. In 1947, a Government survey uncovered a shocking lack of adequate medical services for miners and their families living in the 300-mile soft-coal belt of Virginia, West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky. The region, traditionally, has had many social and economic problems—frequently a depressed area, even in good times. Oldtimers, in a Virginia mining camp, recall medical conditions as they existed.

Mr. PARSONS. I have knowed of men being injured in the coal mines and taken to the hospital and laid as high as 8 hours without even being bathed or any attention given to them whatever.

Mr. EDENS. Back in the olden days, we had very poor medical aid, and when we had to go to the hospital, we had very poor hospital service in this part of the country.

Mr. SMITH. A mine union official remembers it this way.

Mr. DEATON. We'd pay these big doctors through the checkoff. He'd have, in certain areas, he'd have 3 or 4—maybe 8 or 10 younger doctors—many of them just kids—not too well educated, and he would pay those a salary to attend the coal camps. And they wasn't—like I say, too well educated. We didn't get no medical care that's, I'd say, that was fit for stock.

Mr. SMITH. John L. Lewis organized the United Mine Workers Welfare Fund—the biggest do-it-yourself medical care program in labor history. The program brought medical and hospital care, free of charge, to the neglected 200,000 miners and their dependents in the mining areas across the country, wherever they may live or work. The program brought physical rehabilitative services to over 97,000 disabled miners and dependents in the first 5 years of its operation.

DOCTOR. This is the first replacement you have had since 1955. Is that right?

PATIENT. Yes, it is, doc.

DOCTOR. Does it feel like it's working all right?

PATIENT. Yes, it feels good.

DOCTOR. Think you can get back to work now?

PATIENT. Yes, sir; I do.

DOCTOR. Good.

Mr. SMITH. It unearthed and treated a 20-year backlog of chronic cases—paraplegics, amputees, and mine injury victims of every description.

DOCTOR. Do you have any pain now since we've been putting it down like this?

Mr. SMITH. The program led to the construction of 10 new hospitals in the medically blighted soft-coal areas. Like many of the mines in which their patients work, the hospitals are equipped with the latest in automated facilities.

WOMAN. Mashed potatoes—lima beans.

Mr. SMITH. They provide up-to-date techniques in modern patient care. They offer the mineworker and his family something he never had before—a quality of hospital care to compare with some of the best standards in big city medical centers.

Miners have always been plagued by a disease of the lungs called soft-coal workers pneumoconiosis, caused by the constant breathing of coal dust. It is treated routinely at the miners' hospitals by special techniques. This machine registers lung capacity. The patient must be shocked into expelling every last breath of air.

NURSE. OK. Now, let's take in a great, big, deep breath. Take in a deep breath—deep breath. Come on, take in a deep breath—deep breath. Now, blow it all out—blow out—blow out—blow out—blow out—blow—blow—blow—blow—blow. Okay.

Mr. SMITH. A paradox of the union welfare plan: miners receiving medical and hospital care up to the best standards in the country are frequently returned from hospitals such as this—to a home environment like this. Many still live in conditions reminiscent of the depression thirties. For many of these people, their medical and hospital card is often their most valuable possession. From this mining camp at Jones Creek Hollow, Harlan County, Ky.—to Keokee, Va., the most prosperous camp in the region, the welfare money spent is a significant prop to the local economy. Nationwide, the union welfare fund spends $61 million a year on its medical care program alone, derived from a royalty of 40 cents on every ton of coal produced. Should it be withdrawn, the mining areas across the country would be faced with heightened economic, to say nothing of medical, distress. The medical director of the Harlan Miners Memorial Hospital, Dr. David Greeley.

Dr. GREELEY. When we came we didn't know what was going to happen. We didn't know whether we would be accepted into the county society or not. Shortly before the hospital opened, the administrator and I, and our chief of medicine too, met with the leaders of the county society, and we explained to them why we were here, what we hoped to accomplish—that certainly we didn't want to take their patients away from them, that this was an open staff hospital and we hoped that every one of them would take advantage of this and accept appointments on the staff, see their patients here and use members of our staff in consultation. It worked. I don't know why, except that I think people wanted it to work. And since day one, we have all been members of the county society. In the four counties in Kentucky, where the members of our hospital staffs are not members of the county medical society, I think it's primarily because there are some people—not very many—but a few who don't want it to work, for reasons perhaps best known to themselves.

Mr. SMITH. Effect of the plan: 1 million patients, the 200,000 miners and their dependents, withdrawn from the market of private, fee-for-service medicine in their communities. A doctor in private practice in the city of Harlan, Dr. E. Murphy Howard, says:

Dr. HOWARD. If they're going to build these memorial hospitals, and they're going to put all the other hospitals out of business and they're going to put all the mine doctors out of business—and that it'd be complete community care. That statement was made, I reckon, beyond peradventure of a doubt, and as I understand it, it's illegal—corporate practice of medicine is in the State of Kentucky. It's not illegal for a doctor to employ an assistant to help him, but it's illegal for a corporation to exploit the doctors by paying them a salary and employing them to do practice.

Mr. SMITH. Professor of preventive medicine at Seton Hall Medical College, Dr. Benedict Duffy.

Dr. DUFFY. One of the most difficult problems is to find out exactly what the AMA is thinking at any given time. In fairness to our union, it is made up of many differing societies. They don't all agree. Some of them are more advanced or look at things in a different way than others do. But I can recall in a community in New York State, less than 20 years ago, the organized county medical society fighting and defeating, temporarily, Blue Cross voluntary health insurance. This seems incredible. A few years ago and still to this time, as far as I'm aware, closed-panel medical care is so fraught with evil in the mind of official people in Chicago, the AMA office, that they feel that a person in a closed panel should not be a person in good standing in his medical society. I think that this is a shortsighted point of view. I think that a labor union, mineworkers, or Mr. Kaiser, these people have every right—the health insurance plan in New York City is a good example. They have every right in these plans to provide good medical care, and I don't think that we in the AMA should ever stand against good medical care.

Mr. SMITH. The American Medical Association is the leading organization of the medical profession. AMA president-elect, Dr. Leonard Larson.

Dr. LARSON. Well, we believe that as a fundamental principle a patient should have the right to choose or change his physician. I had an experience in New York a couple of years ago when we were making this study of some of the plans in which a waiter in the Statler Hotel restaurant was telling me about his plan—his union plan, and I asked him how he liked it, and he said: "It's good." But he said, "We had our first baby some time ago and my wife didn't want to go to that clinic doctor." "Well," I said, "why?" "Well, she didn't like any of them." "Well," I said, "what did you do then?" He said: "She went to her own doctor that she picked out and she likes him." "Well," I said, "did the plan pay for that?" "No," he said, "I had to pay for it myself." Now, that has been a controversial subject for a long time, because these so-called closed-panel plans do not permit complete freedom of choice. Many of the controversies that have developed around the country between the local medical societies and these plans have been primarily over that one issue. Well, traditionally, I think in a free enterprise system, such as we have in this country, those who render service, regardless of what it is, medical, dental, nursing, television, whatever it may be, use a fee-for-service system. In other words, they're paid by the hour, or they're paid for what they believe the service is worth. I would hate to see the time come that some of those traditional concepts of freedom in this country would be entirely done away with.

Mr. SMITH. Labor's spokesman, AFL–CIO director of social security, Nelson Cruikshank.

Mr. CRUIKSHANK. Some doctors, at times, seem to be primarily concerned with their business interests. Now, I'm certainly not saying that all doctors are at all times, not by any means. But doctors think of themselves as being in business. They actually, in their own letters, and circulars, and magazines, talk about the competition for their services. Well, now, as businessmen this makes sense, this fee-for-service thing. It relates right to this market concept, that health care is a marketable commodity, like a loaf of bread, or a steak on the meat market counter. Now, this isn't nearly so true with respect to their relationship, as a profession. Because, as a profession, they're interested in health services and care for the people. Our feeling is that they're much freer to operate in the professional—free professional area—if they're not on a fee-for-service basis.

Mr. SMITH. On the west coast, the Kaiser health plan operates, and controls its own hospitals. In the mining region of Virginia, West Virginia, and eastern Kentucky, the United Mine Workers Welfare Fund operates, and controls, its own hospitals. In New York City, HIP depends on the voluntary and private hospitals of the community, when hospitalization is required for its members. This proved to be a major weakness of the plan. It caused a 2½-year controversy with organized medicine on New York's Staten Island over the right of HIP doctors to practice in community hospitals. The bitter conflict led to the intervention of a New York State legislative committee. That report immediately after a short pause for station identification.

ANNOUNCER. We continue with CBS reports—"The Business of Health." Here again is Howard K. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. If the battle of the health plans is often obscured by fiscal details and ethical

concepts that the patient doesn't always understand—this skirmish on Staten Island, N.Y., last summer, brought the issue into dramatic focus. It started with what some called the Staten Island ferry baby rush. Expectant mothers, living on Staten Island, who were members of the HIP medical plan, were racing the stork across the waters of New York Bay to have their babies in Manhattan hospitals. The situation resulted when qualified obstetricians, associated with HIP, were allegedly barred from the three voluntary hospitals of Staten Island.

In July, a New York State legislative committee looked into the matter. State Senator George R. Metcalf's Committee on Health Insurance Plans held public hearings. The committee heard testimony from county medical society officers, and hospital administrators—from city employees, and members of their families—HIP directors, and their labor supporters. This woman—an HIP subscriber—headed a delegation of expectant mothers.

Mrs. FEALY. Let's face the fact that our prepaid care hasn't been compromised—it's been sabotaged, and I think you can ask any expectant mother in our group for her feelings on that subject. It is our contention that the medical profession, first and foremost, should serve the sick. And doctors who have been trained to administer their services, should be allowed to do so.

Mr. SMITH. A city employee testifies.

Mrs. MUDGETT. We further feel that when we are admitted to our own hospitals, we have a right to be treated there by the doctor or doctors of our choice. Now, when our so-called voluntary hospitals fail to admit a HIP doctor for 2½ years; when hundreds of us are forced to take long, inconvenient and even medically dangerous trips to Manhattan, Bayonne, and other distant points for hospitalization, we know that a plot exists against our medical plan.

Mr. SMITH. He brought his family—to make a point.

Mrs. MUDGETT. Now, when they have any kind of a fund drive, or of taxation, we pay directly for it. Now, we're first-class citizens in that respect, but second-class when we can't use our hospitals. And I don't think that's right. I mean, if it keeps up at this rate the people are not going to call doctors. They're just going to go to the drugstore—ask the druggest what to do for their younster, because they are not in a position to pay the fees the doctors are charging. Now, we are on a fixed income. We don't have $17 or $21 to put out at one time when our youngsters are sick. And I don't think anybody else does either—unless they happen to have one child, or they are making a tremendous salary. But on ordinary salaries, you just can't do it. So I think more people will be joining these HIP or insurance plans to take care of their health needs, because otherwise they will never get it.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. George Baehr, a founder of HIP and member of the Board of Hospitals of New York City. He charges the medical society on Staten Island and the three hospital boards with conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Dr. BAEHR. The county medical society and the medical boards of the three hospitals believe that they have now discovered HIP's Achilles heel. And that by their joint action, they may be able to destroy the Staten Island medical group and HIP, and thereby obtain an addition of 24,000 patients to their own fee-for-service practice.

Mr. SMITH. He is questioned by Senator METCALF. Is the HIP operation harmful to the physicians in private practice on the island?

Dr. BAEHR. Well, every new doctor that comes into a community, who has patients, is harmful financially to the doctor who might have gotten that patient. And in that way it's harmful, but it's good for the patients. And when they all gang up on you then it's conspiracy in restraint of trade, I think.

Mr. SMITH. The committee questions the Staten Island doctors—officers of the county medical society opposed to HIP.

Mr. RUSSO. Why should they be discriminated against?

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Herbert Berger admits social discrimination against HIP doctors.

Dr. BERGER. Personally, I say they are socially discriminated against, but not medically. I've made that point several times.

Mr. RUSSO. In other words, you're setting yourself up as a court of judgment, so to speak, on a plan—on an insurance plan.

Dr. BERGER. Well——

Mr. RUSSO. And you're saying, in so many words, or in substance, that any medical man that's affiliated with that is going to be ostracized insofar as appointment to your hospital is concerned.

Dr. BERGER. Sir, each of us, I'm sure are courts of judgments, in many areas.

Mr. RUSSO. It's very difficult for us to believe then, that these men are not being discriminated against in their appointments to medical staff and to courtesy privileges of Staten Island hospitals—when you, as a chief of one of those hospital medical staffs, make a statement like that.

Dr. BERGER. We have actually—I think if you'll read further along in there, that despite my abhorrence—no, I'd like to finish this, sir. Despite my personal abhorrence of this plan, I have voted for the inclusion of these names here, because these people did have to be covered, and we have more than a sufficiency of these individuals in our institution.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Joseph Shanaphy, in an interchange with Committee Chairman METCALF, takes the position that eligible physicians are not automatically entitled to hospital staff appointments.

Dr. SHANAPHY. Is the patient. Now, if one individual—whether he's in or out of HIP, as far as I'm concerned, doesn't make any difference. If one individual is found, for reasons other than his technical qualifications, not acceptable to the other people on the medical staff, he has no right to a staff appointment.

Mr. METCALF. This is a fantastic statement which I hope the press takes down. You mean to tell me that you think that these people should be judged by whether they work with the other members of the group? These people are taking care of the health of the people.

Dr. SHANAPHY. Right.

Mr. METCALF. They're not being told whether they can take care of the health of the people whether they belong to the so-called club. Well, would you answer that question?

Dr. SHANAPHY. Not as a yes or no answer—no. I can——

Mr. METCALF. This is incredible to me.

Dr. SHANAPHY. I can only answer that by saying when a hospital does not function sufficiently and properly, the only ones who suffer by this are the patients.

Mr. METCALF. You mean to say the patients are suffering because the boys don't get along downstairs, when they go down to the lunch room, or something?

Dr. SHANAPHY. It carries over more than that, sir.

Mr. METCALF. Do you realize what you're saying?

Dr. SHANAPHY. Well, might I turn the question a little bit and say, is every lawyer admitted to practice in every court in the Nation, merely because he is a graduate of a grade A law school?

Mr. METCALF. We're saying whether they're technically qualified or not. That's what Dr. King was talking about. That's not what you're talking about. You're talking about whether this man gets along with the rest of the fellows in the group.

Dr. SHANAPHY. A man should not be denied privileges, merely because he is affiliated with any health insurance plan. This I would agree with. He should not be denied privileges merely because of it. But I do say that his eligi—not his eligibility but—I think I used a different word here—he is not automatically entitled—he may be automatically eligible for a hospital staff because of his technical proficiency and training. But that does not make him automatically entitled to it.

Mr. METCALF. And you're going to be the judge of whether he gets on this board or not and whether he can take care of people, and whether he can't

Dr. SHANAPHY. I'm only going to be one.

Mr. METCALF. To me again, I think it's an incredible nerve for anybody to say that he can decide whether somebody's going to take care of people in a community.

Dr. SHANAPHY. I'm only going to be one of many. I may be completely overruled by my fellow physicians. I feel that I'm entirely entitled to my own convictions as to why I wish, or do not wish to associate with an individual and an individual hospital. I'm entitled to vote in that fashion. Now, I may be outnumbered. If I am, so be it.

Mr. SMITH. Result of the hearing—a compromise solution. Five additional doctors granted staff appointments in the Staten Island hospitals. But in principle, organized medicine held its position. Restrict the closed-panel health plans. Their most effective weapon—the hospital staff appointment. A doctor unable to practice in a hospital is like a lawyer not allowed in court. A famous Belgian doctor, Rene Sand, once said: "We can buy human life. Every nation within certain limits sets its own death rate." In 1952, a Presidential Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation declared health to be a basic, human right. Pressures are mounting mainly from organized labor, for more complete health insurance coverage. James E. Stuart, president of the Blue Cross Association.

Well, in preparing this report we talked to one woman whose husband died of cancer after a long illness. And the result to her, in addition to losing her husband, was financial calamity. Is there anything that can be done about cases like that?

Mr. STUART. Well, I think that health care is now a matter of right to the American people and not a matter of chance or privilege, or whether or not they have the means to—available to, at the moment, to pay the bill. I think we have to extend voluntary coverage to all of the American people that are self-supporting; that are economically self-sufficient, and we've got to try to make it available to the total population of people who can afford to protect themselves and budget in advance for the illness in the future.

Mr. SMITH. And then what happens to those who are not self-supporting?

Mr. STUART. That is the responsibility of Government.

Mr. SMITH. Relations between organized medicine and organized labor reached a breaking point last summer. The issue: medical care for the aged. The American Medical Association strenuously opposed the intervention of the Federal Government in providing medical care for the aged through the social security system proposed by the controversial Forand bill. This is Madison Square Garden, New York City, a rally of the Council of Senior Citizens Clubs. Twenty thousand elderly citizens turned out to cheer their champion then in Congress, Representative Aime J. Forand of Rhode Island, author of the Forand bill.

Mr. FORAND. But I'm happy to say this—that at long last, every one who has given any thought at all to the problem of health

care for the aged, now agrees that the need exists. That goes for the American Medical Association as well as for every other group. The only disagreement, is how are we going to take care of this problem? Now, they talk about voluntary versus compulsory. I admit that my proposal would be compulsory for every worker to get into the system. And you know as well as I do that the average worker would be tickled to death to pay an additional 25 cents a week to get these benefits. And that is based on the idea that that worker would be having a salary of not less than $4,800 a year. If he were only earning $2,400 a year the cost to him would only be 12 or 13 cents per week—half the price of a pack of cigarettes. And the beauty of it is, that while he is working—he or she is working—he would be prepaying insurance for himself and his dependents, so that when he reaches retirement age his insurance would be paid up.

Mr. SMITH. AFL–CIO President George Meany took the rostrum in support of the social security measure.

Mr. MEANY. The people of this country started taking an active interest in this issue. They heard the American Medical Association denounce the Forand bill as socialized medicine. On investigating further, however, they discovered it would not impose Government control over medicine. It would not change existing relationships between doctor and patient. The charge of socialized medicine clearly was without foundation.

Mr. SMITH. The American Medical Association won the skirmish but the battle continues. AMA president-elect, Dr. Larson, explains why.

Dr. LARSON. One of the basic reasons why we object to inclusion under the social security system is that we feel certain, because of past history, that if service for the aged is provided under the social security mechanism, beginning at 65 or 68 or 70, it doesn't make any difference, that 2 years from now it's going to be down to 60; 4 years from now it'll be 55, or something like that, and ultimately every one in this country will be covered. And we think that that then will be the end of the private practice of medicine in this country.

Mr. SMITH. Nelson Cruikshank expresses labor's viewpoint.

Mr. CRUIKSHANK. Now, we propose that a large part of the cost of medical care should be paid for on the social security principle. And the reason we say this is the only way this area of need can be met, is because under social security you can spread this cost over the entire working period of a person's life. And beyond that you can spread it in another dimension. You spread it over all of the working population. Now, this is the only way that you can keep the rate down to where it can be managed. As long as you just ask the old people to buy old people's insurance, the rate is going to be so high that they can't afford it. Or, if you want to cut the rate down to where they can afford it, then the coverage will be so limited that it won't really bear a significant portion of the burden. Four years ago, the AMA raised these same arguments against the extension of social security benefits to the totally disabled. But just the other day, I noticed that the AMA is now joining the Social Security Administration in the distribution of a film to doctors on the sound administration of the disability insurance program. And yet, 4 years ago, they were saying, literally they were saying, the passage of the disability provision of social security would be the end of private practice of medicine in America. Now, they were wrong on that, and I think they would agree they were wrong on that—that private practice of medicine has not ended in America. We think they're just as wrong about the extension of the cost of medical care for older people through the social security mechanism.

Mr. SMITH. Addressing the Beverly Hills Rotary Club in California, AMA president, Dr. E. Vincent Askey steps up organized medicine's campaign to defeat new legislation tying medical care for the aged to social security.

Dr. ASKEY. I want to thank you for the opportunity to toot the American Medical Association horn just a little bit, and I hope that you'll pardon my probably obvious pride in this organization. We have supported with vigor, in Congress, a medical assistance to the aged bill, which is now called the Mills-Kerr bill, and which is now the law of the land since Congress passed it last fall—and it was signed by President Eisenhower. The Mills-Kerr bill or law now, will provide all the care that needy individuals require—not a limited amount as proposed under social security medical care. And unlike the social security approach, it will not have Government employees telling doctors what drugs, what treatments they must give to their patients; nor telling hospitals how to operate; nor telling nursing homes what they must or must not do. This is true, because the Mills-Kerr law establishes local administration at a minimum of Federal control, and this definitely means economy as well as effectiveness. Furthermore, we believe that social security medical care for the aged would mushroom into compulsory national health insurance for every American as time went by.

Mr. SMITH. Dr. Benedict Duffy.

Dr. DUFFY. It isn't just the aged. I mean, there are many problems and they are social problems, and I think they must be met in a broad, social way. I don't mean by this socialized medicine. I think when we get into this gambit, why it's of very little value to the conversation. I do mean that certain planning must go into the needs of the people. And I would say there was no single mechanism, but I would advance that social insurance, the right of people to voluntarily enter into a program to self-insure through social security, that this free choice of physician guarantee, that this would afford an excellent opportunity to take care of some of the problem, but I think we in medical schools have got to work harder. I think the profession has to take a good look at itself, at its own house. The AMA and the doctor are supposedly the same individual. The fact is that this is not so. The fact is that the only way that a person can progress in the American Medical Association, is to proceed into one's declining years, because it's a seniority system. It's an oligarchy of older men who have decided that what was good enough in their youth is good enough for our future. There are many of us who do not feel this way and we intend, if we live long enough, to try and work through our own organizations, to bring this point of view out. And I think the American Medical Association will in time become more responsive, more positive to many of the social needs which are the medical needs of our time.

Mr. SMITH. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, says:

Mr. RIBICOFF. Well, President Kennedy believes that health care for the aging should be under the social security system. I agree wholeheartedly and 100 percent with the President of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Well, what is the basis for the opposition to the administration plan on medical care for the aging?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Basically, it's blind opposition. It is going back to another era before social security. It is called socialism. It is called many names. It believes that we are going to control medicine. We are going to control hospital care, but we're not going to do anything of the kind. In the measures that are being advocated by the President and that I will advocate, there will be completely free choice. You and I and every other American will have a right to pick his own doctor. You will have a right to pick your own hospital. You will have a right to pick your own nurse. The administrative costs under social security—the overhead, so to speak, is some 2 percent. There isn't a private group or an insurance company anywhere that can operate that cheaply, and with the overall coverage, the experience and the acknowledgment, and the acceptability of social security now by practically every American, social security will give the best coverage, the most coverage, and the cheapest coverage to the people of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Why do you find the Kerr-Mills bill inadequate?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Well, it only takes care of the indigent and doesn't take care of the basic middle group of American people. The indigent, somehow, have always been taken care of by society. The very wealthy take care of themselves. Basically, we're interested in taking care of the great bulk of Americans.

Mr. SMITH. Can you anticipate what will happen to the administration's plan in Congress?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Well, I would say that there will be a difficult fight, because it involves payroll taxes. It will have to go to the House first. This bill will have tough sledding.

The opposition is strong. I do believe that the American people are for health care for the aging, under social security, and will make their views known. I am very hopeful that we will be able to bring out a good health care for the aging under social security before Congress adjourns. This, of course, was advocated by the President in the Anderson-Kennedy bill in the Senate last year, and the President campaigned on this issue across the country. He has mentioned it in a state of the Union message on Monday, and the bill that will be introduced will be to carry out President Kennedy's basic philosophies.

Mr. SMITH. Organized medicine is bitterly opposed to Government intervention in the medical insurance field—for the aged or for anyone else. But most experts agree that the practice of medicine is changing rapidly, being revolutionized by new scientific advances and by new approaches to financing health care. The American medical profession stands at a crossroad. Which direction will it take? Dr. Pratt puts it this way:

Dr. PRATT. If the medical profession, the hospitals, and all those agencies providing health services, wholeheartedly cooperate with each other to provide better integration of these services, even though it may mean giving up a certain amount of autonomy, and if we all wholeheartedly support experimentation in various mechanisms for providing health services, such as closed-panel practice, then I believe we will forestall the necessity for Government to take over all of the health services and medicine in this country. But if we fail to do this, I'm confident that it will not be too many years before we will have true socialized medicine—that is, Government medicine.

Dr. EMERSON. The doctors are opposed to any organization, union, Government, or even fraternal organization, which comes in and attempts to interfere with the personal physician-patient relationship—or where they, in any way, limit the freedom of the doctor in treating the patient.

Mr. SMITH. Can Government intervention be avoided? The answer will, in large measure, depend upon the attitudes that prevail within the ranks of organized medicine. It must decide—and quickly—or the decision will be made by history. This is Howard K. Smith speaking for "CBS Reports."

ANNOUNCER. "The Business of Health" will be continued next week in this time period

on "Face the Nation" with a live debate between Walter Reuther, speaking on behalf of organized labor, and a spokesman for the American Medical Association, Dr. Edward R. Annis. On the eve of President Kennedy's proposals for linking old-age medical care with social security, Mr. Reuther and Dr. Annis will discuss this vital and controversial issue.

"The Business of Health" was prepared with the cooperation of the American Medical Association, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York, the Kaiser Health Plan, and the United Mine Workers Welfare Fund—none of whom viewed the program until this telecast, none of whom had any part in the editing or content of this report.

"CBS Reports"—"The Business of Health" was filmed and edited by the staff of "CBS Reports" under the supervision and control of CBS news.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, in order to consider five nominations ordered reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Henry R. Labouisse, of Connecticut, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, in the Department of State;

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army, retired, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France;

David K. E. Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Great Britain;

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya;

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Belgium;

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Turkey; and

Bernard Gufler, of Washington, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Finland.

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Najeeb E. Halaby, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency;

Robert E. Giles, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce;

Harold E. McCall, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointments in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

Douglas B. Henderson, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

STATE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be representative of the United States on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the State Department be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and the remaining nominations in the State Department will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David K. E. Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain; the nomination of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army (retired), of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France; the nomination of Henry R. Labouisse, of Connecticut, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, in the Department of State; and the nomination of Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Malaya.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my belief that the nominations now before the Senate, reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee, comprise an exceptionally good group of appointees.

Charles Baldwin, Ambassador-designate to Malaya, is an outstanding member of the State Department, and should represent us well in the country to which he has been accredited.

David K. E. Bruce, our former Ambassador to France and Germany, as well as a former Under Secretary of State, needs no introduction to the Members of this body. In the past he has served in both the Virginia and the Maryland Legislatures; thus, we feel akin to him as a politician. As our representative in various countries abroad, he has performed his duties with ability, integrity, and distinction. Mr. Bruce's career has been unusual, in that he served in both the Army and the Air Force during the First World War. In addition, to the best of my knowledge, he and Ellsworth Bunker, our Ambassador to India, are the only two Democrats who received diplomatic appointments of magnitude during the Eisenhower administration. We were, indeed, fortunate to have the services of these two men in the positions to which they were assigned under the previous administration. We are extremely fortunate because of the fact that once again Mr. Bruce has heeded the call to duty, and has consented to serve as our Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

Mrs. Marietta Peabody Tree is nominated for appointment to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations Economic Council. It is my belief that this lady of ability and understanding will be an outstanding representative of this country in the United Nations. The Nation is fortunate in having Mrs. Marietta Peabody Tree available to undertake the difficult and most important assignment which will be hers. We wish her well.

Henry R. Labouisse, who will be the next Director of the International Cooperation Administration, needs no introduction to this body, because of the fine work he has performed through the years in the field of economic systems and in connection with the most important and most difficult task of looking after the wants and needs of the Palestine refugees in the Middle East.

The last nomination before us today is that of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, to be our Ambassador to France. General Gavin has a distinguished record in the Army. He enlisted as a private, in 1924; and during his years in the service, he rose to the rank of lieutenant general. He is honest, candid, and vigorous; and I am sure he will prove to be a worthy Ambassador to France. I express the hope that the Congress will recognize the financial difficulties under which Ambassador Gavin, a man of modest means, will labor, and that we shall, in our wisdom, see to it that the necessary representation allowance is increased, so that he can conduct in a manner worthy of this Nation, the duties incumbent upon him.

Taken collectively, Mr. President, I believe this is an outstanding group of nominees, and I hope the Senate will give them a unanimous vote of approval.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am happy to endorse the nomination of Mrs. Marietta Tree to be U.S. delegate to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Mrs. Tree is a distinguished and able New Yorker who has served in able manner the people of the city and the State of New York, and the people of the Nation. She has been a member of the New York City Commission on Intergroup Relations, of the Fair Housing Practices Commission, of the Urban League, and of many other well-known groups in the fields of social and human welfare.

I believe that this appointment is a most deserved and merited one, which will bring credit to the United States and to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the action taken by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

APPOINTMENT OF CLIFTON R. WHARTON AS AMBASSADOR TO NORWAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, some years ago I had the pleasure of meeting a distinguished American career Foreign Service officer who was at that time assigned to Portugal. I found him

to be a highly skillful, understanding, and tactful diplomat.

It is with great pleasure, therefore, that I have learned of the appointment of this able man, Clifton R. Wharton, to be Ambassador to Norway.

Mr. Wharton has already served our country with ability and distinction in the Foreign Service for 34 years.

We are indeed fortunate to have Ambassador Wharton represent us in the important nation to which he will be sent.

I extend to him and Mrs. Wharton my congratulations and best wishes on the assumption of Mr. Wharton's new responsibilities, which I have every confidence he shall discharge, as always, with great benefit to the Nation.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD outlines of his career as they were published in an article in the Washington Star of February 21, 1961, and an editorial in the Washington Post of February 22, 1961.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 21, 1961]

NEGRO CAREER DIPLOMAT NAMED TO NORWAY POST

President Kennedy has chosen Clifton R. Wharton, a Negro career diplomat, to be Ambassador to Norway.

Mr. Wharton, 61, is now Minister to Rumania. He has been in the Foreign Service 34 years.

As Ambassador at Oslo, Mr. Wharton will hold the highest rank ever attained by a member of his race as a U.S. career diplomat.

Other Negroes have served as Ambassadors, but they held their posts as political appointees.

Mr. Wharton's road to an ambassadorship has been the hard way. His first State Department job in 1925 was as a law clerk at $1,860 a year.

Three years ago, President Eisenhower named him Minister to Bucharest. Prior to that appointment, Mr. Wharton had been consul general at Marseilles, France.

In going up the ladder to his consul general's post, Mr. Wharton served at such points as Monrovia, Liberia; Las Palmas, Canary Islands; Tananarive, Madagascar; Ponta Delgada, Azores, and Lisbon, Portugal.

He was born in Baltimore on May 11, 1899.

He attended Boston University, received a law degree there in 1920 and practiced law in Boston before entering Government service.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1961]

DIPLOMATIC PRIZE

Clifton R. Wharton has won elevation to ambassadorial rank on the basis of a long and meritorious career in the Foreign Service. He has been appointed to one of the most highly prized of diplomatic posts in Western Europe. Having been a Foreign Service officer for the past 32 years, Mr. Wharton is to be promoted from his present post as Minister to Rumania to be Ambassador to Norway.

The post goes to Mr. Wharton because he deserves it, not because he happens to be a Negro. The selection affords an illustration, nevertheless, of the resourcefulness with which President Kennedy seems to be redeeming his pledge to give qualified Negroes something closer to their proportionate place in public office than they have hitherto enjoyed. We look forward to a day when the appointment of a Negro so well qualified as Mr. Wharton will have ceased to be a novelty.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, among those whom the Soviet Union has deprived of their liberty are the unhappy people of Lithuania. Almost 3 million are trapped behind the Iron Curtain.

The people of Lithuania enjoyed a brief reestablishment of their independence in the wake of World War I. On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian Republic was proclaimed, and for 21 years it enjoyed relative freedom. The liberty-loving people of Lithuania, however, were caught up in the expansionist ambitions of the Soviet Union, and in 1940, shortly after the outbreak of World War II, their country was occupied by Communist forces. The Kremlin deceived no one in Lithuania with its propaganda and subversive activity designed to smother the country's freedom with Communist ideology and power.

The flame of freedom has continued to burn brightly in this oppressed land in spite of harsh restrictions, deportations, imprisonment, and other repressive measures; and the hope of independence is still strong in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

Our ties with the people of Lithuania are not only bonds of sympathy and understanding. Many of our citizens trace their origins to this ancient land, and they have helped to keep alive the hope that in the not too distant future, freedom will once more flourish in Lithuania. I am in strong sympathy with the hopes of the people of Lithuania for independence and freedom from Communist tyranny.

MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last week the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, of which I am a member, outlined on the floor of the Senate some of the problems confronting our American migratory working force and inserted in the RECORD material relating to the television documentary film, "Harvest of Shame." The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] joined in this discussion to point out some relevant matters which he felt were omitted from the "Harvest of Shame" film.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate the discussion which took place between these two able and informed Senators. In my opinion, the vital question here is not whether "Harvest of Shame" is or is not a wholly comprehensive and objective documentary. The important thing is that a detailed and forthright discussion of a very pressing problem took place in the Senate of the United States, for it shows that we are not neglecting our obligation as legislators to scrutinize, debate on and act on behalf of every area of our economy regardless of size or locality. We are recognizing that many hundreds of thousands of migratory workers are an integral part of our Nation's working force and as such are fully entitled to our attention.

During the 86th Congress, I worked with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in the subcommittee on proposed legislation to protect the human and working rights of our migrant workers, principally by a crew leader bill and adult and child education bills. I anticipate expanded legislative activities in the subcommittee during this session. And I look forward to detailed hearings on the issues and currents affecting our agricultural economy and those who support it, at which all parties in interest will have full opportunity to be heard.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of February 12, 1961, a letter to the editor of the Times appearing in the February 15 issue, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 6, 1961, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1961]

PROGRESS FOR MIGRANT LABOR

Things are looking up for migratory farmworkers. At least, important plans are on foot to better the migrants' lot. They should have wide public attention and support.

One proposal seeks to solve the migrant's problem by removing the reason for his migrations. Executive Director Walsh, of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, has announced a joint pilot project, sponsored by his committee and the Florida State Migrant Committee, to help seasonal workers find permanent jobs. It will be set up at one of the chief home bases in Florida from which migrants move north in the spring. Training to operate farm machinery can fit them for more stable employment. Then, too, many new jobs are opening up through the movement of industries and the establishment of new ones.

More widely promising are the proposals which Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, chairman of the Senate Migratory Labor Subcommittee, has embodied in bills prepared after 2 years of public hearings. They include Federal grants-in-aid of State and local schools for migrants' children; insured housing loans to farmers and direct loans to growers, nonprofit groups, and migrants themselves; increased health services for farm laborers and compulsory Federal registration of crew leaders. This latter would give the Government much needed authority to set and enforce standards protecting workers against exploitation by those who supply seasonal labor for harvesting. Unfortunately, however, Senator WILLIAMS has not included minimum-wage and child-labor measures. He is known to favor both, but drafting difficulties, which have been formidable, have yet to be solved.

Promising, too, is the rapport which is developing between the three top Government officials who can do more than anyone else to ease the lot of the migrants. Besides Senator WILLIAMS, these are the new Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture, Messrs. Goldberg and Freeman. Both are sympathetic to efforts in that direction, instead of working at odds as did the Secretaries in

the last administration. It will be remembered that Secretary Benson openly opposed measures to help migratory workers which were championed by Secretary Mitchell. We hope the present rapport will continue.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 6, 1961]

PROFITEERING IN HUMAN DISTRESS

Congress has passed reams of laws regulating interstate commerce in goods, but it still has done little to alleviate the appalling conditions which prevail in the interstate commerce in people. We refer, of course, to migrant workers, the underpaid and exploited half million who harvest the Nation's crops but who themselves get a dismally small share of the fruits of that harvest.

Their plight was dramatically brought home to millions of Americans last November, when CBS (with Edward R. Murrow narrating) presented its powerful television documentary, "Harvest of Shame." HARRISON WILLIAMS, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, has a package of bills ready for presentation soon to the Senate. Indications are that the administration is going to press for action. It should, and the public should take on itself as a matter of conscience the job of making known its concern for the plight of these people.

Each time a housewife picks up a neat package of crisply frozen vegetables at her local market, she might well reflect on the possibility that the man (or woman, or child) who picked them went to bed hungry. Largely voteless, mostly uneducated, dependent for their meager living on the only work they know, often cruelly exploited by unscrupulous crew leaders, the migrants have well been called the most underprivileged people in America. They are outside the protection of most laws that govern labor conditions, and all too often even outside the protection of community conscience in those areas where they work.

The migrant problem is one not only for Congress. States and localities have a job to do as well, and more fundamentally the voting and food-buying public itself—which too long has tacitly acquiesced in the exclusion of these half million from the ordinary privileges of citizenship—ought to serve notice that it wants no longer to be a party to profiteering in human distress.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1961]

PROTECTING MIGRANT LABOR

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Unfortunately, your otherwise excellent editorial of February 12 indicates that minimum wage and child labor measures will not be included in the legislative program which has evolved from the work of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Actually, bills for those two purposes are included in a program to be introduced within the next 2 weeks. The bills are revised versions of similar measures introduced last year. Child labor and minimum wage were certainly key goals in 1960 and they continue to be in 1961.

Many of our legislative proposals have already attracted the interest and understanding of Secretary of Labor Goldberg. We also anticipate help and suggestions from other Cabinet members with responsibilities in this general area.

The interest of the New York Times in the effort to improve the lot of the migratory worker has been constant and encouraging. The subcommittee will need widespread support and public understanding within the next year to make the legislative breakthroughs which will resolve these critical human problems.

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

WHO GOT THE GOLD?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, every American is vitally interested in maintaining an adequate national defense. This means not only effective military preparedness but also the preservation of a sound, constructive economic base upon which to operate our Government and our economy.

Nearly 2 years ago I made some remarks in this body in an effort to arouse interest in and to alert my colleagues to the serious situation then confronting us, which involved the rapidly dwindling supply of our gold reserves. Since then I have made several speeches concerning that same development.

Naturally I was greatly encouraged last fall when the feeble voices of the few Members of Congress reverberated into an alarm throughout the country that it was time to do something to conserve our gold reserve. There has been profound interest in my State and the Northwest concerning this very acute problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a recent statement entitled "Who Got the Gold?" prepared by Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash., who has had a great interest in this problem. I urge my colleagues to read these remarks, because I think they will shed some enlightenment on the need for early and effective action to solve this problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO GOT THE GOLD?—A $9,664 MILLION QUESTION

1. The free world nations produced a total of $8,268 million of gold from the beginning of 1950 to the 1960 year end.

2. During this same period foreign free world nations drew out of the U.S. Treasury's gold holdings a total of $6,796 million of gold in payment on their dollar balances.

3. Thus total gold holdings of the free world nations, including the United States and international institutions, should have shown an increase of $15,064 million ($8,268 million plus $6,796 million).

4. But as a matter of fact their total gold holdings increased by only $5,400 million from $35,400 million to $40,800 million.

5. Who got the $9,664 million gold difference between $5,400 million and $15,064 million?

6. Some of this gold, particularly the production of the Union of South Africa, could have been purchased by private individuals in Great Britain, France, West Germany, and other free world nations that permit private ownership of gold but it is not considered likely that as much as $2 billion of this gold passed into private hands.

7. Incidentally, the United States is the only country except Cuba and Indonesia whose gold holdings are now smaller than they were at the beginning of 1950.

8. Even if the United States now had in its Treasury the $9,664 million of gold that neither it nor the other free world nations have in their treasuries, it would not have enough gold to provide a minimum 25 percent gold reserve requirement of $11,498 million against Federal Reserve note currency and adequate coverage on $23,400 million foreign-owned dollars and dollar credits convertible into gold on demand.

9. West Germany, by the way, does not have as much gold as is generally assumed, although its holdings now totaling $2,915 million have increased from nothing at the beginning of 1950. It does, however, own dollars and dollar credits convertible into gold on demand totaling an additional $3,082 million and the fact that there are no pressing claims against its gold or dollars gives it top liquidity with the exception of Switzerland.

10. Gold holdings of the International Monetary Fund and other international institutions increased by only $1,094 million from the beginning of 1950 to the 1960 year end: $1,519 million to $2,603 million.

Where and how is the United States going to get the gold it needs to provide and maintain an intrinsically sound money as specified and defined in article I, section 8, item 5 of the U.S. Constitution?

REPLIES TO INQUIRIES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to appeal to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that he be a little more prompt in providing Members of Congress information in connection with some of the measures which the administration is asking the Congress to consider rather rapidly. I refer particularly to the Federal-aid-to-education bill.

Since I recognized that the administration would ask Congress to give rather prompt consideration to these various measures, on February 2 I directed a letter to the Secretary asking for a statistical breakdown in regard to Senate bill 8, already pending. Later I supplemented this request and asked for a statistical breakdown on the distribution as proposed under administration plans for Federal aid to education, both grants and loans, and asked that it be sent to my office.

I have read in many newspapers, particularly those in my own State, how much Delaware and certain other States are to receive, under the administration's proposal. However, the only material I have received in my office was simply two sheets of paper, stapled together in some hodgepodge manner, which frankly I am unable to decipher.

I respectfully suggest that the administration take time, in some public relations department, to at least answer letters in a manner which can be read.

Certainly as we cross over into the New Frontier Members of Congress will not be expected to buy 50 newspapers—1 from each State—in order to find out what the administration is recommending.

I fully respect the principle that the administration's recommendations are deserving of prompt consideration by the Congress regardless of whether or not we are in agreement with the suggestions. However, as one Member of Congress, I do not intend that these measures be permitted to be steamrollered through without the agencies first having taken the time to supply us with adequate information in order that we can properly evaluate the suggestions.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, over a period of time I have had a great deal of

interest in the whole question of traffic safety, and over the years I have made a number of speeches on the subject. I had a notable interest at the time I served as chairman of the District of Columbia Committee in the House of Representatives. I have a concern for many of the problems facing the District of Columbia.

Among the pressing problems in the District are traffic safety and education, and the construction and improvement of bridges, tunnels, thruways, and roads to better serve the greater metropolitan area of Washington, D.C. I know that the Congress will give serious consideration to these many problems.

I relate briefly what the city of Washington is attempting to do in traffic safety and traffic education. Sometimes I believe people take too lightly traffic education and the responsibility of each driver in fulfilling both his moral and legal obligation to drive safely, cautiously, and courteously within the traffic laws and regulations of their given jurisdiction. This is true in any city or town in the United States and not only peculiar to Washington, D.C. The Citizens' Traffic Board, appointed by the city commissioners, has its responsibilities. The Metropolitan Traffic Area Council and its Traffic Education Committee have their responsibilities and both are doing their utmost in this program.

Also, a great responsibility falls upon the citizens of the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area and the many civic, religious, citizens, service, parent-teacher, and other organizations to implement this traffic safety and education program within the sphere of their particular influence.

I notice that in the District of Columbia Traffic Safety Reporter, in the two most recent issues, there are cartoons, the explanations of which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the District of Columbia Traffic Safety Reporter, January 1961]

THIS IS THE LAW: DON'T BLOCK INTERSECTION

Did you know that there are times when the green traffic light does not automatically mean go ahead? There is perhaps nothing more vexing to a motorist than to find the intersection blocked by cross traffic which has bulled its way ahead even though cars in front of it had come to a complete halt. Motorists who persist in squeezing into the intersection on the pretext that they have the green light even though they can clearly see that the traffic ahead has been halted, are in violation of the law. The correct procedure, when stopped autos in front of you do not permit you to clear the intersection before the light changes to red, is to stop before entering the intersection and to wait for traffic to begin moving again.

This is another in a series of abstracts from the Traffic and Motor Vehicle Regulations of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 46(d). No driver shall enter an intersection or a marked crosswalk unless there is sufficient space on the other side of the intersection or crosswalk to accommodate the vehicle he is operating without obstructing the passage of other vehicles or pedestrians, notwithstanding any traffic control signal indication to proceed."

[From the District of Columbia Traffic Safety Reporter, February 1961]

THIS IS THE LAW: DON'T STRADDLE WHITE LINES

With his normal psychological makeup, a baby would make the worst possible driver. He would consider nothing but his own selfish interests and immediate desires.

The "babyish" adult makes a miserable driver for the same reason. He has never outgrown his babyish egotism.

On the highway, this egotistical type of person betrays himself by such practices as straddling two lanes, thus preventing other vehicles from using them both.

Besides disclosing that he has never probably grown up, the straddling of two lanes is also illegal and subject to the penalties of violating the traffic regulations.

This is another in a series of abstracts from the Traffic and Motor Vehicle Regulations of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 32(a). A vehicle shall be driven as nearly as practicable entirely within a single lane."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Also, there is an excellent editorial entitled "Stop Blaming the Other Guy for the Traffic Situation. Do Something About It Yourself." This editorial has been reprinted in the Washington YMCA Newsletter, February 1961, as a public service so that its members may adopt such a resolution. It would be a good thing if many of the other organizations in the District of Columbia would follow suit and reproduce this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Do you want another resolution for the new year to add to your long list of good intentions?

Here's one: Stop blaming the other guy for the traffic situation. Do something about it yourself.

We have observed a tendency on the part of some people to search for one cause for the entire traffic accident problem. Far too many people think that if they can find the one cause they will be able to locate a quick and single solution. Here's what we have heard:

Older drivers have a tendency to blame younger drivers.

Younger drivers often blame the older drivers.

Fast drivers blame the slowpokes.

Slow drivers blame the fast drivers.

Drivers of large cars blame the drivers of smaller cars.

Men drivers have always had a tendency to blame the women.

Still others claim that congestion is the basic cause for the traffic accident problem.

The best thing a private citizen can do to put a stop to the highway slaughter is to let his public officials know he is behind them in their efforts to stop accidents—and then prove it behind the wheel and in his civic actions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the Traffic Safety Reporter, January 1961, there is an excellent article of safeguarding children in cars which is most significant, and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFEGUARD CHILDREN IN CARS

How often do we think about protecting children riding in a car?

Of course, ideally, all car passengers should be protected by an approved restraining device such as seat belts.

But if you happen to be driving in a car not as yet equipped with seat belts, the following guides are suggested for protecting children from unnecessary injury:

1. Don't drive with a child on your lap.
2. Don't drive with a child standing on the seat. Either you would not feel free to brake hard, or if you did, the child might be thrown against the windshield or instrument panel.
3. Drive slowly with small children in the car. They have no way to brace themselves.
4. Lock all doors; and train the child to keep his hands off handles.
5. Keep heavy objects off the back shelf and the seat behind him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Along the same line, I received this morning an editorial from the February 18, 1961, issue of the Daily Republican Times, Ottawa, Ill., the editorial "Matter of Discipline," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF DISCIPLINE

Every now and then a traffic smashup is traced to the fact that a driver's attention strayed while he was trying to keep child passengers under control. In one recent instance of this kind, a father and six small children were killed.

Doubtless the easiest way to handle the problem of such accidents would be to prohibit an adult from driving with two or more children in the car unless another adult was along to ride herd on them. No such ban is ever likely to be written into law, however; there are good reasons for regarding such a law as undesirable.

What is needed, instead of another law, is general adult awareness of the hazards and special responsibilities that arise from having small children in a car. Discipline, exercised with loving firmness, is a better answer than more law.

Fairly simple rules apply, rules not beyond the grasp of children. "Hands off the doors" is a good one to start with. From then on, parents can easily devise their own rules: Everyone seated, no roughhousing, no hands or heads out the window, and so forth. And there is one important rule for the driver, too: When trouble arises among the young fry, stop the car before doing anything (except vocally) about it. Here, as in many other situations, a bit of forethought can go a long way toward preventing tragedy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Another interesting editorial, which is in the February 1961 issue of the District of Columbia Traffic Safety Reporter, sets forth the views of Dr. Karl Menninger, chairman of the well-known Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kans., an outstanding authority on many subjects who has appeared before many congressional committees giving his views. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The killer behind a steering wheel could be your own emotion out of control, says one of America's leading psychiatrists.

Anger, for example, can be murderous or suicidal for a motorist, according to Dr. Karl Menninger, chairman of the well-known Menninger Foundation in Topeka, Kans.

He points out that we tend to avoid responsibility for our accidents.

"Accidents, we say, are caused by fate, by hard luck, by inadvertence or ignorance or carelessness or distraction or alcohol," says Dr. Menninger. "But if a driver becomes careless, what factors in him contributed to that costly, careless moment?"

The psychiatrist offers this grim answer:

"There is a little murder and a little suicide dwelling in every man's heart. Give him such a powerful weapon as a car, inflame his inhibitions or irritations or frustrations, then add alcohol or fatigue, and the murder or suicide may get committed."

Discussing "accident proneness," which has been a widely used term, Dr. Menninger says:

"Today we would rather say that accident proneness is something that all of us have more or less, and more on one day than on another. The question is, What is your accident proneness level today?

"It fluctuates with various factors. Resentments stemming from childhood, weariness, fatigue, a series of disappointments. And sometimes these feelings lead to an accident.

"We know that relatively few accidents are wholly accidental. The number of accidents ascribable to pure chance must be well below 15 percent."

Dr. Menninger concludes:

"No healthy-minded person ever says—'It can't happen to me.' He might meet a fool, you know. Or he might even temporarily be one."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe that the citizens and the various organizations in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area can do very much to aid in traffic safety and traffic education programs, not only to save lives and prevent serious personal and vehicle damage, but also to improve the flow of traffic in and out of the city and the prevention of traffic jams. One such activity, which I think can be followed by other groups, is a pledge of traffic safety rules, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pledge was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Reproduced in Washington Daily News]

THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE AHEPA-GAPA HELLENIC CIVIC COMMITTEE URGE EACH EASTERN ORTHODOX COMMUNICANT TO PLEDGE AND MAINTAIN THESE SAFETY RULES

The Hellenic Civic Committee is proposing to all of the 37 constituent members of the Council of Orthodox and Greek Societies affecting over 35,000 residents in the area the following traffic safety pledge:

1. Drive within the speed limit—not too fast or too slow—both are hazardous.

2. Do not take up more than one lane—to increase the flow of traffic.

3. Do not block an intersection even in the face of a green light.

4. Do not weave from one lane to another. If you must—give proper signal.

5. Do not drink while you are driving—do not drive after drinking.

6. Show courtesy to your fellow drivers and yield the road to them when they are boxed in.

7. Be alert at the stoplights, and move unhesitatingly when the light turns green. A 5- to 10-second stall at a green light ties up traffic.

8. Give full attention to driving and not to the discussion around you.

9. Keep your car in good condition with at least a half tank of gas. Civil defense also recommends this.

10. Abide by the three C's of driving—care, caution, and courtesy.

The seven Eastern Orthodox churches plus the component members of the council will strive to get each driver to make and keep the above pledge. If each civic and religious group did the same and all drivers fulfilled the pledge, then there would be less accidents and less traffic jams. Our fair city—the Nation's Capital, cannot stand such bad publicity as the traffic jam caused January 19. You cannot shrug it off as one of those things or one of those days.

Sincerely yours,

THE AHEPA-GAPA HELLENIC CIVIC COMMITTEE.

VFW GOLD MEDAL OF AMERICA AND CITATION TO GEN. LYMAN L. LEMNITZER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 7, 1961, it was my privilege, together with approximately 400 Members of Congress, to be the guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at the VFW annual congressional dinner.

As has been the custom in the past, the dinner was characterized by good fellowship and great dignity.

The VFW presents, on this occasion, an award to an individual who has contributed greatly to the well-being of our Nation. This year the VFW Gold Medal of Merit and Citation for outstanding service to our Nation was presented to Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The presentation to General Lemnitzer was made by Mr. Ted C. Connell, of Texas, the national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The address by General Lemnitzer was timely and highly informative. I consider it to be a highly important pronouncement on national security problems. The introduction of General Lemnitzer and the presentation of the award to him by Mr. Connell reviewed General Lemnitzer's distinguished career in the service of our Nation and emphasized his reassuring and forthright stand on the validity of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. As the Members of this Senate are well aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have long supported our Joint Chiefs of Staff system and opposed the outmoded and militarily inefficient single chief of staff.

Because of the importance of General Lemnitzer's fine address and because of the thoughtfulness reflected in Mr. Connell's introduction, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY TED C. CONNELL, OF TEXAS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VFW OF THE UNITED STATES, AWARDING VFW GOLD MEDAL OF MERIT AND CITATION TO GEN. LYMAN L. LEMNITZER, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF; VFW ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 7, 1961

Annually at these dinners honoring Congress, it is the custom of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to recognize an individual who has contributed toward the strengthening of our Nation.

Those who have received these recognitions are those whose names constitute a rollcall of the leaders of our Nation.

Tonight it is my honor as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States to make another such award.

The recipient of our award this evening is a man who has served his country well in war and in these postwar years of so-called peace. He is one of our Nation's most distinguished soldiers and one of our most able leaders. I refer to Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Lemnitzer was born in Honesdale, Pa. He graduated in 1920 from West Point. He was assigned to the Coast Artillery Corps, served in the United States and in the Philippines, and was twice an instructor in physics at West Point. Prior to the war he graduated from the Army's Command and General Staff School and was a graduate of the last prewar class in 1940 from the Army War College.

His war service was one of great achievement. As G–3 for General Eisenhower's Allied Forces Headquarters he made the famous secret submarine trip to north Africa in company with Gen. Mark Clark and Adm. Arnold Wright.

Following that historic mission underwater, he proceeded by air to Gibraltar to participate in the north African landings. He made the trip as a passenger in a B–17. While en route the B–17 was attacked by German aircraft. General Lemnitzer demonstrated that his rating as a distinguished marksman was justified by manning a machinegun and shooting down an enemy plane. After taking part in the Tunisian-Sicilian campaigns, General Lemnitzer, at the conclusion of the war, held the highly responsible position of Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief Mediterranean, Lord Alexander.

His rare ability to carry out delicate missions was again demonstrated when, working with Mr. Allen Dulles he proceeded, in civilian clothes to Switzerland where he helped negotiate the surrender of all German armed forces in northern Italy.

Since the war he has served in increasingly higher positions of trust. Yet, in spite of this succession of high administrative assignments he was determined not to remain chairborne. At the youthful age of 51 he qualified as a paratrooper and took command of the 11th Airborne Division. In Korea he commanded the 7th Infantry Division. He returned to the United States as Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research. When he again returned to the Far East it was as commander of the 8th Army, and soon became Commander in Chief, Far East, and for United Nations commands. When he returned to the United States he served successfully as Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. On October 1, 1956, he was appointed Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

But this long list of services to the Nation does not fully reflect the complete story of General Lemnitzer's contributions.

We in the Veterans of Foreign Wars respect and admire him for his integrity, for his humility, for his determination, and for his intellect. The calm and able manner with which he has discharged the burdensome duties as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has given our Nation and the free world a genuine sense of confidence. We of the VFW, who have so long stood in support of our Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and in opposition to the old-fashioned single chief of staff concept with its one-man dominance of military policy, have gained a deep sense of reassurance from the fact that General Lemnitzer has spoken out so clearly and persuasively in support of our great Joint Chiefs of Staff system.

As commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and in recognition of General Lemnitzer's inspiring leadership and his many contributions to our national security, it is my privilege to present to him at this time the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Gold Medal of Merit and Citation.

REMARKS BY GEN. LYMAN L. LEMNITZER, CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, AT THE VFW ANNUAL DINNER HONORING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1961

Thank you for the great honor you bestow upon me. I can assure you that this is one piece of gold that is not going to flow out of the country.

It is an inspiring sight to look about this room—to see so many distinguished Americans in all walks of life; so large a proportion of our Congress—and reflect that most of you know at firsthand the grim realities of war.

No one is so bellicose as the fellow who was never shot at. On the other hand, men who have been touched by the shadow of war will strive mightily to avoid the recurrence. When the leaders at all levels of society, in political and governmental life and in the private economy, have so uniformly known the tragedy of war, it is axiomatic that they will not be indifferent to the great problems and conflicts that plague the world.

You, who are alumni of our armed services, have always given us essential interest and support in our efforts to achieve the greatest posture of military strength. You view that strength, as do we who are in uniform, as the best guarantee that the world will not again be plunged into a holocaust.

As veterans, you are well familiar with a popular allegation that generals and admirals are always preparing to fight the wars of the future on the basis of the last previous war. I will not debate the accuracy of this thought insofar as it pertains to the past—except to point out that, so far, the United States has never lost a war. What I do want to talk about, however, is what needs to be done with regard to the future.

I need not repeat to you gentlemen any résumé of the breathtaking achievements in military applications of science and technology that have taken place with accelerating speed in the last few decades—and which seem sure to continue at an even faster pace in the future. The combination of a thermonuclear warhead with an intercontinental ballistic missile is but one vivid example. How, then, do we insure that our long-range strategic planning, our programs for research and development, and our production of developed systems, fit fully the context and the requirements of the future?

It is a hard fact of life, that the complex equipment which plays so great a role in shaping our national military strategy, is not produced in a few months, or even a few years. There is a long leadtime from concept until equipment becomes operational in the hands of our forces. The wisdom we display in selecting our objectives for the next 5 years, and the vigor and ingenuity with which we work to obtain those objectives, are going to determine our military effectiveness for a long period ahead.

Hand in hand with the factors of leadtime for equipment, are other leadtimes, which are no less limiting aspects of military readiness. I refer to the development of doctrine, tactics, and training methods, and facilities in order that we may make effective use of the equipment made available to us.

Leadtime also plays an extremely important part in the development of the most essential single element of military capability—the man on whom the effective employment of any machine, or weapon, ultimately depends.

Someone has said that the leadtime for producing a man is 21 years. But before that man can be made ready to take his place in a nuclear-powered submarine, or in the launch crew of a missile, or in any of the innumerable other complex assignments of our modern Armed Forces, still further time is required to give him the highly technical skills he needs to do his job.

I believe that the Armed Forces are not standing still in this regard. To those of you whose memories of training go back to the vast temporary camps of World War I or World War II, it may be reassuring to know that no single aspect of our military establishments has received more thought and attention than our methods of training. We have profited from some of the methods developed by industry. However, I think it is more accurate to suggest that modern industry has widely copied training methods developed by the Armed Forces, because of the complexity of modern equipment.

Even so, the factor of leadtime as applied to individuals, is complicated by some personnel problems which we have not, by any means, fully solved. The part played by career professionals in the effectiveness of the Active Forces of all our services, is becoming increasingly important. This explains why we in the services, as well as the Members of the Congress, scrutinize carefully all of the statistical data on reenlistments and on retention of junior officers. We are particularly fortunate in having the help of many highly knowledgeable, and perceptive Members of the Congress, who have devoted many years of study and thought to this problem.

The management, or programing, as it is often called, of budgetary resources; research and development; production schedules; delivery and testing; and, ultimately, training, requires foresight as well as constant scrutiny. I believe that our techniques in these areas are steadily getting better. They will never be perfect. We have perfected no clear crystal balls. The last one I looked into was pretty opaque. I have it here.

Now it is obvious that the effectiveness of our security does not depend solely on the existence of strength. There is also a requirement for a sound method for the employment of the strength we maintain. In other words, we must have a valid, well thought out strategy.

I think the basic essentials of our approach can be reduced to some classic simplicities. First and obviously, our military posture must be in consonance with and support our national objectives. Second, it must be broad, flexible and imaginative so that it can meet or encompass all potential threats which can reasonably confront us. Third, it must satisfy these first two requirements without such burden on our political and economic structure as to imperil our basic ideals and institutions.

The effort we are carrying out in support of our overall strategy has a number of elements.

We must, at all costs, develop and maintain secure strategic retaliatory forces as the best deterrent to the deliberate initiation of all out general war.

The forces I refer to include the missiles and bombers of the Strategic Air Command; the fighter-bombers of tactical Air Force units overseas; the Navy's remarkable Polaris system as well as its carrier-based aircraft; and the intermediate and short-range missiles manned by our Army and Air Forces and those of our allies overseas.

We are all encouraged by the highly successful initial test of the Minuteman and by the progress already achieved in getting greater range out of the Polaris. I believe we are getting along with this overriding problem, and I can assure you that it will continue to receive priority attention.

Closely related is the program to maintain active and passive defenses against air attack upon the United States. A key part in this program is played by the North American Air Defense Command. It combines air defense capabilities not only of all the U.S. Armed Forces, but also of Canada. Its commander is General Kuter, U.S. Air Force. His deputy is Air Marshal Slemon, of the Royal Canadian Air Force. The air defense program, by contributing to the security of our strategic retaliatory forces, is a vital element in their deterrent effectiveness.

Our national objectives and the strategy which flows from them require that we also maintain a posture of forward development. Forces of all our military services are stationed alongside forces of our allies in key strategic locations overseas. Our 7th and 8th Armies, our 6th and 7th Fleets, our tactical Air Forces, our Marine units afloat and ashore, provide clear evidence to our allies—and also to any potential enemies—that we are able and determined to act promptly and effectively against military aggression. As such they make a vital contribution to deterring war—limited or general—and to the strength of the collective security system.

Since it would be unsound to spread our forces thin so as to try to have some strength everywhere, we maintain and must continue to maintain strategic reserves. These are the centrally located forces of all of the military services which can be rapidly dispatched wherever needed to conduct any type of operation.

In order for these forces to be dispatched rapidly, and so that they can be promptly supplied, we need adequate amounts of modern airlift and, concurrently, sealift. Speed is the essence of effectiveness. A relatively small force, promptly applied, can achieve more than a larger force brought into action later. Without the capability to act rapidly, we would run the risk of having our allies overrun before we could take effective action.

Thus, hand in hand with the requirement to maintain strategic reserves is the collateral requirement to maintain logistic flexibility—the means to transport men, weapons, equipment, and supplies over vast distances to any point of the globe. This is an area in which the United States has traditionally excelled. We must be vigilant to make sure that we keep that margin. There have been promising development in this area which are perhaps not as well known to you as the advances made in weapons systems. These developments have brought with them changes in our logistic technique and doctrine which promise to add substantially to the flexibility of employment of all of our forces.

Still another broad task which must be performed is the maintenance of the ability to augment our peacetime active military strength if war should break out. The requirement to expand would occur even in the case of comparatively small-scale operations. It is not restricted solely to mobilization of military forces, but includes actions to insure production of the equipment and supplies necessary to carry out the operations to win the war.

In part, this task is performed by stockpiling equipment, maintaining plans for conversion of industry to military production, and providing both active and passive protection of industrial, communications, and population centers against attack. In this connection, civil defense activities have a direct influence on our military effectiveness. This is because they can minimize the effects of enemy blows. A clearly effective civil defense, therefore, contributes to the deterrent effectiveness of our total military effort.

For the initial mobilization of military manpower, the Armed Forces look to their respective Reserve components—the Army and Air National Guard and the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps reserves. These organizations provide trained, ready individuals and units. They provide an invaluable asset both for the rapid expansion of active forces in case of war and for any emergency or disaster occurring in the United States.

Beyond these purely military considerations, our strategy requires that the United States not be left behind in the race to unravel the mysteries which still hamper our

mastery of the environment we live in. We can do it, we must do it—we cannot afford to waste that American enthusiasm on which the progress of man so heavily depends. We welcome and we will assist the efforts of other nations in this area, for brains and vision flourish wherever man has a spark of freedom. But I submit that the United States must take on the task of leadership in this drive for greater knowledge. The expenditures we make for the vast research and development needs of our Defense Establishment will be directly reflected in the advances we make in the whole vast spectrum of useful human technology.

The opportunity which lies before us has no precedent. Beyond our shores, hundreds of millions of human beings, still chained to the ox or the buffalo, still struggling with the age-old enemies of want, of hunger, of disease, of ignorance, of tyranny and oppression, look to our example, our leadership, and our assistance.

The full realization of the heights of human well being which are in sight will depend in large part on the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the world. A posture of military strength is an essential prerequisite to such conditions. It is to that purpose that our military effort is directed.

For these great goals, we in uniform need your help.

This is a job for all Americans—a task where none can be bystanders. We need an informed and interested citizenry in every community and hamlet in the United States. This is no time for preconceived notions, for emotional judgments, or half-formed opinions. All Americans owe the country the obligation to apply that enthusiasm which has made this Nation great to the accomplishment of the serious tasks which confront us, and to the harnessing of all our talent and leadership to the heavy demands of the times.

If, with renewed vigor and determination, we can marshal our national will, our American courage and energy and fortitude, we will lead the world to the highest plateau of progress and human understanding which it has ever known. In the process, the unassailable strength of freedom will remain the dominant force on this earth.

PRESIDENT'S SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the editorial in the Wall Street Journal on February 13 raises some very interesting and pertinent questions with respect to the possible future impact of the social security and medicare program embodied in the President's recommendations. This is an extremely timely comment and, therefore, for the benefit of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS ON A MODEST PROPOSAL

When a man comes promising to do good for little children and to ease the sorrows of age, anyone who questions him is bound to sound a little like a skinflint who would take candy from babies and push his grandmother out in the cold.

If you think not so, watch what is going to happen to those in Congress bold enough to raise questions about President Kennedy's proposals to meet the "urgent needs" of the Nation's children and the "haunting fears" of old age that beset the rest of us. Against the emotional wind blown by such imagery, reason is a feeble reed.

Yet somebody had better ask the questions. It is not merely that hidden beneath the tinsel there are a good many prickly nettles; the promise itself is not at all what it seems. For that promise is not simply that society will try to improve its way of taking care of its indigent and helpless, with which aim no man would quarrel; but rather that by this program the Government is going to improve the medical care of all the people. That promise, it seems to us, is pure deceit.

It is going to take some very probing questions even to uncover the tangible nettles tucked away in this program. Offhand, we can recall no program of such magnitude ever being submitted to Congress without a single line in the President's message as to what its cost will be, now or ultimately.

There are, to be sure, some figures given on what the Government says it is going to tax the people initially but even they are not exactly what they seem.

The President speaks of raising social security taxes by only one-quarter of 1 percent and of lifting the base of this tax to the first $5,000 of income, a seemingly trivial price to pay for such wonderful benefits. But this quarter of 1 percent is pyramided; under present law social security taxes are already scheduled to go to 3½ percent for every wage earner in 1963; to 4 percent in 1966; to 4½ percent in 1969. This new proposal is in addition thereto.

And of course in addition to this, there will be an equal amount levied, so the law phrases it, upon the employer, the implication here being that since the employer pays it, it's a gift to the wage earner. But slice this as you will, it means that upon the paycheck of every man affected there will be a payroll tax of more than 9 percent—this 9 percent, mind you, over and above all income taxes, where the lowest rate already is 20 percent.

But if this in itself is no trivial sum, it still offers only a glimpse at the actual cost of this program. It was not without reason that this question was lightly passed over in the President's message. Nobody knows. And the way this program is proposed, nobody can possibly know—neither the President, nor Congress, nor you who are going to pay for it.

Consider: The proposal is that after an initial deduction, which must not be less than $20, the Government will pay "all costs" for up to 90 days in the hospital "for a single spell of illness." "All costs" of nursing home facilities for 180 days. "All costs" in excess of $20 for outpatient diagnostic services. With such an unlimited commitment it is no wonder that Government statisticians haven't yet come up with a cost figure.

Not even the administration pretends the cost will be covered by the $1.5 billion which is supposed to be raised by the "extra" social security tax. And whatever that mysterious figure is now, it, too, is only a beginning. Already the age of the proposed beneficiaries has dropped from 68 to 65 in a bare 6 months; the period of benefits has been extended from earlier proposals; and some new benefits have been added. What would happen to the program, once started, is incalculable.

But if you want to get some idea of the upper reaches of this commitment which the Government would now undertake, you can do a little arithmetic with the President's own figures. He says there are 16 million people over 65. Half of them have medical costs of $700 or more a year. There is a liability here of over $5 billion, just counting the half with major medical problems.

But enough of these nettles. There is no use in even trying to grapple with the limitless cost increases that lie in future changes in the law, or what this wholesale "send the bill to the Government" program will do to future costs. No one can guess at the effect on hospitals from overcrowding when the Government pays most of the bill.

For the costs are not the only thing that tarnish the bright promises, although these are staggering sums for the whole country to pay in order to take care of the few truly needy.

The President assures one and all that this "very modest proposal" is not "socialized medicine." It is not being paid for by the general taxpayer, he says; only by employers and employees, as if the taxpayers were somebody else. And it is not, so we are told, going to touch the private medical system of the country.

Yet here is a measure for the Government to take over the responsibility of medical care for all of us in age, indigent and self-reliant alike. We would have no choice in the matter. So doing, Government takes on the responsibility to see that the money is spent as public funds; it cannot in duty pay out public funds to just any doctor or to just any hospital. Nor will it; the medical facilities for which Government pays Government funds must meet Government standards, and those standards may be medical, financial, social, or whatever the Government would make them.

To pretend that this will not alter, in a deep and fundamental way, the health and medical system of the country is specious. We have no doubt that the few and needy will get better medical care than before. But the price of providing for the needy in this way is not to be measured only in billions of dollars, however many of them there may be, but in what the great apparatus of Government will do to the medical care of all the rest of the people in a country which has achieved—without Government—the highest medical standards of any country in the world.

If this is not socialized medicine, it is nothing. And the President himself promises that this modest program for old people is not an end but a beginning—a "foundation on which to build."

Somebody had better ask questions about what it is that is being built.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CAUTIOUS PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Your Money's Worth—Kennedy's Cautious Program," written by Sylvia Porter, be placed in the RECORD at this point. I believe it will be of interest to Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 21, 1961]

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH—KENNEDY'S CAUTIOUS PROGRAM

(By Sylvia Porter)

So far the Kennedy administration has done little more to combat the current business downturn than a Nixon administration would have done, and to date it actually has shown more caution on antislump moves than the Eisenhower administration showed during the last downturn in 1958.

Considering the torrent of words pouring out of the White House on the economic situation, the headlines being made about the level of unemployment, the administration's efforts to prod Congress into passing urgent legislation to extend jobless benefits and aid depressed areas, this appraisal is surprising. But read on and you'll have the facts to confirm it.

(1) Government spending programs and awards of defense contracts are being accelerated. This is a continuation of the speedup begun during the Eisenhower administration in mid-1960—before any GOP official publicly admitted a recession was on. As Prentice-Hall emphasized, in July–November

1960, military procurement obligations jumped 21 percent above the 1959 span, and this was no accidental rise.

In the 1958 recession Government defense spending was increased much more. Prentice-Hall estimates spending on defense hard goods in the first half of 1958 at almost double the total in the preceding half.

ROAD PROGRAM SPEEDED

(2) Spending on the highway program is being speeded up too—another continuation of a move initiated under Mr. Eisenhower. In the 1958 recession this type of spending was not only accelerated but also increased by more than a quarter-billion dollars.

(3) Unemployment insurance is being extended to workers who already have exhausted State benefits and liberation of the program is being pushed. Similar moves were made in the 1958 downturn. Incidentally, the Eisenhower administration rated temporary aid to the unemployed in that recession as the step of greatest impact.

(4) The outflow of Government cash to individuals who might be in most need now is being accelerated via an order to speed up payment of dividends on veterans' life insurance and of tax refunds. Orders of the same nature were issued in 1958.

MORE DONE IN 1958

(5) Pressure is being put on home mortgage rates through reduction in the FHA's charges, some liberalization of housing credit and an organized campaign to talk down mortgage rates. Much more than this was done to stimulate housing in 1958.

(6) The Federal Reserve System has taken aggressive steps to make credit easily available and lower its cost in order to encourage increased borrowing for homebuilding, new plants, modern equipment, etc. It began moving toward easier, cheaper credit in early 1960—before even its own Governors were sure something was going wrong in the economy. It also acted aggressively to ease credit and cut interest rates in 1958.

Of course, it's not entirely black and white. A Nixon administration wouldn't have favored so broad a depressed areas bill nor, probably, the quick expansion of social security benefits proposed by President Kennedy. It's unlikely that Mr. Nixon would have urged a higher minimum wage immediately. Mr. Nixon's recommendations for "a new tax incentive for businesses to expand" undoubtedly would have been different.

But there's a provocative caution in the pace and type of antirecession action proposed to date and the resemblance between the 1958 antirecession remedies and the 1961 suggestions is, in Prentice-Hall's words, "strikingly close in the broad outlines."

I hope it implies the Kennedy administration's judgment that this recession will be neither serious nor persistent enough to justify crash programs. I think it implies just that.

SERIES OF SEVEN DUPLICATE LOCKS ON ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 17, 1961, I introduced a bill (S. 434) to authorize the construction of a series of seven duplicate locks on the Illinois Waterway. The proposal has been approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army.

The bill was also approved by the administration and the Senate last year. I found myself in difficulties because the Budget Director thought the amount of money needed would probably exceed the budget. In consequence, I had to do the entirely unselfish thing and ask that the bill not be considered, but it was said at that time that the bill could be considered in the next fiscal year. So it is now pending.

The Illinois Waterway extends from the Mississippi River about 38 miles above St. Louis, Mo., to Chicago, a distance of approximately 326 miles. It provides the connection between the Mississippi-Ohio navigation system and the Great Lakes. The rapid and steady growth of traffic on the waterway has made it one of the most heavily used major inland waterway routes of the United States, and it is the only regularly used route connecting the Great Lakes with the Mississippi Valley system of waterways.

I submit for the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to have printed therein, an editorial with respect to the project which appeared in the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star under date of February 15, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLINOIS RIVER—BOTTLENECK OR BOON?

Today, the Illinois River, the keystone of the Nation's water transport, is a bottleneck instead of the great boon it ought to be, and would be if twin locks were installed.

To the north is the great water system of the Great Lakes now linked to the Atlantic Ocean and coastal water transport by the St. Lawrence Seaway.

To the south is the great water system of the Mississippi River and its huge tributaries reaching east and west, linked directly to the Gulf of Mexico.

With the exception of Indianapolis, Ind., every major city in the United States from Minneapolis, Minn., to New York and San Francisco, including all of the bigger inland cities, either are located on the seacoast, on the Great Lakes, or on one of the rivers in this great network. That is no accident.

Water transport is a most vital part of our whole economy.

The one and only connecting link for water transport to pass from these great systems of the north to those of the south, east and west—or vice versa—is the Illinois River, which at the very heart of the system ties the Mississippi to the Great Lakes.

Ever since the tonnage on this river hit 20 million its lock system has been strained. There has since come the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Cal-Sag Canal, opening it to more traffic.

With the continued growth of such traffic north and south the Illinois threatens to become a bottleneck in this great system instead of a gateway from one to the other.

We need a twin-lock system on the Illinois River. The need is soon. The need has long been foreseeable and we've talked about it here for 4 years. It takes years to build such a system, and time is getting away from us right now.

We note, however, that the Kennedy-Johnson natural resources advisory committee completed its studies and submitted a report with heavy emphasis on the very things we have been saying all along.

It spells out the great importance of water transport to industrial development and economic growth, and to national defense, and it declares flatly that present capabilities are overtaxed. It adds that the total traffic will double in the next 20 years.

We hope this report will give new stimulus to the attempts being made by Illinois Senators, in particular, to get action toward realistic facilities on the Illinois River not only for the advantage to this area, but for the sake of the whole system, for the sake of the Nation's economic development and defense capability.

MADISON'S CONTRIBUTION TO RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by a singular coincidence in the same week in which we celebrate the anniversary of the birth of the chief architect of our independence, affectionately known as "the Father of his Country," the Congress has received a proposal from the President of the United States, urging it to embark for the first time in our national history on a program of Federal aid to education. And involved in that program is one of the most unique and vital features of our Federal Constitution, namely, the separation of church and state.

President Kennedy, in recommending the appropriation of funds for public schools, has requested that parochial and other church schools at a certain level be excluded, but at the college level that they be included. That proposal will, of course, touch off a debate on the history and the meaning of the doctrine of the separation of church and state, and its application to the appropriation of public funds for church-owned and operated schools and colleges.

On many occasions, I have expressed the view that the ability and wisdom of the representatives of 13 new States who assembled in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787, to draft a plan for a more perfect Union, have never been excelled in this or any other nation. If that be true, and I challenge any colleague to deny it, the views of the Founding Fathers on the principle of separation of church and state should be a lamp unto our feet.

Students of history well know that religious intolerance did not commence with the crucifixion of Christ and the persecution of his followers. Throughout recorded history organized government has sought to enforce its will in religious as well as temporal affairs. Many of the early colonists in this country, notably those who settled in Massachusetts, came in search of religious freedom. Those who made the first permanent English settlement at Jamestown in 1607 did not come for that purpose, but they did come imbued with the spirit of political freedom; they did organize the first representative government on this continent; and they were the first to realize that there could be no complete political freedom unless the Government was prohibited from interfering with the individual's religious views.

While George Washington was not as active as Thomas Jefferson and James Madison in behalf of legislation on the subject of religious freedom, he, a deeply religious man and always loyal to the established Church of England, endorsed as strongly as Jefferson and Madison, the principle of separation of church and state. In a letter to the members of a new church in Baltimore, he wrote:

We have abundant reason to rejoice that in this land the light of truth and reason has triumphed over the power of bigotry and superstition, and that every person may

here worship God according to the dictates of his own heart. In this enlightened age and in this land of equal liberty it is our boast that a man's religious tenets will not forfeit the protection of the laws, nor deprive him of the right of attaining and holding the highest offices that are known in the United States.

Later, in an address sent to the General Committee of the United Baptist Churches in Virginia, with which my colonial ancestors were associated, and which had suffered perhaps more persecution at the hands of an intolerant government than any other denomination, General Washington wrote:

If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension, that the Constitution framed in the convention, where I had the honor to preside might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the General Government might ever be so administered as to render the liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded, that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny, and every species of religious persecution. For you doubtless remember that I have often expressed my sentiments that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshiping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Again, in his justly famed Farewell Address, which was read to us this morning, Washington said:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens.

Therefore, in discussing today the contribution made by another great Virginian to the cause of the type of freedom which we have enjoyed under a Constitution which provides for the separation of church and state, I wish to emphasize the point made by Washington that there is a difference between religion in government and government in religious affairs. I further emphasize the point that the current debate in connection with a school-aid program of the doctrine of separation of church and state, will avail us little unless it includes the realistic premise that what this day and generation needs is not more Federal aid to the individual, but a more active support by the individual of religion and morality—"great pillars," as stated by Washington, "of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens."

Students of Virginia history will recall the provision for religious freedom that was included in George Mason's bill of rights, and incorporated in Virginia's first constitution, and a still broader provision in a bill offered in the Virginia Legislature by Patrick Henry. It remained, however, for the chief architect of the Philadelphia Constitution, James Madison, to outline the fundamental reasons for the doctrine of separation of church and state, which was subsequently incorporated in Jefferson's statute for religious freedom in Virginia and was written by Madison into the first amendment of the Federal Constitution. It was largely due to his efforts that Virginia was the first State in the modern world with both complete religious freedom and complete separation of church and state.

It was Madison at whose insistence the Virginia Bill of Rights of 1776 was so modified as to read:

All men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience.

Until Madison's amendment the document had provided that there be religious toleration. For this statesman, mere toleration was insufficient; he proclaimed that—

The right of every man is liberty—not toleration.

Madison's primary contribution to the dual causes of religious freedom and the separation of church and state—and that which had the greatest repercussions—was his famous "Memorial and Remonstrance" of 1784 against a proposal of the Virginia House of Delegates to provide, through assessments, for teachers of the Christian religion.

It is important to consider the circumstances which led to Madison's "Remonstrance."

The decision on a general assessment for the support of religion in Virginia had been deferred, by article VI of the 1776 Preliminary Act for Religious Freedom to the determination of a future assembly.

In the house the assessment proposals were vigorously argued by no lesser advocate than Patrick Henry. It may seem paradoxical that the man who a few years before had been proclaimed the "firebrand of the American Revolution" and who in the near future was to denounce the Federal Constitution as a return to tyranny, would fail to appraise the implications of state-sponsored financial support of the Christian religion. Henry advanced as his chief argument the close relation of religion to the prosperity of the state, calling attention to the fate of nations which had neglected religion, and inferring the need of state support. Madison fully answered this contention by stating that the true question was not—Is religion necessary?—but—Are religious establishments; that is, state-supported establishments, necessary for religion?

In spite of Madison's logic and vigor the house adopted on November 11, 1784, the following resolution designed to carry out Henry's plan:

That the people of this Commonwealth, according to their respective abilities, ought to pay a moderate tax or contribution annually, for the support of the Christian religion, or of some Christian church, denomination or communion of Christians, or of some form of Christian worship.

Nevertheless, Madison was able to postpone the third and final reading of the subsequent bill tailored to implement the resolution's intention. Only the determination and resourcefulness of Madison in his opposition and the election of Henry to Virginia's Governorship on November 17 prevented this assessment bill from becoming law in 1784.

Madison used to advantage the delay which his efforts had won. With the endorsement of Mason and Nicholas he prepared between sessions and circulated in June and July of 1785 the remarkable "Memorial and Remonstrance."

The epochmaking document, which I will quote in part, was divided into an introduction and 15 succeeding points:

To the Honorable the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia:

We, the subscribers, citizens of the said Commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration a bill printed by order of the last session of general assembly, entitled "A bill establishing a provision for teachers of the Christian religion," and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill—

1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth "that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right.

2. Because, if religion be exempt from the authority of the society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body.

3. Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. * * * Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity in exclusion of all other religions may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

4. Because the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensable in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. If all men are by nature equally free and independent, all men are to be considered as entering into society on equal conditions; as relinquishing no more, and therefore retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights. Above all, are they to be considered as retaining an equal title to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience.

5. Because the bill implies either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the contradictory opinions of rulers in all ages and throughout the world; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

6. Because the establishment proposed by the bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian religion itself, for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world.

7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost 15 centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution. En-

quire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest lustre; those of every sect, point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy.

6. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of civil government only as it is a means of supporting religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If religion be not within the cognizance of civil government, how can its legal establishment be necessary to civil government? * * * Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty, may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property by neither invading the equal rights of any sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy which offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a lustre to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a melancholy mark is the bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority.

10. Because it will have a like tendency to banish our citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy would be the same species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

11. Because it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with religion has produced among its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the Old World in consequence of vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all differences in religious opinion.

12. Because policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. * * * Instead of leveling, as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill, with an ignoble and unchristian timidity, would circumscribe it with a wall of defense against the encroachments of error.

13. Because attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of society.

14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured.

15. Because, finally, the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion, according to the dictates of conscience, is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the declaration of those rights which pertain to the good people of Virginia as the basis and foundation of government, it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather with studied emphasis.

We, the subscribers, say that the General Assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority. And in order that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it this remonstrance earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addresed, may, on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront His holy prerogative or violate the trust committed to them; and, on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of His blessing, redound to their own praise, and establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the happiness of the Commonwealth.

The influence of this document was widespread not only in Virginia but throughout the other Colonies.

A letter of Madison's describes the profound local effect. He writes that the "remonstrance" met with "the approbation of the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, and a few Roman Catholics, universally; of the Methodists in part; and even not a few of the sect; that is, the Anglicans—his own religion incidently, formerly established by law." The Presbyterians adopted a strong memorial against the assessment bill specifically referring to the fact that it would be unfair to the Jews, as it provided for only one religion, Christianity. The general association of Virginia Baptists was even more extreme in its denunciation of Henry's proposals.

It can be said without exaggeration that Madison's Remonstrance so stimulated the Virginia electorate that not only did the assembly reject the assessment bill in the session of 1785 but it moved to adopt by a margin of 67 to 20 the bill establishing religious freedom, which had been prepared by Thomas Jefferson and introduced into the Virginia Assembly as early as June 13, 1779.

The ferment overflowed Virginia's boundaries and helped stifle attempts in other Colonies to siphon public funds into the regular support of the churches.

Madison overlooked few opportunities to advance the principles of his Remonstrance.

His first amendment to the Constitution reads in part:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Madison wished to go further and proposed an amendment which would protect the principles of religious freedom and separation of church and state not only from Federal encroachment but also from state intervention. That failed to win acceptance, but it illustrates the extraordinary vision of this statesman. His proposal had anticipated by 134 years the Supreme Court's application of the 14th amendment in Meyer against Nebraska (1923) to freedom of religion.

The religious minorities had no greater friend than James Madison. In his youth he heard with deep compassion the sermon of a Baptist minister from the only pulpit legally available to him—the window of a jail.

In his old age, after retirement from the Presidency, he received a letter containing the following tribute from a member of the Jewish faith in New York:

I ought not to conceal from you that it affords me sincere pleasure to have an opportunity of saying that to your efforts and those of your illustrious colleagues in the convention the Jews in the United States owe many of the blessings which they now enjoy, and the benefit of this liberal and just example has been felt very generally abroad and has created a sincere attachment toward this country on the part of foreign Jews.

Madison's influence on our Nation's progress toward freedom of religion and its corollary, separation of church and state, was both extensive and enlightened. He is unexcelled among our forefathers for logical and consistent development of the constitutional ideal of religious freedom.

In conclusion, I wish to quote again from the immortal George Washington, who, in his first inaugural address, said:

It would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge.

The debate of the issue of Federal aid to church schools can be a vital and dynamic contribution to the President's New Frontier program, if it challenges the willingness of our people to prove by their personal conduct that the motto on our coins, "In God We Trust," is something more than a political shibboleth.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Speaking not only for myself, but also, I feel certain, for the entire Senate, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for the wonderful speech he has made on the fundamental principle of the separation of church and state. The Senator delved deeply into the rich history of his own State, quoting the trailblazers and frontiersmen of that day on this subject, as well as on others.

Furthermore, the Senator from Virginia has not only personified the principles he has discussed, but has himself supported and served both church and state during the years of his life, and certainly the years of his public career are especially included.

He is very timely in bringing this message to the Senate today, pointing out with his usual great clarity and his vision of the future, as well, the cardinal principles which he has set before us. I thank him, and say that I believe he has opened a debate which will provoke great interest and bring good, too, to the people of our country. I am delighted, indeed, that he was the spokesman on this point in opening the debate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia appreciates the fine tribute paid by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I have simply touched today on the subject of Federal contributions, first, to parochial schools, which the President said would be excluded, and then the broader application to all church schools. I have quoted from those who framed our laws on this subject and said there should be no distinction in using tax money to support

church institutions at any level, whether it be a primary school, a preparatory school, or a college. That is only one phase which is involved in the program of public aid to education.

When we get further into the subject, the junior Senator from Virginia will have much to say about the undesirability of any feature of Federal aid to education. But today, in keeping with the views of George Washington on the subject of separation of church and state, as amplified by the statements of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, the Senator from Virginia thought it might not be inadvisable to bring to the attention of the Senate and the Nation the light given by the greatest group of statesmen ever to assemble, and who, in the words of a great English statesman, gave us the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man. George Washington said it was a unique instrument without the first amendment; but to make the point clear, Madison wrote into the first amendment the unique and vital principle of separation of church and state, without which there can be no complete political freedom of the individual.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What differentiation does the Senator from Virginia make between the constitutional right of the Federal Government to make contributions, on the one hand, to elementary institutions of learning and, on the other hand, to higher institutions of learning?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia can find no constitutional limitation which holds that if a church school simply teaches certain subjects—they would be elementary subjects—Federal funds could be contributed to such a school, but that in institutions of higher learning such a constitutional restriction does not apply. I argue that there can be no proper distinction, under the Constitution, between church schools at any level, if we are to keep ourselves attuned to the principle of separation of church and state.

As I said a moment ago to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], when the Senate takes up the school bill, I shall quote from a statement made by a distinguished predecessor of the present distinguished Senator from Ohio, Senator Robert A. Taft, who said on the floor of the Senate, about 12 years ago, that if the Federal Government ever embarked upon paying the salaries of teachers, the cost would soon pyramid to $3 billion a year. That is a very conservative estimate. It is very conservative, because once we start paying teachers' salaries which throughout our country's history has been a primary obligation of the States and the political subdivisions, the States will unload on the Federal Government as fast as possible the burden of paying the entire amount. The States will put every pressure possible upon every candidate for office to take that burden off the States and to put it on the Federal Government.

Last, but not least, we know how true it is that the long arm of the Federal Government will follow in the control of Federal dollars. We cannot help having Federal control once a Federal program is begun.

I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under date of February 20, 1961, a letter was written to me by the superintendent of schools of Ashland, Ohio. Ashland is a small community about 60 miles southwest of Cleveland. Enclosed in the letter was a resolution adopted by the Ashland Board of Education. It reads as follows:

ASHLAND CITY SCHOOLS, ASHLAND, OHIO

STATEMENT IN REGARD TO FEDERAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 1961

We, the Ashland City Board of Education, desire for the youth of this community the best educational opportunities the community can reasonably make available. We want teachers who are competent, enthusiastic, and dedicated. We want good teaching facilities, adequate room, and meaningful, modern equipment. We believe we represent the thinking of the community as we express our convictions.

We believe our local community with the aid of the State foundation program can and should provide the funds necessary to maintain our educational program. We, therefore, oppose the extension of Federal aid in any form locally.

We believe that Federal aid to education is expensive because it involves the channeling of tax money from a community by way of the Federal Government back into the local community. We believe that Federal grants carry the potential of some Federal supervision of education. Whether the funds are designated for buildings, equipment, or salaries, by accepting them we are inviting the Federal Government to help determine our school policies.

We believe the Federal Government may well serve the cause of education by subsidizing research in educational methods and techniques. They may well serve any disaster or impoverished area as a temporary measure in helping to bring the schools there up to minimum standards. Additional aid should be provided by the State rather than the Federal Government.

We believe the cost of the educational services in our schools which are now financed by the Federal Government should gradually be assumed by the local community. We believe the community can and should continue to make possible whatever educational advantages seem desirable for our children.

We believe that surpluses of foods and of mechanical equipment can be accepted without concern for Government intervention.

I should like to have the Senator's comment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I endorse all of those reasons for opposition; and at an appropriate time I shall add some new ones.

I shall say now that the most practical way for Congress to help public education would be to reduce public spending and cut taxes, so that the localities would have more of their own money left at home, to spend as they see fit for the improvement of their own schools.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ABOLISHING THE OPERATIONS COORDINATING BOARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the New York Times of February 20. It refers to an Executive order, issued by the President, which abolishes the Operations Coordinating Board. This Board, the Senate will recall, was composed of representatives of the State Department, of the CIA, of the ICA, and other Government officials. It was set up in 1957, and it was charged with coordinating and carrying out certain activities in the field of foreign relations and national security.

In issuing the order, President Kennedy made clear that he intends to do his own coordinating in these matters, and that the Secretary of State alone will assume many of the responsibilities heretofore vaguely entrusted to the Board.

This is a most commendable step in the direction of more effective and streamlined management of the Nation's foreign affairs, because it removes some of the blocks to decisive action, and reposes in the Secretary of State not only the responsibility, but also the authority that should go with it. The decision is in line with the recommendations of the special subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], which for some time has been looking into this problem; and it strikes at the problem of "too many cooks" in foreign policy—a situation with which some of us have been trying to cope for a long time. Again I commend the President for this action, and also the chairman and members of the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee whose recommendations were its precursor. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the article previously noted printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1961]

PRESIDENT ENDS TOP POLICY BODY—HE INCREASES WHITE HOUSE CONTROL OF SECURITY AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

WASHINGTON, February 19.—President Kennedy moved today to strengthen White House control over national security and foreign policy actions, and assure that Federal agencies adhere to "the policy of the White House in those fields."

He issued an Executive order abolishing the Operations Coordinating Board set up by President Eisenhower in 1957 to coordinate Government activities dealing with national security and such problems as improving the image of the United States abroad.

Instead of using the Board "as an instrument for insuring action at the President's direction," Mr. Kennedy said, he intends to maintain "direct communications with the responsible agencies so that everyone will know what I have decided."

Much of the responsibility for the Board's work will be centered in the Secretary of State. As for our image abroad, the President said, this will be the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and all others "concerned by the spirit and meaning of our actions in foreign policy."

Mr. Kennedy said the order abolishing the Board is part of his program for strengthening the responsibility of individual Government departments and maintaining close White House liaison with them.

POLE FOR EXECUTIVE AID

"We, of course, expect that the policy of the White House will be the policy of the executive branch as a whole," he said in a statement. "And we will take such steps that are needed to insure these results."

He said he expected senior officials who had served as members of the Board to keep close, informal touch with each other on problems of common interest.

Among the members of the Board, an adjunct of the National Security Council, were the head of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and Presidential aids.

Bromley Smith, executive officer of the Board in the Eisenhower administration, will continue to work with McGeorge Bundy, Mr. Kennedy's special assistant, "in following up on White House decisions in the area of national security," the President said.

"In these varied ways, we intend that the net result shall be a strengthening of the process by which our policies are effectively coordinated and carried out throughout the executive branch," he explained.

The order, dated yesterday, was made public today.

The Secretary of State, in taking responsibility for much of the Board's work, will rely particularly on the Assistant Secretaries in charge of regional bureaus, while they, in turn, will consult with other departments and agencies, Mr. Kennedy said.

NEED FOR PERMANENT UNITED NATIONS FORCE

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield to me, provided it is understood that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. KEATING. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the wee hours of yesterday morning, the Security Council authorized—for the first time in its history—the United Nations to prevent civil war, and to use force, if necessary. It seems to me, Mr. President, that such action by the Security Council is of great importance in connection with the resolution which calls for the establishment of a permanent United Nations police force. That resolution was submitted today by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and I am a cosponsor of the resolution. It is similar to one which we jointly sponsored in the last session; and at that time it was widely commented on as an important and a useful measure.

Today, in my judgment, the resolution will serve an even more important role, in affirming the support of the Congress for further strengthening of the United Nations. It can serve as a vital proof of the trust which the United States puts in the United Nations and the need which the United States feels for a stronger, more stable United Nations force.

Mr. President, all of us are aware of the crucial nature of the Congo problem that the United Nations is facing today. The unhappy death of former Premier Lumumba has driven the Congo from mere disorder to chaos, from political instability to near civil war. All of us are equally well aware of the role the Soviet Union is playing in fomenting civil war in the Congo—with the aim, no doubt, of sending military supplies secretly to its own supporters, through the United Arab Republic and other pro-Communist nations. We know, furthermore, what the consensus of United Nations opinion is, as shown by the Security Council vote, early Tuesday morning, which authorized United Nations troops to use force, if necessary, to prevent civil war. The Soviet Union would undoubtedly have vetoed that move, had it not feared widespread disapproval from many of the African natives, themselves.

Last week, President Kennedy took the first step to block the calculating and ruthless policy of the Soviet Union. He rightly pointed out that the United States would not condone unilateral action in the Congo, whether by the Russians or by the United Arab Republic. Quite properly, also, our Ambassador to the United Nations immediately affirmed his support of United Nations Secretary General Hammarskjold. Those were the first steps toward stabilizing a situation that the Communists were doing everything in their power to destabilize.

The second step came from the place where it did the most good—from the United Nations Conciliation Commission for the Congo. The 11-nation Commission of African and Asian nations, headed by a Nigerian, agreed that the legitimate government of the Congo was that of President Kasavubu and Premier Ileo. Furthermore, in a report to the Secretary General, the Commission suggested the need for a federal-type government in which different elements in the Congo would be represented. Finally, it recommended an army council, composed of several high ranking United Nations officials, to reorganize the national forces and take them out of politics.

The third—and, to date, the most important—step in stabilizing the Congo situation came—as I have stated—in the small hours of Tuesday morning, when—for the first time in United Nations history—the Security Council authorized the United Nations to prevent civil war, and to use force, if necessary. In order to fulfill this need, Secretary General Hammarskjold yesterday called for reinforcements for the United Nations force in the Congo.

But this is not the end, Mr. President. There are further steps that can and indeed must be made if the independence and stability of the Congo are to be assured. The dangers are still immense which face the new nation. The Soviet Union and 13 satellites and fellow traveling nations have recognized the wholly illegal regime of Antoine Guizenga. And I must say this is more than the rest of Lumumba's followers have done. In spite of the Soviet abstention on Tuesday's vote, their efforts to disrupt any settlement will be long lived and desperate. It will need the full force of the United Nations to block these maneuvers.

What is most urgent now is to set up the United Nations force in the Congo so that it can effectively fulfill its new and expanded responsibility. It should be on a permanent and nonpolitical basis. In the past Secretary General Hammarskjold believed that there was no need for a permanent U.N. force, that forces should be gathered as needed—as we sometimes say, ad hoc—depending on the particular crisis that required attention. I think the whole course of the Congo situation has revealed that that policy is not sufficient at present. In the African Continent it has merely encouraged rivalry and competition between other nations seeking to gain a more important role for themselves in the affairs of their neighbors. All African nations, of course, are not guilty of this, but some, by deliberately withdrawing their troops from the United Nations force at critical moments or offering tacit assistance to one or another of the Congo factions, have certainly aggravated the problems of the United Nations. Hammarskjold tacitly recognized this difficulty in his appeal late yesterday for additional troops.

What is needed, in helping to reorganize the Congolese Army and bring peace to the country, is a permanent United Nations force of some 50,000 to 60,000 men. These men should be fully in the employ of the United Nations and not subject to recall by their own countries, like civil servants at U.N. headquarters.

They should come not from African or Asian nations alone, but from all continents. No one nation should have a predominance that could be politically or militarily exploited. It would, however, be wise to exclude any volunteers from major powers. The force would have to be completely removed from politics and obedient to the orders of the commanding U.N. officials.

Furthermore, such a force should be an integral part of the United Nations. The cost of maintaining it should be an integral part of the United Nations budget so that no nation would be able to withhold the necessary funds for keeping up the force without runnning the risk of losing its U.N. vote, as provided in the Charter. The establishment of a U.N. police force along these lines would put real teeth into the resolution passed by the Security Council. For the first time, it would give the U.N. a bite as well as a bark.

If such a force were created, it would be possible for a federal government to be set up in the Congo, which would not have to rely on native troops, wildly partisan and easily excited. A permanent and stable U.N. force could keep order fairly well, while the political leaders settled down to the absolutely indispensable, but to date quite forgotten, task of restoring economic order, and viability to the Congo. Such U.N. force would have the confidence of the legitimate government, and remove itself effectively from politics. Already it is clear that the pro tem force rapidly

offered, and equally rapidly withdrawn by neighboring African nations, can never win the confidence from the Congolese people and their legitimate leaders.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that I am not criticizing U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold by supporting this resolution, which he has in the past opposed, and which, so far as I know, he may still oppose. This is an appeal to reason, and it is my hope that the situation, as it has developed in the Congo, will cause him to reconsider his views, and to withdraw his opposition to a resolution of this character. On the contrary, I am urging that this initiative be followed up by the executive branch of the Government, in order to strengthen the United Nations, in order to put additional power and authority in Mr. Hammarskjold's hands, and in order to make possible at last a peaceful and stable solution of the Congo problem.

If there is one lesson to be learned from the whole Congo problem, it is the dangers involved when the armies of the mediating force become—or even raise the slightest suspicion of becoming—politically motivated themselves. For the Congo, and for similar situations which may arise in the future, the United Nations needs a permanent, nonpolitical force that will be loyal to the United Nations above all.

For that reason I submit that this resolution deserves the immediate attention of the appropriate committee, of the Congress and of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on this subject?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I had the honor of joining the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] in the resolution to establish a permanent police force for the United Nations. I had no opportunity of saying anything at the time the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] submitted the resolution this morning, but I feel honored to join in it. First, I should like to express my appreciation to the Senator from New Jersey and my colleague from New York for taking the position they have as one being of enormous service to our country and the United Nations; and I am honored to join them in it.

Second, I wish to point out that what is sought to be done by the resolution is to establish a force that will sustain a rule of law; that if we are ultimately to get anywhere with respect to peace in the world, somehow or other, we need a rule of law to replace the rule of force. But a rule of law needs a police force, and a police force under the adjudicating body, which would be the United Nations.

Many of us feel that in cases like Algeria, and other areas where there have been grave dangers to the peace of the world, an effective trusteeship machinery within the United Nations could help people to work out their difficulties in a deliberate way. This kind of trusteeship requires the availability of a force in that particular trust territory, and the United Nations is without such means at the present time.

I very much appreciate the individual judgment of my colleague on Mr. Hammarskjold's views, and I feel that the latter should have learned something from what has happened in the Congo and what is happening that is endangering the United Nations. I hope very much that Congress will act on the proposal which has been initiated by my colleague and by the Senator from New Jersey, who submitted the resolution, and that it will result in an effective contribution toward the establishment of a rule of law in the world.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague from New York. We are certainly delighted to have the force of his influence brought to bear on this resolution, and I am grateful to him for his remarks.

I now wish to refer briefly to another subject.

RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Inauguration Day I spoke briefly on the Senate floor urging that action be taken to implement a number of needed electoral reforms. Foremost on my list is the problem of the "politically dispossessed" who cannot vote because they do not meet various State, district, and local residency requirements.

I can understand the proposition which says that persons newly arrived in an area probably will not be able to make intelligent decisions affecting what are intrinsically State and local issues. This is all well and good. As far as State and local issues and State and local elections are concerned, the Congress does not have a direct role to play and the qualifications for voters can and should be left up to the State.

What worries me is that residency requirements also prevent many qualified American citizens from voting for the President and Vice President. I believe that as long as a man is a citizen, he should be allowed to vote for the President and Vice President—whether he has lived in Shreveport, La., or Buffalo, N.Y., in the year or 2 years previous to an election. It is blatantly unjust to disenfranchise duly qualified American citizens in a national election simply because they cannot meet State and local requirements.

Few people realize just how many voters are in this unfortunate category.

I have no doubt most of the Members of this body recognize the problem. Most Members of Congress do, because all, around election time, must have been deluged with mail from their constituents who were not able to vote for this reason. In general in this country people do not realize the problem.

Estimates of the number of Americans who are "politically dispossessed" because they do not meet the necessary residency requirements range from 5 million, or about 5 percent of the eligible voters, to 8 million or more. This is no mere drop in the bucket. In a close election, the margin of victory is much less than 5 million votes. We had an illustration of that in 1960.

In our urban, mass society of today, frequent movement from one area to another is a way of life for many Americans. Often those who move seek new and better opportunities to contribute to our economy and to advance our economic growth and way of life. There is no reason in the world why they should be penalized for moving or why we should assume that they are ill-informed or irresponsible Americans not deserving of the right to vote.

The basic question arises: What can the Congress do to remove or at least mitigate the effect of these requirements? The answer is by no means easy.

It is clear under the Constitution that the Congress does not have an obvious or inherent authority to legislate in this area. But then, who does? Surely, the question of who votes in a presidential and vice-presidential election is more than a State and local issue. In truth, the outcome of our national elections affects the fate of our Nation and of the entire free world. I feel strongly that it is desirable for the Congress to study and to call attention to the plight of the "politically dispossessed" and to the need to remedy their plight.

I am not personally in favor of contriving some sort of a legislative remedy, at least not yet. There have been a number of attempts, none really successful, to deal with this matter by some kind of a "sense" resolution of the Congress. This method has proven to be both ineffective and too difficult.

I have no objection to an effort in that direction, but it does not do the job.

The American Heritage Foundation, which has done a great deal of excellent work in this area, proposes the following under the heading "How You Can Help."

> If you would like to help restore voting rights to your disfranchised fellow citizens, you can do two things: First, enlist the wholehearted support of your local newspaper editors, radio-TV commentators, civic organizations, business and labor groups, chambers of commerce, and public opinion leaders. Secondly, ask your Governor and State legislators, county and State political leaders of both parties to reexamine your State election laws to see whether they meet the needs of 20th century America.
>
> Remember, States guard their sovereignty zealously. The U.S. Constitution makes each State responsible for establishing voting requirements. So don't pressure legislators.

Parenthetically I say that is a very fine piece of advice.

> Simply point out the problem of the disfranchised voter and invite State officials to take a fresh look at the local election laws to ascertain what can be done to bring them up to date.

I commend the foundation. Theirs is a clarion call for action. The conclusion is obvious and clear cut. Private citizens in American communities across the Nation must be the moving force in correcting this serious inequity. This is an exciting challenge. It is likewise a heavy responsibility, affecting the very basis of American democracy.

Mr. President, New York State has not stood still on this issue. Governor Rockefeller recently requested State ac-

tion to permit all individuals, regardless of how long they had been in the State, to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

I read part of his message to the State legislature:

I strongly urge adoption of a constitutional amendment which would allow the legislature to prescribe reduced residence requirements and special voting procedures to permit persons to vote for President and Vice President even though they are not eligible to vote for local or statewide officers.

As the New York Herald Tribune editorialized, "The fact that a person moves from Brooklyn to Kalamazoo, or vice versa, in no way diminishes his stake in the Presidency."

I commend the Governor and I could not agree with him more. I hope that other States will follow suit. I believe several States have already expressed views similar to those of Governor Rockefeller.

Mr. President, I also hope that some of the material which I intend to introduce for the RECORD today will be of use to these States and generally to scholars in this area and to interested citizens throughout the Nation.

Several months ago I requested the Library of Congress to prepare a report for me on the impact of residency requirements, the history of their use, and the possible avenues for reform. In my remarks on Inauguration Day, I referred to this report and stated I thought it was an extremely competent job and that it should be called to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The report was prepared for me by Mr. Walter Kravitz of the History and Government Division of the Library of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the above-referred-to Herald Tribune article and the study by Mr. Kravitz of the Legislative Reference Service. I have gone through Mr. Kravitz' study several times in an effort to cut it down as much as possible in length.

It was considerably longer in its original form than as I shall have it printed in the RECORD at this time. I apologize to many of the experts and authors in the field whose footnotes have been stricken from my insertion, which is done only for the purpose of saving space. I hope that I have done justice to this very excellent and competent report in my editing of this text.

There being no objection, the article and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR ACTION ON VOTE REQUIREMENTS

It may seem an odd time of year to get back to our old friends, the politically dispossed who can't vote because they moved too recently. But if anything is to be done about their plight it has to be done by the legislatures, and now is the time when lawmakers ought to be thinking about it.

In his message to the New York Legislature, Governor Rockefeller urged action to make it possible for people who move to vote for President and Vice President. This certainly makes sense, and is fine as far as it goes. The fact that a person moves from Brooklyn to Kalamazoo, or vice versa, in no way diminishes his stake in the Presidency. But an estimated 8 million Americans were unable to vote last November becaues they had moved, and were caught in a web of antiquated State residence requirements.

While they're about it, the legislators ought to take another look at the whole concept of residence requirements for voting. The simplest way of ensuring against loss of the presidential vote is to drop residence requirements entirely except for a nominal time in the district—long enough to establish identity and eligibility.

Mobility has become almost a way of life in America today, and those who move most tend often to be the most articulate and politically sophisticated. The newcomer to a community who is really ignorant of local issues is not likely to rush to the polls to vote for candidates he has never heard of. But his right to an exercise of judgment—which includes the right to abstain—ought to be recognized as a concomitant of the fact that our society itself today encourages mobility, while our information media have markedly reduced the time it takes a newcomer to acquaint himself with local conditions. Chances are a person who votes ignorantly after 1 month's residence is going to vote just as ignorantly after 6 months, or 12.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

CURRENT REQUIREMENTS

The Constitution of the United States indirectly delivers into the hands of the States responsibility for setting voters' qualifications in Federal elections. Consequently, the Nation appears to have ridden off in almost as many directions as there are States.

As of the 1960 general election, some 40 different combinations of State, county, precinct, and city residence durations were in use by the 50 States. State residence requirements range from 6 months to 2 years, with some States waiving all or part of the requirement in voting for President and Vice President. County residence requirements vary from none at all to 1 year, and the qualifications for smaller political units cover the same range. The most popular requirements are: in State, 1 year; in county, 3 months; in locality, 30 days. In fact, six States actually have all these provisions.

Table I lists the detailed requirements for each State. Table II gives the number of States using each time period for each of its jurisdictions.

Aside from the multiplicity of provisions, the tables clearly indicate that, as a group, the Southern States set the most stringent provisions for all jurisdictional sizes. It is difficult to say which of the other three regions is the least severe in its demands.

Idaho, the State with the highest percentage of potential voters voting in the 1956 general election, has one of the most moderate residence requirement laws in the country—6 months State, 30 days county.

TABLE I.—*Residence requirements*

State	Requirements			
	State	County	Election district, precinct, or ward	Township, municipality, town, or city
Alabama	2 years	1 year	3 months [1]	
Alaska	1 year		30 days [2]	
Arizona	do	30 days	do	
Arkansas	do	6 months	do	
California	do [3]	3 months [4]	54 days	
Colorado	do	do [4]	15 days	30 days.
Connecticut	do			6 months. [5]
Delaware	do	3 months	30 days	
Florida	do	6 months		
Georgia	do	do		
Hawaii	do		3 months	
Idaho	6 months	30 days		
Illinois	1 year	3 months [4]	30 days	
Indiana	6 months		do	2 months. [6]
Iowa	do	2 months [6]		
Kansas	do		30 days	30 days.
Kentucky	1 year	6 months	2 months [6]	
Louisiana	do	1 year	3 months	4 months. [7]
Maine	6 months	3 months [3 8]		3 months.
Maryland	1 year	6 months	6 months [8]	
Massachusetts	do			6 months. [8]
Michigan	6 months			30 days.
Minnesota	do		30 days	
Mississippi	2 years		1 year [9]	
Missouri	1 year [10]	2 months [6]	2 months [6]	
Montana	1 year	30 days		
Nebraska	6 months	40 days	10 days	
Nevada	do	30 days	do	
New Hampshire	do		6 months	6 months.
New Jersey	do	2 months [6]		15 days. [11]
New Mexico	1 year	3 months [4]	30 days	
New York	do	4 months	do	
North Carolina	do		do	
North Dakota	do	3 months [6]	30 days [4]	
Ohio	do [12]	40 days [3]	40 days	
Oklahoma	do	6 months	30 days	
Oregon	6 months		(13)	
Pennsylvania	1 year [14]		2 months	
Rhode Island	do			6 months.
South Carolina	2 years [9 15]	1 year	4 months	
South Dakota	1 year	3 months [4 8]	30 days	
Tennessee	do	do		
Texas	do	6 months	6 months	
Utah	do	4 months	2 months [6]	
Vermont	do			3 months.
Virginia	do	6 months	30 days	6 months.
Washington	do	3 months [4]	do	
West Virginia	do	2 months [6]		
Wisconsin	do [16]		10 days	
Wyoming	do	2 months [3]	do	

[1] Otherwise qualified electors who have moved to a new precinct in the same county, town, or city may vote in their old precincts.
[2] In election district.
[3] New residents in the State may vote for President and Vice President only, after 54 days of residence.
[4] 90 days.
[5] No elector who has changed his residence from one county, precinct, or town to another loses his right to vote in his former county, precinct, or town until he acquires voting residence in the new one.
[6] 60 days.
[7] Municipality.
[8] Plantation.
[9] Ministers and wives may vote after 6 months' residence.
[10] New residents in the State may vote for President and Vice President only, after 60 days of residence.
[11] In city of 4th class.
[12] 40-day residence requirement when voting for President and Vice President.
[13] Voter must reside in precinct in which he registers.
[14] 6 months if previously an elector or native of the United States.
[15] Public school teachers and spouses may vote after 6 months' residence.
[16] 10-day precinct residence requirement when voting for President and Vice President.

TABLE II.—*Residence requirements by States—Place where voter must reside for period indicated*

Required duration of residence	In State	In county	In locality [1]
Years:			
2	3		
1	35	3	1
Months:			
6	12	8	3
5			
4		2	1
3		10	3
2		5	[2] 5
Days:			
40		2	1
30		4	16
15			1
10			5
No requirement		16	14

[1] Includes 1 State requiring 54 days.
[2] Election district, precinct, or ward.

The most severe State-residence qualifications, 2 years, are required by Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. The most severe county-residence provisions, 1 year, are in effect in Alabama, Louisiana, and South Carolina. The most stringent district-residence requirement, 1 year, is demanded by Mississippi.

* * * * *

Temporary absence does not deprive an elector of his residence. All election codes preserve the residence status of persons in the Armed Forces or in service agencies connected with the Armed Forces. Most States provide that no person shall lose or gain residence status because of absence while employed by the Federal Government. Similarly, most election codes provide that electors who are employed in navigation or who are attending a school, college, university, or other institution of learning retain their residence rights.

Conversely, members of the Armed Forces do not acquire residence by virtue of being stationed at a military establishment within a State. * * * This does not work any considerable hardship upon military personnel since all States now provide them with absentee balloting privileges. These privileges are usually extended to their wives and dependents as well.

* * * * *

Inmates of public or private institutions usually do not establish residence thereby. Domicile recognition is granted in some States, however, to persons in soldiers', sailors', and old-age homes.

ESTIMATES OF DISFRANCHISING EFFECTS

The exact number of persons disfranchised by residence requirement laws is not available nor, indeed, are accurate computations possible under present conditions. The States themselves keep no records. The Bureau of the Census publishes estimates of population mobility but these are not easily translatable into meaningful statistics.

It is the common characteristic of residence requirements that they disqualify only temporarily, usually for no more than one election. At least one writer, therefore, considers this a minor type of disqualification that disfranchises relatively few. Other students of the subject disagree with this estimate. Harold F. Gosnell, for example, wrote in 1948: "There is no question that the residence requirement disfranchises large elements, particularly in a period of economic depression when there are many migratory laborers seeking jobs, or in a war boom period when workers are attracted from their former homes to war industry centers." [1]

More concretely, a survey of nonvoting in Chicago in 1924 by Merriam and Gosnell disclosed that 5.2 percent of the nonvoters interviewed claimed that insufficient legal residence kept them from the polls.[2]

Twenty-eight years later other investigators found that, in the election of 1952, "12 percent of the people who reported that they had not voted said they were disfranchised because of inability to meet [residence] requirements; in terms of total population, this means 3 out of every 100 adults living in private households * * *." [3] Comparing these reports, Lane concludes that the number of persons disfranchised by such requirements is on the rise.[4]

* * * * *

V. O. Key observes: "The geographical mobility of the American population gives the residence requirement a greater significance then might be supposed. In the early 1950's annual census surveys showed that between 3 and 4 percent of the people lived in a different State than they had 1 year earlier; roughly the same proportion lived in a different county of the same State than it had 1 year earlier." [5] Key estimates that residence requirements probably exclude more than 5 percent of the potential electorate from the ballot.[5a]

If the educated guesses published in recent years are to be trusted, the rising trend of disfranchisement postulated by Lane and Smith is clearly documented. Ralph Goldman claims that a conservative figure for 1954 would be 5 million, or about 5 percent of the eligible voters.[6] The American Heritage Foundation estimates that 6 million were disqualified because of residence requirements in 1956, or about 6 percent of eligible voters.[7] And in 1960 the foundation said 8 million otherwise eligible voters would be disfranchised, about 7½ percent.[8]

Whatever the accuracy of these estimates, the facts of American internal migration are undeniable. Americans have always been extraordinarily mobile. In measuring this phenomenon the Census Bureau has discovered that, in 1850, 24 percent of the population was residing in a State other than the one of birth. The figure dropped to 20.6 in 1900, but afterward moved steadily upward, except for 1940. In 1950 it was 25.2 percent.

About one out of every five Americans moved from one location to another at least once in 1957, according to Census estimates, and 14 percent of these moved from one State to another. Of the 171 million civilians 1 year old and over in the United States in April 1959, about 19.2 percent had moved to another house during the previous year. About 13.1 percent had changed residence within their counties; another 3.2 percent had moved from one county to another within their States; and about 3 percent of the total population had moved from one State to another. This bustling internal mobility is probably greater than that in any other country in the world, except perhaps in totalitarian states practicing forced migration.

Who are these movers? What kinds of people are likely to be the targets of residence disqualifications? We have already mentioned migratory labor and the shifts caused by war industries.

We have also mentioned the effect stringent residence requirements were expected to have upon Negro voting. In this connection Gosnell has written: "It is notorious that the Negro agricultural laborers are in a precarious economic position in the South, and that they seek to improve their lot by making changes. Each change constitutes a barrier to voting." [9]

While not denying the effect of residence requirements upon these groups, other observers assert that professional and business people are among the hardest hit. Raymond Moley claims that "great corporations engaged in manufacturing or oil production and distribution or chainstores must of necessity shift managers, salesmen, and other executives constantly." [10] And the Saturday Evening Post recently observed: "By and large, the 'lost voters' are the better educated, more informed people who reasonably could be expected to ballot with the welfare of the Nation in mind and not for selfish reasons." [11]

Recent Census Bureau tabulations tend, at least partially, to confirm this point of view. Of major occupation classifications listed by the Bureau, professional and technical personnel made up the third largest group of movers. The largest group of migrants were what the Bureau calls operatives and kindred workers, i.e., semiskilled and apprentice workers, while the second largest group consisted of craftsmen and foremen. Large numbers of migratory farm laborers are also effected.

PROS AND CONS

No competent authority completely denies the merit of some sort of residence requirements for voters. The theorist may declare, as one has, that "the requirement of special residence for the exercise of the franchise is not compatible with the pure equality of democracy." But he will almost certainly hasten to add that "from the standpoint of the Government it is necessary because only those will look after the consequences of their policies who have to face them. The homeless agitator, now here, now there, will not assume responsibility." [12]

The justification for these requirements is divided into three major propositions:

1. Residence requirements help to prevent fraud.

2. Voters should have sufficient time to acquaint themselves with local candidates and issues.

3. It is more likely that after a period of residence a voter will acquire a stake in community affairs sufficient to encourage responsible voting.

Fraudulent voting practices are undeniably deterred by residence requirements. Even the United Kingdom, with one of the most liberal residence laws in the world, has found it expedient since 1949 to require 3 months' residence in the constituencies of Northern Ireland because of the risk that the balance in some marginal districts might be upset by voters brought across the border. In American practice, the importation of floaters into close districts where a few

[1] Gosnell, Harold F. "Democracy, the Threshold of Freedom." New York, Ronald Press, 1948, p. 114.

[2] Merriam, Charles E. and Harold F. Gosnell. "Nonvoting: Causes and Methods of Control." Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1924, pp. 78, 79.

[3] Campbell, Angus, Gerald Gurin, and Warren E. Miller. "The Voter Decides." Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson, 1954, p. 37.

[4] Lane, Robert E. "Political Life: Why People Get Involved in Politics." Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1959, p. 315.

[5] Key, Valdimer O. "Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups"; 4th ed., New York; Crowell, 1958 p. 669.

[5a] Ibid.; Smith, op. cit.

[6] Goldman, Ralph M. "Move—Lose Your Vote." National Municipal Reivew, January 1956: 6.

[7] American Heritage Foundation undated release [probably Nov. 27, 1956]. See also, "17 Million Barred, Vote Study Finds." New York Times, Nov. 28, 1956: 24.

[8] American Heritage Foundation undated release [November 1960].

[9] Gosnell, op. cit., p. 115.

[10] Moley, Raymond, "The Disfranchised," Newsweek, Nov. 21, 1960, 116.

[11] "Are You Barred From the Polls by Obsolete Laws?" Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 12, 1960, 10.

[12] Braunias, as paraphrased by Gosnell, op. cit., p. 114.

voters may turn the tide is not unknown. Residence requirements tend to discourage such tactics.

The demand that a person shall become acquainted with the candidates and issues upon which he will pass judgment at the polls is also a reasonable one. The ideal of a democratic system is not merely that each member of the society should vote, but that each member should cast an intelligent and knowledgeable vote. Residence requirements insure that a voter has had sufficient time to appraise the local situation and to inform himself about its intricacies.

Finally, it is expected that after a reasonable period of residence the prospective voter will have acquired some material stake in the well-being of the community. His vote, it is hoped, will be tempered by responsibility and by the realization that his own long-term interests are involved. Braunias' "homeless agitator" is thus circumvented, and the influence of the stable element in the community is enhanced.

Responsible critics of our present residence requirement situation make both direct and indirect rebuttal to the arguments cited above. They call attention to the general trend in the development of suffrage in this country. That trend has been toward a widening of the electoral base. The 1830's marked the end almost everywhere of the traditional property limitations. The new States west of the Alleghenies, where social class differences were at a minimum, marked their admission with practically universal suffrage for white men, and the tendency was rapidly carried back into the original States. The enfranchisement of Negroes after the Civil War and the extension of women suffrage to all States in 1920 continued that trend. Unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory residence requirements are relics of less democratic days. They run contrary to the mainstream of American suffrage development.

Granted that there is some justice in a domicile requirement, the crucial question arises as to what is a reasonable length of time? The problem of fraud is at least partially solved by an efficient registration system. A brief rather than a lengthy period of residence should be sufficient additional safeguard.

Local issues are not so complex that an alert and reasonably intelligent potential voter could not prepare himself for a decision on candidates and issues within a similarly brief period. And even if local issues are so complex, it does not follow that when a person moves across the street and thereby into a different precinct or district he loses his competence as a voter.[13] Similarly, removal from one county to another within a State may throw suspicion upon a voter's immediate competence to judge his new county's affairs, but it does not affect his knowledge of State candidates and issues. Finally, in this day of improved communications and growing homogeneity of the Nation, what relation has length of residence in any particular State to knowledge about candidates for President and Vice President?

The groups disfranchised by residence requirements have been described above. These are all worthy members of our society who are being discriminated against simply because of a migratory accident. The person temporarily disfranchised by the State in which he is establishing a new residence is still a citizen of the United States. He may be otherwise qualified in every reasonable respect; yet he is denied the right to vote. Legal restrictions, Morris S. Ogul reminds us, "are necessary if honest, efficiently conducted elections are to be held. However, the object should be to facilitate voting as well as to raise barriers to the exercise of the franchise." [14]

Finally, there is a basic injustice in the wide variety of statutory residence requirements from State to State. Why should a State require a citizen who moves into that State to wait 2 years before voting for national officials, while other States are satisfied with 6 months' residence?

These and similar objections have been voiced by numerous organizations and individuals. The American Heritage Foundation, a nonpartisan organization active for many years in get-out-the-vote campaigns, lists reduction of residence requirements as its No. 1 reform recommendation. At one time the foundation favored 6 months' State and 60 days' county residence. In its latest release the foundation recommends: "Reduce State residence requirements for voting for President and Vice President to 40 days; and to 6 months for other elections."

The National Institute of Municipal Clerks created a committee on uniform election laws in May 1952. A year later this committee recommended that the institute urge the Federal Government "to act to make it possible for interstate movers to vote" in elections of officials of the Federal Government. The institute adopted the report.

The National Association of Secretaries of State has been concerned with the problem since 1953. At its Seattle convention of that year the association approved a model proposal, based upon recent Connecticut legislation, that would permit former residents of a State to vote for President and Vice President in that State until they have qualified under the residence requirements of their new domicile. A special association committee recommended similar action in a report to the 1957 annual meeting. At its 1960 convention in New York the association again went on record in favor of a relaxation of State residence requirements for voters, after listening to an address favoring such relaxation by New York's Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.[15]

Like the Secretaries of State Association, the General Assembly of the States, one of the organizations serviced by the Council of State Governments, has opposed Federal legislation in this area, urging the States to handle the problem themselves. In December 1952, the 11th general assembly recommended that the organization concern itself with absentee voting legislation "including draft proposals to prevent the loss of voting rights by persons who move from one State to another thus becoming disenfranchised." A draft of suggested legislation was approved in 1953 by the drafting committee of State officials, another affiliate of the council. (See appendix.) The model is patterned after the Connecticut law. The drafting committee also recommended that "all States initiate action looking to the establishment of a residence requirement for voting purposes which does not exceed 1 year and which would preferably be the specific period of 6 months. This recommendation applies to all voting, and not just to voting in a national election."

Many Members of Congress have expressed concern over the current state of residence requirements, among them Representatives Laurence Curtis of Massachusetts, Byron L. Johnson of Colorado, George H. Bender of Ohio, and Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York.[16]

Numerous political scientists and other scholars have been critical of the stringency of residence qualifications, including Dudley O. McGovney, Robert E. Lane, Hugh A. Bone, Constance Smith, Clyde F. Snider, Dayton David McKean, Harold F. Gosnell, Henry Steele Commager, Ralph M. Goldman, Morris S. Ogul, and I. Ridgeway Davis. McGovney has suggested a constitutional amendment setting residence requirements at 6 months in the State and 3 months in the voting precinct.

Editorials appeared this year in Life and the Saturday Evening Post urging modernization of election laws and the reduction of residence requirements.[17] The lead editorial in the Washington Post of August 27, 1956, decried the "appalling loss of citizen participation" because of residence disqualifications and argued for a uniform law. Raymond Moley recently devoted a column to criticism of "our absurd and obsolete" election laws. "It seems to me," he wrote, "that Federal legislation might be held constitutional which would permit every qualified American citizen to cast a vote for President and Vice President where he has lived for 30 days." [18]

The public's reaction to the problem of residence requirements was measured by the American Institute of Public Opinion in 1959. A nationwide sample was asked: "Would you approve or disapprove of a law which would require not more than 6 months' residence in any State to be eligible to vote in all elections in that State?" The institute reported the following results: Approve, 72 percent; disapprove, 22 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.[19]

CONTEMPORARY TRENDS IN STATE LEGISLATION

During the past decade a perceptible movement toward the easing of residence requirements has developed. Only a small number of the States are as yet involved and the remedies adopted are sometimes conflicting, but steps have nevertheless been taken on three broad fronts.

One direction of change simply involves reducing the period of residence required within a State's jurisdiction. In recent years Louisiana and Rhode Island have lowered their requirements from 2 years to 1, and New Jersey reduced its State-residence demand from 1 year to 6 months.

A second movement of reform has concentrated upon those residence requirements completely barring from the polls otherwise qualified voters who have moved from one part of the State to another. Alabama, which ordinarily requires 3 months' residence in a precinct or ward, now permits otherwise qualified electors who have moved to a new precinct or ward in the same county, town, or city within 3 months of an election to vote in their former precincts.

---

[13] The severity of precinct requirements may be more apparent than real. Local election judges have been known to interpret the law quite broadly. It is reported that in the 50th precinct of Chicago's 2d ward there were only 22 residents at the time of the November 1960 elections, but 84 votes were cast. The election judges explained that slum-clearing demolition had forced many persons to move from the precinct. The judges said they had permitted these relocated residents to vote. GOP Chicago vote aid charges whitewash. Washington Post, Nov. 24, 1960: A2.

[14] Ogul, Morris S. Residence requirements as barriers to voting in presidential elections. Midwest journal of political science, August 1959: 254.

[15] "Residence Hurdles for Voters Scored." New York Times, Aug. 27, 1960: 6; "State Secretaries Ask Voting Reform," New York Times, Aug. 28, 1960: 27.

[16] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD [daily ed.], June 25, 1953: A4048–A4049; Mar. 5, 1959: A1768. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 2, pp. 1461–1462.

[17] "Let's Not Penalize Mobility," Life, Nov. 14, 1960: 41; "Are You Barred From the Polls by Obsolete Laws?" Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 12, 1960: 10.

[18] Moley, op. cit. For a rebuttal of this position, as well as a similar one advanced by Ralph M. Goldman, see "Constitutionality of Federal Legislation," below.

[19] "Public Would 'Reenfranchise' 10 Million Now Denied Ballot," American Institute of Public Opinion release, June 13, 1959.

Broader reforms involving movement between counties have been adopted by at least eight other States. Otherwise qualified intrastate migrants in these States may cast their ballot for State and National offices at their previous addresses if they have not met local residence requirements by election day. Thus, in California a voter retains the right to vote at his former residence if he moves to another county during the 90 days preceding an election. In North Dakota, South Dakota, and Maine the statutory grace period is 3 months. In Massachusetts, Maryland, and Connecticut it is 6 months, and in Ohio it is 40 days.

The third type of reform has attempted to restore to otherwise qualified individuals who have moved from one State to another the right to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors.

Two types of legislation have been enacted. The first was passed by Connecticut in 1953. It declares that any person who has been registered as a voter in a town of the State and has moved to another State may vote, by absentee ballot, in his previous residence. He may vote only for presidential and vice-presidential electors and only within a 24-month period after he has moved, provided he has not become a qualified voter at his new residence. In 1957, Vermont adopted a similar measure. It specifies a 15-month retention period, and adds the proviso that those wishing to take advantage of the act "must file with their town or city clerk a written declaration of intention to retain such Vermont residence for the purpose of casting a vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors."

A second, and somewhat conflicting, approach was first adopted by Wisconsin in 1954. This method waives all or part of the State's normal residence requirements for new residents who wish to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors.

The Wisconsin statute declares:

"A person who has been a resident of this State for less than 1 year prior to the date of a presidential election shall be entitled to vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors in such elections but for no other offices, providing he was either a qualified elector in another State immediately prior to his removal to this State or would have been eligible to vote in such other State had he remained there until such election, and provided further that he would be a qualified elector under section 601 except that he has not resided in the State for 1 year."

Section 601 states that the person must be 21 years old, a resident of the State for 1 year and of his precinct for 10 days. In effect, therefore, otherwise qualified but newly resident persons in Wisconsin may vote for President and Vice President after 10 days residence in one of the State's precincts.

Three States have followed Wisconsin's lead. In 1958 the voters of California and Missouri approved amendments to their State constitutions to grant new residents the right to vote in presidential elections. The California amendment authorized the State legislature to extend this right to otherwise qualified persons who have resided in California for at least 54 days (the normal precinct requirement). Missouri's constitution now permits a person to vote for President and Vice President after residing in the State at least 60 days. Ohio voters amended their constitution in 1957 so as to authorize the legislature to extend similar privileges to new arrivals in that State. The legislature passed implementing statutes in 1959, and otherwise qualified persons may now vote for presidential and vice-presidential electors in Ohio provided they have resided in the State at least 40 days.

The legislatures of at least four other States have considered and rejected bills to enfranchise new residents who might otherwise lose their vote for President: Arizona, Colorado, Massachusetts, and New York. The Secretary of the State of New York has declared that a measure modeled on the Wisconsin plan will again be recommended to the State legislature.

Oregon's residence provisions are unique. As of the 1960 election a voter was qualified if he had resided 6 months in the State and if he resided in the precinct in which he registered. In the 1960 election, Oregon voters approved a constitutional amendment authorizing the legislature to permit otherwise qualified persons who have resided in the State for less than 6 months to vote for presidential candidates.

In summary, two States—Connecticut and Vermont—permit former residents to cast absentee ballots for President and Vice President, while five States—Wisconsin, California, Missouri, Ohio, and Oregon—waive their normal residence requirements so that new residents may vote for presidential electors.

Both the Connecticut and Wisconsin approaches are limited to presidential elections, for constitutional as well as practical reasons. The Constitution of the United States leaves the entire method of election of presidential and vice-presidential electors to the States. But the States cannot constitutionally waive residence requirements for voters in the election of Members of Congress unless they also waive such requirements for the election of members of the most numerous branch of their legislatures. This the States are unlikely to do since it is in regard to the latter that the argument for a period of residence in order to become familiar with local issues assumes its greatest force.

The Connecticut plan has one great advantage: The voter is at all times eligible to vote for President and Vice President. He retains that eligibility in his original State of residence until the very day he becomes qualified in his new State. Furthermore, if all States were to adopt this system, no State would be required to relax its other residence requirements.

Connecticut's system might prove unsatisfactory in two ways. First, new residents might be encouraged to postpone acquiring familiarity with local political conditions. Secondly, some persons might be discouraged by a cumbersome absentee ballot procedure.

One principal disadvantage impairs the Wisconsin approach. Some interstate migrants would still be unable to vote because they could not meet even the minimal residence requirements, although the number of such persons would admittedly be very small.

The Council of State Governments' affiliates and the National Association of Secretaries of State, as noted above, have approved model proposals based upon the Connecticut legislation.

From one point of view the Wisconsin and Connecticut laws conflict with each other. A qualified Connecticut voter who moves to Wisconsin is embarrased with riches. He may continue to vote in presidential elections in Connecticut by absentee ballot until he fulfills the normal Wisconsin residence requirements. Or he may take advantage of the waiver provisions of Wisconsin law after 10 days. On the other hand, a Wisconsin resident who moves to Connecticut derives no benefit from either State's special laws. He must now complete 1 year's residence in the State and 6 months in a town before he can vote in any election.

At least two writers have suggested an alternative to both the Wisconsin and Connecticut approaches. Goldman recommends that "the States among themselves might adopt a reciprocal-recognition system that would make obstructive residence requirements obsolete."[20] Ogul suggests more concretely that "the ideal solution * * * might be a model State registration system adopted by all of the States with each one granting reciprocity at least for presidential elections."[21]

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

On March 22, 1954, during the 2d session of the 83d Congress, Representative LAURENCE CURTIS, of Massachusetts, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 218, dealing with the subject of residence requirements for voting. In its original form, the resolution proposed that Congress recommend to the States "the immediate enactment of appropriate legislation to enable a person to vote for Federal officials, when such person would be eligible to vote for such Federal officials but for the residence requirements of the State in which he is residing." The resolution was reported by the Committee on House Administration. On August 5, 1954, unanimous consent was requested for its immediate consideration, but objection was heard. On August 9, the resolution was successfully called up. A committee amendment attaching an explanatory preamble was accepted, as was a revision of the body of the resolution to broaden its application to all, not just Federal, elections. In addition, the word "suggests" was substituted for "recommends" and "consideration" was inserted in lieu of "immediate enactment." In this form the concurrent resolution was agreed to by the House. It died in the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS reintroduced his proposal in the following Congress as House Concurrent Resolution 94. It passed the House on June 30, 1955. The Senate agreed to the resolution on January 16, 1956. The final text read as follows:

"Whereas many citizens are deprived of the right to vote because they have recently moved from one State to another and have not subsequent to such move complied with the residence requirements of the State to which they have moved; and

"Whereas it is desirable that citizens should be entitled to vote for the office of President and Vice President whether or not they had moved from one State to another; and

"Whereas such disfranchisement could be avoided by reciprocal arrangements between the several States which would recognize the right of a citizen who had moved from one State to another to continue to vote in the State from which he had moved for such reasonable period of time as would enable him to fulfill the residence requirements in the State to which he had moved: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the consideration of appropriate legislation to enable a person to vote for President and Vice President when such person would be eligible to vote but for the fact that he had moved from one State to another and had not yet fulfilled the residence requirements of such State to which he had moved."

Note that the third paragraph of the resolution appears to endorse State legislation similar to the Connecticut model.

Congress has taken no further action in this field. Two resolutions were introduced during the 1st session of the 86th Congress but neither was reported out of committee. One was introduced on February 17, 1959, by Senator PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan. It called for a constitutional amendment prescribing maximum qualifications for voting in Federal elections as (1) citizenship, (2) age 21, and (3) 1-year residence in a State. On September 10, 1959, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS of Indiana introduced House Joint Resolution 524 which proposed a constitutional amendment restricting State voter

[20] Goldman, op. cit., p. 46.

[21] Ogul, op. cit., p. 262.

qualifications to those of "nonage, nonresidence, or imprisonment."

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION [22]

May Congress regulate by legislation the residence qualifications of voters in Federal elections? Apparently it may not. Other than unenforceable recommendations to the States, such as H. Con. Res. 94, 84th Congress, described above, it would appear that an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is the only method available to Congress for modifying such requirements.

Under the terms of article I, section 2, clause 1, and amendment XVII of the Constitution, the people of the several States are guaranteed the right to vote for Representatives and Senators. But in both instances the Constitution states further that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature(s)." Thus, while the States may not directly prescribe the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress as such, the qualifications the States prescribe for electors of the most numerous branch of their legislatures are adopted by the Constitution for this purpose.

The Supreme Court of the United States discussed the point in *Ex parte Yarborough* (110 U.S. 651, 663):

"The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

It would appear, therefore, that the right to vote for Members of Congress is derived from the U.S. Constitution, and Congress may legislate to protect the rights of those who qualify under State law. But Congress may not legislate as to the qualifications of the voters since this power is given by the Constitution to the States. As in the case of the 15th and 19th amendments, which forbid the States to deny any citizen the voting privilege on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex, it would require a constitutional amendment to effect any change in the residence requirement for electors of Senators and Representatives.

Insofar as the election of the President and Vice President is concerned, article II, section 1, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States provides:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress * * *."

The word "appoint" in this clause has been interpreted in its broadest sense. Thus, the appointment and mode of appointment of presidential and vice presidential electors are said to belong exclusively to the States. If this be so, in a State which selects as its mode of appointment election by the people, the qualifications of the voters are part of this mode. Such qualifications are therefore State responsibilities reserved to them by the Constitution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

[22] This section is based largely upon a previously prepared memorandum by Mollie Z. Margolin of the American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to a question which relates to Federal aid to education, the message of the President sent to us on that subject, and the various positions which are reflected in this Chamber.

I think the important point that I should like to leave with the Senate today is on the question of party positions on this subject. I think it is fair to say that we now have very clearly before us the position of the administration.

To qualify myself, my interest in the subject relates to the fact that I am a member not only of the committee which will handle the proposed legislation, but I am also a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have been cosponsoring with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] what has been generally considered to be the Republican alternative of a group on this side of the aisle, which has now blossomed into a bipartisan alternative to the program put before us by the President.

I mention the question of party positions because I have noted something in the RECORD which I think ought to be made clear. In connection with the subject of Federal aid to education I noted a statement introduced by or on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] on Monday. There were some statements in the context which read to the effect that, "the Republican Party states or takes a certain position." One of those statements is:

> The Republican Party rejects the wasteful and undemocratic measures to appropriate for school aid billions of dollars extracted from the States, only to be partially funneled back to them again with strict limitations on the use to which these funds may be put.

A reference to the headnote indicates clearly that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] puts these statements forth, and I have read one of them, as "Proposed Republican principles, and so forth."

So although he uses the words "the Republican Party takes the position," it is really a proposal by him that the Republican Party should take such a position.

I make that point very clear because I do not feel that either I or, I say, with all respect, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], is speaking other than as an individual Senator, and neither of us, of course, can state the party's position. So in order to have the record upon that subject crystal clear, I think we should note the party's position on Federal aid to education that was set forth in the party platform adopted in Chicago by the Republican National Convention on July 27, 1960. That platform stated:

> Primary responsibility for education must remain with the local community and State. The Federal Government should assist selectively in strengthening education without interfering with full local control of schools. One objective of such Federal assistance should be to help equalize educational opportunities. Under the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, the Federal Government will spend more than a billion dollars in 1960 to strengthen American education.
>
> We commend the objective of the Republican administration in sponsoring the National Defense Education Act to stimulate improvement of study and teaching in selected fields at the local level.
>
> Toward the goal of fullest possible educational opportunity for every American, we pledge these actions:
>
> Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid for school construction—pacing it to the real needs of individual school districts in States and territories, and requiring State approval and participation.

It seems to me very clear that the platform already commits the Republican Party to Federal assistance to school construction. It provides specifically:

> Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid school construction.

That indeed is the policy reflected in the bill introduced by the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], on January 17, which authorized Federal financial assistance for school construction.

There is also S. 723, which I have cosponsored with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and a total of seven other Senators of both parties in which there is provision for Federal aid for school construction.

In terms of primary and secondary public education, the bill goes even further and relates to equalization of educational opportunity in low income States, and provides emergency assistance, not only for school construction but also for incentives to improve teachers' salaries in all the States.

I point out, too, that the basis of our bill is the so-called foundation plan, that is, providing a minimal standard of education for the individual pupil, which is the fundamental idea sponsored in the Senate beginning in 1947 by Senator Robert Taft, who was certainly a very distinguished Republican.

Our point is that we want to find a way of using Federal aid to give equal educational opportunity to all children, in the national interest, whatever may be the economic status of the States in which they live, or whatever may be the economic status, or, indeed, the race, creed, or color of the particular child.

By way of comparison, the cost under our bill as compared with the cost under the bill of President Kennedy is that our bill over a 4-year period would have a cost range of from $710 million the first year to $1 billion the fourth year, or a total cost of $3.4 billion.

I should like to summarize my views, and to say that I have talked with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and told

him I would make these observations in this way on the floor.

I summarize as follows: I do not feel that the Republican Party is committed by its platform to more than Federal aid for school construction. Nor do I feel, on the other hand, that the party is committed against any Federal aid to education. Rather, I feel it is committed to such a program with the limitation which I have described, and I think it should be made crystal clear to anyone who reads the record and runs on our party's platform. For that reason, I wanted to be sure the record was straight.

Second, I believe in proceeding, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I and others joining with us are proceeding, under a foundation plan which will give Federal aid to school construction as well as an incentive to the States themselves to materially improve teachers' salaries. In premising the entire plan upon a fundamental provision of a specific optimum sum per pupil, and providing Federal aid within the context of that formula, we are following the excellent precedent of Senator Robert Taft, who was known in his day as Mr. Republican, and quite properly so. I stress the hope that we may get the support of a majority of the Republican Party who serve in the House and Senate for the kind of program which I have suggested.

This is most important. We are gradually developing the role which the opposition will play in respect to this administration. The administration is developing its programs, and developing its case, and developing its attitude. We, too, on our side must be developing our concept of how we are going to operate now in a totally new frame of reference, without a President who is a member of our party, and yet with a role to fill which in the eyes of the country must be extremely important.

I make these points with respect to the education bill, which is an excellent case in point, to demonstrate two ways in which we can proceed: First, there is a basis in precedent in our own party for enlightened views upon these modern subjects. Certainly Senator Taft is a most respectable and, indeed, quite a proper source upon which to draw in that regard. Second, I wish to demonstrate my deep conviction that we can serve the country and serve our party best by utilizing the doctrine of feasible alternatives, of which this is one. "Feasible alternatives" does not mean that all we must do is to react to what the administration proposes, so that if it proposes a bill on Federal aid to education, we have an alternative to that bill.

It also means that we must have enterprise and initiative. In that connection, other Members of the Senate have introduced measures, such as the resolution that was submitted earlier today with reference to a United Nations police force, which embodied ideas that did not come from the other side, but which arose on this side of the aisle.

I have myself introduced measures of different types, such as the one to set up labor-management productivity councils.

I point that out to emphasize the fact that the idea of a feasible alternative, in which I thoroughly believe, means, whether we are talking about productivity or lag in education, or some other subject, and not merely reacting to a program that is placed before us by an administration proposal, a proposal which will come from the Republican side to meet a particular national need or a particular international situation.

Generally, this is the approach which I believe can be of the most effective use to our people.

In this connection, too, we should not forego the opposition, the dissection, the criticism, the detailed challenge of how we are to make something work, or where we are going to get the money, or with respect to presenting what is generally associated with the conservative position.

This bears out my deep conviction that within my party there is room for all elements, liberal and conservative, as well as those who emphasize opposition, and also for those who, like myself, emphasize the doctrine of feasible alternative.

It should be made clear, as I have tried to make clear in my remarks, that there is this composite of opinion, and that, therefore, there should be a composite of proposed action, such as I have described.

SHIPMENT OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] submitted a resolution for himself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and he asked unanimous consent that the resolution be placed on the calendar without reference to an appropriate committee. No notice was given that this procedure would be requested, and no objection was raised.

Had I been on the floor at the time, I would have raised objection, because I do not believe that is the proper procedure to follow. In my opinion it is an unwise procedure in most instances. I know of no reason why the resolution should not have been referred to committee, or why notice of it might not have been given to the majority leadership.

Consequently, Mr. President, I serve notice that next week I shall move to refer the resolution to committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I certainly had no intention of taking advantage of the majority leader. He was on the floor at the time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I was not on the floor. I had left the floor before the Senator from Delaware rose to speak. Had I been on the floor, I would have objected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought the Senator was on the floor at the time. However, if there is a misunderstanding—and I certainly have no intention of taking advantage of the Senator from Montana—I would be glad to withdraw my request. However, I must say to the majority leader, that if I withdraw my request, I will reoffer the resolution during the next morning hour, and ask that it be read to the Senate, following which, I will ask for its immediate consideration. I recognize the fact, of course, that the majority leader would object to the request for its immediate consideration. Then, under the rules of the Senate, an objection having been made, it would automatically lie over on the desk for 1 day. It would then be automatically handed down for consideration at the next session, during the morning hour. I believe the majority leader is in a much better strategic position if he lets the matter rest where it is and goes along with the procedure that has been followed in this matter. However, if there has been a misunderstanding, I will withdraw the resolution today with the understanding that it shall definitely be reoffered Friday. I serve notice that under those circumstances, I will exercise my right under the rule of the Senate for its immediate consideration in the morning hour, following which one objection would carry it over, but under our Senate rules it will then automatically be handed down for consideration in the morning hour at the next session of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. I was referring to the proper procedure that should be followed, inasmuch as we have committees set up for this purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that there is always great interest in the Senate in having all matters referred to committees, except perhaps those matters in which a particular Senator is interested. I recall that the distinguished majority leader has on occasion acted in this same fashion with respect to certain resolutions, and on occasions he too has favored bringing measures to the floor without committee consideration. Still if the majority leader wishes, I certainly have no objection to carrying this over until Friday; however, I most respectfully advise the majority leader that his objection at this time under the rules of the Senate cannot block its consideration. As I have said, I will reoffer it on Friday, and under the rules of the Senate I will ask for its immediate consideration. I will do this with the full expectation that an objection would be made to such procedure but with the knowledge that this objection would place it where it would be considered during the next morning hour.

I ask the Presiding Officer a parliamentary question: Am I not correct in my understanding of the rules of the Senate? Would they not so apply?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Delaware is correct; but unanimous consent would have to be given for the Senator to submit the resolution at this time out of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is only by virtue of the fact that the morning hour is closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the resolution could be submitted at any time during the morning hour and would then be subject to the objection which I am confident would be made by the majority leader. That would place the resolution in the position where it would automatically come before the Senate for consideration during the next morning hour. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from Delaware does as he suggests, then would it not be in order to move that the resolution be referred to committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes; but we get a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order to move to refer the resolution to committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as the resolution is concerned, there is no intent on my part or, I feel certain, on the part of any other Senator to take a personal stand for or against it. The overwhelming number of resolutions, generally speaking, are referred to committees. I should think that the best way to act would be on a proper procedural basis, so that the committees which have been set up to attend to these matters can take them under consideration and report them either adversely or approvingly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am well aware that the Senate can refer the resolution to committee, can reject it, or can approve it. The resolution I have submitted deals with a shipment of strategic materials—machine tools—to Soviet Russia. The Defense Department has expressed very strong objection to the shipment on the basis that the tools can be used only for military purposes. The Defense Department has definitely stated that it is not in the best interests of our Government to let the shipment be made.

At a time when the United States is spending $40 billion or more annually to defend the Nation against Communist aggression, I feel it is absurd for Congress to adopt a policy which condones a shipment of strategic war materials to Russia. That is my own feeling. I may be alone in that sentiment, but I do not think so. Nevertheless, I believe the Senate ought to act and vote on the question.

I certainly respect the majority leader. As I said, I thought he was on the floor or, at least, had an observer on the floor in his absence.

I want it made very clear that I submitted the resolution in accordance with the rules of the Senate, that it was accepted under the rules of the Senate, and that on this or any other resolution I reserve the right to proceed according to the rules of the Senate, which means that I am not necessarily a guard for the majority party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I understand his point of view. He acted legitimately and legally. All I am doing is appealing for the conduct of the business of the Senate on a proper procedural basis, because committees have been established to consider bills and resolutions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the responsibility and authority of the committees ought to be recognized on legislative questions, but this resolution does not deal with legislation. On occasion I have joined with the Senator from Montana in recommending the referral of legislative measures to committees. At times I have supported the referral of measures to committees when the Senator from Montana thought those measures ought to be considered without referral. I feel certain that we will agree that ofttimes our position is depending on the proposal which is being considered at the time.

I would not want in any way to take advantage of the absence of the majority leader. I really thought he was on the floor at the time, but I accept his statement that he was not.

Mr. President, if it will relieve the Senator from Montana, I ask that the unanimous consent which had been granted be rescinded with the clear understanding—and I serve notice now that whether the majority leader is here or not, at the next morning hour—and there will be a morning hour on Friday—the resolution will be reoffered. At that time, under the rules of the Senate, I shall ask for its immediate consideration. If there is objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution it will automatically go over and will be called up for action by the Senate on the next business day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware withdraw his resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withdraw my earlier unanimous-consent request to submit the resolution since there was a misunderstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. At the same time, I desire to have the RECORD show clearly that on Friday the resolution will be reoffered under the procedure outlined.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly believe completely what the Senator from Delaware has just said. I am sure he was under the impression that I was on the floor, so I can find no fault with his reasoning on that point. Unfortunately, I was not on the floor, but that was my fault, not the fault of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MISSILE GAP

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the missile gap is a subject that has been receiving much attention in the past few days.

Only last Monday the distinguished minority leader reached into Europe, and inserted in the RECORD some misinformation—from the London Observer—about the position of President Kennedy on this subject.

In an effort to prevent further misinterpretations, let me say now that there is a long-range ballistic missile gap; and there will be one for some time to come.

One of the reasons this gap may have been discussed so widely is that it is a simple matter and an understandable one.

The term, so far as I know, was coined several years ago by a well-known newspaperman. It meant that the Russians were ahead of us in developing and building intercontinental ballistic missiles.

It meant that they would have these missiles in significant numbers before we had them in significant numbers.

It meant that this situation was bound to continue for a long time, because this country had failed consistently to put enough effort into developing long-range ballistic missiles.

These facts were admitted by Secretary McElroy, after the matter came up early in 1959.

The basic fact was also admitted by Secretary Gates, in testimony before the Senate committee in 1960.

I predict that in closed testimony before the congressional committee, it will also be admitted, during the hearings which are shortly to begin.

Let me emphasize that however much we try to dodge the implications of the lead the Russians have over us in ballistic missiles, and however much we may be diverted from this simple fact by a discussion of other situations, this question of how many intercontinental ballistic missiles the Russians have today, as compared to the number we have, and how many they can have, and may have, next year and the year after, as compared to the number we shall have then, is not only important in itself; it is also a symbol of our own military scientific progress. It is so regarded, not only by people of the United States, but also by our allies—and common sense would imply by the Russians themselves.

The fact that there has been so much discussion and argument about this matter is proof of its symbolic preeminence; and proof also of its practical importance.

For some reason, there has been a consistent effort to downgrade this issue, an effort most apparent among those who desire to turn public attention to other matters.

Some military men, and some military writers, would like to have more attention devoted to the problems of weapons and equipment for limited war.

In this they are entirely correct. I agree with their position without reservation, and have strongly advocated most,

if not all, of the actions advocated to strengthen our limited war force.

I part with these advocates of greater limited war capability, however, if they try to strengthen their case by ignoring the great dangers, both real and psychological from the standpoint of diplomacy, that have resulted, and can only continue to result, if we continue our failure to match the Russians in the effort to develop and deploy long-range missiles.

Our strategic deterrent forces must be adequate beyond question. We have to at least equal the Russians in the modern and effective long-range weapons. Limited war forces are not intended to be a substitute for long-range missiles, and they are not a substitute. The case for improved limited war forces is weakened by advocates who try to divert attention from the inadequacy of our missile force.

In addition to those who wish to divert our attention to other matters, there are still others who would like to ignore the missile gap, or to explain it away, or to jump to the conclusion that it does not exist at all. These people are motivated by a patriotic desire to make the U.S. position appear as strong as it can possibly be made to appear. They feel that any criticism of our past or present mistakes and failures makes the United States look weak in the eyes of the world or the eyes of the Russians. They feel they must seize upon every pretext to cover up our weaknesses, and pretend they are a fiction or an illusion.

I do not agree with those who try to conceal or obscure the facts. I think their views, however patriotic, are extremely pessimistic about the strength and the future of our country. If this great democracy cannot see its mistakes, admit them, and set about correcting them, then we are truly in a bad way.

My own confidence in this country is far greater than that. We are big enough and strong enough to admit our temporary weaknesses in order to correct them. We have done so many times in our history, and we can do it again.

The Russians know how many missiles we have, just as they know how many airplanes and submarines and other weapons we have. Of course, they know their own numbers.

Friend and foe alike respect us more for our honesty, our realism, and our determination to face and correct any temporary failures. They cannot respect us for any transparent effort to minimize and conceal these failures. To see where we are lacking, to admit it, and to set about correcting it, is a mark, not of weakness, but of strength.

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy announced three major actions, two of which were directed toward increasing and improving the missile forces of the United States. These actions mean more than any mere words. They are more persuasive than any comment that could be made upon them.

The directive to strengthen our Polaris fleet and to speed up our missile and site building program are perfectly consistent with statements made by Mr. Kennedy over the past several months.

According to an article in the New York Times of February 9, 1961, Mr. Kennedy's position on the missile gap is a consistent one, as it is also consistent with statements made by others who have spoken repeatedly on this subject.

The Times quotes Mr. Kennedy as having stated on August 26, "The missile lag looms larger and larger ahead," and as having pointed out at that time that a missile gap does not necessarily mean a deterrent gap.

On September 14 he spoke of a need for "crash programs to provide ourselves with the ultimate weapons which will eventually close the missile gap."

These words have been translated into actions designed to correct the situation they describe.

Whether actions already announced, and other actions which will follow, will be sufficient to meet the needs of the hour is a question that may cause some debate. That debate should be concerned with questions of relative urgency, relative costs, and relative emphasis between our missile program and other necessary programs.

There can be no question or debate, however, on whether the need for closing the missile gap has been recognized by this administration. The need has been recognized and specific and important actions have already been taken, and other actions are now being prepared.

Is there any real excuse today for relaxing our vigilance and our efforts in a game of semantics over what is a missile and what is a gap, and how the figures can be stacked to make the realities of the Russian advantage seem to disappear?

Is it not better to attack the disease itself rather than to just take more aspirin?

The Soviets stole a march on us in the science of missile propulsion. Every informed American knows this today.

Does it help to pretend that having gotten ahead of us in this all-important field, they are now just sitting around in idle missile factories, just waiting for our production to catch up with them? Would that this were true, but we dare not believe it.

No matter how much the question of the extent of the gap or its permanence may be debated, the fact still remains as I stated in the beginning, that a long-range ballistic missile gap does exist, and will exist for some time to come.

If there are those who wish to believe, in spite of the evidence, that the Russians have not possessed a considerable missile production capability for the past 2 years and have produced no more missiles than one plant in the United States can produce in 2 or 3 months, then these people are easily comforted. It is a fact that our one long-range missile plant in production, if called upon to do so, could produce missiles at a rate of nearly one missile per day. In view of this fact, is it reasonable for anyone to assume that an estimate of 150 missiles produced and deployed by the Russians over the past 2 years is far too high?

Think of it—even if the number of Russian long-range missiles is less than a third of that number, we would still have an ICBM gap greater than that predicted by the former Secretary of Defense.

If it should be true—and there are qualified conscientious men who believe it is true—that the Russians have now produced as much as just one of our own plants could produce in 6 months, then the missile gap becomes even more of a problem.

I hope that the gap is not one missile larger than the very minimum that is now admitted.

But even if our fondest hopes are true, the gap is still there. It is real, and it will be there for some time to come. Let us face it. Let us finally dispose of the semantic talk around this issue, and get on with the task of carrying out the corrective actions that President Kennedy has already begun.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I wish to express my belief that the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri has made today, on the floor of the Senate, a profoundly convincing and important statement. I hope that many Americans will read it. It comes from a Senator who has great knowledge of our defense needs, who has been Secretary of the Air Force of his country, and who is regarded by his colleagues as one of the outstanding authorities in this country on the subject. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has done a real service to the free world in making this statement today, and I wish to compliment him on this important speech.

He has given the facts to the American people. They are entitled to know that there is a missile gap between the Soviet Union and this Nation. Unfortunately, they have been ladled soothing sirup from time to time during the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the gracious but undeserved comments of my friend from Ohio. It is my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Aeronautics and Space, and to observe his thoughtful and thorough efforts in the field of civil defense.

I have noticed recent periodic insertions in the RECORD of various items incident to this missile gap, including one from a foreign newspaper only this week. I might ask why the remarks of such outstanding leaders of the Republican Party, such as those of Governor Rockefeller of New York, who was explicit on this subject not long ago, have not had their comments included, because I am sure nobody wishes to make this question of national defense just a partisan matter.

I have made this short talk this afternoon to set straight at least the implications of some recent insertions in the RECORD. Again let me thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

AUTHOR PHILIP WYLIE ASSERTS CIVIL DEFENSE USELESS IN NUCLEAR WAR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Philip Wylie is one of America's most distinguished authors. His fame is worldwide. His views are heard with respect in political, as well as literary, circles.

When President Harry S. Truman formed the Federal Civil Defense Administration in 1949, Mr. Wylie was appointed an expert consultant. He served in that capacity for many years as a dedicated American.

He believed that civil defense was feasible and practical.

With the development of the hydrogen bomb, Mr. Wylie reappraised the concept of civil defense. He concluded that in the thermonuclear age civil defense is impossible and absurd.

He knows that this is a huge bureaucratic boondoggle, which has cost the American taxpayers more than a billion dollars and which is now performing no good whatever. He asserts that no plan—whether of city evacuation, shelters, early warning radar lines, or anything else—has value.

Mr. President, I completely agree with this fine American author.

Not only is civil defense futile in the age of hydrogen weapons, but the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization demonstrates this fact by its every action.

President Kennedy, in naming the Administrator of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, indicated he was gravely concerned and wished to have a report on the entire subject.

I assert, Mr. President, we need a thorough investigation of this agency, its foolish programs, and senseless schemes.

The boondogglers of Civil Defense advise the citizens of Cleveland to evacuate their city in the event of a sudden attack. Then, in a city such as Buffalo, the boondogglers in charge advise digging shelters in backyards and basements, though, of course, in urban areas these would become firetraps. People do not know whether they are to run, to hide, or to try to do both simultaneously.

In the years of its existence, this inept agency has wasted more than $1 billion of taxpayers' hard-earned money.

The taxpayers have paid, and have worried about paying, that money out uselessly. Certainly in this grim period of international anarchy we necessarily must spend millions of dollars for the defense of our country, but the money of the taxpayers should not be squandered and wasted in this manner.

In return for their money, Americans have received nothing but screeching sirens, senseless alerts, and ridiculous nationwide practice alarms.

Leo A. Hoegh was the Administrator of Civil Defense in this Nation under the Eisenhower administration. He was appointed to the position at a salary of $25,000 per annum, after the voters of his State of Iowa did not think enough of his service in a $12,000 per annum position to reelect him for a second term as Governor. During his tenure as head of OCDM he taught learnedly around the country—or he simulated knowledge, anyway—about survival, frightening citizens in regard to the situation. Of course, he is not feeding at the public trough now, since January 20. He is in civil life.

Mr. President, Leo A. Hoegh, the former Administrator of Civil Defense, is not drawing unemployment compensation. No one need to worry about him. We could say, "Scare 'em and then sell 'em," because he has been made the vice president of a corporation in Outer Chicago, which makes fallout shelters for Federal buildings and other buildings. Incidentally, Mr. Hoegh has been placed in charge of the civil defense shelter program, and is selling those shelters.

In my home city of Cleveland, we need a new Federal building. We hope it will be constructed. It may cost the taxpayers $40 million. The building is needed to house all our agencies. In the construction of this building—I do not know whether Mr. Hoegh's firm expects to get the contract for such construction or not—it is contemplated there will be an air raid shelter installed. Mr. President, it is expected that will cost 5 percent of the total cost of the Federal building; in other words, approximately $2 million of the $40 million, for an utterly useless air raid shelter.

As conducted in the past, Mr. President, the Civil Defense Agency has led Americans astray on the dangers of nuclear war and its terrible aftermath. OCDM officials have given Americans only one security—the security of ignorance of the potential horrors of nuclear war.

Philip Wylie explains these horrors and why no civil defense can cope with them in an article in a recent issue of the Rotarian magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Philip Wylie)

This article is written in the hope that its appalling assertions will help intelligent men, everywhere, to reach the heartening conclusion I have reached. But before any optimism can be expressed, my informed and long-standing opinion about the effect of an all-out war needs to be understood.

When in 1949 the President of the United States formed a Federal Civil Defense Administration, I was asked by its just appointed head to serve as an expert consultant. The invitation came owing to my accurate prewar discussions of the then forseen (by nuclear physicists and knowledgeable laymen) A-bomb, and owing to my postwar publication of an essay accurately describing the major problems that would be faced by A-bombed civilians in the United States.

I served FCDA through President Truman's administration and many years of President Eisenhower's. In the days when the United States and the U.S.S.R. were stockpiling mere A-bombs, and before anyone possessed practical hydrogen bombs, I felt certain that in any nuclear war the nation best ready to bear such horrific assault on its civilian front would win the war. In near despair at the apathy of the average citizen of the United States to that threat, I even wrote a novel, "Tomorrow," in which I tried to show what everyone in the United States needed to know, and had to be able to do, to win an A-bomb fight.

With the independent creation of practical H-bombs in the United States and the U.S.S.R., however, I became certain that an all-out engagement with such weapons would create conditions in cities, towns, the countryside, and elsewhere for which no plan—whether of city evacuation, shelters, early-warning-radar lines, or anything else—would be of value. Information about H-weapons' effects, available to anybody who is willing to dig it up and can understand it, led me to these conclusions:

First, an all-out war, with the megaton fission-fusion-fission weapons now possessed in numbers by the United States and the U.S.S.R. would bring about the eventual slaughter of nine-tenths or more of all the people who live in the North Temperate Zone.

Second, the above discernible fact is not considered—certainly not sufficiently considered—by civil-defense planners who tend constantly to ignore all H-weapons' effects save those which will set up an admittedly great havoc, but a havoc with which the presumed survivors can "cope."

Factors which are certain to occur but for which nobody can imagine a solution were and are still being evaded by well-intentioned leaders who cannot grasp them and who seem to me to be blocked, mentally, on a special precondition where H-war is concerned. This is a belief almost as absolute as a religious faith that they and the rest of the people of the land must have a chance to win any war—whatever the megatonnage of weapons used against it, whatever their numbers, and however swiftly they are missile delivered.

It is not my intent to blame any person or group of people for their adamant grip on that illusion. To lose it is to realize that national power in the classic sense is without meaning, that military victory is no longer achievable, that the professional military man exists only so long as he never puts to use his best weapons, and that the world encroachments of the imperial Soviets and the Red Chinese can be stopped only by other means than the use of armed might. For many persons, such realizations are, simply, unacceptable. Their minds cannot, in other words, move into the H-bomb age and operate usefully.

As a result, investigation of various civil defense ideas which, I feel sure, are unrealistic continues. To understand their uselessness one must understand at least a few of the effects of an all-out war which are not today widely known or much mentioned. I shall here list only four examples of such "overlooked" facts.

First, all civil defense programs are based on the assumption that there would be one H-bomb assault only. Thereafter, people who by luck or owing to prepared shelters survived the devastation would be able, in about 2 weeks, to emerge from their shelters and begin the business of decontamination, of finding uncontaminated water and food, of human rescue, and the like.

The fallacy in that—major—supposition is plain. For even if all the citizens had suitable and suitably stocked bomb shelters, what earthly reason is there to imagine that a determined enemy with a huge stockpile of nuclear weapons would limit his attacks to one? Indeed, as bases harden and increasing numbers of missiles with H-warheads are set underground in preaimed rock tubes, the certainty increases that any combatant nation in such a murderous war would be prepared to launch a series of attacks, at intervals of days, weeks, and months—so that a rational program, owing to that one datum, should require shelters equipped to feed, provide water for, and pump filtered air to their inhabitants for months.

But again, such a program is not feasible. An inevitable result of hits, near misses, and even quite distant misses of H-bombs, where large cities are concerned, would be firestorm. In World War II, with mere incendiary weapons, the air forces of the allied nations caused such a phenomenon in Hamburg. So many small fires were set that soon they annucleated into one gigantic pillar of miles-high flame. Everything combustible in a city (or cities wrecked by H-bombs exploding miles from their centers) would feed the whole-city firestorm. Winds of hurricane velocity would rush from all peripheral areas to feed the flame. Trucks, cars, fire apparatus, would be sucked into the vortex from its edges. And most cogently, such firestorms would either roast alive all persons in the shelters under them, or smother them by exhausting the air from every subterranean tunnel, nook, shelter, basement, vault, and cranny beneath the colossal blaze—usually replacing the fire-consumed air with superheated carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide.

Shelters beneath firestorms would be death traps. And the 300-square-mile range that an average H-bomb would wreck ensures the igniting of enough fires to create the phenomenon of firestorm in any one of the world's near-uniformly inflammable cities. True, fires directly set by the heat that a nuclear weapon radiates may be blown out by the ensuing blast wave. But that same wave would crumple enough skyscrapers, gas-storage tanks, filling stations, and homes as gas mains erupted to ignite the great fire that make a city shelter, however sturdy or deep, the last place any informed person would want to be—and be caught dead—in.

It was recognized, a decade ago, that the evacuation of any fair-sized city by vehicles of every sort, even with hours of warning, would lead to disaster. Frightened drivers, poor drivers, hounded by the certainty of oncoming hell, would soon wreck so many vehicles that all exit roads would be blocked solidly. The current suggestions for shelter building are based on the realization that cities cannot be emptied under panicky conditions. Nevertheless, the main exit routes from major cities are still marked as "reserved" for military and civil-defense use in emergency times. That (again) is an example of nonthink. For, if "the siren blew," who really imagines that a frantic populace would abide by mere signs—and leave open the best escape routes from any city? What route, for example, would be taken by the myriads who have homes along these roads and streets?

But in this matter of taking shelter or getting out in time, a different fact, always known and never, to my recollection, faced squarely, would create such a hideous situation that no program could be imagined which would control it. That fact has been documented by tests made during nuclear-bomb explosions on animals with vision comparable to our own. Granting clear weather, the explosion of a medium-sized H-weapon, day or night, would cause all persons indoors or out within view of the fireball, to look at it, by uncontrollable reflex. And such people, seeing the fireball bloom into glaring reality, whether in an air or ground burst, would be made blind instantly, even at distances of 40 miles from the explosion. Sudden light, thousands of times brighter than the sun, would make them turn around to see the source. They would have several seconds to do that before they felt heat or blast and even if they were too distant to feel either. And that instinctive glance would burn their retinas so that they would be sightless.

These unguessable scores of thousands in and around cities, walking, driving cars, and buses, and trucks, piloting commercial planes, driving locomotives, farming, shopping, whatever, would, after one glance, be helpless. Their cars, trucks, trains, and planes would smash. People in the countryside would be unable even to find their way home. And even cloudy weather would merely lessen the area where an H-bomb would blind (even if it did not otherwise harm), the people able to see the fireball—an area, in clear weather, on the order of 5,000 square miles per shot.

Nobody, as I implied, has come forward with any suggestion about how to handle the millions of people who would be abruptly and permanently made blind by a massive H-attack. And nobody has tried to calculate how the chaos created by vehicles driven by and peopled with blind human beings could be dealt with.

Repeated attack, firestorm, and the instant blinding of unwarned (or psychologically unreadied) myriads, are three sure effects to be expected in all-out war. A fourth rises from radioactive fallout. The public of several countries has some concept of certain fallout perils. Civil-defense officials have patiently explained that the radioactive particles which rain from an H-bomb on the elliptical region downwind ellipse of the burst, where high altitude winds are considered, not ground wind—are of deadly peril over vast areas. Two feet of earth are needed as a shield to keep people in the fallout area safe from the intense radiation that would blanket everything in a few hours or less, and for a week or two.

The same officials, however, point out that radioactive isotopes (the lethal-ray-carrying particles of fallout) "decay" rapidly in most cases. In an (average) downwind fallout area where during the first day after the H-shot 15 minutes of surface exposure would give anybody a lethal dose of radiation after a couple of weeks, a person might take an exposure of many days' time without getting radiation enough to become ill. The downwind radioactive area following the burst of a medium-caliber H-weapon will have an area of from 5,000 to 10,000 square miles.

However, the above picture, horrible as it is, does not take into account many further possible or even certain fallout effects. If, for example, attack follows attack, huge areas might become so hot that movement upon them would be impossible for months. Again, since very few citizens of my Nation—or any other—have the instruments and the know-how to measure radiation intensity, survivors of the initial blast, the firestorm, the blinding, the direct radiation, and the heat of H-weapons would have no means of knowing the radiation level in their surroundings.

This ignorance means that multitudes of persons who survived the first day after an H-burst in their area would, owing to some extreme need (like need of a doctor for a beloved, badly hurt person—of water for thirsty children—or of someone to help with the delivery of a baby—and so on), run their errands at the cost of their lives—experience agonizing death days or weeks later.

On the other hand, the problem of first aid, medical aid, succor of all sorts, for the multitudes who would run or drive out of what they know (or imagine) to be a hot area cannot be faced honestly either. Multitudes in thousands of square miles around an H-weapons burst (with undoubtedly a day-and-night pillar of miles-high flame betokening a city in firestorm and with a sky swept by the awesome, rainbow hues of post-blast activity) would be in absolute panic and ruled by a naked instinct for self-preservation. People alive, unhurt, and outside radiation-poisoned regions would not greet with kindness men and women and children arriving on foot or in cars, trucks, or buses from anywhere else. Everybody in vast regions will be filled with the dread that anybody from anywhere else may be, in person, radioactive, or that the vehicle such aid-needing strangers are driving is itself a hot carrier of invisible death.

Enough has been told in magazines and newspapers about the universal shunning of one family accidentally exposed to radiation—but a family guaranteed by scientists as safe for association—to make the general reaction to fallout predictable. The harmless family was avoided like plague-stricken people.

But the ultimate, and worse, fact of fallout is still another—and, again, an unresolved, unresolvable—horror.

Rains would bring increased loads of hot material onto the land, and rains would wash it down watersheds. Radioactive elements would thus concentrate on farms, in pastures, in rivers, and in reservoirs. Moreover, as time passed—as years passed—various micro-organisms, some algae, certain plants, and, through them, soon insects and animals would build up increased, internal stores of radioactive substances. Certain of the minute living things that are the base of the whole, great chain of life that ends in man, and on which man depends to survive, concentrate radioactive material 100,000 times as heavily as it is concentrated in the water or land around them. That order of concentration would be passed upward to man. In sum, while the radioactivity in a fallout area might soon decrease to a harmless amount, the chain of life in that same area would be concentrating that residue, so that the animals and vegetables we eat would grow "hotter"—or fail to mature—while fish and birds would vanish in an annual series of ever-more-sterile hatches.

This last effect—the ecological result of H-war—means that a heavily H-bombed nation would remain a death chamber for man for decades.

Many additional results of H-warfare could be cited to prove that survival is impossible for a nation, for even any considerable minority of a nation, or for nations caught between combatants. American military men have openly given the U.S. Congress an estimate that a first H-bomb assault on the U.S.S.R. would eventually kill most of the people in the Soviet Union, Siberia included, and a high percentage of people in Japan as well, perhaps, as in the Philippines. Any Soviet assault on the United States would have comparable results, whatever precautions the people of the United States had taken. And the nature and history of mankind at war strongly suggests that, after any such initial assault, both sides would be driven into a frenzy so savage that the H-bombing would go on until the last person with a bomb to "deliver" had delivered it on the enemy—even if he had to do it by running the weapon up a bay in a pleasure cruiser and going up, himself, with its detonation.

The U.S.S.R. and the United States know all the foregoing. So do the military men in command of H-weapons and A-weapons. And the U.S.S.R. no more than the United States or any other power wishes to commit suicide in order to wipe out an antagonist.

For such reasons, I concluded with certainty, many years ago, that there would never be an H-war or an A-war. The people of the United States of America and the other bomb-possessing nations have reached an absolute stalemate of unforeseeable but long duration that will never be terminated by holocaust. The differences between freemen and Communist or Communist-dominated peoples will have to be fought out in nonmilitary ways. The Reds will use every stratagem of bluff, of rocket rattling, of the subversion of other peoples, of infiltration, of dishonest propaganda, of economic conquest and means limitlessly amoral and indecent to win the world to communism. The free world has liberty to offer—equality, if it will—and a system of being and doing that has made its citizens the most healthy, comfortable, and physically able in history.

If the free nations can perform an honorable and peaceful winning over (by education, by loans, by private investment, by personal contact) of the uncommitted peoples, they can eventually destroy the Red chance to create a Red world. If we freemen fail the world, we shall eventually lose our own liberties and become slaves, too. That—not H-war survival—is the challenge of the future. And it is my belief freemen will eventually understand that truth and meet its challenge.

As long as we continue to think, mistakenly, that we can engage in, and win, an all-out war, we shall fail to fight properly the only real war in which we and our children and, probably, theirs will be embattled—the so-called war for men's minds.

The Communists have stated their design consistently for 40 and more years—and made appalling gains. They want to subvert, or convert, or somehow take over enough nations and races so that they will be able to deny to the remaining free capitalist nations the hundreds of minerals and raw materials those nations cannot mine or grow or make substitutes for inside their own borders. If we let the Reds achieve that aim, they can deny us hundreds of materials needed to keep our production lines going and our living standard rising. Driven back on our own internal resources, all of us in the free nations would soon revert to an economy of about George Washington's time. Then we'd surrender bit by bit.

Such is the real battle—with mainland China and a dozen other whole nations already lost. We can fight back effectively only by such means as freemen use—by education, by economic aid, by personal contact, by practicing that equality which the currently uncommitted peoples (whom we must win to our side) see we do not now practice, and by meeting the best and biggest challenge of all—the challenge to the once bold and imaginative use of venture capital that once characterized free-world capitalists who, today, fear to venture money in willing, alien lands, and instead take in each other's laundry, timidly.

Perhaps when we can see no martial victory is possible, we shall then make so mighty a free and peaceful "war" as to gain back for the world the peace and freedom it yearns to own. That—not how to take quivering shelter when the bombs fall—is the battle which will rage, whether freemen fight back or not till freedom's gone, or victorious.

The opportunity it represents is free-world-sized; the challenge, just right for our cappacity and strength to lead. But we must first realize what's required to win this fight. Those who call foreign loans giveaways are losing for our side. The unventuresome capitalists who fear to let out their money to strange and yet progressing people are losing. The free man who is unwilling to associate with newly independent but alien people is losing. And all of us have to realize this:

No living man can desire to be free until he is first sure he is equal. A man would rather feel the equal of his fellows and endure tyranny than find himself politically free but in every other way regarded as a second-class person. If the citizens of North America and of Europe and Latin America and free Asia join in the great adventure of educating the unenslaved world about the dignity and productivity that liberty, alone, ensures, the war ahead will get to be man's greatest venture, adventure—and fun.

Anybody not in it already can sign up for myriad duties. Meantime people who hang back with the notion that, no matter what, some crazy "accident" will start the H-bombs flying are worrying over nothing. For that's what any such all-out engagement would make them: nothing * * * unless they live south of the equator. So why worry about a war that would merely dissolve us all in a short time when such a tremendous, and exciting, conflict stands ready made, to be lost or won by us—that is, by you.

U.S. FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, too often the American public is not aware of the tremendous amount of effort which certain private citizens give in their role of advisory commissioners to Government agencies. These dedicated men and women study the operations of programs of Government agencies, make reports and recommendations, and generally contribute to the improvement and growth of the programs.

As coauthor of the so-called Smith-Mundt Act, Public Law 402, 80th Congress, which provides for a program of exchange of persons and for our oversea information program, better known as the Voice of America, I am grateful for the hard work and tremendous contributions made by the Advisory Commission on Information.

Members of this Commission are Mark A. May, Chairman, professor emeritus of psychology of Yale University; Erwin D. Canham, editor, the Christian Science Monitor; Lewis W. Douglas, former Ambassador to Great Britain; Sigurd S. Larmon, chairman of the board of Young & Rubicam, Inc.; and Philip D. Reed, former chairman of the board, General Electric.

This Commission has just filed its 16th report. As usual, it is filled with practical suggestions for improving our oversea information program.

For instance, the Commission has recommended that, in the interests of greater economy and efficiency, the United States should consolidate its foreign information, general education, and cultural programs in one independent agency whose director would have direct access to the President, attend Cabinet meetings, and participate in the deliberations of the National Security Council.

I was particularly interested in this recommendation because it is similar to proposals which I have been making for some years. I hope that further study will be given to the idea. I think it is worthwhile because I think it is practical.

Further, in this report, the Commission points out that we should avoid extremes in dealing with the U.S. Information Agency. The report points out that simply expanding the international public relations effort without doing the necessary work of coordination and consolidation, and undertaking to improve the quality of our information, will not offer a panacea.

In addition, the Commission states—very wisely—that we should avoid the extreme view that our Government should eliminate our oversea information activities.

Mr. President, many citizens interested in cultural relations, information, and public relations are also interested in this activity which our Government undertakes to bring facts about America to people who live in other countries. I am sure that more people will become interested in our international information program if they read the recommendations of the Advisory Commission. For that reason, and for the reasons which I stated before, I ask permission to insert in the body of the RECORD a portion of the report which was filed on February 13, 1961, by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. I again want to offer my appreciation to the members of that Commission for the splendid work they have continued to do in this field.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. THE PURPOSES OF USIA

In previous communications to the Congress, this Commission has identified four functions of the U.S. foreign information program. They are:

1. To counsel the executive branch on international public opinion by making available its specialized knowledge to the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign policies.

2. To explain and interpret to people overseas the meaning and purpose of U.S. foreign policies.

3. To serve as a source of accurate, nonsensational news abroad without competing with U.S. private news sources.

4. To present the full sweep of American life and culture to the people of the world in order to correct misconceptions and to combat false or distorted pictures of the United States.

These functions illustrate the proposition that there are essentially two levels where the public relations factor enters into the consideration of U.S. foreign relations. The first is the advisory level and the other is the level of application.

On the advisory level, this Commission has expressed the view that the U.S. Information Agency's specialized capabilities and knowledge should be more utilized by officials of the Government. Top policymakers should be aware of, understand and respect the attitudes and opinions of other people without permitting these opinions to dictate the course of U.S. policies. Some policymakers possess and project this sense of awareness of other peoples and other cultures. Others have remained blind to or only dimly aware of the importance of being cognizant and considerate of other people's opinions.

This kind of awareness of our relationship with other peoples can seldom be forced upon individuals. It has to be there. Nevertheless every top policy officer, whether gifted or relatively insensitive to this factor, should have at his elbow the advice and guidance of those who are especially and exclusively concerned with the state of foreign public opinion and with the probable reactions of the world to proposed and contemplated policies. The Commission believes that U.S. policies and programs of all departments and agencies which affect our relations with other countries would be benefited through careful consideration of the type of thinking and advice on foreign public opinion that USIA can provide.

Further, it is to be hoped that USIA might enjoy greater participation in policymaking, and in the public presentation of policy, so that public reactions abroad may be considered before, rather than after, the fact.

Such counseling can prove fruitful at all levels of Government. It can be especially important at the Cabinet and National Security Council levels, and for the office of the President. The Commission believes that there should be direct communication between the President and the Director of USIA. The President should call on him for

aid in developing programs of strategic significance in the vital area of U.S. foreign relations.

When it comes to the application of a foreign information program, this Commission has stated that the strategic, commercial, and political interests of the United States require an accurate presentation and explanation of U.S. policies, objectives, and actions. Information services can perform indispensable tasks for the diplomacy of a great power. And international communications are essential in the highly revolutionary period through which we are living.

Although private enterprise and the activities of numerous private individuals and groups remain the main source of information by which foreigners judge the United States, governmentally conducted operations are essential to supplement private effort. This is especially true in countries where private channels of communication are weak, primitive, or ineffectual, or where they are controlled or otherwise interfered with, censored, or excluded.

Despite the initiative, energetic efforts and resourcefulness of private channels of communication, official foreign policy can be adequately explained abroad only through a governmental operation.

This operation must be dedicated and directed towards an eventual successful resolution of the cold war. At the same time, it must work with our historic friends, our new as well as ancient allies, and deal with the sinister plans and efforts of potential enemies.

The total U.S. communications program must, because of the magnitude of its task, direct its programs at the influential in all countries. It must also devise imaginative means of informing, attracting, and holding the interest and satisfying the curiosity of the many.

The achievement of these tasks requires personnel and media output which are of the highest order of excellence, which are reliable and honest, and which are as continuous as they can be.

Finally, the effects of these services are difficult to evaluate. They are seldom demonstrably conclusive in affecting the course of events. However by their continuous but not too obtrusive presence, they can help create climates of opinion, and develop backgrounds for subsequent policies and events. This may at times affect positively or negatively diplomatic negotiations and more often the attitudes and opinion of the average man in different parts of the world.

At this point, a word of warning is indicated. No amount or quality of propaganda, information, culture, or education can be a substitute for U.S. foreign policies or for the domestic strength and stability of our country. Simply expanding our international public relations efforts will not offer us a panacea for all our problems throughout the world. Many ardent advocates of an expanded information, cultural, and educational program have given the impression, unwittingly perhaps, that all that is necessary is to expand our facilities and media in every country in the world. Huge sums have been suggested for these programs on the assumption that increasing the quantitative factor will immediately result in improved foreign relations.

On the other hand, opponents and hostile critics of these programs have insisted that this entire activity should be reduced or completely eliminated, that it is a boondoggle, that national prestige rises only as national power increases irrespective of public relations, cultural, or educational programs, and that the problems in Cuba, the Congo, Berlin, Laos, the Sino-Soviet empire, among many, cannot be materially affected by information and cultural services.

The Commission rejects both extremes. Often too much is expected of USIA in the short run. A policy that is right for the United States may prove unpopular abroad, and no sudden increase of effort will change the picture. The USIA should not be expected to perform short-run miracles. It cannot hope to make some policies palatable in some countries even in the long run, no matter how valid the policy, and it cannot make a bad policy palatable anywhere at any time.

Furthermore, our free and open society, combined with the vastness of our country and our geographical differences, are bound to produce conflicting opinions, which are one of our basic strengths. Yet these differences are magnified and exploited by Communists and others wishing to portray the United States in its most unfavorable light. Sensational reporting has also tended to distort the image of America and to limit the impact and acceptance of USIA activities.

Finally, the biggest limitation is simply time. People's opinions cannot be altered overnight. To change and correct inaccurate opinions about us requires steady, repetitive effort over a long period of time.

The Commission believes that the American people too often fail to understand the need for and the long-range objectives of USIA's activities.

In its previous evaluations of the program, the Commission has called attention to inadequacies and weaknesses and has made recommendations for improvement. But the Commission has also pointed out the successes and gains that have been made which strengthened our national interest, national posture, and national respect in many countries of the world. Hard evidence has been submitted to document these conclusions.

Certainly it can be agreed that there are short-term needs which USIA has met, but the major objectives are long term in nature. Avoidance of extremes in expectation—both favorable and unfavorable—will lead to a more realistic appreciation of the U.S. information program.

II. SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USIA

Having reviewed the purposes of a U.S. information program, it may be helpful at this time to summarize for the new Congress and administration some of the major recommendations which have developed from the Commission's 12 years of experience with the program.

A. Consolidated agency with Cabinet status

In its 15th report to Congress, issued in April 1960, this Commission recommended the consolidation of the Government's information, cultural, and general (as distinguished from technical) educational activities into one independent agency with Cabinet status. The Commission had in mind that the Director and Agency be clothed with a high enough stature to have immediate access to the President and the members of the Cabinet. The use of "Cabinet status" in this report should be understood in this sense.

Briefly stated, the main reason for this recommendation were as follows: Information, cultural, and educational programs are all concerned with communicating with the people of other countries. Consolidation of all such foreign communications into one agency should result in more unified planning for programs which are similar in purpose and method, though this may necessarily be modified to suit the sensitivities of different countries. There should also be more efficient use of limited resources, including manpower.

These programs all require country-by-country variation, administration, and planning. They should be centrally directed and coordinated by a qualified administrator with knowledge of foreign affairs, sensitive antennas, administrative experience, and also with direct access to the President and his Cabinet.

The Commission believes that Cabinet status is needed for such combined operations. Regular attendance at Cabinet meetings by the Director of this Agency would insure greater familiarity with and access to other departments which deal with foreign affairs and with domestic issues that have foreign ramifications. It would also assure to the President direct access to the Director of USIA who would function as his chief counsel and adviser on foreign public opinion.

In addition, high stature of the Director and the Agency in the hierarchy of Government departments should help to avoid many of the contradictory statements made by personnel in the many departments of Government that either directly or indirectly are concerned with foreign affairs. These contradictory statements are a cause of confusion and perplexity among foreign governments and peoples.

Finally, high level status for the position of Director will make it possible to attract men of ability and experience who would not accept subordinate posts. And the same effect will make itself felt in the easier recruiting of able personnel at other levels of the Agency organization.

The Commission further believes that USIA should remain independent, separate from the Department of State.

The Department of State is responsible for foreign policy formulation and guidance. However, experience over the past years has proved that operations are more effectively administered, more imaginative and dynamic when separated from the policy forming agency.

Experience has also demonstrated that separation gives the Agency's program a greater chance for objectively; it protects the nonpartisan character of the program; and it makes management of the Agency more efficient.

In addition, adding a large operational program to the other duties of the Secretary of State would tend to increase unnecessarily the burdens of that office as it faced the complexities of operating a completely different far-flung service.

The important functions of the Department of State and USIA can best be achieved separately, but there should and must be an intimate relationship between the two including a planned and extensive exchange of personnel.

B. The importance of constructive and comprehensive planning

The Commission also has recommended, and wishes to repeat its recommendation, that there be improvement in the planning functions of the Agency.

There should be more adequate and more realistic forward planning to meet the opportunities and the challenges that will arise in the years ahead. This type of planning must be based on a strong research and analysis program capable of determining emerging trends throughout the world. Only by planning ahead will the United States have the personnel and the facilities, the policies and programs—that will enable it to be ready for new situations as they develop. Long range planning also will make it possible for the United States to review and modify programs as needs change and to expand where opportunities exist or the challenge is greatest.

Such forward planning should be directed both to target areas and to target groups. In Africa, in Latin America, in the Near East, south, and southeast Asia and other areas, indeed in all areas including Western Europe, the most careful planning is required if the United States is to approach the future well prepared for all contingencies.

As an example of forward planning for target groups, special programs to the youth of the world deserve consideration. The Agency already has demonstrated competence in approaching this group, but there may be a

need to focus more attention and resources on the younger generation. In many of the newer countries of the world, the emerging rulers are relatively young men and women who should be made fully acquainted with the practices and procedures of democratic societies.

Better planning can also help to improve current operations. The information, education, and cultural programs for each country should be planned and developed in unison, not as unrelated activities.

There are obviously different needs and opportunities to be planned for in different countries. For example, communications techniques and approaches have to be adapted to differing needs and literacy levels. Since the USIA is dealing with essentially scarce resources of both money and manpower, care must be taken to plan for their present use in a manner to achieve the best results.

The Commission believes that a consolidation and shifting of resources and programs from areas of lower priority to those of greater priority are needed at once, without neglecting or appearing to be indifferent to the attitudes of those who are our natural friends.

It is essential for the Agency to make careful plans and hard judgments on these matters in order to conserve available funds and personnel and to operate all programs in the most economical manner possible. Not every country requires all media or all cultural facilities or the same educational assistance. If after thorough examination and review, additional funds for expansion are necessary on the basis of critical situations and trends, the Agency should be encouraged to seek assistance from the Congress for supplemental funds and increased regular appropriations.

C. Strengthening the field structure

The integrated structure in the field whereby the public affairs officer is a responsible and responsive member of the Ambassador's country team should be retained and strengthened.

The Commission pointed out in its 15th report to Congress, and wishes to repeat, that the 1950's witnessed a change in the requirements of USIA's foreign service personnel. The emphasis today appears to be less on technical skills, more on broader education and training and the ability to communicate with foreign audiences on a direct personal basis. These are requirements for representing the United States abroad with foreign citizens from all walks of life. In the opinion of the Commission, appointments ranging from Ambassadors and Ministers to the newly recruited Foreign Service officers should consider these talents of personal communication. This may often be the most important function performed by Foreign Service information officers as a supplement to the Ambassador and his staff.

This requirement for foreign duty among information service personnel should not be taken to mean that the Ambassador, the diplomatic corps, and members of the Foreign Service are relieved of their fundamental responsibilities which (in collaboration with USIS) include not only the explanation of American policies, but the explanation of American culture and society. The Commission believes that the Ambassador in the final analysis is the most important of all the overseas personnel associated with dissemination of information about our country and the explanation of our foreign policy. It is the duty of the public affairs officer to assist him in every way in accomplishing these objectives.

In view of the importance of such collaboration and cooperation between the diplomatic corps and the USIS in the field, the Commission believes it would be an error to break up the harmonious working relationships that have developed among cultural affairs officers (CAO), public affairs officers (PAO), and Ambassadors. To remove the CAO from under the jurisdiction of the PAO, as some have suggested, could not help but have a divisive effect. The attempt to separate information from culture is neither realistic nor practical. It could lead only to two sets of communications programs, unrelated to each other in operation yet overlapping in many areas of content and audience.

Neither would such a step automatically improve the caliber of our cultural representatives. There is no reason why distinguished men of cultural accomplishments may not be persuaded to serve their country abroad for a number of years without impairing the valuable day-to-day work of the regular CAO. It would be folly, however, to expect such culturally distinguished individuals to encumber themselves with the tasks of running libraries, supervising exhibits, or making arrangements for musical extravaganzas—functions which must be the responsibility of the CAO.

For these reasons the Commission believes that the proper course is not to divide the present field structure, but to strengthen and develop it.

Other recommendations made to the Agency previously by the Commission have included the following:

(a) It should remain nonpartisan in character.

(b) It should strive constantly to develop closer relations with Congress.

(c) It should be given the necessary legislative authority for a Foreign Service Corps in order to strengthen its foreign service.

(d) It should encourage the development of top executive ability and talent by selecting and training good managers for all of USIA's high level executive positions and important oversea posts.

(e) Its officers overseas should be provided with more substantial representation funds in order to defray the heavy expense incurred in the ordinary discharge of duty and public obligations.

(f) It should continue to seek more effective working relations with private enterprises which operate in international communications. It should also coordinate and integrate more effectively the President's people-to-people program with the appropriate parts of the Agency.

(g) It should emphasize and develop further those binational or multinational information activities which have been found to be most productive in achieving international understanding.

(h) It should work toward reducing the amount of rotation in oversea assignments so that experienced officers will not be pulled out of a country just as they are reaching full effectiveness.

(i) It should examine the number of and the need for requested reports, reducing paperwork where possible so that there will be more time available for productive endeavors.

(j) It should lay special stress on and support for the United Nations (U.N.) as an instrument for resolving world problems and mitigating major areas of conflict.

(k) It should be encouraged to devise special events and activities such as international meetings, exhibitions, and visitations which will provide opportunities for specific information and education programs.

(l) It should continue to play an important role at international conferences by making available its specialized communications skills, facilities, and knowledge to those who are responsible for presenting the U.S. position and purposes at these meetings.

An elaboration of most of these recommendations may be found in earlier Commission reports to Congress (see especially Nos. 7 and 12 to 15). They are itemized here in order to provide the new Congress, the new administration, and the new Director with the accumulated experience gained from the past. They represent the considered judgment of this Commission after having observed, appraised, and reflected upon the experiences of the United States in this vital area of our foreign relations from the beginnings of the foreign information and educational programs authorized by Public Law 402 and passed by the 80th Congress, January 27, 1948.

From the above enumeration, it is clear that the many tasks that face the Agency require men and women who have character, integrity, knowledge, a variety of skills, sensitivity, personality, energy, and adaptability. It is equally clear that these are complex and difficult demands and requirements for this difficult yet important field. They require our finest talents. And those who do persevere and succeed, sometimes at the risk of life to self and family, should earn their country's gratitude and receive the plaudits of their countrymen.

In addition to its recommendations for the U.S. Information Agency, the Commission would also like to express its concern in a somewhat broader area. The foreign relations of the United States are affected by the policies, programs, statements, and activities of many departments and agencies of the Government. This multidepartmental aspect of our international relations creates problems for an information program charged with the responsibility of speaking for the United States as a whole, and with promoting better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world.

The Commission would like to call attention to three areas where there might be improvement in the interdepartmental coordination of policies, programs, and information operations.

1. There appears to be a need for closer coordination at the executive level of statements with respect to foreign affairs issued by all Government departments. If department heads and their responsible subordinates were required to clear policy statements affecting directly or indirectly the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs before issuing them, there would be greater assurance that the U.S. Government would be speaking with one voice.

2. Domestic policies, too, often have foreign implications and are of interest to people in other countries. Closer coordination at the highest level between the Department of State, USIA, and domestic departments and agencies would provide information in advance that could prove helpful in formulating information programs which explain our policies to people overseas.

3. Effective forward planning in the information area—as in other areas—calls for the deepest, broadest possible knowledge of Communist cold war moves. Here, too, closer coordination at the top level among departments and agencies concerned with the cold war could lead to more effective information programs. And not just programs in reaction to Communist activity, but new, positive, dramatic plans and programs of our own that will move the United States still further ahead on the information offensive.

III. CONCLUSION

In summary, this 16th report to the Congress of the United States has reviewed briefly the purposes and principles of our foreign information program. The Commission has recommended certain steps which it believes will strengthen USIA, with particular emphasis in three areas.

1. The consolidation of the Government's foreign information, cultural, and general educational activities into one independent agency with high level status.

2. The need for more constructive and comprehensive planning, especially long-range planning.

3. The maintenance and strengthening of the harmonious working relationships in the field between USIS and the Ambassadors and their staffs.

In addition, the Commission has stated its belief in the need for closer coordination among the many departments and agencies of the Government whose policies, activities, and statements affect, directly or indirectly, the course of U.S. foreign affairs.

With firm support and wise guidance from the new administration, and with the continued advice and help of the Congress, this Commission is confident that the U.S. Information Agency will continue its steady progress in advancing our national interests,

Respectfully submitted.

MARK A. MAY,
Chairman.
ERWIN D. CANHAM.
LEWIS W. DOUGLAS.
SIGURD S. LARMON.
PHILIP D. REED.

RATIFICATION OF TREATY FOR ESTABLISHING ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a distinguished leader of the American business community has addressed to me a letter, which he may well have addressed also to other Senators, dated February 17. The letter explains, I believe very eloquently, spoken from a background of experience, the writer's deep conviction that ratification of the Treaty for Establishing the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development will be of great benefit to this country. He makes reference to some of the concerns that have been expressed in connection with the treaty.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is from Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., the Whirlpool Corp. of St. Joseph, Mich.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHIRLPOOL CORP.,
St. Joseph, Mich., February 17, 1961.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: This letter is not necessary to persuade you to vote in favor of ratification of the Treaty for Establishing the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Nevertheless, I do want you to have the views of our company. We regard the OECD as an important and very promising forum for the promotion of the economic interests of the United States and of our North Atlantic partners. It can be of persuasive assistance with the more affluent members of the Atlantic community in assisting this country in redressing the imbalance in our international payment accounts.

It is a matter of national concern that greater assistance be furnished by Europe for the underdeveloped nations: OECD could accelerate this activity.

Every American business concerned with international activities, particularly business activities in Europe, is affected by the rival European trade blocs. Our Nation, as well as the business community, has a common interest in minimizing discrimination against American exports by the Common Market. OECD would be an effective force in preventing such discriminations.

Our business friends who argue the protectionist cause, it seems to me, are distorting the purposes of this international body: there is no evidence whatsoever, as I am sure you will agree, that adherence to OECD will remove the historic tariff functions from the Congress and repose them with the Department of State.

With best and kindest wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

PETER H. NEHEMKIS, Jr.

THE NEW YORK HARBOR STRIKE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the gnawing, disturbing strikes which intrude on the convenience, holiday plans, and business travel of Americans understandably produce some pretty high blood pressure. I happen to be one of those inconvenienced. Yet I think it not out of order that a voice speaking a message not normally heard in connection with such concurrence be made a part of the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the expression of opinion contained in an editorial in the Weekly Review of Public Affairs, known as the Commonweal of February 3, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SYMBOLIC STRIKE

Everyone is glad that the New York harbor strike was settled, especially with a settlement described by Secretary of Labor Goldberg as fair, decent, and honorable.

For the 13 days that the strike lasted, the city of New York suffered increasingly serious disruption of its entire economic life, as 100,000 commuters were cut off from their jobs, and as the city's supplies of fresh food and fuel were more and more stringently curtailed. Toward the end of the strike the shutdown of the New York Central Railroad had extended its crippling effects hundreds of miles north and west, even as far as Chicago. And yet the cause of all this hardship, including the complete paralysis of two railroad systems, was a dispute over a handful of jobs by a union with a total membership of only 664.

Clearly, this was an intolerable situation, as so many commentators and editorialists have pointed out. But to say only that the situation was intolerable does not help very much in finding a solution to it.

First of all, it must be remembered that the tug strike was entirely legal and orderly, and came only after lengthy management-union negotiations in which both sides refused to yield on what they considered an all-important point. Secondly, the railroads were not, as many people seemed to believe, merely innocent bystanders in this dispute, and there was no question here of a secondary boycott. The railroads were and are the employers of the striking tug and ferry workers; they were and are management. As for the honoring of picket lines by fellow union members who are not themselves on strike, this is a fundamental of union solidarity, without which no small union could ever hope to stand up to a huge corporation.

The chief issue in the New York strike was the right of management to abolish jobs and procedures it considers unnecessary. Although the number of jobs involved here was less than 100, the railroads thought the principle at stake so important that they were willing to risk a major strike rather than to surrender what they insist is their right. The union too—and with them the railroad brotherhoods—believed that the future consequences of yielding to the railroads on this point were great enough to warrant an extension of the harbor strike to a major railroad tieup.

Thus the New York tug strike did not revolve around the 50 or 60 jobs that were technically at stake; it concerned the whole, hotly disputed issue of featherbedding in organized labor, and by extension the unsolved question of the impact of technology and automation on American society. In that sense, the tug workers' walkout was not a little strike, but a big one, bearing on what is probably the largest and most pressing problem facing the national economy.

The settlement of the stike was made possible by the agreement to hold the principal issue in abeyance until next December, when a Presidential commission headed by former Secretary of Labor Mitchell will complete an exhaustive consideration of the entire problem of work rules and featherbedding. This, by the way, is what the tug workers originally proposed, but the railroads were apparently fearful that such an agreement might suggest that they were relinquishing their right to make these decisions themselves. At any rate, the White House study which is being made represents a real hope of progress on a question which has too long been ignored or evaded.

Automation is coming, unquestionably, and the unions which are trying to block it are fighting a losing battle. But as automation will bring benefits, so too, will it bring certain costs, and the costs must be shared along with the benefits. This is primarily what the unions are fighting for. Technological advances will obviously benefit management, the skilled workers who stay on at automated plants, and in one sense, the consumer as well. But, union spokesmen ask, is the prosperity and well-being of the rest of us to be paid for solely by the suffering of the human beings whose jobs have suddenly become obsolete?

If the answer to this question is clearly no, then steps must be taken to work out the right answer—by the unions, by management, by society at large (whose problem this is), using the agency of Government. The step already taken—the commissioning of the Mitchell study group—is a good one, albeit long overdue. And if the New York strike is to have any good effects, it will be in rousing Americans to a realization of the seriousness of this problem, and of their own responsibility for the solution of it.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN MICHIGAN'S UPPER PENINSULA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a number of cities in Michigan's Upper Peninsula look forward to additional assistance from State and Federal Government to meet the chronic unemployment situation that has affected almost all parts of the economy of this area.

On January 23 I placed in the RECORD some of the resolutions and letters I have received outlining programs being undertaken in these cities to try to combat the unemployment problem. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two more such communications from cities in the Upper Peninsula, one from Bessemer, in Gogebic County, and one from Alpha, in Iron County, Mich.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the city of Bessemer is in dire need of economic assistance; and

Whereas the city of Bessemer in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan has been steadily losing population, declining from 4,300 in 1920 to 3,305 in 1960, while the Nation has been growing rapidly in population; and

Whereas followup studies of local high school graduates over a period of 25 years

reveal that upward of 60 percent of each graduating class leaves the city of Bessemer; and

Whereas there has been a sharp curtailment in the iron ore mining and lumbering industries; and

Whereas the average employment figure in the city of Bessemer is downward and the list of direct relief recipients and persons unemployed continues to grow; and

Whereas the basic industry of iron ore mining is importing foreign ores because of cheap labor costs and because of tax benefits given by the Federal Government and because the Federal Government has failed to recognize the need to take care of the local people as well as the foreign nations; and

Whereas the city of Bessemer would be able to develop economically by development of the vast natural resources such as iron ore, copper, and timber that are located in the area; and

Whereas a program of highway construction to further develop transportation resources into the city of Bessemer would help the economy greatly; and

Whereas the availability of natural gas would assist the local economy; and

Whereas a program of expanded vocational training for persons that have been displaced due to job demands would make available our large labor reserve for national employment or employment in service industries; and

Whereas an expanded program of research and development of mineral resources, in wood products and in the tourist industries, would make available economic opportunities; and

Whereas the Federal Government should divert and relocate defense industries for the national security of the United States; and

Whereas the people of the city of Bessemer have paid substantial amounts in income taxes to the Federal Government without receiving any direct benefits, and further, that this money received from the citizens of the city of Bessemer has been used to support and develop foreign nations to the detriment of the people of the city of Bessemer; and

Whereas there is a direct responsibility on the Congress of the United States to provide employment and work opportunities for the people of the city of Bessemer rather than the welfare programs and increased unemployment compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the city council of the city of Bessemer, That they request the Congress of the United States to give their support to the proposals of the special labor, management, Government program study group headed by PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois and that congressional action be taken to implement these recommendations; and be it further

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Bessemer request the Congress of the United States to support the Flood-Douglas bill that deals with the problems of areas of economic unemployment; and be it further

Resolved, That the city of Bessemer be given high priority in any assistance given under distressed area legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable U.S. Senators PATRICK MCNAMARA, PHILIP HART, and PAUL DOUGLAS, and that copies of this resolution be also delivered to U.S. Representatives JOHN B. BENNETT and DANIEL J. FLOOD.

Attest:

EVERETT O. LAKE,
City Clerk.

PROPOSED PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS FOR BESSEMER, MICH., JANUARY 1961

This report, prepared by the common council, city of Bessemer, contains public works projects which could be initiated to help alleviate the unemployment which presently exists in Bessemer.

These are all projects that have been planned for some time but because of the shortage of funds have never been started. The city of Bessemer does not employ a full time engineer, therefore, we do not have an estimated cost for the projects:

1. Water and sewer improvements:

Relocate 6-inch water main between Fourth Avenue and Yale Avenue with an 8-inch main to relieve pressure problems in the fifth ward.

Install new service lines on Yale Avenue and on streets connecting Eli and Yale Avenues.

Install water and sewer mains from Eli Avenue south to township line on the Johnson Road.

Relay sewer on Porter and Galena Streets.

Improve water volume and pressure in the Jungles and Palms locations.

Install a bypassing 8-inch water main to connect existing main on Hillcrest Avenue with the reservoir on the First Bluff.

Repair retaining wall at pumphouse pond.

Erect hurricane fencing around sewage disposal plant and pumphouses.

Extend water line on West Iron Street from Ethel to Massie Avenue.

2. Storm sewers and drainage ditches:

Install storm sewer on Eli Avenue, North Case Street and the east end addition.

Eliminate open drainage ditches on South State Street and Mill Street by installing culverts and to correct drainage.

Problem on East Colby Street.

3. Expansion of the cemetery.

4. Recreation and parks:

Improve the park on South Clayberg Street.

Develop the First Bluff Park and recreation area including the erection of a recreation building.

5. Citywide street improvements and develop alleys in Main Street business district.

MASTODON TOWNSHIP,
Alpha, Mich.

Hon. PHILIP HART,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for sending me a copy of the Douglas task force report. It is encouraging to know that plight of our people is being considered. We here, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, are definitely faced with a serious problem.

Our direct relief program has increased to a point that we must ask the State to step in. We have an industrial committee set up to explore all the possible avenues of encouraging industry to locate in the area, but a healthy market is needed before industry will expand. Our iron ore industry could take care of us if the market is good, but of course automation has taken its toll here, too, and with an expanding population other industries will be needed to absorb the labor pool. I am one of the unemployed of the steel industry, and being in the 45–50 age group find it very difficult to find stable employment, with my diversified abilities, I have been able to keep my head above water. Something must be done to encourage employment of the older age groups. We have children ready to go to college—this I feel is needed to meet the challenging future—but without a stable income it is extremely difficult. I know because my son just completed his degree at Michigan State and I have a daughter in her first year of college now. There are many more in a less fortunate position than I am in, and I am concerned about them also.

Thank you again for your attention, and would you please send me literature on legislation pertaining to long-term job opportunities, or development of local resources.

Yours sincerely,

JOSEPH A. ROSSI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Friday, February 24, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE AMBASSADORS

Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, U.S. Army, retired, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

David K. E. Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Great Britain.

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federation of Malaya.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Henry R. Labouisse, of Connecticut, to be Director of the International Cooperation Administration, in the Department of State.

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The words concerning Moses, Israel's great leader: Hebrews 11: 27: *He endured as seeing Him who is invisible.*

Almighty God, who art the Supreme Ruler of the universe, we thank Thee for this day when we are commemorating the birth and life of George Washington whom we reverently and affectionately call the "Father of his Country."

Our hearts expand with pride as we think of the moral and spiritual fiber of his character, his lofty idealism, his spirit of adventure, his fortitude in times of hardship, his skill in statesmanship and diplomacy.

We are grateful for his patriotic loyalty to those principles of righteousness and justice which inspired him to champion the cause and the rights of the oppressed colonists.

Grant that in exercising and enjoying the rights of citizenship, which we prize so highly, we may have due regard and respect for the equivalent rights of others.

Accept our gratitude above all for his humble spirit and devout faith in Thy divine providence which made him bend his knees in prayer at Valley Forge that

he might know how to carry on and direct his ways in accord with the eternal wisdom and will of God.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND UNITED STATES-CANADA INTERPARLIAMENTARY MEETING IN OTTAWA, CANADA

The Chair laid before the House the following resignations, which were read:

FEBRUARY 21, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: I regret that I will be unable to attend the United States-Canada Interparliamentary Meeting in Ottawa, Canada.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK IKARD.

FEBRUARY 21, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise that I will be unable to attend the Interparliamentary Conference meeting February 22–26, 1961, in Ottawa, Canada.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE U.S. DELEGATION OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP FOR THE MEETING IN OTTAWA, CANADA

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, he did, on Tuesday, February 21, 1961, appoint as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from February 22 to February 26, 1961, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. DONOHUE, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. YATES, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MURPHY, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. IKARD.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, without being considered as a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter for today only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 1961, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. BEERMANN read the Farewell Address as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame lest instead of warming it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your repre-

sentatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the executon of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interest.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course

which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STRATTON on account of official business to attend the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group meeting in Ottawa, Canada, on the part of the House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 23, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

595. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

596. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the quarterly period ending December 31, 1960, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 98. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to conduct certain studies and investigations; without amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 92. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 55. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 141. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations coming within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Joint Resolution 155. Joint resolution to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of Abraham Lincoln; with amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4721. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, and thus to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 4722. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to the limitation upon the amount of capital grants which may be made for projects under the slum clearance and urban renewal program in predominantly nonresidential areas which are being redeveloped for predominantly nonresidential uses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4723. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the donation of surplus property to volunteer lifesaving corps; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4724. A bill to provide that surplus personal property of the United States may be donated to the States for the promotion of fish and wildlife management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4725. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 4726. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain medical officers of the uniformed services who have served as Surgeons General for 5 or more years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4728. A bill to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 4729. A bill to create a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4730. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to extend to substitute postal employees the provisions

of such act relating to overtime and holiday pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4731. A bill to provide for a program of Federal matching grants to the States to enable the States to provide health insurance for individuals aged 65 or over at subscription charges such individuals can pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 4732. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4733. A bill to make Abraham Lincoln's Birthday a holiday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4734. A bill making the birthday of Abraham Lincoln a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4735. A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, certain portions of shoreline areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4736. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide that the first $50 per month of earned income shall not be taken into account in determining an individual's need for old-age assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 4737. A bill to increase the amount of clerk hire available to each Member of the House of Representatives, to increase the number of employees authorized by each Member of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4738. A bill vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima Volcanic Islands, Pacific Ocean area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4739. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4740. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Queens, Suffolk, or Nassau County, N.Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 4741. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property on the Minidoka project, Idaho, Shoshone project, Wyoming, and Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4742. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act to provide a grant program for the prevention and control of dental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4743. A bill to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 4744. A bill to amend section 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4745. A bill to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4746. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide full parity price supports with respect to wheat, corn, barley, oats, rye, soybeans, flax, and grain sorghums, and reduced production and surpluses of such crops by voluntary participation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 4747. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4748. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property on the Minidoka project, Idaho, Shoshone project, Wyoming, and Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 4749. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4750. A bill to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4751. A bill to extend certain authority of the Secretary of the Interior, exercised through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, to areas outside the national domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4752. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4753. A bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide detention and other benefits thereunder to certain Guamanians killed or captured by the Japanese at Wake Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4754. A bill to amend section 4 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide benefits to certain contractors' employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to withhold the tax credit provided under section 3302 from maritime employers in States that do not meet the conditions required by section 3305(f); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 4756. A bill to authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved; to permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, and thus to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4758. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of $100 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; and to provide an allowance for depreciation of property used by self-employed veterans in determining such annual income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4759. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, and thus to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4760. A bill to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 4761. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H.R. 4762. A bill authorizing certain construction for the protection of the Mystic, Conn., area against hurricane tidal flooding; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 4763. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 4764. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for a more equitable distribution of funds available under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4765. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to establish a 35-hour workweek for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4766. A bill to provide for a program of Federal matching grants to the States to enable the States to provide health insurance for individuals aged 65 or over at subscription charges such individuals can pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4767. A bill to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4768. A bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam shall each be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4769. A bill to amend section 5001 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the number of hospital beds provided for care of veterans shall be increased above the present ceiling of 125,000 to a realistic number commensurate with the requirements of the veteran population of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 4770. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide pensions at the monthly rate of $100 for veterans of World War I; to increase the income limitations applicable to the payment of such pensions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 4771. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Sequoyah, the famous Cherokee Indian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4772. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4773. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4774. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32 of the United States Code to provide benefits for nonregular members of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard disabled from disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4775. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the crediting of certain service performed prior to attaining the minimum age established for the purpose of determining eligibility for retirement and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4776. A bill to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4777. A bill to amend the Dependents' Medical Care Act to provide that all retired members of a uniformed service qualify for benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4778. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4779. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4780. A bill to define the status of retired members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4781. A bill to place Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates (Regulars) in a status comparable with U.S. Naval Academy graduates; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4782. A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4783. A bill to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4784. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to change the terms for which enlistments may be accepted in the National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4785. A bill relating to withholding for State employee retirement, disability, and death benefit system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4786. A bill to provide travel and transportation allowances for members of the National Guard and Reserve components when travel is performed in an active duty or inactive duty training status in compliance with Federal directives; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4787. A bill to further amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and section 7 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of a basic allowance for quarters to an enlisted member of a Reserve component on active duty for training as if he were a member of a Regular component of a uniformed service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4788. A bill to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4789. A bill to clarify the deferred or exempt status of persons who enlist in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4790. A bill to amend section 709 of title 32, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4791. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, with respect to the system of courts-martial for the National Guard not in Federal service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4792. A bill to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 183. Resolution to create a Select Committee on a National Fuels Study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 184. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. Res. 185. Resolution to achieve better self-supervision by motion picture and television industries in regard to the moral quality of their products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. ALBERT presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma relative to the economic message transmitted to the Congress by President John F. Kennedy on February 2, 1961; commending President Kennedy for his enlightened and progressive policy regarding the development and improvement of our natural resources, particularly the forest resources of the Nation; directing that copies of this resolution be transmitted to President John F. Kennedy, to Mr. John Koen, and to each Member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4793. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Donald R. McLean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4794. A bill for the relief of Basilia Okal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 4795. A bill for the relief of Walter J. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 4796. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Hartman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 4797. A bill for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

My Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4798. A bill for the relief of Stanley Alexander Yhap and Joycelyn Patricia Woo-Ming Yhap; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4799. A bill for the relief of Ivan Buric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 4800. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clay Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4801. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elizabeth Fanning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4802. A bill for the relief of Maurice and Nina Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4803. A bill for the relief of Vahran Arslanyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4804. A bill for the relief of Ethel Lauretta Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4805. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Arthur Sugarman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

65. Mr. MONAGAN presented a petition of Jacob P. Treciokas, president of the Waterbury-Lithuanian-American Council, and adopted by the Americans of Lithuanian descent in Waterbury, Conn., on February 12, 1961, to commemorate the 43d anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Proposal To Reinstate National Service Life Insurance to Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1961, the junior Senator from Louisiana made a statement in connection with a bill he was introducing to reopen the national service life insurance program to veterans with lapsed policies. In his statement the junior Senator said:

> Four times in the past 5 years the Senate has passed a measure to allow veterans another opportunity to apply for national service life insurance.

He then inserted in the RECORD the legislative history of the proposal. The legislative history inserted by the junior Senator from Louisiana is incomplete. It is my proposal here to set the record straight. I feel it is necessary because the junior Senator, in his statement, said:

> In every instance, the House of Representatives has stymied action on this measure either because of opposition within the House Veterans' Affairs Committee or the House Rules Committee. The full House membership has never been afforded the chance to vote on the bill.

The significant portion of the legislative history of this proposal, which the junior Senator from Louisiana neglected to include in his summary, is the fact that the Senate Finance Committee,

from which this proposal has originated, has never held a hearing on the bill. In the 84th Congress, the insurance reopening proposal was added, without hearings, to H.R. 7089, an entirely unrelated bill having to do with service-connected benefits for surviving widows and children. In the 85th Congress the national service life insurance reopening proposal was added, without hearings, to H.R. 11382, an unrelated bill pertaining to another insurance question. In the 86th Congress the national service life insurance reopening proposal was added to H.R. 7650, without hearings, an entirely unrelated bill making certain changes in the veterans' pension program. In the 2d session of the 86th Congress it was added to H.R. 11045, without hearings, an unreleated insurance proposal.

There has been substantial opposition to the national service life insurance reopening bill since it was first introduced. It has been opposed by the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget, and it is strongly opposed by several other large groups interested in insurance matters. Before criticizing the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and the House of Representatives for its action on this proposal, the junior Senator from Louisiana should look to the procedure of his own committee. This is an important piece of legislation on which there are widely divergent views as to its merit and certainly it justifies proper hearings before being reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

When the bill H.R. 7650, which became Public Law 86–211, the new pension act, was under consideration in the Senate, as I have indicated above, the junior Senator from Louisiana was successful in having this insurance amendment added as a rider. The House subsequently accepted all of the amendments of the Senate to the pension bill, with the exception of the insurance rider on the ground that this matter was not germane, and was totally unrelated to the pension program. The Senate then receded from its position on this amendment and the bill was sent to the White House where it was signed. At the time this action was taken I assured the junior Senator from Louisiana that if this matter was again added as a rider or came over to the House as a separate bill I would not engage in any parliamentary tactics to obstruct or otherwise delay its consideration. I kept my word and brought the matter to the attention of the House when the so-called Long amendment was again added as a rider to H.R. 11045.

As I have indicated above, even though I was opposed to the substance, it was through no fault of mine that there was objection to the unanimous consent for consideration of this bill with the Long amendment.

If this legislation or the so-called Long bill is considered and reported by the other body I will see that it is immediately considered by the Subcommittee on Insurance and the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs after a report from the Veterans' Administration has been received. I will not use any parliamentary device to obstruct or delay this proposal but I do expect it to be considered on its merits and not as a rider to another bill.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has in the 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses held hearings on proposals to reopen the national service life insurance—the substance of the so-called Long bill. In each and every instance the matter has been rejected in the subcommittee, and it should be noted that this was true prior to the time I became chairman of the committee as well as for the period after I assumed the chairmanship. It seems only fair and equitable that those interested in promoting this type of legislation should be willing to follow the normal legislative process in the Congress without criticizing others who, as far as I can see, have discharged their responsibility to the fullest.

The Need for Greater VA Hospital Facilities on Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in this House providing for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration hospital in Queens, Suffolk, or Nassau County, N.Y.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and its subcommittee on hospitals I am fully cognizant of the vital need for the expansion of veterans hospital facilities in the Nation. As the Representative in this Congress of a district located on Long Island I am especially aware of the woeful lack of such facilities in this particular region. For that reason I call the attention of this House to the introduction of this legislation and the appeal I am making to the Honorable John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1961.

Hon. JOHN S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GLEASON: Today I introduced the enclosed bill to provide for the construction of a general medical-surgical hospital for veterans in Queens, Nassau, or Suffolk Counties on Long Island, N.Y. I want to call your attention to the need for such a hospital on Long Island and to the great support for the project among veterans groups.

There are some three and a half million people residing in the three Long Island counties, and the closest medical-surgical hospitals for the treatment of their needs are located in Brooklyn and Manhattan. In some cases they must travel a distance of over 100 miles to such facilities and then find that they are denied admittance due to lack of available beds.

In addition, the lengthy distances deprive the families of veterans who are admitted to the Brooklyn-Manhattan hospitals from making regular visits thereby denying the veterans of the solace and comfort of their families.

As you know, the only veterans hospital located within these three counties is the neuropsychiatric hospital at Northport. For some 13 percent of all veterans in the Nation there is no relatively close general medical-surgical facility. These men are growing older each year and will have greater need for general hospital facilities.

The proposal is backed, to my knowledge, by all the veterans organizations in the area, and both the Veterans' Affairs Committee and myself have received numerous letters and resolutions of support for the project from State and local veterans groups.

I sincerely hope that you will give this project your careful consideration and that a medical-surgical hospital can be built on Long Island to provide for the needs of the 3 million veterans who reside there.

With best wishes and my high regards,

Very sincerely,

SEYMOUR HALPERN.

As the letter to the Administrator states, Mr. Speaker, there is a neuropsychiatric hospital at Northport, Long Island. But, here again, there is a list of 2,500 waiting for admission. Recently the Veterans' Administration has undertaken an expansion and improvement program for Northport. While the Veterans' Administration is to be complimented for recognizing the acute need for this program, Northport provides neuropsychiatric care, and even the eventual completion of the program still leaves Long Island veterans without a surgical-medical hospital.

As our veterans grow older the need for more hospital facilities increases. Realizing this need, and in conjunction with the geographic lack of such facilities on Long Island, I ask that this House give its every attention and consideration to this proposal.

Tribute to Paul Wooton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tributes paid to the late Paul Wooton. As a former newspaperman myself, the knowledge of Mr. Wooton's great abilities preceded me to Washington. After I came here, I gained an even greater respect for this outstanding man. Paul Wooton was first of all a true newspaperman who performed his duties with great ability and without bias or prejudice. At the same time, he was a fine gentleman who loved other people and had the great capacity of making friends in all walks of life.

Paul Wooton was known primarily as a correspondent for the New Orleans Times-Picayune and as a Louisianan, but we in Mississippi claimed him also. During all of 1960 he served as president of our Mississippi State Society. He held many high offices and high honors in Washington, but he accepted the obligations and responsibilities of this relatively minor post with the same faithful attention to duty that he gave any other assignment.

Paul Wooton was a great newspaperman, a great American, and a wonderful human being. No wonder so many, from the President down to the humblest one of us, are paying tribute on his passing.

Preference in Procurement for Labor Surplus Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in President Kennedy's message of February 2, 1961, which contained his program to restore momentum to the American economy, he referred to a directive which he had sent to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Labor, the General Services Administration, and all heads of executive departments and agencies whereby the heads of Federal agencies were directed to give reasonable preference in procurement to labor surplus areas.

This directive moves in the same direction as my bill H.R. 3456, which would require executive departments to consider channeling procurement contracts for new facilities into labor surplus areas.

For the information of the House, I include President Kennedy's Executive order herewith:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 2, 1961.
To the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies:

In carrying out approved Government programs during the present period of economic slack, we should seek every means consistent with efficiency to accelerate temporarily planned Government procurement, construction and related activities. A particularly high priority should be given to actions which could be taken in time to have an effect on unemployment by this spring and to projects located in areas of labor surplus.

Therefore, you are requested:

1. Immediately to review procurement plans through the end of the current fiscal year and place all planned orders as quickly as possible.

2. To the fullest extent possible within available funds, to speed construction of going public works projects and speed natural resource conservation and development, light construction, maintenance, repair, and other work which can be done or started quickly. New construction starts which have already been funded, but not yet begun, are to be started at the earliest practicable date.

3. To prepare an inventory of construction or other projects which could be accelerated or initiated quickly but for which additional funds might be required.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget will issue detailed instructions on reporting and other procedures. All reports should be submitted no later than February 25 for assembly and appraisal, and are in turn to be forwarded to me by March 1.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Although this order could have been more specific in its reference to new plants and processes, nevertheless when taken in conjunction with the President's language in section II(12) of the message which I have described, this marks a giant step forward in guaranteeing fair treatment to depressed areas in the allocation of Government installations and Government jobs.

I do feel, however, that the only way to insure permanence is to enact the bill which I have introduced and I hope that the House will consider this legislation promptly and favorably.

Civil or Criminal Jurisdiction of Cases Arising on Indian Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction of cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved, and to permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States. My bill is endorsed by the National Congress of American Indians, the Indians' own organization, and has particularly been requested by my own constituents, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

This bill would amend the act of August 15, 1953, 67 Stat. 588, commonly known as Public Law 280. Public Law 280 of the 83d Congress has had a disastrous effect upon portions of our Indian population because it provided for the assumption of State jurisdiction by unilateral action. The consent and concurrence of the Indian tribe involved is neither sought nor necessary under Public Law 280.

As an example of the effect of Public Law 280, let us examine the situation on the Omaha Reservation in Nebraska. Public Law 280 specifically provided that the State of Nebraska shall exercise full criminal jurisdiction over all Indian country within the State. Yet, the administration of the criminal laws of Nebraska is the responsibility of the county governments. The counties in which the Omaha Reservation is located refused to assume this jurisdiction. The Federal Government and the Omaha Tribe were deprived of jurisdiction by the act. A lawless area was created by act of Congress. Murdered men have lain in the street within the Omaha Reservation for over 24 hours before police have investigated the crime. This is an extreme but actual example of how Public Law 280 is operating today.

Less spectacular, but equally important, are the problems of juvenile delinquency and enforcement of traffic regulations on Indian reservations. Within my own State, Montana, there is serious question whether State courts have jurisdiction in juvenile proceedings involving minor Indian children. There is also doubt concerning the jurisdiction of the Montana State Highway Patrol over Indians driving on State and Federal highways within a reservation.

Public Law 280 gives the State the authority to assume jurisdiction with respect to criminal offenses and civil causes of action committed by Indians or arising in Indian country, at such time and in such manner as the State legislature may provide. It is unclear whether the assumption of jurisdiction is an all-or-nothing matter or whether it can be accomplished on a trial or on a gradual basis.

Many States, realizing the problems of assuming full jurisdiction over Indian reservations and uncertain of the legality of partial jurisdiction have refrained from exercising such important jurisdiction as that concerning protective services to Indian children, where some tribes and their local governments would reach an immediate agreement for State jurisdiction if plainly permitted.

My bill would permit piecemeal jurisdiction as the State and tribe concerned shall agree upon from time to time and as experience proves practical and planning may indicate to them advisable. Surely my colleagues in the House of Representatives will agree with me that this is not only a sound and practical approach, it is only the democratic approach.

Since the end of World War II, we have seen many former colonial areas become full-fledged independent nations, and the movement is continuing. In the General Assembly of the United Nations, there is much criticism of the so-called imperialistic powers. The United States of America cannot afford to be imperialistic—nor even imperious, as was Public Law 280, 83d Congress—in dealings with our Indian brothers. We ought not take unilateral action which affects them and the States within which they reside. It behooves the United States to take action affecting their reservations with their consent and concurrence. That is the purpose of my bill.

Downtown Brooklyn Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the proceedings in connection with the presentation of the 31st Annual Gold Medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association posthumously to Walter N. Rothschild, former president of Abraham & Straus:

POSTHUMOUS PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL TO WALTER N. ROTHSCHILD

(Introductory remarks of Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, and president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association; and an address by Richard B. Loomis, vice chairman

of the Gold Medal Committee of Award, and president of the South Brooklyn Savings Bank, on the occasion of the posthumous presentation of the 31st Annual Gold Medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association to Mr. Walter N. Rothschild, the late chairman of the board of Abraham & Straus, as well as the response of Mr. Walter N. Rothschild, Jr., who accepted the Gold Medal Award.)

Mr. Roscoe's introductory remarks are as follows:

"The late beloved Henry Joralemon Davenport, a founder of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, and its president for 20 years, made a priceless contribution for the betterment of our greater community.

"We will certainly miss his advice, counsel, and guidance, which was so highly respected by all. For many years, Mr. Davenport served as chairman of the Gold Medal Committee of Award. He served as chairman of this committee this year. Perhaps one of the last meetings over which Mr. Davenport presided was that of the Gold Medal Committee.

"Mr. Richard B. Loomis, a distinguished citizen of Brooklyn, and president of the South Brooklyn Savings Bank, has served as vice chairman of the Gold Medal Committee of Award for many years. I am honored to present Mr. Loomis, who will make the presentation of the Gold Medal of 1960."

The address of Mr. Richard B. Loomis is as follows:

"The Annual Gold Medal Award to one of Brooklyn's outstanding citizens has for many years been a most significant part of this meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association. It has in the past been a pleasant duty which this year is saddened by the sudden and untimely passing of the leader in so many Brooklyn affairs whose accomplishments we today honor posthumously.

"By this action the name of Walter Rothschild will take fitting place with the 30 previous recipients of this medal who constitute Brooklyn's legion of honor.

"At about the time Walter Rothschild's paternal grandfather, a resident of Alabama, was running the Union blockade with Confederate cotton, his maternal grandfather, Abraham Abraham, was starting a store in Brooklyn which has come to be known by us and throughout the world as Abraham & Straus.

"Into this heritage Walter Rothschild was born in New York City, and in this store in 1913, following graduation from Princeton, he started his business career. He worked in linens, blankets, and boys' clothing, and took time to found and become chairman of the Jewish Big Brothers of Brooklyn.

"After World War I, in which he served as a naval officer, the pace of his business career quickened and his interest in Brooklyn and in the welfare of people deepened.

"Time does not permit a full review of the widespread business, civic, and charitable affairs in which Walter Rothschild played an important part, but their scope may be appreciated from the following:

"In education he was a member of the graduate council of Princeton University, a trustee of Sarah Lawrence College, and chairman, merchants advisory council, New York University School of Retailing.

"In civic affairs he was a member of commission establishing University of State of New York, member of council of State University Medical Center, member of the Citizens Committee for Control of Crime in New York City, member of the finance committee of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, trustee of committee for economic development, director and member of important committees for this Downtown Brooklyn Association, and a member of Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission by appointment of President Eisenhower.

"In business he was president and chairman of the board of Abraham & Straus, which in his lifetime and under his leadership grew from 10 million transactions in 1913, to 12½ times that number; founder and chairman of the executive committee of the Federated Department Stores, Inc.; director and former chairman of the board of Associated Merchandising Corp.; director of Douglas Gibbons, Inc.; and a trustee of U.S. Trust Co.

"For his wartime services he was awarded the Medal of Freedom With Bronze Palm, the highest War Department civilian decoration for oversea service.

"In philanthropy he was chairman, fundraising, Brooklyn Red Cross; trustee and first chairman of citywide fundraising campaign, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; Brooklyn chairman, Greater New York Fund; president, the Animal Medical Center; National Citizens Committee, Community Chests of America; director, Welfare Council of New York; member of advisory committee and chairman of Brooklyn Special Gifts, Girl Scouts; Brooklyn Advisory Council, Boy Scouts; member of executive committee, USO; vice president of the National War Fund and New York City War Fund; director of War Prisoners Aid.

"The family of our late fellow member and eminent Brooklyn leader is represented here today by his son, Walter Rothschild, Jr. To them, through him, we present this gold medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association as an expression of the everlasting gratitude of this association and this community for the long and devoted services of Walter Rothschild, and this scroll which reads—

"The Downtown Brooklyn Association awards posthumously for the year 1960 the association's gold medal for most distinguished service for Brooklyn to Walter N. Rothschild in recognition of his long service and devotion to many humanitarian causes; his interest in and support of the business life, education, cultural and civic betterment of the community of Brooklyn, the city, the State, and the Nation.

"ANDREW S. ROSCOE,
"President.
"RICHARD B. LOOMIS,
"Chairman, Committee of Award."

The response of Walter N. Rothschild, Jr., upon receiving the posthumous gold medal awarded to his father is as follows:

"Mr. Loomis, Mr. Roscoe, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much for the honor you do my father today, and for the medal which symoblizes the act. As a member of both his physical and his business family, I am grateful for your thoughtfulness and for this recognition of his many endeavors for the borough.

"Dad would be proud of this honor, not because he liked medals or monuments—which he definitely did not—but because this medal represents the fact that the Downtown Brooklyn Association continues to strive for the furtherance of the same aims and goals that were behind it from the beginning, which, incidentally, was at the instigation of dad's father, Simon Rothschild.

"Brooklyn meant a great deal to my father. He went to school at Poly Prep, and many of his best and most enduring friendships dated back to those days. He spent 47 productive and fulfilling and happy years at 422 Fulton Street. For him, Brooklyn was a place of pleasant association and successful endeavor. His personal belief, as A. & S. bears massive testimony, was that Brooklyn and its institutions could grow and prosper. He believed that this city deserved the very best of people and effort, and given that, would give a first-class return on the investment. He believed very fundamentally that the future belongs to those who strike out with courage and boldness and that to stand still is to go backward. Finally, he felt that those who prosper in a community owe in return, a great obligation to that community.

"In this medal we have a tangible recognition of such beliefs and endeavors. It leaves with us the challenge of continuing this fine record of service and accomplishment. We must make certain that this medal continues to have recipients worthy of this high tradition."

DOWNTOWN BROOKLYN ASSOCIATION,
Brooklyn, N.Y., February 8, 1961.

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH,
Member of Congress of the United States, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The 31st Annual Gold Medal of the Downtown Brooklyn Association was posthumously presented to Walter N. Rothschild, former president of Abraham & Straus.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding the proceedings of the annual luncheon which was held at the Towers Hotel on Monday, January 30. I would greatly appreciate it if you would honor the Downtown Brooklyn Association by inserting the three addresses treating with the gold medal, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that this historic occasion will be permanently enrolled in the Library of Congress.

With great appreciation, I am,
Faithfully yours,
ANDREW S. ROSCOE,
President.

FEBRUARY 21, 1961.

Mr. ANDREW S. ROSCOE,
President,
Downtown Brooklyn Association,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR ANDY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 8, 1961, together with the enclosure.

I will be pleased to arrange to have the material inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the first opportunity.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
EUGENE J. KEOGH.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, because I want the Members to have the benefit of all the arguments on the proposal now pending before the Ways and Means Committee to extend unemployment compensation, I would like to include my newsletter of April 1959. Although this newsletter deals with setting Federal standards, it does have some bearing on the current proposal because there is a basic philosophy at issue—whether Federal standards or States rights to determine the kind of programs the people want, shall prevail. There is no quarrel with the unemployment compensation program as now constituted, but it is my conviction that no extension should be forced upon those States where workable programs are now in effect:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

APRIL 11, 1959.

The clash of traditional constitutional government of Federal-State prerogatives against ever increasing Federal centralization was never better demonstrated than in the

Unemployment Compensation Act of 1959, during public hearings which are now before the Ways and Means Committee. The proponents of the bill are attempting to prove the bill's stated findings that: (1) States are failing to carry out the purposes and objectives of employment stabilization and security against unemployment; (2) the benefit amounts paid aren't enough; (3) State programs vary, are not uniform in eligibility, amount and duration of benefits. Therefore, to strengthen the economy and provide for the general welfare of the Nation, it is necessary to impose Federal standards on the States. Witnesses testifying included economists, employment experts, business representatives (mostly opposed), and AFL–CIO spokesmen, culminating this week with Mr. George Meany, AFL–CIO president.

Present law continues the original intent of leaving jurisdiction in the States. State legislatures, therefore, have each developed their programs to solve their own unemployment. Employers of four or more pay a tax generally of 3 percent on each employee's first $3,000 of income. Federal Government requires States to pay in three-tenths of 1 percent of this for Federal administrative costs. States are permitted to charge whatever tax they choose to meet their needs, although all States must extend each employer a reduced tax rate commensurate with the stability of employment in his company. This is called experience rating. In 1958, the estimated average State tax was 1.4 percent; 5 States were paying 2.7 percent, while 12 States were paying less than 1 percent. Each State maintains its own reserve fund and can borrow without interest from the Federal Government. The States have $7 billion on hand for unemployment contingencies. The legislatures are representative of the people's wishes and the present law is the result of agreement of labor and management at the State level. The very flexibility of State law matches the varying economic patterns and needs of the Nation.

So it is a matter of grave concern to me that labor leaders now attempt to brand the States as failures in this field. Should they succeed in changing the law without providing their allegations with facts, this Nation will have sustained another body blow threatening the very freedom and solvency of every citizen. Consider these facts, in relation to imposing Federal standards: (1) The employer pays all the tax, the employee nothing; (2) we are told we must force the States to broaden eligibility, to increase benefits and duration, regardless of State experience; (3) increased taxes to business means higher costs, thus higher prices to consumers. Labor leaders, therefore, would be cutting everyone's buying power in imposing arbitrary increases; (4) increased taxes and costs to business could force more labor layoff and so more unemployment; (5) the unemployed drawing benefits are over 50 percent without dependents, including seasonal workers, and family members where others in the family work too—so it isn't the family head primarily being helped; (6) actually, we have gone beyond the area of temporary unemployment compensation and are treating welfare and relief on the one hand or the need for more jobs on the other; (7) the increased benefit wages are getting close to the worker's take-home pay; we are placing a premium on idleness and evasion of working, drawing benefits instead; (8) we are asked to forget the judgment of 7,613 State legislators; (9) the most heavily unionized areas, represented by the Detroit mayor and AFL–CIO leaders, are the ones most desiring Federal control. Having the greatest failure in providing jobs, these men plead most for unemployment compensation.

It seems it's time we tried to create new job opportunities locally—not be for Federal control and aid. Whether new jobs or relief are needed, it's certainly not a guaranteed annual wage for not working. Oddly enough, that seems to be the aim, intended or not. Labor leaders want Federal control—why? So they can straitjacket the Nation? To do what they've done to Michigan—a bankruptcy of economy and ideas? No matter how sincere their intentions, leaders of the 13½ million AFL–CIO workers cannot be allowed to run roughshod over the 67 million labor force—nor should labor leaders get by unquestioned as representatives of 13½ million workers.

I suggested to Mr. Meany that the unemployment compensation Federal standards would defeat his stated purposes to relieve unemployment and increase purchasing power; rather it would do the opposite. The real trouble—beyond the political power of labor leaders over Congressmen—is the Full Employment Act of 1946 which Mr. Meany admittedly likes. This act, through broad language, makes the Federal Government responsible for everyone working, this exceeds the constitutional prerogatives of Federal Government. It should be repealed.

The unemployment compensation debate proves again the failure of some to understand, even recognize, the blessings of the constitutional balance of power between State and Federal Government, and the dangers in destroying this balance.

Reserve Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee on Reserve Legislation, I am intensely interested in legislation which will increase the morale and thus the effectiveness of members of the services. I am equally interested in insuring that the services treat our Reserves as members of the team.

Every Member of Congress, as well as all citizens of this country, is determined that our Armed Forces will be kept at sufficient strength to deter another world war and will respond with force in situations like that facing us in Laos today. We are also interested in seeing that the morale of the members of the armed services is maintained at the highest level.

We fully realize that the maintenance of our armed strength will mean the outlay of tremendous sums of money. It seems to me that we have been inclined to be very liberal in appropriating money in order to furnish the necessary weapons and missiles necessary to be prepared to prevent a war but we sometimes become parsimonious in appropriations dealing with personnel.

In the last Congress my committee, after long and effective hearings, approved the Reserve Officer Incentive Act. As you know, this bill passed the House but was amended beyond recognition by the Senate in the very last days of the past session. At the present time, approximately 65 percent of the officers on active duty are Reserve officers. The services are having a difficult time in securing a larger percentage of our best qualified young Reserve officers to remain on extended active duty after completing their obligated tour of service.

The enactment of the Reserve Officer Incentive Act will do more to secure a larger percentage of better qualified officers to request retention on active duty than any other piece of legislation which can be enacted. It will also bring assurance to Reserve officers who have served many years on extended active duty that they will have a reasonable chance of completing their careers.

I am also introducing a new bill, known as H.R. 3364 in the last Congress, that will provide disability coverage for reservists traveling to and from training.

At the present time, two Reserve officers riding from a training session could be in an automobile accident. Due to the accident one of the reservists may be killed and the other disabled for life.

Under a provision of the Survivor Benefits Act, the family of the reservist who is killed receives the same benefits as the survivors of a member of the armed services on active duty. This, I think, is right and just.

However, the reservist who is disabled for life—and must support his family—would receive no disability compensation. This inequity should be corrected.

I am also introducing a bill that will permit the crediting, for the purpose of determining eligibility for retirement, certain service performed prior to attaining the established minimum age.

Due to a ruling of the Comptroller General in June 1960, an individual who volunteered and served on active duty while he was younger than the minimum age limit is permitted to count the time prior to attaining the minimum age for pay purposes but cannot count this time for retirement.

I am also introducing a bill to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem for expenses while traveling or away from home station. A bill I introduced in the last Congress—H.R. 3357—would have accomplished this. This bill is being reintroduced.

I am also introducing a bill to amend the Medicare Act, in order to provide that retired reservists will receive the same treatment for medical service as is accorded to Regular retired personnel. This medicare is to be furnished on space available basis, consequently, it places no extra burden on the service hospitals, nor does it increase the budgetary requirements for medical services in the Armed Forces.

When the Medicare Act was originally under consideration by the Congress the Senate version authorized this service to retired members of the Reserve. Unfortunately, in the conference a provision was added that this benefit was limited to a retired reservist who had completed 8 years of Federal active duty.

I am also introducing a bill to amend the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act, which would allow members

to make a more intelligent choice in deciding whether to participate in the program established by this act.

In addition to these bills which I have outlined, I am reintroducing several bills which were introduced by various Members of the Congress last year. These bills are:

First. H.R. 11318, recomputation of retired pay, by Mr. KILDAY, of Texas.

Second. H.R. 5195, a bill to amend the Economy Act, dealing with military personnel, by Mr. Foley, of Maryland.

Third. S. 733, a bill dealing with Navy ROTC, by Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina.

Fourth. H.R. 4601, a bill to amend the provisions of the Hiss Act, dealing with military personnel, by Mr. MURRAY, of Tennessee.

Fifth. H.R. 7529, a bill to forgive erroneous payments, by Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts.

Sixth. H.R. 7127, a bill dealing with the Coast Guard Women Reserve, by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan.

Needed: A New Bipartisanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Senator JAVITS, of New York, entitled "Needed: A New Bipartisanship," be printed in the RECORD.

This article was published in the January 23, 1961, edition of the New Republic, and should prove stimulating and interesting to Members of the Senate. Many of us have been considering carefully our role as members of a responsible minority, and this is, in part, Senator JAVITS' theme in an article well worth the time of every Member of Congress and the administration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A NEW BIPARTISANSHIP

(By JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York)

(NOTE.—The terms for a "coalition of liberals." Will the growing stresses within Democratic ranks recently discussed in the New Republic by Selig S. Harrison ("Needed: A New Bipartisanship?" October 14, 1960) sooner or later compel heavy reliance by the Kennedy administration on liberal Republicans in Congress? Sooner than one might suppose, says the senior Senator from New York. But to get GOP cooperation the administration must invite it "on the ground floor of program formulation in fields where it expects bipartisan support * * * before it invites support for the finished product." And civil rights legislation, he adds, is a "must for bipartisanship.")

Bipartisan success or partisan failure—this in my view may well be the blunt choice facing the new Kennedy-Johnson administration as it deals with Congress in the coming months. Will it prepare a strictly partisan program and then seek the bipartisan support needed for its enactment, or will it seek the ideas as well as the support of a liberal coalition? The answer to that question is of immense importance, for should partisan power plays be substituted for a bipartisan approach to key issues, the consequences could be disastrous to our position of peace leadership in the free world and to economic and social progress at home.

Those who see in the appointment of two distinguished Republicans to the Kennedy Cabinet—C. Douglas Dillion as Secretary of the Treasury and Robert S. McNamara as Secretary of Defense—decisive proof of the type of bipartisanship required may be mistaken. Members of the Cabinet operate departments and advise with the President, but the policy they administer is that of the Chief Executive. Whenever their ideas come into final conflict with those of the President, they must expect to be overruled. This alinement of responsibility is absolutely essential to preserve the proper role of the executive under our form of government.

The narrow margin of the Kennedy-Johnson victory and the pickup of additional Republican strength in both Houses normally would tend to intensify partisanship on both sides. When the difference between winning and losing the Presidency is the razor-thin margin of two-tenths of 1 percent of the major party vote, the desire to compile a distinctly Democratic or Republican record of achievement to place before the voters 2 and 4 years hence is very great. And although no one questions his lawful authority, Senator Kennedy by polling a fraction less than half the total popular vote starts his term without the innate advantage President Eisenhower had in his dealings with Congress in 1953 and 1957 immediately after smashing, personal victories at the polls. However, with a Democratic majority of 60 percent in the House and 65 percent in the Senate, the issue of divided government raised so often by Senator Kennedy in the campaign no longer exists. Instead, Senator Kennedy will have to contend with the very serious problem of a divided party with some powerful southern Members in Congress leading an ultraconservative coalition which may be in militant opposition to many measures on which he has pledged action.

The fact is that despite its numerical size, the Democrats really hold a fragile party majority. The Senate is divided into three parts—northern and western Democrats, 41; southern Democrats, 24; and Republicans, 35. To make a majority, considering normal absences, it takes a combination of two of these three elements, or a coalition of northern and western Democrats with some Republicans.

Most significant was the vote of January 11 on amending the Senate rules to end the power of the filibuster to defeat or emasculate legislation. Both 1960 party platforms pledged just such a rules change. However, the Democrats divided, 32 to 31, and the Republicans, 18 to 15, against modifying rule XXII. This division shows very clearly that the fate of legislation in this Congress may be very dependent on whether a conservative or liberal coalition prevails.

One analysis of the North-South Democratic split shows that in the Senate the majority of voting southern Democrats opposed the position of the majority of the voting northern and western Democrats on 40 percent of the 300 rollcalls during the 1960 session. The southern majority was on the winning side on about 1 out of every 3 of these votes, scoring 32 victories in the Senate and 7 in the House. It is no surprise to see Democratic Party unity in Congress disintegrate in a civil rights debate—the northern and southern wing split on 27 civil rights votes last year—but of special interest are the growing number of other major issues which are widening the gap between them.

Last session, a majority of southern Democrats in Congress compiled an eye-opening voting record in opposition to some vital measures.

Foreign policy: Such a majority in both Houses voted against the authorization and appropriation bills for the mutual security program, and for cutbacks; in the House, such a majority opposed U.S. participation in the vital International Development Association.

Depressed areas: In both Houses, voted against the $251 million bill later vetoed by the President.

Minimum wage: In both Houses, opposed raising the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour.

Aid to education: In both Houses, voted against Federal aid either for school construction or to raise teachers' salaries.

Housing: In the Senate, voted against authorizing new funds for public housing, and in the House opposed urban renewal and slum-clearance grants.

Medical care for the aged: In the Senate, voted against the Kennedy-Anderson bill based on social security backed by northern Democrats—and against the Republican voluntary plan to be financed out of general revenues—thus helping to defeat both plans.

WHAT NOT TO DO

Gaged by what happened during the "bobtailed" congressional session last August, the future for a liberal coalition is not auspicious. Returning as the Democratic candidates, Senators Kennedy and JOHNSON launched a campaign to pass a much heralded list of "gut" measures intended to be billed as Democratic accomplishments to the voters that fall. The effort ended in dismal failure for all but the ultraconservative coalition. Federal aid to education and the housing bill died in the House Rules Committee. Senator Kennedy did not get a compromise on the $1.25 minimum wage in conference and it died. Medical care for the great majority of aged was made a partisan issue and both approaches—Democratic and Republican—failed though the Republican approach was reflected in a new program for the medically indigent which could give help to as many as 1 million persons over 65.

The new administration cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the session last August, for if it does the result will be another rout of the liberals.

The August debate on medical care for the aged was a clear example of what not to do in 1961. Every Democrat was rallied to vote against the alternative plan of medical care for the aged sponsored by me and other liberal Republicans; it received 28 Republican votes and that was all. Then Senator Kennedy, who had refused to yield an inch, realized that he could not win over the Southern Democratic opposition to the "Social Security" medical care for the aged bill introduced by Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico and to which he was committed. He needed some liberal votes. So, just before the vote, he turned to the liberals on the Republican side of the aisle and asked for our support; he told us that a true liberal has to vote for a liberal measure regardless of defect, if it comes down to a choice of that bill or nothing at all for the time being. But liberal Republican views had been neither considered nor reflected in the Kennedy-supported bill. So, understandably, we were not a sympathetic audience. The one Republican vote that the bill backed by Senator Kennedy received had been announced as committed in advance of these remarks—he got no others—and his bill was defeated. The approach of the Democratic leadership in the August session on the medical care for the aged bill sacrificed bipartisanship and with it the opportunity for solid accomplishment at the time of benefit to a majority of the aged.

Nonetheless, it is my conviction that the urgent need for dynamic action to sustain

U.S. peace leadership is so widely recognized by many in both parties that it provides the essential basis for that kind of new bipartisanship discussed in the New Republic by Selig S. Harrison ("Needed—A New Bipartisanship?", October 14, 1960). Despite recent discouragements, I believe we can cooperate in a truly effective bipartisan coalition to enact the kind of measures which the much talked about ultraconservative coalition has successfully blocked in the past. But whether this actually happens depends very largely upon the attitude and policies of the new President and Vice President. If Senators Kennedy and JOHNSON learned the lessons apparent to many of us last August, they now must recognize that Republican and Democratic views have to be reflected in legislation before a bipartisan coalition can be expected to fight for it.

I can think of no areas in which a bipartisan coalition would prove more fruitful than in those considered the keys to U.S. peace leadership: policies on aid and trade to win the neutralist nations—and effective progress in obtaining equal opportunity and personal dignity for all without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin. A must measure in 1961 for Senate bipartisanship and the new administration is prompt Senate ratification of U.S. membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the most important effort in economic cooperation since the Marshall plan. Through the OECD, the leading industrial nations of Western Europe will be encouraged to invest more of their resources to spur economic progress in the newly developing, largely neutralist areas. The foreign aid responsibility, most of which we have had to carry for so long, will be more equitably distributed among free world governments with a greater likelihood that in size, scope, and nature it can prove more adequate to the task. Indeed, this development should provide a better climate in the Congress for getting increased funds and long-term financing for the Development Loan Fund.

Bipartisanship can make easier the discharge of other heavy responsibilities. U.S. partnership efforts with other nations in regional organizations such as NATO, SEATO, and the Organization of American States need to be implemented in more extensive cultural and educational programs in addition to broader economic policies. We need to support greater authority for the United Nations and greater opportunity for its agencies along the lines, for example, of a permanent U.N. police force. The armed forces of neutrals sent by the U.N. to border between Egypt and Israel and now to the Congo have proved how great is their need to help prevent conditions like those which have previously led to war. Long overdue is the contribution we can make to strengthening the rule of the law in the world through repeal of the Connally reservation to our membership on the International Court of Justice. Although this proposal for repeal always stirs up strong ultraconservative protest, I believe it can be passed by a bipartisan coalition if the Democratic leadership will stand firmly behind it.

In the field of civil rights under President Eisenhower, a Republican-Democratic coalition in Congress enacted at least some part of the administration's civil rights bills in 1957 and 1960. The first act was passed at the start of Eisenhower's second term which he won by a landslide of popular and electoral votes; the second was put through a few months prior to what most thought correctly would be a hotly contested presidential race. Now we are being led to believe that the Kennedy-Johnson administration will not put its weight behind the effort to seek new laws in the Congress more nearly to assure equal opportunity in education, jobs, housing, and other civil rights. We are advised to take into account the considerable impact that the segregation forces in the Democratic Party in Congress can have on a new Democratic administration anxious to put through its program—7 of the 12 chairmanships of major Senate committees are in the hands of southern Democrats. But neither our national nor world situation will allow any such self-delusion—that we can dispense with civil rights legislation at this time. The hard core of resistance in certain areas of the South to the implementation of the Constitution will not be ended by anything less than new laws passed by the Congress. Little Rock was a historic example of the use of the Federal Executive power resulting in the dispatch of troops to prevent interference with a court order to enforce public school desegregation. It was succeeded all too soon by New Orleans and the defiance of Federal law by the authorities of Louisiana.

THE REPUBLICANS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

The North-South schism in the Democratic Party may make this a hard problem for the new administration, but nonetheless new civil rights legislation is a must for the Nation and a must for bipartisanship. President-elect Kennedy ran on a civil rights plank built on many pledges requiring legislative implementation. For example, and I quote from this plank:

"Technical and financial assistance should be given to school districts facing special problems of transition [in desegregating].

"For this and for the protection of all other constitutional rights of Americans, the Attorney General should be empowered and directed to file civil injunction suits in Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil rights on grounds of race, creed, or color.

"The new Democratic administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission effectively to secure for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment.

"The new Democratic administration will broaden the scope and strengthen the powers of the present Commission on Civil Rights and make it permanent."

The Republican Party is bound to act legislatively on what is the strongest civil rights plank ever unanimously adopted by a major party. It pledges:

"Legislation to provide that the completion of six primary grades in a State-accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes.

"Legislation to authorize the Attorney General to bring actions for school desegregation in the name of the United States in appropriate cases, as when economic coercion or threat of physical harm is used to deter persons from going to court to establish their rights.

"Our continuing support of the President's proposal, to extend Federal aid and technical assistance to schools which in good faith attempt to desegregate.

"Continued support for legislation to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity to make permanent and to expand with legislative backing the work being performed by the President's Committee on Government Contracts.

"Opposition to the use of Federal funds for the construction of segregated community facilities."

Because there is no deep ideological division in the Republican Party on civil rights, but just the opposite—a historic identification with the struggle to advance civil rights—the Republicans' role on civil rights can prove decisive in the Congress. This issue is worthy of our best, as it may well go far to determine, in the eyes of the peoples of the newly developing nations, our Nation's moral fitness for world leadership.

The slow pace of desegregation, the overt resistance by State officials to Federal court orders, as in the tense New Orleans case, the challenge to the South of the sit-in movement, the disproportionate number of Negro workers who are hit hard, and hit first, when unemployment rises—these are but some of the compelling domestic reasons why the new administration must not tolerate a token battle for new civil rights legislation this session. At the very least, we must pass legislation to give the Attorney General power to institute suits in representative civil rights cases, including those over school desegregation; to give a statutory base to the Federal Committee on Government Contracts; to obtain equal job oportunities, at least among Government order contractors, and subcontractors, and affected trade unions; to provide technical and financial assistance for school districts seeking to desegregate, notwithstanding obstructionist efforts by their States; and to extend the life of the President's Civil Rights Commission. It is true that in the Senate most of these proposals fell before a Southern Democratic filibuster last year, allowing only a skeleton bill on voting rights to pass. But since then, 17 new nations in Africa alone, have come into existence, in a world where more than 1¼ billion people have skins that are black, yellow, or brown; what concerns us most about them, is that they shall trust in the sincerity of our efforts to help the world's colored races progress. Yet, they cannot be expected to respect fully our leadership until they are positive that we respect them. In this context, any partisan risks which are thought to be involved, should the new administration press for the passage of major civil rights legislation in 1961, must be subordinated to the overriding national interest in maintaining a firm policy of nondiscrimination and equal opportunity.

A BASIS FOR BIPARTISANSHIP

The motivation behind a move by Republicans into a bipartisan coalition must be clearly understood. Simply to limit ourselves to the role of opposition is not compatible with the objectives we want realized for the American people. Republicans of whom I speak do not believe in heavy Federal spending programs as necessarily a miraculous cure-all for economic ailments; but we do see for the Federal Government fulfillment of its legitimate role as a facilitator and cooperator with the private economy in the development of the country, the advancement of individual welfare and human rights, and in meeting our international responsibilities. From that philosophic springboard, such Republicans have developed and supported positive approaches to the critical problems of increasing productivity, housing, health, education, social security, unemployment compensation, civil rights, farm and national resource policies, and foreign policies essential to effective peace leadership. Republicans should continue to originate ideas and proposals in these fields. But since our primary purpose is to see our Republican Party a truly national party of service to the American people, we should welcome the opportunity to increase our contribution to the legislative result still further through effective bipartisan action when it is in order.

Republicans can take great pride in what they have helped to accomplish for this Nation through bipartisanship when they have been the minority as well as the majority in Congress. Senator Arthur Vandenberg led many of his colleagues out of an isolationist wilderness in the early 1940's as bipartisan support helped our country mobilize to wage the war and then the peace. His most signal achievement was congressional approval of the United Nations, reversing the verdict of the 1920's when the Senate rejected the League of Nations. Had the "do nothing" 80th Congress deserved its label, the Marshall plan would not have materialized. It became a reality because the Republican Congress did not sit on its hands and stamp it a partisan proposal. The momentum gained

from our first major economic and military aid venture has been sustained in the 8 Eisenhower years which saw the development of newly generated economic power in Western Europe.

The basis, the need, and the opportunity for bipartisanship in the coming 87th Congress is thus clearly established. The election results and the growing aggressiveness of the ultraconservatives combine to make liberal programs of the new administration vulnerable. But the sanctions for a coalition of liberals must come from President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON to be successful. The new administration would be wise to invite comment and cooperation from the Republicans interested in the bipartisanship I have described on the ground floor of program formulation in fields where it expects bipartisan support. This should be done before it invites such support for the finished product. Much of the greatness of our Nation resides in our ability in a time of crisis to help define our role of leadership by policy, precept, and precedent at home and abroad through bipartisanship wherever it can prove effective.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Aaron L. Gottesman, chaplain, Hudson County Institutions, Jersey City, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of wisdom and goodness, hear us, we beseech Thee, and bless the President of this beloved land, the Speaker of the House, and every Member of this legislative body. Give them long life, life of peace, life of happiness; above all, life which may prove to be a blessing to our country.

Help us face the tasks and responsibilities of this day with hope, courage, wisdom, and understanding. Kindle our hearts with the spark of Your divine love so that we may realize Your sacred will by being ever loyal to this land of the free and home of the brave.

Enlighten the minds of our leaders; unite and strengthen our Nation in freedom's cause.

Grant, O Lord, that these United States of America may forever serve as a beacon light for liberty-loving people the world over. May brotherhood, freedom, and peace fill our land—as the waters cover the sea.

All this we ask in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

BROTHERHOOD AND WNEW, A SYNONYM

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of the observance of National Brotherhood Week—a time of resolution and dedication to sustain the principles of brotherhood through the year. In 1934 it was proposed that the National Conference of Christians and Jews set aside a special period when people of all faiths in the United States would be invited to promote mutual understanding. National Brotherhood Week has since become the occasion for all Americans to reaffirm their belief that brotherly interest in each other is not only possible, but indeed necessary.

As we strive to secure for all people equal opportunity in housing, education, employment and every area of community life, laws alone are not sufficient. Changes of heart and mind can only come about through a process of basic education. Everything possible should be done to increase educational efforts to build respect for individual rights and respect for religious differences.

One of the outstanding radio stations of America—WNEW in New York City—has made a particularly valuable contribution in this extremely important field and should be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to point out to my colleagues in the House that station WNEW has again received the annual brotherhood award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It received the same award last year and becomes the only radio station ever to be so honored twice.

I heartily congratulate the station—especially Martin Weldon and Lee Hanna—producers and directors—for the production of their award-winning program—an excellent presentation of the issues involved in the proposed Metcalf-Baker bill to prohibit discrimination in housing in New York State. Obviously, discrimination is contrary to the basic tenets of the spirit of brotherhood. The highly desirable award by the National Conference of Christians and Jews was presented to WNEW in recognition of the station's gratifying public service in helping to clarify the issues involved in housing discrimination.

Station WNEW has taken an important lead in educating the listening public in this very sensitive area of human relations.

WKCR, 20 YEARS OF EDUCATIONAL RADIO

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, educational radio, especially as practiced by a select group of stations connected with college and university campuses across the Nation, has made a great contribution to our society. It is my hope that under the driving force of the new Kennedy administration, educational radio and television will become an even more potent force for good in the field of mass communication.

I am privileged to bring to your attention today, Mr. Speaker, the fact that one of the leading educational radio stations in the Nation is about to celebrate its 20th anniversary. I refer to WKCR, located on the campus of Columbia University, in New York City. WKCR deserves congratulations for a job well done—for pioneering in a field which has been overlooked by many of the country's most important institutions of higher education.

James F. Brymer, president of WKCR, has pointed out in a recent letter to alumni of Columbia and other friends of the radio station that the organization started on February 24, 1941, broadcasting to the college dormitories under the auspices of the Columbia University Radio Club. In 1942 the club produced the first experimental FM programs ever broadcast to New York. In 1956, WKCR-FM began operations on low power to the Morningside Heights area.

In 1959 the station received a Federal license to operate as an educational, noncommercial station for the New York metropolitan area, broadcasting on 89.9 megacycles. It has become one of the major educational radio stations in the United States, with effective radiated power output from its FM antenna of 4,200 watts and a primary broadcast range of 75 miles.

WKCR, through President Brymer, has announced that it will hold an open house at the station's seven studios, three control rooms, news room and record library located in Ferris Booth Hall on the Columbia University campus on Thursday, March 2, in commemoration of its 20th anniversary of broadcast activity.

Mr. Speaker, this station and others like it deserve the wholehearted support of the listening public. I am sure you join with me in congratulating WKCR on reaching this milestone in what should be a long history of service.

A HORSE-AND-BUGGY CONGRESS IN A JET AGE

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that I propose to discuss in the special order just granted the action of the Committee on Rules on yesterday of bottling up my resolution to authorize committees of the House to telecast and broadcast their public hearings. I shall call this address "A Horse-and-Buggy Congress in a Jet Age."

I would hope that those interested in the rules of the House would take part

in this discussion. I would hope that I might be able to persuade the Speaker that the House rules now permit committees in their discretion to authorize telecasting and broadcasting of their hearings.

There have been some suggestions that the Speaker is not in favor of telecasting either committee hearings or the proceedings in the House. But be that as it may I propose to develop at some length the rules of the House as they now exist and the reasons why I believe they need to be amended.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, as the President's educational proposals become the subject of hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, and as they move closer to the ultimate decision on the floor of the House, we can expect to hear, in ever-increasing volume, the arguments that Federal aid is unconstitutional. Some of the mail that I have received on this issue seems to take this notion so much for granted that they ask me, in effect, "Since everyone knows this bill is unconstitutional, how can you support it?"

Like other things that everyone knows, this question of the constitutionality of education legislation is at least open to rational discussion, as is the bill in general.

Walter Lippmann, who is by no means an advanced liberal, has written a customarily incisive column on this subject. Under unanimous consent, I include the column, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, in full at this point in my remarks:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Despite Senator GOLDWATER, who has just declared that Federal aid to education is unconstitutional, the practice of Federal aid is in fact older than the Constitution. As early as the land ordinance of 1785, the Confederation provided that the 16th section of each township, or one thirty-sixth of the acreage in the public land States, should be granted to the States by the National Government for the benefit of the common schools.

Ever since the Federal Union was established, it has been giving aid to education in a large variety of ways, and it is sheer deception to declare that what has always been done is unconstitutional.

While Federal aid has been given since the founding of the Nation, what has never been done has been to set up Federal control of education. It is indeed quite contrary to American principles and practices for the Federal Government to control what is taught in the public schools, how it is taught, and who teaches it. The control of education is reserved to the States, and no one engaged in the present discussion is proposing to tamper with that principle. The Kennedy program is unequivocal and scrupulous in reserving to the States the control of education.

Thus in the proposed contribution to public elementary and secondary schools, the Kennedy program leaves it to each State to decide whether the Federal contribution shall be used to build schools or to raise teachers' salaries. The loan program for college housing and for academic facilities is operated by local initiative. The 4-year program for scholarships is to be State administered.

Why then, with such careful respect for States rights, is it necessary to bring in the Federal Government at all? The answer is that the number of children and youths who have to be educated has outgrown the resources which can be raised in a very large number of the States. The American Nation can quite well afford to educate all its young at least at the level of the most advanced States, for example, California. It is nonsense to argue that the United States is too poor to educate its children. But it is not educating them properly, and almost certainly it cannot and will not do so if the whole task of raising the necessary funds is left to the 50 State legislatures and the local school districts.

Here is the essence of the Kennedy program. It has nothing to do with the control of education. It does not propose to have the Federal Government pay all the costs, supplanting the States and localities. It does propose to supplement State and local funds with a comparatively small contribution.

This supplementary support has become necessary because of the spectacular increase in the school population which began after World War II and seems certain to continue for the next 10 years. The cost of educating this growing number of children is rising and will continue to rise, according to the estimates of the highly reliable and conservative committee on economic development. Even if prices remain constant, even if educational standards are not raised, the costs per pupil will rise by almost half during the sixties. For teachers' salaries will have to rise in order to keep pace with earnings in other professions. A larger part of the pupils will be in high schools, where the cost per pupil is much higher than in the elementary schools.

As against this, State and local taxes are, as Beardsley Ruml put it, encountering stiffer resistance. As tax burdens become heavier, the reconciliation of opposing views about taxes becomes increasingly difficult. One reason for the slower growth of State and local revenues is the necessary reliance of those governments, especially the localities, upon the property tax. The smaller geographic units of government are forced to rely upon immobile tax bases which cannot move to other jurisdictions to escape taxation. Although the fiscal capacity of the States is not quite so limited as that of the localities, the political organization of many States does not permit adequate use of State financial resources to supplement the resources of the localities. Urban areas are underrepresented in the governments of most States. The rural-dominated legislatures will not enact the statewide taxes necessary to support the higher educational costs and aspirations of the urban areas.

It is entirely unrealistic politically, Ruml insisted, to expect to achieve a major breakthrough in American public education by operating one at a time upon the 45,000 school districts or even upon the 50 State legislatures.

In all of this we must not fall into the mistake of thinking that this is a proposal to tax the rich, and supposedly more public spirited States, for the benefit of the poorer and less energetic States. The truth is that the poorer States are on the whole making a greater effort to support their schools than are the richer States.

Thus there are 31 States with an income per schoolchild which is below the national average. Yet they are spending 3.6 percent of their personal income on schools whereas the 18 richer States spend only 2.75 percent. The richer States can afford better schools with less personal sacrifice.

In advocating a larger use of the Federal power to raise money for education, the administration is dealing not with some fancy theory but with the hard practical fiscal problems of the States and the localities. Those who oppose the program in principle have almost certainly not understood the problem.

ECONOMIC IMPACT ON ECONOMY

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is an abundance of discussion and activity these days directed toward the fostering of economic growth. Great emphasis is presently being placed on a number of temporary measures designed to have an immediate impact on the economy. Some of these measures, depending upon their substance when reaching the floor of the House, could very well merit support. It seems to me, however, that we can ill afford to continue avoiding coming to grips with our long-range economic woes. We can continue administering first aid to the economy from now until doomsday, but until the Federal Government takes the major preventive actions necessary we will never have a healthy patient.

I certainly believe the Federal Government has an important role to play in the maintenance of a sound and expanding economy. I would differ with those who maintain that this role is one of attempting to force growth through direct intervention in markets or through an improvident enlargement of the public sector of the economy. In fact, I think efforts of this type only serve to impede growth in the long run. I feel that the proper and effective role of Government is to provide an atmosphere conducive to growth. And one of the first moves the Government must make in carrying out this role is the revision of tax policies that act as barriers to full economic activity and renewed economic growth.

In keeping with this belief, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill providing small business concerns with a tax structure which will permit earnings to be plowed back into the business for growth, expansion and modernization. A healthy small business economy is an integral and vitally necessary segment of the total economic picture. If our economy is to expand in order to meet the needs and demands of a growing population, it is imperative that our small business institutions have the means to effect growth and expansion on a sound, constructive basis. Ours is the responsibility for providing these means.

This bill is not aimed at the present economic downturn. It is not an attempt to create immediate tax relief and

thereby stimulate consumer spending. The idea of permitting small and independent business to look to its own profits for a greater share of its needed growth capital was not born of a recession. For many years, and during all phases of the economic cycle, small business has had little access to public markets for capital and has paid a dear price because of the inability to plow its own earnings directly back into the business. That price has been reflected in increased mergers, in many small business failures, and in retarded small business growth and expansion.

This problem certainly has not suffered from a lack of recognition.

During the 83d Congress, House Report No. 1002 of the Select Committee on Small Business stated:

> The serious financial predicament of small business and the detrimental effect of current tax rates on the continued competitive status of the small firm cannot be too strongly emphasized. If small business is to play its part in our economy, it is essential that the tax structure be amended to provide a healthier climate for the growth of new and established small business. A solution of these problems is vital to a sound competitive economy.

It was my privilege to serve on the committee at that time, and to add my signature to that report.

In December 1955, a report of the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Economic Committee stated:

> Federal tax policy in the future should protect the competitive position of small and new businesses by providing adequate tax offsets to business risks and by gearing the structure of tax rates to any differential barriers to acquiring the financial resources required for their growth and development.

In August 1956, the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business stated in a report to the President:

> In the past quarter century an enormous increase has occurred in the burden of Federal taxation. The impact of this development has been especially severe on small businesses. Such concerns have little or no access to public markets for capital. If they are to grow, they must have the wherewithal to expand plant, equipment, and markets. But the heavy burden of taxes nowadays sharply reduces the ability of small enterprises to plow profits back into their businesses.

The House Ways and Means Committee stated in House Report No. 2198 of the 85th Congress:

> Your committee is convinced that one of the greatest problems confronting small- and medium-sized businesses is the acquisition of sufficient capital to modernize and maintain a rate of expansion experienced by their larger competitors. In this regard your committee is aware of the fact that small- and medium-sized businesses must rely to a very large extent upon retained earnings for modernization and expansion. Thus, there is a need to allow such businesses to retain more earnings after taxes to provide the funds necessary for growth.

The final report of the Select Committee on Small Business for the 86th Congress stated:

> It is widely recognized that a reexamination of the tax structure and its impact on business, particularly its impact on small business, should be undertaken as one of the very first steps to accomplish an acceleration of economic growth.

These passages speak for themselves. They are consistent and direct, and they convey a single message. An important, initial step in the acceleration of economic growth is a revision of the tax structure which will permit small and independent business to retain a greater portion of its earnings to provide the growth capital essential to modernization and expansion.

The question might well be asked at this point as to why nothing has been done in view of the seemingly general acceptance of the need to effect this type of tax reform. The lack of action appears to be due primarily to the feeling that budgetary limitations would render any tax reduction which could be granted under the reinvestment formula so small as to be insignificant.

If we look upon this type of tax reform as a mere surrender of Federal revenues, the advisability of which must always be considered in light of existing budgetary limitations, I doubt that we will ever see the day when the combination of our budgetary needs, our estimated revenues, and our towering national debt will afford justification for enactment of the reforms we so badly need.

I believe we must look upon this type of tax reform as an investment. The entire economy would benefit from the resultant encouragement of opportunity and expansion for small business. A generally broadened tax base would inevitably follow the resulting creation of new wealth through increased productivity and employment.

I urge that this program of tax adjustment for small business be given early and serious consideration.

Briefly, the purposes of this bill, as stated in section 1, are as follows:

> To provide for growth, expansion, and modernization for small and independent business enterprises engaged in trade or commerce;
>
> To permit individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small and independent businesses engaged in trade or commerce to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation; to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1961, and to increase the surtax exemption;
>
> To provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings for small and independent businesses engaged in trade or commerce;
>
> To liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans to small and independent business enterprises engaged in trade or commerce;
>
> To provide small and independent business an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate;
>
> To provide family-sized farmers and others engaged in argricultural pursuits an exemption for the improvement, modernization and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care, and marketing of farm products; and
>
> To provide family-sized farms, whether or not such farms are owned in fee or occupied by renters or tenants, an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care, and marketing of the products of such farms.

BACK-DOOR SPENDING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] just spoke about bottling up television broadcasting legislation in the Committee on Rules. I think something should be said of yesterday's action in bottling up in the Committee on Rules the resolution designed to end back-door spending. I am amazed that the Committee on Rules, after being packed as it was the other day for the alleged purpose of bringing out legislation, would refuse to send to the House floor a resolution which has the support of at least 130 Members of the House of Representatives, or more than one-quarter of the entire membership, and which would put an end to the business of bypassing the Appropriations Committee in the matter of spending.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman know the shoe is on the other foot now?

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, February 25, to file a report on the bill H.R. 4806, including any additional views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

NATURAL RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

From the beginning of civilization, every nation's basic wealth and progress has stemmed in large measure from its natural resources. This Nation has been, and is now, especially fortunate in the blessings we have inherited. Our entire society rests upon—and is dependent upon—our water, our land, our forests, and our minerals. How we use these resources influences our health, security, economy, and well-being.

But if we fail to chart a proper course of conservation and development—if we fail to use these blessings prudently—we will be in trouble within a short time. In the resource field, predictions of future use have been consistently understated. But even under conservative projections, we face a future of critical shortages and handicaps. By the year 2000, a U.S. population of 300 million—nearly doubled in 40 years—will need far greater supplies

of farm products, timber, water, minerals, fuels, energy, and opportunities for outdoor recreation. Present projections tell us that our water use will double in the next 20 years; that we are harvesting our supply of high-grade timber more rapidly than the development of new growth; that too much of our fertile topsoil is being washed away; that our minerals are being exhausted at increasing rates; and that the Nation's remaining undeveloped areas of great natural beauty are being rapidly preempted for other uses.

Wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever. Our country has been generous with us in this regard—and we cannot now ignore her needs for future development.

This is not a matter of concern for only one section of the country. All those who fish and hunt, who build industrial centers, who need electricity to light their homes and lighten their burdens, who require water for home, industrial, and recreational purposes—in short, every citizen in every State of the Union—all have a stake in a sound resources program under the progressive principles of national leadership first forged by Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt, and backed by the essential cooperation of State and local governments.

This statement is designed to bring together in one message the widely scattered resource policies of the Federal Government. In the past, these policies have overlapped and often conflicted. Funds were wasted on competing efforts. Widely differing standards were applied to measure the Federal contribution to similar projects. Funds and attention devoted to annual appropriations or immediate pressures diverted energies away from long-range planning for national economic growth. Fees and user charges wholly inconsistent with each other, with value received, and with public policy have been imposed at some Federal developments.

To coordinate all of these matters among the various agencies, I will shortly issue one or more Executive orders or directives:

(1) Redefining these responsibilities within the Executive Office and authorizing a strengthened Council of Economic Advisers to report to the President, the Congress, and the public on the status of resource programs in relation to national needs;

(2) Establishing, under the Council of Economic Advisers, a Presidential Advisory Committee on Natural Resources, representing the Federal agencies concerned in this area and seeking the advice of experts outside of Government; and

(3) Instructing the Budget Director, in consultation with the departments and agencies concerned, to formulate within the next 90 days general principles for the application of fees, permits, and other user charges at all types of Federal natural resource projects or areas; and to reevaluate current standards for appraising the feasibility of water resource projects.

In addition, to provide a coordinated framework for our research programs in this area, and to chart the course for the wisest and most efficient use of the research talent and facilities we possess, I shall ask the National Academy of Sciences to undertake a thorough and broadly based study and evaluation of the present state of research underlying the conservation, development, and use of natural resources; how they are formed, replenished, and may be substituted for; and giving particular attention to needs for basic research and to projects that will provide a better basis for natural resources planning and policy formulation. Pending the recommendations of the Academy, I have directed my science adviser and the Federal Council for Science and Technology to review ongoing Federal research activities in the field of natural resources and to determine ways to strengthen the total government research effort relating to natural resources.

I. WATER RESOURCES

Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency. We now use over 300 billion gallons of water a day, much of it wastefully. By 1980 we will need 600 billion gallons a day.

Our supply of water is not always consistent with our needs of time and place. Floods one day in one section may be countered in other days or in other sections by the severe water shortages which are now afflicting many eastern urban areas and particularly critical in the West. Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home, and industry. If all areas of the country are to enjoy a balanced growth, our Federal reclamation and other water resource programs will have to give increased attention to municipal and industrial water and power supplies as well as irrigation and land redemption; and I am so instructing the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Army.

1. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

A. We reject a "no new starts" policy. Such a policy denied the resource requirements and potential on which our economic growth hinges; and took a heavy toll in added costs and even human life and homes by postponing essential flood control projects. I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, working with appropriate department and agency heads, to schedule a progressive, orderly program of starting new projects to meet accumulated demands, taking into account the availability of funds, and implementing with the agencies concerned, wherever possible, the very excellent and timely report of the bipartisan Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources issued 3 weeks ago.

B. This administration accepts the goal urged by the Senate Select Committee to develop comprehensive river basin plans by 1970, in cooperation with the individual States. I urge the Congress to authorize the establishment of planning commissions for all major river basins where adequate coordinated plans are not already in existence. These commissions, on which will be represented the interested agencies at all levels of government, will be charged with the responsibility of preparing comprehensive basic development plans over the next several years.

C. A major reason for such planning is the ability to identify both the need and the location of future reservoir sites far in advance of construction. This advantage will be dissipated in great measure if the selected sites are not preserved—for uninhibited commercial and residential development in such areas increase ultimate acquisition costs and may result in pressures against the project required. I urge the Congress to enact legislation permitting the reservation of known future reservoir sites by the operating agency whenever such protection is necessary.

D. The full development of the power and other water resource potentials of the Columbia Basin is a vision that must be fulfilled. The Columbia River Joint Development Treaty with Canada is before the Senate for approval. I urge the Senate to approve this treaty at the earliest possible time, to permit an immediate start on the immense efforts that can be jointly undertaken in power production and river control in that basin.

E. This administration is committed to strengthening and speeding up our flood-control program as rapidly as our fiscal and technical capabilities permit. Unfortunately, efforts to reduce flood losses by constructing remedial works are being partially offset by rapid industrial and residential development of flood plain lands.

I am asking all Federal agencies concerned to provide data on flood hazards in specified areas to all 50 States, and to assist in their efforts for effective regulation or zoning of the flood plains. In addition, I have instructed the Federal agencies concerned with urban development—including the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Bureau of Public Roads—to coordinate their activities with the flood-control agencies to insure that their programs utilize flood information to advantage.

F. Complementing larger downstream reservoirs in the control of floodwaters are the small watershed projects which are an integral part of our soil and water conservation program, along with terracing, strip cropping, grass waterways and other erosion prevention measures. Nearly 300 million of our Nation's 460 million acres of farm croplands still need these basic practices for preserving our water and soil resources. I have asked the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with other interested Federal agencies, to review the basic objectives of our soil conservation and watershed management programs, and to make certain that any Federal assistance is directed toward realizing maximum benefits for the Nation as a whole. In addition, there

should be improved coordination of the various Federal and local activities in this field.

2. WATER AND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Pollution of our country's rivers and streams has—as a result of our rapid population and industrial growth and change—reached alarming proportions. To meet all needs—domestic, agricultural, industrial, recreational—we shall have to use and reuse the same water, maintaining quality as well as quantity. In many areas of the country we need new sources of supply—but in all areas we must protect the supplies we have.

Current corrective efforts are not adequate. This year a national total of $350 million will be spent from all sources on municipal waste treatment works. But $600 million of construction is required annually to keep pace with the growing rate of pollution. Industry is lagging far behind in its treatment of wastes.

For a more effective water pollution control program, I propose the following:

First, I urge enactment of legislation along the general lines of H.R. 4036 and S. 120 extending and increasing Federal financial assistance for the operation of State and interstate water pollution control agencies.

Second, I urge that this legislation increase the amount of Federal assistance to municipalities for construction of waste treatment facilities in order to stimulate water pollution construction in those cities with inadequate facilities.

Third, I urge that this legislation strengthen enforcement procedures to abate serious pollution situations of national significance.

Fourth, I propose an intensive and broadened research effort to determine the specific sources of water pollution and their adverse effects upon all water uses; the effects upon the health of people exposed to water pollution; and more effective means of preventing, controlling, or removing the contaminants—including radioactive matter—that now pollute our rivers and streams so that the water may be safely used.

Fifth, I propose the establishment of a special unit within the Public Health Service under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where control measures to prevent and limit pollution of our water will be developed.

Sixth, this same unit should provide new leadership, research and financial and technical assistance for the control of air pollution, a serious hazard to the health of our people that causes an estimated $7.5 billion annually in damage to vegetation, livestock, metals and other materials. We need an effective Federal air pollution control program now. For although the total supply of air is vast, the atmosphere over our growing metropolitan areas—where more than half the people live—has only limited capacity to dilute and disperse the contaminants now being increasingly discharged from homes, factories, vehicles, and many other sources.

3. SALINE AND BRACKISH WATER CONVERSION

No water resources program is of greater long-range importance—for relief not only of our shortages, but for arid nations the world over—than our efforts to find an effective and economical way to convert water from the world's greatest, cheapest natural resources—our oceans—into water fit for consumption in the home and by industry. Such a breakthrough would end bitter struggles between neighbors, states, and nations—and bring new hope for millions who live out their lives in dire shortage of usable water and all its physical and economical blessings, though living on the edge of a great body of water throughout that parched lifetime.

This administration is currently engaged in redoubled efforts to select the most promising approaches to economic desalinization of ocean and brackish waters, and then focus our energies more intensively on those approaches. At my request, a panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee has been working with the Secretary of the Interior to assure the most vigorous and effective research and development program possible in this field.

I now pledge that, when this know-how is achieved, it will immediately be made available to every nation in the world who wishes it, along with appropriate technical and other assistance for its use. Indeed the United States welcomes now the cooperation of all other nations who wish to join in this effort at present.

I urge the Congress to extend the current saline water conversion research program, and to increase the funds for its continuation to a level commensurate with the effort our current studies will show to be needed—now estimated to be at least twice the level previously requested.

II. ELECTRIC POWER

To keep pace with the growth of our economy and national defense requirements, expansion of this Nation's power facilities will require intensive effort by all segments of our power industry. Through 1980, according to present estimates of the Federal Power Commission, total installed capacity should triple if we are to meet our Nation's need for essential economic growth. Sustained heavy expansion by all power suppliers—public, cooperative, and private—is clearly needed.

The role of the Federal Government in supplying an important segment of this power is now long established and must continue. We will meet our responsibilities in this field.

Hydroelectric sites remaining in this country will be utilized and hydroelectric power will be incorporated in all multiple-purpose river projects where optimum economic use of the water justifies such action.

The Tennessee Valley Authority will continue to use the financing authority granted it by the last Congress to meet the power needs of the area it serves.

Our efforts to achieve economically competitive nuclear power before the end of this decade in areas where fossil fuel costs are high will be encouraged through basic research, engineering developments, and construction of various prototype and full-scale reactors by the Atomic Energy Commission in cooperation with industry.

In marketing Federal power this administration will be guided by the following basic principles, which recognize the prior rights of the general public, consumer, and taxpayer, who have financed the development of these great national assets originally vested in them:

(1) Preference in power sales shall be given public agencies and cooperatives.

(2) Domestic and rural consumers shall have priority over other consumers in the disposal of power.

(3) Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles.

(4) Power disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization.

Finally, I have directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop plans for the early interconnection of areas served by that Department's marketing agencies with adequate common carrier transmission lines; to plan for further national cooperative pooling of electric power, both public and private; and to enlarge such pooling as now exists.

III. FORESTS

Our forest lands present the sharpest challenge to our foresight. Trees planted today will not reach the minimum sizes needed for lumber until the year 2000. Most projections of future timber requirements predict a doubling of current consumption within 40 years. At present cutting rates, we are using up our old-growth timber in western stands. Because of the time requirements involved, we must move now to meet anticipated future needs and improve the productivity of our nearly 500 million acres of commercial forest land.

Unfortunately, the condition of our forest land area is substantially below par: 45 million acres are in need of reforestation; more than 150 million acres require thinnings, release cuttings, and other timber-stand improvement measures if growth rates are to be increased and quality timber produced; forest protection must be extended to areas now poorly protected. Losses in growth from insects and disease need to be reduced substantially by wider application of known detection and control measures.

(A) I urge the Congress to accelerate forest development on Federal public lands both as a long-term investment measure and as an immediate method of relieving unemployment in distressed areas.

(B) To make additional supplies of merchantable timber available to small businesses, I have directed the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to accelerate the program of building approved access roads to public forests.

(C) A more difficult and unresolved forest situation lies in that half of our forest land held in small private ownerships. These lands, currently far below their productive potential, must be managed to produce a larger share of our future timber needs. Current forest-owner assistance programs have proven

inadequate. I am therefore directing the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, to develop a program to help small independent timber owners and processors attain better forest management standards and more efficient production and utilization of forest crops.

IV. PUBLIC LANDS

The Federal Government owns nearly 770 million acres of public land, much of it devoted to a variety of essential uses. But equally important are the vacant, unappropriated and unreserved public domain lands, amounting to some 477 million acres—a vital national reserve that should be devoted to productive use now and maintained for future generations.

Much of this public domain suffers from uncontrolled use and a lack of proper management. More than 100 million acres of our Federal grazing districts are producing livestock forage well below their potential. We can no longer afford to sit by while our public domain assets so deteriorate.

I am, therefore, directing the Secretary of the Interior to (1) accelerate an inventory and evaluation of the Nation's public domain holdings to serve as a foundation for improved resource management; (2) develop a program of balanced usage designed to reconcile the conflicting uses—grazing, forestry, recreation, wildlife, urban development, and minerals; and, (3) accelerate the installation of soil-conserving and water-saving works and practices to reduce erosion and improve forage capacity; and to proceed with the revegetation of rangelands on which the forage capacity has been badly depleted or destroyed.

V. OCEAN RESOURCES

The sea around us represents one of our most important but least understood and almost wholly undeveloped areas for extending our resource base. Continental Shelves bordering the United States contain roughly 20 percent of our remaining reserves of crude oil and natural gas. The ocean floor contains large and valuable deposits of cobalt, copper, nickel, and manganese. Ocean waters themselves contain a wide variety of dissolved salts and minerals.

Salt (and fresh water) fisheries are among our most important but far from fully developed reservoirs of protein foods. At present levels of use, this country alone will need an additional 3 billion pounds of fish and shellfish annually by 1980, and many other countries with large-scale protein deficiency can be greatly helped by more extensive use of marine foodstuffs. But all this will require increased efforts, under Federal leadership, for rehabilitation of depleted stocks of salmon and sardines in the Pacific, ground fish and oysters in the Atlantic, lake trout and other desirable species in the Great Lakes, and many others through biological research, development of methods for passing fish over dams, and control of pollution.

This administration intends to give concerted attention to our whole national effort in the basic and applied research of oceanography. Construction of ship and shore facilities for ocean research and survey, the development of new instruments for charting the seas and gathering data, and the training of new scientific manpower will require the coordinated efforts of many Federal agencies. It is my intention to send to the Congress for its information and use in considering the 1962 budget, a national program for oceanography, setting forth the responsibilities and requirements of all participating Government agencies.

VI. RECREATION

America's health, morale, and culture have long benefited from our national parks and forests, and our fish and wildlife opportunities. Yet these facilities and resources are not now adequate to meet the needs of a fast-growing, more mobile population—and the millions of visitor days which are now spent in federally owned parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and water reservoirs will triple well before the end of this century.

To meet the Federal Government's appropriate share of the responsibility for fulfilling these needs, the following steps are essential:

(A) To protect our remaining wilderness areas, I urge the Congress to enact a wilderness protection bill along the general lines of S. 174.

(B) To improve both the quality and quantity of public recreational opportunities, I urge the Congress to enact legislation leading to the establishment of seashore and shoreline areas such as Cape Cod, Padre Island, and Point Reyes for the use and enjoyment of the public. Unnecessary delay in acquiring these shores so vital to an adequate public recreation system results in tremendously increased costs.

(C) For similar reasons, I am instructing the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and other appropriate Federal, State, and local officials and private leaders to formulate a comprehensive Federal recreational lands program; conduct a survey to determine where additional national parks, forests, and seashore areas should be proposed; take steps to insure that land acquired for the construction of federally financed reservoirs is sufficient to permit future development for recreational purposes; and establish a long-range program for planning and providing adequate open spaces for recreational facilities in urban areas.

I am also hopeful that consistent and coordinated Federal leadership can expand our fish and wildlife opportunities without the present conflicts of agencies and interests: One department paying to have wetlands drained for agricultural purposes while another is purchasing such lands for wildlife or waterfowl refuges—one agency encouraging chemical pesticides that may harm the songbirds and game birds whose preservation is encouraged by another agency—conflicts between private landowners and sportsmen—uncertain responsibility for the watershed and anti-pollution programs that are vital to our fish and wildlife opportunities.

I am directing the Secretary of the Interior to take the lead, with other Federal and State officials, to end these conflicts and develop a long-range wildlife conservation program—and to accelerate the acquisition of upper Midwest wetlands through the sale of Federal duck stamps.

CONCLUSION

Problems of immediacy always have the advantage of attracting notice—those that lie in the future fare poorly in the competition for attention and money. It is not a task which should or can be done by the Federal Government alone. Only through the fullest participation and cooperation of State and local governments and private industry can it be done wisely and effectively. We cannot, however, delude ourselves—we must understand our resources problems, and we must face up to them now. The task is large, but it will be done.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 23, 1961.*

JOINT COMMITTEE TO COMMEMORATE THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 155 creating a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of Abraham Lincoln.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas Saturday, March 4, 1961, will mark the centenary of Abraham Lincoln's taking the oath of office as sixteenth President of the United States; and

Whereas the anniversary will be widely observed and noted throughout this land and overseas; and

Whereas the occasion will coincide with exercises commemorative of the American Civil War of 1861–1865; and

Whereas Mr. Lincoln stood at the head of the Government of the United States and its Armed Forces during those years of tragedy and travail; and

Whereas he foresaw the difficulty of the task before him as "greater than that which rested on Washington"; and

Whereas he sought the guidance of Almighty God, saying, "Without the assistance of that Divine Being * * * I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail."; and

Whereas one who stood in the audience at his first inauguration would later write, "the shouts which have resounded for him at the Capitol are still ringing in my ears."; and

Whereas from a wooden platform, projected from the eastern portico, beneath an unfinished dome, he pleaded and reasoned that day for reconciliation and the preservation of the Union, saying:

"I take the official oath today, with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws, by any hypercritical rules. * * * I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. * * * It is safe to say that no government proper, ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. * * * Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric,

with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from, have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to, are greater than all the real ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? * * * Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. * * * We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic cords of memory, stretching from every battlefield, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."; and

Whereas the better angels do, in fact, touch us: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on Saturday, March 4 next, the one hundredth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration shall be commemorated by a joint session of the Congress and/or such other observance as may be determined by the committee on arrangements in cooperation with the national Civil War Centennial Commission, the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District of Columbia, and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia.

Immediately upon passage of this resolution, the President of the Senate shall appoint four Members of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall appoint four Members of the House of Representatives jointly to constitute a committee on arrangements.

Immediately upon passage of this resolution and after the Members of the Senate and House have been appointed, the Speaker shall direct the committee on arrangements to meet and select a chairman from one of their own group and such other officers as will be appropriate and needed who will immediately proceed to plan, in cooperation with the national Civil War Centennial Commission, the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District of Columbia and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, an appropriate ceremony, issue invitations to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Secretaries of departments, heads of independent agencies, offices, and commissions, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, the diplomatic corps, assistant heads of departments, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, members of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, centennial commissions from the various States, Civil War roundtables, State and local historical and patriotic societies, and such other students and scholars in the field of history as may have a special interest in the occasion, organize a reenactment of Mr. Lincoln's first inauguration on the eastern portico of the Capitol, select a speaker and other participants, prepare and publish a program and submit a report not later than June 1, 1961.

For the purpose of this observance, the Architect of the Capitol is directed to retain the speakers platform and radio and television stand erected for the inauguration of President Kennedy and such other facilities as may be required.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have some explanation of this resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use, at the conclusion of which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution indicates, House Joint Resolution 155 provides for the appointment of a joint committee of the House and the other body to make arrangements for such observance of the 100th anniversary of the first inauguration of President Abraham Lincoln as may be deemed appropriate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What will this cost?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I am glad to answer that question. House Joint Resolution 155 provides no authority for the expenditure of any funds. In the discussion in the Committee on Rules it was thought that any cost that might come from the printing of invitations or programs would be met by the committees referred to in the resolution, which already has funds.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how much has already been spent by the Lincoln Centennial Commission?

Mr. THORNBERRY. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. That was not inquired into when the matter was before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. THORNBERRY. No, sir; because this has no relation to that. The discussion was confined to simple arrangements for the observance of this 100th anniversary.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman does not anticipate this is going to cost any additional money beyond what has already been appropriated?

Mr. THORNBERRY. That was the sense of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I want it clearly understood that the gentleman from West Virginia has no objection whatever to extending to President Lincoln the courtesy that was extended to General Washington. The point I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, is this. Are we setting up another gala day demonstration such as we had this week, when there were put on in the city of Washington special sales? It is a travesty on what we are trying to do to honor George Washington. Are we going to set up another occasion of that kind?

Mr. THORNBERRY. If I may answer the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], certainly that is not contemplated in this resolution. In other words, we are simply making arrangements to observe the 100th anniversary of the inauguration of President Abraham Lincoln. We have no control over the merchants of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Congress should exercise some control over that and declare a holiday and make it such.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question raised by the gentleman from Iowa, I should like to say that probably the expense item in connection with this will be less than the amount of money this Congress spent for the joint session held on the occasion of Lincoln's 150th anniversary when the distinguished historian and poet, Carl Sandburg, presented such an eloquent address on the life and influence of our 16th President. At that time the House Administration Committee took the responsibility of accepting the suggestions of the Joint Committee and printed the invitations and the programs which were rather elaborate but I think very appropriate. If I should be fortunate enough, as the author of the bill, to be named as a member of the committee, I will assure the Members of the House that the program in this instance will be much more conservative because we would probably attempt to duplicate what they had 100 years ago in which case it would probably not be as expensive. In any case, I should like to assure the House that it is my belief the committee would not be unreasonable in this regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since today is the centennial of the arrival of the President-elect in Washington, it might be appropriate to point out that in the afternoon of his arrival he had an appropriate reception for Members of Congress at the White House. I feel confident that the shade of Lincoln will be grateful for the reception given him by this House today.

It may also be of interest to know that this was a busy day for him. Having arrived at 6 a.m. he immediately began to accept the heavy schedule that had been planned for him which included a call upon President Buchanan at the White House where he met the members of his Cabinet. Then he had a conference with Montgomery Blair who was to become Postmaster General; sat for a picture in the studios of Mathew B. Brady, 352 Pennsylvania Avenue; received the Illinois delegation led by his former opponent for the U.S. Senate, Stephen A. Douglas; and had dinner with the Sewards, his opponent for the nomination and later to become his Secretary of State. Following that he returned to the Willard where he met many of his friends, the delegates to the peace conference meeting held in Washington, and a delegation from Vermont, attended the reception for the Congress and received Buchanan's Cabinet later in the evening.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is one of several resolutions that have been reported in the last week by the House Committee on Rules. It just happened that while I was named as a member of the subcommittee that looked into this particular request I was not available upon the particular day it was

considered; but I did approve the action taken by the other members of the committee. This particular resolution has the approval, I understand, of the leadership on both sides of the House. There is no objection to this resolution.

However, Mr. Speaker, this was only one of a number of resolutions acted upon by the Committee on Rules since Tuesday. Tuesday, of course, was the first day that the full committee was able to meet, because it was not until just shortly before the meeting of the committee, that the Republican members of the Committee on Rules were selected. We did not have the opportunity to select the members any earlier, because we did not know what size the Committee on Rules was going to be. We will, therefore, have a number of resolutions coming up in the committee. Because of the fact that the new Committee on Rules, as now constituted, has just begun its labors, I owe it to the House, as the ranking member of the committee, to report upon our activities.

We reported the resolutions that we will consider today but we failed to report other resolutions.

You may recall that about 2 weeks ago we had quite a controversy here on the floor of the House as to a certain resolution which dealt with the makeup or the membership of the Committee on Rules. Prior to the vote, and over a considerable period of time, there were many charges made against the Committee on Rules as then constituted, a few of which were true and a great many of which were false. These charges were given as the reason why it was necessary to expand the size of the Committee on Rules. Some people expressed in the press and other places in America that to pack the Committee on Rules by the addition of other members was the only way that Congress could work its will.

I have been a member of the Committee on Rules for the past 18 years. Of course, I rather sweat a bit under the charges and allegations that the Committee on Rules has been blocking the consideration of important legislation. The claim was made that the reason for the drafting of that particular resolution, and the need for expanding or enlarging or packing the Committee on Rules, whichever language you prefer, was that the House might be able to consider all important legislation. It was argued that the Committee on Rules, as previously constituted, had been blocking the consideration of important legislation. It just so happens that every single measure, as I pointed out in the debate on that particular resolution, presented by the administration and designated as must legislation now reached the floor of the House and was acted upon. No action was taken by the Committee on Rules to block consideration of that legislation.

Now, I am of a kindly nature and I try to get along with everyone. It hurts me inside to be accused of things that I do not do, or of being an obstructionist. Some of the radical press and some of our colleagues here on the floor of the House charge that I was a member of an obstructionist group. I pointed out, of course, that I had coalesced from time to time with different members of the committee on different matters. Sometimes with those of the so-called liberal bloc, sometimes with those members of the so-called conservative bloc.

Then, to my amazement, once the resolution was passed and the newly constituted Rules Committee was able to meet in full force on Tuesday last and again yesterday and today, it was not the Republican minority, it was not the so-called members of the supposedly existing coalition, which never did quite exist, that turned out to be the obstructionists, but others. Let us examine what has happened.

We had two resolutions to consider, on which there has been demonstrated a great interest, not only by the Members of the House but by the general public as well. One of the resolutions, as the gentleman from Michigan just mentioned a moment ago, had to do with amending the rules so as to permit the televising of committee sessions in the House, provided the committee desired its session to be televised. We did not have the question before us, and I am rather glad that we did not, of televising the House proceedings because, if we started to televise the House proceedings there might be quite a number of untimely deaths take place in this great body as the result of Members rushing to get in front of the camera, and we certainly did not want that. So we did not even discuss this possibility, but only the matter of televising the committee hearings. We supported that resolution because we thought, inasmuch as a new day has dawned and the House was going to be permitted to work its will, the American public and the voters of this country should be given an opportunity to see how their business was transacted, especially in committees.

Lo and behold, to my great surprise, the "new coalition" in the Committee on Rules of the House voted 8 to 6 against permitting the televising of committee proceedings. I regret this very much, because I think it would be a wonderful thing if we could have the television cameras in the Committee on Rules so the public could see who it is and what group it may be that is obstructing legislation, and that is now standing in the way of the great House of Representatives and preventing the House from working its will on important legislation. We had another very important resolution to consider that sought to amend the rules. That particular resolution had been introduced by many Members of this House. We had all sorts of testimony in support of the resolution. I do not recall that any Member appeared to testify in opposition. This was the resolution that would amend the rules so as to bring an end to the "back-door spending" and the back-door approach to the Treasury. It would reinstate and reestablish that constitutional idea—I know it is outmoded but nevertheless it is still in the book—and comply with the constitutional provision that all appropriations should originate in the House of Representatives. Then, to my amazement, when this resolution was presented, there developed another group of obstructionists—some eight members of our great committee. I am very proud to point out that none of us who are in the minority party voted against this worthwhile resolution. But somehow or other, this particular resolution was killed so that the American people will not have an opportunity, through the actions of the House of Representatives and its Committee on Appropriations, nor will the Appropriations Committee have an opportunity to consider each year or each 2 years, as the case may be, the questions of whether or not funds belonging to the people, tax money, should be appropriated for certain activities. We cannot even discuss here on the floor whether this practice should be permitted to continue, that allows the favored few to go to the back door of the Treasury and say, "I would like to have so much, please, and hand it out"—and receive these funds without the knowledge of the Congress or of the American people. So I am just hoping that my good friends, and I hope I still have a few friends left in the House, who charged the old Committee on Rules, including myself, with being obstructionists, in view of these recent enlightening days, and in view of what has taken place and these revelations that have come about this week that they will—I do not ask them to apologize because that would be asking too much, but if they would just see me privately and say, "Well, I am sorry we referred to you fellows as being obstructionists, after all, we have just been learning in the last few days what 'obstructionists' really means and how best to obstruct those measures that we do not agree with, and that we do not want the House to work its will on in the future." Now we have seen this new situation arise, and I hope you will forgive me for calling it to the attention of this great deliberative body, but I think I should warn you here and now there is every evidence that the House of Representatives is not going to be permitted to work its will as often and on as many measures as it would like. You will recall it had been held out as a goal to be accomplished and a result to come, if you just voted for that particular resolution to expand or to pack, or whatever you may want to call it, the Committee on Rules would allow the House to consider these important matters. You may be interested in watching the vote in the Committee on Rules from now on because I think there are going to be more rollcalls than before. That would be my prediction but, of course, being in the minority, I do not know what is going to happen from day to day, but sometimes I have a suspicion. I suggest, however, it might be wise to watch the rollcalls; they should be interesting. I hope that somehow we can get permission to televise the meetings of the Committee on Rules so that the American public can know who obstructs and who are the obstructionists and who are not, in this day of modern legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that the addition of a few more members to the Rules Committee would stop this obstruction that is being practiced now?

Mr. BROWN. I can only say this in answer to the gentleman, that seemingly, since we have already enlarged the committee, there has been more obstruction in a short time than in any like period in the history of the committee.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Is it not true that on one of these resolutions 25 percent of the membership of the House had requested that they have an opportunity to work their will on it?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. There were more than 25 Members of the House——

Mr. PELLY. Twenty-five percent of the Members.

Mr. BROWN. Twenty-five percent of the Members. More than one hundred Members of the House had expressed their support either by the introduction of similar bills, or otherwise, on the resolution to bring an end to the "back-door spending" arrangement—getting public funds out of the Treasury of the United States without direct appropriation. That does not seem to matter, however. It is just evidence that the House would like to work its will. But, lo and behold, suddenly we find that the House cannot work its will. It is my belief and therefore my responsibility to call to the attention of the full House this later development in legislative legerdemain.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, quickly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know you are always quick with me.

Mr. BROWN. There is a reason. You are too clever.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand the gentleman to say that the House rules prevented televising of committee hearings. Where is that rule? Will the gentleman give me a reference to that?

Mr. BROWN. I do not say it prevented it. I said they wanted to amend the rules to make permissible the right of the committee to have the hearings televised.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you know of any rule preventing the committee televising its hearings?

Mr. BROWN. I am beginning to wonder if I know anything about the rules of the House any more.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if I had known the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was going to feel so disturbed about the resolution increasing the membership of the Rules Committee from 12 to 15, because of personal friendship that I have for him, I might have tried to do something to prevent the disturbance that exists in his mind. All that we did was to make the Rules Committee consistent with democratic institutions of government.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I hope that before the gentleman concludes he will at least express the opinion that the gentleman from Ohio has not always been an obstructionist, and especially so this week. I would agree with the gentleman that we believe in democratic institutions.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would be inclined to say that the gentleman from Ohio, as long as he has raised the question and used the words "not being an obstructionist" this week, has had a different motive in mind. I would say the gentleman has not recovered from the Rules Committee fight, and knowing the gentleman's character to be a good loser, he has adopted a somewhat different attitude.

The gentleman from Ohio is not fooling anyone. If the gentleman thinks he is, I may say there are some people here who have a little intelligence. The amazing thing is that all these resolutions were suddenly put down on the agenda of the Rules Committee without anybody being consulted. The committee had a perfect right to do that, but we are capable of evaluating such action and interpreting the state of mind of some of the members of the Rules Committee.

The gentleman from Ohio talks about having the House work its will. These rules were before the Rules Committee as a standing committee; they were not bills reported out of a standing committee with a request to the Rules Committee for a rule to bring them before the House, bills that had been considered by a standing committee. So when the gentleman's committee was considering these resolutions to amend the rules of the House, the committee was sitting as a committee that had original jurisdiction over the question; and, of course, the situation exists there that exists in any standing committee. Hundreds of bills, yes, thousands of bills, are referred to our standing committees, but never reported out of committee. The members of the committee vote upon a particular bill as it comes up in executive session.

So the situation on these resolutions is entirely different than it was, for example, in the case of the school construction bill last year. That bill passed the House, passed the Senate, but it could not go to conference because there was one objection, and we could not get a resolution out of the Rules Committee to permit that bill to be sent to conference.

I suggest to my friend, who is really a wonderful fellow, that in this instance, he apparently has not entirely lived up to his reputation of being a good loser.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my good friend, the majority leader, that while I have some suspicions in my mind as to the motive behind the thought he just uttered, I will not question his motives; instead, I would just like to point out two things for the edification and education of the House, if possible. Many resolutions that come before our committee are reported out unanimously by the whole committee, including the new eight. I was around the Capitol every day; I was up in the Rules Committee every day. I do not know that we had the question of sending this so-called construction bill to conference before the Rules Committee. The committee had previously reported it out, and I do not recall the gentleman ever mentioning it to me. If he did, it has entirely slipped my memory. I never recall any time that our great majority leader even mentioned it to me as a member of the committee. Of course, the gentleman had no responsibility to consult minority members, but sometimes a person is surprised, he may find help in case of need. He never made any suggestion to me that he was interested in having a rule reported to send that bill to conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I certainly will.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman saying that I, as majority leader, should ask my friend, a Republican member of the Rules Committee, to do something without going through his leadership?

Mr. BROWN. I have never known the gentleman to be very reluctant. Perhaps not as leader, but as a personal friend.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that an invitation?

Mr. BROWN. He might have let me know what his thoughts were.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that an invitation?

Mr. BROWN. It is an invitation.

Mr. McCORMACK. If it is an invitation, will the gentleman comply with my requests?

Mr. BROWN. It is according to what the request is, because it is always so uncertain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman ever conceive where he would comply with my request were I to go before the Rules Committee?

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman will go, I am sure, because he is very fair and very honest and nonpartisan. I am sure the gentleman will agree that he has appeared before the Rules Committee on numerous occasions in the past and has always received the most kindly treatment at the hands of the Rules Committee, including the minority members. I can assure the gentleman that he will have the same kind of treatment in the future, not only because of the high respect we have for the position he holds but also because of our high regard for him personally.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly subscribe to the statement of my friend as to the courteous reception I have had by the minority members, but they are

not always with the Democratic leadership when the vote comes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 5, delete the following words: "a joint session of the Congress and/or".
Page 3, line 6, delete the word "other".
Page 5, delete lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 92 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may make investigations and studies as required in connection with bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to it and, more specifically or in addition thereto, in connection with the following matters within its jurisdiction:

(1) (a) The status, progress, and administration of irrigation, reclamation, and other water resources development programs of the Department of the Interior and of other agencies insofar as the latter affect the work of the Department of the Interior with respect to such programs, including (i) policies and procedures relating to such programs, (ii) projects previously authorized, (iii) projects proposed for authorization and construction (including but not limited to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, the Savery-Pot Hook project in Colorado and Wyoming, the Burns Creek project in Idaho, the San Juan-Chama project and the Navajo Indian irrigation project in New Mexico, the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota, the Mid-State project in Nebraska, the Mann Creek project in Idaho, the Baker project in Oregon, and the Crater-Long Lakes project in Alaska), and (iv) developments under the Small Reclamation Projects Act and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act; (b) compacts relating to the apportionment of interstate waters; (c) the application to Federal agencies and activities of State laws covering the control, appropriation, and distribution of water; and (d) the saline water research and development program.

(2) (a) The administration and operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws, including those which govern the development, utilization, and conservation of oil, gas, and associated resources of the public and other Federal lands; (b) mineral resources of the public lands and mining interests generally, including the conditions, problems, and needs of the mining and minerals industries; (c) mineral resources surveys and the exploration, development, production, and conservation of mineral resources; (d) minerals research needed to improve the position of the domestic minerals industries; (e) proposed long-range domestic minerals programs; and (f) the effects upon domestic mining industries of the world metals situation and the means available to the Government for alleviating the same.

(3) The status, progress, and administration of the national park system and its units and of other recreational developments on public lands or under the jurisdiction of or affecting the Department of the Interior.

(4) (a) The administration and operation of the laws governing the development, utilization, and conservation of the surface and subsurface resources of public lands administered by the Department of the Interior and of forest reserves created out of the public domain; and (b) the withdrawal of public domain lands by military and nonmilitary agencies of the Government from normal operation of the public land and mining laws.

(5) (a) The administration of Indian affairs by agencies of the Government participating therein, the programs and policies of those agencies, the adequacy of existing Indian legislation, and the effectiveness with which it is being administered and with which moneys available to carry out its purposes are being used; (b) the release of Indian tribes and bands from Federal supervision, preparation therefor, and the effects thereof; (c) the present status of Indian treaties and agreements; (d) the availability to Indians of health, education, and welfare services and the extent to which they are receiving the full benefit of Federal programs in these areas; (e) the utilization of tribal land and other resources, with particular attention to the means of developing the skill and aptitudes required for such utilization; and (f) the adequacy and cost of attorney services for Indians and Indian tribes.

(6) The status, progress, and administration of the territories and insular possession of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, including particularly the status of Puerto Rico and revision of the Commonwealth Act of 1952; the operation and administration of the Revised Virgin Islands Organic Act of 1954, the Virgin Islands Corporation Act of 1949, and the Guam Organic Act of 1950, all as amended (with especial attention, in the case of the latter, to the tax structure and financial problems of the government of Guam); local conditions bearing upon and the provisions to be included in organic acts for American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the extension of various laws of the United States to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; the granting of citizenship to residents of American Samoa; and problems concerning the civilian population of the Ryukyu Islands.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of making such investigations and studies, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit, hold hearings, and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its territories and possessions, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States as the nature of the investigation or study requires; may do so not only during the session but also during periods of recess and adjournment; and may require, by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been cleared with the leadership on our side. I understand there is no objection to it, and there are no further requests for time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. THORNBERRY:

Page 5, after line 18, insert new paragraph as follows:

"*Provided,* That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 55 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in or related to the fields of astronautical research and development (including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities), outer space (including exploration and control thereof, and air and space law), and other scientific research and development (including international scientific cooperation) coming within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided,* That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its studies, investigations, and inquiries, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the minority approves this resolution and urges its immediate adoption. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that House Joint Resolution 155 was my own bill, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may fol-

low those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 98, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1961, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including but not limited to the following:

(1) administration and operation of the Federal Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American merchant marine;

(2) administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and all laws and problems relating to fisheries and wildlife;

(3) administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws and problems relating to functions thereunder;

(4) administration and operation of the Panama Canal and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(5) the natural resources and environment of the oceans.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For such purposes the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof as authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is no objection on the part of the minority to this resolution.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 141 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1961, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation relating to all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witness and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

With the following committee amendment: Page 2, line 15, insert: "*Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Chicago Tribune, and other newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, several times in the past we have had bills offered in the House barring strikes in connection with public utilities, but no attention has ever been paid to any of those bills. There have been no hearings, none of them have been considered by the Committee on Education and Labor.

This strike of the flight engineers has again brought this matter to our attention. I was wondering whether we will wait until we are forced to act as we did when we finally enacted and passed the Taft-Hartley law over President Truman's veto, whether we will wait as we did when we adopted the Landrum-Griffin bill, until people throughout the country became so angry that, fearing our defeat at the next election, we finally pass legislation which will correct the situation.

Now, why should we wait? We all know what is needed.

We can recall the saying attributed to William H. Vanderbilt, the railroad tycoon. When a reporter suggested the public's interest was not protected, he is said to have replied: "The public be damned."

That seems to be our attitude at the moment.

The real issue is clear. It is the same which has so often troubled the U.S. Supreme Court. It is this: When must the right granted to the individual by the Constitution yield to the welfare of the people?

For years, it has been my contention that when the government—local, State, or Federal—found it necessary to limit the income of an enterprise which furnished a necessary public service, the rights of individuals or organizations must yield.

Perhaps a few excerpts from the press will bring home to us the present situation to act voluntarily before we are kicked into action by public sentiment:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 22, 1961]

HOPE FADES FOR RETURN OF ENGINEERS—VOTE ON KENNEDY PLEA DELAYED

WASHINGTON, February 22.—Talking took the spotlight from voting today in the crippling airlines strike. The Government hurriedly set up conferences as hope dimmed that the flight engineers would vote to go back to work.

President Kennedy, after appointing a peace-seeking commission yesterday, appealed to the flight engineers to return to work. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, seconded the appeal today.

The engineers' union, however, has been slow to respond. It has asked the engineers to vote on the appeal.

PREDICTS CONTINUED STRIKE

But polling and ballot counting is behind schedule, and one union spokesman predicted that members would vote to continue the strike, which has shut down many flights from the Nation's airports.

The President and Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg conferred in the morning. In early afternoon, Goldberg talked for almost an hour with Ronald A. Brown, president of the flight engineers, and other union officials.

After the meeting, Goldberg and Brown appeared grim. Neither would say exactly what they discussed.

Goldberg also asked airline officials to stand by for conferences with himself, the peacemaking commission, and possibly union officials. Brown and his associates also were asked to stand by.

BOARD RUSHES TO CAPITAL

Meanwhile, Commission members rushed to Washington. Goldberg said they planned to start work immediately. Prof. Nathan Feinsinger of the University of Wisconsin is chairman. Prof. Richard Lester of Princeton, and Prof. J. Keith Mann of Stanford University are the other members.

The strike by the 3,500 flight engineers, causing the worst airline tieup in history, was touched off by a decision of the National Mediation Board.

The Board ruled that the pilots and flight engineers of United Airlines must be represented by one union. At present, each group has its own union. Flight engineers fear their interests would be hurt in a single union, because the pilots outnumber them.

Goldberg, however, has tried to assure the flight engineers that the decision does not automatically apply to other airlines. He says it applies only to United.

LAID OFF 84,000

Goldberg also has told the union the President's Commission cannot change the decision of the Mediation Board.

United has not been hit by the strike. But six other airlines, which say they are losing more than $5 million a day, have laid off upward of 84,000 workers. Eastern, American, and Trans-World airlines have been grounded. Pan American, National, and Western have maintained token service.

At noon, the Flight Engineers International Association issued a statement saying it has had difficulty canvassing its members on Kennedy's appeal because of litigation over the strike.

"Many of the people who should have been doing such work spent all day yesterday and late into the night involved in court proceedings with the airlines," the statement said.

DEMANDED LINES' PLEDGE

"Our largest chapter executive board, for instance, was tied up in court in New York City for 12 hours yesterday until 11 p.m. last night."

The union then demanded a written promise from the airlines regarding lawsuits and recrimination proceedings.

In several areas, the airlines have asked Federal courts for restraining orders against the walkout. In some cases, the airlines also filed damage suits.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 22, 1961]

BACK-TO-WORK PLAN OFFERED BY PRESIDENT—HITCH DEVELOPING, MORE GOVERNMENT PARLEYS SOUGHT

Flight engineers, whose wildcat strike has caused the worst tieup in commercial aviation history, were considering today whether to heed a plea by President Kennedy and return to work.

Union leaders were polling their 2,700 striking members after President Kennedy yesterday offered a peace plan designed to end the 6-day walkout, which has knocked four airlines out of action and virtually immobilized three others.

A big stumbling block appeared to be Western Airlines' firing of its 130 flight engineers yesterday.

Secretary of Labor Goldberg, at a morning news conference, said he still was attempting to contact Terrell C. Drinkwater, Western's president, in an effort to get him to give assurances that no action would be taken against the strikers.

LINE NOT REPRESENTED

Western was not represented during Mr. Goldberg's conference with the carriers yesterday, which preceded the White House announcement.

Mr. Goldberg said he had assumed that Western would go along with the other carriers in pledging no retaliatory measures.

The engineers had planned originally to release the results of the poll at 10 a.m., but postponed the move because of later developments which make it impossible without further conference with Government officials.

A spokesman declined to spell out the "later developments."

He said that polling of one of the union's chapters had not been completed.

However, it was believed that Western's action was complicating the picture. One spokesman for a rank-and-file group said he did not think the engineers would return until Western's engineers were rehired.

SEVEN-MAN BOARD FAVORED

He also said the union wants a seven-man factfinding board, rather than a three-man group.

The walkout is costing the carriers an estimated $6 million a day, has forced the layoff of some 84,000 airline employees and has scrambled travel plans of an estimated half-million passengers.

About 1,500 airline employees in the Washington area have been furloughed, along with another 1,500 workers in related businesses at National Airport.

Unaffected airlines at National Airport were taking up the slack, however, and it was still possible to get flights—with some delay—to nearly all points.

The keystone of President Kennedy's plan is establishment of a three-man commission to hear the flight engineers' jurisdictional dispute.

Pending a report by the Commission, probably within 90 days, the interests of all parties would be protected by guarantees keeping the situation as it existed before the strike.

GOLDBERG GETS PLEDGES

The President issued an Executive order establishing the Commission late yesterday, on the recommendation of Labor Secretary Goldberg. Mr. Goldberg had obtained the status quo guarantees from the airlines and from the Air Lines Pilots Association, which is engaged in a jurisdictional dispute with the Flight Engineers International Association.

The Secretary said he had obtained no assurances from officials of the flight engineers that their members would go along with the plan and return to work. But, he told reporters, "I hope and expect these men to respond to this very fair treatment."

He said no one's rights could be prejudiced under the procedure proposed by President Kennedy.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

Mr. Kennedy appointed these public members to the factfinding Commission: Nathan Feinsinger, professor of law at the University of Wisconsin, Chairman; Richard Lester, economics professor at Princeton University; J. Keith Mann, professor of law at Stanford University.

He directed the Commission to inquire into the issues of the dispute, holding public hearings if desired, and to report its findings and recommendations to him.

In addition, the Commission was authorized to help the National Mediation Board mediate the dispute, with the aim of achieving an amicable settlement.

URGES RETURN TO OPERATIONS

Asserting that the President had approved his statement, Mr. Goldberg declared: "In these circumstances, there is no legitimate reason for the men involved to remain off their jobs or for the carriers involved not to be operating. I therefore strongly urge that the men return to their work and that operations promptly resume."

The plan for ending the wildcat strike was predicated on prompt return of the engineers to work. If they failed to respond promptly, Mr. Goldberg indicated, the carriers and the pilot's union would be free to withdraw their guarantee.

The engineers had rejected a previous plea by Mr. Goldberg to end their strike pending Government fact-finding. He presumably hoped that the guarantee embodied in the new plan would persuade the engineers that they had nothing to lose by returning to work.

NO DISCIPLINARY ACTION

Mr. Goldberg said six struck carriers had given assurances that no disciplinary action would be taken against the strikers if they returned to work promptly, and that the airlines would make no changes in training procedures or representation rights until the Commission submits its recommendations.

The Secretary said Clarence Sayen, president of the Air Lines Pilots Association, also had guaranteed to maintain the status quo by refraining from seeking a representation election, or pressing for decisions on cockpit assignments and training procedures pending the Commission's report.

The airlines covered by the President's Executive order are Pan American Airways, American Airlines, Trans World Airways, Eastern Airlines, National Airlines and Flying Tiger, a large cargo carrier shut down by the strike. Mr. Goldberg said he had been unable to communicate yesterday with a seventh struck line—Western Airlines—but hoped to obtain assurances necessary to bring them into the plan.

However, a spokesman for the engineers said today it was their understanding Western was not included in the proposal.

LINE FIRES ENGINEERS

In Los Angeles, before Mr. Goldberg met Mr. Kennedy, Western Airlines announced it had fired its striking flight engineers. The company said they will be replaced by pilots, trained to handle their duties, as fast as possible.

Mr. Drinkwater said all 130 of the flight engineers will be dropped from the payroll, the Associated Press reported.

Eastern Airlines' flight engineers in Miami were held in contempt of Federal court yesterday and fined $200,000 "or whatever is in the treasury."

Judge Emett C. Choate ruled that the Miami Council of Flight Engineers was in contempt for not responding to a temporary restraining order he issued Saturday commanding an end to their work stoppage.

Judge Choate refused an appeal bond, but offered to withhold action long enough to allow union attorneys to fly to Jacksonville, Fla., to seek a reversal from a fifth circuit court of appeals judge.

In levying the fine, Judge Choate ordered an injunction tying up the chapter's bank account.

Anther struck airline—Northwest—is participating in separate negotiations and is not covered by the Executive order. United Airlines is involved in the jurisdictional dispute, but has not been struck.

CITES ENGINEERS' FEAR

Mr. Goldberg said the flight engineers have expressed understandable fear that a recent decision by the National Mediation Board jeopardized their jobs and their union's bargaining rights and status. The President directed the Commission to inquire into the dispute over performance of the flight engineer's function, the job security of employees performing such function and related representation rights of the two unions.

The National Mediation Board has ruled that flight engineers and pilots at United should be a single unit for purposes of a representation election. The engineers fear this decision will be extended to other airlines and that their union will be swallowed up by the pilot's union. They therefore are demanding reversal of the decision.

MUST APPEAL IN COURT

Mr. Goldberg emphasized that the Mediation Board is an independent agency "whose

rulings cannot be changed by the President, myself, or anyone in the executive branch (because) we are a government of laws and not of men." He said the engineers can challenge the Board's decision only in the courts.

Mr. Goldberg, seeking to reassure the engineers, said the Board's decision in the United case is not necessarily applicable to other airlines. Mr. Goldberg said Francis O'Neill, Chairman of the Board, agreed with him that the United decision might not apply to other airlines.

Mr. Goldberg said the wildcat strike had thrown almost 100,000 persons out of work, and added: "We can ill afford the human and economic damage."

Anticipating possible criticism, Mr. Goldberg said establishment of the Commission "would in no sense be inconsistent with or in derogation of the procedures of the Railway Labor Act," under which Mr. O'Neill's board operates.

He recalled that President Eisenhower last year appointed a study commission to look into a dispute over work rules on the railroads.

Mr. Speaker, acquaintances and friends repeatedly ask, "why are you butting your head against a stone wall?"

Perhaps the answer is that I am just ignorant and stubborn. But an editorial in the Chicago Daily Tribune yesterday called to mind that, while it may be true that "the better part of valor is discretion," and "he that fights and runs away may live to fight another day," may win battles, a war is not won in that manner.

The virtue of determination and adherence to a principle or sound policy is convincingly stressed in the February 22, 1961, Chicago Tribune editorial describing Washington's victory near Monmouth Courthouse on June 28, 1778, when Clinton attempted to withdraw the British Army from Philadelphia.

A more recent attempt to follow Washington's tactics was made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur when he tried to end the war in Korea, with a victory, was defeated by his own Commander in Chief.

The Tribune's editorial which gives the story reads:

IT WAS EVER THUS

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, accepting a freedom award on the eve of George Washington's Birthday, said that when a nation refuses to carry any fight through to a finish, it suffers all the consequences of defeat. He was speaking of his disheartening experience in the war of Korea, where he was obliged to fight with his arms pinioned behind his back by the President, the State Department, and America's fainthearted allies in the United Nations.

"Let us not make such a mistake again," he said, "lest we perish."

The faint of heart are always with us. We hear even today a voice from the highest office expressing doubt whether the Republic can survive through the next 4 years. "The outcome," says Mr. Kennedy, "is by no means certain."

Washington knew the doubters, too. There was Charles Lee, a fantastically ugly Englishman, late of his Britannic Majesty's forces, commissioned a major general in the Continental Army because he was one of the few professional soldiers available.

At the end of the dreadful winter encampment of 1777–78 at Valley Forge, Lee was busy sowing defeatism and disaffection in the Revolutionary Army. Taken prisoner by the British in December 1776, he had engaged in traitorous commerce with his captors. Exchanged for the British General Prescott, and now back at Washington's headquarters, Lee openly preached that American troops could never defeat British troops.

When Sir Henry Clinton was ordered to move the British Army from Philadelphia to New York in June 1778, he decreed an overland march which presented Washington with the opportunity of attacking his exposed flank. Lee announced himself passionately opposed. But when Washington turned to Brig. Gen. Anthony Wayne, he got a different answer. "Fight, sir," Wayne snapped.

The foot-dragging Lee was placed in command of the attack, which was brought off on June 28 near Monmouth Courthouse, N.J. Wayne, with 600 men, hit first. Held up, he called on Lee to bring up support. Lee dawdled and hesitated. When Lafayette urged a general advance, Lee witheringly replied, "Sir, you do not know British soldiers. We cannot stand against them."

Then, without notification to Wayne, Lee ordered a retreat. Only the arrival of Washington saved the Continental Army from disaster. In a rage, the commander in chief reprimanded Lee and personally relieved him. In sweat-stained blue and buff, on a huge white horse, Washington rode up and down the lines, "amid the shouts of the soldiers," as Lafayette recounted it, "cheering them by his voice and example and restoring to our standard the fortunes of the fight. I thought then, as now, that never had I beheld so superb a man."

At the end of the day, Washington held the field. Gen. Henry Knox, Washington's chief of artillery, exulted, "It is splendid: The capital army of Britain defeated and obliged to retreat before the Americans they despised so much."

The years drew on to Yorktown and the reluctant admission of the British Crown almost 2 years later, when the final draft of a treaty of peace was signed, that the war had been lost and American independence had been gained. The constancy of Washington's courage and faith prevailed to create a new nation. If we look to his example, our faith in survival will never waiver, nor will the faint of heart have power to discourage or divert us from the preservation of liberty.

No, I have not the slightest idea that I possess any of the virtues of a Washington or a MacArthur.

I am just set in my way, and, for that reason, recently dropped a bill in the hopper which reads as follows:

H.R. 4587

A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, to make it unlawful for any individual employed by a public utility to participate in a strike against that utility, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title III of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended (29 U.S.C. 185–187), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STRIKES BY EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

"SEC. 305. (a) It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by any public utility to participate in any strike against such public utility.

"(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any individual who violates subsection (a) of this section shall lose his status as a person employed by such utility, but such loss of status for such person shall terminate if and when he is reemployed by such utility.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of March 23, 1932 (the Norris-La Guardia Act, 29 U.S.C. 101–115), or any other provision of law, any district court of the United States may issue a temporary restraining order or a temporary or permanent injunction with respect to any strike against any public utility.

"(c) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'public utility' means any entity engaged in an industry affecting commerce which is under a duty to make any product or service available for public use, if the rates for such product or service, as the case may be, are fixed by the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, by a State or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or by a political subdivision of a State or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

"(2) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and any possession of the United States."

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the minority supports this legislation as amended, and I have no further requests for time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years I have been particularly concerned over the steady increase in our cost of living and the effect it is having on the lives of our citizens who are forced to live on a fixed income. While everyone on a fixed income is a victim of any increase in the cost of living, certainly no segment of our society is more hard hit than are our elderly citizens who are living on their social security benefits.

The high cost of medical care, food, clothing, and housing has increased to the point where thousands of our elderly people are finding it impossible to live on their social security payments and the limited amount which they are permitted to earn from outside sources. As a result they have been forced, in many instances, to turn to their relatives and public assistance agencies for help.

Mr. Speaker, one of the factors which makes it difficult for our social security beneficiaries to support themselves, is their inability under existing law to earn enough from outside sources to supplement their social security checks. The present limitation in the social security law on outside income is unrealistic and inadequate. It fails to compensate for the cost of living increase we are experiencing.

Our social security beneficiaries, Mr. Speaker, are caught between high prices and a legal limitation on the amount of income they may earn from outside sources. I believe it is time for the Congress to do something about this situation and I have, therefore, introduced a bill which will permit social security beneficiaries to earn as much as $2,000 in outside income. This increase will do much to help our older citizens secure enough income to meet the challenge of inflation and maintain an adequate standard of living.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FUELS STUDY

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 183, H. Rept. No. 26) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a Select Committee on a National Fuels Study to be composed of fifteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. The select committee is authorized and directed to (1) make a full and complete investigation and study (including the holding of public hearings in appropriate parts of the Nation) of the current and prospective fuel and energy resources of the United States and the present and probable future rates of consumption thereof; (2) consider and review the existing and prospective governmental policies and laws affecting the fuels and energy industries with the view of determining what, if any, changes and implementation of these policies and laws may be advisable in order to coordinate and provide an effective national fuels policy to assure the availability of fuels and energy adequate for an expanding economy and for the security of the United States, taking into account the investment by private enterprise for the maintenance of efficient and adequate fuels and necessary related industries and the necessity for the maintenance of an adequate force of skilled workers.

SEC. 3. In carrying out these provisions the select committee shall, in addition to such other matters as it may deem necessary, give consideration to (1) the proved and predicted availabilities of our national fuel and energy resources in all forms and factors pertinent thereto; (2) projected national requirements for the utilization of these resources both to meet immediate demands and to provide for future expansion of the economy; (3) the interests of the consuming public, including the availability in all regions of the country of an adequate supply of various fuels at reasonable prices and including the maintenance of a sound competitive structure in the supply and distribution of fuel to both industry and the consuming public; (4) technological developments, in progress and in prospect, including desirable areas for further exploration and technological research; (5) governmental programs and policies now in operation, including not only their effect upon the individual fuel and energy industries, but also their impact upon related and competing fuels and their interaction with other governmental programs; and (6) the need, if any, for legislation designed to effectuate recommendations in accordance with the above and other relevant considerations, including proposed amendments to such existing laws as the Federal Power Act, the Natural Gas Act, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 necessary to integrate existing laws into an effective national fuels program.

SEC. 4. The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 6. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

RESEARCH IN THE FIELD OF METEOROLOGY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate request, which was read.

The clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 681) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there any possible business that can be expedited by the use of Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the acting minority leader will ask me that question. I was not disregarding my friend, but I am simply saying that the acting minority leader will ask the question about the program for next week.

Mr. GROSS. I am not asking a question about next week. I am asking simply about dispensing with Calendar Wednesday. Now, is there any business that can be properly brought to the floor of the House through the use of Calendar Wednesday next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is none that I know of.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to say to the gentleman that under the reservation which I hope still exists to this that it will be my purpose, if no one else on the House floor does, to see that this legislation is expedited, if the use of Calendar Wednesday is necessary for the expedition of legislation for the remainder of this session. I shall not object this time, but that will be the story from here on out.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will meet that situation later.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the majority leader advise the House as to the program for the remainder of this week and the following week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no further program this week, and I will ask unanimous consent, after this request is disposed of, that we go over until Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday there will be 16 money resolutions out of the Committee on House Administration. I will put them in the RECORD. If any Member wants me to read them now, I will be glad to do so, but I shall see that they are inserted in the RECORD.

The resolutions follow:

House Resolution 94, Agriculture.

House Resolution 79, Armed Services.

House Resolution 144, Banking and Currency.

House Resolution 149, Education and Labor.

House Resolution 61, Foreign Affairs.

House Resolution 70, Government Operations.

House Resolution 158, House Administration.

House Resolution 128, Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 165, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 68, Judiciary.

House Resolution 99, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

House Resolution 76, Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 136, Public Works.

House Resolution 85, Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 148, Small Business.

House Resolution 50, Veterans' Affairs.

On Tuesday the money resolution for the Committee on Un-American Activities will be brought up.

On Wednesday we are hopeful that the bill, H.R. 4806, for the temporary unemployment compensation will be in order. I am advised that it will be reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means today, and the chairman is hoping to get a rule on Tuesday, in which event it will be programed for Wednesday.

Mr. HOEVEN. I anticipate that there will be a rollcall on the resolution relating to the Committee on Un-American Activities in the House; at least, I am so advised.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say that is a reasonable inference to draw.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN OECD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of this body who will recall the attempts which have been made by the executive branch of our Government, or more particularly by the Department of State, during the past 15 years, to take from the Congress the power of Congress to regulate the foreign commerce of this country. The first attempt took the form of seeking U.S. membership in the International Trade Organization, known as the ITO. This effort began in 1945 and ended in 1950 when the resolution calling for approval of the Havana Charter, as it was called, for the International Trade Organization died in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The ITO never came into being because the United States was its principal sponsor. Since Congress rejected the charter, other nations that signed it abandoned the effort.

Then next came the OTC or Organization for Trade Cooperation. The resolution regarding the OTC for the approval of that agreement was sent to the House Committee on Ways and Means where it fared little better than the ITO fared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

And again, with the U.S. failure to approve the organization, the OTC did not come into being.

Now today we are faced with this proposition. The Department of State comes before the other body with a request that a so-called treaty be approved by the other body for a proposal again to involve this country in an international trade and economic organization. The Department has not as yet decided that it will submit the OECD to the House of Representatives for approval. If it were so submitted to the full Congress, as the other two proposals were submitted, a simple majority would be required to approve it. But the method has been chosen to submit it to the other body for approval as a treaty where a two-thirds vote is required for ratification. Under that method this body, the House, has no vote whatsoever upon it.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time today because of the extreme importance of the proposal calling for U.S. membership in the OECD. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has before it now the question of ratification of that convention or charter.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that it would be most unfortunate if that ratification were agreed to. My objections, my reasons, are not individual or personal. They go rather to the far more important question of what would be the effect of ratification upon the powers of Congress, upon the separation of powers in our Government and, not least, upon the people who live in the 437 congressional districts of this country and who every 2 years go to the polls to elect their Representatives.

Under our system of government the voters have a right to expect their elected Representatives to be responsible to the people who elect them. Presumably the voters cast their ballots in accordance with their judgment of the various candidates and what they stand for. They believe that if they vote for one candidate rather than another they are supporting the one who most nearly reflects their own views.

The election of Representatives every 2 years is designed to reflect the will of the majority of the people. This view may change from time to time or it may remain quite constant, depending upon the trend of economic and other developments. In any case, the principal reason for such frequent elections is to give effect to the views, the judgment, and the sentiment of the people.

There would be no point in having frequent elections, or any elections for that matter, if upon arrival in Washington and entering upon their duties the elected Representatives found that their influence upon events and on the administration of the people's business was a mere nullity, regardless of how they cast their vote. The electorate under such circumstances would, in turn, be deprived of the meaning of their votes. It would be a complete waste of time to go to the polls.

I make these observations because I think they have a bearing upon the matter which is now before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, a direct and vital bearing.

What is involved in this proposed organization may not be intended, but whether intended or not, the effect would be the same.

Membership of the United States in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development under the articles governing its aims and powers would shift important aspects of authority over the tariff and quotas and other methods of regulating our foreign commerce out of the hands of the Congress to the executive branch, more particularly to the Department of State. It would go further than that. Much of the power would flow into the 20-member body sitting in Geneva or some other foreign seat of power. The United States would have one vote. This fact of itself would immediately dilute this country's influence over events. The charter of the OECD provides that further members may be brought in from time to time, other nations, other countries, and it would not be at all amazing if before the full membership had been determined there would be 50, 75, or more members to participate in the activities of that body, and for each one that was added, of course, the influence of the United States of America would be diluted further.

Decisions having farreaching effects upon our industries, our workers, and our farmers would be reached thousands of miles away, completely out of the range of the eyesight or influence of the Representatives they had elected to Congress. These Representatives, in fact, would not be acquainted with the agenda or the order of business of the OECD; that is, the OECD would not deal with the Congress or the Representatives of the people in considering the agenda that was proposed to be passed upon.

If the Representatives of the people ever knew about it, the burden would be upon them to find out for themselves. They would have no opportunity to voice even an opinion on the questions that would come before the international organization. In their place, in the place of these Representatives of the people, would be delegates of the State Department and they would not be responsive to the electorate.

Mr. Speaker, the probable effects of this proposal are so serious and they go to such important basic questions relating to our constitutional system that every effort should be made to determine the need of the contemplated action. I, for one, do not find the presumed need for it as the Department of State seems to see. So far as my experience goes in the Congress, after 14 years of service, the Congress is capable of regulating the foreign trade of this country and to make appropriate adjustments in the tariff, as it is required and enjoined to do by the Constitution. The Department of State does not charge us in the Congress with incompetence in this field, but the effect of what the Department proposes assumes either incompetence on our part or a defect in our Constitution. If it is the former that worries the State Department, they should come forward with a bill of particulars, and this they have not done. If the Department regards the Constitution defective in charging the Congress with the responsibility of regulating the foreign commerce of this country and laying and collecting taxes and duties, then the proprieties of the case and the regular order would demand that they call for an amendment to the Constitution and not its circumvention by indirection and by questionable methods. I am aware it has been said, and no doubt will be said again, that membership in the OECD by the United States would not restrict or impair the constitutional powers of the Congress. Now I cannot agree with that view, and in any case if the issue is joined on that question, why should the Department of State be the arbiter of the question. There can be no substantial doubt that if the OECD is set up with our approval it would soon invade the province of Congress in the matter of commerce regulation, for one of the aims of that body would be, and I quote from the language of the charter—"to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral nondiscriminatory basis in accord with international obligations"—and that is quoted from article 1 of the charter. Also, the members would be agreed that they will, and again I quote—"both individually and jointly pursue their efforts to reduce or abolish obstacles to the exchange of goods and services." That is in article 2.

Mr. Speaker, unless I am in complete error, this is no more than a restatement of what is already contained in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT, as it is known. The question naturally arises why, if the OECD aims in the field of tariffs and trade are the same as those of GATT—why it should be thought necessary to repeat them in OECD? This has not been explained. It has not been explained why a duplication of activity and effort is called for. It is well known that GATT is the center of a highly controversial issue. In successive extensions of the Trade Agreements Act by the Congress, a section has been inserted each time to the effect that extension of the law was not to be interpreted as approval or disapproval of GATT. In other words, since GATT had never been submitted to the Congress for approval by the executive branch, the Congress went on record to make it clear that extension of the Trade Agreements Act did not carry with its approval of GATT.

Inasmuch as GATT is in operation and the United States continues to participate in it without formal congressional approval, it would be reasonable to assume that the purpose in submitting the OECD, so far as its trade functions are concerned, to the Senate for ratification, is to obtain approval of GATT by the same step. Would it not be more straightforward to send GATT itself for approval?

About 5 years ago the President sent the OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation—to Congress for approval. It was sent to both Houses and would have required only a majority vote in each body. Extensive hearings were held before the Committee on Ways and Means. In one session the approving resolution was voted out of the Committee but did not reach the floor. In the following year, under a new Congress, when the OTC proposal was resubmitted, it failed to get even committee approval.

The purpose of the OTC was to provide GATT with an administrative arm which it lacks. However, Congress failed to approve the proposal and the OTC was dropped by the other countries.

In my opinion, it was the failure of the OTC in the House, as the ITO—International Trade Organization—before it, that is, in 1950, to obtain approval, that brought the State Department to its recent decision to submit the OECD as a convention to the Senate rather than to both Houses for approval. Two failures were no doubt thought to indicate the distaste of the House for relinquishment of its constitutional authority and responsibility in the regulation of foreign commerce. This time the House would not be asked its opinion.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances it would, I feel sure, add fuel to the flame of controversy in this field if the OECD were to be ratified by the Senate. The State Department has said nothing, to my knowledge, explaining why the House has on this occasion been bypassed. Certainly the House participates with the Senate in the constitutional function of regulating our foreign commerce. Should not that body then have a voice in the question?

Nor has the State Department drawn a distinction between the OECD, on the one hand, and the ITO Charter and the OTC Articles of Agreements, on the other, indicating the differences between them, and thus justifying a different treatment of the OECD.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is no trade emergency that would be solved by the U.S. membership in the OECD.

A matter of the far-reaching effect as this proposal should be given thorough airing, and in my opinion it should be rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I would like very much to commend the gentleman from Georgia for taking this time to bring to the attention of the House the ratification of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It seems strange that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] would take this time immediately following that day when the House heard the farewell address of that great American, George Washington, who admonished us in that address to pay heed to our commercial entanglements with foreign nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development is a glorified GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—and I believe it is a master Marshall Plan rolled into one. This new organization of organizations is the heir to the old OEEC—Organization for European Economic Cooperation—which had as its function the postwar industrial reconstruction of Europe through American funds.

But rather than permit old organizations to fade away the State Department in cooperation with like-minded Foreign Offices in 19 other nations has decided to expand and enlarge upon this group and its functions by the simple strategem of revision and name changing—the best example of an organization apparently hoping to continue and now being allowed to continue in some other form or by some other particular name.

Realizing that continued American aid to Europe is becoming untenable as well as unpopular, particularly under the press of imports from that area, the international brigade in the State Department rationalized the need for OECD's foreign aid function as furthering the development of the less developed countries.

Yesterday we reconstructed Europe—tomorrow the world. We enjoyed some freedom of action in the 18-nation OEEC which served as the network of distribution for our funds rather than being a decisionmaking group. In the new organization we would be an integral member and would no doubt provide the lion's share of the costs in return for the privilege of having 1 vote out of 20.

Beyond perpetuating our dollar giveaway programs of the forties and fifties on through the sixties, we have in OECD an additional and more ominous feature that might be called a market giveaway. In the area of foreign trade, for example, the report on OECD is quite clear. It says that—

> Commercial policy, as an element in general economic policy, will certainly be within the responsibility of the future organization.

While OEEC may have completed its function, apparently the proposed organization now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will live on indefinitely as the report expressly outlines in this statement:

> Furthermore, the member countries, having a permanent forum in which to discuss trade matters of significance to general economic policy.

The real inkling of what is yet to come unfolds as the report continues, talking about this particular organization:

> [OECD] will be able to facilitate progress toward the GATT objective of liberalizing world trade.

There we have it. OECD is to help GATT to liberalize world trade. A most startling development, in my opinion, for the following reason: a majority, or 12 of the new 20-nation IECD are members of either the Outer Seven or the Inner Six European trade groups known as the Free Trade Area and the Common Market, respectively. But it is well known that the Common Market of which seven of these are members, is nothing more nor less than a gigantic form of protection against world trade.

None of these nations do a great deal of business with the United States, or at least not in the same percentage they do with their brother members of the Common Market. Their members, by means of collective trade barriers, reduce the opportunity for trade expansion of exports by scores of trading nations; and let me add to this that many have the advantage of the Common Market.

Moreover, the sugar-coated semantics to the contrary, the net effect of these continental trade barriers that are now in existence notwithstanding all of these grand pronouncements that are made here on the floor of the House of Representatives about the exports and the imports of this Nation and others having a common boundary, there are in existence continental trade barriers on the European Continent which directly conflict with GATT's stated goal of trade expansion.

Therefore, I repeat, it will be interesting to observe how these same nations that now actively restrict trade intend also through OECD to facilitate it in a new organization where they enjoy a three-fifths control. Indeed, it would be naive to presume that the American delegation could not have made the same deductions outlined here. It must be assumed that they did; therefore, one must search elsewhere for their rationale. And it is there.

Our little story began to unfold about 15 years ago, and it makes a rather interesting tale. It all began just after the war with the mawkish sentimentality toward internationalism prevalent

at that time. In the almost guiltlike climate of the times the Department of State conceived of GATT in 1947 but failed to submit it to the Congress for its legislative baptism. Perhaps the heady wine of executive agreements, requiring no congressional approval, from the past emergency still coursed through the Department's administrative veins.

In any case this country became firmly cemented to this international trade agreement as a result of that unilateral executive action. The State Department was perhaps embarrassed as its offspring grew in size and influence; and urgently requested congressional approval of l'affaire GATT, then a walking 3-year-old, in 1950. It submitted for legislative approbation the ITO—International Trade Organization—which would have provided GATT with the blessing of Congress and an organizational life of its own.

But the legislators would have none of it. Undaunted, the Department tried again in 1955 with the OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation. After all GATT was now a strapping 8-year-old and still without any visible means of legislative support. Again the Congress said no.

Now, for the third time the Department would again legitimize the GATT under the guise of the OECD.

Mr. Speaker, to approve OECD is to approve GATT. To approve GATT is to share the full responsibility which is that alone of the Department of State. The inestimable damage which they have done to the economy of this country with their immature internationalism is traceable to their trade policy and we should not now grant permanency to a program that has brought us to our present state. Furthermore, to approve OECD would be to condone the devious detours which the State Department conducted around this body in 1947 when GATT was born; for it was under GATT that we were dispossessed of our credentials to conduct the trade policies of this Nation—powers now residually located in Geneva, Switzerland.

To those who wish to approve this unconstitutional phenomenon and would vote now in favor of OECD you must be prepared to explain to the thousands of jobless Americans back home that you had to consider the national interest; that is, international relations, over their welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend and to thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time so that I might be a part of his presentation of the observation that any approval of OECD is certainly not in the best interest of the United States, that it does not have a national aspect at all but, on the contrary, is international in composition from the word "go."

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and I would like to express my appreciation to him for the very fine remarks which he has just made.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply appreciative of the courtesy extended me by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS], in yielding to me for a few minutes the privilege of discussing the wisdom of the Congress in approving the OECD, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which is the third attempt of our State Department to take America into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, better known as GATT, by the back-door entrance.

Before going into my presentation may I take this opportunity to express my high regard for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] who has been one of the leaders in trying to protect the interests of America, the interests of American industry, and the interests of American working men and women in keeping us out of any further entangling alliances that are going to continue to cost us dearly in the way of jobs. I also want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] for his frank and open statement.

This, my friends, is not a political question. It is an economic question, one which involves the very existence of our Government. If we fail to maintain a healthy economic condition, with increasing imports as compared to our exports, this Nation is in difficulty, my friends—so much difficulty that I put it possibly as one of the crises even ahead of our having to meet Russian aggression. I want to picture to you, if I may, the situation that will exist if we continue to lose jobs in America. Let me remind you that better than 72 percent of the revenues coming into the Treasury of the United States come from either corporate or personal income-tax sources. If we continue to lose millions of jobs in this country, who is going to pay the taxes? We are right now contemplating expenditures in the current budget of $41 billion for national defense. How soon are we going to lose jobs to the extent that we cannot continue to put $41 billion in a budget for national defense? That, my friends, is the very thing that old man Khrushchev is hoping will develop. He wants us to bleed ourselves white economically so that he can move in and take over without the military, because we have so reduced the stability of our own economy that we cannot raise sufficient funds to maintain our national defense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with that thought it mind that has been clearly explained by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS] and the distinguished gentleman my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE], I do not need to reassess what has taken place, except to remind you that this is the third attempt of our own State Department to get us embroiled in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. which the Congress has not recognized and not approved. Let me remind you that each time we extend this trade agreement, which we will have to do next year, and every time we have extended them in the past, we have written a caveat in there to the effect that the approval of this legislation by the Congress in no way binds the Congress in the matter of general agreement on tariffs and trade. We are denying any responsibility for it, yet we are cooperating through the State Department illegally, if you please.

Now, during the 15 years that I have had the honor to serve my district in this Congress, I have served with 36 Members of the other body who have graduated from the lower House and gone over to join our colleagues in the other body. Most of them, over the 15 years, have been engaged either with me or aganist me in the matter of my fight in trying to do something about our trade agreements.

I conceived the idea of sending to each Member of the other body a three-page letter pointing out the dangers of this and the reasons why they should not approve the request of the State Department by a two-thirds majority to take the United States into this newly conceived back-door entrance to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which we in both Houses, I think, are opposed to.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like the privilege of reading into the RECORD this letter which today will clear to all Members of the other body:

Hon. ——— ———,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ———: It was my intention to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee on February 15 during the hearings on ratification of U.S. membership in the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). I was unable to be present because of hospitalization, but my profound concern is no less than it was.

I have taken an active part in tariff and trade legislation in the past 14 years, and have kept abreast of the developments during that period. My experience through these years convinced me that the executive branch of our Government, taking advantage of the limited power delegated to the President under the Trade Agreements Act, has broadened that power far beyond its original intent. This was done through the general provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which touched upon substantive powers of Congress, rather than being confined to the tariff-cutting authority granted to the President by Congress.

This general agreement, or GATT, as it is called, was never sent to Congress for approval, either as a treaty, or as an executive agreement. Yet, since it did incorporate certain trade rules, such as the relinquishment of import quotas by the GATT members as a matter of policy, it entered upon new ground not contained in the grant of power extended under the Trade Agreements Act.

The Department of State at first argued that GATT was justified because of the inherent powers of the President to conduct foreign affairs. (See hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, 1949, on the International Trade Organization.) However, after the Supreme Court decision in the steel case on the point of inherent powers of the chief executive, this claim was dropped. It was then said that the Trade Agreements Act authorized the President to enter into trade agreements, and that since GATT was such an agreement, it (i.e., GATT) was authorized under the law. Nothing was said about the breadth of some of the provisions of GATT in the field of trade regulation.

According to this State Department theory, any provisions might have been written into GATT, no matter how far reaching, and regardless of contents, and it would still have been within the limits of the authority delegated by Congress, simply on the grounds that it was a trade agreement, and that the making of trade agreements was authorized by the Trade Agreements Act.

So vehemently has the State Department defended this indefensible position that its ambition to gain control in this field became too obvious for further doubt. Not only has the Department relinquished no forward position; it has held it and justified it and then sought still more ground.

Aside from GATT, further experience with State Department attitude in other fields has confirmed their characteristic statecraft in the conduct of their relations with Congress.

In the case of the ITO Charter (i.e., the charter for the International Trade Organization) the State Department could not say whether it would be sent to Congress as a treaty or an executive agreement under questioning before the Senate Finance Committee. (See hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on the International Trade Organization, March and April 1947, p. 169.) Later it was decided to submit the charter to both Houses as an executive agreement. In the House it was sent to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, where hearings were conducted. The committee failed to report out the charter and the ITO never came into being. The time was 1950.

This should have been evidence enough to suggest that Congress was not willing to sign away its authority to regulate foreign commerce and its power over the tariff, as conferred upon it in article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Nevertheless the Department tried again with the OTC (Organization for Trade Corporation) in 1955–57. On this occasion the articles of agreement were again sent to both Houses as an executive agreement. Instead of going to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House it went to the Ways and Means Committee. No doubt it was thought that the prospects would be better before that committee. This was not the case, however, because, again, the supporting resolution never reached the floor of the House. The OTC thereupon also died.

We now face the third State Department attempt to push this country into an international trade organization, this time in the name of the OECD. Several of its provisions cover the same ground as the ITO and GATT.

On the present occasion, however, the State Department has deserted the House, and has submitted the OECD as a convention or treaty and, as such, it went to the Senate alone. Only 2 months ago I wrote to the Secretary of State inquiring when the convention would be sent to Congress. The Department replied that the date was not yet known and that it had not yet been determined whether the agreement would be sent to both Houses or to the Senate alone.

In the end it was sent to the Senate as a convention, leaving the House to one side.

This represents an odd maneuver indeed. Undoubtedly the refusal of the House to agree with its own divestment of constitutional authority led the State Department to seek another channel.

There can no longer be any doubt about the intentions of the State Department. These intentions have been road-tested for 15 years or more. That Department has sought and still seeks to exercise the powers of Congress in the regulation of foreign comway. The Department wants free elbowroom with no staying hand to restrain it.
with no staying hand to restrain it.

Actually the road now blueprinted by them would lead control over our trade not only away from Congress but before long from the President himself. It would be lodged in an international organization in which we would have only one vote.

It is true that present State and Treasury Department officials deny that the OECD would be an operating agency in the field of trade. If nothing is intended in this field the convention should be modified accordingly; for nothing is clearer than the intent to take part in trade and tariff matters as the convention is written. (See OECD Convention, arts. 1, 2, and 5.)

It must be clear that the unilateral interpretations and assurances of these officials before a congressional committee do nothing to change the actual wording of the agreement.

Then there is the provision (art. 6, par. 3) which says that no decision will be binding on a member unless it has complied with the constitutional requirements.

This is a spurious provision since the State Department would be the judge so far as this country would be concerned. The question would never come before Congress unless that Department should send it to us. Considering the Department's view of the powers the President already has in this field, we may be sure that little or nothing would ever be sent here for approval.

The OECD proposal is extremely serious. Not only does it propose what I firmly believe to be a deprivation of congressional authority; it raises the question of depriving the House of its coequal power with the Senate over commerce through unilateral action by the Senate.

The House would be asked to bow to its emasculation without so much as a vote in the matter.

I hope that as a Member of the Senate you will give the most serious consideration to the unfortunate implications of the OECD if the foregoing judgment is correct.

Sincerely,

CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
Member of Congress.

In conclusion, let me express my appreciation for the courtesy of the gentleman from Georgia. Let me say to you as one who has been battling on this matter for a period of 14 years that this is one of the most serious questions facing America today. Surely, not in the week in which we honor George Washington and listen to his voice of wisdom as to avoiding further foreign entanglements, are we going to give approval through one body of this Congress binding the other body of the Congress, not having a vote, the right to take it into an organization that has already cost us billions and bids fair to cost us billions more if we do not put a stop to it?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for his remarks just concluded. Through the years he has been one of the most able and most consistent fighters to preserve American jobs and American industry from being destroyed by an influx of foreign goods coming into this country from cheap labor countries. I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want first to commend the gentleman from Georgia for bringing this matter up today. I want to commend those who have joined with him in their comments. I want also to agree completely with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] in his statement that the problem of unemployment we have today is probably the direct result of cheap foreign imports. But, let me add to that, neither do we have a labor problem other than an import problem—neither do we have a farm surplus problem other than a farm produce import problem.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am vitally interested in the convention that is before the other body for ratification. I am interested because of what may be expected as the result of the U.S. membership in the newly proposed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, or OECD.

Unless I am badly in error ratification of that instrument would spell doom to the power of the U.S. Congress to determine what this country shall do to provide protection for our farms and factories against ruinous import competition. I think that we should jealously guard this constitutional authority and not allow it to be leeched away.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to expect disavowals and denials from the State Department when its grasp for power is challenged. Yet their actions speak louder than their words. In the name of foreign affairs they blanket with legitimacy almost any action they wish to take, on the ground that under the Constitution the President is empowered to conduct foreign affairs.

They overlook very conveniently the fact that the regulation of foreign commerce is one of the enumerated powers of Congress. This means that if the conduct of foreign affairs could be construed as including foreign trade, the regulation of foreign commerce nevertheless was cut out of this general field and expressly assigned to Congress.

Under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade the State Department very clearly betrayed their real view. They obtained an agreement from the other signatories not to establish or maintain import quotas. Then as a transitory measure, and as a means of gaining the acceptance of other countries, they provided several exceptions, principally for the accommodation of the other countries.

If the State Department cannot see that relinquishment of import quotas as a means of regulating foreign commerce is an act that can properly be accomplished only through a constitutional amendment, and that outlawing of import quotas by means of an executive agreement is to trench upon the express authority of Congress, what then are the Department's professions worth when they say that they do not wish to usurp the powers of Congress?

Mr. Speaker, they have already done so. They have already encroached on our powers; they are already guilty of the very act they deny any intention of committing.

It is obvious what the Department would do if the reins of Congress on their operations in the field of tariff and trade were severed. A ratified treaty that would deliver to the OECD the power to expand trade on a multilateral and nondiscriminating basis "in accordance with international obligations," as is provided

in the convention, would cut off Congress from its constitutional power. About this there need be no doubt whatever, the denials of the State Department to the contrary notwithstanding.

What do the words of the convention mean if they do not mean what they say?

Beyond the expansion of world trade "in accordance with international obligations" the OECD members would also "pursue their efforts to reduce or abolish obstacles to the exchange of goods and services." What does that mean? Do we need an interpreter of a foreign language to interpret that to us? The State Department denies that the OECD would be an operating agency in the field of tariffs and trade. Why then agree to language in an agreement that suggests exactly that?

Do we live with Alice in Wonderland or in the United States?

The State Department also maintains that the OECD is not designed to be an administrative body for GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—such as the ITO was to be—the International Trade Organization.

Yet there is great similarity between the two. The ITO Charter, it will be recalled, was sent to both Houses of Congress for approval, not merely to the Senate for ratification as a treaty. It went to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which, incidentally, killed it—1950.

Let us see how the two compare with each other and then ask first, why the one was designed to administer GATT but not the other, and second, why one was declared to be an executive agreement subject to approval by both Houses while the other one is called a convention, subject to ratification by the Senate alone:

OECD	ITO
On economic development and capital	
To contribute to the economic development of both member and nonmember countries in the process of economic development by appropriate means and in particular by the flow of capital to those countries (art. 2, e).	To foster and assist industrial and general economic development particularly of those countries which are still in the early stage of industrial development, and to encourage the international flow of capital for production investment (art. 1, sec. 2).
On world growth	
To achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in member countries * * * and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy (art. 1, a).	To assure a large and growing volume of real income and effective demand, to increase the production, consumption and exchange of goods and thus to contribute to a balanced and expanded world economy (art. 1, sec. 1).
On obstacles to trade	
To pursue their efforts to reduce or abolish obstacles to the exchange of goods and services (art. 2, d). To contribute to the expansion of world trade on a * * * nondiscriminating basis in accordance with international obligations (art. 1, c).	To promote on a reciprocal and mutually advantageous basis the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce (art. 1, sec. 4).
On markets	
To contribute to the economic development of both member and nonmember countries in the process of economic development * * * having regard to the importance to their economies of * * * receiving expanding export markets (art. 2, e).	To further the enjoyment by all countries, on equal terms of access to the markets * * * which are needed for their economic prosperity and development (art. 1, sec. 3).
On avoiding measures	
To pursue policies designed to achieve economic growth * * * and to avoid developments which might endanger their economies or those of other countries (art. 2, c).	To enable countries by increasing the opportunities for their * * * economic development, to abstain from measures which would disrupt world commerce * * * or retard economic progress (art. 1, sec. 5).

The remarkable similarity both in substance as well as form as shown above in the parallel comparison of the charter of the old ITO and the proposed OECD would lead even the freshman student of political science to conclude that both documents might have been authored by the same writer.

Now if the OECD is not to be the administrative body for GATT, if it is not tailored to GATT's specifications, then by the same token of measurement the ITO also could not possibly have answered that purpose. However, since ITO was by official admission qualified to perform this function, then the only reasonable conclusion to be drawn is that OECD is clearly intended as the heir to ITO—the verbal testimony of its backers to the contrary notwithstanding.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the actions of the State Department in this field contradict the words, the denials of intent to usurp, and the assurances of innocence.

I believe that this body is more than right in being deeply concerned, first, about the detour of the House executed by the Executive in the present instance when previously on similar occasions congressional approval included this body, as in the case of the ITO and the OTC—Organization for Trade Cooperation—and second, about the real and not merely imaginary danger of congressional ousting from its constitutional powers in the field of tariffs and trade.

If the intent is not what the wording of the OECD convention says, and if it is not the intent to operate in the field of tariffs and trade, the convention should be renegotiated and all doubt removed on this score.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] for his able remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, hearings were recently conducted in the Senate on a proposal that the United States become a member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD.

If this venture would actually accomplish what some of its sponsors tell us, that would be one thing. But if it should not do that, the results to this country could be very harmful. That is why I have urged that every facet of the OECD be thoroughly explored. I have urged that the Senate committee extend hearings in order to afford many who feel that they have been handicapped by the rush, may fully prepare themselves and have their day in court.

Personally I feel there are many unanswered questions in regard to OECD. I am sure the general public knows very little about it. The publicity has been scanty and the hearings have been brief. Before we become irrevocably welded to an entanglement involving our prestige, power, and resources, the least that can be expected is for the air to be cleared, and answers given to the many questions that are being asked about OECD.

I think the State Department should provide answers to the following questions:

First. In what way does the OECD differ substantially from or is similar to GATT, the ITO, or the OTC?

Second. Procedurally, why was the ITO sent to the House Foreign Affairs Committee; the OTC to the House Ways and Means Committee; the OECD to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and the GATT sent to neither the House nor the Senate?

Third. If OECD is a multinational organization like GATT having also as its purpose a jurisdiction in the area of foreign trade, then why is OECD considered a treaty while GATT was given the status of an "executive agreement"?

Fourth. If OECD is envisioned as an agency which would help to facilitate GATT's trade goals, would it not seem organizationally prudent to review the soundness of GATT's structure and functions before creating a parallel body which presumably would duplicate GATT's effectiveness or deficiency?

Fifth. The proposed 20-nation OECD is basically a regional group whereas the 44-nation GATT is multiregional or worldwide. Actually 26 of GATT's members are not included among the OECD membership while 2 of the latter are not members of GATT. If their goals are mutual is it contemplated that the OECD will ultimately be expanded to include the current differences in their memberships?

Sixth. While GATT has unquestionably benefited many of its members as witnessed by the rapid rise in manufactures and semimanufactures imported by this country in recent years from GATT members, the reverse has not been correspondingly true. Therefore, will OECD intensify the import-injury to our domestic industries?

Seventh. U.S. officials from Presidents on down the line of authority have repeatedly assured domestic producers that the trade agreements, now administered by GATT, would not injure any American industries. Yet the inclusion of a section in the proposed depressed area bill pertaining to import injury clearly implies that injury did in fact occur. Its inclusion is intended to act as a second escape clause and clearly implies that the initial escape clause did not prove to be the "sure remedy" promised by all past administrations to industries seriously injured by imports. Therefore, prior to committing this country to a second GATT which, without evidence to the contrary, we must presume to be the result of OECD ratification, what considerations have been given to a remedy against the additional impact upon our economy resulting from OECD membership?

Eighth. If on the one hand the OECD is not to be a trade organization then why does article 2(d) of OECD bind the members to "pursue their efforts to reduce or abolish obstacles to the exchange of goods and services and current payments"?

Ninth. On the other hand if the OECD is to be a gigantic Marshall Plan which will "maintain and extend the liberalization of capital movements" then it should be so stated. This country has already contributed over $90 billion in private and Government aid to over 70 countries. There is widespread feeling throughout the Nation that the time has come to plow additional so-called surplus funds into the well-deserving American economy without further delay. If the OECD is another giveaway organization this Congress wants to know about it now. If the above is true, what has the ICA been doing all this time no less than the four international banks to which we belong and as well as the newly proposed banks to which it is suggested we adhere?

Tenth. Why were our people given but 1 short week to prepare their testimony on an organization with vast implications to their jobs, their markets, and their present overloaded tax burdens?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the State Department answers these questions without quibbling and doubletalk, there will be no doubt about the attitude that this body should take toward the OECD. There can be no question that the articles of the convention that would set up the OECD clearly place upon that organization functions that are now performed by GATT.

It makes no difference whether the Secretary of State, of Treasury, or any other executive department brings in a ton of denials and interpretations. Once ratified we would be bound by the articles of agreement and not by what Mr. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, or Mr. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, might have given as their intent. Their words would be buried in hearings that would soon be gathering the dust of oblivion and they could hardly be cited effectively even as legislative history.

It is indeed rather surprising that these high officials would attempt to have us believe that treaties are interpreted in this manner. Once in being, 19 other nations would have something to say about the meaning of the OECD articles of agreement. Even our own officials might change their minds.

Mr. Speaker, since this body is a part of Congress no less so than the other body and since Congress as a whole is vested by the Constitution with the authority to regulate foreign commerce and to lay and collect duties on imports, it would appear as extraordinary procedure if the other body, by mere ratification of a treaty, could strip this body of constitutional power.

Does the treatymaking power go so far that it could be used to supersede the process of constitutional amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I think this body should declare its concern over the implications of OECD ratification, and in very clear terms.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS]. I certainly commend him on the splendid presentation he has made on a very serious situation which faces this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the situation that is having a tremendous effect on the economy of every locality of the Nation where a military installation is located.

During the past administration, the Department of Defense issued a directive, No. 4151, requiring all military installations, including airbases, arsenals, depots, and naval facilities, to contract out for work previously performed by civil service personnel. This policy has already affected the installations in the Fourth District of Alabama which I am privileged to represent.

Should this policy be allowed to remain in force, many persons residing in the areas surrounding these installations and who have been employed through the years, would lose their jobs and be unable to maintain their homes. This will be a direct result of the contracting out policy, as contractors obtaining the contracts will move their own work forces in and out to meet the requirements of the contract at that time.

This policy will destroy the system which was previously determined necessary to maintain and to meet war emergencies for which our Defense Department has been established. Further, it is very questionable that in the event of an emergency the contractor's personnel will be available. In addition, it is questionable that in the event of an emergency such personnel would be as willing as civil-service personnel to relocate overseas when necessary. Further, these facilities all have equipment on hand to accomplish their given mission. What will happen to this equipment? Will it be disposed of as surplus property at considerably below cost value and then, during an emergency period when bases and facilities are augmented, new equipment purchased at inflated prices?

I had the privilege last Friday, the 17th, in company with our distinguished Senators from Alabama, Senators HILL and SPARKMAN, to meet with the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara. At this meeting the Secretary indicated that the policy of contracting out would be a subject of review by the Department at the earliest possible date.

I have also had occasion to write to our distinguished colleague the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Chairman VINSON has advised me that his committee plans to investigate this problem at an early date.

I sincerely hope that the review by the Defense Department and the investigation by the Armed Services Committee will bring about a change in the existing policy in the very near future, as I could not help but feel that it has a detrimental effect on the Military Establishment, as well as the economy of all the areas of the Nation where a military facility is located.

WILLIAM M. STUCKY, U.S. CITIZEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last fall I took an extended tour of the Middle East, Pakistan, India, Hong Kong, and Japan in connection with refugee problems. It was a trip of enormous benefit to my thinking on the subject of the world refugee problem, and I shall have more to say about this topic in general at a later date.

My present purpose in taking the floor is to talk about the service to our country and to the free world of an American citizen who in his lifetime was a one-man ambassador of good will in areas of the world and of endeavor where the true American message is most needed. This man is the late William M. Stucky, newspaperman, writer, teacher, and patriot. On my trip around the world I discovered the penetrating impact of this one man's work.

On January 1 of this year, Bill Stucky died suddenly in his home in Tenafly, N.J. He was 44. Bill left a devoted and lovely wife, Robyn, and two sons, William, Jr., and Robert. Their sorrow and loss is shared by hundreds of men around the United States and around the world, many of whom are unknown to them. To his sons and to his family, Bill Stucky left a legacy of immeasurable value—his contribution to world peace and freedom at the most basic level, the free flow of accurate information within and between nations, and with it an improved portrait of the United States abroad. He loved truth above all, and for this he was loved and respected the world over.

William Stucky was the associate director of the American Press Institute at Columbia University. Under his direction and with his colleagues at the American Press Institute, the institute program of seminars for U.S. and foreign newspapermen opened new horizons in the field of professional and international education. Increasingly Bill found it important to bring together in his seminars leading foreign newspapermen from around the world and this he did. In recent years he traveled extensively, particularly in Asia, Pakistan, and India. His trips resulted in two highly successful and fruitful seminars for foreign editors and intellectuals from these parts of the world. When he died, Bill was completing arrangements for a third such seminar to be held this year.

Before I left for the Middle and Far East this fall, Bill Stucky and two or three of his friends arranged for me to meet members of the "Stucky alumni association" around the world. I took full advantage of this, and it was a rewarding experience.

It is almost impossible to describe the impact of Bill Stucky's work in these countries. Men largely responsible for the Asian view of world affairs—newspapermen, editors, writers, intellectual leaders—learned to trust Bill Stucky without reservation and to take advantage of the opportunity he offered to judge for themselves the truth of America. He made their experience in the United States both a warm, human experience and one that was intellectually rewarding.

Not all of Bill's friends abroad were available when I arrived in their lands, and in some cases I was not able to visit the particular area where they were. Those whom I saw, however, went out of their way to make my visit educational and constructive, to tell me about their country and its problems, both at home and abroad, and to bring me into their homes as an honored guest. They did it for Bill Stucky and I became increasingly aware of the fundamental nature of his contribution and the incredible amount of good will that he had carefully built for Americans everywhere.

In Pakistan, for example, I had the pleasure of social and intellectual companionship with Qayyum Malik, editor of the Enterprise in Karachi, and A. T. Chaudhri, editor of the Morning News, who did me the great honor and courtesy of bringing me into their thinking and their ideas, their suggestions for the betterment of relations between the United States and the countries of the subcontinent. They paid me the honor of frankness, telescoping into a few hours the time that it normally takes strangers in this part of the world to reach mutual confidence. The barriers had all been swept away by Bill Stucky. I was his friend, and that was enough. Our conversations at the Karachi Press Club, to which few Americans had been admitted, were off the record, highly informative, and exciting. I had come to learn, and I did.

In Japan, Hiroshi Shimura, the distinguished foreign editor of a leading Japanese newspaper, Tokyo Shimbun, took 3 days from his normal duties in order to see to it that I missed nothing, and learned about Japan, about its people, and about Japanese-American relationships from an independent editor's point of view. He took me to his home—an experience that not many Americans can boast of. Another friend of Bill's, Takashi Wada, educator and the foreign editor of the Chubu Nippon Shimbun, shared with Hiroshi Shimura his time with me, and saw to it that I was given frank answers to hard questions—the kind of exchange that comes only with trust. Again, all because of Bill Stucky.

I wrote the director of the American Press Institute, Mr. J. Montgomery Curtis, to ask him to send me some of his thoughts about Bill Stucky's work and the institute. Mr. Curtis sent me a wonderful letter, and I should like to read it to my colleagues:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., January 24, 1961.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: It is only today, 3 weeks after Bill Stucky's death, that there is time and energy to write as you deserve to be written about Bill. Your idea of speaking of him from the floor of the House is splendid.

How can I best tell you about the man? The reprint of the Times account is enclosed but, splendid as it is, the whole story isn't there. So you will know the vehicle which gave Bill his outlet, I enclose an API bulletin, but certainly this isn't enough. Perhaps our purpose is best served with a general statement and then some evidence.

Bill, like all really dedicated newspapermen, was devoted to the idea that a good newspaper—free, responsible, reporting faithfully all sides of all the news, striving to be accurate and fair, attaining the highest professional competence and being independent through its income as a newspaper—was indispensable to the progress of its community and its Nation. As he often said: "Show me a good newspaper and I will show you a city which has first-rate schools, clean government, courts in which there is justice for the poorest citizen, incorruptible law enforcement and everything else which makes a city a decent place in which to live, to rear a family, to do business, and to pursue a career."

What did Bill do about his belief? His influence was important in many ways and the following are the chief ones. First, the domestic influence, then the foreign.

Bill planned and conducted American Press Institute seminars for United States and Canadian newspapermen. These were for city editors, publishers and editors, general managers and business managers, advertising managers, women's editors, reporters, and editorial writers. These and other newspaper executives—2,600 in 15 years and about 1,200 during Bill's 5 years here—come to API at Columbia University each year. Bill brought his philosophy to bear on all of them throughout the programs.

But Bill also had his own specialty. It was writing. He loved the English language. He loved to write and did so brilliantly. I think he loved even more the opportunity to teach others—not how to write like a genius because he said that could not be taught, but how to train newspaper writers to produce clear, interesting, and accurate prose. He personally conducted all seminar sessions on writing. His work in this field is mentioned often in the hundreds of letters, telegrams, and cablegrams which are still arriving.

How about his work for the newspapermen from abroad? On his first trip through Asia Bill found that there is no basic difference in the job of the good newspaper and there is no basic difference in good newspapermen anywhere. The language and the customs differ but the job remains the same.

So he traveled through Asia selecting his first seminar group from the Philippines, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Indonesia. Everywhere he went he worked with the newspapermen and brought his philosophy to bear. When they came to Columbia a year later they received the impact again, multiplied by contacts with hundreds of newspapermen as arranged by Bill.

Last fall he went to Asia again. This time he broadened the trip to include Pakistan, India, and Japan. He recruited another fine group of men to come here next August. His seminar will be held, of course, and its success will rest first upon Bill's selection of the men and his plans for them.

For all groups from abroad he held his writing session. In the very first of these he had discovered that, like the basic newspaper job, there is no difference in the purpose or even the method of writing in any language. No matter what the alphabet, the ideograph or the language, the job is the same—to tell the truth simply and in an interesting fashion.

Bill had a special fondness for the Asians. He wanted, above everything else, for their press to be free because without freedom a newspaper is nothing in our terms. Bill's saddest times were when word came in that a newspaper had been suppressed or suspended or put out of business by a government because the newspaper had tried to do a truthful job for its people. His happiest times were when the news arrived that another of his newspaper friends abroad had successfully struck another blow for freedom and for the advancement of his people.

Cordially,

J. MONTGOMERY CURTIS,
Director.

Bill Stucky's entire life has been devoted to the advancement of the exchange of ideas. He was editor of the school paper at Phillips Exeter Academy, a member of the boxing team and the glee club. He more and more became a devotee of the theater and while at Yale was the author of a two-act play, "Touchstone," that ran briefly on Broadway in 1953. He was also the author of a number of radio plays and at Yale was columnist on the Yale Daily News, vice president of the dramatic society, a skillful fencer, and manager of the golf team.

He wrote a number of books for campus musical comedies and after he graduated from Yale went to Hollywood as a writer for a brief period and wrote plays independently.

His newspaper career began shortly before the war and continued after the war. He worked for 4 years on the Louisville Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., as reporter, assistant city editor, and Sunday city editor. And for a number of years he worked with two Lexington, Ky., newspapers—the Leader and the Herald.

Bill Stucky served with distinction in World War II as an officer aboard destroyer escorts and in 1945 went on inactive duty as a lieutenant commander.

In 1949–50 he went to Harvard as a Nieman fellow, studying European and American history.

Bill Stucky's work should not be forgotten and I think it appropriate that specific efforts be made to perpetuate the work that he had so effectively done at home and around the world. It has been suggested by many of his friends that a memorial be established toward this end, and I sincerely hope that this is done. For myself, both in my official capacity and privately, I shall do whatever I can to further the work that was begun by Bill Stucky and by his distinguished colleagues at the American Press Institute.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that America must make major efforts to establish basic avenues of communication and understanding around the world. We know that by our history and our traditions we have a message that remains fresh and exciting—love of freedom, pride in our pioneering beginnings, respect for the basic worth of every human being. But we must communicate this message. Our Government is engaged in a fresh effort to show the heart of America abroad; to demonstrate that we treasure freedom and individual worth above all other values, and that we understand and respect the traditions, cultures, and hopes of others in distant lands. We hope and ask for the same understanding of ourselves. In our frustration over our obvious failures to communicate we launch new programs to make possible human contact and to break down the false barriers that frustrate communication between people.

I care deeply what we as governments do in this regard. But I know full well that in the last analysis it is the Bill Stuckys of our country who must do the job. We have a desperate need for men like this man—in our professions, in our businesses, in our cities and farms, in our schools, and in our Government. Let the example of this one man remain fresh in our minds and inspire other young men to do likewise.

There are many sorrowing hearts around the world as a result of Bill Stucky's premature death. The United States has lost one of its finest citizens. All who knew him, and many who did not, will cherish and share the noble legacy that Bill Stucky left. To his beloved wife Robyn and to his sons, I in this House, for myself and for the country, extend my most profound gratitude, and my prayers for their continued courage and their happiness in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS], be permitted to insert his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] in honoring the late William M. Stucky who was my constituent and lived, as I do, in Tenafly, N.J. Bill Stucky was an internationally known journalist who served as associate director of the American Press Institute at Columbia University. His untimely and sudden death has deeply saddened all who knew and admired him.

His widow and two sons are with us today in the House gallery. Certainly they can be comforted in their loss by the knowledge that the contributions which he made to better understanding between our great country and the other nations of the world have not been forgotten and are here being remembered in a permanent record of our time.

Through Bill Stucky's efforts, our friends in Asia and all mankind are one step closer to that mutual understanding and trust which must someday come if we are to achieve world peace. In the never-ending world battle for the victory of truth over propaganda, fact over fiction, we must follow the inspired trail blazed by Bill Stucky. If we do, the Nation and the world will surely reap a bountiful harvest of peace and freedom based on truth and friendship.

Bill Stucky's work might well be perpetuated by an appropriate memorial. It should be a living memorial that will carry on into the future the principles Bill Stucky so ably advanced for the benefit of our country and the world.

THE ONE-WAY STREET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, when I started this crusade to awaken the little peoples of America to the dangers inherent in our trade and aid programs, some of my colleagues questioned my ability to maintain a 10-week program of weekly speeches on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you now that a million conscientious Americans could talk for 10 times 10 weeks and never exhaust the source material on these two subjects. Every day I find new evidence that this country alone is trying to prepare the peoples of the world for a one world; one big happy family with no greed, no avarice, and no nationalism in our lifetime. The goal is worthy of our efforts, but our efforts cannot be sustained unless we review, reevaluate, and revamp our aid and trade ideals and practices.

To illustrate my point, let us look at a recent piece of information from across the Canadian border. Incidentally, the one country that comes close to competitive equality with our economy is our friend to the north. However, even the Canadians are resentful of our monopolization of the ownership of their means of production. They not only talk about their import-export economy, but they are doing something about it. That is where our two countries differ.

If any American administration put out the kind of proposal just handed down by George Hees, Minister of Trade and Commerce, our State Department would start reacting like a mess of Mexican jumping beans on a hot stove lid.

In essence, this is the review in part:

A shot in the arm * * * for Canadian western oil producers was one description of Trade and Commerce Minister George Hees' directive last week to the Canadian petroleum industry. Mr. Hees ordered Canadian producers to raise their output of oil and natural gas liquids by 45 percent over the next 3 years.

Voluntary increase * * * from the present 550,000 barrel daily production figure to 800,000 barrels a day by 1963 was demanded by increasing both domestic consumption and exports to the United States. Output is to increase to 625,000 barrels daily by mid-1961, 640,000 barrels by the year 1962, and 800,000 by 1963. Oil import restrictions would be imposed if the desired increase was not met, Mr. Hees implied.

Digging below the surface: It is apparent that the new orders were meant for the integrated international companies in Canada which include Imperial Oil, a subsidiary of Standard Oil; British-American; Shell Oil; and Texaco. These companies spin a worldwide web of oil fields and pipelines; they can cut production in one area and import from another if it is cheaper to do so. They also purchase, refine and distribute oil from the so-called Canadian independent companies, which in most cases are dependent on the Big Five for sales and distribution.

Different ground rules * * * for different companies was the reason for the new orders, according to W. Harold Rea, president of Canadian Oil Companies, Ltd. "Foreign oil producing companies can, at times, supply products to importers delivered in Ontario at prices which could idle Canadian refining capacity and not only put hundreds of refinery employees out of work, but also discourage secondary industry in Canada." The directive "will place all refiners in Ontario on an equal footing," he added.

American reaction * * * was equally cautious, with veiled suggestions that if Canada's plans for an increase in exports there seriously hurt the U.S. oil industry something would be done about it and present policies would be "reviewed." On the other hand, the announcement did not come as a surprise to members of the U.S. Government since they were notified a week before the official announcement. Apparently the Canadian plan for increased exports is centered in the Pacific Northwest, where Canadian oil could largely displace other imported crude without upsetting the U.S. domestic market.

What happens when our other oil producing friends start to squawk? If we follow our normal pattern, we will cut our own production so that Venezuela and others can keep their quotas.

A carrot instead of a stck * * * is usually the best way to make the mule move, and I believe Mr. Hees has started a reaction that will lead to a stimulated oil market. Whether or not the set figures are met, the implied alternative of official restrictions will result i.. an increase in Canadian oil production and consumption.

Do you see what I mean when I say that we are the only nation in the world that no longer protects its national interest? Our investors are running away to rosier and more profitable climes, and our unemployed are going to get another reprieve of 13 more weeks of unemployment compensation. This, with all due respect to our President—and I do respect my President and his good intentions—but, I believe that his advisers on trade and aid are just new faces doing business in the same old places.

This is just an example of good government, I presume. The Canadians know that unemployment caused by imports is like a pernicious anemia. It weakens the economy and stops industrial expansion and eventually destroys the body politic.

The Canadians recently announced, and it seems to be unheralded in the American press, an increased tariff on imports of American fruits and vegetables just a short few months after our American Campbell Soup Co. announced plans for the largest cannery in the world to be built by this company in Mexico to take advantage of cheap labor and cheap raw materials. Then, of course, they will ship their products right back to the United States under the old familiar Campbell soup label.

It might be noted that our aid to Mexico made possible the production of these raw materials that will cost many Americans their jobs. At the same time, we will be called upon to spend money in the distressed area legislation to redevelop some communities that have lost their canneries.

Unemployment is a cancer on the body politic of this Nation. Medical science has proven that you cannot cure a cancer with a witch doctor dancing and voodoo sacrifices. You have to operate—and soon—or the body will not be strong enough to live through a major surgery.

I talked to a very respected, and in my opinion a good representative in the Congress last week, after my talk on the floor on this subject. He said:

> I agree with you because I have an industry that is in desperate straits because of Japanese imports.

However when I asked him to join me in this crusade on the floor of the House, he said he could not do that except maybe just to mention his own individual problem. He said to do otherwise might endanger his election because he believed that a great number of his constituents believed in our aid and trade policies. What he would like to see, he said, would be restrictions on the products coming into his particular area. Of course, he would.

But what about other districts and other people and the millions affected adversely by our policies? He had an answer to this, too. He called my attention to the bill, H.R. 5, which is known as the distressed areas bill, and he called my attention to page 5 of that bill, section 5, in which it sets up a priority, mind you, for the aid to be given under this legislation.

The priority is established that the first money to be given out under that bill shall go to a community that finds itself adversely affected by reciprocal trade agreements and unemployment caused by foreign imports.

I do not know whether we are trying to be naive; I do not know whether we are trying to fool ourselves, but if we admit on this floor that we are creating a condition in our country, that we are creating depressed areas by our trade policy, how can we possibly spend money to rehabilitate those areas unless we try to cure the disease that killed them in the first place? How can you go into a community and spend the taxpayer's money to bring in new industries and leave them still unprotected against the devastation of imported goods?

Many people do not understand that tariffs alone cannot cure anything, because there is quite a similar basis of competition between taxes and tariffs. A great many people do not realize that the only difference between a tax and a tariff is this: Taxes are tariffs put on by the country of origin; tariffs are taxes put on by the country of entry. And when you find two competitive companies, one in a country with a high tax and the other in a country with a low tax, one is against the other. Tariffs were never established except in those areas where some potentate established an entry tariff in order to make himself rich. Under most circumstances tariffs were created in this country to protect our way of life against this destruction by those who can create and produce goods cheaper and ship them in, in competition with what we call our high standard of living. In world trade, irrespective of duty rates, if any taxation rates in two producing countries are different, one is being absolutely protected against the other. Taxation rates, in brief, are a form of trade restrictive tariffs. There is not any other explanation of it. We protect through a preferential duty our Government. Our Government is permitted to bring into the United States anything that it uses for its own use, without paying a duty. We protect by quotas. We protect by providing special freight rates. We protect by import restrictions.

Yet, when someone stands on this floor and talks about protecting a community against the devastating effects of import goods, he is called a protectionist. What is a protectionist? If it means that I am standing here talking practically to myself because I feel that the workers in my community ought to be protected in their right to earn a living, I am called a protectionist and I suppose I am a protectionist. But we should also ask ourselves what is our objective. What is the object of export and import? Before we say that we should eliminate or further reduce tariffs in order to improve export trades, let us ask ourselves that question. What is the objective of exporting? The answer is obviously to enable us to acquire and to buy the goods which our country needs, which we cannot reasonably produce for ourselves. When you realize that that was the primary objective, and then when you stop to think that in this year of our Lord only a handful of typewriters are being manufactured in the United States of America, not one telescope is being manufactured in the United States of America, and less than 3 percent of the watches used in this country are manufactured here—they are assembled but not manufactured here—and when you stop to consider all of the consumer items that are brought into this country over low tariff walls, without respect to unemployment and without respect to the devastating effects on the local economy, then you must ask yourselves this question: Have we overstepped the objective that we had in exporting?

The continuation of old, old economic policies in this new day has led us to the ridiculous situation where we say the objective of imports now is to enable our customers to be able to pay for our exports. I can just imagine a 15-cent-an-hour worker in Hong Kong buying a Buick automobile from an American workingman.

I am not saying that we must stop exporting or stop importing; we will always do that so long as this world has different borders in it. I said before, and I am going to say again, Christopher Columbus by accident discovered America. What was Christopher Columbus doing out on this uncharted ocean? He was looking for a shorter way to the Indies, so we are told in our history books. And why was he looking for this? To create commerce and trade, to bring back to Europe the spices, and the wealth, and the things that they made in the Indies. They were looking to see if they could find someone who would buy what they had in exchange for what they needed. They did not go over to buy spaghetti; they had that. We have changed all that. We go to Japan to buy typewriters, to buy bicycles, to buy automobiles; yet we have automobiles, bicycles, and typewriters coming out of our ears in this country. We have overproduction in every consumer line in this Nation of ours, and I do not believe you can sustain our economy by having an overproduction, either by overproducing in America or by overimporting in America. One is just as dangerous to the economy as the other.

There is no way out of this except for us to realize that in order for us to be good neighbors, in order to be friends to the friendly people of the world, we have to be strong enough in our own economic life to give them the help they need. I defy any Member of Congress to refute this statement. No Member of Congress would run either his business, his household, or his political campaign on the same basis that we run our aid and trade policies of America. If he did, he would not be a Member of the House long enough to cast his vote for adjournment.

There are just a few Members here today, but I have always believed what my father used to tell me, that you can sometimes make up in quality what you may lack in quantity, and I am very proud that the quality at least is here today even if the quantity has refrained from wanting to hear. That is one of our problems, we do not want to hear, we do not want to listen; we close our ears. I said a few weeks ago that we ought to hang a sign in our offices reading: "Do not bother me with facts; my mind is made up." We say, "Why tell me what is right or wrong? I am told that this is right; therefore, I will do it."

I want to say to the Members of this Congress, as seriously as I ever said anything in my short 50 years of life, that no matter what we spend for depressed areas, no matter what we spend in aid to education, no matter what we spend in unemployment compensation increases or extensions, no matter what we spend in public works, this Nation will never climb out of the doldrums it is in today until we evaluate our position in trade and aid with other nations. No country can afford to give when they have to borrow to give.

It is as simple in my life as it is in the life of a family, as it is in the life of a

community, as it is in the life of a nation. No one can borrow to sustain their neighbors, because when they do, they end up, both of them, unable to pay back the debt, and confiscation of the goods of one who had it follows. That is as true an economic equation as you can bring before us.

So, as we march in this year of our Lord 1961, hoping to cure and alleviate the situation we find ourselves in, with 5.5 million Americans looking for work—the hardest job is to find a job—with 17 million Americans dependent on social security for their sustenance, with over 9 million Americans depending upon direct relief for their everyday livelihood, with close to 4 million Americans drawing all of their pay from taxes paid into the Government, with at least 7 million more Americans who are directly paid, school teachers and public servants throughout municipal, State, and county governments all over the country, if you total it all up you find something like 43.5 million Americans who are absolutely dependent either upon charity or upon moneys earned by others who do the work. There are too few of us today in the productive facilities of our country.

At this time I want to say I was a rather young man in the days of the first serious depression that I witnessed, but my memory is very clear, for the medicine that we took then was a little different from that prescribed and what the doctor is ordering today. And why? Why is the doctor ordering a new medicine? Is it because medical science and politics have gone so far we can forget the old medicine?

The old medicine was a little bit different, and I will tell you what it was. If I recall rightly, right after the inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, he immediately established a system whereby the known consumption of America was divided between the known productive facilities of America on a pro rata basis in order that the goods that could be sold were sold from various productive facilities scattered all over the United States. There was no call at that time for an increased production. There was a call at that time for increased consumption.

Today we find that we are asking for increased production. If anyone can show me how increasing the production of goods that we already have in surplus can bring this country out of the economic doldrums it is in, I am willing to apologize for the time I am taking this afternoon.

You cannot create prosperity by waving a wand. You have to get down to the basic needs of this country. The basic need is improved purchasing conditions, improved consumer power in America, more money in the marketplace. How many of us have ever stopped to realize if you take a given community, a thriving community with all the normal activities that any community in America has, you find your doctors, your lawyers, your squires, your public officials, your school directors and teachers, all of these and others, and you find a factory. That factory employs a certain number of persons. They receive their pay, they spend it in the community, so the barber, the baker, and the candlestick maker all earn a living. Now, suddenly they shut this factory down. How, then, do the candlestick maker, the lawyer, the doctor, and the businessman on Main Street make a living? They do not make a living.

I was born and reared in a single-industry town. When they closed that coal mine down we all had to move because there was no productive payroll.

Without a productive payroll the Members of Congress cannot get their salaries. There is no place that you can create wealth except in the production and distribution and purchase of goods. Now, that is all; it is fundamental. And, if it is not fundamental, why are we striving so hard to help underdeveloped countries climb economically to the point where they have the production of goods within their own communities?

Mr. Speaker, it has come to the point where those of us who sincerely believe in and who sincerely love this country have got to stop and take stock. You just cannot carry on with what has been going on in the last 8 or 10 years, particularly the last 7.

Now, you ask: Are the reciprocal trade agreements all wrong? Absolutely not. It is the soundest piece of governmental machinery ever created, but when the reciprocal trade agreements are perverted for private personal profit, then they become a drug on the economic body and will soon, after putting it to sleep, annihilate it.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will be glad to.

Mr. DORN. I, for one, want to compliment and congratulate my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], on his philosophy, because he is bringing to the attention of this Congress something that is very, very important. The American people appreciate it. If the gentleman's people in Pennsylvania are unemployed, how can I sell my cotton or wheat or cattle or textile goods? What you are trying to tell this Congress is that America, under the way the reciprocal trade policy is administered, is going to become weaker and weaker, and we cannot supply any foreign aid or any military hardware or anything else to our allies. This is the surest way to destroy this country, operating under the fallacious, ridiculous trade policy we have followed in the last 10 years.

Would anyone get up in the GATT conference or in any of our trade conferences and suggest that Brazil import coffee or Honduras import bananas or India import tea or the Malay States import aluminum or rubber? They would think he was crazy if he made such a preposterous and ridiculous proposal. Yet, that is what they are asking old Uncle Sugar Daddy and old Uncle Sap to do every day, bring in bicycles, automobiles, cotton goods, things we have in surplus, and destroy the United States. The gentleman is exactly right. There is no established policy in Washington that can save a nation which is so basically unsound in its trade policies. Let us go back to fundamentals and put first things first.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman again and I hope he will continue to speak here not only for 10 weeks but every week until this Congress recognizes the facts and does something about these fallacious trade policies, one-way-street policies we are indulging in.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman very kindly. I do not intend to keep going very long, but I just want to read you something out of one of the leading Canadian business papers. Let us see what they are demanding in Canada. Let us just see what they are demanding. This is taken from the Financial Post of Toronto. It is a statement by W. N. Hall, president of the Dominion Tar & Chemical, Ltd., which would be like saying we were talking to the president of General Motors in this country.

I want to quote from his statement. Talking to Canadians he said this:

> Let us encourage manufacture and employment at home and within reason use whatever protectionist tools we have to do this. Let us make a start at getting our people back to work. That is the only answer for Canada in its economic crisis.

He went on to say this:

> No magic formula for full employment will automatically adjust the mix between export and import and save the policymakers from their all-intelligent thought and wise judgment. But they would be very shrewd indeed if they remembered this: I am for the hard sell but I am for the hard buy.

What does that mean? It means this, that no American automobile worker, making $25 a day has the right to expect to be able to buy a shirt from Hong Kong made by a worker who earns 60 cents a day. If I want high wages in this country I have to pay high prices for what I buy; because if I do not pay high prices, the garment industry workers, the textile workers, will not be able to buy my automobile, if I am an automobile worker. So, if I want cheap goods on the market I cannot ask for high wages. The two matters go hand in hand. The cure, as I notice from a statement that came out of Miami yesterday, is not a cure at all. It is ridiculous, because it does not give any consideration to the original philosophy behind our so-called free trade policies.

Let me show you something. It was said yesterday in Miami, at the AFL–CIO conference, that the way to handle the free-trade argument is to create in this country by automation, mind you, technical advancements in producing goods cheaper than other countries could send into this country. Now let me ask you something. We say over in the State Department that we must buy from other countries in order that they remain our friends. If we turn around and produce cheap goods, goods that they, therefore, cannot sell to us, do we lose them as friends then? You have to make up your mind one way or the other. This is a new, almost a phenomenal bit of philosophy put out by the people whom I have nicknamed; I coined a word for them. You know, we have all

kinds of experts today. We have heard about these great leaders that we are bringing into Government. And they are great, I imagine, in their own way. But if you really study the matter a little, you might want to go to the dictionary and find another word for them. I call it stupocrat; because, somewhere along the line, they just have not thought the situation out. They say to us, mind you, that what we have to do is to increase our production so that we can export. That will bring our gold reserves back into balance.

On the other hand, they say, if you remember the ill-fated Boggs bill, that we ought to increase the incentive for Americans to invest overseas. Does anyone kid himself into believing that if I as an American manufacturer go to one of the foreign countries and build a factory to produce goods that I am already selling to that country, I will ever be able to manufacture cheaply enough in America to sell against myself?

I made this statement on the floor on Monday. I know that very few, if any, took the time to read it. But the 10 top items, dollar and volume items, being exported to foreign countries from the United States, are the same 10 top items that American investors are investing in most heavily across the seas. Somewhere this has to break. Somewhere along the line this must crash. We cannot carry on forever.

I remember on this floor when they said that the isolated case of a clothespin manufacturer or a bicycle maker should not be the basis for the determination of our trade policies. But it is no longer an isolated case. The exception has become the rule. Today the isolated cases are those particular industries that are not hurt by imports.

My good friend talked about cotton. Let me tell him just exactly how this cotton thing works. One of our biggest arguments is with Japan. We say, if they buy cotton and other raw materials they should have a market here. Do you see this piece of cotton sticking out there on this lighter, hardly above my thumb? That is the cotton they have from the United States, incidentally at a subsidized price of 8 cents a pound, less than our textile people pay for it. But that is the cotton that went into that. That is reciprocal trade. They buy this bit of cotton from us, then they ship back to the United States 41 million of these lighters. It is the old story of trading a horse for a rabbit. We the American taxpayers got the rabbit and the Japanese industrialists got the horse.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that God willing, and if my health holds out, I expect to be on this floor at least once a week from now until the end of this session, because I sincerely and deeply believe that this disease that affects us today is one that can be cured only by Congress. They cannot mix statesmanship with economics. Idealism is one thing, and I am one who has believed in it all my life. Good neighbors? I have tried to be one all my life, and I will continue to be one. But when my father as a poor immigrant in the steerage of a cattle boat came to this country, and he sank his roots deep by having a large family of children, he gave me a love for America that transcends personal well-being or welfare.

I honestly believe that unless we stop and take stock now the same devastation will hit other lines of consumer goods that has hit the glass industry, the coal industry, and the ceramic industry in my home community. Within 5 years from now this Nation instead of being the prince in the marketplace will be the pauper. I intend to take time every opportunity the Chair allows me to in order that I may fight this battle, even if I have to fight it alone. I know I will not be alone, because gentlemen like my colleague who was just speaking will be here if no one else is here.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. May I compliment the gentleman on the very eloquent and precise manner in which he has explained to the House the significance of the export-import situation. Certainly I am sure we have all learned much of the significance of this regardless of what our occupation may be or the section of the country from which we come.

May I ask the gentleman this question, Whether as he proceeds to make these presentations he intends to document the imports that pertain to the agricultural situation today with the same degree of preciseness as he has presented some of the other problems?

Mr. DENT. Naturally I have started in the field I know best, the manufactured products in my own community and State, but you cannot cover the question of imports and exports in trade today unless you run the whole gamut of the entire picture. I am sure there is a great deal the so-called agricultural States Congressmen will learn before I am through.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I can help to answer our colleague's question?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to my distinguished colleague that, of course, from time to time we put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resolutions adopted by the American Cattlemen's Association against unfair and un-American low wage imports. We put resolutions in the RECORD of the American Vegetable Growers Association and resolutions from many of the cotton industry groups and various farm groups. Last year your distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY], made this astonishing statement.

That statement has never been refuted by any Member here. He made a statement that we could solve the farm problem of this country in one clip if we would prevent the importation of unfair farm products such as feed. He said we could put 70 million new acres into production and solve our farm problem. So I can assure the gentleman from time to time, we will continue to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include in these speeches the unfair way in which we are being deprived of an opportunity to grow and to develop on the farms of America.

I might add, with my colleague's most generous permission, that since 1955, and I am glad my distinguished majority leader is listening here today, Russia has put into production 100 million new acres and every single country under the face of the shining sun is increasing its agricultural output and devoting more acres to agriculture except, again, our old friend, Uncle Sugar Daddy. We are sharing our acres with all the world, and in 5 years, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania says, in the field of agriculture as well as in ceramics and glassware and steel and in all these other great industries, we will be the pauper because we have today only 11 percent of American people living on the farms, the lowest percentage that any great civilization has ever had, Mr. Leader, in the history of the world, and you do not have Communist revolutions out on the farm when people are farming. You cannot get them together because they have to stay to milk the cows and feed the chickens. But, when they have nothing planted and when they are not permitted to plant anything while all the rest of the world is permitted to grow more and more, then you see how close we are to that day, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania so ably warned us here time and again.

The same situation exists on the farm today that exists in his great district. We are unemployed. We have nothing to do. We have nothing to plant and we are not permitted to plant. I say to my distinguished colleague, you will be informed and I am sure you agree with us, as to how the farmers are being affected.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I express my gratitude and pleasure on being informed that this matter will be covered. My interest in this field stems from the fact that we have in my office covered this field rather thoroughly. I had occasion just the other day to make some observations on it, and to make note of the fact that a suggestion is being made to ask the American farmer to reduce his production of oats, barley and rye, as an example, three crops in which American farmers have not raised one single bushel of surplus for the last 12 or 15 years, and we actually have imported them to the extent where we have these grains piled up as a surplus, and then asked the American taxpayers to pay the storage on them. So to that degree, I do have an interest in this and I compliment the gentlemen for their intention to include these matters as a part of the discussions that we are coming to.

Mr. DENT. Thank you very kindly.

In closing I want to say that I stated when I started out on this series of talks that if 10 courageous, conscientious men believing in the seriousness of this problem will join me every week, we do not need 400 Members of Congress. Just 10 men who will share their abilities on this floor. I assure you you will awaken the American people, because only one voice is needed, if it is sincere.

THE LATE HONORABLE JUDGE R. V. BOTTOMLY—A BELOVED MONTANA JURIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound feeling of deep sadness that I announce the passing of my dear friend, the respected jurist, the Honorable Judge R. V. Bottomly, former associate justice of the Montana State Supreme Court. The passing of my friend and colleague of many years has ended a most distinguished career as a public official. As a father of nine children—seven boys and two girls—Judge Bottomly gave much evidence of the application of true Christian principles under our American tradition. All seven boys were Eagle Scouts—highest ranking in scouting; his two daughters held highest rank among Camp Fire Girls. His seven boys served in the military during World War II, all with distinguished records. Since World War II the Bottomly boys are as follows: Ray and Heath both colonels, Richard a judge, Douglas a doctor, Forbes an educator, Byron an insurance agent, and Jim a lawyer. His daughters are Mouriel Bauer and Elizabeth Ann Bottomly.

My fellow Montanans who are distinguished Senators from our State, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, would agree with me that the presence of Judge Bottomly on the Montana scene will be sorely missed. From our intimate association with him in public service we knew what kind of man he was. He was a kind and personable man, and one whom I have tried to emulate in my lifetime. He had a keen analytical mind, and possessed understanding and patience for every individual. To Judge Bottomly, people were persons and these persons were individuals—before God and man their rights and responsibilities were always upheld.

I extend to his widow, Mouriel, of Helena, Mont., and his seven sons and two daughters my sincere and deepest sympathy in their hour of grief, and I join with thousands of Montanans and others throughout the Nation in paying tribute to his life.

Former Associate Justice R. V. Bottomly died early Tuesday morning, February 14, 1961, in Great Falls Deaconess Hospital.

The Kansas-born 75-year-old jurist this year had ended 2) years of service to his adopted State.

Only 1 week before his death he was transferred to Great Falls for further treatment. He had been ill for several months, suffering a bout with pneumonia.

Funeral services were conducted Friday, February 17, at St. Paul's Methodist Church in Helena, Mont., with the Reverend John W. Bartram officiating.

Raymond Victor Bottomly was born in Cederville, Kans., July 16, 1885. He was graduated from Emporia, Kans., Teachers' College and received his law degree at Kansas University in 1915. The same year he moved to Montana and was admitted to the bar.

He opened a legal practice in Harlem in 1915 and had continued in the legal field since.

In 1916, following his marriage to former Mouriel Heath, he homesteaded in the Big Flat country north of Harlem.

Vic Bottomly began his public career in 1922, when he was elected Blaine County attorney and served in this capacity for two terms. From 1933 to 1941 he was Montana attorney for the U.S. Home Owners' Corporation at the State office in Great Falls. After this, he became assistant attorney general, and then in 1942 was elevated to the attorney general post.

Judge Bottomly began service to Montana in 1942, when he was named to the post of attorney general under the State's military absence law. The officeholder, John Bonner, and Howard M. Gullickson, of Billings, first appointed to succeed him, were called into military service. In 1944 Bottomly ran for attorney general.

In 1943 George Niewoehner, White Sulphur Springs lawyer, sought to challenge Bottomly's appointment to the post of attorney general, but then District Judge F. P. Leiper decided the appointment by then Gov. Sam C. Ford would stand. Neiwoehner based his challenge on the fact he had received 127 write-in votes in the 1942 election, in which Bonner was named to the post.

In 1948 Bottomly became a candidate for a seat on the Montana Supreme Court for a 6-year term. In the 1948 election he defeated Associate Justice I. W. Choate and took over the post he had held until this year. Following conclusion of his first term he again ran for the post in 1954 and was once more chosen by the Montana electorate.

Two of the high points of his legal career came shortly before he became a member of the supreme court. He represented Montana before the International Joint Commission in a controversy over allocation of waters of Sage Creek near the Canadian border. Shortly after the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed his contention that Montana's motor carriers taxes are applicable to interstate truckers.

Bottomly was interested in Boy Scouts and the scouting movement. He served as a commissioner of the North Central Montana Boy Scout Council and was a member at large of the national Scout board.

Judge Bottomly was past commander of the Chinook American Legion, past president of the Chinook Lions Club, past master of the Harlem Masons and a member of the Great Falls Consistory of Scottish Rite Masons, Algeria Shrine of Helena, and the Eagles.

He was active throughout his life in public affairs. He was president of the North Montana Development Association, commissioner of the Harlem irrigation district and attorney for other irrigation districts and also served on the Chinook school board.

Judge Bottomly had held the high court position since his election in 1948, until the end of 1960, when he retired from the bench.

The teachers college graduate practiced law, served as a prosecutor on an international commission, and won national recognition in Boy Scout work.

In a dozen years on the supreme court he had heard major cases which have had a part in molding the history of Montana.

On Thanksgiving Day, Bottomly reentered St. Peter's Hospital, and was treated for pneumonia and pulmonary complications. Early in 1960 he suffered an upset, and collapsed on the high court bench. Later, district judges acted in his place on several cases.

Surviving, besides his widow, Mouriel, of Helena; sons Col. Raymond Victor Bottomly, Jr., stationed at the command staff school, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; Col. Heath Bottomly, USAF College, Montgomery, Ala.; Forbes Bottomly, Spokane, Wash.; Byron Eugene, Phoenix, Ariz.; district judge, Richard V. Bottomly, Great Falls; James J. Bottomly, Helena; and Dr. Douglas R. Bottomly, Portland, Oreg.; daughters Mouriel Bauer, Great Falls; and Elizabeth Ann Bottomly, Seattle, Wash., are 23 grandchildren; 3 sisters, Alice Maslin, Long Island, N.Y.; Mabel Duff, Colorado Springs, Colo.; and Ruth Pitsen, Seattle, Wash., and several nieces and nephews. He was preceded in death by two brothers.

The Honorable Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, advises that Montana State University at Missoula, Mont., has accepted a suggestion of Washington, D.C., friends of Judge Bottomly, and that a bookshelf will be established at MSU, with MSU Prof. Edmund Freeman, serving as interim chairman of the book selection committee.

Besides the nine lucky Bottomly children, there were many, many more of us who looked to him for fatherly advice. We shall miss him greatly.

THE COMMON MARKET AND EFTA—THEIR MOVE NEXT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy recently forwarded to the Congress his message on our balance of payments. The President formally rejected devaluation of the dollar, exchange controls, restrictive trade policies, the abdication of our international responsibilities, and the dilution of antirecession measures, as solutions to the payments problem.

OUR PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Instead, he urged eliminating our basic annual deficit in the balance of payments of $1.5 billion primarily by an aggressive program to expand our exports. "The Government must play a more vigorous part in helping to enlarge foreign markets for American goods and services," he said.

Our recent export performance has been good. Our 1960 surplus in commodity exports over imports was $4.8 billion. In the last quarter of 1960, our surplus approached $6 billion on an annual basis.

REQUIRES EXPANDING OUR EXPORTS

Furthermore, U.S. exports in 1960 increased 20 percent over 1959, to a record total of $19½ billion. The removal of quantitative restrictions throughout the free trading world, and boom conditions in Europe and Japan, largely account for this favorable performance.

But if we are to bridge our recurring balance of payments deficit of $1½ billion, we must run an even more favorable surplus on current trade than we now do—by around $1 billion or more. Only thus can we finance our large and continuing programs of military defense and foreign aid, and at the same time avoid restrictionism at home.

IT WOULD ALSO FIGHT UNEMPLOYMENT

We need to expand our exports for an important reason additional to that of our balance of payments. Domestic unemployment in the United States is at around 7 percent of the work force, and production is lagging by many billions a year. An increase in exports will add needed jobs and production to the American economy.

How can we sell more goods abroad? As President Kennedy said, we must keep our prices competitive, and American exporters must really try. These things are for us to do.

OUR FRIENDS MUST HELP

But we cannot do it alone. Our trading partners in the free world must help by reducing the present level of tariffs and similar clogs on trade. This they must do not simply to help us, but to insure that the trade of the free world can be balanced at a high level.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the two regional trading blocs of free Europe, the Common Market—Benelux, West Germany, France, and Italy—and EFTA—the United Kingdom, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal.

Under timetables established by the two blocs, the process of eliminating internal tariff barriers between their constituent countries, which began on January 1, 1959, will be completed by January 1, 1970.

THE COMMON MARKET TIMETABLE

Common Market internal tariffs on manufactured goods have already been reduced by a total of 30 percent, and on agricultural items from 20 to 25 percent. The first 20 percent of reduction was granted to third countries on a most-favored-nation basis, where the reduction did not result in a rate below the ultimate Common Market external rate. The remaining 10 percent reduction, made on January 1, 1961, was not made on a most-favored-nation basis. A further reduction of 20 percent in the internal tariff will take place on December 31, 1961.

In the Common Market, external tariffs will be moved upward or downward to a single set of common tariffs, again by 1970. On January 1, 1961, the first step toward this common external tariff was taken by the adjustment of rates a part of the way.

The EFTA countries will retain their separate external tariffs.

WE'RE ALL FOR THE COMMON MARKET AND EFTA

Since World War II, it has been an object of U.S. policy to encourage economic and political cooperation in Western Europe. Our Marshall plan funds were so administered as to further Europe-wide economic cooperation.

Both the customs union and the free trade area, of which the Common Market and EFTA are respectively examples, are permitted by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, to which we have adhered since 1948. The cooperation inherent in both groupings helps to prevent economic strength from being dissipated by international rivalries and disputes. By broadening both the market in which goods may be sold, and the amount of competition from abroad, both blocs make for greater productivity and well-being. In addition, the Common Market holds particular promise as a means of reducing tension between France and Germany.

BUT HOW WILL THEY AFFECT OUR PAYMENTS PROBLEMS?

So far, so good. But let me return to my point that over the last decade the United States has transformed itself from a country with a persistent balance-of-payments surplus to a country with a persistent balance-of-payments deficit—and problems of a lagging growth rate and recurrent recessions to boot.

To be honest with ourselves, we must realize that both the Common Market and EFTA, with the discriminations inherent in removing their internal tariffs alone, present formidable obstacles to our selling the $1-billion-plus more exports annually which we have seen are essential to our making the grade.

This is because the Six of the Common Market and the Seven of EFTA will be able to sell within their respective areas without paying tariffs, while producers in the rest of the world, including the United States, will have to scale their tariff barriers. In addition, exporters to the Common Market will have to adjust themselves to a common external tariff, which means that many rates will go up and that other rates will come down.

IT'S THEIR SIZE THAT HURTS US

The discrimination against the United States and the rest of the free world inherent in the Common Market and EFTA is immensely more serious than would be the discrimination inherent in approving a customs union between a handful of small countries. The Common Market and EFTA receive 44 percent of total free world exports, even without including their various oversea territories. In 1960, they took 30 percent of all U.S. commercial exports. Furthermore, the percentage of U.S. exports going to the Common Market and EFTA countries is increasing.

Thus, disturbances in trade patterns due to tariff discriminations by the Common Market and EFTA could have serious consequences for the United States, for all third countries, and even for the Six and Seven themselves.

LOWER COSTS PLUS TARIFFS EQUAL TROUBLE

How does this come about? As internal tariffs in the Common Market and EFTA come progressively down toward zero, producers in both groups will get the benefit of the lower costs and greater efficiency that come from larger markets and a more competitive environment. Exporters to the two blocs from the United States and elsewhere will face keener competition within the areas, as well as the necessity of scaling tariff barriers in order to sell at all. This is likely to mean less export income from the blocs to the United States and the rest of the free world—prices will be lower, and volume will be less.

Furthermore, producers within EFTA and the Common Market may well find that their lower costs enable them to obtain a larger share of the world export market. American private businesses will probably continue their tendency to set up subsidiaries within the Common Market and EFTA, and to plow back earnings into further expansion rather than to bring them back to the United States. Since mid-1957, more than 350 new ventures have been undertaken by U.S. firms in the Common Market. Direct investment by U.S. firms in both areas has increased by almost one-third in the same period.

These two likely trends—fewer exports from the United States and the rest of the free world to the Common Market and EFTA, and a relatively smaller share of the world export market outside Europe as a result of increased competition from the Common Market and EFTA—pose a very real threat toward balancing trade and payments at a high level throughout the free world, and toward the successful achievement of the U.S. export drive which we have seen is so vital.

THOUGH EUROPE IS BOOMING TODAY, WE STILL ARE NOT EXPORTING ENOUGH

One hears it argued that the threat posed by the Common Market and EFTA is really not so serious. Increased prosperity within each bloc, it is claimed, will enable purchase of enough exports from the United States and the rest of the free world so as to counterbalance the discriminatory effects I have just mentioned.

The trouble with this argument is that we are dealing with a Six and a Seven which are enjoying a boom right now, today—and our trade surplus is still short $1 billion or more of what we need. When you engraft discrimination on what we now have, our export position, it seems to me, may well get worse, not better. Countries with high productivity, such as West Germany and the United Kingdom, could well use the decided tariff advantages they would have over us to absorb much of the increased market deriving from heightened prosperity in the Common Market and EFTA.

Thus, the effect of eliminating internal tariffs within the Common Market and EFTA—unless measures are taken to counteract it—will be to aggravate rather than alleviate our own balance-of-payments difficulties, and to create a permanent imbalance in free world trade and payments.

THE EXTERNAL TARIFF FURTHER COMPLICATES MATTERS

So much for the internal tariff removal. On top of this, the formula adopted by the Common Market to achieve a common external tariff is inherently biased in the direction of a higher average tariff than is now imposed by the Six themselves. The Common Market formula is the simple arithmetic average of duties in Benelux, France, West Germany, and Italy. France and Italy have very high tariffs—frequently so high as to prevent any appreciable imports of the particular product, and Germany and particularly Benelux have much lower tariffs. Thus a simple arithmetic average will certainly hurt our trade with Benelux and West Germany considerably, without necessarily helping our trade with France and Italy an equivalent amount.

The GATT negotiations at Geneva which commenced in September 1960, and are scheduled to go on throughout most of 1961, include negotiations with respect to the external tariffs of the Common Market unit and of the EFTA countries. They do not deal with the central discriminations involved in the prospective abolition of the internal tariffs of the Six and the Seven. This basic discussion must apparently be swallowed at the outset by the rest of the free world before they go on to bargain with the Six and the Seven on external tariffs. This occurs in three stages, which are designed to yield a rough-hewn sort of reciprocity:

THE THREE STAGES OF GATT NEGOTIATIONS

First. Stage 1, which began in September 1960, involved negotiations with the Common Market by the rest of GATT concerning proposed increases in the Common Market external tariff on products which have been "bound"—previously agreed upon in international negotiations — under GATT article XXVIII. The goal here is a general level of reciprocal and mutually advantageous concessions not less favorable to trade than the present bound agreements. According to a New York Times story of February 1, 1961, this phase of the negotiations, which was to have been completed by December 1, 1960, has broken down because of disagreements involving several hundred items.

Second. Stage 2 will require a judgment on the part of all GATT parties whether the proposed Common Market external tariff satisfies the requirement of GATT article XXIV that it shall not on the whole be higher than the average level of the duties heretofore applicable among the constituent members of the Common Market.

Third. Stage 3 involves the traditional reciprocal tariff cutting. For the United States, this will be in accordance with the authority granted by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. It should be noted that the bargaining power allowed us under this act is relatively meager.

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF THE EXTERNAL TARIFF

I do not doubt, Mr. Speaker, that our skillful and devoted trade negotiators at Geneva will do their best to see that the external tariffs of the Six and the Seven do not place us in a worse position, as to external tariffs, than before—although their only guidelines will be the extremely vague language of GATT articles XXIV and XXVIII, and the limited reciprocal tariff-cutting power under stage three of the negotiations.

But our negotiators at Geneva will have to go some in order to see that the application of external tariffs in the Six and in the Seven do not leave us worse off then before—not to mention the effect of the internal tariff abolition, which will surely leave us worse off. Insight into the problems confronting our negotiations can best be obtained by examining some examples of the probable impact of the proposed Common Market external tariff—using 1958 trade figures—on our export trade:

Example 1: The European automobile industry has achived a level of efficiency, without preferential privileges, which enables it to maintain sales of 400,000 to 500,000 automobiles per year in the United States in competition with our compacts. Our tariff is 8½ percent. Yet it will have in the Common Market the protection of a 29-percent tariff against U.S. compact cars—reduced by 20 percent in the United States makes equivalent reductions in the third-stage tariff-cutting negotiations. This compares with the merest 21 percent German tariff. In the EFTA countries U.S. automobile firms face tariff rates ranging from 12 to 30 percent ad valorem, while British and Swedish vehicles will have—in 1970—no duty at all to pay.

In other important classes of consumers durable and nondurable goods, the United States is not now the principal or even major supplier. But as income levels rise in both areas, the United States should have a chance to compete for this business. However, the Common Market averages now being set will constitute formidable barriers. Most radio and television sets will face a tariff rate of 20 percent; most clothing, rates from 20 to 22 percent; vacuum cleaners, 20 percent; automatic dishwashers, 18 percent; electric washing machines, 19 percent.

Example 2: In 1958, Germany and the Benelux countries purchased $2.7 million of sheep and lamb leather from the United States, the two countries sharing about equally in these imports. The German tariffs are 6 to 8 percent; the Benelux rate 6 percent. France and Italy, with tariff rates ranging from 13 to 23 percent, did not import these products at all from the United States. The arithmetic average of the four sets of rates, the Common Market tariff, works out to 10 percent. The new tariff means an increase of from two to four percentage points in the tariff on our exports, for which a reduction of rates by the nonpurchasers, France and Italy, is obviously inadequate compensation.

Example 3: Three-quarters of total U.S. sales of varnishes and lacquers in 1958 were to Benelux and Germany, whose rates range from 12 to 25 percent. France and Italy, with rates ranging from 20 to 35 percent, accounted for the remaining quarter. The Common Market rate is 19 percent, an increase of four to seven percentage points on much of our trade with the lower tariff countries, with decreases confined to a relatively smaller fraction of our trade.

Example 4: Germany and Benelux, at bound rates of 4 percent, purchased about $750,000 of a total million dollars' worth of putty from the United States. Sales to France and Italy were at rates ranging from 15 to 20 percent. The Common Market rate has been set at 11 percent, nearly three times the present bound rates at which the largest volume of our trade now enters the Common Market.

Example 5: More than two-thirds of our $3 million sales of oil burners are to Benelux and Germany, which have rates of 6 to 10 percent. French and Italian rates range between 21 to 40 percent, and the Common Market rate is set at 14 percent.

Example 6: Five million dollars out of a total of about $8 million in U.S. sales of lifting, handling, and loading machinery went to Germany and Benelux, at rates ranging from zero to 8 percent. Sales to France and Italy were at rates of 15 to 40 percent. The Common Market rate is 14 percent.

Example 7: Nearly three-quarters of a total $4 million in U.S. sales of knitting machines went to Germany and Benelux at a 6-percent bound rate. The Common Market rate of 13 percent is more than double this rate, although it will be a substantial reduction of French and Italian rates, which are now from 20 to 30 percent ad valorem.

Example 8: U.S. sales of metal lathes totaled $5 million. About $1.5 million went to Germany on a bound duty-free basis. However, about $3 million were sold to France at an average duty of about 11 percent. The Common Market rate is 10 percent, a slight reduction in the French duty, but a drastic increase on sales to Germany.

Example 9: A similar situation arises in sales of office and calculating machine parts. Benelux and France shared about equally in total sales of about $7 million. The Common Market rate of 14 percent is one percentage point less than the present bound French rate, but substantially in excess of Benelux bound rates of 6, 8, and 10 percent.

WHERE GATT CAN'T HELP

But here is what mainly disturbs me: even if our negotiators come out on the external tariffs on a completely even-Stephen basis, the serious discrimination against U.S. and free world trade caused by ending the internal tariffs will still exist. We need to be in a better position after 1961 vis-a-vis our European export markets. If nature simply takes its course, we shall be in a worse position.

What I am getting at is that we and the rest of the free world are entering the GATT negotiations at a striking disadvantage. We can do our best in each of the three stages of GATT negotiations, and come out with every ounce of reciprocity to which we are entitled, yet still face a permanent imbalance in trade and payments with the Six and the Seven because of the discrimination ensuing from the removal of the internal

tariffs, which is not reachable by GATT negotiations at all. Thus the three-stage GATT negotiations, even if wholly successful from our standpoint, merely lock the stable after the horse has been stolen.

NEEDED: A SUBSTANTIAL UNILATERAL TARIFF COMMON MARKET AND EFTA

What is needed is a firm and formal recognition by the Six and the Seven that they must make a substantial unilateral reduction in their external tariffs, outside of but concurrent with the GATT negotiations. The advantages the Six and the Seven get from their customs union and free trade areas enable them to make such a reduction. With our payments deficit and our domestic unemployment, the United States needs and deserves it. And so does the rest of the free trade world.

An excellent forum, in which the Six and the Seven could declare themselves in favor of such a unilateral reduction in their external tariffs, is the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, which includes both the Six and the Seven as full members, with ourselves as observers. This will become an even better forum when, in September 1961 it ripens into the Organization for European Development and Cooperation.

With the Six and the Seven committed to a substantial unilateral reduction, the GATT can then proceed with its three-stage exercises, as now planned.

UNLESS YOU ASK, YOU DON'T GET

I would emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we must ask. Only to him that asks is it likely to be given, as was recently convincingly demonstrated when West Germany responded to our request to help share the burden of foreign economic aid.

The time to ask is now—before we waive our right to ask by needless detailed bargaining at GATT on the three stages of external tariff negotiations. Such negotiations are equipped to produce reciprocity for us, not the more than reciprocity that is needed to reduce the basic payments imbalance of the free world.

A decision by the Six and the Seven to lower their external tariffs, substantially and unilaterally, is the road to responsibility—for the United States, for the rest of the free world, and for the Six and the Seven themselves. I am confident that many others in the Congress will agree that this is the road for the free world to follow.

NIKE-ZEUS NOW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, world peace today stands poised upon the precarious parity in mass destruction currently maintained by these United States, as leader of the free world, and the Soviet Union, master of the slave.

So long as this parity exists, peace exists; disturb this delicate balance, and tragedy stalks the earth.

It is this critical circumstance which impels me to speak today.

The welter of words and phrases, opinions, portents, and politics—which currently flow and eddy so confusingly concerning a missile gap in our defenses—further confirms my opinion that our present reliance upon the principle of peace through parity is subject to serious question.

Mr. Speaker, I join with those objective analysts who do perceive, in the military posture of the United States, a specific missile gap.

I am convinced that the Soviet Union presently, and providentially, suffers this same defect.

It is apparent to me that neither of the two mightiest states in the world today possess the capability of active defense against incoming enemy submarine-launched and intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The nation which first exclusively develops and deploys such an antimissile defense weapons system will—at one dramatic stroke: close its missile gap; invalidate the principle of peace through parity; and be in a position to dominate the nations and peoples of this earth.

World domination, Mr. Speaker, is the absolute, immutable goal of the Communists.

At this moment, according to the best intelligence estimates available to me, they are employing at highest priority their maximum resources in the race to create and produce the world's first operational antimissile weapons system.

If they succeed—if they are the first nation to provide highly effective protection for crucial centers of population, industry and military might—they will have neutralized the retaliatory striking power of these United States—and the free world will stand naked, helpless before them.

Clearly apparent, Mr. Speaker, are the implications of that situation.

The Soviet Union would comand a strategic advantage of literally indescribable magnitude. In world councils the ballistic blackmail of the Communist dictatorship could—and I believe would have a position to dictate a new world order.

Just a decade ago we of this Nation help a monopoly on world power. We held that monopoly through exclusive possession of one weapons system—the atom bomb.

The United States used that power for freedom, progress, and world peace.

Had the Kremlin controlled that weapons system, this earth could well be a Communist Soviet of nations today.

There is a danger of this prospect at present.

In this surging era of revolutionary science and technology, it is a fearsome fact that exclusive possession of one weapons system can render the world family of nations subject to the dictate of a single state.

With the deepest interest, Mr. Speaker, I have studied the remarks concerning this serious situation which recently have been made by certain of my distinguished colleagues in both House and Senate, and particularly those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] on this Monday last. It is my hope that every Member of this House will again review that prescient address, which appears on page 2132 of the February 13 RECORD.

I associate myself with the analytical and objective statements therein contained to the effect that this Nation must, at the earliest moment possible, complete its defensive posture through production and deployment of America and the free world's sole anti-missile-missile defensive weapons system, the Nike-Zeus.

This system, now in the final stages of development by the U.S. Army, is the only weapon system on this side of the Iron Curtain specifically designed to meet and master Communist-launched aerospace ballistic missiles.

Its components have been proved effective through 3 years of continuous development. Its major elements progressively have met the most demanding tests. Its solid-fuel motor packs the mightiest propulsive power available to a free-world missile system today—almost 500,000 pounds of thrust.

It is ready for initial production, now.

On the day the Army is able to emplace Zeus batteries in active, operational defense against incoming intermediate range and intercontinental ballistic missiles, this Nation will again stand in a dominant position in the world.

The Communists will know that, as in the case of the manned bomber today, only a bare percentage of their missiles could penetrate this Nation's defenses. They will be certain that we would retain intact the overwhelming proportion of our massive retaliatory power through which to rise and smite their vital centers. They will have to reject, as absolutely infeasible, any plan for launching surprise nuclear attack upon these United States, and they will have to reverse their present policy of ballistic blackmail.

In short, the day this Nation first fields the Nike-Zeus the Communists must leave the jungle of international aggression, and reenter the precincts of the civilized world.

Mr. Speaker, national security is nonpartisan in nature.

The battle flags of party interest will grace the ramparts of national defense.

It is in that sense that unhesitantly I note and commend the previous administration for its support, in terms of a billion-dollar investment, of the work which today has brought the mighty Zeus system to the final stages of advanced development.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, in conscience I cannot forbear noting also that, whereas this House, and subsequently the Senate, wisely through foresight authorized and appropriated the funds necessary, that same administration refused to begin limited production of Zeus defense batteries. As a result, we are losing invaluable leadtime each day in the deadly race against Russia to be first in closing the missile gap.

In this regard I cite the prophetic words of the U.S. Army's determined and dedicated Chief of Research and Development, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau—and I quote:

In their godless communistic society, in their absolute mastery over man and resource, the Soviet dictatorship can field an operational weapons system in an average leadtime of 5 years; this Nation must have 7. I agree with those who hold the view that to delay production of the Zeus today is to court disaster in the future.

Mr. Speaker, with General Trudeau I join with those who hold that view.

It is most saliently expressed in this recent dispatch authored by an outstanding young Washington journalist and reporter of the Hearst publications, Peter Andrews, whose column is serviced to all newspapers of that public information medium.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, his column from the New York Journal American of February 7 entitled "Delay Hurts A-Defense."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

DELAY HURTS A-DEFENSE

(By Peter Andrews)

WASHINGTON.—An all out and, perhaps, last-chance push to get the Nike-Zeus antimissile-missile system into production is underway.

Backers of the world's only defense system to missile attack are pounding on all sides for President Kennedy to make the command decision that will put the Nike-Zeus system into operation.

Lawmakers from both sides of the aisle and top officers of all services are supporting the increased national interest in the project. One of the leading technical journals in the field ran a special 28-page section on the system.

The current issue of Army magazine is devoted almost entirely to the Nike-Zeus. Senator THURMOND, Democrat, South Carolina, sounded the alarm in the Senate last week, Representative MILLER, Democrat, California, picks up the attack again this week.

The whole campaign is hauntingly reminiscent of the pre-World War II days when a group of men tried desperately to warn America of the need for developing air power.

Gen. Arthur Trudeau is the brilliant, hard-minded boss of the Army's research and development program. He speaks at luncheons and conventions, shakes hands, presents slide lectures, and dutifully goes through whatever he has to to get people to listen to his message on Nike-Zeus.

COSTLY COMPLACENCY

"We dare not become so criminally complacent we don't even try to defend ourselves," is the gist of his message.

The issue is as simple as that. With Nike-Zeus in place we could defend ourselves against a missile assault. Without it, we can only hope to absorb the first blow and have enough left to fight back.

The race to achieve an operational antimissile-missile system is one of the few armament springs in which the United States is clearly and definitely ahead of Russia. But time is running out.

The Soviets have put a top priority rating on creation of an antimissile missile. We are still ahead, but we average an 8-year lead time compared to the Soviet's average of 5. Every day an executive department official shoves papers across his mahogany desk without making a decision is another day taken out of our slight edge.

The holdup of the Nike-Zeus program is one of the most mysterious stories in Washington. Although the Zeus is on schedule, the program has not been allowed to go ahead with limited production of proved components. It has been held back until all testing is completed in 1962.

In the whole history of the missile age, the Nike-Zeus is the only system that has ever been refused such a production order.

Cost has been one of the big arguments against creation of a full Zeus system. The men who run Zeus have been able to use some of their stalled time to whittle down the price tag. Present estimates call for about $8 billion for the next 8 years. About the same price we will have to pay to store our surplus wheat.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the message is bitingly clear: Close the gap in our military posture; muzzle the mad-dog missile threat of the Soviet Union; loose the Zeus through America's magnificent production lines, now.

Mr. Speaker, with all the urgency at my command, as a citizen of this Republic and as a Member of Congress, I join with those who petition the new administration to take the dramatic action which will give to America, first and exclusively, the power of world defense against the ballistic missile.

Let us begin production of the Nike-Zeus, at once.

HORSE-AND-BUGGY CONGRESS IN A JET AGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Rules Committee, by a vote of 8 to 6, defeated the motion to report House Resolution 173, to amend the Rules of the House to authorize committees, in their discretion, to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their public hearings. Here is a copy of that resolution:

Resolved, That rule XI26(g) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(g)", and by adding at the end thereto the following:

"(2) Each committee may, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its proceedings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of its proceedings by such methods and by other methods and media of communication."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the House Rules Committee prevented the Members of the House of Representatives from considering and working their will upon what I regard as a most important and salutary reform in House procedure.

But because of the interest of the American people in keeping informed on the operations of their Government, specifically the activities and the decisions of their representatives elected to this body, I propose to discuss this matter at length. I propose to give a brief summary of the historical background of this issue, and then to make some observations on interpretation of the rules, as they now stand, and then to discuss the features of public policy involved in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this problem first arose in the 82d Congress, on February 25, 1952. Under leave to include extraneous matter, I will include all of the portion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, pages 1334–1335, under the heading "Television of Public Hearings."

But first I want to read from that portion of the RECORD a passage and to emphasize what the ruling of Speaker RAYBURN was in response to a parliamentary inquiry propounded by the then minority leader, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, with reference to the telecasting of hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee then being held in Detroit, Mich.:

This is the gist of the Speaker's ruling, as I understand it:

The Chair is operating under the rules of the House. One of the rules reads as follows: "The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees insofar as applicable."

Continuing to quote from the Speaker's ruling:

There is no authority, and as far as the Chair knows there is no rule, granting the privilege of television of the House of Representatives, and the Chair interprets that as applying to these committees or subcommittees, whether they sit in Washington or elsewhere.

I believe that is all that is necessary to quote directly, although I want the entire passage included in my remarks:

TELEVISING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Committee on Un-American Activities called a meeting to be held in Detroit and, I understand, voted to have those hearings televised.

I now understand that the televising of the hearings has been canceled. I understand further that the Speaker, in whom we all have great confidence, has taken the position he has the authority under the rules of the House to call off the televising of the hearings.

I also understand that the Speaker justifies his decision on the ground that the Committee on Un-American Activities operates under the general rules of the House, which of course is true. The general rules of the House give the Speaker the right or privilege of passing upon television, radio, or anything photographic, as far as the House is concerned. But I question, Mr. Speaker, whether this authority would apply to a hearing held in Detroit.

I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that under section 319, Secrecy of Committee Procedure, there is the following quotation:

"It is for the committee to determine, in its discretion, whether the proceedings of the committee shall be open or not."

From that provision under section 319, it is clearly implied that the committee shall be

the judge of what publicity it might desire. Furthermore, in my opinion, it is more of an authority than the Speaker could assume under the general rules of the House.

I note also under the rule, under which, as I understand it, the order to prevent the Detroit television was given, it is stated that—

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

I believe it would be stretching authority considerably to say that because of this rule the Speaker has the right to interpose his own power over a committee as to its own publicity. It could, I am free to admit, be well argued that the chairman of the committee acting as head might have the authority.

May I also call attention that television was used by the subcommittee investigating the tax scandals; the Madden select committee investigating the atrocities relative to the Katyn massacre; the Hébert subcommittee investigating armed services procurements, and the Un-American Activities Committee itself in investigating the Reds in Hollywood. In the Senate there has been the Kefauver committee, the Atomic Energy Committee, the District of Columbia Committee, and the Russell committee. All those decisions to televise were made by the committees themselves.

Mr. Speaker, for clarification of the rules and so that we may understand what may be expected from now on, I submit my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot be heard on the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer his parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, as always, has been kind enough to inform the Chair that he was going to submit this parliamentary inquiry.

It is true that some committees and some subcommittees of the House have begun the practice of having their hearings and their meetings televised; but in each and every instance when the Chair has called attention to the fact that he did not think the rules of the House authorized this, each and every chairman of a committee or subcommittee has ceased doing so at that moment, as far as the Chair understands at this time.

The Chair is operating under the rules of the House. One of the rules reads as follows:

"The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

There is no authority, and as far as the Chair knows, there is no rule granting the privilege of television of the House of Representatives, and the Chair interprets that as applying to these committees or subcommittees, whether they sit in Washington or elsewhere. As the gentleman from Massachusetts says, the Chair, whoever is the Speaker, has control of this end of the Capitol and the House Office Buildings, There being no rule with reference to television or radio, the Chair interprets that the rules of the House shall apply to the committees whether they sit in Washington or outside of Washington. The Chair might indulge in a slight amount of histrionics in saying that if committees all wanted to be televised, and they were not allowed to be televised under the rules of the House in the Capitol or in the House Office Buildings, why they would probably move out of town and think that they would escape the rule, or make a rule in that fashion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a twilight zone which has not been clearly defined as to just what authority the Speaker might have, and I think we should at the earliest possible moment, have some definite rule established. I want to say, too, in fairness to the Speaker that there have been instances—not this particular one—that called for his disapproval of broadcasting. In other words, the decision did not come just upon the Detroit broadcast.

The SPEAKER. In every instance the Chair has held exactly like he has regarding this proposed hearing in Detroit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think television and broadcasting is here to stay and will probably increase in popularity as the days go by. For that reason we should have revision of the rules to define authority.

The SPEAKER. If the House adopts a rule, the Chair will abide by and enforce it, like he does all of the rules of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. In order to do that we would have to amend the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. The Chair was simply calling attention to the rules of the House which do not permit this television in the House of Representatives, or in any committee of the House of Representatives, and the Chair is entirely right about that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is not quite as clear as all that.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the rule will never be changed, myself.

The second occasion upon which this question arose formally and was ruled upon, was the 24th of January 1955. I must point out that in the interval of about 3 years, as we all recall, we had a Republican 83d Congress, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was its Speaker. As he had indicated in his remarks in connection with the parliamentary inquiry he addressed to Speaker RAYBURN, he informally interpreted the rules of the House as authorizing committees, under the present language of the rules of the House, to permit the telecasting and broadcasting of their public hearings. That was no formal ruling, but he did allow committees to broadcast and telecast their hearings; and committees did, in fact, permit telecasting during the 2 years Republicans controlled this Congress, in 1953 and 1954.

When Democrats resumed control in 1955 I propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, on January 24, 1955.

I will insert later from the permanent RECORD the entire colloquy, in which others also engaged, but at this time I will read only for the purpose of the present discussion the following from the ruling of the Chair:

Rule XI of the House provides that the rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the committees of the House of Representatives so far as applicable. The Chair does not think anyone would contend that the House of Representatives is authorized to televise its proceedings or put them on the radio.

The Chair held at that time that this was outside of the rules, and also held that a committee sitting outside of Washington was under the same rules as a committee sitting in Washington, and the Chair held it was governed by the same rules. Here is the entire colloquy of January 24, 1955, on the subject:

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MEADER. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. With the 84th Congress now organizing its committees, it seems to me important to have a clear ruling on the authority of committees to disseminate or permit the dissemination of news of their hearings and proceedings.

By way of background, I might say that this question was raised by the present minority leader in the 82d Congress on the 25th of February 1952. At that time the Speaker expressed the opinion that the rules of the House did not now authorize committees to permit radio and television coverage of their public hearings. I should like to propound that same inquiry but ask for a little greater clarification as to just what news coverage is permissible under the rules of the House of committee public hearings; whether news reporters are permitted to be present; whether photographers taking still pictures are permitted to be present; whether motion picture cameras for newsreel purposes with sound are permitted to be present; whether live radio broadcasting or telecasting or recorded radio broadcasting are permissible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule and also make a statement. Something along the same line was propounded to the present occupant of the chair by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] February 25, 1952.

Rule XI of the House provides that the rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the committees of the House of Representatives so far as applicable. The Chair does not think anyone would contend that the House of Representatives is authorized to televise its proceedings or put them on the radio. The Chair held at that time that this was outside of the rules and also held in response to another inquiry that a committee sitting outside of Washington was under the same rules as a committee inside of Washington, and the Chair held that it was controlled by the same rules.

There is nothing new with reference to this, because the same rules are in effect now in the House of Representatives as they were on February 25, 1952, and until the rules are changed, which would have to come from a resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House changing the rules of the House, the Chair still thinks that it is not in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives or its committees to televise or broadcast hearings or actions before any committee of the House, and so holds and will hold unless and until the rules of the House are amended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps due to my lack of understanding, does the Chair then hold that a regular standing committee of the House cannot authorize broadcasting either by radio or television of its hearings?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair held in 1952 and that is what the Chair holds in 1955.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Will newsreel cameras be permitted to be present in the committee room during public hearings?

The SPEAKER. The reply is the same. It is the same as television.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the Speaker also hold that in the absence of any rule of the House on this subject committees should be required to prohibit the taking of photographs before, during, or after any committee hearing if the Speaker so directed?

The SPEAKER. That is a question to be decided by the committee. The present occupant of the chair was chairman of a committee at one time. When the photographers came in, the Chair always told them they could take pictures of the committee or anyone in the room they wanted to until the proceedings of the committee began. Then they were asked to retire, and they always did retire.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it a correct statement, then, that the matter of photographs before, during, or after committee hearings is in the discretion of the committee chairman or the duly designated presiding officer?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold the photographs could be taken before and after the proceedings, but not during them.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to show that the rules of the House do authorize committees to permit the telecasting and broadcasting of their proceedings; and I hope the Speaker will carefully read the arguments and considerations I am advancing here this afternoon with the view possibly to reconsidering his ruling of January 24, 1955, and that he will reverse it.

Essentially, the reasoning of the Speaker's rulings, as I have read them, against telecasting of committee hearings is that the rules of the House are the rules of the committees of the House; and, since the rules of the House do not expressly authorize telecasting the proceedings of the House but are silent on the subject, therefore, there is no authority vested in committees to allow telecasting and broadcasting of their public hearings.

I want to read first from rule XI–25(g), as follows:

All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

I submit that a proper interpretation of this mandatory provision that committees conduct their hearings in public would necessarily authorize the committees to allow the public to witness their proceedings in person, through reports of the press and through the use of other media of communication such as television and radio normally permitted to record and report any and all public occurrences.

I say that section is express authority for committees to allow their public hearings to be reported not only by the press but by still and movie photography, by television and radio or any other method of communication.

Second, since the rules of the House are the rules of the committees, the provisions which relate to news coverage of proceedings of the House would be applicable to news coverage of committee proceedings.

In this connection I want to read from rule XXXIV, clause 3. I will read the entire rule but emphasize certain phrases:

RULE XXXIV, CLAUSE 3

Such portion of the gallery of the House of Representatives as may be necessary to accommodate reporters of news to be disseminated by radio, wireless, and similar means of transmission, wishing to report debates and proceedings, shall be set aside for their use, and reputable reporters thus engaged shall be admitted thereto under such regulations as the Speaker may from time to time prescribe; and the supervision of such gallery, including the designation of its employees, shall be vested in the Standing Committee of Radio Reporters, subject to the direction and control of the Speaker; and the Speaker may admit to the floor, under such regulations as he may prescribe, one representative of the National Broadcasting Co., one of the Columbia Broadcasting System, one of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and one of the Transradio Press Service.

The language I have just read seems clearly to vest in the Speaker the discretion and power to permit television and radio coverage of proceedings of the House itself. The Speaker, of course, does not have to exercise that discretion. He does not have to allow the telecasting and broadcasting of House proceedings, but I believe the rules have vested in and delegated to the Speaker the power to permit or to disallow broadcasting or telecasting of House sessions.

I want to point out that this must necessarily be so because the Speaker has, in fact, allowed the telecasting and broadcasting of a number of the joint sessions of the Congress. We all know that. We have been here and we have seen the television cameras in the galleries. Many of us have seen these proceedings not only telecast or broadcast, but also the movies which we see later through the television news cameras.

How could the Speaker authorize the television cameras to be here in the House Chamber to cover a joint session if there is no authority in the rules for him to do it?

I cite rule XXXIV as being his authority. Now, you can look in vain for any other authority for it.

I have here House Concurrent Resolution 109, January 26, 1961, and this is all it says:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, January 30, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

I saw that session, the President's state of the Union message, on television myself. There is nothing in the resolution granting authority to the Speaker to permit the telecasting to occur here in the Hall of the House of Representatives. He either does not have the authority to do so or he finds it either under his general authority as the Speaker of the House and his control over this end of the Capitol or he does it under rule XXXIV, clause 3, which I have just read to the House. Now, if the Speaker does have that authority, then the rules are not silent. The House rules have given the authority to the Speaker with respect to the Hall of the House of Representatives to permit telecasting and broadcasting, and therefore, the rules of the House being the rules of the committee, the committee has that same authority.

There is an additional passage in the rules which, in my judgment, bears on this subject. And, I might say that this portion of the rules was adopted subsequent to the last ruling of the Speaker in January 1955, because these were the provisions of the so-called Doyle resolution. One of the provisions of the Doyle resolution which was adopted on March 23, 1955—and this is rule XI–26(j)—is as follows:

A copy of the committee rules, if any, and paragraph 26 of rule XI of the House of Representatives shall be made available to the witness.

I contend that by referring to "committee rules" in the rules of the House by implication, if not by actual delegation, the committees are authorized to make rules, and they can make a rule, in my judgment, governing the manner in which the public shall be able to witness their proceedings, namely, by television and radio coverage, if they see fit.

Well, be that as it may, I frankly must confess I doubt, regardless of the authorities I have cited or perhaps others I might cite, that I will be able to persuade the Speaker that he should reconsider the ruling he made in January 1955. But I do think I should point out that the Speaker, when he first ruled on the matter, indicated to the then minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, that if the House amended its rules, he would abide, of course, by the amendment. And, that passage is rather interesting. Mr. MARTIN said:

I think television and broadcasting is here to stay. It will probably increase in popularity as the days go by. For that reason we should have a revision of the rules to define authority.

The SPEAKER. If the House adopts a rule the Chair will abide by and enforce it like he does all of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

That would seem to indicate that the Speaker's interpretation of the rules was that committees did not have this power but that if the House of Representatives wanted the committees to have this power he would be glad to abide by the rule and enforce it.

Although I have pressed since January of 1955 and in each succeeding Congress to have this resolution considered by the Committee on Rules of the House, it was only 2 days ago that hearings finally were held on the subject. I appeared before the Committee on Rules and I have in my hand a transcript of the public hearings and my testimony before that committee.

But in executive session yesterday afternoon the Committee on Rules by a vote of 8 to 6—and I think we heard here on the floor of the House this afternoon that among the six were the four Republican members then present—Mr.

REECE being in the hospital was not present—the chairman of the committee, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, and the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLMER. The other members of the Committee on Rules voted to pigeonhole and kill this resolution. They were unwilling to let the Members of the House pass judgment on this most important matter. And I say to you that this suppression and bottling up and the denial to the Members of the House of an opportunity to work their will on a matter of public policy is not, in my judgment, in the interest of good government.

What is the significance of the use of these modern devices to permit the public to see their Government in operation?

I have had one primary objective in my service in this House and it was that same objective which led me to seek membership in this body: That is to strengthen the Congress of the United States. It has been my belief that in the last two or three decades the Congress has permitted itself to stand still while great progress has been made by the American economy and while great expansion has occurred in the executive branch of the Government.

This body is one of the three coordinate branches of our Government and its primary job is to lay down the law. It is the lawmaking agency of our Government. It has permitted that power to slip away from it and to be usurped by an aggressive executive branch of the Government to the detriment of the American people.

As I read the Constitution public policy is to be originated, studied, debated, considered and laid down by the elected representatives of the people and if it is not done in that fashion we do not have self-government by sovereign citizens.

So how do you strengthen the Congress? How do you modernize it? How do you improve it so that it can recapture some of that policymaking authority it has let the Executive assume?

I do not believe that the people of the country realize the extent to which laws are made in the bureaus and in the departments of the executive branch of the Government. I do not believe they know that as a matter of routine every committee refers bills which it intends to consider seriously to the bureaus and departments of the executive branch of the Government that have some responsibility for administering laws in that field. I do not believe they know that these departments are not permitted to express their views on proposed legislation unless their views are approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

I do not believe the people of this country know that most bills are drafted in the executive branch of the Government and sent up here and introduced with various degrees of urgency as administration measures. We in Congress have had a tendency in the past two or three decades to become rubberstamps, and lawmaking has originated at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

How can Congress reverse this trend and really assume its rightful authority, the mandate the Constitution imposes upon us? Of course, there are several possible measures to improve the Congress. The people can send more determined, more independent individuals here who will not be dictated to by either a strong Executive or anyone else. But there are some procedural reforms which can be adopted which I have consistently supported and urged.

One of them is to improve the quality and size of committee staffs. I do not believe the American people realize how much of the work of the Congress is done in committees, where a smaller group of men can get together, spend more time than is possible to do with 437 men and women sitting here in this Chamber, and specialize in a field.

The committees can, through their subpena power, get the best information available on a subject by calling before them experts, by compelling the production of documents, and by their staffs' day in and day out conducting exhaustive studies of the field. To the extent that the committees have able staffs to study subjects in their jurisdiction and prepare for hearings, the time of the Congressmen themselves will be saved.

The staffing of committees, the proper expansion of committee staffs, is a simple matter, in my judgment. I do not know why we are reluctant to go ahead with the program. It is just this simple: If you have more work to do than you can do with you own hands and your own time, you get help. The duties of a Congressman today are such that he has limited time to spend on the study in a committee of a particular subject under that committee's jurisdiction. That is where he needs help. For that reason, I have consistently supported requests by committees for adequate committee staffs. I expect next Monday when these measure come up on the floor of the House to support those resolutions for committee staffs.

But there is one additional thing—and I come back to the subject of television and broadcasting—that in my judgment has a bearing on the strength and the usefulness of the House of Representatives. The process of democracy is not just a one-way street. It is not just simply hearing from your constituents. We also must act as leaders in the field of national affairs exercising our responsibility to help educate the electorate. One of the most effective ways is to let the public witness work done by the committees and the consideration given to questions of national policy by the committees. Americans would learn further not only about the subject matter of the hearings of the committees and thus be better informed, but they also would have an opportunity to witness the activity of the man they sent to represent them in the Hall of the House of Representatives.

So it seems to me that it is in the interest of an informed electorate—and self-government cannot work well without an informed electorate—and it is in the interest of the Members of the House and the dignity, the prestige, and the acceptance of the House of Representatives, to use these modern media of communication which permit a person literally to sit in his living room and see what is going on in Washington.

The President—not only the incumbent President but his predecessor—effectively used television and the news conference to get his ideas across to the people of the country.

The Senate of the United States has never had a ban on the telecasting of their committee hearings. We all remember how Senator KEFAUVER of Tennessee held hearings on interstate crime. Those hearings were witnessed in households all across the country. We remember the Army-McCarthy hearings. Recently, we remember the McClellan labor rackets investigation.

It is interesting to note that one of the members of the McClellan committee became President of the United States and the counsel of that committee, his brother, became the Attorney General of the United States.

But, we in the House have a thick curtain drawn between us and the people we represent. What is its effect? What the people do not know, they think just does not exist. They are not aware of the work, the good work, that is done in the numerous committees of the House and in their subcommittees. The effect of this blackout is to downgrade the House of Representatives and to prevent the American people from becoming aware of their work and, in turn, to prevent House Members from getting their views on public issues across to the people of the country.

We are hamstrung in our efforts to exert the influence on public opinion which we, as elected public representatives, have an obligation to do.

For that reason, it seems to me, on a matter of policy as serious as this, the Members of the House themselves ought to pass judgment on this question. It should not be decided by any one man no matter how powerful.

I entitle this speech "A Horse-and-Buggy Congress in a Jet Age." We are not going to stop the use of television and radio for the public to find out about the public business—it is going to be here one day, but to the extent that we prolong this blackout, the House will suffer and its Members will suffer. I believe we ought to modernize and strengthen the Congress and this measure will help us to do that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it the suggestion of the gentleman that the proceedings of the House, whenever the House is in session, should be televised or just the committee hearings?

Mr. MEADER. My resolution relates only to committees and I have not advocated any change of the rules with respect to the telecasting of proceedings in the House Chamber. This is the reason why. Under article I, section 5, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, each House may determine the rules of its proceedings. I submit that the House of Representatives already

has the power to authorize the telecasting and broadcasting of proceedings in the House Chamber and has, indeed, already delegated that power to the Speaker, as I pointed out under rule XXXIV, clause 3. So it is not necessary to amend the rules.

Even if that provision does not provide authority for telecasting House proceedings any time the Committee on Rules reports out a bill such as, perhaps, the bill on Federal aid to education which would have nationwide interest, in that very rule which specifies the terms and length of time for debate and who shall control the debate and so on, the rule could also provide for the telecasting and broadcasting of the debate or parts of it. When the House adopted that resolution, it would be clear that the proceedings were to be telecast and broadcast.

I am going to say to the gentleman, if he is asking me about my views on whether House proceedings should be telecast or broadcast, I suspect one of the reasons the Speaker may feel, although I cannot speak for him, that the House proceedings should not be telecast, is that perhaps the people would see an empty Chamber as they would here today and they would think that Members of the House are not attending to their business.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, that was the very purpose of my question. While it is true, we may not have a great many Members in the Chamber right at this moment, I am sure that these Members are either in committee—because I have just returned from a committee—or they may be doing research in their offices—or taking care of matters for their constituents and there is the possibility that by their mere absence from the floor, some people might get the impression that the Members of Congress are not interested in their work. I think this would be a very erroneous impression. The gentleman mentioned earlier in his remarks the vast scope of duties that confront the average Member of the Congress besides attending all sessions here on the floor of the House. This is, perhaps, one reason why there has been some resistance and reluctance to adopt this program.

Mr. MEADER. I have no quarrel with the Speaker for not allowing telecasting of the House proceedings. I believe he has discretion to permit it or not to do so. He sees fit not to permit it, and I am not quarreling with that.

It is more important for the people that the work of the committees should be telecast, because it is there where details of a subject are gone into, where people can learn more fully about public business than from the debates on the floor.

It is obvious that no radio or television system would report every meeting of every committee. Some of them are not of sufficient general interest to justify the use of the equipment. I might say to you that I was recently in Panama. I attended the Chamber of Deputies of the Republic of Panama, and, lo and behold, they do have a radio station which broadcasts their proceedings in toto. You can drive along in an automobile and listen to the debates going on in the Chamber of Deputies.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. I want to compliment the gentleman for the very fine manner in which he has brought out to the Members of the House the difference between his proposition and others that have been before the House heretofore. I do not believe there is any greater contributing factor than an informed populace in a democratic system of government. It does seem rather unique that the actions of recent date have taken place after the controversy before the Rules Committee, in which they were accused of holding back legislation coming to the floor, in order that the House might be able to express its will, and then find that right at the beginning of the newly constituted committee action that was comparable to that which was criticized only a few weeks ago.

I want to compliment the gentleman for having called this to the attention of the House.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman very much for that contribution. I think it should be emphasized again, because I think the American people have a right to consider it, that in the Republican 83d Congress the people were granted the right to witness the operation of the committees of the House of Representatives, by the use of television and radio. I do think the time will come when they will demand it in the future, and I hope that time will not be far off.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

A BILL TO CUT THE WORKWEEK OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill yesterday, February 22, to enable field service postal employees to work a 7-hour day at the same rate of pay they are receiving for an 8-hour workday.

The reason I introduced this bill, is to insure that postal employees are able to share the benefits of automation within the postal service in the same manner employees in industry are sharing the benefits of efficiency.

Unless the workday of postal employees is shortened, I fear automation within the postal service might result in a cut in the work force needed. This would mean a loss of jobs available during a time when this country is already facing severe unemployment problems. Certainly, we do not want to throw thousands of additional persons into the ranks of the unemployed.

I do not believe the Federal Government should be a party to any program which might have this kind of an effect on our employment situation.

Opponents of shortening the workweek through the years have claimed such a policy is economically unfeasible, yet, in my lifetime, I have seen our workweek almost cut in half. Employees have benefited and our economy has benefited through new products which are used by people in their leisure hours. Today I think we are facing the situation where the workweek is going to have to be cut to provide jobs for all who want to work.

American business in the past few years has made extensive use of automatic equipment to speed work, and cut down on the number of persons needed to perform particular services.

Many of these businesses, in order to share the benefits with their employees, have abandoned the concept of the 40-hour workweek, where automation has made this possible.

I believe the Federal Government should follow the same plan our forward looking business and labor leaders have recognized as good policy.

This is particularly true of the postal service which has been experimenting with various methods to speed the mail to our homes and offices.

With this goal of the post office in mind, and with new methods of mail processing and distribution becoming a reality, I believe the 7-hour workday in the postal service is a wise policy to pursue.

WHERE DID MONEY COME FROM?

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oakland Tribune of February 10, 1961:

WHERE DID MONEY COME FROM?

The first appearance of organized pressure upon the new Congress to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities has taken shape in the form of a double-page advertisement in the New York Times.

It is petition signed by the names of 400 Americans, a large number of them widely known for their advocacy of and association with ultraliberal movements.

This petition demonstrates two things, among many others.

One is that it has a lot of money behind it. A double-page spread in the New York Times is a very expensive venture into public relations.

The other is that it is evidence of the same type of organization which was behind the petition bearing the names of more than 11,000 scientists from 50 countries demanding an end to nuclear testing which was presented to Congress by Dr. Linus Pauling.

Dr. Pauling, a Nobel Prize winner in chemistry, was called upon to name those who were associated with him in getting those signatures. He refused to say under oath.

Naturally the name of Dr. Pauling was high on the list of the 400 who gave their names to this new petition.

Just as it would have been of immense pleasure to all subversive organizations—and to Moscow—for Congress to have done what that other petition asked, so would it please them greatly to see the House Un-American Activities Committee abolished.

Let us not give them those happy moments.

FULL SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FOR WIVES OF RETIRED, DISABLED, OR DECEASED WORKERS PROPOSED IN BILL—DELETING AGE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, back in 1939 we took a long—and at that time very progressive—step forward in our social security system when we recognized that the dependents and survivors of a worker entitled to social security benefits should be entitled to their own benefits in order to provide adequate family income. But there was one important limitation in that definite age requirements were established for the eligible wife, widow, or mother. In the 1956 amendments we took a mincing step forward toward recognition of the problems created by these age requirements for women when we lowered the eligibility age from 65 to 62, with actuarially reduced benefits in the case of a wife or a woman worker. I am today introducing a bill, which, in the spirit of the 1939 amendments, takes another long step forward by removing these dependents age requirements entirely, and paying full benefits for widows and wives of retired, disabled, or deceased workers.

Let us look at just a few examples of how existing law works. One of the most distressing inequities created by the present age requirements arises in the case of benefits now paid to the surviving wife and children of a worker who dies. In such cases, benefits are paid to the widow and her children until the youngest child reaches age 18 at which point they are canceled together. This means that the mother's benefit is suddenly cut off at a time of life when she is least likely to be able to maintain herself and payments can be resumed only when she reaches age 62. This so-called valley of despair simply does not make sense. It seems to assume that all widowed mothers should be paid to take care of their children up to a given age and then must go out and find a job until they get to be 62 years of age. If, as we are told, the purpose of social security is to provide protection against the wage loss, caused by the death of the husband in this instance, how can we continue to assume that the widowed mother no longer needs that protection just because the youngest child has reached his 18th birthday? My bill will correct this grave inequity.

I am also concerned with the fact that the woman widowed at, say 55, currently must also live through this valley of despair for 7 years until she is entitled to her widow's benefit at age 62. Here, again, the assumption seems to be that an elderly woman who has not yet reached the age of 62 can, faced with the tragedy of losing her husband, go out and get a job and take care of herself until she reaches the magic age of 62. Can we continue to delude ourselves that this is a realistic position in the face of the abundant evidence that older workers—particularly housewives who lack any work experience—have insuperable difficulties in finding jobs? More importantly, in humanitarian terms, can we perpetuate the callous concept which, on the one hand, pays benefits immediately to a widow upon the death of her husband just because she has reached a given age, but, on the other hand, forces another widow, who is equally bereft, to wait sometimes several years for hers? Until we have rectified this situation we cannot, in honesty, say that our social security plan does, indeed, provide the worker who has contributed to the plan during his entire worklife with the kind of protection for his family to which he is entitled.

Finally, I am concerned with the family situation in the case of the retired worker and his wife where, again, the age of the wife makes all the difference as to the amount the family receives in the form of social security protection. Under present law the wife cannot receive a full benefit until she reaches age 65. It is true that since the 1956 amendments she can apply for an actuarially reduced benefit at age 62 but this simply means that the amount of her benefit for the rest of her life—or until she is widowed—is reduced to 75 percent of the full amount due her. Are we to assume that the wife of a retired man who is under 62 must eat less, or forgo other necessities of life, until she reaches that age? Are the requirements of family income less, merely because there is a 4- or 5-year difference in the ages of the husband and wife instead of the 3 years implied in the age 62 requirement?

Even more important, perhaps, is the fact that this change will make it possible for the wife of a disabled worker to receive benefits regardless of her age. Because I have long advocated such a change, I was pleased that the 1960 amendments removed the provision of the law which limited disability benefits to persons age 50 and over, so that now they are payable at any age. But without a similar change in the benefits payable to his wife there remains another gross inequity. For example, suppose a man is disabled at 45. He can now receive his disability benefit beginning at that age but his wife will not be eligible until she is 62. It is hardly necessary to point out that the wife of a severely disabled man is surely needed in the home to take care of her stricken husband. Yet, here again, for the period that her benefit is denied she may have no alternative to trying to get an outside job to help support the family and to pay the medical bills which her husband may require.

Finally, my bill would also pay full benefits to women workers at age 62. Present law reduces their benefit to 80 percent of the full amount—again for the rest of her life—in case they find it impossible to wait until they reach age 65 and can apply for a full benefit. Obviously only those women workers who are in the most fortunate circumstances can afford to wait those 3 years. It is, to my mind, neither good social policy nor good public policy to make this discrimination and I believe it should be abolished.

These are some of the questions we must answer if we are to pretend that our social security plan does, indeed, provide protection for the family of the worker who dies, retires, or is disabled. My bill faces up to the fact that we cannot continue the arbitrary and capricious protection provided in existing law by not only repealing the provision which allows reduced benefits at age 62, but also by paying full benefits to dependent wives and widows.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS: SOLDIER AND STATESMAN

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of former Senator Millard E. Tydings has removed from the active scene a man who made an outstanding contribution both to his native State of Maryland and to his country.

All Marylanders join in mourning his passing, and in extending deepest sympathy to his family. This entire Nation has suffered a real loss.

Millard Tydings, throughout his long and distinguished life, exhibited extraordinary courage and a strong and forceful personality. These traits sustained him throughout his magnificent career which began with his election to the Maryland House of Delegates in 1914. From 1921 to 1923 he served in the Senate of Maryland, and thereafter was elected to two terms in the House of Representatives. In 1926 he was elected to the U.S. Senate, and served continuously in that body until 1950.

He was chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

His accomplishments are too numerous to here relate. Perhaps we can sum up by saying he was a big man during difficult and perilous times—one of the great Americans of this century.

Time and again, he proved to this Nation, and to the Senate, that he was thoroughly able to vigorously, and eloquently, defend his strong convictions. No man in the political history of the Free State of Maryland ever rendered greater service to his State, and to his country, both in time of peace, and in time of war.

Millard Tydings left his seat in the Maryland House of Delegates to serve as a private in the Mexican border campaign. Later, during World War I, he served overseas with conspicuous gallantry. He was promoted through the ranks from an enlisted man to lieutenant colonel. Many citations and decorations were bestowed upon him, including the Distinguished Service Medal, and the Distinguished Service Cross, the latter being the second highest honor our Nation can bestow for gallantry in action.

During his 36 years in public life, Millard Tydings was a strong and independent personality. Being without fear, he steadfastly defended his position against all challenges.

The former political boss in his native Harford County, and a former President of the United States, both attempted to unseat the late Senator at different times in his life. He emerged from these battles victorious with his honor intact.

His actions in public life were motivated by a deep-rooted sense of justice. He was often heard to say:

> I shall vote for those measures I believe to be right, and oppose those I believe to be wrong, no matter who advocates them.

This was his personal creed, and he faithfully lived up to it.

FLOOD PREVENTION IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, a bill which I introduced yesterday, and which is a companion to one introduced in the Senate by my colleague from Connecticut, Senator BUSH, authorizes the construction of a project at Mystic, in my district, which has been recommended by the Army Engineers for protection against hurricane tidal flooding.

Mystic is vulnerable to such flooding, as more than one storm in recent years has demonstrated, and the need for protection is urgent. It is my hope that this project may at this session be authorized by the Congress, and that is the entire purpose of my bill.

A survey conducted under provisions of Public Law 71 of the 84th Congress, by the Army Engineers, recommended the construction of two earthfill barriers protected by armor stone, and three land dikes. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors approved this project on February 1, 1961, and the prompt approval of the State of Connecticut and of other Federal agencies concerned is expected.

The State of Connecticut will be expected to share in the cost, and the Federal share of the $2,128,000 estimated cost has been placed by the Army Engineers at $1,490,000.

H.R. 4810—AMENDING SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing at this time a bill (H.R. 4810) amending the Social Security Act to relax the severity of its existing provisions for retired people eligible to receive social security payments. This bill will reduce the deductions from their benefits on account of their earnings by increasing the existing $1,500 earnings limit to $2,400.

In referring to this proposal the Deputy Director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Robert Ball, stated in a letter February 15, 1961:

> As you know, I am in basic agreement with your proposal that the $1 for $2 adjustment should be extended from the present $1,500 to $2,400.

In the recent White House Conference on the Aging, called by President Eisenhower, there was overwhelming endorsement of the general idea that we should, first, make it possible and, second, encourage older citizens to take care of themselves as long as possible. Increasing the allowance to $1,200 over $1,200 would be a real step in this direction.

I would therefore hope that the House committee to which this bill will be referred would take the bill under consideration in the near future so that the proposal can be expeditiously discussed, studied, and acted upon. I believe that it will have the support not only of HEW, but of the majority of people across the country.

An expanded social security program to assist our older citizens with medical care has just been proposed by the President. The well-being of those over 65 is a major issue of this 87th Congress. However, people, whether over 65 or not, while appreciative of Federal programs of assistance when essential, would far prefer to be able to help themselves. One of the ironies of our present social security program is that it forces into nonproductive retirement many who would prefer to continue to support themselves by productive work.

This legislation would ease somewhat the present injustice whereby older people may actually have to pay for the privilege if they wish to work to support themselves. This injustice is morally wrong and psychologically demoralizing for senior citizens. To most people work is an essential ingredient for happiness, self-respect and dignity. The majority of Americans, according to many polls, favor removing the social security earnings limit entirely. However, until such broader legislation is possible of passage the bill I am now introducing provides both flexibility and incentive.

In a 1957 survey of employment figures for men and women over 65 by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance one interesting set of figures stands out. In the sample taken there were 415 men in the age 70 to 71 group, 34.5 percent were registered as fully employed. In the 72 to 74 group there were 542 men covered and 39.9 percent of them were employed. For the women the same report showed 30.6 percent of women age 70 to 71 employed and 36.2 percent of women 72 to 74 employed.

I am quite sure that this increased percentage of individuals working full time in the 72 to 74 age range must reflect the incentive they received at age 72 when they can receive all their social security regardless of their earnings. In the case of both men and women about 15 percent more began to work at age 72 than prior. I think that the $1,200 over $1,200 on the 2-for-1 basis should certainly provide enough incentive so that the percentage of people in the 66 to 71 age group who resume full-time employment would be increased considerably more than the estimate made by Mr. Robert Myers, Chief Actuary. If we get anything like a 10-to-15 percent increase in the number of individuals who elect to resume full-time employment because of the improved incentive in this proposed bill the estimated cost—something under $200 million—resulting from its adoption might disappear—Beneficiary Studies Note No. E–1, January 1961, National Survey of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Beneficiaries, 1957, A–10401–009.

A man who has done extensive research on the subject is Mr. Dwight S. Sargent, personnel director of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York. I think that portions of a letter he wrote January 24, 1961, are interesting and to the point:

> Last year you introduced a bill which was not adopted, but did however suggest the means of eliminating the penalties which had existed in the retirement test rules in effect in 1960. A number of people have told me that your bill, Congressman BARRY, should be given substantial credit for the change in the philosophy of the retirement test which was adopted. As you know, the 2 for 1 principle (for every $2 above the $1,200 limit $1 of social security would be given up) now applies to $300 of earnings over and above the allowable $1,200 permitted without loss of benefits. Senator KERR said the following at the time this bill was adopted:
>
> "It is true that the incentive to work under the conference agreement basis is not as great as I would like to see it because it really only applied to the first $300 beyond the $1,200 limit. But cost considerations forced us to go only this far. In my view we might desirably move this point upward, when adequate financing is available to $1,200 beyond the $1,200 exempt amount. Certainly, we have adopted a sound and equitable basis on which we can build the future."
>
> I was chairman of the employment security and retirement section of the White House Conference. This section discussed the retirement test. A majority, in view of the fact that changes have just been put into effect, approved the recommendation that no changes be made in the retirement

test until sufficient time has elapsed to determine how much incentive to do more work has actually resulted from the new test rules. A substantial minority recommended that the retirement test be liberalized immediately in order to provide more incentive for individuals between 65 and 71 to do more work. I of course was with the minority with this action. At no time when the retirement test was being considered was there any serious suggestion that it be eliminated—as it would be if S. 12 was adopted. This majority opinion will of course be included with the other recommendations which will be sent to Congress within 90 days of the holding of the White House Conference.

Several weeks ago I asked Robert Myers, Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, what he would estimate the cost would be if the "2 for 1" arrangement which now applies only to the first $300 of earnings over the $1,200 base was permitted all the way up. For example a man and his wife are now receiving maximum social security between them of $2,160 a year, he is 66 years old and has held his earnings to $1,200 or less. If the policy of allowing "2 for 1" all the way up was made law the following would be the result, if this individual increased his earnings to $3,000, to $4,000, to $5,000 a year. If he increased his earnings to $3,000 a year he would be earning $1,800 over the $1,200 allowed. Half of this ($900) would be deducted from his social security—so his social security income would drop from $2,160 minus $900, to $1,260 a year. In this case social security would save $900 a year. If he increased his earnings to $4,000 the social security would drop from $2,160 minus $1,400, to $760 a year. In this case social security would save $1,400 a year. If he increased his earnings to $5,000 a year, his social security would drop from $2,160 minus $1,900, to $260 a year, and social security would save $1,900 a year.

I think this kind of an incentive is the most that should be considered. Mr. Myers has estimated that this "2 for 1" plan all the way would cost social security about $200 million more than the plan in effect prior to the 1960 amendments which were effective January 1, 1961. The existing new law will create some savings and some added costs to social security which will modify slightly these estimates given by Mr. Myers. He arrived at his figure by estimating that the savings social security would realize by increased work activities of individuals would total $150 million a year. Against this saving he estimated that there would be an added cost to social security of $350 million a year, leaving a net added cost of $200 million a year.

The added cost comes from situations like this. A man is 66 years old and earning $4,000 a year; he has never applied for social security. If this 2-for-1 rule applied all the way up, you would then have to recognize that he was earning $2,800 over and above the $1,200 permitted. Half of that is $1,400. This $1,400 would then be deducted from the amount of social security which he would be qualified for, and the balance, if any, between this amount, $1,400, would be the amount he would be entitled to begin receiving in social security benefits. If such a man was single and only entitled to $1,000 of social security, based on his prior earnings, he would, of course, receive no social security; but if he was married and entitled to $1,500 of social security, after deducting the $1,400, social security would then start paying him $100 a year.

Mr. Myers' estimates of additional costs are based on the earnings of 1.4 million individuals who are now earning over $2,080 a year and have never applied for social security. The increased payments, such as described above to this group, would total $350 million. This figure should be reasonably accurate because of the records available.

His estimate of the amount of savings, depending on how many people would go back to work, I would assume, must be rather conservative. In my own judgment I think more people would do more work than Mr. Myers has allowed for. If this is true the money that would not be paid out by social security would be higher than $150 million and the net cost would then be lower than $200 million. Mr. Myers' assumptions, as explained in his letter, are as follows:

"Three million two hundred thousand individuals 65 to 71 with no earnings would still not do anything." (I think some would.)

"One million individuals earning less than $900 would do no more work." (I think some would.)

"Three hundred thousand individuals earning from $900 to $1,200 would increase their earnings to an average of $1,700." (I think this is conservative.)

"Three hundred thousand individuals earning between $1,200 and $2,000 would increase their earnings as follows:

"Those earning between $1,200 and $1,600 would earn an additional $500.

"Those earning between $1,600 and $2,100 would bring their earnings up to an average of $2,100." (I think the earnings in these groups would be at least this and probably more.)

The incentive in the present law is obviously inadequate. If, as a first step, the law was further modified to permit earnings only of $1,200 over the $1,200, on a 2-for-1 basis, the cost would be perceptively less than the $200 million cost estimated if the 2-for-1 plan went all the way. Such a proposal, I think, would be more reasonable. In a period of 1 or 2 years there would be sufficient experience learned to determine to what extent individuals between 65 and 71 would do more work if they were reasonably encouraged. The net result of raising the $300 to $1,200 might actually produce a net saving for social security. Once such information was available, the decision to allow the 2-for-1 arrangement to go all the way could then be considered with more information and facts than are now known.

The bill that you introduced last year, I think, accomplished a major change in policy which was good. I would hope that you might again this year consider this reasonable first step improvement in the earnings test.

Sincerely,

D. S. SARGENT,
Personnel Director.

EXAMPLES OF THE EFFECT EARNINGS HAVE ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND TOTAL INCOME UNDER THE PRESENT, PROPOSED, AND POSSIBLY ULTIMATE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS-TEST PROVISION

(Assume man and wife are both age 65 and eligible for maximum social security benefits)

1. Present earning test law: For the first $300 of earnings above $1,200, $1 of social security is given up for each $2 of earnings. Above this $1,500 figure, $1 of social security is given up for each $1 of earnings.

Annual earnings	Social security received	Total income
0	$2,214	$2,214
$1,200	2,214	3,414
$1,500 [1]	2,064	3,564
$2,000	1,564	3,564
$3,564	0	3,564

[1] Point above which there is no incentive to earn more.

2. Proposed earnings test law: For the first $1,200 of earnings above $1,200, $1 of social security is given up for each $2 of earnings. Above this $2,400 figure, $1 of social security is given up for each $1 of earnings:

Annual earnings	Social security received	Total income
0	$2,214	$2,214
$1,200	2,214	3,414
$1,500	2,064	3,564
$2,000	1,814	3,814
$2,400 [1]	1,614	4,014
$3,000	1,014	4,014
$3,500	514	4,014
$4,014	0	4,014

[1] Point above which there is no incentive to earn more.

3. Possible ultimate earnings test law: For all earnings above $1,200, $1 of social security is given up for each $2 of earnings:

Annual earnings	Social security received	Total income
0	$2,214	$2,214
$1,200	2,214	3,414
$1,500	2,064	3,564
$2,000	1,814	3,814
$2,400	1,614	4,014
$3,000	1,314	4,314
$4,000	814	4,814
$5,000	314	5,314
$5,628	0	5,628

To conclude, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of my bill, H.R. 4810:

H.R. 4810

To amend title II of the Social Security Act to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of subsection (f)(3) of section 203 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "For purposes of paragraph (1) and subsection (h), an individual's excess earnings for a taxable year shall be his earnings for such year in excess of the product of $100 multiplied by the number of months in such year, except that of the first $1,200 of such excess (or all of such excess if it is less than $1,200) an amount equal to one-half thereof shall not be included."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply (1) in the case of any individual entitled to old-age insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, or to monthly insurance benefits under section 202 of such act on the basis of the wages and self-employment of a deceased person, with respect to monthly benefits under such title II for months in any taxable year (of such individual) beginning after December 31, 1961, and (2) in the case of any individual entitled to wife's, husband's, or child's insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of a person who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits, with respect to monthly benefits under such title II for months in any taxable year (of such person) beginning after December 31, 1961.

AVERAGING TAXABLE INCOME

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the present time our internal revenue laws provide that in only limited instances may a taxpayer, whose income cycle does not correspond to the calendar year or whose income is by nature bunched in a few years rather than spread evenly over the entire earning years be taxed in relation to the real time cycle in which his income is earned. These instances are found in subchapter Q of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; among them are included provision for artistic or inventive undertaking, for certain situations regarding backpay, damages given for patent infringement and for some other employment situations. I have today introduced a bill to add a new section to subchapter Q which would recognize that the individual's economic cycle is not necessarily coincident with the calendar year and offer the individual the opportunity to be taxed realistically upon his economic cycle.

The inequity of the present system is clear. Payment for work that extends, for example, over a 2-year period is taxed in the period in which the payment is made. With a graduated income tax such as we have, the effect of concentrating the earnings of a longer period into 1 tax year is quite damaging. The bill which I have introduced would broaden the provisions of subchapter Q by allowing more individuals to take advantage of the right to average their taxable income over the period in which it was earned.

Specifically, my bill would permit an individual whose taxable income in the current year exceeds 150 percent of his average taxable income for the previous 5 years to spread this concentrated income back over the 5 immediately preceding years. As an example of how this provision would work, let us assume an individual whose average taxable income for 5 consecutive years has been $3,000. The sixth year, he receives $9,000. His tax libiality for the sixth year would be based upon first, 150 percent of his 5-year average, or $4,500; second, one-sixth of the surplus, $750, for the current year; and third, one-sixth of the surplus for each of the preceding 5 years. The entire amount which is received is taxed, but a portion of that received in the big income year is referred back to previous years. This eliminates the inequity which results when the graduated tax is combined with the economic earning periods which are not equal to the calendar year.

There are limitations included in the bill. One of them is the fact that the average must be carried back over a 5-year period. Also, the taxable income for averaging purposes must not be below $3,000 in any one year. Once the income had been averaged for a 6-year cycle, the new income base for further computations would be the recalculated taxable income, in the examples cited $3,750 for 5 years and $4,500 for the sixth. Upon the average income of the last 5 of these years a new base against which to measure qualification for this averaging system would be established for the individual.

I believe that there is a recognizable inequity in the treatment of taxpayers with fluctuating incomes which this measure could help to overcome.

CHOICE OF USE OF PRIVATE BENEFIT PLANS IN LIEU OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced an amendment to the Social Security Act, section 202, by which an individual would have the right to select whether he shall seek his retirement security through the social security program or through private or corporate retirement programs. I believe that the Social Security Act filled a vital need in our society, providing for the economic security of the retirement years of our population. I do not believe that it is inconsistent with the recognition of the value of the social security program to offer the people whom it would benefit the right to choose some other effective means of providing for financing their retirement.

This bill, then, would open a choice within which the individual preference of the citizen could be expressed and this is an encouragement of personal initiative and would lead to the opening of new opportunity for our citizens to choose a retirement income program that would fit their desires and needs as individuals.

Standards are established in the bill which must be met by insurance policies and retirement plans eligible to be used in lieu of social security. Provision is made for participants in eligible plans to be made no longer liable for social security taxes and for their employers to be exempted from paying into social security for their account. The possibility of one reinstating social security coverage after lapse of one of the eligible programs is also covered.

Just as the introduction of social security improved the retirement situation for Americans, I believe that opening this choice for our people would also strengthen the position they face in enjoying and financing their retirement.

PROPOSAL TO PERMIT THE UNITED STATES TO RECOVER COSTS ARISING OUT OF SITUATIONS CREATING LIABILITY IN ANOTHER

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the last Congress I introduced a bill which would permit the United States to recover the costs, expenditures, and financial obligations which it must bear as a result of situations which create liability in other persons from these other persons. This bill was introduced as a result of the research of Lt. Comdr. John Lasco, of the U.S. Navy's Medical Service Corps, and is related specifically to the high incidence of accidental injuries and deaths among members of the Armed Forces caused by automobile accidents. In those situations in which legal liability is properly imposed upon another person, the United States could recover the amounts paid in medical care for the injured servicemen and in death benefits. I have today reintroduced this bill.

The cost of these incidents is unfortunately high, for the frequency of accidents is likewise unfortunately high. My proposal would give the Government a similar right to collect for the full cost to it of care which it gives and benefits which it pays that exists for other individuals and legal entities in the courts.

It is my hope that action can be taken on this proposal.

FEDERAL INTERFERENCE AT BLAINE

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, more and more restrictions are being placed on the basic freedoms of the American people by the very Federal Government which, according to our Constitution, is dedicated to preserve these freedoms.

The reason for this encroachment on the freedom of our people to conduct their own affairs, I believe, is bureaucracy, which is nothing more than Government by bureau administrators. There are numerous cases to document this trend. One which I am familiar with is the proposition that the new interstate highway through the Blaine Peace Arch must be fenced to attain controlled access.

This Peace Arch is situated at the boundary between Washington State and British Columbia a few hundred yards north of Blaine, a city in my congressional district and a part of Whatcom County. I have received many letters from the people of Blaine, Whatcom County, and the State of Washington objecting to this fence. The people do not want it, yet the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce

is recommending and supporting this barrier with the typical whim so often found in Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the International Peace Arch is the only peace arch in the world and it stands on the United States-Canada border at the westernmost end of the 3,000-mile boundary between the two countries. It was built and dedicated in 1921 to commemorate the signing of the Treaty of Ghent and the Rush-Bagot Agreement between President James Monroe and His Majesty the King in 1817.

Since its dedication, millions of persons from Canada, the United States, and many other lands have been unrestricted in their pilgrimages to this beautiful park. Now the octopus of bureaucracy is encroaching upon the spirit to which the park is dedicated and is encroaching upon the freedom of the local population to decide an issue.

I sincerely hope Secretary Luther B. Hodges will show compassion by acquiescing to the desires of the people most affected by the decision to construct the fence. He has been the Governor of a great State, North Carolina. It is a State that has contributed to the population and culture of my own district. Because of his experience as a Governor, I am sure he can sympathize with the wishes of the people.

The rule that a fence is necessary is silly, Mr. Speaker. The almighty Federal Government of the United States plans a fence beyond its customhouse to the boundary at the Peace Arch. On the other hand, the Province of British Columbia plans to construct a similar fence only as far as its customhouse. This means there will be no fence in the park between the Peace Arch and the Canadian customhouse. What good, then, will a fence do on the American side of the park? They say it is for safety, yet in all its history there has never been an accident.

On the inside walls of the Peace Arch portal are two iron gates and above them are inscribed the words, "May these gates never be closed."

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe the decision of the Federal Government to require this fence is a violation of the spirit to which the park is dedicated and is an affront to the rights of the people of my district to determine what they want or do not want in their park. I, for one, will oppose in every way I know how any designs to fence off the Blaine Peace Arch.

PAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES TO STATES TO ASSIST IN MEETING COSTS OF EDUCATION

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would provide that 1 percent of the Federal individual income tax should be paid to the States to assist them in meeting the costs of education.

During the long discussions on proposed Federal aid to education, the major argument has been that the States lack the taxing authority to successfully meet the costs which our modern society demands for new schools and better education. It has been generally stated, at least in this House, that the control should remain with the States.

This proposal, I believe, would meet both arguments. It would, in effect, give the States a new source of revenue which they could then apply to the education budgets. The amounts paid to each State would depend on the amounts of Federal income tax collected in that State.

No control by the Federal Government would be possible under the provisions of the bill.

Our schools have been meeting the needs of our young people with admirable ability in the past years. This was done while they were being administered by the States and other units of local government. The allegation that these units are not now able to meet their costs does not mean that they are incapable of proper administration.

Let us, therefore, solve the one problem of revenue without complicating the matter further with the risks of Federal intrusion through gigantic aid programs. Let us merely give the States the wherewithal to develop their own programs to meet their own needs.

I intend to introduce a variety of proposals along these lines, any one of which will meet this problem.

The authority of the States, using these funds, will produce more results per dollar under a plan which recognizes the traditional—and effective—responsibility of the States.

EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the advantages of social security coverage have in recent years been expanded to include a number of groups which did not previously have that opportunity.

There remains, among others, one group to which particular circumstances apply. I have today introduced legislation, for referral to the proper committee, which would correct this situation.

I speak of those working individuals who are employed as domestics and are remunerated in some form other than cash.

In my own congressional district I have had several cases called to my attention of persons who have labored throughout their lives for remuneration such as room and board, management of affairs, and the like. At the end of their working days they have neither savings nor benefits, although they have been gainfully employed during their working years.

I strongly urge that this group, limited as it is, be granted the opportunity to obtain the coverage and the protection that their fellow workers enjoy.

CASH PAYMENTS UNDER AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call the attention of my colleagues to the resolution adopted by the County Board of Supervisors of Langlade County, Wis., pertaining to cash payments under the aid to dependent children administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION 58

A resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation permitting localities to demand an accounting from recipients of cash payments under the aid to dependent children categorical aid program administered by the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also permitting distribution of such aid in commodity or voucher form in appropriate cases

Whereas the Federal Government contributes funds for such aid to dependent children program, only upon the condition that such aid be disbursed in cash payments, and that no accounting be demanded of individual recipients thereof as to how such cash is spent; and

Whereas in many cases, cash disbursed to mothers to feed, clothe, and house their children has not been used for this purpose, but has been squandered in taverns and by making unwise and uncalled for purchases of luxury items thereby depriving the children of the necessities of life; and

Whereas it would be in the public interest to permit local authorities to exercise such discretion and control in cases where the recipients of aid to dependent children either manage their money unwisely, or conduct themselves improperly, or care for their children inadequately: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Langlade County Board of Supervisors, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to consider and enact legislation in 1961 amending the laws relating to aid for dependent children to grant discretionary powers to local authorities and public welfare directors to enable them to demand an accounting from recipients of cash payments under the aid to dependent children program, and also to enable them to distribute such aid in the form of commodities or vouchers in lieu of direct cash payments,

where local welfare authorities may deem it appropriate in individual cases; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Wisconsin Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Dated this 7th day of February 1961.

WALTER KLIMOSKI.
JOHN H. WAGNER.
EDWARD GOLBACH.

Attest:

R. M. Moss,
Langlade County Clerk.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT "BOB" MUIR, SWIMMING COACH AT WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this coming Saturday, February 25, a testimonial is to be held in tribute to Robert "Bob" Muir who, for the past 25 years, has been the swimming coach at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

Bob Muir is undoubtedly one of the most beloved individual and, certainly, the most popular coach to ever instruct at Williams. He has had a definite influence for the good on the countless young men who, over the years, have come under his guidance.

But far and above athletic prowess or ability to instruct men in the mechanics of the sport, Bob Muir's contributions have been more lasting and valuable. He has imbued his men with the values of decent sportsmanship, fair and clean competition, and unselfish teamwork. By this means, the men he has coached have imparted the influence of these virtues to a life of integrity, character, and purpose which has been ultimately reflected in the life of the communities, States, and our Nation. Thus through the medium of his profession he has molded men who have made contributions in all walks of life to the strength, progress, and well-being of these United States. Among those young men who had the privilege of his instruction, is the President of the United States, Mr. John F. Kennedy.

So, to such a distinguished American citizen, I know that my distinguished colleagues will join with me in this tribute, and in the wish that he continue to enjoy good health, happiness, and success. For his contribution to our way of life, I know that we are grateful.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my presence was required at the Committee on Education and Labor, and I was not able to be present when my name was called for my special order today. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of legislative business and other special orders on Tuesday, February 28, 1961.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. OLSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEADER, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 15 minutes, on Tuesday, February 28, and Thursday, March 2, 1961.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. DORN), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, February 28.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) for 45 minutes, on Monday, February 27.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) for 30 minutes, on Monday, February 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALFORD and to include an address.

Mr. RYAN.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. MCCORMACK and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. BARRY.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DORN) and to include extraneous mater:)

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 27, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

597. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving a decrease of $12 million in appropriations out of the postal fund for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 95), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to provide that no individual who willfully fails or refuses to answer, or falsely answers, certain questions relating to subversive activities, when summoned to appear before certain Federal agencies, shall be employed on any merchant vessel of the United States or within certain waterfront facilities in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 183. Resolution to create a Select Committee on a National Fuels Study; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4806. A bill to provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation, to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4807. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 4808. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4809. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of the feasibility of developing pumped storage in connection with Federal reservoir projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4810. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to relax the severity of existing provisions with respect to deductions from benefits on account of earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4811. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4812. A bill to prohibit the using of improper methods to influence the acts or decisions of certain Federal regulatory agencies engaged in regulating activities or transactions in or related to interstate or foreign commerce and to repeal authority of the Federal Communications Commission members to receive certain fees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4813. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla.,

to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4814. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 4815. A bill for the recovery of costs, expenditures, and financial obligations of the United States arising from circumstances creating a liability upon some person other than the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4816. A bill to provide for an averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4817. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social security benefits or subject to social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 4818. A bill to establish a cropland adjustment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the age requirements for entitlement to wife's insurance benefits and widow's insurance benefits, and to eliminate the provisions which reduce a woman's benefits in certain cases where she becomes entitled thereto before attaining age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 4820. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 4821. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land to the town of Tellico Plains, Tenn.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4822. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4823. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for licensing independent ocean freight forwarders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4824. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in planning and providing for necessary community facilities to preserve and improve essential mass transportation services in urban and metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 4825. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayers and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for housekeepers and other individuals performing domestic service who are compensated for such service in media other than cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 4827. A bill to establish a Federal Regional Water Pollution Control Research Laboratory in the Pacific Northwest and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 4828. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 4829. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4831. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend section 3 of title 4, United States Code, relating to use of the flag of the United States; to prohibit the use, in advertising for a commercial purpose, of a uniform of any of the Armed Forces of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4833. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the project cost limitation for small flood control projects constructed under general authorization; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," approved August 3, 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4835. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 4836. A bill to provide for a study and investigation by the Commissioner of Education of ways and means of providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in certain activities for the purpose of influencing legislation directly relevant to the purposes which qualify such organizations for tax exemption, without losing certain benefits under that code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4838. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4839. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38, United States Code, to provide veterans' benefits for female members of telephone operating units, Signal Corps, who served overseas during World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit, for purposes of the depreciation deduction, taxpayers to specify, under certain conditions, the useful life of tangible personal property acquired after December 31, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 4843. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of the feasibility of developing pumped storage in connection with Federal reservoir projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 4844. A bill to amend section 9(e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4845. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend section 3568, title 18, United States Code, to provide for reducing sentences of imprisonment imposed upon persons held in custody for want of bail while awaiting trial by the time so spent in custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend section 314 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that an aid and attendance allowance of $150 per month shall be paid to certain paraplegic veterans during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4848. A bill to provide for loans to veterans when housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4849. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4850. A bill to encourage liquidation of frozen capital assets and reinvestment of a substantial portion thereof in medium term Government bonds bearing a low rate of interest by amending subchapter of title I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 4851. A bill to provide for a comprehensive study of compensation to persons affected by the acquisition of property under the Federal or federally assisted programs, through condemnation proceedings or otherwise; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4852. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4853. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4854. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana and one additional judge for the southern district

of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend subsection (b) of Section 60—Preferred Creditors; subsection (e) of Section 67—Liens and Fraudulent Transfers; and subsection (e) of Section 70—Title to Property; of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96b, 107e, and 110e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4856. A bill to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4858. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4860. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4861. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 4862. A bill to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H.R. 4863. A bill to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution establishing a national shrine commission to select and procure a site and formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial building in memory of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate a week in August each year as National Food Service Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 258. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 259. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States concerning residence requirement for voting for President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 169. Concurrent resolution relating to the subject of Federal policy in the field of American Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con Res. 170. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 186. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H. Res. 187. Resolution increasing the clerk hire allowance of Members of the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Hsien-Chi Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Barbara Mlynarczykowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4866. A bill for the relief of Vassilios Hilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Batista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4868. A bill for the relief of William J. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Palmigiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Pietro D'Onofrio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Francesco Di Giacomo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Helene Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4874. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4875. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the New Mexico Boys' Ranch; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4876. A bill for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4877. A bill for the relief of Rosario Ferrante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4878. A bill for the relief of Kiyoko Kawano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4879. A bill for the relief of Lilian E. Gonzalez (Reyes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4880. A bill to authorize the revestment of certain interests in land at the U.S. Naval Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Santina Cuzzupi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4882. A bill to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accept, wear, and display certain decorations tendered to them by the Republic of China; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 4883. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the San Diego County Council, Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 260. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, U.S. Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

66. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Josephine P. Shively, editor, Woman's Health News, Quaker City, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting prompt consideration of their protest to the Food Additives Transitional Provisions Amendment of 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

67. Also, petition of Ella C. Hathaway and others, Santa Barbara, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to praising the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its valuable and necessary work of exposing Communist treason and subversion, and requesting that this most valuable committee be continued in full force; to the Committee on Rules.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Volunteers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, with the problems of the aged one of the most vital items on our agenda, I think it is pertinent to bring to the attention of the Congress an organization which has been actively serving the aged since 1896, the Volunteers of America. As a matter of fact, some 500,000 older people are directly served by this fine group.

I should like to cite for excellence in the very important field of social welfare this national organization of the Volunteers of America, headed by Gen. John F. McMahon.

General McMahon, who rose through the ranks to become the youngest commander in chief in the history of the Volunteers of America, was born into the organization as his parents, John and Rose McMahon, were also members of the Volunteers of America. He was also recently elected lieutenant governor of the Kiwanis' New York metropolitan division and has served his community and our Nation with distinction.

In May of this year the Volunteers of America is holding its grand field council—national convention—in Minneapolis, marking the 65th national meeting which it has held so that the many services they render throughout the United States can be reviewed. These services include:

First. Emergency homes for women and children.

Second. Maternity homes for unwed mothers.

Third. Summer camps for children, family groups, and the aged.

Fourth. Brandon Houses—low cost residential hotels for young women.

Fifth. The Volunteers Prison League offers prisoners counsel and aids their families.

Sixth. Salvage programs for the needy.

Seventh. Rehabilitation programs for the socially and physically handicapped.

Eighth. Sunset clubs and old age homes.

Ninth. Day care centers and family day care programs.

Tenth. Community centers which aid in combating juvenile delinquency.

Eleventh. School clothing programs for needy children.

Twelfth. Mission churches and Sunday school.

Only recently, the Volunteers of America launched a nationwide campaign to supply prison libraries with much-needed books. Within a few short years, over 350,000 volumes, valued at $1 million, have been placed in prisons in 14 States.

The people of our Nation can well be proud of the unexcelled service to God and country performed by the Volunteers of America.

Surplus Property for Purposes of Education, Health, and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 Public Law 61, which I introduced, was enacted to provide that surplus personal property be donated for purposes of education and health. In the 2d session of the 84th Congress civil defense units were made eligible to receive surplus property.

Since 1955 real and personal property costing about $1½ billion has been donated for these worthwhile purposes.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I am enclosing a report from the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which shows that $77,278,690 in real and personal property was donated to the States for these purposes during the months of October, November, and December 1960. Secretary Ribicoff's report also shows that all of the States participated generously in the program, which is of inestimable value at this time of great need. The report follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

Surplus property for which the Federal Government paid $77,278,690 was made available to the States for educational, public health and civil defense purposes during October, November, and December, 1960, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Real property accounted for $1,969,750 and personal property for $75,308,940. Secretary Abraham Ribicoff announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies and civil defense organizations of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Oct. 1 through Dec. 31, 1960

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$75,308,940	$1,969,750	$77,278,690
Alabama	2,626,344	77,696	2,704,040
Alaska	581,680		581,680
Arizona	1,024,571	17,247	1,041,818
Arkansas	629,719		629,719
California	10,822,526	105,057	10,927,583
Colorado	761,766		761,766
Connecticut	541,530		541,530
Delaware	284,723		284,723
Florida	2,355,506	87,214	2,442,720
Georgia	1,297,338		1,297,338
Hawaii	141,541		141,541
Idaho	540,662		540,662
Illinois	2,183,009		2,183,009
Indiana	1,371,636		1,371,636
Iowa	532,899		532,899
Kansas	504,052	6,176	510,228
Kentucky	1,970,228		1,970,228
Louisiana	1,518,843	5,794	1,524,637
Maine	721,357		721,357
Maryland	1,761,761		1,761,761
Massachusetts	2,270,042		2,270,042
Michigan	1,730,375	31,344	1,761,719
Minnesota	872,688		872,688
Mississippi	1,466,540	5,000	1,471,540
Missouri	747,299		747,299
Montana	293,438		293,438
Nebraska	632,656	726	633,382
Nevada	272,712		272,712
New Hampshire	273,145		273,145
New Jersey	1,306,455		1,306,455
New Mexico	527,584		527,584
New York	4,046,637	10,000	4,056,637
North Carolina	3,009,841	9,600	3,019,441
North Dakota	239,868	1,000	240,868
Ohio	2,218,118	17,750	2,235,868
Oklahoma	1,558,757	113,335	1,672,092
Oregon	954,408	350	954,758
Pennsylvania	3,916,522		3,916,522
Rhode Island	412,197		412,197
South Carolina	961,531	12,634	974,165
South Dakota	334,985	202,284	537,269
Tennessee	1,305,614		1,305,614
Texas	3,599,190	1,003,879	4,603,069
Utah	740,932	54,356	795,288
Vermont	130,248		130,248
Virginia	3,414,920	9,000	3,423,920
Washington	1,503,486	197,000	1,700,486
West Virginia	893,482		893,482
Wisconsin	2,774,107		2,774,107
Wyoming	198,686	2,308	200,994
District of Columbia	173,150		173,150
Puerto Rico	357,636		357,636
Virgin Islands			

Extension of Unemployment Compensation Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to urge each and every Member of this House to give careful consideration to the proposals submitted by the President of the United States, establishing a temporary program for the payment of additional unemployment compensation to those who have exhausted their benefits.

We are in a period of economic recession at the present time, with over 5 million workers unemployed. The majority of these have been receiving compensation, but the possibility of their being reemployed prior to the expiration of their benefits is not too good. Many workers have already utilized their full benefits, and are still out of work, with no prospects of a job in sight. They are without any funds with which to support a family, and the local and voluntary welfare agencies are so hard pressed with such a continuing demand against their funds that they find it most difficult to assist so many who have had to come to them for help.

The lack of any purchasing power on the part of such a large segment of our people can seriously hamper the economic health of our country, and I firmly believe that this proposal will give a shot in the arm to our sagging economy.

I am happy to see that the proposal has already been the subject of public hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means, and I understand that executive hearings on the legislation are now in progress.

This is an urgent problem, and one which should be promptly considered by the Congress, and put into operation if the Federal Government is to assume its fair share of its responsibility.

Volunteer Hospital Workers Exemplify the Spirit of Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this is—as we all know—the annual observance known as National Brotherhood Week, originally proposed by the National Conference of Christians and Jews to help us focus our attention on the necessity of supporting the spirit of brotherhood during the entire year.

Splendid examples of persons embodying the principles of brotherly concern for others are the many volunteer hospital workers of America, who, by their unselfish actions, by giving unstintingly of their time and devotion to those less fortunate than themselves, have done so much to give meaning and reality to the ideal of brotherhood. Their activities range from making layettes and rolling bandages to comforting the sick and distributing mail. These humble but vital tasks are essential to the smooth operation of any hospital, and to the humane treatment of its patients.

Outside the hospital, at religious meetings, or at home, volunteer workers spend countless hours in making useful personal items for needy patients, such as blankets and bedclothing. In addition, volunteer workers hold fundraising campaigns, the proceeds of which go to buy those items which they themselves cannot make. It behooves us all to emulate the fine spirit of brotherhood which motivates the volunteer hospital worker.

Responsibility to our fellow man—like freedom itself—is an organic part of the American tradition. We, therefore, call upon all American citizens to bring into their daily actions and to practice to the fullest the principles of brotherhood. For brotherhood eliminates those misunderstandings and conflicts between races and creeds which constitute one of the gravest problems facing our country today.

Fortieth Anniversary of Bishop Vojtassak, Persecuted Prelate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago this month the historical city of Nitra, Czechoslovakia, was the scene of a solemn celebration. There occurred the consecration of the first three Slovak bishops since the creation of the first Republic of Czechoslovakia. Among these prelates was Jan Vojtassak.

Bishop Vojtassak was born on November 14, 1877, in Orava, a Slovakian county, poor in material splendor, but rich in spiritual heritage. He was ordained to the sacred priesthood on July 1, 1900, by Archbishop Micara, the papal nuncio of Pope Benedict XV. In a land rife with religious persecution, Father Vojtassak did not cease to perform his priestly tasks. Nor, even after his elevation to the episcopacy, did he confine himself to diocesan concerns. He gained a reputation both at home and abroad as editor of Svata Rodina—Holy Family.

In 1926 Bishop Vojtassak visited the United States. During his stay he and his fellow Slovak bishops were guests of American cardinals and bishops at the International Eucharistic Congress in Chicago, Ill. Bishop Vojtassak had occasion to meet many Slovak-Americans including John C. Sciranka, of Passaic, N.J., who yet today edits the Slovak newspaper, Katolicky Sokol, in which there recently appeared a fitting tribute to the renowned Slovak prelate.

A stanch foe of the Communists, Bishop Vojtassak was arrested in 1949 and spent a short time in jail. He was thereafter sentenced to 24 years in prison for treason and espionage. The Communist authorities released him in 1956, apparently because of his advanced age. His most recent arrest, however, has not been explained.

The Slovak Newspapermen's Association of America has protested to United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold the cruel and unjust incarceration of this 20th century martyr.

On behalf of free people the world over, I am signally honored to salute this "dry" martyr, this symbol of freedom, Bishop Jan Vojtassak, on the 40th anniversary of his consecration.

House Committee on Rules Votes 8 to 6 Against Reporting House Resolution 115—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 22, 1961, the Committee on Rules, at the request of 121 Members of the House, held a hearing on House Resolution 115. This resolution was introduced by me and provided for a change in the rules of the House so that no legislation permitting withdrawal of money from the Treasury or authority to create obligations by contract in advance would be in order except on bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. This is the so-called antiback-door-spending resolution and would restore control over all Federal expenditures to the Congress.

By a vote of 8 to 6 the resolution was rejected, which prevents the House from considering the bill. Following is a transcript of that part of my statement which preceded questions. At a later point in the RECORD I will insert the balance of my testimony in answer to questions and comments—a reading of which I am confident will show no valid argument to justify the vote against the measure.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS M. PELLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIRST DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman I would like to preface my remarks by saying I appreciate this opportunity to appear here this morning. I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak with respect to House Resolution 115. The other day I read a newspaper article which indicated that consideration of this resolution had something to do with personalities and it distressed me a great deal. I think that the chairman will bear me out in that I first asked him personally, and the only time I spoke to him about a hearing for House Resolution 115, was long before the matter of any enlargement of the Committee on Rules came up. This interest on my part certainly has nothing to do with any vendetta, and furthermore nothing to do with any committee jurisdictional differences. It is purely a difference in views on fiscal responsibility.

In the past, like many other Members of the House, I have introduced various pieces of legislation designed to try to bring a better control of our finances, bills to require regular payments on the national debt, bills to require the balance of the budget, or else in an emergency, a record vote with the ayes and nays on waiving the rule. I have introduced many similar bills, but it seems that there is one fundamental step that the Congress must take which would precede any other legislation and that is to restore control over spending to the Congress itself. I invited any other Member of the House, regardless of party or any other consideration, to join in a request for this hearing. I sent a letter to the chairman of this committee over the signatures of 109 Members asking for this hearing. Later I sent another letter with additional signatures which had come in since the first letter was transmitted with, as I recall, 12 additional names. I

would like to say that if I take the 121 Members—120 now, unfortunately because of the fact that our late colleague, Mr. Norrell, was one of those and unfortunately is not with us any longer, but if I take those signatures, plus the Members of the House who are presently here who were here in May of 1959 when the same principle came before the House when the Thomas amendments to the housing bill were considered.

I am emboldened to say that a majority of the Members of the House are in favor of House Resolution 115. Many Members called me to say they did not wish to sign the letter but that they were in favor of House Resolution 115. In order to cover the field fully I thought it best to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD full information regarding this so-called back-door spending because it is a rather involved subject and I thought for that reason that I would take up the various pros and cons of them and place them in the RECORD.

On February 9, 1961, under a special order I spoke on House Resolution 115. My remarks appear on page 2014 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the letter to the chairman over 109 Members' signatures, together with other information on it.

Then on January 30, as shown on pages 1457–1459 of the RECORD, I put a very interesting tabulation in showing the scope of the back-door spending as it had been, as it had come to the floor in the past 3 years through various measures.

Likewise, at that time, I put in a letter which our colleague, Mr. J. VAUGHAN GARY, had received from the Secretary of the Treasury indicating that the so-called back-door method of deficit or loan authority financing was in fact an appropriation.

Then on February 15, as shown on page A911 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I put in a primer, more or less, which covers this whole subject, showing four methods by which it has been possible to bypass what I believe to be the constitutional provisions covering appropriations. And in that particular primer I mentioned that in the past 3 years, in the 86th Congress, 2d session, the 86th Congress, the 1st session, and the 85th Congress, 2d session, the cuts in appropriations from the President's budget by the bills that came out of the Appropriations Committee were very substantial.

In the 2d session of the 86th Congress the appropriations were $211 million less than the requests; in the 1st session of the 86th Congress they were $1,880 million less than the budget request, and in the 2d session of the 85th Congress they were $617 million less than the request, and all the while as shown by this tabulation there were increases by the back-door method.

In the first year cited the back-door increase over budget amounted to $997 million. In the second case cited the increase over budget was $231 million, and in the final third year the increase was $149 million.

Now I know that there are several witnesses here that are going to speak very briefly on this subject and I don't want to monopolize the time. All the members of the Rules Committee have been here for a great many years and you know what I am talking about. I would, however, bring up this one thing, since I don't know what the guiding principle of the Rules Committee is today. I know if I take the way that individually you voted on back-door spending when it has been considered on individual amendments that the majority of you are against it: but on the other hand I call to your attention the fact that there are many of us who believe that regardless of personal views the House should have a chance to work its will. So all I ask is that you don't necessarily vote today as to whether to report out this resolution as you personally believe, but give those of us who have this principle at heart and the House a chance to work its will.

I might say before I close that the Comptroller General has for a number of years indicated, he being the principal financial officer of the Congress, he does not approve of the back-door method of spending. I call your attention also to the fact that on pages 2267–2268 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1961, there are certain questions and answers which I inserted in the RECORD. And I took the questions which were raised by those who opposed this resolution or opposed the Thomas amendments or the Williams amendments as they have been debated in the past. I gave the answers to them and any other reference to the objections which have been raised.

Finally let me say I have one letter I would like to read. It came to me yesterday. It came from Beaver Falls, Pa., from Irving Forman. It is addressed to me and says:

"I am not one of your constituents. On the contrary I am at the other extreme of the country from the district you represent. However, I read of your most admirable work regarding back-door spending and I feel I must write to you.

"I am wholeheartedly 100 percent in favor of this idea. I support you and your colleagues with all the fervor and admiration I possess. If more of the Representatives and Senators had the same outlook and thought our financial troubles would be decreased and lightened. Keep up the good work, Mr. PELLY. I am sure many millions of citizens are behind you and need someone to lead and direct them.

"I am a steelworker earning $2.39 per hour. In the talk among my fellow workers the most spoken of subjects are rising taxes. We are in favor of commonsense business-like spending and your idea seems the best.

"If there is anything I can do I would be more than grateful to do it. If I can help, you can count on me and many, many others like me. Please let me know. In the meantime continue your good work on your honest approach in budget and appropriations. Keep up the good work."

I think that is the most eloquent argument in favor of the resolution to change the rules of the committee so that a point of order could be made against any appropriation that is not reported by the committee having jurisdiction. Again I thank you, Mr. Chairman and the committee for this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PELLY, you sent me a letter signed by a great many Members of the House.

Mr. PELLY. 120 Members.

The CHAIRMAN. And then you sent me a supplemental list. That is 120 Members of the House who are asking for an opportunity to vote on this measure.

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs me that you are a little too modest, that there are 130 names on it.

Mr. PELLY. I was told by my office, but I will revise and extend, if I may, upward.

Fund for the Families of the Heroic Men of Texas Tower No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, Otis Air Force Base in my district has among its many responsibilities the refueling and manpower transportation of Texas Towers on our northeastern seaboard. Among those in the base's jurisdiction was Texas Tower No. 4. The recent tragedy of this tower's collapse was deeply felt throughout my district, and prominent cape residents under the leadership of Nathaniel A. Denman have begun a fundraising project for the families of the brave men who lost their lives there. The response to their plea for contributions has been heartwarming indeed.

I have today received a letter from Mr. Denman in which he says:

> The Air Force and its contractors mean a great deal to Cape Cod. From blood donations and searching for lost children to helicopters for injured seamen, Otis always helps. Now, with the tragedy of Texas Tower No. 4, we have an opportunity to demonstrate our sympathy and warm feeling toward the families of the brave men lost. * * * We are asking public-spirited individuals and organizations to take a part. If the contributions averaged $1 from each person on the cape, we would assure the children's educations.

I am sure that my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating this group for the effective and compassionate work they are doing on behalf of the bereaved families of the heroic men of Texas Tower No. 4.

Continuation of Remarks on House Committee on Rules Voting 8 to 6 Against Reporting House Resolution 115—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, a reading of the transcript in connection with the hearing on House Resolution 115 before the Committee on Rules makes it difficult to understand why the committee voted 8 to 6 against this needed change in the House rules to restore to Congress its constitutional responsibility and control over the public purse.

Earlier in the RECORD, I have placed my original statement made by the Rules Committee in support of my resolution. The comments and questioning following that statement are included hereinafter and show there is no valid argument against my resolution that I can possibly see unless one favors budget "busting" and no limit on the national debt:

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mr. COLMER. Yes. Mr. Pelly, I have not had an opportunity to see that list or petition. Am I correct in assuming that it is a study group?

Mr. PELLY. This is simply an independent, nonpartisan committee of Members who were organized by two Democrats and two Republicans. Mr. SHEPPARD, of California, joined with us and Mr. FLYNT from Georgia who could not be here, and Mr. HOEVEN, of

Iowa, who I think is probably here, and myself.

Mr. COLMER. I evidently was misinformed about that. I understand that this group does believe in having all these things to come out of the committee and go to the floor. I am correct in that assumption, am I?

Mr. PELLY. The committee letter speaks for itself. We are those who oppose back-door spending and ask for a hearing and a chance to consider the bill on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other questions?

Mr. COLMER. Regardless of who signed it I am in thorough accord with the objective but I did not intend to embarrass you. I don't know who is on the study group. I just merely wanted to inquire whether there was some consistency or whether it is a question of whose back needs a little scratching.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I think this resolution hits at one of the most serious problems that we have confronting the Congress, not only at this time but that we had in the last session of the Congress. This legislation is of the utmost importance if we are going to make an honest endeavor to maintain some fiscal responsibility in the Government and to perhaps some day have a balanced budget and a few other things. Personally I have supported this type of legislation in the past. I feel strongly that on this particular resolution or one like it the House should have an opportunity to work its will and it should be very beneficial to the country if a resolution of this type is adopted. I want to congratulate you, sir, on a very splendid statement and I want to assure you that a great many of your colleagues appreciate the many long hours of work and the efforts that you have put forth in assembling the material in support of this resolution and in the way you have carried through in behalf of this type of fiscal reform that is needed so badly. I think the Congress owes you a debt of gratitude for your service.

Mr. PELLY. I think this particular resolution gets to the heart of our entire financial problem.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. PELLY. And if we would concentrate on it and forget all these other ideas which sound find on paper, then we could place the responsibility for all spending in one committee and then there would not be these arguments as to where the responsibility lies for the increase in the national debt or who is at fault for budget busting. It would be written right there.

Mr. BROWN. The American people would have an idea of knowing what their Government is doing. Under the present system we do not get a true picture of the Government expenditures; is that right?

Mr. PELLY. I think it is a good principle for annual scrutiny by one committee of the Government spending.

Mr. BROWN. This would give the American people important information that they do not have today on Federal spending, is that right?

Mr. PELLY. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BROWN. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I would only like to congratulate our colleague Mr. PELLY on the very fine statement he has made and the very fine research he has done. You do consider that this is in a way restoring some of the powers of Congress that we have let go by; is that true?

Mr. PELLY. Exactly. At one time I think both the taxes and expenditures were under one committee of the Congress. Later it was divided because the work became so great, but all of the expenditures should have an annual scrutiny by some one committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly in favor of the Congress assuming not only more of its power but more of its responsibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. After the taxing and appropriating functions were separated and the taxing function went to the Ways and Means Committee then for a long time the appropriating authority went to the legislative committee and they recommended whatever they wanted for that particular branch of the Government. It was done then by the legislative committee and that became so unsatisfactory because it took away the brakes on appropriations by groups that had some special reason, and placed it in an impartial, presumably, an impartial committee and that was the Appropriations Committee so that all appropriations are now supposed to go to the Appropriations Committee whereas in years gone by up until 1910 I think each legislative committee reported its own appropriations bill and that was found so unsatisfactory that it was changed to this method of having all of them come through one committee so that when we got through with the session of Congress we know how much money had been appropriated.

This way with this so-called back-door spending the Appropriations Committee never knows about it and it is never reported in the ordinary report of the Appropriations Committee as to how much money has been appropriated. Are there any further questions? Mr. TRIMBLE?

Mr. TRIMBLE. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. THORNBERRY?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I have read over those reports and I have gathered that the rule would apply to both the bills which affect domestic legislation and foreign appropriations.

Mr. PELLY. Any appropriation exactly.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Last year or the year when we did have long hearings on a similar proposal and quite a number of people were very anxious that it be passed, the Secretary of the Treasury said it was very necessary for us to pass this resolution, a bill providing for the same authority for the Development and Loan Fund, and apparently there was a difference in the approach to anything that would perhaps help other countries rather than our own people. You don't take that position; do you?

Mr. PELLY. I certainly do not.

The CHAIRMAN. In that connection let me say that the Secretary of the Treasury—I offered this same resolution at that time and I offered it again this year, the same as Mr. PELLY—and the Secretary of the Treasury came in to see me about it and he was very much alarmed about this back-door spending but did confess that he was somewhat embarrassed by reason of the situation in the foreign affairs, and I could not see why we should be more lenient in handling our funds for the foreign giveaway projects than in our own domestic situation, our own domestic funds.

Mr. PELLY. I do not necessarily accept the fact that this resolution would curtail any of the programs. It would only insist that at least somebody scrutinize them. There would be a check and a balance on maybe the enthusiasm of some special groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. SISK?

Mr. SISK. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BOLLING?

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. PELLY, I gather from your statement that you have gone into a considerable amount of research on this. Would you mind listing for the committee the programs that would be affected?

Mr. PELLY. I have them all, I think, pretty well. In fact I think maybe I might cover the history of the thing a little bit here. See if this answers your question. I now read from "House Methods and Practices of Appropriations Including Back Door Spending" which I referred to earlier as a sort of a primer. The second paragraph starts:

"Things went along on this basis until about 1932. With the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a new language device was drawn to supply the Corporation with funds. Rather than the traditional form of appropriation through the regular appropriations process, the language authorized the Corporation to go direct to the Treasury and borrow money for its operations. Over the years, Congress had provided similar borrowing authority to a number of corporations and for a number of noncorporate Government programs, such as housing, CCC, REA, FHA, some types of farm loans, defense minerals procurement, the British loan in 1946, the International Monetary Fund contribution, and so on."

I think, too, that it might be well to offer at this time maybe the tabulation that shows the various bills that have been considered by Congress in the last 3 years, the years which I put in the record but which are a little too long to enumerate but which gives the amounts involved.

Mr. BOLLING. I would like an enumeration of the program so that I know what program will be affected.

Mr. PELLY. Well, I think that yesterday or the day before the majority leader in the House read an article—if I had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I think he had listed all of them.

Mr. BOLLING. You do not include in the statement for the record then the program affected?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, I will go into the whole list for you here. I will read the subjects which are: "Emergency Housing Act," "Export-Import Bank Lending Authority," "Small Business Investments," "Community Facilities," "Depressed Areas," "Minerals Subsidy," "Airport Grants," "Housing Act of 1958," "Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation," "Highway Act of 1958," "Education Bill," "Write-off of Losses Under Defense Production Act," "Borrowing Authority," "Direct Veterans Loans," "TVA Borrowing Authority," "Capitol Power Plant Construction," "Maritime Academy Act of 1958."

That lists the authorities to obligate the Government carried in legislative bills of the 85th Congress, 2d session. Next I will list public debt transactions, the authority to obligate the Government carried in legislative bills of the 86th Congress, 1st session, public debt transactions, and contract authorities.

I will now read what is involved in that: "Bretton Woods Agreement Act, Direct Veterans Loans, Airport Grants, the Housing Act of 1959," and I might say that was when the Thomas amendments were agreed to by the House but were withdrawn by a conference with the Senate, the Housing Act of 1959, and the Highway Act of 1959.

Then in the new authority to obligate the Government carried in the legislative bills, 86th Congress, 2d session, the Housing Act amendments were under that, the college housing loans, the public facilities loans, direct veterans loans, and the Highway Act of 1960. I think maybe if I could hand you this, it actually has the House bills and the Senate numbers.

Mr. BOLLING. Do you have the list of those which were not actually considered in the 85th or 86th Congress?

Mr. PELLY. I have a record which goes back a great many years. I do not know whether I have it with me or not but I would say this, that for example many of the bills that were listed by the majority leader a day or so ago on the floor originally were considered as public debt transactions and then subsequently there seemed to have been a slowdown in that process and they were changed and came by direct appropriation.

Mr. BOLLING. Do you have a listing of the foreign affairs program, the programs that have an impact on foreign affairs that use this device?

Mr. PELLY. No; I have only what I have listed.

Mr. BOLLING. I understand that in the foreign program the administration in recent years has supported it in this fashion as was brought out by the Secretary of the Treasury's embarrassment. Now this thing you call back-door spending, could you define it precisely? Could you say what kind of a procedure it is?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, there are four methods of obtaining funds or authorities to agencies to spend which do not come from the legislation which comes out of the committee having jurisdiction, and I will enumerate those and define them if you wish me to.

The principal devices are, No. 1, public debt transaction, No. 2, note cancellation, No. 3, revolving funds, and No. 4, contract authority. They are fully covered by definitions and I will read them but I think everyone in this committee has been around here long enough so that I am sure they know what those four are.

Mr. BOLLING. What are the public debt transactions? Are they a drawing of the funds on the Treasury that are later paid at a later date?

Mr. PELLY. It is a bill authorizing certain programs of the Government, say housing for example, and it includes a section providing the funds to carry out the program in this way: (a) It authorizes the head of the department or agency concerned to issue notes or other types of obligations for sale to the Secretary of the Treasury; (b) it authorizes and directs the Secretary to buy such notes when the agency head brings them over; (c) it authorizes the Secretary to sell Government bonds to the public to get the money with which to buy the notes from the agency head; (d) and, finally, it authorizes or directs the Secretary to treat the purchases, sales, and redemptions of the notes as a public debt transaction. Thus the name for this technique.

Mr. BOLLING. It in effect is a loan type program?

Mr. PELLY. Exactly.

Mr. BOLLING. This contract authorization, is that the method by which a great deal of the Armed Forces procurement is carried out?

Mr. PELLY. I believe I am correct in saying that the defense appropriations have always come from the Appropriations Committee and that they are not limited to one particular year. They are continuing appropriations.

If I could then try to define what is in it by contract authority, this is another device used in several programs in bills reported by the legislative committees, and it involves language authorizing the agency head to enter into contracts to carry out the particular program of the project involved.

Unlike the other device, this one does not convey authority to draw money from the Treasury. The appropriation to pay off the contract is requested through the regular annual appropriations process, but the trouble is that at the point the role of the appropriations process is essentially ministerial. The act of appropriation to pay the contracts is essentially foreordained because a contract, once made, must be honored.

Mr. BOLLING. This type of procedure would be also eliminated?

Mr. PELLY. That is right.

Mr. BOLLING. And there would be no possibility to contract for missile development on a long-range basis?

Mr. PELLY. What you would do would be to enter into a contract over a period of years, and the funds could all be appropriated in 1 year and be spent over the years. Meanwhile there would be a continuing scrutiny and under this program if you cancel a certain missile, then in turn the Appropriations Committee can stop money going into the program whereas otherwise they cannot recapture it.

Mr. BOLLING. Do you think prudent businessmen would take contracts if there were a serious question as to whether they would be fulfilled by the Government?

Mr. PELLY. I would say that this particular resolution is supported by all business organizations I know of, including those that are concerned with real estate and housing as well as those concerned with defense contracts, etc.

Mr. BOLLING. I assume that evidence of that is in your longer statement?

Mr. PELLY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BOLLING. What organizations are supporting this resolution?

Mr. PELLY. Well, the National Association of Real Estate Boards. I put that into the record.

Mr. BOLLING. Could you read them? I would be interested in knowing now.

Mr. PELLY. I may say that I have not sought endorsements for this resolution but I received, without any solicitation on my part, a letter from the National Association of Real Estate Boards and it reads as follows:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: I noted with interest your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, concerning the anti-back-door spending resolution, House Resolution 115.

"Our association has long opposed the bypassing of the Appropriations Committees in this manner. At our national convention in November of last year, we adopted the following resolution to be included in our 1961 statement of policy:

"We urge the Congress to require that loans and contractual obligations which ultimately become charges on the Treasury be approved by the Appropriations Committees as well as by legislative committees of the Congress.

"You may be assured of the wholehearted support of realtors for the passage of this measure."

Now, I have with me what is called the Taxpayer's Dollar issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and it notes "Comptroller General criticizes bypassing fiscal controls." It has an article entitled "Public Debt Transactions" all indicating that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has long opposed the circumvention of the appropriations process. In fact, I drew on them for certain things that I put in the RECORD. Their statement of transactions goes back to 1958 so I don't think it is up to date.

Mr. BOLLING. Any other organizational support?

Mr. PELLY. No; but I will be very happy if you bring this resolution to the floor to solicit such endorsements and I can assure you that I can come up with plenty—I don't know any public organizations that oppose it.

Mr. BOLLING. Thank you very much, Mr. PELLY.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. O'NEILL?

Mr. O'NEILL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. COLMER?

Mr. COLMER. In line with the questions propounded to you by my colleague Mr. BOLLING, is there any good reason why these appropriations for defense, foreign affairs and so forth could not be made in the ordinary and regular course as other matters are taken care of? In other words, is it essential to the welfare of these programs that this particular so-called back-door approach be followed? In other words, can not the committee take care of that situation from year to year without endangering the program?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad you brought up that question since I should have stated that this resolution would not slow up or change any existing program or programs which might in the future comes before the House. It just simply changes the method by which we finance the program and will not curtail necessarily or in any way affect any program that I can possibly see.

Mr. COLMER. Thank you.

Mr. BROWN. May I ask one more question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. Of course, boiling this thing down to the real content of it, those who oppose legislation of this type are the interests that want an easy way to get money out of the Federal Treasury without having to present their cases in an open hearing before Congress and show the necessity thereof. And those who support the legislation feel that the Appropriations Committee of the House and the House itself as well as the Senate should have some opportunity to pass upon the matter.

Mr. O'NEILL. I think you put that very mildly.

Mr. BROWN. I am a mild man, generally.

Mr. O'NEILL. I think the proponents of this legislation would like to scuttle housing and urban renewal and long range programing.

Mr. BROWN. Any program that cannot stand on its own feet before the Congress or the House has to go around by the back door.

Mr. O'NEILL. This is scuttling legislation.

Mr. PELLY. I resent any impugning of the motives of Members in coming here or saying that I am trying to scuttle any legislation. I will take any legislation and identify it on its merits and I do not try to——

Mr. O'NEILL. I will say that 90 percent of the 140 Members that have signed this petition are constantly in opposition to urban renewal and this housing program and road legislation of the type the Congress has passed.

Mr. PELLY. You can make any statement you want. I will speak for myself and I will say that I am not here to try to scuttle programs but I am trying to restore fiscal responsibility of the Congress where the Constitution put it at the start.

Mr. MADDEN. I am concerned a little bit about it. I don't know whether I am right or wrong, but about 4½ years ago the Congress passed a $34 million highway program and there are just dribs and drabs of this construction in the Nation. It is hardly off the blueprint stage today. What effect would this have on the contractor if the new administration got the highway program on a big scale? What effect would that have on contractors that would come in and say, take a $1 million contract on a stretch of highway that extends over a period of 5 or 6 years in payment, what trouble would they have in coming in here every year or every so often to have assurances that they are going to get their money? Would this hamper the highway program in any way?

Mr. PELLY. Not one iota.

Mr. DELANEY. Wouldn't it affect the cost of that program?

Mr. PELLY. I don't believe it would affect the cost one single bit. If I were a contractor, and it does not have to be a multimillion-dollar one, I would feel better if I knew the money was coming out of an appropriation than I would if it were coming out of some other process.

Mr. MADDEN. Do you think the contractor might be aware that 2 years from now there might be some particular item in his contract that some member of the Appropriations Committee might, the chairman of the subcommittee might get up on the floor and tie it up? Would that throw any fear in him as far as going ahead on a contract that would extend over 4 or 5 years, regarding the possibilities of getting his money under the contract?

Mr. PELLY. Absolutely none, and the fact has been brought out by the fact that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States that represents these big contractors, I would

assume, and other contractors, have supported the control, the restoration of the control of the purse in the Congress.

Mr. SISK. Isn't it a fact that if this bill should become law that every urban renewal project in this country would be stopped immediately in spite of the fact that the President has sent telegrams to every city, urging them to expedite the program?

Mr. PELLY. It would not change it one bit.

Mr. SISK. Why wouldn't it? They are financed under a loan type program.

Mr. PELLY. That is right, and any new bill, new program, that came before the House would be subject to a point of order, while a law on the books would not be affected.

Mr. SISK. There are so many examples that this particular piece of legislation would block and stop further development of practically every urban-renewal project in the country.

Mr. PELLY. I have heard a lot of statements. The only way it would affect them would be if the Appropriations Committee would not appropriate money for an authorized project. That is the only way, or if the House would not act on it.

Mr. BROWN. Wouldn't that be the Congress working its will?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SISK. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLMER. Isn't it also true, Mr. PELLY, that if such a program were endangered that the chairman of the legislative committee could and most likely would come before this committee and lay those facts out and ask for a rule on that particular bill, waiving the point of order? That is frequently done, as every member of this committee knows.

Mr. PELLY. I cannot speak in favor of a rule waiving points of order, because I do not approve of them, but it has been done.

Mr. COLMER. There are cases where it is valuable so to do.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this is a statement that has been made, and, very frankly, I would want to see proof of the fact that it would not affect these programs before I would even consider changing my position on this issue, because, very frankly, I think that your own statements indicated it could block every one of these programs.

Mr. PELLY. My statement is, without equivocation, that it would not block any. I cannot say any more than that.

Mr. SISK. I realize we have a difference of opinion on that. I am open to being convinced, but I have not been so far.

Political Gamesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, campaign trail promises loaded with political sex appeal are as important in winning elections as gapsmanship. But they have a noticeable capacity to turn up later as frightening haunts to winners gaining office with their lure. What seemed to November campaigners to be bold moves ahead often appear to January officeholders as enormous budget-busting millstones around extended political necks. This need not, however, prove catastrophic. All need not be lost. There is a way out. It involves combining political gamesmanship, the art of appearing to produce on campaign promises without actually doing so, with the old parliamentary axiom "kill it with controversy." The specific technique is to put a promise in bill form, making sure the bill also is loaded up with lots more items so unpalatable to large numbers of legislators they must vote against it. The skilled political gamesman can achieve an additional unpopularity bonus for the bill by leaving out numerous other items, the omission of which is wholly unpalatable to another bloc of legislators. Almost surely the bill will be defeated and the haunt exorcised. In the process the political gamesman has appeared to work with selfless devotion to produce on his promise. He remains glorious in defeat. He can sanctimoniously blame the outcome on evil, ignorant, selfish, corrupt, unhuman forces and/or including even the other political party. Unlike touch football, political gamesmanship is not a spectator sport. One of its basic rules is never to admit the game is being played. Only the players themselves are supposed to know. Sometimes bystanders can piece together enough impressions to form an opinion the sport is being indulged in, but they can never be sure. Persons and events hereinabove portrayed are entirely fictional and any similarity to actual persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental.

First Committee Report on Unemployment Compensation Stressed State Option

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in studying the proposal for the extension of the unemployment compensation program, I would like to call attention to the original report of the Ways and Means Committee when the program was first enacted in 1935. You will note the soundness of the basic program and the fact that the original report stressed the importance of not forcing the Federal will upon the States. Following is the complete section or unemployment compensation from the Ways and Means Committee Report No. 615, April 5, 1935. I include it here because it is now out of print:

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Unemployment is an even more prevalent cause of dependency than old age; in fact, it is the most serious of all hazards confronting industrial workers. During the years 1922 to 1929 an average of 8 percent of the industrial workers in this country were unemployed, and in the 4 depression years, 1930 to 1933, the unemployment rate was above 25 percent. Of all urban families now on relief, more than four-fifths are destitute because of unemployment.

Unemployment is due to many causes and there is no one safeguard that is all-sufficient. It can be dealt with in a reasonably adequate fashion only through a twofold approach, similar to that recommended for dealing with the old-age problem. Provisions must be made for the relief of those now unemployed and there should also be devised a method of dealing with the unemployment problem in a less costly and more intelligent way in future years. It should be clearly understood that State unemployment compensation plans made possible by this bill cannot take care of the present problem of unemployment. They will be designed rather to afford security against the large bulk of unemployment in the future.

For those now unemployed the best measure of protection is to give them employment, as is contemplated in the work-relief bill. To provide something better than relief on a needs basis for the unemployed of the future, the establishment by the States of unemployment compensation systems is urgently to be desired. Titles III and IX seek to encourage States to set up such systems and to keep them from being handicapped if they do so.

The essential idea in unemployment compensation, more commonly but less accurately called unemployment insurance is the accumulation of reserves in times of employment from which partial compensation may be paid to workers who become unemployed and are unable to find other work. Unemployment insurance cannot give complete and unlimited compensation to all who are unemployed. Any attempt to make it do so confuses unemployment insurance with relief, which it is designed to replace in large part. It can give compensation only for a limited period and for a percentage of the wage loss.

Unemployment compensation, nevertheless, is of real value to the industrial workers who are brought under its protection. In normal times it will enable most workers who lose their jobs to tide themselves over, until they get back to their old work or find other employment, without having to resort to relief. Even in depressions it will cover a considerable part of all unemployment and will be all that many workers will need. Unemployed workmen who cannot find other employment within reasonable periods will have to be cared for through work relief or other forms of assistance, but unemployment compensation will greatly reduce the necessity for such assistance. Unemployment compensation is greatly preferable to relief because it is given without any means test. It is in many respects comparable to workmen's compensation, except that it is designed to meet a different and greater hazard.

Unemployment compensation is valuable to the public as well as to the industrial workers themselves. It is a measure tending to maintain purchasing power, upon which business and industry are dependent. Had there been a system of unemployment compensation throughout the country in the years from 1922 on, with a 3-percent contribution rate, not only would practically all unemployment of the prosperity period have been compensated, but it is estimated that $2,500 million would have been available for payment of benefits with the beginning of the depression in 1929. Such an amount paid to unemployed workmen at that time would unquestionably have had a most wholesome, stabilizing effect upon business.

Unemployment compensation has behind it an extensive European experience. No country which has experimented with unemployment insurance has ever abandoned it. In this country it has been endorsed by numerous Federal and State commissions and committees, but prior to this year only one State enacted such a law, and this came into operation less than a year ago.

The failure of the States to enact unemployment insurance laws is due largely to

the fact that to do so would handicap their industries in competition with the industries of other States. The States have been unwilling to place this extra financial burden upon their industries. A uniform, nationwide tax upon industry, thus removing this principal obstacle in the way of unemployment insurance, is necessary before the States can go ahead. Such tax should make it possible for the States to enact this socially desirable legislation.

This is one of the purposes of title IX of this bill. In this title a tax is imposed upon employers throughout the country against which a credit is allowed of up to 90 percent of the tax for contributions made by employers to unemployment compensation funds established pursuant to State law.

That this tax is imposed on employers is indicative of the conviction that employers should bear at least a part of the cost of unemployment compensation, just as they bear the cost of workmen's compensation. Each State is, of course, free to assess not only employers but employees; and in this connection it may be noted that in European countries, and under the law recently passed by the State of Washington, employees are required to contribute.

The amount of benefits payable for unemployment from contributions amounting to 3 percent of payroll would vary from State to State. The maximum period for which benefits may be paid depends not only upon the rate of unemployment, but also upon the percentage of wages paid as benefits, the length of the required waiting period, the ratio of weeks of employment to weeks of benefits, and other provisions. The scale of benefits which States will be able to pay from a 3-percent rate of contributions on payrolls will carry the great majority of unemployed workers through normal years until they are able to secure employment again. While the Federal tax is limited to 3 percent (1 percent in 1936 and 2 percent in 1937), some States will probably increase the benefits payable by requiring also contributions from the employees or the State government. Under a reasonable scale of benefits, reserves would accumulate in normal years to carry the fund through minor depressions or the first years of a major depression.

The bill permits the States wide discretion with respect to the unemployment compensation laws they may wish to enact. The standards prescribed in this bill, which are described in part II of this report, are designed merely to insure that employers will receive credit against the Federal payroll tax only for payments made under genuine unemployment compensation laws.

Yet the Federal Government, under this bill, has important functions to perform in order to make it possible for the States to have unemployment insurance laws and to facilitate their operation. It equalizes competitive conditions through the imposition of the employment excise tax provided for in title IX. The bill further provides that the Social Security Board, which is created in title VII to administer all parts of the social security program other than aids coming within the scope of operation of existing bureaus, shall have the duty of studying and making recommendations with respect to the broad problems of economic security. This Board will be able to render important actuarial and scientific services to the States in connection with their unemployment insurance systems. In title III financial aid is given the States by the Federal Government to defray their costs in administering unemployment insurance. Finally, the Federal Government is to handle all unemployment reserve funds, in a trust account in the U.S. Treasury for the benefit of the States to which they belong.

This last provision will not only afford maximum safety for these funds but is very essential to insure that they will operate to promote the stability of business rather than the reserve. Unemployment reserve funds have the peculiarity that the demands upon them fluctuate considerably, being heaviest when business slackens. If, in such times, the securities in which these funds are invested are thrown upon the market for liquidation, the net effect is likely to be increased deflation. Such a result is avoided in this bill through the provision that all reserve funds are to be held by the United States Treasury, to be invested and liquidated by the Secretary of Treasury in a manner calculated to promote business stability. When business conditions are such that investment in securities purchased on the open market is unwise, the Secretary of Treasury may issue special nonnegotiable obligations exclusively to the unemployment trust fund. When a reverse situation exits and heavy drains are made upon the fund for payment of unemployment benefits, the Treasury does not have to dispose of the securities belonging to the fund in open market but may assume them itself. With such a method of handling the reserve funds, it is believed that this bill will solve the problem often raised in discussions of unemployment compensation, regarding the possibility of transferring purchasing power from boom periods to depression periods. It will in fact operate to sustain purchasing power at the onset of a depression without having any counteracting deflationary tendencies.

"George Washington"—Address by Hon. Dale Alford Before the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I had one of the greatest honors which has ever been afforded me in public life. I was invited to give the annual George Washington address to the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. There were many distinguished guests present at this luncheon, including the president general of the Sons of the American Revolution, Dr. H. S. Murphy of New Jersey. On leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include my address given on the 229th anniversary of the birth of the first President of the United States, George Washington, of Virginia. My address, entitled "George Washington," is as follows:

"GEORGE WASHINGTON"—ADDRESS BY HON. DALE ALFORD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FROM ARKANSAS, AT WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 22, 1961

Sons of the American Revolution, on the occasion of a banquet held in this city to commemorate the centennial of the birth of George Washington the principal speaker was Daniel Webster who still holds unchallenged in the hearts of his countrymen the proud position of the greatest of American orators. In the printed editions of Mr. Webster's address on that occasion we find the following paragraph:

"It was the extraordinary fortune of Washington, that, having been intrusted, in revolutionary times, with the supreme military command, and having fulfilled that trust with equal renown for wisdom and for valor, he should be placed at the head of the first government in which an attempt was to be made on a large scale to rear the fabric of social order on the basis of a written constitution and of a pure representative principle. A government was to be established, without a throne, without an aristocracy, without castes, orders, or privileges; and this government, instead of being a democracy, existing and acting within the walls of a single city, was to be extended over a vast country, of different climates, interests, and habits, and of various communions of our common Christian faith. The experiment certainly was entirely new. A popular government of this extent, it was evident, could be framed only by carrying into full effect the principle of representation or of delegated power; and the world was to see whether society could, by the strength of this principle, maintain its own peace and good government, carry forward its own great interests, and conduct itself to political renown and glory. By the benignity of providence, this experiment, so full of interest to us and to our posterity forever, so full of interest, indeed, to the world in its present generation and in all its generations to come, was suffered to commence under the guidance of Washington. Destined for this high career, he was fitted for it by wisdom, by virtue, by patriotism, by discretion, by whatever can inspire confidence in man toward man. In entering upon the untried scenes, early disappointment and the premature extinction of all hope of success would have been certain, had it not been that there did exist throughout the country, in a most extraordinary degree, an unwavering trust in him who stood at the helm."

It is not for me to presume to instruct this gathering on the public career of Washington, the broad outlines of which are certainly as well known to you as to myself. I choose rather to dwell upon certain aspects of his life and character which brought into focus qualities of mind and heart which, had the times been less crucial and demanding, might never have been fully revealed.

We all know that George Washington, son of Augustine and Mary Ball Washington, although born into excellent family connections, was not born to wealth in his own right. Like nearly every Virginia planter, his father was, to employ the familiar expression of the day, "land poor"—acres were broad and plentiful, but the lack of hard cash was a never ceasing problem. To the day of George Washington's death the volume of trade was against the southern landowner, for the reason that to obtain his supply of textiles, manufactured products, and luxuries he was generally obliged to mortgage his crops a year in advance. In the hands of his factor in London he was helpless, even if that individual chose to be honest.

In Washington's youth younger sons were expected to shift for themselves. Had his father lived, it is probable that George would have been given the benefit of an English education which his elder half brothers had enjoyed. But Augustine Washington died when his eldest son by his second wife was but 12 years old, leaving the youthful George in his mother's care and a farm on the Rapahannock as his sole inheritance. Four years later, at 16, George quit schooling altogether and began the study of surveying under Lord Fairfax, an English peer who had inherited vast lands in Virginia and had come over to establish his claims and spend his last years in America. The elderly Englishman took a fancy to the youthful American and commissioned Washington to survey his great forest holdings. Although the youthful surveyor was practically self-taught, he did his work so well that Lord

Fairfax kept him busy for 3 years. Meanwhile, George did not neglect to give considerable study to military tactics and the manual of arms against the day when he might be called to a career in the militia. Thus, before he was out of his teens the lad from the Ferry Farm had already given evidence of two outstanding traits: (1) ambition and (2) steadfast perseverance in whatever he undertook. The youthful surveyor of the Virginia wilderness demonstrated that the child is indeed father to the man.

All this came to an end in 1751 when the failing health of his elder half brother Lawrence who had, since his father's death, served as a sort of second father to George, caused the 19-year-old boy to drop his wilderness surveying and accompany Lawrence, who had contracted the dread disease so common in the 18th century, of tuberculosis. George himself fell a victim to another widely spread 18th century malady—smallpox—which left his face deeply scarred and pitted for life which, after he had become great and famous the various portrait painters to whom he sat tactfully passed over. Incidentally, this trip to the Barbados was the only voyage Washington ever made outside the future United States.

We have his diary of the period—the first of a long series—but in its badly mutilated pages, sometimes mere slivers of paper, we are first made conscious of the matter-of-fact-down-to-earthiness of the writer. Not for him the elaborate musings and reflections of 18th century diarists. Like a distinguished successor in the Presidency of the United States in the far distant future, it was conditions that interested Washington, not theories. Whether it was catching a fox or felling a tree or shipping a hogshead of tobacco to his agent in London, or skirmishing against the Indians and the French, or marrying Mrs. Custis or whipping the Continental Army into shape, it is the bare fact that counts, and facts are the only things that matter for his journal. Thus in this, his first and only long voyage, we read such extracts as "Met with a brisk trade wind and pretty large swell [which] made the ship rock and me very sick." And yet as Rupert Hughes, Washington's biographer, says of this little fragmentary diary of the far away and long ago:

"It is human and at times humorous. It has the convincing quality of something real, the actual Washington tossing about on the waves and hurrying to record what he saw in his little book. He tries to write like an old sea dog, with latitude, longitude, knots, course, and sails sighted, religiously indicated, along with such events as 'catched a dolphin at 8 p.m., a shark at 11 and one of his pilot fish; the dolphin and pilot was dressed for dinner.'" Again, a curious entry which has kept Washington scholars guessing ever since, and is the more fascinating because the truth can now never be known unless we meet Washington in heaven and he condescends to tell us. A gloomy entry in the youthful voyager's diary opens with:

"The seamen seemed disheartened, confessing they had never seen such weather before. It was universally surmis'd there had been a violent hurricane not far distant. A prodigy in ye west appear'd toward ye suns setting [about] 6 p.m., remarkable for its extraordinary redness."

Prodigy is a big word, even a mysterious one. What do you suppose this youth of 19 years, clutching the taffrail in the roughening sea beheld one evening 110 years ago?

Many of Washington's most fervent admirers of the studious and scholarly order have wasted much breath and lamentation on the fact that Washington in his diaries did not see fit to unburden his soul. That was not the purpose of his recordings. From first to last, his series of diaries cover 59 years—omitting the period of the Revolution when he suspended journalizing. The first is dated Friday, March 11, and records his departure as the youthful surveyor of Lord William Fairfax's Virginia. It reads:

"Began my journey in company with George Fairfax, Esqr., we travell'd this day 40 miles to Mr. George Neavels in Prince William County." His last entry, and in all probability, the last time he ever took pen in hand, is dated Friday, February 15, 1799. It reads:

"Morning snowing and [about] 3 inches deep. Wind [northeast], and [mercury] at 30. [continuing] Snowing till 1 o'clock, and [about] 4 it became perfectly clear. Wind in the same place but not hard. [Mercury] 28 at night."

Another entry may be quoted. Washington writes in his diary for 1760 the following concerning a physician who attended the Washington family at that time, and with whom Washington himself appears to have been on very good terms. This did not, however, prevent the master of Mount Vernon from writing. "[Doctor] Laurie came here. I may add drunk." It was a fact, part of the day's history, and Washington duly noted it.

I have dwelt on this aspect of Washington's character as it began to unfold in his youth because everything squares with the career which followed. The distinguished American historian, John Bach McMaster, considered Washington the most elusive character in history, and was inclined to be a bit aggrieved because this was so—or he thought it was so. Nor does McMaster stand alone in this judgment. W. E. Woodward, whose waspish phrases earned him the title of the "debunker," comments thus on McMaster's plight: "McMaster," he says, "thought that Washington's inner life had never been fully understood and never would be.

"From him [McMaster]," continues Woodward, "we get the impression of a great human figure, sitting in dusky isolation, like a heroic statue in an empty plain. To reach it we must travel a road that has been worn so deep by McMaster, and Irving, and Sparks, and Wilson, and Lodge—and innumerable others—that we cannot see over its sides. It is cluttered with the prayer tablets of the pilgrims who have preceded us; and we are out of breath from climbing over the hurdles of reverence and fancy. We approach on tiptoe; we utter the sibilant whispers of awe.

"Washington's mind was the business mind. He was not a businessman, in the modern sense; he did not live in a business age. But the problems which he understood and knew how to solve were executive problems, and he approached them in the great executive manner."

One of Washington's successors in the Presidency, Theodore Roosevelt, once remarked to a friend, "I regard him as the greatest man in our history and one of the very greatest men in the world" The aid suggested that perhaps Washington's judgment might be regarded as an attribute of genius.

"Possibly so," replied Washington's 26th successor. "Certainly he possessed something which pitched him on a different plane from other men of his time and on a plane which I do not find any other American occupying since then."

That, at least, no one can challenge. And it is not simply because Washington was the first President of the United States, the victorious general who had won our independence, and, barring a handful of jealous souls, the idol of the people at large. He could have been all of this and still have been a very ordinary man. Whereas the one outstanding impact which he left upon contemporaries, as he has upon posterity, was the patent fact that whatever else he may or may not have been, he was a most extraordinary man. The next time you are in Richmond, take off a minute or so and drop into the statehouse. There in the main vestibule of the building, designed by Thomas Jefferson, you will find the superb statue of Washington executed from life by the French sculptor Houdon. One glance at that startlingly lifelike figure will convince you, I think, that you stand in the presence of no commonplace individual.

No; the escape is not so easy. If Washington, despite his realism and lack of imaginative flights, was not ordinary, then what was he? Theodore Roosevelt, himself not a subtle man, rough and ready, enormously clever but entirely realistic, was content simply to admit that he did not know and, hence, could not account for the strange power, the lofty grandeur which, even after a century, seemed to emanate from the figure of the first President. Yet Washington was a realist, too. No more than T. R. himself was he poet or philosopher.

The biographer, W. E. Woodward, from whom I have already quoted, sums up the personality in words which, after 162 years, I do not think can be gainsaid: "The keynote of his personality was character * * * not intellect, nor imagination, nor feeling. He was a perfect pattern of will and self-discipline. He possessed fortitude, steadfastness, dignity, courage, honesty, and self-respect."

As to his preferences, it is as an agriculturist that Washington's constructiveness appears in its best light. He was, in truth, a farmer of most exceptional ability and would have been delighted with the progress which scientific agriculture has made in the century and a half since his death. He himself struggled for a lifetime with the poor soil of the Mount Vernon estate; so persistent and painstaking were his methods that he actually managed to make the home farm pay. It is significant that no one since his time has been able to achieve this. Innumerable experiments were tried with fruit trees and varieties of wheat, grasses, and fertilizers. Washington thought the land could be improved by spreading Potomac mud over it, but he never could devise an inexpensive way of getting the mud out of the river and up the hill onto the land.

An amusing passage concerning Washington's lifelong passion for figures; that is, facts, is to be found in one of his biographies. Speaking of one of the boy's earlier schoolmasters who apparently specialized in mathematics, this writer observes:

"In the science of numbers he had an apt pupil in little George, who loved arithmetic as many another boy has loved Shelley. At his tongue's end were all the weights and measures—avoirdupois, pints and gallons, cords of wood, peck of peas, long division, subtraction. I doubt if we can find in history any other character of the first importance who had a passion for counting equal to that of George Washington. During his whole life he kept an eye on the number of things. Every penny he owned and every foot of land was set down, over and over again, in the most orderly and meticulous manner.

"The enumeration of things seemed to afford an outlet for a sort of mental voluptuousness. At one time when he was managing 5 plantations and several hundred slaves he calculated laboriously the number of seed in a pound Troy weight of red clover, and found that a pound contained 71,000 seed. Then he calculated the seed in a pound of timothy, and learned that there were 298,000. Large numbers these, but he got into astronomical dimensions when he set out to calculate the number of seed in a pound of New River grass, and discovered the total to be 844,800."

These were some of the characteristic and obvious features of the man to whom his countrymen in the hour of peril turned. Washington's military experience had been

confined to frontier skirmishes; his political career bounded by the walls of the Virginia House of Burgesses; barring the publication of his journal, or report, to Governor Dinwiddie on his expedition against the French, he was unknown to the world of letters. Still, there was something about him which impressed all who met and did business with him. A certain British officer, one Col. John L. Peyton, met Washington, then still a very young man, at a dinner given in honor of the ill-fated General Braddock. Peyton writes to a friend that Washington's countenance (quote) was "mild and pleasant, promising both wit and judgment. He is of a comely and dignified demeanor, and at the same time displays much self-reliance and decision. He strikes me as being a young man of an extraordinary and exalted character, and—mark this—is destined, I am of opinion, to make no inconsiderable figure in our country." Prophetic words indeed.

"Here," writes Mr. Woodward, "we have a glimpse of the remarkable impression [Washington] always made on men. In appearance he was distinctly impressive. He was 6 feet 2 inches tall, though he invariably described himself as '6 feet in stature'—a curious error for him to have made. His handshake was like hard steel, and his cold gray-blue eyes looked straight at people, in silent appraisal. Whenever he entered a room where he was not known, everyone wondered who he was and felt that somebody special had arrived."

Such were some of the traits of the man upon whom, long after Washington's death, his old and intimate friend and fellow Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, made the just and final appraisal:

"On the whole, his character was, in its mass, perfect, in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies have merited from man an everlasting remembrance. For his was the singular destiny and merit, of leading the armies of his country through an arduous war, for the establishment of its independence; of conducting its councils through the birth of a government, new in its forms and principles, until it had settled down into a quiet and orderly train; and of scrupulously obeying its laws through the whole of his career, civil and military, of which the history of the world furnishes no other example."

Today we will have the annual reading to the House of Representatives of Washington's Farewell Address, in which he admonishes all Americans to forever avoid foreign entanglements. One of the many peculiar political paradoxes of our day will find the Congress within a few days, if the peculiar pattern continues, voting to continue billions of dollars to foreign countries, some of whom have ideologies both foreign and alien to the principles for which General Washington fought so successfully against almost overwhelming odds.

As for me, I yearn for the day we adhere to the recommendation of our first President.

George Washington lived in a day of revolution. I believe it fitting and proper for me, as a Member of Congress, to call attention to my personal belief relative to a revolution through which we are passing today.

It is not revolution by mounting the barricades. There are no visible revolutionaries shouting slogans and charging the heights. No heroes are waving flags and leading the marchers. No bombs are being thrown. It is a revolution not by drama and by violence and by public displays of physical courage. It is a far more subtle revolution than that. I would call it a revolution by ideology. And worse than that—I would call it a legislative revolution. It is a revolution by a trend in law and legislation. It is a revolution—if I may be so bold as to say it—by judicial order. But its victim on every front, as I see the picture, is free enterprise.

What we are losing is part of the American idea, the American dream, the American's sense of individuality for which Washington and our forefathers fought with determined dedication. What we are losing is our individual identity. What we are becoming is a great national mass. Government's place is to maintain the outer fences of the economy in repair. Government's place is not to step inside the sphere of direction and management and assume either authority or responsibility.

That belongs to the people. It belongs to management. It belongs to private initiative.

Where is the Government's place in the tradition of Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry? The Government's place is what the Constitution says it is. The Government's place is to form a more perfect union. It is the Government's place to establish justice. It is the job of Government to insure domestic tranquillity and to provide for the common defense. The Government by its own fundamental document declares these things. The Government should moreover promote the general welfare. And it should secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

That is what the Government says it should do. And this is what it did do for a long time. And this is its function—and no more. This is what is enjoined in the Constitution of the United States. This is what we live by. This is the law.

But what has happened?

There are those who have taken the "general welfare" clause and distorted it out of its original meaning.

I suddenly discover as a citizen of the 20th century that the clause has meanings and interpretations never dreamed of by the Founding Fathers more than a century and a half before.

I suddenly discover that our economic experts are telling us that the Soviet rate of economic growth is faster than the current American rate of economic growth.

For me this is calamity. For me this has significance in determining what it is that brought about a race in which a free country is losing, relatively, as against a slave country or a monolithic state.

How you ask, "Can tyranny be more successful, or at least more relatively productive, than a free country?"

"No" is the answer. A free economy is bound to be more productive than a slave economy. Men work better when they are free. Business prospers when the laws of economics have full play. Supply and demand is not a joke but an economic fact that free enterprise respects as it does all the other well-known laws of free economics.

The trouble with our answer is that we have abandoned many of the bulwarks of a free economy envisioned by the Founding Fathers and a freedom so bravely secured under the leadership of the greatest of all Americans, George Washington.

When Daniel Webster was but 20 years old the following words were a part of an oration he delivered on July 4, 1802: "To preserve the Government we must also preserve a correct and energetic tone of morals. After all that can be said, the truth is that liberty consists more in the habits of the people than in anything else. When the public mind becomes vitiated and depraved, every attempt to preserve it is vain. Laws are then a nullity, and constitutions waste paper. There are always men wicked enough to go at length in the pursuit of power if they can find others wicked enough to support them. They regard not paper and parchment. Can you stop the progress of a usurper by opposing to him the laws of his country? Then you may check the careering winds or stay the lightning with a song. No. Ambitious men must be restrained by the public morality when they rise up to do evil, they must find themselves standing alone."

There are men today who would usurp the power of the Congress and the people. There are ambitious men today who would, knowingly or unknowingly, bring upon us, the people, the shackles of oppressive government, all in the name of human welfare; but alas, in so doing they are destroying the very individual liberties which were preserved under the leadership of the Father of Our Country and his small band of bleeding patriots and American revolutionaries dedicated to the cause of freedom as against tyrannical government; dedicated to the love of home, of the Christian religion, and of country.

As we, in our small way, honor today the birth date of the Father of Our Country, let our prayer, as sons of the American Revolution, be: "God, give America a new breath of patriotism."

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Morris Gordon, of the Greenbelt Jewish Center, Greenbelt, Md., offered the following prayer:

I should like to quote the prayer for our country which is recited in the synagogue every Sabbath. Some of the words will be in the language in which Jesus prayed, in which the Bible was written, in which the Jewish people pray to this day—in Hebrew:

"Our God and God of our fathers, we invoke Thy blessing upon our country, on the Government of this Republic, the President of these United States, and all who exercise just and rightful authority. Do Thou instruct them out of Thy law, that they may administer all affairs of state in justice and equity, that peace and security, happiness and prosperity, right and freedom, may forever abide among us.

"Unite all the inhabitants of our country, whatever their origin and creed, into a bond of true brotherhood to banish hatred and bigotry and to safeguard the ideals and free institutions which are our country's glory.

"May this land under Thy providence be an influence for good throughout the world, uniting men in peace and freedom and helping to fulfill the vision of Thy prophets: 'The day will yet come when they shall beat their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall men learn war any more.'" Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of Wednesday, February 22, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 155) to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inaugural of Abraham Lincoln, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 681) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to enter into contracts for the conduct of research in the field of meteorology and to authorize installation of Government telephones in certain private residences.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are several nominations on the Executive Calendar. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations sent to the Senate by the President.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

John P. Duncan, Jr., of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; and

Frank J. Welch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Herbert Frank York, of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Stephen Ailes, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 93 officers in the Army and Army Reserve, and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

Brig. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Gen. Isaac Davis White, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. James Francis Collins, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Brig. Gen. Charles Harvey Browne, Jr., and sundry other officers in the Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably a total of 6,137 nominations in the Army and Air Force in the grade of colonel and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Creighton W. Abrams, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Paull R. Hanson, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

George W. S. Abbey, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Giles, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously recommends that the Senate confirm the nomination of Robert E. Giles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on Mr. Giles.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ROBERT E. GILES, DESIGNATED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Robert E. Giles was born June 11, 1924, in Spartanburg County, S.C.

He attended public schools in North Carolina, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, receiving his B.S. in commerce in 1949, and his doctor of law degree from the university's law school in 1952.

He enlisted in the Army Air Corps in June 1942 as a private, was subsequently appointed an aviation cadet and commissioned a second lieutenant in 1943. He served as first pilot and crew commander of a B–17 bomber, and was assigned to the European theater. He was released from active military service in November 1945 as a first lieutenant. He now holds the rank of major in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Under appointment by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, he has been serving as Deputy General Counsel of the Department. He was associated with Secretary Hodges as administrative assistant during the latter's term as Governor of North Carolina (1957–61). Prior to that time, he was assistant attorney general for North Carolina (1955–57). From 1953 to 1955, he was assistant director, Institute of Government, and assistant professor of public law and government, University of North Carolina. From 1952 to 1953, he was associated with the firm of Lassiter, Moore & Van Allen, Charlotte, in the private practice of law.

In 1947, he was employed by Southern Appliances, Inc. (wholesale firm), as assistant credit manager; in 1946, he was employed by the Commercial Credit Corp. in its Greenville, S.C., office as unit loan manager; and in 1941–42, he was secretary to the manager of a textile firm in Spindale, N.C.

In 1948, he married the former Alice Ryland of Richmond, Va. They have four children, Martha, 10; David, 8; Lewis, 6; and Nancy, 1½.

He is a member of the North Carolina State bar and is admitted to practice in Federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Najeeb E. Halaby, of California,

to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to advise the Senate that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously recommends that the Senate confirm the nomination of Najeeb E. Halaby to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I may say, Mr. President, that I believe this to be one of the toughest jobs in our Government. Here rests a great deal of the responsibility for the safety of our people who fly, either as passengers or as crew. Approximately 59 million passengers were carried by our commercial fleet last year, and it is estimated that there are 70,000 active aircraft in our country.

Mr. Halaby was born in Dallas, Tex., in 1915. He received his A.B. degree from Stanford in 1937, and his LL.B. from Yale in 1940. He has been admitted to practice before the courts of California and the District of Columbia.

From 1940 to 1942, he practiced law in Los Angeles, Calif. He acquired his first pilot's license in 1933; he was a pilot instructor for the Army Air Corps in 1940; and from 1942 to 1943 he was a production test pilot for the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., in Burbank, Calif.

During World War II he became a naval aviator. He established the Navy's first test pilot school, flight-tested the first American-made jet aircraft, the Bell P–59, and made the first continuous transcontinental jet-powered flight. He also served as assistant chief of the fighter section at the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md.

After World War II, Mr. Halaby became Chief of the Intelligence Coordination Division, Department of State. Later he served as foreign affairs adviser to the Secretary of Defense. He was the first Chairman of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Military Production and Supply Board, and in 1950–51 he served as Assistant Administrator for Mutual Security, in the Economic Cooperation Administration. In 1952, he became Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

In 1955–56 he served as Vice Chairman of the White House Advisory Study Group whose report led to the creation of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Immediately before his nomination by President Kennedy to FAA, the nominee had his own law firm, N.E. Halaby & Associates, in Los Angeles; he was secretary-treasurer of Aerospace Corp., a firm which is principal technical adviser to the Air Force missile and space program; and he served as president of American Technology Corp., a technical ventures group in southern California. During 1957–59, he was executive vice president and director of Servomechanisms, Inc., a maker of airborne electronics equipment.

Mr. Halaby is a member of the board of directors of the Flight Safety Foundation, the Society of Experimental Test Pilots, Town Hall of Los Angeles, the Aero Club of Southern California, and Quiet Birdmen.

He will, I am confident, make a memorable record as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Ambassadors be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of ambassadors will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this trio of Ambassadors—Mr. Gufler, Mr. MacArthur, and Mr. Hare—are extraordinarily able men. They are career Foreign Service officers. They have had meritorious careers. They have served their country well, and each of them will be a credit to the United States in the nation to which he has been appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations of Ambassadors?

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

THE COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these Coast Guard nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all the nominations on which the Senate has acted today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The Vice President has sent to the Presiding Officer a communication addressed to him by the President, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation. Without objection, the communication will be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The communication from the President is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1961.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith two drafts of legislation to carry out recommendations I made in my message to the Congress on February 9.

The first bill would, when enacted, increase opportunities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel. These are the keystones of any health program. Yet we are not presently training enough even to keep pace with our growing population. The enclosed proposal will enable us to narrow substantially our current deficit in this area.

The other bill which I am transmitting will help expand and improve community facilities and services for the health care of the aged, and other persons. It will make possible a substantial addition to the number of nursing home facilities to care for long-term patients, and it will help relieve the shortages of home health care programs.

The enclosed letters from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare describes the two proposals in more detail. I commend this legislation to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Agency, as of June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program, covering the period January 1, 1960, to December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Agency, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CLAIMS OF REYNOLDS FEAL CORP. AND LYDICK ROOFING CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendations concerning the claims of the Reynolds Feal Corp., of New York, and the Lydick Roofing Co., of Fort Worth, Tex., relating to the construction of a building for the American National Exhibition in Moscow (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 137

"Resolution memorializing Congress to extend education benefits to certain veterans; and for other purposes

"Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans education program established by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans education program which would not otherwise have been possible; and

"Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

"Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans arising out of their higher education level will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or who enter, military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the presiding officers of both branches of the U.S. Congress and a copy to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

"Read and adopted in senate February 20, 1961. Read and adopted in house February 2, 1961.

"GEORGE D. STEWARD,
"Secretary.
"GLENN W. EWARD,
"Clerk."

By Mr. KERR:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ENROLLED SENATE RESOLUTION 14

"Senate resolution relating to the economic message transmitted to the Congress by President John F. Kennedy on February 2, 1961; commending President Kennedy for his enlightened and progressive policy regarding the development and improvement of our natural resources, particularly the forest resources of the Nation; directing that copies of this resolution be transmitted to President John F. Kennedy, to Mr. John Koen, and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation

"Whereas President John F. Kennedy, in his economic message to the Congress on February 2, 1961, called attention to the significance of investment in natural resources; and

"Whereas the President pointed out that 'as our needs mount, as past reserves are depleted, and as technological requirements change, we must constantly develop new supplies if growth is not to be inhibited'; and

"Whereas said message further pointed out that the 'improvement of our forest resources will require expanded Government credit sources for the development of woodland properties, more research on forest management, additional funds for cooperative forest programs, acceleration of the national forest program, and improvement of grazing resources'; and

"Whereas the President's position on this matter, as on other areas of our economy, is designed to move the Nation ahead; and

"Whereas the President's program regarding forest resources is of special significance to Oklahoma, particularly as regards the Ouachita National Forest; and

"Whereas in such a program there are excellent opportunities for including improvements for roads and recreational facilities in the said forests in the project work inventories of the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

"SECTION 1. That President John F. Kennedy be and he is hereby commended for his enlightened and progressive policy regarding the development and improvement of our natural resources, particularly the forest resources of the Nation.

"SEC. 2. That in the development of our natural resources special emphasis and high priority be given to the areas of surplus labor.

"SEC. 3. That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to President John F. Kennedy; to Mr. John Koen, Director, National Forest Service, Hot Springs, Ark.; and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of February 1961.

"ELLIOTT COLLINS,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"LEO WINTERS,
"Secretary of the Senate."

CONDOLENCES ON DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE W. F. NORRELL BY OUACHITA RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Ouachita River Valley Association on the 16th of February 1961. This resolution extends condolences on the occasion of the death of the Honorable William F. Norrell, Representative from the Sixth District of Arkansas, and expresses the great loss sustained by the State of Arkansas and the Nation by reason of his passing.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Honorable W. F. Norrell, during his many years as U.S. Congressman for the Sixth District of Arkansas, has worked tirelessly in behalf of the interests and goals of the Ouachita River Valley Association; and

Whereas his sudden and untimely death results in a grievous loss to this association and to the people of the State of Arkansas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Ouachita River Valley Association, in meeting assembled, do hereby express their regrets at this grievous loss and extend their sympathy to Mrs. Norrell and daughter; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and the secretary is hereby instructed to transmit a copy hereof to Mrs. Norrell and to Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN for the purpose of placing the same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

H. K. THATCHER,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTIONS OF CHIPPEWA VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions adopted by the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative, of Cornell, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF CHIPPEWA VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE

I

Be it resolved, That we reaffirm our support of and urge the next session of Congress to enact and the President to approve a bill which embodies the principles of the Humphrey-Price bill.

II

Whereas the development of hydroelectric energy is highly beneficial to the economy and stability of the electric industry in this region, not only in making full use of the natural resources, but also in creating diversity of supply in case of atomic attack; and

Whereas in the construction of small dams designed primarily for irrigation or flood control the hydro potential has been ignored or eliminated by the Department of the Interior and Corps of Engineers without sufficient study, especially with respect to the possibility of pump storage and run of river generation; and

Whereas in all cases where power can be developed on a feasible basis without injury to aspects of the projects authorized, such development should be included: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in all projects now authorized, and in any new start made under authorization of Congress, the Congress be urged to direct a complete study of the possibilities of hydro development in connection with such projects and that wherever practical and feasible such hydro development be included to the end that maximum benefits be received from such natural resources.

III

Whereas it is the desire of the rural electric systems that all types of electric system ownership exist in harmony and cooperate in bringing to the United States the most efficient electric power system in the world, under which the Federal Government, the investor-owned systems, and nonprofit systems can all be heavily interconnected and each supplying efficient generation to such interconnection and each deriving therefrom its total power requirements; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the U.S. Senate, Senate Resolution 71, which would, if adopted, provide surveys and studies upon which the objective of this resolution could be achieved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse Senate Resolution 71, urge its adoption and advocate the development of a nationwide power system through which all entities interested in the electric power business can cooperate in bringing an abundance of low-cost electricity to every corner of the country.

IV

Resolved, That we reaffirm our longstanding support of the 2-percent REA interest rate and of sufficient REA loan fund authorizations to meet all the borrowing needs of the rural electric and telephone systems.

FORREST E. MOHR,
Chairman.
A. C. RINDY.
HENRY A. PLAGGE.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 113, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 95); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations one thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 113, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, entitled "Documentation, Indexing, and Retrieval of Scientific Information."

REPORT ENTITLED "ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS" (S. REPT. NO. 52)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit a report entitled "Activities of the Senate Committee on Government Operations," which I ask may be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

PRINTING OF SENATOR ELLENDER'S REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) to print as a Senate document "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, and I submit a report (No. 53) thereon. The concurrent resolution has been approved by a majority of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, and the concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on February 1, 1961; and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution? The Chair hears none.

The concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1050. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lourdes Casas Ocampo and Carmen Ocampo Carrillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. 1051. A bill to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1052. A bill to include in the gross estate for inheritance tax purposes real property situated outside the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1053. A bill for the relief of David Lew Huie; and

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of Huan-pin Tso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1055. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to permit injured employees entitled to receive medical services under such act to utilize the services of chiropractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1056. A bill to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the project cost limitation for small flood control projects constructed under general authorization; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1057. A bill to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 1058. A bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1059. A bill to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State and/or Federal apprenticeship laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1060. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1061. A bill to establish a medal to be known as the Presidential Medal for Civilian Achievement to provide recognition for certain persons who have made outstanding contributions in the arts, sciences, and related fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 1062. A bill to authorize leases and grants of rights-of-way on Indian lands in the State of New York; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1063. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1064. A bill for the relief of Samuel Pisar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 1065. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1066. A bill to grant grazing preferences to certain landowners who own land adjacent to Fort Stanton Military Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1067. A bill to amend Public Law 503, 84th Congress, so as to provide annuities for the widows of certain Foreign Service officers who retired prior to the effective date of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1068. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lopez-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 1069. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1070. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1071. A bill to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. PELL):

S. 1072. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1073. A bill for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis; and

S. 1074. A bill for the relief of Chao Yao Koh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Thelxiopi Vonofacidow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts;

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; and

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the two last above-mentioned joint resolutions, which appear under separate headings.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 29

Mr. ANDERSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 94); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs five thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 29, issued by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 113, 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 95) to print for the use of the Committee on Government Operations additional copies of Senate Document No. 113, 86th Congress, on scientific information, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 29

Mr. KERR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 96), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works five thousand additional copies of Senate Report Numbered 29, issued by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session.

CHANGE NAME OF LAKE FORMED BY KENTUCKY DAM

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam from Kentucky Lake to Tennessee-Kentucky Lake.

The facts of geography cry out for this change and are well set forth in House Joint Resolution 41 of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Tennessee enacted on March 19, 1959, which I request to have printed in the RECORD.

We hope this will not result in any conflict between the Tennessee and Kentucky delegations in Congress. We seek the cooperation of Kentucky, and hope the delegation will see that it is fair to have both States represented.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1051) to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The resolution presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 41

Whereas one of the State's most important resources is the Tennessee River; and

Whereas in recent years, the river has been made more useful by the construction of dams by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and thereby, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and particularly the great Volunteer State of Tennessee, have been tremendously enriched; and

Whereas among the many outstanding benefits has been the production of vast quantities of electrical power; the control of disastrous floods; the growth of industry, both new and old, and the development of exceptional recreational areas and facilities; and

Whereas in recent years, the tourist and hunting and fishing businesses have attracted large amounts of capital resulting in the construction of splendid motels, hotels, tourist courts, boat docks, fishing piers, parks, playgrounds, and numerous other recreational facilities to accommodate the ever-increasing needs of tourists, and the citizens of Tennessee; and

Whereas the State of Tennessee, its counties and cities, energetic civic organizations and private interests, have extensively promoted and advertised the great Tennessee Valley Authority Lakes of the South, including what is sometimes called Kentucky Lake; and

Whereas the name "Kentucky Lake" incorrectly describes the lake and is a detriment to the efforts of those in Tennessee who have endeavored to promote the development of the lake in Tennessee, and to advertise its important recreational opportunities in other States because it is difficult to explain that most of the lake actually lies in Tennessee; and

Whereas the dam causing the impoundment of water forming the lake is located on the Tennessee River, in the sister Commonwealth of Kentucky, a comparatively short distance north of the Kentucky-Tennessee border; and

Whereas the lake is approximately 184.3 miles in length, and 150.3 miles of the lake are in Tennessee; and only 34 miles of the lake are in Kentucky; and

Whereas the counties and cities near the lake supporting large tourist and hunting, and fishing businesses, are vitally interested in the continued growth and development of the lake and its attractions; and

Whereas it appears to be in the public interest that the name of the lake be changed to Tennessee-Kentucky Lake, so that it may be better promoted and advertised: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring).

1. That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Tennessee are hereby requested to take action to secure the change of the name of Kentucky Lake to Tennessee-Kentucky Lake; and

2. That the State department of conservation take every possible step and use its good offices to assist the Senators and Representatives in Congress in every reasonable way to bring about the change of the name; and

3. That at the expiration of two (2) years, if the name is not changed so as to give the name "Tennessee" due prominence to that portion of the lake located in Tennessee, the lake shall be officially known as Lake Tennessee, and all references by all agencies in all official correspondence and literature published or circulated by the State, its counties or cities shall refer to the said body of water lying south of the Tennessee-Kentucky border as Lake Tennessee, and

4. That the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from Tennessee and the Commissioner of Conservation be forwarded a copy of this resolution.

Adopted March 12, 1959.

JAMES L. BOMAR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
WM. D. BAIRD,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved March 19, 1959.

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

CLOSING LOOPHOLES IN ESTATE TAX LAWS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

which would close a potentially sizable loophole and restore equity, in at least one respect, to our estate tax laws.

Present law, for some reason, specifically exempts from the gross estate of decedents for estate tax purposes real property located in foreign countries.

This may appear to be a small thing, and yet, with increasing convertibility and with the more widespread use of tax havens in connection with the income tax, this sort of thing is going to become daily more important and more frequently used.

With the law as it now stands, a man of wealth can, in contemplation of death, convert his holdings into cash, send the money to the Bahamas or elsewhere and purchase there an office building, apartment house or hotel, and, upon his death, leave his estate to his heirs completely free of any U.S. estate tax. His beneficiaries can then continue to operate this property, hold it or sell it, and bring the entire proceeds back to the United States.

On a taxable estate of $1 million, this procedure could save those who have inherited such an estate $325,700. On a producing oilfield it could be enormous.

My bill would make foreign real property taxable for estate tax purposes along with other property of the decedent. Prior to 1934, the code was not specific on this point. There had been, however, in 1918, a ruling by the Attorney General to the effect that the estate tax did not apply to the value of foreign real property. In 1934 the Congress specifically exempted foreign real estate owned by citizens or residents of the United States from the gross estate for estate tax purposes.

The American Law Institute's tentative draft No. 11, 1956, has this to say about the desirability of this exemption:

> This exemption permits an undesirable escape from the present estate tax law since under it an individual may invest in foreign real estate (including oil developments) shortly prior to death and thereby leave this property free of U.S. taxes.

There has been some fear expressed that it would not be constitutional to impose an estate tax on the value of real property located in a foreign country. The weight of law and logic seems otherwise.

The Supreme Court has never passed on this issue, but it has ruled that Congress may include property in the decedent's gross estate even where it could not tax the property involved directly.

There is a full discussion of the question in Randolph Paul's authoritative "Federal Estate and Gift Taxation." From this discussion, I believe one would conclude that it is constitutional to include the value of foreign real property in the estate of a citizen or resident of the United States for estate tax purposes. Indeed, as pointed out there, the Attorney General's ruling of 1918, which excluded foreign real property prior to the specific exclusion in the 1934 act, "did not state that Congress may not tax foreign real property if it chooses to do so. Congress taxes the transfer of the property, not the property itself. Any lingering doubt should be removed by Cook against Tait, which upheld Congress's authority to tax income received by a nonresident citizen from real property located abroad."

I have no figures to show the dollar amount of lost revenue which this exemption has cost the U.S. Government over the years. Unless this loophole is plugged, the volume will grow.

More and more Americans, movie stars, oil tycoons, and business executives, are living abroad. These people are in an excellent position to make profitable, estate tax-free, real estate investments.

A very popular book, now on the market, which spells out ways to save on estate and gift taxes has this to say:

> There are two investments by which Mr. Planner can reduce the tax on his estate—even in contemplation of death, when the Treasury forbids him the device of making gifts to diminish his taxable estate.
>
> First, investments in real estate situated outside of the United States escape the estate tax. In effect, he reduces a tax by making what can be a good investment.

I will not oblige lazy loophole locators by disclosing what the second possibility is.

This sort of thing should be stopped. I hope a sufficient number of my colleagues will agree with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1052) to include in the gross estate for inheritance tax purposes real property situated outside the United States, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN LIMIT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO BUSH-McCORMACK FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the 84th Congress, I had the privilege of joining the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, then as now majority leader of the House of Representatives, in an effort to expedite the planning and construction of small but urgently needed local flood protection projects. The result of our collaboration was Public Law 685, 84th Congress, 2d session, which authorized the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to develop and construct, within a Federal cost limit of $400,000, small, complete, economically justified flood control projects that have not already been specifically authorized by Congress.

I have been advised by the Army engineers that the $400,000 limitation is now too restrictive, and that much useful work could be accomplished if it were increased to take account of the rise in construction costs since the enactment of Public Law 685, and to provide additional leeway for the future.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the limitation to $800,000. A companion bill is being introduced in the House by Representative McCORMACK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1056) to amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the project cost limitation for small flood control projects constructed under general authorization, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

APPRENTICESHIP LAWS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State and/or Federal apprenticeship laws.

This bill, companion to H.R. 3466, introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, of California, is similar to legislation which we sponsored in the 86th Congress, and we are glad to introduce it this year at the instance of the California Apprenticeship Council.

The nearly 600 joint apprenticeship committees in California—and I am sure that this is also true of many such committees in other States—are doing constructive work in promoting apprenticeship for our youth and in developing much-needed skills for our industries. Their activities are a splendid example of labor-management cooperation.

The funds of these committees are provided either by employer-employee voluntary contributions or through negotiations. Some have a service, such as a coordinator employed by either management or labor or jointly by both. As a result of certain court decisions uncertainty arose as to the legality of these funds and services under criminal provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, section 302 of which relates to restrictions on payments to employee representatives. The Landrum-Griffin Act amended that section in its section 505 to make its provisions inapplicable with respect to money or other things of value paid by any employer to a trust fund established for the purpose of defraying costs of apprenticeship or other training programs. However, the amendment makes applicable to such trust funds the requirements of the proviso to clause (5) of section 302(c).

It is not my purpose here to discuss the merits of those requirements as applied to other situations. I do believe that they impose undue burdens on joint apprenticeship committees, which are operating faithfully under State and Federal law. I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1059) to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State

and/or Federal apprenticeship laws, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND POLICIES

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds that the national defense and the continued economic and industrial growth of the United States are dependent on the adequacy of its skilled manpower, and that to fail to train sufficient people with the skills needed to meet our present and future manpower needs endangers the general welfare and national security and interferes with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce.

The Congress further finds that apprenticeship training programs and systems are today, as they have been in the past, a mainstay in the national effort to pass our skills and our knowledge from generation to generation; that since 1915 more than half of the States have revised their apprenticeship laws and enacted modern ones; that the national apprenticeship law, known as the Fitzgerald Act, was passed by Congress in 1937; that under the stimulation and the provisions of these modern apprenticeship laws, apprentice training programs are organized and conducted as joint employer-employee industry enterprises; that they are administered, wherever feasible, by labor-management joint apprenticeship committees, with the guidance of Federal and State apprenticeship agencies, and in cooperation with Federal, State, and local education agencies; that protection is provided both employers and employees against discrimination and exploitation; that many other similarly organized and conducted programs for journeymen and other skilled workers are also in operation; and that many of the programs are today nationwide in scope and operation, with many hundreds of thousands of employers and employees voluntarily participating at all levels.

The Congress finds further that employers and employees in each industry are, more and more, accepting their responsibilities to train their own skilled workers and provide needed funds, materials, and services. These programs offer our veterans and our youth employment and career opportunities and provide technical and skilled manpower needed in our expanding technical and industrial economy.

In light of the foregoing determinations, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to encourage employers and employees to organize and conduct apprenticeship and other training programs under the provisions of Federal or State apprenticeship laws. It is also the policy to eliminate any obstructions that may exist or occur to their doing so, or to their providing money, materials, and services to be used to promote, administer, and conduct such programs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act—

(1) The term "accredited apprenticeship and other training program" means an apprenticeship or other similar training program registered, approved, and conducted in accordance with the provisions of a State apprenticeship law which is recognized by the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor, or, in those States where such an apprenticeship law does not exist, the term means an apprenticeship or other training program registered and conducted in accordance with the standards and regulations of the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship, United States Department of Labor.

(2) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any territory of the United States and any State or other territory, or between any foreign country and any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or with the District of Columbia or any territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any territory or in the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

SEC. 3. Nothing in any Federal or State law or regulation shall be construed to declare it unlawful for, or to declare it an unfair labor practice for or to prohibit, interfere with, impede, or restrain the full freedom of, employers and employees engaged in commerce or their representatives (1) to organize, administer, or conduct an accredited apprenticeship or other training program; (2) to select, screen, hire, discharge, discipline, place, transfer, and train apprentices in an accredited apprenticeship or other training program; (3) to enforce or effectuate apprentice or other training standards or regulations; or (4) to contribute money, materials, or services to a joint apprenticeship and/or training committee or board to be used for the purpose of promoting, administering, supervising, or conducting an accredited apprenticeship and/or training program: *Provided*, That such funds or other things of value in excess of $5,000 per annum shall be protected by a legal trust agreement and a fidelity bond to cover any person or persons who receive or disburse such funds.

APPLICATION OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

SEC. 4. Whenever the application of any of the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, conflicts with the application of this Act, this Act shall prevail.

THE PRESIDENTIAL MEDAL FOR CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would create an American version of the famed Queen's Honor List to recognize achievement in public service, arts, sciences, and related fields.

Under the measure, the President of the United States would be authorized to award annually 25 Presidential Medals to individuals whose outstanding contributions deserve national recognition in such fields as public service, national affairs, social service, science, medicine, education, letters, the arts, law, engineering, agriculture, labor, and industry. The program is more limited than the Queen's List which honors hundreds of persons annually.

The bill would provide a tax-exempt cash grant of up to $10,000 with each award. The President would announce the awards following recommendations from a special board composed of three Senators, three Representatives and nine public members appointed by the President.

The Federal Government now has a program limited to the Fermi and Lawrence Awards of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service which provides only for Government employees. Congress in 1959 made provision for a National Medal of Science but the program is not yet underway.

None of the current Government awards is equivalent to those in countries like England, Sweden, Netherlands, Denmark, France, Austria, Argentina, and the U.S.S.R. No one N.S. award signifies the official recognition and respect of the U.S. Government and 180 million Americans for distinguished achievement. As the world's mightiest democracy, the United States should have such a program to help spell out our national purpose to the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1061) to establish a medal to be known as the Presidential Medal for Civilian Achievement to provide recognition for certain persons who have made outstanding contributions in the arts, sciences, and related fields, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

WILLIAM A. BELTZ: A GREAT ALASKAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the history of America is replete with inspiring stories of men from humble beginnings whose lives spell achievement. Americans never cease to admire the qualities of one who, endowed with no wealth or inherited advantages, nevertheless makes the most of his inborn capacities and such opportunities as arise to become a leader.

Among those Americans I have known who have risen to heights of achievement by dint of ability and character is a great Alaskan.

William E. Beltz, who died last November, was an Eskimo from the village of Unalakleet, a community far away on the shore of the Bering Sea. In the remote villages of Alaska where he grew up, opportunities for education were limited, indeed. Bill went to a one-room school at the mining town of Haycock where all eight grades were taught by a teacher, Sue Lillian Ausley, to whom Bill gave credit for inspiring him to achieve an education, in the tradition of many others who have been similarly inspired by talented teachers. When he had completed all eight grades, the only formal education available, Bill continued, tutored by Mrs. Ausley, to complete 2 years of high school education.

His trade was that of a carpenter, and he was soon recognized by the other members of the craft as a man to be entrusted with responsibility and leadership. For many years he was business agent of local 1243 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, with a territory covering nearly a quarter of a million miles of northern Alaska. In 1955 he served a term as president of the Alaska Council of Carpenters, an organization of 13 local union chapters. He held other union positions, and served as delegate to several labor and political conventions. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1956,

as was I. I recall vividly our going together to visit the Chicago planetarium—for both of us a first experience. I knew Bill well, and the better I knew him, the more I admired him. At one time he and his son George, a son by an earlier marriage, stayed with us at the Governor's house in Juneau. George was then a student at Sheldon Jackson Junior College at Sitka and a wonderful son of a wonderful father. George, now in his twenties, is a structural steel worker, and lives in Alaska.

Bill Beltz's heritage as an Eskimo and his experience with labor union affairs made him a political "natural" in Alaska, where there is a strong interest in both. Thus, although he did not plan to run for office, he found himself drafted to run for the Territorial legislature in 1949, an election he won. Following this term in the Territorial house of representatives, he was elected to the Territorial senate where he served until statehood came, when he ran and was elected to the first State senate.

At the convening of the first Alaska State Legislature in 1959 the choice of presiding officer of the senate was easily made. William Beltz was elected unanimously. He was serving in this post with distinction when he was tragically stricken, in the prime of life, by a malignancy—a brain tumor—which could not be cured.

He died leaving a fine family on whose behalf I am introducing proposed legislation which will, in some measure, provide the security they need, and for which Bill Beltz was striving. His widow is a remarkable person in her own right. A Public Health nurse, the former Arne Bulkeley was a village nurse in Unalakleet when they met. Their children, Mark, who is 6 years old; Billy, who is 4; Katherine, who is 2; and Axel, an infant, are fine youngsters who will carry on in the tradition of their parents, and will be outstanding citizens of Alaska and the Nation. But, needless to say, they face serious economic difficulty, and it is this situation to which I am now addressing myself.

Before his death, Bill had staked out a homestead claim where he hoped to establish a home for his family. He had established a residence on his homestead, as required by law, in 1959, and at the time of his death had made plans and had begun the labors for developing this and obtaining his patent, to which he would eventually have been entitled. Death, preceded by disabling illness, set a cruel obstacle to the achievement of Bill's plans for a homestead for his family.

When he died, much work remained to be done to comply with the requirements of the homestead law that 30 acres of land be cultivated before a patent may be issued. While he had complied with the requirements of residence and with other preliminaries, the difficult job of clearing and cultivating the land awaited the time he needed to devote to it—time which never came.

It will not be physically possible for his widow and small children to carry on this exhausting job of cultivating the land, which must be completed by the termination of the period for obtaining final patent in 1964. Of necessity, to support her four young children, she is carrying on her professional work for the State department of health.

I am asking Congress to authorize the Department of the Interior to convey this land to Arne and her children so they may have the peace of mind and sense of security which would come from its possession. Without this legislation the promise of a homestead will be lost to the survivors of a great man. So I introduce a bill for that purpose and ask that it be appropriately referred.

William Beltz was, truly, a great and worthy son of America. Enactment of this measure will compensate, in some degree, for his contributions to Alaska and to the Nation and is, therefore, I deeply believe, thoroughly justified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a biographical sketch of William Beltz which was written at the time he assumed the presidency of the Alaska State Senate, and a concurrent resolution of the State legislature expressing their grief on the loss of their colleague whom they had honored with election to the presidency of the first State senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the biographical sketch and concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1065) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The biographical sketch and concurrent resolution presented by Mr. GRUENING are as follows:

SENATOR BELTZ OF ALASKA

It was a cold January afternoon in Juneau, the capital of Alaska. The Democratic members of the Alaskan State Senate were gathered in a party caucus to select a president of the upper chamber of the infant 49th State.

The one selected would have to be the outstanding Senator among them. He would have to be a skilled parliamentarian. He would have to be an efficient and forceful leader, able to command the respect of Republicans as well as Democrats.

The lawmakers did not take long to choose their leader. William Earnest Beltz, a resident of the Eskimo village of Unalakleet, was nominated without opposition and elected by the unanimous vote of his fellow senators.

It was fitting that his name was placed in nomination by Frank A. Peratrovich, a 62-year-old merchant and a veteran of many previous sessions of the territorial senate. For Peratrovich was Beltz' closest competitor for the leadership. And Peratrovich is an Alaskan Thlinget Indian from the village of Klawock.

The election of Beltz was no surprise to Alaskans. He had 10 years of experience in the legislature. He was known as a man who can get his ideas across effectively in debate, and he had proven himself dedicated to the welfare of Alaska and all its people.

Senator Beltz is the type of leader the Alaskan resident regards with confidence as Alaska makes the complicated transition from territorial to State government. He is one of their own. He is a carpenter who has made a living with his hands, and can help to shape their future with a level head.

Beltz and his colleague Peratrovich, the former president of the territorial senate, are testimony to the diversity of peoples in the new State of Alaska. Almost every race on earth is represented, according to the last census, and approximately one-sixth of the population is Aleut, Indian or Eskimo. Members of those three aboriginal populations are lively participants in government and in the commercial development of Alaska.

Latest figures indicate that there are approximately 4,000 Aleuts, 14,000 Indians, and 16,000 Eskimos. The three racial strains are considered the native population since they were in Alaska when the United States purchased the territory from Russia in 1867.

Anthropologists believe that the three groups descended from primitive peoples who originally migrated to the area from Asia. It is believed they came across the frozen Bering Strait—the narrow, shallow strait that once linked the continents of Asia and North America.

Senator Beltz descends from that Eskimo stock that settled the northern and western coasts of Alaska. His father was of German ancestry, however, and had migrated to Alaska from the U.S. east coast State of Pennsylvania.

Jack S. Beltz, now dead, went to Alaska during the Yukon gold rush in 1897. He never found the fabled gold, but he found his place in the thriving territory running a pack train for the hordes of miners passing through on their way to the goldfields. He also found an attractive Eskimo girl to marry in 1906.

The couple had seven children, all of whom have remained in Alaska. Their two daughters live in Fairbanks. Their son Harry is an airline mechanic. John and Tom Beltz are engineers. Bert is a big-game guide and one of the bush pilots who fly small planes into the remote areas of Alaska.

The Beltz family was living at Bear Creek on the Seward Peninsula when William was born on August 24, 1912. The boy attended a small one-room public school in the little mining town of Haycock. His teacher, the late Sue Lillian Ausley, taught all eight grades.

She was attracted by the studious nature of young Beltz and offered to help him continue his education. "Whatever I have achieved is due to Mrs. Ausley," he says today. "She gave me the inspiration."

William chopped wood to earn money to buy books. He spent every evening studying with Mrs. Ausley. Thus, he completed 2 years of high school in a village remote from any high schools.

"I didn't really plan to enter politics, for I was a carpenter," Beltz recalls. "But as it happened I had no choice." He was on a committee named by the Arctic Native Brotherhood to find a suitable candidate from the northern district to run for the territorial house of representatives. The committee found no candidate, and someone suggested that Beltz himself should run for the office.

This launched the political career of the carpenter from Unalakleet. He won the election easily and served with distinction in the 1949 Territorial House. The following year he ran for the upper legislative chamber and has served as a senator since then.

In 1953 Senator Beltz married Arne Bulkeley, a U.S. Public Health Service nurse from New York State who served in Alaskan hospitals. The couple has three children—Mark, 4; William, 2½, and little Katherine Olivia who was born last November.

A carpenter for many years, Beltz has been active in labor affairs. For 3 years he was the business agent of Local 1243 of the United

Brotherhood of Carpenters, with a territory covering nearly a quarter of a million miles of northern Alaska. In 1955 he served a term as president of the Alaska Council of Carpenters, an organization of 13 local union chapters. He has held other union positions, and has been a delegate to several labor and political conventions.

The combination of a labor background and an Eskimo heritage led Beltz to devote much of his legislative efforts to those fields. He has worked hard for the aboriginal populations, and has sponsored several of Alaska's important laws such as the minimum wage requirement and aid to the native blind.

He hopes to introduce more bills of this nature to the legislature, but they must wait. Putting the new State's governmental machinery into action is the most urgent business at hand. As senate president he must expedite the complicated and important legislation necessary for governing Alaska as a State.

Then he can turn once more to his primary interests. These are to further the development of Alaska's resources, stabilize her economy, and promote the welfare of the Alaskan people.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution relating to the death of Senator William E. Beltz

Whereas since the adjournment of the first State legislature the legislature and the State have incurred a great loss through the passing of Senator William E. Beltz; and

Whereas Senator Beltz had served his district and all Alaska as a member of the Territorial and State legislatures with notable distinction and ability; and

Whereas his integrity and qualities of leadership prompted his election as president of the senate for the historical sessions of the first State legislature; and

Whereas his record of service and endeavor will always stand as an inspiration to those who aspire to the finest standards of good citizenship and public service: Be it

Resolved by the senate in second legislature, first session assembled (the house concurring), That this resolution serve as an expression of the esteem and high regard of the members of the legislature for the late Senator William E. Beltz and as a means of extending to Mrs. William E. Beltz and her family the sincerest condolences and best wishes of the members of the legislature on behalf of the people of the State of Alaska.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies.

Under the present law, Federal surplus property can be donated only to medical institutions, health centers, civil defense organizations, schools, colleges, and related organizations. My bill would broaden the eligibility to include certain tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare and recreation agencies, which serve the public in institutions or in groups and which meet at least one of the following criteria:

First. Such agency is licensed by a State standard-setting agency:

Second. Such agency receives funds through a State or local community fund or similar federated fund-raising body; or

Third. Such agency is affiliated with, or is part of, a national standard-setting organization.

The net effect of this bill would be to make a great many of our Nation's critically important welfare and relief agencies eligible to receive needed surplus property. The receipt of such property would permit them to devote more of their overall budget to important welfare, relief, and recreational expenditures.

This bill is cosponsored by Senators BEALL, BENNETT, BUSH, CARLSON, CASE of South Dakota, JAVITS, SALTONSTALL, WILEY, and YOUNG of North Dakota, all of whom cosponsored this bill last year.

This proposal is one in which I have had a longstanding interest. It grows out of recommendation drawn up by a National Welfare Assembly Committee, which included members drawn from American Foundation for the Blind, Child Welfare League of America, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Council on Social Work Education, National Council of Churches of Christ in America, National Federation of Settlement and Neighborhood Centers, National Jewish Welfare Board, National Recreational Association, Salvation Army, United Community Funds and Councils, Young Men's Christian Association, and Young Women's Christian Association.

In addition, the following list of organizations have also expressed a special interest in this legislation:

American Hearing Society.
Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church.
Child Welfare League of America.
National Catholic Community Service.
Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.
Catholic Youth Organziation.
United HIAS Service.
Council of Social Work Education.
Manhattan Club.
Day Care Council of New York.
United Neighborhood House of New York.
The Elmira Neighborhood House, Elmira, N.Y.
Jewish Young Men and Women's Association of Rochester, N.Y.
The Baden Street Settlement, Inc., Rochester, N.Y.
St. Peter Claver Community House, Detroit, Mich.
Lutheran Service Society of Colorado, Denver, Colo.
Area Service Association, Ferndale, Mich.
Sophie Wright Settlement, Detroit, Mich.
The Neighborhood House Association, Denver, Colo.
Seattle Atlantic Street Center, Seattle, Wash.
Denver Federation of Community Centers, Denver, Colo.
Detroit Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Detroit, Mich.
Bidwell Riverside Center, Des Moines, Iowa.
Pillsbury Citizens Service, Minneapolis, Minn.
Alameda Family Service Agency, Alameda, Calif.
Chicago Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Chicago, Ill.
Board and Staff of Wilkie House, Des Moines, Iowa.
Denver Orphans Home Association, Denver, Colo.
Westchester County Recreation Commission, White Plains, N.Y.
Concord Center, Indianapolis, Ind.
Hawthorne Social Service Association, Indianapolis, Ind.
Circle Friendly House, Kansas City, Mo.
Council of Social Agencies, Des Moines, Iowa.
Rochester Community Chest, Rochester, N.Y.
Guadalupe Center, Kansas City, Mo.
Friendly House Community Center, Portland, Oreg.,
Whatsoever Circle Community House, Kansas City, Mo.
Della C. Lamb Neighborhood House, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
Southwest Denver Community Center, Denver, Colo.
The Neighborhood House, San Diego, Calif.
Avalon Community Center, Los Angeles, Calif.
Home of Neighborly Service, San Bernardino, Calif.
Jewish Family and Children's Service of Denver, Denver, Colo.
Southern California Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, Los Angeles, Calif.
Catholic Youth Organization, Los Angeles, Calif.

Last year, a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held hearings on a number of legislative proposals to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, including a bill identical to the bill which I introduce today. These hearings proved extremely useful. A number of the groups listed above appeared or sent statements to the committee in support of the bill which I introduced to permit them to receive Federal surplus property. It was pointed out by many of these groups that, even if the effect of such an amendment is limited because of the present size and nature of the supply of Federal surplus property, whatever assistance is made available would be greatly appreciated.

I have been informed that the General Services Administration already has made a number of welfare agencies eligible for this property by specific administrative action. This is a policy which, I think, the Congress should determine.

The reason that the relevant administrative agencies have given in previous years for opposing this measure is that there is not enough surplus property, or, to put it another way, there are too many welfare agencies. To my way of thinking, this is not realistic. I am glad that there is a large number of active and dedicated welfare agencies. They do a tremendous amount of good work. Certainly, they are entitled to this limited Government help. Once the Congress so specifies, then the relevant Federal agency will and must be charged with the responsibility of carrying out this policy in an orderly and proper fashion. This would probably mean giving the General Services Administration the responsibility for establishing priorities for the donation of certain types of surplus property to qualified welfare agencies, as there obviously would not be enough property to fill the requirements of all such agencies. But, is it not true that the Federal Government today establishes priorities in much the same fashion on the basis of need or seniority for housing grants, farm credit, slum

clearance, highways, national parks, and many other worthy purposes?

Mr. President, I hope that this bill will again receive active consideration from the Senate Government Operations Committee and that the relevant agencies of the Federal Government will not, as they have in the past, oppose it on the arbitrary and unrealistic basis which I have discussed above.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill appear at this point in the RECORD and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business Friday, March 3, in the event that other Senators would like to add their names to this measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 1069) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of subsection (j) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C., sec. 484), is amended by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: ", or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies".

SEC. 2. Paragraph (3) of such subsection (j) is amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after "or for research for any such purpose" the following: ", or for utilization by welfare or recreation agencies";

(2) by striking out "and (B)" and inserting "(B)"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after "Internal Revenue Code of 1954" the following: ", and (C) welfare or recreation agencies".

SEC. 3. Paragraph (2) of subsection (k) of such section 203 is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D);

(2) by striking out "law," in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "law; or"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after such subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this Act to welfare or recreation agencies—".

SEC. 4. Such section 203 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) As used in this section, the term 'welfare or recreation agencies' means tax-supported or tax-exempt welfare or recreation agencies which serve people in institutions and in groups, but in the case of any such agency which is a tax-exempt voluntary agency, includes only an agency which meets at least one of the following criteria—

"(1) such agency is licensed by a State standard-setting agency;

"(2) such agency receives funds through a State or local community fund or similar federated fund-raising body; or

"(3) such agency is affiliated with, or is a part of, a national standard-setting organization."

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 made available to Federal employees a plan of low-cost life insurance. One-third of the premium is paid by the Government and two-thirds is paid by the employee.

Because the plan was new, it was started on a conservative basis in order to assure its financial soundness. There was general agreement that as experience warranted the program would be liberalized. Many of us believe that can be done without impairing the financial soundness of the program.

In general, the plan provides insurance approximating an employee's salary rounded off at the nearest upper $1,000. This means that an employee whose salary is greater than $4,000 but not over $5,000 would have insurance of $5,000, and an employee with a salary between five and six thousand would have insurance of $6,000, and so on, with a maximum of $20,000 in the cases of employees receiving a salary of $19,000 or more.

The original act called for a reduction in the face value of an employee's insurance upon the attainment of the age of 65 whether he continued as an employee or he had retired. The reduction was at the rate of 2 percent a month until the face value of the individual's policy had been reduced to 25 percent of its original amount. Last year, the act was amended waiving the reduction so long as the individual continued as an active employee but upon separation the reduction set in at the prescribed rate of 2 percent a month until the value of the policy was reduced to 25 percent.

The amendment last year was good, but it did not go far enough. I think the reduction to 25 percent is much too severe. It often leaves an estate without a sufficient amount to cover funeral and other terminal expenses. For example, an employee with a salary of between four and five thousand would have insurance with a face value of $5,000. This would be the amount he could carry into retirement. Upon reaching the age of 65—or immediately if then 65 or over—the automatic reduction of 2 percent a month would begin. Thus, 3 years and 3 months later, his insurance which once amounted to $5,000 would have a value of only $1,250. Under present conditions, this is a pitifully small amount. In many instances, it falls short of defraying final expenses let alone leaving a few dollars to dependent survivors.

Mr. President, the measure I am about to introduce is designed to alleviate the situation to some extent. Under its terms, each employee would have an additional block of insurance approximately equal to 25 percent of his salary and the insurance he now has. Specifically, an employee with a salary of less than $5,000 would have additional insurance of $1,000; an employee whose salary is over $5,000 but less than $10,000 would have additional insurance of $2,000; an employee whose salary is over $10,000 but less than $15,000 would have additional insurance of $3,000; an employee whose salary is over $15,000 but under $20,000 would have additional insurance of $4,000; and, an employee whose salary was $20,000 and over would have additional insurance of $5,000.

This additional insurance would not be subject to reduction by reason of advanced age. As will be noted upon study, its benefits are twofold. First, it provides all employees with an additional amount of insurance during their careers—this is the time they are rearing their children—this is the time when they are paying for a home and otherwise getting established—this is the time when added protection is needed. Second, it provides all employees with an additional amount of insurance that will go to their survivors without reduction.

The additional block of insurance provided by the bill would be at the same rate and on the same basis as the basic insurance now held by employees. In other words, the employee would pay two-thirds of the premium, and the Government would pay one-third. The additional cost, in either instance, is small in comparison to the benefits provided.

Mr. President, I send to the desk, for referral to the appropriate committee, a bill designed to accomplish the objectives I have outlined.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1070) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to provide for an additional unit of life insurance, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES FOR THE HEALTH CARE OF AGED AND OTHER PERSONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1071) to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a bill to carry out those recommendations in your

February 9, 1961, special health message to the Congress relating to the expansion of community facilities and services for the health care of the aged and other persons.

The bill would amend section 314(c) of the Public Health Service Act to remove the ceiling on the authorization of appropriations and to authorize earmarking of part of the appropriations for particular activities. The funds which would be available to the States under this increased authorization could thus be directed toward such activities as the establishment and maintenance of programs for improving the scope, quality, and availability of community health services such as those provided in nursing homes, home health care programs, outpatient diagnostic services, and health referral and information centers.

The bill would also authorize the Surgeon General to make grants to public or other nonprofit organizations for studies, experiments, and demonstration projects designed to develop new or improved methods of providing health services outside the hospital for the chronically ill and aged.

The annual appropriation authorization for grants for the construction of public or other nonprofit nursing homes would be raised to $20 million from its current level of $10 million. This amount, together with other public and private construction funds, would make possible a net addition over the next 10 years of one-half of a bed per 1,000 population for the care of long-term patients.

The bill would also remove the current $1,200,000 annual ceiling on funds for research grants in the development and utilization of hospital services, facilities, and resources. In addition, it would authorize such research grant funds to be used for the construction and equipping of experimental or demonstration hospitals or other medical facilities.

Faithfully yours,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators KERR, YARBOROUGH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and PELL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1072) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a proposed bill entitled the "Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1961" the major purpose of which is to increase opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel.

The bill carries out your recommendations for aid to education for the health professions and for extension of research facilities as covered in your health message dated February 9, 1961.

The proposed bill provides for:

1. Grants for construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities.

2. Medical, osteopathic, and dental scholarship grants.

3. Extension and strengthening of research facilities construction grant program.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL, DENTAL, OSTEOPATHIC, AND PUBLIC HEALTH TEACHING FACILITIES

A new 10-year grant program for the construction of medical, osteopathic, dental, and public health school facilities would be provided in a new part B to title VII of the Public Health Service Act. This program is directed toward increasing the facilities for training physicians, dentists, and professional public health workers.

Sums authorized to be appropriated each year for grants would be limited by annual ceilings for the 10-year period, July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1971, of $60 million for matching construction grants for new schools or for major expansion of existing schools, of which $15 million would be available for dental school construction, with priorities based on the amount of expansion which the construction would make possible, and upon considerations of geographical distribution of training opportunities. Another $15 million would be authorized for renovation and replacement of existing teaching facilities which are so obsolete as to require substantial curtailment of enrollment or of the quality of teaching.

Construction grants could be made for any facility needed in teaching of medical, dental, or public health students, including teaching hospitals or other clinical teaching facilities.

The Federal share of construction costs in the case of new schools or major expansion of existing schools could be up to 66⅔ percent of necessary costs of construction. Other grants under this authorization would not exceed 50 percent of construction costs.

In addition to construction grants, the Surgeon General would be authorized to provide financial assistance for projects for the planning of medical, dental, or public health education programs by regional, State, or local public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions, and to give technical advice and consultative services to such agencies.

MEDICAL, OSTEOPATHIC, AND DENTAL SCHOLARSHIP GRANTS

The proposed bill would also add a new part C to title VII of the Public Health Service Act. This part is directed at increasing the number of well-qualified medical and dental students by lowering the economic barriers which prevent many well-qualified young people from entering a career in medicine or dentistry.

This part would authorize Federal grants to accredited schools of medicine, osteopathy, or dentistry, to be used by these schools to make scholarship awards to talented students who are enrolled or have been accepted for admission by the school and are in financial need.

In the first year each school would receive for this purpose an amount equal to $1,500 times 25 percent of its first year class enrollment, and only first-year students would be eligible for this scholarship aid. In the second year the school allotment would be increased to provide for 25 percent of the first- and second-year classes, and the aid would be available to the students in these two classes. A similar increase would be made in the third year; and in the fourth and subsequent years the four classes would be included.

Within the school's allotment limitations, more or less than 25 percent of the students of a class might be aided, with scholarships in varying amounts up to a maximum of $2,000 a year for any one student.

In addition to amounts for student scholarships the draft bill would authorize grants to schools to meet part of the instructional costs of these students. For this purpose each school will receive an amount equal to $1,000 for each scholarship holder but not in excess of $1,000 for 25 percent of the first-year class in the first year, with this maximum increasing by the fourth year to $1,000 for 25 percent of the 4-year enrollment.

EXTENSION AND STRENGTHENING OF RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION GRANT PROGRAM

Closely related to our need for expanded medical and dental training facilities is the increasing need for facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health. The rapidly unfolding opportunities for new research discoveries can be met only by increasing our supply of qualified research personnel and by expanding the facilities required for the conduct of research. The statutory authority for the existing research facility construction grant program administered by the Public Health Service requires extension and modification during the present Congress. The authority for appropriation of construction grant funds expires on June 30, 1962, and no new grant applications may be received after June 30, 1961.

The proposed bill would extend the legislative authority for this program, now contained in title VII of the Public Health Service Act, for 3 additional years. For these 3 additional years the authorization for appropriation of grant funds would also be increased from $30 million to $50 million annually. The need for this program extension and expansion is clearly indicated by the existing backlog of over $60 million in preliminary and final grant applications, by the widespread evidence of overcrowding of available facilities in research institutions throughout the country, and by the rapid expansion of training programs for additional research personnel.

The present provisions of section 706(a) of the act, relating to the amount of Federal grants for the construction of facilities that are to be used partly for research and partly for other purposes, would be modified by the bill to permit Federal participation in the total cost of a facility that is to be used for research and other related purposes (including research training). In the case of other multipurposes facilities, Federal participation in construction costs would continue to be limited to the research part (or "proportionate use") of the facility.

A new provision would be added by the bill to title VII of the act in order to apply to construction aided under this program requirements as to prevailing wages and overtime pay for workmen employed thereon (these are also included in the proposed teaching facility construction grant program).

Finally, the proposed bill would repeal the existing authority for construction of categorical research facilities (in sec. 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act) and would authorize Federal construction and operation, directly or otherwise, of research facilities of particular value to the Nation or a region thereof.

The three major parts of the bill, in combination, offer a program to facilitate the needed expansion of training capacity for education for the health professions and facilities for health research and to stimulate the recruitment of well-qualified stu-

dents. We believe that enactment of this proposed legislation will enable the Federal Government, in cooperation with other governmental authorities and private groups, to go far toward meeting the Nation's growing health service and research requirements.

Faithfully yours,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT GRANTING 18-YEAR-OLD CITIZENS THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a number of years ago I introduced a joint resolution for amendment of the Constitution to grant citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote. I still believe it is a subject which ought to be submitted to the people for their consideration, because this is their country; this is their Republic. The way to change it has been provided for in the amendatory provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and therefore I believe this matter should be submitted to them, and I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGAL EFFECT OF CERTAIN TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements.

This has been referred to over the years as the very celebrated Bricker amendment. I am still vitally interested in it, and therefore I introduce it for reference to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. PELL) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 912, supra, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

TWO-YEAR PERIOD TO REINSTATE NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 16, 1961, the names of Senators PELL and HART were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 977) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 2-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and other Senators) on February 16, 1961.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 16, 1961, the name of Mr. LONG of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 51) authorizing the creation of a commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of an appropriate permanent memorial to the memory of Woodrow Wilson, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey on February 16, 1961.

NATURAL RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on yesterday the President sent to the Congress a message on conservation which was printed in the RECORD of the House proceedings of yesterday. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the message be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without its being read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(For President's message see pp. 2583–2586.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency will resume its public hearings on area redevelopment legislation on Tuesday, February 28, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

The committee will hear the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, as well as several private witnesses who have asked to be heard.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Address dealing with the relationship of the Government's fiscal, social, and foreign policies to the present state of the national economy, delivered by Senator BLAKLEY at a meeting of the La Porte-Bayshore Chamber of Commerce.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address by him to the Irrigation Districts Association of California, fall convention of its 50th year, Statler Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles, December 7, 1960.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Statement by him on the organization and training activities of the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron on Capitol Hill.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Statement prepared by him on the Soviet fisheries threat.

COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST INAUGURAL OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the House has just messaged to the Senate House Joint Resolution 155, to create a joint committee to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first inauguration of Abraham Lincoln. The anniversary will occur on Saturday of next week.

The resolution passed the House unanimously. It was modified along certain lines, so as to delete a provision requiring the holding of a joint session. The resolution calls on the Centennial Commission to meet and plan the appropriate observance.

I hope that, by unanimous consent, this measure may be considered now, during the morning hour, because the time is so very short.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I wish to state that the minority leader discussed this matter with me, and I fully approve what he is proposing in this instance. But I hope this step will not be regarded as a precedent in connection with future resolutions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; I make this request only because the circumstances are so extraordinary and because the commemoration will have to be planned and staged by a week from Saturday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 155) was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas Saturday, March 4, 1961, will mark the centenary of Abraham Lincoln's taking the oath of office as sixteenth President of the United States; and

Whereas the anniversary will be widely observed and noted throughout this land and overseas; and

Whereas the occasion will coincide with exercises commemorative of the American Civil War of 1861–1865; and

Whereas Mr. Lincoln stood at the head of the Government of the United States and its

Armed Forces during those years of tragedy and travail; and

Whereas he foresaw the difficulty of the task before him as "greater than that which rested on Washington"; and

Whereas he sought the guidance of Almighty God, saying, "Without the assistance of that Divine Being * * * I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail."; and

Whereas one who stood in the audience at his first inauguration would later write, "the shouts which have resounded for him at the Capitol are still ringing in my ears."; and

Whereas from a wooden platform, projected from the eastern portico, beneath an unfinished dome, he pleaded and reasoned that day for reconciliation and the preservation of the Union, saying:

"I take the official oath today, with no mental reservations, and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws, by any hypercritical rules. * * * I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. * * * It is safe to say that no government proper, ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. * * * Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step, while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from, have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to, are greater than all the real ones you fly from? Will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake? * * * Physically speaking, we cannot separate. We cannot remove our respective sections from each other, nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced, and go out of the presence, and beyond the reach of each other; but the different parts of our country cannot do this. They cannot but remain face to face; and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. * * * We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic cords of memory, stretching from every battlefield, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."; and

Whereas the better angels do, in fact, touch us: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on Saturday, March 4 next, the one hundredth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's first inauguration shall be commemorated by such observance as may be determined by the committee on arrangements in cooperation with the National Civil War Centennial Commission, the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District of Columbia, and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia.

Immediately upon passage of this resolution, the President of the Senate shall appoint four Members of the Senate and the Speaker of the House shall appoint four Members of the House of Representatives jointly to constitute a committee on arrangements.

Immediately upon passage of this resolution and after the Members of the Senate and House have been appointed, the Speaker shall direct the committee on arrangements to meet and select a chairman from one of their own group and such other officers as will be appropriate and needed who will immediately proceed to plan, in cooperation with the National Civil War Centennial Commission, the Civil War Centennial Commission of the District of Columbia and the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, an appropriate ceremony, issue invitations to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, Secretaries of departments, heads of independent agencies, offices, and commissions, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, the diplomatic corps, assistant heads of departments, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, members of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, centennial commissions from the various States, Civil War roundtables, State and local historical and patriotic societies, and such other students and scholars in the field of history as may have a special interest in the occasion, organize a reenactment of Mr. Lincoln's first inauguration on the eastern portico of the Capitol, select a speaker and other participants, prepare and publish a program and submit a report not later than June 1, 1961.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the resolution (H.J. Res. 155) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

CHRISTIANITY TODAY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am continually impressed by the wisdom, ability, and dedication to the basic principles upon which this Nation was founded, displayed by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover. A tower of moral strength, he symbolizes, perhaps more than any other single American, the determination of this country to remain free in the face of an aggressive world communism.

I know of no person with greater knowledge as to the inherent dangers represented by that false and godless philosophy, or one more competent to alert the American public in meeting its challenge.

Recently, in its issues of October 10 and 24, and November 7, 1960, "Christianity Today" carried three penetrating articles by Mr. Hoover. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

These articles forcibly portray the fundamental antagonism which necessarily exists between the spiritual basis for the structure we know as democracy and the false secular religion of the Communist. Mr. Hoover makes it abundantly clear that Christianity is one of the great forces at our command, with which to meet the greatest menace of our times. I commend these articles to the careful attention of all Americans.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST MENACE: RED GOALS AND CHRISTIAN IDEALS

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

(At the invitation of Christianity Today, the distinguished Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, speaks his mind on the Communist threat to the Christian heritage. Based on his long experience in dealing with subversive forces, Mr. Hoover here relates for Christianity Today's wide readership how the Communist Party operates against the American religious heritage. He expresses some firm convictions on how churchmen and churchgoers may effectively confront the Red menace in prayer, thought, and action. Scheduled in three successive issues, Mr. Hoover's future themes are "Communist Propaganda and the Christian Pulpit," and "Communist Domination or Christian Rededication." Readers of Mr. Hoover's best-selling book "Masters of Deceit" have found it to be a definitive analysis of the Communist menace facing the world today.)

The 20th century has witnessed the intrusion into its body fabric of a highly malignant cancer—a cancer which threatens to destroy Judaic-Christian civilization. One-fourth of the world's land surface has been seared and blackened by this cancer, while one out of every three human beings is caught in its tentacles. At this very hour, some are wondering whether we as a free nation can survive the frontal and underground assaults of this tumorous growth of communism.

Just 100 years ago communism was a mere scratch on the face of international affairs. In a dingy London apartment, a garrulous, haughty, and intolerant atheist, Karl Marx, callous to the physical sufferings and poverty of his family, was busy mixing the ideological acids of this evil philosophy. Originally of interest only to skid row debaters and wandering minstrels of revolution, Marx's pernicious doctrines were given organizational power by a beady-eyed Russian, V. I. Lenin, who, with his Bolshevik henchmen, seized state power for communism in 1917. From that wintry day in St. Petersburg, communism began to flow in ever greater torrents. After Lenin came the crafty and cunning Joseph Stalin and now the ebullient master prevaricator, Nikita Khrushchev. Communism is today literally a violent hurricane, rocking not only the chanceries of the world but seeking to capture the bodies, minds, and souls of men and women everywhere.

UNIVESAL DOMINATION THE GOAL

The full implications of the Communist challenge are shocking. The ultimate Communist goal—as defined by Marx, Lenin, and other Communist leaders—is the ruthless overthrow of our Judaic-Christian heritage and the establishment of a worldwide Communist society. By its very nature, communism is expansionist and universalist. In fact, the Communists feel that they can find their true fulfillment only by conquering non-Communist areas and bringing the whole planet under their dominion.

This overriding Communist goal of universal domination becomes the key to party activities. Feeling that history has destined communism for ultimate victory, the Communists believe that permanent peace with non-Communists is impossible, that life must be an inevitable struggle between the two. "It is inconceivable," Lenin proclaimed, "that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."

REJECTION OF OBJECTIVE MORALITY

Hence, there arises the ugly manifestation of Communist "ethics"—namely, the Communist belief that morality must be subordinated to the class struggle, the inevitable conflict between communism and its opponents. What is moral? Anything which serves to destroy the enemy and promote communism. Lenin was most explicit: "Morality is that which serves to destroy the old exploiting society and to unite all the toilers around the proletariat, which is creating a new Communist society."

Communist morality, of course, is rooted in total rejection of a belief in God and in the values of the Christian moral code. Supernatural concepts and divine revelation play no role in communism. "We repudiate

all morality that is taken outside of human, class concepts," Lenin proclaimed. "We, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and the we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landlords, and the bourgeoisie spoke in the name of God in order to pursue their own exploiters' interests."

This rejection of God gives communism a demonic aspect—transforming it into a fanatical, Satanic, brutal phenomenon. Morality is not determined by ethical standards grounded in an absolute, but in the expedient interpretations of the party—meaning, in actual practice, the whims and desires of the ruling clique or party leader. This leads to the terrifying doctrine that the end justifies the means. Proof of the cynical ruthlessness of such morality is the following description by longtime American revolutionaries:

"With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be 'legal' and 'moral,' or not, does not concern him, so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemies. Consequently, he ignores them insofar as he is able, and it suits his purposes. He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalist conceptions of 'legality,' 'fairness,' 'right,' etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies."

A SOCIETY WITHOUT GOD

Hence, under communism we see a decisive break from and thrust against the Judaic-Christian heritage. Communism is not just another political party, social organization, or economic philosophy which can be understood within the framework of our traditional Western heritage. So to regard communism is radically to misunderstand its terrific driving power, insidious persuasion, and terrifying intent. The Communists are not interested in remodeling or reforming our society, but in organizing a completely different society—a society which by denying God hopes to create a new type of man: Communist man. St. Paul, the great apostle, could say, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." The Communists would pervert this profound truth to say: "If any man be in the Communist Party, he is a new creature."

CONFRONTING THE RED CHALLENGE

The question arises: How can a philosophy so anti-God, antireligious, antihuman be so provocative and appealing to some people in our country? Perhaps in this strategic question we can find some of the challenges of—and answers to—this demonic way of life.

Let's take a look at some of the Communist challenges today and see what we as Christians can do about them.

1. The Communists appeal to man's idealism, and ask the very best of his life. Communist propaganda proclaims Marxism-Leninism "the greatest cause in the history of mankind," worthy of man's highest devotion. The Communist appeal is always to the noblest, the best, the most admirable in man. "The great vision and courage of us Communists has never been matched by that of any past heroes in the annals of mankind. In this respect we have every reason to be proud."

Answer. Have we in America and in the church given sufficient emphasis to Christian ideals, and called for heroic effort in the attainment of great goals? In particular, have we imbued our young people with the moral idealism which helps to mold their lives for Christ? Perhaps we have contented ourselves with catering to man's mediocrity, rather than attempting to bring out the noblest and deepest strands of character. Like Isaiah of Jerusalem, we must ever keep the awe, the majesty, and the holiness of God before us and call men to ever greater efforts in His service. Are we pressing on toward the high calling in Christ, toward the goals of a Christian society? The Christian church—as history has proved—has the power to capture men and lead them to divine levels. By exalting God and His purposes in the lives of men, the church can unmask the utter falsity of communism's siren calls.

2. The Communists do not doubt the validity of their cause; they press ever onward for their secularized Utopia, confident of ultimate victory. "We Communists must possess the greatest courage and revolutionary determination of mankind. While we clearly see the difficulties confronting the cause of communism, we are not in the least daunted by them."

Answer. Are there too many pessimists, waverers, and people of little faith in the ranks of the church today? Is there the enthusiasm among our people to match this Communist aggressiveness and certainty? The Church of Christ has a great message to sing, a great responsibility to fulfill. Never must she feel pessimistic, daunted, or uncertain.

3. The Communists expect from their members a deep sense of personal sacrifice and dedication. "To sacrifice one's personal interests and even one's life without the slightest hesitation and even with a feeling of happiness, for the cause of the party * * * is the highest manifestation of Communist ethics." This is a sacrifice of the members' time, talents, and personal resources, financial and otherwise. Casual effort is not a Communist trait.

Answer. Do we in the church and society really expect a deep sense of personal sacrifice and dedication? Do too many individuals come to church exerting only a casual effort and not giving sacrificially of their time, talents, and personal resources? The Communists have discovered that a demand for the very best actually brings forth the very best from the individual. If the Communists can create such responses on the basis of a cold, cynical materialism, just think of the accomplishments which can be wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit.

4. The party stresses the need for fidelity and loyalty to the mission of communism and the necessity of members to shun all temptations which would distract them from their assigned tasks. "But if for the sake of the party he is required to endure insults, shoulder heavy burdens, and do work which he is reluctant to do, he will take up the most difficult and important work without the slightest hesitation and will not pass the buck."

Answer: In our society today is there too much tendency to "pass the buck," to let George do it? Do we not often start out enthusiastically in civic or church work and then let temptations sidetrack us from our task? Are we embarrassed when we are criticized for doing Christ's work? Are we ready to shoulder heavy burdens? Are too many following the easy road of conformity with secularism and not holding sufficiently high the banner of Christ?

5. The Communists proclaim that working for the party brings internal peace, joy, and happiness to the member. He finds here creative achievement and self-fulfillment. "He will also be capable of being the most sincere, most candid, and happiest of men."

Answer. The Christian Gospel tells of the deep joy, peace, and blessings which come from belief in Christ as Saviour and Lord. Is the church doing enough to overcome the loneliness of contemporary man, his feelings of insecurity and frustration in a world growing more secular every day? Fear, personal unhappiness, and uncertainty stalk the streets today. Crime, juvenile delinquency, and disrespect for law and order are rife. Are we meeting these challenges in the Christian spirit, offering with maximum effort the true answer of the Gospel, telling people that belief in God is the true way to a peace of mind which passes all understanding?

PERVERSION OF THE TRUTH

These are some of the challenges of communism today, and the problems they pose for Christians. Communists, in fact, attempt to capture the historic values of Christian civilization, such as love, mercy, and justice, and after grossly perverting their true meaning, they actually turn these values against their parent.

With shameless perfidy, the Communists hail themselves as the great exponents of love—most truly, one of mankind's most sublime virtues. Under communism, it is proclaimed, "there will be no oppressed and exploited people, no darkness, ignorance, backwardness. In such a society all human beings will become unselfish. The spirit of mutual assistance and mutual love will prevail among mankind." We know, in fact, however, that communism means terror, fear, and slavery. Communism represents a new age of barbarism, which is repealing the centuries of progress of Western man toward tolerance, understanding, and human brotherhood. Communist Man—the product of this system—is a brute, ideologically trained, who unhesitantly conducts purges, runs concentration camps, butchers the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. He is immune to the emotions of pity, sorrow, or remorse. He is truly an alarming monster, human in physical form, but in practice a cynically godless and immoral machine.

ROLE OF THE MINISTRY

If communism is to be defeated, the task must rest largely upon the theologians and the ministers of the Gospel. Communism is a false secular religion with pseudotheological explanations of the great verities of life, such as the creation, life on earth, and the world to come. Communism is an all-encompassing system with explanations—though wrong ones—for this great universe of God. The party offers answers—though perverted ones—for the hopes, joys, and fear of mankind.

In the final analysis, the Communist world view must be met and defeated by the Christian world view. The Christian view of God as the Creator, Sustainer, and Lord of the universe is majestically superior to the ersatz approach of dialectical materialism concocted by Marx and Lenin. The task of our clergy today is to translate this Holy Truth into the daily lives of our men and women. This truly is their responsibility as Christian clergymen.

Strong, responsible, and faithful Christians, wearing the full armor of God, are the best weapons of attack against communism and the other problems of our day. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness." In this way you will be playing a vital role also in helping defend our cherished way of life.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND THE CHRISTIAN PULPIT

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

The Communists are today spraying the world with ideological and propaganda missiles designed to create a deadly radioactive cloud of Marxism-Leninism. From bases behind the Iron Curtain and in the non-Communist world, this cloud of Communist propaganda is drenching many lands, with a particularly heavy fallout in this Nation.

The deadliest of these Communist missiles—whose warheads are exceptionally heavy—are being directed against the Christian pulpit. Communist gunners, with special ideological training and schooled in atheistic perversity, are sighting in the clergy—hoping to shatter, immobilize, and confuse this powerful forum of idealism, morality, and civic virtue. No assignment is more strategic in the Communist world today than the disruption of the church of

God—both within and outside the Iron Curtain.

Why does the church—which has no military forces—merit the most explosive of Communist rockets, the most venomous of Communist hate, the most vituperative of Communist scorn? Because religion, of all facets of Western civilization, represents the eternal "thorn in the flesh" of communism, that jagged rock which is constantly puncturing, exposing, and unmasking Communist claims, performances, and hopes. The Communists realize that unless the Christian pulpit—that mighty fortress of God—is liquidated, pitilessly, mercilessly, finally, the very existence of communism itself stands in jeopardy. The spiritual firepower of the Christian church—based on the love of God—is sufficient to destroy all the Soviet manmade missiles and rockets and extirpate this 20th century aberration.

And the Communists know it—and fear it.

THE RELIANCE ON ATHEISM

To understand the Communist attack against the Christian pulpit, we must, so to speak, transplant ourselves into the control room of party strategy. Let's see the Communist high command at work as it executes its attack against the church. Let's note its mode of approach, its variable tactics, and ultimate goal.

The basic Communist weapon is the materialism of the Communist dialectic. Communism is atheistic, utterly denying God. This has been a fundamental premise of communism since the days of Marx and remains so today under the mendacious huckstering of Nikita Khrushchev. "It is not religion that creates man, but man who creates religion. It is the opium of the people" (Karl Marx). "Religion is a kind of spiritual gin" (V. I. Lenin). "In my outlook on life there is no place for religion" (William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A.). "We remain the atheists that we have always been" (Khrushchev).

Just why, we may ask, does the party rely so greatly on these missiles of atheism? Just why do other phases of Communist strategy alter, but never the dependence on this weapon?

The answer is simple and fundamental to any progress which communism hopes to achieve. Atheism is an all-out weapon of highly destructive and devastating power. If properly launched, atheistic missiles can mangle, cut, and obliterate the spiritual tendons of life—belief in God, faith in Judaic-Christian values, love of the church. The very existence of Communist man—that fanatical atheist imbued with the ethics of expediency—is proof of the paralyzing power of atheism in destroying the taproots of spiritual strength which flow into the individual personality in a Christian civilization. Hence, in Communist strategy, these missiles of atheism are the ultimate weapons, the essential ideological artillery designed not to damage partially but to destroy ruthlessly.

However, as we watch from the Communist control room, we note that, in launching these missiles of atheism toward America, the Communist rocketeers are experiencing considerable trouble. These mighty missiles are propelled, but then, like meteors, they seem to burn up as they approach the atmosphere of America, a proud Christian land. In simple language, here is the problem of party strategists: how can an atheistic Communist Party operate in the United States where the vast majority of the people believe in God?

To attack directly, with an open appeal for atheism, is to risk defeat, frustration, and loss of faith. To stand on the street corner and proclaim, "We the Communists believe in atheism," will not gain recruits. To denounce God in open party appeals will cause open resentment and hostility. What is to be done?

A STRATEGY OF DECEIT

The Communist answer: Employ a strategy of deceit—a technique designed to hoodwink non-Communists. This is today one of the party's most potent attacks against the Christian pulpit.

The strategy means primarily three things:

1. A false claim that the Communists stand for tolerance of religion. The party's tactic in the Christian world is to deemphasize the importance of religion, to talk and write little about it, and emphasize other topics, such as social, economic, and political issues. A leader of the Communist Party, U.S.A., recently commented: "We know there is no God or Supreme Being, but we can't go out and tell this to church people." "We do not declare and must not declare in our program that we are atheists" (Lenin). If questions are asked, Communists pose as being tolerant, and say that religion is a private matter for the individual. "The people's state holds that the question of religious belief is a private matter; belief or nonbelief in religion relates to the personal freedom of an individual."

Actually, however, religion is not a private affair for the Communist. "Religion is an ideological foe of communism, and the reconciliation of the two is impossible." As a Marxist, he must be an atheist. He has absolutely no personal choice. "Personal freedom of an individual" is a deceptive party shibboleth. Any non-Communist believing this double talk is being trapped—and softened up for the next tactic in this strategy of deceit.

2. To achieve a mutuality of agreement with the Christian pulpit on common issues (as defined by the Communists). This tactic is being actively pursued by the Communist Party, U.S.A., today. "Look," the Communists are saying, "we are tolerant of religion, we do not want to attack your faith. Rather, let's work together on issues in which we are both interested—peace, civil liberties, economic justice. We Communists are believers in love, justice, and the brotherhood of man. We, too, want a world of peace and good will. Let's not fight but work together."

Here is the deadly "come along" of communism, directed today at the Christian pulpit. This enables the party to move close to unsuspecting ministers and laymen who see only the exterior verbiage and not the concealed danger. How does the party work here? In many ways: Encouraging churchmen to endorse, support, and even participate in Communist-front groups; to sign Communist-sponsored petitions; to neutralize clerical opposition to communism (if a minister can be influenced to even keep silent about the dangers of communism, the party has gained).

At the same time the party, through infiltration tactics, is attempting to reach inside the churches. In one instance, a Communist official instructed party members to join churches and become active in their organizations. Another member was working in the church office, while still another party official helped conduct the financial affairs of his parish. Most important, of course, is the youth field. A national party leader recently commented that Communist youth must find common ground with church youth groups, not only for ideological reasons but also for the use of their facilities.

3. Exploit the church for their own Communist ends. This brotherliness of Communists is most purposive: The Communists want to hitch as much of the influence of the Christian church as they can capture to the party's cause. This means that if clergymen or laymen participate (knowingly or unknowingly) in fronts, sign Communist-sponsored petitions, speak favorably of Communist objectives—these points must be exploited to strengthen the party's position. To a prospective customer, a Communist canvasser will say, "The Reverend X has signed this petition, why don't you sign too?" "The Reverend Y has endorsed this organization. You know him. Why don't you help us and contribute some money?" "The Reverend Z has spoken favorably of this proposal. This shows that it's in the spirit of the church."

To the Communists, any support gained from church circles enables them to break down the moral antipathy of the community and gives them a desperately desired respectability.

Hence, this strategy of Communist deceit it aimed to undermine, hoodwink, and exploit the Christian pulpit.

A WAR FOR THE MINDS OF MEN

Now, we may ask, what is the answer to this ideological attack? What can the clergy of American do to defeat this Communist strategy?

First, we must make this assertion. The Christian pulpit is today one of America's most formidable barriers against communism. The spiritual dedication of thousands of clergymen, in large and small churches across the Nation, is a powerful antidote to the danger. America owes a great debt of gratitude to the stalwart example of our religious leadership.

Yet the Communist attack toward the church continues. What can you, as clergymen, do to help blunt this tactic?

In our Nation one of communism's most potent allies is apathy toward and lack of knowledge of communism. Very strangely, many citizens will be highly conversant about the diseases of azaleas, the weathering qualities of automobile paints, the latest ways to play a new card game—yet know nothing about communism, that deadly plague which threatens to extinguish our way of life. That is one of the anomalies—and tragedies—of modern-day America.

Perhaps we can pose several questions.

Have you, as a minister, preached any sermons describing the frightful challenge which communism poses for the spiritual heritage of America?

Have you encouraged members of your church to read about communism and to learn about its evil nature?

Have you urged the formation of discussion groups to acquaint men and women with this challenge?

The approach must not be one of fear, but knowledge. Communism is not a monstrosity to be hidden from sight, never spoken about publicly, or shunted into a side closet. Communism is not a controversial subject, best to be left untouched. Communism is not so overpowering as to throw us into a state of hysterical fear, anger, or violence. Like an epidemic of polio, the solution lies not in minimizing the danger or overlooking the problem—but rapidly, positively, and courageously finding an antipolio serum.

THE GREAT CHRISTIAN ANSWER

We in America have this anticommunism serum, the answer to the Communist challenge. It lies in the strength of our Judaic-Christian tradition, the power of the Holy Spirit working in men. Too frequently, both clergy and laymen do not realize the full resources at their command in the Christian tradition—the tremendous power of God to turn men toward good, to make personalities bloom with the living courage of sainted men. The job of you as clergymen is to help channel this divine power into the hearts, minds, and souls of men. Literally, the Gospel has the power to turn the world upside down. That should be your mission.

No greater challenge has ever faced the Christian church. Communism has caused the deaths of millions of people. No enemy

in all these 2,000 years has held such a deadly challenge to the Christian pulpit. As spokesmen of God, your task is to enable men to know the truth, so the truth will set them free.

SOVIET RULE OR CHRISTIAN RENEWAL?

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

"What is past is prologue" was William Shakespeare's magnificent summation of man's position in the vast stream of history. The time has arrived for us, as Christians and as Americans, to peer ahead and see what we as individuals and church members can do to help make this a better world in which to live. Atheistic communism has now been with us as a state power for almost a half century. Talk as we will concerning the past, we cannot undo, revise, or alter the events of the years. "What is past is prologue"—and we must build for the future.

Today two vast ideological worlds confront each other, worlds which embody different deities and conceptions of man. Casting our eyes down the avenue of the next generation, we may pose the issue between the worlds as Communist domination or Christian rededication. Shall the world fall under the cold hand of dialectical materialism where every man must conform to the atheistic, irrational, and immoral laws of a way of life which is contrary to the divine intelligence? Or shall the answer be a rededication to Christian moral values, a digging deep of the wells of personal faith in the bottomless ocean of God's love and the creation of a society which is in harmony with the laws of God?

Will it be the cold world of Communist conformity, or the eager, active, and genuine world of religious dedication?

Unfortunately today many people, watching the Communist world in action, have become defeatist. They see bustling energy, teeming exhilaration, and powerful personal energies keyed to promoting self-sacrifice, fanatical zeal, and party accomplishments. In deep anguish, they say, "How can we compete against such a powerful and dynamic ideology?"

The answer to this skepticism (highly unwarranted, as we shall see) lies in understanding the dynamics of motivation in a Communist society.

Communism has the power to stimulate intense, fanatical, and sustained effort. If we would peer into the day-to-day activities of the Communist Party, U.S.A., for example, we would see a vast panorama of demonic rushing and counterrushing. Members are eternally busy making speeches, collecting money, and passing out handbills. The moment one emergency is surmounted, another arises, more breathtaking and earthshaking than the former. Like ants scurrying on a hot summer day, party members are whirling fanatical action at all levels of the party.

This incessant party activity arises, to a large extent, because of what the Communists call ideological cultivation—which means an educational program designed to immerse the individual in Communist thought for the purpose of making him a more effective party member. Communists speak of ideological cultivation as a weapon of attack. Actually it is the foundation stone of Marxism-Leninism.

TRAINING NEW RECRUITS

A recruit joins the party. Immediately he is sent to a party school to learn, among other things, the ideas, opinions, and prejudices of the Communist masters (Marx, Engels, and Lenin; Stalin is now out of date). Regardless of how busy a member may be in everyday party work or how long he's been in the party, he must continue to attend indoctrination schools and do homework. Among party slogans is "One night a week for Marxist study."

The idea is to make the member think like the party "masters," to imbue him with the Communist personality of these men. To the Communists, the reading, studying, and discussion of Communist classics, such as Marx's "Capital" and Lenin's "State and Revolution," as well as the latest works of the current party leaders, help raise the communist qualities of the members. "Strive to become the best pupils of Marx, Engels, and Lenin." These source books of Communist doctrine, in the party's eyes, give the members a sense of Communist purpose and direction and a zeal to push forward to achieve the party's goals.

Hence, to the Communists, the member must, in the party's language, constantly raise his own ideological level, that is, increase his knowledge of the party's doctrines. Gradually, under such an educational program, the member becomes an advanced or mature Communist able to handle the most difficult of party assignments. Such an individual, because of his indoctrination, automatically thinks as the party wants him to think, subordinates his personal desires to the interests of the party, and works only for Communist goals.

Here arises the dynamics of motion in communism. In the party there is a close relationship between theory and practice. Ideological training is designed to make the member a man of action—revolutionary action. The member is steeled in revolutionary discipline, armed for battles in the fields of infiltration, agitation, and propaganda.

At first blush communism may seem almost like an invincible monster. Admittedly, it can engender tremendous personal effort and zeal, but it has a tragic flaw, a flaw which heralds its eventual destruction.

Communism is anti-God; this is its fatal weakness. Hence, it is contrary to divine laws which give meaning, validity, and depth to the dignity of human personality. The world of communism, despite its overt bustling, energy, and action, is a cold world of sterility, conformity, and monotony. One is no longer regarded as a child of God, to bloom from spiritual roots. Rather, a deadly sameness is enforced, and the individual becomes a robot of the state, servile in thought, and groveling in attitude. The great seedbeds of dissent are deracinated. Critical thought and independent judgment are hunted down and destroyed. Freedom of expression is prohibited. Purges, concentration camps, and faked trials betray the poisonous hand of communism which corrupts everything it touches, creates error, evil, and sin, and transforms love into hate, justice into slavery, and truth into falsehood.

Contrasted to the world of Communist conformity, we as Christians have the unmatched power of Christ. The task for us is spiritual rededication—the creation of a world of love, justice, and truth. This is the Christian ethic which is part of our heritage. Ministers have a vital role in helping to roll back the iron curtain of communism and making real the world of divine love.

HOW COMMUNISM WORKS

In discussing such a mission, let us see what we can learn from the Communists by noting the way in which they inspire their members.

1. Note the Communists' emphasis on returning to the original source of their beliefs to secure inspiration for their members. Communists encourage members, young and old, to study the party's classics. To read such books, they say, is to gain personal guidance and raise the members' Communist qualities "in every respect to the same level as those of Marx, Engels, Lenin."

Answer: Think how much more enriching, rewarding, and satisfying are the original sources of Christian belief than the writings of the bigoted minds of the Communist "masters." The Bible is the word of God. But besides the Bible, the writings of men of God, both clerical and lay, over 20 centuries are also guidelines to personal action. Do we as Christians take enough time to read the Bible—and these other affirmations of our faith? Do we quench our spiritual thirst (symbolized by the troubles, tensions, and anxieties of the day) with the truth ground in such sources? Are we digging deep enough in the wells of our faith? Most truly, the Bible gives inspiration, zeal, and guidance for life. To neglect it, is to reduce our national vitality and strength.

2. Communists stress not only the reading of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, but reading them constantly—on a daily or weekly schedule—and never neglecting this habit even though the member becomes older. "Comrades! Of course it is no easy matter to take Marx, Engels, and Lenin as our models in self-cultivation and to become their most faithful and best pupils. It calls for an iron will and firm determination. It calls for a lifelong devotion to studying Marxism-Leninism."

Answer: How many Christians read the Bible only on special occasions? How many Christians set aside a certain amount of time each day or week for reading religious literature? Do some Christians regard the Bible as a book only for children; do they think that as adults they have outgrown it? Do we view the Bible as an antique book which has no message to our modern age? Do we display the same iron will and firm determination to learn the Christian faith as the Communists do for their ideology?

These are key questions, striking at the very heart of our religious faith and practices.

3. The Communists have no use for a mere ceremonial avowal of Marxism or members interested only in acquiring a minimum knowledge of ideology. "Every one of our party members should not merely be a member of minimum qualifications * * * but should rather seek to make progress and ceaselessly raise his or her own consciousness and understanding of Marxism-Leninism."

Answer: Here again serious challenges are posed. How many church members today are merely members in name, not knowing or even caring what membership in the church of God really means and entails? Do some members object to learning about the tenets of their faith, and say that a few minimum requirements are enough? Has our Christian heritage been diluted by the inroads of secularism and materialism? Is our faith in God a growing, creative experience? Or are we satisfied with lesser visions of inspiration? The answers to these questions will help chart our way.

4. At all times the Communists stress the relationship between theory and action. To study the Communist masters is to ready oneself for revolutionary action. Communists are not interested in preparing members to parade their Marxist IQ's or pass academic examinations. Their knowledge must become a weapon to turn the world upside down for communism. "We study for the sole purpose of putting into practice what we have learned. It is for the party and for the victory of the revolution that we study."

Answer: In Christianity the study of the Bible is a guide to action—action in building a deeper Christian experience for the individual, and a better, more wholesome community. Are we as Christians adapting to actual practice the teachings of Christ? Are our day-to-day actions in the secular world determined by our Christian beliefs? Is the church—the Christian pulpit—effective today in determining men's actions? Are there individuals who think the church is a good organization to have in the community but

should not be taken too seriously in everyday community action? These are challenges to us today.

5. The party stresses the development of the politically mature comrade, the individual on whom it can depend to carry out its mission. The whole purpose of ideological cultivation is to produce the member who will become a better Communist and work for the revolution.

Answer: Christians are also working for a revolution—a revolution of the spirit, not the sword. Deeply committed Christians are needed to carry on the work of the church, to uphold the Judaic-Christian faith. We may raise the question, Are we working tirelessly enough to create these deeply committed Christians? Are we training our members to buckle on the full armor of God, to commit their full lives to Christ? Working for Christian goals is a full-time job, not just a task for Sundays or evening meetings.

THE STRUGGLE IS REAL

How can we compete against such a powerful and dynamic ideology as communism? By way of answer we must say that as Christians and as Americans we can compete. We can defeat this atheistic enemy by drawing upon our spiritual resources.

Make no mistake about it, the struggle ahead is real. The Communists are determined, rugged, and treacherous enemies. The ideology of communism, as we have seen, generates great power. But the faith of communism is a perverted faith, giving predominance to evil, sin, and wrong. It draws its strength from deceit, chicanery, and hypocrisy. That is its fatal flaw, the rotten core which spoils the fruit of its branches.

The future, to a large extent, will be determined by what we as Christians have to say and do. Those who are ministers of the Gospel can help determine this fateful decision: Shall it be a world of Communist domination or Christian rededication? Shall it be the cold world of Communist inhumanity, sterility, and conformity, where the bodies, minds, and souls of men become as stone, lifeless in the darkness of atheistic perversity, or shall it be Christian regeneration, where the power of the Holy Spirit floods in with joy, love, and harmony?

No group in America has a more key responsibility than the clergy. The answer to communism must be on a spiritual level. As representatives of a great tradition, the clergymen of America must light men's souls with deep enthusiasm for the teachings of Christ. A God-centered nation, ever humble before the majesty of the divine Creator, can keep alive freedom, justice, and mercy. This is the heritage of America.

EXCESS OUTFLOW OF GOLD

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is much discussion at the present time about travel between nations, and particularly travel of Americans in foreign countries. This discussion is brought about by our balance of payments, which has resulted in the demand for gold by foreign countries and has reduced substantially our gold reserves.

I have received a letter from Mr. Tom Maupin, of Maupintour Associates, regarding this publicity and the effect that it is having and may have on tourist travel.

I think everyone must agree that we need to encourage travel between nations because of its importance from an international standpoint. The letter from Mr. Maupin is so important that I think it should be called to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAUPINTOUR ASSOCIATES,
February 16, 1961.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
The Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: There seems to have been a feeling generated of late which makes Americans believe tourism travel abroad by Americans is the one big factor to blame for the excess outflow of gold.

Editorialists and financial feature columnists dwell on this subject. The President's recommendation to Congress that duty-free purchases abroad by American travelers be limited to $100 was given headline publicity and this added to the great amount of national attention being directed toward the dollars spent by Americans for services and accommodations while traveling abroad.

The inference that those who take a trip abroad are doing damage to the national interest was obvious and quickly noted. This has been snowballed to the point where many are made to feel that it is now improper, unpatriotic, and un-American to consider traveling abroad.

A rash of stories have appeared extolling the virtues of "see America first" and "buy American." I am fully in favor with the wish that Americans would get to know the wonders of all the regions of this greatest Nation on earth. I hope Americans will buy American products.

However, I believe it is shortsightedly unreasoned and against our real national self-interests for the opinionmakers to create the feeling that it is now morally wrong for Americans to spend dollars to see and learn about the wonders of other peoples of the world.

I receive letters from prospective tourists from all over the Nation, and I talk with local prospects and many are telling me that it is not proper now to consider a trip to a foreign land because it is not good for the Nation to have dollars spent abroad. I receive the impression that some feel it is clearly out of step with the times in the eyes of their neighbors for one to think about a foreign trip this year.

A guilt complex has been created in Americans who contemplate visiting abroad. Perhaps this has been created unknowingly and through the error of no one realizing it and no one doing anything positive to counteract it. Yet it does truly exist, and it is increasingly difficult to erase.

I am confident that it cannot be the considered policy of President Kennedy's administration to discourage American tourism abroad. Surely, if this is the Government's policy, the Government would not be spending millions of dollars financing American technical and material aid for some of the underdeveloped countries to assist them to build their tourism industry to attract more Americans and thereby helping to build the stability of their own economy and a higher standard of living for their own people and a greater understanding of the world by their own people.

I am sure our Government does not desire to disrupt radically the economy of a nation such as Mexico, whose No. 1 industry is the American tourist, and thereby risk gaining another ill-willed and unfriendly neighbor. Such could be near fatal.

It has been the thesis of statesmen that it is vital for survival for Americans to get to know their world neighbors. The people-to-people policy of understanding through personal travel and contact with those of other cultures and outlooks on life has not been a hypocritical Government policy, I'm sure.

I hope that I am correct that the position of the administration and of the Congress has not changed. I hope that it is true that our Government's leaders still champion the belief that a world of good will and direct benefits to our Nation's self-interests still results when American citizens by their own initiative go and see the world and learn to know our fellow world citizens.

I hope our Government is not trying to encourage isolationism.

But, by default, it appears that our Government is definitely encouraging a return to isolationism. Unwittingly, our Nation's leadership is endorsing this feeling from the grassroots that to be a good American this year one will stay within the confines of these borders. By saying nothing to the contrary, our Government is saying that it is not to the Nation's interest for the dollars of tourists to escape into the hands of foreigners, that it is not patriotic to travel abroad. By saying nothing, our Government is permitting the people to believe it is popular, proper, and self-righteous to be anti-foreign spending.

Because there has been a great vacuum of affirmative policy statements, the incentive to travel to other countries and to meet other peoples is being destroyed.

Our Government has given no positive encouragement to Americans to travel abroad. There has been no headline-hitting endorsement by the President on behalf of the value of foreign travel to improve world good-neighbor relations. There has been no use of the President's prestige to dramatize the people-to-people concept as being an essential and patriotic one, that understanding of the world's people through private travel by Americans is a worthy endeavor and highly necessary to the national interest.

There has been nothing done by Government to counteract this ground swell of feeling that now the best national interest of all good patriots can better be served if we all will remain in our own backyard since it costs too dearly in gold to have the privilege and benefits of foreign contact and knowledge.

It is apparently still patriotic for the businessman traveling at his corporation's expense to establish and continue business relationships abroad. Evidently it is only the individual who must pay his own way from his personal income after taxes who is being shamed from seeing foreign lands and people.

The self-centered spirit of isolationism is quick to develop and slow to disappear, easy to encourage, and hard to reason away.

If America's leadership is to discourage a rebirth of isolationism, then it is vital that America's leaders realize the need to take immediate, hard-hitting, and dramatic affirmative means now and for a continuing period to let the people know that it is to their national and own individual self-interest for Americans to travel abroad and to learn from in-person experience about the peoples of the world.

Let's not wake up too late and realize that we are back in the dislike-foreigners decade. There are those, no doubt, who would enjoy seeing such a regression. For survival's sake, we cannot risk doing so.

With best regards,

TOM MAUPIN,
Partner.

PRINTING IN THE RECORD OF REMARKS IN CONNECTION WITH MATTER PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED TO BE PRINTED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, and I should like to have the attention of the Parliamentarian to what I am going to ask.

On Wednesday last I made a statement of about 600 words on the floor of the Senate during the morning hour, not one word of which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The reason why it was not published was that I asked unanimous consent that a newspaper article be printed, after my remarks, in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. I was informed on Thursday by the Director of Planning Service of the Printing Office that the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing prevent the Appendix carrying this article, which I understand, and which I think is perfectly wise and sensible, since my senior colleague from Wisconsin had gotten the floor just before I had and apparently had inserted this same matter in the Appendix of the daily RECORD.

However, in view of the fact that I physically spoke these words, and the words, presumably, were taken down by the reporter, I cannot understand why the rule should prevent my comments on the article from being published in the RECORD. The fact that at the end of my remarks I requested that the article appear in the Appendix of the daily RECORD, it seems to me, should not have prevented my remarks from being printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair knows the Joint Committee on Printing has a rule to prevent duplication of printing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that. I think it is a sound rule, but I do not think that the rule should apply to remarks made previous to the other request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It seems to the Chair that the remarks should have been printed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the earlier decision of the Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of Wednesday be printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD. I was in these remarks referring to an article printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD on February 22, as it appears on page A1151.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTONIA, LITHUANIA, AND LATVIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on January 26 and February 16 of this year I commented on the Senate floor on the struggle of the Lithuanian people and their hope for freedom from the Soviet Union. In my remarks, I included the people of Estonia and Latvia, who were the first victims of Soviet Russia. On February 24 the free Estonians throughout the world and their friends will speak for the subjugated people of Estonia, with the hope that their voices will be heard in the United Nations and in Soviet Russia, which will lead the Soviets to withdraw their troops and agents from Estonia and to permit the people of Estonia their freedom. In this regard, I heartily endorse the Senate resolution introduced by my colleague, the distinguished minority whip, the senior Senator from the State of California [Mr. KUCHEL], in which he asks for the liberation of the people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

Mr. President, I think the spotlight should be focused on Mr. Khrushchev and the Soviet Union and he should be asked how he can take the initiative in the colonialism issue against free countries when Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., says there are mountains of evidence which can be produced to substantiate the Soviet Union's imperialism and colonialism both within and outside the Soviet Union. All we need to do, Mr. President, is to look toward Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, and those nations entirely eradicated by the Soviet expansion; namely, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. And, Mr. President, we should also look to Laos, and the Congo, and Cuba, and parts of Asia and Africa where the Soviet Union is trying to foster upon those people the communistic doctrine, which, if successful, will subjugate the people and their thinking to the communistic state. I repeat what I said on the 16th: that it is hard for us in this great country, with its many freedoms, where even the most renowned Communists or hardened criminals are given full protection under the Constitution and our laws, to visualize, to understand, the struggles, the oppressions, the deprivations that are inflicted upon the people who were once a part of proud nations, but are now under the heel of a Communist dictator. This is all the more reason why we should glory in our own freedom and at the same time give courage to all the people throughout the world who desire to enjoy the freedoms that we have.

I hope the day will come soon when the people in Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain, will again be restored to their freedom and to their rights and dignities.

THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a situation wherein the soil bank program has again been turned into a racket.

In this report I shall point out the maneuvering whereby a Mr. Wayne E. Tallman purchased a 6,960-acre ranch in Colorado for a total cost of $139,200, and then, through subleasing arrangements, placed 3,879 acres of this same land under a 10-year contract with the conservation reserve program, wherein he will, over the 10-year period, collect from the Government $271,000, or $131,800 more than the entire purchase price of the whole ranch. In addition, he or his tenants will have the use of the remaining acreage not placed in the soil bank.

It all began in 1956, when the estate of John W. Baughman Farms Co., operating in Kansas and Colorado, decided to sell between fifty and sixty thousand acres of the company's land holdings in Colorado to meet inheritance and income taxes. This land was located over a three-county area—Kiowa, Kit Carson, and Lincoln—in Colorado.

In January 1957, Mr. Robert Baughman, president of the John W. Baughman Farms Co., offered to sell to his district manager, Mr. Wayne E. Tallman, the 6,960-acre Vogel Ranch, at a price of $20 per acre, or a total of $139,200. The purchase price was to be payable over a period of 10 years in 10 equal installments, with no interest to be collected except on delinquent payments, and the offer was contingent upon Mr. Baughman's being able to work out arrangements to lease a substantial part under the conservation reserve program whereby he could use the cash payments to pay for the farm.

However, Mr. Tallman was confronted with the $5,000 limitation that Congress had placed upon the annual amount which could be paid to any one farmer under the soil bank program.

But this proved to be no obstacle. To get around this $5,000 limitation, Mr. Tallman devised a scheme wherein he would break up the farm into smaller units, cash-lease the different units to various tenants, and then have the tenants sign a contract with the Government under the conservation reserve program, with the proviso that they would turn the money received thereon over to him as cash rental.

But before buying the property, he wanted to be sure that his scheme would work, so on February 14, 1957, at the regular meeting of the Kiowa County ASC Committee, he outlined this cash-lease plan and received assurances that they would approve such a plan. It was agreed at this meeting that, if Mr. Tallman could buy this land, they would accept the same acreage under the conservation reserve program and pay him or his tenants an annual rental of $7 per acre for the next 10 years. This would mean that the Government would be paying $70 per acre over the next 10 years not to cultivate the same land which he was then in the process of buying for $20 per acre.

On February 25, 1957, following this advance arrangement with the county committee of Kiowa County, Colo., Mr. Wayne E. Tallman—operating under the newly organized Wayne E. Tallman Farms Co.—bought from the John W. Baughman Farms Co. the 6,960-acre Vogel Ranch at a price of $139,200, or $20 per acre, payable over a 10-year period as outlined above.

Mr. Tallman then divided this ranch into six tracts, and on March 25, and 26, 1957, he leased the entire acreage to six different tenants for a 10-year period, on a cash rental basis, under terms that would net him $27,100 annually, or a total of $271,000 over the 10-year contract.

In each instance the leasing periods were dated back to March 1, 1957. He had contracted to buy the farm on February 25, 1957.

His leases with the tenants were with the understanding that they in turn, would place under the conservation reserve program, enough of their leased acreage to enable them to collect from the Government an annual payment equal to the agreed annual cash rental. The contract carried the proviso that these Government checks would be turned over to Mr. Tallman for his annual rents.

The tenants' profit would be the free use of that portion of their leased acreage which was not being put under the conservation reserve program.

Details of the acreage leased by the six tenants and the acreage placed in the conservation reserve program are shown in the following chart.

This chart shows the number of acres leased to each tenant. It shows the amount of acreage placed in the soil bank by each of these same tenants, and the amount of their annual payments from the Government, as well as the annual cash rental in each instance. It will be noted how closely the Government payments coincide with the annual cash rental being paid to Mr. Tallman.

I ask unanimous consent to have the chart printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tenant	Cash leases			Acreage placed in conservation reserve	
	Total acreage	Cropland	Annual rental	Acreage	Annual payment
A	1,609	1,236	$5,000	714	$4,998
B	960	957	4,200	602	4,214
C	643	643	2,900	421	2,950
D	1,280	1,187	5,000	714	4,998
E	1,200	1,166	5,000	714	4,998
F	1,300	1,208	5,000	714	4,998
Total	6,992	6,397	27,100	3,879	27,156
Total initial conservation reserve participation				3,879	27,156

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Later, two of the tenants placed additional acreage in the conservation reserve program, bringing the total acreage in the program up to 4,338 acres, producing total annual payments of $29,558. The tenants kept these extra payments as part of their profits for participating in this scheme.

Thus we find that the purchase of the farm, the cash-lease arrangements with the six tenants, and the contracts with the Government under the acreage reserve program were all negotiated and signed within an approximate 30-day period and on terms and arrangements which were all negotiated and agreed upon between the prospective buyer and the ASC committee a couple of weeks before the purchase.

I summarize this transaction:

On February 25, 1957, Mr. Tallman bought 6,960 acres of land for $139,200. Within 30 days enough of this same tract of land had been leased to the Government under a scheme whereby Mr. Tallman, as the owner, would collect indirectly from the U.S. Government, over the next 10-year period, $271,000, or $131,800 more than he paid for the entire 6,960-acre ranch. At the end of this 10-year period Mr. Tallman will have $131,800 in cash profit, plus a 6,960-acre ranch, all paid for by the American taxpayers.

By what line of reasoning would the Government ever agree to pay a speculator $70 per acre not to cultivate land which he was buying at $20 per acre?

The question may well be asked, Why did the ASC committee of Kiowa County, Colo., approve any such arrangement wherein the Government would, over a period of 10 years, pay this speculator $70 per acre not to cultivate $20 land?

Perhaps the agreeableness of the county committee can be better understood when we examine the following transaction:

The record shows that in early 1958 the chairman of the ASC committee in Kiowa County, Colo., leased from the same Baughman estate, on a crop-share basis, 1,120 acres of land. On April 24, 1958, this committee chairman signed a contract with the Government agency of which he was a representative wherein he placed 391 acres of this tract in the conservation reserve on terms under which he receives annual payments of $2,740.

It was the same Mr. Wayne E. Tallman, acting as a representative of the landlord—the John W. Baughman Farms Co.—who on April 28, 1958, approved this conservation reserve contract with the unusual proviso that the customary landlord's share of the conservation payments was to be waived, thus allowing the tenant—the chairman of the Kiowa County ASC Committee—to keep 100 percent of the annual $2,740 in conservation reserve payments.

Ordinarily, when land is leased on a crop-share basis, the landlord and the tenant share in the benefits to be derived from the participation in the conservation reserve program and Mr. Orville S. Brown, vice president and general manager of the John W. Baughman Farms Co., confirmed that this was the only instance wherein a crop-share tenant of their company who participated in the conservation reserve program was permitted to retain 100 percent of the annual payment.

The chairman of the Kiowa County committee was not the only representative of the Government that was cut in on this profitable scheme.

It is interesting to note that a similar special arrangement was extended to another Government employee, who had approved the lucrative arrangements of Mr. Tallman's scheme to bypass the $5,000 limitation.

On November 7, 1956, the office manager of the Kit Carson County ASC office had entered into a crop-share lease with the John W. Baughman Farms Co. for 320 acres of land.

On February 5, 1957, this county office manager applied for a 10-year conservation reserve contract with the Government on 300 acres of this same tract.

On March 14, 1957, this employee arranged for the purchase of the 320 acres which he had been leasing plus an additional 160 acres from the Baughman estate for a total price of $10,560.

On May 29, 1957, the ASC committee approved the conservation reserve contract, wherein this employee will receive Government checks under the conservation reserve program over the 10-year period totaling $33,740 cash, or $23,180 more than the total purchase price of the entire 480 acres.

Mr. President, this is a glaring illustration of what can be expected under any program designed to pay a man not to work.

In conclusion, I want to express my appreciation to the Comptroller General and his staff for their cooperation in developing this report.

TOLEDO BLADE PROTESTS FUTILE CIVIL DEFENSE BOMB SHELTER SCHEME

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the city of Toledo, Ohio, like most large American cities, has many problems, but lack of a king-sized community underground bomb shelter is not one of them.

Nevertheless, highly paid officials of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization apparently just could not rest at night thinking of Toledo, Ohio, mercilessly exposed without a bomb shelter.

They were so worried, they decided to waste $20,000 to $25,000 of taxpayers' hard-earned money to give the citizens of Toledo a bomb shelter they could call their own.

This shelter is to be built under the county courthouse in Toledo and will accommodate, I am informed, 4,000 persons.

Mr. President, deeply touched as I am by the concern civil defense officials show for Toledo citizens, I must protest the foolishness, waste, and outright absurdity of this scheme.

This is typical of the operations of our boondoggling Civil Defense Agency. Indeed, Mr. President, I would not be at all surprised if, after completing this ridiculous bomb shelter, the Civil Defense Agency immediately distributed a mass evacuation plan for Toledo residents in event of enemy attack.

Americans will wonder if civil defense officials would have them run, or hide—or both.

In a perceptive editorial in its edition of Monday, February 20, 1961, the Toledo Blade, one of Ohio's greatest newspapers, finds it highly debatable that the proposed shelter would do any good in a nuclear or biological attack.

The editorial wisely points out that a thermonuclear attack would completely destroy underground shelters in basements and backyards; further, that there is strong doubt anyone would be safe in a bomb shelter if the attack were biological in nature. Ventilating systems would simply draw the deadly air into shelters.

Mr. President, I fully agree with the conclusions of this excellent editorial in the Toledo Blade.

The facts which it makes crystal clear are either unknown to, or ignored by, officials of the useless civil defense agency, who seems to feel that, as long as there is money authorized or appropriated, it must be spent, no matter how foolishly and wastefully.

The conditions of modern warfare make both evacuation and shelter programs for civilians of little use in saving American lives.

Enemy submarines off our coasts could hurl rockets with nuclear warheads 1,500 miles inland with accuracy. We would be lucky to have 3 minutes warn-

ing. Intercontinental ballistic missiles fired from within the Soviet Union would arrive in 15 to 18 minutes, less time than it takes most of us to get home at night through city traffic. These facts render evacuation patently absurd and unthinkable.

Shelters are as futile. Those in target areas would be crushed, their occupants charred and suffocated by the blast and heat. The few survivors of a major attack would emerge into a world of total, incomprehensible chaos and polluted atmosphere.

Significantly, Mr. President, I know of no civil defense official in Ohio who has himself taken the trouble to build a shelter.

Yet these high-salaried civil defense officials continue to try to stampede Americans into a mass shelter program. They persist in throwing money down the drain on senseless schemes such as that now proposed for the city of Toledo.

I am proud that one of Ohio's great newspapers, the Toledo Blade, recognizes the futility of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and its preposterous plans.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Toledo Blade editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Toledo Blade, Feb. 20, 1961]

ATTENTION SENATOR YOUNG

County commissioners can't be blamed, we suppose, for going along with James Ault's fancy plan for a $20,000-plus bomb shelter under the county courthouse that will accommodate up to 4,000 persons or so. As long as the Federal Government is shelling out the money, the net cost to the county should be nil.

Just what good the shelter would do in event of a real attack on this city is highly debatable. Under optimum conditions, only a few minutes' warning—perhaps no more than 3—would be received that an attack is on the way. And during that brief, panic-filled period, the chances are slim indeed that anyone outside the courthouse would have time to get to the shelter anyway.

Certainly, once even the smallest kind of nuclear bomb—say, the type that obliterated so much of Hiroshima or Nagasaki—is exploded over Toledo, it would be too late to try to find the courthouse, let alone Mr. Ault's basement shelter.

As was pointed out in the Senate recently by Senator YOUNG, conditions of modern warfare make shelters of little or no use in saving lives. For if a city were to be hit by an intercontinental ballistic missile with a hydrogen warhead, the total destruction and remaining radioactive elements would be such that underground shelters in basements and backyards would offer little protection. Or if the missile carried a biological or chemical warhead, as we pointed out last week, there is doubt it would be best to be underground in the first place, where the ventilating system would draw noxious elements straight into the shelter.

Still, when Uncle Sam holds out the $20,000 to $25,000 this shelter is estimated to cost, there is a great temptation to take it on the theory that if Toledo doesn't grab it, someone else will. This is one of the discouraging aspects of the entire civil defense program that now drains some $120,000 a day from Federal funds and an equal amount from State and local revenues—with most of it going for salaries and expenses.

Toledo can obviously use any $25,000 it can get from the Government. Only with conditions as they are these days, it's too bad this much has to wind up in concrete and fixtures in the courthouse basement.

A FIVE-POINT PROGRAM FOR STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United Nations, during its 15-year lifetime, has made an effective contribution to the cause of peace. Working through its agencies, the U.N., in many instances, has spelled the difference between peace and war.

However, the changing events, forces, and influences, the lessons of experience, the opening doors of new opportunity and responsibility—all these, and other factors, warrant—in fact, demand—strong efforts to further improve the international machinery of peace.

To enable the U.N. to operate more effectively, I recently made the following recommendations which, in my humble judgment, should be carefully and thoughtfully explored:

First. Formation of World Resources Board to study human need globally, and make recommendations for better utilizing the human, agricultural, industrial, and technological resources of the world for serving mankind.

Second. Establishment of a monitoring board to curb aggression by propaganda among politically differing nations.

Third. Creation of a Peace Council to objectively study—according to basic research principles: (1) The cause and cure of wars; (2) the accommodation of differing social, political, economic ideas among nations; and (3) generally explore for ways to further improve man's relationship to man.

Fourth. Creation of a subagency of the Security Council—similar to that in U.S. courts—to serve as a clearinghouse for charges, particularly to "weed out" false ones, among nations.

Fifth. Establishing a U.N. police force to carry out the peace missions of this international agency.

As time and events confront us with new facts of life, then new efforts are needed to cope with them.

In a fast-changing age, the U.N.—the world's best hope of peace—cannot be a static agency; rather, efforts are needed to keep it up to date to meet the newly emerging challenges of the times.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK McCULLOCH

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. John Herling has written a most illuminating article concerning the new Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Frank McCulloch.

The article, which appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 16, is an excellent review of Mr. McCulloch's background as it has helped to shape his philosophy toward important matters with which he will now be called to deal in a position of great responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Herling's article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FINE APPOINTMENT

(By John Herling)

The trouble with talking about Frank McCulloch, just named Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board by President Kennedy, is that one naturally talks about him in superlatives. Talk of that sort is dangerous because, you tell yourself, nobody can be that good. So you wait around awhile expecting that a knowledgeable chap—a veritable wise guy—would come along and triumphantly point out some flaws in this man.

Frank McCulloch was plunging ahead along new frontiers many years before the New Frontier itself was officially proclaimed by Jack Kennedy. Even when the country acted fat, sassy, smug in the late twenties, the young McCulloch had begun to have his doubts about the old terrain. Such doubts were partly inherited, partly environmental. Brought up in Evanston, the well-known suburb of Chicago, he went on to Williams College from which he recovered by taking the 3-year course at Harvard Law School. Right after leaving in 1929, he, like so many others, was caught up in the iron embrace of the depression.

Unemployment in Chicago seemed somehow to have an especially bitter quality. Dubbed hog butcher of the world, Chicago was a maneater as well. Unemployment seemed colder, wetter, nastier, more voracious in Chicago. Frank McCulloch did not personally suffer the deprivation of unemployment or of economic insecurity. He never felt the wet through holes in his shoes. But it didn't take him long to see that life presented a social agenda of challenging proportions. He helped develop legislative and organizational programs for the unemployed.

Simply put, Frank McCulloch had, and has, a sense of mission. He became convinced early that social justice was basic to a sensible society. The world was out of joint. He believed the grabs and clutches of an acquisitive society could only be coped with by countervailing organizations of various kinds. This led him to encourage trade union organizations as a prerequisite to equality with management in collective bargaining. From the first what distinguished him was kindliness accompanied by an implacable determination to use his head. He would have liked to think that men were better than they are, but he was not discouraged because they were not.

Through the thirties, and in the forties, he became widely known as a lawyer, a community leader, and an educator. He was industrial relations secretary of the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Church. During World War II, he was public member of the regional War Labor Board. He became the head of the labor education division of Roosevelt University. He attended a thousand committee meetings.

Then, in 1949, when the almost incredible happened and PAUL DOUGLAS was elected Senator from Illinois, Mr. McCulloch became his administrative assistant. For 12 years, Mr. McCulloch has worked with one of the country's great Senators. He has gained a uniquely intimate and practical knowledge of labor relations, of our economic system, and of their impact on people. He understands the nature of legislative intent. He has never trimmed on his principles, never belittled the lessons of the past.

Now he moves to a new and important post, a dedicated, seasoned, courageous public servant. President Kennedy could not have made an appointment more promising.

TRIBUTES TO TENNESSEE CITIZENS APPOINTED TO HIGH POSITIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Tennessee is proud that a number of its citizens, both native and adopted, have been appointed to high positions in the new administration.

This pride is reflected by a number of editorials appearing in the newspapers of my State. An excellent example is an editorial from the Cookeville Citizen, whose editor and publisher is Mr. Coleman A. Harwell.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR HIGH APPOINTEES CHEERED BY TENNESSEE

Four recent appointments of President Kennedy have special significance for Tennessee.

They are Rand Dixon as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission; Joseph Swidler as chairman of the Federal Power Commission; Brooks Hays as Assistant Secretary of State for congressional relations; Aubrey J. Wagner as a member of the board of TVA.

Dixon's major public recognition has come as counsel to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. In that capacity he has won the respect and the gratitude of the whole Nation.

He has wisely said, "There is nothing more dangerous to democracy than monopoly, nothing more important than competition."

In the clamor of selfish interests and political foes to discredit the leadership of Senator KEFAUVER, Dixon has been a stanch and wise aid. He has made clear by assembled facts that the Nation's economy is endangered by big combines rigging prices. He has also shown how the individual consumer has been victimized.

Senator KEFAUVER was fully justified in sponsoring his appointment to the important FTC post. The people of Tennessee will be proud of his work in the future as it has been in the past. Interestingly, he follows in the footsteps of another distinguished Tennessean, Ewin L. Davis, who gave him his first job in Washington.

Joseph Swidler was one of the important men in the development of TVA when he served as its General Counsel. It was a matter of regret when he left the Authority to take up private practice of law; now it is gratifying to know that his knowledge and experience will be put to use again in the wide field of power policy, which will have important relation to TVA's future.

Brooks Hays, though but recently a resident of Tennessee, where he came to serve as a TVA board member, has had important past relationships in the State. As president of the Southern Baptist Convention he spent much time in Nashville and throughout the State; as a trustee of Peabody College, he was influential in the field of teacher training.

Hays will be effective in the key position of "ambassador" of the State Department to Congress. His skill and wisdom will be usefully employed in building understanding between the two on vital matters of foreign relations.

President Kennedy wisely advanced the General Manager of TVA to the board. This was the same procedure adopted in case of Gordon Clapp, who was one of the great influences in creating TVA's character and usefulness. Aubrey Wagner, as did Clapp, started with TVA almost at its inception; he has come through every stage of its development to reach its highest administrative post.

His appointment to the policy position was fitting recognition, it was also assurance of continued vigor and service by TVA.

People of the valley will be especially happy to know of President Kennedy's plans to use the great story of TVA as a beacon light of freedom for all the world to observe. Too often in the past, it has seemed that those in high places sought to hide it under a bushel of doubt and distortion.

These four appointments emphasize for Tennessee that President Kennedy has assembled an executive group of demonstrated ability to share and perform duties of his administration.

THOMAS STARR KING

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday I had the honor of participating in a ceremony in Statuary Hall commemorating clergyman, patriot, humanitarian, and naturalist Thomas Starr King, of California.

This ceremony, under the auspices of the Grand Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons of California commemorated the historic efforts of Reverend King, himself a member of the Masonic order, to keep our State in the Union a century ago.

Few people today realize how close California was to joining the South in 1861. I cite, as an example of the sentiment of the State at that time, these interesting statistics. In the 1860 presidential election, Abraham Lincoln received 38,734 votes in California. The votes for the other candidates were: Douglas, 38,023; Breckenridge, 33,975; Bell, 9,136. In other words, because of the divided vote, Lincoln carried the State. But he polled only three votes out of every eight. However, 100 years ago Reverend King delivered his first speech in his crusade to keep California in the Union. And, because of his efforts, California did remain in the Union.

Thomas Starr King was a remarkable man. As pastor of the First Unitarian Society of San Francisco, he was one of the great clergymen of the West. He was also an explorer and naturalist of the first order. He was among the first to call attention to the beauties of Yosemite Valley. And today, in his honor, there is a mountain named Starr King in the Yosemite National Park. I might add that there is also a peak in the White Mountains of New Hampshire in honor of Reverend King's exploits and writing in that region.

During the Civil War, Reverend King made another remarkable contribution. He spearheaded the drive for a sanitary commission, the precursor of the Red Cross. In fact, primarily because of his work, California contributed $1,233,831.31 to the commission. This total was more than one-fourth of the entire amount collected in the United States.

Selected as one of two whom California has honored in Statuary Hall, Thomas Starr King is revered in our memory as a dedicated and courageous Christian cleric who saved California for the Union. And from California came much of the strength and the sinews which preserved our country through the dark and bloody internecine conflict 100 years ago.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR UNDER THE COAL RESEARCH ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of law, on February 15 the Secretary of the Interior submitted his report on the first year's operations authorized by Public Law 86–599. That act, to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research as a means of improving the economic position of the coal industry and, to this end, it instructs the Secretary to establish an Office of Coal Research in the Department.

This law provides for a coal research and development program which, if it is adequately financed and vigorously conducted, will substantially improve the economic position of the coal-mining industry at large and prove highly beneficial to coal consumers, coal-mine workers, distressed coal-mining communities, and the general public.

As stated in the favorable report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that was presented for the committee by the able junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the opportunities for developing new and more effective uses for coal through research are virtually unlimited. However, within the coal-mining industry only the largest producers have the means to conduct coal utilization research on an effective scale. Yet about 90 percent of the almost 5,000 producers of bituminous, lignite, and anthracite coal are small and medium-sized operators.

Mr. President, this type of coal research will be highly useful to the coal-mine operators throughout the country. It is no secret that the coal-mining regions constitute some of the most depressed areas in the Nation. I am confident that this program can substantially strengthen coal operations and improve the economic conditions of the communities where they are located. We have good cause to hope that this program can be a principal means of permanent improvement of the coal industry. It is encouraging that Secretary Udall states that he expects to begin processing research proposals by July 1, 1961.

For the full information of the Senators and the many persons concerned in the coal industry and the coal-mining communities, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Secretary of the Interior be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 7 of Public Law 86–599, "An act to encourage and

stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research, and for other purposes," requires the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the President and the Congress, on or before February 15 of each year, beginning with the year 1961, a comprehensive report concerning activities under the authority of this act. This letter constitutes the first of such reports.

Public Law 86–599 stems from hearings held in 1956 and 1957 by the Special Subcommittee on Coal Research of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The report that followed (H. Rept. No. 1263, 85th Cong., Aug. 27, 1957) recommended a program "of improving the economic position of the coal industry through research, with adequate provision of Federal funds to encourage State and institutional programs in this field. * * *" The act itself instructs the Secretary of the Interior to establish an Office of Coal Research in the Department, and through it to conduct a program of research aimed at developing "new and more efficient methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal." The legislative history indicates that the reason for seeking "new and more efficient methods" is to get more coal used so that miners and other coal workers can be returned to work and distressed coal-mining communities returned to health. The program has in it the seeds of a significant contribution to the economy and welfare of the country.

The Office of Coal Research is to "contract for, sponsor, cosponsor, and promote the coordination of [coal] research," and is to deal with any recognized interested group having suitable personnel and equipment. All results, including patents, must be made available to the general public, except as the Secretary of the Interior may find the withholding of such information necessary in the interest of national defense.

Public Law 86–599 was approved on July 7, 1960, and the Department promptly set to work on administrative details attending creation of a new organization and its operation. The first decision was to establish the Office of Coal Research in the Office of the Secretary in order to make it possible to hit hard at the short-range contract-research program without conflicting with the coal research program of the Bureau of Mines, while at the same time providing for coordination of the two in order to get a unified national coal research program.

An organization structure for the Office has been developed. We are setting up criteria for the submission of research proposals and are developing basic provisions for contracts.

Section 2(3) of the act specifies that technical advisory committees shall be established whose function it will be to assist in the examination and evaluation of research progress and of all research proposals and contracts. These committees are to be composed of recognized experts in various aspects of coal research. After consultation with many persons and organizations in and acquainted with the coal industry, and after careful scrutiny of the many names suggested, in December 1960—following invitations to serve made in October—the then Secretary of the Interior appointed a General Technical Advisory Committee composed of 14 outstanding persons. These include four executives from the coal-producing industry, five representing consumer segments (chemical companies, electric utilities, railroads, and retailers), one equipment manufacturer, two university officials, a representative of the United Mine Workers of America, and a representative of the trade associations. The full composition of the committee is as follows:

Dr. Maurice H. Bigelow, technical director, Plastics and Coal Chemicals Division, Allied Chemical Corp.; Dr. H. B. Charmbury, head, department of mineral preparation, Pennsylvania State University; Mr. F. S. Elfred, chairman of the board, Peabody Coal Co.; Mr. J. D. Jillson, president, Anthracite Institute; Mr. Harry LaViers, president, South-East Coal Co.; Mr. Samuel Lenher, vice president, research and development, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.; Mr. R. E. Salvati, president, Island Creek Coal Co.; Mr. S. T. Saunders, president, the Norfolk & Western Railway; Mr. Walter K. Scherer, president, Fred Scherer, Inc.; Mr. G. A. Shoemaker, president, Consolidation Coal Co.; Dr. G. R. Spindler, dean, School of Mines, West Virginia University; Mr. Philip Sporn, president, American Electric Power Co., Inc.; Mr. W. L. Wearly, president, Joy Manufacturing Co.; Mr. Michael F. Widman, Jr., director of marketing and research, United Mine Workers of America.

Applications for staffing the office of coal research are being received and are being screened. An Acting Director was appointed in December 1960, when technical guidance became necessary. Further selection and appointment of staff is being deferred until a permanent Director is appointed. The selection and appointment of a Director and of key staff members is the most pressing and critical problem. The program may succeed or fail in proportion as these men are suited to its challenge. Extra time spent now in selecting them will, I feel, show up in results later. The outgoing Secretary of the Interior believed it proper to permit the new administration to select the Director of the Office of Coal Research, and he in turn to select his key staff.

We hope to announce the appointment of a Director in the near future and to be able to begin processing research proposals and to enter into contracts by July 1, 1961.

Public Law 86–599 authorized $2 million to remain available until spent, to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. The act, as mentioned above, was approved on July 7, 1960; in August the administration included in a supplemental appropriation request an item of $1 million for the Office of Coal Research to carry out the purpose of the act, and Congress appropriated this amount on September 8. We are asking for an appropriation of $1 million for the coming fiscal year. If granted, this would provide a total of a little less than $2 million for operations during that year.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MOSS subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The attempts of those interested in seeing the coal industry improve its position through an expanded program of research has had to jump two big hurdles—a presidential veto, and then the inaction of the outgoing administration.

The bill which the Congress passed in 1959 provided for a separate agency to conduct a coal research program. We who advocated this were fully aware of the long-range program then conducted by the Bureau of Mines, but we feared that that agency would not attack the current problem with the necessary vigor. Using the argument of duplication of effort, President Eisenhower vetoed that first bill.

In 1960 we passed a coal research program bill suitable to President Eisenhower, but the program was not started. The imminence of a change in administration was given as the reason, and another year slipped away.

It is good to know that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, is now completing a staff for coal research in the Department of the Interior.

Not only is coal vital as an economic factor in my State, and in many States of the Union, but it is a basic resource that should be utilized fully for our national defense and our country. I am pleased indeed to see us moving forward in this very basic field.

PRESERVING THE WILDERNESS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is a growing awareness across the Nation of the need to act now if the primitive, far-from-the-highway areas of our public domain are to be shielded from encroachments that would destroy their true scientific, scenic, and recreational value. The pressures are increasing to intrude the sounds, smells, and signs of our mechanized age into these places reserved for the many among us who seek a tranquil, yet rugged, experience.

At 10 a.m., on February 27 and 28, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will hold public hearings on S. 174, the wilderness bill, which I introduced January 5. I hope the hearings will be brief, because the need for such legislation has been clearly demonstrated over the past 5 years, when extensive hearings were held here in Washington, D.C., and elsewhere. The distinguished assistant majority leader has been a moving spirit in this effort. The President is very much interested in this legislation. As the Washington Post and Times Herald pointed out yesterday, we have ample safeguards in S. 174 for cattlemen and other interests. I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post and Times Herald editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point, and also one from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

PRESERVING THE WILDERNESS

Each year more people, more houses, and more industry encroach on the remaining open land in the United States. Only diligent conservation will preserve for future generations the wilderness areas which were the mark of frontier America and which are an important part of the Nation's patrimony. Once again Congress has a chance, at very little cost to the taxpayer, to secure this heritage of forest, river, and wildlife by a speedy enactment of the national wilderness protection bill, now reintroduced by Senator ANDERSON.

As Mr. ANDERSON noted in presenting the measure, it has been 5 years since the first wilderness bill was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY; through two Congresses and four printed volumes of testimony the Committee

on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered such a bill. "Objections, eliminations, and the inclusion of various special provisions." There should be no responsible opposition to the Senator's new bill.

The measure is not a sweeping change. It envisages no reorganization of present land agencies; no new bureaus would be created. It merely sets aside certain wilderness areas, "unspoiled by manmade changes," in perpetuity. There are ample safeguards for cattle grazing and industrial interests and provision for periodic review of the wilderness tracts.

Indeed, all the lands that could be dedicated to wilderness use and protection are already within established national forests, parks, or refuges. They make up only 5 percent of the Federal lands. This bill is, in reality, only the beginning of what is needed for the future, but it is the necessary first step. Unless lawmakers act soon, much of the opportunity for preservation of these natural havens and retreats will be forever lost.

[From the New York Times]

KENNEDY ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The bright promise of leadership exercised by President John F. Kennedy has been taking shape in the brief month since he was inaugurated; and few things he has said or done during these crowded weeks have more clearly revealed his breadth of vision in dealing with a major national policy question than his message to Congress yesterday on the coming crisis in the conservation and development of America's natural resources. What he said about each of the separate resource problems was very much to the point, but the fact that the President grouped them in a coherent whole is what gave especial distinction to his treatment of this subject. His message showed him to be aware of the intolerable conflicts, duplications, and rivalries that have for many years plagued the Federal Government's natural resource activities—he even listed some (but by no means all) of these conflicts—and he raises the hope that consistent policies based on the national welfare, and not on specific vested interests, will be established in these fields.

The most serious criticism we have of the broad policy statements in his message is that he led up to, but did not follow through with, a proposal that the natural resource functions of the Federal Government be grouped in one department, where they belong, instead of being scattered in innumerable separate little empires. But he did propose some executive and budgetary steps that should help to relieve, if not cure, this fundamental difficulty. A major reorganization in this area is an inescapable necessity. Meanwhile, the innovations he proposes in respect to coordinated direction, expert advice, scientific research, and budgetary controls, all make sense.

If the President is inclined to be more enthusiastic than some of us are about big hydroelectric dam and giant flood control projects, he also laid welcome stress on less dramatic aspects of water control, such as flood plain zoning and small watershed development.

His forest policy recognizes the serious danger of timber shortages, despite optimistic statistics that have been put forth in recent years, suggesting that all's well with our forest situation. The President's comments on "a program of balanced usage" for the public domain are sound; and we warmly welcome his endorsement of the pending wilderness protection bill, and of proposed new park areas. These recommendations will, we hope, be followed up by speedy action in a Congress moving under the leadership that Mr. Kennedy seems intent on giving it.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the tributes that mark the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia, which is celebrated this year on February 24.

The courageous people of Estonia have steadfastly maintained their hope for freedom and independence despite hundreds of years of suppression under Russian rulers. Then on February 24, 1918, they established the Estonian Republic and proclaimed their independence.

One of the smallest nationality groups in Europe, the people of Estonia were permitted to enjoy their independence for only two decades. In July 1940 their tiny country was overrun and annexed by the Soviet Union, and they have since been sealed off from the rest of the world behind the Iron Curtain. But Communist regimentation and oppression have not succeeded in stamping out the flame of freedom, which continues to burn in this unfortunate land. The Estonian people continue to pray for their deliverance and freedom. On this anniversary I am happy to join with Americans of Estonian descent in their hopes that their distressed kinsmen will one day regain their independence.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted today to join in commemorating the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Estonian people. It is only fitting that we pause a moment to do homage today to these brave peoples, who are at the moment, the slaves of Communist tyranny.

During their modern history, the Estonian people enjoyed freedom and independence for a period of only about two decades. These years of liberty were the happiest time in their national life. The stouthearted and industrious Estonian people, living in their historic homeland in the Baltic, had been enduring the insufferable yoke of Rusia's czarist regime for more than 200 years when the First World War began. In that war they saw their chance for freedom. Their golden opportunity came when the czarist regime was crushed by the Russian revolution. The Estonians felt free to take decisive action, and on February 24, 1918, proclaimed their national independence.

That historic event ushered in a new era. In the newly found Estonian Republic they lived and worked under their democratic institutions. All these were their own creation; the Estonians were justly proud of them, and worked hard to safeguard them. For two decades they were happy. Then came the Second World War, and with it the Red army. By mid-1940 Estonia was overrun and occupied. The small country was incorporated into the Soviet Union, thus putting an end to the free Estonian Republic.

Since then, the Estonians have not been free in their homeland. Instead, they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Today, they live in misery, but continue devoutly to pray for their deliverance. We echo their genuine sentiments on the anniversary of their independence day and hope that some day they will again attain their freedom.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION NEEDED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Republican leadership for its announced determination to include civil rights legislation as one of the "must" elements of the legislative program to be added to the 16 items specified by President Kennedy. I would hope also that my own leadership may permit such vital measures as the right of the Attorney General to sue in representative civil rights cases to be added to our program.

The embarrassment which an American community like Lynchburg, Va., must feel in the eyes of the country this morning resulting from the action of a court there in jailing a 16-year-old child because she took part in a sit-in demonstration in a drugstore emphasizes the urgency of this civil rights program. For, sit ins are the result of the frustration of individual Negroes in the rate of progress in their getting equal opportunity.

As a lawyer I accept, of course, the court's decision without comment. I can, however, express the hope that this case will go up on appeal to the highest court in the land if necessary.

I must also register my protest against the Kennedy administration's failure to include civil rights in the President's "must" legislative program at this session of the Congress.

We need additional antidiscrimination laws. I disagree strongly with the view that Executive orders alone can do the job. Executive orders may be effective in certain areas such as housing or airports where federally backed, but they are clearly inadequate to deal with discrimination in jobs and in education.

The positive statement on civil rights adopted by the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church at its meeting yesterday is highly commendable. The council has taken forthright action in urging President Kennedy to issue an Executive order ending discrimination in housing.

Executive action is also essential to end discrimination practices at airport facilities.

The longer we delay in eliminating these and other discriminatory practices, the more difficult the task becomes. Civil rights legislation, in addition to Executive action, is urgently needed now.

I am delighted that the minority leader, on behalf of my party, is going to push it. I pledge my full support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times entitled "Copper Sun, Scarlet Sea, What Is Africa to Me," written by James Reston.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COPPER SUN, SCARLET SEA, WHAT IS AFRICA TO ME

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—When American Negroes stage a pitched battle against

the United Nations in the galleries of the world organization, and parade through the streets of New York shouting "Congo, Yes. Yankee, No," it is obvious that something is seriously wrong.

Moreover, when this fist swinging goes out to the Nation over the television circuits, the viewers are entitled to some kind of explanation.

The easy explanation is that the demonstration was Communist inspired. Within 24 hours of the assassination of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo, the Communists were able to fire up attacks on the Belgians, the United Nations, and the United States everywhere from Moscow and Warsaw to Cairo and Washington, and no doubt there was some Communist inspiration behind the flareup in the U.N.

The full explanation, however, is more complex than that. Despite startling progress in many areas, the American Negro is still living under the most appalling conditions in many cities, and suffering indignities which his rising knowledge of the world will not permit him to accept.

In addition, at least the young intelligent American Negro is beginning to feel part of a larger struggle in which the Nation's ideals are proclaimed to the world but denied to many of his own race at home. The rise of black Africa has arrested his attention and added to his frustrations. More than is generally realized, he has been identifying the battle for freedom in Africa with his own struggle for equality within the United States.

Accordingly, the murder of a prominent Negro in the Congo arouses emotions among American Negroes now that would not have been aroused to the same extent before Africa was so much in the news.

THE NEW RACISM

There is, too, in America today not only an anti-Negro racism but an antiwhite racism led by a small but increasingly powerful sect of black Moslems and by other less extreme organizations backing African freedom movements.

These are not Communist sects, but some of them are putting their race ahead of the Nation to the detriment of both, and, as usual, the Communists are trying to provoke their frustrations and use them for their own purposes.

The irony and tragedy of this is that the main hope for the liberation and freedom of the Congo lies with the United Nations, which the Negro extremists are attacking.

There is no way to avoid the cold war, or civil war or even a major war in central Africa unless the United Nations is left in the Congo to guide the transition to responsibility and independence. Yet the demonstrations are apparently designed to weaken the U.N. at the moment it is needed the most.

The dangers of these demonstrations for the American Negro at home are less dramatic but nevertheless significant. Rightly or wrongly, these pictures on the television of American Negroes battling in the galleries of the U.N. in the middle of Adlai E. Stevenson's speech are open to the interpretation that the demonstrators are more concerned about the Congo than about America.

This is, of course, a fantastically false impression, but it is not difficult to imagine how any suggestion of race before country would be used by anti-Negro racists to slow down the whole process toward racial desegregation in the United States.

THE DECLINING CONTROLS

Thus the battle of the galleries yesterday, if it has done nothing else, has alerted Washington once more to the consequences of frustration in the Negro community. Strange things are happening in the teeming Negro ghettoes of the northern cities. Social controls that worked for generations are no longer working.

For example, the northern Negro no longer fears going to jail for racial demonstrations. Particularly the young intellectuals among them, who are spearheading the battle for equality, regard a jail sentence as a badge of honor, and many of them are as willing to go behind bars for the Congo as for decent housing in Chicago.

In short, we are beginning to see a confluence of the world struggle for freedom in black Africa and the struggle for equal rights in the Negro communities of America. No longer is the American Negro asking, as Countee Cullen did 35 years ago, "Copper sun, scarlet sea, what is Africa to me?"

This is an event of momentous importance, and officials here are just beginning to realize that even their foreign policy will be affected if the causes of these Negro frustrations are not dealt with more effectively.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to join in the sentiments which our friend from New York has uttered with respect to the leadership the able minority leader continues to give to the cause of civil rights legislation in this historic Chamber.

We would not have had any civil rights legislation, in the last session, Mr. President, had it not been for the indefatigable labors of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], aided ably by my friend from New York and other Senators on this side of the aisle, who fought the good fight for equal treatment under law, and who will continue to do so.

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL UNION 223 OF THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution submitted to me by Mr. Joseph H. Alleva, president of Local Union 223 of the New York State Department of Labor Employees. This resolution calls upon the Congress to enact a medical care for the aged program financed under the social security system.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL UNION 223.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: At the last regular membership meeting of this local union, held on February 21, 1961, I was directed to forward the following adopted resolution to you:

Whereas there are 16 million persons in the United States aged 65 or older and millions of these are unable to obtain and pay for adequate medical care; and

Whereas the continued expansion of this segment of our population, coupled with the continued increases in the cost of medical care, will intensify this crucial national problem in the future; and

Whereas we in this union of civil servants firmly believe that the Federal Government should take immediate steps to satisfy this need through a method not involving the means test, which we hold to be repugnant, undemocratic, and an invasion of the rights of the individual: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to immediately establish a system of prepaid medical care for the aged, using the social security mechanism as the means of raising the necessary funds.

Your kind consideration of this important problem would be most appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. ALLEVA,
President.

THE FIRST MEXICAN-AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the first Interparliamentary Conference between Mexico and the United States took place earlier this month. The meetings were held in the city of Guadalajara, capital of the State of Jalisco and the second largest city in Mexico.

It is difficult to speak too highly of the warmth, the cordiality, and the generosity of the hospitality of our Mexican hosts. Moreover, the meeting was highly productive in both the frankness and friendliness in which the problems of these two neighboring nations were presented. Throughout, an atmosphere of utmost good will and harmony prevailed. The entire delegation was led by our distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, whose performance throughout exhibited the high quality of leadership of which we know him to be capable and deeply appealed to our Mexican friends.

The Senate delegation consisted of JOHN BUTLER, DENNIS CHAVEZ, CARL CURTIS, CLAIR ENGLE, ALBERT GORE, BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, MIKE MANSFIELD, EUGENE MCCARTHY, CLAIBORNE PELL, ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, and myself.

The House delegation, headed by Representative SAUND of California, consisted of: JOEL BROYHILL, EDWARD DERWINSKI, DANIEL INOUYE, HARRIS MCDOWELL, JOSEPH MONTOYA, ANCHER NELSEN, ROBERT NIX, WALTER NORBLAD, J. T. RUTHERFORD, and WILLIAM SPRINGER.

On the closing night—Thursday, February 10—we were received by the Legislature of the State of Jalisco and we were addressed and welcomed by Deputy Guillermo Cosio Vidaurri, whose closing paragraphs embodied the spirit that governed the conference. Reply was made to him by our able colleague, Senator ALBERT GORE, whose eloquent address elicited prolonged applause and universally favorable comment.

I ask unanimous consent that the closing paragraphs of Deputy Vidaurri's address, and the entire text of Senator GORE's reply, which was the closing event of the conference, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF REMARKS BY DEPUTY GUILLERMO COSIO VIDAURRI, JALISCO STATE LEGISLATURE

As natives of Jalisco, as Mexicans, as members of the international community, we view with great pleasure the arrival of a new era, an era in which international relations must be oriented toward the attainment of this objective; and you, honorable legislators and illustrious visitors, those of you who attend this first Mexico-United States parliamentary meeting, are the ones

who are laying the foundations for the great structure America demands, because the problems of Mexico are not exclusive to this country, but extensive to all the countries of this continent.

It is truly stimulating to see that, while in other areas of the earth there is tension and insecurity, in this city, which in Juarez's time was the site of the supreme powers of the nation, legislators of two neighboring countries have met in a friendly spirit, in order to find, through an interchange of ideas, concepts and experiences, formulas for coexistence through which greater understanding, friendship, and cooperation may be achieved between two countries with a common destiny and common interests.

We are confident that through this direct contact between men who in some manner or other are engaged in the government of their respective countries, successful formulas will be found, formulas which may be permanent and definite in international relations; for this reason, we are happy that the doctrines of Lincoln and of Juarez, great figures in the history of our two nations, have oriented your thoughts and your works, since these visionary doctrines are still good in this era when man is desperately trying to attain justice as the supreme value which will enable him to find universal happiness.

As lovers of peace, as great admirers of the democratic system, we congratulate ourselves on the fact that this first Mexico-United States parliamentary meeting took place, because we are certain that from the cordial and sincere talks held between the legislators of both countries, the ties of friendship which unite us will be strengthened, we shall emerge with a better understanding toward the problems of Mexico and of Latin America, and continental solidarity will be reinforced, since there is no other means to attain universal peace.

Because America, as President Lopez Mateos has said, "is the continent of human liberties," it must also be the impregnable fortress of democracy, where justice can take a firm stand, for as long as these values remain constant, democracy exists, and where the sun of justice shines, there you will find liberty.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ALBERT GORE TO THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF JALISCO

This solemn session of the Legislature of the State of Jalisco bestows upon the U.S. delegation a signal honor. On behalf of the U.S. delegation, I thank you, and tell you that this honor, together with the cordiality, friendliness, and hospitality we have received from one and all since arriving at Guadalajara, has generated within each of us, not only deep gratitude, but a burning pride in the goodwill, the strength, and high qualities of our Mexican friends and neighbors.

The first meeting of the Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Conference has now concluded, and by all is hailed as a success. A successful international conference is always a step in the right direction, but, in our distraught times, it is a matter of particular significance.

Having attended several unsuccessful international conferences, I have undertaken to contemplate the reasons for the success of this one, and how it differed from others. To begin with, there was a total absence of suspicion and distrust. There were no fears, no tension.

As a Senate adviser delegate for the past 2 years, I have been several times at the conference table in Geneva with the Russians on the subject of atomic weapons tests, and also, the conference on surprise attack. There every phrase was studied for hidden meanings.

Here there have been no hidden meanings; instead, there was mutual respect and trust.

Moreover, neither you nor we have talked in riddles.

This leads me to observe that another reason for our success, in my opinion, is that we met as practical politicians, and talked the language of politics, a greater facility for the understanding of which we do not concede even to our master Mexican political counterparts.

Politics in its true sense is the art of government. I readily concede that its practice is not always artistic in my country. Even so, it is through the democratic system, of which the practicing politician is an effective agent, that the peoples' will is given expression and their aspirations brought to fruition. Nevertheless, we have in my country sophisticates who deprecate those of us who are engaged in governing a great and multitudinous people and who speak quite disdainfully of politicians. I hope my fellow politicians in Mexico are not troubled with such low evaluation of their service and hence undertake quickly to vault to the status of a statesman. If so, let me remind them that a former predecessor of Senator MANSFIELD as Democratic leader of the Senate and one of our great former Vice Presidents, Alben W. Barkley, once defined a statesman as a dead politician.

It may just be that the road to understanding between our people may be more quickly paved by political leaders who speak and understand the language and sentiments of the people than by diplomats speaking in riddles.

One other reason, I believe, for our successful conference, is that instead of trying to settle all the problems of the world we have hewed to our agenda and have discussed the problems on which we met to review. As a result, we better understand you and your problems and we hope and believe you have gained a better understanding of us and our many difficulties.

An understanding of a problem, whether it be national or international, is a prerequisite to its solution.

It would be erroneous to conclude, because our discussions here have been confined to the more acute bilateral questions concerning the United States and Mexico, that the problems of peace and security of our Western Hemisphere and of the world have been out of our hearts. Indeed no.

You recognize us, I am confident, as heirs of a successful revolution against colonialism. We recognize you as heirs of a revolution against oppressive dictatorship and unconscionable exploitation of the people and the resources of Mexico. The people of both our countries have achieved a unique, distinctive culture and way of life. Both of our people have advanced in the art of self-government to a state through which the traditional aims and ends of true popular revolution can be achieved by political reforms generated by the will of the people and mandated on election days in the ballots of free men and women.

What you have achieved in Mexico is rightly the source of intense patriotic pride. The Mexican leader, the Mexican citizen, the Mexican product, the Mexican artist, has attained and is attaining world renown.

We rejoice with you in your traditional love of home, family, and country; your devotion to the dignity and freedom of man; your constant search for justice in individual matters as well as in social causes; your respect of the principles of equality and the consent of those governed as a necessary basis for a society of self-government by freemen.

It is my belief that the people of the United States are sincerely and deeply motivated by good will toward you and toward all mankind.

We wish to be associated with a better life for all people everywhere. Our own way of life is under constant change and improvement. We welcome change for the better in all nations.

But we are aware that all that glitters is not gold. A reform which brings misery instead of improvement to the people is a failure. A revolution which brings dictatorship, oppression, and want instead of freedom and improvement to a people is a failure.

In our search for peace and security in this perilous day, let all freemen bear foremost in mind the fundamental tenets by which our forefathers established the orders of freemen. If we are loyal to these precepts, if we maintain trust in each other, have the courage of our convictions and faith in God, peace and security will be ours.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S GREAT MESSAGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, "We reject," said President Kennedy, in his special message on natural resources, "a no new starts policy."

This is a complete reversal, and a most welcome one, of the Eisenhower policies. President Kennedy has formulated a program of action which means that from now on the United States will again move to develop its natural resources as it did under Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and further seek to atone for the omissions of nearly a decade.

Actually, the Kennedy program is more complete than any preceding outline for resource development, and purposes to go further than did his enlightened predecessors. But his policy is conceived in the same great spirit of Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It means that, departing from the stagnation of the past 8 years, we shall not henceforth allow our rivers to continue to run wastefully to the sea. We shall move, through intelligent river basin planning and engineering, to put an end to the destructive and wasteful—and highly costly—alternations of flood and drought. We shall not allow henceforth our water resources of lake and stream to be wasted or polluted, and our soil and forest resources to be depleted through continuing neglect.

The President particularly mentions not only water development and hydro development, the speeding up of saline water conversion and water and air pollution control. Particularly gratifying to Alaskans is his espousal of the rehabilitation of our depleted fisheries. Alaskans and others on the west coast will hail his plea "for rehabilitation of depleted stocks of salmon in the Pacific."

It is a great message, a great program, from a great President.

FORESTRY AND FOREST INDUSTRIES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the January issue of the Atlantic Economic Review, monthly publication of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research of the Georgia State College of Business Administration, featured a penetrating analysis of the future prospects for forestry and forest industries in the

South. Entitled "Are We Planting Too Many Trees?" the article was written by Forester Robert V. Potter, of the USDA Forest Service's Division of State and Private Forestry. Since it answers many of the questions which have been raised by both farmers and economic planners looking to the future development of the South, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE PLANTING TOO MANY TREES?

(By Robert V. Potter)

The southern landscape has changed markedly in the past decade. From the air one no longer sees an unending mass of cultivated fields. The cornstalk is being replaced by the pine tree. And in the midst of this change prophesiers claim that tree farmers will flood the market with southern pines. From other sources we hear that many more trees must be grown if future needs are to be met. Most people, however, aware that the issue is not a simple one, really don't know what to think.

The confusion brought about by the situation needs clarification. In this article an attempt is made to explain the issue by examining (1) reasons why trees are planted; (2) factors which influence market demand for forest products; (3) forecasts of future demand, and (4) sources of supply of forest products. Armed with this information, the reader will be better prepared to judge for himself whether too many trees are being planted.

CHANGING LAND USE

Growth of industry and impracticability of small farming have led to a mass exodus of people from the farms to the city. Today the South has 600,000 fewer farms than there were 17 years ago. Field by field, farm by farm, as lands become unprofitable for growing cultivated crops, decisions are being made concerning the next best use. Near cities some abandoned farmland is going into residential or industrial uses, but these allocations can absorb only a relatively small share of the total.

The most promising alternative uses for cropland seem to be pasture and tree farming. Farmowners have moved in both directions. But the decision to transfer cropland to permanent pasture or to trees cannot be made easily. Either choice requires an outlay of capital and effort for several years before cash returns are realized. In addition, once started, neither alternative may be reversed or altered without incurring a loss. It is this circumstance, apparently, which leads some landowners to question the wisdom of planting any more former cropland to trees.

TREE PLANTING AT AN ALLTIME HIGH

Forest tree planting, nevertheless, has become very popular. In Georgia, more than 234 million tree seedlings, produced by State nurseries, were planted during the 1959–60 season. In the 11 Southern States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida, the total area planted annually on all ownerships increased over fivefold from 282,716 acres in 1950 to 1,582,935 acres in 1959.[1] These States have definite advantages in growing trees. They have mild climate, long growing seasons, and abundant rainfall. Furthermore, the economics involved in their changing land-use patterns makes it almost inevitable that much marginal cropland will either be planted to desirable trees, or will be abandoned to seed-in naturally in a haphazard fashion.

This boom in tree planting has not occurred without certain repercussions. Landowners who have planted and those who are considering planting trees as a financial investment are asking, "Are we getting pine poor?" They remember that this country already has a huge surplus of farm commodities, and they don't want to see their timber depreciate in value because it may become surplus.

Rural businessmen and officials of town and county governments also are concerned. Decline in rural population is closely associated with the expansion of forest land by tree planting. The decline in rural population means less purchasing power to support country stores and banks and less political support for town and county officials. Increase in size of landownership, also associated with expansion of forest land, sometimes means lower returns to county governments from property taxes.

As this question about tree planting is examined, it becomes increasingly clear that it is asked for a variety of reasons and that a simple, unqualified, "Yes" or "No" answer is inadequate. Tree planting is not a cause of declining agriculture; it is a result. Rural businessmen and public officials have little alternative but to adjust to the changes that are occurring. Landowners, on the other hand, are left with the inevitable decision of what to do with their property. They must decide whether tree farming will be their most profitable form of land use and whether trees represent the best vegetative cover they can maintain on their land.

REASONS FOR PLANTING TREES

Why do people plant trees? Many of them are influenced in the first instance by the encouragement and assistance of Government agencies and forest industries. So, before the objectives of individual landowners are considered, it is necessary to examine the motives of those who encourage the act.

State and Federal agencies promote tree planting on private as well as public lands because of their responsibility for guarding the public interest. The versatility of forests as protective, yet usable, ground cover makes them ideally suited to meet the long-term multiple-use interests of public agencies. Since the lifespan of society is much longer than that of individuals, it is necessary that public agencies place greater emphasis on values of the future. These agencies sometimes differ from individuals by wanting to provide for the more intangible values, such as recreation, wildlife, and esthetics, and to establish a slower rate of use of material assets. They are more content to incur resource expenditures which promise only distant returns, and they encourage private landowners to do so by furnishing them tree seedlings at cost and by providing the technical assistance necessary to insure successful planting.

Like the public groups, timber industries and pulp and paper industries encourage tree planting. Not only do they increase the stocking of their own lands by planting, but they also furnish seedlings and technical assistance to the owners of adjacent private lands. They are interested because the establishment of a large papermill or lumber mill requires large investments of specialized capital which cannot be transferred readily to another location or to another use; and also a specialized work force must be recruited and trained. Such undertakings would be neither possible nor wise unless there were available to the mills a supply of wood which would be adequate for many years into the future. So it behooves forest industries to promote tree planting.

Owners of small private tracts plant trees for a variety of reasons. Their objectives are not always simple, singular, or rational. Some folks plant their old homestead for sentimental reasons, some to manifest pride of ownership, and still others do so for personal esthetic satisfaction. A growing number of people, however, have become investors in a forestry enterprise; they plant trees to acquire periodic income from the sale of wood and gum resin or from the commercial use of their forests for hunting and outdoor recreation. Alert landowners on the fringes of growing cities have also discovered that speculative real estate values are likely to be greater for wooded lands. Sometimes a combination of these reasons lurks in the mind of a landowner when he decides to plant.

It seems inescapable that the reasons for planting trees depend, in the final analysis, upon almost everything else concerning the landowner. His aims are often complex and vague, they change with time, and are molded by the total environment in which he lives.

THE DEMAND FOR FOREST PRODUCTS

Trees are valuable for more than their own physical content. They are part of a forest complex of interrelated, complementary products. The major products and uses of the forest—timber, water, recreation, and wildlife—often occur as joint products of the same tract of land. Of these, only timber and its chemical components are usually exchanged as regular cash crops in the market. More and more, however, price tags in the form of fees are being put on private woodlands for their use in hunting preserves and picknicking and camping areas. For example, 22 shooting preserves throughout Georgia are being opened to hunters this season.[2] It's obvious that demand for this kind of woodland use is likely to continue so long as people have enough time and money to spend on hunting pleasures.

The landowner who plants trees for a wood crop will need to consider additional factors. He will want to know at the outset whether he will be able to sell his products in large enough quantity and at a price sufficient to justify the investment. But such a guarantee can no more be made for tree farmers than for the producers of most other commodities because the factors which determine market demand are, themselves, numerous and variable. More than just per capita income or the amount of leisure time must be considered.

Specifically, the demand for a commodity depends upon (1) the price at which the commodity is offered for sale; (2) the purchasing power of individual consumers as represented by their disposable income and their access to credit; (3) the tastes and preferences of the individual consumers; (4) the total number of consumers; (5) the prices at which substitute and complementary commodities are offered for sale; and (6) the extent to which technology is able to improve the utility of the product.[3] Each of these factors is dynamic and extremely difficult to measure precisely for a country, region, or State. Not even the best informed landowner, therefore, can anticipate future markets with any degree of certainty. Like the investor in stocks, cattle, or chickens, the tree farmer makes an estimate of future conditions and launches out on a calculated risk.

A better understanding of the demand picture for wood and wood extracts may be acquired by examining the many different uses to which they are put. Each year in the United States the total wood used divides about evenly into products which are needed for the production of other goods and services and products which end up as

[1] Based on estimates of Forest Service, USDA, Atlanta, Ga.

[2] "Shooting Preserves Set To Open Oct. 1," Atlanta Constitution, Sept. 20, 1960.

[3] Albert C. Worrell, Economics of American Forestry (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959), pp. 77, 78.

consumers' goods.[4] Lumber is the classical consumers' good. Wood fiber and chemical extracts from pulpwood and resin are typical producers' (processing component) goods. They are used in the production of paper, nylon, yeast, alcohol, adhesives, plastics, and vanillin. They lose their identity as forest products long before the consumer stage is reached.

Demand for a product such as lumber behaves differently than does the demand for wood used as a producers' good. This is due to a difference in the price elasticity of demand, a factor which depends largely on the extent to which the commodity is made more attractive to consumers through manufacturing.[5] Demand depends also on whether the commodity is considered a luxury or a necessity, whether there are any close substitutes, and on the price level. The demand for products such as facial tissues, paper towels, rayon underwear, and nylon stockings is likely to remain fairly stable so long as changes in their retail prices remain within a certain low range or until more desirable substitutes are developed. The demand for lumber, on the other hand, is becoming more and more elastic. Its manufacturing costs and retail prices have increased to a high level with relatively little change in quality of the end product, while at the same time substitutes such as aluminum siding, concrete slabs, and plywood and veneer are competing at an increasing rate.

The elasticity of demand for wooden materials also is affected by the extent the materials are used in a complementary fashion with other goods and services. For example, charcoal will be in demand as long as people use their charcoal grills. The woodworking hobbyist likewise will continue to buy plywood and lumber for milling on the lathes and saws he already owns.

As more of the total wood consumption shifts from uses which are high priced and of limited utility to products which are diverse, of good quality, and relatively inexpensive, it appears likely that the total demand for timber itself will become less elastic, hence more stable. If this stability occurs at a price level which is high enough to allow the manufacturer or processor a fair margin for profit, then the tree farmer will be in a better marketing position than he now enjoys.

The implication, of course, is that tree farmers probably will enjoy favorable markets for their products so long as our growing economy enables a high standard of living and large investment in technology. Because of the extent to which wood is a producers' goods, forestry is particularly vulnerable to any major decline in consumer demand, not merely for wood products but for goods in general. But consumer demand depends on consumer income which can be obtained only by furnishing the productive services used in producing other goods and services. The demand for wood as a producers' good depends, to a large part, therefore, on the level of economic activity in the whole economy. "There can be no such thing as a prosperous forestry without the rest of the economy being prosperous, too." [6]

[4] Ibid., p. 181.

[5] "Price elasticity" refers to the extent to which the consumption of a product will vary with the price asked for it. "Inelastic demand," for example, means that people will buy the same quantity regardless of a change in price. "Elastic demand," on the other hand, means that a small increase in price may bring about a substantial change in the quantity purchased. It is not to be confused with "income elasticity of demand," which is the relative change in demand brought about by a change in the level of income.

[6] Worrell, op. cit., p. 181.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated percentage change in log and bolt requirements for domestic wood product consumption in the United States; based on 3 studies*

Wood product	Department of Commerce [1] (1956–65)	Stanford [2] (1952–75)	Department of Agriculture [3] (1952–75)
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Pulpwood	+48	+60	+96
Sawlogs for lumber		+16	+31
Plywood and veneer logs		+90	+80
Other industrial wood (poles, piling, posts, ties, cooperage, charcoal, etc.)		−1	+14
Total all wood products		+14	+30

Source: derived from volume data in:

[1] Albert C. Worrell, "Economics of American Forestry" (New York: John Wiley & Son, Inc., 1959), p. 386, table 20-4, and U.S. Department of Commerce, "Pulp, Paper, and Board Supply Demand," pp. 20, 25, 28, H. Rept. No. 573, 1957.

[2] Worrell, p. 382, table 20-2, and Summary of Stanford Research Institute, "America's Demand for Wood," table 37, 1954.

[3] Worrell, p. 389, table 20-6, and "Timber Resources for America's Future," p. 465, Forest Resource Report No. 14, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, 1958. Based on the medium projections which are the basic estimates.

PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE DEMAND

Since 1952 three major forecasts of future market conditions for forest products have been made. Three different agencies—U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Commerce, and Stanford University, California—concluded in the light of reasonable predictions of future economic conditions that the consumption of wood products will increase materially. All of these estimates anticipate a continuous increase in demand for wood products. They differ, however, in estimates of future changes in consumer tastes and preferences. Other differences in their estimates of consumption are due mainly to estimated differences in future price levels of wood products. A summary of these three forecasts of the future is given in table 1.

At this point it appears safe to conclude that the demand for wood products will increase in the future. Precisely what will happen to consumption of wood in the future is less certain because of its dependence on supply; and supply will depend on the production decisions and actions which are taken today. Therefore, today's production decisions and actions will affect future consumption.

LOCAL EXCEPTIONS WILL OCCUR

In spite of the general optimism for future demand of wood products, there will always be local and temporary exceptions. Because in our free enterprise system interaction between supply and demand is a dynamic relationship, complete balance between the two is not likely to occur either in point of time or at any one location. In central and southwest Louisiana, for example, there is now enough surplus pulpwood growing to support six more pulpmills the size of the Calcasieu Mill at Elizabeth, La.[7] The Calcasieu operation provides employment for 1,200 people. In some areas, industrial development has not continued at a pace fast enough to utilize fully the raw materials available. In other places such as Florida and Georgia, supply has not yet matched demand and there is keen competition among mills for wood.

SOURCE OF FUTURE SUPPLY

Most southern pine is exchanged in southern and eastern markets. But even there it meets with competition from wood grown in the western part of the United States and in other countries. Therefore, southern timber producers have reason to be interested in present and prospective wood supplied from places beyond their own region.

About 90 percent of the wood products now used in this country is produced here. The remainder is imported chiefly from Canada in the form of softwood products such as pulpwood, woodpulp, and paper. Imported also are some high-quality hardwoods from Central and South America. Canada might increase her exports, but hardly enough to satisfy our expected increased demands. Other free world countries have little softwood timber to spare. It is apparent that we shall continue to depend on our own forests for the bulk of our softwood supply.[8]

Timber from Alaska will probably not enter into eastern lumber markets. A considerable increase in the price of domestic lumber relative to the prices of competing materials would be necessary to make shipments of common grades of lumber from Alaska economically feasible, due to high freight costs. Furthermore, predominant Alaskan species are especially adaptable to pulping, and Alaskan timber is more likely to be used for producing pulp than lumber.

Domestic lumber production is concentrated in the West. Production in 1959 was expected to represent over half of all lumber and two-thirds of the softwood lumber produced in the United States.[9] About two-thirds of the Nation's sawtimber supply and about 80 percent of the country's softwood growing stock volume is located in the West. Most of this volume is in old-growth sawtimber trees of relatively high quality. In addition, increased utilization of sawmill and plywood mill residues can provide relatively low-cost wood for a major expansion of sulfate pulp and whole-wood fiber production during future decades. Over a longer period, large volumes of wood left as logging slash in old-growth operations may also contribute greatly to the pulpwood supply.[10] It appears that west coast timber will continue to compete with the southern pine in eastern markets.

The South contains about 23 percent of the Nation's growing stock, 18 percent of the sawtimber volume, and 40 percent of the Nation's commercial forest land. Growth rates are high, logging conditions are relatively easy, year-round woods employment is possible, and the labor supply is relatively good. Market location is also highly favorable, with relatively short distances to the great industrial centers in the North and Midwest.[11]

In 1959 the South expected to produce about 12.1 billion board feet of lumber to account for 33 percent of national production. There has been no marked trend in total production since 1940, although production of softwood lumber has generally declined, while hardwood lumber production increased.[12] About 61 percent of the Nation's pulpwood supply in 1959 came from southern forests. Here, pulpwood production has increased rapidly from 8.1 million cords in 1945, to about 22 million cords in 1959. About 10 percent of the production in 1958

[7] W. S. Stover, "Bring Us Mills To Match Our Trees," Forests and People, Second Quarter, 1960, published by Louisiana Forestry Association, Alexandria, La., p. 12.

[8] "Look to Your Timber, America," Miscellaneous Publication No. 766, Forest Service, USDA, February 1960, p. 3.

[9] "The Demand and Price Situation for Forest Products," Forest Service and Commodity Stabilization Service, USDA, November 1959, pp. 5, 6.

[10] "America's Demand for Wood," Stanford Research Institute, Stanford University, California, 1954, p. 25.

[11] "Demand and Price Situation of Forest Products," op. cit., p. 6.

[12] Ibid.

was in the form of chipped residues from sawmills and veneer plants.[13]

Reports from forest surveys and other studies recently completed, or underway in Southern States, reveal that, as a result of increased emphasis on forestry, timber growth cut relationships are improving generally across the South. A State-by-State summary of these latest reports follows:

Louisiana: Current pine growth in a 13-parish area of central and southwest Louisiana, is about twice the pine cut. A surplus exists in this area.[14]

Arkansas: The Forest Survey completed in 1959 reveals a 30 percent increase in softwood growing stock (which includes sound, well-formed trees at least 5 inches in diameter) since the 1949 survey.[15]

Mississippi: Since 1948 the area of well-stocked forest land has increased from less than one-third to 56 percent of the total forest area. Softwood growing stock is up 8 percent. The net growth of softwood sawtimber (12 inches and larger in diameter) exceeded the cut by 57 percent in 1956.[16]

North Carolina: At present, North Carolina's timber is growing faster than it is being cut. Growth of softwood pole timber (trees 5 to 9 inches in diameter) exceeds cut by 68 percent. Softwood sawtimber (9 inches and larger) growth exceeds cut by 11 percent.[17]

South Carolina: A current trend level of softwood lumber production is up 11 percent. Pine pulpwood production has increased fourfold during the period 1937–58. Total growth is increasing. Total volume of timber is also increasing, but average size is decreasing. Prospective growth, based on the continuation of the past average annual change in timber volume by diameter class, would sustain a substantial increase in total cut, but it would not sustain a current size class distribution of even the present cut.[18]

Florida: Preliminary information on the 1958–59 forest survey shows Florida is "not quite holding its own in pine volume in the 10 years since the 1948 forest survey."[19]

Southern pines planted since 1952 will not be large enough to have any great effect on the market supply of plywood and veneer timber or sawlogs for lumber before 1975. Pulpwood supply during this period, however, will vary from area to area. In the Southeastern States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina it is likely to be less than adequate for pulp and paper mill requirements. In Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas there is already enough supply on hand to warrant additional industrial expansion.

REASONS FOR OPTIMISM

Present growth-cut relationships of softwoods in some localities may be sufficient reason for landowners to be cautious when considering the planting of additional lands. In some places industrial development has not yet occurred fast enough to utilize fully the added growth of softwoods. Nevertheless, there are some very significant reasons why tree planting should not be dismissed as an unsound investment.

Trees are a highly durable form of capital. Unlike most other agricultural products, timber is not generally a perishable commodity; it does not have to be cut quickly before it spoils. Also, there is a considerable period of time between the age at which a tree attains merchantable size and the age at which it begins to deteriorate from overmaturity. So, trees ordinarily can be stored on the stump and at the same time increase in volume and value. Unlike the marketing of products such as poultry and cattle, timber normally can be held for sale until prices are favorable. The inherent risk-reducing features of the tree provide built-in flexibility for its management and handling.

Rapid industrial expansion in the South is keeping the economy at a high level. Annual expenditures for new plants and equipment in Georgia and elsewhere in the South have nearly doubled since World War II. They have increased in total annual rate in the region from $1.4 billion in 1947 to $2.3 billion in 1958.[20] A large share of these expenditures have resulted in the location, expansion, and diversification in the South of most of the Nation's largest forest products corporations.

The demand for forest products will continue to increase so long as the industrial strength of this Nation continues to grow. Industrial growth in a competitive society means more wages for the average worker. It also means more products of greater variety and higher quality for the consumer. As people's new and growing wants for these products keep pace with their rising disposable income, they are relayed back through the layers of industry to the producers forming each of the layers—the retailers, wholesalers, converters, and timber owners. These producers respond by enlarging their capacity and output, for they too are seeking to satisfy their own insatiable wants. And so long as there are renewable, versatile resources to keep the industries going, the demand for goods can be made to grow as rapidly as the capacity to produce them.

[13] Ibid., p. 9.

[14] W. S. Stover, loc. cit.

[15] H. S. Sternitzke, "Southern Forestry Notes," No. 121, Southern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, USDA, May 1959.

[16] "Mississippi Forests," Southern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, USDA, 1958, pp. 3–9.

[17] "Timber in North Carolina," Forest Resource Report No. 15, Forest Service, USDA, Washington, D.C., January 1959, p. 7.

[18] Final draft, Forest Survey Release No. 55, entitled "South Carolina's Timber Supply," Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, USDA, 1960.

[19] "Florida Forest Service News," vol. 10, No. 5, Tallahassee, Fla., May 1960.

[20] New Factories Double in the South," Atlanta Journal, June 1, 1960.

EXPORT OF MACHINE TOOLS TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during the morning hour on Wednesday I sent to the desk a resolution, the purpose of which was to express that it was the sense of the Senate that the exportation to the Soviet Union of machine tools for the making of ball bearings which may be used for military purposes is inadvisable, and that the approval heretofore granted by the Department of Commerce of a shipment of such tools should be withdrawn.

I then suggested that the proposed resolution be placed directly on the calendar where it could get prompt action. However, later, after talking with the majority leader, I agreed to carry the resolution over until today, with notice then being served that it would be offered during this morning hour, at which time I would ask for its immediate consideration.

However, yesterday I was talking with the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, and he advised me that this shipment has been suspended pending a further study. The Secretary confirmed the fact that while this shipment had been approved by certain officials in the Department of Commerce, the Defense Department had at the same time taken a very strong position, and keep on insisting on that position, that these machine tools could only be used for military purposes, and that in the interest of our national defense their shipment should not be approved. However, now that permission to ship these tools has been suspended there will be no need to call the resolution up at this time. I certainly appreciate the fact that the Secretary of Commerce has reconsidered this earlier decision. The benefit of any doubt as to whether or not these machine tools can be used for military purposes should be resolved in favor of the American people.

I am glad we were able to accomplish this objective without Senate action on the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to compliment the Senator from Delaware on his customary alertness in following through on these questions and carrying them to a conclusion, and I concur in his delight that the order has now been suspended for the so-called small, miniature precision ball bearings that were earmarked for export to the Soviet Union.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for the unflagging interest he has taken in this important matter. The Internal Security Subcommittee conducted hearings on this question, as a result of which it was determined that the Defense Department seriously opposed this license. At the time these hearings were held, the Secretary of Commerce held up the shipment temporarily. I have no doubt in my own mind that it would be a great mistake to send these ball bearing machine tools to Russia. If the Secretary has in fact canceled this license I compliment him for his action, which should have been taken before this.

In my opinion it would be a great mistake to supply any strategic material to the Russians. I would like to see more weight given to the judgment of the Defense Department on these problems. In case of dispute, the sensible procedure, in my opinion, would be to refer the case to the National Security Council for decision rather than to leave it up to the Secretary of Commerce. This is not merely another commercial business transaction. Larger issues of national security and our foreign relations are involved in trade with the Soviet bloc which must not be subordinated to purely economic consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I wish to point out also that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], who is chairman of the subcommittee conducting the hearings, has also expressed great concern over the proposed shipment.

U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is presently under consideration approval of U.S. membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is entirely possible that the text of the convention has not come to the attention of some of the Members and also the country generally, and I believe it would be useful to include the whole text in the RECORD.

It should be pointed out that this does not include certain special protocols but at least it will familiarize interested persons with the 21 articles which constitute this convention, and I ask that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the text of the proposed convention was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The aims of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (hereinafter called the "Organization") shall be to promote policies designed:

(a) to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy;

(b) to contribute to sound economic expansion in member as well as nonmember countries in the process of economic development; and

(c) to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations.

ARTICLE 2

In the pursuit of these aims, the members agree that they will, both individually and jointly:

(a) promote the efficient use of their economic resources;

(b) in the scientific and technological field, promote the development of their resources, encourage research and promote vocational training;

(c) pursue policies designed to achieve economic growth and internal and external financial stability and to avoid developments which might endanger their economies or those of other countries;

(d) pursue their efforts to reduce or abolish obstacles to the exchange of goods and services and current payments and maintain and extend the liberalization of capital movements; and

(e) contribute to the economic development of both member and nonmember countries in the process of economic development by appropriate means and, in particular, by the flow of capital to those countries, having regard to the importance to their economies of receiving technical assistance and of securing expanding export markets.

ARTICLE 3

With a view to achieving the aims set out in article 1, and to fulfilling the undertakings contained in article 2, the members agree that they will:

(a) keep each other informed and furnish the organization with the information necessary for the accomplishment of its tasks;

(b) consult together on a continuing basis, carry out studies, and participate in agreed projects; and

(c) cooperate closely, and where appropriate, take coordinated action.

ARTICLE 4

The contracting parties of this convention shall be members of the organization.

ARTICLE 5

In order to achieve its aims, the organization may:

(a) make decisions which, except as otherwise provided, shall be binding on all the members;

(b) make recommendation to members; and

(c) enter into agreements with members, nonmember States, and international organizations.

ARTICLE 6

1. Unless the organization otherwise agrees unanimously for special cases, decisions shall be taken and recommendations shall be made by mutual agreement of all the members.

2. Each member shall have one vote. If a member abstains from voting on a decision, or recommendation, such abstention shall not invalidate the decision or recommendation which shall be applicable to the other members, but not to the abstaining member.

3. No decision shall be binding on any member until it has complied with the requirements of its own constitutional procedures. The other members may agree that such a decision shall apply provisionally to them.

ARTICLE 7

A council composed of all the members shall be the body from which all acts of the organization derive. The council may meet in sessions of ministers or of permanent representatives.

ARTICLE 8

The council shall designate each year a chairman, who shall preside at its ministerial sessions, and two vice chairmen. The chairman may be designated to serve one additional consecutive term.

ARTICLE 9

The council may establish an executive committee and such subsidiary bodies as may be required for the achievement of the aims of the organization.

ARTICLE 10

1. A secretary general responsible to the council shall be appointed by the council for a term of 5 years. He shall be assisted by one or more deputy secretaries general or assistant secretaries general appointed by the council on the recommendation of the secretary general.

2. The secretary general shall serve as chairman of the council meeting at sessions of permanent representatives. He shall assist the council in all appropriate ways and may submit proposals to the council or to any other body of the organization.

ARTICLE 11

1. The secretary general shall appoint such staff as the organization may require in accordance with plans of organization approved by the council. Staff regulations shall be subject to approval by the council.

2. Having regard to the international character of the organization, the secretary general, the deputy or assistant secretaries general and the staff shall neither seek nor receive instructions from any of the members or from any government or authority external to the organization.

ARTICLE 12

Upon such terms and conditions as the council may determine, the organization may:

(a) address communications to nonmember states or organizations;

(b) establish and maintain relations with nonmember states or organizations; and

(c) invite nonmember governments or organizations to participate in activities of the organization.

ARTICLE 13

Representation in the Organization of the European Communities established by the treaties of Paris and Rome of April 18, 1951, and March 25, 1957, shall be as defined in supplementary protocol No. 1 to this convention.

ARTICLE 14

1. This convention shall be ratified or accepted by the signatories in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.

2. Instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Government of the French Republic, hereby designated as depository Government.

3. This convention shall come into force—

(a) before September 30, 1961, upon the deposit of instruments of ratification or acceptance by all the signatories; or

(b) on September 30, 1961, if by that date 15 signatories or more have deposited such instruments as regards those signatories, and thereafter as regards any other signatory upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification or acceptance;

(c) after September 30, 1961, but not later than 2 years from the signature of this convention, upon the deposit of such instruments by 15 signatories, as regards those signatories; and thereafter as regards any other signatory upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification or acceptance.

4. Any signatory which has not deposited its instrument of ratification or acceptance when the convention comes into force may take part in the activities of the Organization upon conditions to be determined by agreement between the Organization and such signatory.

ARTICLE 15

When this convention comes into force the reconstitution of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation shall take effect, and its aims, organs, powers, and name shall thereupon be as provided herein. The legal personality possessed by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation shall continue in the Organization, but decisions, recommendations, and resolutions of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation shall require approval of the council to be effective after the coming into force of this convention.

ARTICLE 16

The council may decide to invite any government prepared to assume the obligations of membership to accede to this convention. Such decisions shall be unanimous, provided that for any particular case the council may unanimously decide to permit abstention, in which case, notwithstanding the provisions of article 6, the decision shall be applicable to all the members. Accession shall take effect upon the deposit of an instrument of accession with the depositary government.

ARTICLE 17

Any contracting party may terminate the application of this convention to itself by giving 12 months' notice to that effect to the depositary government.

ARTICLE 18

The headquarters of the Organization shall be in Paris, unless the council agrees otherwise.

ARTICLE 19

The legal capacity of the Organization and the privileges, exemptions, and immunities of the Organization, its officials and representatives to it of the member shall be as provided in supplementary protocol No. 2 to this convention.

ARTICLE 20

1. Each year, in accordance with financial regulations adopted by the council, the secretary general shall present to the council for approval an annual budget, accounts, and such subsidiary budgets as the council shall request.

2. General expenses of the organization as agreed by the council, shall be apportioned in accordance with a scale to be decided upon

by the council. Other expenditure shall be financed on such basis as the council may decide.

ARTICLE 21

Upon the receipt of any instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, or of any notice of termination, the depository government shall give notice thereof to all the contracting parties and to the secretary general of the organization.

In Witness Whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, duly empowered, have appended their signatures to this convention.

Done in Paris, this 14th day of December, 1960, in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, in a single copy which shall be deposited with the depository government, by whom certified copies will be communicated to all the signatories.

NBC "WHITE PAPER" DESCRIBES TURMOIL IN PANAMA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, television's ability to probe searchingly beneath the surface of the day's news has been well illustrated by the National Broadcasting Co.'s "White Paper" series. The title for the series is taken from the traditional white papers of the British Government, which for generations have been the printed form of painstakingly accurate reports on controversial situations. Earlier broadcasts in the NBC series deepened our understanding of the U-2 overflights and the sit-ins. Last week a third "White Paper" homed in on "Panama: Danger Zone."

Just 15 months ago, in November 1959, Americans were shocked to discover that the slender ribbon of real estate in Central America called Panama seethed with tension. On the anniversary of Panama's independence, thousands of Panamanians tried to force their way into the United States-protected Canal Zone, in a turbulent effort to demonstrate sovereignty over the territory containing the lifeline of Western commerce and defense, the Panama Canal. The riots caused great concern among many who had long assumed that the operations of the canal were free of the social and economic problems that beset much of the world.

"Panama: Danger Zone" explores the background that led to these dramatic events. It describes our efforts in the intervening year to come to new terms with the residents of that land. Documentary film clips help show that Panama today is also involved in the ageless conflict between those in and out of power, between the haves and the have-nots, between the well-fed and the hungry.

The program was narrated by the distinguished news commentator, Chet Huntley. It was produced by Al Wasserman and Irving Gitlein, and written and directed by Harry Rasky.

Because the script gives some idea of the excellence of this broadcast, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NBC WHITE PAPER NO. 3—"PANAMA: DANGER ZONE"

VOICE. It's truly the eighth wonder of the world. Identical since the day it was opened to world commerce. The number of miles saved between New York and San Francisco by using the Panama Canal is a little short of 8,000 miles. All the operations that you are now viewing, nothing has been changed in almost half a century.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The Stars and Stripes have flown unchallenged over the Panama Canal for the last half century. It is true, little if anything has changed here. But around the canal, the world has been changing. And here, in the Republic of Panama, a country whose friendship we have taken for granted since its birth, The Panama Canal has now become a danger zone.

LORD KONTIKI (singing).

Panama, Panama,
My lovin' Panama.
Panama, Panama, O Panama!
Breaking point of the Americas,
The land divided and the world united.
Sam, Sam, Uncle Sam,
He wants to keep the canal.
If it's a question of sovereignty
He won't recognize Panamanian nationality.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In Panama, each day during May and December there is a darkness at noon as the clouds blacken the sky. The silent people wait for the storm that is almost inevitable.

And at this moment in history, in Panama, another kind of storm is also threatening.

A little over a year ago, in November 1959, on the anniversary of Panama's independence, thousands of Panamanians demonstrated against the United States and tried to force their way into the Canal Zone. The leader of the mob, Member of Panama's Chamber of Deputies, Aquilino Boyd.

Mr. BOYD. The Panamanians felt that they should go to the Canal Zone on November 3, 1959, because that was a way of showing the world that we are sovereigns in that part of our territory and we wanted to bring the Panamanian flag over there as proof of our sovereignty and the way that we were received there by General, by name, Potter, it was outrageous.

General POTTER. It had been bruited around for quite a while that there would be disturbances on November 3. Various groups there, some of them Communist inspired, had said they were going to march into the Canal Zone. They attempted to do it and under the law, and I believe in the law, I was required to stop them. We tried to do it with the police at first, without any show of arms, but finally when the police were overrun, and about 20 percent of them were in the hospital, why we had to call out the troops.

Mr. KONTIKI.—

The Governor gave the order
On the third of November
The Governor gave the order
On the third of November
The Army was given full command
Meaning to stop the demonstration
By the border, they put up a sign
Panamanian don't cross the borderline.
Although they put up the sign
Panamanians did cross the borderline.
And they're singing "Viva Panama."
Soverana el a sona vel canal.

1959, the third of November
A riot took place in Panama
The citizens were not mystified
It was led by Deputy Aquillino Boyd.
When they went up Fourth of July Avenue
American greet Panamanian for true
The soldiers with their bayonets
Throw in boom-bullets and tear gas.
The Governor gave the order
On the third of November
William Potter gave the order
On the third of November
The army was given full command
Meaning to stop the demonstration.
By the border they put up a sign
Panamanian don't cross the borderline
Although they put the sign
Panamanians still cross the borderline.

And they're singing:
"Viva Panama, soverana el a sonal vel canal.
Viva Panama, soverana el a sonal vel canal."

Mr. BOYD. General Potter gave the Panamanians the impression that he has cucarachas in his head because the way he acted and his reactions were very much unfavorable to the United States and to the Government that he represents.

General POTTER. Well, I'm not too sure as to the proper location of the cucarachas. that would be a subject of some discussion. Aquilino Boyd, who I know quite well, is a fine young man, fine appearing and so on and so forth; he is a politico in Panama, he is one of the 57 deputies; I am sometimes suspicious of the statements of politicians, as are most people.

Mr. BOYD. A group of patriots that went there were received by the U.S. Army with fixed bayonets, with birdshots, with hoofs, with clubs, tear gas and the Panamanian people were very fond of the U.S. Army. The army that has fought twice for democracy, the heroes of Guadalcanal and Okinawa were certainly not at their best part. This man, by the name "Potter" called on them to put up that show that was a disgrace of the relations of the United States with Panama.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The aftermath of riot brought increased tension and division to Panama. General Potter ordered the construction of a fence along a section of the Canal Zone.

It stretched along the borderline with Panama where no physical barrier had existed before. And it became a symbol—not only of distrust between the United States and the people of Panama, but also of a changing mood in Latin America.

In January 1959, when Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba, no one realized that before this year was out, the emotions of revolution and inflamed nationalism would have infected all of Central and South America. Certainly, few would have believed it possible for anti-American riots to be directed against the Panama Canal, the heart of our strategic position in Latin America. Why did these riots occur? What do they portend for the future? Will there be further riots? How secure is the Panama Canal? What lessons can we learn from the events in Panama?

The Republic of Panama is located at the crossroads of the hemisphere. It links North and South America—and divides the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. It is the bridge between the Caribbean, an extension of the Atlantic on the north, and the Pacific on the south. And the American-built Panama Canal—50 miles long—slices Panama in half. The Canal Zone extends roughly 5 miles on either side of the canal. And it is there, at the ninth parallel, that the American flag flies, dividing a sovereign nation in two.

This is the Panama Canal—a manmade strait—a funnel for ships moving from one ocean to the other. From 2,000 feet up you can look out at the two oceans at once—from the Atlantic in the foreground, through Gatun Lake, then Gaillard Cut, to the Pacific in the distance.

The seat of American Government in the Canal Zone, and the present Governor, Gen. W. A. Carter, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CARTER. This canal, of course, is the responsibility of the Government of the United States. It was built by the United States, it has been operated as a public utility for world shipping ever since its inception. I can see the ships come through here. And every time they blow the whistle it means more money in the till. The strategic value of the canal is as great now as it ever was.

The chief user, much to everyone's surprise, is the United States. About 70 percent of the traffic through the canal in a year, either is going to the United States, or from the United States. It goes, of course, to all the ports in the world. However, the canal is of vital importance to the countries in Central and South America—particularly those countries on the west coast of South America. For example, I believe the figures are that Peru and Chile—about 70 to 80 percent of their entire export and import goes through this canal. It makes no profit, it runs at no cost to the United States; the only requirement for a ship coming through this canal is that she pay her money, for her tolls, in cash before we put a pilot aboard. Any ship of any nation that comes here goes through the canal. Of our 14,000 employees, about 10,000 are Panamanian citizens, but as long as it's the responsibility of the U.S. Government to provide this world utility for the transportation of the world, I personally believe that the United States must continue to operate the canal.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The fact that we have always operated and owned the canal since it opened in 1914 is something Americans have taken for granted, and the story of the canal's construction is an epic chapter in American history.

A graveyard of equipment remained as evidence of those who tried before us and failed. Ferdinand de Lesseps, the Frenchman who built Suez, met with ruin and heartbreak when 22,000 men died during his attempt.

When the Americans began in 1904, they were confronted with a section of the world's worst jungle. The legend among diplomats at this time in Panama was that each of their predecessors was shipped home in a coffin.

For Panama was a sinkhole of tropical fevers—they called it the white man's grave.

Col. William Gorgas set out to eliminate the dread yellow fever. Each mosquito killed by his Gorgas Gangs, as they were called, cost the United States an estimated $10. But his work saved 70,000 lives.

Col. George Washington Goethals, appointed by Theodore Roosevelt to take command of construction, went down the line to inspect the work every morning. And under his charge new world records were set for excavation.

Mr. SEELEY. The boys from the canal used to go in on Saturday nights for their regular high time at the cantinas and other spots of interest in the city, but I wouldn't say that it was very wild. It always had a charm for me, because it was something so different than I had ever encountered in my life before. Roosevelt, at that time, set the precedent of a President leaving the United States territory and coming into a foreign country, said when he was here that he came for a firsthand look at how things were going. While he was here, he took great delight in slipping away from the official crowd that had him in tow and was found somewhere else all of a sudden. They didn't know just how he got there, but he got there, and usually in conversation with some employee of some division.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In August of 1914—after 40,000 men had labored for 10 years—the oceans were finally to be joined at Gamboa.

Mr. SEELEY. Well, of course, a great deal of excitement prevailed at Gamboa—where the dike was to be blown up—the explosion came from President Wilson pressing a button on his desk in Washington. Explosion. It was quite a thing to see that much material fly into the air and see that great sweep of water come in and fill up the cut. I think everyone that saw that dam blow up received a great thrill from the sight.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The thrill and the excitement of that opening day—August 15, 1914, was reported 'round the world. America boasted its greatest achievement—and our growing military, economic, and political might were symbolized in the American flag that flew over it. But the Panamanians prefer to emphasize another side of the story.

The Spanish explorer, Balboa, had built a city in Panama in 1501—and the existence of the Camino Real—the Royal Road across the Isthmus—represented a proud Spanish tradition that predated our own. In fact, Simon Bólivar, in 1826, wanted Panama to be capital of the Americas.

In 57 years, 53 rebellions were fought by Panamanians trying to free themselves from Colombia.

Theodore Roosevelt boasted, "I took the Isthmus," when he helped create the country of Panama in 1903 using U.S. military might to back their cause of independence.

A treaty was rushed through granting the United States the right to build a canal. But Panamanians claim the treaty gave them few benefits.

The canal administration brought in 45,000 laborers from the West Indies to do the heavy work—under American supervision. This influx of English-speaking Negroes created problems of assimilation that still exist and cause resentment even today.

The Americans built a comfortable colony for themselves—while shanty towns sprang up for the other workers—which still remain.

The most bitter Panamanian complaint was against payroll practices—the double standard set by the so-called gold and silver rolls. The gold roll which meant high pay for Americans. The silver roll—for the others, including native Panamanians—meant a tropical wage scale and lower rates even for comparable work.

When the Americans arrived, the Panamanians say they set a social standard reminiscent of the British in colonial India. Here then was the Panama Canal—a vital strategic, military, and economic resource of the United States—which also benefits Panama to the tune of $63 million annually, directly and indirectly—one-sixth of their national income. But the Panamanians feel they should have larger economic benefits from the canal, which they consider their greatest national resource.

The historical resentments of Panamanians toward Americans were brought into focus by the question of whose flag should fly over the Panama Canal.

According to the Treaty of 1903 between the United States and Panama, the United States is granted rights in perpetuity to act as if it were sovereign in the Canal Zone. The vague phrase: "as if it were sovereign" is interpreted by this country and most experts on international law as giving the United States full rights in the zone. It is not so interpreted by the Panamanians.

Former Panamanian President Dr. Harmodio Arias, considered by many the most powerful man in Panama, talks to NBC News Reporter Harry Rasky.

Dr. ARIAS. I may tell you that the treaty of 1903, when the U.S. officials took charge of the Canal Zone, they did not raise the American flag. Only the Panamanian flag was raised, and in 1906 during the—an investigation in the Senate of the United States—the first Governor of the Panama Canal, General Davies, admitted that the flag of the United States was not being—was not being raised in the Canal Zone.

And that only the Panama flag—and that there were doubts in his mind whether the United States had rights to—to have the flag in the Canal Zone. Subsequently, after 1906, the United States started to put up the flag and eliminate the Panamanian flag. Since then, that has been a source of resentment on the part of the Panamanian people.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Representative DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, who has long had an interest in Panama.

Representative FLOOD. The juridical position of the United States of America is clear. Once you have established a constitutional position, and the position of the United States of America in the Canal Zone, is a constitutional position, the result of a treaty with the Republic of Panama, ratified by the Senate of the United States. Therefore, under our Constitution, that treaty becomes the law of the land. The Canal Zone is an extension of the coastline of the United States of America.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Just opposite Panama City, the capital of Panama—and separated from it only by a street—an American town has been built in the Canal Zone: Balboa. Its residents—U.S. citizens—have definite views about their rights and the place in which they live.

Mr. RASKY. Do you, as a resident here, feel that this a part of the United States?

Mr. LOVELADY. I don't feel that it's a part of the United States, but I do feel that it is land over which the United States has acquired complete jurisdictional rights in perpetuity and that the United States can do with the place what it pleases so long as it does it within the bounds of the treaties that exist between Panama and the U.S. Governments.

Mr. HUNTLEY. What the Canal Zone residents have done is to recreate a tiny slice of America on the ninth parallel.

The morning paper is the Panama American—in English—the banks are American—and so are the stamps—movies and television shows are a little late in coming—but 100 percent American.

The supermarkets have attractively low prices which has been a source of resentment to those who live across the road in the Republic of Panama, where prices for the same goods are high.

The central eating place along the main street called a club house, once maintained a color line. It no longer does, but Panamanians are still critical of the attitudes of U.S. citizens in the zone.

Mrs. AROSEMENA. Well, we call them sonians more or less and I believe they are a different kind of American because they're real American that come here after 1 or 2 months; they live in the Canal Zone; they think they are better off than anyone else and really we don't believe so. In the United States they are very hospitable, here they are very stubborn, they are snobs, and they don't like to mix with the Latin American people.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The Panamanians point to the Tivoli Hotel as an example of American aloofness in the Canal Zone. Some of the permanent guests say they haven't stepped into the Republic of Panama in years. The Republic of Panama is just across the street. For all the mixing that goes on, says one American, that street might as well be the Grand Canyon.

At the schools in Balboa and other Zone towns, the day always begins the same.

They pledge allegiance to the country many have never seen . . . descendants of the men who once dug the canal.

Across the road in Panama—only a stone's throw away—Panamanian children begin their day the same way, singing their national anthem—but in a different setting.

The name of the slum is Puente Del Rey, which translates, "Bridge of the King." Here, too, are descendants of the canal diggers.

The setting is Panama, but this could just as easily be Caracas, Venezuela, or Rio, Tegucigalpa, Lima, Santiago, Havana. For Panama, in its basic internal problems, is almost indistinguishable from any other Latin land.

For most Latin Americans, there is only one hope for breaking the circle of poverty—the Government lottery. In Panama, it begins promptly at 11 a.m. Sunday morning—and is all over a few minutes later.

As in all Latin America, there is heavy unemployment. This is accentuated by a system of patronage rather than a constant civil service. When the administration changes, all government jobs also change. And a man must wait his turn.

The current president, in office only a few months, has started regular days of audience with the unemployed. Weeks of waiting—a Latin learns to wait—may lead to a personal interview—and perhaps a job.

President Chiari, a millionaire, but considered a liberal, talks to a lucky few—but knows there is not enough work to go around.

Like all Latin countries, Panama suffers not only from urban poverty but also from underdevelopment in the rural areas, where over half the population lives. The interior, potentially rich, is almost without roads.

The wheel, and even the plow, are strangers here. The machete is the chief farm implement, frequently the only one. Most of the farmers are squatters, contributing nothing to the national economy and barely able to survive themselves.

The chief industry, as in most Central and South American countries, is owned by North Americans. In Panama, the proprietor of the largest banana plantation in Central America is the Chiriqui Land Co., a part of the United Fruit Co. It is the largest private land owner in the country, employing 11,000 workers, most of them descendants of the Indians from the hills.

In the past, much criticism had been directed against the company for the working conditions of its Panamanian employees—but today, conditions are improved. The workers earn more and live better than laborers outside the plantation even though they are crowded six families to six rooms, all sharing a common kitchen.

The company provides a free school for the children of employees—and a clinic, with free hospitalization for those making less than $100 a month.

There is also a company store, but its goods are priced too high for most of the laborers.

Even though time has brought changes for the better, the fact that a U.S. concern is still the largest private employer in Panama is a continuing source of irritation, and many Panamanians still refer to the Chiriqui Land Co. as El Pulpo, the Octopus. President Chiari explains why there has been a growth of anti-Americanism.

Mr. CHIARI. Sometimes I believe, we have developed, more than anything else, these countries where the economical way of living is very, very poor. And then, of course, they have seen that in some other places in like your own country, there are wonderful ways of living, they will like also to have the same thing. But what happens, when they buy most of the product from your own country they have to pay a very high price for those products on account that you have a very high standard of life. But when we try to sell our products, I mean our country, I mean every country in South America also, then we resent that the prices we get for our products does not compare with the high cost of the product that we pay for when we import it from the United States. And in that way, I say, you cannot take everything for you that is good and let the other people take the poorest or the shortest piece of whatever has been tried to deal between the two countries. And that is one of the reasons of these little ill-feelings and resentments that have occurred between Latin American People and U.S. people.

Mr. HUNTLEY. This is Father Laburu, a Jesuit priest. He is speaking about an additional source of resentment in Panama. "Panama" says the priest, "is a small country. There are a few rich people, and there are many poor." And this is what disturbs Father Laburu, the tremendous contrast between the poor in Panama and the few rich families who dominate the country and have traditionally been concerned only with themselves. His message speaks for itself.

Laburu's voice up: Father Laburu sounds a warning when he says, "Those on top have worried very little about the ones below. Those below have always hated the upper classes. And I tell you, this is a tremendous struggle that is going on."

Mr. HUNTLEY. Over Panama, and Latin America generally, a storm was gathering—but most Americans did not know it, or ignored it. The problem of oppressive poverty, a small wealthy ruling oligarchy, a one-produce economy, a sense of offended national pride, an unstable political system—these had existed for generations. But now, a new idea was injected—the revolutionary message of Fidel Castro.

In 1959, a new voice was heard to add to the stirrings of resentment—against us, and of the poor against the rich. And the voice came from outside Panama. Beamed by powerful transmitters from Cuba, the voice of Fidelismo was heard by the Panamanians.

Castro's voice was aimed most directly at students, and his message helped spark the feelings of nationalism and rage that caused the students to lead the anti-American riots of November 1959.

This is Panama University, established 25 years ago * * * the center of Panamanian intellectual life.

Rich Panamanians send their children abroad to be educated and the students here come mostly from the emerging middle class. A majority of them must work, and they attend classes only at night, leaving an almost deserted campus during the daytime.

KONTIKI:
Panama, O Panama!
Breaking point of the Americas.
The land divided and the world united.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The president of the university, Dr. Garay.

Dr. GARAY. These young students of ours, most of them are not even in the university. suffer from reality. Reality pushes more the student toward a political way of thinking than does any other thing. Give the country a satisfactory political system and you will find the whole country including the 19- and 18-year-olds, backing that system and even defending it to the last drop of blood.

STUDENT. The majority of students, Panamanian students, I think, agree with the Cuban Revolution because they see in the Cuban Revolution what we can say in the Latin Revolutions. The same things Castro is trying, trying, to resolve is the same things we have. We have an historical equality with the other Latin American countries. We have equal problems and we have the same enemies.

GIRL STUDENT. At the beginning I sympathized with Castro, but not any more because I don't like his ideas. He is a sort of Communist and I don't sympathize with the Communists.

STUDENT. I don't care if he is Communist, as the Cuban says, if Fidel is Communist, well I don't care if they put me in the police, understand?

Mr. RASKY. In other words, what you are trying to say is that if what Fidel stands for is Communist, that's okay with you.

STUDENT. Okay, I don't care. If to be Communist is to be freedom, okay, I like the Communist. If that is the correct expressions.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The revolutionary spirit extends to others. Deputy Thelma King, representing a small minority opinion in Parliament.

Deputy KING. I am with Castro, definitely.

Mr. RASKY. How many people in Panama, would you say, were for Castro? What percentage of the population was for Castro?

Deputy KING. I think the majority of the people in Panama are for Castro. Because we understand that if it was not for Castro, the United States would not change their policy toward Latin America.

Mr. RASKY. How about if there was going to be a revolution here in Panama, that a firing squal would be necessary.

Deputy KING. I don't like it. I personally don't like it but I know in a revolution so many people have to die. Maybe when one come, I will be one.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Ambassador to Britain, Roberto Arias, alleged leader of one aborted revolution.

Mr. ARIAS. I have been accused of being involved in a revolutionary attempt, or in various revolutionary attempts, here in Panama, I still believe that Panama needs a revolution. I think it needs a revolution because it needs profound social reform. God grant that it be a bloodless one.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Revolutionary talk, Castroism, anti-Americanism, internal resentments, added to the charged atmosphere. As the first anniversary of the riots of November 1959 drew close, tension rose in Panama. What made the situation even more dangerous was that Latin-American experts were predicting that riots in the Canal Zone in November of 1960 could spread through all Latin America, endangering our whole position there. In the State Department, the Panamanian desk was busier than any other except the Cuban. What emerged was a reappraisal of our approach to the Panamanian problem. The entire American high command in Panama changed.

The State Department sent a new Ambassador—ex-FBI man, and former envoy to the Dominican Republic, Joseph Farland.

Mr. FARLAND. I no sooner got off the gangplank onto the shores of Panama, than I realized that there existed in Panama a political climate which did not augur well for the best relations between our two countries. The atmosphere was charged, politically and emotionally, and the possibility of real conflict was in evidence.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The Pentagon appointed a new head for its Caribbean Command—a man with a good record in human relations—Maj. Gen. Theodore Bogart.

General BOGART. I discovered the situation existing here which was, which represented a great cleavage in relations between this community and the Panamanian community. I realized that what we were seeing was a continuation of a situation that grew out of the last November situation here in Panama.

Mr. FARLAND. It's always customary for an incoming Ambassador to hold a staff meeting and this I did. My instructions to the staff were short and explicit. I told each and every one to forget the necessity of writing reports * * * to get out and to meet the people and to shake hands, and to carry to those people the message of friendship.

Operation Friendship—Amistad—was the name General Gogart gave to a plan for starting the flow of people across the borderline. It involved athletic meets at which Panamanian and American children competed in sporting events.

American jazz played an important role in joint entertainment. American and Panamanian musicians performed together in the Republic of Panama.

Panamanian choirs came to the Canal Zone for the first time to sing Spanish songs * * * before mixed audiences.

Operation Friendship was admittedly a public-relations gesture—a hurried effort to ease a restrained situation. Some questioned its effectiveness.

Sergeant ROE. People who actually count in the—in this thing do not pay much attention to Operation Friendship because the word "friendship" as I know it, and as I've found it in the dictionary—ah—definitely indicates a two-way street. At the present

time, the attitude is not so. The friendship is being offered by the people of the Canal Zone, but it is not being accepted.

Mr. HUNTLEY. On September 17, 1960, the Panamanian press received a bulletin that President Eisenhower had ordered the flying of the Panamanian flag at one spot inside the Canal Zone, in a head-on attempt to deflate anti-American feeling.

In record time—flag poles were set up in the area called Shaler's triangle—close to the border with the Republic of Panama—and a quick ceremony was arranged to raise the Panamanian flag.

The move drew attack from some quarters in Congress.

Representative FLOOD. This is Munich in spades, if I make myself clear. I think the decision was made in the hope that they would appease the mobs which are dictating the foreign policy of the Republic of Panama. It is appalling that any action by our Department of State and/or by the President, and/or by the White House, that vague thing called the White House, which—we're not sure what that means—they advised the President—and they advised him improperly, and wrongly in this case.

Mr. FARLAND. I am particularly gratified at the President's decision. And, while I am not in a position—in my capacity here—as you can well recognize, to enter into any controversy, regarding the advisability of the decision, I can only say this, that the decision taken by the President was in accord with the reporting from this Embassy.

Mr. HOLCOMBE. Well, in my own opinion I felt that was one of the most sensible decisions and positive actions that the American Government had taken toward the Panamanian Government to sponsor good relationship and fraternal feeling for many, many years in the past. I thought it was an excellent thing.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Despite the controversy, the Panamanian flag was flying. The question was—Would this rushed move head off the predicted November riots on the anniversary of Panama's independence? In the days that preceded the anniversary, all military precautions were taken. The Panamanian National Guard prepared, and, on the U.S. side, in the zone, all military equipment was kept in condition, in the event of any emergency.

Meanwhile, a message of forbearance was preached in the American cathedral of St. Luke's in the Canal Zone, and in the Panamanian church of Father Laburu. He says to the women of his congregation, "I urge you to be calm this year. Tell your husbands not to demonstrate * * * to be patient. The Americans in the Canal Zone are changing. Let us live in harmony. On the morning of the day the riots are anticipated * * * the streets of Panama are unusually quiet. * * *

Along Fourth of July Avenue, the borderline, Panamanian National Guardsmen wait. Canal Zone police take up positions at Shaler's triangle * * * where the Panamanian flag flies.

U.S. forces are ready for trouble, but every effort is made to avoid it. As a personal gesture of friendship, General Bogart exhibits the Panamanian flag outside his home.

And for the first time in the half century history of the canal, Panamanians are invited, in celebration of their own Independence Day, to parade through the U.S. Canal Zone.

Along Fourth of July Avenue * * * in front of the post office where last year's riots were centered, there is the first rush of morning traffic. Panamanian National Guardsmen move into position. But no American troops.

And then the parade into the Canal Zone. Past the homes of zone residents * * * past the American church, the Panamanian flag is paraded.

Students from the University of Panama * * * some of whom took part in last year's riots.

Some zone residents are skeptical, still expecting trouble.

And now into Shaler's triangle, the likely location of any disturbance.

Cameras from half a dozen countries * * * come to report trouble.

The Panamanian anthem, played in the U.S. Canal Zone.

And then it is over. In contrast with the year before, not one placard, not one anti-American sign, not a single rock thrown, no words of anger.

AQUILINO BOYD. Well, that proves you that the Panamanian people do not hate the American people. Mr. Eisenhower in September issued a Presidential order, an Executive order, so that the Panamanian flag flies right next to the American flag in the Canal Zone and I think that that is the explanation why we didn't have to go this year over there.

THELMA KING. I guess the Panamanians, especially the youth, are giving the United States a new opportunity—to arrange our complaints in a friendly way.

STUDENT. Well, the demonstration doesn't happen * * * it is because the circumstance that we have last November don't have this year. First the U.S. Governor put out his troops, the special guards they have, we don't see any masks, gas masks, we don't see any guns—or things like that—well, we can, well we can't do the demonstration like we did last time.

Mr. RASKY. Would you say that this was a victory for the State Department?

STUDENT. Well, no, not completely a victory—they changed their way of fight, that's all. In a big combat, a little victory doesn't mean that they are winning the fight.

Mr. FARLAND. Well, the use of the word victory is not fully descriptive. What we did, both Panamanians and U.S. citizens—working together—was to reverse a very dangerous trend. We must never forget that Panama, situated as it is, is the crossroads of the world, and much of our policy is reflected in Panama. The fires that we found have been banked. There is much yet to be done.

FATHER LABURU. Si. * * *

Mr. HUNTLEY. Yes, says Father Laburu. There is much to be done. Perhaps now our own rich are going to change. They must know if they do not give with their money today—tomorrow they will pay with their blood.

The people of Panama—the people of Latin America—have been slow to change. In their religious rituals, they cling to an old Spanish March—two steps forward—one step back. But today they are on the move, stirring from the darkness of their past. Throughout Latin America, a great explosive force is ready to erupt. They look to us for leadership—for help. They can no longer be ignored.

Mr. ARIAS. I feel that if this help doesn't come quickly, all of the countries of Latin America will go into a chaotic condition. The help is needed immediately, urgently. Otherwise the masses are going to revolt against the respective governments and it will be a very difficult problem then. Not only a problem for ourselves, which will be great suffering, but also for the United States.

Mr. CHIARI. Well, you must realize that there have been a lot of times when we just talk and talk but there is not action. And I don't believe that now is the time for talk—it is time for action—and I mean it. I mean it.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The events of last November in Panama must be judged in the perspective of history. Rushed gestures of friendship, hurried recognition of national pride and a deliberate attempt to avoid a riot paid off as a stopgap measure. But the lasting problems of Panama's great economic and social needs—and the importance of helping them to help themselves cannot be solved so easily. What is required is not response to a riot, but the careful advance planning of a consistent program toward Latin America—taking into consideration the requirements of the people and the knowledge that the tide of events brings inevitable change in the hemisphere. If Panama is truly the mirror of our attitudes toward Latin America, we must realize that magnificent and strategic as the canal is as an economic and military resource, it may in the long run prove less important to our country, and, in fact the world, than our handling of the social challenges that make the Panama Canal a danger zone. This is Chet Huntley.

THE FOREIGN LEGION OF U.S. PUBLIC RELATIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Reporter magazine has established a distinguished record for perceptive, accurate reporting of controversial situations which lurk just behind or beyond the pages of the daily newspapers. In the past it has presented outstanding articles on the China Lobby, the loyalty-security program, and the politics of oil, to name just a few among many.

In a recent issue of the Reporter, Douglass Cater and Walter Pincus continue this record of searching depth-reporting, with an analysis of the behind-the-scenes efforts of public relations firms to influence the U.S. Government on behalf of foreign nations. The article details the many successful efforts to plant stories favorable to foreign governments in the legitimate American news media, including radio, television, newspapers, and the wire services. It is disconcerting to learn that "news" stories from and about several foreign countries are frequently written and "placed" by well-paid public relations men. The article points out that one firm estimates it successfully places 1 to 200 in American newspapers each week. In several countries, the wire service "stringer" has been on the payroll of the government he is supposed to be covering.

The result of this is that calculated propaganda on behalf of foreign nations frequently is printed all over our country without any indication of its source. This occurs in spite of the explicit provision in the Foreign Agents Registration Act that any communications intended to influence "any section of the public * * * with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country" must be clearly labeled as such. Justice Hugo Black has said of this requirement that it rests on "the fundamental constitutional principle that our people adequately informed may be trusted to distinguish between the true and the false [and] the bill is intended to label information of foreign origin so that the bearers and readers may not be deceived that the information comes from a disinterested source."

Mr. President, this article makes it clear that in many cases our people, and our Government, have been deceived. To bring this alarming situation to the attention of my fellow Senators and a

wider audience, I ask permission that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN LEGION OF U.S. PUBLIC RELATIONS

(By Douglass Cater and Walter Pincus)

On January 30, 1959, the president of the Mutual Broadcasting System, Alexander L. Guterma, accompanied by the chairman of Mutual's board of directors, Hal Roach, Jr., and several other associates, flew to Ciudad Trujillo, capital of the Dominican Republic. There he entered into an unusual agreement with representatives of dictator Rafael Trujillo. For a consideration of $750,000, paid in advance, Guterma agreed that for an 18-month period Mutual would broadcast a "monthly minimum of 425 minutes of news and commentary, regarding the Dominican Republic." Trujillo's government would serve as its own news agency, supplying Mutual with items of news interest "by telegrams, air-mail dispatches, or telephonic beeper calls." Guterma also gave the Dominicans power of censorship by guaranteeing not to broadcast news inconsistent with their country's best interests, "in your sole and exclusive judgment."

Subsequently, a series of legal actions proceeded out of this deal—a hearing under the Bankruptcy Act involving Mutual, a civil action filed by the Dominicans to get their money back, and a Justice Department case against Guterma for failing to register as a foreign agent. From these proceedings, a fairly detailed account of what happened can be pieced together.

The origins of the agreement Guterma made in Ciudad Trujillo may be traced back to several earlier encounters between Saul S. Nevins, an attorney seeking capital for Guterma, and Porfirio Rubirosa, the celebrated international bridegroom who at the time was serving as Dominican Ambassador to Cuba. During one meeting, Rubirosa complained about the unfavorable press coverage his government was getting in the United States. Nevins had earlier shown how Mutual could do something about it. Nevins had phoned in a story from Ciudad Trujillo about anti-Batista sentiment in the Dominican Republic that subsequently was broadcast twice from Washington, with Nevins identified as Mutual correspondent in the Dominican Republic. Mutual's Washington news director testified later that the practice of taking such information was not unusual. "We get a good deal of our news from people [who are not] newsmen. These can be fire chiefs, Senators, Congressmen."

Evidently the idea that such news coverage could be a salable commodity did not take long to develop. When Guterma's group met with Otto Vega, special assistant to Generalissimo Trujillo, they came right to the point. "They said they were in a position to secure * * * in the United States an outlet for our news," Vega testified later. Guterma produced a map of the mutual network and pointed out the number of stations that would be involved.

BROKER RUBIROSA

Guterma also provided another quick demonstration of the product he was prepared to sell. According to Vega's testimony: "He said, 'Give me an idea, some piece of news you would like to broadcast.' I said that I did not have anything. He said, 'Well, since we have Mr. Rubirosa here and Mr. Roach here, why not say Mr. Rubirosa is going to make a picture for Hal Roach in the Dominican Republic and they are negotiating that'." The very next day, returning to New York in Guterma's private plane, the group heard Walter Winchell recite their make-believe news item over the Mutual network.

During that same flight, Guterma showed Nevins a draft copy of the specific terms he was prepared to offer the Dominicans. The lawyer later professed amazement at their boldness. It amounted to nearly 15 minutes daily to be "carried by the entire network * * * in a normal course of our broadcasting day." There was only one restriction: "We will not carry any news extolling the Communist cause but agree that the primary purpose is to exemplify the stability and tranquillity of the Dominican Republic and its unequivocal position and stand against communism."

Nevins was fearful that the contract might run afoul of the law requiring agents of foreign governments to register with the Justice Department. To get around this requirement, he arranged to draw up papers creating for Guterma a new corporation, Radio News Service, which could claim exemption from the act on the grounds that it was a bona fide news-gathering agency.

The terms were acceptable to both sides, and on February 5, the negotiators having returned to Ciudad Trujillo, Vega brought to Guterma's suite at the El Embajador Hotel a cloth sack containing the $750,000, mostly in thousand-dollar bills. Not all of it, however, went to Guterma. Later, in trying to account for it, he claimed that he had been obliged to pay "brokerage fees" of $50,000 to Rubirosa, $25,000 to Vega (Vega denied receiving it), $37,500 to Nevins, and $57,500 to his other associates.

What remained was evidently insufficient to meet Guterma's pressing financial needs. In mid-February 1959, he lost control of F. L. Jacobs, the holding company in which he combined his various enterprises, and was forced to resign as president of Mutual. Not long afterward, he was indicted for stock fraud in connection with his F. L. Jacobs dealings and he is now serving a 5-year prison term. When that is completed, an additional 8- to 24-month sentence awaits him for failing to register as a Dominican agent.

How seriously did Guterma ever intend to live up to the terms of this agreement with Trujillo? The Dominican Government, in filing suit for the return of its money, now claims that the contract was not performed, was incapable of performance and was entered into by claimant on the basis of mistake in law and fact.

Because Guterma pleaded nolo contendere to the illegal agent charges filed by the Justice Department, there was only fragmentary evidence of the extent to which Guterma managed to turn Mutual into a propaganda outlet of the Dominicans. Robert Hurleigh testified that as Mutual vice president, he once received a call at his Washington office from Guterma in Ciudad Trujillo. He said "he had a Congressman there who had * * * made a speech before the legislature, or whatever the name is, and he thought this would be a good broadcast, so we took the Congressman in on a beeper. * * *" Tapes of the visiting Congressman, Gardner Withrow, Republican of Wisconsin, were used on newscasts during the day. On another occasion Hurleigh sent Guterma a note calling his attention to a Capitol Cloakroom interview with Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, Democrat of Louisiana, on the Caribbean situation. Guterma promptly forwarded tapes of the two network broadcasts to Vega as proof the contract was being fulfilled.

Apparently Hurleigh, who succeeded Guterma as president of Mutual, was unaware at the time of what lay beneath this sudden interest in the Dominicans. The first he learned of it, according to his testimony, was in May 1959, when he and a Mutual reporter visited Ciudad Trujillo on a press junket arranged by the Dominicans. Hurleigh was shocked when Vega made inquiries about the contract. To stave off further involvement in this embarrassing affair, the Dominican Government was paid $12,500, and it returned the 1,100 shares of Mutual stock that Guterma had turned over to Vega as good faith collateral.

In becoming a publicity agent for a foreign government, Guterma was going into a business that has been expanding rapidly in this country during the last few years. Several hundred agents of foreign governments are duly registered at the Justice Department (as Guterma was not), and the number is constantly increasing. Many of these foreign agents are simply promoting tourism, while others are lawyers carrying on the various legal and lobbying activities in Washington that are considered necessary to backstop diplomatic missions. As the files at Justice indicate, a good many—comparative newcomers but more numerous all the time—are professional public relations experts engaged in the business of influencing American opinion.

In the main, of course, this expansion of public relations in the United States on behalf of foreign governments is no more surprising or sinister than the growth of the domestic variety as an adjunct to private or public business. They are, in fact, parallel efforts to meet the same basic need. The systematic cultivation of public opinion is frequently more fruitful than more direct attempts to influence Government officials. But the ways of communicating with the public are intricate indeed. As Harold Oram, Inc., put it in a memorandum soliciting the public relations account of the Government of Ghana: "The services of a professional public relations firms are * * * becoming more of a necessity than ever before. The vast and complex network of media outlets, both mass and specialized, require, for effective utilization, long years of experience and understanding."

UNLABELED COMMERCIALS

In seeking this effective utilization of the media outlets, not every public relations agent of a foreign government has done its work as openly and candidly as the Oram firm. A great temptation for many of them lies in the fact that the press and the other media have proved to be peculiarly vulnerable to the infiltration of blatant propaganda.

For example, in 1954, the Government of Guatemala, then headed by Carlos Castillo Armas, hired John A. Clements Associates at a fee of $8,000 a month to engage in a public-relations campaign on its behalf. This job, according to the Justice Department registration, was to be handled by Clements and Patrick McMahon, who were at the same time serving as editor and Washington editor, respectively, of the American Mercury. As a further coincidence, that magazine published a number of articles on Guatemala during the period, three of them of a political nature. While on the Guatemala payroll, McMahon also acted as consultant to the House committee which investigated communism in Guatemala and, according to his statement to the Justice Department, "prepared [its] report and helped edit the hearings."

Or take the special case of the Nationalist Chinese Government, which has long displayed an anxious regard for its public image in this country:

Item: Early in 1959, the North American Newspaper Alliance carried a series of stories written from Formosa by Don Frifield. The reader was not informed that NANA's correspondent was also employed by Hamilton Wright, the U.S. public relations firm handling the Nationalist China account. Frifield has received $19,700 during the past 2 years for editorial services.

Item: In June 1958, during one of the periodic crises over the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu, there was shown at

Radio City Music Hall in New York a documentary film entitled "Fortress Formosa," which had been produced by 20th Century-Fox. It was subsequently distributed to movie theaters all over the country. In the screen billings, a credit line indicated that it had been "Arranged by Hamilton Wright," but the viewer had no way of knowing that Hamilton Wright serves as Nationalist China's registered agent. The film, in Technicolor and CinemaScope, had actually been shot by the public relations firm's camera crews and then turned over without cost to 20th Century-Fox.

Item: Last October 14, the morning after the third "Great Debate," in which the presidential candidates tangled over Quemoy and Matsu, NBC's "Today" carried on its news roundup a report of Chiang Kai-shek's angry rejection of Kennedy's position on those islands. While the television viewer heard Chiang quoted as voicing firm determination to resist the surrender of the islands, he watched a film clip depicting Nationalist Chinese troops and tanks parading in full battle array. This film was another production of Hamilton Wright supplied gratis to the NBC film library and used without credit.

Item: Since 1957, the Saturday Evening Post has carried a series of signed editorials by Geraldine Fitch in which she has defended Chiang's policies and criticized others for their lack of sympathy with those policies. The Post has identified Mrs. Fitch as an author who "spent many years in China and now lives in Formosa." But it has made no mention of the fact that she is also employed in Taipei as "consultant editor" of the Government Information Office, Republic of China.

Item: In a catalog of free programs offered to independent television stations, Radiant Films, 358 West 44th Street, New York, includes a half-hour documentary, "Miracle in Free China" ("* * * where Madame and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and their 10 million followers are marking time for the return to the mainland") and "Face of Free China" ("How American defense in the Pacific is tied into the general defense of the free world through the U.S. alliance with the Republic of China"). The only hint of who produced and paid for this entertainment is the cryptic mention that it was "Filmed by the world-renowned Hamilton Wright Organization." Neither Hamilton Wright nor Radiant Films, which is not registered as a foreign agent, has supplied the Justice Department with information about the distribution of these films, which were paid for by the Government of Nationalist China.

Item: On a number of occasions in recent years, the New York Times has published letters to the editor, supporting the Chinese Nationalist stands, from Harold Riegelman, a New York attorney who has been both the city's acting postmaster and the Republican candidate for mayor. Though Mr. Riegelman is registered as a foreign agent of Nationalist China, he has not felt an obligation to label his communications under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Neither the Times' editors nor its readers could be expected to know from his letters of Mr. Riegelman's connections with the Nationalist Chinese.

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC RELATIONS

Foreign governments have provided Americans with information about themselves for a good many years. The British, starting with a modest library shortly after the First World War, have expanded the British Information Services in the United States into an efficient operation that now spends $1 million a year, with publishing and film facilities in New York and a B.I.S. representative stationed in Washington's National Press Building, where he is an accessible companion and counselor to the capital's reporters. Thirty-five other countries have established more or less similar information facilities, and have reported expenditures in 1959 totaling nearly $7 million. We do the same thing on a large scale in our U.S. Information Service missions around the world.

But the use of private public relations firms in the United States on behalf of foreign governments dates largely from the end of the Second World War. Sometimes it was a matter of special necessity. The Roy Bernard Co. of New York, which works for West Germany, took the account when its government was not entitled to send an official information mission to this country. A number of firms quickly moved into what was fast becoming a highly profitable field of enterprise. In addition to Nationalist China, Hamilton Wright's clients include Italy and Mexico. Hill & Knowlton, Inc., handles Japan; Harold L. Oran, Inc., has South Vietnam; Curtis J. Hoxter, Inc., works for Austria, Guatemala, and Brazil; Max Rogel, Inc., which formerly had the South Korean account, also takes care of Nicaragua.

During the past 2 or 3 years there has been a scramble among American public relations firms to sign up the emerging African nations. When Vice President Nixon visited Africa in 1957, one enterprising public relations man got himself included in the entourage and tried to sell his services along the way.

The size of a foreign government's public relations operation in the United States is by no means related to the country's size or relative power. The Dominican Republic, for example, has spent during the past 5 years more than $2,500,000 for assorted public relations projects here. In 1946, the Dominicans hired Harry Kiemfuss of New York to set up a Dominican Republic Information Center at $1,500 monthly. In 1952, a Miami Herald columnist Jack Kofoed, was paid $2,300 monthly, which included $800 for expenses, to prepare a book on Trujillo and to write magazine and newspaper stories about the Dominican Republic. ("General Trujillo isn't as well known to the American people as he should be," ran one of several Kofoed columns that year dealing with the Dominicans. "Even his enemies can't deny that Trujillo has, single handed, lifted his country from the lowest state it could reach to the place it occupies now.") In 1957, A. Tyler Hull, a maker of documentary films, was paid $35,000 to prepare a 30-minute color film and a 26-minute black-and-white film for television, guaranteeing in his contract "a minimum of 300 television broadcasts in the United States to an estimated audience of more than 15 million viewers within a period of 24 months."

During the same year, Trujillo hired Sydney Baron, Inc., to combat adverse publicity arising from the mysterious disappearance in New York City of Dr. Jesús de Galíndez, an outspoken opponent of the Dominican dictatorship. Baron listed receipts for 1957 and 1958 amounting to $562,855, of which more than $200,000 went to the well-known attorney Morris Ernst, who was retained "to undertake an investigation of the so-called Galíndez affair insofar as it touches upon implications and accusations against—the Government of the Dominican Republic and persons holding high office in that government." In 1959, even as Guterma was making his deal with the Dominicans, By-Line Newsreel Productions was hired to produce a 15-minute sound movie each month for the purpose of "making increasingly known the progress achieved in the Dominican Republic." The agreement specified that these newsreels, which cost $3,000 apiece, would be shown in 900 movie houses throughout the United States.

As any reporter can testify, much of foreign public relations performs a useful service in keeping the press informed about facts they need to know. Taken as a whole, it is no more mysterious or unscrupulous than public relations work done for domestic clients. It varies, of course, from firm to firm and client to client, since in this unlicensed and unlimited profession the practitioners are pretty much able to devise their own rules and ethics as they go along. But in one respect the work done for a foreign government does differ from that performed in behalf of, say, an American manufacturer. For one thing, the American public's familiarity with the domestic client's product is apt to exert some check on the activities of those who promote it. But such restraints do not apply so rigorously to a foreign client, particularly if it happens to be the government of a country not visited by many American tourists, Congressmen, and journalists who may snoop around a little during their travels.

Obviously in our days, nearly all nations are engaged in some sort of direct or indirect public relations activities abroad. The United States, it is hoped, operates constantly and efficiently in this field. But the activities and the policies of a large country are always the object of scrutiny and debate. The same does not apply to small countries, or rather to their governments—all too often when the very survival of those governments depends to a large extent on the assistance they receive from us. The facts we need to know are often concealed, or get to us too late. All of a sudden there may be a blowup in a country with which we have been deeply involved. When that happens, it not only upsets the best laid plans of the public relations men but greatly harms America's prestige.

HOW MUCH WOULD IT COST?

A foreign government's assumptions about how to handle press relations in the United States are heavily conditioned by the way it treats the press back home. Generalissimo Trujillo had no reason to doubt that he could buy the services of a radio network. When General Batista was still boss in Cuba in 1958, he approached a New York public relations firm with a query about how much it would cost to get favorable stories in the New York Times (Batista felt sure that Herbert Matthews of the Times was in the pay of Castro).

False expectations, it must be added, have sometimes been encouraged by overzealous public relations firms. On file at the Justice Department is a copy of a prospectus prepared by Max Rogel, Inc., soliciting the Nicaraguan account. It makes this claim: "We now have a comprehensive news service that makes it possible to flash a story or a photograph to every major daily newspaper in the United States. This story will come across the wire into the offices of these newspapers. It will be treated as a news story and will be received as such. This is an operation that is very similar to the workings of the two major news services in the United States. It is, in actuality, a service extended to us by one of these two news services on an exclusive basis." What the prospectus apparently referred to was the public relations news wire in New York, which transmits releases around the city and which, of course, has no official connection with either AP or UPI.

A similar impression of accessibility to the heartbeat of the news system was contained in the Rogel proposal to the Korean Government that the first step in its operations would be "to secure a newspaper person who could act as our leg man or stringer in Seoul. * * * This individual will be someone who is known in Seoul and approved by your government. He will be attached to one of the wire services." In a recent interview, Rogel's executive vice president, Clyde Matthews, has stated that his firm never obtained such a wire-service stringer

in Korea. But he pointed out that it is not out of keeping with public relations practice. In Nicaragua, according to the firm's filings with the Justice Department, payments were made to one Leonardo Lacayo, who also serves as a UPI stringer in Managua as well as editor of the progovernment newspaper, Novedades. Matthews estimates that half of the news stories that come out of Nicaragua are in one way or another the products of the firm's initiative.

SWEETNESS AND LIGHT

Naturally those who are in the business of creating favorable impressions about their clients are not apt to underestimate their own accomplishments. Many of the reputed feats of the public relations men prove after investigation to be pretty trivial stuff, a conspicuous waste of a foreign government's money. But it would be a mistake to think that public relations' foreign legion is ineffective. Perhaps the most dramatic example of what it can accomplish occurred in 1955, when the Cubans were faced with the imminent threat that their quota of sugar exports to the United States would be slashed in order to favor domestic producers. Forty-nine Senators had gone on record for revising the Sugar Act ahead of its scheduled expiration at the end of 1956. In desperation, the Cuban sugar industry hired Samuel E. Stavisky, a Washington newspaperman turned public relations counsel.

Stavisky, who has described what ensued in a document entitled "The Sweetest Story Ever Sold," launched a campaign that was responsible in large measure for thwarting congressional action in 1955, and led the next year to a new and highly favorable quota for Cuban sugar that lasted until Castro upset everything. Stavisky estimates that "effective public relations helped the Cuban sugar industry gain an extra million tons of sugar quota in the American market." It was, according to Stavisky, a public relations job with a $100 million payoff for his client.

The operation was directed more at the press than at the politicians. Stavisky reasoned that he had a good but complex story to get across on a subject about which most reporters were notably ignorant. Liked and respected by his former colleagues, he gathered small groups of them for lunch at Washington's Colony Restaurant and discussed the political ramifications of sugar with an old newsman's sense for the interesting "story angle." With the help of a liberal expense account, he "encouraged" reporters to visit Cuba. Some were provided with travel subsidies when they couldn't make it on their own. One correspondent even charged off his gambling losses.

More important, Stavisky soon worked out a news angle that made the fate of Cuban sugar important local news all over the United States. Using an IBM punchcard breakdown of shipping invoices, he traced the origin of the more than $400 million in U.S. exports to Cuba the previous year by State, city, congressional district, product, industry, and company. Soon a steady flow of stories began to appear in local papers around the country about the importance of the Cuban market to Texas oil, California beans, Arkansas rice, and Ohio lard. In the western tier of the North Central States, whose Congressmen were generally hostile to sugar imports, it was discovered that 708 manufacturers had sold Cuba more than $22 million in 1953. This was considered news throughout that region.

A newsman's intimate connections on Capitol Hill served Stavisky in good stead. In early 1955, Stavisky relates, when Vice President Nixon visited Cuba during a Caribbean tour he was briefed with a Stavisky memo and the Havana reporters were loaded with Stavisky-inspired questions for Nixon.

Publicity counterattacks against the domestic sugar interests were also part of the Stavisky operation. When Senator ELLENDER took two "experts" representing those interests into a closed Senate committee session, the fact was soon published in a Drew Pearson column that proclaimed, "ELLENDER Works for Sugar Lobby."

Stavisky measured his impact on newspapers in column-inches. His scrapbook is crammed with clippings from newspapers all over the country, many bearing a word-for-word identity with his press releases. Frequently they have omitted any mention of their origin.

WHO PICKS UP THE TAB?

In assessing the abuses that crop up, those involved in public relations often pass the blame to the press. One veteran public relations man for a Central American client estimates that his firm places between a hundred and two hundred stories a week in the newspapers, often used verbatim, and sometimes with a prominent reporter's byline added. He finds that it is getting easier all the time to do the newsman's job for him. "From my point of view as a public relations man, this is good," he remarks, "but from journalism's point of view it is not good. The number of reporters with time to dig beyond the surface facts seems to be getting smaller and smaller. We fill a vacuum in the flow of news."

He ascribes this condition in part to the economics of U.S. news coverage. Despite the hordes of reporters who congregate in Washington or accompany the President on his good will missions, the ranks of American journalists covering the rest of the world are remarkably thin. By his estimate, nine-tenths of our news from the smaller foreign countries is handled by stringers who piece out their income with other jobs. The Associated Press claims that it services 80 countries, maintaining regular correspondents in more than 50 of them. In many places, at least until events reach a crisis point, news coverage is very much a hit-or-miss proposition.

In Cuba, for example, it turned out after the Castro revolution that the Associated Press stringer at the Presidential Palace had been on Batista's payroll. The Dominican Republic long controlled stringers working for U.S. publications by its control over all domestic papers.

To get coverage for the countries they represent, both great and small, public relations agencies frequently provide travel subsidies for the press. But many feel that the practice has been increasingly getting out of hand and has dubious benefits. Curtis Hoxter says he receives as many as 10 calls a week from reporters looking for junkets. Among a dozen or so public relations firms we interviewed, none had failed to get requests for travel subsidy or other gifts, ranging from a case of liquor on up, as incentives to do a good story.

Among reporters, whose income averages far less than that of their public relations counterparts, there are no generally agreed-upon ethics about these practices. Freelancers particularly, having no guarantee that their articles will be bought, accept it as part of the game. The Society of Magazine Writers does not include in its code of ethics and good practices anything on the subject of accepting or labeling such financial assistance. James Doyle, who wrote a story for North American Newspaper Alliance after a week's trip to Nicaragua last August, paid for by the public relations firm of Max Rogel, argues: "You are not deceiving editors. They know somebody pays your way. But no good reporter is going to be seduced by room, board, or an airplane ride." Doyle claims that for "marginal" stories like Nicaragua, its government must pay the freight or nobody will go. "After all, who gives a damn about Nicaragua?"

Neither Doyle nor John McBride, Latin American columnist for the New York Mirror, who also went on the Nicaraguan junket, believes it would be appropriate to state who paid for such trips in published copy. "When you do something like that," McBride says, "it takes away from your writing no matter what you say. It would hurt if readers knew the paper wouldn't send you down but the Nicaraguan government would."

Economics plays an even bigger role in the newsreel business. Placing films seems to be a nearly sure-shot proposition for the knowledgeable public relations man. The firm of Hamilton Wright, for example, has some of the finest camera crews and equipment in the business. One of its typical contracts, drawn up with the government of Chile, provides that newsreels with commentary will be prepared and delivered free of charge to Fox Movietone, MGM Newsreel, Paramount, Warner Pathé, and Universal International: "This organization guarantees that five or more of the above newsreels shall be accepted and shown by at least one of the above-mentioned companies throughout its entire chain of theaters in the United States." Much the same guarantee has been made to Nationalist China.

According to Hamilton Wright, Jr., such a guarantee is "based on past experience." The normal procedure in placing a newsreel for a client is to prepare seven hundred feet on a subject and supply an informational sheet that will permit the editors to edit it for themselves. Last spring, for example, the firm offered footage on the Formosan elections that Fox Movietone used in its regular newsreels.

The documentary "Fortress Formosa" was turned over to 20th Century-Fox with a grant of full ownership rights for a 5-year period. But Wright minimizes the propaganda value of these efforts. "For theatrical distribution, they must be subtle," he declared. "They cannot have much political content."

He was seconded on this point by John Kuhne, a veteran documentary producer for 20th Century-Fox, who claims that he turns down most film submissions even though they are free. The ones he accepts, like "Fortress Formosa," are picked solely for their entertainment value. He rejects the suggestion that the source of such films might be clearly labeled: "It would look like a direct propaganda bit." He points out that 20th Century-Fox does not label the Defense Department films that are supplied regularly to all major distributors.

Jerome Kahn, assistant news editor of 20th Century-Fox, has said he will incorporate public relations film in his newsreels only when it contains a legitimate news story. There have been times, he claims, when Hamilton Wright has had the only footage of areas Chiang bars to regular photographers. He doesn't object to having a public relations outfit handle the Dominican Republic because this is the only way to get films. The newsreel company simply can't afford to send its own crew.

Among public relations firms, there is general agreement that the theater newsreel is in a declining state and pretty well forced to live on handouts. Even those who do this handing out sometimes feel the pinch. An executive at Harold Oram, Inc., which handles the account of South Vietnam for an annual fee of a mere $38,000, has said, "You never see a film on Vietnam in your theaters because we don't have the money to make it."

Television networks generally keep a sharp eye out for attempts at infiltration by public relations operators. "They try to use us," said Piers Anderton of NBC News, who handles the Huntley-Brinkley newscasts, "but we use them." He will accept footage but

not the accompanying scripts. In reference to the film clip of Chiang's forces that was shown on "Today" right after the Nixon-Kennedy debate over Quemoy, Bill Fitzgerald, news director for the program, points out that it was only a brief sequence and that it had been stored for some time in the NBC film library. He does not feel that the network was under any obligation to identify those who originally provided the film. "They are satisfied with the exposure. There is no prerequisite to mention their name." What about responsibility to the public? "I don't think the public is too interested in knowing," Fitzgerald said.

By far the most fertile field for the planting of public relations film has been in direct submission to independent television stations. It has, in fact, become such an active market that there are now a number of middlemen who specialize in distributing free films being offered for television use. These distributors are paid for each showing, not by the station but by the supplier of the film.

One of the biggest of these distributors, Sterling Movies U.S.A., Inc., puts out quarterly a fat catalog of offerings that have been prepared to fill half- and quarter-hour time slots in a TV station's schedule. The catalog usually makes no mention of who has paid for the production of these films. It is obvious that many are veiled advertisements for tourist resorts or industrial sponsors. In its foreign listings, the spring 1960 catalog listed eight films on Algeria ("The background story on this critical area in world affairs. * * * Enlightening information on the movement toward nationalism"), four on the Sahara, two on Morocco, three on Tunisia, one on Turkey, and six on South Africa ("Points up similarities between United States and South African history"). On investigation, it turned out that several of the Algerian films had actually been paid for by the French Government, which then hired New York producers to edit them, dub in English voices, and pay for the distribution. Essentially the same procedure is known to have been followed by South Africa and governments of several of the other countries involved.

"Public advocacy" by a foreign country's diplomats, argues the Ghana memorandum prepared by Harold L. Oram, Inc., is generally regarded as "improper interference in the internal affairs of the United States" and "a highly ineffective method to convert or persuade the American public. * * * " Therefore, the memorandum goes on, "One of the cardinal rules of effective public relations, particularly in the political sphere, is to remove the source of the ideas (in this case the Government of Ghana or its representatives) as far as possible from the advocates (whether they be private individuals, organizations, or media)."

THE DIM SPOTLIGHT

Oram may be right. But one trouble with his argument is that it does not entirely square with the terms of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, amended in 1942, which specify that a public-relations agent employed by a foreign government is required, after registering with the Justice Department, to make full disclosure of activities and expenditures and to label all communications intended to influence "any section of the public * * * with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country. * * *" The act grew out of congressional concern over Nazi propaganda agents in this country. "Resting on the fundamental constitutional principle," according to an interpretation by Justice Hugo Black, "that our people adequately informed may be trusted to distinguish between the true and the false, the bill is intended to label information of foreign origin so the hearers and readers may not be deceived by the belief that the information comes from a disinterested source." The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, who helped draft the law, counted on fighting fire with fire by using "the spotlight of pitiless publicity" to expose foreign propaganda.

But the law has had a hard time keeping up with expanding public relations activities in the postwar period. Nathan B. Lenvin, chief of the Justice Department's registration section, is quite confident "that the vast majority who come within the purview of the statute have registered." Over its 22-year history, there have been 23 prosecutions for failure to do so and 21 convictions.

But the spotlight in which Congress placed its trust has certainly been less than pitiless. Few people come to look at the files in Lenvin's outer office, and few of the documents give the kind of details that Congress ordered. Many of the reports filed there make only the barest statement about expenditure or activities in behalf of foreign clients. Some public relations agents who submitted fuller details in former years have dropped the practice. (One, who admits that his reports are not very lengthy, says frankly that he has no intention of telling his competitors what he is doing.)

The act's most neglected provision has been the requirement to label the source of political information. Time and again in our investigations we came across what appeared to be clear violations. But the Justice Department has never brought a test case in this area. No one is certain, for example, how precisely a distributor or a television station is supposed to identify films prepared by foreign agents The Federal Communications Commission has also failed to explore this field despite its regulation that "a station disclose to its audience exactly who is paying for or furnishing the broadcast material * * * [on] political matters or controversial issues of public importance."

The FCC's own precedents governing domestic public relations would seem to be pertinent. In 1958, the Commission censured Westinghouse Broadcasting for failing to label film used on a news program that had been provided free of charge by the National Association of Manufacturers. Such a practice, the FCC held, required "the highest degree of diligence on the part of the licensee * * * in ascertaining * * * the actual source * * * and identifying this source plainly to the viewing audience."

Perhaps the law is too cumbersome to cope with the way some news finds its path to the public nowadays: foreign agent to producer to distributor to middlemen to media representative. Frequently, it is a difficult matter to determine the origin of something that finally appears in print or on the screen. And it could quickly become a rather absurd pursuit if the Justice Department were to try to monitor all the stages of this very broad enterprise. Too much that passes for high-powered public relations work is too picayune to matter.

In the long run, the responsibility for keeping the communications channels open and working properly must be borne primarily by those engaged in the business of communication. It is up to those who control the spotlight of publicity to see that it is bright enough and properly focused. The press and other media surely ought not to pass along cheap propaganda simply because they haven't the time or the cash to check stories for themselves. Ultimately, it is not just a matter of economics but even more one of ethics.

There are no cut-and-dried rules to be laid down in this game. A reporter or a broadcaster would be a fool to chuck pertinent information in the wastebasket simply because it came to him from a public relations source. Foreign public relations, as practiced by reputable private firms as well as official Government information agencies, has done a great deal to break down the barriers of isolation and lack of interest that once kept our public opinion aloof and ill informed.

But the press must apply its criteria of selection very carefully in an area of communication that vitally affects our understanding of what is going on in the rest of the world—and of what we are asked to do about it.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, Walter Lippmann, with his characteristic logic and force, makes a devastating argument against the contention of those who oppose Federal aid to education. I read the concluding paragraph of Mr. Lippmann's article:

In advocating a larger use of the Federal power to raise money for education, the administration is dealing not with some fancy theory but with the hard practical fiscal problems of the States and the localities. Those who oppose the program in principle have almost certainly not understood the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

Despite Senator GOLDWATER, who has just declared that Federal aid to education is unconstitutional, the practice of Federal aid is in fact older than the Constitution. As early as the Land Ordinance of 1785, the Confederation provided that the 16th section of each township or one thirty-sixth of the acreage in the public land States should be granted to the States by the National Government for the benefit of the common schools.

Every since the Federal Union was established it has been giving aid to education in a large variety of ways, and it is sheer deception to declare that what has always been done is unconstitutional.

While Federal aid has been given since the founding of the Nation, what has never been done has been to set up Federal control of education. It is indeed quite contrary to American principles and practices for the Federal Government to control what is taught in the public schools, how it is taught, who teaches it. The control of education is reserved to the States, and no one engaged in the present discussion is proposing to tamper with that principle. The Kennedy program is unequivocal and scrupulous in reserving to the States the control of education.

Thus in the proposed contribution to public elementary and secondary schools, the Kennedy program leaves it to each State to decide whether the Federal contribution shall be used to build schools or to raise teachers' salaries. The loan program for college housing and for academic facilities is operated by local initiative. The 4-year program for scholarships is to be State administered.

Why, then, with such careful respect for States rights, is it necessary to bring in the Federal Government at all? The answer is that the number of children and youths who have to be educated has outgrown the resources which can be raised in a very large number of the States. The American Nation can quite well afford to educate all its young at least at the level of the most advanced States, for example, California. It

is nonsense to argue that the United States is too poor to educate its children. But it is not educating them properly, and almost certainly it cannot and will not do so if the whole task of raising the necessary funds is left to the 50 State legislatures and the local school districts.

Here is the essence of the Kennedy program. It has nothing to do with the control of education. It does not propose to have the Federal Government pay all the costs, supplanting the States and localities. It does propose to supplement State and local funds with a comparatively small contribution.

This supplementary support has become necessary because of the spectacular increase in the school population which began after World War II and seems certain to continue for the next 10 years. The cost of educating this growing number of children is rising and will continue to rise, according to the estimates of the highly reliable and conservative Committee on Economic Development. Even if prices remain constant, even if educational standards are not raised, the costs per pupil will rise by almost half during the sixties. For teachers' salaries will have to rise in order to keep pace with earnings in other professions. A larger part of the pupils will be in high schools, where the cost per pupil is much higher than in the elementary schools.

As against this, State and local taxes are, as Beardsley Ruml put it, encountering stiffer resistance. As tax burdens become heavier, the reconciliation of opposing views about taxes becomes increasingly difficult. One reason for the slower growth of State and local revenues is the necessary reliance of those governments, especially the localities, upon the property tax. The smaller geographic units of government are forced to rely upon immobile tax bases which cannot move to other jurisdictions to escape taxation. Although the fiscal capacity of the States is not quite so limited as that of the localities, the political organization of many States does not permit adequate use of State financial resources to supplement the resources of the localities. Urban areas are underrepresented in the governments of most States. The rural-dominated legislatures will not enact the statewide taxes necessary to support the higher educational costs and aspirations of the urban areas.

It is entirely unrealistic politically, Ruml insisted, to expect to achieve a major breakthrough in American public education by operating 1 at a time upon the 45,000 school districts or even upon the 50 State legislatures.

In all of this we must not fall into the mistake of thinking that this is a proposal to tax the rich, and supposedly more public-spirited States, for the benefit of the poorer and less energetic States. The truth is that the poorer States are on the whole making a greater effort to support their schools than are the richer States.

Thus there are 31 States with an income per schoolchild which is below the national average. Yet they are spending 3.6 percent of their personal income on schools whereas the 18 richer States spend only 2.75 percent. The richer States can afford better schools with less personal sacrifice.

In advocating a larger use of the Federal power to raise money for education, the administration is dealing not with some fancy theory but with the hard practical fiscal problems of the States and the localities. Those who oppose the program in principle have almost certainly not understood the problem.

THE PRESIDENT'S NATURAL RESOURCES MESSAGE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, aside from the new President's poor taste in casting innuendo in the direction of former President Eisenhower, his natural resources message is a mish-mash of distortion and political propaganda.

The Eisenhower administration's record in conservation and reclamation is unmatched by any previous administration, Democratic or Republican.

This record was compiled last year by my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I ask unanimous consent to insert this document in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

X

Accomplishments of the Republican administration in natural resources and conservation, 1953–60

(By U.S. Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, senior Republican member of the Senate Government Operations Committee)

More progress has been made between January 1953 and May 1960 in the intelligent conservation, prudent use, and orderly development of America's priceless natural resources, than in any comparable 7-year-plus period in our history.

With the Republican Party giving true meaning to national conservation goals, these have been some of the salient accomplishments:

1. Vast new sections of the arid West have been opened to productive life through the Republican administration's insistence on accelerated construction of reclamation dams and reservoirs.

2. Unprecedented increases in the production of hydroelectric power have contributed to a blossoming of industrial development throughout many of the Western States.

3. Our great network of national parks has been expanded and revitalized.

4. Fish and wildlife conservation has moved forward at a rate unmatched in previous history.

5. Effective steps have been taken to insure wise development of our mineral resources.

6. During fiscal year 1959, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management took in revenues of over $136,700,000 from the conservation and development of the Nation's public domain lands. Since 1785, total revenues from the lease and sale of public domain lands and resources have exceeded $2 billion. The significance of the fact that more than half of this sum has come in since January 1953 needs little emphasizing. At the same time—recognizing the growing values of public domain lands under departmental management—a set of stringent antispeculation policies have been adopted to provide full protection of the public interest.

7. The urgent short-term and long-range water needs of the Nation are being met through imaginative new programs.

8. Statehood has been won for Alaska and Hawaii, thus opening vast new resource reserves to increased productivity and development.

9. Important new programs have been launched to conserve and develop the human resource represented by our Indian population.

This list consists of only the highlights of a massive total conservation upsurge that has, directly or indirectly, helped to better the lives of all Americans under the Republican administration.

These striking accomplishments, achieved through forward-looking programs, are in close accord with the basic conservation philosophy of the Republican Party.

Promotion of cooperative planning and effort—teamwork—in natural resource conservation and development has been a cornerstone of the positive resource policies of the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration. This teamwork approach has paved the way for a resource development effort by both public and private enterprise without parallel in our history. The 1953–60 period seems certain to go down in history as our most golden era in resource progress.

The Republican Party is keenly aware of the fact that today's generation has a solemn obligation to conserve our physical and scenic resources for tomorrow's children. At the same time, the Nation's high standards of living give ample proof that intelligent conservation and orderly development of natural resources are compatible.

Reclamation

Today—after nearly 50 years of the Federal Government's reclamation program which was proposed and started by the Republican Party under President Theodore Roosevelt—some 7,500,000 acres of irrigable land in the 17 Western States are served by reclamation projects. Power-generating capacity stands at more than 5 million kilowatts. Crops produced with reclamation water are worth nearly $1 billion a year.

These are impressive figures.

But far more impressive is the record of accomplishment in the more recent 1953–60 Republican years. This Republican administration has underway the largest water resources construction program in history—a record $1.2 billion was requested in the 1961 budget for flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, and related water resources projects.

In the field of reclamation, since 1953 the Republican administration has sponsored, and Congress has authorized, 51 reclamation projects, or project units, including the billion-dollar Colorado River storage project, the largest reclamation undertaking ever approved in a single piece of legislation.

Included also were the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Wyoming, recently dedicated; the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin project in Oregon; the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project in California; the Lavaca Flats, Mirage Flats extension, and O'Neill units of the Missouri Basin project in Nebraska.

Taken together, these 51 new projects or project units will have a storage capacity of nearly 42 million acre-feet—an increase of 50 percent over the Bureau of Reclamation's storage capacity in mid-1953.

These 51 new projects will ultimately provide full or supplemental irrigation water for nearly 890,000 acres of land—an area larger than Rhode Island and a 12 percent increase over the total irrigable acreage of reclamation projects for the 1953 crop year.

Their hydroelectric powerplants will deliver each year about 8½ billion kilowatt-hours of energy—an increase of one-third over the total energy generated at Bureau hydroelectric plants during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953—the last fiscal year planned by the Truman administration.

Over the same 7-year period, on some of these projects and on units of others authorized earlier, the administration has undertaken 44 new construction starts including 9 supplementary projects, and involving a total present and future investment of nearly a billion dollars.

For the 8 fiscal years ending June 30, 1961, the Department of the Interior has had or requested a total of $1,765 million appropriated for the work of its Bureau of Reclamation. In other words, nearly $1 out of every $3 made available for reclamation activities since 1902 ($4,723 million) will have been appropriated during the Eisenhower administration.

This impressive financial support for western resource development has been possible in spite of record peacetime defense costs, and in spite of the fact that in every fiscal year but one, the Congress, controlled in every session but one by the Democrats, has failed to appropriate as much money as the Republican administration requested for reclamation work.

The importance of the reclamation program to the West cannot be overestimated. Bureau of Reclamation projects deliver annually about 260 billion gallons of water for 106 municipalities and 68 industrial entities scattered throughout the West. Irrigation water is delivered to more than 128,000 farms, embracing more than 8 million acres. These farms produce crops valued at nearly $1 billion annually. The daily activities of nearly 10 million persons who live on farms in industrial areas and in cities provided with water from reclamation projects are vitally affected by these artificially developed supplies of lifegiving water.

These, then, are some of the spectacular accomplishments in reclamation by the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration in the short span of a little more than 7 years. The results of this achievement have contributed immeasurably to the economic stability, not only of the West, but the Nation as a whole.

In addition to authorization of the billion-dollar Colorado River storage project, which will store and transport water for consumption in a four-State semiarid area larger than New England, a second far-reaching legislative accomplishment of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration was the enactment of legislation to provide loans and grants for local construction of small (less than $5 million in Federal participation) reclamation projects and distribution systems for existing reclamation irrigation projects. This program—long advocated by western water user groups—was not finally authorized until 1955, yet a total of nearly $40 million had been appropriated for loans and grants by early 1960, and other requests were awaiting final action.

A third highly significant legislative milestone of this Republican administration in regard to reclamation was passage of Public Law 85–500, known as the Water Supply Act of 1958.

This act provides authority for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to make provision for storage, not only for immediate but also for future water supply needs in connection with Federal multipurpose projects, thereby permitting the Federal Government and local interests to share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction.

Hydroelectric Power

Some indication of the almost incredible scope of the natural resource accomplishments of the Republican administration may be found in an examination of the results achieved from a single phase of conservation in a single area of America.

The Pacific Northwest today, with its plentiful and low-cost hydroelectric energy—increasing more than twofold in the years since 1953—is the strong right arm of a burgeoning era of progress and prosperity. In little more than 7 years, the Federal Government's Columbia River power system grew from two multipurpose dams—Bonneville and Grand Coulee with an installed capacity of 1,814,400 kilowatts—to 17 multipurpose projects completed or under construction with an ultimate installed capacity of 7,818,650 kilowatts.

Currently, the Pacific Northwest region has 161 hydroelectric plants with nearly 10,600,000 kilowatts of installed capacity—two-thirds of them completed or placed under construction during this administration.

Presently under construction, scheduled, or under active consideration are 74 additional projects with an installed capacity of nearly 12 million kilowatts. Half of this capacity is either actively under construction now, or firmly scheduled.

Since 1953, power generated at Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest has totaled 228.3 billion kilowatt-hours—a figure nearly 3½ times greater than that for the preceding 10 years. During this same period, generation from non-Federal dams nearly doubled.

Over $1.5 billion has been allocated to power facilities in the short span of something more than 7 years, a fourfold increase over the total for the previous 10 years due to the progressive construction of hydroelectric dams by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, together with the transmission facilities of Interior's Bonneville Power Administration. As of May 1, 1960, more than $647 million has been repaid to the U.S. Treasury from power revenues—all of this under the Republican administration.

Recreational Resources

Probably in no other area of our national life are the immediate demands being placed on an invaluable resource by the explosive nature of our population growth more dramatically illustrated than in the increasing pressures on America's recreational resources.

Fantastic as they have been, the Nation's population gains do not begin to approach the corresponding rate of increase in outdoor recreational activities by countless millions of Americans.

In our national parks, for example, there were just 1 million visitors in 1920. By 1959 this figure had risen to over 62 million—an increase of more than 6,000 percent—and the upward curve was continuing.

In the progressive years of the Republican administration, the Department of the Interior spearheaded intensified efforts of recreational planners at all levels of government to provide wholesome outdoor recreational facilities for the multiplying millions of Americans today—and to assure at least corresponding benefits for the generations yet unborn.

Through the dynamic programs of its agencies, the Department, in less than 8 years, has achieved advances in this important era of national life unmatched in previous history. These were some of the accomplishments:

1. The National Park Service, with its 10-year program, Mission 66, made spectacular forward strides in preserving, protecting, and improving the irreplaceable national park system. At the same time, since January 1953, more than 600,000 acres have been added to the system, and a number of new areas have been established within the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the establishment of the 29th national park in the Virgin Islands. The total budget for the National Park Service for the first 4 years of Mission 66—a sum approaching $300 million—exceeded the total for the 13 years prior to this administration.

2. The Bureau of Reclamation, whose prime responsibility is development of irrigation for the water-hungry West, established important new water recreational facilities in the arid areas of the Nation through the creation of great manmade lakes at reservoirs.

3. The Fish and Wildlife Service carried out far-reaching programs to provide abundant supplies of fish and game for recreational hunting without depleting wildlife resources.

4. In less spectacular but equally important ways, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs made positive contributions to improving and increasing America's recreational facilities.

Under Mission 66, the National Park Service—which administers about 180 areas of scenic, scientific, or historical importance—made rapid strides during the Republican administration years in restoration and development of park areas.

When this long-range program was inaugurated in 1956, the Nation's parks were neither staffed nor equipped to protect their irreplaceable features, nor to provide proper facilities for the increasing millions of visitors—expected to reach or surpass a total of 80 million when Mission 66 is completed. Lodging and eating facilities were inadequate and outmoded. Interpretive services for proper park enjoyment were lacking, while priceless park features were deteriorating.

From mid-1956 to early 1960, the Park Service, through the investment of more than $100 million, provided new and better park roads, trails, parkways, visitor centers, museums, campsites, utility systems, and a variety of interpretive services throughout the Nation. The sign, "A Mission 66 Project," became a familiar landmark to millions of traveling Americans. Again, all of this under the Republican administration.

During the same period, private enterprise invested more than $17 million to provide new hotels, lodges, motels, restaurants, and other accommodations which allow park visitors to do more than merely drive through park areas.

In the years of the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration the Department of the Interior moved to salvage some of the remaining potential park areas when it requested Congress to approve legislation which would authorize the acquisition of at least three additional national shoreline areas.

In 1959, the national wildlife refuges administered by the Department's Fish and Wildlife Service recorded some 10 million visitors—in contrast with about 3.5 million in 1951.

Like other owners of land in scenic areas away from metropolitan centers. Indian tribal groups during the progressive years of this administration have become increasingly aware of the attractiveness of certain reservation areas to sportsmen and tourists. The White Mountain Apache Tribe in Arizona, for example, has on its reservation about 80 percent of that State's trout stream mileage. It created a large manmade lake in a mountain setting, stocked it with fish, and laid out 500 summer cottage sites for lease. In this and other ways, the Indians during this administration—with the encouragement of the Bureau of Indian Affairs—developed important new recreational resources for the enjoyment of many Americans.

Recognizing America's swiftly growing interest in water recreation, the administration won congressional approval of recreation as one of the specific beneficial uses of the gigantic upper Colorado River storage project.

This enormous project will contribute not only large amounts of water for irrigation and hydroelectric power generation, but also, because of the positive conservation leadership of this administration, will create a great network of manmade lakes which will provide many hours of wholesome recreation for our growing population in years to come.

Use of manmade reservoir lakes of the Department's Bureau of Reclamation has mounted phenomenally during the Republican administration. In 1955, some 10 million people visited and enjoyed the water recreational facilities of reclamation reservoirs. By 1959 a total of 19.5 million persons used these recreational resources—an increase of almost 100 percent in about 5 years.

Fish and Wildlife Conservation

Typical of the greater recognition given during this administration to the need for

improved conservation of our fish and wildlife resources was the reorganization of the Department's Fish and Wildlife Service under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

Under this far-reaching legislation, the sport fisheries and wildlife and the commercial fisheries activities of the Department were divided into separate bureaus of the Service under a commissioner. A new Assistant Secretary of the Interior was designated to supervise all fish and wildlife programs.

A spectacular action under this administration was the laying of the necessary groundwork for establishment of the 9-million-acre Arctic Wildlife Range, an area 3 times as large as any existing American national wildlife area. When the action is completed, the total of national wildlife areas will soar close to 27 million acres—protected for present and future generations of Americans.

In the period of little more than 7 years, a total of 23 refuges, with a total acreage of 114,152 in 22 States, were added to the national wildlife refuge system, and action was begun for the establishment of several others.

Another outstanding action was passage of the new $3 duck stamp law designed to greatly accelerate additions to the network of national waterfowl refuges in the four flyways. The Duck Stamp Act of 1958 ended the diversion of duck stamp funds for other than refuge purposes. Under it, all net revenues on stamp sales are earmarked for selection and acquisition of habitat for waterfowl.

Highly important in the conservation and development of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources were these additional departmental actions during the Eisenhower-Nixon Republican administration:

1. A controversial issue which had been unsolved for many years—oil and gas leasing on refuges—was settled by prohibiting such activity on national wildlife refuges in the 48 contiguous States except in case of oil drainage.

2. In the interest of the salmon fishery of the Northwest, the Department of Interior actively urged that no further dams be built on the Middle Snake River in Idaho below the mouth of the Imnaha until other possibilities for water storage on that river system had been thoroughly explored and considered.

3. Amendments to the Coordination Act of 1946 were sponsored by the Department and now make possible enhancement of fish and wildlife values, as well as the mitigation of losses of such values in Federal water development projects. These amendments make improvement of fish and wildlife a specific purpose of Federal water resource projects—making fish and wildlife an equal partner in this resource development field.

4. The Federal-aid program administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service resulted in new high marks of conservation progress. The magnitude of this program may be judged by the expenditures since January 1953. A total of some $150 million—Federal aid and State funds combined—was invested by the various States on Federal-aid projects for the restoration of game, and nearly $50 million for the restoration of fish. This, of course, did not include restoration projects wholly financed by the States. In the Federal-aid fish restoration work, States completed or initiated construction of 186 lakes with a total surface of 25,000 acres. For the restoration of game, States acquired in fee title, through the Federal-aid program, approximately 1¼ million acres of land at a cost of more than $45 million, about one-third of which is being used for waterfowl management.

5. In addition to the 23 new refuges established in the national refuge system, the Department of Interior also brought about the establishment of more than 40 new units in the system of cooperative areas—Federal lands operated as wildlife management areas by the States under agreements developed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

6. Research in the early years of the administration proved a definite link between unwise use of pesticides and the destruction of several species of desirable birds, land animals, and fish. As a result of these findings, the Department supported legislation which authorizes long-range studies on the effects of pesticides and recommends formulations and practices which would not endanger fish and wildlife. A measure of the growing importance attached to this program may be seen in the fact that the 1958 appropriation of $280,000 was increased to $2,565,000 in 1959.

At the same time, departmental programs aimed at combating various forms of threats to our commercial fisheries resources made important progress since January 1953. For example, explosive increases in the abundance of sea lampreys in the Great Lakes in recent years brought about the destruction of the once valuable lake trout fisheries in Lake Huron and Lake Michigan and greatly reduced the trout population in Lake Superior. During the productive years of this Republican administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries developed electrical barriers to kill spawning adult lampreys, and chemical lampricides to kill developing lamprey larvae in the spawning stream gravels. These methods show excellent promise of reducing the lamprey population to low levels so that the valuable lake trout fishery can be restored.

Here, too, the Republican concept of teamwork between Federal, State, and local agencies, together with private industry, has led to a unified approach to the problems of our commercial fishing industry.

7. A program of standards development for inspection of fishery products was initiated by the Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and was carried out in close cooperation with the industry. The result has been development of five voluntary U.S. standards for major fishery products. These standards define the characteristics of good quality fish and are available to everyone.

Sound Public Land Management

During fiscal year 1959, the Bureau of Land Management took in revenue of over $136,700,000 from the conservation and development of the Nation's public domain lands. Since the Bureau was created in 1946, revenues have totaled more than $1.2 billion. Over 80 percent of these revenues have come in since the Republican administration took office in 1953. Since that year revenues have exceeded appropriations by more than 6.4 to 1.

Major developmental actions affecting the resource programs of the public domain in recent years have included the opening of some 20 million acres of northern Alaska lands to mining and mineral leasing development. The area is known as PLO 82 and is adjacent to Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The opening of these lands to exploration and development may pave the way for major new economic development for the new State.

Of no less importance to the conservation of public lands has been the recent improvement of fire detection and suppression methods in the Western States. The Bureau has placed into effect regulations to carry out the Department's responsibilities under Public Law 167, which provides for multiple use of surface resources on public lands and protects the public interest in those resources through regulatory provisions. Public Law 167 represents the most important change in the mining laws since enactment of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and constitutes one of the most vital conservation measures in history.

Minerals and Metals Programs

Twice, in 1957 and 1958, the Republican administration presented a comprehensive minerals program to the Democratic-controlled Congress. The Congress failed both times to enact this recommended legislation. The only significant portion of the two major minerals programs authorized by Congress was the long-range domestic minerals exploration plan. This legislation established the Office of Minerals Exploration within the Department of the Interior. The program of this Office provides for the sharing of the risk between the Government and private industry to carry out minerals exploration projects which would not normally be undertaken with private capital alone.

The administration has also recommended passage of S. 1537, which would establish policy guidelines by the Congress, to be followed by the Government in recommending and establishing minerals programs. The effect of such legislation would make the maintenance of a sound and healthy minerals industry a major consideration of the Federal Government. It has not been enacted.

The Department of the Interior's Bureau of Mines continues its emphasis on research involving high-temperature and special structural metals, and is attempting to develop new uses for materials having unusual properties.

An outstanding accomplishment of the Bureau during 1959 was the development of a method for making shaped casings of molybdenum at the Electrometallurgical Research Laboratory at Albany, Oreg. Recently, deposition of high purity tungsten into simple controlled shapes by a novel process developed by the Bureau has generated tremendous interest among the designers of missiles. Its possible application in helping to solve the problems incident to high-temperature alloys is significant.

Emphasis was placed by the Department's Geological Survey on the development of new geologic concepts, techniques, and tools to aid in the search for mineral deposits and to determine the water supplies of the Nation.

As a result of geochemical research, a tungsten deposit was located in western Colorado, and new methods of interpreting rock alterations and geochemical anomalies led to a major discovery of silver-lead-zinc ore in Utah. About $11,760,000 for geologic and mineral resources surveys and mapping was expected to be expended during the 1960 fiscal year.

After failure of the Democratic-controlled Congress to enact either recommended program, quotas on imports of lead and zinc were imposed by President Eisenhower, October 1, 1958. In conjunction with moderately increased consumption, these quotas served to improve the situation of these two commodities during 1959. Mine production of lead and zinc have increased.

By proclamations dated March 10 and April 30, 1959, the President provided for regulating imports of crude oil and its principal products into the United States. Subsequently, regulations were issued implementing the proclamations and establishing in the Department of the Interior an Oil Import Administration under the direction of an Administrator and an Oil Import Appeals Board.

This program was initiated to encourage a healthy climate for domestic oil exploration.

Mineral Resource Development

Under the Eisenhower-Nixon policy of "creative conservation," the years since January 1953 have witnessed a period of rapid economic growth and scientific advancement despite substantial defense stockpiling of strategic materials. During this period, the Nation's mines and mineral

plants have sustained a high level of output and, largely through improved technology, developed new resources to meet future needs.

At the beginning of the Republican administration, petroleum production from the public lands amounted to some 80 million barrels a year.

Today, just a little more than 7½ years later, annual production has soared to more than 142 million barrels—enough oil to heat 5 million homes.

In 1949, 124 billion cubic feet of natural gas was extracted from public domain lands.

By early 1960, this total had been raised to nearly 446 billion cubic feet—an increase of more than 300 billion cubic feet in a decade.

In 1949, there were some 22,000 outstanding mineral leases on public lands in the United States covering slightly over 19 million acres.

Today, after little more than 7½ years of this Republican administration, over 107 million acres are covered by more than 132,000 leases.

As with water and land resources, the spectacular advances in mineral resource development since January 1953 have been made possible in large measure by the successful sponsoring by the administration of vital new legislative measures.

Passage of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in 1953 marked the beginning of Federal mineral leasing of offshore submerged lands and the rapid expansion of private exploratory development investments in mineral production.

Providing legal sanction for the application of modern-day multiple-use land management, Public Law 585 of 1954 opened the door to mining and mineral leasing development on the same tracts of land. This law was followed a year later by two laws, one authorizing the extraction of uranium and other source materials from lignite coal deposits, and the other permitting mining claims on some 7.2 million acres set aside as power and water sites in 24 States.

In 1955, Congress passed Republican-backed legislation often described as the most important single conservation measure since passage of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934. Public Law 167, the Multiple Surface Use Act, had the effect of unlocking immense values of surface resources on millions of acres in dormant and abandoned mining claims.

Early in the administration the Department of the Interior initiated an incentive program to encourage exploration for domestic sources of critical and strategic minerals and metals by providing for Government participation in the costs and risks involved.

The program is unique in that for the first time a joint effort was made by the Government and private industry for minerals exploration. The results have been highly satisfactory, adding substantial mineral reserves to the Nation's resources.

Meeting Our Water Problem

Realizing that the enormous demands for water will continue to increase as our population expands and our standard of living rises, the Eisenhower administration has pursued with urgency a vigorous program to find an economical means of converting saline water.

The Department of the Interior's Office of Saline Water has already made a sevenfold reduction in the cost of converting salt water to fresh water, and the outlook for the future is bright, despite the fact that the Democratic-controlled Congress has refused in 4 years out of the last 7 to appropriate as much money as requested for this program.

Saline water conversion pilot plant tests give strong indication of a breakthrough in preventing the formation of scale on distillation equipment. Scale formation is one of the major technological problems in distillation processes. This exciting new development will be utilized in the first of five saline-water-conversion demonstration plants to be built by the Department of the Interior. U.S. Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, has established himself as a farsighted statesman in pushing this program from the start.

One of the plants will work by an electrodialysis process and will be located in the nothern Great Plains in Webster, S. Dak. It will be designed to convert brackish water to fresh water at the rate of 250,000 gallons per day.

Imagine the blessings which will be brought to the arid area of this country, and to the world, if we can be successful in this program. Republican leadership will assure success, if it is at all possible.

Statehood Won for Alaska and Hawaii

Congressional approval of the Republican platform promise and President Eisenhower's request that both Alaska and Hawaii be admitted into the Union was largely due to the persistence of the Eisenhower administration's ardent statehood advocate, Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. As spokesman for the administration, Secretary Seaton helped lead both statehood campaigns.

Indian Affairs

The policies of the Republican administration have struck at the root of the problems of the American Indian and mark a turning point in the history of Indian affairs in the United States.

In 1953 only 79 percent of the Indian children between the ages of 6 and 18 on reservations were enrolled in school. For the last school term the figure was 93 percent, and during this fall term there will be facilities to meet the educational needs of all school-age Indian children on reservations throughout the United States, most, of course, being located in the Western States.

During this administration, the Department has taken positive steps to repair the damages of past educational deficiencies among adult Indian people. Today an adult education program is being conducted at 80 locations, and 3,000 Indians and native Alaskans are enrolled.

Since 1956 the Bureau of Indian Affairs also has conducted a program of vocational training in trade schools and on-the-job training in industrial plants.

In Conclusion

Never in our history has there been such progress in so short a time to benefit so many people as the progress made under the Republican administration in its two terms.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago the distinguished Senator from Arizona commented on a statement on page 3 of the President's message on resources. In speaking of the "no new starts" policy, the President said:

Such a policy denied the resource requirements and potentials on which our economic growth hinges, and took a heavy toll in added costs and even human life and homes by postponing essential flood control projects.

Mr. President, that is a rather curious statement. I can readily understand how the press quickly reached the belief that the statement implied a serious criticism of President Eisenhower.

But, Mr. President, if such a conclusion from that statement were correct, we might well argue that if we did not provide the Weather Bureau with all the money it wanted it would not be able to seed the clouds sufficiently to plow a hole in the eye of a hurricane and, therefore, the State represented by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who at the moment is sitting in the chair of the majority leadership, might be seriously injured by a hurricane and might properly be described as a victim of the administration. Similarly, it might be argued that if we did not appropriate enough money for the seeding of clouds with silver iodide, or something of the sort, the rain that was needed in Texas would not begin to fall, and then the dusts would blow, and people would lose their homes, and someone might be killed in the windstorm that would follow.

All this is an interesting type of logic, and I am glad the distinguished Senator from Arizona remarked the fact, because I must say that if that was intended by the language that was used it was not fair to the gracious gentleman, with a great human heart, who left the White House on January 20—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

But I am rather sure that the incumbent President could not have intended the statement to be regarded in that fashion. However, that is the way it was "dished up" in the headline on the front page this morning.

TRIBUTE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Monday, when fellow Senators recognized the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the congressional service of my senior colleague, Senator CARL HAYDEN, I could not be present. Therefore, at this late date I wish to add my congratulations to my lifelong friend.

A half century is a long time to spend in the service of the people, but it is especially noteworthy when we consider the fact that Senator HAYDEN'S term of service coincides exactly with the life of his State.

CARL HAYDEN was first sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives on February 19, 1912, the same year that the Arizona Territory became the great State of Arizona, and he has served continuously in Congress ever since. His service in the House ran from 1912 to 1926, with time out only for military service as a major in World War I. He was first elected to the Senate in 1926, and has served in the Senate ever since.

Mr. President, things were much different when Senator HAYDEN first came to Congress. Transportation was a problem, for example, and it took him the better part of a week on the train to reach Washington from Arizona. Now it is a matter of hours by air.

The Senate should know also that Senator HAYDEN'S public life began before he arrived in Congress. It began in 1904, when he was elected a member of the Tempe, Ariz., Town Council. The town formerly had been called Hayden's Ferry, in honor of the Senator's father. Before coming to Congress, CARL HAYDEN also served as treasurer of Maricopa County, and had a taste of the rough and tough life of an Arizona sheriff.

Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to congratulate the senior Senator from my State on a long and honorable and distinguished career as a public servant.

THE 14TH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on Washington's Birthday, in this city which bears Washington's name, not the least important observance was the national awards luncheon at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

This was the high moment of the 14th annual Voice of Democracy contest which is sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Association, and the State associations of broadcasters in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Endorsed by the U.S. Office of Education it annually attracts the attention, study, and essays of thousands of our students. Out of these are selected 51 winners from the individual States and the District of Columbia. Their topic is "I Speak for Democracy."

I congratulate the program, the sponsors, and the contestants—even those to whom there go no awards. For our country must be a little richer for the unsung thousands who give their thought to our system of government.

At the Washington Birthday luncheon a narrower selection is announced of the four outstanding contestants.

The Rhode Island representative, William C. S. Mays 3d, of Providence, was among the top four chosen by the distinguished panel of national judges represented at this function by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

William Mays is a senior at Hope High School in Providence and looks forward to attending the University of Rhode Island. As a symbol of the inspiring thinking of these young people I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the text of the essay of William C. S. Mays 3d as delivered at the awards luncheon.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Democracy—stop and ponder this word for a few moments and attempt to gain an image of what democracy means to you. Noah Webster has defined democracy as a "government by the people or a government in which the supreme power is retained by the people and exercised either directly or indirectly through a series of representation."

Unless you have had some connection with another type of government or way of life, you will fail to gain a complete picture of democracy. Even I, as an American, admit defeat because, to me, democracy is my way of life and hence I take many of the happenings of my daily life for granted. I cannot understand not having the privilege of free speech, a trial by jury, an education of my own choosing, worshiping as I please, starting and owning my own business, and so many of the other items that we, as citizens of this great Nation fail to completely appreciate unless we are without.

A quick glance out of a window gives view to a large number of objects that are associated with democracy. The cars passing on the street are symbols of our economy brought about by our system of free enterprise. The street itself was paid for by the taxpayer who either voted for the highway project or had his elected officials vote for him.

Perhaps the greatest example of our democracy is shown every fourth year in our elections. This year, our State, as many in the Nation, was faced with the election of a Governor and his slate, a U.S. Senator, two Representatives to the House, and many posts in local levels. This was in addition to the election of a President of our Nation.

The people weighed each candidate by his platform and promises and then decided upon the ones that they would like best to serve them for the next few years. Their choice has reflected the desires of the people and hence, the people receive their wishes. A privilege granted to only a few—this is America—our way of life—a wonderful way of life.

If there were only some way that we could look at our America, our democracy from an outside point of view, then, only in this way, would we gain a true picture of how wonderful it is to live in a society in which the will of the people is the law of the land. Again, Noah Webster has defined democracy as the most powerful ruling force on the earth—"a government by the people."

Democracy is a government by the people. I speak for democracy.

A CITIZEN OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY SPEAKS FOR DEMOCRACY

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the American people generally accept the statement that what we wish to find in the Nation we must first put into the schools. This applies particularly to the development of those attitudes and accomplishments that are basic in good citizenship. The schools of the Nation are the foundation of both the security and the idealism of the Nation.

This fact is recognized by the inspirational program entitled "The Voice of Democracy." The 14th national awards program sponsored jointly by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Electrical Industries Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and State associations of broadcasters was held in Washington on February 22, George Washington's Birthday.

The winner in each of the 50 States was present. These high school boys and girls represented the best of hundreds of thousands of students who participated in the contest.

The citizens of the new State of Hawaii, the Aloha State, were thrilled when Miss Carol Ogata, of the Pahoa High School, a small rural school on the island of Hawaii, was declared to be the national winner. Through her subject, "I Speak for Democracy," she spoke feelingly of what democracy is and what it means to her.

The concluding paragraph of her statement reflects the spirit of the American school and is inspiring:

Therefore, I vow to defend my country, not with arms and fists, for I am quite helpless with these; not with angry words, for they are of no avail; but in every way I can—through my actions and with my heart. Every time I am given an opportunity to voice my disagreement, I will try to remember that I, too, must give others an equal opportunity to voice their opinions. Every time I communicate with God in my own way, I must remember to put in a few words of thankfulness. Every time I am given a chance to make my own decision, I must weigh the facts carefully, for with my privileges come certain responsibilities. I will defend democracy, for democracy lives through you and through me.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Ogata's entire statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I am an American of Japanese ancestry. My grandparents were immigrants to this country. Our Nation fought a bloody war with the people of my grandparents' homeland. Yet, I am no less an American than a person who can trace his ancestry back to the minuteman who fired the shot heard 'round the world. I am no less an American because this is America. I am no less an American, for that minuteman or his father or grandfather before him was an immigrant also.

Our Nation's greatness was built by the tired, the discontented, the adventurous, the hopeful, and the desperate from numerous countries. To all these America gave a new lease on life, and all these people contributed to America's greatness. The virgin land and open skies presented opportunities, but these were unattainable except through hard work. Hard work did not deter these people, for in America, as nowhere else in the world, a man was truly free. The people worked and suffered but never yielded. Great cities sprang from the earth, until in some places there were forests of buildings instead of forests of towering trees. Industries grew, agriculture flourished, and our country became what it is today—prosperous and still growing.

Hard work and creative thinking built our country, but our country was born and preserved in blood. Americans fought to gain their independence. They fought against common foes. They even fought brother against brother. Yet in the end the United States of America remained united. Such is the history of our Nation, built by the sweat, blood, and ingenuity of countless individuals.

This is our heritage. I, as an American, proud of my heritage, will defend it. Where else can there be so much prosperity and abundance? Where else will you find a Catholic and a Protestant running for the Nation's highest office and have each man considered for his abilities and not for his religion? Where else will you find territories so eager to become a part of the nation? Where else will you find the Government so close to and so representative of the people?

My answer is, Nowhere else but in my homeland—America. To some people America may be the farms and fertile valleys. To others bustling cities, filled with humanity, may spell America. A Negro mother may hear America in the voice of a Marian Anderson. A Jewish citizen may look with pride upon the life story of Albert Einstein. An Italian citizen may add his lusty voice to thousands of other voices cheering a Rocky Colavito.

America is a combination of all these things. America represents something intangible, yet something we live by, day in and day out. It represents something people have given and will give their lives for. It represents something people take for granted at times. It represents democracy. Democracy, our daily way of life, can survive only if all of us are determined to keep it alive.

Therefore, I vow to defend my country, not with arms and fists, for I am quite helpless with these; not with angry words, for

they are of no avail; but in every way I can—through my actions and with my heart. Every time I am given an opportunity to voice my disagreement, I will try to remember that I, too, must give others an equal opportunity to voice their opinions. Every time I communicate with God in my own way, I must remember to put in a few words of thankfulness. Every time I am given a chance to make my own decision, I must weigh the facts carefully, for with my privileges come certain responsibilities. I will defend democracy, for democracy lives through you and through me.

MONTANA RAILROAD MERGERS AND SERVICE CURTAILMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today an examiner for the Interstate Commerce Commission is conducting a public hearing in Miles City, Mont., the second of two hearings in my State, concerning the application filed by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. to discontinue passenger train service between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash.

Also on February 17 the Northern Pacific, Great Northern, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad Cos. filed an application with the Interstate Commerce Commission requesting approval of the proposed merger of these four railroads.

Montana is served by three transcontinental railroads, the Milwaukee Road, the Northern Pacific, and the Great Northern. These railroads play a very important part in the economy of the Treasure State, and they have provided the major source of freight and public transportation. Montana has also been good to these railroad companies.

Now in two separate actions these roads want to curtail, abandon, and consolidate railway service in Montana. If the abandonment and the consolidation are approved, it will mean unemployment in a State which is already confronted with serious depressed economic conditions, and it will take away service from an area which is still fighting to get an orderly public transportation pattern to serve its public. These are very serious matters, and I wish to address myself to these problems for a few minutes today.

The field hearings which are now being conducted by the ICC examiner in Montana concern the Milwaukee Road's announced intention to discontinue the operation of the Olympian Hiawatha passenger train between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash. At the present time the Milwaukee serves 10 Montana communities. If these passenger trains are taken out of service, four of these cities will have no passenger train service, and it is a considerable distance to any other line. The proposed discontinuance will also affect other branch line service now operated in the State by the Milwaukee Road. In most of these communities the Milwaukee Road is a very large influence on the local economy. In fact, at least two of these cities are major points on the Milwaukee Road. If these trains are taken off, it will mean unemployment, disruption of service, and economic distress.

The merger of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern Railroads in Montana will have repercussions which are difficult to predict at this time. Will the passenger train service be reduced to one major line instead of two? What will happen to the rail centers such as Laurel, Livingston, and Havre which serve these lines? Another matter that concerns me greatly is, What will we have if the ICC approves these applications? We will have a monopoly over all passenger train service between Minneapolis and Seattle-Tacoma. This is difficult to justify, in my estimation.

My colleague, the able junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], shares my concern over these developments in the railroad industry.

The railroads of this country have had some tough sledding on occasion, but in recent years sincere attempts have been made to assist them in putting their operations back on a sound business basis. However, I do not think there was ever any intention to let the railroads escape their responsibilities to the consumer and the traveling public. In the instance of the railroads operating in Montana, I have not noticed that any of them were on the verge of bankruptcy. The railroads should quit playing one side against the other; they should face up to their problems. Train discontinuances have become a serious matter in the delivery of mails in some areas of the country.

I know I speak for LEE METCALF as well as myself when I say that because of its growth Montana and the Northwest need the services of competitive transcontinental railroads. We suggest that the Milwaukee Road, the Great Northern, and the Northern Pacific fight to maintain their competitive position in the transportation field with new imaginative policies instead of withdrawing to an easier road to financial prosperity. A brochure circulated by the Milwaukee Road suggests that the approval of its request to discontinue passenger train service from Minneapolis to the west coast will permit them to eliminate a losing operation and enable them to better serve its patrons and the general economy. What about their patrons in Minnesota, the Dakotas, Montana, Idaho, and Washington?

I have ridden the passenger trains on each of these transcontinental railroads, in fact many times. Admittedly, they are not always filled to capacity, but it seems that something could be done to overcome this situation by revising the present rate structures and improving service. Certainly no one would say that passenger trains have become passé. I, myself, like to ride on trains; they offer many conveniences and services that cannot be obtained on any other means of public transportation. Why not offer cheaper train fares to operate the passenger trains at near 100 percent of capacity rather than the present usual 20 to 25 percent? The trains run. Fill them up.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is the authority in these matters, and I do not intend to exercise any undue influence upon them. However, I suggest that the examiners and the Commissioners of the ICC not only listen to the hard, cold facts of a financier's reports and the smooth arguments of legal counsels, but that they also give serious consideration to the man on the street, the inarticulate small businessman, or the small chamber of commerce who can not afford legal representation, the people who will be hurt by curtailment, abandonment, and consolidation of railroad service.

The Northwest is growing. We have an abundance of resources. The railroads can be a part of the future, but not if they retreat. The elimination of Milwaukee passenger trains and the consolidation of the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, C.B. & Q., and S.P. & S. will only add to Montana's distress—a distress figure which now stands at 14.6 percent of our work force unemployed, second only to Alaska with a figure of 18.3 percent. We are not proud of that percentage, and we do not want to see it worsen, but that is what will happen if the railroads have their way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD newspaper articles, editorials, and communications relating to this subject.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., December 19, 1960.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senate.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I have your telegram of December 12, 1960, expressing your views in opposition to the proposal of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. to discontinue effective January 8, 1961, trains Nos. 15 and 16 operating between Minneapolis, Minn., and Tacoma, Wash., Finance Doc. No. 21391. I also have Senator MANSFIELD'S letter of December 8, 1960, enclosing a copy of a telegram from Mr. W. R. Lintz, of Deer Lodge, Mont., who also expresses his views in opposition to the proposed discontinuance.

Numerous protests to the proposal of the railroad have been received and consideration is now being given by the Commission as to whether it should institute an investigation of the proposed discontinuance. In the event the Commission decides to institute an investigation of the proposal of the railroad, an order to that effect will be issued on or about December 28, 1960.

Your request that the Commission issue an order instituting an investigation of the proposal of the railroad is noted, and you may be assured that careful consideration will be given thereto, as well as to the contentions of all parties before a decision in the matter is reached.

I have arranged for you and your correspondent to receive copies of all notices, reports, and orders that may be issued in the proceeding.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. WINCHELL,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 12, 1960.

JOHN H. WINCHELL,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.:

On December 6, 1960, the Milwaukee Road filed a statement with the Interstate Commerce Commission giving notice of its intention to discontinue transcontinental passenger-train service between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash. This action will terminate the operation of the Olympian Hiawatha trains 15 and 16 in the State of Montana.

The Milwaukee Road has a long career in Montana and it continues to bear an important economic influence on a number of communities in the State. The discontinuance of this passenger-train service will have a very serious affect on service and employment in 10 Montana cities. While the Milwaukee Road may have compelling reasons for taking this action the welfare of many of our constituents will be adversely affected.

We, therefore, request that the Interstate Commerce Commission issue an order of investigation in this case, under existing authority, requiring that service on this portion of the Milwaukee Road be continued for an additional 4 months so that this matter can be thoroughly studied. We are deeply interested in this matter and under separate cover we are sending you a sampling of constituent views.

Regards.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
U.S. Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 17, 1961.

EVERETT HUTCHINSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.:

The application filed for approval of the merger of the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad Cos. is potentially one of the most far-reaching proposals to affect the State of Montana and the Northwest in many years.

The Northern Pacific and the Great Northern have long competitive histories in the development and service to the Nation's fourth largest State. The approval of this consolidation would place rail transportation in the hands of a virtual monopoly in view of the Milwaukee Road's announced intention to curtail and discontinue service between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle-Tacoma, Wash.

This merger raises many serious questions which must be answered to the satisfaction of the people of Montana. What changes in employment and service will there be in our State? How many railroad employees will be displaced? What Montana communities will lose passenger and freight service? What improvements may be anticipated?

While the officials of the railroad companies involved may have compelling financial reasons for seeking the approval of this merger we are opposed to any plan which will bring about a major displacement of railroad personnel, curtailment of passenger and freight service, and resulting effects on local economies in a State already hard hit by chronic depressed conditions. Please keep us advised of all developments in this matter. Regards.

MIKE MANSFIELD.
LEE METCALF.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Jan. 15, 1961]

UNION OFFICIAL PREDICTS MERGER COULD END RAIL SERVICE HERE

M. W. Hampton, of Chicago, vice president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, predicted here Saturday night that if the Great Northern and Northern Pacific railroads merge, the Great Falls area will ultimately be without rail service of any kind.

"This, of course, would not occur overnight," he said, "but 25 percent of more than 1,000 jobs in the Butte division of the Great Northern would be affected immediately, and going by records of past mergers, eventually everyone else would be out of jobs."

In a speech before about 300 attending the 10th annual Great Falls Farmer-Labor Institute at Farmers Union headquarters, Hampton called the proposed merger a classic example of monopolistic empire building.

He said the merger of the G.N., N.P., Burlington, and Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroads is "diametrically opposed to the public interest."

Hampton charged that the combined roads would have a free ticket to serve only areas of the Pacific and Northwest where high profit, bulk commodities predominate.

"Instead of competition-inspired expansion, the area would be afflicted with retrenchment of rail transportation services. The scrapping of rail lines and retirement of equipment means loss of service to shippers, interference with economic development and an increased public criticism of the poor service rendered by the railroads."

Hampton said that if there is a merger, someday the Great Falls area will be without rail service because of poor branch line service, causing more persons to turn to trucks and other transportation and eventually the combined railroads asking to eliminate service altogether because of insufficient revenues.

"We have had experience," he said, "and we know the parallel consolidations wipe out 25 to 30 percent of the jobs. In the Northwest, that means upwards of 19,000 workers."

Pointing out that the major economy in rail mergers is the reduction in employees and eventual curtailment of service, Hampton said "If the merger of northwest railroads is allowed the growth rate of the entire region will be slowed."

The union spokesman called on citizens of the States served by the four railroads to awake to the danger of losing their most important ticket to future growth.

"You cannot sell your town as an industrial center or farm products marketing center without rail transportation. Unless every community, every chamber of commerce and every citizen works to keep rail transportation a competitive, dynamic force in the growth of this great region, we will find the Northwest slipping behind other areas of the Nation," he said.

Articles of incorporation were filed in Dover, Del., for the Great Northern Pacific & Burlington Lines, Inc., Friday. Filing of the papers paves the way for an application to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval of the merger.

The ICC apparently will get the application next month and G.N. and N.P. stockholders will vote on the merger later.

[From the Daily Missoulian, Jan. 26, 1961]

CIVIC GROUP'S LETTER FIGHTS RAIL MERGER

A letter has been sent to Missoula businessmen from the Missoula Civic Group protesting the proposed merger of the Northern Pacific; Great Northern; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy and Seattle, Portland & Spokane Railroads.

Application for permission to merge is reportedly to be made by the railroads with the Interstate Commerce Commission in February.

In a statement last week, Vice President C. H. Burgess of the Northern Pacific Railway said that all four systems over the next 5-year period will cut personnel about 8 percent or by some 5,200 employes; the net loss in Montana an expected 304 persons.

Burgess also predicted that the employment in Missoula and Livingston will actually show a slight increase during this period.

LETTER'S TEXT

The letter from the Missoula Civic Group read as follows:

"The Missoula Civic Group was formed in October 1960 with the specific purpose of informing all interested parties in our area of forthcoming plans and intentions of both this group and that of the Northern Pacific Railway in regard to their attempting to merge with three other financially solvent railroads.

"We feel our approach has been entirely objective, having offered the Northern Pacific every opportunity to acquaint you with the pending merger. Thus far the only statements made by the railroads have been primarily supposition. The Missoula Civic Group feels that after 5 years of study on a now completed plan, the railroads asking the Interstate Commerce Commission permission to merge before telling you of the effect of their cutback of employment, facilities, and service.

"Railroad chief executives have said a loss of 8,100 jobs would be felt in the first 2 years. Most serious effect of this loss would be on the Northern Pacific from Casselton, N. Dak. to Sandpoint, Idaho. Speaking conservatively, Northern Pacific officials say Missoula will lose 30 to 37 percent of her more than 500 railroad employees.

"An unbiased survey made for railroad labor organizations by a Chicago research firm shows that 18,000 jobs will be lost on the four systems contemplating merging.

"It is for these reasons and the reasons listed in the attached enclosure that the Missoula Civic Group is approaching all business people on behalf of railway employees, asking that their objection to this proposed merger be supported with the same good will that these Missoula citizens have supported your business over the past years."

The letter was signed by F. A. Caron, chairman of the civic group, and R. S. Murray, chairman of the group's public information committee, both employees of the Northern Pacific Railway.

Enclosed with each letter were two inserts, one of which read:

"Do you know—

"That more than 520 people work for the railroad in Missoula? That 456 of these people are married and have families? That, including families, there are 2,500 railroad people? That there are 725 railroad children in Missoula schools? That there are over 400 railroad homeowners? That railroad homes are valued in excess of $7 million? That local home loaning firms hold 276 mortgages on these homes? That railroaders have 450 accounts in local banks? That railroaders spend $4,500 a month for rent in Missoula?

"EIGHTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS IN TAXES

"That railroaders spend $85,000 a year in property taxes? That railroaders spend $30,000 a year in State income taxes? That railroaders spend $390,000 a year in Federal income tax? That railroaders spend $14,000 a month for gasoline? That the railroaders' power bill is $11,000 a month? That the railroaders' milk bill is over $8,000 a month? That railroaders pay insurance premiums in excess of $25,000 monthly? That the railroad payroll in Missoula is over $330,000 a month?

"The merchants and citizens of Missoula must know these facts so that they may rise in protest to the proposed merger of the Northwest railroads that will take a large percentage of these dollars away from their economy and their friends and neighbors away from their home city."

The other insert was a report headed "The New Threat of Railroad Consolidations,"

compiled by the Montana Railway Employees Association.

The report contends that no one benefits from railroad consolidations except the financier and stockholders which control the railroads; that a monopoly will be created by the proposed merger, and, despite the fact the railroads claim the merger is a move toward greater efficiency, none of the railroads in question are in financial difficulty.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, Feb. 14, 1961]

PROPOSED RAILROAD MERGER IS MAJOR WORRY TO LAUREL

(By Zoe Von Ende)

LAUREL.—This city is running scared.

The people aren't sure what the proposed four-railroad merger will mean to it, but they're expecting the worst. And hoping for the best.

It's a city dominated by three industries: railroad, oil refining, and agriculture.

Payroll and number of employees considered, railroad is probably the most important.

The excitement generated in December and January when Laurel rail unions and the chamber of commerce filed letters of protest of the merger has subsided.

Now, a sort of grim wait-and-see philosophy has taken over.

Laurel's Northern Pacific rail yards reputedly are the largest between the Twin Cities and the Pacific coast. "What will happen," the people ask, "if the NP; Great Northern; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy; and Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroads merge?"

FEWER JOBS?

They assume consolidation will mean fewer trains, less work, fewer jobs.

They expect news any day now that merger plans have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. After that, Laurel, and cities and towns all over the Pacific Northwest hope ICC hearings will be held in their areas.

More important than that, though, is a desire that the NP come up with some definite information concerning postmerger plans.

Local authorities admit they don't know what St. Paul headquarters have in mind. St. Paul has said little.

STRUCK BY FIRE

The situation was worsened last September when a $250,000 fire struck the Laurel car repair shop. A total of 154 was out of work then; a few were rehired; others have been laid off since. NP authorities maintain the latter layoffs are seasonal. But Laurel's not so sure. The people guess the unemployment is connected with the merger.

The Northern Pacific has assured Laurel the shop will be rebuilt. Prefabricated steel has arrived in the Rail City for the new building.

"Salve," one Laurel businessman termed the Northern Pacific's assurances.

"Those prefab deals come down as quickly as they go up," said another.

NO DATE

Northern Pacific officials say they're unable to set any date when the new shop will be in operation. They also say they don't know how many will be reemployed.

Meanwhile, many of the unemployed have left Laurel or taken other jobs. But other jobs are few and far between. The primary bright spot is the city's construction program. Work is expected to begin about mid-April on a $410,000 sewer improvement project.

Many Laurel residents realize their voices will carry little weight with the ICC in protesting the merger. But a glimmer of hope came recently when the ICC agreed to hold off a reduction in rail service in western Montana for several months.

Because they're aware the railroads and ICC probably will not consider loss of jobs in Laurel, and in cities similarly affected, as reason for abandoning merger plans, the protest has been based on loss of service.

The chamber of commerce has added another stipulation. If it becomes apparent the merger will have a positive effect on Laurel, it will withdraw its opposition.

Rumors ran rampant in the city of 4,670. They are stories of more railroad layoffs of cuts in service, of Northern Pacific official statement of plans. They usually amount to nothing.

SCAPEGOATS

Scapegoats are many. Some maintain the Government—the people—gave railroads their land in the first place and the roads have a responsibility to provide jobs and pay property taxes. The railroads have their side of it, too. They cite heavy return to the Government in reduced war freight rates.

"Mergers don't do anybody but stockholders any good," a union man said.

If the Government—the ICC—approves the merger, then it's up to the Government to find new jobs, others say.

The merger itself has been a scapegoat. Its impending consequences have been blamed, among several factors, for voters' turning down a proposed site for a new high school.

It's been held responsible to a large degree for the achievement council's decision to shelve plans for a medical center. Other factors are involved here, too.

AUTOMATION HERE

When the emotion is gone from conversations with railroad men, businessmen and housewives, they'll admit automation is a reality.

The replacement of men by machines and consolidation of efforts is something that must be faced, regardless of the hurts.

Like cities all over the United States which rely on a few basic industries, they wish Laurel didn't. But they also realize there's no point in worrying about what isn't.

Mobility of labor remains a gigantic problem. Laurel is just a minute example of the problem of the country's 5.4 million unemployed.

It's also a problem of increased specialization which has come to American economy with bounding technical advances.

A 45-year-old man who's spent 20 years in a railroad yard probably is in no position to begin training for another occupation.

This is where social responsibility comes in, many observers say. If you can't train the worker for another job, at least make sure his children have opportunity to be liberally educated and prevent the catastrophe later on.

OTHERS CONCERNED

Railroad employees aren't the only ones worried about Laurel's economy. One or two retail businesses have closed in the past few months.

Keeping retail business in Laurel is not a new problem by any means.

"Laurel's proximity to Billings is, and always has been, its biggest problem," many residents will tell you.

It's only a 20-minute drive to Billings. Despite businessmen's campaign to "Shop Laurel First," Billings' shopping centers and lower prices are undeniably attractive to Laurel shoppers.

SAVING GRACE?

But this very proximity is looked upon by a few long-range viewers as the city's saving grace.

As Billings grows, they ask, what's to keep people who work there from having their homes in Laurel? They cite suburban growth all over the country as a good example of such a possibility. A small community with generally good schools is an ideal place for home and children.

More than few Laurel residents already are employed in Billings. They "commute." It works the other way around in a few instances.

But the long-range future—20 years ahead—isn't what's worrying Laurel now.

It's accustomed to seasonal layoffs. This winter's are suspected as being more than that.

The panic has subsided. It's now a matter of waiting and seeing. And hoping.

[From the Montana Kaimin]

PASSENGER SERVICE DISPUTE

(By Sue Lintz)

The Milwaukee Road filed a statement on December 6 with the Interstate Commerce Commission stating its intention to discontinue passenger service between Minneapolis and Tacoma. The action will have a profound effect on all students who travel via the Milwaukee Road because Olympian Hiawatha trains 15 and 16 would be terminated in May.

An announcement was made of the proposed discontinuance but because of complaints by individuals, associations, corporations, communities and railway employees the discontinuance was suspended by the ICC pending extensive investigation of the public need for passenger trains.

In order to retain passenger service on the Milwaukee Road, the opposition to the discontinuance must be overwhelming. A hearing will take place in Butte Friday for the purpose of taking testimony in opposition to the proposal.

Utilities in Montana received a tax cut 2 years ago. As a result of the cut, property was devaluated. In order to qualify for the tax reduction, utilities were required to show a loss of revenue. It has been charged, and appears to be true, that the Milwaukee Road board of directors shut down ticket stations, broke mail contracts and did not advertise the cut in price of tickets that was afforded all railroads by the ICC. In short, deliberate limitation of service discouraged patronage and qualified the Milwaukee for the tax reduction.

Montana is now engaged in a reevaluation of real estate which will raise individual taxes to make up for the tax reduction of utilities.

If discontinuation of these trains is allowed, it may result in considerable unemployment in Montana and hardships may result at inaccessible communities as a result of a lack of service. Weather and terrain conditions make other public transportation unavailable.

Students who would be inconvenienced by the discontinuance of Milwaukee Railway passenger service are requested to sign a petition at the Lodge desk.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 21, 1961.*

C. F. REARDON,
Great Falls, Mont.:

We have requested Interstate Commerce Commission, examiner for Interstate Commerce Commission, to permit you to represent us at public hearing, Elk's Building at Miles City, Friday, February 24, 9:30 a.m. Please read the following statement: "Because of prior commitments and congressional business of importance to the State of Montana and the Nation, it is impossible for us to come to Miles City to appear at this important public hearing. We do, however, wish to make it known and reiterate our statement presented to the Butte hearing that because of potentially serious economic

repercussions, increased unemployment and loss of passenger train service to certain areas of Montana, we must express our opposition to the proposed discontinuance by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. of passenger trains Nos. 15 and 16 operating between Minneapolis, Minn., and Tacoma, Wash. The Milwaukee Road has a long history in the State of Montana. It has provided transcontinental train service, employment for hundreds of people and in certain areas it is a major contributing factor to the economic stability of cities and towns. In some areas of central Montana it is the only means of public transportation. Major areas of the State of Montana are now plagued with depressed economic conditions and the approval of this plan to discontinue Milwaukee Road passenger train service in our State would only increase and extend these conditions. We ask that very serious consideration be given to all the testimony received in Miles City today." We also extend our greetings to our many friends in eastern Montana and please assure them of our deep interest and concern in this matter.

Regards.

MIKE MANSFIELD.
LEE METCALF.

THE OSCAR AWARD

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senate's attention to an event of great importance to one of California's leading industries. The industry is motion pictures, and the event is the annual "Oscar" show of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

Awarded annually for outstanding accomplishment, the 12-inch, 7-pound "Oscar" has become a symbol of achievement and is largely responsible for elevating the artistic quality of motion pictures over the past 33 years.

I need not remind the Senate of the global struggle going on today for man's mind. Motion pictures are playing a vital role in that struggle. We can be proud of the fact that the American motion picture, despite increased international competition, is still far and away the most popular in the world.

The 33d annual awards show will be presented this year on Monday evening, April 17, over the combined radio and television facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. and the Canadian Broadcasting Co. It will be seen in all of our 50 States and in Canada, and will be heard by additional millions throughout the world. It has always been a wonderful show, and this year's should be no exception. I urge all Senators to tune it in. I am certain they will enjoy it.

FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS IN 1960 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Public Works concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by the committee in 1960 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
February 20, 1961.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In compliance with section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, there is enclosed herewith a report of the foreign currencies and the U.S. dollar equivalents utilized by the Committee on Public Works for the period January 1, 1960, to December 31, 1960.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate

[Expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960]

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dennis Chavez:											
Mexico	peso	2,068	165.57	1,176	94.14	625	50.00	1,998	160.00	5,867	469.71
United States	dollar		135.00		42.50		8.00		8.00		193.50
Do.[1]	do				25.68		5.00		2.42		[1] 33.10
Total			300.57		162.32		63.00		170.42		696.31
Senator Stephen M. Young:											
Mexico	peso	980	78.40	970	77.71	625	50.00	250	20.00	2,825	226.11
United States	dollar		177.50				6.50		5.00		189.00
Do.[1]	do				25.68		5.00		2.42		[1] 33.10
Total		980	255.90	970	103.39	625	61.50	250	27.42	2,825	448.21
Theo. W. Sneed:											
Mexico	peso	1,962	157.14	1,205	96.50	656	52.50	787	63.00	4,610	369.14
United States	dollar		117.50		50.00		30.00		50.00		247.50
Do.[1]	do				12.84		2.50		1.21		[1] 16.55
Total		1,962	274.64	1,205	159.34	656	85.00	787	114.21	4,610	633.19
Charles R. Perrin:											
Mexico	peso	325	26.08	340	27.60	718	57.50	250	20.00	1,633	131.18
United States	dollar		110.00		67.50		5.00				182.50
Do.[1]	do				12.84		2.50		1.21		[1] 16.55
Total		325	136.08	340	107.94	718	65.00	250	21.21	1,633	330.23
Totals:											
United States			540.00		237.04		64.50		70.26		911.80
Foreign		5,335	427.19	3,691	295.95	2,624	210.00	3,285	263.00	14,935	1,196.14
Grand total			967.19		532.99		274.50		333.26		2,107.94

[1] Appropriated funds, USAF for miscellaneous and meals served on plane in flight.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,196.14
Appropriated funds:	
S. Res 247	812.50
Government department:	
U.S. Air Force	99.30
Total	2,107.94

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 1961 issue of the Officer, official publication of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, contains an excellent article written by Representative ROBERT L. F. (BOB) SIKES, of Florida, which merits the attention of Congress. The article sets forth a brief description of 13 bills which are on the Reserve Officers Association priority list for approval in the 87th Congress. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article written by the distinguished and able Representative from the Third

District of Florida—who, by the way, is also a brigadier general in the Army Reserve—be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been a member of the Reserve Officers Association for many years and have had the honor of serving as national president of this great organization. I, therefore, feel fully qualified to comment on the outstanding contributions which the Reserve Officers Association has made to our national security during the 38 years of its existence. No group has been a stronger advocate of defense alertness and readiness through the years than has the Reserve Officers Association. The officers, directors, and members of the Reserve Officers Association have also been very instrumental in helping Congress and our defense leaders to shape Reserve legislation and policies to insure good incentives and morale for our Reserve and Active duty forces.

This organization merits the support of all Americans, particularly all officers of our armed services, whether they be Regular or Reserve officers.

EXHIBIT 1

FOR MORALE, EQUALIZATION—13 BILLS ON ROA PRIORITY LIST AS 87TH CONGRESS BEGINS SESSION

(By Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES)

Since World War II, the Reserve Officers Association has moved into a steadily advancing position of prestige in the Nation. It has done so by wielding a sturdy and steadying influence in national defense policymaking and thus, serving to keep our Nation strong.

ROA has enjoyed a succession of accomplishments which might be astounding unless you consider the soundness of our position, based upon our constitutional objective of seeking solely to work for sound national programs.

This success leads us to new and broader missions, presenting a broader and more intensive challenge.

Our association must reconcile itself to the fact that we can never rest on laurels. The horizons are broad, we must move on and on.

The 87th Congress, moving into being with the new national administration in the executive branch, now is at work.

Great problems face our Nation. It is possible that never before in the history of our Nation have situations been more complex, circumstances more trying, and issues more elusive.

We are in a great international gray area.

The Communist powers which continually threaten, and constantly watch for the opportunity to engulf us, are not easy to grapple with. Their campaign is taking on increasing subtleties and wearing new disguises. Communism is sending out new temptations, and offering new and alluring types of bribery.

Against this background, ROA's team begins the work of another year—the 39th since the association's founding.

If we are to serve national defense, we must work for policies which insure forces adequate in numbers as well as in effectiveness. The element of morale is of greater importance in the complexities of these times than ever before. The morale of the personnel of ROA likewise figures importantly in the overall picture of the Nation's defense posture.

With the emphasis upon morale, 13 bills vitally affecting ROA were introduced during the opening days of the Congress. We shall push for hearings on these measures, and hope for their enactment after reasonable consideration.

The following is a thumbnail description of these proposals, many of them as familiar as the Magna Carta to those who dedicate themselves through ROA to our cause:

1. The Reserve officers incentive bill (H.R. 5132 of the last Congress, by Representative MENDEL RIVERS), this is the long-sought "anti-RIF" measure, needed just as vitally now as in 1957 when this problem became acute. This measure passed the House in the 86th Congress but failed to secure Senate approval; now the job has to be done all over again.

2. The retired pay recomputation bill (H.R. 11318 of the last Congress, by Representative PAUL KILDAY). This would restore the time-honored relationship of retired and active duty pay. Passed by the House, it was held up in the Senate pending studies of the entire retirement system. Presumably, efforts will be made in the Senate to peg to this proposal the institution of a contributory retirement plan.

3. To define the status of retired members of the armed service, amending the Economy Act to give Regulars the same rights as reservists to draw whatever pay they may earn in retirement (H.R. 5195 of the last Congress, by Representative John R. Foley).

4. To provide disability coverage for reservists traveling to and from training. This is a need whose statement indicates the justification (H.R. 3364 last Congress, by Representative RIVERS).

5. To permit the crediting, for purpose of determining eligibility for retirement, certain service performed prior to attaining the established minimum age. This would recognize vital service performed in the youthful years of military personnel who are now, in effect, being penalized for what might be called "premature patriotism.

6. To recognize the merited status of naval ROTC graduates who are accepted for the Regular service. This measure passed the Senate last session (S. 3733, by Senator STROM THURMOND, and has substantial backing already in the House).

7. To amend the provisions of an act which adds additional and unwarranted penalties against military personnel, by removing earned retirement rights when the military service upon which such rights were based are not at issue. (H.R. 4601 from the last Congress by Representative TOM MURRAY.)

8. To forgive erroneous payments to widows of military personnel, who received and used modest benefits believed at the time to be entitlements by both user and Government and where they have no resources to repay such sums (H.R. 7529 of the last Congress by Representative THOMAS LANE).

9. To equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem while on active duty and acting on orders to perform duty where per diem is authorized. (H.R. 3357 last Congress, by Representative RIVERS.)

10. To amend the Medicare Act to permit treatment of reservists where facilities, personnel, and space are available for such treatment.

11. To amend the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act to liberalize the conditions under which personnel may consider these options with regard to their retirement pay.

12. To restore travel pay which was severely curtailed last year, vitally reducing training of Reserves. This will require consideration by the Appropriations Committee of the sums and the language in the appropriations bill.

13. To grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve, thus recognizing as in other services the service performed during a period of uncertainty in the SPAR program. (H.R. 71727 from the last Congress, by Representative CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN).

THE BRAZILIAN ECONOMY AND ITS RELATION TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as a Member of the U.S. Senate vitally interested in Latin America, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that the following study be inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This study, prepared by a Brazilian private economist, represents a recent evaluation of the Brazilian economy and its relation to the United States. In my view, it portrays an accurate picture of the problems facing the growth of the Brazilian economy and the stability of its political and social institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the war, Brazil entered a phase of accelerated growth. For instance, between 1950 and 1954, the gross national product increased 5.4 percent per year and between 1955 and 1959, it increased at the average annual rate of 6 percent. Population is increasing at the rate of 2.5 percent per year. The rapid rate of income growth has permitted Brazil to maintain a climate of political and social stability and respect for democratic institutions quite remarkable for an underdeveloped country. This is not to say, however, that social unrest is a phenomenon unknown in Brazil.

U.S. economic cooperation played a significant role in this development process. The work of the Joint Brazil-United States Economic Development Commission, set up during the Truman administration, greatly facilitated the expansion of the Brazilian economy in the 1950's. However, in the last few years, the relations between the two countries grew increasingly colder, due to the tendency of the Republican administration to approach them from an exclusively banking angle.

Even Operation Pan America, which was based on the concept that if political and social stability in Latin America is to be maintained significant economic progress has to take place, found no response north of the Rio Grande during the tenure in office of the last U.S. administration.

Operation Pan America aimed at obtaining in the Latin American countries a per capita income high enough to put into motion a cumulative and automatic process of economic development.

In order to evaluate the effort required to reach this goal, it is enough to consider that, assuming this income level to be around $500 per capita (U.N. estimates), the Brazilian gross national product would have to grow, at a yearly rate of 5.5 percent. This means that between 1958 and 1980, national income or GNP should increase three times. The maintenance of this rate of growth would require a rise in gross investments from $2.9 billion in 1958 to $9.6 billion in 1980, or about 18 percent of the gross national product.

Since a large share of the capital goods required for investment purposes would have to be imported, import requirements should total $3.5 billion in 1980, as compared to actual imports of about $1.2 billion in 1959.

Considering that Brazilian exports average from $1.2 to $1.4 billion a year, and that their prospects for expansion of the coun-

try's traditional exports can hardly be considered promising, normal export proceeds, in the foreseeable future, will be clearly inadequate to finance these massive imports, unless a greater degree of international cooperation can be achieved.

Besides Operation Pan America, a number of specific matters affecting Brazil-U.S. relations should be reviewed, such as (a) financing of petroleum exploitation in Brazil; (b) stabilization of commodity prices; (c) the inflationary process in Brazil; (d) export of public capital; (e) the development of the northeast of Brazil; and (f) technical assistance for the development of small and medium industries in Brazil.

PETROLEUM

As it is well known, the petroleum industry in Brazil is controlled by a state monopoly, the Petrobras, a mixed company in charge of geological field investigation, exploration, extraction, refining, and ocean and pipeline transportation of oil. It would be pointless to argue on the comparative merits of public or private petroleum exploitation, and to go over the often-repeated arguments for and against the state monopoly. The simple truth is that the present policy has wide national support in Brazil, and that the slightest hint of a different policy being attempted would release popular resistance of incalculable repercussions. Even apart from these noneconomic factors, Petrobras justifies amply its existence by meeting all tests of efficiency. Since 1955, when the state monopoly began to operate, the output of crude oil increased by more than 10 times.

COMMODITY PRICES

Between 1954 and 1959 the prices of Brazilian export products fell by more than 40 percent. Brazil's capacity to import would have increased by 16 percent in 1959 in comparison with 1958 if the export and import prices maintained the level of the latter year. The greater volume of exports was in 1959 entirely nullified by the fall in export prices.

Besides curtailing the country's capacity to import essential goods from its development, the deterioration of its terms of trade has at least two other harmful effects: (a) It diminishes Brazil's capacity to borrow abroad, since a relatively greater share of its exports proceeds has to be reserved to repay and service previous credits; and (b) it tends to accelerate the internal inflation, since a larger volume of goods has to be subtracted from internal consumption to be exchanged for the same amount of imported goods.

In pursuance of its intention of seeking stabilization of the world coffee market, Brazil was one of the sponsors of the International Coffee Agreement, now in the second year of operation. Its success can be gaged from the fact that today 28 producing countries and territories, representing over 90 percent of world production, are members of this commodity pact.

Active participation by industrialized countries in these commodity stabilization pacts would be a great significance for the countries exporting primary goods.

INFLATION

In the United States inflation occurs after full employment is reached, that is, it is provoked by attempts to obtain resources for consumption or investment when practically all productive factors are employed. In Brazil, as well as in other underdeveloped countries, the full utilization of resources is prevented by deficiencies in basic sectors, such as transportation and power. To fight inflation without seeking to correct these deficiencies would be to maintain the country in a perpetual underdevelopment stage. The proper policy, which is definitely anti-inflationary over the long run, is therefore to seek the removal of these bottlenecks which prevent part of the production to reach the market. Of course, this does not mean that sound fiscal policies and monetary and credit restraint are not very useful complementary devices.

The refusal of external sources of loans and credit to extend economic assistance to Brazil—both for economic development projects and for compensating the fall in export receipts—does not help Brazil fight inflation; it only concurs to aggravate it, since economic imbalance remains for a longer period of time.

PUBLIC CAPITAL

The major part of the nonmilitary public aid received by Brazil in the postwar period came from the United States. From July 1, 1945, to December 31, 1959, Brazil received $54 million in grants, or 0.09 percent of the total extended by the United States to the world. In relation to loans and other credits utilized during 1940–59, Brazil's share accounted for 6.1 percent of the total—an expressive percentage—or about $1 billion. However, a close look at the composition of the loans to Brazil shows that 91 percent of them have been hard loans made by the Export-Import Bank at relatively high rates of interest, currently running between 5¾ and 6 percent. Furthermore, Brazil has repaid about $450 million, plus over $130 million interest.

Over the next 5 years, Brazil faces, furthermore, an obstacle, which if not surpassed, may deter considerably the country's development; namely, the repayment of the principal and interest of old debts. To overcome it, closer cooperation with the United States is necessary and a joint program providing for the inflow of public funds into Brazil has to be carried out based on the following points: (a) to be substantial in size; (b) to lead to a more adequate system of repayment of the principal and interest of current Brazilian external debt; (c) to assure financing for essential development activities; (d) to create conditions for further inflow of know-how and private capital; (e) to provide soft loans by means of the mechanisms such as the ones of Public Law 480 (agricultural surpluses), in order: (1) to help meet some internal costs of very expensive development projects; (2) to save foreign exchange by offering traditional Brazilian imports, such as wheat, against payment in local currency; (3) to permit the broadening of relief operations in some very distressed sectors of the country.

THE NORTHEAST OF BRAZIL

The northeast of Brazil covers a region of the size of Texas. Its population in 1960 was over 20 million inhabitants; that is, larger than any Latin American republic, except Mexico and Argentina.

The Brazilian northeast is singled out as the most extensive and populated area, in the Western Hemisphere, with an income level of less than $100 per inhabitant. In all states of the northeastern region, per capita income falls well below the Brazilian average. The disparity of living standards between the northeast and the center-south constitutes—beyond any doubt—one of the most serious problems to be faced at the present stage of Brazil's economic development.

The northeast, except for some humid valleys and coastal regions, is afflicted periodically by insufficient rainfall and by droughts. The type of economy now prevailing in the semiarid region is highly vulnerable to droughts. Hence, the characteristics of a social calamity.

Recently, the Federal Government has developed a comprehensive 5-year plan to tackle northeastern problems. A coordinating agency—Superintendency for the Development of the Northeast (Sudene)—was set up with headquarters in the region (Racife, Pernambuco).

Foreign economic assistance may speed up considerably the execution of the plan and play an important role in relieving some of the chronic ills of the reigon, such as malnutrition, poor sanitary conditions, etc.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED INDUSTRIES

Industrial development in Brazil is reaching the point that governmental regulations and programs have to be drafted to assist small and medium-sized industries, in order to avoid excessive concentration and to assure competition.

The experience accumulated in the United States in this field might prove valuable and technical assistance projects in this area should be considered.

NATION'S PLAUDITS EARNED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article published by the Nashville Banner, Thursday, January 19, 1961, proclaiming national tribute to Richard M. Nixon on a job superbly done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO RICHARD M. NIXON: NATION'S PLAUDITS EARNED

Side by side with Dwight D. Eisenhower, sharing in extraordinary degree the responsibilities of administrative stewardship, has stood Richard M. Nixon; and he shares, too, the national accolade for a job superbly done. As he steps down from the Vice Presidency, acknowledgments of an unsurpassed service are fittingly bestowed.

Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston recently nominated him as "Good Will Man of 1960," extending his remarks to point out, in a speech at Baltimore, that "When he lost the closest election of the past century, he was magnificent in defeat. * * * When he proclaimed the election of his opponent, the Vice President spoke with extraordinary good will, good sportsmanship and good patriotism."

But in addition to all that, he has honored every responsibility assigned; in the uniform of his country, in its lawmaking service, in his executive association, where in anxious moments of grave Presidential illness heavy burdens were thrust upon him; or in missions many carrying the American message all over the world. These were and are excerpts of notable record, reflecting the measurement of the man.

His is the moral stamina of deep conviction. In no test of that courage, intelligence, fidelity—the response to duty wherever it has beckoned—has he ever failed his country. That concept of duty and sense of honor are in the highest tradition of personal virtue, the ideal of the worthy public servant, and belonging in the American escutcheon.

More cannot be said of any man by way of tribute, and the vast constituency cognizant of these qualities has said it of Richard M. Nixon.

America owes him a great deal, for the fight he has waged—beginning as a Congressman—on communism and its subversive operations. It is not forgotten that he led out in the investigation that exposed Alger Hiss and was consummated by prosecution and conviction. Nor will it ever be forgotten that as America's official envoy he crossed swords with the enemy in the very shadow of the Kremlin. No less with dignity and honor did he face down Communist-incited mobs on his Latin American tour.

At home and abroad he has exemplified Americanism at its best, bespeaking principles that are fundamental regardless of the political storm that may sweep upon them from time to time.

Through these 8 years of service in next to the highest office, he and his charming wife have earned and held a place in the heart of the Nation; a place of respect and admiration. They still are there.

Official goodbys do not alter the affectionate regard in which America holds Dick and Pat Nixon.

FEDERAL JUDGESHIP BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article published in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Tuesday, February 14, 1961, commenting on the addition of judges to the Federal courts, in which I concur.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADD FEDERAL JUDGES

After 6 years of delay, an omnibus Federal judgeship bill supported by the new Kennedy administration should have a good chance of passage. Favorable action would speed the ends of justice long denied by overcrowded dockets.

The Kennedys propose to create nine new seats on the courts of appeals and five new district judgeships, two for western Pennsylvania. It would also make permanent a presently temporary judgeship in this district and bring the court's full complement to eight judges. The need locally is underscored by the court's time lag in completing a case—second worst in the Nation.

Since 1955 the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Bar Association and the Department of Justice have been urging Congress to increase the manpower of the Federal courts.

But the omnibus judgeship bill has met opposition reflecting at least in part a reluctance by the Democratic majorities in Congress to give Republican President Eisenhower an opportunity to fill so many judgeships with Republicans. Even after Mr. Eisenhower promised to divide the new judicial appointments between the two parties, the Democratic Congress continued to balk, apparently preferring to take its chances on last fall's election.

The Democrats won, of course, and so it is reasonable to suppose that the political objection to the judgeship bill will have been largely overcome. Still, the Eisenhower proposal to make appointments on a bipartisan basis has much to recommend it. If such appointments became traditional, it should work ultimately to increase the independence of the Federal judiciary. The Kennedys have made no such proposal. Whether or not one is forthcoming, the courts still need the manpower and we think the omnibus judgeship bill should be passed.

SALESMEN URGED TO SELL "ONE EXTRA" TO STIMULATE ECONOMY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, our Government is rightly concerned about the depressed state of the economy and 5½ million unemployed.

The Federal Government has serious responsibilities to promote—through many means at its disposal—an expanding economy and full employment. More attention to these responsibilities in recent years could well have prevented the current recession.

But while it has a vital role to play, the Government by no means must be considered to have the sole responsibility in this area.

Business, for example, must redouble its efforts to stimulate the economy with good products attractively priced. And increased sales, of course, will mean increased employment.

A healthy recognition of this was recently displayed by a group of automobile salesmen in a telegram to President Kennedy in which they called on their colleagues in every field to sell one extra of their products.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the telegram be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the 140 members of the diamond chapter of the Plymouth All Star Salesmen's Club in San Francisco for the club's annual sales achievement award trip, today resolved that within the next 2 weeks each of us would sell at least one new car over and above that which we would normally sell. This is our personal contribution to help boost the economy. We feel that salesmen more than any other group hold the key to improvement of the current economic situation. We feel that a little extra effort by each and every salesman in the United States would be a great stimulus to the economy. We are calling on salesmen everywhere to join with us and to extend themselves to sell one extra of whatever their product of service might be.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

IMPORTANCE OF THE NIKE-ZEUS SYSTEM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on February 2, 1961, I delivered, in the Senate, a speech on the Nike-Zeus anti-ICBM missile system and called attention to the January 30, 1961, issue of Missiles and Rockets magazine, which devoted almost its entire contents to providing information on this important defense system. I placed in the RECORD of that date, on page 1659, one of those articles and an editorial; but, because of space limitations, I could not place all of the article in the RECORD.

I have now obtained reprints of the magazine articles and my remarks on the Senate floor. On Wednesday, I sent a copy of my remarks and the articles to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, the Nike-Zeus system is now in the advanced stages of research and development, and it is the only intercontinental ballistic missile defense system under active development in the free world. Former Army Secretary Wilbur M. Brucker, Assistant Army Secretary Richard S. Morse, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, and other leading defense advocates have warned repeatedly that the first country to achieve a practical defense against ballistic missiles will gain not only a tremendous psychological advantage, but more important, a very great military advantage. There is no question but that the Soviets are moving rapidly toward development of an anti-missile-missile system. We have had valuable lead time on the Soviets in this vital competition, but we have already lost at least a year of that lead time by not moving into production of component parts.

The series of articles in Missiles and Rockets magazine points up the fact that very soon President Kennedy will have to make a decision as to whether production of component parts of the Nike-Zeus system should be begun prior to the Zeus' big test later this year as against an Atlas ICBM.

I have been greatly encouraged by news reports, yesterday and today, which indicate that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended to the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, that we immediately move toward production of component parts of the Zeus system, in order to save valuable time in getting the Zeus operational as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to study this material on the Nike-Zeus and to give full support to the recommendation to begin immediate production of component parts of this vital defense system. The Zeus has more than amply proved itself in all tests to date, and there can be no question as to the importance of having at the earliest possible opportunity some form of defense against the threat of ICBM attack. If the Zeus should prove effective in saving only one city, it would be more than worth its cost, for we can have Nike-Zeus protection for less than the cost of rebuilding a single city or industrial complex. In addition, the Zeus system will serve as a great deterrent against enemy ICBM attack, because the enemy would have to have so many more ICBM's for attack purposes, and could not be sure that the most important target areas would be destroyed in such an attack.

We have begun production of component parts of every other important weapons system in connection with which time has been a key factor—such as the Navy's Polaris missile and the Atlas ICBM. We must move on now with the Nike-Zeus.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available in the morning hour to the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MUNDT subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who has demonstrated considerable leadership and knowledge in promoting recognition of the importance of developing the antimissile missile, the Nike-Zeus. I read his speech of February 2. It made a great deal of sense. I have spent much time, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, studying the potentialities and possibilities of this weapon. It seems to me this is one area of our national defense in which we should all unite in moving forward with the greatest amount of expedition.

In this uneasy era, when we are involved in a war of words, and are enjoying what might be called a peace of parity, because both sides, our side and the

Communist side, have developed great striking power in missiles, we must plan carefully for our continuing freedom and security. We have laid to rest, I hope, all talk about the missile gap which it is now known did not exist. We must look to the future.

We must recognize that both sides of this ideological conflict are developing weapons for total annihilation; and to the side that first develops an effective antimissile missile will go a great reward and indisputable world leadership. If we develop it first, it will become a great weapon of peace. If the Soviets should develop the antimissile missile first, it will become a scourge of war and they will use it to browbeat, to intimidate, and perhaps to annihilate the peaceloving and free nations of the world.

So I think we should commend the Senator from South Carolina for his alertness and for continuing to press for this very important development in the whole field of missiles, namely, the development of an effective defense against the potentiality of a missile attack.

It is imperative that, in this particular area, America should get out in front and stay out in front, because nothing could so completely jeopardize peace and freedom in our world as to have the Communists be first in developing an effective defense against missiles, by producing an effective antimissile missile.

So I salute the Senator from South Carolina on his initiative. I hope he continues to press forward in this field. I assure him, as one member of the Senate Subcommittee on National Defense Appropriations, that I will do what I can to help make funds available to move the development of such an antimissile missile forward just as fast as our scientific know-how, our manufacturing capability, and our national finances will permit.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his kind remarks. I appreciate the vision of the Senator from South Dakota in realizing the importance of the Nike-Zeus weapon, the only antimissile missile that has been developed by the free world.

Mr. President, on account of the 3-minute rule, I was unable to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota at the time I made my statement, and I ask unanimous consent that these remarks appear immediately following my remarks on the Nike-Zeus missile.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if it is no violation of the rule—and I trust it will not be so considered—I must mention the House of Representatives in connection with a resolution adopted by the Illinois Senate of the 72d General Assembly. The resolution is in the nature of a commendation of the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, a very distinguished Representative from Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and also the work of that committee.

Under the rule, the names of Members of the House must not be specifically mentioned. So, at the very outset, I proclaim the fact that I do not proceed in the spirit of violating the rule, but, knowing of the attacks that have been made on the committee and its distinguished chairman, I think the resolution of the Illinois State Senate should be incorporated in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 15–A

Whereas the gravest threat facing our State, our Nation, and the world today is international communism, which has as its objective the establishment of a world totalitarian dictatorship and the abolition of all freedoms guaranteed by and enjoyed under our constitutional form of government; and

Whereas the methods used by the exponents of this international traitorous conspiracy includes lies, deceit, terrorism, espionage, sabotage, riots, infiltration into government, respectable organizations, and our every way of life and other treacherous and unlawful procedures; and

Whereas we are continuously warned of the Communist threat in our own State and Nation by J. Edgar Hoover, who warns that communism remains a threat. Student riots in San Francisco last May were an example of the insidious manner in which the Communist Party exploits our youth; and

Whereas we here in Illinois are astonished by the headlines in our better press: "Communist Convention in Chicago Soon," "Plan New Red National Youth Organization, FBI Reports," "New Horizons for Youth," "Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Chairman House Committee on Un-American Activities, Reports 25,000 Skilled Reds in the United States"; and

Whereas our Nation is forced to spend approximately $40 billion of our taxpayers money for our national defense, plus financing other nations of the world with many billions of dollars more to defend our Nation against this treacherous organized conspiracy. It appears that in the interest of our own security and in the best interests of the health and general welfare of our own State and Nation, that we should resort to every means of self-preservation, by eliminating the Communist menace as a danger in our own State and Nation; and

Whereas it has come to our attention that the Communist organized conspiracy, joined by their fellow travelers, the ultra-liberal press; eggheads; uninformed; misinformed; brainwashed phony ultra liberals and that conglomeration of misfits has launched its annual drive to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as a result of their courageous fight have exposed and spotlighted the activities of these Communist traitors in our midst, including the Alger Hisses and hundreds of others working to destroy our country, thereby awakening the American people to the treacherous communistic plot against our very way of life: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we congratulate and commend Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER and all members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for their determined fight to save America from being destroyed from within by the agents of a foreign power; and be it further

Resolved, That we make an appeal to all Members of our U.S. Congress, who were sent to Congress in all good faith by their constituents, to keep the faith and give every support necessary to keep the committee at full strength so it may continue to do an all-American job; and that suitable copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of our U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

CLIFTON R. WHARTON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was very happy to note the announcement that the President intends to nominate a very distinguished career man in the foreign service to be Ambassador to Norway. He is Mr. Clifton R. Wharton, a native of Baltimore, a graduate of Boston University, and now a legal resident of San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Wharton, a Negro, will hold the highest rank ever attained by a member of his race as a U.S. career diplomat. Other Negroes have served as Ambassadors, but they held their posts as political appointees. His road to an ambassadorship has been the hard way—by study, diligence, and dedication to his work. He first came into the Foreign Service in 1925, under President Calvin Coolidge. Three years ago President Eisenhower named him Minister to Rumania. I am happy now to learn that this administration has also recognized the worth and ability of this diplomat, as did President Coolidge and President Eisenhower.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Mr. Wharton, along with an article about his appointment, which appeared in the Washington Star for February 21, 1961, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the sketch and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CLIFTON R. WHARTON

Born: Baltimore, Md., May 11, 1899.

Education: LL.B., Boston University, 1920, LL.M., 1923.

Marital status: Married.

Experience:

Non-Government: 1920–24, member of bar of Massachusetts; law practice.

Government: 1924, examiner, Veterans' Bureau; appellate law clerk, Department of State; 1925 Foreign Service officer, unclassified and secretary in diplomatic service; third secretary, Monrovia; 1927, vice consul of career; vice consul, Monrovia in addition to duties as third secretary; 1929, to Department; Foreign Service officer, class 8, and consul; 1930, consul, Las Palmas; 1934, Foreign Service officer, class 7; 1936, consul and second secretary, Monrovia, temporary; 1937, consul, Las Palmas; consul and second secretary, Monrovia, temporary; 1938, consul, Las Palmas; 1939, Foreign Service officer, class 6; 1941, second secretary and consul, Monrovia; 1942, consul, Tananarive; Foreign Service officer, class 5; 1945, American Maritime delegate, Ponta Delgada; consul, Ponta Delgada; 1946, Foreign Service officer, class 4; Foreign Service officer, class 3; 1949, first secretary and consul, Lisbon; 1950, consul general; consul general, Lisbon in addition to duties as first secretary; 1951, Foreign Service officer, class 2; 1953, consul general, Marseilles; 1956, Foreign Service officer, class 1; 1958, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister

Plenipotentiary to Rumania; 1959, Foreign Service officer, class of career minister.

Military: 1918, U.S. Army.

Memberships and clubs: Not stated.

Office: American Legation, Bucharest.

Home: Care of the American Legation, Bucharest.

Legal residence: San Francisco, Calif.

Political affiliation: Career.

Present position: Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Rumania.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 21, 1961]

NEGRO CAREER DIPLOMAT NAMED TO NORWAY POST

President Kennedy has chosen Clifton R. Wharton, a Negro career diplomat, to be Ambassador to Norway.

Mr. Wharton, 61, is now Minister to Rumania. He has been in the Foreign Service 34 years.

As Ambassador at Oslo, Mr. Wharton will hold the highest rank ever attained by a member of his race as a U.S. career diplomat.

Other Negroes have served as Ambassadors, but they held their posts as political appointees.

Mr. Wharton's road to an ambassadorship has been the hard way. His first State Department job in 1925 was as a law clerk at $1,860 a year.

Three years ago, President Eisenhower named him Minister to Bucharest. Prior to that appointment, Mr. Wharton had been consul general at Marseilles, France.

In going up the ladder to his consul general's post, Mr. Wharton served at such points as Monrovia, Liberia; Las Palmas, Canary Islands; Tananarive, Madagascar; Ponta Delgada, Azores; and Lisbon, Portugal.

He was born in Baltimore on May 11, 1899.

He attended Boston University, received a law degree there in 1920, and practiced law in Boston before entering Government service.

OSLO, NORWAY, February 21.—The newspaper Dagbladet printed today a two-column picture of the new American Ambassador to Oslo, Clifton R. Wharton.

The headline over a short story on Mr. Wharton was, "Welcome to Oslo."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., OF MISSOURI, AND SENATOR-ELECT E. KEITH THOMSON, OF WYOMING

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended, in order that tributes may be paid to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, and the late Senator-elect E. KEITH THOMSON, of Wyoming, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, before the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the people of Missouri and the Nation have lost an outstanding U.S. Senator, and a champion of the rights of man.

It is with a deep sense of loss that I join with my colleagues in the Senate in mourning the passing of my distinguished senior colleague, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

Those of us who worked with him here in the Senate will miss Senator HENNINGS' wisdom, his courage, and his leadership. And the people of Missouri will miss the services of one who served them long and well in Washington.

TOM HENNINGS served in public life for many decades. He was assistant circuit attorney of the city of St. Louis from 1929 to 1934. He then was elected to three terms as U.S. Representative from the 11th Missouri District, serving from 1935 to 1940.

In 1940, at the request of the St. Louis Bar Association, he became a candidate for St. Louis circuit attorney, and was elected. The following year, he volunteered for active duty in the U.S. Navy, and served for more than 3 years.

Following his discharge, he returned to private practice, as a senior partner of a distinguished law firm in St. Louis. He continued the active participation and leadership in public affairs that characterized his entire life, one of his major interests being the Big Brothers of America.

TOM HENNINGS reentered public life in 1950 when he was elected to the Senate. He was elected to a second term in 1956, helping to carry the State for the Democrats.

His was a truly distinguished career. He rose rapidly to a position of leadership here in the Senate and in his party. And he rendered distinguished service as chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee, and as chairman of the Constitutional Rights and Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee.

He had one of the great judicial minds of the Senate during the past decade. And he expressed on many occasions the conscience of the Senate as well, for he led many fights for the preservation of human rights and liberties essential to our democratic way of life.

His integrity was deeply respected by his colleagues.

His passing is deeply mourned.

We shall miss Senator HENNINGS, but take inspiration from a life of public service in the highest tradition of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, September 14, 1960; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, September 15, 1960; New York Times, September 15, 1960; Washington Star, September 16, 1960; Washington News, September 15, 1960; St. Louis Argus and Kansas City Call, October 14, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 14, 1960]

SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

The untimely passing of Missouri's senior U.S. Senator, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., at the early age of 57 removes from the Senate a great constitutional lawyer, a highly intelligent and convinced liberal, and a courtly gentleman.

Senator HENNINGS was a gifted man who early showed the promise which he later fulfilled. Soon after his graduation from law school he became an assistant circuit attorney where he built an outstanding reputation in securing indictments and convictions.

In 1934 when he was only 31 years old he was elected to Congress for the first of three terms and retired in 1940 to run successfuly for circuit attorney. In this important office he secured 2,340 convictions in 2,548 cases, a record which has never been equaled.

After service in the Navy overseas during World War II, he returned to the private practice of law in St. Louis, and in 1950 he was elected to the Senate after a bitter primary fight. He was overwhelmingly reelected in 1956.

TOM HENNINGS was proud of the fact that in the Senate he was the first to oppose Senator Joe McCarthy at the peak of the latter's career because he felt that McCarthy had ruthlessly violated the rights of the individual. In the Senate he also fought unceasingly to combat secrecy in public affairs, and he was an equally stanch fighter against the causes of juvenile delinquency, one of his last public appearances in St. Louis several years ago having been on this subject.

In foreign affairs Senator HENNINGS sided with President Eisenhower and fought with particular vigor proposals which would have curtailed the President's power in foreign affairs, notably the Bricker amendment.

In recent years TOM HENNINGS was seriously handicapped by recurring illnesses. It was characteristic of him, however, even in his last desperate fight against cancer, that he remained active and dedicated to the very end, directing his office from his home and casting his vote as part of a pair on every important bill before the Senate.

Missouri and the Nation have lost an articulate fighter and a conscientious public servant. The Globe-Democrat voices the sorrow of the entire Missouri community and expresses its own and the State's condolences to Senator HENNINGS' lovely wife and to his distinguished and much loved parents.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 15, 1960]

SENATOR HENNINGS

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., was one of the most gifted Missourians ever to serve in the Nation's Capital. First as a Member of the House and then as a Senator he made a public record of which this State can be immensely proud. He was that rare combination, a dedicated liberal with a keen and probing mind and a healthy respect for what is practical. His colleagues were well aware of his abilities; at the time of his death from cancer he was one of the most influential men in the Senate leadership.

The Senator's friends were convinced he had everything necessary for a distinguished political career. His scholarly bent was reflected in his extensive reading and in his felicity of expression on the speaker's platform. He was a redoubtable debater, who sometimes took a wry delight in trapping an opponent but who looked upon political argument with a sense of proportion that

precluded malice. He had no taste for demagogy, and disliked campaigning. He was the first native St. Louisan elected to the Senate, and typified this city rather than Missouri.

A lawyer who made an outstanding record as circuit attorney in St. Louis 20 years ago, Senator HENNINGS served on the important Senate Judiciary Committee. This post furnished him with a base for various activities in behalf of civil rights and progressive causes generally. He was chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, and became known as an active defender of individual rights and a supporter of the Supreme Court, particularly of its integration decision of 1954.

One of Senator HENNINGS' first assignments after his election in 1950 was an investigation of the Maryland "smear" election of that year, in which Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin played a part in the defeat of Senator Tydings, a conservative Democrat. In 1952 he was chairman of a subcommittee that investigated McCarthy's financial affairs; his findings became part of the case for Senate censure of McCarthy. In 1953 he led the successful fight against the so-called Bricker amendment, which would have limited the treatymaking powers of the President.

For these activities, for his inquiries into juvenile delinquency, for his fight in behalf of freedom of information and for his knowledge of constitutional law Senator HENNINGS became known nationally. But much of his influence flowed from less public activities. He was chairman of the Rules Committee, the first Missouri Senator to head an important committee in many years. He served as secretary of the Senate Democratic conference, one of the three top party positions in the Senate. But much of his effectiveness stemmed from his own character; although a liberal, he was accepted by the conservatives who constitute the real core of power in the Senate.

Senator HENNINGS was deeply interested in the electoral process, and after several years of effort was successful last January in effecting Senate passage of legislation to regulate spending in Federal elections, including primaries. One of his last official acts was to write a letter which was to be read at the Democratic State platform conference at Jefferson City. In this letter he expressed confidence that the Missouri electorate will refuse to be swayed by religious prejudice.

Missouri has had many good Senators, and several great ones, since Thomas Hart Benton and David Barton were elected in 1820. Senator HENNINGS' place in this company will be determined in time. But of his superior talent and devotion to the public welfare there can be no doubt.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 15, 1960]

SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, of Missouri, was a fighter who had the respect of his opponents. Such respect genuinely given is rare—and it makes the man who commands it more effective than most fighters for causes. In his decade in the Senate, THOMAS HENNINGS was effective in some important fights. He was a pivot in the minority group that defeated the 1954 effort to curb the President's treatymaking powers. He fought successfully against bills designed to hobble the Supreme Court. He put himself squarely in the path of movements to lessen freedom of the press, freedom to vote and other freedoms. His death at the age of 57 is a misfortune both for his friends and for the country.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 16, 1960]

SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., dead at 57, was one of the many who have with genuine distinction combined the professions of law and politics. His training and practice in the former contributed greatly to the quality of his service for three terms in the House of Representatives (1935–41) and for the past 10 years in the other Chamber of Congress. In the Senate, he was identified as one of the leading liberal spokesmen of the relatively conservative Judiciary Committee. The extension and protection of civil rights and the problems of juvenile delinquency were matters of greatest personal and political interest to him. Never fiercely partisan in his approach to legislative questions, the Missouri Democrat's effectiveness in floor debate and in committee deliberations was enhanced as a result. Assistant Senate Democratic leader MANSFIELD spoke with accuracy for his colleague when he described Mr. HENNINGS as "a man whom we shall all miss, regardless of party."

[From the Washington News, Sept. 15, 1960]

SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, of Missouri, was robust in his thinking and in his activity. But cancer cut him down at 57.

He was afflicted with one of the worst types of this disease, from a medical standpoint, and had suffered with it for several years.

As a victim, he becomes merely another item in the dreadful statistics of this enigmatic ailment. As a man of prominence and ability, his death again dramatizes the complete impartiality of cancer and the steady toll it takes among our ablest citizens.

Senator HENNINGS was a man of sturdy principle. Those who most violently differed with his views had to respect the tenacity with which he held to them. Only cancer could overcome his tremendous vigor—and even against those odds he made a fight of it.

[From the St. Louis Argus and Kansas City Call, Oct. 14, 1960]

TOM HENNINGS, AS I KNEW HIM

(By J. Delmas Escoe, assistant counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights)

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, whose voice in behalf of constitutional rights and human equality was recently stilled by death, was one of the finest and most sincere men I have ever known. I consider it a pleasure and a privilege to have known him and to have worked with him for the past 5 years.

TOM HENNINGS did more than merely champion the cause of democracy. He believed in it and he practiced it. To TOM HENNINGS the equality of man was more than a political issue. It was a way of life.

HENNINGS was not only an able Senator and an eloquent speaker, he was also an effective politician, but in many ways a paradox of the political prototype.

To a great degree, HENNINGS avoided the political spotlight. Many of his friends, including this writer, felt that he did not live up to his fullest political potential, that he would have made an excellent candidate for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency but TOM HENNINGS never sought these offices.

In discussing HENNINGS as a logical Presidential choice, Max Freedman, editor of the Manchester Guardian recently wrote:

"In depth of conviction, skill and courage in debate, and profound dedication to civil liberty, Senator HENNINGS holds a position of unique distinction among the Members of the Senate. But he has cast aside all thought of larger political ambition."

I do not agree with Freedman that HENNINGS had "cast aside all thought of larger political ambition." It is an accepted axiom of political life that every public figure nurtures such thoughts and such ambitions. But, what distinguished TOM HENNINGS from most politicians is that he kept these thoughts and ambitions to himself.

HENNINGS' advocacy of civil liberties and civil rights throughout his public career was in itself somewhat of a paradox. A descendant of wealthy slaveholders, TOM HENNINGS possessed the charm and manners of a southern gentleman. Indeed, he counted among his best friends several of his southern colleagues in the Senate. Yet, he never alienated his southern friends despite his constant sponsorship and support of civil rights legistion. This was because HENNINGS always used an approach of gentle persuasion rather than one of castigation.

But, TOM HENNINGS' knowledge of and devotion to the Constitution of the United States overshadowed his southern heritage. A brilliant lawyer, HENNINGS was considered the Senate's most eminent authority on the Constitution. He fought for first-class citizenship for all simply because he felt that that there was no place for second-class citizenship under our Constitution.

In the spring of 1958, HENNINGS sent the following message to delegates attending a summit conference of Negro leaders in Washington, sponsored by the National Newspaper Publishers Association:

"Your presence here indicates a unity of purpose for the attainment of an objective too long denied Negro Americans the full and equal rights which are guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution of the United States.

"I am deeply devoted to our Constitution and its noble precepts, and I believe, as you do, that those who deny to any citizen the rights and privileges granted by the Constitution make a mockery of that great document and affront the memory of our forefathers who conceived it as a charter for a free republic.

"It is for this reason that throughout my years of service, both in the House and the Senate, I have sponsored legislation to enforce the guarantees of our Constitution and to make it a living and vital force for all Americans, without regard to race, color or creed. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I pledge to continue my efforts toward this end.

"I wish you success in all your deliberations and I hope that this conference may mark the beginning of a new era for full equality and first-class citizenship for all."

This statement reflects as accurately as any that I have known TOM HENNINGS to make just how he felt about our Constitution.

HENNINGS was a liberal in the best sense of the word. He fought as avidly and as fervently for other liberal causes as he did for civil rights. He vigorously opposed McCarthyism and the use of the fifth amendment as an adjectival epithet. He attacked unwarranted secrecy in government and defended the right of the people to know what their Government is doing. He condemned the lack of due process of law in Federal loyalty-security proceedings. He defended the Supreme Court and fought legislation designed to curb the powers of that tribunal. He deplored the use of wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping devices as an invasion of the right of privacy. He was sharply critical of the police practice of holding prisoners and extracting confessions from them before they were properly arraigned and apprised of their constitutional rights. He urged repeal of the Connally amendment to U.S. participation in the International Court of Justice. He assailed the Department of Defense for its practice of considering preinduction activities in determining the nature of a serviceman's discharge. He denounced the State Department's passport policies which restricted a citizen's right to travel. He opposed the Bricker amendment and limitation on the treaty-making powers of the President. He

fought gag orders by some Federal agencies forbidding employees to complain to their Congressmen. He waged a continuous and successful campaign in the Senate for a clean elections bill requiring more adequate safeguards of the election process and more detailed public disclosure of political campaign financing. He urged Federal prison reforms and humane efforts to combat crime and juvenile delinquency without sacrificing the rights of the individual.

Shortly before his death, Senator HENNINGS directed the staff of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to conduct a study of the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. In connection with that study he appointed Miss Belva T. Simmons of St. Louis, one of three Negro members of the subcommittee staff, to personally represent him at the first Missouri Conference on Mental Health which was held recently at Jefferson City. Miss Simmons was in Missouri in the interest of this study when HENNINGS died.

The measure of TOM HENNINGS is perhaps best described in the eulogies and tributes of those who knew him and worked with him.

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the NAACP, wrote in a telegram to Mrs. Hennings: "Throughout his public career, Senator HENNINGS was a constant and uncompromising foe of all forms of bigotry. As a Senator he could always be depended upon not only to vote for human rights legislation but also take an active role in fighting for such measures. His work contributed significantly to the enactment of civil rights statutes by the Congress. He will be sorely missed by all Americans who believe that democracy is indivisible and is the cherished heritage of our entire citizenry."

Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP and one of HENNINGS' closest friends and advisers, in a beautiful tribute to him in his weekly newspaper column wrote: "Senator HENNINGS often said that he reached his decision to champion civil rights after a personal battle with himself. He won the battle."

Then Mitchell went on to quote the following passage from the Senate hearings on civil rights in 1959 in which HENNINGS took issue with a witness from Mississippi on the need for additional Federal civil rights legislation:

"May I have the opportunity to say to you, Mr. Campbell, in the friendliest and most respectful and courteous way, that my own views about these problems are based upon the Constitution of the United States, the Holy Bible, a study of the history of this country and the fate of the free world.

"I think in this day and time when we find ourselves confronted with the power of Soviet Russia where communism is religion, we cannot afford to deny full equality to all our people."

Mitchell concludes: "Senator HENNINGS does not need to follow his own advice now. However, there are many of his colleagues who should understand that it is a legacy that they would do well to remember in the days ahead."

TOM HENNINGS is dead, but his faith lives on.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today my colleagues and I will try within human limitations to express the life and work of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. With the observance of Lincoln's birthday still fresh in our minds, I am reminded of his eloquent Gettysburg statement which is so appropriate at this time:

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

True, our Nation and, indeed, the world will never forget that Senator HENNINGS was a fighter—a fighter who had the respect of his opponents. Born in St. Louis in 1903, TOM HENNINGS graduated from Cornell University and Washington University Law School. He served the people as assistant circuit attorney in St. Louis, as Congressman, as circuit attorney, and as Senator.

His entire career in public service was marked by a high degree of independent judgment. The London Times summed up his career in the Senate with this statement:

Senator HENNINGS emerged as an acknowledged expert on the Constitution and constitutional law, and fought this and other battles in a number of capacities, including chairman of the Senate Rules Committee and of judiciary Subcommittees on Constitutional Rights, Juvenile Delinquency, and Federal Penitentiaries.

I first met TOM HENNINGS when we were prosecuting attorneys for our home counties in Missouri. It was with pride that I watched his meteoric rise in the Democratic Party and in the Senate of the United States. Therefore, it is with the deepest humility that I accepted my election by the people of Missouri to fill Senator HENNINGS' unexpired term.

One could speak at length on TOM HENNINGS' work in the Senate. But, to me, the high points of his career were his fights in opposition to measures he thought contrary to the Constitution or to the welfare of the people. He could always be depended upon to protect the rights of the people from governmental interference. I know of no higher tribute that can be said of any man.

Upon the death of TOM HENNINGS many newspapers throughout our land and abroad spoke of the loss. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials published in the London Times, Los Angeles Times, Rhode Island Pendulum, Salt Lake Tribune, the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Lousiville Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the London Times]

SENATOR THOMAS HENNINGS: CHAMPION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, who died on Tuesday at the age of 57, was the descendant of a wealthy slave-owning family but was probably best known as an ardent champion of civil rights.

He took his stand, writes our Washington correspondent, less on moral grounds than on the argument that the oppression of any minorities was incompatible with the Constitution. He emerged as an acknowledged expert on the Constitution and constitutional law, and fought this and other battles in a number of capacities, including chairman of the Senate Rules Committee and of judiciary Subcommittees on Constitutional Rights, Juvenile Delinquency, and Federal Penitentiaries. He was also a member of the Senate Democratic policy committee and the Democratic steering committee and chairman of the Democratic conference.

HENNINGS was more courageous than some of his colleagues; in 1958, for instance, he dared to tell his Missouri constituents that he was going to vote for substantial foreign aid, an unpopular area of spending in that State. He also led a subcommittee investigation into Senator McCarthy's finances and methods at the height of the latter's campaign.

Another of his interests was in reducing secrecy in Government operations. He insisted on the public's right to know how its business was being conducted.

THOMAS HENNINGS was born in 1903 in St. Louis and graduated from Cornell University and Washington University Law School, where he also coached athletics and lectured in English while a student. From 1929 to 1934 he was an assistant circuit attorney in St. Louis. In 1935 he was elected to the House of Representatives and served until 1940 when he was elected circuit attorney of St. Louis, but a year later he resigned and served in the Navy until 1944. After a period in private law practice, he came to the Senate as the only Democratic candidate to unseat a Republican that year.

Lavish praise was expressed for him yesterday by a number of his colleagues, including Senator KEFAUVER, who said that "his fierce devotion to the principles of freedom of information, and to the highest honesty in government were only a few of his many fine qualities * * * he was an outstanding statesman with a brilliant legal mind."

HENNINGS is survived by his parents, his wife and two stepdaughters. His successor will be chosen at the general election on November 8.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

SEN. HENNINGS DIED TOO SOON

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., died before he could be spared. He was only 57, but he really belonged to an older generation of Democrats, to the generation that interpreted the U.S. Constitution rigorously, believing it meant what it said, with especial emphasis on the parts defining the rights of the people of the United States over against the pretensions of the Government of the United States.

That he will become a saint of journalists there is no doubt. For he was the most effective congressional leader in the movement to tear away the paper curtain behind which so many Government bureaus operate in self-serving secrecy. Through his tireless efforts some holes were punched in that curtain and if he had lived a little longer he might have established at long last the people's right to know what their Government is doing for good or ill in the backrooms of the agencies. He was chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, and no committee was ever more precisely named.

Senator HENNINGS was also chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee and we on the Times have special reason to be grateful for his work in this capacity. When we were engaged in our Pulitzer Prize labor of establishing that most of the narcotics used in southern California are smuggled in from their Mexican source, Senator HENNINGS gave our findings his authoritative confirmation. He had brought his committee to Los Angeles, and afterward he was influential in prodding the State Department into some exchanges with Mexico City.

Missouri will be hard put to duplicate this Senator. Standing by and for the Constitution is not as fashionable as it used to be. The best memorial to Senator HENNINGS would be a successor with his patient persistence and the courage to be a senatorial conscience.

[From the Rhode Island Pendulum]

THE PASSING OF A GREAT SENATOR

We have silently grieved over the death of U.S. Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri. And only now can we give some form of vent to it. When we first learned of his passing, which was more than a week ago, we were so hurt inside on account of it that

we were actually prostrate at the magnitude of the loss.

And debility took over. It was hard to shuffle along with the "as usual" of our grinding routine at the Pendulum. But even in its hurly-burly of men and machines, we heard our inner ear listening to the groan of a moan inside—and inescapable. Our grief was like a wind that tore at our heart.

We could neither cry nor write words of sorrow about it.

Tears and words must have their relevance—and where was the relevance in East Greenwich? Who even knew of Senator HENNINGS? There are now in the U.S. Senate no less than 100 in that so-called exclusive club.

But sometimes in life, regardless of the place and time, we are struck by death, and we the living become as dumb as death. Outwardly anyway. And nobody from the outside can know what is going on inside another person's heart. And besides, what can you say?

And yet, who of us, at one time or another has not felt the proximity of death? And sometimes, too, do we not wish we were dead along with the dead? No more to break. No more to rage. At such moments it feels good to feel with the feelinglessness of death with the dead. As though in a mime: in imitation of it.

Oh for the compassion that goes with the dead and to find identity with it.

Now we openly mourn the passing of TOM HENNINGS. Our grief, our sorrow may fulminate like the wind to no end and to no purpose—may not even be understood. But even so, we grieve and we mourn his passing.

But the truth is, as it must be, that his death, which came so untimely, is a great sorrow for all of us Americans, and not for us alone. Those of us who are imbued with the spirit of true democracy, which means in essence the rise of man to his great stature everywhere in the world, must mourn his passing as well.

We have all lost a valiant soldier in the war of liberation of humanity.

There was no greater champion of civil liberties in the United States than Senator HENNINGS. This is a big statement. But it is only as big as the Senator himself was. He was always fighting in the lists of civil liberties. He protected the constitutional rights of us all. He fought with a quiet but consistent courage. As a lawyer of distinction, he could use effective legal argument. The subtle way he used the legal scalpel won him the admiration and respect of many who opposed his ideas. And he did it all with no attention to himself.

Long before many a johnny-come-lately—the political opportunists of today's fierce presidential campaign—he was at the forefront of the battle for civil liberties and civil rights. Now it seems everybody is on the bandwagon. "But for how long," with justified bitterness do we ask, "will they be on it?"

It seems ironic that he should have died at this time.

We came to know personally Senator HENNINGS while we owned a couple of newspapers in Missouri. And our admiration for him grew as we exchanged some correspondence with him. After a while our admiration hardly knew any bounds.

Senator HENNINGS was a genuine democratic nobleman. Not the phony kind. Not those who trace their ancestry, late or early, to some robber baron. His coat of arms was not of arms, but of great moral courage, of ethics, of culture, of civilized human accomplishments.

Senator HENNINGS was a true American nobleman. And his nobility was such as we can all have as Americans. Of treating others with absolute quality. And this is the way we can answer a Khrushchev, a Nasser—with their fake words, with their damnable lies.

We mourn his passing, and so should you all.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

"SHOW ME" SENATOR

In the death of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., the press of the United States has lost a stanch ally in its fight for freedom of information. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, HENNINGS was quick to turn the spotlight on any Government agency which he believed to be interfering with the people's right to know.

HENNINGS' efforts, however, covered the whole field of civil rights—free speech, right of privacy, freedom of association, as well as freedom of information. As an article in Frontier magazine some months ago remarked, "Above all else, perhaps, HENNINGS symbolized sanity in the era of inquest." And the procedures of his subcommittee have been described as a model for all congressional investigators to follow.

Born in St. Louis in 1903, the Senator exemplified a popular saying of his native State—"I'm from Missouri, show me." Congress needs men who take that attitude, providing, of course, that in being "shown" they follow the elemental rules of fairness and decency.

[From the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., Sept. 16, 1960]

WAYS TO HONOR TOM HENNINGS

The country at large and the Senate in particular have suffered a grievous loss in the death of THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri. He had been in the Senate for scarcely a decade, yet already had made a deep impression as a champion of the constitutional rights of the people. He fought for recognition of the equality of all citizens—an all-embracing cause, which included an incidental but strong hostility to the bureaucratic tendency to conduct public business without fully informing the public.

We hope that his State will pay a suitable tribute to his memory by choosing a successor having the same interests, even if not the same abilities. There aren't many men of such caliber in Missouri or anywhere else.

Congress itself, of course, owes a memorial to the Senator, but not one of those in marble or bronze of which Washington already has at least enough. Mr. HENNINGS' last important legislative achievement was the passage by the Senate June 25 of his clean elections bill—a measure proposing chiefly to introduce honesty in the reporting of campaign expenditures. The House never acted on the measure. If the next Congress should make the bill a law, there could be no more suitable commemoration of a notable career on Capitol Hill.

[From the Louisville Times, Sept. 15, 1960]

SENATOR HENNINGS, HUMANITARIAN

In his 10 years in the U.S. Senate, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., attained a status that was unique. A liberal who was personally acceptable to the conservatives, he was a militant believer in justice.

Justice to him was not an abstract principle. It meant equality of opportunity, the scrupulous observance of the individual's rights—including the right to know what goes on in Government. It meant emphasizing economic rather than military aid to the Nation's allies. It meant giving the underprivileged young people in America's cities a chance to develop as good citizens.

In all these fields he struggled with more or less success against the forces of intolerance and reaction. His death from cancer removes from the Senate Judiciary Committee the most effective opponent of the conservative domination of Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi.

Respected by his colleagues as an outstanding authority on constitutional law, he will be remembered best as a humanitarian who, believing in his country's greatness, believed also that man might aspire closer to perfection.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, if there are any duplications with respect to editorials submitted for the RECORD by my distinguished senior colleague from Missouri, I ask unanimous consent that the duplications be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on the last day of TOM HENNINGS' life he dictated and had delivered to the Democratic State committee in Missouri a statement dealing with religious tolerance. This appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 18, 1960, under the title "Last Testament of TOM HENNINGS."

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1960]

LAST TESTAMENT OF TOM HENNINGS

(By Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS)

(This letter, the last written by the Missouri Democrat before his death on September 13, was sent to John W. Inglish, chairman of the Missouri Democratic State committee. Senator HENNINGS dictated the message from his hospital bed.)

On the occasion of the adoption of our State Democratic platform, containing and reiterating those underlying principles found in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, may I congratulate the distinguished and able members of our State committee and express a reaffirmation of my ever-increasing faith in our great party.

As your senior Senator and as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I am always concerned with the preservation of those rights bestowed upon us through the organic law of the land. I have found that the greatest protection for our rights and freedoms lies in the hands of our people and in the manner in which they exercise these rights.

In the one sentence comprising the first amendment to our Constitution our Founding Fathers directed the course of American life. I would like to repeat it now: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Noting that the very first restriction placed upon the Congress creates the right to worship as one chooses, and noting that article I of the Constitution of our great State emulates this right in specific and emphatic words, we must judge it to be a very prime right of our society of freemen.

I am confident that the wise electorate of Missouri will confirm this constitutional provision on freedom of religion by refusing to accept the religious beliefs of a candidate as a worthy election issue. In clear and concise language, article VI of our Federal Constitution lays down this mandate: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." And in article I of our State constitution we say in words of equal clarity: "No person shall on account of his

religious persuasion or belief be rendered ineligible to a public office of trust or profit in this State."

These are, of course, restrictions on governmental curtailment of the freedom of religion in our land; they do not enchain the private thought or public utterances of those who would for religious causes condemn or distrust his fellow man. But the moral theme of the law was sounded by Thomas Jefferson before the creation of our Union. In a draft for his State legislature of a bill for establishing religious freedom, he wrote, in part:

"The proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow citizens, he has a natural right."

Does it not justifiably follow that the voter who would require of a candidate that he be or not be of a given religious faith, or belong or not belong to a specific church, is enacting a requirement in conflict with a basic precept of our democracy?

When Jefferson said that "truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error," he not only called upon those of his time to search for truth but upon our great party which was to be created in the image of his enlightened views.

I have faith in my fellow citizens, an unshakable faith in their determination and ability to seek and find the truth behind any issue before expressing their ultimate opinion at the polls. I have faith that false issues will be discarded and that the true ones will be faced with calm appraisal and solved only on the basis of proper consideration and intelligent reasoning. I have faith that unwarranted emotionalism and prejudice will be cast aside as sores which beget only solutions for which posterity may sadly pay and long suffer.

Lastly, I have faith and every confidence that our great Democratic Party, founded on truth and consistently the bearer of truth, will elect its candidates in our State and on a national level, and will present the Nation with its next President of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on Bill of Rights Day last December 15, 1960, memorial services for Senator HENNINGS were held in St. Louis. I ask unanimous consent that a digest and other material of these services provided by the chairman, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest and other material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

The Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Tribute Committee, organized under the chairmanship of Dr. Ferdinand M. Isserman, rabbi of Temple Israel, St. Louis, Mo., consisted of the following: Honorary chairman, Gov. James T. Blair; honorary vice chairmen, Hon. Forrest C. Donnell, Senator Edward V. Long, and Senator Stuart Symington; chairmen, Mayor Raymond R. Tucker, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, and Irving Dilliard; members of the committee, Michael J. Aubuchon, Joseph P. Clark, Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, Russell Dearmont, Dr. Elmer Ellis, Fred A. Eppenberger, Thomas J. Guilfoil, David M. Grant, John Raeburn Green, Judge Roy Harper, Mark R. Holloran, Bishop Ivan Lee Holt, Gale F. Johnston, Congressman Frank M. Karsten, Hon. Aloys P. Kaufmann, Louis LaCoss, Jacob M. Lashly, John H. Lashly, Samuel H. Liberman, J. Wesley McAfee, Federal Judge George H. Moore, H. Sam Priest, the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, S.J., John I. Rollings, Morris A. Shenker, Chancellor Ethan A. H. Shepley, Congresswoman Lenor K. Sullivan, Rev. Dr. O. Walter Wagner, Judge Randolph H. Weber, and Mrs. Margaret Bush Wilson.

The committee held a meeting in Mayor Tucker's office in St. Louis and planned to dedicate a plaque in memory of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., at the Soldier's Memorial in St. Louis, and to hold a tribute meeting in Graham Chapel of Washington University on December 15, Bill of Rights Day. The plaque was scheduled to be dedicated at 10 a.m. on Thursday, December 15, at the Soldier's Memorial in St. Louis. The inscription on the plaque reads as follows:

"THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

"(June 25, 1903–September 13, 1960)

"United States Senator from Missouri, 1950–1960; officer in the Armed Forces; forceful advocate of clean elections; protagonist of good government; effective champion of human rights; valiant fighter for civil liberties; vigorous foe of religious and racial intolerance; counselor of delinquent youth; supporter of the Supreme Court; good and tried friend; believer in the equality and dignity of all men, in the spiritual succession of Thomas Jefferson."

Rabbi Isserman presided at the morning dedicatory service. The following invocation was given by Dr. O. Walter Wagner, executive director of the Metropolitan Church Federation of St. Louis:

"There was a Lincolnesque quality about the religion of TOM HENNINGS. Both men shunned the pretense of attending regular public worship for political purposes. Both men exhibited a deep reverence for life and expressed their religion in uncompromising lovalty to high ethical principles. In the privacy of their offices both men, in great crises, cried out to the Living God. These mountainlike men help us to look behind our pretensions and make us mindful to match our lives with theirs. Tall men were they and stalwart, like towering pines deep rooted by the lash of many a gale, they stood serene, majestic. Men said they died—but such men never die; they march the blazing trail in step with God, down through the vast eternities. O God, help us, and all who in future generations will come here to stand in awe of the courageous convictions of THOMAS HENNINGS, and may we emulate him by our devotion to the extension of freedom and human dignity, to the end that all men shall stand tall and free and unafraid. Amen."

In his opening remarks, Rabbi Isserman said:

"The meetings this morning at the Soldier's Memorial and this evening in Graham Memorial Chapel of Washington University were organized so that St. Louisans will have a chance to pay their tributes to the memory of the late THOMAS HENNINGS, JR., one of the most distinguished sons of our city. Because his final services were held in Washington, D.C., and only a handful of St. Louisans were present, many in our city believed that they should have a chance to pay their homage to and show their love for this great Senator. To meet this need in the hearts of many people, this Hennings memorial program was organized. On December 15, Bill of Rights Day, because Senator HENNINGS was such an outstanding champion of the rights of man, the two functions were held to honor his memory. The committee membership was limited, because everyone was ready to serve on it. Mayor Tucker and Irving Dilliard served with me as chairmen. The mayor held the first meeting in his office, and there the decisions were made to unveil the memorial plaque at the Soldier's Memorial in the morning, and to hold an evening tribute meeting in the Graham Chapel of Washington University. Very fittingly present here this morning besides the family of the late Senator HENNINGS are his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., his widow, Mrs. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., his sister and her husband, Mr. and Mrs. David Teasdale, and others. Present also this morning are leaders of the city's business, professional, civic, and cultural life, as well as many holding public office. Mrs. Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., mother of the late Senator, will unveil the memorial plaque. It contains the following inscription: 'THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. (June 25, 1903–September 13, 1960). United States Senator from Missouri, 1950–1960; officer in the Armed Forces; forceful advocate of clean elections; protagonist of good government; effective champion of human rights; valiant fighter for civil liberties; vigorous foe of religious and racial intolerance; counselor of delinquent youth; supporter of the Supreme Court; good and tried friend; believer in the equality and dignity of all men, in the spiritual succession of Thomas Jefferson.' "

Mr. Morris Shenker, a close friend of Senator HENNINGS, and executor of his estate, paid the following tribute:

"Mr. Chairman, I am deeply appreciative of the privilege of addressing this gathering in tribute to the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., in whose memory his family and friends have gathered here today. When the last chapter of a human life has been closed we quite properly set apart time to review, to consider, and to evaluate, and in so doing we come to an appreciation of that which has been well done. In every step of his long and varied career of public service Senator HENNINGS has exhibited the highest regard for the rights of his fellow man, large and small, rich and poor alike. Senator HENNINGS was born in 1903, graduated from Cornell and Washington Universities and was admitted to the Missouri bar in 1926. He was an assistant circuit attorney under Judge Franklin Miller from 1929 to 1934; was elected to the U.S. Congress wherein he served three terms, and answered the call of the citizens of Missouri to assume the office of circuit attorney where he served in 1940 and 1941, when he volunteered for active duty and served as lieutenant commander in the Pacific combat theater. He was elected U.S. Senator in 1950 and reelected by the greatest majority ever given a candidate, up to that time, in 1956. In the U.S. Senate he was a member of some of the most important committees and invariably when others were timid and right and justice demanded he had the courage to speak as was so well said by the New York Times: " 'It was good to see courage in a room at a time when many men are timid.' Senator HENNINGS came to the support and led the fight that defeated the Bricker amendment, the effect of which would have been to limit the power of President of the United States. He led the fight sucessfully to preserve the power of the U.S. Supreme Court against all attacks, and realizing the injustices of uncurbed congressional investigations, while firmly believing that those investigations are necessary, he sponsored codes of fair procedure for congressional committees which code provides that each person that is accused receive the opportunity to face his accuser. He was a recognized authority on constitutional law and was at all times ready to defend the principles of justice under a government of laws and not of men. He will long be remembered for his amiability and consideration for the feelings of others. He never lost the common touch and displayed always that warm, friendly, considerate spirit and that wonderful sense of humor which were his. His admirable human qualities won him devoted friends. He had the quality and power of forgetting for the time self, friends, inter-

ests, and relationships and fight for others stronger perhaps in the cause of justice and equality."

Mayor Tucker, of St. Louis, read the following telegrams received from President Eisenhower and President-elect John F. Kennedy:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 14, 1960.*
RABBI FERDINAND ISSERMAN,
Temple Israel, Kingshighway and Washington, St. Louis:

Through Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS I have learned of the meeting to be held in St. Louis today in memory of my friend, the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. In his lifetime of devoted service to Missouri and the Nation, Senator HENNINGS won the respect and admiration of his countrymen everywhere. His death was a loss to America and the free world. It is an honor to join in this salute to his memory and to express my gratitude for his work.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 14, 1690.*
RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
St. Louis:

I should like to join in the tributes to Senator HENNINGS. He was always quick to recognize and applaud the contributions of others to human rights and human dignity and so it is particularly fitting that we offer a memorial to his career of dedication to public service. He will always be missed. His deep sympathy for the underprivileged and his keen understanding combined to produce a valiant champion of democracy. In a larger sense his memorial is the generations of Americans who will be better able to experience full economic and political freedom and equality.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The meeting closed with the following benediction by the Very Reverend Ned Cole, dean of Christ Church Cathedral in St. Louis:

"O God, who through humble men has revealed Thy will, continue to raise up among us such persons. May the Lord bless us, and keep us. May the Lord make His face to shine upon us, and be gracious unto us. May the Lord lift up His countenance upon us, and give us His peace and His strength, this day and evermore. Amen."

The evening tribute meeting was held in Graham Chapel of Washington University. Music was furnished by Howard Kelsey, university organist, and the university choir, under the direction of Gil Brungardt. Mayor Raymond R. Tucker made the following introductory remarks:

"Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here this evening to pay tribute to the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr. As we do so, I am sure that all of us who knew Senator HENNINGS are very conscious of a deep sense of loss. To the family of Senator HENNINGS, whose loss was much greater and more personal, we can only extend our deepest, and most sincere sympathy. It must, however, be a source of consolation to those who knew and loved Senator HENNINGS, to realize that our Nation is a better place in which to live because of him. Even as we pay tribute to Senator HENNINGS this evening, we know that our words are unequal to the task. The most lasting and the most fitting tributes to Senator HENNINGS are to be found, not in our words, but in his accomplishment during a lifetime of public service. In the words of Lincoln: 'The world will little note, nor long remember, what we say here.' However, the world can never forget the contributions made by Senator HENNINGS. We have only to recall the record of the U.S. Senate during the past decade, and we discover, in that record, monuments to Senator HENNINGS which are most lasting than any of marble. It is in this spirit, I believe, that we are gathered here this evening. We know, full well, that the greatness of Senator HENNINGS is far above our poor power to add, or to detract, by our words here tonight. Senator HENNINGS' place in history is assured, and it is a place of honor. Thus we are gathered here not only to pay tribute to Senator HENNINGS, but also to recall the principles to which he devoted his life, and to reaffirm our faith in those principles. We are assembled here to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished work which Senator HENNINGS so nobly advanced."

The scripture reading from the Old Testament was read by Chancellor Ethan A. H. Shepley, of Washington University, and from the New Testament by Bishop M. W. Clare. Letters of tribute were read by Mr. Morris Shenker, which were received from President Eisenhower, President-elect John F. Kennedy, Vice-President-elect Lyndon B. Johnson, Congressman John W. McCormack, House majority leader, Chief Justice Earl Warren, Senator Estes Kefauver, the staff of the late Senator Hennings, Gov. James T. Blair, Jr., of Missouri, Father Paul C. Reinert, president of St. Louis University, and many others.

The program consisted of the following tributes: "Scholar and Public Servant"—Elmer Ellis, president, University of Missouri; "The Challenge of His Senate Record"—Edward V. Long, U.S. Senator from Missouri(due to the illness of Senator Long, his speech was read by Thomas J. Guilfoil); "The Lawyer"—Federal Judge George H. Moore; "The Supporter of Constitutional Principles"—Irving Dilliard, former editor, editorial page, St. Louis Post-Dispatch; "The Man"—Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman. The benediction was given by the Right Reverend Lloyd A. Sullivan, Epiphany of Our Lord Church. A reception in honor of the Hennings family, and for the committee, was held at the home of Rabbi and Mrs. Ferdinand M. Isserman, 82 Aruncel Place, Clayton, Mo.

SCHOLAR AND PUBLIC SERVANT

(By Elmer Ellis, president, University of Missouri)

Mr. Chairman, friends, I welcome this opportunity to pay personal tribute to the memory of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS and to express the great satisfaction we at the University of Missouri felt in his career. It is no exaggeration to say that we considered him a distinguished member of the community of scholars. He possessed many traits that we would have our students exemplify in the way of personal characteristics. He was one of us in a very real sense. As a teacher and athletic coach at Washington University, while working on his law degree, he became acquainted firsthand with many of the problems, opportunities, and responsibilities of the university scholar.

Mr. HENNINGS did not merely pay lipservice to the values of education. An avid reader and student, his speeches were full of Biblical and classical quotations, which illustrated rather than decorated his basic thought pattern, because they came from ready familiarity with the original sources. Vituperation was absent from his public utterances, because his learning provided him with more effective tools for achieving the ends sought. Educated both in the liberal arts and in the law, he exemplified their values in the causes which he chose to advocate.

Senator HENNINGS had faith in scholarship and in free discussion. He spoke in the tradition of Jefferson and Lincoln when he said: "It is my belief that the first amendment is a positive admonition to Americans to debate, discuss and argue, and indeed to disagree; to participate in diverse associations; to constantly engage in free inquiry."

He was admired for his courage in defending his convictions, and all saw in him the degree to which the educated man can make his ideals an effective force in American life. It took courage as well as skill to oppose a fellow Senator whose methods threatened American freedom, but Senator HENNINGS stood fast against such methods and can be credited with pointing the way to their ultimate censure by the Senate of the United States. Again, the Senator played an important role in defeating those who would curb the powers of the Supreme Court of the United States because of decisions defending the individual's right to civil liberties. Within the Senate itself, he led successfully the fight for civil rights legislation in 1957.

His whole career bears testimony to the depths of his convictions. On one occasion he said: "It is automatic with me to be in sympathy with the rights of the individual." Through his efforts the U.S. Army modified its procedure in checking on the loyalty of its members, so that the individual enjoyed a greater measure of protection without the Army being handicapped as a result. He sought to guarantee voting rights to Negroes in States where they were disenfranchised by segregationist maneuvers. In such things he sometimes stood with the majority of fellow Senators, often with the minority, but he always placed principle above political expediency.

We admired Senator HENNINGS because he was a humanitarian. He spent much time and effort studying the causes and possible remedies for juvenile delinquency. The establishment of a fund to carry on such work in the years ahead reveals how deeply he was committed to the preservation and development of America's greatest resource, its young people.

Commendable also were his efforts to keep the way open for full and free expression of the will of the American people. Senator HENNINGS joined a number of other Senators in an effort to change procedure in the Senate so that a filibuster could be halted by simple majority vote for closure after 15 days. Only last January he succeeded in getting through the Senate a bill to control spending in Federal elections, including primaries. Although these efforts were blocked by opposing forces, they found a warm response on the part of the American people. Because they must be classified as unfinished business, they point up the loss suffered by the untimely death of Mr. HENNINGS.

In the academic community Senator HENNINGS is remembered best perhaps because he demonstrated that the liberally educated humanitarian can be an effective force in American life. Certainly that was one of his greatest contributions. As one commentator put it, he was a "rare combination: a dedicated liberal with a healthy respect for the practical." In Senator HENNINGS' case, a respect for the practical in no way blunted his idealism; it served only to make his ideals more effective. A Washington dispatch immediately after his death mentioned that he was one of the few Members on the liberal side who was personally acceptable to conservative Members of the Senate. Because of that they were willing to see him moved into positions of influence within the Senate itself, and from those vantage points he was able to make his influence felt. Certainly, he pointed the way to a more effective role on the part of the liberal scholar in American life.

Senator HENNINGS identified himself with many of our activities at the university that were in the line of his major public interests. In 1955 we had a conference on juvenile delinquency, at which he delivered the keynote address and stayed throughout to play a leading role in its deliberations. When the order of the COIF was conferred upon him by the chapter of the order in our law school, he read to our students and visiting lawyers and jurists a scholarly legal paper that stimulated thought and discussion. In January 1958 he contributed to our Law

Review another scholarly treatise "Detention and Confession: the Mallory Case."

Because we at the University of Missouri feel so close to him, we are especially pleased that Mrs. Hennings and her family decided to place the Senator's papers in the western historical manuscripts collection at the university where they will become available for study on the part of historical scholars. They will serve as a fitting memorial to an able and distinguished statesman and to a large degree assure that his place in history will be better understood and more adequately explained than those statesmen whose records go into more or less permanent hiding.

THE CHALLENGE OF HIS SENATE RECORD

(By U.S. Senator EDWARD V. LONG)

It is with a feeling of the deepest humility that I speak on this occasion. This is no ordinary ceremony. We memorialize here tonight a great U.S. Senator, who was one of Missouri's most distinguished sons.

Anyone who studies the career of the late THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., even casually, soon becomes aware of the fact that a major portion of his adult life was devoted to the service of his fellow citizens both in peace and in war.

Since my appointment and election to succeed Senator HENNINGS in the U.S. Senate, I have had the opportunity to study something of his philosophy of government and to learn of his activities in the Senate.

As a result, I feel most humble succeeding a man of his attainments, his courage, and his statesmanship. If ours is a better government today, and our Nation a better place for freemen to live, it is because TOM HENNINGS walked and worked among us.

If public officials feel more keenly the need for keeping our democracy vital and alive by making their public record and their actions available we can thank TOM HENNINGS for his great contribution to this principle.

If our election laws are improved so that the guarantees of freedom and fairness are paramount it was TOM HENNINGS who made adherence to these principles and philosophies a major part of his program.

TOM HENNINGS believed and he fought for complete freedom of the press to inquire fully and critically into every phase of our public activity. He believed that if the people were to be really free, they must also have unrestricted and uncensored information. No bureaucrat or public officeholder was too big to be exempt from this probing by our press. He believed that withholding of information from the public was in actuality one of the major crimes against freedom. Our great Senator knew that secrecy in government was a potent weapon of dictators.

TOM HENNINGS wanted our rivers and our forests to belong to all the people and to be used for their benefit, and he fought exploitation of our natural resources by anyone.

TOM HENNINGS' approach to the vital human problems of health, housing, social security, civil rights, and civil liberties mark him as one of the great constructive liberals of our time.

It has been said that some men live so that the age in which they live is lifted and thereby all men walk on higher ground. TOM HENNINGS' life, which he devoted to his State and his Nation—that he devoted to the welfare of all mankind, irrespective of race, creed, or color—has raised all of us to a higher plane of public service and to a greater appreciation and love for our fellow man. His life and his record is a challenge and an inspiration to all of us who follow after him.

I am honored to have a part in paying tribute to the memory of this great Missourian.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., THE LAWYER

(By Judge George H. Moore)

Writing in the New Yorker magazine only last year, that most astute and thoughtful political commentator and Washington observer, Richard Rovers, stated that there was no doubt in his mind, were a vote to be taken among all the Members of the U.S. Senate as to the ablest Senator among them, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., would easily prevail.

A bold remark to be sure, yet one that appears to have a solid foundation and to be supported by the consensus.

But why was this man's ability so marked in a body not lacking in high talent? I submit that the answer which inevitably suggests itself is that, while Senator HENNINGS was a man of charm, compassion, and intellect—all of which greatly contributed to his success in the Senate—this judgment as to his being first in ability stems from the fact that he was primarily a skilled and far above average lawyer—a man who exemplified in his practice, and carried with him into his years in the Congress, the highest qualities and ideals of our profession.

Hear from men who knew him and observed him, not as a political figure, but as a working member of the bar and a skilled prosecutor. The answer is always the same—a man of impressive dignity and courtroom appearance; a master of the English language and of persuasive logic; and the possessor of a warm personality that made men instinctively rely on him. Although years have passed, his successful arguments in criminal cases are still remembered around the courts of this city, where he achieved success at an early age.

However, there is far more here than the mere picture of a successful courtroom advocate. The witnesses testify further to an innate kindness and courtesy; of his sense of the dignity of man even in the tortuous atmosphere of the criminal courts; and of his belief in the responsibility of the prosecutor toward the defendant's rights as well as those of the State.

Finally, and most marked, we hear from all sources not only of his skill, judgment, and fearlessness, but of his acute sense of integrity and honor. Never did the public outcry deter him from dismissing a case when he was convinced of the defendant's innocence; and his well-known hatred of sham and hypocrisy lasted throughout his lifetime. As one of his contemporaries in the circuit attorney's office expressed it to me, THOMAS HENNINGS "never compromised with the truth, and since the lawyer's ultimate function is to bring out the truth he easily fulfilled that ultimate."

Therefore, what we see is a picture of a highly gifted lawyer who had he not turned to other fields would unquestionably have been a leader of the American bar. Yet even in the Senate, the interests of the legal student and skilled practitioner were always with him. Quick to sense injustice, his advocate's skill stood him in good stead on many occasions. Or consider the scholar's intense and faithful interest in the problems of the Senate's Judiciary Committee; his patience with the technicalities of legislative drafting; and his deftness and clarity in debate of the often highly technical or emotional problems that came before the Congress—all the mark of the true lawyer imbued by a sense of the dignity and obligation of his profession.

Senator HENNINGS' legal background and his association is impressive. He had been for many years a partner in the law firm oldest in continuous connection of any firm in this State. Its roll of members through the years has included many illustrious names at the bar—Chief Justice Warwick Hough; John H. Overall; John F. Green; Judge Ernest F. Green, to say nothing of John Raeburn Green and the Senator's own father. Is it any wonder that a man nurtured by such a professional background should have loved and respected his profession, and with his native abilities, become skilled in it?

But beyond the pride he took in his profession, which all of us who knew him well realized, THOMAS HENNINGS took deep nourishment from his roots in the American past. Always to be observed in him was a sense of his connection with history, and the need to maintain his own integrity so that faith would have been kept with that past.

Here then was a man whom the legal profession first trained and brought to fulfillment, and then presented to the Nation so that his great destiny might be achieved. We of the law must always take great pride and comfort in the fact that, such is the enduring nature of our profession that from our ranks we can call forth and dedicate such a man as THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., a statesman, but above all, a lawyer in the highest sense of the word.

THE SUPPORTER OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

(By Irving Dilliard)

The Psalmist likened time and life to the grass of the fields. "In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up," he said. "In the evening it is cut down and withereth." The Old Testament poet was contemplating a life markedly different from the one which brings us together now. The New Testament disciple, Matthew, came far closer to describing the good works of THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., when he said: "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." For no man is perfect, and even the best can hardly hope to improve on Isaiah's well-remembered plan of: "Precept upon precept; line upon line; here a little and there a little."

In his decade in the Senate of the United States—and that is the period of his life that particularly concerns us at the moment for it is the period of the flowering of his devotion to constitutional principles—the late senior Senator from Missouri guided by the rule of first the blade, then the ear, and finally the full corn, if not for him then for others. And to achieve it he knew that it could be only by precept and line—a start now, a gain later, and still further advances tomorrow and the next day for those who would come after him if not to all in his own time.

For it was no accident that found THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., successfully sponsoring the bill in Congress for a memorial to President James Madison. If one of the Founding Fathers were to be given a status of preeminence over the others, surely the high honor would go to James Madison. As Madison worked to give us so many of the constitutional principles by which our Nation has lived—and by which it has survived—so it was Senator HENNINGS who stood by those principles and protected them when others, seeing through a glass darkly, if indeed seeing at all, would have torn apart those long-cherished principles and even would have discarded them.

Senator HENNINGS had little more than taken his oath as a Member of the Upper Chamber of Congress when he found himself almost wholly in charge of an investigation, under the Constitution, into the qualifications and the behavior of one of the most notorious of his colleagues.

It was an ordeal that other Senators had avoided but THOMAS C. HENNINGS saw it through. He did his duty fairly, thoroughly, and tellingly. In the end the carefully documented report of the subcommittee which he headed was a factor in the undoing and the repudiation of that reckless, irresponsible, demagogic misleader, and misrepresenter of far too many American citizens.

When the Eisenhower administration came into office in 1953, it was Senator HENNINGS, a member of the other major political party, who stood out as the strongest protector of the authority of the President to conduct, as the Constitution provides that he must do, the foreign relations of the United States. The leaders of Mr. Eisenhower's own party in the Senate sought to limit severely the authority of the President in the vital field of international affairs. They did this by proposing and striving to pass the would-be Bricker amendment to the Constitution. In committee and on the Senate floor, it was THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., who fought the battle for constitutional principle. In the end the struggle against the detractors of the Presidency was won by a single vote and that makes the role of Senator HENNINGS the more significant. To contemplate the paralyzing obstacles that would have arisen in the wake of the adoption of the Bricker amendment is to measure the debt which President Eisenhower and his successors owe to the Missouri Senator whose memory we are here to honor tonight.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS was a realist in political life and so he became aware early in his career in Congress of the need for our country to face the hard realities about elections and the laws which regulate them. Recognizing the paramountcy of free elections as a constitutional principle, he studied long and deeply over our electoral shortcomings and the means of correcting them. He sought ways to stop corruption of the ballot and to guarantee clean and honest elections, resulting from campaigns whose controlled costs were reasonable and not prohibitive. It was a service that will benefit us as long as our representative institutions survive.

Great as were these good works of the late Missouri Senator, still another must be recorded, and one doubtless of yet greater importance. For it was THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., who more than a score of his colleagues combined turned back the congressional raiders who sought to cripple the Supreme Court of the United States with the Jenner-Butler bill to take away some of the Supreme Court's most vital jurisdiction. The Jenner-Butler bill's backers did not agree with certain of the Supreme Court's decisions in sensitive areas such as race relations and internal security. They showed their disagreement and displeasure by proposing to take away from the Supreme Court its right to hear appeals which historically have been the Supreme Court's responsibility.

It was a bitter battle and in time it came to occupy the close attention of the whole Senate which on the final tests, several by narrowest margins stood with Senator HENNINGS. Every vote counted in the end and a man less stanch in his convictions than THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., would have let down somewhere along the way and the battle to protect the Supreme Court against vindictive trespass would have been lost. The Chief Justice, the eight Associate Justices, and all the judges of our country and their uncounted successors may be grateful that Senator HENNINGS held the constitutional line when colleagues on both sides of the aisle tried to tear a gaping hole in it.

In the aspects of his career now under consideration it is not for us to go into the services of Senator HENNINGS in the fields of juvenile betterment, prison reform, civil service merit system, and international parliamentarianism all of which knew him as an effective friend. Yet we must cite one more area and in doing so we must, so I believe, raise it to our highest level of all. This was in the field of the individual freedoms of the citizen that are guaranteed by the Bill of Rights whose 169th birthday our Nation celebrates today. For in the decade that he served us in the Senate, Washington knew no more persistent defender of free speech, free press, free assembly, free petition, and free religion, with free religion's twin protections of the separation of church and state, and the prohibition of religious tests for public office. He was just as firm against unreasonable searches and seizures, against the belittling of the crucial protections of the fifth amendment, and against any erosion of the rest of the constitutional guarantees that make a reality of the presumption that an accused person in free America is innocent until proved guilty in a court of law where due process is observed to the fullest.

At a time when the popular thing was to discount if not to minimize our civil liberties, Senator HENNINGS led the Senate in the creation of a special Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. He, with the assistance of an able staff which he assembled and eminent counsel which he chose, conducted these hearings in such a way as to awaken many American citizens to the dangerous and often subtle attack on their rights by officials who either did not care about ultimate effects or who were ready to subvert constitutional principle. Wherever the assault was launched there appeared Senator HENNINGS to turn it back. And so he took up arms against the invasion of privacy by wiretapping, against the denial of passports by those who would use the control of passports as a weapon in the cold war, against inhumane deportations and exclusions of refugees and other worthy applicants to our shores. He was quick to see official conduct that might be suited to totalitarian regimes in the dictator states but had no place under a Federal Union which he helped round out to 50 members bound together by the Constitution and its Bill of Rights.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., no longer sits in the Senate of the United States, but his good works will serve generations to come years without end. First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., THE MAN

(By Dr. Ferdinand M. Isserman)

How fitting and appropriate it is that we are assembled here on the campus of Washington University, of whose law school THOMAS HENNINGS was a graduate, completing the 3-year course in 2 and, at the same time, coaching its track team. I am not carried away by the spirit of friendship when I state as I do that THOMAS HENNINGS was of prophetic stature. For the Hebrew word, "Navi," or prophet, means to speak forth the truths of God under any and all circumstances. Would we not equate these with the basic rights of the individual? Did not Jefferson mean that when he wrote about unalienable rights? What are the qualifications of a prophet in the Biblical sense? One thing is certain: he is not a soothsayer or fortune teller. He does predict the future, inasmuch as he endeavors to assay the impact of the conduct of man on the course of human events. The prophet has a sense of kinship with all human beings, like Amos, who rose above the nationalism of his surroundings and said that the Ethiopians were precious in the sight of God. The prophet must have a creative imagination so that he can place himself in the position of his neighbor, feel his woes, experience his agonies, respect his dignity, understand his ambitions and hopes, and be sensitive to his faith. A prophet must be the spokesman of the underprivileged. He must speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. He must battle for human beings who are too feeble to battle for themselves. He must champion their cause in the face of entrenched power, whether of despotic individuals, of tyrannical states, or of oppressive races. He must be aware of the equality of all peoples and ready to uphold it. To do all these things, the prophet must have the greatest of human virtues, the quality of moral courage, absolute fearlessness in speaking the right, absolute indifference to the criticisms and carping of the classes or the masses, always loyal to his convictions, standing for justice as God gives him to see it, undeterred by organized power of men or organizations or states, immovably dedicated to the truth.

Certainly in this sense THOMAS HENNINGS was a prophet. He fought for the Supreme Court when its right to protect the individuals hated by the mob was questioned. He revealed a sense of internationalism when he successfully led his fellow Senators to cooperate with the President of the United States in defeating the Bricker amendment. As chairman of the Prisons Committee of the Senate, he personally visited the prisons, spoke with the inmates, heard their side of the injustices of society against them, and successfully secured legislation to improve the method of sentencing.

As circuit attorney of St. Louis at a time when society was greatly disturbed by crime waves, he was an efficient prosecutor, but carried out his office without rancor or sensationalism. He did not endeavor to exploit the weaknesses of juvenile delinquents for his own aggrandizement. He believed in firm measures to protect society against youthful desperados, but he also recognized society's failures to them. So he became active in the Big Brothers Association, hoping to supply to wayward, loveless, and friendless youth a friend who would take a personal interest in them and who would fill the vacuum in their lives. For this he received a national award of the Big Brothers Association of America, and was hailed, "Big Brother of the Year." He took steps for the suppression of the marihuana traffic in a desire to protect youth from its degenerating influence. He served with me on the board of the Urban League of St. Louis a generation ago to help Negroes overcome the injustices from which they were suffering in his city. It was the era of segregated schools and universities, and of the frustrations from limitations of employment. Only deadend jobs which provided no future were available for Negroes. His sensitive spirit never allowed him to forget these injustices. In the Senate he was a leader in civil rights legislation. Due to his persuasiveness and popularity among his fellow Senators, the bill enforcing the voting rights of Negroes all over this country was passed. His devotion to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution was demonstrated frequently on the floor of the Senate and by the legislation he sponsored, and was well symbolized by his proposal approved to create a James Madison Memorial like those of Lincoln, Washington, and Jefferson in our National City. James Madison, inspired by Thomas Jefferson, was the actual father of the Bill of Rights. For its incorporation in the Constitution, he was responsible.

TOM HENNINGS was insistent on the people's rights to know what transpired in their governments, and led the fight to nullify secrecy of information in Government bureaus and among Government officials. For this he will long be regarded as a saint among journalists, and the Missouri Press Association gave him a special award.

He recognized that incompetent government would be robbing the people of their birthright, so he strove for clean elections, and secured passage of a bill for the merit system among public servants. For this he was recognized by the Hoover Commission and given one of their awards. His devotion to the Constitution of the United States he learned here at this university, sitting at the feet of professors universally recognized for their brilliance. He was the most effective champion of constitutional rights in the Senate in his generation, and was hailed as the outstanding defender of the rights of man in our day.

He was a native of St. Louis, and the enlightened spirit of this city, its harmonious blending of people of many nations, its unsurpassed record in interfaith relationships, its peaceful and unequaled transition from segregation to desegregation, molded his philosophy, even as he helped to sustain its moral atmosphere. The spirit of the forty-eighters which made our community the heart of liberalism in America, and this university a nationally honored champion of academic freedom, were factors in the personality of THOMAS HENNINGS. He opposed the burning of books at our information centers. He was so loyal to the Constitution that his own firm defended the right of bigots to exercise freedom of speech. He was a member of a church both here and in Washington, and elected to have the service over his remains not in the historic walls of the Capitol, but in a Presbyterian Church of which he was a member. In this way did he affirm his religious convictions.

He was so modest that few among his fellow townsmen know of his many accomplishments, or his stature in Washington. As much as I admired his public service, I was not fully aware of its many constructive ramifications. He was not seeking the applause of the masses, or even the commendation of his contemporaries. For one of the greatest Senators of his time, he was the least publicized. His ability and achievements were appreciated more in the Halls of the Senate than in the hearts and minds of the people of Missouri whom he served with such distinction, and who reelected him to office. He had a great capacity for friendship. He fought issues and not men. He was not a crusader who condemned and made appeals to emotions, but a pleader who directed his arguments to the reason of man. His last message issued on the day of his death was addressed to the people of this State not to abuse the freedom of religion by making religion a qualification for public office. Among his friends and intimates were men of every race, nationality, and creed. Negroes regarded him as a national hero. Perhaps his religious philosophy can best be expressed in those verses from the Old Testament which are repeated in the New, "Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy might," and, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.'s life is a glowing page in the annals of man. His record of many achievements is a diadem long to be cherished by the people of the city of his birth. His public service must be a source of joy to his dear ones, to his widow, their children, and to his distinguished parents. Theirs is the satisfaction of knowing that their son, husband, and father served humanity well. His will provided for a foundation to help youth, but his devotion to freedom is a perpetual spiritual foundation, from which all of us can draw strength. "The ablest exponent in the Senate of the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and of Woodrow Wilson," wrote a journalist about him. Appreciation for his life and work can best be expressed by intensified loyalties to the basic rights of mankind. All of us in the spirit of noblesse oblige, must man the ramparts to shield them. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Such vigilance TOM HENNINGS revealed in his life, and by emulating his example, we honor best his memory.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., December 12, 1960.

Rabbi FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
Temple Israel, St. Louis, Mo.

MY DEAR RABBI ISSERMAN: I regret very much that our Court sessions prevent my attendance at the memorial ceremonies for Senator HENNINGS.

Senator HENNINGS was not only a devoted public servant but had a passion for constitutional government and the place of the individual in it. The judiciary had no better friend. His devotion to the Bill of Rights and his insistence upon its observance made his career in the Senate of the United States one of the most important in the history of that great body.

Trusting that the memorial service will be as heart warming as his patriotic service, and with kind regards to all, I am,

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 13, 1960.

Rabbi FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

I regret my inability to be present to render a tribute in person to the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. The Nation has great cause to grieve because, through his passing, it has been denied further benefits of his keen mind, his forceful character, and his noble purpose. More than just a distinguished Senator, TOM HENNINGS was one of the most effective champions of true individual liberty in this century; a stout foe against those who abused freedom in freedom's name; and a steadfast advocate for those whose freedom was abused. We who yet live cannot do less than to dedicate ourselves to the task of keeping alive his boundless faith in the determination and ability of the American people to seek and find the truth, to discard false issues and to solve their problems on the basis of proper consideration and intelligent reasoning.

ESTES KEFAUVER,
U.S. Senator.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO.,
December 15, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

Thank you for your telegram. Deeply regret inability to be in St. Louis today for memorial service honoring Senator HENNINGS whose outstanding record as statesman and lawyer during his years of public service will long be remembered by all of us. I am very sorry it is impossible for me to participate in the tribute being paid him.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. BLAIR, JR.,
Governor.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
December 14, 1960.

RABBI FERDINAND ISSERMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

We, who were members of the staff of the late Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., wish to take this opportunity to express our deep respect and devotion to the memory of our beloved Senator.

Day by day, as we worked with Senator HENNINGS, we came to know his deep wisdom and unwavering dedication to Jeffersonian democracy.

His courage and brilliance were an inspiration to each of us.

His death has left a void in our hearts which will never be filled.

THE STAFF OF THE LATE SENATOR THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

EXCERPT FROM LETTER FROM FATHER PAUL C. REINERT, PRESIDENT OF ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

I join with all the other friends and admirers of TOM HENNINGS in testifying to the lasting contribution which he made to good government and to the protection of human rights and civil liberties throughout a distinguished public career. May his life inspire others to similar careers in the service of all of our people.

EXCERPTS FROM TELEGRAM SENT TO MAYOR RAYMOND R. TUCKER, FROM CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. MCCORMACK, HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER

Senator HENNINGS was one of my most valued friends. He was not only a dedicated public official, but a great American. As a result of his service in both branches of Congress he has left a most valuable imprint upon the pages of American history.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER FROM VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

I cannot think of a more appropriate day to have this meeting on than Constitution Day, as TOM was a great defender of its principles both as an individual and as a Senator and chairman of the Rules Committee and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate. He was a great Senator and an even greater friend.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, for many of us here in this Chamber, for Missourians and for people throughout the breadth of this land, we lost a great friend and an articulate champion with the death of TOM HENNINGS September 13, 1960. The very least we can do is hold this memorial service today. But, to quote President Kennedy:

In a larger sense, Senator HENNINGS' memorial is the generations of Americans who will be better able to experience full economic and political freedom and equality.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with a deep feeling of sadness that I rise to pay tribute to my good friend the late Senator from Missouri, THOMAS C. HENNINGS.

TOM HENNINGS was a close friend, and our friendship extended over a period of many years. He was not only a close friend, but he was a truly remarkable man in the real sense of that word.

TOM HENNINGS had a keen legal mind. He had an amazing capacity to go to the heart of an issue and to lay forth all of the implications in a logical, clear, concise manner.

This talent he devoted to the service of his country, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. And this talent also brought him to the Judiciary Committee, where he became chairman of one of the most important of its subcommittees—the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

It is significant that he sought this position. TOM HENNINGS was a man who believed deeply in the absolute necessity of strengthening constitutional rights and of taking every possible step to assure that they applied equally to all persons, regardless of race, creed, or color.

He thought that the dignity and integrity of the individual was one of the most important of all of the aspects of our form of government. And he also thought that the legitimate reason for forming a government was to protect that dignity and integrity.

TOM HENNINGS has gone, and we will not again have the pleasure of his physical presence on the Senate floor. But, in a larger sense, he has not gone, because the work that he did lives after him and will remain to help guide our footsteps for many years to come.

We are, as we should be, paying tribute to him in these memorial services, but

the greater tribute will be to rededicate ourselves to the promotion of the basic constitutional rights in which he so strongly believed.

The first act of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the present session of Congress was to adopt a resolution expressing its deep regret and sorrow on the death of its colleague and former chairman, the late Senator from Missouri, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE U.S. SENATE EXPRESSING ITS DEEP REGRET AND SORROW ON THE DEATH OF ITS COLLEAGUE, AND FORMER CHAIRMAN, THE LATE SENATOR FROM MISSOURI, THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

Whereas THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., was serving with distinction as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the U.S. Senate when, on September 13, 1960, he was called to rest by his Creator; and

Whereas the people of the State of Missouri as well as those of all the other States of the Union will long remember his dedication to democratic principles and his fight for human rights; and

Whereas we his colleagues on the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration will sorely miss his inspired leadership and devoted participation in our work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration assembled, That we hereby express our deep personal loss, and that we extend to his widow, his family, and his other loved ones our heartfelt sympathy.

Members of the Committee on Rules and Administration: MIKE MANSFIELD, CARL HAYDEN, B. EVERETT JORDAN, HOWARD W. CANNON, J. J. HICKEY, CLAIBORNE PELL, CARL T. CURTIS, KENNETH B. KEATING, JACK MILLER.

Done on January 18, 1961, as the first order of business at the initial meeting of the committee in the 87th Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] in tribute to the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., be printed in the RECORD. Senator MCGEE is unavoidably absent on official business.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MCGEE IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

I wish to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a man who was a truly distinguished Member of this body—the late Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, of Missouri.

Being a rather junior Member of the Senate, I did not have the opportunity to know this great Missourian as well as I wished, but I knew of him and the high principles for which he stood long before I ever became a Member of the Senate. His distinguished career in the House of Representatives and the things he stood for during his illustrious Senate service were well known to all, far and wide.

The monumental achievements of Senator HENNINGS on the Senate Rules Committee which resulted in the clean elections bill that passed this body during the last Congress was but one of his many outstanding endeavors.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, he was a constant champion for civil and human rights; and as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, he led the fight against executive secrecy and for freedom of information. Senator HENNINGS was acutely aware of the close relationship between traditional rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and the right of the people to know what their Government is doing. His lifetime experience and dedication to due process of law, free speech and free press, and equal protection of the laws, found a natural connection with a right to know.

In his arduous committee work, he was not interested in the glare of publicity which often accompanies investigative inquiry—rather he felt it more important to establish a clear, detailed legislative record in the form of committee surveys, studies, hearings, and reports that was vital in the long run in order to form a basis for effective legislation.

As the Members of this body know, the fight for open Government, devoid of secrecy in all but the most critical areas, is a formidable one. Senator HENNINGS thought it was one worth fighting, and he has left us an example and guideline to carry the fight forward.

It was an honor to have served with, and known TOM HENNINGS. We miss him dearly; but we will not forget his goals, his aims, and his dedication to them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one of our God-given endowments is the one of remembrance, and I have often puzzled how impoverished this world would be if we did not have the capacity for remembrance and could not summon up out of the wells of memory those things we would like to remember.

As I think of TOM HENNINGS, I like to remember him as I first saw him in 1935. He came to the House of Representatives 2 years after my advent to that body. He was vigorous, he was trim, and there was energy in his stride. He reflected vigor. There was a booming quality about his voice, and there was that friendliness that endeared him to Members on both sides in that distinguished legislative body.

I quickly learned that TOM HENNINGS lived up to every expectation as a good lawyer, as a dedicated legislator, and as a warm friend.

He had two attributes that impressed me then and continue to impress me. The first was his complete dedication to what he deemed to be sound policy, and the intense effort he devoted to it. This attribute comes sharply to mind, for within the past hour I have submitted for reference a proposal for a constitutional amendment in the nature of what is known as the Bricker resolution. Of all the scholarly, documented speeches that were made on that subject, probably none was more profound than that of TOM HENNINGS, and no one pursued the subject with greater vigor than he. He was convinced that my position was wrong. I was convinced that his position was wrong. But he advanced his cause like the great warrior that he was, and in every one of his speeches there was a reflection of the amount of time and energy that he devoted to that subject.

The other attribute that Senators will remember is how patiently and vigorously he labored in behalf of the clean elections bill. What a commentary it was upon his patience. For 11 days he stood every day on this floor to advance that bill. I fought him every step of the way, and I regarded him as a noble protagonist of his cause, because never did he lose his restraint, never did his patience falter. I have never seen TOM HENNINGS, JR., become irritated or frustrated.

He was the chairman of a subcommittee that handled the very difficult and controversial civil rights bill. In our consideration of that highly controversial bill there were times when he might have been frustrated, times when he might have displayed some anger, times when he might have become impatient because of the slow progress that was being made in the committee, yet never once did I see him lose that fine quality of restraint, no matter how tedious the going and how difficult the cause.

That is how I shall remember TOM HENNINGS all the days of my life—big in body and heart, amiable and patient, energetic and dedicated, friendly and scrupulously fair, always courteous, and ever courageous. He was indeed a happy warrior.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on September 13, 1960, a few days after sine die adjournment of the 86th Congress, death removed from our midst a great American and a close friend of many of us here, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri.

Surely the loss felt by his family and his associates is deep. The Nation has equal cause to grieve, because it has been denied further benefits of his keen mind, his forceful character and his noble purpose.

It is not enough to say that TOM HENNINGS was a distinguished Senator. He was that, in the purest sense, and much more: Indeed, he was one of the most effective champions of true individual liberty in this century; a stout foe against those who abused freedom in freedom's name; and a steadfast advocate for those whose freedom was abused.

A eulogist of another time observed:

The evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones.

If this is a rule, then TOM HENNINGS was a notable exception. Long after the memory of his name may have faded, Americans will still be enjoying the fruits of his courageous labors.

Providence must have fitted him for his highest call to duty. Thirty years ago, as an assistant prosecutor in his native St. Louis, he viewed the ebb and flow of convictions and acquittals not with impersonal detachment Rather, he became endowed with a humane concern that equal justice prevail where the State's tremendous resources may become weighted against those of the accused.

Thus was he made ready for the task he was called upon a quarter-century later to undertake; the task, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of reidentifying and redefining the fundamental liberties of a people made confused and fearful by the

wild trumpetings of misnamed fighters for freedom.

When the need for a true definition of loyalty arose; when tyranny threatened in any guise—in the excesses of civil and military authority or of ministerial agencies at home or abroad—TOM HENNINGS spoke out, and the offenders heeled.

Even on his deathbed, TOM HENNINGS was rallying the national conscience. Shortly before he passed away, he dictated a message to the chairman of the Democratic Party of Missouri which, in the light of later events, stands as a monument to his faith in the durability of Jeffersonian doctrine, our constitutional principles and the goodness of the American will.

One passage in this testament, I believe, best summarizes the philosophy that guided his actions in life.

I have found—

He wrote—

that the greatest protection for our rights and freedoms lies in the hands of our people and in the manner in which they exercise these rights. Had I the power to persuade the acceptance of a cardinal principle to guide us in this respect, it would be: Do not use these rights to abuse the rights of others.

In a passage more specifically related to the problem then at hand, religious prejudice in the presidential campaign, he affirmed:

I have faith in my fellow citizens, an unshakable faith in their determination and ability to seek and find the truth behind any issue before expressing their ultimate opinion at the polls. I have faith that false issues will be discarded and that the true ones will be faced with calm appraisal and solved only on the basis of proper consideration and intelligent reasoning. I have faith that unwarranted emotionalism and prejudice will be cast aside as sores which beget only solutions for which posterity may sadly pay and long suffer.

Lastly—

He concluded—

I have faith and every confidence that our great Democratic Party, founded on truth and consistently the bearer of truth, will elect its candidates in our State and on a National level, and will present this Nation with its next President of the United States.

TOM HENNINGS did not live to see his prophecy fulfilled. That the prophecy was accurate is of less importance than the measure of the faith which inspired it. We who yet live cannot do less than to dedicate ourselves to the task of keeping that faith alive.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the passing of a Senate colleague always causes me deep concern. This concern is especially pronounced when we lose a colleague who was in the prime of life; whom we admired because of outstanding mental attainments, loved because of a capacity for warm friendship, and whose untimely death caused a loss to the entire Nation.

One of the truly great heroes of World War II was Maj. Thomas D. Howie, of Staunton, Va., who landed with the 116th Infantry of the 29th Division on Omaha Beach and led his battalion into St. Lo where he was killed. In a letter written to his wife just a few days before his death, Major Howie praised the 116th Infantry and said:

I am both humble before God and proud before my fellow men that America produces the breed of men I have had the privilege to go into action with.

Such a man was THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri—a brave naval officer as well as a brilliant attorney and an outstanding statesman.

Before entering public life, Senator HENNINGS compiled a fine record as a student and an athlete. A star halfmiler at Cornell, TOM HENNINGS completed his undergraduate academic work with equal vigor and success. He entered law school at Washington University, finishing the normal 3-year course in 2 years, while teaching criminal law and public speaking as well as coaching the track team.

This versatile man entered private practice in 1928 and in the next year became assistant circuit attorney in charge of felony prosecutions. After 6 years of service, in which he compiled a record of 80 percent convictions, TOM HENNINGS was elected to Congress from Missouri's 11th District. Having served for three terms, he retired from Congress in 1940 to run successfully for circuit attorney, in which office he secured 2,340 convictions in 2,548 cases—a record which still stands in Missouri.

Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor our esteemed former colleague took a leave of absence to enter the Navy. He served ably until 1944 when physical disability incurred in the line of duty resulted in his discharge.

After a vigorous fight both in the primary and in the general election, TOM HENNINGS was elected to the Senate in 1950. His outstanding service to Missouri and to the Nation returned him to office in 1956 by more than double his 1950 margin of victory.

During his 10 years in the Senate, TOM HENNINGS demonstrated a principle which I have frequently stressed—the value of practical training and experience in political science. It is only in the hard school of experience that a man learns how to translate theory into practice, whether it be in literature, art, a profession such as law, medicine, or engineering, or the profession of political science, too often referred to as politics. In law school, TOM HENNINGS learned the theory of law, in trial work he learned how to apply those theories. He brought to his service in the House of Representatives his splendid experience as a lawyer, which included a comprehensive knowledge of constitutional law. It is no wonder, therefore, that in his 10 years of service in the Senate, as a member of the Rules Committee, of which he became chairman, and as an outstanding member of the Judiciary Committee, he made many contributions to our country's progress. His ability to debate the causes which he espoused created comfort in proponents, concern in opponents, and admiration in us all.

Over and above all else, Mr. President, TOM HENNINGS was endeared to me by reason of the fact that he loved and admired the South, having had Virginia ancestors who served in the Confederate Army and a Virginia relative who in more recent years was an outstanding member of the Lynchburg, Va., bar. Whenever I think of TOM HENNINGS, I shall think of him as a Virginia gentleman, and, in the Old Dominion, that is our highest tribute.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to say a few words in behalf of my good friend, the late Senator THOMAS HENNINGS. I did not know Senator HENNINGS before coming to the Senate, but I was not here long before I learned to admire him, although I violently disagreed with him on many subjects.

Senator HENNINGS was a true public servant and a loyal American. He was devoted to his friends and was loyal to his friends, and he was esteemed by them.

Senator HENNINGS possessed the qualities that the Supreme Court of South Carolina said are essential for a good lawyer.

First, integrity. Integrity is the heart of character. A man may possess many qualities, but without integrity he is most certainly doomed to failure. Senator HENNINGS was a man of strong integrity.

Second, industry. A man may have intregity, and he may have other qualities, but if he is not willing to work he will probably not go very far. Senator HENNINGS was a prodigious worker.

Third, knowledge. Senator HENNINGS was a man of broad experience. He was widely read. He could discuss with interest and intelligence almost any subject on the scene today and in past history.

He possessed these three essential qualities of a good lawyer to a marked degree.

He was an attractive man. He was a great athlete, and possessed a fine physique. He was personable. He attracted people and was attracted to people.

Personally I felt many times that his heart was with the South in many matters before the Senate, but, because of his constituency, he felt he must represent them.

It was with much regret that I learned of the death of TOM HENNINGS. He was fortunate in having a devoted and loyal and fine wife, who was a great inspiration to him. I know that she has undergone a great deal of suffering in the loss of her fine husband, and she has my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, 98 years ago Abraham Lincoln delivered a historic speech at Gettysburg. Honoring those soldiers who had given their lives on that battlefield, he recognized that they had written a page of American history, and that nothing subsequently said could alter their place in that history.

This is true today, Mr. President, as we honor one who wrote an unalterable page in our history during his lifetime of public service. I speak of our late colleague, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri.

We here admired TOM HENNINGS' keeness of mind, purity of spirit, and sincere dedication to cause. Whether or

not I agreed or disagreed with him personally on various issues, I valued his presence in this Chamber. For, in the very finest tradition of the Senate, he possessed the personal attributes of the great and near great who have so enriched this body.

TOM HENNINGS was a gentleman: This was to be seen in the very way he walked onto this floor—dignified in mien and courtly in bearing—soft-spoken and gentle, courteous to every colleague in his discussions of state and personal matters.

TOM HENNINGS was a scholar: None of us shall forget the wealth of his knowledge. We will always remember the penetrating depth of his arguments in speech and debate. Perhaps most noted as an authority on the Constitution, the scope of his intellect was such that he quickly perceived the essence of all problems he considered. He did not seek publicity, but the press often favored him. Richard Rovere, writing in the New Yorker in 1959, paid him high tribute, saying:

> TOM HENNINGS might win by a landslide any vote taken here (in Washington) for the ablest and most intelligent U.S. Senator.

TOM HENNINGS was a statesman: Devoting the major part of his life to public service, he felt it was the noblest of careers. He wanted to serve, and as he liked to say: "I am not in politics as a dilettante, nor do I seek to go into government for the glamour or the excitement. I am too old for excursions." In this Senate, he gave us not only precept, but also example. He served hard and well as chairman of the Rules Committee, chairman of four Judiciary subcommittes, and as a member of many others. We who served with him 10 years here can state sincerely he served with honor as well as distinction.

TOM HENNINGS was a humanitarian: His hand was ever stretched forth to help others. Nowhere was his sympathetic nature more tellingly revealed than by his probings into the problems of juvenile delinquency and his constant concern with the rights of those too weak to speak for themselves. He was insistent that all citizens use and be granted the liberties guaranteed them by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. How fitting that his last statement, dictated from the bed from which he never rose, concerned the right of any American, of any religion, to hold the highest office in the land.

TOM HENNINGS was a fighter: Against odds, wrongs, and injustices, TOM HENNINGS waged his own war, deploying his talents with courage and determination. He led the fight against attempts to curb the Supreme Court's power and against unjustified secrecy in government. He fought to pass a clean elections bill.

But perhaps his greatest fight was his last one, a fight against an implacable enemy that held certain victory in its diseased grasp. Cancer placed no fear in the great heart of TOM HENNINGS. I saw TOM just a month before he died. Death was all around the room, but defeat was not to be seen or felt. He told me confidently: "BOB, I'll be back up there on the Hill before long." He is. For his spirit now speaks here in the self-same, soft-spoken tones of yesterday as his presence is felt in our midst.

We cannot forget TOM HENNINGS. His contributions shall live on in our annals. His rich legacy shall endure throughout all our land, shared by all our citizens.

As it was spoken at Gettysburg: "The world will little note what we say here," but I say that America will not forget what TOM HENNINGS did here.

Nor in this tribute should we fail to pay special praise to TOM HENNINGS' great and dear wife, Elizabeth. Through the years she was always a tower of help, strength, and purpose, on whom he relied. And in his final days, when cancer sought to still his fighting heart, she was there, as always, to comfort and sustain him.

We think of her as we honor him, and we shall always cherish both.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it was my privilege to know TOM HENNINGS throughout his entire service in the Senate of the United States; and to know him was to esteem his friendship and respect his ability.

He was a man of remarkable facility for fusing the real with the ideal, and for blending vision with faith. He was a master of the practical matters of life, as well as its theory.

He was a warm friend; a man of excellent heart; a good citizen whose public life was dedicated to the public good. His character was marked by the gentleness of charity and the reserve of humility.

The high regard held for him by his associates in the legal profession is evidence of his great capabilites in the field of law, particularly in the area of constitutional law.

I was deeply impressed by his contributions on this subject. He was able simply and succinctly to distinguish between law as the protection of liberty, and decree which stirs rebellion.

He was a man with a meditative turn of thought; a lawyer with a strong and subtle talent for uniting facts with clear reasoning, and presenting them in convincing exposition.

He was a priest of his subject; he honored it with dignity; and he found great satisfaction in fighting for truth and justice. It was his nature to temper all things with kindness.

Few men have greater ability than TOM HENNINGS possessed to press their intellect, their wit, and their charm into fine public service both in his home State of Missouri and for his country at Washington.

He was a man with an attentive ear and vigilant eye; and, therefore, he possessed knowledge which allowed him to use his words sparingly but with maximum effect. When he spoke, he did so with the elevation of authority.

I shall always remember him as a man with tolerance for mental freedom, and I shall always treasure our reciprocal confidence and friendship. I pay tribute to his memory.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the sweet words of the sainted Lincoln come to mind: "The mystic chords of memory swell within me."

The mystic chords of memory swell within the hearts of Senators on this occasion, as we recall a dear friend now departed, our extremely able late colleague, TOM HENNINGS, of Missouri. Through the years, I was pleased to call TOM HENNINGS my friend. I knew him quite intimately. TOM HENNINGS was a good friend, and a dear one. He was an excellent Senator for his State and for his country.

I saw him, with his keenness of perception, and his unique and valued experience as a lawyer, preside over highly important Senate committee hearings in which the public interest was deeply involved. I saw him elicit from witnesses, both friendly and hostile, the kind of answers and the sort of information which he was then able to use as he came to the Senate vigorously to champion the cause of liberty, justice, and decency in American government as he saw it.

Time and again, during my few years in the Senate, I sat in my seat listening to him as he undertook to champion the issues to which he had placed his name. On many of those occasions I found myself in complete agreement with his point of view; because TOM HENNINGS had a way of demonstrating to his fellow Senators not simply the sincerity which moved him to eloquence, but the truth and the logic which inspired him to leadership of just causes.

TOM HENNINGS did so many things so well. He had been a lawyer and a district attorney. He served his country with distinction in World War II as a naval officer. He was an excellent and an imposing Member of the House of Representatives, where he made a reputation for himself which followed him through the years. That reputation was enhanced—indeed, it grew immeasurably—during his years in the Senate.

But, Mr. President, TOM HENNINGS was foremost and always a great champion of individual liberty. Whenever the pressures of modern life threatened freedom; wherever the unpopular were denied the right to speak, and speak forthrightly; whoever, no matter how highly placed, tried to still dissent, TOM HENNINGS was the first to make the cause of liberty his cause.

Mr. President, we in the U.S. Senate lost a close friend last September 13. The Nation lost a dedicated and wise voice. It is not good enough to say that THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, will be missed. He will be sorely and deeply missed.

Freedom, to our beloved colleague, TOM HENNINGS, was a broad, powerful, and all-inclusive doctrine. In an article entitled "The People's Right To Know," published in the American Bar Association Journal for July 1959, he wrote:

> Freedom of information about governmental affairs is an inherent and necessary part of our political system. Ours is a system of self-government—and self-government can work effectively only where the people have full access to information about what their government is doing.

Freedom, to TOM HENNINGS, Mr. President, was always for the people—whether it was their freedom to know, or their freedom to speak, or their freedom to dissent, or their freedom to organize.

In April 1960, in a publication of the New York Civil Liberties Union, entitled "The Challenge of the 1960's: Progress for Individual Rights," under the heading "Civil Liberties in New York," TOM HENNINGS wrote:

In the first amendment (to the Constitution), we find the guide to representative government and a free and democratic society. Justice Cardozo once described the first amendment as "the matrix, the indispensable condition, of nearly every other form of freedom." It is my belief that it is a positive admonition to Americans urging us to debate, discuss and argue and indeed to disagree; encouraging them to participate in diverse associations; admonishing them to constantly engage in free inquiry."

And, concluded TOM HENNINGS:

This I believe is the challenge of the 1960's. If we meet it, we need have little fear for our liberties or for the future of the Republic.

Thus, Mr. President, a gallant statesman, an able exponent of freedom, wrote his own epitaph. Even more, TOM HENNINGS has written for all Americans, for all times, an honorable code of honorable conduct in the public service to the people of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, when TOM HENNINGS died, last September, the Los Angeles Times wrote that he "died before he could be spared."

The truth of those words will be felt for many years to come.

Surely in the years ahead there will be times when we shall be in great need of the unflinching courage and strength of TOM HENNINGS. There will be many times, in the years ahead, when we shall be sorely in need of the dogged persistence TOM HENNINGS showed when he brought death to the Bricker amendment and defeat to the numerous attempts to strike out at the Supreme Court, in reprisal for decisions supporting our civil liberties.

There will always be times when we shall need the brand of integrity of TOM HENNINGS. He scorned political expediency, in his consistent fight to protect the public against the efforts of the special interests.

Above all, in the years ahead, in the struggle to keep the world free from communism and dictatorship, there will be trying times when we shall miss the most the heart and the hand of TOM HENNINGS—for TOM HENNINGS was one on whom we could count unfailingly to keep alive and intact the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I shall always treasure the friendship of TOM HENNINGS. It first came to me while we were associated in the House of Representatives.

When this body was in adjournment, death came to this beloved and most respected Senator, a man whose memory will shine brightly and enduringly in the minds of all Americans who knew him and who were so ably served by him.

Indeed, Mr. President, I am sure that as we sit here today, each of us feels keenly and in a deeply personal sense the absence of our late colleague, Senator THOMAS HENNINGS. His was a magnificent and friendly personality.

It can truly be said of our beloved colleague that he lived with an abiding faith in the democratic process which he so zealously guarded, and, by doing so, provided, in these times of trial and torment, a ringing affirmation of our way of life.

A sense of calling and dedication to his office and the people he represented illumined his 10 years of fruitful service in the U.S. Senate.

TOM HENNINGS was my good, personal friend. All of us knew him as a warm and understanding human being, and, above all, as a fighter for the causes in which he believed.

He exemplified a spirit—far too rare today—of individual courage and conviction dictated by conscience, and an unfailing sense of duty.

In an era when the individual civil liberties of American citizens were under attack from many quarters, TOM HENNINGS dedicated himself to the defense of the liberties he cherished, and which he knew our forefathers had cherished and written into the Constitution of the United States as an enduring monument to their belief in the rightness of individual freedom as a way of life.

To him, the Bill of Rights was more than 10 precepts to be dusted off annually for patriotic speeches, then packed away for another year. He knew the Bill of Rights was the breath of life to our democracy, and it was to these beliefs that he dedicated his own life.

He never wavered in his faith; and throughout 6 years in the House of Representatives, and 10 years in the Senate, he guarded and protected the basic liberties of his fellow Americans.

In war, as in peace, TOM HENNINGS fought for his America. He was elected district attorney of St. Louis in 1940. He volunteered for active duty in the U.S. Navy, 6 months before Pearl Harbor, and he served with distinction in combat until 1944, when physical disability required his discharge.

Mr. President, speaking for myself and, I am sure, for all others who knew TOM HENNINGS, I wish to say simply and most sincerely that he will be deeply missed, both as a friend and as a Senator.

I hope all of us will carry forward the flag he carried so bravely in behalf of the basic freedoms which are the heart and soul of America.

We mourn the passing of a truly great American.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, anyone who has heard the sincere, brilliant, and sympathetic words of praise and appreciation that have been spoken today on this floor with respect to TOM HENNINGS realizes the utter impossibility of equaling those tributes.

However, Mr. President, I think many of us would like, in all conscience, to add our testimonials of deep respect and admiration, not only for TOM HENNINGS as our friend, but also for TOM HENNINGS as a symbol of a freeman who stood for the things which he so well understood freedom to mean.

I know of no person who was more kindly, even in violent disagreement, than TOM HENNINGS.

I know of no one who would go further to accommodate, in every detail within the limits of his capabilities, and without violating or deviating from his principles, the wishes and desires of his associates.

I know of no one who saw more clearly the principles for which he stood. As has been so well said here today, he stood for the basic principles of human freedom under our American constitutional system, and he exemplified those principles constantly.

It was a sad period for all of us during the time when he was ill; and it was a period of mourning when we knew that he had died. But in his service in the Senate and in his associations with his colleagues, he left a stamp of respect that will remain to his honor, the honor of this body, and the honor of his family and his State.

The consistency with which he defended those principles, of which many Senators have spoken heretofore, is certainly outstanding.

I counted TOM HENNINGS among my friends, and I counted him among the outstanding leaders I have known in public life.

Mr. President, it is very true that very few of us agree on all subjects at all times; but it is true that, as time goes on, one comes across countless individuals for whom, even in disagreement, one retains the highest respect. TOM HENNINGS was that kind of an individual.

He has been missed in this body, and he will be missed.

Only one final word. I want here on this RECORD to convey to his beautiful and delightful wife, Elizabeth, my sympathy and condolence, and that of Mrs. Hickenlooper. We hope that Mrs. Hennings can find solace in the esteem which today's RECORD will show to exist for TOM HENNINGS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there are many reasons why I wish to say something about the life and works of TOM HENNINGS. He represented a State adjoining the State which I have the honor in part to serve. In addition to that, TOM HENNINGS was a Member of the House of Representatives 23 years ago, when I was sworn in as a Member of that body. We have been friends ever since.

In more recent times, it was my privilege to serve in this body on a committee of which he was chairman. He served with distinction as chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. He was always very courteous. He was considerate of every witness, of every member of the committee, of every staff member, and of every employee. He respected the views of others, regardless of whether or not those views coincided with his own.

TOM HENNINGS had a very unusual mind. He was a brilliant man, an able lawyer, a distinguished individual.

A great loss has been suffered not only by his family and the circle of friends most closely associated with him, but by his State and Nation. He was a man of great capabilities.

I wish to endorse all the other fine tributes that have been paid to him, and what has been said about him, and to

extend to Mrs. Hennings and other loved ones my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve with TOM HENNINGS both in the House of Representatives and in this body. In his passing, the country lost one of its most courageous citizens and this body one of its most courageous Senators. TOM HENNINGS never hesitated to battle for his convictions, and anyone who took him on had to be ready for the devastating courtesy, and sharp thrusts which he used so skillfully.

We were not members of the same political party, but there was no Member of the Senate for whose opinions I came to have greater respect than those of TOM HENNINGS.

He came to the Senate after the elections of 1950, as I did. During the 10 years we served here together, I found it was always worthwhile to consider the opinions that he expressed. He saw clearly the menace that might exist in certain areas where wealth might be accumulated and then be used with the hope to influence Members of this body in various hidden or unpublicized ways.

The last time I saw TOM HENNINGS we rode to the Senate Office Building on the subway train. I thought he looked better than he had for some months previously, and said so. From no part of his response did I get any indication of the kind of a battle he was then fighting. He said that he was going to take things easier, but gave the impression he was on the road to recovery from whatever illness he had had. There was no complaint, only courage.

The courage he showed at that time was typical of his conduct in the Senate.

I never saw him hesitate to take a stand to which his conscience and principles led him, no matter with whom he might be in conflict or how long the discussions would take. He was unfailingly courteous to those with whose views he did not agree, and he expressed his opinions ably. He was a true servant of the common good and the cause of freedom.

Mrs. Case and our daughter, Jane, would wish to join me in expressing deep sympathy to Mrs. Hennings and his daughter, Sue, who is associated with our daughter in school.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who today are paying special tribute to our late colleague, TOM HENNINGS.

I had the pleasure of first knowing TOM HENNINGS when I entered the House of Representatives. He was a Member at the time. I served with him during the remaining years he stayed in the House of Representatives. I followed his career after he left the House, and still later, when he returned to the Congress, I had the privilege of serving with him in the Senate of the United States.

TOM HENNINGS was a person with a brilliant mind, as others have said today. He had a sharp, incisive way of going straight to the issue of the discussion. He was forceful in presenting his views. He was a man of conviction, a man of courage, a man of great courtesy. I have seen him engage in heated debate, but never reach the point that he was not most courteous to his antagonist, whoever it might be.

TOM was an able legislator. I was with him on different occasions attending meetings of the Interparliamentary Union in other parts of the world, and I saw his work there.

He was a man whom we could ill spare. As the Senator from California said, he went away from us when we could not spare him. We shall long miss him in this body. I shall long remember him as a very fine citizen, an able legislator, a man with brilliance of mind and force in the projection of his ideas to others.

I wish to extend the deepest sympathies both of Mrs. Sparkman and of myself to Mrs. Hennings and to his other loved ones.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues today in expressing deep personal loss, and a feeling of great loss to the country, in the death of one of the brilliant Members of this body.

I first knew TOM HENNINGS when we came to the House of Representatives together in the 76th Congress in 1939. I again knew him when both of us were elected to the Senate in 1950. It was a pleasure to reunite in our service together in the upper chamber and to be closely associated through our many years of service. Our offices were only across the hall. We were neighbors. We were able to visit, to exchange our viewpoints, and to discuss mutual problems.

It was my privilege to serve on my first important committee in the Senate with TOM HENNINGS. It was the committee which was then investigating the McCarthy participation in the Tydings election. I found then, as I have always found later, TOM HENNINGS' dedication to duty to his country. His was a desire to carry forward his duty without regard to the consequences, to its popularity, or to any political liabilities which might be entailed in the following of a line of duty to its ultimate end.

I appreciated deeply his searching mind. He was always seeking, with his great legal training, for the facts and for all of the information available on any subject, before reaching a conclusion. Once he reached a conclusion, he went forward on his course.

I learned to appreciate his great courage in arriving at decisions and in facing up to problems, whether he was fighting almost singly or with the majority, in whatever test was involved.

I appreciated, as we all did, his great independence of action, his desire not to be of any definite opinion before he entered a case and knew all sides of the case, rather than permit anyone to persuade him against what he himself would find to be the proper course of action.

He was the kind of liberal leader we cannot spare at this time, because he did have great courage, regardless of any threats of political reprisal. He could stand alone, if necessary, to fight for the things in which he believed.

He was a great student of foreign affairs, and his contributions were many in this vital field, including the work he did so frequently on the Interparliamentary Union, his attendance at the conventions, and the contributions he made.

Above all, we are going to miss him in this body as one of the greatest constitutional lawyers who ever walked the floor of this Chamber. We have all seen him in the debates, and we all know his deep understanding and the force of his personality. This, among his many assets, was one of his great specialties.

In the last months of his life we realized his courage to fight on despite the tremendous handicaps he carried, with his declining health. We realized how he came to the Senate to cast important yea-and-nay votes, though he was not physically able to be present in the Chamber normally. He would go to the ultimate to be sure that his duty to cast his vote was done, so long as he was able to rise and to walk.

It is great sympathy we have for his wife and for his family, and we deeply regret his passing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to pay my tribute to our departed colleague, Senator HENNINGS, under whom I served. He was the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration when I was a member of that committee.

As has already been said, he was a great lawyer and a distinguished man. He was a tremendously warm friend and a very interesting friend. This is something from which I hope his family will take solace: whenever anyone talked with Senator HENNINGS, he would always open the conversation by talking not about himself but rather about what the other person was doing and how he was getting along; and Senator HENNINGS would raise the question of whether anything was needed, and would ask what he could do about it.

He was always a man who had not only a liberal approach to public questions, as has been stated, but also a liberal mind. He was ready for new ideas and new ways of doing things.

I wish to here and now pay tribute to him for one of the most ingenious decisions I have seen made in the Congress. In my own case, in the Committee on Rules and Administration, I know he appointed a committee of two members to consider what we ought to do about rule XXII of the Senate, that hotly debated rule regarding filibusters. The two members were the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who was an ardent proponent of the rule and of making it stronger, if possible, and myself.

Mr. President, so great were the gifts of TOM HENNINGS that when we reported we did narrow, very materially, the grounds of difference. The reports were so sharply differentiated and the argument was so close that the vote in the committee was 5 to 4. My side prevailed, but nonetheless the incident indicated the luminous mind and the ingenuity of TOM HENNINGS.

There is another thing which can be said about TOM HENNINGS on this floor, after there is stated the affection and respect in which he was held: He was beloved by his colleagues. This is probably the greatest tribute one can pay to any Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a great Senator and a good friend is gone forever from this Senate Chamber. His rich, powerful, persuading voice is heard here no more. His genial smile, his ready handclasp, his hand resting upon one's shoulder—no one ever entered these Senate Halls who bestowed upon it an air of greater cordiality than did TOM HENNINGS.

The cause here that had the Senator from Missouri as an ally was assured of a courageous, capable, constitutional, courteous advocate whose argument it was a delight to hear, an education to analyze, and a pleasure to accept.

A giant at labor, the column upon column his name would fill in the index of each session was a tribute to his industry, to the wide horizon of his interests; and their often tender nature was testimony to the human, lovable character of cur colleague, who was a treasured friend. It all bespeaks the exalted patriotism of this good American whom we shall always remember.

I would recall a poem TOM HENNINGS recited—dedicated to good Americans—to the unknown soldiers as they rested in the Capitol's rotunda—and I borrow lines from that poem to close this tribute to TOM HENNINGS.

> We breathe a last prayer
> For God in heaven
> To give him His care.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it seems eminently fitting that the colleagues and friends of TOM HENNINGS should set aside a day to give these tributes of remembrance to him, because in the best sense of the word he was a man to remember. It was my high privilege to serve with him on both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Rules Committee, of which he was the chairman. In the field of legislation we often stood shoulder to shoulder on the same side, and not infrequently we differed and stood on opposite sides on issues which came before us. But in all instances one was bound to respect the forceful fighting qualities of TOM HENNINGS and also his great courtesy—particularly those who disagreed with him.

In particular I feel we should cite, as other Senators have done, the gallant and admirable fight which he made in behalf of the so-called clean elections bill, a fight to which I was very proud to commit myself fully. He was able in intellect, vigorous in debate, and dedicated in mind and heart. He has left to each of us, his fellow Members of the Senate, a legacy which time cannot efface. He has enriched the Senate by his many years of service here. He has given added luster to the name each one of us proudly bears—U.S. Senator.

On a personal note, it is my desire to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife Elizabeth and to all his family, and to say to them what they must realize that their grief can be largely assuaged by a recollection of a truly notable figure both in his State and in the Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, no one can subscribe more devotedly or wholeheartedly to what has been said about TOM HENNINGS by other Senators than can I. No doubt he will be remembered in the history of the Senate and the House as one of the finest constitutional lawyers we have even encountered. I do not recall a time when I had a legal problem with respect to the constitutionality of proposed legislation that I did not call upon TOM HENNINGS for his advice.

He would have been a great judge if he had been appointed a judge, because he had a deep devotion to the principles of the Constitution, and an ability to make clear in everyday language the meaning of its provisions.

I remember him more, however, as a friend. TOM HENNINGS and I both came to Congress as young men. We were both new, and we lived next door to each other for several years, until he decided to go back to his home county and become the district attorney.

I saw him later during the war years. He served in the Navy, as I did, and on returning to the Senate, no one was more happy than I was to see TOM HENNINGS.

So all of us will miss him for his great qualities, his great energy, and his keen mind. But I will miss him, too, as an old friend. I extend my sympathy to his family and his loved ones.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, so much has been said here in honor of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., with respect to the services which he performed for the Nation as a whole, that there is little I can add. However, I would add that though he was concerned with the problem of all the people, he seemed to be especially devoted to the cause of the underprivileged and the minority groups of our Nation. It was an honor and a privilege for me to be able to serve with TOM HENNINGS in the U.S. Senate. We all looked to his keen mind and his experience to guide us in a number of areas. As we embark now upon a new era, these attributes will be sorely missed.

I close by expressing my deep sympathy for his parents, for his wife, and the rest of his family, at the untimely passing of this great and distinguished American.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it was not my privilege to know TOM HENNINGS long or to know him intimately. Our careers in the Senate overlapped for too short a time to permit that.

Nevertheless, in common with all his colleagues, I came to admire him to respect him as a man of unsound abilities with a firm and courageous dedication to principle. I had looked forward to the possibility of a growing and deepening personal relationship with him.

The public service in a democracy attracts men of widely differing backgrounds, talents, and personalities. In almost infinite variations, they make their contributions and their impacts; and the sum total has been ever more vigorous and vital democratic institutions, better equipped to serve the needs of our country and our times. Underlying this great diversity, however, the perspective of history discloses some qualities that are more indispensable than others if leadership in a democracy is truly to measure up to the test which constantly confronts us.

One of these is a deep-seated belief that the people are capable of governing wisely; that they are capable of participating constructively in the decision-making processes of government; and that race, color, and creed do not reduce this capability. TOM HENNINGS shared this belief.

Another is the ability to see and understand public problems in their true dimensions. TOM HENNINGS could cut through to the core of a problem about as quickly as any man I ever knew.

Still another quality of leadership is the ability to devise imaginative but practical solutions to problems. We have all seen samples of TOM's handiwork. His abilities in this respect brought comfort to those enlisted in the same cause and frustration to those who were not.

And we must not overlook the qualities of intellectual honesty and moral courage. TOM was not one to shrink from the conclusions which his study and analysis of a problem indicated. He was not one to be afraid of the political consequences of an unpopular stand.

And so I respected him. And for these, as well as personal reasons, I shall miss him.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there is obviously little that can be added to what has already been stated with respect to our regret at the untimely passing of the able Senator from Missouri, TOM HENNINGS. I merely wish to echo the sentiments already expressed and add that, like others, I had come to know TOM HENNINGS over the course of 12 years of service with him. Like others, I learned to see TOM HENNINGS as a great American, a great patriot, a man of outstanding ability, and one possessed of a particularly perceptive legal mind. But, most of all, he was a man who had the great characteristic of friendliness and warmth in his approach to his colleagues.

I used to talk with him in the afternoons, as many of us did, in a certain area of the Capitol; and never in my experience have I been privileged to talk on a warmer personal basis with any man than I did with TOM HENNINGS. Like others, I have come to know his very wonderful wife. I know his passing has been a tremendous blow to her. Like others, I wish to extend my sympathy to her and to his family. All of us realize that TOM HENNINGS' death is a great loss to his family, his friends, his State and his Nation. Surely he shall be long remembered and deeply grieved.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is very little I can add to the able remarks which have been made this afternoon regarding our late colleague, Senator THOMAS HENNINGS.

We all knew him as a great and skillful lawyer. He was an outstanding authority on the Constitution. He was devoted to civil liberties and over the years he stiffened the will of the Senate to protect important civil rights.

Senator HENNINGS was a fair, just and honorable man. At all times, on the floor of the Senate or when presiding as chairman of his committee, he went to great pains to see to it that all Senators had an opportunity to state their point of view.

And above all, he was a kindly, gentle man of great good nature.

We in the Senate have already missed him as a distinguished lawyer, an outstanding statesman and a stalwart friend. I express to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the death of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., was a double loss for me. In the first place, it grieved me deeply as a U.S. Senator to see the Nation lose the services of such a knowledgeable and dedicated individual. More personally though, it was a great shock for me to lose such a close friend.

I first met TOM HENNINGS shortly after I entered the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress and, from that day, I always found him to be kind, courteous, and sincere. His work in behalf of his constituents and the Nation as a whole will be long remembered, and I join with my other colleagues in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on behalf of all citizens of Missouri I wish to thank my colleagues for the magnificent tributes that have been paid to the late Senator THOMAS E. HENNINGS, JR. I am sure that his father, Judge Thomas E. Hennings, Sr., one of the outstanding citizens of my State, and his mother, a very great lady in her own right, and, above all, his wife, who contributed so much in the furtherance of his great career, will be extremely gratified to know of the affection and respect in which he was held by his colleagues, so ably expressed this afternoon.

E. KEITH THOMSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader was gracious and kind enough to include in the program for remembrance services today a Member of the House who was elected to the U.S. Senate but who, because of his untimely death, did not take the oath of office. In that connection I first yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement prepared by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], in tribute to the late KEITH THOMSON.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCGEE

I wish to add my voice to the many in both Houses of the Congress in tribute to the late KEITH THOMSON, former Congressman and Senator-elect from my State of Wyoming.

The demise of KEITH THOMSON came as a double blow to the State of Wyoming, for it meant that we lost not only one of the most successful political figures in our State's history, but that we also lost one of our most outstanding State citizens.

That destiny decreed an end to KEITH THOMSON'S career of public service at such an early time in his life—a life that was characterized by relentless drive and energy—was difficult to understand.

A native son of Wyoming and a graduate of her State university, KEITH THOMSON'S personal and political careers were meteoric. As an infantry officer in the Second World War, he was the youngest battalion commander in the Army.

As his party's standard bearer, he rapidly rose from the ranks of the State legislature in Wyoming to her Congressman for three terms and just previous to his death won election to the U.S. Senate.

His untimely death came as a great shock to all who knew KEITH THOMSON. Even his most ardent political foe would never question his dedication to fight for what he believed in and his refusal to waver from his principles. I believe I speak for the whole State of Wyoming when I say that our State lost one of its most remarkably successful public servants when we lost KEITH THOMSON.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I wish today to pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of Wyoming and of the Nation, a man whom I was honored to count as a friend for many years.

It was a real tragedy when, on December 9 last, death suddenly struck down KEITH THOMSON, who, had he lived, would occupy the seat I now hold in the U.S. Senate; his sudden demise was a tragedy for his country and his State, as well as for his devoted family and his many friends.

Mr. THOMSON was born in Newcastle, Wyo., on February 8, 1919. He attended the University of Wyoming, graduating in law in 1941. That same year he entered the Army, where he had a brilliant career and became the youngest battalion commander in the U.S. Army. His decorations include the Purple Heart, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal for heroic achievements in action, and the Italian Cross of Valor. Returning from the war, he established a law practice in Cheyenne, Wyo., and the next year was named by the Jaycees as the outstanding young man in the community. In 1951 he was elected to the Wyoming Legislature to represent Laramie County, and in 1954 he was sent to Congress, where he served for three terms. He was elected by a handsome majority to the U.S. Senate in November of 1960, the month before he died.

I knew KEITH THOMSON as a lawyer in Cheyenne, as a member of veterans' organizations, as an alumnus of the University of Wyoming, as a Member of Congress when I was Governor of Wyoming, and as a friend. I join with the multitude of those who mourn his passing and who extend deep sympathy to his wife and three sons. We have all suffered a great loss, but his family will find consolation in the knowledge that he leaves a fine and proud record of service to his country and his State.

Mr. President, as I sat here this afternoon, listening to the high tributes being paid to the late Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., I thought of what might have been had the Almighty permitted KEITH THOMSON to serve in the Senate for the term for which he was elected. I am sure that the many accolades, statements, and reverences that were made this afternoon would have been well stated in his behalf.

Because he was such a great citizen of Wyoming, and a native of Wyoming, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, a house joint memorial introduced by the entire membership of the House of Representatives, and the Senate, of the State of Wyoming in behalf of the career of this young man, whose 41 years had been devoted to Wyoming.

I am certain, therefore, that this resolution, which was introduced by the entire membership of both bodies, is testimony to the honor, respect, and devotion which the people of Wyoming had for this young man, as expressed by their representatives, irrespective of their political philosophies, at the most recent session of the Wyoming State Legislature.

There being no objection, the Wyoming House joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 5

The career of a young man of 41 has come to a close. During those comparatively short years, he has reached the supremacy of achievement in a life that would cover twice those years in experience and accomplishment of an average citizen.

His humble beginning as a cowboy, soon became obscured by his appearance in World War II as the youngest and ablest combat infantry officer of his rank in the entire U.S. Army. On his return to civil life, his brilliance in the legal profession brought local and national recognition. His vision and talent formed one of the greatest industries of Wyoming, which he developed into a great enterprise that still is one of the largest in our State. He entered the field of politics with equal success—became legislator—Congressman for three terms—then U.S. Senator-elect by one of the greatest tributes ever paid by an appreciative electorate in this State. National recognition of his talents was of such magnitude that many offers for his services were made—and refused—for he had become dedicated to service of Wyoming and the cause of private enterprise.

He drove himself relentlessly each day and night to justify the confidence of his electorate. He once said, "To be a good Congressman requires 18 hours a day," and he gave that, and more. Possibly that is why we are sorrowing together today in a loss of a friend who meant much to the State and the Nation.

Truly a great man, who has given every ounce of devotion, and application of his brilliant mind to the multiple problems that confront our Republic, has laid his life on the altar of sacrifice for those he so ably represented.

His keen mind, that grasped instantly the tactics of military warfare, of litigation, and of national policies is now at rest. We have lost one who had compassion and kindness, firmness and conviction—one who expressed the thoughts and ideals of people from all walks of life—because he had served in all of them in his meteoric career from cowboy to U.S. Senator-elect.

We wonder how Divine Providence could strike down one who had reached a plateau of his career that looked forward to a distant horizon of realization of his objectives. Some day we will know. Suffice it to say now that he has brought inspiration, hope and renewed courage to those who have had their faith restored and their individual dignity honored.

Throughout this brief career, E. KEITH THOMSON had the support and encouragement of a lovely wife and family, for whom, with others, he has created a nation of security, promise, opportunity and peace.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the Senate convened on January 7, and the oath was administered to the new Members of the Senate, there was one who should have been here on that day

who was physically not present, but who was here in spirit. I refer to KEITH THOMSON, a longtime friend of mine from Wyoming, who on the 8th of November of last year was the choice of a very substantial number of the electorate of that sovereign State when he was elected to the U.S. Senate by a majority of 17,000 votes.

That wise old man, Solomon, caused Agur, the son of Jacob, to say that there were four things he did not know. One was the way of an eagle in the air; another was the way of a serpent upon the rock; still a third was the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and a fourth was the way of a man with a maid.

But there is still another which is quite difficult to understand, and we know so little about it. It is that a young man, with a whole vista of life stretched out before him, should be stricken down when there was so much to be done, and so much for which to live.

KEITH THOMSON should have been here on our opening day to raise his hand and take the oath as a Senator of the United States from the State of Wyoming; and what a magnificent person he really was. As has been indicated, he was only 22 years old when he became the youngest battalion commander in an infantry brigade in the 91st Division in World War II. Having been a soldier, having been an enlisted man and an officer, I know what it takes and I know what it means, at age 22, to command a battalion of infantry in battle.

The service he rendered for his country in that conflict over a period of almost 5 years is best attested by the large number of decorations he received for distinguished and valorous conduct and service.

KEITH THOMSON came back from the conflict to practice law and to enter into an extraordinary number of civic activities which in themselves distinguished him as a truly unselfish, civic-minded young man. Thereafter, he was elected to the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, where he made a durable and outstanding record.

Thereafter he became a candidate for the U.S. Senate. In October of 1960, I went to Wyoming to assist him and to do some television shows and to make some speeches in his behalf. I remember the evening we sat in the little town of Worland. He seemed so confident, so vigorous, and so completely certain that he would win a victory. When the tumult and the shouting died, and the captains and the political kings departed, he had won by a majority of 17,000.

I was still with him when he was making plans. He was expressing his committee preferences to me, and he was shaping his course as if he would live forever. What a great way it is to look out upon life. His plans, his dreams, and his hopes were just as rugged as the mountains of Wyoming and just as spacious as its valleys that he crossed in his victory quest.

As late as the 7th of December of last year, he wrote me at great length to confirm our conversations which we had out there, and he enclosed copies of some of the very eloquent letters which had reached him as a result of the vigorous campaign he made. At that very moment, his beloved and gracious family were in Washington, making plans for his advent to the Senate, because that would be a red letter day in his life.

It was on December 10, without warning, without any premonition, that the dread and clammy pain that strikes the human heart and halts the flow of life-giving blood, was upon him like the silent, unheralded killer that it is, and all that was mortal of KEITH THOMSON came that day to an end, after 41 years of a life filled to overflowing with activity, achievement, and service.

Mr. President, what does one say about these amazing fortuities which we behold from time to time? How shall one comprehend the termination of a young life when there is so much for which to live—a lovely family and a country to which he was devoted, service in which he found satisfaction, and even life itself? How tragic that it should come in that season of the year when the animation of the Christmas spirit, which somehow reenergizes all mankind at that time, was bringing a great surge of joy, good will, and happiness, and pervaded every nook and cranny of the universe. Why is it that a young heart should be stilled, a vigorous mind rendered insensible, eloquent lips should be silenced, and the fruitful activity of a questing soul should be brought to an end?

Well, Mr. President, there was a man long ago who seemed to make it understandable. His name was Paul. He was a magnificent missioner, an eloquent preacher, and a man of unshakable faith. He also was most diligent in writing to his associates and to people where he had crusaded. He it was who wrote:

> For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.

Mr. President, it is just that simple when we think about KEITH THOMSON, 41 years old, a great soldier and a great public servant, who had to come to an untimely end. It is not given to us to choose the appointed hour. There is an ordained time for all things, and a season for every purpose. We shall not fully know or understand or appreciate why, at two score years and one, KEITH THOMSON should have to be denied the victory won, for which he had labored so earnestly. But his labors for his community, his State, his country, and his fellow men shall not have been in vain. They are durable; they will live. The fruits of those great labors did not die and will not fade away. Like his immortal spirit, they will carry on.

In this memorial service we remember his gracious and charming wife, Thyra Thomson. She did so much in his behalf. What a companion and helpmate she really was. How she helped him at every stage in his public career. To her we extend our sincere sympathy as we remember another young lawyer who was denied the privilege of holding up his hand in this Chamber on the third of January and taking the oath as a Senator, because of that malady which strikes down more often than any other malady with which we are familiar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, KEITH THOMSON was born at Newcastle, Wyo., about 40 miles west of where I live. His early years were spent in the western hills of South Dakota and Wyoming. Part of his life was spent in South Dakota. Many people in the immediate vicinity of Spearfish and Belle Fourche, S. Dak., at the edge of the Black Hills, remember KEITH THOMSON personally.

Mr. President, to those of us in South Dakota who knew him, it seems unbelievable that so suddenly he should be stricken and taken from our midst.

I do not know that I have talked with anyone who was present immediately at the time when KEITH was taken. But, in any event, I know that KEITH THOMSON would meet every situation with courage, and would go forward unafraid.

He had an unusual heritage in his love of his country. It was my privilege to go to the Arlington National Cemetery when KEITH was laid away. I noted with interest that he was buried in an area where there are many graves marked with the family name, Thomson. So he had a heritage of forebears who distinguished themselves in the military service of their country.

As the distinguished minority leader has already stated, KEITH THOMSON received many decorations for his service during the 5 years he was with the 1st Division. Those decorations included the Combat Infantryman's Badge, the Purple Heart, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal for heroic conduct in action, and the Italian Cross of Valor.

As commander of an Italian infantry regiment in the 91st Division, KEITH THOMSON knew the long march through mud and the other tortures the 91st Division suffered in Italy.

Some years ago I heard one of the infantry corps commanders say that when it came to the awarding of honors or recognition, he thought the infantryman was the forgotten man of World War II. The glamour of the war went to the airmen and to the sailors. But there was a side of World War II that involved drudgery, lonely nights, and the real shot of battle. That was what the infantrymen experienced; and the 91st Division went through that, particularly in Italy.

KEITH went through it; and he returned with his love of his country intensified. He wanted to serve it in peace, as well as in war.

In his first year of the practice of law in Wyoming, he received the junior chamber of commerce award as the outstanding young man. He was president of the alumni association of the University of Wyoming. In those ways and in other ways he received the plaudits of those who knew him.

Mr. President, I have talked with my colleague, Representative BERRY, of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, about KEITH THOMSON's service in the House of Representatives. I am only faithful to what Representative BERRY has told me when I say that he thinks that in KEITH THOMSON the State of Wyoming and the Nation had a real public servant. Representative BERRY looked forward to great things in the

serv ce of KEITH THOMSON as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

It was a great tragedy—one which I have not been able satisfactorily to explain—when KEITH THOMSON was stricken. But, Mr. President, usefulness in life on this earth is not always measured by length of life here. Every day that KEITH THOMSON served in the Armies of the United States and every day that he served in public office in the State of Wyoming, in the State legislature, and in the Congress of the United States, he proved his devotion to the causes of peace as well as to the urgencies of wartime service.

If the people of Wyoming could speak today, I am sure they would say they had faith in KEITH THOMSON and they appreciated his service. The outpouring of votes he received last November was eloquent testimony to their recognition of his worth.

It is a source of great regret to us that KEITH THOMSON is not a Member of this Congress and of the Senate. To those of us who knew him, to the people of Wyoming, and to the people of the western part of South Dakota, his life will always stand as that of a man who served with thorough dedication in whatever opportunities for service come to him, whether in peace or in war.

To Mrs. Thomson and their three brave boys, who have lost their father, Mrs. Case and I wish to extend, at this time, our sincere sympathy; and we hope that the record of the illustrious life he led will assuage some of their sorrow in the lonely days they will experience from time to time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished legislator who has had an outstanding and a most unusual record in the defense of his country. I wish to pay tribute to KEITH THOMSON as a fine citizen, as a fighter, and as one with a great capacity for friendship.

Perhaps the question asked most commonly in connection with the lives of all persons is "Why?" In the case of KEITH THOMSON, his State elevated him to membership in the U.S. Senate; he won the prize. Yet he was denied the opportunity to become a part of this body and to serve here. The question is, "Why?"

That question has been asked through all the ages. The only answer is that the great guiding and creative force, the mind that keeps the stars in their places, the author of all natural laws, does have, and has had since the very beginning of time, another place, another sphere, where men exist and serve.

So, Mr. President, today we pay tribute to the public service of KEITH THOMSON. We extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and their three boys, and we commend to them the ancient faith that they will see him again.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we who knew KEITH THOMSON as a Member of the House of Representatives had looked forward to his coming to the Senate as a new addition of energy and vigor to the Republican side of the aisle, with tremendous pride in coming from a mountain State in which he won a great election. It was a keen disappointment to us all when his untimely passing deprived us of what we knew to be great expectations in terms of service to the Senate and to the people.

I join with my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to his widow and to his family, and in offering them that little solace which comes from the feeling that he was very highly regarded and that in the short life which the Lord gave him to serve he served magnificently the people of the United States and the cause of peace in the world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the untimely death of KEITH THOMSON was a tragic loss to his beloved State of Wyoming, to the Nation, and to this body, where he had been called to serve. It was a deeply felt personal loss to those of us who knew KEITH as a friend, in which number I am proud to be included.

We served together in the House of Representatives, where he exemplified the distinguished attributes of the character and mind that were to lead subsequently to his selection as a Senator from the great State of Wyoming.

KEITH THOMSON's military record has been referred to. It was unique. It was a record of which his family and friends can always be very proud. The testimony of this record and his record as an outstanding public servant is all that we need to know to appreciate how great is the loss of KEITH THOMSON personally and, in the larger sense, as a public figure.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Thomson and his fine boys my deepest sympathy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I did not have the pleasure of knowing the late KEITH THOMSON at all well. I did know him by his excellent reputation as a man of honor and of integrity. I knew him by the great reputation which he honorably achieved by serving as an infantry officer in World War II. My wife and I knew Mr. and Mrs. Thomson somewhat, however, and saw them on occasion when their children and our daughter were attending some of the same classes in this city.

Mrs. Kuchel and I, together with all our colleagues in the Senate, extend to Mrs. Thomson and her family our most sincere sympathy and our deepest condolences. We hope very much that after the duties which the late KEITH THOMSON performed for his country in the House of Representatives and upon American battlefields abroad, all his family will take a real pride in his constant devotion to his family and to his country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is on the interparliamentary delegation to Canada this week, I ask unanimous consent that, in connection with these testimonials, his remarks may be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEITH THOMSON—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Some men are given a short but brilliant life—like a shooting star which, in but a moment, passes in the sky. Such a man was KEITH THOMSON. It was as though he subconsciously knew that too much time was not to be his, but in that time he would accomplish many things.

KEITH THOMSON was what we might call a typical son of the West. He began his career in a way of which many American boys dream. He was a cowboy. But, as many American boys who outgrow those dreams, KEITH THOMSON outgrew his early beginnings.

Law appealed to him and he decided to become a lawyer. He tackled this new task as he did everything in his life—with verve and energy. Then, as war loomed and became a reality, KEITH THOMSON went into this new task with all the energy so typical of him, and he became one of the youngest and ablest officers of his rank in the U.S. Army.

But, KEITH THOMSON was not content to be just another lawyer. Knowing that civic accomplishments came through an active part in politics, he entered that field.

KEITH THOMSON began his political career as so many of our national legislators have, by entering State politics. Then larger fields called, and with the confidence he engendered in everything he did, he was elected by his neighbors and friends to the House of Representatives where he served for three terms. Here, he drove himself as relentlessly as he had in every past endeavor. His first and foremost thought was to keep this Nation strong and free, and as a member of the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he never spared himself from the tasks at hand.

His State of Wyoming recognized his hard work and talents and elected him to the U.S. Senate. Before him seemed to lie many years of selfless work in behalf of his State and country.

But, then, like the shooting star, his pathway ended suddenly. His meteoric career was cut short, and with his death the Nation lost a man whose devotion knew no bounds nor his hours any end when it came to serving the people and his country.

It is difficult to understand sometimes why such a promising young man, at the apex of his career, must be called by a Higher Power. But in leaving, he has left behind him a life whose inspiration to others will always be remembered.

The loss of KEITH THOMSON is a loss to the Nation as a whole. His loss to his family at the early age of 41 is a great tragedy.

I know that only time will heal this sorrow. Mrs. Allott and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomson and his family in the tragedy which has brought sorrow to all of us.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late KEITH THOMSON, who was elected last November to a Senate term after serving three terms in the House of Representatives. His tragic passing caused widespread grief throughout eastern Idaho where he was well known. With a delegation of Wyoming constituents, he attended, on December 7, 1960, a conference at Idaho Falls, Idaho, sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineer Corps, to discuss water resource projects of interest to our two States. He was very happy at that time because of the exceptionally fine race he had made for the senatorial seat, and was looking forward eagerly to the opportunity to serve his State in the Senate.

In his short span of twoscore years, KEITH THOMSON had achieved an enviable record of service in World War II and in various activities which provided an opportunity to use his unusual talents

and his dynamic leadership. It is most unfortunate that Wyoming and the Nation have lost the dedicated services of this outstanding American. He had upheld the highest traditions of the Republican Party and was destined to become one of the party's ablest leaders in the Senate. I extend the condolences of the people of my State to Mrs. Thomson and their three sons who have a rich heritage in the achievements of an illustrious father.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed, in executive session, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will state the nominations reported today.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Duncan, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank J. Welch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen Ailes, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Herbert Frank York, of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ARMY, ARMY RESERVE, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the military nominations be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR KUCHEL, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am always greatly delighted when a very distinguished newspaper in a Senator's State has some very nice things to say about him. I noticed three articles from the Los Angeles Times that speak in high and complimentary terms of my distinguished associate, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I ask unanimous consent that all three of the articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Jan. 25, 1961]

KUCHEL'S STAR BLAZES IN FEDERAL FIRMAMENT

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

Of all the stars in the cloudless Republican sky 8 years ago, none shone brighter than the constellation from California: Warren, Nixon, Knowland, and Knight.

Dimmed perhaps by proximity to another senatorial star was one of lesser magnitude, perpetually mispronounced as Kookle or Kutchle or Kuckle.

But stars burn out or pass to other celestial courses and from the latitude and longitude of Washington, only one—much brighter now—remains visible in the Federal firmament.

The sole survivor is THOMAS HENRY KUCHEL, senior Senator from the Nation's second State and second in command of the GOP rear guard on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

All the Capitol switchboard girls, even most of the radio and television oracles, have at least learned to say Keekle.

At 50, Senator KUCHEL is still a vigorous young man by Republican reckoning, although slightly senile for the new executive branch. His rapid rise to the responsibilities of minority whip—the opposite number of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota—attests not only the Senate's intuitive selection but also his own solid skills.

KUCHEL's political performance is puzzling to many people, for it has none of the color, fire or temperament which characterizes senatorial celebrities. But he has passed the supreme test for elective officials: he is still around.

A lawyer and scion of a newspaper family, he remains the ranking California Republican in the Federal firmament while the stars that shone so brightly in 1953 make or practice law or publish the news in which his name figures more and more often.

The secret of KUCHEL's success was doubtless taught him by the one Californian who escaped political injury and is now safely isolated from battle as the Chief Justice of the United States.

As one of the most popular Governors of California in history, Earl Warren was in many ways the prototype of modern Republicanism and the middle-road, above-partisanship stance which historians will probably say President Eisenhower invented.

In the Senate, to which he was initially appointed by Warren when Richard Nixon became Vice President after only 2 years of his hard-won first term, KUCHEL has been a faithful practitioner of the Warren technique and one of the most consistent supporters of President Eisenhower's policies.

By the percentage ratings of both the liberal Americans for Democratic Action and the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action, KUCHEL stands almost exactly in the middle of the senatorial spectrum.

At the start of each session, when he alines himself with Senators HUMPHREY and JAVITS, to fight filibustering, the bane of all civil rights bills, he is labeled a liberal. But in fiscal matters and whenever appeasement of Red China raises its head, he is generally as conservative as his former colleague, Senator Knowland.

KUCHEL stanchly supported Mr. Eisenhower's controversial vetoes in the politically loaded last session, and campaigned for Mr. Nixon in the touch-and-go California contest. But in 1959 he authored the compromise that salvaged Senator Kennedy's labor bill and has disagreed with the recent Republican administration's partnership policy on public power.

So, if his Arizona colleague and warm friend, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, were to ask, "Where do you stand, sir?" KUCHEL might have to answer, "With a foot in both camps." This is not for lack of strong opinions so much as an innate compulsion toward compromise, a properly senatorial taste for reasonable solutions rather than deadlock, and the diverse character and concerns of his huge and growing California constituency.

KUCHEL is rather more keen for the Federal view of things than many Republicans and most Dixiecrats, though he stops short of most of the liberal Democrats with whom he allies himself semiannually in the civil rights coalition and on some other issues.

He would like to see Uncle Sam get more deeply into the smog problem, for instance, and is a strong backer of Federal reclamation, power, highway, school, and other projects that are anathema to States righters.

This is odd in view of his considerable service in State government, as a California State senator and as controller, but it springs from his naval experience in World War II when we were briefly shipmates on a pier in Long Beach.

As is the case with most politicians who practice nonpartisanship—and they are usually from closely divided States—KUCHEL is moving toward closer alliance with his Republican colleagues as his own reelection approaches.

He is making friendly overtures to the GOP delegation in the House which has become a 14-man minority of the 30-mem-

ber delegation, and there is ample evidence that misery likes company along the New Frontier.

For the first time since he donned his senatorial toga, KUCHEL is operating without powerful Republican allies either in Washington or Sacramento where the Democrats have completed their conquest of both executive and legislative bodies. It is a new and difficult challenge, but he faces it with outward equanimity.

The Senator's views of the Republican Party's future and his own will appear in a subsequent column.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Jan. 27, 1961]

KUCHEL SEEKS TO LEAD STATE'S GOP FORCES

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

Senator TOM KUCHEL, Republican, of California, is moving out of his handsome wood-paneled office in the New Senate Office Building, opened only a year ago, and back to the old, high-ceilinged Senate Office Building across the street, where he will take over the corner suite just vacated by former Vice President Nixon.

The move is politically symbolic as well as a practical way of getting more space instead of ultramodern plumbing and push-button elevators. KUCHEL, the chief Republican survivor of the 1953 California invasion of the Capital, is also moving to succeed Nixon as commander of the Golden State's embattled pocket of GOP resistance here in Washington.

He succeeded Nixon in the Senate 8 years ago when the Eisenhower landslide ended 20 years of Democratic dominion, and was both fortunate and frustrated during his first few years.

KUCHEL, as a Senate freshman, had the immense advantage of learning the ropes as a member of the majority, albeit a slim one, during the 2 Eisenhower terms when Congress was under Republican control.

He also had the help of his experienced colleague, Senator Knowland, his apartment house neighbor, though they frequently parted company on the Senate floor. There Big Bill was the majority leader and plunging fullback for the administration team, though he sometimes ran off in other directions with the ball.

Since conflict is the essence of news, the then senior Senator from California (Knowland seldom failed to emphasize the "senior" bit, and to his everlasting credit KUCHEL has not subjected Senator ENGLE, Democrat, of California, to this) usually monopolized the headlines, however.

KUCHEL maintained his cordial connections with Warren after the former Governor, who appointed him upon Nixon's elevation, was taken out of public politicking by being named Chief Justice.

Warren also appointed Knowland, another California publisher's son, but it was KUCHEL who remained faithful in his fashion to the peculiar pattern of politicking which Warren (and before him Hiram Johnson) imposed on California Republicanism, and which President Eisenhower sought to make the model for the GOP.

But let the Senator define his position in his own words.

"California has always been free of the excessive partisanship that exists in some Eastern States," he says. "The future for Republicans lies in the middle road rather than extremes—extremes are bad for America. Every group in the United States has its lobbies here, but somebody has to lobby for the general public.

"For the next few years our party policy is going to be made in Congress," the 50-year-old GOP Senate whip continued. "We in the minority have to work harmoniously together, offer thoughtful and constructive opposition, and avoid the kind of 'musical chairs' which almost ruined us in 1958.

"The Republican Party has tried to consider the necessity of a fiscally sound program, to find means to protect the value of the dollar without stultifying progress. I think the chief difference between our two great parties is that, although we agree on many things in principle, some of my Democratic friends believe that if a little is good, a lot more is better.

"I'd make a guess that President Kennedy will not recommend to Congress all the promises that were made in Los Angeles by his party. By contrast, the Republican platform last fall was a fine document, and Republicans have given California excellent State government for many years. Maybe this explains the almost unbelievable phenomenon of the national Republican ticket carrying California after the devastation of 1958."

(KUCHEL referred to the off-year election when Senator Knowland sought the governorship, and Governor Knight was obliged to run for the Senate, and both were replaced by their Democratic rivals.)

"We have a tremendous problem in California," KUCHEL added. "As a Republican and a citizen, I certainly hope we may choose an able candidate for Governor and young, vigorous men for the eight new seats we will get in the 1962 Congress."

The Senator, whose constituency is fixed by the Constitution, takes a considerably calmer view of the prospect that Sacramento Democrats will ruthlessly gerrymander the State after the 1960 census than his 14 California colleagues in the House, some of whom are already marked for oblivion.

"We're pretty well mixed up, without too many blocks of solid voters in certain areas, and I doubt it will be possible to gerrymander California very well." KUCHEL declared.

As recently as 1956, when feuding GOP factions in California divided their presidential delegation three ways among Nixon, Knowland, and Knight, the only delegate all could agree on was the Anaheim Senator—he was otherwise left out of the deal.

Now, however, he is the sole survivor, and nothing succeeds in politics like success. Senator KUCHEL is girding himself for his fourth appeal to the voters of his burgeoning State with every sign of confidence that his Warren-Eisenhower way is what most Americans, and certainly most Californians, want.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 19, 1961]

SENATOR KUCHEL PLANNING TO SHOW SELF IN STATE

(By James Bassett)

True to an honored political custom, THOMAS HENRY KUCHEL, California's senior U.S. Senator and GOP whip, won't say positively, "Yes," when asked if he's going to run for reelection next year.

But the 50-year-old descendant of Anaheim's founding family has let it be known bluntly that he intends to "spend a lot of time here" prior to the 1962 primaries.

As KUCHEL sees it, now is the time he'd better not try to match his perfect 1960 rollcall record in the Senate. Last year another Senator skipped more votes than he cast—and wound up as President of the United States, largely as a result of arduous preprimary campaigning.

KUCHEL is impressed by Mr. Kennedy's eminently successful methods.

In anticipation of visiting all sections of California, he has bolstered his Washington office by appointing Ewing Hass, his longtime friend and ex-deputy in the State controller's office, as his top administrative assistant.

KUCHEL's oratory has improved tremendously, too, during his 7 years in the Senate, until now he is a remarkably effective speaker rather than a merely competent one.

What's more, he has developed a sharp, shrewd eye for legitimate issues which cut across party lines and which are calculated to enhance his own prospects in 1962. A prime example was his frontal attack on President Kennedy's proposal to channel defense contracts into depressed areas rather than submit them to competitive national bidding.

"Illegal," was KUCHEL's crisp estimate of this administration plan, which could seriously affect California defense business.

In Los Angeles last week as Lincoln Day keynoter for a combined State-county GOP meeting, KUCHEL left no doubt what kind of Republican he is: He considers ex-President Eisenhower's moderation the proper stance in 1962 as well as 1952; he believes the GOP platform written in Chicago to be a magnificent document.

Both the man and the platform, KUCHEL feels, spel' "a forward-looking American political party * * * in the Lincoln tradition."

As a result of his middle-of-the-road proclivities, the peppery Senator faces a curious coalition of opponents that includes some Republicans of the extreme right wing, and Democrats leaning toward the left. There seems to be a familiar resemblance between these minor GOP detractors and those who urge the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren.

Significantly, KUCHEL himself is a protege of Earl Warren, who elevated him to the State controller's post after his World War II naval service, and later appointed him to Vice President Nixon's vacated Senate seat in 1952.

Warren used to remark that 15 percent of the electorate occupies the right side of the political spectrum, 15 percent the left, and 70 percent the moderate middle. That, the ex-Governor contended, is the reasonable place to be found when the votes are counted.

KUCHEL obviously agrees.

Like Warren, before him, the Senator also aims to pay more attention to the ethnic minorities of California, who have too long been neglected by his party. KUCHEL says the Eisenhower record in civil rights was great—but badly undersold in past campaigns—and he doesn't intend to repeat this error.

You'll find him stumping the Negro and Mexican areas of Los Angeles County this year, selling the story of what the last GOP administration did, with vigor and persuasiveness.

If all this leads to the assumption that KUCHEL figures on a tough fight in 1962, you're dead right. He does.

Although at the present writing the identity of his Democratic challenger is still highly conjectural, KUCHEL doesn't underplay the opposition's 4-to-3 registration edge, nor their desire to complete a clean sweep of the State's top elective offices.

Most speculation centers around two possible contenders for KUCHEL's job.

One is Robert McCarthy, 40-year-old lawyer and present State director of motor vehicles. Last year he migrated to the San Fernando Valley from San Francisco. McCarthy has 10 children. It was quite an exodus from the city where he was born and where he'd been State senator.

Although he claims his uprooting came about as a result of heavy division of motor vehicles duties here, McCarthy grins coyly when asked if Los Angeles' predominant political appeal didn't have some bearing on the move. He's been a hugely efficient boss of this busy department, but he says he won't take a second term.

The other is Los Angeles' State Senator Richard Richards, 44, whose jurisdiction includes 6 million residents—more than live in 40 of our 50 States.

Richards has long been known to have an eye on some higher office. He'd been rumored as a potential candidate for mayor,

but friends suggested this might not be the best springboard for statewide vote getting, because of the intense Los Angeles-San Francisco municipal rivalry.

Over the years Richards has moved from the ultraliberal wing of the Democratic Party toward a more moderate position, and he has been an effective State senator, authoring smog control and important highway legislation.

Less likely KUCHEL challengers are such veteran Los Angeles Congressmen as CHET HOLIFIELD, 57, and CECIL R. KING, 63, whose seniority makes it improbable that they would "go for broke" in a Senate race, and JAMES ROOSEVELT, 53, who failed in his one statewide try against Governor Warren in 1950.

NATURAL RESOURCES MESSAGES OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, President Kennedy yesterday presented to the people of America a stirring challenge on the conservation of our natural resources. He offered to the Congress a great opportunity to serve the people by implementing his recommendations for sound development and prudent use of our basic natural wealth. His message to the Congress gave encouragement that we now will begin to move forward again in a number of essential programs that it has been my privilege to promote during my 17 years in the Congress.

I will not try to recite all of the items mentioned by the President which have been my legislative pets in the past. But I would like to direct attention, Mr. President, to several current bills of which I am author or coauthor that will serve to implement the President's program.

The President rejects a no new starts policy on water projects. A worthy new start in California is the Auburn-Folsom south unit of the Central Valley project, proposed for authorization in S. 103, which I have introduced with the cosponsorship of Senator KUCHEL.

The President advocates increased attention to municipal and industrial water supplies. My bill, S. 13, would encourage States, municipalities, and local agencies to proceed on these projects by authorizing Federal grants for flood control benefits and interest-free loans for irrigation aspects of municipal and industrial water projects.

The President asks the Congress to extend the current saline water conversion program. I was the author of the original act—Public Law 448 of the 82d Congress—which created the Office of Saline Water in the Department of the Interior in 1952. Several bills have been introduced this year to extend and expand the Federal saline water program. Among them is my bill, S. 100.

President Kennedy urges a more effective water pollution control program, including increased Federal assistance to State and interstate agencies. He specifically mentions Senator KERR's bill, S. 120, and adds several recommendations for strengthening enforcement procedures. This is right in line with the proposal which Senator HUMPHREY and I and a number of other Senators have offered in the form of S. 861, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

In hydroelectric power, the President recommends optimum public power development in all multipurpose projects, and he proposes the early interconnection of regions served by Federal projects with common carrier electric transmission lines. This is a goal we have long sought in the Far West, and I anticipate that some positive proposals will be made to the Congress on the subject this session. The Trinity project now under contruction, the Auburn project that I have proposed (S. 103), and the great California State water plan all are part of this pattern.

The President calls for new leadership, research, financial and technical assistance in the control of air pollution. This is precisely what would be provided by S. 455, of which I am cosponsor with Senators KUCHEL, CLARK, SCOTT, and CARROLL.

Among several recommendations to accelerate forest development, the President proposes the building of more access roads. This is the subject of S. 501, of which I am a cosponsor with Senator MORSE and other Senators.

I am especially pleased that the President chose to mention specifically the need for establishing the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, along with the proposed Cape Cod and Padre Island Seashore Parks. I have asked the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior Committee to schedule early hearings on my Point Reyes bill, S. 476.

Among other conservation measures proposed in the message which I cannot refrain from endorsing are comprehensive river basin planning, flood plain zoning, small watershed projects, assistance to small independent timber owners and processors, rehabilitation of depleted stocks of salmon and sardines in the Pacific, a national program for oceanography, and a comprehensive Federal recreation program.

The President has wisely pointed out that all these resource programs, involving many Federal agencies, require coordination at the highest executive level. He has suggested that this be achieved by the creation of a Presidential Advisory Committee on Natural Resources under the existing Council of Economic Advisers. Whatever machinery of coordination is provided, it will have to have real authority to match its tremendous responsibility. In my view, a separate Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers, reporting directly to the President, would be better. I have introduced a bill, S. 239, with 31 of my colleagues as coauthors, to accomplish this. It will be up to the Congress to work out the best mechanics for coordinating the truly magnificent program of natural resource development presented to us by the President.

In summary, Mr. President, no less than nine of President Kennedy's major recommendations on resource conservation are covered in legislation already before the 87th Congress, in bills of which I have the privilege to be the author or a cosponsor. I think my colleagues know that resource development is a field that has been close to my heart and foremost in my legislative endeavors during my entire public career—particularly in the years when I was chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. During all of this time we never have had stronger executive leadership in the field than our President offered to us yesterday. I feel sure that the people of America will respond and that the Congress will act to implement this program.

Mr. President, I noted in the New York Times of today an editorial dealing with President Kennedy's message on natural resources. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear in the RECORD at the conclusions of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The bright promise of leadership exercised by President John F. Kennedy has been taking shape in the brief month since he was inaugurated; and few things he has said or done during these crowded weeks have more clearly revealed his breadth of vision in dealing with a major national policy question than his message to Congress yesterday on the coming crisis in the conservation and development of America's natural resources.

What he said about each of the separate resource problems was very much to the point, but the fact that the President grouped them in a coherent whole is what gave especial distinction to his treatment of this subject. His message showed him to be aware of the intolerable conflicts, duplications, and rivalries that have for many years plagued the Federal Government's natural resource activities—he even listed some (but by no means all) of these conflicts—and he raises the hope that consistent policies based on the national welfare and not on specific vested interests will be established in these fields.

The most serious criticism we have of the broad policy statements in his message is that he led up to, but did not follow through with, a proposal that the natural resource functions of the Federal Government be grouped in one department, where they belong, instead of being scattered in innumerable separate little empires. But he did propose some Executive and budgetary steps that should help to relieve if not cure this fundamental difficulty. A major reorganization in this area is an inescapable necessity. Meanwhile, the innovations he proposes in respect to coordinated direction, expert advice, scientific research and budgetary controls all make sense.

If the President is inclined to be more enthusiastic than some of us are about big hydroelectric dam and giant flood-control projects, he also laid welcome stress on less dramatic aspects of water control, such as flood-plain zoning and small-watershed development.

His forest policy recognizes the serious danger of timber shortages despite optimistic statistics that have been put forth in recent years suggesting that all's well with our forest situation. The President's comments on a program of balanced usage for the public domain are sound; and we warmly welcome his endorsement of the pending wilderness-protection bill and of proposed new park areas. These recommendations will, we hope, be followed up by speedy action in a Congress moving under the leadership that Mr. Kennedy seems intent on giving it.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, from time to time many Members of the Congress have had occasion to call attention to the rapid depletion of our natural re-

sources, and to the consequences to the Nation's future which will result from that depletion.

Last session, in an address entitled "Our Blessed Land," I pointed out to the Senate that America owes her success as a nation, in great part at least, to the abundance of natural resources with which a kind providence has endowed her. I reminded my colleagues of the fact that we are using up our resources at a tremendous rate, a rate which makes it imperative that we reexamine our policies and programs in this field.

It was with a particular sense of satisfaction, therefore—a feeling that I am sure many in this body shared—that I examined the remarkable message on natural resources which President Kennedy presented to the House of Representatives yesterday.

I was gratified with the President's emphasis on the need to coordinate planning and development of the entire range of our natural resources, and his determination to strengthen the programs of the Federal Government in this field.

The President will make it a regular function of the Council of Economic Advisers to report to the President, the Congress, and the people on the status of resource programs in relation to national needs. He will establish a Presidential Advisory Committee on this question, and ask the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate our present programs of resources planning and policy formulation.

One section of the message dealt with water, a subject of most vital concern to my State of Utah and the West. President Kennedy drew from the report of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, which was presented to this body only a few days ago, to emphasize the need for doubling the Nation's water supply by 1980.

He called for maximum development of all our river basins for all purposes. He recognized the importance of planning water resource projects far in advance to preserve the necessary sites.

The President urged a vigorous program of control to meet the growing health menace of water pollution. He specifically asked the Congress to provide increased Federal financial assistance for construction of local waste treatment facilities.

He urged an accelerated program of research and development to make saline and brackish water suitable for use in home and industry. He urged the conservation of soil and watershed that is so vital to water storage in the West.

Mr. President, I particularly invite the attention of my colleagues to two sentences in the President's message. He said:

> In the resource field, predictions of future use have been consistently understated.

And he said:

> Even under conservative projection, we face a future of critical shortages and handicaps.

My principal reason for making these short remarks today is to emphasize these two statements, and to urge Congress to take vigorous action at this session to begin to meet our natural resource crisis.

Development of our water, our soil, our forests, our fuels, and our minerals is not primarily a sectional or partisan question. Every citizen of our country, every business and professional enterprise, every home and farm and community in the Nation is dependent for its existence upon an adequate supply of basic resources.

President Kennedy recognizes that only part of this job can be done by the Federal Government. He said yesterday that only through the fullest participation of State and local governments and private industry can it be done wisely and effectively.

But, by its very nature, much of the task of resource conservation must be carried out through the instrumentality of government. And, because so many of the areas with which we deal cross State lines, we in Congress who make interstate law must take a major share of responsibility.

We now have the leadership in the executive branch—in the White House, in the Department of the Interior, in other departments—which recognizes the vital nature of our resource problem and is willing to take the necessary steps. This is the year in which the Congress of the United States should move boldly to provide future generations of Americans the benefits which can come only from a continuing supply of the abundant resources of this blessed land.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION AS A MEANS OF SETTLEMENT OF AIR TRANSPORTATION LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for several days this week there was a concerted work stoppage on the part of the flight engineers on seven domestic airlines. A review of the history of this matter reveals little justification for the drastic action which these individual flight engineers took. According to the records of the National Mediation Board, the Airline Pilots Association on August 28, 1959, filed an application with the Board asking that it investigate a representation dispute among flight deck crewmembers of United Airlines. The Board, proceeding under section 2, ninth, of the Railway Labor Act, on November 16, 1959, appointed a committee of three to investigate the dispute. On December 5, 1960, the committee concluded hearings, and on January 17, 1961, issued its findings. Based upon the committee's findings, the National Mediation Board on February 6, 1961, issued its decision in favor of the proposal of the Airline Pilots Association that an election be held among all flight deck crewmembers of United Airlines to determine which organization should be their representative. To show their displeasure over the determination of the National Mediation Board, individual flight engineers engaged in certain actions amounting to a concerted work stoppage. For several days they ignored the strong request of the President, through his Secretary of Labor, that they return to work. They also refused to heed the pleas of their union, the Flight Engineers International Association to the same effect. Some of them refused to cooperate with a U.S. district court, and were held in contempt by that court. The President appointed a three-man board of inquiry to investigate the dispute. Finally, on Thursday afternoon those engaging in this concerted action—with the exception of the employees of one airline—agreed to return pending the inquiry of the President's board.

Let it be clearly understood, Mr. President, that this was in no way a legal strike in a bona fide dispute over wages, hours, or conditions of employment between a responsible labor organization and an employer. Those who engaged in this concerted action did so as a means of showing their displeasure over an action taken by a U.S. agency acting under authority granted by the laws of the United States. They defied not only their own union but also the strong request of the President of the United States, through the Secretary of Labor, that they return to work and that they rely on more orderly procedures to present their grievances. Secretary Goldberg was quoted in the press as having said:

> There is no legitimate reason for the men who have walked off their jobs to remain off their jobs.

Some of them have also been held in contempt of a Federal court, the U.S. district court in Miami, presided over by Judge Emett C. Choate.

These individuals caused great hardship and inconvenience to the traveling public. Those who rely upon air transportation for quick transport between points in the United States were forced to crowd into other means of transportation or to change or cancel their travel plans. Those who ordinarily travel by rail or bus experienced great difficulties in competing for limited space with those forced from air transportation. The effects of this stoppage have extended beyond the borders of our country to international travel. This small number of willful individuals did great harm to the economy of our country at a time when Government and business are making strenuous efforts to improve economic conditions. An Associated Press news article reported that losses in revenue and salaries to the six affected airlines exceeded $5 million a day and that the livelihoods of an estimated quarter of a million people were affected.

Mr. President, in regard to my own State, where the vacation period is now underway, I know I have received repeated complaints from business officials, from industry, and from others that a very much greater than average loss has been sustained.

Concerted actions of this type against air transportation are in many ways actions against the public and the public interest. In recognition of the vital public concern in air transportation, Federal and local governments have invested several billion dollars in airports and other

air transportation facilities. The Federal Government subsidizes airlines. It regulates air transportation very closely, fixing rates, awarding routes, and licensing personnel. It maintains flight control facilities, equipment, and personnel. The two principal objectives of such regulations, subsidizations, and service activities of Government agencies are to maintain air transportation facilities as a vital public service in normal times and as a ready adjunct to national defense in times of emergency.

This difficulty, Mr. President, dramatically revealed the inadequacy of present legislation affecting strikes and concerted work stoppages in air transportation. I am advised by competent legal authority that it is extremely doubtful that there is any judicial review of National Mediation Board decisions on such jurisdictional matters. Without in any way justifying the action of the flight engineers, I believe it is appropriate to observe that if they had had an orderly means of contesting the decisions of the National Mediation Board, they might not have resorted to such extreme action. I understand that they contend that there was fraud in the procedure by which this proceeding was initiated. This seems to me to be a contention which the courts should have power to hear and determine.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it seems clear to me that if S. 88, which I am sponsoring, had been enacted before this matter arose, there would have been adequate procedures for preventing such an unwarranted work stoppage. I originally introduced this proposal on January 9, 1959, as S. 80 of the 86th Congress. This bill proposes that section 10 of the Railway Labor Act be amended to provide a means of settlement of air transportation labor disputes by compulsory arbitration. Such a dispute would be subjected to compulsory arbitration only if the President finds that it would substantially interrupt commerce and result in severe hardship. Under the terms of my bill, an individual who continues a strike or concerted work stoppage after such a determination by the President would be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Since this transportation crisis has so clearly shown the need for the remedial provisions of S. 88, I urge that the administration throw its full weight behind this bill and that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare give top priority to hearings and to deliberations looking to a favorable report.

Let us hope, Mr. President, that we shall have the courage in the Congress, and the patriotism, to enact legislation to prevent such actions which handicap and cripple our Nation in its struggle to preserve the freedom and well-being of the American people.

Today I had conferences with both the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the chairman of the subcommittee which would have jurisdiction in this field. They have both told me, understandably, that they have business which will occupy their time and the time of their subcommittees for about 2 weeks. The bills to which they are giving attention are on the priority list given to Congress by the President—the wage and hour bill, so-called, and the education bill, so-called.

I regret to say that I have not been able to receive from either of these distinguished Senators any assurance that even at the termination of the hearings on those two subjects a hearing will be afforded on the bill which I mentioned. I shall continue the effort to have such a hearing, and if all efforts should fail, I shall have to attempt to bring the bill to the floor of the Senate without the benefit of hearings.

Newspapers all over the country have discussed this particular controversy. In my own State an unusually large number of newspapers have come out clearly and forcefully in favor of legislation which would protect the public interest, which is not being presently protected against airline strikes. One such editorial, entitled "Sabotage by Whim," appeared in the Tampa Tribune of Tuesday, February 21. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SABOTAGE BY WHIM

How long will the United States continue to permit a few willful men to sabotage essential public transportation by dropping their whims into its machinery?

This question was heard 2 years ago when a third of the Nation's commercial passenger planes were grounded by labor walkouts. It sounds more insistently now that a strike of flight engineers is crippling or shutting down half a dozen airlines, including the two big Florida carriers, Eastern and National.

The right of public transportation workers to walk off their jobs under any circumstances is subject to challenge. But in this case the strikers do not even have the sanction of their union; they are defying an order to go back to work.

And to make matters worse, their strike is not directed against the airlines. It is really against the National Mediation Board, which on February 6 told the Flight Engineers International and the Air Lines Pilots Association to hold a joint election for a single bargaining agent. Since the engineers are outnumbered by the pilots, they contend the decision will have the effect of wiping out their union and perhaps their jobs.

So far as this issue is concerned, it seems entirely logical to have one union representing flight crews instead of continuing the bickering over jobs which has taken place in the past between pilots and engineers' unions.

But, logical or not, the decision of the Mediation Board was part of the established procedure for adjudicating the dispute between pilots and engineers and was entitled to respect from both. In their protest walkout, the engineers are scorning legal process as well as union authority.

By any test, therefore, the strike is indefensible. Because of the personal pique of 3,000 flight engineers, some 70,000 other airline employees are being forced into idleness and hundreds of thousands of passengers stranded.

This, we submit, is an intolerable situation.

The public interest demands reliable and uninterrupted air service. To achieve it, the Federal and local governments have poured billions of dollars of tax money into airports and airway safety devices; the airlines have spent billions on equipment. But all of this expenditure and effort can be nullified by a handful of men with a job to save or a grudge to serve.

We say the public interest deserves better protection.

One way to help give it that protection is a law which Florida's Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND proposed after the 1958 airlines strike and which he is urging again at this session of Congress. His proposal is simply to require compulsory arbitration of labor disputes on commercial airlines and thus end the strike privilege.

Both union and management customarily oppose all proposals for compulsory arbitration, each apparently fearing some disadvantage from it. Perhaps both will oppose the Holland bill.

But the public, through its tremendous investment of tax money and its right to uninterrupted air service, has the paramount interest here. Congress should see to it, through the Holland bill or similar legislation, that the public no longer will be grounded by the whim of irresponsible men.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to point up the position taken by that very effective paper and its able editorialist, I wish to read into my remarks a part of that editorial:

In their protest walkout, the engineers are scorning legal process as well as union authority.

By any test, therefore, the strike is indefensible. Because of the personal pique of 3,000 flight engineers, some 70,000 other airline employees are being forced into idleness and hundreds of thousands of passengers stranded.

This, we submit, is an intolerable situation.

The public interest demands reliable and uninterrupted air service. To achieve it, the Federal and local governments have poured billions of dollars of tax money into airports and airway safety devices; the airlines have spent billions on equipment. But all of this expenditure and effort can be nullified by a handful of men with a job to save or a grudge to serve.

We say the public interest deserves better protection.

Certainly it is true that the public interest is entitled to be protected by action of the Congress, and there is no other place for the public to turn. Certain it is that notwithstanding the billions of public funds invested, and notwithstanding the fact that air transportation has become a necessity in the fast age in which we live, a few men, by arbitrary action against the decree of their own officials in their union, against a decree of one of the U.S. district courts in our State, in violation of the request of the President and the Secretary of Labor, have found it within their power so to act as to destroy the effectiveness of seven large airline systems to carry out their proper public function for a period of several days, causing great loss to many who were innocent parties to the transaction. Surely there will be courage enough in Congress to come to grips with the problem. If the Congress does not realize it, the public does. This is a situation in which the public interest has been entirely neglected, if not forgotten, in the time behind us.

Three of the newspapers in which we are accustomed to show the greatest in-

terest in the Senate have published editorials today which I should like to have included in my remarks as a part of my statement. The first such editorial is found in the New York Times today under the title "Airlines Strike Lessons." I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINES STRIKE LESSONS

The way President Kennedy and Secretary of Labor Goldberg dealt with the airline flight engineers' wildcat strike was impressive—and promising. Instead of letting matters take their dangerous course, they moved promptly to put an end to the vast disruption and loss which the walkout caused. And they did so not by power but persuasion: through the meetings Secretary Goldberg had with leaders of each side; then by the appointment of the Presidential commission and, finally, through Mr. Goldberg's negotiations with managements and strikers to get the walkout called off until the commission should report. The success of these efforts is cause for warm congratulations.

What the administration did is promising because it is a foretaste of energetic action in the future—with no dragging of official feet—in dealing with labor disputes in essential industries. But the difficulties which have beset the President and Mr. Goldberg in relieving the situation are disturbing. They reveal a woeful lack of protection for the public against strikes that widely disrupt transportation—such as did the recent New York Harbor tugboat strike.

We won't pass judgment here on the merits of the engineers' objections to the ruling of the National Mediation Board. Incidentally, this ruling was based on a thorough study by another three-man, nonpartisan, expert committee—this one appointed under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

But, whatever the merits of the strikers' case may have been, it is grimly fantastic that less than 3,000 men were able, through a strike unauthorized by their union, to stop most of the Nation's airline operations—and not because of a dispute with their employers, but to force the Board to rescind a collective bargaining representation order on an airline not involved in the strike. Not only that. The order does not apply to any other airlines and the engineers have made no request for its reconsideration by the Board—which it is entitled by law to do.

This was an intolerable situation, especially in view of a comparison between cause and effects. How strikes such as this can be avoided is an urgent item of future public business.

Mr. HOLLAND. I quote into my remarks this part of that editorial:

But, whatever the merits of the strikers' case may have been, it is grimly fantastic that less than 3,000 men were able, through a strike unauthorized by their union, to stop most of the Nation's airline operations, and not because of a dispute with their employers, but to force the Board to rescind a collective bargaining representation order on an airline not involved in the strike. Not only that. The order does not apply to any other airlines and the engineers have made no request for its reconsideration by the Board, which it is entitled by law to do.

This was an intolerable situation, especially in view of a comparison between cause and effects. How strikes such as this can be avoided is an urgent item of future public business.

In the Washington Evening Star of today appears an editorial entitled "Airline Strike," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRLINE STRIKE

C. N. Sayen, president of the Airline Pilots Association (AFL–CIO), says the strike by flight engineers "was not a strike against the airlines but a strike in defiance of the U.S. Government to force it to revise under pressure a decision arrived at by due process of law."

If this is so, there is plenty of room for misgiving with respect to the settlement worked out by Labor Secretary Goldberg and announced by President Kennedy.

Under the settlement agreement, the engineers will return to work on five airlines pending an investigation of their grievances by a three-man Presidential commission. The complaint of the engineers is not directed to the airlines, but to a ruling by the National Mediation Board, a ruling with respect to which, again according to Mr. Sayen, the engineers have distorted and misrepresented the facts. So what may be expected from the study by the President's commission? If, in order to satisfy the engineers, it returns with recommendations which undercut the National Mediation Board, a precedent pregnant with trouble for the future will have been established.

It is desirable, of course, to settle any strike. This one was costing the airlines $5 million a day, had resulted in the payless layoff in a time of high unemployment of 84,000 other workers and had created much inconvenience for the public. Even so, we very much doubt the wisdom of these ad hoc settlements by the Secretary of Labor, for actually they settle nothing. Irresponsible strikes designed to coerce the Government should be dealt with through legislation, not through procedures which come very close to appeasement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote a portion of that editorial to point up the position taken by that able newspaper here in the Capital of our Nation:

Irresponsible strikes designed to coerce the Government should be dealt with through legislation—not through procedures which come very close to appeasement.

I have no doubt that from one ocean to the other, and from Alaska to Hawaii, newspapers throughout the Nation are finding occasion to criticize and castigate the action of the flight engineers and also to question the wisdom of the temporary settlement which has been made. The third of the editorials which I have noted today, appears in the Baltimore Sun, which I think is one of the best newspapers in the Nation. It is a thoughtful editorial entitled "Strike Intervention," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKE INTERVENTION

In the airlines strike the country has hoped for two things: that the White House intervention would get the men back to work—which now is happening on most lines; and that the White House interveners would then consider the implications of intervention.

The airlines strike came when the strikers defied (a) a Mediation Board ruling under the National Railway Labor Act (which applies to airlines) and (b) a Presidential no-strike order under the same act pending a factfinding board study of a subsidiary dispute. The effect of Government intervention was to ease the pressure of this defiance not only on the country but on the strikers themselves.

Describing a similar White House intervention in the famous Rail case of 1941, Senator MORSE told the Senate in 1946 that strikes had occurred in the past and would occur in the future whenever the strikers believed they had sufficient power in connection with specific disputes to obtain modification of a Government decision through mediation or intervention of the Chief Executive.

Senator MORSE knew what he was talking about. By no means an antiunion man, he had been chairman of the factfinding board in 1941, and after the board's report had been handed down, the Chief Executive intervened. Finally the dispute was settled on terms more favorable to the unions than the decision on the merits had afforded.

And even this somber precedent-setting fight of 1941 was settled without an actual strike.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think this editorial points up the fact that not only is the strike itself invidious, not only is the neglect of the public interest very clear—and it is avoidable if proper legislation is passed—but also this editorial points up another question which is at the heart of the entire problem. That is that when strikers think they have enough public toehold to force mediation, and through that mediation obtain a better settlement than they were given by an order of the proper public agencies, such intervention by the Government at such time is weak and is not in the public interest. I quote at some length from this last editorial as a part of my statement:

Describing a similar White House intervention in the famous rail case of 1941, Senator MORSE told the Senate in 1946 that strikes had occurred in the past and would occur in the future whenever the strikers believed they had sufficient power in connection with specific disputes to obtain modification of a Government decision through mediation or intervention of the Chief Executive.

That is lifted out of the statement of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] of 1946.

Continuing from the editorial:

Senator MORSE knew what he was talking about. By no means an antiunion man, he had been chairman of the factfinding board in 1941, and after the board's report had been handed down, the Chief Executive intervened. Finally the dispute was settled on terms more favorable to the unions than the decision on the merits had afforded.

And even this somber precedent-setting fight of 1941 was settled without an actual strike.

Mr. President, here is something which deserves the immediate, the thoughtful, the patriotic attention of every Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. This is a matter of the ignoring of the public interest, not only by the workers who have a more direct interest than anyone else, but also by Congress, as it has ignored the public interest up to now, and by the kind of lackadaisical attitude on the part of the public, too often, after the crisis of the moment has been settled.

This is something that is wrong. This is something that is crippling us. This is something that is crippling us at a time when all of us in Congress and throughout the Nation are struggling to make our country more resourceful, more effective, more economical, more able to meet the problems of this modern age.

Mr. President, it is my strong hope and urgent plea that the Members of the Senate will realize that here is a challenge to every patriotic devotion to the public interest, and that all of us will see here a chance to do something for the public which we are supposed to represent, and that all of us may be able to consider the proposed legislation which I have offered.

I am perfectly willing to have changes made in it in any way which will accomplish the desired result. Perhaps there is a better way to do it. I do not know. However, we must do something to guarantee the public against such indefensible, such irresponsible practices as those which we saw in the recent stoppage of work by the flight engineers, and those which we saw only a little while ago in the Port of New York, with its effect on two great rail lines of the country, by the stoppage of work by a handful of men who work on the tugboats which belong to one of the great rail lines.

Mr. President, if we are to have an efficiently functioning Government, we cannot permit this kind of disaster—and that is what it is—to be occasioned by a mere want of courage on the part of legislators to come to grips with the problem which every one of us knows exists and which we ought to be willing to try to solve.

HOW MUCH LONGER FOR CASTRO?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on January 1, 1959, the Cuban Dictator Batista was overthrown by a popular revolution. A few days later a bearded revolutionary who had led the struggle against Batista came down from the Sierra Maestra Mountains where he had waged a long and bloody civil war and became the Prime Minister of Cuba.

Most of us deeply sympathized with the sufferings of the Cuban people under the repressive Batista regime where denial of civil rights, widespread corruption, and social injustice were the rule of life. We shared the economic aspirations of the Cuban people. We all wished Cuba well. Fidel Castro promised to rid Cuba of the abuses of the dictator Batista, bring in social justice, strengthen democratic institutions, hold democratic elections, and raise the standard of living of the average Cuban.

Mr. President, I remember the occasion when Mr. Castro was here and made a tour of the country shortly after his rise to power. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I had a little talk with him, and we said to him, "When are you going to hold elections?" "Oh," he said, "when the people are ready." "Well," we said, "when will the people be ready?" "Oh," he said, "perhaps in 3 or 4 years." We said, "In 3 or 4 years?" "Oh, yes," he said, "they are not ready yet, but they are all for me."

But Cuba today is a nation on the verge of economic collapse and the people have again been denied the liberty which they so earnestly sought.

As we pierce the facade of lies and false promises espoused by Castro, we see that the few trappings of democracy which were set up have now been stripped away and the true, harsh, supreme power of the Communist state revealed. We see a nation that had long enjoyed a deep friendship with the United States turned into a Communist base aimed not only against the United States but against all the nations of this hemisphere. We see and hear daily of attacks on the Catholic Church, the church that 85 percent of the Cuban people belong to, one now challenged, insulted and harassed by the state. We see the aspirations of the Cuban factory workman, and the Cuban peasant trodden underfoot by the regimentation of the Castro bureaucracy. At the universities the desires of the Cuban students, professors, and intellectuals are scorned and their efforts at finding the truth deprecated. To cap all of this, Cuba is in the midst of an economic disarray that will take many years to overcome and will bring much misery to the Cuban people.

The Cuban people are not the only ones to have suffered at the hands of Castro. President Eisenhower was forced to take the severe step of breaking diplomatic relations with Cuba as a consequence of the unceasing campaign of harrassments, vilification and baseless accusations that Castro carried out against us. President Kennedy has stated his concern at the existence of foreign and domestic tyrannies in our Caribbean neighbor, Cuba. Latin American nations have been forced to take actions of a similar nature against Castro in view of the attempts Castro has fostered to subvert their own legitimate governments.

How long must the free world tolerate this menace? How long must our Cuban neighbors suffer under his heavy hand?

In my opinion, if we pursue the right policies Castro will not last out this year. The tide is running out on this bearded demagogue. And my conviction that this is so is supported by substantial evidence.

First of all, however, let us go back to the early days of Castro's rule. Castro came to power in a wave of popular enthusiasm. The Cuban people were beaten down by years of repression, corruption and terror under Batista. They rejoiced in their new hard-won freedom, and hoped that under Castro, Cuba could develop the democratic institutions she so cherishes and the economic development she so desperately required.

Some of Castro's early actions were deceptively encouraging. He eliminated public corruption on almost all levels. The catchword of the Revolution was to build. A fever of building swept through Cuba: housing units for the poor who had formerly lived in mud flats, schools, hospitals—all these sprang up in the land. The serious problem of Cuba's poor public health was being dealt with by a task force of sanitary technicians and by a nationwide educational program teaching the fundamentals of good health to every village and hamlet in Cuba.

However, in endeavoring to do all this, Castro took the wrong path. He allied himself with the Communist world. He abused the human rights of his people. He began to see enemies everywhere and wore himself out fighting these supposed challenges. He began a campaign of vicious attacks against the Catholic church, against the United States, and against his fellow nations of the hemisphere. He attacked the middle class because it resented his growing intimacy with international communism. He attacked labor for standing up for its rights. He attacked the peasants for resisting the collectivization he forced on them. As the months went by, a disenchantment swept the Americas as the realization came that the progress that was visible in Cuba was only skin deep, that the improvements Castro took credit for were merely for show and that Cuba was moving backward rather than forward. Cubans began to flee the repressive atmosphere that Castro had implanted in Cuba. Some days, as many as 600 Cubans waited patiently in line in front of the U.S. Embassy in Havana to obtain visas to come to the United States. Since Castro has come to power more than 45,000 Cubans have fled Cuba.

Castro's great error has been his betrayal of the Cuban revolution. Instead of helping Cuba attain the commendable aspirations of becoming a viable democracy and a healthy growing economy with opportunity for all, Castro has driven the Cuban nation into the ranks of the Communist slave states and in the process has driven out 45,000 of his own people. By so doing he has also aided in bringing about his own ultimate defeat.

Let us now turn for a moment to the reasons for the significant decline of Castro's strength in Cuba and see how he has sown the seeds of his own destruction.

When Castro took over power in January 1959, the Cuban National Bank had $100 million in reserves. Today, a little more than 2 years later, Castro has wiped out all the gold reserves Cuba had and, in addition, has incurred current obligations of over $200 million. This does not include the amount he has to pay U.S. citizens for the $1 billion of U.S.-owned property he has expropriated. Reliable sources indicate that national bank reserves now stand at $3 million. In the process, Castro has caused Cuba to become bankrupt and lose its formerly excellent credit rating and economic stability.

When Castro came to power, he claimed he had the welfare of the Cuban workers and peasants at heart. However, because of the economic devastation created by Castro's high-handed and Communist-oriented policies, the Cuban workers and peasants today in many ways are worse off than ever. Unemployment in Cuba has reached the catastrophic figure of 30 percent of the

work force. The Cuban finds himself in the midst of an inflationary spiral with the government printing money without the proper economic backing, with prices rising and real wages falling. To climax this, he cannot get what he needs unless he resorts to black market operators, for Cuba has now become the land of shortages.

Some may wonder what happened to the much-publicized aid that the Soviet Union, Red China, and the Soviet satellites have all promised Cuba to aid her in her economic development. To this day not one factory has been built nor has the Cuban economy enjoyed the benefits that an intimate relationship with the Communist bloc was supposed to bring. The highly publicized Soviet offer to buy the Cuban sugar crop at high prices has actually resulted in Cuba's receiving 1 cent less per pound for her sugar than the United States would have paid her. Multiply this by billions and the figure is significant. In addition, the crop that the U.S.S.R. bought was dumped on the world market, and Cuba and other sugar-producing states suffered adversely as a result.

To date, the only benefit to Cuba from the sale of sugar to the Sino-Soviet bloc has been the shipment of machine guns, tanks, and other arms to Cuba in return. Reports from Cuba also stress the disenchantment with the supposed technicians that the Communist bloc had promised Cuba to speed her economic growth. The technicians that have arrived in Cuba turn out mostly to be either spies or Communist propagandists while the few that are genuine technicians spend their time, according to what we have been reliably told, copying the blueprints of the Cuban plants and the industrial techniques that these plants use, and sending reports on this activity back to their respective countries. In other words, they have gone to Cuba to help their own nations develop their industry by copying Cuba's, not the other way around.

Industry in Cuba, once privately owned, has to a large extent been nationalized by Castro in his attempts to further regiment business and life of the Cuban people. Communists are being placed in the top level positions of the seized companies without regard to qualifications. Poor management and the vastness of Cuban bureaucracy has imposed upon the Cuban people an economic crisis of vast proportions.

The peso, which under normal circumstances in the United States is equivalent to our dollar, is now worth only 25 cents. Castro's extensive public works program has virtually ceased due to a lack of funds. Businesses are run by followers of the Castro line who are often inexperienced in the complexity of business economics.

In spite of Castro's promises before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 17, 1959, on the occasion of his early visit to the United States, when he had a conversation with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and me, that Cuba would not expropriate private businesses owned by foreign investors, approximately $1 billion of U.S. privately owned property in Cuba has been seized by Castro.

Castro raises his hands with alarm and sounds cries of economic aggression and coercion against the United States for its action in cutting off imports of Cuban sugar. Yet, the record speaks for itself. The United States was in no way contractually bound to purchase Cuban sugar and, in fact, purchased this sugar at a price above that paid on the world market. The Cuban Government, on the other hand, completely voided property rights in Cuba without any attempt to reimburse the owners. This action was only one of a long series of harassing actions undertaken by the Cuban Government which eventually led to the breaking of diplomatic relations with Cuba on January 3, 1961, by the U.S. Government.

Castro is openly calling for revolution throughout all of Latin America. This poses an obvious Communist threat to the Americas. Only positive collective action by the nations threatened with this declaration of war will be able to combat the Red menace.

Exports from Cuba to the countries of North and South America amounted to $484 million in 1959. Although a substantial portion of the dollar value of these exports was Cuban sugar shipped to the United States, which have now been cut off, the balance represents fresh fruits, tobacco, and molasses, which trade is necessary and vital to the existing Cuban economy. The continuance of trade with the Castro government prolongs the threat to every government in North and South America. The Organization of American States is equipped to handle this problem. It has already taken stern action against the two dictators of the Caribbean and, I believe, after thoughtful consideration of the expansionist activities of communism in South America, would be prepared to act again. A complete embargo by the Organization of American States against exports from Cuba could prove to be an important factor in freeing the Cuban people from the tyrannical dictation of Castro and rid the entire Hemisphere of a cancerous growth. In proposing that the OAS consider an embargo against Cuban exports, it should be kept in mind that the embargo is not proposed to hurt the Cuban people who have suffered so much, but rather to effect an early end to Communist infiltration and unrest in the Americas.

In order for an embargo of this nature to be most effective, I believe an invitation should be extended to Canada to participate in these deliberations with the Organization of American States. Canada plays an important role in the defense of the Western Hemisphere and should be invited to share in the development of economic policies as well.

Turning to the place of labor unions in Castro's Cuba, it must be pointed out that they are in the main now controlled by Communists or Communist sympathizers. A few unions have dared to defy their leadership and Castro. The electrical workers, the transport workers, and the hotel and restaurant workers have all openly protested Castro's policies and manifested their discontent by strikes and demonstrations. But they have been hounded by Castro's goon squads. When the electrical workers marched recently on the Presidential Palace shouting "Cuba si, Russia no," they were fired upon, and some were killed, others injured. Cuban labor has become painfully aware that Castro is no friend of the Cuban workingman.

A similar tragedy has befallen the Cuban peasant. After Castro had set forth his initial promises of land reform and given every peasant the vision of a small farm of his own, Castro turned around and forced them into collectivized farms. It is true that the large landholder of the past has disappeared, but in his place Castro has placed the state. And today low productivity is a crime, not only because the state is the landholder but also because the landholder is also the policeman with the gun at the peasant's back.

Castro has drawn the battle lines in his struggle against the Catholic Church in Cuba. As a Roman Catholic priest recently told a visitor in Havana, "We no longer search for a way to live with the Castro regime. We search for a way to die with honor."

The church represents a serious threat to Castro, first because it is anti-Communist and as such is in conflict with Castro's pro-Communist orientation and his close relations with the Communist world. Yet even more importantly, the church is a challenge to Castro because it stresses the dignity and individuality of man; while Castro, in establishing his dictatorship over Cuba, stresses the supreme power of the state and the insignificance of individual man.

Castro has fought the Catholic Church with his demagogery, attempting to ridicule its priests and sisters, accusing them of the vilest acts. To combat the Castro menace and the threat it poses to the morality and the spirit of Cuba, the church has had to resort to the pastoral letter. These pastoral letters must be having a profound effect, since Castro continually rants against them.

In the forefront of the fight that the church is forced to wage against Castro is the 77-year-old archbishop of Santiago, the Most Reverend Enrique Perez Serantes. This venerable priest has acknowledged that "an open battle against the religion of Christ has started," and that "the hour to demonstrate the capacity of our resistance and our preparedness for the fight is at hand." The church must fight communism, the archbishop continued, because the church loves liberty and because it repudiates slavery from wherever it comes.

These are not the words of a simple priest who has a dislike of Fidel Castro, nor can the archbishop ever be called an agent of Wall Street, as Castro is known to call his enemies. Instead, this priest saved the life of Fidel Castro during the Batista dictatorship, and was a staunch supporter of the revolution. When men like him speak and act in the way they do now, another proof of the weakness of the Castro regime is made clear.

Another important group fighting Castro and what he stands for is composed of the Cuban middle class—the

doctors, the lawyers, the professors, the small businessmen, the men Castro needs to staff his hospitals, run his factories, design his houses, and furnish expertise to his nation. Yet 45,000 of these people have fled Cuba. This defection of the intellectuals and the middle class from Castro is even more significant when one remembers that it was the Cuban middle class, its intellectuals and its students, who were the first supporters of Castro. It was only after Castro started to win his long struggle against Batista that the Cuban peasant and worker joined his movement. Now Castro's initial supporters are among his early detractors. This is another most welcome indication of the declining popularity of the Cuban tyrant. Reliable and informed sources state that Castro has lost the popular support of more than a majority of the Cuban people.

If one wants proof of the disenchantment of the Cuban middle class with Castro, one has but to walk through the streets of Miami, Fla., where most of the Cubans who have fled Castro are now seeking sanctuary. These Cuban exiles will take any job in the United States, however menial it be, rather than return to a Cuba that is run by Castro. Eminent Cuban judges serve as bus boys in Florida restaurants; a distinguished Cuban doctor, who formerly was in charge of a famous clinic, now scrubs down the operating room in a Florida hospital. These people prefer poverty in a free state to the life they formerly led in a slave state.

At this point one can well ask, Who supports Castro? How does he stay in power? He lacks a political party and a professional army. He lacks support of the business community and the professional groups. The Catholic Church has turned against him. And the Cuban workers and peasants are becoming increasingly disenchanted with him. It is even argued that Castro's great friend of the past, Comrade Khrushchev, of the Soviet Union, is becoming increasingly dissatisfied with Comrade Castro, and is trying to disassociate himself from what may prove to be an embarrassing relationship with the Cuban Premier. Khrushchev may be noticing that Castro is on his way out; and the Soviet leader rightly knows how dangerous for the reputation of the Soviet Union it would be to be too closely allied with a loser, to be too identified with a weak ruler who can momentarily be deposed.

But we cannot underestimate Castro's power. Castro has behind him the monolithic strength of the state. He has its police, its judiciary, its industry, its land, and its firing squads. But—and this is most important—he has the support of the Communist Party of Cuba, a hard-bitten core of experts in terror. With this, Castro is holding Cuba against the Cubans.

The opposition to Castro is growing. Within Cuba, various underground movements commit daily acts of sabotage. Earlier this month, a $1 million state-owned tobacco plant went up in flames; a few days before that, mothers in a small Cuban city marched on the city hall, to protest Castro's policies; throughout Cuba, bombs went off in scattered places; trains were derailed. One hundred and seventy miles from Havana, in the Escambray Mountain Range, an intrepid band of rebels is pinning down 10,000 of Castro's troops. Castro cannot wipe out this insurrection. Supplies are being parachuted, daily, to the rebels. Still more supplies with which to combat Castro come by sea, at night.

Within Cuba, the anti-Castro forces have rifles, automatic weapons, mortars, and explosives. The anti-Castro forces outside Cuba have accumulated more weapons, including B–26 bombers and transports, with which to launch an attack against the Cuban tyrant. The resistance to Castro is growing in its effectiveness. But Castro is still strong, and must not be underrated.

Historically, the Cuban people have always looked to a single leader to fufill their aspirations and desires. Fidel Castro, as the symbol of opposition to the despotic regime of Batista, satisfied this yearning. Today, there is again in Cuba the yearning for a man to lead the people from the wilderness of domination. However, until now, there has not appeared an individual with the romanticism, spirit of adventure, and qualities of leadership needed to inspire and arouse the Cuban people.

Forty or fifty opposition groups, representing most factions of Cuban political life, are currently engaged in operations designed to overthrow the Castro Communist regime. Their purpose is clear—the overthrow of this Communist dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere. Certainly, their efforts should have the wholehearted moral support of Americans throughout our land.

These groups are providing active opposition, in varying forms, to the Castro government. Castro is at this moment engaged in a conflict with a well-armed and well-supported guerrilla army in Cuba, ranging in estimate of size from 800 to 8,000 men. In addition, many organizations are providing to the Cuban people anti-Castro literature. Radio broadcasts are beamed daily to Cuba, from ships operating in international waters, giving the Cuban people the truth about the Communist conspiracy which stifles freedom and liberty in Cuba. These activities unquestionably will have their effect on Castro; but unless one leader in the forces of democracy emerges, the internal bickering and jockeying for position by anti-Castro groups will nullify their important contributions.

It becomes increasingly urgent that the various anti-Castro groups throughout the Western Hemisphere unite, to form a solid coalition of opposition to the bearded demogogue in Cuba. It is conceded that all groups are in basic agreement that freedom must return to Cuba. Therefore, this common ground should provide the catalyst to form a cohesive, working force invigorated by the desires of the Cuban people to be free from tyrannical domination.

In helping to achieve the end that all of the anti-Castro forces seek, I believe a Cuban forum sponsored by groups interested in the liberation of Cuba would go a long way in solidifying uncoordinated efforts. Such a forum, I believe, would have an effect of shaping the direction of the anti-Castro movement and could serve as a parliament of true Cuban public opinion. Such an attempt at coalition would have a tremendous appeal to the people of Cuba and would provide new hope of effective action for the oppressed against the Sino-Russia-supported Castro.

The objective of such a Cuban forum would be to unify the opposition to Castro and prepare a Constitution for a Cuban Government-in-exile. The impetus for such a meeting must come from the Cuban exiles themselves.

I have talked with some of them, and the idea of a Cuban forum appeals to many of them.

Individual ambitions will have to be subordinated to the goals of a free and democratic Cuba under a constitutional Government. The U.S. Government cannot of course officially participate in this movement. It is up to the Cubans themselves to take the necessary steps, but the United States can and should be sympathetic to any responsible and representative group which promises to restore liberty to the Cuban people.

Castro has adopted as the slogan for the year 1961 "The year of the firing squad." As one of his deputies claimed, "We will erect the most formidable execution wall in the history of humanity." These are the words of the men that run Cuba today. It is hopeful that a united opposition to Castro's dictatorial powers will change the slogan for 1961 from "the year of the firing squad" to "the year of Cuban liberation." The signs point in that direction. I am convinced that firm U.S. action in cooperation with the O.A.S. can spell the downfall of Castro before the year 1961 passes into history.

TWO-COAST SHIP CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY: A MUST FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on January 26, 1961, some remarks were made in the Senate that I reject and repudiate. The Speaker was the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. The occasion was the submission of S. 596.

This bill would repeal the 6-percent differential for shipbuilding for the Pacific coast on a certain limited number of vessels, a differential which has existed for a quarter of a century by reason of section 502d of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The distinguished Senator contends that costs have now been equalized between Atlantic and Pacific coast shipbuilding. Therefore, he says, the differential is no longer needed and should be repealed.

The distinguished Senator is wrong. He is wrong in his opinion, and he is wrong on the alleged facts which he uses to support his erroneous view.

The differential legislation is, in truth, vital to this Nation. The basic reason for congressional enactment of the 6-percent differential is national defense. That was the reason for the enactment in

1936, and remains the reason for the necessity of maintaining the differential now.

This law is related to national defense in this way:

First. It is of the utmost importance that the United States have a shipbuilding industry capable of providing us with world shipbuilding superiority in the event of war.

Second. Such shipbuilding capability must be dispersed on all coastal ranges of the United States, and must not be concentrated in one area.

Third. We cannot allow shipbuilding to be seriously hampered by the risk of concentrated attacks in the event of armed conflict.

One of the first utterances of this proposition by an official of the U.S. Government was that of the Honorable Joseph Kennedy, the first Chairman of the U.S. Maritime Commission.

> There is a decided advantage, both commercial and military, in having our (ship) building and repair facilities well distributed over the three coasts. * * * You have 3,000 miles of (Pacific) coastline. Commercial and military considerations alike dictate the maintenance of a strong construction industry on these shores, even though it may involve some extra expense.

Quotation by Arthur Eldridge, Los Angeles Harbor Department manager, from radio broadcast by Mr. Kennedy. Testimony by Mr. Eldridge on January 18, 1938, before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, H.R. 8532.

In the same hearings in 1938, the Honorable John F. Dockweiler, Member of the House of Representatives from the State of California, stated:

> Therefore, from the national defense angle alone it is essential that the Congress care for and subsidize any construction and operation of ships in Pacific waters plying between ports of the United States and foreign ports so that when such an emergency arose we would have ample auxiliary help from such shipping. If the Pacific coast shipyards are not encouraged to remain on the Pacific coast because of lack of work and employment, the U.S. Government, in time of emergency, would, beyond the question of a doubt, be impaired both as to construction and repair of the ships of the line and their auxiliaries. The President, in his speech the other day to us in Congress, emphasized the point that in the whole picture of national defense we must consider the Pacific coast as well as the Atlantic coast as our frontiers, and I think you gentlemen know what I mean when I say that the most important frontier today is the Pacific coast. (January 19, 1938.)

Only 5 years ago, in 1956, Congress spoke out again on this crucial national defense need, when it enacted Public Law 805, which is now section 502f of the Merchant Marine Act. This second policy statement by the Congress provides that—

> (f) The Secretary of Commerce * * * shall periodically * * * survey the existing privately owned shipyards capable of merchant ship construction * * * to determine whether their capabilities for merchant ship construction * * * provide an adequate mobilization base at strategic points for purposes of national defense and national emergency. The Secretary of Commerce * * * upon a basis of a finding that the award of the proposed construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, or remodeling work will remedy an existing inadequacy in such mobilization base as to the capabilities and capacities of a shipyard or shipyards at a strategic point * * * may with the approval of the President, allocate such construction (etc.) to such yard or yards in such manner as it may be determined to be fair, just, and reasonable to all sections of the country, subject to the provisions of this subsection. * * * In the event that a contract is made providing for a price in excess of the lowest responsible bid which otherwise would be accepted, such excess shall be paid for by the Maritime Administration as a part of the cost of national defense, and shall not be considered as a part of the construction differential subsidy.

The U.S. Navy and the American merchant marine—as represented by Pacific coast operators—gave vigorous testimony on this second policy pronouncement by Congress, underscoring the national defense question. Rear Adm. Albert G. Mumma, U.S. Navy, Chief, Bureau of Ships, Department of Defense, in testimony on June 13, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, stated in part:

> The proposed bill is concerned with the objective of maintaining a strong mobilization base of widely dispersed operating shipyards capable of meeting wartime defense requirements. This is a problem of vital and continuing concern to both the Department of Defense and Department of Commerce, and I might insert as well of the whole Nation, particularly in view of the limited availability of new oceangoing ship construction each year.
>
> A vastly increased need for shipyard skills and facilities is expected during any future defense emergency. To meet this need, a shipbuilding and repair potential capable of rapid expansion must be maintained in peacetime.
>
> Moreover, in the thermonuclear age, strategic dispersal of the operating shipyards comprising this potential is of the utmost importance.

Mr. President, the people of our Nation today would approve and endorse this statement by Admiral Mumma.

Mr. Ralph B. Dewey, president, Pacific American Steamship Association, testifying before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on the House at the same hearing, said:

> It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these hearings would not be complete without some voice from the ship operators. I think that perhaps the Pacific coast ship operators have as great a stake in the ship construction dispersal within this country as any others. There is a natural interest and inclination by any ship operator operating from the Pacific coast to use yards which are in his own neighborhood.
>
> This is more than just an inclination. It is an economic advantage to have available close by during the operation period of the vessel skilled men who participated in the construction phase. * * * So, as to orient the hearing, Mr. Chairman, a little bit farther into the area of ship operation, we do sincerely urge that this committee by whatever language seems appropriate empower, indeed mandate, the Maritime Administration in coordination with the Department of the Navy to develop material and data which will bring clearly forth and show the necessity for dispersal of ship facilities within this country.

This history should lay to rest the question of whether this differential should be maintained, provided that the cost differential between Atlantic and Pacific shipbuilding costs is such as to seriously hamper the continuation of shipbuilding facilities and skills on the Pacific coast. Can you imagine, Mr. President, how it would affect our Defense position if the west coast shipbuilding industry withered away and died?

Is there no cost differential, as the senior Senator from Maryland contends? This matter was the subject of three separate hearings in the 86th Congress:

First. In August 1959 officials of the Maritime Administration testified that their agency had made a preliminary examination and expressed a tentative conclusion that the differential was about 4 percent. The Maritime Administration stated that this was not the result of an exacting survey, but a preliminary estimate only, and that it would like more time to examine the question thoroughly.

Second. In April 1960 representatives of Atlantic and gulf coast shipbuilders testified in favor of repeal of the differential and offered isolated instances of price equalization between East and West. They spoke in generalities and marshalled no real argument at all for repeal of the law.

Third. In June 1960 seven witnesses testified on behalf of the Western Shipbuilding Association. Five of these witnesses were top executive officials of shipbuilding companies. The testimony by the Western Shipbuilding Association was the first fully factual case, completely documented and supported by actual cost information developed from experience in building ships.

That testimony went through each of the component parts, material of all types, plus the labor cost, and concluded with a 7-percent-plus differential still existing in favor of the Atlantic and gulf yards.

The sequence of events following the June hearing is conclusive on the question of costs, at least, to the extent that a complete case was made by the West, but a case in generalities only by the East. Up to this point, no Government authority has spoken out as to the actual cost differential.

Moreover, so important did the chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee [Mr. BONNER] consider the necessity of getting at the truth of the cost question that on September 13, 1960, he instructed the General Accounting Office, official accounting arm of the Congress, to investigate the question and report back to him in January of 1961.

The Western Shipbuilding Association witnesses in the June hearings had urged such an investigation. Moreover, they agreed to abide by the results of this investigation, so confident were they of the figures they had carefully compiled and submitted.

The report on the investigation of the General Accounting Office is nearing completion now, and should be a matter of public record. I hope that the GAO report will be full and extensive and will take into account every factor which goes into the building of a ship—whether it is in California or Maryland.

It seems clear that if the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee chairman concludes at the end of lengthy hearings that an unbiased Government investigation is needed to determine the cost question, it is not possible for anyone, anywhere, to assert at all logically that there is no cost differential or that, if there is, it is of a certain percentage. We need a complete, unbiased investigation to make a sound judgment. In view of the great faith which the Congress places on its own body, the General Accounting Office, it would appear that its report should be of the utmost importance in answering the question.

My colleague from Maryland stated that this question should be viewed dispassionately and with an open mind by all, and concluded by saying that if no reason continued to exist for the differential then it should be repealed. On that point, I am certain he will agree with the logic of the corollary, that if the cost and national defense reasons do still exist for the differential then it should be maintained.

It may be that the comment of the Senator from Maryland was prompted by the record in the House last year on H.R. 8093, another repeal bill. The hearings on that bill were held by a subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. This subcommittee, by unanimous decision, including the vote of the chairman, first concluded that in view of the uncertainties of the cost question, it should be referred to the General Accounting Office for investigation. Thereafter, the majority of eastern and gulf members of the full House committee forced a vote discharging the subcommittee and reported the bill.

This procedure resulted in some of the strongest language I have ever seen in a minority report on a bill before Congress. In the committee's report on the bill—report No. 2089, 86th Congress, 2d session—the minority report was filed by Representatives GEORGE P. MILLER, of California; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, of Washington; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California; and THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington. They said in part:

> We, the undersigned, wish to register our very strong objection to the way in which this bill was reported out by a majority of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Never before has this committee acted in such a high-handed manner nor with such utter disregard for one of its subcommittees. Nor has the full committee ever acted with such little knowledge of the facts involved in a bill. If ever a measure was railroaded through a committee, this was the outstanding occasion.

Even more remarkable are the supplementary views filed by Representatives JOHN H. RAY, of New York, and WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, of Michigan, both of whom could be assumed to share the Atlantic rather than Pacific viewpoint. Their report stated, in full:

> At the close of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine on H.R. 8093 we felt strongly that the evidence was full of contradictions in respect of costs and the need for continuing the 6-percent differential (or any other ship-construction differential) in favor of west coast yards which was established by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It seemed to us when the matter came before the subcommittee for a vote, and it seems to us now, that members of the subcommittee needed outside expert help to analyze and evaluate the evidence and make recommendations. Our votes were cast, with the majority of the subcommittee, to send the record to the General Accounting Office for study and report back to the committee by January 1, 1961.
>
> We regret that the subcommittee's decision to that effect has been set aside by the full committee by the votes of members of that committee who had not heard the evidence.

Members of the Subcommittee on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the only congressional body holding hearings to date, state positively that the cost question is still in doubt. The GAO will, I trust, resolve that doubt soon.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, I venture to hope that a law enacted years ago—enacted in the public interest—enacted, indeed, for the purpose of advancing the security of our Nation, will not be unduly subjected to false criticism or slander.

THE PRESIDENT'S NATURAL RESOURCES MESSAGE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, having read the President's message on natural resources which came to the Congress yesterday, I am delighted to know that Mr. Kennedy is going to continue many sound Eisenhower administration programs for the benefit of the Western States, including the development of their water, land, mineral, and forest resources and the recreation programs. But I am disappointed in his message, which is full of platitudes and generalities, and contains some misstatements.

The Kennedy message recommends countless surveys, commissions, and studies when immediate action is clearly required. For many decades before Eisenhower, we in the West were studied to death. We need action, not more studies and still more bureaucracy.

The Kennedy message was one of the most politically oriented ever presented to Congress. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall said in his February 7 press conference that he was going to "play politics to the hilt" with natural resources, and the Kennedy message bears this out. The President said:

> We reject a "no new starts" policy. Such a policy denied the resource requirements and potential on which our economic growth hinges, and took a heavy toll in added costs and even human life and homes by postponing essential flood control projects.

The Washington Post and Times Herald this morning "guessed" that Kennedy was attacking the Eisenhower administration. However, those of us who are familiar with reclamation and flood control programs know that in fact he was actually indicting the Truman administration and the Democratic leadership in Congress. This is so because it was President Truman who first applied the "no new starts" policy. In fact, the phrase itself first appears in a directive issued by Truman's Bureau of the Budget Director in 1947. President Truman applied the "no new starts" policy in 5 of his 6 years in office. In contrast, the "no new starts" policy was only applied in 1 out of 8 years by Eisenhower, and the reason it was applied in that 1 year was the $12 billion deficit. While I have had my differences of opinion with President Truman and the congressional Democratic leaders, I think this is a shocking attack on them.

Today I have directed a letter to President Kennedy asking that he immediately direct the Secretary of the Army to furnish me with a list of those flood-control projects the delay of which caused the death of American citizens and the destruction of homes. I have asked him, also, for the names of the people whose lives were lost. In addition, I have asked him to make public, so that the record might be perfectly clear, the Budget Bureau directives from 1945 through 1960 dealing with flood control and reclamation projects. I have also asked for the comments of the Department heads given to the Bureau of the Budget on its directives by the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Interior and their subordinates during that same period. Moreover, I have asked for a tabulation of new starts during each of the past 15 years by year, listing the names of the projects, the time they were authorized, the time construction started, and how much money was allocated for construction.

The Kennedy administration has said that it is anxious to make all non-security information available to the public, so I am sure the President will furnish me with the material I have requested. It will show that there have been 49 new starts in the reclamation area alone under the Eisenhower administration, compared to 38 new reclamation starts under Truman.

In the 5 fiscal years 1949 to 1953, the Truman administration recommended only six new reclamation starts. In 3 of those years, 1949–51, the administration recommended only one new start each year; in 1 year, 1953, it recommended none. In all, the Truman administration had a total of 38 new starts—18 requested by the administration, 20 added by the Congress. Actually, the Eisenhower administration initiated construction of 29 percent more projects than the Truman administration and requested 39 percent more new starts than the Truman administration.

One of the most important Eisenhower new starts was the billion-dollar Upper Colorado River project. It is the largest single project ever authorized in one bill. This project was consistently opposed and hamstrung by the Truman administration. Former Senator Watkins and I introduced a bill to authorize the project in 1952, but this was opposed by President Truman, and no action was taken. Precious years of water development were wasted as a result of this imposed delay—water which we direly need in the Upper Colorado Basin and particularly in Utah, where we are into the third year of a serious drought. Recently I suggested that the Glen Canyon Dam should be renamed the Eisenhower Dam because of the key role President Eisenhower played in getting approval of

the dam, which is part of the Upper Colorado project. In view of the misinformation which the Democrats spread in the 1960 campaign, and which is now being perpetuated by the Kennedy administration, it might be well to call the dam the "No New Starts Dam."

I ask unanimous consent that a list of some of the new starts approved under the Eisenhower administration be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reclamation projects, or units, Department has reported favorably on from 1953 to August 1960

No.	Project or unit	Congress	Date enacted	Public Law No.
1	Avondale project, Idaho (rehabilitation of existing project).	83d	July 31, 1953	
2	Buford-Trenton project, North Dakota	83d	do	
3	Dalton Gardens project, Idaho (rehabilitation of project works).	83d	do	
4	Carlsbad project, New Mexico (rehabilitation of spillway).	83d	July 1, 1954	
5	Crescent Lake Dam project, Oregon (reconstruction of dam).	83d	do	
6	Glendo unit, Missouri River Basin project, Wyoming.	83d 85th	July 16, 1954 June 20, 1958	503 695
7	Foster Creek division of Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington.	83d	July 27, 1954	540
8	Santa Margarita project, California	83d	July 28, 1954	547
9	Haystack Dam and Reservoir, Deschutes project, Oregon.	83d	Aug. 10, 1954	
10	Talent division, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon.	83d	Aug. 20, 1954	606
11	Medford and Rogue River Valley Irrigation District rehabilitation, Rogue River Basin project, Oregon.	83d	do	626
12	Ainsworth unit, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	83d 84th	Aug. 21, 1954 May 18, 1956	612 531
13	Mirage Flats extension unit, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	83d	Aug. 21, 1954	612
14	O'Neill unit, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	83d	do	612
15	Lavaca Flats, Nebraska (Missouri River Basin project).	83d	do	612
16	Palo Verde diversion project, Arizona-California	83d	Aug. 31, 1954	
17	Michaud Flats project, Idaho	83d	do	741
18	Santa Maria project, California	83d	Sept. 3, 1954	774
19	Trinity River Division, Central Valley project, California.	84th	Aug. 12, 1955	386
20	Yuma Mesa Irrigation District, Gila project, Arizona (additional works).	84th	Jan. 28, 1956	394
21	Washita River Basin project, Oklahoma	84th	Feb. 25, 1956	419
22	Ventura River project, California	84th	Mar. 1, 1956	423
	Colorado River storage project and participating projects:			
	Storage projects:			
23	Curecanti unit, Colorado	84th	Apr. 11, 1956	485
24	Flaming Gorge unit, Utah	84th	do	485
25	Glen Canyon unit, Arizona	84th	do	485
26	Navajo unit, New Mexico	84th	do	485
	Colorado River storage project and participating projects—Continued			
	Participating projects:			
27	Central Utah (initial phase) Vernal unit.	84th	Apr. 11, 1956	485
28	Emery County, Utah	84th	do	485
29	Florida, Colo	84th	do	485
30	Hammond, N. Mex	84th	do	485
31	La Barge, Wyo	84th	do	485
32	Lyman, Wyo	84th	do	485
33	Paonia, Colo	84th	do	485
34	Pine River extension, New Mexico	84th	do	485
35	Seedskadee, Wyo	84th	do	485
36	Silt, Colo	84th	do	485
37	Smith Fork, Colo	84th	do	485
38	Red Willow Dam, Nebr	84th 85th	May 2, 1956 Aug. 27, 1958	505 783
39	Wapimitis project, Juniper division, Oregon	84th	June 4, 1956	559
40	Hayden Lake unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho (rehabilitation of existing project).	84th	July 2, 1956	
41	Washoe project, Nevada and California	84th	Aug. 1, 1956	858
42	Farwell unit, Nebraska, Missouri River Basin	84th	Aug. 3, 1956	952
43	Crooked River project, Oregon	84th	Aug. 6, 1956	992
44	Little Wood River project, Idaho	84th	do	993
45	San Angelo project, Texas	85th	Aug. 16, 1957	152
46	McMillan Delta project, New Mexico-Texas	85th	Feb. 20, 1958	
47	Mercedes division, lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas.	85th	Apr. 7, 1958	
48	Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington.	85th	May 5, 1958	393
49	Bully Creek extension, Vale project, Oregon	86th	Sept. 9, 1959	248
50	Spokane Valley project, Washington	86th	Sept. 16, 1959	276
51	La Feria division, lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas.	86th	Sept. 22, 1959	357
52	San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California	86th	June 3, 1960	488
53	Norman project, Oklahoma	86th	June 27, 1960	529
54	Burns Creek Reservoir, Idaho		Not enacted	
55	Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas	86th	Sept. 14, 1960	787
56	Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado		Not enacted	
[1] 57	Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project.		do	
58	Mann Creek project, Idaho		do	
59	Nebraska Mid-State project		do	
60	San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico		do	
61	Western division, the Dalles project, Oregon	86th	Sept. 13, 1960	745

[1] Bureau of Budget did not approve (in letter of June 9, 1960).

NOT ENACTED

54. Burns Creek Reservoir, Idaho:

Eighty-third Congress: No legislation.

Eighty-fourth Congress: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-fifth Congress:

Favorable report submitted by Department May 7, 1957.

Hearings in House Interior Committee May 13, 1958.

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee May 22, 1957.

Passed Senate, amended, August 20, 1957 (S. 2757).

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee March 16, 1959.

Favorable report submitted by Department April 21, 1959.

Passed Senate, amended, July 24, 1959 (S. 281).

Hearings in House Interior Committee August 27, 1959.

Hearings in House Interior Committee March 24, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee March 27, 1960.

No hearings were held in House Interior Committee during August 1960 session of Congress for lack of quorum.

55. Cheney division, Wichita project, Kansas:

Eighty-third and Eighty-fourth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-fifth Congress: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Favorable report submitted by Department August 6, 1959.

Passed Senate April 11, 1960 (S. 1092).

Passed House, amended, and returned to Senate August 31, 1960 (S. 1092).

Senate cleared for President August 31, 1960 (S. 1092).

Signed September 14, 1960 (Public Law 86-787).

56. Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado.

Eighty-third Congress:

Favorable report submitted by Department June 9, 1953.

Passed Senate by unanimous vote July 10, 1954.

Eighty-fourth Congress: Passed Senate by unanimous vote July 12, 1956 (S. 300).

Eighty-fifth Congress: Passed Senate by unanimous vote June 27, 1957 (S. 60).

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Favorable report submitted by Department March 25, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee June 6 and 7, 1960. No action taken.

57. Garrison Diversion unit, Missouri River basin project.

Eighty-third and Eighty-fourth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-fifth Congress: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Favorable report submitted to House committee by Department June 9, 1960.

Favorable report submitted to Senate committee by Department June 16, 1960 (identical to House report).

58. Mann Creek project, Idaho.

Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth and Eighty-fifth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-sixth Congress: Favorable report submitted by Department July 21, 1960.

59. Nebraska Mid-State project.

Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth, and Eighty-fifth Congresses: Department made no recommendation.

Eighty-sixth Congress: Favorable report submitted by Department April 24, 1959.

Favorable report submitted by Department April 20, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee May 19, 1960.

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee May 23, 1960.

60. San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico.

Eighty-third and Eighty-fourth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-fifth Congress: No recommendation made by Department.

Eighty-sixth Congress: Department made no recommendation (in report dated March 9, 1959).

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee March 16, 1959. Passed Senate May 19, 1959 (S. 72). Favorable report submitted by Department May 19, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee May 23, 1960.

61. Western Division, the Dalles project, Oregon.

Eighty-third, Eighty-fourth, and Eighty-fifth Congresses: No legislation.

Eighty-sixth Congress:

Hearings in Senate Interior Committee June 13, 1960.

Hearings in House Interior Committee June 13, 1960. Favorable report submitted by Department June 24, 1960. Passed Senate July 1, 1960 (S. 2195). Passed House, amended, and returned to Senate August 31, 1960 (S. 2195).

Senate cleared for President August 31, 1960 (S. 2195).

Signed September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86-745).

Mr. BENNETT. The greatest water conservation program in our history was initiated by the Eisenhower administration. Nearly $2 billion was appropriated for Federal reclamation work during the 8 Eisenhower years. This was just a little short of the total appropriations for the preceding 50 years. In the half century before 1953, only 87 projects were completed—fewer than 2 a year. But since 1953, 30 reclamation projects have been completed, an average of 4 per year, while 53 new projects or units have been authorized, and construction has been started on 49 new or supplementary projects.

It is gratifying to now learn that President Kennedy intends to support reclamation projects, which is in striking contrast to the position he took when he voted against the Upper Colorado storage project and against the Echo Park Dam when the Senate voted on it in 1955.

OTHER WATER CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENTS

It was the Eisenhower administration which took the lead in gaining congressional approval by the Republican Congress in 1954 of the Watershed and Flood Control Prevention Act of that year. Add to this the fact that the Eisenhower administration pioneered and obtained approval of the Small Reclamation Projects Act in 1955. Both of these programs have been of inestimable value in the conservation of water and soil throughout the Nation. Then, too, the program to extract potable water from saline water was initiated and given full support during these same years, and has made remarkable progress. In fact, during the Eisenhower administration scientists made a sevenfold reduction in the cost of converting salt water to fresh water and the outlook for the future is bright, despite the fact that the Democratic controlled Congress has refused in 4 years out of the last 7 to appropriate as much money as requested for the program. The Kennedy administration is most fortunate to be able to start from so high a level of accomplishment.

To read President Kennedy's natural resources message, one would think that the Eisenhower administration had done absolutely nothing for 8 years in the natural resources field.

I have had the Library of Congress prepare a table for me based upon Bureau of the Budget information listing conservation expenditures by the Federal Government from fiscal years 1943 through 1962. This table shows that during the 7 Truman years, $10,464 million was spent for all conservation purposes. During the first 7 Eisenhower years, conservation expenditures jumped almost 50 percent to $15,445 million. When the figures for fiscal year 1962 are added, the total is $18,356 million, under Eisenhower. This hardly supports the patently ridiculous thesis of President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared for me by the Library of Congress showing expenditures during these fiscal years.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Conservation expenditures by the Federal Government, fiscal years 1934, 1943–58 actual, 1959–60 estimated

[In millions of dollars]

	Conservation of agricultural land and water resources	Conservation of land, water, forests, minerals, fish, and wildlife	Total
1934	(1)	(1)	(1)
1943	474	535	1,009
1944	462	405	867
1945	325	308	633
1946	350	340	690
1947	388	694	1,082
1948	285	855	1,140
1949	241	1,199	1,440
1950	337	1,351	1,688
1951	345	1,267	1,612
1952	340	1,366	1,706
1953	320	1,476	1,796
1954	253	1,315	1,568
1955	291	1,202	1,493
1956	305	1,104	1,409
1957	375	1,296	1,671
1958	448	1,543	1,991
1959	547	1,669	2,216
1960	692	1,713	2,405
1961 (estimated)	741	1,951	2,692
1962 (estimated)	773	2,138	2,911
Total Truman, 7 years			10,464
Total Eisenhower, 7 years			15,445
Total Eisenhower, 8 years			18,356

[1] Not available.

[2] Separate breakdown not available. This does not include Emergency Conservation expenditures of $332 million for undetermined purposes.

NOTE.—The figure for fiscal year 1934 is a rough estimate, and the figures for 1943–60 may not be strictly comparable with those of 1951–60. Figures from 1952 budget include Item 452: "Provision of navigation aid and facilities."

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Budget. "The Budget of the Government of the United States, 1960," p. 1013. Ibid., 1962, p. 1067. Figure for 1934 by phone from the Bureau of the Budget, Mrs. Lowe.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, this complete misrepresentation is only measured by the cartoon which appeared in the Washington Post of February 24. Just a casual examination of the Department of Interior expenditures over the past 14 years, for example, shows the poverty of facts displayed by the Kennedy message. During the 7 Truman years covering fiscal years 1947 through 1953, a total of $2,818,303,000 was expended for water development. Under the first 7 years of the Eisenhower administration, it was a great leap forward in the conservation field and $4,422,268,000 was expended for conservation, an increase of 57 percent.

This, of course, does not include the fiscal 1962 budget which was submitted by President Eisenhower and was at an alltime level.

Appropriations for Forest Service, conservation, and range development programs constituted $728 million under Eisenhower, compared to $488 million for a comparable 7-year period under Truman. This is an increase of 67 percent. In addition, Secretary Benson made a complete survey of our national forest needs up to the year 2000, which I hope the Kennedy administration will fully implement during the years it is in power.

In the field of soil conservation, the average annual appropriation under Truman was $53 million, but it has nearly doubled under Eisenhower to $99.3 million per year. This, coupled with the Watershed Act, has given us the greatest era in water development in the history of the United States.

RECREATION

It was the Eisenhower administration which launched a great program to develop the recreational potential of our public lands. For example, the Mission 66 program was launched in 1956 to develop the great potential of our national parks and monuments by the centennial year 1966. The total Parks Service budget during the first 5 years of the program, a sum just over $386 million, exceeded the total for all of the 24 years prior to the Eisenhower administration. At the same time, Secretary Benson initiated and secured approval of Operation Outdoors, to make national forest recreation available to countless thousands more Americans and to advance game management and conservation. This has not as yet been adequately implemented by Congress.

It is important to note that wildlife areas were expanded by 27 million acres and that 23 new national wildlife refuges have been established during the past 8 years. A long-range minerals program was submitted to Congress but Congress refused to take action. Appropriations were recommended for seven key minerals but once again Congress refused to appropriate funds for this important program.

I have noted the Kennedy message is filled with platitudes and generalities but where it is specific, he almost invariably asks for a continuation of the Eisen-

hower administration resources policies. The President wants to continue the program for our national forests and the Small Watershed Act developed by Secretary Benson, and the Mission 66 program for national parks developed by Secretary Seaton. He wants to adopt most of project 2012 for our public lands, and the saline water program pioneered by Seaton. His water pollution program differs only slightly, and he endorses S. 120 which I have cosponsored. This is all to the good, but hardly new.

In two areas, however, President Kennedy is specific. He wants to embark on a vast program of nationalized power and of nationalized interconnecting power lines. He also places a freeze on all nonmineral activity on 180 million acres of western land. This is a blow to private enterprise and to the economies of the Western States, and is, in effect, a no-new-starts policy for public land development.

What we in Utah need are specific proposals. In recent weeks, I have asked the Kennedy administration to begin work immediately on the Provo Bay and Goshen Bay dikes on Utah Lake. This would save enough water to supply a city of 400,000 people.

These projects are included in the related projects as part of the upper Colorado storage program, but I hope they can be stepped up in priority.

I also have asked that construction be started immediately on the Emery County project. Both of these projects are vitally needed to meet the threat of drought, and would furnish employment to areas where unemployment is high. No indication is given by President Kennedy that he realizes the urgency of our problems in Utah.

More progress has been made in conserving and developing our natural resources and our public lands between January 1953 and January 1961 than in any comparable 8-year period in our history. The Republican Party and the American people can take pride in this great record. It is regrettable that President Kennedy would attempt to besmirch this great achievement and at the same time attack President Truman and the Democratic leaders in Congress for their alleged inaction. We Republicans are happy to share credit with the Democrats in Congress for the great record during the past 8 years, and we shall be pleased to join with them to achieve an even greater record in the future.

At the conclusion of my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by the then Vice President of the United States on October 29, 1960, outlining the achievements of the Eisenhower administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON NATURAL RESOURCES BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ISSUED AT CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 29, 1960—SUMMARY OF EISENHOWER RECORD

Endowed by our Creator with an abundance of natural resources, the people of this Nation have forged an economy with the greatest productive capacity in history. Our citizens enjoy the highest standard of living ever attained in this world. The natural resources which supply this ever-expanding economy require our wisest and most vigorous public policy.

At the beginning of this century, a far-sighted Republican President—Theodore Roosevelt—inspired the American people as never before to support public programs leading to the wise use and judicious conservation of these raw materials. Today, if the free world is to have the instruments necessary to preserve liberty, and if we are to continue to achieve the growth the United States should have, we must renew our determination to manage, use, and improve our natural heritage for the benefit of future generations as well as our own.

"God has lent us the earth for our life," John Ruskin wrote in the century past. "It is a great entail. It belongs as much to those who come after us as to us, and we have no right, by anything we do or neglect, to involve them in any unnecessary penalties, or to deprive them of the benefit which was in our power to bequeath."

Those words stand true today.

A wise conservation policy cannot rest simply on the fear that the population of the world—or of the United States—will outstrip the earth's capacity to produce. Science and technology have already increased the productivity of our land and resources far beyond the demands now made on them, and far beyond the imaginings of our forefathers.

A wise policy, therefore, includes, along with preservation and orderly development, basic and applied research, conducted at a tempo which will insure against material shortages in our future.

Following such wise policies in the 1960's, we shall meet many challenges here at home: The challenge to avoid waste; to assure that we do not become a have-not nation; to better the living of our greatly growing number of people.

And broadening such policies, we shall meet challenges—many of them new—imposed by our international role. That role intensifies the demands on our own resources. And it impels us to seek means to put vast undeveloped resources in Latin America, Africa, and Asia to use in the free world's battle against poverty—one of the major battles in the great global struggle in which we are engaged.

WATER RESOURCES

In 1930, our per capita water requirements amounted to 530 gallons daily. Today we need twice as much. And by 1979, we shall need twice as much again.

The problem of assuring our growing country this swelling flood of fresh water is a problem local, regional, and national. Its solution requires an incessant and vigorous effort, undertaken by organizations both non-Federal and Federal, to impound water, irrigate land, control floods, and find an economical way to convert saline and brackish water to fresh.

WATER CONSERVATION

About one thing let us be clear at the outset: The United States must never suffer a crippling water shortage.

The only way to avert this possibility is to continue and expand what the United States now has underway—the greatest water conservation program in our history. At a cost now in excess of $1 billion annually, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has set a precedent-breaking pace in the authorization, construction, and development of water resources projects. Never before have so many such projects been launched.

Since 1953, 30 reclamation projects have been completed—an average of 4 per year—53 new projects or units have been authorized, and construction has been started on 49 new or supplementary projects. In the half century before 1953, only 87 projects were completed—fewer than 2 a year. Of all the money made available for Federal reclamation activities since Theodore Roosevelt signed the Reclamation Act in 1902, 1 dollar in every 3 has been appropriated during the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

And these figures do not include the hundreds of flood control projects also initiated by this administration.

We have built this record of progress in the face of the failure of the opposition-controlled Congress to meet the appropriation figures in the President's annual budgets. In 5 out of the past 6 years, the Congress appropriated for reclamation less than he requested.

These facts are part of the refutation of the opposition's charge that the Republican water resource development program is one of no new starts. More of the refutation is in these facts: The phrase "no new starts" originated in 1947 with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget during the Truman administration, which launched that policy.

In the 5 fiscal years 1949–53, the Truman administration recommended the construction of only 6 new reclamation projects. In 3 of those years (1949–51), the administration recommended only one new start each year; in 1 year (1953), it recommended none. In all, the Truman administration had a total of 38 new starts; 18 requested by the administration, 20 added by the Congress.

By contrast, in 8 years the Eisenhower administration has had 49 new starts, 25 requested by the administration and 24 added by the Congress. The record is clear that the Eisenhower administration has actually initiated construction of 29 percent more projects than the Truman administration and has requested 39 percent more new starts than the Truman administration.

The future water resource development of the United States must include a host of varied programs and policies.

Along with major downstream flood control projects, increased emphasis should be given to programs of Federal assistance for small reclamation and watershed flood control projects initiated and constructed by non-Federal local districts.

There must be continued support of the historic policy of Congress preserving the integrity of State water right laws.

River basin or watershed committees should coordinate the investigation, planning, and development of water conservation projects; wherever practicable, these projects should incorporate facilities for predictable future needs.

And basin funds, which will assure provision for investigation and full beneficial development of each river from its source to the sea, should be authorized by Congress.

INLAND WATERWAYS

Since 1952, this Nation has maintained a rate of growth in inland waterway commerce which is without precedent in our history. The St. Lawrence Seaway—the greatest inland waterway in the world, which extends 2,342 miles into the heart of the North American Continent—stands as a monument to international cooperation and Republican determination after decades of frustrated effort.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that about $8 billion would be required for all authorized and potential waterways. In proceeding to develop our waterways, uneconomic waterways should be deactivated, and, if possible, used for public recreation. To meet the estimated increased requirements for freight transportation, a definite schedule of priorities for the potential new waterways should be maintained, and modernization of existing waterways should proceed rapidly.

EVAPORATION CONTROL

Ground water and water once impounded can still be lost in astonishing quantities through evaporation or consumption by water-loving shrubs and weeds called phreatophytes. The encouraging results of experiments already made indicate that research on evaporation and phreatophyte control should be intensified.

POLLUTION CONTROL

Today our communities and industries are producing increasing and more complex wastes which are making water courses filthy and unusable.

A national program to prevent such pollution requires improved understanding of the types of wastes reaching our streams, and improved methods for their treatment. It requires more aggressive enforcement action to curb those communities and industries that are despoiling our rivers and other water courses. It requires public support of officials who are making sincere efforts to abate water pollution. It requires funds to build municipal waste treatment works, and expenditures by industry to cope with industrial wastes.

Recognizing the need for an effective attack on water pollution, the President in 1955 recommended a stronger and more permanent law than the Taft-Barkley Act of 1948. The administration's 1955 recommendations called for (1) the strengthening of Federal support of State water pollution control programs; (2) the authority to develop water quality standards to be applied to the interstate streams; (3) the broadening of enforcement authority of the Federal Government; (4) the intensifying of research on technical problems of stream pollution and its abatement.

In May of 1956 the Congress finally passed, and the President approved, Public Law 660. Remarkable progress has been made since that time in expanding our program to clean up the waters of America.

State water pollution control programs have been substantially expanded and strengthened by Federal grants and technical assistance and training.

Enforcement actions to prevent pollution of interstate waterways have been used in a dozen serious cases of interstate pollution. Already, conferences and public hearings on an interstate level have resulted in cleaning up more than 4,000 miles of streams. Action has been initiated to abate pollution from Federal installations.

Our research efforts, in universities and colleges, in industrial laboratories, and at Federal and State government installations, have been expanded.

Incentive grants for the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants have more than doubled the annual rate of such construction in the 5 years prior to 1956, when incentive funds were not available. For every $1 of Federal incentive money spent, $5 of local and State money has been put into sewage treatment plant construction since 1956.

Though much has been accomplished, much more remains to be done.

The first national conference on water pollution, scheduled to be held in December, will focus attention on the critical problem of assuring clean water for all purposes. It is clear now, however, that amendments to the existing Water Pollution Control Act should be sought so that its provisions can be extended to apply to all navigable waters.

When clearly needed, Federal assistance should be made available to local communities for pollution treatment facilities. Additionally, consideration should be given to measures that will encourage industries to follow good waste treatment practices.

With the increase in the complexity of wastes reaching our surface and ground waters, we must continue to seek out new and improved and effective waste treatment processes. Our increased requirements for water emphasize the urgent need to increase support for basic research and development.

There is a related subject. The greater the number of our automobiles and buses and smokestacks, the greater the amount of pollution of the only element more important to human life than water—the air we breathe. Working with all interested agencies, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should continue its efforts to acquire new knowledge and develop new techniques for prevention and control of air pollution. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service should be given authority to investigate and hold hearings on air pollution problems and to take action to abate pollution nuisances of interstate significance. Recommendations along these lines have been made to the Congress by the administration and should be acted upon at an early date.

In the past 8 years, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration, through research and experimentation, has reduced sevenfold the cost of saline water conversion. Even at the present cost of approximately $1 per thousand gallons, thousands of communities will soon find it cheaper to convert salt water than to transport fresh water from distant sources. We shall continue to urge approval of legislation to expand this program—legislation not enacted by the last Congress despite the fact that its enactment was recommended by the administration and had broad bipartisan support in the Congress.

The goal before us is to discover a process so efficient that we may not only meet our own needs at a reasonable cost, but also help make the arid lands of the world bloom. The development of a low-cost method of converting sea water to fresh could help solve economic problems in many countries, such as Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Brazil.

Unfortunately, recent Congresses have failed to make available all the funds requested by President Eisenhower for this purpose. The times demand that the saline water program be accelerated. Toward this end, the experimental portion of the saline water program should be expanded, if necessary through the construction of a Federal laboratory for this purpose.

ELECTRIC POWER

In considering electric power, let us be clear once again about a basic pledge: Neither the United States nor any region of the United States must ever suffer, as it did under the Truman administration, a crippling shortage of electric power.

Since 1953, this Nation's electric power generating capacity has nearly doubled. Through cooperative efforts, "brownouts" have been eliminated. This achievement is the direct result of the elimination of stifling and needless controls. Imposed by past Democratic administrations, Federal preemption of waterpower sites prevented non-Federal public and publicly regulated utilities from responding to local demand; material controls made action doubly impossible.

But since 1953, the Federal Power Commission has received applications for non-Federal hydroelectric projects with a total capacity of more than 33 million kilowatts—an amount larger than in any comparable period in our history.

As a measure of our progress in the installation of power facilities, we might remember that the Soviet Union today has the installed capacity which we had in 1942, and that if it continues at its recent rate of growth, by 1975 it will have the capacity we had in 1955.

Projections for electric energy demand show that we shall probably need three times as much capacity in 1980 as we have now. All segments of the industry and government will need to work as a team to meet this increase. Furthermore, by cooperative effort, such as the Northwest power pool, we should assure the fullest possible use of the capabilities of all elements of the power industry—public, private and Federal. And no power capacity should be wasted through failure to use facilities.

Federal hydropower activities are a direct result of water control and conservation construction. Energy generated as a byproduct of storage dams and reservoirs is marketed to help repay the Federal investment in water resource development. As a general rule, non-Federal agencies should construct steam plants. The Federal Government should, however, vigorously proceed to construct multipurpose projects such as the great upper Colorado storage project. And we should continue to stimulate non-Federal power agencies to expand at their current unprecedented rate.

Because an electric utility—public or private—is essentially a monopoly as a matter of economic necessity, privately owned utilities should continue to be strictly regulated in the public interest. Publicly owned utilities should be managed so as to be directly responsible to the people they serve. Neither public nor private utilities should be allowed to become mere tools for the benefit of a managerial class.

It is at the very root of our Federal system that the States and local communities have the full authority to determine whether their utilities are to be publicly or privately owned and operated. When Federal officials use their positions to attempt to control local decisions on these questions, they violate the spirit of the Constitution. Furthermore, American experience suggests that those closest to a problem are most likely to find a successful solution.

ATOMIC ENERGY

In the field of atomic energy, we shall support the teamwork principle, which has already led the world to major achievements. Republican efforts have led to the establishment of a 10-year program to continue the U.S. leadership in atomic power. Three civilian stationary nuclear powerplants are already in operation. Eight more are under construction, and another eight are planned for completion by 1965. All these plants together will have a generating capacity of more than 1.5 million kilowatts. Research and development must continue to receive strong emphasis.

The Rural Electrification Administration has enabled local REA-financed systems to meet the growing demand for electric and telephone service. For such service, the REA has my wholehearted support.

The REA was conceived as a legitimate instrument of Government to extend electrical service to rural areas. It has raised the standard of living throughout our farmlands by virtue of the fact that an REA cooperative must accept a utility responsibility for potential consumers in its area without regard for profit—a responsibility the Federal Government should not have and one private industry cannot be compelled to accept. It should continue to make loans—more than one-third of the total have been made since 1953—at interest rates which take into consideration the REA's acceptance of this responsibility, a service which expands our markets for electrical appliances, increases the national standard of living, and makes our farms the envy of the world.

PREFERENCE TO PUBLIC AGENCIES

Another Federal policy—that of preference to Federal and public agencies in the disposal of federally generated power—has been vigorously followed by the present administration. This policy gives to Federal taxpayers the first benefit of Federal instal-

lations. We are opposed to repealing this preference or to eroding it away through administrative action.

EXOTIC POWER

We commend the electric energy industry for its continuing research in all the "exotic" power fields. Already it is possible to produce magnetohydrodynamic energy and to produce electricity from chemical or heat conversion. The Federal Government should, wherever necessary, stimulate and assist basic research in such fields to develop new sources of energy.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT: MULTIPLE USE

The needs of grazing, timber, water, mining, and industrial activities should be met through multiple use of the public domain wherever consistent with the highest use of such lands. Project 2012, the Bureau of Land Management's long-range program for administering public lands, recognizes the growing value and importance of the remaining unreserved public domain. In following that program, priority should be given to classification and competitive sale of those limited amounts of land necessary to meet urban and industrial expansion in the West.

To public lands, there must be adequate public access. In addition, land exchange authorities should be used, consistent with antispeculation safeguards, to consolidate public land holdings.

Protection of our public domain requires continuous range improvement measures—detention dams, range seeding, brush control and adequate fire protection. The increased use of our land resources demands that these assets be rehabilitated and kept in top condition. A depleted range is as useless as a rundown battery, but both are capable of being restored for sustained use. Primarily, soil and moisture programs should assure preparation for variable use.

SOIL CONSERVATION

The management of our soils and that of our waters are, basically, inseparable. It is for this reason that emphasis has been given to watershed protection, and assistance and encouragement to the Nation's farmers and conservation agencies to use and maintain our soils in a manner so as to improve them and, at the same time, conserve our water resources.

The successful Great Plains conservation program should be extended to the whole Nation. This unique program has accelerated soil, water and grassland research. It has combined cost-sharing and technical assistance to help farmers and landowners adjust to climatic hazards. And it has strengthened the entire economy of the Nation. The program answers President Eisenhower's demand that a direct attack be made on the problems of the Great Plains. If we follow it, we shall not permit the Dust Bowl to return. We must not permit any area of this Nation to suffer because of the lack of a long-range permanent solution to conservation problems.

Above all, the Soil Conservation Service, which gives technical assistance to stimulate good soil conservation practices, must be given increased recognition for its vital role in America's future. There should be no penny pinching in the effort to preserve our soils, as well as our waters, forests, and other basic natural resources.

The principle of soil conservation does not recognize differences in ownership. The key to sound soil conservation lies in balanced and planned action on a watershed basis which applies equally to Government and private lands. Higher priorities have been assigned to private lands in getting soil and moisture programs underway. The time has come to step up our efforts in caring for Government lands in order to achieve the necessary balance. A job of this kind cannot be piecemeal.

COORDINATION OF RESOURCE EFFORTS

The advancement of conservation in the United States has given responsibilities to several agencies of the Federal Government. Coordination of their efforts is possible under the existing arrangement, as exemplified by recent joint conservation policy statements of the Secretaries of Defense and the Interior. What is lacking is a measure which would not only permit, but require, consistent policies and programs.

We should consider establishing a National Council on Resources and Conservation to assure coordinated consideration of national programs directed toward the wise conservation and development of our natural resources. Patterned after the National Security Council, The NCRC should be composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior. Its permanent Chairman would be the Secretary of the Interior.

This Council would eliminate one of the fundamental weaknesses of our national resources policy machinery. All conservation policies—those affecting our soils, water, timber, minerals, wildlife, fisheries, etc.—would be related to one another by coordinated action. The proper balance between conservation, development and use will be maintained by combining coordination responsibility with the authority each member of the NCRC has in his individual capacity.

The NCRC will be responsible for developing uniform policies for protecting our natural resources and assuring their replenishment. It will be an agency not only of coordination but of action. Its membership will assure immediate institution of coordinated development programs. Furthermore, the NCRC would meet at least once monthly and put out periodic reports on its progress.

Basic to the operation of the NCRC would be the pooling of talent and effort to collect, analyze and interpret the basic data necessary to program for future resource development activities. The NCRC would prepare and present a comprehensive natural resources budgetary plan; information and programing detailed by basin and watershed committees would be correlated, and procedures and policies followed by such committees should be simplified through coordinated NCRC efforts. In addition, a permanent technical staff of the NCRC could explore means to eliminate inconsistencies or conflicts in Federal resource policies and initiate or prepare staff studies on suggestions for sound resource programs. One such suggestion, recently made by the League of Women Voters, is that a development loan fund be established to encourage the establishment of State or interstate agencies to undertake river basin development. Such a fund could stimulate local and regional initiative. It could also materially reduce interstate tension by fostering cooperation instead of conflict. After studying its impact upon going programs, the Council might well recommend to the President the creation of such a fund.

One significant distinction should be noted: Democrats in the Congress have suggested a Presidential advisory council be established—an additional level of bureaucracy, without authority or responsibility, to superimpose itself in an advisory capacity upon the present administrative apparatus. We need coordination, not the creation of a powerless new agency. We need to simplify existing review procedures, not complicate them by an advisory board without authority or responsibility.

RECREATION

The recreation potential of all public lands should be developed, where possible, under cooperative agreement with non-Federal recreation agencies. A current inventory of public lands available for recreation development will be maintained. To this end, a commission of recognized conservation, resources, and land management experts should be established to inventory Federal lands now set aside for public purposes. This Commission's studies should determine the recreation reserve lands necessary to meet the Nation's future needs for parks, seashores, wildlife, and other recreational areas.

While some people attack the increased affluence of our society, it is a great satisfaction to realize that Americans in greater numbers than ever before today have the opportunity to live, travel, and enjoy recreation out of doors. Through hunting, fishing, boating, hiking, camping, bird watching, and nature study, millions upon increasing millions of Americans thus deepen their love of country and of the God-given magnificence of the expanses and scenic wonders of our section of this continent. These recreation enthusiasts more than pay their way in our economy—through increased demands for equipment, boats, station wagons, and tourist accommodations. Recreation expenditures amount to well over $43 billion annually. Increased income and more leisure time will make the demands for recreational areas soar even more. Here again, the only solution is through the effective teamwork of all echelons of government.

The Federal Government must continue to make greater provision for recreational opportunities on public domain and forest lands. We have already established long-range programs for recreational development of our national park. Funds spent on rehabilitating the national parks during the first 4 years of Mission 66 exceeded the amounts spent by Democratic administrations for 13 years prior to 1953. But more action is needed. We must act quickly to save our seashore areas of national significance. Additional national park units, such as the Prairie National Park, should be added to the system.

Despite repeated urging by the administration, the Democratic-controlled Congress refused to add to our national park system new seashore areas at Cape Cod, Mass.; Padre Island, Tex.; Oregon Dunes, Oreg.; and Point Reyes, Calif. Prolonged hearings led to the adoption of recommendations to protect the valid interests of local agencies and preserve the seashore areas from destruction through commercialization. Yet because the Democrats in control of Congress did not act, we must go through the whole process once again. This unwarranted delay costs the taxpayers money because of increases in property values. And it prevents action to preserve this heritage for future generations.

Recreation opportunities should be integrated wherever possible with water resource developments, with the assurance of clean water to provide full enjoyment of these facilities. Toward this end, I shall recommend to the Congress the enactment of a Recreation Coordination Act. One of its principal provisions will require adequate consideration of recreation in the acquisition of land for water development projects.

All agencies of this administration have endorsed the principle of wilderness preservation. To this principle, sound and effective legislation should give effect.

Recognizing that our people's demands on our scenic and historical areas will surely increase in the years to come, we have pledged to sponsor a new program, Mission 76. This 15-year program will offer technical cooperation and grants to stimulate establishment and rehabilitation of local, State, and regional park and recreational facilities; it is a program necessary to prevent the destruction of existing facilities through overuse.

NATIONAL FORESTS

The U.S. Forest Service has moved rapidly to meet changing demands for forest

facilities. "Operation Outdoors" recognizes the legitimate demands of the public for wildlife, recreation, and wilderness uses in national forests in addition to timber production and watershed control.

Dependable fire protection through fire presuppression and control work should be extended to all public forest lands. All agencies, public and private, must help to reduce the hazards caused by fire, pestilence, and disease. Increased research on the use of pesticides is necessary, however, and pest control methods should be thoroughly tested and understood before widespread use.

Our forests, public and private, are capable of providing sustained public benefits—recreation, supplies of forest products, and essential employment. Measures taken in the years to come will assure a continued favorable balance between the growth and cutting of America's forests. We must continue high quality forestry conservation to sustain maximum use of our timber resources without depletion.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

Following enactment of the administration-sponsored Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, the Fish and Wildlife Service has acquired increased stature. Competent, well trained, career bureau chiefs now direct the efforts of the Bureaus of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Commercial Fisheries. Long-range plans, now being reviewed by national conservation organizations, should be followed to completion under this new management pattern.

These long-range programs will be vigorously implemented if we have control of the new administration. The manner in which we have pursued our past pledges in these fields was demonstrated vividly in Salt Lake City recently when 15 of the leading national conservation organizations bestowed upon the Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, a Distinguished Conservation Award. I am informed that Secretary Seaton is the first Cabinet officer ever given such recognition. This action represents, to me, widespread public support of Fred Seaton's actions which have led to the establishment of 23 new national wildlife refuge areas, stopped the diversion of duck stamp funds, and assured that all revenues from duck stamps are earmarked for wildlife habitat acquisition, and brought swift enactment of sweeping amendments to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, which assure consideration of fish and wildlife improvement measures at the planning stage of water resource projects.

Wetland preservation, including the acquisition of key areas by Federal or State Governments, is mandatory.

To meet the critical need for wetland areas, a revolving loan fund should be established to be repaid by future duck stamp collections, and from revenues made available to States for habitat acquisition.

Also, we should seek congressional authorization to secure from private landowners wildlife management easements to provide encouragement to maintain wetlands. Much more could be done through coordinating soil bank activities with conservation and recreation objectives.

Sports fish have suffered similar losses of habitat. Maintenance of minimum conservation pools in reservoirs and minimum streamflows in connection with Federal water projects would increase their chances for survival. Further, we continue to urge recognition by the States of fish, wildlife, and recreation management and conservation as beneficial uses of water. Federal activities in the future must include increased research and means to preserve traditionally important spawning areas.

Primary assistance will be provided State and commercial fish hatcheries through greater emphasis on Federal research programs on fish disease, nutrition, and genetics.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

The United States has consistently produced more fish than any other country in the world. Our fishing industry produced a total catch of 5.1 billion pounds of fish in 1959, slightly less than the all-time record catch in 1956 of 5.25 billion pounds. Valued at $342 million to the fisherman, when processed and delivered, the 1959 catch sold to the consumer for over $1 billion. Almost 2 million people are directly dependent upon our fishing industry. We are also the world's largest importer of fishery products, the equivalent of over 2.5 billion pounds of fish and shellfish annually. We also export about 40 million pounds of fishery products.

Recent legislation signed by President Eisenhower will provide aid to depressed segments of the fishing industry to rebuild fishing fleets (which our laws require be constructed in the United States). We provide Federal assistance through loans for fishing vessel and gear repair where private loans are not available on a reasonable basis.

Research activities are opening new vistas for the commercial fishing industry. The increasing use of fishery products in medicines may have a substantial effect upon our daily lives. Increased Federal research in oceanography, biology, and the improvement of marketing and production is part of the long-range commercial fisheries program.

Our objective must be to conserve this resource and strengthen our commercial fishing industry. Our export market should be stimulated, perhaps through the establishment of foreign market development programs. And we should investigate the possibility of establishing a link between our fishermen and research workers similar to the Agricultural Extension Service, to aid fishermen in adapting to new methods and techniques. The fishery attaché program, thus far successful in Mexico and Japan, should be extended to other important fishing nations.

Our tariff structure for fishery products, based upon 1930 trade patterns, needs to be studied in relation to present trade patterns, which are substantially different from those existing 30 years ago. During the past 30 years, economic and technological changes have occurred which have altered the effectiveness of established duties. In addition, many imported fishery products with which our domestic industry must compete are produced at lower costs; many countries provide financial assistance in the form of subsidization, loans, and other aids. A study of the current tariff structure should be made to provide for modifications where necessary and to remedy disparities in classification and duties.

MINERALS

Our minerals industries provide this country's basic supplies for national security. Recent speeches of Democrats in the Congress indicate their continued adherence to the philosophy of the Truman administration, which held our minerals and oil and gas deposits would not be "washed or wasted away by neglect" and advocated "saving" them in the ground. The task force on economic opportunity and progress of the Republican committee on program and progress met this assertion head on in its report last year:

"While some of our needs can be met from abroad, national security requires the maximum practical effort to develop and wisely utilize our own resources. This is not simply a matter of having wealth in the ground. Even when some commodities are temporarily in excess supply—as has lately been the case with a number of domestic minerals—management and production organization must be kept at levels that will allow exploration and orderly development to be carried out. This is especially true since technical change brings about a continuous realinement of the need for particular metals and minerals."

We need to stimulate our mining industries to keep pace with the space age. Depletion allowances are not only a longstanding element in mineral economics; they have demonstrated their value as a reasonable incentive for the development of the Nation's natural mineral resources. They should be maintained at present levels. In a few select instances, such as those of oil, shale, and coal to be used for synthetic liquid fuels, depletion allowances might be increased to encourage development of new minerals industries. In addition, the existing limitation on expensing exploration costs should be removed and replaced with a new limitation of $100,000 per year per taxpayer without any other restrictions.

The expansion of research activity will promote the increased use of coal and improve the coal industry's competitive position. The Office of Coal Research, established under this administration, will do much, through a crash program for applied research, to help the industry drive forward.

As an effective means to assure full conservation and development of the latent resources of the country, as well as assisting State and local municipalities in their development programs, the Federal program of topographic and geologic mapping should be substantially accelerated.

Our strategic and critical stockpiles should be maintained and their objective constantly reviewed to assure our ability to meet national security requirements. To relieve the uncertainty of domestic mineral producers, stemming from the possibility of disposals from Government stocks of minerals and metals, consideration should be given to delegating to the Secretary of the Interior the authority to control all such disposals, and a means established for consultation with the affected producing industries.

We must increase the effort through international consultation to develop fuller awareness of the world supply and demand balance for mineral raw materials. In this way we could contribute to the increased stability of world minerals prices at satisfactory levels for the health of producing industries in the United States as well as free nations abroad.

Twice in the past 4 years, long-range minerals programs proposed by the administration were rejected by the Congress. We have, however, initiated a new minerals exploration program and increased the ability of small mines to use existing exploration expense deductions; much needs to be done to dovetail this program with the research activities necessary to the maintenance of healthy domestic mineral industries.

SUMMARY

We believe impartial historians will recognize the decade of the fifties as one which sustained conservation and resources development achievements on a scale unmatched in our history. Our objective for the sixties is intensified conservation and management for the better use of each of our resources. We must provide the support and incentives needed to meet the demands of the future. These demands will come from within—from our exploding population, which in its thrust toward higher and higher economic plateaus will call for more and more of the treasures of earth and river and sea. And these demands will come from without; from the presence of an implacable foreign foe and from the need of the free world for an America which, supremely strong in every way unremittingly increases its strength in every way, year after year after year. As these demands far surpass any which this country has ever known, in meeting them we in our time can proceed toward victories which would have seemed incredible to past generations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Utah has made a timely contribution toward clearing the misconception that partisan politics has been responsible for any lag or alleged lag in our water resource development program, especially in the Rocky Mountain area.

I have the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee subcommittee which handles the budget for the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department, and also for the civil works program of the Army Engineer Corps. Therefore I am very well acquainted with what has been accomplished during the past 6 or 8 years.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not also true that the Senator serves on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by which many programs for authorizations are considered?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes. I appreciate being reminded of that fact because there has been little if any partisanship displayed in the consideration of legislation authorizing these projects in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

That is a point I wish to emphasize. While there may be some difference of opinion as to the expedition of some of these projects, in the Columbia Basin or in the Colorado River Basin, the record shows conclusively the good progress that has been made during that period.

The majority members of these committees, particularly the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is chairman of the appropriations subcommittee which handles the public works budget, has done exceptionally fine work in trying to coordinate this resource development.

I wish to commend the Senator from Utah for his efforts to dissipate some misunderstanding which may result from the President's message, which obviously had political motivations.

I hope that in the years ahead we shall continue to have the close cooperation and coordination of the Members of Congress from our Western public land States, so that we may continue as rapidly as possible to develop fully the exceptional water and land resources which we possess.

Mr. BENNETT. I share the concern of my good friend, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the Senator from Utah on doing something that has long been overdue, namely, setting the record straight on reclamation starts, hydroelectric starts, flood control, and so forth. I know he speaks from deep interest and experience because of his long interest in the upper Colorado development.

I should like to say to my friend from Utah—to point up some additional arguments as to historic Republican interest in reclamation and hydroelectric development, and so forth—that every structure in Arizona, which had the first dam ever built under the Reclamation Act—and, by the way, we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam on March 8—carries the name of a Republican President. Every reclamation project in the State of Arizona was built or started during the administration of the Republican Party. Most of the flood control projects fall into the same category.

So I am rather surprised that President Kennedy, whom I have known for many years to be a particularly accurate man, and interested in the accuracy of his statements, should have been beguiled into saying what he said yesterday, which I think was very unfortunate indeed.

FILLING OF VACANCY ON JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, chapter 91 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, covering the organization and membership of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, specifies that the joint committee shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of whom are members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, 3 from the majority, and 2 from the minority party, to be chosen by the Committee on Finance.

A vacancy in the Senate membership was created through the retirement of the Honorable J. Allen Frear, former junior Senator from Delaware. I am pleased to announce that the Committee on Finance today unanimously approved the appointment of the Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, junior Senator from Louisiana, to fill the existing vacancy.

The other Senate members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation are HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia; ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma; JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware; and FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there is a growing interest among the citizens of our Nation to develop and foster the growth of a Peace Corps the purpose of which would be to train our youth for oversea work. This idea, though not a new one, appeals to me for if it is properly administered with the emphasis on selecting young men and women of intelligence and maturity such a program can maintain and promote the respect of our Republic in foreign countries. I say it is not a new idea for in my own State near Phoenix we have the independently financed American Institute for Foreign Trade which has for the past 15 years devoted itself to the postgraduate training of young Americans for careers abroad with U.S. international business firms and Government agencies.

The AIFT was and is the pioneer in its field, for it was here that in 1946 the original concept of a Peace Corps was born. It is still unique in practical training of its students. The Institute has been turning out select graduating classes averaging 250 a year until its alumni of about 3,000 today represents America's best trained and most highly respected corps of good will ambassadors. This is private industry's own training ground for their corps of junior executives abroad.

Currently there are 1,000 AIFT graduates overseas with business or government in 78 countries. Another 1,000 are located in some domestic facet of international trade; and about another 1,000 are in apprentice training in U.S. companies that will soon promote them into careers with their oversea subsidiaries.

There is no institution of comparable stature in the United States where determined young men may so effectively prepare themselves for a career abroad. There is no like institution to which the major U.S. international business and banking firms—about 500—come so faithfully to recruit their potential junior executives. Actually, it was U.S. corporations which in the beginning helped significantly in the development of a three-part program which has made the AIFT graduate the most cosmopolitan and knowledgable American anywhere overseas.

The American Institute for Foreign Trade each year accepts 300 prescreened college graduates who receive intensive training in practical techniques of foreign trade, practical use of foreign languages, and contemporary cultures, attitudes, economics, politics, and psychologies of nations abroad. Lectures in foreign trade and area studies are so authoritative and timely that students come to feel that they are living and working in a foreign land created almost to their specifications. Graduates have commented widely that they feel virtually indigenous within a few months after settling down in an oversea locale.

Although the Institute's placement office does not guarantee a job to any graduate, its placement record is unusually high. It is almost 80 percent. In recent years, American Institute has been unable to meet the demands of corporations for AIFT-trained specialists in fields such as engineering, chemistry, and accountancy.

The intellectual climate of the Institute is both vigorous and invigorating. It is not, however, a Valhalla for Phi Beta Kappas.

Its prescreening process departs from the idea of sifting exclusively intelligentsia per se from its applicants. At the Institute prescreening pays sharper need to general intelligence and attitude than to aptitude. Scholastic ability is accepted as a natural prerequisite and so the school authorities are able to focus attention on potential adaptability of applicants to adjust favorably to a foreign environment.

International companies trust the Institute's prescreening process because it produces stable, mature young men who, accepting postgraduate work and spending a substantial amount of money, prove the seriousness of their motivation toward an oversea career.

Wives also play an important role at the American Institute for Foreign Trade. Dr. William L. Schurz, director of area studies, and distinguished Latin American scholar, strongly urges wives

to take a course in world area and language on which their husbands are concentrating. Most of them follow his advice. Many companies have indicated their preference for young men whose wives will be almost as fully preoriented as they. Such women, say they, adjust more quickly and such quick adjustment makes a more effective and a happier employee. On the average, 50 percent of the AIFT student body is married. Wives pay no tuition.

Richard S. Roberts, newly installed 40-year-old vice president of the Institute, who has just returned from a brilliant business executive career spanning 12 years in South America, telling students he came back to AIFT [illegible] alma mater [illegible] do whatever he can to assist in training of still more Institute graduates of the kind that are exercising so great an impact upon American business in, and American relation with, the world. Viewing the limited student body of 300, Roberts said he regretted that school facilities cannot take three times as many applicants.

Mr. President, the American Institute for Foreign Trade is a unique world center of learning in foreign trade. In round numbers, and much more literally than figuratively speaking, Phoenix, Ariz., is the world's training center for foreign trade. In all probability, more American-born men who become the business leaders of trade centers around the world in the next few years will have trained specifically for their foreign careers at American Institute for Foreign Trade than in any one other school.

I think that those who propose a peace corps program can do well to study the success of AIFT and be guided accordingly in their thinking and planning.

THE INADEQUACY OF THE AIRLIFT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Washington Post editorial page has highlighted an important step forward taken by this administration, one in which the Senate is most interested, largely through the efforts of one of our Members. One of the earliest actions of the new administration was a move to reduce, in stopgap fashion, the disturbing inadequacy of our airlift. Secretary of Defense McNamara is asking for 53 more military air transport ships for early delivery for the same reason that Congress forced 50 modern transports into a reluctant department's budget last year—to hold together with bailing wire our hopelessly obsolete and inadequate military airlift in case of a brushfire war.

I congratulate the new administration on making some first steps to prepare us for such emergencies, but I want to thank especially the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who has dinned airlift deficiency into our ears and into the newspapers time after time in recent years.

As chairman of a special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate MATS and Aviation Subcommittee chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he has dramatized our lag in that committee, on the Senate floor, in Appropriations Committee meetings, in interviews, and in articles. From 1955 to 1959, he worked to modernize the airlift through a partnership of the military and commercial lines, through contracting MATS business to civil carriers who thus would build up their cargo fleets in peacetime and make them available for defense in the event of an emergency.

Meanwhile the junior Senator from Oklahoma and his subcommittee inspected MATS bases and conferred with aircraft manufacturers, airlines, and others [illegible] of a cargo plane suitable for both defense [illegible] civilian use. [illegible] from Missouri and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] jointly [illegible] to the Secretary of Defense and reported to the Senate on the condition of our MATS fleet.

The Senator from Oklahoma has dreamed of developments in air cargo which would both strengthen the Nation's defense and open a business frontier which would expand the Nation's economy, but when many parts of the industry failed to support his guaranteed loan bill for air cargo, he turned to the Appropriations Committee to strengthen military airlift through modernizing equipment. Last year, Congress went beyond the President's budget recommendations in approving not only 50 new turboprop cargo planes for MATS but also funds for the development of a dual-purpose long-range plane configurated for cargo. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma would agree with the Washington Post that funds spent for stopgap improvements must not be allowed to dilute or delay this critical devolepment work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Post editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 5, 1961]

MAKING DO

Defense Secretary McNamara's decision to order 53 more military air transport ships was wisely calculated, but it is a stopgap solution for a critical deficiency in airlift. The difficulty is that aircraft available for early delivery are far from ideally suited for long range strategic transport of men and materiel to the world's likely trouble spots.

The 30 Boeing C–135 jet transports to be delivered starting in June will give the Army its first jet troop carriers. These will be a useful addition to the mostly outmoded piston-engine fleet now available. But these jets will need long runways, which may not always be available. The 23 Lockheed turboprop planes also ordered will be in addition to 50 of these craft already on order with funds which Congress pressed on the administration last year. In various respects, these ships, too, fall short of modern airlift requirements, but they will be an improvement and they are available now.

The old administration ran the gamble that it might be possible to get by with minimum modernization of the present inadequate air transport fleet until the kind of ship that is really required is available. Funds for development were provided last year, and the civil and military authorities have recently launched a vigorous program aimed at providing a dual-purpose ship tailored to military needs. Above all, this program must go forward at maximum speed, and funds spent on stopgap improvements in the fleet must not be allowed to dilute or delay this critical development work.

In the light of the grim prospect that two of more brushfire wars could break out in widely separated parts of the world simultaneously, the United States must get itself as near ready for such a contingency as it can. The McNamara order is designed to do this. We hope Congress will back it up with the required money while not losing sight of the need for a new departure in military airlift at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I, too, should like to compliment the new administration on having taken this step to increase and perfect our airlift capabilities. It has become more and more evident that we must have such capability in small or peripheral wars. In my opinion we have not had this capability developed to the extent that it should have been developed. Although we have been fortunate in not having been engaged in any of those wars, that does not mean that we might not become engaged in one tomorrow.

As the Senator from Florida well knows, the last figures which were available on this matter showed our military airlift to be about 20 percent deficient on any D-day plus, probably, 1 or 2 days. I believe that condition has been alleviated to some extent.

However, I was happy to see that one of the first things to be done under the Kennedy administration was to increase the airlift. This will not only help us in time of war but will give the aircraft industry hope that there will be continued interest in the development of new craft. We need this development in the civilian fleet just as badly as we need it in the military fleet.

I thank not only the Kennedy administration for this interest—the Senator from Florida will realize that there will probably be more times when I will not thank the Kennedy administration—but I also thank the Senator from Florida for calling the information to our attention.

I join, too, in commending the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for his constant and dedicated interest in this matter.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Arizona. I am certain that the junior Senator from Oklahoma will deeply appreciate the Senator's commendation. The able Senator from Arizona is himself a splendid, experienced pilot—I think he is now a general in the Air Corps Reserve—and not only knows about this need from his own personal knowledge as a flier, but has given the subject much thought in connection with our Nation's defenses. I appreciate what he has said.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, before the Senate concludes its business for the day, and while the Senator from Arizona is in the Chamber, I should like to say that I have been interested, while sitting here for 4 hours today, in listen-

ing to the speeches which have been made with respect to the President's message on conservation. Two such speeches were made earlier today, one by the able junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the other made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada or possibly the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, both highly commending the President's message on conservation.

Subsequent to those speeches, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], made a speech in the nature of a criticism of the President's message on conservation.

We who come from east of the Mississippi River do not follow this subject with the same thoroughness which [illegible] Senators who come from west of the Mississippi ordinarily follow it. However, if I remember correctly, in the past 4 years the Senate has received several conservation messages and programs, which were actually approved by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In each instance—if my recollection does not fail me, and now my memory is being refreshed from the RECORD—those public work bills were vetoed. On August 10, 1956, the bill was vetoed by the then President of the United States. On April 15, 1958, there was another veto of such a bill. The third one occurred in 1959, when the bill was vetoed by the President, although finally the veto was overriden—here in the Senate, by a vote of 72 to 23.

I merely say that I have not read the message of the present President of the United States with respect to the conservation program, except as it has been reported in the press. But from what I have read about it in the press, it seems to me, at least, that President Kennedy's position is a consistent one. In 1956 and in 1958 he voted for these programs, and he did so again in 1959. In 1959, he not only voted for that bill as it was passed by the Senate, but he also voted, subsequently, to override the veto.

So now he comes along with a program which, as I gather from reading the press, rather well expresses his belief that the country must go forward with the development of conservation programs, reclamation programs, flood control programs, and similar programs.

It seems to me that the record rather eloquently evidences that the previous occupant of the White House was not so much in favor of those programs as was demonstrated by his three specific vetoes.

So I do not know what all the argument is about, except that it appears to me that in what President Kennedy is recommending and urging on the Congress, he is being consistent.

Of course, a little later, as these matters are developed before the Committee on Public Works, and then come to us, we shall have an opportunity to cast our individual votes and to make our own personal expressions.

I am confident that this administration will pursue with vigor the recommendations it has made; and I cannot help feeling that those who believe that we need programs of conservation, reclamation, flood control, and similar programs will be—as I am—generally encouraged by the message sent to Congress by President Kennedy.

Mr. President, in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Kennedy On Natural Resources," which was published today in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The bright promise of leadership exercised by President John F. Kennedy has been taking shape in the brief month since he was inaugurated; and few things he has said or done during these crowded weeks have more clearly revealed his breadth of vision in dealing with a major national policy question than his message to Congress yesterday on the coming crisis in the conservation and development of America's natural resources.

What he said about each of the separate resource problems was very much to the point, but the fact that the President grouped them in a coherent whole is what gave especial distinction to his treatment of this subject. His message showed him to be aware of the intolerable conflicts, duplications and rivalries that have for many years plagued the Federal Government's natural resource activities—he even listed some (but by no means all) of these conflicts—and he raises the hope that consistent policies based on the national welfare and not on specific vested interests will be established in these fields.

The most serious criticism we have of the broad policy statements in his message is that he led up to, but did not follow through with, a proposal that the natural resource functions of the Federal Government be grouped in one department, where they belong, instead of being scattered in innumerable separate little empires. But he did propose some executive and budgetary steps that should help to relieve if not cure this fundamental difficulty. A major reorganization in this area is an inescapable necessity. Meanwhile, the innovations he proposes in respect to coordinated direction, expert advice, scientific research, and budgetary controls all make sense.

If the President is inclined to be more enthusiastic than some of us are about big hydroelectric dam and giant flood control projects, he also laid welcome stress on less dramatic aspects of water control, such as flood-plain zoning and small watershed development.

His forest policy recognizes the serious danger of timber shortages despite optimistic statistics that have been put forth in recent years suggesting that all's well with our forest situation. The President's comments on "a program of balanced usage" for the public domain are sound; and we warmly welcome his endorsement of the pending wilderness-protection bill and of proposed new park areas. These recommendations will, we hope, be followed up by speedy action in a Congress moving under the leadership that Mr. Kennedy seems intent on giving it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think the Senator from Florida will find, if he examines the speeches made, today, in taking the President to task for his message of yesterday, that what ired the Republicans was not so much what he said, but what he openly inferred. He said flatly—although I do not know whether I now use his exact words—that President Eisenhower's lack of interest in this area had endangered lives and property.

Mr. President, I may suggest that if we wished to be equally political in connection with the presentation of a message, we might say that the last three Democratic Presidents endangered the lives and the property of the entire Nation, by not having had the country ready for war.

The Senator from Florida has referred to the vetoing of the famous "pork barrel" bills during the last several Congresses. I believe he will also recognize that the President stated that those bills contained provisions with which he would go along, but that the amounts called for were exceedingly large. Although I come from the West, I went along with the veto, although it meant the stopping of several flood-control projects in my own State. We in the West have never been particularly political in regard to the development of natural resources.

In fact, I think the Senator from Florida recognizes that probably there is no more harmonious committee on the Hill than the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As a matter of fact, we might properly call it the old school tie committee, because all of those who serve on it are from the West and are familiar with these problems. However, despite our great interest in these problems and programs, we have not maintained that the Democrats have been derelict in the performance of their duties or that we have been outstanding in the performance of ours.

I may say the Republican administration has been more active in the field of the development of hydroelectric power programs and reclamation programs than were the Democrats, in their time.

Earlier I stated that every reclamation project developed in my State bears the name of a Republican President.

I do not think the recent message from the White House would have caused any particular feeling on our part if President Kennedy had not—in, I believe, one of his few moments of carelessness—insinuated that President Eisenhower should be charged with taking action which endangered lives and property, whereas actually there has been great activity in these fields; and, in fact, there would have been more if the Democratic-controlled Congress had not insisted on sending to the White House a bill which any American citizen must admit was stuffed full with a great many projects, on many of which feasibility studies had not even been made.

So I think the President was correct in vetoing those measures time and time again.

We merely wished to get the record straight and to encourage the President

to be a little more careful, hereafter, in his choice of language.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I appreciate the suggestions the Senator from Arizona has made.

I only point out that the pork barrel bill—as he and President Kennedy now call it, and say that any reasonable and sensible person would have recognized it to be such—was vetoed, and that both of them voted in favor of overriding President Eisenhower's veto of that bill; both of them were on the majority side in the Senate, when the vote on that question was 72 to 23. In fact, neither in the Senate nor in the House do those who voted to override that veto like to have it said that they were reckless when they voted to override it.

So I cannot help but think that those Members, who were elected to the House and to the Senate by their own constituents, and who have been reelected, have some judgment. Last year it was their judgment that the bill President Eisenhower vetoed should not have been vetoed, and thus they voted to override the veto.

It is obvious that if there continue to be vetoes of conservation and reclamation bills, it will be impossible to obtain appropriations for new projects and programs of that sort, and to have new programs approved, and there will not be as many new starts as we would like to have, or not as many as would have been begun if those bills had not been vetoed.

I do not propose to engage with my friend, the Senator from Arizona, in a debate as to who is right and who is wrong. Obviously, the existence of such a difference of opinion is the reason why there is a center aisle in this Chamber, dividing the two groups of seats of Senators. As between the two groups, there is supposed to be a difference of opinion and views, in regard to how such programs should be handled and run.

So far as concerns the language which was used by President Kennedy, perhaps in this particular area my friends on the other side of the aisle are a little sensitive about it.

Frankly, I do not believe that President Kennedy would try to say that, by virtue of this situation, there was a direct causation as regards the loss of lives.

All of us know that in the absence of flood control projects, lives can be lost. Yet all of us realize that the Government cannot build great numbers of such projects throughout the country at any one time; obviously, it is necessary for other matters, including the budget, to be considered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield again to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is precisely why President Eisenhower vetoed those bills—because they were so crammed full of projects which had not been studied as regards their feasibility—so much so that we could not tell whether they were needed, or were not needed.

The Senator from Florida has alluded to the fact that the Senate finally voted to override President Eisenhower's veto. I may say that our judgment takes rather queer quirks in election years. Last year was an election year; and although I do not say my colleagues were influenced at all by the possibility of influencing a vote here or there by voting in favor of such a measure, nevertheless, on the two previous occasions when the bill was vetoed, they voted to sustain the veto; but last year—an election year—the veto was overridden, and the bill became law.

It will be interesting to see how many of the projects provided for in last year's bill will actually get underway.

I think the Senator from Florida will agree with me—and I say frankly that I do not know how he voted on the bill, last year; after all, that is his business—that it is not wise to authorize projects if we have no idea what they will cost.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would completely agree with the Senator from Arizona; and I would say the record shows that I voted to override the President's veto, whereas the able Senator from Arizona voted to sustain the President's veto; he was one of the 23 Senators who took that position.

Of course I am confident that he is satisfied that the judgment of all 23 of those Senators was the proper one, whereas I cannot help but feel that the judgment of the 72 Senators who voted in favor of overriding the veto was the proper one.

I believe that as a result of the election of a Democratic President, we are now going to have an expression of Democratic philosophy—which is, as I understand it, the philosophy of going forward, whenever feasible, in the development of any possible hydroelectric, reclamation, and flood control programs, in the belief that such programs protect the entire Nation and its property and its people.

I do not believe that the Republicans make such a claim. Perhaps they do. Maybe the Senator can tell me this; I did not know. I thought that, naturally, the Senator's position was, on the Republican side, that he did not advocate reclamation projects of the caliber and with the frequency, and so on, that we on the Democratic side did.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The record, I might say, will bear out the fact that Republicans not only have, but that there have been more reclamation starts under Republican administrations, to my understanding, than under Democratic administrations.

I may say I am happy to hear from my good friend from Florida that the Kennedy administration is going to carry on the philosophy of the Eisenhower administration in the development of our natural resources. We all want to see this done. I think the only place we will differ is in the field of public power, where we Republicans—and many Democrats, I may say, also—feel that where a private company is willing to spend millions of dollars in order to construct a large dam for hydroelectric purposes, there is no need for the Federal Government to get in the act.

I think we are finding ourselves to be pretty much in harmony.

The Senator from Florida has told me we are going to continue, as we did under the Eisenhower administration, toward full development. I told the Senator the only trouble with the Kennedy program is in being concerned with the lives and property which it is implied were endangered under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure my friend does not wish me to let stand uncontested the statement that we intend to carry on with the program of reclamation projects and natural resources programs carried on under the previous administration. I tried to point out that, to the best of my recollection, there were three vetoes of these types of bills by President Eisenhower, and the last veto in 1959, was overridden. The other two vetoes were not overridden.

So it is rather evident, from that fact, that we are not going to continue the policy of having those types of bills vetoed; so, obviously, we are not going to follow President Eisenhower's lead on that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Florida is talking about two different things, because the projects authorized and constructed under the so-called "pork barrel" bill, or the rivers and harbors bill, are construction projects that, in the main, come under the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army. What the Senator is also talking about, when he talks about new starts, is programs that come under the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. In this area, which is of real advantage to the people, and is needed in the West badly, the Republicans have a long and very successful and honorable history in reclamation and irrigation. Theodore Roosevelt was the father of the Reclamation Act in this country. Fifty years ago next March 18 we shall celebrate the opening of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam.

The Senator from Florida has tried to mix together flood control, navigation control, and other works, which, while very desirable in many parts of the country, are not comparable to what was contained in the intent of the message.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. I do not know that we could ever settle this discussion.

I stated at the outset, and I repeat in closing, that it was interesting to sit here today and hear the two commendatory speeches, and then the two critical speeches coming from my Republican friends.

As I said, I have not followed this particular subject with the close scrutiny with which I would like to have followed it, and with which I ordinarily do in subjects that more particularly pertain to my area and State; but I remember very well we had three reclamation bills—or perhaps I should not say reclamation bills, but public works bills—coming out of the Public Works Committee. The bill in 1956 was vetoed. The 1958 bill was vetoed. In 1959 the bill was vetoed. So we did not have anything getting

started or constructed by virtue of those particular programs.

There may have been other projects going along all the time, obviously, and for that we are grateful. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that, under President Kennedy, we are going to see more starts than we have seen previously. I am satisfied that in the area of reclamation we are going to see more activity and action than previously. It remains to be seen, but I earnestly hope and predict it.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1961

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the order entered last Wednesday, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under the order of Wednesday, February 22, 1961, the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 28, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 24, 1961:

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Thomas K. Finletter, of New York, to be the U.S. Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Norman M. Clapp, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Joseph D. Tydings, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maryland for a term of 4 years, vice Leon H. A. Pierson.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Charles B. Martell, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Frank Burton Ellis, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 24, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Robert E. Giles, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Najeeb E. Halaby, of California, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE
AMBASSADORS

Bernard Gufler, of Washington, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Harold E. McCall

To be ensigns

Donald B. Beach	Dee E. Kimbell
Richard B. Fallgren	David L. Osier
David A. Field	Charles K. Paul
Donald J. Florwick	Frederick W. Pierce
Gerald Fussell	John D. Reagan
Ronald K. Hanson	Neil H. Woodley

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be captains

Douglas B. Henderson	Harold Land
Robert Wilcox	Mark A. Whalen
Chester R. Bender	William F. Cass
Richard R. Smith	Roger M. Dudley
Samuel G. Guill	Albert F. Wayne
Paul E. Trimble	Chester I. Steele
Russell R. Waesche, Jr.	Clarence H. Waring, Jr.
Joseph P. Martin	Paul E. G. Prins
George W. Playdon	Edward P. Chester, Jr.
Thomas F. Epley	Larry L. Davis
Julius E. Richey	Roderick Y. Edwards
Frederick J. Statts	Arthur Pfeiffer
Alexander G. Moberg	John F. Kettler
James S. Muzzy	Benjamin F. Engel
Raymond W. Blouin	Robert Waldron
Kenneth W. Donnell	George T. Murati
Fred F. Nichols	James W. Williams
Theodore F. Knoll	William T. Corfield
Myron W. Caskey	Russell O. Foster
Forrest A. Tinsler	Charles L. Turner
Wayne L. Goff	James F. Phair
Ronald M. Freeman	Robert A. Copeland
Joseph A. Ciccolella	Clinton J. Maguire
Howard W. Schleiter	Roger B. Clark
Clarence N. Daniel	George W. Walker
Joseph W. Naab, Jr.	Frank D. Hilditch
Corliss B. Lambert	
Randolph Ridgely III	

To be commanders

Raymond W. Siegel	George J. Bodie
Harry A. Solberg	Emerson Hayes, Jr.
Robert O. Bracken	John W. McCurdy
John W. Hume	Warren F. Stevenson
Jack E. Forrester	Peter E. Gibney
Lewis R. Davison	Joseph R. Steele
John H. Hawley	Mitchell A. Perry
Carol L. Mason	Garth H. Read
Charles E. MacDowell	William E. Dennis
Elmer P. Mathison	Robert J. Lo Forte
Warren C. Mitchell	Owen W. Siler
Henry A. Campbell, Jr.	Robert B. Moore
Harold F. Lynch	Wallace C. Dahlgren
Armand J. Bush	Arthur Hancock
Lester A. Levine	Richard A. Pasciuti
John J. O'Meara	William S. Allan, Jr.
Glenn O. Thompson	Harry H. Carter
Eugene F. Walsh	Bernard E. Kolkhorst
Samuel E. Taylor	

To be lieutenant commanders

Douglas H. Clifton	David C. Porter
Allen C. Pearce	Abe H. Siemens
James H. B. Morton	Ivan C. McLean
Robert R. Hagan, Jr.	Edward G. Taylor
David D. Fritts	Franklin F. Bohlk
Oliver W. Harrison	John W. Cherry
Herbert J. Lynch	Vincent J. Wernig
Leslie M. Greig	Franklin J. Miller
Christopher S. Changaris	James G. Norman
	Russell W. Lentner
Casimir S. Rojeski	Harold A. French
James R. Iversen	William H. Yates
Philip M. Hildebrandt	Sam Pisicchio
Norman L. Scherer	Robert D. Parkhurst
Charles W. Berkman	Otto F. Unsinn
Paul W. Welker	Walter O. Henry
Loren V. Perry	Verne D. Finks
Elmer Winbeck	William L. Aitkenhead
Theodore L. Roberge	Charles F. Baker
Nathan Vanger	James P. Stewart
Charles B. Martinson, Jr.	James H. Swint
	Shirl J. Stephany
Leland O. Wilkie	Leslie D. High
John G. Milosic	Patrick G. H. Bursley
Orville C. Hinnen	Frank E. Parker
Olaf T. Sturdy	Leland C. Batdorf
Harry S. Raleigh	William F. Tighe, Jr.
Leo J. A. King	Roy K. Angell
Thomas C. Pennock	Robert C. Krulish
Hugh E. McCullough	William J. Kirkley
Hugh J. LeBlanc	Edward E. Chambers
Thurston L. Willis	Robert W. Johnson
David T. Haislip	Charles S. Marple
Stanley L. Waltzfelder	Wildred F. Raes
Harold D. Muth	Albert H. Clough
Jack E. Stewart	Randolph Ross, Jr.
James C. Boteler	Robert W. Smith
Richard L. Huxtable	David E. Perkins
Norman P. Weinert	Robertson P. Dinsmore
Rubin E. Young, Jr.	
Fred J. Michalson	Alfred J. Tatman
Richard C. Green	George N. Wood
Wesley J. Quamme	Albertus N. Schroeder, Jr.
William C. Akers	
Donald D. Davison	

To be lieutenants

William D. Harvey	Frank M. Sperry
John D. Franks	Cletus J. Walz
Bertrand J. Ronneberg	Robert F. Ewels
	Edmond Janczyk
Kermit R. Meade	Peter J. DeLaat, Jr.
Paul A. Yost, Jr.	Robert C. Branham
Henry H. Bell	Raymond H. Baetsen, Jr.
Philip C. Lutzi	Robert S. Lucas
Richard F. Malm	Robert A. Carlston
Lambert J. Larson	John F. Lobkovich
Cortland G. Pohle, Jr.	David J. Linde
John L. Klenk	Bruce W. Dewing
Earl A. Baker	Robert B. Sims
Swain L. Wilson	Gilbert P. Sherburne
Phillip B. Moberg	William J. Glass
Lawrence A. White	Herbert W. Eley
Wilfred R. Bleakly, Jr.	John D. Castello
John S. Phillips	Richard B. Brooks
James P. Randle	Donald C. Thompson
John H. Fournet	James R. Kelly
Richard O. Haughey	William S. Black
Richard L. Jacobs	Peter A. Morrill
Louis L. Zumstein	Clarence R. Gillett
Alfred P. Manning, Jr.	Charles E. Jurgens
George J. Roy, Jr.	Robert T. Platt, Jr.
Robert W. Witter	John H. Byrd, Jr.
John G. Martinez	Kenneth G. Wiman
Ted L. Gannaway	John D. Steinbacher
Robert A. Moss	David F. McIntosh, Jr.
Richard M. Thomas	Glenn N. Parsons
Daniel L. Muir	Robert V. Hackney
Graham Hall	Gerald O. Lesperance
John L. Steinmetz, Jr.	Robert G. Moore
Joseph P. Hratko	Melvin W. Hallock
Charles E. Martin	William H. Clark, Jr.
Hugh C. Wyatt	Carlton E. Russell
Robert C. Powell	Leon D. Santman
George E. Maloney	Herbert G. Lyons
Richard J. Knapp	Willie W. Thurmond, Jr.
Robert Russell	
Frederick P. Schubert	John F. Ellis
Robert B. Grant	Robert D. Peters
Norman S. Morrill	Warren D. Andrews
Byron W. Jordan	Alfred H. Walter
David M. Kaetzel	Edwin H. Daniels
Myron E. Welsh	Keith B. Schumacher

Ralph C. Hill	Paul H. Breed
Charles E. Maithieu	Richard P. Cueroni
Glenn F. Young	Arthur P. Roberts
James E. Grabb	William Russell
Edward C. Farmer, Jr.	Edmund L. Cope
Albert G. Stirling	Walter E. Paulsen
Ernest E. Rowland, Jr.	Laurence O. Bates
David H. Howland	Darrell L. Babcock
William D. Markle, Jr.	Theodore J. Wojnar
Donald C. Hintze	Donald W. Smith
Bernard A. Hoyland	George K. Greiner, Jr.
William E. Lehr, Jr.	James H. Conrad
Graeme Mann	Paul T. Anderson
Joseph M. Kelly	Edward Nelson, Jr.
Hal F. Olson	William B. Clark
Roger L. Madson	Nathaniel C. Spadafora
James A. Kearney	Arthur Solvang
Walter W. Kohl, Jr.	Calvin E. Crouch
James C. Irwin	Harry J. Oldford
Walter D. Fox	William E. Smith
Harris A. Pledger, Jr.	Donald E. Hand
William L. King	Richard Q. Lowry
Donald D. Garnett	Sydney M. Shuman
Vaughan W. Driggers	
Jerome V. Flanagan	

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert Farmer	Thomas V. Volkle
Richard H. Wight	Ronald D. Stenzel
Martin H. Daniell, Jr.	Delmar F. Smith
Edwin L. Rahn	Calvin P. Langford
James Napier, Jr.	Alvin J. Arnett
Hugh M. McCreery	Harry J. Reckitt
John B. Mahon	James E. Hognestad
Bobby C. Wilks	Horton E. Gafford

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Herbert Frank York, of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Stephen Ailes, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Harold Francis Linder, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, vice Samuel C. Waugh.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Glenn T. Seaborg, of California, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1963.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

James M. Quigley, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

John P. Duncan, Jr., of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Frank J. Welch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

U.S. ARMY

1. The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be general

Gen. Isaac Davis White, O15080, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

2. The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Francis Collins, O16819, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, O17681, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Harvey Browne, Jr., O387461.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Alvin Daugherty, O337212.

Brig. Gen. Charles Adam Ott, Jr., O428375.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Alfred Smith, O189961.

Brig. Gen. Collin P. Williams, O305510.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arthur Disbrow Bertolett, O296749, artillery.

Col. Thomas Sams Bishop, O403542, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. William Robards Buster, O947289, artillery.

Col. Lincoln Maupin Cummings, O292152, artillery.

Col. Chester Clarence Dawson, O319742, armor.

Col. Angus Ellington Irey, O358192, artillery.

Col. Ivan Edward Jackson, O289886, artillery.

Col. Joseph Nicholas Langan, O387953, infantry.

Col. Robert Francis Murphy, O369851, artillery.

Col. Ralph Sheldon Phelps, O370892, infantry.

Col. Francis Frederick Schweinler, O279772, infantry.

Col. Cecil Lee Simmons, O360399, infantry.

Col. Archibald Alexander Sproul, O406823, infantry.

Col. Herbert Alpress Vernet, Jr., O953606, infantry.

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Francis Halsey Boland, Jr., O233853.

Brig. Gen. Louis Dalhoff Burkhalter, Jr., O280416.

Brig. Gen. Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304.

Brig. Gen. Harold Friend Harding, O263728.

Brig. Gen. William James Sutton, O263659.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John George Cassidy, O309923, infantry.

Col. Stanley Warren Connelly, O4046538, Ordinance Corps.

Col. Ian MacLeod Davidson, O317046, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Theran Mc. Davis, O283688, artillery.

Col. Shelden Douglas Elliott, O519660, Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Col. Robert Morse Ewing, O307711, artillery.

Col. James Deming Hewett, O910307, infantry.

Col. Harrie Stanley Keck, O340748, infantry.

Col. Robert Paul Schulz, O330078, artillery.

Col. Clifford Max Simmang, O342139, artillery.

Col. Willard Webb, O341298, armor.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, O18722, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (colonel U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frank Hamilton Britton, O18703, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. George Thigpen Duncan, O18878, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, O18645, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Robert Augur Hewitt, O18713, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ray Joseph Laux, O42102, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Curtis James Herrick, O18538, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Michael Illig, O20330, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, U.S. Army.

Col. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Eward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard William Doan, O20057, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Alan Beresford Todd, O42088, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Patrick Howard Devine, O31975, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Edward Peters, O31646, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386, U.S. Army.

Col. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Jarvis Tolson 3d, O20826, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Henry Chiles, O20295, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, O20636, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Colonel Travis Tabor Brown, O19574, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Albert Symroski, O19753, U.S. Army.

Col. Milburn Neil Huston, O30612, U.S. Army.

Col. Horace Greeley Davison, O20650, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, O31799, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Martin Worthington, O19797, U.S. Army.

Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, Jr., O30409, U.S. Army.

Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, U.S. Army.

Col. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Charles Haneke, O20263, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The nominations beginning Creighton W. Abrams, Jr., to be colonel, and ending Alfred W. Zerries, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on February 6, 1961.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning George W. S. Abbey, to be captain, and ending Sally A. Souder, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on January 31, 1961; and

The nominations beginning Paull R. Hanson, to be captain, and ending Orey L. Lake, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the State on February 16, 1961.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 9999th Air Reserve Squadron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1961

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron has been formed on Capitol Hill for the benefit of Reserve officers of the Air Force. It meets regularly in room 1224 in the New Senate Office Building. Its formation will enable Air Force Reserve officers to earn points for retirement and promotion purposes.

So that other Members of Congress who are members of the Air Force Reserve may know of the formation of this unit, as well as staff members who may be members of the Air Force Reserve, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared relative to this squadron.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA

The 9999th Air Reserve Squadron had its first training meeting in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building on January 17, 1961.

I have the honor to be the commander of the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron which meets each Tuesday at 0800 in room 1224, New Senate Office Building. Members of Congress and staff members of congressional committees and individual Congressmen are eligible to join the squadron. Training here does not remove the reservist from his mobilization assignment. Training with this squadron provides not only an opportunity while in Washington to be a better informed Air Force reservist but also the opportunity to assure retention, promotion, and retirement.

At our first meeting we had the pleasure of receiving Gen. Thomas L. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, as our speaker. General White not only gave us an excellent status report on the U.S. Air Force but also expressed the views of Air Force reservists on Capitol Hill when he stated that the formation of this squadron was long overdue. General White has assured us that he and members of the Air Staff and major commands wish to assist in making members of this squadron the best informed reservists in the Air Force.

The squadron has been meeting for 6 weeks and in this period of training we have had outstanding speakers who have introduced us to some of the problems and some of the possible solutions facing the military forces at home and around the world.

In accordance with the U.S. Air Force concept that the best possible use of citizen airmen in our aerospace world is with an Air Reserve Force in being, the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron is training us to be able to step into our executive positions as highly qualified and knowledgeable as is humanly possible.

Speaking as a Reserve member of the Air Force, I urge all Air Force reservists in Congress or on the congressional staffs to join the 9999th to improve their knowledge so that they can make a greater contribution to our Nation and to the Air Reserve Forces.

Milwaukee Journal's Unique Editorial Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1961

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the country has been repeatedly reminded of the high esteem in which the Milwaukee Journal is regarded nationally. It has been consistently rated as one of the handful of truly outstanding papers in America.

One of several important reasons for this is the remarkably painstaking effort that goes into the expression of editorial position by this great newspaper.

Recently Paul Ringler, editorial editor of the Journal, told the Milwaukee Rotary Club how the uniquely responsible editorial page of the Journal is put together.

Mr. Ringler explained that the Journal has one of the largest editorial staffs in the country: Five editorial writers and one editorial editor, all of whom are thoroughly trained as reporters. As Ringler puts it:

Each editorial writer has his special fields. He also has secondary fields so that there are, at all times, two men who can handle any major subject. Here are the primary fields of one writer: Education (with athletics and recreation), veterans' affairs, conservation, agriculture, amusements, medical care and general safety, transportation, including railroads and aviation, civil defense, penology, corrections and delinquency and public health.

Mr. Ringler calls research by all odds the most time-consuming function of these five editorial writers. Research on the Journal consists of some imaginative extensions of inquiry—not simply trips to the Journal's morgue, but—in Mr. Ringler's words:

We try to keep one man or another traveling at all times. Last year we had men in Japan and Korea, Soviet Russia, and in the Middle East and Mediterranean areas. Two editorial writers attended both national political conventions at Los Angeles and Chicago. One was at the Governors' Conference at Glacier National Park. One attended the recent White House Conference on the Aging in Washington.

We have a man visiting the legislature at Madison almost every week. One makes regular trips into the State for material. Another makes regular Washington trips to renew contacts in the White House, the State Department and other departments and in Congress.

Mr. President, these are editorial writers—not reporters—who do all this extensive personal research so that Journal editorials will be based on as thorough and complete an understanding of the

perplexing problems in this increasingly complex world as possible.

Mr. President, this Senator has high esteem for what I regard as another great Wisconsin newspaper—the Capital Times of Madison. I worked on the Capital Times as a reporter, something of which I shall always be proud. I am convinced that no paper in America more consistently crusades in the cause of humanitarian idealism than does the Capital Times. I love Bill Evjue's great paper for this.

But, Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal has a different attitude toward its responsibility. Again let Mr. Ringler tell it:

> The Journal editorial sometimes seeks to persuade, usually in a low key, although we can sound the trumpet if the cause deserves it. Most often, however, an editorial tries to inform, to interpret, to educate. We try to guide the reader's understanding of certain situations—to speculate for him on the outcome of proposed measure, to explain the desirability or necessity of certain policies, to expose sometimes hitherto unseen or unsuspected infringements on freedom, justice or integrity in public life.

Mr. President, anyone reading this article can begin to understand what a great force for developing an informed, reasoned, understanding opinion Wisconsin citizens have in the Milwaukee Journal.

The Soviet Fisheries Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, our fisheries industry is in trouble and unless remedial action is taken it is going to be in more serious trouble in the years to come.

Our catch last year, totaling 4,850 million pounds, was less than that of 1959 by 272 million pounds; less than that of 1956 by 400 million pounds; less, in fact, than that of 1950—10 years earlier, or for that matter in 1941 on the eve of World War II.

Meanwhile population has grown, consumption of food fish has grown, and consumption of fisheries products used for industrial purposes has grown. But our fisheries have declined. Understandably, the gap between production and consumption has been filled by imports.

I think you will agree that this is not a satisfactory situation to any of us.

Actually our fisheries production, with minor fluctuations, has remained about the same for the past 25 years on the overall, although some branches of the industry, notably the salmon and menhaden fisheries, have dropped sharply.

Why have our fisheries stopped growing when those of other nations are expanding?

There are several reasons which have been frequently examined by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and its Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, both of which I am chairman.

One is the decline of fisheries research and exploration on the high seas by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, which has this responsibility. This decline results in large measure from our lack of oceangoing scientific vessels from which to conduct such research.

Back of that was a policy, which I expect to change under the present administration, of providing the Bureau a bare minimum of funds for fisheries research operations and no funds at all for new research vessels.

The unfortunate thing about this policy is that it occurred at a time when every other large maritime nation, including Russia, East Germany, and Communist China has expanded and modernized their fisheries research and, with respect to the first two named, their commercial fishing fleets.

A second reason is that our own commercial fishing vessels are becoming old and obsolete with their owners unable to replace them because of diminishing returns and dwindling prospects for revival of the industry.

A third reason, and one which contributes substantially to the diminishing returns, has been the impact of foreign competition, both in the marketplace and in rich fishing grounds adjacent to our continent.

Soviet Russia within the past few years has entered the contest to harvest the nearby treasures of the sea; has entered this contest with great vigor, and frankly states it intends to increase this competition rapidly and effectively with superior ships and research.

A report prepared for me by authoritative Government officials states, and I quote:

> Currently, the Soviet fishing industry which, prior to World War II, was primarily a coastal operation, has progressed to the point where today the U.S.S.R. possesses the world's largest and most modern oceangoing fishing fleet.
>
> As of December 31, 1960, it is estimated that the Soviet high seas fishing fleet consisted of about 3,400 ships totaling approximately 1,330,000 GRT (gross register tons), ranging from 100 to 3,170 GRT.

In 1959 we had 12,109 fishing vessels in all categories with a total net tonnage of 246,445 tons, or an average of 20⅓ tons. As a further disability our ships are small and old while most of Russia's fisheries vessels are large, new, and modern.

The report prepared for me contained some surprising information, but none more so than the relative catch of the United States and other nations on the Grand Banks off Newfoundland, one of the historic fishing grounds of our people that dates back to our colonial period.

This is represented by a table which I reproduce at this point in my remarks. It will be of particular interest to my New England colleagues. Later in my remarks I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire report.

The table follows:

Total 1959 catch on the Grand Banks

Country:	Percent
Canada	35.0
Soviet Union	24.5
United States	2.4
All other	38.1
Total	100.0

Mr. President, what is to be our answer to this threat to an industry which has in the past produced income to our fishermen of approximately $350 million annually, but which now appears in decline, with a drop of $25 million from 1958 in 1959, and a further drop anticipated for 1960 because of the smaller catch.

One answer is more and better fisheries research and considerably more exploration. More research not only should be conducted on the ecology, genetics, and mortality of food fish, their migratory patterns, nutrient requirements, and afflictions, but also on utilization of scrap fish and byproducts for industrial purposes.

More exploration should be conducted to locate new and possibly more distant fishing areas of value where our fishermen, when and if they find it possible to acquire better oceangoing vessels, can join other nations in bringing this wealth from the sea.

On Thursday, February 9, I introduced S. 901, to establish a national 10-year program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research and surveys.

This program would include 5 Departments and 15 agencies. Sections 5 and 6 of the bill relate specifically to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and are, therefore, of particular importance to our fisheries industry.

These fisheries sections would, among other things, authorize the Bureau to increase and modernize its aging, deteriorating, and diminishing fleet of small and ill-equipped research and exploratory vessels and to intensify its scientific studies of our marine resources.

Other aspects of the problem of restoring the American fisheries industry to full vigor and prosperity will be considered by the committee also during the present session.

The Nation's welfare and economy demand that we not forfeit the treasures of the ocean which lie just outside our shores.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the report previously referred to, titled "The Soviet Fishing Industry."

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET FISHING INDUSTRY

I. HISTORY

In tsarist Russia, fishing was conducted primarily from shore, in small sailing craft, or from rowboats. Subsequent to the 1917 revolution, however, the Communist regime undertook to mechanize and enlarge fishing operations. This resulted in the replacement of obsolete fishing vessels by diesel and gasoline-powered craft in some areas. During the first 5-year plan (1928–32), particular emphasis was placed on the establishment of a large trawler fleet for operations in

the Barents Sea and to increasing the size of the Far East fleet. Emphasis was placed on the construction of 360-ton trawlers for these areas. The second and third 5-year plans provided for further modernization of the fishing fleets. The third 5-year plan was interrupted by World War II, resulting in a serious retardation of plans for the expansion of the Soviet fishing fleet.

During the war an estimated 200,000 tons of fishing vessels were destroyed, primarily in the Caspian and Black Seas as well as in the Sea of Azov. As a means of rapidly rebuilding the fishing fleet, the fourth 5-year plan (1946–50) called for the standardization of ship construction. Specifically the plan provided for the addition of 150 trawlers, 3,500 motor vessels (not otherwise described), and 10,000 sail and motor boats.

Substantive development, however, dates from 1950 when satellite shipyards, primarily those of East Germany began delivering new fishing trawlers to the U.S.S.R.

Currently, the Soviet fishing industry which, prior to World War II, was primarily a coastal operation, has progressed to the point where today the U.S.S.R. possesses the world's largest and most modern ocean-going fishing fleet. As of December 31, 1960, it is estimated that the Soviet high seas fishing fleet consisted of about 3,400 ships totaling approximately 1,330,000 GRT (gross register tons), ranging from 100 to 3,170 GRT.

II. ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE

The U.S.S.R. depends heavily on the success of its fishing industry to meet the food requirements of its population. Approximately 25 percent of the animal protein consumed in the U.S.S.R. comes from fish, including those caught in internal waters. The industry is the mainstay of most coastal communities and even some cities such as Murmansk.

The 1959 Soviet fish catch was 3 million metric tons, which places it third after Japan and Communist China as a fishing nation. By the end of 1965 it is planned to increase the catch to 4½ million tons.

III. FISHING ACTIVITIES

A. Comparison by country

The total high seas fish catch for 1958 was 32,673,000 tons, 25 percent of which represented the combined catch of the Sino-Soviet bloc. The Soviet catch, 2,931,000 tons (9 percent of the total) was exceeded only by the Japanese and Chinese Communist catches which totaled 5,505,000 tons and 4,060,000 tons, respectively. The U.S. catch totaled 2,697,300 tons, or about 8.5 percent of the world catch.

With respect to the total world fish catch, the Soviet Union catches only slightly more than the United States. This is unusual and significant when it is noted that the Soviet fishing fleet is considerably larger than the U.S. fleet in terms of total tonnage as well as the size of many of its individual units.

Other important catches by free world countries were Norway with 1,415,000 tons, India with 1,064,400 tons, and Canada with a total catch of 1,033,100 tons.

While official figures have not been received, the world catches for 1959 and 1960 are estimated at 34 and 36 million tons, respectively. It is further estimated that United States and Soviet catches for these 2 years maintained approximately the same relative positions in respect to the total.

B. Fishery research

Fishery research in the Soviet Union appears to be a highly organized effort employing several thousand scientific and nonprofessional personnel both ashore and afloat. Field organizations are maintained in 13 locations in the northern area, the Baltic, Black and Caspian Seas, and the Far East. Precisely, they are to be found in the cities of Murmansk, Riga, Kerch, Batumi, Baku, Krasnoarmeisk (near Moscow), Vladivostok, Leningrad (subcenter at Kalinin-grad), Tallin, Rostov, Astrakhan, Makhachkhala, and Aralsk. Each field organization maintains its own laboratory for the study of ichthyology, applied hydrobiology, genetics of fish, fishing gear, economics, and technology.

There are three different groups which engage in fishing research in the Soviet Union, viz, the universities and the Academy of Science, which devote their attention to the theoretical aspects of fisheries research, and government agencies which are concerned directly with problems relating to the industry and conservation. All biological aspects of fisheries research are coordinated by a central ichthyological committee under the presidium of the Academy of Science. The membership of this committee is composed of representatives from the Academy of Science, the Ministry of Higher Education, and from each of several fisheries research units. There are several local ichthyological committees established in various parts of the country which coordinate research activities on the local level, one such committee being located in Leningrad. Representation on the local committee is similar to that of the central committee.

The All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography (VNIRO) has regional laboratories located throughout the Soviet Union. Two of the most important laboratories are the Polar Institute (PINRO) located at Murmansk, and the Pacific Institute (TINRO) located at Vladivostok. PINRO is responsible for research in North Atlantic fisheries problems while TINRO coordinates research activities in the North Pacific. VNIRO and its laboratories (1) study a large complex of biological problems generally providing for the assessment of the present condition and the future potential of the stocks of fish, (2) undertake technological studies leading toward improved and more efficient methods of processing fish, and (3) study the economics of the fisheries bearing on the formulation of future plans. Scientific personnel in the central agency review plans and results of the research conducted in the field, and assemble information on the population dynamics of the commercially important marine fish in order to forecast the desired amount of catch for the following year (basis for the quota system).

While fisheries research institutes are located at ports in the White, Baltic, Black, and Caspian Seas, as well as at Vladivostok in the Pacific area, only the activities of the latter will be described in some detail as representative of the organizational and operational structure of Soviet fisheries research.

The Pacific Scientific Institute of Fisheries and Oceanography (TINRO), with four branch laboratories at Kamchatka, Magadan, Sakhalin Island, and Khabarovsk is the governmental fisheries research agency of the Soviet Union in the Far East. TINRO operates 15 oceanographic, biological, and exploratory research vessels in the Pacific area. Oceanographic ships, of which three were stationed at Vladivostok early in 1960, operate generally from March to August. Observations at each station include sea water samples at graduated depths from which determinations of temperature, salinity, and pH are made. Plankton tows are also made at each station.

In addition to a headquarters ship based at Vladivostok, each branch laboratory operates a biological research ship for a total of five in the Pacific area. These vessels, probably converted trawlers, conduct biological studies of salmon, herring, and bottom fish aimed at determining the effect of environment on abundance and survival. Collection of fish and plankton together with certain oceanographic observations is the usual type of work conducted aboard these ships. Salmon was the principal fish studied in these areas.

The activities of the exploratory vessels are closely associated with the commercial fisheries. These ships are specifically employed in locating optimum fishing areas and the development of related information which would aid in the increase of the catch. Although operated and maintained by the SOVNARKHOZ (National Economic Council), at least two scientists are aboard each ship for the purpose of making biological and oceanographic observations. A total of seven or eight exploratory vessels operate in the Pacific area. It should be noted that Soviet fishery research vessels operate independently as well as in company with the flotillas during fishing operations.

In 1957 the Soviet Union became a member of the International Commission for Research of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and is bound by agreement to adhere to the Commission's conservation measures governing cod and haddock. Initially three Soviet trawlers, with scientific equipment, participated in the research program conducted in the conservation areas covered by this Commission.

Since 1952 observations have been made by Soviet scientists from a bathysphere in the Barents Sea for the purpose of studying fish and other fauna. From these observations, they report that much information has been gained on the migration, behavior, distribution, and feeding habits of fish. The bathysphere has also been used to observe the action of trawls on the seabed. Observations on the action of trawls are made by towing the sphere in shallow water at about 3 knots speed, thus obtaining a continuous changing picture of the ocean bottom and of the fauna.

Extensive scientific-fishing research and prospecting for big shoals of fish is under way in the waters of the North Atlantic. Investigations in these waters are being conducted by units responsible to the Polar Research Institute of the Fishing Industry and Oceanography. Fish prospecting is directly under the jurisdiction of the fisheries concerned. There is a service prospecting for demersal, or bottom-feeding fish, which keep the trawler fleet informed. Another prospects for herring. In the summer, herring prospecting is conducted from the air off the coast of Murmansk. All vessels engaged in prospecting for fish are fitted out with vertically and horizontally acting echo-sounding equipment.

During the past few years, Soviet scientists, working in close collaboration with fishery experts, have discovered many new trawling and drifting grounds in the Barents Sea as well as beyond its confines. Of great interest as trawling grounds are the northern and northwestern waters of this sea, which have been opened to fishing during the past few years. These waters, to which large shoals of cod migrate in the summer, are occupying an even more prominent place in the Soviet Union's trawler fisheries.

Prior to World War II, the Polar Institute conducted a great deal of research into the biology of herring encountered in the Barents Sea. The regularity of movement of this variety of fish made it possible to work out rational procedures for conducting the catch.

Extensive observations of the distribution and migration of adult Atlantic-Scandinavian herring have been made by the Polar Institute and the fish prospecting service in the North Atlantic, where mass marking of herring is conducted annually. This has made it possible to define more accurately

the routes of migration between feeding and spawning grounds.

IV. AREAS AND PATTERNS OF OPERATIONS

A. General

The operating areas of the Soviet fishing fleet, for which there is sufficient information to develop operational patterns, are as follows:

1. An area of the North Atlantic (Norwegian Sea) bounded by Jan Mayen Island, Iceland, a point about 200 miles southwest of the Faeroes Islands, the Shetland Islands, and the western coast of Norway northward to the Arctic Circle.

2. The Bering Sea.

3. The Newfoundland Grand Banks-Flemish Cap area.

4. An area extending from Cape Verde Islands to the coast of Ghana in the South Atlantic (Gulf of Guinea).

In all of the above areas Soviet fishing trawlers are in an excellent position for the collection of electronics intelligence.

There are several areas on which little information is available as to the operational patterns of the Soviet fishing fleets such as the Far East, the Barents Sea, the Baltic and North Seas, the Caspian and Black Seas, and the Davis Strait west of Greenland where fish research is apparently being conducted.

A comparison of Canadian, United States, and Soviet fishing activity in the northwest Atlantic shows that Canada took 31 percent of the total catch in 1959, the United States 13.2 percent, and the U.S.S.R. 10.5 percent. However, on the Grand Banks the percent of total catch for the above countries was as follows:

Country:	*Percent*
Canada	35.0
Soviet Union	24.5
United States	2.4
Other	38.1
Total	100.0

The Relationship of the Government's Fiscal, Social, and Foreign Policies to the Present State of the National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1961

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], delivered an important address last Friday at a meeting of the La Porte-Bayshore Chamber of Commerce in his State.

The Senator's remarks were a thoughtful and soul-searching examination of the relationship of Government fiscal, social, and foreign policies to the present state of the national economy. He ably discussed what he considers basic sources of our national weaknesses and our national strength.

Mr. President, whether or not one shares the views of the Senator from Texas, any fair-minded person will profit by reading a frank and forceful exposition of those views. To make this able speech available to every section of the country, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the Senator's remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR WILLIAM A. BLAKLEY, LA PORTE-BAYSHORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1961

In Texas—and especially in this part of Texas—it is very difficult to be pessimistic about the future of our country.

In Washington—where a new plan for saving the country pops up every hour on the hour—pessimism is not always so difficult.

I hasten to say that I am not a pessimist, either in Texas or in Washington.

I believe—I know—that our Nation faces grave problems at home and abroad. I am confident that we can solve them.

This confidence grows stronger whenever I come to the gulf coast, where such cities as La Porte are building great strength into the economy through the efforts of their own people.

This is a great section of our great State.

Yours is a region where full advantage is being taken by forward-looking people of tremendous natural resources, wisely used.

It is a region that exemplifies as well as any in our land what can be accomplished under the free enterprise system.

That is important. We need such examples.

We need these examples badly at this time to refute defeatist claims that our way of life is finished—done for—no longer capable of meeting the needs of the American people.

Such claims are made you know—made frequently and loudly.

Just a few days before I came down here from Washington, a professor who is well known as an economic adviser to the President of the United States made an incredible statement.

He said publicly that a welfare state is the best defense against communism.

I reject that statement—utterly. I know you will not accept it.

A welfare state offers no defense at all against communism.

On the contrary, a welfare state is almost sure to pave the way for a Communist takeover by weakening its people and taking away their self-reliance.

A welfare state promises cradle-to-the-grave security.

But it cannot provide any lasting security, and it cannot protect individual freedom.

A welfare state promises something for nothing. But that promise is economically impossible to keep.

Our free enterprise America provides something for something—not just promises.

It provides opportunity for every individual.

It protects the freedom of every individual.

The welfare state's appeal is to the weakly dependent, who no matter how much they are given never think it is enough.

The free enterprise system appeals to constructive builders, who know that they gain most by contributing most.

The choice between the two could never be difficult for men and women reared in the Texas tradition.

Now, we do today confront problems of the utmost seriousness.

We do not need to let these problems scare us.

But we cannot afford, either, to shrug them off and pretend they do not exist.

Why should we? We have met, and met successfully, many difficult problems during our national existence.

There is—presently foremost in the minds of many Americans—the problem of the economic recession.

It would be futile to deny that we are in a recession. I suspect it is not as threatening as some of the theoretical planners would have us believe. I know it is not as pronounced in Texas as in some other areas; but its effects are being felt even here.

Not much comfort—but perhaps some wisdom—is to be gained from realizing that this recession is self-induced. We brought it on ourselves.

Ever since the end of the war, our Federal Government has been on a wild spending spree. This recession is the inevitable morning after.

The Federal Government has been spending more than we can afford here at home.

We also have been sending our dollars all over the world.

Nearly $80 billion have been spent on the foreign aid program since the end of the war.

Many of these dollars have gone to nations whose governments are committed to anti-freedom ideologies. Many of these dollars have been used to create competitors for our own made-in-America products.

Our Government has been doing what our fathers used to warn us against when they took us to town on Saturday afternoon. We have been spending our money foolishly.

As a Nation, we have been spending on an unbalanced plan. We have been spending on nonessentials. We have been spending what we do not have.

That is one of the worst aspects of the situation—that our Government has been living to such a large extent on borrowed money. What we can afford to spend, we should pay for as we go along.

Now, we can—and we will—come out of this self-inclined recession. But the way out is not by the same route that we have been following. We are going to have to turn around, and the sooner we do it the better for all of us.

I do not believe the recession can be conquered by grandiose plans calling for more Federal spending and continued deficit financing for an increased national debt.

We can beat this recession—yes.

But we can beat it only by productive work that will result in greater earnings by our people and a higher income for the Nation as a whole.

You are men of business.

You know that productive work promotes sound expansion of the national economy. This growth produces income.

That is how lasting wealth—real wealth—has been created throughout the history of our country.

Wealth is not just money in the bank or stock certificates in a safety deposit box. These are only symbols of wealth.

Real wealth consists of men and women at work on jobs that produce needed goods and services.

It consists of the sound utilization of natural resources—as they are used in the gulf coast region.

It consists of mutually profitable trade between individuals and between nations.

That is real wealth. Recession or no recession, we have much of it in this country.

There is a paradox in the fact that unemployment grows as living standards reach new highs. We cannot ignore the fact that the number of workers who are unable to find jobs is close to 5,400,000.

But let us not ignore the other fact that 67,000,000 Americans do have jobs.

Our economy last year produced the astounding total of $505 billion in goods and services.

That is not a record of failure.

That accomplishment could not have been marked up by an economy that is finished and done for.

Still, the full economic capacity of the country is not being utilized. National production has been growing at the rate of 2.5 percent a year. I agree with those who say this is not high enough.

We can do more.

We need to do more. Let us remember that the man who seeks in vain for a job does not feel that he is in a recession.

He knows he is in a depression. I mean growth—by production—not increased figures or totals of dollar numbers by inflation.

Production is the answer to the recession. Production by labor—production by capital. Sound economic growth is the answer to inflation. A squinched up economy is not in the American tradition.

In the field of money, adequate credit at reasonable rates of interest must be provided. That is of basic importance.

In thinking of the state of our economy, we need to keep in mind that we cannot equitably compare the value of the dollar today with its value 20 years ago. Such comparisons are theoretical and largely meaningless.

It is true, of course, that our Government has the responsibility of seeing that a sound dollar—a sound currency—is maintained.

It is true, also, that the integrity of the American dollar is at present under heavy attack around the world. That is another of our immediate national problems.

The drain on our gold resources has been steady and continuing.

I will suggest one possible answer to those foreign nations that are calling for our gold.

We might well say to them: "If you do not need our dollars, please use those you are getting and those you have to pay the debt you owe us."

These nations cannot justifiably plead poverty if they wish only to get our dollars to invest them in gold bars.

The dollar has been theoretically said to be weakened. Fortunately it is still from all standpoints the strongest currency in the world.

We can keep it strong if we stop giving away our national treasure to foreign countries and pay our way as we go.

And we must get the financial affairs of our Government in order here at home—and keep them in order.

We can do these things.

We can—if we will.

There is, in my earnest opinion, no limit to what America can do except the limits of the will and the resourcefulness of the American people. The people themselves can set that limit. And only the people can set it.

Not all our problems have to do with money.

The problem that stands out above all others has to do with keeping freedom alive in the world.

Basically, this is a problem only in that it calls for us to make a decision.

We have to decide whether we shall maintain and preserve freedom for ourselves and the generations to come after us.

Freedom is being eroded in America today. Our own apathy and complacency have permitted shocking inroads to be made upon our fundamental rights.

Individual rights have been invaded.

The rights of the sovereign States have been attacked so viciously that in many areas they can hardly be said longer to exist. As an example, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the States cannot enforce laws designed to control subversive activities.

Some of my friends tell me that the people of Texas do not want to hear further talk about the U.S. Constitution and how it has been violated. That it is mundane and uninteresting to hear further about States rights and the desirability for protecting and perpetuating local self-government.

I would hate to think they are right.

The Constitution is the fountainhead of our liberties—our guarantee of freedom in government, freedom of enterprise, and individual freedom.

Let us remember that the first settlers came to America to escape oppression in the Old World. When they founded a new nation, the wisest among them drew up a Constitution that established a government under which freedom flourished.

Under this system of freedom, a strong and vigorous society sprang into existence. It turned out that freedom was not good for men's souls alone—it was good for their material well-being as well.

America became the promised land to the rest of the world's teeming millions. They came here in such numbers that eventually we found it necessary to enact reasonable laws to regulate the flow.

Then an odd thing happened.

Some of those among this new population began to cry for changes in the very system that had made the United States so attractive to them. They felt that the Constitution should be changed to meet some immediate desire. They became impatient with the restrictions the Constitution places on Government.

They became impatient with the provisions in the document itself for its own change. They sought to bring about—and in many instances have brought about—changes by interpretation rather than in response to the will of the people as intended by the Constitution.

The restrictions in the Constitution are important and necessary.

If Government is not restricted, it becomes the master—not the servant—of the people.

We have seen evidence of that truth in recent years—until now we have reached the point at which a man high in the counsels of the Government offers seriously the proposition that a welfare State is the best defense against communism.

We find that there is widespread acceptance of the idea that the purpose of Government is to support the people.

We find many Americans embracing the notion that they no longer have to earn a living—that Government will take care of them without the necessity of their making any productive effort of their own.

We find vociferous support for the concept of a strong central government, with all that means in destruction of the rights of the States—rights clearly set forth in the Constitution in these words:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

As the rights of the States have been weakened, so have the rights of the individual citizen been whittled away.

Ask yourself:

Can an American farmer today plan whatever crops he chooses in whatever quantity he chooses?

Can the American businessman deal with the individual employee as to terms of his employment?

Can a salaried person say that he will provide for his own old age without making use of the social security system?

You know the answers as well as I do.

What can we do about it?

The first answer is that Americans who are concerned about maintaining freedom must express their concern.

They must express it in their choice of public officials. They must express it to their public officials.

Leaders of the Communist Party, United States of America, openly boast that within 48 hours after they give the word they can have Congress or the White House flooded with 100,000 telegrams on any given issue.

Can the profreedom forces do as well?

If freedom is ever lost in America, it will be Americans who are the cause of its loss—and, in my judgment, the loss will be brought about from within and not imposed from without.

It is our responsibility—our obligation—yes, our great opportunity—to save freedom.

Once at a crucial moment during the American Revolution, Gen. George Washington issued the order: "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

It is an order we might well give ourselves in this year of 1961:

"None but Americans on guard"—this day and this night.

Water Needs and Water Law: The Need for Mutual Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last December I had the honor to speak in Los Angeles before the Irrigation Districts Association of California. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at that time be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER NEEDS AND WATER LAW: THE NEED FOR MUTUAL DEVELOPMENT

(Address of U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, to the Irrigation Districts Association of California Fall Convention of its 50th year, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles, Wednesday, December 7, 1960)

President Hansen, Secretary Bob Durbrow, and members and guests of the Irrigation Districts Association of California, I was delighted to receive the kind invitation of your executive committee to appear before this gathering on its 50th golden anniversary and share with you some of my thoughts on the so-called Federal-State water rights problem. It is a subject that must be of vital concern to all Californians, whether they be irrigators of our land or urban and industrial consumers of the Nation's most precious resource—our water. Indeed, the challenges that confront us in the whole water resource area and the relationships that exist between the Federal and State governments in the common effort to meet those challenges are ones that must concern every American. No longer is it just the rapidly growing West that is short of water but our eastern cities and farmland as well.

Your invitation reached me shortly before I left for Paris as a delegate to the Parliamentarians' Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. If I might, for a moment, I would like to relate some of the insights which I gained from that meeting and tell you that I came away more convinced than ever as to the value of the American system of free competitive enterprise, which encourages community and local initiative in order to fully develop both our human and natural resources. Later, I would like to show what we have accomplished in the water resource field by the implementation of this faith in community and local initiative. And I should like also to dwell on some actions undertaken by some representatives of our Federal Government whose experience in water development has largely been one of devising legal theories which, if adopted by our courts, would hamper future progress in this vital area.

* * * * *

Any venture to Europe, and especially after consulting with my legislative colleagues in this major alliance of the free world, makes me ever more aware of the challenges posed by the Soviet regime and its satellites. We

all realize the strides that have been made by the U.S.S.R. in applied scientific technology. Expansion is also being undertaken by the Soviet in the development of irrigation works—for example, when constructed, one canal is reported to be about 1,000 miles long and will result in the irrigation of almost 5 million acres. Although irrigation has taken second place to Russia's desire to develop hydroelectric power, her total irrigated acreage has almost tripled in the last three decades, from over 10 million acres in 1928 to almost 30 million in recent years.

In this important field of irrigation with which you are especially concerned, much can be done to aid our free friends throughout the world, particularly in the underdeveloped and uncommitted areas, by exporting our experience, technology and know-how. We can also help to train here the hundreds of foreign technicians who come to study our water and irrigation practices.

Only a few weeks ago some of your members, among them our mutual friend, Bert Smith, participated in an all-day meeting in Sacramento with Japanese irrigation technicians. This fruitful effort will mean much to bridge the gap between our way of life and those areas of the Near East, north Africa, south Asia, and the Far East, as well as our Western Hemisphere, where all are striving to produce adequate food supplies to meet the needs of the people and to sustain their own way of life.

In April 1959, the Senate established a Select Committee on National Water Resources, which eventually grew to 17 members. My friend, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, was elected chairman at the opening meeting and I was honored with the vice chairmanship. My service with this group has provided an invaluable perspective in terms of the water needs of both our Nation and State. Our committee had 92 studies made ranging from such broad areas as national water resources and problems to such technical subjects as river forecasting and hydrometeorological analysis. Besides the Washington hearings, 22 sessions were held in 19 States. Members traveled 25,000 miles to secure the views of almost a thousand experts and interested citizens including all 50 of our State Governors.

In our study of the precious commodity of water, upon which our human existence depends, we have looked toward optimum development of our resources through encouragement of State and local initiative in planning and implementation. We have attempted to designate areas in which research programs could be initiated, expanded, and undertaken by operating organizations as well as by our universities and colleges. We have recognized that these research efforts must utilize the talents of not only those skilled in engineering and the physical sciences, but also of those educated in economics and the social sciences. We have recognized that there is a real need for the periodic appraisal of our water supply in order that we might more effectively utilize that supply.

Perhaps above all, we saw that there is an immediate need for better public understanding of our national and State water problems. With falling water tables and an exploding population in many areas, we, here in California, are probably more informed than most as to the adequacy of our water supply. Concerning our own State, who can say that our growth in human and economic resources is at its halfway mark or even really begun? Let us reflect on some of the projections that show that the growing demands of our population, agriculture, and industry are pushing us ever nearer to the potential limits of the water supply with which nature has provided us.

In terms of economic growth, we now have a gross national product of $500 billion annually. By 1980, economic exports foresee, based on an annual rate of increase similar to our present one, that we will have a $1,060 billion economy and by the year 2000 it will again have doubled to $2,200 billion. Who would have believed such material growth possible just a few decades ago when many had lost hope in our ability to provide an abundant life?

Similarly, our population growth will rapidly move upward although its rate of increase will not be as great as that of the economic sector. Conservative estimates indicate that in 1980 there will be 244 million Americans and that only 2 decades later, at the dawn of the next century, we will have almost 320 million Americans.

Obviously, California will be a leading element in this expansion. Statisticians predict that our State will almost double its inhabitants in the next 2 decades from our present approximately 16 million to upward of 30 million in 1980. And in the first few years of the coming 21st century, we should reach the 50 million mark. Our industrial and agricultural growth will be as great.

This is not a far-off challenge which we can politely listen to and forget about—this is an immediate challenge—the challenge of the 1960's, a decade in which 26 million young Americans will enter our labor force for the first time. To meet this challenge, we must understand, plan, and act now with prudence and intelligence.

This means in the first instance, that we must have the right amount and quality of water at the right place at the right time if we are to fulfill our human, industrial, and agricultural demands. In California, we are acutely aware of this geographical imbalance since as you know two-thirds of the water is in the northern one-third of our land area. This is the obstacle which we are slowly surmounting with the Central Valley project, the developments of the State water plan in which both Federal and State Governments will cooperate, and in community and private projects of which you are all aware. In this regard, may I congratulate my fellow citizens for voting approval, as a first step, of the recent $1,750 million Water Resources Development Bond Act. I hope that our State government will proceed with courage and reason. With a spirit of equity in the implementation of the program which this act authorizes, with good will and mutual understanding by citizens in all parts of our State, we will be on the road toward constructive achievement. There can be no thought of north and south in our California if our State is to go forward and prosper. This spirit of urban-rural understanding and cooperation should be especially meaningful to those here assembled. For surely, if prospective water demands for our population and industry cannot be met in other ways, there will be increasing attempts to recapture the water now devoted to irrigation and to divert it to municipal and industrial uses. Our fundamental problem is to develop sufficient sources so that our American society, in all its facets, may march steadily ahead.

By 1980 we know that the demands on this Nation's water resources will almost double; by 2000 they will triple. The total requirements for withdrawals from streamflow in 1954 were a little over 300 billion gallons daily. By 1980 they will be almost 560 billion gallons daily. Studies show that in the next 2 decades, as the result of increased efficiency in water utilization—and despite an additional 7 million acres which will come under irrigation—that the national requirements needed for irrigation will actually decrease. This is not so in the case of municipal and mining needs, which will almost double; nor in manufacturing needs, which will more than triple; nor in steam electric power cooling requirements, which will almost quadruple. In summary, by 1980, over 50 percent of our streamflow will be utilized and by the end of this century, over 80 percent. All of this water need not be lost. But if we are to keep down the cost of delivery and meet the demand we must give more attention to better conservation methods, effective pollution control, and make a greater effort to utilize and convert salt water.

I am glad to recall that in the field of saline conversion, I am a coauthor of the present law under which, through varying techniques, full-scale pilot plant research is being undertaken.

There, briefly, I have tried to sketch the goals. Knowing them, we must consider how we get there—the means. As I mentioned earlier, a major factor in restoring Western Europe and in fostering growth in America and here in California has been the stimulation of community and private initiative. As representative of the irrigation districts which have been responsible for so much of the development of our own State's water resources, you well know that the great bulk of the expenditure in this area has been made by you, by local government, and by private citizens. Of the 7½ million acres irrigated in this State, only 25 percent are the result of federally assisted projects.

To do the job that must be done if we are to harness nature, and to provide for an adequate water supply, obviously requires the cooperation of all levels of government and of private groups and individuals. Since most of our development is and will continue to be non-Federal, it is important that we have assurances that what we create will not some day be taken from us. The recent shocking assertion by the U.S. Department of Justice that the Federal Government, not California, owns all the rights to the unappropriated water in our State is an example of what I mean. This spider web—spun in typical bureaucratic style—attempts to spell out Federal ownership of all unappropriated western waters because of the 1848 peace treaty with Mexico. It is argued that ownership of all the unappropriated water is still retained unless it has been divested pursuant to an act of Congress. Other treaties have been found, such as the Louisiana Purchase from France in 1803 and the Spanish Cession of 1819, by which similar claims have been made in other parts of the Nation.

This amazing theory was first voiced in 1945 under a Democratic administration; it has been reechoed by the present Republican administration in the case of *The City of Fresno* v. *State Water Rights Board of California*. What some of us have objected to under present and past administrations, regardless of party, we shall object to under future administrations, regardless of party. I somewhat wistfully hope, however, that the new administration may reexplore the Justice Department position when it takes over next January.

State-Federal conflicts over the control and use of water are especially serious when one realizes that the projected demands in some of the western regions far outreach the present sources of supply. Such weird assertions by the Federal Government in the Fresno case, will inevitably retard State and private planning and action in attempting to meet growing needs.

I am well aware that there are several in this audience who have devoted their adult lives to the intricacies of Federal and State water law. But, I would like briefly to review the present status of a portion of our Federal law in this area. We might, indeed, discover that we have a more sophisticated governmental version of the old western rustler in our midst.

Early in our history, the Federal Government assumed the responsibility for the control, improvement, and protection of our navigable waters. Gradually, there arose a doctrine known as "dominant navigation

servitude," which means that the Federal Government has an absolute and preeminent right to control navigable waters—notwithstanding any prior usage of such waters under State law. It does not matter whether the stream concerned is interstate or intrastate. Long ago, one critic is said to have remarked that the test of navigability is whether a stream is navigable enough to float a Supreme Court opinion. Yet nowhere in the Constitution will you find the word "navigation." Federal control over that subject results from early Supreme Court decisions which held that the promotion of navigation was an essential part of the constitutional power: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." Thus, as a derivation of the interstate commerce clause and under its protective umbrella, much of the Federal effort in the water resource area takes place, such as the work of the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Still later, the Federal Government assumed a responsibility for flood control, irrigation, licensing private power development, and producing hydroelectric power as a byproduct of other multipurpose projects. More recently, legislation has added fish and wildlife preservation, recreation, sediment control, salinity control, and now shore protection and pollution control.

We have, in my view, abundant reason to be grateful for what the Federal Government has done to help our own State solve her water problem. Hoover Dam, here in southern California, the great Central Valley project in northern California, are two of many examples of what reimbursable Federal multipurpose dams have meant to us. Without them, we would not support our present day economy, nor our 16 million people. And with the prodigious undertaking at San Luis, which Congress approved this year, the Government of our country continues an indispensable partnership with the government of our State.

It is the continuing, and I sometimes think, the growing problem of State-Federal water relationships which casts its shadow on future development. The doubts which have arisen through administrative disagreements and regrettable lawsuits have a grievous tendency to throttle water development by every section of our Government. And those doubts need to be eliminated as we set our house in order for tomorrow. Permit me to allude to some of these questions.

A real danger arises in the case of projects built under the navigation umbrella. Questions occur as to the availability of Federal compensation for rights which have vested under State law.

For example, in 1956, despite a plea by the Federal Power Commission that the Congress might constitutionally abolish local water rights without compensation and that it had already done so under the Federal Power Act, the Supreme Court held in a case involving the Niagara Mohawk Power Co., that although the rights were "of a kind that is within the scope of the Government's dominant servitude, the Government has not exercised its power to abolish them." (*F.P.C.* v. *Niagara Mohawk Power Co.*, 347 U.S. 239 (1954), at 248.) The Court relied, in large measure, on section 27 of the Federal Power Act which, in language similar to section 8 of the Reclamation Act, recognizes vested rights acquired under State law.

A decision of importance to those interested in western water rights is *U.S.* v. *Twin City Power Co.* (350 U.S. 222 (1956)). In a 5–4 opinion, the Supreme Court held that the fifth amendment did not require compensation for the land value as a site for hydroelectric power, where Congress had authorized construction of a dam for multiple purposes, one of which was the improvement of navigation. Since the Twin Cities case was concerned with the use of the running waters of the Savannah River, and it had earlier held that it was inconceivable for the running water in a great navigable stream to be capable of private ownership (229 U.S. at 69), the Court decided that in this instance it was dealing with the Federal domain, "an area which Congress can completely preempt, leaving no vested private claims that constitute 'private property' within the meaning of the fifth amendment" (350 U.S. at 227).

A distinction was drawn by the Court with the so-called Gerlach case, which I am sure many of you remember, and which held that Congress in passing the Reclamation Act of 1902 had not preempted but rather recognized the property status of water rights vested under State law. This "classic" case arose here in California and was decided by the Supreme Court in 1950. Briefly, in *U.S.* v. *Gerlach Live Stock Co.* [339 U.S. 725 (1950)], the firm owned uncontrolled grasslands along the San Joaquin River and these grasslands depended upon seasonal floodings. The construction of Friant Dam put an end to the annual inundations and the company claimed compensation for deprivation of its riparian rights. Some owners had been willingly compensated by the Bureau of Reclamation but later others had not, including Gerlach. The Department of Justice argued that Gerlach did not have to be compensated since the Central Valley project had been authorized under the commerce power as a measure for the control of navigation. Gerlach and his associates contended that the construction of Friant Dam had no other purpose than that of irrigation. The Court noted that while the earliest congressional authorization for the Central Valley project had stressed "navigation," the Congress had later "reauthorized" the projects and provided that they be reimbursable in accordance with the reclamation laws. As is its customary practice in construing a Federal statute, the Court shied away from deciding any constitutional issues which had been posed such as whether by virtue of the dominant navigation servitude, the Government could destroy the flow of a navigable stream and thus carry away its waters for sale to private interests without compensation to those deprived of their water rights. The Court noted that:

"We have never held that or anything like it, and we need not here pass on any question of constitutional power, for we do not find that Congress has attempted to take or authorized the taking, without compensation, of any rights valid under State law" (at 737).

"Whether Congress could have chosen to take claimants' rights by the exercise of the dominant navigation servitude is immaterial," said the Court, since Congress had directed the Secretary of the Interior to proceed under the Reclamation Act of 1902, which provides that there will be no interference with State laws "relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder" (32 Stat. 388, 390). The Court concluded that Congress had "elected to recognize any State-created rights and to take them under its power of eminent domain." Indeed, the Bureau of Reclamation had sought to grant compensation for the State-vested rights and Congress had consistently appropriated money for that purpose. The Court found that this established operating practice was impossible to reconcile with the contentions of the Government as represented by the Department of Justice. It would not be the last time, however, that the Department of the Interior was to be embarrassed by a diametrically opposite position of its fellow Cabinet Department.

Another constitutional basis for Federal water resource development is found in the property clause of the Constitution (art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2), which empowers Congress "to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States * * *."

This clause has been of special importance for the development of water resources in the States of the West which were largely carved out of the public lands. It has provided the constitutional foundation for the Reclamation Act of 1902, as well as the basis for the disposal of the public lands. Beginning in 1866 and then in 1870 and 1877, the latter known as the Desert Land Act, Congress recognized the so-called appropriation system governing the use of water on the public lands. As you know, this doctrine, which is basic to the frontier spirit of the West, originated with the miners. The first appropriation of water in streams adjacent to lands used for mining was held to have a better right than the others which came later. "First in time, first in right." Related to this concept there evolved the corollaries of beneficial use and due diligence. To claim the use of the water one must not only get there first, but make use of it, and within a reasonable time.

The Desert Land Act of 1877 recognized these concepts when it stated that in addition to a bona fide prior appropriation, a previous right to the use of water: "* * * shall not exceed the amount of water actually appropriated, and necessarily used for the purpose of irrigation and reclamation; and all surplus water over and above such actual appropriation and use, together with the water of all lakes, rivers, and other sources of water supply upon the public lands and not navigable, shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public for irrigation, mining, and manufacturing purposes subject to existing rights." (Sec. 1, 19 Stat. 377; 43 U.S.C. 321.)

These concepts differ from the riparian doctrine more familiar in the Eastern United States, where rights to the use of water are based on ownership of adjacent land and do not diminsh with disuse.

In 1935, in *California Oregon Power Company* v. *Beaver Portland Cement Co.* (295 U.S. 142 (1935)), the Supreme Court had held that the Desert Land Act effected a severance from the land itself of all water upon the public domain that had not been previously appropriated, and extended the right of appropriation to any declarant who reclaimed desert land. Nothing in the Court's opinion implied that the United States retained ownership of any unappropriated waters on the public domain.

But now, alas, enters the pernicious doctrine that the United States owns all of the unappropriated water in a river to which I have earlier referred. This theory is not new. In 1945, a team of Department of Justice attorneys intervened in the case of *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming* (325 U.S. 589), which concerned an equitable apportionment between these States of the water of the North Platte River. According to the Supreme Court of the United States, Justice now argued: "The United States acquired the original ownership of all rights in the water as well as the lands in the North Platte basin by cessions from France, Spain, and Mexico in 1803, 1819, and 1848, and by agreement with Texas in 1850. It says it still owns those rights in water to whatever extent it has not disposed of them" (at p. 612).

The Court did not stop to determine what rights to unappropriated water of the river the United States may have. The Court found that the water rights on the Federal projects involved in the case before it had been obtained in compliance with State law. Whether they might have been obtained by

Federal reservation is not important. It appears, I think, that the Court believed the contention of Federal water ownership was not well founded. The Reclamation Act applied and the appropriation of water was made not for the use of the Government. On the contrary, relying on *Ickes* v. *Fox* (300 U.S. 82 (1937)), the Court held that the Government was simply the carrier and distributor of water. The water rights were the property of the landowners, wholly distinct from the property right of the Government in the irrigation works.

But then the Court added:

"We intimate no opinion whether a different procedure might have been followed so as to appropriate and reserve to the United States all of these water rights. No such attempt was made. Though we assume arguendo that the United States did own all of the unappropriated water, the appropriations under State law were made to the individual landowners pursuant to the procedure which Congress provided in the Reclamation Act. The rights so acquired are as definite and complete as if they were obtained by direct cession from the Federal Government. Thus even if we assume that the United States owned the unappropriated rights, they were acquired by the landowners in the precise manner contemplated by Congress" (p. 615).

"Thus, the question of the ownership by the United States of unappropriated water is largely academic so far as the narrow issues of this case are concerned" (p. 616).

But the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo again has been dusted off and the sleeping claims of Federal preeminence have been reawakened. They have been interjected into the case of *Arizona* v. *California*—whose final outcome means so much to the future of our State—and the Fresno case which I noted earlier.

On May 26, in the U.S. Senate, I attempted to analyze these claims in terms of both history and law. As a lawyer, I voiced my complete, unequivocal disagreement with the bizarre contentions so sweepingly advanced by the Federal attorneys. I repeat that disagreement now.

Let me mention one more judicial decision, the so-called Pelton Dam case of 1955 which imposed a "rocking chair" doctrine on the status of our water rights (*F.P.C.* v. *Oregon* (349 U.S. 435)). In December 1951, the Federal Power Commission had decided to grant the application of the Portland General Electric Co. for a license to construct and operate the Pelton project on a nonnavigable river wholly in Oregon. The State of Oregon objected that the company had failed to obtain a permit from its hydroelectric commission, and that State sovereignty extended to waters located within its boundaries since the Congress had separated the title to the land from the right to control the waters and had allowed the States to regulate the latter under the acts of 1866, 1870, and 1877. This case, in reality, arose because Oregon desired to protect some fish which it believed would be destroyed by the erection of Pelton Dam. Out of such simple facts and desires is constitutional history often made.

In the Pelton case it was not the navigation power that justified the granting of the Federal license but rather the property clause. The land on either side of the river on which the dam was to abut turned out to be within a Federal reservation. The Court distinguished "reserved" lands from "public" lands—the latter subject to private appropriations under the public lands laws—and held that since the acts of 1866, 1870, and 1877 were not applicable to "reserved" lands and waters, there was no need to consider Oregon's contention that they constituted express congressional approval to a State to regulate the use of waters within its boundaries.

Within a few weeks, the Department of Justice had amended its pleadings in the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy case to argue that as a result of Pelton, the rights of the United States to the use of waters flowing through or over reservations or withdrawals by the United States date to the act of withdrawal or reservation. While the matter was resolved by a consent decree, I mention it to demonstrate the alacrity with which the Justice Department attempts to widen the Federal scope.

On June 30, 1959, the United States filed a brief in *Arizona* v. *California* which read in part:

"By withdrawal of lands from the public domain and reservation thereof for Federal purposes the already existing right to use unappropriated appurtenant water is insulated against appropriation under local laws. The quantum of the right so reserved is at least the quantity of water necessary for the beneficial uses of the Government property. The right is not limited by past use, and is not lost by nonuse."

This contention is shocking and alarming. Imagine the probable effect. Presently, there are 225 million acres withdrawn or reserved by the Federal Government in the 48 mainland States and an additional 90 million acres in Alaska. Much human and monetary effort have been invested by State and local agencies and private groups and individuals subsequent to the time when most of this land was withdrawn early in this century. One distinguished American has rightly stated that:

"If this doctrine is held by the courts to be sound and Congress does nothing about it, it amounts to no less than a Sword of Damocles over the water rights which provide the basis for economic development and growth of all our Western States."

I wholeheartedly agree.

There is no requirement that the Federal Government shall have observed the corollaries of beneficial use or due diligence This is the "rocking chair theory." The Government thus could wait a decade or a century, and then move in and allege that its claims go back to the date of withdrawal. This is most unfortunate. Obviously, there is hardly a stream in the West which would not be affected since our watersheds are often in reserved areas, oil withdrawals, and national forests.

Those who contend such a thing have overlooked 36 statutes enacted by the Congress since 1866 which clearly show the congressional intention in this regard. They have overlooked as recent an enactment as section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, popularly known as the "O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment," where it is declared "to be the policy of the Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watershed within their borders, and likewise, their interests and rights in water utilization and control."

They have overlooked the words of a great progressive President, Theodore Roosevelt, who understood the importance of assuring community initiative in developing the American West, which the old maps long referred to as the Great American Desert. It was Theodore Roosevelt, who in his message to Congress, which resulted in the Reclamation Act of 1902, stated:

"The distribution of water, the division of the streams among irrigators, should be left to the settlers themselves in conformity with State laws, and without interference with those laws, or with vested rights. The policy of the National Government should be to aid irrigation in the several States and territories in such manner as will enable the people in the local communities to help themselves, and as will stimulate needed reforms in the State laws and regulations governing irrigation."

Thus, in section 8 of the Reclamation Act, we find: "* * * the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing herein shall in any way affect any right of any State, or of the Federal Government, or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream, or the waters thereof."

Against this intriguing, important, and complex background, the next Congress has abundant reason to act. In my view, it ought to adopt legislation which, generally, would:

1. Remove clouds on water rights previously vested under the laws of the 17 Western States;

2. Provide for future acquisition, under appropriate State law, of rights to the use of all unappropriated waters;

3. Provide adequate protection for all Federal interests in the use and development of such waters.

I said in the Senate earlier this year:

"The proposed legislation would attain these purposes by having Congress declare that all unappropriated waters, whether ground or surface, nonnavigable or navigable, are available for appropriation under State laws. Federal agencies and permittees, licensees, and employees of the Federal Government would be required to acquire property rights to the use of water under State law in carrying out Federal water uses. All existing rights of third parties under State or Federal law would be protected, including Indian rights."

Such congressional action, admittedly, will be exceedingly difficult to obtain. But it would be in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt. It would be in the interest of the American people. It would hasten the day of maximum development of a priceless natural resource. It would encourage cooperation. It would be invaluable in developing the Nation's strength. And beyond all that, it would, I think, be in keeping with the unique system of self-government which our American Constitution gives to all of us as our greatest heritage.